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1. INTRODUCTION

In a recent study devoted to a strategic analysis of Assurbanipal’s eighth campaign, J.M. Córdoba sounded a justifiable note of caution regarding the identification of Madaktu\(^1\). One of the principal cities of Elam and a royal “Residenzstadt”, Madaktu was the subject of a general study in 1986 by Pierre de Miroschedji\(^2\). Recent scholarship suggests, however, that his identification of Madaktu with Tepe Patak has not received general acceptance by Assyriologists\(^3\). Nor has the collateral problem of identifying Badace, a toponym mentioned by Diodorus (XIX.19.1) in his account of the conflict between Antigonus and Eumenes in 317 B.C., with Madaktu and hence with Tepe Patak been accepted by Classicists and ancient historians\(^4\). The present study has therefore been written in the hope that some further clarification of the identification of Madaktu/Badace is possible provided the Assyrian and Greek sources are read judiciously and the geography of Susiana is kept clearly in mind.

2. MADAKTU = BADACE

Before proceeding to the actual documentation on the city of Madaktu I shall begin with a necessary digression. The strong probability that the Elamite city known in Assyrian sources as Madaktu (“ma-dak-teii”) is identical with the city known to Diodorus as Badace was apparently first voiced in 1882 by the French Assyriologist J. Oppert\(^5\). This was based

---


largely on the phonetic similarity of the two names but in my opinion there is an additional argument, obvious to Maximilian Streck but overlooked by most scholars subsequently, which adds weight to the identification of Badace with Madaktu. For the Assyrian letter ABL 281 clearly associates Madaktu with the river Ulaya, just as Diodorus says that Badace lay on the Eulaeus (see below). As the river known to the Assyrians as the Ulaya and to the author of the Book of Daniel as the Ulai is identical to the Eulaios/Eulaeus of Greek and Roman literature, this provides yet another circumstantial argument in favour of the equation Madaktu = Badace. As we shall see, if this assumption is accepted, we are then in a position to use the Ulaya/Eulaios – the ancient name for the Karkhah river – in an attempt to locate Madaktu/Badace (Fig. 1). Without it, the theatre of operations in both Assurbanipal’s expedition and the engagement between the forces of Antigonus and Eumenes becomes virtually impossible to pin down.

3. MADAKTU


From this we learn that, after abandoning Madaktu, Kudur-Nahhunte made his way to Haidala which lay in the midst of the mountains. Haidala is the Assyrian form of the Elamite toponym Hidali, well-attested in the Persepolis fortification texts, which we know was located close to Huhnur/Hunar/Unar, a town which some scholars believe, on very
general grounds, to have been near Arrajan, some 8 kms. northwest of Behbehan\textsuperscript{13}. Thus, a person who worked as baker in the treasury at Huhnur (PFT 1790) is also attested as having served under an overseer with responsibility for Hidali\textsuperscript{14}. Hidali, in turn, we know was on the post-route from Persepolis to Susa (PF 1398, 1399, 1404)\textsuperscript{15}. Given the number of stages between Hidali and Persepolis to the east, and between Hidali and Susa to the west, Hinz suggested that Hidali ought to have been located somewhere around Behbehan\textsuperscript{16}, and this would indeed suit Sennacherib’s description of Haidala as being ‘in the mountains’, while Ghirshman believed it to be identical to Shushtar\textsuperscript{17}. Be that as it may, nothing in the terse description of Kudur-Nahhunte’s flight from Madaktu to Haidala indicates the distance between the two. We know roughly where Haidala lay, but this does not help in locating Madaktu.

As noted above, however, we do have an important piece of information in the slightly later letter from Bel-Ibni to Assurbanipal, ABL 281. The background to ABL 281 is given in K. 2524: “Auf meinem achten Feldzuge bot ich, auf Befehl Assurs und der Istar, meine Truppen auf. Gegen Ummanaldasi, den König von Elam, schlug ich die Straße ein. Bit-Imbi, welches ich (bereits) auf meinem früheren Feldzuge eingenommen hatte, eroberte ich damals, (desgleichen) Rasi, Hamanu nebst seinem Bezirk. Er aber, Ummanaldasi, den König von Elam, hörte von der Eroberung von Rasi (und) Hamanu und die Furcht Assurs und der Istar, welche an meiner Seite gingen, warf ihn nieder und Madaktu, seine Residenzstadt, verließ er und floh nach Dūr-Undasi. Den (Fluss) Idide überschritt er und machte diesen Fluss zu seinem Stützpunkte (Verteidigungslinie), sich rüstend zum Kampfe wider mich. Naditu, die Königstadt, eroberte ich samt ihrem Bezirk, die Königstadt Bit-Bunaku eroberte ich samt ihrem Bezirk, die Königstadt Hartabanu eroberte ich samt ihrem Bezirk, die Königstadt Tūbu eroberte ich samt ihrem Bezirk, das gesamte Flußufergebiet, Madaktu, die Residenzstadt nebst ihrem Bezirk eroberte ich”\textsuperscript{18}.

ABL 281, on the other hand, tells us, “Because he feared, Ummanaldas abandoned Madaktu. He removed his mother, his wife, his children and all his family, he crossed the Ulaya to the south and proceeded to the city of Talah”\textsuperscript{19}. Talah (\textit{\textsuperscript{\textasciitilde}Ta-la-ah})\textsuperscript{20} is elsewhere associated with another town called Radē which, under Tiglath-Pileser III, appears as one of...
thirty-six Aramaean tribes in southern Babylonia conquered by the Assyrian king. Hence, Zadok has suggested that Talah was “probably on the Babylonian-Elamite border”.

Although this text suggests that Ummanaldas’ flight was from north to south (west), and this contradicts the testimony of K. 2524 (see below), it clearly suggests that Madaktu was on the (north-)east side of the Ulaya, i.e. Karkheh, which lay to the south of it.

K. 2524, on the other hand, paints quite a different picture of Ummanaldas’ retreat, for it tells us that, after fleeing Madaktu, Ummanaldas proceeded to Dur-Undasi whereupon he crossed the Idide river, putting the river between himself and the Assyrian army. Assyrian Dur-Undasi/Elamite Al Untash-Napirisha, is the archaeological site of Choga Zanbil, a city some 40 kms. southeast of Susa which was founded by the Middle Elamite ruler Untash-Napirisha (1340-1300 B.C.)

Although Neo-Elamite remains are not known from Choga Zanbil, large portions of the site remain unexplored and it seems wisest, in the present case, to assume that 7th century Dur-Undasi = Middle Elamite Al Untash-Napirisha. Furthermore, this is suggested by Assurbanipal’s narrative of Ummanaldas’ retreat, for Choga Zanbil/Dur Undasi is located immediately to the west of the Diz river. The river known to the Assyrians as the Idide and to the Elamites as the Hithite has without hesitation been identified with the Ab-e Diz. Thus, we can understand K. 2524 to say that,
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22 Zadok, R. Geographical names according to New- and Late-Babylonian texts. Wiesbaden: RGTC 8 [= TAVO Beiheft B 7], 1985: 303.

23 Flight to the east would seem more sensible than flight towards the south, although if Bel-ibni’s report is correct, Ummanaldas may have intended seeking shelter in the marshes of southwestern Khuzistan along the Babylonian border. In view of the very explicit wording of Assurbanipal’s narrative, it is surprising that two scholars seem to have reversed the order of events in a way which is critical for determining on which side of the Idide the city of Dur-Undasi lay. As Streck’s translation says, “Madaktu, seine Residenstadt, verließ er und floh nach Dür-Undasi. Den (Fluß) Idide überschritt er und machte diesen Fluß zu seinem Stützpunkte (Verteidigungslinie)”. And yet, J.J. Finkelstein, “Mesopotamia”, JNES 21 (1962): 83, n. 34 misconstrued this entirely when he wrote, “The Elamite king is said to have fled from Madaktu across the Idide (generally agreed to be the Ab-i-Diz) to Dur Untash, the river thus intended to serve as a barrier against the pursuing Assyrians. Cf. Gerardi, P., Assurbanipal’s Elamite campaigns: A literary and political study, Philadelphia: unpubl. PhD diss., 1987: 195. “Ummanaldas, in response to the Assyrian assault, left his northern stronghold, Madaktu, crossed the river Idide to the south and entered Dur-Undasi, making the river his line of defense”. Yet the text clearly says that Ummanaldas fled to Dur-Undasi before he crossed the river, which he then used as a line of defense. Furthermore, as Dur-Undasi/Choga Zanbil is indeed on the west side of the Diz, this is the only sequence which makes sense for if the Elamite had somehow crossed from the northeast, over the Diz, and taken refuge in Choga Zanbil, he would have found himself on the side of the river closest to the pursuing Assyrian army. The muddle here seems to be caused by Finkelstein and Gerardi assuming that Ummanaldas took refuge in the city. He didn’t. Rather, he made for the city but, because it was on the west side of the Diz, he crossed the river and apparently waited on the opposite site, abandoning a city in which he could have found himself pinned down with an Assyrian army advancing on him and a river blocking his retreat to the rear.


after reaching Dur Undasi, Ummanaldas then crossed the Diz river in order to put the river between himself and the Assyrians should they pursue him.

Putting the information from ABL 281 together with that of K. 2524, therefore, we can conclude the following:

1. Madaktu lay to the north of a portion of the (ancient bed of the) Karkheh (Ulaya) river.
2. Madaktu lay to the west of Haidala.
3. Madaktu lay to the west of Dur-Undasi.
4. Madaktu lay to the west of the Diz (Idide) river.

For the most part, other Neo-Assyrian sources from the time of Assurbanipal’s campaign mentioning Madaktu contain little geographical information. For example, they refer to “Singers, both male and female...among the captives taken from Madaktu to Assyria”\(^{27}\), and we learn that after his campaign, Assurbanipal installed Humban-nikas II, son of Urtak, on throne of Madaktu\(^{28}\). There may, however, be a kernel of relative geographical positioning when Assurbanipal threatens the king of Elam with deportation: “Because you have not sent (back) these people, I am coming to destroy your cities. I will carry off (the people) of Susa, Madaktu (and) Hidalu”\(^{29}\). In his analysis of Assurbanipal’s campaign against Teuman, Córdoba suggested “Madaktu, Hidalu und Susa als Dreigestirn die Hauptstädte des Reiches bildeten”\(^{30}\). Can we go one step further and see, in the enumeration Susa-Madaktu-Hidalu a west-east geographical sequence, comparable to the often repeated sequence Dilmun-Magan-Meluhha, which would allow us to position Madaktu between Susa and Hidalu? This is a tempting possibility but one which we cannot yet confirm. The most that can be said is that both Susa and Madaktu lay close to the Ulaya and that both lay to the west of Hidalu. The relative positions of Susa and Madaktu, and whether the latter was to the north or south of the former, are not indicated in the Neo-Assyrian sources.

---


4. BADACE

At this point the investigation of Madaktu’s location can be aided by drawing on the testimony of Diodorus concerning the location of Badace. In spite of the fact that Susiana figures reasonably prominently in the accounts of Alexander’s pursuit of Darius III and Nearchus’ reunion with the Macedonian army, and information from contemporaries of Alexander was transmitted by later writers like Strabo, Quintus Curtius and Arrian, none of these sources mentions Badace. In fact, Badace is only mentioned by Diodorus in his account of the wars of the Diadochoi (Diodorus XIX.19.1). As in the case of the Neo-Assyrian sources on Madaktu, however, it is impossible to situate Badace without fully comprehending the sequence of events surrounding the conflict between Eumenes and Antigonus. For this reason a synopsis of their movements is given below which will hopefully clarify some of the geographical parameters of the encounter:

- Eumenes arrived at Susa (XIX.15.5) while Antigonus wintered in Mesopotamia (XIX.15.6).
- Antigonus left Mesopotamia, entered Babylonia, built a pontoon bridge over the Tigris and moved his army across (XIX.17.2), thus moving to the east in Eumenes’ direction.
- Learning of this, Eumenes set out from Susa for the Pasitigris river ‘which is a day’s march from Susa at the place where it flows out of the mountainous country that is occupied by the unconquered tribesmen called the Uxii’ (XIX.17.3) - although the text calls the river in question the Tigris, this is patently an error for the Pasitigris (modern Karun), the name of which means ‘Little Tigris’.
- “Keeping this river in front of them as a protection and holding the bank from its source to the sea with pickets, they [Eumenes and his troops] awaited the onset of the enemy” (XIX.17.4).

Thus, the salient point of this narrative is as follows. After wintering in Mesopotamia, Antigonus decided to pursue they Eumenes into Khuzistan. Eumenes therefore abandoned Susa, on the Karkheh (Eulaios), and heading eastwards crossed the Karun (Pasitigris) and waited on the opposite side, using the river as his line of defence. Whereupon:

- Antigonus and his army arrived at Susa (XIX.18.1).
- Antigonus and his men broke camp and marched at night, since it was very hot; then made camp “near the river before sunrise” (XIX.18.1).

Although “the river” is not named, it cannot have been the Pasitigris (Karun), for the narrative continues:

- “When he [Antigonus] reached the Coprates River, he began to make preparations for crossing. This river, running from a certain mountainous region, enters the Pasitigris, which was at a distance of about eighty stades [9 mi.] from Eumenes’ camp...Seizing a few punts, he sent some of the infantry across in them, ordering
them to dig a moat and build a palisade in front of it, and to receive the rest of the army" (XIX 18.3-4).

Thus, the river which Antigonus and his men had reached, in their pursuit of Eumenes, was not the Pasitigris (Karun), still less the Eulaios (Karkheh), but the Coprates. Scholars have long been unanimous in identifying this with the Ab-e Diz, the ancient Idide/Hithite. While Antigonus remained on the west bank of the river, an advance party of infantry was sent across the river and instructed to dig themselves in, building a palisade (obviously facing east, i.e. in the direction of Eumenes’ forces), so that they could defend the river foreshore when it came time for the remainder of Antigonus’ forces to cross.

– as soon as Eumenes learned of Antigonus’ advance, ‘he crossed the pontoon bridge over the Tigris [again an error for Pasitigris]...and surprised the soldiers of Antigonus who had crossed...and compelled all to flee to the river. They all rushed to the boats, but many died who couldn’t swim and ‘Antigonus, although he saw that great number being destroyed, could not go to their aid on account of his lack of boats’ (XIX 18.4-7).

Thus, Antigonus was forced to watch as his troops, not yet fully dug into their position on the east bank of the Diz, were attacked and forced back into the river.

– “Believing that the crossing was impossible, Antigonus set out toward the city of Badacê, which is situated on the bank of the Eulaeus River” (XIX.19.1)

In short, as Antigonus stood with the bulk of his army on the west bank of the Ab-e Diz, he was forced to stand by and watch as his advance party, which had crossed over to the eastern side of the river, were overwhelmed by Eumenes troops. Finding himself in no position to attempt a counter-attack, Antigonus instead headed west, stopping finally at Badace on the banks of the Eulaios river.

This account gives us as clear a picture of the geography of central Khuzistan as we can hope to find in the ancient sources. The fact that Diodorus never says that Antigonus crossed the Eulaios strongly suggests that Badace lay on the east side of the river. Presumably, as Eumenes was still on the east side of the Diz, Antigonus felt no need to put a second river between his troops and those of his enemy, preferring to shelter in Badace rather than to attempt the crossing of the Eulaios.

Badace, then, should be located somewhere along the eastern side of the Karkheh and certainly to the west of the Diz. Such a location, moreover, is comparable to that given for Madaktu in K. 2524 from which Ummanaldaš fled, in the direction of Choga Zanbil (Dur Undasi), prior to crossing the Ab-e Diz (Idide). To summarize, 1. Madaktu/Badace was situated on the Ulaya/Eulaios, more specifically on its eastern side; 2. Madaktu/Badace was situated west of the Diz. We do not know whether Madaktu/Badace was located to the north or the south of Susa.
at Badace Antigonus decided to march to Ecbatana, noting that there were two possible routes, one long and hot\(^3\), via Colon (Halwan), the other short and cool via the mountains but dangerous in view of the hostile tribesmen along the way. Antigonus opted for the shorter, more dangerous route and ‘after losing many men and endangering the entire undertaking, he came with difficulty on the ninth day safe into the settled part of Media’ (XIX.19.8).

It is clear from this account that Antigonus departed for Media from Badace, but it does not follow from Diodorus’ account that Badace was itself on a main route. Diodorus merely says that, after his men had rested at Badace “for a few days”, Antigonus “decided that the best course was to march to Ecbatana in Media and with that as a base to gain control of the upper satrapies. There were two roads leading into Media, each having a disadvantage...” (Diodorus XIX.19.1). Diodorus’ account merely tells us that there were two roads into Media. It does not specify that they emanated from Badace. Obviously, they could both be reached from Badace, but that is a very different matter and proximity to a route into Media cannot, I think, be used as a criterion of Badace’s location.

In view of this evidence - both Diodorus’ testimony and the Neo-Assyrian sources - I think we may safely reject a number of locations for Madaktu/Badake suggested in the past.

5. TEPE PATAK

It was not, as de Miroschedji claimed\(^3\), Roland de Mecquenem who first suggested Tepe Patak = Madaktu, but H.C. Rawlinson. Rawlinson wrote, “Badaca I believe to have been situated about 25 miles N.W. of Susa, between the two arms of the Duwárij, where some very remarkable ruins still exist of the same character as those of Susa, and known in the country by the name of Páták, or Pátákah; and I am the rather inclined to this opinion, as there are no ruins upon the Kerkhah to the N. of Susa which could possibly represent Badaca, and the place must necessarily have been considerably to the northward in this direction, to have enabled Antigonus to reach the inhabited parts of Media at Khorrámábad, in nine days, even by the short cut across the mountains of Charban”\(^3\).\(^3\)

In view of what we have seen of the Neo-Assyrian sources and Diodorus, I can see no justification for suggesting a) that Badace lay to the west of the Eulaios; or b) that it lay along the Duwairij. Rawlinson’s most valid point is, of course, that the “civilised part of

\(^{31}\) Rawlinson, Col. Sir H.C. Observations on the Geography of Southern Persia, with reference to the pending Military Operations. PRGS 1 (1857): 290, wrote of the “long and hot” route in 1857 as follows: “in the country of Susiana there are footpaths leading up the mountains in many directions along which several English travellers have passed, such as Mr. Layard, Mr. Loftus, and myself, but these are mere paths; they are not roads practicable to artillery; the only military route by which the mountains can be ascended from Susiana is along the valley of the Kerkha, but in that case the circuit is enormous. You have to follow the river almost as high up as Kermanshah, in order to get through the mountains and come out upon the plateau of Iran”.


\(^{33}\) Rawlinson, Major. Notes on a March from Zoháb, at the foot of Zagros, along the mountains to Khúxistán (Susiana), and from thence through the province of Luristan to Kirmásháh, in the year 1836. JRGS 9 (1839): 91.
Media’’ must have been attainable in nine days marching from Badace through the mountains. As he wrote, “The short road, which is described by Diodorus as conducting from Susa into Media, through the mountains of the Cossæans, ‘‘difficult, narrow, precipitous, through a hostile tract, badly furnished with necessaries, but short and cool,’’ was of course the route up the valley of the Kerkhah to A’bi-Garm, and from thence across the mountains to Khorrar-ábád; and this is also the track across Mount Charban, which measured, according to Pliny, between Susa and Ecbatana, 380 Roman miles, a statement that is strictly accurate; but I doubt if Antigonus pursued this exact route in his retreat from Badaca, for, in the face of an enemy, he could scarcely have traversed, in nine days, the space of about 180 miles, intervening by the high-road between the ruins which I suppose to represent Badaca and the first inhabited region of Media, at Khorram-ábád. As he appears to have altogether slighted the power of the mountaineers, and the reported difficulties of the country, I conclude that he took the most direct route that would conduct him therefore from the Púli-tang to the pass of Ka’llún, and so on, through the heart of the mountains, along the road which I have laid down in my map; and which is still sometimes followed by travellers with light baggage. The distance along this road will correspond with his nine marches; and the place where he was in danger of losing his whole army will thus fall in with the position of the steep and precipitous defile of Ka’llún, which exactly answers to the description of Diodorus”34.

I cannot see that this very particular description of a possible route through the mountains, even if correct, can only be applied to a route originating at Tepe Patak. Indeed, as A.H. Layard wrote in 1846, “The Duwárij is formed by two streams rising in the hills usually occupied by the Lur tribe of Sagwand....The two streams unite in the lower part of the small plain of Patak. In this plain there is a tappeh and several mounds. There is a tradition, both among the Arabs and the Lurs, that this is the site of an ancient city of great extent. The plain of Patak is about due north of Dizful”35. And Layard continued, “Patak, between the sources of the Dawárij, has been pointed out [by Rawlinson in 1839] as the site of Badaca, but the assertion of Diodorus, that that city was upon the Eulaeus, is in direct opposition to this supposition. There are no ruins at Patak of sufficient size to mark the site of a large city”36.


34 Rawlinson, Major. Notes on a March from Zohábat, at the foot of Zagros, along the mountains to Khúzistán (Susiana), and from thence through the province of Luristan to Kirmánsháh, in the year 1836. JRGs 9 (1839): 63.
35 Layard, A.H. A Description of the Province of Khúzistán. JRGs 16 (1846): 70.
36 Layard, A.H. A Description of the Province of Khúzistán. JRGs 16 (1846): 94.
The identification of Tepe Patak with Madaktu/Badace, however, was later revived by Roland de Mecquenem\textsuperscript{38} and most recently argued in favour of by Pierre de Miroshedji\textsuperscript{39}.

6. CHOGA ZANBIL

Long before the identification of Choga Zanbil with Al Untash-Napirish, W.K. Loftus wrote, “With respect to the site of Badaca, I believe that it is to be recognised in some large ruins, the most prominent of which is named Tel Zembil [Choga Zanbil], which were observed and visited by General Williams and Mr. Churchill near the right bank of the Diz, and only a few hours south-east of Susa”\textsuperscript{40}. Of Loftus’ suggestion one should note that he was at least faithful to Diodorus in choosing a site west of the Diz and east of the Karkheh.

7. KALA-I-RISA

Billerbeck himself suggested that the site of Madaktu/Badace was in the mountains, something never stated in either Diodorus or the Assyrian sources. He wrote, “Diese Festung lag in den Bergen, war oft Residenz der susischen Könige und scheint von diesen während der letzten grossen Kämpfe mit Assyrien mitunter als ein sicherer Aufenthalt betrachtet worden zu sein, als Susa selbst...Auch die Lage dieser Festung ist ungewiss...Nach Ansicht des Verfassers hat man vielmehr im Hinblick auf die Andeutungen der alten Urkunden Madaktu an einem der Pässe zu suchen, welche nördlich von Susa von dem Gebirge herunter führen, und wo noch heute die grossen Vesten Kala-i-Risa und Kala-i-Dis sich erheben. Durch an Ort und Stelle aufgefunden Inschriften lässt sich diese Annahme freilich nicht bestätigen, noch weniger natürlich die Frage beantworten, welcher von den genannten beiden Plätzen das alte Madaktu ist, denn die zum Teil in Trümmer liegenden Vesten sind noch garnicht untersucht. Die grösste Wahrscheinlichkeit spricht für Kala-i-Risa, welches denn auch von hervorragenden Kennern des Landes und der assyrischen Geschichte als das alte Madaktu angesprochen wird, obwohl das viel ausgedehntere und von Natur festere Kala-i-Dis sich allerdings noch besser zur Aufnahme einer königlichen Residenz eignen würde. Immerhin ist das an einem landschaftlich noch schöneren Punkt gelegene Kala-i-Risa ein gut zu verteidigender, starker Platz und die Zugänge durch das enge und gewundene Kerchathal können ohne grossen Kraftaufwand gesperrt werden. Bedrohlich ist eigentlich nur ein Angriff über die Berge von Norden her”\textsuperscript{41}.

Billerbeck’s suggestion appears entirely out of context. Nothing suggests that Madaktu lay in the mountains, and the map accompanying Billerbeck’s monograph posits, without any justification, a location for Madaktu near the Sasanian site of Pol-e Dukhtar, c.

\textsuperscript{41} Billerbeck, A. Susa: \textit{Eine Studie zur alten Geschichte Westasiens}. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1893: 70-72.
100 kms. southwest of Khorramabad. Finally, such a location would not fit at all with the geographical information reviewed above.

8. SOMEWHERE ON THE DIZ TO THE NORTHEAST OF SUSA

Mistaking the Diz for the Eulaios, F.H. Weissbach wrote in 1896, “Die Stadt lag jedenfalls nordöstlich von Susa, am Ab-i-Diz”\[^{42}\].

9. TEPE SENJAR

De Mecquenem, speaking of Gaston Maspero, says that he identified Madaktu with Badace “qu’il plaçait à Tépé Sindjar, ruine qui se trouve à 15 km. au N.-E. de Suse”\[^{43}\]. During his 1977 survey in Khuzistan, de Miroshchedji noted, apropos Tepe Senjar, “Tépe Senjar [KS-7] semble avoir été, après Suse, l’une des agglomérations majeures de la région aux IX\(^e\)-VII\(^e\) siècles; la poterie néo-élamite y est particulièrement abondante et constitue la majorité des tessons observés en surface”\[^{44}\].

Tepe Senjar, which appears to have lain on an ancient bed of the Karkheh (comparable to the modern Sha(p)ur, but further north), could be a candidate for Madaktu/Badace if that city indeed lay to the north of Susa. It has been common, in the secondary literature\[^{45}\], to assume Madaktu was to the north of Susa, and although this is nowhere stated categorically\[^{46}\] it seems far more likely that Eumenes led his troops northward to as cool a destination as he could comfortably reach before halting to give his men a few days to recuperate\[^{47}\].

10. DERRE-I SHAHR

Rejecting all previous suggestions, G.G. Cameron wrote in 1936, “A location of Madaktu at the ruins near Derre-i Shahr in the Saimarreh plain on the Karkhah River fits the geographical requirements better than does Oppert’s location on the Ab-i-Diz north of

\[^{46}\] Bosworth, A.B. Nearchus in Susiana. In: Will, W., ed. Zu Alexander d.Gr.: Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag am 9.12.86. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1987: 554, n. 43, “Le Rider [Suse sous les Séleucides et Parthes, 1965: 268] states that Badace ‘sans aucun doute’ lay to the north of Susa. There is every reason for doubt. We have no indication how Antigonus reached the road through Cossaean territory (Diod. xix 19.2), but it is clear that he did not return to Susa. It is perfectly possible that he by-passed the capital to the south before diverging into the Zagros”.
\[^{47}\] I am indebted to Prof. Bosworth for this idea, and it will be clear that he no longer holds the view expressed in the preceding note. Prof. Bosworth feels that Tepe Senjar is too far south (i.e. that it would still have been too warm and perhaps the area around it would have been stripped of provisions).
Dizful, or Billerbeck’s at Kalat-i-Raza just northwest of Susa\(^{48}\). As in the case of Billerbeck’s suggestion, Cameron’s would not at all fit the context of the Neo-Assyrian campaigns against Elam which presume a much closer proximity between Susa and Madaktu than a location in the Zagros mountains, nor do any of the sources ever say that Badace or Madaktu was actually in the mountains. Perhaps the main virtue of Cameron’s suggestion is the fact that the site he chose for ancient Madaktu lay along the upper Karkheh.

11. SLAB 6, ROOM XXXIII, SENNACHERIB’S PALACE AT NINEVEH

Finally, we should consider the depiction of Madaktu from Sennacherib’s palace at Nineveh which bears Assurbanipal’s epigraph, KUR ma-dak-te, ‘land of Madaktu’ (Fig. 2). The depiction clearly shows the walled city of Madaktu occupying a pointed prow of land with a major watercourse - presumably the Eulaios - and a minor one - perhaps an irrigation canal or smaller tributary - on two sides (the third is broken). After the description of Ummanaldas’ flight from Madaktu to Dur-Undasi and his crossing of the Idide, Assurbanipal’s annals list a number of cities which were conquered by the Assyrians, noting “das gesamte Flußufergebiet, Madaktu, die Residenzstadt nebst ihrem Bezirke eroberte ich”\(^{49}\). Finkelstein pointed out that the phrase used in the annals translated by Streck as “Flußufergebiet”, birît narîm, is in fact the Akkadian equivalent for “‘peninsula’, or more specifically, “riverine peninsula”\(^{50}\). Based on this he suggested that, while it was impossible to suggest “a definitive identification of the precise ‘peninsula’ which that city [Madaktu] dominated,...it is probably to be assumed that the peninsula dominated by Madaktu is that formed by the Ab-i-Diz on the eastern side, together with one of its parallel tributaries on the western side”. This, however, ignores the association between Madaktu/Badace and the Ulaya/Eulaios river which is unequivocally the Karkheh, while implying that Madaktu lay along the Idide, known to later authors as the Coprates. Such, however, is certainly stated in no sources of which I am aware.

As we now know that the Sha(p)ur river, which today runs close to the west side of Susa, is in fact the ancient bed of the Karkheh from c. 1500 B.C. - 500 A.D., we should not, however, be seduced into looking for Madaktu/Badace near the banks of the present course of the Karkheh. In fact, the 13 ha., 12 m. high mound Tepe Senjar (KS-7) is on the east bank of a now dry watercourse\(^{51}\), to the north of Susa, which could well have been either part of the ancient Karkheh itself, or a canal running off the river\(^{52}\). Either way, it is tempting to compare the depiction of Madaktu at Nineveh which shows the city wedged


\(^{50}\) Finkelstein, J.J. “Mesopotamia”, *JNES* 21 (1962): 83 and n. 34.

\(^{51}\) See the map in Johnson, G.A. *Local exchange and early state development in southwestern Iran* Ann Arbor: Anthropological Papers of the Museum of Anthropology 51, 1973: Fig. 5.

\(^{52}\) Similarly. KS-120, a 30 ha. site, appears(according to Johnson’s Fig. 5) to lie on the old course of the Karkheh, albeit to the south of Susa. This, however, is Haft Tepe, most probably ancient Kabnak. Johnson’s map certainly gives the impression that both sites lay to the north and south of Susa, respectively, along the ancient bed of the Ulaya/Eulaios (Karkheh).
between two watercourses with the situation of a site like Tepe Senjar, though this is by no means proof that the identification is correct.

**12. CONCLUSION**

The identification of Madaktu/Badace with a particular archaeological site in Susiana is still a long way off, but I hope it has been shown that the site must lie on the ancient course of the Karkheh (Ulaya/Eulaios), almost certainly on its east bank; that it lay to the west of the Diz; that it was most probably to the north of Susa; and that it was not necessarily at the hub or the land routes leading into Media. Furthermore, it should be clear that it cannot have lain in the drainage of the Diz, Duwairij or Saimarreh rivers. If this article can only conclude with negatives it has shown, I hope, where to look, if not necessarily where precisely the site may be found. To achieve that goal we must await fresh epigraphic data from the mounds of Khuzistan.
Fig. 1: Map showing the approximate courses of the main rivers of Khuzistan from c. 1500 B.C. to 500 A.D. as determined by M.J. Kirkby (after Potts, D.T. Elamite Ula, Akkadian Ulaya and Greek Choaspes: A solution to the Eulaios problem, in press [see n. 7]).
Fig. 2: A depiction of the city of Madaktu from Sennacherib's palace at Nineveh (after Potts, D.T. The archaeology of Elam: Formation and transformation of an ancient Iranian state. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999: Fig. 8.2).