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"sakhkq⁵. A couple of years later Scheftelowitz² preferred a reading Karsakka, which according to him was related to the Avestan anthroponyms Kërësaoxšan-, Kërësauuazdah-, Kërësāni- and Kërësāspa-(all composed with kërēs-, “meagre, skinny”⁶). 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.

Dandamayev⁵, however, rightfully questioned this reading, for the simple reason that the sign GĀN cannot be read kar. It can be read kár, but in Dandamayev’s view kár does not occur in Achaemenid Babylonia. Accordingly he reads mKán-sak-ka-⁶ and reconstructs *Kancaka-, with reference to *Kacaka- (El. ba-Ka₄-za-ka₄). In his review of Dandamayev’s book, Zadok⁷ immediately replied to this objection: kár does exist in Neo-Babylonian and, moreover, *Kancaka- can only be rendered by mKán-šak-ka-⁷.

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 KĀN. Despite Zadok’s opinion, kár does not seem to occur in Achaemenid Babylonian. According to Röllig & von Soden⁸ this value is only attested in Neo-Babylonian and Neo-Assyrian texts. The three
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examples of kár 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 kár so far has been discovered.

Zadok’s second argument (“Only Kán-šak-ka- as may render *Kancaka-“) is dismissible, for SAK has a value šak$^9$ as a result of which the name can easily be read mKán-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)
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