

## 9. Susa in the Late 3<sup>rd</sup> Millennium: From a Mesopotamian Colony to an Independent State (MC 2110-1980)

Katrien De Graef\*

### 9.1. Introduction

At the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium, Susa was conquered by Urnamma and came under the control of the Sumerian Ur III dynasty.<sup>1</sup> Not much later, with the Shimashkean ruler Ebarat I, a new political power rose in Central Iran,<sup>2</sup> a power which would eventually play a major role in the downfall of the Ur III Empire.<sup>3</sup>

Most of what is known about this particular part of history is based on Mesopotamian sources: royal inscriptions and year formulae of the Ur III kings, as well as administrative documents from the Ur III period.<sup>4</sup> In contrast to the remarkably large number of Ur III tablets from Mesopotamia, documentation on the Ur III period in Susa is rather scanty.<sup>5</sup>

Most recently, Steinkeller (2007: 221-222) published a new inscription of Idattu I, which identifies Idattu I as a son of Kindattu and a grandson of Ebarat I.<sup>6</sup> Hence, Steinkeller concluded that at least for the line of Ebarat I, the *Shimashki King List* (*ShKL*) is to be considered a genuine chronological source. However, since this is not true for the early Shimashkean rulers, the question arises as to whether this is true for the later Shimashkean rulers.<sup>7</sup>

However, in what follows, I will not focus on the history or chronology of the Shimashkean dynasty (see my forthcoming *A Socio-economic History of the Early Sikkalmahat*), but on what happened to the city of Susa in the late 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium. An important source for the end of Ur III rule in Susa is the archive of Igibuni, a group of 38 texts, dating from the 4<sup>th</sup> year of Shusuen to the 1<sup>st</sup> year of Ibbisuen; it was excavated by R. Ghirshman in the 1960s, but only recently published in De Graef 2005b (= *MDP* 54). Hitherto, the archive of Igibuni is the only coherent group of Ur III texts from Susa for which we have complete stratigraphic evidence.

I will focus primarily on the end of the Sumerian domination of Susa and the takeover by the Shimashkeans, and especially what the sources from Susa can tell us about this transitional period. In order to complete, as fully as possible, the very scanty documentation on the Ur III period in Susa, I will start with the Igibuni archive and try to link these texts with as many previously published Susa texts as possible. This, hopefully, will allow us to shed some more light on the rather turbulent political and historical evolutions Susa underwent at the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium.

---

\* I would like to thank P. Steinkeller for providing me with his forthcoming article "On the Dynasty of Shimashki: Twenty-Five Years After" and his full edition of the inscription of Idattu I from the Schøyen Collection [This text has recently been published by P. Steinkeller as *CUSAS* 17, no. 18]. My cordial thanks go, as always, to M. Tanret who read the preliminary version of this article and offered various suggestions and corrections.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Marchesi (2013).

<sup>2</sup> For the question of the location of this Shimashkean State, cf. Stolper 1982; Henrickson 1984; Steinkeller 1988a; Steinkeller 2007; Potts 2008 and especially Steinkeller 2014: 291-295.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Wilcke 1970; van Dijk 1978; Stolper 1982; Steinkeller 1988a; Potts 1999: ch. 5; Steinkeller 2007; Marchesi 2013; Steinkeller 2014.

<sup>4</sup> Cf., amongst others, *RIME* 3/2, Jean 1922; Edzard 1959-1960; Lambert 1979b; Stolper 1982; Gomi 1984; Sigrist & Butz 1986; Steinkeller 1988a; Potts 1999: ch. 5; Steinkeller 2007; 2014.

<sup>5</sup> As for administrative documents, we only have 49 Ur III texts and 12+x Shimashki texts, which I will discuss later on in this article. As for other textual sources, we have eight royal inscriptions (from Shulgi, Shusuen, Tanruhurater, Mekubi and Idadu, cf. most recently Malbran-Labat 1995: 20-29) and the so-called *Shimashki King List* (which dates to Old Babylonian times, cf. Scheil 1931; Gelb & Kienast 1990: 317-318; Glassner 1996b, with collation).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. De Graef 2006: 52-55, 68.

<sup>7</sup> De Graef 2012 and De Graef forthc. The names and order of the Shimashkian rulers listed in this kinglist are: (1) <sup>d</sup>*gi-ir-na-am-me* (2) *ta-zi-it-ta* (3) *e-ba-ar-ti* (4) *ta-zi-it-ta* (5) *lu-x-ra<sup>1</sup>-ak<sup>2</sup>-lu-ub<sup>3</sup>-ba-an* (6) *ki-in-da-at-tu* (7) *i-da-at-tu*, (8) *tan-ru-hu-ra-te-er* (9) *e-[ba]-ar-ti* (10) *i-da-at-tu*, (11) *i-da-at-tu-na-pi-ir* (12) *i-da-at-tu-te-em-ti*, Subscript: 12 LUGAL.MEŠ *ši<sub>2</sub>-maš-su-u*, cf. Glassner 1996b; Sallaberger & Schrakamp, Section 2.3, this volume.

## 9.2. The Archive of Igibuni<sup>8</sup>

At the end of the 21<sup>st</sup> and last archaeological campaign of the *Délégation archéologique française en Iran*, during the winter of 1966-1967, the director Roman Ghirshman decided to open a new stratigraphic *chantier*. His aim was to bridge the gap, of more than 250 years in the occupation of Susa, between the most recent levels found earlier on the Acropolis, some wells from the Ur III period, and his earliest *chantier A* dated within the *Sukkalmah* period, about MC 1800.<sup>9</sup> This new *chantier*, called *chantier B*, was located in a small area (ca. 700m<sup>2</sup>) on the southern edge of the *Ville Royale*, on one of the terraces of the ancient second sounding of de Mecquenem, excavated in the 1920s (Allotte de la Füye et al. 1934: 218-221).

In the seventh and oldest level of *chantier B*, a group of 38 tablets was found in two rooms of a house. The content of these tablets, all dating from the late Ur III period (from the 4<sup>th</sup> year of Shusuen to the 1<sup>st</sup> year of Ibbisuen), revealed that the house belonged to a scribe called Igibuni. Using stratigraphic evidence, as well as the content of the tablets, mostly socio-economic texts such as loans and administrative lists, we were able to define this archive as a “remnant-archive”, *i.e.* the leftovers of what had belonged to Igibuni’s archive at a certain point in time. Shortly after IS 1 (IS = Ibbisuen), during the renovation or reconstruction of his house, Igibuni decided to sort out his archive, throwing away tablets that had lost all value for him and mixing (at least a part of) them with the filling material used to raise the floor of one room.

The main body of texts found in Igibuni’s house are small administrative tablets (16 in total: *MDP* 54, 13-14, 16, 19, 20-22, 26-28, 30-34 and 37), mentioning only amounts of barley and the names of the persons to whom these amounts are given, sometimes only one or two lines in length. Since five of them specifically state that they concern ur<sub>5</sub>-ra loans, it seems likely that all the distributed amounts of barley mentioned on these tablets are linked to loans. A second large group are loans (14 in total: *MDP* 54, 2-12, 15, 18 and 25), seven of them are specified as being ur<sub>5</sub>-ra loans (*MDP* 54, 2-3, 5-6, 8, 11 and 15). In addition, there is one blank tablet (*MDP* 54, 35), a small fragment of a donation bearing the seal of Beliariq (Akk. *Bēlī-ariq*) governor (Sum. en si<sub>2</sub>) of Susa under the reign of Shusuen (*MDP* 54, 29), two lists of household expenses (*MDP* 54, 17 and 23), one of them mentioning a gift to the *sukkal* Shumama (Akk. *Šu-Mama*), and four undefined fragments (*MDP* 54, 1, 24, 36 and 38).

The seventh level of *chantier B* shows traces of violent destruction (*cf.* Gasche 1973: 12-13). The hundreds of projectiles, identified as typically Ur III by H. Gasche (*ibid.*), found at Level 7, seem to indicate that (at least this part of) Susa was conquered violently, probably in the beginning or first part of Ibbisuen’s reign. This destruction is to be attributed either to the conquest of Susa by the Shimashkean ruler Ebarat I, or to the attempt by Ibbisuen to recapture the city afterwards.<sup>10</sup>

## 9.3. Other Late 3<sup>rd</sup> Millennium Texts from Susa

In the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, a huge amount of administrative texts (more than 500), both in Akkadian and Sumerian, were found in Susa and consequently published in the series *MDP* (*Mémoires de la Délégation archéologique en Perse*) by V. Scheil (vols. 10, 22, 23, 24 and 28) and G. Dossin (vol. 18). The greater part of these texts is to be dated within the Old Elamite II-III period,<sup>11</sup> *i.e.* from the Ur III domination, through Shimashkean rule and up to the end of the *Sukkalmahat* (roughly from MC 2100 to MC 1550).

Only a very small number of them bear year formulae (*i.e.* year names of Ur III kings or as yet unattributed year names, most probably to be attributed to the Shimashkean rulers as shown by De Graef 2008a). The larger part make no mention of year names whatsoever and, as the hand copies (drawn by different hands under the supervision of Scheil) in these volumes are not particularly reliable concerning palaeography, it is in many cases impossible to date these texts more precisely. Another difficulty is the lack of the use of patronyms in many of the early Susa

<sup>8</sup> The texts of the Archive of Igibuni are published in De Graef 2005b (*MDP* 54). *Cf.* also Steve et al. 1980: 87, 133; De Meyer 1986; De Graef 2008b.

<sup>9</sup> For the archaeological context of *chantier B*, *cf.* Ghirshman 1968; Gasche 1973: 10-15; Steve et al. 1980; Steve et al. 2002: 397, 442-443.

<sup>10</sup> Two year names of Ibbisuen point at military campaigns to Susa and the Shimashkean state: IS 9 (mu <sup>d</sup>i-bi<sub>2</sub>-<sup>d</sup>EN.ZU lugal urim<sub>2</sub><sup>ki</sup>-ma-ke<sub>4</sub> hu-u<sub>2</sub>-nu-ri<sup>ki</sup> saĝ-kul ma-da an-ša-an<sup>ki</sup>-še<sub>3</sub> (...) dugud ba-ši-in-ĝen (...) -gen<sub>7</sub> (...)) “Year when Ibbisuen, the king of Ur, went with massive power to Huhnuri, the bolt to the land of Anshan and like (...)”) and IS 14 (mu <sup>d</sup>i-bi<sub>2</sub>-<sup>d</sup>EN.ZU lugal urim<sub>2</sub><sup>ki</sup>-ma-ke<sub>4</sub> šušin<sup>ki</sup> a-dam-dun<sup>ki</sup> a-wa-an<sup>ki</sup> u<sub>4</sub>-gen<sub>7</sub> ka bi-in-ge<sub>4</sub> u<sub>4</sub> 1-a mu-un-gur<sub>2</sub> en-bi lu<sub>2</sub>-a mi-ni-in-dab<sub>5</sub>-ba-a “Year when Ibbisuen, the king of Ur, overwhelmed Susa, Adamdun and Awan like a storm, subdued them in a single day and seized the lords of their people”). The transcription and translation of Ibbisuen’s year names are taken from [cdli.ucla.edu/tools/yearnames/](http://cdli.ucla.edu/tools/yearnames/). Steinkeller (2007: 223 and esp. n. 31) believes that Ibbisuen regained control of Susa in the 9<sup>th</sup> year of his reign when he launched a military campaign against Huhnuri and Anshan, since the control of Susa would have been indispensable for Ibbisuen to attack Huhnuri and Anshan. It seems though that if Ibbisuen regained control in Susa in the 9<sup>th</sup> year of his reign, this renewed control was also rather short-lived, since it was necessary to subdue Susa again in his 14<sup>th</sup> year of reign.

<sup>11</sup> For this chronological designation, *cf.* Steve et al. 2002.

texts, meaning prosopographic study, alone, cannot be used to date them. As a consequence, one could say that most of these texts are floating. The publication of the stratigraphically contextualized Igbuni archive now gives us the opportunity to connect a few of these “floating texts” to it and, in so doing, to anchor them chronologically.

Apart from the Igbuni Archive, we were able to distinguish five groups of Susa texts that can be dated in the late 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium, some of which are linked to the Igbuni archive:

- 1) texts bearing an Ur III year name
- 2) texts that can be attributed to the Ur III period based on other data
- 3) texts mentioning (a person called) Igbuni (not belonging to the Igbuni Archive)
- 4) texts bearing a year formula mentioning the Shimashkean ruler Ebarat
- 5) texts bearing a year formula probably to be attributed to the Shimashkian rulers

### 9.3.1 Texts Bearing an Ur III Year Name

Seven texts bear such a year name:

text	genre	date
1) <i>MDP</i> 10, 126	list of witnesses	AS 4
2) <i>MDP</i> 28, 454	takeover purchase (i <sub>3</sub> -dab <sub>5</sub> )	AS 5
3) <i>MDP</i> 10, 125	receipt	AS 5 <sup>12</sup>
4) <i>MDP</i> 28, 467	small administrative note	ŠS 2
5) <i>MDP</i> 28, 410 <sup>13</sup>	purchase of a female slave	ŠS 4
6) <i>MDP</i> 10, 121	delivery (m u -DU)	IS 2 <sup>14</sup>
7) <i>MDP</i> 18, 79 <sup>15</sup>	takeover purchase (i <sub>3</sub> -dab <sub>5</sub> )	IS 3

Sigrist & Gomi (1991: 289) also attribute the following Susa texts to the Ur III period: *MDP* 10, 3 and 4; *MDP* 14, p. 23; *MDP* 22, 144; *MDP* 23, 293, 294 and 303; Scheil 1916: 20-21. *MDP* 22, 144 is indeed an Ur III text (cf. *infra*). As for the other texts, we should formulate the following remarks:

*MDP* 10, 3: There is no indication, whatsoever, to date this receipt of one driven ox (g u<sub>4</sub>-da-ri-a) by Beliya, to the Ur III period, cf. *MDP*: 54, 93-94 and De Graef 2007. Probably dated to the beginning of the *Sukkalmahat*.

*MDP* 10, 4: This expenditure (zi-ga) of four fattened sheep for the *gūšum* offering is sealed by a servant of Ebarat called Shubaba<sup>16</sup> and belongs to the Kuya dossier,<sup>17</sup> which can be dated to the beginning of the *Sukkalmahat*, during the reigns of Ebarat II, Shilhaha and Attahushu, who were at least partly contemporaries.<sup>18</sup>

*MDP* 14, p. 23: Scheil cites this text in connection with the title GA.RAŠ, written on an axe with an inscription mentioning Shulgi (“Un petit texte que je crois inédit se trouve sous cette forme dans mes notes, cahier 1895: 25 juin”), but does not mention the origin of the text. In other words it is not at all certain that this text originates from Susa.

*MDP* 23, 293 and 294: Both texts are published between a group of texts bearing a year name mentioning the Shimashkean ruler Ebarat (*MDP* 23, 291-292, 295-297, 299-302 and 304-305, cf. *infra*). It seems quite possible that these texts were found together with the Ebarat texts and can thus be dated to the same period. But, the same then goes for *MDP* 23, 298 which is not mentioned by Sigrist & Gomi.

<sup>12</sup> This text is labelled “IS 3 ?” in Sigrist & Gomi 1991: 250. *MDP* 10, 125: 9-10 read mu<sup>1</sup> en-unu<sub>2</sub><sup>1</sup>-gal<sup>1</sup> inana ba-ḥuḡ<sup>1</sup>, which seems to be rather a variant or abbreviation of Amarsuen’s 5<sup>th</sup> year name: mu en-unu<sub>6</sub>-gal-an-na / en-u<sub>3</sub>-nu-gal-an-na en-inana unuḡ<sup>ki</sup>-ga ba-ḥuḡ “Year Enunugalanna was installed as en-priest of Inanna in Uruk” (transcription and translation from cdli.ucla.edu/tools/yearnames/).

<sup>13</sup> Steinkeller 1989: no. 87. Cf. also De Graef 2005a.

<sup>14</sup> This text is labelled “undated” in Sigrist & Gomi 1991: 289 and “AS 5 or IS 2” in Sallaberger 1999: 210. *MDP* 10, 121: 9-10 read mu<sup>1</sup> en<sup>1</sup>-inana maš<sub>2</sub>-e pa<sub>3</sub>-da<sup>1</sup>, which is most probably a variant of Ibbisuen’s 2<sup>nd</sup> year name: mu en inana unuḡ<sup>ki</sup> maš<sub>2</sub>-e i<sub>3</sub>-pa<sub>3</sub> “Year (Ibbisuen) chose by means of the omens the en-priest of Inana in Uruk” (cf. cdli.ucla.edu/tools/yearnames/).

<sup>15</sup> This text is not included in Sigrist & Gomi 1991.

<sup>16</sup> Formerly read Shubau, cf. De Graef 2005b: 99-102. The correct reading of this name is Shubaba (š u<sup>d</sup>-ba-ba<sub>6</sub>), see Glassner 2012: 322.

<sup>17</sup> The texts belonging to the Kuya dossier – as well as the other texts from *MDP* 10 – were collated by us during our stay at the Louvre (autumn 2007). The Kuya texts will be treated in a future study.

<sup>18</sup> De Graef 2005b: 99-113; 2006: ch. IV and de Graef 2012.

*MDP* 23, 303: This text, earlier published as *MDP* 18, 85, is also to be found between the Ebarat texts, and has an as yet unknown year name (not mentioning Ebarat). We believe this text might be dated to the Shimashkean period (De Graef 2008a).

Scheil 1916: 20-21: As Scheil indicates in his article, it concerns an Ur III text from Drehem and not from Susa.

### 9.3.2 Texts to be Attributed to the Ur III Period

Four other texts can be attributed to the Ur III period with certainty:

text	genre	attributed by
8) <i>MDP</i> 22, 144	delivery (mu-DU)	Shulgi (l. 16)
9) <i>MDP</i> 18, 219 <sup>19</sup>	list of witnesses	ensi Zariqum <sup>20</sup> (ll. 12-13)
10) <i>MDP</i> 18, 236 <sup>21</sup>	letter	(Sollberger's corresp. kings of Ur)
11) <i>MDP</i> 28, 424 <sup>22</sup>	declaration	sukkal Shumama <sup>23</sup> (l. 19)

Notwithstanding the fact that these 11 texts date roughly from the same period as the Igbuni archive, only three of these Ur III texts can actually be linked with the Igbuni texts, *i.e.* certain individuals known to us from Igbuni's archive (probably) also figure in these texts:

Abba: supplier of small stock in *MDP* 18, 79 (IS 3), can possibly be identified with the creditor Abba from *MDP* 54, 2, 3 (both ŠS 5) and 7 (ŠS 8).

Ahuwaqar (Akk. *Aḫū-waqar*): fifth witness in *MDP* 28, 410 (ŠS 4), can possibly be identified with Ahuwaqar from *MDP* 54, 23 and 38 (s.d.).

Beliariq (Akk. *Bēli-ariq*): mentioned in *MDP* 28, 424 (Ur III), can be identified with the "cupbearer" (Sum. *sāgi*, SILA<sub>3</sub>, ŠU.DU<sub>8</sub>) and ensi of Susa Beliariq whose seal is found on *MDP* 54, 29 (s.d.).

Hunum: husband of the declarer in *MDP* 28, 424 (Ur III), can possibly be identified with Hunum, father of the debtor Ahuhi (or *Aḫū-tāb*), on the seal of *MDP* 54, 2 and 3 (both ŠS 5).

Shuishtar (Akk. *Šu-Ištar*) (nu-banda<sub>3</sub>): witness in *MDP* 28, 424 (Ur III), can possibly be identified with Shuishtar from *MDP* 54, 21 (s.d.).

Shumama sukka: witness in *MDP* 28, 424 (Ur III), can be identified with the *sukkal* Shumama in *MDP* 54, 23 (s.d.).

The reason why only a few of these texts can be linked with the Igbuni archive is obvious: we only have a few remnants of the Igbuni archive. However, even if we had all of it we would not expect to find connections with all of the published Ur III material, since the archaeological site of Susa is large and the texts of Igbuni's archive were found on a very small part of this site, *viz.* the small area (ca. 700m<sup>2</sup>) on the southern edge of the *Ville Royale*, on one of the terraces of the ancient second sounding of de Mecquenem. It goes without saying that other parts of Susa were also occupied during the Ur III period. Indeed, according to the most recent overview on the archaeology of Susa by Gasche in the *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* (Steve et al. 2002), the Acropole and the Apadana, as well as the whole southern edge of the *Ville Royale*, was occupied during the Old Elamite II period.

Surely this also implies that more than the 49 texts (38 from Igbuni + 11 previously published in *MDP*) at present attributed to the Ur III period, must date from that time. Unfortunately, we have no clue at all as to where precisely in Susa the *MDP* texts were found. All archaeological information that could contribute to a more detailed dating of these texts is lost forever. Palaeography could be of use here, but, as we have already stated, the *MDP* hand-copies are not a good basis: the whole collection of Susa texts needs to be collated so that a thorough palaeographic study can be carried out.

Up to now, we have discussed the Ur III texts, *i.e.* texts written under the administration of the Ur III Empire as known from Mesopotamian history and chronology. As to the end of this period in Susa we must note a difference with Mesopotamia proper. Whereas the Ur III Empire falls (at least officially) definitively at the end of

<sup>19</sup> This text is not included in Sigrist & Gomi 1991.

<sup>20</sup> For Zariqum, ensi of Susa, cf. Hallo 1956: 221-223 and Kutscher 1979. Both authors agree that Zariqum was certainly at Susa from AS 4 until ŠS 4.

<sup>21</sup> Sollberger 1966: no. 8. This letter is not included in Sigrist & Gomi 1991.

<sup>22</sup> This text is not included in Sigrist & Gomi 1991.

<sup>23</sup> Shumama, *sukkal* of Susa, is mentioned in the archive of Igbuni (*MDP* 54, 23) and in several other Ur III texts, cf. amongst others Gelb 1961: 17 and Sigrist 1990b: nos. 14, 83, 193.

Ibbisuen's reign (IS 24) in Mesopotamia, Ur III rule ended earlier in Susa (and Elam). The most recent Ur III text from Susa dates to the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of reign of Ibbisuen (*MDP* 18, 79). Moreover, three Ibbisuen year names from the first half of his reign presume troubles in Elam and Susa.

Knowing that the most recent Ur III text from Susa dates from IS 3, one could interpret the dynastic marriage between Ibbisuen's daughter and the governor of Zabshali in IS 5<sup>24</sup> as an attempt to (re-)confirm or strengthen the political alliance with Susa's hinterland. It is, after all, assumed that even the very core of Ur's dominions was in open rebellion shortly after Ibbisuen's accession to the throne.<sup>25</sup> The attacks on Huhnuri and Anshan in IS 9 and on Susa, Adamdun and Awan in IS 14, show the ultimate convulsions of declining Ur III control on Susa and the Elamite periphery. We know that Level 7 of *chantier B* was violently destroyed, and it thus seems quite probable that this can be linked with either the conquest of Susa by Ebarat, or the reaction hereupon by Ibbisuen, as stated in his year names. This means the Shimashkeans took control over Susa somewhere between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> year of reign of Ibbisuen.

But what happened after IS 3, after the conquest of Susa by the Shimashkeans? Here, the published texts mentioning an Igibuni, in all probability identical to the one from our late Ur III archive, offer interesting chronological information.

### 9.3.3 Texts Mentioning a Person Called Igibuni

Only five of the formerly published *MDP* texts mention a person called Igibuni: *MDP* 18, 120, *MDP* 24, 389 and *MDP* 28, 495, 520 and 521. Igibuni is a rather rare Elamite personal name, translated by the *Elamisches Wörterbuch* as "Bruderherz". The fact that there are few attestations of the name Igibuni outside his archive makes it plausible that these texts refer to one and the same person, viz. our Igibuni, son of Atta. We know from his seal that he was a scribe (dub-sar), but it is possible that this was only an honorary title. None of these texts bear an Ur III year name. One of them (*MDP* 18, 120) bears an as yet unknown year name: mu us<sub>2</sub>-sa e<sub>2</sub> kišeb-ba gibil ba-du<sub>3</sub>, "Year after the year the new storehouse was erected".

This is not the only Susa text bearing an unknown year name. Three different groups of year names can be distinguished within the Susa material:

1) Ur III year names

2) year names mentioning Ebarat

3) year names which cannot, as yet, be attributed to any king or period, but which are based on the Mesopotamian model

After having studied this last group (De Graef 2008a), I concluded that all of them have to be given a fairly early date, i.e. at the very beginning of the *Sukalmahat* when the Shimashkean kings and their subordinates, the *Sukalmahs*, ruled Susa.

In *MDP* 18, 120 we also find two other persons known from the Igibuni archive, viz. Adara and Shumama, which implies that this text is situated close to the Ur III period (because it is connected with Igibuni) but not in it (because of the unattributed year name). In view of the fact that the Igibuni archive is late Ur III, *MDP* 18, 120 must have been written shortly after IS 3.

*MDP* 24, 389 mentions the toponym AN.ZA.GAR<sub>3</sub> LUGAL, which occurs in the Susa texts from the Old Elamite II period onwards.

The small note *MDP* 28, 495 is published within a group of 22 notes, of which 12 bear a BALA-formula. At present, we know that the three variants of the BALA-formula (BALA URU.DAG, BALA IGI.URU<sup>ki</sup>, BALA GU.LA) were used from the Old Elamite II period onwards.

Both *MDP* 28, 520 and 521 deal with the delivery of *takšūm* small stock. The precise meaning of the word *takšūm* is not known, but according to Gelb (1957: 296) it was an Old Akkadian loanword in Sumerian,<sup>26</sup> which points to a rather early date. Note in this respect, also, the Sargonic style of the seal of Shusuendan (Akk. *Šu-Šin-dān*), mentioning the epithet "king of Kish" (luga l kiš<sup>ki</sup>) for Shusuen, on one of the tablets of the Igibuni archive.

In *MDP* 28, 521 the name Igibuni is followed by a profession (lu<sub>2</sub> X), which is, unfortunately, illegible on the hand-copy. Collation of this tablet is necessary.

We can conclude, therefore, that the five texts mentioning a person called Igibuni should be dated somewhere at the end of the Ur III rule at Susa, or shortly afterwards, at the beginning of Shimashkean rule.

<sup>24</sup> mu tu-ki-in-PA-mi-ig-ri<sub>2</sub>-ša dumu-munus lugal ensi<sub>2</sub> za-ab-ša-li<sup>ki</sup>-ke<sub>4</sub> ba-an-tuku "Year the governor of Zabshali married Tukinhattimigrisha (*Tukin-hatti-migrisha*) the king's daughter" (cf. cdli.ucla.edu/tools/yearnames/).

<sup>25</sup> Cf. amongst others Gomi 1984 and Sallaberger 1999: 172-178.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. *CAD* T sub *takšū* B (*takšiu*) saddlebag, where *MDP* 28, 520, 521 and 522 are labelled as "Ur III", and most recently Schrakamp 2006: 165-166 who translates (š<sup>cs</sup>) dag/da-ag-si as a kind of "Gestell" or "Halterung".

Going one chronological step further we come to the reign of Ebarat I. There are some texts with an Ebarat year name among those published. These will allow us to draw conclusions with regard to the chronological position of Ebarat I *vis à vis* Ur III domination.

#### 9.3.4 Texts Bearing a Year Formula Mentioning Ebarat

Finally, we have 13 texts bearing a year name mentioning Ebarat. One of them is published as *MDP* 18, 199 and edited by Steinkeller (Steinkeller 1989: no. 88), the others are published as *MDP* 23, 291-292, 295-302, 304-305. In all, three different year names mentioning Ebarat are found:

*MDP* 18, 199: mu e-ba<sup>1</sup>-ra<sup>1</sup>-[at lugal]<sup>27</sup> “Year Ebarat became king”

*MDP* 23, 291, 295, 296, 297, 299, 300, 301, 302, 304 and 305: mu us<sub>2</sub>-sa i<sub>3</sub>-a-ba-ra-at (*MDP* 23, 296 var. e-ba-ra-at) lugal “Year after the year Ebarat became king”

*MDP* 23, 292: mu <sup>d</sup>i<sub>3</sub>-a-ba-ra-at lugal mu us<sub>2</sub>-sa AM<sup>9</sup> ([...])? “Year<sup>d</sup>Ebarat became king, year after the year ...”

It is possible that the last year name is a scribal error: maybe the scribe forgot to write the “us<sub>2</sub>-sa” after the initial “mu” and put it at the end. The sign after “mu us<sub>2</sub>-sa” is illegible and it is not clear if there are more signs to follow. Collation of this tablet is necessary. Note however, the deification of Ebarat’s name.

We can conclude that there are at least two different year names mentioning Ebarat, and possibly a third (maybe even more if (some of) the unattributed year names belong the reign of Ebarat or one of his successors), which means Ebarat reigned for at least two years over Susa. Of particular importance is where the Ebarat texts were found. They were found, by de Mecquenem in the 1920s, during the excavation of the second sounding, situated in the middle of the southwest edge of the *Ville Royale*. Unfortunately, de Mecquenem describes the finds of this sounding, in a way characteristic of his time, slightly romantically and often without mentioning the most important archaeological data that would have been (and still is) crucial for the interpretation of the finds, among them a rather large group of cuneiform tablets (Allotte de la Füye et al. 1934: 218-221). He mentions Islamic constructions, followed by a level with Sassanian remains, among them kilns, cuneiform tablets and sarcophagi. Below there were Neo-Babylonian and Neo-Elamite layers, with funerary vases full of tablets. Still lower he found a level which he dated to the 20<sup>th</sup> century and under which was a level with Ur III graves together with cylinder seals, a small silver treasure and small votive tablets mentioning the name of Ebarti (“de petites tablettes votives avec invocation du nom d’Ebarti”). We can now establish that de Mecquenem was wrong in his interpretation of these texts as votive tablets, since these are, no doubt, our 13 administrative texts bearing a year name mentioning Ebarat. This shows that the Ebarti tablets were found associated with an Ur III context, no doubt on top of it, and that they were found in the vicinity of our *chantier B*.

### 9.4. Dating the Fall of Susa

#### 9.4.1 Ebarat I or Ebarat II?

One of the main questions is, of course, to which Ebarat these year names and tablets should be attributed: Ebarat I, the third king from the *SbKL*, dated ca. MC 2060, or Ebarat II, the so-called founder of the *Sukkalmahat*, dated ca. MC 1980. There is still no consensus amongst Assyriologists: successively they have been attributed to Ebarat I, Ebarat II, back to Ebarat I and so on (a full history of these attributions is given in Steve et al. 2002: 434). Most recently, these authors attributed them to Ebarat I, which is indeed very logical, since they were found by de Mecquenem in an Ur III context, in exactly the same part of Susa where we know the Ur III administration ruled till at least IS 3, viz. the second sounding.

#### 9.4.2 An Interregnum during the Reign of Shusuen?

Steve, Vallat and Gasche put forward a further hypothesis on the reign of Ebarat I: they proposed that Ebarat I’s reign in Susa was very short lived: according to them he only held the city during the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> years of the reign of Shusuen. This hypothesis is based exclusively on the name of the 7<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Shusuen, which mentions his devastation of Zabshali.<sup>28</sup> According to Steve, Vallat and Gasche, a much more complex reality lies hidden in this year name. They refer to an Old Babylonian tablet containing copies of inscriptions on three statues of Shusuen, published by Kutscher (1989). A more recent and collated version of these texts can be found in *RIME* 3/2 (*RIME* 3/2.1.4.3-6). One of these inscriptions mentions a campaign of Shusuen against the LU<sub>2</sub>.SU. Contrary to Steinkeller

<sup>27</sup> Cf. De Graef 2004 for this reading.

<sup>28</sup> mu <sup>d</sup>i<sub>3</sub>-<sup>d</sup>EN.ZU-lugal urim<sub>2</sub><sup>ki</sup>-ma-ke<sub>4</sub> lugal an ub-da 4-ba ma-da za-ab-ša-li<sup>ki</sup> mu-ḥulu “Year Shusuen, the king of Ur, king of the four quarters, destroyed the land of Zabshali” (cf. cdli.ucla.edu/tools/yearnames/).

(1988a; 2007), who proved that LU<sub>2</sub>.SU was a spelling of Shimashki (cf. also Civil 1996), Steve et al. (2002: 432-433) believe the “lu<sub>2</sub> su” are the people of Susiana. Consequently, they consider the campaign against the LU<sub>2</sub>.SU to be a campaign against Susa and that this can only have been necessary if the city had fallen in the hands of an enemy, *in casu* Ebarat I. Shusuen defeated him and he fled into the mountains, pursued by the Ur III army.

Firstly, the Igbuni texts date from the 4<sup>th</sup> year of Shusuen, till the 1<sup>st</sup> year of Ibbisuen. Thus it seems very likely that a possible interregnum of Ebarat I during ŠS 5-6, would have been documented in this archive, all the more so, since both the Igbuni and Ebarat texts were found in the same part of Susa. Nothing whatsoever in the Igbuni texts points at a temporary takeover of Susa by Ebarat.

Secondly, the interpretation of the Shusuen inscriptions mentioned above by Steve, Vallat and Gasche. The Sumerian inscription on the first statue (*RIME* 3/2.1.4.3)<sup>29</sup> does not describe a campaign by Shusuen against Zabshali and the LU<sub>2</sub>.SU, but, on the contrary, describes how the land of the LU<sub>2</sub>.SU, the lands of Zabshali, whose surge is like a swarm of locusts, from the border of Anshan to the Upper Sea, threatened the empire of Shusuen, how their kings fought the army of Shusuen and how eventually Shusuen was victorious. We must thus conclude that this inscription points to a threat by the aforementioned lands against Shusuen, rather than a military initiative by Shusuen. However, the Akkadian inscription (*RIME* 3/2.1.4.5)<sup>30</sup> on the second statue does mention the fact that Shusuen devastated the lands Zabshali, Sigrish, Nibulmat, Alumidatum, Garta and Shatilu.

The main question we have to ask ourselves is: do these inscriptions describe one and the same campaign or two different campaigns? Kutscher (1989) believes they describe two different campaigns. Steve, Vallat and Gasche (2002) subscribe to this hypothesis. According to them the difference between the campaigns is that the first one was held against the LU<sub>2</sub> SU, which they believe is Susiana, to dethrone Ebarat I, while the second one describes the pursuit of Ebarat I, who had fled to the mountains (his natural habitat) pursued by the army of Shusuen who devastated lands on its way. We see one real argument which could prove that the inscriptions describe different campaigns: they both state that the ensi of Zabshali was taken prisoner, but in the Sumerian text (*RIME* 3/2.1.4.3)<sup>31</sup> this person is called Ziringu, whereas in the Akkadian text (*RIME* 3/2.1.4.5)<sup>32</sup> he is called Indasu. Two different ensis would mean two different campaigns. The Sumerian inscription clearly shows that Zabshali was in fact an extensive territory (from Anshan to the Caspian Sea), a sort of confederation of several smaller territories and cities. Indeed, we read on ll. 24-30 from col. iii:

ensi<sub>2</sub> gal-gal ma-da-ma-da za-ab-ša-li<sup>ki</sup> u<sub>3</sub> ensi<sub>2</sub>-ensi<sub>2</sub> iri<sup>ki</sup>-iri<sup>ki</sup> me<sub>3</sub> e<sub>3</sub>-a mu-da-an-gur-re-ša

“The great governors of the lands of Zabshali and the governors of the cities whom he had brought back from battle he took as bound captives”.<sup>33</sup>

In fact, this passage clearly states there was more than one ensi of Zabshali. This, by itself, undermines the argument that two different ensis imply two different campaigns. But there is more. The ensi of Zabshali is indicated in two different ways in the Akkadian version of the text: in the first colophon Indasu is given as a personal name (*in-da-su*), in the second one Indasu could indicate the origin of the man (lu<sub>2</sub> *in-da-su*). This opens the possibility that Indasu could have been the name of an area within the greater territory of Zabshali, and that it was

<sup>29</sup> *RIME* 3/2.1.4.3: ii 14-iii 11: u<sub>4</sub>-ba LU<sub>2</sub>.SU<sup>ki</sup> ma-da-ma-da za-ab-ša-li<sup>ki</sup> za<sub>3</sub> an-ša-an<sup>ki</sup>-ra a-ab-ba igi-nim-ma-še<sub>3</sub> buru<sub>5</sub>-gen<sub>7</sub> zi-ga-bi ni-bu-ul-ma<sup>l</sup>-[at<sup>ki</sup>] x<sup>l</sup>-[x-x]-[am<sup>ki</sup>] si-ig-ri<sub>2</sub>-i<sup>ki</sup> a-lu-mi-da-tim<sup>ki</sup> ga-ar-ta<sup>ki</sup> a-za-ba-ar<sup>ki</sup> bu-ul-ma<sup>ki</sup> nu-šu-uš-ma-ar<sup>ki</sup> nu-uš-ga-ne-lu-um<sup>ki</sup> zi-zi-ir-tum<sup>ki</sup> a-ra-bi-ir<sup>ki</sup> ša-ti-lu<sup>ki</sup> ti-ir-mi-um<sup>ki</sup> [u<sub>3</sub>]<sup>l</sup> [...]da im-ma-da-e<sub>3</sub>-eš<sup>l</sup> [lugal]-[bi]<sup>l</sup> [me<sub>3</sub> šen]-[šen]<sup>l</sup>-ba gaba mu-na-da-ri-eš<sup>l</sup> šu<sup>l</sup>-[EN].ZU lugal-kala-ga lugal urim<sup>ki</sup>-ma lugal an-ub-da limmu<sub>2</sub>-ba-ke<sub>4</sub> a<sub>2</sub> den-lil<sub>2</sub> lugal-na-ta inim<sup>l</sup> nin-lil<sub>2</sub> nin-ki-ağ<sub>2</sub>-ğā<sub>2</sub>-na-ta me<sub>3</sub> šen-šen-ba AGA<sub>3</sub>.KARA<sub>2</sub> bi<sub>2</sub>-in-se<sub>3</sub>-se<sub>3</sub> “At that time, LU<sub>2</sub>.SU<sup>ki</sup> (which comprises) the lands of Zabshali, whose surge is like (a swarm) of locusts, from the border of Anshan to the Upper Sea. Nibulmat[at], ..., Sigrish, Alumidatum, Garta, Azahar, Bulma, Nushushmar, Nushgalenum, Zizirtum, Arahir, Shatilu, Tirmium, and (...) came forth (to do battle). Their [kings], confronted him (Shusuen) in [battles and com]bat. Shusuen, mighty king, king of Ur, king of the four quarters, by the might of the god Enlil, his lord, and at the command of the goddess Ninlil, his beloved lady, was victorious in those battles and combats” (cf. Frayne 1997).

<sup>30</sup> *RIME* 3/2.1.4.5 (compilation of Ex. 2: 10-20 and Ex. 1: 15-28): u<sub>3</sub>-ba-li-iq ma-at za-ab-ša-li<sup>ki</sup> ma-at si-ig-<ri<sub>2</sub>>-i<sup>ki</sup> ma-at ni-bu-ul-ma-at<sup>ki</sup> ma-at a-lu-mi-da-tim<sup>ki</sup> ma-at ga-ar-ta<sup>ki</sup> ma-at ša-ti-lu<sup>ki</sup> šu+niĜEN<sub>2</sub> 6 ma-ta-tim a-za-ba-ar<sup>ki</sup> bu-ul-ma<sup>ki</sup> nu-šu-uš-ma-ar<sup>ki</sup> [nu<sup>l</sup>-uš-ga-ne-lu-um<sup>ki</sup>] [zi<sup>l</sup>-zi-ir-tum<sup>ki</sup>] [a]-[ra-bi]-[ir<sup>ki</sup>] [...] “He destroyed the land of Zabshali, the land of Sigrish, the land Nibulmat, the land Alumidatum, the land Garta (and) the land Shatilu – altogether six lands. Azahar, Bulma, Nushushmar, Nushgalenum, Zizirtum, Arahir ... [Too broken for translation]” (cf. Frayne 1997).

<sup>31</sup> *RIME* 3/2.1.4.3 caption 2 colophon 3 vii 31-37: zi-ri<sub>2</sub>-in-gu [ensi<sub>2</sub>]<sup>l</sup> ma-[da] za-ab-ša-[li]<sup>ki</sup> mu-sar-ra za<sub>3</sub> zi-ri-in-gu lugal LU<sub>2</sub>×KAR<sub>2</sub> “Ziringu, governor of the land of Zabshali. Inscription on the shoulder of Ziringu, the king (taken) as a bound captive” (cf. Frayne 1997).

<sup>32</sup> *RIME* 3/2.1.4.5 Ex. 1 caption 1 colophon 1: in-da-su ensi<sub>2</sub> za-ab-ša-li<sup>ki</sup> mu-sar-ra za<sub>3</sub>-ga-na “Indasu, governor of Zabshali. Inscription on his shoulder” and colophon 2: mu-‘sar<sup>l</sup>-ra [murgu x<sup>l</sup> ki lu<sub>2</sub> in-da-su lugal LU<sub>2</sub>×KAR<sub>2</sub> ġiri<sub>3</sub> an-us<sub>2</sub>-sa “Inscription on the shoulder, the ‘man’ of Indasu, the king taken captive, with (Shusuen’s) foot trampling him” (cf. Frayne 1997).

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Frayne 1997.

wrongly treated as a personal name in the first colophon, because the scribe forgot to write a “lu<sub>2</sub>” before it. This last point is somewhat weakened by the absence of the determinative “ki” after Indasu (but we may wonder what it does before the “lu<sub>2</sub>”). We cannot but conclude that there is no argument at all, to deduce the existence of two campaigns from these inscriptions. In our opinion, everything points at the two inscriptions describing one and the same campaign. Exactly the same toponyms are enumerated – some in exactly the same order. Moreover, and no less importantly, there is no year name of Shusuen mentioning a second campaign against the east.

How should we deal with the interpretation by Steve, Vallat and Gasche that the campaign was directed against Susa, LU<sub>2</sub>.SU? Why would the Sumerian king attack this city if it was not in the hands of an enemy? This, of course, hinges on the interpretation of “LU<sub>2</sub>.SU”. *Contra* Steve, Vallat and Gasche who believe the LU<sub>2</sub>.SU are the people of Susiana, Steinkeller (1988a) convincingly argued that the LU<sub>2</sub>.SU are the Shimashkeans. In our opinion the aforementioned passages additionally and definitively prove the equation LU<sub>2</sub>.SU = *Šimāški*, since they translate the Sumerian “LU<sub>2</sub>.SU<sup>ki</sup>” as “*ši<sub>2</sub>-maš-ki-im<sup>ki</sup>*” in the Akkadian version.<sup>34</sup> Most recently, Steinkeller (2007: 227, esp. n. 47) showed that, in all probability, Ebarat remained loyal to the Ur III empire throughout the reigns of Shulgi, Amarsuena and Shusuen, and that Ebarat clearly had no part in the Shimashkean revolt against Shusuen and that if he participated at all, it was on Shusuen’s side. In other words, it is obvious that the military campaign by Shusuen against Zabshali in his 7<sup>th</sup> year of reign, was directed against the Shimashkean state and not against Susa, which was still under Ur III control at that time.

## 9.5. Susa Under Shimashkean Rule

As already shown in *MDP* 54 and earlier in this article, Ebarat I must have conquered Susa shortly after IS 3. This has recently been confirmed by Steinkeller (2007: 223), who has dated Ebarat’s reign in Susa to between IS 4 and 8. Steinkeller (2007: esp. n. 31) believes that Ebarat’s reign was short-lived and that Ibbisuen regained control of Susa in his 9<sup>th</sup> year of reign when he launched a military campaign against Huhnuri and Anshan (cf. n. 11). Unfortunately, we have no Susa texts with a *post* IS 3 year name that can prove that Ibbisuen did indeed recapture Susa.

Some Susa texts might indicate that other Shimashkeans ruled at Susa after Ebarat I. In our study of the tablets from Susa with unattributed year names (De Graef 2008a), we showed that they can, most probably, be attributed to Shimashkean rulers. Three texts might indicate that the year name they bear can be attributed to Idattu I, who we now know was the son of Kindattu and the grandson of Ebarat I (Steinkeller 2007: 221-222). *MDP* 18, 123 and 124 both bear the year name mu us<sub>2</sub>-sa zi-da-na ba-ḥulu “Year after the year Zidana was destroyed” and both are sealed by the scribe Shunanaya (Akk. *Šu-Nanaya*), who was a servant of Idattu (De Graef 2008a: 74-76). *MDP* 24, 385 bears the year name mu <sup>urudu</sup>alan ḥu-ut-ra-an-te-em-ti ba-dim<sub>2</sub> “Year when the copper statue of Hutrantepti was made”. Following the *Genealogy of Shilhakinshushinak*,<sup>35</sup> Idattu was the legitimate descendant (*ruhu šak*) of Hutrantepti, which makes it plausible that he was the one to make a statue of Hutrantepti (*ibid.* 78-79). Another text, *MDP* 28, 505, bearing the year name mu us<sub>2</sub>-sa alan ku<sub>3</sub>-babbar 4-bi ba-dim<sub>2</sub> “Year after the year when 4 silver statues were made” might have been written under Tanruhurater’s reign, as the text mentions his house or palace: e<sub>2</sub> tan-<sup>d</sup>ru-ḥu-ra-/te-er (De Graef 2008a: 80-81). Tanruhurater was the son of Idattu I (Malbran-Labat 1995: 26-29).

It, therefore, seems possible that after the short reign of Ebarat I (ca. IS 4-8?) and the establishment, by him, of Shimashkean rule at Susa, which was probably interrupted by the military attempts of Ibbisuen to recapture the city (IS 9 and IS 14), his grandson Idattu I and his great grandson Tanruhurater retook power in Susa (at the end of Ibbisuen’s reign and later), after which their descendant Ebarat II took power and eventually institutionalized the *Sukkalmahat* in Susa (ca. 1980 BCE).

<sup>34</sup> *RIME* 3/2.1.4.3 col. ii: 14-20: u<sub>4</sub>-ba LU<sub>2</sub>.SU<sup>ki</sup> ma-da ma-da za-ab-ša-li<sup>ki</sup> za<sub>3</sub> an-ša-an<sup>ki</sup>-ta a-ab-ba igi-nim-ma-še<sub>3</sub> buru<sub>5</sub>-gen<sub>7</sub> zi-ga-bi “at that time LU<sub>2</sub>.SU<sup>ki</sup> (which comprises) the lands of Zabshali, rose like locusts from the borders of Anshan up to the Upper Sea (*i.e.* Caspian Sea)” followed by 12 (+x) toponyms which are said to have come forth to do battle (col. ii: 21-41: Nibulmat, (...), Sigrish, Alumidatum, Garta, Azahar, Bulma, Nushushmar, Nushgalenum, Zizirtum, Arahir, Shatilu, Tirmium and<sup>1</sup> (...) – 6 lines lost), from which we can deduce that these toponyms belong to the LU<sub>2</sub>.SU<sup>ki</sup>. Eleven of these toponyms occur in the Akkadian version, after the indication <sup>1</sup>ma<sup>1</sup>-ta-at ši -maš-ki-im<sup>ki</sup> “the lands of Shimashki”: *RIME* 3/2.1.4.5 Ex. 2 Obv.: 9-20 = Ex. 1 Obv. viii 14-28: <sup>1</sup>ma<sup>1</sup>-ta-at ši -maš-ki-im<sup>ki</sup> u-ḥa-li-iq ma-at za-ab-ša-li<sup>ki</sup> ma-at si-ig-<ri<sub>2</sub> >-i<sup>ki</sup> ma-at ni-bu-ul-ma-ar<sup>ki</sup> ma-at a-lu-mi-da-tim<sup>ki</sup> ma-at ga-ar-ta<sup>ki</sup> ma-at ša-ti-lu<sup>ki</sup> ŠU+NIĜEN<sub>2</sub> 6 ma<sup>1</sup>-ta-tim<sup>1</sup> a-za-ḥa-ar<sup>ki</sup> bu-ul-ma<sup>ki</sup> nu-uš-ma-ar<sup>ki</sup> <sup>1</sup>nu<sup>1</sup>-uš-<sup>1</sup>ga-ne-lu<sup>1</sup>-um<sup>ki</sup> <sup>1</sup>zi<sup>1</sup>-zi-ir-<sup>1</sup>tum<sup>ki</sup> [a<sup>1</sup>]-<sup>1</sup>ra-ḥi<sup>1</sup>-[ir<sup>ki</sup>] “the lands of Shimashkim; he destroyed the land, the land Sigrish, the land Nibulmat, the land Alumidatum, the land Garta, the land Shatilu, altogether six lands; Azahar, Bulma, Nushushmar, Nushgalenum, Zizirtum, Arahir” (cf. Frayne 1997).

<sup>35</sup> König 1965: 48, 48a and 48b.