

Kurigalzu I's stamped bricks from Ur MSKH Q.2.33-34

Ignacio Márquez Rowe – ILC, CSIC (Madrid)

*En record de Miquel Civil,
que m'inicià a la UB en la recerca assiriològica*

1. The stamped brick fragment presented here is housed in the Gabinete de Antigüedades of the Real Academia de la Historia in Madrid with the accession number 2013/4.¹ It had been a part of a private collection in Madrid before it was gifted in the late 1980s to another private collector who in turn decided to donate it to the Cabinet a decade ago. The fragment measures $8.3 \times 6 \times 5.1$ cm, and the stamp on the face of the brick with cuneiform writing measures 4.7×5.1 cm. Although the provenience and acquisition details are unrecorded, the piece, which shows a heavily worn surface, stems in all likelihood from Ur. It preserves the end of the last three lines of a stamped Sumerian inscription recording restoration work by Kurigalzu I on the Ekišnuġal for Nanna, a building inscription exclusively attested on bricks found at Tell al-Muqayyar, namely MSKH Q.2.33-34.²

2. Nine bricks and fragments MSKH Q.2.33-34 were known so far, six kept in the University of Pennsylvania Museum and three in the British Museum. Perhaps other copies, unpublished, are housed in the Iraq Museum as a result of the agreement of the tripartite division of finds from Ur among Baghdad, London and Philadelphia at the time of the joint archaeological expedition led by Sir Leonard Woolley, when the bricks were excavated.

3. Before museums embraced the digital era over the past decades the only published image of MSKH Q.2.33-34 was a photograph of the stamped face of an otherwise unspecified brick in *The Museum Journal* 16, no. 4 (December, 1925), p. 305. The photographed item can now be safely identified with CBS 15330 in the Philadelphia collections.³ It was very probably on the basis of this well-preserved brick from the Penn Museum that the composite text edition of MSKH Q.2.33-34

1. For the kind permission to study and publish the fragment, I wish to express my sincere thanks to Prof. Luis Alberto de Cuenca y Prado, Academic, who drew my attention to it, and Prof. Martín Almagro Gorbea, Academic and Keeper of the Cabinet of Antiquities.

2. The abbreviations used in this note follow https://cdli.ox.ac.uk/wiki/abbreviations_for_assyriology.

3. Joshua Jeffers and Jon Taylor kindly provided me with photographs of bricks kept in the Penn Museum and the British Museum, respectively. My sincere gratitude to both of them. Images of the stamped faces of all six bricks in the Penn Museum are available online in www.penn.museum/collections (and also in cdli.ucla.edu). Of the three pieces in the British Museum, one (BM 13709) could not be reidentified (cf. also the online catalogue www.britishmuseum.org/collection).

was done and eventually published in 1928 in the first volume of the *Ur Excavations Texts* series (*Royal Inscriptions*). Drawings of the two slightly different cuneiform texts stamped on the edge and the face of the brick are there reproduced on plate XXXVII under the same no. 155, and on page 48 one can find the transliteration of both Sumerian texts as well as their English combined translation.

4. Presumably because the *editio princeps* in UET I assigned the same publication number, viz. no. 155, to the “several copies” then divided among the different museums,⁴ John A. Brinkman assumed in his 1976 eminent catalogue of cuneiform sources pertaining to specific monarchs of the Kassite dynasty that all the extant bricks, the number of which was unspecified, were duplicates and therefore bore identical inscriptions.⁵ MSKH Q.2.33-34 were thus defined as “bricks from Ur bearing on their side a stamped nine-line Sumerian building inscription (Q.2.33) and on their face a slightly different stamped ten-line Sumerian building inscription (Q.2.34) recording restoration work by [Kurigalzu] on the Ekišnugal for Nanna”. Brinkman’s description has been uncritically adopted to this day,⁶ despite the fact, known since 1985, that not all the bricks were stamped with the same text or in the same manner.

5. The cuneiform bricks and fragments in the British Museum and the Penn Museum were catalogued in 1981 and 1985, respectively. As indicated by the title of his book, *Cuneiform brick inscriptions in the British Museum, the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, the City of Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery, the City of Bristol Museum and Art Gallery*,⁷ Christopher B. F. Walker concentrated on the cuneiform texts rather than the artefacts themselves. Brinkman’s Q.2.33 and Q.2.34 thus became Walker’s CBI no. 66 (Kurigalzu no. 33) and no. 67 (Kurigalzu no. 34), respectively; and as a result, the three bricks from Ur in the British Museum bearing the inscriptions under discussion, viz. BM 137409, BM 137410 and BM 137411, all of them fragmentary and in a poor state of preservation,⁸ appear listed twice under both the nine-line and the ten-line Sumerian texts stamped on their edge and face.⁹

6. Hermann Behrens, in turn, titled his own catalogue “Die Backsteine mit Keilinschriften im University Museum”,¹⁰ and indeed, here, each brick has its own entry. Nevertheless, admittedly following Walker’s publication, all bricks are listed and grouped according to the cuneiform text they bear. The six bricks from Ur in the Penn Museum bearing the stamped Sumerian texts under discussion accordingly appear under nos. 43 and 44 which correspond to “Kurigalzu 33 (Walker Brick Inscriptions Nr. 66)” and “Kurigalzu 34 (Walker Brick Inscriptions Nr. 67)”, respectively.¹¹ Bricks CBS 15330 and CBS 16477 are registered under no. 43 (viz. A and B), and CBS 15342,

4. See UET I, p. xvii.

5. See MSKH, p. 217; cf. also the earlier catalogue studies by Faisal El-Wailly, “Synopsis of royal sources of the Kassite period”, *Sumer* 10 (1954) 46, and Kurt Jaritz, “Quellen zur Geschichte der Kaššû-Dynastie”, *MIO* 6 (1958) 233.

6. See, for example, Alexa Bartelmus, “Restoring the past. A historical analysis of the royal temple building inscriptions from the Kassite period”, *Kaskal* 7 (2010) 156 n. 72.

7. London 1981.

8. See note 3 above.

9. According to Walker (*Cuneiform brick inscriptions*, p. 60), BM 137409, which has Q.2.34 on the face, has a completely illegible inscription stamped on the edge. The same holds true, one should add, for BM 137410.

10. *JCS* 37 (1985) 229-248.

11. *JCS* 37 (1985) 238.

CBS 16553b, UM 35-1-392 and UM 35-1-398 under no. 44 (viz. A, B, C and D). The combined classification used by Behrens possibly accounts for the fact that CBS 15330 which has Q.2.33 stamped on its face and Q.2.34 on its edge is listed under no. 43 but is inconsistently missing under no. 44. Among other inaccuracies or mistakes in the catalogue, one should mention that UM 35-1-398 does not bear any stamped inscription on the edge; that CBS 16553b is not a fragment but an almost fully preserved half-square brick (see below) stamped with Q.2.34 on its face and with no inscription on the edge; or that CBS 16477 bears Q.2.33 on its face.¹²

7. As these last examples show, the evidence from the Penn Museum clearly invalidates the long-held assumption that the inscription Q.2.33 is stamped on the edge of bricks which have Q.2.34 on the face, or, conversely, that the inscription Q.2.34 is stamped on the face of bricks which have Q.2.33 on the edge.¹³

8. There is some confusion too regarding the find-place of bricks MSKH Q.2.33-34. Brinkman wrote that they were “found in the gateway providing access to room 1 of the ‘E-mu-ri-a-na-ba-ag’ from the southeast”. His statement is based on what was recorded in UET I. There, in the Table of the inscriptions, on p. xvii, the “several copies” of no. 155 are reported to come “from the gateway across court beside E-nun-makh” with reference to Woolley’s preliminary account of his work shortly back from Ur in 1925.¹⁴ The reference in *AJ* 5, namely on p. 390, makes no mention of stamped bricks but describes the discovery of a gateway, remodeled by Kurigalzu, that gave access to the rooms and courts lying between Edublamah and Enunmah (viz. TTB 27a, 27, 33, 34, 35). Woolley’s full report and interpretation of these Kassite architectural ruins would only appear forty years later, posthumously, in UE VIII.¹⁵ Here he put forward his conclusion that the complex of rooms and courts facing the SE wall of Enunmah (he renumbered as Rooms 1 to 5)¹⁶ had been newly built by Kurigalzu and formed a separate building, namely a temple he then called Emurianabag for want of a better name. As he himself expressly pointed out, the inscriptions of Kurigalzu found in this building, identified as UET 1 152 and UET I 155, did not throw any light on the true name of the shrine since they only provide the generic name Ekišnuġal, a name also found in his inscriptions from other buildings.¹⁷

12. Note furthermore that Behrens quoted indistinctively “Q.2.33-34” for both “Kurigalzu 33” and “Kurigalzu 34”, and that he did not identify CBS 15330 as the brick photographed in *MJ* 16, p. 305 (although he did identify other photographs of Penn Museum bricks in the same article, such as bricks CBS 15339 [no. 16 B] and CBS 15332 [no. 33 A] on pages 302 and 303, respectively).

13. As stated, for example, in Walker’s *Cuneiform brick inscriptions*, p. 60. Strangely enough, studies such as Tim Clayden’s “Kurigalzu I and the restoration of Babylonia” published in *Iraq* 58 (1996) 109-121, esp. 119 n. 60, or Bartelmus’ article in *Kaskal* 7 (2010) mentioned above (note 6), specially p. 156 n. 72, omit any reference to the bricks kept in the Penn Museum catalogued by Behrens. The omission of this essential evidence possibly explains why the inaccuracies or mistakes present in the *editio princeps* have been reproduced until this day.

14. C. L. Woolley, “The Excavations at Ur, 1924-1925”, *AJ* 5 (1925) 390.

15. UET VIII, pp. 5-8, with plans on pls. 47-48, and photographs on pls. 1-3.

16. TTB 27a = Room 1, TTB TTB 27 = Room 2, TTB 33 = Room 3, TTB 34 = Room 5, and TTB 35 = Room 4; one should accordingly correct the concordance of room numbers in Aaron Schmitt’s “Hidden under the floors. The inventories and archives of the Ganunmah at Ur from the third to the first millennium BC”, in J. M. Evans and E. Rossberger (eds.), *Ancient Near Eastern Temple Inventories in the Third and Second Millennia BCE: Integrating Archaeological, Textual, and Visual Sources*, München 2019, fig. 7 p. 87.

17. UE VIII, p. 6. Apart from Kurigalzu’s stone door-socket (UET I 152) and stamped bricks (UET I 155), other inscribed objects were found on this site, namely re-used stamped bricks of Ur-Namma (UET I 40) and clay tablets and

9. Because ‘Emurianabag’ has been so far identified as the find-place of MSKH Q.2.33-34, it may be as well to add a brief note on the name and nature of this putative Kassite temple at Ur. The use of quotation marks introduced by Brinkman, and presently followed, is meant to indicate that ‘Emurianabag’ is in all likelihood a misnomer.¹⁸ It is important to emphasize here that, as already mentioned, such an unproved designation was acknowledged by Woolley himself. “It is true —he wrote in his main report— that we found re-used in the Kassite building a door-socket of Šu-Suen [UET I 80] which originally belonged to a temple called E-mu-ri-a-na-ba-ag and that we have on the strength of that discovery assigned the name to this particular site; but it is *impossible* to say whence the stone was brought, and it seems *quite certain* that the site was unoccupied until the time of Kuri-galzu. Whether the building erected by him *really* possessed this name, taken from some other building in the neighbourhood, now destroyed and replaced by the new construction, again *we do not know*, for the Kuri-galzu inscriptions [UET I 152 and UET I 155] throw no light on the question”.¹⁹ Nevertheless, it is also true that Woolley went astray in his popular book *Excavations at Ur, A record of twelve years’ work* published in 1954, when he attributed to Kurigalzu the naming of the shrine ‘Emurianabag’.²⁰ Roger Moorey, in revising and updating Woolley’s classic, sensibly edited out the whole passage, well aware of the mistake and problem.²¹ Brinkman’s criticism, however, did not only challenge the correctness of the temple’s designation, but also questioned Woolley’s reconstruction of the building proper. Rather than a separate shrine, he posited that the building could very well be an extension of, or an annex to, the Enunmah.²² Likewise, Ernst Heinrich concluded after reviewing in detail the architectural evidence that the Kassite building could have hardly been a temple and suggested in turn that its function must have rather been to provide access to the courtyard of the ziggurat complex.²³ Both Brinkman’s and Heinrich’s re-evaluations have been followed since,²⁴ but it is worth noting that, again, Woolley himself realized and wrote that at first sight the building might have been no more than an enlargement of Enunmah; nevertheless, a number of features, importantly including the characteristic buttressed façade (the upper part of which is visible in Woolley’s restoration of the courtyard of Kassite Edublamah)²⁵, made him believe that the complex of rooms and courts he had

fragments (U. 117 and U. 118), see UE VIII pp. 7 and 8 respectively (for the cuneiform tablets, which still remain unidentified and unpublished, see UE VIII, p. 101, and also Schmitt, “Hidden under the floors”, pp. 93 and 95). Apart too from UET I 152 and UET I 155 found in ‘Emurianabag’, three other inscriptions of Kurigalzu give the generic name Ekišnuḡal, namely UET I 153 (MSKH Q.2.55) found in the Nanna Court area, UET I 154 (MSKH Q.2.54) found in the Enunmah, and UET I 161 (MSKH Q.2.32) found loose at the site (see Brinkman “Ur: ‘The Kassite period and the period of the Assyrian kings’”, *Or* 38 [1969] 316 n. 4; *id.*, MSKH, pp. 217, 222; Clayden, “Ur in the Kassite Period”, in S. Paulus and T. Clayden [eds.], *Babylonia under the Sealand and Kassite Dynasties*, Boston/Berlin 2020, pp. 103, 106).

18. See Brinkman, *Or* 38 (1969) 316 n. 4, and *id.*, MSKH, p. 217 n. 27, p. 222 n. 35.

19. UE VIII, p. 6 (all italics are mine). For Emurianabag, or é.mu.ri.a.na.ba.AK, the sanctuary of Nanna rebuilt by Šu-Suen at Ur, see A. George’s, *House Most High. The Temples of Ancient Mesopotamia*, Winona Lake IN 1993, p. 128, no. 813.

20. *Excavations at Ur: A record of twelve years’ work*, London 1954, p. 205. One should note, though, that the book was written twenty years after the close of work at Ur when Woolley was already over seventy years old.

21. See Woolley, *Ur ‘of the Chaldees’*, London 1982, p. 220.

22. “Ur: ‘The Kassite period and the period of the Assyrian kings’”, *Or* 38 (1969) 316 n. 4.

23. *Die Tempel und Heiligtümer im alten Mesopotamien. Typologie, Morphologie und Geschichte*, Berlin 1982, pp. 211, 229-230, and figs. 306-307.

24. See Clayden, *Iraq* 58 (1996) 119 n. 59; P. A. Miglus, “Die Sakralarchitektur in Ur zur Kassitenzeit” in A. Bartelmus *et al.* (eds.), *Karduniaš. Babylonia under the Kassites*, vol. 2, Berlin / Boston 2017, p. 345.

25. UE VIII, pl. 51; the upper part of the putative temple can be seen in the background of the drawing, behind the NE wall of the court. This drawn restoration has been reproduced very often in books or chapters on ancient

brought to light in the 1924-25 campaign formed an independent, original sanctuary.²⁶ Woolley has had no followers: the most recent studies dealing with the temple complex of Nanna during the Kassite period make no mention whatsoever of ‘Emurianabag’ or of a shrine lying between Edublamah and Enunmah.²⁷

10. As mentioned above, there is some confusion regarding the find-place of bricks MSKH Q.2.33-34. The reason is that Brinkman based his assessment on UET I (1928), and his conclusion that they were “found in the gateway providing access to room 1 of the ‘E-mu-ri-a-na-ba-ag’ from the southeast” is not entirely correct. Although a number, unfortunately unspecified, of copies were indeed discovered there, other bricks stamped with the same text were also found elsewhere.²⁸ This is reported by Woolley himself, namely in his main publication of the works carried out on the ziggurat and its surroundings. There, in UE V (1939), he recorded that the stamped brick U. 3252, which is none other than CBS 16477, was found in the Kassite pavement of either Room 3 or Room 4 of the Ningal temple.²⁹ And another brick MSKH Q.2.33-34, with no indication of its excavation number, was reportedly “found loose in the rubbish in front of the stairway bastion” of the ziggurat.³⁰ Concerning the bricks MSKH Q.2.33-34 discovered in ‘Emurianabag’, no reference is given in UE VIII (or *AJ* 5, for that matter) as to where exactly or how they were found. Paradoxically enough, the most precise information is the one provided in UET I, p. xvii, restated by Brinkman. One should note, however, Clayden’s remark that bricks BM 137410 and BM 137411 were found loose.³¹ This information is unfortunately not secured by either citation or interpretation of evidence; and doubts are further complicated by the author’s statement in the previous line that stamped bricks MSKH Q.2.33-34, to which both BM copies belong, were found *in situ*.³²

11. The dimension of bricks MSKH Q.2.33-34 is also an aspect worth considering, mainly for two reasons. First, not all copies are of the same size, as one could readily and wrongly deduce

Mesopotamian art and architecture (see e.g. Heinrich’s *Die Tempel und Heiligtümer*, fig. 312, where Woolley’s dome of Edublamah is deleted on the basis that domes seem to be a much later architectural development).

26. UE VIII, p. 6.

27. R. L. Zettler and W. B. Hafford, “Ur. B. Archäologisch”, *RIA* 14 (2014-15), pp. 367-385, esp. 370-375; Clayden, “Ur in the Kassite Period”, pp. 102-109; or M. Gruber, “The topography of the temenos at Ur and its changes from the Third Dynasty to the Kassite period”, in K. Kaniuth *et al.* (eds.), *Übergangszeiten. Altorientalische Studien für Reinhard Dittman anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstags*, Münster 2018, p. 181, where he designates the site as “the building complex set between the Ziggurat Terrace and Enunmah”, eloquently characterized with a question mark in his plan or “schematic elevation model of the temenos” (fig. 6 p. 186).

28. One should therefore correct also the statement in Bartelmus, *Kaskal* 7 (2010) 161 n. 106.

29. UE V, p. 56. Cf. Clayden, “Ur in the Kassite Period”, p. 104. The brick, stamped on its face, shows traces of bitumen; so, also UM 35-1-392 (cf. the observations made by Woolley in this regard in UE V, p. 56).

30. UE V, p. 124. Cf. Clayden, “Ur in the Kassite Period”, p. 102 (one should correct the bibliographical references given there).

31. See *Iraq* 58 (1996) 119 n. 60. It may be noteworthy that Clayden omits to refer to the third copy in the BM, viz. BM 13709, which is precisely the one that remains today unidentified (see note 3 above).

32. Although no reference is made to the bricks found in the Ningal temple or near the stairwell of the ziggurat. On the other hand, the stamped bricks MSKH Q.2.32 are also listed among the objects found loose at the site (*Iraq* 58 [1996] 119 n. 60), following Brinkman’s description (MSKH p. 217), although they were reportedly found *in situ* according to UET I, p. xvii (ad no. 161). One should also note that in the previous footnote, *Iraq* 58 (1996) 119 n. 59, Clayden incorrectly attributes to Woolley the wrong identification of Ekišnuḡal with Emurianabag.

from the information given in UET I;³³ and second, not all examples therefore tally with what Woolley deemed was the standard, typical size of bricks used in Kurigalzu's work all over Ur. This is important because, as is well known, the standard size of bricks, viz. 0.32 m. square \times 0.08 m or 0.32 \times 0.16 \times 0.08 m, was one of the two criteria used by Woolley to date to the Kassite period the structures he excavated at Ur.³⁴ The only extant copy of MSKH Q.2.33-34 with the "typical" Kassite measurements is UM 35-1-398; UM 35-1-392, CBS 15330 and CBS 16477 measure 0.27-0.28 m. square \times 0.05-0.06 m, and CBS 16553b is 0.28 \times 0.14 \times 0.05 m.

12. The edition of the Sumerian texts stamped on bricks MSKH Q.2.33-34 exhibits serious mistakes and inconsistencies that do not seem to have been recognized since the publication of UET I. To begin with, and as indicated above, the designations 'face' and 'side' used so far to distinguish or identify, respectively, between Q.2.33 (nine-line) and Q.2.34 (ten-line) inscriptions are misleading and should be avoided. On the other hand, as pointed out by Behrens, CBS 16477 (the brick that was found in the pavement of the Ningal temple) attests to the existence of a different stamp of Kurigalzu's nine-line inscription (the variant text reads nita kala-ga instead of lugal kala-ga in line four), an important aspect that seems to have gone unnoticed in more recent studies. From collation of the photograph, there can be little doubt that this slightly variant text (one could term Q.2.33.2 following Brinkman's nomenclature) is also the one stamped on the edge of brick BM 137411.³⁵ Finally, and more importantly, Léon Legrain's copies of the cuneiform texts ('side' and 'face') in UET I are not correct, and neither are of course his transliterations, followed to this day.³⁶ This is indeed important because Legrain's (and Behren's and Walker's) misreading concerns the verbal form in the last line of the text: what is certainly written is hu-mu-un-gibil, not mu-un-gibil;³⁷ and as is now known, the use of the modal prefix is an almost unconditional indication that the text is to be dated to Kurigalzu I, not Kurigalzu II.³⁸

33. Of course, only bricks fully or almost fully preserved are relevant, viz. CBS 15330, CBS 16553b, CBS 16447, UM 35-1-392 and UM 35-1-398, all from the Penn Museum. Measurements of all of them are given by Behrens in his catalogue in *JCS* 37 (1985) 238. The measurements given in UET I, p. xvii, correspond to CBS 16553b, an unexpected choice since it is the only extant half-square brick (see below).

34. The other one being the technique employed in wall building; see UE VIII, p. 16 and 46, and Clayden, "Ur in the Kassite Period", p. 101. Interestingly, all fully preserved bricks with other inscriptions of Kurigalzu (viz. UET I 157-159, 161 and 163) have according to UET I, pp. xvii-xviii, the "typical" Kassite dimensions.

35. One should accordingly correct Walker's reading in *Cuneiform brick inscriptions*, p. 59. It is possible, though apparently unprovable given the bad state of preservation of the text, that the edge of brick BM 137410 was also stamped with this variant inscription.

36. As stated by Frederic G. Kenyon in the preface to UET I (p. v), although the general editing of the volume had been done by Gadd, Legrain was responsible for the texts from the seasons of 1924-1925 and 1925-1926 working on them "after his own copies". Legrain was indeed the field epigraphist during these campaigns (see also Woolley, *AJ* 5 [1925] 347, and now also D. Charpin, "Epigraphy of Ur: past, present, and future" in G. Frame *et al.* [eds.], *Ur in the twenty-first century CE. Proceedings of the 62nd Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Philadelphia, July 11-15, 2016*, University Park USA 2021, pp. 183-185).

37. The sign HU can be read in BM 137410 (face), BM 137411 (face), CBS 15330 (face and side), CBS 16477 (face), CBS 16533b (face), UM 35-1-392 (face) and UM 35-1-398 (face). As a matter of fact, Legrain's copy of UET I 155 (face) on plate XXXVII shows an aberrant MU at the beginning of line 10, indeed hinting at the presence a sign, viz. HU, before MU.

38. See Bartelmus, *Kaskal* 7 (2010) 157, with reference to Brinkman, MSKH, p. 65; for a discussion on the attribution of inscriptions to one or other king of the same name, see Brinkman, MSKH, pp. 205-207, and now specially Bartelmus, *Kaskal* 7 (2010) 151-168. Note that El-Wailly (*Sumer* 10 [1954] 46) and Jaritz (*MIO* 6 [1958] 233) attributed the texts differently: the former to Kurigalzu II and the latter to Kurigalzu I. Walker and Behrens followed Brinkman's

13. The three versions of what Woolley called “the normal” Ekišnuġal text of Kurigalzu,³⁹ viz. Kurigalzu I, follow in transliteration:⁴⁰

Q.2.33.1:

^dnanna / lugal-a-ni-ir / ^dku-ri-gal-zu / lugal kala-ga / lugal uri₅^{ki}-ma / lugal ki-en-gi ki-uri-ke₄ / e₂-kiš-nu-ġal / e₂-ki-aġ₂-a-ni / hu-mu-un-gibil

Q.2.33.2:

^dnanna / lugal-a-ni-ir / ^dku-ri-gal-zu / nita kala-ga / lugal uri₅^{ki}-ma / lugal ki-en-gi ki-uri-ke₄ / e₂-kiš-nu-ġal / e₂-ki-aġ₂-a-ni / hu-mu-un-gibil

Q.2.34:

^dnanna / lugal uri₂^{ki} / lugal-a-ni-ir / ^lku-ri-gal-zu / lugal kala-ga / lugal ki-en-gi uri / lugal an-ub-da limmu₂-bi / e₂-kiš-nu-ġal / e₂-ki-aġ₂-a-ni / hu-mu-un-gibil

14. The stamped text on the new brick fragment kept in the Gabinete de Antigüedades of the Real Academia de la Historia in Madrid preserves the end of the last three lines of Kurigalzu I's inscription:

... / [e₂-kiš-n]u-ġal / [e₂-ki-a]ġ₂-a-ni / [hu-mu-u]n-gibil

Although the text could therefore belong to any of the three versions, the size of the stamp suggests that in all likelihood the original text was Q.2.34.

cautious, undetermined attribution. One should also point out here that Clayden (*Iraq* 58 [1996] 118-119) did already argue for the attribution to Kurigalzu I of the reconstruction of many of the buildings of Ur, and particularly its religious complex, naturally including the Ekišnuġal; see also now Brinkman, “Babylonia under the Kassites: some aspects for consideration”, in A. Bartelmus and K. Sternitzke (eds.), *Karduniaš. Babylonia under the Kassites*, Boston/Berlin 2017, p. 23.

39. See UE V, p. 56.

40. One should note that most copies of MSKH Q.2.33-34 are presently rather badly preserved; so that the transliteration of Q.2.33.1, for example and in particular, is mainly based on Legrain's edition in UET I. Note that there are a number of typographical mistakes in Walker's transliterations (uri for uri₅ and uri₂ or ba for bi).



RAH 2013/4