**64) Kansakka or Karsakka?** – The Murašû Archive contains many Iranian names, one of which appears in BE 9 76:12, a contract drafted in 425 B.C. In their index of personal names to the edition of the text, Hilprecht and Clay have "Kar(Gan?)-sak-ka-" and connected this name with names such as Bagasākhq and Mhd"sakkhq<sup>1</sup>. A couple of years later Scheftelowitz<sup>2</sup> preferred a reading Karsakka, which according to him was related to the Avestan anthroponyms Kërësaoxšan-, Kërësauuazdah-, Kërësāni- and Kërësāspa-(all composed with *kërës*-, "meagre, skinny"³). This reading was adopted by Zadok, who reconstructed an Iranian name \*Krsaka-, a -*ka*-extension of a retrenchment of a name composed with \**krsa*-4.

Dandamayev<sup>5</sup>, however, rightfully questioned this reading, for the simple reason that the sign GÁN cannot be read *kar*. It can be read kár, but in Dandamayev's view kár does not occur in Achaemenid Babylonia. Accordingly he reads <sup>m</sup>Kán-sak-ka-' and reconstructs \*Kancaka-, with reference to \*Kacaka- (El. <sup>hal</sup>Ka<sub>4</sub>-za-ka<sub>4</sub><sup>6</sup>). In his review of Dandamayev's book, Zadok<sup>7</sup> immediately replied to this objection: kár does exist in Neo-Babylonian and, moreover, \*Kancaka- can only be rendered by <sup>m</sup>Kán-šak-ka-'.

Some remarks should be made concerning this spelling and the underlying Iranian name. The first sign of the name discussed here is in all likelihood KÁN. Despite Zadok's opinion, *kár* does not seem to occur in Achaemenid Babylonian. According to Röllig & von Soden<sup>®</sup> this value is only attested in Neo-Babylonian and Neo-Assyrian texts. The three

- **1** H.V. Hilprecht & Clay, A.T., Business Documents of Murashû Sons of Nippur dated in the reign of Artaxerxes I (464-424 B.C.) (BE 9), Philadelphia, 1898, 61.
  - 2 I. Scheftelowitz, "Altiranische Studien", ZDMG 57 (1903), 166.
  - 3 M. Mayrhofer, Die altiranischen Namen (IPNB 1), Vienna, 1979, I/59-60.
- **4** R. Zadok, "Iranians and Individuals bearing Iranian Names in Achaemenian Babylonia", *IOS* 7 (1977), 103 and n.134).
- **5** M.A. Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia* (Columbia Lectures on Iranian Studies 6), Costa Mesa, 1992, 93.
  - 6 W. Hinz, Altiranisches Sprachgut der Nebenüberlieferungen (GOF Ir. 3), Wiesbaden, 1975, 144.
- **7** R. Zadok, review of M.A. Dandamayev, Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia, *BSOAS* 58 (1995), 159.
  - **8** W. Röllig & von Soden, W., Das akkadische Syllabar (AnOr 42), 4th ed., Rome, 1991, 14 no.78.

examples of  $k\acute{a}r$  listed by Röllig and von Soden come from two literary texts: a kudurru from the reign of Merodachbaladan II (721-710 B.C.) on the one hand and from an exemplar of the "Story of the Ox and the Horse" (library of Assurbanipal) on the other hand. Although the Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian syllabaries are not very different, no Late Babylonian example of  $k\acute{a}r$  so far has been discovered.

Zadok's second argument ("Only Kán-šak-ka-' may render \*Kancaka-") is dismissible, for SAK has a value  $\check{sak}^9$  as a result of which the name can easily be read <sup>m</sup>Kán-šak-ka-'. Any objection for a reconstruction \*Kancaka- is hereby ruled out. One should, however, not connect \*Kancaka- with \*Kacaka-, as Dandamayev does. Rather \*Kancaka- is a -ka-extension of a -ca-hypocoristic of a retrenchment of a name containing \*kan-, "to long for" (OInd. and Av. kan-).

Jan Tavernier (18-08-2005)

<sup>9</sup> R. Borger, Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon (AOAT 305), Münster, 2003, 293 no.184.