

Sealand at the dawn of the Kassite era” in P. Lombard and Kh. Al-Sindi, eds. *Twenty Years of Bahrain Archaeology, 1986-2006*. Actes du colloque international de Manama, 9-12 décembre 2007. Ministry of Culture, Bahrain.

CHARPIN, D. 1986. *Le clergé d'Ur au siècle d'Hammurabi (XIXe - XVIIIe siècles av. J.-C.)*. HÉO 22. Genève, Paris.

ID. 2005. “Chroniques bibliographiques 5. Économie et société à Sippar et en Babylonie du nord à l'époque paléo-babylonienne” in RA 99: 133-176.

DALLEY, S. 2009. *Babylonian Tablets from The First Sealand Dynasty in the Schøyen Collection*. CUSAS 9. Bethesda.

FRAYNE, D.R. 1990. *Old Babylonian Period (2003-1595 BC)*. RIME 4. Toronto.

GABBAY, U. 2014. “A Balaḡ to Enlil from the First Sealand Dynasty” in ZA 104(2): 146-170.

GEORGE, A.R. 2007. “The civilizing of Ea-Enkidu: an unusual tablet of the Babylonian Gilgameš epic” in RA 101: 59-80.

ID. 2013. *Babylonian Divinatory Texts Chiefly in the Schøyen Collection*. CUSAS 18. Bethesda.

GRONEBERG, B. 1980. *Die Ort- und Gewässernamen der altbabylonischen Zeit*. RGTC 3. Wiesbaden.

HORSNELL, J.A. 1999. *The Year-Names of the First Dynasty of Babylon*. 2 vols. Toronto.

KRAUS, F.R. 1984. *Königliche Verfügungen in altbabylonischer Zeit*. SD XI. Leiden.

MOON, J. et al. 2015. *Ur Region Archaeology Project: Report 2015*. <www.urarchaeology.org>

NASHEF, K. 1982. *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der mittelbabylonischen und mittellassyrischen Zeit*. RGTC 5. Wiesbaden.

VAN SOLDT, W.H. 1994. *Letters in the British Museum. Part 2*. AbB XIII. Leiden.

VELDHUIS, N. 2008. “Old Babylonian Documents in the Hearst Museum of Anthropology, Berkeley” in RA 102: 49-70.

Odette BOIVIN, <odette.boivin@mail.utoronto.ca>, University of Toronto

98) A Fragment Of a Royal Building Inscription from the Kassite Period — The cuneiform fragment belongs to a Sumerian building inscription on clay brick dated to the Middle-Babylonian period, during the reign of the Kassite king Kurigalzu.

The brick was originally part of a private collection which was assembled after several trips to Palestine and other neighbouring countries and which belonged to Monsignor Salvatore Garofalo, an eminent scholar of biblical studies.¹⁾ Unfortunately, the present whereabouts of the brick is unknown, since it was lost immediately after the death of the owner.

The present study was made possible thanks to some photographs taken by Prof. G. Lacerenza (Università di Napoli “L’Orientale”) years ago, when the same Monsignor Garofalo entrusted him with the publication of its collection.²⁾ According to the heir of the late Monsignor Garofalo, the collection also included six further bricks and various cuneiform tablets.³⁾ Regrettably, I have not succeeded in finding any trace of these objects or their current location.

1. ^dEn-lil₂
2. lugal-kur-kur-ra
3. lugal-a-ni-ir
4. 'ku-ri'-gal-[zu]
5. 'šagina' [...]
- [...]

1. To Enlil
2. lord of the land
3. his lord
4. Kurigalzu
5. the general [...]
- [...]



The clay fragment is 8.3 cm in width and 5.5 cm in depth, while the length of the preserved section is 12.5 cm. Despite some minor damage on the top of the brick, it is reasonable to assume that no line is missing at the beginning, especially considering that the name of the addressee of the dedicatory

inscription, the god Enlil, appears in the first visible line. The edge of the right side is slightly cut, nonetheless, the overall width of the brick has not been much compromised. On the contrary, at least a few lines have been lost from the bottom, which is considerably damaged. Neither the building or the intended location of the brick are known. The inscription is ruled and was created by incision.

Considering the incipit of this inscription, which is abruptly interrupted at line 5, the best parallels known to me so far are BEHRENS 1985: 242 no. 68G from Ur, HILPRECHT 1893 no. 38 from Nippur, GRÉGOIRE 1981 no. 54⁴⁾ and a series of bricks kept in the British Museum, all from Dūr-Kurigalzu.

Both the bricks from Ur and the ones from Nippur record the building activities of Kurigalzu on the E-kur-igibara.

The brick from Ur arranges the inscriptions into nine lines, out of which only line 8 features two segments within the same spatial unit.⁶⁾ Similarly, the brick from Nippur also arranges the text into nine lines of which only line 8 is indented.

On the other hand, both Grégoire MVN 10 054 and the bricks from the British Museum commemorate Kurigalzu's activities in the E-u-gal in Dūr-Kurigalzu.

As regards all the inscribed bricks from Dūr-Kurigalzu related to the E-ugal, their texts are either stamped or inscribed and their *ductus* is fairly neat yet, on the whole, more archaising than that found on bricks from other locations or bricks that are linked to other temples.⁷⁾ However, despite these minor variations, which are, nevertheless, an important clue which helps to identify the various *ateliers* of production, the text is always arranged into eight lines, of which lines 5 and 6 are indented.

Although broken, line 5 in the Garofalo fragment is wider than the lines preceding it, and this was probably caused by the indentation of the line in question. It can be assumed, therefore, that the Garofalo fragment records the E-u-gal as the temple restored by Kurigalzu.

Kurigalzu mentioned in the fragment could be Kurigalzu I, the great builder and founder of Dūr-Kurigalzu, as has been proposed by Clayden and then by Veldhuis and Bartelmus, and in contrast to Grégoire's assumption that the king referred to was Kurigalzu II.⁸⁾

1) For a discussion on this collection see NIGRO 2008. For a more recent outline of S. Garofalo's profile see MOSETTO 2014: 140-147.

2) Later on, Prof. G. Lacerenza kindly provided me with the photographs through Prof. S. Graziani (Università di Napoli "L'Orientale"). I would like to thank them and Mr De Luca, heir of Monsignor Garofalo and former curator of the Reparto di Antichità Egizie e del Vicino Oriente of the Musei Vaticani, for having authorised the publication of the fragment.

3) Personal communication of Mr De Luca.

4) This brick belongs to the French private collection *de Serres* in Paris [GRÉGOIRE 1981: 13 and pl.16].

5) WALKER 1981: 60 BM 090022, BM 090028, BM 090045, BM 090046, BM 090049, BM 090051, BM 090052, BM 090057, BM 090339, BM 090583, BM 090818. For a detailed overview and discussion about the cuneiform royal sources from the Kassite period see BRINKMAN 1976.

6) Noteworthy, the brick HILPRECHT 1893 no. 081 from Nippur, which also records the king's activities in the E-igi-bara, features a more neat and archaising *ductus* and a disposition of the text into ten single lines.

7) See for instance the difference between the texts from Dūr-Kurigalzu and the ones from Ur and Nippur mentioned above or between BM 090051 and BM 090295, both from Dūr-Kurigalzu but addressed to different temples.

8) CLAYDEN 1996, VELDHUIS 2008, BARTELMUS 2010: 148-149 *contra* GRÉGOIRE 1981:15.

Bibliography

BARTELMUS, A. 2010, "Restoring the Past. A Historical Analysis of the Royal Temple Building Inscriptions from the Kassite Period", *Kaskal* 7: 143-171.

BEHRENS, H. 1985, "Die Backsteine mit Keilinschriften im University Museum", *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 37: 229-248.

BRINKMAN, J.A. 1976, *A Catalogue of Cuneiform Sources Pertaining to Specific Monarchs of the Kassite Dynasty* (Materials and Studies for Kassite History, Vol. I), Chicago.

CLAYDEN, T. 1996, "Kurigalzu I and the Restoration of Babylonia", *Iraq* 58: 109-121.

GRÉGOIRE, J.P. 1981, *Materiali per il Vocabolario Neo-Sumerico* vol. 10, Roma.

HILPRECHT, H. 1893, *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania* vol. 1 part 1, Philadelphia.

MOSETTO, F. 2014, “Garofalo Salvatore”, in R. Fabris, G. Ghiberti, E. Manicardi (a c.), *Al primo posto le Scritture. Bibliisti italiani del Novecento*, Salvatore Sciascia Editore, Caltanissetta – Roma: 140-147.

NIGRO, L. 2008, *Gerusalemme e la Palestina: uno sguardo tra Bibbia e Archeologia. La Terra Santa nelle fotografie di Monsignor Salvatore Garofalo*, Collana di Studi e Documentazione 2, Città del Vaticano.

VELDHUIS, N. 2008, “Kurigalzu’s Statue Inscription”, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 60: 25-51.

WALKER, C.F. 1981, *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*, London.

Noemi BORRELLI, <noemibrll@gmail.com>, NAPLES, ITALY

99) An inscribed bead with a votive inscription of Kadašman-Turgu (L-29-449)¹⁾ — The early excavations of the University of Pennsylvania (1889-1900) discovered a vast amount of inscribed objects from Kassite times.²⁾ The lapis lazuli bead L-29-449 was already included in Brinkman’s catalogue of Kassite inscriptions as L.2.7.³⁾ It contains a short votive inscription of which a translation is given here. To my knowledge it is the only documented Kassite object from the Ekur which John H. Haynes, excavator of Nippur from 1893-1900, recovered from a filling sealed by a pavement in the ziggurat courtyard. All the other inscribed lapis lazuli objects were found within constructions of the Parthian period in secondary context.⁴⁾

Haynes gives the following description of the object in his report of 7 December 1895 sent to Philadelphia:⁵⁾

“The ball or sphere of Lapis Lazuli is flattened at its two poles and perforated in the direction of its short diameter, which measures 1.2 centimeters. The average measurement of its greater diameter, measured at right angles to its lesser diameter or axis, is 2.5 centimeters. The flattened ball or sphere is not wholly symmetrical, though the lack of symmetry does not offend the eye. The inscription, as you will judge from the above pencil rubbing, passes entirely around the sphere in the line of its greatest circumference.”

The findspot of L-29-449 can be reconstructed in connection with the results of the 1948-50 excavations of the Joint Expedition.⁶⁾ It was found to the southeast of the “Enlil Temple” below a mudbrick pavement, which was laid as a continuation of the burnt brick pavement in *street 22*.⁷⁾ The date of the archaeological context can be narrowed down to a time span from about the late 12th century to the 11th century BC. The bead was probably donated for the statue of the goddess “Lady of Nippur”. A comparable object exists with the unpublished inscribed lapis lazuli bead UM L-29-448⁸⁾ in the same collection without known context. It was not included into Brinkman’s catalogue.

A pencil rubbing⁹⁾ of L-29-449 was sent to Philadelphia by J. H. Haynes with his report:



The Babylonian inscription¹⁰⁾ reads as follows:

ṛa-na^d NIN¹.EN.LÍL^{ki} be-el-ti-šu Ka-dáš-man-túr-gu i-qí-iš

ana^d Bēlet-Nibru^{ki} Bēlti-šu Kadašman-Turgu iqī-š

To^d Lady of Nippur, his lady, Kadašman-Turgu dedicated.

1) The author wants to thank Alex Pezzati (Senior Archivist, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA) for his assistance and permission to publish the rubbing of this inscription here.

2) CLAYDEN 2011: 1-56.

3) BRINKMAN 1976: 154, L.2.7.

4) Several votive objects from the Kassite period were found within the large mud bricks of “Parthian Phase II/III”. For the objects found in the so-called “Nippur Hoard” see CLAYDEN (2011b:1-56).

5) Haynes’ report of 7 December 1895 (NE 8/6), preserved in the archive of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

6) MCCOWN & HAINES 1967, 16-17. The findspot is further described with a summary of the archaeological evidence of the Ekur in Kassite times in SCHNEIDER *forthcoming*. In this paper I could exclude construction work of