The appearance of two comprehensive Akkadian dictionaries has revolutionized Assyriological studies, but sometimes the previous generations (or some individuals among them) seem to have known better than the well-equipped present generation. A case in point is the entry sarrapu "Silberschmied" in Bezold, Glossar, p. 240a, which is not found in any other Akkadian dictionary, earlier1 or later. CAD § (1961) briefly notes on p. 114a: "**sarrapu (Bezold Glossar 240a) see šārip dušē". No reference to *sarrapu is made under the latter entry (p. 110b), but one finds a word occurring in ADD 626 = 806, r. 4 and previously read zarabbu in CAD Z (1961), corrected there into "LÚ ša-rip₂ (RAB) d[u₂-ši-e]". AHw Lfg. 12 (1974), accepting the correction, does not even bother to refer to the deleted lemma, and no *sarrapu is found in the Nachträge to AHw included in Lfg. 16 (1981).

Against this background, it is interesting to find the following entry in D.J. Wiseman’s and J.V. Kinnier Wilson’s preliminary catalogue of the 1950 Nimrud texts in Iraq 13 (1953), pp. 102ff.: "(amel) sarrapu (SIMUG.GUSKIN), ‘goldsmith’, [ND] 423, 7" (index, p. 122). No justification is given for the reading, which pops up a few years later in B. Parker’s catalogue of Nabû temple texts in Iraq 19 (1957), pp. 125ff. (cf. p. 127 ad ND 5447, 10, and index, p. 137), again without any justification or comment.

Interestingly, in Parker’s edition of BT 101 (Iraq 25 [1963], p. 90), completed after the appearance of CAD §, the reading sarrapu is no longer maintained. Evidently the authority of the dictionary had crushed whatever ideas Miss Parker may have earlier harbored about the reading of the logogram. The reading sarrapu does not figure in J.N. Postgate’s (1973) edition of ND 423 (GPA no. 118) either, where the word “goldsmith” is given in logographic transliteration (LÚ.SIMUG.GUSKIN) only. From the space

between the components of the logogram and the glossary entry in Postgate, *FNALD* (1976), p. 183b, it is clear that the intended reading was *nappāh hurāši*. This of course agrees with the position of *AHw* (p. 739a) and *CAD* (N/1, p. 309), where all attestations of *(ĽU)SIMUG KUG.GI* are listed under *nappahu*. And it of course also agrees with today’s Assyriological common opinion. Compare simply Borger, *ABZ* (1981), p. 140 (under 338 SIMUG), as well as K. Deller, *AfO* 32 (1985), p. 50, and O. Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries in the City of Assur II* (1986), p. 132, both with a space between SIMUG and KUG.GI clearly implying the reading *nappāh hurāši*.

But is the reading *šarrāpu* earlier suggested for this logogram really out of the question? One should note that the passage in *ADD* 626 = 806 containing the word “zarabbu”, corrected into *šārip d[ušē]* in *CAD*  ($.p$. 110b, is not damaged at all; on the contrary, the signs in question, *(ĽU)ZA-rab-bi*, are perfectly preserved and their reading is not in doubt, as can be easily seen from the two (independently made) copies by Johns. Hence the ‘correction’ suggested in *CAD* is not acceptable. Moreover, there is no justification whatsoever in Neo-Assyrian for a syllabic value RAB = *rēp* posited by the ‘corrector’. One must therefore take a more serious look at the and its implications.

*ADD* 626 (= 806) is an administrative document listing landed property (field and orchards) sold to “servants” (ARADMES) of government officials under Tiglath-pileser III (Obv. 1-6), Shalmaneser V (Obv. 7-12) and the ruling king (Obv. 13-Rev. 8), who must be Sargon II. The reverse, clearly pertaining to the reign of the ruling king, details silver and copper dues collected from five individuals identified by name and profession. One of these is identified as “Nabûwa the goldsmith” *(ĽdPA-u-a SIMUG.KUG.GI, r. 13)*. A person with the same name, this time identified as *(ĽU)ZA-rab-bi*, figures among the buyers of land in the preceding section (r. 4).

Since both sections of the text pertain to the same reign, the two entries are contemporary and could accordingly pertain to the same individual. *(ĽU)ZA-rab-bi* would then be a syllabic spelling of SIMUG.KUG.GI. This seems plausible in view of Syr. *šarrāpa* “refiner of silver” (Payne Smith, p.485b, *nomen professionis* from *sṛp* “to refine, purge”) and Bibl. *sōrēp* “gold-, silversmith” (Köhler-Baumgartner, p. 817b,

2) Alternation of syllabic and logographic spellings, even within the same text, is a feature well attested in Neo-Assyrian, note e.g. the spellings of “groom” in *ADD* 852 *(ĽU GIS GIGIR in col. I, 6, *(ĽU)SU-SA-ni/nu in I, 2*, and rev. II, 2, and mere *su in I, 8 and 10)*. The equation *(ĽU GIS GIGIR = *(ĽU)SU-SA-nu* tentatively proposed by me in *AOAT* 6 (1970), p. 319, *JSS* 21 (1976), p. 172, and OLZ 74 (1979), col. 35a, can now be considered certain, as the logographic and syllabic spellings occur as orthographic variants in different manuscripts of a cultic commentary (*LKA 71 // TIM* 9, 59):

*(ĽU GIS GIGIR d*EN *ĽU/SAL t*EN.[LIL] * LKA 71, 8

*(ĽU)SU-SA-NU t*EN *ĽU/SAL d*EN.[LIL] * TIM 9, 59, 11.
participle of šrp “to smelt, refine”). LÚZA-rab-bi would then have to be read LÚ ša-rab-bi and interpreted as a variant of */šarrāpu/, a nomen professionis from šarrāpu “to refine metals (gold, etc.) by firing” (CAD §, p. 102, cf. MA šarpū “silver”), featuring three well-attested phonological features of Neo-Assyrian: (1) secondary voicing of a stop in voiced root environment (šarrāpu → šarrābu⁵; (2) quantity metathesis (šarrābu → šarrabbu⁴), and (3) neutralization of gemination before a stressed syllable ending in a geminate (šarrabbu → šarrabbu)⁵.

The possibility that /šarrāpu/ might be the Neo-Assyrian reading of (LÚ)SIMUG.KUG.GI had occurred to me on the basis of the ADD 626 passage as long as 22 years ago⁶, but in the absence of further evidence it seemed (despite the Syriac and Biblical parallels) too tenuous to be seriously advocated. I suspect that the šarrāpu entry in Bezold, Glossar, and the readings of Wiseman, Kinnier Wilson and Parker in Iraq were likewise based on the ADD passage, and that the latter decided to reverse their opinions because they too felt that the evidence was too tenuous.

In fact, however, additional evidence for the reading LÚ SIMUG.KUG.GI = /šarrāpu/ has been available, albeit in disguised form, for over twenty years! In Orientalia 37 (1968), pp. 81ff., E. Klengel-Brandt published a fragment of a terracotta Pazuzu head from Aššur (Ass 169 = VA 5803) bearing the following inscription in Neo-Assyrian characters: “This is the head of Pazuzu which Gabbu-ilâni-ēreš the goldsmith (SIMUG.KUG.GI) and prophet (za-[a]b-bu) of the god Aššur made with the skill of his hands and keeps displaying to the people”.

A study of the photograph published on pl. VII reveals that reading the word in line 3 as zabbu “prophet, ecstatic” is out of the question. The second sign ends in two verticals and can thus (also judging from the copy on p. 81) only be DA or RA. Since the former reading makes no sense (no root z/š-d/t-b/p exists in Akkadian), the only feasible reading is ša-ra-b/pu. Hence in Ass 169 we have another Neo-Assyrian example of a person identified both as SIMUG.KUG.GI and /šarrāpu/, and this time there is no doubt whatsoever about his identity.

Since šarrāpu (etymologically) means “refiner, smelter”, it could of course be speculated that ša-ra-pu in Ass 169 is not a syllabic spelling but a synonym of SIMUG.KUG.GI. However, this possibility is practically excluded by ADD 626, as it is extremely unlikely that an administrative document would identify a person by two

---

3) Cf. turtānu ~ turtannu, hu-šab-bu ADD 1252, 17, dēnu ~ de-en-nu ADD 397, r. 3¹, out of many similar examples.

4) Cf., e.g., za-ri-pi GPA 35, 12 ~ za-ri-bi ADD 386, 10, root zrp; ir-ti-di-bi ABL 251, 19, beside ri-di-pi ibid., 17, root rdp; a-ra-šib-bi NL 69, r. 4¹, root rsp.


6) Cf. AOAT 6, p. 321, s.v. šarrāpu.
aspects/descriptions of an occupation rather than a single occupational title. Hence in ADD 626 at least /sarrāpu/ is best taken as the Neo-Assyrian reading of SIMUG.KUG.GI, and this interpretation seems likeliest in Ass 169 too. Why should Gabbu-ilâni-êreš have been a goldsmith by profession but at the same time a “(metal) refiner/smelter” of Aššur? The latter title does not mean that when serving Aššur, he changed from a goldsmith into a smelter, but simply indicates professional affiliation with the temple of Aššur. The co-occurrence of a syllabic and a logographic spelling (sa-ra-pu and SIMUG.KUG.GI) in the same context can be easily explained as a stylistic device trying to mask the repetition of identical words in two subsequent lines.

Goldsmiths in present-day Iraq produce both gold and silver artifacts, refining their working materials themselves. The article kuttimmu in CAD K, pp. 608-609, makes it plain that the same situation has prevailed in Mesopotamia from the earliest times on. Thus “goldsmiths” not only also were “silversmiths”, but “refiners” and “smelters” of precious metals _par excellence_. This explains why there was no logogram SIMUG.KUG.UD “silversmith” in cuneiform and why “smelter” could become a word for “gold- and silversmith” both in Hebrew and in Assyrian.

7) Many Neo-Assyrian logograms had more than one current reading, e.g. GIS.GIGIR (= mugirru or narkabtu), KASKAL (hulu or harrānu).

8) Compare, e.g., Kisir-Aššur, exorcist of the Aššur temple (Hunger, _Kolophone_, pp. 68ff.), and Marduk-zeru-iddina the chanter (kalâ) of Sin and the king (ibid., p. 136).