

## VISUAL REPRESENTATION OF THE DIVINE AND THE NUMINOUS IN EARLY ACHAEMENID IRAN: OLD PROBLEMS, NEW DIRECTIONS

(Mark A. Garrison, Trinity University, San Antonio, TX)

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1. The research problem
- 1.2. Temporal and geographic parameters
- 1.3. The problem of the written sources
  - 1.3.1. *Herodotus*
  - 1.3.2. *Zoroastrianism*

### 2. Background: the depiction of the divine and numinous in Iran c. 1000–559

- 2.1. Hasanlu
- 2.2. Marlik
- 2.3. Elam
- 2.4. Other corpora

### 3. The depiction of the divine and numinous in Iran c. 559–521

- 3.1. Pasargadae
- 3.2. Susa glyptic corpora
- 3.3. Babylonian glyptic corpora
- 3.4. Tomb at Arjan

### 4. The depiction of the divine and numinous in Iran at the time of Darius I, c. 522–486

- 4.1. Introduction to the evidence
  - 4.1.1. *The victory monument of Darius I at Behistun*
  - 4.1.2. *The funerary relief of Darius I at Naqsh-i Rostam*
  - 4.1.3. *The seals preserved in the Persepolis Fortification archive (509–493) and the Persepolis Treasury archive (492–458)*
- 4.2. Auramazda and the “other gods” at Behistun, Naqsh-i Rostam, Susa, and Persepolis: the textual evidence
  - 4.2.1. *Behistun*
  - 4.2.2. *Naqsh-i Rostam*
  - 4.2.3. *Royal inscriptions at Susa and Persepolis*
  - 4.2.4. *Deities mentioned in the texts from the Fortification archive*
- 4.3. The figure in the winged ring/disk
  - 4.3.1. *The figure in the winged ring at Behistun*
  - 4.3.2. *The figure in the winged ring at Naqsh-i Rostam*
  - 4.3.3. *The figure in the winged ring and the winged ring-and-disk in architectural sculpture at Persepolis*
  - 4.3.4. *The figure in the winged ring/disk and the winged disk in the seals from the Persepolis Fortification archive and the Persepolis Treasury archive*
  - 4.3.5. *The figure in the winged ring/disk, the winged ring-and-disk, and the winged ring/disk: discussion*
- 4.4. Other anthropomorphic depictions of the divine and numinous at Persepolis
  - 4.4.1. *Figure in nimbus*
  - 4.4.2. *Figure posed on an animal/creature, stand, or pedestal animal(s)/creature(s)*
  - 4.4.3. *Figure in crescent*
  - 4.4.4. *Horus child in papyrus field*
- 4.5. *Mischwesen* at Persepolis
- 4.6. Theriomorphic depictions of the divine and numinous at Persepolis
- 4.7. Aniconic depictions of the divine and numinous at Behistun, Naqsh-i Rostam, and Persepolis
  - 4.7.1. *Lunar and astral symbolism*
  - 4.7.2. *Marru-spade of Marduk, stylus of Nabu, and other cult objects in the so-called late Babylonian worship scene*
  - 4.7.3. *Stylized tree and plant imagery*
  - 4.7.4. *Fire*
  - 4.7.5. *Other aniconic symbols*

### V. Summation

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. The research problem

The issues surrounding the depiction of the divine and the numinous for the early Achaemenid period are complex.<sup>1</sup> While we may be able to articulate a specific visual “grammar” and “syntax” with respect to scenes of deities and numinous beings, any speculation as to the nature/functions of those supranatural entities, their specific names, and rituals associated with them is greatly hindered by the almost total lack of texts that yield any insight into those issues.<sup>2</sup> Unlike the situation in the preceding Assyrian and Babylonian periods in the Tigris and Euphrates river systems, there exist for the Achaemenid period in Iran no omens, incantations, ritual texts, literary texts, *kuduru* monuments, etc. that could be applied as frames of reference for the images. We are unable to articulate with any degree of resolution how the early Persians differentiated between individual deities and between deities and numinous beings. As the data exist currently, it is not possible to move from iconography to religious semantics with any high degree of certainty.

Nevertheless, we are able to draw some inferences about distinct manners in which the inhabitants of Southwestern Iran in the 6th and early 5th cent. marked the divine and/or numinous. Clearly there were signifiers that distinguished between the supernatural and real worlds. So, too, we may be able to infer some general characteristics of a potentially specific Elamo-Persian response to the representation of the numinous. The resolution of these inferences will, of course, be rather low in comparison to other times and places of ancient Western Asia.

While the historical background of the early Achaemenid period in Iran in its broadest sense may be pieced together, the details are often lost to us. The written sources for the period before Darius are rare, and none of them may be described as yielding great insight into matters historical. The situation is even worse with regard to the written sources for religious belief and ritual. The visual record is only somewhat better, owing to the important relief sculptures from Pasargadae for the reign of Cyrus II. The visual and written records in Iran then become very rich for the period of Darius I.

### 1.2. Temporal and geographic parameters

This essay is concerned principally with the area of Western and Southwestern Iran (**figs. 1–2**) from the time of Cyrus II (c. 559–530) to the end of the reign of Darius I (c. 522–486). This particular period represents the most critical, formative period for what we today designate as the Achaemenid Persian empire. It is during this time, but especially in the reign of Darius I, that most of the visual and courtly protocols were established and canonized.

The concept of “Achaemenid Persia” designates multiple phenomena, and can mean different things to different researchers. Chronologically, the end date of the period is fixed by the death of the last king, Darius III, in 331. There is no general agreement on where we put the beginning of “Achaemenid” Persia. Traditional starting points for the political concept of the empire include the (hypothetical) beginning of the reign of Cyrus the Great (generally identified as Cyrus II) c. 559, or the beginning of the reign of Darius the Great (Darius I) c. 522.<sup>3</sup> This discussion turns on numerous issues, chief of which is the validity of Darius’ genealogy given in the famous texts of his rock-cut inscriptions at Behistun.<sup>4</sup> The bulk of scholarly opinion today sees Darius’ account at Behistun as an attempt by an interloper and regicide to legitimate his usurpation of the throne.

The issue of the validity of Darius' genealogy at Behistun is in fact one aspect of a set of broader questions concerning the date(s) of the arrival of the first Iranian-speaking peoples into Western and Southwestern Iran; the contacts that these early Iranians had with the older, politically more powerful, and centralized cultures of Elam (both the lowlands of Elam, centered on the Susiana, and the highlands, centered on Anshan), Assyria, and Babylonia; and the nature of the political and social structures of these early Iranians.<sup>5</sup> Again, there is no consensus on any of these questions.

There are three main sources of data about the Persians pre-Darius I: the Greek and Roman authors; texts, generally royal, from Assyria and Elam; and the archaeological record. The classical sources are of almost no use for the pre-Cyrus II period (see also the comments on pp. 4–5 concerning the Classical sources for the period after Cyrus II). The Assyrian texts appear to reference the Persians with a group of toponyms, *Parsua*, *Parsuash*, or *Parsumash*. The earliest reference (to *Parsua*) is found in the annuals of Shalmanesar III (858–824).<sup>6</sup> The archaeological record is uneven and difficult to interpret. The most critical loci are: the site of Anshan (modern Malyan); some seals and other material culture from Susa; scattered and isolated burials and material culture in Southwestern Iran, the most spectacular of which is the burial at Arjan; survey data, especially from the Marv Dasht plain in Fars and the Ram Hormuz plain in southeastern Khuzistan; and a few heirloom seals preserved in the Persepolis Fortification archive (dated to the years 509–493) in the reign of Darius I.<sup>7</sup>

Based on analyses of these data and linguistic “archaeology,” the arrival of the first Iranian-speaking peoples into Western and/or Southwestern Iran has been put as early as the middle of the 2nd mill. (SUMNER 1994) and as late as c. 1000, with most commentators identifying the Western Central Zagros regions of Iran as the first place where the earliest Iranian-speaking peoples settled (MIROSCHEDJI 1985; STRONACH 2003: 249–251). This question is critical in the present context because the date at which one places the early Iranians determines the evidence which one may use when discussing the issue of the representation of the divine and the numinous at the very earliest phases of Iranian culture. Some recent opinions, including my own, have stressed the need to push back the conceptual foundations of “Persian” art into the 7th cent well before the time of Cyrus II.<sup>8</sup>

Geographically, the Achaemenid empire was vast, stretching from Greece to the Indus river valley. Culturally, this space encompassed myriad peoples and beliefs. The “archaeology” of the empire proper is a work that has yet to be written; indeed, given the scale of the phenomenon, this undertaking is a daunting proposition.<sup>9</sup> As mentioned, I confine myself in this study to Iran, especially Southwestern Iran (and mainly the provinces of Khuzistan and Fars; **fig. 2**), in hopes of eliciting the particular and distinctive Persian response to the visual depiction of the divine and numinous at its formative period.

### 1.3. The problem of the written sources

The lack of a “Persian Herodotus” has been bemoaned by historians of both ancient Greece and Persia. The problem is twofold; first, the lack of any linear, narrative Persian account of Persian political and cultural history (Behistun being a notable exception for political events in one year of the reign of Darius I); second, as compensation for the lack of a narrative history from Persia, the desire to employ the most famous account of Persian history and customs, that of the 5th cent. Greek Herodotus, despite the obvious problems of trying to do so. Section 1.3.1. will briefly

address the role of Herodotus within the context of the study of the depiction of the divine and numinous in ancient Persia.

Although we do not have a Persian Herodotus, the Achaemenid Persian kings did leave a substantial corpus of royal texts, carved onto the rock faces at Behistun and Naqsh-e Rostam, on buildings at Pasargadae, Persepolis and Susa, on foundation documents at Persepolis and Susa, and on monumental free-standing sculpture and stelae at Susa and in Egypt.<sup>10</sup> These texts, written in Babylonian, Elamite, and/or Old Persian (and Egyptian for those monuments from or originally from Egypt), have figured prominently in the discussion of the religion of the Achaemenid Persians. From the time of the first translations of these inscriptions, one item has dominated the discourse: Darius' repeated invocation of the god Auramazda. Aura Mazda is the primary god of a religion still actively practiced today, Zoroastrianism. There has been an almost obsessive desire to identify in the Achaemenid texts Zoroastrian beliefs/concepts. Even more so than the use of Herodotus, the use of the later Zoroastrian sources (principally the Avestan texts) to reconstruct Persian religion is fraught with difficulties. Section 1.3.2. will briefly address the role of Zoroastrianism within the context of the study of the depiction of the divine and numinous in ancient Persia.

### 1.3.1. Herodotus

The shadow of the Greek historian Herodotus looms large in Achaemenid studies, and this is especially true with regard to the depiction of deities. Reasons for the critical role that Herodotus has traditionally played in Achaemenid studies are varied, but lack of any similar source material indigenous to Persia and the iconic status of Herodotus as the “father of history” surely account for a great deal of this situation. Despite the hard work that has been done in articulating the biases of the classical sources as a whole, even today the sheer weight of their presence often trumps the archaeological and textual record from Persia itself.<sup>11</sup> The mining of Herodotus is still one of the first steps in most examinations of ancient Persian culture.

For the critical, formative periods leading up to the reign of Darius, Herodotus and the classical sources in general are of little use. Nonetheless, Herodotus's excursus on Persian customs in *Historiae* I.131–140 has traditionally been the starting point for any discussion concerned with the depiction of (or, rather, lack of depiction of) deities in ancient Persia. In particular, section I.131 has played a critical role.<sup>12</sup>

I know that the Persian have these customs (*nomoi*). It is not their custom to erect statues (*agalmata*), temples, and altars, but they even make fun of those who do, because — as it seems to me — they have not considered the gods to be of human form, as do the Greeks. But it is their custom to go up to the highest summits of the mountains and sacrifice to Zeus, calling the entire vault of heaven Zeus. And they sacrifice to the sun and the moon and the earth and fire and water and the winds. Only to these, now, they have sacrificed from the beginning, but they have learnt, from the Assyrians and the Arabians, to sacrifice also to Ouranie; the Assyrians call Aphrodite Mylitta, the Arabians Alilat, and the Persians Mitra. (*Historiae* I.131.1–3)

The passage is ambiguous on several levels, as it involves a confusing array of what Herodotus takes to be “accepted practice” (based on personal knowledge), and Herodotus's own attempts to understand what this practice means within the framework of his own Greek cultural identity (i.e., to explain Persian behavior in terms Greeks would understand) merged with comments on some aspects of what he took to be the Persian pantheon.<sup>13</sup> Making the Persian deity Mithra female and associating the deity with Aphrodite are perhaps two of the most famous blunders in

the whole of Herodotus's work. It is one example of the problems inherit in the Herodotean method of understanding foreign customs within a Greek context. The marvel is not that Herodotus was so wrong, but that modern scholars can ignore and/or argue away this and other problems so as to salvage the work as some type of portal into ancient Persian belief and customs.<sup>14</sup>

### 1.3.2. Zoroastrianism

The earliest datable royal text of Darius I is carved on a sheer rock-face at Behistun overlooking the ancient road, the Khorasan Road, that connected the Tigris and Euphrates river systems with Central Asia. The texts and the accompanying relief have been intensively studied, and will be the focus of further analysis below (pp. 16–17 and 19–21). For the purposes of the discussion of Zoroastrianism, I give a few sample quotations from the Old Persian version of the main text at Behistun:

DB 4, 2–31, par. 52. Saith Darius the King: This is what I did by the favor of Ahuramazda in one and the same year after that I became king. XIX battles I fought; by the favor of Ahuramazda I smote them and took prisoner IX kings. One was Gaumata by name, a Magian; he lied; thus he said: "I am Smerdis, the son of Cyrus": he made Persia rebellious...

DB 4, 33–36, par. 54. ... The Lie made them rebellious, so that these (men) deceived the people. Afterward Ahuramazda put them into my hand; as was my desire, so I did unto them...

DB 4, 43–45, par. 57. Saith Darius the King: I turn myself quickly to Ahuramazda, that this (is) true, not false, (which) I did in one and the same year.<sup>15</sup>

Two features in the royal inscriptions at Behistun and Naqsh-e Rostam—the repeated invocation and importance of the god Auramazda (true also of the royal inscriptions at Persepolis), and the dichotomy that Darius established between the "truth" and the "lie"—have formed the major basis for identifying Zoroastrian precepts, and thus Zoroastrianism at the time of Darius I.<sup>16</sup> It is not my intent to cover this ground again, nor to attempt even a summary treatment of the topic of ancient Persian religion. My emphasis here is on what I see as obstacles toward better understanding of the study of ancient Persian religion, namely the assumptions that:

- 1) some of the Persians at the time of Darius believed in a religion that was based on the precepts and teachings of the prophet Zarathustra; and
- 2) assuming 1), the key to understanding the Achaemenid texts and visual imagery is through the Zoroastrian writings, in particular the *Avesta*.

Aura Mazda is the Avestan name of the primary god of Zoroastrianism.<sup>17</sup> The name is a compound, *aura*, god/lord, and *mazda*, wise. While Zoroastrianism was the state religion in the Sasanian period (3rd–7th cent.), the primary texts dealing with the religion are in fact much later in date. The *Avesta* refers to a collection of texts written in a distinctive language (Avestan, part of the Iranian subdivision of the Indo-Iranian branch of Indo-European) to record Zoroastrian scripture, i.e., its holy book.<sup>18</sup> According to tradition, which seems ill founded, the *Avesta* was destroyed/dispersed with the conquest of Alexander the Great. Under the Arsacids and then the Sasanian kings, attempts were made to reassemble the texts as well as the oral tradition concerning the religion. Scholarly opinion seems to agree on the existence of a Sasanian *Avesta*, but the existence of pre-Sasanian versions is highly problematic; modern scholarly discussion of the date of the original compositions are now legend. Whatever its origins, the *Avesta* as it survives today is only a fragment of a much larger whole, with the oldest surviving manuscript

dating back only to 1288 CE. Thus the extant *Avesta* can in no way be read as a unified work. Many passages are obscure and impenetrable as preserved. Scholars today generally identify two layers in the *Avesta*: the Old Avestan texts, which are written in a more ancient dialect of Avestan and consist of the so-called *Gathas* (*Yasna* 28–34, 43–51 and 53),<sup>19</sup> the *Yasna Haptanhaiti* (*Yasna* 35–41), and *Yasna* 27;<sup>20</sup> and the Young Avestan texts, which consist of the remaining *Yasna*, the *Visprad*, “(prayer to) all the patrons,” an appendix to the *Yasna* with invocations and appeals to the “*ratu*” (patrons), the *Khorda Avesta*, “little *Avesta*,” everyday prayers cited by the faithful, the *Siroza*, “thirty days,” a list of the deities who patronize the thirty days of the month, the *Yashts*, twenty-one hymns to individual deities (*yazata*), the *Videvdad*, “law of breaking off with the demons,” and some twenty-two odd fragments of texts. Another group of texts, composed in the 9th cent. CE and later in Middle Iranian, also known as Pahlavi, are often brought into this discussion. They include, among many, the *Bundahishn*, a treatise on the origin of the world; the *Denkard*, which includes a summary of lost Avestan texts and legends about Zarathustra; the *Zadspram*, a collection of cosmogonic, legendary, and apocalyptic material; and the *Ardai Viraz*, a story of a journey to heaven and to hell.

In the *Avesta* the god *Aura Mazda* is “the mightiest Ahura and the Wise one” (*Yasna* 33.11); he can be named as both *Aura Mazda* and *Mazda Aura* (KUIPER 1985: 684). For Zarathustra, *Aura Mazda* became the “Creator of all” (*Yasna* 44.7), “the one uncreated God, existing eternally, ... including all other beneficent divinities” (BOYCE 2001: 19f). There has been a very strong desire to identify the *Auramazda* mentioned in the Achaemenid royal texts with *Aura Mazda* the main god of later Zoroastrian belief.<sup>21</sup> By extension, the Achaemenid Persians themselves (or at least the ruling elite) are then seen as the earliest documented Zoroastrians. This research question, aptly articulated by BRIANT as the “pseudo-question du ‘zoroastrisme des Achéménides’” (1997: 71), has consumed tremendous scholarly energy. Its two most conspicuous features are elaborate argumentation to discount the mass of Achaemenid archaeological, textual, and visual data that clearly are un-Zoroastrian in nature, and the use of the *Avesta* and other Zoroastrian texts to reconstruct religion and religious imagery in Southwestern Iran at the time of the Achaemenid Persians. The use of the *Avesta* and other Zoroastrian texts is especially fraught with difficulties. From a historical perspective the gap in time (and cultural context) between the Achaemenid period and the later *Avesta* and other Zoroastrian texts is just too great, in my opinion, to admit those texts in any interpretive enterprise of Achaemenid texts and imagery. However, this opinion very much represents a minority perspective.

The Achaemenid royal texts themselves and other evidence from the period (discussed on pp. 15–52) show clearly that myriad religious options existed in Southwestern Iran in the early Achaemenid period, most of them deeply rooted in Elamite and Assyro-Babylonian traditions. One option was also, for lack of a better term, what we may call “Mazdaism,” i.e., worship of a pan-Iranian (but not a specific Zoroastrian) deity, *Auramazda*.<sup>22</sup> Our working assumption, then, is that one is apt to meet various religious traditions in the Achaemenid material in Southwestern Iran. In attempting to understand the grammar and syntax of imagery related to the divine and numinous, in most cases it is not possible, or indeed necessary, to articulate that imagery within a narrowly defined religious dogma. We may still discuss this imagery, its constituent parts and syntax, and relate it to material better known in other contexts, but in the end, our sources simply do not allow precision as to the (deity-)specific religious context(s) of the imagery.

## 2. Background: the Depiction of the divine and numinous in Iran c. 1000–559

In this section I shall very briefly survey some of the evidence for the representation of the numinous and divine in Iran in the period c. 1000–559. It is beyond the scope of this study to provide anything nearing a comprehensive account of this subject. Nevertheless, it is important to understand something of the nature of the visual contexts that the early Persians would have encountered; for that reason, certain evidence will be highlighted in the following discussion. The reader should also be aware that the early Persians would have been tied into a universe of visual imagery much greater than that delimited by the artificial political boundaries of modern Iran. Indeed, glyptic evidence from the Fortification archive at Persepolis from the time of Darius I (discussed in detail on pp. 29–52) indicates an exceptionally strong connection with the visual traditions, both stylistic and iconographic, of imperial Assyria. Any analysis of the numinous and divine in the early Achaemenid period will need to consider the Assyrian evidence in some detail.

In the period leading up to the time of Cyrus II (c. 559–530), the evidence for visual depictions of the divine and numinous in Iran is uneven and confined almost exclusively to Western Iran. Sites that have been the focus of intensive scientific archaeological excavation include Hasanlu Tepe in Azerbaijan in far Northwestern Iran; Godin Tepe, Tepe Nush-i Jan, Ziwiyeh, and Jameh Shuran in the West Central Zagros (Khurdistan); Baba Jan in Luristan; Marlik and Tepe Ozbaki in North Central Iran; Susa, Tepe Sialk, and Tepe Giyan in Central Khuzistan; and Anshan in Fars. Surveys and limited excavations have been conducted in the Marv Dasht plain in Fars, the Ram Hormuz plain in Eastern Khuzistan, the Susiana lowlands in Central Khuzistan, and the Deh Luran plain and Kumishgan and Saimarreh river valleys in Luristan.<sup>23</sup> The so-called “Luristan” bronzes, the authentic ones at least, belong somewhere in the central Western Zagros (see also p. 10). While at first blush this appears to be an impressive list of sites and regions, in fact the great bulk of the material from these excavations and surveys consists of pottery and faunal material. Of the sites, Hasanlu alone may be said to have yielded a large corpus of visual imagery; indeed, Hasanlu level IV represents the largest collection of artifacts and architecture from any one place in Western Iran in the early 1st mill. The material from Susa, the lowland capital of Elam, is surprisingly meager, and the highlands of Elam, Anshan, whence the Teispid predecessors of Cyrus II, and Fars proper remain poorly documented.<sup>24</sup> There are a number of seals that have been found in the Luristan excavations and surveys from the 1930s, but many of them, I suspect, in fact date to the Achaemenid period.<sup>25</sup> A small but important corpus of seals clearly of pre-Achaemenid date is preserved in the Fortification archive (dated to the time of Darius I) at Persepolis (GARRISON in press [a]). Several of these bear directly on the issue of divine iconography. The almost total lack of any data from Ekbatana (modern Hamadan), the capital of the most influential political power in Western Iran in the pre-Achaemenid Period, the Medes, is a huge problem. Indeed, one still cannot identify with confidence any artifact as “Median.”<sup>26</sup>

### 2.1. Hasanlu

The visual imagery from Hasanlu shows strong connections to Assyria and North Syria.<sup>27</sup> Two corpora of material, glyptic and ivories, account for most of the visual imagery from the site. The 105 seals/sealings have been studied in an exemplary fashion by MARCUS (1996). They were found mainly in level IVB, which is dated c. 1100–800; however, the terminal date of the phase

remains open to dispute.<sup>28</sup> As was typical in the Assyro-Babylonian tradition, the numinous is generally marked by winged creatures: e.g., winged, bird-headed creatures (seals nos. 6, local style; 58, Neo-Assyrian style; 69, Provincial Assyrian Style), winged lions (seals nos. 18, 21–22, all local style; 57, 59, 61, all Neo-Assyrian style); winged bulls (seals nos. 68, 70, 72, all provincial Assyrian style); winged horses (seal no. 74, provincial Assyrian style); and winged, human-headed (?) bulls (seal no. 67, provincial Assyrian style). Two seals are strikingly tied to the Assyrian tradition: seal no. 62 (**fig. 3**) showing a kneeling, winged genie on either side of a stylized tree above which is a winged ring; and seal no. 81 (**fig. 4**), of Middle Assyrian inspiration, showing a winged, bird-footed genie on either side of a tree above which is a winged ring.<sup>29</sup>

The addition of wings is also the main marker of the numinous in the ivories from Hasanlu (MUSCARELLA 1980). Winged lions (nos. 163–168, 185) and bulls (nos. 214–220) are again common, as well as winged, human-headed lions (nos. 185, 226, 228, 284). An exceptional Assyrian ivory shows a winged genie holding a kid and a bouquet of flowers (no. 281).

Two other artifacts from Hasanlu deserve mention. The first is a decorated horse breastplate showing a heroic figure controlling two bulls (WINTER 1980). I mention this piece to raise the difficult question concerning the identification of the “heroic figure,” i.e., a (generally) male figure, sometimes winged, who reaches out to either side to grasp (and so control) an animal/creature, or who pursues/confronts an animal/creature, often with a weapon.<sup>30</sup> The heroic encounter scene is ubiquitous in the visual arts of the 1st mill. and has a very ancient pedigree in the visual imagery of ancient Western Asia. We must seriously consider the possibility that in some contexts the heroic figure may have numinous and/or divine qualities. The second artifact is the famous gold bowl from Hasanlu.<sup>31</sup> Some components of the imagery on this much-discussed artifact have long been thought to show connections to Hurrian myth; if this is indeed the case, perhaps the imagery is somewhat tangential to the topic at hand. The date of the artifact is also uncertain.<sup>32</sup> The figure in the chariot pulled by a bull, the combatants, and fantastical creatures find no ready parallels in Iran in later periods. Within the context of this discussion, the gold bowl represents first and foremost an example of how the discovery of one artifact may potentially modify in a substantial manner our understanding of the depiction of the divine and the numinous.

## 2.2. Marlik

Although stylistically distinct from the material at Hasanlu, the famous metal vessels from the stone tombs at Marlik in North Central Iran just south of the Caspian sea show many of the same conventions for rendering the numinous as we have seen at Hasanlu.<sup>33</sup> The tombs and their contents cannot be dated with any great precision; in general, the material appears to range in date from the late 2nd mill. down to c. 700. Iconographic influences are wide ranging, but, as at Hasanlu, Assyrian influence is pronounced. In this corpus of visual imagery winged creatures are again the most common indicator of the supra-natural (bulls, bird-headed lions, human-headed lions, etc.).<sup>34</sup> Heroic encounter scenes occur on several vases; one shows a rather spectacular four-winged figure with frontal face (NEGAHBAN 1996: no. 15); another, clearly Middle Assyrian in inspiration, shows a double-headed lion demon as a hero (NEGAHBAN 1996: no. 21).



### 2.3. Elam

Elam is a term that we have borrowed from Sumerian scribes to identify what is today the modern provinces of Khuzistan and Fars.<sup>35</sup> This area contains multiple distinct ecological zones; the two most critical ones for this survey are the lowlands of the Susiana in Western Khuzistan and the highlands in Eastern Khuzistan and Fars. The traditional (but by no means only) ceremonial and political center of the lowlands was Susa; that of the highlands, Anshan. The Susiana, by environment and topography, naturally looked westward to Sumer and Akkad. We are less well informed about the highlands. Kings in the lowlands have left copious documentation of royal tutelary. That tutelary, which starts from the time of the Shimashki kings (21st cent.), often included “king (*lugal*) of Anshan and Susa.”<sup>36</sup> The exact nature of and, indeed, even the existence of a bipolar Elamite “culture” based on the lowland–highland dichotomy has often been discussed.

Elam, especially the highlands, played a critical role in the formation of Persia. As LIVERANI (2003: 10) has recently noted, “Persia is the heir of Elam, not of Media.” In their seminal studies BRIANT (1984) and MIROSCHEDJI (1985) articulated this process of acculturation (Iranians and Elamites) as the “*éthnogenèse des Perses*.”<sup>37</sup> If Iranian-speaking peoples were in the highlands since some time in the late 2nd mill., this process would have been ongoing for hundreds of years.<sup>38</sup> Our first glimpse of the political expression of this process is the appearance of the Teispid line of kings of Anshan: Teispes, Kurash (i.e., Cyrus I), Cambyses (I), and Kurash (Cyrus II).<sup>39</sup>

We know little of the material culture of the Teispid rulers of Anshan; of the material record at Susa we are somewhat better informed. In Elam as a whole, the period under review equates roughly with what today is called the Neo–Elamite period.<sup>40</sup> In the 8th and 7th cent. the Elamites, mainly of the lowlands, figure prominently in Assyrian records; from the Assyrian perspective the period appears to have been one of intense conflict. The conflict climaxed, again from the Assyrian perspective, in the sack of Susa, c. 646, described so vividly in Assyrian accounts.<sup>41</sup>

The visual record from Elam of the Neo–Elamite period is very poor and fragmentarily preserved. The material from Susa constitutes the largest corpus, but it is particularly uninformative for the subject of divine iconography, and it comes from disturbed contexts. This is true even of the Neo–Elamite glyptic assemblage from Susa (AMIET 1972: nos. 2121–2201). I have opted to discuss three of the most critical sources, the seals preserved on two corpora of administrative tablets from Susa (the Acropole and Apadana tablets) and the material from the tomb at Arjan near Behbahan in Eastern Khuzistan, in the following section (see pp. 13–15).

It is thus difficult to say anything substantive about depictions of the divine and numinous in Elam in the period c. 1000–559. Given the critical role of the Elamites in the highlands in the formation of ancient Persia, it would be especially important to have some insight into its religious imagery. I have recently suggested that a few heirloom seals preserved in the Fortification archive at Persepolis may have originated in the highlands of the second half of the 7th cent. (GARRISON in press [a]). Of these, one seal in particular, PFS 1308\* (**fig. 5**), provides a rare glimpse of divine iconography for this time and place. A seated figure, probably female, faces right (nothing of the chair/stool is preserved). She holds a mace in her left hand. She wears an elaborate polos headdress with a serrated upper edge, a horn projecting from the front brim, and a rectangular-shaped extension with horizontal striations from the back. An elongated, teardrop-shaped coiffure emerges from the back of the neck below the headdress. She appears to wear a long garment (no detailing is preserved). She sits inside a rectangular canopy/structure.

The edges of the structure are decorated with an alternating pattern of striations and circles. In front of the seated figure is a standing figure, probably female, who faces left and raises both arms, palms cupped upward, in front of her chest. A rounded cap (or coiffure?) rests on her head; a long plait or ribbon dangles from the back of the cap. She wears a long, double-belted garment. In the terminal field there is a paneled Elamite inscription in five (preserved) lines.<sup>42</sup>

The horned headdress of the seated figure, the elaborate framework in which the figure sits, and the figure standing at right with upraised arms would seem to identify the scene as that of a worshipper before a seated deity (or a statue of a seated deity). A somewhat similar type of scene is very popular in Assyro-Babylonian glyptic, and certain stylistic qualities of the carving have connections with Babylonian glyptic.<sup>43</sup> In the Assyro-Babylonian examples the seated female deity often holds a ring and sits in an elaborate, high-backed chair. Several other features distinguish the scene in PFS 1308\* (**fig. 5**) from Assyro-Babylonian glyptic: the unmediated confrontation of deity and worshipper; the depiction of both of the arms of the worshipper raised with hands cupped upward; the lack of filler motifs (stars, crescents, *sibitti*, etc.); the exact form of the framework in which the deity sits; the conventions for rendering the cap and head of the standing figure and the facial details of both figures; and, finally, the paneled Elamite inscription. These features may signal specific highland Elamite responses to the depiction of the divine. Nevertheless, one is struck by the vocabulary (e.g., seated goddess), syntax (worshipper before seated deity), and iconography (horned headdress) that PFS 1308\* (**fig. 5**) shares with depictions of the divine in Assyria. Noteworthy also is the emphatic anthropomorphism in the depiction of the divine and the fact that the deity is female.

#### 2.4. Other corpora

I note, but shall not discuss, two remarkable corpora of metal artifacts, the so-called “Treasure of Ziwiye” and the “Luristan bronzes.”<sup>44</sup> Illegal excavation, museum and dealer duplicity, and modern forgeries seriously compromise this material as meaningful sources of discussion for the topic under consideration. Given the difficulty of distinguishing real from forgery in both of these data sets, one must conclude with MUSCARELLA (1995: 996) that, despite the extraordinary quality of many of the individual artifacts, we can gather no “*cultural* information” from them.

### 3. The Depiction of the divine and numinous in Iran c. 559–521

As we move into the period of the reigns of Cyrus II and Cambyses II, the evidence for the depiction of deities in Iran is still very limited. The reliefs from Pasargadae, the imperial capital of Cyrus II, clearly stand as the most critical documentation. There are also substantial numbers of sealed administrative tablets from this period. These tablets come from various contexts. The largest number (and there are many that are still unpublished) are from temple archives in Babylonia, and thus outside of Iran proper.<sup>45</sup> Understandably, the glyptic imagery in these archives from Babylonia is overwhelmingly Babylonian in its style and iconography. Of interest are the large number of devotional scenes, the so-called “Babylonian worship” or “late Babylonian worship” scene, where a worshipper with upraised arm(s) stands before a stand/pedestal (often with the spade of Marduk and/or the stylus of Nabu, an animal, creature, or some other religiously-charged item depicted on it) or before an animal/creature.<sup>46</sup> Although Neo-Babylonian in origin, it has long been recognized that this type of scene, executed generally in an abstracted cut and drilled style or in a fleshy modeled style, extended down well into the 5th

cent. in both Babylonia and Persia.<sup>47</sup> Finally, I have included in this period two small but important corpora of sealed tablets from Susa, the so-called Acropole tablets and Apadana tablets, and the tomb at Arjan near Behbahan in eastern Khuzistan.<sup>48</sup>

### 3.1. Pasargadae (fig. 6)

Although fragmentarily preserved, the reliefs of Cyrus II's (c. 559–530) imperial residence at Pasargadae offer critical evidence for the depiction of the numinous at the very highest levels of court patronage and, potentially, for insight into the imperial religious ideology of Cyrus II. In particular, the reliefs from the so-called Gate R (figs. 7–8) and Palace S figure prominently for this discussion.

The relief of the four-winged figure from Gate R (fig. 8) is well known and has been discussed often, thus I give here only the most general introduction to its architectural context and iconographic detail.<sup>49</sup> The building stands at what appears to have been the eastern limit of the formal palace precinct. It is a rectangular, freestanding structure, with two rows of four columns in the interior and a doorway centered in the middle of each wall. Overall, the structure is rigidly symmetrical in its plan; STRONACH (1978: 47, figs. 22 and 24) restores a recessed mudbrick façade on all four walls. With its soaring roof, perhaps as high as sixteen meters, the structure would have had a commanding physical presence. The doorway on each of the short walls pierces a thick wall; the threshold and flanking socles are in black stone, the large projecting doorsills in white stone. HERZFELD suggested long ago that these two doorways were lined with colossal winged bulls (on the southeastern door) and winged human-headed bulls (on the northwestern door) facing outwards, although this reconstruction has never been definitely confirmed.<sup>50</sup> The doorway on each of the long walls pierces a much thinner wall; the threshold and flanking socles are in white stone and there are no projecting doorsills. The eastern doorjamb of the northeastern door is still in situ and preserves the famous four-winged figure. The figure moves into the structure. It is assumed that similar figures stood in the other three doorjamb in the long walls. Above the four-winged figure, but no longer preserved, was a copy of the trilingual inscription CMa (aka DMA): “I am Cyrus the King, an Achaemenid.”<sup>51</sup> The vexing problem of the date of all of the inscriptions that mention Cyrus at Pasargadae remains open, although the bulk of scholarly opinion now favors attributing all of these inscriptions to the reign of Darius I.<sup>52</sup> The relief of Gate R would seem, however, to date to the time of Cyrus II.

There has been no end to speculation on the identification of the four-winged figure in Gate R.<sup>53</sup> The figure has even been identified as Cyrus himself; some have invoked a passage in Herodotus (*Historiae* I.209) involving a dream of Cyrus where he saw Darius with a pair of wings on his shoulders. The relief, despite its varied iconography (e.g., Egyptianizing headdress, Elamite (?) garment, etc.) and peculiarities of style (e.g., Syrianizing/Assyrianizing wings), is firmly rooted in Assyrian traditions, as, indeed, is the whole of the surviving visual program of Gate R, if HERZFELD's suggestions concerning the bull colossi on the main doorways is correct.<sup>54</sup> STRONACH (1978: 51f; 1997: 42f), following HERZFELD, has argued that the four-winged figure in Gate R is apotropaic, based ultimately on the late 8th cent. winged genius from Sargon II's palace at Khorsabad.<sup>56</sup> In combination with what must have been the strongly Assyrianizing bull colossi lining the doorways of the short walls (see STRONACH 1978: 51, “carved... in almost the same style” as the Assyrian examples), the four-winged figures would have then reinforced the conception of “supernatural protection” both within the structure itself and beyond to the site of Pasargadae as a whole.

Two observations, however, give pause to this interpretation: the movement of the four-winged figure into the structure, rather than facing outward (as noted by ROOT 1979: 301); and the position of the right arm and the hand gesture of the winged figure. The movement inward would seem to mitigate against any reading of the figure as apotropaic (based, at least, on Assyrian conventions). The position of the arm and the gesture are paralleled somewhat by those of Darius I in his relief at Behistun, and seem very close, if not exactly similar, to the gestures of Darius I and the figure in the winged ring at Naqsh-e Rostam (see the discussion on pp. 25–27); in both reliefs Darius appears before some type of numinous presence. As ROOT (1979: 174–176) has remarked, this gesture in Assyrian art conveys the concepts of greeting or blessing. The gesture and similar ones also appear in the seals used in the Fortification archive (discussed on pp. 29–36). Like the relief at Naqsh-e Rostam, the figure who makes this gesture (and related gestures) almost always stands before some type of numinous presence. This particular combination of a figure, hands upraised in a specific gesture, standing before/approaching an animal/creature or deity recurs in the art of the early Achaemenid period (see also p. 46).

Perhaps the visual dynamics involving the winged figure in Gate R may have been similar to that seen in the main scene on Darius' tomb at Naqsh-e Rostam; i.e., a static encounter/engagement between a standing figure and a numinous/divine figure. In Gate R, we could postulate two four-winged figures in the northeastern doorway being confronted by two standing figures in the (no-longer preserved) southwestern doorway. Following the suggestion that we have here some type of scene of encounter/engagement between a human and a numinous entity, one would expect the now-missing figures on the southwestern doorway of Gate R to have been human, perhaps even the figure of Cyrus himself.

These observations suggest that the visual dynamic in Gate R may have been specifically construed toward concrete concepts of imperial power as well as broader concepts of protection; i.e., the bull colossi project concepts of royal power outward, while the four-winged figures (and whatever stood in the southwestern doorway) focused inwardly, to a nexus of potentially numinous interaction centered, perhaps, on the figure of Cyrus himself. This dynamic of literal movement inward and outward would then seem to presage abstract concepts of kingship that figure so prominently in the art of Darius I.<sup>57</sup>

The reliefs of Palace S (**figs. 9–11**) may be treated more briefly. The plan of Palace S is, essentially, an expanded version of Gate R, with towers added at the corners and porticos at the facades (STRONACH 1978: 56–77). As in Gate R, reliefs were presumably found in the four doorways to the main hall, although nothing is preserved in the northeastern doorway above the level of the dado course (STRONACH 1978: pl. 61b). All the reliefs are in a very fragmentary state of preservation. For the purposes of our discussion, only the northwestern and southeastern doorjambs are relevant.<sup>58</sup>

On the jambs of the northwestern doorway, which pierces the northwestern short wall and, presumably, marked the main entry axis of the structure, were preserved the bare lower legs and feet of a human figure followed by the lower legs and bird-taloned feet of some creature (**fig. 10**), both moving out from the structure (STRONACH 1978: fig. 34). The end of an elaborate fringed belt tie is preserved hanging between the legs of the creature on the left-hand doorjamb (**fig. 10**). On the jambs of the southeast doorway (i.e., the doorway opposite the northwestern doorway, and thus still on the main axis of the structure) were preserved the lower legs and feet of a human figure wearing a short skirt and full-length fish-skin cloak followed by the lower hindlegs, hoofs, and tail of a rampant bull (creature?) (**fig. 11**), both moving out from the

structure (STRONACH 1978: fig. 35). Directly in front of the rampant bull is a staff, presumably held by the bull.

These reliefs in Palace S, as in those in Gate R, have strong Assyrian overtones. The combination of the human figure followed by the bird-taloned creature is vividly documented in the late Assyrian repertoire, especially at Sennacherib's palace at Nineveh, where the smiting god is followed by a lion demon (STRONACH 1997: 44). The group seems apotropaic in nature. While the pairing of the fish-garbed man and bull-man is unknown in the Assyrian repertoire, the fish-garbed man is found with other protective figures in Sennacherib's palace at Nineveh, while the bull-man occurs in various apotropaic contexts.<sup>59</sup> STRONACH (1997: 44f) has remarked that wherever the fish-garbed man appears charged with an apotropaic function, it "necessarily has to be thought of as a supernatural protective being (as opposed to a mere human agent, garbed for ritual purposes)."

The vocabulary of numinous power in these images from Pasargadae, both those from Gate R and Palace S, relies heavily on reference to the animal world (birds, bulls, lions, and fish); the four-winged figure in Gate R was certainly winged, as probably also were many other figures which are now no longer preserved or only partially preserved in other buildings. This numinous vocabulary, while overwhelmingly Assyrian in inspiration, clearly references elements from other cultures as well.<sup>60</sup> The four-winged figure of Gate R has traditionally been explained as a pastiche; here we are particularly hindered in our analysis owing to the almost total lack of evidence for the Teispid dynasty at Anshan.

That the figures in Palace S were intended primarily as apotropaic may be suggested by their movement out of the structure, but the worldly, processional character of the imagery in the southwestern doorway of Palace S may hint at a more complex message. It is interesting to note that the overall program in Palace S appears to have had a chiasmic symmetry similar to that which I have suggested for Gate R.

### 3.2. Susa glyptic corpora

Two small corpora of seals from Susa, preserved on administrative tablets today known as the Acropole tablets and the Apadana tablets, are critical points of reference for visual imagery in Southwestern Iran in the 6th cent.<sup>62</sup> A total of sixteen different seals were used on the Acropole tablets (AMIET 1973: 6–12, pls. 1–4, nos. 1–16); seven different seals were used on the Apadana tablets (AMIET 1973: 12–14, pls. 4–5, nos. 17–23).

Despite the relatively small number of seals preserved in these corpora, the imagery is varied and critical to our discussions of depictions of the numinous (if only because of its very existence). There are no unambiguous depictions of deities in anthropomorphic form, such as we saw in PFS 1308\* (**fig. 5**). There are occurrences of the heroic encounter that clearly have numinous qualities (AMIET 1973: nos. 1 [winged, human-headed bulls], 2 [winged creatures], 3 [winged, human-headed bulls], and 17 [winged hero]), as well as scenes of winged genii flanking a stylized tree (AMIET 1973: nos. 4–5 [**fig. 12**] and 6), composite human-animal atlantid figures (AMIET 1973: no. 7), winged human figures in isolation (AMIET 1973: nos. 8–9 and 10), scenes with winged lions (AMIET 1973: nos. 13 and 23), and an attendant before a winged human figure (AMIET 1973: no. 18). The morphology of the numinous in these seals is remarkably similar to that seen in monumental relief at Pasargadae: winged animals, winged humans, and composite bull-men. Of course, the range of activity documented in these seals is much greater than the processional and (potentially) paired oppositions seen at Pasargadae. In particular I would note

the occurrence of the atlantid figures (AMIET 1973: no. 7, from the Acropole tablets), bull-men, who introduce the theme of “ascension” that will become a critical aspect of the numinous in the reign of Darius I (see pp. 39–42).

Around the seals preserved on the Acropole and Apadana tablets, AMIET collected a group of cylinder seals, mainly unprovenanced, but a few having been excavated at Susa, as part of his “late Neo-Elamite” glyptic corpus. For the most part vocabulary and syntax of the numinous in these seals echoes that seen in the Susa corpora. There are three important exceptions. Unfortunately, these exceptional cylinders are all unprovenanced. Two of the seals show striking divine/numinous imagery and thus have often been discussed and illustrated. The first is AMIET 1973: no. 32 (**fig. 13**), which shows a female figure, wearing a feather-topped, horned, divine headdress and a long, fringed Assyrian garment, stepping on the back of a lion couchant. Arrows are held in the right hand, a bow in the left; over both shoulders the deity has quivers and bow cases tipped with globes. AMIET (1973: 17f) identified the figure as the Assyro-Babylonian “*déesse guerrière*,” Ishtar. The deity and her iconography are well documented in Assyrian glyptic.<sup>63</sup> The second cylinder is AMIET 1973: no. 34 (**fig. 14**), which is the famous cylinder seal carrying an Elamite inscription naming “Hupan-kitin, son of King Shutur-Nahunte.”<sup>64</sup> The scene shows a rampant *mushushu* dragon, an acolyte of Marduk and Nabu, on either side of a highly stylized *marru*-spade of Marduk.<sup>65</sup> While the vocabulary of the scene (*mushushu* dragons, *marru*-spade of Marduk) is clearly Babylonian, the disposition of the elements is unusual for Babylonian glyptic.<sup>66</sup> The *mushushu* dragons are more commonly seen on the typical late Babylonian worship scenes (generally on stamp seals) consisting of a worshipper before a *mushushu* dragon (on a pedestal) on whose back are the *marru*-spade of Marduk and/or the (double) stylus of Nabu.<sup>67</sup> The baroque, modeled style of carving and the royal-name inscription suggest a commissioned piece, which may account for the uniqueness of the scene. Finally, the cylinder seal AMIET 1973: no. 29 shows in the Assyrian tradition a fish-man on either side of a stylized tree; above the tree floats a figure in a winged symbol, while on the backs of the fish-men are human figures holding a pail and reaching out toward the figure in the winged symbol.<sup>68</sup> The syntax of the scene is rigidly Assyrian, as are the aniconic (stylized tree) and composite anthropomorphic/theriomorphic depictions of the divine and numinous (figure in the winged symbol, fish-men).

In summary, while the glyptic evidence preserved on the tablets from Susa seems to draw heavily on aspects of the depiction of the divine in Assyria and Babylonia, we are hard-pressed to identify specific deities. Winged creatures, however, abound.<sup>69</sup> The three unprovenanced cylinders discussed above thus stand out owing to their very specific referencing of traditional Assyro-Babylonian divine iconography. The seals are so strongly Assyrianizing/Babylonianizing that I very much doubt whether they would be discussed in an Elamite context, had they no Elamite inscriptions.<sup>70</sup> If they are truly “Elamite” products, one cannot be completely certain that Ea, Ishtar, and Marduk are the referents in the three seals (i.e., AMIET 1973: nos. 29, 32, and 34 respectively).

### 3.3. Babylonian glyptic corpora

Numerous archives of sealed administrative tablets from Babylonia exist at the time of Cyrus II and Cambyses.<sup>71</sup> Although, *stricto sensu*, beyond the geographic confines of this essay, the importance of the glyptic evidence from Babylonia demands some comment. The two most important archives are the temple archives of Eanna at Uruk and Ebabbar at Sippar.<sup>72</sup> The so-

called late Babylonian worship scene accounts for over 60% of the published material from the Eanna (EHRENBERG 2001: 188). Although standardized to a certain degree, the scene can contain quite a wide assortment of divine imagery (either affixed to pillared pedestals or floating in the field) in various combinations; that imagery includes, e.g., the double lion symbol with star (Ishtar), the *marru*-spade of Marduk, the stylus of Nabu, *mushushu* dragon (acolyte of Marduk and Nabu), star (Ishtar), moon (Sin), dog (Gula, but not exclusively), lightning bolt (Adad), ram-headed staff (Ea), winged disk, rhomb, various Mischwesen (e.g., fish-apkallu, goat-fish, composite winged scorpion-man, etc.), *kudurru*, plant, bird, etc.<sup>73</sup> As EHRENBERG (2001: 190) notes, the “emphatic concentration on the divine” and the “substitution of symbols for anthropomorphic deities” in these late Babylonian worship scenes is fully in keeping with trends in late Babylonian art as a whole. Although in many ways the late Babylonian worship scene may be characterized as the quintessential Babylonian religious image, the scene clearly resonated outside of Babylonia, as witnessed by its popularity in the seals from the Fortification archive at Persepolis in the time of Darius I.<sup>74</sup>

### 3.4. Tomb at Arjan

The tomb at Arjan, discovered in 1982, lies some ten kilometers north of Behbahan, an important city on the Susa–Persepolis nexus in Eastern Khuzistan. The date of the tomb is still under discussion. Suggested dates range from the first half of the 8th cent. (ALIZADEH 1985: 56) down to the second quarter of the 6th cent. (STRONACH 2003: 253f; GARRISON 2006: 78).<sup>75</sup> Many metal objects, ranging from small gold bracteates to the famous bronze bowl (some 43.5 cm in diameter), were found in the tomb (MAJIDZADEH 1990). Two of the objects are inscribed in Elamite: “Kidin–Hutran, son of Kurlush” (VALLAT 1984). One of these inscribed objects is a gold ring, which shows two rampant winged lions posed heraldically.<sup>76</sup> The lower part of a bronze stand from the tomb has three atlantid figures (STRONACH 2003: fig. 23:5). The bronze bowl, containing some “112 human figures, 66 animals of 33 species, diverse trees, and various artifacts” (ALVAREZ–MON 2004: 208), appears to reference directly the divine only through the rosette in the center of the bowl.<sup>77</sup> Thus, as regards the visual imagery from the tomb at Arjan, we seem again to have a situation where the divine/numinous is not represented in anthropomorphic form; the use of winged creatures and atlantids would seem to resonate well with the glyptic evidence from the Acropole and Apadana tablets at Susa.

## 4. The Depiction of the Divine and Numinous in Iran at the Time of Darius I, c. 522–486

### 4.1. Introduction to the evidence

The evidence for the depiction of the numinous is exceptionally rich in the period of Darius I. The reign of Darius I has long been recognized as the time when official, court-sponsored Achaemenid art witnessed a codification of forms in the service of a visual language of empire.<sup>78</sup> The evidence from the seals preserved on the Fortification archive now allows us to see that, at least in the first half of the reign of Darius I, this process involved a great deal of experimentation. This insight adds considerable depth to our understanding of the visual dynamics of the two famous rock-cut reliefs of Darius I, those at Behistun and Naqsh–i Rostam. The material for this period is so rich that the best that one can attempt here is an introduction

that touches on some of the potential for topics under discussion and provides avenues for future research. I shall concentrate on three corpora of data: the rock-cut relief at Behistun, the rock-cut relief on the tomb of Darius I at Naqsh-e Rostam, and the seals preserved as impressions on the Fortification archive and the Treasury archive at Persepolis. Behistun and Naqsh-e Rostam are two of the most critical monuments for the whole of the repertoire of monumental relief for the Achaemenid period. Despite the radically different functions of the reliefs—one a victory monument, the other a funerary monument—the overall structure of the two scenes is remarkably similar. The seals preserved in the Fortification archive and the Treasury archive are not as well known as the two great rock-cut reliefs of Darius I, but they do, as we shall see, contribute in a most substantial manner to the discussion.

There follows first a very brief introduction to each of these data sets. I then discuss the relevant evidence provided by texts that accompany the reliefs and glyptic. Thereafter, I treat the most important divine/numinous iconographical types that range across those data sets: winged symbol in all of its variants, followed by other anthropomorphic, theriomorphic, and aniconic depictions of the divine and numinous.

#### *4.1.1. The victory monument of Darius I at Behistun*

Carved on the sheer cliff face of the mountain of Behistun, some sixty-six meters above the springs on the plain, is one of the most famous monuments of ancient Western Asia, the trilingual texts and relief of Darius I (**figs. 15–16**).<sup>79</sup> The monument looks down over the ancient Khorasan road that links the Tigris and Euphrates alluvial plains with Central Asia. The text and relief have been the focus of intense study since the 19th cent. of our era.<sup>80</sup> It is clear that the trilingual texts and relief were executed over a period of time; some of the changes would seem to represent rather major modifications of the conception of the monument (SCHMITT 1990a: 301 for a summary). The addition of the text DB V and the figure of the last rebel, Skunkha the Scyth, to the relief are the last major changes to the monument. The modifications suggest very strongly that the monument had been completed by c. 519.

The relief is executed in a large rectangular space. Darius stands at the left of the tableau, facing right, one foot resting on the prostrate body of Gaumata who raises his arms in an act of pleading. In his left hand Darius holds a bow that rests on his left foot; his right arm is bent and raised before his face, the hand cupped with the palm forward. Darius has a thick, square-tipped beard and wears the Persian court robe, strapless shoes, bracelets, and a crenellated crown decorated with stars and interlocking lotuses.<sup>81</sup> Behind Darius stand two weapon bearers, one carrying a bow, the other a spear. Before Darius the nine rebel leaders, their hands bound behind their backs, their necks attached by a rope, stand in a line facing Darius. Above the scene of the bound rebels hovers a figure who emerges from a winged ring with bird's tail and undulating appendages. This figure faces to the left, toward Darius (for a detailed discussion of this figure see pp. 26–27).

The Babylonian version of the text DB is cut on the rock face to the left of the visual tableau. The first Elamite version of the text is to the right of the relief. The second Elamite text is at lower left. The Persian text is directly below the relief. In the relief field minor inscriptions, eleven in number (DBa–k) and clearly added after the cutting of the figural images, identify the figures (with the exception of the weapon bearers and the figure in the winged ring/disk) (SCHMITT 1990a).



ROOT (1979: 182–226) remains the most thorough treatment of the relief of Darius I at Behistun. The great bulk of the imagery and text at Behistun do not figure directly into our discussions of the numinous and divine. The two most critical issues are the repeated occurrence of Auramazda in the inscriptions at Behistun and depiction of the figure in the winged ring who hovers over the scene of Darius and the rebels (see pp. 19–21 and 26–27, respectively).

#### *4.1.2. The funerary relief of Darius I at Naqsh-i Rostam*

For his funerary monument (**fig. 17**) Darius selected the rock face in a recess in the Husain Kuh (Mountain of Mercy), approximately six kilometers to the north of Persepolis. Known today as Naqsh-i Rostam, the site had been a sacred place since the 2nd mill. if not earlier. The character of the place was certainly changed, however, by Darius' decision to place his tomb here (tomb I in the numbering schema of SCHMIDT 1970).<sup>82</sup> Three later Achaemenid kings followed his lead, cutting tombs (tombs II–IV in the numbering schema of SCHMIDT 1970) and reliefs modeled on that of Darius. The famous stone tower, Ka'bah-i Zardusht [Cube of Zoroaster], was probably the most conspicuous freestanding feature in what became, for all intents and purposes, an Achaemenid religious sanctuary.<sup>83</sup> Commentators are generally unanimous in dating the carving of the tomb relief at Naqsh-i Rostam to the early years of the reign of Darius I.

The facade of the tomb of Darius has a distinctive cruciform shape. The bottom register was carved flat and left blank. The middle register shows an architectural facade of four columns with adorsed bull protome capitals supporting roof beams that carry an entablature; a door in the middle of the façade (leading into the rock-cut burial chambers) has a banded frame and an Egyptianizing cavetto molding over the lintel.

The top register contains the famous relief. Darius, at the left of the tableau and facing to the right, stands on a three-stepped podium that rests on a platform held aloft by two tiers of personifications of the subject peoples/lands of the empire (thirty in number). He raises his bent right arm before his chest, the hand held open, the back of the hand facing the viewer. This gesture, the so-called greeting/blessing gesture, is long known from Neo-Assyrian contexts (ROOT 1979: 174–176). His left hand, held at waist level, grasps the top of a bow. Darius has a long, blunt-pointed beard (presumably a squared beard, but shown in profile), and wears the Persian court robe, strapless shoes, bracelets, and a crenellated crown. The objects of Darius' attention potentially appear to be: the figure emerging from the winged double ring with bird's tail and undulating appendages (floating near the upper center of the tableau); the blazing fire altar (placed to the right on the platform, it acts as a vertical counterbalance to the standing figure of Darius at left); and the crescent inscribed in a disk (in the upper-right field of the tableau).<sup>84</sup> The figure emerging from the winged double ring with bird's tail and undulating appendages faces left, toward the king (for a detailed discussion of this figure see pp. 25–27). To the left of this central scene on a raised frame three weapon-bearers are disposed one atop the other in registers. To the right of the central scene on a raised frame three attendants who hold their left hands up to their mouths are disposed one atop the other in registers. Four spear-bearers are carved in three registers on a wing projecting out perpendicular to the facade at left. A similar projecting wing at right has three attendants who cover their mouths disposed in three superimposed registers.

The relief is accompanied by two inscriptions (DNa–b): the Old Persian and Elamite versions of DNa are located in the top register, in the field behind Darius; the Akkadian version of DNa is located above the spear-bearers on the wing projecting out perpendicular to the facade at left.

DNb is located in the middle register, accompanying the architectural façade: the Old Persian in the panel to the left of the doorway, the Elamite in the panel to the right of the doorway, and the Akkadian in the panel at far right. Minor inscriptions in the relief field in the top register (DNc and DNd, and DN I–IV, XVI–XVII and XXIX, clearly added after the cutting of the figural images) identify the platform bearers and the top two weapon-bearers on the raised frame to the left of the central scene.<sup>85</sup>

ROOT 1979: 147–181 remains the most thorough treatment of the relief of Darius I at Naqsh-i Rostam. She identifies numerous sources of influence in the iconography of the relief, Egypt and Assyria figuring most prominently, and articulates the complex political and religious messages that the relief sought to convey. I shall concentrate on two aspects of the iconography of the relief: the figure in the winged double ring and the crescent inscribed within a disk (see pp. 25–27 and 47–48, respectively).

#### *4.1.3. The seals preserved in the Persepolis Fortification archive (509–493) and the Persepolis Treasury archive (492–458)*

The Persepolis Fortification archive, found in chambers of the northern fortification (**fig. 18**) at Persepolis (whence the name of the archive) represents the administration of a state food rationing system that covered an amorphous area consisting of the environs of Persepolis (Parsha), Pasargadae (Batrakatash), and Shiraz (Tirazzish), and a broad (?) expanse to the northwest along the royal road to Susa.<sup>86</sup> The texts from the Fortification archive concern the storage, transfer, and distribution of food rations to workers (mainly agricultural), administrators, some of the Achaemenid elite, animals, and deities in the various administrative regions of the system; the payments of food rations for travelers of various social statuses and administrative ranks moving on the royal road between Persepolis and Susa (often to locales in the far western and eastern edges of the empire) also figure very prominently in the archive.<sup>87</sup> Many of the texts include date formulae, from which it can be established that the archive covers the thirteenth through twenty-eighth years in the reign of Darius the Great (i.e., 509–493).<sup>88</sup> The majority of the texts were written in cuneiform Elamite, but there is also a substantial corpus of texts written in Aramaic, and a very large corpus of tablets that carry only seal impressions (no texts).<sup>89</sup>

As has been stressed on numerous occasions, the importance of this material from the Fortification archive for our understanding of multiple aspects of early Achaemenid culture, especially its art, cannot be overstated.<sup>90</sup> The seals preserved in the Fortification archive represent the single most extensive and important corpus of visual images from the early years of the reign of Darius I. They provide a critical point of reference/balance for the much better known monumental reliefs at Behistun, Naqsh-i Rostam, and Persepolis. Indeed, in many cases the evidence provided by the glyptic imagery from the Fortification archive radically transforms our understanding of style, iconography, thematic development, artistic processes, etc., at the time of Darius I.

It would require a book-length manuscript to treat in detail the imagery involving the numinous and the divine in the seals from the Fortification archive. That statement in and of itself is radically transforming within the context of our traditional conceptions of the Achaemenid Persian response to the divine/numinous in visual images.<sup>91</sup>

A much smaller archive of sealed administrative tablets from Persepolis, the Persepolis Treasury archive, also contributes directly to the discussions that follow.<sup>92</sup> The archive consists of both inscribed (and sealed) tablets and uninscribed (and sealed) “labels.” The texts record

payments by the Persepolis Treasury between 492–458. Only seventy-seven discrete seals, preserved as impression(s), occur in this archive. Forty-three of these seals are cylinders; thirty-four are stamp/signets. Only seventeen seals occur on the inscribed tablets and thus may be attributed to specific users and dated via the texts.<sup>93</sup> Of those seals SCHMIDT (1957: 16) could attribute on the basis of textual evidence (both from the Elamite texts and from the inscriptions on the seals) only seven seals to the reign of Darius I: PTS 1\*, PTS 2\*, PTS 3\*, PTS 4\*, PTS 14\* (perhaps), PTS 24\*, and PTS 33\* (**fig. 67**).<sup>94</sup> We may now also definitively date the creation of PTS 42\* and PTS 61s to at least as early as the reign of Darius I, since these seals also occur in the Fortification archive.<sup>95</sup> Stylistically, it is possible that PTS 15\*, PTS 19, PTS 27, and PTS 34 may also date to the time of Darius I, if not earlier. Based, in my opinion, on style, other seals that may possibly date to the period of Darius I are PTS 16, PTS 20\* (**fig. 39**), PTS 22, and PTS 23 (**fig. 40**), the last three of which are altar scenes, PTS 26, a scene with a seated crowned figure, PTS 35, an animal combat, PTS 36, a centaur-archer, and PTS 62s, a late Babylonian worship scene.<sup>96</sup> Thus, a total of some twenty-one seals from the Treasury archive may potentially have been executed at the time of Darius I.

#### 4.2. Auramazda and the “other gods” at Behistun, Naqsh-i Rostam, Susa, and Persepolis: the textual evidence

Textual evidence has always played a considerable role in the study of divine imagery in ancient Western Asia. Periods such as the Neo-Assyrian are especially rich in written sources (literary, temple records, omens, etc.) that may help to determine, e.g., a divine, “state-sponsored” pantheon, specific iconographic attributes of deities, numinous creatures of ill omen, apotropaic creatures, etc. Some texts even describe cult statues and the ritual surrounding their creation and maintenance.<sup>97</sup>

No such descriptive texts survive for Southwestern Iran in the early Achaemenid period. Our primary textual sources are the royal inscriptions at Behistun and Naqsh-i Rostam and the administrative documents from the Fortification archive. None of these texts has as its primary purpose the description of the physical characteristics of the divine/numinous.

The controversies surrounding the interpretation of the evidence for the divine in the Achaemenid royal inscriptions are now legend. Darius mentions only one god by name in his inscriptions at Behistun and Naqsh-i Rostam: Auramazda. I shall attempt to articulate the data and issues surrounding the interpretation of this deity. The evidence for deities mentioned in the documents from the Fortification archive have now been treated in some detail by various scholars. While the list of divine names that can be culled from these documents is relatively straightforward, there is much disagreement on the significance of these names.

##### 4.2.1. Behistun

There are four versions of the main text at Behistun, one in Old Persian, one in Babylonian, and two in Elamite.<sup>98</sup> As mentioned, only one deity is mentioned by name: Auramazda. That one deity plays a conspicuous role in the text. The following list summarizes the roles/functions of Auramazda in the main text (DB) at Behistun:

- 1) by the favor of Auramazda, Darius is king (DB 1.11–12, par. 5, etc.);
- 2) Auramazda bestowed the kingdom on Darius (DB 1.11–12, par. 5, etc.);

- 3) by the favor of Auramazda, the countries showed respect to Darius' law (DB 1.20–24, par. 8);
- 4) Auramazda bore Darius aid until he gained possession of the kingdom (DB 1.24–26, par. 9);
- 5) by the favor of Auramazda, Darius holds the kingdom (DB 1.24–26, par. 9);
- 6) Darius sought the aid of Auramazda to overthrow Gaumata the Magian and Auramazda gave him that aid (DB 1.48–61, par. 13);
- 7) by the favor of Auramazda, Darius reestablished the kingdom (DB 1.61–71, par. 14);
- 8) by the favor of Auramazda, Darius reestablished his royal house (DB 1.61–71, par. 14);
- 9) Auramazda assisted Darius, his generals and/or his army in battle (DB 1.83–90, par. 18, etc.);
- 10) Auramazda put the rebels into Darius' hand (DB 4.33–36 par. 54);
- 11) Darius turned himself “quickly to Auramazda, that this is true, not false, (which) I did in one and the same year” (DB 4.43–45, par. 57);
- 12) Auramazda will be a friend to those who do not conceal the record of what Darius has accomplished (DB 4.52–56, par. 60);
- 13) Auramazda will smite those who conceal the record of what Darius has accomplished (DB 4.57–59, par. 61);
- 14) by the favor of Auramazda, Darius accomplished his deeds in one year; “Auramazda bore me aid, *and the other gods who are*” (DB 4.59–61, par. 62, etc.);
- 15) Auramazda will be a friend to and make successful those who protect the inscriptions and sculpture (DB 4.72–76, par. 66);
- 16) Auramazda will smite and destroy the deeds of those who destroy and do not protect the inscriptions and sculpture (DB 4.76–80, par. 67);
- 17) by the favor of Auramazda, Darius made the inscription (DB 4.88–92, par. 70);
- 18) the Elamite rebels were faithless and did not worship Auramazda; Darius worshipped Auramazda and by the favor of Auramazda Darius “did unto them” as was his desire (DB 5.14–17, par. 72);
- 19) those who worship Auramazda will receive divine blessing both in life and death (DB 5.18–20, par. 73).

Briefly, the invocations of Auramazda in the early part of the text, DB1.1–71, pars. 1–14, are varied and quite personal.<sup>99</sup> Thereafter, as the account moves into a historic mode in DB 1.83–DB 3.92, pars. 18–50, the invocations become highly typed, stock phrases repeated over and over. In DB 4 (DB 4.33–92, pars. 54–70) the invocations (?) again become very personal or admonitory, with little repetition of phrases. One exception, and an important one, is the phrase “Auramazda bore me aid, *and the other gods who are*” (DB 4.59–61, par. 62; repeated in DB 4.61–67, par. 63). These are the only places in the whole of the inscription where Darius invokes gods other than Auramazda.

How exactly we are to evaluate this very personal connection between Darius and Auramazda is a perplexing question. Given the sophistication and complexity of the Behistun monument and its overtly ideological and propagandistic (apologetic) nature, the reading of this relationship at face value as a purely personal and religious one seems rather naive. The literary aspects of the text probably ought to be weighed as heavily as the ideological. Indeed, one cannot help but be struck by the oral aspects of the text, its repeated use of stock refrains (e.g., “by the favor of

Ahuramazda”). SCHMITT has noted that the “recurring acknowledgement that Darius owes his power to the will and aid of Ahura Mazda functions as a kind of *topos*” (1990a: 304).

To complicate the issue, one also cannot help but notice the rather striking change of tone regarding Auramazda in DB V, a column added to the original Persian text after the third Elamite revolt and the defeat of the Saka. Although only fragmentarily preserved, the text clearly seems to take a turn toward the dogmatic: the Elamite rebels did not worship Auramazda, Darius worshipped Auramazda (DB 5.14–17, par. 72); those who worship Auramazda will receive divine blessing both in life and death (DB 5.18–20, par. 73). Whereas previous references to Auramazda do indeed read much like a literary *topos*, these last references in DB 5 are striking statements of religious faith. Several commentators have suggested that this text signals a major shift in politico-religious ideology.<sup>100</sup>

#### 4.2.2. *Naqsh-i Rostam*

There are two main trilingual inscriptions at Naqsh-i Rostam (DNa and DNb). As at Behistun, only one god, Auramazda, is mentioned by name. The following list summarizes the roles/functions of Auramazda in the two main texts, DNa and DNb:

- 1) Auramazda is a great god who created “this earth, who created yonder sky, who created man, who created happiness for man, who made Darius king, one king of many, one lord of many” (DNa 1–8, par. 1 and DNb 1–5; par. 1);
- 2) by the favor of Auramazda, Darius seized the countries outside of Persia, ruled them, etc. (DNa 15–30, par. 3);
- 3) Auramazda bestowed the earth on Darius and made Darius king when he saw the earth in commotion (DNa 30–47, par. 4);
- 4) by the favor of Auramazda, Darius “put it down in its place,” etc. (DNa 30–47, par. 4);
- 5) by the will of Auramazda, Darius did all that he did (DNa 47–55, par. 5);
- 6) Auramazda bore Darius aid, until Darius did the work (DNa 47–55, par. 5);
- 7) may Auramazda protect Darius from harm, and his royal house, and the land (DNa 47–55, par. 5);
- 8) Darius prays to Auramazda concerning (7) and may Auramazda give it to him (DNa 47–55, par. 5);
- 9) “that which is the command of Ahuramazda, let this not seem repugnant to thee; do not leave the right path; do not rise in rebellion” (DNa 56–60, par. 6);
- 10) by the favor of Auramazda, Darius is “of such sort that I am a friend to right, I am not a friend to wrong” (DNb 5–11, par. 2);
- 11) Auramazda bestowed physical skillfulness on Darius (DNb 45–49, par. 8i);
- 12) by the favor of Auramazda, that which has been done by Darius was done “with these skillfulnesses which Ahuramazda” had bestowed on him (DNb 45–49, par. 8i).

Again, I shall present here only a few brief comments. The two creation statements (DNa 1–8, par. 1 and DNb 1–5; par. 1) stand out from anything at Behistun and have been the focus of much discussion.<sup>101</sup> It is also interesting to note that there is little to no stock repetition of phrases as occurs at Behistun. Notable also are the statements that Darius prays to Auramazda (DNa 47–55, par. 5), the invocations to follow the command of Auramazda and follow the right path (DNa 56–

60, par. 6), and Darius' declaration that he is a friend "to right" and "not a friend to wrong" (DNb 5–11, par. 2).

Overall, the texts at Naqsh-i Rostam are viewed as very personal statements on the part of Darius (ROOT 1979: 74f; BRIANT 2002: 211f). In this respect DNb has been described as "remarkable for its style and inspiration" (BRIANT 2002: 211), consisting of a list of royal virtues and the duties of the king and subjects. Both texts, like those at Behistun, stress what can only be described as a unique and close relationship between Darius and Auramazda.

#### 4.2.3. Royal inscriptions at Susa and Persepolis

Various texts dating to the reign of Darius have been found at Susa and Persepolis. None of these texts are comparable in length to those at Behistun and Naqsh-i Rostam. Several of the inscriptions from Susa incorporate passages that are direct quotations of parts of inscriptions from Persepolis (DSa, DSb, DSc, DSd, DSk, DSm) and Naqsh-i Rostam (DSe, DSf, DSt).<sup>102</sup> The texts from Susa and Persepolis do not contribute in a significant manner to our understanding of the divine. Again, Auramazda is the only god mentioned by name. Of potential interest are the following:

DPd 1.1–5: "Great Ahuramazda, the greatest of the gods."

DPd 3.12–24: "Saith Darius the King: May Ahuramazda bear me aid, with *all the gods*... this I pray as a boon from Ahuramazda together with *all the gods*. This boon may Ahuramazda together with *all the gods* give to me!"<sup>103</sup>

DPf 2: "By the grace of Ahuramazda I built this fortress. And Ahuramazda was of such a mind, *together with all the gods*, that this fortress (should be) built."<sup>104</sup>

DSe, 6.49–52: "Me may Ahuramazda together with *the other gods* protect, and my royal house, and what has been inscribed by me."

DSk, 2.3–5: "Saith Darius the King: Ahuramazda is mine, I am Ahuramazda's. I worshipped Ahuramazda; may Ahuramazda bear me aid."

In DPd we have the emphatic repetition, three times, of "all the gods."<sup>105</sup> DSe has a reference to "the other gods," as in DB 4.59–61, par. 62 and DB 4.61–67, par. 63, while DPf has "all the gods."

#### 4.2.4. Deities mentioned in the texts from the Fortification archive

Although for the most part recording mundane collection and disbursement of food commodities by the state, the texts from the Fortification archive yield valuable insight into religious matters through the state's sponsorship of certain cult activities.<sup>106</sup> HENKELMAN (2006: 34) has concluded that the texts from the Fortification archive document a "religious landscape of the Achaemenid heartland (that) was a fascinating and variegated tapestry woven from Elamite and Iranian traits." The emphasis in this passage, and his study as a whole, is the need to consider some aspects of Persian religion within the context of Elamite–Iranian acculturation.<sup>107</sup> While this may seem a

relatively straight-forward and logical approach to take, given the critical role of Elam and Elamite in Persian culture (especially at the time of Darius I), the traditional tack to the study of Persian religion has in fact stressed its “purity” (via the Avestan texts) and separateness from not only Elamite religious traditions but those of Babylonia and Assyria as well.<sup>108</sup> As we shall see, the visual evidence preserved in the glyptic from the Fortification archive requires a similar re-structuring of long-held assumptions.

In brief, the ration system documented in the Fortification archive at times made payment of commodities to support cult activities involving the worship of deities. The transactions include commodities for offerings (often in the guise of commodities distributed to the deity or deities), the names of deities, and the titles of some cultic personnel.

The type of sacrifice that occurs most frequently, one that at times involves the king, is the *lan* ceremony.<sup>109</sup> While the discussion on the *lan* involves various issues (not least of which is what the word actually means!), the major points of contention seem to be whether this sacrifice can be associated with one particular deity and, if so, which deity. As often happens, the debate seems to hinge on one’s position with regard to the question of Achaemenid Zoroastrianism. For KOCH (e.g., 1977: 137f), the *lan* ceremony was one devoted exclusively to Zoroastrian Aura Mazda.<sup>110</sup> For HENKELMAN, *lan* was simply a term to denote “offering, oblation” and “continues an older semantic field, with all of its cultic implications...”, but it also appears to be the Persian representative of a longstanding tradition of regular sacrifices that simultaneously serve as the officiants’ maintenance” (2006: 236).<sup>111</sup>

While commodities for the *lan* ceremony are the most numerous type of “religious” reference in the texts, other religious feasts are also named. Additionally, the texts record provisions for offerings to named deities, unnamed deities, and place names. No fewer than nineteen deities are named. Given the importance of this textual information for the study of religion at the heart of the empire, it may be worthwhile to list the relevant evidence.<sup>112</sup>

Named deities:

- Adad (7 texts)
- Earth (<sup>AŠ</sup>KI<sup>MEŠ</sup>) (2 texts)
- Humban (26 or 27 texts)
- Napir(i)sha (10 texts)
- Shimut (1 text)
- Nabbazabba (1 text)
- Halma (1 text)
- Nah (1 text)
- Auramazda (10 texts)
- Mishdushish (6 texts)
- Ishpandaramattish (goddess) (6 texts)
- Narishanka (2 texts)
- Marirash (4 texts)
- Pirdakamiya (3 texts)
- Irdanapirurtish (2 texts)
- Minam (1 text)
- Shetrabattish (1 text)
- Turme/a (3 texts)
- Zizkurra (1 text)

Unnamed deities:

- mishebaka*, “all the gods” (12 texts)
- <sup>AN</sup>*nappi-na*, “for the gods” (49 texts)
- <sup>AN</sup>*nap* <sup>AN</sup>*shashaka-na*, “other gods” (1 text)

Place names:

- Mountains, eleven in number (14 texts)
- Rivers, five in number (6 texts)
- hapidanush*, a locale and associated religious rite? (3 texts)
- tikrakkash*, a locale and associated religious rite? (3 texts)
- kushukum*, a locale and associated religious rite (21 texts)
- shumar*, tomb or burial mound (4 texts), and *bashur*, an offering table (?) at a tomb (3 texts)<sup>113</sup>
- ziyan*, “temple” (3 texts)

Religious feasts:

- ship* (9 texts)<sup>114</sup>
- anshi* (1 text)
- pumazish* (1 text)
- bakadaushiya* (1 text as a solitary term)<sup>115</sup>
- months, two in number (9 texts)

Miscellaneous:

- akrish*, a type of offering “for the gods” (4 texts)
- daushannuash*, “offering feast” (1 text)<sup>116</sup>
- napir<sup>r</sup>rama<sup>7</sup>*, “(the offering) of the god” (1 text)

There is considerable debate on exactly who many of the named deities are. Based on etymology, the great bulk of them are clearly of Iranian and Elamite origin (as one would expect). Several are well known from earlier periods (e.g., Adad, Earth, Humban, and Napir[i]sha), and Auramazda figures prominently in the royal inscriptions. As HENKELMAN (2006: 267, 281) has noted, the picture one takes away from this evidence is not that there were two separate religious spheres, one Iranian, the other Elamite; rather, the deities (whether Elamite or Iranian) were treated indiscriminately because, one may assume, they were considered simply as *Persian* deities.

While the types of insights that this evidence yields are, by their nature, of very low resolution (i.e., the frequency of a type of offering, the existence of a certain deity), the material is nevertheless really quite remarkable and radically transforms our understanding of religious process at the heart of the empire. Two items especially are worthy of note. First, given the dominance of Auramazda in the texts from Behistun and Naqsh-i Rostam, the relatively rare occurrence of the name of the god in the Fortification archive and the fact that the god in no way receives special treatment are nothing short of astounding.<sup>117</sup> It reminds us, yet again, of the inherent difficulties of attempting to abstract from the royal inscriptions a lived, as opposed to an ideological, reality.<sup>118</sup> The royal texts are by their nature exceptionally complex documents of rhetoric, and thus should be used with great caution in making sweeping generalizations about Persian culture in the late 6th cent.<sup>119</sup>



Second, one wonders to what degree the list of deities that can be culled from the Fortification archive represents in any fashion a “state-sponsored pantheon.” If the answer to this question is yes (and there seems to be no compelling reason why it should not), then to what degree should we reflect on these deities as we examine the visual evidence for the divine and numinous in both monumental relief and glyptic? Given the fact that the texts provide absolutely no clues to a religious iconography, and the fact that we are ignorant of a divine iconography for those deities that are known from other periods or sources, such an enterprise will not be attempted in this study. Nevertheless, an awareness of the diversity of the religious landscape as glimpsed through the Fortification texts ought constantly to provide a point of reference in attempts to understand the larger picture revealed by the visual evidence.

#### 4.3. The figure in the winged ring/disk at Behistun, Naqsh-i Rostam, and Persepolis

The most perplexing and often-debated question in the study of religious iconography of the Achaemenid Persians is the identification of the figure in the winged ring/disk.<sup>120</sup> This image, in myriad variations, is an important element in both monumental and glyptic arts of the period of Darius I and later. It is also one of the few unambiguously numinous entities in the known corpus of monumental art from the Persian heartland. The discussion on this image’s identification has traditionally been closely connected to understanding the nature/role of Auramazda in the royal texts at Behistun, Naqsh-i Rostam, Persepolis, and Susa.

The method adopted here is to articulate separately the evidence offered by the reliefs at Behistun and Naqsh-i Rostam and the glyptic in the Fortification archive and Treasury archive, followed by an attempt to synthesize that evidence. For consistency of reference, I employ the following descriptive vocabulary:

##### Figure in winged ring:

The figure clearly emerges/is embedded in a ring from which wings emerge; the image almost always has a bird’s tail and appendages (“tendrils”); it may also have a yoke-like device above the ring.

##### Figure in winged disk:

The figure clearly emerges/is embedded in a solid disk from which wings emerge; the image almost always has a bird’s tail and appendages (“tendrils”); it may also have a yoke-like device above the disk.

##### Figure in winged ring/disk:

Global term to designate both of the two previous types.

##### Winged ring-and-disk:

A disk inscribed within a ring from which wings emerge; the image almost always has a bird’s tail; it often also has appendages (“tendrils”) and a yoke-like device above the ring-and-disk.

##### Winged disk:

A disk from which wings emerge; the image often has a bird’s tail, also at times appendages (“tendrils”) and a yoke-like device above disk.

Winged ring-and-disk/disk:

Global term to designate both the winged ring-and-disk and the winged disk.

Winged symbol:

Global term to designate all of the previous types.

*4.3.1. The figure in the winged ring at Behistun*

Above the scene of the bound rebel leaders at Behistun hovers a figure who emerges from a winged ring with bird's tail and undulating appendages (**figs. 15–16**). This rendering of the figure in the winged ring is one of the most detailed and complex of all known examples of the winged symbol. The upper two-thirds of the figure, depicted in profile, is shown. The figure looks to the left toward Darius. He extends his left arm, bent, along the upper edge of the wing and holds a ring;<sup>121</sup> his right arm is bent and raised before his face, the hand, a separate piece of stone that has been inserted into the rock face, flat with the palm facing the viewer. The figure has a thick, squared beard (only blocked-out); a rounded mass of hair emerges from below the headdress at the back of the neck. The figure appears to wear the Persian court robe. It is belted, but, with the exception of a single vertical fold on the lower part of the garment, folds are not indicated. A ribbon or plait emerges from the back of the hair to hang down along the figure's back. He wears a polos headdress that carries four superimposed rings at its base. The front of the headdress is very damaged; conventionally above these rings at the front of the headdress there have been restored horns (no longer preserved). LUSCHEY (1968: 80f, fig. 4) restored along the top of the polos a scalloped edge (feathers?), which is difficult to see in published photographs.<sup>122</sup> Above the polos a polygonal-shaped piece of stone has been inserted into the rock, a metal clamp inserted to hold it in place. On this piece of stone is carved an eight-pointed star symbol within a disk.<sup>123</sup> On each of his wrists there is a lobed bracelet.

It is not known whether the two insertions, right hand and star-in-disk, simply represent corrections to rock unsuitable for carving, or mark substantial programmatic changes to the figure.<sup>124</sup>

The figure emerges from a ring. The outer edge of the ring is adorned with a band of interlocking spirals. The wings are broad and squared. The feathers undulate in horizontal bands along the length of the wings, broken into three sections of equal length by two rows of single spirals set diagonally across the height of the wings; each feather terminates at the tip in a spiral. The tail fans out broadly continuing the outline of the partial figure's lower body. The feathers undulate in radiate bands along the length of the tail, broken into two equal sections by a row of single spirals; each feather terminates in a spiral. To either side of the tail an undulating appendage hangs down from the intersection of the ring and wings; each appendage has a tripartite termination. Above the wings there is a yoke-shaped object (which is shown as running behind the figure); its ends also terminate in spirals.<sup>125</sup>

*4.3.2. The figure in the winged ring at Naqsh-i Rostam*

In the upper field to the left of the blazing fire altar, on the right half of Darius' tomb facade at Naqsh-i Rostam, hovers a figure who emerges from a winged double-ring with bird's tail and undulating appendages (**fig. 17**). As at Behistun, the figure faces to the left, toward Darius. He extends his left arm, bent, along the upper edge of the wing; the hand is poorly preserved, but it is

generally assumed that he held a ring (as do the figures in winged rings in the other royal Achaemenid tombs at Naqsh-e Rostam). His right arm is raised in front of his body; the hand is destroyed, but it is generally assumed that it was held flat with the palm facing the viewer (echoing the position of Darius' right hand). The figure has a long, blunt-pointed beard with rows of small curls (presumably a squared beard, but shown in profile); a rounded mass of hair with rows of curls emerges from below the headdress at the back of the neck. The figure wears the Persian court robe; vertical and diagonal folds appear to be indicated on the lower part of the garment. The figure wears a cylindrical headdress. The top of the headdress is poorly preserved and does not allow a definitive reading.<sup>126</sup>

The figure emerges from a double ring. The rings are either beaded, or have "tangent curls" (SCHMIDT 1957: 85). The wings are broad and squared. The feathers undulate in horizontal bands along the length of the wings, broken into four (?) sections of equal length by three (?) rows of single spirals set diagonally across the height of the wings. The tail fans out narrowly continuing the outline of the partial figure's lower body. The feathers undulate in radiate bands along the length of the tail, broken into three roughly equal sections by two rows of single spirals; each feather terminates in a spiral. To either side of the tail an undulating appendage hangs down from the ring; each appendage has a tripartite termination.

#### *4.3.3. The figure in the winged ring and the winged ring-and-disk in architectural sculpture at Persepolis*

Two structures that carry relief sculpture on the *takht* at Persepolis (**fig. 18**) may be dated, at least in conception and partial execution, to the reign of Darius I: the Apadana and the Palace of Darius.<sup>127</sup> A third structure, the so-called Central Building, may also date to late in the reign of Darius. Since there is no inscriptional evidence associated with the Central Building (unlike the Apadana and the Palace of Darius), a dating in the reign of Darius relies on stylistic analysis of the sculpture, comparison of iconographic details of that sculpture (e.g., the forms of the crowns) to other reliefs, the likelihood that the scene of the king and crown prince date to the reign of Darius, and the perceived topographical relationship of the building to the Apadana.<sup>128</sup>

There is fragmentary evidence that both the Apadana and the Palace of Darius were decorated with winged ring-and-disks.<sup>129</sup> On the Apadana, traditionally there has been restored a winged ring-and-disk (without tail and appendages) on the canopies above the audience scenes on the panels that originally stood in the center of the eastern and northern stairways (**fig. 19**). This restoration is based on no actual preserved relief fragments, but on the supposition that a winged ring-and-disk ought to have been there since it is found on the canopies over audience scenes and scenes of the enthroned king that decorated the doorjambs in the Hall of 100 Columns and the Central Building.<sup>130</sup> A fragment of the wing of what may have been a winged ring-and-disk is found over the central panel of the southern stairway in the Palace of Darius (**fig. 20**).<sup>131</sup> To either side of the tail (running under the wing) there are five stacks consisting of connected segmented stalks, the furthest out of these is taller and topped by a palmette.<sup>132</sup> To either side of the winged ring-and-disk and plant stacks there is a winged, human-headed bull-leonine creature sejant.<sup>133</sup> Each creature (presumably, since only the one to the right is preserved) faces toward the winged ring-and-disk and wears a thick, square-tipped beard (seen in profile) and a horned headdress with feather top. The creature at the right raises one paw to place it on the top of the nearest palmette.

The creatures flanking the winged ring-and-disk on the southern stairway of the Palace of Darius would appear to be drawn directly from the tradition of the Assyrian guardian figures that decorate doorways in Assyrian palaces. More importantly, the composition of winged ring-and-disk flanked by divine creatures is also well documented in the glyptic evidence; it clearly marks a critical element of visual syntax in the representation of the divine (see the discussion pp. 34–35). The composition is rigidly symmetrical, focused on the winged ring-and-disk. It establishes a hierarchy, the winged bull-leonine creatures clearly subordinate to the winged ring-and-disk via placement and pose.

Given the very visible and ideologically significant presence of the figure in the winged ring at Behistun and Naqsh-i Rostam, it seems rather striking that the image type does not occur in the preserved evidence on either the Apadana or the Palace of Darius.<sup>134</sup> Its absence on the Apadana is especially interesting given the importance of the structure and its prominent placement in the “public” area of the *takht*.

How much significance one ought to attach to the apparent absence of the figure in the winged ring/disk on the Apadana and the Palace of Darius depends to a great deal on whether the so-called Central Building is to be dated to the reign of Darius. The figure in the winged ring is found floating above the scenes of the enthroned king and crown prince supported by subject peoples (on the doorjambs of the eastern doorway, **fig. 21**) and the procession of king and attendants (on the doorjambs of the southern and northern doorways) in the Central Building.<sup>135</sup> The execution and detailing of each figure in the winged ring in the scenes are exceptionally fine. While the figure in all cases holds one hand open, parallel to the plane of the relief, and grasps a ring in the other hand, i.e., exactly the same as on the reliefs at Behistun and Naqsh-i Rostam, there are many iconographic and stylistic details that set these images apart from those at Behistun and Naqsh-i Rostam. For example, a rib is indicated along the top of the wing, the wing tips are rounded, there are five rows of feathers indicated on each wing (the top two rows of feathers being given more elaborate detailing), three rows of feathers on each tail, the feathers have straight sides and terminate in scalloped edges, the tendrils terminate in spirals, the edges of the billowy sleeves of the Persian court robe are elaborately treated with stacked folds, the headdresses are simple cylindrical polos headdresses (undistinguished along the top edges), etc. Do these considerable iconographic and stylistic changes simply reflect the development from early Darius (i.e., Behistun and Naqsh-i Rostam) to late Darius, and the move from rock-cut relief to architectural sculpture, or are these changes significant as far as distinguishing between sculptures executed in the reign of Darius I from that of Xerxes (or perhaps even later)?

While the evidence is by no means conclusive, the changes that we see in the rendering of the figure in the winged ring in the Central Building may help to substantiate the arguments of those who would prefer a post-Darius date for the structure and its reliefs. It would also seem noteworthy that the figure in the winged ring is displayed so prominently in the Central Building, but apparently not at all in the Apadana and the Palace of Darius (suggesting again that the Central Building was not a work of Darius I). If the later dating of the Central Building is correct, then the clear absence of the figure in the winged ring in the Apadana, the premier showcase structure on the *takht*, and the Palace of Darius may reflect real programmatic decisions on the part of the planners: the restriction of the figure in the winged ring to “devotional” and victory scenes in monumental art.

#### 4.3.4. *The figure in the winged ring/disk and the winged disk in the seals from the Fortification archive and the Persepolis Treasury archive*

The figure in the winged ring/disk and the winged disk occur in several forms in the seals from the two Persepolitan archives.<sup>136</sup> As one may expect, the glyptic evidence contains a much greater variety in the depiction of the image types than monumental relief. The scale and preservation of the glyptic evidence often preclude any detailed analysis of specific iconography features (headdresses and heads of the figure in the winged ring/disk are, for instance, rarely preserved). Both of the major types, figure in the winged ring/disk and the winged disk, occur fairly rarely (given the large sample from which we may draw) and in a limited number of scenes, suggesting a rather tightly controlled semantic field.

By way of preliminary analysis, I here organize the two major types, figure in the winged ring/disk and the winged disk, into several subtypes with a short discussion and list of examples. The total sample of seals presented here is forty-three (thirty-one from the PFS corpus, two from the PFUTS corpus, and ten from the PTS corpus).

##### A. Figure in the winged ring/disk (and variants)

###### 1. Figure in winged ring with bird's tail:

- PFS 1359 (only the bottom part of the ring and tail are preserved) (held aloft by atlantids)
- PTS 2\* (with heroic encounter, date palms, trilingual royal-name inscription)
- PTS 15\* (with two attendants on pedestal winged lions)
- PTS 22 (with altar scene)

PTS 2\* and PTS 15\* are the glyptic examples which bear the closest detailed resemblance to the rendering of the figure in the winged ring at Behistun and Naqsh-i Rostam. The scene on PTS 15\* is particularly striking. The exact form of the winged symbol in PTS 22 is difficult to distinguish via the published photograph, although SCHMIDT (1957: 27) described it as "partly encircled." The device is only partially preserved on PFS 1359; the attribution of the symbol on this seal to this particular type must thus remain provisional.

###### 2. Figure in winged ring-and-disk with bird's tail

- PFS 11\* (**fig. 22**) (with altar scene [two crowned figures], palm trees, trilingual royal-name inscription)
- PFS 1567\* (**fig. 23**) (with two attendants on pedestal goat-fish, inscription)
- PTS 14\* (with two attendants on pedestal goat-fish, inscription)

In this type the figure emerges from the top of the wing-and-disk, although on PFS 11\* (**fig. 22**) the body of the figure and the ring-and-disk seem to merge together. Whether it represents a synthesis of the figure in a winged ring and the winged ring-and-disk as preserved in monumental sculpture is difficult to say, given the scale of the glyptic examples. On PTS 14\* the figure in the winged ring-and-disk raises one arm with the hand cupped upward, while the other arm lies along the wing and apparently holds a ring. With the exception of the cupped hand, the pose has close ties to the depiction of the figure in the winged ring at Behistun and Naqsh-i Rostam. On PFS 11\* the figure in the winged ring-and-disk also appears to hold his hands cupped upward.

3. Figure emerging from winged device with bird's tail
  - PFS 7\* (**fig. 24**) (with heroic encounter, palm trees, trilingual royal-name inscription)
  - PFS 91 (**fig. 25**) (handing ring to figure in Persian court robe)
  - PFS 122 (**fig. 26**) (held aloft by atlantids over stylized tree, winged figure)
  - PFS 310 (**fig. 27**) (held aloft by atlantids over stylized tree, two attendants)
  - PFS 420 (held aloft by atlantids over stylized tree)
  - PFS 553 (**fig. 28**) (with scene of deity on back of animal)
  - PFS 586s (held aloft by atlantids over stylized tree)
  - PFS 774 (**fig. 29**) (with heroic encounter)
  - PFS 1053 (with heroic encounter)
  - PFS 1071 (**fig. 30**) (with heroic encounter)
  - PFS 1601\* (**fig. 31**) (with banquet scene, inscription)
  - PFUTS 1\* (**fig. 32**) (over stylized tree, flanked by attendants standing on fish-men, inscription)
  - PFUTS 18\* (**fig. 33**) (with heroic encounter, trilingual royal-name inscription)

In this type the central part of the winged symbol is defined neither as a ring nor a disk. There appear to be two variations. In one the wings appear to emerge out of the upper body of the figure: PFS 7\* (**fig. 24**), PFS 310 (**fig. 27**), PFS 586s, PFS 1071 (**fig. 30**), PFS 1053, PFUTS 18\* (**fig. 33**), and probably also PFUTS 1\* (**fig. 32**). On PFS 310 (**fig. 27**) the body of the figure merges into the bird's tail. In the other variation, the figure emerges from the top of the wings: PFS 91 (**fig. 25**), PFS 122 (**fig. 26**), PFS 420, PFS 774 (**fig. 29**), PFS 1601\* (**fig. 31**). The abstracted style of PFS 553 (**fig. 28**, see also PFS 793s below) probably accounts for the version seen there where just the head of the figure is indicated over the wings. Generally there are no appendages near the tail.

4. Figure in winged disk with bird's tail
  - PFS 793s (over stylized tree with winged genii)
  - PTS 36 (with archer scene)

The scene on PFS 793s actually shows only the head of the figure emerging from the winged disk. The schematic style of the carving probably accounts for the abstraction.

5. Figure in winged U-shaped device
  - PFS 82\* (**fig. 34**) (over human-headed creature, with two attendants on pedestal winged creatures, inscription)

There is only one example, but it is a remarkable design and very detailed. The figure emerges from a cushion-like object set into a yoke-like object. He wears some type of rounded headdress with a half-round on the top. One hand is indicated, held parallel to the pictorial plane with palm open toward the viewer. This is the same hand gesture used by the figures in the winged rings at both Behistun and Naqsh-e Rostam. The device has no appendages.

## B. Winged ring/disk

1. Winged ring-and-disk

- PFS 83\* (**fig. 35**) (held aloft by atlantids, with scene of cow and calf, inscription)
- PFS 115\* (**fig. 36**) (with archer scene, inscription)
- PFS 166 (**fig. 37**) (over stylized tree with winged genii)
- PFS 211 (with devotional scene)
- PFS 389\* (**fig. 38**) (over paneled inscription, with winged fish-men and attendant)
- PFS 514 (**fig. 39**) (with heroic encounter)
- PFS 1189 (with heroic encounter)
- PTS 20\* (**fig. 40**) (with altar scene, inscription)
- PTS 23 (with altar scene)
- PTS 24\* (over stylized tree flanked by spearmen)

Although rendered stylistically in various manners, the reference to the ring-and-disk is clear. One assumes that this form is directly related to that seen on architectural sculpture at Persepolis.

2. Winged disk

- PFS 62 (with heroic encounter)
- PFS 1190 (**fig. 41**) (with three-figure animal combat)
- PFS 1360 (with banquet scene)
- PTS 19 (with atlantids; central part of winged device is not preserved)
- PTS 26 (with audience scene, horse [?])

PFS 1190 (**fig. 41**) is the most elaborate version of this subtype, showing long, curved appendages and a yoke-shaped object above the disk.

3. Wings, tail, and appendages

- PFS 196 (**fig. 42**) (with heroic encounter)
- PFS 216 (**fig. 43**) (held aloft by atlantids, attendants)
- PFS 285 (**fig. 44**) (over stylized plant, caprid courrant)
- PFS 522 (with hunt scene)
- PFS 851 (with heroic encounter)

In this type there is no clear indication of either a ring or a disk. The image simply consists of wings, tail, and generally appendages. Three of these examples (PFS 216 [**fig. 43**], PFS 285 [**fig. 44**], and PFS 522) may in fact have had figures in winged rings/disks and so belong to subtype A.3. The rings on the top of the wings of PFS 196 (**fig. 42**) are unique in depictions of the symbol in the PFS corpus. They may be abstractions of the yoke-shaped object or, potentially, the two heads seen on the top of the wings on some examples of the figure in the winged ring from the Neo-Assyrian period.<sup>137</sup>

Out of the approximately 1,148 distinct (and legible) seals identified to date in the PFS corpus (i.e., those seals that occur on the Elamite tablets published by HALLOCK 1969), only sixteen show a version of the figure in the winged ring/disk, fifteen a version of the winged ring/disk.<sup>138</sup> It is interesting that the two major types are almost equally represented in number. The total of thirty-one seals that have some version of the winged symbol represents only 2.7% of the total

number of seals in the PFS corpus. Thus, as an iconographic type (both with and without the figure), the winged symbol is rare in the PFS corpus. Of the twenty-one seals in the PTS corpus that may potentially date to the time of Darius I, five show a version of the figure in the winged ring/disk, five a version of the winged ring/disk. Although it may seem significant that almost 50% (ten in number) of the seals that date to the time of Darius I (twenty-one in number) from the PTS corpus contain a winged symbol, this sample may be skewed by the smaller number of seals in the PTS corpus, the restrictive administrative range represented by the offices/officials involved in these transactions, and the elite status of those offices/officials.

Of great interest is the larger compositional format in which both major types are found. These are highly restricted, consisting almost exclusively of the heroic encounter and scenes where the winged symbol is the focus of the composition or contained within a larger devotional scene. A schematic breakdown follows.

A. Figure in winged ring/disk:

- a. focal element in devotional scene: PFS 82\* (**fig. 34**), PFS 91 (**fig. 26**), PFS 1567\* (**fig. 24**), PTS 14\*, PTS 15\*
- b. part of larger devotional scene: PFS 553 (**fig. 28**)
- c. part of larger altar scene: PFS 11\* (**fig. 22**), PTS 22
- d. held aloft by atlantid(s): PFS 1359
- e. held aloft by atlantids above stylized tree: PFS 122 (**fig. 26**); PFS 310 (**fig. 27**); PFS 420, PFS 586s
- f. above stylized tree with attendants: PFS 793s, PFUTS 1\* (**fig. 32**)
- g. part of heroic encounter scene: PFS 7\* (**fig. 24**), PFS 774 (**fig. 29**), PFS 1053, PFS 1071 (**fig. 30**), PFUTS 18\* (**fig. 33**), PTS 2\*
- h. part of banquet scene: PFS 1601\* (**fig. 31**)
- i. part of archer scene: NA
- j. part of animal scene: NA
- k. part of hunt scene: NA
- l. part of audience scene: NA

B. Winged ring/disk:

- a. focal element in devotional scene: PFS 389\* (**fig. 38**)
- b. part of larger devotional scene: PFS 211
- c. part of larger altar scene: PTS 20\* (**fig. 40**), PTS 23
- d. held aloft by atlantids: PFS 83\* (**fig. 35**), PFS 216 (**fig. 43**), PTS 19
- e. held aloft by atlantids above stylized tree: NA
- f. above stylized tree with attendants: PFS 166 (**fig. 37**), PTS 24\*
- g. part of heroic encounter scene: PFS 62, PFS 196 (**fig. 42**), PFS 514 (**fig. 39**), PFS 851, PFS 1189
- h. part of banquet scene: PFS 1360
- i. part of archer scene: PFS 115\* (**fig. 36**), PTS 36
- j. part of animal scene: PFS 285 (**fig. 44**), PFS 1190 (**fig. 41**)
- k. part of hunt scene: PFS 522
- l. part of audience scene: PTS 26

As mentioned, most of the examples, both for the figure in winged ring/disk and the winged ring/disk, generally fall into one of two broader semantic categories of scenes: devotional and



heroic encounter. Devotional scenes include scene types a–f. Additionally, one may construe an overtly religious/ritualized character to the banquet scene (h) and the audience scene (l).

Heroic encounters (scene g) account for the other numerically significant scene type. In the heroic encounters, the winged symbol generally appears to act as a “terminal device” rather than being the main focus of the scene as a whole, although this is a rather subjective distinction. The winged symbols themselves in these heroic encounters are often embedded in their own scene, at times recalling aspects of the “devotional” scenes; e.g., on PFS 774 (**fig. 29**) and PFS 1071 (**fig. 30**) the figure in the winged symbol is held aloft by atlantid(s), and on PFS 514 (**fig. 39**) the winged ring–and–disk is over a stylized plant. The complexity and clearly polyvalent nature of the heroic encounter scene itself ought not to rule out the possibility that in some contexts these scenes also carried an overtly “religious/ritualized” message.<sup>139</sup>

The figure in winged ring/disk and the winged ring/disk occur only rarely in the remaining scene types, archer scene (i), animal scene (j), and hunt scene (k). None of these scenes are overtly religious in nature, but the archer on PTS 36 is a composite creature (hence perhaps mytho–religious in nature), and the winged symbol in the animal combat on PFS 285 (**fig. 44**) is over a stylized plant (as in many examples in the devotional scenes).

With the exception of the scene where the winged symbol is held aloft by atlantids above stylized tree (e), the winged ring/disk occurs in the same types of scenes as the figure in winged ring/disk. Additionally, the winged ring/disk occurs in four scenes, archer scene (i), animal scene (j), hunt scene (k), and audience scene (l), which are not documented for the figure in winged ring/disk. One may infer from this evidence that while there appears to have been greater freedom in the use of the winged ring/disk, in general there is great conformity between the scene types in which the two major iconographic types, the figure in winged ring/disk and the winged ring/disk, occur.

The restricted range of scene types in which the winged symbol occurs is highlighted by its rarity/absence in several very popular scenes. For example, considering briefly just the sample from the PFS corpus (all seals of which we know to have been executed in or before the reign of Darius), it is striking that out of over 500 documented seals that may be classified as “animal scenes” (e.g., animal combats, animal files, etc.) only two examples, both showing variations on the winged ring/disk, contain a winged symbol: PFS 285 (**fig. 44**) and PFS 1190 (**fig. 41**). Archer scenes, another very large and important category in the PFS corpus numbering approximately 127 seals, contains only one example that shows a winged symbol: PFS 115\* (**fig. 36**). Finally, it should come as no surprise that the winged symbol almost never occurs in the so–called “late Babylonian worship” scenes, of which there are well over thirty examples in the PFS corpus.<sup>140</sup>

There are some noteworthy elements of syntax associated with the winged symbol. With the exception of most of the heroic encounters, the winged symbol in the glyptic evidence from the Fortification and Treasury archives is almost always very carefully centered as the focal element (or part thereof) of the design (figure in winged ring/disk: e.g., PFS 7\* [**fig. 24**], PFS 11\* [**fig. 22**], PFS 82\* [**fig. 34**], PFS 91 [**fig. 25**], etc.; winged ring/disk: e.g., PFS 115\* [**fig. 36**], PFS 166 [**fig. 37**], PFS 216 [**fig. 43**], PFS 389\* [**fig. 38**], etc.). On PFS 389\* (**fig. 38**) and PFS 1601\* (**fig. 32**), the winged symbol occurs over a paneled inscription, a visual dynamic very similar to that of the monumental relief at Persepolis.

This restriction of scene type and the tightly controlled syntax in which the winged symbol occurs surely cannot be accidental, but must signify critical iconological boundaries.

The winged symbol is often coupled with other very distinctive and, with the exception of composite creature, rare elements of the visual vocabulary documented in the PFS corpus. For simplicity, I list them here:

composite creatures:

ring/disk: PFS 83\* (**fig. 35**), PFS 116s (**fig. 37**), PFS 211, PFS 216 (**fig. 43**), PFS 389\* (**fig. 39**), PFS 514 (**fig. 40**), PFS 851, PFS 1189, PTS 19

figure in winged ring/disk: PFS 82\* (**fig. 34**), PFS 91 (**fig. 25**), PFS 122 (**fig. 26**), PFS 310 (**fig. 27**), PFS 420, PFS 553 (**fig. 28**), PFS 774 (**fig. 29**), PFS 793s, PFS 1053, PFS 1071 (**fig. 30**), PFS 1359, PFS 1567\* (**fig. 23**), PFUTS 1\* (**fig. 32**), PFUTS 18\* (**fig. 33**), PTS 2\*, PTS 14\*, PTS 15\*

pedestal creatures:

ring/disk: PFS 211, PFS 389\* (**fig. 38**)

figure in winged ring/disk: PFS 82\* (**fig. 34**), PFS 91 (**fig. 25**), PFS 553 (**fig. 28**), PFS 1567\* (**fig. 23**), PFUTS 1\* (**fig. 32**), PFUTS 18\* (**fig. 33**), PTS 14\*, PTS 15\*

atlantids:

ring/disk: PFS 83\* (**fig. 35**), PFS 216 (**fig. 43**), PTS 19

figure in winged ring/disk: PFS 122 (**fig. 26**), PFS 310 (**fig. 27**), PFS 420, PFS 586s, PFS 774 (**fig. 29**), PFS 1071 (**fig. 30**), PFS 1359

stylized tree/plant:

ring/disk: PFS 166 (**fig. 37**), PFS 285 (**fig. 44**), PFS 514 (**fig. 39**), PTS 24\*

figure in winged ring/disk: PFS 122, PFS 310 (**fig. 27**), PFS 420, PFS 586s, PFS 793s, PFUTS 1\* (**fig. 32**)

inscriptions:

ring/disk: PFS 83\* (**fig. 35**), PFS 389\* (**fig. 38**), PTS 20\* (**fig. 40**), PTS 24\*

figure in winged ring/disk: PFS 7\* (**fig. 24**), PFS 11\* (**fig. 22**), PFS 82\* (**fig. 34**), PFS 1567\* (**fig. 23**), PFS 1601\* (**fig. 31**), PFUTS 1\* (**fig. 32**), PFUTS 18\* (**fig. 33**), PTS 2\*, PTS 14\*

altars:

ring/disk: PTS 20\* (**fig. 40**), PTS 23

figure in winged ring/disk: PFS 11\* (**fig. 22**), PTS 22

date palms:

ring/disk: PTS 24\*

figure in winged ring/disk: PFS 7\* (**fig. 24**), PFS 11\* (**fig. 22**), PFUTS 18\* (**fig. 33**), PTS 2\*

crown/elaborate headdress:

ring/disk: PFS 196 (**fig. 42**), PFS 389\* (**fig. 38**), PFS 1189, PTS 23

figure in winged ring/disk: PFS 7\* (**fig. 24**), PFS 11\* (**fig. 22**), PFS 82\* (**fig. 34**), PFS 774 (**fig. 29**), PFUTS 1\* (**fig. 32**), PFUTS 18\* (**fig. 33**), PTS 2\*, PTS 14\*, PTS 22

bow/arrow:

ring/disk: PFS 196 (**fig. 42**), PFS 115\* (**fig. 36**), PTS 24\*, PTS 36

spear:

ring/disk: PFS 522, PFS 1360, PTS 24\*

figure in winged ring/disk: PFS 82\* (**fig. 34**)

flower:

ring/disk: PFS 389\* (**fig. 38**), PTS 23, PTS 24\*, PTS 26

figure in winged ring/disk: PFS 1567\* (**fig. 23**), PFUTS 1\* (**fig. 32**)?, PTS 14\*, PTS 15\*, PTS 22

Persian court robe:

ring/disk: PFS 196 (**fig. 42**), PFS 522, PFS 851, PTS 23, PTS 24\*, PTS 26

figure in winged ring/disk: PFS 7\* (**fig. 24**), PFS 11\* (**fig. 22**), PFS 91 (**fig. 25**), PFS 774 (**fig. 29**), PFUTS 18\* (**fig. 33**), PTS 2\*, PTS 14\*, PTS 22

ring:

figure in winged ring/disk: PFS 91 (**fig. 25**)

Although composite creatures are by no means rare in both glyptic archives, they appear to be almost a mandatory element in scenes that include a winged symbol. Their frequent appearance in conjunction with the winged symbol may signal an attempt to intensify the numinous character of the scenes (see the comments on pp. 43–46). Composite creatures often serve as pedestal creatures in these scenes (i.e., creatures on whose backs individuals stand). Again, as a phenomenon, pedestal creatures are rare in both Persepolitan glyptic corpora. The high percentage of them in scenes with a winged symbol cannot be fortuitous. DUSINBERRE (1997) has discussed the possible coding of rank and status through the use of pedestal creatures in Achaemenid glyptic. The frequent occurrence of pedestal creatures in these scenes that contain a winged symbol may add support to that analysis.

Composite creatures, generally variations of the bull–man, also often occur as atlantids holding winged symbols aloft. This is an ancient combination.<sup>141</sup> One is also struck by the conspicuous connection to Naqsh–i Rostam, where we have a reconfiguration of the combination of the figure in the winged ring and atlantids.<sup>142</sup> The evidence from the PFS corpus would suggest that the connection between atlantids and the figure in the winged ring/disk had very strong associations with religiosity and, potentially, concepts of cosmic kingship. These associations are also reinforced by the combination of atlantids, a winged symbol, and a stylized tree, the so–called “sacred” tree. This combination of elements again has a long history and is especially prominent in the glyptic arts of Assyria.<sup>143</sup>

There is an exceptionally high percentage of inscriptions on scenes that contain a winged symbol. Inscribed seals are relatively rare in the PFS corpus, accounting for less than 10% of the total number of seals.<sup>144</sup> No fewer than thirteen scenes that have a winged symbol also contain inscriptions (approximately 30% of the scenes that have a winged symbol from both of the Persepolitan archives).<sup>145</sup> Four of these seals, PFS 7\* (**fig. 24**), PFS 11\* (**fig. 22**), PFUTS 18\* (**fig. 33**), and PTS 2\*, contain trilingual royal–name inscriptions, surely, again, not a fortuitous coupling.<sup>146</sup> Inscribed seals are clearly very special phenomena and are generally associated with officials and offices of exceptionally high status/rank.

Lastly, the winged symbol often occurs in scenes that are “loaded” with royal iconography: e.g., altars, date palms, crowns, bows, spears, flowers, the Persian court robe, and trilingual inscriptions. Particularly dense iconography is found on e.g., PFS 11\* (**fig. 22**): two figures in Persian court robes and dentate crowns, fire altar, palm trees, and paneled trilingual royal–name inscription, rendered in a full, modeled version of the Court Style;<sup>147</sup> PFUTS 18\* (**fig. 33**): one figure in Persian court robe and dentate crown, pedestal creatures, palm trees, and paneled trilingual royal–name inscription; PFS 82\* (**fig. 34**): spear–men attendants and an inscription; PFS 389\* (**fig. 38**): a crowned figure (probably in the Persian court robe) holding a flower, a crowned fish–man attendant, and a paneled inscription; PFS 1567\* (**fig. 23**): attendants holding flowers and a paneled inscription; PFUTS 1\* (**fig. 32**): dentate crowns, pedestal creatures, and a

paneled Elamite inscription; etc. PFS 91 (**fig. 25**) is a particularly important scene where the figure in the winged symbol extends a ring to a figure in the Persian court robe. This scene seems to extend/narrate the reliefs at Behistun (**figs. 15–16**) and Naqsh-i Rostam (**fig. 17**), where the figure in the winged ring simply holds the ring.<sup>148</sup> Of the two archer scenes in which the winged symbol occurs, PFS 115\* (**fig. 36**) and PTS 36, the former is one of the most impressive designs in the whole of the PFS corpus: an archer shooting at a rampant caprid before a tree, with an inscription, in a richly modeled style of carving.

In summation, the range of scenes that involve the winged symbol and the syntax of those scenes are very restricted. The visual vocabulary associated with the winged symbol is highly charged, often connoting aspects of elite status and/or kingship. In particular the combination of winged symbols and inscriptions in both monumental relief and Persepolitan glyptic seems to have been exceptionally potent. The combination of winged symbols and inscriptions may have functioned on multiple levels of meaning (see the discussion on pp. 38–40). From a glyptic perspective, the close combination of winged symbols and inscriptions may have both echoed the royal message found in monumental relief sculpture and acted as a marker of affinity among the elite to the new ruling dynasty.

#### 4.3.5. *The figure in the winged ring/disk, the winged ring-and-disk, and the winged ring/disk: discussion*

The question of the identity/identities of the winged symbol in all of its various manifestations is one of the most nagging in the whole of the study of the visual arts of the Achaemenid period. Commentators are divided on the basic question of whether the two basic image types, figure in the winged ring/disk and the winged ring-and-disk, represent one and the same phenomenon. As the survey of the textual and visual evidence from the time of Darius has shown, the issues are complex, with the visual evidence exhibiting much variation in iconographic details. It is clear that formally the figure in a winged ring/disk owes much to (early) representations of a figure in a winged ring/disk from Assyria. Unfortunately, for the purpose of potentially solving the issue in the Achaemenid period, there is no consensus on exactly whom that figure represents in the Neo-Assyrian period, the Assyrian state god Ashur, or some iteration of the sun god Shamash.<sup>149</sup>

Various and now well-known opinions have been put forward concerning the identity of the winged symbol in Achaemenid art.<sup>150</sup> Given the importance of the winged symbol in both monumental and glyptic arts in the Persian heartland, the desire to connect the winged symbol with the only repeatedly named deity in the Behistun and Naqsh-i Rostam texts (and for that matter almost all royal Achaemenid texts), Auramazda, has been exceptionally strong (e.g., LECOQ 1984; ROOT 1979: 169–176; STRONACH 1997: 46).<sup>151</sup> The suggestion that the figure in the winged ring/disk represents the *fravashi* (“spirit”) of the king has been of long-standing tradition (UNVALA 1930). SHAHBAZI (1974; 1980), followed by many commentators, identified the figure in the winged disk with the concept of the royal *Khvarenah* (Avestan: “Glorious”).<sup>152</sup> CALMEYER (1975) suggested a connection with the “daimon” of the king’s ancestor. JACOBS (1991; in press) has suggested that the figure in the winged ring/disk is a conflation of Auramazda and a sun god, while the winged ring-and-disk/disk is a symbol of the sun god \**Uvar/n-*.<sup>153</sup>

Many of these theories involve projecting religious concepts from much later periods backward to the Achaemenid period. As remarked above, this approach is open to a variety of criticisms. There exists, however, a concept documented much closer in time and space to the early Achaemenid period. This is the Elamite concept of *kitin*.<sup>154</sup>

*Kitin* is something that the gods bestow. As HENKELMAN (2006: 292) explains:

*Kitin* is a hard-to-define abstraction that was crucial to (Neo-)Elamite religion and royal ideology. In broadest terms, *kitin* seems to refer to divine authority and power as it emanates from the divine down to the mortal world. “Divine protection” is a translation that covers some of its occurrences, but is probably just a weak rendering of its full significance for an Elamite audience. Other uses of the term lead to supplementary interpretations such as “god-given royal power,” “divinely-enforced legal protection,” “legal authority,” “legal order, rules,” and “divine symbol, emblem.”

While many gods can bestow *kitin*, only the main and most popular Neo-Elamite god, Humban, bestows *kitin* on the king in the Neo-Elamite period.<sup>155</sup> In particular, HENKELMAN cites a fascinating passage in one of the inscriptions accompanying the reliefs of Hanni of Aiapir at Kul-i Farah (EKI 75:20-1):<sup>156</sup> “May the *kitin* of Tepti, the founder-of-*kitin*, of *sipak* Napir, protector of the gods, of Šimut, herald of the gods, of Humban, under (whose) *kitin* a king (stands), be placed upon my relief!” Here we see not only the direct connection between Humban’s *kitin* and the king, but the direct association of *kitin* and royal sculpture.

HENKELMAN (2006: 294) notes that in the Neo-Elamite period not only do kings stand under *kitin*, but they may use it as an instrument of power. The concept resurfaces in the Achaemenid period in the Elamite version of the famous *Daiva Inscription* of Xerxes (XPh. 29-32):<sup>157</sup>

And among the lands there was (a place) where, formerly, (the people) made (for) the *daiva* their sacrificial feast(s). Then, by the effort of Ahuramazda, I devastated that place of *daiva*-worship and I placed *kitin* upon them: “(for) the *daiva* you shall not make their sacrificial feast(s)!”

The inscription as a whole has provoked endless and heated debates that need not detain us.<sup>158</sup> It is the employment of the Elamite concept of *kitin* (and only in the Elamite version of the text!) that seems so provocative with regard to our consideration of the figure in the winged symbol.

Taking the Elamite and Achaemenid evidence together, one is struck by:

- 1) the physical relationship of *kitin* to Neo-Elamite kings, i.e., the king stands under *kitin*;
- 2) the conceptualization of *kitin* as a distinct entity (a power used by kings in both the Neo-Elamite and Achaemenid periods);
- 3) the invocation of *kitin* in protection of the relief of Hanni.

These characteristics of *kitin* appear strikingly to articulate the characteristics of the figure in the winged ring/disk in the early Achaemenid period: the king stands under the figure in the winged ring/disk; the figure in the winged ring/disk is a distinct entity that animates itself in multiple ways; the figure in the winged ring/disk literally oversees relief.

Of course, attempting to replace the concepts of *fravashi*, *Khvarenah*, or daimon with that of the *kitin* simply dislodges one monolithic explanation with another, albeit one which in my opinion has the advantage of actually being documented in the Achaemenid period. I reiterate what I have written previously, that we are not well served by seeking such monolithic explanations to such complex images. The two major types (with and without the figure) and the

variations within the types may have represented different deities/concepts intrinsically and/or within different contexts.<sup>159</sup> In this sense the variations that one sees in the visual evidence may perhaps reflect the diverse religious landscape recorded in the textual evidence from the Fortification archive. So, too, the winged symbol may have become polyvalent by the Achaemenid period, laden with historical associations to various iterations of Assyro-Babylonian solar deities, overlaid with Elamite concepts (*kitin*) associated with the god Humban and Iranian concepts of solar and Mazdean deities. Finally, it is clear that the image in the Achaemenid period had exceptionally intense linkages with Achaemenid dynastic ambitions.<sup>160</sup> MOOREY (1979: 225), although working without the benefit of the full range of glyptic imagery from the PFS corpus, recognized this possibility:

... from the outset Achaemenid religious iconography—even its most conspicuous emblems—reflects a more polytheistic attitude (echoing Darius at Behistun: “With the help of Ahuramazda and *all the gods*” [emphasis MOOREY]) than some interpretations allow; particularly when they do not sufficiently acknowledge the persisting strength of the richly varied Assyro-Babylonian legacy underlying it. Each individual symbol may well at the time have had various meanings (or, at least, levels of meaning), not a single, invariable one.

From an ideological standpoint, such a polyvalent symbol as the figure in the winged ring/disk would have been an exceptionally powerful tool as Darius sought to legitimize both his specific seizure of power and his general dynastic program. The very restricted range of imagery in which the winged symbol occurs in both glyptic and monumental relief at the time of Darius, the very careful structural composition of those scenes, and the importance of the high frequency of the occurrence of the winged symbol with design elements that mark exceptionally high status/rank (e.g., inscriptions, atlantids, pedestal creatures, “sacred trees,” palm trees, crowned figures, figures wearing the Persian court robe, etc.), suggest that the occurrence of the winged symbol is not simply random. While its specific divine signifier may have varied with context, its political content is without question: the legitimacy of specifically Achaemenid rule. It then becomes especially intriguing to consider the possibility that the winged symbol was chosen as one of the central images of Achaemenid kingship owing to its very polyvalence. This polyvalence could have been perceived as a potential catalyst for inviting more fluid readings of the symbol within specifically royal contexts. As several commentators have noted, in many scenes the figure in the winged ring/disk and the king are essentially one and the same; they wear the same garments, crowns, beards, and make the same gestures. It cannot have escaped the planners (nor, one assumes, troubled them) that many viewers of, e.g., the reliefs at Behistun and Naqsh-e Rostam might have made the logical (visual) inference that Darius and the figure in the winged ring/disk were one and the same.

The important analysis by DALLEY (1986) on the winged symbol in late 2nd and 1st mill. seems especially relevant to this discussion. In that study, she identified various names for the winged disk: *Ṣalmu* (Babylonia, Syria, Anatolia, and Northwest Arabia), and *Ṣalmu/Ṣalmu-sharri* (Assyria). All these names could be used for the sun god (Shamash), and had associations, particularly *Ṣalmu-sharri*, with oath taking, especially oaths of loyalty to the king.<sup>161</sup> In the second half of the 2nd mill. among the Hittites, Egyptians, and at Ugarit the winged disk was a sign to represent the cuneiform <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>si</sup> as a form of address to the king, thus serving as a “solar symbol intimately connected with the king” (DALLEY 1986: 98). In those contexts the winged

disk and the title <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>si</sup> were used as markers for any deity or ruler to whom oaths were due (i.e., the sign is complex and polyvalent). In the Neo-Assyrian period the god Šalmu “is found at coronations, royal burial sites, and treaty ceremonies” (DALLEY 1986: 97). She stresses that the loyalty oath to the king “was sworn publicly in the Near East on an annual basis from at least the Hittite empire period down through the Hellenistic period” (DALLEY 1986: 99).

These comments seem especially striking with regard to the reliefs at Behistun and Naqsh-i Rostam. In particular we note the metaphorical relationship between the king and the figure in the winged ring, the concept of coronation (Behistun), the linkage to royal burial rites (Naqsh-i Rostam), and the concept of loyalty (the texts at Behistun and Naqsh-i Rostam).<sup>162</sup> Finally, DALLEY (1986: 100) notes of the Assyrian pictorial evidence that divine symbols are present when there was a need for “overt reference to national and royal oaths”; when the Neo-Assyrian king is shown fulfilling his religious duties, divine symbols are not present. What COGAN says of the Neo-Assyrian stelae is directly applicable to the royal reliefs at Behistun and Naqsh-i Rostam: the stelae “reminded all onlookers of the political loyalties expected of them.”<sup>163</sup>

Thus, on what I would identify as its primary level, the figure in the winged ring/disk in these overtly royal contexts acts as a sign of legitimate kingship.<sup>164</sup> Multiple secondary levels of meaning would include such concepts as loyalty (via the Neo-Assyrian inheritance) and divine approval (the specific divine referent consciously ambiguous and so open to various readings depending on the viewer).<sup>165</sup> I leave open the possibility that the very ambiguity of the image may also have provoked more direct readings of divine kingship.

The combination of concepts of “partial-figure-ness,” ascension, and kingship finds other expressions in the visual arts of the time of Darius. I have previously discussed in other venues the remarkable seal PFS 261\* (**fig. 45**) (GARRISON 2000: 139–141; GARRISON in press [b]). The design includes a figure that emerges from a composite winged creature consisting of a bull’s head, bird’s tail (and body?), and scorpion tail. The figure is in the act of drawing a bow, shooting toward a rampant lion at the right. The archer wears a polos-like headdress (perhaps a crown) and an elaborately rendered Persian court robe. On his back is a quiver with arrows and another bow; an Elamite paneled inscription names one Shati-dudu, son of Tardumannu.<sup>166</sup> One notes the intensity of royal/divine signifiers: the partial human figure, composite creature, pedestal creature, paneled inscription, quiver, bow (duck-headed), crown (?), and Persian court robe. The design is thus particularly dense and nuanced in its semantic, referencing multiple aspects of kingship and divinity.<sup>167</sup> The archer emerging from a composite creature is structurally very similar to the figure emerging from the winged ring/disk.<sup>168</sup> In a similar manner, and famously, the official Achaemenid coinage of type I shows a partial figure holding a bow and arrows (**fig. 46**). Here again we have the concurrence of the partial figure with crown, beard, Persian court robe, bow, and arrow.<sup>169</sup> The large number of composite human-animal archers that are preserved in the PFS corpus potentially represent another referent for the figure in the winged ring/disk.<sup>170</sup> Rounding out this visual repertoire of partial human figures are the figure in a nimbus on PFS 38 (**fig. 47**), the figure in a lunar crescent on PFS 105s (**fig. 48**), PFS 244s, and PFUTS 82s (**fig. 49**), and the crowned figure found within a circle.<sup>171</sup> The crowned figure found within a circle is generally the focus of adoration, but most of the evidence for this image type dates to the reign of Xerxes.<sup>172</sup>

Dressed in royal garments and accoutrements, all of these various manifestations of the partial human figure, doubles of the king, seem on a primary level to reference Achaemenid kingship. These references themselves are multidimensional; at times “pacific” (e.g., the figure in a circle holding a flower, the figure in a winged ring/disk extending hands in the greeting/blessing

gesture, etc.), at other times militant/aggressive (e.g., PFS 261\* [fig. 45], type I coin archer [fig. 46], etc.). Nevertheless, the very “partial-figure-ness” of the image types elevates them to the numinous; literally, the concept of Achaemenid kingship hovers between the earthly and the divine.<sup>173</sup>

#### 4.4. Other anthropomorphic depictions of the divine and numinous at Persepolis

In addition to the various manifestations of the figure emergent that have just been discussed, evidence exists for anthropomorphic depictions of other divine and numinous beings in Achaemenid art at the time of Darius I. This evidence comes from the glyptic preserved on the two Persepolitan archives. Although the exposition of this evidence is lengthy, its existence needs to be stressed, especially given the weight attached to Herodotus’ oft-quoted statement that the Persians did not render deities in human form.<sup>174</sup>

##### 4.1.1. *Figure in nimbus*

A traditional manner of indicating the divine in the Assyrian tradition is to encircle the upper body of a figure with a circle (or lozenge) from which rays (or spikes) emerge; the rays generally terminate in circular devices.<sup>175</sup> A figure in a nimbus has only rarely been documented in the whole of the Achaemenid Persian period.<sup>176</sup> The seals from the Fortification and Treasury archives add only a few more examples of a figure in a nimbus, but three of them are quite remarkable.<sup>177</sup> The most striking examples from the PFS corpus are the much-discussed PFS 38 (fig. 47), a seal belonging to the royal woman Irtashduna, a wife of Darius I, and PFS 68 (fig. 50).<sup>178</sup> On PFS 38 (fig. 47) a figure in a nimbus occurs in the upper part of the terminal field of a wonderfully executed heroic encounter scene. The figure (apparently beardless?) emerges from a triple ring from which radiate rays that terminate in stars. Details of dress and headgear are only very faintly preserved; the figure appears to wear a conical headdress with a knob at its top. The figure floats over an elaborate floral element. Immediately to the right are seven dots, an Assyrian convention of rendering the *sibitti*.<sup>179</sup> If beardless, as it seems, the figure is probably female and, perhaps, to be associated with Ishtar and/or Anahita. Given the wealth of astral symbolism in the PFS corpus and at Behistun, this linkage seems highly likely (see pp. 47–48).

On PFS 68 (fig. 50) the upper body of a male figure, with a long, rounded beard and wearing a conical headdress and long undecorated robe, is surrounded by a notched ring; to either side of the figure stands a winged male figure who holds a bucket and apparently dabs at the nimbus (or raises a hand in adoration). Both the rendering of the nimbus and the overall scene vividly recall Assyrian conventions (see especially COLLON 2001: no. 269), but the style is very clearly Persepolitan (see GARRISON 2000: 129–134). There is unfortunately no way of discerning exactly which deity is here depicted.

PTS 21 (fig. 51), which I suggested above may possibly, on the basis of style, date to the time of Darius I, preserves part of an exceptionally well-rendered figure in a nimbus of stars (SCHMIDT 1957: 26, pl. 7). An apparently male figure stands to the right, facing the figure in the nimbus. There is an object between them (SCHMIDT 1957: 26, altar or wedge-shaped Nabu symbol). SCHMIDT (1957: 26) identified the figure in the nimbus as female and, accordingly, Ishtar.

##### 4.4.2. *Figure posed on an animal/creature, stand, or pedestal animal(s)/creature(s)*



Another traditional convention of indicating the divine in the Sumero–Akkadian and Assyrian visual repertoire is to pose a static figure on the back of an animal/creature or on a stand. This particular convention could represent either the statue of the deity or its epiphany. These types of scenes are rare in the seals from the PFS and PTS corpora. PFS 211 is an elaborate scene showing a figure on the back of an animal (only partially preserved); to the left is a bull–man with a bucket, to the right a human figure with hands raised, potentially standing on the back of a caprid (the preservation in this passage is poor); in the terminal field only the tail of a winged symbol is preserved. PFS 553 (**fig. 28**), rendered in a heavy drilled style, shows a figure (the head is not preserved) standing on the back of a winged creature marchant. The lower body of the figure is surrounded by dots; this may be a stylized nimbus or simply stars. Projections from the front and back of the body may be weapons (?). At left there is a composite creature; farther to the left, above a rectangular object, is an abstracted winged symbol (see p. 43). This heavy drilled style is often seen in the PFS corpus; it is another direct inheritance from Assyrian glyptic. The design itself is also heavily Assyrianizing.<sup>180</sup>

PFS 1312s (**fig. 52**) shows a male figure on a stand; to the left is a fish–man, to the right a goat–fish. The fish–man and goat–fish are traditional creatures in the Assyrian divine repertoire; both are apotropaic figures and associated with the water god Ea.<sup>181</sup> BLACK and GREEN (1992: 93) note that the two are often paired together in pictorial representations. The combination of the two here with a male figure on a pedestal strongly suggests that the male figure is divine. Both the male figure and the fish–man hold their hands up on their chests.<sup>182</sup>

Much more common in the glyptic from both of the Persepolitan archives are figures posed “in action” on the backs of animals/creatures, what we have called “pedestal creatures.”<sup>183</sup> I also include in this category those scenes where a figure raises a leg to place his foot on the back of an animal/creature. Pedestal animals/creatures come in a variety of forms and are used to support a variety of figure types and activity. The pedestal creatures themselves tend to be based on bulls or lions, but PFS 1567\* (**fig. 23**) has goat–fish; the creatures are often winged.<sup>184</sup> The activities that they support include heroic encounters (e.g., PFS 36\*, PFS 931\*, PFUTS 18\* [**fig. 33**], PTS 1\*, etc.), archers (e.g., PFS 390\*, PFS 864, PFS 1569, etc.) and devotional scenes (e.g., PFS 82\* [**fig. 34**], PFS 91 [**fig. 25**], PFS 389\* [**fig. 38**], PFS 1567\* [**fig. 23**], PFUTS 1\* [**fig. 32**], PTS 15\*, etc.).<sup>185</sup>

Much work remains to be done in the analysis of the use of pedestal creatures and their significance. Pedestal creatures appear to be a method to elevate the participants not only literally but also metaphorically; i.e., they are a clear marker of the numinous. At the same time, in some devotional scenes they support the attendants themselves. PTS 15\* is an excellent example of the use of pedestal creatures in a devotional scene.<sup>186</sup> To either side of a figure in a winged ring there is a robed male figure standing on the back of a winged, horned lion marchant. Each male figure holds a flower and raises one hand in the greeting/blessing gesture, clearly directed toward the figure in the winged ring.<sup>187</sup> The male figures do not appear to have royal iconography. PFS 82\* (**fig. 34**) and PFS 1567\* (**fig. 23**) are very similar scenes; unfortunately the heads of the figures on PFS 1567\* (**fig. 23**) are not preserved and so we cannot discern whether they wear crowns. On PFS 82\* (**fig. 34**) the figure at right wears a conical headdress with a knob on its top. PFS 389\* (**fig. 38**) is an interesting variation where crowned fish–men flank a winged ring–and–disk over an inscription panel; a crowned figure stands on their tails, holding a flower and making the greeting/blessing gesture. PFUTS 1\* (**fig. 32**) shows crowned fish–men again; they are arrayed in such a manner that they support not only the attendants but the inscription. As in so

much of this material, such scenes with attendants on pedestal creatures to either side of a winged symbol have strong Assyrian precedents (see COLLON 2001: nos. 152–153).

#### 4.4.3. *Figure in crescent*

Two seals from the PFS corpus, PFS 105s (**fig. 48**) and PFS 244s, and one seal from the PFUTS corpus, PFUTS 82s (**fig. 49**), preserve a figure in a lunar crescent. On PFS 105s (**fig. 48**), a beautifully executed seal that is well preserved, about two-thirds of the figure is indicated, facing to the right. He is bearded, with a thick mass of hair at the back of his neck, and wears a long robe and polos headdress. A ribbon hangs down from the back of his neck. He appears to hold a scepter; one arm is raised and held in front of his chest. An extension from his lower back appears to be part of the scepter or perhaps a weapon (?) (see COLLON 2001: no. 361). The crescent curves upward sharply all the way to the head of the figure, creating the impression of a full circle (see COLLON 2001: no. 361). The crescent and figure are held aloft by a bull-man. An elaborate floral device rises to either side of the bull-man. The large and spectacularly carved stamp seal PFUTS 82s (**fig. 49**) is very similar. Here again we see a bearded figure wearing a tall conical headdress, facing to the right. He raises one arm before his chest with the hand held flat, the thumb separated. A sheath extends downward from the back of his waist. The crescent sweeps upward to touch the figure's headdress. A lotus blossom extends to each side of the crescent with a seven-pronged floral device immediately below the crescent. PFS 244s is very poorly preserved. Here again about two-thirds of the figure is indicated in the crescent, facing right. He is bearded, with a thick mass of hair at the back of his neck; he appears to wear a long robe and perhaps a polos headdress. One arm is raised and held in front of his chest; the hand is apparently held flat, but this may simply be a carving convention.<sup>188</sup> Four circles stacked vertically immediately in front of the figure may represent a staff.<sup>189</sup> The crescent is approximately a half-circle. Below the crescent is a stylized floral device; above, a star. At right a bearded attendant raises one arm.

All of these scenes conform to image types (“god in the crescent,” uplifted by bull-man, as object of devotion) that are well known from Assyro-Babylonian glyptic of the 7th and 6th cent.<sup>190</sup> It is interesting that, like the examples from the seals on the Fortification archive, the Neo-Assyrian scenes showing a god in the form of a partial figure in a crescent are often executed on stamp seals. Commentators generally agree that the image in Assyro-Babylonian contexts is a depiction of the moon god Sin.<sup>191</sup>

Although only three examples of the god in the crescent have been identified on the seals from the Fortification archive, there is other evidence from the Achaemenid period for the image type, and of course the crescent alone is ubiquitous in Achaemenid art (see pp. 47–48).<sup>192</sup> The image may be related to the partial figure within a circle (especially when the lower edge of the circle is thickened to form a crescent; e.g., MOOREY 1978: 146–148). Whether the depictions of the god in the crescent in the PFS corpus reference the Assyro-Babylonian deity Sin or perhaps a Persian equivalent is unknown.<sup>193</sup>

#### 4.4.4. *Horus child in papyrus field*

The remarkable seal PFS 38 (**fig. 47**), the personal seal of the Irtashduna, a wife of Darius I, appears to show a rendering of the nude Horus child with pigtail sitting in a papyrus field. The image occurs in the lower field of the small space between the hero and the creature to right. The

preservation in this area of the seal design is, however, very poor. The Horus child sitting on a lotus is documented in Neo-Assyrian glyptic.<sup>194</sup>

#### 4.5. *Mischwesen* at Persepolis

The visual world of both monumental relief and glyptic at the time of Darius is alive with a striking variety of composite human-animal creatures; I can give only a very general and preliminary introduction to them in this forum. We have already encountered many of these creatures in previous sections.

Two of the most interesting and clearly very important creatures are the human-headed bull and the bull-man, both of whom occur in a variety of contexts.<sup>195</sup> In monumental art at Persepolis, human-headed bull-leonine creatures flank a winged ring/disk on the southern stairway of the Palace of Darius (**fig. 20**).<sup>196</sup> These creatures wear divine horned crowns. PFS 113\* (**fig. 53**), a large royal-name seal, and PFS 1155 each show a hero controlling two winged, human-headed bulls; in PFS 526\* the hero confronts a single winged, human-headed bull. The creatures on PFS 113\* (**fig. 53**) and PFS 526\* wear crowns with serrated upper edges. The same creatures, again crowned, are seen on PTS 1\*, another royal-name seal, this time acting as pedestal creatures for the heroic encounter. A slightly different variant is the winged, human-headed bull that acts as the hero in PFS 1204. It is noteworthy that the human-headed bull is exceptionally rare in archer scenes, and almost nonexistent in animal combats and heraldic animal scenes.<sup>197</sup>

A striking variant on the human-headed bull is what one could call the human-faced bull creature. In this variant a human face is attached to a bovine neck and body (rather than a human head attached to a bovine body). PFS 108\* (**fig. 54**) is one of the most arresting examples in the PFS corpus; two rampant, winged, human-faced bulls flank a circular stylized plant device. These creatures each have a large, curved caprid-like horn from which a smaller, curved horn emerges; it is highly likely that the horn does in fact refer to caprids and is part of the significance of the creature. The same creatures (the horns are not preserved) also appear on PFS 320\* (**fig. 55**), another inscribed seal, this time flanking an inscription, and in the heroic encounters of PFS 38 (**fig. 47**), PFS 98\* (**fig. 56**), and others.<sup>198</sup> The bodies of the horned (again, big, curved caprid-like horn), human-faced creatures in PFS 73\* (the creature alone and marchant) and PFS 848\* (an archer scene) may be bovine, although the slender bodies and curved tails may be leonine. The high percentage of inscribed seals among seals that show the human-faced bull creature cannot be a coincidence; the creature clearly signifies high status/rank.

Bull-men are featured in the PFS corpus almost exclusively as atlantids; there is one example, PFS 553 (**fig. 28**), where a bull-man stands behind a divine (?) figure on a winged creature. The bull-men atlantids can occur in pairs supporting the winged symbol (PFS 1071 [**fig. 30**], each shown with two wings in the terminal field of a heroic encounter; PFS 1359 [lower bodies not preserved]);<sup>199</sup> more often they hold aloft the winged symbol while disposed to either side of a stylized tree (e.g., PFS 122 (**fig. 26**), PFS 310 (**fig. 27**), although the lower bodies not preserved). On PFS 122 (**fig. 26**) and PFS 1071 (**fig. 30**) the bull-men are ithyphallic. A single bull-man atlantid supports the winged symbol on PFS 774 (**fig. 29**) (in the terminal field of a heroic encounter) and a figure in a crescent on PFS 105s (**fig. 48**).<sup>200</sup>

The bull-man has a long history in the visual arts of ancient Western Asia. The creature has traditionally been identified with the Assyrian term *kusarikku*; since the Old Babylonian period it had been an attendant of Shamash (EHRENBERG 1999: 28, with previous bibliography).

Ehrenberg identifies the bull-man in the 1st mill. as a “protective Mischwesen” and notes the continued association with Shamash via the winged disk. ROOT (1979: 148) notes the association of the bull-man and scorpion-man (see p. 45) with cosmic phenomena. A very common scene in Neo-Assyrian glyptic shows bull-men atlantids supporting a winged symbol.<sup>201</sup> Similar scenes in the PFS corpus appear to carry this tradition down into the middle of the 1st mill.

There are a few striking occurrences of other human-bull composites: e.g., PFS 1\* (**fig. 57**), a winged bull creature that appears to have a human upper torso and arms and a bull’s head; PFS 684, a winged bull-man; PFS 802, a bull creature archer that, like the bull creature on PFS 1\* (**fig. 61**), appears to have human upper torso and arms; PFS 1204, a winged bull creature with human arms and shoulders, a human face, bull neck, and caprid horns.<sup>202</sup> Another variation of the bull-man, known in only one example (PFS 1381s), is the winged male figure that has a bull-head appendage to either side of his body.

Given the longevity of both the bull-man and the human-headed bull in the visual arts of Western Asia, and the lack of any specific textual documentation from the Achaemenid period concerning such creatures, any attempt to identify them with specific deities or numinous entities is bound to be conjectural at best. At most we may assume that, as in the Assyrian period, in certain contexts the human-headed bull and the human-faced bull creature had general protective qualities, thus its disposition to either side of inscriptions in both monumental and glyptic art. Both the human-headed bull and the human-faced bull creature also seem to be connected to certain aspects of Achaemenid royal ideology, hence its appearance on monumental relief at Persepolis and on several inscribed seals, two of which are royal-name seals. As discussed, the glyptic evidence suggests that the bull-man as atlantid retained a strong linkage to the winged symbol.

More common than the human-bull creatures are human-headed lions in the PFS corpus. These creatures can be both bearded and unbearded and are generally winged. They often occur as the opponent of the hero in heroic encounters.<sup>203</sup> As with the human-bull creatures, they are almost nonexistent in archer scenes and rare in worship scenes (e.g., probably PFS 82\* (**fig. 34**), PFS 442.).<sup>204</sup> Human-headed lions are commonly found in animal combats (e.g., PFS 8 [**fig. 58**], PFS 74, PFS 156, PFS 508, etc.) and as heraldic pairs (e.g., PFS 111, PFS 460, PFS 1508, etc.). PFS 46 shows a winged, human-headed lion in what is apparently a processional scene.<sup>205</sup>

Human-caprid combinations seem rather rare in the PFS corpus, although, as mentioned, it is often difficult to distinguish specific types of animal bodies,<sup>206</sup> some of the evidence discussed above may thus in fact be applicable here.<sup>207</sup> We may have human-faced caprids in the heroic encounters on PFS 222 and PFS 1002. The partially preserved human-faced creature in the archer scene on PFS 302 appears to have goat horns.<sup>208</sup> Otherwise, one is hard-pressed to identify unambiguously composite human-caprid creatures.

What may be called “centaur-like” creatures belong in a separate category.<sup>209</sup> These creatures generally have an animal body, often winged, and legs onto which are attached the upper torso and head of a human. The great majority of these creatures occur as archers; the scenes are often visually stunning and remarkably dynamic.<sup>210</sup> The specific animal body, bull or lion, is often difficult to determine with any degree of certainty. At times, the creatures have two sets of animal forelegs (e.g., PFS 250 [**fig. 59**]). The human torsos appear to be nude, although some do wear a (double or triple) belt (e.g., PFS 203, PFS 250 [**fig. 59**], PFS 306, PFS 349, PFS 351, etc.). The figures rarely wear crowns, but preservation of heads is spotty (e.g., PFS 78 [**fig. 60**] and PFS 174, cylindrical polos headdresses; PFS 1371, feather crowns). Interesting variants include a

scorpion body (PFS 78 [fig. 60] and PFS 118; PFS 1416 has a scorpion tail) and a bird body (PFS 715 in flight, PFS 864 with legs, and PFS 1199).

These composite creature archers and the scenes in which they occur seem to reach back and reference designs, few in number, found on Middle Assyrian and Kassite Babylonian glyptic and Kassite kudurrus.<sup>211</sup> It is interesting that these creatures are rarely found in Neo-Assyrian or Neo-Babylonian glyptic, one of the few occasions where glyptic inheritances from those periods does not seem to have played a substantial role in the PFS corpus.<sup>212</sup> “Lion centaurs” who wear horned headdresses do occur in monumental relief in the North Palace of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh (BARNETT 1976: pl. 20, slab II). BLACK and GREEN (1992: 119) note that these creatures were called *urmahlullu*, “lion-man,” and were apotropaic. They seem quite different in form from the examples in the PFS corpus. As is generally the case, the specific referents for the Persepolitan material are lost to us, although given the fact that most of the creatures are archers one may assume that they had general apotropaic qualities. The scorpion creatures are clearly related to the scorpion-men that occur in other contexts in the PFS corpus and also in Assyro-Babylonian art (discussed immediately below).<sup>213</sup>

There are a few examples of human-scorpion creatures, of various constitution, that appear in the PFS corpus. A now well-known scene, PFS 4\*, shows winged scorpion-men in a heroic encounter.<sup>214</sup> These creatures have a bearded human head attached to a winged scorpion body with bird’s legs and feet. They wear banded, domed headdresses with knobs at the top; vertical projections along the front of the headdress may be horns. Although only fragmentarily preserved, PFS 903 (fig. 61) has a beautiful pair of heraldic winged scorpion-men that are very similar in form to those on PFS 4\*.<sup>215</sup> We have already noted the two examples of scorpion creatures who are archers (PFS 78 [fig. 60] and PFS 118); these creatures are distinct in form from the scorpion creatures just discussed. Finally, PFS 706\* (fig. 62) is a rather complex variation on the scorpion-man. The creature, which seems to be the object of an attendant at right, has what appears to be a lion body with wings, a human torso (also winged), a bird’s head, and a scorpion tail. The creature carries an elaborately handled device, more like a censer than a bucket, and raises its other arm in an apparent greeting/blessing gesture (the hand is not preserved).

The scorpion-bird-man creatures on PFS 4\* and PFS 903 (fig. 61) are commonly seen in other seals of the Achaemenid period and earlier. EHRENBERG (1999: 21) has tracked the literature on the first appearance of the creature and its possible identification with the *girtablullu*, “scorpion-man.”<sup>216</sup> Most commentators have stressed the benevolent character of the scorpion creature; the evidence from the PFS corpus would seem to suggest a similar reading.

Fish-men occur on three seals: PFS 389\* (fig. 38), where there are two, both winged, one wearing a dentate crown, serving as pedestal creatures; PFS 1312s (fig. 52), where a fish-man and a goat-fish appear with a male figure on a stand; and PFUTS 1\* (fig. 32), a spectacular scene of attendants standing on the backs of fish-men flanking a central stylized tree over which a figure in a winged device floats. These fish-men also support the paneled Elamite inscription. As mentioned above, the fish-man and goat-fish are traditional creatures in the Assyrian divine repertoire; both are apotropaic figures and associated with the water god Ea (see p. 41). The fish-men’s flanking of the inscription and the winged symbol and their serving as pedestal creatures for the attendants on PFUTS 1\* (fig. 32) and PFS 389\* (fig. 38) suggest that at least the apotropaic qualities of the creature are carried over into the time of Darius I.

Winged humanoid figures are ubiquitous in the glyptic evidence from the PFS corpus. They appear regularly as protagonists in the heroic encounter;<sup>217</sup> there are a few examples of human

archers who are winged (PFS 239, PFS 730, and PFS 1116). Winged humanoids are also very popular in devotional scenes, often with a winged symbol and/or stylized tree (e.g., PFS 122 [fig. 26], PFS 166 [fig. 37], PFS 216 [fig. 43], PFS 310 [fig. 27], etc.); they sometimes carry buckets. On PFS 68 (fig. 50), as we have seen, two winged humanoids stand to either side of a male figure in a nimbus.

In an Assyrian context these winged humans in devotional scenes would be called “winged genii,” generally identified as the *apkallu*, protective sages.<sup>218</sup> Whether these creatures in the PFS corpus denoted the Assyrian *apkallu* is unknown. However, the visual resonance with the Assyrian material is very strong.

#### 4.6. Theriomorphic depictions of the divine and numinous

There is a long tradition in the arts and literatures of ancient Western Asia for the use of animals as symbolic representations for specific deities, divine and numinous forces, and general oppositional concepts such as nature–culture and wild–civilized.<sup>219</sup> The depiction of animals in the Persepolitan glyptic corpora and the reliefs at Persepolis is ubiquitous; indeed, as seen in the preceding analyses, one is hard–pressed to find any major compositional type in which animals do not appear in the PFS corpus. Over one–third of the legible scenes in the PFS corpus show only animals. By far the most common animal is the lion; wild goat and antelope follow next; wild sheep, deer, and bulls occur less frequently.<sup>220</sup> Lions and bulls are often winged, clearly indicating some numinous aspect. Given the popularity of both winged and natural animals and the long history of animal symbolism in the arts of ancient Western Asia, it seems almost certain that many of these animals and/or scenes signified something beyond the mundane love of animal form. At the same time, since we lack any key to translation of the symbol meanings of these animals (such as those provided, e.g., by *kudurru* monuments of Babylonia), we remain ignorant as to specific divine/numinous linkages.<sup>221</sup>

In particular types of scenes, however, the divine significance of the animal/creature is unambiguous. This is especially true in a small group of scenes from the PFS corpus where an individual with upraised rams, a traditional indication of worship/adoration, is disposed in front of an animal/creature. These scenes are vivid, with the attendant directly confronting the creature without any mediating elements. The creatures are winged leonine composites in PFS 12a (fig. 63), PFS 12b, PFS 269, and PFS 1572\*. PFS 85a\* (fig. 64) and PFS 85b\* appear to be a variation on this scene type; here, however, the animal, a rampant lion, is behind the attendant. PFS 706\* (fig. 62) and PFS 918 also belong in this scene type, although the creatures have some human elements and thus are not, *stricto sensu*, theriomorphic. The remarkable composite creature in PFS 706\* (fig. 62) has already been noted (see p. 45). In PFS 918 the attendant stands before a multi–headed creature (of the two that are preserved, one is human, the other animal). In many of these scenes both arms of the attendant are shown with the pincher–like hands cupped upward.

This scene type is not encountered in the Assyro–Babylonian evidence. Two very similar scenes on unprovenanced seals were classified by Amiet as late Neo–Elamite; I have suggested an eastern Elam/Fars origin for this material.<sup>222</sup> The scenes obviously have much in common with the so–called late Babylonian worship scenes.

The late Babylonian worship scene is very popular in the PFS corpus.<sup>223</sup> The Persepolitan material includes as the focus of worship the *mushushu* dragon (PFS 451s [fig. 65], PFS 813\*, etc.), goat–fish with the ram–headed staff on its back (PFS 1216s\* [fig. 66] and PFS 1240\*),

dog (PFS 406), and bull (PFS 518).<sup>224</sup> In a Babylonian context, these creatures had fairly specific referents: the acolyte of Marduk and Nabu (*mushushu* dragon); the *suhurmashu*, “carp-goat,” linked with Ea (goat-fish with the ram-headed staff); and the acolyte of Gula (dog).<sup>225</sup> The bull on PFS 518 could have had multiple referents. A slight variation on the scene type, PFS 143s, replaces the (pillared) pedestal with a stand on which a bird is perched; EHRENBERG (1999: 21) notes that perched birds can symbolize the deities Shuqamuna and Shumalia in the Kassite period, Ninurta in the Neo-Assyrian period.<sup>226</sup>

#### 4.7. Aniconic depictions of the divine and numinous at Behistun, Naqsh-i Rostam, and Persepolis

Other possible symbolic representations of the divine and numinous that do not have anthropomorphic or theriomorphic aspects are placed in this category.

##### 4.7.1. Lunar and astral symbolism

As we have noted, lunar imagery is ubiquitous in the visual arts at the time of Darius I. It is given monumental expression in the form of a crescent inscribed within a disk on the relief of the tomb of Darius I at Naqsh-i Rostam (**fig. 17**). The inclusion of the image on the relief has provoked little detailed discussion.<sup>227</sup> The specific combination of the two elements, crescent and disk, in one form is confined in the time of Darius I almost exclusively to his tomb façade.<sup>228</sup> To my knowledge there is no similar image in the glyptic evidence from Persepolis; there are, however, a few examples where the crescent has a small dot at its center, perhaps representing a condensed (glyptic) version of the crescent inscribed within a disk.<sup>229</sup>

The crescent inscribed within a disk as a representation of the moon god Sin has a long tradition in the arts of ancient Western Asia, dating back to the Old Babylonian period (BLACK/GREEN 1992: 55). The fusion of the two symbols may have represented both lunar and solar deities in the form of an eclipse. The crescent inscribed within a disk is, however, rarely depicted in glyptic in the 1st mill.

ROOT (1979: 177) suggests that the image within the Achaemenid context combines both solar and lunar associations in one form, although she does not identify any specific deities. JACOBS (in press, *sv* Ma), has linked the image as found on the tomb façades at Naqsh-i Rostam with the Persian lunar deity, Ma, who is mentioned in later sources. BOYCE (1982: 114–116) has attempted to explain the triad of sun-moon-fire on the tomb reliefs in terms of orthodox Zoroastrian doctrine.<sup>230</sup>

There is perhaps no more frequently occurring element in the PFS corpus than the crescent.<sup>231</sup> The symbol occurs almost always in the upper portion of the field.<sup>232</sup> One is hard-pressed to find a major scene type that does not include some examples with a crescent.<sup>233</sup> It often occurs in combination with a star, e.g., PFS 71\* (= PTS 33\*, **fig. 67**) (see also immediately below).<sup>234</sup> It seems noteworthy that no glyptic examples exist from the time of Darius I (of which I am aware) where the crescent is paired with the figure in the winged ring/disk or the winged ring/disk. This seems all the more remarkable given the prominence of the pairing of the figure in the winged ring and the crescent inscribed within a disk on the relief of the tomb of Darius I at Naqsh-i Rostam.

The crescent was also one of the most common symbols in Assyro-Babylonian glyptic.<sup>235</sup> Its identification with the moon god Sin seems secure (see also p. 42). The ubiquity of the lunar

imagery in the visual arts at the time of Darius I suggests that a lunar deity of some type played a significant role in Southwestern Iran in the late 6th and early 5th cent.

Another popular symbol in the PFS corpus, perhaps as numerous as the crescent, is the star. As with the crescent, it would seem that there is no major scene type in which the star cannot be documented.<sup>236</sup> In the PFS corpus the star is generally rendered abstractly by a series of three or four intersecting diagonal marks, thus yielding a six- or eight-pointed star respectively. It generally occurs in the upper half of the design field where it is often paired with the crescent (e.g., PFS 71\* [fig. 67]). It is commonly found in the terminal field of a design.<sup>237</sup> This symbol is only rarely combined with the figure in the winged ring/disk or the winged ring/disk in the glyptic evidence: PFS 83\* (fig. 35), a cow and suckling calf combined with a bull-man supporting a winged ring/disk; PFS 122 (fig. 26), a devotional scene; PFS 285 (fig. 44), a caprid courant.

Although not depicted as an independent star-like element floating in the upper field, there are several occurrences of stars on the rock relief of Darius at Behistun. The most significant must surely be the star-in-disk on the top of the horned headdress worn by the figure in the winged ring (figs. 15–16; see pp. 26–27). Additionally, the headband of Darius' crown at Behistun is decorated with a frieze of alternating star-in-disks (eight-pointed stars) and abstracted floral devices (probably lotuses).<sup>238</sup>

As with the crescent, the star has a long history in the visual arts of ancient Western Asia and is particularly popular in Assyro-Babylonian glyptic.<sup>239</sup> Its exact significance is often unclear, although the star, representing the planet Venus, was one of the symbols of Ishtar (BLACK/GREEN 1992: 109).<sup>240</sup> In fact, ROOT (1979: 213) suggests that the star atop the horned headdress worn by the figure in the winged ring at Behistun is similar in form to the emblem of Ishtar in earlier periods (on some Neo-Assyrian seals the goddess wears a star-topped crown). ROOT and STRONACH (1997: 46) have suggested that the impetus for this reference to Ishtar, as with so much at Behistun, probably came from the rock relief of Anubanini near Sar-i Pul, where the star-in-disk of Ishtar floats in the upper field between the goddess and Anubanini. For ROOT, the star-in-disk potentially may have suggested a “conscious syncretization of Ahuramazda to Ishtar as well as to Assur” as a way to stress the victory in warfare theme.<sup>241</sup> For Stronach, the linkage to Ishtar seems to reflect the concept of investiture. In this context it is interesting to note the frieze of alternating star-in-disks (eight-pointed stars) and abstracted floral devices (probably lotuses) that decorate Darius' crown. These star-in-disks on Darius' crown seem to have the same form as that atop the crown of the figure in the winged ring; thus, potentially, these stars may also obliquely reference the goddess.<sup>242</sup> One final, intriguing aspect to this issue ought to be noted. The (reduced) copy/variant of the Behistun relief that was found at Babylon apparently did not include a figure in a winged ring, but a star. SEIDL (1999: 110–112, fig. 2) restored with the star both a sun and crescent-in-disk on analogy with Babylonian monuments. The reference here to Ishtar seems straight-forward; however, the Babylonian context of the relief clearly dictated some not insubstantial modifications to the message of both the text and the relief.<sup>243</sup>

Lastly, one should note the careful arrangement of seven dots, two horizontal rows of three plus one to the right, in the upper field on PFS 38 (fig. 47). This arrangement of dots is often seen in Neo-Assyrian glyptic and is generally taken to represent the *sibitti* (Pleiades).<sup>244</sup> It is the only known occurrence of the *sibitti* in the PFS corpus.<sup>245</sup>

#### 4.7.2. *Marru-spade of Marduk, stylus of Nabu, and other cult objects in the so-called late Babylonian worship scene*



As noted several times in the discussion above, the PFS corpus contains a substantial number of seals, mainly stamps, which show the so-called late Babylonian worship scene.<sup>246</sup> The most common elements depicted on the (pillared) pedestal by far are the combination of the *marru*-spade of Marduk and the stylus of Nabu.<sup>247</sup> As in earlier periods and contemporary Babylonian contexts, these seals are often executed in an abstract style with heavy use of unmasked drill and cutting wheel. The head of the *marru*-spade is more often abstractly rendered as a circle rather than a triangle. The stylus can be indicated with double (e.g., PFS 116s [fig. 68]) or single verticals (e.g., PFS 262s), and all three (or two) elements may be joined by a crossbar. The upper fields of these scenes very often have a star (e.g., PFS 273s [fig. 69]) or lunar crescent (e.g., PFS 1121s). There may be other elements as well on the pedestal in these scenes. For example, on PFS 1205s\* (fig. 70) the pedestal also holds a stand with lamp; on PFS 186s and PFS 1140s there is only the *marru*-spade and the stand with lamp;<sup>248</sup> on PFS 1278s there is a *marru*-spade and stylized plant. Lastly, as mentioned, there are a few examples where the *marru*-spade of Marduk and the stylus of Nabu rest on the back of a *mushushu* dragon (e.g., PFS 451s [fig. 65]; see p. 46).<sup>249</sup>

Cult objects other than the *marru*-spade of Marduk and the stylus of Nabu are also documented on pedestals in these late Babylonian worship scenes from the PFS corpus. They include stylized plants (e.g., PFS 1278s), a *kudurru*-shaped object supporting lightning bolts (PFS 289s\* [fig. 71]), and a *kudurru*-shaped object supporting a crescent and dot (PFS 862s [fig. 72]). The *kudurru*-shaped object in these scenes is well documented in Late Babylonian and contemporary seals from Babylonia.<sup>250</sup> In most Western Asiatic contexts lightning bolts represented the weather god; in Assyria they represented Adad (BLACK/GREEN 1992: 118). The crescent and dot may represent the glyptic version of the crescent-in-disk seen in monumental art; in any case, the lunar association is clear.<sup>251</sup>

#### 4.7.3. Stylized tree and plant imagery

Plant imagery is ubiquitous in the seals from the PFS corpus.<sup>252</sup> Much of that imagery may signify specific divine and numinous associations that are now lost to us.

As we have seen in the above discussions, several examples from the PFS corpus specifically show a stylized tree that appears in scenes of highly charged religious content (see p. 35). These trees are not true to life, but represent some stylized amalgamation of features, some of which are connected to the date palm. In Assyrian monumental art this tree generally consists of a “central trunk topped by a large palmette with a network of branches leading from the trunk to smaller palmettes forming an arch around the central trunk” (PORTER 2003: 11). The tree, in myriad variations, is often identified as the “sacred tree”; its exact referent and significance—indeed, its very identification as a stylized “tree”—is one of the most often-discussed questions in the historiography of Assyrian art.<sup>253</sup> The stylized tree in devotional scenes in the PFS corpus exhibits several variations. PFS 166 (fig. 37) shows a winged genius on either side of a tree that has a central trunk from which stems emerge forming a cross-hatched network; the stems are topped by triangular-shaped buds. The tree type seems similar to what COLLON (2001: 83) has called the “arch-and-net tree”: a “central trunk within an arch, the two being linked by a network of zigzag or cross-hatched lines.” The tree on PFS 166 (fig. 37) lacks the arch. On PFS 310 (fig. 27) a bull-man (?), standing on either side of the stylized tree, supports a figure in a winged symbol; the tree is very similar to that seen on PFS 166 (fig. 37) and again seems to

lack the arch. PFS 122 (**fig. 26**) and PFS 420, both scenes of bull-men supporting a winged symbol over a stylized tree, show what may be highly abstracted versions of COLLON'S arch-and-net tree; here the stalks and trunk have become simply a hatched pattern (PFS 420) or only a series of arches (PFS 122 [**fig. 26**]), while above the buds are simply a continuous zigzag. The tree on PFS 793s, flanked by winged genii with a winged symbol above, is very abstracted, consisting of a series of drill holes placed one atop the other.

Other plants that seem especially charged with religious meaning within a Persepolitan context are the lotus, cypress, and date palm. The lotus occurs as a decorative device on the crown of Darius at Behistun (**figs. 15–16**), and is held by the seated king and the standing prince in the original central panels of the Apadana (**fig. 19**) and by the king as he processes with attendants on doorjambs of the Palace of Darius.<sup>254</sup> The lotus appears sporadically in the Persepolitan glyptic corpora: e.g., in the audience scene on PFS 22 (**fig. 73**), a design that recalls the Apadana panels, the seated figure holds what appears to be a lotus; both crowned figures in the audience scene on PTS 26 hold a lotus; on PFS 105s (**fig. 48**) lotus blossoms frame the scene of the bull-man supporting the figure in the crescent.<sup>255</sup> The lotus has a long history in the visual arts of ancient Western Asia and Egypt, symbolizing, among other things, death and rebirth, sexuality and fertility, kingship, power and authority, social position, etc.; it is also the symbol of some Egyptian deities.<sup>256</sup>

The cypress tree is freely displayed on the staircases of the Apadana; it is especially prominent as an item to separate the gift/tribute-bearing delegations (e.g., SCHMIDT 1953: pl. 19). A highly stylized version of the tree occurs rarely in the PFS corpus.<sup>257</sup> Its significance is unclear.

The date palm, realistically rendered (in distinction to the stylized tree that, while having features of the date palm, is clearly a hybrid, fantastical phenomenon), is one of the most conspicuous features of royal-name seals.<sup>258</sup> In those seals there are often two date palms acting as a framing device for the main scene. The date palm also occurs regularly in other seals from the Persepolitan glyptic corpora.<sup>259</sup> An important scene is preserved on PTS 24\*, where spear-men in court attire (including quiver) stand on either side of a date palm; a winged ring-and-disk hovers above the palm. The design has the same vocabulary and compositional syntax as royal-name seals. The structure of the scene is exceptionally close to many of the scenes that show the stylized tree with attendants.

In these glyptic scenes the date palm is part of a complex of symbolism that is intimately tied to Achaemenid kingship (see the discussion on pp. 38–40). Like the figure in the winged ring/disk, the date palm is probably polyvalent, having associations with sexuality (and thus the goddess Ishtar), fertility, abundance, riches, divine gift, and, more practically, control over the environment. Its incorporation into the elements of Achaemenid kingship may also be a direct statement about Achaemenid power in Babylonia, a place famously associated with date palm cultivation.<sup>260</sup> The fact that the date palm is so prevalent in royal-name seals, but completely absent in monumental relief at the time of Darius, indicates a carefully constructed ideological program in which specific symbolism was targeted to specific media.<sup>261</sup>

#### 4.7.4. Fire

In his famous passage on the religious customs of the Persians, Herodotus (*Historiae* I.131.1–3, discussed on p. 4) states that the Persians worship the sun, moon, earth, fire, water, and winds; these entities are described as the only original deities of the Persians. The blazing fire atop the stepped altar/podium on the tomb relief of Darius I (and all subsequent tomb reliefs) at Naqsh-e Rostam (**fig. 17**) is generally taken as visual proof of at least part of Herodotus's statement. The

fire at Naqsh-i Rostam is also often seen as confirmation that the Achaemenid kings were Zoroastrian.<sup>262</sup>

Given the importance and high visibility of the funerary relief of Darius I at Naqsh-i Rostam, it is interesting to note the new glyptic evidence for the depiction of altars on which there is a fire in the seals from Persepolis.<sup>263</sup> One of these examples, PFS 11\* (**fig. 22**), a royal-name seal, is one of the most important seals in the whole of the PFS corpus.<sup>264</sup> The evidence from Persepolis reinforces previous identifications of two distinctive altar types, the tower altar (e.g., PFS 11\* [**fig. 22**]) and the stepped altar (e.g., PFS 75 [**fig. 74**]).<sup>265</sup> The two standard types in the glyptic evidence from Persepolis apparently each follow a rigid grammar. The tower altar almost only occurs as the focal element in a static scene flanked by attendants. These designs with tower altars, moreover, are often loaded with royal iconography: date palms, Persian court garments, crowns, paneled inscriptions, winged symbols, etc. The stepped altar type is either the endpoint of a procession of figures (e.g., PFS 75 [**fig. 74**]) or is attended to/worshipped by a single individual (e.g., PFS 578s [**fig. 75**]).

#### 4.8.4. Other aniconic symbols

Mention may be made briefly of two other rare symbols that occur in the PFS corpus. The first is the rhombus.<sup>266</sup> As in earlier periods, its exact significance in the PFS corpus is unclear.<sup>267</sup> Finally, PFS 284\* preserves the sole occurrence of an *ankh* in the PFS corpus.<sup>268</sup> The design itself and other aspects of its iconography are unusual for Persepolitan glyptic, and the inscription is in Greek letters (the only known example of such in the PFS corpus), suggesting that we probably have in PFS 284\* a non-local product.

## V. Summation

One of the principal observations to have emerged from this preliminary analysis is the very existence of a rich and detailed iconography for the depiction of the divine and numinous in the early Achaemenid period. This imagery was permeated, moreover, by anthropomorphic, theriomorphic, and aniconic depictions of deities. The existence of this imagery would seem to complement the evidence, documented in the texts from the Fortification archive, that shows the existence of a wide array of deities whose worship was sponsored by the state. Both the textual and pictorial evidence stand in direct contrast to the two most generally perceived notions about religious imagery and the Achaemenid Persians: first, that they did not depict deities in anthropomorphic form (the “Herodotean” perspective); second, that the prevailing religious belief was Zoroastrianism (the “Avestan” perspective).

Of the imagery itself, it is clear that the grammar, syntax, and vocabulary of the depiction of the divine and the numinous in the early Achaemenid period was deeply embedded in traditional Assyro-Babylonian and Elamite representational imagery.<sup>269</sup> This observation suggests that further forays into the analysis of religious imagery within the early Achaemenid period ought to start from an Assyro-Babylonian perspective rather than from an Avestan one.

Despite the wealth of visual evidence, we still find ourselves in the maddening situation of being unable to sort out specific significances of specific imagery directly via Achaemenid sources. Thus the leap from iconography to religious semantics remains for the moment a perilous endeavor. Analyses that seek to synthesize, more fully than I have been able to do, the glyptic evidence from the Fortification and Treasury archives will be critical in moving efforts

forward toward a better understanding of religious semantics. The importance of the imagery preserved in these archives cannot be overstressed.

Much more analysis is required, then, to move beyond the superficial observation that the depiction of the divine and the numinous in the early Achaemenid period was deeply embedded in traditional Assyro-Babylonian and Elamite representational imagery. Nevertheless, we may hazard two general observations. First, one aspect of the syntax of the depiction of the numinous seems repeatedly emphasized. This phenomenon, for lack of a better term, I have articulated as “ascension” or “upliftedness.” We have repeatedly seen the numinous expressed through the concept of movement upward by the use of winged figures, atlantids, partial figures emerging from winged symbols, partial figures in various other guises, astral symbolism, and figures standing on animals/stands and pedestal creatures. This concept permeates the visual imagery in both glyptic and monumental relief. Indeed, it seems so deeply embedded in the Persian consciousness that it is expressed not only in the visual arts, but also in the very architecture at Naqsh-i Rostam and Persepolis. The tombs at Naqsh-i Rostam (**fig. 17**) are literally carved on the sheer face of the rock, inaccessible except by climbing upward (presumably by ropes and/or ladders). The cruciform shapes of the facades of the tombs carved onto the sheer rock face seem magically to float upward. That movement upward is reiterated by the use of atlantid figures to support the platform on which Darius stands.<sup>270</sup> At the highest level float the figure in the winged ring and the crescent inscribed in a disk. At Persepolis this concept is expressed through the very fabric of the terrace and its architecture: the terrace that elevates the architecture above the surrounding plain (**fig. 76**); the podia that elevate the buildings above the terrace (**fig. 77**); the inverted floral column bases that float on the floors of the structures (**fig. 78**); the columns that rest on the bases and elevate the protome animal capitals above the floors; and the protome animal capitals that support the roof on their backs (**fig. 79**), acting as pedestal creatures within an architectural context.

Second, king and kingship are intimately connected to/interwoven within this visual grammar and syntax. Through the use of crowns, Persian court robes, inscriptions, bows, archers, date palms, pedestal creatures and, in some cases, what can only be the very figure of the king himself, the centrality of king/kingship is constantly reiterated and/or reformulated. “Ascension,” then, may be the defining characteristic of the numinous, the divine, and the royal.

---

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank Jürg Egger, who has done much to facilitate the production of drawings of relief sculpture at Behistun, Naqsh-e Rostam, and Persepolis included in this essay. These drawings were made by Ulrike Zurkinden-Kolberg and are indicated by (\*) in the captions to the illustrations. Furthermore, I am indebted to Wouter Henkelman, who kindly read a draft of the essay and provided valuable comments. The author is, of course, responsible for any errors. My thanks, as always, to the following individuals, who make possible work on the seals from the Fortification archive: Matthew W. Stolper, Margaret Cool Root, Laura Magee, and Langley Garoutte. I wish to thank also Ms. Kelly Grajeda at Trinity University. The photographs and drawings of the seals on the Persepolis Fortification tablets are courtesy of the Persepolis Fortification Tablet Seal Project. I wish to thank Walter Farber at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago for kindly facilitating my work on the seals on the Persepolis Treasury Tablets. Line drawings indicated by (†) in this article are by the author. Permission to publish the seal impressions from the Persepolis Fortification archive comes from the Director of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Abbreviations follow the conventions established in GARRISON/ROOT 2001: xv–xvi. As in all previous publications, I designate an image reconstructed from impression(s) on the PF tablet(s) as a “seal”; “PFS corpus” designates the complete corpus of seals that occur on the PF tablets (i.e., those tablets published in HALLOCK 1969). Appendix I contains a list of all seals from the Fortification archive mentioned in this study with reference to the volume in the OIP series in which the seal is (or will be) published.

<sup>2</sup> For the purposes of this essay I use the term “numinous” to designate a supernatural entity while reserving the term “divine” for deities.

<sup>3</sup> Increasingly, scholars have begun to emphasize the critical role played by Elam and the Elamites in the formation of “Persia.” The role of Elam in the “*éthnogenèse des Perses*” was already articulated by BRIANT (1984) and MIROSCHEJJI (1985) in their seminal studies, and has now been reemphasized most recently by POTTS (2005: 22f), HENKELMAN (2006: 24–33), and ALVAREZ-MON/GARRISON in press. In this sense note also POTTS 1999: 306f on the rise of the Achaemenids as simply a change of leadership in Elam “via an *ethno-classe dominante*” (following BRIANT 1990: 53f and BRIANT 1988) and WATERS 2004 on the role of intermarriage between the Achaemenids and the Teispid rulers of Anshan. For recent surveys on the various opinions on the status of Elam post 646 (i.e., after the sack of Ashurbanipal), see MIROSCHEJJI 1990; CARTER 1994; POTTS 1999: 288–302; WATERS 1999; WATERS 2000: 100f; HENKELMAN 2003; STRONACH 2003: 251, 255–258; YOUNG 2003: 244f; MIROSCHEJJI 2003: 35; TAVERNIER 2004: 20f; HENKELMAN 2006: 3–33; GARRISON 2006; GARRISON in press (a).

<sup>4</sup> The question remains open today. Among many recent surveys of the evidence note WATERS 1996; BRIANT 2002: 62–138, 889, 895–903, with additional bibliography in BRIANT 1997: 50–52 and BRIANT 2001: 82–84; KELLENS 2002; STRONACH 2003; WATERS 2004.

<sup>5</sup> For recent surveys of these questions with previous bibliography, see, e.g., BRIANT 2002: 13–28, 877–950; WATERS 1999; and the references given in note 3.

<sup>6</sup> WATERS 1999: 100 collects the references. It is generally thought that this *Parsua* lay somewhere in the central Zagros in Western Iran, although there is debate. Most scholars take the earliest references to Persians in Fars to be the land of *Parsuash* mentioned in the annals of Sennacherib (705–681) (WATERS 1999: 102).

<sup>7</sup> POTTS 1999: 259–320 provides an overview of much of this evidence. Anshan: MIROSCHEJJI 1985; HANSMAN 1987; SUMNER 1988; CARTER 1994: 65. Seals and other material from Susa: GARRISON 2006 most recently treats this material in some detail with previous bibliography. Burials, including Arjan: SCHMIDT et. al 1989: 17f, 25–30, 229–474, 487–490 (Iron age burials and material culture from Luristan); CARTER 1994: 72f; STRONACH 2003: 252–255; HENKELMAN 2003: 187f; STRONACH 2005; ALVAREZ-MON in press (the last four references with previous literature on the tomb from Arjan). Marv Dasht survey: SUMNER 1986; SUMNER 1994. Ram Hormuz survey: CARTER 1994; CARTER/WRIGHT 2003. Heirloom seals from the Persepolis Fortification archive: most recently GARRISON in press (a) with previous literature.

<sup>8</sup> GARRISON 2006; GARRISON in press (a); STRONACH 2003: 258 who proposes that, as regards art historical terminology, the beginning of the Achaemenid period ought to be pushed back to c. 635; WATERS 1999: 105 suggests an even earlier date, c. 691–646, for the “change from Elamite to Persian political domination in Fars” and foundation of an “independent Persian kingdom.”

<sup>9</sup> BRIANT/BOUCHARLAT 2005 now marks a watershed in this regard.

<sup>10</sup> See LECOQ 1997 for a recent compilation of Achaemenid royal texts.

<sup>11</sup> The critical examination of the Greek sources was a *Leitmotiv* of the Achaemenid History seminars held in the 1980s and early 1990s. Of the published proceedings, note in particular SANCISI-WEERDENBURG 1987; SANCISI-WEERDENBURG/KUHRT 1987; KUHRT/SANCISI-WEERDENBURG 1988. ROOT 1979: 4–42 remains a critical contribution to the topic.

<sup>12</sup> The translation is from DE JONG 1997: 91.

<sup>13</sup> The passage has been discussed often, usually in association with the other principal statements from Greek and Latin authors on the use of divine imagery by the Persians: e.g., Berossus in Clement of Alexandria (*FGrH* 680 F11) on the introduction of the worship of cult statues by Artaxerxes II; Strabo (*Geographica* XI.14.9) and Duris (*Athenaeus* X.434e) on the worship of Mithra; Plutarch (*Vita Artaxerxis* 3.2) on the enthronement of Artaxerxes II at Pasargadae in a temple of Anahita; Strabo (*Geographica* XV.3.13) on the Persians not erecting either statues (*agalmata*) or altars; Strabo (*Geographica* XV.3.15) on statues of Anahita and Omanus in Persian sanctuaries in Cappadocia; Dinon (in Clement of Alexandria *FGrH* 690 F28) on the worship of gods in the form of statues (*agalmata*), etc. JACOBS 2001 and BRIANT 2002: 240–254, 676f, 915–917, 998f capture most of the pertinent data and bibliography. DE JONG 1997: 76–120 has provided an in-depth and very valuable analysis of the passage and Herodotus in general as a source for the study of Iranian religions. He comments (DE JONG 1997: 119) that Herodotus’s “description of the Persian religion is mainly important because of its great antiquity, not because of its great informative qualities.” More recently

MIKALSON 2003: 155–165 has a good discussion of Herodotus’s interest in religion, both Greek and foreign. As others did before him, he stresses what he labels Herodotus’s “*graeca interpretatio*” and adds that “most of what Herodotus attributes to the Persians are practices, not the beliefs underlying them” (MIKALSON 2003: 156f; the exception is the issue of anthropomorphism). HARRISON 2000: 208 notes: “Herodotus’ accounts of foreign religions provide some of our most valuable insights into the nature of Greek religious assumptions.” GOULD 1989: 99 is an acute summary: “Herodotus has no key to an understanding of these things that he has often accurately observed.” I have less faith in the trustworthiness of Herodotus’s observations themselves.

<sup>14</sup> GEORGES 1994: 54–58, 194f is an important contribution on the misrepresentation of Persian religion by Herodotus.

<sup>15</sup> By convention, I use the Old Persian version of all of the trilingual royal inscriptions and the sigla and translations of KENT 1953 (with one exception on p. 22 for DPd 3.12–24). Only one major text has been discovered since KENT 1953, the quadrilingual on the statue of Darius from Susa (DSab). New studies and translations of the royal texts include LECOQ 1997; SCHMITT 1991; SCHMITT 2000.

<sup>16</sup> The study of theophoric names that occur in various textual sources (from various contexts) also plays a critical part in this line of research. The bibliography is extensive. Perhaps the most influential work is still BOYCE’s multiple volumes as part of her *History of Zoroastrianism* (esp. 1975 and 1982; more concisely stated in BOYCE 1985 and BOYCE 1992: 125–132). GNOLI, who has written extensively on the topic, provides an update in GNOLI 2000. Select critical studies on various aspects of religion in the Achaemenid period include: DUCHNESNE–GUILLEMIN 1972; KOCH 1977; HERRENSCHMIDT 1977; HERRENSCHMIDT 1980; SCHWARTZ 1985; HERRENSCHMIDT 1990; KELLENS 1991; AHN 1992; SANCISI–WEERDENBURG 1995: 1041f; DE JONG 1997; STAUSBERG 2002: 157–186; KELLENS 2002. See WEBER/WIESEHÖFER 1996: 462–464 for bibliography on Achaemenid religion and religious policy; for valuable bibliography on the issue of the “religious component of Achaemenid monarchic ideology” (BRIANT 2002: 915) rather than the “pseudo-question du ‘zoroastrisme des Achéménides’” (BRIANT 1997: 71), see BRIANT 2002: 894f, 915–917; BRIANT 1997: 71–74; and BRIANT 2001: 112–118, DE JONG 1997: 38–75 has surveyed the historiography on “Zoroastrian history,” distinguishing three different approaches: fragmentizing, harmonizing, and diversifying.

<sup>17</sup> Parthian: *Aramazd*; Pahl: *Ohrmazd/Hormizd*; New Persian: *Ormazd*. BOYCE 1985a provides a general survey. See also JACOBS in press, *sv* Auramazda. Zoroastrianism is a form of Mazda worship propagated by a prophet, known in Avestan as Zarathushtra (Greek: *Zōastrês*; Latin: *Zoroastres*; Pahlavi: *Zaratusht*).

<sup>18</sup> The following description of the *Avesta* is deeply indebted to KELLENS 1989.

<sup>19</sup> Considered by many to contain the life and teachings of the prophet himself, Zarathustra.

<sup>20</sup> The *Yasna*, “sacrifice,” are a heterogeneous collection of seventy-two liturgical texts associated with the *haoma* ceremony.

<sup>21</sup> Much of the bibliography may be tracked in references cited in note 16. There have been some who have taken a more cautious stance; see especially the literature cited in KUIPER 1985: 684.

<sup>22</sup> Following SANCISI–WEERDENBURG 1995: 1042: “To know that Ahura Mazda was venerated among the Persians does not tell us much about the different ways he was worshipped. It is too simple to assume that the name of the god guarantees unity of cult; among Christians, ‘God’ is worshipped in various ways and by various denominations.”

<sup>23</sup> The survey by LEVINE 1987 is still the best introduction (with full bibliography) to the archaeological data. More recent summaries of research in Khuzistan and Fars, where most of the scholarly interest has been focused, include MIROSCHEJJI 1990; POTTS 1999: 259–308; WATERS 2004. See SCHMIDT et al. 1989 for the data from the 1930s expeditions in the Kumishgan and Saimareh river valleys in Luristan. MUSCARELLA 1995 provides a valuable survey of the artistic record.

<sup>24</sup> For an “Anzanite” glyptic corpus see p. 9. I place the two small corpora of seal impressions from Susa (the Acropole and Apadana tablets) in the middle of the 6th cent., and thus they will be discussed in the next section (see pp. 13–14).

<sup>25</sup> GARRISON 2006. MARAS 2005: 136–138 addresses some of this evidence.

<sup>26</sup> This is a much debated issue; MUSCARELLA 1987 for the lack of any securely identifiable Median art; STRONACH 2003a and RAZMJOU 2005 for recent surveys of the evidence with more optimistic outlooks.

<sup>27</sup> Among several discussions of this topic, see, e.g., MARCUS 1995: 2493–2498, with bibliography.

<sup>28</sup> DYSON/VOIGT 2003: 219–224 review the construction stages in Hasanlu Period IV.

<sup>29</sup> On this scene see also the discussion on pp. 49–50.

<sup>30</sup> GARRISON/ROOT 2001 for some 313 examples of this imagery in the glyptic from the Fortification archive at Persepolis, dated to the early years of Darius I (for fuller discussion see pp. 18–19). GARRISON 1988: 24–160 is still, I think, the only attempt at a semi-comprehensive survey of the pre-Achaemenid evidence for the heroic encounter from Assyria, Babylonia, and Iran.

<sup>31</sup> Primary publications: PORADA 1959; BARRELET 1984; WINTER 1989. See also recently RUBINSON 2003.

<sup>32</sup> See NEGAHBAN 1996: 61 for a summary of opinions.

<sup>33</sup> Indeed, there are iconographic connections between the two corpora. For the metal vessels see NEGAHBAN 1996: 53–102.

<sup>34</sup> E.g., NEGAHBAN 1996: nos. 8, 12, 15; see the brief discussion in NEGAHBAN 1996: 92f, with ill. 9.

<sup>35</sup> POTTS 1999: 1–9 surveys the origins of the word “Elam” and its significance. POTTS (1999: 10) identifies “the Elamite area at its greatest extent to have extended from Kermanshah province in the northwest to the eastern border of Fars in the southeast,” thus including the province of Luristan.

<sup>36</sup> POTTS 1999: 146–149 reviews the tutelary of the Shimashki kings.

<sup>37</sup> As POTTS (2005: 22–23) and HENKELMAN (2006: 15–33) have recently reiterated, “Persia” was forged in the highlands of Elam; note also various studies in ALVAREZ–MON/GARRISON in press.

<sup>38</sup> See the discussion on p. 3 on the arrival of Iranian-speaking peoples into Iran; WATERS 1999 has recently summarized the scholarship.

<sup>39</sup> Following the genealogy that Cyrus II gives in his famous “Cyrus Cylinder” from Babylon (BERGER 1975: 197, line 21); on this often-discussed passage in the Cyrus cylinder and the Teispids in general see POTTS 2005: 13–15, 17–23.

<sup>40</sup> See POTTS 1999: 260–262 for a concise review of the various proposed subdivisions of the Neo–Elamite period.

<sup>41</sup> WATERS 2000: 68–80 for the Assyrian sources for the lead-up to the conflict and the sack of Susa.

<sup>42</sup> The v. sign at the beginning of the first preserved line appears to mark the actual first line of the inscription. The other signs are illegible as preserved.

<sup>43</sup> GARRISON in press (a) for extended commentary on the iconography and style of PFS 1308\* (fig. 5).

<sup>44</sup> MUSCARELLA 1977 on the Treasure of Ziwiye and MUSCARELLA 1990 on the Luristan bronzes discuss the ethical issues with previous bibliography. SCHMIDT et al. 1989: 49–60, 255–361, 413–474 report on some artifacts of 1st mill. date excavated at Surkh Dum in Luristan (and thus of secure provenance); again, winged creatures dominate the repertoire of the numinous.

<sup>45</sup> E.g., EHRENBERG 1999 on a corpus of sealed tablets from the Eanna sanctuary at Uruk; MACGINNIS 1995 on the Ebabbara at Sippar. PEDERSEN 1998: 181–213 surveys the archives from Babylonia for the period 1000–300.

<sup>46</sup> E.g., EHRENBERG 1999: nos. 19–70, 73–153. On this scene type see further the discussion on pp. 14–15.

<sup>47</sup> ZETTLER 1979 studied this phenomenon in some detail.

<sup>48</sup> GARRISON 2006 for the Susa archives.

<sup>49</sup> STRONACH 1978: 44–55, pls. 40–49 stands as the official publication of the relief, although many of the reliefs from Pasargadae had been known, drawn, and studied much earlier (STRONACH 1978: 47f). See ROOT 1979: 46–49, 295, 300–303 for valuable commentary; note also the comments of STRONACH 1997: 42–44.

<sup>50</sup> STRONACH: 1978: 44 reviews the evidence.

<sup>51</sup> The translation is from WATERS 1996: 14.

<sup>52</sup> STRONACH 1978: 102f; STRONACH 1990; WATERS 1996; STRONACH 1997: 48f; STRONACH 1997a and BRIANT 2002: 63, 889 provide overviews of the arguments with previous literature.

<sup>53</sup> “Syncretic deity, some metaphorical vision of an abstract idea of imperial domain, or a vision of Cyrus himself in a mythical aspect of ideal kingship” (ROOT 1979: 303). STRONACH 1978: 53–55; ROOT 1979: 301–303 survey the various interpretations.

<sup>54</sup> Note the comments of ROOT 1979: 302. BOARDMAN 2000: 102 identifies the inspiration for the four-winged figure in “Egyptianizing figures of the Levant coast, probably Phoenicia, and was Cyrus’ bid to invoke divine support from the deities of the subject peoples.” Not surprisingly, he concludes that the relief was designed and executed by an immigrant artist, perhaps Greek.

<sup>56</sup> ROOT 1979: 302 notes that the stylistic rendering of the internal parts of the wings harkens back to the time of Ashurnasirpal II.

<sup>57</sup> Note also the comments of ROOT 1979: 295, 300–303.

<sup>58</sup> On the jambs of the southwestern doorway, which pierces the southwestern long wall, were preserved the bare feet of two human figures wearing long robes, the bare foot of a third man, and three legs of a hoofed quadruped, all moving out from the structure (STRONACH 1978: fig. 36). Although in a fragmentary state of preservation, the scene appears to show some type of procession with a bovine animal/creature (STRONACH 1978: 70).

<sup>59</sup> See also the comments in the following paragraph.

<sup>60</sup> STRONACH (1997[a]: 45) suggests that this Assyrianizing imagery in Palace S may not be referencing specific Assyrian imagery, but, rather, a message of power and legitimacy that would be known to an Iranian audience (“home constituency”) given the fact that Assyrianizing protective figures had been known in Iran since the 7th cent.

<sup>62</sup> These seals were the starting point for AMIET’s identification of “late Neo–Elamite” glyptic. GARRISON 2006 surveys the complexity of the dating of the Susa corpora. The dates suggested in GARRISON 2006 and followed here, c. 550–520, are somewhat lower than the traditional chronology for the two corpora. Both sets of tablets were written in cuneiform Elamite. There are 299 Neo–Elamite texts from the Acropole series of tablets (administrative documents covering outlays and receipts of a wide range of “materials, receipts of finished goods and other transfers” in the area around Susa and areas extending to the east and south in Khuzistan [STOLPER 1992: 268]); there are seven Neo–Elamite texts from the Apadana series of tablets (legal contracts [gold and silver promissory notes and one receipt for sheep] among private citizens [STOLPER 1992: 267f]).

<sup>63</sup> Note the discussion of depictions of the deity in COLLON 2001: 127, esp. nos. 240 and 243 (COLLON identifies the style of this particular seal, which is similar to the style seen on AMIET 1973: no. 32, as Babylonian). AMIET 1973: 18 also identifies his no. 18 as another winged deity, perhaps female.

<sup>64</sup> The seal, owing to its royal-name inscription, figures in many discussions of Neo–Elamite history and culture; e.g., MIROSCHEJJI 1982: 61f; STEVE 1986: 14f; STEVE 1992: 22; HARPER et al. 1992: 213; VALLAT 1995; POTTS 1999: 295–297; WATERS 1999: 114f; TAVERNIER 2004: 19–22; GARRISON 2006: 76f.

<sup>65</sup> GIOVINO 2006: 124 identifies the object as a spade-head atop a pole.

<sup>66</sup> I.e., the use of *mushushu* dragons disposed heraldically around the *marru*-spade of Marduk is, as far as I can tell, unique. Of course, symmetrical three-figured scenes, e.g., an animal/creature on either side of a plant/tree device, attendants on either side of a sacred tree, etc., can be found in both Babylonian and Assyrian glyptic.

<sup>67</sup> The *mushushu* dragon generally rests on a pedestal in these worship scenes. On these scenes see EHRENBERG 1999: 19f; COLLON 2001: 11 for the *mushushu* dragon on cylinder seals; see also p. 46 of this essay. Note that AMIET 1973: nos. 28 and 42, the latter excavated at Susa, show the *marru*-spade of Marduk and the stylus of Nabu in combination with a winged creature marchant.

<sup>68</sup> The scene of attendant on either side of a stylized tree occurs in various forms in Assyrian glyptic; see the recent discussion in COLLON 2001: 82–85, nos. 152–155, 157–165, 173–175, 179–182; see also pp. 49–50 of this essay.

<sup>69</sup> Decoration from monumental buildings at Susa of this period is almost nonexistent. It is interesting to note, however, that Ashurbanipal's accounts of the destruction of Susa indicate the existence of guardian figures for the temples and fierce wild oxen for the gates (Prism F V 40–41 = A VI 58–60; see BORGER 1996: 55). I thank WOUTER HENKELMAN for this reference.

<sup>70</sup> The question of glyptic carving styles as representative of specific cultures, i.e., Assyria, Babylonia, lowlands Elam, and Anshan, is a topic that cannot be addressed in this form.

<sup>71</sup> PEDERSÉN 1998: 181–213 surveys the archives from Babylonia for the period 1000–300. Note the comments of DANDAMAYEV 1986: 274, who states that some 819 Babylonian economic/legal documents dated to the reign of Cyrus II and 998 documents dated to the reign of Cambyses were known to him; additionally, he counts 861 letters from “the time of the supremacy of the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid kings.” See ZADOK 1986: 283–285 on the relevant archives from Nippur; BAKER/WUNSCH 2001 for the Egibi archive and the Nappahu archive, both private, from Babylon and Borsippa, respectively. For Uruk and Sippar see note 72 of this essay.

<sup>72</sup> For Uruk see EHRENBERG 1999; EHRENBERG 2001. For Sippar MACGINNIS 1995: 164–181. Both archives have material pre- and post-dating the period under discussion here.

<sup>73</sup> Surveyed by EHRENBERG 1999: 17f and EHRENBERG 2001: 188–194.

<sup>74</sup> As articulated in the seminal study by ZETTLER 1979; see also the discussion on p. 48 of this essay.

<sup>75</sup> See also the discussions of the tomb and its material culture in MAJIDZADEH 1990; CARTER 1994: 72f, 76; POTTS 1999: 303–306; HENKELMAN 2003: 185f (with full bibliography, especially on the dating of the tomb); STRONACH 2003; ALVAREZ-MON 2004; STRONACH 2005; POTTS 2005: 17; ALVAREZ-MON in press has suggested that most of the artifacts from the tomb date to the end of the 7th cent., the inscriptions and the tomb itself to the first half of the 6th cent.

<sup>76</sup> STRONACH 2003: 252, fig. 23.3. ALVAREZ-MON in press is an in-depth analysis of the imagery on the gold “ring.”

<sup>77</sup> See ALVAREZ-MON 2004: 229, where the king is interpreted as a mediator between the “deities and humans” and the work as a whole as upholding “the primary religious character of a work of art.”

<sup>78</sup> ROOT 1979 remains the most comprehensive analysis of official Achaemenid art.

<sup>79</sup> Greek: *Bagístanon*; Old Persian: \**Bagastana*, “place or stand of the god(s)”; in modern times various other forms of the place name have been used (SCHMITT 1990: 289f).

<sup>80</sup> SCHMITT 1990a: 299: “This inscription is the most important document of the entire ancient Near East”. DANDAMAEV 1976: 1–22 for historiographic discussion of Behistun. LUSCHEY 1968 remains essential. BORGER 1982 on the stages of execution of the monument. ROOT 1979: 182–226 is a wide-ranging and important discussion. For bibliography see KENT 1953: 1–5; ROOT 1979: 59–61, 182–226; SCHMITT 1990; SCHMITT 1990a; LUSCHEY 1990.

<sup>81</sup> For the decoration on the band of Darius' crown see the discussion on p. 48.

<sup>82</sup> SCHMIDT 1970: 10 and 121 for the early relief at Naqsh-i Rostam. SCHMIDT 1970: 10 notes the discovery of a few stray sherds of 4th and 3rd mill. date.

<sup>83</sup> This is an especially critical point, given the oft-repeated statement that no Achaemenid Persian sanctuary has been found/excavated. In 1936 (13 May–13 June) and 1939 (5 June–31 July) SCHMIDT excavated some twenty-four 10.00 x 10.00 m. trenches in the mound at Naqsh-i Rostam. These excavations were the first documented excavations at the site, although it was known that others had excavated there, including HERZFELD in 1933 and FLANDIN and COSTE in 1840. The work conducted by SCHMIDT was published in volume III of the folio-size Persepolis series (SCHMIDT 1970). An examination of SCHMIDT 1970 indicates that the actual excavations on the mound at Naqsh-i Rostam were a hurried and largely unfinished affair (in contrast to the rather more careful and detailed exposition of the tower Ka'bah-i Zardusht and the reliefs of the royal tombs in the same volume). The excavations were done very rapidly with a large crew of workmen, not unusual for the time. In addition, it seems clear from SCHMIDT's text (published posthumously) that SCHMIDT himself probably was not present much or at all during the excavations. The research agenda of the two campaigns, although never clearly stated in the publication, was limited to clearing the tower Ka'bah-i Zardusht, exploring just inside the fortification wall in the southwestern corner of the mound, and clearing the area immediately in front of the Tomb of Darius (tomb no. I). It is an oddity of modern archaeological research that the mound site of Naqsh-i Rostam, one of the premier Achaemenid period sites in the central Achaemenid homeland in Fars, remains largely an unknown phenomenon. Debate still continues over the function of the one still-visible building on the mound, the Ka'bah-i Zardusht (POTTS 2007: 278–282 has recently surveyed the scholarship); the larger spatial and temporal contexts of the royal tombs themselves at the site remain unknown. As the premier burial place of the Achaemenid kings, Naqsh-i Rostam holds a unique place in Achaemenid imperial culture. It seems very likely that in addition to being a place of burial, the site was also a religious sanctuary. That religious sanctuary lies buried in the mound at the foot of the cliff. A thorough program of excavation and survey at Naqsh-i Rostam is one of the highest priorities of Achaemenid archaeology.

<sup>84</sup> The crescent inscribed in a circle has no anthropomorphic elements. For a detailed discussion of this element, see pp. 47–48; for the figure in the winged double ring see pp. 36–40.

<sup>85</sup> KENT 1953: 137–141; the Old Persian text has recently been restudied: SCHMITT 2000: 23–49.

<sup>86</sup> The exact western extension of the area covered by the administrative system is unclear. HENKELMAN 2006: 65–72 surveys the evidence and interpretations. KOCH 1990, for instance, identified six administrative regions in the Fortification archive stretching all the way to Susa; HALLOCK 1977 and HALLOCK 1978 identified three regions confined mainly to Fars. The literature on the archive is now substantial. For general overviews and bibliography see GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 1–32 and HENKELMAN 2006: 39–111, the latter being an especially rich and important contribution; note also the discussions and bibliographic updates in BRIANT 2002: 422–442, 938–946; BRIANT 1997: 11, 43, 85f; BRIANT 2001: 18, 103, 114, 133–136. A major synthetic work devoted to the archive will soon appear (BRIANT/STOLPER/HENKELMAN in press).



<sup>87</sup> For the published (excavated) tablets that carry Elamite inscriptions see HALLOCK 1969; HALLOCK 1978; HENKELMAN 2003a (for some unprovenanced texts see now JONES/STOLPER 2006). Before his death HALLOCK had read and transcribed another 2,586 texts, thirty-one of which were the PFa tablets published in HALLOCK 1978. HALLOCK's unpublished transliterations have had some currency among a small group of Elamite specialists, and they have periodically been cited in the literature. These texts are now being prepared for publication by WOUTER HENKELMAN. They are provisionally designated by the siglum PF-NN, or simply NN. Note RAZMJOU 2004 for a project to process some 35,000 fragments from the archive that were sent back to Iran in 1951. HENKELMAN 2006: 45–51 systematically describes the published corpus of Elamite tablets, both excavated and unprovenanced.

<sup>88</sup> See HENKELMAN 2006: 74f where he notes that BOWMAN, in his unpublished manuscript on the Aramaic tablets, read a date as early as year 4 (on his tablet no. 1), 518–517. A. AZZONI, who has now undertaken a restudy of the Aramaic tablets from the Fortification archive, cannot as yet confirm BOWMAN's reading.

<sup>89</sup> HENKELMAN 2006: 52–59 and JONES/STOLPER in press survey the evidence. JONES/STOLPER in press estimate that there are over 600 tablets that carry Aramaic texts in ink (and/or incised) and approximately 4,000–5,000 tablets that carry no texts, only impressions of seals (“uninscribed tablets”); AZZONI in press for the Aramaic tablets; DUSINBERRE in press (a), for the seals applied to the Aramaic tablets; GARRISON in press (c) for the uninscribed tablets and seals that occur on them. BRIANT/STOLPER/HENKELMAN in press will deal with many facets of the archive.

<sup>90</sup> See GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 1–21 and GARRISON 2000 for the most recent surveys of scholarship and a discussion of research pathways for the visual imagery. The seals have now begun to appear in studies concerned with peoples and places beyond the Fortification archive and Persepolis (e.g., BOARDMAN 2000: 152–174; DUSINBERRE 2002; ROOT 2002; NIMCHUK 2002; GATES 2002; ANDERSON 2002; DUSINBERRE 2003: 162–166; Miller 2004: 168–170; BIVAR 2005). Volumes II (*Images of Human Activity*) and III (*Animals, Creatures, Plants and Geometric Devices*) of the Persepolis Fortification Tablet Seal Project are currently in preparation. A very small sampling of seals that will appear in these volumes may be found in ROOT 1989; ROOT 1998; GARRISON 2000. There are just under 1,200 distinct seals preserved as impressions on the PF texts (what we call the PFS corpus; these are the images that are the focus of the Persepolis Fortification Tablet Seal Project). For sigla and general citation conventions see note 1 of this essay.

<sup>91</sup> That response as filtered through the Greek and Avestan sources; see the discussion on pp. 3–6.

<sup>92</sup> See GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 33–34 for an overview of the glyptic evidence from the Treasury archive. The seals were published in SCHMIDT 1957: 4–49, pls. 2–14; texts in CAMERON 1948. All the texts were written in cuneiform Elamite, with the exception of one in Babylonian. The seals are here given the siglum PTS. See the comments in note 1 of this essay on the use of “\*” and “s” in these seal numbers.

<sup>93</sup> Some seals from the Treasury archive may also be dated by royal names that occur in the seal inscriptions.

<sup>94</sup> Of these seals two also occur in the Fortification archive: PTS 4\* (= PFS 113\*) (**fig. 53**) and PTS 33\* (= PFS 71\*). I have addressed PTS 14\* in GARRISON 1998. SCHMIDT (1957: 16) attributed PTS 14\* to the time of Darius based on the name in the inscription, Ashbazana (Greek Aspathines), and its use early in the reign of Xerxes. To me neither argument seems to secure the date of the seal to the time of Darius, especially since it is clear that PTS 14\* is a replacement seal for the seal that Ashbazana used in the Fortification archive (PFS 1567\*). Stylistically, PTS 14\* seems linked to PFS 11\*, but the rendering of the wings of the figure in the winged ring/disk cannot be paralleled, to my knowledge, in the PFS corpus. I have, nevertheless, included PTS 14\* in the analyses that follow.

<sup>95</sup> PTS 42\* = PFS 1084\*; PTS 61s = PFS 451s.

<sup>96</sup> SCHMIDT (1957: 26, note 122) gives arguments for a later dating of PTS 20\*.

<sup>97</sup> The literature is substantial. I would note, recently: SEIDL 2000; BAHRANI 2003; and the collection of essays in TOORN 1997, DICK 1999, and WALLIS 2005 from which one may review something of the nature of the evidence and its interpretation.

<sup>98</sup> Following convention, I use the translation and cite the OP text as established by KENT 1953: 116–35, although the text has been emended in numerous places (SCHMITT 1991 provides an updated edition); for a concise comparison between the textual versions at Behistun, see SCHMITT 1990a: 304f.

<sup>99</sup> The bibliography on the text at Behistun is considerable: see BRIANT 2002: 124–128, 900f; BRIANT 1997: 50–52; BRIANT 2001: 82–84.

<sup>100</sup> BRIANT 2001: 127–28, following KELLENS 1987 and SANCISI-WEERDENBURG 1980: 16–21.

<sup>101</sup> For a bibliography see BRIANT 2002: 136, 170f, 210–213, 908, 913.

<sup>102</sup> SZc (Suez) also incorporates direct quotations from DNa; DH (Hamadan), from DPh.

<sup>103</sup> I here follow the translation of LECOQ 1997: 228 and SCHMITT 2000: 59, replacing KENT's “the gods of the royal house” with “all the gods.” My thanks to WOUTER HENKELMAN for this correction.

<sup>104</sup> This text, located on the outer face of the southern terrace wall, occurs only once and only in Elamite. The translation is from SCHMIDT 1953: 63.

<sup>105</sup> On DPd see BRIANT 2002: 241 and 915 with bibliography and the references in note 101 of this essay.

<sup>106</sup> KOCH 1977 is a book-length monograph of the subject (summarized in several places, e.g., KOCH 1991; KOCH 1995). The subject has now received thorough review in HENKELMAN 2006 on which much of what follows is indebted.

<sup>107</sup> The “éthnogenèse des Perses,” as discussed on p. 3.

<sup>108</sup> HENKELMAN 2006: 35–38, 385f for the traditional dichotomy on the relation between Elamites and Iranians in scholarly literature.

<sup>109</sup> HENKELMAN 2006: 113–238 for detailed exposition of the evidence and its interpretation. With one possible exception (see below note 111), the *lan* ceremony is never qualified for a particular deity. Previous research includes, selectively, KOCH 1991; KOCH 1995; HANDLEY–SCHACHTER 1998; and RAZMJOU 2004.

<sup>110</sup> This is based on no actual textual evidence from the Fortification archive, but on her assumption that the most frequently occurring type of sacrifice would naturally be to Aura Mazda, since the Persians at the time of Darius I were Zoroastrians; see the critique in HENKELMAN 2006: 147–176.

<sup>111</sup> Note also HENKELMAN 2006: 152, 387–391 on the journal PF–NN 2202, which qualifies *lan* “either for the Elamite god Humban or ‘for the gods’” (HENKELMAN 2006: 152).

<sup>112</sup> The following is culled from HENKELMAN 2006: *passim*, but especially 239–318, 407–456.

<sup>113</sup> On the *sumar* see HENKELMAN 2003a.

<sup>114</sup> On this feast see now HENKELMAN in press.

<sup>115</sup> See HENKELMAN 2006: 315–317 for a discussion of the term *bakadaushiya*, where it is paired with divine names.

<sup>116</sup> See HENKELMAN 2006: 451 for alternate readings.

<sup>117</sup> HENKELMAN 2006: 422f for the texts.

<sup>118</sup> Although note, among other references, KOCH 1995: 1966–68, where the evidence from the Fortification archive is seen to confirm preexisting notions of Achaemenid religion based on the royal texts.

<sup>119</sup> We are brought back yet again to the status of the “pseudo-question du ‘zoroastrisme des Achéménides’” (BRIANT 1997: 71); see also the discussion on pp. 4–6 of this essay.

<sup>120</sup> By the convention ring/disk, I seek to encapsulate the two dominant forms of the center of the image from which the figure emerges, one a ring, the other a disk. The figure in the winged ring/disk is always a partial figure, varying from simply the head (only in glyptic) to the upper three-quarters of the human body. For the descriptive vocabulary employed in this analysis see the following discussion.

<sup>121</sup> See BRIANT 2002: 901, where A. KUERT is quoted as identifying the object held by the partial figure as a “halter” or “leading rope.” I follow the traditional reading of the object as a ring.

<sup>122</sup> Fig. 16 here published, drawn from the photograph found in FONDACIÓN “LA CAIXA” 2003: fig. 4, does not include this detail. First-hand observation of this passage is needed in order to confirm its existence.

<sup>123</sup> Following STRONACH 1997: 48: “eight arms of the disc that caps the crown of Ahuramazda.” The eight points can clearly be seen in FONDACIÓN “LA CAIXA” 2003: fig. 4; cf. ROOT 1979: 186: “a seven-pointed star symbol.”

<sup>124</sup> E.g., STRONACH 1997: 46 describes the circular device atop the crown as a “conscious addition to the original design.” Note that there are similar insertions for the curved bow (not the string) held by Darius and the upper part of the bow held by the figure immediately behind Darius.

<sup>125</sup> ROAF 1983: 134, table fig. 137 indicates no yoke.

<sup>126</sup> Most assume that the partial figure wears a crenellated crown similar to that of Darius; SCHMIDT 1957: 85 is uncertain whether or not the headdress was crenellated. HENKELMAN 1995–96: 285 states that the crown “seems to show traces of crenellations.”

<sup>127</sup> There is a great deal of discussion on the chronology of the buildings, especially the Apadana. ROOT 1979: 83–86 (Palace of Darius) and 90–95 (Apadana) and ROAF 1983: 127–140, 150–157 review the evidence.

<sup>128</sup> ROOT 1979: 98–100, with some caveats, suggests late Darius; ROAF 1983: 142–144, late Xerxes for the main hall, Artaxerxes I for the north stairs.

<sup>129</sup> KREFTER 1971 often adds a figure in the winged ring in his restorations of the structures on the *takht*, based only on the assumption that such a figure ought to have been there; e.g., see the figure in the winged ring at the roof line of the Apadana, KREFTER 1971: Beilage 4.

<sup>130</sup> As explained in TILIA 1972: 190. KREFTER 1971: Beilage 16 reconstructs in addition a figure in a winged ring above the canopy, following the scenes of the enthroned king (the canopies replaced, however, by attendants holding parasols) in the Central Building.

<sup>131</sup> SCHMIDT 1953: pls. 126–127. Only the right wing tip is preserved; ROAF 1983: fig. 141 also identifies parts of the tail and appendages; KREFTER 1971: Beilage 11 for a reconstruction of the full facade.

<sup>132</sup> KREFTER 1971: Beilage 11 restores a palmette on the top of all ten stacks.

<sup>133</sup> These are exquisitely conceived and executed creatures. The preserved one has an intricately worked beard and hair and a bull’s ear with earring.

<sup>134</sup> As noted in notes 129 and 130, KREFTER did reconstruct a figure in a winged ring in various places on the Apadana. The relationship of the winged ring–and–disk to the partial figure in the winged ring is treated in more detail on pp. 36–40. Most commentators implicitly treat them as representative of one and the same phenomenon. Even if the winged ring–and–disk is equated with the figure in the winged ring, the fact that the usage of the two types seems quite distinct in monumental sculpture at the time of Darius I is noteworthy.

<sup>135</sup> For the reliefs see SCHMIDT 1953: pls. 75 (southern doorway), 76 (northern doorway), and 77–79 (eastern doorway). In all cases the figure faces in the same direction as the king. Note also the appearance of the winged ring–and–disk on the top of the canopy under which the king and crown prince are depicted on the jambs of the eastern doorway; the winged ring–in–disk is the central, focal element, flanked on each side by five lions marchant.

<sup>136</sup> The following discussion with accompanying lists should be considered preliminary in nature; the subject requires a book-length analysis. I include in this discussion two seals from the seal corpus preserved on the uninscribed tablets: PFUTS 1\* (**fig. 32**), since it has an elaborate scene showing the attendants flanking the figure in the winged disk in combination with the stylized

tree; PFUTS 18\* (**fig. 34**), since it carries a trilingual royal-name inscription and has a detailed rendering of the figure in the winged ring/disk.

<sup>137</sup> COLLON 2001: 80 for examples and discussion.

<sup>138</sup> For the purposes of this statistical analysis I have not included PFUTS 1\* (**fig. 32**) and PFUTS 18\* (**fig. 33**) from the un-inscribed tablets.

<sup>139</sup> See the discussion of the heroic encounter in GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 53–60. Note also the remarks of UEHLINGER 1999: 146–49, 154–56.

<sup>140</sup> On the late Babylonian worship scene see the discussions on pp. 14, 46, and 48. Further study of the seals on the un-inscribed tablets has now revealed one example of a late Babylonian worship scene that includes a figure in a winged disk.

<sup>141</sup> See GARRISON in press, *sv* atlantids, where I trace the history of atlantids in the art of Western Asia. The atlantid figure first appears consistently in the art of Western Asia in the middle of the second mill., where it already is often paired with winged disks. The tradition of the grouping of atlantid figures and the winged disk continues into the Neo-Assyrian period in glyptic art. COLLON (2001: 85, 121) has suggested that the atlantid figure (at least in COLLON 2001: no. 230, and, it seems, extended to other scenes with atlantid figures as well) in Neo-Assyrian glyptic represents a link between earth and heaven. MATTHEWS (1990: 113f) notes that the atlantid scene in the Neo-Assyrian period appears to be “specially related to the ritual aspects of kingship”; Matthews relates the atlantid figures themselves to demonic foundation figurines of the Neo-Assyrian period, concluding that the atlantids are “direct representations of the supernatural world.” See also the discussion on pp. 43–44 on the bull-man.

<sup>142</sup> ROOT 1979: 153–61 discusses the use of atlantids in Achaemenid monumental relief. Within this context (king, atlantids, royal sacrifice) note the important reliefs at Kul-i Farah (especially the relief now labeled Kul-i Farah III), dating to the Middle and Neo-Elamite periods; see HENKELMAN in press with full bibliography.

<sup>143</sup> For Neo-Assyrian glyptic see COLLON 2001: 82–85. RUSSELL 1998: 687–696, PORTER 2003: *passim*, especially 11–58, and GIOVINO 2006 have recently surveyed the evidence and scholarship on the stylized tree in Assyrian monumental art. See also the comments on pp. 49–50.

<sup>144</sup> There are only approximately ninety-four inscribed seals among those seals preserved in the PFS corpus (GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 7).

<sup>145</sup> I include PFUTS 1\* (**fig. 32**) and PFUTS 18\* (**fig. 33**) in this account.

<sup>146</sup> There are four known seals that carry trilingual inscriptions naming Darius in the PF archive: PFS 7\* (**fig. 24**), PFS 11\* (**fig. 22**), PFS 113\*=PTS 4\* (**fig. 53**), PFUTS 18\* (**fig. 33**). The royal-name seals of Darius in the PT archive are: PTS 1\*, PTS 2\*, PTS 3\* and PTS 4\* (= PFS 113\*). See GARRISON in press (e) for an analysis of these seals.

<sup>147</sup> I have discussed PFS 11\* in more detail in GARRISON 1998: 127f; GARRISON 2000: 141f; GARRISON in press (e).

<sup>148</sup> Reinforcing the concepts of investiture, as articulated by ROOT 1979: 173f, 191 and STRONACH 1997: 46f.

<sup>149</sup> JACOBS in press, *sv* Auramazda, discusses the issue in some detail. See also, e.g., DALLEY 1986; PARPOLA 1993: 184f; COLLON 2001: 79–82; and ORNAN 2005.

<sup>150</sup> Opinions most recently surveyed in JACOBS (in press, *svv* Auramazda, \*Uvar/n–) and MERRILLEES 2005: 115–118. JAMZADEH 1982; LECOQ 1984; JACOBS 1987; JACOBS 1991; KAIM 1991; and D’AMORE 1992: 210f remain important discussions.

<sup>151</sup> This despite the fact that in no place is the figure in the winged ring/disk ever specifically identified by name. Not until the end of the 5th cent. is any other deity named in the Achaemenid royal inscriptions. Jacobs (in press, *sv* Auramazda), surveys some of the scholarship; note also KAIM 1991.

<sup>152</sup> The Old Persian form is \**farnah*. For the Zoroastrian divinity see DE JONG 1999. The earliest evidence for the concept of a divine *Khvarenah* is Avestan. The winged ring/disk in this theory is to be associated with a “universal” *Khvarenah* (as opposed to a “royal” *Khvarenah*); on the *Khvarenah* note also e.g., CALMEYER 1979 and JACOBS 1987.

<sup>153</sup> As JACOBS notes, LECOQ (1984: 328) has acknowledged that the winged disk with and without the figure might have acquired a solar aspect. MERRILLEES (2005: 115f), following DALLEY 1986, seems to associate the “winged symbol” with oaths via the sun god Shamash as a “personification of their (sc. Achaemenids’) beliefs,” but I am unclear as to what exactly the author means. MOOREY 1979: 221 suggested that the “winged-disk” remained a sun symbol in the Achaemenid period.

<sup>154</sup> The linkage of *kitin* to the winged symbol, while not articulated by HENKELMAN (2006: 291–298), is certainly embedded in his argumentation.

<sup>155</sup> In earlier periods other gods also had the power to bestow *kitin*.

<sup>156</sup> The translation is from HENKELMAN 2006: 292.

<sup>157</sup> The translation is from HENKELMAN 2006: 294.

<sup>158</sup> Surveyed with bibliography in BRIANT 2002: 550–554, 965f; BRIANT 1997: 74f; BRIANT 2001: 117f.

<sup>159</sup> Contexts that one ought to consider include temporal, geographical, social, functional, etc.

<sup>160</sup> Or, following ORNAN’s (2005: 211–117, 222f, 225–227) suggestion that the winged symbol could symbolize either Ashur or Shamash in a Neo-Assyrian context (or other deities in other contexts), the polyvalent nature of the winged symbol would be yet another *inheritance* of the Achaemenid image(s) from Neo-Assyrian predecessor(s). It is interesting to note that while ORNAN deftly explores the multiplicity of meaning of the winged symbol in Syro-Palestinian, Anatolian, and Assyrian contexts of the first mill., she asserts categorically that the winged symbol represents only Auramazda in the Achaemenid period.

<sup>161</sup> See DALLEY 1986: 92–94 for the suggestion that in the Neo-Assyrian period Šalmu was the symbol on which “oaths to all royal family could be sworn by eunuchs and vassals who were not of royal blood,” and Šalmu–šarri was the symbol on which oaths could be sworn by members of the royal family.

<sup>162</sup> Indeed, I do not think it too much of a stretch to contemplate the idea of both texts at Behistun and Naqsh-e Rostam as extended, and complexly formulated, loyalty oaths; e.g., DB 4.52–56, par. 60, where Auramazda will be a friend to those who do not conceal the record of what Darius has accomplished; DNa 56–60, par. 6, where “that which is the command of Ahuramazda, let this not seem repugnant to thee; do not leave the right path; do not rise in rebellion.”

<sup>163</sup> COGAN 1984: 60, as quoted in DALLEY 1986: 100.

<sup>164</sup> In this sense the Elamite concept of *kitin* may also have played a critical part in this reading, as well as that of divine approval.

<sup>165</sup> On the deliberate ambiguity of the winged symbol in Neo-Assyrian contexts see ORNAN 2005: 216f.

<sup>166</sup> For the inscription see GARRISON 2000: 140.

<sup>167</sup> I have suggested that the archer and composite creature together in PFS 261\* (**fig. 45**) simultaneously reference two distinct traditions regarding divinity: the deity who rises/is elevated (e.g., Ashur/Shamash in the winged disk), and the deity who stands on the back of an animal/creature.

<sup>168</sup> The specific martial qualities of the figure in PFS 261\* (**fig. 45**) must derive in a rather direct manner from depictions of the figure in the winged ring in Assyrian monumental sculpture (e.g., slabs B–11 and B–3 from Room B, Palace of Ashurnasirpal II at Nimrud; MEUSZYŃSKI 1981: pl. 2).

<sup>169</sup> Almost all commentators agree that the images on these coins represent the Achaemenid king or symbolize some aspects of Achaemenid kingship. CARRADICE 1987 provides an excellent introduction to the archer coinage. On the imagery of the coinage note ROOT 1979: 117; ROOT 1989; STRONACH 1989; RIDER 2001: 127; NIMCHUK 2002; and GARRISON in press (b).

<sup>170</sup> See also the discussion on pp. 44–45; I discuss these archers in some detail in GARRISON in press (b).

<sup>171</sup> For PFS 38 (**fig. 47**) see also p. 40; for PFS 244s see p. 42.

<sup>172</sup> E.g., PTS 16 and PTS 17. The stylistic qualities of PTS 16 leave open the possibility that its cutting dates to the reign of Darius. SCHMIDT 1957: 24f, pl. 6 interpreted the crowned figure found within a circle on PTS 16 and PTS 17 as representations of Auramazda. These seals are also discussed by MOOREY 1978: 146–148; CALMEYER 1979: 307f; and STRONACH 1989: 267; the first two opting for reading the figures in circles as deities. The lower edge of the circle is generally thickened to form a crescent.

<sup>173</sup> As in ROOT 1979: 310, it is the concept of kingship, not a specific king, that is the focus of these semantics.

<sup>174</sup> For the passage and a brief commentary see p. 4.

<sup>175</sup> GARRISON in press, *sv* Figure in Nimbus, surveys the history of this imagery in Assyria.

<sup>176</sup> The most famous and often illustrated example being the seal, probably dated to the 4th cent., found in the Nereid coffin from Gorgippa (ancient Anapa), now in St. Petersburg (e.g., COLLON 1987: no. 432), showing a crowned figure worshipping a female figure in a nimbus standing on the back of a lion; that figure has often been identified as Anahita (MOOREY 1979: 223–225; BRIANT 2002: 253f and 917 for a recent discussion of the seal and previous bibliography; see also JACOBS 2006).

<sup>177</sup> Two other examples from the PFS corpus, PFS 1164 and PFS 1591, may potentially be heirlooms from the Neo-Assyrian period. Study of the seals on the uninscribed tablets has now revealed a few more examples of scenes that include a figure in a nimbus. Note also the stamp seal PT4 554a (SCHMIDT 1957: pl. 17, from the Treasury building), which shows a female figure surrounded by a nimbus. The seal is executed in a heavy drilled style; as SCHMIDT 1957: 47 the seal could be early Achaemenid in date.

<sup>178</sup> GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 83–85 for a detailed analysis and bibliography of PFS 38 (**fig. 47**); GARRISON 2000: 143, fig. 21 for PFS 68 (**fig. 50**).

<sup>179</sup> For the *sibitti* see the discussion on p. 48.

<sup>180</sup> The deity on the back of a winged creature calls to mind some scenes in Assyrian glyptic showing a deity on an animal (e.g., COLLON 2001: no. 136); less similar are COLLON 2001: nos. 232–233, 290–292, where a deity (identified as Ninurta) strides over a composite creature.

<sup>181</sup> E.g., COLLON 2001: 10f; HERBORDT 1992: 218, note 13 for previous literature on the fish-man. There is evidence that the Elamite god Napirisha was equated, or was said to be similar, to Ea; see, e.g., VALLAT 1983; VALLAT 1997; POTTS 2004: 152–154. I thank WOUTER HENKELMAN for these references.

<sup>182</sup> See HERBORDT 1992: pl. 15, no. 5; a stamp seal (from Nineveh).

<sup>183</sup> DUSINBERRE 1997 has discussed some aspects of pedestal creatures in Achaemenid glyptic.

<sup>184</sup> See, e.g., the iconographic index in GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 522, PEDESTAL ANIMAL(S)/CREATURE(S).

<sup>185</sup> Note again PTS 14\*, which may date late in the reign of Darius I (GARRISON 1998 discusses the seal in association with PFS 1567\* (**fig. 23**); see also the comments in note 94).

<sup>186</sup> See p. **Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.** for dating of PTS 15\* to the time of Darius I.

<sup>187</sup> The seal is discussed on p. 29 in association with the figure in the winged ring. SCHMIDT 1957: 24 describes the objects held by the figures as “rod, or the like, with globular head,” perhaps owing to his identification of these figures as “priests,” but I see no reason why these objects may not simply be very elaborate flowers.

<sup>188</sup> See COLLON 2001: pl. 48c for photomicrograph of the god in the crescent on no. 230, where the hand is clearly depicted as open and held parallel to the picture plane.

<sup>189</sup> See COLLON 2001: nos. 229 and 361 where the god in the crescent holds a staff.

<sup>190</sup> See HERBORDT 1992: 101 for provenanced and unprovenanced examples; COLLON 1992; COLLON 1993–1997; and KUHNE 1997 on the origins of the motif of the moon god in a crescent; COLLON 2001: 118, nos. 229–230 and 361. As JACOBS (in press, *sv* Ma) and others have noted, the crescent with a human figure, and lunar imagery as a whole, are very popular in the west, especially the Aramaic “Namenssiegel” (see, e.g., KEEL 1994: 135–202 with copious documentation).

<sup>191</sup> HERBORDT 1992: 100f identifies three variations in the depiction of the god.

<sup>192</sup> See JACOBS in press, *sv* Ma. In the PFS corpus, as well as in Assyro-Babylonian glyptic, depictions of the symbols of the moon god are far more numerous than depictions of him in anthropomorphic form.

<sup>193</sup> There is textual evidence of much later date for a Persian moon god, Ma (Avestan/Old Persian *máh-*); see JACOBS in press, *sv* Ma; note MERRILLEES 2005: 140, note 17 on textual evidence concerning Cyrus and Sin. See also the discussion on pp. 47–48.

<sup>194</sup> GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 84 discuss the representation of the Horus child with previous literature and comparanda.

<sup>195</sup> Note the animal and composite creature index in GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 500, QUADRUPEDS, Bull creature. Note BLACK/GREEN 1992: 48–51 for the distinction between bull-men, upright bulls with human heads and torsos, and human-headed bulls, bulls with human heads. POTTS 2002 has recently surveyed the scholarship on the identification of the human-headed bulls at Persepolis.

<sup>196</sup> See the discussion and references on p. 27; I include them here although bull characteristics are not the most pronounced. The one preserved creature has a winged lion body, human head, and bull ear.

<sup>197</sup> Archer scenes: PFS 383, where the human-headed creature (lion or bull) is being attacked by another creature; PFS 1559, a winged human-headed creature that appears to attack a rampant creature; PFS 302, where only the human head of some type of composite creature, apparently the antagonist of the archer, is preserved.

<sup>198</sup> PFS 30, PFS 1227\*, PFS 1465, PFS 1566\*, PFS 1641, and PFS 1684. PFS 816\* may show the same creatures, again with an inscription, but the heads are not preserved. Probably also to be included are the creatures on the heroic encounters of PFS 514 (fig. 39), PFS 1002, and PFS 1076.

<sup>199</sup> On PFS 1053 what appear to be bull-men are disposed heraldically below the winged symbol.

<sup>200</sup> PFS 442 shows what may be a single, winged bull-man in an atlas pose. On PFS 1582 a winged bull creature (the head is not preserved) stands in an atlas pose.

<sup>201</sup> E.g., COLLON 2001: nos. 208–211; HERBORDT 1992: pl. 3:13; EHRENBERG 1999: no. 199. Already in the 2nd mill. there is a strong tradition of the coupling of atlantid figures and winged symbols. GARRISON in press, *sv* Atlantid figures, reviews the evidence. See also the discussion on p. 35 on atlantids.

<sup>202</sup> For the heroic encounters see the iconographic index in GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 519, HEROES AS COMPOSITE CREATURES.

<sup>203</sup> See the iconographical index in GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 502f, QUADRUPEDS, Lion creature.

<sup>204</sup> The human-faced creature on PFS 848\*, an archer scene with human-faced bull creatures discussed on p. 43, may have a leonine body.

<sup>205</sup> A single example from the PFS corpus, PFS 739\*, shows a lion-headed human with taloned feet. This creature is known since the Old Babylonian period (BLACK/GREEN 1992: 119–121) and is popular especially in the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian periods. For the 1st mill. the creature has been identified as *ugallu*, “‘big weather creature’, a beneficent demon protective against evil demons and illnesses” (BLACK/GREEN 1992: 121).

<sup>206</sup> Note the comments of GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 497.

<sup>207</sup> Note especially the discussion on p. 43 regarding human-faced bull creatures.

<sup>208</sup> The preserved part of the creature recalls, however, what we have described as human-faced bull creatures (see p. 43).

<sup>209</sup> I recognize that the term “centaur” is problematic in this context, given that none of the animal bodies of such creatures from the PFS corpus are equine.

<sup>210</sup> I have addressed this scene type in a preliminary manner in GARRISON in press (b). There is one example of such a scene from the PTS corpus, PTS 36, which stylistically looks as if it could date to the time of Darius I. Similar “centaur-like” creatures do appear rarely in scenes other than archers: e.g., in PFS 629\* such a creature appears to be in a procession.

<sup>211</sup> For Middle Assyrian and Kassite glyptic see the list of occurrences in SEIDL 1989: 176f. For the kudurrus see SEIDL 1989: 177.

<sup>212</sup> SEIDL 1989: 177 lists only one example of composite archer creatures in Assyro-Babylonian glyptic (PORADA 1948: no. 749, unprovenanced). See now also COLLON 2001: no. 65, which is also unprovenanced and I believe could easily date down into the Achaemenid period.

<sup>213</sup> On p. 39, following GARRISON in press (b), I suggest that the human torsos of the “centaur-like” creatures are related to occurrences of the figure in the winged ring/disk; clearly belonging to the fantastical, numinous world, these “centaur-like” creatures reinforce the numinous aspect of the partial figure.

<sup>214</sup> Other scorpion-men in heroic encounters include PFS 29 and PFS 1586.

<sup>215</sup> Another seal, PFS 1573, again only fragmentarily preserved, probably preserves very similar scorpion creatures in a heraldic scene. PFS 126, a heraldic scene, has the same creature, but rendered slightly differently.

<sup>216</sup> As EHRENBERG notes, SEIDL 1989: 169–171 differentiates between the “scorpion-man,” *girtablullu* (whom she identifies as a demon) and the scorpion-bird-man (whom she identifies as divine).

<sup>217</sup> See the iconographical index in GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 500, QUADRUPEDS, Bull creature; 519, HEROES AS COMPOSITE CREATURES, Human creature.

<sup>218</sup> See, e.g., RUSSELL 1998: 674–682, 690–696; BRAUN-HÖLZINGER/MATTHÄUS 2000; and PORTER 2003: 16, 24f, 36f, 91 for recent surveys on the considerable previous literature on the identification of the winged genii in Assyrian monumental relief and beyond. WINTER 2000: 69f discusses the apotropaic qualities of winged genii on seals.

<sup>219</sup> The topic is daunting in its breadth and complexity. Aspects of the symbolic associations of animals in the art of Western Asia have recently been surveyed in BRENIQUET 2002: 157–165; ROOT 2002; SCURLOCK 2002. Other essays in COLLINS 2002 are also pertinent.

- <sup>220</sup> See GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 497 on the difficulty of distinguishing specific animal types in the PFS corpus. In particular, one is hard-pressed with regard to distinguishing between deer, gazelles, wild goats (ibexes), and wild (short-haired) sheep. We generally identify bovidae with outward splaying horns as wild sheep (male and female), paralleled and curved horns as wild goat.
- <sup>221</sup> There are, however, many forays that have attempted such. One of the more commonly discussed themes is the lion and bull combat, so provocatively displayed in monumental relief at Persepolis (ROOT 2002 has recently discussed the theme). Another common thread in this line of inquiry is the linkage of the lion, bull, and bull slaying to the god Mithra (pursued vigorously by BIVAR, e.g., BIVAR 1998: 9f, 31–38; BIVAR 2005).
- <sup>222</sup> AMIET 1973: 20, nos. 46–47; see GARRISON 2006. AMIET's only point of contact for this scene type was PFS 12a/PFS 12b.
- <sup>223</sup> On the scene see also the comments on pp. 14–15 and 48–49. ROOT 1998 has offered some preliminary observations on the use of the pyramidal stamp, a seal shape often associated with the late Babylonian worship scene; note also ROOT 2003 on the late Babylonian worship scene itself.
- <sup>224</sup> Note also PTS 62s, which shows the *marru*-spade and double stylus on a *mushushu* dragon that rests on a pedestal. The seal probably dates to the time of Darius I.
- <sup>225</sup> See, e.g., EHRENBERG 1999: 19–22 with previous literature. As she notes, some of these animals/creatures could also have general apotropaic qualities.
- <sup>226</sup> A design very similar to that seen on PFS 143s, and also dated to the reign of Darius I, is found on the Eanna seal impressions (EHRENBERG 1999: no. 74).
- <sup>227</sup> ROOT 1979: 177 surveys the scholarship; see also JACOBS in press, *sv* Ma.
- <sup>228</sup> But note the discussion on p. 48 of the Babylonian copy/variant of the Behistun relief, which SEIDL (1999: 110–112, fig. 2) restored with a sun and crescent-in-disk.
- <sup>229</sup> E.g., PFS 720 and PFS 1654; note the interesting PFS 862s (fig. 72), where the crescent and dot sit on a *kudurru* in a late Babylonian worship scene (discussed on p. 49). The cylinder seal PT7 33 (SCHMIDT 1957: pl. 15, from the Apadana), an animal combat, shows an additional dot above the crescent and dot. Stylistically the seal is related to the local Fortification style and probably dates to the time of Darius I.
- <sup>230</sup> DUSINBERRE in press presents similar arguments.
- <sup>231</sup> For a sample of the range of the occurrence of the crescent in the scenes of heroic encounter from the PFS corpus, see the iconographic index in GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 512, DEVICES AND SYMBOLS, Crescent.
- <sup>232</sup> There appears to be only one example in the PFS corpus, PFS 936s, showing the crescent on a standard, an image that was very popular in western glyptic of the Neo-Assyrian period (see KEEL 1994).
- <sup>233</sup> E.g., here illustrated, heroic encounters: PFS 1\* (fig. 57) and PFS 38 (fig. 47); devotional scene: PTS 21 (fig. 51); late Babylonian worship scene type: PFS 451s (fig. 65), PFS 1205s\* (fig. 70), PFS 1216s\* (fig. 70).
- <sup>234</sup> See also the discussion in note 245 on the stamp seals PT5 212 and PT6 453.
- <sup>235</sup> See the comments of, e.g., HERBORDT 1992: 100f; COLLON 1993–1997; KEEL 1994: 148; SEIDL 2000: 90–98; COLLON 2001: 118.
- <sup>236</sup> E.g., here illustrated, animal combat: PFS 8 (fig. 58); caprid courant: PFS 285 (fig. 44); devotional scenes: PFS 122 (fig. 26) and PFS 1312s (fig. 52); late Babylonian worship scene type: PFS 273s (fig. 69); heraldic scorpion-men: PFS 903 (fig. 61); archer: PFS 71\* (= PTS 33\*, fig. 67).
- <sup>237</sup> For a sample of the range of the occurrence of the star in the scenes of heroic encounter from the PFS corpus, see the iconographic index in GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 513, DEVICES AND SYMBOLS, star. Note also PFS 237s, an interesting stamp seal showing no figural imagery, only a star, crescent, and rhomb.
- <sup>238</sup> Note the drawing in TILIA 1978: 58, fig. 7a. For stars on decoration on the band of Darius' diadem see STRONACH 1997: 48; see HENKELMAN 1995–96: 276: “band with crenellations on top of it, decorated by rosette-like and floral ornaments.”
- <sup>239</sup> See, e.g., the comments of COLLON 2001: 15; BLACK/GREEN 1992: 169f.
- <sup>240</sup> EHRENBERG 1999: 17 notes that the seven-pointed star is clearly associated with Ishtar in the Late Babylonian period; she suggests that the six-pointed and eight-pointed stars are probably also to be linked with the goddess in the glyptic from Eanna.
- <sup>241</sup> ROOT (1979: 213, note 90) notes as well that the crown topped by a star is worn by other deities in Assyrian monumental art; thus no specific deity may have been intended by its use at Behistun.
- <sup>242</sup> The rosettes that decorate the headbands of the weapon bearers who stand behind Darius at Behistun may also potentially be allusions to Ishtar. LUSCHEY 1968: 81 states that the bracelets that the figure in the winged ring wears are also decorated with rosettes. For the rosette as a sign of Ishtar see BLACK/GREEN 1992: 156f. The rosette is ubiquitous in architectural sculpture at Persepolis.
- <sup>243</sup> Note SEIDL 1999: 109f. How, if at all, this evidence from Babylon is to be factored into our understanding of the star atop the horned crown that the figure in the winged ring at Behistun wears (and the fact that this section of the relief is clearly a separate insertion into the rock) is not clear.
- <sup>244</sup> On the various interpretations of the seven dots in Neo-Assyrian glyptic, see, e.g., HERBORDT 1992: 102f; COLLON 2001: 14.
- <sup>245</sup> Note also, however, the two very similar stamp seals PT5 212 and PT6 453 (SCHMIDT 1957: pl. 17) from the Treasury building, each of which shows the *sibitti*, two crescents, and the *marru*-spade (with cross-bar) of Marduk. Stylistically, the seals could easily date to the time of Darius I.
- <sup>246</sup> See pp. 14–15, 46 and note 222. Note also PTS 62s, which shows the *marru*-spade and double stylus on a *mushushu* dragon that rests on a pedestal. The seal probably dates to the time of Darius I.
- <sup>247</sup> These emblems have often been discussed; see, e.g., EHRENBERG 1999: 17 with previous literature.

<sup>248</sup> For the identification of this object as a stand with a lamp see JAKOB-ROST 1997: 74, nos. 256–257 (VA 2569 and VA 750); note also DELAPORTE 1920: pl. 54:22 and DELAPORTE 1923: pl. 92:9b, 33, all described as “lampadaire de Nouskou.” For the lamp as a symbol of the god Nusku see also BLACK/GREEN 1992: 116.

<sup>249</sup> The *marru*-spade of Marduk and/or the stylus of Nabu also occur, but rarely, outside of the late Babylonian worship scene; e.g., in PFS 27\* a winged leonine creature marchant moves toward an inscription where the *marru*-spade and the stylus act as vertical dividers in the inscription. See also PFS 1501, where they occur in the terminal field of a heroic encounter; note also the two seals PT5 212 and PT6 453 discussed in note 245.

<sup>250</sup> EHRENBERG 1999: 18 discusses various terminology used to describe these objects and the opinions on their possible significance.

<sup>251</sup> See the discussion on pp. 47–48. Note EHRENBERG 1999: nos. 102 and 104–105 where an oval-shaped object appears between the crescent and the *kuduru*-shaped object. Are these oval-shaped objects simply elaborate moldings on the vertical element that supports the crescent, or do they reference the disk of the crescent-in-disk?

<sup>252</sup> E.g., see the varied examples in the iconographical index in GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 523, PLANTS OTHER THAN TREES; 523, TREES.

<sup>253</sup> COLLON 2001: 82–85 for an excellent introduction to the Neo-Assyrian glyptic evidence for the stylized tree. RUSSELL 1998: 687–696 and PORTER 2003 include much of the scholarship on the meaning of the stylized tree. GIOVINO 2006 has recently surveyed the early historiography on the stylized tree; she argues for resurrecting the idea that the object is not a tree but a “constructed cult object.”

<sup>254</sup> For the Apadana panels see the discussion on pp. 27–28. For the king and attendant on doorjambs of the Palace of Darius see SCHMIDT 1953: pls. 138B, 139B, 140–141.

<sup>255</sup> See also the iconographical index in GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 523, PLANTS OTHER THAN TREES, Floral element, Lotus blossoms and buds.

<sup>256</sup> See, e.g., the recent discussions by MERRILLEES 2005: 137–139 and BAKKER 2007.

<sup>257</sup> See the iconographical index in GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 525, TREES, Conifers; *pace* MERRILLEES 2005: 135. Note also the seal PT6 51 (SCHMIDT 1957: pl. 16, from the Treasury building), which shows a cypress. The style is local Fortification style and probably dates to the period of Darius I.

<sup>258</sup> Date palms occur on all seven royal-name seals of Darius I from the PFS and PTS corpora; see above note 146.

<sup>259</sup> E.g., see the iconographical index in GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 525, TREES, Date palm, Palm.

<sup>260</sup> PORTER 2003: 14–18 provides an overview of the multiple meanings of the date palm.

<sup>261</sup> I address this issue briefly in GARRISON in press (b).

<sup>262</sup> This “pseudoquestion” of Zoroastrianism among the Persians is discussed on pp. 5–6. There is a substantial literature that has developed around the questions of “sacred fire,” fire temples, fire altars, and fire worship among the Achaemenids. KELLENS 1990; BRIANT 2002: 916; BRIANT 1997: 72f; CHOKSY 2007; POTTS 2007; and GARRISON in press (d) survey some of this scholarship. On the issue of the fire specifically at Naqsh-i Rostam as evidence for Zoroastrianism see, e.g., BOYCE 1987a: 7; on fire in Zoroastrianism see BOYCE 1987; on the distinction between altar and fire-holder see GARRISON 1999: 613.

<sup>263</sup> GARRISON in press (d) has collected the evidence.

<sup>264</sup> The seal is also discussed on pp. 29–36 concerning the depiction of the figure in the winged ring/disk in Persepolitan glyptic.

<sup>265</sup> YAMAMOTO 1979 and HOUTKAMP 1991 are earlier compilations of the archaeological and pictorial evidence for “fire altars” in the Achaemenid period. GARRISON in press (d) discusses the evidence from Southwestern Iran in the reigns of Darius and Xerxes. MOOREY 1979: 222f, 225 remains important. See also GARRISON 1999: 613 on terminology and MERRILLEES 2005: 119f and CHOKSY 2007 on actual fire altars.

<sup>266</sup> For a sample of the range of the occurrence of the rhombus in the scenes of heroic encounter from the PFS corpus, see the iconographic index in GARRISON/ROOT 2001: 513, DEVICES AND SYMBOLS, Rhomb.

<sup>267</sup> EHRENBERG 1999: 18 (following BLACK/GREEN 1992: 153 and MACGINNIS 1995: 172) notes that the rhombus may have apotropaic powers and associations with Ishtar.

<sup>268</sup> There are several seals from the unscribed tablets in the PF archive that have Egyptian hieroglyphic inscriptions; one of them employs an *ankh* sign in the inscription. These seals will be published by GARRISON/RITNER in preparation.

<sup>269</sup> By extension, this data would seem to raise serious questions about an Iran permeated by a rigid Zoroastrianism based on the teachings of the prophet Zarathustra.

<sup>270</sup> These atlantids are completely human and, moreover, personifications of the peoples/lands of the empire. Exactly how we are to understand the adoption of this pose, which in previous periods had such strong association with numinous beings, at Naqsh-i Rostam is unclear. ROOT (1979: 153–161) discusses the atlantid figures in Achaemenid monumental relief with regard to the question of whether the images represent actuality (a real ceremony) or metaphor (king’s relationship to the subject peoples), concluding that “the Achaemenids clearly adapted a pose previously found almost exclusively in ritual/cosmic contexts for a decidedly political representation” (ROOT 1979: 152). Given the fact that in the glyptic evidence from Persepolis atlantids are exclusively numinous in character, we may want to entertain again the idea that these atlantids at Naqsh-i Rostam signify a more blatantly cosmic concept of kingship. Interestingly, the atlantids on the tomb facades at Naqsh-i Rostam and on doorways of the Central Building are combined, as in glyptic (Achaemenid and earlier), with the figure in the winged symbol (although the atlantids in monumental relief support the platform/throne, not the figure in a winged symbol). I explore these issues in more detail in Garrison in press (f).

## Appendix

List of seals from the Fortification Archive cited in this study with publication volume number in the projected three-volume project. A seal with a Cat.No. indicates that it appears in vol. 1, i.e., GARRISON/ROOT 2001. Final publication status of the seals from the unscribed tablets in the archive (i.e., PFUTS) has yet to be determined.

PFS 1* (Cat.No. 182) ( <b>fig. 57</b> )	PFS 211 (vol. 2)
PFS 4* (Cat.No. 292)	PFS 216 (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 43</b> )
PFS 7* (Cat.No. 4) ( <b>fig. 24</b> )	PFS 222 (Cat.No. 117)
PFS 8 (vol. 3) ( <b>fig. 58</b> )	PFS 237s (vol. 3)
PFS 11* (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 22</b> )	PFS 239 (vol. 2)
PFS 12a (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 63</b> )	PFS 244s (vol. 2)
PFS 12b (vol. 2)	PFS 250 (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 59</b> )
PFS 22 (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 73</b> )	PFS 261* (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 45</b> )
PFS 27* (vol. 3)	PFS 262s (vol. 2)
PFS 29 (Cat.No. 302)	PFS 269 (vol. 2)
PFS 30 (Cat.No. 291)	PFS 273s (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 69</b> )
PFS 36* (Cat.No. 5)	PFS 284* (Cat.No. 111)
PFS 38 (Cat.No. 16) ( <b>fig. 47</b> )	PFS 285 (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 44</b> )
PFS 46 (vol. 2)	PFS 289s* (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 71</b> )
PFS 62 (Cat.No. 104)	PFS 302 (vol. 2)
PFS 68 (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 50</b> )	PFS 306 (vol. 2)
PFS 71* = PTS 33* (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 67</b> )	PFS 310 (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 27</b> )
PFS 73 (vol. 3)	PFS 320* (vol. 3) ( <b>fig. 55</b> )
PFS 74 (vol. 3)	PFS 349 (vol. 2)
PFS 75 (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 74</b> )	PFS 351 (vol. 2)
PFS 78 (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 60</b> )	PFS 383 (vol. 2)
PFS 82* (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 34</b> )	PFS 389* (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 38</b> )
PFS 83* (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 35</b> )	PFS 390* (vol. 2)
PFS 85a* (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 64</b> )	PFS 406 (vol. 2)
PFS 85b* (vol. 2)	PFS 420 (vol. 2)
PFS 91 (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 25</b> )	PFS 442 (vol. 2)
PFS 98* (Cat.No. 217) ( <b>fig. 56</b> )	PFS 451s (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 65</b> )
PFS 105s (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 48</b> )	PFS 460 (vol. 3)
PFS 108* (vol. 3) ( <b>fig. 54</b> )	PFS 508 (vol. 3)
PFS 111 (vol. 3)	PFS 514 (Cat.No. 192) ( <b>fig. 39</b> )
PFS 113* = PTS 4* (Cat.No. 19) ( <b>fig. 53</b> )	PFS 518 (vol. 2)
PFS 115* (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 36</b> )	PFS 522 (vol. 2)
PFS 116s (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 68</b> )	PFS 526* (Cat.No. 216)
PFS 118 (vol. 2)	PFS 553 (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 28</b> )
PFS 122 (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 26</b> )	PFS 578s (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 75</b> )
PFS 126 (vol. 3)	PFS 586s (vol. 2)
PFS 143s (vol. 2)	PFS 629* (vol. 2)
PFS 156 (vol. 3)	PFS 684 (Cat.No. 183)
PFS 166 (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 37</b> )	PFS 706* (vol. 2) ( <b>fig. 62</b> )
PFS 174 (vol. 2)	PFS 715 (vol. 2)
PFS 186s (vol. 2)	PFS 720 (Cat.No. 57)
PFS 196 (Cat.No. 224) ( <b>fig. 42</b> )	PFS 730 (vol. 2)
PFS 203 (vol. 2)	PFS 739* (vol. 2)



PFS 774 (Cat.No. 58) (**fig. 29**)  
PFS 793s (vol. 2)  
PFS 802 (vol. 2)  
PFS 813\* (vol. 2)  
PFS 816\* (vol. 3)  
PFS 848\* (vol. 2)  
PFS 851 (Cat.No. 60)  
PFS 862s (vol. 2) (**fig. 72**)  
PFS 864 (vol. 2)  
PFS 903 (vol. 3) (**fig. 61**)  
PFS 918 (vol. 2)  
PFS 931\* (Cat.No. 270)  
PFS 936s (vol. 3)  
PFS 1002 (Cat.No. 196)  
PFS 1053 (Cat.No. 45)  
PFS 1071 (Cat.No. 29) (**fig. 30**)  
PFS 1076 (Cat.No. 193)  
PFS 1084\* (vol. 2)  
PFS 1116 (vol. 2)  
PFS 1121s (vol. 2)  
PFS 1140s (vol. 2)  
PFS 1155 (Cat.No. 190)  
PFS 1164 (vol. 2)  
PFS 1189 (Cat.No. 8)  
PFS 1190 (vol. 2) (**fig. 41**)  
PFS 1199 (vol. 2)  
PFS 1204 (Cat.No. 136)  
PFS 1205s\* (vol. 2) (**fig. 70**)  
PFS 1216s\* (vol. 2) (**fig. 66**)  
PFS 1227\* (Cat.No. 219)  
PFS 1240\* (vol. 2)  
PFS 1278s (vol. 2)  
PFS 1308\* (vol. 2) (**fig. 5**)  
PFS 1312s (vol. 2) (**fig. 52**)  
PFS 1359 (vol. 2)  
PFS 1360 (vol. 2)  
PFS 1371 (vol. 2)  
PFS 1381s (vol. 2)  
PFS 1416 (vol. 2)  
PFS 1465 (Cat.No. 21)  
PFS 1501 (Cat.No. 238)  
PFS 1508 (vol. 3)  
PFS 1559 (vol. 2)  
PFS 1566\* (Cat.No. 218)  
PFS 1567\* (vol. 2) (**fig. 23**)  
PFS 1569 (vol. 2)  
PFS 1572\* (vol. 2)  
PFS 1573 (vol. 3)  
PFS 1582 (Cat.No. 232)  
PFS 1586 (Cat.No. 121)  
PFS 1591 (vol. 2)  
PFS 1601\* (vol. 2) (**fig. 31**)  
PFS 1641 (Cat.No. 18)  
PFS 1654 (Cat.No. 122)  
PFS 1684 (Cat.No. 17)  
PFUTS 1\* (**fig. 32**)  
PFUTS 18\* (**fig. 33**)  
PFUTS 82s (**fig. 49**)

**Illustrations** (+Ulrike Zurkinden-Kolberg; ++author)

- Fig. 1 Map of Iran.
- Fig. 2 Map of Marv Dasht plain and surrounding areas.
- Fig. 3<sup>+</sup> Drawing of a modern impression of a seal from Hasanlu, “Central Assyrian style”; winged genii flank a stylized tree, above which is a winged ring (MARCUS 1996: 118, fig. 84 [no. 62]).
- Fig. 4<sup>+</sup> Drawing of an impression of cylinder seal from Hasanlu, “Middle Assyrian stylistic legacy”; winged, bird-footed genii flank a tree, above which is winged ring (MARCUS 1996: 128, fig. 103 [no. 81]).
- Fig. 5<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing of PFS 1308\*; seated female enclosed in frame is approached by attendant with upraised arms, paneled Elamite inscription in terminal field.
- Fig. 6 Plan of Pasargadae (STRONACH 1978: fig. 3 [between pp. 4–5]).
- Fig. 7 Plan, Gate R, Pasargadae (STRONACH 1978: fig. 22).
- Fig. 8 The four-winged figure from the eastern door doorjamb of the northeastern door, Gate R, Pasargadae (STRONACH 1978: fig. 25).
- Fig. 9 Plan, Palace S, Pasargadae (STRONACH 1978: fold-out 3 [between pp. 58–59]).
- Fig. 10 Preserved figures on the left-hand jamb of the northwestern doorway, Palace S, Pasargadae (STRONACH 1978, fig. 34).
- Fig. 11 Preserved figures on the left-hand jamb of the southeastern doorway, Palace S, Pasargadae (STRONACH 1978: fig. 35).
- Fig. 12<sup>+</sup> Impression of a seal (AMIET 1973, no. 5) on tablet Sb 12813 (DELAPORTE 1920: pl. 48, no. 19) from the Acropole series of tablets, Susa; winged genii flank stylized tree. Courtesy of the Département des Antiquités Orientales, Musée du Louvre, Paris.
- Fig. 13<sup>+</sup> Drawing of a modern impression of cylinder seal, unprovenanced, but conventionally dated to the Neo-Elamite period; female goddess holding arrows and bow places forward leg in back of lion couchant, paneled Elamite inscription in terminal field (DELAPORTE 1923: pl. 94:5; AMIET 1973: no. 32). Louvre A. 836, Paris.
- Fig. 14<sup>+</sup> Drawing of a modern impression of a cylinder seal, unprovenanced, but conventionally dated to the Neo-Elamite period; rampant mushushu dragons flank a highly stylized marru-spade of Marduk, paneled Elamite inscription in terminal field (AMIET 1973: no. 34). Israel Museum, Jerusalem.
- Fig. 15<sup>+</sup> The relief on the rock-cut monument of Darius I at Behistun (after SCHMITT 1990a: 301, fig. 22).
- Fig. 16<sup>+</sup> Detail of the figure in the winged ring on the rock-cut monument of Darius I at Behistun (after Fundación “la Caixa 2003: 29, fig. 4).
- Fig. 17<sup>+</sup> Top register of the relief on the rock-cut tomb of Darius I at Naqsh-e Rostam (after SCHMIDT 1970: pl. 19)
- Fig. 18 Persepolis citadel (takht) and immediate surroundings (adapted from KLEISS 1992: 155, fig. 1) showing the findspot of the Persepolis Fortification archive (letter A). Courtesy of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Fig. 19 Reconstructed drawing of the audience scene on the panel that originally stood in the center of the eastern stairway of the Apadana (after TILIA 1972: fig. 3).
- Fig. 20<sup>+</sup> Tip of the wing of a probable winged ring-and-disk, central panel of the southern stairway on the Palace of Darius (after SCHMIDT 1953: pl. 127).
- Fig. 21<sup>+</sup> Detail of the figure in the winged ring, north jamb, east doorway, Central Building (after SCHMIDT 1953: pl. 79).
- Fig. 22<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 11\*; crowned attendants with one arm upraised flank “altar” over which figure in a winged ring hovers, palm trees flank the scene, paneled, trilingual (Old Persian, Elamite, Babylonian) royal-name inscription in terminal field.
- Fig. 23<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 1567\*; attendants with one arm upraised standing on backs of goat creatures flank figure in a winged ring, paneled Elamite inscription in terminal field.

- Fig. 24<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 7\*; crowned hero controls two rampant winged bulls, palm trees flank the scene, paneled, trilingual (Old Persian, Elamite, Babylonian) royal-name inscription in terminal field.
- Fig. 25<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 91; attendant grasps ring offered by figure in winged device, addorsed, horned creatures below, rampant caprid at right.
- Fig. 26<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 122; bull-men flanking stylized tree support figure in winged device, winged figure at right.
- Fig. 27<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 310; bull-men flanking stylized tree support figure in winged ring, winged figure with bucket and cone at left, figure with upraised arm at right.
- Fig. 28<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 553; figure stands on back of winged creature, bull-man (?) at left, winged symbol hovers over rectangular device at left.
- Fig. 29<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 774; crowned hero controls two rampant winged, horned lions, bull-man supports figure in winged device in terminal field.
- Fig. 30<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 1071; hero controls two rampant lions, bull-men support figure in winged device in terminal field.
- Fig. 31<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 1601\*; seated figure before table is approached by attendant with upraised arms, figure in winged device hovers over paneled Elamite inscription in terminal field.
- Fig. 32<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFUTS 1\*; attendants (one at right is crowned) standing on backs of fish-men (one at left is crowned) flank stylized tree over which hovers figure in a winged device, paneled Elamite inscription in terminal field
- Fig. 33<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFUTS 18\*; crowned hero standing on backs of winged, bird-headed creature and winged lion controls two inverted lions, figure in winged device hovers above, palm trees flank the scene, paneled, trilingual (Old Persian, Elamite, Babylonian) royal-name inscription in terminal field.
- Fig. 34<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 82\*; attendants holding spears standing on backs of winged lions flank figure in winged device hovering over human-headed, winged creature, Aramaic inscription in terminal field.
- Fig. 35<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 83\*; winged cow suckles calf, winged bull-man supports winged ring, paneled Aramaic inscription and star in upper field.
- Fig. 36<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 115\*; archer shoots toward rampant caprid before stylized tree, winged ring in upper field, Akkadian inscription in terminal field.
- Fig. 37<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 166; winged genii flank stylized tree over which winged ring hovers, small figure sits on lotus blossom in terminal field.
- Fig. 38<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 389\*; winged fish-men (one at left is crowned) flank paneled Elamite inscription over which hovers winged ring, crowned attendant with raised arm stands on fish-men's tail at right.
- Fig. 39<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 514; hero controls two winged, human-headed lions (?) marchant, winged ring hovers above stylized floral element in terminal field.
- Fig. 40<sup>+</sup> PTS 20\* on tablet PT3-384; attendants flank table and stepped altar, winged ring hovers above, Aramaic inscription in terminal field.
- Fig. 41<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 1190; two lions attack caprid; winged disk hovers above.
- Fig. 42<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 196; hero combats rampant lion with sword, winged device hovers in terminal field.
- Fig. 43<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 216; attendants with buckets, one at right winged, flank figure who supports winged device.
- Fig. 44<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 285; caprid courrant and star, winged device hovers above stylized floral element in terminal field.
- Fig. 45<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 261\*; archer emerging from back of winged composite bull-fish-scorpion creature shoots at rampant lion, paneled Elamite inscription in terminal field.
- Fig. 46<sup>+</sup> Type I gold Daric (after STRONACH 1989: fig. 1:1).
- Fig. 47<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 38; hero controls two rampant, winged, human-faced bulls, Horus child on papyrus and rhombus between hero and creature at right, seven sibittii and

- figure in nimbus of stars hover above elaborate stylized floral element in terminal field, segmented vertical object terminating in point in terminal field, crescent in upper field.
- Fig. 48<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 105s; bull-man supports partial figure in crescent, lotus blossoms flank the scene.
- Fig. 49<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFUTS 82s; partial figure in crescent hovers above floral device, papyrus buds flank the scene.
- Fig. 50<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 68; winged genii with buckets flank figure in nimbus.
- Fig. 51<sup>+</sup> PTS 21 on tablet PT4-198; female figure in nimbus of rays is approached by attendant, in between these figures is tall stand-like device, perhaps incense burner or symbol of Nabu, crescent in upper field.
- Fig. 52<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 1312s; figure with arms at chests stands on podium flanked by fish-man and goat-fish.
- Fig. 53<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 113\* (= PTS 4\*); hero controls two rampant human-headed bulls, palm tree at left, paneled, trilingual (Old Persian, Elamite, Babylonian) royal-name inscription in terminal field.
- Fig. 54<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 108\*; winged, human-faced caprids (?) flank circular floral device, Babylonian inscription in terminal field.
- Fig. 55<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 320\*; rampant, winged, human-faced bulls flank paneled Elamite inscription.
- Fig. 56<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 98\*; winged hero attacks with mace rampant, winged, human-faced bull, Elamite inscription in terminal field.
- Fig. 57<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 1\*; winged bull creature controls two winged, bird-headed creatures inverted, crescent above creature at right, paneled Elamite inscription in terminal field.
- Fig. 58<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 8; winged, human-headed lion (?) attacks stag courrant, star in field between the two creatures, another animal (bird?) in field below stag.
- Fig. 59<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 250; winged centaur archer shoots at inverted lion.
- Fig. 60<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 78; winged, centaur archer with bird body and scorpion tail shoots at winged lion marchant, lion couchant in field between the two, bird stands above floral element in terminal field.
- Fig. 61<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 903; winged human-headed scorpions flank stylized tree, star in terminal field.
- Fig. 62<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 706\*; attendant with upraised arms stands before composite winged creature with bird-head, human torso, lion body and scorpion tail holding elaborate bucket(?), paneled Elamite inscription in terminal field.
- Fig. 63<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 12a; attendant with upraised arms stands before winged, horned lion.
- Fig. 64<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 85a\*; attendant with upraised arms stands before paneled Elamite inscription and rampant lion.
- Fig. 65<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 451s; attendant with upraised arm stands before mushushu dragon on pedestal, spade of Marduk and stylus on back of musushu dragon, crescent in upper field.
- Fig. 66<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 1216s\*; attendant with upraised arm stands before goat-fish on pedestal, ram-headed staff on back of goat-fish, vertical element bisects center of scene, crescent in upper field, Babylonian inscription at left.
- Fig. 67<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 71\* (=PTS 33\*); archer shoots at rampant lion, dead lion between the two, star in upper field at left, crescent in upper field at center, paneled Aramaic inscription in terminal field.
- Fig. 68<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 116s; attendant with upraised arm stands before spade of Marduk and double stylus on pedestal, circle in upper field at left.
- Fig. 69<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 273s; attendant with upraised arms stands before spade of Marduk and double stylus on pedestal, star in upper field.

- Fig. 70<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 1205s\*; attendant with upraised arm stands before spade of Marduk, double stylus and lamp on pillared pedestal, crescent in upper field, Babylonian inscription at left.
- Fig. 71<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 289s\*; attendant with upraised arm stands before a kudurru-shaped object supporting lightning bolts on pillared pedestal, cross in upper field, Babylonian inscription at left.
- Fig. 72<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 862s; attendant holding vase stands before a kudurru-shaped object supporting a crescent and dot on pillared pedestal.
- Fig. 73<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 22; seated figure is approached by two attendants, the first leading the second by the hand.
- Fig. 74<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 75; procession of two figures toward stepped altar and large rectangular structure, attendant at left leads horned animal, attendant at right holds pitcher over fire on altar.
- Fig. 75<sup>++</sup> Composite line drawing PFS 578s; attendant holds two cups (?) over fire on stepped altar, hooked device at left, comb-like device at right.
- Fig. 76<sup>+</sup> View of the western face of the terrace at Persepolis (after photograph MBG).
- Fig. 77<sup>+</sup> View of the Apadana, from the northeast (after photograph MBG).
- Fig. 78<sup>+</sup> View of the interior of the Apadana (after photograph MBG).
- Fig. 79 Reconstruction of the western portico of the Apadana, looking to the west (after KREFTER 1971: Beilage 28).

## Bibliography

- AHN G., 1992, *Religiöse Herrscherlegitimation im achämenidischen Iran. Die Voraussetzungen und die Struktur ihrer Argumentation*, Leiden.
- ALIZADEH A., 1985, A Tomb of the Neo-Elamite Period at Arjan, Near Behbahan: *AMI* 18, 49–74.
- ALVAREZ-MON J., 2004, *Imago Mundi: Cosmological and Ideological Aspects of the Arjan Bowl: Iranica Antiqua* 39, 203–238.
- in press, The Golden Griffin from Arjan, in: ALVAREZ-MON J., ed., *The Archaeology of Iran: Late Elamite and Early Achaemenid Periods*.
- ALVAREZ-MON J./GARRISON M.B., eds., in press, *Elam and Persia*. Winona Lake.
- AMIET P., 1972, *Glyptique susienne des origins à l'époque Perses Achéménides*, Paris.
- 1973, *La glyptique de la fin de l'Élam: Arts asiatiques* 28, 3–32.
- D'AMORE P., 1992, *Glittica a cilindro achemenide: Linee di uno sviluppo tematico-cronologico: Contributi e Materiali di Archeologia Orientale* 4, 187–267.
- ANDERSON B., 2002, *Imperial Legacies, Local Identities: References to Achaemenid Persian Iconography on Crenelated Nabataean Tombs: Ars Orientalis* 32, 163–207.
- AZZONI A., in press, *The Bowman MS and the Aramaic Tablets*, in: BRIANT P./STOLPER M.W./HENKELMAN W., eds., *Les archives des fortifications de Persépolis dans le contexte de l'empire achéménide et de ses prédécesseurs. Actes du colloque*, Paris.
- BAHRANI Z., 2003, *The Graven Image. Representation in Babylonia and Assyria*, Philadelphia.
- BAKER H.D./WUNSCH C., 2001, *Neo-Babylonian Notaries and their Use of Seals*, in: HALLO W.W./WINTER I.J., eds., *Proceedings of the VLVe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale. Part II: Seals and Seal Impressions*, Bethesda, 197–213.
- BAKKER J., 2007, *The Lady and the Lotus: Representations of Women in the Achaemenid Empire: Iranica Antiqua* 42, 207–220.
- BARNETT R.D., 1976, *Sculptures from the North Palace of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh (668–627 BC)*, London.
- BARRELET M.-TH., 1984, *Le décor du bol en or de Hasanlu et les interpretations proposées à son sujet*, in: BARRELET M.-TH., ed., *Problèmes concernant les Hurrians (Editions Recherches sur Civilisations, Mémoire 49)*, Paris, 13–176.
- BERGER P.-R., 1975, *Der Kyros-Zylinder mit dem Zusatzfragment BIN II Nr. 32 und die akkadischen Personennamen im Danielbuch: ZA* 64, 192–234.
- BIVAR A.D.H., 1998, *The Personalities of Mithra in Archaeology and Literature. Biennial Yarshater Lecture Series 1*, New York.
- 2005, *Mithraism: a Religion for the Ancient Medes: Iranica Antiqua* 40, 341–358.
- BLACK J./GREEN A., 1992, *Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia. An Illustrated Dictionary*, Austin.
- BOARDMAN J., 2000, *Persia and the West. An Archaeological Investigation of the Genesis of Achaemenid Art*, London.
- BORGER R., 1982, *Die Chronologie des Darius-Denkmal am Behistun Felsen (NAWG, Phil. Hist. Kl. 1982,3)*, Göttingen, 105–131.
- 1996, *Beiträge zum Inschriftenwerk Assurbanipals. Die Prismklassen A, B, C = K, D, E, F, G, H, J, und T sowie andere Inschriften*, Wiesbaden.
- BOYCE M., 1975, *A History of Zoroastrianism. Vol. I: The Early Period (Handbuch der Orientalistik VIII.1.2)*, Leiden/Cologne.
- 1982, *A History of Zoroastrianism. Vol. II: Under the Achaemenids (Handbuch der Orientalistik VIII.1.2)*, Leiden/Cologne.
- 1985, *Art. Achaemenid Religion: EI* 1:426–429.

- 1985a, Art. Ahura Mazda: EI 1:684–687.
  - 1987, Art. Ātaš: EI 3:1–5.
  - 1987a, Art. Ātašdān: EI 3:7–9.
  - 1992, *Zoroastrianism Its Antiquity and Constant Vigour* (Columbian Lectures on Iranian Studies 7), Costa Mesa/New York.
  - <sup>2</sup>2001, *Zoroastrians. Their Religious Beliefs and Practices*, London/New York.
- BRAUN–HOLZINGER E.A./MATTHÄUS H., 2000, Schutzgenien in Mesopotamien und den angrenzenden Gebieten: ihre Übernahme in Zypern, Kreta and Griechenland, in: UEHLINGER 2000, 283–321.
- BRENIQUET C., 2002, Animals in Mesopotamian Art, in: COLLINS 2002, 145–168.
- BRIANT P., 1984, La Perse avant l’Empire (un état de question): *Iranica Antiqua* 19, 71–118.
- 1988, Ethno-classe dominante et populations soumises dans l’Empire achéménide: le cas de l’Égypte, in: KUHRT/SANCISI–WEERDENBURG 1988, 137–173.
  - 1990, The Seleucid Kingdom, the Achaemenid Empire and the History of the Near East in the First Millennium BC, in: BILDE P./ENGBERG–PEDERSEN T./HANNESSTAD L./ZAHLE J., eds., *Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom* (Studies in Hellenistic Civilization 1), Aarhus, 40–65.
  - 1997, Bulletin d’histoire achéménide I (Topoi, Supplément 1), Lyon, 5–127.
  - 2001, Bulletin d’histoire achéménide II (Persika 1), Paris.
  - 2002, *From Cyrus to Alexander. A History of the Persian Empire*, Winona Lake.
- BRIANT P./BOUCHARLAT R., eds., 2005, *L’archéologie de l’empire achéménide: nouvelles recherches*, Actes du colloque organisé au Collège de France (Persika 6), Paris.
- BRIANT P./STOLPER M.W./HENKELMAN W., eds., in press, *Les archives des fortifications de Persépolis dans le contexte de l’empire achéménide et de ses prédécesseurs*. Actes du colloque, Paris.
- BROSIUS M./KUHRT A., eds., 1998, *Studies in Persian History: Essays in Memory of David M. Lewis* (Achaemenid History 11), Leiden.
- CALMEYER P., 1975, The Subject of the Achaemenid Tomb Reliefs, in: *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Symposium on Archaeological Research in Iran. 23rd October–1st November 1974*, Tehran, 233–242.
- 1979, Zur Genese altiranischer Motive: VI. Toxotai: *AMI* 12, 303–313.
- CAMERON G.G., 1948, *The Persepolis Treasury Tablets* (OIP 65), Chicago, IL.
- CARRADICE I., 1987, The “Regal Coinage” of the Persian Empire, in: CARRADICE I., ed., *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires* (BAR Int. Series 343), London, 73–95.
- CARTER E., 1994, Bridging the Gap between the Elamites and the Persians in Southeastern Khuzistan, in: SANCISI–WEERDENBURG H./KUHRT A./ROOT M.C., eds., *Continuity and Change*, (Achaemenid History 8), Leiden, 65–95.
- CARTER E./WRIGHT H., 2003, Archaeological Survey on the Western Ram Hormuz Plain, in: MILLER/ABDI 2003, 60–82.
- CHOKSY J.K., 2007, Reassessing the Material Contexts of Ritual Fires in Ancient Iran: *Iranica Antiqua* 42, 229–269.
- COGAN M., 1984, *Imperialism and Religion*, Montana.
- COLLINS B.J., ed., 2002, *A History of the Animal World in the Ancient Near East* (Handbook of Oriental Studies 64), Leiden.
- COLLON D., 1987, *First Impressions. Cylinder Seals of the Ancient Near East*, Chicago.
- 1992, The Near Eastern Moon God, in: MEIJER D.J.W., ed., *Natural Phenomena: Their Meaning, Depiction and Description in the Ancient Near East*, Amsterdam, 19–37.

- 1993–1997, Art. Mondgott. B. In der Bildkunst; RIA 8:371–376.
- 2001, Catalogue of Western Asiatic Seals in the British Museum. Cylinder Seals V: Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian Periods, London.
- DALLEY S., 1986, The God Šalmu and the Winged Disk: Iraq 48, 85–101.
- DANDAMAEV M.A., 1976, Persien unter den ersten Achämeniden, Wiesbaden.
- 1986, The Neo-Babylonian Archives, in: VEENHOF K.R., ed., Cuneiform Archives and Libraries (Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul 57), Leiden, 273–277.
- DB = SCHMITT 1991
- DELAPORTE L., 1920, Catalogue des cylindres, cachets et pierres gravées de style oriental. Vol. I: Fouilles et missions. Musée du Louvre, Paris.
- 1923, Catalogue des cylindres, cachets et pierres gravées de style oriental. Vol. II: Acquisitions. Musée du Louvre, Paris.
- DICK M.B., ed., 1999, Born in Heaven, Made on Earth: The Making of the Cult Image in the Ancient Near East, Winona Lake.
- DUCHESNE-GUILLEMIN J., 1972, La religion des Achéménides, in: WALSER G., ed., Beiträge zur Achämenidengeschichte (Historia Einzelschrift 18), Wiesbaden, 59–82.
- DUSINBERRE E.R.M., 1997, Imperial Style and Constructed Identity: A “Graeco-Persian” Cylinder Seal from Sardis: Ars Orientalis 27, 99–129.
- 2002, An Excavated Ivory from Kerkenes Dağ, Turkey: Transcultural Fluidities, Significations of Collective Identity, and the Problem of Median Art: Ars Orientalis 32, 17–54.
- 2003, Aspects of Empire in Achaemenid Sardis, Cambridge.
- in press, Circles of Light and Achaemenid Hegemonic Style in Gordion’s Seal 100, in: Festschrift for Crawford H. Greenewalt, jr.
- in press (a), Seal Impressions in the Persepolis Fortification Aramaic Tablets: A Few Preliminary Comments, in: BRIANT P./STOLPER M.W./HENKELMAN W., eds., Les archives des fortifications de Persépolis dans le contexte de l’empire achéménide et de ses prédécesseurs. Actes du colloque, Paris.
- DYSON JR. R.H./VOIGT M.M., 2003, A Temple at Hasanlu, in: MILLER/ABDI 2003, 219–236.
- EHRENBERG E., 1999, Uruk. Late Babylonian Seal Impressions on Eanna-Tablets (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Orient-Abteilung, Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka Endberichte 18), Mainz.
- 2001, Sixth-Century Urukian Seal Impressions at Yale, in: HALLO W.W./WINTER I.J., eds., Proceedings of the VLVe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale. Part II: Seals and Seal Impressions, Bethesda, 185–195.
- EI = YARSHATER E., ed., 1982–, Encyclopædia Iranica, London/Boston/New York.
- FGrH = JACOBY F., 1923–1969, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (Fragments of Greek Historians), 15 vols., Berlin/Leiden.
- Fundación “la Caixa”, 2003, 7000 Años de Arte Persa. Obras Maestras del Museo Nacional de Irán, Barcelona.
- GARRISON M.B., 1988, Seal Workshops and Artists in Persepolis: A Study of Seal Impressions Preserving the Theme of Heroic Encounter on the Persepolis Fortification and Treasury Tablets. Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan (= UMI Ann Arbor, # 8907034).
- 1998, The Seals of Ašbazana (Aspathines), in: BROSIUS/KUHRT 1998, 115–131.
- 1999, Art. Fire Altars: EI 9:613–619.
- 2000, Achaemenid Iconography as Evidenced by Glyptic Art: Subject Matter, Social Function, Audience and Diffusion, in: UEHLINGER 2000, 115–164.
- 2006, The “Late Neo-Elamite” Glyptic Style: A Perspective from Fars: BAI 16, 65–102.



- in press, Art. Figure in nimbus, Atlantid figures, in: EGGLEER J./UEHLINGER CH., eds., *Iconography of Deities and Demons in the Ancient Near East*.
  - in press (a), The Seal of Cyrus the Anšanite, Son of Teispes (PFS 93\*): Susa – Anšan – Persepolis, in: ALVAREZ-MON J., ed., *The Archaeology of Iran: Late Elamite and Early Achaemenid Periods*.
  - in press (b), Archers at Persepolis: The Emergence of Royal Ideology at the Heart of the Empire, in: *Published Proceedings of the Conference the Archaeology of Iran: Late Elamite and Early Achaemenid Periods*, London.
  - in press (c), The Uninscribed Tablets from the Fortification Archive: A Preliminary Analysis, in: BRIANT P./STOLPER M.W./HENKELMAN W., eds., *Les archives des fortifications de Persépolis dans le contexte de l’empire achéménide et de ses prédécesseurs. Actes du colloque*, Paris.
  - in press (d), The Representation of “Fire Altars” in the Early Achaemenid Period: The Evidence from Persepolitan Glyptic, in: ABDI K., ed., *Memorial Volume for Shahpur Shahbazi*.
  - in press (e), Royal Name Seals of Darius I, in: HENKELMAN W.F.M./JONES C.J./WOODS C., eds., *Festschrift for Matthew W. Stolper*, Chicago.
  - in press (f), By the Favor of Auramazdā: Kingship and the Divine in the Early Achaemenid Period, in: IOSSIF P.P., ed., *Royal Cult and Emperor Worship from Classical to Late Antiquity (Studia Hellenistica)*, Louvain.
- GARRISON M.B./RITNER R.K., in preparation, *Seals with Hieroglyphic Inscriptions from the Persepolis Fortification Archive*.
- GARRISON M.B./ROOT M.C., 2001, *Seals on the Persepolis Fortification Tablets. Volume I: Images of Heroic Encounter (OIP 117)*. Chicago, IL.
- GATES J.E., 2002, The Ethnicity Name Game: What Lies behind “Graeco-Persian”? *Ars Orientalis* 32, 105–132.
- GEORGES P., 1994, *Barbarian Asia and the Greek Experience*. Baltimore.
- GIOVINO M., 2006, Assyrian Trees as Cult Objects, in: TAYLOR P., ed., *The Iconography of Cylinder Seals (Warburg Institute Colloquia 9)*, London, 110–125.
- GNOLI G., 2000, *Zoroaster in History (Biennial Yarshater Lecture Series 2)*, New York.
- GOULD J., 1989, *Herodotus*, London.
- HALLOCK R.T., 1969, *Persepolis Fortification Texts (OIP 92)*, Chicago, IL.
- 1977, The Use of Seals on the Persepolis Fortification Tablets, in: GIBSON M./BIGGS R.D., eds., *Seals and Sealing in the Ancient Near East (BM 6)*, Malibu, 127–133.
  - 1978, Select Fortification Texts, in: *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran* 8, 109–136.
- HANDLEY-SCHACHLER M., 1998, The Lan Ritual in the Persepolis Fortification Texts, in: BROSIUS/KUHRT 1998, 195–204.
- HARPER P.O. et al., 1992, *The Royal City of Susa. Ancient Near Eastern Treasures in the Louvre*. New York.
- HARRISON T., 2000, *Divinity and History. The Religion of Herodotus*. Oxford.
- HANSMAN J., 1987, Art. Anshan: *EI* 2:103–107.
- HENKELMAN W., 1995–96, The Royal Achaemenid Crown: *AMI* 28, 275–293.
- 2003, Persians, Medes and Elamite Acculturation in the Neo-Elamite Period, in: LANFRANCHI/ROAF/ROLLINGER 2003, 181–231.
  - 2003a, An Elamite Memorial: the Šumar of Cambyses and Hystaspes, in: HENKELMAN W./KUHRT A., eds., *A Persian Perspective. Essays in Memory of Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg, (Achaemenid History 13)*, Leiden, 101–172.

- 2006, *The Other Gods Who Are. Studies in Elamite–Iranian Acculturation Based on the Persepolis Fortification Texts*. Dissertation, University of Leiden, Leiden.
- in press, *Parnakka's Feast. Šip in Pārsa and Elam*, in: ALVAREZ–MON J., ed., *The Archaeology of Iran: Late Elamite and Early Achaemenid Periods*.
- HERBORDT S., 1992, *Neuassyrische Glyptik des 8.–7. Jh. v. Chr. unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Siegelungen auf Tafeln und Tonverschlüssen (SAA I)*, Helsinki.
- HERRENSCHMIDT C., 1977, *Les creations d'Ahuramazda: Studia Iranica* 6, 17–58.
- 1980, *La religion des Achéménides: état de la question: Studia Iranica* 9, 325–339.
- 1990, *Manipulations religieuses de Darius Ier*, in: MACTOUX M.–M./GÉNY E., eds., *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque*, vol. 4, Paris, 195–207.
- HOUTKAMP J., 1991, *Some remarks on Fire Altars of the Achaemenid Period*, in: KELLENS 1991, 23–48.
- JAKOB–ROST L., 1997, *Die Stempelsiegel im Vorderasiatischen Museum*, Berlin.
- 1987, *Das Chvarnah – Zum Stand der Forschung: MDOG* 119, 215–248.
- 1991, *Der Sonnengott im Pantheon der Achämeniden*, in: KELLENS 1991, 49–80.
- JACOBS B., 2001, *Kultbilder und Gottesvorstellung bei den Persern – Zu Herodot, Historiae 1.131 und Clemens Alexandrinus, Protrepticus 5.65.3*, in: BAKIR T. et al., eds., *Achaemenid Anatolia – Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Anatolia in the Achaemenid Period, Bandırma 15–18 August 1997, Leiden*, 83–90.
- 2006, 14 November, *Art. Anahita*, in: EGGLER J./UEHLINGER CH., eds., *Iconography of Deities and Demons in the Ancient Near East*, [http://www.religionswissenschaft.unizh.ch/idd/prepublications/e\\_idd\\_anahita.pdf](http://www.religionswissenschaft.unizh.ch/idd/prepublications/e_idd_anahita.pdf) (18 Feb 2008).
- in press, *Art. Auramazda, Ma*, in: EGGLER J./UEHLINGER CH., eds., *Iconography of Deities and Demons in the Ancient Near East*.
- JAMZADEH P., 1982, *The Winged Ring with Human Bust in Achaemenid Art as a Dynastic Symbol: Iranica Antiqua* 17, 91–99.
- JONES C.E./STOLPER M.W., 2006, *Fortification Texts Sold at the Auction of the Erlenmeyer Collection: ARTA 2006.001* (see: <http://www.achemenet.com>, section: Publications en ligne, ARTA, sommaire)
- in press, *How Many Persepolis Fortification Tablets are There?*, in: BRIANT P./STOLPER M.W./HENKELMAN W., eds., *Les archives des fortifications de Persépolis dans le contexte de l'empire achéménide et de ses prédécesseurs. Actes du colloque*, Paris.
- DE JONG A.F., 1997, *Traditions of the Magi: Zoroastrianism in Greek and Latin Literature*, Leiden.
- <sup>2</sup>1999, *Art. Khvarenah*, in: VAN DER TOORN K./BECKING B./VAN DER HORST P.W., eds., *Iconography of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, Leiden/Boston/Köln, 481–483.
- KAIM B., 1991, *Das geflügelte Symbol in der Achämenidischen Glyptic: AMI* 24, 31–34.
- KEEL O., 1994, *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel IV (OBO 135)*, Freiburg Schweiz/Göttingen.
- KELLENS J., 1987, *DB V: un témoignage sur l'évolution de l'idéologie achéménide*, in: GNOLI G., ed., *Orientalia Iosephi Tucci memoriae dicata (ISMEO 2)*, Rome, 677–682.
- 1989, *Art. Avesta: EI* 3:35–44.
- 1990, *Excursus à propos du prétendu "culte du feu": Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 15, 118–121.
- 2002, *L'idéologie religieuse des inscriptions achéménides: Journal asiatique* 290, 417–434.
- KELLENS J., ed., 1991, *La Religion iranienne à l'époque achéménide. Actes du Colloque de Liège 11 décembre 1987 (Iranica Antiqua, Supplément 5)*, Gand.
- KENT R.G., <sup>2</sup>1953, *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon (AOS 33)*, New York.

- KLEISS W., 1992, Beobachtungen aus dem Burgberg von Persepolis: AMI 25, 155–167.
- KOCH H., 1977, Die religiösen Verhältnisse der Dareioszeit. Untersuchungen an Hand der elamischen Persepolistafelchen (Göttinger Orientforschungen III. Reihe: Iranica 4), Wiesbaden.
- 1990, Verwaltung und Wirtschaft im persischen Kernland zur Zeit der Achämeniden (Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients 19), Wiesbaden.
- 1991, Zu Religion und Kulte im persischen Kernland, in: KELLENS 1991, 87–109.
- 1995, Theology and Worship in Elam and Achaemenid Iran, in: SASSON 1995, 3:1959–1969.
- KREFTER F., 1971, Persepolis Rekonstruktionen. Teheraner Forschungen 3, Berlin.
- KÜHNE H., 1997, Der Gott in der Mondsichel: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 24, 375–382.
- KUHRT A./SANCISI-WEERDENBURG H., eds., *Method and Theory (Achaemenid History 3)*, Leiden.
- KUIPER F.B.J., 1985, Art. Ahura: EI 1:683–84.
- LANFRANCHI G.B./ROAF M./ROLLINGER R., eds., 2003, *Continuity of Empire. Assyria, Media, Persia (History of the Ancient Near East, Monographs 5)*, Padova.
- LECOQ P., 1984, Un problème de religion achéménide – Ahura Mazda ou Xvarnah?, in: *Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata (Acta Iranica, 2nd series, Hommages et Opera Minora 23)*, Leiden, 301–326.
- 1997, *Les inscriptions de la Perse achéménide*. Paris.
- LEVINE L., 1987, The Iron Age, in: HOLE F., ed., *The Archaeology of Western Iran. Settlement and Society from Prehistory to the Islamic Conquest*, Washington D.C./London, 229–250.
- LIVERANI M., 2003, The Rise and Fall of Media, in: LANFRANCHI/ROAF/ROLLINGER 2003, 1–12.
- LUSCHEY H., 1968, Studien zu dem Darius-Relief von Bisutun: AMI 1, 63–94.
- 1990, Art. Bisotūn. ii. *Archaeology: EI 4:291–299*.
- MACGINNIS J., 1995, Letter Orders from Sippar and the Administration of the Ebabbara in the Late Babylonian Period, Poznan.
- MAJIDZADEH Y., 1990, The Arjan Bowl: *Iran* 30, 131–144.
- MARAS S., 2005, Notes on Seals and Seal Use in Western Iran from c. 900–600 BCE: *Iranica Antiqua* 40, 133–147.
- MARCUS M.I., 1995, Art and Ideology in Ancient Western Iran, in: SASSON 1995, 4:2487–2505.
- 1996, Emblems of Identity and Prestige: The Seals and Sealings from Hasanlu, Iran. *Commentary and Catalogue (University Museum Monograph 84; Hasanlu Special Studies 3)*, Philadelphia.
- MATTHEWS D.M., 1990, Principles of Composition in Near Eastern Glyptic of the Later Second Millennium B.C. (OBO.SA 8), Fribourg Switzerland/Göttingen.
- MERRILLEES P.H., 2005, *Catalogue of the Western Asiatic Seals in the British Museum. Cylinder Seals VI. Pre-Achaemenid and Achaemenid Periods*, London.
- MEUSZYŃSKI J., 1981, Die Rekonstruktion der Reliefdarstellungen und ihrer Anordnung im Nordwestpalast von Kalḫu (Nimrūd) (Räume: B.C.D.E.F.G.H.L.N.P) (*Baghdader Forschungen* 2), Mainz am Rhein.
- MIKALSON J.D., 2003, *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars*, Chapel Hill.
- MILLER M.C., 2004, In Strange Company: Persians in Early Attic Theatre Imagery: *Mediterranean Archaeology* 17, 165–172.
- MILLER N.F./ABDI K., eds., *Yeki Bud, Yeki Nabud. Essays on the Archaeology of Iran in Honour of William M. Sumner*, Los Angeles.
- DE MIROSCHEJJI P., 1982, Notes sur la glyptique de la fin de l'Élam: RA 76, 51–63.
- 1985, La fin du royaume d'Anšan et Suse et la naissance de l'empire perse: ZA 75, 265–306.
- 1990, La fin de l'Élam: essai d'analyse et d'interprétation: *Iranica Antiqua* 25, 47–95.

- 2003, Susa and the Highlands. Major Trends in the History of Elamite Civilization, in: MILLER/ABDI 2003, 17–38.
- MOOREY P.R.S., 1978, The Iconography of an Achaemenid Stamp-Seal Acquired in the Lebanon: Iran 16, 143–154.
- 1979, Aspects of Worship and Ritual on Achaemenid Seals, in: Akten des VII. Internationalen Kongresses für Iranische Kunst und Archäologie, München, 7.–10. September 1976 (AMI, Ergänzungsband 6), Berlin, 218–226.
- MUSCARELLA O.W., 1977, “Ziwiye” and Ziwiye: The Forgery of a Provenience: JFA 4, 196–219.
- 1980, The Catalogue of Ivories from Hasanlu, Iran (University Museum Monograph 40; Hasanlu Special Studies 2), Philadelphia.
- 1987, Median Art and Medizing Scholarship: JNES 46, 109–127.
- 1990, Art. Bronzes of Luristan: EI 4:478–483.
- 1995, Art and Archaeology of Western Iran in Prehistory, in: SASSON 1995, 2:981–999.
- NEGAHBAN E.O., 1996, Marlik. The Complete Excavation Report (University Museum Monograph 87), Philadelphia.
- NIMCHUK C.L., 2002, The “Archers” of Darius: Coinage or Tokens of Royal Esteem?: Ars Orientalis 32, 55–79.
- ORNAN T., 2005, A Complex System of Religious Symbols: The Case of the Winged Disc in Near Eastern Imagery of the First Millennium BCE, in: SUTER C.E./UEHLINGER CH., eds., Crafts and Images in Contact. Studies on Eastern Mediterranean Art of the First Millennium BCE (OBO 210), Fribourg Schweiz/Göttingen, 207–241.
- PARPOLA S., 1993, The Assyrian Tree of Life: Tracing the Origins of Jewish Monotheism and Greek Philosophy: JNES 52, 161–208.
- PEDERSÉN O., 1998, Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East 1500–300 B.C., Bethesda.
- PORADA E., 1948, Corpus of Ancient Near Eastern Seals in North American Collections. Vol. 1: The Collection of the Pierpont Morgan Library (Bollingen Series 14), New York.
- 1959, The Hasanlu Bowl: Expedition 1, 19–22.
- PORTER B.N., 2003, Trees, Kings, and Politics. Studies in Assyrian Iconography (OBO 197), Fribourg Schweiz/Göttingen.
- POTTS D.T., 1999, The Archaeology of Elam. Formation and Transformation of an Ancient Iranian State, Cambridge.
- 2002, Gopatshah and the Human-Headed Bulls of Persepolis: Electrum 6, 9–14.
- 2004, The Numinous and the Immanent. Some Thoughts on Kurangun and the Rudkhaneh-e Fahliyan, in: VON FOLSACH K./THRANE H./THUESEN I., eds., From Handaxe to Khan. Essays Presented to Peder Mortensen on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday, Aarhus, 143–156.
- 2005, Cyrus the Great and the Kingdom of Anshan, in: CURTIS V.S./STEWART S., eds., Birth of the Persian Empire (The Idea of Iran 1), London, 7–28.
- 2007, Foundation Houses, Fire Altars and the Frataraka: Interpreting the Iconography of Some Post-Achaemenid Persian Coins: Iranica Antiqua 42, 271–300.
- RAZMJOU S., 2004, Project Report of the Persepolis Fortification Tablets in the National Museum of Iran: ARTA 2004.004 (see: <http://www.achemenet.com>, section: Publications en ligne, ARTA, sommaire)
- 2005, In Search of Lost Median Art: Iranica Antiqua 40, 271–314.
- LE RIDER G., 2001, La naissance de la monnaie. Pratiques monétaires de l’orient ancien. Paris.
- RLA = EBELING E./EDZARD D.O., eds., 1932–, Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie, Berlin.
- ROAF M., 1983, Sculptures and Sculptors at Persepolis (Iran 21), London.

- ROOT M.C., 1979, *King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art. Essays on the Creation of an Iconography of Empire* (Acta Iranica 19), Leiden.
- 1989, *The Persian Archer at Persepolis: Aspects of Chronology, Style and Symbolism*, in: DESCAT R., ed., *L'or perse et l'histoire grecque. Table ronde*. CNRS, Bordeaux, 20–22 mars 1989 (Revue des Études Anciennes 91), Paris, 33–50.
- 1998, *Pyramidal Stamp Seals: The Persepolis Connection*, in: BROSIUS/KUHRT 1998, 257–289.
- 2002, *Animals in the Art of Ancient Iran*, in: COLLINS 2002, 169–209.
- 2003, *Hero and Worshipper at Seleucia: Re-Inventions of Babylonia on a Banded Agate Cylinder of the Achaemenid Empire*, in: POTTS T./ROAF M./STEIN D., eds., *Culture Through Objects. Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honour of P.R.S. Moorey*, Oxford, 249–283.
- RUBINSON K.S., 2003, *The Hasanlu Gold “Bowl”: A View from Transcaucasia*, in: MILLER/ABDI 2003, 237–242.
- RUSSELL J.M., 1998, *The Program of the Palace of Assurnasirpal II at Nimrud: Issues in the Research and Presentation of Assyrian Art: AJA 102*, 655–715.
- SANCISI-WEERDENBURG H., 1980, *Yaunā en Persai*, Groningen.
- 1995, *Darius I and the Persian Empire*, in: SASSON 1995, 2:1035–1050.
- SANCISI-WEERDENBURG H., ed., 1987, *Achaemenid History I: Sources, Structures and Synthesis*, Leiden.
- SANCISI-WEERDENBURG H./KUERT A., eds., 1987, *Achaemenid History II: The Greek Sources*, Leiden.
- SASSON J.M., ed., 1995, *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, Farmington Hills.
- SCHMIDT E., 1953, *Persepolis I. Structures, Reliefs, Inscriptions (OIP 68)*, Chicago.
- 1957, *Persepolis II. The Contents of the Treasury and Other Discoveries (OIP 69)*, Chicago.
- 1970, *Persepolis III. The Royal Tombs and Other Monuments (OIP 70)*, Chicago.
- SCHMIDT E. et al., 1989, eds., *The Holmes Expeditions to Luristan (OIP 108)*, Chicago.
- SCHMITT R., 1990, *Bisotūn. i. Introduction: EI 4:289–290*.
- 1990a, *Bisotūn. iii. Darius' Inscriptions: EI 4:299–305*.
- 1991, *The Bisotun Inscriptions of Darius the Great. Old Persian Text (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicum I, The Inscriptions of Ancient Iran I, The Old Persian Inscriptions, Texts I)*, London.
- 2000, *The Old Persian Inscriptions of Naqsh-e Rostam and Persepolis (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicum I, The Inscriptions of Ancient Iran I, The Old Persian Inscriptions, Texts II)*, London.
- SCHWARTZ M., 1985, *The Religion of Achaemenian Iran*, in: GERSHEVITCH I., ed., *Cambridge History of Iran. Vol. 2: The Median and Achaemenian Periods*, 664–697.
- SCURLOCK J., 2002, *Animal Sacrifice in Ancient Mesopotamian Religion*, in: COLLINS 2000, 389–403.
- SEIDL U., 1989, *Die babylonischen Kudurru-Reliefs. Symbole mesopotamischer Gottheiten (OBO 87)*, Freiburg Schweiz/Göttingen.
- 1999, *Ein Monument Darius I. aus Babylon: ZA 89*, 101–114.
- 2000, *Babylonische und assyrische Kultbilder in den Massenmedien des 1. Jahrtausends v.Chr.*, in: UEHLINGER 2000, 89–114.
- SEIPEL W., 2000, ed., *7000 Jahre persische Kunst. Meisterwerke aus dem Iranischen Nationalmuseum in Teheran, Wien/Milano*.
- SHAHBAZI A.S., 1974, *An Achaemenid Symbol, I. A Farewell to “Fravahr” and “Ahuramazda”*: AMI 9, 135–144.
- 1980, *An Achaemenid Symbol II. Farnah “(God Given) Fortune” Symbolized*: AMI 13, 119–147.
- STAUSBERG M., 2002, *Die Religion Zarathustras. Geschichte – Gegenwart – Rituale*. Stuttgart.

- STEVE M.-J., 1986, La fin de l'Elam: à propos d'une empreinte de sceau-cylindre: *Studia Iranica* 15, 7–21.
- 1992, *Syllabaire élamite. Histoire et paléographie (Civilisations du Proche-Orient, Serie II, Philologie 1)*, Paris.
- STOLPER M.W., 1992, Cuneiform Texts from Susa, in: HARPER P.O./ARUZ J./TALLON F., eds., *The Royal City of Susa. Ancient Near Eastern Treasures in the Louvre*, 253–260, New York.
- STRONACH D., 1978, *Pasargadae*, Oxford.
- 1989, Early Achaemenid Coinage: Perspectives from the Homeland: *Iranica Antiqua* 24, 255–279.
- 1990, On the Genesis of the Old Persian Cuneiform Script, in: VALLAT F., ed., *Contribution à l'histoire de l'Iran. Mélanges offerts à Jean Parrot*, 195–203, Paris.
- 1997, Anshan and Parsa: Early Achaemenid History, Art and Architecture on the Iranian Plateau, in: CURTIS J., ed., *Mesopotamian and Iran in the Persian Period: Conquest and Imperialism 539–331 B.C.*, London, 35–53.
- 1997a, On the Interpretation of the Pasargadae Inscriptions, in: MAGNUSSEN B. et al., eds., *Ultra Terminum Vagari. Scritti in onore de Carl Nylander*, Rome, 323–329.
- 2003, The Tomb at Arjan and the History of Southwestern Iran in the Early Sixth Century BCE, in: MILLER/ABDI 2003, 249–259.
- 2003a, Independent Media: Archaeological Notes from the Homeland, in: LANFRANCHI/ROAF/ROLLINGER 2003, 233–248.
- 2005, The Arjan Tomb: Innovation and Acculturation in the Last Days of Elam: *Iranica Antiqua* 40, 179–196.
- SUMNER W.M., 1986, Achaemenid Settlement in the Persepolis Plain: *AJA* 90, 3–31.
- 1988, Art. Maljan, Tall-e (Anšan): *RIA* 7:306–320.
- 1994, Archaeological Measures of Cultural Continuity and the Arrival of the Persians in Fars, in: SANCISI-WEERDENBURG H./KUHRT A./ROOT M.C., eds., *Continuity and Change, (Achaemenid History 8)*, Leiden, 97–105.
- TAVERNIER J., 2004, Some Thoughts on Neo-Elamite Chronology: ARTA 2004.003 (see: <http://www.achemenet.com>, section: Publications en ligne, ARTA, sommaire).
- TILIA A.B., 1972, *Studies and Restorations at Persepolis and Other Sites of Fārs (IsMEO Reports and Memoirs M 16)*, Rome.
- 1978, *Studies and Restorations at Persepolis and Other Sites of Fārs (IsMEO Reports and Memoirs 18)*, Rome.
- VAN DER TOORN K., 1997, ed., *The Image and the Book. Iconic Cults, Aniconism, and the Rise of Book Religion in Israel and the Ancient Near East (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 21)*, Leuven.
- UEHLINGER CH., 1999, 'Powerful Persianisms' in Glyptic Iconography of Persian Period Palestine, in: BECKING B./KORPEL M.C.A., eds., *The Crisis of Israelite Religion. Transformation of Religious Tradition in Exilic and Post-Exilic Times (Oudtestamentische Studiën 42)*, Leiden/Boston, 134–182.
- UEHLINGER CH., ed., 2000, *Images as Media. Sources for the Cultural History of the Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean (Ist Millennium BCE) (OBO 175)*, Fribourg Schweiz/Göttingen.
- UNVALA J.M., 1930, The Winged Disk and the Winged Human Figure on Ancient Persian Monuments, in: *Dr. Modi Memorial Volume: Papers on Indo-Iranian and other Subjects in Honour of J. Jamshedji Modi*, Bombay, 488–513.
- VALLAT F., 1983, Le dieu Enzak: une divinité dilmunite vénérée à Suse, in: POTTS D.T., ed., *Dilmun. New Studies in the Archaeology and Early History of Bahrain*, Berlin, 93–100.
- 1984, Kidin-Hutran et l'époque néo-élamite: *Akkadica* 37, 1–17.

- 1995, Šutruk–Nahhunte, Šutur–Nahhunte et l’imbroglio néo-élamite: NABU 2, 37f.
  - 1997, Inšušinak, Ea et Enzag: NABU 3, 103f.
- WALLIS N.H., ed., *Cult Image and Divine Representation in the Ancient Near East* (ASOR Book Series 10), Boston.
- WATERS M.W., 1996, Darius and the Achaemenid Line: AHB 10, 11–18.
- 1999, The Earliest Persians in Southwestern Iran: The Textual Evidence: Iranian Studies 32, 99–107.
  - 2000, A Survey of Neo-Elamite History (State Archives of Assyria Studies 12), Helsinki.
  - 2004, Cyrus and the Achaemenids: Iran 42, 91–102.
- WEBER U./WIESENHÖFER J., 1996, *Das Reich der Achaimeniden: eine Bibliographie*, Berlin.
- WINTER I.J., 1980, A Decorated Breastplate from Hasanlu, Iran. Type, Style, and Context of an Equestrian Ornament (University Museum Monograph 39; Hasanlu Special Studies 1), Philadelphia.
- 1989, The “Hasanlu Gold Bowl”: Thirty Years Later: Expedition 31, 87–106.
  - 2000, Le Palais imaginaire: Scale and Meaning in the Iconography of Neo-Assyrian Cylinder Seals, in: UEHLINGER 2000, 51–87.
- YAMAMOTO Y., 1979, The Zoroastrian Temple Cult of Fire in Archaeology and Literature (I): Orient 15, 19–53.
- YOUNG T. CUYLER, 2003, Parsua, Parsa, and Potsherds, in: MILLER/ABDI 2003, 243–448.
- ZADOK R., 1986, Archives from Nippur in the First Millennium B.C., in: VEENHOF K.R., ed., *Cuneiform Archives and Libraries* (Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul 57), Leiden, 278–288.
- ZETTLER R.L., 1979, On the Chronological Range of Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Seals: JNES 38, 257–270.