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ABSTRACT

THE SAMARKAND REGION OF SOGDIANA: FIGURINES, COSTUME AND IDENTITY; 2ND-1ST CENTURY BCE - 8TH CENTURY CE

FIONA JANE KIDD

This thesis presents a study of costume represented on figurines associated with the Samarkand region dated to between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 8th century CE. It has focused on three broad aims. First, to identify the characteristics of the costume. Second, to discuss the characteristics of Samarkand region costume in the context of comparative material from surrounding areas in order to facilitate a better understanding of the role and impact of these societies and influences on Sogdiana, and in particular the Zarafshan Valley. Third, to explore aspects of Sogdian identity in order to ascertain the place of Samarkand regional dress in this broader context.

For the period between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century costume portrayed on female figurines may be described as enveloping, showing general similarities with dress styles of contiguous regions, in particular Bactria and Chorasmia. Similarities in costume have also been noted during this period with the nomadic worlds of the Saka and Scythians. Male costume of this period is more fitted, reflecting strong similarities with that of the Kushan and Parthian empires.

For the early medieval period, between the 5th and 8th centuries CE, the repertoire of dress associated with the Samarkand region is considerably less than for the previous period, however, there are various types of headdresses. The main influence during this period is Sasanian, although there remains a certain degree of continuity in the costume from the previous period.

This thesis has identified a number of styles of ornamentation represented on costume portrayed on figurines from the Samarkand region of Sogdiana dated to between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century CE that may be identified with this region in particular. Although it remains difficult to gauge the role of such ornamentation in society, it is nevertheless clear that it is the ornamentation of garments rather than the garment or headdress type itself, which is distinctive of the region. The place of Samarkand region dress under the broader Sogdian umbrella is also difficult to define for various reasons. However, it is possible to say that it retained strong localised traits, which, on evidence available to date, have few details in common with the costume of broader Sogdiana and the Sogdian diaspora.
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Figure 29  Female figurine from Sakhsanokhur dated to the Kushan period (after Mukhitdinov 1973: fig. 3).
Figure 30  Terracotta head of a Scythian from the Caucasus dated to the 6th century BCE (after Krypnov 1940: 370).
Figure 31  Tang period figurine (after Mahler 1959: pI. 12b).
Figure 32  Tang period figurine (after Mahler 1959: pl.12a).
Figure 33  Tang period figurine (after Mahler 1959: pl.12d).
Figure 34  Tang period figurine (after Mahler 1959: pl. 19).
Figure 35  Hephthalite terracotta from Budrash (after Abdullaev, Rtveladze et al. 1991 v. I: 13, fig. 364).
Figure 36  Detail of winged headdresses on terracotta figurines from Afrasiab housed in the Tashkent Museum (after Abdullaev 1990: fig. 1, 8, 1 – VI).
Figure 37  Drawing of a Sogdian on the Statue of Darius (after Roaf 1974).
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Figure 48 Fragment of sculpture from Hadda dated to the Kushan period (after Barthoux 2001: pl. 75d).
Figure 49 Fragment of sculpture from Hadda dated to the Kushan period (after Barthoux 2001: pl. 52a).
Figure 50 Fragment of sculpture from Hadda dated to the Kushan period (after Barthoux 2001: pl. 66a).
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Figure 52 Male figure from a rock cut relief from Bisotun (adapted from von Gall 1969-70: 315, abb. 6).
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Figure 57 Detail of rock relief at Tang-i Sarvak (after Goldman 1997: b31).
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Figure 59 Illustration of headdress in fig. 58 (after Musche 1988: pl. VI, 1.2).
Figure 60 Detail of statue from Palmyra, 3rd century CE (after Dentzer-Feydy, J. and J. Teixidor 1993: cat. 197).
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Figure 62 Detail of headdress from capitals at Taq-i Bustan (after von Gall 1984: abb. 1).
Figure 63 Detail of headdress from capitals at Isfahan (after von Gall 1984: abb. 1).
Figure 64 Detail of headdress from capitals at Taq-i Bustan (after von Gall 1984: abb. 1).
Figure 65 Detail of Anahita from relief of Chosroes (591 – 628) at Taq-i Bustan (after Goldman 1997: A15).
Figure 66 Capital from Taq-i Bustan (after Ringbom 1957: fig. 8).
Figure 67 Stucco statue from Karashar (after Thordeman 1940: fig. 247).
Figure 68 Statue form Bajo-davane aman (after Jis1 1968: pl. 4, 2).
Figure 69 Statue from Uzdağ (after Jis1 1968: pl. 4, 3).
Figure 70 Detail of funerary bed from the Miho Museum. Dated to between the second half of the 6th to the early 7th century CE (after Miho Museum 1997: (L) p. 253, Panel E and (R) p. 251, Panel G).
Figure 71 Illustration of an ossuary from Aq-kurgan (after Pugachenkova 1994: fig 4b).
Figure 72 Kushan coin (after Rosenfield 1967: pl. II, 38).
Figure 73 Kushan coin (after Rosenfield 1967: pl. IV, 57).
Figure 74 Kushan coin (after Rosenfield 1967: pl. IX, 181).
Figure 75 Unprovenanced silver coin (after Ghirshman 1948: 13, fig. 9).
Figure 76 Detail of a wall painting showing a figure wearing a belt from room 1, object 24, Panjikent (after Raspopova 1980: fig. 67).
Figure 77 Illustration of a wall painting showing an image of a warrior from room 6/55, northern wall, Panjikent (after Raspopova 1980: fig. 55).
Figure 78 Wall painting from Miran, c. 3rd – 4th century CE (after Bussagli 1978: 18).
Figure 79 Wall painting from Miran, c. 3rd – 4th century CE (after Bussagli 1978: 25).
Figure 80 Reconstruction of costume from Tillya-tepe, burial 1 (after Sarianidi 1989: fig. 15).
Figure 81 Reconstruction of costume from Tillya-tepe, burial 2 (after Sarianidi 1989: fig. 17).
Figure 82 Reconstruction of costume from Tillya-tepe, burial 3 (after Sarianidi 1989: fig. 25).
Figure 83 Reconstruction of costume from Tillya-tepe, burial 4 (after Sarianidi 1989: fig. 88).
Figure 84 Reconstruction of costume from Tillya-tepe, burial 5 (after Sarianidi 1989: fig. 5).
Figure 85 Reconstruction of costume from Tillya-tepe, burial 6 (after Sarianidi 1989: fig. 41).
Figure 86 Reconstruction of female costume from Dzhety-asur (after Levina 1996: fig. 114, 1).
Figure 87 Reconstruction of female costume from Dzhety-asur (after Levina 1996: fig. 114, 2).
Figure 88 Reconstruction of female costume from Dzhety-asur (after Levina 1996: fig. 115).
Figure 89 Reconstruction of female costume from Dzhety-asur (after Levina 1996: 306, fig. 111, 1).
Figure 90 Reconstruction of female costume from Dzhety-asur (after Levina 1996: 306, fig. 111, 2).
Figure 91 Reconstruction of female costume from Dzhety-asur (after Levina 1996: 308, fig. 113, 1).
Figure 92 Reconstruction of female costume from Dzhety-asur (after Levina 1996: 308, fig. 113, 2).
Figure 93 Reconstruction of ceremonial female costume from Dzhety-asur (after Levina 1996: 313, fig. 118).
Figure 94 Reconstruction of costume from Koktepe (after Rapin 2000: 44, fig. 7).
Figure 95 Reconstruction of upper body garment from Ust-Edigan dated to the 1st – 2nd century CE (after Chudjakov 1997: fig. 5, 3 (L) and fig. 7, 3 (R)).
Figure 96 Reconstruction of the Katanda kandys, c. 5th - 6th century CE (after Potapov 1953: 69).

Figure 97 Woollen trousers from Noin Ula, c. 1st century BCE (after Trever 1932: pl. 22, 2).

Figure 98 Female mummy from Subeshi dating to the 6th - 5th century BCE (after Mallory and Mair 2000: pl. 6).

Figure 99 Headdress from Zagunluq dated to 1000 or 600 BCE (after Mallory and Mair 2000: 214, fig. 125).

Figure 100 Low boot from Grave 36 from the delta of the Qum Darya in the Lop Nor desert (after Bergman 1939: pl. 26, 6b).

Figure 101 Felt conical cap from Cemetery 5 (after Bergman 1939: pl. 10, 2).

Figure 102 Felt conical cap from Cemetery 5 (after Bergman 1939: pl. 11, 4).

Figure 103 Felt conical cap from Cemetery 5 (after Bergman 1939: pl. 10, 7).

Figure 104 Felt conical cap with ornamentation from Grave 36 (after Bergman 1939: pl. 26, 3).

Figure 105 Scythian gold clothing plaque (after Aruz, Farkas et al. 2000: cat. # 166).

Figure 106 Reconstruction of Scythian headdress from Chertomlyk. Late 4th century BCE (after Jacobsen 1995: fig. 32).

Figure 107 Detail of Scythian gold headdress from Karagodeuashkh. Late 4th century BCE (detail after Jacobsen 1995: fig.).

Figure 108 Unprovenanced gem from north west India (after Callieri 1997: pl. 65, Cat. U 7.43).

Figure 109 Illustration of jugate portrait from sealing, 306 – 350 CE (after Goldman 1997: T16).

Figure 110 Illustration of portrait bust on sealing dated to the 4th century CE (after Goldman 1997: B1).

Figure 111 Illustration of jugate portrait bust on sealing (after Goldman 1997: B2).

Figure 112 Illustration of portrait bust on sealing, 4th century CE or later (after Goldman 1997: B6).

Figure 113 Detail of frieze showing Scythian dress from a vessel from Kul Oba, 4th century BCE (after Jacobsen 1995: fig. 84).

Figure 114 Detail of female figure from unprovenanced Sasanian silver vessel (after Goldman 1997: A27).

Figure 115 Detail of female figure from unprovenanced Sasanian silver vessel (after Goldman 1997: A28).

Figure 116 Detail of female figure from unprovenanced Sasanian silver vessel (after Goldman 1997: A29).

Figure 117 Detail of an unprovenanced Sasanian silver bowl (after Goldman 1997: B10).

Figure 118 Detail of an unprovenanced Sasanian silver bowl (after Goldman 1997: B11).

Figure 119 Sasanian silver bowl (after Thordeman 1940: fig. 257).

Figure 120 Gold plaque from the Oxus Treasure (after Dalton 1905: pl. 14, 69).
Figure 121  Stucco plaque from Damghan, 6th – 7th century CE (after Goldman 1997: B46).
Figure 122  Felt wall hanging from Pazyryk, barrow 5 (after Rudenko 1970: fig. 154).
Figure 123  Parthian period bone figurine from Seleucia on the Tigris. (after Goldman 1997: b29).
Figure 124  Headdress worn by Tekke Turkman female (after Prokot and Prokot 1981: 48, fig. 69).
Figure 125  Tekke Turkman headdress (after Prokot and Prokot 1981: 40, fig. 58).
Figure 126  Comparison of cloaks shown on wall paintings from various sites dated to the early medieval period.
Figure 127  Comparison of figures wearing coats with right lapels represented in various media and dating to the early medieval period.
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By the Medieval period, the fame of Sogdian wealth, embodied in the idyllic image of Samarkand captured in the above quote by Muqaddasī, had spread far beyond its borders, carried along the bustling trade routes to the east and west of the Zarafshān Valley. Moreover, for centuries prior to this, the pivotal location of Sogdiana on these trade routes, its fertile oases and rich intellectual life rendered it a highly desirable conquest. This is demonstrated in various historical sources, including the records of the Achaemenid kings and Alexander the Great in the west and the annals of the expansionist Han Chinese government in the east, and culminating in the Muslim invasions of the early 8th century CE. These textual sources all provide a valuable snapshot of Sogdiana during various periods of its history, as seen from the outside. Paradoxically, however, an internal perspective on Sogdiana is largely missing from these records, and it has been left to the archaeologist to remedy this situation. Unfortunately, to date what has been recovered by archaeologists of Sogdian wealth, especially prior to the 4th century and the resurgence of urban life in the Zarafshān Valley, is precious little. This has rendered the historical past of Sogdiana at best sketchy.

Provenanced terracotta figurines and plaques from the Samarkand region of Sogdiana dated to between the 2nd - 1st century BCE and the 8th century CE are a critical source of evidence for Samarkand regional society during this period. Costume is one of the most visible methods of communication in both the antique and contemporary society. The study of the costume represented on provenanced terracottas from the Samarkand region provides significant insight on the way in which identity was communicated and is therefore intrinsic to the establishment of an integrated cultural history for Sogdiana.

This thesis documents and explores regional identity in the local Samarkand region of Sogdiana as manifest in the costume of local terracotta figurines and
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1 Muqaddasī: 248.
2 Roach-Higgins and Eicher 1992: 3 have discussed the usage of various terms to explore "modifications" and "supplements" to the body. They settle on the umbrella term dress "as the best technical term because other terms do not identify all possible modifications and supplements to the body that we believe dress includes". They suggest that the term "costume" serves to objectify elements. However, the definition given in the Oxford English dictionary for costume underlines the appropriateness of its usage in this thesis: "In historical art: The custom and fashion of the time to which a scene or representation belongs; the manner, dress, arms, furniture, and other features proper to the time and locality in which the scene is laid (obs.); hence, those belonging to a particular painting or sculpture." Dress, headdress and ornamentation are automatically included in the term costume, whereas in dress this is less specific.
Central Asia, Sogdiana and the Zarafshan Valley: the geo-political context

The original inhabitants of Sogdiana, the Sogdians, were a sedentary agricultural people who spoke Sogdian, an east-Iranian language. Evidence regarding their belief system(s) is nebulous, however, Avestan and Achaemenid period sources, together with those from the early medieval period, suggest that a localised form of Zoroastrianism was practised.

Sogdiana is situated in modern Uzbekistan. As such it is located in the desert zone of Eurasia, characterised by small fertile oases. According to Christian, the cultures of this entire zone “reflected a complex symbiosis between the strict demands of irrigation agriculture, and the cultural, commercial and military pressures of the pastoral nomads to their north, and agrarian empires to their south and east”.

Sogdiana is located in a region that is described variously in modern geopolitical terms. Transoxiana typically designates the region beyond the right bank of the Amu Darya (Oxus), including northern Bactria (Tokharistan), Sogdiana and Chorasmia. The Arabic term Ma warā’al-nahr covers a similar region. Shiratori describes the borders of Russian Turkestan as the Caspian Sea on the west, the Syr Darya (Jaxartes) in the north, the Pamirs in the east and the Hindu Kush in the south. This area is also known as western Turkestan, and embraces modern Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tadжikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. The terms Middle and Central Asia are also used quite liberally to describe this region. According to Soucek, Central Asia covers “western Turkestan and the western part of eastern Turkestan”. Finally, the term Inner Asia encompasses the countries of modern Kazakhstan, Kirghizistan, Tadжikistan, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Sinkiang and Mongolia.

A geographical description of Sogdiana in antiquity remains a contentious issue because of the confusing nature of evidence regarding its borders and the fluidity of borders over time. Nevertheless, there are several topographical features forming the natural boundaries of Sogdiana and the Zarafshan Valley, which can be
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3 Plaques (also referred to as tiles) from the Samarkand region are stamped low relief images. In the Samarkand region they are often characterised by a decorative border, sometimes giving the impression of a niche. They are usually arched or rectangular. They appear to have been used both on their own, and also incorporated into the walls of ossuaries. Figurines and plaques are referred to collectively as “terracottas” in this thesis.

4 Fieldwork and travel undertaken in both Uzbekistan and the Russian Federation was made possible by generous funding from several sources. Continual funding from an Australian Postgraduate Award (APA) between March 1999 and September 2002 allowed me to spend extended periods in Uzbekistan in order to learn Russian and access literature otherwise difficult to source from outside Central Asia. A grant-in-aid from the University of Sydney Near Eastern Archaeology Foundation in 2000 and 2001 and a grant-in-aid from the James Kentley Memorial Scholarship in 2002 allowed me to travel to Uzbekistan and the Russian Federation to access the various collections of figurines associated with the Samarkand region. The University of Sydney Central Asia Programme (USCAP) also provided valuable funding for travel in 2001 and 2002. I am indebted to these bodies for their support of my research.

5 Shkoda 1996; see also Grenet 1986.


7 Shiratori 1928: 81.

8 Soucek 2000: xi – xii.

9 Ibid.: xi.
understood as the “heartland of Sogdiana” (see Map 3). The Kyzil Kum desert forms a vast uninhabitable barrier between Sogdiana and Chorasmia to the north, while in the west the Oxus river forms a natural border. The Jaxartes river forms the eastern limit of the region. The southern border between Bactria, later Tokharistan, and Sogdiana is the most contentious. In several ancient written sources the Oxus is often understood to have formed Sogdiana’s border with Bactria during the Achaemenid and Hellenistic periods. However, the building of the Iron Gates at Derbent during the 3rd century BCE may indicate that the Hissar Mountains formed the southern boundary of the region, at least from this period.

The heartland of the ancient oasis of Sogdiana is centred on the lower Zarafshan River. Afrasiab (modern Samarkand, Hellenistic Marakanda) is perceived as the main political and administrative centre, at least during the Achaemenid and Hellenistic periods. However, textual and archaeological sources are largely silent on Afrasiab between the end of the Hellenistic period and the beginning of the Chinese Wei period (220 - 256 CE), when Samarkand and a number of other independent principalities are noted as making up Sogdiana. Despite the pre-eminence of the role given to Samarkand (recorded under the name Kang) in the Chinese sources dating from the early medieval period onwards, it should be recognised that there were other important centres in the broader region of Sogdiana, including the oases of Bukhara and Nakhshab and Panjikent.

The geographic location of Sogdiana has had a major impact on its history and foreign relations. During the Achaemenid period, Sogdiana served as the limit of the “civilised” world. Beyond the Jaxartes lay the “barbarian” world of the nomadic peoples known collectively from literary sources as the Saka. Similarly, from an eastern perspective, the ephemeral nomadic presence separating Sogdiana from the Chinese capitals rendered it nebulous and peripheral. Yet the social, political and economic relationship between the sedentary Sogdians and the nomadic peoples living along the Jaxartes had a significant impact on Sogdiana. Often the relationship between nomadic and sedentary peoples is an antagonistic one. However, political events, for example during the Hellenistic period, reflect the apparent socio-economic interdependency of the Sogdians and the nomadic peoples to their east, thereby making their relationship a close one.

The legacy of nomadic interactions in Sogdiana prior to the rise of Islam in that region has raised numerous problems for art historians and archaeologists. The nomadic lifestyle is one of mobility, located on the periphery of or external to the state, thereby making it difficult for a state to assert control. Moreover when nomadic peoples do form a sedentary (or at least semi-nomadic) state, their culture often becomes eclectic as they adopt various facets of the sedentary culture(s) and tolerate a wide variety of social and cultural practices. One of the implications of this in Sogdiana is the difficulty of identifying ethnic traits in archaeological, artistic and textual sources. This is further complicated by several issues including the decentralised nature of the Sogdian political/administrative system and the apparent regionalism within the broader state, the opening up of the region to trade, at least from the 3rd century CE, and the ensuing establishment of a Sogdian diaspora among trading communities to the east. These factors, together with the lack of visual
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10 See p. 53.
11 See Rakhmanov and Rapin 1999.
12 See p. 52ff.
13 See for example Barfield 1990: 153.
sources and the nature of early archaeological investigation undertaken in the region, have contributed to the enigmatic notion of Sogdiana.

**Costume and Identity**

An investigation of costume and aspects of identity portrayed on figurines from the Samarkand region facilitates an alternate perspective on the above mentioned historical issues. Costume, including dress and headdress, comprises three separate elements: textile or cloth, the garment or headdress itself, and ornamentation. The high visibility of costume underlines its critical role as an indicator of various horizontally and vertically defined identities in society. These include kin-based, social, political, economic and ideological identities. In ancient society costume served as an identity marker from the micro level, comprising the individual or family, to the macro, or state (national) level. Implicit here is the ability of costume to communicate non-verbally across all sectors of society. This demonstrates the intrinsic role of costume represented on terracottas from the Samarkand region, especially in the absence of other visual sources from Sogdiana prior to the appearance of wall paintings in the region in the early medieval period.

The definition of identities facilitates a clearer understanding of the way in which society functioned. The maintenance of socially constructed identity categories depends on maintaining and establishing difference, immediately defining what belongs to "us" and what belongs to "them". This suggests that all aspects of costume including fabric, the garment or headdress itself, and its ornamentation, together with the way in which it is worn, need to be considered, where possible, in order to attempt to understand what is being signified. Although costume only communicates part of the overall picture used to signal identity, its study can facilitate a clearer insight into the content and boundaries of these identity categories.

Identity is expressed in costume as a complex layering of socially defined categories, which allow people to negotiate their public and private lives. However, the layering of identities in ancient society is often rarely visible to and understood by scholars. To identify different social groups, it is important to understand who comprised these social groups. In the Sogdian context, this task is particularly difficult, especially for the period prior to the appearance of wall paintings, for which there is very little evidence regarding the makeup of urban or rural society. The figurines and plaques provide a valuable opportunity to begin to address this issue by defining individual aspects of costume, including ornamentation.

**Visual representations of Sogdians**

Images of people interpreted as Sogdian, and the issues they raise regarding the identity of Sogdians in general, are discussed in detail in Chapter 6. Nevertheless, several points should be underlined here regarding the problematic nature of the identification of Sogdians in archaeological and art historic literature. The archaeological record has yielded few images that can with any degree of certainty be
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14 See for example Gorshenina 1999.
15 See also Sørensen 1997: 96.
18 Barth 1969.
19 Hairstyle and jewellery and other forms of body ornamentation, for example tattooing and cosmetics, may also serve as important identity markers. See also Roach-Higgins and Eicher 1992: 2.
20 See for example Sørensen 1997.
identified as Sogdian. The earliest images of Sogdians have been identified on Achaemenid reliefs, although the accuracy of the details portrayed on these images remains questionable. There is a gap of close to a millennium before further images of Sogdians may be identified, such as those portrayed on wall paintings in various Sogdian centres, together with funerary reliefs from Sogdian trading communities representing, probably, members of the Sogdian diaspora. This highlights the important role of the Samarkand region figurines on two counts. Firstly, they help bridge this chronological gap. Secondly, the figurines from the Samarkand region are the largest collection of images to date, which were produced in the Sogdian heartland prior to the appearance of wall paintings in the 4th century CE. This suggests that the traits represented on the figurines are ones that may be associated in particular with that region. Additionally, as minor works of art the figurines potentially provide an insight on social membership groups whose legacy is otherwise rarely preserved in the archaeological record.

The term Sogdian often seems to be used as an umbrella term, especially in the context of trade. While the evidence points to the idea that Sogdians were prolific traders, it must be borne in mind that people from other regions were also traders. A representation of a "trader" should not unequivocally be identified as a Sogdian. Furthermore, usage of the umbrella term Sogdian often undermines the degree of regionality within Sogdiana itself, as demonstrated in various textual and other sources. This suggests that identifying traits on a very specific level, such as the Samarkand region, may in fact be instructive in understanding the transmission of identity markers among members of the diaspora. Finally, little distinction is made between images of Sogdians living in the diaspora and those living in the Sogdian heartland of the Zarafshan Valley. The establishment of a costume typology facilitates the possibility to begin to establish the criteria by which Sogdians living in the Zarafshan Valley were recognised. This may be then used to assess other images interpreted as Sogdian from other regions.

**Sogdian costume**

While the costume of surrounding regions, such as Bactria, Parthia and the Sasanian Empire has been the subject of a considerable amount of scholarly research, that of Sogdiana, and in particular the Zarafshan Valley, has only rarely been the focus of study. One of the main reasons for this is the lack of material from the region on which to base such a study. Naymark has discussed the early medieval costume of Sogdiana, defining the basic garment types worn by males and females.
and briefly commenting on aspects of social differentiation. Sogdian dress portrayed on wall paintings from the early medieval period has been discussed in particular by Lobacheva, Bentovich, Maytdinova and Yatzenko. The wall paintings are especially important as a comparative source because their size facilitates a much clearer picture of details such as ornamentation, as well as colour which is absent on the figurines. A recent study of early medieval Sogdian clothing by Yatzenko provides descriptions, including jewellery and fabric colour, of Sogdian clothing documented predominantly on wall paintings both within and external to Sogdiana. This is particularly important for a broader understanding of Sogdian dress, as such detail is generally not manifest on the figurines.

The scant research on Sogdian dress, especially prior to the early medieval period, has resulted in an ill-defined understanding of "Sogdian" identity. While the wall paintings of Sogdiana have the potential to illuminate many details of dress during the early medieval period for surrounding regions, there are few personages outside the Panjikent corpus that can be identified with certainty as Sogdian. Furthermore, iconographic representations shown on other media, such as coins (albeit rarely in the Sogdian case) and statuary are associated with certain, usually aristocratic or at least privileged, social groups. As a result such images cannot necessarily be seen as a window on the general population. The approach of scholars to the Samarkand figurines is typically from an iconographic perspective. In Sogdiana this has proved problematic as much of the iconography portrayed on the figurines - in particular attributes - is not immediately recognisable. Nevertheless, the perception of figurines and plaques as vernacular art forms suggests that they are a viable source for exploring issues of identity. This thesis - a study of the costume portrayed on the terracotta figurines and plaques - approaches the figurines from such a perspective, employing them to provide a database of characteristics typical of the Samarkand region. It will be shown in Chapter 6 that there are numerous problems in the attribution of Sogdian identity on the basis of visual representations. By providing a database of costume associated directly with the Samarkand region, it becomes possible to address this issue.

The figurine as a medium of enquiry

Figurines are a very common find on excavations throughout the Mediterranean, the Near East and Central Asia. They are a popular medium of enquiry because of their potential to yield information regarding ideological, ritual, political and social aspects of society. However, often the information interpreted from the figurines is greatly exaggerated, often to suit the political or intellectual agenda of the scholar. The study of figurines is also often limited by the tendency to

26 Lobacheva 1979.
27 Bentovich 1980.
30 Yatzenko 2003.
31 One exception is RM A19 276. To what extent such details on the figurines existed at all should be questioned. Although some images portray important detailing of ornamentation, the vast majority does not. There may be various reasons for this, including the size of the image, the status of the wearer, the function of the figurine, etc. See also p. 9, below.
32 The most obvious example of this is Maria Gimbutas and her work on the Upper Palaeolithic "Venus" figurines, which has received strong criticism from scholars promoting a feminist agenda. Both sides, however, are arguing from a political standpoint. See also Lee 2000: 111–114 for a brief
place them in stereotyped categories such as "mother goddess" or "fertility figurine". For the Sogdian figurines in particular, there has been a tendency to interpret female figurines under the broad umbrella of Anahita, the Avestan goddess of water and fertility. Such broad interpretations often act as a barrier to the study of the figurines from a local context. Another common theme in the study of Sogdian figurines is that of ethnicity.

In many cases the iconography and costume represented on these figurines is unique and, when viewed in comparison with other regions, reflects characteristics which may be interpreted as localised. The value of a study of the costume portrayed on the Samarkand region figurines lies in its ability to underline such specific, local, traits, thereby providing a critical comparative source for other regions, both within Sogdiana, and more distant.

One important question should be raised: to what extent is the costume portrayed on figurines from the Samarkand region indicative of costume worn by the general population? It is accepted that various elements of costume may be specific to deified and ruling figures. Nevertheless, comparisons drawn with the costume portrayed on statuary, wall paintings and other visual media from surrounding regions, in addition to that reconstructed from burials, implies that, at least in certain contexts, costume worn by the figurines is similar to that worn by the general population of the Samarkand region.

**Figurines from the Samarkand region**

The corpus of anthropomorphic terracottas from the Samarkand region includes both provenanced and unprovenanced material. Provenanced figurines come from three main sites: Afrasiab, Tal-i Barzu and Kafyr-kala (see Map 3). There is also a considerable collection of unprovenanced figurines associated with the Samarkand region housed in the State Hermitage, St. Petersburg. Male and female personages are represented among the preserved figurines. They are typically thought to portray divine figures, heroes/mythological figures and rulers. It is also possible that some of them represent individuals from privileged social positions.

There are several concerns in using terracottas, in particular those associated with the Samarkand region, to undertake research into regional society in Sogdiana. These are discussed in detail in Chapter 2. It is nevertheless important to mention some points here. The majority of provenanced figurines from the Samarkand region are either surface finds or come from a questionable stratigraphic context. Despite issues of provenance and stratigraphy, scholars who have studied the Samarkand region terracottas have divided them into two main chronological groupings: "Kushan" (loosely dated to between the 1st century BCE and the 4th century CE) and early Medieval (dated to between the 5th to 8th centuries CE). This framework is necessarily broad and must remain so until further finds of figurines from stratified contexts are made. The general theme of chronology has begun to be addressed by recent Uzbek-French excavations at Afrasiab, which have uncovered several figurines in stratified contexts. The dating framework used in this thesis essentially follows the discussion of this. Discussions by Bailey 1996, Hamilton 1996, Beck 2000 and Marcus 1996 are also valuable.
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35 See for example Meshkeris 1989; Mandel'shtam 1960; Zaslavskaya 1959.
36 These have been documented in an unpublished report by L. Sève n.d.. Most of these figurines are housed in the Afrasiab Museum and are included in the database in Appendix I.
that established by the French on the basis of their excavations in the Samarkand region (Afrasiab and Koktepe). In particular, the above two chronological periods remain similar, although the term "Kushan" is avoided for the earlier period, and the beginning of this period is pushed back by a century. Thus, the two periods, which provide the chronological framework for this thesis comprise an earlier period, dated to between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century CE, and a later, early Medieval period, dated to between the 5th and 8th century CE.

Previous research on terracottas from the Samarkand region has underlined the difficulty of addressing the chronological issues on the basis of figurines. Many of these problems can only be addressed through further excavation and remain a separate issue. For this reason specific questions regarding the chronology of the figurines and attempts at a narrowing of the current chronological framework based largely on ceramic evidence are not addressed in this thesis. The problems of chronology in Sogdiana for the period prior to the beginning of Islam are well recognised. Analysis of the costume represented on the terracottas cannot hope to definitively resolve such issues. However, it can add to a growing body of information regarding specific aspects of Sogdian culture and society, including the influences of past and contemporary societies as represented on costume.

Previous research

Figurines from the Samarkand region have been published by numerous scholars since the end of the 19th century when collectors began combing the ancient site of Afrasiab, and probably surrounding areas. Many studies of the figurines, including those by Veselovsky, Vyatkin, Trever, Mandel'shtam, and Zaslavskaya are characterised by a common theme of ethnic identity. This is based on physiognomy and costume and has tended to be very subjective. V. A. Meshkeris has published numerous studies of Sogdian terracottas since 1962, facilitating study into the art history and iconography of Sogdiana which, prior to the early medieval period, remains a relatively unknown subject due to the lack of material evidence. These studies are critical to current understanding of the figurines. In the light of more recent and continuing excavation by Uzbek, Russian, French and Italian teams in the area, in addition to other archaeological excavations in Central Asia, there is now a broader archaeological and theoretical framework in which to base a study of the costume represented on the figurines from the Samarkand region.

Limitations of the study

Despite the wealth of potential for costume studies, there are numerous limitations, especially from an archaeological perspective, that must be acknowledged. Provenanced figurines incorporated in this thesis may be associated with the Samarkand region, although many are without archaeological context. While
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37 See Sève n.d. regarding the dating of figurines from Afrasiab.
38 It is recognised that the use of such broad chronological limits may obscure important developments or changes in costume that would inevitably occur over a period of several centuries. Nevertheless, much more evidence represented on various media is required before such developments may be more closely defined.
39 Veselovsky 1887, 1917.
40 Vyatkin 1926.
41 Trever 1934.
42 Mandel'shtam 1960.
context is a critical factor for the interpretation of material remains in archaeology, there is still much to be gained, as shown above, from a study of the costume on the figurines from the Samarkand region.

The interpretation of costume from secondary sources, such as figurines, is by definition subjective. Archaeological evidence for costume typically comes from burials, yet even from the wider Central Asian region such evidence is relatively scarce, and there are no cases to date which have yielded costume that has been conclusively identified as Sogdian. Additionally, problematic issues in the reconstruction of the remains of garments and their ornamentation found in burials suggest a cautious approach to this type of evidence is required. It is also important to consider whether costume found in burials is representative of costume worn in life. Sørensen has suggested that costume found in burials is an important source for understanding the construction of social identity in life because in both contexts the expression of identity is based on similar ideas.

Various physical aspects of the terracottas, together with their state of preservation, impact on the elucidation of costume. The size of the figurines raises important issues regarding the representation of details. The majority of the figurines studied would have been less than 10 cm in length if fully preserved. While there is evidence to suggest that some of the figurines and plaques from the Samarkand region are based on monumental prototypes, their size on the other hand suggests that it would have been extremely difficult to replicate the level of detail found on such prototypes. This implies that certain features portrayed on the figurines are stylised, or possibly omitted completely. It is clear from the Sogdian wall paintings and other finds of clothing remains that detail of design, ornamentation and colour were an important aesthetic in early medieval Central Asian society. However, much of this detail appears to have been omitted from the terracottas. The reason(s) for this is unclear. It is possible that such details, including the application of coloured paint, were never added. It may also be that some details were originally stamped in low relief and have not been preserved. Alternatively, the level of detail may be connected with the function of the terracottas and the social levels at which they operated.

The preservation of the figurines in some cases also raises issues. The definition of details can be vague, especially if the figurine type is not recognised. One reason for this is their age. The continued use and re-use of moulds is another reason. The longer a mould was in circulation, the poorer the quality of figurine it would produce. This underlines the importance of working with a large corpus of figurines. When several examples of the same type are preserved, it is possible to define details and characteristics more exactly.

Finally, it should be noted that figurines from the Samarkand region do not appear to have been intended to be viewed in the round. Only very rarely are details shown on the rear of the figurine and they appear to have been made for frontal viewing only. Again, this presents a serious limitation for the study of details of the costume.

These problems are further compounded by the eclecticism of Sogdian art. Various attributes pointing to surrounding regions, especially Scythia, Parthia, Sasanid Iran and the Turkic Kaghanate, together with more localised influences, can

45 See for example the recent study by Yatzenko 2001 who reassesses the remains of costume in the Tillya-tepe burials. See also the differences in the reconstruction of the Tillya-tepe costume in Sarianidi 1985, 1989.
47 For example Meshkeris 1979b.
be detected on the terracottas. One of the peculiarities of Sogdian art, especially during the early medieval period, is the unique combinations of iconography and the manner in which the details are portrayed on figurines and plaques. During the period covered by this thesis (i.e., 2nd – 1st century BCE – 8th century CE), Sogdiana was never a fully centralised state, but was characterised by small fortified towns and larger cities. Consequently, there was no court or dynastic art. Instead examples of Sogdian art, in particular terracotta art, appear to be regional and diversified, possibly reflecting the liberty of craftspeople in creating their works.48

Costin has stated that "...figurative representations are best interpreted within the context of where they were made, for whom they were made, why they were made, and with background of their creators."49 Unfortunately, in the case of the figurines in question, this knowledge, and avenues leading to it, is lacking. Nevertheless, with the previously outlined limitations in mind, there is much visual information embodied in the costume of the figurines that can be used to explore some aspects of identity in the Samarkand region.

Use of ethnographic sources

The use of ethnographic and ethno-archaeological sources to better understand ancient society is a contentious practice with much literature devoted to it.50 Stark has cautioned that "although ethnographic data are still used to derive direct material correlates for prehistoric human behaviour in a traditional matter, there is reason to believe that no direct analogs exist among societies for prehistoric societies."51 Similar sentiments are echoed by other scholars.52 On the other hand, Gibbs argues that ethnographic material may be used "as a heuristic device, that is, to generate ideas and possibilities."53 There is a very large body of ethnographic and ethno-archaeological material, and its sheer diversity underlines the need for caution in its application to the archaeological record.

Modern ethnographic literature documenting traditional dress in the Samarkand region provides considerable information regarding issues of identity.54 Two different types of modern ethnographic literature regarding Central Asia and Uzbekistan have been consulted for this thesis: 18th and 19th century Russian and English language travel literature, and 20th century ethnographic studies of traditional dress in Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and Tadzhikistan, primarily by Russian scholars. The early travel literature was written during the period of political expansionism under the colonial governments of England and Russia (known as the "Great Game"). Some of this literature is especially important as it dates largely to a period prior to English or Russian influence on the greater population. However, several comments should be made regarding the nature of observations made in these accounts. Namely, the dress worn by the people described and depicted in these early diaries, logs and accounts would have undergone rapid development and change during and after this time, especially as the influence of Russia pervaded the region. The documentation of dress is never the focus of these accounts, but is noted in passing, highlighting what
was noteworthy from an external perspective rather than what was "normal" for the subject peoples. Images created from the perspective of a traveller almost certainly would not have been documented from a purely academic perspective but more from a sense of curiosity or novelty. It is also possible that the travellers may have had only a limited understanding of the details of the dress that they drew and described. Nevertheless, even from a cursory glance at the images of the people that the travellers' accounts deal with, it is clear that a similar cut and combination of garments has remained relatively stable from antiquity. In many cases they continue to be worn today.

A valuable body of 20th century ethnographic literature documenting the clothing of the Samarkand region provides valuable insight into the costume of this region and the use of identity markers in society. Much of this literature details specific garment types, including their construction, and is therefore another important source for visual comparison. This literature also notes the function and development of costume from the mid-19th century up to the Soviet period and in particular it documents the layering of identities relevant to these periods. This is critical to understanding the society in which the costume was worn as it underlines the potential of costume in defining identities (although it is still often very difficult to define the identities embodied in the various symbols). Nevertheless, temporal and contextual factors prevent this information being used to identify similar social categories in ancient Sogdian society on the basis of the terracottas, although such a possibility for their existence cannot be denied.

It is indeed possible to define various superficial similarities in the types of dress and headaddresses worn in modern Central Asia with those of antiquity, thereby suggesting that visual comparisons with modern traditional dress from this region should not be ignored. These include female costume characterised by a long, loose fitting dress worn over loose fitting trousers, and a headscarf. However, the limitations noted above indicate the serious issues in using this type of evidence for anything more than visual comparative purposes.

In this thesis ethnographic material has been used primarily to clarify or better understand the representation on the terracottas of specific garments and headaddresses and the ways in which they were worn. This means it has been used only as a visual comparative source. It has not been extended to provide conclusive semiotic or semantic interpretations of the costume and ornamentation shown on the terracottas. Ethnographic material has also not been used to provide interpretations of the possible context(s) in which the figurines may have operated.

**Methodology**

The primary material for this thesis is the anthropomorphic terracotta figurines and plaques associated with the Samarkand region. The primary focus of the thesis is the costume, including dress and headaddresses represented on these terracottas. Collections of terracottas associated with the Samarkand region are housed in numerous museums across the Russian Federation and Uzbekistan. Terracottas from two collections, the Kastalksy and Veselovsky collections, are held in the State Hermitage, St Petersburg. Other collections are held in Uzbekistan, at the Samarkand.
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56 The identification of jewellery types is not included in this thesis. In the majority of cases not enough diagnostic elements are retained (if they were ever portrayed) for useful, objective study. One of the reasons for this may be the size of the terracottas. In cases where details are visible, these are briefly commented on. Their discussion, however, is limited.
Museum,\textsuperscript{57} the Afrasiab Museum, located at that site, the Samarkand Institute of Archaeology and the Samarkand Kraevedchesky Museum. The terracottas housed in these five museums were personally documented there during visits between 2001 and 2002. The State University of Samarkand houses a very small collection of figurines, none of which show diagnostic elements of costume and were therefore not included for study in this thesis.\textsuperscript{58} A small collection of Samarkand regional terracottas is held in the State History Museum in Moscow, which I was unable to visit. There is another collection held in the History Museum in Tashkent to which I was unable to gain access. Terracottas from these two latter museums are only included for comparative study in this thesis where they have been clearly reproduced in publication.

Due to the focus of this study, the catalogue of terracottas established for study is not exhaustive; rather it is a selection of figurines based on relevance to the study of costume. The primary reason for the inclusion of a figurine is the preservation of diagnostic attributes of costume. Only sighted figurines were considered for inclusion in this study. This means that numerous published figurines associated with the Samarkand region were excluded. This factor has led to some incongruities in the typology whereby certain garments or headdresses have been marked as unprovenanced due to the absence of provenanced pieces in the collections studied, when in fact there are provenanced pieces from other collections that have not been included in this study. In such cases, the undocumented pieces are clearly referred to in the discussion of comparative material. The primary reason for the exclusion of all non-sighted figurines from this study was the quality of published images of Sogdian figurines generally. The nature of the typology adopted for this study depended on the identification of details of costume. In many cases the preserved state of a figurine makes this task a difficult one, even when it is viewed from life. The quality of photographs and illustrations in published literature tends to compounds this issue, leading to subjective interpretations of detail. One means of overcoming this has been to supplement discussions of comparative material with references to non-documented Samarkand region figurines.

The total assemblage of figurines and plaques documented during research for this thesis comprises five hundred and ninety-six pieces. These are included in a catalogue (Appendix I), which provides, where available, details of provenance and publication(s). Of these figurines, 111 are used as type examples in the typology. Type examples are those figurines that demonstrate most clearly the specific attributes of a garment or headdress. Some figurines are listed as type examples for more than one garment or headdress type. Illustrations or photographs have been included for all type examples in the pages following the dress and headdress typologies. Type examples have been highlighted in the catalogue by means of a double underline under the relevant museum identification numbers. In cases where a figurine has no available museum number but has been used as a type example, the bibliographic references have been underlined instead.

It should be noted that the nomenclature of figurines in some collections has been standardised in the catalogue to facilitate sorting. In the A and SA collections\textsuperscript{59} museum numbers have been standardised to a four digit number system. For example, the figurine referenced A587 in the text will be found as A0587 in the database. In the RM collection the numbers have been standardised to a six digit system. For

\textsuperscript{57} Museum of History of Culture and Art of the Peoples of Uzbekistan.

\textsuperscript{58} These have been published in Avanesova 1976.

\textsuperscript{59} See p. 37.
example A19 99 in the text becomes A019 099 in the catalogue. The integrity of the original museum nomenclature has been maintained throughout the text.

Plates showing comparative illustrations are organised initially according to the category of artefact (e.g., terracottas) or visual representation - monumental statuary, wall paintings and so on. Within these groups images are sorted geographically, and finally, chronologically. There are two primary justifications for this. Firstly, although an image may come from a particular region, it does not necessarily represent the local inhabitants of that region. For example, wall paintings from Afrasiab represent various delegations of the surrounding regions. Secondly, it is possible that artefact categories such as terracottas functioned in different contexts to, for example, monumental statuary. The intended audience of the wall paintings would have been different to that of terracottas, and the messages embodied in each type of representation may also have been different.

The most immediate issues in dealing with the terracottas from the Samarkand region, as discussed above, are those of provenance and chronology. The figurines from the Kraevedchesky Museum and the State Hermitage, comprising the Kastalsky and Veselovsky collections, are unprovenanced. However, it is understood that all of the figurines from the Afrasiab Museum were found at Afrasiab. Some were recovered from stratified contexts, while others were surface finds. This is also true for the few examples included in the study from the Samarkand Institute of Archaeology. Figurines from the Samarkand Museum comprise various collections coming from the site of Afrasiab and its surrounds. Many of these are also without a clear stratigraphical context.

Figurines housed in the various museums in Samarkand were photographed where possible and in some instances drawn. Figurines held in the two Hermitage collections were documented by means of illustrations by the author. Permission for photographing these figurines was unable to be obtained as only a comparatively small number of them has been published. Given the size of these two collections (approximately 2000 pieces altogether, including zoomorphic figurines and some small architectural details) and the relatively short period of time (approximately 10 weeks) spent in St Petersburg, it was not possible to illustrate every piece individually. Pieces were selected for illustration on the basis of their preservation and variation of details, and on whether or not they were a different type from those, which had been previously photographed in Samarkand. It should be noted that the author had only limited experience of technical drawing prior to coming to the Hermitage. While every effort has been made to ensure that the drawings are technically correct and that the representation of details on the figurines is faithful, the limitations of single dimensional line drawings are nevertheless recognised. One of the aims in the documentation of the figurines was to note the variations in ornamentation and garment and headdress styles. For example, close attention was paid to figurines of the same type or series, but which portrayed differences in the ornamentation of the costume.

The catalogue (Appendix I) of figurines discussed above is the database on which the typology used for this thesis was established. The typology is discussed fully in the introduction to Chapter 4. One of the guiding aims in the construction of the typology was the need to recognise the potential for different levels of signalling in costume, including the cut and shape of a garment or headdress and its

---

60 Numerous figurines were unable to be included in the study because the preservation of detail was too poor. In omitting such examples it is nevertheless important to be conscious of the issues in compiling a database of quality examples at the expense of quantity.
Although the meaning of such symbolism is very difficult to investigate in the absence of archaeological context, this nevertheless facilitates a closer definition of characteristics specific to the Samarkand region. Another aim was to allow for future comparative examinations of the costume represented on figurines from the Samarkand region with that on figurines and other visual representations from other regions.

Summary

The study of costume represented on terracotta figurines and plaques from the Samarkand region, dated approximately from the 2nd - 1st century BCE to the 8th century CE, has the potential to provide an alternate perspective on the social, cultural and political history of Sogdiana during this period to those offered in the scholarly literature to date. An investigation into the costume of the Samarkand region of Sogdiana facilitates the study of a localised region in Sogdiana. It also provides a potential means of exploring the multi-dimensionality of identity in Samarkand society. Furthermore, it is hoped that with the further study of costume styles and attributes from other regions of Sogdiana, ideas of the visual construction of regional (and other) identities will emerge.

This thesis is divided into three broad sections. Chapters 1, 2 and 3 provide the theoretical and historical background to the figurines and the Samarkand region. Chapter 2 introduces theoretical and practical aspects of the study of figurines in general, and then uses this context to assess figurines from the Samarkand region as a body of primary material. Chapter 3 presents a micro-view of the history of Sogdiana and the Samarkand region in particular. Chapter 4 presents the typology of costume associated with the Samarkand region and discussion of the comparative material. Chapters 5 and 6 discuss the art historic context of the costume. Chapter 5 defines more closely the local traits of Samarkand regional costume, while Chapter 6 places this in the broader context of Sogdian dress as a means of better understanding issues in the representation of Sogdian identity.

The aim of this thesis is threefold. The first is to identify the characteristics of costume from the Samarkand region. This will be achieved by means of a typology of the costume represented on terracottas. The second is to discuss these traits in the context of comparative material from surrounding regions. This will facilitate a better understanding of the role and impact of these societies and influences in and on Sogdiana. The third aim is to explore current evidence regarding the identification of Sogdians from art historic sources, both in the Sogdian heartland of the Zarafshān Valley, and also in the Sogdian diaspora, which emerged with the development of the trade routes. Although the makeup of specific identity groups within Samarkand regional society are not yet understood, these aims will facilitate the development of a deeper understanding of the representation of local identity in the Samarkand region.

---

The study of “Sogdian” terracottas has typically focused on those from the Samarkand region, as they are the most numerous and widely published. However, collections from other regions in Sogdiana, such as the Nakhshab and Bukhara oases and Panjikent, should also be included under the “Sogdian” umbrella. Each of these regions has yielded important collections of figurines that share few stylistic traits with each other, indicating the importance of localisation within broader Sogdiana. Despite the diverse geographical and chronological context of discoveries of terracottas in Sogdiana and Central Asia generally, there remain serious lacunae in general understanding of their value and function in the sacred and secular worlds, and the economic context in which they operated. In Sogdiana, these issues are compounded by the lack of art historic and archaeological evidence with which to understand the institutions and mechanics of Sogdian culture and society. These factors have serious implications for the study of identity on the basis of the costume represented on terracottas from the Samarkand region.

This chapter will survey the research issues involved in the study of figurines as artefacts, and more specifically, the terracottas from the Samarkand region. Part I provides an overview of the theoretical possibilities and the practical realities of establishing identity in antiquity on the basis of costume. Part II looks at the terracottas as archaeological artefacts. Part III details the specific issues related to the study of the terracottas from the Samarkand region.

1. Costume and Identity in Archaeology

Costume and the study of identity

Sørensen defines identity as “the characteristics of an individual or group that are assigned and assumed by the group and others as a result of perceived differences from and similarities to others. These identities are created and assigned qualities, which result in both cohesion and separation, and material culture is employed in a variety of ways to express them. It is thus different from, for example, subjective personal self-identity.”¹ The expression of political, social, cultural, economic, kin and regional identities was a critical means of negotiation in ancient society. The creation and expression of difference implies that the boundaries of identity categories were changed as society developed under different influences. It also suggests that as an individual moved through the various categories some identities were added or removed while others remained stable.

Costume is understood in this thesis to comprise three parts: 1) the cloth or textile from which it is manufactured; 2) the sum of pieces of cloth making up the garment or headdress itself; and 3) the ornamentation of the garment or headdress.³ Cloth and textile are not considered as variables in the typology (see Chapter 4).

¹ For figurines from the Bukhara region see Ad'ilov 1983 and Akhrarov and Usmanova 1990. For figurines from the Nakhshab oasis see most recently Suleimianov 2000. For figurines from Panjikent see Bryikina 1999; Marshak, Litvinsky et al. 1985 and Marshak 1964.
² Sørensen 1997: 94.
³ This is similar to Sørensen 1997: 96. However, ornamentation is not limited to a separate group, but instead makes up part of the overall costume.
because it is not usually possible to recognise the type of cloth represented on the figurines. However, it is likely that the use of a particular type of textile, its colour and embroidery, were important repositories of signalling. Garments and headdresses, and their ornamentation, are taken as the elements to which meaning is applied. This meaning may be applied either individually, in the garment or headdress (i.e., cut, length, style of neckline etc.), or in the ornamentation. Alternatively, meaning may be found in the combination of these (and other) elements. In identifying the individual parts making up the entire costume, it is possible that certain elements are being (unconsciously) objectified in the typology. However, this method potentially shows more clearly the physical construction of identity through the elucidation of its constituent parts.

The use of codes and the construction of identities

"Codes" or symbols are used as a signalling device to communicate to others (and the self) the various identities embraced by an individual. Costume "codes" are manifest in various guises. The manner of wearing a garment, the cut of a garment, the colour, the type of fabric, and the type and placement of ornamentation all immediately signal a message to those within the group. A message is also sent to those outside a group unable to read the specific codes, thereby creating difference. Costume is one of the primary vehicles for the expression of identities because of its ability to communicate non-verbally.

Codes are not necessarily static. Rather they changed as a person changed or evolved their identities, sometimes becoming layered together with other identities, sometimes being altogether discarded. Static codes such as tattoos or other permanent body markings may be indicative of a stable identity, whereas non permanent items, such as pins or belts or a specific headdress may signify a more transitional or dynamic identity. However, permanent items could also be changed by the addition of other elements, such as new lines on a tattoo. It may be assumed that some codes yielded a greater significance on their own, while others were read in combination with other codes. The codes were also malleable as fashions changed, and individuals expressed their choices from within a defined set. This implies that subjectivity plays an important role in their interpretation, a factor which in many cases may render the codes difficult to interpret from the archaeological record alone.

The physical development and production of these signifiers, for example the specific mineral or vegetable dye used to colour fabric or the materials used to make a bead, is limited to the availability of materials to the producer. In this respect it is possible to argue that availability to resources was a factor in the establishment and development of these codes. "...Relationships among the interlinked systems of technology (involved in creating dress) and systems of aesthetic and moral beliefs, which limit how identities can be expressed, are both intricate and subject to alteration as change in one of the systems is likely to stimulate change in the others."8

---

4 A judgement may occasionally be made regarding the thickness or other nature of the fabric on the basis of the drapery or the apparent "rigidity" of a garment. However, this becomes very subjective.

5 Costume represented on wall paintings would provide fertile ground for inquiry into these aspects because of the level of detail, such as motifs, and also their use of colour. See however p. 261 regarding the limitations on the use of colour in wall paintings.


7 See p. 9 for a discussion of the issue of subjectivity in the study of the costume portrayed on the figurines.

Michelle Marcus in her study of objects from Hasanlu in Iran has shown that it is possible to detect various socially constructed identities in Hasanlu society that are not otherwise immediately visible. On the basis of finds of clothing pins in graves, together with those found on a group of people killed in an incidental situation, Marcus has discussed the promotion of individual and group identity of males, females and children within and without the larger social group in Iran during the early first millennium BCE. Marcus suggests that the presence of clothing pins on predominantly females and children may reflect a specific means of communicating status and group affiliation to extended groups within and without Hasanlu society. They may also reflect specific issues concerning the role of females and children in society, such as their vulnerability. On a much wider scale, the perception of the pins as weapons also communicates a message of power to invading societies, a real threat during this period, while to the immediate society their size, and the access of the wearers to iron, also communicates a specific economic status. This example clearly underlines the various realms in which codes could be read, and the value in understanding them.

Ethnic identity: modern and ancient

Almost all previous studies of figurines from Sogdiana have at least in part focussed on the definition of ethnic groups making up the local population(s). The groups are defined according to both race and ethnicity and include Indo-Europeans, Mongolians, Scythians, Turks. These definitions are based predominantly on physiognomic considerations and are very subjective. Costume is also used to support these identifications, however, the observations are very general. This raises the question of the definition of ethnic groups in the archaeological record. Historical sources suggest that at least three broad population groups existed in Sogdiana between the 2nd century BCE and the beginning of the 8th century CE: the Sogdians, the nomadic “Saka”, possibly including the Kangju, and, from at least the 4th century CE, Turkic speaking peoples. The terms “Turkic speaking” and “Saka” are umbrella terms, and it is likely that they incorporated various groups who identified themselves differently from others under the same umbrella. Several critical points should be mentioned regarding the identification of ethnicity in antiquity, which highlight the problematic nature of the ascription of such identity groups on the basis of archaeological evidence.

Ethnic groups can be defined as “self-conscious identity groups constructed through the process of social and cultural comparison vis-à-vis others...”. They allow interrelations to be built with surrounding peoples, and may have been especially important for the eclectic population of Samarkand. Following Barth, ethnic identity can be attributed to populations which: 1) are biologically self-perpetuating; 2) share fundamental cultural values, realised in overt unity in cultural forms; 3) make up a field of communication and interaction; and 4) have a

---

10 Ibid.
12 Mandel'shtum 1960; Meshkeris 1968; Zaslavskaya 1959.
13 See below, p. 55 and p. 60ff.
14 It has also been argued that the Kangju were a Turkic speaking people. For example see Shiratori 1928.
membership which identifies itself and is identified by others, as constituting a category distinguishable from other categories of the same order.\textsuperscript{16}

For archaeologists the notion of self identification is problematic because of its subjectivity. An individual may wear symbols associated with an ethnic group for various reasons, including self protection and social acceptance. However, this does not necessarily infer that the individual ascribes to that ethnic group. There are several clear examples of this in the Sogdian context discussed in Chapter 6. Ethnic identity can be used as a survival and adaptive tool and the presence of elements relating to a specific ethnic group should not immediately imply the intrinsic membership of an individual to a specific population group. This suggests that the attribution of ethnic identity in antiquity should be approached with great caution.

Ancient conceptions of ethnicity

The construction and development of ethnicity in ancient societies is a topic that is receiving growing interest and an increasing body of literature to propound it.\textsuperscript{17} Very often ethnic groups are described as sharing a similar territory, language, religion and way of life. However, such \textit{a priori} assumptions limit our understanding of the concept and function of ethnicity in antiquity and should be accepted with caution as ultimately they deny the possibility of pluralist societies.\textsuperscript{18} As Kamp and Yoffee have noted, "people may live in the same environment and face the same problems of subsistence, yet their values and material culture may reflect quite different ethnic traditions."\textsuperscript{19}

Modern conceptions of ethnicity are very much interwoven with 19\textsuperscript{th} century movements of nationalism and imply a very different picture to the implications of the term in antiquity. Sources from the first millennium CE reveal a number of indicators that were taken into consideration when ascribing ethnicity: language, appearance, costume, arms and weapons, lifestyle, kin, religion.\textsuperscript{20} As noted above, modern scholarship has also highlighted more subjective indications of ethnicity, such as the sense of belonging to a particular group.\textsuperscript{21} Regarding perceptions of ethnicity in the Achaemenid Empire in relation to tribute payments amongst subject groups, Briant comments, "the term \textit{ethnos} corresponds fairly closely to a word used by the Great Kings in their inscriptions, \textit{dahyu}. Both refer to a community and to the territory in which that community lived and reproduced.\textsuperscript{22} Briant also discusses the concept of status amongst the Persian nobility. He comments, "the Greek authors make it very clear that "Persian" ethnicity refers to distinct social realities\textsuperscript{23} which include noble birth, but also being held in favour by the king. This indicates the importance attributed to status.

In fact, in many cases in antiquity it is the expression of status (based broadly on socio-economics, politics and religion) which appears to have taken precedence over ethnicity. Interpretations of material culture in the archaeological record typically focus on manifestations of status as this is predominantly what is preserved.\textsuperscript{24} Expressions of group affiliation are often strengthened during periods of

\textsuperscript{16} Barfield 1990: 10-11.
\textsuperscript{17} Pohl 1998; Millar 1998.
\textsuperscript{18} See especially Kamp and Yoffee 1980: 95.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.: 88.
\textsuperscript{20} Pohl 1998.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.: 20-21.
\textsuperscript{22} Briant 2002: 393.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid.: 331.
\textsuperscript{24} See for example Marcus 1994.
instability and uncertainty, and they may be seen equally as an expression of status in a power-play. If, as Pohl suggests, "ethnicity is about being different", then inherent in this is the concept of status whereby the expression of difference immediately implied a perceived or real status in comparison with an external "other". Many of the foundations of ethnicity incorporate a broader concept of status, ultimately expressing a desire to be different or to prove difference, almost always ultimately for political (power) means. Pohl suggests that "ethnic distinction becomes important when elites also display their ethnic diversity, for instance the Ottoman Turks in the Balkans. Otherwise, dress serves as a social marker rather than for ethnic distinction, that is vertically. Horizontally, it rather distinguished small communities, for instance villages, in a neighbourhood that falls within the limited horizon of most of its members". This suggests that the expression of status, rather than specifically ethnicity, may be a more fruitful avenue of research when trying to locate specific population groups in the archaeological record.

The nature of Sogdian society during the period from the 2nd–1st century BCE to the early 8th century CE – a mixture of nomadic, semi-nomadic and settled peoples living in various small principalities – suggests an eclectic but interdependent mix of peoples and lifestyles. This implies an extraordinarily complex web of interaction and pluralism during what appears to have been a relatively stable period. Taken together with the fact that detailed evidence regarding Sogdiana is limited, and the absence of context for the majority of the figurines, discussions of identity in Sogdiana remain necessarily limited. In a practical sense, however, as will be shown later in this chapter, while it is important to recognise that such groups existed in society, on the basis of current evidence, the illumination of these groups and their make-up in a Sogdian context must remain a task for future scholarship.

Regional identity

Considerations of ethnic identity in antiquity indicate that the idea of status may be more useful for regions such as Sogdiana whose history is characterised by relative stability. It is nevertheless possible to approach identity from a different perspective - that of regional identity, on the basis of provenanced terracottas. Although it should be recognised that under the broad umbrella of regional identity numerous other identity groups existed, the definition of such identity groups establishes a critical comparative source, while also providing a better understanding of the construction of identity at a localised (i.e., Samarkand) level.

There are several sources of evidence suggesting that regionality within Sogdiana played an important role. Collections of terracottas from various centers in Sogdiana demonstrate clear differences in style and type series, indicating localised production, or at least production for a localised market. Although some comparisons have been made between the costume represented on the Samarkand region figurines and that portrayed on figurines from other regions in Sogdiana, it is clear that the figurine collections from Panjikent, western Sogdiana (the Bukhara oasis) and southern Sogdiana (the Nakhshab oasis) are on the whole independent of each other. The construction of Sogdian personal names used among members of the Sogdian

26 Ibid.: 40.
27 See generally Chapter 3. Despite the numerous waves of nomadic peoples entering Sogdiana, either settling there or passing through the region, there is little evidence of wide scale destruction associated with their appearance.
28 See for example Suleimanov 2000: 203.
diaspora also indicates the importance of Sogdian regionality. Written sources from China show that Sogdian personal names often included the name of a region in Sogdiana (eg. Kang or An), presumably indicating the origin of the individual or at least his/her family. On the other hand, it should be noted that Sogdian wall paintings are a more ambiguous source for exploring regional identity. One reason for this may be attributed to the intended audience of the paintings, in addition to elements of propaganda that may have been incorporated into the paintings. This again underlines the importance of the terracottas as an alternative source for understanding regional identity.

By taking regional identity as the central theme of research, it is possible to access identity, as expressed through costume, on a broader scale, while at the same time overcoming the thorny problems outlined above in the definition of ethnicity in antiquity. Of course, aspects of ethnicity, and other social identities including professional and civil identities, are almost certainly incorporated in elements used to communicate regional identity, although in most cases these remain unrecognised. It is hoped that with future finds of stratified terracottas it will be possible to access more specific socio-cultural identities in the Samarkand region.

Gender

Gender as a category of archaeological inquiry implies a holistic approach of accessing and understanding the structure of ancient societies. While in many cases the identification of gender on the figurines may appear obvious, there are in fact numerous issues that should be considered. The literature on gender groups is increasing, not only in feminist circles, but also more generally as the understanding of this identity in the archaeological record becomes more widespread. Gender is defined by Gibbs as "purely a social and cultural construct, comprising the roles given to, and identities perceived by, men and women in a particular society (female/male)". Sex, on the other hand, is defined as "a physiological distinction (woman/man)".

Like ethnicity, gender is an important category in structuring social life and behaviour in a particular society. Some researchers see gender as a "dynamic historical process" in itself, thereby arguing that it should form a central research focus. Spencer-Wood, following Wylie, argues that "gender is a basic aspect to culture that cross-cuts other subsystems and can't be reduced to any other more fundamental variable". This view suggests that gender can be treated as a primary category of inquiry used to better understand the structure of society. However, gender can also be seen under the umbrella of status. Although gender in archaeology is discussed essentially in terms of power relations between men and women, the

29 See Xinjiang 2000 generally regarding the use of names in the Sogdian diaspora.
30 This should not be seen as a simplistic attitude towards gender studies. One of the aims of feminism is to change the way scholars think by introducing an unbiased language of gender. Traditional views of women tend to result in different ways of treating of female and "man" in academic discourse. See Spencer-Wood 1991. They also tend to form a starting point for inquiry into social institutions. These issues are clearly outlined by Hodder 1991. Women should not form the sole focus of gender studies. Instead gender studies should focus on exactly that -- gender, incorporating male, female and ambiguous gender identities, such as hermaphrodites or eunuchs.
31 See Conkey and Specter for critique and bibliography.
32 For example see Spencer-Wood 1991; Conkey 1991.
physical ascription of gender has received considerably less attention. The
importance of the topic in coroplastics and other visual representations is
demonstrated in several issues associated with terracottas from the Samarkand region,
in particular the presence of androgynous figures in coroplastic art and the presence
and absence of breasts on figurines from similar series.

The work of Kimball-Davis in extending perspectives on gender in the
archaeological record is critical in understanding some of the issues involved in the
attrition of gender. Kimball-Davis has investigated burials in several areas of the
southern Urals. Her team has used modern ethnographic research to extrapolate
information from artefacts found in the archaeological record to explore male and
female status. One of the results of her work has been to challenge the stereotype of
male and female gender identity. For example among the nomadic Sauro-Sarmatian
burials of the Pokorovka region males could be buried with children, but no examples
were found of females buried with children. It was also found that female warriors,
while not a common identity, were nevertheless not rare among the people buried
here.36 This evidence serves as a warning in using conventional ideas to approach
gender identity in the archaeological record.

Several factors regarding the attribution of gender on the Samarkand
terracottas underline the problems of using stereotyped ideas to define gender.
Attributes are often associated with specific figures. A circular attribute shown on
several figurines has been tentatively identified by some scholars as a mirror.37 The
Iranian speaking nomadic legacy in Sogdiana is clear in both textual and art historic
sources, and it is justifiable to attempt to better understand the presence of the mirror
on the basis of such sources. Evidence of mirrors found in Sarmatian burials shows
that they are associated not only with females, but with males, and also with
children.38 Although there is much evidence to associate the mirror with a divine
female figure,39 the evidence of the burials indicates that it is difficult to use the
mirror as a basis to identify gender. Furthermore, the similarity of clothing worn by
nomadic males and females of the Eurasian Steppes (a long shirt or jacket worn over
trousers tucked into boots) is well known. For figurines portrayed in this type of
clothing, caution should again be shown in gender identification.

The identity of physical attributes on figurines generally has served as the
basis of their gender ascription in the typology. However, in the context of the
Samarkand region figurines, it should be noted that there are several examples of
figurines of a very similar type in terms of attributes and costume, some of which
have breasts, and some of which do not. The presence of breasts is equated with
female figures, while the presence of facial hair has been equated with male figures.
The absence of these traits has implied an un-defined sex, although often the
ascription is made on the basis of clothing or other figurines forming a comparable
type series. It is important to recognise that an ascription of gender made on this basis
only remains preliminary, and that the definition of gender as a social construct is
highly complex. Nevertheless, to a certain extent, at least on a superficial level, these
sex identities may be accepted.

36 Davis-Kimball 1997.
37 Khazanov 1964: 93, n. 34 suggests that the attribute shown at the left hand of figurine type RM A55
963 is a mirror. The identification of this attribute, however, remains unclear. In most cases it appears
simply as a circular shape, and no evidence of a handle is preserved.
38 Ibid.: 89.
The representation and interpretation of style on figurines

There is a vast literature on the meaning and function of style in archaeology and art history. Style is commonly viewed by scholars as a tool for accessing non-verbal methods of communication inherent in an artefact or group of artefacts. This sub-section presents an overview of its meaning and role in archaeological and art historical enquiry as is relevant to the discussion of costume portrayed on the terracottas. It should be noted that context is a critical element in the interpretation of style and while the observations included here highlight the potential for information embedded in the terracottas, the reality is rather more limited.

Style and communication

One of the central issues in the study of style is that of communication: who is communicating and who is reading. Expressions of style in figurines include the way(s) in which they are manufactured, and, more importantly for the current thesis, the manner of portraying costume, including the manner of wearing, cut and ornamentation. Despite the myriad of interpretations of style and its practical application, stylistic analysis remains a critical tool in understanding communication and the expression of identity markers in the archaeological record. Ultimately theories of style are about methods of inter- and intra-group communication. Style defines a way of doing things. The stylistic analysis of objects facilitates a relative and contextual understanding of their social functions. Stylistic expression also involves choice. According to Davis, "style matters as the *explanadum* for art history or archaeology; without style we have nothing to talk about, no problem to solve". Hodder defines style as "the referral of an individual to a way of doing things". He underlines the importance of context, both spatial and temporal and argues that style can have different meanings in different contexts. Wiessner essentially sees style as non-verbal communication. She elaborates on Hodder's definition, suggesting that "style is a means of communication based on doing something in a certain way that communicates information about relative identity". She argues that "style is not power but a medium of communication that can legitimise power".

Sackett's theory of isochrestism attempts to define the difference between functional and stylistic variation. It explores the idea of where style is to be found and how it is expressed. Sackett argues that style implicitly reflects ethnicity because of the choices made by the producers of an object to manufacture and ornament it in a particular way. "The choices they make are largely dictated by the technological traditions within which they have been enculturated as members of the social groups that delineate their ethnicity". Sackett believes that it is unlikely that different ethnic groups would choose to create and decorate objects in exactly the same manner because of the multiplicity of ways of "doing" things. Sackett places an external emphasis on the person reading the "codes" reflected by the style, rather than the codes being consciously read from the inside. This focuses on the conscious recognition of difference which embodies the active signalling principle. From an outsider's point of view style is read as difference, clearly defining the Other.

---

40 Davis 1990: 23.
41 Hodder 1990: 45.
43 Ibid.: 106.
44 This has been developed in Sackett 1986, 1990.
45 Sackett 1990: 33.
46 Ibid.: 37.
However, from an insider’s point of view, style is unconsciously created and perceived as maintaining social categories. For Sackett, style lies in both function and ornamentation and his theory of isochrestism essentially supports the idea that style is equal to ethnicity.  

Scholars have argued that style in some way supports the maintenance of social boundaries and that its application is a conscious act. Because of the move towards less objective means of analysing ornamentation, the all encompassing nature of theories of style often fail to take into account the possibility of random (ornamental) expression on artefacts. Hodder has called attention to the problem of over-interpretation, however, his efforts to explain the social and political context of style often undermine the idea that style can of itself simply represent an aesthetic. Wiessner similarly cautions against the role of subjective interpretation (especially of symbols) advocated by Hodder by focusing on description and analysis of a broad corpus of material as the basis of interpretation. While the formal and conservative nature of ritual artefacts may argue against this, the idea that all ornamentation should be analysed requires review.

Wobst comments that “the less an artifact is visible to members of a given group, the less appropriate it is to carry stylistic messages of any kind. Classes of artifacts which never leave the context of individual households and which are not usually visible to members of other households...are unlikely to carry messages of social group affiliation.” This perspective sees the artefact and expressions of style as purely functional and does not take into account the inherent bias of the producer of the artefact. Furthermore, signalling embodied in the figurines may have acted on various levels. For example, while it is possible that figurines were used in a domestic context, their small size may indicate their portability: they could easily have been taken into various contexts. Additionally, there is no reason why artefacts used in private contexts would not have been decorated for pleasure. Admittedly, while such decoration may have incorporated some means of signalling, this may have been less active. Finally, Wobst's theory takes into consideration only visual elements of style. Style found in technology was also an important means of non-verbal communication.

These observations underline the importance of style and the information it may elicit, in addition to the implications for the excavation and study of artefacts generally, in particular their stratigraphical context. It is important to bear in mind that many theories of style have been propounded in ethno-archaeological or anthropological contexts, providing a generally well-rounded image of social institutions manifest in verbal and non-verbal communication. However, much of the manner of communication remains invisible on the Samarkand region figurines because of the lack of context. The anthropological and ethno-archaeological evidence underlines the validity of style as an analytical tool in the social sciences, however, the ability to define identities in the archaeological record remains problematic and is best assessed by a holistic approach to artefacts.

**Summary**

The aim of this section has been to explore the theoretical possibilities of studying costume in antiquity. It has been shown that the contextualised study of
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costume embraces a diverse range of identity categories including social, kin, political, economic and ideological. However, the practical reality of such studies is considerably lower, especially for terracottas from the Samarkand region. The primary reason for this, discussed in further detail below, is their lack of context.

Despite this, there are two identity categories that are more readily accessed, albeit superficially, in the absence of context: gender and regional identity. Another identity, status, is inherent in these categories, although not necessarily as easy to identify and define. Female gender may be ascribed on the basis of the presence of breasts, although the absence of breasts does not automatically define a non-female (i.e., male or androgynous) status. Male identities may be defined on the basis of the presence of facial hair, although again, the absence of facial hair cannot be regarded as indicative of non male identities. Regional identity may be ascribed on the basis of provenance, although for terracottas this can only become more certain if there is a large(r) concentration of the same or very similar types from one region. There are many other vertical layers of identity within this broad group that can only begin to be accessed through contextualised analysis. Despite these limitations, costume remains an especially attractive medium of inquiry in archaeology and art history because of its ability to communicate non-verbally across all levels of society.

II. FIGURINES AS ARTEFACTS

Production of terracotta figurines

Empirical evidence regarding the production and trade/exchange of figurines in Central Asia is confined to a few precious finds of figurine production areas in potters quarters, rare finds of clay matrices and figurines in stratified contexts and the observation of manufacturing techniques evident in the figurines themselves.

Figurines documented in this thesis were produced using one of three methods: moulds, hand modelling or a combination of these two techniques.51 Plaques were mould made. In Sogdiana, mould made figurines have most commonly been dated to between the 2nd - 1st century BCE and the 4th century CE, while the combination technique is usually dated to the early medieval period.

Hand-modelled figurines.

Hand modelling was the most basic method of modelling a figurine. Clay was taken and shaped into the desired form. Sometimes a sharp instrument was used to define details of clothing and costume. More often these elements appear to have been defined with the fingers. There is an abundance of hand-modelled figurines associated with the Samarkand region, but they lack detail in the costume. For this reason only a few examples of figurines from this group will be discussed in this thesis.

51 Several articles have recently been written on this subject in the Central Asian context: L. Sève has written an excellent report identifying figurine generations in the Afrasiab figurines. This has not been published. See also Ilyasov and Mkrtychev 1991/2. General descriptions of production techniques across the Near and Middle East and the Mediterranean do not vary much. While most of the Sogdian figurines are covered with slip, only very few have any evidence of paint. There is also a large amount of literature regarding essentially similar manufacturing techniques for figurines made from a single mould used in other regions. See for example Van Ingen 1939 regarding the figurines from Seleucia on the Tigris. Barrelet 1968 discusses manufacturing processes for Mesopotamian figurines. There is also much literature detailing basically similar manufacturing practices in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds. See for example Higgins 1986 and 1967; Bémont, Jeanlin et al. 1993.
Combination mould made and hand modelled figurines

This group is characterised by figurines typically combining a mould made head and a hand-modelled body. They are characteristic of the early medieval period. Two methods of production were possible. In one, a single piece of clay was worked at once, using a mould for the head and then hand modelling the body. Alternatively the head and body were made separately and then joined prior to firing.\(^52\) It is not unusual to find the same heads used for figurines moulded onto the walls or handles of ceramic vessels. The quality of the modelling of individual heads was maintained to a higher degree than for single mould figurines.\(^53\)

Mould made figurines and plaques

Square or arched mould made plaques or tiles, often with a decorative border, appear from the early medieval period, either as individual tiles, or worked onto the walls of an ossuary. Perforations were also found on either side of some plaques, perhaps indicating that they were hung on a wall or an entry post. It was not uncommon to find mould made heads used as ornamentation on ceramic vessel walls or handles and ossuary walls. In all instances mould made figurines discussed in this thesis are frontal or flat backed figurines. This means that only a single mould was used to make the figurine. The back of the figurine was typically flat or slightly convex. The manufacture of mould made terracottas occurred in two separate stages:

1) The making of the matrix, and
2) The casting of the figurine from the matrix.

The initial step in making a matrix was to model a figurine archetype, usually from clay although other media such as wax, bronze or wood were possible.\(^54\) Details were worked with basic instruments such as wooden points, smoothing tools and spatulas.\(^55\) A cast was taken from the archetype by layering wet clay over the front of it. This was allowed to dry. It was then removed from the archetype and fired. Only a few matrices have been found to date in the Samarkand region: these are of clay. Plaster moulds would also have been possible although there is no evidence for their usage in Central Asia. It cannot be ruled out that moulds were produced without an archetype by taking a lump of clay and carving it out in the reverse to form a mould. However, this process would have been immeasurably more difficult and presumably time consuming. Theoretically a mould can be made from any figurine, not necessarily an archetype, however, it was generally only from archetypes or a first generation figurine that a matrix would be made,\(^56\) as these figurines retained a higher quality of modelling.

To cast the figurine the mould was packed with layers of wet clay. This was allowed to dry, thereby shrinking away slightly from the edges of the mould, allowing it to be turned out more easily. It is unclear if releasing agents were used to ease removal of the figurine from the mould. After the figurine was turned out, it was allowed to further dry, and then fired. After turning the figurine out from the mould, it was possible to make some slight additions to the figurine, such as detailing of ornamentation or hair for example. This production process could take several hours.

\(^{52}\) Sève n.d.
\(^{53}\) Ibid.
\(^{54}\) Higgins 1986: 66; Bémont, Jeanlin et al. 1993: 97. The identification of clay archetypes in the archaeological record is very difficult. One indication that a figurine may have been used as an archetype or a first generation figurine is the clarity of detail shown in the modelling.
\(^{55}\) Bémont, Jeanlin et al. 1993: 97.
\(^{56}\) Ibid.: 96.
There is no evidence in Central Asia regarding the types of kilns used to fire the figurines, however, these were not necessarily different from those used to fire ceramic vessels. The process of casting a figurine was essentially a mechanical one, not requiring any specialised skill prior to the firing stage.

Several observations should be made concerning the use of matrices. If the clay was dried in the matrix, depending on factors such as the consistency of the clay and climate, this process could take up to several days. This implies that for other than very small scale production, numerous moulds would be required for each figurine producing entity. If figurines were fired in their moulds, assuming they were of clay or another medium that became brittle through firing, this would severely shorten the life of the mould. The moulds would become increasingly friable and this may explain why so few moulds are found in Sogdiana.

The re-use of archetypes or moulds for the production of figurines is an important issue, as it may partly explain the conservatism found in the representation of many costume styles on the figurines. A common practice in the study of figurines is to identify figurine generations. These consist of “families” of figurines produced from an original matrix over a period of time. This facilitates understanding the process of the dispersion of the figurines, and also the gradual changes within a particular figurine group or series. Among the figurines from Afrasiab examined by Sève no first generation figurines are identified, although numerous examples of second and later generation figurines are provided. Sève notes up to seven generations, albeit with some variations. These generations are identified on the basis of their size and the degradation of the quality of the modelling. Sève suggests that the generations may have existed simultaneously, although their circulation life is very difficult to estimate. During the early medieval period moulds appear to have been used even after being broken. Their circulation life was extended by their wider application not just as figurines and plaques but also on ossuaries and ceramic vessels.

An important issue regarding the practice of signalling in artefacts is raised by the extended use life of a figurine or a matrix in society. Wobst comments that “specific stylistic form is seen to emit messages which are broadcast throughout the use life of artifacts.” This is significant as it may imply that the messages embodied in the costume of the figurines reflect a relatively stable context, and/or that they are relatively specific. The period of time over which a mould could be re-used is debatable, both from the point of view of the durability of the mould and also of the development or changes in ideas. However, the conservative nature of religion and cult may enhance the argument for the prolonged currency of moulds within society.

**Figurine production and the market**

It is important to consider briefly the economic context in which the figurines were produced, especially in the light of the relative absence of evidence of urbanism.
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57 Bémont, Jeanlin et al. 1993: 104 show that the same kiln was used by artisans for both vessels and coroplastic art at numerous sites in the Gallo-Roman world.

58 Sève n.d.

59 Ibid.

60 Pers. comm 16/03/03.

61 Sève n.d.


63 Note however, that costume itself may have changed relatively quickly over a given period. See Pohl 1998: 85. This should again be taken into consideration when assessing the representation of dress on the figurines. Gübel 1998 has also discussed the use life of moulds in a Phoenician context.
in Sogdiana between the 3rd century BCE and the beginning of the 4th century CE. While little research has been undertaken into the economics of the production and marketing of craft goods in Sogdiana and Central Asia generally, several observations may be made.

The production of craft goods is not necessarily dependent on complex, urban societies, and nor is it dependent on control by an elite. Hays states that "increased investment in visual arts activities, such as decoration of ceramics, room walls, and textiles, need not be a sign of increased leisure time nor of the emergence of luxury goods controlled by a class of managerial elites, as has often been assumed. Rather, in some kinds of societies, it may signal increased competition and social stress due to changing organisational scale." Rosen defines craft specialisation in an archaeological context as "the restricted production of specific goods or a range of related goods for use beyond the immediate needs of the producer or his close household or relations." Specialisation is a feature of societies of different levels of social complexity. However, it requires the production and generation of a surplus of goods. Specialisation is dependent on a number of factors including access to raw materials, specialised knowledge and investment in time and capital.

Although it is likely that the people producing the archetypes and moulds for figurine production in Sogdiana were specialists, there is no evidence to confirm this. So too the high quality of some of the figurines may reflect their being produced by highly specialised craftspeople for a specific clientele. Again, there is little evidence to directly demonstrate this. Nor is there any evidence to date as to whether these craftspeople were attached to or independent from centralised (elite?) control. Finally, their social status also remains elusive. Such considerations are significant. For example, Costin and Williams have discussed the importance of recognising gender in craft production in order to better understand the function of the artefact and the context in which it operated, together with the perspective from which it was created. They suggest that the "natural bias" of artisans, including status, neighbourhood and market, serves to contextualise many of the messages expressed in figurative representations.

The economic context in which the master craftspeople and artisan/potters acted, and the relationship between them in Sogdiana remains unknown. The casting of a figurine from a matrix can be viewed as a relatively unskilled process, assuming the clay was already prepared and the application of a releasing agent, such as a powder, was a simple process. Certainly in the Sogdian context, where the figurines were not cast in the round but were flat backed, the process was a relatively simple one. Evidence discussed below indicates that figurines from southern Sogdiana and Bactria were probably produced in the potters quarters, possibly by a potter or the potter's family. In this respect, there is no reason why unskilled members of the family could not have cast the figurines from the mould, perhaps leaving them to dry and then be fired by the potter. However, it should not be ruled out that figurine manufacture was undertaken by a "specialist" (although not necessarily a "coroplast"

64 Rosen 1997; Wattenmaker 1998.
68 Costin 1996.
69 Williams 1987.
70 Ibid.: 97; Costin 1996: 120.
71 Muller 1994: 177.
which suggests a specialisation associated with the making of the archetypes and/or moulds).

The production of figurines in potters' quarters is demonstrated by the discovery of a number of figurines at Erkurgan, situated in the Nakhshab Oasis in southern Sogdia.\textsuperscript{72} A group of fourteen figurines representing a single series, with slight variations manifest on each individual figurine, was found laid out on the floor next to the northern wall of a house in the potters' quarter of the site. This evidence suggests that the figurines were made within the potter's residence and possibly by the potter(s) or members of their families. The scope of such production areas are unclear: whether they are indicative of household industry or workshop industry\textsuperscript{73} is an issue for further research in the broader context of the economics of production in southern Sogdiana and Bactria.

Sève has made some preliminary observations on modes of figurine production and marketing at Afrasiab on the basis of mould usage.\textsuperscript{74} Market force was based on production rather than the quality of the figurine itself. Sève also cautiously suggests on the basis of the degradation of the majority of the figurines that several workshops produced identical moulds that were given to external workshops who then produced copies of the images themselves.\textsuperscript{75} A large number of mould combinations were used,\textsuperscript{76} resulting in the ability to produce for a very wide market with relatively little effort on the part of the artisan. Pugachenkova cites evidence to suggest that during the early centuries CE some figurines were sold in temples,\textsuperscript{77} while early medieval texts suggest they were sold on markets.\textsuperscript{78} It is possible that figurines were sold in both temples and markets during these periods.

Summary

While the comments above may have little bearing on the representation of costume on the figurines in general, they nevertheless highlight critical issues regarding their context of manufacture. They also shed some light on the individual circumstances in which they were produced and sold, which in turn may have some bearing on the portrayal of specific details on the figurines, including their costume. These observations illustrate the fact that much remains to be gained from a constructive study of the mechanics of manufacture and trade of figurines in the Samarkand region.

The artistic environment of the figurines: the use of stylistic conventions

The iconography of Sogdian figurines is a common theme of research. It is typically assumed that in Sogdiana monumental prototypes for the figurines were

\textsuperscript{72} Isamiddinov and Khasanov 2000.
\textsuperscript{73} Peacock 1981: 188 – 9 and p. 192. "Household industry" and "workshop industry" are terms used by Peacock in reference to ceramic production in Roman Europe and North Africa. "Household industry" is focused on the market rather than just household requirements and is undertaken predominantly by women. Specialised equipment is not necessarily used, neither is there a specific area in which production activities are carried out. "Workshop industry" incorporates a much broader demand and economic context in which production is carried out by males with specialised equipment in a specific area. "Domestic industry" is another (Marxist) term used to describe a more controlled manner of production of goods, carried out in the home, but dependent on a centralised control, which provides the raw materials and monitors the quality of the product, in addition to the marketing of the goods.
\textsuperscript{74} Sève n.d.
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{77} Pugachenkova 1978: 31.
\textsuperscript{78} Barthold 1968: 107.
carved wooden statues, or perhaps larger clay or alabaster statues, no longer extant.\footnote{Meshkeris 1979b. That monumental prototypes may have been used in some cases is indicated by a head fragment in the Samarkand Museum, RM A19 45, which is very similar to the head of a statue of a donor from Peshawar in Ingholt 1957: pl. 401.} This remains one of the anomalies of Sogdian society. Other schools of thought regarding the origin of types represented in coroplastic art advocate a separate development of monumental and coroplastic art while others see some influence from monumental art.\footnote{See Alroth 1989: 15.}

It has alternatively been suggested that the iconography of Sogdian figurines is not indicative of the recognised iconography of deities representing the Sogdian pantheon, known predominantly from coins and wall paintings, because the figurines represent “second rank” divine figures.\footnote{Bryikina 1999: 191.} Carless-Hulin, in discussing the acceptance of motifs in complex societies, suggests that the iconography associated with the non-elite\footnote{Carless-Hulin 1989: 93 uses the term “lower class”. “Non-elite” is here understood to mean “members of a society not involved in political administration and having comparatively modest resources.” See Wattenmaker 1998: 9. There is little evidence that figurines functioned in the realms of the elite only. See for example Muller 1994.} is much more inward looking and focused on the local, domestic sphere.\footnote{Carless-Hulin 1989.} It is from this perspective that the Sogdian figurines have been approached in previous studies.\footnote{See below, p. 39ff a brief discussion of the work of Meshkeris, Zaslavskaya and Mandel'shtam.} This may provide some support for the idea that Sogdian figurines were the vernacular art of the non-elite, representing a localised iconography and cult. However, as there is no evidence of what elite Sogdian art comprised prior to the appearance of wall paintings at the beginning of the 4th century CE, it is difficult to substantiate this.

It is possible to make some preliminary observations regarding the context in which iconography circulated in Sogdiana during the early medieval period. While the iconography was largely known to the people who made the figurine archetypes and/or the matrix for the figurines, there were nevertheless specific regional adaptations. In a recent study on Kushan period figurines from Bactria, Ilyasov and Mkrtychev suggest that master moulds were made by specialised craftspeople who worked largely outside the region.\footnote{Ilyasov and Mkrtychev 1991/2: 107. The extent of the sculptor’s understanding of the prototype – the attributes and the significance of certain iconographic features – should also be considered, especially as changes to original features can directly affect the way in which the figurine is viewed in an art historic context. Adaptation can also be interpreted as degradation, and it is possible that some masters producing for the Samarkand region did not comprehend the symbolism of the original iconography. See for example Grenet 1996: 368. The reproductions and variations on the Sasanian winged headdresses found in the Samarkand region are an example of such innovations. However, such changes may also indicate the social and economic environment in which the figurine was produced.} However, their moulds were employed by local artisans/potters to produce figurines for the general population. It is possible that matrices for the Sogdian market were produced according to similar practices. However, the degree of regionality demonstrated in Sogdian coroplastic art suggests that individual “masters” had a close relationship with the region for which they produced.

Marshak has discussed the similarity between Sasanian and early medieval Sogdian iconography represented on Sogdian wall paintings.\footnote{See generally Marshak 2002b.} He has suggested that these stylistic similarities may be traced to “collections of sketches and model books” which may have been used by Sasanian artists and circulated amongst Sogdian
The sources for many of the narratives represented on Sogdian wall paintings are mixed, comprising Indian, Greek and Iranian literary traditions. That they were relatively well known in Sogdian society is suggested by the correlation of numerous “Sogdian tales” in text and illustration. Marshak suggests that in several instances the format of the murals is similar to that of illustrated scrolls, and that these may have provided the initial source for the paintings, developing out of a rich oral tradition connected with a broader Iranian tradition of secular literature. This underlines the complex and highly developed narrative and artistic sphere in which early medieval Sogdian artists worked.

There are numerous examples of the use of stylistic conventions on the terracottas. It is important to distinguish between stylistic conventions and other traits that may be defined as specific to the Samarkand region. Stylistic conventions are clear, for example, in the representation of certain styles of drapery. The similarities in the representation of drapery shown on the tunics of some of the Samarkand region figurines and those shown on figures in Parthian dress from the Parthian Empire are very clear. Another convention is noted in the manner of portraying the hem of ankle length dresses where it falls over the feet of the wearer. The folds of the dress where it covers the ankles and feet on AM 91 33 and RM A19 127 are mirrored on ankle length garments on the paintings of the southern wall of the sanctuary at Fayaztepe.

Finally, the manner of holding objects, in particular the representation of the hands and fingers, also suggests the use of stylistic conventions. For example RM A19 101 portrays a very distinct manner of holding an attribute, with the emphasis clearly placed on the position of the fingers in relation to the attribute. This figurine is dated to the 1st century BCE – 4th century CE. This manner of holding an attribute finds numerous parallels in later Sasanian and other art from the Iranian and Turkic speaking worlds.

These stylistic conventions point to a broader cultural and artistic milieu in which artists producing for the Sogdian, or Samarkand, market, may have worked. They also raise important questions regarding the circulation of motifs and iconography in regional Sogdiana, and the role of local artisans and workshops, especially prior to the 4th century CE. During this period it is noteworthy that while stylistic conventions are clearly recognised in the depiction of drapery for example, the iconography of the figurines is not always recognised from other regions. This may suggest a synthesis of traditions at work on the figurines, combining iconographic features of indigenous beliefs with stylistic conventions used in the broader region. Such syncretism is one of the defining features of terracottas from the Samarkand region.

From a historico-political perspective the sharing of motifs and conventions is significant. While the textual evidence for Sogdian history underlines a certain independence in this region, and certainly a decentralised system of administration, the visual evidence on the other hand suggests an underlying element of unity among states, empires and more localised regions through the sharing of certain motifs and conventions. During the early period in the Samarkand region this sharing included a local (Chorasmian and Bactrian) level while incorporating older elements circulating
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in the Saka and Scythian nomadic worlds of the Eurasian steppes to the north and east. During the early medieval period the focus shifts to regions in the south, east and west, in particular the Sasanian empire, and the Turkic kaghanate.

The function of figurines

One of the primary issues concerning the function of figurines lies in their identification as secular and/or ritual (the possibility that figurines incorporated both of these aspects cannot be excluded). There are numerous types of personages represented among the figurines from the Samarkand region: divine figures (these may represent deities, although the possibility of priestesses must also be included), deified figures (perhaps suggesting an ancestor cult) and folk and mythological heroes (for example, rider figures). Musician figurines are also popular and probably point to another important group in society. This broad spread of identities may reflect different functioning spheres for different figurines. However, there is no conclusive evidence regarding the interpretation of identities or status portrayed on the Samarkand region figurines. One of the reasons for this is the absence of context. Another is the lack of evidence regarding Sogdian social institutions, especially prior to the early medieval period.

Ethnographic material is often cited to better understand the function of figurines in ancient society. There is also a very diverse archaeological literature regarding figurine function in antiquity. For Central Asia in particular, Brykina has discussed ethnographic and archaeological evidence of figurine usage connected with burial rites. Although such studies are important for the questions they raise, there is only a limited value in extrapolating from them to better understand the figurines from the Samarkand region (or any other region) because of the different social regulators. Nevertheless, it is useful to briefly mention some evidence of figurine usage in Central Asia.

The early ritual nature of figurines in Bronze Age Bactria is demonstrated at Djarkutan in southern Uzbekistan where they were generally found in ritual contexts. For example, anthropomorphic figurines were found in a cenotaph placed in front of an altar. There is also evidence to suggest that anthropomorphic figurines were produced within a temple context.

Several figurines have been found in nomad burials in the Zarafshân Valley associated with Sauromatian-Sarmatian culture. According to Obel’chenko the figurines represent Nana, the ancient Near Eastern goddess of fertility, love and battle. Obel’chenko mentions two figurines: one from Kuyo-Mazar, for which no illustration or date is given, apparently found in the grave of a woman; another figurine in mentioned in the inventory for kurgan 7 at Khazarin. The left hand is
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positioned at the chest while the right arm is held across the stomach in a similar attitude to some figurines from the Samarkand region. The figurine is in a seated pose and there is no evidence of costume. This burial is dated to between the 2nd and 7th century CE. Obel'chenko suggests the presence of the figurines in these burials indicates that these women were adherents of the cult of Nana.

Schematised anthropomorphic figurines have also been found in female burials in the Ferghana Valley dated to the mid first millennium CE. Brykina suggests they acted as protective or family deities, reflecting "an echo of beliefs from the matriarchal tribal system."

Pugachenkova uses the difference in artistic quality of figurines dated to the first centuries CE from Dalverzin-tpea to discuss their function or role. She surmises that the lesser quality figurines, usually hand made or made using the combination hand/mould technique, were used as idols. Their resemblance to other statuary was probably only symbolic. The higher quality figurines were copies of monumental statuary and seen as works of art although they too, probably had a cultic function.

A very cautious note regarding evidence of Zoroastrian and Persian rites involving figurines may be added. Al-Brun refers very briefly to the use of figurines in the Persian festival of Dai-ba-Mihr-Roz. On the day of this festival "a human-like figure of paste or clay" was placed at gateways. The use of figurines in modern Zoroastrian communities has been documented by Boyce. Although these consist predominantly of zoomorphic figurines, human figures were also made. Human figures, amongst others, were modelled from a sweet dough in a ceremony marking the final act of creation at the end of the year, an event which had come to be celebrated in conjunction with All Souls and the New Year. According to Boyce, the ritual would originally have incorporated celebrations marking the beginning of spring. A description of the modeling of the figurines reflects the ritual aspect in which "the greatest care for cleanliness and purity" took precedence. Boyce comments on the profound effects of time and the loss of original meaning for several rites and observances, and suggests in this context that the figurines modelled for Panji were now seen as toys. It is not clear whether the figurines modelled from the dough were maintained for the entirety of the five day rite.
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Summary
The lack of archaeological context for the figurines from the Samarkand region is a serious impediment to their functional analysis. This also has serious implications for understanding the context(s) in which the costume represented on the figurines operated. On the other hand, costume remains a critical visual source whose documentation serves as an important initial step in understanding the construction and expression of identities in the Samarkand region. Although it is not possible at this stage to understand which identities are being signalled, the figurines inherently embody numerous covert and overt biases and expressions regardless of their status or context. For this reason they communicate important statements on the society in which they functioned.

The study of costume represented on terracottas is problematic because of the limited knowledge of the context in which they operated. If the terracottas operated in a visually limited context, such as the household, it is possible that their signalling value would be limited because they would only be seen by a small number of people. However, if they operated in a temple or similar context, they may be viewed by a wider range of people, thereby significantly increasing their potential for communication. This reflects a contentious issue: on the one hand, dress is one of the most economical means of non-verbal communication. It immediately signals to all who come into visual contact with an individual specific details regarding social, economic and other statuses. However, if figurines operated in a visually secluded context, there may be little value in putting effort into communication mechanisms. Although it is not possible to resolve these issues, they are nevertheless important to consider as they focus on the value of the communication embodied in costume portrayed on terracottas.

III. FIGURINES AND PLAQUES FROM THE SAMARKAND REGION

This section provides an outline of the archaeological and chronological issues of sites yielding terracottas included in this thesis. It should be seen within the broader context of the historical framework presented in the following chapter. Provenanced figurines in the present study are from three sites in the Samarkand region: Afrasiab, Tal-i Barzu and Kafyr-kala (see Map 3).

The sites
Afrasiab
Afrasiab is the ancient site of Samarkand, also known as Marakanda to the Greeks. It stretches over an area of over 200 hectares to the north east of modern Samarkand and is the largest site in Sogdiana and one of the great ancient cities of Central Asia. It has been the focus of numerous archaeological expeditions since the late 19th century, which continue to the present time.116

The earliest levels of Afrasiab date to the Achaemenid period. Fortification walls during this period encompassed approximately 5 km. The Achaemenid period also saw a huge outlay of works to establish canals for irrigation, building a strong urban foundation that was to flourish over the next two centuries until the arrival of Alexander’s forces in 329 BCE. During this stage, the fortification walls stretched 13 km around the site. However, between the end of the Hellenistic and the beginning of the early medieval period, there is little real evidence of urbanism, despite over a

century of excavation. Remains of pottery from the Greek garrison are basic and utilitarian, and cannot be associated with an urban population. Nevertheless, Chinese sources dating from the Sui period indicate that Samarkand played a key role in the politics of the region, best demonstrated by wall paintings from the site dated approximately to the middle of the 7th century and reflecting the international political arena of the period. Afrasiab was conquered by the Arabs in 712 CE.

During the early medieval period the outer limit of Samarkand was marked by a series of fortified castles. Tal-i Barzu and Kafyr-kala are two of these.

*Tal-i Barzu*

Tal-i Barzu (TB) was excavated over a number of seasons by Grigor'ev between 1936 and 1948. The development of rural settlements in the Zarafshn Valley can be traced along the courses of various canals. Tal-i Barzu—situated on the right bank of the Dargom 6 km south east of Samarkand—is one of numerous settlements identified as fortified castles that began to appear from the 2nd century CE. Some scholars have associated Tal-i Barzu with Riwdad of the Arabic sources. Most recently, however, it has been tentatively suggested that Tal-i Barzu may be identified with Burw_dh_, a fortified castle mentioned in letter V-15 from Mugh. In a regional context, this identification would place it in a geographic framework, established on the basis of evidence from the Mugh documents, which encompasses an area stretching from south east to south west Samarkand. There are numerous problems concerning the chronology of Tal-i Barzu, which have been the focus of numerous articles. These are summarised in the tables below.

*Kafyr-kala*

Kafyr-kala is located 12 km south east of Samarkand on the Dargom Canal. It was first excavated under the direction of Grigor'ev between 1938 and 1940. It has recently and very tentatively been identified with Arabic Riwdad. Like Tal-i Barzu, Kafyr-kala is also a fortified castle. It is surrounded by smaller country estates, and is dated to the early medieval period. More specifically, it is associated with the urban renewal of the 4th century CE. Recent Italian excavations at the site have discovered 296 seals in an archive, however, details are yet to be published.

**Issues of periodisation**

Grigor'ev established a chronology for the Samarkand region based on ceramics recovered during his excavations at Tal-i Barzu between 1936 and 1940. The site was initially divided into six periods, with slight variations in the chronology, beginning around the middle of the first millennium BCE. Grigor'ev later revised...
this dating, pushing TB I into the 6th – 5th century BCE, and limiting TB VI to the beginning of the 8th century CE.\textsuperscript{127} The other periods remained the same. This dating was soon challenged by Terenozhkin on the basis of his excavations at Afrasiab. He proposed a much later dating for Tal-i Barzu, shifting the first period to the 2nd – 1st century BCE.\textsuperscript{128} This period was equated with Afrasiab IV, which was associated with the Kangju/Yuezhi invasions. Terenozhkin also incorporated material from Kafyr-kala, basing the chronology of this site on that of Tal-i Barzu. The chronology for Afrasiab and Tal-i Barzu suggested by Terenozhkin is outlined in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Chronology</th>
<th>Corresponding Periods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TB I</td>
<td>6th – 4th century BCE</td>
<td>5th century BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB II &amp; III</td>
<td>4th – 2nd century BCE</td>
<td>1st century BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB IV</td>
<td>2nd – 1st century BCE</td>
<td>6th century BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB V</td>
<td>1st – 4th century CE</td>
<td>8th century CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB VI</td>
<td>5th – 6th century CE</td>
<td>12th century CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Sogdian chronology based on Terenozhkin 1945 and 1950.

In 1967 this chronology was reviewed by Stavisky, who proposed a later dating for Tal-i Barzu. Stavisky dated the earliest levels of the site to the end of the 2nd – beginning of the 3rd century CE.\textsuperscript{129} The chronology suggested by Stavisky is outlined in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Chronology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TB I</td>
<td>End of 2nd (?) century CE – 1st half of the 3rd century CE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB II</td>
<td>250 – 300 CE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB III</td>
<td>End of the 3rd – 4th century CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB IV</td>
<td>5th – 6th century CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Sogdian chronology based on Stavisky 1967: 26

The beginning of the Uzbek-French excavations on the site of Afrasiab and also at Koktepe has presented an opportunity to review this periodisation again in the specific context of the Zarafshan Valley. Rapin has identified seven phases (a – g) between the first appearance of the Greeks at Afrasiab and the beginning of the 2nd century CE based on historical events.\textsuperscript{130} Rapin’s chronology is summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Chronology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrasiab II A</td>
<td>329 – 327 BCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{127} Grigor’ev 1946a: 151.
\textsuperscript{129} Stavisky 1967: 27.
\textsuperscript{130} Rapin 2001: 75-77.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 150 BCE</td>
<td>(Phase C) Brief Hellenistic revival at Afrasiab under Eucratides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 145 BCE</td>
<td>(Phase D) First nomadic (Sacaraque) invasions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 BCE – 50 CE</td>
<td>(Phase E) Fall of Sacaraque power; brief urban period at Afrasiab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of the CE</td>
<td>(Phase F) Under Kangju control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd – 4th CE</td>
<td>Period of urban renewal at Afrasiab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 – 400 CE</td>
<td>Chionite invasion of Sogdiana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Chronology of the Zarafshan Valley according to Franco-Uzbek excavations at Afrasiab and Koktepe based on Rapin 2001.

**Figurines from the Samarkand region**

**Chronology**

The issue of chronology remains central for the figurines of the Samarkand region. Attempts have been made in various studies to date the figurines on the basis of different criteria, including comparative material, associated pottery, slip or manufacture techniques. Despite the significance of these studies, there remains no unified approach to the figurines, and the historical and iconographical issues similarly remain relevant. Continuing discussions regarding the dating of levels at Afrasiab have compounded the issue and many publications continue to give wildly different dating frameworks for some figurines. Due to the problematic stratigraphical context of the majority of provenanced figurines, such information is not included in the Catalogue. Instead the reader is directed to the references provided, where available, in the bibliography for each figurine. In the typology reference is made to the date of figurine(s), which represent the type example(s) for each type variant or ornamentation group. These dates are based on those given by Meshkeris in her 1962 and 1989 publications. These provided a working framework, although it is probable that many of the chronological issues will only be solved by the continued excavation of sites in the Samarkand region and the discovery of stratified finds of figurines.

As noted in the Introduction, figurines found in stratified contexts during Franco-Uzbek excavations at Afrasiab have been given a broad chronology, and it is this chronology that is followed in this thesis. Two periods have been defined. The first one is dated to between the 2nd - 1st century BCE and the 4th century CE. The later period is between the 5th century CE and the beginning of the 8th century CE.

**The collections**

The figurine collections of five museums in Uzbekistan and the Russian Federation were studied for this thesis. Due to the uncertainties regarding the various collections of figurines associated with the Samarkand region, it is useful to provide a

---

131 See for example Mandel'shtam 1960.
132 Compare for example the dating of RM A55 963 in Meshkeris 1989: 111, fig. 20, 1 and Abdullaev, Rtveladze et al. 1991, v. II: 43, fig. 430.
brief overview of knowledge concerning the figurines in each museum whose collections were documented for this thesis. The figurines comprising each collection are referred to throughout this thesis by the prefix assigned to them by the museum in which they are housed. Table 4 below provides a concordance of figurine prefixes with the museums and particular collections from which they come, together with details of provenance.

As noted above, figurines associated with the Samarkand region are also housed in the Tashkent Museum of History and the State Museum of History in Moscow. Neither of these collections were studied directly. Although there are numerous well preserved examples of figurines in these collections, especially in the collection of the Tashkent Museum, figurines from these collections are referred to in comparative analysis only, and have not been included in the catalogue.

The State Hermitage St. Petersburg

Two large collections, those of Veselovsky and Kastalsky, are housed in the Oriental Department of the State Hermitage in St. Petersburg. Figurines in both of these collections are completely unprovenanced. It is known that Veselovsky obtained this part of his collection from an antiquarian in Samarkand. Many of the figurines in both the Kastalsky and the Veselovsky collections find close parallels with provenanced figurines from the Samarkand region. However, there are also numerous figurines that manifest a complete departure from the represented types. Their presence in these collections may be explained by the fact that both Kastalsky and Veselovsky were general collectors over a broad area. While the Kastalsky collection remains largely unpublished, many of the better preserved figurines of the Veselovsky collection were published in 1934 by Camilla Trever. Other examples from these collections appear in random publications by Mesheriris.

The Registan Museum, Samarkand

Figurines housed in the Samarkand Museum comprise a number of collections formed under various antiquarians and excavators of Afrasiab and surrounding sites, in particular Tal-i Barzu and Kafyr-kala, since the late 19th century. Many of these figurines, although provenanced, are unstratified. Figurines from the Samarkand Museum have been published in various publications, although the main one is a catalogue by Meshkeris.

Although in her 1962 catalogue Meshkeris provides details regarding the provenance of the figurines housed at this museum, there are nevertheless some issues that should be noted. While in the majority of cases the provenance of the figurines is clear, there are some discrepancies in the literature regarding the site from which some figurines originate. Nevertheless, unless otherwise stated, the figurines from the Registan Museum may be assumed to come from sites within the Samarkand region. The prefixes used in the Samarkand Museum usually indicate the collection

---

133 Museum of the History of the Peoples of Uzbekistan.
134 Permission to access the collection held at the Tashkent Museum was unable to be obtained. Additionally, there is a small collection of terracottas from the Samarkand region held at the State History Museum in Moscow. I was not able to visit this collection.
135 Trever 1934: preface.
136 A recent article by S. Gorshenina about early Russian and French excavations in the Samarkand region contextualises to a certain extent the current problems facing the content and provenance of the major collections. See Gorshenina 1999.
137 Trever 1934.
138 Mesheriris 1962.
139 Ibid.: 4-5.
from which the figurine originated: A19 indicates the collection of L. S. Barshevski, acquired by the museum in 1895,\textsuperscript{140} said to have come from Afrasiab. Figurines in the A36 collection are from the excavations at Afrasiab by V. L. Vyatkin and were acquired in 1933. Some of these were published in his 1926 monograph on Afrasiab.\textsuperscript{141} Some caution should also be taken in the acceptance of their provenance, as he refers to finds of figurines from Afrasiab and its surrounds\textsuperscript{142} (although again in the catalogue the provenance is given as Afrasiab). A374 indicates the collection of a herdsman Husein Sharipov. These were acquired in 1947. Prefixes A55, A180 and A181 are from the excavations of G. V. Grigor’ev at Tal-i Barzu (comprising 35 figurines); figurines with the prefix A183 are from his excavations at Kafyr-kala (15 figurines). The remaining figurines come from various excavations at Afrasiab undertaken by other museum staff members. Note however, that these prefixes are not in all cases specific; for example some figurines published by Vyatkin in his 1926 monograph do not have the prefix A36. The A19 and A374 collections are certainly without stratigraphy, while their said provenance, Afrasiab, can be accepted but not with complete certainty (note however, that their provenance is indicated as Afrasiab in this thesis).

The Afrasiab Museum, Afrasiab
Figurines housed in this museum are from Afrasiab and comprise both stratified and unstratified examples collected during Franco-Uzbek excavations since 1989. They are largely unpublished.

The Samarkand Institute of Archaeology
There is a very small collection of figurines held in the Samarkand Institute of Archaeology. The examples included for study in this thesis from Afrasiab have not been published.

The Kraevedchesky Museum, Samarkand
There is a very small collection of figurines held in this museum. They are completely without provenance or stratigraphy and have not been published.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>State Hermitage, St Petersburg</th>
<th>Veselovsky</th>
<th>Unprovenanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Afrasiab Museum</td>
<td>Veselovsky</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM</td>
<td>Kraevedchesky Museum, Samarkand</td>
<td>L. S. Barshevski</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM A19</td>
<td>Registan Museum</td>
<td>V. L. Vyatkin</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM A36</td>
<td>Registan Museum</td>
<td>G. V. Grigor’ev</td>
<td>Tal-i Barzu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM A55</td>
<td>Registan Museum</td>
<td>G. V. Grigor’ev</td>
<td>Tal-i Barzu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM A180</td>
<td>Registan Museum</td>
<td>G. V. Grigor’ev</td>
<td>Tal-i Barzu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM A181</td>
<td>Registan Museum</td>
<td>G. V. Grigor’ev</td>
<td>Kafyr-kala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM A183</td>
<td>Registan Museum</td>
<td>Husein Sharipov</td>
<td>Afrasiab and surrounds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{140} See Gorshenina 1999 about the history of this collection in Samarkand: 375 – 378.

\textsuperscript{141} Vyatkin 1926.

\textsuperscript{142} Ibid.: 20-21.
Previous research

Documented excavations of Afrasiab began in the 1870’s under Borzenkov however, the earliest published descriptions of the figurines appear to be from Veselovsky’s 1887 informal excavations at the site. No illustrations of the figurines or indications of their find-spot are given in his publication, although he does note the variety in the types found, observing similarities with Greek, Sasanian, Buddhist and Cypriot sculpture. A later article by Veselovsky details the influence of Hellenism on figurines he assigns to the Sasanian period.

In 1926 Vyatkin published a short monograph on Afrasiab, including a brief section on the figurines found there during his informal excavations. He discusses manufacturing techniques and gives a description of the figurines. No details of stratigraphy are given. He focuses particularly on the clothing of the figurines, and details at least three ethnic groups on the basis of this and physiognomy. Similar ethnic identifications are also found in the 1934 catalogue of Terracottas from Afrasiab by Camilla Trever in which four ethnic groupings are defined: Iranians, Tokharians, Turks and Scythians.

A number of articles published around the middle of the 20th century focused on the ethnicity of the so-called “Kushan” period Sogdian figurines. The identification of ethnicity was primarily on the basis of physiognomy, perpetuating a common, albeit flawed, theme of research from the end of the 19th century. These studies also provide a significant discussion on the iconography, and social/ritual context of the figurines. In 1956 Zaslavskaya published a series of rider figurines from Afrasiab in which the primary classification was race/ethnic affiliation. Two main groups based on physiognomy and costume characteristics were identified: Mongolian and European types, together with an unidentified group. Zaslavskaya suggested the figurines were representative of the ruling classes of Sogdian society, and demonstrate the effects of the gradual influence of Mongolian peoples on the local Sogdian population. Zaslavskaya continued this theme in a later article on “Kushan” period fertility goddess figurines. So-called fertility figurines were identified as standing female figures, holding fruit, grain or flowers in one or both hands. They were sub-divided into nine groups on the basis of clothing and attributes. Zaslavskaya suggested that the attributes, clothing and headdresses of the figurines demonstrate a syncretism indicative of their cultural and social environment, thereby representing the processes of sedentism among the nomadic population. Attributes of the figurines, such as the lotus, are also indicative of the importance of the fertilising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RM A400</th>
<th>Registan Museum</th>
<th>unclear</th>
<th>Afrasiab and surrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>State Hermitage, St Petersburg.</td>
<td>Kastalsky</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIA</td>
<td>Samarkand Institute of Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 showing museum prefixes of collections documented for this thesis.

143 Veselovsky 1887. See also Gorshenina 1999: 367.
144 Veselovsky 1917.
145 Vyatkin 1926.
146 Trever 1934.
147 Ibid.: 21-22.
148 Zaslavskaya 1956.
149 Ibid.
150 Zaslavskaya 1959.
powers of water, which Zaslavskaya linked to the development of rural land
ownership and irrigation during the “Kushan” period in Sogdiana.\textsuperscript{151} Two ethnic
groups were identified: European and an Indo-European/Mongolian type.\textsuperscript{152}

In 1960 Mandel’shtam published an article on the chronology of Sogdian
“Kushan” period figurines.\textsuperscript{153} Initial classification was based on stratified finds of
figurines from Tal-i Barzu and Afrasiab dated to the “Kushan” period, which were
used as comparative examples to justify the dating of unprovenanced figurines.
Mandel’shtam tentatively established twelve groups based on various aspects of the
figurines – physical type, costume, use and colour of slip. These are dated from the
2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE to the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE. Two ethnic types were established on the
basis of physiognomy: a “wide faced” group representing the invading nomadic
peoples, and a “narrow faced” group, representing the original Sogdians.\textsuperscript{154}

Perhaps the best known studies of Sogdian terracottas are those of V. A.
Meshkeris.\textsuperscript{155} Meshkeris has published a number of articles detailing a chronological
and typological classification of the anthropomorphic figurines. A typology of the
Sogdian “Kushan” period figurines was published in 1968.\textsuperscript{156} Three style groups for
the figurines were defined based on methods of manufacturing and proportion. The
\textit{primitive archaic} style comprises male and female figurines characterised primarily
by their squat proportions (the head is approximately 1/3 the size of the body) and
clothing style. The \textit{mature style} is characterised by a smaller head and comprises a
thematically unified group or canon based on the strict adherence to a realistic style to
personify deities. It comprises three groupings: males, females and musicians of both
genders. Females are further divided into five groups and several sub-groupings
based on gesture, attribute and costume. The third group comprises \textit{stylised figurines
with a backing or background}.

The general ideas of the typology and chronology were greatly expanded in
two subsequent volumes, \textit{Koroplastika Sogda} (1977) and \textit{Sogdiiskaya Terrakota}
(1989). These monographs provide an art historic view of figurines encompassing the
period 550 BCE to the 8\textsuperscript{th} century CE.\textsuperscript{157} The focus of the 1989 volume is a
comprehensive classification of the figurines, perhaps as a synthesis of previous
works on the figurines, which categorised them on the basis of only one specific
characteristic and did not take into account all the figurine types for a given period.
The categories in this analysis are diverse, and include iconography and comparative
works, the proportions of the figurines (canon), manufacturing technique, stylistic
characteristics, date, provenance (site and museum), bibliography and analogies.
Three “complexes” are established on the basis of chronology:\textsuperscript{158} Complex I
comprises the “ancient” period (2000 – c. 500 BCE) and is characterised by the
fluence of local styles on Hellenistic and Central Asian types. Complex II covers the
“Kushan” period (2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE – 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE) and shows the canonisation of
local styles into a unique “Sogdian” style. Complex III incorporates the “ Early
Medieval Period” (or Late Sogdian period: 5\textsuperscript{th} – 8\textsuperscript{th} century CE) and is characterised

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{151} Ibid.: 50.
\item \textsuperscript{152} Ibid.: 44 – 45.
\item \textsuperscript{153} Mandel’shtam 1960.
\item \textsuperscript{154} Ibid.: 159.
\item \textsuperscript{155} There are a number of well recognised problems in these, and other works, of Meshkeris. See
\item \textsuperscript{156} Meshkeris 1968.
\item \textsuperscript{157} See further Grenet 1978.
\item \textsuperscript{158} Meshkeris 1989: 27ff. This chronology is generally seen to be problematic, however, such
problems can only be resolved with further excavation.
\end{itemize}
by the appearance of a new “historical style” stamping out the local style of the previous period and replacing it with humanistic traits. Each group is then divided according to differences in manufacture type, gender and iconography.

Meshkeris’ approach aims to “expose the complex ideology of feudal society and the glorification of folk heroes”. However, the complex nature of the typology has not taken into account the intrinsic theoretical and chronological issues of the Sogdian figurines. Despite producing much invaluable information, Meshkeris’s conclusions have not gained a broad acceptance. There are also numerous inconsistencies in the referencing of the figurines and the illustrations of the figurines are often not clear enough to define details. Together with the problem of chronology and provenance, the study of Sogdian terracottas has become extremely tentative.

The most recent, albeit unpublished, work on the Afrasiab figurines has been undertaken by L. Sève and establishes a different approach to previous works. Sève focuses on methods of manufacture and the identification of figurine generations, primarily on figurines recovered during the Franco-Uzbek excavations at Afrasiab (ongoing since 1989). Attempts at the reconstruction of figurine generations mark a new interest in the more practical aspects of figurine manufacture in localised societies. Sève defines three primary groups of figurines: mould made, hand modelled and mixed (moulded and modelled) types. These are then classified according to zoomorphic and anthropomorphic types, the latter being again divided according to gender. The results of this brief study are particularly important as they are based mainly on stratified material, and represent an important step towards a more secure chronology for the figurines.

Other methods of figurine analysis, such as the mineral analysis of fabric, may further develop present knowledge of the place of figurines in ancient societies. For example an analysis of the clay from which a figurine is made in order to ascertain the source may, in comparison with other samples, indicate whether certain artisans or workshops produced the figurines. Such a study could also address the sourcing of clay for workshops and the relation of the source(s) to the urban area. Furthermore, a fabric analysis would indicate the quality of the clay used for figurines: was it high quality, possibly leftover from vessel manufacture, or was it of lesser quality, obtained from a different source? Was it different from that used for vessels? Such questions may also shed light on the manufacture of figurines in an urban or semi-urban environment. Was figurine production a specialised skill limited to a particular context (for example the specific role of the temple priest), or was it, as the physical evidence suggests, part of the domain of the potter and his/her family? From such an analysis it may also be possible to map the dissemination of figurines from a single workshop, or figurines made from the same source of clay. This would establish a crucial insight on localised trade practices and usage of figurines in urban, and possibly rural, areas. It may also illuminate the place of figurines in cultic contexts.

\[159\] Ibid.: 20.
\[160\] See also the review by Grenet 1991.
\[161\] Sève n.d.
\[163\] For example Ilyasov and Mkrtichy 1991/2.
Figurines and the use of typologies in archaeological and art historic research

The development of the typology used in this thesis is discussed in detail in the introduction to Chapter 4. However, it is necessary to comment briefly in this sub-section on the role of topologies in archaeological research. A typology aims to classify entities according to different variables and attributes. There is a vast literature devoted to methodological considerations for the development of artefact and other typologies from within the various theoretical perspectives of archaeological inquiry. Although figurines are a very common small find on archaeological sites throughout the Mediterranean, the Near East, Western Asia and Central Asia, there is no single or broadly applied methodological or typological approach to their study. This is partly due to the various indicators that figurines as artefacts embody, including their potential as markers of political, social, cultural, ritual, historical, and economic developments. Nevertheless, figurines are typically classified according to their iconography or manufacture type. In many cases this establishes a critical comparative source for religious and art historic studies. Figurines are also often presented in catalogues, which illustrate only the best preserved examples of type series and sub-groups. The catalogues provide little information about minor variations in the detail or the total number of fragments in the corpus. One reason for this may be that it is difficult to discuss the figurines in an archaeological context as they are often a surface find or have no associated stratigraphy. Studies focussing on the costume of figurines are often based on a limited iconographic group or a specific type or headdress of piece or clothing. Yet the exploration of attributes on the figurines provides a significant means of accessing non-verbal communication mechanisms. There are few typologies that have been developed specifically for the study of costume represented on an entire corpus of statuary.

The pragmatic approach to typologies in archaeology adopted by Adams and Adams suggests three basic kinds of typological ordering: descriptive, comparative and analytical. The typology established in this thesis is essentially descriptive whereby it identifies and describes different types of dress and headdress represented on the terracottas through the establishment of groups (the use of this word is arbitrary) on the basis of the presence or absence of different attributes. It will be noted that very little statistical analysis of different combinations or clusters of elements represented on different figurines type series has been undertaken in this thesis. The main reason for this is that the number of examples making up the final groupings established by the typology, the ornamentation groups, are small, often comprising only a single or several examples. At this stage, these are considered to be too small to justify such analysis. However, they may become more significant when studied in comparison with the ornamentation systems found on figurines or other visual representations from other regions of Sogdiana or neighbouring regions of Bactria and Chorasmia.

167 Van Ingen 1939; Meshkeris 1962; Trever 1934.
168 It also suggests that the figurines at the disposal of the archaeologist represent only a fraction of what in reality would have existed.
169 For example Meshkeris 1979a.
Summary

This section has highlighted numerous themes and issues of research regarding terracottas generally, and in particular those from the Samarkand region of Sogdiana. The study of figurines as artefacts has underlined several issues regarding the chronology and context of the Samarkand region figurines, which can only be resolved with future finds of terracottas from archaeologically stratified contexts. These issues must remain a goal for future research. Despite this, however, it has been shown that various other avenues of research remain fruitful areas of enquiry. Although ethnic identity and iconography have been the major focus of previous research on Sogdian figurines, it is suggested that regional identity may provide a more rewarding avenue of research. The close attention paid to details of ornamentation in the typology (see Chapter 4) establishes a framework for future iconographic studies of the figurines.
SOGDIANA AND THE ZARAFSHĀN VALLEY FROM THE ACHAEMENID PERIOD TO THE BEGINNING OF THE ISLAMIC PERIOD: A HISTORICO-POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE

This chapter provides an historico-political framework of Sogdiana based on textual and archaeological evidence from the end of the Achaemenid period to the beginning of Arab rule, essentially from the mid-4th century BCE to the early 8th century CE. It aims to present a historical context in which to better understand the different influences on the costume of the Samarkand region of Sogdiana. The task is not an easy one for a number of reasons. For example, Sogdiana remained essentially peripheral to the larger empires that surrounded it during this period. This has meant that while there are numerous written histories which encompass the major contiguous empires, such as those of the Han Chinese, the Kushans, the Parthians and the Sasanians, the attention paid to Sogdiana is only ever minimal. The nature of the textual sources dealing with Sogdiana reflects the intrinsic complexity of a region that traditionally lay beyond the centers that experienced the more "mainstream" influences of the Achaemenid Empire, Hellenism and Indian (Buddhist and Hindu) culture. From a Persian perspective, Sogdiana lay on the border between the "civilised" and "barbarian" worlds. For the Chinese, too, Sogdiana embodied a peripheral status with its nomadic elements far from the ruling center. The intermediary location of Sogdiana on the trade routes linking China with the Mediterranean has meant that evidence regarding this region comes from all sides, but only sporadically from within.

When viewed from a Central Asian perspective, however, the notion of Sogdiana as peripheral cannot be maintained. Its location on the trade routes, its political independance and the richness of the oases in the region ensured that its territory remained a priority in the foreign policies of surrounding Empires. Despite this, or perhaps because of it, an important part of Sogdian identity is based on its ability to maintain its strength and independence. Two factors were critical to this: the decentralised nature of the Sogdian political and administrative system, and its geographical location, providing a mixed context of nomadic and sedentary interactions.

It is almost impossible to view history without taking into account the geography of a region and, as noted above, this was intrinsic to the socio-political development of Sogdiana. The region of Sogdiana is small and well protected. Its natural borders are deserts, rivers and mountains: the Kyzil Kum desert to the north, the Amu Darya to the west, the Syr Darya to the east and the Hissar mountains to the south. Curtius described Sogdiana as a desert waste (VII, 10.1). Yet, one of the overriding traits of Sogdiana is the fertility and abundance of its oases. Muqaddasī comments:

"There are continuous villages, surrounded by trees and gardens, all the way from Samarkand to near Boyāra; one sees no village before one enters it for the trees about it. It is the most beautiful land on God's earth,"

1 Christian 1998: 3 - 20 provides a very useful overview of the importance of geography and ecology in influencing historical developments on a broader scale in Central Asia and the Eurasian Steppes.
2 See p. 53 regarding the attribution of the Hissar Mountains as the southern border of Sogdiana.
abounding in trees, pervaded with streams and resounding with birds' songs".3 "In the summer it is paradise ...".4 This idea of fertility has played an intrinsic role in Sogdian ritual and cultural development. It has also meant that Sogdiana was a region coveted by surrounding peoples, both for its fertility and also for its central position on the trade routes crossing Central Asia and linking China with the Mediterranean. Yet even in antiquity, it was exactly this location which gave it an enigmatic image, especially because of the relationship with the nomadic peoples to the east and north. It was perhaps this relationship which swayed the fortunes of Sogdiana away from the south and the influence of Hellenism and the west, compelling it to become more inward looking, at least until the early medieval period.

In many respects this chapter provides a micro view of Sogdian history, perhaps at the expense of a broader view of the role of Sogdiana in the historical machinations of Central Asia. In some ways, it may be argued that this approach is premature,5 especially given the quantity and nature of archaeological evidence from this region to date. While this criticism is wholly acknowledged, the primary material of this study - costume - provides an insight into micro society that in many respects remains otherwise elusive. While the underlying form of dress may reflect much broader influences, archaeological and especially ethno-archaeological studies have shown the significance of ornamentation and other details of costume operating at local (regional, possibly even district) levels of society, and possibly during a limited period.6 This underlines the importance of attempting to understand Sogdiana and the Zarafshan Valley from a regional or localised, micro perspective.

It is clear from the following that there is much confusion regarding many aspects of regionality in the literary and archaeological sources for Sogdian history. At the foundation of this lie the serious lacunae in these sources. Nevertheless, they do indicate that the notion of geographical and political regionality played an important role in Sogdiana and this is perhaps one of the overriding characteristics of pre-Islamic Sogdiana.

This chapter provides a historico-political overview of Sogdiana between the Achaemenid period and the beginning of the Islamic period. Historical periods are treated essentially chronologically. However, the ancient Chinese language sources are treated in a separate sub-section. There are several reasons for this. Firstly, the internal complexities and the tendency to integrate older sources has resulted in much confusion and apparent mis-information. Secondly, the information they provide is difficult to compare with western textual sources because of the usage of different ethnonyms and toponyms. Thirdly, because they provide the only textual source which treats the political situation of Sogdiana in any detail just prior to and during the early medieval period of that region. In some cases this has resulted in issues being revisited, albeit from a different perspective.

3 Cf. Shiratori 1928: 96.
4 Muqaddas: 248
5 And perhaps in some respects even inappropriate. See for example Christian 1998: xvii.
6 There is a very large body of literature on this. See for example Braithwaite 1982; Hays 1993; Kaiser 1983-4; McCracken 1988; Mortensen 1991; David, Sterner et al. 1988.
Sogdiana in the Avestan sources

The Avestan sources regarding Sogdiana are minimal and the information they provide is tenuous at best. There are two main Avestan sources relating to Sogdiana: the Videvdat and the Mihr Yašt. Information from these sources is primarily geographical. In the Videvdat I.4 Sogdiana (suxā) is described as the second best of all Avestan lands. The Mihr Yašt (X.IV.XIV) links Sogdiana (suyād) with the name Gava, which it locates between the lands of Merv and Chorasmia. Tomaschek associated Gava with He in the Chinese sources and Kushaniya in the Arabic sources as early as 1877. He located it between Samarkand and Kattakurgan, an equation that has been supported by many scholars.

Another short passage in the much later Greater Bundahišn Chapter 175 also mentions Sogdiana: “Ayrēra9 son of Pašang in the land of Sogdiana and him they call Gopat the king”. References to Gopatshah and the country of Gopatstan describe him either as a perfection of mankind, or as a half man, half bull being: “From foot and to the waist he is an ox, and from the waist up he is a man ...”. Bailey has suggested that Gopatshah was the rat or chief of Sogdiana. However, this is nebulous and inconclusive and many questions remain regarding the historicity of this figure and his link with Sogdiana.

The Achaemenid period

Sogdiana in the Persian language sources

The name of Sogdiana and its inhabitants, the Sogdians, makes its earliest appearance in Old Persian (OP) inscriptions under a number of different spellings but which can be generally designated Suguda or Sugda. Harmatta has suggested that the OP version was adopted from the Sogdian language while Dresden notes that already in the 6th century BCE the Sogdian language was differentiated from other Old Iranian languages. This implies that the Sogdian people were a recognised ethnic entity by this period. Achaemenid inscriptions and rock carvings similarly underline this, whereby

---

7 Note the precautions regarding the use of the Avesta as a historical source in Schlerath 1979.
9 Wolff 1910: 317. Note also that Harmatta 1979: 156 has discussed the meaning of Suyōa and associates it with fire and burning. Through this he suggests a link with pre-Zoroastrian fire cults in the region.
11 Cf., Trever 1940: 74. One of the earliest scholars of Sogdiana in the Chinese sources is W. Tomaschek. Much of the literature discussing the Chinese sources refers to his Centralasiatische Studien vol. II Sogdiana, published in Vienna in 1877. Unfortunately I have been unable to obtain this work in Australia.
12 Cf., Trever 1940: 74. Markwart 1938: 162, n. 2 also supports the association between Kusani and He. See also Beneviste 1933-34: 269. Grenet 2003: 209 suggests that Kushaniya was only founded with the Hephthalites.
13 Bailey 1932: 950. About the meaning of the word Gopat see also Humbach 1985.
14 Humbach 1985: 332-334 cites texts from the Bundahišn. See also p. 328 for the location of this country.
15 Ibid.: 334, text 10. Trever 1940: 75-6 also argues that the figure of Gopatshah is linked to the Zarafshān Valley.
16 Bailey 1932: 950.
17 Humbach 1985: 329 for example refutes this association.
18 Harmatta 1979: 154.
19 Ibid.: 154.
Sogdians are shown as an independent ethnic or geographic group, defined by their clothing and their tribute.21

The political situation of Sogdiana under the Achaemenids

Achaemenid evidence suggests that while Sogdiana was seen under the umbrella of the administration of the satrapy of Bactria-Sogdiana, there are certain clear distinctions to be made between the two regions. This is demonstrated in both artistic and textual sources. According to Herodotus (III, 92-3), Sogdiana lay in the sixteenth province of the Achaemenid Empire together with the Parthians, Chorasmians and the Arians, while Bactria was part of the twelfth province together with “their neighbours as far as the Aegli”.

During the Achaemenid period Sogdiana and Bactria formed a single satrapy22 in the Achaemenid empire in which Sogdiana essentially formed a buffer zone between Bactria and the “civilised” world and the nomads living to the east and north of the Syr Darya who played an instrumental role in Sogdian society. The organisation of this administrative unit is quite complicated, as it is clear that there were numerous differences between Sogdiana and Bactria, both politically and culturally.23

Despite the fact that there is almost no evidence to define any border between Bactria and Sogdiana during this period, the imperial lists supplied from the Achaemenid capital clearly suggest that they were, at least in some aspects, distinguished from each other.24 For example, Sogdiana supplied lapis lazuli and carnelian for the building of the palace at Susa while Bactria provided gold.25 The identity of Sogdians on the Apadana reliefs is contested. Delegation 17 has been suggested by some to represent the Sogdians and Chorasmians while other scholars have interpreted this group as Saka.26 The members of this delegation bear bracelets, axes and daggers and are leading a horse.27 The Bactrians are carrying a vessel and a skin.

Briant identifies three different levels of organization within the Bactrian-Sogdian satrapy: the central administration; the urban leaders in the cities; and a clearly defined class of apparently autonomous local princes (hyparchs), which may represent pre-Achaemenid Bactrian social organisation.28 The relations between the (urban) rulers and the local Sogdians were essentially feudal.29 The extent of power of the (rural) hyparchs

21 Sogdians are named on the Darius Statue. They are also thought to be represented in the Royal Tombs as group 7. Some scholars have also associated Sogdians with Delegation 17 on the Apadana reliefs. For a discussion of the Achaemenid visual sources see Chapter 6.
22 Prior to this there is evidence to suggest that a single “Bactrian culture” encompassed the region, dating approximately from the Iron Age. No distinctions are able to be made regarding Bactria, Sogdiana and Margiana. This period however, appears to have been particularly flourishing, given the extent of irrigation canals found in eastern Bactria. See Briant 2002: 752–754; Lyonnet 1993: 203.
23 Briant 2002: 746; Holt 1988: 31; Lyonnet 1993. These are perhaps most clearly highlighted by the fact that while Bactria appeared to submit quickly to Alexander, Sogdiana on the other hand took two years to conquer.
24 Briant 2002: 173 for these lists.
26 Briant 2002: 175.
29 Briant 1978: 72.
was territorial and in reality may have been quite widespread. Holt comments "... royal authority was not very visible in much of the region and it tended to dissipate further where populations were more mobile, more remote, or more loyal to an indigenous nobility unfettered by the Achaemenids". Sogdian society appears to have remained essentially traditional and probably agriculture-based.

The relationship between the Sogdians and the nomadic Saka beyond the Syr Darya during the Achaemenid and ensuing periods was an important one. The events which followed the founding of Alexander Eschate on the Syr Darya bear witness to this and may be seen in a similar context to those of the founding of Cyropolis and other fortresses during the Achaemenid period. Holt observes that "the announced intention to keep the Scythians out of Alexander’s empire by means of a military colony ran counter to local, long established conventions of close interaction between the diverse peoples on both banks of the Jaxartes". These nomadic groups include the Saka *para Sugdum*, the Saka *haumavarga*, the Saka *tigrakhauda*, the Saka *paradrya* and the Saka of the Marshlands and Plains. The close relationship between the nomads and the sedentary Sogdians (and to a lesser degree the Bactrians) is attested by the political organization of the country. It is also indicated by the similarity of military dress described by Herodotus (VII, 64-67) in his account of the Persian army whereby the Saka are named together with the Sogdians and Bactrians. Other evidence of relations between the sedentary and nomadic populations is indicated in the textile finds of the Pazyryk burials which, according to some scholars, may have been woven in the Bactria-Sogdiana satrapy and which may indicate an east-west trading, or other, relationship. Briant also underlines the close relationship between the peoples living in this border region, suggesting that the border towns established by Cyrus also acted as refuges for the Saka.

Although there is little archaeological evidence to date of the Achaemenids in Sogdiana, textual and artistic sources indicate the significance of their cultural influence in this region. The Iranian legacy is clearly preserved in the underlying foundation of artistic expression in Sogdiana, demonstrated on the figurines of the following periods. It seems that this influence was transmitted not by aggressive invasions or re-settlement programmes, but rather by a symbiotic process of gradual acculturation which married Achaemenid to local styles and expressions. This legacy was maintained in Sogdiana, in various degrees, until its fall to the Arabs in the 8th century.

*The Hellenistic period*

The Graeco-Roman literary sources present a view of Central Asia, and especially Sogdiana and the Sogdians (Gk. Σωγδιανῆ), from the time of Alexander to the 1st century CE. Sogdiana is traditionally seen as a buffer zone between Bactria and the Saka who lived on the far side of the Syr Darya. The Syr Darya also served as the eastern limit of the "civilised" world, and the position of Sogdiana as a peripheral entity is clear in the general (mis)understandings of the region in the sources for this period.

---

31 Ibid.: 56.
33 Briant 2002: 747 and for further references regarding this.
34 de la Vaissière 2002: 25-6 refutes the idea of a significant trading relationship involving the Saka and Sogdians during the Achaemenid period and sees the finds of the Altai burials in the context of diplomacy.
The aim of the following section is simply to define the position of Sogdiana and Samarkand during the Hellenistic period. There are several primary historical issues pertinent to this period including the relationship and borders between Bactria and Sogdiana, the identity of the nomadic invaders who brought about the downfall of the Greco-Bactrian Kingdom and the nature and date of Sogdian independence.

The political situation of Sogdiana during the Hellenistic period

The conquests of Alexander the Great in Central Asia between 329 and 327 BCE led to the opening up of this region to the west and were to have an unprecedented impact on the culture and politics of this and surrounding regions. Accounts of Sogdiana in the classical sources vacillate between portraying the richness and abundance of the land and a vast wasteland, referred to as the "desert places". Nevertheless it is clear that urban centers were already well developed under the Achaemenids. According to Curtius (VII, 6.10), Marakanda (Samarkand) at the time of Alexander's invasion was a "city begirt by a wall of seventy stadia, and the citadel is enclosed by another wall". Several Sogdian cities are named in the Alexander period histories including Marakanda, Nautaka (Shahr-i Sabz), Alexander Eschate, Cyropolis, Xenippa (Erkurgan) and Gabae. References are also made to numerous "forts" in the country to which the Sogdians retreated as an act of defiance against Alexander. In most cases it is clear that these were located in rural areas. Justin (XII, 5) and Strabo (XI, II.4) mention twelve and eight cities respectively being founded in Bactria and Sogdiana during this period.

The Syriac version of the history of Alexander the Great also documents evidence regarding Samarkand, and another center, Kesh. Alexander narrates, "we set out from thence, and came to a country which they call Sôd [Soghd], and the country was very populous. I saw there a large river going forth on the south west quarter ...". The narration continues, "And then we came to the country of the Sundîkâyê ("the inhabitants of the Sugd") ... I commanded a city to be built there and to be called Samarkand ... I commanded that all the Sundîkâyê should come to that place and should make a feast to Rhea and offer sacrifices to her". The text suggests that Sundîkâyê and Sôd represented the names of two different countries. Samarkand is associated with Sundîkâyê while from another passage, it is clear that Kesh is associated with Sogdiana: "From thence he came to the country of the Sogdians, and there too he built a city and named it Kûsh". However, the same text gives another name for Samarkand: "He [Alexander] also passed by the Serici who [live] in ... And when they had received him and become subject to him, he built a city there and named it Samîrkûr (Samarkand)". Despite this confusion

35 Lit. "Alexandria the furthest". It is generally accepted to be Khojent (Leninabad) in western Ferghana. Cyropolis is also thought to have been located in this general region, although not necessarily on the exact site of the modern city. See Fraser 1996: 15-161 and Bosworth 1995: 15-17.
36 Holt 1988: 29 for further references and bibliography regarding these.
37 Pseudo-Callisthenes: 113.
38 Ibid.: 115.
39 Ibid.: 160.
40 Ibid.: 160. Regarding the reference to Serici, it is unclear exactly which people is indicated here. Justin also speaks of the Seres (XIII, 20). Although the name is usually associated with the Chinese, the meaning here is unclear.
(and the evident propaganda), it is clear that there were several regional centers of Sogdiana during this period.42

The building of Alexander Eschate highlights the intrinsic role of the Saka in Sogdian society. Holt suggests that it sparked the full scale revolt against the Macedonians which was to last two years. He argues that it symbolised for the first time Macedonian attempts to entrench themselves in the region and permanently divide the Sogdian-Saka relationship.43 Furthermore, the extent of the Sogdian and Saka reaction to the founding of this city44 underlines the importance of their relationship. Alexander considered the nomads a “barbarian” people whom he neither understood nor trusted and therefore attempted to forcibly control. It was only with the weakening of Alexander’s policy towards the Sogdian uprisings and his marriage in 327 to Roxanne, herself the daughter of the Bactrian Oxyartes, that he was able to re-establish a working relationship with the local Sogdians.45

There is little doubt that the Sogdians, together with the neighbouring Saka on the eastern frontier, formed a very strong political and military unit whose strengths had been well utilised by the Achaemenids. It is possible that the leaders had more control in the urban centers, while local princes or hyparchs, probably coming from the local aristocracy, were dominant in the rural areas. The power of the latter was probably territorial and is evident in their ability to stockpile food and also to organise their military defence.46 It is clear that the rural/agricultural economy was well developed, although the administration of the urban and rural sectors appears to have been quite differentiated between local rulers and the satrap.47

There is evidence to suggest that Sogdian society during the Achaemenid and Hellenistic periods was characterised by its regionality although the underlying Iranian culture acted as a strong cohesive across the territory. The fact that there are relatively few coins to come from Sogdiana indicates that the economy remained traditional, based on barter and exchange. One of the strengths of Sogdiana appears to have lain in the apparently disparate nature of its settlements. Although there are accounts of Sogdian defectors to the Macedonian side, Alexander’s attempts to control Sogdian society reflect his lack of understanding of this region and it is questionable the extent to which Alexander was ever able to conquer Sogdiana.48 The difficulties of the Macedonian

42 The text also raises for the first time in the textual sources the issue of the differentiation of the “state” of Sogdiana and the principality of Sogdiana.
43 Holt 1988: 55-56. See also Briant 2002: 746ff; de la Vaissière 2002: 25, n. 18. See, however, Bosworth 1995 v. II: 16 who suggests that the reasons for the revolt may be found in civil disputes between the Sogdians and Saka. “The announcement of the new city might have evoked justified fears that existing settlements (and nobles) would lose territory to it ...”. See also Litvinskij 1960. Another view of the situation in Sogdiana is given by Bloedow (Bloedow 1991), who argues that it was Alexander’s taking of local prized horses in Sogdiana that led to the uprising, underlining the vulnerable position this would have left the Sogdians in. Bloedow, however, appears to underestimate the strength of the relationship between the nomadic Saka and the sedentary Sogdians and also the minimal extent of the impact of Hellenism in Sogdiana in comparison to Bactria.
44 The extent to which this city had been planned or built is unclear. See Bloedow 1991.
46 Briant 2002: 748.
47 See Ibid.: 748-52.
48 Holt 1988: 69 questions the extent to which Alexander’s “conquering” of Sogdiana can be accepted, commenting that “Alexander’s only real success lay in the fact that he was able, after two very difficult years, to extricate himself from a problem largely of his own making.”
campaigns in Sogdiana – it was more than two years before they were able to leave - are expressed by Cleitus, the governor of Bactria and Sogdiana, who says of the region, "... so often rebellious, and not only untamed, but not even capable of being subdued".49 This observation reflects the dubious state in which Alexander left Sogdiana and also indicates the attitude of the Macedonians towards the Sogdians.50

The archaeological evidence: Afrasiab IIA, c. 330 BCE

Two periods of Greek settlement at Afrasiab have been identified on the basis of archaeological evidence. The first (Afrasiab IIA) is probably associated with the invasions by Alexander (329 - 327 BCE). The second stage (Afrasiab IIB) is linked to the fleeting renaissance of Hellenism under Eucratides (c. 170 – 145 BCE) who tried to push his Empire back into Sogdiana. This attempt was brought to an end by the notorious nomadic invaders known under the umbrella term "Saka".51

Afrasiab IIA has been dated to approximately the end of the 4th to the beginning of the 3rd century BCE.52 Lyonnet associates the end of this period with the rule of Antiochus I (c. 280 – 261) and tentatively calls it pre-Seleucid.53 It coincides with period IV at Koktepe.54 It is characterised primarily by a massive reconstruction campaign of the Achaemenid ramparts.55 During the Achaemenid period Afrasiab was enclosed by a 5.5 km line of fortifications. By the Hellenistic period this had grown to 13 km together with increased urban development.56

There are, however, conflicting indicators of urbanism at Afrasiab by the time of the Alexander invasions. Despite extensive fortifications surrounding the citadel and lower city and abundant finds of ceramics (parallels with which are found at Ai Khanum57), there is little other domestic or ritual evidence of this urbanism and little indication of a residential quarter.58 Excavations have shown that the area thought to comprise the main town was divided into three sections. In the northern section was the

49 In Curtius VIII, I.35
50 See Holt 1988: 70-86 for a discussion of Greco-Macedonian attitudes towards Alexander and the East in general. These attitudes are largely summed up in Strabo's comment "Now in early times the Sogdians and Bactrians did not differ much from the nomads in their modes of life and customs, although the Bactrians were a little more civilised" (XI, 11.3)
51 See below, p. 56.
53 Lyonnet 1998: 151. Lyonnet notes that it may be related either to the first campaigns of Alexander in Transoxiana, c. 329-327, or to those of Seleucus, between 311 and 303. She favours an Alexander period dating because of the utilitarian nature of the vessels found at Afrasiab and the fact that they are concentrated in fortified areas, thereby indicating occupation by a military force rather than a civilian one.54 Rapin 2001: 75.
54 Rapin and Isamiddinov 1994.
56 See Lyonnet 1998.
57 Several reasons are put forth for the apparent general absence of stratified layers at Afrasiab. The main one at this stage is the huge size of the site and the relatively minor area that has to date been covered by excavations. See also Bernard, Grenet et al. 1992: 292ff regarding the apparent absence of domestic remains during the Hellenistic period at Afrasiab. The excavators do not agree with the suggestions made previously by Kabanov that earlier Hellenistic levels were destroyed to erect new buildings around the beginning of the CE. Instead they suggest that they must be sought in a different area of the site. The more recent Franco-Uzbek excavations have also tended to concentrate on the fortifications of the site, these being the most dominant feature on the plateau.
upper town which housed the official buildings. A mill was found in this section which Isamiddinov and Rapin cautiously associate with ritual. The main palace was found in the eastern section while the western section formed the sacred area. It is possible that the residential section of the town was in the center of the plateau while in the southern section were houses surrounded by larger gardens.

Post Alexander: 323 – c. 200 BCE

At the death of Alexander in 323 Sogdiana retained its satrapal relationship with Bactria and the two were passed into the hands of Perdiccas by Philip. In 321 control was given to Stasanor by Antipater. The establishment and extent of Seleucid power in Sogdiana and the Zarafshan Valley is unclear. Seleucus I came to power in 312/11 and in c. 306 established control over Bactria. Evidence of Seleucid penetration of the Zarafshan Valley remains piecemeal, and the virtual absence of Seleucid coins here indicates that relations in Transoxiana were minimal. However, as Zeimal has suggested, the name Sogdiana does not necessarily include the Zarafshan Valley. Lyonnet argues that Samarkand became independent some time during the rule of Antiochus I, around 280 – 250 BCE.

By the middle of the 3rd century an uprising led by the Bactrian and Sogdian satrap Diodotus during the reign of Antiochus II (261 – 246) led to the establishment of the Greco-Bactrian Kingdom in the satrapy of Bactria and Sogdiana. Again, the little evidence that exists of the presence or influence of this Kingdom in the Zarafshan Valley is primarily numismatic. Zeimal has suggested that Greco-Bactrian control never reached north of the Hissar Mountains and as the interests of this Kingdom turned to the south, the seceding of Sogdiana was apparently relatively unchallenged. It is also to this period that the building of the Iron Gates at Derbent dates. This nomad wall extended the physical border of the Hissar Mountains and probably entrenched the border between Bactria and the Zarafshan Valley and the Kashka Darya.

A recent article by Lerner has reframed thinking on the extent of Hellenism in Sogdiana. Lerner has argued on the basis of numismatics that “prior to c. 221 BCE Euthydemus governed Sogdiana either as a satrap under Diodotus II, or as an independent sovereign. However, by c. 221 BCE Euthydemus so well established his position over the country that he became Sogdiana’s undisputed sovereign issuing his own coinage.

59 Isamiddinov and Rapin 1999: 37.
60 Ibid.
61 Ibid.
62 Justin XIII, 22.
63 Zeimal 1983: 237-8 discusses only two coins of Seleucid origin found in Transoxiana. Although the first Sogdian coins were Seleucid imitations, this strengthens the argument, according to Zeimal, against the inclusion of the Zarafshan Valley in the Seleucid Empire. See, however, Lerner 1999 for a summary of the numismatic evidence in Sogdiana prior to the reign of Euthydemus.
64 Zeimal 1983: 236.
65 Lyonnet 1998: 152. Following numismatic arguments put forth by Zeimal based on the presence of imitations of the coins of Antiochus I in Samarkand, Lyonnet similarly argues from a numismatic point of view.
66 See Rakhmanov and Rapin 1999.
67 Rapin 2001: 76.
68 Lerner 1999.
with the regal title". Although Lerner discusses a “flourishing” Greco-Sogdian kingdom, there is little other real evidence of this to date in either Bukhara or Samarkand.

**Sogdian Independence c. 200 – 130 BCE**

Evidence regarding Sogdian independence from the Greco-Bactrian kingdom is nebulous. In western Sogdiana (centered on the Bukhara oasis), Sogdian independence has been discussed on the basis of numismatics. The dating for independence at Samarkand, however, is much less certain and there are few archaeological indications to support the dates suggested by numismatics. As early as 1910 Allotte de la Fuye placed Sogdian independence, at least in the Bukhara region, at the death of Euthydemus (who ruled between c. 235 – 200 BCE), around 200 BCE. This has been challenged by Bopearachchi on the basis of new numismatic discoveries. He claims that the Sogdians achieved independence during the lifetime of Euthydemus, sometime between 208 and 206 BCE. The extent of the independent region, however, is questioned, as coins serving as evidence of the event are limited to the Bukhara region. It is possible that it was only this region that gained independence in 208 – 206 BCE.

**The border between Sogdiana and Bactria**

The issue of the border between Sogdiana and Bactria in the Seleucid and Greco-Bactrian periods remains problematic, although research during the last decade has resolved some of the issues. The origin of the problem lies in the (mis)understanding of the classical authors regarding its location. While Strabo (II, 1.15) and Ptolemy (XI and XII) claim that the Oxus (Amu Darya) formed the border between Bactria and Sogdiana, there remain numerous issues concerning the course of this river in antiquity. Many scholars now agree that the Hissar Mountains probably formed this border. However, the role of this “border” during the Achaemenid period is unclear. Lyonnet has suggested that the border may not have reflected the ethno-cultural divisions of the area, which she has shown to be more complicated. Instead, she proposes two distinct regions whose cultural continuity reaches deep into antiquity. The first area comprises the region to the east and north of the Kunduz River, including the plains of the Wakhsh and the Qizil Su and the Zarafshan Valley which share “common cultural features related to the Indian world”. The second area includes the plain of Bactra and
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74 Bopearachchi earlier states that the coins were bought in “the Bukhara region” (Ibid.: 11). This has apparently been confirmed by the most recent studies of the coins. See also Rapin and Isamiddinov 1994: 559.
75 Regarding Ptolemy, see most recently Rapin 1998: 202-203. Revisions made to the map by Rapin show that it was probably based on information from different periods and that this is a likely source for the apparent mistakes. See also Stavisky 1986: 50-53; Holt 1988: 19-24; Bernard and Francfort 1978: 3-15 and 45-48.
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the Surkhan Darya, which reflects a more Central Asian cultural influence. While it is generally accepted that the Iron Gates formed the northern border of the Kushan Empire, Lyonett has shown that the "cultural" divisions to the north prior to this require further research.

Unlike in Bactria, indications of the impact of Hellenism on Sogdiana remain nebulous although there is considerably less evidence of material culture on which to base an opinion. There are several reasons for this. The nature of the initial contact between the Sogdians and the Greeks on the whole appears to be one of tolerance rather than interaction. A revolt broke out when the Greeks threatened the relationship between the sedentary Sogdians and the nomadic peoples living along the Syr Darya. The nomad presence on the eastern frontier was intrinsic to Sogdian society and it is clear from Achaemenid and Hellenistic sources that they also played an important role in Sogdian politics at this period. The importance of the Persian legacy in the country is demonstrated especially in the artistic and religious sources for the region, but it is also ambivalent politically. Early Sogdian coinage shows a strong Persian influence with legends written in Aramaic, the *lingua franca* of the Achaemenid Empire, and the use of a Persian rather than Greek metrological system. The decentralised nature of the country was conducive to neither broad scale political control nor the acceptance and dissemination of the artistic expression, which was one of the hallmarks of Hellenistic culture.

**Nomadic invaders c. 150 BCE – 50 CE**

*The nomadic invaders of Sogdiana and the Zarafshān Valley*

In Polybius (XI, 34) the communication between Euthydemus and Antiochus provides a snapshot of the situation which was to bring about the ultimate fall of the Greco-Bactrian kingdom. Euthydemus says to Antiochus that "... if he did not yield to this demand [to rule the Bactrian kingdom], neither of them would be safe: seeing that great hordes of Nomads are close at hand, who were a danger to both; and that if they admitted them into the country, it would certainly be utterly barbarised". The identity of these and later invaders of Transoxiana remains unclear and establishing their identity is hampered by the conflicting and confused textual and archaeological sources. Very scant visual sources have also fuelled the debate.

The problem of the identity of the nomadic invaders of Sogdiana and Bactria and their relations with the sedentary population from about 145 BCE to the 1st to 2nd century
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78 Ibid.

79 The comments by Holt 1988: 22-23 regarding the role of topographic features acting as "borders" in antiquity provide a different perspective on the idea or role of borders. "A desert place may well separate various peoples, but it will be shown that these were barriers to the Graeco-Macedonians more often than to the natives of the east. Likewise, mountain chains were often cut by corridors through which armies and commerce might pass. Rivers, especially those which penetrated deserts, were the least likely borders. These tended to attract peoples together, not separate them".

80 There is some evidence of a renaissance of Hellenistic influence on Sogdian culture during the early medieval period. Greek motifs for example are found in levels dating to the 4th-5th century CE in Afrasiab and Tal-i Barzu. It has been suggested that these are due to the circulation of much older art objects in society at this period.

81 Note however, that measures are given in Greek Staters in the *Sogdian Ancient Letters*. See Grenet, Sims-Williams *et al.* 1998.
CE has been addressed from an archaeological perspective by Lyonnet in her discussions of the ceramic complexes of A'i Khanum and Afrasiab and, most recently, by Rapin in his discussion of finds from Koktepe. This issue remains one of the most significant of Sogdian and Bactrian political history during this period and although no conclusions are absolute, scholars are now in a position to explore more closely the nature of these invasions and the identity of the invaders. The period is defined by the death of Eucratides in approximately 145 BCE and the rise of the Kushan yabghu, probably sometime in the mid-2nd century CE. Two large invasions of Sogdiana have been identified for this period. In reality these were probably made up of many smaller waves of peoples moving through the country.

**Textual sources**

Greco-Roman sources list numerous ethnonyms for the different nomadic peoples who led the early waves of invasions into Central Asia. According to Strabo (XI.8.2), the Asioi, the Pasianoi, the Tochari and the Sacaraques, all of whom come from beyond the Jaxartes (Syr Darya), were responsible for the downfall of Greek power in Bactria. The Saka are also mentioned in this context. According to Pompeius Trogus (XXXI-XXXII), the Scythians comprise the Saraucae and the Asiani while the Tochari are mentioned as subjects of the Asiani. The similarity of the names hints at a common source. It has been suggested that Strabo's Pasianoi is another variation of the name Asiano who correspond to Trogus Pompeii's Asiani. If this is accepted then there are three different peoples associated with the fall of the Greco-Bactrian Empire: the Sacaraques, the Asiani and the Tochari.

Rapin loosely equates these three groups with the Sai/Saka and the Yuezhi of the Chinese sources whom he associates specifically with the Asiani while Bernard associates the Yuezhi with the Tocharians of the Greco-Roman sources on the basis of the early medieval name for Bactria - Tokharistan.

**Visual sources**

In addition to the literary sources a number of different sites have yielded visual representations of warriors in battle from this period, although their identity is far from settled. Bernard and Pugachenkova have suggested that the family represented on the frieze at Khalchayan in southern Uzbekistan is one of the leading clans of the settled Yuezhi.

The magnificent burials at Tillya-tepe in north eastern Afghanistan are thought to preserve the remains of an aristocratic Saka family group dated to between the 1st century BCE and the 1st century CE. They appear to have been a sedentary nomadic family,
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84 See most recently Falk 2001.
85 Rapin 2001: 82.
86 Ibid.: 82-3. The term Yuezhi has been used throughout the present work to refer to the Da [Great] Yuezhi unless otherwise indicated.
88 Ibid.: 760.
89 Pugachenkova 1971.
90 Sarianidi 1989.
ruling a local fiefdom from the nearby city of Emshi-tepe. They may have originally been part of a horde that moved south from the steppe regions, eventually splitting into two groups. One group moved through Parthia and ended up in Drangiana. Bernard calls these peoples the Sacaraques and it is these people(s) that gave their name to Sakastan or Seistan, the lower basin of the Helmand River between Afghanistan and Iran. They are also known as the Indo-Parthians. The other group, the Indo-Scythians, moved south and east, eventually ending up in north west India. Although there is an underlying similarity between the grave goods from Tillya-tepe and other artistic objects of the wider steppe, including the material culture of the Yuezhi, more specific comparisons, demonstrated especially in jewellery, can be drawn between the Tillya-tepe material and that of the Indo-Parthians and Parthia generally. However, while the material culture of these burials represents a definite affinity with western Steppic cultures, a more precise ethnonym for the deceased and their culture still eludes scholars.

Some scholars have also argued that the battle scenes on the belt plaques from Orlat, located north west of Samarkand, similarly portray this early wave of invasions. However, there is much dispute concerning both the date of the plaques and the identity of the warriors portrayed on them. Whether they represent Kangju, Yuezhi or another ethnic (nomadic) grouping remains unclear.

It is clear, nevertheless, that a comparison of the styles represented on the pieces shows a nomadic influence on the Orlat plates, while the Khalchayan frieze reflects a Hellenistic influence.

Archaeological evidence: Afrasiab IIB

The fortifications of the first Greek settlement at Afrasiab eventually crumbled and were later replaced on a more simple scale. This marks the second stage of Greek “occupation” at Afrasiab (Afrasiab IIB) and has been dated to the period immediately preceding the fall of Greek power in Bactria, perhaps sometime between the end of the 3rd century and the second quarter of the 2nd century BCE or slightly later. Afrasiab IIB is associated with the rule of Eucratides at Ai Khanum (c. 170 – 145 BCE) and his invasion of Sogdiana. This phase ended with an event or group of events that saw the fall of Ai Khanum to nomadic invaders in 145 BCE. The brief renaissance of Hellenism Eucratides brought to Sogdiana is evidenced most clearly in the repairs to the fortifications at Afrasiab. This phase has not been documented at Koktepe.
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92 There are various interpretations of the identity of the deceased. See Olbrycht 1998: 26-7 for a brief summary of these. Yatzenko 2001 has studied the dress from these burials and claims “the deceased buried in Tillya-tepe must be considered early Yuech-chih [Yuezhi] from the beginning of Kujula Kadphises' reign” (p. 86). He does admit some similarities with Sarmatian costume – see p. 104 - which are the result of “several waves of migrations of eastern peoples which had lived in the regions bordering Bactria before” (p. 107).
93 Rapin 2001: 90. Note however that Marshak 1987: 235 suggests they date to the 4th century CE, documenting the invasion of Sogdiana by the Chionites. Litvinsky 2001 also argues for a later dating, c. 3rd century CE. For reproductions of these plaques see Abdullaev, Rtveladze et al. 1991 v.I: 176-178.
95 Ibid.: 558. See also Lyonnet 1998: 152 and 154. Afrasiab IIB is placed tentatively around the middle stages of the rule of Eucratides (c. 170 – 145 BCE), c. 160 – 150.
The first nomadic invasions c. 145 BCE: the fall of the Greco-Bactrian Kingdom

On the basis of extensive studies of the ceramic assemblages of Afrasiab and in particular Ai Khanum and the Bactrian plain, Lyonnet has shown that the nomadic invaders at the end of the 2nd century BCE can in part be identified by the ceramic assemblages they left behind. Three different shapes in particular are characteristic of different sites in Sogdiana and Bactria dated to this period: bottle shaped vessels, vases with a tripod base and stemmed goblets (goblet sur piedouche).

In eastern Bactria, based especially on the pottery from Ai Khanum dated to approximately 145 BCE, the nomadic invasion can be defined by two different ceramic forms: vases with tripod bases and bottle shaped vessels. The initial invasion is characterised by the presence of vases with tripod bases and is loosely associated with the "Scythians". More specifically, these vessel types can be traced to peoples coming from the east, from Ferghana and western China, on the basis of similar shapes found in China and associated with the Wusun of the 5th to 3rd centuries BCE.

This was followed several years later by the appearance of bottle-shaped pots connected with the Yuezhi. Significantly, none of these bottle-shaped vessels have to date been found at Afrasiab.

A third ceramic vessel type is also characteristic of this general wave of invasions: the stemmed goblet. In the Zarafshan Valley, the appearance of stemmed goblets is dated to approximately 150 – 125 BCE, i.e., after the fall of Eucratides. The goblets have also been found at sites on either side of the Amu Darya, including Babashov and Tillya-tepe, up to Kafirmigan, including the Bishkent Valley to Tulkhar and Aruktan. The ceramic assemblages of Erkurgan 8 – 13, dated from the 1st century CE – c. 350 CE, also contain similar stemmed goblets. The goblets have been associated with a people(s) of western origin, who formed a corridor through Chorasmia, Sogdiana, Bactria and into northwest India where their progression was probably halted by the rise of the Kushan Empire. The carriers of these vessels are loosely identified as Scythians, but more specifically as the Sacaraque of the Greco-Roman sources.

The ceramic evidence suggests that Bactria and Sogdiana were invaded around 145 BCE from two different directions – the east and the north respectively. Whether the invaders comprised different groups within a larger tribal "federation", or were completely separated, remains unclear. Several tentative conclusions may be drawn from this. Firstly, the Yuezhi (possibly to be identified with the Asiani of the classical sources) almost certainly did not take full control of the Zarafshan Valley, but instead can be associated with the fall of the Greco-Bactrian heartland of eastern Bactria. Secondly, however, on the basis of ceramic evidence, it is not possible to rule out their presence in
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101 Rapin 2001: 68. It is also interesting to note that the anthropomorphic evidence from burials in the Bishkent Valley, Babashov and on the Bala Hissar at Ai Khanum show a Europoid type. See Lyonnet 1997: 165.
103 Note that finds of these goblets at Kandahar dating to c. 150 BCE have been asssociated with both the Indo-Scythians and also the "Saka" from Parthia. Svend Helms, pers. comm.
the Zarafshan Valley and it is likely that they passed through this region. That they had some sort of relations with the Kangju during the second half of the 1st century CE, however, is confirmed by the Chinese sources.104

The Zarafshan Valley saw two main nomadic invasions, the first of which, perhaps shortly after 130 BCE, brought about the fall of Samarkand (Afrasiab III), and constituted a people of western origin. These invaders are known under the umbrella term Scythians, however, more specifically, they are thought to be the Sacaraques of the Graeco-Roman sources. These people have been associated with stemmed goblets. They followed a north-south access corridor from the steppe, through Sogdiana and into northwestern India.105 The second invasion appears to have taken place some time around 50 CE and is discussed below.

**Afrasiab III**

Afrasiab III corresponds with period V at Koktepe. The main event of this phase is the fall of Samarkand at the hands of the Sacaraques.106 It is characterised by the absence of repairs to the fortifications and several primitive structures, which are the only architectural features that have, to date, been associated with the period.107 Many ceramic shapes and forms continue from the previous period, although some new ones also appear, including the stemmed goblets.108 This period is especially noteworthy in the context of the nomadic invasion, as it does not show the same levels of destruction as at other sites in eastern Bactria that were ravaged by nomads coming from the east. In fact, the quality of ceramics from this period remains remarkably high, although some deterioration is indicated in the application of slip.109 This suggests that the “invasions” were reasonably peaceful, allowing the continuation of political and social life.

**The second nomadic invasions c. 50 CE**

The second invasion or wave of invasions in Sogdiana can also be documented on the basis of nomadic burials and associated finds. This is period VI at Koktepe, associated with the burial of a high ranking female dated to the mid-1st century CE. The pottery from this burial is of local manufacture and similar to that found in other kurgans in the Zarafshan Valley.110 No stemmed goblets have been found here. This is consistent with other burials on the right bank of the Zarafshan and implies that they date to a later period. Comparative evidence of the grave finds from Koktepe reflects a northern origin or influence for many of the goods associated with the burial. Rapin has cautiously proposed a Saka-Sarmatian identity for this wave of nomadic invaders.111 The nature of this invasion may in part be judged by the burial goods at Koktepe. No arms were found in the burial. The high quality of the ceramics found in the niches is

104 See below p. 63ff.
105 Note that their route remains questionable. On the presence of the stemmed goblets south of the Hindu Kush see Helms 1997: 60-63.
108 Ibid.: 147.
110 Rapin 2001: 53. Lyonnet has associated this period at Koktepe with Afrasiab II B or Afrasiab III. At Afrasiab III there are stemmed goblets. However, these were absent at Koktepe.
similar to other locally made pieces. This suggests a reasonably peaceful relationship involving exchange between these peoples.\textsuperscript{112} Moreover, the burial finds reflect a high degree of cultural exchange and contact. A bronze cauldron found in the eastern niche of the burial reflects generally the steppe nomadic world, from Siberia to the Black Sea, from the 6th century BCE to the beginning of the CE.\textsuperscript{113} The heritage of a mirror lying at the left hand of the deceased is even more generalised, such an item being a common feature of female burials in the nomadic world stretching from Mongolia to the Black Sea.\textsuperscript{114} It is important to note, however, various similarities with what may be termed eastern influences, especially in the nature of the burial itself. For example the body was laid with the head facing the east, while the cruciform tomb with a northern dromos, finds parallels with those of Ferghana.\textsuperscript{115} Rapin sees the Koktepe burial as a "synthesis of cultural elements which appear to illustrate affinities with Ferghana rather than Chach and the Kangju confederation".\textsuperscript{116}

The invasion of the middle of the 1st century CE was by peoples of a northwestern origin, possibly Sarmatian, and who probably formed part of the Kangju confederation.\textsuperscript{117} The evidence of the grave goods found at Koktepe suggests that these peoples had an important relationship with the traders of the northern trade route, which itself was probably controlled by northern steppe nomads.\textsuperscript{118} The relationship between the various settled and (semi-?) nomadic population groups in Sogdiana by this stage appears to have been relatively peaceful. This is underlined by the fact that irrigation systems remained intact and that nomadic burials are found largely outside the irrigated lands. This implies that instead of ravaging the agricultural land, the invading nomads subjugated the people, essentially leaving their established infrastructure in place.\textsuperscript{119} The burial at Koktepe demonstrates what appears to be a peaceful and symbiotic relationship between the different population groups: the structure of the tomb reflects some similarities with tombs found in Ferghana; pottery from the eastern niche was the product of a local workshop; the cauldron of the western niche, although perhaps of regional production, suggests typically Scythian burial rites.

**Summary**

The period following the invasions of Alexander until c. 50 CE was a fluid one in Sogdiana. Sogdiana and Bactria initially remained united under their Achaemenid satrapal legacy, despite the differences between the two regions. However, Seleucid influence highlighted the differences of these two regions, already attested in the Achaemenid sources. While western historical sources focus on the spread of Hellenistic culture in Bactria and to the south, Sogdiana seceded and became more peripheral. There

\textsuperscript{112} Ibid.: 54.
\textsuperscript{113} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{114} Ibid.: 61.
\textsuperscript{115} Ibid.: 71.
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid.: 72. Author's translation. Note that the use of the term "confederation" should be cautious as there is little evidence regarding the administrative and political organisation of the Kangju at this time. Pulleyblank 1999: 153-4 also questions the use of this term when discussing the nomadic peoples west of China.
\textsuperscript{117} Rapin 2001: 92.
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid.: 62.
is little real evidence of Greek influence in Sogdiana to date, and the politically
decentralised nature of the region was not conducive to a sweeping acceptance of
Hellenistic culture. This may have been one of the reasons it took Alexander much longer
than he could have initially anticipated to conquer Sogdiana. Furthermore, the
archaeological record of the Greek occupation of Samarkand shows that, in spite of
Alexander’s intentions, in reality it was short lived, and was followed by a long break in
urban development in the region, which continued until the 4th century CE.120

Waves of nomadic incursions into Sogdiana, beginning just after the middle of the
2nd century BCE, appear to have been relatively peaceful. The period defines the clear
break in the fortunes of Sogdiana and Bactria. While Bactria was enveloped by
Hellenism and turned towards the south, Sogdiana maintained its Iranian legacy, which
served to filter the strong local influence and ultimately it was this which was to
predominate in Sogdiana.

*Sogdiana in the Chinese sources c. 206 BCE – early 8th century CE*

This section deals with relevant ancient Chinese histories that comment on the
historico-political situation in and around Sogdiana, and in particular the place of
Samarkand in this territory, from the 2nd century BCE to the 8th century CE.121 These
sources provide an important, albeit complex and often confusing, perspective. They are
particularly important for the detail they provide on the westward movements of various
nomadic peoples and are a critical source for the political situation of Sogdiana during the
early medieval period.

A reconstruction of the history of the ancient region of Sogdiana based on the
Chinese sources is particularly complex and problematic. There are several reasons for
this. Peoples and countries in these texts were named according to their Chinese
transliterations, which were often copied from one history to another, during which time
mistakes crept into the script. The names recorded by the Chinese were not necessarily
those that the inhabitants of the region used themselves and, moreover, the Chinese had
their own formula for recording and abbreviating names. This may explain the apparent
absence of the name Sogdiana in the Han period sources. More recent data and personal
commentaries were often added by the writers when discussing ancient periods. These
were often inconsistent with other contemporary histories and were used with the benefit
of hindsight, or to reflect a specific (contemporary) political situation. Moreover, some
histories contain incorporated excerpts from other histories which are now totally lost. It
is consequently very difficult to prove or disprove the foundation of these
inconsistencies.122 Modern historians and western sinologists in some instances have
translated place and people names according to their own interpretation, thereby
perpetuating the usage in translation of a name that is not necessarily fact. This is
especially true for the use of the name Kangju, which has been employed by numerous
scholars interchangeably with Sogdiana during the Han period and later equated with
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120 See Grenet 1996 regarding the revival of urban development in Sogdiana.
121 See Table 5 on p. 88 for a list of Chinese dynasties and their corresponding dates.
122 See the introduction by Loewe in Hulsewé 1979: 24 regarding the authenticity of the texts. See also
regarding the *Shiji* and the *Hanshu*. 
Kang or Samarkand. The vacillating nature of nomadic states, both in name and territory, is also another reason for the complexity.

Sogdian social structure is also an important factor to take into account when assessing the Chinese histories. Sogdian society from approximately the 2nd century BCE to the 8th century CE was essentially two-tiered, comprising the original Iranian speaking sedentary inhabitants and the infiltrating nomadic peoples. In the early medieval period, these included Turkic and Iranian speaking peoples. However, the identity of the earlier invading peoples remains debated. Typically the invaders became the rulers with whom the Chinese came into contact, and it is perhaps their names which appeared in the Chinese histories. Nevertheless, the importance of trade in the region ensured that the local inhabitants also maintained a certain kudos in society. The mingling of identities is to be expected and is apparent in visual sources of the early medieval period, and in textual sources relating to Sogdian merchant towns to the east.

The problem of vocalisation of place and people names in Classical Chinese is a further complication. As remarked by Loewe, a linguistic interpretation of the Chinese sources would present a very useful tool with which to assess the geographical information contained in the histories. The primary issue here is simple: it remains unknown exactly how ancient Chinese was vocalised. Karlgren has produced numerous works on this subject, not without criticism, and his GSR has become a standard reference. This work presents three variations for each Chinese character. These serve as filters to show a possible development from archaic (early Chou) to ancient (c. 600 – 650 CE) to modern Mandarin pronunciation. However, these filters remain hypothetical. A more recent work on the same subject has been produced by Pulleyblank. He provides numerous alternatives in vocalisation to those given by Karlgren. Pulleyblank's volume expands the possibilities for vocalisation, perhaps increasing chances of mistakes, but also allowing for a wider scope for understanding these terms. For the non-Sinologue, this volume has the benefit of being able to work from the Hanyu Pinying romanisation to the Chinese. Ultimately, however, the problem remains that there is no certainty as to the correct pronunciation of names. In this thesis Chinese personal and place names have been transliterated in square brackets according to the Hanyu Pinyin system.

There are numerous translations of the Chinese sources into western languages. Wylie in 1881 undertook the translation of the *Tsien Hanshu* into English. Chavannes has translated into French numerous chapters of the *Hou Hanshu* and the later histories, especially the *Tangshu*. In 1979 Hulsewé published an English translation of some of the chapters of the Former Han Dynasty (*Hanshu*). Most recently, Hill has
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123 Shiratori 1928: 84-90 argues strongly for a Turkic origin of the early BCE/CE nomadic invaders of this region, however, the question is unresolved.
124 See for example Xinjiang 2000.
125 Loewe in Hulsewé 1979: 67.
126 Karlgren 1957.
127 See Leslie and Gardiner 1996: 28ff for a comprehensive discussion of the problems of philological arguments.
129 Wylie 1881.
130 Chavannes 1906, 1907.
131 Chavannes 1969.
published his English translation of the *Hou Hanshu* on the Internet.\textsuperscript{133} Other commentaries on the texts, especially those by Enoki,\textsuperscript{134} Shiratori,\textsuperscript{135} Pulleyblank\textsuperscript{136} and Maenchen-Helfen\textsuperscript{137} also provide translations of specific sections of various texts.

Commentaries on these sources are vast. A number, however, stand apart, if not for any other reason than the fact that they discuss the entire period covered by the history, thereby providing an integrated historical perspective. Shiratori has provided a comprehensive discussion of Sogdiana and Sute\textsuperscript{138} while Enoki has also discussed in detail the status of Sogdiana during the Sui and Tang periods.\textsuperscript{139} Commentaries by Chavannes are also critical for a broader understanding of the situation portrayed in the Chinese sources,\textsuperscript{140} while the introduction of Hulsewé by Loewe provides a much needed note of caution on these discussions, in addition to voluminous bibliographic references.\textsuperscript{141}

The complexity of the Zarafshān Valley, although certainly defined by numerous nuances in dress and other manifestations of material culture that were readable among the population at the time, remains extremely difficult to document from archaeological and literary records. As a result, while the Chinese written sources provide a critical source for Central Asian history and Sogdiana in particular, much of the information is confusing and should not be seen in isolation from other material and textual sources.

**Han Period Sources (206 BCE – 220 CE)**

There are three main textual sources for Central Asian history during the Han period: Chapter 123 of the *Shiji*,\textsuperscript{142} Chapters 96a and 61 of the *Hanshu*,\textsuperscript{143} and Chapters 77 and 88 of the *Hou Hanshu*.\textsuperscript{144} However, only the *Hou Hanshu* makes specific reference to Sogdiana, where it is understood under the name Liye [Liye]. The Kangju "confederation", of which Sogdiana was later a part, is treated at length in the *Hanshu*. Some of the later Chinese histories provide historical information regarding the ruling regimes of Sogdiana.
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\textsuperscript{133} http://depts.washington.edu/uwch/silkroad/texts/hhshu/hou_han_shu.html.
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\textsuperscript{142} The *Shiji* was started by Ssu-ma T’an [Sima Tan] (d. 110 BCE) and completed just prior to 90 BCE by his son, Ssu-ma Ch’ien [Sima Qian] (7145 - 76 BCE). Regarding historiographical considerations of this text see Loewe in Hulsewé 1979: 8; Enoki 1998 (1983); Leslie and Gardiner 1996: 19-31 and Hulsewé in Loewe 1993: 405-409. See Watson 1993 for a translation of the text.
\textsuperscript{143} The *Hanshu* (HS) or the History of the Former Han was probably compiled by Pan Ku (32 – 92 CE) and was completed after his death by his sister, Pan Chao (748 - 7116 CE). The chapter on the western regions was probably finished during his lifetime. The HS deals with the period of Chinese history from 202 BCE – 23 CE. See Hulsewé 1979: 8 and also Loewe 1993: 129-30 for historiographical comments.
\textsuperscript{144} The *Hou Hanshu* (HHS) or the History of the Later Han deals with the period of Chinese history from 23 - 220 CE. Although the text was probably not completed until the early 5th century CE, it is nevertheless included in this section. Two chapters are of interest for the present study: Ch. 88, translated by Chavannes 1907 and Ch. 77, translated by Chavannes 1906. See Leslie and Gardiner 1996: 20-21 for historiographical considerations.
family living in regions relevant to the present discussion, which also cover the Han period: they will be discussed in detail chronologically. The Han period histories, like the later histories, consist of reports and biographies of the “Western Regions” gathered by Chinese emissaries for the Han government in their attempts to build a trading network with this region. The “Western Regions” covers Central Asia, including Chinese Turkestan, centered around the Taklamakan Desert. These regions were distant from the Han centers of government in Luoyang and Changan, a factor which is strongly reflected in the histories by some of the dealings between the Chinese and the nomadic rulers of these areas. The amount of information on specific territories within the “Western Regions” varies. This in itself is significant, as it reflects the level, and in some contexts the nature, of contact between the Chinese and the administrative arm of each territory.

There are several relevant issues raised in these sources concerning Sogdiana during the Han period, for which there is little consensus among scholars:

1. The identity and geographic location of Sogdiana;
2. The geographic location of Kangju;
3. The relationship between Liye, Kangju and the Yuezhi;
4. The status of Samarkand during the Han period histories;
5. The date of Sogdian independence from Kangju.

The identity and geographic location of Sogdiana

In the Han period sources there is no direct use of the name Sogdiana. However, the name Liyi is understood as a mis-spelling of the name Si-yi (Liyi). According to the *Hou Hanshu* “the Kingdom of Li-yi (Liyi) is a dependency of Kangju”. If it is accepted that Sogdiana is represented by the name Liyi in the *Hou Hanshu*, it becomes possible to assess evidence regarding the geographic location of this kingdom. Sogdiana has been given various geographic definitions within and external to Central Asia. However, these are problematic as they tend to encompass numerous different periods, rather than a single one. Furthermore, the Chinese sources, together with the Syriac and the later Arabic sources, use the name Sogdiana to imply what is understood as both a country and a state.

145 The content of the histories must be viewed with the necessary limitations implied by the nature of the reports and the information included must be handled with this in mind. See Wada 1979 for further details regarding these issues.

146 See Pelliot 1938: 148, n. 1: Soydaik; Sou-ya, *Si\"ok-i\ek, *Si\"ok-dek. See, however, Chavannes 1969; Duyvendak 1939. The meaning of this name is disputed. Kang is thought by Pulleyblank to be related to the Tokharian word for stone, kank. This does not solve very much as there are numerous names in the region that have been associated with this word: Samarkand; Tashkent; Kandahar etc. However, Hulsewe 1979: 123 notes that “the K’ang-ch’ü (Kangju) region was known as the Stone Country i.e., Samarkand”. See also Leslie and Gardiner 1996.

147 *Hou Hanshu* Ch. 88. Chavannes 1907: 195.

148 There was an earlier school of thought that advocated a location in the Crimea for Sogdiana. This has been discussed by Enoki 1998a (1955): 12 and de la Vaissière 2002: 237-8. See also Shiratori 1928: 97-100.

149 There are numerous issues in the translation of the Chinese terms for country and state. This issue is discussed in various introductions to the texts and introductions to the Chinese texts. See for example Loewe’s introduction in Hulsewé 1979: 1-70.
While Shiratori has discussed Su-i [Suyi], which represents another mis-spelling of the name Liyi, in detail, he has not offered an exact location for Liyi during the Han period because of the lack of information in the sources. He states that Sogdiana was "obviously situated to the south of the Sir Darya," and tentatively places it "nearly corresponding to the whole area covered by the six Cao-wu [Zhaowu] states as identified in the Tang period". On the other hand, Pulleyblank argues that Sogdiana comprised the region of modern Ferghāna, a view that has received little support. He argues that "the Ta-yüan (Tochari) [Dayuan] occupied Sogdiana proper from c. 124 B.C.E., taking over the lands north of the Oxus previously held by the Yueh Chih [Yuezhi] and separating the latter from the K'ang-chü [Kangju], who then, as probably already in Chang Ch'ien's [Zhang Qian] time, occupied the region around Tashkent and the steppes north of it".

On the basis of evidence from the Han period sources it is not possible to further identify the exact location of Liyi. Later sources, however, shed more light on this problem and this issue will be discussed below, drawing on these sources.

The geographic location of Kangju
Liyi is represented in the *Hou Hanshu* as a kingdom within the realm of the nomadic peoples known as the Kangju. The geographic location of the Kangju is discussed in the three Han period sources. This may shed some light on the location of Liyi during the Han period. The *Shiji*, reflecting the situation prior to the beginning of the 1st century B.C.E, states that Kangju was located to the northwest of Dayuan [Ferghāna] and acknowledged partial sovereignty to the Xiongnu in the east and the Yuezhi in the south. It is also known from Zhang Qian's mission to the Western Regions during the second half of the 2nd century B.C.E that he passed through territories controlled by the Yueh-Chi and the Kangju and that during this period there existed cordial relations between these peoples.

In the *Hanshu*, discussing the period c. 200 B.C.E to 23 CE, five petty states are listed as belonging to the Kangju: Su-hsieh [Suxie], Fu-mo [Fumo], Yü-ni [Yuni], Chi [Ji] and Yü-chien [Aojian]. Although their identity remains unknown, none of these has been associated with later named countries or principalities in the Zarafshān Valley or Sogdiana. Shiratori suggests that they may be understood as belonging to Kangju proper (i.e., the right bank of the Syr Darya), and refer to a period prior to the envelopment of Sogdiana by the Kangju.
Two other names are mentioned in the description of Kangju in the *Hanshu*: “The seat of the king’s government in winter is in Leyuenidi to the town of Beitian.”\(^{158}\) Benjamin has recently cautiously suggested that these names may refer to Samarkand and Bukhara.\(^{159}\) However, Benjamin himself notes that this is problematic for two reasons: firstly because of the distance between the two centres (put at seven days on horseback); and, secondly, the absence of any phonetic association.

Finally, in the *Hou Hanshu*, dealing with the first two centuries CE, Kangju is mentioned only very briefly. This may indicate that it was no longer deemed important to the Chinese. It is stated that Liyi, together with Yancai and Yan, were dependencies of Kangju.\(^{160}\) This suggests that sometime after 23 CE the Kangju moved westwards into the Zarafshan Valley and beyond.\(^{161}\) While Shiratori has questioned the inclusion of Yancai and Yan in the Kangju realm,\(^{162}\) Pulleyblank alternatively suggests that this text is evidence of the expanded power of the Kangju during this period.\(^{163}\)

Kangju is the name of a nomadic people or confederation of peoples documented in the Han period Chinese sources.\(^{164}\) Prior to at least c. 20 CE the Kangju appear to have been centred to the north east of the Zarafshan Valley, on the eastern side of the Syr Darya. During the later Han period, Kangju territory was extended south west, into the Zarafshan Valley. For an unknown period, but perhaps during the first three centuries CE, they may have controlled the kingdom of Liyi, perhaps located in the Zarafshan Valley.

The relationship between Liyi, Kangju and the Yuezhi

Sometime during the period of the *Hou Hanshu*, between 20 and 220 CE, Liyi was incorporated into the Kangju confederation. The role of Liyi in this confederation is not stated in any of the Han sources. Nor is it immediately clear if this name indicates a country or state. This silence in itself is indicative to a certain extent of its role, as it suggests that both Kangju and Liyi were of only minor importance to the Chinese. However, that the Kangju remained an active force is evident from Chapter 77 of the *Hou

---

\(^{158}\) *Hanshu* 96A 15B.
\(^{159}\) Benjamin 2003: 2
\(^{160}\) Ch. 88 Cf., Chavannes 1907: 195.
\(^{161}\) Tolstov developed the “Greater Chorasmia” theory that Kangju (Avestan Kangha) was centred in Chorasmia, and enveloped at its height in the 1st century BCE the southern steppes to the Urals in the north and west, and included Sogdiana in the south east and Khorasan in the south west and the Syr Darya in the east. See Tolstov 1948a and 1948b. This theory has not gained widespread acceptance and is not considered further here.
\(^{162}\) Shiratori 1928: 98-100.
\(^{163}\) Pulleyblank 1968: 253-4.
\(^{164}\) There is little evidence regarding the political and administrative organization of these people. Rapin 2001 uses the term “confederation” while Zadneprovskiy 1996 uses “nomadic federation”. Both interpretations remain surmise.
Hanshu, which describes events in 84 CE. The report details the role of the Kangju in fighting against Chinese expansionism in the Tarim Basin. The Chinese were also forced to appease the Yuezhi before asking them to intervene with the Kangju on their behalf, as the two had recently been joined by a marriage.\(^{165}\)

The question of a Yuezhi presence in the Samarkand region prior to their settlement south of the Iron Gates has received much attention.\(^{166}\) The foundation of the problem lies in the association between Sogdiana and the Yuezhi reported in the Tangshu, where it relates the genealogy of the Yuezhi people: \"K’ang [Kang] lies to the south of the Na-mi [Nami] Stream, with 30 larger castles and 300 smaller forts. The monarch, Wên [Wen] by family name, is a man of Yüeh-shih [Yuezhi] origin\".\(^{167}\) However, Shiratori has argued that Kang is an abbreviation of the name (falsely) applied to Sogdiana by the Chinese on the basis of the previous rulers, the Kangju.\(^{168}\) If this is accepted, a Yuezhi identity for the early rulers of Sogdiana is impossible, as the Kangju and the Yuezhi are two different people.\(^{169}\)

Evidence from the Hanshu also argues against an entrenched Yuezhi presence in the Zarafshân Valley. In this text, five states are listed as belonging to the Yuezhi. None of these has been convincingly located in the Zarafshân Valley, although some have been located on the right bank of the Amu Darya.\(^{170}\) According to Shiratori, \"there is no reliable evidence in history that the Yueh Chih [Yuezhi] race did at any time occupy Sogdiana\".\(^{171}\)

Despite this, it is likely that at the time of the Shiji, the Kangju and the Yuezhi had similar lifestyles and dressed in a similar manner so that it may have been difficult to tell them apart. For example, regarding the Kangju the Shiji notes: \"its people likewise are nomads and resemble the Yuezhi in their customs\".\(^{172}\)

While it is likely that at least a branch of the Yuezhi passed through the Zarafshân Valley on their way to Daxia (Bactria), there is little evidence that they became firmly entrenched there. Evidence of a marriage between the royal families of the Yuezhi and the Kangju indicates that they maintained some sort of presence in the Zarafshân Valley. However, it seems unlikely that the Yuezhi had a major permanent role at any stage in this area.

The status of Samarkand during the Han period histories

Samarkand, or any other name meaning the same, has to date not been recognised in any of the Han period sources.

The date of Sogdian independence from the Kangju

Until around 220 CE, at the end of the Han dynasty, Liyi was apparently still under Kangju influence. However, by the period of the Chinshu (265 – 317 CE) the

\(^{165}\) Chavannes 1906: 230.
\(^{166}\) Shiratori 1928; Benjamin 2003.
\(^{167}\) Chavannes, E. 1900: 132-147; see also Shiratori 1928: 107.
\(^{168}\) Shiratori 1928: 102.
\(^{169}\) Ibid.: 102.
\(^{170}\) See Hulsewe 1979: 121-123, n. 289-296 for the identification and location of these. See also Abdoullaev 2001 and Benjamin 2000: 148.
\(^{171}\) Shiratori 1928: 102. Rapin 2001: 69 draws a similar conclusion on the basis of archaeological evidence.
\(^{172}\) Watson 1993: 234.
situation appears to have altered: "The country of K'ang-kü [Kangju] lies on the north west of Ta-wan [Dayuan] (Ferghana)... It borders (upon) Su-i [Suyi] and I-liieh [Yiliej]."\textsuperscript{173} Suyi here is the transcription for Sogdiana.\textsuperscript{174} On the basis of this text it is possible to suggest that Sogdiana became independent from the Kangju some time during the first half of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE, or prior to 265.\textsuperscript{175} Enoki, on the other hand, argues that the description of tribute brought to the Chinese by the Kangju in the Chinshu is similar to the products of Sogdiana mentioned in the Hou Hanshu, and that independence from the Kangju was not achieved until sometime after 265.\textsuperscript{176}

Conclusion to the Han Period sources

Sogdiana, or the Zarafshăn Valley, appears to undergo a major shift between the Hellenistic period and the end of the Han period (220 CE). The apparent absence of a direct reference to the name Sogdiana or Samarkand in the Chinese sources during this period may indicate that it played an insignificant role from a Chinese perspective. Alternatively, if the Chinese did have an association with Sogdiana, it may have been through an invading nomadic group who used their own name for the region, rather than that of the sedentary inhabitants.

The name Sogdiana is recognised under the misspelt name of Liyi in the Hou Hanshu. It is not possible at this stage to locate this region geographically on the basis of these sources only. Nor does this region in any way necessarily include Samarkand or any other centers mentioned in the textual sources relating to the preceding periods. Liyi came under Kangju influence during the period covered by the later Han Dynasty (c. 20 – 220 CE). Prior to this, as outlined in the Shiji, it seems that the state of Kangju was located on the eastern banks of the Syr Darya and comprised at least five principalities.

The role of the Yuezhi in the Zarafshăn Valley during the Han period remains problematic. Evidence of a marriage between the ruling families of the Kangju and the Yuezhi in 83/4 CE suggests that these two powers may have been present in some form in the Zarafshăn Valley during the 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the Yuezhi were a settled presence there. It is unclear exactly when the Zarafshăn Valley became independent of the Kangju. However, it may have been around 265 CE.

The Wei (220 – 265 CE), Chin (265 – 317) and Northern and Southern Dynasties (317 – 585) Periods.

The period from the end of the Han to the beginning of the Sui Dynasty (c. 220 – 585) represents a tumultuous one in the history of Sogdiana and the Zarafshăn Valley as it covers the period of the "Hun" invasions. The identity of these nomadic invaders remains debated. Enoki and Shiratori have suggested on the basis of the Chinese sources that two peoples can be distinguished: the Chionites and the Hephthalites. The Kidarites are another nomadic group who played a role in these invasions. There are numerous

\textsuperscript{173} Enoki 1998a (1955): 11.

\textsuperscript{174} See Pelliot 1938: 148, n. 1.

\textsuperscript{175} It is also interesting to note that in the Kaaba of Zoroaster inscription at Naqsh-i Rustam of 262 CE Shapur I (239 – 270) lists Sogdiana as belonging to the northeastern extent of the Kushan Empire. However, this remains speculative. For the text see Huyse 1999: 24 § 3.

\textsuperscript{176} Enoki 1998a (1955): 11; see also Pulleyblank 1968: 256-7, n. 5. Tribute from the Kangju is noted in the Chinshu between the years 265-274, with the latest in 287.
other issues raised in the sources dating to this period, for which further explanation is
given in the Sui and Tang period sources. These will be discussed in more detail below.
The main Wei period sources include the Weishu\textsuperscript{177} and the Weiliie.\textsuperscript{178} Various chapters
of these have been translated by Chavannes.\textsuperscript{179} Three issues in these histories are
relevant to the current study:
\begin{enumerate}
\item The relationship between Sogdiana/Sute and Samarkand/Kang;
\item The identity of Wennasha; and
\item Sute and Samarkand and the Chionites and Hephthalites.
\end{enumerate}

The relationship between Sogdiana/Sute and Samarkand/Kang
The Weishu ch. 102,7a\textsuperscript{180} states that: “The country of Su-t’e [Sute] lies in the west
of the Ts’ung-ling [Coughling]. It is the ancient Yen-ts’ai [Yancai]. Its other name is
Wên-na-sha [Wennasha].” Another text, the Tongdian, dated to the 9\textsuperscript{th} century, states
“Suk-yok communicated with the Hou Wei dynasty. Its other name is Su-tê [Sute]”.\textsuperscript{181}
Shiratori has discussed in detail the correlation between Sute and Sogdiana on the
basis of the Chinese sources.\textsuperscript{182} Suk-yok is almost certainly a reference to the Iranian
language version of the name Sogdiana.\textsuperscript{183} Shiratori has argued that Yancai was not
Sute, despite the fact that the name Wennasha in the Peishi and Choushu is also
associated with it.\textsuperscript{184} Shiratori suggests that “Su-tê [Sute], the transcription of Sukdok,
meant in the North and South Dynastic period not the whole of Sogdiana, but the
particular state of Kushanik [Arabic Kushaniya] or Ho [He]”.\textsuperscript{185}

The name Samarkand is also recognised for the first time in the Chinese sources
under the name Hsi-wan-chin [Xiwanjin]\textsuperscript{186} in the Weishu, representing the name of both

\textsuperscript{177} For a discussion of some of the historical issues relating to this text see Ware 1932. According to Ware,
the basis of this text must be the Peishi.
\textsuperscript{178} Again the problem of authenticity and originality arises. Enoki 1998b (1959): 145 advocates that the
Peishi is the original text. The Weiliie by Yü Huan, dates to the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE.
\textsuperscript{179} Chavannes 1969.
\textsuperscript{180} Maenchen-Helfen 1944-5: 226. A slightly different translation is given in Shiratori 1928: 98. See also
\textsuperscript{181} Ch. 193, p. 20 cf., Shiratori 1928: 97.
\textsuperscript{182} Shiratori 1928.
\textsuperscript{183} See Ibid.: 97ff regarding this point. This name must have been preserved among the Iranian speaking
peoples of Sogdiana. The name is probably not preserved in the Chinese records as they would probably
have had dealings with the nomadic invaders ruled the country at that time, rather than the indigenous
Sogdian population. The nomadic invaders would have used their own version of the name of Sogdiana,
rather than the original Iranian Sukdok.
\textsuperscript{184} Ibid.: 98-100.
\textsuperscript{185} Ibid.: 116 and also p. 136. Pulleyblank 1966: 26 suggests that Kushaniya was the former Kuei-shan
[Guishan] City, the capital of the Tochari who occupied Sogdiana from c. 124 BCE. The Arabic sources
are also very informative about the role of Kushaniya. Al-Istakhri calls Kushaniya the “heart of Sogdiana”
because of its fertility and wealth. Ibn Hawkal gives Kushaniya precedence as the “centre vital des villes du
Sughd” (Hauqal: 480), while according to Ya’kubi, it is one of the important districts of Sogdiana
(Ya’kubi: 110). Tomaszek (cf., Barthold 1968: 96) suggests Kushaniya was an independent principality
during the pre-Islamic period. Tomaszek’s argument is based on the information in Ibn Khurradādbhit,
where it is stated that the Kushan-shah was once the ruler of all Transoxiana (cf., Barthold 1968: 9).
Most recently, Grenet has claimed that Kushaniya, probably located between Samarkand and Bukhara, “is very
unlikely to have been founded by the earlier Kushans or Kushano-Sasanians”. Instead he suggests it was
founded by the Kidarites (Grenet 2003: 209).
\textsuperscript{186} Weishu ch. 102,7a cf., Maenchen-Helfen 1944-5: 226.
the country and the state. It is also known as Kang. It is clear from this that Samarkand (Kang) is distinct from Sute (Sogdiana). The *Weishu* also lists another seven states during the Northern and Southern Dynasties belonging to Sogdiana: Mi-mi (?) [Mimi]; Mou-chih (Mu) [Muzhi]; Ch’ieh-pu-tan (?) [Qiebudan]; Sê-chih-hsien [Sezhixian] (Ts’ao) [Cao]; Nu-mi [Numi]; Fu-huo [Fuhuo] (An); Ch’ieh-sê-ni [Qiesemi] (Shih) [Shi]. Although this is the earliest Chinese evidence of the division of Sogdiana into states, it is difficult to say when this division took place.

**The Identity of Wennasha**

Sute is equated with Wennasha in the *Weishu*. In the *Tongdian* Sute is mentioned in relation to another name, Tê-čü-mêng [Dejumeng]. Shiratori translates Tê-čü-mêng as “*Toquz manab*” or “Nine princes”. Following Shiratori, this may have been a reflection of the political situation in Sogdiana during the Northern and Southern Dynasties (317 - 589), the period during which the name Sute was used. He therefore translates Wennasha as the “nine kings of the Wen family”. Enoki suggests that Wennasha was the name of Sogdiana under the Xiongnu and that Wen is a translation of the Turkic Hun, meaning Chion. He cautiously translates Wennasha as Unnasha, the king of the Una or Hun peoples.

**Sute, Samarkand and the Chionites and Hephthalites**

According to Enoki, Sute served as the Chionite centre during the period of their rule in that region. In 437 CE it was ruled by King Hu-i [Huyi]. He was the fourth generation of Chionite kings to rule there. This implies that Sogdiana was conquered by the Chionites around 350 BCE.

Enoki has suggested that the Chionite kingdom was destroyed by the Hephthalites between 467 and 480 although they first appeared in Sogdiana around 437 CE. The *To-pa Wei* records (386 - 535) note sporadic tribute being sent from Sute between 435 and 479. According to the *Sungshu* Sute was also sending tribute to the Liu Sung court (420 - 479) during the reign of T’ai-tsu [Taizu] (424 - 453 CE). Records of the *To-pa Wei* show that after 479 the name of Sute disappeared from the tribute records. However, tribute is received from Samarkand from 473. This may indicate that under the Hephthalites, Samarkand became the focus of power in Sogdiana. Tribute from Samarkand continued intermittently, though regularly, until 509.

---

187 Shiratori 1928: 140.
190 Ibid.: 139.
193 Ibid.
195 Ibid.: 122.
196 Ibid.: 124.
197 Enoki 1998b (1959): 153. Note, however, that Maenchen-Helfen 1944-5: 231 states that “the date of the conquest of Sogdiana by the Hephthalites cannot even approximately be established”.
199 Shiratori 1928: 142.
This information, however, does not clarify whether Sute and Samarkand played the part of independent cities, or one ruling the other, for example in the form of a capital city. The fact that there is some overlap in the years during which their tribute appears in the Chinese courts suggests that they were independent cities within the wider state of Kang. It is also possible to suggest on the basis of tribute lists recorded by the To-pa Wei that the power center of the state of Kang shifted from Sute to Samarkand sometime towards the end of the 470's. However, this does not necessarily indicate that either of these cities held exclusive power. Tomaschek has explained the difference between Sute and Samarkand in economic and political terms: "That as Samarkand was always the focus of intellectual activities, the rendezvous of merchants, and the storing place of commodities, for Sogdiana, so Kushani had a particular significance and glory as the capital of the Kushans, and later of the Haital-Huns".200

Conclusion to the Wei and Later Wei period sources

Wei and Later Wei histories cover the significant period of the Hun invasions of Transoxiana. Tribute lists recorded by the To-pa Wei seem to indicate a shift in power between the states of Sute and Samarkand sometime after the middle of the 5th century. This may be attributed to the period of the invasion of the Hephthalites in 479. Enoki suggests that during the Chionite period Sute acted as the capital of Kang. Wennasha, which was also known as Sute, could additionally be translated as the name of the Chionite king. Tribute was received from Sute until 479 after which the name disappears from the tribute lists. However, from 473 Samarkand is also noted as having sent tribute to the Chinese. In 479 tribute arrived from both Sute and Samarkand. Tribute from Samarkand continued until 509.

The Sui (581 – 617) and Tang (618 – 907) Periods

The information in the Sui and Tang period sources partially helps to explain some of the issues addressed above in the earlier period sources, although there remain numerous problems. The main Sui and Tang period sources are the Suishi, the Tangshu and the T'ung-tien [Tongdian]. Three main issues regarding Sogdiana are discussed in this section:

1. The identity of the Zhaowu Dynasty;
2. The identification of the Zhaowu states;
3. The status of Samarkand during the Sui and Tang periods.

The Zhaowu Dynasty

The Zhaowu family is named in the Suishi as the rulers of Kang:

"The king [of Kang], whose proper family name is Wên [Wen], is a man of the Yüeh-shih [Yuezhi] race. Originally they occupied Chao-wu [Zhaowu] City to the north of the Ch'i-lien [Qilian] Mountains. As they were defeated by the Hsiung-nu [Xiongnu], they crossed the Pamirs to the west, and came at last into possession of their country. Branches of the family each made a subsidiary king, and therefore the countries right and

200 Cf., Shiratori 1928: 141.
left of K'ang [Kang] assumed Chao-wu [Zhaowu] as the family name, thereby showing that they did not forget their origin.\textsuperscript{201}

A very similar text is given in the Tangshu:
"K'ang [Kang] is also called Sa-mo-čien [Samojian] as well, being what was represented as Hsi-wan-čien [Xiwanjin] in the Yiian-Wei period. To its south is Ših [Shi], 150 li away; to its north-west, Ts'ao [Cao], over 100 li away; to its south-east, the domain of Mi, 100 li away; and to the north that of Middle Ts'ao [Cao], 50 li away. K'ang [Kang] lies to the south of the Na-mi [Nami] Stream, with 30 larger castles and 300 smaller forts. The monarch, Wèn [Wen] by family name, is a man of Yüeh-ših [Yuezhi] origin. In the beginning they abided by Čao-wu [Zhaowu] City north of the Č'i-lien [Qilian] Mountains, but as they were defeated by the T'u-čüeh [Tujue], they moved a little southwards to fall back upon the Pamirs, and thus came to possess their country. The branches of the family made subsidiary kings who ruled respectively: An, Ts'ao [Cao], Ših [Shi], Mi, Ho [He], Huo-hsin [Huoxun], Mou-ti [Mudi], and Ših [Shi]. These are commonly called "Nine Houses", sharing the same family Čao-wu [Zhaowu] all around.\textsuperscript{202}

The Wen family genealogy given here links them with the Zhaowu family and the Yuezhi. The texts also provide a list of eight districts or states over which the family ruled from Kang. According to the Suishi Zhaowu is the name of the town from which the family originated. It is suggested that the Wen family assumed the name Zhaowu when they became the rulers of the surrounding principalities.\textsuperscript{203} Shiratori suggests that Wen was an older (Iranian) family name that was replaced by Zhaowu. It is also possible that both names were used concurrently, one representing the older, settled, Iranian-speaking population, the other the newer, "invading" population. "We may presume that Wèn [Wen] was the Iranian term which the Iranian speaking Sogdians gave to the reigning house, and Cao-wu [Zhaowu] the name by which the Turkic rulers and their direct followers call themselves and their masters."\textsuperscript{204}

\textsuperscript{201} Cf., Shiratori 1928: 101. Note also there is a very similar passage in the Xien Tangshu 221B.I.a regarding Kang, quoted in Pulleyblank 1952: 320, n. 1: "The rulers have the surname (hsing) Wen. They were originally Yüeh Chih [Yuezhi] men. Earlier they lived in the city of Chao-wu [Zhaowu] north of the Ch'i-lien [Qilian] [mountains]. They were overthrown by the T'u-chüeh [Tujue] and moving southwards along the Ts'ung-ling [Coughling], possessed this country. The brand lines [of the royal house] became separate kings, namely An, Ts'ao [Cao], Ših [Shi], Mi, Huo-hsin [Huoxun] (Khwārīzam), Wu-ti [Wuti] and Ših [Shi]. [Together with K'ang] they are commonly called the "Nine Surnames". They all have the surname (ših) Chao-wu [Zhaowu]." Pulleyblank argues that the Xien Tangshu text is not related to the Suishi because in this text there is no mention of the nine surnames and that there is no association at all with the Zhaowu family name. He suggests that the term did not appear before the 8\textsuperscript{th} century CE, when it is used in reference to the Ordos Sogdians, rather than those of Kang. He also suggests that it may have been imposed on the Sogdians by the Chinese and was not a Sogdian term of reference.

\textsuperscript{202} Quoted in Shiratori 1928: 107.

\textsuperscript{203} Suishi in Ibid.: 101.

\textsuperscript{204} Ibid.: 140. Enoki 1998b (1955): 124 suggests that they "were one of the powerful families of the Hephthalites".
The Zhaowu states

In the *Suishu* and *Tangshu* a list of states ruled from Kang (Samarkand) by the Zhaowu family is given. In the *Suishu* this list comprises nine states: Mi; Shih [Shi]; Ts’ao [Cao]; Ho [He]; An; Na-so-po [Nasebo]; Wu-na-ho [Wunahe] and Mu.\(^{205}\) In the *Tangshu* the list is slightly different, comprising An, Ts’ao [Cao], Shih [Shi], Mi, He, Huo-hsin [Huoxun], Mou-ti [Mudi], and Shih [Shi].\(^{206}\)

Another reference to a list of Sogdian states ruled by the Zhaowu family is found in the Turkic *Kül Tegin* inscription dated to 701. The pertinent passage records the phrase *alty Cub Sogdyq*,\(^{207}\) which has various nuances in interpretation, but which essentially means that Sogdiana comprised six states at this period ruled by the Zhaowu family.\(^{208}\)

Apart from the variations of the names making up these lists, there is also the problem that while the Chinese lists comprise nine and eight states (albeit with slight variations), the Turkic one indicates only six. Shiratori has examined both of the Chinese lists and traced a Zhaowu heritage to Kang, An, Ts’ao [Cao], Shih [Shi], Mi and He.\(^{209}\) He suggests that this must be the list that is referred to in the *Kül Tegin* inscription and therefore the Tang period Zhouwu states. Shiratori cites another text of the Buddhist pilgrim Huichao which appears to confirm this situation: “From Ta-shih [Dashi] eastwards, they are all Hu countries, namely – An, Ts’ao [Cao], Shih [Shi], Shih-Lo [Shilo], Mi and Kang”.\(^{210}\) Prior to this, according to Shiratori, all of the names mentioned in the *Suishu* list can be assigned a Zhaowu heritage. Therefore, sometime between the Sui and Tang periods, there was a shift in the political make up of Sogdiana.

Another report, that of Hsiian-tsang [Xuan cang], dates to 629 CE\(^ {211}\) and provides a very limited report on Sogdiana. He refers to Sogdiana as Suli. The name Suli also refers to the inhabitants of Sogdiana. Suli is described as encompassing the region between the Chu River and the Iron Gates. This statement is interesting as it includes the region covered by the Kangju state during the Han period, and does not reflect the political situation indicated by the *Suishu* and the *Tangshu*.

The status of Samarkand during the Sui and Tang periods

The Sui and Tang histories confirm that Kang was the ruling center of Sogdiana, although the principalities over which it ruled vary between these two periods.\(^{212}\)

---

\(^{205}\) Cf., Shiratori 1928: 101.

\(^{206}\) Cf., Ibid.: 107.

\(^{207}\) Marquart 1898: 16. See also Malyavkin 1989 for a discussion of this term.

\(^{208}\) Shiratori 1928: 106-7. Malyavkin 1989: 72 suggests that it can be translated as “Sogdians from six principalities” or “Sogdians from the six principalities headed by the princes entitled yabgu”. For a different perspective on the Zhaowu states see Malyavkin 1989: 69. He suggests that the name was linked to “the Sogdians who resided in the countless trading centers along the major East-West routes, in different states and along the Tang Empire’s borders”.

\(^{209}\) Shiratori 1928: 125.

\(^{210}\) Ibid.: 135.

\(^{211}\) Beal 2000.

\(^{212}\) Note also that in the *Suishu* a completely undocumented name is given for the residence of the King of Kang: A-lou-ti [A lou ti] City. Attempts to trace this name in the literature have been unsuccessful, and its identification remains problematic, although it is assumed to be a reference to Samarkand. See Chavannes 1969: 132 and 133, n. 5, 2.
Summary of evidence pertaining to Sogdiana in the Chinese sources

Despite the complexity of the Chinese sources and the dense commentaries based on them, they provide very little historical detail regarding Samarkand and Sogdiana. Nevertheless, a few hypotheses may be cautiously proposed:

1. The name Samarkand in a form recognisable to modern scholars has not been recognised in the Han period sources. It is first recognised in the Weishu as Samojian. It is also known as Hsi-wan-chin [Xiwanjin] and Kang.213

2. During the Han period, the name Sogdiana appears to be represented by the name Liyi, a misspelling of Suyi. It is known as Sute in later periods. The exact location of this region on the basis of Han period sources remains unknown. During the period of the Hanshu Liyi is a dependency of the Kangju. Later period sources indicate that Sute was the name of a principality in the Zarafshān Valley.

3. During the period of the former Han Dynasty, Kangju is thought to have comprised the region to the north east of the Zarafshān Valley, perhaps with the Syr Darya forming its western limit. Sometime during the first century CE, however, this border appears to have been extended to the west to encompass Liyi, probably located in the Zarafshān Valley.

4. By the period of the Chinshu (265 – 317), Suyi (i.e., the Liyi of the Han period) may have become independent from the Kangju. It is possible that this occurred sometime between 220 and 265, or some time thereafter.

5. The relationship between Sute and Samarkand remains unclear, although from tribute lists it is clear that they were both centers of influence in their own right during the Wei, Sui and Tang periods. The ruling family of Sogdiana was centred in Samarkand during the Sui and Tang periods.

6. The “state” of Kang comprised numerous countries or principalities, ruled by the Zhaowu Dynasty and known as the Zhaowu states during the Sui and Tang periods. The exact number of countries ruled by Kang is unclear on the basis of evidence in the Suishi and the Tangshu. On the basis of the Kül-Tegin inscription, dated to 701 CE, Shiratori suggests that during the Sui period Kang may have ruled over nine principalities, while during the Tang period this may have been reduced to eight.

The establishment of Sogdian trading colonies

The merchant traders of Sogdiana comprised an important social category from at least the 3rd century CE. The importance of trade in Sogdian society is highlighted in travellers' accounts of the Sogdians. For example in the Memoir of Wei Tsie on the Western Barbarians:

---

213 Markwart 1938: 35-6 gives another variation from the History of the Northern Dynasties: Sak-ban-kin [Sakbanken]. This refers to a period prior to 494 CE.
“The people of the kingdom of K’ang [Kang] are usually merchants. When a boy reaches the age of 5, he takes to the study of books. When he begins to understand these, he is sent to study commerce. The winning of profits is considered by most of the inhabitants an excellent thing.”

The Ancient Sogdian Letters provide an interesting insight into the trading world of the Sogdians and on east-west trade during this period. Their dating is generally accepted to be around 312 - 314. Despite the political problems referred to in the letters, which are associated with the movement of Huns (Chionites?) west from China, it is clear that the trade infrastructure is well developed, with Sogdians located at most towns along the southern trade route skirting the Tarim Basin and further to the east.

The establishment of Sogdian colonies in China along the northern and southern trade routes began as early as the Three Kingdoms period (c. 220 – 265 CE). These were probably inhabited by merchants, caravaneers and perhaps adventurers/pioneers and their families. Sogdian colonies are known in the Tarim Basin, the Mongolian Highlands and northern China. The broader context of trade is also important in understanding the influence of Turkic and Mongolian elements found in early medieval Sogdiana.

The reasons for this expansion are to be understood largely in the context of an expanding trading network, and also war, with later political events contributing to the

---

214 Chavannes 1969: 133, n. 5.
215 Harmatta 1979: 159 attributes the letters to 196 - 7 CE. Henning 1948 suggests a date of 312 - 313; Grenet, Sims-Williams et al. 1998 argue for a slightly later dating, 313-314. See also de la Vaissière 2002: 51. The Ancient Sogdian Letters were found in 1907 by Aurel Stein in watchtower T12a north west of Dunhuang on one of the main trade routes between China and Central Asia. One of the primary problems associated with the letters as a historical source is their date. Although the letters are dated by the day and month in which they were written, the year is not given. However, references are made in several of the letters to political events within China involving Sogdian merchants and it is these political events that form the basis for discussions of the date of the letters. In letter II it is stated that the Chinese Emperor fled from Luoyang because of famine after which his fortified palace and residential city were burnt. Following this the Xiongnu took control of China. It has been assumed that the destruction was wrought by the Xiongnu or Huns, however, this is not explicitly stated in the letter. It is this unstable situation that the Sogdian merchants found themselves in. The date of these events in relation to the writing of the letter is unclear. It is known only that the writer had not heard from other (Sogdian) merchants inside China for the preceding three years, and that they had departed eight years before. Various dates have been assigned to the letters. Stein suggested a date of 100-150 CE on the basis of his understanding of the invention of paper and historical events (Stein 1921 (1980-1983) v. 2: 671. See also Henning 1948). Harmatta 1979 has argued for a slightly later date, also on the basis of historical events. See also Bivar 1983: 211. See also Grenet and Sims-Williams 1985 for a discussion and evaluation of the historical arguments.

216 Bivar 1983: 211; See also Grenet, Sims-Williams et al. 1998 regarding the historical context of the letters.

217 See Xinjiang 2000; de la Vaissière 2002: 48-76.

218 Xinjiang 2000: 151. There is little evidence to date concerning the beginning of Sogdian merchant activities in the east. However, a dubious epitaph from the tomb of a Sogdian merchant found at Ganzhou claims that the family of the deceased, Kang Jingben, had been visiting the area from Kangju since 110 – 105 BCE (Xinjiang 2000: 132). Although the status of his family as chieftains suggests a long association with Ganzhou, the validity of the statement has been questioned (Xinjiang 2000: 132).


220 Xinjiang 2000: 118. See also Pulleyblank 1952: 350 ff.
Sogdian push to the east.\textsuperscript{221} Marshak also mentions overpopulation in Sogdiana itself as another factor in the early stages of the expansion.\textsuperscript{222} The infrastructure of the colonies shows that they were permanent residences and home to a broad spectrum of inhabitants.\textsuperscript{223}

A recent article by Rong Xinjiang\textsuperscript{224} surveys current evidence regarding the expansion of Sogdian trading colonies into China. It is possible to gain some understanding of Sogdian life in these colonies through an assessment of the historic texts and other smaller texts such as epitaphs of Sogdians. Temples apparently belonging to specific clans are found in larger centers, and this suggests that Sogdians lived in extended family groups within the broader Sogdian quarter.\textsuperscript{225} The Ancient Sogdian Letters I, III and VI also indicate that, at least on the southern trade route, these communities were linked to each other.\textsuperscript{226} One such link was a postal system extending as far as Samarkand, and which apparently operated between predominantly Sogdian communities.\textsuperscript{227}

There appears to have been a degree of autonomy among the Sogdian residents in the Chinese cities and towns. Communities were led by a \textit{sabao} who was both a political and a religious leader. Although Buddhism in Sogdiana was only a very minor religion it spread quickly throughout the Sogdian communities on the trade routes during the Tang period and many Buddhist texts were translated into Sogdian. Ancient Letter III also implies that women had some autonomy in the trading world and may also demonstrate that females were literate.\textsuperscript{228}

Numerous works of art from Sogdian colonies in China\textsuperscript{229} indicate a high standard of living and also a certain degree of assimilation. The impact of trade and the colonies on life in Sogdiana itself, and especially Samarkand, where many of the colonists are thought to have come from, is difficult to assess. On the one hand, it may be seen from the perspective of a greater sense of internationalism. Whether this would have filtered through to all levels of society is debatable. For example, in an unpublished paper about the self-image of the Sogdians, Grenet has argued that in fact there is little evidence to suggest that the Sogdians themselves intrinsically valued trade, and that they remained faithful to the legacy of the nomadic peoples who dominated the region prior to the establishment of long range trade.\textsuperscript{230}

\textbf{The Hun Invasions c. 350 - 550}

Present knowledge of the period of the Hun invasions of Transoxiana is limited by contradictory evidence comprising primarily textual and numismatic sources. From the Chinese sources discussed above, it can be established that the Zarafshān Valley

\textsuperscript{221} The Arab invasion and anti-Arab activities forced many Sogdians to flee to the east, to Khujand and Fergāna. See Krachkovskij and Ju 1951: 112.
\textsuperscript{222} Marshak 2002: 13.
\textsuperscript{223} See especially Xinjiang 2000.
\textsuperscript{224} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{225} Ibid.: 124.
\textsuperscript{226} de la Vaissière 2002: 62.
\textsuperscript{227} Ibid.: 52-3.
\textsuperscript{228} Ibid.: 62.
\textsuperscript{229} Several of these pieces are discussed in Chapter 6.
\textsuperscript{230} This paper was presented at a conference in Oxford in 2003. I am very grateful to Frantz Grenet for making this available to me.
during this period underwent a number of political shifts, partly due to further waves of nomadic peoples vying for control of the lucrative trade routes. The names of three groups of nomadic invaders between the 4th and 6th centuries are known from numismatic and textual sources: the Chionites, the Kidarites and the Hephthalites. Some scholars have advocated that the Chionites and the Kidarites represent the same people, although there is little doubt that the Hephthalites formed a separate group. The main problem in the identification of these peoples has to do with the nature of the evidence. While textual sources allow for the differentiation of the Chionites from the Kidarites, scholars studying the numismatic sources tend to merge them into the same people.

The Chionites in Sogdiana

The Chionite conquest of Transoxiana is thought by some scholars to have occurred c. 350 – 375 CE. Unfortunately almost nothing is presently known regarding the material culture of this people, and they are only recognised in textual sources. They are thought to have come from the east to Central Asia, originally comprising part of the Xiongnu or Huns. That they were a powerful force is demonstrated by the fact that the Sasanians withdrew from their war against the Romans in order to protect their eastern borders from them. A treaty was made in 358 with the Sasanians, drawing the Chionite king Grumbates into an alliance against the Romans.

According to Enoki the Chionites are represented in the Chinese sources under the name Wen and Zhaowu. He suggests that "Wen (uan) [WenJ must be a translation of Un, from the old Turkish of Central Asia, derived from Hun and corresponding to Chion or Xyon, an Iranian name, as is shown by the other name of the Hun Kingdom of Sogdiana, Wên-na-sha [Wennasha], perhaps a translation of Unnasha, i.e., the king of the Unna or Hun people". On the other hand, Zeimal argues that it was the Kidarites who entered Bactria and Sogdiana during the 350’s and may be identified with the earliest nomadic hordes pushing through Central Asia at the end of the Kushan period. Zeimal further argues that the Chionites of the Latin sources were the same as the Kidarite Huns of the Greek authors. He suggests that the term Kidarite indicates a dynastic name, while Chionite (and Hun) indicates an ethnic name.

---

231 For a useful overview of the issues see Bivar 1983: 213.
232 See especially Grenet 2003 for an outline of the arguments regarding this.
233 Dating is after Grenet 2003.
234 Bivar 1983: 211. There are different theories regarding the names of the Chionites, Kidarites and Hephthalites. One school associates the three names with different stems of the one larger people (tribal grouping), the Huns. Alternatively the names are thought to represent the same people by different names during different periods. Evidence of their burial rites in Procopius (Wars I, 3) suggests that the Hephthalites and Kidarites were distinct from each other. Another point of debate is the dissimilarity of their languages. See also Grenet 2003: 206, note 4.
235 Bivar 1983: 211.
237 The link between the Chionites and the Kidarites was initially made on the basis of a reading of a coin legend, bago Kidaro, which was part of the Tepe Marajan hoard buried during the reign of Shábūr (383 – 388). Grenet has shown that there is little evidence to support this reading, which can, in fact, be read as Kay Wahram, the name of one of the last Kushano-Sasanian kings ruling from Kabul (Grenet 2003: 206-7).
239 Ibid.
Grenet suggests that the Chionites brought about the end of the Kushano-Sasanian kingdom in Bactria around the 370's but only later subjugated Sogdiana. He argues that while the Chionites were an unrelated people who gained control initially over the area to the south of the Hindu Kush, this power was later lost to the Kidarites who were in some respects closely aligned to the Sasanians. He places the rise of the Kidarites early in the 5th century.

The Kidarites in Sogdiana

The Kidarite movements were motivated by their desire to control the trade routes crossing China, India, Bactria and Sogdiana. Textual and numismatic evidence shows that they were closely associated with the Sasanians, a relationship that they were able to exploit.

The genealogy of the Kidarites is disputed in the ancient literary sources and by modern scholars. The Weishu provides the first mention of a king, Kidara, during the period 424 - 451. He is the king of the Great Yuezhi and his descendants are either the Kidarites (the Kushanshahs) or the Kushans.

That the Kidarites actually reached the Zarafshān Valley is clear from several coins from Samarkand bearing the name Kidara (kydr), which Grenet places in the fifth century. These coins continue a similar type (with the archer on the reverse) known from this region since the 1st century CE. Nevertheless, only seven out of approximately 2000 of these coins bear the name Kidara. This indicates that Kidarite control in the Zarafshān Valley was short lived. The break in embassies arriving from Samarkand in China between 441 and 457 CE is explained by Grenet as the result of the Kidarite conquest of the Zarafshān Valley. He places their arrival in Samarkand sometime after 437 CE.

The Hephthalites in Sogdiana

The Hephthalites conquered Sogdiana from their base to the south in Bactria. The date of their invasion of Sogdiana is disputed. However, Marshak and Negmatov and Grenet claim it was c. 509. Alternatively, Enoki has suggested that the Chionites, ruling from Sute or Sogdiana, were under attack by the Hephthalites from about 467 and were finally overcome by 480. After the fall of Sute, Samarkand, which was under the rule of the Zhaowu family, themselves Hephthalites according to Enoki, was able to resume sending tribute to the Chinese. Harmatta similarly suggests that the Hephthalites conquered the Kidarites in 466.

241 Ibid.: 207.
243 Zeimal 1996: 120.
244 Ibid.: 120.
246 This argument is based on that of de le Vaissière. Grenet 2003: 206-7.
248 Grenet 2003: 211.
The Kidarite and subsequent Hephthalite periods are associated with a flourishing urbanisation in Sogdiana, which was coloured by a southern (Bactrian and ultimately Indian) influence. Although there is little archaeological evidence from the Zarafshân Valley to reconstruct Sogdian society during the early part of this period, the establishment of towns such as Panjikent in the 5th century, and the discovery of the wall paintings at Dzhark-tepe indicate a flourishing region. Shishkina has suggested Sogdiana underwent a period of urban decline, which lasted at least from the 1st century BCE/CE to the 5th to 6th centuries CE. On the other hand, Marshak and Negmatov have commented that "between the third and the seventh centuries there were no prolonged periods of decline". Grenet has attributed a period of urban revival in Sogdiana to the 5th century. The decentralised nature of Sogdiana translated not into large urban settlements, but rather into smaller, fortified rural settlements. Although these settlements were to some extent politically isolated, the role of Sogdian merchants on the trade routes meant that they were not necessarily culturally isolated.

The influences represented in Sogdian art during this and the following period, such as wall paintings and various silver vessels found in Sogdiana, similarly indicate a diverse cultural and artistic heritage, including influences from Sasanian Iran and Tokharistan, India, China, the Turkic Empire and even Byzantium. This can in part perhaps be attributed to the role of Sogdian merchants and the position of Samarkand on the trade routes. Marshak comments that the Sogdian style was "distinguished by its narrative content, dynamism and love of contrast." Artistic influence from Sasanian Iran is attested in the wall paintings and figurines, while cultural influences from the south also become apparent in the 5th century. However, a demonstrably local filter is applied to both cultural and artistic influence, and Sogdian art and architecture developed along its own local lines, characterised by its eclecticism. Similar local developments are also found in Sogdian religious practices. This indicates an outward looking society with strong localised traits and a rich social, intellectual and cultural life.

The Turkish Kaghanate (c. 556 – 712 CE)

The primary sources for this period in Sogdiana include Chinese and Arabic literary sources and numismatics. The Mount Mugh archive of Déwāshātich, the last ruler of Panjikent, contained mainly administrative and legal documents. Nevertheless, it sheds some light on the chronology and relationships of the rulers of Panjikent and Sogdiana during the final stages of Turkic rule there. Similarly, wall paintings at various Sogdian cities provide important comparative data for historical events noted in the literary sources, while Turkic inscriptions and numismatics also provide some insight

251 Grenet 2003: 211.
252 Berdimuradov and Samibaev 1994; Berdimuradov and Samibaev 1999; Berdimuradov and Samibaev 2001 1999; 2001
255 Grenet 1996.
257 Ibid.: 250.
258 See for example Grenet 1986 and Shkoda 1996.
259 For a broader view of relations between Sogdians and Turks see de la Vaissière 2002: 197-201.
260 See very generally Dresden 1983: 1228.
into the relationship between Sogdiana and the Turks. Coin legends during this period were written in both Sogdian and Turkic. Coins were minted in the local provinces such as Kang and Chāch.

The first Turkic Kaghānate

The Turkic Kaghānate at its peak encompassed an enormous territory including Central Asia and the northern Caucasus to the eastern European steppes. The Turks rose under Bumin in 522, however, it was in 553 that his son Muhan and the brother of Bumin, Ishtemi, divided the Empire in order to better administer it. Sometime after this the Hephthalite Empire fell to the western Turks. During this period, Sogdiana and greater Transoxiana were to serve as a buffer zone between the Persians in the west and the Turks in the east.

The relationship between the Turkic speaking peoples and the Sogdian speakers was not necessarily a peaceful one, especially in view of the rich gains to be had from the control of Sogdiana and the various trade networks, and the divisive actions of Sogdian merchants to secure direct links with Byzantium at the expense of the Sasanians. The gradual rise of the Turks in Sogdiana is characterised by a strong infiltration of Turkic culture and peoples, and can be documented in two stages. Initially, principalities of Transoxiana remained under local rule with tribute being paid to the Kaghānate. Later, in the 7th century, after the split of the Eastern and Western Kaghānate due to family factionalism, which culminated under the rule of Nivar kaghan (581 – 587), the local ruling dynasties were taken over by the Turks, who began minting their own coins in an effort to demonstrate their power in the region and also over the northern and southern trading routes passing through Central Asia. However, the decentralised nature of the state of Kang made it difficult for the Turks, like others, to conquer.

Soucek comments that the countries making up the state of Kang "remained a kaleidoscope of more or less independent principalities, Iranian languages, and religions, although a vague kind of Turkic suzerainty – perhaps rather an intermittent series of pragmatic political submissions – bound the local monarchs to the kaghans". The description of the king of Kang in the Suishi wearing plaited hair demonstrates that Turkic customs had penetrated the upper classes. Further evidence of the political and economic importance of the role of the Turks in Samarkand and Sogdiana is indicated by the marriage between the ruler of Samarkand and the daughter of a Turkic kaghan, Kara Čubin. Some time between 605 and 616.

In 631 the king of Samarkand requested the Tang court that Samarkand and Sogdiana be incorporated into their Empire. This proposal was refused by the Tang because of their disinterest towards the Western Kaghānate of which Sogdiana was a part. Sogdiana did not pose any threat to the Chinese since the Sogdian army was

---

261 Baratova 1999.
262 There are various dates proposed for this event. See Sinor and Klyashtorny 1996: 332.
264 Ibid.: 306 who cites a direct reference from the Suishi.
268 Ibid.: 135, n. 2.
negligible, and there is no evidence of any military offensives undertaken by them on the far side of the Syr Darya. From the Sogdian perspective, however, there was some prestige to be gained from Chinese overlordship, especially in military terms. Similarly, from a trade perspective there were some benefits. For example, Chinese influence had a stabilising influence on trade relations, in addition to promoting the circulation of Chinese goods.\(^{270}\)

**The Tang Dynasty interlude in Sogdiana**

Nevertheless, despite their initial disinterest, the Chinese set their sights in staking a claim in the western regions of the Turkic Empire, especially lucrative Sogdiana. Sino-Turk relations were unsurprisingly stormy,\(^{271}\) but also resulted in the inevitable dynastic marriages, which provided a more stable basis, although undoubtedly the balance lay somewhat unevenly with the Chinese who took advantage of internal divisions within the Western Kaganate. The fall of Kashgar to the Chinese during the mid 7th century placed them on the doorstep of the Sogdians and served as a starting point for Chinese incursions to the west. This is captured in an inscription on the Kül Tegin Stela:

> "Because of the discord between the nobles and the commoners, because of the cunning and deceitfulness of the Chinese who set the younger and elder brothers, nobles and commoners against each other, the Türk people caused the disintegration of the empire that had been their own, caused the ruin of the qaghan who had been their qaghan. The sons of the nobles became slaves of the Chinese, their ladylike daughters, maidservants. The Türk nobles gave up their native offices, accepted Chinese titles and ranks, submitted to the Chinese emperor, and for fifty years they offered him their labour and strength.\(^{272}\)"

The Chinese defeated the Turks in 658 and Sogdiana became part of the Tang Empire, although their rule was only nominal, and, in fact, Sogdian states remained practically independent. Nevertheless, the influence of the Tang Dynasty in Sogdiana was not negligible, as is evidenced by numerous finds of coins with Chinese style square holes in the center. That this contact also occurred on a more intimate level is demonstrated by a mural in the palace at Afrasiab which demonstrates a familiarity with Tang art, and which may also manifest the presence of the Chinese in local society.\(^{273}\)

**The Second Turkish Kaganate in Sogdiana**

The Second Turkish Kaganate was founded under Elterish (682 – 692) after an interval of approximately a quarter of a century.\(^{274}\) Again, a snapshot of this event is captured by the Kül Tegin Stela:

> "Leading campaigns to the east and to the west, my father gathered the people and made the rise. And all together they numbered seven hundred men. When they were seven hundred, my father, in accordance with the

\(^{270}\) Soucek 2000: 53.

\(^{271}\) See briefly Malyavkin 1989: 68.

\(^{272}\) Soucek 2000: 55. The Kül Tegin stela is dated to 701 CE.

\(^{273}\) See most recently Kageyama 2002.

\(^{274}\) Sinor 1990: 310.
institutions of our ancestors, organised those who had been deprived of a qaghan, who had become slaves and servants, who had abandoned their institutions.... He led forty-seven campaigns and fought in twenty battles.

By the grace of Heaven he deprived of their state those who had a state, he deprived of their qaghan those who had a qaghan, he subjugated his enemies and made them bend their knees and bow their heads.\textsuperscript{275}

The extent of Turkic rule over Sogdiana is adduced in numerous legal and commercial documents, which show, for example, that merchants had to receive official approval from the Khagan in order to undertake trade with Iran.\textsuperscript{276} It is during the 7th century and the beginning of the 8th century that the most intense political activities of the Turks was undertaken in an effort to ensure their footing in the region, stimulated by encroaching Arab raids. The circulation of Turkic coins in Sogdiana indicates the extent of their rule and penetration in Sogdian life, with most officials and rulers being given both a Sogdian and a Turkic name.\textsuperscript{277}

It is conceivable that many wealthy Sogdians tried to emulate wealthy Turks in appearance and also in the naming of their children. However, is is not uncontestable that Turkic names and Turkic style dress necessarily represent a person who defined him/herself as ethnically Turkic. Rong Xianjing comments that “even though many Sogdians who served the Turks bore names that were rendered in a Turkish style, they had retained their identity and their own leaders within the Turkish khanate”.\textsuperscript{278} This sounds a warning to attempts to trace ethnic identity through written and visual sources.

The Arab Invasions of Sogdiana
The beginning of Arab raids

Sporadic incursions by the Arabs into Transoxiana occurred from the second half of the 7th century onward. The impact of these events was greatly hampered by civil unrest in Iraq and Khurāsān, which forced the return of Arab troops from the east and thus their initial successes were not consolidated. Arab literary traditions provide various dates for the initial incursions into Sogdiana. Abū 'Ubayda is the only Arabic source to mention a successful raid made by the Arabs on Māymurgh in 654. Raids under 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyad are noted in 673.\textsuperscript{279} Attempts were made by the government of ‘Uthmān (c. 675 or 6) to capture Samarkand after the initial invasion of Bukhara. However, these proved unsuccessful.\textsuperscript{280}

Sporadic raiding was carried out by the Arabs until the early 8th century when they were unified under Kutayba b. Muslim with a new policy towards Central Asia which played on the internal factions within the region. Bukhara was under attack between 706 and 709. However, it was the alliance of the Sogdian king Tarkhūn with the Arabs\textsuperscript{281} that ultimately led to the downfall of first Bukhara and then the other oasis

\textsuperscript{275} Soucek 2000: 55.
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\textsuperscript{278} Xinjiang 2000: 138.
\textsuperscript{279} Cf., Frye 1954: 37.
\textsuperscript{280} Ya'kubi: 109.
\textsuperscript{281} Frye 1954: 46-7.
settlements in Transoxiana. From the east also, Sogdiana was under attack by the Turks who were anxious to re-establish their hold over the area and the important economic gains to be had from the lucrative trading networks.

*Rulers of Panjikent and Samarkand.*

One of the primary historical issues during this period concerns the leadership of Kang and its principalities and their relationship with the Arabs. The primary sources of evidence for this are textual and numismatic. Documentation from the Mount Mugh archives and Arabic sources, together with that from the Chinese historical sources and travellers accounts, facilitate at least the partial reconstruction of political events at this time at both Panjikent and Samarkand. Evidence concerning the events and relations between the various Sogdian factions, the Turks and the Arabs, have recently been examined by Grenet and de la Vaissière through analysis of documents from the Mount Mugh archive. They have shed much light on this complex situation.

The names of three rulers at Panjikent are known: Gamaikian, Chekin-chur Bilga and Dewiishtich, the latter being perhaps the most famous as the owner of the Mugh archive at his fortified mountain residence. These rulers were unrelated and there is no evidence of hereditary kingship at Panjikent. Details regarding the two former rulers are less well documented. Gamaikian is the first name of a king from Panjikent recorded in numismatic evidence. Livshitz suggests that his rule immediately preceded that of Chekin-chur Bilga, and can be placed approximately from 670-80 – 695.

Chekin-chur Bilga is a Turkic name known from both numismatic sources and the Mugh documents. His rule can be placed between the final decade of the 7th century and the beginning of the 8th century. The title given on his coin legends reads “Ruler of Bacht and Ruler of Panc.” The location of Bacht remains uncertain, although it was probably part of either the Samarkand or Ustrushana regions.

Three rulers are also known from Afrasiab: Varxuman, Tarkhiin and Ghūrak. According to the Chinese sources the predecessor of Varxuman was Shishpir who ruled from Kesh.

**Varxuman**

Varxuman is the earliest mentioned ruler of Kang. In the *Tangshu* it is stated that “during the yong-hoei (650 – 655) period, Kao-ti [Gaodi] (= the emperor Koa-tsang [Guazang]) bestowed this territory on the government of K’ang-kiu [Kangju] and gave
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283 Baratova 1999: 233 notes an alternate reading of the coin legend by Smirnova, who reads the name as ‘Bidkan’, which later became ‘Bidijan’.
284 Livshitz 1979: 57.
285 Ibid.: 58 comments that this name is clearly of Turkic origin.
286 There are various nuances in the dating. Livshitz 1979: 65 suggests a date of approximately 694 and 709 or 690 - 704; Baratova 1999: 233 supports this dating. Marshak and Raspopova 1987: 182 place his rule between 690 – 704 CE. Grenet and de la Vaissière 2002: 166 suggest c. 693 – 707 CE.
288 Ibid. See also Livshitz 1979: 60. Marshak and Raspopova 1987: 182 suggest that this territory extended to the north of Panjikent.
289 Mode 1993: 109. See also Smirnova 1963: 28. The role of this center is little explored. However, the Syriac version of the history of Alexander the Great also refers to it. See Wallis Budge 2003: 160.
the title of governor of the kingdom, Fou-hou-man [Fu hu man]. According to the Tangshu Tou-so-po-t'i [Dousoboti] followed Varxuman to the throne. The relationship between these two rulers is unclear.

Tarkhon

The date of Tarkhun's accession to the throne is unclear. He is first mentioned in 704. According to Turkic sources the first successful Turkic invasion against the Sogdians took place under Kül Tegin in 701 CE. Tarkhon formed an alliance with the Arab leader Kutayba b. Muslim by advocating a policy of appeasement, paying the Arabs tribute and giving up Sogdian hostages to them. Frye suggests that these actions, however, led the local nobility to revolt against Tarkhun, which ultimately led to his downfall at the hands of the Samarkand people, and the proclamations of Dewashtich as ruler of Samarkand and all Sogdiana.

Alternatively, Grenet and de la Vaissière have argued that Dewashtich did not make his proclamation until 721. This is discussed in detail below. Tarkhun ruled until around 710 when he took his own life after being imprisoned by the Arab invaders. The actions of the nobles of Samarkand in ousting Tarkhun indicate a certain amount of autonomy from this group, which becomes more pronounced during events under the rule of Dewashtich.

Dewashtich

The rule of Dewashtich has been the focus of much debate, for numerous reasons. His relations with the invading Arabs and his proclamations as ruler of Sogdiana will be discussed here. Dewashtich appears to have come to the throne in Panjikent in c. 708. Documents from his archive at Mount Mugh indicate that he was for a brief period the ruler of both Panjikent and Samarkand, and therefore of all Sogdiana. The documents call him "Sogdian king, ruler of Samarkand". Tabari similarly calls him "diqhan of the people of Samarkand" while later documents from Mount Mugh refer to him only as
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290 Chavannes 1969: 135. Litvinskij 1998: 115 suggests a date of around 660 for his rule. Note also that the use of the term K'ang-kiu [Kangju] as translated by Chavannes is an anachronism and should be read as Kang or Kang guo, which means the State of Kang. Guo is understood in Mandarin as country, state or nation (Svend Helms pers. comm).
293 Marquart 1898: 15.
294 This is to be seen in the context of the actions of Arab invaders in Paykand, and also Chorasmia. In Paykand the price of their internal revolt against the Arab occupiers was almost a complete destruction of their city, while in Chorasmia the local inhabitants were almost completely annihilated by the Arabs for their insurrection. See Gibb 1970: 33-58. It may be presumed that Tarkhun knew of the reprisals enforced by the Arabs, and, given the difficulties of raising help from the Chinese or the Turks, knew that appeasement was the best policy. This may also explain the apparent ease with which the Arabs took Samarkand.
295 Frye 1951: 123.
296 Grenet and de la Vaissière 2002: 158.
297 Krachkovskij and Ju 1951: 111; Livshitz 1979: 61; Gibb 1970: 42. Ya'kubi presents a different perspective on his death: he claims that Tarkhun was killed by Ghtirak, his predecessor (Ya'kubi: II, 344.2 and 300.2 cf, Krachkovskij and Ju 1951: 111).
299 Krachkovskij and Ju 1951: 112.
300 Livshitz 1979: 61. He notes that this term is a synonym for king.
the “ruler of Pañca (Panjikent),” previously, scholars placed the date of this claim around the time of the death of Ghiurak. However, renewed studies of the Mugh archive have presented a different picture of his rule, indicating that his claim to kingship of all Sogdiana occurred only in the final stage of his life and that it was in fact short-lived.

Grenet and de la Vaissière argue that the events of 721 provided a clear opportunity for Dewashtich to seize the throne, thereby challenging the rule of Ghiurak in Kang, which was recognised by the Sogdian nobility and the Arabs. It seems from correspondences in the Mugh archives that Dewashtich was in league with various settlements along the Dargom channel to the south east of Samarkand, which was the main water supply for Samarkand. He was also under the belief that he had the support of the Turkic army. With this as security he was able to exploit Ghiurak and his factions in Kang in order to raise his prestige in the eyes of the Arabs, who were also trying to control the channel. This allowed Dewashtich in 721 to challenge the rule of Ghiurak in his correspondences with the Arabs, using the royal title. It is unclear to what extent this title was accepted by the Arabs.

By spring 722 it became clear that the Turkic army would not be continuing their role in Sogdiana. Together with the continuation of Arab attacks in Sogdiana under Sa’id al-Harashi two factions amongst the Sogdian nobility emerged. One of these, and apparently the more popular, led by Kārzānch but apparently still loyal to Ghiurak, turned to the king of Ferghāna for support against the Arabs. This group was duped by the queen of Ferghāna who did not allow them to enter the Valley and who alerted the Arabs to their predicament. They were massacred by the Arabs at Khudjand. The others turned to Dewashtich and his mountain stronghold. They were isolated by the retreat of the Turkic army and also were attacked by the Arabs, during which time Dewashtich was executed.

Ghiurak and the fall of Samarkand

Ghiurak was the popular ruler of Samarkand until 737 or 738. From 712 Sogdiana was under the suzerainty of the Arabs. The fall of Sogdiana to the Arabs is recorded by al-Tabari:

“Qutayba reached Sughd ... with twenty thousand men. He reached it accompanied by Khwarazmians and Bukharans ... and said: “When we light on a people’s courtyard, how evil will be the mourning of them that are warned!” He besieged them for a month. In the course of being

302 The claims of Dewashtīch to the throne of Samarkand, and therefore all of Sogdiana, known from the Mount Mugh documents have been variously dated. The historico-political situation has been discussed most recently by Grenet and de la Vaissière 2002. Earlier discussions can be found in Livshitz 1979; Freiman 1936 (1951); Frye 1951; Krachkovskij and Ju 1951; Zakeri 1995.
304 Ibid.
305 Ibid.: 158.
307 Frye 1951: 123, following Tomaschek, claims that Ghiurak was a member of the royal family of Ushrushana.
308 The court of the Tangshu received notice of his death in 738. See Chavannes 1969: 210
309 Krachkovskij and Ju 1951: 111; Livshitz 1979: 61.
besieged, [the Sogdians] fought [the Muslims] several times. They wrote to the king of Shash and the ikshad of Ferghana: "If the Arabs vanquish us, they will visit upon you the like of what they brought to us!". [The latter] agreed to set out [against the Arabs] and sent [word] to [the Sogdians]: "Send [against the Arabs] those who may distract them, so that we may make a night attack on their camp".310

Support for the Sogdians against Arab invasions of Samarkand was sent by Châch and Ferghâna (although it never reached them) and also the Turks. This is mentioned by Ghûrak in his first letter to the Tang court dated to 719 and also by Tabari. However, Gibb sounds a note of warning regarding the truth of Ghûrak statement.311 Although Ghûrak was forced into a policy of appeasement towards the Arabs, he maintained a significant degree of autonomy.

The treaty Ghûrak signed with the Arabs forced him to pay tribute (according to the sources this was a surprisingly low amount), supply a specified number of troops to the Arab army,312 and, finally, to remove men of fighting age from the city until the Arabs had established a Muslim religious infrastructure. This last stipulation was reneged upon by Kutayba, the general of the Arab army. Nevertheless, Ghûrak and his followers, rather than signing a new treaty with the Arabs, erected a new city outside Afrasiab called Farankath.313

Summary

Zakeri has commented that "Arab hegemony and control over the territories conquered in Khurasan and later Transoxiana was at best limited and their rule was constantly threatened by powerful Persian and Turkish princes."314 Part of the reason for this was the civil disputes among the different Arab factions, but it is also partly due to the fierce nature of the Central Asian States. It was only under Kutayba, when relationships were formed with the local population, that the Arabs were finally able to bring the region under control.315 The ideal of the noble soldier in Sogdian society was matched by reality and is evidenced in al-Tabari’s description of the Sogdian soldiers at the time of the fall of Samarkand. An Arab commander commented: "We surrounded them, but I have not seen a people as fierce in fighting as the sons of these kings ...".316 The response of the captured soldiers to the Arabs similarly reflects the importance of
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310 Soucek 2000: 59. Akhunbabaev and Grenet (Bernard, Grenet et al. 1990:370) note that there is a very fragmentary representation of a scene thought to represent aspects of the fall of Samarkand in the palace of Dëwâshfích at Panjikent. See also Azarpay 1981: 65, fig. 28 and 29.
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this: "You have not fought anybody but princes, or nobles of the nobles, or heroes, and when you killed a man, he was none other than the one whose power was equal to one hundred". These were the ideals which Sogdian society appears to have held in esteem, echoes of which are found on the Panjikent and Afrasiab wall paintings. The continuity of such themes in the rare pieces of art from Sogdiana reflect an underlying sense of stability in this region, despite the perpetual waves of nomadic peoples.

**Summary**

The history of Sogdiana is one of interactions between nomadic, semi-nomadic and sedentary peoples. One of the major factors in these interactions was the geographical location of Sogdiana. Sogdiana has played the traditional role of a nexus between the "civilised" and "barbarian" worlds. This peripheral role is juxtaposed with the importance of Sogdiana and Sogdian merchants on the trade routes, a role that does not appear to have been of major significance in Sogdian identity. Together with the nature of historical and archaeological documentation for Sogdiana, the cultural and political development of Sogdiana is perceived as both eclectic and enigmatic.

A significant implication of the geography of Sogdiana is demonstrated by its socio-political culture. Political control in Sogdiana was divided between urban and rural rulers and was characterised by its decentralisation. The "desert waste" of Sogdiana was divided into numerous small, independent oasis principalities. Little evidence survives of the interactions between these principalities. Gibb, commenting on the early medieval period in Sogdiana, suggests that "the 'confederacy' of these states, however, was in no sense an alliance and probably amounted to little more than a *modus vivendi*". In fact, despite the major influence of Sogdiana on the trade routes, especially to the east, it is important to note that a unified "Sogdian Empire" never existed.

There is some evidence of the importance of the notion of regional identity for those who identified themselves as Sogdian. Evidence from Sogdian trading communities in China suggests that clans such as Kang and Shi built their own temples while Sogdian personal names invariably incorporated the principality from which the family originated. The *Ancient Sogdian Letters* show that, in their own language, merchants referred to themselves as Sogdians, continuing their vernacular. A different picture is presented in the Chinese sources, however, where such names appear unknown, or, at least, unused until the early medieval period. This highlights the problem of accessing the different population groups, including regional communities, living in Sogdiana, cautioning the extent to which such sources may be used to explore such issues.

Central to the issue of identity, and so clearly highlighted in the various literary sources, is the debate concerning the make up of the social groups in Sogdiana. The legacy of this question can be traced back to Achaemenid attempts to identify the various Saka peoples living on the peripherary of their world. It is later attested in the appearance of the Kangju and Yuezhi in Central Asia in the 2nd century BCE. It is also
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318 Regarding the Syr Darya in particular Holt 1988: 23 says: "This area, indeed, was a true frontier zone, but no precise border; it was a meeting place rather than a barrier."
320 Xinjiang 2000: 124.
321 See generally Ibid.
evident in the continuing debates regarding the identity of the Turkic speaking peoples in Sogdiana during the 3rd to 6th centuries and the extent of their interaction with the Sogdians. The nebulous nature of sources regarding these peoples underlines the enigmatic notion of Sogdiana, in both modern and ancient scholarship.

The research on costume undertaken for this thesis provides an alternate means of approaching some of the historical issues raised in this section. A study of costume at a regional level will add in particular to evidence regarding identity raised in several of the sources discussed here. This issue of identity is to be seen on both a horizontal and a vertical level - i.e., within the broader region of Sogdiana, and also within a specific region, in this case Samarkand. Furthermore, there is no doubt that Sogdiana was a major meeting point for numerous different peoples, both nomadic and sedentary. A study of the costume represented on the terracottas from the Samarkand region (or indeed any other region in Sogdiana) also has the potential to yield information regarding the impact of specific peoples on local society. These two broad issues underline the importance of the historical context in which the figurines operated.

The paradox of Sogdiana lies in the fact that while it was viewed as peripheral in both eastern and western sources, its role in trade and its location on the trade routes can only be described as pivotal. Furthermore, so little evidence regarding Sogdiana comes from within the region, rendering much of its history a history of the rulers rather than a history of the ruled. This chapter has concentrated on sources relating to the microhistory of Sogdiana in an attempt to clarify what is known from archaeological and textual sources. The complex nature of the historiographical sources and the lacunae of internal evidence, especially prior to the early medieval period, have limited the scope of this chapter. Nevertheless, the intrinsic position of Sogdiana in Central Asia, the importance of the relationship with the nomadic peoples to the north and east, and the importance of the Sogdian region in understanding the link between the East and West have been clearly underlined.
### Chinese Dynasties and Corresponding Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Dynasty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>206 BCE – 9 CE</td>
<td>Han (Former Han)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – 23</td>
<td>Hsin (Wang Mang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 220</td>
<td>Han (Later Han)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 – 265</td>
<td>San-kuo (Three Kingdoms, Wei, Wu &amp; Shu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265 – 317</td>
<td>Western Chin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317 – 589</td>
<td>North and South Dynasties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317 – 420</td>
<td>Eastern Chin (southern China)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386 – 535</td>
<td>To-pa Wei (Later Wei) (North China)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420 – 479</td>
<td>(Liu) Sung (South China)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502 – 556</td>
<td>Liang (South China)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557 – 581</td>
<td>Chou (North China)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589 – 618</td>
<td>Sui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618 – 907</td>
<td>Tang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Chinese dynasties and corresponding dates.
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The purpose of the typology developed for this thesis is twofold. Firstly, to establish a system of classification for the costume represented on terracotta figurines and plaques from the Samarkand region. Secondly, to facilitate a means of exploring representations of identity at a regional or localised level within the broader territory of Sogdiana.

As discussed above, these aims are complicated by two serious issues: the provenance and the chronology of the figurines. The development of the typology to study the costume represented on the figurines and plaques was largely dictated by these, and other, limitations. A typology based on chronology, provenance or stratigraphy is neither reliable nor possible given the nature of the collections. The typology presented here is therefore primarily descriptive, based on specific garment and headdress types and the observation of details such as cut, manner of wearing, and ornamentation. Of course, other methods of costume classification are possible. For example, Wobst divided male dress from Yugoslavia into three main categories based on degrees of visibility of specific features and their ability to communicate non-verbally.1

Dress and headdresses are treated in separate typologies, although the method of classification is the same. The prefix D is used to denote dress in the typology sequences (explained below), while HD is used for headdress. Garments or headdresses that are difficult to identify or define are prefixed UD (undefined), followed by their typology sequence. The dress typology is initially divided into upper body garments, lower body garments, footwear, accessories and armour. The illustration on page 92 shows the breakdown of the dress typology. Upper body garments (UBG) are those worn over the shoulders and can be further sub-divided based on the presence or absence of a central front seam. Garments with a central front seam that are able to be worn either open or fastened are referred to as open upper body garments (UBGO). Those having no central front seam and only able to be worn closed are referred to as closed upper body garments (UBGC). Lower body garments (LBG) are those worn from the waist down. In the case of the Samarkand region terracottas, this section comprises only trousers.

Alpha-numeric sequences rather than descriptive terms have been used to refer to each type variant and ornamentation group. Dress is divided initially into types (i.e., type D00) incorporating the generic name of a garment: eg. coat or dress. Each type has a number of type variants (i.e., D00.00) which reflect the different styles in cut and the manner of wearing a specific garment. Where possible, type variants are further differentiated into ornamentation groups (i.e., D00.00.00). These show the range of ornamentation found within a type variant. Ornamentation is divided into two types: applied ornamentation and drapery. Applied ornamentation refers to the use of shapes and patterns, perhaps to symbolise buttons and plaques. Examples of these shapes include circles, ovals, small triangles and squares. Applied ornamentation is found either directly on the garment or headdress, or on a band that serves as an additional element of ornamentation. Drapery refers to the use of straight or curvilinear lines on garments and headdresses to denote folds or creases in the fabric. On the costume of the Samarkand region drapery is found predominantly on dresses and trousers. Not all type variants have

1 Wobst 1977.
ornamentation groups. In cases where there is more than one ornamentation group, the first one may be characterised by the absence of ornamentation. The terms ornamentation and decoration are used interchangeably throughout the study to mean the addition of an element or elements to a basic type variant to express differentiation in the broadest sense of the term.

The typological divisions outlined above for dress are more arbitrary for the headdresses due to difficulties identifying the construction of many types, type variants and ornamentation groups. The illustration on page 179 shows the breakdown of the headdress typology. Attempts to adhere as closely as possible to the divisions outlined have been made, however, in many instances it has not been possible to identify ornamentation groups for headdresses, regardless of whether the headdress is ornamented or not. This is due to the broad variation in headdress type variants, and in many cases, their relatively poor preservation. Type (i.e., HD00) represents the generic headdress type (eg. cap or crown). Type variant (i.e., HD00.00) categorises the manner of wearing the headdress and the variations in the basic shape. The ornamentation group (i.e., HD00.00.00) represents the range of ornamentation found within the type variant.

Although a detailed description for each typological sequence is provided, it is recognised that in many cases the representation of details such as ornamentation remains unclear and any interpretation is, to a certain degree, subjective. It is hoped that the use of alpha-numeric sequences rather than descriptors to identify type variants and ornamentation groups will lead to a more open approach to costume without the bias of classical scholarship, which often characterises the nomenclature of established garment or headdress types. Museum identification numbers are used to refer to the figurines whenever possible.

Schematised drawings are given for each type variant and ornamentation group. These demonstrate as clearly as possible the placement and symbols used to denote ornamentation on the figurines, together with the cut and manner of wearing of a garment or headdress. It must be noted that these are necessarily interpretative and subjective and in this sense represent a suggestion only of what the garment or headdress may in reality have looked like.

The typology comprises three sections: 1) a comparative table showing schematised illustrations of all type variants and ornamentation groups within each type; 2) a description of each garment or headdress, based on a type example and 3), where available, a discussion of the comparative material and the chronological and geopolitical implications of these. As noted in Chapter 1, type examples are those figurines that demonstrate most clearly the specific attributes of a garment or headdress. Some figurines are listed as type examples for more than one garment or headdress type. In cases where there are a number of similar type variants (for example, differences in the length of a garment only), these are discussed together. Archaeological evidence, essentially comprising material finds from burials, is discussed, where applicable, separately from other comparative material. Comparative material typically comprises other sources of visual representations, such as small and monumental statuary and wall paintings. Sources for comparative material are necessarily wide ranging, both chronologically and geographically. Especially in the cases of more generic garments
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2 See p. 9 for a discussion of the limitations of the study, especially regarding issue of subjectivity.
3 See p. 37ff for an explanation of these.
and headdresses, this has meant that the discussion of type variants appears to be rather random and with little attempt at synthesis. While in certain cases this is acknowledged, the overview of the provenanced costume in Chapter 5 is designed to analyse and clarify the parallels discussed in the typology.

It will be noted that no distinction is made in the structure of the typology regarding chronology or gender. Chapter 2 outlines the issues involved in the identification of gender and chronological associated with the figurines. However, the summary of provenanced costume provided in Chapter 5 gives an overview of the possible breakdowns of garment and headdress types by chronology. Gender is discussed, where applicable, on the basis of individual garment types throughout the typology.

A note should be made regarding the use of terminology associated with costume studies in Central Asia. The majority of the literature on this subject is in Russian, and many of the terms used to describe specific garments are taken directly from one of the local languages of the region, often with little explanation. Some terms, such as caftan, are used indiscriminately to describe both open and closed upper body garments, while others, such as shirt, tunic and dress, are often used interchangeably, with little or no explanation or definition.

In order to overcome such issues of terminology, generic terms for garments have been used in the typology, together with a schematised illustration for each type variant and ornamentation group. Attempts have also been made to standardise the terminology, albeit at the risk of repetition. Several further comments should be made regarding the use of terms and descriptors. A horizontal or vertical band is a common element of ornamentation on dress. For example, this may be applied to the center front openings of a garment, or it may form a vertical panel in the center of a dress. This is referred to in the description and discussion of garments variously as a trim band, an applied band or, simply as a band. However, where it is used to line the hem of a garment - either trousers or an upper body garment - it is referred to as a hem. A band on the end of sleeves is referred to as a cuff. It should be noted however, that the distinction between a cuff and wrist ornamentation is often nebulous.

As noted in Chapters 1 and 2, the issue of provenance is a major one. Type variants and/or ornamentation groups comprising only unprovenanced figurines are marked with an asterisk (*). This indicates that there is no evidence with which to conclusively associate or dissociate these types or groups with the Samarkand region. Chapter 5 provides a discussion of the garments and headdresses portrayed on provenanced figurines only.
THE DRESS TYPOLOGY

Diagrammatic representation showing the structure of the dress typology
TYPE D01 – CLOAKS

Cloaks represented on figurines from the Samarkand region are predominantly either shin or ankle length and are worn in one of two ways: draped around the shoulders and unfastened (type variant D01.01) or fastened at the chest and thrown behind the shoulders (type variant D01.02). In all cases, cloaks are distinguished by the absence of a collar. While there are no indications of drapery, three different types of applied ornamentation have been identified on cloaks: the circular motif, a V-shape pattern, and a ladder pattern, essentially made up of small rectangular shapes placed immediately next to each other. This patterning is applied either directly on the centre front openings of the cloak, or to a band lining the centre front openings, and which presumably continues behind the neck, although this is not visible. No ornamentation is shown on the hem. Cloaks worn thrown behind the shoulders appear to be unornamented. Type variant D01.01 is typically portrayed on female figurines dated to between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century CE. Type variant D01.02 is worn by both male and female figures during the early medieval period.

Shin length cloak worn draped around the shoulders. The following ornamentation groups have been defined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date and provenance</th>
<th>Type example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No ornamentation</td>
<td>Afrasiab, c. 2nd-1st century BCE - 4th century CE</td>
<td>RM A19 96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date and provenance</th>
<th>Type example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circular shaped pattern is applied directly on the centre front openings.</td>
<td>Afrasiab c. 2nd-1st century BCE - 4th century CE</td>
<td>RM A19 98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D01.01.03

**Description**  V-shape or chevron pattern stamped directly on the centre front openings.

**Date and provenance**  Afrasiab c. 2nd-1st century BCE – 4th century CE.

**Type example**  AM 89 2 075 07

D01.01.04

**Description**  Band ornamented with circular shaped pattern lining centre front openings.

**Date and provenance**  Afrasiab c. 2nd-1st century BCE – 4th century CE.

**Type examples**  RM A19 101

D01.01.05

**Description**  Band divided by evenly spaced horizontal lines, forming small rectangular sections similar to a ladder pattern, lining centre front openings.

**Date and provenance**  Afrasiab c. 2nd-1st century BCE – 4th century CE.

**Type Example**  RM A19 99

**DISCUSSION OF CLOAK TYPE VARIANTS D01.01**

*Description of figurines type(s)*

Cloak type variant D01.01 is associated with a figure often interpreted as Anahita on the basis of iconography. The figurine type shows a female figure wearing a shin or ankle length dress underneath the cloak, and often holding various attributes typically interpreted as fruit or flowers. Note however, that D01.01.04 is not necessarily a female garment as no breasts are shown on figurines wearing this style of cloak. Cloak type variant D01.01 is very well represented in the corpus on figurines dated to between the

---

4 For example see Zaslavskaya 1959; Meshkeris 1989:

5 See for example Zaslavskaya 1959; Mandel'shtam 1960 and Meshkeris 1968.
2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century CE. Numerous figurines from Afrasiab located in the Tashkent Museum also represent similar styles of cloak. It may be possible to add an ankle length variant to this group. Two other figurines preserved only from the knees down indicate that an ankle length open upper body garment was also known, although the possibility that this garment represents a kandys (see below D03) cannot be ruled out (for this reason it is not included as a type variant). On both of these examples the garment is ornamented with a band with incised circles on the centre front openings in a very similar style to D01.01.04.

Comparative material

The description of Anahita, the Avestan goddess of water and fertility, in Yasht 5 of the Avesta includes a beaver skin cloak in her iconography. Images of female figures wearing cloaks draped around the shoulders from various other parts of Eurasia point to the broad geographical and chronological range of this figure. For example, Scythian images of a seated female figure (fig. 107) wearing a long cloak or kandys (see Type D03) link the garment to a sacred context. A wall hanging from Pazyryk (fig. 122) shows a cloak (or kandys?) ornamented with a gold band on the centre front openings worn by a seated goddess. Some Sasanian images of Anahita (fig. 66) also show her wearing a cloak.

Numerous examples of female figures from contiguous regions demonstrate that cloak type variant D01.01 is well known in both Central Asia and Sogdiana in various media. Although the cloak is very well represented in Samarkand on figurines dated to between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century CE, it is not until the 3rd-4th century CE that figurines appear at Erkurgan wearing a cloak, while it has not been documented on published figurines from the Bukhara oasis. A figurine from Koi Krylgan-kala (fig. 1), dated to the beginning of the 4th century BCE, shows a very similar cloak to that of D01.01.01 and D01.01.04, although it is worn in a different manner. The cloak covers the right shoulder and falls gracefully over the right side of the body. On the left shoulder it is barely visible, apparently falling behind the shoulder on this side. Numerous examples from Bactria dated to the Kushan period show a female figure wearing a cloak in various manners, and with various types of ornamentation. A figurine from Shortepa in Bactria, dated between the 1st and 3rd century CE shows a female (?) figure wearing a thin, pleated cloak (fig. 26). The pleating may be caused by the thin material, or the cloak may have been deliberately pleated at the shoulders. Similar ornamentation to that of D01.01.05 is found on a figurine from Airtam, although here it is shown on the centre
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6 For example S48/107 in Meshkeris 1989: 117, fig. 25; S48/180 in Meshkeris 1989: 127, fig. 34; S48/179 in Meshkeris 1989: 126, fig. 33, 1.
7 Sève n.d.: pl. XV, 70 and pl. 31/6, 70 (91.3.301) and Trever 1934: pl. 13, 185b (A186 - this is illustrated under type example D04.03.01).
8 Wolff 1910: 181.
9 Both of these garments are traditionally associated with male members of the Persian ruling classes.
11 Ringbom 1957: fig. 7 and fig. 8.
12 Suleimanov 2000: 208 and pl. 152, 1, 2.
14 Vorob'eva 1968: 146.
15 Abdullaev, Rtveladze et al. 1991 v. I: 89, fig. 75.
front openings of a coat. A figure from Hadda wears a long cloak over the head, which is also ornamented with the ladder pattern on the center front openings (fig. 20). A seated figurine from Dalverzin-tepe wears a very long cloak draped over the shoulders. An unornamented band is visible on the left side of the garment, however, it is difficult to see if this is replicated on the right side. It is also possible that the line simply indicates the folds of the material (fig. 27).

Wall paintings from Bactria, also dated to the Kushan period, suggest a non-divine context for cloaks. For example, a standing figure on a wall painting from Fayaz-tepe (Termez), perhaps a worshipper, is wearing a cloak ornamented with flowers draped around the shoulders. Comparisons with early medieval cloaks worn by males and females portrayed in banqueting scenes on wall paintings from Panjikent and Varakhsha and Balalik-tepe in Northern Tokharistan (fig. 126) demonstrate the continuity of the garment type, albeit with variations in ornamentation. On these examples contrasting fabric trims on the centre front openings are shown, rather than beading or other applied ornamentation. A means of fastening the cloak on the Panjikent examples in the form of a circular element with ties at approximately chest level also differentiates it from the earlier examples. Some examples also show a single or double lapel.

Archaeological evidence

Burials dating to the 2nd and 1st millennium BCE in the Tarim Basin have yielded several cloaks while Levina has noted remains of leather cloaks found in burials on the Syr Darya delta, decorated on the center front openings and hems, and dated predominantly to the 3rd - 4th century CE.

Cloaks similar to type variant D01.01 are documented in other regions of Sogdiana, as well as Chorasmia and Bactria. This indicates a common cultural context for these cloak type variants, with possible antecedents associated with the cultures of the Iranian speaking nomadic cultures of the Eurasian steppes. Notably, in his study of the dress of the Yuezhi between the period of the 1st century BCE to the 4th century CE, Yatzenko does not discuss this style of cloak. In Sogdiana and Chorasmia cloak type variant D01.01 may be associated with female figures in a ritual or divine context prior to

16 Koshelenko 1985: 398, fig. 17.
17 Barthoux 2001: pl. 98e.
18 Koshelenko 1985: 398, fig. 22.
19 Albaum 1990: 22, fig. 2.
20 See for example Belenitzkii 1959: pl. 9.
21 Several female mummies from Qiwrighul dated to 1800 BCE have been described as wearing cloaks made of different materials. One cloak is knee length, and woven from sheep's wool. Another is described as a "golden-brown woollen wrap consisting of two strips of plain weave that had been stitched together (the loom employed seems to have been incapable of producing a piece of cloth wide enough to cover the woman" [Mallory and Mair 2000: 212]). Whether these garments served as shrouds or were worn during the lifetime of the deceased is unclear. Another female mummy from Lopnor Grave 36 wore a "large dark brown woollen cloak trimmed with a yellow and red border and fastened together with wooden (and one bone) pins" (Mallory and Mair 2000: 213). This is dated to c. 1000 BCE. Another calf length cloak made of finely woven dark red twill worn by a female mummy from Zaghunluq is dated to the 1st millennium BCE (Mallory and Mair 2000: 216). It is unclear whether men also wore similar cloaks.
the early medieval period. However, in the early medieval period, cloaks are worn in secular banqueting scenes by both males and females. One of the characteristics of cloaks from the Samarkand region is their comparatively modest ornamentation. This is echoed in representations of cloaks from other regions of Central Asia. However, it contrasts with cloaks shown on wall paintings dating to the early medieval period, which are characterised by richly decorated woven fabrics.

Cloak worn in the style of a cape, fastened at the chest and thrown behind the shoulders.

D01.02*

**Description**

The length of the cloak/cape is unclear although the style is very well known among other figurines from the early medieval period. On the basis of these, it may be suggested that it is approximately knee length. The cloak is unornamented and fastened at the chest with a circular clasp.

**Date and provenance**

Unprovenanced.

**Type**

A772

**Examples**

DISCUSSION OF CLOAK TYPE VARIANT D01.02*

**Description of figurines type(s)**

Two different figurine types show a seated figure wearing this style of cloak. A772 shows a seated male figure holding a pan flute. The cloak is fastened with a circular ring clasp. Stratified examples of a similar type series from Panjikent are dated to the 6th – 7th century CE. The iconography of this type is well recognised, although the identity of the figure remains debated. Marshak identifies it as Adbag.

**Comparative material**

A wall hanging from Pazyryk (fig. 122) portrays a mounted figure wearing a short cloak fastened at the chest and flowing behind him approaching a seated goddess. Other examples of cloaks worn in this manner are known from Chorasmia and Bactria. A female figurine from Koi Krylgan-kala dated to the 4th – 3rd century BCE wears an ankle length cloak fastened at the chest with a pendant ring. A male figurine from Babatag (fig. 25) in Bactria, dated to the 1st – 2nd century CE, shows a musician wearing a cloak or cape in a similar style. The figurine is naked except for the cloak and large anklets.

23 Bryikina 1999: 274.
25 Rudenko 1970: pl. 154. This wall hanging almost certainly has a western origin.
27 Ibid.: 89, fig. 73.
This may suggest a ritual context for this figurine. A male figure on the Khalchayan frieze also wears a similar garment type.\textsuperscript{28}

Cloak type variant D01.02 is well documented in Central Asia prior to the early medieval period. Significantly, this type variant is not represented on wall paintings from Panjikent or any other Sogdian centers to date. By the Middle Ages, at least on the basis of Persian miniatures, the garment seems to have disappeared.\textsuperscript{29}

CLOAKS - UNDEFINED

| Description | Sleeveless upper body garment of unclear length with a very deep vertical section at the front. This section continues approximately three quarters of the length of the garment. It is lined on either side with a double band. On the outer edge is a narrow, unornamented band. Immediately next to this lies a slightly broader band ornamented with a pattern comprising of semi-circles laid sideways, lining the outside edge of the band. |
| Date and provenance | Unprovenanced. |
| Type example | SA 362 |

Description of figurine type(s)

Standing, frontally represented figurine wearing an upper body garment similar to a cloak, although apparently fastened at the lower section. The left hand is held at the side of the body. The right arm is bent at the elbow, and a small, circular (?) object is held in the hand at chest level. The identification of the garment is unclear: the absence of sleeves associates it with a cloak, however, the deep vertical section at the front, which seems to close towards the lower part of the garment, associates it with either a shirt or dress.\textsuperscript{30}

Comparative material

Pilipko documents a garment similar to a kandys, with a very deep front section (figs 13 and 14).\textsuperscript{31} This is dated to not earlier than the 2\textsuperscript{nd} – 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE.\textsuperscript{32} A similar garment is also shown on a bowl from Chorasmia worn by a seated four armed goddess.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{28} Pugachenkova 1971: pl. 68.
\textsuperscript{29} See for example Gorelik 1979a. No reference is made to a cloak of this type.
\textsuperscript{30} The illustration given in Meshkeris 1989: 99, fig. 9, 1b shows the left arm on the outside of the garment. Although the figurine is located in an exhibition case in the State Hermitage (from which it could not be removed for study), closer inspection suggests that while the shape of the arm is visible underneath the garment, the arm itself is covered.
\textsuperscript{31} Pilipko 1977: 195, fig. 6, 1 and 2.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.: 196.
\textsuperscript{33} Nezarik and Bulgakov 1996: 220, fig. 13.
An outer garment or tcherkeska, probably worn originally by the Scythians, is described as having "no collar and (it is) cut with a long narrow v-shaped opening from the neck to below the breast bone".\footnote{Widengren 1956: 234.} Examples of traditional wedding dresses from Samarkand and Bukhara show a dress with long sleeves, and a very deep section cut in the front, which is similarly lined on either side with an embroidered band.\footnote{See for example Kalter and Pavlovi 1997: pl. 42; pl. 520-1, all dated from the end of the 19th century – early 20th century.}
TYPE D02 – COATS

Coats are open upper body garments with full length sleeves of various lengths and worn either fastened or unfastened. There are relatively few variations within this garment type. Applied ornamentation, like that for cloaks, is relatively modest and is typically located on the centre front openings of the garment. Drapery is shown on only one example. In most cases, coats are associated with male figures.

Thigh length coat with full length sleeves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>The coat is worn with the right side wrapped over the left. A band ornamented with a circular shaped pattern lines the centre front openings and the hem.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and provenance</td>
<td>Afrasiab, c. 2nd-1st century BCE - 4th century CE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D02.01**

**Description of figurines type(s)**

Only one figurine portrays this type variant, of which only the upper half of the body is preserved. It is represented frontally. No attributes are shown and no indications of gender are recognised.

**Comparative material**

This style of short coat with no collar and an ornamented band lining the hem and centre front openings is associated with various nomadic peoples of the Eurasian Steppes, such as the Scythians and the Parni. However, in these cases the coat is almost always worn belted around the waist. A short sleeved waist length coat is portrayed on a figurine from Koi Krylgan-kala dated to the 4th BCE. A band with incised horizontal lines ornaments the centre front openings. The closest analogies for D02.01 in Central Asia come from a Yuezhi/Kushan context where short coats are worn without a belt and ornamented on the centre front openings.

There has been much debate regarding the significance of the wrap of coats in Central Asia and China, with the direction of the wrap – whether left over right or right over left - being cited as evidence of ethnic identity. However, a brief survey of the literature suggests that other factors were involved. According to Yatzenko, open upper

---

36 See Widengren 1968 regarding the symbolism of the belt. For Scythian examples see Aruz, Farkas et al. 2000: 206, cat. no. 146. For examples of short coats associated with the Parni see Pilipko 2001: fig. 7, 10.
37 Tolstov and Vainberg 1967: tbl. 25, 8.
38 See Yatzenko 2001: pl. 12, 47 (from Takhti-Sangin) and 48 (from Sakhsanokhur); pl. 13, 34 and 35, both from Dalverzin-tepe.
body garments wrapped with the left side over the right are indicative of steppe nomadic peoples including the Iranian speaking peoples, the Huns and the early Turks, while coats wrapped with the right over the left are typically associated with deities and cult figures.\textsuperscript{39} Jisl, on the other hand, has observed that while male Turks wear their coats wrapped with the right side over the left, the opposite is true for the females.\textsuperscript{40} D02.01 is the only example of a coat in this corpus on which the direction of the wrap is clearly shown.

\textbf{Archaeological evidence}

A reconstruction of the male dress from Tillya-tepe shows a lavishly ornamented short coat with full length sleeves with a belt around the waist.\textsuperscript{41} The manner of wrapping is not preserved although the reconstruction shows it wrapped right over left. Costume reconstructed from the Dzhety-asar burials also shows some females wearing short jackets (see figs 86, 87, 89, 91 and 92).\textsuperscript{42}

Although this style of short coat is well known from other regions, the lack of comparative evidence from Sogdiana suggests that it was not traditionally worn in this region.

Knee length coat with full length sleeves.

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{D02.02*} \\
\hline
\textbf{Description} & Undecorated trim on centre front openings, which continues around the hem. The sleeves are cuffed. \\
\hline
\textbf{Date and provenance} & Unprovenanced. \\
\hline
\textbf{Type} & A691 and SA 434 \\
\hline
\textbf{Examples} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textbf{DISCUSSION OF COAT TYPE VARIANT D02.02*}

\textit{Description of figurines type(s)}

Two very different figurine types wear this coat. One of these (A691) is a standing female, represented frontally. The right hand is resting on the right thigh and the left arm is bent and held across the stomach. An attribute was possibly held in the right hand, although there is no remaining evidence of this. The generic nature of the

\textsuperscript{39} Yatzenko 2000: 323-325.
\textsuperscript{40} Jisl 1968:189-90.
\textsuperscript{41} Yatzenko 2001: 87, pl. 10.
\textsuperscript{42} Levina 1996.
coat and the minimal ornamentation makes it difficult to compare this coat with other examples. It is worn over a knee-shin length dress, details of which are unclear. There is a torque around the neck.

The second type (SA 434) is a seated, frontally represented male figure. Only the upper half of the body is preserved. This figurine type is clearly related to a series of ruler figurines dated to the 6th – 8th CE43 from Panjikent44 and Afrasiab,45 which show a seated figure with one hand resting on the thigh and the other held at the stomach.

Comparative material

Comparative material for D02.02 is wide ranging, both chronologically and geographically. Kushan period statues of members of the ruling family from Shotorak (figs 41 and 42)46 show a similar style of coat. This coat style is echoed in Kushan period coins47 (fig.72).

Archaeological evidence

Several mummies from the Tarim Basin wear a long coat. The so-called “Chärchän Man” from Zaghnulq, dated to between 1000 – 600 BCE, was buried with “an enormous outer coat made of extremely thick brown thread”.48 It was trimmed with a very narrow line of deep red piping on the edges of the centre front openings. A male mummy from Qizilchoqa wore a similar coat, although on this example mittens were attached to the arms.49 It was made of skin, and worn with the fleece on the inside. It is dated to between 800 – 530 BCE.50 An illustration of the garment shows a narrow facing on the centre front openings. It was probably worn fastened.51

Male dress from burials found in the Syr Darya delta also includes examples of coats fastened with a leather belt.52 Several different fabrics appear to have been used including cotton, wool and silk (with red or dark pink ornamentation), less often leather (with brown or black ornamentation).53 The latter were decorated with silver or bronze, beads. Gilded beads were also found. Levina suggests that the silk garments appear to be of Chinese manufacture.54

Several parallels for D02.02 have been described, suggesting a very broad chronological and geographical range for this type variant. The generic nature of the coat itself, and its ornamentation, compound this issue.

43 Meshkeris 1989: 262.
44 Ibid.: 260, fig. 153.
45 Vyatkin 1926: 24, fig. 21.
46 See for example Pugachenkova 1971: pl. 134.
48 Mallory and Mair 2000: 215 and p. 216, fig. 128.
49 Ibid.: 218, fig. 130.
50 Ibid.: 217.
51 Ibid.: 218, fig. 130.
52 Levina 1996: 207.
53 Ibid.: 207.
54 Ibid.: 127.
COATS ON PARTIALLY PRESERVED FIGURINES

Shin length coat worn fastened.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Narrow undecorated trim on the centre front openings, on either side of which are slightly wavy lines incised on the diagonal, representing drapery.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and provenance</td>
<td>Afrasiab c. 2nd-1st century BCE – 4th century CE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Examples</td>
<td>AM 91 3 548 and A287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF COAT TYPE VARIANT D02.03**

*Description of figurines type(s)*

Several figurines belonging to the same type series portray this coat type variant. None of these is preserved above the chest. Nevertheless, the type series is identified as a standing, frontal, probably female, figure. The left hand is held across the lower stomach. The right hand is slightly above this. The coat is worn fastened down the centre front and is slightly flared at the bottom. It is worn over loose fitting ribbed trousers (see type variant D07.01.04). The manner of modelling makes the coat appear stiff and unmoving, indicating that it may be made from a heavy weight fabric, or possibly padded. The possibility that this type variant is a dress, with a central trim band and drapery on either side, similar to type variant D04.01, may also be considered.

**Comparative material**

A figurine of indeterminate gender from Erkurgan portrays a very similar style of garment, interpreted by Suleimanov as an example of a local dress. A faint central line running down the front of the garment is emphasised by diagonally incised lines running down from the centre, perhaps indicating pleating. It is dated to the 1st–2nd century CE. A figurine from Kalali-Gir 2 (fig. 2) dated to between the mid 4th century BCE and the early 2nd century BCE shows a schematised version of the diagonal pleating on the lower part of the body.

Kushan rulers shown on coins and in statuary wear a similar style of coat. On these examples, however, the coat is worn open or fastened at the chest only. A statue from Surkh Kotal (figs 43 and 44) shows the coat, worn open, although possibly

---

55 See illustration of A287 in the dress type examples.
56 Suleimanov 2000: 190 and pl. 144, 3.
57 Vainberg 1994: 73, fig. 7.
fastened at the chest (only the lower half of the body is preserved). It is significant that images of Kushan rulers never (?) show the coat worn fastened in the manner of D02.03. Comparative material from Kushan period statues suggests that this garment type may be interpreted as a coat or dress. It is well known in Sogdiana and Chorasmia, suggesting a localised type worn by males and females.

Coat of uncertain length.

| Description | Full length cuffed sleeves and worn fastened with a belt. The right lapel is folded back forming a triangular shape and appears to be trimmed with a narrow undecorated band. |
| Date and provenance | Afrasiab c. 5th - 8th century CE. |
| Type | RM A19 81 |

**DISCUSSION OF COAT TYPE VARIANT D02.04**

**Description of figurines type(s)**

A single example preserving the torso from just below the waist portrays this coat type variant. The iconography of this figurine type, however, is known from other sources. In particular, a coin with the legend “of Akun, the Chionite king” (fig. 75) shows very similar representation of a coat with a right lapel folded back, fastened at the waist and flared out below this. The figure is in profile, with the left arm bent at the elbow, the hand resting at the hip, and a lance (?) in the right hand.

**Comparative material**

There are numerous examples of coats with a triangular shaped lapel on the right side from Central Asia, typically dated to the early medieval period. These are distinguished from other coats which have the left lapel folded back, or a double lapel. A lapel is the front section of a coat, which can be either folded back towards the shoulders, or, less commonly, folded forwards over the chest. It is differentiated from a collar, which is placed around the neck and can be worn either standing up or folded down over the neckline of the garment.

Some scholars have tried to associate the side on which the lapel is folded on a coat or cloak with a specific population group or region. For example, Ilyasov has suggested that coats with a triangular lapel folded back on the right side are one of the

---

58 See Pilipko 2001: 316, fig. 13.
59 Ghirshman 1948: 13, fig. 9.
ethnic indicators of the Hephthalites\textsuperscript{60} while Yatzenko has suggested that coats with the left lapel folded back are indicative of Sogdians during the 5\textsuperscript{th} – 8\textsuperscript{th} century CE.\textsuperscript{61} However, this is not supported by the evidence. Figure 127 shows examples of figures from various centres in Sogdiana and Tokharistan, and also further to the east, wearing coats with single left and right lapels, in addition to the double lapel. Noteworthy also is a figure on an ossuary from Aq-kurgan in Sogdiana (fig. 71) wearing a shin length coat belted at the waist, with a left lapel.\textsuperscript{62}

Coats with a lapel or lapels appear in visual sources from the early medieval period. The significance of the lapel is difficult to judge on present evidence. Visual sources associated with Sogdiana confirm that lapels are portrayed in various manners in this region. They are found on coats and cloaks worn by males and females.

Coat of uncertain length (only upper body fragments of this type series are known) characterised by full length sleeves and the absence of a collar. It is worn with a plain belt around the waist.

\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
\textbf{D02.05.01*} \\
\hline
\textit{Description} & The centre front openings are ornamented with a plain trim. Sleeves have a narrow cuff. \\
\hline
\textit{Date and provenance} & Unprovenanced \\
\textit{Type} & SA 382 \\
\textit{Example} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{60} Il'yasov 2001.  \\
\textsuperscript{61} See Yatzenko 2003: 15 for his discussion of Tang period figurines. He identifies two figurines as specifically Sogdian on account of their dress, including a coat with the left lapel folded back. See also Chapter 6.  \\
\textsuperscript{62} Pugachenkova 1994: 232, fig. 4.
**D02.05.02**

*Description*
The centre front openings have a trim ornamented with a circular shaped pattern on it. The sleeves are cuffed.

*Date and provenance*
Unprovenanced

*Type example*
SA 432

**D02.05.03**

*Description*
The centre front openings have a trim ornamented with an upside down V pattern on it, similar to a chevron. The sleeves are cuffed. The cuffs are ornamented with short vertical lines.

*Date and provenance*
Unprovenanced

*Type example*
A308

**DISCUSSION OF COAT TYPE VARIANT D02.05**

*Description of figurine type(s)*
In each case only the upper body, from the waist to the neck, is preserved. These figurines show a frontally represented figure, perhaps male, with the arms folded across the chest.

*Comparative material*
A figurine from the Samarkand region preserving the head and torso shows the same garment type variant and position of the arms. Here however, wings are attached to the back of the figure, perhaps indicating a divine context. Meshkeris' illustration of this figurine shows that the right cuff is ornamented with a very small circular pattern, while the left is plain. The centre front openings appear to be ornamented with a "ladder" pattern. Meshkeris dates this figurine to the 6th–7th century CE on the basis of finds of similar figurines from Panjikent, and also images of similar figures on ossuaries.

Although D02.05 is unprovenanced, comparative material shows that this style of open upper body garment is known in the Samarkand region.

---

63 Meshkeris 1989: 230, fig. 125, 1.
64 Ibid.: 231.
TYPE DO3 THE KANDYS
TYPE D03 – THE KANDYS

Although there remains some dispute concerning the exact name of this garment, the kandys is understood as a long coat, in Sogdiana typically knee length or slightly longer, with unusually long sleeves (sometimes referred to as “pendant sleeves”) and the absence of a collar. The sleeves reach well below the level of the wrist and hand, often stretching to thigh level or below. The manner of wearing the kandys on the Samarkand region figurines is consistent on all examples: it is worn draped around the shoulders and never fastened, leaving the arms and hands free.

The kandys is originally a Median garment, appropriated by the Persians and made famous by Xenophon’s explanation of its function at the Persian court. Xenophon indicates that the sleeves were usually ornamental, used only in the presence of the king, when the wearers of the garment were compelled to put their arms in the sleeves, probably as a means of protection for the king. Achaemenid period depictions of the kandys often show ties hanging over the front of the shoulders on the chest, reminiscent of a short collar. These bands continued over the shoulders, to form a draped (ornamental?) triangular shape on the back of the garment. In the Achaemenid context, according to Bittner, these symbolise the high ranking of the wearer of the garment. In the Achaemenid context it is primarily a ceremonial garment, embodying a symbol of the court and aristocracy. It is, however, interesting to note that Kushan period representations of the kandys often show the wearer with the arms in the sleeves (figs 46 and 47). It is possible that the sleeved upper body garments carried as a gift for the Persian king by the 11th Delegation – the Saka Tigrhauda – on the eastern stairway at the Apadana in Persepolis are kandys’. As will be seen below, evidence from Eurasia provides several examples of females wearing the kandys in a sacred context.

Evidence of the kandys amongst the different peoples in the Parthian Empire manifest different ways of wearing this garment. Early images on Arsacid coins show warriors, identified by Pilipko as Parni, wearing a kandys worn over the shoulders and

---

65 Bittner 1987: 188.  
66 Cyropedia VIII, 3.10. For a discussion of the classical sources regarding this garment see Abdullaev and Badanova 1998: 189-195. Knauer 1999: 23 suggests origins for the garment may be sought in pre-Achaemenid Iran. She notes a male bronze statuette from Hasanlu dated to the 9th century BCE wearing a similar garment (p. 22, fig. 8), and associates it with Median dress from whom, as is known from the classical sources, it was taken over by the Achaemenids.  
67 Cyropedia VIII, 3.10. Bittner suggests that the origin of this ritual may lie in Cyrus’ fear of the invincibility of the Median army, whom he forced to put their arms in the sleeves of their riding coats to prevent them from using their hands (Bittner 1987: 192, n. 1). However, it would also have been possible for the wearer to conceal weapons in the sleeves of the kandys, especially as the cuffs were closed.  
68 Bittner 1987: 188.  
69 See for example Bittner 1987: pls. 23 and 24.  
70 See for example Rosenfield 1967: pl. 98a. It is interesting to note that the left sleeve hangs below the length of the hand, while the right sleeve is pushed back to reveal the hand. This manner of wearing is still to be found in Central Asia today, and has been documented over a very wide geographic region on different garments. The practice is also found later on dancer figurines from the Tang period. Note also the depiction on the northern wall, Room 1 at Afrasiab of the Chinese princess who wears a coat with a long left sleeve. See Al’baum 1975. For an ethnographic perspective see Barber 1999 who documents a similar phenomenon on tunics and dresses.  
71 Pilipko 2001: 293 sees this people under the umbrella Saka group coming from the Eurasian Steppes. They rose to success sometime during the 3rd – 2nd century BCE, and are to be clearly distinguished from...
Knee length kandys with sleeves reaching to the hem of the garment.

**D03.01**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Square stamp or ladder pattern on sleeves. It is possible these shapes represent small plates or plaques, sewn onto the length of the sleeves (see discussion below).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and provenance</td>
<td>Afrasiab c. 2nd-1st century BCE - 4th century CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>RM A19 93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D03.01***

*Description of figurines type(s)*

D03.01 is shown on figurines preserved only from the waist down. It shows a standing figure (comparative examples indicate it is female), frontally represented. The left hand is positioned over the lower stomach, holding a circular shaped attribute. The right hand is not preserved. The kandys is worn over a shin length dress (details of which are difficult to define) and loose fitting trousers (D07.01.01).

**Comparative evidence**

There are few representations of the kandys which show the sleeves hanging to the hem line of the garment. An ivory diptych from Carrand dated to the 5th century CE shows a group of four men on the lower register, one of whom is wearing a kandys with sleeves reaching to the hem. Maytdinova has also documented an ankle length kandys with sleeves reaching to the hem of the garment, and a small triangular lapel on the right side. It is also dated to the early medieval period.

---

the Parthians, who Pilipko sees as a west Iranian language speaking people known from the end of the 2nd - beginning of the 1st millennium BCE in the Turkmene-Khorasan valley.

72 Ibid.: 295. See also fig. 2, 1.
73 Ibid.: fig. 10, 7.
74 Knauer 1999: 1163, fig. 13.
75 Maytdinova 1992: tbl. 32. The source for this reconstruction is unclear. One caption to the illustration states that it comes from Karategina, but on p. 168 the explanation states that it is a reconstruction by the author of female costume from Kumeda.
Shin length kandys with sleeves reaching to approximately knee level

**D03.02**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th>Sleeves are ornamented with rectangular plaques on sleeves.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
<td>Afrasiab c. 2nd-1st century BCE – 4th century CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>AM 91 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D03.02**

**Description of figurines type(s)**

There are numerous examples of standing, frontally represented female figurines wearing kandys D03.02. They are associated with various attributes including fruit, flowers, a vessel and a small human image, which convey ideas of fertility and suggest a sacred status for this garment type variant. The left hand is positioned over the lower stomach. The right hand is held almost at chest level. In all cases the kandys is worn over an ankle length girdled dress (D04.03.02).

**Comparative evidence**

Evidence of the kandys from other regions in Sogdiana is limited to two examples from Erkurgan, dated to the 5th – 6th century CE, which portray a very similar style and manner of wearing to the Samarkand figurines. Other evidence suggests that the kandys was worn by female figures in sacred Scythian contexts. A small gold costume plaque (fig. 105) shows a divine female figure in profile, seated before a standing figure in a scene that is widespread in the Eurasian steppes. The female is wearing an ankle length kandys, ornamented on the centre front openings with a thick trim with incised diagonal lines, and long arms that hang at the side of the garment and touch the floor. Similar plaques are widespread and date to the first half of the 4th century BCE. Another seated Scythian goddess in a ritual drinking scene is wearing a kandys and a very high headdress (fig. 107). The sleeves hang below the knees on the seated figure and the centre front openings are ornamented with an applied trim. The Scythian evidence is significant as it represents the kandys in a divine female sphere. This is continued in the Samarkand figurines and also later in the Sasanian world (fig. 65) where images show Anahita.

---

76 Suleimanov 2000: figs. 166, 2 and 3. It is not possible to see if any details are represented on the figurine due to the quality of the photograph. Nevertheless, none is given in the description of the figurines.

77 Reeder 1999: pl. 41; Aruz, Farkas et al. 2000: 236 and cat. no. 166 for similar plaques from Chertomlyk kurgan. The scene may represent a number of different rites associated with ancestor worship, an investiture scene, an initiation scene or a marriage scene between a divine female and a king.

78 Knauer 1999: 14, fig. 13.
wearing the kandys. It also suggests an alternate context to that shown by the Achaemenid period evidence.

Several examples from Bactria demonstrate the popularity of the kandys in this region. A plaque from Zartepe (fig. 21) in the private collection of V. A. Zav'yalov in St. Petersburg shows a female figure wearing a kandys. The left hand is placed across the lower stomach, holding a diamond shaped attribute. A circular shaped vessel with a narrow neck is held in the right hand at chest level. The length of the garment is not preserved, and details of ornamentation on the sleeves are not very well preserved. However, the centre front openings are clearly marked with incised slightly diagonal lines while the preserved left cuff appears to be ornamented with incised evenly spaced vertical lines. It is possible that the sleeves have more decoration in the form of bands encircling the arms, but these are too poorly preserved to comment on. Other Kushan period examples show a slightly different manner of wearing, whereby the kandys is worn partially or completely closed (figs 13 and 14). The placement of the ornamentation is also different to that portrayed on the Samarkand region kandys: the shoulder seams and the area between the centre front openings are decorated with beading. There is also a narrow line of beading between the centre front openings (see fig. 13). Whether this is the ornamentation of a garment worn under the kandys, or represents the junction of each side, is unclear.

Some early Tang period figurines wearing the kandys are interpreted by Mahler as of “Sino-Tocharian” type. One of these shows a very similar kandys to that portrayed on the Samarkand figurines (fig. 31). It is a shin length kandys worn over a dress of the same length, which appears to be worn belted. Loose fitting trousers are worn underneath. Another figurine, interpreted as a “Tokharian” shows the kandys fastened at the chest, but bears some similarities to the Samarkand region kandys (fig. 32). These include the headdress and the loose fitting trousers worn with folds shown falling from the inner calf (07.01.02). Differences are clear for example in the manner of wearing. The kandys is fastened at the neck and appears to have a thick, tube-like collar.

Archaeological evidence

A calf length kandys is preserved in the burial of a female at Subeshi, north east of the Tarim Basin and dated to the 4th – 3rd century BCE (fig. 98). The kandys is sheepskin, worn with the fleece on the inside. The mummy was found with the garment draped over the shoulders, but unfortunately the length of the sleeves is not described. A plain facing appears to have been sewn onto the centre front openings. Underneath the kandys was a “blouse” and a skirt. A high pointed headdress worn by the deceased has led some scholars to associate it with a priestess or royalty.

79 Goldman 1997: A15. See also Ringbom 1957: fig. 8.
80 I am grateful to V. A. Zav'yalov for allowing me direct access to this figurine.
81 Pilipko 1985: tbl. 30. See also p. 85ff. For photos of originals see Pilipko 1977: 194, figs. 5, 4 and 5; see also p. 196 for more specific dating (2nd – 3rd centuries CE). A very similar depiction of the kandys is shown on another figurine from Emshi-tepe. See Kruglikova 1971: 165. fig. 6, 5.
82 Mahler 1959: pl. XIIb.
83 Ibid.: pl. 12b.
84 Ibid.: pl. 12a.
85 Mallory and Mair 2000: 220. See also pl. VI.
86 Ibid.: 220.
The Katanda kandys (fig. 96) is dated to the 5th – 6th century CE. It is made of leather with a fur lining and was heavily decorated, indicating that it was worn by a high ranking person. The garment is approximately knee length, the sleeves slightly shorter. Rudenko has argued that the sleeves have shrunk over time. However, it is more probable that the sleeves in this case were never meant to be functional, but were purely for symbolic value. Wood or leather were used as ornamentation plaques, either plain or gilt. Evidence of similar shaped plaques ornamenting the sleeves of the garment worn by the seated goddess on the carpet is also found at Pazyryk (fig. 122), which Yatzenko interprets as a kandys.

The calf length kandys is associated with female figures in the Samarkand region dated to between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century CE. Attributes associated with Samarkand region figurines wearing the kandys suggest a sacred status for this garment. This is confirmed by examples from the Saka and Scythian worlds, and also by burials from the Taklamakan desert to the east. This sacred/divine context contrasts with that documented in the Achaemenid world, where the kandys is associated with high ranking male figures associated with the king.

Ankle length kandys with sleeves reaching approximately to lower thigh or knee level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D03.03*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D03.03***

*Description of figurines type(s)*

This figurine type is unique. It shows a frontally represented, standing female figure wearing the kandys over an ill-defined closed upper body garment. Typically

---

87 Knauer 1999: 1149.
88 Ibid.: 1148.
89 Zakharov 1925: 44-45. The length of the back measures 1.5 metres. The length of the leather sleeves is given as 1 metre yet they appear to hang almost to the hem of the garment.
90 Yatzenko 1999: 149-50. Yatzenko 2001: 84 also alludes to a kandys from one of the female burials at Tillya-tepe, yet, neither he nor Sarianidi give further details of this garment, nor is it shown in any of the reconstructions of the dress. Yatzenko 2001: 90-91 however, discusses the kandys under male dress from Tillya-tepe, where he suggests that it is indicative of the Yuezhi.
figurines wearing the kandys are shown wearing a girdled dress under the kandys, but in this instance the lower garment is characterised by four horizontal panels (see UD D04.09*).

**Comparative evidence**

Ankle length kandys are known from Median and Achaemenid examples. The sleeves on these examples are usually about mid thigh level, but one example shows them to be slightly longer – almost to knee level.91

Figures on gold plaques in the Oxus Treasure92 show similar examples of the kandys with ornamentation on the centre front openings (e.g. fig. 120). These are of varying lengths – knee, shin or ankle length, although in all cases the sleeves do not appear to be excessively long. Three of the images are shown in profile, and it is possible to see the continuation of the ornamentation panel around the shoulder, and onto the back. Two examples93 indicate that the trim band finished at the back of the garment in a triangular shape, which, according to Bittner, was a mark of rank.94 While these figures are typically understood in an Achaemenid context, more recently Abdullaev and Badanova have suggested that they represent Bactrians in Bactrian dress during the Achaemenid period.95

Representations of the kandys in the Samarkand region are limited to the period between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century CE. However, it almost seems to disappear from the Zarafshān Valley after this period although early medieval figurines from southern Sogdiana are shown wearing the kandys. Notably, the kandys is absent from Sogdian wall paintings, where the typical outer garment is the cloak, the coat or simply a tunic or dress. Prior to the 4th century CE the kandys in the Samarkand region is associated with females in a sacred context. This may point to a Scythian legacy.

---

91 Bittner 1987: pl. 29, 1.
92 See Abdullaev and Badanova 1998: 210, fig. 2.
93 Ibid.: 210, figs. 2, 2 and 4.
94 Bittner 1987: 188.
95 Abdullaev and Badanova 1998:197.
TYPE D04 DRESSES

D04.01

D04.02

D04.03

D04.04

D04.05

D04.06
TYPE D04 – DRESSES

Dresses on terracottas from the Samarkand region may be worn either as an outer garment or with an open upper body garment over them. They are predominantly shin or ankle length. In all cases where the legs are visible, trousers are worn underneath the dress. There is a significant amount of variation in dress ornamentation groups. Lines are often used to indicate folds and drapery, which may be an attempt to portray more realistically the fall of a garment. Such drapery may give an indication of the weight of the material. It is also possible to consider these lines as an individual, decorative effect, particular to a specific workshop. Folds and drapery are often found on the lower half of the garment, with no clear indication of what is producing the lines, for example a tuck or pleat. Parallels for a similar emphasis on drapery are found in Parthian, Kushan and Sasanian art. Folds are also found occasionally on the sleeves of dresses, representing a “bunching” effect. This may be indicative of a number of things: it is possible that coiled metal armbands were worn over the sleeve or it could be an attempt to portray realistically the fall of the material (again indicative of a lightweight material). Most likely it indicates the latter, whereby a particular method of gathering was employed, for example ruching. This effect is well documented in Kushan art.\(^{96}\) Applied ornamentation, either directly on the dress, or on a relief band attached to the garment, is focused predominantly on the centre of the dress, running in vertical panels, but also around the hem, and only occasionally on the sleeves and neck. Sleeve ornamentation is difficult to comment on as in many cases a cloak or kandys is worn over the dress. The applied ornamentation of dresses on Samarkand region terracottas may be divided into three broad groups: pleated dresses, dresses with central trim bands, and dresses with ornamented hems. None of these groups is exclusive. While in many cases breasts indicate that dresses were worn by females, the absence of breasts on some figurines renders the attribution of gender to these examples problematic. It should be noted here that dress type variant D04.01, D04.02 and D04.03 are discussed together due to the similarities in dress style and ornamentation.

\(^{96}\) For example Pugachenkova 1971: pl. 134.
Loose fitting, knee length dress with full length sleeves and a narrow cuff.

**D04.01**

**Description**
A single line of circular shapes runs the length of the centre of the dress. Irregularly sloping lines, slightly on the diagonal, are on either side of this ornamentation. Dress is worn by a female figure.

**Date and provenance**
Afrasiab c. 2nd -1st century BCE - 4th century CE.

**Type**
RM A19 94

**Example**

**DISCUSSION OF DRESS TYPE VARIANT D04.01**

See discussion under type variant D04.03 on p.123. See in particular references to type variant D04.02.04 and the discussion of dresses with drapery.

Loose fitting, shin length dress with full length sleeves in almost all cases worn by a female figure. Some examples show a cuffed sleeve. The neck is probably round, however, often the neckline is distorted by a thick torque. The following ornamentation groups have been defined:

**D04.02.01**

**Description**
Two long dart shaped “pleats” or triangular inserts on the lower half of the dress are indicated by two pairs of incised lines, forming tight triangles running approximately from the waist to the hem of the garment. The exact nature of these lines is unclear as they appear to simply fall from the hips, with no evidence of tucks or the formation of pleats. It is also possible to see the lines simply as an attempt to portray the fall of the dress more realistically. Sleeves are full length and cuffed.

**Date and provenance**
Afrasiab c. 2nd -1st century BCE - 4th century CE.

**Type**
RM A19 96

**Example**
D04.02.02

Description

Three vertical lines on either side of an imaginary centre line are incised on the lower half of the garment, perhaps indicating "pin stripe" pleats or drapery folds.

Date and provenance

Afrasiab c. 2nd - 1st century BCE - 4th century CE.

Type example

RM A19 85

D04.02.03

Description

A band runs down the centre of the dress with evenly spaced horizontal lines, forming a ladder pattern. The sleeves are cuffed.

Date and provenance

Afrasiab c. 2nd - 1st century - 4th century CE.

Type example

RM A19 99

D04.02.04

Description

A band ornamented with evenly spaced circular shapes runs down the centre of the dress. The same pattern is found around the hem, although here it is directly on the dress. Some figurines show a cuffed sleeve. On either side of the central band are roughly incised slightly sloping lines, perhaps indicating pleating produced from the central trim band. Some examples show a number of closely spaced vertical lines directly underneath the right breast (these are not shown on the schematised illustration. See for example RM A19 93). Although in some cases they seem to continue directly on either side of the central band, this is not true for all of the lines, and it seems possible to interpret them as coarse folds or creases. Alternatively they may indicate the presence of a sheer scarf or other fabric worn over the dress, and underneath the cloak, although there are no parallels for this.

Date and provenance

Afrasiab c. 2nd - 1st century - 4th century CE.
Type example

D04.02.05
Description
Dress ornamented with an oval shaped pattern around the hem and cuffed sleeves.

Date and provenance
Afrasiab c. 2nd - 1st century - 4th century CE.

Type example
RM A19 89

D04.02.06
Description
Drapery is indicated by incised lines drawn on the diagonal on the lower half of the dress, one inside the other. Inside the innermost lines, marking the centre of the dress, are two circular shapes. The hem is ornamented with the same circle shaped pattern. The sleeves are ornamented with a double line of circular shapes running the length of the sleeves.

Date and provenance
Tal-i Barzu, TB I c. 2nd - 1st century - 4th century CE.

Type example
RM A55 963

DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D04.02
See discussion below on p. 123.
Loose fitting ankle length dress with full length sleeves. The following ornamentation groups have been defined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D04.03.01*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D04.03.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description

Dress ornamented with three panels of incised shapes running from the neck to the hem. The centre panel comprises evenly spaced circular shapes while the two external panels are evenly spaced upside down V (Λ) shapes. Circular shapes ornament the neckline. The sleeves are cuffed.

Date and provenance

Unprovenanced

Type example

Trever 1934: pl. 7, 99

DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANTS D04.01, D04.02 AND D04.03

Description of figurines type(s)

Type variants D04.01, D04.02 and D04.03 are associated with female figurines belonging to various type series, typically interpreted as fertility goddesses on account of the attributes they hold, including objects interpreted as fruit, flowers, a vessel and an image of an infant. Although the dress type variant is generic, there is significant variation in the ornamentation. This basic dress type variant may be associated with reconstructions of dresses from burials at Tillya-tepe, Koktepe and the Dzhety-asar culture (see figs 80-85, 94 and 86-93 respectively). It should be noted that ornamentation group D04.03.03* does not have breasts. The following discussion is divided into sections based on the manner of ornamentation i.e., either applied or drapery, although there are some dress styles which manifest both types of ornamentation,

Dresses with drapery or pleating

Dresses with vertical diagonal drapery

Diagonal pleating on the lower half of dresses similar to that on D04.02.06 has been noted on figurines from various sites in southern Sogdiana and Bactria. Abdullaev and Yatzenko have associated diagonal pleating on the lower half of dresses with Yuezhi costume.97 Similar drapery styles are associated with the Sarmatian populations of the northern Black Sea region, as identified by Abdullaev.98 Various figurines from Bactria of a similar date, for example from the middle reaches of the Amu Darya (fig. 11), Dalverzin-tepe,99 Mirzakultepe (figs 23 and 24) and Sakhsanokhur (figs 28 and 29) confirm this manner of pleating in this region. General variations on the diagonal pleating are also found on figurines from Erkurgan in levels dating to the 1st – 2nd century CE,100 which Suleimanov interprets as local.101

97 Yatzenko 2001: pl. 13, 40. See also pl. 13, 44 and p. 322. See also Suleimanov 2000: 203.
99 See also Pugachenkova 1978: 50, fig. 34. It is dated to the 1st – 2nd century CE. For another Bactrian example, from Emshi-tepe, see Kruglikova 1971: 164, fig. 5, 4.
100 Suleimanov 2000: 190 and pl. 144, 3. See also the reference to this figurine in the discussion of coat D02.03.
Dresses with horizontal diagonal drapery

D04.01 and D04.02.04 portray lines incised on the diagonal on either side of an ornamentation band. These are understood to represent drapery or creases/folds on the fabric of the garment itself. The representation of the folds/drapery on either side of the central ornamentation panel is well known from Kushan art (see for example figs 43 and 44). A figurine from Dalverzin-tepe (fig. 27) also shows an example of this. A mould from Chorasmia (fig. 2) also shows a schematic version of this manner of pleating on either side of a central band.

Dresses with triangular and pin stripe pleating

Despite the popularity of figurines wearing dresses with long triangular pleats and pin stripe pleating from the Samarkand region, no parallels from other regions have been found. It is possible that D04.02.01, D04.02.02 and D04.03.01 represent local ornamentation styles.

Girdled dresses

D04.03.02 is usually interpreted as a girdled dress. However, it is also possible to consider that the figure is wearing two separate garments – a high waisted skirt worn to the sternum, into which a tunic or shirt was tucked. There is some archaeological evidence to support this: an ankle length woollen skirt was found in the burial of a female at Subeshi in the Tarim Basin.

According to Maytdinova the girdled dress is one of the most popular in Sogdiana and Tokharistan during the early medieval period and is differentiated from other regions by the use of various methods of drapery. Maytdinova suggests that its broad distribution in Central Asia represents a local dress style, originating in the Hellenistic east. Numerous examples have been found in Samarkand, Nakhshab and also Bactria, dating from the final centuries BCE and the early centuries CE. However, examples of girdled dresses from Samarkand are clearly different from other regions whereby flowing lines manifest a clear focus on the bust.

The girdle may be associated with fertility in Greek art, and the combination of the bunched sleeves, the girdle and the attributes associated with the figurines wearing this dress (human figure, cup, fruit) all point to a particularly sacred context for this dress. This is also supported by the kandys worn over the dress (see D03.02). A more intrinsic

101 Ibid.: 190.
102 See for example the statues of “Kushan” princes from Surkh Khotal in Pugachenkova 1971: pl. 133.
103 Mallory and Mair 2000: 220.
105 Ibid.
106 Suleimanov 2000: 201. See for example pl. 144, 1.
107 For example the seated female on the right in the Khalchayan frieze. See Pugachenkova 1971: 51. This figure is noteworthy, especially because of the V-shape neckline. The neckline of the dresses worn by the other female figures is circular. The seated figure is also differentiated from the other female figures on account of the small crescent shape attached to her headband. Both of these factors may indicate that she is of a different status. The neckline of the dress D04.05.02 is not a conventional V shape, however, it also is clearly differentiated from the rounded necklines of all the other dresses defined here.
108 This is also one of the reasons for the identification with this general type series with Anahita, on the basis of her description in the Avesta.
association between the girdled dress and fertility is found in the Avestan description of the iconographic image of Anahita:

"... in der Gestalt eines schönen Mädchens, eines sehr kräftigen schön gewachsenen hochgegürtenen, eines geradgewachsenen – reich die Herkunft – eines adeligen; in einen kostbaren viel gefalteten goldenen Mantel gekleidet. [127] ... sie schnürt sich ihre Taille, damit (ihre) Brüste schön gestaltet und damit sie gefällig seien..."  

Dresses with applied ornamentation

Dresses with vertical ornamentation panels

Vertical ornamentation panels comprise both applied bands (e.g., D04.02.03 and D04.02.04), and patterns stamped or incised directly onto the body of the garment (e.g., D04.03.03*). There is limited evidence of dresses with an applied central band from other regions of Sogdiana. A figurine from Nakhshab, dated to the 5th – 6th century CE shows an ankle length dress with a broad band running down the center.  

Other examples of this method of ornamentation from Erkurgan include a female figure dated to the 3rd – 4th century CE wearing a long dress, ornamented with incised upside down V (Λ) or chevron shapes on either side of the body, similar to the patterning on the body of the dress of D04.03.03*.  

There is also some evidence on this patterning on the sleeve, although this is less well preserved.

Dresses with applied central trim bands are well documented on Parthian and Kushan costume (fig. 73). The stone statue of Kanishka from Surkh Khotal (figs 43 and 44) dated to the 2nd century CE presents a close analogy to dresses with this manner of ornamentation. The statue shows a dress, worn underneath a coat of similar length, with an applied central band ornamented on the outside edge with very small circular objects, and on the inside with a single column of heart-shaped objects. A less common variation is found on a figurine from the middle reaches of the Amu Darya (fig. 12). A rare comparative example from Margiana (fig. 8) shows a figurine wearing a dress with a central band with diagonal lines shown on either side. Pugachenkova has dated it to the 1st – 2nd centuries CE.  

The style of dress shown on this figurine, which sits off the shoulder and is ornamented with relief beading around the neck, is not comparable with that of the Samarkand region figurine. Nevertheless the details of the drapery facilitate a better understanding of the more stylised representation of drapery on the Samarkand figurine.

Vertical ornamentation panels on sleeves are also documented on dresses from the Samarkand region. Examples of dresses with heavily ornamented sleeves similar to D04.02.06 from 4th – 3rd century BCE Sarmatian period burials have been noted by

---

11 Suleimanov 2000: 197 and fig. 166, 2.
112 Ibid.: 193 and fig. 154, 1.
113 Pugachenkova 1979: 116, fig. 134.
114 Pugachenkova 1959: 130, fig. 9, 2.
Levina has also noted rows of beading on the sleeves of garments worn by females from the Dzhety-asar burials.\textsuperscript{116}

**Dresses with ornamented hems**

Dresses with ornamented hems similar to D04.02.04 – D04.02.06 are known from centres throughout Central Asia in contexts prior to the 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE. The reconstruction of the dress from Koktepe (fig. 94) shows a single row of gold beading around the hem\textsuperscript{117} while the dress portrayed on the statue of Kanishka (figs 43 and 44) mentioned above associates this style with the Kushan dynastic art. In Chorasmia a figurine from Koi Krylgan-kala (fig. 3) dated to the 4\textsuperscript{th} BCE, shows an ankle length dress with an applied (?) horizontal band around the hem ornamented with small circles. Immediately below this band is a rough double zigzag line.\textsuperscript{118} Two other figurine fragments from Toprak-kala (figs 5 and 6) dated to between the 5\textsuperscript{th} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries BCE show a similar decoration on the hem although here the ornamentation consists of just the zigzag line, below which the feet are visible, similar to the Samarkand figurine.\textsuperscript{119} Tolstov dates similar figurines from Dzhanbas-kala to the 4\textsuperscript{th} – 2\textsuperscript{nd} BCE.\textsuperscript{120}

**Dresses with ornamented necklines**

D04.03.03* is the only example of a dress with a decorated neckline. Yatzenko has noted various different styles of neck ornamentation on dresses found in Sarmatian burials.\textsuperscript{121} A figurine from Mirzakul-tepe shows a dress with a chevron pattern around the neck (fig. 24). Dresses ornamented at the neck generally have no other neck ornamentation, such as a torque or necklace.

**Summary**

The cut of the dress of type variants D04.01 – D04.03 appears generic, following an A-line style, perhaps slightly less flared in the skirt section, with full length sleeves. General comparisons may be drawn between this style and those reconstructed from various burials in Central Asia, including Koktepe, Tillya-tepe and the Dzhety-asar culture discussed above, all of which are dated prior to the 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE. Dresses portrayed on figurines dated between the 2\textsuperscript{nd} – 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE and the 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE embody the most comprehensive evidence of costume worn in the Samarkand region during this period because of the diversity of elements of decoration represented on them. These elements include the use of applied ornamentation, and the different manners of representing drapery. It has been demonstrated above that similar methods of ornamentation are well known in Central Asia during this period, although notably, there is less evidence for certain methods of depicting drapery, such as pin stripe and triangular pleating (darts?). However, it is the combination of one or several of these elements on the dresses portrayed on the terracottas that may be distinguished as particular to the Samarkand region.

\textsuperscript{115} Yatzenko 1983: 172.
\textsuperscript{117} Rapin 2001: 44, fig. 7.
\textsuperscript{118} Tolstov and Vainberg 1967: tbl. 25, 1.
\textsuperscript{119} Mambetyllaev 1986:31 figs. 13, 3 and 6.
\textsuperscript{120} Cf., Ibid.: 33. These figurines are associated with a cult of the domestic hearth.
\textsuperscript{121} Yatzenko 1983: 172.
DRESSES ON PARTIALLY PRESERVED FIGURINES

Dresses in this section are discussed as separate type variants, as their length is unclear.

Dress of undefined length with full length sleeves.

D04.04*

**Description**
Exact fit of dress is unclear from the single preserved fragment. Sleeves are long and cuffed. Around the neck and continuing half way down the chest is a line of incised circular shapes. It is unclear if this represents a vertical opening on the chest, or if it is purely decorative. The hem is ornamented with a unique pattern similar to the shape of a seed or pod, positioned on the point and slanting backwards.

**Date and provenance**
Unprovenanced

**Type**
A729

**Example**

Description of figurines type(s)
Single example of this type variant portrays a standing, frontally represented female figurine. The right hand is resting across the lower stomach. The left hand is positioned on the thigh. No attributes are preserved.

Comparative material
Although the style of the dress is ill-defined, the manner of ornamentation nevertheless finds comparisons with other regions in Central Asia. An early Kushan period figurine from Mirzakultepe (fig. 24) shows a similar style of chest and neck ornamentation. Here also a line of beads (?) in the shape of small V’s form a chevron pattern running around the neck and continuing down the centre of the dress to the waist. An early medieval period hand modelled figurine fragment from Chach portrays a line of small circles around the neck which continue down the chest to the top of the stomach where the line diverges to either side of the body. A line of circular shapes is also marked around the upper arm.

Archaeological evidence
According to Levina dresses with a vertical section at the chest are relatively common in burials of the Dzhety-asar culture. It is possible that the beading of

---

123 Bogomolov 1992: 120, fig. 2, 1.
D04.04* ornaments the seam or opening of a section cut into this part of the dress. The reconstructed dress from the Koktepe burial also shows a line of beading around the neck, and running halfway down the chest (fig. 94).\(^\text{125}\) Reconstructions of women's Scythian clothing from Tovsta Mohyla in the Ukraine show a similar ornamentation around the neck and on the chest, either as a single panel in the centre, or two panels on either side of the chest.\(^\text{126}\) The dress also has small plaques around the upper and lower arms.

Dress of undefined length with full length sleeves.

\begin{center}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round necked dress with three columns of small incised circular shapes running the preserved length of the dress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA 372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D04.05***

*Description of figurines type(s)*

Frontally represented figurine wearing a cloak (D01.01.04*) over the dress. The arms are characterised by their coarse modelling. The right hand is positioned at the chest, holding an indistinct attribute. The left hand, also holding an attribute, possibly a lotus, is held across the stomach.

*Comparative material*

See discussion of type variant D04.03.03* under dresses with vertical ornamentation panels on p. 125.

---

\(^{125}\) Rapin 2001: 44, fig. 7.

\(^{126}\) Reeder 1999: 27, fig. 3.
Dress of undefined length with full length sleeves.

**D04.06***

*Description*  
Dress with round neck and full length cuffed sleeves. Circular shaped ornamentation is shown on the left sleeve. Two vertical panels of ornamentation run down either side of the dress. It is worn by a female figure.

*Date and provenance*  
Unprovenanced

*Type*  
A329

*Example*  

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D04.06***

*Description of figurines type(s)*  
Torso and upper thigh fragment of a female figurine wearing an unornamented cloak (D01.01.01) over the dress. Although the reconstruction of the dress shows a round neck, it is possible that this line is actually a torque with central terminals at the front on which is preserved a single circular ornament on the right side. The right hand is positioned across the upper stomach. The left arm is slightly below this, holding a tulip.

*Comparative evidence*  
Evidence of dress from Sarmatian burials shows that it was not unusual to find the left sleeve of a dress more heavily ornamented than the right. Yatzenko suggests that this may indicate that the right hand was used more frequently for work.\(^{127}\) The concentration of ornamentation on one sleeve may indicate that the particular hand played a ritual (?) role in some contexts and was therefore used less often.

Refer also to the discussion above of type variants D04.01 - D04.03 regarding dresses with vertical ornamentation panels.

\(^{127}\) Yatzenko 1983: 172.
Dress of undefined length with full length sleeves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>D04.07</strong>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D04.07***

*Description of figurines type(s)*

Standing female figurine, represented frontally wearing girdled dress of unclear length with evidence of ruching. The right hand is held across the upper stomach, holding an undefined attribute. The left hand is positioned across the lower stomach, also possibly holding an attribute, although this is unclear.

**Comparative material**

A similar style of ruching to that represented on the lower part of the dress, without the additional plaque ornamentation, is found on a figurine from Gyuur-kala, stratigraphically dated to the 2nd - 3rd centuries CE. Both the arms and the legs are portrayed with heavy, closely spaced semi-circular lines, indicating a heavily draped material. The drawing shows that the lines do not continue across the body, but are limited to these areas. Pugachenkova suggests that this dress type reflects local developments.

---

128 Ruching refers to a method of gathering (usually lightweight) material as a means of ornamentation.
129 Pugachenkova 1962: 139, fig. 16 (left).
130 Ibid.: 139.
See above the discussion of type variants D04.01 – D04.03 regarding girdled
dresses.

Archaeological evidence

Similar shaped clothing plaques have been found in the burial of a male at Tillya-
teppe, where they are shown to ornament trousers.\textsuperscript{131} The complex crease or fold lines
between and on either side of the plaques may indicate that the garment was ruched on
the lower part. It is possible that the plaques also served to hold this in place. The nature
of the folds may indicate that the dress was of a lightweight material, such as linen, silk
or very lightweight wool. Ruching also requires that the fabric from which the garment is
constructed must be longer to begin with than the desired length, and also somewhat
wider than the final resulting measurement to create a draped appearance. This would be
an economic consideration and may indicate a higher status for the wearer. If the
ornamentation on the lower part of the body indicates trousers, parallels can be drawn
with Yuezhi dress, especially as square plaques are associated with Yuezhi dress
ornamentation.

**Dresses - Undefined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Shin length garment with narrow vertical wavy lines. It is possible that the lines indicate simply knife or accordion pleats (simultaneous rows of pleating facing the same direction), from either the shoulders or the waist.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and provenance</td>
<td>Unprovenanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type example</td>
<td>A923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of figurines type(s)**

Only one figurine in the corpus shows this type variant. It shows a frontally
represented, standing figure, preserved from the waist down, including the wrist and hand
of the left hand, which is resting on the lower stomach. Loose, somewhat cropped,
trousers (D07.02.01*) are worn underneath the garment, together with low boots
(D08.03*). The lines on the garment may indicate drapery, possibly formed by a belt
around the waist. Full length sleeves are cuffed. The nature of the pleating indicates a
lightweight material on which such pleating or drapery would hold its shape.

**Comparative material**

There are numerous parallels for this style of drapery covering the lower half of
the body, from both Sogdiana and surrounding regions. A similar style of garment is
worn by figurines from Ayaktepe 2, close to Varakhsha and dated to the first centuries

\textsuperscript{131} Sarianidi 1989: 88, fig. 32.
CE. Other very similar examples from Kiz'il-Gir 2 and Erkurgan also manifest a similar style, and confirm the above dating. A very similar figurine was found at Afrasiab, and has been dated to the 1st century CE. The dress is also belted, yet no pleating is shown. There are also several examples of figurines from Ai Khanum. D04.02.01 - 3, indicate that the pleats do not necessarily begin at the shoulders. Several examples from Kushan period Bactria also demonstrate this manner of drapery. Numerous dancer figures portrayed on wall paintings from various centres in early medieval Tokharian and Sogdiana show a flowing ankle length dress worn with a girdle just below the breasts or around the waist (it is possible that this is a skirt, worn high on the stomach), the voluminous skirt being emphasised by the closely spaced vertical lines. This style is also found on Tang female figurines. This style of dress is typically worn long, to the ankles.

The evidence above indicates that the general heavily pleated or draped style is well known in Sogdiana from the Hellenistic period.

| Description | Ankle length dress with full length sleeves. The body of the dress is characterised by four horizontal sections, divided by a narrow horizontal band. Each section is covered with numerous long narrow, slightly curved, panels. |
| Date and provenance | Unprovenanced |
| Type example | SA 376 |

**Description of the figurine type(s)**

Standing, frontally represented figurine, possibly female, judging by the slight swelling of the bust. A kandys (D03.03*) is worn over this garment.

**Comparative material**

Two comparative pieces may be cited. A figurine from Kampyr-tepe dated to the end of the 2nd BCE – 1st century CE may show a similar style of armour, although in this

---

133 Ad'ilov 1983: 69, fig. 2, 1.
134 Suleimanov 2000: fig. 143, 4; fig. 144, 1 and 4. Note also the iconographic link between this last figurine and a series characteristic of the Samarkand region in Kidd 2002.
135 1983: 47, fig. 14. Dating is given on the basis of a coin dated by Zeimal to the 1st to 3rd centuries CE.
136 Shishkina 1994: 89, fig. 5.
137 See Abdullaev 1996: 57, fig. 1.
138 See for example Abdullaev, Rveladze et al. 1991 vol. 1: 125, fig. 148 from Dalverzin-tepe. See also Abdullaev, Rveladze et al. 1991: v. 1: 89, fig. 75 for an example form Shortepa; Savchuk and Mal'keeva 1989: 36, fig. 3 for an example from Kampyr-tepe.
139 Maytdinova 1987: 122, figs. 6, 1a – 5a.
140 Mahler 1959: pl. 8.
case the chest is covered by a circular chest plate.\textsuperscript{141} Nikonorov describes the costume of the figure simply as a "dress", however, the vertical lines, perhaps indicating the protective metal (or leather?) plates,\textsuperscript{142} and the single horizontal line at approximately lower thigh level are similar in style to the dress represented on the Samarkand figurine. In addition, the protective headgear and the chest plate indicate that the "dress" could also be interpreted as armour. Pugachenkova interprets the figure as "a mythical idolized king", while Nikonorov and Savchuk interpret it as a chief priest or a Saka or Yuezhi sovereign.\textsuperscript{143} According to Abdullaev, it represents "one of the members of the ruling class of nomads who in the second half of the second century BC conquered Bactria...".\textsuperscript{144} A similar type of armoured dress is known from graffiti at Iluraton, dating from the first half of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE.\textsuperscript{145} This dress is typical of Sarmatian armour during this period.

\textsuperscript{141} Nikonorov and Savchuk 1992: 51, fig. 3.
\textsuperscript{142} Abdullaev 1995: 177 calls this chain mail.
\textsuperscript{143} Nikonorov and Savchuk 1992: 50.
\textsuperscript{144} Abdullaev 1995: 177.
\textsuperscript{145} Mielczarek 1993:fig. 19.
TYPE D05 – TUNICS

Tunics differ from shirts and dresses primarily on the basis of length. Tunics are approximately mid thigh length with a round neck and are worn either with or without a belt. Tunics are typically worn over semi-fitted or fitted trousers, usually tucked into knee high boots. In all examples they are worn as outer garments. Applied ornamentation is comparatively rare on tunics, and is found only as random beading on the lower half of the garment, or around the hem. Drapery is shown by means of lines on the lower half of the garment. Tunics are worn predominantly by male figures, and often musicians.

Mid thigh length tunic with full length sleeves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D05.01*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D05.01*

*Description of figurine type(s)*

Tunic worn by a standing, frontal lute player. This tunic differs to that worn by other lute players in both the length and the wavy style of the hem.

*Comparative material*

Comparable evidence for this garment type is well represented on Kushan period coins. For example a coin shows Pharro on the reverse (fig. 74) wearing a tunic portrayed in a similar manner with drapery on the lower half of the garment, presumably caused by the belt. Significant also are the knee high boots (see generally D08.01), which are characteristically worn together with the tunic on the Samarkand figurines, and parallels for which are to be found in Parthian art (figs 52 and 53).

Mid thigh length tunic with a straight hem and full length sleeves. The following ornamentation groups have been defined:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Variant</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date and Provenance</th>
<th>Type Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D05.02.01</strong></td>
<td>Tunic worn with belt (D09.01.01). Drapery on the lower half of the garment consists of diagonal lines covering each leg, slightly curving inwards towards the hem. These are separated by horizontal crescent shaped lines indicating a slight depression between the legs.</td>
<td>Afrasiab c. 2nd - 1st century BCE - 4th century CE.</td>
<td>RM A19 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D05.02.02</strong></td>
<td>Lower half of the garment has incised vertical lines over either leg, perhaps indicating folds, or possibly the shape of the legs underneath the garment.</td>
<td>Afrasiab c. 2nd - 1st century BCE - 4th century CE.</td>
<td>RM A19 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D05.02.03</strong></td>
<td>Mid thigh length tunic with full length sleeves. The style is perhaps slightly more fitted than the other ornamentation groups in this type variant, reflected in the more rigid appearance of the garment. This may be indicative of a thicker fabric. There is a wide unornamented band around the hem.</td>
<td>Tali Barzu; TB I c. 2nd - 1st century BCE - 4th century CE.</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 10, 148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D05.02**

*Description of figurine type(s)*

D05.02.01 is worn by a figure of undefined gender playing a flute. D05.02.02 is worn by a female figure playing an instrument similar to a lute. D05.02.03 is portrayed on various figurine types showing a standing, frontally represented female.

---

146 See for example Pugachenkova 1966. These may be seen in a wider context of figurines from Central Asia dated to the Kushan period and associated with entertainment.
figure with hands positioned on the lower stomach. This costume is the classic nomadic outfit comprising the tunic worn over trousers tucked into knee high boots.

**Comparative material**

Similar drapery to D05.02.01 is shown on Kushan period figures from Shotorak in Bactria wearing a knee length belted dress (fig. 47). The drapery is to be seen in relation to the belt. Other figures from eastern Parthia dated to the late Parthian period also wear a belted tunic or dress with a similar style of pleating on the lower part of the garment to that of D05.02.01 (figs 53 and 54).

Thigh length tunic with full length cuffed sleeves and slightly flared skirt. The garment is worn with a belt (D09.01.02), and is very slightly flared. The following ornamentation groups have been defined:

---

**D05.04.01**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No ornamentation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
<td>Afrasiab c. 2nd-1st century BCE - 4th century CE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
<td>RM A19 113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D05.04.02**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Small, apparently random “balls” in low relief ornament the skirt section. Four incised vertical lines below the waist, two on either side of the body, indicate drapery.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
<td>Afrasiab c. 2nd-1st century BCE - 4th century CE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
<td>RM A19 97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

147 Pilipko 2001: fig. 13, 1 and 3.
148 Ibid.: fig. 10, 7 and 9.
Description of figurine type(s)

Type variant D05.04 is worn by standing, frontal male figurines. No attributes are shown. The arms are bent sharply at the elbows. One hand rests on the belt, the other slightly above it, on the stomach.

Comparative material

Tunics worn over trousers tucked into high boots can be associated with the classic Parthian “tailored suit” and can be viewed more generally as characteristic of Central Asian nomadic costume, based on ancient Iranian dress. This style of dress was probably inherited from the Medians with their nomadic background, rather than the Achaemenids whose draped style of dress is more aligned with the west and a sedentary lifestyle. In west and east Parthian art from the 1st century CE, it is the classical costume of the “foreigner”, typically from Central Asia, or the “north” or steppe zones (fig. 55) and is contrasted with the draped clothing of the Hellenistic west. Kushan period coins also provide a particularly rich source for the imagery of various deities dressed in belted tunics worn over fitted trousers tucked into knee high boots (fig. 74).

The presence of relief “beads” on D05.04.02 is noteworthy. Costume ornamentation on the Samarkand region figurines is usually portrayed with incised lines or stamps, rarely in relief. The relief beading is shown on some figurines from the Nakhshab Oasis.

Upper thigh length tunic with cuffed full length sleeves and a deep V-neck.

152 Suleimanov 2000: fig. 152, 3.
**D05.05***

**Description**  
Small circular shaped objects modelled in low relief (similar manner of representation to those described above on tunic D05.04.02) ornament the front of the tunic in vertical panels. The neck line is also ornamented with circular shaped objects. A central band ornamented with circular shapes (beading?) runs from the neck to the hem. On either side of this are two more columns of circular shapes. The hem and sides of the garment appear to be trimmed with a plain, narrow band. It is possible that this represents evidence of a tabard, although there are no precedents for this in Sogdiana. At the sides, above the band, is another short vertical panel of three beads.

**Date and provenance**  
Unprovenanced

**Type example**  
KM 04

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D05.05***

**Description of figurine type(s)**  
Standing, frontally represented figure with both hands held across the stomach, the right above the left. The inner line of the legs forms a curve, perhaps indicating that the figure was originally placed on a horse or other object.

**Comparative material**  
D05.05* manifests clear parallels with a group of figurines from Merv\(^1\) (fig. 7) in the style of the ornamentation of the garment, in addition to the placement and style of the arms and hands. The style was initially dated to the 2\(^{nd} - 3\(^{rd}\) century CE,\(^2\) but more recently has been dated most recently to the 6\(^{th} - 7\(^{th}\) centuries CE.\(^3\) The similarities of D05.05* with costume from Merv, the lack of other convincing parallels from the Samarkand costume corpus with Merv, and the singularity of the type series in the Samarkand region suggests that this costume type variant was not typical of the Samarkand region.

---

\(^1\) Simpson and Herrmann 1995: pl. 4a. See further Pugachenkova 1962: 139, fig. 16 for similar examples from the region.


\(^3\) Simpson and Herrmann 1995: 142.
Tunics - undefined

**Description**
Tunic falling to slightly above the knees with full length sleeves. The hem is portrayed as slightly wavy, perhaps indicating a lighter fabric. The skirt section is incised with horizontal lines indicating folds or perhaps the fall of the fabric over the body.

**Date and provenance**
Unprovenanced

**Type example**
A927

**Discussion of Type Variant UD D05.06**

*Description of figurine type(s)*
Figurine preserved from the waist down. The tunic is approximately knee length. It is worn together with knee high boots (D08.02*). The right hand is resting on the right thigh. The left hand is not preserved.

*Comparative material*
According to an illustration given by Meshkeris, the upper half of the garment is shown with diagonal lines emanating from a central point on the chest. For tunics with a wavy hem see discussion of type variant D05.01*. This style of drapery is known from coats (see discussion of type variant D02.04) and dresses (see possibly discussion of type variant UD D04.08*), however, it is not known on tunics. It may represent a local tunic style.

**Description**
Thigh length garment preserving only the skirt section. The hem is characterised by a broad band, decorated with an arrow head pattern, the apex pointing to the right. A band ornamented with small circles in the center of the garment may be the hanging end of a belt. Alternatively it may be a central ornamentation band.

**Date and provenance**
Unprovenanced

**Type example**
SA 436

[^156]: Meshkeris 1989: 139, fig. 43, 1b.
DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT UD D05.07*

Description of figurine type(s)

A single, fragmentary example of this figurine type exists. It represents a standing, frontal figure, holding a circular attribute (a wreath?) in the right hand over the upper thigh. A cuff line, or bracelet, is visible around the wrist. The left hand is not preserved.

Comparative material

A figurine of undefined gender from the middle reaches of the Oxus shows a similar upper body garment, in this instance a dress, ornamented on the hem with circular shaped elements (fig. 9). The wreath, or circular object is held in a similar position, but in the left hand.\footnote{Pilipko 1977: fig. 2, 4.}
TYPE DOG LUCNAR UPPER BODY GARMENTS (SHRIR)
TYPE D06 - UNCLEAR UPPER BODY GARMENT (SHIRT?)

This garment type includes upper body garments worn primarily by rider figures. They are unclear because in all cases the figurine is preserved to the waist only. The garment appears to be closed, and probably represented a shirt or tunic. Zaslavskaya has suggested that the dress of the rider figures was either a caftan or a type of armour. In all cases where they are preserved, the sleeves are full length, often with a cuff. There are various styles of applied ornamentation on these garments, predominantly placed around the neck. These garments are always worn as outer garments, and typically by male figures.

---

Garment with full length sleeves and deep V-neck. The following ornamentation groups have been defined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D06.01.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D06.01.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

158 Zaslavskaya 1956: 106.
D06.01.03

**Description**
The neck is decorated with a plain band and there is a "bunching" or ruched effect on the sleeves. It is unclear exactly what this represents: it could be that the sleeves are pushed up, causing folds; it is also possible that they represent spiral arm bands or ring armour.

**Date and provenance**
Afrasiab, 5th – 8th century CE.

**Type example**
RM A19 54

D06.01.04*

**Description**
Neck band ornamented with small, evenly spaced circles.

**Date and provenance**
Unprovenanced

**Type example**
SA 82

DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D06.01

*Description of figurine type(s)*
D06.01 is shown on various type series, predominantly rider figures, holding clubs, daggers or sword. D06.01.02 is an exception to this. It shows a figure with both hands clasped at the front over the lower stomach, wearing an ill-defined lower body garment (UD D07.05). It is in fact possible that the V interpreted here as the neck of the upper body garment may represent the ends of a cloak that is thrown behind the shoulders in the manner of D01.02, and that the circular "pendant" represents a brooch used to fasten the cloak. This is suggested by the slight widening at the left shoulder of the bands indicating the neck line.

*Comparative material*
There are a number of rider figurines from Kandahar preserving the upper body wearing an upper body garment with a deep V neck. One of these shows a very narrow band lining the neck, next to which are small dots (fig. 19). 159 The stratified figurines have been dated to Saka levels at Kandahar, c. 150 – 120 BCE. 160 See also comments

159 Helms 1997: 387: fig. 228, 852 and 998.
160 Ibid.: 93. Other similar unpublished figurines include 2167 from NE XI 210.12 and 1882 from NE XII 300.9.
below for D06.02. Rider figures wearing shirts with a deep V neck are also typical of Parthian art.161

Sleeves with "rings" comparable with D06.01.03, perhaps representing ring armour, are well known from Sasanian period reliefs showing Sasanians and Parthians, for example at Firuzabad and Naqsh-i Rustam.162 It is also noteworthy, however, that they are also represented on type variant D06.02, which is associated with figurines holding drums.

Garment with full length, cuffed sleeves and a wide V neck with a broad applied band with various types of decoration. The following ornamentation groups have been defined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D06.02.01</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Broad trim band on the V-neck, ornamented with two incised lines on either side. The apex of the V is flattened.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and provenance</td>
<td>Afrasiab c. 5th - 8th century CE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type example</td>
<td>RM A19 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D06.02.02</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Broad trim band on the V-neck, ornamented with six coarse (perhaps hand made) circular swirls incised on the band. The apex of the V is rounded.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and provenance</td>
<td>Afrasiab c. 5th - 8th century CE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type example</td>
<td>RM A36 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

161 See for example Downey 2003: fig. 81, No. 88 and fig. 82, No. 89.
162 Vanden Berghe 1983: 63, fig. 8.
DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D06.02

Description of figurine type(s)

Both of these examples belong to a similar figurine type characterised by a frontally represented rider figure holding an hourglass shaped drum across the stomach with both hands. It is also noteworthy that both examples have a small circular object positioned in the centre of the chest, above the apex of the V neck.

Comparative material

A figurine from Kandahar (fig. 18) preserving the head and torso shows a similar style of shirt with a broad band lining the neck.\textsuperscript{163} It is dated to c. 50 BCE and associated with the arrival of the Saka in this region.\textsuperscript{164} The Kandahar figurine is also playing an hourglass shaped drum. The Kandahar figurines are especially important because they come from very well stratified contexts. Their dating challenges that proposed for the Afrasiab figurines.

Garment with a small, high V-neck.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
\textbf{D06.03*} \tabularnewline
\hline
\textbf{Description} & Small circular shapes, widely spaced, are shown in low relief ornamenting the neck line. \tabularnewline
\hline
\textbf{Date and provenance} & Unprovenanced. \tabularnewline
\hline
\textbf{Type example} & A504 \tabularnewline
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D06.03*

Description of figurine type(s)

Type variant is associated with a rider figure. It is differentiated from other rider figures by general costume, and also the manner of ornamentation on the upper body garment.

Comparative material

A rider figurine from the Saka levels of Kandahar (fig. 17) shows a similar style of ornamented collar on the back of closed upper body garment although it is not possible to define the exact garment type on the basis of the preserved remains.\textsuperscript{165}

\textsuperscript{163} Helms 1997: 387, fig. 228, no. 679.
\textsuperscript{164} Ibid.: 93.
\textsuperscript{165} Ibid.: figs. 228 and 998.
Unornamented garment with a round neck and full length sleeves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D06.04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D06.04**

*Description of figurine type(s)*

In all cases this garment is associated with rider figures. There are no diagnostic attributes preserved on this garment. In some instances it is worn with a belt, in others it is worn plain.

Although the generic nature of the garment makes it difficult to place geographically and chronologically, the rider figures on which it is shown are typically associated with the early medieval period.
**TYPE D07 - TROUSERS**

Trousers are lower body garments, worn in a variety of different styles, by both males and females. Females wearing trousers in almost all instances have a knee-ankle length dress over them, restricting visibility to the lowest section, while males often wear them under a tunic, either tucked into knee high boots, or over their boots. Drapery and applied ornamentation is shown on trousers.

Full length, loose fitting trousers. The following ornamentation groups have been defined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D07.01.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D07.01.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D07.01.03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**D07.01.04**

**Description**
Narrow paired vertical bands, possibly indicating ribbing, ornament each leg. It is also possible that these lines represent a braid, ribbon or a particular manner of stitching.

**Date and provenance**
Afrasiab c. 2nd-1st century BCE - 4th century CE.

**Type example**
AM 913548

---

**D07.01.05**

**Description**
Random circular shapes decorate the lower part of each leg.

**Date and provenance**
Tal-i Barzu c. 2nd-1st century BCE - 4th century CE.

**Type example**
RM A55963

---

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D07.01**

**Description of figurine type(s)**
Loose-fitting trousers worn by standing, frontally represented female figures underneath knee – ankle length dresses (see generally D04.01 – D04.03). In most cases these figures have been interpreted as fertility goddesses on account of the attributes they are carrying.

**Comparative material**
Unornamented loose fitting trousers worn by both males and females are generic, found over a wide geographic region throughout the period under discussion. Reconstructions of dress from Koktepe (fig. 94) and Tillya-tepe (figs 80-82) show a similar style of trousers. Wide legged or loose fitting trousers continue to be worn as part of traditional dress in Uzbekistan.

Similar drapery lines to those of D07.01.02 are marked on loose fitting trousers on a Tang period figurine (fig. 32). This figure is also wearing a shin length kandys, which is typical of Sogdian dress for the period 2nd-1st BCE – 4th century CE (See D03). A female figurine dated to the 3rd – 4th century CE from Nakhshab shows a similar style of pleating on the trousers to that of D07.01.03.166

Trousers D07.01.04 with relief vertical “stripes” perhaps to be interpreted as ribbing, are best represented on Parthian rock cut reliefs (fig. 52).167 Kawami interprets

---

166 Suleimanov 2000: pl. 149, 2.
167 See for example Kawami 1987.
the lines as "sharp vertical pleats",\textsuperscript{168} caused by the stiffness of the material from which the trousers were made, possibly cotton, linen or wool. On the Parthian reliefs the trousers are worn under a belted thigh length tunic. Similar trousers are also known from Kushan images where they are either worn over the shoes (fig. 46), or tucked into a shin high boot.\textsuperscript{169} This costume as a whole is well represented by a group of Samarkand region figurines.\textsuperscript{170}

Trousers decorated with beading similar to D07.01.05 have been found in several burials. For example the reconstruction of trousers from Grave 1 at Tillya-tepe shows ornamentation at the small vertical slits cut at the inner leg from the ankle. According to Yatzenko, this is a specific attribute of Tillya-tepe.\textsuperscript{171} Burials from the Syr Darya delta region have also preserved some evidence of trousers. On the basis of beads found in the region of the shins and ankles in burials from kurgan 236, at the Alt'inasar 4L burial ground, dated broadly to between the 4\textsuperscript{th} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries BCE and the 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries CE, Levina has suggested that beading may have decorated at least the lower leg of trousers.\textsuperscript{172} Levina notes however, that some of the material of this burial ground is not typical of the Dzhety-asar culture.\textsuperscript{173} Finally, finds from Noin Ula show a very similar style of trousers, dated to the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE (fig. 97).\textsuperscript{174}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loose fitting, cropped trousers. The following ornamentation groups have been defined:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D07.02.01</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{168} Kawami 1987: 141.
\textsuperscript{169} Rosenfield 1967: pl. 59, 98a. See also representations of figures on reliefs of Shapur I at Bishapur II and III interpreted by some scholars as "easterners". See for example Herrmann 1998: 46 and Herrmann 1980: fig. 5. See also p. 42-3.
\textsuperscript{170} See for example RM A19 97, RM A36 31 and RM A19 113.
\textsuperscript{171} Yatzenko 2001: 86 and 87, pl. 7.
\textsuperscript{172} Levina 1996: 208.
\textsuperscript{173} Ibid.: 66.
\textsuperscript{174} Trever 1932: pl. 22.
**D07.02.02**

**Description**
Circular shapes ornament the lower legs.

**Date and provenance**
Afrasiab c. 2nd-1st century BCE - 4th century CE.

**Type example**
RM A19 94

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D07.02**

*Description of figurine type(s)*

Standing, frontally represented female figure wearing a knee or shin length dress (D04.02) underneath a cloak (D01.01) and holding attributes. The right hand is positioned on the upper stomach, holding an indistinct attribute. The left hand, also holding an attribute, is positioned slightly below this. This figurine type is typically defined as a fertility goddess.

*Comparative material*

No parallels for this type variant have been found. This may indicate it is a local garment.

Full length, fitted trousers.

**D07.03**

**Description**
There is an evenly spaced upside down V shaped or chevron pattern (Λ) on each leg.

**Date and provenance**
Unprovenanced

**Type example**
SA 436

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D07.03**

*Description of figurine type(s)*

Figure preserved from the waist down. A circular object, perhaps a wreath, is held in the right hand at upper thigh level. The left hand is not preserved. The figure is wearing an upper body garment (?) with an arrow head pattern on the hem (see UD D05.07*).
**Comparative material**

Fitted trousers associated with Khalchayan show a much smaller upside down chevron (Λ) pattern as a vertical band on the center front of the leg.\(^{175}\) Yatzenko attributes this garment to the Kushan/Yuezhi realm between 50 and 350-400 CE.\(^ {176}\)

Loose or semi-fitted trousers worn tucked into knee high boots. While the ornamentation groups for this type variant have been identified in D07.01, the variation in the manner of wearing justifies the establishment of a separate type variant. The following ornamentation groups have been defined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>D07.04.01</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>D07.04.02</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{175}\) Cf., Yatzenko 2001: 89, pl. 12, 84.
\(^{176}\) Ibid.: pl. 12, 84.
D07.04.03

**Description**  
Vertical ribbing on each leg. See also description for D07.01.04.

**Date and provenance**  
Afrasiab c. 2nd-1st century BCE - 4th century CE.

**Type example**  
RM A36 31

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D07.04**

Description of figurine type(s)

Fitted or semi-fitted trousers tucked into knee high boots are associated with figurines wearing classical nomadic dress, best documented on various Parthian and Kushan reliefs and statuary\(^{177}\) and also figurines playing a stringed instrument.

Comparative material

See above discussion of D07.01 regarding ornamentation parallels. Trousers tucked into knee high boots with “pin stripe” pleating (D07.04.02) and also with ribbing (D07.04.03) are clearly paralleled in Parthian period rock cut reliefs (figs 52 and 53).

**TROUSERS - UNDEFINED**

**Description**  
Lower body garment, possibly a very lightweight scarf or chaps. Fabric falls in diagonal folds away from the center of the legs.

**Date and provenance**  
Kafyr-kala or Afrasiab, 5th - 8th century CE.

**Type example**  
RM A183 366

Description of figurine type(s)

The figurine is preserved in the style of a rider figure, the curved underside of the legs of the figurine apparently formed from where the figure was placed on the back of a horse.

Comparative material

The pose and headdress (HD04.04) of this figure immediately associate it with a figurine series from the potters quarter of Erkurgan dated to the late 5th - early 6th century.

\(^{177}\) Widengren 1956: 248; Goldman 1973: 181, fig. 7.
CE and interpreted as a ruler figure. The lower body garment appears at first glance to represent the classic so-called "leggings" or chaps similar to those worn by the famous statue from Shami. However, there are several anomalies with the Samarkand figurine, which render it difficult to interpret the lower body garment.

Comparative evidence comes from Paykand where a figurine dated to the 6th to 8th century CE (fig. 16) wearing a lower body garment comparable to that shown on the Samarkand figurine. The Paykand figurine is very similar to another figurine from the middle reaches of the Oxus.

The chest appears to be bare except for several short vertical lines just below the neck, and two small lumps further down the chest, perhaps breasts, but in reality a little low. It is possible that they may be part of a bulky necklace, well known from Indian or Gandhan art. Finally, the long plaits which frame the sides of the face are typical of those shown worn by Sassanian rulers, and shown on coins.

It is possible to see this garment as a scarf, floated over the lower half of the body and similar to well known images of Anahita on Sasanian silver vessels (figs 114-116). In the Sasanian images the ends of the scarf are often shown floating over the forearms of the figure: this may explain the lines on either side of the stomach on the Samarkand figure, although the ends are not shown. The draping of the material is shown diagonally, falling away from the line formed by the closed legs.

---

178 Semenov and Mirzaakhmedov 2000: 38 and fig. 118, 2.
179 Pilipko 1977: fig. 2, 3.
180 Goldman 1997: A27 - A29. See also 1967: fig. 18, 19 and 22.
TYPE D08 – FOOTWEAR

Footwear identified on the terracottas is extremely generic, making it very difficult to cite specific geographic and chronological parallels. For this reason, footwear should not be seen as an isolated costume accessory but rather in combination with other garments and headdresses of the specific type series.

Knee length boots with a horizontal upper edge. The following ornamentation groups have been defined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date and provenance</th>
<th>Type example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D08.01.01*</td>
<td>No ornamentation is preserved on these boots. Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 8, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D08.01.02</td>
<td>An unornamented band lines the upper edge of the boots. There may be another line around the shin of the boot, although this is unclear. There are some issues in the definition of details shown on this type variant. Coarse rectangular shapes appear to cover the knees, while the ribbing of the trousers appears to continue on the shins. The thick bands on the knees may be the upper edges of the boots, while it is also possible that the boots themselves were also decorated.</td>
<td>Afrasiab c. 2nd - 1st century BCE - 4th century CE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D08.01

Description of figurine type(s)

D08.01.01* is typically shown on musician figurines playing a stringed instrument. D08.01.02 is found on figurines wearing classical nomadic dress best represented on Parthian rock cut reliefs. The right hand is typically positioned on the upper stomach, the left just below this.
Comparative material

D08.01.01 is without diagnostic features and therefore especially difficult to attribute with any certainty to a specific region or period. Although it is portrayed on only one figurine type series from the Samarkand region, parallels are found in the terracotta art of Panjikent dating to the 6th – 8th century CE. A figure from Chach dated to the early medieval period wears a similar style of knee high boots with a band around the upper edge to that of D08.01.02. It is ornamented with closely spaced vertical lines.

Archaeological evidence

It is possible that the band around the upper part of the boot of D08.01.02 is both ornamental and practical. Evidence of footwear from some Altai burials shows that high boots were detailed with a band sewn over the seams. While the band may have had a decorative and symbolic function, it also had a practical function, protecting the seams from the rain and presumably also wind. Such a band would also serve to generally reinforce the seam.

Knee length boots characterised by a curved upper edge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>There is a plain band around the shin of the boot.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and provenance</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type example</td>
<td>A927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of type variant D08.02*

Description of figurine type(s)

There is a single example of this figurine type. It is preserved from the thighs down. A tunic (?) covers the legs, almost to the knees (see UD D05.06*). Only the right hand is preserved. It is resting on the thigh. There are no recognisable indications of gender preserved on this figurine.

Comparative material

D08.02 is very generic and can be attributed to numerous areas spanning a broad chronology. Scythian warriors on Attic vases are shown wearing greaves of a similar shape when viewed frontally. However, the dress (or the preserved parts thereof) of the

---

181 For example Meshkeris 1989: 264, fig. 156.
182 Bogomolov 1992: 120, fig. 2, 2.
183 Rudenko 1970: pl. 55, d (reconstructed). See also the illustration of a felt stocking on p. 88, fig. 31.
184 For example Vos 1963: pl. IVa and pl. V.
figurine is not indicative of this context. Similar boots with rounded uppers are also worn by Tang period figurines (figs 33 and 34), where they reach just above the knee.  

Low boot, reaching just above the ankle.  

**D08.03***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>A broad, unornamented band lines the upper edge of the boot. As loose fitting trousers are worn with these boots, it is possible that this upper line represents the trousers tucked into the boots and flounced over the top.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and provenance</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type example</td>
<td>A923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D08.03***

**Description of figurine type(s)**

D08.03* is preserved on a single figurine wearing a shin length dress (see UD D04.08*) with loose fitting trousers (D07.02.01*) underneath. There are no recognisable indications of gender on this figurine. Only the left hand is preserved. It is resting on the thigh.

**Comparative material**

The generic nature of this style is very difficult to trace, also because details of footwear are often unable to be observed as they are covered by trousers. Perhaps the clearest evidence for short boots comes from the famous Kul Oba vessel (fig. 113), which shows two males at work, wearing short boots into which semi-fitted trousers are tucked, held in place by a narrow band around the ankle. On some scenes it is possible to make out a line just below the upper edge of the boots. Finds from burials suggest that they were made of leather. Klochko reconstructs a pair of leather boots found at a Scythian grave at Bulkavogo, showing them to be ankle length, and fastened at the ankle with a narrow band. A small bone statuette from Filippovka, dated to the 4th century BCE shows a mounted rider wearing typical nomadic dress of a caftan worn over tight fitting trousers, which are tucked into low boots. The boots are of interest as they show a double band around the top. It is also possible however, that this line represents the line of the trousers slightly flounced out over the boots. Finally, boots found in a burial}

---

185 de la Vaissière 2002: pl. IV, 3.  
186 Examples of low boots from burials show that they may have been approximately 25 cm high. See Levena 1996: 214.  
187 See Aruz, Farkas et al. 2000: catalogue no. 146.  
188 Klochko 1992: 30, fig. 2.  
189 Aruz, Farkas et al. 2000: 171, cat. no. 111.
at Lop Nor (fig. 100) provide another comparative example. No means of fastening the boot at the ankle was found. Low boots made of leather were also found in burials of the Syr Darya delta. Like the Scythian boots above, common to these were also the narrow ties for fastening, complete with a clasp. It is also possible that the ties were used for fastening the trousers around the ankle. An important difference between the short boots characteristic of Scythians from the northern Pontic region and the apparently short boots represented on the Samarkand figurines is the absence of the narrow strip/tie around the foot.

---

190 Levina 1996: 208.
TYPE D09 – BELTS AND CLASPS

Belts can be divided into three separate elements - clasps, terminals and plaques attached to the underlying belt. Archaeological evidence suggests that the belt itself usually consisted of a leather or woven band with bronze, silver, gold or, less often, bone used for the other elements. Only bronze belt elements have been found in early medieval Sogdiana. Details of ornamentation and fastenings on the belts portrayed on the terracottas are not well preserved, nor has any evidence of terminals been identified, although these were certainly used in Sogdiana. In this respect, only very general comments can be made here regarding clasps, plaques and the belt itself.

Belts in the ancient Iranian and Turkic worlds were used to symbolise the status of the wearer and are typically associated with warrior nomadic peoples. In the Indo-Iranian world generally the belt and accompanying ornamentation is seen, together with the crown and the throne, as a symbol of royalty and high rank. According to Lobacheva the quality of the belt and the type of elements attached to it were indications of the status of the wearer.

Raspopova and Arzhantzeva have studied respectively Sogdian belts and belts shown on the Afrasiab wall paintings. Both of these studies indicate the generic nature of belts across Eurasia, thereby highlighting the problem of provenance and chronology. This is also underlined by Jisl in a study of belts in the Turkic Kaganate.

Belts portrayed on the Samarkand terracottas do not immediately reflect any evident indications of status. It is possible that the small size of the figurines prevented the detailing of many of the differences commonly found on other representations of belts, for example on wall paintings and monumental statutory, as well as plaques found in the archaeological record. Nevertheless the scenes shown on the Orlat belt plaques and on belts portrayed on the Panjikent and Afrasiab wall paintings, suggests that such figurative elements were important. Jisl has suggested that in the Turkic world belts were worn only by men, although this may be limited to a specific type of belt.

---

191 Raspopova 1965: 82.
192 Ibid.: 80, fig. 2 gives examples of terminals found in Sogdiana. Gold terminals inlaid with turquoise were also found in the Koktepe burial. See Rapin 2001: 49, figs. 10, 19-21 and p. 51, fig. 5.
194 Lobacheva 1979: 29.
195 Raspopova 1965. See also Raspopova 1980.
197 Jisl 1968.
199 Ibid.: 191.
Narrow banded belt. The following type variants have been defined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Variant</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date and Provenance</th>
<th>Type Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D09.01.01</strong></td>
<td>Unornamented. No means of fastening is shown; it may have been fastened at the back.</td>
<td>Afrasiab, Tali Barzu and Kafir kala, c. 2nd-1st century BCE - 8th century CE.</td>
<td>RM A19 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D09.01.02</strong></td>
<td>Narrow unornamented band, fastened in the center with a circular clasp and with the remaining cord hanging from the clasp.</td>
<td>Afrasiab, c. 2nd-1st century BCE - 4th century CE.</td>
<td>RM A19 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D09.01.03</strong></td>
<td>Remains of a single rectangular plaque ornament the belt on either side of a circular clasp, slightly separate from it.</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>SA 506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D09.01**

**Description of figurine type(s)**

Belt type variant D09.01 is portrayed on a variety of figurine types, predominantly rider figures. D09.01.02 is worn by male (?) figurines wearing a tunic over fitted trousers. D09.01.03 is known from a single example, which preserves only
the lower half of the body. A dagger (?) is attached to the belt on the right side while a sheath hangs vertically across the thighs. Two thin threads hang from the waist on the right. Two sets of paired small beads (?), one above the other, are attached to these threads. Objects such as these may reflect the status of the wearer of the belt.

**Comparative material**

A very plain type of belt similar to D09.01.01 is represented on coins of the early Parthian period, dating to the 1st century BCE. A similar style of belt is often shown on figures from the eastern region of Parthia, also wearing a very similar style of garment to that of the Sogdian figures. These do not necessarily provide a chronological indicator for the belts discussed here however. Bentovich suggests that simple belts tied with a knot were an indication of low status during the early medieval period in Central Asia.

The circular clasp shown on D09.01.02 and D09.01.03 is characteristic of the Eurasian steppe generally. On the Samarkand figurines, it is used to fasten belts with either a long or a short tongue hanging from the clasp. Circular clasps are not typical of personages on the wall paintings of Afrasiab or Panjikent. However, numerous examples have been found during excavations at Afrasiab and Panjikent. The costume of the figurines wearing such a clasp is typical of earlier nomadic representations of clothing and also that of Parthia. The hanging ends of the belt are also a common feature in the representation of belts in Parthia and Sassanian Iran. Clear evidence for the circular clasp, together with the entire dress of this figurine type, is found on a relief at Bishapur showing figures interpreted as east Iranians. The reliefs are dated to between 260 and 273 CE. A similar type of clasp is found on a male figure at Gandhara, who is also wearing a similar costume to the one worn with the belt.

Similar belt plaques to D09.01.03 are found on the Panjikent wall paintings. Some figures are shown wearing belts characterised by evenly spaced plaques on either side of the clasp (fig. 76).

**Archaeological evidence**

The belt type variant is extremely generic and found throughout the Eurasian Steppes. The types of belts commonly found in burials are highly detailed, indicative of a high ranking person. Plain belts were probably made from wool or leather or another organic material, and are therefore unlikely to have survived in the archaeological record.

---

200 Curtis Sarkhosh 2001: 300.
201 For example Pilipko 2001: fig. 10, 4 from Butkara.
203 Raspopova 1980: 87, fig. 61. All of these examples are dated to the 8th century CE. See also fig. 62 on p. 88.
204 Herrmann 1980: fig. 5, showing registers 4 and 5.
205 Ibid.: 42-3.
206 Ibid.: 11.
207 Pilipko 2001: fig. 9, 7.
208 Raspopova 1965: 84, fig. 5 and p. 85, figs. 6-7.
209 For example the belt worn by the deceased male at Tillya-tepe on fig. 83.
**D09.02***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Very narrow, rectangular plaques.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>SA 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>example</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D09.02***

*Description of figurine type(s)*

This type of belt is worn by rider figures.

*Archaeological evidence*

There are numerous comparative examples of square and rectangular plaques from Sogdiana dating generally to the early medieval period. Raspopova has also documented a number of square and rectangular plaques from Panjikent dated to the mid-late 8th century CE.

---

**D09.03***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Belt comprising rectangular plaques.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>SA 558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>example</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D09.03***

Belt worn by a rider figure. See notes for type variant D09.02 on this page.

---

210 Arzhantzeva 1987: 105, figs. 8, 9-17.
211 Raspopova 1980: 90, figs. 63, 1-3.
**D09.04**

**Description**  
Belt comprising large, semi-hemispherical shaped plaques.

**Date and provenance**  
Unprovenanced.

**Type example**  
A504

---

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D09.04**

**Description of figurine type(s)**  
Belt worn by a rider figure. There is only one example in this type series.

**Archaeological evidence**  
A number of provenanced examples demonstrate that this plaque type is local. Examples from Panjikent are dated to the mid to late 8th century CE, or are otherwise of an unknown date. Oval shaped plaques are associated with Kafir kala on the Vakhsh, Tayakhta, Moigyi-Taiiga, and Dzhargalant'ı.

The belt itself in type variants D09.02 – D09.04 is unclear as it is covered by plaques or plates. There is also no visible means of fastening the belt. There are three variations in the plaques used as ornamentation on the Samarkand terracottas: narrow rectangular plaques; rectangular and semi-spherical plaques, all of which are well documented in Sogdiana. While an early medieval dating is indicated by the comparative evidence, this should not necessarily be seen as an indicator for the chronology of the figurine because of their extremely generic traits. Raspopova indicates that square or rectangular plaques are typical of Turkic burials of Siberia and the Semirech’ıe and have not been documented in south eastern Europe. This may provide more evidence for regional Turkic influence on Sogdian material culture.

---

212 Arzhantzeva 1987: 105, figs. 8, 24-27. See also Raspopova 1980: 90, figs. 63, 4-7.
213 Raspopova 1965.
214 Ibid.: 80.
215 Raspopova 1965: 82.
**TYPE D10 – SCARVES**

Scarves are pieces of material draped over or around the body for warmth and/or ornamentation. In Central Asia during the period under discussion there is ample evidence to associate various types of scarves generally with entertainers, in particular musicians and dancers. For example the musicians on the Airtam frieze wear a scarf over the head and draped around the shoulders. Female figures from the Sasanian period are often portrayed wearing a transparent scarf over the lower body. These figures are typically associated with various attributes including animals, vessels and flowers and have been interpreted as Anahita. Tang period poetry also underlines the importance of flowing fabrics in dance routines, especially those of Central Asian dancers. There are few parallels for the scarves shown on the figurines from the Samarkand region, suggesting they may represent local types.

Rectangular/square shaped scarf thrown diagonally over the right shoulder and arm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>The edges are trimmed with a double band of ornamentation, set slightly back from the edge of the wrap. The outer band is ornamented with a zigzag pattern, while the inner band has an upside down chevron pattern.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and provenance</td>
<td>Unprovenanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type example</td>
<td>A344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D10.01**

*Description of figurine type(s)*

Single example of this type is known. The right arm is bent sharply at the elbow and holding an object at the left shoulder. The left arm is held at the side of the body. The wrap is worn over another garment, the details of which are not clearly preserved.

*Comparative material*

The position of the right arm together with the placement of the wrap recalls figurines from Erkurgan and Bactria also showing a himation draped over the shoulder, which recall Hellenistic period images. At Kucha rare examples of a garment

---

216 See for example Pugachenkova 1979: fig. 153.
218 See for example Bogomolov 1992.
219 Suleimanov 2000: fig. 149, 2.
220 See for example Abdullaev 1999: 128, figs. 3-5; Abdullaev 2000: 20, figs. 1, 1, 2, 4-6; figs. 2, 1 and 4. Similar examples are known from other Kushan period sites in Bactria. For other examples see Ilyasov and Mkrtchyan 1991/2: pl. 3, 2 and pl. 4, 1, 2 and 4.
worn over one shoulder are found, which Yatzenko suggests is typical of Kushan costume.221

Short scarf worn over both shoulders and falling in a deep fold on the center front of the body. The ends (or fastenings?) of the scarf are not shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D10.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D10.02**

**Description of figurine type(s)**

This scarf type variant is worn exclusively by musician figurines, many of which are female.

**Comparative material**

A figurine from Shotorak (fig. 45) dated to 150 CE shows a female (?) figure wearing a scarf similarly draped over the front of the body in a comparable manner.222

221 Yatzenko 2000: 323.
222 Goldman 1997: 441.
TYPE DII HARNESS
TYPE D11 - THE CHEST HARNESS

The chest harness is well known from representations of ruling figures from the Sasanian Empire, such as coins, bowls and sculpture.\textsuperscript{223} These examples show numerous variations of the harness, representing both heavily ornamented and completely plain types. Like representations of winged crowns from the Samarkand region, differences between the Samarkand chest harnesses and their Sasanian counterparts are not surprising. One point of difference is the level of the chest band on the Samarkand examples: it appears to sit lower on the chest than on the Sasanian examples.

\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
\textbf{D11.01*} \\
\hline
\textit{Description} & The harness has broad bands over the shoulders, forming a V just below the chest, the band encircling the chest and cutting off the apex of the V. The chest band is also quite broad. \\
\hline
\textit{Date and provenance} & Unprovenanced \\
\hline
\textit{Type example} & SA 482 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D11.01*

\textit{Description of figurine type(s)}

A single figurine fragment preserving the torso shows this harness type variant. It is difficult to identify other features on the fragment. It is possibly worn by a female figure.

\textit{Comparative material}

A similar harness to this is found on a silver bowl in the Hermitage dated to the reign of Shapur II (309 – 379 CE).\textsuperscript{224} While on many Sasanian examples the shoulder straps form a basic rectangle with the band around the bust, the shoulder straps on this example clearly form a V with the bust band.

\textsuperscript{223} Goldman 1993: 227, fig. 37.
\textsuperscript{224} Erdmann 1969: pl. 61. See also pl. 65 for another, later example of an unknown king on a plate from Berlin.
**Description**
The shoulder straps sit high on the shoulders, curving over the chest to the horizontal chest band. The shoulder straps appear slightly broader than the chest band.

**Date and provenance**
Afrasiab c. 4th century CE

**Type example**
RM A505 1

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D11.02**

**Description of figurine type(s)**
Harness is worn by a warrior figurine wearing an “Athena” helmet (see HD07.01) and a lamelar skirt (see D12.02).

**Comparative material**
It is difficult to draw clear parallels between the Samarkand region harnesses and those from other regions because of the lack of diagnostic features preserved on the Samarkand examples. Differences in the shape and position of the shoulder straps have been noted by several authors as belonging to specific Sasanian kings,\(^{225}\) however, only very broad parallels can be defined here.

\(^{225}\) See for example Borisov and Lukonin 1963: 16, fig. 3.
**Type D12 Armour**

Preserved details of armour on the figurines suggest that either lamellar or plate armour was used. Lamellar armour is characterised by the plates or lamellae being joined to each other by a thread on the reverse of each plate, running through rivets, and forming rows. The rows were joined to each other by another long thread usually running above and below each row, although vertical threads are also known. The lower row usually sits over the lower edge of the row above it, however, later examples from Japan show that the reverse was also employed. Both iron and leather lamellae are known.

According to Thordeman, lamellar armour disseminated from Central Asia, spreading through military conflict with neighbouring peoples to the east and the north, although this should not imply that this type of armour originated here. Lamellar armour was typically used for protecting the limbs, but it could also be used as body armour. Plate armour is formed by plates joined to each other on the side, top and bottom, that is, both vertically and horizontally. This rendered the armour less flexible, and also considerably more time intensive to make. Plate armour was typically used as body armour.

---

**D12.01**

**Description**  
Full body armour in the form of a knee or shin length "coat", fastened at the waist. Horizontal lines cross the body of the coat, probably representing the lines of the lamellae. The sleeves are short, reaching to the upper arm.

**Date and provenance**  
Unprovenanced.

**Type example**  
A765

---

226 Thordeman 1940: 248.
227 For numerous references to Medieval travel writers regarding leather armour see Swietoslawski 1999: 25.
228 Thordeman 1940: 259-260.
229 John of Plano Carpini’s description of Mongolian iron lamellar provides a vivid image of the construction of this type of armour: "...they make a number of thin plates of the metal, a finger’s breadth wide and a hand’s breadth in length, piercing eight little holes in each plate; as a foundation they put three strong narrow straps; they then place the plates one on top of the other so that they overlap, and they tie them to the straps by narrow things which they thread through the afore-mentioned holes; at the top they attach a thong, so that the metal plates hold together firmly and well. They make these into armour for horses as well as men and they make them shine so brightly that one can see one’s reflection in them" (Dawson 1980: 34). It is also possible that lamellae were covered with material, and therefore the individual plates were not shown. An example of this is found worn by the warrior on the embroidered piece from Mt Mug (Raspopova 1980: 86, fig. 60). No central line of the garment is shown on either the upper or lower body. Raspopova suggests that the armour could have comprised either plate or lamellar, covered by a leather cover, similar to armour depicted on some Persians miniatures dated to the 14th - 15th century (Raspopova 1980: 83).
DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D12.01

Description of figurine type(s)

One example represents this type series. It shows a plaque fragment, preserving the body between the neck and the knees. In the right hand traces of a bow (?) are preserved. Another unidentified object is preserved in the left hand.

Comparative material

There are a number of comparative examples of this type of armour from Central Asia and contiguous regions, suggesting it was well known in both sacred and secular contexts. Armour worn by Mongolians and represented on medieval Persian miniatures provides a detailed view of this type of armour coat or khuyagh. According to Gorelik this type armour of coat is of Central Asian origin. Various other examples confirm the presence of this type of armour coat in Central Asia generally. An unprovenanced Sasanian silver bowl (fig. 119) shows two duelling soldiers dressed in similar armour coats. Evidence of the shape of the lamellae used on the coat is preserved on the bowl: while the upper and lower edges appear to be straight, at least one of the side edges was characterised by a double arc, which was positioned facing out from the central front openings. Tiny dots are represented on the bands in between the lamellar. These appear to be decorative, as they are also shown on the mail coif. The bowl has been dated by Arendt to the 5th – 6th century CE.

Another similar type of armour is shown on a stucco figure from Karashar (fig. 67) dated to the 8th to 10th century CE and now in the British Museum. On this example, however, the collar sits spread open at the neck, and is fastened with a small rectangular shaped object, the fastened seam continuing to the center of the stomach. Around the waist is a belt comprising two narrow undecorated bands, quite similar to that preserved on the type variant discussed here. The lower part of the figure is covered with the same style of armour, ornamented with a band around the hem and a central split, the upper end of which is hidden by a rectangular pouch covering the pelvic area, and similarly of apparently lamellar construction. This section would have facilitated movement, both on the ground and while riding. The external edge of the lamellae is ornamented with a double arc on the vertical side and with a small circle in the center of each arc, possibly indicating rivets.

230 Thordeman 1940: fig. 249.
231 Gorelik 1979b: 40.
232 Ginters 1928: pl. 35a. According to Brentjes 1996: pl. 34, the plate is from Kulagysh. This cut is very similar in shape to the coats worn by Scythian warriors into battle depicted on a frieze found on a silver helmet from Peredieva Mogila and dated to the 4th – 3rd century BCE. The scene is reproduced in Brentjes 1996: pl. XXXI, 15 and 16.
233 A similar type of lamellae is also found on a stucco relief from Dandān-Uiliq in Chinese Turkestan. Reproduced in Thordeman 1940: 259, fig. 248. Published in Stein 1907 v. 1, p. 252 figs, 30-32 and pl. II. Dated to the 8th CE.
234 Cf., Thordeman 1940: 262.
235 Thordeman 1940: 258, fig. 247. See also Stein 1921 (1980-1983): pl. CXXXV for similar figures.
236 This is similar to a long (armoured?) shirt worn by a warrior on one of the Takht-i Sangin bone plates. See Brentjes 1996: pl. XV, 1.
Warrior figures on the northern and southern walls of Room 55, Object 6 at Panjikent (fig. 77 shows the figure on the northern wall) display similar styles of armour. Both of these examples also preserve some evidence of the lamellae. The armour worn by the figure on the southern wall is very similar to that worn by the warriors on the Sasanian bowl discussed above. Here, however, there are three arcs on the vertical side of the plates rather than two. The lamellae worn by the figure on the northern wall however, have two small semi-circular protrusions from at least one side, similar to that of the Karashar and Sasanian figures, but much smaller. The patterning of these plates is interesting. Rather than simply facing out, as they do on the warrior shown on the bowl described above, in this instance the rows alternate, with one row manifesting the curved edge facing right, and the next with the curved edge facing left. Although the majority of them face in the one direction, to the left of the figure, there are some plates that are placed in the reverse. That the armour of these warriors was different is demonstrated in the number of rows of plates. The figure on the northern wall has approximately 14 rows of plates, plus a hem (?) below the waist. The figure on the southern wall is poorly preserved below the knee, however, to this length there are at approximately 7, while on the figure on the northern wall there are approximately 10 to this level. Smaller lamellae were used on the armour worn by the warrior on the northern wall. On the figurine, there are 9 rows of armour depicted from the waist down, and it is possible to suggest in this respect a closer similarity with the figure on the southern wall. Similarity between the two figures is also noted on the narrow bands between the rows of lamellae. Actual finds of this type of plate have to date not been published.

Another example from Panjikent manifests further variation on this armour. Here the chest is covered by a decorative swirl covering each pectoral. Although the lower part of the figure is not preserved, the armour appears to be approximately knee length. There are worn traces of ornamentation on the horizontal plates.

A small plaque from Kurgan-Tyobe (fig. 22) portrays a standing frontal figure wearing a garment described as a “Kushan kaftan (chapan)”. The figure is thought to represent Farn or Farr. The garment is worn with a belt around the narrow waist. It is open on the chest and appears to have double lapels that are very slightly shaped into triangles. These come together just above the belt. Below the belt the coat is joined. On either side of the central line are horizontal lines, very similar to those shown on the armour type discussed here. The figure is standing with legs spread, holding a triton in the right hand and has a palm leaf motif emanating from behind each shoulder. Denisov dates the plaque to the Kushan period, and questions the date suggested by Meshkeris for other plaques which she dates to the 6th – 8th century CE. Denisov also notes the broad dissemination of this style of garment. These examples bear important differences to observations of typical lamellar armour. Especially noteworthy is the band that separates each of the rows, clearly visible on the Sogdian, Sasanian and Karashar examples, but not on the Panjikent examples.

237 Raspopova 1980: 84, fig. 57.
238 Similar lamellae are found on a figure on the northern wall of Room 1, Object 24. See Raspopova 1980: 85, fig. 58.
239 Brentjes 1996: pl. 36, 3.
241 Denisov 1981: 42.
242 Denisov 1981: 43.
The line between the rows of lamellae is usually formed by the lower row positioned slightly over the row above it.

Armour worn in duelling scenes represented on bone plates from Orlat\textsuperscript{243} demonstrate a similar type of armour on the upper body. In all instances the upper body armour is tight fitting, highlighting the very slim waist. The lower body is covered with a flared skirt with horizontal and vertically hatched lines, representing lamellar or plate armour. The upper body piece represents some important similarities to the type of armour represented on the Sogdian terracotta, in particular the upper body piece manifests the same central line with three horizontal panels on either side.\textsuperscript{244} It is just possible to make out very closely spaced vertical lines on some of the warriors, and this may indicate the individual lamella.\textsuperscript{245} In cases where it is possible to tell, this style of armour is worn by all of the warriors, except one, who appears to be wearing a plate upper body armour put on over the head.\textsuperscript{246} The full-length sleeves appear to be quite full and billowing, and it is possible that they are part of a garment worn under the armour covering the chest. There are also some important differences, between the armour shown on these two pieces, particularly the high neck and the plate armour skirt.

The armour skirt is quite different from that of the Sogdian plaque and appears to be constructed in a different manner to that of the upper body armour. Here, the skirt appears to have been constructed as plate armour, probably on a leather skirt. It is also curious that narrow bands between the plates appear to run vertically rather than horizontally. Only the skirts worn by the warriors in the bottom right and left corners appear to show some sort of continuity with the upper body garment.

Archaeological evidence

Finds of lamellae from Panjikent provide a more precise idea of a possible date for the lamellae worn by the warriors depicted on both the Sasanian bowl and the Panjikent wall paintings.\textsuperscript{247} Lamellar armour fragments are also known from other regions of Turkestan, found during the explorations of Stein and Bergman, with the earliest finds from the Taklamakan Desert being dated to around the beginning of the 1st century CE.\textsuperscript{248} These comparative examples manifest important evidence in the joining of the lamellar to form the rows.

There is much evidence from the early medieval period from Sogdiana and other regions which indicate that this type of armour coat or khuyagh is well known. The two attributes on the unprovenanced plaque may indicate a sacred context for this figure, although the evidence shows that it was worn in secular military contexts also. It is possible that the armour type shown on the Orlat Plates may be a distant prototype for the armour represented on D12.01 as there are some similarities in the style of plating.

\textsuperscript{243} Abdullaev, Rtveladze et al. 1991 v. I: 177, fig. 273 and 275 and p. 178, fig. 276.
\textsuperscript{244} Ibid. v. I: 178, fig. 276.
\textsuperscript{245} For example the warriors on the right side of the plate.
\textsuperscript{246} Abdullaev, Rtveladze et al. 1991, I: fig. 276. The figure is on the upper register, facing right, second from the right.
\textsuperscript{247} Similar lamellae are found on a figure on the northern wall of Room 1, Object 24. See Raspopova 1980: 85, fig. 58.
\textsuperscript{248} Thordeman 1940: 251.
D12.02

**Description** Plate armour comprising a knee length skirt worn with a belt and a purse attached in the center and trousers underneath.

**Date and provenance** Afrasiab c. 4th century CE.

**Type example** RM A505 1

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D12.02**

*Description of figurine type(s)*

A single figurine preserves this armour type variant. Although the upper body clothing is unclear, the figure appears to be wearing a harness on the chest (D11.02) and an “Athena” type helmet (HD07.01). The figure is interpreted as male and dated to the 4th century CE. Square metal plates were probably sewn directly onto a leather lining, or perhaps a cloth lining, although this may not have been able to support the weight of the plates.

**Comparative material**

A similar style of armour shown on a coin of Vasudeva I. A statue from Karashar shows a warrior in type variant D12.02 lamellar armour, but with a similar pouch worn at the center front (fig. 67).

D12.03*

**Description** Details of the lower legs only are visible. The armour consists of closely spaced slightly curved lamellae tightly fitted around the legs.

**Date and provenance** Unprovenanced.

**Type example** SA 876

---

250 Pugachenkova 1971: fig. 127.
DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT D12.03*

Description of the figurine type(s)

Complete plaque showing a standing armoured figure holding a small camel (?) attribute on a plate in the right hand and a sword in the left. A small anthropomorphic figure is shown to the right of the figure. The iconographic type of a figure holding an animal at shoulder level is well known amongst plaques and figurines and wall paintings from Panjikent and Afrasiab during the early medieval period. The attributes indicate a divine status.

Comparative material

A very similar type of leg armour is worn by the duelling figures on an unprovenanced Sasanian plate, now in the Hermitage (fig. 119). A reconstruction by Pugachenkova of a warrior on the duelling scene at Khalchayan shows a warrior wearing the lamellae armour for the entire length of the legs. Similar armoured trousers are also worn by deities represented on Kushan coins dated to the 2nd – 3rd century CE.

Archaeological evidence

An intact portion of this type of armour was also found by Tolstov at Chirik-Rabat in Chorasmia, dated to the 4th – 2nd BCE. The type is extremely generic and continues to be found into the Sasanian period.

---

251 Brentjes, B. 1996: pl. 34, 4.
252 Ibid.: pl. 25, 6. Note also the similarities between this armour and that worn by the Indo-Scythian king Azes I (30 – 10 BCE?) on a coin illustrated in Brentjes 1996: pl. XXXIII: 4
253 See for example Pugachenkova 1971: pl. 128. Coin of Vasudeva I. See also Abdullaev 1995: 169, fig. 3.
254 Tolstov 1962: fig. 82, a and b.
DRESS TYPE EXAMPLES

CLOAKS D01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Cloak 1" /></td>
<td>D01.01.01</td>
<td>RM A19 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Cloak 2" /></td>
<td>D01.01.02</td>
<td>RM A19 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Cloak 3" /></td>
<td>D01.01.03</td>
<td>AM 892 075 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Cloak 4" /></td>
<td>D01.01.04*</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 7, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Cloak 5" /></td>
<td>D01.01.05</td>
<td>RM A19 99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COATS D02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Coat 1" /></td>
<td>D01.02*</td>
<td>SA 362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Coat 2" /></td>
<td>UD D01.03*</td>
<td>A772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Coat 3" /></td>
<td>D02.01</td>
<td>RM A420 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Coat 4" /></td>
<td>A691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Coat 5" /></td>
<td>D02.02*</td>
<td>SA 434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DRESSES D04

D04.01
RM A19 94

D04.02.01
RM A19 96

D04.02.02
RM A19 85

D04.02.03
RM A19 99

D04.02.04
RM A19 98

D04.02.05
RM A19 89

D04.02.06
RM A55 963

D04.03.01*
A186

D04.03.02
AM 91 33

D04.03.03*
Trever 1934: pl. 7, 99.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dresses</th>
<th>Tunics D05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D04.04* A729</td>
<td>UD D04.09* SA 376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D04.05* SA 372</td>
<td>D05.01* A327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D04.06* A329</td>
<td>D05.02.01 RM A19 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D04.07* A391</td>
<td>D05.02.02 RM A19 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD D04.08* A923</td>
<td>D05.02.03 RM A64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TUNICS

D05.04.01
RM A19 123

D05.04.02
RM A19 97

D05.04.03
RM A36 31

D05.05*
KM 04

UD D05.06*
A927

D06.01.01
RM A19 51

D06.01.02
RM A181 1238

D06.01.03
RM A19 54

D06.01.04*
SA 82

UNCLEAR UPPER BODY GARMENTS (SHIRTS?) D06

UD D05.07*
SA 436
THE HEADDRESS TYPOLOGY

Diagrammatic representation showing the structure of the headdress typology
TYPE HD01 – CAPS

Caps represented on the figurines from the Samarkand region may be divided into two groups on the basis of their shape: conical or peaked, and rounded or rectangular. Rounded or rectangular caps find numerous parallels in later, especially Turkic, sources while conical or peaked caps have been associated with peoples of the Saka world, in particular the Saka Tigrabauda (Saka of the pointed cap), on the basis of the Achaemenid depictions of subject peoples (figs 37-39), and also literary sources. The specific identification of the people(s) represented under this umbrella has received much attention in the literature, although the intrinsic issue of identity remains. Identity in this case may be linked to both ethnicity (territorial) and status, with the wearer of pointed hats in some regions belonging to a specific (privileged) class. While it is possible to see cap type variants HD01.01 to HD01.01.06 in this general historico-cultural context, it is also possible that they are the local variations of this much larger generic type. By definition the term caps implies that they were constructed from a soft material such as felt or leather, both of which would have aided in maintaining the shape of the headdress more successfully than a lighter material alone. It will, however, be noted below that HD01.03 finds more parallels with helmets than caps, although it is of a similar shape. This point underlines the difficulty in identifying real headdress types, thereby highlighting the issue of subjectivity, discussed in Chapter 1.

To some extent the conical cap has become one of the hallmarks of Sogdian identity. It is found on figurines of various identities from the Samarkand region across the chronological spectrum encompassed in this study. One of the reasons for the enduring nature of this cap may be attributed to its symbolism. According to Suleimanov, it represents “a sacred headdress of archaic pastoral-agricultural peoples, having a phallic symbolism and associated with fertility cults.”

Low conical cap with erect peak worn on top of the head, showing the hair framing the face. The following ornamentation groups have been defined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HD01.01.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description No ornamentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and provenance Afrasiab c. 1st century BCE - 4th century CE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type example RM A19 44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See for example Schmidt 1957 - 1970; Hachmann 1995; Vos 1963.
2 See for example Narain 1987; Gardiner-Garden 1987; Schmidt 1957 - 1970.
4 Suleimanov 2000: 210-1.
HD01.01.02

Description  A plume (?) falls forwards over the front of the cap.

Date and provenance  Afrasiab c. 1st century BCE - 4th century CE.

Type example  RM A19 32

HD01.01.03

Description  Peak falls slightly forward.

Date and provenance  Afrasiab c. 1st century BCE - 4th century CE.

Type example  RM A374 3

HD01.01.04*

Description  Vegetation motif on the centre front of the cap, running in a column from the base of the cap to the top where the peak falls forward.

Date and provenance  Unprovenanced.

Type example  SA 101

DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD01.01

Description of the figurine type(s)

The conical cap is one of the most ubiquitous and characteristic types among Sogdian headdresses. It is found across a number of different figurine types, including rider figures dated traditionally to the early medieval period, and musician figurines dated to the 2nd-1st century BCE - 4th century CE. In the majority of cases it is not possible to define a gender for the wearers of these cap type variants on the basis of preserved remains.

Comparative material

The shape of this cap is generic and it has a broad geographic dissemination across the Eurasian steppes. Conical shaped headdresses are clearly portrayed on various delegations and individuals on Achaemenid period reliefs associated generally with the Saka and sedentary Central Asian populations. Issues regarding the identification of the figures are discussed in more detail in Chapter 6. Images of Scythians, especially in a
Greek context, also provide an important comparative source for parallels with the various conical caps discussed here.

There are also several parallels for this type variant from within Sogdiana itself, in addition to contiguous regions, in particular Chorasmia. A similar type of cap to HD01.01.01 is found on figurines from Erkurgan dated to the 3rd – 4th century CE. Another figurine from Erkurgan dated to the 3rd – 4th century CE shows a cap similar to HD01.01.03 with the peak falling forwards. A fragment of a head in monumental statuary from Gyar-kala (fig. 40) in Chorasmia dated to c. 1st century CE shows a very similar shape and manner of wearing of HD01.01 generally.

Notably, parallels from Bactria for this headdress type variant are less common. A “garland bearer” from Khalchayan wears a similar style cap, also in a similar manner, to HD01.01.03. Here it is worn loosely on top of the head, leaving visible the hair underneath. Sculpture from the reception palace at Khalchayan is dated to the 1st century BCE. Negmatov has discussed a male figure identified as a Kushan or Tokharian warrior, which wears similarly styled headgear to HD01.01.01. Although the photograph of this figurine in the publication is unclear, it appears that the manner of wearing the cap – sitting loosely on the hair, leaving the fringe visible – is similar to that of the Samarkand figurines wearing this headdress type variant. The cap is peaked at the top. It appears to have a centre line running directly down the middle of the cap, as though it had been folded. There is also a decorative band of barely visible vertical lines around the base of the cap. Negmatov dates it to the 1st century BCE. A statue fragment from Hadda may also represent a similar style of cap (fig. 50).

A soldier interpreted as a Saka-Parthian from Gandhara is also wearing a very similar shaped cap “with folded or fur edge” similar to HD01.015.02. It is also possible that this edging is the hair showing from underneath the cap. Scythian plaques dated to 350 – 300 BCE used as bridle ornamentation show a figure wearing a comparable cap, although somewhat lower, and possibly made from softer material, with a less rigid peak.

Archaeological evidence

Archaeological evidence for the conical cap comes in particular from the Lop Nor burials (figs 101-104) where numerous examples of conical caps were found. The headdresses were made predominantly from felt, with some examples showing ornamentation using ephedra. Some examples were ornamented with feathers (fig. 104) attached to the side or front of the cap. This manner of ornamentation may provide

---

1 See for example Vos 1963 regarding the images of Scythians depicted on Attic vases. For various images of Scythians on metal work, see Reeder 1999 and Jacobsen 1995.
2 Suleimanov 2000: fig. 155, 1 and fig. 158, 3.
3 Ibid.: fig. 162, 4.
4 Pugachenkova and Rempel’ 1965: fig. 52. It is also reproduced in Abdullaev, Rveladze et al. 1991 v. I: 318.
5 Pugachenkova 1971: pl. 19.
6 Ibid.: 127.
8 Alkazi 1983: 117, 26. See also p. 121, fig. 38.
9 Reeder 1999: pl. 148, from Babyna Mohyla. Reeder suggests the figures may depict Amazons.
10 See for example Bergman 1939: pl. 10, 1 - 4, 6 - 7 and 9; pl. 11, 4; and pl. 26. 2 and 3.
11 For example Ibid.: pl. 10, 2.
some parallels for that shown on HD01.01.04*. Unfortunately on the basis of the preserved evidence it is difficult to discuss the identity of the wearers of these headdresses.

Despite the broad chronological and geographical parallels for the conical cap across Central Asia and the Eurasian steppes, it is nevertheless clear that it was one of the most popular headdress types in Sogdiana from the mid 1st millennium BCE to the beginning of Islam in the region.\(^{16}\) While most of the art historic evidence (small and monumental statuary) discussed in this section has been typically associated with males, it is not possible to rule out female wearers of such caps, as demonstrated by several of the Samarkand region figurines which are demonstrably female (see below, HD01.02). It should also be pointed out that in a Scythian context, female figures are known to have worn a high pointed headdress. This is discussed below in relation to HD01.04.

**Type variant HD01.02**

**Description**

Broad conical cap with peak falling to the left.

**Date and provenance**

Afrasiab c. 2nd-1st century BCE - 4th century CE.

**Type example**

RMA 1943

**Discussion of the figurine type(s)**

Although only head fragments portraying this type variant are preserved among the collections studied, a fully preserved figurine in the collection of the Tashkent Museum shows a standing, frontally represented female figure wearing an ankle length cloak ornamented with circular elements (possibly similar to DO1.02; see also D01.01.02 and D01.01.04*) on the centre front openings over a dress of a similar length.\(^{17}\) Indistinct attributes are held at chest and stomach level. This general iconographic type is well recognised in the Samarkand region between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century CE and is typically interpreted as a female fertility figure.

**Comparative material**

It is difficult to assign the importance, if any, of the peak falling to the left or right of the head. A figure from Chach dated to the early medieval period shows a similar style

---

\(^{16}\) Modern ethnographic evidence also documents the continuity of this general shape in Central Asia. From Chorasmia, see for example Zad'ikhina and Sazonova 1979: 163, fig. 1-3.

\(^{17}\) S48/107. Illustrated in Meshkeris 1989: 117, fig. 25. See also Meshkeris 1968: fig. 1, 6 and fig. 2, 4; Meshkeris 1977: pl. 4, 4
of headdress, with the peak also falling to the left. This type variant may be seen as a variation of the classical conical cap of Sogdiana described in HD01.01.

**HD01.03**

**Description**  Ribbed (?) conical cap worn low on the head, covering the hair.

**Date and provenance**  Afrasiab and Kafyr-kala c. 5th - 8th century CE.

**Type example**  RM A183 633

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD01.03**

**Description of the figurine type(s)**  This type variant is found on figurine head fragments only, which represent different figurine types.

**Comparative material**  Several comparative examples show that this type of headdress covered a broad geographic and chronological range, almost always associated with a nomadic Scythian or Saka context. A figurine from Kirovabad (fig. 30) in the Caucasus dated to the 6th - 5th century BCE shows a bearded figure wearing a headdress curved across the forehead and with a central decorated stripe (unclear in the reproduction). Krypnov associates this headdress with the conical headdresses of the Scythians and also draws parallels with facial features on figures in the Oxus Treasure and on figures portrayed on vases from Kul Oba (e.g. fig. 113).

Zaslavskaya has discussed the dress of rider figures from Afrasiab. The “ribbed” cap, identified as a helmet, is assigned to a group of riders interpreted as European on the basis of facial features. Although such an attribution is problematic, a western influence is nevertheless suggested by the comparative material. In particular, the evidence suggests a Scythian heritage for this type variant. Later parallels from Erkurgan, dated to the 3rd - 4th century CE, have also been interpreted by Suleimanov in a Scythian context.²³

---

¹⁸ Bogomolov 1992: 116, fig. 1, 6. A profile of a male figure on a bowl shows a very similar style of cap. As the face is shown in profile it is to be assumed that the headdress is also in profile, in which case the peak would be falling forwards. See Musche 1988: pl. 1.

¹⁹ Krypnov 1940: 370.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Refer to the discussion of gender identity in Chapter 2.

²² It is also noteworthy that traditional Uzbek headgear from Sogdiana manifests a widespread popularity of the ribbed cap, either domed or conical. The ribbing was formed by inserting rolls of paper or cotton. See Kalter and Pavaloi 1997: 234, pl. 465-6.

²³ Suleimanov 2000: 195 and fig. 158, 3.
High conical cap. The following ornamentation groups have been defined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date and provenance</th>
<th>Type example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HD01.04.01</strong>*</td>
<td>Unornamented</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HD01.04.02</strong>*</td>
<td>High conical cap with a narrow band around the base. Vague traces remain of circular shaped objects above the band.</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD01.04***

*Description of the figurine type(s)*

Headdress type variant is associated with rider figures.

*Comparative material*

High conical shaped caps and hoods, like the conical caps of type HD01.01, are widespread across the Eurasian steppes and are typically associated with the Saka and Scythian nomadic peoples, in particular rider figures, but also sacred figures.\(^{24}\) They are also represented on a number of Tang period figurines (figs 33-34).

*Archaeological evidence*

Evidence from several burials associates the high conical headdress with females in a nomadic context. The burial at Issyk-kul\(^{25}\) yielded such a headdress. Although the deceased was initially interpreted as a male, more recent studies have suggested in fact that it was a female.\(^{26}\) A scene depicting a seated female (?) figure on a gold leaf headdress fragment from Karagodeuashkh (fig. 107), dated to the late 4\(^{th}\) century, also

---

\(^{24}\) See for example the headdress worn by the Issyk-kul figure, now understood by some scholars to be a priestess (Davis-Kimball 2002: 96 – 111). See Akitsev 1978: 47, fig. 62 and 63.

\(^{25}\) See Akitsev 1978 generally.

\(^{26}\) Davis-Kimball 2002: 96-111.
provides evidence for this type variant. Finally, the burial of a female wearing a high conical cap from Subeshi in the Tarim Basin (fig. 98) also indicates a broader nomadic heritage for this headdress. These examples suggest a cultic association for this headdress type variant.

Low peaked cap worn high on the head. The following ornamentation groups have been defined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date and provenance</th>
<th>Type example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HD01.05.01*</td>
<td>Unornamented.</td>
<td>SA 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD01.05.02</td>
<td>Peaked cap with a very broad band (?) around the base. It is possible that the band represents a large piece of material, folded and tied in a particular way at the back, and therefore invisible from the frontal view. It is also possible that the band, apparently smooth, represents a strip of fur.27</td>
<td>RM A181 1393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD01.05.03</td>
<td>Peaked cap with arrow head ornamentation across the band.</td>
<td>A400 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 There are numerous ethnographic images of caps of this style worn by various members of society. See for example Lansdell 1887: 419 which shows a similar style of cap worn by "Central Asian musicians".
DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD01.05

Description of the figurine type(s)

This type variant is found on figurine head fragments only, which represent different figurine types. It is not possible to define a gender for any of these ornamentation groups. HD01.05.03 is worn by a figure holding a narrow rectangular shaped attribute with both hands at face level.

Comparative material

See above discussion of conical cap HD01.01. The band around HD01.05.02 finds some parallels in Scythian headresses portrayed on Attic vases\(^2\) although these examples have long ties to fasten under the chin.

---

**HD01.06**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cap with an emphasised peak on the centre top. It is worn high on the head.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and provenance</td>
<td>Unprovenanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type example</td>
<td>A366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD01.06*

Description of figurine type(s)

Only head fragments of this type variant exist. It is not possible to define a gender for this variant.

Comparative material

Although there are several examples of this type variant, no comparative material was found. It is possible that such caps represent highly schematised version of a head­dress found on a fragment of a Kushan period statue from Hadda (fig. 49).

---

\(^2\) Vos 1963: pl. XVIII, f.
HD01.07

Description
Low cap worn high on the head with a slight swelling in the centre.

Date and provenance
Afrasiab

Type example
AM 91314

DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD01.07

Description of figurine type(s)
Only head fragments of this type variant are known. They belong to different figurine types.

Comparative material
Numerous rounded caps are represented at Hadda during the Kushan period, which appear to be worn set back on the head in a similar manner to this type variant. There is a very clear Hellenistic influence on the Hadda sculptures, especially manifest in the modelling of the facial feature and the pose. A similar low cap is worn by a banqueting “Sogdian” shown on a funerary relief in the Miho Museum (fig. 70, L). A seated bearded male with thick hair is shown with a very small, low conical shaped headdress worn on the top of the head.

HD01.08.01

Description
Rounded cap worn low on the head, covering the forehead. The circular form of the cap may imply that it was structured, however, this is unclear. The following ornamentation groups have been defined:

Date and provenance
Kafyr kala, c. 5th – 8th century CE.

Type example
RM A183 804

29 Barthoux 2001: pl. 66, a and b; pl. 75, e.
30 For a discussion of this piece (panel E) by Lerner and Juliano in Miho Museum 1997: 247-257. See also Chapter 6 for a discussion of this particular panel.
**HD01.08.02***

*Description*  
Rounded cap with band ornamented with circular pattern.

*Date and provenance*  
Unprovenanced

*Type example*  
KM 04

**HD01.08.03**

*Description*  
Rounded cap worn low on the head and ornamented with a very coarsely executed hatching pattern.

*Date and provenance*  
Afrasiab, unstratified.

*Type example*  
AM RO 136

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD01.08**

*Description of figurine type(s)*  
HD01.08.01 and HD01.08.03 is found on figurine head fragments only, which represent different figurine types. HD01.08.02* is represented on a rider figurine wearing an ornamented tunic (D05.05*).

*Comparative material*  
A similar shaped cap to HD01.08.02* is worn by a figure of a “foreigner” from Mathura. It is ornamented with a similar pattern around the band, and a hatching pattern on the body of the cap, like that of HD01.08.03. It is dated to the Kushan period. Similar shaped caps to HD01.08.03 are worn by attendants on several Sasanian bowls. These are worn on top of the head, so that the fringe and hair at the sides of the face remain visible.

Tamashanta or beret shaped headdress edged with a two tiered band and worn to the middle of the forehead. While the headdress appears to be in the shape of a beret, various interpretations on the basis of comparative material are possible. The headdress may comprise a headscarf, held in place by a particular manner of folding, and possibly fastened at the back of the head. It is also possible to see it in the context of female headdresses from Palmyra, which show an ornamented band around the forehead covering a headscarf. The following ornamentation groups have been defined:

---

31 Alkazi 1983: 121, fig. 40.
33 See Alkazi 1983: 115.
34 See for example Dentzer-Feydy and Teixidor 1993: 180. This style of headdress is often covered with another scarf, draped over the head and shoulders.
DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD01.09

Description of figurine type(s)

Only head fragments showing this headdress exist and it is not possible to assign a gender to the wearers. A figurine housed in the Tashkent Museum shows another variation in the ornamentation of this type variant. A figurine housed in the Tashkent Museum shows another variation in the ornamentation of this type variant. On this example the front of the headdress is ornamented with apparently randomly placed circular shapes. The double tiered base band is ornamented with incised diagonal lines on each tier, one side reflecting the other.

Comparative evidence

Several examples of monumental statuary portray a headdress of a similar shape to type variant HD01.09. A similar shaped headdress is portrayed on a pre-Kushan statue from the Apsidal Temple at Taxila. Marshall calls it a “chaplet” and attributes a Hellenistic origin to it. He also suggests that it was an indoor headdress worn by the Parthian nobility. A Parthian example from Seleucia on the Tigris (fig. 56) confirms this. A Kushan period image of Surya from Mathura shows a very similar shaped headdress, interpreted as a “Mauli or turban...held on by a headband tied at the back.” It is possible that the headdress on the Samarkand figurines is constructed in a similar way, although no evidence of the construction method is preserved. It is also noteworthy that this statue is wearing a torque “of Celtic origin with central ornament”.

References:

36 See for example Marshall 1960: pl. 26, fig. 36.
38 Alkazi 1983: 115, fig. 22.
39 Ibid.: 115. The torque is found on several figurines from the Samarkand region, some of which also have a rectangular central element. For example RM A19 85.
Two figures on the Miran wall paintings dated to the 3rd century CE also wear a similar shaped headdress worn higher on the head (figs 78 and 79). These examples show the head held slightly to the side, however, they do not allow a view of the back of the head. They are also characterised by a lock of hair curled onto the cheek, an attribute noted on an unprovenanced figurine apparently wearing a tightly tied scarf over the head (See UD HD01.11*). It is noteworthy that the head from Taxila discussed above also bears a shortened form of the hair curling onto the cheek.

Archaeological evidence

There is some archaeological evidence for similar shaped caps. For example, a knitted cap from the Zaghunluq burial, dated to between 1000 and 600 BCE (fig. 99) worn by a male may be compared on the basis of its shape. A reconstructed cap dated to the 4th century BCE from Tetianyna Mohlya in Ukraine is also of a similar shape. The cap is ornamented around the base with two gold foil bands. The top of the headdress is ornamented in a similar manner to the rim, all with gold foil pendants.

Rectangular shaped cap worn high on the head. The following ornamentation groups have been defined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date and provenance</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HD01.10.01*</td>
<td>Unornamented.</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>SA 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD01.10.02*</td>
<td>Vertical ribbed (?) lines incised slightly on the diagonal. There is a slight gap in the centre of the cap where the lines meet.</td>
<td>Unprovenanced.</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 12, 170.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40 Bussagli 1978: figures on p. 18 and p. 25. See also comments regarding these paintings under UD HD01.11*.
41 See also HD UD09.01 (A901).
42 Mallory and Mair 2000: 214, fig. 125.
43 Reeder 1999: pl. 108.
DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD01.10*

Description of figurine type(s)

Unprovenanced head fragments only, comprising different type series. There are no indications of gender or other status on HD01.10.01*. Traces of a moustache on HD01.10.02* indicates a male wearer for this particular ornamentation group.

Comparative material

Several comparative examples from the early Medieval Turkic speaking world may explain the presence of this headdress type variant in the Sogdian world. A stone head fragment (fig. 69) from Ugdzug, near the Ongin River, shows a male wearing a similar shaped headdress to HD01.10.01*, although in this example the cap is higher.44 It is worn on top of the head, with the open hair framing the face. It is unclear if the cap is ornamented. Jisl has cautiously suggested that the head belongs to the body of a statue found nearby representing a Turkish ruler.45

Another stone portrait (fig. 68) from Bajo-davane aman in Mongolia shows a similar cap to HD01.10.01*.46 Unfortunately it is not possible to tell from the available reproduction of the image if there was any ornamentation on the headdress. It is worn to the tops of the ears, covering the upper part of the forehead. The style is also reminiscent of the shape of the headdress worn by one of three prominent figures on the western wall at Afrasiab,47 although here the cap is more angular. According to VI_ek, the stone portrait represents a Mongolian, with Chinese associations while Jisl suggests that it represents an Eastern Turk.48 Jisl further suggests that the East Turks had two different types of headdress: low rounded (stumpfkegeligen) caps and the much higher and more rigid cylindrical caps (possibly similar to HD01.04*).49 Similar rounded caps are also found on figures cautiously identified as Sogdians on funerary art from China.50 It may be possible to associate this type variant with a Turco-Sogdian population, perhaps living outside of the Zarafsh _ n Valley.

44 Jisl 1968: pl. 4, 3.
46 Ibid.: pl. IV, 2.
47 Albaum 1975: 21, fig. 4, 1.
49 Ibid.: 190.
50 Miho Museum 1997: 247-257. See also Chapter 6.
## UNDEFINED CAPS

### UD HD01.11*

**Description** Tight fitting headdress worn low on the head. It is also possible that the headdress is a piece of fabric wrapped tightly over the head and fastened behind, thereby giving the impression of a cap.

**Date and provenance** Unprovenanced.

**Type example** A901

**DISCUSSION OF UD HD01.11***

*Discussion of figurine type(s)*

Head fragments only preserve this headdress type. There is a lock of hair curled onto either cheek.

*Comparative material*

Sculptured curls on the face of one of the figures (A901), together with a similar shaped headdress, are found on worshippers and other figures on wall paintings at Miran (figs 78 and 79), located on the southern trade route around the Taklamakan Desert, and dated to the second half of the 3rd century CE. The manner of wearing the headdress at Miran is slightly different – it is worn higher on the head, and may in fact represent a beret.

### UD HD01.12

**Description** Headdress, perhaps in the form of a cap, worn high on the head and characterised by a central "ridge". On some examples this ridge appears to trace the shape of the top of the head from front to back, while on others it appears more as a slight, but nevertheless distinct, swelling on the top of the head.

**Date and provenance** Afrasiab, c. 2nd-1st century BCE - 4th century CE.

**Type example** RM A19 88

---

51 Bussagli 1978: 18 and 25.
Although there are numerous figurine fragments preserving this headdress type, its exact features remain difficult to explain, in particular the central ridge or swelling. The headdress type is associated with figurines playing a wind instrument held with both hands in front of the body. These figurines also wore a scarf (D10.02) that has few parallels outside the Samarkand region.

Comparative material

Despite the popularity of this headdress in the Samarkand region, no comparative material has been found. It is possible that this cap represents a local headdress type variant.
TYPE HD02 – HEADBANDS

Headbands are essentially understood as bands, either ornamented or plain, worn on the head. They differ from HD03 (diadems) primarily in the absence of ornamentation external to the band itself, such as the addition of fillets above the band. There are numerous variations in the representation of headbands on the figurines. They are typically worn low on the head, covering the hairline, or just above the hairline. The nature of the modelling of the figurines renders it difficult to distinguish between bands worn only on the fore part of the head (tiaras), and those encircling the head completely. For this reason no distinction is made in the reconstructions, although it is acknowledged that the two different band types may exist. Headbands were probably constructed using various materials. Evidence from burials shows that they could be made from gold, often pressed, or wood or leather. It is also possible that cloth was used, perhaps as a roll, although this is considerably less likely to have been preserved in the archaeological record.

HD02.01

Description
Unornamented narrow headband worn above the hairline. Hair is shown above and below the band.

Date and provenance
Afrasiab, 5th – 8th century CE.

Type example
RM A19 27

DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD02.01

Description of figurine type(s)
Head fragments only exist of this type variant, belonging to various figurine types. The gender of figures wearing this band is unclear.

Comparative material
The extremely generic nature of this band makes it difficult to find comprehensive comparative material. Various Sasanian period representations of female figures (figs. 111 and 112) show a similarly narrow, unornamented band worn in a similar manner, although on the Sasanian examples the hair is worn long. It is also possible to mention here the headband worn by a female, possibly associated with the Dzhety-asar culture (see fig. 89).
**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD02.02**

*Description of figurine type(s)*

Headband worn across the hairline by a female figure with shoulder length (?) hair, and possibly with the hands clasped the chest.

*Comparative material*

See comments for HD02.01.

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD02.03**

*Description of figurine type(s)*

This headress type variant is associated with a specific group of standing, frontal female figurines characterised by the placement of the hands, with widespread fingers, on the upper stomach, or directly underneath the breasts. The dress of this figure is shown on a complete figurine from Afrasiab. Several schematic vertical lines cover the lower part of the legs and may indicate a Hellenistic dress style, comprising a himation worn over an ankle length dress, although this is unclear.

In some instances the diadem appears to be worn over a shoulder length scarf, while in others, the scarf is less clear, and it possible that hair instead of a scarf is depicted.53

---

53 For a list of the figurines comprising this group see Kidd 2002. One example from this group, KM 03, is important to mention here because of its close associations with the Dalverzin-tepa material. Although the
**Comparative evidence**

There is some variation in the representation of this headdress. The band essentially comprises a wide open V, which frames the forehead. On some examples it appears as though the band is placed over the fringe in a manner similar to Bactrian examples discussed below. This may also be similar to the headdress shown on a figurine from the middle reaches of the Amu Darya (fig.10). On other examples, however, the hair appears to be covered by a scarf, as there are no indications of striations. It is possible that this is a stylistic effect, whereby the artisan has not illustrated the striations of the hair. This is further supported by the fact that the hair is in the same shape and length as on the figurines with striated hair.

Parallels with Bactrian terracottas are significant and may indicate an association with the local, sedentary Bactrian and Sogdian populations. Dalverzin-tepe in particular has yielded numerous examples of a female figure – interpreted as the Great Bactrian Goddess - characterised by a high fringe, typically with a headband ornamented in various styles. Pugachenkova describes this headdress as a “high cap”: “a cap mounted with a radiate semi-circle resting on a rectangular basement with pointed top. An arrow-like pendant descends to the forehead. The ears decorated with drop-like pendants are covered by ear flaps.” A short fringe is visible below the band, while above it the hair radiates out from a central (ill-defined) parting. Many of the Dalverzin-tepe pieces have been stratigraphically dated to the 1st BCE – 1st CE.

**Archaeological evidence**

Reconstructions of a Scythian headdress by Miroshina show a diadem or headband worn over a scarf covering the head.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HD02.04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

figurine is unstratified, the Dalverzin-tepe material allows to date it to the 1st – 2nd century CE. Although the head fragment is well preserved however, the exact headdress or difficult to understand.

54 For example AM 89 2 045 22 (23/7/89).
55 For example Kabanov 1984: fig. 2, 1.
56 Pugachenkova 1978: 35.
57 See for example ibid.: 60, fig. 40; p. 62, figs. 41-3 and p. 167, figs. 116, 1 and 2. See also Ilyasov and Mkrtchien 1991/2: pl. 5.
59 Miroshina 1977: figs. 8, 9 and 11.
DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD02.04

Description of figurine type(s)

Several figurine types are associated with this headdress. They preserve either the entire upper body and head, or just the head. A463 shows a hand modelled upper body attached to the modelled head. The arms are held at chest level, with an unclear attribute held over the shoulder. Other examples preserve only the head, although they clearly belong to a different type. There is also some variation in the size, and possibly the shape, of the beads. This may be a result of the coarser modelling of some examples. For this reason, it was decided not to attempt a further breakdown of the group.

Comparative material

Several comparative examples of headbands ornamented with rings or similar elements at the front are known from Chorasmia. A figurine head fragment from Toprakkala dated to the 5th - 3rd century BCE shows a very narrow band with three evenly spaced cylindrical elements (?) across the front. It appears to be worn over a soft cloth headdress, or at least a high fringe.60 Another example from Bolshaya Aibuiir-kala on the Usturt plateau dated to the 4th - 1st century BCE61 shows a band ornamented with three evenly spaced rings set across the forehead. Lines above the band may indicate the striations of the hair. Alternatively, this could be interpreted as a scarf covering the hair.

| HD02.05* |
| Description | Headband comprising a broad band ornamented with closely spaced circular ring-like elements. The headband is worn above the hairline. A small teardrop shaped pendant is attached to the centre of the headdress, and hangs on the forehead. |
| Date and provenance | Unprovenanced |
| Type example | SA 181 |

DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD02.05*

Description of figurine type(s)

Single head fragment of this type variant. Gender unclear.

Comparative material

Several Sasanian influenced representations of female figures on unprovenanced silver bowls dated to the 6th to 7th centuries show a band tied round the head. It covers

60 Mambetyllaev 1986: 31, fig. 13, 1.
61 Mambetyllaev 1990: 110, fig. 12, 1.
the hairline and continues around the head above the ears and is knotted at the center back of the head (see figs 117 and 118).

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|l|p{10cm}|}
\hline
\textbf{HD02.06}  \\
\hline
\textit{Description} & Headband ornamented with closely spaced circle shapes, worn low on the forehead covering the hairline.  \\
\hline
\textit{Date and provenance} & Tal-i Barzu, c. 2\textsuperscript{nd}-1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE – 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE.  \\
\hline
\textit{Type example} & RMA A181 1399  \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textbf{DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD02.06}

\textit{Description of figurine type(s)}

Female figure with shoulder length hair, parted in the centre and wearing a cloak or kandys over a garment with a broad, ornamented neckline, which may in fact be a torque. An indistinct attribute is held in the left hand at chest level.

\textit{Comparative material}

Comparative examples from within Sogdiana indicate that this headband type variant may be local. A male figurine form Erkurgan dated to the 3\textsuperscript{rd} – 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE wears a narrow band across the top of the head, above the line of the fringe, which is ornamented with small circles shown in relief.\textsuperscript{62} Suleimanov interprets the figure as a king. A seated female figure on a wall painting from Varakhsha wears a very similar style of headband (fig. 126).\textsuperscript{63} It covers the hairline across the forehead, continuing around the head just above the ears. It is ornamented with a single line of circular shapes, possibly representing precious stones. See also the discussion for HD02.05*.

\textsuperscript{62} Suleimanov 2000: fig. 155, 3 and p. 194.

\textsuperscript{63} Illustrated in Lobacheva 1979: 41, fig. 5, 3.
HD02.07

**Description**  Headband in the form of a “roll” with three clips (?) or narrow bands wound vertically around the headdress across the front. It is worn above the hairline.

**Date and provenance**  Afrasiab, TB I. c. 2nd century BCE - 1st century CE.

**Type example**  SA 13

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD02.07**

*Description of figurine type(s)*

A complete example of a figurine of undefined gender preserved in the Tashkent Museum shows it holding a vegetation attribute in the left hand and a circular object in the right hand.  

**Comparative material**

See discussion of type variant HD02.08*.

---

HD02.08*

**Description**  Headdress comprising a roll (?) similar to HD02.07, with a large object worn at the centre front.

**Date and provenance**  Unprovenanced.

**Type example**  A19

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD02.08***

*Description of figurine type(s)*

Preserved head and torso fragments associate the headdress with RM A19 101.  

The preserved examples show a standing female figure wearing a cloak (D01.01.04) over a dress (D04.03.03) and associated with attributes interpreted as flowers and fruit.

**Comparative material**

It is possible to compare the headdress portrayed on a head fragment from Khumbuztepe in southern Chorasmia (fig. 4), associated with a figurine type series.

---

64 S48/107, illustrated in Meshkeris 1968: fig. 2, 6; Mandelshtam 1960: fig. 3, 1. See also RM A19 114 I for a torso fragment of this type series. RM A19 103 probably also belongs to this type series.

65 Meshkeris 1989: fig. 36, 1 shows a reconstruction of a complete figurine. See also fig. 36 1b and 1v.

66 Mambetyllaev 1984: 28, fig. 6, 1.
dated to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} - 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE.\textsuperscript{67} The headdress is interpreted as a turban-like headdress with a knot or band at the front. An unclear rectangular object at the centre front of the headdress, however, may provide a parallel for HD02.08*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>HD02.09</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD02.09**

*Description of figurine type(s)*

Head fragments only. Gender unclear.

*Comparative material*

No comparative material has been found for this type variant. It may represent a local type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>HD02.10</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD02.10**

*Description of figurine type(s)*

Type series comprises head fragments only. Gender unclear.

*Comparative material*

No comparative material has been found for this type variant. It may represent a local type.

\textsuperscript{67} Ibid.: 28.
TYPE HD03 – DIADEMS

Diadems are banded headdresses, which have an ornamental element or elements attached above the band. They differ from HD02 (headbands) in this latter respect. Diadems can be divided into groups on the basis of their shape: diadems with central curvilinear or floral elements, and diadems with triangular fillets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HD03.01*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD03.01*

Description of figurine type(s)

Head fragments only of this type variant exist. These fragments belong to different figurine types.

Comparative material

Similar headdress styles are well represented on the wall paintings of Dilberdzhin68 and on statuary from Hadda (fig. 51).69 Several centers on the northern and southern trade routes skirting the Taklamakan Desert also provide important comparative material, in addition to indicating a Buddhist context for this headdress. Two examples on wooden votive tablets from Dandan Oiluq, dated provisionally to the 7th century CE, show a similar headdress worn by a princess.70 More elaborate examples are known from Qizil. For example a figure on a wall painting from Qizil dated to c. 650 CE shows a highly ornate variation of this headdress, characterised by the large central circular element and worn by a male.71 Another example dated to 600 - 650 CE shows a female wearing a more ornate version again of this type variant.72

---

68 Pugachenkova 1989: 97, fig. 2.
69 Barthoux 2001: pl. 77, c, d; pl. 78, d-f.
70 See Bussagli 1978: 56 and also p. 59.
71 Ibid.: 30.
72 Ibid.: 81.
**HD03.02**

**Description**
A floral motif in the center is placed above a pendant in the form of a circle-rectangle-circle pattern. The floral motif is made up of four elongated leaf shapes (perhaps modeled on the acanthus type), which appear to be leaning slightly forward.

**Date and provenance**
Kafyr-kala, 5th – 8th century CE.

**Type example**
RM A183 604

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD03.02**

**Description of figurine type(s)**
Single example of this type variant preserving only a head fragment.

**Comparative material**
No comparative material has been found for this type variant. See p. 253 for a discussion of the circle-rectangle-circle motif.

---

**HD03.03**

**Description**
Headdress characterised by a narrow band around the base ornamented across the front with three slightly elongated fillets in the form of a semi-ellipse. They are decorated with small, semi-spherical petal-like elements around the edge. The headdress is worn across the upper line of the forehead, above the hairline. Floral elements represented above the fillets (not shown here) are unclear. It is possible that the headband was worn over a scarf, and that the floral elements were attached (perhaps as plaques or woven) to the fabric.

**Date and provenance**
Unprovenanced.

**Type example**
A511

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD03.03**

**Description of figurine type(s)**
Single example of this type variant preserves only a head fragment.
Comparative material

Meshkeris suggests a similarity between this type variant and headdresses worn by figures shown in wall paintings from Varakhsha.\(^{73}\) Another comparable headdress type is found at Panjikent on a wall painting dated to the 8\(^{th}\) century CE, worn on one of the three heads of Veshparker. Here, however, it is shown as a single element, apparently tucked into a cloth headband, and topped with a crescent and sun motif.\(^{74}\) Also noteworthy is the head fragment of a statue from Hadda, dated to the Kushan period (fig. 48). It shows a similar conception of the circular fillets on a narrow band, also with a floral decorative theme demonstrated by the central bud surrounded by petals, which decorate each fillet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HD03.04*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD03.04**

*Description of figurine type(s)*

Single example comprising a head fragment only.

**Comparative material**

Although the basic form of this headdress appears generic, there is little comparative material. One possible comparison may be found in the headdress worn by the central figure at Naqsh-i Rustam III.\(^{75}\)

---

\(^{73}\) Meshkeris 1989: 280.

\(^{74}\) Azarpay 1981: 29, fig. 5.

\(^{75}\) Vanden Berghe 1959: 25, pl. 29b. See also von Gall 1990: pl. 12a-b and 13a-b.
HD03.05*

**Description**
Headdress comprising a band ornamented with single incised vertical lines dividing it into rectangular shapes. Above this are low triangular shaped fillets.

**Date and provenance**
Unprovenanced.

**Type example**
SA 500

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD03.05***

*Description of figurine type(s)*
Several examples comprising head fragments only. These belong to different figurine types, although the crown itself is similar on all examples.

*Comparative material*
See comments for HD03.04*.

HD03.06*

**Description**
Diadem ornamented with teardrop shaped fillets with a circular object on the top. The fillets are placed with the rounded end attached to the diadem and the point projecting up from this.

**Date and provenance**
Unprovenanced

**Type example**
SA 296

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD03.06***

*Description of figurine type(s)*
Single example comprising a head fragment only.

*Comparative material*
Although the preserved evidence of this headdress appears quite schematic, there are nevertheless numerous comparative examples from the Kushano-Sasanian realm for this headdress type variant. A possible prototype may be found on a Parthian period rock relief from Tang-i Sarvak (fig. 57). A crown worn by Warhran I (273 – 276)\(^7\) shows similarly shaped fillets, together with a large globe in the center. Royal female figures

\(^7\) Gobl 1971: pl. 3, 40-45. See also Borisov and Lukonin 1963: 14, fig. 1.
wearing a similar type of diadem are also known in the Sasanian world. One example, dated to between 306 and 350 CE, exhibits a narrow base with four preserved flutes positioned slightly above it. It is worn loosely on the hair, the fringe visible underneath.

77 Goldman 1997: T16.
TYPE HD04 CROWNS

HD04.05

HD04.04

HD04.03

HD04.02

HD04.01
**Type HD04 Crowns**

Crowns are defined essentially according to shape. There are two main varieties of crowns – calathus crowns and crowns characterised by a narrow base with vertical rectangular fillets. Such headdresses are typically associated with persons of higher or distinguished rank.

---

**HD04.01**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Small low crown worn on top of the head in the form of a kalaf. The base band is very narrow, while the body of the crown is semi-circular and appears to be ornamented with a single, wavy line, possibly forming triangular shapes with rounded or bulging sides.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and provenance</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type example</td>
<td>A767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion of Type Variant HD04.01**

*Description of figurine type(s)*

Single example comprising a head fragment only. Evidence of a moustache indicates a male wearer.

**Comparative material**

There are several comparative examples of this headdress type from Sogdiana and neighbouring Bactria. A figurine from Erkurgan, dated to the 3rd – 4th century CE\(^78\) shows a headdress with a wide base worn across the upper part of the forehead, although this may also be understood as a soft cap. Suleimanov interprets it as a kalaf.\(^79\) A similar style of headdress is worn by a female figure, identified as Tyche-Oanindo, on a Bactrian falar.\(^80\) Here it is shown worn in a similar manner, set back and worn in the center of the head. A plaque fragment from Panjikent, dated to the 6th – 7th century CE, although only partially preserving the head, may also be compared with the Hermitage fragment.\(^81\) Finally, a similar type is also portrayed on a female figure comprising part of a portrait of a royal Kushan-Sasanian or “Huna” couple (fig. 108).\(^82\) Callieri suggests the portrait may be Kidarite and dates it to the end of the 4th or beginning of the 5th century CE, noting Sasanian influence on the headdress.\(^83\)

---

\(^78\) Suleimanov 2000: 191 and fig. 150, 1.

\(^79\) Ibid.: 191.

\(^80\) Pugachenkova 1971: pl. 117.

\(^81\) Meshkeris 1989: 268, fig. 161.

\(^82\) See for example Callieri 1997: pl. 65, U7.43. Unknown provenance.

\(^83\) Ibid.: 231-2.
HD04.02*

**Description**
Crown comprising high, narrow rectangular shaped fillets with a point on the top and a small circle on each point.

**Date and provenance**
Unprovenanced

**Type example**
A250

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD04.02**

*Description of figurine type(s)*
Head fragments only preserve this type variant. Gender is unclear.

*Comparative material*
See discussion for HD04.03*.

HD04.03*

**Description**
Crown comprising high, narrow rectangular shaped fillets with a point on the top.

**Date and provenance**
Unprovenanced

**Type example**
A549

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD04.03**

*Description of figurine type(s)*
One head fragment only preserves this type variant.

*Comparative material*
The peaked flutes of this headdress are typically interpreted as solar symbols, associated with a number of different regions and styles. A similar iconographic element is found on Kushan and Sasanian coins, specifically during the rule of Phraates IV, on Mithra at Nimrud Dagh, and on the sculpture of Ardashir II (379 – 383) at Taq-i Bustan. A similar style of fluting is also found on a head fragment attached to a ceramic handle from Tal-i Barzu. On this example there is a band around the base of the crown, which is ornamented with evenly spaced circular shapes. This is also similar to a Sasanian

---

84 Herzfeld 1941: 299, fig. 393.
85 Location of this fragment is unknown. It is photographed in the unpublished dissertation of Grigor'ev, G. V. *Tali Barzu kak Pamyatnik Dokushanskogo Sogda*. Archive of the LOIA, F. 35, op. 2. See also Grigor'ev 1940b: fig. 4b and Meshkeris 1989: 163, fig. 69.
The Sasanian king Narseh (293 - 302) shown on the relief at Naqsh-i Rustam IV also wears a similar fluted crown.

**HD04.04**

**Description**

Multi-arched crown, the arches sitting on a base and decorated with a point in the centre of each arch. The base of the crown is also decorated with closely positioned vertical lines. The crown is worn loosely on the top of the head, leaving open the fringe and the long plaits or curls framing the sides of the face.

**Date and provenance**

Afrasiab

**Type example**

A183 366

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD04.04**

**Description of figurine type(s)**

Female figure with a naked (?) torso and wearing a garment draped around the legs. The gender of the wearer is unclear: despite the breasts, the pose is typically one of a male ruler. The figurine appears to combine two known iconographic types from Sogdiana: parallels for the headdress come from a number of figurines from Erkurgan while variations on the lower body are from a number of figurines, from Paykand (fig. 16) and also from Margiana. For full discussion of this figurine type see Trousers UD D07.05.

**Comparative material**

The best comparative evidence for this headdress type variant comes from a series of terracotta figurines from Er-kurgan dated to the end of the 5th – beginning of the 6th CE. The canonic image shows the figure holding a sword held in the left hand, the point placed on the ground between slightly spread legs. The long hair on the temples can be compared with Sasanian examples. The figurines are thought to portray a male ruler figure. A similar figurine found at Paykend (fig. 16) has been dated to the 5th – 6th century CE. This evidence suggests that the headdress was well known in the broader territory of Sogdiana.

---

86 Hinz 1969: 203, pl. 123.
87 Suleimanov and Isamiddinov 1990.
88 Semenov and Mirzaakhmedov 2000: fig. 2.
89 Koshelenko 1985: tbl. CVI, 6.
90 Suleimanov and Isamiddinov 1990.
91 Lukonin 1971: 155.
92 Suleimanov and Isamiddinov 1990: 55. See also Suleimanov 2000: 214.
93 Semenov and Mirzaakhmedov 2000: fig. 2.
HD04.05

Description | Structured headdress worn high on the head, possibly similar to a calathus crown. The top of the headdress is slightly rounded, perhaps indicating a soft material. Two horizontal bands of ornamentation are wrapped around the circular shaped headdress. The lower band is a chain of oval shapes, while the upper one is a zigzag line.

Date and provenance | Tal-i Barzu

Type example | RM A181 1238

Discussion of type variant HD04.05

Description of figurine type(s)

Headdress worn by a male (?) figure wearing a shirt with a deep V neck and holding both hands over the lower stomach.

Comparative material

This type of crown, known as a calathus after the Greek term, was widespread throughout the Greek influenced art of Scythia (fig. 106), in particular in the western Eurasian Steppes. Jacobsen suggests, however, that the Scythian version of this headdress did not necessarily derive from a Greek or western Asian prototype but from a broader Scytho-Siberian context. According to Jacobson, “the true Scythian crown...is essentially a form of the calathus, a head-dress distinguished by its high body and widened upper section”. The shape of the calathus crown itself is also known from the Achaemenid reliefs. For example on a relief from the Apadana a Persian is shown wearing a fluted crown of a similar shape.

In both the Western Asiatic world of the Black Sea, and the eastern end of the Steppe, the calathus is associated with a number of divine female figures. The headdress of the seated figure on the Pazyryk wall hanging (fig. 122), although not distinctly of the calathus shape, may nevertheless represent a schematised version of this headdress. Scythian examples, discussed below, are well known from finds burials such as Bolshoi Bliznitz’i.

While the calathus crown is widespread in the Scythian world during the 4th – 2nd century BCE, in the immediate Sogdian context there are few parallels. In particular a

---

94 The shape of this crown is comparable with modern ethnographic evidence of headdresses from the Tekke Turkmen in Turkmenistan shows the construction of similar shaped traditional headdresses (Prokot and Prokot 1981: 48, fig. 69 (Pl. XII, 124 in this thesis)). The possibility of both types variants in antiquity should therefore be considered.
96 Ibid.: 140.
97 Godard, A. 1965: pl. 55.
figurine from Afrasiab\(^98\) wears a highly ornamented calathus crown comparable with the Scythian crowns discussed below. The poorly preserved lower part of a copper incense burner from Dzhar-tepe shows a cultic scene in which the upper parts of four figures are preserved.\(^99\) One of these figures, although partly corroded, shows a female wearing what appears to be a calathus crown, however, there are various conflicting figurative and descriptive interpretations of this image.\(^100\) A fragment of a wooden frieze from Kalai-Kalaha in Ustrushana shows a headdress of similar shape, however with different decoration.\(^101\) A possible comparison from the middle reaches of the Amu Darya may also be cited (fig. 15). It appears to be three tiered, with ornamentation on the center tier.

Ethnographic parallels may be mentioned in regard to an alternate interpretation of this headdress. For example, a headdress worn by modern Tekke-Turkmen females (figs 124 and 125) shows a plate of various sizes worn at the front of the head only, attached to a soft base.\(^102\) When seen from the front, it is not easy to discern the difference between such a plate and a headdress such as a calathus crown.

**Archaeological evidence**

Highly ceremonial Scythian headdresses are often calathus crowns, consisting of a number of decorative bands, probably attached to a soft fabric base (similar perhaps to fig. 106). Jacobsen suggests that the base of these headdresses may have been constructed from reeds and leather, which were then covered in gold foil.\(^103\) A kurgan at Bolshoi Bliznitz’i has preserved the remains of a female, buried with a similar shaped headdress.\(^104\) It is divided into three decorated tiers. The base and upper tier are ornamented with a geometric pattern. The middle tier is much broader and shows a mythological scene. The dating of the burial is uncertain, probably between the 4th and 2nd BCE, although the contents reflect an earlier period.

The calathus crown is typically associated with the Scythian world, and, together with the high pointed headdress,\(^105\) is typically associated with divine female figures. Nevertheless, the figurine on which this headdress is preserved is probably male. Although not a satisfying conclusion to draw, as has been seen above with the kandys, the cross-over between genders for some garments is not unknown, and until there is more evidence to discuss either this figurine type or the headdress type variant, it is difficult to add to this.

\(^98\) RM A19 276, photographed in Meshkeris 1962: tbl. 8, 83 and 84. The location of this mould is unknown. See also the illustration of SA 870 in Meshkeris 1989: 119, fig. 27, 1b.

\(^99\) Berdimuradov and Samibaev 1994: 100, fig. 4.

\(^100\) See for example the Abdullaev and Berdimuradov 1991: 66, fig. 2 and Beridimuradov 1994: 100, fig. 4.

\(^101\) Marshak and Negamov 1996: 270, fig. 43.

\(^102\) See for example Prokot and Prokot 1981: 40, fig. 58.

\(^103\) Jacobsen 1995: 143.

\(^104\) Rostovtzeff, M. 1917: 72. See also Miroshina 1980: 33.

\(^105\) See HD01.04.
**TYPE HD05 - HEADSCARVES**

Headscarves are portrayed in various individual manners on figurines from the Samarkand region. Modern ethnographic evidence confirms a diverse manner of wearing headscarves in this region, attributing such variations to a number of factors, including geographic region, the rite with which they are associated and the age of the wearer.\(^{106}\)

### HD05.01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th>Turban-like headdress worn slightly lower on the head, covering the fringe, but leaving the hair open on the sides of the face.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
<td>Tal-i Barzu, TB I c. 2(^{nd}) BCE - 1(^{st}) CE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
<td>RM A180 2338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD05.01**

**Description of figurine type(s)**

Numerous figurines representing the same type, are associated with this type variant. They are characterised by the position of their hands on the lower stomach and their dress, comprising a tunic (D05.02.03) worn over fitted trousers (D07.04.01).

**Comparative material**

The exact manner of folding and wrapping for this headdress is unclear, however, characteristic of all examples is the protruding, slightly bulbous, fold at the front. Modern ethnographic evidence from Samarkand suggests that the turban headdress was constructed from a number of pieces of fabric tied and wrapped in a specific manner to reflect nationality and social status. Differences in the shape and length of the fabric, together with the colour and manner of wearing are also important identity markers.\(^{107}\) The manner of wearing, or more specifically, tying, this headscarf may be specific to the Samarkand region.

---

\(^{106}\) Sukhareva 1982: 302ff.
\(^{107}\) Sukhareva 1954: 302 ff. for general descriptions of the headdresses worn by women in various regions of Central Asia.
HD05.02

Description
Scarf tied into a complicated knot, which sits high on the head. The actual manner of wearing the scarf is not always clear as the line between the hair and the head scarf is ill defined. However, common to all examples is a very clearly formed band (not shown on the schematised illustration), typically interpreted as hair, which curls into the cheek on either side of the face just above the chin, and characterised by a small gap in the center of the forehead. This band forms a perfect frame for the face. Lightly incised horizontal lines fill the inside of this. This is then framed by another line demarcating the hair from the headdress. From this interpretation it appears that the headdress is worn slightly back on the hair, leaving the front part free, and covering the rear part, almost down to the middle of the neck. Numerous closely spaced lines probably indicate the folds of the material where it has been pulled up, suggesting that it was of lightweight material.

Date and provenance
Afrasiab, c. 2nd-1st century BCE - 4th century CE.

Type example
SA 47

Discussion of type variant HD05.02

Description of figurine type(s)
Only head fragments showing this type variant are known. A reconstruction of this type is given by Meshkeris. The statuettes associated with this headdress type variant have been dated to the "Kushan" period, and Meshkeris associates their headdress specifically with female fertility.

Comparative material
This headdress has also been described as the "bow" headdress and has been the focus of a special study by Meshkeris, where it is illustrated by numerous variations.

108 A photograph of one of these heads shows it attached to the body of another figurine. See Abdullaev, Rveladze et al. 1991 v. I:172, figs 265 and 266. It should be noted that this is a reconstruction, and that the head and body are separate. K. Abdullaev pers. comm.
109 Meshkeris 1979a: fig. 1, 6.
110 Ibid.: 16-17. See also Sukhareva 1982: 83-4 who discusses the fertility aspect of this headdress in the context of modern ethnographic evidence.
111 Meshkeris 1979a: fig. 1. This type of headdress is particularly well documented in ethnographic literature. According to this evidence, the tied headdress was typically worn over a cap (Sukhareva 1982: 82) or a separate piece of fabric (Sukhareva 1982: 85). The second piece of fabric could also be worn over
Similar bow or turban headdresses are also documented in Choresmia. While the apparent deep antiquity of this headdress style is recognised by Meshkeris, a closer possible source of influence on the Sogdian style may be the Parthian Empire.

For example, a female statue from Palmyra (fig. 60) provides a clear comparison with the manner of wearing this headdress, and also a similar means of representing the hair. The hair is swept back from the face, the striations clearly marked. A headband is visible at the centre of the forehead, however, the hair covers this band at either side. The headscarf is worn in the form of a turban, sitting across the top of the headband and enveloping the swept up hair on either side of the head.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HD05.03*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headdress comprises an apparently stylised variation of the &quot;bow&quot; headresses. The knot is rendered as a geometric square shape positioned in the centre of the headress, with a deep depression in the middle of this. On either side of the &quot;knot&quot; appear to be the ends of the scarf. On the right hand side there are two clear sections, while on the left, the ends of the scarf are less clear. Nevertheless, on both sides attempts at a realistic portrayal of the folds of the material have been made with the addition of incised lines. It is possible that the hair on either side of the head is also covered by the scarf, and the face is framed with a narrow band. Alternatively, this &quot;band&quot; represents the hair that frames the face, in which case the headdress covers only the top of the forehead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD05.03***

*Description of figurine type(s)*

One incompletely preserved head fragment only represents this type variant.

**Comparative material**

See discussion above for HD05.02.
**HD05.04**

*Description*
Scarf tied as a low bow, with a small circle indicating the central knot. It is worn on the top of the head only, leaving the hair free to frame the face.

*Date and provenance*
Afrasiab, c. 2nd-1st century BCE - 4th century CE.

*Type example*
RM A19 39

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD05.04**

*Description of figurine type(s)*
Only head fragments preserve this headdress type variant.

*Comparative material*
See discussion above for HD05.02.

---

**HD05.05**

*Description*
Scarf fastened with small rectangular pendant at centre front. The line across the top of the headdress may be a fold line over the hair. The hair is completely covered by the headscarf, which is ornamented with a rectangular shaped object, possibly a brooch, on the front of the headdress, and which may assist in holding in place the forehead ornamentation. The forehead ornamentation is detailed with both dotted and straight lines.

*Date and provenance*
Unprovenanced

*Type example*
A381

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD05.05**

*Description of figurine type(s)*
Only head fragments of this type variant exist.

*Comparative material*
This type variant has been discussed by Meshkeris\(^{114}\) and Mandelshtam\(^{115}\) who interpret it as a variation of the turban headdress, characterised by a bow and interpreting

---

\(^{114}\) Meshkeris 1979a.
the forehead decoration as hair. They date it to the Kushan period. Nevertheless, while
the markings on the forehead of HD05.05* and HD05.06* are often referred to as hair,116
careful observation suggests that they may in fact represent forehead ornamentation. The
markings comprise four lines. The upper line, closest to the edge of the headdress
comprises very small dots tracing a line from each temple to the centre of the forehead in
the form of an elongated S, positioned on its side. Below this dotted line is a solid line,
tracing the same shape as the line above. Two similar dotted lines are below this solid
line. If the markings are accepted as forehead ornamentation, it is possible that they were
held in place by a band, perhaps hidden under the headscarf. Other examples of forehead
decoration from Sogdiana are found on two figurines from Nakhshab dated to the 3rd – 5th
century CE, which show a small semi-circular pendant on the forehead.117

There are rare examples of forehead markings on terracottas from the Samarkand
region, including a small rectangular plaque118 and a tear drop shaped pendant.119 Facial
markings on the cheeks and occasionally on the chin, however, are not unusual,
especially on statuettes dating to between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century
CE.120 Jacobsen has suggested that although there was a strong tradition of forehead
decoration in the Near East, evidence from burials in the Scythian world suggests that the
tradition was very widespread and need not have originated from there.121 This is echoed
by Levina in her discussion of evidence regarding headdresses found in the Dzhetys-asar
burials, highlighting that beading attached to the front of the headdress and covering the
forehead was very common.122 Typical of almost all of the female burials from this
region for which evidence exists to discuss forehead ornamentation is the presence of
"soft" headdresses (perhaps headscarves), of red silk or bright pink cotton, with beading
attached to the front.123

Numerous parallels for forehead decoration are found at Palmyra.124 A statue
from Palmyra, dated to the early 3rd century CE, is significant as it shows that the
forehead ornamentation worn together with a headscarf wrapped around the head and
with a brooch or similar pendant at the centre front.125 Other examples show chains of
small precious stones worn in various manners, attached either to a headband or to the
headdress worn above this. The exact method of attaching the forehead ornamentation to
the headdress is unclear, however, it would seem that it was attached either on the inside
or the outside of the headdress or headband.126 Musche suggests that there do not appear
to be any rules regarding the wearing of this type of ornamentation, commenting that it

115 Mandel'shtam 1960.
117 Suleimanov 2000: pl. 157, 4 and discussion on p. 210. He also refers to the Airtam harpists and some
Bactrian goddesses.
118 For example SA 68.
119 For example SA 181 (HD02.05*).
120 Examples include RM A181 1399, RM A19 88 and RM A36 26.
121 Jacobsen 1995: 144.
122 Levina 1996: 215 and illustrations on p. 308, fig. 113, 1 and p. 309, fig. 114, 2.
123 Ibid.: 215.
124 Musche 1988: 32. See pl. 3, 1.2.1 – 1.3.4. See also pl. 5.
125 Colledge 1976: pl. 89.
126 Musche 1988: 30. Ethnographic sources from Sogdiana show that during the late 19th century a forehead
piece was attached to a scarf at the top of the head, and fell over the front of the head and the forehead. See
for example Kalter and Pavaloi 1997: pl. 615.
was probably dependent on a number of different factors such as personal taste and, of course, economy.\textsuperscript{127} Colledge notes that the use of forehead ornamentation, as an extension of the wearing of the diadem, arose after c. 150 CE.\textsuperscript{128} The Palmyrian examples provide a context in which to better understand this type of headdress in the Samarkand region.

**HD05.06*\**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Headscarf covers the hair completely. For description of facial ornamentation see above, HD05.05*.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and provenance</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type example</td>
<td>SA 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD05.06*\**

**Description of figurine type(s)**

Only head fragments of this type variant exist.

**Comparative material**

See discussion of HD05.05* above.

Scarf folded with flap at the front. The exact form, wrapping and fastening of this headdress is unclear. A flap of material appears to have been bought forward from behind the head, and tucked (?) underneath the headdress at the front. A horizontal line across the front of the headdress, which runs underneath the front flap, may indicate a fold line of the material. The headdress is worn loosely on top of the hair, which frames the face and appears in several examples to be curled at the sides of the face. Two ornamentation groups have been defined for this type variant:

**HD05.07.01\**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No ornamentation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date and provenance</td>
<td>Afrasiab, c. 2\textsuperscript{nd}-1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE – 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type example</td>
<td>RM A36 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{127} Musche 1988: 33.

\textsuperscript{128} Colledge 1976: 97.
**HD05.07.02***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th>Small circles ornament the front fold along the base of the headdress. These possibly indicate beading or similar ornamentation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
<td>A380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD05.07**

*Description of figurine type(s)*

Only head fragments preserve ornamentation group HD05.07.02*. HD05.07.01 however, is preserved on a number of figurine types, including that of a standing figure in a niche, wearing a cloak and holding attributes in each hand at chest level.¹²⁹

*Comparative material*

A similar style of headscarf to HD05.07.01 is shown on a figurine from Khumbuztepe in southern Chorasmia, dated to the 2nd – 3rd century CE.¹³⁰ According to Vorob’eva, this style of headdress, described as a “turban like image tied with a knot to tie at the front”,¹³¹ originates from north-west India where it is portrayed on Gandharan sculpture of the Kushan period. Similar types of headdresses were found at Koi Krylgan kala on fully preserved figurines of a female figure interpreted as Anahita (see fig. 3).¹³² HD05.07.01 also finds numerous similarities among statue heads from Hadda, although here they are all worn low on the head, covering the fringe, but still leaving the hair at the sides of the head open.¹³³ Here the construction of the headscarf is clearer, giving a better understanding of the folding. These examples also show the frontal ornamentation so clearly demonstrated on HD05.07.02*.

General comparative material from Erkurgan manifests a similar type, dated to the 1st – 2nd century CE.¹³⁴ Suleimanov notes similar examples from the region to the west of Bukhara and suggests that the type represents the aristocratic female headdress of the Saka.¹³⁵

---

¹²⁹ See for example Meshkeris 1989: 130, fig. 36, 1g and 1v.

¹³⁰ Mambetyllaev 1984: 28, fig. 6, 1 and discussion on p. 34.

¹³¹ Ibid.: 34.

¹³² Tolstov and Vainberg 1967: tbl. 29, 38, 40.

¹³³ Barthoux 2001 See especially pl. 79. See also pl. 84, e, interpreted as the “head of a deity”.

¹³⁴ Suleimanov 2000: pl. 146, 3.

¹³⁵ Ibid.: 203 compares them with figurines in Meshkeris 1989: 117 – 118. Suleimanov also draws parallels with the headgear worn by Indo-Parthian kings and also Vima Kadphises on his coins. See also Gobli 1984: pl. 4, 2.
Description
Headscarf tied in the form of a rectangular shaped headdress characterised by horizontal lines meeting diagonal lines indicating a complex folding of material. The contained shape of the headdress suggests that it did not comprise only of a piece or pieces of folded fabric, but possibly had some sort of structure underneath to give it the rectangular shape. Small spherical shaped ornaments are attached vertically across the lower edge of the headdress, decorating the forehead.

Date and provenance
Unstratified

Type example
Trever 1934: pl. 13, 191.

Discussion of type variant HD05.08*

Description of figurine type(s)
Only head fragments of this type variant exist. No indications of gender are preserved on these fragments.

Comparative evidence
The form of this headdress is unclear. Similar shaped headdresses are known from those worn by members of the royal suite portrayed on the Afrasiab wall paintings, in addition to a bone figurine from Seleucia on the Tigris (see fig. 123), where the headdress is worn very high on the head, perhaps indicating a structured form rather than just a scarf. Another interpretation is possible. A headdress worn by Tekke Turkmen women (fig. 124) shows a rectangular metal plate attached to a soft base, and worn at the fore of the head only. The plate is often decorated with incised lines forming geometric or floral patterns and inlaid carnelian. When viewed frontally, it is difficult to judge the shape of the plate. Additionally, some examples show a similar style of forehead ornamentation to that of HD05.08*.

136 For example the leader of a group of three male figures on the western wall. See Al'baum 1975: 21, fig. 4, 1.
Type HD06 Winged Headresses
TYPE HD06 - WINGED HEADDRESSES

Vast quantities of Sasanian coins, rock cut reliefs and silver vessels depicting the king and his entourage in various activities, especially hunting and banqueting, are well preserved and have been a focus of scholarly research for a century. That each king wore a crown designed especially for him, and that his family also wore specific crowns, has rendered the issue of Sasanian chronology in many cases much more secure than in contiguous regions. While the spread of the motif of the winged crown in its numerous guises into surrounding regions potentially facilitates the establishment of a more secure chronology, in the Sogdian case this is frustrated by local interpretations and additions to the recognised Sasanian repertoire. Traits characteristic of specific Sasanian kings are often combined on the Samarkand region terracottas to form a new crown type, thereby hampering attempts at dating. The crowns examined here reflect the eclectic mix of local and Iranian artistic and cultural elements in the art of Sogdiana.

The winged headdress comprises two main elements: the wings on either side of the crown and the central, usually circular, element between the wings. Both of these motifs may be associated with solar symbols, while the wings in particular may also be associated with the heavens. In Achaemenid Iran these symbols were connected with Ahura Mazda, while in Sasanian Iran they were associated with Verethraghna, the Iranian god of Victory. The winged crown in Sasanian art also symbolised the deified state of the wearer - usually the king, but sometimes members of his immediate family are also portrayed in the winged crown.

Winged crowns on terracottas from Afrasiab located in the Tashkent Museum have been discussed by Zaslavskaya. Zaslavskaya established six groups based on the differences in details of the crowns, such as the shape of the central element and the wings (fig. 36). The winged crowns discussed here add to this group. An important difference in the execution of the crowns is that while in Sasanian art they are represented in profile, on the examples examined in this thesis they are always represented frontally. It is therefore easy to misinterpret details of the crowns. For this reason, no ornamentation groups are defined for winged headdresses, despite the fact that the characteristic elements for each type variant are very similar. Only general parallels have been found for winged headdresses HD06.01 - HD06.07*. These will be discussed together after HD06.07*.

138 Ibid.: 64-5.
139 Zaslovskaya 1971.
140 These groups are illustrated in Abdullaev 1990: 63, fig. 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>HD06.01</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Winged headdress characterised by a narrow single tiered base, divided into small rectangular sections, and an unornamented central “crescent”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
<td>Afrasiab 5th - 8th century CE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
<td>RM A19 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of figurine type(s)**

Head fragments only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>HD06.02</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Winged headdress characterised by the central crescent resting on a single pearl in the centre of the band.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
<td>SA 215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of figurine type(s)**

Head fragments only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>HD06.03</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Winged headdress characterised by two pearls, resting on the base, support the central crescent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and provenance</strong></td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type example</strong></td>
<td>A152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of figurine type(s)**

Head fragments only preserve this headdress type variant.
HD06.04*

**Description**
Headdress with a central crescent resting on a double pearl and “wings” supported on low pedestals on either side of the central crescent.

**Date and provenance**
Unprovenanced

**Type example**
A53

**Description of figurine type(s)**
Head fragment only.

HD06.05*

**Description**
Winged headdress characterised by a triangular centre piece and the absence of a central crescent. Wings emanate from the upper edges of the triangle. The centre piece is ornamented with a rectangular shaped object on the centre. A ‘ribbon’ (?) flows on either side of the face. It is possible that this represents the hair, however, it appears to continue in a single line over the forehead, thereby framing either side of the face.

**Date and provenance**
Unprovenanced

**Type example**
SA 208

**Description of figurine type(s)**
Head fragments only.

---

141 Similar “ribbons” framing the sides of the face are preserved on a head fragment in the Veselovski collection. See Trever 1934: pl. 8, 111.
HD06.06*

Description  Winged headdress with a very large central crescent ornamented with a floral (?) motif in the center. The crescent sits on two pearls, which form the point from which the wings fan out to either side.

Date and provenance  Unprovenanced

Type example  SA 207

Description of figurine type(s)  A single head fragment of a figurine shows this headdress type variant.

HD06.07*

Description  Winged headdress characterised by a large crescent shape on either side of the head, forming a base from which the wing motifs emanate. Underneath each base is an elongated S shape, the tail of which curls into the centre of the base, while the head, curling in on itself, stretches vertically into the centre of the headdress. Directly above the head of each S is a line of three circles. Below this, and in between the head of each S, is a small, semi-ellipse form. Other smaller swirls around the tail of each S and underneath the wing bases frame the forehead. The overall impression is one of a complicated floral motif, which, taken as a whole, appears almost to represent two swans facing each other.

Date and provenance  Unprovenanced

Type example  A516

DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANTS HD06.01 - HD06.07*

Description of figurine type(s)  A single head fragment showing this type variant exists.
Comparative material

HD06.01 finds some similarities with a figurine from Budrach. According to Ilyasov this is a Hephthalite headdress, with strong Sasanian influence. Another figurine from Budrach dated to the 6th - 7th century shows a winged headdress, somewhat coarser, with a central triangular piece at the front similar to HD06.05* (fig. 35). The unprovenanced example from the Hermitage shows a higher quality of modeling, and also differences in the manner of representing the "wings", in addition to the "ribbons" framing the face. Headdresses with triangular centre pieces are not common. A headband from Palmyra provides a rare comparative piece (figs. 58 and 59).

A similar crown to HD06.04* is depicted on a wall painting fragment from Pendjikent, dated to the first quarter of the 8th century. The central crescent is quite small, and appears to be placed on a triangular shaped object with a small pearl on the central point. The wings are also set in a slightly arched base ornamented with the pearl motif. Similar shaped crowns are found at Taq-i Bustan (figs 62 and 64) and Isfahan (fig. 63). This style of crown is associated in particular with a number of Sasanian royal families, beginning with Xusro II (590/1 – 628). Although there are significant differences, such as the crown base and the absence of the pearls, and the presence of the “mural” motif, the styling of the wings is comparable. Similar crowns are also worn by Peroz (459 – 484), Hormizd IV (579 – 590), Xusro V (631 – 633), Ardasher III (628 – 630) and Yazdgard III (632 – 651).

### HD06.08

| **Description** | Headdress characterised by a large curvilinear shape bent to the right. The “wings” on either side of this, portrayed by narrow individual lines, rest on a narrow rectangular base, and also lean to the right. The foremost line on the right hand side of each wing is differentiated by a double line. |
| **Date and provenance** | Afrasiab 5th - 8th century CE. |
| **Type example** | RM A19 82 |

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD06.08**

**Description of figurine type(s)**

Headdress type variant is represented on figurines of various iconographic types from Sogdiana. The example from the Samarkand region documented in the Samarkand Museum shows the chest and head of a warrior figure holding an animal at face level in the open palm of the left hand.

---

143 Ibid.: 196.
144 Abdullaev, Rtveladze et al. 1991, v. II: 13, fig. 364.
146 Göbl 1971: tbl. XII - XIII.
Comparative material

The iconographical elements associated with this figure are well known from terracotta plaques and the Pendjikent wall paintings.\textsuperscript{147} An unprovenanced ossuary located in the Tashkent Museum, dated to the 6\textsuperscript{th} - 7\textsuperscript{th} centuries CE,\textsuperscript{148} shows a seated deity wearing what appears to be a similar headdress. The scene involves two deities, judging the soul of the deceased.\textsuperscript{149} Mode has discussed the imagery associated with a figure depicted in the same crown as the one represented here, and associated it with the Sogdian "camel god".\textsuperscript{150} The iconography of this figure is generally associated with a warrior figure and an animal – not necessarily a camel. The crown shown on the Samarkand region terracottas is slightly different to that portrayed on other representations of this deity and may reflect a local headdress style.

A plaque fragment preserving the head and upper body of a figure was recently found at Afrasiab portraying a similar type of headdress and iconography.\textsuperscript{151} Here however, the right "wing" curves inwards, towards the central object, while that on the left, although not as well preserved, appears to curve out, to the left. A peacock is held in the palm of the left hand. Comparative evidence also shows a sword, which, together with the peacock, has led scholars to suggest an association between this figure and the Hindu god Karttikeya, the god of young warriors.\textsuperscript{152} The central motif of the crown on this figure appears to be a bird holding a circular object in its mouth, and a Sasanian link has been suggested.\textsuperscript{153} Grenet has suggested that the image represents a syncretism between Verethraghna-Wahram (the Iranian god of Victory) and Karttikeya.\textsuperscript{154} Although the clothing of the figure, of which only the chest and head are preserved, is completely different, the position of the bird, and the headdress, are quite similar. Both have the central object facing to the right, the narrow base of the headdress sitting loosely on the head, the thick hair covering the ear, and a circular earring. HD06.08 is well known from Sogdiana, in particular from Afrasiab and Panjikent.

ZOOMORPHIC WINGED HEADDRESSES

There are two unprovenanced examples of winged headdresses associated with zoomorphs. These are dated by Meshkeris to the 5\textsuperscript{th} – 8\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{155}

\textsuperscript{147} Marshak 1990: 303, fig. 13.
\textsuperscript{148} Illustrated in Marshak and Raspopova 1994: 18, fig. 22.
\textsuperscript{149} Cf., Ibid.: 18.
\textsuperscript{150} Mode, M. 1991/2.
\textsuperscript{151} The plaque fragment is now located in the Samarkand Institute of Archaeology, Afr 2000 P15/10 L40. It was found in the trench of Olga Inevatkina in the pre-Islamic palace to the east of the citadel during the 2000 season directed by Frantz Grenet. I am grateful to Frantz Grenet for allowing me to discuss it here.
\textsuperscript{152} Frantz Grenet, pers. comm. 23/12/03.
\textsuperscript{153} Pers. comm. 23/12/03.
\textsuperscript{154} Meshkeris 1989: 193.
HD06.09*

**Description**
Headdress comprising a double tiered band, on top of which sits the indistinct figure of an animal.

**Date and provenance**
Unprovenanced

**Type example**
SA 205

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD06.09**

See discussion below.

HD06.10*

**Description**
Winged headdress comprising a double tiered band with the wing elements set symmetrically on the band. The base of the each wing element is characterised by a clear semi-circle, and an indistinct zoomorphic figure in the centre of the crown.

**Date and provenance**
Unprovenanced

**Type example**
SA 206

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANTS HD06.09* AND HD06.10**

*Description of figurine type(s)*

Head fragments only represent these type variants.

*Comparative material*

Numismatic and textual sources show that zoomorphic crowns are associated with Sasanian rulers. They are also represented on some Napki coins of the 5th century CE associated with the ruler of the Khingla line who ruled from K-pi_. Zoomorphic figures are shown on the crowns of several Sasanian rulers including Ardasher I (224 – 241) and Sapur I (241 – 272). Crowns worn by Wahram II (276 – 293) and his family portray the head and neck of an animal with pointed ears, or horns. Göbl

---

156 See for example Grenet 2003: 217.
159 Ibid.: table II.
160 Ibid.: table IV.
interprets this as either a horned horse or a boar's head while Mode has interpreted it as a Senmurv. Nevertheless, in consideration of Wahram II's namesake, Verethraghna-Wahram, it is more likely that this animal is a hoak, one of the seven animal incarnations of this god. Finally, a rather diminished eagles head (?) is found on a crown of Hormizd II (303 – 309). Zoomorphic crowns are worn by both kings and crown princes, and queens in the Sasanian world. In most cases it is not possible to define a gender for the Samarkand figurines portrayed in a winged headdress.

Chinese sources also directly refer to the use of a crown distinguished by a bull or fish head by rulers of local principalities in Sogdiana. For example, in the Suishi the ruler of the principality of Cao is described as wearing a crown characterised by a fish head while in the Beishi and the Tongdian the ruler's crown is described as representing a bulls head. While HD06.09* and HD06.10* are unprovenanced, they would perhaps not be out of place in Sogdiana.

161 Ibid.: 44.
163 I am grateful to Frantz Grenet for drawing my attention to this.
165 Cf., Ibid.
**TYPE HD07 – HELMETS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HD07.01</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Undecorated semi-circular helmet slightly dipped on either side at the front, and rising slightly in the centre. The fringe is shown underneath, spreading to either side from a central part.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date and provenance</td>
<td>Afrasiab, c. 4th century CE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type example</td>
<td>RM A505 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION OF TYPE VARIANT HD07.01**

*Description of figurine type(s)*

Complete plaque representing a standing, frontally represented warrior figure wearing a plate armour skirt (D12.02) and a harness over the chest (D11.02). Loose flowing trousers are worn under the armour skirt. The right arm is bent sharply at the elbow, the hand holding a short sword is positioned over the right shoulder. The left hand is held at the side of the body, holding an indistinct attribute, perhaps the head of a horned animal.\(^{166}\) Alternatively it is possible to see this as a floral attribute. The figure is standing on a low pedestal, the front of which has been incised with long horizontal and short vertical lines, possibly indicating bricks.

*Comparative material*

Images of Athena at Khaltchayan show a very similar style of helmet\(^{167}\) although here it is worn somewhat lower on the head. The style is also known from a statue of Athena from Nisa.\(^{168}\) A very similar style is also found at Hadda\(^{169}\) although here the helmet is less rounded.

---


\(^{167}\) Pugachenkova 1971: pl. 88 and 90.

\(^{168}\) See image in Litvinsky 1998: pl. 7, 1.

\(^{169}\) Barthoux 2001: pl. 104, c.
**Description**
Rectangular shaped helmet with broad divergent brim.

**Date and provenance**
Tali-i Barzu, TB IV, 5th – 6th century CE

**Type example**
RM A180 1712

**Discussion of type variant HD07.02**

Description of figurine type(s)
Frontally represented seated female figure in an arch shaped niche ornamented with relief circular objects. The figure is wearing a long, indistinct upper body garment. The iconographic type may be related to a better preserved plaque from Afrasiab.

Comparative material
Comparative material comes from a wall painting at Dilberdzhin, which shows a seated figure wearing a helmet lower on the head and rather more ornate.\(^{170}\) There is also a peak at the center of the top of the headdress. A profile view may explain as a plume running down the center of the helmet.\(^{171}\) There is a clearly Hellenistic influence on both the Dilberdzhin and the Afrasiab image. The figure on the Dilberdzhin painting is dated to not earlier than the 4th century CE\(^{172}\) and has been interpreted as Arshtat, goddess of honour and truth.

---
\(^{170}\) Kruglikova 1976: 97, fig. 56.
\(^{171}\) Ibid.: 100, fig. 59.
\(^{172}\) Ibid.: 96.
HEADDRESS TYPE EXAMPLES

CAPS HD01

HD01.01.01
RM A19 44

HD01.01.02
RM A19 32

HD01.01.03
RM A374 3

HD01.01.04*
SA 101

HD01.02
RM A19 43

HD01.03
RM A183 633

HD01.04.01*
SA 82

HD01.04.02*
A747

HD01.05.01
SA 138

HD01.05.02
RM A181 1393
HD01.05.03
A400 2

HD01.06*
A366

HD01.07
AM 91 3 14

HD01.08.01
RM A183 804

HD01.08.02*
RM 04

HD01.08.03
AM RO 136

HD01.09.01
RM A374 4

HD01.09.02
RM A19 46

HD01.10.01*
SA 55

HD01.10.02*
Trever 1934: pl. 12, 170.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caps</th>
<th>Headbands HD02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HD UD01.11*</td>
<td>HD02.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A901</td>
<td>HD02.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RM A19 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HD02.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RM A19 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headbands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HD02.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD02.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD02.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM A181 1399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD02.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD02.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COSTUME OF THE SAMARKAND REGION OF SOGDIANA, 2ND-1ST CENTURY BCE – 8TH CENTURY CE

This chapter discusses the costume portrayed on provenanced figurines from the Samarkand region. It is based on evidence discussed in the previous chapter. The present chapter is divided into two main sections. The first provides an overview of the particular garment and headdress types, type variants and ornamentation groups for each period. This section is sub-divided into the two main chronological periods used throughout this thesis. The reader is directed to the specific type variant/ornamentation groups established in Chapter 4 for a detailed discussion of the parallels and references. The second section explores various aspects of the ornamentation found on the costume. While Chapter 4 has highlighted the various influences on and parallels with Samarkand regional dress, thereby locating it firmly in a broader tradition of costume among peoples of the Iranian speaking world in antiquity, questions remain regarding the specific traits that isolate Samarkand regional costume from that of surrounding regions. The aim of this chapter is to clarify elements of costume associated specifically with the Samarkand region. This will also facilitate a discussion of Samarkand regional costume in the broader Sogdian context, which is the focus of the following chapter.

Tables 6 and 7 provide a summary of the costume portrayed on provenanced terracottas from the Samarkand region dated to between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century CE and between the 5th and 8th century CE. The discussion in this and the following chapter will focus on these provenanced types only.

Costume of 2nd-1st century BCE – 4th century CE

Dress

Open upper body garments (D01, D02 and D03)
Shin length cloaks worn draped over the shoulders (D01.01) and often ornamented on the centre front openings are typical female dress of the Samarkand region during this and the following period. Cloaks are also worn in other regions of Sogdiana (Er-kurgan), as well as Bactria and Chorasmia. Like the kandys (D03.01 and D03.02), cloaks D01.01 are associated in particular with divine female figures in a broader Scythian and Saka context. Two examples of coats are known during this period. Coat type variant D02.01, a short coat with ornamentation on the centre front openings and hem, and worn wrapped with the right side over the left, finds few parallels for this period among settled populations. It may, however, indicate the continuing nomadic heritage evident in other elements of the costume of the region. The drapery of coat D02.03 clearly points to a Kushan influence, however, the actual cut of the coat is generic. Similar styled coats are also found at Erkurgan and in Chorasmia.

It is significant that parallels for open upper body garments remain largely within the territories of Chorasmia, Bactria or Sogdiana itself, or otherwise reflect links with a nomadic (Scythian/Saka) past.

Closed upper body garments (D04 and D05)
Dresses and tunics are also very typical of female dress worn in the Samarkand region. The generic shape of dresses finds parallels in reconstructions of dresses from the burials of Tillya-tepe and Koktepe. Shin (D04.02) and ankle (D04.03) length dresses,
typically associated with females, perhaps divine, are worn either underneath an open upper body garment (cloak or kandys), or on their own. Dresses are comparatively richly ornamented in various ways, including patterning on the front (e.g. D04.01, D04.02.03, D04.02.04 and D04.02.05) and sleeves (e.g. D04.02.06) of the garment, perhaps symbolising bracteates or plaques, or lines conveying the drapery or folds of the fabric (e.g. D04.02.01 and D04.02.02). Dresses also exhibit elements of drapery, which may be identified as local (e.g. D04.02.01, D04.02.02 and D04.02.06). These are discussed in more detail below. Girdled dresses (D04.03.02) may point to a rare Hellenistic influence on dress in the Samarkand region, although such dresses were widespread in Central Asia during this and later periods. Tunics, on the other hand, are associated with male dress and are modestly decorated with applied ornamentation (e.g. D05.04.02 and D05.04.03) and/or drapery (e.g. D05.02.02). They may be worn with a belt (e.g. D05.02.01, D05.04.01, D05.04.02 and D05.04.03). While dresses comprise the richest source of evidence for isolating localised characteristics, tunics on the other hand are clearly influenced by the costume styles and stylistic conventions of the Parthian and Kushan empires.

**Lower body garments (D07)**

Lower body garments (trousers), are portrayed on male (D07.04.01, D07.04.02 and D07.04.03) and female figurines (D07.01.01, D07.01.02, D07.01.03 and D07.01.04). Trousers worn by females are typically loose fitting, however, some examples show females wearing fitted trousers, often tucked into knee high boots (D07.04.01). Male trousers are in all cases semi-fitted or fitted. Both male and female trousers are typically ornamented in a variety of manners, including applied ornamentation (D07.01.01 and D07.04.03) and drapery (D07.01.02, D07.01.03 and D07.04.02). While ribbed trousers (D07.01.04 and D07.04.03) find clear parallels in Parthian costume, other ornamental styles are less common. In particular, the cropped style of D07.07.02 appears unique.

**Footwear (D08), belts (D09) and scarves (D10)**

Footwear and belts associated with the Samarkand region are very generic, preserving no real ornamentation and comparable with other examples across a broad geographic region. However, scarf type variant D10.02 is distinguished by its manner of wearing and the clear representation of lines indicating the folds of the material. It may be a localised style worn in the Samarkand region.

**Headdresses**

**Caps (HD01)**

Caps are comparatively well represented among the headdresses of the Samarkand region during this period, comprising eight examples. In particular, there are several variations of the conical cap (HD01.01). The conical cap is perhaps the most stereotypical form of headdress in the Samarkand region. The presence of the beret shaped cap or tamashanta (HD01.09) is also noteworthy in the broader geographical and chronological context of finds from the Taklamakan Desert dating to the first millennium BCE. This style of cap is also known from Scythian burials. Again, this places the influence of the Iranian speaking nomadic world in the fore. Cap type variant UD HD01.13 should be noted in particular as characteristic of the Samarkand region.
Headbands (HD02)

Several examples of headbands can be associated directly with the Samarkand region. HD02.03 also shows some parallels with headbands worn by the so-called Great Bactrian Goddess. HD02.07 bears some similarity to headbands found in Chorasmia, while HD02.06 may be a local headdress type.

Headscarves (HD05)

Headscarves or turbans are typically associated with female figurines from the Samarkand region. The turban shaped headdress, HD05.01, is also a comparatively popular headdress, associated in particular with figurines in the classic nomadic dress of a long upper body garment worn over semi-fitted trousers tucked into knee high boots. This costume type is worn by both males and females. Headscarves find numerous parallels with the contiguous regions, especially Parthia and Chorasmia.

Costume of the 5th – 8th century CE

Although the range of headdresses portrayed in small plastic art during the early medieval period is comparable with the preceding period, there are relatively few examples of dress from the Samarkand region dated to the later period. Several factors may explain this. It is possible that there was a shift of focus away from terracotta art to wall paintings, resulting in the decreased manufacture of terracottas. Wall paintings were not only found in the main centres in Sogdiana. They have also been discovered at other smaller sites, such as Dzhar-tepe. The Tangshu also provides evidence of wall paintings at other provincial centers in Sogdiana.1 The importance of Panjikent in antiquity tends to be emphasised because of the monumentality of the wall paintings from this site, in addition to the Mt Mugh archive. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that Panjikent has only recently, and tentatively, been identified in the Chinese sources.2 Although it was wealthy, Panjikent apparently did not play a pivotal role in Sogdian politics. Panjikent has been relatively extensively excavated, yet the number of terracottas yielded from the site appears to be comparatively few. It is also not uncommon to find cast terracotta heads moulded onto handles or other body parts of ceramic vessels, especially ossuaries, indicating an apparent increased usage of terracotta heads rather than complete bodies. Finally, of course, it is possible that figurines of this period remain to be found in the Samarkand region. For example, Suleimanov documents an increased diversity of terracottas from the Nakhshab oasis dated to the 3rd–4th century CE and later, while the opposite appears true for the Samarkand region figurines

Dress

Open upper body garments (D02)

There is one example of a coat, showing a right lapel (D02.04). This is a very common style of coat in Central Asia during the early medieval period, associated with various peoples. There is no evidence to associate it in particular with the Samarkand region or Sogdiana in general.

---

1 Tangshu ch. CCXXI cf., Chavannes 1969: 145.
2 See above, p. 34.
Closed upper body garments (D06)

Closed upper body garments of uncertain length, typically associated with rider figures, are the most common garment types represented on figurines associated with the Samarkand region during this period. There are numerous variations in the ornamentation of the garments, focussing in particular on the V shaped neckline (e.g. D06.01.01, D06.01.02 and D06.01.03). The difficulty of finding convincing comparative evidence for these variations in ornamentation may imply that they are local styles. However, the ornamentation style of two shirts, D06.02.01 and D06.02.02, shows strong similarities with shirts associated with rider figurines from stratified contexts at Kandahar, dated to the Saka period. This challenges the dating of the Samarkand figurines, which are clearly of a different type to the other rider figures whose costume is discussed in this section.

Harnesses (D11)

One example (D11.02) of a harness is preserved, symbolising the Sasanian influence on Samarkand region figurines. It may be an iconographic attribute of the divine figure.

Armour (D12)

There is one example of an armour plated skirt which has clear parallels in both local and broader Centra Asian region.

Headresses

Caps (HD01)

Numerous different styles of caps are preserved. Significantly, some of these (especially HD01.07) may be compared with styles found in the Turkic kaghanate. HD01.03 may in fact represent a helmet, with parallels coming from the Caucus region during the mid 1st millennium BCE. HD01.05.03 may be seen as a continuation of the conical cap, which was so popular during the preceding period. HD01.08 may represent a local headdress type, while the form of HD01.08.03 finds similarities with some Sasanian period headdresses.

Headbands (HD02)

Three headbands are associated with the Samarkand region. One of these, HD02.01, is of a very generic style and difficult to securely place either geographically or chronologically. HD02.04 may be seen in a regional context, with parallels coming from Chorasmia. HD02.10 may be associated with the Samarkand region in particular.

Diadems (HD03)

Only one diadem, HD03.02, is associated with the Samarkand region. The absence of strong parallels elsewhere suggests it may represent a local style.

Crowns (HD04)

Two crowns are associated with the Samarkand region. These appear to be local type variants, although HD04.05, possibly a calathus crown, points to a continuing Scythian legacy in this region. HD04.04 is associated in particular with the Samarkand region, and also with Erkurgan.
Winged headdresses (HD06)

Given the strong Sasanian influence on Sogdian artistic culture, the presence of winged headdresses should be wholly expected in the repertoire of costume from the Samarkand region. However, it is noteworthy that the winged headdresses portrayed on the terracottas differ in their details from those known from Sasanian and other Sasanian-influenced contexts. It should also be noted that HD06.08 appears to be a local headdress type, finding parallels with the headdress of deities on terracottas and wall paintings from Panjikent, and also on ossuaries.

Helmets (HD07)

Two examples of helmets are preserved. HD07.01 is typical of the iconographic attributes of the goddess Athena. HD07.02 may be compared with the helmet worn by the central figure of the northern wall in room 12 of the north eastern complex at Dilberdzhin. This comparative evidence suggests that the helmets may be seen as part of the iconography of these figures.

Summary

This summary of the costume portrayed on provenanced figurines from the Samarkand region highlights the diversity of parallels found in the costume of this region. It is important to differentiate between the use of stylistic conventions on costume and the actual cut of a garment or headdress itself. Stylistic conventions are especially clear in the use of a particular style of drapery, for example, drapery represented on the diagonal on either side of the central line of a dress (D04.01 and D04.02.04) or coat (D02.03) and the use of ribbing on trousers (D07.01.04 and D07.04.03). Similar conventions are associated with the Kushan and Parthian empires. Yet other methods of showing drapery, discussed in more detail below, are critical in isolating Samarkand regional dress from other areas. It has also been shown that the cut of the garments, in particular those dated prior to the 4th century CE, is relatively generic, finding parallels with both archaeological and art historic evidence. Headdresses for both periods on the other hand, although often able to be placed in a broader Scythian/Saka context, appear nevertheless more original. Various comments have been made in this thesis regarding the additional importance given to headdresses in signalling because of their high visibility. This is supported by the diversity of headdresses from the Samarkand region. The diversity of influences on the costume from the Samarkand region, including the Parthian, Kushan and later the Sasanian empires, and a broad Iranian speaking nomadic heritage, is balanced by the addition of specific elements of ornamentation that may be understood as local, and which combine to produce what may be understood as the distinguishing feature of costume from this region – its syncretism. The following section explores the particular elements of ornamentation that may be understood as indicative of Samarkand region costume.
SAMARKAND REGION COSTUME OF THE 2ND-1ST CENTURY BCE - 4TH CENTURY CE
Table 6 Samarkand regional costume of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} – 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE – 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE.
SAMARKAND REGION COSTUME OF THE 5TH – 8TH CENTURY CE
Table 7 Samarkand region costume of the 5th–8th century CE
Ornamentation patterns and motifs on the costume of the Samarkand region

Having defined the particular garment and headdress types worn in the Samarkand region and noted their parallels with the surrounding regions, it is necessary to highlight which details or combination of details isolate this costume from that of other regions. Which attributes may be defined as characteristic of the Samarkand region and to what extent should they be understood as indicative of "regional" identity? According to Cordell and Yannie "nearly any attribute may be socially meaningful, but specific meaning varies from one context to another." Hays has commented that "First, decoration may be important in signalling and negotiating identity with gender roles, age grades, access to trade partners or other special economic statuses, and membership in sodalities. Second, visual arts may also figure strongly in trade systems which were characterised by competition for goods and for alliance. Finally, ritual activities themselves usually demand "special" objects and costumes. Use of exotic materials and a high investment of labour, time, and skill in making and decorating objects are some of the ways to make objects "special"." Although in some cases it may be argued that ornamentation was purely decorative, there is nevertheless much evidence to suggest that elements of ornamentation communicated social status.

Numerous issues arise in the interpretation of the patterning or ornamentation represented on the figurines and plaques. For example, the preservation of such details on the figurines is not always clear. Moreover, the nature of figurine manufacture (i.e., their size and mass production) suggests that the patterns may have been quite schematised to begin with. This is highlighted for example by the detailed patterning on costume shown on Parthian or Kushan sculpture. Finally, the apparently generic nature of the patterns or ornamentation together with the fact that in the Samarkand region the patterning typically comprises only single motifs rather than combinations of motifs, renders their interpretation difficult. While it is recognised that the intrinsic meaning of the ornamentation portrayed on the figurines may be significant on various levels, in many cases this information is difficult to access in the archaeological record. For this reason, the ornamentation portrayed on the costume of the figurines should be used cautiously to further explore attributes of regional identity.

As discussed above, ornamentation is divided into two types: applied ornamentation and drapery. It should be noted that ribbing (indicated in the schematised drawings as two closely spaced parallel lines) is included in this discussion as applied ornamentation rather than drapery. Patterning preserved on provenanced (and also unprovenanced) figurines is relatively simple and unvaried, comprising geometric (curvilinear and rectilinear) motifs. Many of the figurines commonly dated to before the 4th century are decorated with an incised pattern. In many cases, it is not possible to tell whether the patterning is part of the matrix, or if it was applied separately, although the relative "mass production" of a figurine may indicate that it was part of the matrix itself. The aim of the following sub-section is to isolate the elements of ornamentation (applied

---

3 Cordell and Yannie 1991: 98.
5 For example Rapin 2001: 57.
6 Note however, that Lobacheva 1979 has defined some differences in the costume of various socio-economic and professional identity groups represented on the Panjikent wall paintings.
and drapery) that may be associated especially with the Samarkand region. As in the previous section, the reader is directed to the discussions of particular garment or headdress types in Chapter 4 for details regarding parallels and also references.

**Applied ornamentation**

**A. The circle pattern**

The circle is by far the most widespread symbol in the corpus, and indeed, is a ubiquitous pattern used in various media throughout Central Asia. On the Samarkand region figurines it is found on cloaks (D01.01.02 and D01.01.04), coats (D02.01), dresses (D04.01, D04.02.04, D04.02.06 and D04.03.03), tunics (D05.04.02 and D05.04.03), shirts (D06.01.02 and D06.02.02), trousers (D07.01.05 and D07.02.02) and headbands (HD02.06). Evidence from the burials of Koktepe, Tillya-tepe and the Dzhety-asar culture indicates the widespread use of small circular gold buttons or bracteates. That they were sewn onto clothing is demonstrated by the two tiny holes on opposite sides, through which thread was threaded. It is possible that the circle pattern may symbolise such bracteates. Other interpretations, however, are possible. Burials from the Dzhety-asar culture have widespread evidence for the use of larger beads in costume ornamentation, although even a small quantity of these would have been heavy. Such beads may have been imported, perhaps conveying an immediate indication of status to others. The circle, and in particular the circle with a dot in the centre, is often associated with the sun or a fire cult. However, it is difficult to comment further on the semantic meaning of this pattern, in particular because of its widespread usage in Central Asia.

**B. The “ladder pattern”**

The “ladder pattern” essentially comprises small squares, or possibly rectangles, placed immediately next to each other. These may represent the use of square or rectangular clothing plaques sewn to a garment. The ladder pattern is found on cloaks (D01.01.05) and dresses (D04.02.03). Evidence of similar shaped clothing plaques is widespread across the Eurasian steppes, and is especially well known in the Scythian burials from the Pontic area. The plaques were made in a number of different ways. For example they may have been wood or leather, either left plain, or covered in gold foil, or they may have been made of just gold, either plain or with an impressed image. It is unclear if there was any semantic meaning in the rectangle or square shape itself or if meaning was conveyed in other aspects of the plaque, for example the material used to manufacture it, or its specific placement on a garment (see also D and E).

**C. The V shape pattern**

The V or chevron pattern is less common on the costume of the Samarkand region figurines. It ornaments cloaks (D01.01.03) and dresses (D04.03.03). The symbolism of this pattern is unclear. It is possible that the shape represents a woven or embroidered design. Although it is a very simple pattern, there is little comparative evidence. It is, however, found on closed upper body garments from Bactria, dated to the Kushan period. Triangular shaped gold plaques were found in the burial of a high ranking female at Issyk-kul. The semantic meaning of the shape, if any, is unclear.

---

7 Obel'chenko 1992: 18ff. See also Grach 1966.
8 Pugach enkova 1979: fig. 91 and 159. See also Yatzenko 2001: pl. 12, 61 and pl. 13, 39.
9 Akishev 1978: pl. 18.
D. Rectangular shaped clothing plaques
Rectangular shaped clothing plaques ornament the sleeves of kandys D03.02. There are numerous comparative examples of gold rectilinear shaped plaques from the Tillya-tepe burials. These may be either plain, or impressed with a motif or pattern. See also comments for B. The semantic meaning of the shape, if any, is unclear.

E. Square shaped clothing plaques
Square shaped clothing plaques ornament the sleeves of kandys D03.01. See comments for B and D.

F. The oval shaped pattern
This is a rare pattern, portrayed on a single ornamentation group where it ornaments the hem of a dress (D04.02.05). It may be a variation on the circle pattern (see above, A). The semantic meaning of the shape, if any, is unclear.

G. Ribbing
Ribbing, symbolised by two closely spaced parallel lines, has been identified on trousers worn by both males and females (D07.01.04 and D07.04.03). A similar ornamentation style is well known in the Parthian Empire.

H. The circle-square-circle motif
A commonly found ornamentation motif combines two circles with a square or rectangle in the centre. Although not found as an ornamental motif of dress, this combination is especially popular on headdresses from numerous regions, where it appears on the front of a band that is often across or above the forehead. On figurines from the Samarkand region it is found on a more elaborate headdress or diadem with additional ornamentation motifs (for example HD03.02). It is possible that the shapes represent precious stones, although the semantic meaning of the motif is little explored. This motif, or variations on it, is extremely common in Central Asia throughout the period from the 2nd century BCE to the 8th century CE. It is also found across a broad range of media, including wall paintings, monumental statuary and actual finds of jewellery.

Draper
I. Horizontal drapery
Drapery represented by horizontal lines slightly on the diagonal, is found on dresses (D04.01 and D04.02.04) and coats (D02.03) where it is placed on either side of the central line of the garment. Clear parallels for this style of drapery come from the Kushan Empire, suggesting the use of a stylistic convention among artisans working there. A similar drapery style is also shown on garments from Chorasmia (albeit highly

---

10 For example TM 17/196 in Meshkeris 1989: 195, fig. 94, 9.
11 See for example Bussagli 1978: 30 which shows a worshipper from Qizil wearing a necklace with a pendant showing this motif. Other examples include the headbands worn by figures on Ibid.: 49, also from Qizil.
12 Barthoux 2001: pl. 73, d and pl. 81, b and c.
13 Pugachenkova 1978: fig. 79, which shows a pectoral with rectangular pendant and an oval shaped piece of carnelian in the centre. It is dated to the second half of the 1st century CE.
schematised) and Erkurgan. While it is possible that this drapery style spread from the Kushan empire to Sogdiana and Chorasmia, an important factor to take into account here is chronology. In particular, the Chorasmian example is dated to between the mid-4th and mid-2nd century BCE, while the Erkurgan example is dated to the 1st – 2nd century CE. It is possible that this particular style of drapery was already known in Central Asia before the rise of the Kushan Empire. In this respect, it is possible to suggest that this manner of representing drapery reflects a localised style.

J. “Darts”
Two elongated triangular shapes with the apex falling from the waist and approximately covering each leg, are represented on dresses only (D04.02.01) dated prior to the 4th century CE. No parallels for this manner of representing drapery have been found and it is possible that it is typical of the Samarkand region.

K. Triangular form drapery
Triangular form drapery is found on the front of dresses only (D04.02.06), where it is combined with other elements of applied ornamentation. While it is possible to point to precedents for this style of drapery in a Scythian context dating to the second half of the 1st millennium BCE, the slightly coarse manner of representing the lines, combined with the applied ornamentation, may be indicative of the Samarkand region in particular, prior to the 4th century CE.

L. “Pin-stripes”
“Pin-stripes” are found in both dresses (D04.02.02) and trousers (D07.01.03 and D07.04.02). Similar styles of drapery from the Parthian empire exist, however, again, the simple lines on the trousers, and its use on dresses, is unique to the Samarkand region.

M. Drapery from girdle
It has been suggested that the use of the girdle entered Central Asian costume through Hellenistic influence. This style was to be long-lived, as it is also found among Chinese women during the Tang period. The effect of the girdle worn under the bust is often enhanced by the use of simple, vertical lines running the length of the dress. The complex system of lines portrayed on the dress (D04.03.02) from the Samarkand region demonstrate that this is unique.

N. Side drapery on tunic
This style of drapery is found on tunics D05.02.01, D05.02.02 and D05.04.02. See notes below for O.

O. Side and centre drapery on tunic
Drapery on tunic D05.02.01 is shown by narrow lines on either side of the skirt of the tunic, and crescent shaped lines across the lap of the garment. These lines may be attributed either to the belt worn with the tunic, or a lute or similar string instrument held across the stomach. Very similar methods of representing drapery have been noted in the Parthian and Kushan Empires, suggesting the use of stylistic conventions in each case.
P. Calf drapery
Calf drapery in the form of three short, curving lines emanating from the inside edge of the lower leg is shown on loose fitting trousers only (D07.01.02). Although a comparative example of this style of drapery is found on a Tang period figurine, it is nevertheless rare and may be included as another form of drapery characteristic of the Samarkand region.

Q. "Rings" around shirt sleeves
Shirt D06.01.03 portrays "rings" around each upper arm, which may be interpreted in a number of ways. Most likely, however, in the context of the rider figure, is that they represent ring armour. Evidence for this is widespread in Central Asia, especially during the Sasanian period.

Summary
Several ornamentation styles, in particular drapery, may be associated with the Samarkand region: darts (J), triangular form drapery (K), "pin stripes" (L), drapery from girdle (M) and calf drapery (P). It is noteworthy that all of these elements are represented on figurines dated to between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century CE. It should also be noted that some of these elements, in particular triangular form drapery (K), drapery from girdle (M) and calf drapery (P), may be representative of workshop styles or conventions rather than reflections of what was physically worn. This may indicate that these markings were used to communicate on a different level to other means of applied ornamentation.

Materials used in the ornamentation of costume
Although it is not possible to distinguish on the basis of the ornamentation patterns on the terracottas the specific materials used in ornamentation, textual and archaeological sources provide some information regarding the various types of materials that may have been used in the manufacture of applied ornamentation on costume in the local Samarkand region. This section will discuss evidence of materials that may have been used in ornamentation on costume from the Samarkand region and Sogdiana in general.

In the Achaemenid sources Sogdiana is famous for its lapis lazuli and carnelian. Turquoise and carnelian have been found in small quantities at Samarkand, and it is possible that both of these were used as costume ornamentation. Carnelian is particularly characteristic of traditional Turkmen jewellery. Markovin suggests that it embodied protective powers, guarding against both sickness and poverty. Markovin also associates red with a widespread belief in a sun cult. Two rectangular gold terminals inlaid with small circular pieces of turquoise were found in the Koktepe burial. This inlaid style is one of the signatures of Sarmatian art.

14 Cf., de la Vaissière 2002: 22. Note however, that neither of these was mined in Sogdiana. Lapis lazuli probably came from Badakhshan near the eastern border of Bactria, while carnelian may have been imported to Sogdiana from India. See de la Vaissière 2002: 23-26.
15 Ibid.: 39; Pruger 1971: 118. For discussion of the possible sources, especially those located in the Kyzil Kum, see Tosi 1974: 148-150.
17 Rapin 2001: 49, fig. 10, 19-21 and fig. 11, 5. This inlaid style is one of the signatures of Sarmatian art. See further Aruz, Farkas et al. 2000.
believed to ensure wealth, protect against snakes and scorpions and aid in victory over enemies. Gilded glass pearls were also found as headdress ornamentation in the Koktepe burial. It is also possible that amber, imported from the Baltic, was known in Sogdiana from the 2nd century CE. It is possible that other precious stones or metals such as agate, jade, and possibly even coral were used. Se-se, the meaning of which is unclear, but is thought to be emeralds, is listed as a precious stone of Kang and Persia in numerous Chinese sources. These sources also note that such stones were used in the ornamentation of costume of peoples of various regions. Other forms of costume ornamentation include embroidered fabrics, and fabrics with patterns or images woven into them. A textile associated with Kang during the Sasanian period is po-tie. The exact meaning of the term is unclear. Laufer has suggested that it may mean cotton brocade. Although such fabrics cannot be identified on the figurines, wall paintings and textile fragments indicate the importance of richly embroidered textiles in Sogdiana.

The identification of ornamentation on costume also raises questions regarding the actual existence and age of the ornamentation represented on visual sources, and its role in the society in which it functioned. These are important in understanding the value and meaning of such ornamentation, and the pace at which “fashions” developed. Similar issues have been broached by Tissot in regard to jewellery in Gandharan art. Tissot concludes, however, that it is not yet possible to ascertain if sculptors and carvers were copying real jewellery (contemporary or older), or if they were working from carved models. Nevertheless, that they may have portrayed imaginary elements on the ornamentation should also be considered.

The use of patterning and symbols to represent ornamentation

It has been suggested that the symbols used to represent ornamentation (for example the circle pattern) were stylised and schematised versions of real elements such as plaques or beads found in some burials (e.g. Tillya-tepe burials 1 and 2 (figs 80 and 81)). This raises several issues. Reconstructions of costume found in burials demonstrate the sheer number of beads or buttons or stones potentially used to decorate a garment. Reconstructions show that these were often built into large panels of ornamentation. On the other hand the reconstruction of costume from the Koktepe...
burial demonstrates that ornamentation could also comprise a single line of beading. This suggests that the representation of single lines of ornamentation on the dress of the figurines may in some cases be a true indication of the quantity of ornamentation. While it may be understood on the basis of costume found in the Koktepe and Tillya-tepe burials that the regions of ornamentation on the garments shown on the figurines may be largely faithful to the original, the patterns used to indicate the ornamentation are more probably symbolic and do not necessarily convey the true level of detail of ornamentation.

It is possible that the generic nature of the patterning bears no significance at all, and was created at the whim of the artisan.27 Certainly the use of the circle pattern in Central Asia is almost ubiquitous for a significant period of time. It should not be ruled out that the intrinsic meaning of a pattern had been lost (for a variety of reasons), and that its reproduction on the figurines was a mechanical one. The longevity of symbols in society could be relatively brief, even on apparently formal ritual structures. For example among the Lur nomads Mortensen has documented that within a period of 150 years the meaning of symbols employed on gravestones had become apparently lost to the local people due to social dislocation.28 This is significant given the broad chronological time frame of the provenanced figurines.

Finally, a note of caution should be added regarding the extent to which the patterns and motifs shown on the costume of the figurines may be interpreted. Ornamentation does not necessarily imply status. The use of gold beads, such as those found in abundant numbers in the Tillya-tepe burials and to a lesser extent, the Koktepe burial, demonstrates that the deceased was in a position to acquire them. Societies unable to procure such materials may have used other means of representing status, for example, embroidery. On the other hand, in the context of dress ornamentation found in Sarmatian burials of the 1st–3rd century CE, Yatzenko has indicated that this may not be the case, as all burials examined by him contained beading. He suggests instead that items indicating high status may have been manufactured from organic material, and therefore may not have survived.29 Yatzenko also suggests that other means may have been used to show status, such as the use of colour.30 This is also discussed by Smirnov, who shows that gold beads were only found in the burials of rich Sarmatian women, while beads made from other materials were common in less distinguished burials.31 These factors should be borne in mind when assessing reconstructions of costume from burials. Such evidence suggests that, without knowing the colour and/or material from which elements period of mass production of figurines, it may have been uneconomical to invest the time required to consistently reproduce such detail.

27 The potential to add or revise minor features of a figurine, which may be devoid of ritual or sacred context, should be considered. RM A180 2336 is covered on both sides with circular tube stamps, while the rear side of RM A180 2338 has a single line of these stamps running lengthways, with several short rows of the stamps in two different places crossing the central line. The variety and nature of ornamentation on the shirt type variant D06.02.02 also suggests that some ornamentation was added to the figurine after coming out of the mould. It is unclear whether such innovations would be acceptable in a highly formalised ritual or cultic situation, where the emphasis on ritual and iconography was presumably paramount. It may indicate a less formal environment in which some figurines functioned.

30 Ibid.
31 Smirnov 1964: 139 and 147.
of ornamentation were manufactured and the context in which they functioned, their value as an indicator of identity and status may be subjective.

The placement of ornamentation on dress

Ethnographic and archaeological studies suggest that ornamentation placed on different regions of the body may be interpreted as the delineation of these zones based on ideas of vulnerability or pollution relevant to a particular group. While it is possible to see a focus of ornamentation on particular areas also as purely decorative, this suggests that there may have been an implied amuletic or magical effect of such ornamentation. The identification of such zones would be dictated by social and cultural considerations.

The ornamentation of costume on the Samarkand region figurines is not limited to the openings of garments. While it is not unusual for it to be placed around the openings of a garment (for example D04.03.03), it is also commonly found in a vertical panel(s) running down the centre of the body, for example on the centre front openings of cloaks (D01.01.02-05) and the centre front of dresses (for example D04.01, D04.02.03 and D04.02.04). While there are several examples of dresses (D04.02.06) and kandys (D03.02) with sleeve ornamentation, evidence regarding ornamentation on this part of the costume is less conclusive as it is often unclear. Necklines of dresses were very rarely ornamented (D04.03.03 is a rare exception), although in numerous cases figurines dated prior to the early medieval period appear to be wearing a torque (see for example AM 91 33 and RM A19 95). The presence of a torque worn by females wearing dresses may have acted as an alternate means of ornamentation around the neck. The neckline of shirts is in almost all cases ornamented (D06.01.02, D06.01.03, D06.02.01 and D06.02.02). Notably, however, the ornamentation of the shirt necklines is of a different character to the ornamentation of the dresses, cloaks and kandys discussed above. While the ornamentation of the neck of type variant D06.02 finds clear parallels with other rider figurines associated with a Saka context, that of type variant D06.01 is much simpler and generic. The ornamentation of female lower body garments is more difficult to comment on as often it was covered by long dresses. However, trousers worn with other garments were often ornamented, for example with "ribbing" (D07.01.04) or with the ubiquitous circle pattern (D07.01.05). These observations suggest that the centre of the body (especially in female dress), the neck (especially for male rider figures), and also on the legs (for males and females generally) were focus areas. Many of the heads of figurines were also crowned with a headdress, or some other decorative element added to the hair, demonstrating that this regions should also be included as a focal point for ornamentation in the Samarkand region.

---

33 The use of applied borders is widespread on costume from the Samarkand region between the 2nd century BCE and the 8th century CE. Such borders are also a typical feature of traditional clothing from the Samarkand region, which continue today and are known generally as ḍeziyak (Kalter and Pavaloi 1997: 236) and include various regional characteristics (Ibid.: 237). They are usually sewn on the edges of traditional garments. Regarding the richly woven tapestry bands characteristic of Shanpula for example, Bunker suggests that they may have played an amuletic role, "protecting the wearer and endowing her with good luck" (Keller 2001: 45). The fact that it was women's clothing rather than men's with which the bands were associated may also reflect a specific role played by women in that society. They could also reflect the lifestyle of women, who in a pastoralist society were given the role of weavers.
34 See for example Meshkeris 1962: pl. XV, 227.
Similar focus areas are noted on the dress of regions contiguous to the Samarkand region, albeit with some differences. At Tillya-tepe the emphasis is on the centre front openings of garments, the sleeves, hem and also the neck, although here the sheer quantity of beading used to ornament the dress cannot be compared with the simple single bands of ornamentation shown on dress of the Samarkand figurines. Similar areas of ornamentation are also represented on the dress from the Dzhety-asar burials. Nevertheless, the ornamentation of the Koktepe and Dzhety-asar burials includes curvilinear patterns, while that of Tillya-tepe and the Samarkand region figurines is predominantly rectilinear.

Absence of, or minimal, ornamentation is also noteworthy. In the Samarkand region, tunics, worn predominantly by males, are usually characterised by their very modest ornamentation (D05.04.02 and D05.04.03 are rare examples of ornamented tunics). This may be a reflection of lifestyle. It is also possible that ornamentation was less important on some male garments.35

It is not uncommon to find a special emphasis on the breasts on some figurines dated prior to the 4th century CE, for example RM A19 94, RM A19 95 and in particular RM A181 1398. This usually comprises lines radiating out from the nipple to the base of the breast. Some examples show these lines only on the upper half of the breast. The nipple itself has been emphasised by the imprint of a circular or triangular stamp. It is unclear whether these marks represent lines on the breast itself, or are on the fabric of the dress. It is possible that the lines are simply used to render realistically the drapery of the fabric, similar to that shown on dress type D04.03.05 and D04.04.03, or to emphasise their fullness. This manner of breast “ornamentation” is not found on all figurines and often no special attention is paid to this region of the body. However, that such ornamentation may be associated with a differentiated status should also be considered. The first indication of this is the attributes associated with these figurines, which include a circular object, often interpreted as fruit, and a pine-cone shaped attribute.

Several comparative images also suggest that the breasts were a particular focal point. An image of two goddesses wearing a long skirt and holding a dragon (?) in each hand from the Karabulak kurgan is embroidered onto a piece of silk cloth which covered the face of a female.36 The breasts are indicated simply by a circle, in the centre of which is a cross. The stomach is marked by the same symbol, but here inside a larger circle. The burial has been dated to the 1st century CE. The iconography of this figure and other visual representations found in this burial are associated with north-west India. The figure itself is interpreted as a fertility goddess, whose typical iconography depicts the snake. Decorated breasts are also found on figurines from Khotan.37

Yatzenko shows that the breasts were a focal point of ornamentation on females buried at Tillya-tepe,38 suggesting that the decorative elements found on this area of the body indicate love (Eroses) and fertility. The breast ornamentation on the Samarkand terracottas, consisting mainly of incised lines and a circle shaped (sometimes it appears triangular shaped) stamp indicating the nipple, may be associated with the radiating lines

35 See also n. 33.
36 See also Pugachenkova and Rempel 1986: 11, fig. 2.
37 For example D'iaconova 1960: pl. 20, 760.
38 See Yatzenko 2001: 85.
of the sun or a wheel. The sun cult was a dominant one in the Saka world, although in this context it was represented by a male god rather than a goddess. 39

Sogdian attitudes towards the body

It is possible to explore Sogdian attitudes towards the body on the basis of garment style and the placement of ornamentation. While the latter, discussed above, is important in understanding focal points of the body, the former may shed light on differences in conceptions of male and female attitudes toward the body on the basis of the extent to which the body is displayed or covered. 40

Female dress dated to the 2nd -1st century BCE – 4th century CE in Sogdiana is traditionally loose fitting, covering the entire body, except the head, feet and hands. 41 Yet it is noteworthy that while upper body garments were typically loose fitting, with absolutely no indication of waist or hips, breasts were often clearly emphasised, by the garment itself, and in some cases by their ornamentation. Trousers worn by females under the dress are similarly loose fitting. The costume worn by (privileged) females on early medieval wall paintings in Sogdiana and Tokharistan is very similar to that depicted on figurines dated to between the 2nd -1st century BCE and the 4th century CE (see fig. 126). This may indicate an underlying continuity in ideologies relating to women during these two periods. The enveloping nature of female costume may suggest that in certain contexts females were removed from society.

Male costume portrayed on figurines dated prior to the 4th century CE usually comprises a semi-fitted tunic. 42 Underneath fitted or semi-fitted trousers are worn, sometimes tucked into knee high boots. This dress style typically points to the influence of the nomadic legacy on Sogdian society. Male costume of the early medieval period provides a sharp contrast to this, with the emphasis on a very narrow waist and only slightly broader shoulders. The differences in the representation of male and female costume on figurines dated prior to the 4th century CE may reflect their different functioning spheres. Although it is difficult to conclude further, differences in costume

39 Although an iconographic discussion on the ornamentation is beyond the scope of this thesis, several comments may be made here regarding this. According to Mukhitdinov 1975: 107 one of the main iconographic associations of the sun was the mirror. In Scythian iconography the mirror is held by a seated female often attended by a male. The mirror has not been clearly identified as an attribute on Sogdian terracottas dated to between the 1st century BCE and the 4th century CE. This indicates that in Sogdiana prior to the 4th century CE, the mirror as an iconographic attribute was not popular, while in other regions of Central Asia, both within and beyond the borders of the Kushan empire, the mirror was a popular attribute. Given that the mirror can generally be associated with a solar cult, under the umbrella of fertility cults, it may be possible to see the decorated breasts in the Samarkand region of Sogdiana as a local variation in iconography of the solar cult. The Tal-i Barzu figurines with decorated breasts hold a circular disk in the left hand. Some stylistic similarities are shown on figurines from Saksonokhur holding a mirror (illustrated in Mukhitdinov 1973: 100, fig. 1 - 3). Some of the Saksonokhur examples are dated to the pre-Kushan period and wear a dress (?) pleated from the waist down, the pleats spreading from an axis on the middle of the skirt. Both the Saksonokhur and the Tal-i Barzu figurines also wear a torque with a depression marking the terminal.

40 There are relatively few naked or semi-naked figurines in the examined corpus. Although nakedness in itself is to be seen as a form of dress – like physical garments, nakedness also conveys a particular message - it will not be examined here. See Bonfante 1989 for discussion.

41 See for example RM A19 96.

42 See for example RM A36 31.
possibly reflect different attitudes towards male and female stata in Samarkand regional society.

_Sogdian dress and the use of colour_

The richness of the colours and patterning manifest on Sogdian wall paintings is similarly reflected in clothing and other pieces of textile found in burials, especially those of the Taklamakan Desert, which have been so well preserved. Parthian and Kushan dress is also noteworthy for the richness of its embroidered or woven designs. There is essentially no evidence regarding the use of colour on the terracottas (AM RO 136 is a very rare exception). It is nevertheless useful to make a few comments here regarding the use of colour in costume shown on wall paintings and in woven fabrics. This will provide some idea of a possible colour range and the use of colour as a signalling device on the costume of the Samarkand region.

The wall paintings of the early medieval period have greatly expanded evidence regarding the use of fabric and colour. According to Yatzenko the predominant colours worn by Sogdians (including those of the diaspora) included red, white, blue, yellow (including gold), green and black, usually in a system combining three of these colours. Monochrome dress was only occasionally worn. Patterns usually comprised floral motifs and the pearl bordered medallions. However, it should be noted that there were some limitations on the use of colour on the wall paintings. Kossolapov and Marshak have discussed the limitations of economy and geography in the use of colour on wall paintings in Central Asia and western China. Trade connections would have ensured the free flow of natural pigments throughout this region, however, this was to a certain extent limited by economy. Colours used in the wall paintings were usually found to be available locally. In Sogdiana the controlled use of lazurite is noteworthy. Sogdian paintings are characterised by the use of red, yellow and blue, and the combination of these into perfectly harmonious hues. Certain colours, such as green, orange and violet are in most cases absent. Marshak and Kossolapov suggest that this is because the Sogdian artists were unable to attain exact shades of this colour to produce the perfect harmonies characteristic of Sogdian painting. These factors should be kept in mind when discussing the use of colour as an identity code.

The only archaeological evidence regarding the use of colour in fabric in Sogdiana for the period prior to the early medieval period is the Koktepe burial. The evidence is very fragmentary, and may not be necessarily representative of what was worn by the sedentary Sogdian population. Analysis indicates that the fabric used in the

45 It is noteworthy that there is similarly almost no evidence for the use of paint on Sogdian ossuaries (Pavchinskaya 1994: 211).
46 For further discussion of this see Kalter and Pavaloi 1997: 229.
47 Yatzenko 2003: 11.
48 Kossolapov and Marshak 1999.
49 Ibid.
50 Ibid.: 77.
51 Ibid.: 54-55.
52 Ibid.: 52.
53 Ibid.
The headdress of the deceased was red, or at least contained red.\textsuperscript{54} The popularity of red fabric appears to have been widespread across the Eurasian Steppes and the symbolism of this colour with life giving forces is well documented, especially in burials.\textsuperscript{55}

The manufacture of cloth and clothing in the Samarkand region

Barnes and Eicher have commented that "to understand the role of dress in a given society, an analysis of the creative act of making dress is essential. Usually the production of objects that are to be worn is itself gender-specific..."\textsuperscript{56} Technical considerations regarding the manufacture of cloth and other materials used for clothing in ancient societies will not be considered here in detail due to the lack of evidence. There is no evidence from the Samarkand region to date to show who wove the textiles employed in costume, or who constructed the individual garments and headdresses, or further, who ornamented them.\textsuperscript{57} It should be noted that while Yatzenko has suggested that broad ethnic groupings may be identified by the way in which a garment is constructed,\textsuperscript{58} Maytdinova suggests a common manner of garment construction for all Central Asian people.\textsuperscript{59}

There is very little archaeological evidence of textile manufacture in Sogdiana prior to the early medieval period. Numerous clay loom weights dated to the Hellenistic period have been found on the floor of one of the primitive dwellings immediately inside the Hellenistic rampart of Afrasiab.\textsuperscript{60} Although Lebedeva and Kabanov originally suggested the area may have been a ritual site associated with fire worship on account of the semi-circular hearths found there, it seems more likely that the area was connected with domestic textile production,\textsuperscript{61} with fires being used to heat the rooms while baked clay plates may have served to protect the base of the hearth.\textsuperscript{62} Similar evidence for textile production has also been found during more recent excavations at Afrasiab near

\textsuperscript{54} Rapin 2001: 49-50.
\textsuperscript{55} Cf. Jones and MacGregor 2002: 8-9. Bittner has briefly discussed the use and symbolism of colour in the Achaemenid Empire, as well as highlighting the current inadequate research into the technologies used to extract vegetable dyes, and the range of colours used (Bittner 1987: 84-89). He suggests that red was associated with the military, which later translated into a pure status symbol and also world power while white was associated with ceremony (Bittner 1987: 89).
\textsuperscript{56} Barnes and Eicher 1992: 4.
\textsuperscript{57} Barber has argued that textile and costume manufacture was usually in the hands of females, and only when manufacture became highly organised did it enter the realm of men (Barber 1991: 283 - 291). Davis-Kimball on the other hand cites modern ethnographic evidence demonstrating that in some Kazakh communities both men and women were equally employed in the production of woollen felt used to make clothing (Davis-Kimball 2002: 36).
\textsuperscript{58} Yatzenko 2000: 316-318.
\textsuperscript{59} Maytdinova 2000: 53. Lifestyle was an important factor in the type of loom used for weaving and consequently the width of the fabric used to construct dress. The difference between sedentary and nomadic looms may be found in the potential for the difference in the width of the woven fabric. This has important implications for garment construction. While very wide pieces of fabric may simply be crapped over the shoulders with a hole cut for the head, narrower pieces of fabric would need to be sewn together.
\textsuperscript{60} Rapin and Isamiddinov 1994: 557.
\textsuperscript{61} Bernard, Grenet et al. 1992: 290. The skill levels of such domestic industry, if indeed this is what it was, should not be underestimated. Cemeteries at the village of Shanpula have yielded very well preserved textile remnants, which show a high level of detail. See in particular Keller 2001.
\textsuperscript{62} Bernard, Grenet et al. 1992: 290.
the granary (situated immediately below the mosque) and also in the Hellenistic levels at Koktepe.63

The Koktepe burial provides the only archaeological evidence of textiles for the Samarkand region. The remains of fabric found here are very scant and their analysis is inconclusive. While the fabric used for the headdress and the dress or other garments worn by the deceased appears to be the same, or at least similar, it is not possible to define exactly what it was. It may have been silk, linen, hemp or cotton.64 The remains of a belt around the waist may be wool.65

The Sogdian Ancient Letters, dated to the early 4th century CE, mention the trade of hemp and woollen clothing.66 This however, should not imply that such fabrics were necessarily used in Samarkand, or to make costume. Tang period tribute lists show that Samarkand was associated with a fabric called varnakā, although the exact meaning of this is disputed.67 Another textile, “hair brocade”, which Schafer suggests may be a wool or wool/silk mix, has also been associated with the Samarkand region.68 The village of Zandana, near Bukhara, is also famous for its silks.69 Several Chinese language sources, including the Weishu and the Suishi also refer to silk production in Sogdiana.70 Silk was worn by the aristocratic and ruling members of society. Hemp and cotton weavers would have been employed to weave for the general population.

Summary: ornamentation and identity in the Samarkand region

This chapter has defined various costume types and styles typical for the Samarkand region between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the early 6th century CE. While there are some similarities between these characteristics with surrounding regions, when taken in combination with the manner of ornamentation, it may be stated that the costume of the Samarkand region displays some localised attributes, which isolate it from the costume of surrounding regions. Although by no means necessarily a complete repertoire of costume worn in the Samarkand region, the following costume styles can be defined.

For the period between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century CE the combination of a long cloak draped over the shoulders worn over a dress, usually distinguished by some form of (modest) ornamentation and loose fitting trousers underneath, also often ornamented, is typical for females. A variation on this dress style shows the long dress and loose fitting trousers worn without an open upper body garment. Males typically wore a tunic, generally with little applied ornamentation, worn over fitted trousers, often tucked into knee high boots. Females are also shown in this style. Another variation on female dress shows a slightly longer tunic with trousers underneath, which cover the ankles. Belts and footwear are generic, while a short scarf falling over the front of the body in loose semi-circular drapes is typical. Headdresses are

---

63 Frantz Grenet pers. comm. 28/12/03. Further evidence of locally produced textiles comes from the Ferghana Valley (see Anarbaev and Matbabaev 1993-4) and western China (Bunker 2001; Keller 2001)
64 Rapin 2001: 50.
65 Ibid.: 48.
66 Cf., de la Vaissière 2002: 49.
67 See Schafer 1963: 201 and n. 48 on p. 327. It may refer to a coloured fabric such as linen or cotton. It appears to have been imported to Samarkand from Burma.
typically fabric based (i.e., "soft"), comprising caps and headscarves. Headbands are less commonly worn.

Various methods of ornamentation are portrayed on the figurines. While applied ornamentation finds some similarity with ornamentation of neighbouring regions, several methods of representing drapery on dresses and trousers, on the other hand, may be isolated as characteristic of the Samarkand region. Such styles include the use of darts, pin-stripes, triangular form drapery, drapery used to enhance the bust and drapery at calf level on trousers. A particular emphasis is on the centre of the body, the neck and the legs.

Evidence of Samarkand regional dress during the early medieval period, as portrayed on the figurines, is limited, comprising various closed upper body garments and elements of military wear. However, headdresses are more fully represented. There are no examples of female dress, besides armour, preserved on provenanced figurines. However, this gap is well filled by the evidence of the wall paintings, in particular at Pandjikent. Evidence regarding male dress during this period is also limited, comprising a coat of undefined length with a triangular shaped lapel and several variations on the V necked shirt, and also a round necked shirt. In addition to the various fabric based caps, there are also several headbands and diadems and crowns. Helmets are also known. Finally, ornamentation during this period is particularly modest, especially on male costume.

The similarities in garment and headdress types and type variants shown on figurines from Samarkand with the costume of surrounding areas may be understood on the basis of a common cultural milieu operating in these regions prior to the early medieval period in Central Asia, while details such as applied ornamentation and drapery reflect an important means of differentiation between regions. Whereas the similarities of costume styles are the result of wide regions being under the control of a single empire or dynasty, together with a similar ethnic legacy, regionality is to be identified predominantly in details of ornamentation rather than the actual cut of the garment itself.

To what extent is the costume portrayed on the provenanced terracottas representative of costume associated with the Samarkand region generally? Unfortunately it is difficult to answer this question as so little is known regarding the costume worn in this region prior to the early medieval period. While there is certainly more diversity of costume during the period prior to the 4th century CE, it is not possible to say if this is representative. Nevertheless, such diversity does contrast with the relatively limited evidence, especially of dress, for the early medieval period. Yet this may be indicative of the function of the figurines themselves, rather than a reflection of the costume repertoire of the Samarkand region. Ultimately, it should be born in mind that the figurines embody specific information relating to specific context(s), and perhaps acted in unison with other artefact groups and sources of visual representations, which served to communicate with the local population on various levels. For this reason, the figurines should not be expected to provide a complete repertoire of costume worn during the periods studied, but instead should be used to supplement other sources that represent costume.
The previous chapter focused on costume and attributes of costume that may be identified as typical of the Samarkand region as portrayed on provenanced figurines. It also addressed various questions of identity raised in a study of ornamentation portrayed on costume. This has provided a significant comparative source for future studies of costume from other regions within and external to Sogdiana. In order to gain a better understanding of the place of this regional costume style it is useful to locate it in the broader context of Sogdian costume.

The aim of this chapter is to compare the costume of the Samarkand region, as defined in Chapter 5, with costume portrayed on figures identified as "Sogdian" in a broader art historic context. It asks the question: what is currently recognised as "Sogdian" costume and how does the costume of the Samarkand region fit in with this? The discussion is not intended to be exhaustive, but will focus on several examples of images portraying Sogdians from various contexts, regions and periods. These will provide a snapshot of Sogdian costume in its broadest sense and create a framework within which to compare Samarkand regional costume.

Several issues concerning the nature of the primary sources for costume should be clarified. First, while the evidence of costume represented on the Samarkand region terracottas dated to between the 2nd - 1st century BCE and the 4th century CE is relatively rich, there is considerably less evidence for Sogdian costume generally, apart from that represented on terracottas from other regions of Sogdiana. Consequently, Sogdian costume as a whole during this early period has not yet been a focus of scholarly research.

Paradoxically, for the early medieval period, while there is an abundance of source material for Sogdian dress, especially from wall paintings and funerary art, this is not the case for the dress represented on the figurines. Nevertheless, discussions of Sogdian costume relate predominantly to this period. Notably, however, the evidence of headdresses portrayed on the figurines associated with the Samarkand region during this period is rich, while headdresses associated with the broader "Sogdian" population is limited. There is one exception to this. Ossuaries from the Samarkand region dated to this period exhibit a similarly diverse repertoire of dress and headdress types. Yet this should be expected, as terracotta tiles were either incorporated into ossuary walls, or used on their own. The comparative lack of variation of headdresses in the costume repertoire of Sogdians depicted on wall paintings between the 5th and 8th centuries CE, on the other hand, is noteworthy. It may indicate both the different contexts in which the images operated and the different functions they served.

The second issue regarding the nature of the primary material concerns the problem of comparing images represented on media operating in different functioning spheres, which in turn may suggest different audiences for these pieces. This question has been prompted by the absence of demonstrably female dress documented on the

1 While individual elements of costume portrayed on many of the figures discussed in this section have been noted in the discussions of comparative material in the typology, it is nevertheless important to see them as a whole in their own context. This will lead to a more comprehensive understanding of the place of Samarkand regional costume in Sogdian society.
provenanced figurines dating to this period, and also the limited number of female headdresses. Is it justified to expect to find similarities in costume portrayed on terracottas, wall paintings and funerary art? Why are Samarkand region terracottas comparatively poorly represented during the early medieval period when compared with other visual sources, in particular wall paintings? Why is there such a diversity of headdresses represented on small plastic art, while those represented on wall paintings appear relatively limited? While such questions are beyond the scope of this thesis, it is nevertheless important to draw attention to them and highlight possible areas for future study. The leading role played by Samarkand in Sogdian political history suggests that the costume of this region is a potentially fruitful source to focus on these issues.

In effect, the nature of the primary material limits the extent of a discussion of the place of Samarkand regional costume within a broader Sogdian context. The discussion below will focus on Samarkand regional costume (i.e. dress and headdress) dated to between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century CE, and Sogdian dress of the early medieval period as a means of exploring continuities and changes between the two periods and across the media types.

**DEFINING “SOGDIAN”**

Before exploring visual evidence for Sogdian costume, it is important to consider what is understood by this term. The term “Sogdian” is often used to refer broadly to a wide spectrum of people living in various regions including the Zarafshan Valley, the Semi’rêche and trading communities bordering the Tarim Basin. In some cases the use of this more general term obscures possibilities of exploring regional aspects of Sogdian culture, such as costume. It is important to discuss briefly the implications of the often nebulous use of the term. Two main points may be considered. First, although Sogdiana represents a geographic territory centred on the Zarafshan Valley, from as early as the beginning of the 4th century CE, although probably much earlier, a Sogdian diaspora had spread out along the trade routes to the east. While the basic beliefs and language of these communities appear to have been comparable, various other differences in economy, lifestyle and geography, in addition to general experience, may have impacted the way(s) in which members of these communities expressed their identity. While a discussion of the distinctions in identity between those Sogdians living in the Zarafshan Valley “heartland” and those of the diaspora – if any – is beyond the scope of this thesis, there are nevertheless several factors, which suggest that regionality was important. These include the individuality of regional art styles within Sogdiana, attested for example in coroplastic art, and the presence of the names of principalities from the Zarafshan Valley in the personal names of Sogdians of the diaspora.

These two points suggest that the term ‘Sogdian’ needs to be clearly explained in regard to the particular

---

2 The diaspora comprised developed communities of Sogdians, often living together in larger Chinese towns and cities, and which appear to have been divided into clan groups led by a political or religious leader, the sabao. These trading communities were located in regions to the east of Sogdiana, in particular along the northern and southern trade routes around the Taklamakan Desert, and stretching further into China. Sogdian communities are also known in other regions, for example the Semi’rêche.

3 See for example Xinjiang 2000 regarding religious practices in Sogdian trading communities. See also p. 74.

4 See above, p. 86.
geographic region being discussed, and that what is typically “Sogdian” in one region may not be typical for another region.

Following on from this, the second point concerns the criteria used to distinguish Sogdian from non-Sogdian in textual and visual sources. In the present discussion this refers to visual differences more specifically between ethnic Turks, Sogdians and Turco-Sogdians during the early medieval period. As discussed below, there are numerous reasons why people disguise their identity, and in an archaeological context, these present serious impediments to gaining a true understanding of the criteria that may be used to pinpoint specific identities. The point is clearly underlined in the description of the rulers of Kang given in the Suishi, dated to the late 6th century CE:

The king wears plaited hair, is crowned with seven kinds of jewels and gold flowers, and dressed in silk, brocade and white cotton. His wife has a knot of hair, which is veiled over with black cloth. The adult males have their hair cropped short, and are clothed in brocade robes.

This description indicates that while the king wore his hair long in the Turkic manner, the general male population had short hair. This has prompted Shiratori to suggest that although the king of Kang may have belonged to the Hephthalites who wore their hair short, it was in obeisance to the Turkic overlords of Kang that he is described in the Suishi as wearing his hair plaited. Shiratori also suggests that the short hair of the adult males indicates that they comprise the original (Iranian) inhabitants. The knot of hair worn by the females is also significant, as it is similar to the style portrayed on images of female consorts known from Sogdian funerary reliefs from China. Yet it is a style associated with Chinese women during this period. This again raises questions of the identity of these women: were they actually Chinese or, as Grenet has considered, were these consorts perhaps Sogdian, and for reasons of propriety portrayed in Chinese costume?

Regardless of such details, however, it is important to bear in mind that the rulers of Kang described above in the Chinese sources probably did not belong to the original sedentary Sogdian population. Early medieval Sogdian society was mixed, comprising local, sedentary peoples and various newcomers whose ethnic identity remains debatable but are generally thought to include either Iranian or Turkic speaking peoples, or probably both. The influence of the Turkish Kaghahanate on Sogdian society is clear on

---

5 See p. 269. The point has also been explored by Grenet n.d.b.
6 Suishi ch. 83, p. 6 cf., Shiratori 1928: 101. Note also that the addition of gold flowers in the hair is a common characteristic for the ornamentation of women’s hair. For example women from C’iang described in the Chinshu decorate their head with gold flowers (cf., Shiratori 1929: 45).
7 Ibid.: 52. This is an example of how identities become confused in the archaeological and art historical record.
8 Ibid.: 52.
9 See below, p. 276.
10 Grenet n.d.b The absence of female figures in Central Asian costume has recently been discussed by Grenet who suggests that female Sogdian dress was identified predominantly with dancing girls and entertainers and in this context reflected aspects of impropriety. It was therefore deemed disrespectful for the consort of these men to be depicted in Central Asian dress. Yet it remains unclear if the consort portrayed on these images was actually Chinese or if she was simply wearing Chinese dress.
figures represented on the wall paintings. Yet, it is not always possible to define which of these groups held positions of power. Even if positions of power were held predominantly by Turkic speaking peoples, it is possible that local peoples would attempt to emulate to a certain extent Turkic modes of self-identification in order to assimilate with them. Therefore, the presence of long plaits on males should not be taken automatically as representative of ethnic Turks. It is just as likely to represent a personage conforming to the standards of the court, regardless of their ethnic origins. Sogdian trading activities and the location of their settlements on the trade routes indicate that the tolerance of diverse peoples in Sogdian courts was standard.

**Visual representations of Sogdians**

Discussions of Sogdian identity on the basis of visual representations are complex, and often inconclusive. This is underlined by the historico-political situation of the Zerafshan Valley. With these issues in mind, the following section will explore various images of 'Sogdians' as a means of better understanding the place of Samarkand regional costume in the broader Sogdian context.

*Achaemenid representations of Sogdians (6th - 4th century BCE)*

While there are a number of male figures identified as “Sogdian” on Achaemenid reliefs, there are no representations of females at all on the Achaemenid period reliefs. Roaf cautiously identifies Sogdians (or Chorasmians) on reliefs at the Apadana (delegation 17) at Persepolis, the Tripylon (delegation 17), the Hall of 100 Columns (delegation W9), the Palace of Artaxerxes I (delegation XIV), and the Palace of Darius (delegation VI). Three Achaemenid period reliefs showing figures interpreted as Sogdians will be discussed in this section: The Darius Statue, the Royal Tombs at Naqsh-i Rustam, and the Apadana reliefs from Persepolis.

Figures depicted on the Darius Statue from Susa and the Royal Tombs at Naqsh-i Rustam are particularly important as they are identified by an inscription naming their country of origin. This provides a (theoretically) secure means of identifying specific traits of subject peoples of the Empire. It is important to bear in mind, however, that these images were created by craftspeople or masters whose real contact with the Sogdian people may have been very limited. Although there are some variations in the dress of the figures identified as Sogdian, their headdress, comprising a conical cap, remains largely constant throughout the period under discussion, and it is possible to suggest that headgear was one of the primary means of identifying peoples during this period.

*The Statue of Darius*

The kneeling image of a man on the base of the Statue of Darius (fig. 37) dated to sometime after 500 BCE, is best identified as a Sogdian by his headgear. It is described as a “bonnet” with an erect peak at the front, the tip curling very slightly backwards, and

---

11 Roaf 1974: 149.
12 The Darius Statue was found in Susa, however, it was probably made in Egypt, and was intended for an Egyptian audience. See Ibid.: 73.
13 The importance of headgear in ethnic identification has been explored by Vos 1963: 47. See also Wobst 1977.
14 Roaf 1974: 111.
longer flaps at the sides, perhaps to tie under the chin. It sits high enough on the back of the head to allow a knot of hair fastened below the cap to be visible. A similar style of headgear is worn by the Saka of the Marshlands and the Saka of the Plains on the Darius statue, although on these figures the peak is more like a plume in the centre of the head. The Sogdian figure has a short, pointed beard. There is no evidence of an upper body garment. A calf length garment in the form of a loincloth, the folds of which are clearly shown around the thighs and the calves, covers the lower body. The intended audience of the Statue was probably Egyptian, and there are clear Egyptian influences in the style of dress, especially in the naked chest and the loincloth. These limit the comparative value of the dress with that of the figurines.

On the other hand, the headdress is largely comparable with other Achaemenid and later period representations of Sogdians who are stereotypically characterised by a conical cap. Importantly, there are also significant parallels with the conical caps worn by other nomadic Saka peoples portrayed on the Achaemenid period reliefs.

The Royal Tombs at Naqsh-i Rustam

The Achaemenid period Naqsh-i Rustam reliefs are also inscribed with the names of each delegation, although the inscription for the delegation assumed by some scholars to be Sogdian is not preserved. Sogdians have been cautiously identified as Delegation 7 at Naqsh-i Rustam (fig. 38). The figures interpreted as Sogdians wear loose fitting full length trousers underneath a fastened coat. The coat has full length sleeves and a broad trim lining the centre front openings. A belt is looped twice around the waist. The lower hem of the coat, worn to just above the knees, is raised in the centre front of the garment and curves down at the sides, apparently to shin level (the so-called "cutaway"). There is no rear view of the garment. This style of coat is very similar to that worn by the Chorasmians, Bactrians and Saka groups represented on these reliefs. Differentiation between the costume of the figures is shown only in details such as the headdress or the tying of the belt. The headdress is unfortunately unclear on all the preserved figures interpreted as Sogdian at Naqsh-i Rustam. Nevertheless, Schmidt cautiously suggests it is conical, with cheek flaps extending to the chin.

The Apadana reliefs at Persepolis

The identity of the figures represented in Delegation 17 at the Apadana (fig. 39) remains disputed, although Roaf has cautiously identified them as Sogdians and Chorasmians. Other scholars have interpreted them more generally as Saka. The figures comprising Delegation 17 wear a similar style of cut-away coat to the figures interpreted as Sogdians on the Royal Tombs. Their headdress is slightly different to that shown on the Darius statue. On the Apadana figures there is no peak, but instead a bulge at the centre front of the head which is less emphasised. Roaf describes it as a knob. Nevertheless, both headdresses are characterised by the cheek flaps extending under the chin, and the generally conical form.

15 Ibid.: 118.
16 Roaf 1974: 118 calls it a "pointed crest".
17 Schmidt 1957 - 1970 v. III: fig. 43.
18 Ibid.: rear of fig. 44.
19 See also p. 47.
20 Roaf 1974: 112.
Discussion

Gorelik has identified two broad cultural/ethnic groupings on the basis of the costume represented on the Achaemenid reliefs: Median and Persian.\textsuperscript{21} The Sogdians, together with the Chorasmians, are identified under the Persian umbrella as a settled east Iranian language group. Gorelik associates their costume with that of the nomadic Saka peoples. This is clearly differentiated from other complexes, including that of Bactrians.\textsuperscript{22} While it is difficult to dispute the similarity in costume of the Chorasmians, Sogdians and the Saka, the question of parallels in the corpus of Samarkand region costume established in this thesis should be considered.

The headdress worn by delegations identified as Sogdian on the Achaemenid reliefs is a conical cap with cheek flaps that extend under the chin and which were probably used to fasten it. Some examples show a peak at the centre front, while others a more squat "knob". Although the conical cap is a characteristic headdress of provenanced terracottas from the Samarkand region, none of these shows the cheek flaps, nor do they evidence the pronounced knob shown on the Achaemenid examples. Wobst has suggested that "head-dress...carries stylistic messages specific in terms of the largest group that an individual affiliates with."\textsuperscript{23} One of the reasons for this may have been that, being worn on the head, headdress achieved a high level of visibility, even in a crowd or from a distance. The Achaemenid reliefs underline the importance of the role of the headdress as a signifier of broad-scale "ethnic" groups whereby every subject people is individualised by a distinctive headdress. It is then significant that the general shape of the headdress worn by Sogdians on the Achaemenid period reliefs bears general parallels to those worn by various figurines from the Samarkand region.

On the other hand, there are no parallels in the costume of the Samarkand region for the coat worn by the Sogdian delegations on the Achaemenid period reliefs. There may be several explanations for this. It is possible that the coat was associated with a particular social group, one perhaps whose lifestyle was linked to horse riding, although not necessarily nomadism. For example the Sogdian "hyparchs" mentioned in the classical sources may represent a specific group including mounted warriors who moved about on horses.\textsuperscript{24} The extended back of the coat and the shortened front would have been well suited to riding, even as a formal or ceremonial style of dress. This is further supported by the fact that two other coats of a comparable style have been associated with nomadic peoples. These include the coat from Cemetery 2 at Katanda in the Altai\textsuperscript{25} and, perhaps, a (reconstructed) garment found in a female burial on the Syr Darya delta, dated to the 3rd – 4th century CE (fig. 93).\textsuperscript{26} In this respect it may be conjectured that the absence of this coat style in later sources of Sogdian and Samarkand regional dress is more apparent than real, especially in the absence of any other images of Sogdians, apart from terracottas, prior to the 4th century CE. Terracotta art may not have been an appropriate medium on which to represent a figure wearing a coat of this style. It should also be considered that dress and fashions had changed by the time of the appearance of

\textsuperscript{22} Gorelik 1985: 38-9.
\textsuperscript{23} Wobst 1977: 334. Regarding the importance of headdress in signalling identity see also Vos 1963: 47.
\textsuperscript{24} Bloedow 1991 has argued that Sogdiana was in fact famous for its horses.
\textsuperscript{25} This is described in detail in Zakharov 1925: 43
\textsuperscript{26} See Levina 1996: 213-3 and fig. 118.
the figurines, and that this style of coat was simply no longer worn. Finally, it is also possible that such a coat was not worn in the Samarkand region.

Despite the fact that Iranian culture remained one of the defining characteristics of Sogdian society, and that in Sogdiana it contrasted clearly with the Hellenistic culture that pervaded Bactria after the invasion of Alexander, the legacy of Achaemenid influence on Sogdian dress appears to be negligible. Admittedly there are few representations of females during the Achaemenid period with which to compare the abundant female figurines from the Samarkand region. Nevertheless, the hallmarks of Achaemenid female dress during this period—the full sleeves and the drawn up robe—have not been recognised on any of the figurines documented in this thesis. There are, however, very general similarities between the dress of the Sogdians, in particular the pointed cap and the trousers worn under a long shirt or coat, and the costume of the Iranian speaking nomadic world in general.

Several points have been raised in this discussion. Whether or not Achaemenid period representations of Sogdians are faithful in their detail, it is nevertheless clear that Sogdian costume was differentiated from that of the Bactrians, despite their political relationship during this period. Furthermore, the strong parallels between the costume of the Sogdians and Chorasmians, and the Saka peoples underlines the closeness of their relationship and perhaps the perspective of a Sogdian world view, a factor which is clearly demonstrated in textual sources and costume dated in particular to between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century CE. Finally, much importance is attributed to headdress as a defining element in large group affiliation. It is significant that in all cases discussed here, it is the conical cap that links the Achaemenid period representations of Sogdians with the costume of the Zarafshan Valley of later periods. The conical cap presents itself as a headdress associated continuously with the Sogdians, and perhaps more specifically with the inhabitants of the Zarafshan valley, since the Achaemenid period.

**Representations of Sogdians between the 2nd century BCE and the 4th century CE**

Many of the best preserved and most diagnostic figurines in the collections from the Samarkand region have been dated to between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century CE. However, with the exception of coroplastic art from various Sogdian centres, there are no other figural representations of Sogdians dated to this period, which have been conclusively identified. Duyvendak has, however, suggested that a funerary relief from Xiaotang Shan in Shantung, dated to before 129 BCE portrays images of Sogdians. The early dating of the relief, together with the inscription mentioning the name “Hu” indicate the relevance of this relief for the present discussion.

**Xiaotang Shan burial relief**

The relief shows a battle scene between the Chinese and Central Asian nomadic peoples. An inscription reading "Hu-wang, "the King of the Hu (barbarians)" identifies

---

28 See Chapter 3.
29 Duyvendak 1939.
one of the figures.\textsuperscript{30} The relief has been published a number of times, and with a number of different interpretations.\textsuperscript{31}

Duyvendak has studied the scene in detail and suggests that it depicts an historical event involving a battle between the Hu and the Chinese. It is possible to define the clothing generally as a thigh length caftan or coat, usually belted (it is not possible to tell in all cases) and worn over full length loose fitting, slightly flared, trousers. It seems that the trousers are worn loose over the feet. Details on the upper body garments are illustrated in several different ways, which may indicate different groups. For example foot soldiers (moving in both directions) are shown wearing a short black coat and white trousers. Some of the mounted figures are shown in a similar short coat with a black background and tiny white objects, perhaps indicating lamellae, or ornamentation. Other figures are shown in grey or light coloured short coats over light coloured trousers. Significantly, figures in this scene wear the erect conical cap.

Discussion

There are several issues in Duyvendak's discussion that should be considered. The use of the term "Sogdian" to identify the Hu warriors in the scene is questionable for such an early period. It was not until the Tang period that the term Hu is understood to have indicated the Sogdians, if at all.\textsuperscript{32} It would be surprising to see such an early direct reference to Sogdians, even under the Kangju, although the Kangju were known to the Chinese. In this respect, the warriors described as Hu cannot be further defined.\textsuperscript{33} Furthermore, the general dress style of the Xiaotang Shan warriors is ubiquitous during this period throughout Central Asia, western China and the Eurasian Steppes to the Pontic region.\textsuperscript{34} The conical cap may, however, provide an important point of reference for the costume of the Samarkand region.

The costume worn by the warriors portrayed on this relief is difficult to compare with that shown on figurines associated with the Samarkand region. Indeed, an important difference is that the figurines associated with the Samarkand region are shown wearing shirts or tunics over loose fitting trousers, which are often tucked in knee high boots. On the other hand, similarities with the dress of Scythians portrayed on gold vessels from the

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid.: 256. The artist remains unknown and the subject matter and location has prompted Duyvendak to question to authenticity of the image. He suggests that on account of the spontaneous nature of the battle an official artist would not have been present at the scene, and indicates as most likely the presence of foreign influence on the painting. This should be borne in mind with regard to the accuracy of the illustrations. See Ibid.: 262-3.

\textsuperscript{31} Soper 1974. See also Hung 1989: 199, fig. 75 and p. 201, fig. 77. The battle scene remains difficult to interpret in the context of a shrine. According to Soper, "...it may have been intended simply as a proud reference to the exploits of Chinese armies in the far west during Wang's adult years" (Soper 1974: 261).

\textsuperscript{32} See n. 33.

\textsuperscript{33} Sinor 1990: 288 states that "the term "Hu" is open to two interpretations: it may be used as a generic for "Barbarians," or, specifically, may designate the Sogdians". Mau-Tsai 1958 v. II: 755 suggests that during the Tang period the term "hu" specifically indicated Sogdians, although there was an additional underlying meaning of "barbarian". See also v. II: 490-91 n. 22. According to Laufer 1919 (1973): 194, following Chavannes and Pelliot, usage of the term during the Han period was in reference to Turkic peoples, while from the 4th century CE it referred to Central Asian peoples, in particular "of Iranian extraction".

\textsuperscript{34} See for example images of Scythians on gold vessels from the Pontic region in Jacobsen 1995: fig. 84. See also Keller 2001: 35, fig. 37 and Keller 2001: 31, fig. 29 for figures portrayed on textile remains from Shanpula, on the southern rim of the Tarim Basin. These are dated to between the 3rd century BCE and the 3rd century CE.
northern Black Sea region (see for example fig. 113) may be seen as broadly similar with the Xiaotang Shan warriors.

*Representations of Sogdians during the Early Medieval Period, c. 5th – 8th century CE*

Discussions of Sogdian costume in the scholarly literature deal predominantly with this period because of the relative abundance of sources – in particular wall paintings and Sogdian art from China.

*Early medieval wall paintings*

The wall paintings of four Sogdian centres provide evidence of Sogdian dress between the 5th and 8th centuries CE. The earliest known paintings are from Dzhar-tepe and have been dated to the 4th or early 5th century CE.36 The paintings of Afrasiab date to between 650 and 675 CE.37 Those from Pendiikent are dated to between the 6th and 8th century, although most are from the early 8th century CE.38 Finally, the paintings of Varakhsha are dated to the 7th and beginning of the 8th century CE.39 Significant research on the costume represented on wall paintings from other centres of early medieval Central Asia and the Tarim Basin has been undertaken by D’yankova,40 Bentovich,41 Lobacheva,42 Maytdinova43 and Yatzenko.44 These include descriptive works of the different costume styles and details, including Sogdian costume, and provide a general comparative resource. The importance of the wall paintings lies in the realistic portrayal of costume, in addition to the use of colour.45 However, in discussions of Sogdian dress based on costumes portrayed on wall paintings, issues remain regarding the geographical or ethnic identity of the figures. Despite this, there are very broad parallels that may be drawn between various costumes portrayed on the wall paintings and those of the provenanced terracottas. The discussion below will outline the main characteristics attributed to Sogdian dress portrayed on wall paintings both in Sogdiana and other centers.

Typical male Sogdian dress depicted on wall paintings from various centres in Sogdiana between the 5th and 8th centuries CE comprises numerous variations on a long sleeved tunic or dress with a round neck and often worn belted. The openings of the garment, including side slits on the skirt, were typically decorated with a contrasting fabric. The tunic is worn to the knees, or slightly above, or to shin level. Loose fitting trousers were worn underneath. This may be seen as a variation of the costume worn by a specific group of figurines dated to between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century CE, comprising a tunic worn over trousers, often tucked into knee high boots.46 Shin length dresses with trousers worn underneath are also typical of female dress prior to the

---

35 See p. 5-6.
37 Marshak 1994: 11.
40 D’yakonova 1961.
41 Bentovich 1980.
45 See p. 261.
46 See for example RM A36 31.
4th century CE. Nevertheless, the manner of ornamentation of the tunics portrayed on the wall paintings clearly differentiates them from the costume of the previous period. Although this may simply indicate a change in aesthetic among the population, it may equally reflect a shift in ideas regarding the body, and also economy and lifestyle.

It is possible to define more specific characteristics of costume on the wall paintings. According to Lobacheva, there are several characteristics of Sogdian (and Turco-Sogdian) dress at Panjikent worn by the aristocracy and merchants. Coats worn by the aristocracy have full length sleeves with low cuffs. The hem, collar and sleeves of these coats are also characterised by contrasting pieces on fabric. Coats worn by merchants have longer sleeves and higher cuffs. Bentovich has suggested that the coat with a lapel on the right and a trim on the hem is typical for Panjikent. There is one example of this style of coat from the Samarkand region (D02.04).

Cloaks worn over dresses with round necks are particularly characteristic of female Sogdian dress represented on the wall paintings. The cloaks often have a decorated band lining the center front openings, reminiscent of the cloaks documented above on the figurines (D01.01). An important difference is the presence of a single or double lapel on the cloaks. Notably, however, a figure portrayed on the Varakhsha wall paintings wears a cloak with no collar, and a trim on the centre front openings, very similar to type variants D01.01. It is difficult to comment on the dresses worn under cloaks as they are usually hidden. The general outfit comprising a cloak with ornamented centre front openings is especially characteristic of female costume represented on the figurines from the Samarkand region dated to between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century CE.

Discussion

It is possible to suggest that the general dress styles represented on both male and female figurines dated prior to the 4th century CE show some continuity with that of the early medieval period represented on the wall paintings of Sogdian centres. This is most clearly demonstrated by the presence in both repertoires of the cloak worn draped over the shoulders, and the tunic worn over trousers tucked into knee high boots. Changes are noted in the cut of the tunic, whereby in the early medieval period it was relatively loose fitting and longer, and also in the presence and placement of ornamentation of tunics. While various styles of drapery are characteristic of the dress of the Samarkand region prior to the 4th century CE, other means of naturalistic portrayal are used on the wall paintings.

Images of Sogdians in China during the early medieval period

The presence of Sogdian trading communities in western China and further east stimulated the development of another style of "Sogdian" art incorporating various traits from Chinese art. There are a number of pieces, dated predominantly to the 6th and 7th centuries CE, portraying figures identified as Sogdian. These works represent an important source of images of the Sogdian diaspora, which underline a fusion of Chinese.

47 Lobacheva 1979: 22.
and Central Asian cultures, ultimately in a Sogdian context. Three pieces in particular will be discussed in this section.

**Stone mortuary bed, Anyang, Henan Province**

A stone mortuary bed from Anyang in Henan Province was identified by Scaglia as an example of Sogdian art bearing Zoroastrian ritual scenes. It has been dated to the Northern Qi dynasty (550 – 577 CE). The costume worn by figures on the reliefs comprises a shin length coat, worn fastened around the waist with a belt. It has a double lapel, folded back on either side. The hem and centre front openings are characterised by a broad band ornamented with circles. The sleeves of the garment, including the cuffs, are ornamented with a number of narrower bands circling the arm, either plain, or ornamented with the circular pattern. In some instances, the sleeves are ornamented with only a single ornamented band around the upper arm. Trousers are fitted at the ankle with a narrow band. The hem of the trousers on some figures is ornamented with a narrow band with the circular pattern. This may indicate a higher rank, as a seated ruler figure is depicted wearing this style of trousers, as are figures forming the head of a procession, while those behind them wear the simpler style without ornamentation.

The dress ornamented with circular motifs is described by Anchung as “classic Sogdian dress, and most of the figures in the murals at Afrasiab ... wear similar apparel”. There are no clear examples of headdress on these images, and in many cases it appears that headgear was not worn. The belts, where it is possible to tell, appear to be ornamented with square shaped plaques. Armed figures wear long garments with round necks and pearl ornamented trimming around the hem and up the centre of the garment. Coats with double lapels and open at the neck are worn by other figures. This costume reflects a Central Asian identity for almost all the men. However, the women’s hairstyle – the chignon – betrays a Chinese influence. Scaglia suggests a Sogdian identity for these people, and that the tomb probably belonged to an inhabitant of Samarkand.

**Funerary couch, Miho Museum**

A funerary couch with 11 panels and two gate post towers located in the Miho Museum (fig. 70) thought to originate in northern China during the late 6th – early 7th century shows a similar style of cultic scene foreign to Chinese art, which is probably to be interpreted in the context of Sogdian funerary art. Lerner suggests three possible

---

48 The most recent piece to be added to this growing corpus of evidence was found in August 2003. A sarcophagus bearing imagery comparable with that discussed in this section was found in a tomb dating to the Northern Zhou period in Xi'an. The epitaph stone identifies the owner as Shi jun, from Kesh, to the south of Samarkand. See Yang Junkai, 2003 "The Third Significant Discovery about Zoroastrianism - Tomb of Mister Shi, Sabao of the Northern Zhou, at Xi'an" in *Wenwu tiendi* 11: 26-29. I am very grateful to Judith Lemer for this information.

49 See also Boqin 2000. This has also been discussed by Anchang 2000.

49 See also Boqin 2000. This has also been discussed by Anchang 2000.

50 Anchang 2000: 75.

51 Scaglia 1958: 17. Although these garments are typically interpreted as coats, it is noteworthy that the ornamental trim band does not reflect an open garment, and only in some circumstances does this trim band continue to form the trim along the center front of the garment. It is difficult to decide whether this is deliberate, or is simply a result of the complex detailing of the scenes.

52 Ibid.

ethnic identities for the figures portrayed on the panels: the men, certainly Central Asians, and probably Sogdians and also some Turks, while the women are Chinese.54

Lerner and Juliano have cautiously identified two panels in particular, which depict a Sogdian male as the focus of a particular scene.55 They suggest Panel E (fig. 70, L) portrays the marriage feast of a Sogdian man to a Chinese lady. Here the male figure is wearing a rectangular shaped hat positioned on the crown of his head. He has short hair and a beard that is pointed at the chin. The shape of this headdress can be compared with HD01.l0.01*, which has been associated with the Turkic speakers during the early medieval period. He is wearing an open upper body garment draped over the shoulders. While the design of this garment is unclear, it is very similar to that worn by the female figure seated opposite. The shoulders are covered by a short outer panel, which covers only the upper part of the arm. The rest of the cloak is visible to the side of the body. Underneath this is worn a closed garment, probably a dress. It is belted around the waist. No details of the belt are visible. The dress is characterised by a broad central panel, the length of which is unclear, and a broad hem. The figure is wearing knee high boots with curved uppers, similar to those of D08.02*. The dress of this figure appears to be largely similar to that of the entertainers shown on the lower register of the panel.

The costume worn by the female figure on this panel is noteworthy. A cloak is worn draped around the shoulders, and appears quite long. Although there is no ornamentation on the centre front openings, it is possible to compare the manner of wearing broadly with that of D01.01. Although details of the dress worn underneath are difficult to define, the long sleeve covering the right hand is similar to the dress worn by the central female figure of the boat scene on the northern wall at Afrasiab.56 This may indicate a Chinese context in this instance, although it should be noted that the dress with a long sleeve is known generally across the Eurasian steppe.57

Panel G (see fig. 70, R) is cautiously interpreted by Juliano and Lerner to represent the deceased in a banquet scene. The man is wearing a rectangular shaped cap, perched on the crown of his head, similar to that described above. He has short hair, identical in style to the figure described above and no beard. His dress is unclear. The upper body garment has a round neck and is characterised by a broad panel running vertically down the centre. It is ornamented with large circular shapes. Around the waist is worn a distinctive belt, possibly a rolled up sash with semi-circular shaped ornaments attached to the under side. A similar belt is worn by two kneeling figures at the bottom of the panel, one of whom also wears a similar shaped hat. It is unclear whether the upper body garment is open or closed, however, it is likely that it is the ubiquitous knee–shin length dress with the ornamented central panel. The lower body garment is also unclear. High boots are worn to the knee. They are characterised by a curved upper line, and a horizontal panel ornamented with circles (?) just below the upper edge.

**Stone couch from the tomb of An Qie**

A stone divan from the tomb of a Sogdian aristocrat, An Qie, also portrays numerous images of people in Central Asian clothing, together with Zoroastrian ritual

---

56 Albaim 1975: fig. 21.
57 Barber 1999.
scenes.\textsuperscript{58} An Qie died in 579.\textsuperscript{59} His name betrays his family’s origins (An = Bukhara), although he lived in Changsong.

Different characters are portrayed on the panels of the couch, providing a particularly rich comparative source. Dancers are portrayed wearing red knee length dresses with an unornamented belt around the waist. A plain band ornaments the hem. Particularly noteworthy are the long sleeves, which appear to hang below the length of the hand, and may be associated with a particular dance movement.\textsuperscript{50} The dancers wear fitted black caps on their heads. It is unclear whether they are wearing loose fitting trousers under the dresses, or if these are knee high boots. An image, probably of a ruler on a hunting expedition, shows him wearing a knee length (?) brown coat fastened at the front and ornamented with red trim at the centre front, hem and cuffs. A celebration scene involving music shows several different types of costume. The central figure wears a long red coat with an open collar and long sleeves with a brown trim band on the centre front openings and the cuffs. He wears high black boots underneath the coat. He does not wear a headdress. The figure seated on his left is wearing a similar dress, and also a rectangular shaped headdress, worn loosely on top of the head. A figure in the back row appears to be wearing a garment with double lapels folded back. He has no headdress. Other figures next to him are wearing an upper body garment that appears to have a round neck. A banqueting scene shows a seated male and female. Details of the clothing are difficult to make out, however, the female appears to be wearing a cloak over her shoulders.

Fulai suggests that “the same group of people are being depicted”.\textsuperscript{61} There are a number of figures on the screen whose costume associates them broadly with Central Asia: figures wearing long coats with double lapels, belted, and with knee high boots. Other figures wear a round necked closed garment, also with a belt, and which is not out of place in Central Asia. These figures have short hair, while those in the long coats have long hair. On the basis of descriptions of people living in the kingdom of Kang in the \textit{Beishi}, Fulai suggests that those with short hair are Sogdians, and those with long hair are Turkic.\textsuperscript{62}

\textbf{Discussion}

Inscriptions associated with some of the funerary art from China indicate an affiliation with Sogdiana on the basis of personal names, making these pieces valuable sources for exploring Sogdian culture and society. Ancheng suggests the clothing worn by the above described figures is “classic Sogdian”, similar to that worn by figures on the Afrasiab paintings.\textsuperscript{63} This is broadly true, although there are differences in elements of ornamentation, such as the use of very broad trims or borders, and the panels covering the shoulder and upper arm of the coat worn by the central male figure on panel E of the funerary bed in the Miho Museum. The headdress of the male figures or both of these panels is atypical of headdresses found on wall paintings, although there are some similarities with headdresses represented on the Samarkand region figurines. It is

\textsuperscript{58} Fulai 2000.
\textsuperscript{59} Marshak 1994: 22.
\textsuperscript{60} See for example Barber 1999.
\textsuperscript{61} Fulai 2000: 27.
\textsuperscript{62} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{63} Anchang 2000: 75.
therefore possible to suggest that specific geographic or regional identity markers may have been incorporated into costume, as they were in personal names.

Although certain elements of costume portrayed on these figures may be associated with Sogdian dress in general, for example the tunic or dress worn over trousers and the applied ornamented hem, and the Zarafshān Valley in particular, the Sogdian costume of the trading communities tends to exhibit a syncretic mix of features different to that found in the Zarafshān Valley. The dress of the peoples identified as Sogdian discussed in this section generally comprises a knee length coat or shirt worn over semi-fitted trousers, which may or may not be tucked into knee high boots. Ornamentation is found around the hem of the garment and also on a vertical panel on the centre front of the upper body garment. Yet this general dress style is not limited to figures interpreted as Sogdian, but is to be seen in a much broader Central Asian context. Furthermore, traits that have been interpreted by some scholars as specifically Sogdian, or Turco-Sogdian, for example the folded back left lapel (see below), are not found on these images. On the funerary couch in the Miho Museum two figures with long plaited hair are situated on the left of the central figure on panel G. Unfortunately the details of their dress are hidden. Nevertheless, this raises the issues of mixed identities in this context.\(^\text{64}\) The very nature of the trading networks and the role of the Sogdian merchants implies that they would have been exposed to different influences and tastes.

There are numerous parallels in the general style of male costume between these images from China and those on wall paintings from within Sogdiana, and which are also very generally echoed on dress from the Samarkand region of the earlier period, together with some specific headdresses from the same period. However, none of the elements defined in Chapter 5 as characteristic of the Samarkand region has been identified on the costume of these figures.

\textit{Tang period tomb figurines}

Tang period tomb figurines provide an especially rich source of imagery of Central Asian (and other) peoples in various guises of everyday life. Several of these figures have been identified as Sogdian on the basis of their costume.

A Tang period figurine in the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin shows a figure wearing a knee length coat, wrapped left over right and with a triangular lapel on the left side. Mahler interprets this figure as a north eastern Iranian.\(^\text{65}\) Yatzenko, however, suggests that the figure may be identified more specifically as Sogdian on the basis of specific elements of costume including a high conical cap, a shirt with triangular sections cut at the side seams, trousers tucked into knee high boots with a pointed or straight upper, a caftan or coat with a single lapel and wrapped from left to right and an attached wide hem and a belt with a short tongue.\(^\text{66}\) This identification raises several points. The triangular up-turned brim is unknown from other visual or textual sources relating to the Zarafshān Valley, or Sogdian costume in general, while the coat with the left lapel turned back is also found in other regions. Moreover, it seems that the coat with the right lapel

\(^{64}\) Xinjiang 2000: 138 also comments on this mixing of identities in certain contexts. See further the discussion by Xinjiang 2000: 129.

\(^{65}\) Mahler 1959: pl. 21 a – c.

\(^{66}\) Yatzenko 2003: 15. See also the figurine in Kalter and Pavaloi 1997: 17, fig. 6 which is identified by Yatzenko 2003: 15 as Sogdian. de la Vaissière 2002: pl. IV illustrates Tang period figurines wearing high conical caps interpreted as Sogdians.
turned back is more common for the Zarafshan Valley. While it cannot be ruled out that this headdress type variant is affiliated with Sogdiana, the boots and coat remain more broadly representative of Central Asian dress, rather than specifically Sogdian. It therefore seems premature to identify these figures as Sogdian.

On the other hand, several Tang period figurines identified as “Tocharian” or “Sino-Tocharian” by Mahler67 reflect significant similarities with the dress portrayed on some Samarkand figurines dated to the 2nd-1st century BCE – 4th century CE. One figurine (fig. 31) identified as Sino-Tocharian wears a shin length kandys over a dress of a similar length, and which appears to be worn with a narrow belt around the waist.68 A “Tocharian” male (fig. 32) also wears a kandys, fastened at the neck with a tie. It is unclear what is worn underneath the kandys, however, very loose fitting trousers are worn, interestingly with folds etched into the insides of the calves69 similar to D07.01.02. The dress style reflects that shown on figurines from the Samarkand region dated prior to the 4th century CE.70

Discussion

Several Tang period figurines have been interpreted as Sogdian on the basis of the combination of specific elements of costume including a conical cap with an upturned and peaked brim and a coat with a folded back left lapel. However, the justification for these interpretations is unclear as there is little evidence from within Sogdiana itself, or the Sogdian trading communities in China, to confirm such identifications. The conical cap with the upturned brim is not evidenced on visual representations associated with Sogdiana. The coat with the folded back left lapel is noted on various figures, some of which may be identified as Sogdian, but found both within and external to, Sogdiana. While the predominance of “Sogdian” merchants on the trade routes cannot be doubted, the inclusion of traders and merchants from other regions of Central Asia under this umbrella should also be considered. The Tang period figurines discussed in this section exhibit some elements of costume that may be associated with Sogdians, in particular the conical cap (HD01.01), the long shirt with divided side seams, knee high boots (D08.01 and D08.02*), and possibly the coat with the right lapel (D02.04). Only the trousers with creases shown in the inner calf have a close parallel in trousers from the Samarkand region (D07.01.02). With the exception of these trousers, in the broader context of Central Asia the other traits are essentially generic attributes of costume, which require further evidence before they can be attributed to Sogdians in particular.

Summary

This brief survey of visual comparative sources of Sogdian costume has highlighted ambiguities in current understanding of Sogdian identity on the basis of costume alone. Although there has been significant research into the costume portrayed on visual representations of figures thought to represent Sogdians during the early medieval period, specific traits of Sogdian costume are in many cases ill-defined, and in fact, the use of this term often requires further justification. Comparative study of the

67 Mahler 1959: see for example pl. XIIa and b.
68 Ibid.: pl. XIIb.
69 Ibid.: pl. XIIa.
70 For example Trever 1934: pl. 8, 106.
costume represented on the terracottas with that shown on figures whose identity to a greater or lesser degree may be understood as Sogdian suggests some differences in the costume worn by certain members of the diaspora and those of the Sogdian heartland. Numerous reasons may be cited for this, including the different audiences for whom the pieces were intended, together with their function(s) and the fact that individuals of different status may have been recognised in the local community by different identity codes, in addition to the development of regional identities. These issues require more research before they can be fully understood.

Where does this leave the place of Samarkand regional costume in the broader Sogdian context? The conical cap is typically—and correctly—associated with the Zarafshān Valley during between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 4th century CE. It is one of the hallmarks of Sogdian costume represented on Achaemenid period reliefs. Yet, while there is considerably less evidence for this headdress style during the early medieval period in the Zaraşfān Valley, variations of the conical cap are often described as an indicator of Sogdian identity in the broader context of the trade routes. The variations, such as the triangular shaped upturned brim, are not known in the Zarafšān Valley to date. General male and female costume styles represented on figurines dated to before the 4th century CE show some continuity with those worn during the early medieval period in Sogdiana, and also among the diaspora. These styles include the cloak worn draped around the shoulders and semi-fitted trousers tucked into knee high boots worn underneath a tunic, and later a slightly longer dress. Yet, while these styles may be characteristic of Sogdian costume in general, they are also generic enough to be associated with other population groups, such as women in Tokharia, depicted at Balalyktepe (fig. 126).

Due to the scant comparative evidence, and the discontinuous nature of the primary and comparative material, it is difficult to understand the place of Samarkand regional dress in the broader context of Sogdian costume. There is no doubt that "Sogdians" of both the diaspora and the Zarafshān Valley were recognised by their dress in the early Medieval period, and probably also previous to this. An Lushan, an influential Sogdian soldier, is described as being "dressed in Sogdian garb..." when soldiers came to visit him.71 However, the particular traits of "Sogdian" costume are difficult to isolate, on the basis of the above evidence, from what may be described more generally as Central Asian dress. Locally made figurines, such as those from the Samarkand region, in addition to the important collections from other regions in Sogdiana, such as Panjikent and Erkurgan, are a valuable means of identifying specific costume elements that may be recognised as local. When the database of imagery expands, it will be fruitful to isolate and compare these local traits with the costume of the Sogdian diaspora.

SUMMARY AND GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

This thesis has focused on three broad aims. First, to identify the characteristics of Samarkand region costume from the Samarkand region. Second, to discuss the characteristics of Samarkand region costume in the context of comparative material from surrounding areas in order to facilitate a better understanding of the role and impact of these societies and influences on Sogdiana, and in particular the Zarafshan Valley. The third aim has been to explore aspects of Sogdian identity on the basis of visual sources in order to ascertain the place of Samarkand regional dress in this broader context.

As noted in Chapter 2, there are numerous and serious theoretical limitations to this study, primarily because of the problematic archaeological context for the majority of the figurines. Chapter 3 provides a detailed discussion of the historical context of the Samarkand region and Sogdiana from the Achaemenid period to the beginning of the 8th century CE. This section is critical to understanding the range of cultural and political influences that one may expect to find on the costume of the terracottas from the Samarkand region. Chapter 4 presents the typology of the costume represented on terracottas from the Samarkand region dated to between the 2nd-1st century BCE and the 8th century CE. The breakdown of costume into garment and headdress types, type variants and ornamentation groups has helped to isolate elements of costume peculiar to the Samarkand region. The comparative material discussed in this section demonstrates, in particular, parallels from the surrounding regions of Bactria and Chorasmia, the Saka/Scythian world of the 2nd half of the 1st millennium BCE, the Parthian and Kushan empires and, from the early medieval period, the Turkic and Sasanian worlds. Chapter 5 identifies the garment type variants and the specific ornamentation styles that are characteristic of the Samarkand region on the basis of provenanced figurines only. This chapter also considers various aspects of identity conveyed by ornamentation. Chapter 6 places the evidence of the costume represented on the figurines from the Samarkand region in the broader context of visual representations of figures interpreted as "Sogdian" from various regions and periods.

One of the primary characteristics of Samarkand regional costume is its eclecticism. This is manifest in the diversity of comparative material discussed in this thesis. Yet for the two main chronological periods considered, the eclecticism is drawn from different sources. For the first of these chronological periods (2nd-1st century BCE – 4th century CE), parallels tend to be limited to regional, Central Asian sources, with an additional emphasis on nomadic peoples included under the Saka and Scythian umbrellas. For this period female dress of the Samarkand region may be defined predominantly as enveloping. It is characterised by shin length cloaks or kandys worn over shin or ankle length dresses with loose fitting ankle length trousers worn underneath. Cropped, shin length trousers are also known during this period. It was also possible for the dress to be worn without an over-garment. While the applied ornamentation of dresses finds parallels with ornamentation styles and placement from contiguous regions, it is the manner of representing drapery on dresses and trousers that isolates the dress of figurines from the Samarkand region. Five styles in particular may be associated with the Samarkand region during this period: "calf drapery" on trousers; and on dresses, triangular form drapery, "darts", drapery from girdle and "pin stripes". A completely different style of female dress is also documented, which is similar to male dress worn...
during this period. It comprises a thigh length tunic worn over loose or semi-fitted trousers, often tucked into knee high boots. The male tunics are typically worn belted, with modest ornamentation on the lower half of the garment. This is the classic costume of the Iranian speaking nomads, however, the ornamentation portrayed on the Samarkand region examples (in particular ribbing) indicates strong parallels with the Parthian and Kushan representative styles. Headdresses during this period appear to be "soft" (fabric based) and generally comprise variations on the conical shaped headdresses, or headdresses. Both of these types are common Central Asian styles during this period and their legacy remains visible in the headdresses of the region today. Headbands were also worn, although less commonly. Although it has been possible to isolate certain features of costume particular to the Samarkand region, it is in general the total sum of elements that characterise the Samarkand regional style for both males and females during this period.

In the second chronological period (5th – 8th century CE), the relative abundance of costume types, type variants and ornamentation groups is considerably less than that documented in the Samarkand region for the earlier period. Scholars are therefore forced to turn to other visual sources, such as wall paintings and ossuaries found in the Samarkand region to supplement the meagre evidence supplied by the figurines. There is a continuation of styles from the previous period, although with an increasingly obvious Sasanian influence. While there is very little evidence of female costume preserved on figurines documented for this study, male dress in the form of a closed upper body garment is well provided for by the numerous rider figurines traditionally dated to this period. Headdresses in particular manifest an eclectic range of parallels, including regional Central Asian, Scythian, Turkic and Sasanian. While no elements of costume from this period can be isolated as distinctive of the Samarkand region, there are certain general characteristics, such as the innovative style of adapting elements of Sasanian dynastic iconography.

The issue of regional identity in Sogdiana and Samarkand has been explored in this thesis on the basis of costume represented on figurines. There are two important factors, however, which must be borne in mind. While it has been possible to define stylistic elements, in particular elements of drapery, that may be associated with the Samarkand region, it has been shown that none of these traits are found on figures in the broader Sogdian context that have been interpreted as Sogdian. One of the obvious reasons for this may be attributed to time; traits peculiar to the Samarkand region are found on figurines dated to before the 4th century CE, while all of the comparative material dealing with images of Sogdians is dated to the early medieval period. It may also be suggested that with the opening up of society from the early medieval period, Sogdian costume styles became more open to the influence of increasingly dominant empires, such as the Sasanian empire in the west and also the Turkic Kaganate in the east.

The discussion of figures interpreted as Sogdians in art historical contexts has also highlighted several problems in current research regarding this. Primarily, it seems that while the fragmented nature of Sogdian political administration in the Zarafshan Valley may be reflected in the diversity of the costume of Sogdians living both in the Zarafshan Valley and in the trading communities to the east, little research has been undertaken to define more closely such regional traits. Important corpora of material include the
figurine collections of Panjikent, the Nakhshab and Bukhara oases, and also, although more scant, Sogdian art from China. Admittedly, on the basis of present evidence such regionalism is difficult to define, however, identifications of Sogdians in scholarly literature are nevertheless made with little justification as to why. This is particularly clear in the identification of some Tang period figurines as Sogdians. In addition to the principalities of the Zarafshān Valley, there were numerous Sogdian communities established along the trade routes during the early medieval period. No doubt there were elements of regionalism among these societies. Further research into such societies may focus on traits that were specific to them.

To date, the Samarkand terracottas remain the only source of visual representations directly linked to the indigenous population from this region prior to the early medieval period. As noted above, this makes them a critical source of evidence during this period. Although the number of provenanced figurines dated to the early medieval period decreases, they nevertheless embody a critical comparative source for other visual representations from the Zarafshān Valley, predominantly wall paintings, and also visual evidence attributed to the Sogdian diaspora during this period. These factors underline the importance of the figurines as a source of evidence for beginning to establish elements of Sogdian identity in a localised context, such as the Samarkand region. Moreover, in this respect the figurines provide a very particular insight on Sogdian identity, as they comprise a source of visual evidence that may have been used in a very different context to other sources of visual evidence from Sogdiana, such as wall paintings. The functioning sphere of different media types, such as terracotta and wall paintings, may explain why little comparative material has been found for several type variants and ornamentation groups identified in the dress and headdress typology. This also raises numerous questions regarding workshops and the role(s) of visual arts in Samarkand society. These are important areas for future research.

Continued costume research remains a critical component of archaeological and art historical research on Sogdiana, and Central Asia in general. There are several important collections of figurines referred to in this thesis, which may be used to present comparative analyses of costume traits for other regions of Sogdiana, such as Panjikent, and the Nakhshab and Bukhara oases. While it must be assumed that not all of these figurines may necessarily be identified as local, and that in many cases the use of stylistic conventions renders some elements of their costume syncretic, they nevertheless provide an excellent window on local costume characteristics. Moreover, the study of costume represented on the slowly increasing corpus of Sogdian art from China provides further fruitful opportunities to explore the different levels of interaction between the Sogdian "heartland" of the Zarafshān Valley, and the diaspora, if, indeed, such links were maintained. Such studies are also important both for their insight on Sogdian society, history and culture, and also as a comparative source for contiguous regions.

While the importance of terracotta figurines from the Samarkand region as a critical source of evidence has been lessened by the absence of archaeological context, this thesis has shown that they nevertheless provide a critical resource with which to access regional society.
Map A General area covered in this thesis, including modern political boundaries. The inset numbers refer to detailed maps below. 1 = the northern Black Sea region; 2 = Chorasmia; 3 = the Zarafshan Valley; 4 = Bactria and 5 = the Tarim Basin and the Altai Mountains.
Map 1 Sites of Scythian burials from the region to the north of the Black Sea mentioned in the text (adapted from Jacobsen 1995: 80).

Map 2 Detail of Chorasmia and sites mentioned in the text (adapted from Harmatta 1996: map 8).

Map 3 Detail of the Zarafshân Valley, including the names of sites mentioned in the text (adapted from de la Vaissière 2002).
Map 4 Detail of Bactria including the names of sites mentioned in the text (adapted from Harmatta 1996: map 7).

Map 5 Tarim Basin and the Altai Mountains, including sites mentioned in the text (adapted from Harmatta 1996: map 1).
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Figure 1 Terracotta figurine from Koi Krylgan-kala, c. 4th - 3rd century BCE.

Figure 2 Pottery mould from Kalali-Gir 2, mid 4th - early 2nd century BCE.

Figure 3 Terracotta figurine from Koi Krylgan-kala, c. 2nd - 3rd century CE.

Figure 4 Head fragment of a terracotta figurine from Khumbuztepe.

Figure 5 Fragment of a terracotta figurine from Chorasmia.

Figure 6 Fragment of a terracotta figurine from Chorasmia.

Figure 7 Figurine from Merv dated to the 3rd - 4th century CE.

Figure 8 Figurine from Merv dated to between the 1st - beginning of the 3rd century CE.

Figure 9 Kushan period figurine from the middle reaches of the Amu Darya.

Figure 10 Kushan period figurine from the middle reaches of the Amu Darya.

Figure 11 Kushan period figurine from the middle reaches of the Amu Darya.

Figure 12 Kushan period figurine from the middle reaches of the Amu Darya.
Figure 13 Kushan period figurine from the middle reaches of the Amu Darya.

Figure 14 Kushan period figurine from the middle reaches of the Amu Darya.

Figure 15 Kushan period figurine from the middle reaches of the Amu Darya.

Figure 16 Figurine from Paykand

Figure 17 Unstratified terracotta horse and rider figurine from Old Kandahar.

Figure 18 Terracotta figurine from Old Kandahar dated to between c. 120 and 50 BCE.

Figure 19 Terracotta figurine Old Kandahar dated to between c. 150 and 120 BCE.
Figure 20 Statue from Hadda.

Figure 21 Terracotta figurine from Zar-tepe.

Figure 22 Plaque from Kurgan-tyobe dated to the Kushan period.

Figure 23 Terracotta figurine from Mirzakultepe.

Figure 24 Terracotta figurine from Mirzakultepe.

Figure 25 Terracotta figurine from Babatag.

Figure 26 Terracotta figurine from Shortepa.

Figure 27 Terracotta figurine from Dalverzin-tepe.

Figure 28 Female figurine from Sakhsanokhur dated to the Greco-Bactrian period.

Figure 29 Female figurine from Sakhsanokhur dated to the Kushan period.

Figure 30 Terracotta head of a Scythian from the Caucasus dated to the 6th century BCE.

Figure 31 Tang period figurine.
Figure 32 Tang period figurine.

Figure 33 Tang period figurine.

Figure 34 Tang period figurine.

Figure 35 Hephthalite terracotta from Budrash.

Figure 36 Detail of winged headdress on terracotta figurines from Afrasiab housed in the Tashkent Museum.

Figure 37 Drawing of a Sogdian on the Statue of Darius.

Figure 38 Relief showing a Sogdian from Royal Tomb 6 at Naqsh-i Rustam.
Figure 39 Delegation of the Chorasmians and Sogdians (?) from the Apadana at Persepolis.

Figure 40 Head from Gyar-kala, Sultanuizdag, c. 1st – 2nd century CE.

Figure 41 Kushan period statue from Shotorak.

Figure 42 Kushan period statue from Shotorak.

Figure 43 Lower half of statue from Surkh Kotal.

Figure 44 Illustration of fig. 43.

Figure 45 Female figure from Shotorak, c. 150 CE.

Figure 46 Detail of Kushan donors from Shotorak.

Figure 47 Illustration of male Kushan donor from Shotorak.

Figure 48 Fragment of sculpture from Hadda dated to the Kushan period.

Figure 49 Fragment of sculpture from Hadda dated to the Kushan period.

Figure 50 Fragment of sculpture from Hadda dated to the Kushan period.

Figure 51 Fragment of sculpture from Hadda dated to the Kushan period.
Figure 52 Male figure from a rock cut relief from Bisotun.

Figure 53 Figure in late Parthian dress from Gandhara.

Figure 54 Figure in late Parthian dress from Peshawar.

Figure 55 Figure in late Parthian dress from Mathura.

Figure 56 Ceramic head from Seleucia on the Tigris.

Figure 57 Detail of rock relief at Tang-i Sarvak.

Figure 58 Detail of statue from Palmyra dated to the first half of the 2nd century CE.

Figure 59 Illustration of headdress in fig. 58.

Figure 60 Detail of statue from Palmyra, 3rd century CE.

Figure 61 Illustration of stucco bust from Palace I at Kish, 5th century CE.

Figure 62 Detail of headdress from capitals at Taq-i Bustan.

Figure 63 Detail of headdress from capitals at Isfahan.

Figure 64 Detail of headdress from capitals at Taq-i Bustan.

Figure 65 Detail of Anahita from relief of Chosroes (591 – 628) at Taq-i Bustan.

Figure 66 Capital from Taq-i Bustan.

Figure 67 Stucco statue from Karashar.
Figure 68 Statue form Bajo-davane aman.

Figure 69 Statue from Uzdağ.

Figure 70 Detail of funerary bed from the Miho Museum. Dated to between the second half of the 6th to the early 7th century CE. Panel E (L) and Panel G (R).

Figure 71 Illustration of an ossuary from Aq-kurgan.
Figure 72 Kushan coin.

Figure 73 Kushan coin.

Figure 74 Kushan coin.

Figure 75 Unprovenanced coin.

Figure 76 Detail of a wall painting showing a figure wearing a belt from room 1, object 24, Panjikent.

Figure 77 Illustration of a wall painting showing an image of a warrior from room 6/55, northern wall, Panjikent.

Figure 78 Wall painting from Miran, c. 3rd - 4th century CE.

Figure 79 Wall painting from Miran, c. 3rd - 4th century CE.

Figure 80 Reconstruction of costume from burial 1 at Tillya-tepe.

Figure 81 Reconstruction of costume from burial 2 at Tillya-tepe.

Figure 82 Reconstruction of costume from burial 3 at Tillya-tepe.

Figure 83 Reconstruction of costume from burial 4 at Tillya-tepe.
Figure 84 Reconstruction of costume from burial 5 at Tillya-tepe.

Figure 85 Reconstruction of costume from burial 6 at Tillya-tepe.

Figure 86 Reconstruction of female costume from Dzhety-asur.

Figure 87 Reconstruction of female costume from Dzhety-asur.

Figure 88 Reconstruction of female costume from Dzhety-asur.

Figure 89 Reconstruction of female costume from Dzhety-asur.

Figure 90 Reconstruction of female costume from Dzhety-asur.

Figure 91 Reconstruction of female costume from Dzhety-asur.

Figure 92 Reconstruction of female costume from Dzhety-asur.

Figure 93 Reconstruction of ceremonial female costume from Dzhety-asur.

Figure 94 Reconstruction of costume from Koktepe.
Figure 95 Reconstruction of upper body garment from Ust-Edigan dated to the 1st – 2nd century CE.

Figure 96 Reconstruction of the Katanda kandys, c. 5th - 6th century CE.

Figure 97 Woollen trousers from Noin Ula, c. 1st century BCE.

Figure 98 Female mummy from Subeshi dating to the 6th - 5th century BCE.

Figure 99 Headdress from Zaghunluq dated to 1030 or 600 BCE.

Figure 100 Low boot from Grave 36 from the delta of the Qum Darya in the Lop Nor desert.

Conical shaped headdresses from burials in the Lop Nor region.

Figure 101 Felt conical cap from Cemetery 5.

Figure 102 Felt conical cap from Cemetery 5.

Figure 103 Felt conical cap from Cemetery 5.

Figure 104 Felt conical cap with ornamentation from Grave 36.
Figure 105 Scythian gold clothing plaque.

Figure 106 Reconstruction of Scythian headdress from Chertomlyk dated to the late 4th century BCE.

Figure 107 Detail of Scythian gold headdress from Karagodeuashkhh dated to the late 4th century BCE.

Figure 108 Unprovenanced gem from north west India.

Figure 109 Illustration of jugate portrait from sealing, 306–350 CE.

Figure 110 Illustration of portrait bust on sealing dated to the 4th century CE.

Figure 111 Illustration of jugate portrait bust on sealing.

Figure 112 Illustration of portrait bust on sealing, 4th century CE or later.

Figure 113 Detail of frieze showing Scythian dress from a vessel from Kul Oba. 4th century BCE.

Figure 114 Detail of female figure from unprovenanced Sasanian silver vessel.

Figure 115 Detail of female figure from unprovenanced Sasanian silver vessel.

Figure 116 Detail of female figure from unprovenanced Sasanian silver vessel.

Figure 117 Detail of an unprovenanced Sasanian silver bowl.
Figure 118 Detail of an unprovenanced Sasanian silver bowl dated to the 6th - 7th century.

Figure 119 Sasanian silver bowl, provenance unclear.

Figure 120 Gold plaque from the Oxus Treasure.

Figure 121 Stucco plaque from Damghan, 6th - 7th century CE.

Figure 122 Felt wall hanging from Pazyryk, barrow 5.

Figure 123 Parthian period bone figurine from Seleucia on the Tigris.

Figure 124 Headdress worn by Tekke Turkman female.

Figure 125 Tekke Turkman female headdress.
Figure 126 Comparison of cloaks shown on wall paintings from various sites dated to the early medieval period.

Figure 127 Comparison of figures wearing coats with right lapels represented in various media and dating to the early medieval period.
Appendix I: Catalogue
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat No.</th>
<th>Museum Code</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Bibliography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 3, 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 7, 99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 8, 106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 8, 113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 8, 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 10, 120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 13, 185a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 13, 191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 13, 196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 13, 197; Meshkeris 1989: 196, fig. 95, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 14, 209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 A 0005</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 A 0011</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 1, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 A 0016</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 8, 115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 A 0017</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 6, 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 A 0018</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 9, 123; Meshkeris 1977: pl. 5, 2; Meshkeris 1968: fig. 3, 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 A 0021</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 7, 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 A 0048</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 A 0049</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 A 0050</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 A 0051</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 A 0052</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 A 0057</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 A 0059</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 A 0060</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 8, 112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 A 0061</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 12, 175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 A 0062</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 A 0063</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 A 0064</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 10, 148; Meshkeris 1968: fig. 1, 2; Meshkeris 1989: 109, fig. 19, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 A 0066</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 A 0065</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 6, 85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat No.</td>
<td>Museum Code</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>A 0215</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 6, 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>A 0217</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>A 0220</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>A 0228</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 10, 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>A 0234</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>A 0248</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>A 0250</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkcris 1989: 295, fig. 188, Iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>A 0268</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 8, 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>A 0277</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>A 0282</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>A 0283</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>A 0287</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>A 0289</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>A 0290</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>A 0292</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>A 0295</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>A 0296</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>A 0299</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>A 0300</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>A 0301</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>A 0308</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>A 0312</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>A 0314</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>A 0322</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>A 0325</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>A 0326</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>A 0327</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1914: pl. 8, 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>A 0328</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>A 0331</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>A 0333</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1914: pl. 13, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>A 0336</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1914: pl. 7, 102; Meshkcris 1989: 139, fig. 43, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat No.</td>
<td>Museum Code</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>A 0340</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>A 0342</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>A 0344</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 7, 103; Meshkteris 1989: 99, fig. 9, 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>A 0349</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>A 0350</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>A 0355</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>A 0363</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>A 0366</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 14, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>A 0374</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 7, 98; Meshkteris 1968: fig. 3, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>A 0375</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>A 0376</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>A 0377</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>A 0378</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>A 0380</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>A 0381</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>A 0383</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>A 0385</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>A 0390</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkteris 1969: 122, fig. 29, 3; Cambridge History of Iran 1983 v. 3: pl. 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>A 0394</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>A 0399</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 9, 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>A 0405</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>A 0407</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>A 0413</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>A 0422</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 12, 177; Meshkteris 1969: 294, fig. 187, 1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>A 0426</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>A 0428</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>A 0440</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>A 0447</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 6, 91; Meshkteris 1989: 121, fig. 28, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>A 0448</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>A 0450</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>A 0453</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 13, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT NO.</td>
<td>MUSEUM CODE</td>
<td>PROVENANCE</td>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>A 046</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>A 0463</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 14, 218; Meshkeris 1989: 183, fig. 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>A 0467</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1977: pl. 4, 7; Trever 1934: pl. 7, 96; Reconstruction given in Meshkeris 1989: 114, fig. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>A 0468</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>A 0469</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Mandel'shtam 1960: 147, fig. 2, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>A 0470</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>A 0474</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pt. 6, 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>A 0475</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>A 0477</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 12, 171; Meshkeris 1989: 294, fig. 187, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>A 0478</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>A 0480</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>A 0482</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 10, 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>A 0483</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 14, 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>A 0484</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 12, 172; Meshkeris 1989: 294, fig. 187, 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>A 0485</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>A 0486</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>A 0487</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>A 0490</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pt. 5, 73; Meshkeris 1989: 290, fig. 184, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>A 0501</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>A 0502</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 185, fig. 87, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>A 0504</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pt. 10, 140; Konstakov and Tepstor 1891: 358, fig. 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>A 0505</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 13, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>A 0506</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>A 0508</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 192, fig. 92, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>A 0510</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 293, fig. 177, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>A 0511</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 280, fig. 174; Meshkeris 1979: 8, fig. 3, 4 (noted as SA 227)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>A 0512</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>A 0513</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 9, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>A 0514</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 7, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>A 0516</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1977: pl. 20, 4; Trever 1934: pl. 15, 190, Meshkeris 1989: 285, fig. 175, 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>A 0526</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 9, 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT No.</td>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>PROVENANCE</td>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>A 0529</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>A 0549</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>A 0552</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>A 0565</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>A 0569</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>A 0581</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>A 0594</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>A 0599</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>A 0608</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>A 0617</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>A 0635</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>A 0651</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 9, 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>A 0656</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>A 0679</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>A 0682</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 9, 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>A 0683</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 10, 141; Meshkern 1994: 212, fig. 111, lb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>A 0686</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>A 0688</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 10, 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>A 0689</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>A 0690</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 10, 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>A 0691</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkern 1994: 107, fig. 17, lb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>A 0695</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>A 0696</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 8, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>A 0699</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>A 0707</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>A 0711</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>A 0712</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 14, 204; Meshkern 1994: 257, fig. 151, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>A 0714</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>A 0719</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>A 0720</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Trever 1934: pl. 14, 200c; Meshkern 1989: 250, fig. 144, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>A 0721</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat No.</td>
<td>Museum Code</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>A 0727</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>A 0728</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>A 0729</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>A 0730</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>A 0731</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>A 0732</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>A 0734</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>A 0741</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>A 0746</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>A 0757</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>A 0768</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>A 0780</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>A 0782</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>A 0784</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>A 0786</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>A 0788</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>A 0791</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>A 0792</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>A 0793</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>A 0795</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>A 0796</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>A 0797</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>A 0798</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>A 0799</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>A 0801</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>A 0802</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>A 0803</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>A 0804</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>A 0805</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>A 0806</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>A 0807</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat No.</td>
<td>Museum Code</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218 A 0926</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 A 0927</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 A 0931</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221 A 0978</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222 A 0989</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223 A 0990</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224 A 1011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225 A 1027</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226 AM 90 9000 04</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227 AM 90 2045 22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228 AM 90 205 07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229 AM 90 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 AM 90 3 87</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231 AM 91 1 138</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Grenet 1990: 369, fig. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232 AM 91 3 013 01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 AM 91 3 130</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234 AM 91 3 24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235 AM 91 3 348</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 AM 91 32</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237 AM 93 1 013 01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238 AM 93 1 013 01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239 AM 93 71</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 AM 94 94 P1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241 AM 95 136</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242 KM 03</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243 KM 04</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244 KM 05</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 RM A019 014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkis 1962: 19, fig. 3, 2 and pl. 1, 11; Fugachenkova and Remper 1965: fig. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 RM A019 023</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkis 1962: pl. 15, 277; Abdul'iev, Kveladze et al. 1991: 174, fig. 270; Vasyunin 1926: 25, fig. 24; Meshkis 1989: 186, fig. 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247 RM A019 025</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkis 1962: pl. 16, 295; Vasyunin 1926: 23, fig. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248 RM A019 027</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkis 1962: pl. 15, 279; Meshkis 1989: 182, fig. 84, 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat No.</td>
<td>Museum Code</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>RM A019 032</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 6, 69; Pugachenkova and Rempel 1965: fig. 60; Vysotskii 1926: 23, fig. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>RM A019 033</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 6, 71; Pugachenkova and Rempel 1965: fig. 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>RM A019 034</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 8, 97; Vysotskii 1926: 23, fig. 19; Meshkerni 1989: 148, fig. 52, 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>RM A019 035</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 6, 62; Meshkerni 1989: 111, fig. 20, 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>RM A019 036</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>RM A019 037</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 18, 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>RM A019 038</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 18, 326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>RM A019 039</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 8, 92; Meshkerni 1989: 111, fig. 20, 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>RM A019 040</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>RM A019 041</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 18, 318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>RM A019 042</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 18, 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>RM A019 043</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>RM A019 044</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 18, 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>RM A019 045</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 17, 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>RM A019 046</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>RM A019 047</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 18, 326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>RM A019 048</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 18, 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>RM A019 049</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 17, 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>RM A019 050</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>RM A019 051</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 18, 341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>RM A019 052</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 18, 339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>RM A019 053</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 18, 341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>RM A019 054</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>RM A019 055</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 20, 337, Meshkerni 1989: 267, fig. 1; Rempel 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>RM A019 056</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>RM A019 057</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 9, 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>RM A019 058</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 9, 105; Meshkerni 1989: 146, fig. 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>RM A019 059</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 9, 100; Meshkerni 1989: 147, fig. 51,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>RM A019 060</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 9, 91; Abdullaev, Rivelade et al 1991: v. 1: 175, fig. 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>RM A019 061</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 9, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>RM A019 062</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerni 1962: pl. 4, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat No.</td>
<td>Museum Code</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>RM A019.994</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 4, 33; Vyatkin 1926: 22, fig. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>RM A019.995</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 3, 32; Zaslavskaya 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>RM A019.996</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 3, 31; Vyatkin 1926: 22, fig. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>RM A019.997</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 8, 38; Meshkeris 1989: 139, fig. 43, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>RM A019.998</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 4, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>RM A019.999</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>RM A019.100</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 5, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>RM A019.101</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 5, 44; Meshkeris 1989: 139, fig. 36, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>RM A019.102</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>RM A019.103</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>RM A019.104</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>RM A019.105</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 266: fig. 159; Meshkeris 1962: pl. 26, 336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>RM A019.106</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 8, 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>RM A019.107</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 5, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>RM A019.115</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 12, 166; Meshkeris 1989: 184, fig. 86, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>RM A019.116</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 12, 162; Meshkeris 1989: 185, fig. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>RM A019.117</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 5, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>RM A019.118</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>RM A019.119</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>RM A019.120</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>RM A019.121</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 4, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>RM A019.122</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>RM A019.123</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 6, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>RM A019.124</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 28, 374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>RM A019.125</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 5, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>RM A019.126</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 12, 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>RM A019.127</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: 68, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>RM A019.128</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 9, 106; Meshkeris 1989: 223, fig. 119, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>RM A019.129</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>RM A019.130</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 17, 305; Pegachenko and Rempel 1965: fig. 148; Zabelina and Rempel 1948: fig. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>RM A019.131</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 6, 63; Mandel'shtam 1960: 154, fig. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat No.</td>
<td>Museum Code</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>RM A019 172</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: 82, 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>RM A019 175</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 22, 333; Meshkerris 1989: 294, fig. 187,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>RM A019 182</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 4, 37; Pugachenkova and Rempel 1965: fig. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>RM A019 187</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 19, 331 (Museum code is A180 1712); Meshkerris 1989: 239, fig. 134, 2, Abdul'shav, Rvetsler et al 1991 v. 1: 175, fig. 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>RM A019 190</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 6, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>RM A019 194</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 18, 317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>RM A019 196</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>RM A019 198</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>RM A019 203</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 8, 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>RM A019 205</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>RM A019 216</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1977: pl. 4, 1 and 2; Meshkerris 1989: 118, fig. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>RM A036 009</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 5, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>RM A036 010</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 12, 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>RM A036 011</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>RM A036 015</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 8, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>RM A036 018</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>RM A036 019</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 2, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>RM A036 023</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>RM A036 024</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 6, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>RM A036 025</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 18, 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>RM A036 026</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 8, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>RM A036 028</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 10, 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>RM A036 029</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1963: pl. 3, 30,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>RM A036 030</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 8, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>RM A036 031</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 8, 89; Meshkerris 1989: 139, fig. 43, 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>RM A036 032</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 9, 107; Meshkerris 1989: 223, fig. 19, 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>RM A036 036</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 18, 321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>RM A055 600</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 2, 17; Grigoriev 1985: 78, fig. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>RM A055 563</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 3, 24; Grigoriev 1940b: pl. 1, 5; Pugachenkova &amp; Rempel 1965: fig. 66. Abdul'shav, Rvetsler et al 1991 v. 2: 43, fig. 430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>RM A180 1377</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>RM A180 1712</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Meshkerris 1962: pl. 19, 332, Grigoriev 1940b: fig. 3, 3; Meshkerris 1989: 240, fig. 136, 1; Grenet 1996: 369, fig. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>RM A180 1881</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 19, 333; Meshkeris 1989: 240, fig. 135, 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>RM A180 1882</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 3, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>RM A180 2336</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 2, 20; Mandel'shtam 1960: fig. 1, 4;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>RM A180 2334</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 2, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>RM A180 2338 (1)</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 2, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>RM A180 2341</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 2, 19; Meshkeris 1989: 109, fig. 19, 1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>RM A180 2397</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 16, 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>RM A181 1236</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Grigor'ev 1940a: pl. 1, 5; Meshkeris 1989: 152, fig. 56; Meshkeris 1962: pl. 10, 108;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>RM A181 1239</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 9, 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>RM A181 1392</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 3, 13; Grigor'ev 1940a: pl. 1, 1; Mandel'shtam 1960: fig. 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>RM A181 1393</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Grigor'ev 1940a: fig 3a; Meshkeris 1962: pl. 2, 21; Meshkeris 1989: 109, fig. 19, 1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>RM A181 1395</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: 58, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>RM A181 1396</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 3, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>RM A181 1398</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: 60, 25; Grigor'ev 1940b: fig. 4, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>RM A181 1399</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 4, 42; Meshkeris 1989: 135, fig. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>RM A181 1400</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 4, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>RM A181 237</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>RM A181 570</td>
<td>Tali Barzu</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>RM A183 7</td>
<td>Kafir kala</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 17, 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>RM A183 010</td>
<td>Kafir kala</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>RM A183 109</td>
<td>Kafir kala</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 16, 293; Meshkeris 1989: 228, fig. 123, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>RM A183 241</td>
<td>Kafir kala</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 17, 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>RM A183 249</td>
<td>Kafir kala</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 17, 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>RM A183 326</td>
<td>Kafir kala</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>RM A183 359</td>
<td>Kafir kala</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 17, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>RM A183 604</td>
<td>Kafir kala</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 16, 294; Meshkeris 1989: 228, fig. 123, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>RM A183 636</td>
<td>Kafir kala</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 18, 315; Meshkeris 1989: 216, fig. 113, 1 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>RM A183 704</td>
<td>Kafir kala</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 18, 313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>RM A183 804</td>
<td>Kafir kala</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>RM A184 030</td>
<td>Kafir kala</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 6, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat No.</td>
<td>Museum Code</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>RM A274 004</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 6, 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>RM A374 005</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1962: pl. 16, 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>RM A399 004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>RM A400 002</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>RM A420 001</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>RM A441 001</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>RM A441 002</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>RM A481 001</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>RM A505 004</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Abdullaev, Rtveladze et al 1991: v. 2: 48, fig. 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>RM A505 005</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Abdullaev, Rtveladze et al 1991: v. 1: 172, fig. 354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>RM A505 013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abdullaev, Rtveladze et al 1991: v. 1: 47, fig. 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>SA 0001</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>SA 0002</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>SA 0004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>SA 0005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>SA 0006</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>SA 0010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>SA 0011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>SA 0012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>SA 0013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>SA 0015</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>SA 0016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>SA 0018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>SA 0019</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>SA 0021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>SA 0022</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>SA 0025</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>SA 0027</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>SA 0031</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>SA 0041</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>SA 0042</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Unprovenanced items are not associated with a specific provenance location. Reconstruction given in Meshkeris 1979: fig. 1, 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAT NO.</th>
<th>MUSEUM CODE</th>
<th>PROVENANCE</th>
<th>BIBLIOGRAPHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>SA 0049</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>SA 0050</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>SA 0051</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>SA 0052</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>SA 0053</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>SA 0055</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>SA 0056</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>SA 0057</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>SA 0058</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>SA 0059</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>SA 0060</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>SA 0061</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>SA 0062</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>SA 0063</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>SA 0064</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>SA 0065</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>SA 0066</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>SA 0068</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>SA 0069</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>SA 0070</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>SA 0071</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>SA 0073</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>SA 0074</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>SA 0075</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>SA 0076</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>SA 0077</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>SA 0078</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>SA 0079</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>SA 0080</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>SA 0081</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>SA 0082</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>SA 0083</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>SA 0084</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>SA 0085</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>SA 0086</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>SA 0087</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat No.</td>
<td>Museum Code</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>SA 00870</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1988: 113-5, fig. 27, 1b; Meshkeris 1988: fig. 3, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>SA 0088</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>SA 0089</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>SA 0090</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>SA 0091</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1977: pl. 15, 4; Meshkeris 1989: 214, fig. 112, 1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>SA 0092</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>SA 0094</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>SA 0095</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>SA 0097</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>SA 0100</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>SA 0101</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>SA 0103</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>SA 0104</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>SA 0108</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>SA 0109</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 179, fig. 82, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>SA 0110</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>SA 0111</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>SA 0112</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>SA 0113</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>SA 0114</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>SA 0115</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>SA 0116</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>SA 0117</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>SA 0118</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>SA 0119</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1965: 17, fig. 8, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>SA 0120</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>SA 0121</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>SA 0122</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>SA 0123</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>SA 0124</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1977: pl. 24, 3; Pugachenkova and Kempel 1965: fig. 153; Meshkeris 1989: 190, fig. 90, 1, l; Meskhieris 1979: 15, fig. 6; Strelkov 1958 v. 7, pl. 145, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>SA 0125</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>SA0206</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 190, fig. 90, 1, 4 and p. 191, fig. 91, 1, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>SA0207</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1977: pl. 8, 4; Pugachenkova and Rempel 1965: fig. 151; Meshkeris 1989: 190, fig. 90, 1, 3; Stekloff 1958: v. 7, pl. 145, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>SA0208</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 191, fig. 91, 1, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>SA0209</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>SA0210</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>SA0211</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>SA0212</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>SA0214</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>SA0215</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>SA0216</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 185, fig. 87, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>SA0219</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>SA0221</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1977: pl. 13, 8; Meshkeris 1989: 192, fig. 92, 1, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>SA0222</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 222, fig. 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>SA0224</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 185, fig. 87, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>SA0228</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>SA0230</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482</td>
<td>SA0235</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>SA0242</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>SA0245</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>SA0255</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>SA0257</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>SA0258</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>SA0256</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>SA0266</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>SA027</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>SA028</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>SA0285</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 185, fig. 87, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>SA0293</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>SA0299</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>SA0303</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>SA0304</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat No.</td>
<td>Museum Code</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>SA 0305</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>SA 0307</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkéris 1989: 227, fig. 122, 1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>SA 0311</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>SA 0318</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkéris 1989: 276, fig. 170, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>SA 0318</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>SA 032</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>SA 0321</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>SA 0323</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>SA 0324</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>SA 0325</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>SA 0326</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkéris 1977: pl. 13, 6; Meshkéris 1989: 194, fig. 93, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>SA 0327</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>SA 0344</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>SA 0345</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>SA 0346</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>SA 0347</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>SA 0348</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>SA 0349</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>SA 0361</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>SA 0362</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>SA 0363</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>SA 0364</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>SA 0365</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>SA 0366</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>SA 0367</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkéris 1989: 232, fig. 127; Meshkéris 1977: pl. 30, 91 &amp; p. 63, fig. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>SA 0368</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>SA 0369</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>SA 0371</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>SA 0372</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>SA 0375</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Reconstructed in Meshkéris 1989: 111 fig. 20, 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>SA 0376</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkéris 1989: 107, fig. 13, 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT NO.</td>
<td>MUSEUM CODE</td>
<td>PROVENANCE</td>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>SA 0377</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>SA 0378</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>SA 0382</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>SA 0383</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>SA 0384</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>SA 0385</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>SA 0386</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>SA 0389</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>SA 0390</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>SA 0391</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 122, fig. 29, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>SA 0395</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>SA 0396</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>SA 0398</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>SA 0401</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td>SA 0407</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>SA 0408</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>SA 0409</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>SA 0411</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td>SA 0412</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>SA 0414</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>SA 0415</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>SA 0418</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>SA 0430</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>SA 0432</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>SA 0434</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 265, fig. 158, 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>SA 0435</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>SA 0436</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Reconstruction in Meshkeris 1977: 23, fig. 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>SA 0444</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>SA 0448</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>SA 0449</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>SA 0454</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1977: pl. 13, 3; Meshkeris 1989: 196, fig. 95, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT NO.</td>
<td>MUSEUM CODE</td>
<td>PROVENANCE</td>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>SA 0545</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>SA 0500</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>SA 0506</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>SA 0520</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>SA 0521</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564</td>
<td>SA 0524</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>SA 0525</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>SA 0526</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td>SA 0528</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568</td>
<td>SA 0529</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569</td>
<td>SA 0534</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 265, fig. 158, 1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>SA 0535</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571</td>
<td>SA 0536</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>SA 0542</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>SA 0549</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 272, fig. 166, 1; Meshkeris 1979: 9, fig. 3, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574</td>
<td>SA 0550</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 237, fig. 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575</td>
<td>SA 0552</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 277, fig. 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td>SA 0555</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 249, fig. 143, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>SA 0556</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 273, fig. 165, 1; Meshkeris 1979: fig. 4, 1 (noted as SA 554)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>SA 0557</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 273, fig. 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>SA 0558</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 244, fig. 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>SA 0562</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 272, fig. 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>SA 0563</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>SA 0567</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td>SA 0570</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1989: 253, fig. 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>SA 0587</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>SA 0872</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>SA 0874</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1977: pl. 18, 2; Pugachenkova and Rempel 1965: fig. 154; Sztejnaif 1958: v. 7, pl. 145, g; Meshkeris 1989: 247, fig. 141, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>SA 0874</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1977: pl. 18, 2; Meshkeris 1989: 243, fig. 141, 1; Pugachenkova and Rempel 1965: fig. 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>SA 0876</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkeris 1977: pl. 18, 1; Meshkeris 1989: 248, fig. 142; Meshkeris 1979: 9, fig. 3, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT No.</td>
<td>MUSEUM CODE</td>
<td>PROVENANCE</td>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>SA 7250</td>
<td>Unprovenanced</td>
<td>Meshkoris 1989: 212, fig. 111, 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591</td>
<td>SA 7520</td>
<td>Kafir kala</td>
<td>Meshkoris 1989: 212, fig. 111, 1; Grigor'ev 1946b: 98, fig. 46, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>SA 7563</td>
<td>Chilek</td>
<td>Meshkoris 1989: 255, fig. 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593</td>
<td>SA 7584</td>
<td>Kafir kala</td>
<td>Meshkoris 1989: 227, fig. 132, 1; Grigor'ev 1946b: 98, fig. 46, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td>SamGU 4-2-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Avenaeva 1976: fig. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>SIA 17 9 0 0 0 2 0 9 1 0 2 0 0 0</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td>SIA AF92</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596</td>
<td>SIA AF 20 0 0</td>
<td>Afrasiab</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>