

3. W. Hinz & H. Koch, l.c., 259, 260 and 286.
4. Cf., most recently, M.W. Stolper, "Elamite" in: R.D. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, Cambridge, 2004, 70.
5. Ibid.
6. A form su-da-āš-ni occurs once in Neo-Elamite.

Jan TAVERNIER (18-08-2005) Jan.Tavernier@arts.kuleuven.be

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven – Faculteit Letteren, Blijde Inkomststraat 21, B-3000 LEUVEN (BELGIQUE)

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"sakkhq¹. A couple of years later Scheftelowitz² preferred a reading Karsakka, which according to him was related to the Avestan anthroponyms Kērēsaosān-, Kērēsauuazdah-, Kērēsāni- and Kērēsāspa- (all composed with *kērēs-*, "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 *krša-⁴.

Dandamayev⁵, 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 ^mKán-sak-ka-³ and reconstructs *Kancaka-, with reference to *Kacaka- (El. ^{hal}Ka₄-za-ka₄⁶). 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-³.

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 Soden⁸ this value is only attested in Neo-Babylonian and Neo-Assyrian texts. The three 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-³ 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-³. 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-*).

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.
9. R. Borger, *Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon* (AOAT 305), Münster, 2003, 293 no.184.

Jan TAVERNIER (18-08-2005)

65) Three Emesal compositions mentioned in rituals – (a) According to LKU 51:31', a Neo-Babylonian ritual text from Uruk, the *kalû* whispers into the right ear and the left ear (of Dumuzi?) on the 27th day of Du'ūzu. The content of the whisper was read by Falkenstein, LKU, p. 18:31 as: IM.ŠU.ÍL.TÚG. This reading was followed by Beaulieu in his new edition of the text: "the cultic singer murmu[rs] the incantation Imšu-iltug into his right ear and into his left ear [...]".¹

However, no composition bearing this name is known from the *kalû*'s repertoire and no sense could be made of this sequence of signs. Rather, the signs should be read differently. Besides Balags, Eršemmas and Eršahungas, there was another genre which was performed by the *kalû*: the Emesal Šuilla prayers.² LKU 51:31' should therefore be read: ^{lú}GALA ^{im}ŠU.ÍL.LA³ a-na GEŠTU.MIN ZAG-šú a-na GEŠTU.MIN HÚB-šú ú-l⁴la-ah⁴[haš...], "The *kalû* whisp[ers] a Šuilla into his right ear and into his left ear [...]"

Although Falkenstein copied the sign after ÍL as KU,³ it is likely that it is a scribal (or a copyist's) mistake for the similar LA sign.⁴