A SYRIAC INCANTATION BOWL

IN

THE FINNISH NATIONAL MUSEUM, HELSINKI

A SPECIMEN OF EASTERN ARAMAIC "KOINÉ"

BY

TAPANI HARVIAINEN

TAPANI HARVIAINEN

A SYRIAC INCANTATION BOWL
IN THE FINNISH NATIONAL MUSEUM, HELSINKI

A Specimen of Eastern Aramaic "Koiné"

Among the antiquities presented by the Iraqi Government to the President
of Finland, Dr. Urho Kekkonen, in summer 1977, there is a bowl with an
incantation text written in Syriac Estrangelo script.[1] The original cata-
logue number of the bowl is ℰℱ (= Maṭḥaf ᶜIrāqī, Iraqi Museum, Baghdad)
7863. The antiquities are now treasured in the Finnish National Museum
(Helsinki) as a gift of President Kekkonen, and the bowl bears the cata-
logue number VK 5738:3.

The bowl is made of rather coarse, light brown clay. Its diameter measures
18.8-19.1 cm and that of the flat base 6.7 cm, the height is 8-8.5 cm, and
the thickness of sides 1.1 cm. As is usual in incantation bowls, the text
is written in spiral form inside of the bowl beginning from the bottom,[2]
a kind of Maltese cross is depicted in the middle of the bottom but there
is no circle around it.[3] The ink is black. Originally the text seems to
have reached the brim of the bowl in 14 coils but two last of them are now
almost completely faded and obliterated.

---

1 As a rule the incantation bowls written in Syriac letters are called
  "Syriac bowls" although their language is not always genuine Syriac,
  cf. V.P. Hamilton, *Syriac Incantation Bowls* (an unpublished dissertation,
  Brandeis University, Department of Mediterranean Studies, 1971; Disser-
  tation Abstracts 71-30,130), p. 95-97, and below, p. 26-28.
  In the same manner in this paper I shall call bowls written with Hebrew
  and Mandaic characters "Jewish bowls", resp. "Mandaic bowls", without
  referring to any specific Aramaic dialect or to the religion of the
  writers.
2 For the few exceptions, see Hamilton, p. 7-8.
3 Crosses within a circle are usual in Syriac bowls, see Hamilton, p.
  8-9.

According to the kind information provided in a letter by the Director
of Iraqi Museum, Dr. Subhi Anwar Rashid, the bowl was found together
with two more bowls during the construction of a dam in Diyala region
on March 29, 1976. The two other bowls have not yet been published.

The contents of the incantation of this H(elsinki)B(owl) do not essen-
tially deviate from corresponding Syriac texts published by MONTGOMERY,[1]
TEIXIDOR,[2] HAMILTON,[3] and others.[4] Its closest counterparts are number
6 of Layard-Ellis,[5] number 37 of Montgomery,[6] and especially number
44107 in the Iraqi Museum (henceforth IMB) published by Teixidor.[7]
Hamilton has given substantially amended interpretations of these three
bowls in his dissertation.[8] Nevertheless, all of them are rather frag-
metary, and thus the well-preserved text of HB sheds additional light on
a certain scheme of Syriac incatation texts[9] and their linguistic pecu-
liarities.

The Date and Function of Incantation Bowls

According to the general opinion Aramaic incantation bowls date from the
Sassanian period, i.e. 3rd-7th centuries AD; there is no evidence for any

1 J.A. Montgomery, *Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur* (University of
  Pennsylvania Museum. Publications of the Babylonian section, Vol. III,
  Philadelphia 1913), p. 32-36, 223-243 (Texts 31-37).
2 J. Teixidor, The Syriac Incantation Bowls in the Iraq Museum. *Sumer*,
  Vol. XVIII, Baghdad 1962, p. 51-62.
3 Hamilton, p. 121a-124b, 159-164 (Texts 18-21).
4 Cf. the bibliographies in E.M. Yamauchi, *Mandaic Incantation Texts*
  (American Oriental Series, Vol. 49, New Haven, Conneticut 1967), p.
  379-382, and in Hamilton, p. 225-233.
5 A.H. Layard, *Discoveries in the Ruins of Niniveh and Babylon* (London
  1853), p. 521-522, amended in Hamilton, Text 10, p. 112a-112b, 146-147.
6 Montgomery, p. 242-243, amended in Hamilton, Text 9, p. 110a-111b,
  146-147.
7 Teixidor, p. 54-56, amended in Hamilton, Text 14, p. 116a-117b, 152-153.
8 My interpretations both of HB and IMB were prepared before I had Hamil-
  ton's dissertation at my disposal; thus the agreements and disagreements
  have come about independently.
9 Among the incantation bowls known to me this scheme occurs in Syriac
  bowls only.

Arabic influence.[1] As for the relative chronology of Syriac bowls, those written in Estrangelo are obviously of more recent origin than the others.[2] In comparison with the letter forms of Hamilton's Estrangelo bowls (nos. 11-15) the types of HB are more in accordance with the true Estrangelo,[3] a fact which seems to date HB as the latest one, i.e. as originating from the 7th century.

That the bowls were used as tools of protective magic, needs no additional proofs. As a rule they have been unearthed in an inverted position,[4] only sometimes facing one another and joined with bitumen at their lips.[5] However, we do not know the manner in which the bowls were considered to repel evil spirits, diseases, etc.[6]

The Script and Spelling

As mentioned above, the script of HB is a rather careful Estrangelo. The only significant deviation is that §d§[7] has no diacritical dot; §r§ is distinguished from it by the addition of a dot on the top of the character. §y§ has a peculiar form in the suffix §-hy§ where it is depicted as a rather long stroke pointing down and to the left (not to the right as the final §n§). The loop of §t§ is very small and the foot begins from below the line. §d§ is sometimes a circle like §w§, and on the other hand §w§ may occur in a form resembling the figure 9, i.e. §d§. §y§, §n§, and §c§ are partly difficult to distinguish one from another.

---

1 Cf. Montgomery, p. 102-105; Yamauchi, p. 2-4; Hamilton, p. 19-23.
2 Hamilton, p. 45-46. Teixidor (p. 62, on the basis of palaeographical features): Estrangelo bowls belong to a latter period than 600 AD.
3 Cf. the tables Syriac Bowl Script in Hamilton, p. 37a-b.
4 It is often claimed that bowls were found under ruins of home foundations but a definitive evidence is lacking, see Hamilton, p. 17-18, but cf. below, p. 16.
5 There are also cases with an inscribed egg inside a bowl, see idem, p. 10-11.
6 They have been explained as prisons or traps of demons (Hyvernat, Montgomery, McCullough), bowls for ritual beverage (Budge), and the overturning as a case of sympathetic magic (Gordon); for details, see Hamilton, p. 7-19, and J. Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia V, Later Sassanian Times* (Studia Post-Biblica, Vol. XV, Leiden 1970), p. 218-219, 231-232, 234-235, cf. also below, p. 10, note 6.
7 The symbols §-§ indicate in this paper a grapheme.

There are numerous §'§, §w§, and §y§ letters used to indicate vowel
sounds (*matres lectionis*), e.g. §mh'dwr§ (line 3), §ḥwmr'§ (5), §'kyl§
(8). *Seyame* points occur frequently in plural forms but without consist-
ency; probably some of them have only faded away. *Linea occultans* does
not occur in HB nor do any other diacritical marks.[1] For the phonetic
spellings, see below, p. 27.

The Text

Since the texts of HB and IMB are almost identical and supplement one
another, I have found it convenient to present them one after the other
in this publication of HB, all the more reason because on the basis of
HB I have been able to read considerably larger parts of IMB[2] than Tei-
xidor and Hamilton were able to.[3]

HB:

---

1 For the palaeography and orthography of other Syriac incantation bowls,
  see Montgomery, p. 32-35, and Hamilton, p. 38-50.
2 The reading is based on the photograph of IMB published in Teixidor,
  Plate 2, Fig. 3.
3 The line numbers refer to the coils of HB so that a new, numbered line
  begins with the word which occurs on the supposed radius leading from
  the centre of the bowl through the start of the text to the brim. The
  text of IMB has been arranged according to that of HB; a colon indi-
  cates the boundary between two coils of IMB counted similarly but,
  since the beginning is effaced, starting from the end of the text. The
  line numbers 13⁺, 14⁺, and 15⁺ are located arbitrarily in the end part
  of IMB. Line numbers with an asterisk mark refer to the text of IMB.

12   word 1   ܡܘܗ̈ܒܝ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܘܡܢܝܚܢܐ ܘܐܠܟܣܢܝܐ

ܦܘܡܗ — — — ܪܚܡ ܘܚܕܝܢ ܘܢܥܡܣܟ ܘܚܠܛܘ

IMB:

ܒܚܘܒܐ ܕܒܪܢܫ :

4+   ܐܘ ܪܦܢ + word 1 ܐܠܗܐ ܡܒܘ̈ܚܡ — — ܐܟܪ̈ܝܚܕ ܠܕ ܗܘ ܠܡܐ

— ܠܕ ܗܘ ܐܝܬ ܐ : ܛܝܘܗ —

5+   — — — ' ܘ̈ܪܚܐ ܠܡܚܝܬܐ : ܠܘ ܠܕ ܗܘ ܠܡ ܚܘܝ̈ܒܐܕ—

6+   — — ܦܕ̈ܚܐ ܪܡ : ܩܚܠ ܬܢ ² ܒܡܘܢ ܕܒܣܚ̈ܢ

ܐܘ ܟܠܐ ³ ܨ̈ܚܠܩ ܘܣܡܚܟ + word 1 ⁴ܘܚܒ̈ܣ ܒ̈ܪܚ (?)—

7+   — — — ܚܘܝܢ̈ܐ—⁵ ܚܠܝܡ ܥܚܣ̈ܝ ܒܠܡܚܝ : ܠܘ ܢܨ̈ܝ ܪ

ܣܢ̈ܘ̈ܝ ܠܘ ܘܟܚܒܘܣܬܚܐ ܠܚ̈ܢ ܠܩܠ̈ܢ ܘ̈ܛܦ̈ܚܐܕ

ܥܘܪ ܚܚܘܒ ܥܚ⁶(?)

8+   ܒܚܘ̈ܣܐ + word 1 ⁷ܐܕ̈ܚ ܘ̈ܣܟ̈ܡܐ ܒܝ̈ܢ ܣܘ̈ܡܚ̈ܐ

ܐܘܬ⁸ ܐܟ̈ܠܐ ܘ̈ܝ̈ܣܚ̈ܒ : ܨ̈ܝ̈ܢ ܒܚ̈ܒ ܣ̈ܚܚ̈ܣܝ

ܩܘ̈ܝ̈ܬ̈ܚ ܣܡ̈ܝܢܚ̈ܐ ܘ̈ܥ̈ܢ ܠ̈ܚܣ̈ܘ̈ܝ̈ܒ

9+   ܙܝ̈ܚܛܕ ܠܚ̈ܚ ܣܘ̈ܝܚܐ ܗܘ̈ܢ ܐ̈ܝ̈ܢܚܠ ܐܕ̈ܚ̈ܚ ܨ̈ܝ̈ܢܚ̈ܐܕ

-9   ܐܠܝ̈ܬ ܒ̈ܚܠ ܒ̈ܣ ܐܟ̈ܣܢ̈ܟ ܙ̈ܢ ⁹-ܘ̈ܚܣܚ̈ܐ

-10   ܘ̈ܚܣ̈ܚ̈ܘ ܐ(ܒ̈ܫ)ܚ ܚܝ̈ܠ̈ܐ ¹⁰-ܣ̈ܢ ܐ̈ܠܗ̈ܐ ܘ̈ܝ̈ܢ ܨ̈ܝ̈ܢ

ܣ̈ܣ : ¹¹ܐܟ̈ܣ̈ܘ̈ܚ̈ܪ̈ܝ : ܘ̈ܣ̈ܚ̈ܒ̈ܐ

10+   ܐ̈ܠ̈ܚ̈ܐ ܠ̈ܚ̈ܒ̈ܒ ܨ̈ܝ̈ܛ̈ܒ ܘ̈ܣ̈ܚ̈ܒ̈ܘ̈ܣ ܠ̈ܚ̈ܣ̈ܝ ¹²ܐ̈ܣ̈ܚ̈ܒ̈ܬ̈ܚ̈ܐ

ܒ̈ܣ̈ܚ̈ܝܪ ⊞ ϽϽϼϥϭϥϥϥϥϥϥϥ ϵ ϵͻϵ Ͻ Ͻ ϵ ϽϵϽϽϽ

ܐܘ̈ܝ̈ܪ ܚ̈ܝܬ̈ܐ ϽϏϾ Ͽ ⊕ϞϞ ⦃⦃ ϙϙ ϗ ⅀⋇

ܘ̈ܚ̈ܣ̈ܘ

11+   ¹³ܘ̈ܚ̈ܛ̈ܪ̈ܣ̈ܘ ¹⁴ܘ̈ܥ̈ܒ̈ܚ ܘ̈ܝ̈ܛ̈ܘ : ܐ̈ܠ̈ܠ̈ܝ̈ܬ̈ܐ ܘ̈ܩܣ̈ܘ̈ܚ̈ܐ

[Syriac text spanning lines 15–28, with marginal line numbers 12+, 13+, 14+, 15+ and obliterated names]

obliterated names

Textual notes on IMB:

1 Hamilton reads before §rwḥ'§ -' $w^c l$ kwl. The text deviates here from that of HB.

2 Hamilton: $mḥwyn'$ "I make known" as in Montgomery 37:7 (= Hamilton, Text 9).

3 Hamilton: $y'th$ "it" (obj.). According to Hamilton (p. 60 § 4.13. and p. 92 § 9.11.) the object particle $yt/y't$ occurs in Syriac bowls only in this phrase $d-mqbl$ $y'th$ (Montgomery, Text 37:7; Layard-Ellis, line 2 = line 5 in Hamilton, Text 10; and here) all of which are his readings.[a]

4 The emendation of Hamilton $wd[l'$ $mqbl$ $'r'zÿ$ $ml^ïk'$ $rwgz'$ $ïtyn$ $^c ylwḧ$ $b-sy]p'$ (based on Montgomery 37:8) seems to demand a correction which

---

[a] Montgomery: $dmqbl$ · $'th$; Layard-Ellis: $dmqbl$ $'lh$.
However, the form §ytky§ "you" (fem. obj.) is found in the Estrangelo bowl (Die Vorderasiatische Abteilung des Berliner Museums, No. VA 3383) published by M. Lidzbarski (Die Herkunft der manichäischen Schrift, *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-historische Klasse,* Berlin 1916, p. 1213-1222), p. 1214. The article and the bowl have escaped Hamilton's attention.

is more in conformity with HB and Layard-Ellis[a], particularly so in
the beginning (*w-d-byšwt' mqbl*) since the space between §wd-§ and
§mqbl§, which are visible in the photograph, is too large for §1'§
only.

5 Hamilton (obviously on the basis of Layard-Ellis, line 2/5): *w-ḥrb'*
qdmwhy[b], i.e. *qdm* in the true Syriac suffixed form which according to
him is the only occurrence of this type in Syriac bowls (elsewhere
§qdmwḥ§, §ᶜlwḥ§, etc., see Hamilton, p. 65 § 6.9.).

6 Hamilton: [*ytyb*]. The plural form is surprising in this context but
the ending appears very clearly in the protograph. On the other hand,
interpretation of the first part is far from certain. The word might
be *nyštbyn* "they (fem., cf. *'ntyn* in line 10) will be captured". If
the reading could be corroborated by means of a review of the bowl
itself, it would give strong support to the hypothesis that the incan-
tation bowls were considered to be the prisons of demons; this would
also mean that the demons were treated with food and drink (*'kyl...*
št'), cf. above, p. 5, fn. 6.

7 Hamilton: [*w-mk*]*l*.

8 The final part of §ḥ§ is extraordinary tall as if it were a combination
of §y§ and §1§, but it is probably an error of the scribe only.

9 Hamilton: *š[lm' mn bl]* *'bwkwn* "peace from Baal your father"; in Mont-
gomery 37:10 he has read equally *šlm[' mn] bl 'bwkwn*[c]. §bl§ 'Baal'
does not occur elsewhere in Syriac bowls.

10 Hamilton: *w-'rᶜ' wᶜ šlm'* "and earth...". However, §wšbᶜ'§ is rather
well visible in the photograph and it is followed by §wᶜyn§, a haplo-
graphy instead of §wšbᶜyn§ "and seventy".

11 Hamilton supplies *nyqbt'* referring to the parallel phrase in Montgomery
37:11 (Hamilton, p. 152), but cf. line 11 of HB: "ishtars" only as
opposed to line 9: "female ishtars".

12 Teixidor and Hamilton: *d-bytql'* "of the mysterious voice". In HB, at
least, the word is unambiguously §mtql'§.

13 Teixidor: *w-ᶜbdwt'* (?), Hamilton: *w-ᶜbdwẗ* "and the magical action(s)".

14 The word §wdyw'§ has been omitted by Hamilton both in his text and
autograph.

15 Teixidor: *w-ḥmr̈'* "the wines (?),

---

[a] Layard-Ellis: *wd byšwt' m..' wr''' 'lyn...* (lines 2-3), but Hamilton:
wdbyšwt' mh... m[l']kï rw[g]z' 'tyn ᶜ[lwh b]ṣyp'. According to the
autograph of Layard-Ellis (p. 521) there is hardly place enough for the
emendation of Hamilton.

[b] Layard-Ellis: *nḥyp' wqdlh*.

[c] Montgomery: *šlm'...l 'bwkwn*.

16 Teixidor: *zydnyt'* "(the) impious (male idols)..."; Hamilton: *zynyt'* "(the) impious (pebble spirits)", obviously his scribal error instead of *zydnwt'* mentioned in his glossary (p. 181) with reference to this line.

17 Lacking in Teixidor, Hamilton has *wl...'*.

18 Teixidor: *d-b-zywn'* "which is in the losses"; Hamilton: *d-b-zywn'* "which are in the losses". However, the reading is uncertain (§d-b-zdwn'§ ?), cf. below, commentary on line 11 of HB, p. 23.

19 Hamilton: *w-ḥṭywt'*, his scribal error instead of *ḥṭywn'* mentioned in his glossary (p. 182).

20 *w-yr̈d'*, both in Teixidor and Hamilton, is very questionable in regard of the reading as well as the meaning "howlers" (cf. Montgomery, p. 81 and 93 on §yrwryn§). Could it be only a dittography of §n(y)dr'§?

21 Teixidor: *w-sgt'*, Hamilton: *w-sgyt'*, "the numerous ones". According to Hamilton (p. 190) the only occurrence in Syriac bowls.

22 Lacking in Teixidor, Hamilton has *wm̌šqpṭw* (?) without translation.

23 Teixidor and Hamilton: *twmrwn*, a non-Aramaic spelling and form[a] mentioned by Hamilton (p. 82) occurring once, obviously here[b].

24 Teixidor and Hamilton: *d-qrby'* "(to the mountains) that are near". According to the photograph, however, the first §d§ has a diacritical dot <u>above</u> it, i.e. it is §r§, and between §b§ and §'§ there is no §y§. In <u>addition</u> to that, the expression "the mighty mountains" is more suited to the context, cf. below, commentary on line 13[+], p. 25.

25 Teixidor has here only *psryn* "you be annihilated" which is the last word of his publication. Hamilton: *psryn wbnh l' mqbḷ* "be annulled.."; in the commentary (p. 152) he adds: 'If I read the passage correctly it is "and his son do (sic! T.H.) not receive (?) nor guard with these names".'

26 Hamilton: *d'tyw' 'yḥ* without translation.

27 Lacking in Hamilton.

28 Hamilton has only *hwzḥty ᶜlmyn... 'myn* (idem, p. 153: I am inclined to think that there is here an attempt to write the alphabet, at least the first part...), cf. below, commentary on line 15[+], p. 26.

---

[a] Cf. C. Brockelmann, *Syrische Grammatik* (Achte Auflage, Leipzig 1960), p. 91; J.N. Epstein, *Diqdûq 'aramît bablît* (Jerusalem 1960), p. 63; R. Macuch, *Handbook of Classical and Modern Mandaic* (Berlin 1965), p. 297.

[b] The occurrence, 4:11 (= Montgomery 32:11), mentioned there is not correct.

Translation

(1) This amulet bowl is designated for the salvation and guarding of the house (2) and abode of Farrukhdadh, son of Bawai, and Shishin, daughter of Gushnai, (3) and of Maḥbodh and Mahadur Gushnasp and Bar Gadbeḥar, sons of Shishin. The mystery amulet of heaven is buried in heaven (4) and the mystery amulet of earth is buried in earth, and this is the mystery amulet of the house. But I say against the sorceries[1] and against all the magical practices (5) and against all the messengers[2] of the idol-spirits and against the legions and against all the amulet-spirits and the ishtars and against all the demons and the devils and the mighty satans (6) and the mighty liliths, (I) declare this decree unto you: Every one who accepts Yah[3], attains good, but who accepts wickedness, the mystery words (7) come upon him, swords and sabres, and they stand up in front of him and kill him and the fire surrounds him and the flames fall[4] upon him; who hears the decree, he sits[5] (8) in the house, eats and treats food, drinks and treats drink, is glad and makes glad, he is a brother for its people[6] and a friend for the occupants of the house, he is a comrade for the children and called Foster-father, (9) he is a companion for the cattle and called the Good Fortune. Receive (pl.) peace from your Father who is in heaven and seven[7] (greetings of) peace from the male gods and from female[8] ishtars, (from him) who sets (10) victorious peace in (with) his Judgement, who[9] sets the staggering

---

1 IMB: But I say against everything that is in it (= in the house), against..., cf. Montgomery 37:5 (= Hamilton 9:5): *'n' 'ymr ᶜl kwl d-'ytbh ᶜl ḥrš'* etc.
2 The list of evil spirits of IMB deviates from that of HB.
3 IMB: Yahallah, cf. below, commentary on line 6, p. 17-18.
4 IMB: the flame falls.
5 IMB: they will be captured (?), cf. above, p. 10, note 6.
6 IMB: for the people.
7 IMB: and seventy seven.
8 There is no word "female" in IMB.
9 IMB: in (with) the Judgement and who.

destruction in fire. (Magic symbols). Friends...(?)[1] (Magic symbols).
Moreover you (pl. fem.), spirits and the amulet-spirits, (11) the[2]
liliths and the deceivers and the demons and the devils and the plague-
spirits and the no-good-ones and the evil spirits and the impious amulet-
spirits, the male idol-spirits and the ishtars[3] and the curses and the
accidents and the shames (+ 1 word) (12) (+ 1 word) and the vows and the
trials and the worships and the spells, which are cursed and consumed
and dissolved, go out (+ 2 words), flee...!

<div align="center">+ + +</div>

IMB: (11) ... the shames which are in the losses (?), (12) and the sins
and the vows and the howlers (?) and the worships and the spells, which
are cursed and consumed and dissolved, go out, evaporate, and be expelled
(excommunicated), flee and pass over (13[+]) and do not say (anything) but
go to the mighty mountains and to the evil sea and to the evil desert(s).
As a sinful slave who deserts from his Lord (14[+]) he does not receive
nor retain these names of God. Amen, Amen, Amen, Selah. Sealed is the
salvation to (obliterated names), (15[+]) the sons and daughters of Gush-
nai. Amen, Amen, Amen, Selah. ABGD HWZ ḤṬY KLMNn S'PṢ QRŠTt Amen, Amen,
Selah.

Commentary

Line 1:

§qm'y'§ "amulet (bowl)" is usually spelled §qmy'§.[4] §y§ and §'§ are very
similar in the text, but as a rule §'§ is clearly higher than §y§. The
same spelling §qm'y'§ occurs in Syriac bowls also in IM 50327 (line 1),[5]
and in the bowl of Lidzbarski;[6] in addition to them, there is §qmtyh§ in

---

1 IMB: A friend of (?), cf. below, commentary on line 10, p. 22.
2 IMB: and the.
3 IMB: the female ishtars.
4 See Montgomery, p. 44 and 301.
5 Teixidor (p. 53): §m/qm'/ly'§; Hamilton (Text 12:1): §qm'y'§.
6 Lidzbarski 1916, p. 1214.

the bowl published by Montgomery in 1918.[1] The Mandaic form of the word
is §qmaha§,[2] and in a Jewish bowl "amulet" is spelled §qmy'§.[3] All of
these irregular forms reveal the same trend of development, viz. the
confusion of laryngeal consonants, a phenomenon well attested in Mandaic
and Jewish Eastern Aramaic[4] and occurring sporadically also in other
Syriac bowls.[5] Cf. below, p. 26-27.

§'sywt'§ is the genuine Syriac form ($'\mathring{a}sy\bar{u}t\mathring{a}'$)[6] instead of §'swt'§
occurring in other bowls.[7]

Line 2:

§mdwrt'§ is not found in Syriac dictionaries.[8] However, it has an exact
counterpart §mdurta§ "dwelling(-place), lodging" in Mandaic ($\sqrt{dwr}$).[9]

§prwkd'd§ = Persian Faruχ^{w}d$\bar{a}$dh.[10]

§b'w^{c}y§, cf. §b'b^{c}y§ in IM 23776:2,5,8,12[11] and §b'by§ in Hamilton 19:1.[12]

---

1 J.A. Montgomery, A Syriac Incantation Bowl with Christian Formula
  (*American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, 34, 1917/18),
  p. 137-138 (= Montgomery 1918); Hamilton, Text 2:1.
2 E.S. Drower - R. Macuch, *A Mandaic Dictionary* (Oxford 1963), p. 413;
  qmaha-amulets are still used among Mandaeans, see E.S. Drower, *The Man-
  daeans of Iraq and Iran* (Photomecanical reprint, Leiden 1962), p. 26.
3 C.H. Gordon, Aramaic Magical Bowls (*Orientalia* 10, 1941, p. 116-141,
  272-276, 278-289, 339-360), Text 7:1 (p. 127 and 129).
4 See e.g. Macuch, p. 79-80.
5 See Hamilton, p. 52-53.
6 C. Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum*[2] (Halis Saxonum 1928) (= Brockelmann,
  Lexicon), p. 32; J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*
  (Oxford 1967) (= Payne Smith), p. 23.
7 Cf. Montgomery, p. 282; Yamauchi, p. 309-310; Hamilton, p. 174. The
  only counterpart known to me is in the bowl of Lidzbarski (1916, p.
  1214).
8 §mdwrt'§ = "partus, generatio" mentioned by R. Payne Smith (*Thesaurus
  Syriacus*, Oxford 1868, c. 2020) is less suited to the context, cf.
  e.g. *dwrh w-mšknwth w-byth* in Montgomery 34:2-3 (= Hamilton 6:2-3).
9 Drower-Macuch, p. 258.
10 F. Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch* (Marburg 1895), p. 96.
11 Teixidor, p. 57 (= Hamilton, Text 15).
12 p. 122a-b.

If all of them represent the same name, Persian Bābhai (?),[1] we have
here a case of laryngeal confusion (cf. below, p. 26-27); §w§ seems to
indicate the fricative realisation of /b/ preceded by a vowel. Since
the clients as a rule are identified in incantation bowls with their
mother´s name,[2] §b'w^{c}y§ should be a female name, but in Hamilton 19:1
Babai is son of Mehanosh.[1]

§šyšyn bt gwšny§, both names occur also in other bowls.[3]

§bt§ is probably a phonetic spelling instead of the proper Syriac
§brt§; in Syriac incantation bowls §r§ occurs in the word "daughter"
only in Montgomery 36:1,2.[4]

§mḥbwd§ = Persian Mahbōdh,[5] §ḥ§ pro §h§ is again a case of laryngeal
confusion (cf. below, p. 26-27).

§mh'dwr§ = Persian Mahaδar / Mahaδur.[6]

§gwšnsp§ = Persian Gušnasp.[7]

§gdbḥr§ "Gad has choosen"; Gad occurs in numerous Semitic languages as
the name of a deity, "Tykhē", "Fortuna", as well as an appellative,[8]
and it is the Aramaic counterpart of the Persian Farna, Farruχ[9] found
numerously in incantation bowls as the initial part of names; §bhira§
is a Mandaic *malwaša* name.[10]

---

1 Justi, p. 54-55; according to Th. Nöldeke (Persische Studien, *Sitzungs-
  berichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Aka-
  demie der Wissenschaften*, 116. Band, Wien 1888, p. 387-423) = "Väter-
  chen" (p. 411, 414, 395, fn. 5), but cf. also Syriac §b'wy§ = Bôi, see
  idem, p. 412-413.
2 Montgomery, p. 49 & fn. 1; Yamauchi, p. 13; Drower, p. 26-27; see also
  the end of this list of names: "sons of Shishin".
3 See Montgomery, p. 280; Yamauchi, p. 371, 368; according to Nöldeke (p.
  401) Syriac §gwšnwy§ is a compound with Persian *gušnasp* "stallion".
4 = Hamilton, Text 8, see also idem, p. 54 § 3.7.
5 Justi, p. 185.   6 idem, p. 184.   7 idem, p. 122, 354.
8 See L. Koehler - W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexicon
  zum Alten Testament* (Dritte Auflage, Leiden 1967), p. 169, II §gad§;
  R. Dussaud, *La pénétration des Arabes en Syrie avant l´Islam* (Institut
  français d´archéologie de Beyrouth. Bibliothèque archéologique et his-
  torique, Tome LIX, Paris 1955), p. 110-112.
9 Justi, p. 494
10 Drower-Macuch, p. 53.

§bnh§ (pl. with suff. sg. 3. fem.) is either a phonetic spelling instead of the Syriac §bnyh§ (read [bǎneh]) or a Mandaism as proposed by Montgomery[1]. Cf. below, p. 26-27.

Lines 3-4:

§rz šmy' b-šmy' qbyr w-rz 'r^c' b-'r^c' qbyr w-rzh d-byt' hdyn§. In IM 23776:1 the incantation bowl is called §rz'§ (*mzmn hn' rz' w-ḥtmt' l-byth d-...*).[2] Thus the phrase obviously refers to a microcosmos idea: The bowl of the house is a miniature of the cosmic bowls buried in heaven and earth which preserve and maintain the order of elements.[3] The burying of the bowls of heaven and earth <u>in</u> heaven, resp. earth implies by analogy that the bowl of the house was buried <u>in</u> the house, cf. above, p. 5, fn. 4.

§hdyn§ does not occur as a demonstrative pronoun in Syriac.[4] Contrary to that, it is normal in Jewish Eastern Aramaic[5] and in Jewish incantation bowls[6], and in one Mandaic bowl it is spelled §hadin§[7]; the true Mandaic form is §hazin§ which probably originated from +§hadin§.[8] Syntactically §hdyn§ is here a predicative, but §ptgm' hdyn§ (line 6), §hn' qm^{c}y'§ (line 1), and §ptgm' hn'§ (IMB, line 6+) go to show that §hdyn§ is a pronoun without a specific difference from §hn'§.

§'l'§ (= Syriac §'ellǎ'§) indicates that the magic bowl has to bear an incantation, to bury a bowl whatsoever is not sufficient.

§ḥrš'§ means either "sorceries" (*ḥaršē*) or "sorcerers" (*ḥarrašē*).

---

1 Montgomery, p. 35 and 172.
2 Teixidor, p. 57 & fn. 8 (= Hamilton, Text 15).
3 Cf. B.A. Levine, The Language of the Magical Bowls (in Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia V*, p. 343-375), p. 371-373.
4 But occurs in the parallel text, Montgomery 37:5 (= Hamilton, Text 9).
5 *hǎdēn*, see Epstein, p. 23-24.
6 §hdyn§ in Montgomery 3:6, §hd'yn§ in Montgomery 28:4.
7 Yamauchi, Text 32:52 (p. 294).
8 Macuch, p. 165 and 67.

Line 5:

§'šgnd'§. The true Syriac form of this Iranian (?)[1] loan word is
§'îzgaddå'§[2] which occurs also in Jewish Aramaic.[3] However, Mandaic has
retained the same form §ašganda§.[4]

§ptykr'§ is a spelling implying the same vocalization pattern which
exists in Mandaic §p(a)tikra§ in contrast to Syriac and Jewish
§ptakrå'§.[5]

§gnd'§ is a similar case of non-assimilation as §'šgnd'§ above. /n/ of
of the original Pahlavi *gund* is assimilated in the standard Syriac
§gûddå'§[6] but retained partly in Mandaic (§gunda§ / §gud§, §guda§)[7] and
Jewish Aramaic (§gûndå'§ / §gûddå'§).[8] In Syriac bowls §gnd'§ occurs also
in Montgomery's text 37:6[9] and according to Hamilton in Layard-Ellis.[10]

Line 6:

§y'h§ is a variation of the Tetragrammaton *yhwh*. In IMB there is §y'lh§,
i.e. a combination of *Yah* and *Allaha*, in Layard-Ellis possibly §'lh§

---

1 H. Happ, Zu ἀσγάνδης, ἀσκανδής, ἀστάνδης = "Bote" (*Glotta* 40,
  1962, p. 198-201). For Sumerian aš-gan-du and Akkadian *ašgandu* men-
  tioned by Happ also as Iranian loan words, see *The Assyrian Diction-
  ary of the University of Chicago*, Vol. 2, A, Part II (Chicago-Glück-
  stadt 1968), p. 427a, and G. Widengren, "Synkretismus" in der sy-
  rischen Christenheit (in *Synkretismus im syrisch-persischen Kultur-
  gebiet*, hrsg. von Albert Dietrich, Göttingen 1975, p. 38-64), p. 55
  & fn. 102a; Widengren accepts these etymologies with great hesita-
  tions.
2 The Syriac and Jewish §'îzgaddå'§ is developed through the change of
  the initial [a] into [i] (followed by a sibilant, see Brockelmann,
  Syrische Grammatik, p. 35-36 § 58, §'izgandå'§ is attested in Syriac,
  see Brockelmann, Lexicon, p. 9) and the partial assimilation of [š]
  into the voiced [g], cf. Syriac §ḥûšbånå'§ realized as [ḥužbānā] in
  Eastern Syriac (Brockelmann, Grammatik, p. 19-20 § 29,2).
3 M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yeru-
  shalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (Reprint, New York 1950), p. 46.
4 Drower-Macuch, p. 40.
5 idem, p. 366; Yamauchi, p. 366; Brockelmann, Lexicon, p. 617; Jastrow,
  p. 1254.
6 Brockelmann, Lexicon, p. 104.
7 Drower-Macuch, p. 84 and 82.   9 = Hamilton, Text 9:6.
8 Jastrow, p. 223.   10 = Hamilton, Text 10:3.

"Allah", cf. above, p. 9, note 3 and fn. a. According to Hamilton
§y'h§ occurs also in Montgomery´s text 31:6 (= Hamilton, Text 3). For
other occurrences of the Tetragrammaton in Syriac bowls, see Hamilton,
p. 185 (where §yh§ of Lidzbarski´s bowl (1916) is lacking). Although
Yah may be identified with "your Father who is in heaven" (line 9), we
have to pay attention to "male gods and female ishtars" which are
placed (almost, cf. §mš̄w'§ sg.) on a par with the Father (same line).
Thus we can draw no conclusions from these passages concerning the reli-
gion of the sorcerer or clients, so with all the reason since §iaha§ is
known also in the Mandaean religion as a deity who dispells evil spirits.[1]

§mqbyl y'h§ "accepts Yah" seems to refer to the acceptance of Yah as the
protective power of the house, cf. Montgomery, Text 6:11: "And whoever
will transgress against this press and does not accept these rites (*w-
hlyn rzyn l' mqbyl*), shall split asunder violently...".

§ml̈'§ (without medial §'§) §r'z̈'§. §ml'§ is probably a plural *status con-
stuctus* which, as in Mandaic,[2] is identical with *status emphaticus* as
far as the spelling is concerned, at least. A similar case we have on
line 8[+] of IMB, §dyr' byt'§ "occupants of the house", the counterpart of
which in HB is, however, the genuine Syriac form §dyry byt'§.[3]

Line 7:

§ᶜlwhy§ (twice). Because there are vestiges of phonetic spellings in this

---

1 Cf. the Mandaean *Qolastā XV* (*Mandäische Liturgien*, mitgeteilt, über-
   setzt und erklärt von M. Lidzbarski, Berlin 1920, p. 22, line 8 -
   23,3): "Ein jeder Amuletgeist und Götze (*humarta u-patikra*), der sein
   Haupt hochhebt,..., er wird geschlagen und geplagt werden durch Jāhā,
   Jāhā, Z´hā, Z´hā und durch die Engel, die gegen sie gesandt wurden und
   kamen. Zitternd eilet weg vor ihnen...".
   See also Yamauchi, p. 36.
   §yh§ as the protecting Lord occurs further in the Christian Syriac
   Book of Protection; Syriac Charms (ed. by H. Gollanz, London 1912),
   Codex C § 18, p. 86 / lxxxii.
2 Macuch, p. 206-207, 390-391.
3 §r'z'§ is spelled here with medial §'§, cf. §rz§, §rzh§ on lines 3-4.

text (cf. below, p. 27), we could suspect that §h§ (without *linea occultans*) may still have been pronounced in the dialect of the writer.

§qdmh§. In Aramaic the prepositions §ᶜl§ and §qdm§ have parallel forms when extended by possessive suffixes. Thus the analogy of §ᶜlwhy§ would demand §qdmwhy§, i.e. the true Syriac pattern. The nearest counterpart is again Mandaic, §qudmeh§.[1] Also Jewish Aramaic discloses shortened forms (§qmyh§ = *qammeh*) side by side with longer ones (§qdmwhy§ = *qd̥ᷝmohi*).[2]

Line 8:

§l-'nšh§, §'§ without *linea occultans* and possibly still pronounced,[3] cf. §ᶜlwhy§ above.

§hw'§ (twice and once on line 9) is either act. part. (= Syriac §hᷲwe'§) used to substitute the future tense[4] or the 3. pers. masc. personal pronoun used as a copula[5] or, in this context less probably, pf. of the verb √hw' "he has become".[6]

§mrbyn'§ = Syriac §marbyᷲnᷲ'§ "that which makes to grow, foster-father/mother"[7] and Mandaic §mrabiana§ "fosterer, one who nurtures".[8]

---

1 Drower-Macuch, p. 406; Macuch, p. 239.
2 Epstein, p. 136.
3 §'§ is retained in Mandaic with consistency in the classical period, i.e. until the first half of the first Muslim century, see Macuch, p. 134 and lxv.
4 Cf. Montgomery 37:3 (= Hamilton 9:3): [*w-kl d-'yt*]*lh w-d-hwyn lh* "and everything that belongs and will belong to (him)"; Th. Nöldeke, *Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik* (Leipzig 1880), p. 187 § 270, e.g. *'aylên d-men bᷲtran hᷲwên* "die welche nach uns sein werden". In Mandaic, however, act. part. §hauia§ occurs only in conditional clauses, see Macuch, p. 439.
5 According to Hamilton (p. 63) there are three variants of this pronoun in Syriac incantation texts: §hw'§, §hw§, and §hwhw'§. Jewish Aramaic has similar variants: §hw'§, §hw§, and §'yhw§, see Epstein, p. 20-21.
6 Cf. however, Mandaic, Th. Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik* (Halle 1875), p. 369-370: "So wird nun auch §hua§ oft als γέγονε = ἔστι gebraucht, besonders mit der Negation,...e.g. *hašta d-ruḥṣanai ᶜl haiia hua* "jetzt, da mein Vertrauen auf das Leben ist".
7 Payne Smith, p. 298.
8 Drower-Macuch, p. 278.

Line 9:

§byr'§ is traditionally translated as "cattle" in bowl texts,[1] and because in the Syriac *Book of Protection* (ed. by Gollanz) where so numerous objects have been dealt with there is no charm for a well (Syriac §bẹ'rå'§, §bîrå'§)[2], this interpretation seems to be preferable. In the same form, §bira§ without the more original /^{c}/, the word occurs in Mandaic.[3]

§gd ṭb'§, cf. above, p. 15, §gdbḥr§.

§qblyw§. If the ending has been read correctly - it is rather faded in the bowl - the imperative would be that of the 2. pers. fem. sg. (referring to Shishin) with a 3. pers. masc. sg. obj. suff. attached (referring to "peace") and thus the spelling would be a phonetic one (*qabbĕliw*) instead of the true Syriac §qblywhy§. However, in IMB its counterpart is §qblw§, i.e. the normal Syriac imp. 2. masc. pl. without an object suffix. Consequently, it is more probable - also in regard to the context - that §qblyw§ is an unsuccessful attempt to follow the traditional spelling §qblw§; the long final vowels were dropped from the pronunciation "schon vor der ältesten Literaturepoche"[4], (i.e. 4th century AD), and thus the pl. imperative was realized as *qabbel*.[5] In Classical Mandaic there is no special form for imp. pl.; however, Modern Mandaic has preserved lengthened pl. imperatives *bareχyōn, bareχyen*.[6] Could §y§ of §qblyw§ have a connection with these lengthened forms?

For the idea of "acceptance", see above, p. 18, §mqbyl y'h§.

§'bwkwn d-b-šmy'§ looks at the first glance like a Christian formula.

---

1 Montgomery, p. 284; Hamilton, p. 53.
2 Brockelmann, Lexicon, p. 56; Payne Smith, p. 34, 54.
3 Drower-Macuch, p. 62
   "Well" is not mentioned in Mandaic incantation texts, see Yamauchi, Glossary A.
4 Brockelmann, Grammatik, p. 45 § 75.
5 Cf. Hamilton (p. 79) on §'nwn 'ytpqyd§ (Montgomery 35:6 = Hamilton 7:6): "Note that here the plural is expressed by the singular as sometimes happens in Syriac and Mandaic."
6 See Macuch, p. 257-258, 274-275, "preserved" is the wording of Macuch.

However, it is well attested in Palestinian Jewish Targums[1] and in Gnostic and Mandaean texts various emanations and deities are called "Father".[2]

§d-mšw'§ is a spelling indicating the singular in genuine Syriac, at least (vs. pl. §mšwyn§), and thus it refers here and on line 10 to "your Father" only and not to other gods.

Line 10:

§mtql'§, $\sqrt{tql}$ af^{c}el = "effecit ut offenderet",[3] "to let to fall (into sin)".[4]

§hbl'§ means either "injury, destruction" (= Syriac §ḥbålå'§) or "destroyer" (= Syriac §ḥabbålå'§).

For the contents of line 10, cf. *Ginza iamina* (ed. by J.H. Petermann, *Thesaurus sive Liber Magnus vulgo "Liber Adami" appellatus, opus Mandaeorum summi ponderis*, Lipsiae 1867), p. 8, lines 8-13: *la tisigdun l-saṭana l-patikria u-l-ṣalamata u-l-ṭ^{c}ia u-šigša d̲-hazin alma d̲-man d̲-sagid l-saṭana napil b-nura d̲-iaqda alma l-iuma d̲-dina u-alma l-šita šaiia purqana u-alma d̲-ṣabia malka rama d̲-nhura d̲-daiinlun l-kulhun almia daiinlun l-nišmata kul ^{c}niš kd̲ ^{c}ubadia ^{c}dh* "Do not worship Satan, idols and graven images and error and confusion of this world, because he who worships Satan will fall into the glowing fire up until the Day of Judgement, to the Hour, the hours of redemption, up until the time demanded by the Exalted King of Light, he who judges all the beings, judges the souls of all people according to the works of their hands." For the Judgement (§b-dynh§), see also Montgomery, p. 135-136, Teixidor, p. 55, fn. 6, Rudolph (see below, fn. 2), p. 190, and below, p. 25,

---

1 M. McNamara, *Targum and Testament* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1972), p. 115-119.
2 Cf. e.g. the registers in *Die Gnosis, Zweiter Band, Koptische und mandäische Quellen* (eingeleitet, übersetzt und erläutert von M. Krause und K. Rudolph, Zürich und Stuttgart 1971), p. 454-455, 467.
3 Brockelmann, Lexicon, p. 831.
4 Payne Smith, p. 618.
  Less probably of $\sqrt{qly}$ etpe/a. "to be fried, scorched", idem, p. 506.

Ginza citation.

§ddyn§. If these letters between the magic symbols represent a word (cf. IMB where the letters §dd§ have diacritical dots of §d§ below them), it would be pl. st. abs. of §dådå'§ "friend, uncle".

§'ntyn§ "you" fem. pl. although all of the following demons are not of feminine gender, §n§ is retained in the spelling (cf. Syriac §'n̄tyn§ = ['atten]) in the same way as in Mandaic §anatun§ (masc., fem. $^+$§anatin§ is not attested)[1]. Also in Jewish Aramaic there is §'ntwn§ besides §'attû§ and §'attûn§.[2]

Line 11:

§nkwlt'§ is obviously a fem. plural of the Syriac word §nåkô/ûlå'§ "deceptor",[3] "crafty, wily, deceitful".[4]

§šyd'§ vs. §š'd'§ on line 5. The former goes with Mandaic (§šida§)[5] and Jewish Aramaic (§šêdå'§, §šedå'§)[6], and the latter with Syriac (§šẹ'då'§, §ši'då'§).[7]

§pg^c'§ = Syriac §peg^{c}å'§ "hostile encounter, accident",[8] cf., however, Mandaic §piga§, §pigia§ "deaf-mute, dumb".[9]

§l'ṭb'§ = Mandaic §laṭaba§ "no-good-one", "fiend".[10]

§qrwt'§ means according to Montgomery (p. 301 and 84), Teixidor, and Hamilton "(magical) invocation(s)" (a derivative of $\sqrt{qr'}$ "to call") which,

---

1 Realized as [anatton], $^+$[anatten]. In Modern Mandaic, however, /n/ has been assimilated into /t/ and the results are [atton], [atten]. Macuch, p. 154.
2 Epstein, p. 21.
3 Brockelmann, Lexicon, p. 429.
4 Payne Smith, p. 339.
5 Drower-Macuch, p. 460.
6 Jastrow, p. 1523.
7 Brockelmann, Lexicon, p. 748; Payne Smith, p. 553.
8 Payne Smith, p. 434; for "plague", see Montgomery, p. 92.
9 Used also of a kind of demon, Drower-Macuch, p. 370.
10 Drower-Macuch, p. 228; Yamauchi, p. 202, Text 14:14.

however, does not occur in Syriac dictionaries. On the support of the Mandaic expression *u-qiria u-nidria u-ašlamata* (cited in Drower-Macuch, p. 41, s.v. §ašlamata§) "and accidents and (evil?) vows and surrenderings (forfeitures)" I think that §qrwt'§ is the Syriac plural of §qeryå'§ in the sense "pollutio", "an effusion during sleep"[1] from the root $\sqrt{qry}$ "to happen", or more generally "an accident", cf. Mandaic §qiria§ "mishap, strife, accident, accidental pollution, obstinacy, quarrel, dispute"[2]. Syriac dictionaries do not mention a plural form of §qeryå'§, but numerous Syriac nouns of this pattern (with *yod* as the third root consonant) get a /w/ in the plural (e.g. §'ôryå'§, pl. §'ôrawwåtå'§);[3] thus §qrwt'§ would be read *qrawwåtå*.

§z'dnyt'§, adj. pl. fem. = "impious, presumptuous, furious", cf. Mandaic *hwmria zadaniata*.[4] For the variation §z'dnyt'§ vs. §zydnyt'§ in IMB, cf. the Mandaic pair §zadana§ - §zidana§[5] and Jewish Aramaic §zêdånå'§, §zêdônå'§ "wilful, violent, tyrant".[6] The word does not occur in Syriac dictionaries.

§qll'§ means in Syriac "opprobrium",[7] "belittling, contempt, ignomity, shame",[8] cf., however, Mandaic §q(u)lala§ 1 "snare, trap".[9]

The following two words are almost effaced in HB. However, the last traces do not accord with their counterparts §d-b-zywn"§ / zdwn" w-ḥṭywn'§ in IMB.

---

1 Brockelmann, Lexicon, p. 691; Payne Smith, p. 519.
2 Drower-Macuch, p. 412.
3 See Brockelmann, Grammatik, p. 63-64 § 111a.
4 Cited in Drower-Macuch, p. 157 *sub* §zadana§.
5 idem, p. 157 and 165; Yamauchi, p. 326.
6 Jastrow, p. 391.
7 Brockelmann, Lexicon, p. 665.
8 Payne Smith, p. 507.
9 Drower-Macuch, p. 406, = §qula§.

Line 12:

§nwsy'§ = Syriac "tentatio", "trial".[1]

§sgdt'§ = Syriac "veneratio, venerandum, idolum, templum", "worship, adoration".[2]

§'šlmt'§ does not occur in Syriac dictionaries. In bowl texts it has been translated as "(initiatory) rites", "spells",[3] but according to Levine '"deliverance spell/spirit", i.e. that which delivers one into the hands of evil' is a more correct rendering.[4] However, Drower-Macuch and Yamauchi translate the exact Mandaic counterpart §ašlamata§ "surrenderings (cf. تليم), tyrannous requisitions".[5]

§d-lyṭyn w-mšḥpyn w-šryn§ are according to the context passive participles. For §mšḥpyn§ cf. Jewish Aramaic §šaḥaptå'§ "wasting away, consumption",[6] the root does not occur in a suitable meaning in Syriac nor in Mandaic.[7] Of the numerous meanings of the verb $\sqrt{šry}$ "to dissolve", "to loose from consecration"[8] are most suited to the context.[9]

Commentary on the End of IMB

Line 12[+]:

§yrd'§, see above, p. 11, note 20.

§'tkrzw§ (etpe. imp. masc. pl.) = Syriac "excommunicatus est",[10] cf. also

---

1 Brockelmann, Lexicon, p. 433; Payne Smith, p. 333.
2 Brockelmann, Lexicon, p. 458; Payne Smith, p. 360.
3 See Montgomery, p. 85-86, 304; Hamilton, Texts 7:4 and 14:3.
4 Levine, p. 356.
5 Drower-Macuch, p. 41, where the phrase *u-qiria u-nidria u-ašlamata* is translated "and accidents and (evil?) vows and surrenderings (forfeitures)". A variant of §ašlamata§ is §šalamata§ "forfeitures, yieldings", idem, p. 442. Yamauchi (p. 360): "requisitions".
6 Jastrow, p. 1549; Montgomery, p. 93.
7 Syriac §šḥåpå'§ "first milk after parturition" (Payne Smith, p. 572) and Mandaic §šahpa§ 1 "leaf, fringe(?)" (Drower-Macuch, p. 449) have hardly anything to do with our occurrence; Mandaic §šahpa§ 2 = §šahba§ 2 "a cutaneous disease, eczema (?)" is possibly related to Jewish §šaḥaptå'§ (idem).

§makrzå'§ "excommunicated".[1] The idea of excommunication of evil spirits resembles closely the divorce formulas of some Jewish and Syriac bowls.[2]

§psw§ (imp. masc. pl.), obviously = the Mandaic and Jewish Aramaic verb $\sqrt{psa/y}$ "to step", "to step on", "to tread on" which goes back to the root $\sqrt{ps^c/\dot{h}}$.[3] If the etymology is correct, we have here again a case of weakened laryngeals, cf. below, p. 26-27.

Line 13[+]:

§'zylw§ with preserved §'§ in imp. pl. *pro* Syriac §zlw§ = [zel]. The initial syllable is retained in Mandaic §^{c}zil§ realized [ézzel][4] and also in Jewish Aramaic there are forms with and without it (§'îzîlû§ – §zîlû§).[5]

For "mighty mountains and evil sea (and evil desert)", cf. *Ginza iamina* (ed. Petermann, p. 66, lines 13-15): *bišia b-ṣubianun naplia b-iama rba d̲-sup mištiknia b-hšuka u-balalun ṭura haška alma l-iuma ium dina u-alma l-šita šaiia d̲-purqana* "The evil will fall by their own will into the Great Suf-Ocean, be made to dwell in the darkness, and the Dark Mountain will swallow them, up until the Day, the Day of Judgement and up until the Hour, the hours of redemption."

§byšt'§ (sg. fem.) is here used as a neutral noun[6] because §ym'§ is of masc. gender and thus §byšt'§ can not be its attribute.

§bryt'§ = Syriac §barrîtå'§, pl. §baryåtå'§ "fields, wilds, desert places".[7]

---

8 Payne Smith, p. 595-596; Brockelmann, Lexicon, p. 803.
9 For $\sqrt{šry}$ and other terms for the reversing and releasing of spells, see Levine, p. 368-371.
10 Brockelmann, Lexicon, p. 344.

1 Payne Smith, p. 521.
2 See Neusner, p. 235-241; Hamilton, Texts 4 and 5, & p. 131-135.
3 Drower-Macuch, p. 375; Jastrow, p. 1194.
4 Macuch, p. 138 § 91.
5 Epstein, p. 60.
6 See Brockelmann, Grammatik, p. 104 § 189: "das Böse".
7 Payne Smith, p. 55.

"deserts from his Lord, he does not receive" possibly refers to line 6.

Line 14[+]:

§slḥ§ (also on line 15[+]). Spellings of Hebrew §sälåh§ in Syriac bowls are §slh§ (the correct one), §slḥ§,[1] §s'lh§, §s^{c}lh§, and §slḥh§.[2] The vacillation testifies again to the instability of laryngeal consonants, cf. below, p. 26-27.

Line 15[+]:

§'bgd...§. The alphabet with a protective power and other final formulas are in agreement with those described by Lady Drower as occurring in magic rolls used still among Mandaeans.[3] §n§ appears both in the initial-medial and final shape and §t§ similarly in the final and independent form.

Concluding Remarks

Linguistically the most interesting feature of this bowl text is the abundance of Mandaic vocabulary and forms. Words and patterns having exact parallels only in Mandaic are §mdwrt'§ (line 2), §'šgnd'§ (5), §ptykr'§ (5), §byr'§ (9), §l'ṭb'§ (11), §z'/ydnyt'§ (11), and §'šlmt'§ (12); §gnd'§ occurs also in Jewish Aramaic. In addition to them the spellings §bnh§ (2), §qdmh§ (7), and §'zylw§ (13[+]) are in accordance with the grammar of Mandaic but not of Syriac. Other phenomena pointing to Mandaic are the preservation of §'§ in §l-'nšh§ (8) and that of §n§ in §'ntyn§ (10) (cf. phonetic spellings below), the employment of alphabet (*abaga*) in the end of IMB, some Mandaic expressions ("victorious peace", "mighty mountains", "evil sea") as well as the rather numerous cases of laryngeal confusion: §qm^{c}y'§ (1), §b'w^{c}y§ (2), §mḥbwd§ (2),

---

1 Spelled so also in the bowl published by Lidzbarski (1916, p. 1214).
2 For the occurrences, see Hamilton, p. 191.
3 Drower, p. 26 and 240. The alphabet also brings the bowl text of Layard-Ellis (= Hamilton, Text 10) to an end; however, all of the letters have been repeated and §t§ is written four times in Layard-Ellis.

§byr'§ (9), §psw§ (12[+]), §slḥ§ (14[+], 15[+]); however, the last phenomenon
is shared with Jewish Aramaic.

An explanation of these Mandaisms would be the hypothesis that the writer
of the incantation was a Mandaean exorcist who attempted to write Syriac
but was not always able to discern between genuine Syriac and his native
Aramaic dialect. On the other hand, there are in this text words and
forms occurring only in Syriac (§hn'§ (1), §nkwlt'§ (11), §qrwt'§ (?, 11),
§nwsy'§ (12), §bryt'§ (13[+]); §[c]lwhy§ (7), masc. pl. ending §-'§) or in
Jewish Aramaic (§hdyn§ (3, 6), §mš̆ḥpyn§ (12)). In addition, §'sywt'§ (1),
§bt§ (2), §'r[c]'§ (4),[1] and the verb √krz are Syriac and Jewish Aramaic
but not Mandaic, similarly §npln§ (7, part. fem. pl.) and §š̆lmyn§ (9,
st. abs. pl. with a numeral) disagree with the morphology of Mandaic.[2]
Also the traditional adherence to a script system determined by the
writer´s religion, a fact stressed by Lidzbarski,[3] is against such a
hypothesis.

Thus another solution seems to be more probable. Phonetic spellings (§bt§
2, §ml'§ 7, §ytyb§ 7, §qblyw§ 9, §dykr'§ 11, §š'd'§ 5 vs. §š̆yd'§ 11, etc.)
indicate that the exorcist was not versed in the details of Syriac ortho-
graphy, i.e. he wrote more or less as he spoke. If so, his dialect was
not genuine Syriac, but a dialect which had much in common with Mandaic
(and Jewish Aramaic). In an area (Central Mesopotamia) with a mixed
population (cf. Persian proper names) and far from Syriac cultural centres
such an amalgamation of closely related dialects (cf. Greek Koiné), espe-
cially in the field of vocabulary, appears more than likely.

Other Syriac bowl texts disclose similar deviations from Syriac vocab-
ulary and morphology (cf. Hamilton´s grammatical sketch, p. 51-94, and

---

1 *Pro* Mandaic §asuta§ (Drover-Macuch, p. 28), §brat§ (idem, p. 70),
  §arqa§ (idem, p. 39).
2 *Pro* the Mandaic normal spelling §napqa§ realized, however, [nāfqan],
  see Macuch, p. 208, 48-49.
  For st. abs. pl. in Mandaic, see idem, p. 206-209, for nouns with
  numerals, idem, p. 414.
3 Lidzbarski 1916, p. 1218-1220.

glossary, p. 165–202). Also the textual properties of the incantations
reflect the syncretistic nature of these bowl texts: formulas and names
were rather freely borrowed from one religion and language to the other.
Thus the dialectal interference is not limited to a certain type of
Syriac type of text (HB, IMB, Montgomery 37, Layard–Ellis). It is quite
possible that a linguistic study of Jewish and Mandaic incantation texts
would reveal parallel proofs of the influence of Syriac on those dialects
as well as of their mutual contacts. Similarly it would be profitable
to examine which of the numerous alternative morphemes of Jewish Eastern
Aramaic could be attributed to an amalgamation of Eastern Aramaic dia-
lects.

Pl. 1, Helsinki Bowl.

Pl. 2, The Incantation Text of HB.