Nabu 2021-054 C. Thissen

54) Gilûa: short for Gimil... — The recent publication of the neo- and late Babylonian documents in the Chester Beatty library, Dublin by Mary Frazer (RA 114, p. 159 ff.) sheds new light on the NB name Gilûa, spelled *m.gi-lu-ú/u-a*. Previously, the name was tentatively associated with Hurrian (K. Åkerman, P. Lapinkivi, PNA p.423): Gilū(a), (possibly a hypocor. based on a Hurr. name of the type Kel-DN); possibly Hurr.; Gelb *et al.* 1943, OIP 57, Nuzi, p.83, for Kel-Teia, Kel-Tešup, Kel-Tilla; Tallqvist 1918, APN, p.80, 111, 115, on *Gi-li-ia*, *Ka-li-DN*, *Ki-li-DN*; Wilhelm 1998 RlA 9/1-2, p.123, on the name type Kel-DN). Zadok linked the name to MB *Ki-li-ia*: "[Weidner, AfO 16, Anhang 1 = BM 130827, *Gi-lu-ú*] the 15th witness, a non-Semitic ancestral name common in Babylonia from the early 1st millennium B.C. (with a hypothetical earlier cognate, cf. MB *Ki-li-ia*, M. Hölscher 1996 [IMGULA 1], p. 124a)", R. Zadok (NABU 2003: 34).

However, this assumption is not convincing: the Hurrian names come from the mid-second millennium, nearly a millennium before the name Gilûa appears in NB; furthermore, except for the name ge-lu(-)(u)m-Atal, OIP 57 and APN always have the spelling -li- instead of -lu- for the name Kel-DN?; finally, the proven Hurrian hypocoristic spells ki/ge-(e)-li-(i)-ia, never -lu-... (APN, p.80a; OIP 57, p.81b).

We now have two cases that equate the (Early) NB name Gilûa with Gimil... ("==" means the same individual; DN = a deity):

- 1. The (non-existing) family name Gilûa of Nergal-ibni/Nabû-udammiq(-SIG₁₅) can be identified as Gimil-Nanaya: Hunger Bagh. Mitt. 5, 2:33 > gi-lu-ú-a == ŠU-DN < ibid, nos. 11, 13, 27, 31; all Early NB, Uruk). Note also the witness Iddin-Nabû/Tappûa in both nos. 2 and 11. Hunger did not recognize ŠU-DN as being Gimil-DN, but notice the following: (Dar 280:26 and Iraq 55 p.149 no.1:16) ŠU-DN == gi-mil-DN (NN Nbn passim, Camb 179:16, CM 20, 97:19 and Cyr 268:13) == gi-mil-lu-DN (Panayotov/Wunsch 2014, KT 1463 no.1:13); resp. (Baker 2004, AfO Beih. 30 Nappāhu 56:14 and 171:9) ŠU-DN == gi-mil-DN (ibid 55:21).
- 2. Līšir/Gilûa//Mu?[!] ... in Frazer RA 114, no. 3:14-15 (Uruk, 27 Nbk) is almost certainly the namesake son of Gimillu//Mušēzib (UCP 9-1, 53:9, Uruk, 28 Nbk): both are witnesses and have fellow-witnesses who are found together in other tablets (Kleber, BaAr 7, no. 65; AnOr 8, no. 12; Frazer, RA 114, no. 2; all Uruk, Nbk), proving a common Urukean 'bubble' of witness acquaintances: Bēl-ahhē-iqīša/Mušēzib-Marduk//Egibi, Nabû-balāssu-iqbi/Nabû-ēţir//Šangû-parakki, Nergal-nāṣir/Aqarā//Bēl-aplu-uṣur and Nādin/Uraš-šumu-uṣur//Bēl- eṭēri. Furthermore, no other individual (DN-Obj-)Līšir/Gi... (i.e. Gimillu or Gilûa)//Mu... can be found in the Neo-Babylonian prosopography, nor in any other family from Uruk in the period around Nbk II: Nabû-zēru-līšir/Gimillu from the Kudurrānu family (YOS 7, 121:12) is from Larsa, Camb; his exact namesake from the Kurî family (AUWE 28, 146) is from Uruk, Dar (I thank Karlheinz Kessler for sharing this tablet that dates from the period around Darius I, considering the scribe Ea-kāṣir in other AUWE 28 documents); the sign *Ku* sowieso does not resemble the first sign of the family name in RA 114, 3:15). Finally, Mušēzib is the only family name starting with *Mu* that comes from Uruk (Wunsch AOAT 369, Babylonische Familiennamen).

> Cornell THISSEN <cornell_thissen@hotmail.com> VU Amsterdam (THE NETHERLANDS)

© Nabu Achemenet Juin 2021