

STUDIA ORIENTALIA
EDITED BY THE FINNISH ORIENTAL SOCIETY
51:14

AN ARAMAIC INCANTATION BOWL
FROM BORSIPPA

ANOTHER SPECIMEN OF EASTERN ARAMAIC "KOINÉ"

APPENDIX:

A CRYPTOGRAPHIC BOWL TEXT OR AN ORIGINAL FAKE?

BY
TAPANI HARVIAINEN

HELSINKI 1981

ISBN 951-95075-7-4
ISSN 0039-3282
Helsingin yliopiston monistuspalvelu
Painatusjaos Helsinki 1981

TAPANI HARVIAINEN

AN ARAMAIC INCANTATION BOWL FROM BORSIPPA

Another Specimen of Eastern Aramaic "Koiné"

The Aramaic incantation bowl dealt with in this article was purchased by a Finn in Borsippa (Birs Nimrud), Iraq, in 1973. The bowl was broken into two bigger and three smaller pieces, but since all the pieces were preserved, the purchaser was able to glue the bowl together. The joints scarcely hamper the reading of the text (see plates 1 and 2 at the end of this article). The bowl remains in the private collection of the purchaser.

The bowl is made of light brown, fine clay. It is 15.5 cm in diameter, the flat base measuring 4.5 cm in diameter; the height is 4.5 cm, and the thickness of the sides 0.4 cm. The beginning of the text is written horizontally in three lines inside of the base (centre), while the main part flows upward in spiral form in 13 coils reaching the brim of the bowl. The ink is black and well preserved. On the outside there is no trace of writing.¹

1 The line numbers refer to the coils which begin with the word $\text{N}\text{N}\text{N}\text{N}$, so that a new, numbered line begins with the word which occurs on the supposed radius leading from the centre through N of $\text{N}\text{N}\text{N}\text{N}$ to the brim.

For Aramaic incantation bowls in general, their date (3rd-7th centuries AD), and function, see C.D. Isbell, *The Story of Aramaic Magical Incantation Bowls* (*Biblical Archeologist*, Vol. 41, No. 1, 1978, p. 5-16, henceforth: Isbell BA), T. Harviainen, *A Syriac Incantation Bowl in the the Finnish National Museum, Helsinki. A Specimen of Eastern Aramaic "Koiné"* (*Studia Orientalia* 51:1, pre-print Helsinki 1978), p. 3-5, and the literature quoted there.

In this connection I wish to mention the emendations which Prof. Franz Rosenthal has made in the reading of the Syriac incantation bowl published by me earlier (see above). His translation of lines 9-10 "He who makes (*mšawwē*, cf. Mandaic) peace is found not guilty in the Judgement; he who makes corruption is burnt in the Fire" (*mtql'* from $\sqrt{\text{ql}}$ "to burn", not from $\sqrt{\text{tql}}$) is more probable than my "(from him) who sets victorious peace in (with) his Judgement, who sets the staggering destruction in fire". Similarly, "flee" in line 12 and 12⁺ should be "fly". I am grateful to Prof. Rosenthal for this private note.

The Script and Spelling

When compared with numerous other incantation bowl texts, this one stands out for the skill and care of its writing. The forms of the square script letters conform well to those presented by J.A. Montgomery in the first column (bowl 7) of Plate xxxix of his book *Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur*.¹ However, \$h\$² and \$ḥ\$ are not distinguishable; nor are \$d\$ and \$r\$, the distinction between \$w\$ and \$y\$ (and sometimes \$n\$) usually having to be made on the basis of the context rather than the outer shape. The same is true of \$b\$ and \$k\$ as well as \$s\$ and final \$m\$. In the last two coils, the writer, cramped for space, has had to reduce the size of characters, thus considerably complicating the interpretation of this part.

The spelling is well-nigh consistent. The main deviation appears in the words שמיה (in lines 1, 3, and 11), ליליה, איממה (both in line 7), חסינה, חקיפה (both in line 9), and ארעה (line 11), in which the ending of *status determinatus* is \$h\$ instead of '\$' elsewhere in the text. בח חנה (line 5) belongs possibly to the same group. שמיה, ליליה, איממה, and ארעה represent words which are determined generically; however, this explanation does not cover other cases. The plural forms of masculine nouns terminate in \$y\$. \$y\$ indicates [i] and [e] vowels also in other positions (e.g. imp. קבילו, centre); on the other hand, the cases where \$y\$ seems to correspond to a "shewa" vowel (צִלְחָה, prefixes of pa^{cc}el) are accounted for by other factors (see below, p. 8 and 23). The pronominal suffix of the 3. pers. masc. is always spelled with \$-yh\$, whereas \$-h\$ indicates its feminine counterpart (e.g. ביתיה, ליה, נינטרוניה *contra* סוגיה and בה).

The text includes a considerable number of words which do not occur in other incantation texts.

Text

- (2) שמעו וקבילו ה דזהר יי (1) אסותא מן שמיה לכיניחיי בר חתאי שמיה לכיניחיי
בר חתאי וכל שום דאית ליה ויתסי (3) ברחמי שמיה מן לוטתא ומן אשלמתא ומן

1 University of Pennsylvania, The Museum, Publications of the Babylonian Section, Vol. III. Philadelphia 1913.

2 The symbols \$-\$ indicate a grapheme.

אנקתא ומן בכיתא ומן כל (4) מידעם ביש אמן אמן סלה
 גזירין חרימין ומשמתינן אסירין פכירין וצמידין לוטתא (5) ונידרא וקריתא צלחתא
 קלא ביזיונא חיטינא דכתשיתון בת חנה נידרא דאלהי ומללחא דאיסתרתא מקבלחא
 (6) דאובהחא גיסא דשבילי מטריי דביריתא גורגיא דאיגרא בז קלא איאי דדברא
 זיוי בר מתא קימא דחיץ בה ליחשא (7) דקרנתא ריהטא דסיהרא וסוגיה דמומתא
 משמתא דליליה וחזונא דאיממה ניתסרון וניכמרון כולהין פתיכרין על קרינהין
 ועל משדרנהין (8) ניתברון וניזיחון מן כל גבא חדרא דכיניחיי בר חתאי ומן רב
 יוסף בר אימא דאימה ומן ביתיה בשום תלתא מלאכין בשריאל במזדהט באיכרום (9)
 חסינה ובאצב תקיפה הלין מלאכי ניהוין פרחוני ומיצרי ביני טב לביש וניהוין
 ליה לרב יוסף בר אימא דאימה ולכיליחיי בר חתאי נטריא והרמגוני אינון (10)
 נינטרוניה ונישיזבוניה וניפחזוניה וניכלכלוניה לכיניחיי בר חתאי מן עינא
 בישתא ומן מסכיחא חסמתא ומן מחשב ליבא ומן מללת לישבא
 ניתחתם ביתא ויתביה ואילין (11) ביתיה וסלקין איגריה ונטרין ליה בעיריה
 וקיניניה אסיר וחתיים כיניחיי בר חתאי בפגריה אחידין וחתימין תלה מאה הדמי
 קומתיה באסיר עזקת שמיה ובחתמתא דסרתא דארעה (12) כל דיזי בישוי ונהמיי
 וטומיתא דלא תיקרבון ליה לכיניחיי בר חתאי בשום פתיכרי ואיסתרתא ומשום אראר
 וידואל ורם ונישא טוב אסיר וחתיים כיניחיי בר חתאי בעיזקתיה דסליטוס רבא
 (13) יו דמאה ונמקא כתישא דמצדתא ות... כל וחיליה איאי אזיט ורזנו חדת
 וירקא אלהי ומומתא ומנא אלהיך שריה יהוה יסוס רוח קד פתיכרי ואיסתרתא אמן
 אמן סלה

Translation

Hear (pl.) and accept the Lord, who has warned, Yahwe! (1) Salvation from
 the heavens for Keyaniḥaye (2) bar Ḥatai and everything he has, and he
 will be saved (3) by the mercies of the heavens from the curse and from
 the (deliverance) spell and from the necklace charm and from weeping and
 from all (4) evil. Amen, Amen, Selah!

Condemned (Cut off), banned (perforated), and anathematized, forbidden
 (bound), clasped (split), and attached are the curse (5) and the vow and
 the invocation (mishap), the scream, the dishonour (curse), the disgrace,
 the fault, you (pl.) who harass, the idol temple (?), the vow of gods, and
 the word of ishtars, the counter-charm (6) of ghosts, the highway robber,
 the protector-demons of streets, the rattle of roof, *baz* (-demon), the
 ayay-sound (?) of desert, the light-beings outside of the town, that
 which oppresses in it (= town), the whisper (7) of corners, the running of
 the crescent (destroyer) (-demon), and the multitude (practice) of the

accursed oath of night and vision of day time. They will be bound, and all the idol-spirits will return against their summoner and against their sender. (8) They will pass by and move away from every side of the surroundings of Keyaniḥaye bar Ḥatai and from Rabbi Josef bar 'Imma who has sworn this (sc. incantation) and from his (= K's) home in the strong name of three angels, Sariel, Mazdat (?), (and) 'Ekhrum. (9) And through a powerful band (remedy) these angels will be exorcists (??) and boundaries between good and evil and they will be a guard and (+ one word) for him, Rabbi Josef bar 'Imma who has sworn this (incantation), and for Keyaniḥaye bar Ḥatai. They (10) will guard and save and encourage and maintain Keyaniḥaye bar Ḥatai against the evil eye and the envious female watcher and the male plotter and the female backbiter (*or*: ...the evil eye and the envious gaze and the intrigue and the imprecation).

Sealed is the house and the people living in it, and they (= angels) enter (11) his house and mount his/its roof and guard him, his cattle and his properties. Bound and sealed is Keyaniḥaye bar Ḥatai as to his body, closed and sealed are the three hundred members of his body with the bond of the signet-ring of the heavens and with the seal of the band of the earth, (12) so that you, all evil demons and moaners and impure females, will not come to him, Keyaniḥaye bar Ḥatai. In the name of the idol-spirits and ishtars and for the sake of the name of 'Ar'ar (?) and Yedu'el and Ram-we-Nissa. Again bound and sealed is Keyaniḥaye bar Ḥatai with the signet-ring of Great Selitos (?) (13) and the crushed...of nets (??)...and its power, ayay (??)..... the gods and the oath(s) and the bowl (?), your God, Sariah, Yahwe, Jesus, the Ho(ly) Gho(st) (?), the idol-spirits, and the ishtars. Amen, Amen, Selah!

Commentary

Centre

שמעו and קבילו are genuine J(ewish)A(ramaic) pl. imperative forms; \$y\$ in קבילו indicates a "full" vowel.¹ In Syriac the ending \$w\$ is mute for native vocalizations; in Mandaic sg. imperatives are used also for the pl. and in the sparse pl. forms there is an ending *-un / -iun*².

1 Cf. J.N. Epstein (אפשטיין), *דקדוק ארמית בבליה*, (A Grammar of Babylonian Aramaic. Jerusalem 1960), p. 38 and 44.

2 See R. Macuch, *Handbook of Classical and Modern Mandaic* (Berlin 1965), p. 258.

ה and יי are variants of YHWH.¹

זהר pa. pf. "to warn, admonish", on the other hand "to illumine, emit light".² Cf. Ezekiel chap. 3 where "warning" (הזהיר) occurs several times; this chapter could well belong to the favourite literature of Jewish magicians.³

Line 1

שמיה "heaven(s)" or "his (sc. Yahwe's) name", occurs also in line 11 where, at least, "heavens" is more probable.

כיניני does not appear in other bowls. The name seems to be a composition of the roots \sqrt{kwn} and \sqrt{hyy} , but its vocalism remains questionable. [k^eyānī-ḥāyē]⁴ "my vigour lives / revives" is just one possibility among others.

Line 2

ויחטי = ויחאטי etpe. impf. As a result of the weakening and confusion of the laryngeal consonants,⁵ §'§ has been dropped. As for the prefix of impf. §y§ *pro* §n§, see below, p. 22.

Line 3

The exact meaning of אשלמתא remains to be ascertained; "deliverance spell" is suggested by Levine.⁶

אנקתא = ענקתא "necklace charm". The spelling with an erroneous §'§ instead of §^c§ occurs twice in other Aramaic bowl texts.⁷ Cf. ויחטי above.

1 For variants, see Montgomery, p. 273, and C.D. Isbell, Two Aramaic Incantation Bowls (*Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research*, Number 223, 1976, p. 15-23, henceforth: Isbell BASOR), p. 23.

2 M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and Midrashic Literature* (Reprint, New York 1950), p. 382. E.S. Drower and R. Macuch, *A Mandaic Dictionary* (Oxford 1963), p. 163-164.

3 For biblical verses and phrases in bowl texts, see S.A. Kaufman, A Unique Bowl from Nippur (*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 32, 1973, p. 170-174) and the literature mentioned there. See also C.D. Isbell, *Corpus of the Aramaic Incantation Bowls* (SBL Dissertation Series 17. Missoula, Montana 1975, henceforth: Isbell), p. 195 (list of quotations from Scripture).

4 Cf. חאי בר Bar-ḥāye, Montgomery, p. 275.

5 See Harviainen, p. 14 & 26-27 and the literature mentioned there.

6 For different interpretations, see *idem*, p. 24.

7 Isbell BASOR, p. 16, line 1, and Montgomery 12:9 (= Isbell 23:9).

Line 4

Most of the verbs have both a legal and a concrete signification; חרימין = "excommunicated" or "perforated",¹ פכירין = "inserted, clasped, fettered" or "split, broken open".²

Line 5

קריחא = "invocation"³ or "mishap" as in Mandaic.⁴

אחחא has \$w\$ added on the top of line between \$y\$ and \$h\$. \$y\$ does not occur elsewhere in this text as a counterpart of an expected "shewa" vowel which is found in JA אַחַחֵא⁵, cf. below, p. 23. Thus \$y\$ is either an error *pro* \$w\$ which has been added later or the pattern is dissimilar to that of JA, appr. [siw^atā].

קללא "dishonour, curse", cf., however, Mandaic *q(u)lala 1* "snare, trap".⁶

אזיונא = (1) "contempt, disgrace", (2) "prison, lock", (3) "slit".⁷

Meanings (1) and (2) are possible here, but the context חייטנא — קללא lends more support to the first one. \$dbzywn\$ in the Syriac bowl of the Iraqi Museum, 44107, line 11⁺ is most probably the same word, to be read \$w-bzywn\$, cf. also the context \$w-ql' w-bzywn' w-htywn'\$.⁸ The word is not mentioned in Syriac dictionaries, but the language of bowl texts does not show respect for boundaries between literary dialects. אזיא in Montgomery 5:3 (= Isbell 10:3) may belong to the same root rather than to \sqrt{bzz} "to spoil, plunder".⁹ אזיונא does not occur elsewhere in bowls known to me.

1 Mandaic pe. = "to excommunicate" (Drower-Macuch, p. 153) = Syriac af^cel (J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. Reprint, Oxford 1976, p. 158). According to Jastrow JA pe. means "to perforate", pa. "to excommunicate" (p. 503-504).

2 Jastrow, p. 1266. Drower-Macuch, p. 373. Cf. also Akkadian *paḫāru* (aram. Lw. ?) "(Hände usw.) fesseln" (W. von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*, Band II. Wiesbaden 1972, p. 812a); I am grateful to Prof. Jussi Aro for this reference and other valuable remarks.

3 See Montgomery, p. 84.

4 Mandaic *qirīa 1, qiriata 2* = "mishap, strife, pollution; incantations, spells", Drower-Macuch, 412.

In Syriac bowl texts the word is spelled with \$w\$, see Harviainen, p. 22-23, and V. Hamilton, *Syriac Incantation Bowls* (an unpublished dissertation, Brandeis University, Department of Mediterranean Studies, 1971. Dissertation Abstracts 71-30,130), p. 197.

5 Jastrow, p. 1266, = "cry".

6 Drower-Macuch, p. 406.

7 Jastrow, p. 153.

8 See Harviainen, p. 9 & 11, note 18. Original publication: J. Teixidor, *The Syriac Incantation Bowls in the Iraq Museum (Sumer, Vol. XVIII, Baghdad 1962, p. 51-62), p. 54-56.*

9 See also below, p. 11.

חִיטִינָא appears in other bowls only in the Iraqi Museum bowl mentioned above in which it is spelled $\$ḥṭywn'\$$.¹ A noun pattern corresponding to חִיטִינָא occurs in Syriac ($\$ḥṭyānā'\$$),² not in other Eastern Aramaic dialects.

דַּכְתְּשִׁתוֹן "you (pl.) who harass", act. part. pl. + enclitic suff. 2. masc. pl. For the meaning, cf. especially Syriac $\sqrt{kt\check{s}}$ pass. part. "vexed or harassed by a demon".³

חַנְהַ remains obscure. Who could Bath Ḥannah (or the daughter of Eve / Ḥawwah) be in this context? A demon or a relative of Keyaniḥaye harassed by demons? The translation "idol temple" goes back to Persian بتخانه *bot-khāna* "idol temple; tavern" (بت *but* "idol, image, any figure that is an object of adoration").⁴ In this case, however, בַּחְנָה * would be a more probable spelling.

מַלְלַח, spelled with to ל's as in Montgomery 6:9 (= Isbell 11:9), "word", according to Levine "imprecation".⁵ The second $\$l\$$ may represent the doubling of [l], cf., however, Mandaic *minilṭa* with the dissimilation of [ll],⁶ מַלְלָא ⁷, and מַלְלַח below in line 10.

מַקְבֻלְחָא, $\$m\$$ and $\$b\$$ are almost faded away and thus the reading of the word remains uncertain. Possibly = קִיבְלָא "counter-charm" found in many bowl texts.⁸

Line 6

אֲוֹבְהַתָּא seems to be derived from the Hebrew term אֹב "Totengeist"⁹, the plural pattern follows the analogy of אֲבָא / אֲבָ — אֲבַהַתָּא "father(s)". McCullough mentions אֲוֹבִין "ghosts" in his Bowl A, line 2.¹⁰ However, the

1 See Harviainen, p. 9

2 Payne Smith, p. 138, "fault, slight sin".

3 idem, p. 232.

4 F. Steingass, *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary* (London, s.a. [1892]), p. 154-155.

According to C. Bartholomae (*Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg 1904, c. 968, s.v. *būṭay*) *būt* "Götzenbild" occurs also in Middle Persian.

5 B.A. Levine, *The Language of the Magical Bowls* (in J. Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia V, Later Sassanian Times*. *Studia Post-Biblica*, Vol. XV. Leiden 1970, p. 343-375), p. 355-356.

6 Macuch, p. 51. Drower-Macuch, p. 268.

7 Jastrow, p. 792.

8 Montgomery, p. 86 and 142 (similarly קִיבְלִי before גִּיטִי).

9 L. Koehler - W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* (Dritte Auflage, Lieferung I. Leiden 1967), p. 19-20.

10 W.S. McCullough, *Jewish and Mandaean Incantation Bowls* (Near and Middle East Series, 5. Toronto 1967), p. 3-5.

reading of this word (probably to be read אִינוֹן "they") is rather doubtful.¹

According to Montgomery and Isbell, גִּסְטָא means "side; familiar spirit".² In this text, at least, the Syriac and Mandaic signification "marauder"³ is preferable, since גִּסְטָא is followed by דְּשִׁבְלֵי "of roads, highways". However, the context implies that "the highway robber" is rather a demon than an ordinary bandit.

מְטַרְי "protector-demons", cf. Mandaic *maṭaraia* "watcher, purgatory-demon, purgatory-dweller"⁴ and Syriac ṣmaṭṭ^e rāyā'ṣ "custos"⁵.

1 McCullough's publication raises several more questions. According to the photograph of the bowl (published in McCullough, p. 2) the following interpretation is at least as possible as that of the author's.

(1) חֲלִיזוּא אֵילְאֵיל דִּלְרִיעוּאֵל שְׂרִיָּאֵל וְשִׁלִּישֵׁיָּאֵל אֵילִין אַתִּין חֲמֶשֶׁה מְלֶאכִין (2) דִּימְרִין עַל פּוּמָה דְּבֹאבֵי בֵּר מַחְלַפְתָּא אֵינוֹן וִיכְבְּשׁוֹן יֵת קֵיימַתְהָ דְּמֶאֱבְרִזִּין בֵּר חוּא (3) וְדִישִׁלְמָאֵל בַּת מְרִידוֹךְ תַּחַת רִיגִילָה דְּבֹאבֵי בֵּר מַחְלַפְתָּא סְדִים חֵיא דְּבֵה דְּבֹאבֵי בֵּר מַחְלַפְתָּא (4) דְּצִיר וַחַתֵּם בִּיעֻזְקַתָּה דָּאֵל שְׂדֵי דְּבֹאבֵי בֵּר מַחְלַפְתָּא

(1) Ḥaliziwa, 'El'el, Dil-re'u^cel, Šari'el, and Shelishi'el enter (and) come (or: they come), these five angels (2) who afflict through the mouth (= word, command) of Babhai bar Maḥlaphta. And they will tread the the dedication(-prayer)s of Mahbarzin bar Ḥawwa (3) and of Shelam'el bath Maredukh under the foot of Babhai bar Maḥlaphta. Shut is the life which is in him, Babhai bar Maḥlaphta, (4) who is tied and sealed with the signet-ring of 'El Shaddai. Of Babhai bar Maḥlaphta.

McCullough:

(1) חֲלִיזוּא אֵילְאֵיל דִּלְרִיעֵיָּאֵל שְׂרִיָּאֵל וְשִׁלִּישֵׁיָּאֵל אֵזְלוֹן אַתּוֹן חֲמֶשֶׁה מְלֶאכִין (2) דִּי מְמַרִין עַל בֵּיתָה דְּבֹאבֵי בֵּר מַחְלַפְתָּא אֹבִיָּן וִיכְבְּשׁוֹן יֵת קֵיימַתְהָ דְּמֶאֱבְרִזִּין בֵּר חוּא (3) יְרוּשִׁלְמָאֵי בַת מְרִידוֹךְ תַּחַת רִיגִילַח דְּבֹאבֵי בֵּר מַחְלַפְתָּא קְרִיסְתִיא רַבַּת (4) דְּצִיר וַחַתֵּם בִּיעֻזְקַתָּה דְּאֵל שְׂדֵי דְּבֹאבֵי בֵּר מַחְלַפְתָּא

(1) Girt are El-El, Dilri^cel, Sariel, and Shlishiel; be gone, ye five angels (2) who are afflicting the house of Babai, son of Maḥlaphta, with ghosts; and they will bind Qyymthd M'brzyn with a millstone; (3) the Jerusalemite, daughter of Mruduk, (is) under the protection (or "good luck") of Babai, son of Maḥlaphta, (and of) Qristia, mistress of Babai, son of Maḥlaphta; (4) this (lit. "which") is tied and sealed with the signet-ring of El Shaddai belonging to Babai, son of Maḥlaphta.

According to Isbell (p. 3), however, "'Bowl A' is very clear and legible, and there is little to add to McCullough's transcription, translation, or commentary to it." Discrepancies of this kind complicate the evaluation of bowl texts for linguistic purposes.

2 Montgomery, p. 142-143. Isbell, p. 162 (vocabulary, no. 178).

3 Payne Smith, p. 69. Drower-Macuch, p. 76 and 91.

4 Drower-Macuch, p. 241.

5 C. Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum*² (Halis Saxonum 1928, henceforth: Brockelmann, *Lexicon*), p. 562.

בִּירִיתָא "streets", cf. Mandaic *biria* 1, pl. *biriata*¹ and Syriac $\$berrit\bar{a}'\$,$ pl. $\$bery\bar{a}t\bar{a}'\$,$ "street, broad place"².

גִּוּרְגַּיָא = Syriac $\$g\bar{u}rg\bar{a}y\bar{a}'\$,$ "clangor, excitatio" from the root \sqrt{grgy} "rostris compulsatis clangorem dedit".³ As for דַּמִּיגְרָא, cf. Syriac and JA $\$bar'egg\bar{a}r\bar{a}'\$,$ "demon", "Poltergeist".

אִימָא בִּזְמָא וְקִלְלָא remains obscure. In Montgomery 5:3 (= Isbell 10:3) אִימָא וְקִלְלָא as well as אִימָא בִּזְמָא in Isbell 52:3-4 may conceal a similar expression.⁴ Certain occurrences of אִימָא בִּזְמָא are also questionable in this respect. A demon by the name of *baz* or *biz* is known to Mandaean.⁵ אִימָא is obviously an onomatopoeic word; it seems to occur also in line 13. זִינִי "(Mand.) light-beings"⁶; however, זִינִי "weapons" or "losses"⁷ is a reading of quite the same probability.

אִימָא = [qayyāmā] or [qāymā] "being, standing, existing".

אִימָא act. part. from the root \sqrt{hws} "to squeeze, press closely", cf. אִימָא (a case of laryngeal confusion) in Montgomery 1:11 (= Isbell 1:11).

אִימָא "whisper, charm", the pattern tallies with Mandaic *lihša*⁸, not with Syriac or JA $\$l\bar{e}h\bar{s}\bar{a}'\$,$ ⁹

Line 7

אִימָא קִרְנָתָא "(street-)corner", pl. with $\$-t\$,$ "when used figuratively"¹⁰.

אִימָא רִיחָא "running" as in JA and Mandaic.¹¹

אִימָא obviously = *sahra* 2 in Mandaic. Among many interpretations proposed

1 Drower-Macuch, p. 62.

2 Payne Smith, p. 55. Cf. Isbell 68:4: מִרִּי בִּירִיתָא "the Lord of the Streets" (?).

3 Brockelmann, *Lexicon*, p. 131.

4 אִימָא בִּזְמָא could be derived from the root \sqrt{bzz} "to spoil, plunder", see above, p. 8.

5 Drower-Macuch, p. 46 and 60.

6 idem, p. 166.

7 JA אִימָא זִינִי I = "weapon; ornament", II = "restriction, loss", Jastrow, p. 393; Mandaic *zaina* 1 = "weapon; fetter(s)", 2 = "harm, damage, loss, mischief", Drower-Macuch, p. 158.

8 Drower-Macuch, p. 236.

9 Payne Smith, p. 241. Jastrow, p. 704.

10 Payne Smith, p. 520.

11 Jastrow, p. 1473. Drower-Macuch, p. 433.

for the term,¹ "crescent spirit" may gain support from the "running" mentioned as a characteristic of this demon, also the vocalism with an *i*-sound in the first syllable could be more closely related to JA קִיְהָרָה and Mandaic *sira*² "moon" than to (Syriac) §sārḥā'§ "corruptor, destroyer". However, if the word is a metathesis of §srḥ'§ as proposed by Nöldeke, §h§ in סִיְהָרָה is to be read §h§.

סִיְהָרָה = either סִיְהָרָה I = "multitude, largeness" or סִיְהָרָה II = "walk; study; practice, usage", which occur in JA,³ but not in other Eastern Aramaic dialects (+ suff. 3. pers. fem. sg.).

מִשְׁמַחָה obviously pa^{cc}el pass. part. fem. from the root $\sqrt{\text{smt}}$ (/t/ of the feminine suffix is assimilated into the last root consonant) = "accursed, excommunicated, banned". Dictionaries do not mention a noun with the prefix §m-§ of this root.

חִיזוּנָה "vision", the genuine Aramaic form instead of the hebraizing חִזוֹנָה which also appears in bowl texts.⁴

דַּאימָמָה "of day time", spelled as in Syriac (§'Imām§).⁵

נִיְתַסְרוּן = נִיְתַסְרוּן, the mute §'§ has been dropped, similarly דַּאֲתַסְרוּ in Montgomery 4:4 (= Isbell 5:4) and נִיְתַסְרוּ in Montgomery 19:14 (= Isbell 21:14). For the prefix §n-§ of this and following verbs (*pro* יִתְסִי, line 2), see below, p. 22.

נִיְכַמְרוּן, the root $\sqrt{\text{kmr}}$ is attested in a meaning suited to the context, viz. "to return", only in Mandaic and Modern East Aramaic ("Assyrian").⁶ Pa^{cc}el implied by the spelling bears, however, a transitive signification, "to send back", which does not make sense here. Thus we have to interpret the form as ethpa^{cc}al in which /t/ is assimilated into the first root

1 "crescent-spirit, sorcery-spirit", "Zauberer", "Verderber", "corruptor, destroyer", for the sources of proposals, see S. Niditch, *Incantation Texts and Formulaic Language: A New Etymology for ḥumry* (*Orientalia*, Vol. 48, 1979, p. 461-471), p. 463, fn. 12.

Drower-Macuch, p. 310: "demon"; for occurrences in Mandaic bowl texts, see E.M. Yamauchi, *Mandaic Incantation Texts* (American Oriental Series, Vol. 49. New Haven, Connecticut 1967), p. 343.

2 J. Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Targumim und Midraschim* (Zweite Auflage. Berlin und Wien 1924), Dritter Band, p. 485, s.v. קִיְהָרָה, סִיְהָרָה, קִיְהָרָה. Drower-Macuch, p. 329 *sira* 1.

3 Jastrow, p. 961.

4 See Isbell, p. 165 (vocabulary, no. 274).

5 Payne Smith, p. 13.

6 See Drower-Macuch, p. 218-219.

consonant.¹ This verb with the assimilated /t/ occurs also in the Syriac bowl Hamilton 16:5 (§nkmrwn\$, Hamilton and Teixidor: "may they be made mournful - and may there fall upon their master their invocation").²

פתִּיכִרִין, \$y\$ indicates that the vocalism resembles that of Mandaic (*patikra*) and deviates from JA and Syriac (§p^etakrā'\$).³ After כּוּלֵהִין *status determinatus* would be expected *pro st. abs.* here. For the suffix הִין-הִין (כּוּלֵהִין, קִרְיֵנִהִין, and מִשְׁדֵּרְנֵהִין), see below, p. 21-22.

Line 8

נִיחְבְּרוּן = נִיחְעֲבְרוּן, \$^c\$ has been dropped as '\$' above in יתסי (line 2) and נִיחְסֵרוּן (line 7), similarly וּחְבֵטְלוּן וּחְעֵבְרוּן in Isbell 43:6.

נִיזִיחוּן "they will depart", the confusion of laryngeal consonants has called forth various neologisms of the roots $\sqrt{zw\eta}$, \sqrt{zwc} , $\sqrt{z\eta h}$, and $\sqrt{vz\eta}$,⁴ cf. דִּיזַח in Montgomery 3:2 (= Isbell 8:2), וּחְזִיזְעוּן etc. in Montgomery 7:5 (= Isbell 3:5), וּחְזִיזְחִין in Isbell 39:4, and וּחְזִיזְחוּן in Isbell 43:6.

חֲדָרָא = Mandaic *hdara* and Syriac §h^edārā'\$ "district round about", pl. "surroundings".⁵

Rabbi Josef bar 'Imma is not attested in other bowl texts known to me. He is probably the actual writer of the bowl text, not an authority on exorcists like Joshua bar Peraḥia.⁶

רַבִּי is the genuine Eastern (Babylonian) Jewish title *pro* Palestinian רַבִּי.⁷

דְּאִימָה seems to be pf. of p^{ec}al of the root \sqrt{ymy} "to swear" spelled with an initial '\$' as in Syriac⁸ (cf. אִימִיחִי in the bowl text published by

1 See Mandaic counterparts in Drower-Macuch, p. 218, and Macuch, p. 267. Assimilated forms are common also in JA, see Epstein, p. 50. However, J. Malone ("הלכות פטוקות של הארמית בין בלשני גלגל ובלשני גלגל המנדאית" [Observations of Linguistic Similarity Between the Babylonian Aramaic of "Hālakot Pēsuqot" and Mandaic], *Leshonenu* 37, 1973, p. 161-164) mentions this phenomenon as one of the features shared with Aramaic of the Hālākōt Pēsūqōt and Mandaic (p. 161, § 2.3.).

2 Iraqi Museum, no. 60960, published by Teixidor, p. 59-61.

3 See Drower-Macuch, p. 366, Jastrow, p. 1254, and Payne Smith, p. 471.

4 See Montgomery, p. 130 and 139.

5 Drower-Macuch, p. 131. Payne Smith, p. 128.

6 For Joshua bar Peraḥia, see J. Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia V, Later Sassanian Times* (Studia Post-Biblica, Vol. XV. Leiden 1970), p. 235-241.

7 H.L. Strack, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (transl., New York 1969), p. 303, note 9.

8 Payne Smith, p. 193, s.v. §yimā', 'imā'§.

Smelik, line 3; hardly af^cel which would be spelled (אומית(י));¹ in this case the final \$h\$ indicates the object suffix of the 3. pers. fem. sg. referring to the incantation in its totality. A suffix of the 3 pers. masc. would require a \$y\$ between \$m\$ and \$h\$, see above, p. 4. Thus, e.g. "who is his mother" is improbable. Similarly the fact that \$y\$ is lacking makes imperfect forms (with a suffix) unlikely.

טזזזזז-angel is not attested in other bowl texts; the name seems to be Persian.²

מאיכרום = "how exalted!"

Line 9

לצא seems to equal Syriac \$^{ce}šābā'\$ "bandage; binding up; remedy, prescription"³, \$' pro \$^c derives its origin from the confusion of laryngeals. The final '\$' is either forgotten or the form is a *status constructus*, i.e. "with help of the Mighty one's band".

הלין "these" as in Mandaic and Syriac.⁴ In JA הלין occurs in earlier Tractates of the Talmud (Nedarim etc.) as well as in the Geonic literature; it is found also in a number of Aramaic bowls.⁵ However, הני is the standard form of JA.⁶

ניהוין, see below, p. 21-22.

פרחוני, there is no suitable derivative from the root \sqrt{prh} in Aramaic dictionaries.⁷ Persian پری خوان *parī-khūān* "exorcist, magician"⁸ (+ \$y\$, the Aramaic plural ending) offers a tempting explanation; however, *parī* goes back to *pairikā-* "Zauberin, Hexe"⁹, which would require a \$y\$ (and obviously also \$k\$) between \$r\$ and \$h\$. Thus the meaning of this word remains uncertain.

1 K.A.D. Smelik, An Aramaic Incantation Bowl in the Allard Pierson Museum (*Bibliotheca Orientalis*, Jaargang XXXV, 1978, p. 174-175).

2 Cf. *Ahura-mazdāh*, Μαζαῶος, Μαζαῶα, *Mazdai*, *Mazda-data* (F. Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch*. Marburg 1895, p. 7-10, 201) & מזדואי in Isbell 19.

3 Payne Smith, p. 423. מצבעא "finger" might also be possible here as *status constructus*; the word is of fem. gender, and thus תקיפה cannot be its attribute.

4 Drower-Macuch, p. 121. Payne Smith, p. 104, s.v. \$hān\$.

5 Epstein, p. 24.

W.H. Rossell, *A Handbook of Aramaic Magical Texts* (Shelton Semitic Series, Number II. Ringwood Borough, New Jersey 1953), p. 28, § 4.10.

6 Epstein, p. 23.

7 Could the enigmatic נ(ו)לְפָחָה (Ezek. 13:20) occurring in a prophecy against magic bands be reflected in this term? For Ezekiel quotations, see Kaufman, p. 171-172, and above, p. 7.

מיצרי "boundary" or "rope-bridge";¹ in the text Isbell 57:7, however, the word occurs with the meaning "corner" (= Mandaic *mišraq*;² Isbell: "the four borders of the house of Bahram-Gušnasp").

בני טב לביש, masc. sg. st. abs. forms in a neuter signification.

כיליחי, a mistake *pro* כיניחי.

נטריא, possibly = Syriac $\$n^e\dot{t}ury\ddot{a}'\$$ "observatio"³, i.e. an abstract noun with the ending $\$-y\dot{\$}$ as in Syriac.⁴

רהמגוני/הד/ח could be a Persian term, but its meaning and etymology are not clear to me.

אינון accords with the "dialectal and Geonic" אִינוֹן "they" in JA⁵ (cf. Mandaic *hinun* and Syriac $\$hennon\$, \$'ennon\$\$$);⁶ contrary to them, the usual JA counterpart is אִינוֹ, אִינְהוּ.⁷

Line 10

For the prefix $\$ny-\$$ of the following verbs ($pa^{cc}el$), see below, p. 23.

ניפחזוניה, on the basis of other verbs we would expect a transitive (causative, $pa^{cc}el$) sense also here. The root \sqrt{phz} has a general meaning of "being reckless, wanton" or "boasting". With a positive intention $pa^{cc}el$ may be roughly construed in this context as "to encourage, harden".

ניכללוניה, the root \sqrt{klk} (from \sqrt{kw}) does not occur in Aramaic. It seems to be a loan from the Old Testament, from a passage such as "and Joseph provided his father, his brothers, and all his father's household with food (Gen. 47:12, Revised Standard Version), or "a man's spirit will endure sickness" (Prov. 18:14, RSV). In Hebrew כלכל means also "to arm, fit out".⁸

8 Steingass, p. 246.

9 Bartholomae, c. 863.

1 Jastrow, p. 828, s.v. מצר, מ(י)צרא I & II. Hardly = Iranian *šinvat*-bridge.

2 Drower-Macuch, p. 269.

3 Brockelmann, Lexicon, p. 426.

4 See Th. Nöldeke, *Syrische Grammatik* (Leipzig 1880), p. 76, § 137. However, נטריא would be the spelling expected.

5 Epstein, p. 20.

6 Macuch, p. 154. Nöldeke, p. 42.

7 Epstein, p. 20.

8 Jastrow, p. 643.

מסכיחא from the root $\sqrt{\text{sky}}$ "to look, look out, foresee, hope". A noun **maskīṭā*' does not occur, in any event, in dictionaries, and thus מסכיחא seems to be the active participle st. det. sg. (or pl.) of $\text{pa}^{\text{cc}}\text{el}$ (or $\text{af}^{\text{c}}\text{el}$) = "female watcher(s), speculator(s) (sc. with the evil eye)".¹ Cf., however, מחשב and מללה below.

חמחא "envious" as in Mandaic and Syriac,² found also in the bowl texts Isbell 38:4 (the envious eye) and Isbell 42:9 (the evil and envious eye). In JA $\sqrt{\text{hsm}}$ means "to muzzle" or "bright and hard, flinty" (pass. part.).³

ליבא מחשב and the following מללה לישנא are analogous expressions in which "heart" and "tongue" are the active organs. מחשב (masc.) and מללה (fem.) are in *status constructus*. However, their grammatical structure is not clear. The former seems to be an act. part. of the stem $\text{pa}^{\text{cc}}\text{el}$, appr. = "plotter",⁴ but as its counterpart, we would expect ממללה* in the second idiom.⁵ If מללה is considered a participle, מללה לישנא could mean "a female backbiter". However, the occurrence of מללה in line 5 above leads us to surmise that מסכיחא, מחשב, and מללה were nouns (or infinitives) at any rate, appr. "the envious gaze and the thought of heart (= intrigue) and the word of tongue (= imprecation)".

יתביה, for the suffix, see below, p. 19-21.

אילין, according to the context = עילין from the root $\sqrt{\text{c}11}$ "to enter". Similar spellings are well attested in Mandaic.⁶

The entrance of helping and protective spirits who come to a house (and onto its roof) in order to defend it against calamities is an idea found also in other bowl texts,⁷ as well as in a version of the Syriac Book of

1 See Drower-Macuch, p. 330, Jastrow, p. 989, and Payne Smith, p. 376.

2 Drower-Macuch, p. 151. Payne Smith, p. 151.

3 Jastrow, p. 488.

4 See Payne Smith, p. 160-161, Jastrow, p. 508-509, and Drower-Macuch, p. 154. The shadings of the root and its stems vary in dialects.

A noun **mhšb*' does not occur in Aramaic dictionaries.

5 מללה could be explained as (1) a pass. part. of the stem *pe.*, found in Syriac (Payne Smith, p. 273, = "eloquent"), (2) an act. part. of *pa.* without the prefix $\$m\$,$ cf. examples provided by G. Dalman (*Grammatik der jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch*. Leipzig 1894, p. 229-230), or, most easily, (3) a case of haplography *pro* ממללה.

6 See Yamauchi, p. 346, s.v. $\sqrt{\text{c}11}$, and Drower-Macuch, p. 20, s.v. ALL II.

7 Cf. Isbell 49:11; Harviainen, HB, lines 7-9, and IMB, lines 7⁺-9⁺; and C.H. Gordon, Two Aramaic Incantations (*Biblical and Near Eastern Studies. Essays in Honor William Sanford LaSor*. Grand Rapids, Michigan 1978, p. 231-244), ZRL 48, line 6, p. 233-234.

Protection copied in AD 1802/3 (!).¹ These clauses seem to lend support to the conclusion that at least one of the purposes conceived for magical bowls was to serve as a combined prison and food cup of *spiritus familiares*.²

Line 11

The number of the members of Keyaniḥaye's body, viz. three hundred, is exceptional. In Aramaic bowl texts the usual amount is 248 (e.g. Isbell 44:8, 46:5, 53:14) which agrees with the number mentioned elsewhere in Jewish traditions. In contrast, later generations of Syrians possess 366 members.³

עזקה שמיא = "the signet-ring of the heavens" or, less probably (cf. lines 2-3), "the signet-ring of his (sc. God's) name".

דארתא most probably = דארתא "of the band, bundle".⁴ Another interpretation would be "of the princess",⁵ but "a princess of the earth" occurs nowhere else. אירא which Isbell believes to mean "prince" is also rather "a band, bind", at least in his text 50:3-4 & 7, cf. the parallelism with "the signet-ring". The same may be true of §sd't'§ in Hamilton 18:10.

Line 12

נהמי, obviously from the root \sqrt{nhm} "to make noise, roar, moan". The ending §-y§ seems to be a kind of *nisba*.

טומיחא could be an equal *nisba* formation as נהמי, now with the fem. pl. ending = "impure females (sc. demons)"; cf. masc. טומי in Montgomery 29:7 (= Isbell 37:7: "impurities") in a similar list of tormentors.

משום, according to Jastrow "in the name of; for sake of (preventing)".⁶ However, the difference between בשרם and משום remains vague in our two occurrences.

אראר and ידואל are not present in other texts known to me. §r§ and §d§ are

1 H. Gollanz, *The Book of Protection* (London 1912. Repr. Amsterdam 1976), Cod. A § 15, p. 11-12.

2 See Harviainen, p. 5, fn. 6, and p. 10, note 6.

3 See Gollanz, Cod. A § 12, p. 9, and § 23, p. 16.

4 See Jastrow, p. 57, s.v. אִירָא I.

5 Cf. אִירָא "prince" in Isbell 3:17, 57:5, and 58:4,12.

The idea of a relationship between microcosm and macrocosm is not unknown in bowl texts, see Harviainen, p. 16.

6 Jastrow, p. 1536.

not discernible; in addition, the final \$r\$ of 'Ar'ar may be a final \$k\$.

רם ונישא, a loan from Isa. 6:1 and 57:15 (רם וְנִשָּׂא, RSV: "high and lifted up", "the high and lofty One") where the expression occurs as a name of God.

טליטוט, the first \$s\$ is uncertain. Names of spirits with a final \$s\$ are numerous in magical texts, and no doubt, every magician could coin new ones. טליטוט does not appear in other texts known to me.

Line 13

The following letters and words are rather well preserved and legible. However, they remain incomprehensible. The publications of incantation bowls abound similar obscure passages,¹ but obviously many of them result from the lack of a final insight unlocking the correct interpretation.

מנא, if the reading is correct, מנא refers to this bowl itself;² as a rule the bowls are called כאמא, קמיעא, or כיבשא.

שריה, spelled with \$s\$ as in Hebrew (*šār-yāh*), cf. שריא in Geller B, line 10.³ A good example of the vacillation between \$s\$ and \$ss\$ is provided by the third bowl of Borisov, in which we first have שר על הסרים and טרא רבא later on.⁴

טוט is a transcription of the Greek form Ἰησοῦς; cf. יאוטט in Isbell 52:3 as well as the Syriac \$yhws\$ and its variations in Geller A.⁵

קרוח, the first two letters are annoyingly faded, but if the reading is correct, we may be concerned here with an abbreviation of *rūḥā'* (*d^e-qudšā'* "the Holy Ghost"; this kind of abridgement is a usual phenomenon in Syriac and Jewish manuscripts. Jesus (*ʿšū*)⁶ and the Holy Ghost (*ruḥa d-qudšā*)⁷ are well attested in Mandaic texts where both of them bear a

1 See e.g. ZRL 48 published by Gordon, p. 233-236.

2 = JA מנא "thing, vessel, garment", Jastrow, p. 796.

3 M.J. Geller, Two Incantation Bowls Inscribed in Syriac and Aramaic (*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*. University of London. Vol. XXXIX, 1976, p. 422-427), p. 426. According to Geller שריא means "the princes", which could be true in an older text. Here, however, the masc. pl. ending is \$-y\$, not \$-y'\$.

4 A.Y. Borisov (А.Я. Борисов), Эпиграфические заметки. Четыре арамейские магические чаши Эрмитажа (*Эпиграфика Востока XIX*, 1969, p. 3-13), p. 11. These four bowls have not been mentioned by Isbell in his Corpus.

5 Geller, p. 424-425.

6 Drower-Macuch, p. 358.

7 Idem, p. 428, 406.

negative connotation. Taking into account the syncretistic nature of bowl texts the appearance of names of this kind in a "Jewish" bowl is not quite surprising, cf. also the end of the sentence פתיכרי ואיסתרמא "the idol-spirits and the ishtars". The magicians endeavour to influence their own gods and spirits as well as their antagonists.¹

Linguistic Remarks

In this bowl there are a considerable number of words and constructions which deviate from JA. Most of them, however, have counterparts in other Eastern Aramaic dialects. These features could be classified as follows:

Mandaic	Mand. & Syr.	Syriac	Others
זיוי ? (line 6)	גיסא (6)	חיסטנא (5)	Pref. -י (2)
ליחשא (6)	מטריי (6)	גורגיא (6)	מללחא (5)
כמר√ (7)	ביריתא (6)	איממא (7)	Suff. -הין, ין-
פתיכרא (7,12,13)	חדרא (8)	אימה (8)	(7,9)
יתביה (10, pl. + suff.)	הלין (9)	אצב(א) (9)	נטריא (9)
	חמסתא (10)	אינון (9)	נהמי (12)
			טומיתא (12)

The lexical deviations - surprising numerous in a rather short text like this one - may be attributable to our imperfect knowledge of JA; the same is true in regard of nominal patterns, although it is probable that koine-trends would influence these areas of language most readily.

Masc. Pl. + Suff. 3. Pers. Masc. Sg.

יתביה (line 10) is not necessarily a plural form, although Keyaniḥaye hardly lived alone in his house. However, in bowl texts, we have a number of similar cases in which the suffix added to a masculine plural consists of $h\$$ only (*pro* $\$$ -why $\$$). Such examples in Aramaic bowls are בניה "his sons" in Isbell 2:4, 33:2, and 61:5, בנה (idem) in Isbell 70:3, and לינשה "to his wives" in Isbell 60:11 as well as prepositions supplied with suffixes עחורה "after him" in Isbell 60:11 and עליה "over him" in Isbell 64:4, 65:3, and 67:5 (?).²

¹ See Isbell BA, p. 9-10.

² "Regular" forms are also represented in bowls: רעיונוהי (Isbell 53:7), מרוהי (Isbell 23:6, twice), קדמוהי (Isbell 8:11 and 12:11 where there is a mistaken $\$t\$$ *pro* $h\$\$$, cf. Montgomery 8:11), קדימוהי (Isbell BASOR, Part III:1, p. 18), and עלוהי (Isbell 12:16).

We encounter the same phenomenon in Syriac bowls. In Hamilton 1:11 and 1:14 $\$bnf\$\$$ means "his sons", which occurs also in HB published by me (line 2);¹ the prepositional cases are $\$qdmh\$\$$ (Hamilton 6:10 and Harviainen, line 7),² $\$^c\text{lyh}\$\$$ (Hamilton 10:6),³ and $\$^c\text{lk}\$\$$ (probably fem., Hamilton 8:3).

In Mandaic, masc. nouns with this suffix are identical in singular and plural, thus ^cdh ([$\bar{i}d\bar{i}$]) means either "his hand" or "his hands", cf. also $\$bnh\$\$$ "his sons", $\$^c\text{hh}\$\$$ "his brothers", and $\$^c\text{lh}\$\$$ / $\$^c\text{l'wh}\$\$$ in Mandaic incantation texts.⁴ A parallel development has taken place in Modern East Aramaic dialects: [bētu] = "his house" or "his houses",⁵ [$^c\text{aine}$] = "his eye" or "his eyes".⁶

According to Montgomery, this phenomenon is a Mandaism.⁷ However, on the basis of Modern East Aramaic we may now consider the change to be a general trend of development in Eastern Aramaic. Bowl texts bridge the gap which has existed between Mandaic and Northern Modern dialects in this respect. In favour of the argument that the difference between singular and plural forms has disappeared and was not substituted by another distinction, the pseudo-correct $\text{מן ימינהי ומן צמלהי מן קדמוהי ואחרוהי}$ in the fourth bowl text published by Borisov⁸ is also a clear proof.

As for other personal suffixes, the vacillation of *plene* and *defective* spellings in bowls complicate the decision. However, the preponderance of *defective* incidences seems to support the conclusion that the masc. nouns

1 Harviainen, p. 6 and 16.

2 idem, p. 7 and 19. Contrary occurrences are $\$qdmwhy\$\$$ (Hamilton 10:5) and $\$qdmwfi\$\$$ (Hamilton 9:8).

3 Contrary occurrences are $\$^c\text{ylwh}\$\$$ and $\$^c\text{ylwh}\$\$$ in its duplicate (Hamilton 9:8,9 and 10:15).

4 See Macuch, p. 158, and Yamauchi, p. 90.

5 See Th. Nöldeke, *Grammatik der neusyrischen Sprache am Urmia-See und Kurdistan* (Leipzig 1868), p. 147, § 77, and K.G. Cereteli (Tsereteli, Церетели), *Современный ассирийский язык* (Moscow 1964; also in Italian [Naples 1970], English [Moscow 1978], and German [Leipzig 1978]).

6 O. Jastrow, *Laut- und Formenlehre des neuaramäischen Dialekts von Midin im Tur Abdin* (Zweite Auflage. Bamberg 1970), p. 52, § 47 (in ṭūrōyō the form of the article distinguishes between singular and plural also in nouns supplied with suffixes).

7 See Montgomery, p. 30, 125, and 172. בנה and עלה mentioned on p. 172 by him refer, however, to a feminine owner and thus are irrelevant in this question. Also in our bowl the fem. suffix is a mere $\$-h\$\$$ (see above, p. 4).

Rossell (p. 38-39) mentions the phenomenon and considers the suffix $\$-why\$\$$ to be "borrowed from Reichsaramäisch".

8 Borisov, p. 12.

and prepositions had lost the distinction between singular and plural also when other suffixes were added to them.

Fem. Pl. Endings *pro* Anticipated Masc.

In נית(א)סרון וניכמרון כולהין פתיכרין על קרינהין ועל משורנהין (line 7) פתיכרין should be of masc. gender (cf. the opposition between פתיכרין and איסתרתא). Similarly we have no reason to suppose that the angels mentioned in line 8 were feminine. Nevertheless, נהוין, which twice refers to them, is impf. of 3. pers. fem. pl. The letters $\$w\$$ and $\$y\$$ are not always distinguishable in bowl texts, and if we had no more examples, we could easily read $\$w\$$ instead of $\$y\$$ in these words. However, the following phrases reveal that the confusion of masc. and fem. possessive suffixes of plural forms was one of the development trends in Eastern Aramaic. In רזהון דיפתכרי ופקון סטני ופתכרי ולו<טתא אסי>כרן כולהין מן מהפ<י>רוז... ניד<ר>כי ולוטתא כל פתיכרי דיכרי ואיררתא ניקבתא ... אסי<י>כרן כולהין... (Isbell 58:1-3) we have feminine forms referring to groups consisting of both masc. and fem. demons; on the other hand, masc. forms occur instead of the anticipated fem. possessive suffixes and fem. plurals of participles in כבישין נשי חרשאתא אינין חרשיהון ועודיהון ולוטתיהון ואקריחהון כבישין דישינ נשי חרשאתא ... כבישין מזליהון (Isbell 57:7) and in וכוכביהון אסירין עובדי [י]דיהון (Isbell 57:8).

This phenomenon does not appear in Eastern Middle Aramaic dialects, not even in Mandaic where there is a tendency to favour masc. sg. forms in verbs irrespective of the gender of the subject(s)¹ and in which different possessive suffixes are well preserved; the same applies to Modern Mandaic.² However, Modern East Aramaic reveals a parallel development concerning suffixes at least. The difference between genders is retained only in the suffixes of the singular; in the plural the feminine forms have disappeared and have been replaced by their masc. counterparts.³ Similarly, masc. pl. participles have been substituted for fem. pl. st.

1 See Yamauchi, p. 142-143, § 10.16.

2 Macuch, p. 159-160.

3 Cereteli, p. 31-32. A. Siegel, *Laut- und Formenlehre des neuaramäischen Dialekts des Tur Abdin* (Beiträge zur semitischen Philologie und Linguistik. Heft 2. Hannover 1923. Repr. Hildesheim 1968), p. 68.

abs. forms in Modern East Aramaic as well as in Modern Mandaic.¹ In bowl texts this tendency has given rise either to "modern" constructions like those in the last two examples or, pseudo-correct constructions which are visible in our bowl as well as in the phrase Isbell 58:1-3 cited above.

It is possible that also נהוין derives from the same development although in its larger form. In Mandaic masculine imperfects are often used instead of feminine, and imperative forms except that of the 2. pers. masc. sg. are obviously restituted, as well as in Syriac (there is no genuine imperfect left in Modern Mandaic).² Likewise, the Modern East Aramaic imperative has only the masc. form in the plural (imperfect has disappeared there also).³ Thus נהוין may result from a dialect in which genders were no longer distinguished in the plurals of the imperfect, i.e. נהוין could be a pseudo-correct feature in this bowl text.

$\text{\$y\}$ as a Prefix of the Imperfect

The prefix $\text{\$y\}$ of יתסי (line 2) is exceptional here but well documented in other Aramaic bowls, cf. Rossell: "In the 3rd. masc. sg., either $\text{\textcircled{?}}$, $\text{\textcircled{1}}$, or $\text{\textcircled{7}}$ may occur. Both preformative $\text{\textcircled{?}}$ and $\text{\textcircled{1}}$ occur in a ratio of 2 to 1 to preformative $\text{\textcircled{7}}$. In the 3rd. plural masculine, the preformative $\text{\textcircled{?}}$ occurs in a ratio of 3 to 1 to preformative $\text{\textcircled{1}}$ and in a ratio 7 to 1 to preformative $\text{\textcircled{7}}\text{\textcircled{7}}$ seems to be limited to the Jussive" and "may well reflect Accadian substratum" (?).⁴ $\text{\$1\}$ occurs also in Mandaic bowls, but the sole occurrence of $\text{\$y\}$ is $\text{\$1'ymt\}$ ' $\text{\$}$ "he may not reach" in the incantation Yamauchi 22:94.⁵ The present spelling of Mandaic indicates, however, that $\text{\$y\}$ is no Hebraism of JA, but originates from spoken dialects in which /y/ has been retained in this position or, more likely, is a Western feature.⁶

1 Cereteli, p. 31-32. Siegel, p. 104.

Macuch, p. 280 and 278 (*pro* Classical Mandaic *napqa(n)* etc.).

In JA the final $\text{\$n\}$ of feminine participles of plural is often dropped, thus פְּתוּבָא may be fem. pl. = פְּתוּבָן , see E.Y. Kutscher, *Aramaic (Encyclopaedia Judaica)*, Vol. 3. Jerusalem 1971, c. 259-287), c. 280-281.

2 Macuch, p. 257-258 and 274-275.

3 Cereteli, p. 52. Siegel, p. 146-147 and 170.

4 Rossell, p. 48-49.

5 Yamauchi, p. 116, § 9.5.

6 Or did the magicians consider the ancient Imperial Aramaic *y-* more impressive than the prosaic *n-*?

§ny-§ as the Prefix of Pa^{cc}el

As mentioned above (p. 4), §y§ occurs as the counterpart of an anticipated "shewa" in addition to the prefixes of pa^{cc}el (נינטרוניה etc. in line 10) only in צלחחא and there also §y§ hardly indicates an original "shewa" (see above, p. 8). Malone has called attention to similar forms of pa^{cc}el in the Hālākōt Pēsūqōt (מיקים, מיחיבין, מיקים). Although the prefix is spelled *plene* only in the participles in that text while in Mandaic §y§ (or §^c§) appears regularly in the prefixes of participles only when suffixed and, in addition to them, in the prefixes of the imperfect, Malone is inclined to see here one of those features which link the language of the Hālākōt Pēsūqōt with Mandaic.¹ In our case the conformity is more evident, and we can conclude that §y§ in the prefixes of pa^{cc}el indicates a "full" vowel (i) as in Mandaic.² Consequently, we have here one more isogloss which testifies in favour of the larger dispersion of the Mandaic dialect type in the past.

* * *

Features which could be called *Eastern Aramaic koiné* seem to be found almost in every bowl text. Unfortunately, the publishers of texts have usually been satisfied with the interpretation of the contents of the texts. No doubt many of the exceptional features have been normalized since they have seemed like mistakes to the publisher. In the absence of clear photographs it is no easy task to trace phenomena of this kind.

In conclusion we may enumerate the koiné features which are exhibited by just two bowls, our bowl here and the Syriac bowl published by me earlier:³

- (1) Confusion of laryngeal consonants.
- (2) Phonetic spellings (e.g. §ny-§, §l-'nšh§) which may indicate deviations between spoken and literary dialects.
- (3) Pronouns which do not conform to the boundaries of literary dialects.
- (4) Easy transfer of nouns and different noun formations from one dialect to another.

1 See Malone, p. 163, § 2.7. and footnotes 13A-15.

2 idem. Macuch, p. 127-128, § 80.

3 Harviainen, esp. p. 26-28.

- (5) Conformation of masc. plural nouns supplied with possessive suffixes to the corresponding singular forms; similar development in prepositions which follow the pattern of masc. plurals when supplied with suffixes.
- (6) Confusion of genders occurring in pronominal suffixes of the plural and possibly also in impf. forms of the plural in verbs.
- (7) Use of the impf. prefix \$y-\$ besides the Eastern \$n-\$.

The realization of /ā/ as [ã] or [o] (indicated by \$w\$) is well attested in many bowl texts,¹ but does not appear in these two incantations, cf., however, ן in פרחוני (?? line 9).

Among the literary Eastern Aramaic dialects, Mandaic provides us with the most counterparts of these phenomena, a fact which may be a consequence of the less solid literary usage of this dialect. Also Modern East Aramaic dialects are worth looking into in this respect. The most startling detail is the impf. prefix \$y-\$, which testifies that this koiné is not identical with any known type of Eastern Aramaic. Teixidor has divided the Syriac script of the bowls published by him into Palmyrene Syriac and Edessene Estrangelo.² Perhaps the Palmyrene type of script was not the only loan from Western regions in Mesopotamia; together with other cultural contacts also dialect features (immigrants, magicians?) may have reached areas where Eastern Aramaic was spoken.

1 See Rossell, p. 20-21, § 3.15, and Hamilton, p. 55, § 3.9.

2 Teixidor, p. 61.

APPENDIX

A CRYPTOGRAPHIC BOWL TEXT OR AN ORIGINAL FAKE?

Among the antiquities presented by the Iraqi Government to HM Carl XVI Gustaf, the King of Sweden, there is a small bowl with a "text" written in four circular lines inside the bowl. The lines are separated by circles inscribed with the same ink. The bowl which belongs to His Majesty's collection is now preserved in the Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities (Medelhavsmuséet) in Stockholm.¹

1 I am greatly obliged to *Husgerådskammaren* (The Royal Household Office) for their kind permission to publication.

The characters with which the text is written do not represent any known alphabet. Thus the bowl may be inscribed by an illiterate magician for an alphabet client. However, the number of different characters, viz. 22 (some of them are uncertain), gives rather the idea that we are here dealing with a cryptographic text in which Aramaic letters have been replaced by new, magic characters.¹ All the characters are written separately and quite carefully. They have the following forms: א, ב, ג,² ד, ה, ו, ז, ח, ט, י, כ, ל, מ, נ, ס, ע, פ, צ, ק, ר, ש, ת, יו, יז, יח, יט, and כ.

The inscription is quite short and does not indicate (possible) word boundaries. Thus, a deciphering remains haphazard, and my attempts have not met with success. Nevertheless, I here wish to publish two photographs of the bowl, as this kind of inscription is obviously not unique. According to Montgomery there are in the University of Pennsylvania Museum about 30 bowls which he classifies as "original fakes". They are "inscribed with letters arbitrarily arranged, or with pot-hooks, or even in some cases with mere scrawls." In addition to them "there are a few texts which are fairly written...and may be in some non-Semitic tongue, whether, for example, in Pahlavi,..." Montgomery's description of the bowl no. 2954 closely resembles the bowl discussed here: "One of the neatest of the (sc. fairly written T.H.) bowls, No. 2954, containing only four circular lines of inscription, interested me as presenting a novel alphabet; but I soon came to the conclusion that this is but another "fake", produced we may suppose by some learned impostor — or wag."³ As far as I know, no photograph of this inscription has been published and the same is true of the other exceptional bowls mentioned by Montgomery. A comparison of this suspect material may, however, give us useful information on ancient Mesopotamian superstitions and, at least, answer the questions raised by Montgomery almost half a century ago.

¹ Cryptographic spellings are well attested in bowl texts, see Isbell BA, p. 14-15, and his article Some Cryptograms in Aramaic Incantation Bowls (*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 33, 1974, p. 405-407).

² A similar sign occurs in Isbell 63, three times in line 1 and once in line 7.

³ Montgomery, p. 14.



Pl. 1. Bowl from Borsippa.

Photo Museovirasto (National Board of Antiquities and Historical Monuments, Helsinki), Timo Syrjänen 1979.



Pl. 3. The Bowl Presented to HM Carl XVI Gustaf.

Courtesy of Medelhavsmuséet (The Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities, Stockholm).



Pl. 2. Text of the Borsippa Bowl.

Photo Museovirasto, Timo Syrjänen 1979.



Pl. 4. Inscription of the Cryptographic Bowl.
Courtesy of Medelhavsmuséet.