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## Chapter One

The Excavations

Since the fifties, the development projects in Iraq have indirectly, contributed to the expansion of our knowledge of the history, culture and civilization of ancient Iraq. Before undertaking any initial steps on any developmental project, the Department of Antiquities and Heritage would survey the areas concerned and carry out all the necessary archaeological investigations and excavations, in order to save whatever could be saved of the archaeological and cultural remains.

Accordingly, one could mention, for example, the results of the salvage-excavations on the Great Mesayab Project (Mesayab-al-Kabir) ${ }^{1}$, the surveys and excavations in the area of the Nehrawan Project ${ }^{2}$, salvage excavations in the basin of Shahrazur ${ }^{3}$ and in Dokan ${ }^{4}$. Other salvage operations were carried out in the areas of Highway No. 1 Project ${ }^{5}$, Hamrin Basin Projects ${ }^{6}$, Qadisiyah Dam Project ${ }^{7}$, and Saddam Dam ${ }^{8}$. In all those and in others the Department of Antiquities and Heritage had undertaken investigations and excavations of the archaeological sites which lie within these areas.

Should we trace excavation works undertaken by the Department of Antiquities since the fifties down to the present time, we would find that the greater part of the work was salvage operations particularly in the regions where development projects were planned.

One such project was the railway-line, Baghdad-'Ukkashat-al-Qa'im, which led the Department of Antiquities to excavate Tell Chokha, in order to discover any significant archaeological remains that may have bearing on the history and civilization of ancient Iraq.

In addition, urban expansion necessitates similar investigations and excavations, in areas which lie just outside cities and towns. Such are the cases of Tell Qalinj

1-Department of Antiquities and Heritage, Section of Investigations, File no.138/39 on the Mesayab-1-Kabir Project.
2 - Adams, R.: Land Behind Baghdad. 1965, p. 125.
3 - Hijara, Ismail: Excavations in Shahrazur. Sumer 31 \& 32, 1975 \& 1976: 59-80 \& 375-81 (Arabic).
4-Al-Alusi, Salim: Statistical Synopsis. Sumer 15, 1959, pp.114-5 (Arabic).
5 . Rumayidh, Salah Salman: Excavations in Highway No.1. Sumer 38, 1982, p. 40 (Arabic).
6 . Abu-Soof, Bahnam: Salvage Excavations in the Hamrin Dam Basin. Sumer, 35, 1979, p.416, (Arabic).
7 - Al-Shukri, Sabah J: Archaeological Salvage Projects in Qadisiyah Dam Basin. Sumer, 42, 1986, p. 9 (Arabic)
8 - Abu-Soof, Behnam: Comprehensive Salvage Excavations, in Saddam-Dam Basin. in Researches in the Antiquities of Saddam Dam Basin and Other Researches. 1987, p.8, (Arabic).

Agha ${ }^{1}$ in Irbil, Tell Abu-Thar², Telul Al-Habibiyah ${ }^{3}$ and Tell Abu-Sukhair in the suburb of Dora south of Baghdad ${ }^{4}$.

Similarly, road-building and road-expansions have been behind other excavations in a number of archaeological tells, as for example the cases of Tell Bastki in Nineveh ${ }^{5}$, and Tell Mizyad near Babylon ${ }^{6}$.

In other words, apart from a few exceptional cases, most of the excavation work undertaken in Iraq in the last four decades was motivated by saving the sites where the lands, in which they were located, were earmarked for developmental projects ${ }^{7}$.

In the case of Tell Chokha, the Baghdad-Ukkashat-Qa'im Railway-line was bound to infringe on some parts of the site. Hence the Department of Antiquities and Heritage commissioned a number of its archaeologists to excavate the site, and work started at the beginning of February $1980^{8}$.

Chokha lies on the right side of the Euphrates about 1.50 km from its current coarse, on the left side of the Baghdad-Anbar Highway, and about 9 km . from the town of Faloujah. The area covered by the site is nearly $195 \times 165 \mathrm{~m}$, and the tell 2 m higher than the surrounding land.

There are a number of ancient sites in Iraq that has the name Chokha, like Choga Mami (pronounced Chokha in Arabic) and Chokha (Umma- Umm al-'Agarib). There is no explanation as to the meaning of the word, however, Al-Hamawi used the word to explain a collapsed well ${ }^{9}$. It name could also be of Turkish origin (Chokha) meaning plenty, possibly referring here to the numerous number of graves on the surface, as it was the burial ground for one of the Dulaim tribes. Unfortunately, no cuneiform tablets or inscribed objects were found in Chokha to help in the identification of its ancient name.

Initially the area was surveyed, and a contour map was drawn and divided into interlinking squares, each square measuring $10 \times 10 \mathrm{~m}$ (fig.4). The purpose was to keep an exact record of the archaeological finds during excavations ${ }^{10}$.

At the beginning, work concentrated on Sq.6D that represents the northern summit of the site, it would have been the first to be removed by the railway construction work. In the course of scraping and digging to a depth of $30-50 \mathrm{~cm}$, diverse pottery
${ }^{1}$ - Abu-Soof, Bahnam: Excavations in Qalinj-Agha. Sumer 25, 1969, pp.3-14, (Arabic).
2. Madhloum, Tariq: Excavations at Abu Thar. Sumer 15, 1959, pp.69-85, (Arabic).
3. Al-Adhami, Khalid Khalil: Excavations in Tellul Al-Habibyah in Baghdad. Sumer 37, 1981, p.212, (Arabic).

4- Al-Janabi, Tariq: Tell Abu Sukhair in Dora. Sumer, 34, 1984, p.73, (Arabic).
5- Madhloum, Tariq: A Study of a Bronze Akkadian Statue. Sumer 32, 1976, p. 45 (Arabic).
6- Mahdi, A.: Ishan Mizyad, an Important Akkadian Centre.
7- Like Tell Es-Sawwan, examples of excavations accompanying seasonal restoration and maintanance work on important ancient archaeological sites are carried out in : Ur, Babylon, Nimrud, Aqarquf, and in site which were fields of study and research by Iraqi and international academic institutions. Sippar was excavated by the college of Arts, the University of Baghdad; Warka by a German expedition; Nippur by an American expedition; Abu Salabikh by a British expedition; Larsa by a French expedition and Yarim Tepe by a Soviet expedition.
8- The expedition included the writer as director, and Riyadh Abdul-Rahman, Abdul-Hamid Hassan Akkar, Ismail Ibrahim Sherif, Sabah Mehdi and others. The excavation season covered the period between february 1980 to December 1981. In addition, the expedition was to undertake investigation, sounding and excavating the sites that fall in the path of Highway No.1.
9. Al-Hamawi, Yaqut: M'ujam al-Buldan, vol.2. Beirut 1956.

10_ Al-Dabbagh, Taqi, Al-Jadir, Walid \& Al-Fitian, Ahmed Malik: Methods of Archaeological Excavations. 1983 (Arabic).
examples were discovered. This point in particular had suffered from continued infringements by a recent Islamic cemetery. At a depth of about 60 cm from the summit a number of burial jars, characterised by being elongated in shape and bulging at the sides were unearthed. Continued digging revealed blocks made of "libn" and mud, distributed between the graves, which we ascertained to be parts of walls belonging to a building unit above this level, as floors were observed at the bottom of the blocks. This was further confirmed when the area of excavation was extended to include Sq. 6E. There, many pottery sherds of various shapes were observed, and the graves were more numerous. The total number of graves in those two squares amounted to 68 , as a result, we could consider the place a Parthian cemetery. Blocks of "libn" and sections of floors continued to appear in a number of places among the graves.

At a depth of $90-120 \mathrm{~cm}$ in the same two squares, "libn" and mud walls appeared; They were 50-110 thick and constituted sections of rectangular rooms of various areas. The rooms were numbered $1,2,3,4,5,6$ and 7 (fig.5).

In those rooms a large collection of archaeological finds were discovered dating to the Early Dynastic period. Underground-water, at a depth of 220 cm below the surface, precluded further vertical excavation in those two squares, which turned in a pond of mud and water. As the fragments of painted pottery (particularly Scarlet Ware) were quite significant (fig.23), and as the purpose of excavation was to gather information about the nature of the settlement and its cultural and historical relations to other sites, it was decided to extend excavation to include parts of the two Sqs.5D and 5E. It is noteworthy to indicate that due to the abundance of graves in this part of the tell, the site has been subject to acts of looting and destruction. At a depth of about 90 cm from the surface, the extensions of the walls of rooms 5,8 and 9 appeared, as did parts of room 10.

Significantly, there appeared a large collection of diverse archaeological finds in the southern part of Sq. 5 E , at the depth of the underground water. Again excavation was impeded by the water, and work had to be extended to Sqs. 5 F and 6 F , so that the total dimension of the area of excavation became $25 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}$. After removing the graves and digging to the depth of the underground water, sections of walls of the rooms 12,13 and 14 appeared. One of the archaeological finds discovered here was a broken painted pottery jar (fig.22).

Due to the infringement of recent graves, the archaeological finds were more numerous, scattered particularly, below or near the graves.

Excavation included the eastern sections of Sqs. 5F and 6F, making the dimensions of the area $25 \times 20 \mathrm{~m}$; with the aim of discovering structures to complete rooms 7 , 14,15 and 3 . While investigating the function of the building, two walls built with plano-convex "libn" bricks were uncovered measuring $28 \times 16 \times 8 \mathrm{~cm}$.

The evidence from the bricks showed that the entire area had suffered a massive fire. As the two walls were not joined together, it was difficult to ascertain the purpose for which they were built; and as this section of the tell had no structural remains, it was thought probably a large courtyard belonging to a particular building or to room 7. The remains of another wall were uncovered; it stood along the length of the wall separating rooms 3 and 4 , and extended to the length of 1.5 m within the courtyard, it may have divided the courtyard into two parts. It had been destroyed, hence it was not possible to discover its remaining length. It was necessary to dig in the direction of the north to a distance of 5 meters to include the halves of Sqs.7C, 6 C and 5 C making the dimensions of the excavated area $20 \times 30 \mathrm{~m}$. Here again, more graves appeared, which were removed, and vertical digging continued, whereupon the lengths of the walls discovered in former squares were observed. Those walls were damaged as a result of the infringement of the graves upon them. The walls
extended westward revealing rooms $8,10,15,16$ and 17 , excavation extended westward to include $5 \mathrm{~F}, 5 \mathrm{E}, 5 \mathrm{D}$ and 5 C . The excavated area became $25 \times 30 \mathrm{~m}$ which perhaps comprised the entire structural area.

However, it was not possible to have a complete plan of the building units, as the north-western walls of rooms $8,10,11$ and 16 appeared, also, parts of rooms 18 , 19 and 20. They differ from the pervious units by having two floors belonging to one level, and therefore may belong to a different structure. This was confirmed by later checking of the excavations in the expanded areas. It was found that the lower phase held the remains of the walls which did not exceed three rows of "libn" belonging to the same level.

Upon examining the exposed walls and floors throughout the area of excavations, which comprised a number of rooms, courts and passages, it appeared that they constituted three structural levels. The first of which was represented by the blocks of "libn" scattered among the graves that had caused the obliteration of most of their characteristics, thus eliminating structural and architectural details of this level, excepting in the case of a few remains of walls. Below this floor the walls of level II stood.

Level III was noted in more than one place that its foundations were below the level of the ground water, which leads to the assumption that other structural levels exist below this level as the evidence of pot sherds and the remains of a fire suggest. These indications appeared as the soil of the nearby tell was being removed. Digging became inconclusive as muddy waters impeded the excavations, so it was stopped. Another area which came to be known as Area Two, was excavated; it was adjacent to the first on the southern side. The main reason for excavation was to continue tracing the buildings exposed in Area One, which could have direct bearing on and shed light on the nature of the buildings. Excavation concentrated on an area measuring $15 \times 15 \mathrm{~m}$, which included $\mathrm{Sqs} .8 \mathrm{G}, 8 \mathrm{~F}, 7 \mathrm{G}$ and 7 F (fig.6).

As in previous excavations the presence of recent graves posed a problem. However, as none of its parts was joined to any structural remains, it is difficult to have any information about level I (it was largely damaged by the graves). The blocks of "libn" which were scattered among the graves, on the same level as the wall did not help to give any specific indications about the extent of level I.

At a depth of $60-90 \mathrm{~cm}$, Level II began to be discerned. After exposing the walls, it appeared that they formed rooms of different sizes; they were numbered successively: $1,2,3,4,5,6,7$, and 8 . But the extensions of some of the walls were to the north-west, hence the excavation expanded westward to an area measuring 5 m , thus completing Sqs. 7G and 7F.

The level of ground water in this location again precluded continued digging (figs. $12 \& 13$ ). No further expansion northwards was possible, and it was not possible to connect this area with Area One. However, the remains of two adjacent rooms (nos. 10 and 11) were discovered.

The south-western section of the excavation-area did not yield any information, due to the many deep faults, which meant digging in mud and underground waters. Therefore, the area was extended northwards to include Sqs. 6 F and 6 G , making the area $15 x 30 \mathrm{~m}$. As usual the graves appeared again, and after removing them the remains of the walls of Level II appeared at a depth of $50-80 \mathrm{~cm}$ beneath the surface of the tell. Those walls were built with "libn" measuring $28 \times 16 \times 6-8 \mathrm{~cm}$.

Upon putting together the plans of the buildings in this part with those of the buildings exposed in Area One, it appeared that they represented building-units of varied plans and sizes, which is a characteristic of the Early Dynastic III period.

These buildings could be of help to understand the development of the architecture of the period, of which still little is known particularly in the region of the middle Euphrates.

In an effort to gather more specific and detailed information about this settlement, a sounding-pit was dug at the southern summit of the settlement, measuring $10 \times 20 \mathrm{~m}$. It comprised Sqs.12Q and 13Q. The Purpose was to discover the building levels in this part of the site, and to determine whether they were similar to those found in the first summit, or whether they date to a different period (fig.7).

After removing the graves in this section and digging to a depth of $30-50 \mathrm{~cm}$, the beginnings of the remains of a wall began to appear. The northern part of its length was discovered; it was 1.50 m long and its width varied between 20 cm and 60 cm . It was believed at the beginning that it was part of Level I, but it was difficult to ascertain its connection with the blocks of "libn" which were found scattered among the graves. Continued digging revealed two further structural levels dating to the same period as that of the first summit. The pottery and other building materials were the evidence upon which the date was based.

# Chapter Two 

The Architecture

The importance of the two areas excavated in Tell Chokha from Level II (figs 8 \& 10 ), become more clear when the buildings are compared with finds from other Sumerian sites. These structures were similar to most of the private dwellings discovered in Khafaje ${ }^{1}$, Kish $^{2}$, Nippur ${ }^{3}$ and Mari ${ }^{4}$. In addition, the walls in this level were observed to be thicker than usual, as the level included more than one structural unit. Clearly the difference of styles of buildings causes the difference in the shape and size of the structural unit, though the building materials are the same.

Close observation of the plastered wall, at the points where it meets with the floors, has shown that the buildings had been used for dwelling purposes in two phases, as there were two floors. Each had a different thickness, varying between 15 and 30 cm . A large block was found, on top of which was placed a large kiln. In addition numerous "tanours" were found placed in the dwelling units, as the case was in Abu-Salabikh ${ }^{5}$, Nippur ${ }^{6}$ and other sites. Although the possibility that a dwelling unit could have more than one "tanour"; careful investigation was conducted to ascertain to which structure each "tanour" belonged.

## The Buildings of Level II

## Unit One

It lies in the north-western section of the excavated area, in Sqs. 5D. C and 6D, C. They were numbered $1,5,11,16$. Area 16 was larger than any room in this unit. It represented the main courtyard as the other rooms surrounded it. Room 1 and other rooms next to it stood on the south-eastern side. Rooms 5 and 11 also were on the side of the courtyard but on the lower floor. For reasons of their own, the inhabitants had narrowed the courtyard by adding a wall which was not joined to the other by cross-bound bricks. It had a 70 cm wide entrance, which could have been the only entrance to the unit in the northern or eastern sections, a part which lay outside the range of the excavations. It was observed that this unit closely resembled house no. 7 of level Vb in Tell Asmar ${ }^{7}$.

It is probable that the exposed parts of rooms 18, 19 and 20 in Sqs.5, C. E and P constitute an independent unit, but as excavations came to an end, it was not possible to discover further details. It was found that the walls were used in one dwelling phase, as no upper floor parallel to the first phase was found, although two layers of plaster were discerned. Such a phenomenon indicates that the walls had been restored. The remains of "tanours" were observed in the cross section on the excavations in area 18. The slight tilt of the walls towards the west, suggests that those walls were partitions, and may have been built at a later time [fig.10]. They were not joined with other walls near them, but were joined together within the unit.

[^0]However, there were gaps in the dividing wall between rooms 18 and 19 on the one hand and rooms 8,10 and 11 on the other hand, those were caused by the recent graves.

## Unit Two

This unit lies to the south-west of the first unit within Sqs. 5ED and 6ED and was numbered $2,8,9$ and 10 , and it appeared that it was used in two phases as there were some changes in the buildings. In one instance the inhabitants of the first phase made use of the walls from the earlier levels which belonged to the same level, by adding walls at a later time, without joining them by cross-binding in the bricks. The north-western wall had a 95 cm wide entrance, and the south-western wall of room 9, were both built during the first phase. The remains of a "tanour", 80 cm in diameter, were found in the middle of room 10 . The north-western side of room 2 was long and had an entrance 85 cm wide; it seems this room was used in both phases as a number of layers of wall-paint were observed. The wall in the middle of the room which was added did not belong to phase one, rather to the lower phase, because it stood on the lower floor, a fact which leads to the belief that it was built in the time of phase one. Such changes and additions to the building at the time of construction and at a later time occur in other sites, as in Nippur ${ }^{1}$. The remains of a "tanour" were found $(85 \mathrm{~cm}$ in diameter and of a height averaging 28 cm ) in the large room 8 . The entrance of this room was not found because its south-western and south-western walls were not higher than 60 cm . Room 10 which seemed to be a courtyard in the lower phase, had become a rectangular room after the new additions in phase one (the upper phase), when the two, south-western and the north-western walls of room 9 were built. One of those walls extended towards the west into room 10. It is noteworthy that a grave rich with funerary objects was discovered near the entrance separating rooms 10 and 2 , which will be discussed in a later chapter ${ }^{2}$.

A detailed study of the buildings of this unit shows that they resemble others contemporary in date from sites as Abu-Salabikh ${ }^{3}$, Khafajeh ${ }^{4}$ and Nippur ${ }^{5}$.

## Unit Three

It lies to the east of the two previous units within Sqs.6CDEF, and consisted of one house. Its walls did not exceed 50 cm in height. It seems that the inhabitants made use of walls of an older phase, as they constructed the structures of their unit on older foundations. This was confirmed by the closure of the entrance on the southeastern wall of room 4. It was the largest in the unit and there was evidence that it had suffered a great fire [fig.15]; the ashes and rubble made a layer 25 cm thick, while the remaining walls were not more than 35 cm high. A "tanour" 105 cm wide was discovered at a distance of 4.20 m from the western comer of courtyard 7. The remaining height of the "tanour" were $8-15 \mathrm{~cm}$.

## Unit Four

It lies on the south-western side of Unit Three within Sqs.5E, 6E, 7E, 5F, 6F and 7 F ; rooms $6,10,11,12,13,14$ and 15 . It seems more complex than other units, and may have been occupied in two phases. The walls were different in each phase. For example, the two walls which separated the rooms 12 and 13 on the one hand and 14 and 15 on the other hand, did not stretch westwards when followed through, and showed no trace before the northern corner of room 13. Also, there

[^1]were few differences between the two phases. There were walls which constituted corners of rooms in one phase but it was difficult to ascertain corresponding walls in the second phase. However, those were walls of low height, not exceeding three rows, and they stood on a thick layer of rubble. It seemed the walls of this unit were shared between the two phases on the eastern side, but not on the western side. It was also observed that the floors sloped to the west. Two locations where "tanours" had stood were found; one in room 13, near the northern corner, was 60 cm in diameter, $2-3 \mathrm{~cm}$ thick, and $8-15 \mathrm{~cm}$ high, the other was similar but its walls were 10 cm high, and stood in the eastern corner of room 6 . Significantly we found that the added wall which separated rooms 14 and 15 was constructed by placing the bricks in the upright and horizontal positions (or English bond, as known today), which is the common way in most discovered buildings of the Early Dynastic period ${ }^{1}$. Room 11 was not regular in shape (fig.13), it was similar to room 45 of house VIII, of the private dwellings in Khafajeh ${ }^{2}$, as an entrance 70 cm wide was found in the northern side of the room opening onto courtyard 13. However, the end of the buildings of this unit on the western side were not discovered, because the settlement sloped sharply and the recent graves were numerous making it difficult to identify the details of this courtyard. The entrance in room 11 belongs to the lower phase, while the entrance that belongs to the upper phase is placed slightly to the south, a feature similar to the houses which surround the northern temple in Nippur, Level III ${ }^{3}$.

The average remaining height of the walls in this unit was $25-60 \mathrm{~cm}$. Room 11 was subject to a fire in the upper phase. A large collection of sherds, large and small jars, some with spouts, were discovered, which indicates the importance of this room, as it may have been a store-room or a kitchen.

## Unit Five

It lies within Sqs. 8GF, 7GF; rooms $1,2,3$ and $4^{4}$. It appears that the main courtyard in this unit was probably room 2 as it had more than one entrance opening onto it and as it had a "tanour" 75 cm in diameter whose remaining height was 8 cm .

Once more the damage that befell the western part of this unit precluded unearthing any specific details. Room 4A was the largest; it was rectangular and its southwestern side had an entrance 80 cm wide leading to room 4 . Room 1 had an entrance in its south-western side 80 cm wide, opening to courtyard 2 . The floor of phase one in this yard covered the remains of a "tanour", which was exposed when the paving removed. The continuos occupation of this unit resulted in the renewal of the floors; the second is only 20 cm above the first. The walls had two layers of plaster and the entrances changed location.

## Unit Six

It lies within Sqs. 8GF, to the south eastern side of the previous unit and include rooms $5,6,8$ and 9 . The largest is room 6 , however, the entrance was not found, because, the remaining height of the walls did not exceed 25 cm (fig.13).

Room 5 was to rectangular in plan and had an entrance in the south western side, its north western wall continued westwards disappearing towards the cross section. The south-eastern side continued to a distance of 4 m from the eastern corner where at that point the wall was broken, revealing no further details. Looking at the plan of this unit, one can recognise that room 9 was the main courtyard and what con-

[^2]firms this, is the presence of semi-circular pits dug in the ground, and plastered with bitumen. Their diameters averaged $35-40 \mathrm{~cm}$ and their depth varied $28-35 \mathrm{~cm}$. They could have been used to store water or for other purposes.

The floor of room 8 the largest room, sloped towards the entrance which was in the south-western side and was 70 cm wide. No trace of a "tanour" was found in this unit, indicating that it had a different and important function.

In conclusion the buildings of this level represent different domestic units like those found in Tell al- Sawari ${ }^{1}$ one of the salvaged sites in the region of Qadissiyah Dam (Haditha), and those found in Abu Salabikh ${ }^{2}$, Kish $^{3}{ }^{2}{ }^{2}$ Nippur ${ }^{4}$ Tell Muqdadiyah ${ }^{5}$, Khafajeh ${ }^{6}$, Tell Asmar ${ }^{7}$ and Gubba ${ }^{8}$ in the Hamrin Basin.

The oldest units were the ones constructed over the foundations of level III, with the exception of the last unit in which no "tanour" was found. These units are distinguished by closed or narrow rooms, and floors that sloped towards the courtyard. It is noteworthy that most of the walls of this level were built with "libn" and plastered; the "libn" measured $29 \times 15 \times 8 \times 28 \times 14 \times 6-7.5 \mathrm{~cm}$. They were similar to those used in the other sites mentioned above, and date to the same period. Archaeological finds were abundant in this level.

## Level III

The majority of the buildings of this level were little different from their predecessors. It was easy to remove the upper walls, and clarify some of the architectural features (figs. 9 \& 11).

The walls of this level were built with "libn" of nearly the same measurements as in the previous level. Most of the layers of wall plaster were identified. However the "libn" did not show finger marks as those observed in Kish ${ }^{9}$.

The manner of laying the bricks varied from one building to another, sometimes it was two rows of vertically placed bricks, followed by one row of horizontally placed bricks, and then a row of vertically placed bricks. Sometimes differences were noted in the manner of building the walls of one room, particularly in the case of the wall between rooms 1 and 2 (fig. 14).

The remaining height of the walls of this level varied between 35 and 80 cm although mud and underground water precluded measuring the vertical depth of the walls, they were $85-110 \mathrm{~cm}$ thick. A glance at the plan of this level reveals more than one independent structural unit (unit 11).

[^3]However, the largest structural remains were those that fell within Sqs. 6CDEF, $7 \mathrm{CDEF}, 8 \mathrm{~F}$ numbered $1,2,3,4,5,6,22 \& 23$. Courtyard 5 is considered a central court of this building, because of the wide area it occupied. Although its eastern part has not been entirely exposed as it lay within the area of the cross-section yet, the extensions could be followed in the walls of rooms 22 and 23 towards the southern and eastern sides. There were two entrances overlooking this courtyard, one from room 2 which lay in the north-western section measuring 105 cm , and the other was in the south-western side leading to room 6 and measured 110 cm . Surrounding the courtyard were a number of long rooms, except in the case of room 3 which was a square and had two entrances leading to rooms 2 and 4. In that room a votive plaque was found (fig.74), similar to the Khafajeh plaque. Also found in that room were two cylinder seals and a collection of pottery which included jars with spouts and pieces of sea-shells. Those finds suggests the importance of the rooms, and may have served religious purposes.

The entrance to room 1 was not found, but there was an entrance connected it to room 6 measuring 90 cm in width. Room 6 had an entrance leading to the courtyard and room 4 did not have one. However, there were remains that indicated that rooms 4,22 and 23 had entrances to the courtyard, but they were not within the area of excavations. Similarly it is likely that the main entrance to this unit lay in the eastern section which was not included in the excavations. Perhaps the open courtyards which were numbered 7 and 25 each represented a yard not connected with any building, and may have been an open-space between the buildings. It was observed that there were buildings attached (adjacent) to this building on the northwestern and the south western sides. It is noteworthy that the building had been subject to a great fire as a layer of rubble thicker than 40 cm was observed and it contained the scattered remains of wooden beams $10-12 \mathrm{~cm}$ in diameter. The remains of the beams were found in rooms 6 and 1 , and may have been part of the roofs.

Significantly a fragment of pottery inlaid with shells pieces in the shape of an ostrich egg, was found in one of the graves which belonged to the destroyed Level I (fig.56). This sherd was quite similar to those found in Mari ${ }^{1}$, and Kish ${ }^{2}$. Also a cylinder seal and a collection of Scarlet Ware pot sherds were discovered (fig.23).

An examination of the walls of this building revealed that the north-western section of the rooms surrounding the main courtyard were plastered with a layer of pure clay. Four layers were identified in that wall, which indicates that renovations were carried out in the building which in turn suggests the importance of this part of the building. Furthermore, no entrances in rooms 1 and 3 were found leading to the courtyard; this indicates a certain significance to those rooms; and may have been used for ritual purposes, as suggested by the presence of the votive plaque ${ }^{3}$. In addition no object of domestic nature was found, although the building generally resembles the main house in Tell Agrab ${ }^{4}$ and it could be considered closely similar to the Temple Oval in Khafajeh ${ }^{5}$. Taking into account the large size and religious significance of the latter, it too, was surrounded by small buildings. Again it could resemble the important buildings in Tell Abu-Salabikh ${ }^{6}$, such building units surrounded the main building in Chokha. It is probable that the building was an important centre or a station on the trade routes between the city of Mari in the west, the Diyala region in the east and Sumer in the south, especially it lies half way between

1- Mari II: pl.LXXI
2- Kish. I: pl.VII.
3. Basmachi, F.: Engraved Stone Plaques in the Iraq Museum. Sumer 7 (1951), pp. $63-4$ (Arabic).

4-Delougaz, Houses: pp.267-270
5- Dellougaz, Oval Temple: p. 138.
6. Postgate, N.: Abu Salabikh. in, Fifty Years of Mesopotamian Discovery. (1983), p. 91.

Tell Aswad near Ramadi and the city of Sippar near Yusfiyah (fig.1). In the Diyala region Tell Al-Muqdadiyah played a similar role in the trade routes leading to the Hamrin settlements ${ }^{1}$.

The importance of Chokha lies in its proximity to the Euphrates. Most routes passed by the river as that was easier than taking the desert route ${ }^{2}$, particularly during the Early Dynastic period, the Euphrates region enjoyed greater prominence than the sites on the banks of the Tigris ${ }^{3}$. Furthermore, the sites dating to the Early Dynastic period like Chokha, Tell Aswad and Sawari suggest that the Sumerian influence was prevalent.

There were three units surrounding the main building, two to the north-west and one to the south west. The unit in the extreme north west which fell in Sqs. 5DC and 6DC comprised a central courtyard surrounded by rooms to the south-east and the south-west which were numbered $8,9,10,11$ and 12 . No entrances were found in rooms 8 and 12 leading to the courtyard, but an entrance one meter wide was found in room 10 , it had a small stone door socket; another entrance 90 cm wide was found in the same room leading to room 9 . while the main entrance of room 9 was not unearthed, possibly it is located in the unexcavated part of the site. The floor of this unit including that of the courtyard sloped towards the north. Two "tanours" were found next to each other one 90 cm in diameter and the other 75 cm in diameter. The remaining height of their walls was 12 cm , both were found in the eastern part the courtyard. This unit resembles to some extent the private houses in Nippur ${ }^{4}$.

Unit Two shared with Unit One its north eastern wall and shared with the main building its south eastern wall. It lay within Sqs. 6DEF, 5DEF, and were numbered $15,16,17,18$, and 19 . Courtyard 18 was considered the main yard in the unit. It was surrounded by rooms on the three sides: the north-eastern, the south-eastern, and the south-western; hence it resembles house II in Tell Asmar ${ }^{5}$. Because of a fault in the ground the southern corner of this unit was not excavated. Room 17 was nearly square in shape, its floor sloped towards the entrance, 95 cm wide and opens onto the courtyard. A "tanour" stood in the eastern section of this unit; it was 85 cm in diameter and its remaining height was $5-10 \mathrm{~cm}$, but the main entrance of the unit which lead to the outside was not discovered, as it lay outside the range of our excavations.

Upon an examination on the shared walls between those three units we discovered that the two structures adjacent to the building were not joined by cross bounded brick with the main building, instead they were an addition; therefore, the main building was built at an earlier period.

It is important to note the significant of this building and its massive walls were used for a long period.

Three rooms surrounded the building on the south western sides they fell within Sqs. 7 GF and 8 GF and were numbered 21,24 and 25 . Also there were extensions of the walls constituting those rooms to the south and to the west, but not much could be learnt about them as they fell outside the range of excavations.

[^4]The remains from the southern summit of Chokha, in the sounding pit of Sqs.13Q and 12 Q (fig.7), are of similar date to that of the first summit, as the various archaeological finds and the architectural buildings date to the Early Dynastic period. The buildings of level II were parts of three rooms, where in the middle of which an entrance was found leading to the southern side, but its details were indistinct as parts of the structure were confused in this cross section of the excavations.

The walls were used in two phases, as two floors were observed; on the first an added wall was discovered, it was not joined by cross-bonded brick with other walls, but had the same plaster with them. Painted pot sherds as well as fragments of worked stone were found within those walls; they consisted of, bases and other parts of jars and vessels (fig. 82 \& 83).

The walls belong to level III from parts of a unit in the eastern side comprising a rectangular room which had an entrance 80 cm wide in the north-western side that led to an apparently large courtyard. In the middle of the courtyard a "tanour" stood, 90 cm in diameter and its remaining height was 10 cm . It seemed that the small building was independent as no other structural remains were discovered next to it. It resembled the smail independent homes scattered in Tell Gubba in the Hamrin Basin, which was built with plano-convex brick ( $29 \times 15 \times 6-7.5 \mathrm{~cm})^{1}$.

A large kiln was noted in the western part of the excavation area, similar to others noted from Early Dynastic sites, like Khafajeh and Abu Salabikh.

From the description of the architectural remains of Chokha and by comparing them to other sites of that period like Kish, Abu Salabikh, Nippur, Eridu, Khafajeh, Tell Asmar, Muqdadiya, and the sites in Hamrin, also, Mari and al Sawari on the Euphrates, it is possible that the exposed buildings in level II represent dwelling homes which were occupied at times close to each other, as the evidence of the differences between the floors from one to the other unit shows, and the fact that most of them had "tanours". Significantly an independent unit comprised an open courtyard surrounded by rows of rooms ${ }^{2}$.

The structural remains of the buildings of Level III reveal that the main unit represented an important administrative centre in the settlement, which was surrounded by small structures on smaller areas. It is probable that it was a trading station on the caravan route or a station where goods were traded. The great size of the building suggest its importance and prominence in the life of the settlement, but as it was subject to great fire the role and importance of this settlement dwindled and it was reduced to the presence of a few houses. A review of the other settlements in Khafajeh, Mari, Kish and Abu Salabikh which correspond in date to Chokha, reveals that they too were subject to a great fire. Andre Parrot ascribed the fire which destroyed the temple of Ishtar in Mari to the same historical period. He also ascribed the fire which destroyed the Temple of Sin in the ninth phase in Khafajeh to the invasion of King Eannatum of Lagash known for his internal and external wars ${ }^{3}$.

Tell Chokha had been subject to many invasions due to many disputes between the Sumarian cities seeking to control water sources and expand their agricultural territories or to dominate the main trading stations which are important to the life of the city state.

[^5]Thus we could imagine the settlement of Chokha as the first Sumarian trading station on the caravan route on the Euphrates if it were not a suburb of the city of Rabiquim. Future excavations in the other sites on the banks of the river might provide us with important findings in this connection.

# Chapter Three 

The Pottery

Chokha yielded a very rich collection of pottery; the types and forms known from other sites of Mesopotamia in the Early Dynastic III period, except for a very few pieces which date to Early Dynastic I (figs. 30 \& 33). Many were decorated with incised geometrical motifs or painted (figs. $40 \& 45: 3-5-10$ ), sometimes incisions were made with the finger nails on the shoulders of the vessels ${ }^{1}$.

The craftsmanship of the pottery was of high quality, most of the pieces were made on the wheel. They were smooth with a thin slip of the same clay from which the vessels were made ${ }^{2}$; on some the slip was of different clay as the colour was different. The colours of the clay varied between ochre and red, with sand grains appearing as white granules when the pottery was broken. The laboratory analysis ${ }^{3}$ of some of the pottery fragments from this site revealed that the clay contained volcanic residues as well as iron sediments and quantities of quartz crystals ${ }^{4}$ and it was found that it contained a high quality of pyroxina ${ }^{5}$.

Hence, this type of pottery contained a large quantity of coarse angular crystals and it seems that some of it had been well fired which caused black spots to appear on the surface. The black spots were organic materials found in the clay. It was found that $35 \%$ of the pottery vessels showed such black spots ${ }^{6}$.

In the light of the above, we conclude that the pottery vessels of the Early Dynastic period were on the whole locally made and the similarities with pottery from other places suggest the prevalence of the habit of exchanging goods at that time ${ }^{7}$.

Chokha was close to the river and had a strategic significance hence its pottery vessels shared all the characteristics of other sites in the upper Euphrates (fig.24), and were similar to examples found in the Diyala region (figs. $22 \& 23$ ) ${ }^{8}$. Also, pottery types from the main Sumerian cities in the south, have their parallel at Chokha; again confirming the importance of this settlement and its significant role in trade ${ }^{9}$.

The rims and bases vary in shape, some have round high bevelled rims (figs.51:5053 and 49:41 and 42), or flaring types (Fig.41:52 and 55) or just plain round mouths (figs.45:3, 5, 6 and 10).

The bodies vary according to the size and shape of the jar, with some fundamental changes in the general form. Some jars are characterised by high shoulder bending sharply at the point of meeting with the body of the jar (figs.20, $40 \& 45: 1,5,6$,

[^6]7, 10 and 11), a characteristic feature of the Early Dynastic period ${ }^{1}$. Some jars have spherical shaped bodies and have no bases (figs.28, 29 \& 46:17; fig. 50:49; fig. $51: 51 \& 57$; Fig. $53: 67,68$ and 70).

Another type of jars are oval (figs.45:12; Figs. 61 \& 62:148, \& 150). Others are pear shaped with different kinds of bases, some with ring like bases, and others are round (figs.20,21,24, 25, 36, 45,46, 49, 51, 52, \& 54). The various forms of the pottery vessels have been classified as follows:

1) Jars
2) Bowls and Goblets.
3) Fruit Stands.

## 1: Jars

The Jars varied in forms and are here sub-classified as follows:
A) Large jars
B) Medium sized jars
C) Small jars
D) Spouted Jars

## A) Large Jars

There was a substantial number of those in different shapes and designs and made of different types of clay. They were 33 in number, there are pear shaped jars with wide mouths and without necks; with incised decorations mainly in the shape of triangles, and wavy lines on the shoulders. Their mouths were round with flared rims (figs.45:5 \& 10; fig.46:16). Their colours were ochre and red. Some had upright handles (figs.20:A, 34:A, 26; fig.45:1, 6, 7, 11; fig.44:36; 51, $52 \& 57$ ). They resemble examples from Kish ${ }^{2}$, Khafajeh ${ }^{3}$, Abu Salabikh ${ }^{4}$ and the Hamrin sites like Gubba ${ }^{5}$, Uch Tepe ${ }^{6}$ and Tell Modhhur ${ }^{7}$. Minor differences were observed in the shape of the upright handles and in the incised decorations from one site to another. Some of the large jars were either round or pear-shaped with mouths less wide than those of the former group and with very short necks and flaring rims, while few had pronounced shoulders (figs.45:7, 11, 13; fig.46:16, 19, 22). The ringed bases were either concave or convex at the centre.

It appears that most of the jars had loose ended handles connected at the upper end. The decorations consisted of incised wavy lines; a ring usually circled each jar at the shoulder, or where the shoulder met with the body of the jar. However, some jars were plain and without handles (fig.46:17).

The pottery was characterised by excellent craftsmanship some items had coloured decorations in red black and orange (figs.45:1 \& 6; fig.49:38; also figs.22, 23, 24 and 25). The large jars discovered in Chokha resemble others discovered in each of

[^7]Khafajeh ${ }^{1}$, Tell Asmar ${ }^{2}$, Gubba ${ }^{3}$, Uch Tepe ${ }^{4}$, Modhhur ${ }^{5}$, Kish ${ }^{6}$ and Abu Salabikh ${ }^{7}$.

## B) Medium sized Jars

This group numbered ninety jars, they vary in colour and degree of firing. Generally they had round bodies, with medium height necks, round bevelled rims and circular ringed bases (fig.46:14, 15, 18, 21; fig.49:35, 40, 41; fig.50:47, 48; fig. $51: 54$ ). Few vessels were pear-shaped, with wide mouths and bevelled rims; some had between three to five incised relief bands with the finger nail decoration round the shoulders and bodies of the jars (figs.45:3, 4, 8, 9; fig.51:58); while on the upper parts of other jars, were bands painted in red (fig.24:A; and 50:48).

These types of pottery could be compared with what had been discovered in other sites like Khafajeh ${ }^{8}$, Tell Asmar ${ }^{9}$, the sites of Hamrin, as Gubba ${ }^{10}$, Uch Tepe ${ }^{11}$, Modhhur ${ }^{12}$, and in the south, Abu Salabikh ${ }^{13}$ and Uqair ${ }^{14}$.

All those jars except one were made of red clay. One was made with ochre coloured clay and was painted with red (fig.24). It resembled the pottery jars discovered in the regions of the upper Euphrates ${ }^{15}$, which had wide mouths, outward slanting rims, short necks and spherical bodies. There were medium sized jars without bases, others with ringed bases, some with wide mouths and bevelled rims and others with a raised band round the mouth. However, the majority were either round or pear shaped (figs.50:47 \& 48; fig.51:56). Jars similar to those were found in Khafajeh ${ }^{16}$ in graves 117 and $167^{17}$. Among this group was a pear shaped jar with a short neck; it had four pierced lugs on the shoulder, possibly for hanging (fig. 25) ${ }^{18}$.

Noteworthy an unusual and rare pottery jar was found (fig.27) ${ }^{19}$, medium sized and oval in shape with a somewhat wide mouth, flaring rim, and a flat base which helps the body to stand on a surface. The lower part of the body is somewhat sloped on the sides to help create the flat base making it resemble a 'tanour'. The craftsmanship is rough and the jar is thought to have been used for cooking pur-

[^8]poses. As it is unique one could pose questions, like why was it made in this manner? What was it used for? Why were not other similar jars found elsewhere?

We may be unable to answer such questions, possibly, special circumstance in the settlement could have necessitated the manufacture of such a jar, such as a sudden illness requiring its usage for medicinal purposes, or it could have been made for a special recipe, or it could have been used in connection with the semi spherical basins dug in the floors of the last unit of level II ${ }^{1}$.

## C) Small Jars

About ninety five small jars of different shapes and variable quality of craftsmanship, were found (figs.28, $29 \& 42$ ). A certain number of those jars were pear shaped with small mouths, round flaring rims and flat bases (fig. 50 :45; fig. $51: 50$ \& 53; fig.53:65, 66, 69; fig.54:71, 75, 76; fig.57:93, 95, 99, 100, 101). There were some round jars with no bases, large mouths and round flaring ringed rims, and on the whole ochre coloured. Few were red in colour and only one was grey (fig. 51:51, 57; fig. $39: 67,68,70$ ). The grey jar, coarsely made by hand, was pearshaped with large mouth, flaring rim and a round ring base (fig. $57: 92$ \& 94). There were other pear-shaped types with flat bases (fig.50:45; fig.51:52, 53, 55; fig. $57: 91,96,98,100$ ), those had wide mouths and round upward flaring rims with brown bands on the shoulders of the body (fig.57:75).

By comparing the pottery of this site with other sites we found similarities between them and those of Khafajeh ${ }^{2}$ Tell Asmar ${ }^{3}$, Kish ${ }^{4}$ Mari ${ }^{5}$ Abu Salabikh ${ }^{6}$, Gubba ${ }^{7}$, Uch Tepe ${ }^{8}$, Abqa ${ }^{9}$ and Madhur ${ }^{10}$.

Also found were two jars (fig. 29:B) one flat base and pear-shaped and with two adjacent mouths connected by a hole between them; they were ochre in colour (fig.50:44). Similar jars were found in Sawari ${ }^{11}$, Qadissiyah Dam Project, as well as in Khafajeh ${ }^{12}$, Uch Tepe ${ }^{13}$, Kish $^{14}$ and Ur $^{15}$.

The second jar was round in shape with a large mouth, no rim, and with two small round handles opposite each other (fig.50:49). Similar jars were found in Khafajeh ${ }^{16}$.

[^9]
## D) Spouted Jars

A fairly sizeable collection of those jars was found, some were oval in shape with different types of bases; some had ring bases (fig.47:34 and 61:142, 145, 246; fig.62); others had flat bases (fig.61:143, 144, 147); the mouths of most of these vessels were rather large, with protruding circular rims, some jutting to the outside (figs.36:A, 41 and 47:23, 25, 27, 28; fig.48:29,31). Those jars had spouts on the shoulder, with the exception of one jar, most had very short spouts (fig:48:30; fig.61:146; fig.62:150). The unusual jar had a long spout (fig.61:147), to which similar specimens were found at Abqa (Hamrin Basin); however, the bases were visibly different, the jar from Chokha had a flat base, whereas the jars from Abqa has ring bases, redish in colour, while others made of ochre colour clay. Other spouted jars had pear-shaped body (fig.61:143 \& 144; fig.62:148). A pear-shaped vessel had no neck and a large mouth with a small spout and was ringed and convex, its diameter was greater than its height (fig.62:156). This type had parallels from other sites such as Khafajeh ${ }^{1}$, Tell Asmar ${ }^{2}$, Abu Salabikh ${ }^{3}$, Uch Tepe ${ }^{4}$, Madhhur ${ }^{5}$, Abqa ${ }^{6}$, Ur ${ }^{7}$, Kish ${ }^{8}$ and Ubaid ${ }^{9}$.

## 2) Bowls and Goblets

The Chokha Settlement has provided us with large quantities of goblets and bowls, which comprised $36 \%$ of the total unearthed archaeological finds. These goblets had an incomplete cone-shaped body, with wide mouths, round rims, and flat string cut bases (figs.37, 43 and 44). Doubtless those vessels were used most commonly as drinking vessels (figs.58, 59, 75 and 76) ${ }^{10}$. It was noted that some were deep, the diameter of the mouths were smaller than the wider type. The bases of some were round and ringed (fig.58:102, 103, 106, 107; fig.59:116, 117; fig.60:140), while some had no bases (fig.59:120).

The goblets were of various types, a number were pear-shaped (fig.52:59, 60, 64) with slightly flaring rims; others had plain rims, and few had bands just below the rims (fig.52:64). Most of the goblets had bases.

A number of goblets were cylindrical with flat bases (fig.52:62 \& 63), others were bell shape (fig.52:61). The colour was either red or ochre. Parallels could be found from other sites like Khafajeh ${ }^{11}$, Tell Asmar ${ }^{12}$ and Gubba ${ }^{13}$, Uch Tepe ${ }^{14}$ Abu

[^10]Salabikh ${ }^{1}$, Kish ${ }^{2}$, Madhhur ${ }^{3}$, Abqa ${ }^{4}$, Sippar ${ }^{5}$, Ur ${ }^{6}$ and Al Ubaid ${ }^{7}$. The similarities among the specimens which are wide spread across Mesopotamia, and continued to the Early Dynastic period, suggest the predominant use of those types of vessels ${ }^{8}$.

## 3) Fruit-Stands

This type of pottery is characterised by being cylindrical in form with a wide base, wide mouthed for the support of a large vessel (fig.55). It is noted that the upper and outer part of most of the fruit-stands have decorative bands possibly made with finger nail incisions (fig. 55:78, 79, 80). Most had round flaring rims (figs.5:77, 79, 80); however, some had round collard rims (fig.55:78). Like the variation in size and form, the bases also varied in type, some were round with a slight flare (fig. 55:77), or they had reinforced rings which circled the slightly concave bases (fig. $55: 78,79,80$ ). The body is occasionally decorated with raised bands with incised wavy lines on them; near the base there are round holes, possibly for holding the stand (fig. $38: \mathrm{A}$ ).

Eight fruit-stands were discovered at Chokha, which were either ochre or buff in colour, with a slip of the same type of clay. There was one stone fruit-stand (fig.86:A) which resembled the fruit-stand from Ur ${ }^{9}$.

Other similar examples were found in the sites of Khafajeh ${ }^{10}{ }_{\perp} \mathrm{Kish}^{11}{ }^{11} \mathrm{Abu}$ Salabikh ${ }^{12}$, Ur ${ }^{13}$ _ Gubba ${ }^{14}$, Tell Asmar ${ }^{15}$ _ Tell Agrab ${ }^{16}$ and Tell al Willaya ${ }^{17}$.

Four painted jars were found along with a collection of sherds of pottery of Scarlet Ware (figs.22, 23 and 36:B); each jar had its distinct type of decoration. On one jar (fig. $35: 38$ ) the painted decoration showed a large tree in red and black; however, the jar was not intact and other details of the tree could not be discerned (fig.34), and it probable that only one side was painted. The motif on this jar resembled that on jar no. C545-542 discovered in Tell Asmar ${ }^{18}$.

The jar shown in (figs.22; \& 45:1) was painted in light red with triangle and diamond motifs similar to the geometrical decoration on a jar from Khafajeh ${ }^{19}$.

[^11]The two other jars showed geometrical designs in red and black (fig.45:6); they were similar to those discovered in Tell Gubba ${ }^{1}$ and Khafajeh ${ }^{2}$.

Other fragments of painted pottery, in red and black, were found; they showed geometrical forms also. One fragment was the upper part of a man's body (fig.25). Noteworthy, a rim fragment from a jar inlaid with pieces of shell in bitumen, was discovered at Chokha. It will be discussed in detail further below.

Another piece was a pottery disk which had two holes on its "upper" section ${ }^{3}$. It is probable that it was a loom weight (fig. 31$)^{4}$.

Also found, were two fragments representing the lower parts of conical solid footed goblets (fig 30) ${ }^{5}$. Similar fragments were found in several other sites, like Khafajeh ${ }^{6}$, Abu Salabikh ${ }^{7}$, Kish $^{8}$ and Ubaid ${ }^{9}$.

The upper part of a fragmentary jar is one of the unusual finds at Chokha (fig $46)^{10}$. It has a bevelled rim, upright handle and the shoulders, resembling others found at Kish ${ }^{11}$, Abu Salabikh ${ }^{12}$ and Khafajeh ${ }^{13}$. This jar had triangular incised decorations within interlinking circles, only one slightly similar jar was noted in Kish ${ }^{14}$. However, the Kish example had only one row of triangles. Another difference is the incised decoration on the handle of the Chokha vase suggest a palm frond motif, while the Kish one had applied dots.

[^12]
## Chapter Four

## Cylinder Seals, Votive Plaques \& Miscellaneous Objects

## Cylinder Seals

Nine Cylinder Seals and one seal impression were unearthed at Chokha. They have varied repertoire depicting combat scenes between wild and domesticated animals such as lions and gazelles, scenes of banquets with drinking figures, or boat scenes. The whole scenes are sometimes engraved on the seals in two registers, thus expanding the area in the depiction of a subject. All can safely be dated to the Early Dynastic period, with the exception of one, which may belong to the end of the Jamdat Nasr or Early Dynastic I.

## Description of the Seals

1) IM 87833 (fig.63)

Sq. 6D in the south western section of room 2, on the floor. Marble. $2.1 \times 1.2 \mathrm{~cm}$.
Worn seal showing animals fighting. All the figures can be identified, a lion stands upright on its hindlegs; in front of it stands a hero who is protecting two crossed domestic animals: a goat and a gazelle, as the rear of the goat and the horns of the gazelle can be discerned. Another animal standing on its hind legs could be seen behind the goat. Traces of a figure standing behind this latter animal could be noted; it seems from the shape of the head to be a composite human figure. On the whole, the scene on this seal does not seem to be very clear as the figures stand out in very low relief. The heads of all the figures in the scene stand at the same height which was a characteristic of Early Dynastic II glyptic. Seals with similar subjects were found in Kish ${ }^{1}$, and Fara ${ }^{2}$.
2) IM 87834 (fig.64)

Sq. 6 E Level II room 5 on the floor. Marble. $3.2 \times 2 \mathrm{~cm}$.
The seal shows one main scene and two secondary ones in two registers. The main scene shows two crossed lions, standing upright on their hind legs, their heads pointing in opposite directions. To the left a composite horned creature stands upright facing one of the lions and holding its main.

The upper register of the secondary scenes, shows a contest scene of a hero standing in the centre, on his right and left are two crossed domestic animals. The lower register is depicted with five figures: one composite creature hurrying to save a domestic animal attacked by a lion which is standing upright on its hindlegs, followed by an animal pursued and being attacked by a lion which also stands upright on its

[^13]hindlegs. Such a theme is common in the Early Dynastic II-III seals ${ }^{1}$. Seals resembling this one were found in Abu Salabikh ${ }^{2}$, and in Kish ${ }^{3}$.
3) IM 87835 (fig. 65)

Sq. 6D, room 4 in the fill part of level II. Marble. $2.5 \times 1.1 \mathrm{~cm}$.
The upper part of the seal is broken; the scenes depicted are in two registers separated by two parallel lines. Most of the upper register is missing because of the break, but what remains suggests that it consisted of a drinking or a banquet scene. A seated figure on a chair could be observed facing right, in front of him are two figures also seated on chairs and facing left, dressed in ankle length garments with tasselled fringes.

The lower register shows two crossed lions standing upright on their hindlegs in the centre of the scene, and each is attacking and holding the rear of two homed animals. This scene closely resembles one found on a seal from Kish ${ }^{4}$. The terminal is a dagger placed vertically.

The style and subject of the seal place it within the transitional period towards Early Dynastic III. Seals with similar scenes to those in the lower section were noted in Kish ${ }^{5}$, and Fara ${ }^{6}$.
4) IM 87836 (fig.66)

Sq.5E, level II, room 5 on the floor. Shell. 3.6x1.1.
Banqueting scene in two registers, separated by two parallel lines. The scenes on both registers are almost identical with variation only in the actual engraving. The banquet scene consists of two seated figures -possibly male and female- the female had long hair falling down her back. They both wear long fleeced garments and are seated on crossed legged stools. They are drinking from a central vessel on a stand, through "straw" tubes. It is unusual to depict the banqueting scene twice in one seal ${ }^{7}$. Similar seals were found in Khafajeh ${ }^{8}$, Kish $^{9}$, and Mari ${ }^{10}$.
5) IM 89991 (fig.67)

Sq.6D, Level II, room 3 on the floor. Clay seal impression $3.2 \times 2 \mathrm{~cm}$
Fighting scene; bull-man holding the mane of a lion that crosses with a bull, who in turn is pursuing a goat, which turns its head to look at the bull; part of a fourth animal is visible. All animals stand on their hind legs.

Scenes similar to the one depicted on this impression were found in Abu Salabikh ${ }^{11}$, and a similar impression was found in Kish ${ }^{12}$.

[^14]6) IM 89992 (fig.68)

Sq.6D, Level II, Unit Three, room 4 , in the fill. Alabaster. $3.4 \times 2.2 \mathrm{~cm}$.
Fighting and mythological scene. Horned human figure wearing belt, who is in the centre of the composition with crossed animals on either side. He is holding a bull that crosses with a lion; who in his turn is attacking another bull. On the other side, the hero is holding a lion who is crossed with a second lion; the latter is attacking a bull. Between the two bulls is a monster figure, or possibly a stylised rendering of the nude hero with upturned curly hair. Similar seals were found in Khafajeh ${ }^{1}$, $\mathrm{Ur}^{2}$ and Mari ${ }^{3}$. However, in style this seal belongs to the "Fara" group ${ }^{4}$. One seal in the Iraq Museum is very similar in the manner of cutting the figures, that it could be the work of one seal cutters.
7) IM 87993 (fig.69)

Sq. 7 C, level III, room 4 in the fill. Granite. $3 \times 1.5 \mathrm{~cm}$
Badly worn seal, it is difficult to discern some of the details of the scene. But it seems that there are seven figures which cannot be identified to be human or animal. It is probable that the engraving is unfinished and that the work was not of a high degree of accomplishment, with an extensive use of the drill. Such technique in the execution of Early Dynastic seals was common.
8) IM 87994 (fig.70)

Sq. 6D, level II, room 2, in the fill. Ivory. $2.5 \times 1.5 \mathrm{~cm}$
Animal fighting scene; two groups of combatants. Lion crossed with gazelle, and at the same time, subduing an ibex by holding it in reverse. The second group of combatants depicts a second lion crossed with a stag and it is subduing a second stag with elaborate horns. A seal with a similar scene was found in Khafajeh ${ }^{6}$.
9) IM 87995 (fig.71)

Sq.6G, level II, room 3, in the fill. Alabaster. $2.8 \times 1.3 \mathrm{~cm}$
Boat scene. Crudely cut seal showing a boat scene; the prow ends with a god figure holding a punting pole, his horned crown is very distorted. The body of the boat is serrated at the bottom. Inside the boat are two seated figures with a vessel between them, possibly representing a drinking scene. Seals with similar subject occur in both the Early Dynastic and later the Akkadian periods, and discovered in most of the ancient sites; the best examples came from Khafajeh (in the Temple Oval and in private houses) ${ }^{7}$.
10) IM 87997 (fig.72)

Sq.6G, level II, room 3, in the fill. Marble. $2.4 \times 1.2 \mathrm{~cm}$

[^15]A stylised spread winged eagle fill the surface of the seal. The two serrated semicircular lines below the eagle may represent a stylised boat; however, similar seals were found in Khafajeh ${ }^{1}$ and Fara ${ }^{2}$.

## Votive Plaques

Excavations in Chokha have provided us with two plaques. They were different in form and in the kind of stone of which they were made.

The first plaque ${ }^{3}$, was almost rectangular, 23 cm long, 16 cm wide and 3.5 cm thick. It was made of a blackish grey stone ${ }^{4}$; and it had a round hole in the centre about 2 cm in diameter.

This plaque was free from relief expect for a shallow groove around the edge 0.2 0.3 cm deep and $0.5-0.7 \mathrm{~cm}$ wide, which originally may have had inlay decoration of geometrical motifs made with shell or mother of pearl in bitumen. It was broken in half when it was discovered and a few fragments were missing. One similar plaque was discovered in the northern Temple in Nippur. It too had a groove around the edges.

The second plaque is square, 29 cm long and 3 cm thick ${ }^{6}$. It is made of white alabaster, it is broken into pieces with some missing, however, the subject of the relief is similar to the votive plaques found in Khafajeh and Ur (fig 74) ${ }^{7}$.

The relief is divided into three registers. The upper shows a seated figure on a chair at the right end. His face and head are shaven his massive shoulders are broad and straight, and he carries in his left hand a tree frond which touches his clothes, while his right hand is raised possibly holding a cup (the relief is damaged here). He is bare chested, wearing a broad belt and a long tasselled kilt. Two figures are facing the seated figure, both have their hands clasped to their chests; they are beardless with their hair in locks falling down their shoulders, they wear long kilts with tasselled fringe ${ }^{8}$.

The second field consist of two parts, on either side of the central round hole. It shows a cow with long horns that curve front wards; it has a long tail that reaches down to the ground. It is similar to the cows in the milking scene from Tell Al 'Ubaid'.

The cow is in a quiet mood its suckling calf has bent its front and its hindlegs in such a way as to be able to suck its mothers milk. The scene is repeated in the other section of the field, but in a reversed direction.

[^16]The subject of this second field of the plaque has corresponding similar subjects in plaques from Nippur (Temple of Enanna) ${ }^{1}$, Khafajeh (Temple of Sin, level VIII) ${ }^{2}$, and Tell Asmar (Temple of Abu) ${ }^{3}$.

In the lower third register a figure precedes a chariot; he wears a knotted belt that hangs down on the right of a long tasselled kilt. He holds a long staff in front of him with the right hand and his left hand is folded to his chest; he is bareheaded and has long locks of hair which fall down the sides of his face to his chest. He is followed by the animals (onagers) that pull a chariot. The skill of the artist is demonstrated in the parallel lines of forelegs and heads as the sequence of four animal are shown to be running beside each other. The front of the chariot survives showing the pole springing from the top of the body in a high curve and then descending to the yoke, with the quivers rising in front indicating that it is a war chariot. On the whole, it is possible to compare this scene with plaques found in $\mathrm{Ur}^{4}$, and with a plaque found in Khafajeh in the Temple Oval ${ }^{5}$.

## Miscellaneous Objects

The finds from the excavations are not limited to architectural remains, pottery, clay tablets and cylinder seals. They include other diverse materials and objects which contribute in a significant way to give a clearer picture of the site. The excavations in the Chokha settlement have provided us with the following:

1) A number of clay model chariots and few wheels.
2) Fragments of various stone vessels.
3) A piece of pottery inlaid with shell pieces, and an ostrich egg.
4) A bead with incised signs.
5) Flint and obsidian tools and implements.

## The Clay Chariots

Almost all Sumerian sites have offered examples of model of chariots made of clay of different shapes, size and styles (fig. $75 \& 76$ ), their significance is yet to be determined; but the most probable explanations suggest that they may have been toys, or used for votive purposes ${ }^{6}$.

The first example of a clay chariot has an upright back (fig.75) ${ }^{7}$. It is relatively long and the upper end is almost triangular. The front of the chariot is covered with something like a ledge which is solid, and had a semi circular end. The front protrudes 2 cm beyond the frontal axis. The rear axis is behind the base. The wheels are missing (fig.75). Similar examples were found in $\mathrm{Kish}^{8}, \mathrm{Ur}^{9}$, Chagar Bazar ${ }^{10}$, and Tell Aswad near Ramadi ${ }^{11}$.
${ }^{1}$ - Hansen, Nippur: pl.VI.
2- Frankfort, Sculpture: pl. 108.
3- Ibid.: pl. 106.
4- Ur Exc. II: p.376, pl.181B.
5- Frankfort, Sculpture: pl. 107.
6- Moorey, P.R.: Kish Excavations: 1923-1933. 1976, p. 62
7- It was found among the finds in a child's grave in square 5C, room 17 of Level II. Its measurements are: length, 13.2 cm , width 7 cm , height 14 cm . IM 87944 .
8- A Cemetery: 66-67; also, Moorey, P.R.: Kish Excavations 1923-1933. 1976, p.64.
9. Ur Exc. II: p. 389, pl. 188.
10. Mallowan, Op. Cit.: p. 215.
11. Ant. Dept. archive, File: Tell aswad no.39/85, Al-Anbar.

The second example is a small zoomorphic chariot; it is intact (fig.76) ${ }^{1}$, and cylindrical in shape. The diameter at the end is slightly greater than it is in front, the rear tapers to a pointed end, the head of a ram with twisted horns is in the front.

The protrusion below the neck with a hole through it, was probably for a string to pull with; also, a hole runs through the back of the ram. The chariot has two axis, one at the front and one at the rear; with solid clay wheels. The two front wheels are larger than the two rear ones (fig.76). Other similar specimens of this chariot were found in $\mathrm{Ur}^{2}$, Nippur ${ }^{3}$, Khafajeh ${ }^{4}$, Tell Asmar ${ }^{5}$ and Chagar Bazar ${ }^{6}$.

The third chariot model is also a zoomorphic one, it is incomplete with the wheels and head missing the fore and hindlegs were exchanged for axis in order to hold the wheels?. The craftsmanship of the wagon is coarse. A few slanting lines at a protrusion which stands at the backbone of the animal's body. The entire body is a solid piece and thus it is different from the former two examples (fig.77).

In addition to the chariot models, a number of solid clay wheels were unearthed in different locations, in the course of excavations (fig. 56 ); they were of different shapes and sizes, and were generally made from reddish clay. The quality; of the craftsmanship varied. The wheels were characterised by having a thick central part: to the distance of up to one centimetre from the centre of the hole. That part was nearly twice as thick as the rest of the wheel (fig.89).

It is rare to find an archaeological site that represents a historical period extending from Warka to late periods which does not have parts of such wheels. In other words, small chariots or parts thereof are found in sites like Kish, Ur, Nippur, Khafajeh, Abu Salabikh, Sippar and Mari.

## Stone Vessels

Several stone vessels and fragments of stone cups were found at Chokha. One (fig.80-81) ${ }^{8}$, is a small soft stone shallow square-shaped resptacle with a thick rim, the outer side of the rim is square, and the cup is a round semi-spherical depression, the base is flat and square. Each corner of the rim has a geometrical decoration consisting of a dot in circle motif and round the mouth are two incised lines; just below the rim is a band of hatched incisions (fig.81). No similar stone "cup" has been found in other sites, but the cup's material and the geometrical decoration of dot in circle belong to group of soft stone "steatite" vessels that had a wide distribution in Mesopotamia and the Gulf and Iran during the Early Dynastic period. Perhaps the nearest example to the Chokha find are a group of vessels from Mari ${ }^{9}$. The dot and circle were a popular motif in the Gulf region and even appear on the back of the Dilmun type stamp seals ${ }^{10}$

[^17]Another stone vessel was a roughly worked fruit stand ${ }^{1}$, of which only the lower part remains (fig.86), and it is similar to the fruit stand found in $\mathrm{Ur}^{2}$.

In addition a number of stone fragments, some were parts of bases, others from the sides and rims of the vessels; they were on the whole made of vained marble (fig.83), closely resembling those found in $\mathrm{Ur}^{3}$ and $\mathrm{Kish}^{4}$. On the whole it could be said that the collection of the stone fragments of those vessels resembled the conical bowls, in so far as the forms of the base and the upper part suggested. Few had holes on them possibly for purposes of restoration. Mending stone vessels in ancient Mesopotamia was a regular practice, best seen on the votive vase from Warka ${ }^{5}$, and the restored vessel found in Suleimeh, one of the largest sites in the Hamrin Basin ${ }^{6}$.

Noteworthy, is that most of those objects were found in the fill of room 4, Unit Three of Level II at Chokha, adding credence to the suggestion that this building was of special importance.

A pottery rim inlaid with pieces of shell and an ostrich egg7. The pottery object formed the upper part of a rim and the neck to be placed over the ostrich egg which formed the body (fig. 84 \& 85). On the flat side of the rim shell triangles are inlaid with bitumen forming inter-linked diamonds geometrical design, the same motifs are repeated below the rim round the neck.

The ostrich egg had one section cut and the inlaid pottery neck-rim was placed over. The edge by the opening was painted brown.

It should be noted that this remarkable find was found like the stone vessels in room 4. It also falls with similar objects discovered on sites located on the Euphrates, such as Kish ${ }^{8}$, $\mathrm{Ur}^{9}$, Nippur ${ }^{10}$, and Mari ${ }^{11}$

A spherical shaped vained onyx bead (blue grey with white veins) ${ }^{12}$. Four cuneiform signs, two on either side of the pierced hole that ran through the bead. Unfortunately the signs are illegible, but may have served magical purposes or symbols of certain deities (figs. 78 \& 79) ${ }^{13}$.

## Stone tools and Implements

A collection of flint tools in the form of brown scrapers and knives (some light coloured and some dark) were found. They had well shaped ends and on the whole did not exceed 10 cm in length. There were knives and saws, some made of black

[^18]obsidian and some of white stone (figs. 87 \& 96). Some of those tools resembles others discovered in Kish ${ }^{1}$, Abu Salabikh ${ }^{2}$, Sippar ${ }^{3}$, Uch Tepe ${ }^{4}$ and Gubba ${ }^{5}$.

A number of shell were found in graves and in the fill. Most of them had traces of "kohl" which supports the prevalent notions that they were used as containers for cosmetic material (fig.88).

[^19]
## Tell Chokha: Early Dynastic III Pottery from Level II

Abbriviation: IM: Iraq Museum. Ex.: Excavation. MB: Main Building. c.: clay. pr.: pear-shaped. Sq.: Square. rm.: room. h.: ht. r.: rim dia.. b. body dia. of vessel. th.:thickness; hl.:hole; bs.: base. For the comparative types, the site is first mentioned then the publication. For the Diyala sites, Khafahjeh, Asmar: Delougaz, Pottery. Tell Gubba: Fuji, Gubba. Uch Tepe: Gibson, Uch Tepe. Madhhour: Roaf, Sumer. Abu Salabikh: Postgate, Iraq.

| No. | IM No. | Ex.No. | Description | Unit | Location | Measearments cm | Comparative Pottery Types |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 91638 | 125 | Red painted jar with upright handle. Reddish pear-shaoed, wide rimmed jar | Two $=$ | Sq.5D, Courtyard 10, in fill | $\text { h. } 32 \text {, r. } 13 \text {, b. } 27.3 \text {, bs. } 10.5$ | Khafajeh. pl. 193:526-370 |
| 2 |  | 190 | Reddish pear-shaoed, wide rimmed jar. | = | Sq.5F, Rm.17, in fill | $\text { h. } 13.8 \text {, r. } 16 \text {, b. } 10.5$ |  |
| 4 | 87941 | 213 | buff clay small round jar buff clay round jar, geometrical deco. | One $=$ | $\stackrel{\text { Sq. }}{=}====$ | 17.5, r.12.5, b. 18.2 , bs. 8 | bba. fig. $21: 8$ |
| 5 | 87957 | 246 | Large pear-shaped jar, broken \& Repair ed | Four | Sq. 5F, Rm. 12, N. sec. in fill | h. 29, r.23.3, b. 36, bs. 12 | Uch Tepe. pl.98:9 |
| 6 | 87959 | 250 | Red c., pr. painted red \& Black, upright handle | Four | SqSF Rm.12, N. sec. in | h. 21.4 , r.12, b.19, bs. 7.8 | Gubba. Fig.21:5; Uch Tepe, pl.98:10 |
| 7 | 87969 | 294 | Red c., pr. broken \& repaired. | Six | Sq.8G, Rm.9, on floor | h.29.5, r.13.2, b.24.8, bs.9.8 |  |
| 8 | 87973 | 311 | Buff c., oval small jar | Four | Sq.7F, Rm.11, in fill | h. $13, \mathrm{r} .10, \mathrm{~b} .14,7 \mathrm{~cm}$ |  |
| 9 | 87977 | 328 | $=\quad=\quad=$ | = | Sq. 7F, Rm.11, in fill | h.17.2, r. 10.6, b.14.1, bs. 7.5 | Khafajeh. pl.175:C505-370 |
| 10 | 87978 | 329 | buff c., pr.large jar | Five | Sq.7G, courtyard 2, in fill | h.28.5, r.19.3, b.33, bs. 14.4 |  |
| 11 |  | 331 | Buuf c. medium oval jar | Six | Sq. $8 \mathrm{G}, \mathrm{Rm} .5$, in fill | h.25.1, r.13.7, b.22.4, bs. 9.6 | Khafajeh. pl.181:C526-371 |
| 12 |  | 332 | Buff c. large long jar | $=$ | $=====$ | h.32.8, r.11.8, b.19.5, bs. 10 | Asmar. pl.176:C467-350 |
| 13 |  | 336 | Red c. pr.large vessel, broken | Five | Sq.7G, Rm.3, on floor | h. 25, r. 12, b. 27 , bs. 12 | Khefajeh. pl.66: e524-370 |
| 14 | 91609 | 15 | Buff c. pr. medium jar | Two | Sq.6D, Rm.2, on floor | h. 13.8, r. 12.8, b. 16.5, bs. 7.1 |  |
| 15 | 91611 | 19 | round | Three | Sq.6D, Rm.4, on floor | h.14.5, r. 12.9, b. 17.5 , bs. 7.8 | Gubba. fig.21:3; Uch Tepe. pl.98: 9; Madhhour. Sumer 43, fig.13:1A1 |
| 16 | 91621 | 50 | Red c. $=$ large jar | $=$ | $==\quad=$ in fill | h. 28, r.17, b. 27 , bs 12.5 | Uch Tepe. pl.99:2; Madhhour. <br> Sumer 34, fig. 12:4 |
| 17 | 91622 | 51 | Greenish c. round large vessel | Two | $==^{=} \quad=$ | h.36, r.13.3, b. 31 | Asmar. pl.184:C555-510 |
| 18 |  | 113 | Red c. pr.medium jar | $=$ | Sq. $5 \mathrm{E}, \mathrm{Rm} .9$, in fill | h. 16.8 , r. 13, b. 18 , bs. 8 | Khefajeh. pl. 180:C526-460 |
| 19 |  | 120 | Buff c. oval medium jar | $=$ | Sq. SE, Rm.9, on floor | h. 26.7 , r. 17, b. 24 , bs 10.5 | Madhhour. Sumer 43, fig.13:1A2 |
| 20 | 91637 | 123 | $=$ pr. large vessel | $=$ | $=-=$ | h.30.7, r.22.2, b.34, bs. 15 | Gubba. pl.2:3 |
| 21 |  | 130 | Red c. pr. medium jar | $=$ | Sq. 5E, Rm. 5 , on floor | h.22.1, r.17.8, b.25, bs. 11 |  |
| 22 |  | 131 | Buff c. oval medium jar | = | $====$ | h. 26, r.12, b. 21 , bs. 9 | Khafajeh. pl.184:C555-320 |
| 23 | 91664 | 190 | $=$ long spouted medium jar | = | Sq.5D, Rm.8, on floor | h. 22.9, r. 11.4, b. 15.5, bs. 7 |  |
| 24 |  | 254 | $\geq=1$ | Four | Sq. 7F, Rm.11, in fill | h. 24. r.10, b. 13.5 , bs. 7.6 | Khafajeh. pl. 180:C525-2621 |
| 25 |  | 280 | $=$ oval | Four | Sq.8F, courtyard 7, in fill | h. 19, r.9.8, b.13.2, bs.6.5 |  |
| 26 |  | 309 | $=$ | Two | Sq. 5E, Rm.9, in fill | h. 21.4, r. 10, b.13.5, bs. 6 | Uch Tepe, pl.96:8 |


| No. | IM No. | Ex.No. | Description | Unit | Location | Measearments cm | Comparative Pottery Types |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27 |  | 316 | $==\quad=$ | Four | = | h. 23, r.11, b.14.5, | Abu Salabikh. Iraq 39, fig.5:3, p. 290 |
| 28 | 116999 | 317 | $=$ | $=$ | = $=$ = $=$ | h.23.5, r. 11 , b. 15.4, bs. 5 | Khafajeh. pl.90:e.C526-362; Abu Salabikh. Riaq 39, fig.5:3 |
| 29 |  | 52 | $=$ long $==$ | Three | Sq.6E, Rm.4, in fill | h. 24.5, r.11.5, b. 14.7, bs. 6.3 | Khafajeh. pl.90:C523-362 <br> Abu Salabikh. Iraq 39, fig.5:8 |
| 30 | 91623 | 54 | = oval $=$ = | $=$ | = = = | h.25.6, r.9.9, b.15.8, bs. 7.5 | Khefajeh. pl.90:C526-3635; Abu Salabikh. Iraq 39, fig.5:3 |
| 31 |  | 55 | $=$ long $=\quad=$, repaired | = |  | h. 24.5, r.11.5, b. 13.8, bs.6.5 | Khafajeh. pl.182:C567-362 |
| 32 | 91624 | 56 | $=$ | = | $====$ | h.27.7, r.10.5, b.12.7, bs. 7.7 | $=$ pl.90:C526-362 |
| 33 |  | 65 | $=\quad=$ | Two | Sq.SD, Rm. 10, in fill | h. 29, r. 12, b. 15, bs. 8.6 | Abu Salabikh. Iraq 39, fig. 5:3 |
| 34 |  | 95 | Red c. | Four | Sq.6E, Rm6, on floor | h. 26.5 , r.11, b. 14.5 , bs. 6.7 | $=\quad=\quad=38$, fig. $7: 8$ |
| 35 | 91610 | 16 | $=\mathrm{pr}$ medium jar | Three | Sq.6E, Rm.4, in fill | h. 19, r.10.7, b. 15 , bs. 6.8 | Madhhour. Sumer 34, fig. 12:6 |
| 36 | 91620 | 49 | $=\mathrm{pr}$ large jar with upright handle | $=$ | = | h.36, r.16, b.32, bs. 13.5 |  |
| 37 |  | 95 | $=\quad$ long medium jar | Four | Sq.6E, Rm.6, on floor | h. 26.5, r.11, b.14.5, bs 6.7 | Khafajeh. pl.193:D526-371 |
| 38 | 91636 | 122 | $=$ medium jar, red and black paint with upright handle, base missing | Two | Sq.5E, Rm.9, on floor | $\text { h. } 23.5 \text {, r. } 12.5, \text { b. } 23.5$ | Gubba. fig.21:2 |
| 40 |  | 166 | Red c. round medium jar | Four | Sq.5E, Rm.5, in fill | b. 19.4, r. 10.8, b. 22 , bs. 9 | Asmar. pl.193:D525-370; Gubba, fig. 20:6; Madhhour. Sumer 43, fig. 13:2A |
| 41 |  | 169 | Red c. pr. medium jar | $=$ | Sq.7F, Rm. 15 , in fill | h.19.5, r.12.6, b. 18, bs 9 | Asmar. pl. 192:D151-370 |
| 42 |  | 170 | $=\quad=\quad=$ Broken \& repaired | - | $====$ | h. 20 , r.13, b.18, bs. 9 | Uch Tepe. pl.98:2 |
| 43 | 91656 | 171 | $=\quad=$ large $=\quad=$ | Two | Sq.5D, Rm.8, in fill | h.30.5, r.13.7, b.27.5, bs. 9.2 |  |
| 44 | 91625 | 63 | Red c. pr. small jar with double mouths | $=$ | Sq. $5 \mathrm{E},=9=$ | h.9.9, r. b.8.9, bs 3.7 | Khafajeh. pl.161:B575:225; Uch Tepe. pl.74:7; Kish |
| 45 |  | 152 |  | - | $=-5=$ | h.9.3, r.3.1, b.8.2, bs.3.5 | Khafajeh. ol. 165:B675-220 |
| 47 |  | 165 | $=$ round medium jar | Four | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sq. 6E, in Grave, 6F, Rm. } 11 \\ & \text { in fill } \end{aligned}$ | h.14.5, <br> b. 14.5, r.4.6 | Khefajeh. Delougaz, Houses; pl.183:C545-340 |
| 48 |  | 168 | = $=$ | $=$ | Sq.7F, in grave, Rm. 15, in fill | h.6, r. 10,4, b. 14.5, bs. 4 | Khafajeh. Delougaz, Houses: pl.183:C545-340 |
| 49 | 91660 | 175 | Buff c. round shallow bowl with four lugs | Three | Sq.6D, Rm.4, in fill | h.7.5, r.7.2, b. 8 | Khafajeh. pl.147:B043-503 |
| 50 | 91600 | 4 | Red c. pr. small jar |  | Surface find | h.9.7, r.3.1, b.9, bs. 4.3 |  |
| 51 | 91617 | 44 60 | Grey c. round small jar Red c. onion shaped sm | Three | Sq.6E, Sq.6E, Rm.4, in fill Sq.6E, Rm.4, in fill | h.9.3, r.6.7, b. 9 | Madhhour. Sumer , 43, fig:6; Abu Abu Salabikh. Iraq 39, fig. 5: 2 |
| 53 |  | 61 | Red c. onion shaped small jar Red c. pr. small jar | Two | Sq.6E, Rm.4, in $=5 \mathrm{E}=9$ | h. 10.1, r.9.2, b. 10.8 , bs. 4.9 h.11.3, r.4.2, b. 10.2, bs. 5.5 | Abu Salabikh. 38, fig.8:23 Asmar. pl.163:B645-220 |
| 54 |  | 67 | Red c. round medium jar | $=$ | Sq.5D, Rm.8, on floor | h. 20, r.13.7, b.19.5, bs.9.6 | Asmar. pli.163:B645-220 |


| No. | IM No. | Ex.No. | Description | Unit | Location | Measearments cm | Comparative Pottery Types |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55 |  | 82 | Red c. pr. small jar | One | Sq.5D, Rm.15, in fill |  |  |
| 56 | 91632 | 111 |  | Two | $=5 E=9=$ | h. 11.4, r. 7.4 , b. 10 , bs. 3.3 | Abg a. Sumer 38, p.47, fig. 12 |
| 57 58 |  | 116 | $=$ round small jar | Two | - $=$ - | h. 10.7 , r. 7.5, b. 10 | Mari. Syria 19, pl. 11:4 |
| 58 | 91635 | 121 | Buff c. round medium jar | $=$ | $====$ | h.22.2, r.14.6, 21.5, bs. 10.3 | Khafajeh. pl.99: e.C655-460; |
| 59 | 91601 | 2 | $=$ pr. roughly made small jar |  | Surface find | h.8.3, r. 5.8, b. 7.4,bs. 6 | Gubba. fig.21:9 |
| 60 | 91602 | 4 | Red c. medium size cup |  |  | h.9.4, r.6.6, | Asmar. pl.151:B165-220 |
| 61 | 91628 | 97 | Red c. cylindrical cup, broken \& mended | Four | Sq. 6F, Rm. 6 , on floor | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { h.9.5, r.11.7, } & \text { bs.6. }\end{array}$ | Khefajeh. pl.146:B16-200 |
| 62 | 91642 | 149 | Red c. small cylindrical cup | $=$ | Sq.7F, Rm.15, on floor | h.7.8, r.6.6, bs. 4.3 |  |
| 64 | 91659 | 174 | $\underset{\text { Buff c. pr. small jar }}{=}=$ | = | = = = = | h.7.3, r.7.8, bs. 3.8 | Asmar. pl. 149:B65-210 |
| 65 |  | 14 | Buff c. pr. small jar Red c. round small jar | Three | Sq.7C, Rm. 17 , in fill Sq.6D, Rm.1, in fill | h. 11, r.9, b. 10.6 , bs. 4.2 | Abqa. Sumer 38, p.47, fig. 11 |
| 66 |  | 17 | $=\quad=\quad=$ | Three | Sq.6E, Rm.4, in fill | $\begin{aligned} & \text { h. } 7.5, \text { r. } 5.2 \text {, b. } 7.5 \text {, bs. } 3.8 \\ & \text { h. } 8.9, \text { r. } 6.1, \text { b. } 8, \text { bs. } 4.1 \end{aligned}$ | Uch Tepe. pl.73:10 <br> Khafageh. pl.98:eB576-220 |
| 67 |  | 22 | $=\quad=\quad=$ | $=$ | $==^{=}=$ | h.8.2, r.6.8, b.8.5 | Abu salabikh. Iraq 39, fig.8:21 Khafajeh. pl. 103:755-520 |
| 68 | 91616 | 43 | $=\quad=\quad=$ | $=$ |  | h.8, r.5.4, b.8.3 | Uch Tepe. pl.74:2B \& D <br> Khafajeh. pl.103:AB545-540 |
| 69 |  | 62 | $=\quad=\quad=$ | Two | Sq.SE, Rm9, in fill |  | Gubba. fig.19:4; Uch Tepe. pl.74:4 Khafajeh. pl.98:KB184-220C |
| 70 |  | 64 | $=\quad=\quad=\quad$, broken \& mended | Tw | Sq.5D, courtyard 10, in fill | h.6.4, r.5.5, b.6.9 | Khafajeh. pl. 103:CB655-520 |
| 71 |  | 18 | $=\quad=\quad=$ | Three | Sq.6D, Rm4, on floor | h.8.4, r.3.8, b.8.5, bs. 4 | $\begin{aligned} & =\text { pl.98:bD-545-220c; Uch } \\ & \text { Tepe. pl. } 73: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| 72 |  | 45 | Red C. pr. small jar | = | Sq.6E, Rm.4, in fill | h.9.5 b.8.8,bs. 3.5 | Тере. pl.73:10 |
| 73 |  | 99 100 | $=\quad=\quad=$ | Four | Sq.6F, Rm.6, on floor | h. 8.5, r.3.6, b. 6.6 , bs. 3.6 |  |
| 75 | 91629 | 119 | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{=} \\ & \text { Buff } \mathrm{c}\end{aligned}=$ | Two | $=\stackrel{=}{=}=$ | h.7.9, r.2.6, b.6, bs. 2.2 | Khafajeh.pl.98: bB545-220C |
| $\begin{aligned} & 76 \\ & 77 \end{aligned}$ |  | 132 | Redc. $=$ | Four | Sq.SE, Rm.9, on floor | h.9.5, r.5.2, b. 8.2 , bs. 4.2 | Abu Salabikh. Iraq 39, fig.8:23 |
|  |  | 21 | Red c. small fruit stand, parts missing | Three | Sq.6E, Rm.4, on floor | h.9, r.3.2, b.7.5, bs.3.5 <br> h. 11.5, body: upper dia. 11 | hafajeh pl.174:C363-810 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | middle dia. 4 | Abu Salabikh. Iraq 39, fig.5: 12 ; |
| 78 | 91619 | 48 | Red c. Large fruit stand, mended | $=$ |  | h 22.8 body: lower dia 12 | Iraq 44, fig.4:15 |
|  |  |  | Red c. Large fruit stand, mended | $=$ | Sqs.6D,E, Rm.4, | h.22.8, body: upper dia. 23 middle dia. 7 | Khafajeh. pl.174:C364-810 |
| 79 | 91627 | 80 | $=\quad=\quad=$ |  |  | lower dia. 20 |  |
|  |  |  | $=-=$ | Two | Sq.5D, Rm.10, on floor | h. 23 , body: upper dia. 26 middle dia.7.5 | Gubba. fig.21:1 <br> Abu Salabikh. Iraq 38, fig.7:5 |
| 80 |  | 11 | $=\quad=\quad=$ |  |  | lower dia. 24.8 |  |
| 80 |  | 1 | = $=$ = = | Two | Sq.5E, Rm.9, on floor | h.24.8, body: upper dia. 23.5 | Khafajeh. pl.174:C365-810 |


| No. | IM No. | Ex.No. | Description | Unit | Location | Measearments cm | Comparative Pottery Types |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 81 |  | 3 | Buff c. chariot wheel | Three | Sq. 6 D , Courtyard 7, in fill | dia.6.4, th.3.3, dia. hl. 0.4 |  |
| 82 | 91603 | 6 | $=\quad=$ | $=$ | Sq.6D, Rm.3, on floor | dia.6.7, th.3.4, dia. hl. 0.4 |  |
| 83 |  | 8 | Red c. $=$ | = | $====$ | dia.6.4, th.3.2, dia. hl 0.3 |  |
| 84 |  | 9 | $=\quad=$ | = | $=-=-$ | dia.6.9, th.3.2, dia. hl. 0.4 |  |
| 85 |  | 68 | Buff c. $=$ | $=$ | Sq.6E, Rm.4, in fill | dia, 7.1, th. 2.6, dia. hl.0.3 |  |
| 86 |  | 70 | $=\quad=$ | = | $====$ | dia.4.1, th.2.3, dia. hl.0.3 |  |
| 87 |  | 83 | $=\quad=$ | Two | Sq. SD, Rm.8, in fill | dia.5.9, th.2.7, dia. hl. 0.4 |  |
| 88 |  | 84 | $\operatorname{Red} \mathrm{c}$ = $=$ | = | $====$ | dia.4.4, th. 2, dia. hl 0.4 |  |
| 89 |  | 109 | $=\quad=\quad=$ | Four | Sq. SE, Rm.9, in fill | dia.5.6, th.2.8, dia. hl.0.5 |  |
| 90 |  | 193 | Red c. round small jar, broken \& repaired | Two | Sq. SF, Rm.6, in fill | h.9.4, r.3.5, b.8, bs. 4.5 |  |
| 91 |  | 194 | $=\quad=\quad=$ | $=$ | $====$ | h.9, r.8, b. 10, bs. 4 |  |
| 92 |  | 196 | Buff c. oval $=$ | One | Sq. 5C, Rm. 16, in fill | h. 8.5, r.3, b.6.6, bs. 4.1 |  |
| 93 | 87938 | 205 | $=\mathrm{pr} .=$ | Four | Sq. 5 F , in fill | h. 10.5, r.3.4, b.8.6, bs. 4.8 |  |
| 94 |  | 206 | $=\quad=\quad=$, broken \& repaired | One | Sq. 5C, Rm. 17, in fill | h.8.6, r.3.1, b. 7.9 | Uch Tepe. pl.73:14; Madhhour. Sumer 43, fig.12:8 |
| 95 |  | 211 | $=\quad=\quad=$ | Two | Sq. 5D, Rm.8, in fill | h. $11.5, \mathrm{r} .4, \mathrm{~b} .9 .8$, bs. 5.2 |  |
| 96 | 87945 | 219 | Redc. $===$ | One | Sq. SC, Rm. 17 , in fill | h. 9.9, r. 8, b. 10.5 , bs. 4.1 | Abq'a. Sumer 38, p. 47 , fig. 12 |
| 97 |  | 229 | Buff c $==$ | Four | Sq. 5F, floor of courtyard | h.9.8, r.3.6, b.8.7, bs. 3.7 |  |
| 98 |  | 242 | Redc. $===$ | $=$ | $==$ | h. 10.2 , r.10, b. 12.4 , bs. 4.5 |  |
| 99 | 87954 | 243 | $=\quad=\quad=$ | $=$ | $=\sim=$ | h.9.9, r. 2.9, b. 8.4 , bs 3.9 |  |
| 100 |  | 285 | Buff c. $===$ | Six | Sq. $8 \mathrm{G}, \mathrm{Rm} .9$, in fill | h.9, r.8, b. 9, bs. 5 | Abu Salabikh. Iraq 38, fig.8:23; Abq'a. Sumer 38, p.47, fig. 12 |
| 101 |  | 312 | $=\quad=\quad=$ | Four | Sq.7F, Rm. 11, in fill | h. 10, r. 3.2 , b.8.6, bs 3.8 | Uch Tepe. pl.73:14 |
| 102 |  | 191 | Red c. semi-conical pot | $=$ | Sq.5E, Rm.6, in fill | h. 7.3 , r.11.5, bs. 3.2 | Asmar. pl.148:B63-200d; Gubba. fig. 19:7 |
| 103 04 |  | 192 208 | $=\quad=\quad=$ $=\quad=\quad=$ | $=$ | $=\sim=-$ | h.6.4, r. 11.2, bs. 4.3 | Asmar. pl.148:B63-200d; <br> Madhhour. Sumer 43, fig. 14:1 |
| 104 | 87939 117274 | 208 | $=\quad=\quad=$ | = | $=-==$ | h.7.2, r.12.5, bs. 4.6 | Khafajeh. pl.146:B001-200A |
| 105 | 117274 | 209 | $=\quad=\quad=$ broken \& repaired | Two | Sq. 5D, Rm. 10, in fill | h.7.7, r. 18.1 , bs. 5.4 | Khafajeh. pl.96:EB82-200 |
| 106 |  | 212 | Buff c. $==$ | $=$ | $=-=8=$ | h.6.5, r. 14.6, bs. 4.7 | Khafajeh. pl.96:AB002-200A; Uch Tepe. pl.61:1 |
| 107 |  | 230 | Red c. $====$ | One | Sq.5C, Rm. 17, in fill | h.6.5, r. 12.6, bs.4.1 | Asmar. pl.146: B032-200 |
| 108 |  | 238 | $=$ = $=$ = | Two | Sq. SF, in fill | h.8.3, r. 15.7, bs. 5.4 | Khafajeh. pl.146:B002-220A |
| 109 |  | 268 | Buff c $===$ | Five | Sq. $7 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{Rm}$. 1, on lloor | h.8.1, r.15, bs.4.2 | Asmar. pl. 146:B001-200A |
| 110 |  | 270 | Red c. $====$ | $=$ | $====$ | h.7.7, r.15, bs. 4.5 | Asmar. pl. 146: B002-200A |


| No. | IM No. | Ex.No. | Description |  | Unit | Location | Measearments cm | Comparative Pottery Types |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 111 |  | 272 | = $\quad=\quad=$ |  | $=$ | $= \pm$ = | h.8.5, r. 15, bs. 4 | Sippar. Al-Jadir: Excavations at Sippar. In, Researches in the Gubba. Fig.20:2 |
| 112 | 117272 | 273 | Buff c. $===$ | $=$ | $=$ | $= \pm==$ | h. 6.5 , r. 14.4 , bs. 5 | Asmar. pl.146:B032-200d |
| 113 |  | 281 | Redc. $===$ | $=$ | Six | Sq. $8 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{Rm} .6$, on tloor | h. 8, r. 1.4 .8 , bs 4 | Abu Salabikh. Iraq 38, fig.8:12; Gubba. fig.20:2; Uch Tepe. pl.61:8 |
| 114 | 117270 | 223 | Buff c. $=\quad=\quad=$ | $=$ | One | Sq.6C, Rm. 16 , in fill | h. 7.5, r. 16.4, bs. 5.4 | Khafajeh. pl. 146:b032-200A ; <br> Gubba. fig. 19:9 |
| 115 |  | 251 | $=\quad=\quad=$ |  | Six | Sq. $8 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{Rm} .6$, on floor | h.8.3, r.17, bs. 4.6 | Asmar. pl.146:B32-200b |
| 116 |  | 252 | $=\quad=$ | $=$ | Four | Sq.7F, Rm.11, in fill | h.8.5, r.16.5. bs. 5 | Asmar. pl.148:B63-200b |
| 117 |  | 267 | Red c. $===$ | $\pm$ | $=$ | $====$ | h.7.6, r.16.2, bs. 3.4 | Asmar. pl.146:B32-200A; Ur. Exc. II, pl.251:4A, \%A \& B |
| 118 |  | 269 | $=\quad=\quad=$ |  | $=$ | Sq. $7 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{Rm} .10$, on floor | h.6, r. 13.8, bs. 5 | Khafajeh. pl.146:B002-220A |
| 119 |  | 271 | Buff c. $=\quad=\quad=$ | $=$ | $=$ | $====$ | h. 7.5, r. 16.7 , bs. 4.2 | Khafajeh. pl.146:B002-220A; |
| 120 |  | 303 |  | $=$ | $=$ | $=\sim==$ | $\text { h. } 5.4, \text { r. } 16, \text { bs } 4.8$ | Madhhour. Sumer 43, fig. 14:5 |
| 121 |  | 308 | $=\quad=\quad=$ |  |  | $====$, in fill | h.9.5, r.16, bs. 5.7 |  |
| 122 |  | 313 | $=\quad=\quad=\quad=$ |  | $=$ | $=\sim==\quad=$ | h. 8, r. 12, bs. 5 | Khafajeh. pl.148:B84-210 |
| 123 |  | 314 | $=\quad=\quad=\quad=$ |  | $=$ | $=\sim=\sim$ | h.8, r. 10 , bs. 4.5 | $=$ pl.149:B83-210A |
| 124 |  | 315 | $=\quad=\quad=$ |  | = | $=\sim=\sim=$ | h. 7.5 , r. 9.7 , bs. 4.4 | $=$ pl.149:B83-210C |
| 125 | 87986 | 363 | Red. $\mathrm{C}=\quad=\quad=$ |  | South trench | Sq. 12 Q , in fill | h. 11.5, r. 30 |  |
| 134 |  | 71 | Buff c. $=\quad=$ |  | One | Sq.6D, Rm. 1 , in fill | h.8.5, r. 16, bs. 4.5 | Uch Tepe. pl.61:3 |
| 145 | 87950 | 235 | $=$ pr. large spouted jar. |  | Four | Sq. $5 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{Rm} .12$, in fill | h. 29.5, r. 12.4 , bs. 12 | Asmar. pl.180:C526-262C |
| 147 | 87966 | 288 | $=$ round medium spouted jar |  | Six | Sq.8G, Rm. 8, on floor | h. 17.5 , r. 10, b. 11.8, bs. 3.2 | Abq'a. Sumer 38, p.45, fig. 6 |
| 148 149 |  | 23 55 | $=\text { long }==$ |  | Two | Sq.6D, Rm.2, in fill | h. 18.3 , r.11, b. 14.2 , bs. 5.8 | Khafajeh. pl.180:C526-262b; <br> Uch Tepe. pl.99:5; <br> Asmar. pl.C526-362b |
| 149 |  | 55 | $=\quad=\quad=$ |  | Three | Sq.6E, Rm.4, in fill | h. 24.5 , r. 11.5 , b. 13.8 , bs 6.5 | Uch Tepe. pl.89:5 |

Early Dynastic III Pottery from Level III

| No. | IM No. | Ex.No. | Description | Unit | Location | Measearments cm | Comparative Pottery Types |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 126 |  | 33 | Red c. semi-conical pot, broken \& repait]red | MB | Sq.6E, Rm. 1, on floor | h. 7.9, r. 17.3 , bs 4 | Asmar. pl. 146:B32-200A |
| 127 |  | 34 | $=\quad=\quad=\quad=$ |  | $====$ | h.8, r.16.3, bs 4.2 |  |
| 128 |  | 35 | $=\mathrm{=}$ = = | $=$ | $==$ = $=$ | h. 10.2, r.18.5, bs. 5 | Gubba. fig.20:2 |
| 129 |  | 36 | $=\quad=\quad=$ | $=$ | $==$ = $=$ | h. 7.8, r. 16.5, bs. 4 |  |
| 130 |  | 37 | = | $=$ | = $=$ | h.7.7, r.17, bs. 5.5 | Asmar. pl.146:B003-200d; Abu Salabikh. Iraq 39, fig.5:9 |
| 131 |  | 38 | $=\quad=$ | $=$ | $=\sim=\sim=$ | h.8, r.16.8, bs.4.6 |  |
| 132 |  | 39 | Buff c. $===$ | Two | Sq.6D, Rm.16, in fill | h.8.4, r.15.8, bs 4 | Abu Salabikh. Iraq 39, fig.8: 12 |
| 133 |  | 40 | $=\quad=\quad=\quad=$ | $=$ | $===$ | $\text { h.7.5, ,.16, bs. } 4.5$ |  |
| 135 |  | 72 | Red c. $===$, traces of fire | MB | $=-2$ on floor | h.8.5,r.16, bs.4.5 |  |
| 136 |  | 73 | Buff c. $===$ broken \& repaired | Two | Sq. 5D, Courtyard 18, in fill | h.8.1, r.15.3, bs. 4 | Uch Tepe. pl.61:3 |
| 137 |  | 74 | $=\quad=\quad=\quad=$ | $=$ | $==\quad=\quad=$ | h.9.9, r.13.8, bs. 3.7 | Khafajeh. pl.146:8003-700 |
| 138 |  | 75 | Red C $====$ | = | $=-\quad=\quad=$ | h.8.3, r.14.3, bs. 4 | Madhhour. Sumer 43, fig. 14:31; Abu Salabikh. Iraq 39, fig.5:1 |
| 139 |  | 76 | $=\quad=$ | MB | Sq. 6E, Rm.6, on floor | h.7.5, r.14.4, bs.4.5 |  |
| 140 |  | 77 | $===\quad=\quad=\quad=$ | Two | Sq. 5E, Rm.7, in fill | $\text { h. } 6.8 \text {, r. } 6.6 \text {, bs. } 5.6$ | Asmar. pl. 146: B001-200A |
| 141 |  | 78 | $=\mathrm{=}$ = $=$ | One | Sq. 5 C , courtyard 16 , in fill | $\text { h. } 10, \text { r. } 14.4 \text {, bs. } 4.4$ | Khafajeh. pl.146: B003-700; Gubba. fig.20:2; Uch Tepe. pl.63:7; Abu Salabikh. Iraq 39, fig. 39:5 |
| 142 |  | 189 | Red c. long, spouted large jar | Two | Sq. 5D, Rm.15, on floor | h.30, r.11, b. 18.5, bs. 8.3 | Khafajeh. pl. 180:C526-262b |
| 143 | 91666 | 199 | Buff c. pr. medium spouted jar | $=$ | Sq.5D,courtyard 15, on floor | h. 15.6 , r. 9.9, b. 18.5 , bs. 5.2 | Madhhour. Sumer 43, fig. $12: 5$ |
| 144 | 91667 | 200 | $=\quad=\quad=$ | B | $==\quad=\quad=$ | h. 19, r. 10.3, b. 14.6, bs 5.4 |  |
| 146 |  | 255 | $=$ oval $=$ | MB | Sq.7F, Rm. 23, on floor | h.24.8, r.9.5, b.12.8, bs. 6.8 | Khafajeh. pl.90:d,C526-362b |
| 147 | 87966 | 288 | $=$ round | Six | Sq.8G, Rm.8, on floor | h.17.5, r.10, b.11.8, bs. 3.2 | Abq'a. Sumer 38, p.45, fig. 6 |
| 150 |  | 57 | Redc.oval $===$ | MB | Sq.6D, Rm.1, on floor | h. 24.5 , r. 10.5, b. 16.5 , bs. 8.7 | Khafajeh. pl.180:C562-362b Ur. Ur Exc.II, Type 253 |
| 151 |  | 58 | $=\quad=$ | $=$ | = | h. 23, r.10.7, b. 13.8, bs. 7.5 | Abu Salbikh. Iraq 38, fig.7:8 |
| 152 |  | 59 | $=$ long $=$ = | $=$ | $=\sim=-$ | h.22, r.10, b. 12.3, bs. 7.8 | Abu Salbikh. Iraq 38, fig.7:8 Iraq 39, Fig.5:8 |
| 153 |  | 94 | Buff c. $=\quad=\quad=$ | Two | Sq.6E, Rm.6, in fill | h. 23, r.9.5, b. 15.2 , bs. 7.4 | Khafajeh. pl.90:eC527-362 |
| 154 |  | 114 | Red c. conical small spouted jar | Two | Sq.5E, Rm.17, in fill | h.17.5, r.9.7, b. 13 , bs. 5.4 |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 155 \\ = \end{gathered}$ | Sq.5D, Rm. 16, in fill | $\begin{aligned} & 167 \\ & \text { h.23.3, } .10 .5, \text { b. } 14, \text { bs. } 6.7 \end{aligned}$ | Buff c. long medium spouted jar Khafajeh. pl.90:eC527-362 |
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