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ENGLISH ABSTRACT

A standard can be defined as a long shaft with a sign or emblem attached to the top which may be held or which may stand on the ground. Standards are represented in Mesopotamian art from the emergence of the first city-states in the fourth millennium BCE until the first millennium BCE. This study examines how standards are depicted in the iconographic record of the third and fourth millennia BCE by examining their form, function and symbolism. Perhaps the most well-known type of standard is the battle standard, but there were also other types of standards — divine standards, royal standards, standards in ritual context, standards in judicial procedures, architectural, ritual, and city standards.

The iconographic sources include glyptic art, or cylinder seals, as well as representations on vessels, inlays, plaques, stelae or stelae fragments, and rare examples of extant standards. A catalogue of all known iconographic representations of standards is provided. These examples are presented and compared, and commonalities and differences are identified and examined.

The study is laid out in seven chapters. Chapter 1 provides the methodological framework for the study. Chapter 2 follows as a short background to the period under discussion, the third and fourth millennia BCE, providing a general context for the discussion. The main discussion of standards begins from Chapter 3. The standards of the four periods under consideration — namely, the Uruk, Early Dynastic, Akkadian and Neo-Sumerian periods — are discussed in Chapter 3, Chapter 4, Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 respectively. Each standard represented in each period is discussed in turn and some preliminary summaries and conclusions are presented. In Chapter 7 the findings from Chapters 3-6 are presented, analysed and interpreted. This entails first a discussion on the different standards themselves, then an evaluation of the different functions or the different contexts within which these standards are depicted, and thereafter a brief summary of each of the four periods under discussion is provided.
OPSOMMING

’n Standaard kan gedefinieer word as ’n lang stok met ’n teken of ’n embleem wat aan die bopunt van die stok aangeheg is en wat vasgehou kan word of op die grond kan staan. Standaarde word in die kuns van Mesopotamië van die eerste stadstate in die vierde millennium vC tot die eerste millenium vC verteenwoordig. Hierdie studie ondersoek hoe standaarde uitgebeeld word in die ikonografiese rekord van die derde en vierde millennia vC deur hulle vorm, funksie en simboliek te ondersoek. Die mees bekende tipe standaard is dalk die oorlogstandaard, maar daar was ook ander tipes standaarde — goddelike standaarde, koninklike standaarde, standaarde in rituele konteks, standaarde in geregtelike prosedures, argitektoniese en stad standaarde.

Die ikonografiese bronne sluit in gliptiese kuns, of silinderseëls, asook voorstellings op potte, inlegsels, gedenkplate, stelae of fragmente van stelae, en sel dsame voorbeelde van behoue standaarde. ’n Katalogus van alle ikonografiese voorstellings van standaarde wat bekend is, is aangeheg. Hierdie voorbeelde word aangebied en vergelyk, en gemeenskaplikhede en verskille word geïdentifiseer en ondersoek.

Hierdie studie bestaan uit sewe hoofstukke. Hoofstuk 1 bied die metodologiese raamwerk vir die studie. Hoofstuk 2 volg as ’n kort agtergrond tot die periode wat bespreek word, die derde en vierde millennia vC, wat ’n algemene konteks vir die bespreking aanbied. Die hoofbespreking van standaarde begin vanaf Hoofstuk 3. Die standaarde van die vier periodes onder oorweging — naamlik die Uruk, die Vroeë Dinastieke, Akkadiese en Neo-Sumeriese periodes — word in Hoofstuk 3, Hoofstuk 4, Hoofstuk 5, en Hoofstuk 6 onderskeidelik bespreek. Elke standaard wat in elke periode voorkom, word om die beurt bespreek en sommige voorlopige opsommings en gevolgtrekkings word aangebied. In Hoofstuk 7 word die bevindings van Hoofstukke 3-6 aangebied, ontleed en geïnterpreteer. Dit behels eerstens ’n bespreking van die verskillende standaarde, dan ’n evaluering van die verskillende funksies of die verskillende kontekste waarin hierdie standaarde uitgebeeld word, en daarna volg ’n kort opsomming van elkeen van die vier periodes onder bespreking.
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1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION
Standards are found in the visual or iconographic record of Mesopotamia from the Uruk Period in the fourth millennium BCE until the first millennium BCE. Considering their prevalence and this long history, surprisingly little research has been done into the standards of the earlier periods¹. This study will discuss the form, function and symbolism of standards in third and fourth millennia BCE Mesopotamian iconography.

The Sumerian terms for standard are Šunir and Ûrî(-gal), and the Akkadian terms are šurinnu/šunirru², urigallu, urinnu and ithuru³ (Pongratz-Leisten 1992; Pongratz-Leisten 2011:106; van Buren 1945:1). The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary defines a standard as “a flag or figurehead attached to the upper part of a pole and raised to indicate a rallying-point; the distinctive ensign of a sovereign, commander, nation, etc.; of an army” (Brown 2002:3000). Seidl’s definition of a standard as a “Stange mit daran befestigtem Zeichen, die aufgestellt oder getragen werden kann”⁴ (2011-2013:111) differs from that of the Shorter Oxford Dictionary in that, while the latter identifies only the “flag or figurehead” surmounting the pole as the standard, Seidl accepts this to be part of the standard. This difference is reflected in van Buren’s (1945:1) distinguishing between ‘emblems’ and ‘standards’, defining an ‘emblem’ as a “symbol which has been put into material form” and a ‘standard’ as an emblem which has been “mounted on a long shaft” in order for it to be set up or moved. Szarzyńska (1996:1) identifies three components of a standard: [1] a high shaft, sometimes with a pointed lower end to drive the standard into the ground, [2] an emblem attached to the top of the shaft, and [3] streamers, tassels or fringes which hang from the top of the standard and which were probably the ends of the binding securing the emblem to the shaft [Fig.1.1].

¹ See below 1.4 for previous studies on Mesopotamian standards.
² According to van Buren (1945:1), Šunir or Šurinru was the “generic name for symbols of every description, whether unmounted or mounted on standards.”
³ Although this last term was only used from the Middle Assyrian Period onwards (Pongratz-Leisten 2011:106).
⁴ “A rod with an attached sign which can be carried or placed”.

Because a standard comprised of an emblem, there is not one single archetypal standard, but a variety of standards with different appearances. While some standards were in use for a period of a millennium or more, others are known from only one example. To study individual Mesopotamian standards of the third and fourth millennia BCE, the iconography of different standards across these two millennia will be examined in order to make comparisons and draw conclusions.

1.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS
The iconography of the different Mesopotamian standards of the third and fourth millennia BCE will be studied in order to answer four major research questions:

1. According to van Buren (1945:1), contemporary texts mention standards, but they do not describe how these standards looked or what symbolic meaning could be attached to them. Therefore, the first research question must be which standards are represented in the iconographic record of Mesopotamia during the third and fourth millennia BCE? How did these different standards look? Did their appearance stay consistent, or were there variations in how a specific standard looked?


---

5 The standard represented in Fig.1 is depicted on ED63 and is discussed in 4.4.1.
battle standards had two major functions, “ideological (granting divine protection, symbolizing the *esprit de corps* of the units, etc.), and practical (facilitating command, control and communication of the troops).” In this study, therefore, military or battle standards refer specifically to standards which are associated directly with battle.

Brown (2002:3000) describes a standard as “the distinctive ensign of a sovereign, commander, nation, etc.” The “ensign of a sovereign [or] commander” would be a royal standard, but the “ensign of a ... nation” can not be categorised as any of Pongratz-Leisten’s types of standards. Because the primary political unit of third and fourth millennia BCE Mesopotamia was not the nation, but the city-state⁶, standards associated with such a political unit can be termed city standards, rather than national standards. In fact, Jacobsen (1967:101) theorised that the writing of several city-names were originally pictures “of a symbol... affixed to a stake for carrying” — in short, a standard. The city standard therefore represents an additional seventh type of standard to the six types identified by Pongratz-Leisten. These categories are not necessarily mutually exclusive — one individual standard may conform to more than one of these types. For example, a single standard can be both a divine standard and be placed in a ritual or an architectural context. The question then is not only which standards, but what type of standards are represented in the iconographic record of Mesopotamia during the third and fourth millennia BCE. Were specific standards associated with specific scenes or found in specific contexts?

3. What did the different standards mean or symbolise? If a standard is “the distinctive ensign of a sovereign, commander, nation, etc.” (Brown 2002:3000), and if the emblem surmounting a standard also served as a symbol of a local deity or “some other conventional sign” (Szarzyńska 1996:1), then who or what did each standard symbolise, or with whom or what was each standard associated? Is this reflected in the appearance of the standard, and if so, how?

4. Were the same standards used during different periods of the third and fourth millennia BCE? What changes occurred over time? What can we deduce was the function and symbolism of the various standards at different times?

---

⁶ See especially 2.2.1.
1.3 DEFINITION
In this work a standard will be defined as: A long shaft with an attached emblem at the top. In some cases, there is no emblem surmounting the pole, but decoration at the side. The standard may or may not have streamers or tassels which hang from the base of the emblem. It may be held by a figure, whether that figure is a human, a deity, a mythological being or an animal, or it may stand on the ground or be attached to a building in an architectural setting. Staffs or sceptres are differentiated from standards in that they have shorter shafts [see Fig.1.1].

1.4 PREVIOUS STUDIES ON MESOPOTAMIAN STANDARDS
There has been limited research done into Mesopotamian standards. Bleibtreu (1992) and Deller (1992) provide invaluable insight into the function and symbolism of standards, but the standards studied are from the Neo-Assyrian Period (ca. 934-609 BCE) and therefore date to more than a millennium later than the period discussed in the present work. Similarly, Vidal (2009) discusses the military standards of the Old Babylonian Period, which date to the beginning of the second millennium BCE. Pongratz-Leisten’s works (1992; 2011-2013), although mentioning Sumerian standards, are philological: the differing terms used to describe Mesopotamian standards and an analysis of the textual evidence for standards respectively. Similarly, Szarzyńska (1996) examines the standards of the Uruk Period as iconograms or ideograms. While these are invaluable in the study of early Mesopotamian standards, they are not iconographic studies.

Mayer-Opificius’s (1996) and Sarre’s (1903) studies discuss standards from the Uruk Period until the Neo-Assyrian Period and from the Early Dynastic Period until the 16th century CE respectively, but their focus is specifically on military or battle standards, and are therefore of limited value to a study on standards in general. Additionally, Sarre’s work is more than a century old and is therefore outdated. Seidl’s discussion on the archaeological and iconographic evidence for Mesopotamian standards in the Realllexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie (2011-2013), on the other hand, gives an up-to-date overview of the material available, but information is compressed and limited.

Some specific iconographic representations of standards have been discussed, but these are also not comprehensive studies on the standards. For example, Bänder’s (1995) monograph
on the Naram-Sin Victory Stele\textsuperscript{7} discusses the standards depicted on this stele, but only a page and a half are devoted to these standards, and, although the appearance of the standards is described, there is no attempt to understand their symbolic meaning or place them within a broader context (1995:228-229). The standards depicted on the Gudea Stelae\textsuperscript{8} are discussed in Suter’s (2000:177-179) definitive study on the Gudea material (ca. 2144-2124), and these are placed within a broad context, but they are not compared with similar standards from the same period.

There is therefore a dearth of information on standards represented in the iconographic record of Mesopotamia during the third and fourth millennia BCE, and the aim of this study is to fill that void.

\textbf{1.5 METHODOLOGY}

\textbf{1.5.1 TEXT AND IMAGE}

In 1964 Oppenheim contended that “the texts on clay tablets are far more valuable, far more relevant, than the monuments that have been discovered, although the latter... offer welcome illustration to the wealth of factual information contained on clay tablets, stelae, and votive offerings” (1964:10). However, “the primacy of text as the most truthful and transparent source of historical information... is rejected by historical criticism” (Bahrani 2002:19). The visual repertoire can provide information which can be either complementary or distinct from that surmised from textual sources (Winter 2010f:72). This is not to say that texts should be completely ignored, but that rather than looking for direct or perfect matches, a “mental background” should be sought (Suter 2000:8). Still, Lewis’ (2005:76) sentiment that “iconography complements texts, it cannot replace them” cannot be supported when no contemporary texts on the subject are available. The cuneiform script was first developed during the period under discussion in this study, and texts mentioning standards are first known from the second half of the third millennium BCE\textsuperscript{9}. Therefore, for the first two periods of study, the Uruk Period and the Early Dynastic Period, there are no texts for comparative study. However, some of the signs of the archaic Uruk script dating from the Uruk Period represent standards\textsuperscript{10}, and the script itself can be used as a comparative source in the iconographic study of standards. Ancient texts and the archaic Uruk script itself are

\textsuperscript{7} Discussed below in 5.8.
\textsuperscript{8} Discussed below in 6.8.1 and 6.9.5.2.
\textsuperscript{9} For more on the textual evidence for standards, see Pongratz-Leisten (1992; 2011-2013).
\textsuperscript{10} See below, especially 3.1 and Table 3.1.
therefore used where applicable or possible to elucidate finds, but these are not and can not be the primary source of information in a study on standards of the third and fourth millennia BCE.

1.5.2 THE ICONOGRAPHIC METHOD
Keel (1997:7) contends that ancient Near Eastern imagery was “not intended to be viewed... (Sehbild), but rather to be read (Denkbild),” meaning that ancient Near Eastern artworks and images portrayed a meaning other than their outward appearance. In a sense, all ancient Near Eastern art, even when documenting real events, was symbolic. Any depiction of a standard must therefore be “read” in its specific context in order to understand its precise meaning. This can be difficult, because Mesopotamian art is very seldom “captioned” as, for example, Egyptian art was, and the “captions” which exist are not straightforward, usually having no self-evident relationship with the image (Black and Green 1992:15; Ornan 2005:10).

In this study the iconographic approach will be followed. Iconography is defined as “that branch of the history of art which concerns itself with the subject matter or meaning of works of art, as opposed to their form” (Panofsky 1939:3), and works to “retrieve the symbolic and allegorical meanings contained in works of art” (D’Alleva 2005:23). The art historian Panofsky developed a model by which material is collected, examined, interpreted and classified. According to this model, three layers of meaning can be discerned — the first, the “iconographic description” is a pure description of what is seen, in the second “iconographic analysis” the subject of the representation is determined, and finally, the aim of the “iconological interpretation” is to reveal deeper meanings (Panofsky 1939:14-15; 1955:26-41) [Table 1.1].
Table 1.1: Panofsky’s model (after Panofsky 1955:40-41).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT OF INTERPRETATION</th>
<th>ACT OF INTERPRETATION</th>
<th>EQUIPMENT FOR INTERPRETATION</th>
<th>CORRECTIVE PRINCIPLE OF INTERPRETATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Primary or natural subject matter — (A) factual, (B) expressive — constituting the world of artistic motifs.</td>
<td>Pre-iconographical description (and pseudo-formal analysis).</td>
<td>Practical experience (familiarity with objects and events).</td>
<td>History of style (insight into the manner in which, under varying historical conditions, objects and events were expressed by forms).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Secondary or conventional subject matter, constituting the world of image, stories and allegories.</td>
<td>Iconographical analysis.</td>
<td>Knowledge of literary sources (familiarity with specific themes and concepts).</td>
<td>History of types (insight into the manner in which, under varying historical conditions, specific themes and concepts were expressed by objects and events).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Intrinsic meaning or content, constituting the world of “symbolical” values.</td>
<td>Iconological interpretation.</td>
<td>Synthetic intuition (familiarity with the essential tendencies of the human mind), conditioned by personal psychology and “Weltanschauung”.</td>
<td>History of cultural symptoms or “symbols” in general (insight into the manner in which, under varying historical conditions, essential tendencies of the human mind were expressed by specific themes and concepts).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panofsky’s approach has been utilised by many ancient Near Eastern iconographic studies, whether explicitly, such as Bonatz (2000), Lamprichts (1999), Ornan (2010), Suter (2000), Steymans (2010a), Weissenrieder and Wendt (2005) and Winter (2010a), or unstated, such as Frankfort (1939) and Ornan (2005).

Van Straten (1986:168-170) revised Panofsky’s model, dividing Panofsky’s third phase into two phases, those of iconographical and iconological interpretation, with the prior being the explicit, intentional meaning of the artist, and the latter being the non-explicit meaning, which is influenced by the social, cultural and historical background of the work of art [Table 1.2]. Similarly, Keel and the ‘Fribourg School’ follow Panofsky’s basic model, but divide their iconographic interpretation scheme into the analysis of motifs, scenes/themes and decorations and stress that each motif can mean different things depending on the Sitz im Leben or context in which it is found [Table 1.3] (Keel 1992, 1997; Keel and Uehlinger 1998). Motifs, scenes/themes and decorations can be classified by their type, and these types can constitute independents avenues of research. Steymans (2010b:28) describes typology as “die Zusammenstellung ähnlicher Objekte zu Gruppen, weil sie einen besonderen Zug
gemeinsam haben oder eine Anzahl von Beschaffenheiten teilen, die es bei Objekten außerhalb der Gruppe weniger häufig gibt”\(^\text{11}\). In the present study, Panofsky’s basic model will be used, but the revisions and developments by van Straten (1986) and Keel (1992) will also be taken into consideration. Additionally, this study will also incorporate what D’Alleva (2005:27-8) terms “comparative iconographic analysis” in that the significance of the similarities and differences in iconography/iconology between different standards will be investigated.

Table 1.2: Van Straten’s model (van Straten 1986:169 Diagram II).

\(^{11}\) “the compilation of similar objects into groups because they have some particular trait in common or because they share a number of features which are less common outside the group”.
Table 1.3  Keel and the Fribourg School’s iconographic interpretation scheme (after Weissenrieder and Wendt 2005:25).

Goff (1963:xxxiv) differentiates between what she calls the “vertical method” and the “horizontal method” of studying symbolism. The vertical method studies “separate symbols, one at a time, and traces the use of each through a series of cultures in different times and places.” The horizontal method “studies all the symbols used in a given culture in a limited time.” This study will be a combination of the two types of study in that it will study all standards within a relatively limited period of time, but it will trace the use of these standards across that period. The culture and traditions were rather homogenous and relatively consistent across the two millennia under discussion12. Because of this “conservative nature of ancient art, one may apply conclusions from early findings to later ones, and vice versa” (Ornan 2005:10). A hypothesis of this study is that there were changes over time in the symbolism of various standards, but information learned about standards from one period may be used to gain insight into standards from another period.

1.5.3 SOURCES
The primary sources for this study are the artefacts which constitute the iconographic record. Glyptic art, particularly cylinder seals, is by far the most common source for pictorial representations in the ancient Near East. The majority of examples of standards will therefore come from depictions on seals, either from the cylinder seal itself, or from an impression of the seal. Standards are also represented in other media, including inlays, painting and relief sculpture decorating vessels, relief sculpture on plaques, stelae and stelae fragments, a trough, architectural models, and sculpture in the round. Not only are depictions

12 See 1.5.1.
of standards represented, but also extremely rare examples of actual standards and emblems from the archaeological record. Seals have been collected into catalogues such as those by Amiet (1980) which represents the seals and seal impressions of the Uruk and Early Dynastic periods, and Boehmer (1965) which represents those of the Akkadian Period. Cylinder seals and other artefacts from specific sites are also collected together and published in excavation reports. These provide the primary written sources for the objects included in the catalogue.

Ancient texts that were contemporary with the source artefacts mention standards, and in the archaic Uruk script itself some standards are represented as symbols in the script. These provide further information on the primary iconographic sources. However, in this work, although both texts and script are referenced, they are not the primary focus of this study. It is understood that the presence of the same standards in both the iconographic record and in the archaic Uruk script suggests some connection between the two, and the sources should not be studied independently. However, it is not the main intention of this work to explain and discuss the use of standards in the archaic Uruk script, but in the iconographic record.

1.5 RESEARCH DESIGN

1.5.1 PARAMETERS OF THE STUDY

The goal of this study is to document the development of the form, function and symbolism of different standards over the period of the third and fourth millennia BCE — from the Uruk Period until the Neo-Sumerian Period (4000-2004 BCE). In order to make the study feasible and accomplishable, it must have limitations. The motifs under investigation will be limited to standards, as defined above in 1.3. The study will be confined to those standards which are found in Mesopotamia. However, a select few standards from outside Mesopotamia will be mentioned where these are relevant to the study. For example, the Proto-Elamite crescent standards on **U71-U73**\(^{13}\) are mentioned because of their significance to the argument of the deity associated with the crescent standard during the Uruk Period, as well as the relevance to the origin of crescent standards.

Temporally, the study will be limited to the third and fourth millennia BCE, covering the Uruk (ca. 4000-2900 BCE), Early Dynastic (ca. 2900-2334 BCE), Akkadian (ca. 2334-2150 CE) and Neo-Sumerian (ca. 2157-2004 BCE) periods and the Sumerian and Akkadian

\(^{13}\) For these standards, see 3.4.
cultures. The reason for studying this period and these cultures is that by the Neo-Sumerian Period “both Sumerians and Akkadians had long been assimilated into a homogenous population with common traditions and culture” (Oates 1986:43). Bottéro (1992:2) even argues against differentiating between Sumerian and Akkadian culture, thought and religion, recognising “only one composite culture.” This is not to say that the culture stayed static. That it changed over a period of two thousand years is to be expected, but these changes were a development of a society, rather than complete breaks in tradition between the Sumerians and Akkadians. The cultures of the Isin-Larsa and Old Babylonian periods which followed at the start of the second millennium BCE show a break with the traditions of those of the Sumerians and Akkadians. The third and fourth millennia BCE therefore provide a well-defined cultural and temporal unit which can be studied.

The research design will comprise of the collection, cataloguing, iconographic analysis, and iconological interpretation of the examples of standards of third and fourth millennia BCE Mesopotamia, and the comparison of these examples in order to deduce the function, symbolism and context of the different kinds of standards.

1.5.2 OUTLINE
A short general historical background will be provided in Chapter 2 to place the study in its correct context.

Thereafter, the standards of each of the four major periods of the third and fourth millennia BCE will be studied in chronological order: Chapter 3 will discuss the standards of the Uruk Period, Chapter 4 will discuss those of the Early Dynastic Period, Chapter 5 will discuss those of the Akkadian Period, and Chapter 6 will discuss those of the Neo-Sumerian Period. Each of these four major chapters will begin with a brief introduction to the period and its art. Thereafter, each standard represented during the period will be discussed under a separate subheading. A brief summary of the standards represented in the period, and the contexts within these standards are depicted will conclude each of these four major chapters.

A summary, analysis and conclusion are provided in Chapter 7. The history and use of each standard will be summarised. The different types or contexts of standards will be summarised. Thereafter final conclusions will be drawn regarding the form, function and
symbolism of standards in the iconography of third and fourth millennia BCE Mesopotamia. The catalogue of objects discussed in the study is represented by Appendix 1.

1.5.3 THE CATALOGUE
Depictions of standards, as defined in 1.3, in the iconographic record of third and fourth millennia BCE Mesopotamia will be collected into a systematic and comprehensive catalogue. The material can then be analysed, discussed, interpreted and compared. In the catalogue, as presented in Appendix 1\textsuperscript{14}, the material will be classified according to the following criteria:

1. **Catalogue Number**
The catalogue number refers to the entire artefact, and not the standard or standards represented on the artefact. Each entry in the catalogue will be classified according to which period it is from. A catalogue entry beginning with U is from the Uruk Period, a catalogue entry beginning with ED is from the Early Dynastic Period, a catalogue entry beginning with A is from the Akkadian Period, and a catalogue entry beginning with NS is from the Neo-Sumerian Period. As closely as possible, the catalogue entries will be numbered according to where they are first mentioned in the text of the study. For example U1 would be the first standard discussed or mentioned in Chapter 3 on the Uruk Period, and ED7 would be the seventh standard discussed or mentioned in Chapter 4 on the Early Dynastic Period.

2. **Name**
If the artefact is known by a specific name, this name is given. For example, ED66 is Eannatum’s Stele of the Vultures, and A74 is the Victory Stele of Naram-Sin. Most catalogue entries, particularly the cylinder seals, are not known by a specific name, and no name will therefore be given.

3. **Image**
The best photograph or drawing that could be found of the artefact. This is usually an image of the entire artefact, but in some cases the image is a close up of the standards represented on the artefact, as, for example on ED66, ED70, ED74 and A74. In these cases, an image of

\textsuperscript{14} Appendix 1, the catalogue, is provided on the accompanying disc.
the entire artefact, or a reconstruction of the entire scene, will be included in the text. Cylinder seals will be represented by an image of an impression of the seal.

4. Picture Credit
The source of the image represented. The majority of these images are from books, museum catalogues, catalogues of cylinder seals and excavation reports. Some examples are from online sources, and a link to the website and the date accessed are provided. Other images are photographs taken in a private or personal capacity, in which case the surname of the individual who took the photograph is given, followed by the initials of their given names.

5. Type of Standard
If more than one type of standard is represented, these are listed from left to right and from top to bottom. A question mark in parentheses (?) after the type of standard indicates that the identification of this standard is not certain.

6. Place of Origin and Context
First the place of origin is given, then the exact context if this is known through excavation. If the artefact was not acquired through excavation, but through trade, this is noted.

7. Type
What type of medium the catalogue entry represents. The majority of examples are cylinder seals or cylinder seal impressions, but there are also inlays, plaques, stelae, etc.

8. Material
The material from which the object was made.

9. Size
The size of the object in centimetres. In some cases the height of a seal impression is recorded as “height of seal”, as to differentiate between the height of the impression and the height of the artefact upon which the seal was impressed. “Preserved” height/length/etc. is used when the entire artefact has not survived, and “minimum” height/length/etc. is used when the entire artefact has not survived, but a minimum measurement has been projected. Unless otherwise specified, abbreviations are as on Table 1.4.
### Table 1.4: Abbreviations for measurements in the catalogue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Thickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Breadth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10. Collection

The museum number of the artefact. If only the museum in which the object is located is known, this is given in parentheses. If the excavation number is known, this is given after the museum number. In some cases, only the excavation number is known. For the abbreviation of the museum when the full name is not given in the catalogue, see Table 1.5, and for the abbreviations of the site of excavation, see Table 1.6.

### Table 1.5: Abbreviations for museums when the full name of the museum is not given in the catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>Musée du Louvre, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLMJ</td>
<td>Bible Lands Museum, Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>British Museum, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EŞEM</td>
<td>Eski Şark Eserleri Müzesi, Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Iraq Museum, Baghdad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMKG</td>
<td>Koninklijke Musea voor Kunst en Geschiedenis, Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Museum of Fine Arts, Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLC</td>
<td>Yale Babylonian Collection, New Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YCB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Seal</td>
<td>The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>Die Sammlungen Bibel+Orient der Universität Freiburg Schweiz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1.5: Abbreviations for museums when the full name of the museum is not given in the catalogue*
11. **Literature Published**

Previous literature in which the object has been discussed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Site of Excavation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As</td>
<td>Tell Asmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Tell Agrab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GN</td>
<td>Jemdet Nasr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Kish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh</td>
<td>Khafajeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Tello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Uruk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.6: Abbreviation of sites of excavation
2. GENERAL HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 FOURTH MILLENNIUM BCE

The Uruk period (4000-2900 BCE) takes its name from the site of Uruk, a town in Sumer of prime importance during this period. This period has been referred to as the “Urban Revolution” (van de Mieroop 2004:19) or “Proto-Urban epoch” (Demange et al 1995:17) and represents the first urban civilization. Social structures which differed from the traditional village communities of the previous Ubaid period arose entirely as a result of indigenous forces. The first towns were founded and were characterised by labour specialization which led to the development of a social hierarchy (van de Mieroop 2004:26). Common features include monumental buildings, public art, the first script, and a higher level of political and economic organization than seen before with specialization and standardization of industrial production (Postgate 1992:24).

The temple was the only urban institution during this period (Stone 1995:236). The city of Uruk included two major religious centres, Eanna, where Inanna, goddess of love and war, was worshipped, and Kullaba which contained the structure called the Anu Ziggurat\textsuperscript{15}, although there is no evidence that it was dedicated to the sky god An during the Uruk period (Perkins 1949:110). At this time, the Anu Ziggurat was not a ziggurat as known today, a stepped pyramid surmounted by a temple, but its precursor, a ‘High Temple’, a temple built on a high platform (Lenzen 1941:6). This platform was formed from the continuous levelling and rebuilding of the temple on the same site (Moortgat 1969:1).

The monumental architecture suggests a powerful elite commanding an organized, skilled and resourceful labour force. The figure known as the “Priest-king” played a very important role\textsuperscript{16}. A few limestone statuettes depict him in ritual nudity [Fig. 2.1], and cylinder seals show him performing cultic activities and combatting foes, both animal and human\textsuperscript{17}.

\textsuperscript{15} For discussions on these religious centres and their development see Perkins (1949), Goff (1963), and Lenzen (1941).
\textsuperscript{16} For more on this figure, see below 3.2.2.
\textsuperscript{17} Although royal hunts may also have been a ritual activity, see van Dijk (2011b).
The monumental building projects must have been supported by a well ordered economy. Trade was important, and at an early period an extensive network of trade routes linked Sumer to the rest of the ancient Near East\(^\text{18}\). Sumer was open to influences from the outside, and, in turn, developments from within Sumer were liable to affect neighbouring regions.

The first script, which can be called proto-cuneiform (Woods 2010b:35) was invented towards the end of the period. The earliest phases are still known almost exclusively from Uruk\(^\text{19}\), but very few contemporary sites have been excavated, and it is possible that writing was invented elsewhere. As with all early ancient Near Eastern remains, it is virtually impossible to obtain exact dates for the strata in which the earliest writings were discovered (Gelb 1963:62). Two chronological phases can be identified by differences in style, technique and complexity of the documents (Woods 2010b:35). The earliest phase of the archaic Uruk script (Uruk IV) was a pictographic form, with one sign representing a word whose meaning was clear, and the tablets can therefore be understood, although it is impossible to determine the language in which they were written. Texts from the succeeding

---

\(^{18}\) For overland trade routes in the ancient Near East, see Astour (1995). For trade routes between Mesopotamia and Egypt, see Mark (1997). For trade routes crossing the Syro-Mesopotamian steppes and the Zagros Mountains and extending into eastern Anatolia and present-day Iran, see Algaze (1989; 2005). For trade between Mesopotamia and South Asia, see Potts (1995:1451-1459).

\(^{19}\) For a full discussions on and catalogues of the signs of the archaic Uruk script, see Falkenstein (1936) and Green and Nissen (1987).
period (Uruk III) have been identified as having been written in Sumerian\textsuperscript{20} (Falkenstein 1936:37-8). The earliest texts which can be understood are Sumerian. It is therefore thought that the Uruk III texts are also Sumerian.

Because writing was only invented during this period, and no historical documents exist, not much is known historically about this period. Even in ancient times, the Sumerian King List\textsuperscript{21} viewed the period as coming before the Flood, a distant time steeped in mystery.

In the south, the final two centuries of the period (3100-2900 BCE) constitute a distinct archaeological period, named the Jemdet Nasr Period after the site in southern Mesopotamia in which the culture was first identified\textsuperscript{22}. This period is represented by distinct cultural artefacts such as pottery, cylinder seals and cuneiform tablets (Leick 2010:94). In the north, the Gawra and Ninevite periods are approximately contemporary with the Uruk and Jemdet Nasr periods (Goff 1963:xxxvii-xxxviii).

\section*{2.2 THIRD MILLENNIUM BCE}

\subsection*{2.2.1 EARLY DYNASTIC PERIOD 2900-2334 BCE}

Throughout Mesopotamia during the early third millennium BCE the first recorded dynasties arose. Ruling families in various cities passed political power from one generation to the next. As a result, this period is known as the Early Dynastic (ED) period (2900-2334 BCE). It is also sometimes called the pre-Sargonic period, in reference to the succeeding Akkadian period\textsuperscript{23}, or the Old Sumerian period. An archaeological sequence in the Diyala Region established by the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago divides the ED period into three main subdivisions, ED I, ED II, and ED III (Kuhrt 1995:27).

The characteristic social unit was the city-state, comprising of a principal urban centre with dependent villages and farmlands, centred around the temple and the lands of the local god or

\textsuperscript{20} It should be noted that the pictographic Uruk III writing was also used at Jemdet Nasr, Khafajah and Tell Uqair (Woods 2010b:35), sites in the north where the Semitic Akkadians are first known (Oates 1986:19-20).

\textsuperscript{21} The \textit{Sumerian King List} is a compilation of the dynasties and kings of Sumer, and the length of their reigns, which dates from the First Dynasty of Isin. See http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/section2/c211.htm for a transliteration and http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/section2/tr211.htm for a translation of the \textit{Sumerian King List}, and see Jacobsen (1939) for a full discussion on this text.

\textsuperscript{22} This period is sometimes seen not as a separate archaeological period, but as another name for Uruk III, eg. Woods (2010b:35). For the problems with the terminology and chronology of the archaeological phases, see Crawford (2004:18-19; 23-25) and Finkbeiner and Röllig (1986).

\textsuperscript{23} Discussed below 2.2.2.
goddess (e.g., Inanna of Uruk). Each city-state was independent and was believed to be the domain of one particular deity (van de Mieroop 2004:43). The fortunes of these deities rose and fell with those of the city. The importance of the ruling dynasties is evident with the emergence of the palace, the ruler’s residence and administrative centre, the earliest example of which is known from Kish during the ED III period (Moortgat 1969:20).

During the ED Period, the city-states grew in size and their number increased to at least twelve (Kramer 1963:73), and possibly as many as thirty (Zettler and Horne 1998:4). By the ED III period, 80 percent of the population lived in cities larger than 40 hectares (Kuhrt 1995:31).

The relationships between the city-states ranged from vassalage to equality, but they were never unified into a strong centralized state like Egypt. They frequently warred amongst themselves for power, and over territory and irrigation rights. One such battle is depicted on the Stele of the Vultures of Eannatum of Lagash24 (AO 16109, AO 50, AO 2346, AO 2348) [Fig. 4.11], dating to circa 2460 BCE, which commemorates the events surrounding a border dispute between Lagash and Umma, and Lagash’s victory (Winter 2010b:7). The cities also had peaceful diplomatic relations which they strengthened through gift exchange. The so-called Treasure of Ur from Mari is an example of this25. There may have been coalitions of cities, such as the Kengir League which was suggested by Jacobsen (1970:40). Despite the political instability of the relationships between the city-states, there was a marked degree of economic interdependence between them. Inscriptions of Ur-Nanshe of Lagash attest to long-distant trade with Dilmun26.

The most prevalent type of artwork during all periods was glyptic art, the engravings on cylinder seals. During the Early Dynastic Period, the most common type of larger-scale artwork is the type of statue known as worshipper statue or votive figure [Fig. 2.2]. These represented both men and women and were thought to embody the essence of the person depicted. As such, they were placed in the temple as a substitute for the continual worship of the person depicted27 (Hansen 2003a:29; Moortgat 1969:37).

24 Discussed below as ED66 under 4.5.
25 For a full catalogue and discussion of the so-called Treasure of Ur from Mari, see Parrot (1968).
26 For these texts, see, for example Frayne (2008:83-84 RIMEP E1.9.1.2) and (2008:87-89 RIMEP E1.9.1.6a). For the location of Dilmun, see Potts (1995:1455).
27 For more on these statues, see Evans (2012). For royal votive statues, see Marchesi and Marchetti (2011).
For the first part of the period, sources are mainly archaeological in nature. The first historical inscriptions appear towards the end of the period, allowing for the first time a reliable reconstruction of historical events (Kuhrt 1995:43). At the end of the ED period, Lugalzagesi (c 2370 BCE), a high priest of Umma, defeated Urukagina\(^{28}\) of Lagash, and captured Lagash, Uruk, and Ur, and made Uruk his capital. He was eventually defeated by Sargon of Akkad (2334-2284 BCE), who founded the Semitic-speaking Akkadian dynasty (2334-2284 BCE) (Leick 2010:109; Zettler and Horne 1998:6-7).

2.2.2 AKKADIAN PERIOD  2334-2150 BCE

The period under the dominion of Sargon’s dynasty is called the Akkadian period, the Old Akkadian Empire, and the Sargonic period (Kuhrt 1995:44). Sargon built on Lugalzagesi’s successes and united Sumer and Akkad into the world’s first empire (Liverani 1993). People of different languages, religions and cultures were united under the Akkadian kings.

\(^{28}\) This ruler is also known as Uruinimgina. For more on the reading of this name, see Edzard (1991) and Lambert (1992).
Sargon’s empire comprised of Sumer and Akkad, northern Mesopotamia, the Diyala region and Elam, and stretched “from the Lower Sea <to the Upper Sea>” (Frayne 1993:11 RIMEP E2.1.1.1) — from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf (Oates 1986:28) — and accordingly he took the title “King of the Four Quarters (of the Universe)” (Frankfort 1996:84). According to inscriptions, Sargon campaigned in the north against Mari and Ebla and “as far as the Cedar Forest and the Silver Mountains” (Frayne 1993:28-29 RIMEP E2.1.1.11), areas which can be identified as the Amanus and Taurus mountain ranges in present-day southern Turkey (Oates 1986:32).

After the city-states were defeated, they were united and integrated into a centralised Akkadian bureaucracy. Little is known about the internal organization of the Akkadian empire (Charpin 1995:810). Governors installed to run the city states were called “sons of Akkad” by Sargon (Postgate 1992:40), and “slaves of the king” under Naram-Sin (Frankfort 1996:48), indicating the Akkadian attempt to create a loyalty amongst subordinates. This was further achieved through the deification of the Akkadian kings, the most notable visual representation of which is the horned headdress of divinity worn by Naram-Sin on his Victory Stele [Fig. 5.8] which commemorated his defeat of the Lullubi (Demange et al 1995:39-40). This deification is usually seen as a deliberate attempt to unify the Akkadian empire by creating a rallying point for the empire’s diverse and potentially divisive elements. By posing as a god, the Akkadian king could secure absolute obedience from the various governors of the empire (Roux 1992:156).

That the empire was protected by the first standing army is suggested by an inscription of Sargon which states that “54,000 men daily eat in the presence of Sargon” (Frayne 1993:29 RIMEP E2.1.1.11). Akkadian, a Semitic language, became the official language and was used for royal inscriptions as well as archival documents (Charpin 1995:810). International trade flourished by land and sea (Leick 2010:8), with a text from the period claiming that “[h]e [Sargon] moored the ships of Meluḫḫu, Magan and Tilmun at the quay of Agade” (Frayne 1993:28 RIMEP E2.1.1.11).

---

29 Despite what is suggested by the title, these governors may have been the original rulers of the city-states, and not newly Akkadians newly appointed to the position (van de Mieroop 2004:60).
30 For the horned headdress of divinity, see Boehmer (1972-75a) and van Dijk (2011a:130-151).
31 Discussed below as A74 under 5.8.
32 Melukha, Magan and Dilmun may be identified as the Indus Valley, Oman and Bahrain respectively (Potts 1995:1452-1459).
No buildings from this period have yet been discovered in Sumer or Akkad, and the capital city of Akkad has also never been found. Little art of the period is known besides works which were found at Susa where they were taken as spoils. The fragments of stelae which survive all depict military conquests (Hansen 2003b:189), while few examples of votive statues are known. The art of the period was meant to express the “ideal of a strongly centralized military empire” (Demange et al 1995:35), but this does not mean that it was in direct contrast to the art of the preceding ED period – in fact, the Sargon Stele (Sb 1) can be considered “the immediate successor of the Stele of the Vultures” (Moortgat 1969:47).

Sargon’s successors, Rimush (2284-2275 BCE), Manishtushu (2275-2260 BCE), Naram-Sin (2260-2223 BCE) and Shar-kali-sharri (2223-2198 BCE), all faced internal opposition from the Sumerian city-states. Central authority, and the Akkadian dynasty, collapsed under Shar-kali-sharri with the arrival of the Gutians (Leick 2010:8).

In later Mesopotamian tradition, the Akkadian dynasty marked a complete break with the previous Sumerian ED period. For the first time in history the whole of Mesopotamia was united under one ruler. The ruling power had passed from Sumerians to Semitic Akkadian speakers. However, Sargon’s rule is never treated as foreign in contemporary sources, and today it seems that there was a greater continuity between Akkadian rulers and their Sumerian predecessors than had earlier been thought (Frankfort 1996:84). The Akkadian period can be seen as the result of the intensifying rivalries between the Sumerian city-states at the end of the ED period (Kuhrt 1995:44).

### 2.2.3 Gutian Period 2284-2120 BCE

In the anarchy after the fall of the Akkadian empire, the land fell to the Gutians, who are generally thought to have come from the Zagros mountains and upper valleys of the Diyala River (Leick 2010:80), although they were not the cause of the demise of the Akkadian empire (Speiser 1952:100). Very little is actually known about the domination of the Gutian kings. This period is sometimes referred to as being a brief “dark ages”, and the *Sumerian King List* vii:1 says of it, “Who was king? Who was not king?” (Jacobsen 1939:113). Despite their negative treatment in sources, it seems that they controlled little more than the Diyala region (Leick 2010:81).

---

33 For the art of the Akkadian period, see Amiet (1976).
34 See Hendrickson (1986:23) for the difficulties in locating Gutium during the Akkadian period.
It is uncertain how much territory the Gutians controlled. Some of the Sumerian city-states, notably Lagash, seem to have been little affected by the Gutians and took advantage of the situation to revive their traditions (Smith 1932:305). They certainly suffered less than the cities of the north. Akkad was destroyed, and much of the north was laid to waste (Moortgat 1969:55).

2.2.4 NEO-SUMERIAN PERIOD 2157-2004 BCE

The Neo-Sumerian period refers to the period just before and during the Third Dynasty of Ur (Ur III) (2112-2004 BCE), which also marked a reversion to Sumerian as the official language. Although it has been argued that there was a marked difference between the Sumerian and Akkadian civilizations, Neo-Sumerian culture owed as much to the Akkadian dynasty as the Akkadian dynasty had owed to the achievements of ED Sumer. Moortgat (1969:55) even argues that the period would be better called a “‘Sumero-Akkadian’ revival”. Changes across the periods are highlighted by the changes in official language, but they represent a development of society, rather than complete breaks in tradition.

The period is often characterised as a “Sumerian Renaissance” (Kuhrt 1995:59) or “Sumerian “revival” (Oates 1986:43). However, it is clear that by this time both Sumerians and Akkadians had long been assimilated into a homogenous population with common traditions and culture. It is not known when Akkadian was first spoken in Mesopotamia, but evidence suggests at least some of the population spoke the language as early as the 26th century BCE (Huehnergard 2011:xxiii). The deliberate use of Sumerian must reflect a degree of consciousness of the Sumerian cultural heritage (Oates 1986:43). This does not presuppose any hostility between the Sumerian and Akkadian portions of the population. As noted by Cooper (1983:9), “there is no explicit statement of anti-Akkadian (in the ethno-linguistic sense) anywhere in Sumerian literature.”

2.2.4.1 SECOND DYNASTY OF LAGASH circa 22nd century BCE

Of the Sumerian cities, Lagash, was the most notable to regain some authority and autonomy during the Gutian period. There are many literary texts concerning the history of this Second

---

35 Although Akkadian continued to be used (Demange et al 1995:45).
36 See for example Nissen (1986).
Dynasty of Lagash, but its founder and the exact number of rulers and the length of each reign is unknown\textsuperscript{37}. The best-known and most illustrious ruler of the dynasty was Gudea (c. 22\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE\textsuperscript{38}), best known for his many statues\textsuperscript{39}. His inscriptions\textsuperscript{40} imply considerable political prestige. They primarily concern temple restorations, but also mention trade with Iran, Asia Minor, Lebanon, and lands beyond the Persian Gulf. Statue B (AO 2) contains the only reference to a military conquest, recording a military campaign into Elam (Price 1923:42), “He defeated the Cities of Anšan and Elam and brought the booty therefrom to Ningirsu in his Eninnu\textsuperscript{41}” (Edzard 1997:35 RIMEP E3/1.1.7.StB). Similarly, only one fragment of a relief (AO 57, AO 26428 A) bears a depiction of bound captives (Suter 2000:18 n.99; 323 SO.5). The Second Dynasty of Lagash therefore seems to have been a time of revival, with the construction of temples, and with a revival in the arts. The \textit{Gudea Cylinders}\textsuperscript{42} (MNB 1511 and MNB 1512) [Fig. 2.3] are the longest extant texts written in the Sumerian language (Demange \textit{et al} 1995:52).

\textbf{Fig. 2.3: The Gudea Cylinders (Suter 2000: 73 Fig. 14)}

\textsuperscript{37} See Suter (2000:15-17) for a discussion on the difficulties in establishing this chronology and for a list of earlier literature discussing the matter.

\textsuperscript{38} Although the exact date is unknown, at least part of his reign coincided with that of Ur-Nammu (Steinkeller 1988).

\textsuperscript{39} See Colbow (1987) and Johansen (1978) for the Gudea statuary.

\textsuperscript{40} See Edzard (1997 RIMEP 3/1) for transliterations and translations of inscriptions from the Second Dynasty of Lagash.

\textsuperscript{41} Eninnu was the temple of Ningirsu in Girsu in Lagash.

2.2.4.2  THIRD DYNASTY OF UR  2112-2004 BCE

Utu-Hegal of Uruk overthrew the last Gutian king in about 2120 BCE. He started to unify the land of Sumer, ruling over city-states through governors. Ur-Nammu (2113-2096 BCE), governor of Ur, secured independence for his city and founded the Third Dynasty of Ur. Around 2112 he overthrew his former protector and assumed the title “King of Ur” (Hallo 1966:134). The dynasty lasted more than a century and represents the final heyday of Sumerian civilization. Although the empire was extended to Elam and Assyria under Ur-Nammu’s son and grandson, Shulgi (2094-2047 BCE) and Amar-Suen (2046-2038 BCE) respectively (Leick 2010:170), it seems military action was limited. Ur-Nammu may have died in battle\(^{43}\), but inscriptions\(^{44}\) dedicated to him and Shulgi are more often religious than military in nature.

Ur III kings adopted the titles of the Akkadian kings and were also deified (Evans 2003:419). Ur-Nammu claimed the title “King of Sumer and Akkad” (Hallo 1966:139), for the first time officially acknowledging the composite origins of the region. The Ur III concept of state and administration was influenced by the Akkadians, but was more centrally organized. The government was bureaucratic, as the tens of thousands of legal, economic and administrative documents show. The risk of rebellion was minimized by careful management of districts or provinces under the authority of governors\(^{45}\). Military affairs were not in the hands of these governors, but under the control of garrison commanders who were directly responsible to the king (Oates 1986:43).

With this political stability, there was also a revival of Sumerian art, literature and law. The primary written sources for this period are abundant and include hymns and prayers, myths, court literature and a law code written by Ur-Nammu which is the earliest surviving text of its kind\(^{46}\) (Michalowski 1995). There were also extensive building programmes. True ziggurats

\(^{43}\) Ur-Nammu’s death is commemorated in a Sumerian poetic composition called *The Death of Ur-Nammu and His Descent to the Netherworld*, but no historical texts concerning the matter exist. See Kramer (1967) for a translation and discussion on the text.

\(^{44}\) See Frayne (1997 RIMEP 3/2) for inscriptions from the Ur III period.

\(^{45}\) The number of these districts ranges somewhere between twenty (Charpin 1995:811) and forty (Oates 1986:43).

\(^{46}\) For a translation and discussion of this text, see Finkelstein (1969).
were built for the first time during this period (Moortgat 1969:56). The best-preserved example is the ziggurat of Ur, built under Ur-Nammu’s reign\textsuperscript{47}.

In about 2004 BCE, during the reign of Ibbi-Sin (2026-2004 BCE), the sixth ruler of the dynasty, the Ur III empire collapsed under pressure from the Amorites in the west and Shimashki in the east (van de Mieroop 2004:78-9). City-states on Sumer’s periphery, at Assur, Mari and Susa, broke loose and overran the cities of the south, and the Elamites destroyed Ur. Ishbi-Erra (2017-1985 BCE), Ibbi-Sin’s governor at Isin, declared independence from Ur, and for two or three centuries, small city-states vied for independence in struggles polarised around the rival cities of Isin and Larsa.

\textsuperscript{47} See Woolley (1939) for a full discussion on this structure and its development.
3. URUK PERIOD

3.1 INTRODUCTION
The earliest standards in Mesopotamian iconography are found in the Uruk Period\(^{48}\). Their emergence and use in this period — for example, what they looked like, and the contexts in which they were found — can throw light onto the origins of standards in general and can give insight into later standards from Mesopotamia.

During the Uruk Period social structures arose which differed from those of the preceding Ubaid Period. The first towns were founded and “[t]he growth of settlements on a new scale also called for new structures of power and political leadership” (Nissen 2003:16). These changes are reflected in the art of the period. Cylinder seals were invented by the Uruk administration (Collon 2005a:14) and it stands to reason that the scenes depicted on Uruk Period cylinder seals reflect the ideology of this administration. Individually identifiable figures, such as the so-called Priest-King or En figure\(^{49}\), are represented for the first time, and ritual scenes are depicted taking place at temples or sacred buildings.

There are three major standards from the Uruk Period which are found in a variety of contexts and which may also have variations in their appearance. These are the ring-post; which can be found with or without a streamer; the ringed pole and the Bügelschaft. Knobbed poles and floral/star standards are also found, although each is found in only one iconographic context with little variation.

Reed buildings were constructed from as early as the preceding Ubaid Period (Perkins 1949:88), and the reeds which were used in reed architecture grow as tall as 4,50 metres (Moorey 1994:361), which makes the stems of these reeds ideal for use as the shafts of standards. Two of the most well-represented standards in Uruk Period iconography — the ring-post with streamer and the ringed pole — were originally made of reed [Fig. 3.1]\(^{50}\).

\(^{48}\) Due to the problems relating to the terminology and chronology of the Uruk and Jemdet Nasr periods (see 2.1), the two are treated here as one. Although the term “Uruk” will be used for convenience, it is noted that the majority of pieces discussed come from the end of the Uruk Period or the Jemdet Nasr Period.

\(^{49}\) See below 3.2.2 for more on this figure.

\(^{50}\) See below for more on these standards.
Standards were found not only in Uruk Period iconography, but also in the archaic Uruk script. Their appearance and use in the two sources though is different — not all standards found in the archaic Uruk script are found in the iconographic record and vice versa [Table 3.1]. The ring-post with streamer, ring-post without streamer, ringed pole, Bügelschaft and a variation on the Bügelschaft in which the emblem of a standard is formed by two Bügelschafts which are joined at their bases by a bar are found in the archaic Uruk script, but the Doppelvolute, knobbed pole and floral/star standard are absent. Conversely, there are signs found in the script which represent standards which are not illustrated in the iconographic record, for example the signs which can be read as GEŠTU (Falkenstein 1936:Sign No. 291, 298-300; Green and Nissen 1987:Sign No. 203a & 203b), NIR (Falkenstein 1936: Sign No. 302-304; Green and Nissen 1987:Sign No. 414), ADAB (Falkenstein 1936:205, 305-307; Green and Nissen 1987:Sign No. 19) and KALAM (Falkenstein 1936: Sign No. 607; Green and Nissen 1987:Sign No. 282). A variation of the sign ADAB appears to be a crescent standard, which is unknown in the iconography of the Uruk Period, but is represented in later periods\(^{51}\). Despite these differences in the portrayal of standards in the archaic Uruk script and Uruk Period iconography, the textual and palaeographic evidence can offer insight into the iconography of the standards of the Uruk Period, and can therefore not be ignored.

\(^{51}\) See 4.4, 5.4 and 6.3 for the crescent standard in the Early Dynastic, Akkadian and Neo-Sumerian periods respectively. For more on standards in the archaic Uruk script, see Szarzyńska (1978-88; 1996).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD IN THE ICONOGRAPHIC RECORD</th>
<th>SIGN IN THE ARCHAIC URUK SCRIPT (URUK IV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ring-Post with Streamer</td>
<td>MUŠ3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-Post without Streamer</td>
<td>LAGAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doppelvolute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringed Pole</td>
<td>ŠEŠ NUN (NUN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bügelschaft</td>
<td>ŠEŠ URI3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knobbed Pole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floral/Star Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Standard (Proto-Elamite)</td>
<td>ADAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEŠTU (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEŠTU (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KALAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Standards represented in Uruk Period iconography and in the archaic Uruk script (Images from the iconographic record from Appendix 1. Signs from the archaic Uruk script all from Green and Nissen 1987).
3.2 THE RING-POST

3.2.1 INTRODUCTION
The most commonly depicted type of standard of the Uruk Period is the ring-post. This standard consists of a shaft which ends in a ring and which usually has a streamer hanging down from one side of the ring. There are examples without this streamer. A third variation consists of two ring-posts without streamers standing back-to-back to form one standard and is called the Doppelvolute\(^\text{52}\) (Heinrich 1957:33-34).

The ring-post with streamer and the ring-post without streamer are often treated as one symbol (eg. Goff 1963:85-86), and Heinrich (1957:33 n.30) states that they are similar to each other in both form and meaning. But Szarzyńska (1987-88:3-4) recognizes the ring-post with streamers and the ring-post without streamers as two separate symbols. Both were signs used in the Uruk IV script; the ring-post with streamer is identifiable as the sign MUŠ\(^\text{3}\) (Green and Nissen 1987:248 Sign No. 374; Falkenstein 1936: Sign No. 208-209), and the ring-post without streamer, according to Szarzyńska (1987-88:11) “remain[s] unidentifiable”, but according to Green and Nissen (1987:237 Sign. No. 323), represents the sign LAGAR (see also Falkenstein 1936: Sign No. 210-211). These two signs are found together on some of the archaic texts from Uruk, such as ATU No. 324 (Falkenstein 1936: Taf. 27) “in separate entries as independent designations” (Szarzyńska 1987-88:3-4). Both symbols were found with the divine indicator, indicating that they represented a deity (Szarzyńska 1987-88:10), and because two signs occurring together cannot logically refer to the same deity, the signs must be separate and have separate meanings.

In the iconographic material, it is possible that one cylinder seal impression U33 contains depictions of both the ring-post with streamer and the ring-post without streamer. The impression is fragmentary, and it is uncertain whether the ring-post in the lower of the two registers of the impression has a streamer or not. The cylinder seal U66\(^\text{53}\) contains depictions of two different types of standards in a procession, but U33 would be the only example from the Uruk Period where more than one type of standard are depicted in different iconographic contexts on the same artefact. Also, there are at least five other standards definitely representing the ring-post with streamer depicted on the seal impression. It is therefore more likely that the ring-post in question also has a streamer, and is treated as such in this work.

\(^{52}\) All three types of ring-post are discussed separately below.

\(^{53}\) Discussed below 3.4.
The ring-post has traditionally been identified as a door- or gate-post of a reed hut made of a reed bundle with the upper ends bent to form a loop and with the ends of the reeds forming the “streamer”. A pole with a reed mat was inserted through the rings of two of these ring-posts to form the door of the building (Andrae 1933:21-25; van Buren 1945:43). Heinrich (1957:32-33) contends that where the ring-post is directly associated with a building, it has nothing to do with a door. However, on U5, U10 and U11 items which can be identified as temple inventory and therefore “inside” are separated from figures and animals “outside” by ring-posts, which suggests that these ring-posts act as door- or gateways.

3.2.2 THE RING-POST WITH STREAMER

The ring-post with streamer was used in texts as the sign for Inanna55 (Falkenstein 1936:59) and in iconography it must therefore also represent her or be associated with her. Goff (1963:86) argues that the ring-post with streamer was originally associated with fertility, and that, although it became associated with Inanna, as a fertility symbol, this was not its only meaning.

Steinkeller (1998) uses textual evidence to propose that the ring-post with streamer represented a scarf, shawl or headband which was attached to the top of a pole. This assessment is supported by Beaulieu (1998). Their arguments ignore the repeated association in iconography of the ring-posts with reed structures (Braun-Holzinger 2007:21 n.56). Furthermore, Marchesi and Marchetti (2011:190 no.19) point out that the bindings on the ring-posts, visible especially on clay models U1 and U2, point to the ring-posts being reed bundles which are bound together.

The ring-post with streamer is also called the “gate-post” (van Buren 1945:43), “reed pole” (Bahrani 2002:18), the “‘roller-blind’ reed pylons” (Jacobsen 1991:117 n. 22), the “beribboned standard” (Goff and Buchanan 1956:231; Goff 1963:84), “tasseled standards” (Buchanan 1981:45), “ring bundles” (Egenter 1994:29), the “Schilfringbündel”56 (Blocher

54 These are discussed in more detail below in 3.2.2.
56 “reed ring bundle”

Four baked clay inlays from Uruk U1-U4 represent the ring-post with streamer. U1 and U2 are rendered realistically, with the bindings securing the reed bundles together and with the streamers clearly visible, while U3 and U4 are rendered more abstractly. These inlays were found in association with baked clay inlays of geometric shapes, rosettes and animal forms, and Jordan (1930:43) suggests that U1 formed part of a representation of a reed hut, but the exact iconographic context of the inlays is unknown.

The ring-post with streamer is found most famously on the uppermost register of the Warka Vase U5 [Fig. 3.2]. Although broken, enough of this register survives to reconstruct a scene in which a female figure receives three male figures. The middle of the male figures is unfortunately lost\(^{61}\), but can be identified by the piece of his net skirt that survives as the figure conventionally called the Priest-King or the En\(^{62}\) (e.g. Steinkeller 1999:105, 110-111). Because of the garment he wears, he is also referred to as the “Man in net kilt” (Steinkeller 1999:104), “Mann im Netzrock”\(^{63}\) (Blocher 2013:84; Strommenger 2008:3), or “Netzrockmann”\(^{64}\) (Strommenger 1962:54). This figure also always has a beard and wears his hair bound in a chignon.

---

\(^{57}\) “ring reed bundle”

\(^{58}\) “ring bundle”

\(^{59}\) “Inanna standard”.

\(^{60}\) “the staff with streamer”

\(^{61}\) According to oral tradition, the fragment depicting this figure was lost after the excavation of the Vase (Strommenger 2008:1).

\(^{62}\) The two terms are often used interchangeably, as for example, by Schmandt-Besserat (2007:42). However, for problems regarding the term “Priest-King” and its association with the En, see Suter (2014:554-555) and Michalowski (1997:100). See Hallo (1957:3-10) for a philological discussion on the term ‘En’. In this work the term “Priest-King/En figure” will be used throughout for convenience.

\(^{63}\) “Man in net skirt”.

\(^{64}\) “Net skirt man”
The identities of both the female figure and the Priest-King/En figure on U5 have been much debated. They are found together on a series of cylinder seals U6-U8 with abbreviated versions of the scene on U5 which generally depict the female figure holding a ring-post with streamer, and the male figure holding an ear of grain while both face towards two containers. One cylinder seal U9 depicts the two figures standing before the two containers.

---

65 See below in this section.
66 Identified variously as an ear of corn (eg. van Buren 1935) or a stalk of barley (eg. Jacobsen 1991:116). See below for a further discussion.
and not holding the ring-post with streamer or ear of grain\textsuperscript{67}. The two containers can be identified as the Warka Vase and its companion (Chau 2008:2). This second Warka Vase survives as just one piece, now housed in the Vorderasiatisches Museum (VA 8792) [Fig. 3.3]\textsuperscript{68}. The two figures are important because they are the only figures with clear and individual iconography which are repeatedly and consistently found in association with any standard during the Uruk Period. Indeed, although the ring-post with streamer is identified as the symbol of Inanna, Marchesi and Marchetti (2011:192) suggest that the ring-post with streamer was associated with not only the female figure, but also with the male figure. This is supported by the iconographic evidence: the female figure is found associated with the ring-post with streamer only on \textbf{U5} and the four associated cylinder seals \textbf{U6-U9}, while the male figure is found associated with the ring-post with streamer in these and in eight additional examples, \textbf{U10–U17}\textsuperscript{69}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{second_warka_vase_fragment.jpg}
\caption{Fragment of second Warka Vase (Heinrich 1936: Taf. 4.a)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{67} See also Braun-Holzinger (2007:Taf. 10 FS12) for a similar scene without ring-post with streamer.
\textsuperscript{68} Asher-Greve (2013:360) suggests this second vase depicted a procession of women, replacing the nude men depicted on the second register of \textbf{U5}. The fragment of the second vase which has survived shows the long-haired figure and temple inventory, and is virtually identical to the corresponding part of \textbf{U5}. There is therefore simply not enough evidence from this fragment to support or oppose Asher-Greve’s suggestion.
\textsuperscript{69} A figure which could be reconstructed as the Priest-King/En figure may hold a standard in \textbf{U103} and \textbf{U106}, but the reconstruction of these as standards is uncertain. See below 3.7.
The scene depicted on U5 and associated cylinder seals has traditionally been thought to represent the rite of the sacred marriage (eg. van Buren 1935:334; Jacobsen 1976:24; Schmandt-Besserat 2007:43-4), a ritual which Cooper (2013:54) describes as “the sexual union between the king, playing the role of the god Dumuzi, and the goddess Inana”, or, rather, a priestess acting the role of this goddess. The reading of the scene on U5 as the sacred marriage ritual has influenced the identification of the two figures. Suter (2014:560-561) argues against this interpretation and argues that the scene depicts rather an event involving grain storage, as evidenced by the related cylinder seals “which reduce the scene to its essentials: the two protagonists are seen walking toward or standing on either side of two large containers, possibly grain silos” (Suter 2014:560). Bahrani (2002:18 n.7) points out that the exact nature of the event depicted is irrelevant, and that the inclusion of the ring-posts with streamers demonstrates that it is related to Inanna, and as such, can be regarded as a religious narrative regardless of what the event is that is being depicted.

The female figure can be associated with Inanna by the ring-posts with streamers next to which she stands, but it is unclear whether she represents Inanna herself or another female figure associated with this goddess. This is reflected in the caution with which scholars have treated the subject. For example, Furlong (1987:78) calls her “the Inanna Figure”, and Braun-Holzinger, who first favours an identification with Inanna, although conceding that there is a chance she represents a priestess (2007:9, 9 n.7), later (2013:33) avoids answering the question of her identity by stating that “der zweizipflige, teilweise zerstörte Kopfputz zeigt ihre besondere Stellung an — Göttin oder Priesterin.” This caution is found as early as in Heinrich’s report on the Kleinfunde in which he states that she could be understood as “die Gottheit selbst oder nur als ihre Vertreterin, also ihre Priesterin” (Heinrich 1936:16).

As mentioned above, the interpretation of the scene as depicting the sacred marriage ritual has influenced the identification of both male and female figures, and the female figure has been identified as the mortal priestess of Inanna in her role as Inanna in this ritual (eg. Nunn 2010:249; Schmandt-Besserat 2007:34-4). Suter (2014:555) does not restrict her to being a priestess, but believes her to be “an elite woman linked to Inanna”, possibly even a queen.

---

71 “The two-pointed, partially destroyed headdress indicates her special position – goddess or priestess.”
72 “the deity herself or only her representative, ie. her priestess.”
The female figure has also been identified as a goddess, and particularly Inanna, based on the headdress which she wears (eg. Basmachi 1975-76:124-5; Moortgat 1969:13; van Buren 1935:332), with a horned headdress typically being associated with divinity. However, the piece of U5 above the female figure’s head was broken and fixed in antiquity (Heinrich 1936:15), and the headdress worn by her is thus incomplete and cannot be identified with certainty as the divine horned headdress (Bahrani 2002:17). According to Boehmer (1972-75a:432) the earliest evidence for the horned headdress of divinity is during the ED II Period, and the headdress worn by the female figure on U5 can therefore not be this headdress. Marchesi and Marchetti (2011:192) identify the figure as Inanna by her constant association with the ring-post with streamer. According to Asher-Greve and Westenholz (2013:163 n. 662) it is not possible to distinguish between humans and deities in Uruk Period iconography. This does not discount the possibility of the female figure being a goddess. Additionally, the headdress, whether or not it indicates divinity, is peculiar to this female figure, and the fact that she has clear and individual iconography is indicative of her having an important status or being an important individual and the headdress may be representative of her special position.

While the male figure is generally accepted as the Priest-King/En, there are arguments for him representing a god. Marchesi and Marchetti (2011:189-196) argue that the Priest-King/En figure of the Uruk material represents a god, whom they identify as a male form of Inanna. They base their argument partially on the figure represented on the small Early Dynastic relief in the Louvre known as the Figure aux Plumes ED48, whom they identify as Ningirsu. The Figure aux Plumes, however, does not appear to represent either a god or a ruler.

Van Buren (1939-41:43) suggests that the Priest-King/En figure “represented a god, but not necessarily always the same god. It served as the portrait of any god who enacted the rôle of bridegroom in a ceremony of the sacred marriage.” In regards to the Uruk material, this god

73 See Boehmer (1972-75a) for a discussion on the “Hörnerkrone” or horned headdress of divinity, and Furlong (1987) and Romano (2008) for discussions on the horned headdress of divinity during the Early Dynastic Period.
74 Furlong (1987:76-78) suggests that the headdress worn by the female figure on the Warka Vase and associated seals represents a shrine.
75 Contra van Buren (1935:333), “By the time of Uruk IV deities were completely anthropomorphized, as the representations on the alabaster vase and on certain seals prove.”
76 For a full discussion on the Figure aux Plumes, see ED48 in 4.3.
would be Dumuzi (eg. Hansen 1998:49; van Buren 1935:335; 1939-41:37). Jacobsen (1976:24) believes him to be Amaušumgalanna, whom he identifies as the husband of Inanna. This does not necessarily contradict the view that the Priest-King/En represents Dumuzi, as Dumuzi was identified with Amaušumgalanna at least as early as the Early Dynastic Period (Leick 1998:31). On Uruk period cylinder seals such as U6 and U8 the Priest-King/En figure is often shown carrying an ear of grain. According to van Buren (1935:335; 1945:13), this is an ear of corn, and she argues that the pictograph depicting the ear of corn developed into a cuneiform sign SIG which, when the divine determinative was added, was the sign for Dumuzi. This would suggest that if the Priest-King/En figure did represent a god, that this figure should be identified as Dumuzi. The sign which van Buren (1935:335) gives as this sign is Deimel Sign No. 167 (Deimel 1922:19), which Deimel identifies as the sign GAL. However, according to Juan-Pablo Vita Barra (personal correspondence), this sign does indeed represent the sign SIG7, which “en su función de verbo, tiene el significado ‘ser verde’; como adjetivo, puede significar ‘brillante’”, but it is not related to Dumuzi, forming rather part of the divine name “{d (= DINGIR) DIG7.PAB.NUN} = Isimud (una divinidad menor)”. Furthermore, Jacobsen (1991:116-117) identifies the ear of grain as a stalk of barley, and the sign for EN was a stalk of barley (Labat 1988:82-83 Sign No. 99; Falkenstein 1936: Sign No. 321, Green and Nissen 1987: Sign No. 134). Whether or not the Priest-King/En figure represents Dumuzi may be a moot point, for, as Steinkeller (1999:105 n.2) notes, “for all practical purposes these would still be representations of a human, since Dumuzi was thought by the ancients to have been...a deified mortal king.” Furthermore, if the scene depicted on U5-U9 does represent the sacred marriage, then it is irrelevant whether the two figures represented Inanna and Dumuzi or mortal figures, because in this ritual, the human figures would act as substitutes for the deities, and, in a sense, become these deities (Bahrani 2002:20-21; Hansen 2003a:24).

The Priest-King/En figure is also found in scenes in which he is found in association with the ring-post with streamer, but in which the female figure is absent on U10-U17.

---

77 Van Buren (1939-41:37) identifies him as “the earliest embodiment of the later Tammuz, lover and spouse of the goddess Istar,” ie. Dumuzi.
78 “in its function as a verb had the meaning “to be green”; as an adjective it could mean “brilliant””
79 “a minor deity”. Isimud in Sumerian, Usmu in Akkadian. For more on this god, see 5.2.3.1.
80 Marchesi and Marchetti (2011:192) also identify it as an ear of barley.
The objects found next to the two ring-posts with streamers on **U10** correspond to those found next to the ring-posts with streamers on **U5**. The objects to the right of the ring-posts with streamers on **U5** can be identified as votive offerings (Heinrich 1936:16) or temple inventory (Hockmann 2008:327). The objects found on **U10** can therefore also be identified as temple inventory and, despite the Inanna figure not being depicted in this scene, because of its similarity with **U5-U9**, this seal can also be identified as an abbreviated version of the same scene. Interestingly, the Priest-King/En figure here carries a zoomorphic vessel in the shape of a caprid, identifiable as a vessel by the spout on its back, rather than the ear of grain he usually carries. Other scenes which appear to depict temple inventory in association with the ring-post with streamer are **U18** and **U19**, the latter of which contains two zoomorphic vessels, one bird⁸¹ and one ram (Brandes 1986:52). Zoomorphic vessels in various shapes also appear on **U5, U18** and **U33**.

In the three seals **U11-U13** in which the Priest-King/En figure is found in association with the ring-post with streamer, he is depicted feeding the herds/flocks. In all three instances, he is feeding sheep⁸². The scene on **U14** is uncertain because only half of the seal survives. On what remains, the Priest-King/En figure is followed by his long-haired attendant⁸³ who holds an ear of grain. Behind the attendant is a ring-post with streamer. The Priest-King/En figure holds what Delaporte (1923:106) identifies as “une tige de graminée”⁸⁴, but the seal is broken at the Priest-King/En’s hands, making an exact identification of this object impossible. However, in **U12**, the only other scene in which the attendant holds an ear of grain, the Priest-King/En figure also holds an ear of grain and feeds a flock of sheep, so it is probable that the Priest-King/En figure in **U14** similarly holds an ear of grain to feed the flock, and that this flock is what is missing on the broken half of the seal. This reading may be supported by the ring-post with streamer and the hoofed animal which decorate the top of the seal. Although the head of the animal has not survived, making it impossible to unequivocally identify the species, the rear of it is the same as the sheep depicted in **U13**.

---

⁸¹ For a bird vessel from the ED II level of the Small Temple at Khafajeh, see Delougaz (1952: Plates 7, 27), and for a bird vessel from the Sin Temple III, see Delougaz (1952: Plate 25a).

⁸² In this regard, see Starr (2015a; 2015b) for more on the role of the Sumerian ruler as a “Shepherd King”. In connection to the debate over whether the Priest-King/En figure represents Dumuzi, Dumuzi was a shepherd god and was called “Lord of the Sheepfolds” (Frankfort 1939a:17), and the feeding of the flocks by the Priest-King/En figure can therefore not be used to determine the figure’s identity. The scene may be indicative of a mortal Priest-King/En’s responsibility to care for the herds and flocks, or it could be reflective of Dumuzi’s role as a shepherd.

⁸³ See below for a discussion on this figure.

⁸⁴ “A stem of grass.”
In U11 and U13, the Priest-King/En figure holds plants with eight-petalled rosette-type flowers, while in U12 he holds the ear of grain more traditionally associated with him. As Goff (1963:62) points out, “since the rosettes represent a deviation from the more realistic grain on which the animals were fed... their appearance must be recognized as significant.” Rosettes are traditionally associated with Inanna\textsuperscript{85}, and because both the ring-post with streamer and the rosette are found in these scenes, the scenes must be particularly associated with this goddess.

Rosettes, herds of sheep and the ring-post with streamer are also found together on the trough U20, the cylinder seal U21, and the baked clay inlays of ring-posts with streamers U1-U4 were found with baked clay inlays of rosettes and sheep (Jordan 1931:33-39), while sheep and the ring-post with streamer are found together on U5, U20 and U22-U27\textsuperscript{86}. On U22 only the sheep and the ring-post with streamer are represented, on U25 and U26 there are also plants. On U5, U20, U21, U23, U24 and U27, the sheep and ring-post with streamer are found in association with a building. On U20, U21, U23 and U27, the ring-post with streamer surmounts the building or emerges from the roof. The two larger ring-posts with streamers on U5 mark the entrance of a building (Suter 2014:552). On U24, two sheep are found facing the building on either side, and behind these sheep the ring-post with streamer is located. The sheep are emerging from the building on U20, U23 and U27\textsuperscript{87}.

Flocks of sheep then appear to have been particularly associated with the ring-post with streamer, and by extension, with Inanna\textsuperscript{88}. This observation was already made by van Buren (1939:99-101; 1935), who saw the ring-post with streamer, rosette and sheep as designating Inanna, and the ringed pole\textsuperscript{89}, cattle and ears of corn as designating Dumuzi. But according to Frankfort (1939a:21 n.3), “barley, rosette and branch on the one hand, and goat, sheep, antelope, calf or stag on the other, seem interchangeable” and Goff (1963:85-86) argues that

\textsuperscript{85} According to Seidl and Krebernik (2006-2008:446), this association with Inanna/Ištar and the rosette is due to the equation of the rosette and the star, “die aber weder terminologisch noch formal fundiert ist” (“which is neither terminologically nor formally founded”). However, see van Buren (1939) for Inanna’s association with the rosette, and Ornan (2005:152) and Barrelet (1955:244 n.107) for Inanna’s association with rosettes at the end of the fourth millennium BCE. See also 3.6.

\textsuperscript{86} Sheep are also found associated with rosettes without the ring-post with streamer. See for example van Buren (1939:figs. 3 and 4).

\textsuperscript{87} For a discussion on herds emerging from huts, see Delougaz (1968). See also Frankfort (1955:15-17) for a discussion on the “Temple-and-Flock Motif.”

\textsuperscript{88} Although flocks of sheep are associated with her, this does not presuppose that the sheep is symbolic of her.

\textsuperscript{89} Discussed below 3.3.
“there is no consistency in pairing the symbols” (1963:86), citing examples of cattle associated with the ring-post with streamer. However, the examples Goff uses are U39, in which it is a ring-post without streamer,90 which is associated with cattle, and U15 and U28, in which the ring-posts with streamers are attached to a structure which in turn is mounted on the back of a bull,91 and which are therefore iconographically different to the feeding of the flock scenes.

Still, there are examples where herds or flocks of animals which are not sheep are associated with the ring-post without streamer. U29 and U30 depict horned animals with the building flanked by a ring-post with streamer. Delaporte (1923:98) identifies the animals on U30 as antelope, while Ward (1910:180) identifies them as ibex, although the horns are too straight for this identification. On U31 the ring-post with streamer is found next to a building and associated with three animals which Frankfort (1955: Page opposite Plate 80) identifies as cattle, although their rendering is rather abstract, making this identification uncertain.92 One bull is found on U32 with a ring-post with streamer and surrounded by ideograms which can be translated as “the festival of the evening/morning Inanna (= Venus)” (Nissen, Damerekow and Englund 1993:17) or “festival of In’ananak of the morning and of the evening” (Marchesi and Marchetti 2011:192 n.31). Because only one bull is shown, it does not signify a herd, but would rather represent something specific to this festival, perhaps a sacrifice, and is therefore iconographically unrelated to the herd and flock scenes. Calves may emerge from a byre flanked by a ring-post with streamer which is depicted on U33, but the identification of these animals as calves is uncertain (Goff and Buchanan 1956:232). On U34 is a scene which Westenholz (2007:334) suggests to be a sacred marriage next to a ring-post with streamer. However, the scene depicts what appears to be a human figure and a horned animal. This scene may be related to the scenes in which the Priest-King/En figure feeds the flocks on U11-U14 because the figure on the left appears to hold something towards the horned animal. It is clear then that, although there are some rare examples of other herds or flocks of animals being associated with the ring-post with streamer, by far the most common and consistent are flocks of sheep.

90 Discussed below 3.2.3.
91 Discussed below in this section.
92 The association of a herd of cattle with the ring-post with streamer is unusual as cattle are the only herd which are associated with both the ring-post without streamer and the ringed pole. See below for both.
In a scene which recalls the Lion Hunt Stele (IM 23477) [Fig. 3.4]93, U17 depicts the ring-post with streamer in association with the Priest-King/En figure who is hunting bulls with bow and arrows94. The ring-post with streamer is found between the Priest-King/En figure and a bald, naked attendant who carries a quiver and arrows. The association with the ring-post with streamer places this hunt in a religious or ritual context95, and suggests that “the hunt is carried out either for the goddess or under her command” (Hansen 2003a:23). The nudity of the attendant may also point to the hunt being a ritual96.

Fig. 3.4: The Lion Hunt Stele (Becker 1993: Taf.36.a)

93 See Nöldeke (1934:11-13; Taf. 12-13) and Becker (1993:57-58; Taf. 36-38) for discussions on and images of the Lion Hunt Stele.
94 Contra Suter (2014:555), “Inanna’s standard never occurs in hunt or war scenes.”
95 For a discussion on Mesopotamian royal hunts and their religious or ritual aspect, see van Dijk (2011b).
96 See Bahrani (1993:13-14) for ritual nudity. See also Al Gailani Werr (2013:392) for “nudity as fashion” during the third and fourth millennia BCE.
In U15 and U16 the Priest-King/En figure is found in association with ring-posts with streamers which are mounted on a structure which in turn is mounted on the back of a bull. Similar structures with ring-posts with streamers are found on U5, U28 and U35, although the structure is found on the back of a ram on U5 and on the back of a lion in U35. Although not all of seal U16 has survived, enough of the structure remains that it can be reconstructed with ring-posts with streamers by comparison to other examples. The structure appears slightly differently on the five examples, but clearly represents the same thing. It has been identified as a ziggurat (Andrae 1933:39), perhaps covered with a mesh or mosaic (Nöldeke 1934:53), but temples had not yet taken the form of the ziggurat during this period. McCaffrey (2013:238) suggests that the structure on the seal “represents a temple structure particular to Inanna”, and Perkins (1949:136) suggests it was a temple tower on which Inanna’s temple stood, but also notes that it is uncertain if Inanna’s temple at Uruk stood on such a platform (Perkins 1949:136 n.299). While the ring-posts with streamers do associate the structure with the goddess, it is more likely then that it represents an altar (Braun-Holzinger 2007:27; von der Osten 1934:16), perhaps in the form of a temple tower (Frankfort 1939a:20), or a portable pedestal (Goff 1963:68). According to Andrae (1933:39), two large ring-posts with streamers in front of the structure on U35 suggest that the scene is located within the sacred precinct. The same applies to the structure on U5. The structures may then represent actual objects found in the temple inventory and belonging to Inanna (Heinrich 1936:16; Jacobsen 1991:117 n.22). Because on U35 the structure is found beside two ring-posts with streamers, and because representations of other objects found in the temple inventory on U5 are also shown on U35, it appears that the scene may, like U6-U10, be an abbreviated version of the scene found on U5. Similarly, the two Warka Vases and Priest-King/En figure on U16 may point to this also being an abbreviated version of the same scene. Although the structure surmounting a bull and two ring-posts with streamers are all that survive of U28, it is possible that this too represents a similar scene. In comparison, the

97 Although on U16 he wears a smooth skirt rather than the usual net skirt, the figure can be identified as the Priest-King/En figure by his beard and chignon (Braun-Holzinger 1997:27).
98 These animals are generally referred to as sheep or rams (e.g. Heinrich 1936:16; Hockmann 2008:327), but Marchesi and Marchetti (2011:191) are more cautious and call them “caprids”, the subfamily of the Bovidae family which includes the ovis (sheep) and capra (goat) genera. This work will follow the same designation when the species is uncertain.
99 See Lenzen (1941) for a discussion on the development of the ziggurat from its origins until the Ur III period.
100 According to Goff (1963:68) the temple towers were also not built during this period, but Temple IX at Eridu already stood on a terrace during the Ubaid Period (Schmid 1995:96). See also Lenzen (1941:28-29) for the high terrace with temple at Tell Brak dating to the Jemdet Nasr Period, and Schmid (1995:96-100) for the so-called Anu Ziggurat at Uruk and Painted Temple at Uqair, which both stood on terraces during the Uruk Period.
structure on U15 is unusual as it is located in a boat. This further suggests that the structure is portable and therefore not a fixed building.

Hockmann (2008:330-333) compares the structure to a symbol found on U36. Here a ring-post with streamer is found amongst the uppermost of two registers of symbols. Buchanan (1966:8) first suggested that these are “objects for use in worship”, but U36 has been identified as a so-called “city seal” in which the symbols represent names of cities (Matthews 1993:36-38). On U36 the ring-post with streamer forms part of the name of the city Zabalam (Matthews 1993:35, 38), of which Inanna was the city deity, while the symbol likened to the structure found on U5, U15, U16, U28 and U35 forms part of the name of the city Uruk (Matthews 1993:37-38). By comparison to this seal, Hockman (2008) argues that the upper register of U5 can be related to U36 and similar seals, and that the upper register of U5 represents an exchange of goods between various cities.

On U5, U15 and U16 the Priest-King/En figure stands before the structure. On U15 he stands directly before it, while on U16 two vessels identifiable as the Warka Vases are between the Priest-King/En figure and the structure, and on U5 two ring-posts with streamers, the female figure and a nude male figure carrying a vessel separate the Priest-King/En figure from the structure. It is uncertain whether the Priest-King/En figure appeared on U28 and U35 as neither seal survives in its entirety, although by comparison to U5, U15 and U16 this appears likely.

On U5 and U35, small human figures are standing on the structure — on U5 there are two figures, while on U35 there is one. On U5 the structure is surmounted on two rams and on U35 it is on a lion, but no humans stand on the structures on U15, U16 and U28 which are surmounted on bulls. It is unclear if this is of significance or merely a coincidence. The figures on U5 and U35 appear to be the same, with long hair, no beard and a long skirt. According to Nunn (2010:248) and Delaporte (1923:106), these figures are female. A female statuette from Sin Temple IV at Khafajeh [Fig. 3.5] dating to the Uruk Period with long hair

101 For discussions on city seals, see Moorey (1976:103-104), Matthews (1993) and Steinkeller (2002). As a city seal, the symbols on U36 would form an early pictographic script, and U36 is therefore technically outside the scope of this study. It has been included because of its possible relevance to the interpretation of other examples.

102 See Asher-Greve and Westenholz (2013:42-44) for a discussion on Inanna of Zabalam.
and wearing only a skirt may be an example of sculpture in the round of this figure. Jacobsen (1991:117 n.22) identifies the figures on U5 as Inanna, although this cannot be, as the goddess would not be represented alongside herself. McCaffrey (2013:238) identifies the figures as “twin statues” of Inanna. The figures are more commonly identified as male (eg. Goff 1963:70, 267; Heinrich 1936:16, van Buren 1939-41:36). The two figures on the structure on U5 have been identified as a male followed by a female (eg. Bahrani 2002:18; Frankfort 1996:27), but, because the two figures appear the same, and must therefore represent the same figure or at least the same type of figure, this is unlikely. The foremost of these two figures holds an object generally accepted to be the pictographic sign EN, first identified as such by Heinrich (1936:16), and for this reason this figure has been identified as the Priest-King/En figure (Frankfort 1996:328 n. 27). However, the figure does not exhibit the beard, chignon and net skirt usually associated with the Priest-King/En figure, and this identification can therefore not be correct. Furthermore, Goff (1963:267) suggests that the object represents some ritual object which was the prototype of the EN sign, but not the EN sign itself, and it would therefore not act as an identifier of the figure. According to Nöldeke (1934:53), the figure on U35 is probably a priest. The three figures on the structures on U5 and U35, without beards and with long, loose hair, share iconography with the figure which is often found in association with the Priest-King figure, although the latter figure wears a short skirt, where those found on U5 wear long skirts, and the length of skirt of the figure on U35 is unclear because of the condition of the seal. Schmandt-Besserat (2007:42) identifies this figure as an attendant to the Priest-King/En figure. This does not contradict the idea that

103 Nudity is unusual for a representation of a human female in the third and fourth millennia BCE. The only known examples are from Uruk and Khafajeh. From Uruk there is a headless alabaster figure (Moortgat 1969: Plate 11), and the middle pieces of two stone figurines (Becker 1993: Taf. 61 nos. 942, 943). The upper torso of a fourth figure from Uruk has been identified as both female (Nöldeke, von Haller, Lenzen and Heinrich 1937:52, Taf. 49 e) and male (Becker 1993:76). From the Sin Temple VIII at Khafajeh is a figure who wears the usual Early Dynastic garment which covered one shoulder, but where the garment usually covered both breasts, one breast on this figure is exposed (Frankfort 1934: Plate 26 no. 250). A figure on the Standard of Ur was identified by Woolley (1934:273) as female, but is more likely male because the figure is wearing only a skirt, which was the typical dress for men during the Early Dynastic Period, while women wore a garment which covered one shoulder. See Frankfort (1939b:51-55) for a discussion on dress during the Early Dynastic Period and al Gailani Werr (2013) for a discussion on Sumerian fashion from the Uruk until Neo-Sumerian periods.

104 Van Buren (1939-41:36) identifies the figures as male because of their dress, stating that “women at that time do not seem to have worn belted garments.” However, the female statuette from Sin Temple IV at Khafajeh appears to wear a belted skirt.

105 See, for example, U10, U12, U14 and the figure behind the Priest-King/En figure on U5. For a scene in which the long-haired figure and the Priest-King/En figure appear together but without a standard, see for example the Blau “Plaque” or “Scraper” British Museum BM 86260 (Aruz and Wallenfels 2003:39 catalogue number 9). See Gelb, Steinkeller and Whiting (1991:39-43; Plate 12) for more on the Blau Plaque. This long-haired figure is not the only figure to accompany the Priest-King/En figure. See for example the nude attendant on U17.
the figure is a priest. Indeed, because the long-haired figure is usually found in association
with the Priest-King/En figure in scenes where a ritual appears to be taking place — in U12
and U14 this is the feeding of the sacred herd/flock, while in U5 and U10, the figure carries
votive offerings — the identification of somebody involved in the cult is most likely.

Multiple seal impressions on the same cylinder have been reconstructed to form U33, a
composition of two registers in which at least six ring-posts with streamers are found. Buchanan (1966:8) compares U33 to U36, stating that U33 is “a similar design, but with worshippers and a shrine”. However, U36 is a “city seal” and the two can therefore not be iconographically related. In the upper register of U33 two ring-posts without streamers flank a building which can be identified as a shrine (Goff 1963:65). Two men walk away from this shrine. The second man carries what is probably a “girdle with a tassel” (Goff and Buchanan 1956:231). A similar girdle is carried by a figure on U53 and is probably also what is carried by the long-haired attendant on U5 (Heinrich 1936:16). Not enough survives of the figure at the front to identify what this figure carries. A third ring-post with streamer is found

---

106 Although see above for the possibility of one of these being a ring-post without streamer.
107 Discussed below 3.3.
next to a byre or a cultic object, perhaps an altar, shaped like a byre from the sides of which emerge the heads of animals, probably calves (Goff and Buchanan 1956:232). For a similar byre with animal heads projecting from the sides, see U39\textsuperscript{108}, although the forelegs are also visible in the latter. The lower register contains “ritual objects” (Buchanan 1981:45), including three volutes which probably belonged to ring-posts with streamers (Goff 1963:65). One of these is found next to a zoomorphic vessel in the shape of a bull\textsuperscript{109}, but not enough survives of the seal to identify the context of the other two ring-posts with streamers, although a second spouted vessel may be found between them (Goff and Buchanan 1956:234). U33 is unique in that the cult and the care of the herds/flocks are represented together (Goff 1963:65), and this suggests that the caring of the herds/flocks was also considered a ritual activity.

3.2.3 RING-POST WITHOUT STREAMER
The most frequently depicted type of ring-post is the ring-post with streamer, but two variations, the ring-post without streamer, and the Doppelvolute\textsuperscript{110}, in which two ring-posts without streamer back to back form one symbol, are also known. There are only six examples of ring-posts without streamers, U37-U41\textsuperscript{111}. U37 is the top half of a bituminous limestone inlay of a ring-post without streamer. Unfortunately, it is uncertain how the inlay was used or what its iconographic context was, but the fact that the centre is decorated with gold foil (Heinrich 1936:43) suggests that the piece, and the symbol, was held in some reverence.

In both U38 and U39, the ring-post without streamer is found in association with a herd and a reed hut from which animals emerge. The sacred nature of these huts is evidenced by their association with the ring-posts without streamers. On U40 the ring-post without streamer is found in a scene with a human figure who is “driving a long-horned ox in the temple compound” (Mallowan 1947:134). According to Mallowan (1947:134) the symbol between the human figure and ox on U40 is a “staff with a bent head or crook”, rather than a ring-post

\textsuperscript{108} Discussed below 3.2.3.
\textsuperscript{109} There are no other definite examples of bull-shaped vessels in association with a standard in the iconographic record although U81 may depict a bull-shaped vessel in association with a temple with a Bügelschaft. A bull- or calf-shaped vessel may be found with three other zoomorphic vessels of varying shapes but not associated with a standard on a cylinder seal from Uruk (Brandes 1986:51; 56 Fig. 1.). For an example of a bull-shaped vessel from Sin Temple IV at Khafajeh, see Delougaz (1952: Plate 25b, 26) and for one of unknown provenance, see Peltenburg (1991:38-39 catalogue number 15).
\textsuperscript{110} “double volute”
\textsuperscript{111} Although see above for the possibility of a ring-post without streamer appearing on U33.
without streamer, but both van Buren (1949:60-61) and Szarzyńska (1987-88:10, 11 Table 7, Fig. 5) identify it as a cult symbol. The scene therefore represents a similar theme to U38 and U39, although no human figures are found on either of the latter, and the ox does not emerge from the building in U40. Mallowan (1947:134) identifies the human figure on U40 as a shepherd, although the figure would more accurately be termed a “herdsman” (van Buren 1949:60). If the enclosure does represent a sacred enclosure, the figure may rather represent a temple official or a figure otherwise associated with the cult, similar to the nude figure on U17 and the long-haired figure on U5, U10, U12 and U14.

On both U38 and U39, the herds with which the ring-post without streamer is associated are cattle, while on U40, the ring-post without streamer is found next to an ox. There appears, therefore, to be a connection between cattle and the ring-post without streamer. In the archaic Uruk script, the sign representing the ring-post without streamer was, like the sign representing the ring-post with streamer, associated with a deity.\(^{112}\) Because the ring-post without streamer appears to be particularly associated with cattle, the deity symbolized by the ring-post without streamer may then have had some kind of special association with cattle. Szarzyńska (1987-88:11) suggests that the deity with whom the ring-post without streamer was associated was the god An\(^ {113}\). Van Buren (1945:44-47) equates the ring-post without streamer with the separate sign and standard the Bügelschaft\(^ {114}\), and her identification of the deity represented by the ring-post without streamer as a god (van Buren 1949:61), and specifically An (van Buren 1945:47) is therefore flawed. Szarzyńska (1987-88) clearly differentiates between the two symbols, and her evidence for the ring-post without streamer being associated with An is based on evidence specific to the ring-post without streamer (Szarzyńska 1987-88:11). It should be noted, however, that part of Szarzyńska’s argument revolves around artefacts found at the so-called “Steingebäude”\(^ {115}\) near the Anu Ziggurat, but that there is no archaeological evidence that the structure was dedicated to An during the Uruk Period (Nöldeke, von Haller, Lenzen and Heinrich 1937:47; Perkins 1949:110).

Possible support for the association of the ring-post without streamer with An is that Jacobsen (1976:96) suggests that the Bull of Heaven which was killed by Gilgamesh and Enkidu, as

---

\(^{112}\) See above 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.

\(^{113}\) For more on An, see Eberling (1928a), Black and Green (1992:30) and Leick (1998:4-6).

\(^{114}\) Discussed below 3.4.

\(^{115}\) “stone building”.

told in both the Sumerian poem *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven: ‘Hero in Battle’* and in tablet VI of the Babylonian *Epic of Gilgamesh*\(^{116}\), is an older form of An.

On **U38** the ring-post without streamer is found surmounting the reed hut, while on **U39** it is found next to the reed hut. Although the ring-post on **U39** does not survive in its entirety, Nöldeke (1934:47) identifies it as such by comparison to **U20**. However, the ring-post on **U20** has a streamer, and it is clear that the ring-post on **U39** does not. The buildings on **U38** and **U39** are not temples or shrines, but shelters for the herds, and the ring-post without streamers associated with these buildings therefore mark the herds as the property of the divinity associated with the ring-post without streamer (van Buren 1950:143-4). On **U40** the ring-post without streamer is found between the human figure and the ox within the sacred enclosure. What remains of the scene on **U41** appears more similar in theme and appearance to a series of Early Dynastic seal impressions from Ur which generally show a human figure with a vessel next to a building which can be identified as a “reed hut arched over, adorned with side buckles or horns”\(^{117}\) (Legrain 1936:11). The two vessels found above the kneeling figure on **U41** may also represent temple inventory, similar to the items found alongside the ring-posts with streamers on **U5**, **U10** and **U18**. This suggests that the scene on **U41** takes place within or at a sacred building, and that the ring-post without streamer indicates the door- or gateway of this building.

### 3.2.4 THE DOPPELVOLUTE

The ring-posts without streamers on **U38-U41** are therefore all associated with buildings, and **U42** is unusual for a depiction of a ring-post without streamer, because the ring-post without streamer is not associated with a building\(^{118}\). Instead, it appears amongst other symbols which are arranged in two registers. Repeated at least five times in the lower of the two registers on **U42** is a symbol with a triangular base surmounted by two circles. This symbol may be related to the *Doppelvolute* found on one seal impression **U43** and three sculptures **U44-U46**. The *Doppelvolute* is a variation of the ring-post in which two ring-posts without

\(^{116}\) See George (2003:166-175) for an English translation of *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven: ‘Hero in Battle’,* and (2003:47-54) for an English translation of tablet VI of the *Epic of Gilgameš*. See also [http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/cgi-bin/etcsl.cgi?text=c.1.8.1.2#](http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/cgi-bin/etcsl.cgi?text=c.1.8.1.2#) for a transliteration and [http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/cgi-bin/etcsl.cgi?text=t.1.8.1.2#](http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/cgi-bin/etcsl.cgi?text=t.1.8.1.2#) for a translation of *Gilgameš and the Bull of Heaven*.

\(^{117}\) For the Ur seal impressions, see [ED4-ED21](https://scholar.sun.ac.za) discussed below under 4.2.

\(^{118}\) Indeed, according to Lenzen, **U42** is not only unusual for a depiction of a ring-post without streamer, but also for a seal impression from Uruk; “die Abrollung weicht von den bisher bekannten Darstellungen sehr ab” (“the impression differs greatly from the previously known representations”) (Lenzen 1960:56).
streamer are depicted back to back as one symbol. It has been equated with the so-called “eye-idols” [Fig. 3.6] such as those from Tell Brak119 (Frankfort 1949; Heinrich 1957:33-34). Andrae (1933:33) identifies these as “Hütten-Symbole”120 and sees in them a sacred building with a Doppelvolute emerging from the roof. Van Buren (1955:166) interprets this as a “reed hut surmounted by the divine symbol of the Mother-goddess,” and Frankfort (1949:194-198) also associates U44 and related pieces with a goddess. However, the Doppelvolute is formed by two ring-posts without streamers, which can be associated with a god, and not the ring-post with streamers, which is identified as the symbol of Inanna121.

![Fig. 3.6: Eye-idols (Roaf 2004:66-67 detail)](image)

Mallowan (1947:33-35) identifies two different but related forms of “eye-idols”. The first is the “eye-idol”, which he believed to represent some divinity (Mallowan 1947:205), and the second is the “spectacle-topped idol” which has perforations in place of eyes and which Mallowan considered to be older. Mallowan (1947:33-35) also denies Andrae’s identification of “eye-idols” as hut symbols. As Goff (1963:151) points out, “the many anthropomorphic figures which have been found in Tell Brak since the publication of Andrae’s book cannot all be representations of a sanctuary and its accompanying beribboned standard or ringed pole122.”

---

119 For a discussion on the “eye-idols” from Tell Brak, see Mallowan (1947:33-36; 150-159; 205-210).
120 “Hut symbols”.
121 See above 3.2.2.
122 For the ringed pole in the Uruk Period, see 3.3.
There is a difference between the “eye-idols” and the *Doppelvoluten* and just because the “eye-idols” do not represent a hut surmounted by a standard, does not mean that the *Doppelvolute* was not a standard. Indeed, **U43** clearly represents a *Doppelvolute* emerging from the top of a building. Furthermore, in two examples **U45** and **U46** the “eye idols” are found on some kind of base. Mallowan (1947:156-157) identifies these as “spectacle-topped idols” standing on pedestals, but it is possible that they are related to **U44** in which the *Doppelvolute* is found on a pedestal which is “obviously carved to simulate a shrine”\footnote{Mallowan (1947:195) identifies it rather as an idol “standing on a podium or altar.”} (Goff 1963:151). **U44** would then represent in sculpture in the round the building depicted in relief sculpture on **U43** and **U45**, and **U46** may be a miniature representation in sculpture in the round of this same building.

### 3.2.5 RING-POSTS - SUMMARY

There are three types of ring-post — the ring-post with streamer, the ring-post without streamer, and the *Doppelvolute*. The ring-post with streamer is symbolic of or associated with Inanna, while the ring-post without streamer may be associated with An, and both can therefore be described as divine standards. It is uncertain whether the *Doppelvolute* represents a separate standard, or is merely a variation of the ring-post without streamer.

The ring-post with streamer and the ring-post without streamer are both held as standards. The ring-post with streamer is held only by the female figure on the Warka Vase **U5** and related seals **U6-U8**. The ring-post with streamer is found once on **U9** next to this figure and not held by her. It is repeatedly found in association with the Priest-King/En figure on **U6-U18**, but is never held by him. It is also found associated with the long-haired attendant of the Priest-King/En figure on **U5, U10, U12 and U14**, although this is likely due the long-haired figure’s association with the Priest-King/En figure, rather than with the ring-post with streamer. This similarly explains the association of the ring-post with the nude attendant on **U17**. The ring-post without streamer is only held once by a figure who appears to be related to the cult on **U40**.

The ring-post with streamer and the ring-post without streamer are both found in ritual contexts. The ring-post with streamer is found in association with a ritual on **U5-U9**,
although whether this reflects the sacred marriage rite or some other fertility rite, or a ritual involving grain storage or the exchange of goods, is uncertain. U10 may also represent this ritual. The ring-post with streamer is also found in scenes which appear to be rituals on U15, U16, U28, U29, U33 and U35. In one scene on U32 a specific ritual for Inanna may take place. A ritual hunt is depicted on one seal U17. The ring-post with streamer is also found in scenes in which it is associated explicitly with the caring/feeding of the herds/flocks by the Priest-King/En figure on U11-U14, and in scenes with sheep, which may implicitly be caring/feeding of the herds/flock scenes on U20-U27, U30, U31 and U33. The ring-post without streamer is found in ritual contexts when it is associated with the caring/feeding of the herds/flocks on U38 and U39, and also likely when it is held by the figure in sacred enclosure on U40.

All three types of ring-post can be classified as architectural standards because they are all found attached to or associated with buildings. The ring-post with streamer can surmount the building as on U23, U20 and U27, flank the building as on U21, U24, U29, U30, U31 and U33, or it may stand for a door- or gateway of a building as on U5, U10, U11, U18, U28, U32 and U35, and perhaps on U12, U13, U14, U22, U25 and U26. The ring-post with streamer is also found mounted on a structure which in turn is mounted on the back of an animal and which may represent an altar in the form of a temple tower on U5, U15, U16, U28 and U38. The ring-post without streamer can surmount the building as on U38, flank it as on U39, or it may stand for a door- or gateway as on U41. On U43-U46 the Doppelvolute is only found surmounting the building.
3.3 RINGED POLE

A second reed standard is in the form of a shaft with pairs of rings on either side. It is known as the “ringed pole” (Delougaz 1968:185; Goff 1963:77; Steinkeller 1998:88), “ringed post”\(^{124}\) (Furlong 1987:374), “post with pairs of rings” (van Buren 1945:48), “ring-staff” (Black and Green 1992:155), “ringed-shaft” (Delougaz 1968:196), “Ringträger”\(^{125}\) (Heinrich 1957:31; Nunn 2010:247, Strommenger 1962:55), “Bündel mit den Ringpaaren”\(^{126}\) (Andrae 1933:24), “Schilfbündel mit Ringpaaren”\(^{127}\) (Strommenger 1962:55) or simply the “Ringstandarten”\(^{128}\) (Braun-Holzinger 2007:29). This ringed pole was formed from a reed bundle which was bound together and with the loose ends being bent over to form the rings on either side of the shaft\(^{129}\) (van Buren 1945:48). There can be one pair of rings, as for example on \(U47\)\(^{130}\); two pairs of rings, as for example on \(U48-U51\) and \(U61\); or three pairs of rings, as for example on \(U52-U61\). Because ringed poles with both two and three pairs of rings are attached to the same building on \(U61\), it appears that there is no difference in meaning between the two\(^{131}\). The ringed pole can also be found either singly, doubly or trebly.

As a written sign, the ringed pole is represented by the sign NUN (Green and Nissen 1987:260 Sign No. 421; Falkenstein 1936: Sign Nos. 249-252) and is restricted to the Uruk IV script (Szarzyńska 1987-88:10) and is always found with two pairs of rings\(^{132}\). Andrae (1933:40) sees the pairing of the rings on the ringed pole as symbolic of the union of the male and female principles, and suggests either the pairing of Inanna-An or Inanna-Dumuzi. However, the reed standards represented separate deities (Szarzyńska 1987-88:10-11), and van Buren (1939-41:41) argues that the ringed pole was associated with a god\(^{133}\).

Andrae (1933:23) recognizes the standard found on the Gudea Stele \(NS50\) and similar standards\(^{134}\) to be related to the ringed pole and for the ringed pole to therefore have been in

---

\(^{124}\) Perhaps through confusion with the ring-post and the ringed pole representing the same symbol.

\(^{125}\) “Ring carrier”.

\(^{126}\) “Bundle with the pair of rings”.

\(^{127}\) “Reed bundle with pair of rings”

\(^{128}\) “Ring standards”

\(^{129}\) See Heinrich (1957:16 Abb. 10) for a reconstruction.

\(^{130}\) Although see below for the possibility of this ringed pole having three pairs of rings.

\(^{131}\) As noted also by van Buren (1939-41:41-42).

\(^{132}\) Falkenstein (1936: Sign No 250) most likely had two pairs of rings, and the fact that it is shown with rings only on one side is probably a matter of caution.

\(^{133}\) See below for more on the possible identity of this deity.

\(^{134}\) Discussed below in Chapter 6.6.
use for more than a millennium. However, the standard found on NS50 has two pairs of what appear to be solid balls or knobs on either side of the shaft with a fifth ball or knob at the top of the shaft, rather than only pairs of rings on either side of the shaft. Van Buren (1945:48) also notes that the later standard had a “slender rod” while the Uruk Period ringed pole “was so thick and heavy that it was always firmly erected on a solid base.” While the Uruk Period ringed pole was often surmounted on a building, it is also found freestanding without a base on U48, U53, U56 and U57, and possibly also on U47 and U60, although the bottoms of these latter ringed poles have not survived. The shaft of the ringed pole is also rendered not only as “thick and heavy”, as for example on U53, U61, U55, U58 and U59, but also as rather slender, as for example on U47, U49, U56, U57 and U60. Furthermore, while one of the standards on the Naram-Sin Victory Stele A74135 from the Akkadian Period has the same appearance as the standard on the Gudea Stele NS50, neither this standard nor the ringed pole of the Uruk Period are known from the Early Dynastic Period, and therefore there is no evidence for continuity between the two.

The ringed pole is found associated with the herd in U51, U54, U55, U58, U59, U61, U62, U63 and U64. In all these, the ringed pole is associated with herds of cattle. On U48, rather than a herd of cattle, only one bovid is shown. This bovid is surrounded by objects which may depict temple inventory, and the bovid itself may represent the temple herd. The cattle and ringed pole on U51 are also surrounded by objects which may be identified as temple inventory, and the cattle may, similarly to U48, represent the temple herd. On U56 and U57, two seal impressions which are virtually identical and have only minor differences in the votive objects depicted, each also have one bovid. This animal may reflect part of the temple inventory, and is perhaps a vessel similar to that found on U33136. By comparison to the cattle, the lion137 found on U56 and U57 may also be a vessel similar to the lion vessel on U5, although it should be noted that the lions do not have spouts on their backs to indicate this, and that no lion vessels are known from the archaeological record.

135 Discussed below in Chapter 5.8.
136 Discussed above in 3.2.2.
137 Lenzen (1963:18) describes the animal as “ein Löwe oder ein Mähenschaf” (“a lion or a Barbary sheep”). By the feet of the animal, it can be identified as a lion, because it has paws and not hoofs, see Schmidt (1972:Plate 18c) for a clear view of the feet.
The ringed poles surmount a byre from which calves emerge on \[U51, U54, U55, U58, U59\] and \[U61\]. The seal impressions \[U62\] and \[U64\] do not contain the lower parts of the scenes depicted, but by comparison to these examples, it is likely that they also had calves emerging from the byre. On all of these except \[U51\] adult cattle are shown outside the structure. \[U63\] shows only the ringed pole and the hindquarters of two bovids. It is possible, although this impression is so fragmentary that it is impossible to say with certainty, that the seal which made this impression was similar to \[U55, U59\] and \[U61\], and that the ringed pole emerged from a byre from which calves emerged and that the cattle which have survived surrounded this byre and stood on a higher level.

Either one or three ringed poles can surmount the byre. One ringed pole surmounts the buildings on \[U51, U59\] and \[U63\], while three ringed poles surmount those on \[U54, U55, U58\], \[U61\] and \[U62\]. There are two ringed poles on \[U48\], but they stand separate and do not emerge from a roof. These two ringed poles would represent the door- or gateway of the building, similar to the use of the ring-posts in \[U5, U10\] and \[U11\]. The cylinder seal \[U64\] is broken and badly worn, but appears to depict at least two ringed poles surmounting the building. In the other examples, either one or three — but never two — ringed poles surmount buildings; this would suggest that \[U64\] originally had three ringed poles.

The ringed poles which are found in association with the herds have either two or three pairs of rings. The ringed pole on \[U51\] has two pairs of rings, while those on \[U54, U55, U58\] and \[U59\] each have three pairs of rings. Because of their fragmentary nature, it is uncertain how many pairs of rings the ringed poles on \[U62-U64\] had, although it is clear that that on \[U62\] had at least one, and that that on \[U63\] had at least two.

Due to their association with the ringed pole, the cattle can be identified as sacred herds (Lenzen 1961:35). The fact that objects bearing the ringed pole were found in Uruk (\[U47, U49, U50, U51, U52, U56, U57, U59, U60, U62\] and \[U63\]), Khafajeh (\[U58\] and \[U61\]) and Tell Billa/Shibaniba (\[U53\]) suggests that the deity associated with the ringed pole had a relatively

\[138\] See Fig. 3.1 for a reconstruction of such a byre.
\[139\] Although the ringed poles on \[U58\] appear to merge together, there are three shafts, clearly indicating that three ringed poles were intended.
\[140\] See above in 3.2.2.
widespread cult\textsuperscript{141}. Szarzyńska (1987-88:11) suggests that the herds of cattle could aid in the identification of this deity. Van Buren (1939-41:42) notes that \textbf{U61} is “important, for it was found in the temple of the Moon-god Sin\textsuperscript{142},” at Khafajeh, which suggests that she believed the ringed pole to be associated with this god. Although the moon god was associated with the bull\textsuperscript{143}, this god was associated with the symbol ŞEŠ (Falkenstein 1936: Sign Nos. 244-246; Green and Nissen 1987:286 Sign No. 523) in the archaic Uruk script\textsuperscript{144} (Szarzyńska 1987-88:10, 12-13), and it is unlikely then that he was also associated with the ringed pole. The signs which represent the ringed pole are variants of the sign for \textbf{NUN}\textsuperscript{145} (Szarzyńska 1996:9-10; Nunn 2010:247). \textbf{NUN} had a general meaning along the lines of “prince, princely, lofty” which was used mainly as an epithet (Szarzyńska 1987-88:8), and Steinkeller (1998:88) identifies the sign as a symbol for the god Enki. There is little evidence for an association with Enki and cattle. Ea, the Akkadian equivalent of Enki, is depicted with his foot up on a bull on the Akkadian greenstone cylinder seal of Adda (BM 89115)\textsuperscript{146}, but the god is not generally or consistently associated with the animal. This does not mean that the ringed pole was not associated with Ea, and the cattle depicted on \textbf{U48}, \textbf{U51}, \textbf{U54}, \textbf{U55}, \textbf{U58}, \textbf{U59}, \textbf{U61}, \textbf{U62} and \textbf{U63} may still represent the property or sacred herds of this god.

However, Keel and Schroer (2002:109) identify the ringed pole as the symbol of the birth goddess Nintu\textsuperscript{147}. According to Selz (1995:266), Nintu’s name “ist etwa mit “Herrin, die gebiert/erschafft” wiederzugeben\textsuperscript{148}, which suits her function in birthing. Delougaz (1968) argues that the calves or lambs emerging from the huts are meant to represent newborn animals emerging from birthing huts where animals were taken to give birth. Jacobsen (1973:279-280) therefore argues that the word for birth-hut was used metaphorically as the word for uterus or womb, and that Nintu originally meant ““Lady (nin) Birth-hut (tur5)” with a potential metaphorical meaning “Lady (nin) Womb (tur5)\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{a}} (Jacobsen 1973:280). This is

\textsuperscript{141} According to Szarzyńska (1987-88:15), \textbf{U54} is from Ur. Delougaz (1968:188) suggests that it may come from Uruk. The provenance of this piece is actually unknown (Furlong 1987:378).


\textsuperscript{143} See Ornan (2001) and van Dijk (forthcoming) for more on this connection.

\textsuperscript{144} See below 3.4 for more on the symbol ŞEŠ and its association with the moon god.

\textsuperscript{145} According to Falkenstein (1936) these are separate signs, with the ringed pole being represented by Sign Nos. 249-252 and the sign for \textbf{NUN} being Sign No. 236. Green and Nissen (1987:260 Sign No. 421), on the other hand, categorise these as the same sign, namely \textbf{NUN}.


\textsuperscript{148} “is to be rendered as approximately “mistress who gives birth/creates”\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{a}}.\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{a}}
reflected in the fact that “[i]n der Piktographie Uruks hat die Hütte den Lautwert tut/tur >>Geburt<<, da tur >>Hütte<< und tur >>Geburt<< mit demselben Logogram geschrieben werden”149 (Schroer and Keel 2005:288). The two meanings of the word have therefore been conflated in Stol’s (2000:80) rendering of Nintu’s name as “Lady Birth-Hut”, and Asher-Greve and Westenholz’s (2013:50) rendering of her name as “The Mistress Divine Birth Hut”.

The sign for TUR3 in the archaic Uruk script (Green and Nissen 1987: Sign No. 563)150 looks like a hut surmounted by a type of ringed pole. But this does not account for the ringed pole itself as the separate sign NUN in the archaic Uruk script, nor as a separate standard in Uruk Period iconography. The ringed pole is represented most commonly as surmounting a cattle byre, as on U51, U54, U55, U58, U59, U61, U62, U63 and U64, and probably on U49, U50 and U52, but it is also depicted flanking buildings, as on U47, U53, U56, U57 and U60. On U48 it is not associated directly with architecture, but it may be representative of a building. On U47, U53, U56, U57 and U60, the ringed pole is associated with scenes in which human figures bring offerings towards a temple, and these are therefore ideologically distinct from the scenes with cattle byres. This separation in ideology between the ringed poles surmounting cattle byres and the ringed poles which flank the buildings may be mirrored in the distinction between the TUR3 and NUN being two separate signs in the archaic Uruk script. The relevance of this division though is unclear. It may be that the cattle byres surmounted by ringed poles and the temples flanked by the ringed pole are both associated with the cult of Nintu, but with different aspects of that cult. It may also be that these reflected the cults of two separate deities. A simpler explanation, and one that fits with all the iconographic evidence, is that the ringed pole was symbolic of or associated with divinity, rather than with a specific deity. In this way, the cattle byres surmounted by ringed poles were associated with divinity, as suggested by the inclusion of the ringed poles, and with Nintu in particular, as suggested by the calves emerging from the birthing hut, and the ringed poles flanking buildings reflect the divine nature of those buildings.

The ringed pole is found in association with humans in ritual scenes on U47, U53, U56, U57 and U60. In all five examples, there are two ringed poles, one on either side of a building.

149 “in Uruk pictography, the hut has the phonetic value tut/tur >>birth<<, as tur >>hut<< and tur >>birth<< are written with the same logogram.”
150 See also Falkenstein (1936:Sign No. 239).
The ringed poles on U53, U56, U57 and U60 each have three pairs of rings. The ringed pole on U47 appears to have one pair of rings, but the impression is fragmentary, and not all of the ringed-pole has survived. By comparison to U53, U56, U57 and U60, it is possible that there were more pairs of rings on the ringed pole on U47\textsuperscript{151}. The buildings flanked by the ringed poles can be identified as shrines (Goff 1963:115) or temples (van Buren 1939-41:41).

On U53, U60, U56 and U57, the last two of which are virtually identical, nude figures carry objects towards a building. Boehmer (1999:26) identifies these figures as “Gabenbringer”\textsuperscript{152}, figures carrying votive offering towards the sacred buildings. Objects surrounding the figures on U56 and U57 may therefore be temple inventory. Two figures on U60, one clothed and one naked, stand before the building to receive the offerings. The iconography of U53 is the most complex of the scenes in which the ringed pole is found in association with humans involved in ritual. Three figures approach the sacred building. The middle wears a net skirt, but he is clean shaven and bald, and is therefore iconographically different from the Priest-King/En figure which is associated with the ring-post with streamer\textsuperscript{153}. Heinrich (1957:38-39) identifies him as the “königlichen Hirten”\textsuperscript{154} and Strommenger (1962:55) suggests that he belongs to the “Gefolge des >>Netzrockmannes<<”\textsuperscript{155}. Braun-Holzinger (2007:29) notes that he holds his hands in the same position as the second small figure on the structure surmounted on the back of rams on U5\textsuperscript{156} and that he may be holding a small object in his hands. The first of the two nude figures on U53 carries a large string of beads and the second carries a girdle\textsuperscript{157} which can be identified as cult objects (Goff 1963:131-132) and places the scene in a ritual context (Goff and Buchanan 1956:231).

Also on U53, a boat approaches the sacred building. Two figures pilot the boat, while a third stands above it. It is unclear whether this figure is meant to be understood to be standing in the boat (eg. Braun-Holzinger 2007:29) or on the river bank behind the boat from where he directs the boat (eg. van Buren 1939-41:41). A boat also approaches the sacred building on

\begin{footnotes}
\item[151] A suggestion also made by Lenzen (1960:54) by comparison of U47 to U53.
\item[152] “Gift bearers”.
\item[153] According to Goff (1963:131), this figure has “two heavy disk-like objects” on his shoulders, but there is only one of these disks. It is uncertain what it represents, but it is different in appearance to the chignon worn by the Priest-King/En figure on U6-U17.
\item[154] “Royal shepherd”.
\item[155] “retinue of the Net skirt man”.
\item[156] Discussed above in 3.2.2.
\item[157] This girdle is also carried by a nude figure on U33 and may be what is carried by the long-haired attendant on U5. See above in 3.2.2.
\end{footnotes}
U47. The bow and the stern of the boat on U53 end in plant decorations, an attribute found also on the boat on U15\textsuperscript{158}, but not on the boat on U47. It has been suggested that these plants form the EN sign (Strommenger 1962:55). According to van Buren (1939-41:41), the scene on U53 represents the sacred marriage, and the fact that the boat “has burst into flowers and foliage” (van Buren 1939-41:41) is presumably because of the fertility aspect of this ritual. Goff (1963:132), on the other hand, suggests that the scene reflects part of a myth which is now lost to us. Even if it does represent a myth, some kind of ritual or cultic activity is still involved.

The ringed pole is therefore found in only two iconographic contexts — in scenes with the herd, and in scenes in which human figures are involved in some kind of ritual. The ringed pole is always found in an architectural context, but there is a difference in its use when it is found in association with herd scenes and when it is found in ritual scenes. The herd scenes have one, two or three ringed poles surmounting the roof of the byre while on the human scenes two ringed poles flank the shrine or temple. An exception is U48 in which two freestanding ringed poles serve as door- or gateposts. These differences can elucidate the iconographic contexts of the fragment of a vase U52, and two seal impressions U49 and U50, on all three of which only the ringed poles have survived. U49 and U50 each have at least two ringed poles which emerge from the roof of a sacred byre, identifiable as such by the similarity to especially U54, but also U55, U58 and U61. The ringed poles on U49 and U50 would therefore have been associated with herd scenes, rather than scenes with humans involved in ritual activity. Only the ringed-poles survive on U52, and no iconographic context is discernible, but because no building is found between the two extant ringed poles, it is most likely that these ringed poles also surmounted a building, and were therefore associated with a herd scene. The ringed pole may be associated with the goddess Nintu when it surmounts cattle byres, but it is more likely that the ringed pole was associated with divinity in general.

\textsuperscript{158} U15 is discussed in more detail in 3.2.2.
3.4 **BÜGELSCHAFT**

Another standard associated predominantly with architecture during the Uruk Period is the so-called “Bügelschaft” (Falkenstein 1936:59; Heinrich 1957:32; Steinkeller 1998:88). It is also called the “Standarte mit einfachem Ring”\(^{159}\) or “die einfache Ringstandarte”\(^{160}\) (Braun-Holzinger 2007:21), the “buckled shaft” (Woolley 1934:347), “buckled post” (Steinkeller 1998:88), “buckled spear”\(^{161}\) (van Buren 1939-41:42), “an urinnu”\(^{162}\) or spear with handle” (Langdon and Harden 1934:123), “poles with loops” (Wiseman 1962:18), “ringed poles” (Goff 1963:100), the “gatepost” (Collon 1982:92) or “gatepost standard” (Buchanan 1966:65). Van Buren (1945:44-47) calls it a “gate-post without streamer”, but she identifies this standard as both the Bügelschaft and the ring-post without streamer. Black and Green (1992:154) similarly identify it as a ring-post, but call it “a rather different ring-headed post without streamer.”\(^{163}\)

The Bügelschaft consists of a shaft with a ring, half ring or three-quarter ring attached to the side. It differs from the ring-post without streamer in that while the Bügelschaft has the ring attached to the side of the shaft, the ring of the ring-post without streamer is at the end of the shaft, forming one continuous line with the shaft. The shaft is never as thick as that which is sometimes shown on the reed standards, as for example on U1, U2, U3, U4, U20, U43, U54, U55 and U58, and it appears therefore that it is made of wood rather than reed (Heinrich 1957:35). This can be supported by ED1\(^{164}\), a copper Bügelschaft standard dating to the Early Dynastic Period which was found at Tello and which had a wooden core (Parrot 1948:106). The Bügelschaft can be identified as a door- or gatepost, similar to the ring-post with streamer (Heinrich 1957:35). In this regard, U65 is important, as it is a model of a shrine on which the doorway is flanked by two Bügelschafts (Nöleke, Haller, Lenzen and Heinrich 1937:45) and it shows how the Bügelschaft appeared in three-dimensional sculpture in the round, as opposed to the two-dimensional depictions in paintings or relief sculpture such as that on cylinder seals. In U66-U70, two Bügelschafts are connected at the base by a horizontal line which may represent the threshold of the building (van Buren 1945:44-45).

\(^{159}\) “standard with simple ring”.

\(^{160}\) “the simple ring-standard”.

\(^{161}\) Although no Bügelschafts appear as spears in the Uruk Period, there are examples from later periods. See for example ED25 for the Early Dynastic Period, and A3, A21, A22, A25, A35, A27 and A53 for the Akkadian Period.

\(^{162}\) “Urinnu” is an Akkadian term for “standard” (Pongratz-Leisten 2011:106). For the Sumerian and Akkadian terms used to denote “standard” and “emblem” see 1.1.

\(^{163}\) Despite the wide range of English terms, the German term Bügelschaft will be used in this work as it is the most commonly used designation for this standard.

\(^{164}\) Discussed in 4.2.
The attachment on the side of the shaft of the Bügelschaft can either be round or triangular and in the archaic Uruk script these are represented as two separate signs. In the archaic Uruk script the Bügelschaft with the triangular attachment can be divided further into the Bügelschaft with double triangular attachment (Falkenstein 1936: Sign No. 246; Green and Nissen 1987: Sign No. 595) and Bügelschaft with single triangular attachment (Falkenstein 1936: Sign No. 244-245; Green and Nissen 1987: Sign No. 523). The Bügelschaft with the double triangular attachment was represented by the sign ŠEŠ, while the Bügelschaft with single triangular attachment was represented by the sign ŠEŠ during the Uruk IV stage and the sign URI3 in the Uruk III stage (Szarzyńska 1987-88:7). The Bügelschaft with round attachment (Falkenstein 1936: Sign No. 248) represented the sign URI3 during the Uruk IV stage and became identical with the Bügelschaft with single triangular attachment during the Uruk III stage (Szarzyńska 1987-88:7). According to Steinkeller (1988:88) “the Sumerian word describing emblems was urin (URI3), a well-documented designation of divine emblems in later periods.” According to Szarzyńska (1987-88:6; 1996:11), the logogram URI means “care” or “protection”, a meaning which originates from the Bügelschaft’s function as a door- or gatepost (Szarzyńska 1996:11 n. 22). The Bügelschaft standard in the iconographic record can itself therefore also be seen as symbolic of care and protection.

The two signs in the archaic Uruk script which can be equated with the two Bügelschafts with triangular attachments appear with the divine determinative, which signifies that they were symbols representing a deity or deities (Szarzyńska 1987-88:10). These symbols represented the sign ŠEŠ, which, according to Steinkeller (1995:705, 710; 1998:88), could also be read as NANNA and was a symbol for the moon god Nanna165. According to Falkenstein (1936:59 n.8), the name of the moon god Nanna was not written with only the sign ŠEŠ, but was written as ŠEŠ.KI166. However Szarzyńska (1987-88:13) argues that Nanna’s name was originally written with just the ŠEŠ sign, or with the ŠEŠ sign and divine determinative. This suggests that the Bügelschaft may be associated with or symbolic of the moon god.

165 Compare Green and Nissen (1987:306 Sign No. 596) where the URI3 sign forms part of the sign for NANNA.
166 See Steinkeller (1995:696) for the identification of ŠEŠ.KI with ŠEŠ.NA due to scribal error.
A possible problem for the identification of the Bügelschaft with the moon god is that during later periods the crescent standard was associated with this deity and was a much more obvious emblem to be associated with him. Additionally, both the crescent standard and the Bügelschaft were used during later periods, which suggests that they represented different concepts or deities. The crescent standard is not found in Mesopotamian iconography during the Uruk Period, but it is found on U71, a seal impression from Susa, and U72 and U73, two seal impressions from Chogha Mish. On U71-U73 the crescent standard is found in scenes which appear to be of a ritual nature. On U71 it is carried by a figure in a procession, and on U73 it is held by a figure next to a building which can be identified as a temple (Delougaz and Kantor 1996: page opposite Plate 154). On U72 the crescent standard is held by a figure who is seated in a boat behind a larger seated figure, and the crescent standard may act as an identifier for the larger figure. Delougaz and Kantor (1996:137, 138, 146; 1996b: page opposite Plate 151) identify this figure as the city ruler by his larger size, iconography and by his holding a rope which binds captives, but they also note that the “great difference in scale between the city ruler and the retinue surrounding him is extremely rare in Protoliterate art” (Delougaz and Kantor 1996:146). This figure does not sit on a stool, but on a bull. The crescent and the bull are both associated with the moon god in later periods and Mayer-Opificius (2001:285) suggests this scene represents the journey of the moon god. However, it is impossible to distinguish between humans and deities in Uruk iconography (Asher-Greve and Westenholz 2013:163 n. 662), and it is therefore impossible to identify this figure as the moon god, although the scene may still be associated with this deity. When the crescent standard’s appearance on these Proto-Elamite seal impressions is considered, its absence from the iconographic record from Uruk Period Mesopotamia is curious, particularly because a crescent standard appears as the sign ADAB in the archaic Uruk script (Falkenstein 1936: Sign No. 305-307; Green and Nissen 1987:172 Sign No. 19). Further complicating the matter is the fact that contemporary artefacts bearing the Bügelschaft were found at Susa, for example on U74, U75 and U76, and at Jebel Aruda in modern-day Syria, for example on U77 and U78, in iconographic contexts similar to those of the Mesopotamian examples. This suggests a similar use or meaning of the Bügelschaft over a vast area.

167 Discussed below in 4.4, 5.4 and 6.3. For the crescent standard’s association with the moon god Sin of Harran during the Assyrian Period, see Ornan (2005:163-167) and Cornelius (2014:155-159).
168 See also above 3.3.
169 See also above in 3.2.2.
170 Furthermore, if the scene did represent the moon god, it would be the first attestation of the connection between the Moon God and both the Crescent Standard and the bull in the iconographic record.
Van Buren (1939-41:42; 1945:47) argues that the Bügelschaft was originally the symbol of An because of the symbol’s association with cattle and because where the ring-post with streamer was found in the Eanna Precinct at Uruk, the Bügelschaft “constantly occurred” (van Buren 1945:47) at the Anu Ziggurat. However, her argument is flawed because she equates the ring-post without streamer with the Bügelschaft, where they are clearly two separate signs and standards. Falkenstein (1936:59) identifies both the ŠEŠ and URI3 signs with the Bügelschaft, and questions whether the Bügelschaft represented a specific deity, as the ring-post with streamer represented Inanna. Heinrich (1957:35-36) suggests that the Bügelschaft was not identified with a single god, but could represent or be associated with a number of deities. Many of the artefacts used to argue his hypothesis are not from the Uruk Period, and each standard should first be studied in each period in isolation to draw such conclusions for each period individually.

Because of the complex relationship between the three signs — the Bügelschaft with round attachment, the Bügelschaft with single triangular attachment and Bügelschaft with double triangular attachment — in the archaic Uruk script, it is difficult to argue a meaning for the Bügelschaft. Furthermore, the use of the three standards in the iconographic record is different to the use of the signs in the archaic Uruk script. In the iconographic record, the most commonly depicted type of Bügelschaft during the Uruk Period is the Bügelschaft with round attachment, which is found on U66, U67, U68, U69, U70, U79, U80, U81 and U82. While Bügelschafts with triangular attachments are found only during the Uruk and Early Dynastic Periods, Bügelschafts with round attachments are found in all periods discussed in this study. However, as a sign in the archaic Uruk script the Bügelschaft with round attachment is only found during stage IV. During the Uruk Period, the Bügelschaft with triangular attachment is found only on U84. Not enough survives of the attachments on the Bügelschafts on U65 to be able to identify them as round or triangular, but U65 was found in the Anu Ziggurat at Uruk, and U67-U70 and U80, which were all also found in the Anu Ziggurat, all depict Bügelschafts with round attachments. Indeed, U81 and U82 which are also from Uruk, but from the Eanna Precinct, also show Bügelschafts with round attachments. The Bügelschafts on U65 therefore most likely had round attachments. It is also impossible to differentiate in the iconographic record between the Bügelschaft with single triangular

---

171 However, for An’s possible association with the ring-post without streamer, see above 3.2.3.
172 See above in 3.2.2.
173 See below in 4.2, 5.3 and 6.2.
attachment and the *Bügelschaft* with double triangular attachment, and it is therefore impossible to argue for a difference in meaning or use between the two in an iconographic context.

Examples of *Bügelschafts* with round attachments were found at a wide geographic spread of sites. U65, U67, U68, U69, U70, U80, U81 and U82 are from Uruk, U79 is from Khafajeh, U66 from Abu Hatab, and U83 from Jemdet Nasr. U84, the only example of a *Bügelschaft* with triangular attachments, is from Jemdet Nasr.

On U65, U81, U82 and U84 the *Bügelschafts* are attached to a building so that only the attachments are visible at the side of the building, while on U79 they flank the building. It is possible that the two *Bügelschafts* on U80 represent the door- or gateway of a building, similar to the ring-post with streamer on U5, U10, U11, U18, U28, U32 and U35, and perhaps on U12, U13, U14, U22, U25 and U26. U83 represents only two *Bügelschafts* with no iconographic context and therefore adds little to the discussion.

U84 represents a fragment of a vase which was found at Jemdet Nasr. The building to which the *Bügelschafts* are attached stands alone, although animals, birds and fish are also found on the vase, as well as two eyes which are separated by a band of checkerboard decoration. On U79, a cylinder seal from Khafajeh, a shrine is flanked by two *Bügelschafts* with round attachments. Above this building is a broad arch, above which are three eight-petalled rosettes and a face. Mallowan (1947:210) suggests that the rosettes were astral symbols and that the face represents an “eye god”. Van Buren (1939:103) identifies the face as representing the goddess Inanna. While Inanna was associated with the rosette¹⁷⁴, there is no other evidence that she was associated with the *Bügelschaft*. According to Goff (1963:153), there is no evidence that the eyes were considered to be symbolic of a particular deity. Because two eyes decorate both U79 and U84, it is possible that these two pieces are iconographically related, although their exact meaning is unknown.

U80, U81 and U82 from Uruk appear to depict more obviously cultic or ritual scenes. U80 represents part of a cult scene in which a male figure with a beard and bound hair and a second figure with long hair stand before two *Bügelschafts* with round attachments. Boehmer

¹⁷⁴ For more on the rosette’s association with Inanna, see above in 3.2.2.
(1999:85) identifies the long-haired figure as a woman with strange headdress, while according to Nöldeke, Falkenstein, von Haller, Heinrich and Lenzen (1938:26) this figure carries a staff with three prongs and can be compared to the long-haired attendant on U5, U10, U12, U14 and U34\textsuperscript{175}. On U82 a female figure stands next to a temple with attached Bügelschafts with round attachments. Two human figures bearing unidentifiable objects approach the building. The caprids, possibly goats, and bushes surrounding these two figures are an unusual feature which Brandes (1979:224) suggests places the sanctuary in a rural setting of “Buschgelände mit weidenden Tieren”\textsuperscript{176}. A specific building may be represented. U81 depicts a procession of human figures carrying votive offerings towards a temple. Not all of this temple survives, but because one Bügelschaft with round attachment is attached to the one side, the other side of the building was most likely similarly decorated. One of the figures appears to carry a girdle similar to those on U5, U33 and U53\textsuperscript{177}. The reconstructed seal impression is quite fragmentary, and only the head of a bull survives in the field. This bull head can probably be reconstructed not as a live animal, but as a zoomorphic vessel (Lenzen 1961:31) like those found on U5, U18, U19 and U33\textsuperscript{178}. Iconographically U81 therefore appears more similar to other examples from Uruk but with ring-posts than it does to other examples of Bügelschafts.

On U66-U70 two Bügelschafts with round attachments are connected at the base by a crossbar. The Bügelschafts on U67-U70 appear as the only decoration, suggesting they are of some importance. Of these, only U67 has survived in its entirety, but from the crossbars at the bottom of U68 and U70 it is clear that these appeared the same. Although not much has survived of U69, according to Nöldeke, Falkenstein, von Haller, Heinrich and Lenzen (1938:27) it had the same appearance as U68 and U70. On U67 and U68, the attachment faced towards the centre and on U70 it faced outwards. Not enough survives of U69 to ascertain in which direction the attachments faced.

On U66 the two Bügelschafts with round attachments which are connected at the base by a crossbar appear as the emblem of a standard and may represent a separate standard to the Bügelschaft. This standard may be related to two signs found in the archaic Uruk texts (Falkenstein 1936:Sign Nos. 303 and 304), although the attachments on the signs face

\textsuperscript{175} See above in 3.2.2 for a discussion on this figure.

\textsuperscript{176} “bush lands with grazing animals”.

\textsuperscript{177} U5 and U33 are discussed under 3.2.2, U53 is discussed under 3.3.

\textsuperscript{178} Discussed in 3.2.3.
inwards, while those on **U66** face outwards, like those on **U70**. The standard is found in a procession of three men which approaches a temple or shrine. Szarzyńska (1996:1) identifies these figures as “a priest and two nude men”. A second standard is also found in this procession. Mayer-Opificius (1996:216) considers the seal to be a fake due to the building having unusual architectural elements for an Uruk Period building, the figures having unusual faces, and the treatment of the lead figure’s hair being “ganz und gar ungewöhnlich”\(^\text{179}\) (Mayer-Opificius 1996:216), but Suter (2000:179 n. 61) suggests that these features can be better explained as Egyptian influence. In this regard, Amiet (1957:129) identifies the emblems surmounting these two standards as the Egyptian signs \(\text{ka}\) (Gardiner 1927:445 Sign No. D28) and \(\text{ḥ}\) (Gardiner 1927:510 Sign No. V28), although with slight variations. The emblem identified with the \(\text{ka}\) sign has the \(\text{ Bügelschaft}\) round attachments rather than ending in hands, as the Egyptian \(\text{ka}\) sign does. The identification of the second emblem as the \(\text{ḥ}\) is debatable, because the seal is damaged around the standard’s emblem. Although the emblem identified with the \(\text{ḥ}\) sign is otherwise unknown in Mesopotamia, the emblem with the two \(\text{ Bügelschafts}\) with round attachments which are connected at the base by a crossbar is clearly related to the \(\text{ Bügelschafts}\) depicted on **U67-U70**, and it is therefore unnecessary to identify it with the Egyptian \(\text{ka}\) symbol if there are clear differences in the appearances of these two signs.

Depictions of the \(\text{ Bügelschaft}\) can thus be divided into representations of the \(\text{ Bügelschafts}\) with triangular attachments — exemplified during the Uruk Period only by **U84** — and \(\text{ Bügelschafts}\) with round attachments — **U66-U70** and **U79-U83** — although there seems to be no difference in the use of these. The \(\text{ Bügelschaft}\) is found in an architectural context, either attached to or flanking buildings which are most likely temples or shrines in **U65**, **U79**, **U81**, **U82** and **U84**. On **U80** the \(\text{ Bügelschafts}\) may represent a doorway. The \(\text{ Bügelschafts}\) with round attachments which are connected at the base by a crossbar on **U67-U70** may represent two door- or gateposts connected by a threshold. **U66**, in which the \(\text{ Bügelschafts}\) with round attachments which are connected at base by crossbar forms the emblem of a standard may reflect a separate standard to the \(\text{ Bügelschaft}\).

\(^{179}\) “completely and utterly unusual”.
The Bügelschaft is also found in a ritual setting in U66, U81 and U82. U66 represents a procession of standards before a temple or shrine, and on U81 and U82 figures bear offerings towards sacred buildings. U80 may also depict some kind of ritual activity, although the exact iconographic context of this is unknown.

The building depicted on U82 may represent a specific building identifiable by its location in a rural setting. On U79 and U84 the buildings to which the Bügelschafts are connected are found in association with large eyes. This may signify the buildings as specific shrines or temples. The rosettes on U79 may associate the scene with the goddess Inanna, but this would be unusual considering this goddess’s association with the ring-post with streamer.

The sign ŠEŠ which represented the Bügelschaft with triangular attachment in the archaic Uruk script also stood for the name of the moon god Nanna. There is no explicit iconographic evidence to link any of the examples with the moon god, although this is not ruled out, and the evidence from the archaic Uruk script cannot be ignored. It appears then that while the Bügelschaft may have been associated with Nanna during the Uruk Period, it may also have functioned as a mark of divinity in general. This may also further explain the sign URI’s meaning of “care” or “protection”.
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3.5 KNOBBED POLE

U85-U91 all depict a procession of figures holding long poles which end in knobs. On U86-U91 the knobs are only on the top of the shaft, while on U85 they are on the top and bottom of the pole. U92 shows slight variation in the form of this knobbled pole, with the knobs having a short horizontal line above them. Frankfort (1955: Page opposite Plate 22) calls the knobbled pole on U92 simply a “tall object”. The knobbled pole (Buchanan 1981:53) is also called a “post capped with a knob” (Wiseman 1962:4), a “stafflike object” (Frankfort 1955: Page opposite Plate 82), a “staff impaling [a] globe” (Frankfort 1955:Page opposite Plate 29) or a “Stab mit Kugelbekrönung”180 (Moortgat 1966:88).

The figures who carry the knobbled poles wear their hair in pigtails, which identify them as women (Collon 2005a:16). These pigtailed figures are also shown without the knobbled pole in seated and squatting positions and arranged in pairs with one of the figures upside down (Frankfort 1955:17). The figures may be involved in activities associated with pottery or the textile industry (Collon 1995a:55). Moortgat (1966:88) suggests that they are involved in cultic activity. On U85-U88 four pigtailed figures are depicted, on U89 there are five, and on U90-U92 there are three. On U93 and U94 the pigtailed figures are squatting while holding knobbled poles. Three figures are depicted on U93, while U94 shows five, four of whom hold a knobbled standard. Because the scenes are otherwise virtually identical, there seems to be no significance in the difference in number of figures.

The examples come from a wide geographic range. U85 is from Jemdet Nasr, U88 from Tello, U89 from Tell Agrab, U92 and U94 from Khafajeh, U93 from Tell Asmar, U90 from Ur. U87 was acquired near Uruk (Moortgat 1966:88). U95 is “said to be from Western Iran” (Buchanan 1981:53), but has a similar design to U85-U91, with four pigtailed women each holding or raising their arms towards a knobbled pole. U96 from Susa may be related to U93 and U94, with squatting figures holding knobbled poles. Knobbled poles also decorated a building on a seal impression from Jebel Aruda on U97. U98 depicts standing and seated figures with knobbled poles in areas divided by vertical lines. Keel-Leu and Tessier (2004:16) describe the “Kultraum” of this cylinder seal as Mesopotamia, Iran or North Syria, showing how widespread this and related motifs were.

180 “rod with ball finial”.
3.6 FLORAL/STAR STANDARD

U99 and U100 depict standards associated with horned caprids. U99 has three standards with emblems in the form of five-petalled rosettes, while U100 has one standard which has an emblem which appears as a circle with short radiating lines and a dot in the centre and the shaft terminates at the bottom in another dot. Buchanan (1981:58) describes the standard on U99 as a “floral standard”, and Porada (1948:6) describes that on U100 as a “star-shaped design on [a] pole”. According to Goff (1963:122) they are both fertility symbols, being that they are incorporated into plant forms, and solar symbols, and, as such, they “place the ideas of the fertility cult in a cosmic setting by blending solar and fertility ideas into one” (Goff 1963:102). Support for the argument that the rosette and star were meant to be understood as equated or related is found in the fact that, according to Labat, the sign for DINGIR is represented by both a star and a rosette (Labat 1988:48-49 Sign No. 13). If the floral/star standard can be associated with this sign, some religious connotation for the standard is suggested, because DINGIR was the sign for “deity”. Vertical lines on U100 may represent a shrine (Ward 1910:181), which would further support the idea that these standards are related to the cult.

U101 and U102 appear to be iconographically related to U99 and U100 in that they depict horned ungulates associated with a standard. The standards on U101 and U102 are both rendered crudely. Frankfort (1955:16) suggests that the standard on U101 represents “the gatepost symbol”, with which he equates both the Bügelschaft and the ring-post with streamer \(^{181}\). While sheep are depicted with ring-posts with streamers on U22, U25 and U26, the standards on U101 and U102 do not look like ring-posts with streamers. Goff (1963:122) considers the iconography of U102 to be related to U99 and U100 because of the inclusion of the standard and rosette above the one animal’s back on U102. Because U101 and U102 are so similar in appearance, all four examples — U99-U102 — may then be related. The scenes may also be related to the feeding of the herds/flocks scenes depicted on U12, U13, U14, U21, U22, U24, U25, U26, U30 and U31, all of which are associated with the ring-post with streamer.

---

\(^{181}\) Frankfort (1955:16) describes his catalogue number 880 as having “two gatepost emblems”, and his catalogue number 854 as having “gatepost symbols”. These represent U79 and U31 respectively and are discussed in 3.4 and 3.2.2.
3.7 UNCERTAIN

In some instances, it is unclear whether a standard is being depicted due to the fragmentary nature of the artefact. This is the case with the second standard on U66, the emblem of which Amiet (1957:129) identifies as the Egyptian ḫ sign\(^{182}\). Other examples where the identification of a standard is uncertain are the seal impressions U103-106.

The scene on the seal impression U103 represents a building with two levels with a female figure on one side and four figures on the other side of the building. The second of these figures appears to be the Priest-King/En figure, although it is unclear if the skirt he wears is of net or not. This Priest-King/En figure holds a long pole, but the seal impression is unfortunately so fragmentary that it is unclear whether this is a staff, a spear or a standard. There are no other examples of the Priest-King/En figure holding a standard, so although this cannot be ruled out, it seems likely that the figure here does not hold a standard. The Priest-King/En figure is represented holding a spear\(^{183}\), but these are in scenes where he is shown in victory over enemies, and the scenes are therefore not comparable to U103 where the figure is found in a ritual context. What remains of U104 is so similar to U103 that Amiet (1980a:Pl. 13bis; page opposite Pl. 13bis) considers them to be impressions from the same seal. Rova (1994:Tav 38) and Lenzen (1960:49-50), however, treat them as being from two separate seals. On U104 four figures approach an architectural structure. The second of these figures is taller than the rest and holds a long pole. As in U103, it is uncertain whether this pole represents a standard or not. On both U103 and U104 the scene appears to be cultic in nature.

What little remains of the seal impression U105 shows a human figure standing before a shaft surmounted by a horizontal crossbar with a streamer hanging from the side. According to van Buren (1939-41:45) the cross bar supports “symbols of some kind”, and Falkenstein (1936:59) sees this as a symbol of a deity. The figure standing before this standard is identified as a nude priest pouring a libation (van Buren 1939-41:45).

A hunt scene with a boar is depicted on U106. A figure which may be identified as the Priest-King/En (Lenzen 1950:7) holds a long pole. It is uncertain whether this is a standard, although because it appears in a hunting scene, it more likely represents a spear like that held

\(^{182}\) Discussed above 3.4.

by the final figure in the hunting group depicted on U107. Boehmer (1999:51) suggests that the figure is hunting in the marshes in a boat and that the long pole that he holds is “eine Stakstange”\(^\text{184}\) which he uses to steer the boat.

While the four stone heads excavated in the so-called Eye Temple in Tell Brak U108-U111 are not of a fragmentary nature, their identification as emblems of standards is debated. All four of these heads have vertical grooves carved at the back (Mallowan 1947:91). Perkins (1949:191) suggests that they are masks\(^\text{185}\), but the grooved back and the fact that they are smaller than life-size argues against this. Mallowan (1947:91) suggests that they were secured to a wooden pole “like a totem”, or, rather, like a standard, but cautions that “there are no Mesopotamian parallels for this.” Goff (1963:155) points out that it cannot be determined if these heads were attached to poles or if they had wooden bodies. If U108-U111 did act as standards, their findspot in the Eye Temple suggests they had a religious or ritual purpose, and Moortgat (1969:16-17) suggests U109 represents a god\(^\text{186}\). However, the small size of U109-U111 makes the identification of these pieces as standards unlikely as the emblems would not have been identifiable at a distance. Although U108 is larger than U109-U111, the similarity between the four argues for their being related in function. For this reason, it also appears unlikely that U108 served as a standard, despite its size making this a possibility.

\(^{184}\) “canoe pole”.

\(^{185}\) An identification also followed by Moortgat (1969:16).

\(^{186}\) Although it is curious that he describes U108 as a woman, although U108 is nearly twice the height of U109, and therefore would logically represent a more important figure.
3.8 SUMMARY
The primary context in which standards are found in the iconography of the Uruk Period is in association with architecture. The ring-post with streamer, ring-post without streamer, *Doppelvolute*, ringed pole and *Bügelschaft* are all found in explicitly architectural contexts, either attached to buildings or flanking them. The floral/star standard may also represent an architectural standard if the vertical lines on U100 represent a building.

The freestanding ring-posts, both those with and without streamers, and *Bügelschaft* developed from architectural elements which functioned as door- or gateposts. The ring-post with streamer, ring-post without streamer and ringed pole were originally made of reed and were attached to reed buildings. In comparison, the *Bügelschaft* was originally of wood.

The ring-post with streamer, the ring-post without streamer, the ringed pole, the *Bügelschaft* and the variation of the latter in which the standard’s emblem consists of two *Bügelschafts* joined at the base by bar are all found as signs in the archaic Uruk script. The ring-post with streamer, the ring-post without streamer, the ringed pole and the *Bügelschaft* are found with divine determinatives in archaic Uruk texts, indicating that the signs represented deities. The ring-post with streamer can be identified or associated with Inanna, but the deities with which the other three signs, and by extension standards, are associated is less clear. The ring-post without streamer may be associated with An, the ringed pole with Nintu, and the *Bügelschaft* with Nanna, although the ringed pole and *Bügelschaft* may also, and primarily, be associated with divinity in general.

The standards of Uruk Period iconography are also depicted in ritual contexts. The ring-post with streamer on the U5-U9 is found in association with a ritual which, if not the sacred marriage, appears to be related to fertility. Similar scenes in which figures carry offerings towards a sacred building are found in association with the ring-post with streamer, ringed pole and *Bügelschaft*.

A procession of two unique standards is found on U66. One of these standards appears with an emblem in the form of two *Bügelschafts* joined at the base by a bar. The seal is badly damaged at the emblem of the second standard, but what remains of this emblem appears similar to the Egyptian ḫ sign, although it does not appear to represent this sign. Also found in procession are the knobbed standards, in which all the standards appear the same.
In scenes in which standards are associated with herds or flocks, these standards may also be described as being in a ritual context because these scenes may be related to the card/feeding of the herds/flocks motif. The ring-post with streamer, ring-post without streamer, ringed pole and floral/star standard are all found in this context. The ring-post with streamer, ring-post without streamer and ringed pole are all found attached to or flanking buildings from which animals emerge. Vertical lines on U100 may represent a shrine, which would also associate the floral/star standard and caprids on this seal with a sacred building. The ring-post with streamer and floral/star standards are also found with herds/flocks and perhaps vegetation, but without a building, although the standard itself may indicate the presence of such a building.

Not all standards of the Uruk Period are held by individuals. According to the definition of a standard used in this work, this does not discount them from being standards, but it is still the clearest indicator of a standard. The ringed pole, Bügelschaft and floral/star standard are never held as standards during the Uruk Period. Their use in this period can elucidate their origin and development over the entire period studied. The ring-post with streamer is held only by the female figure who can be identified as Inanna or a human woman related to this goddes. However, it is associated more often with the Priest-King/En figure than it is with this female figure. The long-haired attendant of the Priest-King/En figure is also found in association with the ring-post with streamer, but this is more likely due to this figure’s relationship with the Priest-King/En figure than any relationship with the ring-post with streamer itself. The ring-post without streamer is only held once by a figure who appears to be involved in the cult. The knobbed pole is held by pigtailed figures in a procession, although the exact context of this procession is unclear. If it represents some kind of ritual activity, then in all instances when a standard is held during the Uruk Period, the standard would appear to be involved in some kind of ritual or cultic activity.

Because the buildings with which the Uruk Period standards are associated appear to be shrines or temples, all standards of the Uruk Period therefore appear to be of a more or less religious nature.

---

187 See 1.3.
4. EARLY DYNASTIC PERIOD

4.1 INTRODUCTION
The Early Dynastic Period is characterised by the emergence of city-states which were ruled by the first recorded dynasties. Ruling families of various city-states passed political power from one generation to the next and the city-states were “in a permanent state of conflict with each other over territorial affairs, irrigation or canal problems and matters of hegemony” (Demange *et al.* 1995:20). This is reflected in the art of the period — not only overtly in scenes of conflict such as those depicted on Eannatum’s Stele of the Vultures **ED66** and the so-called Standard of Ur **ED70**, but the idea of conflict is also central to one of the main Early Dynastic themes in glyptic art, the contest scene\(^{188}\). These are scenes in which animal and human figures combat each other and include “natural” as well as “mythological” animals and beings new to the Early Dynastic Period such as the bull-man, the human-headed bull and the hero\(^{189}\).

It is impossible to distinguish between humans and deities in Uruk Period iconography, but during the Early Dynastic Period for the first time deities can be identified by the appearance of horns or horned headdresses on their heads\(^{190}\) (Asher-Greve and Westenholz 2013:163). Because each city-state was believed to be the domain of one particular deity, in some cases it becomes possible to identify specific deities\(^{191}\).

During the Early Dynastic Period buildings were constructed of mud brick\(^{192}\) (Hansen 2003a:27) rather than reed. In terms of the standards represented in the Early Dynastic Period, the change of building material is reflected in the absence of the reed standards; the ring-post with and without streamer and the ringed pole are no longer represented in the iconographic record.

---

\(^{188}\) The other main theme of Early Dynastic glyptic is the banquet scene (Collon 2005a:27). See below for more on contest and banquet scenes as well as further literature.


\(^{190}\) See Furlong (1987) and Romano (2008) for the use of the horned headdress of divinity during the Early Dynastic Period.

\(^{191}\) See for example the discussions on **ED35** in 4.2 and **ED66** in 4.5.

\(^{192}\) For the developments in Mesopotamian temple construction see Schmid (1995), Heinrich (1957; 1982) and Lenzen (1941),
Of the standards found in the Uruk Period — the ring-post, the ringed pole, the Bügelschaft, the knobbed pole and the floral/star standard — only the Bügelschaft, knobbed pole and floral/star standards are still represented during the Early Dynastic Period, although there are differences in the use of these standards during the two periods. Standards which are new to the Early Dynastic Period and were not found during the Uruk Period are the crescent standard and the Imdugud/bird standard, and possibly a standard in which a lion is part of a composite emblem.\textsuperscript{193}

\textsuperscript{193} Although see below 4.5 for the argument whether the latter is a standard.
4.2 **BÜGELSCHAFT**

Of the three major standards from the Uruk Period — the ring-post, the ringed pole and the Bügelschaft — only the Bügelschaft is still found in the Early Dynastic Period. In this period, it is found in two main iconographic contexts — in scenes in association with architecture and in scenes of a mythological nature\(^ {194}\) in which the Bügelschaft is associated with contest scenes and other scenes with anthropomorphic figures.

Dating from this period is **ED1**, the only extant standard of the third and fourth millennia BCE\(^ {195}\), a Bügelschaft standard which was excavated at Tello\(^ {196}\). This Bügelschaft stood 3.27 metres high and was made of copper sheeting which was originally nailed to a wooden core (Parrot 1948:106). It was found on the brick paving on the northwestern side of the Phase 5 of the Temple of Ningirsu [Fig. 4.1]\(^ {197}\), and Parrot (1948:68, 106) believes it would have stood at the door of this temple. The standard therefore has a clear architectural and religious context.

![Fig. 4.1: Findspot of ED1, marked 17 (De Sarzec and Heuzey 1884-1912: Plan C, detail)](https://scholar.sun.ac.za)

\(^{194}\) The term “mythological” should not be understood to imply a specific mythological setting for the scene, but rather to denote that mythic or supernatural figures act as participants in this scene. The term should be understood as such throughout the work unless stated otherwise.

\(^{195}\) Although see **ED75** in 4.8.1 for a possible emblem of a standard.

\(^{196}\) Or, rather, extant at the time of excavation. On the fate of the standard after excavation, De Sarzec and Heuzey (1884-1912:410) record, “debris au Louvre et à Constantinople” (“debris to the Louvre and to Constantinople [Istanbul]”). It is therefore unfortunately uncertain exactly what happened to the standard and where it or its pieces now reside.

\(^{197}\) Fig. 4.1 is a detail of the larger map published by De Sarzec and Heuzey (1884-1912:Plan C.1). See also Marchesi and Marchetti (2011:319 Pl. 10.1) for a simplified version of this map. For more on Ningirsu, see Braun-Holzinger (1998-2001c; 2013:154), Black and Green (1992:138), Fischer (1997:117-119) and Leick (1998:130-131). See also 4.5 for more on this god.
ED2, two copper column casings from Tell al-Ubaid approximately 3.60 metres in length, most likely stood outside the door of the Temple of Ninhursag (Hall and Woolley 1927:116). Heinrich (1957:35 n.37) believes they represent Bügelschafts, although Hall and Woolley (1927:116; Plate XXXVIII) reconstructed these copper columns as supporting a roof above the doorway of the temple. Similarly, Woolley (1955:45 n.8) suggests that a stone half-ring found at Ur ED3 functioned as a ring attachment for a Bügelschaft. The exact use of both the copper column casings from Ubaid and the stone half-ring from Ur are, however, uncertain, and it is uncertain if the stone half-ring was attached to anything. ED1 is therefore the only definite Bügelschaft yet excavated, although it must be noted that if the copper casings were originally the shafts of Bügelschafts, these were also from an architectural and religious context.

4.2.1 SCENES WITH THE BÜGELSCHAFT IN ASSOCIATION WITH ARCHITECTURE
ED1 was excavated in an architectural context. The association of the Bügelschaft with architecture is also represented in the iconographic record on ED4-ED23, ED26, ED27 and ED29-ED38. In the majority of these examples, on ED4-ED6, ED8-ED21, ED23, ED26, ED27, ED29, ED32, ED34, ED36 and ED38, the Bügelschaft is attached directly to a building. Of these, on ED4-ED6, ED8-ED15, ED17-ED21, ED23, ED29, ED32 and ED38 the Bügelschaft is attached directly to the wall of the building, with only the “buckle” of the Bügelschaft being visible. On ED22, ED30, ED31, ED33 and ED37 the Bügelschaft is freestanding of the building, although in all these examples the Bügelschaft can still be understood to be attached to the building, or at least be located in an architectural context next to or near the building.

ED4-ED23 represent a series of cylinder seal impressions with generally similar iconography from the Seal Impression Strata (SIS) at Ur. While there is only one example, U84, from

---

198 Legrain (1936:9ff) identifies the seals which made these impressions as being from the Jemdet Nasr Period, but more recent studies place them in the Early Dynastic Period. Karg (1984) dates SIS 4-8 to Early Dynastic II, but these strata are more generally thought to be Early Dynastic I (eg. Machesì and Marchetti 2011:52-54, 88-89; Matthews 1993:43-44, 46-47. See both for more literature.). Amiet (1980a:48) avoids giving the SIS sealings a specific date by placing them in his “période de transition” (period of transition), a period between the Jemdet Nasr Period and the earliest of the Royal Burials of Ur of Early Dynastic III. Matthews (1993:43) notes that “stylistic comparanda for the Ur SIS 4-8 seal impressions… are not common” and that “the discussion is still open on the subject” of the dating of the SIS (1993:46). Iconographically, many of the Ur examples appear more similar to Uruk Period examples than to other Early Dynastic Period examples of both the Bügelschaft and other standards, but the archaeological evidence which places them within the Early Dynastic Period (see for
the Uruk Period of a Bügelschaft with triangular attachments, five of the Early Dynastic seal impressions from Ur, ED6, ED16, ED17, ED24 and ED25, have Bügelschafts with triangular attachments. Of these, the Bügelschafts on ED6, ED16 and ED17 are attached directly to a building. On ED6 the seal impression has two registers. The Bügelschafts with triangular attachments are found attached to a building on the upper register, while a bovid, a jar and leaves are found on the lower register. A man with a vessel stands next to the building with Bügelschafts with triangular attachments on ED17, and, according to Legrain (1936:33), the presence of a tree indicates that “this may be another type of shrine near a grove.” In this regard, a grove of a deity is mentioned in various Early Dynastic inscriptions. For example, a stone door socket which recounts Enmetena’s temple constructions (British Museum BM 86900), mentions the construction of a temple for the goddess Ninmah and an accompanying grove, and a fragment of a stone vessel with a dedicatory inscription of Enmetena (Vorderasiatisches Museum VA 7248), mentions the construction of a sacred grove for the goddess Ninhursag. Groves such as these are still recorded during the Neo-Sumerian Period. A statue dedicated by Gudea to Ningirsu, Gudea Statue B, or “the Architect with Plan” (Louvre AO2), for example, records Gudea’s construction of the Eninnu, the temple of Ningirsu, and the installation within this temple of a grove.

For transliterations and English translations of these texts, see Frayne (2008:218-219 RIMEP E1.9.5.16) and (2008:228-229 RIMEP E1.9.5.25) respectively.

For a transliteration and English translation of this text, see Edzard (1997:30-38 RIMEP E3/1.1.7StB). For more on the statues of Gudea, see Johansen (1978) and Colbow (1987).
On ED16 cattle emerge from the building with Bügelschafts with triangular attachments, and a man with a vessel sits on a stool outside the building. The Bügelschafts on ED16 are unusual because instead of being attached directly to the building with only the attachments indicating their presence, they emerge from the roof of the structure, similar to the Uruk Period ringed poles on U44, U45, U46, U49, U50, U51, U54, U55, U58, U59, U61 and U62, and ring-posts on U20, U23, U27, U38 and U43. The Bügelschafts on ED16 are also unusual in that each is held in a claw of a spread eagle above the building. Legrain (1936:33) calls this “a remarkable feature, and almost certainly a religious emblem.” Heinrich (1957:27-28) identifies the spread eagle as Indugud. Indugud was usually depicted as a lion-headed eagle, but references to a saw-like beak suggest that it was at least sometimes envisaged with a bird’s head (Black and Green 1992:107). A relief with Indugud grasping the haunches of two stags was excavated at the Early Dynastic Temple of Ninhursag at Tell al-Ubaid (BM 114308) [Fig. 4.2] and may have hung above the doorway of the temple. It is possible that the spread eagle on ED16 had a similar function to this relief. The spread eagle is also found on ED19 and ED23 where it is also shown above a building, on ED20 where it is found in the field, and possibly on ED22. Indugud itself is found in association with the Bügelschaft on ED26 and ED27, and also on ED28 where it stands in a variant pose on the back of a bull. A possible problem with the identification of the spread eagle with Indugud is that the spread eagle is found on a seal impression which can be identified as a city seal [Fig. 4.3] on which it forms part of “a pictograph of a city which has the spread eagle for an emblem” (Legrain 1936:39). Furthermore, there are seal impressions from the SIS at Ur which contain depictions of Indugud. Fig. 4.4 can be dated by its iconography to later in the Early Dynastic Period than the seal impressions with the spread eagle, but Fig. 4.5, which contains “an early example of the lion-headed eagle” (Legrain 1936:29) can be dated to the same period as ED16 and related seal impressions. Although it is not impossible that the spread eagle and Indugud are the same, it therefore appears unlikely because both appear at the same time, and the iconography would not be consistent if both represent Indugud.

\[201\] A suggestion also made by Legrain (1936:36). For a possible Early Dynastic standard with Indugud and a discussion on this creature, see Eannatum’s Vulture Stele ED66 in 4.5 below. See also NS87-NS89 in 6.10 for Indugud/Anzu standards from the Neo-Sumerian Period.

\[202\] See Hall and Woolley (1927:28-29), Braun-Holzinger (1984:28) and Fuhr-Jaepelt (1972:24-131) for more on this piece.

\[203\] This relief was reconstructed as an element above the doorway of the temple by Hall and Woolley (1927:Plate XXXVIII), although see Delougaz (1940:142) for problems with this reconstruction.

\[204\] See above 3.2.2 for more on city seals.

\[205\] This city is possibly also represented on Legrain 1936:Plate 23 Nos. 416, 417 and 421.

\[206\] This seal is worth noting because it depicts Indugud twice, once in the spread eagle pose holding an animal in either claw, and once on the back of a bull, as for example on ED28.
Fig. 4.3: City seal impression from Ur with spread eagle (Legrain 1936: Pl. 22 No. 415)

Fig. 4.4: Seal impression from Ur with two depictions of Imdugud (Legrain 1936: Pl. 30 No. 517)

Fig. 4.5: Seal impression from Ur with depiction of Imdugud (Legrain 1936: Pl. 14 No. 279)
Of the two examples of Bügelschafts with triangular attachments which are not attached to buildings, ED24 and ED25, on ED24 the Bügelschaft is found amongst other symbols which include a scorpion, a leg and leaves which together may stand for a pictographic inscription (Legrain 1936:28). In this regard, Matthews (1993:68) sees the Bügelschaft as representing the sign UR. ED25 is unique amongst depictions of the Bügelschaft, and, indeed amongst depictions of standards in general, in that two Bügelschafts are each held as a standard by a figure which is identifiable as a monkey (Legrain 1936:31). The Bügelschafts on ED25 are also unique for the Early Dynastic Period in that their bottoms terminate as spears. The seal is divided into two registers. In the upper register are the monkeys holding the Bügelschafts, two human-headed bulls, one of which is attacked by an eagle, the other by a scorpion, a deer which is attacked by what may be a lion-headed scorpion (Legrain 1936:31), and a crescent and a goat. In the lower register a man in a skirt stands in a chariot which is drawn by equids. A second skirted figure stands behind the chariot, and a third in front of it. Two dogs accompany the chariot, and spears are shown above it. A nude figure in front of the chariot is in an inverted posture. Collon (1986:74) suggests that inversion signifies death, and this figure may therefore represent an enemy which has been killed.

On the examples from the Ur SIS, not only Bügelschafts with triangular attachments, but also Bügelschafts with round attachments are depicted. These Bügelschafts with round attachments are found on ED5, ED7, ED9, ED10, ED11, ED15, ED18, ED21, ED22 and ED23. In most examples from Ur the Bügelschafts are attached to a building, but on ED22 they flank it. It is possible that ED7 also flanked a building, but that this building has not survived. Most of the seal impressions depicting Bügelschafts with round attachments from Ur represent a similar scene. ED9-ED11 all depict cattle emerging from a building with attached Bügelschafts, and a man with a vessel. Little survives of the scene depicted on ED18, but what remains shows a human figure standing next to a building with an attached Bügelschaft. It is possible that it originally depicted a scene similar to those on ED9-ED11. In comparison, the scene on ED15 is slightly more complex. There is a building with attached Bügelschafts from which an animal emerges, a human figure with a vessel, and what Legrain (1936:33) identifies as “a dog, a scorpion, a leaf, a border of dots”. On ED5 a human

---

207 See above 3.4 for the different readings of the Bügelschaft in the archaic Uruk script.
208 The Bügelschaft as a spear is better represented during the Akkadian Period, see A3, A9, A10, A21, A22, A25, A35, A37, A45 and A53, but no examples are known from the Neo-Sumerian Period.
figure drives cattle next to a building with Bügelschafts with round attachments. Little remains of the building on ED21, but a round attachment indicates that it was decorated with Bügelschafts. Next to the building, a man stands behind a bull, perhaps involved in a milking scene. A human figure stands between two Bügelschafts with round attachments on ED10 and raises one arm in what Legrain (1936:32) calls “a very archaic scene of worship”. It is possible though that the figure is not worshipping the Bügelschafts with round attachments, but that the Bügelschafts flanked a building which is now lost.

In comparison to ED5, ED7, ED9, ED10, ED11, ED15, ED18 and ED21, the iconography of ED22 and ED23 is more complex, and has a more obviously cultic setting. ED22 has two registers. In the lower register, a long-haired figure who can be identified as a female (Cooper 1975:261) stands with a goat between two Bügelschafts with round attachments which flank a shrine. The upper register contains representations of a star and a “marital scene” (Legrain 1936:35). According to Cooper (2013:52) this represents cultic sexuality and may be related to the so-called sacred marriage, although Cooper (1975:261) also identifies both figures as female by their hairdos, which would make some kind of sexual activity unlikely. However, a nude male figure involved in the cult on ED35 has long hair, and one of the long-haired figures on ED22 may therefore also be male. Some kind of ritual sex may then be depicted on the upper register of ED22. Legrain (1936:35) suggests that a spread eagle was also found in the upper register.

On ED23 two long-haired female figures wearing long garments and a nude figure, all of whom bear offerings, approach a male figure who wears a diadem and a long smooth skirt. This male figure stands under a canopy next to a building which has attached Bügelschafts with round attachments. This building is surmounted by a spread eagle and Legrain (1936:35) identifies the scene as a “ritual offering at the shrine of the spread eagle”. The scene is important because it is the only representation of a libation before a standing figure from the Early Dynastic Period (Braun-Holzinger 2013:56). This suggests that the figure in front of whom the libation is poured is one of significance. According to Frankfort (1939a:70), the figure under the canopy is a god or a statue of a god who can be identified by

---

209 The antelope on ED5 originate from a separate seal impression (Legrain 1936:25) and are therefore iconographically unrelated to this scene.

210 See above 3.2.2 for more on the sacred marriage ritual.

211 Although in the sketch of the reconstruction of the seal (Legrain 1936:Plate 20 No.387) the figure wears a net skirt, Karg (1984:30) points out that on the original impression the skirt is smooth and that any pattern is more likely made from fingerprints on the impression.
the small long-horned ungulate and the plant in front of him. There are, however, no divine attributes which would definitively mark this figure as a god, and Legrain (1935:123) is more cautious, stating that the figure may be a priest, ruler, god or statue of a god.

It is unclear whether the attachments of the Bügelschafts depicted on ED4, ED8, ED12, ED13, ED14, ED19 and ED20 are round or triangular. All of these depict a similar theme. The scenes on ED4, ED12 and ED13 all depict cattle emerging from a reed hut with attached Bügelschafts and with a human figure holding a vessel. An animal emerging from a hut with attached Bügelschafts and a human figure is also depicted on ED14. Not enough survives of the seal impression to ascertain whether the figure held a vessel, but by comparison to ED4, ED9, ED10, ED12, ED13, ED15, ED16, ED17, ED19 and ED20 this appears likely. ED19 depicts the human figure with vessel next to the structure with attached Bügelschafts, but unlike ED4, ED12, ED13 and ED14, there is no animal emerging from the building. On ED8 a seated human figure next to the building with attached Bügelschafts is “probably holding a jar” (Legrain 1936:32), although this jar is no longer extant. On ED20 a human figure holding a rampant bull and another holding a vessel stand on either side of a building with attached Bügelschafts.

Of the Bügelschafts where the attachment is uncertain, by comparison to other examples it may be that the buildings with round tops — ED4, ED8, ED12, ED13 and ED14 — had Bügelschafts with round attachments, as on ED9, ED10, ED11 and ED15, and the buildings with flat tops — ED19 and ED20 — had Bügelschafts with triangular attachments as on ED6 and ED17. There are, however, examples of flat-top huts with round attachments such as ED5, ED18 and ED23, and the Uruk Period examples U81 and U82 also have buildings with flat roofs with Bügelschafts with round attachments, but where the attachments on ED5, ED19 and ED20 extend outwards from the top of the roof, those on ED18, ED23, U81 and U82 are at the side of the building. Similarly, the Bügelschafts with round attachments on ED22 and the Uruk Period example U79 flank the building, rather than being attached to it.

Because the scenes in which the two different types of Bügelschafts (those with triangular attachments and those with round attachments) are found are so similar, there does not appear to be any difference in the function or meaning between them. For example, both types of Bügelschaft are found associated with buildings in scenes of domestic activity and with cattle. Similarly, of the examples in which a spread eagle is associated with a building, the
Bügelschafts emerging from the building on ED16 have triangular attachments, while the Bügelschafts associated with the buildings on ED19, ED20, ED22 and ED23 all have round attachments.

While the majority of scenes with Bügelschafts on the seal impressions from Ur contain depictions of cattle, these are iconographically different from the care/feeding of the herds/flocks motif found in the Uruk Period. As Delougaz (1968:90) notes, the calves which emerge from the buildings during the Uruk Period are generally replaced in the Early Dynastic Period by full-grown cattle, and human figures which appear to be involved in dairy activities are also depicted. These scenes can therefore be related to ED29, an inlaid stone frieze from the Temple of Ninhursag from Tell al-Ubaid which Heinrich (1957:26) calls the “Melkerfries”. In this scene, two calves emerge from a building. To the right of the building men milk cows, and to the left they hold vessels and pour liquid from one vessel to another. They are probably making butter (Moortgat 1969:43). Two Bügelschafts are attached to the doorway of the building. According to Hall and Woolley (1927:92) a “panel topped by a crescent” is found above this doorway. This may simply reflect the architecture of the building, rather than some symbolism. However, the crescent above the doorway on ED29 may also be iconographically related to copper bulls’ heads from the frieze of the Temple of Ninhursag at Tell al-Ubaid which had crescent shape decorations on the foreheads [Fig. 4.6], and both the crescent on the bulls’ heads and above the doorway on ED29 may represent the male principle, or more specifically, the moon god (Ornan 2001:5; van Dijk 2011a:60, 162). That the frieze ED29 once decorated the Temple of Ninhursag indicates that the scene depicted has some kind of religious significance.

---


213 “Milker frieze”.

Stellenbosch University https://scholar.sun.ac.za
Fig. 4.6: Copper bull’s head with crescent on forehead from the Temple of Ninhursag at Ubaid (Hall and Woolley 1927: Plate VII.2)

Depictions of the Bügelschaft were not only found on seal impressions from the SIS at Ur; a series of seals from across Mesopotamia ED26, ED27, ED30, ED31, ED32, ED33 and ED34 represent cylinder seals or seal impressions with multiple registers. ED27 and ED30-ED34 have two registers, while ED26 has three. On ED30, ED31 and ED32 the lower register depicts a herd, while on the upper register there is a depiction of a building which on ED30 and ED31 is flanked by Bügelschafts, and on ED32 has attached Bügelschafts. On ED33 the herds are depicted in the upper register and the building with flanking Bügelschafts in the lower register. The uppermost of the three registers on ED26 contains a depiction of a building with attached Bügelschafts, the middle register depicts a herd, and the lower register is badly damaged, but appears to represent a more mythological scene which includes Imdugud. The inclusion of Imdugud may be relevant here because Imdugud was associated with Ningirsu214, the patron deity of the Lagash, from whence this seal originates215. On all five examples ED26 and ED30-ED33, figures are seated outside the building with Bügelschafts in what can be described as a “banquet scene” (eg. Selz 1983), a “Trinkszene”216 (Boehmer 1965:passim) or a “Symposion”217 (eg. Karg 1984:31; Heinrich

214 For more on Ningirsu, see 4.5.
215 See below ED66 for more on Imdugud and its association with the god Ningirsu.
216 “Drinking scene”.
217 “Symposium”.
1957:81)\textsuperscript{218}. According to Selz (2004:185), “banquets were an important part of political and religious ceremonies”, and, although the figures are depicted outside the temple, archaeological evidence suggests that the banquet took place within the temple (Romano 2012), which would make these banquets a ritual activity. Divine banquet scenes appeared during the Early Dynastic Period\textsuperscript{219}, but none of the figures on \textbf{ED26} and \textbf{ED30-ED33} exhibit signifiers of divinity, and the scenes therefore most likely represent banquet scenes involving mortals. \textbf{ED33} contains a depiction of a crescent next to the building with the Bügelschafts, but this crescent is found next to a female figure and can therefore not identify the figure as the male moon god.

\textbf{ED27} and \textbf{ED34} also contain two registers, but their iconography appears more complex. Braun-Holzinger (2013:132) describes the upper register of \textbf{ED27} as an “ausführliche Herden-/Melkszene”\textsuperscript{220}. Cattle emerge from a building with attached Bügelschafts. Next to this building are a figure milking a cow and other figures involved in domestic duties. Above the cow is a crescent which cradles a ball\textsuperscript{221}. The lower register depicts a more mythological scene which includes Imdugud grasping the haunches of two caprds, as well as two human figures, one bald and one with long hair, holding onto a human-headed lion. This human-headed lion is often found in association with the boat god\textsuperscript{222}, and Collon (1997) identifies the figure seated upon the boat god as the moon god. Although neither the boat god nor the moon god are depicted on this seal, the human-headed lion may then be representative of the moon god. The crescent cradling a ball which was depicted in the upper register is also found in the lower register between the human-headed lion and the figure with long hair. The crescent is associated with the moon god, and its repetition on the seal suggests that it is of significance. The scenes may therefore be especially related to the moon god\textsuperscript{223}.

\textsuperscript{218} For a full discussion on this motif during the Early Dynastic and Akkadian periods, see Selz (1983). See also Rohn (2011:53-59) and the Proceedings of the Congress Drinking in Ancient Society. History and Culture of Drinks in the Ancient Near East (Milano 1994) for discussions on and analyses of banquet scenes using a variety of methodologies. See also Romano (2012; 2015).

\textsuperscript{219} For more on divine banquet scenes, see Braun-Holzinger (2013:85-88).

\textsuperscript{220} “Detailed herding-/milking scene”.

\textsuperscript{221} The crescent cradling the ball is unusual, but may be an early version of the crescent enclosed within a disc. For more on the crescent within a disc, see Black and Green (1992:54-55). See also NS2 in 6.3.1 for more on the ball cradled in a crescent.

\textsuperscript{222} See Braun-Holzinger (2013:89-123) for a full discussion on the boat god, and Green (1993-1997:255) and Braun-Holzinger (2013:117-118) for more on the human-headed lion. See also Green (1993-1997:259-262) for more on the boat god.

\textsuperscript{223} Although the inclusion of Imdugud may also suggest some kind of association with Ningirsu, see below \textbf{ED66}. 
Parts of **ED34** are quite damaged and the iconography of this seal appears rather different from those discussed above. The upper register contains a boat with three occupants, a hoofed animal and a figure holding an unidentifiable object. Imdugud may be above the hoofed animal (Braun-Holzinger 2013:182) and may represent "ein Tierkampfmotiv, Löwe über Stier" (Braun-Holzinger 2013:49). In the lower register three figures approach a building with attached Bügelschafts from the left. Delaporte (1923:107) identifies the figure closest to the building as a deity. The figure’s hair is in a chignon and Braun-Holzigner (2013:49-50) suggests this figure also wears a horned headdress of divinity, which would support the identification of this figure as a god. This horned headdress, however, is not clearly visible, which makes this identification uncertain, as the figure may just as likely be a priest or other figure of importance. Two additional figures approach the building from the right. One of these figures carries a hoofed animal and this scene can therefore be identified as a ritual scene in which a sacrifice takes place (Heinrich 1957:81). Objects between these two figures and the building may represent items for use in the sacrifice and accompanying rituals. These include a curious object which Delaporte (1923:107) identifies as the body of the sacrificed animal, but which is actually a stand with three arms (Braun-Holzinger 2013:182).

**ED35**, a wall plaque from Ur, has two registers. In the upper register three female figures who wear long robes and have long hair and a cap or fillet stand behind a larger male figure who is nude. According to Woolley (1955:45) this man wears “a head-cloth kept in place by a fillet”, and according to McCaffrey (2013:233) he has a towel over his shoulder, but he is more commonly identified as having long hair (eg. Braun-Holzinger 2013:173; Winter 2010d:70-71). He is pouring a libation in front of a seated male figure who has long hair falling over his shoulders, and who wears a long skirt and holds a vessel in both hands. This figure can be identified as a deity by the horned headdress he wears (Braun-Holzinger 2013:173). The plaque is important, because this is one of the earliest representations of an anthropomorphic deity

---

224 “An animal combat motif, lion above bull”. Imdugud is also found on the back of a bull on **ED28**. See University of Pennsylvania Museum B15606 (Aruz and Wallenfels 2003:88 Catalogue Number 47) for a comparison of Imdugud on the back of a human-headed bull. See van Dijk (2011a:77-80) for more on the motif of Imdugud with the bull. See also Fig. 4.4 and Fig. 4.5.

225 Compare for example the stand on a relief from Nippur which dates to the early Akkadian Period (University of Pennsylvania Museum L-29-346). For more on this relief, see Boese (1971:122-125, 188) and Braun-Holzinger (2013:173).

226 Woolley (1955:45) suggests that the figure may represent a statue of a seated god, but the figure is usually identified as the god himself (eg. Braun-Holzinger 2013:36; Winter 2010d:70). This work follows the latter interpretation.
(Aruz and Wallenfels 2003:74). Woolley (1955:45) suggests that, based on analogy with the Ur-Nanshe relief\(^\text{227}\), the smaller figures represent the children of the ruler, and the taller figure represents the ruler himself\(^\text{228}\). This is unlikely because the male figure is nude, and nudity appears to have been a ritual requirement for priests pouring libations during the third millennium BCE (Bahrani 1993:14), and not for rulers\(^\text{229}\). Winter (2010d:71) suggests that the female figures are priestesses. The nude male figure probably then represents a priest who offers libation on behalf of these priestesses. The overseeing of libations may have been an important act in itself (Bahrani 2001:115), and that the priestesses oversee the pouring of the libation may indicate their elevated status (Aruz and Wallenfels 2003:75 n7).

In the lower register, a male figure who is nude and bald pours a libation in front of a temple or shrine, identifiable as such by the attached Bügelschafts. Behind the male figure are an \textit{en face} female figure with long hair, a bald male figure in a long garment who carries a hoofed animal, and a female figure with bound hair and a long dress. The plaque was excavated in the \textit{giparu} at Ur (Woolley 1955:46), the residence and administrative centre of the \textit{entu}-priestess of the moon god Nanna\(^\text{230}\). The \textit{en face} female in the lower register has therefore been identified as the \textit{entu}-priestess (Winter 2010d:71; Woolley 1955:46). Braun-Holzinger (2013:151) suggests that the findspot of the relief points to a relationship with the moon god, and Heinrich (1957:36) identifies the building with Bügelschafts as the sanctuary of Nanna. This all suggests that the god depicted in the upper register is Nanna. This is further supported by the fact that the headdress which the god wears has “a crescent supported on a low stem which rises from the upper edge of the bar joining the two horns” (Furlong 1987:272), with the crescent being particularly associated with the moon god.

Winter (2010d:71) understands the narrative of the plaque to proceed from the bottom to the top. The plaque then depicts the pouring of a libation outside the temple of Nanna, and then another libation being poured inside the temple to the god himself. Heinrich (1957:83) likens the lower scene to earlier examples from the Uruk Period where offerings are brought to a temple or shrine\(^\text{231}\). Because the first definite representations of anthropomorphic deities are

\[^{227}\] Louvre AO2334. For more on this relief, see Boese (1971:197), Parrot (1948:90-91) and Cabrera Pertusatti (2009).

\[^{228}\] McCaffrey (2013:235) also identifies this figure as the ruler.

\[^{229}\] Indeed, according to Marchesi and Marchetti (2011:207 n.109), it is impossible to identify any nude Early Dynastic figure involved in a ritual with the ruler. See Bahrani (2001:59-60) for male nudity.

\[^{230}\] For more on the \textit{giparu} and the \textit{entu}-priestess, see Weadock (1975) and Harris (1957-1971).

\[^{231}\] See for example \textit{U5, U10, U33, U52, U56, U57, U60, U81 and U82}.  

known from the Early Dynastic Period\textsuperscript{232}, the upper register represents a new and more explicit model of this motif in which the libation is being poured to the god himself.

A similar theme is found on the seal ED\textsuperscript{36}. A female with long hair who wears a cap or fillet and a cape, like the female figures on ED\textsuperscript{35}, stands behind a long-haired male figure in a long skirt who pours a libation before a seated male figure identified as a god by his horned headdress. This god has long hair and a beard, wears a smooth skirt and holds a vessel in both hands, therefore appearing similar to the god on ED\textsuperscript{35}. Behind the god is a niched temple facade, identifiable as such by the attached Bügelschafts. Before the god is an offering table in the form of a standing caprid upon which is a tray\textsuperscript{233}. At the god’s feet are two bovids which leads Ornan (2001:5) to identify the god as Nanna. Winter (2010d:72) identifies the headdress worn by the female figure as the aga, a special cap which was associated with the entu-priestess, and further suggests that the seal represents a conflation of the two scenes depicted on ED\textsuperscript{35} in which both the god and the god’s sanctuary are depicted (Winter 2010d:73).

ED\textsuperscript{37} is a plaque of which only the upper right hand corner survives. Parts of two registers are visible. In the upper register is a doorway flanked by two Bügelschafts. Langdon and Harden (1934:123) identify the Bügelschaft as “an urinmu or spear with handle conventionalized”. While the Bügelschaft appears as a spear during the Early Dynastic Period on ED\textsuperscript{25}, those depicted on ED\textsuperscript{37} are not of this form. On the lower register is depicted the head and upper right hand side of a human figure, and the body of a caprid. Moorey (1967:98) identifies this scene as being part of a procession which approaches the shrine, while Langdon and Harden (1934:123) understand the human figure to be hunting a stag. Considering processions are commonly associated with standards and with temples, but hunt scenes seldom are\textsuperscript{234}, it is more likely that the scene represents a procession.

\textsuperscript{232} Although see U72 for a possible depiction of the moon god from the Uruk Period. See Braun-Holzinger (2013) for a full discussion on the representation of deities during the Early Dynastic Period.

\textsuperscript{233} This object is generally identified as an offering table, see for example Hansen (1998:62), Moortgat (1966:96) and Braun-Holzinger (2013:177). Aruz and Wallenfels (2003:122) quote Winter (2000:796) as identifying the object as a lyre, but there is no Winter 2000 in the bibliography of this book, and there is no reference to this object being a lyre in any of the Winter 2000s listed in her published works. For the lyre closest resembling the object on ED\textsuperscript{36}, see University of Pennsylvania Museum 30-12-253, the reconstruction of which is discussed in De Schaunsee (2002:17-49). For Early Dynastic bull-lyres, see van Dijk (2013). The object on ED\textsuperscript{36}, however, is more similar in appearance to the so called ram in the thicket (BM 122200; University of Pennsylvania Museum 30-12-702) than to any known lyre from the Early Dynastic Period.

\textsuperscript{234} For examples of processions from the Uruk Period, see U5, U53, U56, U57, U66 and U103, and from the Early Dynastic Period, see ED\textsuperscript{23}, ED\textsuperscript{34} and ED\textsuperscript{35}. U17 represents the only hunt scene in association with a
A male figure who is clean shaven and bald and who wears a short skirt is incised on a fragment of pottery **ED38**. He holds what is identified as either an offering table (Genouillac 1934:72) or vessel containing an offering (Parrot 1948:122). The potsherd is decorated with vertical zigzag lines around a rectangular shape within which the figure stands, and a long vertical area next to this rectangle. The zigzag pattern recalls the decorative plano-convex brickwork found in buildings at Tello [Fig. 4.7]235. This suggests that the zigzag pattern on **ED38** indicates a building. The unincised rectangle in which the figure is found would then represent a doorway. The long vertical unincised area next to this doorway may be void of the zigzag pattern so that the objects depicted in the area are clearly defined. In this way, the item used for offering is clear. Above this are two semi-circular shapes attached to the edge of the area. These semi-circles may represent *Bügelschafts* which flank the doorway within which the man stands, further indicating the religious aspect of the building depicted.

---

235 See also the Igbal of Enannatum (Hansen 1970:251 Fig. 2). Dee Delougaz (1933:1-38) for a full discussion on plano-convex bricks and especially (1933:21 Fig. 19) for different patterns produced by the laying of plano-convex bricks.
4.2.2 MYTHOLOGICAL SCENES WITH THE BÜGELSHAFT

4.2.2.1 CONTEST SCENES

During the Early Dynastic Period the Bügelschaft is found not only in scenes associated with architecture, but also in scenes of a mythological nature. On ED40, ED41 and ED42 it is held by a figure in association with a contest scene\textsuperscript{236}, and on ED39 it appears freestanding next to a contest scene. ED40, ED41 and ED42 are the first examples of the Bügelschaft being held as a standard. The only variation of the Bügelschaft which was held as a standard during the Uruk Period is that on U66 in which two Bügelschafts joined at the base by a crossbar form the emblem of the standard\textsuperscript{237}. Bügelschafts are much more commonly held as standards during the Akkadian Period\textsuperscript{238}.

\textsuperscript{236} For more on contest scenes, see Rohn (2011:14-52; 2014:6-8) and Collon (1995b). For contest scenes as symbolic images of war, see Mayer-Opificius (2006:57-61).
\textsuperscript{237} See 3.4 for more on U66.
\textsuperscript{238} Discussed below in 5.2.
On ED40 an animal contest between two lions and two caprids is shown. Next to this scene the seal is divided into two registers. In the lower register there is a third lion, while in the upper register there is an inscription with the seal owner’s name, Ezida (Woolley 1934:341). Next to this inscription a bull-man, an anthropomorphic figure with the face and upper body of a man, and the lower body, ears and horns of a bull, holds a Bügelschaft. The bull-man was an apotropaic figure, and that he is holding a Bügelschaft, which originally had the meaning of “care” or “protection” in the archaic Uruk script may then be of particular significance. On ED41 a man in a short skirt holds two caprids in the “Master of Animals” pose. On the left of the man is a crescent, and on the right is a six-pointed star. Moortgat (1966:91) identifies the central human figure as “ein Held” who is protecting the caprids from the lion which is attacking them. Next to the grouping on the right is a lion standing on hind legs and on the left is an indistinct figure who holds a Bügelschaft in both hands. ED39 contains a scene in which three human figures, one of which is inverted, are involved in a contest scene with two lions and a caprid. Collon (1986:74) suggests that inversion signifies death. This would mean that the one human figure has died, perhaps being killed by the lion next to which the figure is placed. A Bügelschaft acts as a terminal to the scene. This Bügelschaft looks slightly different in that the shaft is shorter than in other examples. The contest scene on ED42 comprises two nude figures, one with horns and one with spiky hair, and two caprids. The horns correspond to Furlong’s Type B of divine headdress in which “the horns appear to rise directly from the head” (Furlong 1987:4) and therefore identify the figure as a god. There are no divine attributes by which we can discern the identity of this god. A crescent is found in the field between the god and the first caprid, and although this could indicate some relationship with the god and the moon, it is equally likely that the crescent merely acts as a filler. Next to the contest scene is a third nude figure with spiky hair who holds two Bügelschafts, one in each hand.

4.2.2.2 SCENES WITH ANTHROPOMORPHIC FIGURES
The figure who holds the two Bügelschafts on ED42 may be related to a motif found on a series of seals ED28 and ED43-ED46 and on an inlay ED47 which represents a nude en face.

---

239 See 3.4 above.
240 For more on the “Master of the Animals” motif, see Calmeyer (1972-75:334-335), Keel (1978:86-125) and Lang (2002:100-106).
241 “A hero”.

Stellenbosch University https://scholar.sun.ac.za
figure\textsuperscript{242} with locks of hair who stands holding a \textit{Bügelschaft} in either hand. This figure can be identified as “the nude hero” (eg. Frankfort 1955:40; Van Buren 1935-36:245), the “Wild Man” (eg. van Buren 1937-39:12) or “Sechslockiger Held”\textsuperscript{243} (Boehmer 1965:9). During the Early Dynastic Period the nude hero is found not only holding the \textit{Bügelschaft}, but also holding an overflowing vase\textsuperscript{244}, in contest scenes and mastering animals (Wiggerman 1983:99-102). Wiggermann (1983; 1992:164-166) identifies the figure as the \textit{lahmu} and posits that the figure was originally “a spirit of the rivers” (Wiggermann 1992:165). The evidence for this name and identification appears to come from later (Assyrian) sources. As Ellis (1995:165) points out, this was an ancient figure “in Mesopotamian tradition, and had come in and out of the Assyrian repertory more than once, perhaps with different names at different times and contexts.” Even Wiggermann (1992:148) concedes that the name \textit{lahmu} is not a Sumerian name but an Akkadian one, and as such cannot be the figure’s original name. The figure’s origin and original meaning are therefore obscure and unknown, and assigning him the name \textit{lahmu} and its associated meaning and functions for this early period is problematic. He cannot be identified by headdress or other attribute as a divinity, but he does not appear to be a mere mortal either, and is therefore best described as a supernatural or mythological being (Wiggermann 1983:99).

The composition of \textit{ED43-ED46} is unusual because the nude hero is carved transversely across the seal. Collon (2005a:182) calls these figures “giants”, believing that this sideways placement indicates their size, but it may equally have been a way of emphasising the importance of the figure, or it may have been the most practical way of carving the figure. \textit{Bügelschafts} functioned as door- or gateposts, and because the nude hero is found holding two of them, in this guise he has been identified as a “gatekeeper” (eg. Frankfort 1955:40). This motif became much more common during the Akkadian Period\textsuperscript{245}, but these Early Dynastic seals may be the forerunner of the Akkadian Period motif.

On \textit{ED43} the nude hero holding two \textit{Bügelschafts} is found in association with a lion, on \textit{ED44} with a caprid, and on \textit{ED46} with a scorpion, while on \textit{ED45} and \textit{ED47} the nude hero holding two \textit{Bügelschafts} is depicted alone. The iconography of \textit{ED28} is more complex, with

\textsuperscript{242} Although only one eye is visible in \textit{ED45}. Cyclopes were not unknown in early Mesopotamian art, see for example Porada (1948:Catalogue number 4), but by comparison to \textit{ED28, ED43, ED44, ED46} and \textit{ED47}, the figure on \textit{ED45} is more likely to be represented in profile.

\textsuperscript{243} “Hero with six locks of hair”.

\textsuperscript{244} For more on the overflowing vase, see 5.2.3.1.

\textsuperscript{245} See especially 5.2.3.1 for the nude hero as a gatekeeper.
the nude hero being accompanied by a bull with a lion-headed eagle on its back, various human figures, and with a star and two scorpions located in the field. The two Bügelschafts which are held by the nude hero are also more complex than other examples of the Bügelschaft because they are surmounted by crescents²⁴⁶. It could be argued that the crescents surmounting the Bügelschafts on ED28 link these Bügelschafts with Nanna, but there is no evidence that the nude hero holding two Bügelschafts or the Bügelschaft itself are generally associated with the moon god.

4.2.3 SUMMARY
The Bügelschaft is found in two iconographic contexts during the Early Dynastic Period. Firstly, it is found in association with architecture in a realistic setting in which domestic and cultic activities are depicted. Secondly, it is found in association with anthropomorphic figures in a more mythological setting, particularly in association with contest scenes and held by an en face nude hero. In one example ED40 the Bügelschaft is held by a bull-man. On two examples, ED26 and ED27, the Bügelschaft is found on seals with multiple registers in which the Bügelschaft itself is found in an architectural setting, but another register contains a more mythological motif. The iconographic contexts in which the Bügelschaft is found suggest that during the Early Dynastic Period iconography in general was moving from being more naturalistic to being more mythological. This trend continues into the Akkadian Period²⁴⁷.

During the Early Dynastic Period the Bügelschaft may appear to be associated with the deities Nanna and Ningirsu, but this may be due to the findspots of the artefacts involved. For example, the god on the upper register of the relief plaque from Ur ED35 can be identified as Nanna, and the temple with the Bügelschafts on the lower register may therefore be identified as his sanctuary. It is possible also that the series of seals from Ur which depict sanctuaries with Bügelschafts are primarily and predominantly associated with Nanna by virtue of their being from the city of which he was patron deity. Similarly, the Bügelschaft standard ED1 was excavated outside the Ningirsu Temple at Tello and must clearly be associated with this god. The seals with Imdugud — ED26, ED27, ED28 and ED34, and possibly ED16, ED19, ED20, ED22 and ED23 if these latter examples represent Imdugud and not simply a spread eagle — may also be associated with this god because of his

²⁴⁶ For crescent standards during the Early Dynastic Period see 4.4.
²⁴⁷ See below 5.2.
association with the creature. However, the human-headed lion and crescents cradling balls on ED27 may link the scene with the moon god, while the inclusion of the Imdugud can also be associated with Ningirsu, and it is curious that the seal would be related to two deities. More plausible then is that during the Early Dynastic Period the Bügelschaft, like in the Uruk Period, was a mark of divinity in general.
4.3 KNOBBED POLE

The procession of women holding knobbed poles on U85-U96 from the Uruk Period is unknown during the Early Dynastic Period. In this period the knobbed pole is found in more varied contexts on ED48-ED51, and possibly on ED52-ED54.

ED48 is a relief plaque which is generally referred to as the *Figure aux Plumes* due to the appearance of the figure depicted. This figure wears a headband from which two plumes emerge. These plumes have been identified as “two ears of barley” (Marchesi and Marchetti 2011:195) and as feathers (Braun-Holzinger 2007:18), although it is uncertain exactly what they represent. The figure wears a long net skirt, has long hair, and his face is shaved, but scratches under his chin indicate a beard on his neck.

Before this figure are two knobbed poles, with the bindings which secure the knobs to the poles indicated by lines on the poles. The figure raises his hand, but it is unclear whether he is holding the first knobbed pole (De Sarzec and Heuzey 1884-1912:165) or if he is raising his hand in a gesture of worship or adoration (Parrot 1948:70). These knobbed poles have been described as “posts surmounted by disks” (van Buren 1945:92), clubs (Boese 1971:144 n. 723), or more commonly as colossal maces (De Sarzec and Heuzey 1884-1912:165; Marchesi and Marchetti 2011:195) or poles with maceheads (Parrot 1948:70; van Buren 1939-41:43). Braun-Holzinger (2007:18) refers to them as “Keulenstandarten”, noting their use as standards. Because the inscription on ED48 appears to mention some maces made of lapis lazuli (Wilcke 1997:674), the knobbed poles on ED48 may represent these lapis lazuli maces. These two standards then represent the door- or gateway to a sacred building, as for example on ED61 during the Early Dynastic Period and U5, U10, U11, U18, U28, U32, U35, U48 and U80, and perhaps U12, U13, U22, U25 and U26 during the Uruk Period. The inscription on ED48 mentions the god Ningirsu as well as his temple Eninnu (Wilcke 1997:674), and it has been argued that the knobbed poles must represent the temple of Ningirsu (Braun-Holzinger 2007:18; Groenewegen-Frankfort 1951:17; van Buren 1939-41:43). The plaque is broken on the upper right corner and the top of a third pole is therefore missing. This third pole may have also represented a knobbed pole (Gelb, Steinkeller and

---

248 See above 3.2.2 for the use of the net skirt during the Uruk Period.
249 “Mace standards”.
250 For this inscription, see Wilcke (1997).
251 Van Buren (1939-41:43) states that there are four knobbed poles, with two missing their upper parts, but only three poles or shafts are visible.
Whiting 1991:66; Marchesi and Marchetti 2011:195). De Sarzec and Heuzey (1884-1912:165, 302) suggest by comparison to the so-called “Physician’s Seal” from the Neo-Sumerian Period NS43\(^{252}\) that the third pole on ED48 was surmounted by a different emblem and would have formed a standard which would have been the focus of the cult. If the third pole did not represent a third knobbed pole but a second type of standard, this standard may have been similar to that depicted on Eannatum’s Vulture Stele ED66\(^{253}\) because both are associated with Ningirsu or his temple.

![Figure 4.8: Reconstruction of the two fragments of the chlorite vessel from Adab (Aruz and Wallenfels 2003:333 Fig. 86)](image)

The identity of the figure has been much debated. He has been identified as the god Ningirsu (eg. Braun-Holzinger 2007:18; 2013:24; Machesi and Marchetti 2011:195; van Buren 1939-41:43) and as a ruler (Dolce 1997:2-3; Aruz and Wallenfels 2003:68). The plumed headdress worn by the Figure aux Plumes is unusual and can be compared to that found on a chlorite vessel from Adab, fragments of which are now in the Oriental Institute (A195A) and the Eski Şark Museum (EŞ 3114) [Fig. 4.8]. According to Banks (1912:268), the Sumerian cuneiform

\(^{252}\) See 6.4.1 for more on this seal.

\(^{253}\) For more on this standard, see below 4.5.
sign gal was “a conventionalised picture of a cap with projecting feathers” and the sign for lugal was reflected in the depiction of a figure with the plumed headdress on the Adab vessel [Fig. 4.9]. The major problem with this interpretation is that it was based only on the fragment of the vessel now in the Oriental Institute (A195A), and two other figures wearing the same headdress are found on the fragment in the Eski Şark Museum (EŞ 3114). Because three figures wear this same headdress on the same artefact, it cannot denote kingship. Some of the figures on the Adab Vessel, including the one wearing the headdress similar to the Figure aux Plumes on the Oriental Institute fragment, carry musical instruments and have therefore been identified as “a procession of musicians” (Aruz and Wallenfels 2003:333). The other two figures with the same headdress stand in front of what appears to be the elaborate facade of a building. Decoration of a similar appearance is found on some depictions of buildings identifiable as shrines from the Uruk Period, for example U53, U56, U57 and U81 and in the frescoes of the Uruk Period Painted Temple at Uqair (Lloyd, Safar, Frankfort 1943: Plate X, XII). Although dating from a different period, it is possible that the building on the Adab Vessel is therefore a shrine. The figures on the Adab vessel could then represent figures involved in the cult, and, by comparison, the Figure aux Plumes may also represent such a figure, possibly a priest. This can be supported by the fact that the Figure aux Plumes raises his hand to or holds one of the knobbed poles which represent the temple of Ningirsu, which, as De Sarzec and Heuzey (1884-1912:165) note, would identify the figure as a worshiper rather than a deity.

Fig. 4.9: Banks’s comparison of the lugal sign and a ruler (Banks 1912:268)
The knobbed pole also represents a building on ED49. This cylinder seal contains a depiction of a seated figure and a contest scene in which an antelope, a lion and a figure identifiable as a bull-man (Buchanan 1966:36) or a second antelope (Langdon 1924:82-83) participate. To the right is a building which is flanked by two knobbed poles which Buchanan (1966:36) describes as a shrine. For depictions of shrines of similar appearance from the Early Dynastic Period, see especially ED19, ED20, ED23, ED27, ED31 and ED33.

On ED50 a figure “with horns and a tail, and ithyphallic (?)” (Legrain 1951:13) holds a knobbed pole in both hands. There is a dot on either side of the pole, but it is uncertain whether these are meant to be understood as part of the standard or not, because they are not physically attached to it. That no other known ringed poles date from the Early Dynastic Period but that there are other knobbed poles from this period suggests that the standard on ED50 represents a knobbed pole. The iconography of the figure — the horns, tail and ithyphallic — suggests that this figure represents a bull-man, similar to the Early Dynastic depictions of the bull-man found for example on ED40 and perhaps ED72, as well as Akkadian depictions such as on A2, A3, A8 and A41. Before the figure is a boat above two animals, and a second knobbed pole. ED50 is similar to ED48 in that it depicts a figure holding a knobbed pole standard while a second standard is found nearby, although the figure on ED48 is anthropomorphic while that on ED50 appears to be a bull-man. This second standard may delineate a sacred space, like the standards on ED49 and ED48 and can therefore be considered an architectural standard.

On ED51 are a knobbed pole and what Legrain (1951:15) identifies as a spread eagle, a scorpion, and “an offering table”. The spread eagle is found in association with the Bügelschaft standard on ED16, ED19, ED20, ED22 and ED23 and with a crescent standard on ED61. It is possible that the knobbed pole, like on ED48-ED50, is indicative of a sacred space, in this case one particularly associated with the spread eagle. Because ED16, ED19, ED20, ED22, ED23, ED51 and ED61 were all found at Ur, it may that the spread eagle and any sacred building associated with it were particularly associated with this site. If the knobbed pole on ED51 does represent a sacred space, the offering table may then represent

254 Although see 3.3 for ringed poles during the Uruk Period. A similar looking standard consisting of a rod with balls is known from the Akkadian Period and the Neo-Sumerian Period, but this reflects a different standard to the knobbed pole. For more on this latter standard, see 5.8 and 6.4.
255 See 4.2.2.1 and 4.7 respectively for more on these standards.
temple inventory.

The knobbed pole may also be found on **ED52-ED54**, although the identification of these as knobbed poles is uncertain. **ED52** contains a depiction of a contest scene. A nude figure holds two horned animals, one in either hand, which are being attacked by lions. A second male figure stands on the left of this grouping and seizes the lefthand side lion by its tail. Acting as a terminal is a long pole surmounted by a knob. Parrot (1956:189) describes this as a “*maru*”, the Sumerian word for “spade” or “shovel”\(^{256}\). The knob which surmounts the pole on **ED52** is pointed, so the identification of it being a spade or shovel is plausible, although it may also reflect a knobbed pole. The cylinder seal **ED53** contains two registers. The lower register depicts a contest scene in which bull-men, antelope and lions take part. There is a crescent in the field. The upper register contains a depiction of a chariot with a driver which is drawn by an equid. Beneath the equid is a prostrate human figure which can be identified as a fallen enemy (Porada 1948:17). In front of the equid is a small figure under a rayed disc, and a lion fighting a caprid, apparently all that remains of a contest scene which was erased to form an empty panel. Acting as a border to this panel is a vertical line with a circle at the top. It is uncertain if this merely functioned as a border to the empty panel, or if this represents a knobbed pole. **ED54** is a cylinder seal with two registers. In the lower register is what Braun-Holzinger (2013:199) suggests to be a hunt scene in which a figure in a chariot which is pulled by equids, possibly mules (Moortgat 1966:96) is followed by a dog and three men with weapons. In the upper register is a mythological scene in which the boat god and passenger are preceded by a human-headed lion\(^{257}\) and followed by a figure who can be identified as a deity by the horned headdress. This figure holds a long shaft which is surmounted by a knob which Moortgat (1966:96) identifies as a spear or the rudder of the boat god, while Braun-Holzinger (2013:199) describes it as “einen langen Stab, der oben wie das Ruder des Bootgottes verdickt ist.”\(^{258}\) If this knobbed pole represented a spear, it would presumably have had a pointed end, and not a round knob. The fact that this knobbed pole is held suggests that it functions as a standard.

Therefore, during the Early Dynastic Period the knobbed pole is still held as a standard, as it was in the Uruk Period, although it is not found in processions of standards. A single

\(^{256}\) ePSD: shovel

\(^{257}\) See 4.2.1 for more on the boat god, passenger and human-headed lion.

\(^{258}\) “A long rod which at the top is thickened like the rudder of the boat-god”. 
knobbed pole is held by a single figure in each example. On ED48 the knobbed pole is held by a figure involved in the cult, most likely a priest, on ED54 it is held by a deity, and on ED50 by a figure which may represent a bull-man. There is therefore no consistency in the type of figure who holds the knobbed pole as a standard — on ED48 the figure is a mortal involved in the cult, and while on ED54 and ED50 the figures holding the knobbed pole are both mythological in nature, on ED54 it is a divine being, while on ED50 it is a supernatural creature. The knobbed pole is found in both “realistic” and “mythological” settings. The knobbed poles on ED49, and the possible knobbed poles on ED53 and ED52 are found in association with contest scenes. On ED54 it is found in a mythological scene with the boat god where it is held by a deity.

The knobbed pole is found in association with architecture on ED48-ED51. While on ED49 this association is explicit, the standard is found flanking a building, on ED48, ED50 and ED51 the knobbed pole is representative of the building.
4.4 CRESCENT STANDARD

The crescent standard is not known from the iconography of Mesopotamia during the Uruk Period, although it is found on contemporary seal impressions from Susa and Chogha Mish.\(^{259}\) The crescent standard is first found in Mesopotamian iconography during the Early Dynastic Period, although there are relatively few examples. It is found associated with contest scenes, scenes of domestic activity, mythological scenes, and scenes of a ritual nature. The crescent standard is usually represented quite simply, with a shaft and a crescent emblem, as on ED55-ED62. The crescent standard on ED63 also consists of a shaft and crescent emblem, but also has added decoration in the form of streamers which hang from the base of the emblem. The crescent standards on ED64 and ED65\(^{260}\) are more complex, with the shaft of the standard being mounted on animal-footed base and with decoration hanging from the crescent emblem of the standard.

4.4.1 STANDARD CRESCENT STANDARD

The most common context in which the crescent standard is found during the Early Dynastic period is in association with the contest scene, as on the cylinder seals ED55-ED58 and ED63. On ED55 leopards and lions attack antelope and the crescent standard acts as a terminal to the scene. ED56 depicts a contest scene with crossed lions, bulls and deer and a crescent standard which again acts as a terminal. While ED55 and ED56 contains contest scenes in which only animals act as participants, the contest scenes on ED57, ED58 and ED63 also have human figures. On ED57 a human figure holds the tail of a lion which attacks a caprid. A second human figure stands in front of the caprid, and a crescent standard is found behind this figure, acting as a terminal to the scene. Buchanan (1966:27) describes the human figures each as being a “hero”, and although these figures don’t look like the archetypical hero because they wear clothing\(^{261}\), their participation in the contest scene marks them as such. ED58 contains a hero holding the tail of a bull and stabbing a lion which crosses the bull and bites its back. A crescent standard acts as a terminal to the scene. ED63 contains a depiction of two crossed animals, and two human figures on either side which appear to be involved in the contest scene. Acting as a terminal to the scene is what Legrain (1925:174) describes as “an emblem formed of a long lance with cross bars or streamers supporting a crescent”, but which represents a crescent standard rather than an emblem. This crescent standard is unique in the Early Dynastic Period depictions of crescent standards in

\(^{259}\) See above 3.4.

\(^{260}\) See Fig. 4.10 for a reconstruction of this standard.

\(^{261}\) See above 3.4. See also Boehmer (1972-1975b:293-302) for more on the iconography of the hero.
that it has decoration, most likely in the form of streamers, on the shaft below the crescent emblem.\textsuperscript{262}

The cylinder seals \textbf{ED59} and \textbf{ED60} depict scenes in which only lions are found in association with crescent standards and which cannot be described as contest scenes. On \textbf{ED59} five rampant lions are shown on hind legs. In the field are what Legrain (1951:17) describes as a “star, crescent, offering table”. The star and crescent are found above the lions, while the “offering table” appears rather to be a crescent standard which acts as a terminal to the scene. \textbf{ED60} contains an inscription which identifies it as the seal of Ur-gar (Legrain 1951:17). Two crossed lions hold crescent standards which act as borders to the inscription. Lions are the only animals which are found alone with the crescent standard, and it is possible then that they have some kind of special significance with regards to this standard. A problem with this is that the crescent standard, being a lunar symbol, would most obviously have been associated with the moon god, and the lion was not traditionally associated with this god. It is equally possible then that the fact that the lions are found with the crescent standard is coincidental, or perhaps that the lions were symbolic of a contest scene. The contest scene itself was not specifically or especially associated with either the crescent standard or the moon god, but rather various standards in general have been found in association with the motif.

\textbf{ED61} appears to depict a scene of domestic activity, perhaps a milking scene (Legrain 1951:14) in which a human figure kneels behind a cow while a second figure stands in front of the animal. Above the cow is a spread eagle. A crescent standard acts as a terminal to the scene, and according to Legrain (1951:14) may represent a shrine. \textbf{ED61} is therefore similar to other Early Dynastic scenes such as those with the Bügelschaft in which domestic activities take place beside a shrine, see for example \textbf{ED4-ED17, ED19-21 and ED29}. The spread eagle found above the cow may associate this scene with a specific shrine, as on \textbf{ED16, ED19, ED20, ED22} and \textbf{ED23}\textsuperscript{263} where the spread eagle is found in association with shrines decorated with Bügelschafts. The scenes with the spread eagle in association with the Bügelschaft are from Ur, the patron deity of which was Nanna, the moon god, and \textbf{ED61},

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[262] Indeed, the only other standard from the Early Dynastic Period which has decoration on its shaft is \textbf{ED69}, see 4.6. See also \textbf{ED64} and \textbf{ED65} below for decoration which appears to hang from the crescent emblem itself. See also \textbf{NS8} in 6.3.2 for a crescent standard from the Neo-Sumerian Period with streamers and a crossbar which decorate the shaft.
\item[263] These examples are discussed in 4.2.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
which is also from Ur, has a crescent standard, which also links the scene to the moon god. It is possible then that the spread eagle was associated with the moon god.  

**ED62** contains a scene in which a boat god transports a seated figure. A human-headed lion is found just behind the boat god. The boat god holds a pole which appears to be topped by a crescent, but it is uncertain whether this is an oar or a crescent standard. Collon (1997) argues that the passenger of the boat god is the moon god. This identification may support the identification of the crescent-topped pole which the boat god holds as being a crescent standard rather than an oar.  

### 4.4.2 CRESCENT STANDARD WITH ANIMAL-FOOTED BASE

**ED64** and **ED65** represent a more elaborate variation of the crescent standard. **ED64** is a cylinder seal which contains two registers. The upper register contains a depiction of a contest scene in which a hero holds two antelope which are attacked by lions. A second hero stabs both lions. In the lower register a male and female figure, the latter identifiable by her ponytail, sit on either side of a crescent standard which is decorated by two “dotted pendants” and has an “animal-footed stand” (Buchanan 1981:126). Both figures raise their hands towards the crescent standard. This gesture can be described as a “gesture of recognition and humility”, a “gesture of respect”, or a “gesture of worship” (Aruz and Wallenfels 2003:214, 321, 448). Behind the female figure are a plant and an attendant, and in the field behind the male figure is a star. A shell inlay from Ur **ED65** appears to represent half a scene, the second half of which would originally have appeared on a second inlay which would have been placed above **ED65** (Aruz and Wallenfels 2003:75) [Fig. 4.10]. It depicts a nude figure who can be identified as a priest (Woolley 1934:525) holding a libation to a stand with animal feet. Although the upper part of this scene has not survived, Amiet (1980a:165) notes the similarity between the animal feet of the stand and the ornaments which appear to hang from the upper portion of the stand on this piece and those of the standard on **ED64**. Although Woolley (1934:525) suggests the stand on **ED65** was surmounted by a crossbar, it is more likely that, due to the similarity between **ED65** and **ED64**, a crescent standard was also originally depicted. Because a libation is held to the crescent standard with animal-footed stand in the scene on **ED65** and because the figures on **ED64** raise their hands to the

---

264 Although more research into other contexts within which the spread eage is found, which is outside the scope of this study, will have to be done to verify this.  
265 See above 4.2.1 for more on the boat god and human-headed lion.
crescent standard in a gesture of respect and devotion, it is clear that the crescent standard with animal-footed stand is treated with prestige and reverence by the associated human figures in both scenes. This variation of the crescent standard — a crescent standard surmounted on an animal-foot stand and with pendants attached to the crescent emblem — may then be particularly associated with the cult. That it was the cult of the moon god may be suggested not only by the fact that it is a crescent standard, the crescent being particularly associated with the moon god, but that the animal feet appear to be those of a bull, an animal which was particularly associated with the moon god. An identification with the cult of the moon god may also be suggested by the fact that ED65 was found at Ur, the patron deity of which was Nanna.

Fig. 4.10: Reconstruction with upper part of the standard depicted on ED65 (R.M. van Dijk)

266 See above 3.3 and 3.4.
4.4.3 CRESCENT STANDARD SUMMARY

The crescent standard is therefore found in relatively few contexts during the Early Dynastic Period. The most common context with which it is associated is the contest scene. The participants in these contest scenes are all “natural” figures — wild animals — and are not “mythological” like the bull-man who is found in the contest scenes within which the Bügelschaft is found, although human heroes are found in both the contest scenes with the crescent standard and with the Bügelschaft. In contrast, the crescent standard is found in a mythological context on ED62 in which it is held by the boat god and is found in association with the moon god and the human-headed lion. In all the contest scenes the crescent standard acts as a terminal. The two crescent standards on ED60 also act as the borders of the area in which the inscription of the seal owner’s name is found. In ED59 the crescent standard may act as a terminal or a filler motif in the scene.

On ED61 the crescent standard may represent a shrine, and the crescent standard is therefore found in an architectural and religious context in this example. It does not appear to represent a building in any of the other examples.

A variation of the crescent standard in which the standard has an animal-foot stand and has pendant decorations hanging from the crescent is found in a cultic context on both ED64 and ED65. In this manifestation, the crescent standard may be especially associated with the moon god during the Early Dynastic Period.
4.5 IMDUGUD/BIRD STANDARD AND COMPOSITE LION STANDARD

Ed66, Eannatum’s Stele of the Vultures, which records a border conflict and victory of Lagash over Umma, is the earliest known monument depicting a war (Bahrani 2008:147). The two sides of the stele have been termed the “historical” and the “mythological” sides due to the subject of the relief carvings [Fig. 4.11]. The “historical” side is divided into four registers which show the human conflict and its aftermath

The “mythological” side is divided into two registers and represents the action of the deities after the conflict. On the upper register is a large male figure who holds a net in which are naked enemies. Behind this figure is the head of a deity, identifiable as such by the horned headdress, and behind this deity is the top part of a standard. In the lower register is part of a chariot, before which is the upper part of the head and the headdress of a deity. The presence of part of a skirt indicates that a figure originally stood in the wheeled vehicle (Barrelet 1970:251).

---

Fig. 4.11: Winter’s reconstruction of the “mythological” and “historical” sides of Eannatum’s Stele of the Vultures (Winter 2010b:42 Fig. 3; 45 Fig. 8)

---

For a full discussion on both sides of the stele, see Winter (2010b) and for the reconstruction of the stele, see especially Barrelet (1970) and Romano (2007).
The large figure in the upper register is generally identified as Ningirsu, the patron deity of Lagash (e.g. Winter 2010b:8-10; Fuhr-Jaeggelt 1972:66; Marchesi and Marchetti 2011:22 n.69 et passim; Parrot 1948:97) and a warlike storm god (Green 2003:17 et passim), although no headdress has survived to definitely identify the figure as a god. Perkins (1957:58) identifies him as Eannatum himself because the text on ED66 mentions that this ruler holds the net of the gods. However, the larger size of the figure bespeaks the figure’s importance, and because a smaller deity is found behind the large figure, the large figure most likely also represents a deity, because a mortal would not have been depicted as more important than a deity. Asher-Greve (2014:33-34; 2013:167) argues that the figure represents Enlil, the father of Ningirsu, although concedes that “whether Enlil was already considered the father of Ningirsu is not attested for Eannatum’s times” (Asher-Greve 2014:33). The figure is more likely to represent Ningirsu because of the object held in his hand, which Börker-Klähn (1982:124) calls a “Standarte”, although it actually depicts an emblem. This emblem is the lion-headed eagle identified as Imugud (Green 2003:25) which holds two lions in its claws. This creature was particularly associated with the god Ningirsu, although, as Fuhr-Jaeggelt (1972:66) notes, “der Löwenadler ist nicht Ningirsu, er meint ihn lediglich”. It is found on objects from Lagash, all of which were dedicated to Ningirsu, and is never depicted as held by a ruler (Winter 2010b:9). This further argues against the figure being the mortal ruler Eannatum, and supports the figure being the god Ningirsu.

The smaller figure in the upper register is usually identified as a goddess (De Sarzec and Huezey 1884-1912:100; Parrot 1948:97), but a problem with this identification is that it is based on the hairstyle of the figure which has been reconstructed as long and falling over the shoulders of the figure (Winter 2010b:9, 42 Fig.3). Gods are also depicted with long hair, and, furthermore, according to Furlong (1987:232), “originally the hair was represented dressed in a formalized bun like the Royal bun worn by the large figure holding the net.” This would mean that the figure instead represents a god as goddesses are depicted with long hair flowing down their backs in the Early Dynastic Period. Braun-Holzinger (2013:80)

---

268 See Frayne (2008:126-140 RIME 1.9.3.1) for a transliteration and English translation of this text.
269 See especially Fuhr-Jaeggelt (1972:passim) for the association between the lion-headed eagle and Ningirsu. See also Suter (2000:187) and Braun-Holzinger (2013:76) for more on this association and for further literature.
270 “The lion-headed eagle is not Ningirsu, it only represents him.”
271 See for example ED35 and ED36.
identifies the figure as one of the sons of Ningirsu, either Igalima or Šušaga, and further identifies the second small deity on the lower register of the stele as the other son. However, based on iconographic comparisons to other pieces, Barrelet (1970:244) argues the figure could be either a god or a goddess. Perkins (1957:58) suggests the smaller figure in the upper register represents “the ruler’s personal goddess”, but it is more generally identified as Ninhursag, either in her capacity as the wife of Enlil (Asher-Greve 2014:33-34; 2013:167), or as the mother of Ningirsu (Winter 2010b:9). Winter (2010b:10) identifies the figure on the lower register also as Ninhursag. Parrot (1948:97) identifies the figure in the upper register as Inanna because of the association of this figure with the conflict depicted in this register, and identifies the figure in the lower register as the goddess Bau, the wife of the god Ningirsu.

The identity of the smaller figure on the upper register is important to this study, because of the standard found directly behind this figure. Braun-Holzinger (2013:78) even calls this figure the “Standartenträger”. Barellet (1970:245; 250 Fig. 12) and Winter (2010b:42 Fig. 3) both reconstruct this figure standing, but Romano (2007:7; 21 Fig. 1) argues against this reconstruction and posits that the figure was seated and that the standard was held by a figure standing behind this seated deity [Fig. 4.12]. Moortgat (1969:43) also suggests that there was a third figure on this register who held the standard, but understands these two smaller figures as standing behind the larger figure. There may, however, be too little space for a third figure who holds the standard, and the standard may instead be held behind the back by the figure whose headdress has survived on the same fragment of the stele as the standard itself, similar to the standardbearers on A74, or the standard may have been placed in the ground. Whether there are two or three figures depicted on this register is, however, not crucial to this study, because even if a third figure held the standard, the standard would still be associated primarily with the smaller figure on the upper register, and with the larger figure.

273 For more on Igalima and Šušaga, see Edzard (1976-1980) and Krebernik (2011-2013) respectively.
274 An identification also argued for compellingly by Starr (2011b).
275 Also known as Baba. For more on Bau, see Eberling (1928b), Black and Green (1992:39), Fischer (1997:125-128) and Leick (1998:23). See also 6.3.3 and 6.9.
276 “Standard bearer”.
277 See Fig. 4.10 for Winter’s reconstruction.
How the standard itself looked has also been much debated. The emblem of this standard appears similar to the lion-headed eagle emblem held by the larger figure in the upper register, but the head of this winged creature has not survived. It is therefore uncertain whether it represents Imdugud [Fig. 4.11] (Bahrani 2008:151; Winter 2010b:9, 42 Fig. 3; Sarre 1903:336-337; Moortgat 1969:43) or a bird (Braun-Holzinger 2013:75; Seidl 2006-2008:311; Barrelet 1970:247 Fig. 10b, 250 Fig. 12), and specifically an eagle [Fig. 4.12] (Börker-Klähn 1982:124; De Sarzec and Heuzey 1884-1912:101; Parrot 1948:97, Romano 2007:16).

The emblem may more likely represent Imdugud due to the similarity in the creature’s depiction to that of the Imdugud which is held by the larger figure on ED66, as well as depictions of Imdugud on other artefacts from Lagash, such as the Vase of Enmetena (Louvre AO 2674), the relief plaque of Dudu (Louvre AO 2354) [Fig. 4.13], and a macehead.
dedicated for the life of Enannatum (British Museum BM 23287)\textsuperscript{278}, the very ruler whose victory \textbf{ED66} celebrates. However, in these examples Imdugud holds two animals in its claws, while the creature depicted as the emblem of the standard does not, although the reason for this may be precisely because it is an emblem of a standard. A problem with the identification of the winged creature with Imdugud is that the body of the winged creature on the standard looks not only like the depictions of Imdugud, but also like the vultures depicted on the other side of \textbf{ED66} which gives this Stele its modern name, the Stele of the Vultures. Furthermore, an eagle is depicted on fragments of a stone basin, also from Lagash (Louvre AO 61) [Fig. 4.14], which reveals that Imdugud was not the only winged creature depicted on artefacts found at the site. The major difference between representations of Imdugud and the eagle is that Imdugud is shown \textit{en face} while the eagle is shown in profile\textsuperscript{279}, but unfortunately the stele is too badly damaged to ascertain if the head of the winged creature on the standard is shown \textit{en face} or in profile.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Plaque_of_Dudu_R_M_van_Dijk.jpg}
\caption{Plaque of Dudu (R.M. van Dijk)}
\end{figure}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{278} For an image of the Vase of Enmetena, see Moortgat (1969:Pl. 113), and for an image of the Enannatum Macehead, see Aruz and Wallenfels (2003:76 catalogue number 35). See Marchesi and Marchetti (2011:360 Pl.51.4) for a reconstruction of the Plaque of Dudu.
\item\textsuperscript{279} In this regard, see also \textbf{ED16} and \textbf{ED23} for the spread eagle with head in profile.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Textual evidence is also ambiguous. Neither Imdugud nor a bird, nor a standard are mentioned in the text of ED66 itself. The Gudea Cylinder A xii:22\textsuperscript{280} mentions a standard which Edzard (1997:77) translates as “the Thunderbird” and which, according to Suter (2000:89), represents Imdugud. The text, however, is from the Neo-Sumerian Period, and dates to roughly 300 years later than ED66. The text on ED48 the Figure aux Plumes\textsuperscript{281}, which, like the ED66, dates to the Early Dynastic Period and is therefore more similar in ideology, mentions “Ein Vogel, ein Rabe des Eninnu”\textsuperscript{282} (Wilcke 1997:674), and it is possible that this bird could be linked to the winged creature on ED66, although van Buren (1939b:85) notes of ravens and crows that “in art it is difficult to recognize these birds with any certainty”. The text on ED48, however, does not mention that the bird is associated with a standard, whereas the “Thunderbird” on the Gudea Cylinder A is explicitly stated to be a šunir (Edzard 1997:77 RIMEP E3/1.1.7CylA xiii:22), a standard.

A possible second standard is found behind the figure on the lower register. De Sarzec and Heuzey (1884-1912:101) describe the object behind this figure as “une sorte de baldaquin,

\textsuperscript{280} See Edzard (1997:68-101 RIME E3/1.1.7Cyls) for translations of the two Gudea Cylinders.
\textsuperscript{281} See 4.3.
\textsuperscript{282} “A bird, a raven of Eninnu”.
bordé de larges découpures et décoré de la figure très effacée d’un petit lion passant.”

Braun-Holzinger (2013:77) and Seidl (2006-2008:311) identify it instead as a lion standard. Lion standards are known from the Neo-Sumerian Period, but as an emblem this lion appears rather small, especially when compared to the size of the emblem of the standard in the upper register of ED66. Therefore, if this object is a standard, the lion must be part of a larger composite image. The lion was associated with Ningirsu (Green 2003:17; Suter 2000:198), and it is possible that the lion behind the deity in the lower register of ED66 is indicative of this relationship. Imdugud with its claws in the haunches of two lion is “one of the most common symbols of Lagash, probably connected with the main god Ningirsu” (Romano 2015:290 n.13). This motif is illustrated, for example, on the Vase of Enmetena, the relief plaque of Dudu and the Eannatum macehead mentioned above. It is also held by the large figure on the upper register of ED66 itself. Because the iconography of ED66 glorifies Lagash and the deities associated with this city-state, and because this motif is symbolic of Lagash and Ningirsu, the lion in the lower register, which must form part of a larger composite emblem, may be one of the lions in such a representation of Imdugud with its claws in the haunches of two lions [Fig. 4.15].

Fig. 4.15: Possible reconstruction of the composite emblem with a lion in the lower register of ED66 (R.M. van Dijk)

283 “A sort of canopy lined with large cutouts and decorated with a figure of a little passant lion which is very faded.”

284 See 6.8.
With the above taken into account it is possible to suggest the probable identities of the figures on ED66 as well as the appearance of the standard in the upper register. Because Imdugud is specifically associated with Ningirsu, the Imdugud held by the larger figure would identify this figure as Ningirsu. Because the two anthropomorphic figures occur together on the stele, the smaller figure must be related to or associated with Ningirsu. Winter (2010b:10) suggests that the same two figures appear in both registers of the stele. The recurrence of Ningirsu as the figure in the chariot in the lower register is supported by the fact that the storm god was frequently represented in a chariot, although it should be noted that this motif is more common during the Akkadian Period (Green 2003:32 n.113 et passim). Imdugud was also associated with Ninhursag, as evidenced by the Imdugud Relief which decorated her temple at Ubaid [Fig. 4.2]. Four life-size lions decorated the entrance of the Temple of Ninhursag at Ubaid (Hall and Woolley 1927:18, 112-113 Plate X-XI), revealing that the lion was at least sometimes associated with this goddess. If the lion behind the figure on the lower register does represent an emblem or part of an emblem of a standard, this standard can therefore also be associated with both Ningirsu and Ninhursag. These two deities are therefore the deities most likely to be depicted on ED66, with the larger figure in the upper register and the figure in the chariot in the lower register representing Ningirsu, and with the smaller figure in the upper register and the figure facing the wheeled vehicle in the lower register representing Ninhursag.

Because of Imdugud’s association with both Ningirsu and Ninhursag, the standard behind the smaller figure in the upper register may then represent Imdugud. The most persuasive arguments against this identification are the fact the body of the winged creature on the emblem appears the same as those of the vultures on ED66, and the fact that no other Imdugud standard is known until the Neo-Sumerian Period. However, during the Neo-Sumerian Period there are also standards with bird and bird-man emblems, so the latter point is not enough to argue against the identification of the emblem of the standard being Imdugud. However, if the lion in the lower register is part of a composite emblem of a

---

285 See also 3.4 for this relief.
286 The lion was more generally associated with Inanna/Ištar. This association appears to apply more to the goddess Ištar and from the Akkadian Period on (Seidl 1957-1971:487). For more on the association between Ištar and the lion, see Asher-Greve and Westenholz (2013:172 n.719 et passim), Cornelius (2009:passim), Braun-Holzinger (1987-1990:91) and Seidl (1976-1980:88-89).
287 See 6.10.
288 See 6.9.
standard, and of a standard in which the emblem is in the form of Imdugud with its claws in the haunches of two lions in particular, this argues against the standard in the upper register representing an Imdugud standard, because two standards with the same type of emblem, in this case an Imdugud emblem, could logically be assumed to look the same. Therefore, if the lion in the lower register represents part of an Imdugud standard, the standard in the upper register would more likely represent a bird standard. Bird standards are known from the Neo-Sumerian Period\textsuperscript{289} where they are associated with goddesses, and if the standard in the upper register represents a bird standard, then it can be associated with or representative of the goddess which it is placed next to, rather than the larger figure of Ningirsu, who already holds an emblem of Imdugud, and therefore already has a divine and identifying attribute.

Whether the emblem represents Imdugud or a bird, the standard depicted on the upper register of ED66 is described by De Sarzec and Heuzey (1884-1912:101) as “une enseigne militaire”\textsuperscript{290}, which suggests it is the first recorded military standard, and Sarre (1903:337) describes this standard as a symbol of victory. However, the standard is not associated directly with the battle or with any army — these are depicted on the other side of the stele — and it can therefore not be described as a battle standard, as this should have been depicted along with the military action. Furthermore, according to Winter (2010b:11) the “mythological” side of the stele “can be called a “culminating scene,” because the action is completed. Therefore, this standard is depicted in a scene which occurs after the conflict, and the standard is therefore also temporally removed from the actual battle. It is associated with deities and can be described as a divine standard. Because Ningirsu holds captives in a net, the standard can also still be understood as a symbol of victory, and of the power which enabled this victory.

\textsuperscript{289} See 6.9.

\textsuperscript{290} “A military ensign.”
4.6 FLORAL AND STAR STANDARDS

While during the Uruk Period it was difficult to differentiate between the floral and star standards, during the Early Dynastic Period the two can be more easily differentiated and appear in separate contexts.

The floral standard is represented only in ED67. This cylinder seal depicts two ibexes standing on their hind legs and turning back towards a “‘tree’ tipped with three rosettes” (Buchanan 1966:24) with five petals. Next to this is part of a second “tree”, and a deer on either side of what Buchanan (1966:24) calls a “rosette-topped ‘pole’” which is found on a scalloped-patterned hill. The fact that no branches emerge from the “pole” suggests that this does indeed represent a standard, although it should be noted that the absence of branches may be due to space limitations and that vegetation may be represented. The motif of the two horned ungulates mounting a hill with vegetation is a well-known one, and one which indicates that the standard represents a floral standard and not a star standard, despite the emblem appearing quite starlike.

In the Early Dynastic Period, the floral standard on ED67 is therefore similar in iconography to the Uruk Period examples of the floral/star standards because of its association with horned caprids. The Early Dynastic star standards ED68 and ED69, however, are not found in this context, but in association with contest scenes. In ED68 this is an animal contest scene in which lions and ibexes act as participants, and in ED69 it is a mythological contest scene which includes two nude heroes, a human-headed bull, a bull-man, a lion and a caprid. The star standard on ED69 also appears to have decoration on the shaft. Moortgat (1966:94) describes this standard as “ein Bügelschaft, von einem Stern bekrönt”. However, the decoration on the shaft is inconsistent with the usual Bügelschaft iconography because the Bügelschaft generally only has one “buckle” on one side of the shaft, but on ED69 there is a “buckle” on either side of the shaft which together form a reverse S-shape. This suggests that the standard instead represents a star standard with some kind of decoration on the shaft, although exactly what this decoration represents is unclear. In ED68 the crescent is found directly above the star standard, which lead Wiseman (1962:27) to identify the standard on ED68 as a “moon crescent standard”. The presence of the star, however, makes this unlikely.

---

291 See above 3.6.
292 The motif appears already during the Uruk Period, as, for example, on U11.
293 “a Bügelschaft surmounted by a star”.
294 For the Bügelschaft, see 3.4, 4.2, 5.2 and 6.2.
because, while the crescent standard on ED63 has decoration in the form of streamers hanging from the shaft of the standard\textsuperscript{295}, on ED68 it is clear that a star is being depicted and not similar decoration to that on ED63.

\textsuperscript{295} This type of decoration is also found on the crescent standard associated with Sin of Harran. See also 3.4.
4.7 UNCERTAIN

It is uncertain whether ED70-ED73 represent standards because of their fragmentary natures.

ED70 the so-called Standard of Ur was originally identified by Woolley (1934:61, 567) as a standard because it was found close to the shoulder of an individual, but, according to Hansen (1988:45), there is no real evidence to suggest that it did indeed originally function as a standard. However, Starr (2011a) argues that the Standard of Ur is an actual standard, although correctly dismissing it as being a battle standard and suggesting rather that it represents a royal standard. However, there are no royal standards in the iconographic record until the Persian Period (Seidl 2011-2013:115), and textual evidence for royal standards is also sketchy. According to Pongratz-Leisten (2011-2013:108), there is reference to a standard from the reign of Shulgi, but it is unclear whether this is a royal or divine standard, and other textual evidence for royal standards derives from the Middle Assyrian Period onwards. There is therefore neither iconographic nor textual evidence supporting the identification of the Standard of the Ur being a royal standard. Furthermore, emblems of standards were meant to be readily identifiable, and the intricate work of the decoration of ED70 argues against it being a standard at all. Although ED70 itself does not represent a standard, it does contain depictions of three possible standards. These are found on the upper register of the War Side. Behind the figure identifiable as the ruler of Ur, perhaps Urpablisag (Asher-Greve 2014:31), are three figures whom Woolley (1934:270) identifies as “royal bodyguard” due to their clothing and the fact that they carry “axes and spears”. Suter (2000:179) suggests that these are not spears that these figures carry, but standards. This interpretation can be supported by A74 in which the standard bearers carry standards, and, like the figures on ED70, axes, and wear helmets and military gear. However, unlike the standards on A74, those on ED70 are not associated directly with the battle depicted on the other side of the Standard of Ur, and they can therefore not be described as battle standards. Unfortunately no emblems have survived, and we therefore cannot know how they looked, or who or what they symbolised or represented, or, indeed, whether they represent standards at all.

ED71 is a seal impression with two registers, both of which appear to represent libation.

---

296 Starr (personal correspondence) contends that “just because the Standard of Ur was not correctly identified as a royal standard doesn’t mean it isn’t one”, and describes the Standard of Ur as “the first royal standard in history”. It is the position of this work that the so-called Standard of Ur is not an actual standard.

297 A74 is discussed below in 5.8.
scenes. In the upper register is a seated figure behind whom are four female figures, the first of which holds what Legrain (1936:45) calls a “standard”, although unfortunately no emblem has survived.

What remains of the seal impression ED72 appears to represent a contest scene between humans and animals. A figure holds what appears to be a standard, the emblem of which has not survived, in both hands. This figure has a tail, and may therefore have been a bull-man.

Very little remains of the seal impression ED73. A nude figure, part of a horned ungulate, and the lower part of a figure standing above a winged animal are depicted. Before the nude figure is what Legrain (1936:45) describes as “a spear with side buckle” and which may therefore be a Bügelschaft, although this identification is uncertain because the upper part of this object has not survived, so it is not known if there was an emblem. The context is also unclear, except that it appears to be part of a mythological scene, as evidenced by the winged creature.
4.8 INCORRECTLY IDENTIFIED AS STANDARDS

4.8.1 BULL STANDARD
The so-called Standard of Mari ED74 has been reconstructed to depict the successful return from a battle (Schroer and Keel 2005:274)\textsuperscript{298}. According to Nadali ED74 does not recount an actual event, but was meant to act rather as “a perpetual memorial to the superiority of the forces of Mari over its enemies” (2007:344). Parrot (1956:140, 145) reconstructed one figure as bearing a standard with a bull emblem [Fig. 4.16], and this standard has become known as the “Stierstandarte von Mari”\textsuperscript{299} (Schroer and Keel 2005:274). Calmeyer (1967:166) argues that this reconstruction is incorrect and that the bull is not an emblem of a standard, but a rein ring [Fig. 4.17]\textsuperscript{300}. Muscarella (1988:330) notes that a chariot is included in the scene, which supports Calmeyer’s hypothesis.

![Fig. 4.16: Parrot’s reconstruction of the “Stierstandarte von Mari” (Parrot 1956: Pl. LVII.C)](image)

Sarre (1903:366) suggests that ED75, a bronze statuette of a bull with silver inlay is an emblem of a standard, and it would therefore be similar to that depicted on ED74 if the latter were a standard. ED75, however, represents instead a rein ring (Braun-Holzinger 1984:36-37). That a rein ring with bull decoration similar to that proposed for ED74 and ED75 is known from Ur (Woolley 1934:Plate 167a) can support this hypothesis. It appears then that neither the “Stierstandarte” on ED74 nor the bull statuette ED75 actually represents a

\textsuperscript{298} For the original reconstruction of ED74, see Parrot (1956:136-151, Plates LVI-LVII).
\textsuperscript{299} “Bull Standard of Mari”.
\textsuperscript{300} For more on rein rings as well as examples, see Braun-Holzinger (1984:33-37, Tafeln 26-29). For the reconstruction of the so-called Standard of Mari standard with the bull as a ring-rein and not an standard emblem, see Fig. 4.17.
standard. Additionally, despite the fact that in English ED74 is called “the Standard of Mari”, this object is a decorative panel (Dolce 1978:134; Schroer and Keel 2005:274), and not a standard in the strict sense of the word.

![Image of ED74]

**Fig. 4.17:** Calmeyer’s reconstruction of the bull on ED74 as a rein ring (Calmeyer 1967: Abb.6 detail)

### 4.8.2 CRESCENT STANDARD

ED76 contains two registers which are not separated by a horizontal line. In the upper register is a scene in which, according to Wiseman (1962:18), “seven persons, five holding staves, approach a seated figure behind whom is a crescent standard on a base.” In the lower register is a mythological contest scene which includes bull-men, lions, a bull and a hero who holds two curving poles. This hero is taller than the other figures in the lower register, and his head intrudes into the upper register where the seated figure and the object which Wiseman describes as a “crescent standard on a base” are situated. It appears rather that this object is an eighth human figure, the bottom half of which is missing because of the presence of the hero’s head, and that it is actually not a crescent standard.
4.9 SUMMARY/CONCLUSIONS

As in the Uruk Period, in the Early Dynastic Period the Bügelschaft is found in an architectural context. The Bügelschaft ED1, which reflects the only extant standard of the third and fourth millennia BCE, was found in association with the temple of Ningirsu, and the archaeological evidence therefore supports the iconographic evidence with regards to the Bügelschaft being associated with architecture. The knobbed pole is now also found in an architectural context, where in the Uruk Period it was restricted to being found in procession scenes. The crescent pole may also be found in an architectural context in ED61 where it may represent a shrine. In the same example, the crescent standard appears to be represented in association with domestic activity, a common theme with which the Bügelschaft is associated during the Early Dynastic Period. The Bügelschaft is depicted particularly in association with milking scenes.

The contest scene and the banquet scene are the two most commonly depicted motifs in Early Dynastic glyptic art (Collon 2005a:27). It is of little surprise then that standards are found in association with both these types of scenes. The Bügelschaft, crescent standard, knobbed pole and star standard are all found in association with the contest scene. In contrast, only the Bügelschaft is found in association with the banquet scene. Although the figures on ED64 are seated, they are not involved in a banquet scene, but they are venerating the crescent standard, and the scene is therefore of a ritual context. The Bügelschaft, knobbed pole and crescent standard are also found in scenes of a ritual context. Particularly noteworthy of the scenes with a ritual context are the libation scenes found in association with the Bügelschaft on ED23, ED35 and ED36, with the possible variation of the crescent standard with an animal-foot stand on ED65, and on the standard of uncertain appearance on ED71.

During the Early Dynastic Period standards are held by a variety of types of figures. They are held by human figures in contest scenes, and in scenes in which the human holding the standard is involved in the cult. They are also held by “mythological” figures. Bull-men hold the Bügelschaft on ED40, the knobbed pole on ED50, and the standard of uncertain appearance ED72. The nude hero is especially associated with the Bügelschaft and is often depicted en face holding one of these standards in either hand. In ED54 the knobbed pole is held by a figure who can be identified by the horned headdress as a deity, and on ED62 the boat god may hold a crescent standard. During the Uruk Period the ring-post with streamer is held by a female figure who is sometimes identified with Inanna, but ED54 and ED62, if the
identification of the standard on the latter is correct, contain the first depictions of a figure definitely identifiable as a god holding a standard.

While the Bügelschaft appears to have been associated with the god Nanna during the Uruk Period, during the Early Dynastic Period it was perhaps associated with the deities Nanna and Ningirsu, although, as in the Uruk Period, it more likely functioned as a mark of divinity in general. The crescent standard could more obviously be associated with the moon god than the Bügelschaft because of its appearance resembling a crescent moon, although only the variation of the crescent standard found on ED64 and ED65, in which the standard has an animal-foot stand and pendent decorations, is found in ritual scenes in which the standard is venerated. The Imdugud/bird standard and the possible composite lion standard found on ED66 are associated with Ningirsu. The knobbed pole may also be associated with Ningirsu, as for example on ED48, but it, like the Bügelschaft, probably rather served as a mark of divinity in general.

The smaller figure on the upper register of ED66, who may represent Ninhursag, is also associated with the Imdugud/bird standard and the possible standard with a composite emblem including a lion, although this association may be an indirect one which is dependent on her relationship with Ningirsu. It must therefore be noted here that, while Inanna was associated with the ring-post with streamer during the Uruk Period, it is only male gods with whom standards are associated during the Early Dynastic Period. This is curious when the profusion of goddesses during the Early Dynastic Period is taken into account. However, because only two gods appear to be associated with standards, the lack of association of deities with standards may be a general trend, and not one based on gender identities. This can be linked to the facts that the Early Dynastic Period is the earliest period in which definite visual representation of deities appear, and that it is mostly impossible to identify specific deities in Early Dynastic iconography (Braun-Holzinger 2013:149-150). This furthermore reflects the development from the more “natural” scenes in the iconography of the Uruk Period to the more “mythological” scenes in the Early Dynastic Period. This trend continues and becomes more pronounced in the iconography of the succeeding Akkadian Period.

301 For more on the prevalence of goddesses during the Early Dynastic Period, see Asher-Greve and Westenholz (2013:44-60, 163-171).
5. AKKADIAN PERIOD

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Hansen (2003b:189) describes the Akkadian Period as “an era of profound artistic creativity, reaching one of the peaks of artistic achievement in the history of Mesopotamian art — and even in the history of world art.” Akkadian art, exemplified by the glyptic art, continues the traditions and themes of Sumerian Early Dynastic art, but new and more varied iconographies are introduced. There are a greater number of artistic themes, motifs and individually distinguishable figures, and many of these appear for the first time during the Akkadian Period and are unique to this period (Asher-Greve and Westenholz 2013:172). Depictions of deities become common, and many of these are identifiable by a specific iconography. Collon (2005a:35) suggests that this is a result of the “reorganization into an official pantheon of the Sumerian terrestrial and Akkadian astral deities” during the Akkadian Period. This pantheon was more androcentric than the previous Sumerian Early Dynastic pantheons (Asher-Greve and Westenholz 2013:172), and this is reflected in the art of the period. Few goddesses besides Ištar are identifiable. According to Frankfort (1934:2), “[m]any of the scenes on cylinders are evidently renderings of myths, but great uncertainty prevails as to their interpretation.” The exact identification of many of these scenes may be uncertain, but at the very least they may be described as “mythological’ in the sense that deities and other mythological beings are represented.

The imperial art of the Akkadian Period was meant to express the “ideal of a strongly centralized military empire” (Demange et al 1995:35). This reflects the result of the intensifying rivalries between the Sumerian city-states at the end of the Early Dynastic period (Kuhrt 1995:44), rather than signifying a break with the Early Dynastic cultural or artistic tradition. This, in turn, is expressed by the fact that the Naram-Sin Victory Stele A74 continues and develops the tradition of Eannatum’s Stele of the Vultures ED66.

These developments in the artistic tradition are reflected in depictions of standards and the contexts in which these standards are found. The Bügelschaft, the knobbed pole, the crescent

---

302 For a full discussion on the repertoire of Akkadian cylinder seals, see Boehmer (1965).
303 See Frankfort (1934) for myths depicted in Akkadian Period glyptic art, and see Green (1997) for the depiction of myths in Mesopotamian art. See also Steinkeller (1992) for mythological motifs in Akkadian art and some problem in identifying these.
304 Discussed below in 5.8.
305 Discussed above in 4.5.
standard and the star standard of the Early Dynastic Period are represented also in Akkadian Period iconography. The pennant standard, the tasselled standard, the rod with balls and a standard surmounted by a rearing lion-griffon are new to the Akkadian Period.
5.2 BÜGELSCHAFT

5.2.1 INTRODUCTION
The Bügelschaft continued to be depicted in the iconography of the Akkadian Period, although the changing focus of Akkadian iconography is represented in scenes with this standard. The Bügelschaft is still found associated with contest scenes\textsuperscript{306} and in scenes of human or domestic activity, but it is now also found more often in association with deities in scenes of an overtly “mythological” nature.

5.2.2 CONTEST SCENES AND THE NUDE HERO

5.2.2.1 CONTEST SCENES
As in the Early Dynastic Period examples ED39-ED42, during the Akkadian Period the Bügelschaft is found in association with contest scenes as depicted on the cylinder seals A1-A9.

On A1 is an animal contest scene in which two lions attack two antelopes. A bull-man who does not appear to be involved in the contest holds a Bügelschaft. According to Woolley (1934:347), the Bügelschaft on A1 is “a post emblem of protection, marking the entrance to guarded park and safety.” The function of this and Bügelschafts depicted in similar scenes therefore recalls that of the Bügelschafts of the Uruk and Early Dynastic periods where the standard marked a sacred space and as a cuneiform sign had the meaning of “care” or “protection”\textsuperscript{307}.

A2-A5 contain contest scenes in which human figures and “natural” animals\textsuperscript{308} participate. On A2 a human figure with a flat cap fights a bull and a lion attacks a second bull. On A3 a hero holds the tail of a lion which attacks a gazelle which in turn is being held by a second hero. On A4 two human figures fight two crossed lions. The scene on A5 consists of two groupings, one in which a lion attacks a horned animal and another in which a hero in a cap fights a bull. In each of these scenes, a bull-man who is not involved in the conflict holds a Bügelschaft.

\textsuperscript{306} For discussions on contest scenes during the Akkadian Period, see Rakic (2014) and Boehmer (1965:1-46).
\textsuperscript{307} See 3.4.
\textsuperscript{308} As opposed to “mythological” animals. For “mythological” as it applies in this work, see 4.2.
On A6-A9 the contest scenes contain “mythological” contestants. On A6 and A7 two heroes each battle with a human-headed bull while a bull-man holds a Bügelschaft. A star-spade is found in the field on A6. The object in third millennium Mesopotamian iconography called the “star-spade” consists of a shaft surmounted by a star and terminating in a spade or spear point. The star-spade is not understood in the present work to represent a standard, either as an individual standard or as a variation of the star standard. In German it is referred to as the “Sonnenzeichen” (eg. Keel-Leu and Teissier 2004:52), which is perhaps a more accurate name — according to Manuel Molina, the star-spade represents the cuneiform sign for the sun god, DINGIR+UTU (Juan-Pablo Vita Barra, personal correspondence). The sign DINGIR represents the “star” or the star-spade, and the sign UTU represents the “spade”. There is variation in the representation of the star-spade on Akkadian cylinder seals, with crossbars decorating the shaft [Fig. 5.1]. Although these variations appear similar to the NUN or TUR3 signs, it is unlikely that these signs are represented, and “la variante en question du signe UTU ressemble à NUN”309 (Camille Lecompte, personal correspondence). The fact that the star-spade represents a cuneiform sign does not necessarily exclude it from representing a standard, as the ring-post with streamer, the ring-post without streamer, the ringed pole and the Bügelschaft are all found as standards in the Uruk Period iconographic record and as signs in the archaic Uruk script310. However, the star-spade is only ever represented in the field of a scene or acting as a terminal to a scene, it is never held by any type of figure, nor is it placed in an architectural, military or ritual context, and it therefore does not appear as a standard.

Fig. 5.1: Variations of the star-spade with crossbars decorating the shaft (Boehmer 1965: Taf. XXXIV.409 detail; XLIX.587 detail; Taf. XXXII.394 detail; XLVIII.563 detail; L1.611 detail)

309 “the variation in question is the sign UTU resembling NUN”
310 See 3.1.
A8 contains three groupings of battling contestants; a hero fights a human-headed bull, a second hero combats a lion, and a bull-man fights a lion. The Bügelschaft is found in the field between the bull-man and lion. Also in the field are other symbols; a crescent standard is found between the first hero and the human-headed bull, a star standard is found between the second hero and the lion which this figure battles, and between this second group and the third group of the bull-man and lion is a star-spade. Two groups of contestants are found on A9. The first group consists of a hero fighting a human-headed bull, while the second group consists of a bull-man fighting a lion. In the field between the two groups is an inverted Bügelschaft which Porada (1948:22) calls a “reversed gatepost”. It is not clear what significance, if any, this inversion has. It cannot represent death unless it associates the entire scene with death because no single figure holds, and therefore is directly associated with, the Bügelschaft.

The Bügelschafts on A9 and A3 end at their bases in a spear point, or, because the Bügelschaft on A9 is inverted, it could be that this Bügelschaft should be understood to be surmounted by a spear point, as on A18 and A48. The Bügelschafts on A2, A6 and A7 are surmounted by decoration in the form of an hourglass shape. The Bügelschaft on A4 is unusual in that the “buckle” on the side is a full circle, and not the usual semi-circle.

5.2.2.2 THE NUDE HERO BETWEEN TWO BÜGELSCHAFTS
Another motif from the Early Dynastic Period examples ED28 and ED42-ED46 and which is also found in the Akkadian Period is the hero standing between and holding two Bügelschafts, as on A10, A11 and A12.

On A10 the hero holding two Bügelschafts is found in association with three other figures. Wiggermann (1997:38) identifies a seated god with five snakes extending from his legs as the god Tišpak. A human figure grasps the plough which this god holds. Behind Tišpak a second god holds a mace in both hands. A10 is unusual because the two Bügelschafts appear differently; the shaft of the Bügelschaft on the right of the hero extends beyond the buckle and terminates at the base in a spear point, while the buckle of the Bügelschaft on the left of

---

311 A8 is also discussed in 5.4 and 5.5.
312 See 4.2.1 for inversion signifying death.
313 For more on Tišpak, see 5.2.3.2.2.
the hero is at the end of the shaft and there is no spear point. This may point to the two representing different symbols or standards, but the differences in appearance may also be due space limitations on the seal. It is otherwise unclear what the difference in appearance could mean.

On A11 the hero is found carved transversely across the seal, as on the Early Dynastic seals ED43-ED46. Alongside this hero is a fish. A12 contains two heroes each standing between and holding two Bügelschafts. That the figure is represented twice in one scene may point to this figure representing a specific type of hero, rather than a specific, individual figure. On both A11 and A12 the hero holding two Bügelschafts is found in association with the god with flowing water who can be identified as the god Ea, and, according to Amiet (1956:118-119), the hero on A11 acts as “gardien de porte... à la personne du dieu Éa.” This would suggest that the Bügelschafts are symbolic or representative of the sacred space or shrine of this deity. Because the fish was associated with Enki/Ea (van Buren 1933:10), the fish between the hero and the Bügelschaft on A11 can further associate the scene with this god. Indeed, according to Boehmer (1965:87) A11 is the earliest definite depiction of Ea.

5.2.3 IN ASSOCIATION WITH DEITIES

5.2.3.1 EA - THE WATER GOD
Scenes in which the Bügelschaft is found in association with a hero or heroes and the god with flowing water is the most commonly depicted association of the Bügelschaft with a deity during the Akkadian Period. This grouping is depicted on A11 and A12 as well as on A13-A32. Although A33 is damaged and the upper part of the standard and the standard bearer behind the seated god do not survive, by comparison to the aforementioned examples, this cylinder seal probably also depicts the same grouping. On A34 and A35 the god with flowing water and the Bügelschaft are depicted, but there is no hero. However, the scenes on these cylinder seals are similar to other examples, and they can therefore be iconographically linked to the grouping of the god with flowing water, the hero and the Bügelschaft.

314 See 5.2.3.1.
315 “the gatekeeper… to the god Ea”
316 See below in this section for discussions on each.
On A13, A14, A15, A18, A19, A20, A21, A25, A28, A33, A34, and A35, the god holds a vase with overflowing water\textsuperscript{317}, while on A16, A17, A22, A23, A24, A26, A27, and A29, streams of water issue from the shoulders of the god and on A30 and A32, the streams issue from his waist. The cylinder seal A31 is damaged and it is unclear whether the god holds a vase or if the water issues from his person. According to van Buren (1933:1), the overflowing vase and the god with streams of water are so closely related that “they form an indissoluble whole, a single conception” and they cannot be studied apart. The overflowing vase has been identified as the \textit{hegallum} (Aruz and Wallenfels 2003:217; Black and Green 1992:184; Ornan 2005:18), an “emblem symbolizing fertility” (Gelb, Jacobsen, Landsberger, and Oppenheim 1956:168) as well as “abundance and prosperity” (Suter 2000:63)\textsuperscript{318}.

The god is identifiable as the water god Ea\textsuperscript{319} by the streaming water and the fish which are sometimes found swimming along this water. Van Buren (1933:12-15) identifies the nude hero holding the Bügelschaft or the overflowing vase as Dumuzi-absu, one of the six sons of Ea. When a second hero is present, van Buren (1933:14, passim) identifies this figure as Ningišzida\textsuperscript{320}. However, these figures do not represent gods, as no indicators of divinity, such as the horned headdress, are shown, but simply represent the figure known as the nude hero\textsuperscript{321}. On A11, A17, A21, A23, A24, A25, A27, A28, A29, and A33, one hero is depicted holding a Bügelschaft, and on A12, A13, A14, A15, A16, A18, A19, A20, A22, A26, A30, A31, and A32, two heroes hold Bügelschafts. On A34, rather than being held by a hero, the Bügelschaft is found in the field.

On A13, A14, and A15, only the grouping of the god with flowing water, hero and Bügelschaft is depicted. Ea sits and holds an overflowing vase in one hand. On either side of him is a hero who holds a Bügelschaft. On A13, the heroes are standing, while on A14 and A15, they are kneeling. In these scenes, the hero epitomises his role as “der besondere Diener des Ea”\textsuperscript{322} (Boehmer 1965:42). Of the other examples in which the god with flowing water, the

\textsuperscript{317} This symbol is called an “overflowing vase” by, for example, Suter (2000:63) and Edzard (1997:56). It is also known as the “vase with streams” (eg. Black and Green 1992:184), the “flowing vase” (eg. van Buren 1993:passim; Aruz and Wallenfels 2003:217) and the “Wassersprudelnde Gefäß” (vase with flowing/gushing water) (eg. Seidl 1957-1971:586).

\textsuperscript{318} For a full discussion on the overflowing vase and the god with streams of water, see van Buren (1933), and for more on the overflowing vase, see van Buren (1945:124-133), Black and Green (1992:184) and Seidl (1957-1971:486).

\textsuperscript{319} Sumerian Enki.

\textsuperscript{320} See 6.2 for more on Ningišzida.

\textsuperscript{321} See 4.2.2.2 for the identification of this figure.

\textsuperscript{322} “The special/particular servant of Ea”.
hero and the Bügelschaft are found together, A17, A19, A21, A23, A25 and A33, represent presentation scenes in which a figure is brought before Ea by an intercessor, and A12, A16, A18, A20, A22, A24, A26, A30, A31 and A32 represent worship/adoration scenes in which the figure stands before Ea in an attitude of worship. The differentiation between these two types of scenes may be arbitrary and it is possible that no real difference was originally implied or understood — in both types of scenes the figures approaching or being led before the seated divinity hold their hands in gestures of humility or worship, and in the so-called worship/adoration scenes A16, A18, A20 and A24, as well as the so-called presentation scenes A23 and A44 the human worshipper who approaches the god holds an animal offering.

In the presentation scenes depicted on A17, A19, A21, A23, A25 and A33 a human figure is brought before Ea by another deity. In A19, this deity has two faces which identifies him as Usmu, the minister of Ea who is first found in Akkadian Period iconography (Boehmer 1976-1980:179-180). On A17, A21, A23 and A25 the deity leading the human figure can be described as a “minor deity” (Frankfort 1955: Page opposite Plate 38), although Usmu stands before this deity and may act as a further intercessor on A21 and A25. On A21, A23, A25 and A33 a single nude hero who holds a Bügelschaft stands behind the enthroned Ea, on A17 the nude hero holding a Bügelschaft stands in front of and faces Ea, and on A19 a nude hero who holds a Bügelschaft stands on either side of Ea who is enclosed in a frame which represents his shrine.

A12, A16, A18, A20, A22, A24, A26, A30, A31 and A32 depict worship/adoration scenes in which a figure approaches Ea in an attitude of worship, but is not led forward by an interceding figure. On A16, A18, A20, A22, A24 and A32 this figure appears to be human, while on A12, A26, A30 and A31 the figure is a deity, identifiable as such by the horned headdress. This is in contrast to the presentation scenes in which the figure led before Ea is

323 A view also held by Winter (1986:253), “the modern distinction between “worship” and “audience,” [ie. presentation] ritual and civil petition, sacred and secular should not be imposed upon the Mesopotamian situation.” The distinction between presentation and worship/adoration scenes is kept in this work for ease of description. For a discussion on these types of scenes, see Rohn (2011:65-85).
324 A44 is discussed below in 5.2.3.2.2.
325 For a full discussion on presentation scenes from the Akkadian Period until the end of the Old Babylonian Period, see Haussberger (1991).
326 Known in Sumerian as Isimud. For more on Usmu and his identification as the two-faced god, see Ungnad (1928-29), Black and Green (1992:110) and Boehmer (1976-1980:179-181).
327 A52 and this type of depiction of shrine are discussed in more detail below in this section.
always human. On **A31** the deity depicted before Ea may be Usmu (Frankfort 1955: Page opposite Plate 92), although the seal is in bad condition and this identification is therefore uncertain. If Usmu is depicted on **A31**, the scene may be related to that depicted on **A34** in which Usmu stands before the enthroned Ea. On the latter, an inscription separates Usmu from a figure whom according to Porada (1948:26) is a “minor god carrying sticks [who] seems to rest his hand” on the frame of this inscription, but who may rather raise his hand in a gesture of worship or adoration. Behind Ea a Bügelschaft acts as a terminal to the scene.

On the cylinder seals **A19**, **A27**, **A30** and **A32**, Ea is depicted within his sanctuary. This shrine is represented as a frame around the god. On **A30** and **A32** Ea stands within his shrine and has water issuing from his waist, on **A19** the god sits within the shrine and holds an overflowing vase, and on **A27** he sits within the shrine and water comes from his shoulders. On **A30** and **A27** this shrine itself is surrounded by water. On **A30**, **A32** and **A19** a nude hero holding a Bügelschaft stands on either side of the shrine. It should be noted that here the Bügelschafts themselves are not attached directly to the shrine, although they still function as gate posts to the shrine as in earlier periods.\(^{328}\)

On **A30** a second god approaches the shrine with his hands clasped together in “an attitude of worship” (Collon 1982:92). A small figure on **A32** raises his hand towards the standing Ea in a gesture of greeting or supplication. On **A19** a human figure approaches the shrine with his hand raised in the same manner as the figure in **A32**. However, where the scenes on **A30** and **A32** can be described as worship/adoration scenes, that on **A19** can be classified as a presentation scene, because Usmu stands between the human figure and Ea.

The iconography of **A27** is more complex. Ea is seated within his sanctuary which has water flowing around it. Beneath the upper frame of the shrine is a canopy which according to Heinrich (1957:83) represents the original form of the shrine. Behind this shrine a kneeling nude hero holds a Bügelschaft which marks the entrance to the sanctuary (Woolley 1934:362). Streams of water from the shrine extend to cover this figure. Approaching the shrine are two deities, both of whom have rays emerging from their shoulders and are in postures of ascent. The god closer to the shrine ascends a mountain surmounted by a temple. He wears a short skirt and holds a club in one hand. The second stands with one leg on a

\(^{328}\) See above 3.4 and 4.2.
crouching lion and has his other foot on the shoulder of a smaller god who is nude and appears to be subjugated (Boehmer 1965:79). The god wears a long garment and holds a saw in one hand. Frankfort (1939a:102-103) identifies the first god as Marduk, arguing that the figure’s inferiority, as evidenced by his approaching Ea and his hand which is raised in a “gesture which may convey adoration or merely speech”, marks him as the son of Ea. Frankfort further identifies the second god as Ninurta due to this figure’s association with the lion. However, Braun-Holzinger (1993:127) points out that this second god is identifiable as the sun god Šamaš because of the “Šamaš kennzeichnende Säge” which he holds. Braun-Holzinger further identifies the first god as a moon god because of his ascending posture and the rays which issue from his shoulders. However, these are more commonly associated with the sun god, and this would suggest that both deities represent sun gods. Woolley (1934:362) therefore suggests that the first god is the Sumerian Utu and the second is the Akkadian Šamaš, while Boehmer (1965:83-84) suggests that they both represent Šamaš, although two different aspects of this god. It is unusual that the sun god would be shown in a scene in which he appears less important than Ea, and it is more likely that the sun god is visiting Ea than that this is a worship/adoration scene.

A13, A31 and A36 may be related to the scenes in which Ea is found within his shrine. On A13 Ea holds an overflowing vase and sits between two Bügelschafts which are connected at their bases by a horizontal line. A nude hero holds each standard, and a tree acts as a terminal to the scene. Buchanan (1966:65) describes this structure as a “platform enclosed by two gateposts”, and, because it frames Ea, it is possible that it represents his shrine, as in A19, A27, A30 and A32, although in this case the Bügelschafts form an integral part of the structure. On A31 two heroes holding Bügelschafts stand on either side of a shrine. Ea is seated before the shrine and is approached by Usmu. Although Ea is not depicted inside the shrine here, the scenes appear to be related, and it is possible that the grouping of Ea and Usmu was understood to be found within the depicted shrine. Related to A31 may be A36 in which two nude heroes kneel and hold a Bügelschaft on either side of a shrine. Although no god is depicted on this cylinder seal, by comparison to A13, A19, A27, A30, A31 and A32, a similar meaning can be suggested in which the god Ea can be understood to be within the shrine.

329 Amiet (1976:46-47) also identifies these gods as Marduk and Ninurta.
330 “characteristic saw of Šamaš”.
A28, A29 and A35 depict a scene in which a bird-man — a figure with the upper body of a human and the lower body of a bird — is brought before Ea by Usmu. On A37 the god before whom the bird-man is brought does not have the flowing water to identify him as Ea, but by comparison to A28, A29, A35 and similar scenes, this god can also be identified as Ea. On A28 and A29 the hands of the bird-man are bound and on A23, A28 and A37 the creature is driven from behind by a god towards Ea. This suggests that the bird-man is a captive, perhaps a criminal brought before Ea for judgement (Frankfort 1934:27; Ravn 1960:28). The presence of the Bügelschaft being held by a nude hero suggests that the scene takes place within the sanctuary of Ea (Ravn 1960:28). Because the Bügelschaft on these examples is depicted in a judgement scene, it can be described as being depicted within a judicial context, although the standards themselves cannot be described as judicial standards.

It has been suggested that the scene represents the capture of Anzu after this creature stole the Tablet of Destinies (eg. Frankfort 1934:27). Lambert (1966:69-70) argues against this identification because Anzu is nowhere described as a bird-man, and because the preserved myth contains no judgement scene. Additionally, if there had been a judgement scene, Ea would not have acted as the judge as he had only a minor role in the myth, and Anu or Šamaš, as divine judges, would instead have acted as judge in divine affairs. Wiggermann (1993-1997a:223) further points out that the lower part of the bird-man is that of an aquatic bird and not an eagle and, furthermore, that the bird-man is not found in the iconography of Lagash as a representation of Anzu could be expected to be. Green (1997:141) counters this by stating that in the Sumerian Ninurta and the Turtle it is from Enki, the Sumerian Ea, that the Tablet is stolen, and the fact that Anzu could have a lion’s head or a beak suggests that there was “some inconsistency in how the creature was envisaged.” Wiggermann (1993-1997a:223) suggests that the bird-man represents rather Enmešarra but, as Green (1993-1997:249) points out, this god is also never described as a bird-man. It appears more likely then that the scene represents a myth which is unknown from the extant texts (Lambert

---

332 Although the authenticity of A37 is questioned because of several unusual or unique features such as the absence of water associated with Ea, and the pose of Usmu in which he raises one leg in a posture of ascent. See Keel-Leu and Teissier (2004:346-347) for further details.
333 For more on Im dugud/Anzu, see 4.2.1, 4.5 and 6.10.
334 In Mesopotamian mythology, the Tablet of Destinies allowed whoever was in possession of it to control the destinies or fates of all in the universe. For more on the Tablet of Destinies, see Lawson (1994:19-36).
335 For a translation and full discussion of the Standard Babylonian version of the Anzu Epic, see Annus (2001).
336 ETCSL c.1.6.3 http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/cgi-bin/etcsl.cgi?text=t.1.6.3#
337 See above 4.2.1.
1966:70) and until further evidence comes to light, the creature must simply be called the bird-man.\(^{338}\)

On \(A28\) and \(A29\) the Bügelschaft is held by a hero who is positioned behind the enthroned Ea, and on \(A37\) it is found freestanding in the field behind Ea, acting as a terminal to the scene. On \(A35\) the Bügelschaft is held by the bird-man — the first and only time this occurs (Boehmer 1965:88). That the bird-man holds the Bügelschaft on \(A35\) is curious because the bird-man can be characterised as a “captive” (Frankfort 1955: Page opposite Plate 55) and an “enemy of the gods” (Wiggermann 1996:216) and should then not hold a standard which is associated with sacred spaces and care and protection.\(^{339}\)

The Bügelschaft on \(A28\) is surmounted by a knob, while that on \(A29\) is surmounted by decoration in the form of an hourglass shape and that on \(A37\) has two horizontal lines which appear similar to the hourglass shape. Keel-Leu and Teissier (2004:247) describe the standard on \(A37\) as “eine Kombination von Bügelschaft und Sonnenzeichen”, or star-spade, although the appearance of the Bügelschaft can rather be explained in it terminating in a spear point. The Bügelschafts on \(A3, A9, A10, A21, A22, A25\) and \(A35\) also terminate in a spear point, and the Bügelschaft on \(A37\) is therefore not unique. The Bügelschafts which end in spear points share features with the star-spade, but this does not mean that they represent a hybrid Bügelschaft-star-spade standard, but rather that they had a point which could be driven into the ground so that the Bügelschaft could act as a freestanding standard.

5.2.3.2 OTHER DEITIES

Although most commonly associated with Ea, the Bügelschaft is also found in association with other deities on \(A10\) and \(A38\)-\(A48\). On \(A38\) the Bügelschaft is found in association with a battle between four gods.\(^{341}\) A nude, clean-shaven figure holds in both hands a Bügelschaft which is uniquely depicted with a forked shaft (Delaporte 1923:108). In the field are a mace, a star and globes. None of the gods depicted on \(A38\) have any accepted identifying attributes and must therefore represent minor or unknown deities. The Bügelschafts depicted on the

---

338 For more on the theme of the bird-man being brought before Ea, see van Buren (1933:41-50), Ravn (1960:28-30) and Rohn (2011:89).

339 As discussed above 4.2 and 5.2.2.1.

340 “a combination of Bügelschaft and sun sign”.

341 See Boehmer (1965:49-59) and Rohn (2011:60-64) for discussions on the depiction of Götterkämpfe on Akkadian Period cylinder seals.
cylinder seals A39 and A40 are associated with gods who do not appear to be minor deities, but it is uncertain who these gods are. On A39 a seated god is depicted between two kneeling heroes, each of whom holds a Bügelschaft. By comparison to the similar scenes depicted on A14 and A15, this god may be Ea, but the lack of an identifying attribute, such as the overflowing vase held by the god on A14 and A15, makes definite identification impossible. On A40 a seated god is approached by two human figures who are led forward by a second god. Behind the seated god a third god holds a Bügelschaft. The seated god holds a sceptre, but it is uncertain whom this god represents. Other identifiable major deities such as the sun god and snake gods are also depicted in association with the Bügelschaft.

5.2.3.2.1 THE SUN GOD
While on A27 the sun god is found in a scene with the Bügelschaft, it is more likely the water god Ea with whom the Bügelschaft is associated on this cylinder seal because the water which covers Ea’s shrine extends to surround the nude hero holding this Bügelschaft, thereby implicitly connecting the two. On A41 and A42 the sun god is the principal deity with whom the Bügelschaft is associated. On A41 the sun god, identifiable by the rays emitting from his shoulders and the saw which he holds, sits between two twisted columns. Above the god are curved lines which end in dots. McCown, Haines and Hansen (1967:80) suggest that these symbolise the setting sun, but when compared to A27, it appears more likely that they represent a canopy which is supported by the twisted columns, and Collon (2005a:167) therefore suggests that this represents a specific famous shrine of the sun god. Next to each of the twisted columns stands a bull-man who holds a Bügelschaft. A smaller figure approaches from the right, and this may therefore represent a worship/adoration scene. On A42 a bull-man holding a Bügelschaft stands on either side of the sun god who is in a posture of ascent and who has rays emitting from his shoulders. Next to this grouping the sun god, again identifiable by the rays emitting from his shoulders, fights a lion-headed demon, a theme found exclusively in the Akkadian Period (Boehmer 1965:58 n.75). A41 is important because it demonstrates that Ea is not the only god who was depicted within a shrine and with whom the Bügelschaft was associated during the Akkadian Period. However, on both A41 and A42 the Bügelschaft is held not by the nude hero, but by a bull-man, a

For other examples of this theme, see Boehmer 1965: Taf. XXXVI.307, Taf. XXIX.339, and Taf. XXXVIII.462. On Boehmer 1965: Taf. XXIX.346 the lion-headed demon is found in a battle of the gods which does not include a god with rays emitting from his shoulders. On Fig. 5.5 (Boehmer 1965: Taf. XXXVIII.461) the lion-headed demon is led towards the sun god by another god with rays emitting from his shoulders. This may point to the second god with rays representing a subordinate to the sun god.
figure which was commonly associated with the sun god Šamaš and which Boehmer (1965:57) refers to as the “Bügelschafthalter des Sonengottes (sic)”\textsuperscript{344}. In contrast, the Bügelschaft on \textbf{A43} is held not by a bull-man, but by a god. On this cylinder seal, the enthroned sun god, identifiable by the rays emitting from his shoulders, is seated between two attendant gods. The god behind the sun god holds a door or gate\textsuperscript{345}, and the god in front of him holds a Bügelschaft. A crescent, axe, dagger and mace are found in the field. The door or gate held by the attendant behind the sun god recalls \textbf{A65}, \textbf{A66} and \textbf{A67}\textsuperscript{346} upon which scenes in which the sun god is flanked by two attendants, each of whom holds a door or gate, are depicted. On \textbf{A43} the Bügelschaft takes the place of the second door or gate, and must therefore fulfil a similar function. In other words, the Bügelschaft here acts as a door- or gatepost, as it did in the Uruk and Early Dynastic periods.

\subsection*{5.2.3.2.2 THE GOD STANDING ON A SNAKE-DRAgon}
On \textbf{A44} the Bügelschaft is found behind a deity who stands on a creature which Moortgat (1966:102) identifies as a “gehörnten Löwen”\textsuperscript{347} and which Boehmer (1965:100) identifies as a “Schlangendrachen”\textsuperscript{348}. This creature can be identified as \textit{Mušḫuššu}\textsuperscript{349} (Wiggermann 1997:36) and was originally associated with Ninazu and later with Tišpak when the latter replaced Ninazu as the tutelary deity of the city of Eshnunna\textsuperscript{350} (Black and Green 1992:166). Because Tišpak replaced Ninazu as the city god of Eshnunna during the Akkadian Period (Wiggermann 1993-1997b:458), and because \textit{Mušḫuššu} became associated with Marduk from the Old Babylonian Period (Wiggermann 1989:121) the god on this cylinder seal is likely to represent Tišpak. The god mounted on \textit{Mušḫuššu} is approached by two deities, the second of which leads by the hand a human figure who carries an animal offering. Behind this human figure is a fourth figure who carries a bucket, but, because the upper part of this figure is damaged and no headdress is therefore visible, it is uncertain whether this figure

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{343} According to Black and Green (1992:49) this association is from the Old Babylonian Period, but \textbf{A41} and \textbf{A42} demonstrate that the bull-man was linked to the sun god from at least as early as the Akkadian Period.
\item\textsuperscript{344} “Bügelschaft-holder of the sun god”.
\item\textsuperscript{345} For more on the door or gate associated with the sun god, see 6.5.
\item\textsuperscript{346} Discussed below 5.5.
\item\textsuperscript{347} “horned lion”.
\item\textsuperscript{348} “snake-dragon”.
\item\textsuperscript{349} See Wiggermann (1993-1997b:462 Fig. 1; 1997:51 Fig. 2.d) for the development in the iconography of \textit{mušḫuššu}. See Wiggermann (1999:168-169) for more on \textit{mušḫuššu}. See also 6.2 and 6.11 for more on \textit{mušḫuššu}.
\end{itemize}
represents a deity or a human figure. Between this fourth figure and the Bügelschaft is a two-headed snake\textsuperscript{351}. Two maces are found in the field. In the case of this cylinder seal, the Bügelschaft may be representative of the divinity of the god mounted on mušḫuššu, or it may symbolise that the action is taking place inside the shrine of this god, rather than being associated specifically with the god.

5.2.3.2.3 SNAKE GODS

The Bügelschaft is also found in association with snake gods on \textbf{A10, A45} and \textbf{A46}\textsuperscript{352}. On \textbf{A45} a snake god, a figure with an anthropomorphic upper body and the lower body of a snake, sits before a shrine which is held or supported by a second god. The snake god is approached by a human figure who clasps his hands together and whom Buchanan (1966:65) identifies as a worshipper. A freestanding Bügelschaft acts as a terminal to the scene. The same snake god is found on \textbf{A46} where he holds the end of his own tail which has a snake’s head. A god with wings emerging from his waist, scorpions for hands and snakes for feet, and a god with scorpions for hands, goats for feet (Pittman 1987:23) and lions emerging from his waist are found behind the snake god. A nude god holding a mace approaches the snake god. Between this god and the snake god is a Bügelschaft which may either mark the divinity of the snake god or symbolise that the scene takes place inside the snake god’s shrine. Because of the presence of the snake-god and the scorpion-handed gods, Wiggermann associates this cylinder seal with the iconography of Ninazu/Tišpak (Wiggermann 1997:39), and identifies the snake god himself as Ištaran\textsuperscript{353} (Wiggermann 1997:44; 1998-2001d:573). Boehmer (1965:102) argues that the snake god cannot be of high rank, because he is sometimes depicted without the horned headdress of divinity, and he is never depicted with one of the major deities like Ea, Šamaš or Ištar. Conversely, McEwan (1983:221) suggests this snake god represents Nirah/Irḫan\textsuperscript{354}, but Wiggermann (1997:44) argues against this identification, stating that the snake god must represent “an independent lord” because of the distinct iconography and appearance associated with this figure. According to Harper, Muscarella, Pittman, Porter and Spar (1984:26) the snake god may rather have been “a fertility deity, perhaps of Iranian inspiration”, which may ostensibly be supported by the fact that the “provenienced seals showing the snake-god seem to be distributed… with a centre

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{351} See also \textbf{NS1} in 6.2 for the grouping of mušḫuššu, snake and Bügelschaft.
\item \textsuperscript{352} See Boehmer (1965:102-104), Black and Green (1992:166-167) and Wiggermann (1997) for discussions on the snake god or snake gods.
\item \textsuperscript{353} For more on Ištaran, see Lambert (1976-1980b) and Wiggermann (1997:42-44).
\item \textsuperscript{354} For more on Nirah/Irḫan, see Wiggermann (1997:42-44; 1998-2001d).
\end{itemize}
outside Sumer proper in the East” (Wiggermann 1997:44). However, the earliest depictions of an Elamite snake god are from the beginning of the second millennium BCE in which a god sits on a snake throne (de Miroshedj 1981:2; Pl. I), and the Akkadian Period depictions of the snake god with a human head and upper torso and the lower body of a snake from Mesopotamia predate these related Elamite depictions. The snake god therefore appears to have a Mesopotamian origin, and Wiggermann’s (1997:44; 1998-2001d:573) identification of this god as Ištaran is the most likely. Wiggermann (1997:38) also identifies the seated god with five snakes extending from his legs on A10 as the god Tišpak, but the iconography of this cylinder seal is different to that of A45 and A46, and the arguments against the identification of Tišpak need not to apply to A10.

5.2.3.2.4 THE GOD WITH A BULL

On A47 and A48 the Bügelschaft is found in association with a seated god and a bull which stands on its hind legs and is described by Porada (1948:27) as placing its forelegs into the lap of the god, and by Ward (1910:409) as leaping into the god’s lap. On A47 a nude hero holding a Bügelschaft stands behind this seated god while a human figure and a goddess approach him. Although the goddess is behind the human figure, the scene appears to be a presentation scene. On A48 a Bügelschaft is attached directly to the two sides of a shrine next to which the god is seated. The god “holds a staff or curved blade behind him” (Collon 1982:81), but unfortunately this does not aid in his identification. A small bull places its forelegs into the god’s lap; a second larger bull stands directly behind the enthroned god. Two birds, one of which is a spread eagle356, are found just above the second bull. Above these birds are two horizontal lines upon which is a crouching bull. A second god stands behind this grouping, approaching the seated god, or perhaps leading the animals towards the god. Ward (1910:409) suggests that the god in these scenes is the moon god because of the bull’s association with this god357, but there are no other indicators, such as a crescent, which support this identification. Boehmer therefore identifies the figure as a “Gott der (Haus-) Tiere”358 (1965:124) and a “Tier fütternder Gott”359 (1965:98). Because the Bügelschaft is explicitly associated with a shrine in A48, the Bügelschaft on A47 may also represent the door- or gatepost of a shrine.

---

355 Discussed above 5.2.2.2.
356 See above 4.2.1, 4.3, 4.4.1 and 4.5 for more on the spread eagle.
357 For this association, see 3.3.
358 “god of the (domestic) animals”.
359 “god who feeds animals”.
5.2.3.2.5 VEGETATION GOD
On A49 a seated god is approached by a group of four other deities, two of whom Boehmer (1965:94) describes as carrying two Bügelschafts “denen oben frisches Grün entsprießt”360. These Bügelschafts are unique and may point to a fertility aspect associated with the standard, although this fertility may be associated rather with the seated god, marking him as a vegetation deity.

5.2.4 IN ASSOCIATION WITH DIVINE SYMBOLS
The cylinder seal A50 does not contain any depictions of deities, but has iconography which may be associated with certain gods. Four kneeling nude heroes each hold a Bügelschaft in both hands. Above each nude hero is a symbol — an overflowing vase, a fish, a crescent, and a solar disc in the form of a disc within which is a four-pointed star with three wavy lines radiating from between each of these points. Next to the Bügelschaft which is held by the nude hero beneath the fish is a wavy line which may represent a snake (Eisen 1940:44) or a stream of water361 (Boehmer 1965:92). An inscription identifies the owner of the cylinder seal as “Shatpum, son of Shallum (or Dunnum)” (Eisen 1940:81).

According to Aruz and Wallenfels (2003:217) and Boehmer (1965:92), the nude heroes, overflowing vase, the fish and the wavy line — whether it represents a stream of water or a water snake — indicate that the iconography of A50 is linked to the god Ea, although Aruz and Wallenfels (2003:217) concede that “the meaning of individual symbols could change in different contexts.” The crescent is associated with the moon god Sin and the solar disc with the sun god Šamaš, and therefore, even if the iconography of this seal is connected with the water god, it is not connected exclusively with this god. Aruz and Wallenfels (2003:217) also note that the overflowing vase, fish, crescent and solar disc are all “astral or planetary symbols”, with the overflowing vase and the fish being the precursors of later zodiac signs.

The overflowing vase was a symbol of fertility and abundance, and, while the fish was a symbol of the water god it also sometimes served as “a sign of beneficence” (Black and Green 1992:82). The Bügelschaft was likewise associated with protection. The crescent was not only associated with the moon god, but “may be the lunar body which is thus pictured

360 “with fresh green sprouting from the top”.
361 Although Boehmer (1965:92 n. 53) also states that the wavy line could also represent a “Wasserschlange” (water snake).
without any reference to the divinity” (van Buren 1945:61). It is possible then that the iconography of A50 is associated with protection and prosperity, rather than being associated with specific deities, although the emblems are clearly also related to specific deities.

The copper alloy statue from Bassetki, now in the Iraq Museum in Baghdad, IM 077823, which depicts the lower part of a seated nude hero [Fig. 5.2] may be a three-dimensional representation of the kneeling heroes depicted on A50. Hansen (2003b:195) suggests that the kneeling posture of the heroes on A50 is meant to represent the seated posture of the Bassetki statue. According to Al-Fouadi (1976:69) the statue “very probably was holding a wooden log (possibly an emblem) whose bottom was fitted in the tube which stems upwards from the pedestal”. In other words, the statue probably held a standard [Fig. 5.3]. By comparison to the heroes on A50, as well as other examples of kneeling heroes holding Bügelschafts on A14, A15, A16, A18, A24, A26, A27, A29, A36 and A39, the standard which the Bassetki statue held would be a Bügelschaft. The inscription on the base of the Bassetki statue reveals that a temple was built in honour of Naram-Sin362, and Braun-Holzinger (1984:24) suggests that the statue was a standard-bearer which acted as furniture fitting of this temple. Moorey (1994:261) suggests that it was “one of a pair of ‘guardians of the gate’ in a temple”. This fits with the iconographic evidence in which nude heroes hold Bügelschafts which function as door- or gateposts. The Bassetki statue therefore represents a three-dimensional version of the two-dimensional motif represented on A14, A15, A16, A18, A24, A26, A27, A29, A36, A39 and A50, and, moreover, supports the iconographic interpretation of the symbolism and function of the Bügelschafts in these scenes.

362 For a transliteration and translation of the text on the base of the statue, see Frayne (1993:113-114 RIMEP E2.1.4.10).
Fig. 5.2: Bassetki Statue (Aruz and Wallenfels 2003:195 Fig. 58)

Fig. 5.3: Reconstruction of the Bassetki Statue (Rashid 1976:52).
5.2.5 SCENES OF HUMAN ACTIVITY

The Bügelschaft is found not only in scenes of a mythological nature, but also in scenes of a domestic nature and in association with humans on A51, A52 and A53.

The cylinder seal A51 has two registers. The upper register contains depictions of a milking scene and other pastoral or domestic activity and a crescent is shown in the field. The lower register contains a pastoral scene with a reed hut with two Bügelschafts which act as gateposts. A shepherd herds two goats and three sheep from this building. A dog, a basket and a second human figure complete the scene. According to Boehmer (1965:123), A51 is the only Akkadian cylinder seal with two registers which depicts pastoral life. Boehmer further suggests that the scenes on A51 reflect an event in the life of Etana363, and the iconography of this seal would then have a mythological setting. This, however, does not mean that pastoral or domestic activity is not depicted. A51 therefore represents a continuation of the motifs with which the Bügelschaft was associated during the Early Dynastic Period, as for example on ED4-ED17, ED19-ED21 and ED29.

Banquet scenes are depicted on A52 and A53364. On A52 a male figure is seated before a second standing male attendant. This scene is mirrored by a female attendant standing before a seated female. The two seated figures hold what Porada (1948:31) describes as a “stick”. Behind the seated female a Bügelschaft acts as a terminal to the scene. The scene on A53 is more obviously a banquet scene as two seated figures each hold a cup in an upraised hand. Between them stands an attendant. Behind the two seated figures is a Bügelschaft which acts as a terminal to the scene. The shaft of this Bügelschaft terminates at the bottom in a spear point and is surmounted at the top with decoration in the form of two horizontal lines which appears similar to the hourglass decoration found on A2 and A6. There is a crescent in the field above the figure on the right365. Although the crescent is the symbol of the moon god, as Black and Green (1992:54) point out, the crescent was also sometimes “considered to have a magically protective power”, and the crescent does not necessarily associate the scene on A53 with the moon god366.

---

364 See 4.2.1 for more on the banquet scene. See also Boehmer (1965:115-117) for more on the “Trinkszene” during the Akkadian Period.
365 A crescent is frequently found in association with drinking scenes, see for example Boehmer 1965: Taf. LVI.671, 672, 675, 677, 678, Taf. VLII.680-682.
366 See also 5.4.
5.2.6 DECORATION ON THE BÜGELSCHAFT

Decoration of the Bügelschaft during the Akkadian Period is more varied than before. The standard is found terminating at the base in a spear point, as on A3, A9, A10, A21, A22, A25, A35, A37, A45 and A53. Because the Bügelschaft on A9 is inverted, it is unclear whether the spear point decoration should be understood to be at the base of the standard or surmounting it. Spear points are found surmounting the Bügelschafts on A18 and A48, and possibly on A19, although the cylinder seal is damaged at the top of both standards depicted, and it is possible that a knob is shown or that a vertical line is shown above the spear point. A knob is found surmounting the Bügelschafts on A26, A28 and A32, while two horizontal lines decorate the top of the Bügelschafts on A2, A6 and A53. The Bügelschafts on A7, A13, A15, A22, A24, A29 and A36 are surmounted by an hourglass shape, and that on A27 by a rectangular shape. It is sometimes difficult to differentiate between shapes, for example the Bügelschafts on A34 and A50 may be surmounted by either an hourglass shape, or a rectangular decoration, while the decoration on those on A37 may either be in the form of two horizontal lines or an hourglass shape. On A49 the Bügelschafts terminate at the top in vegetation. This may associate these Bügelschafts specifically with a vegetation deity. Besides A49, there is no difference in what type of decoration is associated with what type of iconographic context, and the differences in decoration may therefore be arbitrary, and the fact that there was decoration may merely have been artistic preference.

5.2.7 SUMMARY

During the Akkadian Period there was a continuation of Early Dynastic motifs with which the Bügelschaft was associated and contexts in which it was found. As in the Early Dynastic Period, the Bügelschaft is found in scenes of a mythological setting and of a more natural “realistic” setting, although there appears to be a merging of the two. Cultic scenes such as worship/adoration scenes, for example, take place directly before the deity. The bringing of an animal offering during the Akkadian Period is similar to the pouring of a libation before a deity during the Early Dynastic Period — both show subservience and honour to the divine. The pastoral setting on A51 may be representative of the Etana myth. The banquet scenes A52 and A53 are the only scenes with no obvious mythological aspect. The Bügelschaft is still found in association with contest scenes and there are still depictions of a nude hero standing between and holding two Bügelschafts, although there are differences in how these scenes are represented. Whereas on the Early Dynastic Period contest scenes the Bügelschaft is held by a bull-man, an indistinct figure, a nude hero, and was also found freestanding in the
field where it acts as a terminal, there is more standardization during the Akkadian Period, with the Bügelschaft being held by a bull-man in all contest scenes except on A8 and A9 where it is found freestanding in the field. During the Early Dynastic Period the nude hero holding two Bügelschafts is generally found in isolation, but during the Akkadian Period he is more commonly found in association with a deity.

During the Akkadian Period the Bügelschaft is held by a bull-man in contest scenes and in scenes in which it is found in association with the sun god. It is held by a nude hero in scenes in which it is found in association with the water god and on A10 where it is found in association with a snake god. On A35 it is held by a bird-man, which is unusual as the bird-man is an adversary of the gods, not, like the bull-man and the nude hero, an attendant. In other examples it is found freestanding in the field where it usually acts as a terminal to a scene.

With regard to deities, during the Akkadian Period the Bügelschaft is especially, but not only, associated with Ea. It is also found in scenes where it is associated with the sun god, snake gods, a seated god who has a bull placing its forelegs in his lap, and perhaps a vegetation deity. When the Bügelschaft is found in association with a deity, it is always with a god, never a goddess. This reflects the fact that “the Akkadian pantheon is more androcentric than Sumerian pantheons [which] is reflected in narrative images largely centering on gods and in the preponderant number of seals featuring gods rather than goddesses” (Asher-Greve and Westenholz 2013:172).

The Bügelschaft is, as in the Uruk and Early Dynastic period, found in an architectural, and a ritual or cultic context. It is still found as a door- or gatepost of a sacred space. In the worship/adoration and presentation scenes where the standard is held by a nude hero it may symbolise the shrine of the deity. It is also depicted in a judicial context on A28, A29 and A35 in scenes in which the bird-man is brought before Ea for judgement, although the Bügelschaft itself cannot be termed a judicial standard.
5.3 **KNOBBED POLE**

During the Early Dynastic Period the knobbed pole was found in both “realistic” and “mythological” settings — it was associated with architecture and ritual scenes, and with contest scenes. There are fewer depictions of the knobbed pole from the Akkadian Period than there are from the Early Dynastic Period, and the use of this standard and the context in which it is found appear to be more consistent\(^{367}\). The knobbed pole is found on A54 and A55, and possibly on A56.

On A54 a god with rays emerging from his shoulders stands in a posture of ascent, resting his foot on a stylised mountain (Boehmer 1965:75) or a multi-staged podium (Braun-Holzinger 1993:128) which is surmounted by a horn which appears to be that of a bezoar goat (Boehmer 1965:75) which curves towards the god. This horn is unusual, but it is not unique; it is also found on Boehmer (1965:Taf. XXXI.376) where it surmounts a mountain, identifiable as such by the usual scalloping pattern, upon which a god with rays emerging from his shoulders rests his foot\(^{368}\). This suggests that it is also a mountain upon which the horn is surmounted on A54. A crescent is found in the field between the god and the horn. The god has rays emerging from his shoulders and holds a mace at his side. Braun-Holzinger (1993:129) identifies this god as the moon god. A second figure stands holding a gate. A similar scene is depicted on Buchanan (1966:Plate 28.348) and on Collon (1982:Plate XXIV.170) in which a god in a posture of ascent with rays emerging from his shoulders stands next to a figure who holds a gate. On A55, A65, A66 and A67 a god rises between two mountains which are situated between two gates which are each held by a figure\(^{369}\), and by comparison to these scenes, the god on A54 can also be identified as the sun god rather than the moon god. Behind the figure which holds the gate is a second figure who holds what is described by Boehmer (1965:75) as “eine gewaltige Keule”\(^{370}\), and by Braun-Holzinger (1993:128) as a “Knauf bekrönter Standarte”\(^{371}\). Williams (1928:241) describes it as a “tasseled lance”, but what he identifies as a tassel is actually the left arm of the figure who holds the standard.

---

\(^{367}\) Although this may be a consequence of the rarity of depictions.

\(^{368}\) Although here the horn curves away from the god with rays emerging from his shoulders.

\(^{369}\) See also Boehmer (1965: Taf. XXXIII-XXXVI) for more examples of this grouping.

\(^{370}\) “A huge club/mace”.

\(^{371}\) “A standard surmounted by a knob”.
On A55 a “mass d’armes sur hampe”\(^{372}\) (Parrot 1948:139) is located behind the sun god between the door- or gateways. The standards on A54 and A55 may be similar to those depicted on ED48\(^{373}\) in that they may represent huge maces which were used as standards. On ED48 the knobbed poles served to represent the door- or gateway to a sacred building. Those on A54 and A55 cannot be symbolic of a door- or gateway as a gateway is depicted in the scene. It is possible, however, that these knobbed poles are meant to be understood to be within a sacred building, and therefore to be representative of this structure.

On A56 is a battle between two male figures whom Collon (1982:72) identifies as gods. The first god pulls the second by the beard and steps on his leg. A female figure faces the battle and raises her hand to her forehead. Behind the first god is a figure in a short skirt and a flat cap who holds a curved club and what Woolley (1934:362) calls a lance, and what Collon (1982:72) calls a “spear or a standard”. Woolley (1934:362) identifies the conquering god as Šamaš, the female figure as Ištar and the figure carrying the standard as “a servant of Shamash”, but there are no attributes with which to identify these figures. The shaft of the object held by the fourth figure is surmounted by a triangle, and the identification of a lance or spear is therefore possible, as on the Early Dynastic ED52. However, the standard-bearers on A74\(^{374}\) hold a weapon, in this case an axe, in one hand and a standard in the other, and accompany the figure of Naram-Sin who is involved in combat. By comparison, it is suggested that the figure on A56 who accompanies the battling god also holds a weapon, in this case a curved club, in one hand, and a standard in the other. The standard on A56, however, unlike those on A74 cannot be described as a battle standard because it is associated with the god, and it is not meant to lead troops, as is the function of a battle standard.

During the Akkadian Period the knobbed pole is found in association with the sun god on A54 and A55. Although Woolley (1934:362) identifies a god on A56 as Šamaš, there are no attributes to identify the god as the sun god. The knobbed pole is held by figures who may represent gods on A54 and A56, and in A55 it is found in the field. On A54 and A55 the knobbed pole is found in association with door- or gateways, and may be symbolic of the sacred space within these door- or gateways, but, unlike during the Early Dynastic Period, the knobbed pole does not represent the architecture itself.

---

\(^{372}\) “Mace on a pole”.

\(^{373}\) Discussed in 4.3.

\(^{374}\) See 5.8.
5.4 CRESCENT STANDARD

Whereas the contest scene was the context in which the crescent standard was most commonly found during the Early Dynastic Period, during the Akkadian Period it is found in this context only twice — on A8 and A57. The contest scene depicted on A57 represents an animal contest scene in which two lions and a leopard attack two antelopes. A small crescent standard is found in the field. A8\(^{375}\) contains three groupings of mythological figures involved in a contest scene; a nude hero fights a human-headed bull, a hero with cap fights a lion, and a bull-man fights a lion. A small clothed figure with hair bound in a chignon stands to a side. In the field amongst the fighting figures are a crescent standard, a star standard, a star-spade and a Bügelschaft.

During this period the crescent standard is more commonly found in association with deities. On A58, A59 and A60 the crescent standard is held by a god in a posture of ascent, and on A61 and A62 it is found in association with a seated deity.

On A58 an en face goddess with weapons emerging from her shoulders\(^ {376}\) holds a mace in her right hand and places her left hand on a male figure’s shoulder. A god stands in front of the human figure and all three face a god who places one foot on a mountain and holds a mace in his left hand and holds a crescent standard in his right. Behind this god stands another god who holds a mace. Braun-Holzinger (1993:123) identifies the goddess as a war goddess, while Colbow (1991) identifies this goddess and goddesses with similar iconography as representations of the “kriegerische Istar”\(^ {377}\). Braun-Holzinger (1993:123) further identifies the male figure as a captive who is portrayed “deutlich als göttliches oder zumindest dämonisches Wesen”\(^ {378}\). This male figure, however, has his hair bound in a chignon and does not wear the divine headdress, and is therefore human. This scene may represent a presentation scene in which the war goddess leads the worshipper towards the god who holds the crescent standard. Collon (1982:84) suggests this god to be the sun god, but Braun-Holzinger (1993:123) identifies him as the moon god because of the crescent standard, and Boehmer (1983-84:128) identifies him as the moon god Sîn by comparison to A59.

---

\(^{375}\) A8 is also discussed in 5.2.2.1 and 5.5.

\(^{376}\) See also the Early Dynastic Vulture Stele ED66 for a goddess with weapons emerging from her shoulders. ED66 is discussed in 4.5.

\(^{377}\) “The martial Istar”. See Colbow (1991) for a full discussion on the iconography of Istar in her martial aspect. See also Cornelius (2009) for the iconography of Istar as a warrior goddess.

\(^{378}\) “Clearly as a divine or at least a demonic being”. In this case, “demonic” meaning “supernatural”. 
Two groupings are found on A59. In the first grouping, two gods battle with each other. Next to this grouping is a god in a posture of ascent who holds a weapon in his left hand and a standard in his right. Legrain (1951:21) incorrectly identifies this god as placing his foot on a crouching bull and as holding a standard which has a caduceus as an emblem. The standard held by the god is mounted on animal hooves, and may therefore be related to the Akkadian pennant standards and the Early Dynastic crescent standards ED64 and ED65379, and it is these hooves which Legrain appears to misidentify as a crouching bull. The emblem of the standard is a crescent (Collon 1993-1997:372), but, as Braun-Holzinger (1993:122) notes, it is unusual in that the ends of the crescent are bent down, in contrast to other depictions of the crescent. Legrain (1951:21) identifies the god holding the standard as a sun god. Boehmer (1965:73) also identifies the god as the sun god Šamaš, but later (1965:76, 130) appears to favour an identification of the moon god Nanna, particularly because this god does not have rays emerging from his shoulders. Another figure faces this god and raises one hand, perhaps towards the standard. The two groupings are separated by a large quiver (Legrain 1951:21) or a stylized depiction of a plough (Braun-Holzinger 1993:122).

Similarly to A59, two groupings, one of which consists of battling deities, are found on A60. The two deities involved in the conflict on A59 are both gods, whereas on A60 a war god and a war goddess, whom Boehmer (1965:58) identifies as Ištar, fight an enemy. Next to this grouping a god places his right foot on a mountain and holds a weapon in his left hand and a standard in his right. Legrain (1925:187) identifies the emblem of this standard as a “colossal caduceus, a club with two curved blades terminating in lions’ heads on either side of the round head”, and identifies the god as Ninurta. However, Braun-Holzinger (1993:123) identifies the emblem as a “halben (?) Sichel” 380, and argues that the figure represents the moon god (1993:127). Another figure stands facing the god in the posture of ascent, but because of the damage to the impression, it is unclear whether this figure is a god or a human.

In each case, the god holding the standard on A58, A59 and A60 does not carry the saw of Šamaš, but a club or mace, and appears to represent the moon god. An identification of this god with the sun god is also possible, but less likely.

379 See 5.6 and 4.2.2 for more on these standards respectively.
380 “a half (?) crescent”.
Whereas on A58, A59 and A60 the crescent standard is found in association with a god in a posture of ascent, on A61 and A62 it is found in association with a seated deity. On A61 the crescent standard is found in front of the seated figure, while on A62 the figure holds the standard. On A61 the crescent standard is found before a seated god who has rays emerging from his shoulders and who holds a saw, which identify him as the sun god. On either side of him stands an attendant, and facing him is a figure whom Buchanan (1966:66) suggests to be a “seated worshipper.” On A62 three deities approach a seated goddess who holds a crescent standard. Frankfort (1955:45) describes this goddess as “anonymous”, but it is possible that the crescent standard identifies her as the wife of the moon god. Asher-Greve and Westenholz (2013:173-174) identify a goddess seated below a crescent on a seal dating to the end of the Akkadian Period or beginning of the Neo-Sumerian Period as Ningal, the wife of Nanna. The goddess on A62 holds the crescent standard and the standard is therefore directly and explicitly associated with her. This goddess is therefore even more likely to represent a goddess associated with the moon, or the moon god, than the goddess on the cylinder seal described by Asher-Greve and Westenholz. It must be noted, however, that the crescent standard would identify her through her relationship with the moon god, and the standard in this case is still associated with and symbolic of the moon god.

Therefore, during the Akkadian Period the crescent standard is found in two contexts — in association with contest scenes where it is found in the field, and in association with deities. When it is found in association with deities, it is held by a god in a posture of ascent who most likely represents the moon god and by a seated goddess who may be the moon god’s consort. On A61 the crescent standard is found in the field before a seated god who may be identified as the sun god. The crescent emblems surmounting the standards on A59 and A60 are also unusual as the crescent on A59 has ends which bend down, and that on A60 appears to depict only half a crescent.

381 The shaft of A62, as well as those of the Neo-Sumerian crescent standards depicted on NS8, NS11, NS12, NS13 and NS18 appear short and these standards may rather represent sceptres. They are understood in this study to be standards because crescent sceptres are unknown, and because in each of these examples the crescent standard is held by a steady figure, and the shortness of the shaft is most likely due to limitations in space.
382 See Asher-Greve and Westenholz (2013:174 n.727) for the dating of this seal.
383 Although it should be noted that the crescent was commonly found in the field on Akkadian cylinder seals and was found in association with figures who were not deities and can therefore not always act as an identifying symbol or attribute. See for example 5.2.5.
5.5 STAR STANDARD
During the Akkadian Period the Star Standard is found in association with contest scenes and a banquet scene, and possibly in association with the sun god.

On **A8** and **A63** are depictions of contest scenes in which both animals and mythical beings participate. A star standard acts as a terminal to both scenes. A nude hero, a bull-man, a lion, a bull and three human-headed bulls participate in the contest scene depicted on **A63**. Three groupings of contestants — a nude hero and a human-headed bull, a hero with a cap and a lion, and a bull-man and a lion — are depicted on **A8**. In the field are a Bügelschaft, a crescent standard, a star standard and a star-spade. The inclusion of both the star standard and the star-spade on this cylinder seal indicates that the two were understood to represent separate symbols.

**A64** depicts two seated figures drinking through straws from a vessel which is placed between them. A crescent is found above the vessel in the field. Behind the seated figures and acting as a terminal is what Hammade (1987:20) identifies as “a star above a cross”, but which may represent a star standard with a crossbar decoration. Boehmer (1965:116) identifies the scene amongst “Trinkszenen mit nicht identifizierten Gottheiten”, although the figures have no divine indicators, and may therefore represent humans.

On **A65**, **A66** and **A67** the sun god is depicted between mountains, identifiable as such by their scalloped pattern, which in turn are between two doors or gates which are held by attendants. The scene represents the sunrise, in which the sun god rises from between two mountains as attendants open the gates of heaven for him, and is known only from the Akkadian Period (Kurmangaliev 2009-2011:617; van Buren 1945:180). A star standard acts as a terminal in each of these scenes. Keel-Leu and Teissier (2004:62) describe the standard on **A66** as an “[u]nvollständiges Sonnenzeichen”, but it may rather represent a star standard. However, **A65**, **A66** and **A67** appear the same as a series of seals with the same subject matter, but with the star-spade acting as the terminal instead of the star.

---

384 **A8** is also discussed in 5.2.2.1 and 5.4.
385 “Drinking scene with unidentified deities”.
386 For more on this motif, see Rohn (2011:86), Ziffer (2014:60) and Kurmangaliev (2009-2011:617). For the use of the motif in texts, see Heimpel (1986).
387 “Incomplete star sign” (ie star-spade).
standard, and it is therefore possible that these star standards do represent simplified star-spades. This identification may be supported by the fact that they are found in association with the sun god, and the star-spade or sun sign was the cuneiform sign representing this god’s name.

---

388 See, for example, Boehmer (1965: Taf XXXVIII.392, Taf XXXVII.394, Taf XXXVIII.395, Taf XXXVIII.399, and Taf XXXIV.402).
5.6 PENNANT STANDARD

A standard which is mounted on animal hooves and which has “an unidentifiable object resembling a sandal” (Collon 1993-1997:372) as an emblem appears on A68, A69 and A70. McMahon (2006:122-123) argues for the identification of the emblem as a sandal or pair of sandals, while Colbow (1997:21) and Braun-Holzinger (1993:124) describe it as a pennant, and van Buren (1945:184) describes the entire standard as a “standard with [a] pennant”. Other standards, for example the standards depicted on A74, A71 and A72, were decorated with fabric, and it is more likely then that those on A68, A69 and A70 are related to these and are also decorated with a fabric pennant, rather than that they have sandals hanging from them. On A68 and A70 the shaft of the standard is surmounted by a ball/knob and the pennant is attached to the shaft just below the ball/knob, while on A69 the pennant is attached to the top of the shaft. Collon (1993-1997:372) suggests that, although only two hooves are visible, the base of the pennant standard was a tripod. The animal hooves upon which these pennant standards are mounted recall those of the Early Dynastic crescent standards on ED64 and ED65, as well as the Akkadian crescent standard A59. Braun-Holzinger (1993:124-126) identifies the god with the pennant standard as the moon god, and the tripod with animal hoofs may therefore be especially associated with this god. According to Woolley (1934:350), the pennant standard “flies the colours of the god and marks the approach of the shrine”, and it would therefore function in a similar manner to the Bügelschaft.

On A68 a human figure, a god standing on a lion-griffon, and a god standing between two mountains next to the pennant standard approach a seated god. The god on the lion-griffon can be identified as the storm god (Braun-Holzinger 1993:125; Colbow 1997:21 n. 12) and the god next to the pennant standard can be identified as the moon god by the crescent which surmounts his horned headdress. McMahon (2006:122) argues that the mountains between which the moon god stands were meant to be associated with the seated deity, and that, because these were typically associated with the sun god, the seated god must represent the sun god Šamas. Colbow (1997:21) notes that it is unusual for the storm god and moon god to be depicted as adorants of another god, “and therefore... rendered in an inferior position.”

389 For A74, see 5.8, and for A71 and A72, see 5.7.
390 For ED64 and ED65, see 4.4.2, and for A59, see 5.4.
391 For more on the lion-griffon, see Green (1993-1997:258) and Collon (1986:44-45). See also Green (2003:27-33) for the relationship between the storm god and the lion-griffon, which Green refers to as a leonine dragon. See also 5.8 for the lion-griffon.
392 Although McMahon (2006:122) also suggests that the seated deity may represent the god Enlil.
It may be instead that the storm god and moon god are visiting the seated deity, similar to the scene on A27.

A69 is the seal of “Ur-SI, porter and servant of Enmenanna” (Woolley 1934:550), a daughter of Naram-Sin and an En Priestess of the moon god in Ur (Boehmer 1965:180). A seated god is approached by three deities, the second of which holds a branch of vegetation and the third of which holds a plough. Because of the presence of the branch of vegetation and the plough, Woolley (1934:350) describes the seated god as “a god of vegetation”, but, because the owner of the cylinder seal was a servant of an En Priestess of the moon god, the seated god more likely represents the moon god. Woolley further misidentifies the deity closest to the seated god and the deity carrying the plough as Enmenanna and Ur-Si respectively, but their horned headdresses identify them as deities. The figures in procession who hold the branch of vegetation and the plough are more likely to represent vegetation deities (Asher-Greve and Westenholz 2013:174, 177).

On A70 the sun god with rays rises from between two mountains. On either side of the sun god is a nude god who holds a mace towards the sun god. Next to this grouping, a god places one foot either on an animal (Buchanan 1081:170) or on a mountain (Braun-Holzinger 1993:125) and holds a pennant standard. If the seated god on A68 does represent the sun god, it is interesting to note that the association of the moon god with pennant standard and the sun god appears on two of the three cylinder seals on which the pennant standard is depicted. This may point to a special connection in this grouping, although the link may also be merely coincidental. More examples would be needed in order to determine whether the association is coincidental or not, and unfortunately none are known.

Although no similar standard is known from the Neo-Sumerian Period, impressions of an Isin-Larsa or Old Babylonian cylinder seal from Nippur depicts a seated figure who wears a cap and is approached by a clean shaven and bald human figure and a goddess. Behind the seated figure is a pennant standard [Fig. 5.4]. This suggests that, despite no known depiction of the pennant standard from the period in between, there was continuation in its depiction and, one may therefore surmise, in its use.

393 See 5.2.3.1.
394 Contra Colbow (1997:21) who states that “the god never really takes the pennant standard in his hand.”
395 See McCown and Haines (1967:Pl. 119.11-13, 17) for the seal.
Fig. 5.4: Reconstruction of a seal from the Isin-Larsa or Old Babylonian Period with a pennant standard (McMahon 2006:122 Fig. 12)
5.7 TASSELED STANDARD

On A71 and A72 a tasselled standard is found in association with a scene in which gods attack a large bird which is carved vertically on the seals. These two standards look different to each other — on A71 short tassels hang from a plinth surmounting the shaft of the standard, similar to the standards depicted on the Neo-Sumerian Gudea stelea NS61-NS63 and NS83-NS86, and on A72 the standard has one long tassel, similar to those on the Naram-Sin Victory Stele A74  — but their inclusion in such similar scenes suggests that they represent the same standard. These standards are unusual in that they have a material element, but are not surmounted by an emblem.

On A71 a god holding a tasselled standard stands behind and facing a large bird. In front of and facing the large bird is a god who shoots with a bow and arrow at the bird while holding a mace in his other hand. He raises his leg and rests his foot on what Buchanan (1966:63) suggests is a hill or mountain with streams running down its sides. Van Buren (1933:25), however, points out that hills and mountains are usually depicted by a scalloping pattern, and that the object upon which the god rests his foot appears “more like a shelter of boughs with branches or roots within it.” Behind this god is a procession of four deities — a god with rays emerging from his shoulders, a god with lines extending from his garment, a god with a battle axe and a god who holds an overflowing vase.

Frankfort (1939a:135) identifies the god with the bow and arrow as Ninurta while van Buren (1933:26) identifies him as Marduk. The god is rather simply and cautiously identified as a “[k]riegerischer Gott” by Boehmer (1965:70). Van Buren (1933:26; 1934:71) identifies the first god in the procession as Gibil, although the rays emerging from this god’s shoulders can identify him as the sun god Šamaš. The lines which extend from the garment of the second god in the procession have been identified as ears of corn (van Buren 1933:26; 1934:71) or grain (Buchanan 1966:63), and van Buren (1934:71) therefore identifies this god as Dumuzi-ab-zu. If the lines emerging from the garment of this god do represent vegetation,

---

396 Although the standards on NS61-NS63, NS83-NS86 and A74 are surmounted by emblems and those on A71 and A72 are not. NS61-NS63 and NS83-NS86 are discussed below in 6.8.1 and 6.9.5.2 and A74 is discussed in 5.8.

397 For problems with these identifications, see below.

398 “War-like god”.

399 For more on Gibil, see 6.4.1.
the god may be a vegetation deity\textsuperscript{400}. However, these lines may instead represent rays, and the god would therefore be “ein zweiter Strahlengott”\textsuperscript{401} (Boehmer 1965:54). There are problems with both the identification of the lines emerging from the garment of this figure as vegetation and as rays. Two gods with rays emerging from their bodies are found together on Akkadian cylinder seals, as for example on \textbf{A27} and \textbf{A42}, and on Fig. 5.5\textsuperscript{402}. However, these rays always emerge from the shoulders of both deities. Vegetation is shown emerging from the garments covering the lower bodies of gods on Fig. 5.6\textsuperscript{403}, but in these cases the vegetation is clearly identifiable as such by the inclusion of leaves, which is absent on the lines emanating from the garment of the figure on \textbf{A71}. The lines on the figure on \textbf{A71} could therefore be either rays or vegetation, but with the rays being unusually placed on the lower body, or with the leaves of the vegetation being omitted, in both cases due to space limitations. If rays are depicted, perhaps van Buren’s suggestion of the god Gibil could apply to this god rather than to the first god in the procession. Van Buren (1933:26; 1934:71) identifies the third figure as Ningišzida, but this identification is based on the erroneous identification of the battle axe as serpents emerging from this god’s shoulders. This god can rather be identified as “ein Kriegsgott”\textsuperscript{404} (Boehmer 1965:54). The overflowing vase which the final god in the procession holds identifies this god as Ea.

---

\textsuperscript{400} Curiously, Frankfort (1939a:115) appears to describe Ninurta as both “the destroyer of Zu”, and therefore the god with the bow and arrow, and as having “plants which sprout from his body”, which suggests that he also identifies the vegetation deity as Ninurta.

\textsuperscript{401} “A second god with rays”.

\textsuperscript{402} See also Boehmer (1965:Taf.XXXIX.339 and 340) for two gods with rays emerging from their bodies.

\textsuperscript{403} See also Boehmer (1965: Taf.XLV.532) for a god with vegetation emerging from the clothing of the lower body.

\textsuperscript{404} “A war god”.

---

Fig. 5.5: Seal with two gods with rays emerging from their bodies (Boehmer 1965: Taf. XXXVIII.461)
On A72 two gods attack a large bird while a third god holds a tasselled standard. These gods have no associated attributes which enable their identification as specific deities. A similar scene to that on A72 in which two gods attack the bird of prey is depicted on A73. Accompanying this grouping is a third god who holds what both Collon (1982:77) and Ward (1910:47) call a “staff”. By comparison to A71 and A72, the object which the attendant god holds may actually represent a standard, with a small nearly horizontal line which surmounts it representing a tassel.

The scene depicted on A72 and A73 may represent an abbreviated version of the more complex scene depicted on A71, although the fact that one god attacks the bird with a bow and arrow on A71 and two gods battle with the bird on A72 and A73 suggests that both scenes may represent two different aspects of the same scene or episode. The inclusion of the bird in these and similar scenes suggests that the scenes are all related, even if their exact appearance and components differ. A star-spade acts as a terminal to the scene on A73. Because the star-spade was a symbol of the sun god, this scene may be associated with the sun god. This would further link A73 to A71 on which the sun god is depicted. The sun god is also witness to the fight with the bird on Boehmer (1965:Taf. XLI.481 and possibly Taf XXVIII.335), and this episode may therefore be especially associated with the sun god.

---

405 See for example Boehmer (1965: Taf. XXVII.323, Taf. XXVIII.334, 335, 336, and Taf. XLI.481) for similar scenes.
406 See 5.2.2.1.
407 This cylinder seal is similar to A72 and A73 in that it depicts two gods battling with a large bird. A third god stands to the side in a posture of ascent, and a tree acts as a terminal to the scene. The seal is worn, making the identification of the third god difficult, although the posture of ascent suggests the figure may be the sun god.
The bird itself has been described as a “gigantic bird with great, outspread wings” (van Buren 1933:25), a “gewaltigen Adlers”408 (Boehmer 1965:54), a “bird of prey” (Buchanan 1966:63; van Buren 1933:26), an eagle (van Buren 1939:83; Ward 1910:47) and a spread eagle (Collon 1982:77). The bird has also been identified as Anzu409 (Frankfort 1939a:115, 172; 1955:43, van Buren 1939:83; Collon 2005a:178), and although Anzu was more generally depicted as a lion-headed eagle, it was not always represented in this way410, and according to Collon (2005a:178) it was sometimes “depicted as a bird or bird-man”411. Furthermore, a cylinder seal from Tell Asmar depicts a similar scene to that on A71, A72 and A73, except that two gods fight a lion-headed eagle, or Anzu, rather than a large bird [Fig. 5.7]. This suggests that in at least some cases the large bird on similar scenes was meant to be understood as Anzu, although the cylinder seal from Tell Asmar is the only known example where this is explicitly the case. Van Buren (1933:26) identifies the scene on A71, A72 and A73 as “the contest between Marduk and the god Zû, here represented in the form of a bird of prey”. Marduk was named as the “smiter of the skull of Anzû” (Livingstone 1989:7) in Ashurbanipal’s *Acrostic Hymn to Marduk and Zarpanitu*412, and van Buren’s identification therefore appears to be anachronistic. In the *Anzu Myth*413, Ninurta fights against Anzu with a bow and arrow, which supports the identification of the god attacking the large bird on A71 as Ninurta if the identification of the bird with Anzu is correct. A71, A72, A73 and the related cylinder seals, however, are not mentioned in either Fuhr-Jaepelt’s (1972) monograph on the iconography of Imdugud/Anzu or in Collon’s (2006) discussion on the iconography of Ninurta. The reason for this may be that it in these and related scenes it is usually two deities which battle with the large bird, and it is therefore problematic to connect the scene with the contest between Ninurta and Anzu, as Ninurta fought Anzu by himself. Furthermore, as Ornan (2010:242) points out, the *Anzu Myth* is “attested in writing no earlier than the Old Babylonian period”. This makes the identification of the scene on A71, A72, A73 and related seals difficult, because the myth is not known from the time of production of these seals. However, there may have been an oral tradition of the *Anzu Myth* or of a similar myth during the Akkadian Period, and it may be this Akkadian version which is depicted on A71, A72 and A73. It is therefore uncertain exactly which myth the scenes depicted on A71,

408 “A mighty or huge eagle”.
409 See 4.2.1, 4.5 and 6.10 for more on Imdugud/Anzu.
410 See above 4.2.1.
411 Although see 5.2.3.1 for problems with identifying the bird-man with Anzu.
412 For a transliteration and translation of this hymn, see Livingstone (1989:6-10 SAA 03 002).
413 See Annus (2001) for the Old Babylonian Version of this myth, dating to the early second millennium BCE and therefore the closest textual reference in time to A71.
A72 and A73 and the related cylinder seals represent. It does, however, appear that the tasselled standard was related specifically to the battle with the large bird as it does not appear associated with any other scene.

Fig. 5.7: Scene in which two gods fight Anzu (Ornan 2010:417 Fig. 15 detail)
5.8 ROD WITH BALLS AND LION-GRIFFON STANDARDS

There are two standards on the Victory Stele of Naram-Sin A74 [Fig. 5.8], a monument which illustrates Naram-Sin’s victory over the Lullubi. Following Naram-Sin are three male figures identifiable as soldiers by their dress. One of these figures carries a spear, and two carry standards. Winter (2010c:138) identifies these figures as the “elite guard accompanied by a probable officer”, with the “elite guard” being the standard bearers and the “probable officer” the figure who carries the spear.

Fig. 5.8: Winter’s reconstruction of the A74 with one lower register added (Winter 2010c:148 Fig. 9)

---

For a full discussion on A74, see Bänder (1995).
In the second register of soldiers below Naram-Sin, Börker-Klähn (1982:Abb 26k) reconstructs the figure below the two standard bearers in the upper register as holding a third standard with the emblem of an eagle with outstretched wings [Fig. 5.9]. Bänder (1995:229) suggests that this standard is similar to the standards on the Vulture Stele ED66 and the Gudea stele NS83, NS84 and NS85\textsuperscript{415}. In Börker-Klähn’s reconstruction, this suggested third standard is different from the two standards in the upper register in that it has a shorter shaft and it is not decorated with tassels. Furthermore, the area in which the emblem would appear is damaged\textsuperscript{416}, making the reconstruction and identification of any emblem here difficult, if not impossible. In Bänder’s reconstruction of this standard [Fig. 5.10], it looks like a spear. Because other soldiers on A74 carry spears with shorter shafts and no tassels, it is more likely that the shaft which Börker-Klähn reconstructs as a standard is actually that of a spear.

\textsuperscript{415} Bänder (1995:229) only mentions NS83 and NS85, but the same standard is represented on NS84, and NS84 has been included here for this reason. It is unclear why it was omitted from Bänder’s analysis.

\textsuperscript{416} A point conceded by Bänder (1995:229), “[d]er lange Schaft ist erhalten, ihre Form jedoch kaum noch zu erkennen. Die Relieffläche ist an dieser Stelle zerstört” (“the long shaft is normal, but its shape is barely recognizable. The relief surface is destroyed at this point”).

Fig. 5.9: Börker-Klähn’s reconstruction of a third standard on A74 (Börker-Klähn 1982: Nr. 26k detail)
Mayer-Opificius (2006:215) identifies the standards as *Feldzeichen*, or battle standards, which represent “symbols of the squadrons taking part to the battle” (Nigro 1998a:219). The standards on A74 are the first true battle standards in Mesopotamian iconography. Although the standard on Eannatum’s Vulture Stele ED66417 is on a monument recording a battle, the standard is not associated with the human conflict, but with the action of the deities. The larger god holds enemies in a net and smashes the head of one enemy with a mace, so the standard is found in association with violence, and with the aftermath of some conflict, but this does not associate it directly with the battle. The standard on ED66 can therefore more accurately be described as being associated with the deities, rather than being a battle standard. Similarly, on A56418 the standard, although associated with a battle of the gods, is associated with one of the gods involved in the battle, and it does not function as a battle standard to mark a squadron or rally troops.

As de Morgan, Jéquier and Lampre (1900:151) point out, the standards reveal “dans les armées de Naram-Sin une organisation méthodique"419 which appears to be absent in earlier depictions of battles, such as those on ED66 and ED70420. This difference in the representations of combat may reflect a difference in the actual organization of combat itself.

---

417 Discussed in detail in 4.5.
418 See 5.3.
419 “a methodical organization within the armies of Naram-Sin”.
420 See 4.5 and 4.7 for more on these pieces.
during the Akkadian Period as compared to that of the Early Dynastic Period. The fact that the standards on A74 represent the first true battle standards in Mesopotamian iconography may be because these standards represent the first battle standards in actuality. During the Early Dynastic Period the conflicts were between city-states, but during the Akkadian Period it was the army of the Akkadian Empire, made up of different city-states, which was involved in battle. If the battle standards are representative of different squadrons, and if the squadrons came from different cities, this may reflect the organization of not only Naram-Sin’s army, but also of the Akkadian Empire. The reason that there are no battle standards in earlier iconography is because the Early Dynastic armies were not comprised of squadrons from different places which needed to be differentiated and led with the use of battle standards.

On ED66 and on a fragment of an Akkadian victory stele, probably from the reign of Sargon (Louvre Sb 2)\(^{421}\), the enemies are held in a net, while on a fragment of a stele from the reign of Sargon (Louvre Sb 3)\(^{422}\) and a fragment of a stele from the vicinity of Nasiriyah (Iraq Museum IM 55639)\(^{423}\), the enemies are bound. In these examples, the scenes depicted occur after the battle when the victory has already been achieved. Conversely, the scene on A74 represents the moment of the victory, and the action is ongoing. Winter (2010c:133) describes the Akkadian soldiers as moving “through time, into battle against the Lullubi”. The Akkadian army is in the process of victory. A wounded enemy soldier falls to the ground in front of Naram-Sin, grasping an arrow which has pierced his neck\(^{424}\). Further to the right, other enemy soldiers beg for mercy, but they have yet to be subjugated — they are not yet restrained as in the aforementioned representations. The standards on A74 are therefore directly and explicitly associated with the battle, and must represent battle standards.

Two standards are depicted on A74, and both are unique in Akkadian Period iconography. The first standard takes the form of long handled weapon with a narrow blade\(^{425}\) which is surmounted by a plinth upon which is a figure who holds a long object. Bänder (1995:229)

---

\(^{421}\) See Amiet (1976:76-77 No. 61a-d) for images of this stele fragment.

\(^{422}\) See Amiet (1976:75 No. 5) for an image of this stele fragment.

\(^{423}\) See Strommenger (1962: Pl. 118) for an image of the stele fragment.

\(^{424}\) This weapon has been described as both a spear (e.g. Bahrani 2008:110) and an arrow (e.g. Nigro 1998a:290). By comparison to the arrow held in Naram-Sin’s hand and to the spears held by the Akkadian soldiers, it is more likely an arrow.

\(^{425}\) Amiet (1976:31) describes this weapon as “une longue hache-hallebarde”, a long spear-axe, but it may rather represent a narrow-bladed piercing axe.
describes this figure as “ein geflügeltes Mischwesen” and Mayer-Opificius (2006:214-215) identifies it as a scorpion-man.

The scorpion-man is found most commonly in the iconography of the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian periods (Black and Green 1992:161), but its earliest attestation is during the Early Dynastic Period where it is depicted on cylinder seals and on the front panel of the Great Lyre from the Early Dynastic Royal Tombs at Ur (University of Pennsylvania B17694). During the Akkadian Period, the scorpion-man is depicted on a cylinder seal now housed in the Louvre (AO 25305) which depicts two battles — the first in which the sun god and a second deity battle with a vegetation god, and the second in which the scorpion-man fights in a duel with swords against a god. This scorpion-man has rays emanating from its body, which suggests an association with the sun god, an association which is more explicit in the Neo-Assyrian Period when scorpion-men are depicted supporting a winged solar disc, as, for example on a carnelian cylinder seal now in the British Museum (BM 102966). This link between the scorpion-man and the sun god may associate the standard on A74 with the sun god. However, the scorpion-men on the artefacts from the Early Dynastic and Akkadian period do not have wings, as the figure on the standard on A74 does. Wings therefore appear to be a later addition to the iconography of the scorpion-man, and the figure on the standard on A74 cannot represent a scorpion-man.

426 “a winged Mischwesen/hybrid creature”
427 Green (1993-1997:250) differentiates between the Early Dynastic scorpion-men which are depicted with the bodies of scorpions and the heads and limbs of humans, and the later representations in which the scorpion-man has the upper body of a human, and the lower body of a bird with a scorpion tail, and understands them to be two separate figures. Seidl (1989:170) regards them as representing the same figure.
428 See von der Osten (1934:Plate VI.47); Amiet (1980a: Pl. 95.1245C, Pl. 107.1427), and Teissier (1984:125 Fig. 335).
430 See also Amiet (1980b:59 Fig. II-20).
Amiet (1976:31) identifies the figure surmounting the standard as a winged lion holding a weapon. This creature can be identified as the lion-griffon. Collon (2006:101) identifies the lion-griffon as the “classic version of the Anzu-bird”, and dates this identification to the third millennium BCE, whereas according to Wiggermann (1992:185) the lion-griffon only came to represent Anzu after the Neo-Sumerian Period. Imdugud/Anzu is more commonly identified as the lion-headed eagle. That the lion-griffon and the lion-headed eagle were originally understood as two, separate figures is evidenced by an Early Dynastic engraved shell plaque from Tello which is now in the Louvre (AO 328) (Parrot 1948:114; 113 Fig. 27.m) [Fig. 5.12] upon which both the lion-headed eagle and the lion-griffon are represented on two registers which are separated by a band with two stylized eyes. Fuhr-Jaepelt (1972:81) describes the association of these motifs as “rätselhaft”. The lion-griffon was the mount of the storm-god, and the fact that both the lion-griffon and the lion-headed eagle were related to the storm god may explain their inclusion together on this plaque. Also, because both the lion-griffon and the lion-headed eagle were associated with the storm god, Amiet (1976:31) may be justified when he states that the lion-griffon emblem on A74 is closely related to the emblem on the standard on ED66, which he identifies as a representation of Imdugud.

432 Also known as the lion-dragon. See above 5.6 for more on the lion-griffon.
433 See 4.2.1, 4.5 and 6.10.
434 “puzzling”
435 See 5.6.
As well as on the Early Dynastic plaque from Tello, the lion-griffon was depicted on Akkadian Period cylinder seals where it is associated with the storm god\textsuperscript{436}, but in all known examples the lion-griffon is shown on all fours. It is depicted rearing on its hind legs on cylinder seals from the Neo-Sumerian Period onwards\textsuperscript{437}. On terracotta plaques dating to the Isin-Larsa or Old Babylonian Period it is found holding a staff [Fig. 5.13]\textsuperscript{438} and is therefore similar in appearance to the figure surmounting the standard on A\textsuperscript{74}. Although the lion-griffon is found on all fours in Akkadian Period iconography, by comparison to depictions of the lion-griffon in later periods, it is most likely this figure which surmounts the first standard on A\textsuperscript{74}.

\textsuperscript{436} See, for example, Boehmer (1965:Taf. XXX.362-366, Taf. XXXI.367-374).
\textsuperscript{437} For a Neo-Sumerian example, see NS\textsuperscript{46}. For Isin-Larsa and Old Babylonian Period examples, see Collon (1986:Plate V.7, 15, Plate XIII.127, 131-137).
\textsuperscript{438} See also McCown, Haines and Hansen (1967:Plate 143.2) for the plaque from Nippur now housed in the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (53-11-96) on the left of Fig. 5.13, and Barrelet (1968:LXXXI.840) for the plaque from Eshnunna now housed in the Louvre (AO12451) on the right of Fig. 5.13.
The second standard is surmounted by five balls or discs. This standard is different to the Uruk Period ringed pole in that the balls appear to be solid, there is an odd number of these balls, and the shaft of the standard is thinner\(^\text{439}\), but it is similar to the rod with balls of the Neo-Sumerian Period\(^\text{440}\). It is called the “rod with balls” (van Buren 1945:153, Collon 1986:29), the “Kugelstab”\(^\text{441}\) (Collon 1980-83:299), the “Kugelstandarte”\(^\text{442}\) (Mayer-Opificius 2006:215) or the “Kugelstabstandarte”\(^\text{443}\) (Bänder 1995:229). From the Isin-Larsa Period the shaft is shorter and it is held by a deity as a rod or sceptre, rather than as a standard. Mayer-Opificius (2006:214-215) suggests that the rod with balls may be associated with the goddess Ištar, but in later periods when the rod with balls was held as a sceptre, it was always a god which held it, and never a goddess (Black and Green 1992:155), which makes this identification unlikely. The god holding the rod with balls has been identified as the weather god (Prinz 1915:128-129) and as the sun god (Ward 1910:379, 413; Frankfort 1939a:161; Collon 1980-83:299; Bänder 1995:229 n.1030). According to Black and Green

\(^{439}\) For more on the differences between the two types of standard, see 3.3.

\(^{440}\) Discussed below 6.6.

\(^{441}\) “Ball-rod”.

\(^{442}\) “Ball standard”.

\(^{443}\) “Ball-rod standard”.

---

Fig. 5.13: Terracotta plaques from the Isin-Larsa or Old Babylonian Period with lion-griffons (left, K. Blanchard; right, R.M. van Dijk)
“an identification of Šamaš may be the more plausible suggestion, for the symbol is also occasionally associated with the bull-man.” However, on an Old Babylonian cylinder seal now housed in the British Museum (BM 89757) a god holding a ringed pole is depicted with the sun god, and on a second cylinder seal (BM 89238) the storm god rests his foot on a bull and holds a ringed pole and is depicted alongside the sun god. The sun god can therefore not be represented by every god holding a ringed pole, and the ringed pole may be representative of power or divine authority rather than being representative of a specific deity.

Unfortunately the Akkadian text inscribed on A74 is fragmentary and what remains does not mention the standards or any deities with whom the standards may be associated. Other inscriptions may throw light onto which deities are represented by the standards depicted on A74.

In two inscriptions Naram-Sin is called the “general of the god Ilaba” (Frayne 1993:96, 98), and the “leader of the troops of the city of the god Ilaba” (Frayne 1993:88), with Ilaba being identifiable as Zababa (Nigro 1998b:93), and the troops mentioned in the latter text being those of the city of Kish. It is therefore possible that Naram-Sin and his troops marched and battled by Zababa’s order and with his aid and protection. One of the standards on A74 may then be representative of or associated with this god or with the city of Kish. A Historical Fragment of Sargon from Warka mentions “the standard of the god Zababa” (Barton 1929:117), and, although no similar reference is found in any known Naram-Sin inscription, the Sargon inscription reveals that such a standard did exist.

From the Old Babylonian Period Zababa was associated with Ningirsu or Ninurta, both of whom also had martial aspects to their personalities (Black and Green 1992:155), and it is possible that Zababa shared similar iconography with Ningirsu and Ninurta already during the Akkadian Period. There is no known iconography for Zababa during the Akkadian

446 For a transliteration and an English translation of the original Akkadian inscription, see Frayne (1993:143-144 RIMEP E2.1.4.31).
447 For a transliteration and an English translation of this text, see Frayne (1993:95-99 RIMEP E2.1.4.3).
448 For a transliteration and an English translation of this text, see Frayne (1993:88-90 RIMEP E2.1.4.1).
449 For a transliteration and an English translation of this text, see Barton (1929:116-117).
Period. The symbol most commonly associated with Zababa is the vulture-headed staff\textsuperscript{450} depicted on Kassite Period \textit{kudurrus}\textsuperscript{451}, but according to Strawn (2005:193-194), the lion was also associated with this war god. The lion-griffon was related to Indugud/Anzu which was associated with Ningirsu and Ninurta, but had more leonine features. It is therefore possible that the lion-griffon on A74 was associated with Zababa.

The imperial deities of the Akkadian Empire were Zababa and Ištar, both of whom were deities associated with war. Ištar is associated with Zababa in several Naram-Sin inscriptions\textsuperscript{452}. One of these inscriptions states that “through the love which the goddess Aštar [Ištar] showed him [Naram-Sin], he was victorious in nine battles in one year” (Frayne 1993:113 RIMEP E2.1.4.10), and another states that “the goddess Aštar gave him no rival” (Frayne 1993:131 RIMEP E2.1.4.25). Ištar was therefore closely related to Naram-Sin’s victories in warfare, and she may be associated with one of the standards, perhaps with the rod with balls, as suggested by Mayer-Opificius\textsuperscript{453} (2006:215). Ištar was the patron deity of the Akkadian capital city Agade\textsuperscript{454}, and if the standard was associated with this goddess, it could also have represented this city, or the soldiers of this city.

On the other hand, one Naram-Sin inscription states that “[t]he god Enlil (is) his [Naram-Sin’s] (personal) deity (and) the god Ilaba, mighty one of the gods, is his clan (god)” (Frayne 1993:104 RIMEP E2.1.4.6), and another that Naram-Sin was the “gov(er)nor of the god Enlil”\textsuperscript{455} (Frayne 1993:96 RIMEP2.1.4.3). Naram-Sin may therefore have fought with the support of the god Enlil. Enlil was the patron deity of the city of Nippur, the religious centre of Mesopotamia. Therefore, it would have been important for Naram-Sin to claim the support of this powerful god. As with Zababa, there is no known iconography for Enlil during the Akkadian Period. On the Kassite Period \textit{kudurrus} his symbol is the horned headdress (Seidl 1989:35, 144). Although there is no known iconography for Enlil during the

\textsuperscript{450} Leick (1998:fig 10 description) identifies the sceptre as being surmounted with a vulture-headed emblem, but Black and Green (1992:187) and Seidl (1957-1971:490; 1989:74) identify this sceptre as an “eagle-headed staff” or an “Adlerstab” (“eagle staff”). It is more likely that a vulture is represented due to the vulture’s association with war and battlefields. See van Buren (1939b:84-85) for examples of this association.

\textsuperscript{451} For a full discussion on \textit{kudurrus} and the symbols found on \textit{kudurrus}, see Seidl (1989). See also Seidl (1980-1983:275-277).

\textsuperscript{452} See for example Frayne (1993:88-90 RIMEP E2.1.4.1; 90-94 RIMEP E2.1.4.2; 95-99 RIMEP E2.1.4.3; 113-115 RIMEP E2.1.4.10; 130-131 RIMEP E2.1.4.25).

\textsuperscript{453} See above.

\textsuperscript{454} For more on Ištar as the patron deity of Agade, see Asher-Greve and Westenholz (2013:62, 95, 105-108).

\textsuperscript{455} For transliterations and English translations of these texts, see Frayne (1993:104-108 RIMEP E2.1.4.6; 95-99 RIMEP E2.1.4.3).
Akkadian Period, this does not discount him from being represented by the rod with balls standard on A74. Enlil was one of the most powerful Mesopotamian deities, and could therefore have been associated with the rod with balls if the latter was symbolic of power or divine authority.\textsuperscript{456}

The matter of which deities are represented by the standards is further complicated by an inscription which states that Naram-Sin was victorious in battle due to the aid of Ištar and Enlil\textsuperscript{457} (Frayne 1993:94). If this text reflects the identities of deities with whom the standards on A74 are associated, then Ištar and Enlil are represented by the two standards, and not Zababa. However, Zababa is a better candidate to be represented by the lion-griffon standard than either Ištar or Enlil.

The identification of the deities with whom the standards on A74 may be associated remains uncertain, because the rod with balls is unique in the Akkadian Period, and the lion-griffon standard is unique in Mesopotamian iconography, and therefore no direct comparanda exist. No matter which deities — or, by extension, which cities or the armies of which cities — are represented, the standards can be seen as the divine sanctioning and support of Naram-Sin’s military expeditions and represent the first true battle standards in Mesopotamian iconography.

\textsuperscript{456} See above in this section.
\textsuperscript{457} For a transliteration and English translation of this text, see Frayne (1993:90-94 RIMEP E2.1.4.2).
5.9 UNCERTAIN

As in the Uruk Period and Early Dynastic Period, the fragmentary nature of the artefacts makes the identification of some possible standards uncertain. On A75 a seated figure is approached by a goddess who leads by the hand a clean shaven human figure. A second human figure carries a goat. Behind the seated figure a fifth figure holds a standard. The cylinder seal is badly damaged at this point, and the emblem of the standard has not survived.

A standard is represented on A75 but what type of standard is represented is uncertain. On A76-A83 it is uncertain if the objects depicted are standards.

On A76-A79 a standard may be found in association with the so-called “winged gate”, which most likely represents a temple. On A76, A77 and A78 this structure is found on the back of a bull, while according to Buchanan (1966:58) the animal upon which it is surmounted on A79 is a goat. On A76 and A77 a figure in the field holds a staff or pole. This object may have been meant to represent a standard, although no emblem is depicted. Buchanan (1966:58) suggests that a male figure behind the goat on A79 holds a staff, but this may be a rope which is fastened to the structure on the back of the goat, rather than either a staff or a standard. On A78 a seated goddess holds a rope which appears to be around the neck of the bull upon which the winged gate rests. In the field is what Moortgat (1966:104) suggests to be a “Symbolstandarte”. This object consists of a shaft which has a crossbar at its midpoint. The left side of the crossbar curves back to meet the shaft. A line joins the top of the shaft with the right hand side of the crossbar. It is uncertain what this object represents.

On A80 a seated figure is approached by a second figure. Behind the seated figure is what Buchanan (1966:67) describes as a “post”, but which may represent a standard. The cylinder seal impression is broken before the top of the shaft and it is uncertain if the shaft was surmounted by an emblem and therefore constituted a standard or if a post or a dividing line is represented. An antithetical contest scene in which two heroes battle with two human-headed bulls is depicted on A81. Next to this grouping is a nude hero who holds what appears to be a pole (Teissier 1984:128). It is possible that this pole was meant to represent a standard. On A82 three figures approach the sun god who holds his saw and rests his foot on

---


459 “Symbol standard”.
a mountain. In the field is a line which may represent a standard, although it has no emblem and may represent a pole or staff instead.

On cylinder seal A83\(^{460}\) is a contest scene with three groupings; in two of these groupings a nude hero fights a lion, and in the third two human-headed bulls fight each other. A bull-man \(^{461}\) holds a standard. This standard consists of a shaft surmounted by two horizontal lines, which in turn are surmounted by three lines which angle upwards and form a triangle. A small horizontal line intersects the top of this triangular shape. No other standard of this appearance is known. Its closest parallel in appearance is the inverted star-spade\(^{462}\) on the cylinder seal British Museum BM 123568 [Fig. 5.14]\(^{463}\), but the standard on A83 has no star, and a horizontal line is found below the “point” at the top of the standard, and it therefore does not represent a star-spade. The horizontal line may represent a plinth upon which the emblem of the standard rested, as for example on A74 and NS61-NS63 and NS83-NS86. The object held by the bull-man on A83 may rather represent a spear, although this would not explain the three lines of the triangular emblem. Additionally, there are no other depictions of the bull-man holding a spear during the Early Dynastic and early Akkadian Periods. It is therefore uncertain exactly what the object held by the bull-man on A83 is.

![Image of cylinder seal with inverted star-spade]

**Fig. 5.14: Seal with inverted star-spade (R.M. van Dijk)**

\(^{460}\) A83 is to be published with the other cylinder seals in the collection of the Iziko Museum of South Africa in Cape Town.

\(^{461}\) This bull-man is unusual in appearance because the figure wears a hat rather than having horns, and the legs end in feet rather than hooves. However, the figure can be identified as a bull-man by the tail and the build of the lower body.

\(^{462}\) For more on the star-spade, see 5.2.2.1.

\(^{463}\) See also Amiet (1980a: Pl. 84.1114) for this cylinder seal.
5.10 SUMMARY
The standards represented in Akkadian iconography are the Bügelschaft, the knobbled pole, the crescent standard, the star standard, the pennant standard, the tasselled standard, the rod with balls and a standard surmounted by a rearing lion-griffon. The Bügelschaft, knobbled pole, crescent standard and star standard are known from the Uruk Period and the Early Dynastic Period. The rod with balls is similar to the ringed pole of the Uruk Period, but these do not reflect the same standard. The pennant standard, tasselled standard, the rod with balls and the standard surmounted by a rearing lion-griffon are new to the Akkadian Period, and the tasselled standard and the standards surmounted by a rearing lion-griffon are unique to the Akkadian Period. The Bügelschaft is the most commonly depicted standard during the Akkadian Period, being represented on 53 of the 83 examples from this period.

Standards are found in a variety of contexts during the Akkadian Period. The Bügelschafts on A28, A29 and A35 are depicted in a judicial context, and are the only standards in this study to appear in such a context. As in the Uruk and Early Dynastic periods, standards are found in an architectural context. On A48 and A51 this is explicit, with Bügelschafts being attached directly to a building, while on A19, A30, A31, A32 and A36 the Bügelschafts flank the structure. Bügelschafts which are in the field of contest scenes may be representative of a sacred space, and may therefore by symbolic of a sacred structure. The crescent standard on A57 and the star standard on A63 may have also served to indicate a sacred space. The pennant standard, although not associated with a contest scene, may also have indicated “the approach of the shrine” (Woolley 1934:350).

Standards are found in more mythological contexts or settings than before. This reflects the fact that during the Akkadian Period “[t]he repertoire of subjects is richer than at any other period” (Collon 2005a:35) and that “[n]ew mythological and religious themes appear in significant numbers first and only on Akkadian seals” (Asher-Greve and Westenholz 2013:171-172). The Bügelschaft, crescent standard and star standard are found associated with contest scenes. The Bügelschaft on A51 may be related to the Etana myth. A28, A29 and A35 in which a bird-man is brought before Enki appear to reflect a mythical episode. Similarly, the scenes in which the tasselled standard appears seem to represent some specific myth which involved a battle with a large bird. Both scenes have been related to Anzu mythology, but appear rather to represent some unknown myth. A27, in which either the sun
god and moon god, or two versions of the sun god approach Enki, may also depict an unknown myth.

The Bügelschaft, knobbled pole, star standard, pennant standard and tasselled standard are depicted in scenes in which they are associated with deities. Reflecting the fact that "goddesses are rarely involved" (Asher-Greve and Westenholz 2013:184) in Akkadian iconography, only the crescent standard on A62 is held by a goddess; in all other instances in which a deity holds a standard or is associated with a standard, this deity is a god. It may be that the goddess on A62 is related to the moon god, and that the standard is primarily associated with this god.

The Bügelschaft is associated especially with the water god Enki, but also with the sun god, the god standing on the snake-dragon and other snake gods, the god into whose lap a bull places its forelegs, and a vegetation god. Because the Bügelschaft is associated with such a variety of gods, it appears that, as in the Uruk and Early Dynastic period, this standard was representative of divine power, rather than of a specific deity. When associated with a deity, the knobbled pole is primarily associated with the sun god, and the crescent standard is associated with the moon god and the sun god. The pennant standard is primarily associated with the moon god, but on two of the three examples in which it appears, A68 and A70, it is associated with both the moon god and the sun god. That the sun god is associated with four standards reflects the fact that this god was the most popular deity to be depicted on cylinder seals during the Akkadian Period (Collon 2005a:35).

The rod with balls and the standard surmounted by a rearing lion-griffon on A74 are located in a military context and reflect the first true battle standards. The standards may be associated with or symbolic of the god Zababa and perhaps Enlil or Ištar, but this identification is uncertain.

Standards are held by a variety of figures. The Bügelschaft is held most commonly by the nude hero in association with Enki, but also by the bull-man in contest scenes and in association with the sun god, and by the bird-man on A35. The knobbled pole, the crescent standard, the pennant standard and the tasselled standard are held by gods. The crescent standard is held by a goddess on A62. The rod with balls and the standard surmounted by a
rearing lion-griffon on A74 are held by human soldiers. The Bügelschaft, the crescent standard, the star standard and the pennant standard are also found freestanding in the field.
6. NEO-SUMERIAN PERIOD

6.1 INTRODUCTION
The art of the Akkadian Period is characterised by a variety of artistic themes, motifs and individually identifiable figures, with many scenes which include only deities. In comparison, the art of the Neo-Sumerian Period is relatively conservative, with few themes and motifs. As Asher-Greve and Westenholz (2013:188) state, “[a]bsent from the visual repertoire are many motifs popular in Akkadian imagery, in particular on seals, such as mythological themes and scenes only involving deities.” The art of the Neo-Sumerian Period is centred on the ruler, rather than deities. This is reflected, for example, in the stelae of Ur-Nammu and Gudea which record the achievements of these rulers. This does not, however, mean that deities are absent from Neo-Sumerian iconography. The majority of Neo-Sumerian cylinder seals represent presentation scenes — scenes in which a human figure is brought into the presence of a deity — which, during this period, become standardised and have few variations (Collon 2005a:36). While the presentation scene is a ritual scene, Evans (2003:418) argues that it is best understood within the context of human state bureaucracy, and that it “can be viewed as a type of official propaganda” and that “the king’s assumption of the seated position — the one assumed by deities — both asserts his own authority and expresses a dynamic integration of the human and divine that is reflected in the royal ideology of the period.”

These changes and developments are reflected in depictions of standards during the Neo-Sumerian Period. The Bügelschaft, crescent standard, knobbed pole, star standard and rod with balls of the Akkadian Period continue to be represented in the art of the Neo-Sumerian Period. The Akkadian Period pennant standard, tasselled standard and the standard with lion-griffon emblem from Naram-Sin Victory Stele are not known from the Neo-Sumerian Period. New to Neo-Sumerian are the scorpion standard, the lion standard, bird and bird-man standards, and possibly a snake standard. The Imdugud/Anzu standard is

---

464 According to Asher-Greve and Westenholz (2013:219-220), this conservative approach is a reaction to the changes in the preceding Akkadian Period. However, as Evans (2003:417) points out, “such ideas have been discarded now; regardless of a shift in subject matter, artistic achievement at the end of the third millennium B.C. drew upon traditions that spanned the entire millennium.”

465 For discussions on the Ur-Nammu and Gudea Stelae, see Canby (2001) and Suter (2000) respectively. In this work, fragments of the Ur-Nammu Stele are represented by NS35 and NS92, and the Gudea Stelae by NS50, NS61-NS63 and NS83-NS86. See also Börker-Klähn (1982: Taf.A-F) for possible reconstructions of the Gudea Stelae.

466 For presentation scenes in which the king is the focus of the presentation, see Winter (1986). This type of royal presentation scene is depicted on NS56 in 6.6.
represented in the Neo-Sumerian Period but is unknown from the Akkadian Period, although it may have been depicted on Eannatum’s Vulture Stele ED66 from the Early Dynastic Period.
6.2 BÜGELSCHAFT

The Bügelschaft is the most commonly depicted standard of the Akkadian Period, but in contrast there is only one known depiction, NS1, of this standard during the Neo-Sumerian Period467.

Gudea’s libation vessel NS1 depicts an antithetical group in which two intertwined snakes are flanked on either side by a snake-dragon holding a Bügelschaft [Fig. 6.1]468. An inscription on the vessel reveals that it was dedicated to Ningišzida, Gudea’s personal deity469. The snake-dragon can be identified as Mušḫuššu and was usually associated with the snake gods Tišpak and Ninazu470. However, Mušḫuššu was also associated with Ningišzida during the reign of Gudea471. That the intertwined snakes are supernatural beings and not mere snakes is indicated by the fact that they have teeth (Wiggermann 1993-1997b:458). Vacín (2011b:256) identifies this pair of snakes as representing the god Ningišzida himself and Jacobsen and Alster (2000:315 n.8) identify the scene depicted on NS1 as representing “the gate of the god’s cella through which the cult-image is visible.” The Bügelschafts held by the two Mušḫuššus may act as the door- or gateposts to a sacred structure, because the Bügelschaft served to mark door- or gateways since the Uruk Period472, and because texts attest to Mušḫuššu guarding door- and gateways (Wiggermann 1993-1997b:460). Van Buren (1934:79) suggests that, because the heads of the snakes touch the spout of the vessel, the snakes are meant to be understood to drink the libation which is poured from the vessel. This may support Vacín’s identification of the snakes with Ningišzida, because this is the god to whom the libations from this vessel would be poured. However, Suter (2000:66) identifies the snakes as representing not Ningišzida, but muššatur473, with whom Mušḫuššu is associated in texts (Wiggermann 1993-1997b:462). In this regard, muššatur and Mušḫuššu are mentioned together on Gudea Cylinder A xxvi:20-25 (Edzard 1997:86 RIMEP E3/1/1/7/CylA) where they act as guardians of a doorway in the Temple of Ningirsu. This

467 The cylinder seal impression Bodleian S180 in the Ashmolean Museum may contain a depiction of a Bügelschaft. Buchanan (1966:75-76; Plate 31.425) identifies the cylinder seal which made this impression as Neo-Sumerian, but by the inclusion of the seated monkey it can instead be dated to the Isin-Larsa or Old Babylonian Period. For more on the monkey on the cylinder seals of the beginning of the second millennium BCE, see Collon (1982:45-46).
468 For the grouping of snake-dragon, snake and Bügelschaft, see also A44 in 5.2.3.2.2.
469 For a transliteration and English translation of this inscription, see Edzard (1997:157-158 RIMEP E3/1/1.7.66).
470 See 5.2.3.2.2 for more on Mušḫuššu.
471 According to Suter (2000:66), this association is exclusive to the reign of Gudea.
472 As described in previous chapters.
473 Muššatur is the Sumerian name, the Akkadian is bašmu. For more on muššatur/bašmu, see Wiggermann (1992:166-168).
may be a textual representation of the type of scene depicted on NS1. Rather than the snakes serving as a cult image within a sacred space, they, like the snake-dragons, act as door- or gateway guardians to a sacred space belonging to Ningišzida.

The Bügelschaft therefore serves the same purpose in the Neo-Sumerian Period as it did in the preceding Uruk, Early Dynastic and Akkadian Periods. It acted as a door- or gatepost to a sacred space. Although only one example of this standard exists from the Neo-Sumerian Period, and this standard is associated specifically with the god Ningišzida, by comparison to the preceding periods, it is more likely that it was a mark of divinity or sacred space in general.

Fig. 6.1: The scene depicted on NS1 (Heuzey 1902:281)
6.3 CRESCENT STANDARD
There are only seven examples of the crescent standard dating to the Akkadian Period which are represented on A8 and A57-A62. These crescent standards are found in contest scenes and in association with deities — most likely the moon god, a seated goddess who may represent his consort, and perhaps the sun god. In comparison, the crescent standard is well represented in the iconographic record of the Neo-Sumerian Period, and is found in only three major contexts, although within those contexts there is relatively little variation. During the Neo-Sumerian Period, the crescent standard is primarily found in association with contest scenes, presentation scenes and worship/adoration scenes. In only two examples it is found in scenes which cannot be classified as one of these three types of scenes.

6.3.1 CONTEST SCENES
The crescent standard is found in association with a contest scene on three cylinder seals NS2, NS3 and NS4. On NS2 and NS3 the contest scene involves only animal participants. On NS2 two lions attack a goat. A crescent standard which cradles a disc acts as a terminal to the scene. Moortgat (1966:109) describes this as a “Standarte mit Sonnenscheibe in der Mondsichel”474. According to Black and Green (1992:54), the crescent was often depicted within a disc from the Old Babylonian Period, but, according to Collon (1982:132), it actually “seems to be an Ur III innovation”, and the crescent emblem of the standard depicted on NS2 may be an early representation of this variation. On NS3 two lions attack a bull. A crescent standard and what Porada (1948:34) describes as a lizard together serve as a terminal to the scene. The contest scene on NS4 depicts a lion being attacked with a weapon by a nude hero. A crescent standard acts as a terminal. Collon (1982:117) suggests there was originally meant to have been a third figure, but there was insufficient space and the crescent standard was represented instead. When appearing in Neo-Sumerian contest scenes the crescent standard is therefore never held, it is always located in the field where it acts as a terminal to the scene.

6.3.2 PRESENTATION SCENES
The crescent standard is found in association with presentation scenes on NS5-NS22. On NS5-NS13 two figures approach a third figure who is seated. On NS5 a seated male figure who is clean shaven and wears a cap is approached by a worshipper and a goddess. There is an eagle in the upper field between the worshipper and the seated figure. Behind the seated

474 “Standard with a sun disc in the crescent”. See also ED27 in 4.2.1 for the ball cradled in a crescent.
figure is a standard with an emblem in the form of a sun disc nestled in a crescent, like that on NS2. According to Fischer (1997:170), this standard was recut on top of a line of inscription, and the seated figure was recut and originally a seated deity was the object of the presentation. Although it is unclear exactly when the recutting occurred, it must have been during the Neo-Sumerian Period, because NS5 is a seal impression on a tablet which can be dated to this period. On NS6, NS7 and NS8 it is unclear whether the seated figure is a deity, a ruler, or perhaps a deified ruler. On NS6 and NS7 the crescent standard is found in the field either behind (NS6) or in front of (NS7) the seated figure. The crescent standard on NS6 is rather ornate, with streamers from the shaft just below the crescent emblem, and cross bars about half way down the shaft. A crescent, a ball-staff and a star are also found in the field. On NS7 there is a lion-scimitar in the field behind the seated figure. The lion-scimitar was typically associated with the god Nergal (Seidl 1957-1971:488), but at least until after the Old Babylonian Period this association was not exclusive (Wiggermann 1998-2001b:224). The inclusion of the lion-scimitar therefore does not necessarily associate the scene on NS7 with the god Nergal. The seated figure on NS8 holds a crescent standard, and behind this figure are “indeterminate objects or signs” (Buchanan 1966:81). Legrain (1951:25) identifies the seated figure on NS9 as a goddess, but this identification is uncertain, as there are no divine attributes. Behind the seated figure is what Legrain identifies as a “crescent over an arrow”, but which may represent a crescent standard. Goddesses are the object of presentation on NS10, NS11, NS12 and NS13. On NS10, there is a crescent standard in the field between the seated goddess and an interceding goddess who leads a worshipper forward by the hand. In the field are a crescent and a vessel, and beneath the inscription is a bull. On NS11, NS12 and NS13 the seated goddess actually holds the crescent standard. On NS12 a scorpion and a bird are depicted behind this goddess, and on NS13 there is a scorpion between the goddess and the two figures who approach her. According to Braun-Holzinger (1993:133) the crescent standard which is held by a goddess should not be understood as an attribute of the goddess and it can therefore not be used to establish her identity. However, the crescent standard is not simply associated with the goddess, but is actually held by the goddess on NS11, NS12 and NS13, illustrating an explicit physical connection between the two. If the crescent standard is not the attribute of the goddess, it must be associated with her in some other way. If the crescent, and therefore the

475 For more on this, see 6.6.
477 For more on the scorpion and the bird, see below NS22.
crescent standard, were representative of the moon god, the goddess may be related to this
god in some manner, perhaps as his consort. It appears then that when a seated figure holds a
standard in these scenes, this figure is a goddess, and this may identify the seated figure on
NS8 as a goddess. On NS10 the crescent in the field is also associated with a goddess. On
the other hand, when a crescent standard is found in the field associated with a seated figure
on NS6 and NS7, it is uncertain who this figure is or whether the figure is divine or mortal.

It is not only seated figures who appear as the object of presentation in presentation scenes.
On the cylinder seal NS14 and the cylinder seal impression NS15 a goddess leads a
worshipper by the hand towards a standing figure. The standing figure on NS14 is a deity,
and behind this figure in the field is a crescent standard. On NS15 the standing figure wears
a strange headdress and holds a crescent standard in one hand and a scimitar in the other.
Buchanan (1981:257) identifies this figure as a “god in [a] feather crown”, but it is uncertain
whom this figure represents.

The cylinder seal NS16 contains two scenes on two registers. In the upper register four
female figures with raised arms approach a seated goddess. In the lower register a figure is
approached by three other figures, one of which is obscured by a large chip in the seal. A
crescent standard acts as a terminal to this scene in the lower register.

Not all of the scenes on the two cylinder seal impressions NS17 and NS18 can be
reconstructed. A worshipper and a god can be reconstructed on NS17. Before the god is a
crescent standard, and the worshipper may be lead forward by a third figure. By comparison
to other scenes (eg. NS12, NS15, NS14, NS20, NS47, NS52, NS56, NS65, NS66, NS68
and NS70), this third figure would most likely be a goddess. Asher-Greve and Westenholz
(2013:192) identify these interceding goddesses involved in presentation scenes as Lamma, a
minor protective goddess478. On NS18 a seated god who holds a crescent standard is
approached by a goddess who, by comparison to other presentation scenes, would have led a
worshipper.

The cylinder seals NS19, NS20, NS21 and NS22 all show traces of recutting, but originally
appear to have had presentation scenes.

478 For more on Lamma, see Spycket (1960; 1980-83), Foxgov, Heimpel and Kilmer (1980-83:448-450) and
On NS19 the presentation scene in which a worshipper is led by the hand by a goddess towards a seated goddess is still clearly visible. A ladder pattern has been cut over where an inscription would have been. Between the two goddesses is what Buchanan (1966:77) suggests is a crescent standard. However, it is unclear if this was originally part of the presentation scene, if it was added later, or if there was originally a crescent in the field and a shaft was added in the recutting to transform a crescent into a crescent standard.

The original presentation on NS20 is, like that on NS19, still visible. One figure approaches a second, seated figure. Between them is a worn area where a third figure may originally have stood (Buchanan 1966:79). Behind the seated figure, in the area intended for an inscription, are a standard with an emblem which is obscured by a chip in the seal and a crescent standard mounted on the back of an animal. That the crescent standard is mounted on an animal is unusual, but not unique, as the crescent standards on NS26 and NS27 are mounted on the back of a bird and that on NS28 is mounted on the back of a bull479.

The original presentation scene on NS21 is now barely visible, with various motifs covering the scene. Collon (1982:145) suggests that it originally consisted of two figures approaching a seated figure, and that the crescent standard which is now carved on the cylinder seal was originally a crescent between the seated figure and the first approaching figure. A spread eagle and a scorpion have also been added in the area which originally contained an inscription.

According to Collon (1982:145) NS22 may originally have contained a presentation scene in which two figures approach a third standing figure. This standing figure remains, but a bird and a scorpion have been carved on a smooth area where the other two figures were originally placed. There is a crescent standard in the field in front of the extant standing figure, which, according to Collon is part of the original scene, although both the standard and the standing figure have been recut. Colbow (1997:23) suggests that the combination of crescent standard, bird and scorpion represent the moon god, his wife and a third deity, and that the “scene might be interpreted as an adoration of three divine emblems embodying the persons” of these three deities. There are problems with this hypothesis. Firstly, birds were

479 See below 6.3.3 for more on all three standards.
not typically associated with Ningal, the wife of the moon god\textsuperscript{480}. Secondly, on Kassite Period \textit{kudurrus} the scorpion was labelled as the symbol of the goddess Īšḫara (Seidl 1989:157), but this appears to be the earliest attestation of the scorpion as a symbol of a deity\textsuperscript{481} (Seidl 1957-1971:488), and, furthermore, Īšḫara was first associated with the snake or hydra, not the scorpion\textsuperscript{482} (Lambert 1976-1980a:177; Bidmead 2002:57). Despite these problems, Colbow’s identification of this scene as a worship/adoration scene may be correct, but it ignores the fact that the seal was recut and that it was originally a presentation scene which was represented. It is uncertain when the recutting occurred, and therefore it is unclear whether the worship/adoration scene reflects Neo-Sumerian iconography, or that of a later period.

In these recut scenes NS\textsubscript{19}, NS\textsubscript{20}, NS\textsubscript{21} and NS\textsubscript{22}, it is uncertain if the crescent standard was part of the original presentation scene or if it was added during the later recutting. It is therefore problematic to use these to draw conclusions in the use of the crescent standard during the Neo-Sumerian Period.

6.3.3  WORSHIP/ADORATION SCENES
The scenes on NS\textsubscript{23}-NS\textsubscript{32} represent worship/adoration scenes. On NS\textsubscript{23} and NS\textsubscript{24} one figure stands on either side of a crescent standard. Each figure raises one hand in a gesture of worship. Only the top half of the cylinder seal NS\textsubscript{25} remains, but by comparison to NS\textsubscript{23} and NS\textsubscript{24}, the scene depicted on this seal can also be reconstructed to represent two figures, one standing on either side of a crescent standard and raising one hand towards the standard. Colbow (1997:22-23) identifies these and similar scenes from the Isin-Larsa Period as representing the “veneration of the crescent standard... as a representative of the moon god.” NS\textsubscript{23}, NS\textsubscript{24} and NS\textsubscript{25} were all excavated at Ur, which, because the moon god was the patron deity of this city, may support Colbow’s identification.

On NS\textsubscript{26}, as on NS\textsubscript{23}-NS\textsubscript{25}, one figure stands on either side of a crescent standard, but, unlike on NS\textsubscript{23}-NS\textsubscript{25}, on NS\textsubscript{26} a nude hero with a flowing vase is included next to the

\textsuperscript{480} Although see 6.9.5.1 for the possible association of a bird standard with Ningal on NS\textsubscript{76}. For more on Ningal, see Braun-Holzinger (1998-2001b) and Black and Green (1992:138).

\textsuperscript{481} Although see 6.7.

The crescent standard on NS26 is mounted on a goose-like bird which Collon (1982:143) identifies as the symbol of the goddess Bau. Maxwell-Hyslop (1992) argues against the identification of the goddess typically associated with this bird as Bau, suggesting instead that the goddess represents Nanše, an identification which may be supported by the Sumerian composition Nanše and the Birds which relates how this goddess created birds. The combination of the bird, which is therefore a feminine symbol, and the crescent standard, which is more generally associated with gods and would therefore be a masculine symbol, is therefore curious, although there are other examples of goddesses associated with crescent standards, as for example on NS8, NS10, NS11, NS12 and NS13. On NS27 two female figures stand on either side of a vessel with a date palm and a crescent standard mounted on the back of a bird. Fischer (1997:171) describes the latter as a crescent standard above a standing bird, implying that the two constitute separate entities, but by comparison to NS26, the crescent standard is mounted on the bird. Fischer (1997:171) further suggests that one of the female figures is a goddess, but this figure has no divine attributes. Despite this figure not representing a goddess, perhaps this type of crescent standard mounted on the back of a bird is specifically associated with a goddess while the simpler crescent standard is associated either more generally with divinity or more specifically with the moon god during the Neo-Sumerian Period. The crescent standard which is mounted on the back of an animal on NS20 is more curious. Buchanan (1966:79) suggests the animal may be a lion, and this animal was associated with both gods and goddesses. However, as mentioned above, NS20 was recut and it is uncertain if the shaft of the standard was added to a crescent, or if the crescent standard was originally mounted on the back of the animal. It is therefore problematic to use the standard depicted on NS20 for comparison with that depicted on NS26.

The crescent standard on NS28 is also mounted on the back of an animal, in this case on the back of a bull (Parrot 1948:258). Because the bull was associated with the moon god, and because the crescent and crescent standard were associated with the moon god, this crescent standard mounted on the bull may be particularly associated with this god.

---

483 For more on the nude hero and flowing vase, see 5.2.3.1.
485 For this text and a full discussion thereof, see Veldhuis (2004). For more on the association of various goddesses with birds, see also 6.9.
486 For more on the vessel with date palm, see below.
487 For more on the association of the lion with various deities, see 6.8.
488 See 3.3.
The worship/adoration scene depicted on NS28, as well as those depicted on NS29-NS31 include two worshippers raising their hands towards a bi-conical vessel with a date palm and two palm fronds. On NS29 and NS30 a crescent standard acts as a terminal to the scene, while on NS31 the crescent standard is next to the vessel with the date-palm between the worshippers. By comparison to other scenes including the vessel with a date palm, it is clear that it is this vessel with the date-palm and not the standard which is the focus of ritual or the primary object of worship. Buchanan (1981:262) describes this vessel and date palm as a “date palm in vase” and Legrain (1951:24) describes it as a “vase palm and dates”. Collon (1982:139), on the other hand, describes it as a “date-palm altar” and von der Osten (1934:29) appears to combine these two understandings and describes it as a “vase-shaped altar bearing a palm leaf and two clusters of dates”. Depictions of this vessel with the date-palm appear to have been particularly popular at Ur (Collon 1982:139), but are also known from other sites. The scene depicted on seals may be an abridged version of the type of scene depicted on the second register of the “good face” of the so-called Ur-Nammu Stele [Fig. 6.2]. This register has an almost antithetical scene. On the left the ruler pours a libation into a vessel with a date-palm which is in front of a seated goddess. Behind the ruler stands an interceding goddesses or Lamma who raises both arms. On the left the ruler pours a libation into a vessel with a date-palm which is in front of a seated god who holds a ring and rod. Behind the ruler stands a second figure of Lamma who raises both hands. Woolley (1974:77) identifies the seated deities as the moon god Nanna and his wife Ningal. This scene recalls the Early Dynastic plaque from Ur ED35 in which in the upper register a priest pours a libation into a vessel which is placed in front of the god Nanna. The vessel on ED35 does not contain a date-palm, but the scene may represent a forerunner to the scene with the vessel with a date-palm on the Ur-Nammu Stele and therefore to the similar scenes depicted on Neo-Sumerian seals. NS33 is a trial piece of a seal engraver upon which a seated deity holding a crescent standard with a short shaft and a date-palm are carved. According to Legrain (1951:24) the two motifs are “only notes for a further composition” and it is

489 See, for example NS29 and NS30. The vessel with date palm is also found in association with other standards. See also NS42 in 6.4.1, with a star standard in 6.3.2, with a rod with balls, see NS59 in 6.6, and with a bird standard, see NS80 in 6.9.3.

490 All but two of the 23 Neo-Sumerian cylinder seals in the British Museum which bear this motif are from Ur, see Collon (1982:catalogue numbers 336-358, 470).

491 See, for example NS48 for an example from Brak. See also Parrot (1948: Planche XI.1482) for an example from Tello and Canby (2001: Plate 14.b) for an example from Nippur.

492 For a full discussion on this stele and its reconstruction, see Canby (2001). For images of the Ur-Nammu Stele and the register under discussion, see Canby (2001: Plates 1, 3, 10).

493 See 4.2.1.
therefore uncertain if this reflects a complete unified scene. However, the inclusion of the two motifs together points to an association between the two and recalls the scene on the Ur-Nammu Stele. Scenes with the vessel with the date palm may therefore be particularly associated with the worship of the moon god\textsuperscript{494}. According to Collon (1982:139-140), the vessel with the date palm appears to have been a symbol of fertility, and the scenes with this object may therefore represent a fertility ritual centred around the cult of the moon god.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Fig_6.2_Register_of_the_Ur-Nammu_Stele_with_a_ritual_involving_a_vessel_with_a_date-palm_Canby_2001_Pl.3.b_detail.jpg}
\caption{Register of the Ur-Nammu Stele with a ritual involving a vessel with a date-palm (Canby 2001: Pl.3.b detail)}
\end{figure}

The worship/adoration scenes discussed thus far, \textbf{NS23}, \textbf{NS24}, \textbf{NS25}, \textbf{NS26}, \textbf{NS28}, \textbf{NS29}, \textbf{NS30} and \textbf{NS31}, all depict two figures facing an object of worship. In \textbf{NS23-NS26} this object of worship is the crescent standard itself, while in \textbf{NS28-NS31} it is the vessel with the date palm. The worship/adoration scene on \textbf{NS32} is therefore unusual because three figures approach the crescent standard from the same direction. A quadruped stands on either side of the crescent standard.

\subsection{6.3.4 UNUSUAL SCENES}

The scenes depicted on \textbf{NS34} and \textbf{NS35} are unusual and cannot be categorised as contest scenes, presentation scenes or worship/adoration scenes. On the cylinder seal \textbf{NS34} there is a seated goddess. In the field in front of this goddess is a spread eagle and behind her is an upright creature, possibly a dragon or a lion-griffon without wings, which holds a crescent

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{494} Although see McCaffrey (2013:230-232) for an interpretation of scenes in which a libation is poured to the vessel with a date-palm as being representative of or associated with the sacred marriage ritual.}
standard. A second inverted scene on this seal depicts a figure riding an equid, but the significance of this scene is unclear.

Four crescents are depicted together on two fragments from the fifth register of the so-called “poor face” of the Ur-Nammu Stele NS35. Little survives of the register depicted, but the fourth crescent appears to be mounted on a pole (Canby 2001:26), and, because the crescents look the same, this suggests that these were crescent standards. In the middle of these crescents is an object surmounted by a knob. Woolley (1974:98) identifies this object as the “upper part of [an] angel’s headdress”, referring to the horned headdress of divinity, but when compared to other such headdresses on the Ur-Nammu Stele, this object looks different. Canby (2001:27) describes it as “unfamiliar” and suggests that it is the top of a parasol, such as that held by the attendant behind Sargon on the Sargon Stele in the Louvre Sb1 [Fig. 6.3] (Amiet 1976:73, fig 1c). The parasol on the Sargon Stele, however, is not surmounted by a knob such as that on NS35, although parasols depicted on first millennium BCE Neo-Assyrian reliefs are 495. However, Neo-Assyrian iconography dates to over a millennium later than the production of NS35 and can therefore not be used as comparanda to identify the object depicted on NS35 and it must therefore at present remain unidentified. Similar rows of crescents as that on NS35 are depicted on the so-called pot à tabac vessels of the Isin-Larsa Period where they form the emblems of standards contained within boats [Fig. 6.4] (de Graeve 1981:24-27; Plates II.6, III.7, III.8, IV.9 and IV.10). Cros, Heuzey and Thureau-Dangin (1910-1914:38) suggests that the standards identify these boats as sacred boats, with the crescents identifying them as the boat of the moon god 496. Delougaz (1952:120), however, argues that the crescents mounted on poles within these boats don’t represent standards, but represent “a purely decorative motif”. Furthermore, nothing similar to the object surmounted by a knob in the middle of the crescents on NS35 is represented on the Isin-Larsa Period pot à tabac vessels. Whatever the case, although these represent the closest apparent iconographic parallel to the crescents depicted on NS35, not enough of the latter survives for definite identification. Indeed, it is even unclear if the crescents on NS35 form the emblems of standards.

495 See, for example Assyrian palace reliefs such as BM 118908 from the Southwest Palace of Tiglath-Pileser III at Nimrud (Barnett and Falkner 1962: Plates LXVIII-LXXI) and BM 124533 from the Northwest Palace of Ashurnasirpal II, also from Nimrud (Layard 1853: Plate 12).

496 See U72 for an Uruk Period example from Chogha Mish of a boat which may represent the sacred boat of the moon god.
Fig. 6.3: The Sargon Stele (Marchesi and Marchetti 2011:Plate 56.1)

Fig. 6.4: Pot à tabac vessel with crescent standards (Postgate 1992:123 Fig. 6:10)
6.3.5 SUMMARY
During the Neo-Sumerian Period the crescent standard is found in contest scenes, in presentation scenes, in worship/adoration scenes, and on the two unusual scenes on NS34 and NS35.

Because the crescent is a logical symbol or manifestation of the moon god, the crescent standard could logically be associated with the moon god. This identification appears to be supported by the fact that the crescent standard appears primarily on objects excavated at Ur, the patron deity of which was the moon god. Colbow (1997:22) therefore identifies depictions of gods in close association with the crescent standard, even on examples from sites other than Ur, as representations of the moon god. However, the fact that the sun god is associated with the crescent standard during the Akkadian Period on A61 and a goddess who may represent the consort of the moon god holds the crescent standard on A62 during the Akkadian Period and on NS8, NS10, NS11 and NS13 during the Neo-Sumerian Period, and is associated with the crescent standard on NS10, means that not all deities associated with the crescent standard can represent the moon god. According to Braun-Holzinger (1993:133), therefore, the crescent standard is only reminiscent of the moon god or his spouse. However, it may be instead that the crescent standard was representative of the moon god, and by extension his consort or another figure in his retinue. It appears then that the crescent standard was especially but not exclusively associated with the moon god during the Neo-Sumerian Period, and this association is represented in worship/adoration scenes, and perhaps also in the presentation scenes in which a god is the object of the presentation.

In the worship/adoration scenes in which a crescent standard appears, it is not a deity who is the object of worship, but either the crescent standard itself or the vessel with the date-palm. In the scenes in which the crescent standard is the object of veneration the crescent standard may be representative or symbolic of the moon god (Colbow 1997:22-23), and the scenes in which the vessel with the date palm is the focus of the ritual may be specifically associated with the moon god. It must be noted though that other types of standard are also sometimes depicted in the latter type of scene497.

497 See above 6.3.3.
The crescent standard is held by a goddess on NS8, NS11, NS12 and NS13 and by the god with the unusual feather headdress on NS15. On NS34 it is held by a creature, possibly a dragon or a lion-griffon without wings.

Most of the crescent standards or the Neo-Sumerian Period are undecorated, but the crescent standards on NS2, NS5, NS6, NS20, NS26, NS27 and NS28 have decoration. On NS2 and NS5 the emblem of the standard is in the form of a disc nestled within crescent, on NS6 the crescent standard has streamers from the shaft just below the crescent emblem and crossbars about halfway down the shaft, and on NS26 and NS27 the crescent standard is mounted on a bird, and on NS20 and NS28 the standard is mounted on the back of an animal. The crescent standard mounted on the bird on NS26 may be specifically associated with a goddess, and that mounted on the bull on NS28 may be particularly associated with the moon god.
6.4 KNOBBED POLE
During the Akkadian Period the knobbed pole appears to have been associated with the sun god. It is found in an architectural context, but, unlike during the Early Dynastic Period, the knobbed pole does not represent the architecture itself. In the Neo-Sumerian Period the knobbed pole is found in a variety of contexts on NS36-NS43. There are also four further variations of the knobbed pole represented during this period, although these may represent weapons rather than standards. A mace-scimitar is depicted on NS44, a knobbed pole with two attached eye axes is depicted on NS45, a knobbed pole with three knobs or mace heads is depicted on NS46, and a knobbed pole with seven small mace heads radiating from the central knob is depicted on NS47.

6.4.1 “TYPICAL” KNOBBED POLE
Presentation scenes are depicted on NS36-NS41. The two cylinder seal impressions NS36 and NS37 have presentation scenes in which the object of presentation is a standing god. On NS36 a worshipper is led towards this god, perhaps by a goddess (Buchanan 1981:258), and on NS37 the worshipper stands before the god. The god on NS36 is in a posture of ascent and holds the knobbed pole, and on NS37 the god stands and raises his hand towards the standard. There is a crescent in the field above the standard on NS37. On NS38 is a presentation scene in which a goddess leads a human figure towards a seated goddess. In the field is a crescent. Acting as a terminal to the scene is what Delaporte (1923:116) describes as a “masse d’armes colossale dont le manche se termine en fer de lance” and which looks like a knobbed pole. On NS39, an impression of the seal of Enmedu, an interceding goddess or Lamma leads a worshipper forward by the hand towards an enthroned goddess. The seated goddess holds in her hand what Fischer (1997:155) describes as “eine Keule”, but the shaft appears longer than that of a mace, and it may therefore rather represent a standard. This knobbed pole is unusual because there is a line slanting upwards and outwards from the base of the knob on both sides of the standard. This does not reflect a variation of the knobbed pole; rather, these lines are the remains of a disc nestled within a crescent on top of which the knob of the knobbed pole was carved (Fischer 1997:155). Little survives of NS40, an impression of the seal of Ur-Ningišzida, but it appears to have depicted a presentation scene with a worshipper and a goddess who was the object of presentation (Fischer 1997:160). In the field in front of the goddess is a lion-headed eagle, and behind her, acting as a terminal to

498 “Enormous mace with a shaft that terminates in a spearhead”.
499 “a mace”.
the scene is a knobbed pole. The cutting of the cylinder seal NS41 is rather crude, and it is difficult to discern the exact details. A presentation scene with two standing figures and a seated figure may be depicted. In the field in front of the seated figure is a knobbed pole.

On NS42 is a worship/adoration scene with two figures facing a vessel with a date palm and two palm fronds. To the left of this vessel with a date palm is a knobbed pole, and to the right is a crescent. The two figures raise their hands, but, by comparison to other seals such as the seals in the NS28, NS29 and NS30, it is clear that this gesture is aimed towards the vessel with the date palm, and not the knobbed pole or crescent.

The so called “Physician’s Seal” of Ur-lugal-edina NS43 depicts a god who raises his hand towards two knobbed poles and a third symbol. Unusually for a representation of a male deity, the god is depicted en face. Ward (1910:371) suggests that the god is Girra, the god of fire, who is mentioned in the inscription on the seal. According to Ward (1910:255) the two knobbed poles represent “slender columns... each [with] a vase standing on the top”, while de Sarzec and Huezey (1884-1912:302) suggest that the knobbed poles are enormous maces which have their heads attached to the shaft by a large protruding nail. By comparison to ED48 they can be identified as colossal maces. What the third symbol represents is less clear. It consists of a shaft which ends in or is surmounted by two barbed lines. These may represent branches or antlers (Ward 1910:255; Delaporte 1920:10; de Sarzec and Huezey 1884-1912:302), or perhaps a lamp which contains a fire (Ward 1910:255). Hanging down from the top of the shaft are two long streamers which appear to be braided in the centre. The inscription reveals that Ur-lugal-edina was a doctor specialising in midwifery, and Collon (2005a:148) identifies this symbol as “the tools of his trade”. De Sarzec and Huezey (1884-1912:303) argue against this symbol representing medical or surgical instruments, stating that it would be improbable that these would be depicted next to a deity. Instead, de Sarzec and Huezey suggest that the symbol represents a whip, an identification also supported by Delaporte (1920:10). However, Ward (1910:255) argues that “the handle is so exactly like the two other columns and the objects above it are such that it is unlikely that it is a whip with its handle.” If the two knobbed poles, like those depicted on ED48, depict the door- or

500 For more on the vessel with a date palm, see above 6.3.3.
501 For an English translation of the inscription on NS43, see Collon (2005a:147). For more on Girra, see Michalowski (1993:156-157), Frankena (1957-1971) and Leick (1998:68) where this god is discussed under his Sumerian name Gibil. See also 5.7.
502 See 4.3.
gateway to a sacred structure, the third symbol on **NS43** could represent the object of cult worship. In this regard, it may represent a ritual or religious standard, perhaps associated with the god Girra. However, Girra was a god who was associated with fire, and the identification of the upper part of this symbol representing a lamp with flames may therefore be more accurate than the entire object representing a standard. Although the third object on **NS43** therefore does not represent a standard, the two knobbed poles do.

### 6.4.2 KNOBBED POLE VARIATIONS

Variations of the knobbed pole are depicted on **NS44-NS47**. Despite being reconstructed from four seal impressions on the same tablet case, the scene represented by **NS44** is quite worn and incomplete. It depicts a worship/adoration scene with a human figure and a goddess. There are a crescent, an inverted crescent and at least one snake between the two figures. In the field behind the goddess is what Buchanan (1981:253) describes as a “mace-scimitar standard”.

On **NS45**, an impression of the first seal of Lu-Dumuzi, is a presentation scene in which a goddess leads a worshipper forward to a figure in a posture of ascent whom Fischer (1997:168) describes as a “stehenden, kriegerischen Gott im kurzen Rock”\(^{503}\). Fischer further describes this god as holding “eine Doppellöwenkeule, mit der angewinkelten eine Fensteraxt”\(^{504}\). However, the *Doppellöwenkeule*, or “double line scimitar” (Wiggermann 1998-2001b:223) is described as “[e]ine Keule, deren Kopf von zwei Löwenköpfen flankiert ist”\(^{505}\) (Seidl 1989:157), and no lion head protomes are visible on the object held by the figure in the posture of ascent on **NS45**. This object can therefore not be described as a *Doppellöwenkeule*, but instead as a knobbed pole with two attached eye axes. This object therefore represents a variation of the knobbed pole which is similar to the standard on **NS44** in that both represent knobbed poles which have bladed weapons attached on either side of the knob.

Another worship/adoration scene is represented on **NS46**. A worshipper raises his hand in a gesture of reverence or supplication towards a grouping of a standard in the form of a three-

\(^{503}\) “standing martial god in a short skirt”.

\(^{504}\) “a mace with twin lions’ heads with attached eye axe”. An eye axe is an axe with two large holes in the blade. For more on the *Doppellöwenkeule* or mace with twin lions’ heads, see van Buren (1945:177-178). For an image of the *Doppellöwenkeule*, see Seidl (1957-1971:488\S 8).

\(^{505}\) “a mace, the head of which is flanked by two lion heads”.

Stellenbosch University https://scholar.sun.ac.za
headed knobbed pole which is placed upon a mountain and is held on the right by a god in a posture of ascent and on the left by a lion-griffon. The god holds an axe in his other hand. According to Wiggermann (1998-2001b:223) the “three-headed mace [is] the earlier form of the double lion scimitar”, and the standard on NS46 may therefore be related to that on NS45. Both these standards are held by a figure in a posture of ascent, and it is possible, although uncertain, that both represent the same figure. Collon (2005a:170) identifies the god on NS46 as Meslamtaea⁵⁰⁶, who is mentioned in the inscription on the seal⁵⁰⁷. According to Wiggermann (1992:38) Meslamtaea held a mace in his right hand and an axe in his left hand, and because the god depicted on NS46 is depicted in just this manner, the identification of this god as Melamtaea appears to fit. Perhaps the three-headed mace is specifically associated with this god. If the object held by the god and lion-griffon on NS46 represents a mace, this does not mean that it doesn’t also function as a standard, as those on, for example ED48 did.

On NS47 is a presentation scene in which two goddesses and a worshipper approach a god in a posture of ascent. This god shoulders a weapon which may represent an axe and in his other hand he holds a knobbed pole which has seven small mace heads radiating from it. There is a spread eagle above the accompanying inscription. Buchanan (1981:258) compares the object held by the god to the “fanlike object” held by a god who can be identified as Ningirsu on a seal impression of the so-called “Second Seal of Ur-Dun” (Fuhr-Jaepelt 1972:196-197; 195) on a clay tablet in the Louvre AO 448 [Fig. 6.5] (Delaporte 1920:13; Pl. 10.2, T.110). The object on this seal impression does not have a shaft and appears as “une

---


⁵⁰⁷ For a transliteration and English translation of this inscription, see Collon (1982:170).
sorte d’anneau d’où rayonnent en éventail sept tiges terminées chacune par deux armes" (Delaporte 1920:13), and is therefore not the same object as that which mounts the shaft on the standard depicted on NS47. Gudea Cylinder B vii:12 mentions a seven-headed club or mace which is held by Lugalkurdu, a god in the entourage of Ningirsu. Van Buren (1945:178) identifies this not as Lugalkurdu’s weapon, but as one of Ningirsu’s weapons, an identification also made by Börker-Klähn (1982:144) and Suter (2000:190). Börker-Klähn (1982: Taf F) reconstructs a seated god, identifiable as Ningirsu, as holding a seven-headed object on the Gudea Stelae [Fig. 6.6], and Suter (2000:190) identifies the god holding the seven-headed mace as Ningirsu. The object held by the god on NS47 may represent this seven-headed mace, and the seated god would therefore be Ningirsu. A lion-headed spread eagle, or Imdugud/Anzu, who was associated specifically with the city-state of Lagash, is depicted above the inscription. This further supports an identification of Ningirsu, the patron deity of Lagash. If these identifications are followed, the seven-headed object on NS47 could represent a weapon rather than a standard, although in this case the weapon appears to act as a standard.

Fig. 6.6: Börker-Klähn’s reconstruction of Ningirsu holding a seven-headed object (Börker-Klähn 1982: Taf. F detail)

508 “A kind of ring from which radiate seven rods terminating in two arms”.
510 For more on Lugalkurdu, see Lambert (1987-1990b) and 6.9.5.2.
6.4.3   KNOBBED POLE SUMMARY
The four variations of the knobbed pole represented on NS44-NS47 appear to be weapons which act as standards. This corresponds to the fact that the knobbed poles of the Neo-Sumerian Period look more like maces than do those of previous periods. This probably reflects that knobbed poles were mace standards, at least from the Early Dynastic Period when they are mentioned as such on the inscription on ED48. The two knobbed poles on ED48 acted as the door- or gateway to a sacred building. The two knobbed poles on NS43 may similarly represent a door- or gateway, with the ritual object and god being understood as being inside the sacred space. The knobbed pole is also found freestanding in the field on NS37, NS38, NS40, NS41 and NS42, as does the scimitar-mace variation on NS44. The knobbed pole is held by a god on NS36, as are the knobbed pole variation in which seven maces radiate from the central knob on NS47 and the knobbed pole variation with two attached eye axes on NS45. On NS46 the variation with three mace heads is held by both a god and a lion-griffon. On NS39 the knobbed pole is held by an enthroned goddess. Unlike in the Akkadian Period, it is never the sun god with whom the knobbed pole is associated. The god on NS46 represents Meslamtaea, that on NS43 may be Girra, and the god on NS47 may be Ningirsu. There is therefore no apparent consistency regarding with which deity the knobbed pole was associated, although it is more frequently associated with a god than a goddess.
6.5 STAR STANDARD

During the Akkadian Period the star standard was associated with contest scenes on A8 and A63, a banquet scene on A64, and a scene in which it may have been associated with the sun god on A65, A66 and A67. There are only two examples of the star standard during the Neo-Sumerian Period, NS48 and NS49.

Little remains of the seal impression NS48. A date palm, a scorpion and two intertwined snakes\textsuperscript{511} are depicted. On the left of the date-palm is a star surmounted on a shaft. There is a horizontal line at the base of this shaft, and Buchanan (1966:74) suggests that it may be a star-spade which is depicted, but it may also be a star standard with some kind of base. Because so little of NS48 is extant, it is unclear what the iconographic context of the standard is.

A presentation scene is depicted on the cylinder seal NS49. A worshipper is brought before a seated goddess. Behind this goddess is a bull-man who holds a star standard. There is a crescent in the field between the seated goddess and the group approaching her, but it is unclear whether this is meant to aid in the identification of the goddess. If it does, this goddess may represent the consort of the moon god.

Because only two star standards are represented in the Neo-Sumerian iconographic record and the iconographic context of one of these is uncertain, it is impossible to draw conclusions over meaning or relevance, except that the standard appears to have been rare in this period.

\textsuperscript{511} See 6.3.3 for more on the vessel with a date palm. See NS1 in 6.2 for similar intertwined snakes.
6.6 ROD WITH BALLS
The rod with balls is also called the “globe staff” (Porada 1948:34), “Scheibenstange” (Andrae 1933:49), “Kugelstandarten” (Mayer-Opificius 2006:215), “Stab mit...Kugeln” (Moortgat 1966:108) and “standard with... dots” (Buchanan 1981:226). During the Akkadian Period the rod with balls is only represented on A74 where it functions as a battle standard. During the Neo-Sumerian Period this standard is depicted on NS50-NS59 in a variety of contexts.

A fragment of a stele from the reign of Gudea of Lagash NS50 depicts a curved object which Andrae (1933:47) describes as a “Kulthütte” but which is more commonly understood to be a stele (eg. Börker-Klähn 1982:148; Suter 2000:189; Parrot 1948:179). This object is flanked on either side by a rod with five balls, three maces and a lion-headed axe. While these items are usually described as weapons (eg. Suter 2000:189; Parrot 1948:179), Börker-Klähn (1982:148) identifies them as “Standarten und Emblemen” and Parrot (1948:179) describes them as “une série de symboles ou accessoires cultuels”. These understandings do not have to be mutually exclusive — the objects may be weapons which functioned as cult items. The maces and axes are all mounted on pedestals, but the rod with balls is planted directly into the ground. This suggests that the rod with balls was different to the associated weapons, and it may therefore reflect a standard which was fixed into the ground rather than being mobile. By comparison to the size of the rod with balls and associated weapons, the curved object must represent a stele rather than a building.

Little remains of an object on the far right of the stele fragment. Börker-Klähn (1982:148) reconstructs this object as a harp, suggesting it represents Ningirsu’s instrument ušumgal-kalam-ma, or “Dragon-of-the-Land” mentioned on Gudea Cylinder B xv:21 (Edzard 1997:94). Suter (2000:189) argues against this identification, suggesting instead that it represents “a bow with arrows, or perhaps a quiver.” Both suggestions have their merit — a musical instrument would fit well with other cultic objects, but a bow and arrows would align with

512 “Disc-rod”.
513 “Ball-standard”.
514 “A rod with balls”.
515 See 5.8.
516 “Cult hut”.
517 “Standards and emblems”.
518 “A series of symbols or cultic accessories”.
519 For a transliteration and translation of this text, see Edzard (1997:88-101 RIMEP E3/1.1.7.CylB).
Parrot’s (1948:179) statement that the stele depicted on **NS50** is protected by the weapons surrounding it.

Andrae (1933:47) links the rod with balls on **NS50** with the ringed pole of the Uruk Period, but these do not represent the same standard\(^{520}\). It has been suggested that the rod with balls is a stylized representation of a tree in which the balls represent leaves (Cros, Heuzey and Thureau-Dangin 1910-1914:284; Parrot 1948:179). **NS50** is large enough that a tree with individual discernible leaves could have been represented if that was the intention, and if a schematised or stylised tree is represented, this must reflect the actual appearance of the standard, rather than an iconographic abstraction thereof. In other words, the rod with balls must represent how the standard actually looked, and not be a schematised depiction of that standard. If the rod with balls represents a tree, it is a highly schematised and abstract representation thereof. The rod with balls, however, is first depicted in the Akkadian Period on **A74** exactly as it appears in the Neo-Sumerian Period. There is therefore no evidence for the rod with balls ever having represented or been associated with a tree, and, although this is possible, it is unlikely.

A curved object similar in appearance to the stele depicted on **NS50** is represented on **NS51**, although on **NS51** this object is located within a boat. Attached directly to either side of this curved object is a rod with three balls. A human figure rows at the back of the boat, and at the front of the boat is a bird. Outside the boat, perhaps on the bank of a river, is a standard with a bird emblem\(^{521}\). While Mayer-Opificius (1996:215) identifies the curved object as a stele, according to Parrot (1948:258) it represents a canopy with attached poles with balls. Because the rod with ball standards are attached directly to the curved object, it is more likely that a structure is depicted than a stele, as standards are known to have been attached to buildings in a similar manner in earlier periods, as for example on the Uruk Period examples **U38**, **U54**, **U55**, **U58** and **U61**. Furthermore, while there are depictions of structures within a boat, as for example on **U15**, there are no known depictions of a stele within a boat. The boat then contains within it a structure similar to the sacred structures depicted during the Uruk Period, as for example on **U54**, **U55**, **U58**, **U79** and **U82**, and during the Early Dynastic Period, as for example on **ED4-ED6**, **ED8-ED21**, **ED23**, **ED26**, **ED27**, **ED29**, **ED32**, **ED34**, **ED35** and **ED36**. Therefore, although similar in appearance to the stele depicted on **NS50**, 520 See 3.3 and 5.8 for more on the differences between these standards. 521 For more on this standard, see 6.9.4.
the object depicted on NS51 is different. The rod with balls is found in an architectural standard on NS51, whereas on NS50 it is found in a ritual or cultic context.

The rod with balls is further placed in a ritual context on NS52-NS57 where it is associated with presentation scenes. Depicted on NS52, the cylinder seal of Ursukkel, a scribe and the son of Urdujumzida (Moortgat 1966:108), is a presentation scene in which a seated goddess is approached by a second goddess who leads a worshipper by the hand. In front of the seated goddess are a crescent and a rod with five balls. On NS53, an impression of the cylinder seal of Ureškuga, son of Abbagina (Fischer 1997:159), an interceding goddess or Lamma leads a worshipper by the hand towards an enthroned goddess. In the field between the two goddesses are a scorpion and an eagle. Behind the seated goddess is a lion above which is a rod with five balls. On NS54 an interceding goddess or Lamma leads a worshipper towards a seated goddess. Between the two goddesses is a rod with five balls. According to Fischer (1997:159) there is a bird in the upper field between the two goddesses, and between the interceding goddess and the worshipper is “möglicherweise ein Gefäß in der Form eines Vogels”\(^{522}\), although these are difficult to discern. On the seal impression NS55 is a presentation scene in which a goddess leads a worshipper to a seated god. In the field in front of the god is a crescent, and behind him a small lion stands erect on its hind legs and holds a rod with seven balls. The presentation scene on NS56 has a goddess and a human figure standing before a figure who wears a rounded cap and is seated on a throne with lion decoration. De Sarzec and Huezey (1884-1912:309) identify the figure as a god wearing a turban, but the headdress is similar to the royal cap worn, for example, by Ur-Nammu on his stele\(^{523}\) and by Gudea of Lagash in his representation in statues\(^{524}\). Winter (1986:255) therefore identifies seated figures with rounded caps in Neo-Sumerian presentation scenes, such as the figure on NS56, as the king or ruler, and Ward (1910:110) suggests that the seated figure on NS56 represents Shu-Sin, who is mentioned in the inscription accompanying the scene. Shu-Sin was, like Naram-Sin, deified\(^{525}\), and the seated figure can therefore be better described as a deified king (Andrae 1933:18) and the scene can be described as a royal presentation scene\(^{526}\). In the field are a sun disc resting in a crescent\(^{527}\) and a spread eagle.

\(^{522}\)“possibly a vase in the shape of a bird”

\(^{523}\)For the standards depicted on the Ur-Nammu Stele, see NS35 in 6.3.4 and NS92 in 6.13. For a full discussion on the stele, see Canby (2001).

\(^{524}\)For more on the Gudea statuary, see Johansen (1978) and Colbow (1987).

\(^{525}\)For Shu-Sin’s deification and divine kingship, see Brisch (2006).

\(^{526}\)For more on royal presentation scenes on Ur III seals, see Winter (1986) and Fischer (1997:130-134).
Behind the seated figure is a lion standing erect on its hind legs holding a rod with five balls. De Sarzec and Heuzey (1884-1912:309) describe the standard as a type of tree with five branches ending in fruit or buttons, but, as mentioned above, there is no evidence for the rod with balls representing a tree. Andrae’s description of it as merely the “baumartige Symbol”528 (1933:18) is therefore more apt. The presentation scene on NS57, an impression of the cylinder seal of Ur-Enlila, consists of an interceding goddess or Lamma leading a worshipper forward by the hand towards a seated figure who wears a rounded cap. According to Fischer (1997:164), this cap was recut to replace a horned headdress, the remains of which are still visible. It is uncertain when this recutting occurred. Therefore, although it is uncertain if a deified ruler is depicted on NS57, as is on NS56, it is certain that it was originally a deity that was represented. In the field between the goddess and the seated figure is a lion who holds a rod with five balls in its forepaws. In the upper field are a lion-headed eagle and a disc within a crescent. The rod with balls is thus found in six presentation scenes in which the figure is one of three different types of figure; on NS52, NS53 and NS54 this figure is a goddess, on NS55 a god, and on NS56 a deified ruler. On NS57 the figure which is the subject of the presentation appears to be mortal, but the remains of the horned headdress reveal that this figure was originally intended to be a deity. The rod with balls can therefore not represent or be associated with a specific figure during the Neo-Sumerian Period, but can instead be associated with divinity in general.

The rod with balls is also associated with a contest scene and what may represent a worship/adoration scene. Depicted on NS58 is a contest scene in which two heroes fight a lion-griffon. A rod with five balls acts as a terminal. On NS59 two figures face a vessel with a date palm529 in what may be a worship/adoration scene. Acting as a terminal to this scene is a rod with three balls which is held by a stylized lion and goat. There is a bird in the field above the lion.

In the Neo-Sumerian Period the rod with balls is found in an architectural context on NS51, in a mythical context on NS58 in which it is associated with a contest scene, and in a ritual or cultic context when it is associated with the presentation scenes on NS52-NS57, and with the

527 Fuhr-Jaeppelt (1972:177) identifies this as a rosette resting in a crescent. For more on the disc within a crescent, see 6.3.1.
528 “tree-like symbol”.
529 For more on the vessel with a date palm, see 6.3.3.
worship/adoration scene on NS59. The stele and cultic weapons with which the rod with balls is associated on NS50 also give this rod with balls a ritual or cultic context.

On NS55, NS56, NS57 and NS59 the rod with balls is held by a lion, on NS53 the rod with balls is found just above a lion, on NS50 the axe in the procession of weapons is decorated with a lion’s head, and on NS58 a lion-griffon takes part in the contest scene. There may therefore be a special association between the rod with balls and the lion. However, the rod with balls is also associated with a bird on NS51, NS56 and NS59, and the prevalence of the association of the rod with balls with the lion and the bird may be coincidental and due to the extant iconographic examples of this standard.

Although the rod with balls has been described as a tree or at least tree-like on NS50 (Cros, Heuzey, Thureau-Dangin 1910-1914:284; Parrot 1948:179), NS51 (Parrot 1948:258) and NS56 (de Sarzec and Heuzey 1884-1912:309; Andrae 1933:18), there is no definite evidence to support this identification.
6.7 SCORPION STANDARD

A standard with a scorpion emblem is found only on one cylinder seal impression NS60 dating to the reign of Shulgi\(^{530}\). The impression is incomplete, but appears to depict a presentation scene in which a seated god is approached by at least one figure of a supplicant goddess or Lamma. Behind the seated god is an inscription, and below this inscription are two gods, one on either side of what Buchanan (1981:234) describes as a “pole, topped by a scorpion on [a] line”, or, in other words, a scorpion standard.

On Kassite Period *kudurrus* the scorpion was labelled as the symbol of the goddess Išḫara\(^{531}\) (Seidl 1989:157). The earliest textual reference to Išḫara is from Ebla during the 24\(^{th}\) century BCE (Prechel 2009). According to Archi (2002:29) the cult of Išḫara spread from Ebla to Babylonia during the Akkadian Period, and was introduced at Ur during the reign of Shulgi. However, her cult “was not very popular” (Asher-Greve and Westenholz 2013:204 n.923) during the Neo-Sumerian Period.

According to Seidl (1957-71:488), the connection between Išḫara and the scorpion on the Kassite Period *kudurrus* is the earliest attestation of the scorpion as a symbol of a deity\(^{532}\). Furthermore, Išḫara was first associated with the *bašmu*, a snake or hydra\(^{533}\), and not the scorpion (Lambert 1976-1980a:177; Bidmead 2002:57). The scorpion standard on NS60 is therefore unlikely to represent Išḫara. In fact, according to van Buren (1937-1939:20-22), the scorpion could be associated with both gods and goddesses in presentation scenes, and on NS60 the scorpion standard is located behind an enthroned god. The scorpion standard on NS60 therefore appears to be associated with a god, and cannot be representative of the goddess Išḫara. The god with whom the standard is associated unfortunately has no other identifying attributes, and his identity can therefore not be ascertained.

---

\(^{530}\) Although see NS91 in 6.13 for a possible second scorpion standard.

\(^{531}\) For more on Išḫara, see 6.3.2.


\(^{533}\) According to Wiggermann (1992:166), *bašmu* is the Akkadian term for both Sumerian *uṣum* and *muššatur*. For more on *bašmu*’s identification with *uṣum* and *muššatur*, see Wiggermann (1992:166-168). See 6.2 for more on *muššatur*. 
6.8 LION STANDARD
A lion on one of the fragments of ED66 from the Early Dynastic Period may be part of a standard. This possible standard on ED66 cannot be termed a lion standard, because the lion would have formed part of a larger composite emblem. The first lion standards appear in the Neo-Sumerian Period. This type of standard is found in a procession of standards on the Gudea Stelae NS61, NS62 and NS63, in a contest scene on a cylinder seal A64, and associated with presentation scenes on cylinder seal impressions NS65-NS73.

6.8.1 PROCESSION OF STANDARDS
The fragments of the Gudea Stelae represented by NS61-NS63 and NS83-NS86 appear to depict a procession of standards. NS84, the best preserved of these, depicts two figures holding two different standards, and part of a third figure also holding a standard. On NS83 and NS85 the upper part of the standard and the head of the standard bearer are preserved, and on NS61-NS63 only the emblem of the standard and the tassels below the emblem have survived. Only part of the emblem depicted on NS86 is extant. At least three different types of standards were represented. Lion standards are represented on NS61-NS63, while bird standards or standards with winged beings are represented on NS83-NS86.

Landsberger (1961:17 n.64) links the standards depicted on NS61-NS63 and NS83-NS86 with a passage in Gudea Cylinder A xiv:14-27 (Edzard 1997:78 RIMEP E3/1.1.7.CylA) which mentions three different standards associated with districts which were involved in temple construction. Landsberger (1961:17 n.64) proposes that the “Löwe mit Scheibe” represents the standard of Inanna. Gudea Cylinder A xiv:27 describes Inanna’s standard as “aš-me šu-nir-dinanna-kam” (Edzard 1997:78 RIMEP E3/1.1.7.CylA). While “šu-nir-dinanna-kam” clearly means “Inanna’s standard”, the exact meaning of “aš-me” is less clear. In translations of the Gudea Cylinders, it has been variously translated as a “star-disc” (Barton 1929:219), “the (Venus) disk” (Jacobsen 1987:406), “the disk” (Suter 2000:394), a “Sonnenscheibe” (Pongratz-Leisten 1992:303), and as a rosette (Edzard 1997:78 RIMEP E3/1.1.7.CylA; Römer 2010:55).

534 Although this object may not represent the emblem of a standard. See 6.9.5.2.
535 Only the lion standards will be discussed here. For the standards depicted on NS83-NS85 and the object on NS86, see below 6.9.5.2.
536 “Lion with disc”
537 “Sun disc”
538 Furthermore, the ePSD gives the translation of ašme as “radiance” (http://psd.museum.upenn.edu/epsd/nepsd-frame.html accessed 23 September 2015). However, according to
Pongratz-Leisten (1992:303) suggests that the disc on the lion’s back “hat...ursprünglich einen Metallaufsatz getragen, der die Form einer rosette hatte”\textsuperscript{539}. If the standard on \textit{NS61-NS63} does represent Inannas’s standard as described on \textit{Gudea Cylinder A}, it is the disc on the lion’s back which is specifically described as belonging to or representing the goddess, and not the lion. However, as Suter (2000:177) points out, Inanna was “traditionally also associated with lions”\textsuperscript{540}, which would reinforce the connection between Inanna and the standards depicted on \textit{NS61-NS63}. Van Buren (1945:39) states that one of the lion standards (\textit{NS63}) does not have a disc, but Suter (2000:370 ST.27) reconstructs this lion emblem with a disc, and the three standards on \textit{NS61-NS63} must therefore reflect that same standard\textsuperscript{541}. Although van Buren (1945:40) has suggested that these standards with the emblem consisting of a lion with a disc on its back are associated with the god Ningirsu, it is therefore most likely that they are associated with or representative of Inanna.

According to Suter (2000:177), a stamped brick from Tello with a recumbent lion with a disc on its back [Fig. 6.7] is the only known parallel to the lions with discs on their backs depicted on \textit{NS61-NS63}\textsuperscript{542}. On the stamped brick, the disc is surmounted on a short shaft, which in turn is surmounted on the back of the lion (Cros, Heuzey and Thureau-Dangin 1910-1914:309 Fig. 19), whereas on \textit{NS61-NS63} the disc lies directly on the back of the lion. Furthermore, the lion on the stamped brick is recumbent, while those on \textit{NS61-NS63} are pacing towards the right. However, despite these differences, Fuhr-Jaeppelt (1972:100) argues that these lions with discs on their backs are all of a common tradition. This reveals that, at least in Lagash, the lion with a disc on its back was a recognised symbol or emblem.

\textsuperscript{539} “Originally had a metal fixture which was in the shape of a rosette”.
\textsuperscript{540} See also 4.5 for more on this association.
\textsuperscript{541} Fuhr-Jaeppelt (1972:100) only mentions two lion standards, \textit{NS61} and \textit{NS62}. It is possible that \textit{NS62} was left out of her discussion because the fragment with the lion emblem is now housed in the Eski Şark Museum in Istanbul and was first published by Börker-Klähn (1982:catalogue number 61b), although this does not explain its inclusion by van Buren (1945:39-40) and not by Fuhr-Jaeppelt (1972:100).
\textsuperscript{542} Although in the presentation scenes \textit{NS65}, \textit{NS66}, \textit{NS67}, \textit{NS69}, \textit{NS71} and \textit{NS72} a lion standard is associated with a disc, this disc is found in the field in the scenes and is not attached directly to the standard. Additionally, the disc is a fairly common motif in Neo-Sumerian presentation scenes. \textit{NS72}, \textit{NS65}, \textit{NS66}, \textit{NS67}, \textit{NS69}, \textit{NS721} and \textit{NS72} can therefore not be seen as parallels or comparanda to the lion standards on \textit{NS61-NS63}. 
6.8.2 CONTEST SCENES

A lion standard is found in association with a contest scene only on cylinder seal NS64. This cylinder seal depicts an antithetical scene in which two nude heroes each hold an inverted lion by its hind legs. The nude hero on the left plunges a dagger into the stomach of the lion. Between the two groupings of nude hero and lion is a standard with the emblem of a lion which faces right. On either side of this emblem is a six-pointed star. While the eight-pointed star was generally associated with Inanna/İštar, the significance of the six-pointed star is unfortunately unknown (Black and Green 1992:170). The inscription on this seal dates from the Neo-Sumerian Period543 but, according to Collon (1982:168), the iconography appears to be “carved in the Akkadian tradition as opposed to the Ur III, whatever the date at which it was executed.” While the nude heroes particularly are carved in a style reminiscent of those of the Akkadian Period, Boehmer (1965:32) dates the cylinder seal to the Neo-Sumerian Period by the style of sculpture of the lion’s face and the two stars, as well as by

543 See Collon (1982:66) for a transliteration and English translation of this inscription.
the inscription, and suggests that the seal is from the reign of Shulgi (Boehmer 1965:32 n.132).

6.8.3 PRESENTATION SCENES
Presentation scenes are depicted on the cylinder seal impressions NS65-NS73. In all of these the presentation is made to a seated deity. In NS65-NS71 this deity is a god, and on NS72 and NS73 it is a goddess.

Inanna/Ištar is the Mesopotamian deity most commonly associated with the lion (Seidl 1957-71:487). The lion standards on NS61-NS63 most likely represent or are associated with Inanna, particularly because the disc is also her emblem. In the presentation scene on NS73 the lion standard is held by a human figure who stands behind a seated goddess. Because this is the only other example where the standard is held and is not located in the field, it is possible that this reflects a similar ideology to NS61-NS63, although the standard on NS73 is not found in a procession of standards. If these four standards are related, this may indicate that the enthroned goddess on NS73 represents Inanna. It is then also possible that the goddess depicted in the presentation scene on NS72 also represents Inanna because this goddess is associated with a lion standard. There are, however, no other attributes which enable the identification of this goddess.

The lion standard is also associated with gods on the presentation scenes NS65-NS71, and the lion standard can therefore not only represent or be associated with Inanna. The lion was particularly associated with Ningirsu during the Neo-Sumerian Period (Green 2003:23-24), but was also associated with Ninurta, Nergal (Cornelius 1989:59), Zababa and Ninazu (Strawn 2005:193-194, 206). However, according to van Buren (1939b:4), “the lion was not the emblem of one particular god, but indicated the war-like strain which was latent in the character of most divinities”. It is therefore possible that the gods with whom the lion standard is associated on NS65-NS71, and even the goddesses on NS72 and NS73, are not meant to represent a specific deity, but rather that the “power, authority and strength” (Green 2003:23) of the lion are associated with these deities.

544 See above 6.8.1.
6.8.4 SUMMARY

The lion standard is found in a procession of standards on NS61-NS63, in a contest scene on A64, and in presentation scenes on NS65-NS73.

There is a variety of decoration amongst the Neo-Sumerian lion standards. Tassels on the standards on NS61, NS62, NS63, NS65, NS67 and NS71 are represented by wavy lines below the lion emblem. The lion standard on NS73 also has a tassel, but this tassel does not appear as wavy lines, but hangs down from the side of the emblem like those on the Naram-Sin Victory Stele A74. On NS66, NS68, NS69 and NS72 the lion emblem is surmounted on an oblong shape. On NS72 this shape is quite large, but “there is a single vertical line from the middle of the bottom of the “box” which probably makes it a standard” (Ulla Kasten, personal correspondence). These oblong shapes most likely represent plinths upon which the lion emblem rested. These variations most likely reflect artistic preference, and not different types of lion standard. In contrast, the inclusion of a disc on the back of the lion on NS61-NS63 seems to indicate that these standards reflect a different tradition to the lion standards which do not include such a disc. The lion standards which include the disc can be associated with Inanna, as both the lion and the disc were associated with this goddess. The simpler lion standards in which the emblem consists of only a lion with no disc are associated with both gods and goddesses, and are most likely symbolic of the power of divinity, rather than being associated with a specific deity or deities.

Lion standards are held only by human figures, never by a deity. The more complex lion standard in which the lion has a disc on its back is held by a human figure and carried in a procession on NS61-NS63. The simpler lion standard is held by a human figure only on NS73 where this figure is standing behind a goddess. In all other examples, NS64-NS72, the lion standard is found in the field.
6.9 BIRD AND BIRD-MAN STANDARDS

During the Early Dynastic Period a standard with an emblem in the form of a bird or Imdugud/Anzu is depicted on Eannatum’s Vulture Stele ED66. No standards with bird or Imdugud/Anzu emblems are known from the Akkadian Period, but both types of standard, as well as a standard with an emblem in the form of a composite bird-man figure, are depicted in Neo-Sumerian Period iconography.

Bird standards are represented on the cylinder seals NS74, NS75, NS76, NS80 and NS82 and the seal impressions NS51, NS77, NS78 and NS79, and standards with bird or composite bird-man figures are depicted on the fragments of the Gudea Stelae NS83, NS84 and NS85. Bird standards are associated with a contest scene on NS74, with presentation scenes on NS75-NS79, with worship/adoration scenes on NS80 and NS81, with a boat scene on NS51, and with a procession of standards on NS82-NS85.

6.9.1 CONTEST SCENES

On the cylinder seal NS74 a female figure stands between two lions which stand on their hind legs and extend their forelimbs towards her. There is a scorpion in the field between the female figure and one of the lions, and a bird standard acts as a terminal to the scene. The bird which forms the emblem of the standard has a long neck and two outstretched wings.

6.9.2 PRESENTATION SCENES

The cylinder seals NS75 and NS76 and cylinder seal impressions NS77, NS78 and NS79 depict presentations scenes. In all five examples, the seated figure who is the object of presentation and the focus of the scene appears to be a goddess. Also, in all five examples, the bird emblem is represented in profile and without wings. On NS75 a seated goddess is approached by a second goddess or Lamma who leads a worshipper. Behind the enthroned goddess is a bird standard. The cylinder seal NS76 has two registers. In the lower register are three water birds which Legrain (1951:22) describes as “three swans with raised wings on...”

---

545 See 4.5 for more on ED66.
546 This type of bird-man figure is not to be confused with that found on Akkadian seals, as for example on A28, A29 and A35 in 5.2.3.1.
547 Imdugud/Anzu standards are discussed below in 6.10.
548 See also NS12, NS21 and NS22 in 6.3.2, and NS87 in 6.10 for the combination of bird and scorpion.
549 Buchanan (1981:206) identifies the bird emblem of this standard as representing a goose. See, however, Asher-Greve and Westenholz (2013:210-217) for the “evidence of mistaking a goose for a swan or vice versa” (2013:217) in Mesopotamian art and thought. Because of this difficulty in differentiating between goose and swan, in this work these birds will be referred to simply as “waterbirds.”
the river”. In the upper register is a presentation scene in which a worshipper is led forward by an interceding figure to an enthroned figure who Legrain (1951:22) identifies as a goddess. Behind the seated goddess is a bird standard. The bird which forms the emblem of this standard looks different to the water birds in the lower register, and must therefore represent a different type of bird. Not only does the bird emblem have a shorter neck than the birds in the lower register, but it also does not have raised wings. The seal impression NS77 comes from the seal of the shepherd Idabidu, servant of the erez-diğir-priestess Geme-Lamma (Asher-Greve and Westenholz 2013:210). It depicts a presentation scene in which a worshipper is led forward by an interceding goddess or Lamma to an enthroned goddess. Between the two goddesses is a bird standard, above which in the field is a disc within a crescent⁵⁴⁰. The inscription on the seal impression mentions the goddess Bau⁵⁵¹, and the seated goddess may represent her. On NS78 an enthroned goddess is approached by a second, interceding goddess or Lamma. Originally there was also a worshipper (Fischer 1997:161). Between the two goddesses in the lower field is a small bird standard, and in the upper field is what is described by Fischer (1997:161) as an “einfacher Adler”⁵⁵², but which may represent Imdugud/Anzu⁵⁵³. Not all of seal impression NS79 has been preserved. Only a seated goddess and interceding goddess or Lamma remain, the latter would have been leading a worshipper by the hand. The seated goddess holds a bird standard. The legs of this bird emblem are represented as if it is standing on the shaft of the standard. This is unusual for a bird standard, as the birds on bird standards are “almost invariably without legs” and “cannot be anything but a model or image of a bird” (van Buren 1945:30), as opposed to a living bird.

6.9.3 WORSHIP/ADORATION SCENES

On NS80 is a worship/adoration scene in which a human figure faces a vessel with a date palm⁵⁵⁴. On the other side of the vessel with a date palm is what Legrain (1951:22) describes as a “spread eagle hovering above a diminutive figure” and what Buchanan (1966:74) describes as an “[e]agle on pole”. Unfortunately, the seal is chipped just below the bird, which makes the exact identification of this object as a bird standard uncertain. If it does

---

⁵⁴⁰ For more on the disc within a crescent, see 6.3.1.
⁵⁵¹ See Fischer (1997:157) for a transliteration of this inscription.
⁵⁵² “simple eagle”.
⁵⁵³ For more in Imdugud/Anzu, see above 4.5, and below 6.10.
⁵⁵⁴ For more on the vessel with a date palm, see 6.3.3.
represent a standard, its closest parallel in appearance is the standard represented on the Gudea Stelae NS83-NS85\textsuperscript{555}.

On NS81 a figure raises a hand towards a bird standard in a gesture of worship. This scene suggests that the bird standard was seen as an object of veneration, and would therefore have been linked to a divinity\textsuperscript{556}.

6.9.4 BOAT SCENE
On the cylinder seal impression NS51 is a scene with a boat and a bird standard which may be positioned on the bank of the river\textsuperscript{557}. Parrot (1948:258) describes the standard as “l’aigle déploïé est dressé sur la “lance de Marduk””\textsuperscript{558}, while Mayer-Opificius (1996:215) describes it as “einige Wasservögel, die möglicherweise zu einer weiblichen Göttin gehören”\textsuperscript{559} and suggests that it may be associated with either Ningal, Ištar, Bau or Nanše. The bird standard on NS51 looks different to those depicted on the presentation scenes NS75-NS79 because it is depicted en face and in flight with outstretched wings, while those on N75-NS79 are depicted in profile and without wings, as if they are perched on the shaft of the standard. Similarly, while the bird standard on NS51 and NS74 are both represented with outstretched wings, that on NS51 is shown en face as if it is flying, while that on NS74 is shown in profile as if perched on the shaft of the standard. The bird standard on NS51 is, however, similar in appearance to a bird standard depicted in a procession of standards on NS82.

6.9.5 PROCESSIONS OF STANDARDS
6.9.5.1 GLYPHTIC
The scene on the cylinder seal NS82 depicts a winged figure, “presumably a deity” (Buchanan 1971:3), in a chariot drawn by a quadruped. Buchanan (1981:193) suggests that this quadruped, although it looks like an ass, may be “a crude version of the serpent-dragon”. This “serpent-dragon” can be identified as Mušḫuššu and was associated with the gods Ninazu, Tišpak and Ningišzida before the Old Babylonian Period\textsuperscript{560} (Wiggermann 1993-1997b:457-458). None of these gods, however, is described as having wings, and are therefore unlikely to represent the winged deity on NS82. It is unusual for a deity to be

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{555} Discussed below in 6.9.5.2.
\textsuperscript{556} For more on this, see below throughout 6.9.
\textsuperscript{557} NS51 is also discussed in 6.6. See there for more on the boat and the objects within the boat.
\textsuperscript{558} “The spread eagle surmounting the “lance of Marduk””.
\textsuperscript{559} “Some waterbird that may belong to a goddess”.
\textsuperscript{560} See 5.2.3.2.2, 6.2 and 6.11 for more on Mušḫuššu and the deities with whom Mušḫuššu was associated.
\end{flushleft}
depicted with wings. During the Akkadian Period, Ištar is sometimes depicted with wings\textsuperscript{561}, and during the Old Babylonian Period the so-called Queen of the Night figure [Fig. 6.8], who is sometimes identified as Ištar, but more likely represents Eriškigal\textsuperscript{562}, also has wings. In both cases, the deity with wings is female. According to Buchanan (1971:3) there is only one other known example of a deity with wings from the Neo-Sumerian Period which appears on a cylinder seal impression [Fig. 6.9] (Buchanan 1981:260-261 catalogue number 679). This deity is a god who has two small horizontal wings, but whose identity is unknown. The winged deity on \textbf{NS82} can therefore not be identified on the basis of the figure’s wings. The winged figure rides in a chariot, and during the preceding Akkadian Period, the deity most commonly depicted in a chariot is the storm god\textsuperscript{563}, although in this case the chariot was drawn by lion-griffon and not \textit{Muššuššu}\textsuperscript{564}. There therefore appears to be no direct comparanda which can be used to identify the deity depicted on \textbf{NS82} based on the chariot drawn by \textit{Muššuššu} either.

Behind the god in the chariot is a procession of three standards, each carried by a human figure. These standards have for emblems a spread eagle, a waterbird and what Buchanan (1981:193) describes as “probably [a] snake with pin through it”\textsuperscript{565}. That there are two standards with bird emblems — the spread eagle which is represented \textit{en face} and with outstretched wings, and the waterbird which is depicted in profile and with no wings — indicates that these represent different concepts or ideologies, and should be associated with different deities.

\textsuperscript{561} See for example Boehmer (1965:Taf. XXXII.377, 379 and 382).
\textsuperscript{562} See Collon (2005b) for images of the Burney or Queen of the Night Relief (British Museum ANE 2003-718.1) and related pieces. See Cabrera and van Dijk (forthcoming) and Collon (2005b) for more on the identity of this goddess.
\textsuperscript{563} See for example Boehmer (1965:Taf. XXXI.372, 373 and 374).
\textsuperscript{564} The animal drawing the chariot on \textbf{NS82} cannot represent the lion-griffon, because the lion-griffon was depicted as being winged, and the creature on \textbf{NS82} has no wings. For more on the lion-griffon, see 5.8.
\textsuperscript{565} This possible snake standard is discussed in 6.12.
Fig. 6.8: The so-called Queen of the Night (R.M. van Dijk)

Fig. 6.9: Seal impression with a depiction of a god with wings (Buchanan 1981: 260 Catalogue Number 679)
The spread eagle is similar in appearance to the bird emblem of the standard on **NS51**, and these two may then represent the same type of standard\(^{566}\). The waterbird, on the other hand, is similar in appearance to the bird emblems of the standards depicted on the presentation scene **NS75-NS79**. In these presentation scenes the bird standard is associated with a goddess, and on **NS79** the goddess even holds the standard. Similarly, the bird standard in the contest scene **NS74** has an emblem of a bird which has wings and is depicted in profile. This standard on **NS74** is associated with a female figure, who, by her association with a contest scene, cannot be a mere mortal female, and may therefore represent a goddess. The identification of this female figure as a goddess may be supported by the fact that the similar bird standards on **NS75-NS79** are all associated with a goddess. When the bird standard with the bird emblem in profile is associated with a deity, it is always associated with a goddess. Therefore, this suggests that it can be associated with a goddess when there is no accompanying figure. In other words, the bird standard with the bird emblem in profile on **NS82** can, by comparison to **NS74-NS79**, also be associated with a goddess. Similarly, the bird standard on **NS81** probably also represents a goddess. However, Asher-Greve and Westenholz (2013:218-219) suggest that waterbirds are associated not with a single goddess, but with goddesses who are the consorts of gods who act as patron deities of various city-states, and as such the waterbirds are “symbols of love, divine marital union, and protection of their city and citizens” by these goddesses. In this capacity, the goddesses depicted on **NS76**, which is from Ur, may represent Ningal, the wife of Nanna, the patron deity of Ur, and the goddesses on **NS77-NS79**, which are from Lagash, may represent Bau, the wife of Ningirsu, the patron deity of this city-state. Similarly, the bird standard on **NS81** may represent Bau, as this standard was excavated at Lagash. However, that two bird standards are depicted in a procession of standards on **NS82** suggests that these standards are representative of some kind of entity or power, and a general symbolism can therefore not apply to them. The goddess most commonly associated with birds is Nanše\(^{567}\) and it is possible then that Nanše was represented by the bird standard with the waterbird emblem. The neck of the spread eagle bird on **NS82** appears like that of a water bird, rather than a bird of prey such as an eagle, and it is unclear with whom it may be associated, as there is so little comparanda.

---

\(^{566}\) Although this bird is in a spread eagle position, it is possible that it represents not an eagle, but some other kind of bird, perhaps even a waterbird. The term “spread eagle” will be used here to differentiate this standard from the bird standard with the waterbird emblem.

\(^{567}\) See 6.3.3.
6.9.5.2 THE GUDEA STELAE

As on NS82, there appear to be at least two different types of standard with bird or bird-like emblems on the fragments of the Gudea stelae NS83-NS85. The first type of bird figure is depicted on each of NS83-NS85. The emblem of this standard has been described as an “aigle éployé…à bec assez long” (Parrot 1948:180) and as an “Adlerstandarte” (Börker-Klähr 1982:149), but it actually represents a hybrid or composite bird figure with “the head and outstretched wings of a bird and the torso of a human figure holding a staff against its chest” (Suter 2000:177) and can best be described as a bird-man.

A second emblem is depicted on NS86. This emblem is in the form of a lion-headed eagle with outstretched wings (Parrot 1948:180), i.e. Imdugud/Anzu. It has been reconstructed by (Börker-Klähr 1982:Taf C) as an Imdugud/Anzu standard which is planted in the ground next to a star standard, the emblem of which is visible to the right to the Imdugud/Anzu emblem. Mayer-Opificius (1996:217) accepts the reading of the Imdugud/Anzu standard, but questions whether the star emblem has been identified correctly, and whether these standards were planted in the ground. Suter (2000:178) points out that the shape of the apparent star emblem is not regular in shape and therefore probably does not represent a star. Suter further argues against the objects on NS86 representing standards at all because the star-like object is not carried by an animal, as the disc on the lion standards represented on NS83-NS86, and because there is no room for tassels as on the other standards on the Gudea Stele NS61-NS63 and NS83-NS86. According to Suter, the Imdugud/Anzu is therefore also unlikely to represent a standard, and may instead be part of a chariot.

Although the Imdugud/Anzu emblem on NS86 probably does not belong to a standard, a second bird or bird-like standard may still be represented on the Gudea Stelae. Two standards are visible on NS84. Although the emblem of the standard on the left is damaged, Suter (2000:179) suggests that it “could be interpreted as the lower part of a bird in profile” [Fig. 6.10], like the emblems of the bird standards on NS74-NS79 and NS81, and the middle standard in the procession depicted on NS82.

---

568 Mayer-Opificius (1996:217) only mentions two standards with this emblem, those represented on NS84 and NS85, but it is clear that NS83 represents the same emblem and standard.

569 “Spread eagle with a rather long beak”.

570 “Eagle standard”.

571 Van Buren (1945:31) describes this figure as a god who holds a weapon and has an eagle which “rises above the god’s head like a fantastic head-dress.” Suter’s (2000:177) description is more accurate.

572 For an example of an Imdugud/Anzu attachment to a chariot, see Börker-Klähr (1982: catalogue number 46, Taf E second register).
Landsberger (1961:17 n.64) links the fragments of the Gudea Stelae with depictions of standards with a passage in *Gudea Cylinder A* xiv:14-27 which mentions three standards associated with districts involved in temple building. In this passage, Ningirsu’s standard is described as “šu-nir-maḫ-bi lugal-kur-dúb” (Edzard 1997:78 RIMEP E3/1.1.7.CylA xiv:18), and Nanše’s standard is described as “u₅-kù šu-nir-₄-nanše-kam” (Edzard 1997:78 RIMEP E3/1.1.7.CylA xiv:23).

Ningrisu’s standard “šu-nir-maḫ-bi lugal-kur-dúb” has been translated variously to mean “exalted emblem of the king who subdues the world” (Barton 1929:219), “erhabene Standarte ‘König, der das Feindland niederschlägt’” (Römer 2010:55), “magnificent standard “King who makes the mountain tremble”” (Edzard 1997:78), “August standard *Lugalkurdub*” (Jacobsen 1987:405) and “huge standard, Lugalkurdub” (Suter 2000:394). Selz (1997:177) argues that the god Lugalkurdub was originally the name or epithet for one of Ningirsu’s weapons ṣáṛ-ūr, “(the one) that flattens everything”, and that it is this weapon which is

---

573 See also 6.8.1.
574 “Lofty standard “king who strikes down the enemy country””. 

---
represented in *Gudea Cylinder A* xiv:18. However, the god Lugalkurdub and the weapon Lugalkurdub appear as separate entities even in the *Gudea Cylinders*.

The meaning of Nanše’s standard “**u5-kù**” was “unerklärt” to Landsberger (1961:17 n.64). It has been translated as “the holy prow” (Jacobsen 1987:406) and “die ‘Reine Kajüte(?)’” (Römer 2010:55). However, as Suter (2000:178) points out, the term **u5** can refer not only to a part of a ship, but also to a waterbird, and Nanše’s standard has therefore also been translated as “White Swan (?)” (Edzard 1997:78) and “the sacred gull” (Suter 2000:394).

If the standards on the Gudea Stelae NS61-NS63 and NS83-NS86 are linked with the passage in *Gudea Cylinder A*, the standards on NS83-NS85 should represent or be associated with Ningirsu and/or Nanše. Landsberger (1961:17 n.64) originally identified the “Anzu” standard as representing Ningirsu’s standard, a proposal which Mayer-Opificius (1996:217) considers “sicher unbestritten”. However, the Imdugud/Anzu emblem depicted on NS86 most likely did not form part of a standard, and can therefore not represent Ningirsu’s standard. Furthermore, as Suter (2000:179) points out, the Imdugud/Anzu emblem cannot be identified with Lugalkurdub mentioned in *Gudea Cylinder A* because Imdugud/Anzu and Lugalkurdub are separate beings or entities in the text. For example, *Gudea Cylinder A* xiii:22 mentions a standard called “**AN.IM.MI.MUŠEN**” (Edzard 1997:96 RIMEP E3/1.1.7.CylA), translated as a “thunderbird” by Jacobsen (1987:404) and Edzard (1997:96), and as “Anzu” by Heimpel (1987:206), Römer (2010:54) and Suter (2000:89). If a separate standard with an Imdugud/Anzu emblem is described in this passage, the Lugalkurdub standard mentioned in *Gudea Cylinder A* xiv:18 cannot also be represented by Imdugud/Anzu. If the Imdugud/Anzu depicted on NS86 does form the emblem of a standard, this standard may represent the standard mentioned in *Gudea Cylinder A* xiii:22. However, Suter’s arguments against this object representing a standard are persuasive.

The bird-man standard represented on NS83-NS85 is identified as Nanše’s standard by Mayer-Opificius (1996:217) and Pongratz-Leisten (1992:303), but this identification is based on the description of the emblems of these standards being birds, and not bird-men. Van

---

575 See 6.4.
576 “Unexplained/unaccounted”.
577 “The pure cabin”.
578 “certainly uncontested”.
579 See above.
Buren (1945:31) identifies the bird-man standards as being associated with Ninurta, with “the god and his attribute... fused into one mystic whole”. Asher-Greve and Westenholz (2013:211) identify this standard, as a standard with an emblem in the form of a “bird-man/woman”, as representing Nanše’s standard, arguing that, as with other deities, “Nanše presumably had several symbols, emblems and attributes pertaining to her different roles and functions”, and that this standard was one of these symbols. Suter (2000:179) suggests that the standard with the bird-man emblem represents Ningirsu’s standard Lugalkurdub and that the possible bird standard on NS84 represents Nanše’s standard, although concedes that “there need not be a perfect match between the standards in the text and those depicted on the stelae”. It may also be that the standards represented on the Gudea Stelae NS61-NS63 and NS83-NS86 are not linked with those mentioned in Gudea Cylinder A xiv:14-27, although the fact that fragments of the Gudea Stelae also represent the shipment of building material and construction work argue against this.\footnote{See Suter (2000:180-185) for a discussion on these fragments.}

The fragments of the Gudea Stelae NS83-NS85 therefore appear to represent the Lugalkurdub standard of Ningirsu and the u5-kiû standard of Nanše, with the bird-man standard depicted on NS83-NS85 representing Lugalkurdub, and the second standard on NS84, which may represent a waterbird, representing Nanše’s standard.

**6.9.6 SUMMARY**

Bird standards are depicted in a variety of contexts during the Neo-Sumerian Period — in association with one contest scene on NS74, in four presentation scenes in which a goddess is the focus of the presentation on NS75-NS79, in two worship/adoration scenes on NS80 and NS81, in one scene with a boat on NS51 and as part of a procession of standards on NS82-NS85.

Different types of birds are represented. The bird standards on NS74-NS79 and NS81, one of those on NS82, and possibly the second standard on NS84 have emblems in the form of waterbirds which are represented in profile. The bird emblem on NS74 has outstretched wings, but those on NS75-NS79, NS81 and NS82 do not. A bird standard with a bird depicted en face with outstretched wings in a spread eagle pose is depicted on NS51, on one of the standards on NS82, and possibly on NS80, although the identification of the latter as a
standard is uncertain. If it is a standard, it may be a parallel to the standard with a bird-man emblem depicted on NS83-NS85, rather than being a bird in a spread eagle pose. However, the bird-man emblem depicted on NS83-NS85 probably represents Lugalkurudub, the standard of Ningirsu, and it is unlikely that NS80, which originates from Ur, would represent the standard of the patron deity of Lagash. If a bird standard with the waterbird emblem is represented on NS84, this most likely represents the standard of the goddess Nanše. On NS74-NS79, the bird standard with the waterbird emblem is associated with goddesses. Ningal may be represented on NS76 and Bau may be represented on NS77-NS79 respectively, although it is also possible that Nanše is depicted. The bird standard on NS81 is the focus of worship and may also represent the goddess Nanše.

The bird standards and bird-man standards are held by human figures in the processions of standards depicted on NS82-NS85. A goddess holds the bird standard depicted on NS79. In the other examples — NS51, NS74, NS75, NS76, NS77, NS78 and NS80 — the bird standards are located in the field. It acts as a terminal to the contest scene on NS74, and perhaps to the two presentation scenes on NS75 and NS76.
6.10 IMDUGUD/ANZU STANDARDS

During the Early Dynastic Period a standard with an emblem in the form of either a bird or Imdugud is depicted on ED6581. No examples of the Imdugud/Anzu standard are known from the Akkadian Period. During the Neo-Sumerian Period the Imdugud/Anzu standard is found associated with a contest scene on the cylinder seal NS87 and in two presentation scenes on the cylinder seal impression NS88 and the cylinder seal NS89582.

On NS87, two nude heroes battle with a lion. In the field acting as a terminal to the scene are an Imdugud/Anzu standard and what Collon (1982:114) describes as “a smaller standard surmounted by a long-necked, full-bodied vessel or mace-head flanked by two griffin heads”, but which actually represents a double lion-headed mace or sceptre583 (Black and Green 1992:169; Collon 1986:53). On the left of the double lion-headed sceptre is a water bird, and to its right is a scorpion584. A crescent is located in the field above the double lion-headed sceptre. Imdugud/Anzu was traditionally associated with the god Ningirsu585, but the meaning of the double lion-headed sceptre is less clear. During the Neo-Sumerian Period it was associated with a variety of deities, both gods and goddesses, and it is therefore impossible to associate it with a specific deity on NS87586.

On NS88 a bald worshipper is led by an interceding goddess or Lamma towards a seated god. This god holds in his right hand an overflowing vase, above which is a small god who raises his hand. Behind the seated god is an Imdugud/Anzu standard. The seated god can be identified by the overflowing vase as Enki587, but the presence of the Imdugud/Anzu standard suggests some association with Ningirsu, unless it is representative instead of Lagash, the city of which Ningirsu was the patron deity. This latter interpretation may be supported by the fact the inscription of the seal which made the impressions reveals that the seal belonged to

581 See 4.5 for more on this standard.
582 It may also be represented on the fragment of the Gudea Stelae NS86 if the emblem is attached to a standard, although see above.
583 This object is also called a “lion club” (Buchanan 1981:237) and a “lion club standard” (Buchanan 1966:80). In this work it is not understood as representing a standard because when it is held by a deity it has a short shaft, and therefore represents a sceptre or a weapon. For examples of a warrior goddess holding this double lion-headed sceptre on Old Babylonian seals, see Collon (1986:Plate XXIX.386 and 388).
584 For other examples of water bird and scorpion, see NS12, NS21, NS22 in 6.3.3 and NS74 in 6.9.1.
585 See above 4.5.
586 Although the inclusion of the bird, scorpion and crescent may link the iconography of NS87 to that of NS22, discussed in 6.3.2.
587 See 5.2.3.1 for Ea/Enki and this god’s association with the overflowing vase.
the scribe of Ur-Lamma of Lagash\textsuperscript{588}. However, if this is the case, it is unclear why Enki is represented, as he was the patron deity of Eridu.

On \textit{NS89} an interceding goddess or Lamma leads a bald worshipper towards a seated goddess. Between the two goddesses is a double-headed Imdugud/Anzu standard. According to Fuhr-Jaeppelt (1972:202), this standard is unique, and it may have been added at a later date to the original engraving of the cylinder seal. Imdugud/Anzu was usually associated with the god Ningirsu, and when associated with a goddess, Fuhr-Jaeppelt (1972:253) identifies the goddess as Ištar in her martial aspect. This suggests that the goddess on \textit{NS89} represents Inanna/Ištar, whether the Imdugud/Anzu originally formed the emblem of a standard or was found as a separate symbol in the field.

During the Neo-Sumerian Period, the Imdugud/Anzu standard is found associated with other symbols acting as a terminal to a contest scene on \textit{NS87}, and in association with presentation scenes on \textit{NS88} and \textit{NS89}. On \textit{NS88} it is associated with a god who is identifiable as Enki, and on \textit{NS89} it is associated with a goddess who may represent Ištar.

\textsuperscript{588} For a transliteration and French translation of this inscription, see Delaporte (1920:14).
6.11  **MUŠHUŠSU STANDARD**
A standard with an emblem in the form of *Mušhuššu* is represented on one seal impression NS90. This seal impression represents a presentation scene in which a bald worshipper is led forward by the hand by an interceding goddess or Lamma towards an enthroned goddess. Between the two goddesses is a standard with a long-necked serpent dragon, above which a crescent is located in the field. Fischer (1997:158) describes the standard as a “Schlangendrachenstandarte”\(^{589}\). The serpent dragon, identifiable as *Mušhuššu*, was usually associated with male divinities such as Ninazu, Tišpak and Ningišzida\(^{590}\), but on NS90 the *Mušhuššu* standard is associated with a goddess. Asher-Greve and Westenholz (2013:207) identify the seated goddess as Geštinanna, the spouse of Ningišzida\(^{591}\), whose identity they argue is signified by the inclusion of a symbol typically associated with her husband in Neo-Sumerian Period Lagash, from whence this seal impression originates. The *Mušhuššu* standard is therefore not only associated with the goddess Geštinanna on NS90, but additionally, and primarily, with her husband Ningišzida. The association between *Mušhuššu* and Ningišzida on NS90 can be supported by reference to the latter in the inscription on the seal (Fischer 1997:158-159).

\(^{589}\) “Serpent dragon standard”
\(^{590}\) For more on the association between *Mušhuššu* and these gods, see 5.2.3.2.2 and 6.2.
\(^{591}\) For more on Geštinanna, see Edzard (1957-1971), Black and Green (1992:88) and Leick (1998:67).
6.12 SNAKE STANDARD
A procession of three standards is depicted on NS82. These standards have emblems in the forms of a spread eagle, a water bird and what Buchanan (1981:193) describes as “probably [a] snake with [a] pin through it”. The snake standard is unique in third and fourth millennia BCE Mesopotamian iconography. The snake was associated with Eriškigal, Ninazu, Tišpak, Ningišzida, Ninmada, Ištaran and Inšušinak, as well as with Iššara, but it was the snake god Niraḫ who was “in origin a deified snake, [although] he is not necessarily (only) represented as such”. (Wiggermann 1998-2001d:573). McEwan (1983:221) argues that it is likely that snakes which were depicted on seals were meant to represent Niraḫ, but, as Wiggermann (1998-2001d:573) points out, the identities of snakes in Mesopotamian art are difficult to establish. Therefore, although the snake standard on NS82 may be associated with or representative of Niraḫ, this association is uncertain. Indeed, even the identification of this standard as a snake standard is uncertain.

NS82 is also discussed in 6.9.5.1.

See Wiggermann (1997) for a full treatment on these “snake gods”.

See 6.7 for this association.

For more on Niraḥ, see 5.2.3.2.3.
6.13 UNCERTAIN
As in the Uruk, Early Dynastic and Akkadian Periods, the fragmentary or worn nature of some pieces makes the identification of standards depicted on them uncertain.

A presentation scene is depicted on the cylinder seal NS91 in which an interceding goddess or Lamma leads a worshipper towards a seated goddess. There is a crescent in the field between the two goddesses, and acting as a terminal to the scene is what Collon (1982:125) describes as “a tree or fork-shaped standard.” It is unclear which it represents, but if it does represent a standard, the emblem looks a little like the pincers of scorpions as for example depicted on NS48, NS74, NS12 and NS22. A scorpion standard is depicted on NS60, and it is therefore possible that a scorpion standard is intended here too. However, NS91 is badly worn, and the identification of this object not only as a scorpion standard, but as a standard at all, is uncertain.

A fragment of the second register of the so-called poor face of the Ur-Nammu Stele NS92 may depict a row of standards, although the fragment is “terribly defaced” (Woolley 1974:78) and this identification is uncertain. At least six vertical lines are visible, the first of which has a crescent shape at its halfway point. Canby (2001:23) identifies these vertical lines as standards and suggests that the row of standards continued to the right edge of the stele. However, Woolley (1974:78) suggests that the lines form “an apparent trellis pattern at the top of the fragment [that] might possibly be the wall of a byre”, rather than that they represent standards. The fragment is broken so that the tops of these lines are not visible, so it is impossible to be certain if they represent standards, and if they do represent standards, how these looked.

596 See 6.7.
597 According to Canby (2001:23) there are nine vertical lines, but only six are clearly visible on photographs published by both Canby (2001: Plate 30.12), depicted in the catalogue as NS92, and Börker-Klähn (1982:Taf. 94b). According to Katherine Blanchard, the Fowler/Van Santvoord Keeper of Collections of the Near East Section of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, where NS92 is now housed, it is not possible to see “more on the fragment than is in the book [i.e. Canby 2001]” (personal correspondence).
6.14 SUMMARY

During the Neo-Sumerian Period the standards represented are the Bügelschaft, the crescent standard, the knobbed pole, the star standard, the rod with balls, the scorpion standard, the lion standard, the bird and bird-man standards, the Imdugud/Anzu standard, the Mušḫuššu standard, and possibly a snake standard. Whereas the Bügelschaft is the most commonly depicted standard of the Akkadian Period, only one example, NS1, is known from the Neo-Sumerian Period. Other standards which are only known from one representation are the possible snake standard depicted on NS82, the Mušḫuššu standard depicted on NS90, and the scorpion standard on NS60, although it is possible that the latter is also represented on NS91. Conversely, the crescent standard, which is only represented seven times in Akkadian Period iconography on A8 and A57-A62, is the most commonly depicted standard of the Neo-Sumerian Period, being represented 34 times.

During the Neo-Sumerian Period standards are found in a variety of contexts, but the changes in artistic tradition between the Akkadian and Neo-Sumerian periods are reflected in the contexts in which the standards are found. Whereas in previous periods standards were frequently represented in an architectural context, during the Neo-Sumerian Period only the Bügelschaft on NS1 and the knobbed poles on NS43 are found in an architectural context where they represent door- or gateposts to a sacred space. Standards are found in a ritual context on various types of scenes such as presentation scenes and worship/adoration scenes. The crescent standard, knobbed pole, star standard, rod with balls, scorpion standard, lion standard, bird standard, Imdugud/Anzu standard and Mušḫuššu standard are all represented in presentation scenes, while the crescent standard, knobbed pole, rod with balls and bird standard are represented in worship/adoration scenes. In the worship/adoration scenes, the crescent standard and bird standard are both represented as being the focus of the ritual, while the knobbed pole and rod with balls are found in the field and are associated with the ritual. The crescent standard, rod with balls, lion standard, bird standard and Imdugud/Anzu standard are also associated with contest scenes. The lion standard, bird and bird-man standards and possible snake standard are depicted in processions of standards. The lion standard and bird and bird-man standards depicted on the Gudea Stelae NS61-NS63 and NS83-NS86 probably represent the standards of Ištar, Nanše and Ningirsu respectively, and functioned as representing districts associated with these deities.

598 See 5.4.
599 See 6.1.
The standards depicted on the Gudea Stelae are not the only standards which functioned as divine standards during the Neo-Sumerian Period. The Bügelschaft is associated with the god Ningirsu on NS1, but is more likely, like in preceding periods, to be symbolic of divinity in general. The crescent standard is especially associated with the moon god, but may also have been associated with his consort or another figure in his retinue through their association with him. The knobbed pole on NS43 may be associated with Girra, although this association need not apply to all depicted knobbed poles. The variation of the knobbed pole on NS46 which is three-headed is associated with Meslamtaea, and the variation which is seven-headed on NS47 may be associated with Ningirsu. The rod with balls is associated with divinity in general, and the scorpion standard is associated with a god, although this god cannot be identified. The variation of the lion standard in which the lion supports a disc on its back is associated or representative of the goddess Ištar, while the simpler lion standard without a disc is associated with divinity in general, although in this case it appears to symbolise the power and authority of divinity. The bird standard in which the emblem appears in the form of a waterfowl is associated with Nanše on the Gudea Stelae fragment NS84 if this standard is a bird standard. Other depictions of goddesses associated with bird standards may also represent Nanše. The goddess associated with bird standard on NS76 may be Ningal, and the goddess associated with the bird standards on NS77 and NS79 may be Bau, in their capacities as the consorts of the patron deity of Ur and Lagash respectively. The standards with the emblem in the form of a bird-man on NS83-NS85 are associated with or represent the god Ningirsu. The Imdugud/Anzu standard is associated with Enki on NS88 and with Ištar on NS89, which is surprising, considering Ningirsu was the god with which Imdugud/Anzu was most commonly associated. The Mušḫuššu standard on NS90 is associated with Geštinanna through her relationship with Ningišzida. During the Neo-Sumerian Period standards are therefore associated with a wider variety of deities than in previous periods, and this is reflected in the fact that more varied standards are depicted. Both gods and goddesses are associated with standards, although it appears that goddesses are sometimes associated with standards purely through their relationship with their spouse, as for example Ningal’s association with the crescent standard and possibly the bird standard, Bau’s possible association with the bird standard, and Geštinanna’s association with the Mušḫuššu standard. However, the goddesses Nanše and Ištar are associated with or represented by the bird standard and the lion standard in which the lion supports a disc on its back respectively, demonstrating that goddesses during this period were seen as powerful and
worthy of reverence in their own right, and not only through their relationships with male gods.

During the Neo-Sumerian Period standards are held by a variety of types of figures. Human figures, animal figures, both natural and mythological, and deities, both gods and goddesses are depicted holding various standards. The lion standard in which a disc is surmounted on the back of the lion and the bird and bird-man standards on the Gudea Stelae NS61-NS61 and NS83-NS86 are carried by human figures in a procession. On NS61-NS63 the human figures have not survived, but by comparison to NS83-NS85 it is clear that the standards on NS61-NS63 were carried by similar figures. The spread eagle, waterbird and possible snake standards on NS82 are also carried by human figures in a procession of standards. On NS73 a lion standard is held by a human figure behind an enthroned goddess in a presentation scene. The rods with balls on NS55 and NS56 are both held by lions who stand on their hind legs. Both of these standards are found in association with a presentation scene. The knobbed pole on NS59 is held by a lion and a goat. The Bügelschaft on NS1 is held by Mušḫuššu. On NS46 the three-headed knobbed pole is held by a lion-griffon and a god, Meslamtaea. Deities hold a variety of other standards; the standard most often held by a deity is the crescent standard. On NS11-NS13 the crescent standard is held by a seated goddess in a presentation scene who most likely represents Ningal. An enthroned god holds the crescent standard in the presentations scene depicted on NS33, and a standing god with a feather headdress holds the crescent standard on the presentation scene on NS15. A deity holds the crescent standard on the trial piece NS33. In the presentation scene on NS36 a god in a posture of ascent holds the knobbed standard. The seven-headed knobbed pole on NS47 is held by a god in a presentation scene who may be Ningirsu. The scorpion standard on NS26 is held by two small gods, and the bird standard on NS79 is held by a goddess in a presentation scene who may be either Nanše or Bau.
7. SUMMARIES, ANALYSES AND CONCLUSIONS

In Chapter 1, four main research questions were laid out: 1. Which standards are represented in the iconographic record of Mesopotamia during the third and fourth millennia BCE? 2. What was the function of these standards? 3. What did these different standards mean or symbolise? 4. Were the same standards used during the different periods of the third and fourth millennium BCE?600

An attempt will be made to answer these questions in the following manner: First, a summary and analysis of each standard represented in Mesopotamian third and fourth millennia BCE iconography will be given. This summary will include the development of the standard in each period and attempt to answer with whom or what the standard was associated, or who or what it represented or symbolised. The main function or functions of the standard will also be discussed. Thereafter, there will be a summary and analysis of the different functions of these standards. This will include the different types of standards, and the contexts in which standards are represented. This will be followed by a short summary and analysis of each of the four periods under discussion in this study, the Uruk Period, the Early Dynastic Period, the Akkadian Period and the Neo-Sumerian Period, explaining which standards were represented in each period, what the major functions of standards were in each period, and revealing how these changed over time.

7.1 SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF EACH STANDARD

The standards represented in third and fourth millennia BCE Mesopotamian iconography are the ring-post with streamer, the ring-post without streamer, the Doppelvolute, the ringed pole, the Bügelschaft, the knobbed pole, floral and star standards, the crescent standard, an Imdugud/bird standard, the Imdugud/Anzu standard, the bird and the bird-man standards, the pennant standard, the tasselled standard, the rod with balls, the lion-griffon standard, the lion standard, the scorpion standard, the Mušḫuššu standard, and the snake standard [Tables 7.1 and 7.2].

600 See 1.2 for more on these research questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Uruk Period</th>
<th>Early Dynastic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
<th>Neo-Sumerian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ring-Post With Streamer</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="U12" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-Post Without Streamer</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="U38" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doppellolute</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="U43" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringed Pole</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="U56" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bügelschaft</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="U78, U66" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="ED7" /></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="A50, A10" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="NS1" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knobbed Pole</td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="U89" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="ED51" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="A54" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="NS40, NS39, NS44, NS45, NS46, NS47" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floral/Star Standard</td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="U99, U100" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="ED67" /></td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="A66" /></td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="NS49" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRESCENT STANDARD</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(U73) (Proto-Elamite)</td>
<td>(ED63, EDED64)</td>
<td>(A59, A62)</td>
<td>(NS17, NS27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMDUGUD/BIRD STANDARD</th>
<th><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ED66)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMDUGUD/ANZU STANDARD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(NS87, NS89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIRD AND BIRD MAN STANDARDS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(NS74, NS75, NS83)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PENNANT STANDARD</th>
<th><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A68)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TASSELLED STANDARD</strong></td>
<td>![Image](A71, A72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROD WITH BALLS</strong></td>
<td><img src="A74" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LION-GRIFFON STANDARD</strong></td>
<td><img src="A74" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LION STANDARD</strong></td>
<td>![Image](NS62, NS65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCORPION STANDARD</strong></td>
<td><img src="NS60" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MUšḪUŠŠU STANDARD</strong></td>
<td><img src="NS90" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SNAKE STANDARD</strong></td>
<td><img src="NS82" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1: The standards represented in the iconography of third and fourth millennia Mesopotamia
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Uruk Period</th>
<th>Early Dynastic Period</th>
<th>Akkadian Period</th>
<th>Neo-Sumerian Period</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ring-Post with Streamer</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-Post without Streamer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doppelvolute</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringed Pole</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bügelschaft</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knobbled Pole</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12 #</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floral/Star Standard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floral Standard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent Standard</td>
<td>(3) *</td>
<td>11 **</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52 (+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMDUGUD/Bird Standard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMDUGUD/Anzu Standard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird Standard</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird-Man Standard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennant Standard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasselled Standard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod with Balls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion-Griffon Standard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion Standard</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scorpion Standard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musḫuššu Standard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake Standard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (+3)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>339 (+3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not Mesopotamian standards
** Nine typical, simple crescent standards, two crescent standards with animal-footed bases
# Eight simple knobbed poles, four more elaborate variations of the knobbed pole

Table 7.2: The standards of third and fourth millennia Mesopotamia by frequency of representation (excluding uncertain standards)
7.1.1 RING-POST WITH STREAMER

The ring-post with streamer\(^{601}\) is the most frequently depicted standard in the iconographic record of the Uruk Period. It is, however, represented only in the Uruk Period [Tables 7.1 and 7.2]. The reason for this is that it was originally made of reed and associated with reed architecture. By the succeeding Early Dynastic Period, the sacred buildings with which standards were associated were made of mud brick, and the accompanying standards were no longer made of reed, but of wood or more durable materials such as copper, as for example the Bügelschaft standard ED1 and possibly ED2. The ring-post with streamer was originally associated with architecture, but it is also held as a standard on U6, U7 and U8 where it may be associated with some ritual activity. It can further be associated with ritual activity on U5, U10, U15, U16, U29, U33, U35 and U34. It may be associated with a festival of Inanna on U32. On U11-U14 it is associated with the care/feeding of the herds/flocks, which may also be considered a ritual activity. On U20-U27, U30 and U31 the ring-post with streamer is associated with sheep, and this may also be related to the care/feeding of the herds/flocks scenes. On U17 it is associated with a hunt, which may also have had a ritualistic element to it. The ring-post with streamer therefore appears to have been represented primarily in ritual contexts. As such, it was also a divine standard, as MUŠ3, the sign identified with the ring-post with streamer in the archaic Uruk script [Table 3.1], represented the goddess Inanna, and the ring-post with streamer can therefore be associated with this goddess when it is depicted in the iconographic record. The rituals with which the ring-post with streamer was associated may therefore represent rituals of the goddess Inanna.

7.1.2 RING-POST WITHOUT STREAMER

Like the ring-post with streamer, and for the same reasons, the ring-post without streamer\(^{602}\) is only represented in the Uruk Period [Tables 7.1 and 7.2]. As a reed standard, the ring-post without streamer is associated with buildings on U38 and U39. It is held by a figure, perhaps in association with some kind of ritual activity, on U40. The ring-post without streamer is represented by the sign LAGAR in the archaic Uruk script [Table 3.1], and may be associated with the god An in both the archaic Uruk script and in the iconographic record.

---

\(^{601}\) The ring-post with streamer is discussed in 3.2.2.

\(^{602}\) The ring-post without streamer is discussed in 3.2.3.
7.1.3 **DOPPELVOLUTE**

The *Doppelvolute*\(^{603}\) appears as a variation of the ring-post in which two ring-posts without streamers are depicted back to back as one symbol [Table 7.1]. Like the ring-post with streamer and the ring-post without streamer, the *Doppelvolute* was a reed standard and it is likewise only represented in the Uruk Period [Table 7.2]. It is only found in an architectural context, surmounting buildings.

7.1.4 **RINGED POLE**

The ringed pole\(^{604}\), another reed standard, is also only depicted in the Uruk Period [Tables 7.1 and 7.2]. In all depictions of the ringed pole in which its context is discernible, it is associated with architecture, either surmounting a building, as on U49-U51, U54, U55, U58, U59 and U61 and probably U52, U62, U63 and U64, or flanking it, as on U47, U53, U56, U57 and U60. It is also found in a ritual context on U53, U56, U57, U60 and perhaps on U47. On U51, U54, U55, U58, U59, U61-U64 it is associated with the caring of the herds, which may also be considered a ritual activity as these were the herds of the temple and therefore the property of a deity. In this regard the ringed pole, identified as the sign NUN in the archaic Uruk script [Table 3.1], may have been associated with the god Enki, and it could be suggested that the ringed pole in the iconographic record is also associated with this god. However, it appears more likely that it was associated with the goddess Nintu, or with divinity in general.

7.1.5 **BÜGELSCHAFT**

The *Bügelschaft*\(^{605}\) is one of only three standards which are represented in all four periods of this study [Tables 7.1 and 7.2]. The *Bügelschaft* was originally, like the ring-post with streamer, the ring-post without streamer, the *Doppelvolute* and the ringed pole, an architectural standard, but, unlike these standards, the *Bügelschaft* was not a reed standard, but was made of wood and of more durable materials such as copper. This accounts for the continuation in its use — and the loss of the ring-post with streamer, the ring-post without streamer, the *Doppelvolute* and the ringed pole — after the Uruk Period when the sacred buildings with which standards were associated were no longer reed structures, but were made of mud brick. The original architectural context and function of the *Bügelschaft* is

---

\(^{603}\) The *Doppelvolute* is discussed in 3.2.4.

\(^{604}\) The ringed pole is discussed in 3.3.

\(^{605}\) The *Bügelschaft* is discussed in 3.4, 4.2, 5.2, and 6.2.
exemplified by U65, an architectural model with two Bügelschafts flanking a doorway in the niched facade. The Bügelschaft is also depicted flanking or attached to buildings on U74-U77, U79, U81, U82 and U84, and may be representative of a building on U78 and U80. The Bügelschaft is furthermore represented in a ritual context on U81 and U82, where figures carry votive offerings towards the shrines with which the Bügelschaft is associated, and perhaps also on U76, U78 and U80.

In the archaic Uruk script the Bügelschaft is represented by the signs ŠEŠ and URI3 [Table 3.1]. The sign ŠEŠ may represent the moon god Nanna (Steinkeller 1995:705; 1998:88; Szarzyńska 1987-88:13) and the Bügelschaft, its equivalent in the iconographic record, may therefore likewise be associated with Nanna, and the buildings decorated with the Bügelschaft may be the temples or shrines of this god, with the associated rituals performed in his honour. However, the sign URI3 means “care” or “protection” (Szarzyńska 1987-88:6; 1996:11), and it is more likely that this reflects the function or symbolism associated with the Bügelschaft. In this way, the Bügelschaft marks the buildings as a sacred space, under the “care” or “protection” of a deity.

During the Uruk Period a variation of the Bügelschaft appears in the form of a standard with an emblem consisting of two Bügelschafts connected at their bases by a horizontal bar. This variation is represented in a procession of standards on U66 and therefore has a ritual context. A second standard in this procession appears to have an emblem similar to the Egyptian hieroglyph ḫ, but the cylinder seal is damaged and the exact appearance and identification of this second standard is uncertain.

ED1 represents an actual Bügelschaft from the Early Dynastic Period. ED2 and ED3 may also represent Bügelschafts although the identification of these is less certain. ED1 was excavated in the Temple of Ningirsu at Tello, and is therefore of a definite archaeological and religious context. The Bügelschaft is the most frequently depicted standard of the Early Dynastic Period, being represented on 47 of the 76 examples discussed under this period [Table 7.2]. Of these, in addition to ED1-ED3, in 35 other examples, Bügelschafts are depicted in an architectural context, either flanking or being attached to a building. These buildings with Bügelschafts are associated with domestic activity on ED4-ED21, ED27 and ED29. On ED22-ED23, ED34-ED36 and possibly ED38 they are associated with ritual activity — ritual sex may be depicted on ED22, votive offerings are brought to the temple or
shrine with Bügelschafts on ED23 and ED34, and libations are poured before a shrine or temple, or before a god on ED35 and ED36. The scene depicted on ED37 is fragmentary, and may be ritual or domestic. The Bügelschaft is associated with banquet scenes on ED26 and ED30-ED33 and is depicted in scenes of a mythological nature, either in association with contest scenes, as on ED39-ED42, or in scenes in which a nude hero stands between two Bügelschafts, holding one in each hand, as on ED28 and ED42-ED47.

During the Early Dynastic Period, the Bügelschaft on ED27 is associated with the god Nanna, with this god being identified by the crescent adorning his horned headdress, and by the findspot of this plaque. The Bügelschaft ED1, excavated in the Temple of Ningirsu, has a clear connection to this god. However, rather than being specifically associated with these gods, it is more likely that the Bügelschaft acted as a symbol of divine power, or of “care” and “protection”, as it did in the Uruk Period.

The Bügelschaft is also the most frequently depicted standard of the Akkadian Period, being represented on 53 of the 83 Akkadian Period examples in the catalogue [Table 7.2]. Whereas the Bügelschaft was primarily associated with domestic activity during the Early Dynastic Period, this association is only represented once during the Akkadian Period on A51. As in the Early Dynastic Period, the Bügelschaft is associated with contest scenes, as on A1-9; banquet scenes, as on A52 and A53; and in scenes in which a nude hero stands between two Bügelschafts, holding one in each hand, on A10-A12. The Bügelschaft is represented in scenes of a mythological nature not only in the contest scenes A1-9, but also in scenes in which it is associated with deities. The deity most frequently associated with the Bügelschaft is the god Ea, as represented on A11-A35 and A37. Other deities with whom the Bügelschaft is associated are the sun god, as on A27 and A41-A43; the god on a snake dragon, as on A44; snake gods, as on A10 and A45-A46; a god with a bull, as on A47 and A48; and a vegetation god, as on A49. Therefore, although the Bügelschaft is particularly associated with Ea during the Akkadian Period, this association is not exclusive. Instead, the Bügelschaft may be seen as symbolic of divinity in general, as it was in the Uruk and Early Dynastic periods. This can be supported by the iconography of A50, upon which four Bügelschafts are each associated with a separate divine symbol, and can therefore not be associated with one single deity.

As in the preceding Uruk and Early Dynastic periods, the Bügelschaft is depicted in an architectural context. On A19, A27, A30-A32, A36, A45, A48 and A51 the Bügelschaft is
depicted either flanking or attached to a building, and on A13-A18, A20-A26, A28-A29, A33-A35, A37, A39-A41, A43 and A47 the Bügelschaft is representative of the building. While the Bügelschaft is the most commonly depicted standard of both the Early Dynastic and Akkadian periods, only one example of this standard is known from the Neo-Sumerian Period [Table 7.2]. On NS1 the Bügelschaft is held by Mušḫuššu and functions as a door- or gatepost to a sacred space. Although this standard is associated through an inscription with the god Ningirsu, it was probably, as in previous periods, a mark of divinity.

That the Bügelschaft was represented only once during the Neo-Sumerian Period is reflective of the change or development in the function and symbolism of standards across the third and fourth millennia BCE. The first standards of the Uruk Period were associated with architecture, and the Bügelschaft continued to be represented in architectural settings through the Early Dynastic and Akkadian Periods. By the Neo-Sumerian Period, the actual buildings themselves are no longer represented, and architectural standards become less relevant in the iconographic record. Instead, in scenes which take place within a sacred space, such as presentation scenes and worship/adoration scenes, standards which appear to be associated with specific deities replace the Bügelschaft, which is representative of divinity in general.

Therefore, although there is variation in the use of the Bügelschaft during the four periods of study, there is considerable continuity in the major contexts, function and symbolism of this standard. It was originally and primarily an architectural standard, and, although associated with specific deities during different periods, it was more accurately associated with divinity in general, and with divine “care” and “protection”. Therefore, the buildings associated with the Bügelschaft were sacred buildings, and were under the care or protection of the divinity with whom they were associated.

7.1.6 KNOBBED POLE

The knobbed pole606 is depicted during all four periods of this study [Tables 7.1 and 7.2], but there are differences in how it was represented during each period. During the Uruk Period the knobbed pole is only represented in processions of standards in which all standards are knobbed poles. On U97 the knobbed pole is depicted as forming part of a construction, but this example is from Jebel Aruda and is therefore technically outside the scope of this study.

606 The knobbed pole is discussed in 3.5, 4.3, 5.3, and 6.4.
It has been included for its relevance to knobbed poles of the later periods, because the Early Dynastic knobbed poles on **ED48-ED51** are, like on **U97**, depicted in an architectural context. While on **ED49** the association between the knobbed pole and the building is explicit, with two knobbed poles flanking the construction, on **ED48, ED50** and **ED51** the knobbed pole is symbolic or representative of the building. The knobbed pole is held by a variety of figures during the Early Dynastic Period; on **ED48** it is held by a figure involved in the cult, on **ED54** by a deity, and on **ED50** a figure who may represent a bull-man.

During the Akkadian Period on **A54 and A55** the knobbed pole is associated with door- or gateways and may be symbolic of the sacred space within these door- or gateways. However, unlike in the Early Dynastic Period, in the Akkadian Period the knobbed pole does not represent the architecture itself. On **A54** and **A55**, and perhaps on **A56**, the knobbed pole is associated with the sun god Šamaš. However, because these are the only examples of the knobbed pole from this period, it is uncertain if this association is reflective of a specific relationship between this god and the knobbed pole, or if it is merely coincidental.

During the Neo-Sumerian Period the knobbed pole is depicted in its typical form of a shaft surmounted by a round emblem on **NS36-NS43** as well as by four variations on **NS44-NS47**. These variations may reflect weapons which act as standards. During the Neo-Sumerian Period the knobbed pole is associated with presentation scenes on **NS36-NS41** and a worship/adoration scene on **NS42**. In these examples it is therefore in a ritual context. On **NS46** the knobbed pole variation is held by the god Meslamtaea, the god on **NS43** may represent Girra, and the god holding the knobbed pole variation on **NS47** is most likely Ningirsu. There therefore ostensibly does not appear to be any continuation from the Akkadian Period where the standard may have been associated with the god Šamaš. However, the knobbed pole variations held by Meslamtaea on **NS46** and Ningirsu on **NS47** have distinct decoration and these variations may be specifically associated with these gods. Additionally, the simpler, typical knobbed poles may in actuality be symbolic of divine power or authority in general rather than a specific deity, an association found from at least the Early Dynastic Period. Furthermore, the knobbed poles on **NS43** recall those on **ED48** which represented door- or gateposts, again revealing an architectural tradition for the knobbed pole from the Early Dynastic until the Neo-Sumerian Period. The inscription on **ED48** also reveals that the knobbed poles on this example were mace standards, and at least some of the other examples of knobbed poles may similarly have been colossal maces which
functioned as standards. Therefore, although there were variations in the depictions of the knobbled pole from the Early Dynastic, Akkadian and Neo-Sumerian periods, the major contexts, functions and meaning or symbolism of the knobbled pole were consistent throughout these periods.

7.1.7 FLORAL AND STAR STANDARDS
The floral and/or star standards\(^{607}\) were represented in all four periods of this study [Tables 7.1 and 7.2]. During the Uruk Period it is difficult to distinguish between floral and star standards. While \(U99\) appears to be a floral standard, the emblem on \(U100\) is more ambiguous. According to Goff (1963:102) this ambiguity is deliberate as both solar symbols and plants were symbols of fertility. During the Uruk Period, the floral/star standards are only associated with horned ungulates. In Early Dynastic Period it becomes easier to differentiate between floral and star standards. The standard on \(ED67\) has a floral emblem and continues the Uruk Period tradition in that it is associated with horned ungulates. The star standard is represented on \(ED68\) and \(ED69\) and acts as the terminal to contest scenes. \(ED67\) is the last known floral standard; during the Akkadian and Neo-Sumerian periods only the star standard is represented. Akkadian Period star standards are depicted in a variety of contexts. On \(A63\) the star standard acts as a terminal to a contest scene, on \(A64\) it acts as a terminal to a banquet or drinking scene, and on \(A65-A67\) it is depicted in a scene of a mythological nature in which the sun god rises from between two mountains, which in turn are between two door- or gateposts. In the Neo-Sumerian Period the star standard is associated with a presentation scene on \(NS49\) and is depicted on \(NS48\) in uncertain context. The floral standard is therefore only represented in the Uruk and Early Dynastic Periods where it is associated with scenes of herds/flocks. The star standard is known from all four periods, but its use does not appear to be consistent. It must also be noted that some of the examples from the later periods may actually represent star-spades instead of star standards.

7.1.8 CRESCENT STANDARD
In the archaic Uruk script a variation of the sign \(ADAB\) appears to be a crescent standard [Table 3.1], but the crescent standard\(^{608}\) is not known from the Mesopotamian iconographic record during the Uruk Period. The crescent standard is represented on \(U71-U73\), but these

\(^{607}\) The floral and star standards are discussed in 3.6, 4.6, 5.5, and 6.5.

\(^{608}\) The Proto-Elamite crescent standards are discussed in 3.4. Mesopotamian crescent standards are discussed in 4.4, 5.4, and 6.3.
examples are from outside Mesopotamia and therefore technically fall outside the scope of this study. However, they reveal that there was a tradition in the use of the crescent standard in the ancient Near East before the first known representation of this standard in Mesopotamia during the Early Dynastic Period [Tables 7.1 and 7.2].

During the Early Dynastic Period, there are two variations of the crescent standard [Table 7.1]. The first is the more typical, simpler representation of this standard, in which a shaft is surmounted by a crescent emblem, as represented on ED55-ED63. The second variation, which is known only from the Early Dynastic Period, is more elaborate and consists of a shaft surmounted on an animal-footed tripod, of which only two feet are depicted, and of a crescent emblem with attached pendants as represented on ED64, and the lower half of which is represented on ED65. The simpler crescent standard is associated with contest scenes on ED55-ED59 and ED63. It is associated with a scene of domestic activity on ED61, and with a mythological scene involving a boat god on ED62. The crescent standard with the animal-footed base is depicted in a worship/adoration scene on ED46 in which it is the object of veneration, and on ED65 it is associated with a nude figure who is pouring a libation. The crescent standard with the animal-footed base is therefore only associated with scenes of a ritual context. The more elaborate variation of the crescent standard, as depicted on ED64 and ED65, may be especially associated with the moon god.

During the Akkadian Period the crescent standard is only represented in scenes of a mythological nature. On A57 it is associated with a contest scene, on A58-A61 it is associated with scenes involving deities, and on A62 it is held by a goddess who is the focus of the ritual in a presentation scene. On A58-A60 the god holding the crescent standard most likely represents the moon god, and the seated god on A61 may represent the sun god. The goddess on A62 who holds a crescent standard may represent the consort of the moon god. This goddess would be associated with the crescent standard through her relationship with the moon god, rather than having her own individual connection with the standard.

While there is a relatively limited number of depictions of crescent standards from the Early Dynastic Period and Akkadian Period, with 11 depictions from the Early Dynastic Period and seven depictions from the Akkadian Period, the crescent standard is the most frequently

---

609 See Fig. 4.10 for a reconstruction of this standard.
represented standard of the Neo-Sumerian Period, being represented in 34 examples [Table 7.2]. It is associated with contest scenes on NS2-NS4, with worship/adoration scenes on NS23-NS32, and with presentation scenes on NS5-NS20. The cylinder seals NS21 and NS22 have been recut, but originally also represented presentation scenes. Because worship/adoration scenes and presentation scenes can be described as ritual activities, and because the majority of scenes within which the crescent standard is represented constitute one of these two types of scene, the crescent standard is primarily depicted in a ritual context during the Neo-Sumerian Period. Although the crescent can logically be associated with the moon and therefore the moon god, the crescent standard does not appear to be exclusively associated with the moon god during the Neo-Sumerian Period. On NS8, NS11-NS13 it is held by a goddess who may be identified as the consort of the moon god, and on NS10 it is in the field in front of this goddess. However, the association of the crescent standard with this goddess would be dependent on her relationship with the moon god, and it is the moon god who it therefore primarily associated with the crescent standard in these scenes.

The portrayal of the crescent standard therefore appears to be relatively consistent from the Early Dynastic Period until the Neo-Sumerian Period. Unlike the Bügelschaft and knobbed pole, which are also relatively well represented during the same period, the crescent standard is never represented in an architectural context, either flanking or being attached to a building, or representing a building. Also, whereas the Bügelschaft and knobbed pole appear to be symbolic of divinity or divine power or protection in general, the crescent standard appears to be especially, although not exclusively, associated with a specific deity, the moon god.

### 7.1.9 IMDUGUD/BIRD STANDARD

During the Early Dynastic Period a standard with an emblem in the form of Imdugud or a bird appears on ED66 [Tables 7.1 and 7.2]. The standard is associated with deities, the god Ningirsu and the goddess Ninhursag, and may have served as the divine symbol of either of these deities, depending on the exact form of the emblem. If this emblem represented Imdugud, the standard would most likely have served as Ningirsu’s divine standard, acting as a symbol of victory and the power of this god. If the standard represents a bird standard, it would more likely be associated with the goddess. An association with the goddess may be

---

610 The Imdugud/bird standard is discussed in 4.5.
more plausible, as the standard is located directly behind her, and the god is already holding an emblem in his hand.

7.1.10 IMDUGUD/ANZU STANDARD

On ED66, it is not only the standard in the upper register which may have been an Imdugud standard\textsuperscript{611}. There may be a second standard on the lower register of ED66 which may have an emblem in the form of Imdugud clutching two lions in its claws\textsuperscript{612}. The first definite representations of the Imdugud/Anzu standard date to the Neo-Sumerian Period [Tables 7.1 and 7.2]. The Imdugud/Anzu standard serves as a terminal to a contest scene on NS87, and is associated with presentation scenes on NS88 and NS89 in a ritual context. While Imdugud/Anzu was traditionally associated with Ningirsu, on NS88 it is associated with Enki and on NS89 with a goddess who may represent Ištar. This suggests that during the Neo-Sumerian Period the Imdugud/Anzu standard may have been symbolic of divine power rather than of a specific deity.

7.1.11 BIRD AND BIRD-MAN STANDARDS

While the standard depicted on the upper register of ED66 may have been a bird standard, the first definite bird standards are from the Neo-Sumerian Period\textsuperscript{613} [Tables 7.1 and 7.2]. There are at least two variations of the bird standard — one in which the bird emblem is in the form of a spread eagle, as on NS51, NS80 and the leftmost standard in the procession on NS82, and one in which the emblem is in the form of a bird in profile with no wings, as on NS75-NS79, NS81 and the centre standard in the procession on NS82. A bird standard in which the bird is in profile may also be held by the centre figure in the procession of standards on NS84. The bird standard on NS74 is unusual in that it is depicted in profile, but has raised wings.

The bird standard is associated with a presentation scene on NS75-NS79 and therefore has a ritual context in these scenes. In all five examples, it is a goddess who is the object of presentation, and the bird standard therefore appears to be particularly associated with a goddess or goddesses. On NS76 this goddess may be Ningal, and on NS77-NS79 it may be

\textsuperscript{611} This possible Imdugud standard is discussed in 4.5, the definite Imdugud/Anzu standards are discussed in 6.10.

\textsuperscript{612} For a reconstruction, see 4.5 Fig.4.15.

\textsuperscript{613} For the possible bird standard see 4.5. The definite bird standards and bird-man standards are discussed in 6.9.
Bau. It is also possible that Nanše is the object of presentation in these scenes, and therefore the goddess associated with these bird standards. If the central standard on NS84 represents a similar type of standard, this standard may be Nanše’s standard u5-ku₆¹⁴. A variation of the bird standard in which the emblem is in the form of a composite bird-man figure is represented on NS83-NS85. This standard may represent Lugalkurdub, the standard of the god Ningirsu. The standards on NS83-NS85 can therefore be described as divine standards, and along with the lion standards depicted on the related pieces NS61-NS63 which represent Inanna’s standard aš-me, are unique in this study in that the exact names of the standards themselves are known. This differs from the Imdugud/Anzu standard and the Mušhuššu standard in which only the name of the creature depicted on the emblem is known.

7.1.12 PENNANT STANDARD

The pennant standard⁶¹⁵ is represented on three exemplars, all from the Akkadian Period [Tables 7.1 and 7.2]. In two of these, A68 and A69, the pennant standard is associated with a presentation scene, and on A70 it is associated with a scene with three deities. The pennant standard is also depicted on cylinder seal impressions from the Isin-Larsa or Old Babylonian Period, but no examples of it are known from the Neo-Sumerian Period.

7.1.13 TASSELLED STANDARD

The tasselled standard⁶¹⁶ is also only known from the Akkadian Period [Tables 7.1 and 7.2], where it is represented on A71, A72 and A73 in a scene of a mythological nature in which deities battle with a large bird. Although the tasselled standard itself is only represented in the Akkadian Period, there are other standards which are decorated with tassels or streamers from all periods. For example, the standards on NS61, NS2, NS63, NS65, NS83, NS84 and NS85 have tassels like those on A71, while those on A74 and NS73 have tassels/streamers like those on A72. The ring-post with streamer from the Uruk Period has a streamer which is ostensibly similar in appearance to the tassels/streamers on A72, A74 and NS73. However, in the case of the ring-post with streamer, this streamer is formed from reeds, while on the other examples, the tassels/streamers would have been of fabric. Therefore, while tassels and streamers are known to have decorated other standards, the tasselled standard on A71-A73

---

⁶¹⁴ See Fig. 6.10 for a reconstruction of this standard.
⁶¹⁵ The pennant standard is discussed in 5.6.
⁶¹⁶ The tasselled standard is discussed in 5.7.
represents a specific individual standard which was associated with a specific mythological scene.

### 7.1.14 ROD WITH BALLS

The rod with balls is represented in the Akkadian Period and in the Neo-Sumerian Period [Tables 7.1 and 7.2]. Although similar in appearance to the ringed pole of the Uruk Period, these reflect two separate standards, because, whereas the ringed pole has rings as opposed to balls and always has an even number of rings, the balls attached to the rod appear to be solid and there is an odd number of balls. The shaft of the rod with balls is also thinner than that of the ringed pole. The rod with balls also differs from the ringed pole in its function or context. During the Akkadian Period the rod with balls is depicted on A74 where it functions as a battle standard. In the Neo-Sumerian Period the rod with balls is associated with a variety of contexts — on NS50 it flanks a stele and on NS51 it appears to be part of a construction on a boat. On NS52-NS57 it is associated with presentation scenes and on NS59 it is associated with a worship scene. In both types of scenes, the rod with balls is in a clear ritual context. On NS58 it acts as a terminal to a contest scene. It is uncertain which deity the rod with balls is associated with or represents on the Akkadian A74, although it is likely that it is associated with Ištar or Enlil. It may also be representative of divine power and authority, rather than a specific deity. During the Neo-Sumerian Period the rod with balls is associated with a goddess on NS52-NS54, a god on NS55 and a deified ruler on NS56, and it can therefore not represent a specific figure. It is therefore most likely associated with or representative of divinity in general.

### 7.1.15 LION-GRIFFON STANDARD

The lion-griffon standard is only represented once, during the Akkadian Period [Tables 7.1 and 7.2] on A74 where it functions as a battle standard and may represent or be associated with the god Zababa and the city of Kish.

### 7.1.16 LION STANDARD

A lion standard may be depicted on ED66 in the Early Dynastic Period, although if this object does represent a standard, it is more likely that the lion forms part of a larger

---

617 The rod with balls is discussed in 5.8 and 6.4.

618 The lion-griffon standard is discussed in 5.8.
composite emblem. The first definite depictions of lion standards are from the Neo-Sumerian Period [Tables 7.1 and 7.2]. The lion standard is associated with presentation scenes on NS65-NS73 where it has a clear ritual context. On NS61-NS63 it is represented as part of a procession of standards. The exact context of the procession is uncertain, so it is not clear whether the standards on NS61-NS63 were also of a ritual context. The lion standard is associated with both gods and goddesses, but it is only held by human figures. The goddess Inanna was traditionally associated with lions, and the lion standards in which a disc rests on the back of the lion on NS61-NS63 can be associated with this goddess, and represent her standard aš-me. The simpler lion standards in which the emblem consists only of a lion may be symbolic of the power and authority of divinity rather than a specific deity.

7.1.17 SCORPION STANDARD
A scorpion standard is represented only during the Neo-Sumerian Period, and there is only one definite depiction of this standard [Tables 7.1 and 7.2]. On NS60 it is located beneath an inscription behind a seated deity who is the object of the presentation in a presentation scene. A second scorpion standard may be depicted on NS91 where it is again located behind a seated deity in a presentation scene, although the identification of this as a scorpion standard is uncertain.

7.1.18 MUŠḪUŠŠU STANDARD
The Mušḫuššu standard is represented only once on a cylinder seal impression from the Neo-Sumerian Period NS90 [Tables 7.1 and 7.2], in which it is associated with a goddess in a presentation scene. Mušḫuššu was associated with Ningišzida during the Neo-Sumerian Period, and the seated goddess with whom the Mušḫuššu standard is associated on NS90 may be Ningišzida’s consort Geštinanna.

7.1.19 SNAKE STANDARD
The snake standard is represented only once on a Neo-Sumerian Period cylinder seal NS82 [Tables 7.1 and 7.2], where it is depicted in a procession of standards.

---

619 For this possible composite standard, see 4.5. The lion standard is discussed in 6.8.
620 The scorpion standard is discussed in 6.7.
621 The Mušḫuššu standard is discussed in 6.11.
622 The snake standard is discussed in 6.12.
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| Uruk           | Ring-post with streamer*  
                | Ring-post without streamer*  
                | Ringed Pole *  
                | Ring-post with streamer  
                | Ring-post without streamer  
                | Ringed Pole  
                | Bügelschaft  
                | Ring-post with streamer  
                |
| Early Dynastic | Imdugud/Bird standard*  
                | Standard with composite emblem with lion*  
                | Bügelschaft  
                | Crescent standard  
                | Bügelschaft  
                | Knobbed Pole  
                | Imdugud/Bird standard**  
                |
| Akkadian       | Rod with Balls*  
                | Lion-griffon standard*  
                | Bügelschaft  
                | Crescent standard  
                | Rod with Balls  
                | Lion-griffon standard  
                | Rod with Balls***  
                |
| Neo-Sumerian   | Lion standard  
                | Bird-standard  
                | Bird-man standard  
                | Mušḫuššu standard  
                | Crescent standard  
                | Knobbed pole  
                | Lion standard##  
                |

* The standard appears to be a divine standard, although the exact identity of the deity is uncertain.
** The standard appears to function as a city standard through its association with a deity.
*** The standard appears to function as a city standard through its association with a deity, but the identity of this deity is uncertain.
# The standard is associated with what appears to be a building on a boat.
## The standard is a district standard rather than a city standard.
### The standard is possibly a city standard.

Table 7.3: The functions or contexts of the standards of third and fourth millennia Mesopotamia.
7.2 SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF FUNCTIONS OR CONTEXTS

Standards cannot only be classified by their appearance, but also by their function or context. Pongratz-Leisten (2011-13:107-110) identifies six different types of standards; divine standards, royal standards, standards in a ritual context, standards in judicial procedures, standards on military campaigns, and standards in an architectural context. Standards can also function as city standards, and this provides a seventh type of standard to be analysed [Table 7.3]. These categories should not be seen as mutually exclusive. A single standard depicted on a single artefact can, for example, be both a divine standard and be placed in a ritual or an architectural context.

7.2.1 DIVINE STANDARDS

During the Uruk Period the ring-post with streamer, ring-post without streamer, ringed pole and Bügelschaft are represented both in the iconographic record and as signs in the archaic Uruk script [Table 3.1], where, when paired with the divine determinative, they serve as divine names. The identification of these as divine standards in the iconographic record is less certain [Table 7.4]. The ring-post with streamer is represented by the MUŠ sign in the archaic Uruk script, and is used as the sign for the goddess Inanna. The majority of iconographic representations of the ring-post with streamer are from Uruk, the city of which Inanna was the city deity, which may support the association between Inanna and this standard. However, the ring-post with streamer is not only represented in artefacts from Uruk, nor is it the only standard represented at Uruk. The scenes on U5-U9 appear to represent a ritual involving a male figure who can be identified as the Priest-King/En figure and a female figure. In these scenes the ring-post with streamer is directly associated with the female figure, and can identify her either as Inanna herself, or as a mortal female associated with her. Because the standard can be specifically associated with Inanna, at least in some instances it can be described as her divine standard. The ring-post without streamer may represent the sign LAGAR and was used in the archaic Uruk script for the god An. The ring-post without streamer may also be associated with this god in the iconographic record, but this identification is less certain. The ringed pole represents the sign NUN in the archaic Uruk script and may have been the symbol of the god Enki, but in the iconographic record the ringed pole appears to have been associated with the goddess Nintu, or, more likely, with divinity in general. Therefore, the ring-post without streamer and the ringed pole may represent the divine standards of An and Nintu respectively, but this is uncertain.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deity</th>
<th>Uruk</th>
<th>Early Dynastic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
<th>Neo-Sumerian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INANNA/İŞAR</td>
<td>Ring-post with streamer</td>
<td>Rod with balls * @</td>
<td>Lion with disc (aš-me)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>Ring-post without streamer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NINTU</td>
<td>Ringed pole *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA/ENKI</td>
<td>Ringed pole *</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bügelschaft **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANNA/ŠIN @@</td>
<td>Crescent standard #</td>
<td>Crescent standard ##</td>
<td>Crescent standard</td>
<td>Crescent standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NINGIRŠU</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indugud/Bird standard @</td>
<td>Knobbed pole variation</td>
<td>Bird-man standard (Lugalkurdub)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NINHURSAG</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indugud/Bird standard @</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZABABA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lion-griffon standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENLIL</td>
<td>Rod with balls * @</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knobbed pole variation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESLAMTAEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bird standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NINGAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bird standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANŠE</td>
<td>Bird standard (u5-kù)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NINGIŞZIDA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mušhuššu standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEŠTINANNA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mušhuššu standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Although the standard may be associated with divinity in general
** Although the standard is associated with divinity in general
@ Uncertain due to difficulty in identifying standard
@@ The crescent standard is particularly, but not exclusively associated with the moon god throughout the third and fourth millennia BCE
# Outside Mesopotamia
## Particularly the variation with the animal-footed base

Table 7.4: Deities associated with standards in third and fourth millennia Mesopotamian iconography
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The Bügelschaft is represented in the archaic Uruk script by the two signs ŠEŠ and URI3 [Table 3.1] depending on the period and the exact appearance of the sign. The sign ŠEŠ may be associated with the god Nanna, and the Bügelschaft may have been particularly associated with this god during the Uruk Period. However, during the Akkadian Period, the Bügelschaft was particularly, but not only, associated with the water god Ea623. The Bügelschaft therefore does not appear to have been associated with one specific deity, but seems rather to have been associated with divinity in general. This is reflected in the fact that the sign URI3 means “care” or “protection”, and can associate the Bügelschaft with the divine “care” and “protection” when it appears in the iconographic record. The Bügelschaft itself, however, cannot be described as a divine standard.

Similarly, the knobbed pole appears to represent or be associated with divinity in general, and therefore does not reflect a specific divine standard. However, the Neo-Sumerian variations of the knobbed pole in which a three-headed mace on NS46 and a knobbed pole with seven small mace heads radiating from it on NS47 may represent the divine standards of Meslamtaea and Ningirsu or Lugalkurdub respectively624. With regards to the knobbed pole with seven small mace heads radiating from it on NS47, there are other standards in the iconographic record which may better be described as the divine standard of Ningirsu. However, this does not discount the possibility that this god had more than one divine standard.

Imdugud/Anzu was associated with Ningirsu, and the Imdugud/Anzu standard could therefore be assumed to be Ningirsu’s standard. Therefore, in the Early Dynastic Period, if either the standard in the upper register or the possible standard in the lower register of ED66 represents an Imdugud standard, it may be described as Ningirsu’s divine standard625. However, during the Neo-Sumerian Period, although Imdugud/Anzu is associated with Ningirsu, the Imdugud/Anzu standard is not actually associated with this god. It is associated with Enki/Ea on NS88 and with Inanna/Ištar on NS89, but it should not be understood to be either of their divine standard, as Imdugud/Anzu is not generally associated with either deity626. However, neither the standard on NS88 nor NS89 should be understood to be Ningirsu’s divine standard either because it is explicitly associated with other deities who

623 See 5.2.31.
624 See 6.4.2.
625 See 4.5.
626 See 6.10.
were not part of Ningirsu’s entourage. According to Gudea Cylinder A xiv:18, Ningirsu’s standard was called **Lugalkurdub**, and this standard may be represented by the bird-man standard depicted on the Gudea stelae fragments **NS83-NS85**. Gudea Cylinder A xiv:23 further identifies Nanše’s standard as **u₅-kù**, which may be represented by a bird standard held by the central figure on **NS84**, although the stele fragment is broken at the emblem of this standard, making exact identification uncertain. Gudea Cylinder A xiv:27 names Inanna’s standard as **aš-me**, and this standard may be represented in the iconographic record by a standard with the emblem in the form of a lion with a disc on its back on **NS60-NS63**. These three standards are unique in the third and fourth millennium BCE because they are the only standards in the iconographic record which are known by name.\(^{627}\)

During the Neo-Sumerian Period, **Mušḫuššu** was associated with the god Ningišzida, and the **Mušḫuššu** standard on **NS90** may be associated with the goddess Geštinanna through her relationship with Ningišzida as his wife. The **Mušḫuššu** standard may therefore represent the divine standard of the god Ningišzida on **NS90** although it is not directly associated with him on this example.\(^{628}\)

The lion-griffon standard and the rod with balls on Naram-Sin’s Victory Stele **A74** may be associated with specific deities, perhaps Zababa and Ištar or Enlil respectively. The two standards may also be associated with the cities of which these deities were city deities, with the lion-griffon representing or being associated with Kish through Zababa, and the rod with balls with Agade through Ištar or with Nippur through Enlil. These standards primarily represent battle standards and city standards, but can be referred to as divine standards if they do represent or are associated with Zababa and Ištar or Enlil.

The crescent, and therefore the crescent standard, can logically represent the crescent moon, and would therefore represent or be associated with the moon god. During the Uruk Period it is depicted on **U71** from Susa, and **U72** and **U73** from Chogha Mish.\(^{630}\) These Proto-Elamite examples are technically outside the scope of this study, but are relevant to the history and identification of the crescent standard. **U72** particularly may be associated with the moon.

---

\(^{627}\) See 6.8.3 and 6.9.5.2 for the lion standard identifiable as **aš-me**, and the bird standard identifiable as **u₅-ku** and the bird-man standard identifiable as **Lugulkurdub** respectively. See 6.8.3 and 6.9.5.2 also for more on the Gudea Cylinders.

\(^{628}\) See 6.11.

\(^{629}\) See 5.8.

\(^{630}\) See 3.4.
god, as the larger size of the figure in the boat may identify this figure as a deity, and the crescent standard and bull may identify the figure specifically as the moon god. Iconographic representations of the crescent standard are first known from Mesopotamia itself during the Early Dynastic Period. A variation of the crescent standard in which the shaft of the standard is mounted on an animal-footed tripod which has pendants attached to the crescent emblem is depicted on ED64, and the lower half of this standard is represented on ED65. This type of crescent standard may be particularly associated with the moon god during the Early Dynastic Period. During the Akkadian Period a god who may be identified as the moon god holds a crescent standard on A58-A60. A goddess who holds a crescent standard on A62 may be the wife of the moon god, with the crescent standard primarily being associated with the moon god. However, if the god associated with the crescent standard on A61 represents the sun god, the crescent standard wasn’t only associated with the moon god and his consort during the Akkadian Period. Similarly, during the Neo-Sumerian Period the crescent standard is held by a goddess on NS8 and NS11-NS13, and is in the field in front of a goddess on NS10. The goddesses on these examples may, like the goddess on A62, be identified as the consort of the moon god. The crescent standard, as in the Akkadian Period, would be depicted with this goddess by virtue of her relationship with the moon god, and the primary association of the crescent standard would therefore be with the moon god. On NS23-NS26, NS31 and NS32 the crescent standard is the object of worship/adoration scenes, and is most likely representative or symbolic of the moon god. The crescent standard therefore appears to be particularly, but not exclusively, associated with the moon god in Mesopotamian iconography throughout the third and fourth millennia BCE. Despite being associated with the sun god on A61 and with goddesses on A62, NS8, NS11-NS13 and NS10, the primary association of the crescent standard appears to be with the moon god, and it is highly likely that it represents the divine standard of this god.

7.2.2 ROYAL STANDARDS
No royal standards are known from third and fourth millennia BCE Mesopotamian iconography [Table 7.3].

---
631 See 4.4.2.
632 See 5.4.
633 See 6.3 for the crescent standard in the Neo-Sumerian Period.
7.2.3 STANDARDS IN A RITUAL CONTEXT

Standards are represented in a ritual context during the Uruk Period, Early Dynastic Period, Akkadian Period and Neo-Sumerian Period [Table 7.3].

During the Uruk Period the ring-post with streamer is associated with a scene which may represent the so-called sacred marriage ritual on U5-U9634. The exact nature of the scenes depicted on U5-U9 is much debated, but some kind of ritual does appear to be taking place, even if this is not the so-called sacred marriage ritual. The ring-post with streamer on U32 appears to be associated with a festival of the goddess Inanna. Figures carry votive offerings towards sacred buildings on U10, U33, U53, U56, U57, U60, U76, U81 and U82. The buildings are depicted with attached standards or are flanked by standards, as on U33, U53, U56, U57, U60, U76, U81 and U82, or the structure itself is symbolised or represented by a standard, as on U10. The presentation of votive offerings can be seen as a ritual activity, and these standards are therefore depicted in both an architectural and a ritual context. The ring-post with streamer is associated with a hunt on U17. Hunts were viewed as ritual activity635, and, because the ring-post with streamer is associated with a hunt on U17, this hunt can be understood as a ritual hunt either in honour of the goddess Inanna or under her guidance, and the standard can therefore also be understood to be in a ritual context. Processions of standards are depicted on U66, U85-U96 and U98. The ritual context of the procession of standards on U66 is clear, as the standards are being carried towards a sacred structure. Because only the procession of standards is depicted on U85-U96 and U98 with no further context to identify an exact scene, a ritual context cannot be ascribed to the standards on these examples. Some kind of ritual activity also appears to be taking place on U29, U34, U40 and U47, and on U103-U106 if standards are represented on these last examples, although exactly what kind of ritual activity is taking place in all these examples is uncertain. On U11-U14 the Priest-King/En figure is involved in the feeding/caring of the flocks/herds. Because the flocks/herds were the divine property of the deities, this can be understood as a ritual activity636. Standards are associated with the flocks/herds, but without the Priest-King/En figure on U20-U27, U30-U31, U38, U39, U54, U55, U58, U59, U61-U64, U74 and U99-U102. Although the Priest-King/En figure is not represented in these scenes, they are related to the feeding/caring of the flocks/herd scenes depicted on U11-U14. However,

634 For more on the so-called sacred marriage ritual, including further literature, see 3.2.2, 4.2.1 and 6.3.3.
635 See 3.2.2.
636 See 3.2.2.
because the actual ritual feeding/caring of the animals is not depicted, the standards depicted on U20-U27, U30-U31, U38, U39, U54, U55, U58, U59, U61-U64, U74 and U99-U102 cannot be described as being in a ritual context.

During the Early Dynastic Period domestic activity takes place alongside a building on the scenes represented on ED4-ED21. The Bügelschafts associated with the buildings depicted in these scenes suggest that the buildings are religious in nature. It is possible therefore that the activity which appears to be domestic which is taking place at these structures could be regarded as ritual activity because it occurs at a sacred building. The identification of these scenes as ritual in nature is, however, uncertain. The ritual activity which takes place on the scenes represented on ED22 and ED23 is more overt. A scene on ED22 appears to represent cultic sexuality and may, like U5-U9, be related to the so-called sacred marriage ritual. However, the two figures may both be female, and the identification of this as the so-called sacred marriage is unlikely, although some kind of ritual may still be taking place. On ED23 a nude figure pours a libation to a figure in front of a shrine. The pouring of libations was a ritual activity and is also depicted on ED35 and ED36. On ED35 a libation is poured both before a temple and before a god who can be identified as the moon god Nanna. ED36 represents a conflation of these two scenes, with a libation being poured to a god who sits in front of a temple. On ED65 a nude figure pours a libation at the foot of what can be identified as a crescent standard surmounted on an animal-footed tripod through the similarity in its appearance to the crescent standard depicted on ED64, although only the lower half of the standard on ED65 is extant. The crescent standard surmounted on an animal-footed tripod on ED64 appears to be the object of an adoration/worship scene. The standards on ED22, ED23, ED35, ED36, ED64 and ED65 are therefore all represented in a ritual context.

Votive offerings are brought towards a temple on the lower register of ED34, and this scene can therefore be related to the Uruk Period scenes depicted on U10, U33, U53, U56, U57, U60, U76, U81 and U82, and the Bügelschafts attached to the temple can be described as being in a ritual context. The Bügelschafts on ED37 and ED38 may also be in a ritual context, although the exact nature of these scenes is less clear.
Banquet scenes637 are one of the two most popular scenes of Early Dynastic glyptic art, and this scene continues to be depicted in the Akkadian Period. The banquets depicted on these scenes can be described as ritual feasts, and standards associated with banquet scenes are therefore represented in a ritual context, although these standards cannot themselves be described as ritual standards.

During the Akkadian Period scenes of a mythological nature in which individually identifiable deities are depicted become common. The scenes, and the standards associated with them, however, can be described as mythological and religious, but not as ritual in context.

During the Akkadian Period worship/adoration scenes and presentation scenes in which a human figure is led before a seated deity become popular638. In presentation scenes the human figure is brought before the god by an interceding deity, and in worship/adoration scenes, the human figure stands before the deity in an attitude of worship. There may originally have been no real difference implied or understood in these scenes, with the differentiation between the two being a modern application which was not relevant at the time of the production of these scenes. Both these types of scenes can be understood as ritual activity, and any standards associated with these scenes can therefore be understood as being in a ritual context.

Both of these types of scenes continue to be depicted during the Neo-Sumerian Period, but changes become more pronounced. While presentation scenes continue to represent a human figure being led by an interceding figure to a deity, the worship/adoration scenes usually do not actually include a deity. For example, on NS81 a figure raises a hand in a gesture of worship towards a bird standard, on NS23-NS25 two figures face towards a crescent standard, on NS26 two figures face towards a crescent standard which is mounted on the back of a bird, and on NS32 three figures face towards a crescent standard. In these examples, the standards are the object of the worship/adoration scenes. On NS27 two figures face a vessel with a date palm and a crescent standard mounted on the back of a bird, on NS31 two figures face a vessel with a date palm and a crescent standard, on NS42 two figures face a vessel with a date palm and a knobbed pole, and on NS80 a figure faces a vessel with a date palm.

637 For more on the banquet scene, including further literature, see 4.2.1.
638 For more on the worship/adoration and presentation scenes, including further literature, see 5.2.3.1.
and a bird standard. On NS28-NS30 and NS59 two figures face a vessel with a date palm, while a standard acts as a terminal to the scene. On NS28 this standard is a crescent standard mounted on the back of a bull, on NS29 and NS30 it is a crescent standard, and on NS59 it is a rod with balls. The vessel with a date palm therefore appears to be the object of worship/adoration in these scenes, rather than the associated standard. This suggests that the vessel with a date palm also is the object of worship/adoration on NS27, NS31, NS42 and NS80, rather than the standards represented on these examples. Despite not being the primary object of worship/adoration, these standards are all still represented in a ritual context. The examples in which the standard is the object of worship/adoration may be related to the scene on the Early Dynastic example ED64 in which a crescent standard surmounted on an animal-footed stand is the object of worship/adoration, and the examples with the vessel with a date palm may be related to the Early Dynastic examples ED23, ED35, ED36 and ED65 in which a libation is poured.

7.2.4 STANDARDS IN JUDICIAL PROCEDURES

The Bügelschaft on A28 and A29 is associated with a scene most likely representing an episode in a myth in which a bird-man is brought before Ea for judgement. These two examples are the only standards depicted in a judicial context in the study [Table 7.3]. The Bügelschaft itself, however, cannot be described as a judicial standard.

7.2.5 STANDARDS ON MILITARY CAMPAIGNS

Only two standards in this study, from the Akkadian Period, can be described as battle standards [Table 7.3]. Although scenes of violence and war are depicted during the Early Dynastic Period on the so-called Standard of Mari ED74, the so-called Standard of Ur ED70 and Eannatum’s Stele of the Vultures ED66, the standards represented on these examples are not battle standards. The so-called “bull standard of Mari” on ED74 does not actually represent a standard, but a reign ring of a chariot. The shafts depicted on ED70 more likely belong to spears than to standards. However, if these did represent standards, no emblems survive which would enable the identification of these standards or their symbolism. The Imdugud/bird standard in the upper register of ED66 cannot be classified as a battle standard because, although it is associated with violence — captives are held in a net

---

639 See 5.2.3.1.
640 See 4.8.1.
641 See 4.7.
and Ningirsu smashes the head of one of these figures with a mace — it is not associated with the actual battle. The standard is not associated with the human battle, but rather with the divine action after the battle. As such, the standard on ED66 can more fittingly be described as a divine standard which happens to be associated with violence. The standard on the Akkadian Period cylinder seal A38, although associated with a battle of the gods, cannot be described as a battle standard as it is not used in a military campaign to lead or rally the troops.

The lion-griffon standard and the rod with balls on Naram-Sin’s Victory Stele A74 are represented directly and explicitly within the context of a military campaign. The exact symbolism or meaning of these standards is uncertain because the lion-griffon standard is unique in Mesopotamian iconography, and the rod with balls is unique in the Akkadian Period and no direct comparanda exist. Contemporary texts reveal that the deities most associated with battle during the reign of Naram-Sin were Zababa, Ištar and Enlil. It is possible then that the lion-griffon standard was associated with or representative of the god Zababa and Kish, the city of which he was patron deity, and that the rod with balls was associated with or representative of Ištar and Agade, the city of which she was patron deity. These standards would in this way have been the standards which rallied and led the troops of Kish and Agade respectively. The standards could also have been associated with or representative of Zababa and Enlil as Naram-Sin’s personal and clan deities respectively. Whichever deities or cities are associated with or represented by the lion-griffon standard and the rod with balls on A74, the standards represent the first true battle standards in Mesopotamian iconography.

There are therefore only two battle standards represented in Mesopotamian iconography of the third and fourth millennia BCE, and they appear together on a single artefact, the Victory Stele of Naram-Sin A74.

7.2.6 STANDARDS IN AN ARCHITECTURAL CONTEXT

Individual standards may be identified as architectural standards, but standards associated with specific scenes should not necessarily be considered as such. For example, in

642 See 4.5.
643 See 5.2.3.1.
644 See 5.8.
presentation scenes, popular during the Akkadian and Neo-Sumerian periods, a worshipper is brought before and presented to a deity. If this presentation took place within the deity’s temple or sanctuary, it could be argued that the associated standards are representative of this sacred space. However, presentation scenes do not have to include a standard, and when standards are represented in presentation scenes, these appear to represent divine standards rather than architectural standards. Just because a scene takes place within an architectural structure, it does not mean that any associated standards must be representative of this architecture. Similarly, Woolley (1934:347) describes the Bügelschaft associated with the contest scene on A1 as “a post emblem of protection, marking the entrance to guarded park and safety.” This would suggest that the Bügelschaft on A1 as well as other standards associated with contest scenes were representative of an enclosed space in which the contest scene took place. However, this does not presuppose that the standards associated with contest scenes are architectural standards. Standards therefore cannot be identified as architectural standards based only on the type of scene within which they are represented. Individual standards need to be examined in order to identify those which are depicted within an architectural context.

The earliest standards, of the Uruk Period, are represented in an architectural context, and standards continue to be depicted associated with or representing architecture until the Neo-Sumerian Period [Table 7.3]. In the Uruk Period the ring-post with streamer, the ring-post without streamer, the Doppelvolute, the ringed post, and the Bügelschaft all appear as architectural standards, either surmounting a structure, flanking a structure, being directly attached to a structure, or representing or symbolising a structure. The ring-post with streamer surmounts a building on U20, U23 and U27, the ring-post without streamer surmounts a building on U38, all four examples of the Doppelvolute on U43-U46 surmount a building, and the ringed pole surmounts a building on U49-U52, U54, U55, U58, U59, U61, U62 and U64. The Bügelschaft is never depicted surmounting a building. The ring-post with streamer flanks a building on U21, U24, U29-U31 and U33, the ring-post without streamer flanks a building U39, the ringed pole flanks a building on U47, U53, U56, U57 and U60, and the Bügelschaft flanks a building on U79. The Bügelschaft is the only standard which is represented as being attached directly to a building, and therefore forming an integral part of the structure, as on U65, U74, U75, U76, U77, U81, U82 and U84. The ring-post with streamer, the ringed pole and the Bügelschaft are depicted as representing or symbolising the door- or gateway of a building. The ring-post with streamer represents a building in this
manner on U5, U10 and U11, the ringed poles represent a building on U48, and the Bügelschaft is representative or symbolic of a building on U80, and perhaps on U67-U70 where two Bügelschafts are connected to each other at the base by a horizontal line. This horizontal line may be indicative of the space within a structure between the two Bügelschaft which would act as a door- or gateway. Therefore, although the ring-post with streamer, the ring-post without streamer, the Doppelvolute, the ringed pole and the Bügelschaft all appear in an architectural context or as architectural standards during the Uruk Period, there are differences in how these standards were related to architecture. While the Doppelvolute is only represented as surmounting a building, the Bügelschaft is never represented in this manner. Conversely, the Bügelschaft is the only standard which is represented as being attached directly to the structure of a building, and therefore forming a part of the building itself, rather than acting as a decoration to the structure.

Because the ring-post with streamer, the ring-post without streamer, the ringed pole and the Bügelschaft were all associated with deities, it follows that the buildings with which they were associated were sacred structures. The buildings which are associated with ritual activity on U5, U10, U33, U47, U53, U56, U57, U60, U76, U80, U81 and U82 may be described as temples or shrines, while those associated with herds or flocks on U11, U20, U21, U23, U27, U30, U31, U38, U39, U51, U54, U55, U58, U59, U61-U64 and U74 can be described as byres, and may represent the structures housing the sacred herds or flocks of a specific deity, or the sacred herds or flocks of the temple complex of a specific deity. Therefore, even though the latter served a domestic purpose, the building itself was still considered a sacred building.

The Bügelschaft is the only one of these Uruk Period architectural standards which is represented in the iconographic record after the Uruk Period. This is because the ring-post with streamer, the ring-post without streamer, the Doppelvolute and the ringed pole were reed standards, and as such they were associated with reed architecture. By the Early Dynastic Period, the sacred buildings with which standards were associated were no longer constructed from reed, but were made of mud brick, and the standards associated with such structures were no longer made of reed either. Instead, they were of more durable materials such as wood with copper plating, such as the Bügelschaft ED1 and possibly ED2. The Bügelschaft was the only one of the major architectural standards of the Uruk Period which was not a reed standard, and this accounts for its continued use in later periods, as well as the absence of the
ring-post with streamer, the ring-post without streamer and the ringed pole in the iconographic record after the Uruk Period.

The architectural context of the Bügelschaft is also evident in the Early Dynastic, Akkadian and Neo-Sumerian periods. The Early Dynastic Bügelschaft ED1 was excavated at the Temple of Ningirsu in Tello, and is therefore of a definite architectural context. In the iconographic record of the Early Dynastic Period the Bügelschaft is always either attached directly to the building, or flanks the building, although, due to how the buildings are depicted, it is sometimes difficult to discern which. It is associated with a scene of domestic activity on ED4-ED21, ED27 and ED29. On ED33, ED23, and ED34-ED36 it is associated with a ritual scene. Because the buildings with Bügelschafts are sacred buildings, the banquet scenes depicted alongside such buildings on ED26, ED30, ED31, ED32 and ED33 may also be described as ritual activity. Similarly, the half-rings depicted on ED38 may represent Bügelschafts, and some kind of ritual activity may therefore be represented. Not enough survives of ED37 to discern whether it represents a domestic scene or a ritual scene. However, as mentioned above, the fact that the Bügelschaft marks these buildings as sacred structures means that even scenes of domestic activity can be viewed as being related to the cult, and these scenes are therefore of a religious nature, if not a ritual nature.

The Bügelschaft continues to be depicted in an architectural context during the Akkadian Period. It can be directly associated with a structure, as on A19, A27, A30-A32, A36, A45, A48 and A51, or it can be associated with architectural elements, such as on A41 and A43. On A41 the sun god sits between two twisted columns, each of which is flanked by a Bügelschaft held by a bull-man. In this case, the twisted columns are representative of the architecture of the building within which the sun god is seated. On A43 the sun gods sits between two gods, one who holds a Bügelschaft and the other who holds a door- or gateway. This recalls the function of the Bügelschaft during the Uruk Period when it also served as a door- or gateway. On A43, therefore, the Bügelschaft and the door- or gateway are complementary and serve the same purpose. This throws light onto the purpose of the Bügelschaft on other Akkadian examples — it was as an architectural standard which served as a door- or gatepost. The Bügelschaft is therefore representative of the door- or gateway of a structure on A14-A16, A18- A20, A22, A39 and A42 where two Bügelschafts, each held by a nude hero, are represented on either side of a deity. Furthermore, the examples where a single Bügelschaft is held by a nude hero next to a deity on A17, A21, A23-A26, A28, A29,
A33-A35, A37, A40, A44, A46 and A47 may also represent a door- or gateway, and can therefore be described as architectural standards. On A13 Ea sits between two Bügelschafts which are each held by a nude hero and which are connected at the base by a horizontal line. These Bügelschafts therefore recall the Uruk Period examples U67-U70, and support the view that these earlier Bügelschafts also represent architectural standards.

There is only one known depiction of the Bügelschaft dating to the Neo-Sumerian Period. The two Bügelschafts on NS1, like those of the Uruk, Early Dynastic and Akkadian periods, are of an architectural context. Each of these Bügelschafts is held by Mušḫuššu and functions as a door- or gateway in the temple of Ningirsu. There is therefore incredible continuity in the function and symbolism of the Bügelschaft in the iconography of Mesopotamia during the third and fourth millennia BCE. It first appeared during the Uruk Period as an architectural standard, and continued to be represented in this manner until the Neo-Sumerian Period.

The Uruk Period floral/star standard on U100 may also be associated with architecture, if the hatched lines on this example reflect a structure. While none of the star standards depicted in Early Dynastic Period iconography are represented in an architectural context, the Akkadian Period examples A65-A67 are associated with a scene in which the sun god rises from between two mountains which in turn are flanked by two door- or gateways. Although these Akkadian Period star standards are represented in association with architecture in the form of door- or gateways, the star standards themselves do not appear to be of an architectural nature.

During the Uruk Period, the knobbed pole is primarily depicted in processions of standards, as on U85-U96 and NS98, but on U97 two knobbed poles flank a structure. Although U97 is from Jebel Aruda and is therefore technically outside the scope of this study, it has been included for its relevance to the origin of the knobbed pole as an architectural standard. In Mesopotamian iconography knobbed poles are associated with or representative of architecture from the Early Dynastic Period until the Neo-Sumerian Period, but U97 reveals that this association had its roots in the Uruk Period. The architectural context of the knobbed pole is explicit on ED49 where two knobbed poles flank a building. More often, though, the knobbed pole is representative or symbolic of the building with which it is associated. On the Early Dynastic Figure Aux Plumes ED48 the two knobbed poles represent the door- or gateway of a sacred structure, which, according to the inscription on the plaque,
may be the temple of Ningirsu. Similarly, the two knobbed poles on the so-called Physician’s Seal NS43 from the Neo-Sumerian Period represent the door- or gateway to a sacred structure. Because the inscription on NS43 mentions the god Girra, it is possible that this is the god depicted on the seal, and that the knobbed poles on NS43 are representative or symbolic of the temple or shrine of this god. Unlike during the Early Dynastic and Neo-Sumerian periods, during the Akkadian Period there is no example in which two knobbed poles appear together as door- or gateways. The knobbed poles on A54 and A55 are depicted alongside door- or gateways, and it is therefore unlikely that they represent door- or gateways if these are explicitly represented. However, it is possible that these knobbed poles are meant to be understood to be inside the sacred building suggested by the door- or gateways, and the knobbed poles may therefore be symbolic or representative of this structure. The knobbed pole is therefore depicted in an architectural context during all four periods of this study.

Architectural standards are therefore represented in all four periods of this study, the Uruk Period, Early Dynastic Period, Akkadian Period and Neo-Sumerian Period. The ring-post with streamer, ring-post without streamer, Doppelvolute, floral/star standard and rod with balls are each only associated with architecture during one period. The knobbed pole is associated with architecture from the Early Dynastic Period until the Neo-Sumerian Period, and the Bügelschaft is represented as an architectural standard in each of the four periods.

7.2.7 CITY STANDARDS

City Standards are difficult to identify in the iconographic record of third and fourth millennia BCE Mesopotamia [Table 7.3]. A ring-post with streamer on U36 forms part of the name of the city Zabalam, and the ring-post with streamer surmounted on a structure on U5, U15, U16, U28 and U38 may form part of the name of the city Uruk. These examples, however, form part of an early pictographic script and cannot be called city standards. The Imdugud/bird standard on Eannatum’s Vulture Stele ED66 may, through its association with Ningirsu, be associated with the city-state of Lagash. However, this standard would primarily be associated with Ningirsu, and can therefore be described as a divine standard, rather than a city standard. Similarly, the Imdugud/Anzu standards of the Neo-Sumerian Period, NS87-NS89 may represent Lagash. This would account for their being associated

---

645 See 3.2.2.
646 See 4.5.
647 See 6.10.
with deities who are not Ningirsu on NS88 and NS89. In these cases the Imdugud/Anzu standards would be associated with Enki and Inanna/Ištar respectively, as well as with the city-state Lagash.

As battle standards, the two standards on Naram-Sin’s Victory Stele A74 reflect the standard of a military unit, and this unit would be from a particular city or city-state. Therefore, even though these standards are associated with deities, their primary association may be with the city-states, rather than with the deities, and they could therefore be better described as battle standards and city standards than as divine standards. The rod with balls on A74 may represent or be associated with Agade and Ištar, or with Nippur and Enlil, and the lion-griffon standard may represent or be associated with Kish and Zababa.648

If the standards depicted on the Gudea Stelae, the lion standard on NS61-NS63, the bird-man standard on NS83-NS85, and the bird standard on NS84, can be identified with the passage in Gudea Cylinder A xiv:14-27, then they are associated with districts involved in temple construction. These standards cannot be described as city standards because they do not represent cities, but they do reflect standards which represent a specific area or location, and are therefore of the same ideology as city standards.

7.3 SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF EACH PERIOD

The standards as depicted in the iconographic record of third and fourth millennia BCE Mesopotamia have been summarised and analysed by their appearance and their function [Tables 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3]. Each period should also be discussed in order to gain a fuller picture of the form, function and symbolism of the standards of third and fourth millennia BCE Mesopotamian iconography.

7.3.1 THE URUK PERIOD

The standards depicted in the iconographic record of the Uruk Period650 are the ring-post with streamer, ring-post without streamer, Doppelvolute, ringed pole, Bügelschaft, knobbed pole and the floral/star standard [Table 7.1 and 7.2]. There are only seven different standards

648 See 5.8.
649 See 6.8.1 and 6.9.5.2.
650 The standards of the Uruk Period are discussed in Chapter 3.
known from the Uruk Period\(^651\), but each of these standards is relatively well represented. The ring-post with streamer is the most frequently depicted standard of the period, being represented on 36 objects. The ringed pole is represented on 18 objects, the \textit{Bügelschaft} on 17, the knobbed pole on 14, the ring-post without streamer on six, the \textit{Doppelvolute} on five, and the floral/star standard on four [Table 7.2].

The ring-post with streamer, ring-post without streamer, \textit{Doppelvolute} and ringed pole are only known from the Uruk Period. The reason for this is that they represent reed standards associated with sacred buildings made of reed. By the Early Dynastic Period these structures were no longer made of reed, but of mud brick, and the reed standards therefore fell into disuse. The standards of the Uruk Period appear to be primarily architectural standards, although they are also depicted in other contexts. The art of the period reflects the ideology of the temple institution, and this, in turn, is reflected in the scenes with which standards are depicted. They are found primarily associated with buildings, but also in ritual scenes and with individually identifiable figures such as the Priest-King/En figure of the period. Standards are also associated with scenes of the sacred flocks or herds.

The ring-post with streamer, ring-post without streamer, ringed pole and \textit{Bügelschaft} are not only portrayed in Uruk Period iconography, but they are also represented in the archaic Uruk script where [Table 3.1], when paired with the divine determinative, they represent a deity. In this manner, the ring-post with streamer is associated with Inanna, the ring-post without streamer may be associated with An, and the ringed pole may be associated with Enki. In the iconographic record, however, the ringed pole is more likely associated with divinity in general, and with Nintu in particular when it is associated with cattle byres. The \textit{Bügelschaft} may be associated with Nanna, but is more likely associated with divinity in general\(^652\) [Table 7.4].

\textbf{7.3.2 THE EARLY DYNASTIC PERIOD}

Of the standards represented in the Uruk Period, only the \textit{Bügelschaft}, the knobbed pole, the floral standard and/or star standard are also depicted in the Early Dynastic Period\(^653\). It is

\(^{651}\) Not counting the Proto-Elamite crescent standards \textbf{U71-U73}.

\(^{652}\) See 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.3 and 3.4 for the association of deities with the ring-post with streamer, the ring-post without streamer, the ringed pole and the \textit{Bügelschaft} respectively.

\(^{653}\) The standards of the Early Dynastic Period are discussed in Chapter 4.
difficult to distinguish between the floral and star standards during the Uruk Period, but the appearances of the emblems of these standards become more distinct during the Early Dynastic Period, and it is therefore easier to differentiate between the two standards in this period. During the Uruk Period the crescent standard is depicted on Proto-Elamite seals. During the Early Dynastic Period it is also represented in the Mesopotamian iconographic record. An Imdugud/bird standard and perhaps a standard with a composite emblem of which a lion is a component are also represented during the Early Dynastic Period, although only one example of each of these standards is known, and both are depicted on the same object, ED66 [Table 7.1 and 7.2].

The Bügelschaft is the most frequently depicted standard of the Early Dynastic Period, being represented on 47 of the 69 objects with identifiable standards. The crescent standard is the second most frequently represented standard, being represented 11 times — nine times in its simpler form, and twice with an animal-footed base and with pendants hanging from the crescent emblem. The knobbed pole is depicted on seven objects, the star standard is represented twice, and the floral standard, Imdugud/bird standard and the possible lion standard are each represented once [Table 7.2].

The two main themes in Early Dynastic glyptic art are the contest scene and the banquet scene, and standards are associated with both these types of scenes. In contest scenes standards are generally located in the field or act as terminals to the scenes, but in some examples they are held by a figure not involved in the fighting. The banquet scene can be understood as a ritual activity, and the standards associated with these scenes are indicative or representative of the space within which the banquet took place. Therefore, the standards associated with banquet scenes have both a ritual and an architectural context. Other ritual scenes represented during this period include the pouring of libations and the worship/adoration scene. In this regard, deities are depicted for the first time during the Early Dynastic Period. Standards are also associated with scenes of domestic activity. Because cattle are usually depicted in these scenes, they can be understood as a continuation of Uruk Period traditions which involve the care/feeding of the flocks/herds. The characteristic political unit of the Early Dynastic Period was the city-state. These city-states battled against

654 See 4.2.1 for more on the banquet scene, including further literature, and see 4.2.2.1 for more on the contest scene, including further literature.
655 See ED35 in 4.2.1.
each other, and this political climate is reflected in scenes such as those depicted on ED66. Standards are therefore represented associated with the major themes in Early Dynastic art.

7.3.3 THE AKKADIAN PERIOD

The Bügelschaft, as in the Early Dynastic Period, is the most frequently depicted standard of the Akkadian Period, being represented 53 times. The use of the knobbed pole, star standard and crescent standard is continued from the Early Dynastic Period into the Akkadian Period. There are three examples of the knobbed pole, six of the star standard, and seven of the crescent standard. The pennant standard and tasselled standard are new to the Akkadian Period, and are only represented during this period. Each of these are represented three times. Both of these standards are represented three times. The lion-griffon standard and the rod with balls are represented together on one example, A74. The rod with balls is only represented once, on A74, during the Akkadian Period, and the lion-griffon standard is unique in third and fourth millennia BCE Mesopotamian iconography [Tables 7.1 and 7.2].

The glyptic art of the Akkadian Period is rich and varied, with more individually identifiable figures and more scenes of a mythological nature. As such, scenes with deities become common. As a result, standards are associated with deities in a variety of scenes. While, as opposed to the Early Dynastic Period, standards are depicted rarely in scenes of domestic activity and banquet scenes, standards are associated with presentation scenes, worship/adoration scenes, and scenes which appear to represent mythological episodes. Standards are still associated with contest scenes. Imperial art develops the Early Dynastic artistic tradition in that military achievements are represented, as exemplified by Naram-Sin’s Victory Stele A74, upon which the first battle standards are depicted.

7.3.4 THE NEO-SUMERIAN PERIOD

The Bügelschaft, knobbed pole, star standard, crescent standard and rod with balls continue to be represented during the Neo-Sumerian Period. A standard which had an emblem in the form of either Imdugud or a bird appeared during the Early Dynastic Period on ED66. During the Neo-Sumerian Period standards with both bird and Imdugud/Anzu standards are represented. New to the Neo-Sumerian Period are also the scorpion standard, lion standard,
bird-man standard, *Mušḫuššu* standard and snake standard. With twelve different standards, the Neo-Sumerian Period has the greatest variety of standards [Table 7.1]. However, most of these are represented three times or less. The * Bügelschaft*, the standard most frequently depicted in both the Early Dynastic and Akkadian periods is only represented once in the Neo-Sumerian Period. The *Mušḫuššu* standard and snake standard are also both only represented once, and there is only one definite depiction of the scorpion standard, although it may be represented a second time on NS91. There are two known depictions of the star standard, and three of the Imdugud/Anzu standard and the bird-man standard. The crescent standard is the most frequently depicted standard of the Neo-Sumerian Period, being represented on 34 objects. The rod with balls is depicted 10 times, the bird standard 12 times, and the lion standard 13 times. There are eight examples of the knobbed standard, and four further variations of the knobbed pole [Table 7.2].

While Akkadian art was characterised by a variety of themes, motifs and individually identifiable figures, the Neo-Sumerian Period art was comparatively conservative with relatively few themes and motifs. The most common type of scene is the presentation scene, and worship/adoration scenes and contest scenes are still represented. Standards are associated with each of these three types of scenes. Standards are also associated with scenes of human activity, such as on the Gudea Stelae fragments NS61-NS63 and NS83-NS85, where three different standards — the lion standard, the bird standard and the bird-man standard — are carried in a procession. The standards represented on the NS61-NS63 and NS83-NS85 are also the first standards in the iconographic record which are known by name.

**7.4 CONCLUSIONS**

The fact that the * Bügelschaft* is only represented once in the entire Neo-Sumerian Period is reflective of the change in the function and symbolism of standards during the third and fourth millennia BCE. While the standards of the Uruk Period are predominantly and primarily architectural standards, by the Neo-Sumerian Period architecture is not generally depicted in the iconographic record. There are therefore few depictions of architectural standards, because there are few depictions of buildings, with which standards would have been associated. The presentation scene is the most frequently depicted type of scene in the Neo-Sumerian Period. Presentation scenes and worship/adoration scenes can be understood to take place within a sacred space, i.e. within a temple. Standards associated with specific,
individual deities are depicted in these scenes, rather than the Bügelschaft, which can be associated with or representative of divinity in general. Therefore, the standards in these scenes no longer function as indicators of divinity in general, but act as identifying attributes themselves. Where in the Akkadian Period deities are identified by associated attributes, as for example Ea being identified by a vase of overflowing water, and Šamaš being identified by the saw which he held, in the Neo-Sumerian Period, the deities can be identified by the standards with which they are associated.

There is therefore a marked change and a development in the way standards were represented in the third and fourth millennia BCE iconographic record from being primarily functional to being primarily symbolic. This reflects the iconographic tradition. The scenes of domestic activity of the Uruk Period and Early Dynastic Periods are replaced in the Akkadian Period by mythological scenes, and in the Neo-Sumerian Period by ritual scenes. While ritual scenes are already depicted in the Uruk Period, these scenes involve humans bringing offerings towards a temple or shrine. By the Neo-Sumerian Period, the human figures themselves are brought directly into contact with the deities. This reveals a shift in the conception of divinity, or in the conception of humanity’s relationship with the divine, where deities are explicitly involved in the lives of humans, and humans can actively seek the support of the deities. Such a shift is also reflected in the move of standards from being depicted outside the building to indicating the space inside the building, which suggests a transformation to a more intimate setting and a more intimate sacred representation.

Although standards functioned as identifying attributes by the end of the third millennium BCE, individual standards were already associated with specific deities from the Uruk Period. However, there is a greater variety of standards associated with individual deities during the Neo-Sumerian Period. This suggests a development in the importance of not only these deities, but in the concept of divinity in general. Because standards had become particularly associated with specific individual deities, and because there is a greater amount of standards, this suggests a greater amount of distinguishable deities. With the focus of Neo-Sumerian scenes being on religious ritual, the deities involved in these rituals needed to be readily identifiable. Therefore, the standards associated with deities in the presentation and worship/adoration scenes enable us to identify which deity is the subject of the ritual. This, in turn, suggests a relevance and importance attached to these deities, whether that be as the
personal deity of a human worshipper, or as a significant deity in the Mesopotamian pantheon.

The study of standards in the iconographic record of Mesopotamia during the third and fourth millennia BCE also suggests that the religious significance of standards was also of social importance. During the Uruk Period, standards are associated with rituals, whether explicitly, such as in the scenes related to the so-called sacred marriage, or implicitly, such as in scenes involving the care/feeding of herds/flocks or hunting. In these scenes, the Priest-King/En figure acts for the betterment of the entire society, either by providing for or protecting the community. The associated standards indicate that his activities are divinely sanctioned. The standards represented in the glyptic art of the Early Dynastic, Akkadian and Neo-Sumerian periods are predominantly in mythological settings, but the standards depicted on monumental art can offer further insight. During the Early Dynastic Period, on Eannatum’s Vulture Stele ED66, the standard or standards is/are associated with divine, not mortal activity. The related scene on Naram-Sin’s Victory Stele A74 depicts the human activity, but the standards associated with this scene indicate that this action was divinely sanctioned and supported. The standards depicted on the fragments of the Gudea Stelae NS61-NS63 and NS83-NS85 represent three standards associated with districts involved in temple construction. Each of these districts is under the domain of a specific deity, Ningirsu, Nanše and Inanna. This suggests that standards were not only important religiously, but also socially, although that it was their religious aspect which made them socially relevant and important.

A study of standards is important for an understanding of the religious development in Mesopotamia during the third and fourth millennia BCE, but, according to the iconographic record, standards appear to have had relatively little political relevance. No royal standards are known in the iconographic record of third and fourth millennia BCE Mesopotamia, and the standards which may be categorised as city standards are identified as such through their association with the deity of the city-state. These standards are therefore primarily divine standards, and, as such, are principally of religious significance, although they still fulfil a political function in the sense that they are associated with political units.
7.5 AVENUES FOR FURTHER RESEARCH
This iconographic study of the form, function and symbolism of standards in third and fourth millennia BCE Mesopotamia opens up a variety of avenues for further research. Firstly, there should be a study on the standards represented in second millennium BCE Mesopotamian iconography, and thereafter, an iconographic study on the standards of first millennium BCE. Which trends, first identified in the present study, continue after the close of the third millennium BCE? Which standards continue to be represented in the iconographic record of the Isin-Larsa and Old Babylonian periods, and what is the function of these standards, or in which contexts are they depicted? Is there continuation from the third and fourth millennia BCE, and what would this mean or signify with regards not only to the use of standards in Mesopotamia, but also, and more importantly, to Mesopotamian society as a whole?

Secondly, an in-depth study of the textual evidence for Mesopotamian standards of the third and fourth millennia should be done, and the findings of that study should be compared to the information acquired from this iconographic study to reveal the differences and similarities in how standards were represented in the two types of sources. This could illuminate the differences in the way these two types of sources were used to reflect Mesopotamian society, as well as disseminate information.

Finally, there should be a study of standards in the third and fourth millennia BCE outside Mesopotamia and how these are related to those from Mesopotamia proper. Were the same standards employed in different areas, and did standards have the same functions in different areas? What can this tell us about the use of standards across the ancient Near East in general, and what can it tell us about the interactions between ancient Near Eastern societies?
### ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADFU</td>
<td>Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AoF</td>
<td>Archiv für Orientforschung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJA</td>
<td>American Journal of Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJSL</td>
<td>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASPM</td>
<td>Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas und Mesopotamiens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr</td>
<td>Analecta Orientalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOAT</td>
<td>Alter Orient und Altes Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AoF</td>
<td>Altorientalische Forschungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOS</td>
<td>American Oriental Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Assyriological Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATU</td>
<td>Archaische Texte aus Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AuOr</td>
<td>Aula Orientalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUWE</td>
<td>Ausgrabungen in Uru-Warka Endberichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVO</td>
<td>Altertumskunde des Vorderen Orients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaF</td>
<td>Baghdader Forschungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaM</td>
<td>Baghdader Mitteilungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAR</td>
<td>Biblical Archaeology Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BiOr</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Orientalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAD</td>
<td>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOG</td>
<td>Colloquien der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Cuneiform Monographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPOA</td>
<td>Civilizations du Proche-Orient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ePSD</td>
<td>The Pennsylvania Sumerian Dictionary Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETCSL</td>
<td>Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAOS</td>
<td>Freiburger altorientalische Studien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRLANT</td>
<td>Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMES</td>
<td>History of the Ancient Near East Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDD</td>
<td>Iconography of Deities and Demons in the Ancient Near East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEJ</td>
<td>Israel Exploration Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAOS</td>
<td>Journal of the American Oriental Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS</td>
<td>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEOl</td>
<td>Jaarbericht van het Voor-Aziatisch-Egyptisch-Gezelschap Ex Oriente Lux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNAS</td>
<td>Journal of the American Oriental Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNES</td>
<td>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNSL</td>
<td>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAM</td>
<td>Misson Archéologique de Mari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDP</td>
<td>Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSVO</td>
<td>Materialien zu den frühen Schriftzeugnissen des Vorderen Orients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATCP</td>
<td>The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAC</td>
<td>Orientis Antiqui Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBO</td>
<td>Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIC</td>
<td>Oriental Institute Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIP</td>
<td>Oriental Institute Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLA</td>
<td>Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBF</td>
<td>Prähistorische Bronzefunde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>Publications of the Babylonian Section (of the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quad. Sem.</td>
<td>Quaderni di Semitistica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td><em>Revue d’assyriologie et d’archéologie orientale</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIMEP</td>
<td>Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Early Periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIA</td>
<td><em>Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAA</td>
<td>State Archives of Assyria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAACT</td>
<td>State Archives of Assyria Cuneiform Texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAOC</td>
<td>Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAIVA</td>
<td>Untersuchungen zur Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE</td>
<td>Ur Excavations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVB</td>
<td><em>Uruk vorläufiger Bericht</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WZKM</td>
<td>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WVDOG</td>
<td>Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 1: Catalogue
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## CONTENTS

### URUK PERIOD STANDARDS
- Ring-post with streamer: 1-36
- Ring-post without streamer: 37-42
- *Doppelvolute*: 42-46
- Ringed pole: 47-64
- *Bügelschaft*: 65-84
  - Crescent standard: 71-73
- Knobbed pole: 85-98
- Floral/star standards: 99-102
- Uncertain: 103-111

### EARLY DYNASTIC STANDARDS
- *Bügelschaft*: 112-158
- Knobbed pole: 159-165
- Crescent standard: 166-176
- Imdugud/bird standard: 177
- Standard with a composite emblem which includes a lion: 177
- Floral and star standards: 178-180
- Uncertain: 181-184
- Incorrectly identified as standards: 185-187

### AKKADIAN PERIOD STANDARDS
- *Bügelschaft*: 188-240
- Knobbed pole: 241-243
- Crescent standard: 244-249
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Star standard</td>
<td>250-254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennant standard</td>
<td>255-257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasselled standard</td>
<td>258-260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod with balls</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion-griffon standard</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>262-270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEO-SUMERIAN STANDARDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bügelschaft</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent standard</td>
<td>272-305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knobbed pole</td>
<td>306-317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star standard</td>
<td>318-319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod with balls</td>
<td>320-329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scorpion standard</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion standard</td>
<td>331-343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird and bird-man standards</td>
<td>344-356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imdugud/Anzu standard</td>
<td>357-359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mušḫuššu</em> standard</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>361-362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>U1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Picture Credit   | Van Dijk, RM |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Ring-Post with Streamer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Place of Origin and Context | Uruk  
Eanna Precinct, Stratum IV (?) |
| Type             | Inlay |
| Material         | Baked Clay |
| Size             | H: 12.8cm; T: 4.1cm |
| Collection       | VA 14539 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dolce 1978: Tav I W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrich 1957:31, 32; 31 Abb. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrich 1982:56; Abb.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan 1930:43; Taf. 19c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number: U2

Name

Picture Credit: Dolce 1978: Tav. II W2

Type of Standard: Ring-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context: Uruk
Eanna Precinct, Stratum IV-III

Type: Inlay

Material: Baked Clay

Size: H: 15cm; W: 7,7cm

Collection: (Iraq Museum)
W 5591

Literature Published:
Andrae 1933:10, 23; 10, Fig. 9; Taf. I.d
Dolce 1978: Tav. II W2
Goff 1963:116; Fig. 484
Jordan 1931:36-37; 34 Abb. 23
Catalogue Number: U3

Name

Picture Credit: Dolce 1978: Tav. I W3

Type of Standard: Ring-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context:
- Uruk
- Eanna Precinct, Stratum IV-III (?)

Type: Inlay

Material: Baked Clay

Size: H: 13.5cm; W: 5.2cm; T: 1cm

Collection: W 4999d

Literature Published:
- Andrae 1933:21; Taf. 1.d (right)
- Dolce 1978: Tav. I W3
- Jordan 1931:37; 34 Abb. 24 (right)
Catalogue Number: U4

Type of Standard: Ring-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context:
- Uruk
- Eanna Precinct, Stratum IV-III

Type: Inlay

Material: Baked Clay

Size:
- H: 19.3
- W: 12.5
- T: 2.7

Collection:
- VAT 14540
- W 4999b

Picture Credit: Woods 2010:70 Cat No. 39

Literature Published:
- Andrae 1933:21; Taf. 1.d (left)
- Dolce 1978: Tav. I W4
- Jordan 1931:37; 34 Abb. 24 (centre)
- Woods 2010:70; Catalogue Number 39
Catalogue Number U5

Name The Warka Vase

Picture Credit Roaf 2004:61 (detail)

Type of Standard Ring-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context Uruk
            Eanna Precinct
            Kleinfunde/Sammelfund

Type Vase

Material Alabaster

Size H: ca. 105cm; D: 36cm

Collection IM 19606
            W 14873

Literature Published
            Amiet 1980: Pl. 45.644
            Braun-Holzinger:14; Taf. 1-2; FS1
            Goff 1963:70-71, 91, 92, 95, 96, 171, 267; Fig. 286
            Heinrich 1936:15-16; Taf. 2-3; 38
            Heinrich 1957:65, 66, 67; 64 Abb. 69
            Heinrich 1982:41, 56; Abb. 97
            Schroer and Keel 2005:290-291; Nr. 192
            Van Buren 1939:41:33-36; 34 Fig. 1
Catalogue Number: U6

Name

Picture Credit: Heinrich 1936: Taf. 17d

Type of Standard: Ring-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context:
- Uruk
- Eanna Precinct
- Kleinfunde/Sammelfund

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Limestone/gypsum

Size: H: 4.7cm; D: 3.8cm

Collection: BM 116721

Literature Published:
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 45.649
- Braun-Holzinger 2007:30; Taf. 11; FS26
- Collon 2005:148; 149 Catalogue Number 639
- Frankfort 1939:xxiv; Pl. Vg
- Furlong 1987:370; XXV
- Heinrich 1936:14, 29; Taf. 17d
- Schroer and Keel 2005:292-293; Nr. 194
- Van Buren 1939-41:39; 35 Fig. 6
- Wiseman 1962:1; Pl. 2a
Catalogue Number  U7

Name

Picture Credit  Heinrich 1936:Taf. 18d

Type of Standard  RIng-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context  Uruk
Eanna Precinct
Kleinfunde/Sammelfund

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Gypsum/alabaster

Size  H: 4.8cm; D:3.3cm

Collection  VA 11041
W 14772c2

Literature Published
Amiet 1980: Pl. 45.651
Braun-Holzinger 2007:26; Taf. 10; FS11
Furlong 1987:366; XXI
Heinrich 1936:29; Taf. 18d
Moortgat 1966:87; Taf. 6. 31
Rova 1994: Tav. 35.607
Van Buren 1939-41:39-40; 38 Fig. 7
Catalogue Number  U8

Name

Picture Credit  Heinrich 1936: Taf. 18b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Ring-Post with Streamer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eanna Precinct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kleinfunde/Sammelfund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Steatite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 5.5cm; D: 3.4cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collection  IM 18830
             W 14806p

Literature Published
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 45.648
- Braun-Holzinger 2007:27; Taf.10; FS13
- Furlong 1987:368; XXIII
- Goff 1963:96, 150, ; Fig. 347
- Heinrich 1936:29-30, Taf. 18b
- Rova 1994: Tav. 35.605
Catalogue Number: U9

Type of Standard: Ring-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context:
- Uruk
- Eanna precinct
- Kleinfunde/Sammelfund (Uruk III)

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Limestone

Size: H: 4.2cm; D: 3.7cm

Collection:
- IM 18831
- W 14778g

Picture Credit: Heinrich 1936: Taf. 18a

Literature Published:
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 45.646
- Braun-Holzinger 2007:27; Taf. 10; FS14
- Furlong 1987:368; XXIV
- Heinrich 1936:29; Taf. 18a
- Rova 1994: Tav. 34.604
Catalogue Number  U10

Type of Standard  Ring-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context  Unknown

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Magnesite

Size  H: 4.7cm; D: 4.2cm

Collection  (Dresden)

Picture Credit  Braun-Holzinger 2007: Taf. 15 FS29F?

Literature Published

Amiet 1980: Pl. 44.643
Andrae 1933:28, 38; Taf. II.c
Braun-Holzinger 2007:30; Taf. 15; FS29F?
Frankfort 1939:xxiv; Pl. Vc
Goff 1963:61, 87, 91, 92, 96, 97; Fig. 244
Catalogue Number: U11
Name: The Preusser Seal

Picture Credit: Braun-Holzinger 2007: Taf. 14 FS28

Type of Standard: Ring-Post with Streamer
Place of Origin and Context: Acquired near Warka/Uruk
Type: Cylinder Seal
Material: Marble
Size: H: 5,4cm; D: 4,5cm
Collection: VA 10537

Literature Published:
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 43.636
- Andrae 1933:25-26, 36-37, 40, 42; Taf. V.a-c
- Braun-Holzinger 2007:30; Taf.14; FS28
- Collon 2005:13, 15; 12 Catalogue Number 6
- Frankfort 1939:xxiii, xxiv; Pl. Ib, Illa
- Goff 1963 60, 65, 81, 86, 101, 104; Fig. 241; 269
- Moortgat 1966:87; Taf. 5. 29a&b
- Nöldeke 1934:52; Taf. 29.a
- Rova 1994: Tav. 47.782
- Schroer and Keel 2005:280-281 Nr. 180
Catalogue Number  U12

Name

Picture Credit  Braun-Holzinger 2007: Taf. 11 FS16

Type of Standard  Ring-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context  Uruk
  Eanna Precinct
  Kleinfunde/Sammelfund

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Lapis Lazuli

Size  H: 3,1cm; D: 2,4cm

Collection  IM 18828
  W 14766f

Literature Published
  Amiet 1980: Pl. 43.637
  Braun-Holzinger 2007:27-28; Taf. 11; FS16
  Goff 1963:62, 81, 86, 97; Fig. 249
  Heinrich 1936:29; Taf. 17b
  Rova 1994: Tav. 34.603
  Schroer and Keel 2005:278-279 ; Nr. 179
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>U13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Ring-Post with Streamer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eanna Precinct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kleinfunde/Sammelfund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Calcite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 7,2cm; D: 4,2cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>BM 116722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amiet 1980: Pl. 43.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braun-Holzinger 2007: Taf. 15; FS31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfort 1939:xxiv; Pl. Vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goff 1963:62, 81, 86; Fig. 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrich 1936:14; Taf. 17c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiseman 1962:1; Pl. 1a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number  U14

Name

Picture Credit  van Dijk, RM

Type of Standard  Ring-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context  Unknown
Acquired by the Louvre in 1912

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  White Limestone

Size  H: 6,2cm; D: 4,3cm

Collection  AO 6620

Literature Published
Amiet 1980: Pl. 44.639
Andrae 1933:28, 38; Taf. II.d
Braun-Holzinger 2007:31; Taf. 15; FS30
Delaporte 1923:106; Pl. 69.8a-b; No. A.116
Goff 1063:62, 81, 97; Fig. 250
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>U15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
<td>Ring-Post with Streamer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Uruk, Eanna Precinct, Kleinfunde/Sammelfund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Lapis Lazuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 4.3cm; D: 3.5cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>VA 11040, W 14772c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit** Heinrich 1936: Taf. 17a

**Literature Published**
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 46.655
- Braun-Holzinger 2007:27; Taf. 11; FS15
- Collon 2005:172, 175; 174 Catalogue Number 807
- Frankfort 1939:xxiv; Pl. Ille
- Goff 1963:67, 68, 69, 100, 105, 112131, 214, 243; Fig. 282
- Heinrich 1936:28-29; Taf. 17a
- Heinrich 1957:65, 67; 64 Abb. 68
- Moortgat 1966:87; Taf. 6.30
- Rova 1994: Tav. 34.602
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>U16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Braun-Holzinger 2007: Taf. 11 FS15A

**Type of Standard**  
Ring-Post with Streamer

**Place of Origin and Context**  
Uruk

**Type**  
Cylinder Seal

**Material**  
Marble

**Size**  
H: 3,0cm, D: 3,8cm

**Collection**  
IM 41187  
W 16804

**Literature Published**  
Amiet 1980: Pl. 46.652  
Braun-Holzinger 2007:27; Taf. 11; FS15A  
Rova 1994: Tav. 47.786
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>U17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Ring-Post with Streamer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>White Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 1.9cm; D: 2.1cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>BM 131440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**  
Amiet 1980: Pl. 121.1614  
Braun-Holzinger 2007:31; Taf. 15; FS33  
Schroer and Keel 2005:280-281; Nr. 182
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Van Buren 1939-41: 34 Fig. 2

**Type of Standard**  Ring-Post with Streamer

**Place of Origin and Context**
- Uruk
- Seal Layer III

**Type**  Cylinder Seal

**Material**

**Size**  H: 5.5cm; D: 4.4cm

**Collection**  (Vorderasiatisches Museum)
- W 15415

**Literature Published**
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 45.650
- Goff 1963:92, 96; Fig. 324
- Nöldeke, Lenzen, von Haller and Göpner 1936:25-26; Taf. 25.e
- Rova 1994: Tav. 35.612
- Van Buren 1939-41:36; 34 Fig. 2
Catalogue Number

Name

Picture Credit  Rova 1994: Tav. 59.970

Type of Standard  Ring-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context  Uruk
Eanna III
Ob XVI3

Type  Seal Impression

Material  Unbaked Clay

Size

Collection  IM 66 854
W 21 166

Literature Published

Brandes 1986:51-56
Rova 1994: Tav. 59.970
Catalogue Number  U20
Name  The Uruk Trough

Picture Credit  Amiet 1980: Pl. 42.623

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Ring-Post with Streamer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Trough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 15.2cm; L: 96.5cm; W: 35.5cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>BM 120000; VA 8768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Literature Published
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 42.623
- Andrae 1930:2, 4; 2 Abb. 1-3
- Andrae 1933:25, 27, 29, 38, 42; 27 Fig. 40.a-b
- Barnett and Wiseman 1960:8-9
- Delougaz 1968:186; 187 Fig. 5
- Furlong 1987:374; XXVII
- Goff 1963:114, 121; Fig. 470
- Heinrich 1957:12, 18, 31, 61; 12 Abb. 5
- Heinrich 1982:6; Abb. 16
Catalogue Number U21

Name

Picture Credit Buchanan 1981:56 Catalogue Number 160

Type of Standard

Ring-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context

Unknown

Type

Cylinder Seal

Material

Creamy Brown Marble

Size

H: 2.9cm; D: 2.3-2.2cm (irregular)

Collection

YBC 12624

Literature Published

Buchanan 1960:24, Number 2
Buchanan 1981:57; 56 Catalogue Number 160
Catalogue Number  U22

Name

Picture Credit  Heinrich 1936: Taf. 19a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Ring-Post with Streamer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Place of Origin and Context | Uruk  
Eanna Precinct  
Kleinfunde/Sammelfund |
| Type | Cylinder Seal |
| Material | White Chalcedony |
| Size | H: 3.5cm; D: 3.0cm |
| Collection | VA 11043  
W 14597 1 |

Literature Published

- Amiet 1980: Pl. 41.621
- Collon 2005:13, 15; 12 Catalogue Number 7
- Heinrich 1936:30; Taf. 19a
- Moortgat 1966:85; Taf. 2.9
- Rova 1994: Tav. 35.608
Catalogue Number: U23

Picture Credit: Van Dijk, RM

Type of Standard: Ring-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context:

Type: Vessel
Material: Stone
Size: H: 10.8 cm

Collection: VA 7236

Literature Published:
- Amiet 1980: 42.624
- Andrae 1930: 4; 3 Abb. 4-6
- Andrae 1933: 29, 37; 28 Fig. 41
- Heinrich 1957: 12, 18, 31, 61; 13 Abb. 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>U24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Keel-Leu and Teissier 2004: 411 Nr. 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Ring-Post with Streamer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Place of Origin and Context**  Diyala Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Marble</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Size</strong></th>
<th>H: 3.85cm; D: 3.22cm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>VR 1981.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Literature Published**  Keel-Leu and Teissier 2004:15; 411 Nr. 9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>U25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**
Amiet 1980: Pl. 41.620

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Ring-Post with Streamer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Banded Opal and Bariate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 3,3cm (present height); D: 3,3cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Collection** | Haskel Museum A. 3648 |

**Literature Published**
Amiet 1980: Pl. 41.620
Goff 1963:66, 86, 87; Fig. 275
Williams 1928:237; No. 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>U26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
(accessed on 9 September 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Ring-Post with Streamer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Acquired by Pierpont Morgan sometime between 1885 and 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Green Serpentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 1.6cm; D: 1.3cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>Morgan Seal 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 41.622  
- Goff 1963:66, 86, 87; Fig. 274  
- Porada 1948:4; Pl. II.5
Catalogue Number U27

Type of Standard Ring-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context Uruk
Eanna IV

Type Seal Impression

Material Asphalt

Size

Collection (Iraq Museum) W 20485

Picture Credit Rova 1994: Tav. 41. 714

Literature Published
Lenzen 1963:21-22; Taf. 15.e
Rova 1994: Tav 41.714
Catalogue Number U28

Type of Standard Ring-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context Unknown

Type Cylinder Seal (Fragmentary)

Material Marble

Size H: 6.3cm; W: 4.4cm; B: 2.1cm

Collection NCBS 22 (YALE)

Picture Credit Buchanan 1981:47 Catalogue Number 138

Literature Published
Amiet 1980: Pl. 46.653
Buchanan 1981:46; 47 Catalogue Number 138
Heinrich 1957:65, 67; 64 Abb. 67
Von Der Osten 1934:16; Pl. III.22
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>U29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Ring-Post with Streamer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>White Marble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>L: 2,8cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>Private Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**  
Sold Through Christies where it was incorrectly identifies as Early Dynastic:  
Catalogue Number: U30

Name

Picture Credit: Frankfort 1939: Pl. VIIId

Type of Standard: Ring-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context:
- Unknown
- Acquired by the Louvre

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Black Basalt

Size: H: 4.1cm; D: 3.5cm

Collection: MNB 1166 (Louvre)

Literature Published:
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 42.627
- Andrae 1933:29; Taf. II.b
- Delaporte 1923:98; Pl. 63.5; No. A.27
- Frankfort 1939:xxv; Pl. VIIId
- Heinrich 1957:39, 75; 74 Abb. 81
- Ward 1910:180; Fig. 186
- Weber 1920: Nr. 490
Catalogue Number: U31

Picture Credit: Frankfort 1955: Pl. 80.854

Type of Standard: Ring-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context:
Tell Agrab
Shara Temple, 32.65m; M 14:2, in altar

Type: Cylinder Seal
Material: White Marble
Size: H: 4.4cm; D: 4.3cm

Collection: IM 31400
Ag. 36:245

Literature Published:
Amiet 1980: Pl.42.625
Frankfort 1955: Pl. 2.0; 80.854
Goff 1963:100; Fig. 366
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th><strong>U32</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
<td>Ring-Post with Streamer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>Former Erlenmeyer Collection Seal 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Woods 2010: Fig. 2.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Literature Published** | Nissen, Damerow and Englund 1993:17; Fig. 18
Woods 2010:50; Fig. 2.20

[Stellenbosch University](https://scholar.sun.ac.za)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Ring-Post with Streamer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Seal Impression(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Goucher College Collection 869 (in YBC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Literature Published

- Amiet 1980: Pl. 48bis A
- Delougaz 1968:188; 189 Fig. 10
- Buchanan 1981:45; 44 Catalogue Number 136
- Goff 1963:65, 81; Fig. 270
- Goff and Buchanan 1956

**Picture Credit**: Goff and Buchanan 1965:Pl. XIX Fig. 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>U34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Ring-Post with Streamer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Green Calcite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>BLMJ Seal 204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Literature Published** | Westenholz 2007:333-334; 334 Fig. 23.1 |

**Picture Credit** Westenholz 2007:334, Fig. 23.1
Catalogue Number: U35

Name

Picture Credit: Marchesi and Marchetti 2011: Pl. 48 9

Type of Standard: Ring-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context: Unknown

Type: Cylinder Seal (fragmentary)

Material: White Limestone

Size: H: 4.8cm; D: 4.1cm

Collection: IM 11501

Literature Published:

Amiet 1980: Pl. 46.654
Andrae 1933:39; Taf. IV.a
Collon 2005:172, 175; 174 Catalogue Number 808
Goff 1963:67, 69, 86, 214; Fig. 285
Nöldeke 1934:52; Taf. 29.b
Parrot 1949:37; Pl. Ila
Catalogue Number: U36

Name

Picture Credit: Buchanan 1966:8 Text Image

Type of Standard: Ring-Post with Streamer

Place of Origin and Context

Type: Seal Impression(s)

Material: Baked Clay

Size

Collection: Ashmolean 1926. 591, 608, 675, 735

Literature Published

Amiet 1980: Pl. 122.1629
Buchanan 1966:8, 8 Text Image; Pl. 2.9a-c
Falkenstein 1936: Pl. 71. 656 o, Rd.
Matthews 1993:34-38; Fig. 10:a64
Rova 1994: Tav. 51.841
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Ring-Post without Streamer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Place of Origin and Context | Uruk  
Eanna Precinct  
Kleinfunde/Sammelfund |
| Type | Inlay |
| Material | Bituminous Limestone, Bitumen, Gold Foil |
| Size | D: 1.0cm |
| Collection | VA 11145  
nov W-Number. |

**Literature Published**
- Becker 1993:26; Taf 16, Nr. 304
- Dolce 1978:13; Tav. V W26
- Heinrich 1936:43; Taf. 33.o
Catalogue Number: U38

Name

Picture Credit: Heinrich 1957:11 Abb. 2

Type of Standard
Ring-Post without Streamer

Place of Origin and Context
Unknown
Acquired by the Louvre before 1870

Type
Cylinder Seal

Material
White Limestone

Size
H: 4.2cm; D: 3.5cm

Collection
Klq 17 (Louvre)

Literature Published
Amiet 1980: Pl. 43.632
Andrae 1933:10, 29, 33, 37; Taf. II.a
Delougaz 1968:188; 189 Fig. 9
Delaporte 1923:98; Pl. 63.3a-b; No. A.25
Heinrich 1957:12, 13, 31, 61; 11 Abb. 2
Catalogue Number  U39

Type of Standard  Ring-Post without Streamer

Place of Origin and Context  Uruk
Eanna Precinct Level IV

Type  Seal Impression

Material  Clay

Size  Height of seal: ca. 2.6cm

Collection  VAT 15374
W 9656 gc

Literature Published
Amiet 1980: Pl. 10.186
Boehmer 1999:53; Abb. 53
Delougaz 1968:186; 187 Fig. 2
Falkenstein 1936: Pl. 58. 573 Rs
Frankfort 1939:20 text-fig. 5
Goff 1963:62, 86; Fig. 252
Heinrich 1957:12, 20; 13 Abb. 7
Nöldeke 1934:43, 47; Taf. 25d
Rova 1994: Tav. 33.580
Catalogue Number  U40

Name

Picture Credit  Mallowan 1947: Pl. XXI.12

Type of Standard  Ring-Post without Streamer

Place of Origin and Context  Tell Brak
                           From site H.H. top metre, Northern half of the mound in later debris.

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Limestone

Size  H: 2.3cm; D: 1.5cm

Collection  BM 126319
            F.726

Literature Published

Amiet 1980: Pl. 43.633
Mallowan 1947:134-135; Pl. XXI.11&12
Rova 1994: Tav. 54.902
Van Buren 1949:60-61
Wiseman 1962:2; Pl. 2e
Catalogue Number: U41

Type of Standard: Ring-Post without Streamer

Place of Origin and Context:
- Uruk
- Eanna III

Type: Seal Impression
Material: Clay
Size: Preserved Height: 3.5cm

Collection: W 22173

Picture Credit: Rova 1994: Tav. 45.758

Literature Published:
- Rova 1994: Tav. 45.758
- Schmidt 1972:72; Taf. 19.k
Catalogue Number: U42

Name

Picture Credit: Rova 1994: Tav. 39.663

Type of Standard:
- Ring-Post without Streamer
- Doppelvolute

Place of Origin and Context:
- Uruk
- Eanna III (?)
- Seleucid Wall in Na XVI3, 4, layer with clay tablets of the Jemdet Nasr Period

Type: Seal Impression

Material

Size

Collection: W 19418b

Literature Published:
- Rova 1994: Tav. 39.663
- Lenzen 1960:56; Taf. 26.h, 32.i
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of</strong></th>
<th>Doppellvolute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of</strong></td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Origin and</strong></td>
<td>SIS 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Seal Impression(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>IM 120934 (U 14122); BM 1930.13.404 (U 14886); (British Museum U 14123a); UPenn 31.16.670 (U 14123b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U 13894; U 14122; U 14123; U 14836; U 14886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**
- Frankfort 1939:41 Text-fig. 18
- Furlong 1987:376; XXIX
- Heinrich 1957:30, 81; 29 Abb. 28
- Legrain 1936:36; Pl. 20.389; Pl. 51.389, 51.389
- Matthews 1993:66; Fig. 15.32

**Picture Credit** Legrain 1936: Pl. 20.389
Catalogue Number  U44

Type of Standard  Doppelvolute

Place of Origin and Context  Unknown

Type  Architectural Model

Material  Steatite

Size  H: 30,0cm; W: 9,2cm; B: 8,1cm

Collection  VA 10112

Picture Credit  Goff 1963: Fig. 663

Literature Published
- Andrae 1933:30ff, 39; Taf. III
- Frankfort 1949:195, 198, 200; 196 Fig. 2
- Goff 1963:151-152 Fig. 663
- Heinrich 1957:71-72; 70 Abb. 75
- Van Buren 1950:143
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>U45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Goff 1963: Fig. 661

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Doppelvolute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Place of Origin and Context** | North Syria  
Purchased in Aleppo |

**Type**  
Amulet - Architectural Model?

**Material**  
Serpentine

**Size**  
H: 3.5cm

**Collection**  
(Ashmolean Museum - Frankfort 1949:200)  
(British Museum - Goff 1963:xxix)

**Literature Published**  
Frankfort 1949:198, 200; 196 Fig. 8  
Goff 1963:151-152; Fig. 661  
Mallowan 1947:33ff, 156-157; Pl. XXVI.1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>U46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Picture Credit** | Goff 1963: Fig. 662 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Doppelvolute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Tell Brak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Amulet - Architectural Model?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Black Serpentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 2.1cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Collection** | Ashmolean F.1090 (S) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Literature Published</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frankfort 1949:198, 200; 196 Fig. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goff 1963:151-152; Fig. 662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallowan 1947:33ff, 157; Pl. XXVI.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Place of Origin and Context** | Uruk  
Eanna V  
Nb XVI3 |
| **Type** | Seal Impression(s) |
| **Material** | Clay |
| **Size** | |
| **Collection** | W 19410, 5, 12 |

**Literature Published**

- Amiet 1980: Pl. 13bis.E
- Lenzen 1960:53-54; Taf. 31.a-f
- Rova 1994: Tav. 38.654

**Picture Credit** Lenzen 1960:Taf. 31.f
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>U48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name**

**Picture Credit**  
Amiet 1980: Pl. 42.626

**Type of Standard**  
Ringed Pole

**Place of Origin and Context**  
Acquired in South Iraq in 1936

**Type**  
Cylinder Seal

**Material**  
Green Marble

**Size**  
H: 1.7cm; D: 1.5cm

**Collection**  
BM 128844

**Literature Published**

Amiet 1980: Pl. 42.626  
Van Buren 1939-41:41; 38 Fig. 10  
Wiseman 1962:6; Pl. 5d
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>U49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Picture Credit** Lenzen 1960: Taf. 32.d

**Type of Standard** Ringed Pole

**Place of Origin and Context**
- Uruk
- Eanna III
- Ld XVI1, 2, from the debris of the Jemdet-Nasr Period

**Type** Seal Impression

**Material** Clay

**Size** H: 2,8cm

**Collection** Location Unknown
W 19207

**Literature Published**
- Furlong 1987:374; XXVIII
- Lenzen 1960:66; Taf. 32.d
- Rova 1994: Tav. 38.658
Catalogue Number: U50

Name

Picture Credit: Lenzen 1961: Taf. 27.g

Type of Standard: Ringed Pole

Place of Origin and Context:
- Uruk
- Eanna IV
- Nc XVI5, southern half, 50cm below the surface

Type: Seal Impression

Material: Clay

Size

Collection: W 19731i

Literature Published:
- Lenzen 1961:35; Taf. 27.g
- Rova 1994: Tav. 40.679
Catalogue Number: U51

Type of Standard: Ringed Pole

Place of Origin and Context: Uruk
Eanna IV
Oc XVI 3, from the intermediate layer between Uruk III and Uruk IV.

Type: Seal Impression

Material: Clay

Size

Collection: W 20 689; W 21 060,17; W 21 110

Picture Credit: Amiet 1980: Pl. 120.1605

Literature Published:
Amiet 1980: Pl. 120.1605
Brandes 1979:226-233; Tav. 32
Lenzen 1964:23; Taf. 26.l, 28.f
Rova 1994: Tav. 42.725
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>U52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Heinrich 1936: Taf. 25b

**Type of Standard**  Ringed Pole

**Place of Origin and Context**  
- Uruk
- Eanna Precinct
- Kleinfunde/Sammelfund

**Type**  Fragment of Vase

**Material**  Bituminous Limeastone

**Size**  D: ca. 7,4cm

**Collection**  
- VA 11284
- W 14819b

**Literature Published**  
- Goff 1963:115; Fig. 473
- Heinrich 1936:38; Taf. 25b
Catalogue Number U53

Picture Credit Braun-Holzinger 2007: Taf. 14 FS24

Type of Standard
Ringed Pole

Place of Origin and Context
Tell Billa (Shibaniba)

Type
Cylinder Seal

Material
Diorite

Size
H: 4.3cm; D: 3.6cm

Collection
IM 11953

Literature Published
Amiet 1980: Pl. 46.656
Andrae 1933:23, 39-40; Taf. IV.c
Boehmer 1999: Abb. 121b
Braun-Holzinger 2007:29; Taf. 14; FS24
Collon 2005:172; 173 Catalogue Number 800
Frankfort 1939:xxiv; Pl. Illd
Goff 1963:68, 131, 171; Fig. 544
Heinrich 1957:38-9, 41; 43 Abb. 41
Heinrich 1982:41; Abb. 99
Rova 1994: Tav. 54.901
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>U54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>van Dijk, RM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Ringed Pole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Fragment of Vase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>Preserved Height: 24,5cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>AO 8842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Literature Published</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrae 1933:46; 19 Fig. 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delougaz 1968:188; 189 Fig. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furlong 1987: 378; XXXI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goff 1963:121; Fig. 471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall and Woolley 1927:xi,150 Pl. XXXIX.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrich 1957:12, 13, 14, 17, 31; 12 Abb. 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number  U55

Name

Picture Credit  Amiet 1980: Pl. 121.1613

Type of Standard  Ringed Pole

Place of Origin and Context  Uruk
Uruk IVa

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  White Magnesite; Silver ram on top

Size  H: 5,3cm (8,5 with ram); D: 4,6cm

Collection  Ashmolean 1964:744

Literature Published

Amiet 1980: Pl. 121.1613
Boehmer 1999:53; Abb.X
Collon 2005:14 14 Catalogue Number 12
Delougaz 1968:188, 192; 189 Fig. 11
Hamilton 1967
Moorey and Gurney 1978:43-44; 60 Fig. 1.9; Pl. IV.9 ; No. 9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>U56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
<td>Ringed Pole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Uruk Eanna Precinct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type Seal Impression(s)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>Height of Seal: 4.4cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Boehmer 1999: Abb. 121a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Literature Published** | Boehmer 1999:26, 194, 198; Abb. 121a  
Lenzen 1962:22; Taf. 19.e-f  
Lenzen 1963:18; Taf. 13.f-h  
Rova 1994: Tav. 44.750  
Schmidt 1972:71; Taf. 18.c, e; Taf. 19.a-c; Taf. 42.a (incorrectly marked as 42b) |
<p>| <strong>Collection</strong> | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>U57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Rova 1994: Tav. 45.751

**Type of Standard**  
Ringed Pole

**Place of Origin and Context**  
Uruk  
Eanna III

**Type**  
Seal Impression

**Material**  
Clay

**Size**  

**Collection**  
W 22419,1

**Literature Published**  
Rova 1994: Tav. 45.751  
Schmidt 1972:71; Taf. 18.d
Catalogue Number  U58

Picture Credit  Frankfort 1936:69, fig 54B

Type of Standard  Ringed Pole

Place of Origin and Context  Khafajeh
Sanctuary of the Small Temple in O43

Type  Vessel

Material  Green Stone

Size

Collection  Kh. V14

Literature Published
Delougaz and Seton Lloyd 1942:106; 104 Fig. 98
Delougaz 1968:186; 187 Fig. 6
Frankfort 1936:71; 69 Fig. 54A&B
Furlong 1987:358; XIV
Goff 1963:114, 121; Fig. 469
Heinrich 1957:12, 13, 14, 31; 12 Abb. 3a&b
Schroer and Keel 2005:191-192; Nr. 191
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>U59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit** Lenzen 1964: Taf. 26.k

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Ringed Pole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nc XVI 5, from the filling of the large courtyard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Seal Impression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Collection** W 20659

**Literature Published**
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 120.1604
- Lenzen 1964:23; Taf. 26.k, 28.e
- Rova 1994: Tav. 42.724
Type of Standard: Ringed Pole

Place of Origin and Context:
- Uruk
- Eanna IV
- Nb XVI 4, Filling rubble of the Great Court

Type: Seal Impression

Material: Clay

Size: H: 2.5cm

Collection: W 20554

Picture Credit: Rova 1994: Tav. 42.722

Literature Published:
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 120.1606
- Lenzen 1964:23; Taf. 26.h, 28.f
- Rova 1994: Tav. 42.722
Catalogue Number U61
Name

Picture Credit Amiet 1980: Pl. 42.629

Type of Standard Ringed Pole
Place of Origin and Context Khafajeh Sin Temple II
Type Cylinder Seal
Material Grey Limestone with shell and silver
Size H: 6.3cm; D: 6.0cm
Collection (Iraq Museum) Kh. VII260

Literature Published
Amiet 1980: Pl. 42.629
Delougaz 1968:186, 193, 194; 187 Fig. 4
Frankfort 1939:xxv; Pl. Vla
Frankfort 1955: Pl. 1.a; 6.33
Furlong 1987:360; XV
Goff 1963:98, 121; Fig. 358
Heinrich 1957:12, 13, 31, 61; 11 Abb. 1
Rova 1994: Tav. 55.919
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>U62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Picture Credit   | Amiet 1980: Pl. 121.1620 |
| Literature Published |
| Amiet 1980: Pl. 121.1620 |
| Matthews 1993: Fig. 5.24 |
| Rova 1994: Tav. 52.867 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Ringed Pole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 5,0cm; L: 5,5cm; T: 2,8cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>AO 8859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number  U63

Picture Credit  Rova 1994: Tav. 40.678

Type of Standard  Ringed Pole

Place of Origin and Context  Uruk
                          Eanna III

Type  Seal Impression

Material

Size

Collection  (Heidelberg and Iraq Museum)
             W 20280,1; W 20383,2; W 20383,3; W 20383,5; W 19731d

Literature Published
Lenzen 1961:35; Taf. 27.f
Lenzen 1963:19, 20-1; Taf. 14a, i-k
Rova 1994: Tav. 40.678
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Place of Origin and Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ringed Pole</td>
<td>Acquired by Pierpont Morgan sometime between 1885 and 1908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
<td>Alabaster</td>
<td>D: 4.0</td>
<td>Morgan Seal 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porada 1948:3; Pl. I.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number  U65

Name

Type of Standard  Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context  Uruk
Anu Ziggurat

Type  Architectural Model

Material  White Stone

Size  H: 3.4cm

Collection  (Vorderasiatisches Museum)
W 16618

Picture Credit  Goff 1963: Fig. 457b

Literature Published
Goff 1963:111-112; Fig. 457b
Heinrich 1957:36, 41, 48-50; 49 Abb. 50
Heinrich 1982:41; Abb. 93b
Nöldeke, von Haller, Lenzen and Heinrich
1937:45; Taf. 48.k; 46 Abb. 6 for comparison
Catalogue Number  U66

Name

Picture Credit  Goff 1963: Fig. 361

Type of Standard  Uncertain
Two Bügelschafts connected at the base by a crossbar

Place of Origin and Context  Abu Hatab
Acquired in Baghdad

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Steatite

Size  H: 4.0cm; D: 1.8cm

Collection  VA 10893

Literature Published

Amiet 1957: 128-129; Fig. 9
Amiet 1980: Pl. 46.658
Andrae 1933: 45; Taf. IV.b
Braun-Holzinger 2007: 30; Taf. 14; FS27
Goff 1963: 97; Fig. 361
Heinrich 1957: 36; 46 Abb. 47
Moortgat 1966: 87; Ta. 6.33
Rova 1994: Tav. 49.818
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Two Bügelschafts connected at the base by a crossbar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Place of Origin and Context | Uruk  
Anu Ziggurat  
Anu A, Eastern Corner |
| Type | Seal Impression |
| Material | Clay |
| Size |  |
| Collection | (Iraq Museum and Vorderasiatisches Museum)  
W 16919d |
| Literature Published | Amiet 1980: Pl. 13.229  
Boehmer 1999:86; Abb. 91  
Heinrich 1982:35; Abb. 86  
Nöldeke, Falkenstein, Von Haller, Heinrich and Lenzen 1938:27; Taf. 31.c  
Rova 1994: Tav. 36.623 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Two Bügelschafts connected at the base by a crossbar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Place of Origin and Context** | Uruk  
Anu Ziggurat  
Anu A |
| **Type** | Seal Impression |
| **Material** | Clay |
| **Size** |  |
| **Collection** | (Iraq Museum and Vorderasiatisches Museum)  
W 16919e |
| **Catalogue Number** | U68 |
| **Name** |  |
| **Picture Credit** | Rova 1994: Tav. 36.624 |
| **Literature Published** | Nöldeke, Falkenstein, Von Haller, Heinrich and Lenzen 1938:27; Taf. 31.d  
Rova 1994: Tav. 36.624 |
Catalogue Number: U69

Picture Credit: Rova 1994: Tav. 36.625

Type of Standard: Two Bügelschafts connected at the base by a crossbar

Place of Origin and Context: Uruk
- Anu Ziggurat
- Anu A

Type: Seal Impression

Material: Clay

Size

Collection: (Iraq Museum and Vorderasiatisches Museum)
- W 16919f

Literature Published:
- Nöldeke, Falkenstein, Von Haller, Heinrich and Lenzen 1938:27; Taf. 31.e
- Rova 1994: Tav. 36.625
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>U70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Picture Credit** | Rova 1994: Tav. 36.626 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Two Bügelschafts connected at the base by a crossbar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Place of Origin and Context** | Uruk  
Anu Ziggurat  
Anu A |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Seal Impression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Material</strong></th>
<th>Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Size** |  |

| **Collection** | (Iraq Museum and Vorderasiatisches Museum)  
W 16919g |

| **Literature Published** | Nöldeke, Falkenstein, Von Haller, Heinrich and Lenzen 1938:27; Taf. 31.f  
Rova 1994: Tav. 36.626 |
Catalogue Number U71

Picture Credit Amiet 1980: Pl. 17.282

Type of Standard Crescent Standard

Place of Origin and Context Susa
South Acropolis
Level 17 - 15,5m

Type Seal Impression on a Bulla

Material Clay

Size H: ca. 4,0cm

Collection Sb 1957 (Louvre)

Literature Published
Amiet 1980: Pl. 17.282
Collon 2005: 158; 159 Catalogue Number 711
Rova 1994: Tav. 21.382
Catalogue Number U72

**Type of Standard** Crescent Standard

**Place of Origin and Context** Chogha Mish R18:312

**Type** Seal Impression

**Material** Clay

**Size** H: 4.2cm

**Collection** II-760

**Literature Published**
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 125.1669
- Collon 2005:158; 159 Catalogue Number 712
- Delougaz and Kantor 1996:131, 137, 138, 146; Pl. 151B
- Rova 1994: Tav. 5.82
- Schroer and Keel 2005:284-285; Nr. 187

**Picture Credit** Collon 2005:159 Catalogue Number 712
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>U73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Delougaz and Kantor 1996:Pl. 154B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
<td>Crescent Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Chogha Mish R17:206/714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>7,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Published</strong></td>
<td>Delougaz and Kantor 1996:46; Pl. 154B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Standard</td>
<td>Bügelschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Susa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Gypsum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 4,45cm; D: 3,85cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>BM 102416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**

Collon 2005:16, 19; 18 Catalogue Number 28
Wiseman 1962:6; Pl. 5e
Catalogue Number: U75  

Name:

Picture Credit: Amiet 1980: Pl. 16.271

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Susa

Type: Stamp Impression

Material: Clay

Size

Collection: Sb 1948 (Louvre)

Literature Published:
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 16.271
- Boehmer 1999: Abb. 102a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Susa, Acropolis Level 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Seal Impression on Bulla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Boehmer 1999: Abb 116a (detail)

**Literature Published**

Amiet 1980: Pl. 124.1650  
Boehmer 1999:30, 119; Abb. 116a  
Rova 1994: Tav. 7.120
Catalogue Number  U77

Name

Picture Credit  Rova 1994: Tav. 2.36

Type of Standard  Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context  Jebel Aruda
Pit under S 69

Type  Seal Impression(s)

Material  Clay

Size  Preserved Length: ca. 6,0cm

Collection  (Aleppo Museum)
JA 562B; JA 570A; JA 682; JA 684

Literature Published  
Rova 1994: Tav. 2.36
Van Driel 1983:53-54, 57; Nr.36
Catalogue Number  U78

Name

Picture Credit  Rova 1994: Tav. 3.40

Type of Standard  Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context  Jebel Aruda
                          Room S 43

Type  Seal Impression(s)

Material  Clay

Size

Collection  (Aleppo Museum)
              JA 378, 397, 483, 484, 485

Literature Published
Rova 1994: Tav. 3.40
Van Driel 1983:56; Nr.40
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Place of Origin and Context | Tell Agrab  
                     | Shara Temple  
                     | 32,50m  
                     | L 13:4 |
| Type              | Cylinder Seal     |
| Material          | White Limestone   |
| Size              | H: 5.0cm; D: 4.4cm |
| Collection        | IM 27176  
                     | Ag.35:793 |

**Literature Published**
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 48.681
- Frankfort 1955:15; Pl. 2.q; 84.880
- Goff 1963:100, 122; Fig. 370
- Heinrich 1957:39, 75; 84 Abb. 80
- Mallowan 1947:210; Fig. 19
- Rova 1994: Tav. 58.955
Catalogue Number   U80

Name

Picture Credit  Boehmer 1999: Abb. 80 (detail)

Type of
Standard    Bügelschaft

Place of
Origin and
Context       Uruk
                   Anu Ziggural
                   Anu C

Type              Seal Impression

Material          Clay

Size              Height of Seal: ca. 2,7cm

Collection       VA 13594
                  W 16961h

Literature Published

Amiet 1980:13.223
Boehmer 1999:81, 85; Abb. 80
Heinrich 1982:35; Abb. 85b
Nöldeke, Falkenstein, Von Haller, Heinrich and Lenzen 1938:26; Taf. 30.f
Rova 1994: Tav 36. 617
Catalogue Number  U81

Name

Picture Credit  Lenzen 1961: Taf. 25.n

Type of
Standard  Bügelschaft

Place of
Origin and
Context  Uruk
Eanna IV

Type  Seal Impression(s)

Material  Clay

Size  H: 2.7-2.8cm; L: ca. 10.0cm

Collection  W 197292; W 19733a; W 19740a

Literature Published
Amiet 1980: Pl. 120.1607
Lenzen 1961:30-31, 60; Taf. 25.a-n
Rova 1994: Tav. 39.665
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>U82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Rova 1994: Tav. 46.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
<td>Bügelschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Uruk, Eanna IV (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>W 21 004,3; W 21 331,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**
Brandes 1979:220-225; Tav. 31
Rova 1994: Tav. 46.768
Catalogue Number: U83

Name

Picture Credit: Matthews 1989:233 Fig. 3.26

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Jemdet Nasr Mound B, NE Area

Type: Sherd of Cultic Vessel

Material: Buff fabric

Size: Preserved Height: 4.1cm

Collection

Literature Published: Matthews 1989:232; 233 Fig. 3.26
Catalogue Number  U84

Type of Standard  Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context  Jemdet Nasr

Type  Vase (fragmentary)

Material

Size

Collection  (Field Museum)

Literature Published
Field and Martin 1935:316; Pl. XXXI
Goff 1963:94, 121, 153; Fig. 346
MacKay 1931:263; Pl. LXXX.1,2
Matthews 2002: Fig. 18.7

Picture Credit  Matthews 2002: Fig. 18.7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>U85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Matthews 2002: Fig. 7.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Knobbed Pole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Jemdet Nasr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Material**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Size</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Collection**  IM 2777
GN3301; TM2777

**Literature Published**

- Amiet 1980: Pl. 18.306
- Frankfort 1939:xxv; Plate VIIIe
- Matthews 2002: Fig. 7.6
- MacKay 1931:286; Pl. LXXII. No. 24
- Rova 1994: Tav. 50.830
Catalogue Number U86

Name

Picture Credit Delaporte 1923: Pl. 69.5

Type of Standard Knobbed Pole

Place of Origin and Context Unknown
Acquired by the Louvre

Type Cylinder Seal

Material Green Serpentine

Size H: 1.9cm; D: 1.8cm

Collection AO 6646

Literature Published
Amiet 1980: Pl. 19.308
Delaporte 1923: 106; Pl. 69.5; No. A.114
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>U87</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Moortgat 1966: Taf. 7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
<td>Knobbed Pole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Acquired near Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Red-brown Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 1.35cm; D: 1.35cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>VA 10544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Literature Published** | Amiet 1980: Pl. 18.304
Moortgat 1966:88; Taf. 7.40 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Picture Credit   | Amiet 1980: Pl. 18.307 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Knobbed Pole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin and Context</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amiet 1980: Pl. 18.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rova 1994: Tav. 49.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Legrain 1951: Pl. 33.543

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Knobbed Pole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin and Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassite grave 45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Steatite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H: 1,9cm; D: 1,8cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U 17401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legrain 1951:40; Pl. 33.543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stellenbosch University  [https://scholar.sun.ac.za](https://scholar.sun.ac.za)
Catalogue Number  U91

Name

Picture Credit  http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details/collection_image_gallery.aspx?assetId=1527913001&objectId=1439246&partId=1 (accessed on 9 September 2015)

Type of Standard  Knobbed Pole

Place of Origin and Context  Unknown

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Chlorite

Size  H: 2,1cm; D: 2,0cm

Collection  BM 102421

Literature Published  Wiseman 1962:4; Plate 3k.
**Catalogue Number**  U92

**Name**

---

**Picture Credit**  Frankfort 1955: Pl. 22.227

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Knobbed Pole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Khafajeh Sin VI Q 42:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Grey-green Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 1,7cm; D: 1,6cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>OI A17068 Kh. V 139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**  Frankfort 1955:8, 17; Pl. 22.227
Catalogue Number  U93

Name

Picture Credit  Frankfort 1955: Pl. 52.542

Type of Standard  Knobbed Pole

Place of Origin and Context  Tell Asmar
33m

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Grey Stone

Size  H: 1,9cm; D: 2,0cm

Collection  OI A12249
As. 33.217

Literature Published  Frankfort 1955:17; Pl. 52.542
Catalogue Number  U94

Name

Picture Credit  Frankfort 1955:17; Pl. 29.296

Type of Standard  Knobbed Pole

Place of Origin and Context  Khafajeh
                          N 44:6
                          House 5

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Red Stone

Size  H: 2,2cm; D: 2,2cm

Collection  Kh V 283

Literature Published  Frankfort 1955:17; Pl. 29.296
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th><strong>U95</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Buchanan 1981:52 Catalogue Number 154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Knobbed Pole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Said to be from Western Iran</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Dark Green Serpentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 1,5cm; D: 1,45-1,35cm (irregular)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>YBC 12832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>Literature Published</strong> | Buchanan 1981:53; 52 Catalogue Number 154 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>U96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Type of Standard**  
Knobbed Pole

**Place of Origin and Context**  
Near Susa

**Type**  
Cylinder Seal

**Material**  
Pale Grey Stone, possibly Calcite

**Size**  
H: 2.55cm; D: 2.2cm

**Collection**  
BM 132336

**Picture Credit**  
Collon 2005:17 Catalogue Number 15

**Literature Published**  
Collon 2005:16; 17 Catalogue Number 15
Catalogue Number  U97

Name

Picture Credit  Rova 1994: Tav. 3.41

Type of Standard  Knobbed Pole

Place of Origin and Context  Jebel Aruda
Room S 36

Type  Seal Impression

Material  Clay

Size  H: ca. 2,0cm; L: ca. 6,0cm (Preserved)

Collection  (Aleppo Museum)
JA 263

Literature Published
Rova 1994: Tav. 3.41
Van Driel 1983:56; Nr.41
Catalogue Number: U98

Name

Picture Credit: Keel-Leu and Teissier 2004:412 Nr. 11

Type of Standard: Knobbed Pole

Place of Origin and Context: Northern Syria/Mesopotamia/Iran

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Diorite

Size: H: 1,77; D: 0,17cm

Collection: VR 1981.6

Literature Published: Keel-Leu and Teissier 2004:16; 412 Nr. 11
Catalogue Number  U99

Picture Credit  Buchanan 1981:59 Catalogue Number 169

Type of Standard  Floral/Star Standard

Place of Origin and Context  Unknown

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Light Brown Marble with Dark Flecks

Size  H: 3.8cm; D: 3.0cm

Collection  NBC 5989

Literature Published  Buchanan 1981:58; 59 Catalogue Number 169
                       Goff 1963:102, 122; Fig. 392
Catalogue Number  U100

Picture Credit  Porada 1948: Pl. IV.21

Type of Standard  Floral/Star Standard

Place of Origin and Context  Acquired by Pierpont Morgan sometime between 1885 and 1908

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Black Serpentine

Size  H: 2,8cm; D: 2,55cm

Collection  Morgan Seal 21

Literature Published
Goff 1963:102, 122; Fig. 391
Porada 1948:6; Pl. IV.21
Ward 1909:68; Pl. XVIII.130
Ward 1910:181; 181 Fig. 494
Catalogue Number: U101

Name

Picture Credit: Frankfort 1955: Pl. 5.24

Type of Standard: Floral/Star Standard

Place of Origin and Context:
- Khafajeh
- Sin II
- Q 42:41

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Alabaster

Size: H: 2.0cm; D: 1.7cm

Collection:
- (Iraq Museum)
- Kh VII 267

Literature Published:
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 27.431
- Frankfort 1955:16; Pl. 5.24
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>U102</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Frankfort 1955: Pl. 20.214

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Floral/Star Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Place of Origin and Context | Khafajeh  
Sin IV  
Q 42:24 |
| Type | Cylinder Seal |
| Material | Pale Green Stone |
| Size | H: 3,2cm; D: 2,6cm |
| Collection | OI A17129  
Kh V 308 |

**Literature Published**  
Frankfort 1936:36, Fig. 28 Kh V 308  
Frankfort 1955:15, 16,17; Pl. 1.k; 20.214  
Goff 1963:101, 122; Fig. 378
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>U103</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**

Amiet 1980: Pl. 13bis.A

**Type of Standard**

Uncertain

**Place of Origin and Context**

Uruk

Eanna IV

Nb XVI3, next to the Riemchen Wall on a pavement of broken bricks

**Type**

Seal Impression

**Material**

Clay

**Size**

Minimum Height of Seal: 2,cm; D: 1,9cm

**Collection**

W 19410,6; W 19410,3

**Literature Published**

Amiet 1980: Pl. 13bis.A

Lenzen 1960:49-50; Taf. 26.a; 29.d, f

Rova 1994: Tav. 38.648
Catalogue Number  U104

Name

Picture Credit  Lenzen 1960: Taf. 29.g

Type of Standard  Uncertain

Place of Origin and Context  Uruk
Eanna IV
Nb XVI3, next to the Riemchen Wall on a pavement of broken bricks

Type  Seal Impression

Material  Clay

Size

Collection  W 19410,9

Literature Published
Lenzen 1960:50; Taf. 29.e, g
Rova 1994: Tav. 38.649
Catalogue Number  U105

Picture Credit  Amiet 1980: Pl. 48.675

Type of Standard  Uncertain

Place of Origin and Context  Uruk

Type  Seal Impression

Material  Clay

Size

Collection  W 2135

Literature Published

Amiet 1980: Pl. 48.675
Falkenstein 1936:59
Van Buren 1939-41: 45; 39 Fig. 15
Catalogue Number  U106

Picture Credit  Amiet 1980: Pl. 10.188

Type of Standard  Uncertain

Place of Origin and Context  Uruk
                      Eanna IV

Type  Seal Impression

Material  Clay

Size

Collection  W 9656ec, ed, ee; W 9760f; W 9850

Literature Published

Amiet 1980: Pl. 10.188
Boehmer 1999:51-53; Abb. 49
Braun-Holzinger 2007:28; Taf.13; FS20
Nöldeke 1934:43, 46-47; Taf. 25.a
Rova 1994: Tav. 37.634
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Uruk (Acquired in Trade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 5,0cm; D: 4,4cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>VA 4207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**

- Amiet 1980: Pl. 39.603
- Moortgat 1966:85; Taf 1.1
- Rova 1994: Tav.47.777
- Weber 1913:160-161; Abb. 82
- Weber 1920: Nr. 515
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>U108</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name**

![Image of a head sculpture](image_url)

**Picture Credit** Mallowan 1947: Pl. I.b

### Type of Standard
- Uncertain

### Place of Origin and Context
- Tell Brak
- Eye Temple

### Type
- Sculpture

### Material
- Alabaster

### Size
- H: 17,0cm

### Collection
- BM 126460

### Literature Published
- Goff 1963:155; Fig. 674
- Mallowan 1947:91-92; Pl. Ia-c
Catalogue Number  U109

Name

Picture Credit  Mallowan 1947: Pl. II.3.a

Type of Standard  Uncertain

Place of Origin and Context
  Tell Brak
  Eye Temple

Type  Sculpture

Material  Alabaster

Size  H: 9.2cm

Collection  (Aleppo Museum)

Literature Published
  Goff 1963:155; Fig. 675
  Mallowan 1947:92-93; Pl. II.3a-c
  Moortgat 1969:16-17
Catalogue Number  U110

Name

Picture Credit  Mallowan 1947: Pl. II.2

Type of Standard  Uncertain

Place of Origin and Context  Tell Brak

Type  Sculpture

Material  Alabaster

Size  H: 5,5cm

Collection  BM 126461

Literature Published

Goff: 1963:155; Fig. 676 (right)
Mallowan 1947:92; Pl. II.2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th><strong>Uncertain</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tell Brak</strong>&lt;br&gt;Tell Brak Eye Temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sculpture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td><strong>Calcite</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td><strong>H: 7cm</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Picture Credit** | Mallowan 1947: Pl. II.1 |

<p>| <strong>Literature Published</strong> | Goff 1963:155 Fig. 676 (right)&lt;br&gt;Mallowan 1947:92; Pl. II.1 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>ED1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Marchesi and Marchetti 2011: Pl. 11.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Place of Origin and Context** | Tello/Girsu  
Tell K  
Temple of Ningirsu  
Phase 5 |
| **Type** | Standard/Gatepost |
| **Material** | Copper |
| **Size** | H: 327cm; D: 10cm |
| **Collection** | Unknown |

**Literature Published**
- De Sarzec and Heuzey 1884-1913:410; Plan C.1
- Heinrich 1957:35
- Marchesi and Marchetti 2011:44; Pl. 11.11
- Parrot 1948:63, 68, 106; 62 Fig. 15.17; 62 Fig. 23; 109 fig 26c
- Van Buren 1939-41:42
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>ED2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Picture Credit   | Hall and Woolley 1927: Pl. XXVI |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature Published</td>
<td>Hall and Woolley 1927:116; Pl. XXVI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin and Context</th>
<th>Ubaid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temple of Ninhursag</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Copper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Size | H: ca. 360cm |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Stellenbosch University  https://scholar.sun.ac.za
Catalogue Number ED3

Name

Picture Credit Woolley 1955: Pl. 44. U.6463

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Half-ring Sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>U 6463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Literature Published

Woolley 1955:45, 171; Pl. 44. U.6463
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Ur Pit W. SIS 6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>U 18660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Catalogue Number**  ED4

**Name**

**Picture Credit**  Legrain 1936: Pl. 3.45

**Literature Published**

Legrain 1936:19; Pl. 3.45
Heinrich 1957:28, 36, 80; 27 Abb. 24d
Catalogue Number: ED5

Name

Picture Credit: Legrain 1936: Pl. 9.187

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Ur
SIS 4 (?)

Type: Seal Impression
Material: Clay

Size

Collection: U 13871

Literature Published: Legrain 1936:25; Pl. 9.187
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Ur Pit W. SIS 4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>U 14521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Literature Published

Legrain 1936:26; Pl. 10.205

Picture Credit
Legrain 1936: Pl. 10.205
Catalogue Number: ED7

Name

Picture Credit: Legrain 1936: Pl. 17.326

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Ur
Pit G, 6,55m from surface

Type: Seal Impression

Material: Clay

Size

Collection: U 13005

Literature Published: Legrain 1936:32; Pl. 17.326

Stellenbosch University  https://scholar.sun.ac.za
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>ED8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture Credit</th>
<th>Legrain 1936: Pl. 17.336</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin and Context</th>
<th>Ur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIS 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Seal Impression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>U 15016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Catalogue Number: ED9

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Ur
Pit D. SIS 4

Type: Seal Impression(s)

Material: Clay

Size

Collection: U 14622; U 14774

Picture Credit: Legrain 1936: Pl. 17.337

Literature Published: Legrain 1936:32; Pl. 17.337

Stellenbosch University  https://scholar.sun.ac.za
Picture Credit: Legrain 1936: Pl. 17.339

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Place of Origin and Context | Ur  
SIS 4-8 |
| Type | Seal Impression |
| Material | Clay |
| Size | |
| Collection | U 14832 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legrain 1936:33; Pl. 17.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Place of Origin and Context** | Ur  
SIS 4 |
<p>| <strong>Type</strong> | Seal Impression |
| <strong>Material</strong> | Clay |
| <strong>Size</strong> | |
| <strong>Collection</strong> | U 14588 |
| <strong>Literature Published</strong> | Legrain 1936:33; Pl. 17.340 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>ED12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Type of Standard**  
Bügelschaft

**Place of Origin and Context**  
Ur  
SIS 4

**Type**  
Seal Impression

**Material**  
Clay

**Size**

**Collection**  
U 13962

**Picture Credit**  
Legrain 1936: Pl. 17.341

**Literature Published**  
Legrain 1936:33; Pl. 17.341
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Ur SIS 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>U 14821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Legrain 1936:33; Pl. 17.342

**Literature Published**
Heinrich 1957:28, 36, 80; 27 Abb. 24c
Legrain 1936:33; Pl. 17.342, 49.342
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>ED14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Legrain 1936: Pl. 18.347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>U 14700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Literature Published** | Legrain 1936:33; Pl. 18.347 |

Stellenbosch University  [https://scholar.sun.ac.za](https://scholar.sun.ac.za)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Ur SIS 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>U 14554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**

- Amiet 1980: Pl. 58.794
- Furlong 1987: 376; XXX
- Heinrich 1957: 29, 36; 27 Abb. 25
- Legrain 1936: 33; Pl. 18.348, 49.348
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Legrain 1936: Pl. 18.349

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Place of Origin and Context | Ur  
SIS 4-5 |
| Type | Seal Impression |
| Material | Clay |
| Size |      |
| Collection | U 18404 |

**Literature Published**

- Amiet 1980: Pl. 58.796
- Delougaz 1968:190; 191 Fig. 13
- Heinrich 1957:27, 29, 36, 80; 27 Abb. 24a
- Legrain 1936:33; Pl. 18.349, 49.349
Catalogue Number: ED17

Picture Credit: Legrain 1936: Pl. 18.355

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Ur
Ur
SIS 4

Type: Seal Impression

Material: Clay

Size

Collection: U 14692

Literature Published:
Legrain 1936:33; Pl. 18.355
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>ED18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Ur Pit W. SIS 4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>U 18401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**

Legrain 1936:35; Pl. 18.386

Picture Credit: Legrain 1936: Pl. 18.386
Catalogue Number  ED19

Picture Credit  Legrain 1936: Pl. 18.360

Type of Standard  Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context  Ur
SIS 4

Type  Seal Impression

Material  Clay

Size

Collection  U 14189

Literature Published
Amiet 1980: Pl. 58.795
Heinrich 1957:36, 80; 79 Abb. 96
Legrain 1936:34; Pl. 18.360
Catalogue Number ED20

Name

Picture Credit Legrain 1936:34; Pl. 18.361

Type of Standard Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context Ur
SIS
Exact depth not recorded

Type Seal Impression

Material Clay

Size

Collection U 14802

Literature Published

Heinrich 1957:36, 80; 78 Abb. 95
Legrain 1936:34; Pl. 18.361
Catalogue Number  ED21

Name

Picture Credit  Legrain 1936: Pl. 18.362

Type of Standard  Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context  Ur
Pit W. SIS 4-5

Type  Seal Impression
Material  Clay
Size

Collection  U 18401

Literature Published  Legrain 1936:34; Pl. 18.362
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Ur SIS 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>CBS.21.16.657 (UPenn) U 14625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Catalogue Number** ED22

**Name**

**Picture Credit** Legrain 1936: Pl. 20.385

**Literature Published**
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 62.831
- Heinrich 1957:77, 80; 78 Abb. 91
- Heinrich 1982:42; Abb. 100
- Legrain 1936:35; Pl. 20.385, 51.385
Picture Credit: Legrain 1936: Pl. 20.387, 51.387

Catalogue Number: ED23

Name

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context:
- Ur
- Pit D. SIS 4
- Pit W. SIS 4-5

Type: Seal Impression(s)

Material: Clay

Size

Collection:
- U 14790; U 15019; U 18404

Literature Published:
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 61.823
- Frankfort 1939:xxviii, 70, 114; XVe
- Goff 1963: Fig. 701
- Heinrich 1957:36, 80, 83; 79 Abb. 93
- Legrain 1935:123; 122
- Legrain 1936:35-36; Pl. 20.387, 51.387
Catalogue Number  ED24  Name

Picture Credit  Legrain 1936: Pl. 14.259

Type of Standard  Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context  Ur  SIS 4

Type  Seal Impression

Material  Clay

Size

Collection  U 14187

Literature Published  Legrain 1936:28; Pl. 14.259
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>BM 1930,1213.407 (U 13963)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></td>
<td>ED25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Legrain 1936: Pl. 16.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Published</strong></td>
<td>Amiet 1980: Pl. 96.1260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number  ED26

Name

Picture Credit  Amiet 1980: Pl. 83.1106

Type of Standard  Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context  Tello

Type  Seal Impression

Material

Size

Collection  (Istanbul)

Literature Published  Amiet 1980: Pl. 83.1106
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>ED27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Picture Credit</strong></th>
<th>Amiet 1980: Pl. A.1148</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Place of Origin and Context** | Unknown  
Acquired by the Louvre in 1927 |
| **Type**             | Cylinder Seal |
| **Material**         | Shell |
| **Size**             |      |
| **Collection**       | AO 10920 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Literature Published</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amiet 1980: Pl. 87.1148; A.1148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delougaz 1968:190; 191 Fig. 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stellenbosch University  https://scholar.sun.ac.za
Catalogue Number ED28

Type of Standard Bügelschaft with Crescent Emblem

Place of Origin and Context Unknown
Acquired in Trade

Type Cylinder Seal

Material Shell or Marble

Size H: 2.1cm; D: 1.3cm

Collection BM 102546

Picture Credit Amiet 1980: Pl. 98.1282

Literature Published
Amiet 1980: Pl. 98.1282
Van Buren 1937-39:12-14; 13 Fig. 12.
Wiseman 1962:18; Pl. 15e
Catalogue Number  ED29

Picture Credit  Hall and Woolley 1927: Pl. XXXI.3

Type of Standard  Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context  Ubaid
  Temple of Ninhursag

Type  Inlaid Frieze

Material  Limestone and Slate

Size  H: 22,0cm; L: 115cm

Collection  IM 513 (Original); BM 116754 (Cast)

Literature Published
- Amiet 1980: PI 87.1151
- Delougaz 1968:190, 195; 191 Fig. 15
- Dolce 1978:156; Tav. XLIII Ob 1
- Hall and Woolley 1927:xi, 91-94 ; Pl. XXXI
- Heinrich 1957:22, 24, 26, 81; 23 Abb. 16
- Schroer and Keel 2005:266-267; Nr. 165
Catalogue Number: ED30

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Kish

Type: 

Material: 

Size: 

Collection: IM 13225

K.753

Literature Published: Amiet 1980: Pl. 88.1156

Picture Credit: Amiet 1980: Pl. 88.1156
Catalogue Number  ED31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Place of Origin and Context | Babylon  
Tell Amran (Esagila) |
| Type | Cylinder Seal |
| Material | Stone |
| Size | H: 4.6cm; D: 2.1cm |
| Collection | KMKG 01365 |

Literature Published

Amiet 1980: Pl. 88.1164
Khazai 1983: 77; 77 Fig. 45

Picture Credit  Khazai 1983: 77 Fig. 45
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>ED32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Porada 1948: Pl. XVII.108

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Acquired by Pierpont Morgan sometime between 1885 and 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>White Marble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 4.0cm; D: 1.2cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>Morgan Seal 108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 88.1158
- Andrae 1933:24; 19 Fig. 39a
- Heinrich 1957:81, 83; 79 Abb. 99
- Porada 1948:26; Pl. XVII.108
- Ward 1909:26; Pl. I.2
- Ward 1910:37; 36 Fig. 81
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>ED33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture Credit</th>
<th>Buchanan 1966: Pl. 19:235</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature Published</td>
<td>Buchanan 1966:46; Pl. 19:235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Brown Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 4,7cm; D: 1,8cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Collection | Ashmolean 1949.880 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>ED34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture Credit</th>
<th>Amiet 1980: Pl. 103.1361</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin and Context</th>
<th>Unknown Acquired by the Louvre in 1903</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Shell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>H: 4.1cm; D: 2.3cm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>AO 4107</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrae 1933: 24-25; 19 Fig. 39b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiet 1980: Pl. 103.1361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaporte 1923: 107; Pl. 70.2, No. A.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furlong 1987: 254; F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrich 1957: 81; 79 Abb. 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number: ED35

Name

Picture Credit: Van Dijk, RM

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Ur
Giparu of the Larsa Period, in a chamber on the NE side

Type: Wall Plaque

Material: White Limestone

Size: H: 22.9cm; W: 26.3cm; T: 3.2cm

Collection: BM 118561
U 6831

Literature Published
Amiet 1980: PI 102.1355
Boese 1971:190-191; PI XXI.4; U4
Heinrich 1957:36, 83; 81 Abb. 101
Furlong 1987:272; G4
Schroer and Keel 2005:314-315; Nr. 219
Woolley 1955:45-46, 173; Pl. 39.c
Catalogue Number ED36

Type of Standard Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context Umma?

Acquired in Trade

Type Cylinder Seal

Material Transparent Greenish Marble

Size H: 4.3cm; D: 2.5cm

Collection VA 3878

Literature Published

Amiet 1980: Pl. 102.1358
Collon 2005:165; 164 Catalogue Number 757
Furlong 1987:276; G6
Heinrich 1957:83; 82 Abb. 102
Heinrich 1982:104; Abb. 175
Moortgat 1966:96; Taf. 22.144
Schroer and Keel 2005:316-317; Nr. 221
Weber 1913:158-159; Abb. 80
Weber 1920: Nr. 430

Picture Credit Moortgat 1966: Taf. 22.144
Catalogue Number  ED37

Name

Picture Credit  Boese 1971: Pl. XXXIV 1 KU1

Type of Standard  Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context  Kutha (?)

Type  Wall Plaque (Fragment)

Material  Marble

Size  H: 18,5cm; D: 4,0-4,5cm

Collection  Ashmolean 1933.1331

Literature Published

Boese 1971:206; Pl. XXXIV 1 KU1
Langdon and Harden 1934:123; Pl. XVI.b
Moorey 1967:98-103; Pl. XLIII.a
Catalogue Number ED38

Name

Picture Credit Parrot 1948: 123 Fig. 29.a

Type of Standard Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context Tello
Tell P

Type Incised Pottery Fragment

Material Baked Clay

Size

Collection TG 5572

Literature Published
Genouillac 1934:72; Pl. 63.1
Parrot 1948:122; 123 Fig. 29.a
Catalogue Number: ED39

Name

Picture Credit: Amiet 1980: Pl. 99.1305

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Unknown

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Green Porphyry

Size: H: 1.3cm; D: 0.8cm

Collection: (Louvre) (Former de Clercq Collection)

Literature Published: Amiet 1980: Pl. 99.1305
Catalogue Number: ED40
Name: Seal of Ezida

Picture Credit: Woolley 1934: Pl. 198.64

| Type of Standard | Bügelschaft |
| Place of Origin and Context | Ur, PG 779, Chamber D |
| Type | Cylinder Seal |
| Material | Shell |
| Size | H: 3.7cm; D: 2.0cm |
| Collection | IM 14580, U 11174 |

Literature Published:
Amiet 1980: Pl. 78.1035; 98.1300B (detail of 1035 with bull-man and Bügelschaft)
Woolley 1934:341, 568; Pl. 198.64
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>ED41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Picture Credit</strong></th>
<th>Amiet 1980: Pl. 98.1281</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></th>
<th>Acquired in Trade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Shell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 1,9cm; D: 1,0cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>VA 3896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Literature Published</strong></th>
<th>Amiet 1980: Pl. 98.1281</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moortgat 1966:91; Taf. 14.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weber 1920: Nr. 75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number: ED42

Name

Picture Credit: Amiet 1980: Pl 98.1283

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Tello

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material

Size

Collection: T. 654

Literature Published: Amiet 1980: Pl. 98.1283
Catalogue Number  ED43

Name

Picture Credit  Wiseman 1962: Pl. 27d

Type of Standard  Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Shell core

Size  H: 3,3cm; D: 2,1cm

Collection  BM 89463

Literature Published

Amiet 1980: Pl. 98.1288
Collon 2005:183; 182 Catalogue Number 860
Wiseman 1962:31; Pl. 27d
Ward 1910:77, 214, 378; 77 Fig. 205; 378 Fig. 22b
**Catalogue Number**  ED44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>KMKG 1444 (Brussels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Amiet 1980: Pl. 98.1287

**Literature Published**  Amiet 1980: Pl. 98.1287
Catalogue Number   ED45

Name

Picture Credit  Amiet 1980: Pl. 98.1289

Type of Standard  Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context

Type

Material

Size

Collection  (Private Collection in Switzerland)

Literature Published  Amiet 1980: Pl. 98.1289
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>ED46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Amiet 1980: Pl. 98.1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
<td>Bügelschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Asmar Snake Shrine J 23:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Heamatite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 1,9cm; D: 1,4cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>(Iraq Museum) As 33.600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Literature Published** | Amiet 1980: Pl. 98.1290  
                      | Frankfort 1955:40; Pl. 69.757 |
Catalogue Number: ED47

Name

Picture Credit: Dolce 1978: Tav. XXIII T22

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Tello

Type: Inlay

Material: Mother-of-Pearl

Size: H: 5.9cm; W: 1.3cm

Collection: AO 329c

Literature Published:
- Dolce 1978:50; Tav. XXIII T22
- De Sarzec and Heuzey 1884-1913:271, 271 Fig. A
- Parrot 1948:114;113 Fig. 27.1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Knobbed Pole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Place of Origin and Context** | Tello  
Tell K  
Temple of Ningirsu  
Phase 5 |
| **Type** | Plaque |
| **Material** | Limestone |
| **Size** | H: 18,0cm; W: 16,0cm; T: 4,0cm |
| **Collection** | AO 221 |

**Catalogue Number**  ED48  
**Name**  Figure aux Plumes  

**Picture Credit**  Braun-Holzinger 2007: Taf. 8 FS8  

**Literature Published**

- Braun-Holzinger 2007:25; Taf. 8; FS8
- De Sarzec and Heuzey 1884-1913:164-166; Pl. 1bis a&b
- Gelb, Steinkeller and Whiting 1991:66-67; Pl. 32-33
- Heuzey 1902:76-79; No. 1
- Parrot 1948:56, 59, 70; 57 Fig. 14.f; 71 Fig. 17.a; 103 Fig. 24.b
- Wilcke 1997

[Stellenbosch University](https://scholar.sun.ac.za)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>ED49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Credit</td>
<td>Buchanan 1966: Pl. 15.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Standard</td>
<td>Knobbed Pole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Kish Mound A, Grave 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Shell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 3.6cm; D: 1.9cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Ashmolean 1924:320, K 1333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Published</td>
<td>Amiet 1980:165; Pl. 104.1381, Buchanan 1966:36; Pl. 15.181, Langdon 1924:82-3; Pl. XXI.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Catalogue Number**  ED50

**Name**

**Picture Credit**  Legrain 1951: Pl. 6.87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Knobbed Pole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Pink Steatite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 1,29cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>U 6807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**  Legrain 1951:13; Pl. 6.87
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>ED51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Legrain 1951: Pl. 8.115

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Knobbed Pole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Place of Origin and Context | Ur  
Diqiqqeh Cemetery |
| Type                | Cylinder Seal |
| Material            | Clay         |
| Size                | H: 2,8cm; D: 1,4cm |
| Collection          | U 1646 |

**Literature Published**  
Legrain 1951:15; Pl. 8.115
Catalogue Number: ED52

Name

Picture Credit: Amiet 1980: Pl. 77bis.C

Type of Standard
Knobbed Pole (?)

Place of Origin and Context
Mari
Temple of Ištar, Exterior

Type
Cylinder Seal

Material
Light Green Stone

Size
H: 2.15cm; D: 1.3cm

Collection
AO 18358
M 566

Literature Published
Amiet 1980: Pl. 77bis.C
Parrot 1956:189; Pl. LXV.566

Stellenbosch University https://scholar.sun.ac.za
Catalogue Number: ED53

Name

Picture Credit: Amiet 1980: Pl. 72.963

Type of Standard: Knobbled Pole (?)

Place of Origin and Context: Acquired by Pierpont Morgan sometime between 1885 and 1908

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: White Marble

Size: H: 3.8cm; D: 2.35cm

Collection: Morgan Seal 119

Literature Published:
Amiet 1980: Pl. 72.963
Porada 1948:17-18; Pl. XiX.119
Ward 1910:45-46, 418, 427; 45 Fig. 119
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Knobbed Pole (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Acquired in Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Shell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 5.05cm; D: 1.77cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>VA 2952</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 108.1435
- Boehmer 1965: Pl. XXXIX.466
- Frankfort 1939:xxviii; Pl. XV.n
- Moortgat 1966:96; Pl. 22.145
- Ward 1910:41,42; 41 Fig. 108
- Weber 1920: Nr. 406
Catalogue Number  ED55  Name

Type of Standard  Crescent Standard

Place of Origin and Context  Ur
PG.

Type  Cylinder Seal
Material  Shell
Size  H: 2,0cm; D: 1,2cm

Collection  30-12-502 (UPenn)
U 11491

Literature Published  Legrain 1951:16; Pl. 11.144
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Legrain 1951: Pl. 13.163

**Type of Standard**  
Crescent Standard

**Place of Origin and Context**  
Ur

**Type**  
Cylinder Seal

**Material**  
Calcite

**Size**  
H: 2.6cm; D: 1.8cm

**Collection**  
CBS 30.12.56

**Literature Published**  
Legrain 1951:17; Pl. 13.163
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>ED57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Kish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 2.0cm; D: 1.2cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Ashmolean 1925.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K 1604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan 1966:27; Pl. 10.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Picture Credit: Buchanan 1966: Pl. 10.125
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>ED58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Credit</td>
<td>Buchanan 1966: Pl. 10.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Standard</td>
<td>Crescent Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Kish C8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Greenish-brown Gypsum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 2,7cm; D: 1,6cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Ashmolean 1931.204 K 754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Published</td>
<td>Buchanan 1966:27; Pl. 10.128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number  ED59

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Picture Credit | Legrain 1951: Pl. 13.162 |

| Type of Standard | Crescent Standard |
| Type of Standard |

| Place of Origin and Context | Ur |
| Place of Origin and Context |

| Material | Baked Clay |
| Material |

| Size | H: 3.4cm; D: 1.0cm |
| Size |

| Collection | U 16147 |
| Collection |

| Literature Published | Legrain 1951:17; Pl. 13.162 |
| Literature Published |

Stellenbosch University  https://scholar.sun.ac.za
Catalogue Number: ED60

Name: Seal of Ur-gar

Type of Standard: Crescent Standard

Place of Origin and Context: Ur

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Steatite

Size: H: 2.2cm; D: 1.0cm

Collection: 31-43-36 (UPenn) U 16546

Literature Published: Legrain 1951:17; Pl. 13.175

Picture Credit: http://www.penn.museum/collections/object/102689 (detail) (accessed on 9 September 2015)
Catalogue Number ED61

Picture Credit Legrain 1951: Pl. 7.96

Type of Standard Crescent Standard

Place of Origin and Context Ur
Diqiqqeh Cemetery

Type Cylinder Seal
Material Black Steatite
Size H: 2.7cm; D: 1.3cm

Collection U 17727

Literature Published Legrain 1951:14; Pl. 7.96
Catalogue Number ED62

Picture Credit Buchanan 1981:131 Catalogue Number 346

Type of Standard Crescent Standard (?)

Place of Origin and Context

Type Cylinder Seal
Material Light Brown Limestone
Size H: 2.8cm; D: 1.7cm

Collection NBC 9119

Literature Published

Buchanan 1981:130; 131 Catalogue Number 346
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Nippur Temple Hill S corner of SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 3.0cm; D: 2.2cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>B3978 (UPenn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Published</td>
<td>Colbow 1997:20; 29 Fig.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number: ED64

Name

Picture Credit: Buchanan 1981:127 Catalogue Number 338

Type of Standard: Crescent Standard with Animal-Footed Base

Place of Origin and Context: Cylinder Seal

Material: Lapis Lazuli

Size: H: 3.7cm; D: 1.3cm

Collection: NBC 2589

Literature Published:
- Amiet 1980: Pl. 89.1180
- Buchanan 1981:126; 127 Catalogue Number 338
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>ED65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Picture Credit: Woolley 1934: Pl. 102.b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Plaque</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Ur; Loose in soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Shell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 7.5cm; W: 4.6cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>BM 120850; U 7900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dolce 1978:88; Tav. XLI U183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolley 1934:282;525; Pl. 102.b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Catalogue Number
ED66

### Name
Eannatum’s Stele of the Vultures

### Picture Credit
Van Dijk, RM; Van Dijk, RM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Imdugud/Bird Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard with a Composite Emblem which includes a Lion(?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></th>
<th>Tello</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Stele</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Material</strong></th>
<th>Limestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Size</strong></th>
<th>H: 180,0cm; W: 130,0cm; T:11,0cm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>AO 16109, 50, 2346, 2348</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Literature Published

- Amiet 1980:162; Pl. 103.1369
- Barrelet 1970
- Börker-Klähn 1982:124-125; Nr.17
- De Sarzec and Heuzey 1884-1913:94-103; Pl. 4.B (Imdugud/Bird), 4C (Lion); Pl. 48
- Furlong 1987:232; D5a
- Heuzey 1902:101-117; No. 10
- Parrot 1948:95-101; 98 Fig. 23; Pl. Vla
- Schroer and Keel 2005:336-339; Nr. 242
- Ward 1910:35; 35 Fig. 76
- Winter 2010b
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>ED67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Picture Credit</strong></th>
<th>Amiet 1980: Pl. 79.1051</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Floral Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Kish From YW at 7m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Seal Impression(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>Ashmolean 1930.387a-e; 1930.395x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Literature Published</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amiet 1980: Pl. 79.1051</td>
<td>Buchanan 1966:24; Pl. 8.102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stellenbosch University  https://scholar.sun.ac.za
Catalogue Number   ED68


Type of Standard  Star Standard

Place of Origin and Context  Ur
Found loose in the soil

Type  Cylinder Seal
Material  Marble
Size  H: 2.2cm; D: 1.6cm

Collection  BM 120566
U 8911

Literature Published
Wiseman 1962:27; Pl. 23e
Woolley 1934:353, 539; Pl. 208.222
Catalogue Number  ED69

Picture Credit  Moortgat 1966: Pl. 19.115

Type of Standard  Star Standard

Place of Origin and Context  From a Private Collection

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Lapis Lazuli

Size  H: 2.2cm; D: 1.2cm

Collection  VA 692

Literature Published
Amiet 1980: Pl. 104.1373
Moortgat 1966:94; Pl. 19.115
Catalogue Number  ED70

Name  The Standard of Ur

Picture Credit  Van Dijk, RM

Type of Standard  Uncertain

Place of Origin and Context
- Ur
- Royal Cemetery
- PG. 79

Type  Box (?)

Material  Shell, Limestone, Lapis Lazuli and Bitumen

Size  H: 21,59cm; L: 49,53cm; W: 4,5-2,5cm

Collection  BM 121201
- U 11164

Literature Published

Woolley 1934:61-62, 266-274; 567; Pl. 90-93
Catalogue Number  ED71

Name

Picture Credit  Legrain 1936: Pl. 31.533

Type of Standard  Uncertain

Place of Origin and Context  Ur
Depth not recorded

Type  Seal Impression

Material  Clay

Size

Collection  U 18169B

Literature Published
Amiet 1980: Pl. 101.1348
Legrain 1936:45; Pl. 31.533, 58.533
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Place of Origin and Context | Ur  
SIS 1 |
<p>| Type                     | Seal Impression |
| Material                 | Clay |
| Size                     |        |
| Collection               | U 13610 |
| Literature Published     | Legrain 1936:45; Pl. 30.530, 58.530 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>ED73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Legrain 1936: Pl. 30. 529

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Place of Origin and Context | Ur  
SIS 1 |
| Type             | Seal Impression |
| Material         | Clay |
| Size             |      |
| Collection       | U 13637 |
Catalogue Number ED74

Name The Standard of Mari

Picture Credit Van Dijk, RM

Type of Standard Incorrectly Identified as a Bull Standard

Place of Origin and Context
Mari
Temple of Ištar

Type Inlay

Material Shell and Shale

Size H: 10.4cm (standard bearer), 2.6cm (bull)

Collection AO 19820
M 459 (standard bearer); M 458 (standard)

Literature Published
Calmeyer 1967
Dolce 1978:134-135; Tav. XXXVII M316-340
Parrot 1956:140, 145; 140 Fig. 81; 146 Fig. 87;
Pl. LVI, LVII.c
Schroer and Keel 2005:274-275; Nr. 174
Catalogue Number  ED75

Type of Standard  Incorrectly Identified as the emblem a Bull Standard

Place of Origin and Context  Acquired in Trade in Mosul

Type  Sculpture

Material  Bronze inlaid with Silver

Size  H: 11,2cm; L: 9,7cm; W: 3,7cm

Collection  AO 2151

Picture Credit  Van Dijk, RM

Literature Published

Braun-Holzinger 1984:36-37; Taf. 27 Nr. 114
Heuzey 1902:324-328 ; No. 173
Sarre 1903:366; Fig. 22
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>ED76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Wiseman 1962: Pl. 15f

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Incorrectly Identified as a Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>White Marble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 4.1cm; D: 2.6cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>BM 89378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**
- Ward 1910:46; Fig. 120
- Wiseman 1962:18; Pl. 15f
Catalogue Number: A1

Name

Picture Credit: Frankfort 1939: Pl. XVIb

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Ur, PG 1276

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Marble with Copper Caps

Size: H: 2,6cm; D: 1,4cm

Collection: IM 14594

U 12158

Literature Published:

Boehmer 1965:16, 17, 21, 22, 24, 57, 85, 86, 151; Taf. VIII.79; Nr. 339
Frankfort 1939:xxviii; Pl. XVIb
Woolley 1934:347,579; Pl. 204.147
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>A2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Quartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 2.49cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>Metropolitan Museum 41.160.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.metmuseum.org/Collections/search-the-collections/323878?rpp=20&amp;pg=1&amp;ao=on&amp;ft=41.160.290&amp;pos=1">Link</a> (accessed on 9 September 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Published</strong></td>
<td>Boehmer 1965:17, 24, 25, 27-29, 85, 153; Taf. X.110; Nr. 448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number A3

Type of Standard Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context Type Cylinder Seal

Material Rock Crystal

Size H: 2,8cm; D: 1,7-1,8cm

Collection BM 136873

Picture Credit Collon 1982: Pl. X.72

Literature Published Collon 1982:54; Pl. X.72
Catalogue Number A4

Picture Credit Boehmer 1965: Taf. XI.124

Type of Standard Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context

Type Cylinder Seal

Material

Size

Collection (Laval, Musee archeologique)

Literature Published
Boehmer 1965:26-28, 30, 31, 37, 85, 154; Taf. XI.124; Nr. 470
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>A5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  

**Type of Standard**  
 Bügelschaft

**Place of Origin and Context**  
Type: Cylinder Seal  
Material: Shell  
Size: H: 3,1cm

**Collection**  
Metropolitan Museum 41.160.287

**Literature Published**  
Metropolitan Museum Database: http://www.metmuseum.org/collection/the-collection-online/search/323875?rpp=30&pg=1&ft=41.160.287&pos=1
Catalogue Number: A6

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Ur PG 521

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Dark Green Steatite

Size: H: 4.1; D: 2.7

Collection: CBS 16875 (UPenn) U 8993

Picture Credit: Boehmer 1965: Taf. X.113

Literature Published:
Boehmer 1965:25, 27-29, 43, 57, 85, 86, 89, 154; Taf. X.113; Nr. 455
Woolley 1934:353, 540; Pl. 208.232
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Boehmer 1965: Taf. VI.58

**Type of Standard**  
Bügelschaft

**Place of Origin and Context**

**Type**  
Cylinder Seal

**Material**  
Black Porphyry

**Size**  
H: 3,4cm; D: 2,1cm

**Collection**  
(Louvre)  
(Former de Clercq Collection)

**Literature Published**

Boehmer 1965:15, 16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 57, 85, 148; Taf. VI.58; Nr. 228  
De Clercq 1885:242; Pl. XXXIX.58bis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>A8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
<td>Bügelschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Black Serpentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 3,9cm; D: 2,8cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>Private Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**

**Literature Published**
Catalogue Number: A9

Name

Picture Credit: Porada 1948: Pl. XXIV.156

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Acquired by Pierpont Morgan sometime between 1885 and 1908

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Shell

Size: H: 3.5cm; D: 1.8-1.95cm (concave sides)

Collection: Morgan Seal 156

Literature Published: Porada 1948:22; Pl. XXIV.156
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Picture Credit | http://www.mfa.org/collections/object/cylinder-seal-163847 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Black Serpentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 2,95cm; D: 1,8cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>MFA 65.1413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wiggermann 1997:38; Fig. c3, 6a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number: A11

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Cylinder Seal

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material:

Size:

Collection: Vatican 7

Picture Credit: Boehmer 1965: Pl. XLII.492

Literature Published:

Amiet 1956:116, 118-119; 119 Fig. 5
Amiet 1980: Pl 111.1475
Boehmer 1965:87, 89; Taf. XLII.492; Nr. 1142
Catalogue Number: A12

Picture Credit: Amiet 1980: Pl. 111.1472

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Literature Published: Amiet 1980: Pl. 111.1472

Place of Origin and Context

Type

Material

Size

Collection: IM 25576
Catalogue Number: A13

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Unknown

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Greenish-Black Serpentine

Size: H: 3.4cm; D: 2.1cm

Collection: Ashmolean 1954.202

Picture Credit: Buchanan 1966: Pl. 28:349

Literature Published: Buchanan 1966:65; Pl. 28:349
Catalogue Number: A14

Name

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Unknown

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Green Jasper

Size: H: 1,7cm; D: 0,9cm

Collection: Ashmolean 1949.893

Picture Credit: Buchanan 1966: Pl. 28:350

Literature Published: Buchanan 1966:65; Pl. 28:350
Catalogue Number: A15

Name

Picture Credit: Boehmer 1965: Taf. XLIV.522

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context:

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material

Size

Collection: (UPenn)

Literature Published:
Boehmer 1965:42, 59, 92, 93, 177; Taf. XLIV.522; Nr. 1215
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Brown Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 3,3cm; D: 2,2cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>KMKG 01360 (Brussels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Khazai 1983: 92 Fig. 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Published</strong></td>
<td>Khazai 1983:92; 92 Fig. 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></td>
<td>A17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Khafajeh Surface, x 24:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Black Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 2,5cm; D: 1,4cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>(Iraq Museum) Kh VI 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**
Frankfort 1955:43; Pl. 38.395
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>A18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Dark Green Serpentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 4.0cm; D: 2.6cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>Private Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Catalogue Number: A19

Picture Credit: Porada 1948: Pl. XXXI.202E

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Acquired by Pierpont Morgan sometime between 1885 and 1908

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Black Serpentine with Calcite Vein

Size: H: 3.0cm; D: 1.9cm

Collection: Morgan Seal 202

Literature Published:
Boehmer 1965: 42, 92, 93, 132, 133, 177; Taf. XLIV.518; Nr 1210
Porada 1948: 26; Pl. XXXI.202
Catalogue Number: A20

Name

Picture Credit: Porada 1948: Pl. XXXI.203

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Acquired by Pierpont Morgan sometime between 1885 and 1908

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Black Serpentine

Size: H: 2.1cm; D: 1.1cm

Collection: Morgan Seal 203

Literature Published:
- Porada 1948:26; Pl. XXXI.203
- Ward 1910:99; 99 Fig. 284
Catalogue Number: A21

Name

Picture Credit: Boehmer 1965: Taf. XLIV.523

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Acquired by the Louvre in 1880

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Light Green marble

Size: H: 3.6cm; D: 2.6cm

Collection: MNB 1905

Literature Published:
Boehmer 1965:42, 47, 88, 89, 92, 93, 177; Taf. XLIV.523; Nr. 1207
Delaporte 1923:112; Pl. 73.4; No. A.161
Ward 1910:99, 378; 99 Fig. 286, 378 Fig. 22a
Weber 1920: Nr. 248
Catalogue Number: A22

Name

Picture Credit: Boehmer 1965: Taf. XLIV.520

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Acquired by the Louvre in 1898

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Black Serpentine

Size: H: 3.1 cm; D: 2.1 cm

Collection: AO 2730

Literature Published:
Amiet 1976:134; 114: No. 79
Boehmer 1965:42, 88, 92, 177; Taf. XLIV.520; Nr. 1213
Delaporte 1923:111; Pl. 72.13; No. A.158
Ward 1910:99; 99 Fig. 285
Catalogue Number: A23

Name

Picture Credit: Boehmer 1965: Taf. XLII.499

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Unknown

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Green Black Porphyry

Size: H: 3,3cm; D: 2,1cm

Collection: (Louvre)
(Former de Clercq Collection)

Literature Published:
Boehmer 1965:42, 88, 89, 176; Taf. XLII.499; Nr. 1154
De Clercq 1885:63-64; Pl. XXXVII.83bis
Ward 1910:84, 98, 99, 417; 100 Fig. 289
Weber 1920: Nr. 253
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>A24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Picture Credit | http://www.bible-orient-museum.ch/bodo/search_einfach.php?id=51b9df12154e7#&bomid=257 (accessed on 9 September 2015) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin and Context</th>
<th>Mesopotamia/Elam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Marble</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>H: 2.54cm; D: 1.39cm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>VR 1981.53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Published</th>
<th>Keel-Leu and Teissier 2004:59-60; 421 Nr. 70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Catalogue Number  A25

Type of Standard  Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material

Size

Collection

Picture Credit  Frankfort 1939: Pl. XXIc

Literature Published  Frankfort 1939:xxx; Pl. XXIc

Stellenbosch University  https://scholar.sun.ac.za
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>A26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
<td>Bügelschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Acquired by the Louvre in 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Greenish Serpentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 3.0cm; D: 1.9cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>AO 4418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Delaporte 1923: Pl. 73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Published</strong></td>
<td>Delaporte 1923:111-112; Pl. 73.1; No. A.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Standard</td>
<td>Bügelschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Ur Royal Cemetery PG 699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Dark Green Stone with Copper Caps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 3.6cm; D: 2.4cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>IM 14577 U 9750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**
- Amiet 1976:46; Fig. 29
- Boehmer 1965:42, 43, 63, 75, 79, 83, 86, 91-93, 108, 175; Taf. XLI.488; Nr. 1139
- Collon 2005:35; 34 Catalogue Number 105
- Frankfurt 1939:102-103; Pl. XVIIIk
- Heinrich 1957:83; 82 Abb. 104
- Heinrich 1982:144; Abb. 225 (detail)
- Parrot 1949:39; Pl. II.g
- Schroer and Keel 2005:348-349; Nr. 249
- Woolley 1934:362, 548; Pl. 215.364
Catalogue Number: A28

Name

Picture Credit: Boehmer 1965: Taf. XLIII.502

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Acquired in Baghdad

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Serpentine

Size: H: 4,0cm; D: 2,6cm

Collection: Kopenhagen 5711

Literature Published:

Boehmer 1965:42, 47, 89, 93, 176; Taf. XLIII.502; Nr. 1157
Ravn 1960:28-30; No. 22
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>A29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Picture Credit: Moortgat 1966: Taf 30.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
<td>Bügelschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Acquired in Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Serpentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 3.7cm; D: 2.6cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>VA 3329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Literature Published** | Moortgat 1966:103; Taf. 30.223                | Weber 1920: Nr. 396
Catalogue Number: A30

Name

Picture Credit: Collon 2005:164 Catalogue Number 760

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Cylinder Seal

Material: Black Serpentine

Size: H: 2,7cm; D: 1,53-1,55cm

Collection: BM 89771

Literature Published:

- Amiet 1980: Pl. 111.1474
- Boehmer 1965:82, 89, 176; Taf. XLII.501; Nr. 1156
- Collon 1982:92-93; Pl. XXVIII 191
- Collon 2005:165; 164 Catalogue Number 760
- Heinrich 1957:83; 82 Abb. 103
- Ward 1910:37, 76, 77, 131, 214, 217, 374, 378; 214 Fig. 648
Catalogue Number: A31

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Ischali

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Gypsum

Size: H: 3.2cm; D: 2.0cm

Collection: A 7267 (Oriental Institute)

Picture Credit: Frankfort 1955: Pl. 92.991

Literature Published: Frankfort 1955: Pl. 92.991
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>A32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Picture Credit   | Boehmer 1965: Taf. XLII.500 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin and Context</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Formerly in the Freiburg Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boehmer 1965:42, 89, 113, 176; Taf. XLII.500; Nr.1155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stellenbosch University  https://scholar.sun.ac.za
Catalogue Number A33

Name

Picture Credit De Sarzec and Heuzey 1884-1913: Pl. 30bis.15

Type of Standard Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context Tello

Type Cylinder Seal

Material Black Serpentine

Size H: 3,8cm; D: 2,4cm

Collection

Literature Published
De Sarzec and Heuzey 1884-1913:291-293; Pl. 30bis.15
Ward 1910:84, 99; 99 Fig. 288
Catalogue Number  A34

Name

Picture Credit  Porada 1948: Pl. XXXI.204

Type of Standard  Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context  Acquired by Pierpont Morgan sometime between 1885 and 1908

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Black and Brown Steatite

Size  H: 2,95cm; D: 1,66cm

Collection  Morgan Seal 204

Literature Published

Porada 1948:26; Pl. XXXI.204
Ward 1910:84, 85; 84 Fig. 238
Catalogue Number: A35

Name

Picture Credit: Frankfort 1955: Pl. 55.580

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Tell Asmar
  Houses IVb; G 18:11

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Grey Stone

Size: H: 3.2cm

Collection: (Iraq Museum)
  As 31.640

Literature Published:
Boehmer 1965:87, 88, 111, 115, 176; Taf. XLII.494; Nr. 1144
Frankfort 1933:46; 41 Fig. 27
Frankfort 1955:43; Pl. 55.580
Catalogue Number A36

Name

Picture Credit Buchanan 1981:172 Catalogue Number 450

Literature Published
Buchanan 1981:173; 172 Catalogue Number 450

Type of Standard Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context Unknown

Type Cylinder Seal

Material Shell

Size H: 3.2cm; D: 1.7-1.8cm

Collection NBC 9241
Catalogue Number: A37

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Cylinder Seal

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Serpentine

Size: H: 3.66cm; D: 2.39cm

Collection: VR 1981.235

Literature Published:
Keel-Leu and Teissier 2004:347-348, 417 Nr. 448

Picture Credit: Keel-Leu and Teissier 2004:417 Nr. 448
Catalogue Number: A38

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Acquired by the Louvre in 1884

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Black Serpentine

Size: H: 2.2cm; D: 1.3cm

Collection: AO 1163

Picture Credit: Delaporte 1923: Pl. 70.9

Literature Published:

- Boehmer 1965:53, 54, Nr. 858
- Delaporte 1923:108; Pl. 70.9; No. A.129
Catalogue Number  A39

Name

Picture Credit  Porada 1948: Pl. XLI.261

Type of Standard  Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context  Acquired by Pierpont Morgan sometime between 1885 and 1908

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Black Serpentine

Size  H: 1.8cm; D: 0.9cm

Collection  Morgan Seal 261

Literature Published  Porada 1948:33; Pl. XLI.261
Catalogue Number  A40  

Name

Picture Credit  Legrain 1951: Pl. 20.300

Type of Standard  Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context  Ur  
Trial Trench A, South End

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Greenish Steatite

Size  H: 2,0cm; D: 1,0cm

Collection  U 20

Literature Published  Legrain 1951:24-5; Pl. 20.300
Catalogue Number A41

Picture Credit Collon 2005:166 Catalogue Number 765

Type of Standard Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context Nippur
Scribal Quarter
TB 196 IV 2

Type Cylinder Seal

Material Pink Limestone

Size H: 3.7cm; D: 2.5cm

Collection IM 56043
2N 445

Literature Published
Collon 2005:167; 166 Catalogue Number 765
McCown, Haines and Hansen 1967:80; Pl. 109.11
Schroer and Keel 2005:350-351; Nr. 254
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Boehmer 1965: Taf. XXIX.338

**Type of Standard**  
Bügelschaft

**Place of Origin and Context**  
Tod (Upper Egypt)

**Type**  
Cylinder Seal

**Material**

**Size**

**Collection**  
Cairo Museum No. 70752

**Literature Published**

Amiet 1980: Pl. 112.1487  
Boehmer 1965: 57-60, 68, 75, 79, 85, 86, 114, 131, 168; Taf. XXIX.338; Nr. 886
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>A43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Schroer and Keel 2005:349 Nr. 251

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Place of Origin and Context** | Jerusalem  
West of Jaffa Gate, Mamilla Complex, on the ground of Grave 51 |
| **Type** | Cylinder Seal |
| **Material** | Dark Stone (Serpentine?) |
| **Size** | H: 3,8cm; D: 2,1cm |
| **Collection** | In the care of the excavations management |

**Literature Published**  
Schroer and Keel 2005:348; 349 Nr. 251
Catalogue Number  A44

Name

Picture Credit  Moortgat 1966: Taf. 29:211

Type of Standard  Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context  Acquired in Trade

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Limestone

Size  H: 2,9cm; D: 2,9cm

Collection  VA 3303

Literature Published

Boehmer 1965:100, 110, 181; Taf. XLVIII.572; Nr. 1314
Moortgat 1966:102; Taf. 29:211
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>A45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Buchanan 1966: Pl. 27:344

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin and Context</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Mottled Dark Green Serpentine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>H: 3,0cm; D: 1,9cm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Ashmolean 1949.885</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Published</th>
<th>Buchanan 1966:65; Pl. 27:344</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Stellenbosch University  https://scholar.sun.ac.za
Catalogue Number A46

Name

Picture Credit Pittman 1987:23 Fig. 11

Type of Standard Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context

Type Cylinder Seal

Material Metadiorite

Size H: 3.2cm

Collection Metropolitan Museum 55.65.5

Literature Published

Harper, Muscarella, Pittman, Porter and Spar 1984:26; 27 Fig. 30
Pittman 1987:23 Fig. 11
Wiggermann 1997:39; 53 Fig. 4b
Catalogue Number: A47

Name

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Acquired by Pierpont Morgan sometime between 1885 and 1908

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Drab Serpentine

Size: H: 3.9 cm; D: 2.5 cm

Collection: Morgan Seal 215

Literature Published:
Boehmer 1965:98, 110, 124, 180; Taf. XLVIII.564; Nr.1305
Porada 1948:27; Pl. XXXIV.215
Ward 1910:121, 125, 173, 409, 426; 114 Fig. 317

Picture Credit: Porada 1948: Pl. XXXIV.215
Catalogue Number A48

Name

Picture Credit Collon 1982: Pl. XX.156

Type of Standard Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context Unknown

Type Cylinder Seal

Material Calcite (Limestone Breccia)

Size H: 4,25cm; D: 2,7-3,05cm

Collection BM 134849

Literature Published Collon 1982:81; Pl. XX.156
Catalogue Number A49

Type of Standard Bügelschaft

Type of Object Cylinder Seal

Material

Size

Collection Florence Archaeological Museum No. 14384

Picture Credit Boehmer 1965: Taf. XLV.529

Literature Published
Boehmer 1965:94, 178; Taf. XLV.529; Nr.1238
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>A50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Seal of Shatpum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Aruz and Wallenfels 2003:217; Catalogue Number 145

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Red Jasper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 2,8cm; D: 1,5cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Collection       | Metropolitan Museum L.1992.23.5  
(Anonymous Loan) |

**Literature Published**  
Aruz and Wallenfels 2003:217; Catalogue Number 145  
Boehmer 1965:42, 92, 93, 132, 133, 178; Taf. XLIV.525; Nr. 1220  
Eisen 1940:44; Pl. V.35
Catalogue Number: A51

Name

Picture Credit: Heinrich 1957:23 Abb. 17

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Cylinder Seal

Material:

Size:

Collection:

Literature Published:

Boehmer 1965:123, 132; Taf. LIx.703; Nr. 1670
Heinrich 1957:22, 24, 26, 81; 23 Abb. 17
Ward 1910:146, 417; 145 Fig. 396
Weber 1920: Nr. 405
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>A52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td>Porada 1948: Pl. XXXIX.251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type of Standard**
- Bügelschaft

**Place of Origin and Context**
- Acquired by Pierpont Morgan sometime between 1885 and 1908

**Type**
- Cylinder Seal

**Material**
- Black Serpentine

**Size**
- H: 3.6cm; D: 2.1cm

**Collection**
- Morgan Seal 251

**Literature Published**
- Porada 1948:31; Pl. XXXIX.251
Catalogue Number: A53

Type of Standard: Bügelschaft

Place of Origin and Context: Unknown

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Black Serpentine

Size: H: 2,3cm; D: 1,3cm

Collection: Ashmolean 1959.327

Picture Credit: Buchanan 1966: Pl. 28:355

Literature Published:
Buchanan 1966:66; Pl. 28:355
Catalogue Number  A54

Name

Picture Credit  Boehmer 1965: Taf. XXXVI.427;

Type of Standard  Knobbed Pole

Place of Origin and Context  Adab/Bismaya

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Basalt

Size  H: 3.3cm; D: 2.0cm

Collection  A 531 (Oriental Institute)

Literature Published
Boehmer 1965: 72, 75, 85, 172; Taf. XXXVI.427; Nr. 1040
Williams 1928: 240-241; No. 23
Wilson 2012: 113, 173, Pl. 92.f
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Parrot 1948:139; Pl XI.1423

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knobbed Pole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Place of Origin and Context**  
Tello

**Type**  
Cylinder Seal

**Collection**  
TP 1423

**Literature Published**  
Parrot 1948:139; Pl XI.1423
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Knobbed Pole (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Ur PG 489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal (Broken and Mended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Lapis Lazuli with Silver Caps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 2,2cm; D: 0,9cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>BM 120554 U 8971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Catalogue Number** A56

**Name**

**Picture Credit** Collon 1982:72; Pl. XIX.139

**Literature Published**

- Collon 1982:72; Pl. XIX.139
- Woolley 1934:362, 572; Pl. 214.359
Catalogue Number  A57

Name

Picture Credit  Woolley 1934: Pl. 204.152

Type of Standard  Crescent Standard

Place of Origin and Context  Ur
PG 1227

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Shell

Size  H: 3,2cm; D: 1,8cm

Collection  IM 13206
U 12053

Literature Published  Woolley 1934:347, 578; Pl. 204.152
Catalogue Number  A58

Type of Standard  Crescent Standard

Place of Origin and Context  Unknown

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Dolomite (Magnesian Limestone)

Size  H: 2,95cm; D: 1,8cm

Collection  BM 103009

Picture Credit  Collon 1982: Pl. XXIV.164

Literature Published  Collon 1982:84; Pl. XXIV.164
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>A59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Ur, PJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Green Steatite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 3.1cm; D: 2.0cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>U 18724</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Boehmer 1965: Taf. XXXVI.437

**Literature Published**  
Boehmer 1965:73, 76, 130, 173; Taf. XXXVI.437; Nr. 1059  
Legrain 1951:21; Pl. 17.243
Catalogue Number: A60

Name

Picture Credit: Blanchard, K.

Type of Standard: Crescent Standard (Half Crescent)

Place of Origin and Context: Nippur

Type: Seal Impression

Material: Clay

Size: H: 2.4cm; L: 4.4cm

Collection: B8077 (UPenn)

Literature Published:
Boehmer 1965:57, 58, 66, 67, 70, 168; Taf. XXIX.347; Nr. 900
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>A61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Buchanan 1966: Pl. 28:356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
<td>Crescent Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Mottled Dark Grey Serpentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 2.0cm; D: 1.1cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>Ashmolean 1933.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Published</strong></td>
<td>Buchanan 1966:66; Pl. 28:356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>A62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Picture Credit   | Frankfort 1955: Pl. 71.778 |
| Literature Published | Frankfort 1955:45; Pl. 71.778 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin and Context</th>
<th>Asmar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface; L 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Shell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>H: 3,3cm; D: 0,9cm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>(Iraq Museum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As. 33.471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></td>
<td>A63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Hammade 1987: 27 Fig. 53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Star Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Marble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 3,1cm; D: 2,0cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>Aleppo M.6397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**

Hammade 1987:26; 27 Fig. 53
Catalogue Number: A64

Picture Credit: Boehmer 1965: Pl. LVII.682

Type of Standard: Star Standard

Place of Origin and Context: Unknown

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Serpentine

Size: H: 2.7cm; D: 1.3cm

Collection: Aleppo M.4770 (Hammade)  
Aleppo 3047 (Boehmer)

Literature Published:
Boehmer 1965:85, 116; Pl. LVII.682; Nr.1618
Hammade 1987:20; 21 Fig. 38
Catalogue Number: A65

Type of Standard: Star Standard

Place of Origin and Context: Cylinder Seal

Material: Black and White Marble or Limestone

Size: H: 2.4cm; D: 1.5cm

Collection: Leiden, Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten 59

Literature Published:
Boehmer 1965: 72, 76, 78, 85; Taf. XXXIV.403; Nr. 982

Picture Credit: Boehmer 1965: Taf. XXXIV.403
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>A66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Keel-Leu and Teissier 2004: 423 Nr.75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Star Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Olive Brown-Black Serpentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 3.73cm; D: 2.3cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>VR 2002.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**  Keel-Leu and Teissier 2004:62; 423 Nr.75
### Catalogue Number
A67

### Name

### Picture Credit
Boehmer 1965: Taf. XXXIII.395

### Type of Standard
Star Standard

### Place of Origin and Context
Tell Asmar
Houses IVb; G 18:7

### Type
Cylinder Seal

### Material
Shell

### Size
H: 3.2cm

### Collection
(Iraq Museum)
As. 31.854

### Literature Published
Boehmer 1965:72, 74, 85, 171; Taf. XXXIII.395; Nr. 969
Frankfort 1955:40; Pl. 55.588.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>A68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Picture Credit</strong></th>
<th>McMahon 2006: Pl. 157.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Pennant Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></th>
<th>Nippur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burial 14, Skeleton 1, Level XIIB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Material</strong></th>
<th>Blue-green Marble-like Stone with White Vein</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Size</strong></th>
<th>H: 3.2cm; D: 1.9cm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>Lot Number 18 N 174</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Literature Published</strong></th>
<th>McMahon 2006:121; Pl. 157.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>A69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Boehmer 1965: Taf. XLVI.548

**Type of Standard**  
Pennant Standard

**Place of Origin and Context**  
Ur  
PG 719

**Type**  
Cylinder Seal

**Material**  
Green Marble

**Size**  
H: 3.1cm; D: 2.1cm

**Collection**  
U 9844

**Literature Published**  
Boehmer 1965:27, 180; Taf. XLVI.548; Nr. 1287  
Woolley 1934:350-1, 550; Pl. 206.198
Catalogue Number: A70

Name

Picture Credit: Buchanan 1981:171 Catalogue Number 443

Type of Standard: Pennant Standard

Place of Origin and Context: Unknown

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Light Green Serpentine with Dark Flecks

Size: H: 2.3cm; D: 1.3cm

Collection: NBC 1517

Literature Published: Buchanan 1981:170; 171 Catalogue Number 443
Catalogue Number  A71

Name

Type of Standard  Tasselled Standard

Place of Origin and Context  Kish  
C10 at 3 (4)

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Black Serpentine with Green Flecks

Size  H: 3.8 cm; D: 2.4 cm

Collection  Ashmolean 1931.105  
K 962

Picture Credit  Buchanan 1966: Pl. 26.328

Literature Published

Boehmer 1965:54, 57, 70, 75, 82, 83, 89, 111, 126, 167; XXVII.324; Nr. 869
Buchanan 1966:63; Pl. 26:328
Collon 2005:178, 181; 180 Catalogue Number 849
Frankfort 1939:135; Pl. XXIIIg
Van Buren 1934:70-71; Pl. IX.a
Catalogue Number  A72  Name

Picture Credit  Buchanan 1966: Pl. 26:329

Type of Standard  Tasselled Standard

Place of Origin and Context  Kish

Type  Cylinder Seal
Material  Buff Sandstone
Size  H: 2,3cm; D: 1,5cm

Collection  Ashmolean 1930.129
            KM132

Literature Published  Buchanan 1966:63; Pl. 26:329
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Tasselled Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Serpentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 2.97cm; D: 1.7cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>BM 129483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**

- Boehmer 1965:54, 57, 82, 85, 126, 167; Taf. XXVII.325; Nr. 870
- Collon 1982:77; Pl. XXI.147
- Ward 1910:47; 47 Fig. 126

**Picture Credit**

Boehmer 1965: Taf. XXVII.325
Catalogue Number  A74

Name  The Victory Stele of Naram-Sin

Picture Credit  Van Dijk, RM

Type of Standard  Rod with Balls
                 Standard Surmounted by a Rearing Lion-Griffon

Place of Origin and Context  Originally Sippar, Excavated in Susa on the Acropolis

Type  Stele

Material  Limestone

Size  H: ca. 200cm; W: ca. 150cm; D: 18-25cm

Collection  Sb 4 (Louvre)

Literature Published

Amiet 1976:128; 93-95: No. 27a-c
Bänder 1995
Börker-Klähn 1982:134-136; Nr. 26a-k
Schroer and Keel 2005:344-345; Nr. 246
Winter 2010c

Stellenbosch University  https://scholar.sun.ac.za
Catalogue Number A75

Picture Credit Buchanan 1966: Pl. 29.385a

Type of Standard Uncertain

Place of Origin and Context Acquired in Baghdad in 1921

Type Cylinder Seal

Material Green Prase

Size H: 3,3cm; D: 2,0cm

Collection Ashmolean Loan from Col. KL Stevenson

Literature Published Buchanan 1966:70; Pl. 29.385a&b
Catalogue Number  A76

Type of Standard  Uncertain

Place of Origin and Context  Unknown

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Shell

Size

Collection  Formerly in the Collection of Rev Simmermann, today lost

Literature Published

Boehmer 1965:105, 106, 119; Pl. L.591; Nr. 1351
Ward 1910:126, 148; 126 Fig. 361

Picture Credit  Boehmer 1965: Pl. L.591
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.J. Sargonid Grave 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Lapis Lazuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 2,0cm; D: 1,1cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>U 18975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**

Boehmer 1965:16, 105, 106, 111, 126; Pl. L.590; Nr. 350
Legrain 1951:20; Pl. 19.288
Catalogue Number  A78

Name

Picture Credit  Moortgat 1966: Taf. 32.237

Type of Standard  Uncertain

Place of Origin and Context  Bought in Babylon

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Green Limestone

Size  H: 2,1cm; D: 1,0cm

Collection  VA 8461

Literature Published
Moortgat 1966:104; Taf. 32.237
Weber 1920: Nr. 387
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>A79</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Kish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Altered Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 4.5cm; D: 2.1cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>Ashmolean 1929.260 Kish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Buchanan 1966: Pl. 23.296

**Literature Published**  Buchanan 1966:58; Pl. 23.296
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>A80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Credit</td>
<td>Buchanan 1966: Pl. 28:358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Standard</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Tell Brak, JNP, T. Halaf Court, top metre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Ashmolean 1939.332 (170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Published</td>
<td>Buchanan 1966:67; Pl. 28:358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></td>
<td>A81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Teissier 1984:129 Catalogue Number 75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Marble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 2,95cm; D: 1,5cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>Marcopoli Collection Seal 75, Old Number 1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**  Teissier 1984:128; 129 Catalogue Number 75
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A82</td>
<td>VA 3265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moortgat 1966: Taf. 29.209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Literature Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Moortgat 1966:102; Taf. 29.209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin and Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donated to the Vorderasiatisches Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
<td>Serpentine</td>
<td>H: 2,0cm; D: 2,1cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>A83</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Van Dijk, RM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Banded Onxy/Agate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 3,1cm; D: 2,0cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>Iziko Museum of South Africa, Cape Town</td>
<td>1528b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Published</strong></td>
<td>To be published</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></td>
<td>NS1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td>Gudea's Libation Vessel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Van Dijk, RM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Bügelschaft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Place of Origin and Context** | Tello  
Tell V |
| **Type**             | Libation Vessel |
| **Material**         | Steatite |
| **Size**             | H: 23,0cm; D: 8,0-12,0cm |
| **Collection**       | AO 190 |

**Literature Published**

- Frankfort 1939:119; 119 Text Fig. 33
- De Sarzec and Huezey 1884-1912:234-236; Pl. 44.2A-C
- Edzard 1997:157-158
- Heuzey 1902:280-285; No. 125
- Parrot 1948:198-199; Pl. XXI
- Von der Osten 1926:411; 410 Fig. 13.
- Ward 1910:130, 131, 419; 129 Fig. 368c
Catalogue Number  NS2

Name

Picture Credit  Moortgat 1966: Taf. 37.284

Type of Standard  Crescent Standard

Place of Origin and Context  Acquired in Babylon

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Soapstone

Size  H: 2,5cm; D: 1,0cm

Collection  VA 8457

Literature Published
Moortgat 1966:109; Taf. 37.284
Weber 1920: Nr. 224a
Catalogue Number: NS3

Name

Picture Credit: Porada 1948: Pl. XLII.273

Type of Standard: Crescent Standard

Place of Origin and Context: Acquired by Pierpont Morgan sometime between 1885 and 1908

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Hematite

Size: H: 1.6cm; D: 0.95cm

Collection: Morgan Seal 273

Literature Published: Porada 1948:34; Pl. XLII.273
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>NS4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture Credit</th>
<th>Collon 1982: Pl. XXXVI 262</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin and Context</th>
<th>Ur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Chlorite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>H: 1,95cm; D: 0,9cm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>BM 128566</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Published</th>
<th>Collon 1982:116-117; Pl. XXXVI 262</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></td>
<td>NS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Picture Credit** | Fischer 1997: 180 Nr. 51 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Place of Origin and Context** | Tello |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Seal Impression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Material** | Clay |

| **Size** |     |

| **Collection** | BM 13078A |

<p>| <strong>Literature Published</strong> | Fischer 1997:170-171; 180 Nr. 51 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>NS6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Buchanan 1966: Pl. 33:450

| Type of Standard | Crescent Standard |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin and Context</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Mottled Brown Soapstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 1,7cm; D: 1,0cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Ashmolean, Liddon Collection 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**  
Buchanan 1966:80; Pl. 33:450
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>NS7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Picture Credit**: Buchanan 1966: Pl. 33:445

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Acquired in Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Obsidian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 1.7cm; D: 1.0cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>Ashmolean 1915.241 (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**: Buchanan 1966:80; Pl. 33:445
Catalogue Number  NS8

Name

Picture Credit  Buchanan 1966: Pl. 33:455

Type of Standard  Crescent Standard

Place of Origin and Context  Kish
YW at 3m

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Steatite

Size  H: 1,6cm; D: 0,8cm

Collection  Ashmolean 1930.97
KM145

Literature Published  Buchanan 1966:81; Pl. 33:455
Catalogue Number: NS9

Name

Picture Credit: Legrain 1951: Pl. 20.309

Type of Standard: Crescent Standard

Place of Origin and Context: Ur, Diqiqqeh Cemetery

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Black Steatite

Size: H: 2.9cm; D: 1.2cm

Collection: U 18696

Literature Published: Legrain 1951:25; Pl. 20.309
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>NS10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Picture Credit   | Fischer 1997: 175 Nr. 13 |
| Literature Published | Fischer 1997:158; 175 Nr. 13 |

<p>| Type of Standard | Crescent Standard |
| Place of Origin and Context | Tello |
| Type | Seal Impression |
| Material | Clay |
| Size |      |
| Collection | BM 13186 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>NS11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Delaporte 1920: Pl. 5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
<td>Crescent Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Tello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Serpentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 2.6cm; D: 1.4cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>MNB 1461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**

Delaporte 1920:14-15; Pl. 5.10; No. T.121
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Dark Steatite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 2.3cm; D: 1.35cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>NCBS 126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**

Buchanan 1981:221; 220 Catalogue Number 586

Von der Osten 1934:25; Pl. XII.126

**Picture Credit**

Buchanan 1981:220 Catalogue Number 586
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>NS13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Picture Credit</strong></th>
<th>Delaporte 1923: Pl. 76.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></th>
<th>Acquired by the Louvre in 1893</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Material</strong></th>
<th>Bituminous Paste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Size</strong></th>
<th>H: 2.9cm; D: 1.4cm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>AO 2370</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Literature Published</strong></th>
<th>Delaporte 1923:117; Pl. 76.2; No. A.224</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Stellenbosch University  [https://scholar.sun.ac.za](https://scholar.sun.ac.za)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>NS14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Picture Credit   | Buchanan 1966: Pl. 31:420b |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Type: Cylinder Seal, Material: Black Serpentine, Size: H: 2,6cm; D: 1,4cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Ashmolean 1954.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Published</td>
<td>Buchanan 1966:76; Pl. 31:420a&amp;b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Standard</td>
<td>Crescent Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Seal Impression(s)</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 2,3cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>MLC 1902 (Yale)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**

Buchanan 1981:257; 256 Catalogue Number 666a-c
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>NS16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Picture Credit   | Collon 1982: Pl. XXXIX 298 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Lapis Lazuli with Gold Cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 3.06cm, 3.25cm with Cap; D: 1.23cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>BM 120552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Literature Published | Collon 1982:123; Pl. XXXIX 298 |
| <strong>Catalogue Number</strong> | NS17 |
| <strong>Name</strong> | Picture Credit Buchanan 1981:264 Catalogue Number 692b |
| <strong>Picture Credit</strong> | Buchanan 1981:264 Catalogue Number 692b |
| <strong>Type of Standard</strong> | Crescent Standard |
| <strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong> | Seal Impression |
| <strong>Material</strong> | Clay |
| <strong>Size</strong> | H: ca. 2,3cm |
| <strong>Collection</strong> | NBC 1857 |
| <strong>Literature Published</strong> | Buchanan 1981:265; 264 Catalogue Number 692a-b |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>NS18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
<td>Crescent Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>Ashmolean 1937.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Buchanan 1966: Pl. 32.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Published</strong></td>
<td>Buchanan 1966:78; Pl. 32.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>NS19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong> Buchanan 1966: Pl. 31:428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
<td>Crescent Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Kish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Pale Grey Schist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 2,5cm; D: 1,3cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>Ashmolean 1929.250 K V845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Published</strong></td>
<td>Buchanan 1966:77; Pl. 31:428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number: NS20

Name

Picture Credit: Buchanan 1966: Pl. 32:443

Type of Standard: Crescent Standard mounted on an Animal

Place of Origin and Context

Type: Cylinder Seal
Material: Steatite
Size: H: 3,0cm; D: 1,6cm

Collection: Ashmolean 1954.194

Literature Published

Buchanan 1966:79; Pl. 32:443
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>NS21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>NS21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Collon 1982: Pl. XLIII 362

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Chlorite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 2,7cm; D: 1,3cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>BM 128554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**  Collon 1982:145; Pl. XLIII 362
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>NS22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Picture Credit</strong></th>
<th>Collon 1982: Pl. XLIII 363</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Ur Diqiqqeh Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Calcite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 2,85cm; D: 1,55cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>BM 119199 U 2754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Published</strong></td>
<td>Collon 1982:145; Pl. XLIII 363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number: NS23

Name

Picture Credit: Collon 1982: Pl. XLIII 359

Type of Standard: Crescent Standard

Place of Origin and Context: Ur

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Aragonite

Size: H: 1.8cm; D: 0.75cm

Collection: BM 130629

Literature Published: Collon 1982:144; Pl. XLIII 359
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>NS24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Picture Credit</strong></th>
<th>Collon 1982: Pl. XLIII 360a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Ur TTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Chlorite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 1,7cm; D: 0,8cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>BM 116581 U 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Published</strong></td>
<td>Collon 1982:144; Pl. XLIII 360a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>NS25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture Credit</th>
<th>Collon 1982: Pl. XLIII 360</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin and Context</th>
<th>Ur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Found in a bead-maker's hoard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cylinder Seal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Chlorite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>H: 0,8cm; D: 0,75cm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>BM 138038</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Published</th>
<th>Collon 1982:144; Pl. XLIII 360</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Catalogue Number NS26

Type of Standard Crescent Standard mounted on a Bird

Place of Origin and Context Ur Diqiqqeh Cemetery

Type Cylinder Seal

Material Chlorite

Size H: 1,6cm; D: 0,8cm

Collection BM 123189 U 17738

Literature Published
Collon 1982:144; Pl. XLIII 361
Legrain 1951:39; Pl. 32.518
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>NS27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Picture Credit</strong></th>
<th>Fischer 1997: 180 Nr. 53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Crescent Standard mounted on a Bird</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></th>
<th>Tello</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Seal Impression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Size</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>BM 14884A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Literature Published</strong></th>
<th>Fischer 1997:171; 180 Nr. 53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Catalogue Number  NS28

Name

Picture Credit  Parrot 1948: Pl. XXX.327

Type of Standard  Crescent Standard mounted on a Bull

Place of Origin and Context  Tello

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material

Size

Collection  TP 258

Literature Published  Parrot 1948:258; Pl. XXX.327
Catalogue Number: NS29

Name

Picture Credit: Legrain 1951: Pl. 18.267

Type of Standard: Crescent Standard

Place of Origin and Context: Ur

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Clay

Size: H: 2,5cm; D: 1,4cm

Collection: 32-40-340 (UPenn)

U 17702

Literature Published: Legrain 1951:22; Pl. 18.267
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>NS30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Picture Credit   | Legrain 1951: Pl. 18.261 |
| Literature Published | Legrain 1951:22; Pl. 18.261 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Ur AH (Large residential quarter of the Larsa town lying SE of the Temenos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Black Steatite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 1.3cm; D: 0.7cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>U 17309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number: NS31

Name:

Picture Credit: Collon 1982: Pl. XLIII 358

Type of Standard: Crescent Standard

Place of Origin and Context: Ur

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Chlorite

Size: H: 0,9cm; D: 0,6cm

Collection: BM 122976

U 17018

Literature Published:

Collon 1982:144; Pl. XLIII 358

Legrain 1951:23; Pl. 18.277

Stellenbosch University  https://scholar.sun.ac.za
Catalogue Number: NS32

Picture Credit: Woolley 1934: Pl. 216.390

Type of Standard: Crescent Standard

Place of Origin and Context:
- Ur
- Area TTF
- Loose soil, top level

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Calcite

Size: H: 1.9cm; D: 1.15cm

Collection: BM 1205668
- U 8800

Literature Published:
- Collon 1982:122-123; Pl. XXXIX 296
- Woolley 1934:364, 538; Pl. 216.390
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Ur \nDiqiqqeh Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Trial Piece of a Seal-Engraver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>U 6607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Picture Credit   | Buchanan 1966: Pl. 32:433 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Acquired in Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Steatite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 2,3cm; D: 1,3cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Ashmolean 1914.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan 1966:78; Pl. 32:433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Canby 2001: Pl. 52.66a,b (detail)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Crescent Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Literature Published</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canby 2001:26-27, 37; Pl. 52.66a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reade 2001:175; 176 Fig.1&amp;2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woolley 1974:98; Pl. 41.b (Entire Stele)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></th>
<th>Ur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lying on west side of courtyard of Dublal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Stele (Two Fragments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Size** | Left: H: 12,5cm; W: 19,0cm; T: 7,5cm |
|          | Right: H: 16,0cm; W: 16,0-27,0cm |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>Left Fragment: 1927-5-27-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U 6587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right Fragment: BM 118545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number  NS36

Name

Picture Credit  Buchanan 1981:259 Catalogue Number 671

Type of Standard  Knobbed Pole

Place of Origin and Context  Tell Jokha (Umma?)

Type  Seal Impression

Material  Clay

Size  H: 1.95cm

Collection  NBC 264

Literature Published  Buchanan 1981:258; 259 Catalogue Number 671
Catalogue Number  NS37

Name

Picture Credit  Buchanan 1981:255 Catalogue Number 658b

Type of Standard  Knobbed Pole

Place of Origin and Context

Type  Seal Impression

Material  Clay

Size  H: ca. 2,3cm

Collection  NCBT 2253 (Yale)

Literature Published

Buchanan 1981:254; 255 Catalogue Number 658a-b
Ward 1910:401-402; 401 Fig. 1305b
Catalogue Number  NS38

Name

Picture Credit  Delaporte 1923: Pl. 75.12

Type of Standard  Knobbed Pole

Place of Origin and Context  Acquired by the Louvre in 1894

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Green Serpentine

Size  H: 2.6cm; D: 1.3cm

Collection  AO 2609

Literature Published  Delaporte 1923:116; Pl. 75.12; No. A.203
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>NS39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Seal of Enmedu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Fischer 1997:174 Nr. 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Knobbed Pole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Tello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>BM 12261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**  
Fischer 1997:155; 174 Nr. 2
Catalogue Number  NS40
Name  Seal of Ur-Ningišzida

Picture Credit  Fischer 1997:176 Nr. 19

Type of Standard  Knobbed Pole

Place of Origin and Context  Tello

Type  Seal Impression
Material  Clay
Size

Collection  BM 20974A

Literature Published
Fischer 1997:160; 176 Nr. 19
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>NS41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Buchanan 1966: Pl. 33:459

**Type of Standard**  
Knobbed Pole

**Place of Origin and Context**  
Kish

**Type**  
Cylinder Seal

**Material**  
Grey Volcanic Ash

**Size**  
H: 2,0cm; D: 1,2cm

**Collection**  
Ashmolean 1926.489  
K 3037

**Literature Published**  
Buchanan 1966:82; Pl. 33:459
Catalogue Number  NS42

Name

Picture Credit  Von der Osten 1934: Pl. XIV.160

Type of Standard
Knobbed Pole

Place of Origin and Context
Unknown

Type
Cylinder Seal

Material
Dark Grey Serpentine

Size
H: 1.8cm; D: 0.9cm

Collection
NCBS 160
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Knobbed Pole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Tello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Greyish-Brown Veined Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 6.1cm; D: 4.5cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>MNB 1350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**

- Collon 2005:147-148; 147 Catalogue Number 638
- Delaporte 1920:10; Pl. 5.4; No. T.98
- De Sarzec and Huezey 1884-1912:301-303; Pl. 30bis.16a-b
- Ward 1910:17, 255, 371; 255 Fig. 772
- Weber 1920: Nr. 498
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>NS44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Buchanan 1981:252 Catalogue Number 656e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
<td>Knobbed Pole (Variation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Seal Impression(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 2.4cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>NBC 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Published</strong></td>
<td>Buchanan 1981:253; 252 Catalogue Number 656a-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></td>
<td>NS45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td>The First Seal of Lu-Dumuzi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Fischer 1997: 179 Nr. 46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Knobbed Pole (Variation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></th>
<th>Tello</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Seal Impression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
<th>BM 13079A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Literature Published**  
Fischer 1997:168-169; 179 Nr. 46

---

Stellenbosch University  
https://scholar.sun.ac.za
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>NS46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Knobbed Pole (Variation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Uruk (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Dolomite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 4.17cm; D: 2.64cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>BM 116719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**
Collon 1982:169-170; Pl. LII 471  
Collon 2005:167-8 Catalogue Number 781

**Picture Credit**
Collon 2005:168 Catalogue Number 781
Catalogue Number  NS47

Name

Picture Credit  Buchanan 1981:259 Catalogue Number 673

Type of Standard  Knobbed Pole (Variation)

Place of Origin and Context  Tello

Type  Seal Impression

Material  Clay

Size

Collection  YBC 13463

Buchanan 1981:258; 259 Catalogue Number 673
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>NS48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Picture Credit</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan 1966: Pl. 30.404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Literature Published</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan 1966:74; Pl. 30.404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Star Standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell Brak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNP, packing N. Terrace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Material</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Size</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Collection</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashmolean 1939.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Star Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Ur  Diqiqqeh Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Steatite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>W: 1.0cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>U 17713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Picture Credit</strong></th>
<th>Legrain 1951: Pl. 22.351</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Published</strong></td>
<td>Legrain 1951:27; Pl. 22.351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number  NS50

Name

Picture Credit  Suter 2000:338 ST60

Type of Standard  Rod with Balls

Place of Origin and Context  Tello
T Tell A/B

Type  Stele (Fragment)

Material  Limestone

Size  H: 34,3cm; W (Left Fragment only): 32,8cm, (Both Fragments) 43,0cm; D: 12,0cm

Collection  Left Fragment: AO 4581
Right Fragment: EŞEM 5802

Literature Published
Andrae 1933:47, 48; 19 Fig. 35
Börker-Klähn 1982:48; Nr. 63
Cros, Heuzey and Thureau-Dangin 1910-1914:283-284; Pl. X.1 (AO 4581)
Parrot 1948:179; 178 Fig. 36.i
Suter 2000:189, 190, 389; 338 ST60
Catalogue Number: NS51

Picture Credit: Parrot 1948:259 Fig. 52.e

Type of Standard: Bird Standard
Rod with Balls

Place of Origin and Context: Tello

Type: Seal Impression

Material
Size

Collection

Literature Published:
Mayer-Opificius 1996:215; 221 Abb. 2
Parrot 1948:258; 259 Fig. 52.e; Pl. XXX.300
Catalogue Number  NS52
Name  The Seal of Ursukkel

Picture Credit  Moortgat 1966: Pl. 36.268

Type of Standard  Rod with Balls

Place of Origin and Context  Acquired by the 1886-87 Babylonian Expedition

Type  Cylinder Seal
Material  Soapstone
Size  H: 2,1cm; D: 1,1cm

Collection  VA 2842

Literature Published  Moortgat 1966:108; Pl. 36.268
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>NS53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td>The Seal of Ureškuga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Fischer 1997: 175 Nr. 15

### Literature Published

Fischer 1997:159; 175 Nr. 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Rod with Balls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Tello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>BM 13188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number  NS54

Name

Picture Credit  Fischer 1997: 175 Nr. 16

Type of Standard  Rod with Balls

Place of Origin and Context  Tello

Type  Seal Impression

Material  Clay

Size

Collection  BM 20934A

Literature Published  Fischer 1997:159; 175 Nr. 16
Catalogue Number  NS55

Picture Credit  Buchanan 1981:227 Catalogue Number 602

Type of Standard  Rod with Balls

Place of Origin and Context  Tell Jokha (Umma?)

Type  Seal Impression(s)

Material  Clay

Size  H: 2.45cm

Collection  NBC 2825
Same seal impressed on NBC 658
Catalogue Number NS56

Picture Credit De Sarzec and Huezey 1884-1912:309 Fig. O

Type of Standard Rod with Balls

Place of Origin and Context Tello

Literature Published
Andrae 1933:17-18, 49; 19 Fig. 27
Delaporte 1920:22; Pl. 11.13 (T.213)
De Sarzec and Huezey 1884-1912:309-310; 309 Fig. O
Ward 1910:28, 110; 28 Fig. 52a

Type Seal Impression

Material

Size

Collection AOT c. 38
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>NS57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td>Seal of Ur-Enlila</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Fischer 1997: 177 Nr. 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Rod with Balls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Tello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>BM 17800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**  
Fischer 1997:164; 177 Nr. 31
Catalogue Number: NS58

Name

Picture Credit: Porada 1948: Pl. XLII.269

Type of Standard: Rod with Balls

Place of Origin and Context: Acquired by Pierpont Morgan sometime between 1885 and 1908

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Black and Brown Serpentine

Size: H: 2.3cm; D: 1.15cm

Collection: Morgan Seal 269

Literature Published: Porada 1948:34; Pl. XLII.269
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Rod with Balls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Steatite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 1.7cm; D: 0.8cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>NBC 9353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Published</strong></td>
<td>Buchanan 1981:262; 263 Catalogue Number 685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit** Buchanan 1981:263 Catalogue Number 685
Catalogue Number  NS60

Type of Standard  Scorpion Standard

Place of Origin and Context  Tell Jokha (Umma?)

Type  Seal Impression

Material  Clay

Size  Preserved Height: 2.3cm

Collection  NBC 4290

Picture Credit  Buchanan 1981:235 Catalogue Number 622

Literature Published
Buchanan 1981:234; 235 Catalogue Number 622
Catalogue Number: NS61
Name: The Gudea Stelae

Type of Standard: Lion Standard
Place of Origin and Context: Tello
Collection: AO 4577

Material: Limestone
Size: H: 17,0cm; W: 14,0cm; D: 4,0cm


Literature Published:
- Börker-Klähn 1982:149; Nr. 66
- Cros, Heuzey and Thureau-Dangin 1910-1914:290-1; 291 Fig 6.a; Pl. IX.6
- Parrot 1948:180; Pl. 37 (full stele)
- Suter 2000:177-179, 230, 369; 368 ST.25
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>NS62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Lion Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Tello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tell A/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Stele (Fragment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 10.8cm; W: 14.8cm; D: 1.5cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>EŞEM 5828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**

Börker-Klähn 1982:150; Nr. 70
Cros, Heuzey and Thureau-Dangin 1910-1914:290-1; 291 Fig. 6.b
Suter 2000:177-179, 230, 391; 390 ST.63
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>NS63</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Suter 2000:370 ST.27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Lion Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Tello  Tell A/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Stele (Fragment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 36,0cm; W: 30,0cm; D: 6,5cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>AO 4586; ESEM 5808; ESEM 6150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**
- Börker-Klähn 1982:147-148; Nr. 61
- Suter 2000:177-179; 371; 370 ST.27
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>NS64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Picture Credit** | Collon 2005:133 Catalogue Number 566 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Lion Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Quartz Crystal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 3,75cm; D: 2,85cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>BM 113871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**
- Boehmer 1965:31-34, 40, 66, 156; Taf. XIV.158; Nr. 547
- Collon 1982:66-67; Pl XVII.121
- Collon 2005:131, 134; 133 Catalogue Number 566
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>NS65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Khazai 1983:41 Fig. 51

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Lion Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin and Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Seal Impression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Clay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>H: 3,3cm; D:2,2cm (Estimated Dimensions of Seal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>KMKG 181 (Brussels)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Literature Published**  
Khazai 1983:41, 102; 41 Fig. 51, 102 Fig. 105
Catalogue Number  NS66

Name

Picture Credit  Keel-Leu and Teissier 2004:426 Nr. 97 (detail)

Type of Standard  Lion Standard

Place of Origin and Context

Type  Seal Impression

Material  Clay

Size  H: ca. 2,0cm; L:4,0cm

Collection  VR 1981.1

Literature Published

Keel-Leu and Teissier 2004:80-81; 426 #97
Catalogue Number: NS67

Name

Picture Credit: Buchanan 1966: Pl. 32.436

Type of Standard: Lion Standard

Place of Origin and Context: Unknown

Type: Seal Impression

Material: Clay

Size

Collection: Ashmolean 1912.1161

Literature Published: Buchanan 1966:78; Pl. 32.436
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>NS68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Buchanan 1981:232 Catalogue Number 618b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Lion Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Tell Jokha (Umma?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Seal Impression(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 1.7cm (with Cap Marks 2.0cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>YBC 1067; YBC 9807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**  Buchanan 1981:233; 232 Catalogue Number 618a&b
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>NS69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  Buchanan 1981:235 Catalogue Number 619c

**Type of Standard**  Lion Standard

**Place of Origin and Context**  Tell Jokha (Umma?)

**Material**  Clay

**Size**  H: 2.0cm (With Cap Marks ca. 2.3cm)

**Collection**  YBC 6765; YBC 1641

**Literature Published**  Buchanan 1981:234; 235 Catalogue Number 619a-c
Catalogue Number: NS70

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Lion Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Tell Jokha (Umma?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 2.4cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>YBC 1296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Picture Credit: Buchanan 1981:235 Catalogue Number 620

Literature Published:
Buchanan 1981:234; 235 Catalogue Number 620
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th>NS71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Buchanan 1981:227 Catalogue Number 601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Lion Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Seal Impression(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 2.5cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>NBC 2783; NBC 974; NBC 1956; NBC 2784; NBC 2790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Published</strong></td>
<td>Buchanan 1981:226; 227 Catalogue Number 601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue Number: NS72

Name

Picture Credit: Buchanan 1981:219 Catalogue Number 574

Type of Standard: Lion Standard

Place of Origin and Context

Type: Seal Impression
Material: Clay
Size: H: 1,95cm

Collection: NBC 645

Literature Published: Buchanan 1981:218; 219 Catalogue Number 574
Catalogue Number: NS73

Type of Standard: Lion Standard

Place of Origin and Context: Seal Impression

Material: Clay

Size: H: 2.55cm

Collection: NBC 676

Picture Credit: Buchanan 1981:219 Catalogue Number 575

Literature Published: Buchanan 1981:218; 219 Catalogue Number 575
Catalogue Number  NS74

Name

Picture Credit    Buchanan 1981:207 Catalogue Number 535

Type of Standard     Bird Standard

Place of Origin and Context

Type    Cylinder Seal
Material    Steatite
Size    H: 2,2cm; D: 1,0cm
Collection    Newell Seal 158 (Yale)

Literature Published
Buchanan 1981:206; 207 Catalogue Number 535
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>NS75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Picture Credit   | Buchanan 1966: Pl. 30:392 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bird Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Steatite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 2,3cm; D: 1,2cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Ashmolean 1949.891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Literature Published | Buchanan 1966:73; Pl. 30:392 |
Catalogue Number  NS76

Name

Type of Standard  Bird Standard

Place of Origin and Context  Ur

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Black Steatite

Size  H: 3.4cm; D: 1.0cm

Collection  U 1173

Literature Published

Legrain 1951:22; Pl. 18.247

Picture Credit  Legrain 1951:22; Pl. 18.247
Catalogue Number  NS77  
Name  Seal of Idabidu

Picture Credit  Fischer 1997: 175 Nr. 11

Type of Standard  Bird Standard

Place of Origin and Context  Tello

Type  Seal Impression

Material  Clay

Size

Collection  BM 19341A

Literature Published
Asher-Greve and Westenholz 2013:210; 404 Fig. 55
Fischer 1997:157-158; 175 Nr. 11
Catalogue Number   NS78

Type of Standard   Bird Standard

Place of Origin and Context   Tello

Type   Seal Impression

Material   Clay

Size

Collection   BM 13193A

Picture Credit   Fischer 1997:176 Nr. 21

Literature Published

Fischer 1997:161; 176 Nr. 21

Stellenbosch University  https://scholar.sun.ac.za
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>NS79</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Asher-Greve and Westenholz 2013:404 Fig. 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Bird Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Tello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>(Istanbul)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asher-Greve and Westenholz 2013:210; 404 Fig. 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genouillic 1912: Pl. IV.5974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Collection | Ashmolean 1953.99  
                 U 19165 |

**Catalogue Number**: NS80

**Name**

**Picture Credit**: Legrain 1951: Pl. 18.265

**Literature Published**

- Buchanan 1966:74; Pl. 30.401
- Legrain 1951:22; Pl. 18.265
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>NS1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Credit</td>
<td>Parrot 1948: Pl. XXX.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Standard</td>
<td>Bird Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Tello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Published</td>
<td>Parrot 1948:261; Pl. XXX.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Number</td>
<td>NS82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picture Credit</strong></td>
<td>Buchanan 1981:192 Catalogue Number 502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Standard</strong></td>
<td>Bird Standard, Bird Standard, Snake Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Cylinder Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Dark Steatite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 2.5cm; D: 1.3cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>YBC 12583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Published</strong></td>
<td>Buchanan 1960:28; No. 47, Buchanan 1971:3, 17; Pl. I.c, Buchanan 1981:193; 192 Catalogue Number 502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Standard</td>
<td>Bird-Man Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Tello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tell A/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Stele (Fragment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>H: 23,0cm; W: 26,5cm; D: 10,0cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>EŞEM 5811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**

- Börker-Klähn 1982:149; Nr. 67
- Cros, Heuzey and Thureau-Dangin 1910-1914:290-1; 291 Fig. 6.d
- Suter 2000:177-179, 230, 367; 366 ST.23
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Bird Standard (?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bird-Man Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Origin and Context</strong></td>
<td>Tello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tell A/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Stele (Fragment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 53,0cm; W: 49,0cm; D: 15,0cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>EŞEM 5824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**

- Börker-Klähn 1982:149; Nr. 68
- Suter 2000:177-179, 230, 373; 372 ST.28
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></th>
<th><strong>NS85</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td>The Gudea Stelae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**: Börker-Klähn 1982: Nr. 69

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of Standard</strong></th>
<th>Bird-Man Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Place of Origin and Context** | Tello  
Tell A/B |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th>Stele (Fragment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>H: 20,8cm; W: 19,0cm; D: 7,0cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Collection**: AO 4576

**Literature Published**
- Börker-Klähn 1982:149-50; Nr. 69
- Cros, Heuzey and Thureau-Dangin 1910 -1914:290-1; 291 Fig. 6.c; Pl. X.2
- Parrot 1948:180, Pl. 37 (full stele)
- Suter 2000:177-179, 230, 369; 368 ST.24
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Incorrectly Identified as an Imdugud/Anzu Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Place of Origin and Context | Tello  
Tell A/B |
| Type | Stele (Fragment) |
| Material | Limestone |
| Size | H: 22,0cm (Total), 9,0cm (Image Surface); W: 8,5cm; D: 12,0cm |
| Collection | EŞEM 5810 |

**Catalogue Number** NS86

**Name** The Gudea Stelae

**Picture Credit** Suter 2000: ST26

**Literature Published**
- Börker-Klähn 1982:150; Nr. 71
- Cros, Heuzey and Thureau-Dangin 1910-1914:290-1; 291 Fig. 6.e; Pl. XI.1
- Suter 2000:178-179, 369; 368 ST.26
Catalogue Number  NS87

Type of Standard  Imdugud/Anzu Standard

Place of Origin and Context  

Type  Cylinder Seal

Material  Calcite

Size  H: 3.05cm; D: 1.75-1.83cm

Collection  BM 129467

Literature Published

Collon 1982: 144; Pl. XXXV.249
Ward 1910: 401, 407; 401 Fig. 1305a
Weber 1920: Nr. 115

Picture Credit  Collon 1982: Pl. XXXV.249
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>NS88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Delaporte 1920: Pl. 10.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Imdugud/Anzu Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin and Context</td>
<td>Tello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Seal Impression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>AO 3548; AO 3549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literature Published**  
Delaporte 1920:14; Pl. 10.7, 10.9; No. T116
Catalogue Number  NS89

Name

Picture Credit  Fuhr-Jaepelt 1972: Abb. 206

Type of Standard  Imdugud/Anzu Standard (Two-Headed)

Place of Origin and Context

Type  Seal

Material

Size

Collection  (Basel)

Literature Published  Fuhr-Jaepelt 1972:202; Abb. 206
Catalogue Number  NS90

Picture Credit  Fischer 1997:175 Nr. 14

Type of Standard  Mušḫuššu Standard

Place of Origin and Context  Tello

Type  Seal Impression

Material  Clay

Size

Collection  BM 18805

Literature Published

Asher-Greve and Westenholz 2013:206-207; 406 Fig. 60
Fischer 1997:158-159; 175 Nr. 14

Stellenbosch University  https://scholar.sun.ac.za
Catalogue Number: NS91

Name

Picture Credit: Collon 1982: Pl. XL.306

Type of Standard: Uncertain - Scorpion Standard?

Place of Origin and Context

Type: Cylinder Seal

Material: Lapis Lazuli

Size: H: 1.75cm; D: 0.85cm

Collection: BM 129496

Literature Published: Collon 1982:125; Pl. XL.306
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>NS92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>The Ur-Nammu Stele</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Picture Credit**  
Canby 2001: Plate 30.12 (detail)

**Type of Standard**  
Uncertain

**Place of Origin and Context**  
Ur  
Dub-lal-mah  
Filling of Lower Courtyard L.L

**Type**  
Stele (Fragments)

**Material**  
Limestone

**Size**  
H: 30,0cm; W: 33,0cm

**Collection**  
B16676.12B (UPenn)  
U 3264

**Literature Published**

Börker-Klähn 1982:155-156, Taf. 94b  
Canby 2001:23, 32-33; Pl. 30.12  
Woolley 1974:78, 97; Pl. 41.b, 44.a