IV. MORPHOLOGY

IV.1. INDEPENDENT PERSONAL PRONOUNS

The following independent personal pronouns are attested in the bowl texts. The more common forms are listed first when more than one variant occurs. Uncertain forms and Hebrew forms are placed in parentheses.[1]

1st p. sg.	אנה ;אנא; (אני)
2nd p. masc. sg.	את; (אתה)
2nd p. fem. sg.	אנתי
3rd p. masc. sg.	הוא
3rd p. fem. sg.	הי ;היא
1st p. pl.	אנחנא; (אנחן)
2nd p. masc. pl.	(אנתו); (אתו); (אתן); אתון
2nd p. fem. pl.	(אנתי); אנתין; אתין
3rd p. masc. pl.	אינון
3rd p. fem. pl.	(אינין)

SOME EXAMPLES:

1st p. sg.: לית אנא פתחא לכון 'I will not open for you' (N&Sh 12a:4); ואנה רחימנא אזלנא אנה פאבק בר כופיתאי 'I P. son of K. go' (AIT 2:1);[2] אנה כומיש בת מחלפתא 'and I love you' (N&Sh 6:3); 'I K. daughter of M.' (AIT 17:2); אנא מומינא ומשבענא 'I adjure and invoke' (Bor 1:3).

2nd p. masc. sg.: את שידא דדברא בריך אתה 'you are blessed' (AIT 25:3); 'if you are a demon of the open field/you, demon, of the open field' (WB:3).[3] אשבעת עליכון את בר איגרי קלילא 'I have adjured you (pl.), you (sg.) fleet son of roofs' (Go 5:10).[4]

---

[1] Forms which are used in some texts otherwise than is normal also appear in parentheses, e.g. אנתי is regular for the 2nd p. fem. sg., but possibly appears as a pl. form in some texts. Thus, it is parenthesized in the list.

[2] In AIT 27, which forms a close parallel to AIT 2, one may read אזילנא אנא.

[3] שידא is apparently used in a generic sense, since the following participle forms are in the pl., e.g. לבישיתון.

[4] Again, the phrase את בר איגרי קלילא is probably employed in a generic or collective sense referring to all demons. The instance is also noted below in treating the 2nd p. fem. sg., where parallel incongruences are attested.

2nd p. fem. sg.: אסירת וחתימת אנתי מבכלתא בישתא 'bound and sealed are you, the evil Tormentor' (N&Sh 12b:1); ותרכית יתיכי אנתי ליליתא 'and I have dismissed you Lilith' (AIT 17:3); אנתי ליליתא בישתא 'you evil Lilith' (Go G:6).[5]

3rd p. masc. sg.: דהוא מתיב 'who renders' (AIT 8:7);[6] הוא יאסר 'may he place' (N&Sh 21:11); דהוא שליט על טור 'which was ruling over the mountain' (SB 8); דהוא אביכון 'which is your father' (SB 19);[7] בריך הוא 'blessed be he' (Go B:4).[8]

3rd p. fem. sg.: היא תיפרוסינין 'may she sprinkle them' (AIT 28:4);[9] לילי הי לילי 'lili who is lili' (?) (N&Sh 4:5); דהי אמיכון 'which is your mother' (SB 20).[10]

1st p. pl.: אנחנא מנמלכא בת אנחנא כתבנא 'we have written' (AIT 1:14-15); ו אימאי 'we M. daughter of 'I. and ?' (ZRL 1-2).[11]

2nd p. masc. pl.: דאתון מיתדמין לבני אינשא 'that you appear to people' (N&Sh 25:10); אתון בתריה דאבונא בר גריבתא 'you are in place of 'A. son of G.' (AIT 4:7); אתון בתריה [ד]מאראי אתון אסירי 'you are bound' (AIT 19:13); חתימיתון ומחתמיתון בר איתי 'you are behind M. son of 'I.' (Go 11:16-17);[12] אתון חרשי בישי 'you are sealed and countersealed, you artificers of evil' (WB: 6-7); אתון חמשה מלאכין 'you five angels' (McCu A:1);[13] אתון שידי ודיוי 'you demons and devils/*devs*' (WB:8).

2nd p. fem. pl.: פק אתין כו מן ביתה 'depart (you), then, from her house' (AIT 17:7);[14] אתין לא תיתחזין 'you should not appear' (Go K:4);[15] אנתין רוחי בישאתא 'you evil spirits' (Boris 1:3).[16]

---

5   I have no photograph of the text at my disposal, but in a facsimile the reading of Gordon looks secure.

6   Based on a photograph, דהוא is certain, but the rest, to my mind, are uncertain.

7   Even though SB is partly rather faded, the reading – based on a photograph – is certain here.

8   I have no photograph of the text at my disposal, but in a facsimile, the reading of Gordon seems secure.

9   Read according to the emendation by Epstein (1921: 55). Montgomery reads תיפרוסינון with *waw*. Based on a photograph of the text, both readings are possible due to the inconsistency in the forms of *waw* and *yod* in the script. The context does not help to solve the problem.

10   The omission of the letter א in הי may be due to haplography, since the writing is very dense.

11   I have no photograph of the text at my disposal, but in a facsimile Gordon's reading looks plausible.

12   The reading is based on a facsimile of the text and is not certain.

13   Harviainen here emends אתין 'they come,' but though the readings in McCu A-B are often open to criticism, as noted by Harviainen and, especially, by Segal *pace* Isbell (see Harviainen 1981: 10, n. 1; Segal 1970: 611; Isbell 1975: 3), McCullough's original reading is probably correct at this point.

14   כו is read according to the emendation by Epstein (1921: 48). אתין could also be read with *waw* (i.e. אתון).

3rd p. masc. pl.: אינון ידעין אינון נינטרוניה 'they will guard him' (BOR:9-10); 'they know' (MB I:9); אינון יבטלון וישמתון 'they will annul and ban' (AIT 12:9).

DISCUSSION

As common in Aramaic, the pronouns of the 3rd p. may be used as a copula, e.g. בשום אטון ארזין וניטר(וא)ל ופקיד(אל) דאינון קימין עים מדין 'In the name of 'A.-'A. and N. and P. who (they) stand with ?' (N&Sh 23:6); דהוא שליט 'who (he) is in control' (AIT 11:7; GE A:4); דהוא כביש שידין 'who presses down devils' (TB 6).

BTA has special forms of the 3rd p. sg. and. pl. – i.e. ניהו (masc. sg.); ניהי (fem. sg.); נינהו (masc. pl.); נינהי (fem. pl.) – which serve as the copula.[17] However, regular pronouns of the 3rd p. may also be used in this function. According to Schlesinger, only the special forms occur in the pl., while in the sg. the regular forms predominate.[18] By contrast, Nedarim uses the regular forms in the pl. as well, alongside the special copulative forms.[19] In the bowl texts, only the regular forms are so far attested.

The pronouns of the 3rd p. may also be used as demonstrative pronouns (see IV.4. *Demonstrative Pronouns*).

1st p. sg.

In the bowl texts both אנה and אנא appear, the former being the more common orthographic variant. Both spellings may appear side by side in the same text, cf. אנה... ואנא מנכון 'I... and I am one of you' (N&Sh 21:13). אני appears in some Hebrew formulae, e.g. לישמיך אני עושה 'in your name I act' (G 2:1).[20]

אנא/אנה is common throughout Aramaic.

2nd p. masc. sg.

With respect to the 2nd p. sg. in general, it is noteworthy that the bowl texts preserve a gender distinction – at least in the orthography – as opposed to TO,[21] TJ,[22] BTA,[23] Mandaic,[24] GA, including Targum Neophyti,[25] and PsJ.[26] The preser-

---

[15]   On the basis of a photograph of the text, one could also read אתון לא תיתחזין; as usual, *waw* and *yod* are practically indistinguishable.

[16]   אנתין could could also be read with *waw* (i.e. אנתון).

[17]   For these forms, see Epstein 1960: 22-23; Kutscher 1962: 156-157.

[18]   Schlesinger 1928: 11-12.

[19]   Ibid.

[20]   Gordon reads לישמוך.

[21]   Dalman 1905: 107.

[22]   Tal 1975: 1.

[23]   Epstein 1960: 20.

[24]   Nöldeke 1875: 86.

vation of gender distinction in the 2nd p. is characteristic of Official Aramaic.[27] A separate fem. form is also found in Qumran Aramaic, though it is rare,[28] and among the Late Aramaic dialects, it occurs in Samaritan Aramaic, in Syriac – only as the *ketiv* – and Palestinian Christian Aramaic.[29]

The forms attested for the 2nd p. masc. in the bowl texts are את and אתה. It is evident that אתה in the bowl texts is a Hebraism, since otherwise it is employed in Aramaic only in Samaritan Aramaic, where the use of Hebrew forms alongside Aramaic ones is well attested.[30]

את predominates in TO and TJ.[31] In Late Aramaic, it is the regular form in standard BTA,[32] and it is also common in West Aramaic, where it is known in Targum Neophyti,[33] Palestinian Talmudic Aramaic (PTA),[34] Samaritan Aramaic, alongside אתה,[35] and in Palestinian Christian Aramaic.[36]

Many Aramaic dialects present a form of the 2nd p. masc. sg. in which the *nun* is preserved in the orthography, e.g. אנאת in Mandaic.[37] Importantly, this kind of form is unattested in the bowl texts, and in this respect, the Aramaic of the bowl texts also deviates from Nedarim and Geonic Aramaic, which preserve the *nun* in the orthography.[38] Nedarim employs אנת for both genders.[39]

---

25   Dalman 1905: 106; Golomb 1985: 47. The 2nd p. fem. form אתי is preserved in MS.Vat. Ebr.30 (=MS. V) of *Bereshit Rabba*. See Kutscher 1976: 31.

26   Cook 1986: 131.

27   See Segert 1975: 165, 167; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 43-45. Note, however, that Egyptian Aramaic employs אנת alongside אנתי for the 2nd p. fem. sg. Ibid.

28   Tal 1975: 2; Cook 1986: 131.

29   Macuch 1982: 131; Nöldeke 1898: 44; Schulthess 1924: 32; Müller-Kessler 1991: 67.

30   For the use of Hebrew pronouns alongside the Aramaic forms in Samaritan Aramaic, see Macuch 1982: 131 ff. One could, of course, argue that אתה is an attempt to imitate the Biblical Aramaic אנתה (*ketiv*). Cf. Rosenthal 1974: 19.

31   Dalman 1905: 107; Tal 1975: 1.

32   Epstein 1960: 20.

33   Golomb 1985: 47. It also occurs in the Palestinian Targum fragments from the Cairo Geniza (Fassberg 1990: 111).

34   Dalman 1905: 106.

35   Macuch 1982: 131. The *qere* in Syriac attests to the same form as well. See Nöldeke 1898: 44.

36   Schulthess 1924: 32; Müller-Kessler 1991: 67.

37   For Mandaic, see Nöldeke 1875: 86.

38   Cf. Rybak 1980: 79; Epstein 1960: 20.

39   In addition to Nedarim, אנת commonly appears in BT in the pre-Amoraic passages of an *aggadic* nature. Wajsberg 1997: 121.

2nd p. fem. sg.

The standard form in the bow texts is אנתי. By contrast with this form, in the corresponding enclitic personal pronoun, the terminal *yod* is not preserved in the orthography (see below).

It is possible that אנתי occurs sporadically for the anticipated pl. form: ולא תיכבשון יתיה אנתי ברקת(י) דיכרא וניקבתא 'and you should not suppress (pl.) him, you, male and female cataract' (N&Sh 25:8-9). One could argue that אנתי refers only to the first word – ברקת(י) – which is of fem. gender and which is perhaps used in a generic sense. However, N&Sh 25 observes no clear distinction between *waw* and *yod*. Thus, it is possible as well – though perhaps less likely – that we should read here אנתו. אנתו may also appear in two texts published by Obermann and Schwab respectively, but the readings are uncertain.[40] Hence, the question about the correct reading and interpretation of these forms remains open.

Other possible cases occur in AIT 8. In line 8 the text – as read by Montgomery – goes: אנתי ליליתא לילי דיכרא ולוליתא ניקיבתא ושלניתא וחטפיתא 'you (fem. sg.) Lilith (fem.), male lili, and female Lilith and ghost (fem.) and demon (fem.).' Here, also, it is possible to read אנתו, but I must stress that the reading of this word is far from certain due to the poor condition of the text.[41] It is possible as well – as in the first example – that the pronoun refers only to the first Lilith, which would again be used in a generic sense, after which all possible types of Lilith are listed.[42] In that case, אנתי would have been used as expected.

In line 15 of the same text Montgomery reads: אנתי ליליתא בישאתא קיבלי [ביש]י and translates: 'you evil Liliths, Counter-charms, ...' Epstein emends the reading as follows: אנתי ליליתא בישתא קבולי גיט.[43] If the reading of Epstein is correct, אנתי presents no peculiarity here.[44] Note that also in the 2nd p. masc. we encounter an example where there seems to be incongruence: אשבעת עליכון את בר איגרי קלילא 'I have adjured you (pl.), you (sg.) fleet son of roofs' (Go 5:10).

---

[40] In Ober. II:3, Obermann reads אנתו, but Isbell emends to אנתי and explains that the feminine gender agrees with the nearest word, which is feminine. See Isbell 1975: 138-139. Once again, the question cannot be resolved with the aid of palaeography, the distinction between *yod* and *waw* being uncertain. According to Rossell, אנתו appears in Schwab F, too. I cannot check the reading. Note, however, that the readings of Moise Schwab have come in for a great deal of criticism. See e.g. Isbell 1975: 10.

[41] My reading is based on a photograph of the text.

[42] On this question, see also Montgomery 1913: 156-157. A parallel is found in Go F, where the text – as read by Gordon – runs: אף אנתי ליליתא בישתא לילי (ב)דיכרא לילי(תא) נקבתא וחנקתא וברחא שלניתא עת?תא והללתא שיקלי גיט(יכי). Here again אנתי may be understood as referring only to ליליתא בישתא, or to read אנתו, which is, however, less likely.

[43] See Epstein 1921: 37. Note that Epstein reads בישתא (probably sg.) instead of בישאתא (pl.).

[44] This section of the text is so erased that on the basis of a photograph I am unable to decide which reading is correct.

Perhaps, the most likely explanation for such instances is that the magical incantations typically use side by side words addressed to a demon (which is used in a generic sense) and those addressed to all demons. In the former case, sg. grammatical forms are common, while in the latter, pl. forms are employed.

אנתי is the regular form for the 2nd p. fem. sg. in Official Aramaic.[45] It is unattested in TO and TJ as well as in Qumran Aramaic. In Late Aramaic, אנתי has been identified only in the Geniza fragments of the Palestinian Talmud and as the *ketiv* in Syriac.[46]

3rd p. masc. and fem. sg.

In the bowl texts, the masc. form possibly attests only to the spelling הוא, while in the fem. היא and הי are found.[47] All of them occur quite infrequently. The spellings הוא and היא are common in JA, where they are attested, for instance, in Biblical Aramaic,[48] TO,[49] TJ,[50] and GA,[51] including Targum Neophyti and PsJ.[52] The characteristic forms of standard BTA איהו (masc.) and איהי (fem.) are so far unattested in the bowl texts.

The spelling הי for the fem. is regular in Official Aramaic.[53] In Middle Aramaic, it has been identified in Nabatean and Palmyrene as opposed to TO and TJ.[54] Within the Late Aramaic dialects, the spelling without the final *'aleph* is the exclusive rule in Syriac and in Palestinian Christian Aramaic.[55] הי is the regular form in Geonic Aramaic, too.[56] In Mandaic, the consistent spelling is הע, where *'ayin* is a graphical variant of *yod*.[57] הי also occurs in Samaritan Aramaic alongside היא.[58]

---

[45] Segert 1975: 165, 167; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 43-45. As already noted, אנת also occurs.

[46] Sokoloff 1990: 79; Nöldeke 1898: 44. In Syriac, the *qere* is ['at] as in the masc.

[47] The masc. form is possibly written הו in Go D:10 where the text runs: דהו ביל איניש 'the one who is lord of mankind' (?). The reading is uncertain.

[48] Rosenthal 1974: 19.

[49] Dalman 1905: 107.

[50] Tal 1975: 1.

[51] Dalman 1905: 106; Fassberg 1990: 111-112.

[52] Levy 1974: 57; Cook 1986: 130.

[53] Segert 1975: 165; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 43, 45; Hug 1993: 55. In Biblical Aramaic, the spelling is היא (Segert 1975: 165).

[54] For Nabatean, see Levinson 1974: 23, and for Palmyrene, Cantineau 1935: 61.

[55] Nöldeke 1898: 44; Schulthess 1924: 32.

[56] Epstein 1960: 20; Müller-Kessler 1991: 67.

[57] See Nöldeke 1875: 5, 86.

[58] Macuch 1982: 131.

1st p. pl. c.

The form employed in the bowl texts is אנחנא, which is common in the older strata of Aramaic. A British Museum bowl published by Gordon, may attest to the spelling אנחן, but I cannot check the reading.[59]

The spelling אנחן is attested in Official Aramaic.[60] אנחנא is also known in Official Aramaic, including Biblical Aramaic, in which both the spelling with final *'aleph* and the one with final *he* are attested.[61]

אנחנא is the regular form in TO,[62] TJ,[63] and in Qumran Aramaic.[64] In Late Aramaic, אנחנא is almost totally replaced by other forms. In BTA, it is attested in שטרות and in Geonic Aramaic.[65] Additionally, אנחנא occurs in Targum Neophyti alongside the more common אנן and as the main form in PsJ.[66] According to Tal, אנחנא is one of the traits which closely connect the language of TJ with Official Aramaic (הארמית הקדמונית in his terms), as opposed to the Late Aramaic dialects.[67] The bowl texts accord with the same tradition.

2nd p. masc. and fem. pl.

The regular masc. form in the bowl texts is אתון, while the occurrence of the separate fem. form is not absolutely certain since the fem. forms אתין can be read as אתון as well.[68] The same goes for אנתין (Boris 1:3): it may alternatively be read as אנתון. When we take into account the fact that the gender distinction is maintained in the 2nd p. pl. in TO and TJ, which present a set of independent personal pronouns generally similar to that of the bowl texts, and the fact that the bowl texts also attest to the gender distinction in the 2nd p. sg., it is more likely that the separate fem. pl. form also exists in the bowl texts. Moreover, the occurrence of a separate fem. form would be in keeping with the generally conservative character of the Aramaic represented in the bowl texts.

The masc. form אתו probably appears in a British Museum bowl published by Gordon, e.g. מאן חרשי בישי אתו ומאן נידרי בישי אתו,[69] but since no photograph (or even facsimile) of the text is at my disposal, the reading cannot be

---

59   See Gordon 1941: 342.

60   Segert 1975: 166; Hug 1993: 55; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 43, 45.

61   Segert 1975: 166.

62   Dalman 1905: 107.

63   Tal 1975: 1.

64   Cook 1986: 131; Beyer 1984: 516.

65   Tal 1975: 4; Epstein 1960: 20-21.

66   Golomb 1985: 47; Cook 1986: 131; Fassberg 1990: 112.

67   Tal 1975: 4, viii.

68   This is of course due to the fact that it is hard to distinguish *waw* and *yod* in the script of the bowl texts.

69   Translated by Gordon: 'All ye bad sorceries and bad vows.'

checked.[70] The text under discussion shows some other standard BTA features as well, a fact which is in favour of the occurrence of אַתּוֹ.

The first attestation of אַתּוּן and אַתּין for the 2nd p. masc. and fem. pl. respectively is in Middle Aramaic, where they occur in TO and TJ.[71] Official Aramaic including Biblical Aramaic exhibit only forms with the original *nun* preserved – or more likely appearing as the result of degemination – after the initial *'aleph*, i.e. אַנתּם and אַנתּון;[72] the fem. form is unattested.[73]

In East Aramaic, both אַתּוּן and אַתּין are attested in the pronunciation (*qere*) of Syriac.[74] BTA and Mandaic yield only the masc. form, i.e. אַתּוּ or אַתּוּן in standard BTA, אַנתּון in Geonic Aramaic, and אַנאתּון in Mandaic.[75] The fem. form is evidently unattested in them.[76]

In West Aramaic, both אַתּוּן (masc.) and אַתּין (fem.) are employed in Samaritan Aramaic and in Palestinian Christian Aramaic.[77] The masc. form אַתּוּן is well attested in GA, including Targum Neophyti and PsJ,[78] whereas the fem. form אַתּין is rare and apparently identified only in the Geniza fragments of the Palestinian Targum and in Targum Neophyti.[79] This is probably due to the fact that fem. forms in general are rare in many Aramaic texts, and not due to the possible neutralization of the gender distinction.

אַנתּין probably appears for the 2nd p. fem. pl. in Boris 1:3, though, importantly, it may be read as אַנתּוּן instead. The latter possibility is supported by the fact

---

[70] See Gordon 1941: 342. One wonders whether it would be possible to read *defective* אַתּ, since the terminal *nun* and *waw* sometimes look quite similar. The spelling אַתּ is probably attested in a bowl from the Iraq Museum, too, published by Gordon (bowl no. 9731, line 8). See Gordon 1941: 349.

[71] Dalman 1905: 107; Tal 1975: 1; Fassberg 1990: 112.

[72] Segert 1975: 166; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 43; Folmer 1995: 83. Ancient Aramaic shows no certain instances of the 2nd p. pl. forms. See Segert 1975: 166; Degen 1969: 55; Dion 1974: 150. As regards the assimilation and 'degemination' of *n*, see the discussion in Muraoka & Porten 1998: 10-16 and the references given there. See also Folmer 1995: 74-94; Moscati 1964: 105; and Brockelmann 1908: 301-302. The etymology of these forms is treated in the latter two.

[73] See Segert 1975: 166; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 43.

[74] Nöldeke 1898: 44. The *ketiv* in Syriac contains *nun* after the initial *'aleph*.

[75] Epstein 1960: 20-21; Nöldeke 1875: 86.

[76] Concerning Mandaic Nöldeke (1875: 87) states: 'Eine Femininform אַנאתּין kommt nich vor; doch würde es nicht überraschen, wenn sie sich noch gelegentlich fände.' Note that Modern Mandaic attests to a separate fem. form *atten* (see Macuch 1965: 154). Besides, the enclitic personal pronoun of the 2nd p. fem. pl. (i.e. *-tyn*) occurs at least once in *Classical* Mandaic (see Nöldeke 1875: 87).

[77] Macuch 1982: 131; Schulthess 1924: 32; Müller-Kessler 1991: 67.

[78] Dalman 1905: 106; Golomb 1985: 47; Cook 1986: 130.

[79] The spelling is אַתּ both in the Geniza fragments and in Neophyti. Fassberg 1990: 111-112. Cf. also Sokoloff 1990: 81.

that אנתין is otherwise attested in Aramaic only as the *ketiv* in Syriac.[80] The context, however, strongly supports a fem. form: (fem.) אנתין רוחי בישאתא 'you evil spirits.' Besides, אנתין is the expected fem. form, e.g. in Biblical Aramaic.[81] If the correct reading is אנתון, it is the masc. form peculiar to Geonic Aramaic (see above).

3rd p. masc. and fem. pl.

The masc. form attested in the bowl texts is אינון, while the fem. form אינין is so far rarely if at all attested. The fem. form has been attested as a copula in (AB E:7), where one may read אילין אינין דחנקן 'these are those that strangle' (?). However, one could read אינון as well. Moreover, אינין appears as a demonstrative pronoun, equal to English 'those' (see below IV.4).[82]

Here, again, the forms peculiar to standard BTA – i.e. אינהו (masc.), אינהי (fem.) – are not found in the bowl texts.[83]

The first attestation of אינון is in Biblical Aramaic, where it occurs side by side with המון and המו.[84] In TO and TJ, אינון is the exclusive rule,[85] and it is the regular form in Qumran Aramaic as well.[86]

In the Late Aramaic period, אינון is typical of the western dialects. Rybak maintains that in West Aramaic, it 'slowly replaced המו.'[87] It is attested in GA,[88] including Targum Neophyti, the Palestinian Targum fragments from the Cairo Geniza, and PsJ,[89] as well as in Samaritan Aramaic.[90]

In East Aramaic, אינון occurs as the sole form in Geonic Aramaic and as the regular form in Nedarim.[91]

---

80 See e.g. Muraoka 1997b: 18.

81 See Rosenthal 1974: 19.

82 One should note that it is not always evident whether אינין (or אינון) is used as a demonstrative pronoun or as a personal pronoun.

83 Note, however, that Gordon reads אינהו in a British Museum bowl (no. 91776, line 5), but does not translate it, for אינהו lacks any evident sense in the context (?). See Gordon 1941: 342. For the forms of BTA, see Epstein 1960: 20-21; Kutscher 1971a: c. 280.

84 Rosenthal 1974: 19. Note that the spelling in Biblical Aramaic is *without* the *yod*, i.e. אנון.

85 The spelling is אנון, without the *yod*. See Dalman 1905: 107; Tal 1975: 3; Fassberg 1983: 163; Fassberg 1990: 112.

86 Tal (1975: 3) states: 'ברגיל משמש בקומרן אינון;' see also Cook 1986: 131.

87 Rybak 1980: 108.

88 Dalman 1905: 106; Fassberg 1983: 160; 1990: 112.

89 Golomb 1985: 47; Cook 1986: 130; Fassberg 1990: 111-112. The spelling is either אינון or אנון.

90 Macuch 1982: 131.

91 Rybak 1980: 108; Epstein 1960: 21. According to Rybak, אינון is unattested in 'the printed text of Nedarim.' Ibid. Moreover, it appears as an enclitic personal pronoun in Syriac. See e.g. Muraoka 1997b: 18. In Syriac, there is no *yod* after the initial *'alaph*.

As אינון its feminine sister form אינין appears only in JA,[92] where it is attested in Biblical Aramaic,[93] TO,[94] TJ,[95] GA including Targum Neophyti, the Palestinian Targum fragments from the Geniza, and PsJ,[96] and in Geonic Aramaic.[97]

CONCLUSIONS

The inventory of independent personal pronouns used in the bowl texts is in general conservative. The salient conservative isoglosses include (a) the terminal -/n/ in the 2nd p. pl. is mostly retained as opposed to standard BTA; (b) the preservation of gender distinction in the 2nd p. sg. and pl.; (c) the use of many Official and Middle Aramaic forms, e.g. אנחנא, as opposed to the more developed variants of standard BTA; (d) as opposed to standard BTA, no special forms are used as the copula.

The bowl texts employ many forms in common with other Aramaic dialects, especially with TO and TJ and to a somewhat lesser degree with Geonic Aramaic and the Nedarim type of Aramaic. All other forms except the 2nd p. fem. sg. אנתי, the 2nd p. fem. pl. אנתין, and 3rd p. fem. sg. when spelled הי tally with TO and TJ. Among the relevant dialects אנתי is known only in Official Aramaic and Syriac (only as *ketiv*).[98] אנתין occurs in Syriac (*ketiv*).

The most important deviation from Nedarim type of Aramaic and from Geonic Aramaic occurs in the 2nd p. forms. Remarkably, the original *nun* is preserved in both Nedarim and Geonic Aramaic, while in the bowl texts the *nun* is preserved in the orthography in the 2nd p. fem (אנתי), but assimilated in the 2nd p. masc. sg. (את) and in the 2nd p. masc. and fem. pl. (אתון and אתין). Moreover, the 2nd p. fem. pl. אנתין, with *nun*, also occurs.

In this respect, the bowl texts resemble Qumran Aramaic where, too, the forms with *nun* preserved and the forms with the assimilation of the original *nun* occur side by side, e.g. אתי *versus* אנת.[99] For instance, in TJ only the forms with assimilation occur.[100] The occurrence of different types of forms side by side (e.g. אנתי alongside את) may indicate that our texts yield different Aramaic dialects or that they represent a mixed type of language, the latter being more probable (see V. *Conclusions*).

---

92   Note, however, that it appears as an *enclitic* personal pronoun in Syriac. See e.g. Muraoka 1997b: 18. There is no *yod* after the initial *'aleph*.

93   Spelt אנין. See Rosenthal 1974: 19.

94   Dalman 1905: 107. The spelling is אנין, with no *yod* after the initial *'aleph*.

95   Tal 1975: 1. The spelling is אנין.

96   Dalman 1905: 106; Golomb 1985: 48; Fassberg 1990: 111; Cook 1986: 131.

97   Epstein 1960: 20.

98   Some dialects, such as Qumran Aramaic (Tal 1975: 2), have אתי, with the final *yod* preserved as in our texts, but with assimilation of the *nun*, as opposed to the bowl texts.

99   Cf. Tal 1975: 2.

100   Ibid.

IV.2. ENCLITIC PERSONAL PRONOUNS

Enclitic personal pronouns (subjective pronominal suffixes) are frequently attached to active and passive participles in the bowl texts. Examples are found in a number of persons and in the basic stem as well as in the derived stems.

SOME EXAMPLES:

1st p. sg.: ידענא 'I know' (N&Sh 5:4); ואנה רחימנא 'and I love' (N&Sh 6:3); אנא מישתבענא 'I swear' (N&Sh 12a:7); מומינא ומשבענא וגזרנא ומשמיתנא ומבטילנא 'I adjure, invoke, decree, ban, and annul' (N&Sh 19:5-6); ולבישנא לבושא דארמסא 'and I am dressed in the garment of 'A.' (AIT 2:2); מחיתנא עליכון 'I bring down upon you' (AIT 2:6); אזילנא 'I go' (Go 11:1).

2nd p. fem. sg.: אסירת וחתימת אנתי מבכלתא בישתא 'bound and sealed are you, the evil Tormentor' (N&Sh 12b:1); אסירת ואחידת (AIT 26:3); אלמא פומך פתחת 'why do you open your mouth?' (N&Sh 21:3).

2nd p. masc. pl.: כיפיתון אסיריתון כבישתון 'you are roped, tied, and suppressed'(N&Sh 5:7); ולא חמתון 'and you do not see' (N&Sh 6:4); קריתון 'you call' (N&Sh 13:18), גדליתון 'you dress' (N&Sh 13:18); מיתקריתון 'you are called' (N&Sh 13:11); מידכריתון 'you recall' (N&Sh 13:17, 18); דאמריתו 'that which you say' (N&Sh 13:15, 19).

COMMENTS

According to Dalman's grammar, the coalescence of active and passive participles with enclitic personal pronouns of the 1st and 2nd p. has been identified in TO.[101] Tal, on the other hand, argues that the coalescence of the active and passive participles with enclitic personal pronouns is a feature which is attested, for instance, in the later additions to TJ.[102] By contrast, the trait is unattested in TJ proper and in other Targums.[103] It remains problematic how we should account for the instances in TO, listed by Dalman.[104] In any case, this phenomenon is typical of East Aramaic, while in West Aramaic it is rarely attested.[105] In the Eastern dialects, the coalescence is attested commonly in Syriac,[106] Mandaic,[107] and BTA.[108] Within the

---

[101] Dalman 1905: 107, 289-291, 352.

[102] Tal 1975: 191.

[103] Ibid.

[104] Since the trait is frequent in East Aramaic, one might argue that the instances in TO are due to the late Babylonian influence. Note also the possibility that they may indeed be present in the additions which do not represent genuine TO. According to Tal, this is the case in TJ. For the additions inserted in TO, see Sperber 1959: xvii-xviii.

[105] Kutscher 1971a: c. 275.

[106] Nöldeke 1898: 44-45.

[107] Nöldeke 1875: 87; Macuch 1965: 154-155.

West Aramaic dialects, examples can be found in GA and Palestinian Christian Aramaic.[109] In sum, we may conclude that the frequency of the fusion is a clearly East Aramaic, notably BJA, feature in our texts.

1st p. sg.

In these texts, the coalescence is especially common with 1st p. sg. pronouns. In the basic stem, these forms are not always easily distinguishable from the 1st p. pl. perfect, the consonantal form of both often being quite identical. Compare אנחנא כתבנא 'we have written' (AIT 1:14-15) with בין דידענא שמה בין דלא ידענא שמה 'whether I know his name or do not know his name' (N&Sh 5:4). In the first example, כתבנא is a 1st p. pl. perfect form. ידענא could also be understood as a 1st p. pl. perfect, but in its context it is clear that the subject is in the 1 st p. sg. The use of 1st p. sg. enclitic pronouns with participles is frequent, which can mostly be determined by the context or sometimes by the preceding independent personal pronoun, e.g. ואנה רחימנא יתכון 'and I love you' (N&Sh 6:3). In the derived stems, there is no ambiguity in these forms.

We have practically no reliable possibility of being absolutely certain whether the pattern of the active participle with enclitic pronouns of the 1st p. is of the type *qāṭel-na* as in TO or *qəṭel-na*, typical of the Yemenite reading tradition of BTA.[110] However, since spellings of the type קיטילנא are unattested, we may assume that the former is more plausible.

2nd p. sg. fem.

Even though the 2nd p. fem. sg. independent personal pronoun is commonly אנתי, with the final *yod* preserved in the orthography, this letter disappears in the corresponding enclitic form, e.g. תוב אסירת ואחידת אנתי רוחא בישתא 'again, you (fem. sg.) evil spirit are bound and held' (AIT 26:3-4). Moreover, the *nun* after the initial *'aleph* which is preserved in the independent pronoun, at least in the orthography, is assimilated in the enclitic form. This trait is shared by Mandaic, where in the 2nd p. sg. enclitic form, the *nun* is not preserved, e.g. *rabit* 'thou art great,' as opposed to the independent pronoun *anat* 'you.'[111]

It may be assumed that in these enclitic forms the gender distinction is neutralized, both forms being marked with the ending ת-. The neutralization also occurs in BTA.[112]

---

[108] Epstein 1960: 21-22.

[109] Dalman 1905: 107; Fassberg 1983: 163-164; 1990: 113; Schulthess 1924: 18, 32; Müller-Kessler 1991: 68. Note that, for instance, in the Palestinian Targum fragments from the Cairo Geniza, there are only 'four certain examples' (Fassberg 1990: 113), and in Palestinian Christian Aramaic, too, the trait is infrequent (see Müller-Kessler 1991: 68).

[110] See Morag 1988: 43, 134.

[111] See Macuch 1965: 154-155.

[112] See Epstein 1960: 22.

2nd p. masc. pl.

The final *nun* is regularly preserved in the orthography, e.g. אתון כיפיתון אסיריתון
כבישתון כולכו 'you all are roped, tied, and suppressed' (N&Sh 5:7); כמה דעינין
לכון ולא חמתון אודנין לכון ולא שמעיתון 'as you have eyes, but you do not see,
as you have ears, but you do not hear' (N&Sh 6:4). Only examples of a form in
which the final *nun* has been elided from the script are found in N&Sh 13, e.g.
דאמריתו 'that which you say' (N&Sh 13:15, 19) and in AIT 8:11, where the text
runs מיטול דחתימיתו בעיזקתיה דאל שדי 'because you are sealed with the sig-
net of El Shaddai.' Montgomery reads חתימיתי, which is also possible, but would
be a fem. form.[113] The same form from AIT 8 is given as the sole example of a
fem. pl. participle attached to a pl. pronominal suffix in the grammar of BTA by
Epstein.[114]

חתימיתו is in accordance with standard BTA, where the final *nun* typically
disappears.[115] In Nedarim, the forms with the final *nun* are attested alongside the
standard BTA forms.[116] The presence of final *nun* is regular in Geonic Aramaic,
too.[117] Thus, the majority form of the bowl texts – with the *nun* preserved in the
orthography – accords with Nedarim and Geonic Aramaic. A similar form is stan-
dard in TO as well.[118]

The pattern of the active participle used with enclitic pronouns of the 2nd p.
masc. pl. may be of the type *qāṭəlittūn* as in TO or *qaṭlittū(n)*, in accordance with
BTA, as it is reflected in the Yemenite reading tradition.[119]

IV.3. SUFFIXED PRONOUNS

The pronominal suffixes added to nouns (possessive suffixes), prepositions, num-
bers, and particles are as follows. Uncertain and Hebrew forms are placed in paren-
theses and the more common forms are listed first when more than one variant oc-
curs. The forms added to verbs (object suffixes) are listed and discussed in connec-
tion with verbs (see below IV.10.7. *Verbs with Object Suffixes*).

1st p. sg.	-א; -י
2nd p. masc. sg.	-יך; -ך
2nd p. fem. sg.	-יך; -ך; -כי; -יכי

---

[113] AIT 8 is indistinct, with *waw* and *yod* practically indistinguishable.

[114] See Epstein 1960: 41.

[115] Rybak 1980: 88.

[116] Ibid.

[117] Ibid.

[118] See Dalman 1905: 290-291.

[119] See Morag 1988: 44.

3rd p. masc. sg.	‏(-יהוא/-והיא); (-הו); (-י); (-הי); -וי; -והי; -ה; -יה‏
3rd p. fem. sg.	‏-יה; -ה‏
1st p. pl.	‏(-); (-י'); (-נה); -נא‏
2nd p. masc. pl.	‏-כו/-יכו; -ייכון/-יכון/-כון‏
2nd p. fem. pl.	‏(-כי); -כין‏
3rd p. masc. pl.	‏-הן; -ון; -הו/-יהו; -יהון /-הון‏
3rd p. fem. pl.	‏-הין‏

SOME EXAMPLES:

1st p. sg.: ‏עלי‏ 'on me' (N&Sh 21:4); ‏בתרי‏ 'after me' (N&Sh 21:5); ‏לי‏ (N&Sh 23:5); ‏וראשי‏ 'and my head' (N&Sh 21:13); ‏בחילי דנפשי‏ 'in my own might' (AIT 2:1); ‏בלבאי‏ 'by my heart' (Ober. II:5).

2nd p. masc. sg.: ‏פומא דפתח[נא] עלך‏ 'the mouth that I open at you' (N&Sh 21:6); ‏בישמך מרי אסואתא‏ 'in your name, Lord of salvations' (AIT 3:1; AIT 19:1); ‏גרמך‏ 'your body' (AIT 7:17); ‏בשמיך מריא איבול‏ 'in your name the lord 'I.'' (AIT 19:5);[120] ‏לישמיך אני עושה‏ (Go 2:1).[121]

2nd p. fem. sg.: ‏פומך‏ 'your mouth' (N&Sh 21:3); ‏עינך‏ 'your eye' (N&Sh 21:4); ‏בן[רג]ליך‏ 'with your foot' (N&Sh 21:5); ‏ליכי‏ (N&Sh 6:3; AIT 7:9, 10); ‏לך‏ (N&Sh 21:7); ‏דאיתליכי‏ 'which is yours' (AIT 1:14); ‏עליכי‏ 'against you' (AIT 1:14); ‏שקולי גיטיכי וקבלי מומתיכי‏ 'take your *get* and receive your ban' (SB 10-11);[122] ‏דתיתמחין בטורפס לילביכי‏ 'which is smitten in the lobe of your heart' (AIT 11:7);[123] ‏ותרכית יתיכי אנתי ליליתא‏ 'and I have dismissed you, you Lilith' (AIT 17:3); ‏ובשמיך מרתין איבולית‏ 'and in your name, our lady 'I.''(AIT 19:5).

3rd p. masc. sg.: ‏אינתתיה‏ 'his wife' (N&Sh 19:1); ‏ימיניה‏ 'his right side' (N&Sh 25:9); ‏ליה‏ (N&Sh 12a:5); ‏בתריה‏ 'after him' (N&Sh 12a:6); ‏ילדותיה‏ 'his childhood' (N&Sh 25:2); ‏שמיה‏ 'his name' (AIT 8:4); ‏שקיה‏ 'his legs' (N&Sh 9:3; 13:6); ‏עיניה‏ 'his eyes' (N&Sh 13:5); ‏סנדליה‏ 'his sandals' (N&Sh 13:6); ‏ובבניה‏ 'and against his sons' (AIT 2:4); ‏שמאלה‏ 'his left side' (N&Sh 25:9); ‏פומה‏ 'his mouth' (N&Sh 6:1);[124] ‏לישנה‏ 'his tongue' (N&Sh 9:2); ‏עלוהי‏ (N&Sh 7:6,8; 9:14, 12a:5); ‏מן קדומוהי‏ 'from him' (N&Sh 12a:2); ‏כל חזוהי‏ 'all who see him' (N&Sh 9:4); ‏על אנפוהי‏ 'on his face' (N&Sh 21:11); ‏בתרוהי‏ 'after him' (N&Sh

---

[120] In AIT 28:1, one reads ‏[בש]מיך מרי שמיא וארעה‏.

[121] Gordon reads ‏לישמוך‏.

[122] Even though the text of SB on the whole is quite faded, ‏שקולי גיטיכי וקבלי מומתיכי‏ seems legible in a photograph. The spelling ‏גיטכי‏ occurs in Go G:11-12 and in AIT 26:6, as emended by Epstein (1921: 54).

[123] Based on a photograph of the text, this is evidently the correct reading, the only problem being the last word, where Montgomery reads ‏ליבבכי‏ and Epstein ‏לילבכי‏. See Epstein 1921: 40-41. For the meaning of the idiom, see ibid.

[124] ‏פומיה‏ in N&Sh 9:2.

12b:9); דלא יתון עלהי 'so that they should not come upon him' (N&Sh 25:4);
עלי (N&Sh 12b:8);[125] על חינכוהי 'on his palate' (N&Sh 9:10).

3rd p. fem. sg.: לה 'to her' (N&Sh 12a:4; 12b:7); דוכתא דנעבר וניעול עלה 'this is a place for us to pass through and enter into (it)' (N&Sh 12a:4-5); מנה 'from her' (AIT 11:3); מן קדומיה 'before her' (N&Sh 3:4).

1st p. pl.: לנא (N&Sh 12a:4; AIT 8:7); אבהתנא 'our fathers' (N&Sh 19:8); ובשמיך והוא שליטנא וברינא 'and he is our ruler and our creator' (Ober. II:5); מרתין איבולית 'and in your name, our lady 'I.'(AIT 19:5).

2nd p. masc. pl.: לכון (N&Sh 6:3; 12a:4); עליכון (N&Sh 13:21; AIT 14:3); ואנה רחימנא יתכון 'and I love you' (N&Sh 6:3); עליכו (N&Sh 13:20; N&Sh 25:5, 7; AIT 5:3); בליביכו 'against your hearts' (N&Sh 13:14).

2nd p. fem. pl.: ואבכין 'and your father' (AIT 17:11); אימכין 'your mother' (AIT 17:10).

3rd p. masc. pl.: סביהון (N&Sh 5:4); כולהון (N&Sh 5:3); להון (N&Sh 12a:4); בדירתיהון 'in their dwelling' (AIT 8:5);[126] מלכיהון 'their angels' (AIT 11:5); ולבניהון ולבנתהון ולביתיהון ולקינינהון 'and for their sons, their daughters, their house, and their property' (AIT 12:2-3); בעירהון 'their cattle' (Go 7:7); סנייהו ומסיקייהו 'their enemies and oppressors' (N&Sh 21:8); שבעאתהן 'through the seven of them' (MB I:18).[127]

DISCUSSION

1st p. sg.

The regular ending attested in the bowl texts is י-. In contrast, the characteristic form of BTA, אי-, only appears in Ober. II:5, where one may read בלבאי 'by my heart.'[128] Note that the regular י- is also found in that text, e.g. ושולטני (line 5). The other form typical of BTA, ø-, is so far unattested in the bowl texts.[129] י- is the standard form throughout Aramaic.

2nd p. masc. sg.

The majority form in the bowl texts is ך-. In addition, we encounter the spelling יך- in the phrases לישמיך and בישמיך 'in your name,' which appear several times in the bowl texts, e.g. בשמיך מריא איבול מלכא רבא דאלהי ובשמיך מרתין איבולית מלכתא רבתא 'in your (masc.) name, lord 'I., the great king of the gods and in your name, our lady 'I, the great queen' (AIT 19:5-6). יך- is curious in these instances, since generally in Aramaic this ending is attached to pl. nouns.[130]

---

[125] ויצוחת עלי 'and she cried at him.'

[126] In the photograph, one could read הין- instead.

[127] The reading seems correct according to a facsimile.

[128] לבאי instead of לבי.

[129] For the forms of BTA, see Kutscher 1971a: c. 281; Epstein 1960: 121-123.

Perhaps for this reason, Gordon reads in Go 2:1 לישמוך with *waw* – instead of לישמיך – and correspondingly בישמוך in AIT 28:1,[131] where Montgomery – followed by Epstein – reads בישמיך. Gordon argues that *waw* appears in these instances as a *mater lectionis* indicating that *qameṣ* 'was pronounced *o* in Babylonia.'[132] Merely on a textual basis, the problem cannot be solved due to the fact that the distinction between *waw* and *yod* is seldom made in the orthography.[133] For other reasons, the reading with *yod* is more plausible (see below).

In the Tiberian tradition of Biblical Aramaic, the 2nd p. masc. sg. suffix is marked with *qameṣ* preceding the final ך- (e.g. אֱלָהָךְ 'your God').[134] When this suffix is added to masc. pl. nouns, there exists a *ketiv-qere* distinction: the *ketiv* is יך- while the *qere* accords with the form used with sg. nouns (i.e. ךָ-).[135] In BTA, the 2nd p. suffix with pl. nouns may be used for the corresponding suffix with sg. nouns as well, and, evidently, *vice versa*.[136] Hence, בניך (or בנך) could mean either 'your sons' or 'your son.'[137] Kutscher is of the opinion that both suffixes were pronounced -[āk̲],[138] corresponding to the *qere* in Biblical Aramaic. Furthermore, in Mandaic, too, the suffix is the same for both numbers (i.e. -אך), the pronunciation being identical with the *qere* in Biblical Aramaic.[139] If the pronunciation of both forms was alike, it is only natural that there occurs fluctuation in the orthography. This is the most likely explanation for the suffix -יך (attached to a sg.

---

130 Unfortunately, we have no instances of masc. pl. nouns with the 2nd p. masc. sg. suffix in our texts.

131 Gordon reads בישמוך in Go 8:1 as well. Note that even though the rest of the phrase ב/לישמיך אני עושה in Go 2:1 and elsewhere is in Hebrew, the beginning, i.e. ב/לישמיך, is apparently in Aramaic. See the discussion in Boyarin 1978: 157, n. 100, where Boyarin is of the opposite opinion. Does he indicate that ל/בישמוך – the correct reading in his opinion – reflects Mishnaic Hebrew ? Note that the Hebrew phrases and quotations in the bowl texts generally reflect Biblical Hebrew. Note also that ב/לישמיך does not always appear in a Hebrew context, as Boyarin admits. See ibid.

132 Gordon 1941: 118, 120. See also above III.6. *Waw as a Counterpart of* */ā/ (*qameṣ*).

133 In Go 2, it looks as if sometimes the distinction would have been made, the *yod* being represented by a shorter stroke, but sometimes – as far as I can observe in a photograph – anticipated *yod* is represented by a long stroke as well.

134 Rosenthal 1974: 26.

135 Ibid.

136 Kutscher 1971a: c. 281; 1962: 160. Also in Targum Neophyti יך- is occasionally attested for masc. nouns, e.g. *mymryk*. See Levy 1974: 62.

137 Boyarin has pointed out that in TO and TJ as well, the suffix of the 2nd p. masc. sg. when added to pl. nouns appears without *yod*, e.g. אחך 'your brothers.' Boyarin argues that this is due to the fact that the vocalization of TO goes back to Babylonia and, therefore, reflects eastern influence. See Boyarin 1976a: 175-176; 1978: 146.

138 The quality and quantity of the vowel /a/ is beyond our scope here, -/āk̲/ being the 'historical' form.

139 See Nöldeke 1875: 176-177; Macuch 1965: 158.

noun) in the bowl texts. Unfortunately, the paucity of examples containing suffixes of the 2nd p. masc. sg. weakens our conjecture presented above. Since the instances are connected with the idiom בישמיך 'in your name' + the name of a deity, one could also suggest a sort of *pluralis majestatis*.

2nd p. fem. sg.

In contrast with 2nd p. masc. sg., we have plenty of instances of the corresponding fem. form. The most common form in the bowl texts is -יכי, e.g. שלם ליכי מדינתא דעמיה סגי סני 'May peace be on you, a city with a very large population' (N&Sh 6:3); אשבעית עליכי חלבם ליליתא בת ברתה דזרני 'I adjure you H. Lilith, granddaughter of Z.' (AIT 11:5-6);[140] שקולי גיטיכי 'take your bill of divorce' (AIT 11:8; SB 10),[141] ופטרית יתיכי 'and I divorced you' (SB 9). -ך is also well established, e.g. פומך 'your mouth' (N&Sh 21:3). Furthermore, -יך is found, suggesting a pronunciation of the [ek̲] type, e.g. ובשמיך מרתין איבולית 'and in your name, our lady 'I' (AIT 19:5); לומתיך 'your curses' (Ober. II:5).

No clear distinction can be observed in the distribution of -יכי and -ך, cf. ליכי (N&Sh 6:3 and elsewhere) and לך (N&Sh 21:7).[142] No distinction is made with the suffix used with masc. pl. nouns and some prepositions and the suffix used with fem. nouns and masc. sg. nouns (cf. מומתיכי, עליכי, and יתיכי).

Save the peculiar *yod* which commonly appears before -כי,[143] the suffix -כי, as such, is one of the numerous conservative traits in these texts. It is the characteristic form in Official Aramaic after both vowels and consonants.[144] In Middle Aramaic, -כי is attested in TO and TJ apparently only with masc. pl. nouns,[145] as well

---

[140] In the photograph, -כי is not absolutely certain. The text in AIT 18 (line 5), which is a duplicate of AIT 11, confirms the reading in AIT 11. Besides, in a bowl from the Iraq Museum (11113) published by Gordon one encounters – if the reading is correct – ליליתא אשבעית עליכי חלבם as well. See Gordon 19941: 350-352. The text partly parallels AIT 11 and 18.

[141] In the photograph, one could also read the pl. forms שקול גיטכי. שקולו גיטיכי possibly appears in a bowl from the Iraq Museum (no. 11113) published by Gordon. See Gordon 1941: 351. I cannot check the reading.

[142] Fluctuation between -כי and -ך is attested as early as in Official Aramaic, e.g. לך alongside לכי. See Muroka & Porten 1998: 49.

[143] The same spelling, -יכי, also occurs with verbs in the bowl texts, e.g. אובלתיכי 'I have led you' in N&Sh 7:5 (see below IV.10.7. *Verbs with Object Suffixes*).

[144] In official Aramaic, the *yod* before -כי mostly appears with masc./dual nouns, e.g. בניכי 'your sons' (B2.7:7); אפיכי 'your face' (A2.2:2) as opposed to ברתכי 'your daughter' (B3.6:4). Note, however, the 'striking' זיליכי (B2.3:19), which may be compared with our ליכי. Note also בדיליכי in Qumran Aramaic (Muraoka & Porten 1998: 56). For the suffix of the 2nd p. fem sg. in Official Aramaic, see Muroka & Porten 1998: 49-50, 55-56; Segert 1975: 169, 171; Folmer 1995: 161-168. The form with the terminal vowel elided from the spelling appears as a minority form, e.g. עליך 'on you' alongside עליכי (see Muroka & Porten 1998: 49; Tal 1975: 79).

[145] See Dalman 1905: 109, 204; Tal 1975: 79, 82; Fassberg 1990: 117, n. 88.

as in the Aramaic of Qumran.[146] In Qumran, the forms with the terminal *yod*
omitted are already common.

In the Late Aramaic dialects – both Western and Eastern – the terminal *yod* is
generally omitted in the script.[147] The most important exception is Syriac, where
yod has been preserved in the *ketiv* in any position, though it was not pro-
nounced,[148] and the same goes for Palestinian Christian Aramaic.[149] Some dialects
attest to ‑כֿי as a rare minority form. For instance, in PsJ it sometimes occurs at-
tached to masc. pl. nouns,[150] and it is also found infrequently in BTA.[151]

It is evident that ‑כֿי is preserved in the bowl texts as an archaic vestige, while
the actual vernacular form is reflected by the *plene* spelling ‑ךָי.[152] Hence, the
situation here accords with Syriac, where, too, the script (*ketiv*) maintains an archaic
form, disappeared from the pronunciation (*qere*) (see also below).

3rd p. masc. sg.

The masc. form of the 3rd p. sg. abounds in these texts. It is mostly written *plene*,
‑יה, e.g. באיקובתיה 'against his threshold' (Go 5:4), but sometimes *defective*, ‑ה,
as well, e.g. דאית בה בעלמא 'which are (in it) in the world' (N&Sh 5:3).[153]
Even in the same text, one comes across both spellings (‑יה and ‑ה), e.g. לא מן
ימיניה ולא מן שמאלה 'neither from his right side nor from his left side' (N&Sh
25:9); אסותא דישמיא תהוי לה לביתיה דהורמיז בר ממא 'may there be sal-
vation from heaven for the house of H. son of M.' (AIT 14:2). However, most texts
maintain the gender distinction in the orthography: ‑יה for masc. *versus* ‑ה for fem.,
e.g. ומן ביתיהון כוליה ומן כולה דירתהון 'and from all of their house (masc.)
and from all of their dwelling (fem.)' (N&Sh 14:3); אבדה גברא דקטיל גברא
מילות איתתיה ואיתתא מילות בעלה 'the mighty Destroyer who kills a man
from *his* wife and a woman from *her* husband' (AIT 3:2-3); שמיה... שמה 'his
name... her name' (AIT 8:4).

‑והי commonly appears after masc. pl. nouns and the prepositions which fol-
low the pattern of masc. pl. nouns when supplied with possessive suffixes, e.g.
דמרוהי 'of his lords' (AIT 12:6); קמת וצוחת עלוהי 'she stood up and cried at
him' (N&Sh 12a:5; B1/2:5). In N&Sh 9:13, Naveh and Shaked read יתכבשו

---

[146]   Tal 1975: 79-80; Cook 1986: 133.

[147]   Tal 1975: 82-83.

[148]   Nöldeke 1898: 45; Muraoka 1997b: 19, 33.

[149]   Schulthess 1924: 33; Müller-Kessler 1991: 69-70.

[150]   Cook 1986: 133.

[151]   See the instances in Epstein 1960: 122.

[152]   It has been suggested that the final *-ī* in the suffixes of the 2nd p. fem. sg. had already been
        dropped in speech in the Official Aramaic period. For the different theories presented, see
        Folmer 1995: 165-168. See also Muraoka & Porten 1998: 27-28, 49.

[153]   בה 'in it' refers to עלמא which is of masc. gender.

(ה)דמאיהוא 'may his members be pressed down.' Given that the reading is correct, the ending -יהוא is obscure. Should we read -והיא instead?[154] If so, -והיא stands for the common -והי; the final *aleph* might have been created under the influence of the spelling of the 3rd p. independent personal pronouns הוא and היא.

The ending -ה/-יה is also frequently attached to masc. pl. nouns and to these prepositions,[155] e.g. ויבשון שקיה 'may his legs dry' (N&Sh 9:3); עלה 'on it' (N&Sh 11:9). In the bowl texts, -יה and -והי are found even in the same text, e.g. in N&Sh 9: יבשון שקיה (line 3), כל חזוהי 'all that see him' (4); עליה (4, 5); עלוהי (14).

-י as a suffix for the 3rd p. masc. sg. is attested in N&Sh 12b: ויצוחת עלי 'and she cried at him' (line 8).[156] While וצוחת עלוהי occurs in the parallel texts (N&Sh 12a:5; B1/2:5) and otherwise only the regular forms -ה/-יה and -והי occur for the 3rd p. masc. sg. suffix in N&Sh 12b,[157] it is quite possible that the form under discussion is a scribal error. On the other hand, -י appears infrequently in this function in BTA, too, and one could argue that *yod* may reflect a pronunciation corresponding to that of Mandaic, where the suffix is pronounced [-ī].[158] This possibility may gain additional force by the use of *yod* in West Aramaic: according to Levy, Targum Neophyti attests in constructs to *yod* as a suffix for 3rd p. masc. in place of -ה/-יה, e.g. *byyty d'abwk*.[159] Moreover, -י is attested, among other forms, in the Palestinian Targum fragments from the Cairo Geniza,[160] in PTA,[161] in Samaritan Aramaic (*qere*),[162] and in Palestinian Christian Aramaic.[163]

עלהי occurs in N&Sh 25 (line 4). In the parallel phrase (line 8), עלוהי is attested, suggesting that עלהי in line 4 is an error for עלוהי. Alternatively, עלהי may be understood as a phonetic spelling, perhaps indicating the same form as עלי (see immediately above). The latter possibility is supported by the fact that

---

[154] Even though this text attempts to distinguish *waw* from *yod*, the latter being marked by a shorter stroke, the distinction is far from consistent. One should also note that the text at this point is rather indistinct, at least in a photograph of the text.

[155] See Naveh & Shaked 1985: 32; Rossell 1953: 38; and Montgomery 1913: 30.

[156] According to Geller, חומרי 'his amulet' appears in AB 2, but while חומריה is evident in a photograph and facsimile, חומרי is probably a printing error. Another possible instance is in N&Sh 13:16, where לי may appear for ליה.

[157] אינתתיה (12); שמיה (11); בתרוהי (9); לה (9); יתיה (8, 9, 10); קטליה (8); קודמוהי (line 5).

[158] See Epstein 1960: 123; Macuch 1965: 158. The disappearance of *he* is apparently connected with the weakening in /h/. See also III.2. *Laryngeals and Pharyngeals*.

[159] Levy 1974: 63-64.

[160] Fassberg 1990: 114.

[161] Fassberg 1990: 117.

[162] Macuch 1982: 132.

[163] Schulthess 1924: 33; Müller-Kessler 1991: 69. The form is attested in later texts.

מן ימיני ומן צמלהי 'on his right and on his left' are probably to be read in Bor 4:3 alongside forms with the regular -והי.[164]

The Hebrew suffix -הו appears in N&Sh 3 in a Hebrew phrase: בעוז גדודהו, which is translated by Naveh and Shaked as 'by the power of his army.'[165]

According to Geller, -וי appears in AB B:2: לשגיה צרי עמוי 'to thwart the enemies of his people.' Unfortunately, the reading is far from certain. Montgomery finds the form -וי in AIT 4: אחוי בישי 'his wicked brothers' (AIT 4:3). The spelling אחוי accords with the Mandaic pronunciation of 'his brother' (or 'his brothers').[166] In GA, the ending *-oy* is well attested as a suffix of the 3rd p. masc. sg. added to pl. nouns.[167] While Epstein points out evident Mandaic flavour in AIT 4 in general,[168] one may argue that אחוי testifies to Mandaic influence, too.

-ה is the regular form throughout Aramaic; the *plene* spelling -יה is typical of the later strata, but already appears regularly in TO and TJ.[169] It is more common in East Aramaic,[170] yet it has also been identified in western texts.[171]

-והי appears attached to masc. pl. nouns already in Official Aramaic, including Biblical Aramaic.[172] It is regular in this function in TO,[173] TJ,[174] and Qumran Aramaic.[175] In the Late Aramaic period, -והי is common, perhaps as a historical spelling. It occurs in GA alongside the characteristic -וי.[176] At least in the Palestinian Targums, it may be due to the influence of TO.[177] Within the East Aramaic dialects, -והי is attested in Syriac, but only as the *ketiv*, pronounced [aw], and in BTA, alongside the standard -יה.[178]

---

164   צמל- is obscure, but evidently stands for שמאל-.

165   For this phrase, see Naveh & Shaked 1985: 151.

166   See Macuch 1965: 158. Montgomery (1913: 134) points out that the forms *-ūi* and *-ōi* are 'Mandaic, and also Palestinian.'

167   Fassberg 1983: 169; 1990: 114ff; Kutscher 1971a: c. 273; Dalman 1905: 109.

168   See Epstein 1921: 33.

169   Dalman 1905: 109; Tal 1975: 79.

170   In contrast with other East Aramaic dialects, the *plene* spelling *-yh* is unattested in Syriac. See e.g. Nöldeke 1898: 44.

171   Levy 1974: 63.

172   Segert 1975: 170.

173   Dalman 1905: 109.

174   Tal 1975: 79.

175   Cook 1986: 132.

176   Dalman 1905: 109. In addition to PTA, it appears in Targum Neophyti (Levy 1974: 64), while the Palestinian Targum fragments from the Cairo Geniza attest only to -וי (Fassberg 1990: 114). In Targum Neophyti, the suffix is limited to a number of nouns (see Golomb 1985: 52).

177   See Fassberg 1983: 171.

178   Nöldeke 1898: 45, 85; Epstein 1960: 122-123.

The use of ־יה attached (also) to masc. pl. nouns and to the prepositions which follow the pattern of masc. pl. nouns (in this respect) is a normal feature in BJA.[179] Mandaic, too, employs the same form, -yh/-h, with both numbers.[180]

The trait is attested also in Syriac bowl texts, as opposed to the proper Syriac use of ־והי in this function. In the Syriac incantations, 'his sons' is consistently written בנה,[181] and, in addition, once one comes across the form עליה 'upon him' (Hamilton 10:6) as opposed to קדמוהי 'before him' (same text, line 5), with the proper Syriac suffix.[182] It is possible that at least some of the Syriac texts testifying to the trait are based on BJA originals, which would explain the phenomenon in the Syriac texts.[183]

3rd p. fem. sg.

The 3rd p. fem. sg. suffixes present a complex picture. On the one hand, the fem. form in the bowl texts is commonly written *defective* ־ה, when attached to both sg. and pl. nouns, e.g. ולא תקטלין ית בנה ובנתה 'and do not kill her sons and daughters' (AIT 11:8); מנה 'from her' (AIT 11:3); מן בנה 'from her children/ sons' (AIT 29:6).[184] This implies that both forms were pronounced alike. On the other hand, the suffix ־יה may also be used with fem. *singular* nouns (see below).

־ה for the 3rd p. fem. sg. is standard in Aramaic when the suffix is added to sg. nouns and to fem. pl. nouns,[185] whereas the spelling is commonly ־יה when added to masc. pl. nouns.

As noted above, in the bowl texts, the suffix ־יה, which may be argued as being identical with the regular 3rd p. masc. sg., is rather often used for a fem. noun in the sg. The phenomenon is discussed below in the light of the following in- stances: וכל מידעם דביש ומעיק לה למאדאראפרי בת מאנושי חרשות ועבדין דמיתעבדין יתכבשון ויטמרון בארעה מן קדומיה 'May everything which is evil, and whatever oppresses (*her*) M.-'A. daughter of M., sorceries, and

---

179 Kutscher 1971a: c. 281; Montgomery – evidently due to poorer knowledge of BJA in his time – assumed the trait in the bowl texts to be a Mandaism. See Montgomery 1913: 125, 172.

180 Nöldeke 1875: 177-178; Macuch 1965: 158.

181 Instances are found e.g. in Hamilton 1:1; 2:2. See Hamilton 1971: 65, 177. The correct identification of the forms as pl. is certain due to the use of *seyame*.

182 Hamilton 1971: 65.

183 See I.2.4.1. *'Koiné' Features*.

184 Even though the reading of AIT 29 is largely uncertain, it is apparent that מנה מן בנה מן ביתה מן דירתה כלה 'from her, from her children, her house, and from all of her dwelling' in line 6 refers to מתאניש בת ראשן.

185 In TO and TJ, 3rd p. fem. sg. is spelled ־הא when following a vowel and ־ה when following a consonant. See Dalman 1905: 203ff.; Tal 1975: 79; Folmer 1995: 240-241. The spelling ־הא is also found in some other Aramaic dialects. See the discussion in Folmer 1995: 237ff. and in Muraoka & Porten 1998: 50-52 and the literature given there. Importantly, ־הא is so far unattested in our texts.

magical acts which are performed, be pressed and hidden in the earth before *her*'
(N&Sh 3:3-4). Only קדומיה מן – which obviously refers to Mādar-Afri, *daughter*
(בת) of Manošay, the client of the text – requires a note in this sequence.[186] If
קדומיה were the only example of ־יה in N&Sh 3, there would be nothing excep-
tional, since the preposition קדום typically requires a suffix attached normally to
plural nouns.[187] Note, however, עלה 'above her' (N&Sh 23:9), with the regular
fem. suffix.[188] In line 2, the text runs as follows: ידדמכון בעפרא חבילי נידרא
דכוליה דוכא 'may there lie in the dust the injuries of vows of every place.' The
suffix ־יה here refers to דוכא 'place,' which is generally a fem. word in Aramaic.
Hence, there seems to be a tendency in this text to employ the suffix ־יה where ־ה is
expected. A parallel is found in N&Sh 6:3 where the text runs: שלם ליכי מדינתא
דעמיה סגי סגי 'Peace on you, city (fem.) whose population is very numerous.'
The suffix ־יה refers here to מדינתא 'city' which should be of feminine gender.

Another example is attested in Go 6, where ־יה appears several times referring
to a fem. noun, cf. דלא ניחטון בה באמטור בת שלתא ובזרעיה ובביתיה
ובקינינה 'so that they may not sin against 'A. *daughter* of Sh. and against her off-
spring (seed) and against her house and against her property' (Go 6:2-3). In line 1
the text runs: דלא לישמעון עליה על אמטור בת שלתא ומן זרעיה ומן ביתיה
קינינה [ ] 'so that they cannot hear (anything) against 'A. daughter of Sh. and
against her seed and against her house and against her property;' and in line 7:
מן אמטור בת שלתא ועל זרעיה ועל ביתיה וקינינה. On some points my read-
ing presented above differs from that of Gordon. Importantly, Gordon reads the
suffixes which refer to 'A. *daughter* of Sh. with *waw*, e.g. ביתוה, זרעוה, עלוה.[189]
According to him, *waw* appears here as a *mater lectionis* for *qameṣ*.[190] Both read-

---

[186] In line 3 the suffix used of her is ־ה (לה), which may be understood either as the regular
       fem. suffix [-ah] or, in theory, as a masc. form [-eh]. The 3rd p. masc. suffix is written in
       these texts either as ־ה or as ־יה.

[187] Cf. קדמוהי that commonly appears in these texts. For instance in Biblical Aramaic, the 3rd
       p. fem. sg. suffix added to pl. nouns is ־ה (*ketiv*). See Segert 1975: 170. A parallel case in
       connection with the preposition על (evidently in the combination מעל) is attested in N&Sh
       22, where the text runs: מן ימינה חרביאל ומשמאלה (מ)יכאל ומלפנה סוסיאל [ומע]ליה
       שכינת אל ומאחורה 'On her right side is H., on her left side M., in front of her is S, and
       above her the *Shekhina* of God, and behind her... (N&Sh 22:2-3). Here the suffix ־יה is
       attached only to the preposition על (or מעל), which commonly requires a suffix used with
       masc. pl. nouns. Cf. e.g. עלוהי in N&Sh 25:7. Note, however, עלה 'above her' in N&Sh
       23:9. Hence, there remains a possibility that both spellings, עליה and עלה, were
       pronounced alike (see below).

[188] As noted immediately above, על also requires a suffix attached normally to *plural* nouns.

[189] In addition, Gordon reads פקינינה in lines 1 and 7. He argues that *pe* here is 'the con-
       junction פ, common in Arabic and known in Ugaritic and the Zinjirli, Elephantine,
       Nabatean and Palmyrene dialects of Aramaic.' According to him, it may be borrowed from
       Arabic. See Gordon 1941: 126. See also IV.9.

[190] Gordon 1941: 118, 126.

ings are possible – as Gordon admits – since the text under discussion makes no distinction between *waw* and *yod*,[191] but the reading -יה makes more sense as compared with other Aramaic dialects.[192] Furthermore, it is hard to explain why *waw* would occur frequently as a *mater lectionis* for *qameṣ* only in the 3rd person suffixes.

Parallels to some instances in Go 6 may possibly be found in SB, where the text, as read by Geller, runs מן ביתה מן פשורה ומן דירתיה ומן קיניניה דברתא 'from the house and from the table and from the dwelling and from the possessions of that daughter' (SB 13). All the suffixes evidently refer to ברתא 'daughter.' Unfortunately, the reading is not certain due to the bad condition of the text. If the reading is correct, it is interesting that -ה and -יה vacillate freely; all the nouns (-בית, -פשור, -דירת, and -קינין) evidently occur in the sg.

Further examples of this phenomenon are probable, for instance, in Ober. II:1-2 and in Go G. In the former the text runs as follows: ולא ליתיבון לה שינתא לעיניה ולא ליתיבון לה ניחא בפגרה בחילמיה ובחיזונה 'and let them not restore sleep to her eyes, nor restore ease in her body during her dream(s) or during her vision.' The text refers in all probability to אונא בת גיית.

In Go G, we may read several instances of -יה referring to מזדואי בת אמא, e.g. דשריא על איסקבת ביתיה דהדא מזדואי בת אמא סלמא 'who dwells on the threshold of this M. daughter of 'I. S.' (Go G:3).[193]

Some of the instances given here may alternatively be understood as pl./dual forms. This is probable in the case of עניה 'her eyes' from Ober. II:1-2. חילמיה from the same instance is possibly a pl. form, too ('her dreams'). Yet, it may be a sg. noun instead ('her dream'). Note, for instance, ומיתחזיא בחילמא דליליא 'and appears in the dream of the night' in TB 3, where חילמא appears in the sg. Besides, the parallel חיזונה 'her vision' is also a sg. noun with the 3rd p. fem. sg. suffix.

All in all, in the light of the fact that we encounter 3rd p. fem. sg. suffixes spelled -ה with *masc. pl.* nouns (see above) and the fact that we also have instances of -יה with fem. nouns in the sg. (see above), it may be argued that both suffixes were pronounced alike. Furthermore, we encounter at least one instance where -יה occurs referring to a fem. pl. noun: מן בנתיה 'from her daughters' (Go G:8).[194]

---

[191] Gordon 1941: 126.

[192] Already Boyarin and Harviainen, respectively, were of the opinion that the correct reading in Go 6 is -יה. See Boyarin 1978: 157, n. 100; Harviainen 1983: 108. The interpretation of these forms in Boyarin 1978 differs from mine (see below).

[193] I have no photograph of the text at my disposal, but the reading is probable on the basis of a facsimile. Yet, instead of דהדא one might read דההא, which could stand for דההיא.

[194] For the expected בנתה. מן בנתיה refers to the same מזדואי בת אמא סלמא as earlier in the same text. Cf. the instance listed above. Therefore there is no reason to translate 'his daughters' *pace* Gordon.

הי- also quite commonly appears as a 3rd p. fem. sg. pronominal suffix (attached to sg. nouns) in BTA and Geonic Aramaic, a fact neglected by grammars.[195] Its occurrence is possible in Targum Neophyti, too.[196] Additionally, we encounter הי- as a fem. form in some GA marriage contracts from the Cairo Geniza.[197] In Mandaic, the 3rd p. masc. suffix 'is mostly used also for the feminine,' but, in addition, Mandaic attests to a special fem. form, pronounced -[a], which appears sporadically in the classical texts, and which can be used for both numbers, e.g. *kadpa* 'her shoulder' or 'her shoulders.'[198]

In Samaritan Aramaic, *-e* – equal to the 3rd p. masc. sg. suffix – is used with fem. nouns in the sg. alongside *-a*.[199] In his study of Samaritan Aramaic, Z. Ben-Hayyim argues that it is not impossible that the expansion of the pronunciation of the 3rd p. fem. sg. possessive suffix as [e] (instead of -[a]) in the Samaritan Aramaic reading tradition was restricted by the pronunciation of the corresponding suffix as [a] in the Samaritan reading tradition of Hebrew.[200] According to him, *-e* as a fem. sg. form derives its origin from *-ayh* (< *-ayhā*), a form of 3rd p. fem. sg. suffix used with masc. pl. nouns.[201] Moreover, Ben-Hayyim notes that in GA, *-e* is attested as a result of analogy with some fem. pl. nouns, too, e.g. מִצְוָתֶה דְאוֹרָיתִי.[202] According to Ben-Hayyim, the fact that the gender distinction of the suffix of the 3rd p. masc. sg. and the 3rd p. fem. sg. added to masc. pl. nouns had become neutralized, blurred the distinction between different suffixes and resulted in the use of *-e* as a fem. suffix with sg. nouns, too.[203] Thus Ben-Hayyim's arguments.

---

[195] Friedman 1974: 65-69. The suffix is known both in the printed editions and especially in the MSS. The fact is neglected e.g. in Epstein's grammar of BTA.

[196] The regular form is ה-, but, according to Levy, הי- appears often in place of ה-. See Levy 1974: 64. Yet, even though Levy does not mention it, הי- is possibly found *only* with masc. pl. nouns. According to Golomb, the suffix is always ה- with sg. nouns. See Golomb 1985: 50. In the Palestinian Targum fragments from the Cairo Geniza, the form of the 3rd p. fem. sg. added to masc. pl. nouns is *-eh*, while the form used with masc. sg. nouns is the regular *-ah*. Fassberg 1983: 165-166; 1990: 114.

[197] As referred in Friedman 1974: 64-65. The forms in Palestinian marriage contracts were identified by M. A. Friedman, in a paper which I have been unable to obtain.

[198] Macuch 1965: 158.

[199] Ben-Hayyim 1967: 146-147; Macuch 1982: 133.

[200] Ben Hayyim 1967: 146. In Ben-Hayyim's system [e] denotes a mid, front vowel equal to IPA [ɛ] (תנועה קדמית בינונית). For the system used by Ben-Hayyim, see Ben-Hayyim 1961: 13ff.

[201] 'זו מוצאה מן *-ayh* (< *ayhā*) כלומר מכינוי הנסתרת בשמות בעלי ריבוי זכרי.' (Ben-Hayyim 1967: 146).

[202] Ben-Hayyim 1967: 147. Ben-Hayyim (ibid.) uses the term 'ארמית היהודים.' Some instances are found in Palestinian Christian Aramaic, too.

[203] Ibid.

It is common among the Late Aramaic dialects that the 3rd p. fem. sg. suffix added to pl. nouns and the 3rd p. masc. sg. suffix are identical, i.e. basically הי-.[204] Syriac maintained the distinction in the *ketiv* (the masc. *-h versus* the fem. *-yh*), but not in the *qere*.[205] In some dialects the fem. suffix used with masc. pl. nouns evidently also extended – as a result of analogy – to sg. nouns.[206] This could have been the process in some dialects of BJA as well.[207] As well known, in BJA, הי- appears as a generalized 3rd p. masc. suffix irrespective whether the qualified noun is in sg. or pl. Thus, we would be in the situation, prevalent in Mandaic, in which only one form of 3rd p. sg. suffix was in use, irrespective the gender or number of the qualified noun.[208] One may argue that a more or less similar situation is reflected in the bowl texts, too. We may, however, alternatively suggest a different kind of development (see below).

All in all, it is evident that the forms in different dialects reflect a process of neutralization which was taking place in Late Aramaic. The neutralization took place not primarily between the genders, but between the forms used with sg. nouns and the forms used with pl. nouns, but various dialects attested to different trends of development.[209] In Mandaic, the process of neutralization had gone so far that the same suffix was mostly used for both numbers,[210] whereas in most persons the gender distinction remained.[211] A similar process is well attested in BTA, where 'in a number of persons the plural suffixes are used for the singular as well (and apparently *vice versa*).'[212]

This development can be seen in the *qere* of the Tiberian tradition of Biblical Aramaic, too. In Biblical Aramaic, the suffix of the 3rd p. fem. sg. הx- when

---

[204] See above and the tables given in Fassberg 1990: 116-117.

[205] See Muraoka 1997b: 19, 33; Fassberg 1990: 116-117.

[206] This is the theory held by Ben-Hayyim, at least as concerns Samaritan Aramaic.

[207] As concerns the bowl texts, Harviainen argues – without trying to explain the process – that the use of the suffix הי- as a fem. sg. form in the bowl texts is connected with the confusion of 3rd p. sg. suffixes in Mandaic. According to him, the 3rd p. suffixes merged in BJA as well as in Mandaic. See Harviainen 1983: 108.

[208] In Mandaic the masc. form is also generally used for fem., and appears with both numbers as well. See Macuch 1965: 158.

[209] For instance, in the Palestinian Targum fragments from the Cairo Geniza, the 3rd p. masc. sg. suffix with pl. nouns, i.e. *-oy*, also appears sporadically as the 1st p. suffix. See Fassbeg 1990: 118.

[210] In some persons there are two forms, either of which can be used with both numbers.

[211] In addition to the confusion in the 3rd p. sg., in the 2nd p. pl., the masc. is often used for the regular fem. form. In the 2nd. p. sg. and in the 3rd p. pl. the gender distinction is maintained with regularity. For the forms in Mandaic, see Macuch 1965: 157-159.

[212] Kutscher 1971a: c. 281. By 'plural suffixes' Kutscher means suffixes used with pl. nouns. Nöldeke noted that this kind of neutralization is typical of Mandaic and BJA, whereas Syriac and the West Aramaic dialects preserved the original distinction. See Nöldeke 1875: 174.

attached to sg. nouns, whereas when attached to masc. pl. nouns, the *ketiv* is ־ֲיֵה and the *qere* ־ַה.[213] Thus, the form used with a sg. noun and the *qere* in the pl. are homophonous.

Hence, there remains a possibility that also in the Aramaic dialect represented in the bowl texts – as in Biblical Aramaic (*qere*) – the pronunciation of the 3rd p. fem. sg. was [-ah] irrespective of whether it was attached to sg. or pl. nouns.[214] The coalescence could well have resulted in confusion in the orthography between the suffix with sg. nouns and the one with pl. nouns.[215] As pointed out at the beginning, we have examples in the bowl texts in which ־ה appears attached to pl. nouns. This suggestion would, perhaps, explain as well why ־יה as a fem. form appears only sporadically in the bowl texts. Since, if the pronunciation of the 3rd p. fem. sg. suffix was equal to the corresponding masc. form (something like [eh]), one would expect more instances of ־יה as a fem. suffix. David Golomb has argued that in Targum Neophyti, too, the 3rd p. fem. sg. suffix was pronounced [ah] irrespective of whether it was added to sg. or pl. nouns.[216] Mandaic, too, attests a by-form pronounced [a] for the 3rd p. fem. sg; this form with a clear affinity with the Biblical Aramaic *qere* appears for both numbers (see above). Further, the use of both ־והי and ־יה attached to masc. pl. nouns was noted above (3rd p. masc. sg.).[217] Moreover, earlier in this study it was noted that a parallel situation is attested in the bowl texts concerning the 2nd p. masc. sg. suffix: also in the 2nd p. masc. sg. there occurs fluctuation in the orthography between the form attached to sg. nouns and the form attached to pl. nouns (i.e. between ־ך and ־יך), which suggests that the pronunciation of both suffixes was identical; a parallel is again found in the pronunciation of Biblical Aramaic (see above). In the 2nd p. fem. sg., too, similar fluctuation is apparent (see above). Based on this comparison, it is quite probable that the process of neutralization in the Aramaic dialect represented by the bowl texts (or in some of them) was similar, in this respect, to the *qere* in Biblical Aramaic.

---

[213] See Rosenthal 1974: 26.

[214] The question concerning the quality and quantity of the vowel *a* is beyondt our scope here. Thus, it is immaterial from our point of view whether we should read e.g. [ah] or [åh]. Boyarin considers the possibility that there was a *fem.* suffix *-ah* in BJA most unlikely: 'There is simply no evidence for such a form in BJA.' Boyarin 1978: 157, n. 100. He maintains apparently that the standard form is *-åh*. Note, however, the *qere* in Biblical Aramaic, which may reflect a BJA form.

[215] Note the vacillation between ־ה and ־יה in SB line 13. See above. Note also that 'above her' is sometimes written עלה, sometimes עליה. Note N&Sh 22:2; N&Sh 23:9.

[216] Golomb 1985: 53.

[217] Cf. also the inconsistencies in the spelling of the 2nd and 3rd p. pl. forms, e.g. ומן ביתיהון כוליה 'and from all of their house' in N&Sh 14:3 (see below). The inconsistencies may be connected with the same phenomenon.

1st p. pl.

The regular form in the bowl texts is -נא,[218] e.g. בינא ובין אבהתנא 'between us and our ancestors' (N&Sh 19:7-8). Besides, -ין is attested only in the name *Martyn* ('our lady'): מרתין איבולית 'our lady, 'I.' (AIT 19:5);[219] possibly in a bowl from the Iraq Museum published by Gordon: על בבין 'on our gate.' (No. 9731);[220] and it is likewise possible in AIT 8, where the text runs, as emended by Epstein:

אנחנא ית מאי דשמיע להון מין רקיעא ולאבון שומון בישי (AIT 8: 9-10).[221] This is translated by Epstein: 'nous l'avons fait descendre, (tout) ce que eux(!) ont entendu du ciel, et obéi à notre père, mauvais.' However, the text is too erased to make certain whether the reading is correct.[222] Note that Epstein assumes that אבון is 'peut-être aussi une faute pour אבוכון.'[223] Due to the uncertainty and rarity of the occurrences, -(')ן cannot be taken as casting light on the normal language of the bowl texts.

-נא is characteristic of Official Aramaic, including Biblical Aramaic,[224] TO,[225] TJ,[226] Nabatean Aramaic,[227] and Qumran Aramaic.[228] In Late Aramaic, it is a minority form, predominating only in PsJ,[229] where forms common with TO and TJ are frequent. It appears rarely in BTA,[230] Targum Neophyti,[231] and Fragment-Targums.[232]

---

[218] In a British Museum bowl (no. 91776) published tentatively by Gordon, there is attested the spelling -נה (על בבאין דילנה). See Gordon 1941: 342-344. The same text attests to the spelling -נא (דילנא), too. Since no photograph or facsimile of the text is at my disposal, I cannot check the spellings.

[219] This divine name is also found in a Palestinian amulet published by Naveh and Shaked, cf. לשם מרתן(י) (A. 8:1). For this divine name, see Naveh & Shaked 1985: 78-79 and the reference given there.

[220] The text is published in Gordon 1941: 349. No photograph of the text is at my disposal. In a facsimile, the reading looks possible, but the text is too poorly preserved to be used as a certain proof.

[221] See Epstein 1921: 42. אבון well attested in BTA, too (see Epstein 1960: 123).

[222] The uncertainty of this reading may also be supported by the fact that the translation does not make too much sense.

[223] Epstein 1921: 42.

[224] Segert 1975: 170; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 52-53. See also Folmer 1995: 155-158. Ancient Aramaic has -ן, which also occurs in Official Aramaic alongside -נא. See ibid. and Degen 1969: 55; Hug 1993: 56-57.

[225] Dalman 1905: 109.

[226] Tal 1975: 79.

[227] Tal 1975: 80.

[228] Ibid.

[229] Cook 1986: 134.

[230] Epstein 1960: 123; Cook 1986: 134.

[231] Golomb 1985: 50.

[232] Cook 1986: 134.

The regular ending in standard BTA is ‑ָן/‑ִי,[233] which is infrequently if at all attested in these texts (see the discussion immediately above).

2nd p. and 3rd p. pl.

The regular masc. forms are ‑כון (2nd p.) and ‑הון (3rd p.) when attached to sg. nouns or fem. pl. nouns, and more commonly ‑יכון and ‑יהון when attached to masc. pl. nouns.[234] But inconsistencies are attested in the spelling, e.g. בדירתיהון 'in their dwelling' (AIT 8:5); ומן ביתיהון כוליה 'and from all of their house' (N&Sh 14:3).[235]

All these forms are frequently attested in the bowl texts, whereas the variants with the elision of final *nun* only occur in a couple of texts, e.g. ואשבעית עליכו 'I adjure you' (N&Sh 25:5, 7),[236] באסניהו 'in their granaries' (N&Sh 13:19).

N&Sh 25 is so far the only text which yields ‑כ as the sole form of the 2nd p. pl. suffix (two instances), but – in contrast – the 3rd p. pl. suffix appears there in its fuller form, i.e. ‑הון instead of ‑הו.[237] Most commonly ‑(י)כו and ‑(י)הו are attested in N&Sh 13, where they abound as a poss. suff., combined with prepositions, and as an obj. suff. with verbs.[238] However, also in that text, the fuller variants are common, cf. עליהון (7, 9); עליכון (passim); מישתייכון (10); מיכליכון (line 10); מיפומיהון (21). מינהון (8); כולהון (20); בנתהון (8); בניהון (8). This may suggest that the elision of the terminal *nun* is only sporadic in the pronouns.

The attestation of the fem. suffixes ‑כין (2nd p. pl.) and ‑הין (3rd p. pl.) in these texts is probable, but not absolutely certain. Since most of the texts make no clear distinction in the script between *waw* and *yod,* it is rather difficult to say merely on a textual basis whether separate fem. pl. forms exist, though their exist‑ ence has been asserted by various scholars. The reasoning of the publishers of the bowl texts seems to be based more on etymological than textual grounds. Mont‑ gomery presents separate fem. suffixes ‑כין and ‑הין in several texts published by him. In the following section, some of the possible attestations of ‑כין and ‑הין in these texts are discussed.

---

233   See Epstein 1921: 123-124; Kutscher 1971a: c. 281.

234   ‑ייכון is also found: א[ס]רתייכון 'your bindings' (HUN 2).

235   In Go G, we repeatedly find לוהן (e.g. line 9) for the regular להון. This bowl presents other peculiar spellings, too. See Gordon 1934b: 466. לוהן may testify to the weakness of /h/. See III.2. *Laryngeals and Pharyngeals.*

236   In AIT 5:3, one can read אשב[ע]ית עליכו].

237   Note כלהון (line 5 twice).

238   The following examples occur: בליביכו (line 14); עליכו (20); ברישיכו (15, 17); רמנכו (14); לאגנהו (16); תפתורהו (19); להו (15); כלהו (13); כנשונכו כבשונכ ואחיתונכו (16); בדיריהו (19); לחדותהו (16); לשיפורהו (16); לקרניהו (16); סחפונהו (16); שדונהו (16); נירדופינהו (19); בארחתהו (19); באישכריהו (19); באסניהו (19). For object suffixes, see IV.10.7.

The second p. fem. suffix is – according to Montgomery – found several times in AIT 1 (e.g. עליכין), but on the basis of the photograph, no distinction can be observed between *waw* and *yod*. In AIT 6, Montgomery reads ושתא הדא מיכלהין שני 'and this year out of all years' (AIT 6:6). However, on the basis of a photograph, one could also read הון-. Also in AIT 7:17 הין- is highly questionable, even though that text – to some extent – tries to distinguish between *waw* and *yod*. In AIT 8, Montgomery presents several occurrences of the suffix כין-, but the text on the whole – at least based on the photograph – is erased and the bowl broken in several pieces. In the photograph, large parts of the text are illegible; and in those parts of the text where one can read it, the text – to my mind – observes no persuasive distinction between *waw* and *yod*. Hence, I am not too convinced of the possibility of distinguishing כין- from כון- in this text either. Montgomery admits explicitly that 'the confusion of ו and י in our script renders the distinction between masc. and fem. uncertain.'[239] In AIT 9, there seems to be a tendency to maintain the distinction in the script between *waw* and *yod*, the former being quite regularly expressed by a longer stroke and the latter by a shorter one. Hence, it is quite possible that there occur the separate fem. suffixes כין- and הין- as read by Montgomery. Moreover, I am inclined to read בהין in place of בהון in line 6, cf. ורמתא בהין איתמסראה 'and by them (?) the heights surrendered (?)' (AIT 9: 6-7) However, this cannot be said with certainty, since notwithstanding the general tendency to maintain the distinction between *waw* and *yod,* some words are written as if no distinction were observed, e.g. מתוך אותיות in line 5 is written as if it were מתיך איתיות. In the last lines of the text, too, one cannot see any clear distinction between *waw* and *yod* in the script. No distinction in the script can be seen in AIT 11, where, too, the distinction between *waw* and *yod* can be made only on etymological grounds. However, AIT 18, which presents a duplicate text, confirms some forms in AIT 11, since the distinction between *waw* and *yod* is observed quite well in that text. For instance, עליהין and שקול גיטיכין in AIT 18:9 look reliable in a photograph. Unfortunately AIT 18 is largely 'mutilated.'[240] It looks as if there was a tendency to distinguish *waw* from *yod* in AIT 12, where הין- in line 8 is quite possible, but not certain. In AIT 14, Montgomery reads in line 7 as follows: יא. יחוש תבון תמן תרמון יתבין ('sitting') לגו נורא יקידתא. Epstein emends יתבין to יתכין (the object particle ית+ the 2nd p. fem. pl. suffix כין-).[241] Epstein's emendation looks very possible in a photograph of the text, but it is hard to find in the text fem. demons to whom יתכין might refer. Owing to the grammatical incongruencies, the whole sentence remains somewhat obscure. AIT 17 is 'an abbreviated

---

239   Montgomery 1913: 157.

240   See Montgomery 1913: 193.

241   See Epstein 1921: 47.

replica' of AIT 8,[242] with several possible occurrences of fem. pl. suffixes. There seems to be a tendency to distinguish between these two letters, but with no consistency. In AIT 28, too, there seems to be a tendency to distinguish between these letters. Unfortunately the text is rather poorly preserved, which makes many instances uncertain. At least כולהין in line 5 looks evident.[243]

The fact that in the 2nd p. sg. there are separate fem. forms attested argues in favour of the attestation of separate fem. forms in the 2nd p. plural as well. On the other hand, among the texts where *waw* and *yod* can be distinguished in the script, there seem to be found some texts which do not observe a distinction between masc. and fem. pronominal suffixes in the plural. An example may be taken from a bowl published by Gordon:[244] כבישין נשי חרשאתא אינין חרשיהין ועובדיהון ולוטתיהון ואקריתהון 'suppressed are those enchanting women, their spells, their magical acts, their curses, and their invocations' (TB:7).[245] The subject of the sentence, i.e. נשי חרשאתא אינין 'those enchanting women,' is of fem. gender, and there occur both the feminine (הין-) and masculine (הון-) suffixes which refer to this feminine subject. Harviainen has noted the same feature in a bowl published by him. There the text – as read by Harviainen – runs: ניתסרון וניכמרון כולהין פתיכרין על קרינהין ועל משדרנהין 'they will be bound, and all the idol-spirits will return against their summoner and against their sender' (BOR 7). Harviainen points out that פתיכרין 'should be of masc. gender.'[246] He admits that it is often difficult to distinguish between *waw* and *yod,* and had we no other examples, 'we could easily read *waw* instead of *yod* in these words.'[247] As in aforediscussed TB, there is an evident attempt in BOR to distinguish between these two letters, and therefore it is quite possible that the suffixes are confused, as suggested by Harviainen.

These examples suggest that at least some subdialects represented in the bowl texts had lost the gender distinction in these forms. Here we may present a parallel from Biblical Aramaic, where the *ketiv* of the fem. suffix is equal to the corresponding masc. suffix, as opposed to the *qere,* where the gender distinction is made.[248]

---

[242]   Montgomery 1913: 191.

[243]   As read by Epstein (1921: 55). Montgomery reads כולהון.

[244]   See also Harviainen (1981: 21) where other examples can also be found.

[245]   In his *Corpus of the Aramaic Incantation Bowls* Isbell reads חרשיהון, but according to a photograph of the text, the correct reading is חרשיהין, as read by Gordon. There seems to be a proper distinction between *waw* and yod in this text, but – as far as I can see – *he* and *ḥet* cannot be distinguished in the script. Hence one could also read הרשיהין, etc. אקריתהון may also be understood to mean 'their accidents' or 'accidental pollutions' on the basis of Mandaic *qiria* 'mishap, strife, accident, accidental pollution, etc.' See Harviainen 1981: 8; 1978: 22-23.

[246]   Harviainen 1981: 21.

[247]   Ibid.

However, to my mind, for evident textual reasons, the attestation of this trait in the bowl texts needs to be proven by further persuasive examples.

According to Harviainen, the confusion of masc. and fem. possessive suffixes does not occur in 'Eastern Middle Aramaic dialects, not even in Mandaic,' but a parallel may be found in Modern East Aramaic, where the difference between the genders is neutralized in the pl. suffixes.[249] In Harviainen's opinion, the confusion of genders in the plural suffixes is one of the so-called '*koiné*' features appearing in the bowl texts.[250]

Once one evidently comes across ‑כי as a fem. pl. suffix, i.e. גיטכי 'your bill of divorce' (AIT 17:9).[251]

In Go 5:10 כון‑ apparently refers to the masc. sg. form: אשבעת עליכון את בר איגרי קלילא איסרה טבא דאיתשמש בביתיה.[252] Gordon translates the sequence 'I have adjured you (pl.!), O thou (sg.) fleet son of roofs, the good prince, who has used the house of...' He gives two possible explanations: (1) עליכון is used as a 'pl. of polite address;' or (2) את should be emended to a pl. form אתון, since "בר איגרי might possibly be pl.'[253] However, the other attributes are definitely in the singular. A scribal error is, of course, a possibility. One sometimes cannot help thinking that the scribes of these texts were not at all interested in whether the text they produced had any grammatical consistency.

‑(י)כון (2nd p.) and ‑(י)הון (3rd p.) and the corresponding fem. forms ‑(י)כין (2nd p.) and ‑(י)הין (3rd p.) are standard in most of the Aramaic dialects. Importantly, the majority forms of the bowl texts accord with Nedarim and Geonic Aramaic, as well as with TO and TJ, whereas the elision of the terminal *nun*, typical of standard BTA forms, is rarely attested in the bowl texts.[254]

In addition, the 3rd p. masc. pl. suffix with the syncope of ה may appear in MB I, but the interpretation of this puzzling phrase in line 14 is uncertain. The text runs, as read by Gordon: ובתרון דיכסון ובתרון דיכסון ובתרון דיכסון 'and after

---

248 See Rosenthal 1974: 26.

249 Harviainen 1981: 21.

250 See I.2.4.1.

251 In this word and often in AIT 17 in general, *yod* is often represented by a small angle, and *waw* by a longer stroke. Thus it seems to be safe to claim that the reading with final *yod* is correct here. Unfortunately, there is no clear consistency in this differentiation, and one finds, consequently, anticipated *waw* letters represented by an angle and anticipated *yod* letters represented by a stroke.

252 Based on a photograph of the text, some words in the sequence are uncertain, but those words which are important for our purpose here are certain.

253 Gordon 1941: 124.

254 The final *nun* is unattested in standard BTA, while Nedarim yields side by side forms with the elision (e.g. ‑הו) and more conservative variants (e.g. ‑הון). For Nedarim and Geonic Aramaic forms, see Rybak 1980: 88.

them who cover and after them who cover and after them who cover.' Moreover, in lines 17-18 we have the following instance: ענפיאיל מלאכה מפליג בותרון 'the angel ʿA. who diverts after them.' The suffix under discussion is written הן- in line 18: שבעאתהן 'through the seven of them,' and correctly, i.e. הון-, likewise in line 18: שמידהון 'their name.' If the readings and the interpretations are correct, as it seems according to a facsimile, we have in this bowl several instances of a 3rd p. masc. pl. suffix ון-, with the syncope of the original ה (/bāṯarhōn/ > */baṯrōn/).[255] If it is not a scribal error, which is unlikely in the case of four occurrences, the syncope testifies evidently to weakness in /h/ (see above III.2). The suffix ון- is – as far as I know – unattested in BJA. By contrast, it is familiar from Samaritan Aramaic and,[256] and what is more important, from Mandaic.[257] It should be pointed out that in addition to ון-, MB I shows some other uncommon features, too, such as the use of הדין as a fem. form for anticipated הדא (See IV.4. *Demonstrative Pronouns*). Nevertheless, the occurrence of ון- in MB I suggests, perhaps, that this ending was used in BJA (or in some dialects of BJA), as in Mandaic. The exceptional *defective* spelling הן- may be understood as a further indication of uncertainty as to how the ending was to be spelled. We may argue that the scribe was uncertain about the spelling of the ending due to the fact that it was pronounced differently (= [ūn] or [ōn]?) in his actual vernacular from the form represented by the standard Aramaic spelling (הון- = [hōn]). On the other hand, it is possible as well that the use of the exceptional suffix ון- in MB I is based on the influence of Mandaic. Note also that א is used as a vowel letter in this text more frequently than in general: באיתיה (line 21), אל שדאי 'El Shadday' (24), and *passim* ליליאתה and בישאתה. The letter א is sometimes employed in this function in a medial position in other bowls, too, especially in fem. pl. endings (אתא/ה-), but, in contrast, spellings of the type באיתיה are exceptional. We might go even further and argue that all the exceptional features in MB I, such as the use of הדין as a fem. form, may be explained by the fact that it was, perhaps, written by a scribe who was more familiar with Mandaic than with BJA.[258] However, while the text contains several Hebrew words and idioms and while salient Mandaic features are rare, it is apparently more plausible to assume that this text was written by a less educated scribe whose spellings reveal some differences between literary Aramaic and the spoken variety.

[255] בותרון is further discussed in III.6. *Waw as a Counterpart of* */ā/ (qameṣ).

[256] See Macuch 1982: 132.

[257] Mandaic has the endings *-hun, -un, -aihun,* and *-aiun* (Macuch 1965: 159).

[258] Some other exceptional spellings in this bowl are noted in Gordon 1984: 220-221.

CONCLUSIONS

The set of pronominal suffixes used in the bowl texts shows many conservative forms with clear affinities especially with TO and TJ. These include: (1) י- as the regular form of the 1st p. sg.; (2) preservation of the gender distinction in the 2nd p. sg.; (3) והי- as a 3rd p. masc. sg. used with pl. nouns; (4) נא- as a 1st p. pl. form; (4) preservation of the terminal *nun* in the 2nd and 3rd p. pl. All these are opposed to standard BTA.

However, the generally conservative character of these forms is opposed by the occurrence of some isoglosses in common with standard BTA: (1) יה- as a 3rd p. masc. sg. form used with masc. pl. nouns (alongside והי-) and confusion of the 3rd p. fem. sg. suffixes used with masc. pl. nouns and the ones used with fem. (sg. and pl.) and masc. sg. nouns; (2) the occurrence of the pl. suffixes with the terminal *nun* elided in some texts; (3) confusion of the 2nd p. sg. suffixes used with sg. nouns and the ones used with pl. nouns,[259] as in BTA and Mandaic. The last trait is partly shared with the *qere* of Biblical Aramaic, too, and found in TO as well. The 3rd p. masc. pl. suffix ון- is a trait shared by Mandaic.

The confusion of the gender distinction in the pl. forms is rarely attested in other Aramaic dialects, but – as noted – the occurrence of this phenomenon in the bowl texts is uncertain as well. The fact that the same feature is known from Biblical Aramaic (*ketiv*) may be of importance.

IV.4. DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

In the following, the demonstrative pronouns are classified into proximal (demonstratives of proximity) and distal (demonstratives of distance) according to the traditional division, though no clear distinction can be made between different demonstratives in the bowl texts in the respect of proximity *versus* distance.

Demonstrative pronouns of proximity are as follows. The more common forms are listed first. Uncertain forms are placed in parentheses. Further, even though an attempt is made to separate the adjectival and substantival use of these pronouns, it must be stressed that in many instances it is far from certain whether a given form is used adjectivally or substantivally, a fact which is due to the syntactic ambiguity typical of these texts.

---

[259] Similar inconsistencies are probable in some other persons, too (see above). (1) and (3) reflect the same process of neutralization.

masc. sg. 'this'	**fem. sg.**
הדין	הדא
הדאין	דה
(אידין, אודין, אדין); (הודן, הודין, הידן, הידין)	
דנא	(דנא)
דן	(הדין)
דנון/דנין	
דין	
(ההין)	
הנה	
(דא)	

Plural 'these'

הלין
הנין
הינין
אילין
(אילה), (אילי)
(דנן)

EXAMPLES OF THE USE OF THESE DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS ARE AS FOLLOWS:[260]

hdyn

(a) Used adjectivally:

הדין עלמא 'this world' (N&Sh 2:9); הדין ביתיה ודירתיה 'this house of his and dwelling of his' (N&Sh 27:6); הדין קמיעה 'this amulet' (N&Sh 22:1; 24:1; AIT 1:1, 6; Go A:1; Go H:1; and GE A:1).[261] הדין איסרא ורזא 'this spell and mystery' (AIT 3:1);[262] הדין כסא 'this bowl' (AIT 8:1; 28:1); ביתיה דמיהרוי בר בהדין שמה רבה 'the house of this M. son of G.' (N&Sh 19:9); גושנאי הדין ובחתמא הדין 'by this great name and seal' (MB I:20); הדין ביתא 'this house' (AIT 7:12); רזא הדין 'this mystery' (AIT 7:13); ודהדין ביתא 'and of this house' (AIT 19:19); הדין רזא 'this mystery' (N&Sh 21:1); הדין רזא דרוסת קים ושריר לעולם 'this mystery is true, made fast, and sure for ever' (AIT 13:8);[263]

---

[260]   The examples are classified into (a) adjectival and (b) substantival use only with those demonstratives of which there are more than only a few cases attested in the bowl texts. Note that in the case of דנא, הדאין, דנין, ההין, הנה, הנין, and הינין all the occurrences attested are listed.

[261]   הדין קמיעא in N&Sh 5:1.

[262]   AIT 28:1 is read according to the emendation by Epstein (1921: 55). The reading of Epstein looks reliable in a photograph of the text.

בכסא הדין 'in this bowl' (AIT 14:6); ויתנטר הדין הורמזדד 'may this H. be saved' (Go 10:5).

(b) Used substantivally:

הדין א(א)אא 'this is ?' (N&Sh 4:1); להדין 'to this one' (N&Sh 5:1; AIT 1:5, 7); הדין הוא שמא רבא 'this is the firm seal' (N&Sh 18:4); הדין חתמא שרירא 'this is the great name' (AIT 3:6); הדין חתמ[ה] 'this is the sealing' (N&Sh 20:2); הדין צילמה דלוטתא ודליליתא 'this is the figure of the curse and of the Lilith' (Go I:1).

hd'yn

על הדאין אנ[ור] בר פרכוי 'upon this 'A. son of P.' (AIT 28:4).

dn'

דנא קמיעא לאסותה דהדא ניונדוך בת כפני 'this is an amulet for the salvation of this N. daughter of K.' (AIT 10:1); ואיסכופתא דנא 'and this threshold' (IMB:5).

dyn

דין איסורה מן יומא דין ולעולם 'this is the bond from this day for ever' (N&Sh 18:2); מן יומא דין ולעלם (N&Sh 19:9; AIT 6:11, 12; MB I:22, 26; AB B:7);[264] דין רזא 'this is the mystery' (N&Sh 19:1); דין יומא מכל יומא 'this day above any day' (AIT 17:1).

dnn

רזא דנן 'this mystery' (N&Sh 6:1); מן יומא דנן ולעלם 'from this day for ever' (PB:9; AIT 3:5; AIT 7:16).[265]

dnyn/dnwn

מן יומא דנון/דנין ולעלם (N&Sh 25:4,7).[266]

hhyn

בכסא ההין 'in this bowl' (AIT 14:6).

---

[263] Epstein (1921: 45) translates דרוסת 'vrai, juste;' Montgomery reads דריסת. According to a photograph, both readings are possible.

[264] In MB I and in AB B instead of ולעלם, we find ולעולם. Instead of מן, מין is found in AB B. The phrase is also found in AIT 7 [Myhrmann]:16, AIT 10:7, and elsewhere. In Go A:4, as read by Gordon, we find the following variant: מן יומא דין ולעלום. I have no photograph of the text, but in a facsimile, the reading seems secure.

[265] In AIT 3 instead of ולעלם, we find ולעולם, and instead of מן, מין is found. In AIT 7, one finds ולעולם. The phrase is also found in AIT 8:16, AIT 12:12, AIT 16:13, AIT 19:20, N&Sh 8:5-6, N&Sh 12b:13, in AIT 22:5, where one finds the spelling יומה דינן ולעלו[ם] מן, in PB:9; AB D:5, Go 6:8, Go H:15, and, moreover, in some texts the reading of which cannot be checked. Go 1:4 attests to the variant: מן יומא דנן ושעתא דה וילעלם.

[266] It is uncertain whether one should read דנין or דנון. See below.

hnh

הנה צילמה 'this is the figure' (N&Sh 18:1).

hd'

(a) Used adjectivally:

להדא מילתא הדא מזמנא 'this incantation (word) is appointed' (N&Sh 7:1); והדא בהמנדוך בת סמא 'and to this B. daughter of S.' (AIT 1:4, 5-6, 7); הדא איצפנדרמיד בת 'and this 'I. daughter of' (AIT 26:4); ושתא הדא 'and this year' (AIT 6:5); דהדא מירדוך בת באנאי 'of this M. daughter of B.' (AIT 7:10); הדא איסקופתה 'this threshold' (AIT 9:11); ואיסקופתה הדא (AIT 10:2).[267]

(b) Used substantivally:

הדא היא עיזקתא דשלמה מלכה בר דויד 'this is the seal-ring of King Solomon, the son of David' (G A:1-2).[268]

dh

מן יומא דנן ושעתא דה וילעלם 'from this day and this hour and for ever' (Go 1:4).

d'

דגיסא דא 'of this troop' (SB 7).

hlyn

הלין שמהתא 'these names' (N&Sh 2:7); הלין מלאכי 'these angels' (BOR:9); הלין רזין 'in the name of these seven words' (AIT 6:7);[269] הלין מילין שבע הלין בשום 'these mysteries (secrets)' (AIT 6:11);[270] הלין בר שרקוי וניונדוך אינתתה 'these (people), the son of Sh. and N. his wife' (AIT 10:4); דהלין איסרי 'of these charms' (AIT 19:14).

hnyn

דהנין אינשה 'of these men' (PB:6, 8).

hynyn

הינין אינשא 'these men' (PB: 9).

'ylyn

מלאכי אילין 'these angels' (N&Sh 2:8); אילין אינין דחנקן 'these are those that strangle' (?) (AB E:7);[271] גיי ומשכוי וארדוי אילין 'these G. and M. and 'A. (AIT

---

[267] Read according to the emendation by Epstein (1921: 40). הדא is certain in a photograph of the text.

[268] Even though no photograph of the text is at my disposal, the reading is evident on the basis of a facsimile.

[269] At least based on a photograph of the text, הלין in AIT 6:7 is rather indistinct.

[270] In a photograph of AIT 6, הלין in line 11 is indistinct.

7 [Myhrmann]:10, 15); וכל דעבד על אילין שמהתא 'and each that works by these names.'[272]

Demonstrative pronouns of distance are as follows:

masc. sg. 'that'	fem. sg.
(דיך) ;ההוא	(דוך) ;ההיא
masc. pl. 'those'	**fem. pl.**
אינון	אינין
הנהון	
הנון	
pl. c. אהניך	

THE OCCURRENCES OF DISTAL DEMONSTRATIVES IN THE BOWL TEXTS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

hhw': בההוא חתמא 'with that seal' (AIT 10:3, 5);[273] חילינא בההוא דיברא שמיא וארעא 'I am strong in Him who has created heaven and earth' (Go 11:4); וההוא נידרא[274] ;ואזלו על ההוא עבדנא 'and that vow' (Go L:2-3, 5 etc.);[275] ובההוא שמה רבה (GE A:17); 'in that great Name' בההוא איסורא 'with that bond' (TB 1).

hhy': ההיא ליליתא 'that Lilith' (N&Sh 5:6); דההיא לוטתא 'of that curse' (Go L:2, 7 etc.);[276] בההיא שעתא 'at that time' (GE B:5).[277] וההיא שיקופתא וההיא ערתתא ערתתא 'and that knocking and that deadly enmity' (Go L:3-4, 7, etc.).[278]

hy': היא עיזקתא דשלמה מלכה 'that is the signet-ring of King Solomon' (Go A:1).[279]

---

[271] Geller reads אילין אינין דחנקו and translates 'these and those that strangle.' Apparently one should, however, read חנקן, with the final *nun*.

[272] Found in a British Museum bowl published in part by Gordon (1941: 340). Since no photograph or facsimile of the text is at my disposal, I cannot check the reading. According to Gordon, הלין occurs in the same text: דהלין שמהתא.

[273] Read according to the emendation by Epstein (1921: 40).

[274] Attested in a British Museum bowl (no. 91776) published tentatively by Gordon (1941: 342-344). Gordon translates these words: 'and are gone to that practitioner.' No photograph or facsimile of the text is at my disposal.

[275] According to a facsimile, the readings of Gordon seem to be correct.

[276] In line 5 וההיא לוטתא. According to a facsimile, the readings of Gordon seem to be correct, but one could also read דההוא and וההוא, respectively.

[277] Geller reads here a masc. form ההוא (בההוא שעתא), but while *waw* and *yod* are practically indistinguishable, there is no reason to assume a masc. form here.

[278] According to a facsimile, the reading of Gordon seems to be correct.

[279] I have no photograph of the text at my disposal, but in a facsimile, the reading seems secure. Once again, היא could be read הוא as well, while *waw* and *yod* are indistinguishable.

'ynwn: אינון מלאכין 'those angels' (AIT 13:4). חתימין וימחתמין גוריי בר

בר(ז)אנדוך וגושני בת איפראהורמיז רגוריי בר פרדדוך אינון 'may those G. son of B. and G. daughter of 'I. and G. son of F. be sealed and countersealed' (N&Sh 15:1-3).

' ynyn: נשי חרשאתא אינין 'those enchanting women' (TB:7).[280]

hnhwn: והנהון חרשי והנהון מבדדי 'and those spells and those scatterings' (Go L:5-6 etc).[281]

dw/yk: דו/יך דתקי 'this family' (?) (AIT 28:2);[282]

hnwn: והנון מבדדי 'and those scatterings' (Go L:6); והנון חרשי והנון מבדדי (Go L:6).

'hnyk: אהניך אחוי בישי 'those evil brothers of his' (AIT 4:3).[283]

DISCUSSION

Demonstrative pronouns of proximity

In the periods of Middle Aramaic and Late Aramaic, Aramaic dialects disclosed varying inventories of demonstrative pronouns. Especially the East Aramaic dialects developed forms which deviate conspicuously from the Official Aramaic forms. It is typical of Aramaic dialects of the Middle and Late Aramaic periods that they use more than one form of demonstrative side by side. This holds true for the bowl incantations as well. The system of demonstrative pronouns in the bowl incantations is, in general, conservative, and the more developed forms of standard BTA – viz. הנך, הך, האיך; הני, הא, האי – are so far unattested in the bowl texts.[284]

In the Aramaic of the bowl incantations, the standard masc. sg. proximal demonstrative is הדין, whereas the corresponding fem. form is הדא. The regular pl. form is הלין, which is used for both genders. These demonstratives are used both as nouns (mostly as the subject of a nominal sentence) and adjectives (as an attributive adjective). When functioning as adjectives, the demonstrative pronouns in the bowl incantations either precede or follow the nucleus (the noun which they

---

[280] Even though it is generally hard to distinguish אינין from אינון, there seems to be a distinction between *waw* and *yod* in this text. According to Gordon's translation ('the enchanting women – they...'), אינין is not used here as a demonstrative pronoun. See Gordon 1951: 307.

[281] Gordon translates חרשי as 'black arts.' I have no photograph of the text at my disposal, but in a facsimile, the reading seems secure. In lines 5-6 one may read והנהון חרשי והנון מבדדי and והנון חרשי והנון מבדדי.

[282] Read accordng to the emendation by Epstein (1921: 56).

[283] As emended by Epstein (1921: 33). He translates 'ces mauvais frères-là.' As far as I understand, אחוי must be taken as a pl. of אח + a 3rd p. masc. sg. suffixed pronoun. See above IV.3. Instead of אהניך 'those,' Montgomery reads אהנוך 'Enoch.'

[284] For the standard BTA demonstrative pronouns, see Epstein 1960: 23-25.

qualify), the former being more common. Both usages are known in other Aramaic dialects.

The standard masc. form, הדין, frequently occurs in the bowl texts. When used adjectivally, it more often precedes the qualified noun, e.g. בהדין שמה רבה 'by this great name' (MB I:1, 20); מן הדין ביתא 'from this house' (AIT 7:12); הדין רזא כסא מזמן הדין 'this bowl is appointed' (AIT 8:1, 28:1);[285] הדין רזא 'this secret' (AIT 13:8), ודהדין ביתא דמשרשיה 'and of this house of M.' (AIT 19:19);[286] הדין כסא ניהוי לחתמתא 'may this bowl be for the sealing' (AIT 14:1), but there are several exceptions to this rule, e.g.[287] וכיבשא הדין 'and this press' (AIT 6:4, 7); מחתם ביתא הדין 'this house is countersealed' (AIT 10:2);[288] וכסא הדין 'and this bowl' (AIT 19:14); ויומא הדין... וירחא הדין... ועידנא הדין 'and this day... and this month... and this period' (AIT 6:5-6). Even in the same text הדין may both precede and follow the qualified noun, e.g. הדין כסא ניהוי לחתמתא 'may this bowl be for the sealing' (AIT 14:1) and in the same bowl (line 6) דאידכר שמיהון בכסא הדין 'whose names are mentioned in this bowl;' even in AIT 6 where הדין mostly follows the modified noun, one finds הדין כיבשא (line 11).

When a noun is qualified by both הדין and an attributive adjective (or a relative clause in the same function), one may argue that there is a tendency for הדין to precede the qualified noun while another attribute follows the noun,[289] e.g.

(a) ברזא הדין ובהדין (d) שמה (n) רבה (a) ובהדין (d) חתמא (n) דשררא (a)
'with this mystery, and with this great name, and with this true seal.'
(MB I:23);

(d) בהדין (d) שמה (n) רבה (a) ובחתמא (n) הדין (d)
'by this great name and by this seal' (MB I:20);

(d) בהדין (d) שמה (n) רבא (a)
'by this great name' (AIT 3:9);

(d) בשום דהדין (d) שמה (n) רבא (a)
'on the authority (in the name) of this great name' (AIT 3:11).

Note that הדין otherwise follows the noun in these examples. The problem here lies in the fact that the cases when a noun is qualified *both* by הדין – or any other demonstrative pronoun – and by an attributive adjective are rare in the bowl texts.[290] Therefore, it may be that the cases are too few to cast much light on the

---

285 The latter text is read according to the emendation by Epstein (1921: 55).

286 Read according to the emendation by Epstein (1921: 51).

287 For further instances of the use of הדין, see above.

288 Montgomery reads ביתה, but the emendation by Epstein with final א- is doubtless correct. See Epstein 1921: 40.

289 In the following, (a) stands for another attribute, (d) for the demonstrative pronoun, and (n) for the qualified noun.

usage of the bowl dialect in this respect. However, it is interesting that in Iddo Avinery's study of the position of the demonstrative pronoun in Syriac, the word order attested here, i.e. *d-n-a*, is rare, while the usual word order in this kind of construction in Syriac is *n-d-a*.[291]

Sporadically, הדין is used for the anticipated feminine form. In MB I we find as follows:

דהדין מהאנוש בר אזרמידוך ודהדין חוה אישתיה (lines 6-7).[292]

דהדין מהאנוש בר אזרמידוך ודהדין חוה בת אימה אינתתיה (24).

דהדין מהאנוש בר אזרמידוך ודהדין חוה בת אימה אינתתיה (26).

דהדין מהאנוש בר אזרמידוך והדה חוה אינתתיה (20).

דהדין מהאנוש בר אזרמידוך והדה חוה אינתתיה (22).

As may be noted, three times הדין is used indiscriminately instead of the anticipated הדא, and twice the feminine form הדה is used, as 'correct.' According to Gordon, this kind of use of הדין is due to ignorance on the part of the scribes of the bowl texts. Rather ironically he states (regarding the scribe of the MB I):

> Nor is the occasional (but not consistent) use of masculine *hdyn* 'this' for feminine *hdh* 'this' a tribute to the scribe's scholarship. But magicians are not expected to be savants.[293]

It is probable that the scribes of the bowl texts tried to imitate a literary dialect which was, perhaps, rather different from their vernacular. Still I find it a little difficult to believe that the differences between these two forms of the same (living) language were so significant that this kind of fluctuation could be explained merely on the basis of the scribes' education. They wrote in their mother tongue, and, therefore, there must be a deeper reason for 'ungrammatical forms' than just the scribes' poor education. A possibility that the exceptional features in MB I may be based on the influence of Mandaic is discussed above in connection with the treatment of the 3rd p. pl. suffixed pronoun (See above IV.3).

290　In addition to the examples presented above, only the following cases are known to me: להדא (לי)ליתא דשריא עים יותאי אהניך אחוי בישי 'those evil brothers of his' (AIT 4:3) נשי בת חתאי 'for this Lilith who dwells with Y. daughter of Ḥ.' (N&Sh 13:1), and אינין חרשאתא 'those enchanting women' (TB:7). Note the word order in the last case. Additionally, one finds two cases in which a noun is qualified both by the pl. demonstrative הלין and by a numeral: בשום הלין שבע מילין 'in the name of these seven words' (AIT 6:7); בשום הלן שבע מילין דישמיא (AIT 6:7). Since הלין always precedes the qualified noun, these examples prove nothing.

291　Avinery 1975: 125. The word order in this kind of contruction in Syriac is also discussed in Muraoka 1972: 194. Muraoka points out that the position of the demonstrative in the construction 'seems to have no functional significance.' The word order is discussed further below in connection with separate demonstratives and in the conclusions of this chapter.

292　'Of this M. and of this H., his wife.'

293　Gordon 1984: 220.

It may be of importance that in all the instances found in MB I, הדין when used in connection with a feminine name is immediately preceded by a case in which is it used with a masculine name (viz. מהאנוש בר אזרמידוך), e.g.

דהדין מהאנוש בר אזרמידוך (masc.) ודהדין חוה אישתיה (fem.)

In MB I, we also find הדין followed by a list of both masculine and feminine items: הדין באיתיה ודירתיה ואיסקופתיה ובית מישכביה איתתיה ובניה ובנתיה וכוליה באיתיה 'this house (masc.) of his, his dwelling (fem.), and his threshold (fem.), and his bedroom (masc.), and his wife (fem.), and his sons (masc. pl.), and his daughters (fem. pl.), and everything in his house.' (21-22). A close parallel is found in a bowl published by Naveh and Shaked: הדין ביתיה ודירתיה דבריכיש בר אחתא 'this house (masc.) and dwelling (fem.) of 'A.' (N&Sh 27: 1-2, 6).

Another instance is found in Yam 1, where one may read מזמן הדין מילתא 'this word is designated.' Even though מילתא is generally of fem. gender, it has surprisingly been taken here as a masc., as confirmed by the masc. participle מזמן. This phrase may be compared with מזמנא הדא מילתא in N&Sh 7:1, with the grammar as expected. While מזמן in Yam 1 is most obscure, we may suggest that the use of הדין, too, could be attributed to the carelessness of a scribe.

Nevertheless, one should take into consideration the possibility that these inconsistencies may testify to the beginning of a breakdown in the system of demonstrative pronouns, a trend of development which results in those Modern East Aramaic dialects in which the same form of proximal demonstrative is used for both genders.[294]

A Syriac bowl published by Naveh and Shaked (N&Sh 10) reveals an interesting parallel to the usage of MB I. This incantation uses the Syriac fem. sg. demonstrative pronoun *hāḏe* (spelt with *ḥet*!) for both the feminine and masculine names, cf. **ḥd' bršpt br 'ḥtbw** 'This Bar-Shapta *son* of Ahat-Abu' (lines 7, 13); **ḥd' nṭ[rwy] br rbyt'** 'this Natroy *son* of Rebita' (7); **wḥd' mṭry' br qymt'** 'and this Matriya *son* of Qayyamta' (7); **wḥd' rbyt' bt ḥw'** 'and this Rebita *daughter* of Hawwa' (11). In addition, as in MB I (and Yam), the BJA masc. demonstrative הדין (spelt also with *ḥet*) appears in line 13 for a feminine noun, cf. **wḥdyn rbyt'** [ ] 'and this Rebita...' The regular Syriac masc. sg. demonstrative *hānā* is not attested in this bowl. The usage of this bowl is – as far as I know – without parallel in other Syriac incantations. Correspondingly, in the Nabatean Aramaic inscriptions, the masculine demonstrative *dnh* appears occasionally as feminine and the

---

[294] There are differences among Modern East Aramaic dialects in this respect. Some dialects, such as Ṭūrōyo and Hertevin, maintain gender distinction in sg. demonstratives, whereas others, including Modern Mandaic, have lost the distinction. See Jastrow 1990: 96-97; Macuch 1965: 166; Tsereteli 1978: 62. For instance, in Modern Mandaic the forms for the sg. proximal demonstrative are *ā, hā,* and *ahā,* all of which are used for both genders.

feminine *d'* as masculine.[295] Moreover, Samaritan Aramaic attests to sg. demon-
stratives which are used indiscriminately for both genders.[296]

In AIT 28, we once meet a form spelt הדאין (line 4). It is probably a scribal
error for הדין, which – according to the emendation by Epstein – is found in the
same text as well (line 1).[297]

הידן or הודן occurs in Go 7: מזמן הי/ודן קמיא 'this charm is designated'
(Go 7:1).[298] Gordon reads הודן and argues that *waw* indicates *qameṣ*.[299] The text
– as usual – makes no distinction between *waw* and *yod*.[300] Thus both readings
(הודן/הידן) are possible. The same form is attested in J (line 1), a bowl from the
Hilprecht collection in Jena which was originally published by Gordon (bowl 'g' in
Gordon 1941),[301] and later again by Oelsner.[302] Gordon, followed by Oelsner,
reads הודין קמיעה, with *waw* after the initial *he*, but in a photograph of the Jena
text, one may read הידין קמיעה as well. Once again, *waw* and *yod* are not dis-
tinguished. The reading of Gordon and Oelsner may be supported by the sporadic
but evident use of *waw* as a counterpart of */ā/* in the same text, e.g. יותיה
'him' (6); וקומו 'and they stood up' (7).[303] In these cases, there are apparently no
grounds for reading with *yod*.[304] On the other hand, a Syriac incantation attests to
הידין with *yod* after the initial *he*, and a parallel pl. form הינין occurs in the bowl
texts.[305] Thus both readings (הודין and הידין) are possible.

אדין may appear in a couple of bowls published by Gordon, cf. אסיר אדין
'bound is this;'[306] אדין גושנין 'this G.'[307] The form – if the readings are correct –
resembles the one attested in the Samaritan Aramaic reading tradition.[308] Note also

---

[295] Levinson 1974: 33.

[296] See Macuch 1982: 135.

[297] See Epstein 1921: 55.

[298] For קמיא, see III.2.

[299] Gordon 1941: 118, 129.

[300] My judgement is based on a photograph of the text.

[301] See Gordon 1941: 346-347. The bowl has the same basic text as N&Sh 12 and B 1/2.

[302] Oelsner 1989: 39-40. Neither of the publications contain a photograph, but Müller-Kessler
has published a photograph of the text with notes, see Müller-Kessler 1994: 8-9 & Tab. III.

[303] For this phenomenon, see above III.6. Waw *as a Counterpart of* */ā/* (qameṣ).

[304] Note, however, the discussion concerning קומו in III.6.

[305] הידין is found in AIT 37:5, 7 (Syriac). The reading is based on the emendations by Naveh
and Shaked, see Naveh & Shaked 1985: 128. הינין 'these' occurs in PB:9.

[306] Bowl e from the Hilprecht collection in Jena (no photograph). See Gordon 1941: 346.
Gordon could read 'provisionally' only a few words of this this text which – according to
him – is written in 'highly dialectal Aramaic.'

[307] According to Gordon, אדין גושנין 'this Gušnin' occurs several times (lines 4, 6-7, 8, 9, and
10) in the Iraq Museum bowl no. 9736. The regular הדין appears in line 1 (מזמן הדין
'appointed is this'). See Gordon 1941: 349-350. No photograph nor facsimile of the text is
at my disposal.

the possibility that we have a variant of this pronoun in Go A:1, where we could read either אודין or אידין, but it is more likely that it represents the Hebrew אָדוֹן, 'Lord,' with *waw* for *qameṣ* (see above III.6. Waw *as a Counterpart of* */ā/).

הדין is the dominant Middle Aramaic masc. demonstrative pronoun used to point to the nearer object. In To and TJ, הדין is used alongside דין.[309] In TO and TJ הדין is used only adjectivally, generally after the qualified noun.[310] The Aramaic of Qumran, Palmyrene Aramaic, and the Aramaic of Dura Europos employ הדין as well.[311]

In the period of Late Aramaic, הדין appears as the standard masc. sg. demonstrative pronoun in Geonic Aramaic and in Nedarim.[312] The examples given by Wajsberg may suggest that הדין is common in the Aramaic of the Early Amoraim, too.[313] The standard form in Mandaic is *hazin*, while the variant with ד is attested only in some forms of the sort *hadinu*, 'this is he.'[314] Both Mandaic variants basically correspond to הדין of the Aramaic incantations. Additionally, the form with /d/ maintained in the orthography occurs once in the Mandaic incantations.[315] Alongside the standard form, Mandaic employs *hai*, which resembles the standard BTA form האי.[316] As noted, האי is also found in Nedarim, especially in the variant readings, which represent 'a text in transition.'[317] The Mandaic form *hazin* can be used both adjectivally and substantivally; and when it is used as an adjective it may either precede or follow the noun to which it belongs.[318]

In West Aramaic, הדין is attested in GA, where it is used both substantivally and adjectivally.[319] In the Palestinian Targum texts, הדין when used as an adjective appears after the qualified noun, but in contrast, Palestinian Talmudic Aramaic attests to the inverted word order.[320] הדין/הדן also predominates in the Palestinian amulets published by Naveh and Shaked.[321] Additionally, it appears in PsJ, where

---

[308] See Macuch 1982: 135.

[309] Dalman 1905: 113; Tal 1975: 8.

[310] Dalman 1905: 114; Cook 1986: 137.

[311] Tal 1975: 10.

[312] Rybak 1980: 95; Epstein 1960: 24; Tal 1975: 10.

[313] See Wajsberg 1997: 127ff.

[314] Macuch 1965: 165. For the use of ז instead of ד in Mandaic, see Nöldeke 1875: 43-44; Macuch 1965: 67-68.

[315] Yamauchi 1967: 78.

[316] Macuch 1965: 165.

[317] See Rybak 1980: 94.

[318] Nöldeke 1875: 340.

[319] Dalman 1905: 111; Kutscher 1971a: c. 272. According to Fassberg (1983: 175), the Palestinian Targum fragments from the Cairo Geniza only employ הדין adjectivally. See also Fassberg 1990: 122.

[320] Tal 1980: 49, 54.

הדין occurs 'exclusively as a post-nominal adjective,'[322] and in Samaritan Aramaic.[323] In the Samaritan Aramaic reading tradition, ־ה was not pronounced.[324]

It is striking that הדין, otherwise unattested in Syriac, is found in some Syriac incantation texts, but it is, however, possible that the use of הדין there is due to textual borrowing from the Aramaic incantations.[325]

דנא seldom occurs in the bowl incantations. It is always spelt with final *'aleph*. In addition to AIT 10, דנא is possibly attested in a bowl published by Gordon, though the text is not clear. Here it is noteworthy that the qualified word is feminine: ואיסכופתא דנא 'and this threshold' (IMB:5). According to Montgomery, it is found in AIT 6 and AIT 30 (AIT 6:6, 30:1), but as noted already by Epstein, the occurrence of דנא there is unlikely.[326] Montgomery also maintains that דנא appears in AIT 16:8 in an adverbial combination כדנא, 'likewise.' However, it is evident that כדנא in AIT 16 is akin to Syriac /kdānā/ 'yoking, bringing under the yoke,' and not connected with the demonstrative דנא.[327]

This pronoun (spelt either זן, זנה, זנא, or דנא) is the regular masc. sg. demonstrative pronoun in Old Aramaic (Ancient Aramaic) and in Official Aramaic.[328] Later on – spelt either דנא or דנה – it is attested in Biblical Aramaic,[329] in Nabatean Aramaic,[330] in Palmyrene Aramaic,[331] and occasionally in Qumran Aramaic.[332] According to Tal, דנא is not found in TJ,[333] and it is evidently unattested in TO as well. In the western dialects of the Late Aramaic period, דנא appears in GA – in *Bereshit Rabbah* and occasionally in the Palestinian Targum texts as well.[334] While דנא in Qumran Aramaic is an archaism, Tal maintains that it is used in the Palestinian Targums as 'קישוט ספרותי,' which appears only in certain

---

321   דן is also attested. הד(י)ן occurs several times in the amulets: 19:5; 19:10 and *passim*; 30:8. ד(י)ן appears in the adverbial combination כדין 'thus,' 'so' (16:8, 17) and once adjectivally: מן יומדן (17:32).

322   Cook 1986: 138.

323   Macuch 1982: 135.

324   Ibid.

325   See above and I.2.4.1. *'Koiné' Features*. The more common Syriac proximal demonstrative pronouns are *hānā* (masc.), *hāḏē* (fem.), and *hāllēn* (pl.). See Nöldeke 1898: 46.

326   See Epstein 1921: 34; 1922: 40. Based on the photograph of the text, AIT 6 is very indistinct and practically no room is left between the words.

327   See Epstein 1921: 48.

328   Segert 1975: 176; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 56-57; Folmer 1995: 198; Hug 1993: 59.

329   Rosenthal 1974: 20. The form in Biblical Aramaic is spelt with final *he*.

330   Levinson 1974: 33.

331   Rosenthal 1936: 49.

332   Tal 1980: 45.

333   Tal 1975: 8.

334   Levy 1974: 77; Cook 1986: 138; Tal 1980: 51.

phrases.[335] In PsJ דנא is 'primarily used in adverbial combinations.'[336] Among the East Aramaic dialects, דנא can be found in documents (שטרות) maintained in BT;[337] otherwise it is evidently unattested in East Aramaic. שטרות evince other archaic features as well.

דנן commonly appears in the phrase מין יומא דנן ולעולם, which with minor fluctuation in the orthography abounds in these texts.[338] Additionally, דנן appears sporadically in other contexts, e.g. רזא דנן (N&Sh 6:1); גיטא דנן 'this *get*' (SB 9);[339] לבריכיהביה דנן 'to this B.' (Go C:6 twice);[340] קמיעה דנן 'this amulet' (Ellis 5:1), and Go 1:2, where one finds דישרין באנשי דנן, which is translated by Gordon: 'which are lodged against these people (to wit).'[341] Gordon argues that the combination באנשי דנן is 'ungrammatical,' since it consists of a pl. noun and a sg. pronoun,[342] but, דנן can refer to pl. nouns too, as illustrated by the instances from PsJ and TO, cf. *dnn tlt' ywmyn* 'these three days;' *dnn 'rb'yn šnyn* 'these 40 years.'[343] However, it must be stressed that these are special cases where the time-expression has, perhaps, been understood as a single unit (cf. this period of 40 years). In the bowl texts, דנן typically appears after the qualified noun.[344]

Montgomery is of the opinion that דנן is 'archaic and seldom in Talmud.'[345] In this he is followed by Epstein, who points out that דנן is dialectal in BT and that it is attested in שטרות,[346] and by Tal, who states that דנן in Aramaic occurs in archaic language, such as incantations, שטרות, and גיטין preserved in BT.[347]

---

[335] Tal 1980: 51.

[336] Cook 1986: 138-139.

[337] Epstein 1960: 23.

[338] For the instances, see above. The same phrase as in several bowl texts is attested in BT: מיומא דנן ולעלם (Gitt 65b), cf. Epstein 1960: 24.

[339] Note that the same phrase is found in BT, representing 'Urkundenstil.' See Schlesinger 1928: 85.

[340] I have no photograph of the text at my disposal, but in a facsimile, the reading seems secure. The regular הדין appears in a parallel phrase in line 7.

[341] On the basis of the photograph, the text, on the whole, is rather poorly reserved, and it is written in a clumsy handwriting. Thus, many words remain unclear, but באנשי דנן seems to occur in the text, as read (with hesitation) by Gordon. דנן may appear as well in a bowl from the Iraq Museum published by Gordon (no. 11113), cf. קבילו קיבלא דנן which is translated by him 'receive this charm.' See Gordon 1941: 350-351. No photograph or facsimile of this text is at my disposal.

[342] Gordon 1941: 118.

[343] Examples are gathered from Cook 1986: 139.

[344] Note the difference in word order of the parallel phrases in Go C: בריכיהביה דנן (twice) as opposed to הדין בריכיהביה. The regular word order also appears in מזמן קמיעה דנן, which has been attested in Ellis 5:1, as emended by Epstein (1921: 41). Epstein's reading is highly probable.

[345] Montgomery 1913: 131.

[346] Epstein 1960: 23.

The spelling דנאן is also found in BTA.[348] דנן is attested rarely in TO, where it is mostly used adverbially.[349] In addition, דנן occurs in GA – mostly in adverbial combinations – and in TJ, where it is used only as an adverb, such as כדנן 'so, thus.'[350] Tal argues that besides TO and TJ, the occurrences of דנן in Targums are suspect.[351] All in all, דנן is one of the less frequent demonstratives in any dialect of Aramaic, and it seems to be quite often connected with time-expressions.[352]

דנין, which is attested twice in N&Sh 25, presents an enigma. One may ask whether the form should be read דנון with *waw*; דנון is listed by Epstein as 'an archaic and dialectal' form appearing in BTA.[353] Generally in the bowl texts, ו and י are hardly distinguishable.[354] In the pointed texts, such as TJ, the final syllable of דנן is vocalized with *qameṣ* (or *miqpaṣ pumma*).[355] Hence, the reading with *waw* (instead of *yod*) would testify to the use of *waw* where *qameṣ* is expected, a phenomenon attested sporadically in the bowl texts (see above III.6. Waw *as a Counterpart of* **/ā/*).

In the bowl texts, דין is attested as a variant of דנן in basically the same phrase. Compare מין יומא דנן ולעולם (N&Sh 18:2); מן יומא דין ולעולם (AIT 3:5). This phrase either with דין or דנן is a very common idiom in the bowl texts. In AIT 25, one finds the variant מן יומא דין ולגליל עלם 'from this day for the sphere of eternity' (line 7).

In addition, דין appears sporadically: דין איסורה 'this is the bond' (N&Sh 18:2; 19:1); דין רזא 'this mystery' (N&Sh 19:1).[356] The instances show that besides the stereotyped phrase דין יומא, דין can be used both adjectivally and substantivally. It is typical of many Aramaic dialects that דין is used only substantivally.[357] דין is possibly used as part of the particle כיהידין 'thus' in AIT 15:5.[358]

---

347 Tal 1975: 9.

348 Epstein 1960: 23.

349 Dalman 1905: 113.

350 Dalman 1905: 111; Cook 1986: 139; Tal 1975: 8. Cook gives an example where דנן is clearly used as an adjective, viz. *ṭwr' ṭbt' dnn* 'this good mountain' (Deut. 3:25).

351 Tal 1975: 8, especially n. 6. In other Targums, examples of דנן are found e.g. from PsJ. See Cook 1986: 137, 139.

352 Apart from the examples found in the bowl texts, cf. the instances adduced from TJ: דנן תלחא זמנין;דנן ארבעים שנין, see Tal 1975: 8; and in PsJ: דנן אשרין שנין, see Cook 1986: 139.

353 See Epstein 1960: 23.

354 Naveh and Shaked pointed out the difficulty in distinguishing *waw* and *yod* in this text at least as regards עליכו, which could also be read עליכי. See Naveh & Shaked 1993: 138.

355 See Tal 1976: 8-9. Note also the spelling דנאן found in BTA.

356 דין קמיעא has been attested in line 1 of a bowl originally published by Jeruzalmi (= Isbell 69:1). I cannot check the reading.

357 Thus in GA (at least in the Palestinian Talmud and in Targum Neophyti), in TO, TJ, and primarily also in PsJ. See Dalman 1905: 113; Levy 1974: 79; Cook 1986: 137-138.

דֵין is the main form of the masc. sg. demonstrative pronoun in the Genesis Apocryphon (spelt דן) and in many other Aramaic texts from Qumran.[359] In TO and TJ it is normally used substantivally, whereas the form with prefixed *hā* (i.e. הֲדֵין) is used adjectivally.[360] דֵין occurs also in GA and rarely in Palestinian Christian Aramaic, along with הֲדֵין.[361] In BTA, דֵין is one of the less frequent demonstratives; it is commonly attested in the tradition which is connected with the Palestinian rabbis;[362] and, in addition, it is characteristic of the Aramaic dialect of the Early Amoraim, which has been analyzed by Eljakim Wajsberg.[363]

הֲהֵין is attested once in the bowl texts: בכסא ההין 'in this bowl' (AIT 14:6). Epstein reads הֵין here,[364] but on the basis of a photograph of the text, the correct reading is doubtless ההין. Since הֲדֵין is attested in the same text as well, it is possible that ההין is a scribal error. Note כסא הדין 'this bowl' (line 1) and הֲדֵין בכסא (6). Especially the latter instance, which completely parallels the phrase with ההין, arouses suspicion that ההין in this text is miswritten for הֲדֵין. On the other hand, ההין is found in GA (spelt either ההין or ההן), where it generally appears as an adjective.[365] Thus, the attestation of ההין here is possible as well. If so, it would be noteworthy that we meet in a BJA bowl text with a form which is unknown in Middle Aramaic as well as in East Aramaic, but familiar from West Aramaic.

The regular Syriac demonstrative *hānā* may occur sporadically in the bowl texts: הנה צילמה 'this is the figure' (N&Sh 18:1);[366] וקמת וצוחת על הנא סאיני וססאיני וסנגרו וארתיקו. The latter example is from a bowl published by Gordon (Hilprecht bowl g).[367] This bowl has the same basic story as N&Sh 12,

---

358   Montgomery reads מנה ביהיכדין which is emended by Epstein מנה כיהיכדין and translated 'il compta ainsi.' See Epstein 1921: 47. Epstein argues that 'la lecture est sûre,' but the first letter looks much more like *bet* in a photograph, even though the distinction between *bet* and *kaph* is far from certain in this text. The decision is complicated by the fact that the idiom appears in the middle of a magical formula with no evident meaning. According to Gordon, הכדין appears in a bowl from the Iraq Museum (no. 9736) published by him. See Gordon 1941: 349-350.

359   Kutscher 1957: 4; Tal 1980: 45.

360   Dalman 1905: 114; Cook 1986: 137. It is interesting that also in TO, TJ, the Palestinian Targum, and in PsJ דֵין is used in stereotyped time-expressions, e.g. *yōmā dēn* 'today.' See Cook 1986: 137-8; Levy 1974: 79.

361   Levy 1974: 77, 79; Schulthess 1924: 33; Müller-Kessler 1991: 71.

362   Epstein 1960: 23-24. Epstein puts דֵין under the rubric ארכאית ודיאלקטית וגאונים.

363   See Wajsberg 1997: 127.

364   Epstein 1921: 47.

365   Dalman 1905: 111; Tal 1980: 53. Dalman argues that ההין can be derived from הֲדֵין. He states: 'Aus הֲדֵין ist durch Abschleifung des ד und neue Vorsetzung der Partikel ה entstanden a) mit Erhaltung des Vokals der zweiten Silbe: *comm.* ההין' (Dalman 1905: 111).

366   The text has also been published by Geller (= Aaron bowl A) in Geller 1986: 107.

367   See Gordon 1941: 346-347. A photograph of this text is included in Müller-Kessler 1994.

and it is possible that וקמת וצוחת על הנא סאיני in the Hilprecht bowl is a corruption of the more original (?) וקמת וצוחת עלוהי אסאוני 'she stood up and cried at him: O S.' in N&Sh 12a:5.[368]

Since other demonstratives attested in N&Sh 18 are normal BJA forms (viz. דין and הדין), there remains a possibility that הנא in N&Sh 18 is the Hebrew particle *hinnē*.[369] The most promising example occurs in Go K:1, where the text runs מזמן הנא 'designated is this.' Since the rest of the phrase is unintelligible, we cannot be absolutely sure what the letters *he, nun,* and *'aleph* stand for, but it is probable that the Syriac form of demonstrative appears here;[370] the combination מזמן + demonstrative + noun is frequently encountered in these texts. It is interesting that הנא is written here with final *'aleph*, in keeping with the Syriac spelling tradition and as opposed to other occurrences of this form in the Aramaic bowl texts. The text under discussion exhibits no other telltale Syriac features.

Until more evidence is available, the significance of these occurrences remains unclear.

The regular fem. sg. form, pointing to the immediate object, is הדא. When used adjectivally, הדא mostly precedes the qualified noun, e.g. הדא רשנוי בת מארת 'this R. daughter of M.' (AIT 8:13, 17); הדא חתמתא 'this sealing' (AIT 9:11).[371] The inverted word order is, however, found sporadically, e.g. ואיסקופתה הדא 'this threshold' (AIT 10:2).[372]

The earliest attestation of הדא is in Middle Aramaic; it occurs in TO and TJ alongside דא; the former is normally used adjectivally and the latter substantively.[373] Additionally, it is one of the less common demonstratives in Qumran Aramaic.[374]

הדא is common throughout East Aramaic; it is known in Mandaic, where *hada* is used as a 'doublet of the more frequent *haza*,' and in Syriac, where it is almost the exclusive form.[375] In both dialects, it may either precede or follow the modified noun, when used as an adjective.[376] Moreover, הדא appears in Nedarim,

---

[368] The same text is attested in B1/2 (line 5) published by Müller-Kessler.

[369] Naveh and Shaked assume that the form under discussion could be Hebrew *hinnē,* but 'it is somewhat more likely that we have the Syriac form of the demonstrative pronoun.' For further discussion on הנה, see I.2.4.1. '*Koiné' Features.*

[370] The reading of Gordon is evident in a photograph of the text.

[371] More examples can be found at the beginning of this chapter.

[372] Read according to the emendation by Epstein (1921: 40).

[373] Dalman 1905: 114.

[374] Tal 1980: 46.

[375] Macuch 1965: 165; Nöldeke 1898: 46.

[376] Nöldeke 1875: 340; 1898: 171. Nöldeke's opinion that the demonstrative pronoun either precedes or follows the modified noun in Syriac is partly rejected by Avinery (1975: 123ff), who argues that the demonstrative pronoun in most cases follows the qualified noun.

alongside the standard BTA form הא; and it is the predominant form in Geonic Aramaic as well.[377]

Among the West Aramaic dialects, הדא (also spelt הדה) is attested in GA, including Targum Neophyti, alongside דא,[378] in Palestinian Christian Aramaic,[379] in Samaritan Aramaic,[380] and in PsJ.[381] In GA, הדה/הדא is generally used as an adjective, while דה/דא appears in the function of a substantive.[382] In addition, הדה is the sole attested fem. sg. form in the Palestinian amulets published by Naveh and Shaked.[383]

When used adjectivally, הדא generally follows the modified noun in many Middle and Late Aramaic dialects, such as TO, TJ, the Palestinian Targum texts, and PsJ.[384] However, in most of them there is arbitrariness in this respect. On the other hand, in Palestinian Talmudic Aramaic, including the Palestinian Midrashim, הדא as well as other proximal demonstratives precede the modified noun.[385]

Alongside the standard הדא, דא/דה is found infrequently in the bowl texts. It appears in a phrase which with slight variations is common in the incantations: מן יומא דנן ושעתא דה וילעלם 'from this day and this hour and for ever' (Go 1:4). Moreover, it is attested sporadically. For instance, דא occurs several times in Go D, qualifying a female name: וקאמוי דא בת זארק 'and this Q. daughter of Z.' (Go D:6, 12, 14, 15).[386] As to their use, no distinction is made between the regular הדא and דא: both forms may be used adjectivally, as is evident from Go D, where הדא is used in the same function as the above-discussed מנה דהדא דירתא :דא 'from this dwelling' (Go D:8); בהדא איסקופתא 'on this threshold' (Go D:12); and וקאמוי דא בת זארק 'and this Q. daughter of Z.'[387] This is in agreement with the evident fact that in the bowl texts, no different sets of demonstratives are used for substantival *versus* adjectival usage. However, it may be argued that הדא mostly precedes the qualified noun, and דא/דה follows it (note the instances above).[388]

---

[377] Rybak 1960: 85.

[378] Dalman 1905: 111; Fassberg 1983: 177; 1990: 120-121, 123; Levy 1974: 80.

[379] Schulthess 1924: 33; Müller-Kessler 1991: 71.

[380] Macuch 1982: 135. In the Samaritan reading tradition, the pronunciation is [āda].

[381] Cook 1986: 137.

[382] Fassberg 1983: 175; 1990: 120-121; Tal 1980: 47ff.

[383] הדה is found in the amulets 16:18, 17:7, and 27:19.

[384] See Cook 1986: 137-138; Tal 1980: 48ff.; Fassberg 1990: 121.

[385] Tal 1980: 54.

[386] I have no photograph of Go D at my disposal, but according to a facsimile, the readings are evidently correct. In line 14, אינתתיה 'his wife' is added after דא.

[387] The readings of Go D look secure in a facsimile.

[388] Since דא is rarely attested in these texts, one must be careful in this respect. דא also appears in a Syriac bowl published by Geller, cf. *ḥtym' 'sqpt' d'* 'sealed is this threshold'

דה/דא as fem. sg. is well attested in Aramaic. In the Ancient Aramaic inscriptions and in Official Aramaic, one finds the spellings זא, זה, and דה,[389] whereas דא is found in Biblical Aramaic.[390] דה/דא is common throughout Middle Aramaic; the spelling דא predominates, being the sole or main variant of this form in TO,[391] TJ,[392] in the Aramaic of Qumran,[393] and in Nabatean Aramaic.[394] Palmyrene Aramaic attests to the spelling דה.[395]

In the Late Aramaic period, דה/דא is peculiar to West Aramaic. It is found in GA, including Targum Neophyti,[396] in Palestinian Christian Aramaic alongside the more common *hāḏā*,[397] and in PsJ.[398] Within East Aramaic, דא appears only in Mandaic, where it had 'a very limited use,'[399] and in the documents (שטרות) found in BT.[400] Moreover, it is attested in BT in the tradition which is connected with the Palestinian rabbis.[401]

דא is possibly attested as a *masc.* form in SB where the text runs: דגיסא דא שליט דהוא על טור (SB 7-8), which is translated by Geller 'of this troop which was ruling over the mountain.' Since שליט should be a masc. form, דא must be understood as a masc. demonstrative. גיס in the meaning 'troop' is attested in N&Sh 13:6, and it should be of masc. gender.[402] In line 9, one reads גיטא דנן 'this *geṭ*,' which may suggest that דא in line 7 is a scribal error. While the photograph of the bowl is rather poor, the readings remain uncertain.[403]

(line 5) and *ḥtym byt' d'* 'sealed is this household' (line 12). See Geller 1986: 422ff. Since דא is evidently otherwise unattested in Syriac, one could take it here as a '*koiné*' feature, according to the classification by Harviainen (see above I.2.4.1). However, a dot under *ālaf* in a latter example indicates that דא here is a shortened variant of the regular Syriac *hāḏē*.

[389] See Segert 1975: 175-176; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 56-57; Hug 1993: 59; Degen 1969: 59; Dion 1974: 156; Fitzmyer 1967: 152. The spelling זא is regular in Old Aramaic (Ancient Aramaic) and in Official Aramaic, while דה only appears once in the Hermopolis papyri. According to Segert (1975: 176), the spelling זה is attested in the Asshur Ostracon. This spelling, however, is not listed in other relevant studies.

[390] Rosenthal 1974: 20.

[391] Dalman 1905: 113.

[392] Tal 1975: 8.

[393] Beyer 1984: 545-546; Tal 1980: 45.

[394] Levinson 1974: 33.

[395] Rosenthal 1936: 49.

[396] Dalman 1905: 111; Golomb 1985: 54-55.

[397] Schulthess 1924: 33; Müller-Kessler 1991: 71.

[398] Cook 1986: 137, 139.

[399] Macuch 1965: 165.

[400] Epstein 1960: 23-24.

[401] Ibid.

[402] Cf. e.g. Syriac *gaysā* 'troop.' See Payne Smith 1903: 69.

[403] See Geller 1997: 325.

As noted above, the regular pl. form in these bowl texts is הלין, equivalent to English 'these.' It is used exclusively as an adjective, always before the modified noun, e.g. הלין שמהתא 'these names' (N&Sh 2:7). Once we encounter the spelling האלין (Yam 9).

הלין occurs generally in the East Aramaic dialects of the Late Aramaic period, while in Middle Aramaic it is known to me only in the Palmyrene inscriptions.[404] It is evidently a contracted form from earlier *hā + 'illēn.[405] Among the East Aramaic dialects, הלין is attested as the sole pl. form in Mandaic and Syriac,[406] while Geonic Aramaic employs both אלין and הלין.[407] In Nedarim, הלין is the regular form, but אלין and the standard BTA form הני are also used.[408] When Mandaic or Syriac employ it adjectivally, it may appear either before or after the qualified noun.[409] The same holds true for BTA, but it is more common that the demonstrative precedes the noun.[410]

In the West Aramaic dialects, it is found in PsJ,[411] among other forms, in Palestinian Christian Aramaic as the only form,[412] in Samaritan,[413] and also in GA.[414]

הנין is attested several times in a bowl published by Geller, e.g. דהנין אינשי 'of these men' (PB:6). It always appears in basically the same phrase with minor variations in the spelling.[415] הינין is found once in the same bowl as well: דהינין אינשה 'of these men;' it is either a scribal error for the more common הנין or a variant with a diphthong in the first syllable. The latter possibility may, perhaps, gain additional force from the fact that other demonstrative pronouns with the same sort of variation are recorded in other Aramaic dialects: according to

---

[404] Rosenthal 1936: 49. The standard form is, however, אלן, ibid.

[405] Note that האלין, which is also attested in our texts (see above), may represent this form. Yet, it is equally possible that the *'aleph* is a vowel letter for /ā/. An earlier phase of the development can evidently be seen in forms such as הא אלן, cf. Rosenthal 1936: 50.

[406] Macuch 1965: 165; Nöldeke 1896: 46.

[407] Epstein 1960: 24; Rybak 1980: 82.

[408] Epstein 1960: 24; Rybak 1980: 82; Wajsberg 1997: 130.

[409] Nöldeke 1875: 340; 1898: 170.

[410] Margolis 1910: 71.

[411] Cook 1986: 137.

[412] Schulthess 1924: 33; Müller-Kessler 1991: 71.

[413] The forms attested in the orthography of Samaritan Aramaic are האלין, האלין/א, and אהלין, while the pronunciations in the reading tradition are [āllen] and [âllen]. Macuch 1982: 135.

[414] Levy 1974: 79; Fassberg 1990: 123. According to Levy, הלין, is found in *Bereshit Rabbah*. According to Tal (1980: 51), Palestinian Talmudic Aramaic attests to the forms א(י)לין and הלין, the former being more common.

[415] One would expect instead of אינשה (lines 4, 6) and אינשא (line 9), אינשי as in line 6 or בני אינשה as in lines 1 and 2.

Dalman, הילין 'these' occurs in GA alongside הלין;[416] and a Syriac incantation uses הידין 'this' alongside הדין.[417] Note also that הידין may occur in Go 7:1, though Gordon reads הודן.[418]

Both הנין and הינין are rather peculiar, and we have so far not come across them in any other incantation.[419] As such, they are rarely attested in other Aramaic dialects. According to Rybak, הנין occurs once in Nedarim.[420] הנין is related to the standard BTA demonstrative הני 'these,' and Modern Mandaic *hannī* 'these.'[421] The Syriac *feminine* demonstrative of distance *hānnen* 'those' is evidently derived from the same form as well. The omission of *nun* in final position is typical of standard BTA.[422] Originally הנין was evidently a 'sister form' of the more common הלין, with a change of liquid.[423] Changes of liquids are well attested in East Aramaic dialects, especially in Mandaic.[424]

אילין is one of the less frequent demonstrative pronouns appearing in the bowl texts. It is known already in Old (Ancient) and Official Aramaic;[425] in the period of Middle Aramaic, it occurs in Qumran Aramaic as the standard form,[426] in TO,[427] in TJ,[428] and in Palmyrene.[429]

Within the Eastern branch of Late Aramaic, it is known in Geonic Aramaic alongside הלין, in the variant readings of Nedarim alongside הלין, and it also predominates in שטרות quoted in BT.[430] The characteristic form of GA is אֵלַיִין, with the original diphthong triphthongised.[431] Nevertheless, the form in the bowl

---

[416]   Dalman 1905: 111.

[417]   הידין is found in AIT 37:5, 7. The reading is based on the emendations by Naveh and Shaked (1985: 128).

[418]   See above.

[419]   According to Montgomery's reading, הני appears in AIT 29:8, even though he does not translate it, but as shown by Epstein (1921: 58), the reading is incorrect.

[420]   Rybak 1980: 109: הנין תרתי (Nedarim 2b); for reasons unknown to me, Rybak translates הנין as 'those.'

[421]   See Epstein 1960: 23; Macuch 1965: 165. It is striking, as noted by Macuch, that הני is unattested in Classical Mandaic, though it still lives in Modern Mandaic (*hannī*).

[422]   Kutscher 1971a: c. 279. See also III.3. *Word-final Consonants*.

[423]   Rybak (1980: 82) demonstrates the following development: הלין < הנין < הני.

[424]   See Nöldeke 1875: 50-55.

[425]   The spelling in Ancient and Official Aramaic is אלן, while the Biblical Aramaic form is spelt אֵלֶּן. See Segert 1975: 175-176; Degen 1969: 59. אלן is unattested in Egyptian Aramaic, which employs אלה. Muraoka & Porten 1998: 56, especially n. 270.

[426]   Tal 1980: 45.

[427]   Dalman 1905: 113.

[428]   Tal 1975: 9.

[429]   Rosenthal 1936: 49.

[430]   Rybak 1980: 82; Epstein 1960: 23-24.

texts is evidently to be read ['illēn] as in Biblical Aramaic and TO. The Palestinian amulets attest to the spelling אלין.[432]

אילי is attested in AIT 25: מן קדם אילי נסתרתי ואלי נסתרן [ ] 'from these you are kept and these' (?) (line 2). אילה אינון מלאכיה 'these are the angels' (5).[433] The reading and translation of the first phrase is problematic. Montgomery reads and translates: מן קדם אילי נסתרתי ואלי נסתרי 'from these you are kept and these are kept (from you).' Epstein reads (based on a facsimile): מן קדם אילי ויסתרתי ואלי ויסתרתי.[434] On the basis of a photograph, *nun* is certain, as read by Montgomery. The end of the sentence is very indistinct and remains unclear.

אילי, אלי, and אלה could be related to אילין, with the loss of the terminal *nun*. However, though the loss of terminal *nun* is typical of BJA, אלי, אילי, and אלה are rare or totally unattested in Late Aramaic. Note also that *nun* in the terminal position is otherwise retained in that text, e.g. הדין, אינון, ויקרבון, להון. Hence, there remains the possibility that the use of these pronouns here is in imitation of אלה known in Official Aramaic, including Biblical Aramaic (spelt in Biblical Aramaic אֵלֶּה). However, it is most likely that these pronouns should be explained as Hebraisms, since the text under discussion contains other Hebrew elements as well.[435]

The more common proximal demonstrative pronouns appearing in the bowl texts may be compared with other relevant Aramaic dialects with the aid of the following table:

Singular:

	הדין	דנן	דנא	דין	הדא
TO	+	+	−	+	+
TJ	+	+	−	+	+
standard BTA	−	−	−	−	−
Nedar	+	+	−	−	+
Geonic	+	−	−	−	+
Syriac	−	−	−	−	+
Mandaic	+	−	−	−	+

---

431   For the pronouns attested in GA, see Kutscher 1971a: c. 272 and Tal 1980: 46ff. At least the Palestinian Targum fragments attest to an almost consistent distinction between אֵלֵּין (in which the original diphthong contracts) and הָאֵלַּיִן (in which the original diphthong is divided into two syllables or becomes a triphthong). The former is used as an adjective, whereas the latter is used substantively. See Fassberg 1983: 176; 1990: 120-121. In GA, one also finds the spelling אֵלֵּין, see ibid. and Levy 1974: 80.

432   אלין is the only pl. form found so far in the amulets; it occurs in amulets 19:8 and 26:9.

433   On the basis of a photograph, א and ל of אלה are certain, but the third letter is problematic. If it is ה, the vertical stroke is faded.

434   See Epstein 1921: 53.

435   See Montgomery 1913: 208; Epstein 1921: 53-54.

Plural:

	הלין	אילין
TO	–	+
TJ	–	+
standard BTA	–	–
Nedarim	+	+
Geonic	+	+
Syriac	+	–
Mandaic	+	–

Demonstrative pronouns of distance

Demonstrative pronouns of distance rarely appear in the bowl texts (see the beginning of this chapter). As is well known in many Aramaic dialects, 3rd p. independent personal pronouns may be used as demonstrative pronouns, e.g. ההיא ליליתא 'that Lilith' (N&Sh 5:6); אינון מלאכין 'those angels' (AIT 13:4); בההוא איסורא 'by that bond' (TB:1). In the bowl texts, they are used almost only adjectivally, always before the qualified noun (see the examples above). When used adjectivally, the sg. forms הוא and היא appear with the prefixed demonstrative element -ה (cf. דין and הדין),[436] whereas in the pl. we encounter forms both with and without -ה: אינון and אינין as opposed to הנון, which is most likely to be taken as a combination of אינון and -ה. It is noteworthy that אינון and אינין appear without the prefixed -ה in the bowl texts, since normally the dialects which use the forms with this element (e.g. the Palestinian Targums and PsJ) attest to it in both sg. and plural.[437]

---

[436] A possible exception is attested in AIT 30, where Montgomery twice reads הוא מרא 'that lord' (lines 4 and 5). However, Epstein emends with good reason: חיאמרא (or חואמרא) which is the name of an evil spirit corresponding to חומרא (or חימרא) in line 3. See Epstein 1922: 40.

[437] Because of this, one may argue that אינון or אינין are not used as demonstratives, but as independent personal pronouns. This view is evidently reflected in Naveh's and Shaked's translation of N&SH 15:1-4, cf. אנדוך וגושני בת בר(ז)אנדוך גוריי בר חתימין וימחתמין 'may (the following) be sealed (2) and countersealed: Gōray son of Burzāndukh, (3) and Gusgnay daughter of Ifra-Hurmiz and Gōray son of Frāda-dukh, *they*, (4) their sons... those G. son of B. and G. daughter of 'I. and G. son of F. be sealed and countersealed' (N&Sh 15:1-3). This interpretation is very possible. Note especially a somewhat parallel phrase in Go D:5-6 where this is the case. However, one may also understand אינון as a demonstrative, since it is common in the bowl texts that a demonstrative pronoun appear after or before the personal name of a client, e.g. חתים ביתיה דמיהרוי בר גושנאי הדין 'may the house of *this* M. son of G. be sealed...' (N&Sh 19:9); איסרין נידרי ולוטתא וקיריתא מיניה דסרגיס ברברנדוך הדין 'the vows, curses, and misfortunes are bound from *this* S. son of B.' (N&Sh 23:7-8); תוב חתימין ומחתמין הלין בר שרקוי וניונדוך אינתתה בת כפני וזדוי ברה 'again sealed and countersealed are *these*: the son of Sh. and N. his wife daughter of K., and Z. her son' (AIT 10:4). Note also e.g. AIT 3:4, 8:1, 9:3-4, 19:3-4, 26:4. In addition, אינון in AIT 13:4 is

הוֹא and הִיא are common as demonstratives throughout Aramaic, while אִינּוּן and אִינִּין are restricted to JA.[438] Even though אִינִּין as a personal pronoun (fem. pl. 'they') is well known in JA,[439] it is is rarely attested as a demonstrative pronoun. This is evidently due to the fact that fem. demonstratives in general are less commonly attested in Aramaic texts than the corresponding masc. forms.

הנהון appears several times in Go L; הנון is found twice alongside הנהון (see above). To my knowledge, הנהון as such is otherwise unattested in Aramaic, but it closely resembles the BTA form הנהו.[440]

According to Gordon, הנון indicates that the second *he* of הנהון was not pronounced.[441] Alternatively, one may argue that הנון equals the Syriac demonstrative pronoun *hānnon* 'those,'[442] or it may be taken as a misspelling for הנהון, or else we should read הנין.[443] Still it is possible to maintain that it is a phonetic spelling of האינון, well known from JA (see below).

Save the above-discussed הנון/הנהון, basically the same set of distal demonstratives as in the bowl texts already occurs in Biblical Aramaic.[444] Later on, ההוא, ההיא, and האינון are attested alongside the demonstratives proper in TO,[445] TJ,[446] in GA, including the Palestinian Targums,[447] and in PsJ.[448]. In all of these, the

---

אינון מלאכין ירחמון ויחבבון (ו)יחבקון ית .unquestionably a demonstrative pronoun, cf בהמנדוך בת סמא 'may those angels pity and love and...and embrace B. daughter of S.' (AIT 4-5). Read according to the emendation by Epstein (1921: 44). Note also the note of Naveh and Shaked concerning Aramaic amulets: 'The demonstrative pronoun is often used as a kind of article with proper names' (Naveh & Shaked 1993: 65).

438 הוא appears as a demonstrative already in the Ancient Aramaic inscriptions. See Degen 1969: 59.

439 It is found in Biblical Aramaic, TO, TJ, GA including Targum Neophyti, PsJ and in Geonic Aramaic. Rosenthal 1974: 19; Dalman 1905: 106-107; Tal 1975: 1; Golomb 1985: 48; Fassberg 1990: 112; Cook 1986: 131; Epstein 1960: 20.

440 For this form, see Epstein 1960: 25. It is most likely a combination of הא + אנהו. In addition to הנהון, Go L exhibits only a few linguistic features which deviate from the majority of the bowl texts: Only *nun* appears in Go L as an imperfect prefix, cf. ניהדרון (line 6), ניהדר (line 8), ניתבדר (line 11). Moreover, ניהדר seems to appear as a fem. form.

441 See Gordon 1937: 94.

442 For the Syriac forms, see Nöldeke 1898: 46. הינון is attested in Mandaic and, alongside other forms, in GA. See Nöldeke 1875: 89; Sokoloff 1990: 163.

443 הנין is one of the proximal demonstrative pronouns discussed earlier in this chapter.

444 The forms found in Biblical Aramaic are הוא and אנון (see Rosenthal 1974: 21). Feminine forms are unattested. Alongside אנון, the Old Aramaic form אלך is attested as well. See Rosenthal 1974: 20.

445 Dalman 1905: 113.

446 Tal 1975: 11.

447 Tal 1980: 60-61. The Palestinian Targums display the forms ההוא, ההיא, and האינון, whereas in Palestinian Talmudic Aramaic אינון is rare and, instead, demonstratives proper, such as איליך and הלוך, are used. Additionally, forms based on the object particle ית appear as demonstratives of distance.

above set of demonstratives is used only adjectivally.[449] In Samaritan Aramaic, we encounter the forms ההוא, ההיא, and (ה)אינון in the older strata of the language.[450] Later, they were replaced by other forms.[451] The forms based on ההוא and ההיא are attested alongside other sg. forms in Palestinian Christian Aramaic and as the sole sg. forms in Syriac.[452] The pl. form (ה)אינון is unattested.

The situation in Mandaic is different, since the main forms of Mandaic to designate the farther object are specifically Mandaic pronouns האנאתה (sg. c.), האנאתון (masc. pl.) and האנאתין (fem. pl.).[453] One also encounters, alongside other forms, the sg. forms האהו and האהע, which correspond to ההוא and ההיא in the bowl texts, while in the pl. Mandaic has הינון,[454] resembling the above-discussed הנון.

Standard BTA uses ההוא and ההיא in the sg. and הנהו in the pl.[455] Geonic Aramaic and the dialect of the writings of Anan attest to the corresponding sg. forms written ההו and ההי, respectively.[456]

In Biblical Aramaic as well as in TO, TJ, the Palestinian Targums, and PsJ these forms, when used as adjectives, usually occur in the post-nominal position.[457] In contrast with the above-mentioned dialects, in Palestinian Talmudic Aramaic distal demonstratives precede the modified noun.[458] In BTA and – in the opinion of Nöldeke – also in Syriac, they may either precede or follow the noun, the former being more common in BTA and in the older strata of Syriac.[459] Concerning the word order in Syriac, Nöldeke states:

> Die meisten alten Schriftsteller (wie Afr.) stellen das Demonstrativ öfter vor; andre lieben jedoch mehr die Nachstellung, aber alles ohne Consequenz.[460]

---

[448]   Cook 1986: 140.

[449]   Dalman 1905: 114; Tal 1980: 60-61; Cook 1986: 140.

[450]   Tal 1980: 62.

[451]   Ibid.; Macuch 1982: 135.

[452]   Schulthess 1924: 33; Müller-Kessler 1991: 71-72; Nöldeke 1898: 46. Syriac has the forms *haw* and *hāy*, while the forms *haw*, *'āhū* and *hāy*, *āhī* occur in Palestinian Christian Aramaic.

[453]   Nöldeke 1875: 91. According to the reading tradition, the forms were pronounced [hanatia], [hanatun], [hanatin] respectively (see Macuch 1965: 165).

[454]   Nöldeke 1875: 89, 336. Also in the sg., the forms without the prefixed *ha-* (i.e. הו and הע) are attested. Nöldeke 1875: 336.

[455]   Epstein 1960: 25.

[456]   Epstein 1960: 26.

[457]   Rosenthal 1974: 21; Cook 1986: 138, 140; Tal 1980: 60.

[458]   Tal 1980: 61.

[459]   Nöldeke 1898: 171; Margolis 1910: 71. In all the instances of ההוא and ההיא cited by Epstein, ההוא and ההיא precede the noun. See Epstein 1960: 26.

[460]   Ibid.

Avinery, in his paper on the Syriac demonstrative pronouns, argues, however, that in Syriac 'the cases in which the demonstrative pronoun precedes the substantive are not frequent.'[461]

In Mandaic, הָאהֹו and הָאהֹע can be used both substantivally and adjectivally, and when used as demonstrative adjectives, they can either precede or follow the qualified noun.[462] At least the masc. form הָאהֹו occurs more often before than after the noun.[463]

Thus, one encounters the word order which basically parallels that of the bowl texts in East Aramaic dialects – Syriac possibly excluded – as well as in Palestinian Talmudic Aramaic. In contrast, the basic array of distal demonstratives used in the bowl texts is that of Jewish Middle Aramaic (Biblical Aramaic, TO, TJ) and West Aramaic (the Palestinian Targums, PsJ, Samaritan Aramaic).

The only distal demonstrative proper whose attestation is certain in the magic bowls is אֲהנִיך, found in AIT 4:3. Epstein noted that this bowl has a Mandean flavour, even though it is written in the Jewish script.[464] According to Greenfield, אֲהנִיך is 'well known from both Babylonian Aramaic and Mandaic.'[465] As such, it is evidently unattested in BTA, whereas the regular form in BTA is הנך/הנאך.[466] The characteristic form in Mandaic is הָאנִיך.[467] The BTA form is vocalized as הֲנַך by Epstein, but Macuch maintains that the vocalization of the type הַנֵּך appears in BTA as well.[468] Basically the same form is also attested in modern Ṭūrōyō, i.e. *hānǝk*.[469]

Possible is also דוֹך, which, according to the emendation by Epstein, occurs in AIT 28: דוֹך דתקי (AIT 28:2). Epstein translates 'cette famille,' but the reading is far from certain.[470] He argues that דוֹך resembles דָּך.[471] דָּך appears as a fem. sg. demonstrative pronoun 'that' in Biblical Aramaic.[472] Note that *waw* apparently

---

461 Aninery 1975: 123ff. The material of Avinery's analysis consists of the Peshitta translation of the Pentateuch, see Avinery 1975: 123. Taking into account the voluminous nature of the literature written in Syriac, it is quite possible that there are differences in this respect. One should also bear in mind the possibility of Hebrew influence in the case of the Peshitta OT.

462 Macuch 1965: 407; Nöldeke 1875: 338.

463 Macuch 1965: 408.

464 See Epstein 1921: 33.

465 Greenfield 1973: 151.

466 See Epstein 1960: 25. In the same place Epstein states that אהניך is attested in the bowl texts: 'בהשבעות: אהניך.'

467 Nöldeke 1875: 91.

468 See Macuch 1965: 165.

469 Jastrow 1990: 96.

470 See Epstein 1921: 56, where דתקי is also discussed.

471 Ibid.

472 Rosenthal 1974: 20.

testifies to the rounding of original /ā/ (see above III.6. Waw *as a Counterpart of* */ā/*). Yet, the reading with *yod* is also possible, since דָּךְ, the masc. counterpart of דָּךְ, is also familiar from Biblical Aramaic.[473] Is דתקי of masc. or fem. gender? דיך (masc.) and דך (fem.) are also attested in GA.[474] TO and TJ employ דיכי among more common forms.[475] According to Tal, it is evident that דיכי was already moribund at the time when TJ was composed.[476]

CONCLUSIONS[477]

This study shows that the demonstrative pronouns of standard BTA are unattested in the bowl texts. The only possible exceptions known to me are אהניך and הנהון. As noted above, the basic series of proximal demonstratives in the bowl texts is הדין, הדא, and הלין (compare the table presented above). The same series appears as archaic and dialectal forms in BTA, especially in the Nedarim type of tractate and in Geonic Aramaic. TO and TJ employ the same sg. forms, but the pl. form הלין is unattested. All of these forms are attested in many West Aramaic dialects of the Late Aramaic period as well. The isoglosses in common with West Aramaic are evidently to be interpreted as a shared heritage from Middle Aramaic.[478]

As for the less common demonstratives appearing in the bowl texts, it is of importance that most of them are typical of both Middle Aramaic and West Aramaic. These include דנא, דין, דנן, דה, אילין, and אינון. דנא is also unattested in TO and TJ, and rare in West Aramaic, while ההין is known only in West Aramaic.[479] דיך is typical of Official Aramaic, including Biblical Aramaic.[480] Note, however, that its occurrence is uncertain in the bowl texts.

---

[473] Rosenthal 1974: 20.

[474] Dalman 1905: 112.

[475] See Dalman 1905: 113; Tal 1975: 11. דיכי is attested twice in PsJ, probably under the influence of TO. See Cook 1986: 140.

[476] Tal 1975: 11. דיכי appears in BT in some fixed idioms (ibid.).

[477] In *Conclusions*, the references are given only if not given earlier.

[478] It is also possible to argue that some typically Western forms in the bowl texts may be due to the influence of the Palestinian magical tradition in Babylonia. We know for certain that some texts of Palestinian origin were later transmitted to Babylonia. Moreover, as noted by Naveh and Shaked (1993: 21-22), Palestinian influence may often be detected in the Babylonian magic bowl texts. As noted above, many of the demonstrative pronouns attested in the bowl texts are also found in the Palestinian amulets published by Naveh and Shaked. Importantly, many of the instances attested in the amulets resemble the cases found in the bowl texts. Note, for instance, הדין קמיעה (A 19:10, 30:8), which is common in the bowl texts (see above), and מלאכיה אלין (A 26:9), which parallels מלאכי אלין in N&Sh 2:8. In addition, the phrase מן יומדן ועד לעלם with several close parallels in the bowl texts is attested in the amulets (in A 17:23 and probably also in A 1:11-12).

[479] Note that the occurrence of ההין in the bowl texts is uncertain.

[480] The spelling in Official Aramaic is *defective*, i.e. דך; זך also occurs. Biblical Aramaic has דָּךְ. See Segert 1975: 175; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 57.

In East Aramaic, the less common demonstratives of the bowl texts are mostly attested only in official documents, such as גטים, maintained in BT, and in that tradition of BT which is connected with the Palestinian rabbis. אילין also occurs in Geonic Aramaic and in the variant readings of Nedarim. The only typically Eastern form in the bowl texts is אהניך, and perhaps הנין, which is known to me only in Nedarim. The occurrence of הנה in the Aramaic bowl texts is uncertain.

When comparing the use of demonstrative pronouns in the bowl texts with other Aramaic dialects, the following remarks can be made:

First, in the bowl texts there is no distinction between demonstratives which are used substantivally and those used adjectivally. Thus, the same form may function both in the function of a substantive and in attributive function. In this respect, the bowl texts differ considerably from TO and TJ, since it is typical of TO and TJ that there exist two different sets of demonstratives; the first set is used only substantivally, while the second set with prefixed -ה is used only adjectivally. GA, including the Palestinian Targums, generally parallels the system of TO and TJ, but the distinction between the substantival and adjectival forms was beginning to disappear in them.[481] Especially, this is evident in Palestinian Talmudic Aramaic.[482] As in the bowl texts, no distinction is made between adjectival and substantival forms in the East Aramaic dialects and in Palestinian Christian Aramaic.[483] The same array of demonstratives also appears both adjectivally and substantivally in the Aramaic of Qumran.[484]

Secondly, in the bowl texts the demonstrative pronouns when used adjectivally appear either after or – which is more common – before the qualified noun. This trait is shared by East Aramaic in general and – among West Aramaic dialects – by Palestinian Talmudic Aramaic and Palestinian Christian Aramaic, where there is no fixed word order.[485] Here the system of the bowl texts deviates remarkably from TO and TJ, where the demonstratives usually follow the nucleus.[486] In the passages of BT possibly reflecting the Aramaic of the Early Babylonian Amoraim, there seems to be a tendency that הדין follows the modified noun, while the pl. form הלין precedes it, as in the bowl texts.[487] It is interesting that the language of

---

[481] See Fassberg 1983: 177-178; Fassberg 1990: 122; Tal 1980: 47ff.

[482] Tal 1980: 51ff.

[483] For Palestinian Christian Aramaic, see Tal 1980: 58-59.

[484] Tal 1980: 46. In the Aramaic of Qumran the set used is דן, דא, and אלין (ibid.).

[485] Tal 1980: 53, 59, 61; Schulthess 1924: 85.

[486] The same goes for Official Aramaic. See Folmer 1995: 325ff.; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 235-238.

[487] Note the examples given by Wajsberg (1997: 128ff.). Note for instance בעלמ' הדין in MS München as against the duplicate בהאי עלמ' of MS Vatican. For details, see Wajsberg 1997: 128ff.

the Early Amoraim and that of TO seem to side against the bowl texts, at least as regards הדין.[488] The model of TO and TJ is followed by many West Aramaic dialects of the Late period, such as the Palestinian Targum texts.[489]

In sum, it may be said that the use of the demonstratives in the bowl texts is typically Eastern and 'more developed,'[490] while – by contrast – the forms used in these texts are typically conservative, many of them common with TO, TJ, and with more archaic sub-dialects of BJA.

IV.5. THE INDEPENDENT POSSESSIVE PRONOUN

The regular form of the independent possessive pronoun (or possessive particle) used in the bowl texts is -דיל, e.g. דילי ידי 'my hands' (AIT 7:12), whereas the sister form -דיד, as such, is rarely if at all attested. The problem lies in the fact that the possible occurrences of -דיד are of most uncertain reading. Note, however, בידידי 'in my own right' in AIT 2:5.

In Biblical Aramaic די and ל are written separately;[491] -דיל is the exclusive rule in TO and TJ.[492] In East Aramaic, -דיל is the basic form in Syriac,[493] Mandaic,[494] and in Nedarim, where it appears alongside the standard BTA form -דיד.[495] According to Rybak, Geonic Aramaic attests to -דיל as well,[496] and it was apparently widespread in the Aramaic of the Early Babylonian Amoraim.[497]

We may conclude that the bowl texts side here with TO and the Nedarim type of Aramaic as opposed to standard BTA.

---

[488] הלין is, of course, unattested in TO.

[489] For the Palestinian Targums, see Tal 1980: 49. Also in Qumran Aramaic, the demonstrative pronoun when used adjectivally always appears after the modified noun. See ibid.

[490] Here I refer to the fact that no distinction exists between the substantival and adjectival forms and to the fact that the word order is free.

[491] Rosenthal 1974: 20. In Old (Ancient) and Official Aramaic, we encounter the spellings -זל and -זיל. See Segert 1975: 328-329; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 55; Hug 1993: 59.

[492] Dalman 1905: 119; Tal 1975: 7.

[493] Nöldeke 1898: 47.

[494] Nöldeke 1875: 332ff.

[495] Rybak 1980: 83; Epstein 1960: 27. -דיד is regular in GA as well, while -דיל is rarely attested. See Dalman 1905: 118; Fassberg 1983: 174.

[496] Rybak 1980: 83.

[497] Wajsberg 1997: 132.

IV.6. THE RELATIVE PRONOUN

The relative pronoun in the bowl texts is mostly written -ד, but -די is also found,[498] mainly preceding a word with an initial *shwa*.

SOME EXAMPLES:

בהדין שמה רבה דהוא שליט 'by this great name which dominates' (MB I:1);[499] דכל אתר דדכרין שמיה 'that wherever (every place in which) his name is mentioned' (N&Sh 12a:7); ועל מלויתא חציפתא דלויא עים יויתאי בת חתאי 'and against the impudent female companion who accompanies Y. daughter of H.' (N&Sh 13.7-8); וינשי דקימין 'and women who stand' (N&Sh 2:4-5); חילינא בההוא דיברא שמיא וארעא 'I am strong in Him who has created heaven and earth' (Go 11:4); שמיה דימקבלא 'the heaven which receives' (N&Sh 2:8-9); קליה די מצמדנא די סכת פדנא 'the burnt (thing) which I attach, which is the coulter of the plough' (N&Sh 4:4).

As noted, -די occurs in the great majority of cases only before a word with an initial *shwa*;[500] otherwise it apparently represents a historical spelling. Sometimes *yod* may, perhaps, indicate a vocal *shwa*, too (cf. above III.4. Yod *and* waw *as a Counterpart of* shwa). The spelling -די, when preceding a word with an initial *shwa*, accords with the Babylonian *vocalization* of TO.[501]

The relative pronoun -ד/-די abounds in analytical genitive constructions, such as ברחמי דישמיה 'by the mercy of Heaven' (AIT 25:1) (see below IV.8.2. *Genitive Expressions*).

The form -די is typical in the older strata of Aramaic, including Biblical Aramaic,[502] while the shorter form, -ד, predominates in the later dialects. Already, in TO -ד is standard.[503] Later on, it is the rule e.g. in Syriac,[504] in GA (mostly),[505]

---

[498] See also Rossell 1953: 29.

[499] The reading is evident according to a facsimile.

[500] *də-bərā* > possibly [divrā] or [diwrå].

[501] Note the examples in Dalman 1905: 116ff. See also Boyarin 1978: 146. It is typical of the bowl texts as well of the Babylonian *vocalization* of TO that the combination *Cə + Cə results in CiC-. See above III.4. Yod *and* waw *as a Counterpart of* shwa.

[502] The spellings attested in Old (Ancient) Aramaic and Official Aramaic are ז, זי, and די. See Segert 1975: 177; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 59; Hug 1993: 60. In Qumran Aramaic, די is more common than ד. See Fassberg 1990: 125 and the literature given there.

[503] Dalman 1905: 118.

[504] Nöldeke 1898: 47.

[505] Dalman 1905: 116, 118. In the Palestinian Targum fragments from the Cairo Geniza, ד is standard in the non-translation portions, while in the translation portions, די and ד are 'usually in complementary distribution as determined by the Masoretic text.' For details, see Fassberg 1990: 122, 124.

in Mandaic,[506] and in BJA, where -ד׳ occurs only in non-standard tractates, and in Geonic Aramaic.[507]

In the bowl texts, the form of the relative pronoun basically accords with the Late Aramaic dialects, -ד being the dominant form. The spelling with *yod* when preceding a *shwa* in an initial syllable is of importance; this spelling convention apparently expresses a Babylonian pronunciation as reflected e.g. in the Babylonian *vocalization* of TO.

IV.7. INTERROGATIVE AND INDEFINITE PRONOUNS

מא appears as an equivalent of English 'what,' e.g. מא עבדו ליה 'what have they done to him?' (N&Sh 12a:6). מא is the rule in most Aramaic dialects, including e.g. Official Aramaic and TO/TJ.[508] Within East Aramaic, מא appears in Syriac,[509] in Mandaic,[510] in Nedarim, in Geonic Aramaic,[511] and apparently also in the Aramaic of the early Babylonian Amoraim.[512] The spelling מה predominates in GA, including PsJ.[513] By contrast, the form is מאי in standard BTA.[514] It is noteworthy that this form is unattested or, at least, rare in our texts: it may occur in AIT 8, where the text as emended by Epstein runs as follows: ולאבון שומון בישי אנחנא ית מאי דשמיע להון מין רקיעא (AIT 8:9-10).[515]

According to Gordon, מאן 'who' is found in a British Museum bowl published by him:[516] מאן לביתיכון אעיל 'who is entering your house.'[517] In the same text, it is attested a couple of times as an indefinite pronoun: מאן ד 'whoever' (line 6). I have been unable to check the readings. The same form, written מן, occurs as an indefinite pronoun in some other texts, e.g. במן דברא שמיא וארעה 'in him who created heaven and earth' (AIT 2:2).

---

[506] Macuch 1965: 166-167.

[507] Epstein 1960: 27.

[508] See Segert 1975: 178; Tal 1975: 13; Dalman 1905: 120. The spelling is מה in Official Aramaic and Biblical Aramaic. Segert 1975: 178; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 59.

[509] Nöldeke 1898: 46.

[510] Macuch 1965: 167.

[511] Epstein 1960: 28.

[512] See Wajsberg 1997: 132.

[513] Cook 1986: 144.

[514] See Kutscher 1971a: c. 280; Epstein 1960: 28.

[515] This is translated by Epstein: 'nous l'avons fait descendre, (tout) ce que eux(!) ont entendu du ciel, et obéi à notre père, mauvais' (Epstein 1921: 42). The reading is uncertain. See also below IV.10.4. *Participles*.

[516] No. 91776 line 8.

[517] The spelling אעיל is obscure, and makes me wonder whether the section is somehow corrupt.

As מא, מאן is also standard in Aramaic,[518] and it is also the rule in standard BTA.[519]

The indefinite pronoun 'something' is מיד(י)עם.[520] It is frequently attested, e.g. וכל מידעם דביש 'and every evil thing' (N&Sh 3:3, 11:5);[521] ומן וכל מידעם דאית להון 'and from whatever they have' (Ge C:11-12);[523] דאם מידעם 'if at all' (AIT 2:4). מינדעם also occurs: וכל מינדעם סניא 'and everything hostile' (AIT 5:2). By contrast, the form of standard BTA, מידי, is so far unattested in the bowl texts.[524] מידעם is common in the older strata of Aramaic alongside מנדעם.[525] מידעם is regular in TO and TJ, and it is well attested, alongside מידי, in Nedarim and its variant readings.[526] It is also common in Geonic Aramaic,[527] and it appears in West Aramaic, too, e.g. in PsJ, though the form typical of West Aramaic is כלום.[528] The forms of Mandaic are /mindam/ and /minda/.[529] Hence, there remains a possibility that מינדעם reflects the Mandaic form, but it is however, more probable that it is in imitation of Official Aramaic, a fact which would fit the general nature of the bowl texts.

In older strata, including TO, the vowel of the middle syllable is apparently /ā/, e.g. /middāʿam/ in TO, while in standard BTA one finds /ē/, /middē/.[530] Does the spelling of the type מידיעם in the bowl texts indicate that the /ʿ/ was actually lost?[531] Note that the form of Syriac is /meddem/.[532]

---

[518] See the references given when treating מא above. The spelling is מן in the older strata. See Segert 1975: 178; Hug 1993: 60. TO attests to both מן and מאן; TJ only to the former. Dalman 1905: 120; Tal 1975: 13.

[519] See Kutscher 1971a: c. 280; Epstein 1960: 28.

[520] See also III.3. *Word-final Consonants*.

[521] מידיעם also occurs in Ober. I:4, 6.

[522] The spelling כל מידיעם ביש is apparent in a bowl (18N18) found recently at Nippur. This bowl with several duplicates is discussed in Hunter 1995.

[523] The reading is evident according to a facsimile.

[524] Cf. Rybak 1980: 90.

[525] Tal 1975: 16.

[526] Rybak 1980: 90; Tal 1975: 16; Dalman 1905: 122.

[527] Rybak 1980: 90. Wajsberg (1997: 110) argues, by contrast, that מידעם/מדעם is not common in the early Geonic literature. Further, it belongs to the language of the Early Amoraim (ibid.).

[528] Tal 1975: 16; Cook 1986: 142.

[529] See Rybak 1980: 90.

[530] See Dalman 1905: 121-122.

[531] Cf. spelling of the type ראישא (N&Sh 13:4) *versus* רישכו (N&Sh 13:15).

[532] See Muraoka 1987: 51; Nöldeke 1898: 165-166. According to Dalman (1905: 121), מידי goes back to מדם. See also Gordon 1934: 330.

The bowl texts yield conservative forms. Note especially מינדעם, familiar from Official Aramaic and Nabatean.[533] By contrast, the form typical of standard BTA, מידי, is unattested.

As regards the interrogative and indefinite pronouns in the bowl texts, we may conclude that our texts side with more conservative dialects, such as TO and the Nedarim type of Aramaic as against standard BTA. They even yield a form of the indefinite pronoun, i.e. מינדעם, which is unknown in TO and TJ, but well attested in Official Aramaic. Note, however, the possibility that מינדעם may reflect the Mandaic form, and was indeed used in some BJA dialects.

IV.8. INFLECTION OF NOUNS

Since our texts are unpointed, several details concerning the inflection of nouns and adjectives remain uncertain. An example ready to hand is the fact that it is often uncertain whether a masc. form ending in *yod* expresses the pl. emphatic state or the pl. absolute state with the elision of the final *nun*. Therefore, the intention here is not to offer an extensive description of the inflection of nouns or noun patterns, which are even more difficult to be certain of. Instead, it is my intention to point out the salient features in the inflection – as far it is possible on the basis of unpointed texts – which may be used in comparing the language used for our texts with other relevant dialects.

It is self-evident that as is the case with other Aramaic dialects, the Aramaic of the bowl texts has the masc. and fem. genders; two numbers – sg. and pl.; and three states – absolute, construct, and emphatic. The endings marking these forms are given in the following paradigm:

	absolute	construct	emphatic
masc. sg.	Ø	Ø	-ה/-א
fem. sg.	-ה/-א	-ת	-תא/-תה
masc. pl.	-ַי/-(י)ן	-י	-יה/-יא/-י
fem. pl.	-ן	-ת	-/תא/ה
			-ותא-אתא/ה

─────────────

533   For מנדעם, see Segert 1975: 179; Tal 1975: 16.

SOME EXAMPLES:

masc. sg. absolute state: שלם ליכי 'may peace be on you' (N&Sh 6:3); גבריאל גבר תקיף 'G. the mighty hero' (N&Sh 5:8); וכל שום דאית ליה 'and any name he may have' (N&Sh 25:1-2); ומן כל מידעם ביש 'and from all evil' (BOR 3-4); ביני טב לביש 'between good and evil' (BOR 9).

masc. sg. construct state: וקינין חיא 'and the livestock of life' (N&Sh 4:8); בשום תלתא מלאכין 'in the name of three angels' (BOR 8).

masc. sg. emphatic state: הדין קמיעא 'this amulet' (N&Sh 5:1); בעלמא 'in the world' (N&Sh 5:3); בגיטא 'in the *get*' (N&Sh 5:7); בהדין שמה רבה 'by this great name' (MB I:1);[534] סדרוס רשיעה 'the wicked S.' (N&Sh 12a:2); ואזלת לחד טורא 'and she went to a mountain' (N&Sh 12a:2); מיתחזתון בדהבא וכספא 'you make yourselves visible in gold and silver' (N&Sh 13:11); חדייה חדיא דגברא לטבא 'his chest is the chest of an evil man' (N&Sh 13:5); כרסיה ימא דלא ביבי 'his belly is a lake without canals' (N&Sh 13:6).

masc. pl. absolute state: ומן טולין 'and from shadow-spirits' (N&Sh 25:3); חרשין בישין 'evil spells' (ZRL 7);[535] בשבעה חתמין 'by seven seals' (MB I:8);[536] כמה דעינין לכון ולא חמתון אודנין לכון ולא שמעיתון 'in the same way as you have eyes but do not see, as you have ears but do not hear' (N&Sh 6:4); אתון כולכון מלאכין קדישין 'all of you holy angels' (Go 6:5); שיתי מלכותא 'sixty kingdoms' (N&Sh 13:3).[537]

masc. pl. construct state: בתי חיא 'the houses of life' (N&Sh 4:8); דכול בני אינשא 'of all the people' (N&Sh 2:3).

masc. pl. emphatic state: דכל בני אינשה בישי ותקיפי 'of all evil and violent people' (N&Sh 6:2); מן שידי ומן דיוי 'from demons and from devils' (MB I:7);[538] כל גיברי 'all heroes' (N&Sh 5:8); וכוכבי ומזלי 'and stars and planets' (N&Sh 9:1); וקטיל ילדיא 'and kills children.' (Go H:3).[539]

fem. sg. absolute state: דיהי לה לאסו 'that it may be a healing to this one' (N&Sh 5:1); קימא בדוכה 'sitting in a place' (PB 3).

fem. sg. construct state: מן ילדותיה 'from his childhood' (N&Sh 25:2); ומן מללת לישנא 'and from the female backbiter' (BOR 10).

fem. sg. emphatic state: אסותא מן שמיא ל 'healing from heaven to' (N&Sh 3:1); מדינתא דעמיה סגי סגי 'a city whose population is very numerous' (N&Sh 6:3); שלהביתא דנורא נפקא מיפומיה 'a flame of fire comes out of his mouth' (N&Sh 13:18).

---

534 The reading is evident according to a facsimile.

535 The reading is evident according to a facsimile of the text.

536 The reading is evident according to a facsimile of the text.

537 Cf. תלתין יומי ירחא 'thirty days of the month' in N&Sh 6:8.

538 The reading is evident according to a facsimile of the text.

539 The reading, on the basis of a facsimile, is probable, but not certain.

fem. pl. absolute state: וכל רוחין ביש 'and all evil spirits' (N&Sh 15:4);[540]
ומין קדם בנין ויבנן 'and from sons and daughters' (AIT 3:10).

fem. pl. construct state: מן ארבעא זוית ביתיה 'from the four corners of his
house' (N&Sh 25:11).[541]

fem. pl. emphatic state: ולוטתא ומשקיפותא 'and curses and afflictions'
(N&Sh 4:6); וכל רוחי בישאתה 'and all evils spirits' (MB I:4);[542] ליליאתא
'Liliths' (MB I:7); מנטרנא דרוחי טבאתא ו[מחב]לנא דרוחי בישאתה 'the
guardian of the good spirits and destroyer of the evil spirits' (AIT 11:9); איבריה
תרתי ארזפתא 'his arms are two hammers' (N&Sh 13:5); אסואתא 'salvations'
(AIT 3:1).

IV.8.1. STATES[543]

The emphatic or determinate state has lost its original 'emphatic' or determining
function in the East Aramaic dialects and become the basic form of the noun; the
use of the absolute state has been limited to certain specific syntactic functions.[544]
These trends of development are apparent in the bowl texts as well: the em-
phatic state commonly occurs as the normal form of the noun and adjective, e.g.
אתון אעברו דינא ולוטתא ושיקופתא מין 'you, remove the enchantment and
curse and knock from...' (Go 1:4); קלקלא מלא משמלא 'the word fulfills (and)
completes' (N&Sh 4:4); כמיפל חיסיא מן טורא 'as the rocks fall from a moun-
tain' (N&Sh 7:7); בידיה חרבא קטלא 'in his hand there is a sword of slaying'
(N&Sh 13:6); רמי לה פולקתא בפומה 'he cast a hatchet into her mouth' (N&Sh
13:8).[545]

As in other East Aramaic dialects, the absolute state is common in certain
syntactic positions (noted below). However, in the bowl texts the absolute state is
also used quite frequently – especially in the pl. – in positions where one would ex-
pect the emphatic state to be employed. We come across plenty of instances, where,
it seems, the absolute state is used as the basic form of the noun, in line with
Official Aramaic, e.g. אומיתי ואשבעיתי עליכון רוחין ושידין 'I adjure and in-
voke you, you spirits and devils' (Go 2:6); מן דיוין ומן מבכלין ומן סטנין 'and
from devils and tormentors and satans' (AIT 10:4);[546] בני גיבורין דהוו חלישין

---

540   ביש = /bišān/. רוח is commonly taken as a fem.

541   As noted by Naveh and Shaked (1993: 138), 'ארבעא should of course have been ארבע.'

542   The reading is evident according to a facsimile of the text.

543   The construct state is treated below in IV.8.2. *Genitive Expressions.*

544   See Kutscher 1971a: c. 275; Schlesinger 1928: 19, especially n. 1; Nöldeke 1898: 144ff.;
      Macuch 1965: 207. See also Friedman 1974: 62. In BT, the absolute state is common in the
      passages of Palestinian origin, too. Wajsberg 1997: 140.

545   Further examples are presented above at the beginnig of IV.8.

'sons of the mighty ones who were weak' (N&Sh 13:10);[547] כן תיתנו לי אבן

וביר ואבן ובור מנכון 'so shall you give me a stone from you' (N&Sh 6:4-5); מנכון

גבריאל משבענא יתכון 'the well, the stone, and the pit, I adjure you' (N&Sh 6:8);

קל ברבל בילילי קל תרנגול גבר תקיף 'G. the mighty hero' (N&Sh 5:8);[548]

בינגהי 'the voice of a wolf in the evenings, the voice of a cock in the mornings'

(BP:6).

Both the emphatic and absolute states may be found in basically identical
positions. Compare, for instance, the following instances where we find אסותא
'healing' in both the emphatic and the absolute state: מזמן הו/ידן קמיא לאסותא
[ב](ש)מך אני עושה הדין 'appointed is this amulet for a healing' (Go. 7:1);[549]
קמיעא דיהי לה לאסו [550] 'by your name I make this amulet that it may be a heal-
ing to this one/to him/her' (N&Sh 5:1).[551] הדין קמיעא דיהי לה לאסו may also
be compared with הדין כסא ניהוי לחתמתא in AIT 14:1, where חתמתא appears
in the emphatic state as opposed to אסו in N&Sh 5. Compare also וכל מידעם ביש
'and everything whatsoever evil' (AIT 12:10) with כל מידעם בישא (N&Sh 25:4).
An illuminating example occurs in N&Sh 13: אתא מריא אתא גיס <את>א 'there came
the lord, there came the troop' (N&Sh 13:6).

It is often difficult to ascertain whether a given masc. pl. form occurs in the
emphatic state or in the absolute state with the elision of the final *nun*: both forms
end in י-.[552] For instance, מזיקי in the phrase כל מזיקי כלהון 'all the harmful
spirits' (N&Sh 25:6) could be understood as either of these forms.

The absolute state is generally used for predicate adjectives/participles: אפיכין
כל נידרי ולוטתא ואשלמתא וחרשי ולוטתא 'upset are all the vows and curses
and spells and sorceries and curses' (Go 1:1); הפיכא לוטתא 'overturned is the
curse' (N&Sh 2:4). הפיכי כוכבי ומזלי 'overturned are the stars and the planets'
(N&Sh 2:3).[553] מדינתא דעמיה סגי סני 'a city whose population is very nume-
rous' (N&Sh 6:3).

---

547 Cf. עַל שידי ועל דיוי (N&Sh 13:7); the forms may be understood as appearing either in the
absolute state with the apocopation of the final *nun* or in the emphatic state.

547 Cf. בני בתולתא 'sons of virgins' and בני ארעא מקטלא דירה 'sons of the land which kills
its inhabitants' in the same line. In both of these constructions the emphatic state is used
(i.e. בתולתא and ארעא), as opposed to גיבורין.

548 Cf. סדרוס רשיעה 'the wicked S.' (N&Sh 12a:2).

549 קמיא stands for the regular קמיעא. הו/ידן is discussed in IV.4. *Demonstrative Pronouns*.

550 Note that the beginning of this common phrase is in Hebrew.

551 In 'מסכת חלמות' we find parallel forms to לאסו: לטיבו, לבישו as opposed to the standard
BTA forms לבישותא and לטיבותא. See Friedman 1974: 62.

552 Cf. Mandaic, where due to the apocopation of the final *nun*, the absolute and emphatic state
'in der Schrift nicht zu unterscheiden sind' (Nöldeke 1875: 305).

553 הפיכי in N&Sh 2 could as such represent the emphatic state as well, but in the light of the
former example, הפיכא לוטתא, from the same text, it is evident that הפיכי appears in the
absolute state, with the elision of the final *nun*.

The absolute state is more commonly used with כל 'all, every,' but the emphatic state also occurs rather frequently. Compare the following instances: דוכא וכל טלא דכוליה 'of every place and every shaded place' (N&Sh 3:2); כל אתר 'every place/any place' (N&Sh 12a:7);[554] וכל בנין 'any/all children' (N&Sh 12a:8); *versus* כל פתיכרי ואיסתרתא 'all the idols and istars' (Go 6:2); כבשתינון לכל שידי ומזיקי 'I suppress all demons and harmful spirits' (N&Sh 5:3); כל ליליתא בישתא וכל שידי 'all evil Liliths and all demons' (N&Sh 14:4). One should also note ומן כל מידעם ביש 'and from all evil' in BOR 3-4 and elsewhere as against וכל מידיעם סניא (N&Sh 25:4) and ומן כל מידעם בישא 'and all hateful things' (N&Sh 14:4).

Further, the absolute state is generally used with nouns qualified by a numeral and in the distributives, and in some other special functions, such as with דלא 'without'[555] and in some fixed phrases with a preposition, e.g. בשבעה חתמין 'with seven seals' (Go 3:3); אתא בשלם גברא 'there came in peace the man' (N&Sh 13:9);[556] שלם דלא שלם יהוי עליכון 'peace without peace shall be upon you' (N&Sh 13:14); ועד לעלם 'to eternity/for ever' (N&Sh 8:IV:5-6);[557] לא בימם ולא בן דכר ובן נקבא 'whether masculine or feminine' (N&Sh 5:3; בלילה 'neither by day nor by night' (AIT 26:6). Once again, exceptions appear, as exemplified by the following instances: איבריה תרתי ארזפתא 'his arms are two hammers' (N&Sh 13:5); ואזלת לחד טורא 'and she went to a mountain' (N&Sh 12a:2);[558] ולא בכל עידנא ועידנא 'and not at any time whatsoever' (AIT 26:5).[559]

In East Aramaic, the absolute state is retained in similar syntactic positions (predicate adjectives/participles, with nouns qualified by a numeral, etc.) as in our texts, but with greater consistency.[560] However, on the basis of the examples cited

---

[554] כל אתר in Targum Neophyti (Deut. 11:24), while TO and PsJ have כל אתרא in the same place. Cf. Cook 1986: 172.

[555] See Schulthess 1924: 81.

[556] גברא 'a man' appears in the emphatic state, but in the adverbial construction בשלם 'in peace,' שלם occurs in the absolute state. בשלם occurs in TJ, too, as opposed to בקושטא (cf. Tal 1975: 86.), and also in Mandaic, where nouns often appear in the absolute state 'in gewissen Zusammensetzungen mit Präpositionen.' Nöldeke 1875: 302-303.

[557] The phrase לעלם 'for ever' is very common in the bowl texts. The same phrase – in the absolute state – is known in other East Aramaic dialects, such as Syriac and Mandaic, too. See Muraoka 1987: 40; Nöldeke 1875: 303.

[558] Note that in Syriac, too, the absolute state may appear with the numeral 'one,' e.g. *gavrā ḥaḏ*. See Muraoka 1987: 41. It is possible that the numeral 'one' had developed into a sort of indefinite article. See Muraoka 1987: 48.

[559] Read according to the emendation by Epstein, which seems to be correct in a photograph of the text. See Epstein 1921: 54.

[560] For the use of the absolute state in East Aramaic, see Nöldeke 1898: 154; Schlesinger 1928: 19 (n. 1), 23-27, 90-96; Nöldeke 1875: 300-308; Muraoka 1997b: 59-61.

by Schlesinger, the emphatic state seems to be common with כל in BTA, e.g. כל ליצנותא אסירא, כל יומא.[561] Therefore, we might assume that the use of the emphatic state with כל in the bowl texts reflects the BTA model in this respect.

The bowl texts often present examples in which the use of states does not seem to follow any strict rules, as exemplified by the following instance: מלאכין קדישין וכל ורוחי בישתא ולישן חמרין זידני זידניתא 'sacred angels and all evil spirits and tongue of impious amulet-spirits' (AIT 4:1).[562] At the beginning of this section, we have a noun (i.e. מלאכין) and the adjective which qualifies it (קדישין) in the absolute state. Then, we have a pl. noun (רוחי) and its attribute (בישתא) in the emphatic state, and at the end, there occur – which is most obscure – a noun in the absolute state (חמרין) qualified by two attributes, masc. (זידני) and fem. (זידניתא), in the emphatic state. Such examples abound in the bowl texts. In addition to the example cited above, note, for instance, the following instances:

כל שידין (abs.) ודיוין (abs.) וליליאתה (emph.) וכל חילמי (emph.)
'all the demons and *devs* and Liliths and dreams' (MB I:12);[563]
דקטיל גברא (emph.) מילות איתתיה ואיתתא (emph.) מילות בעלה ובנין (abs.) ויבנן (abs.) מין אבוהון ומין אימיהון
'who kills a man from the side of his wife and a woman from the side of her husband, and sons and daughters from their father and from their mother' (AIT 3:2-3); מרכבתיה מרכבא לטבי 'his chariot is a chariot of the evil ones' (?) (N&Sh 13:6).

The last instance is of a different sort: here we encounter a noun in the absolute state (מרכבא) in place of the expected construct state.[564]

Inconsistencies in the use of emphatic and absolute forms are common in TJ and TO.[565] According to M. Z. Kaddari, forms with the ending א- and those without it (both in sg. and pl.) appear in the passages of TO without a Hebrew *Vorlage* (e.g. poetic passages) with approximately equal frequency, and, in the cases where the Targumist has, so to say, 'changed the state' appearing in the Hebrew *Vorlage*,[566] it is typical that the forms with the ending א- are preferred over the forms with no ending.[567] Both forms may appear in any syntactic position; even the form with א-

---

561 See Schlesinger 1928: 91.

562 The conjunction ו which precedes רוחי is apparently a scribal error.

563 חילמי could be taken as the absolute state form, too.

564 Cf. *mrkbthwn mrkbt ltby* in a Syriac bowl cited by Naveh and Shaked (1985: 207). On the same page, Naveh and Shaked give instead of מרכבתיה מרכבא לטבי the reading מרכבתיה מרכבתא לטבי (= a printing error?). The original reading on page 198 is the correct one.

565 See Tal 1975: 85-87.

566 This means that an emphatic state is used when the Hebrew text has a noun without article and *vice versa*.

may appear as a predicate.[568] He asserts that the frequent use of the emphatic state for the anticipated absolute state in TO cannot be explained by the BT influence on copyists – by contrast with the general explanation – but the more or less indiscriminate use of the emphatic state is an authentic feature of the dialect represented by TO: the dialect of TO is in the transitional position between those dialects which maintain the distinction between the absolute state and the emphatic state (Official Aramaic, West Aramaic) and those dialects where the distinction is neutralized (BTA, Syriac).[569] He argues further that the fact that a noun as a predicate may appear with the ending א-, in contrast with the East Aramaic dialects, shows that the usage of TO is not dependent on East Aramaic.[570] While the original distinction between the absolute state and the emphatic state was not yet totally neutralized in the Aramaic of TO, consequently, the use of the absolute state was not restricted to certain syntactic positions, as in East Aramaic.[571] This theory has been rejected by Cook, who assumes that a copyist 'being accustomed to finding most Aramaic nouns in the emphatic state, would unwittingly render many nouns (not all) as emphatic, regardless of their context in the MS.'[572] Abraham Tal, too, points out similar problems to Cook: it is difficult to know whether a given ending was original or whether it was added by a copyist under the influence of BT.[573]

Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that the picture reflected by the bowl texts accords in many respects with TO and TJ. In all of these, the absolute and emphatic states may equally be used in many syntactic positions – e.g. as connected with the word כל and with numerals – where in East Aramaic the absolute state is regular.[574] Note, however, that in East Aramaic, too, in the positions where the use of the absolute state is regular, the emphatic state also occurs.[575] No systematic study of this phenomenon in various Aramaic dialects is available, but it seems that the system is much more complicated than it seems at first glance. In the bowl texts, the study of the use of states is complicated by the fact that in this kind of text it is most

---

[567] Kaddari 1963: 235-241.

[568] Ibid.

[569] See Kaddari 1963: 240-241. Kaddari states that the distinction was neutralized in 'הארמית הבבלית,' but – as is well known – this development did not happen in West Aramaic. For the West Aramaic dialects, see e.g. Kutscher 1976: 7-8; Schulthess 1924: 81.

[570] Kaddari 1963: 240-241.

[571] Ibid.

[572] Cook 1986: 171.

[573] Tal 1975: 85, n. 80. The influence of East Aramaic on the copyists of many JA dialects is pointed out repeatedly in Kutscher's study of GA (Kutscher 1976). Note especially pp. 7-8.

[574] In addition to the study of Kaddari (cited above), see Tal 1975: 85-86, where TJ in particular is discussed.

[575] Cf. the discussion in Nöldeke 1898: 144-154 concerning Syriac and in Nöldeke 1875: 300-308 concerning Mandaic.

difficult to know on what grounds a given noun is understood as logically deter-
mined or undetermined. As shown above, we have in these texts lists of spirits
some of which appear in the absolute and others in the emphatic state – for no evi-
dent reason. We could guess – instead of taking all the inconsistencies as anomalies
with no sense – that some semantic rules were present in these cases to determine
the choice of states. As pointed out by Abraham Tal, the rules for the choice of the
states (the absolute state *versus* emphatic state) even in the earlier periods of Ara-
maic, e.g. Biblical Aramaic and Official Aramaic, were different from those known
from Hebrew.[576] Tal cites examples of exceptional choice of states (absolute and
emphatic) from the later West Aramaic sources, too, and as noted in passing above,
even in the Eastern dialects, the rules governing the use of states are not as clear cut
as one might expect. On the basis of these facts, we have to bear in mind the
possibility that some of the inconsistencies in these texts might reflect nuances of a
state system which is not yet known properly. This does not mean, of course, that
many of the inconsistencies would not imply the breakdown of a more original
system and testify to the trends of development leading to the model known from
East Aramaic.

Accordingly, Tal assumes that inconsistencies in TJ, such as תלתין גברא
versus שבע שנין, suggest that the state system was in the process of change at the
time when TJ (and TO) were redacted. We may assume that further development
had taken place by the time the bowl texts were inscribed. This is evident in the light
of the fact that the emphatic state is more regularly employed as the basic form of
the noun than, for instance, in TO and TJ. Besides, the fact that inconsistencies are
so common implies the breakdown of the state system. Nevertheless, the absolute
state is more common in these texts than in standard BTA. The scribes of these
texts – we may argue – tried to imitate Official Aramaic, and, therefore, used the
absolute state more than the regular type within BTA, in general. It is noteworthy
that the absolute state is likewise common in those passages of BT which exhibit
an Aramaic different from standard BTA. These include, for instance, the Aramaic
of the early Amoraim, which has been analyzed by Eljakim Wajsberg, and
'מסכת חלומות.'[577] As regards the state system, we may propose that the bowl
texts have linguistic affinity with many 'different' passsages of BT. Yet, more de-
tailed studies are needed to demonstrate the relationship between different non-
standard traditions of BTA.

---

[576] Tal 1975: 87.

[577] See Wajsberg 1997: 140-141; Friedman 1974: 62. As discussed elsewhere in this study, the
מסכת חלומות has other linguistic affinities with the bowl texts as well. See IV.10.2.
Imperfect.

IV.8.2. Genitive Expressions

The classical construct state is still used to express the genitive relationship, but it is less common than other constructions,[578] e.g. חבילי נידרא 'the injuries of vows' (N&Sh 3:2); ומין בתי חיא 'and from the houses of life' (N&Sh 4:8); כפתינון לכיפי ארעה 'I bind the rocks of the earth' (N&Sh 5:2). The construct state is regular in compound nouns, such as בני אינשה, and with participles, e.g. כתבי סיפרי 'who write books' (N&Sh 6:9).[579] The genitive relationship is generally expressed by analytical constructions with the relative pronoun ד/-די-, e.g. עבדין דפרזלא 'acts of iron' (N&Sh 12a:3);[580] איסרא דקברא 'the spell of the tomb' (N&Sh 4:2); ובמימרא דמלאכי 'by the command of the angels' (N&Sh 13:3); בישמיה נידרא דאלהי 'in the name of the Lord of salvations' (AIT 8:1); דמרי אסואתא 'the vow of gods' (BOR 5). The classical construct and analytical constructions may vary with no evident motivation. Compare, for instance, ברחמי שמיא 'by the mercy of Heaven' in N&Sh 11:8 with the parallel ברחמי דישמיה in AIT 25:1. The spelling -די is common when preceding a word with an anticipated *shwa* in the initial syllable,[581] e.g. עבדת לחרשין דינחשה 'she performed sorceries of copper' (N&Sh 12a:3). A proleptic 3rd p. suffixed pronoun often precedes the relative pronoun, e.g. קרינא לכון גיבריה דארעה 'I call you, the mighty of the earth' (N&Sh 6:4); בישמיה דמריא בגדנא 'in the name of the lord B.' (N&Sh 13:3). The common phrase 'in the name of X' (exemplified above by the latter instance) is generally expressed in these texts by בישמיה ד. One should note, however, that it is often unclear (in a genitive construction) whether a noun ending in -ה presents a suffixed 3rd p. fem. or masc. pronoun,[582] or a noun in the emphatic state. For instance, לוטתא דימא ויברתה in N&Sh 2:4, may be understood either as 'the curse of the mother and the daughter' (/bartā/) or as 'the curse of the mother and her daughter' (/bartah/).[583]

All these three constructions referred to above are already known in Biblical Aramaic.[584] Later on, they appear in all forms of Aramaic.[585] In Biblical Aramaic,

---

[578]   See the examples above. Note that in this work the term 'construct state' also includes *status pronominalis*, e.g. ועד דערדקיהון 'and to their young ones' (N&Sh 5:3-4); וכל קיניניהון 'and all their possessions' (ZRL 3). In the latter example, the reading is evident according to a facsimile. For the genitive construction in the bowl texts, see also Rossell 1953: 36-37.

[579]   Cf. גברא דחיל חטאין in Shabb. 31b.

[580]   The first noun is generally in the emphatic state, but some exceptions are found. עבדין may be compared with Mandaic, where the corresponding word *l'bid* is preferably used in the absolute state. See Macuch 1965: 392. For the relative pronoun, see above IV.6.

[581]   See above IV.6. *The Relative Pronoun* and III.4. Yod *and* waw *as a Counterpart of* shwa.

[582]   Both suffixes may be spelt -ה. See IV.3.

[583]   Cf. Naveh & Shaked 1985: 137.

[584]   See Rosenthal 1974: 25.

the use of the classical construct state predominates, but the analytical construction with די is used 'indiscriminately alongside the cstr. st.'[586] Instead, the construction with proleptic pronominal suffix is 'comparatively rare.'[587] In TO, too, the contruct state prevails over the other constructions.[588]

In East Aramaic – excluding Mandaic – the analytical construction predominates, the construct state being restricted to certain specific contexts, such as compound nouns.[589] In West Aramaic, some dialects prefer the classical construction while others are inclined to use the analytical constructions.[590]

It is evident that in the genitive expressions, the bowl texts follow the model of East Aramaic, notably that of BTA.

IV.8.3. The Inflectional Endings of Nouns and Adjectives

The endings attested are listed above at the beginning of chapter IV.8. *Inflection of Nouns.* The following forms or traits are deserving of comment:

Singular

In the majority of cases the ending of the masc. sg. emphatic state is א-, but ה- is also commonly attested.[591] The same applies to the fem. forms ending in -*ā* (sg. absolute and emphatic states; pl. emphatic state). Typically both א- and ה- appear in the same text, as is exemplified by the following instances from AIT I, where all the relevant occurrences – excluding names – are listed:

א-: אסותא 'salvation' *fem. st. emph.* (AIT 1:3, 5); ליליתא 'Lilith' *fem. st. emph.* (6, 8, 9, 14); נורא 'light' *masc. st. emph.* (9); זיקא 'blast' *masc. st. emph.* (9); בני אינשא 'mankind' *masc. st. emph.* (12, 13); יממא 'day' *masc. st. emph.* (13); בישתא 'evil' *fem. st. emph.* (14).

ה-: קמיעה 'amulet' *masc. st. emph..* (AIT 1:1, 6); ליליה 'night' *masc. st. emph.* (line 13).

In this text, as is regular, א- is the majority form, which may be used for the ending of masc. and fem., noun and adjective. In this text, the minority form, ה-, does not appear for the fem. ending, but in other texts ה- is attested in this function,

---

[585] Modern Aramaic is beyond our scope here.

[586] Rosenthal 1974: 25.

[587] Ibid.

[588] In TO the construct state prevails over the construction with -די by 3 to 1, whereas in Daniel the ratio is 15 to 1, and in Ezra 7 to 1. Kaddari 1963: 245.

[589] See Nöldeke 1898: 154ff.; Schlesinger 1928: 62-76. In Mandaic, the construct state is more common than in other East Aramaic dialects. Macuch 1965: 390-393.

[590] See Cook 1986: 212ff. and the literature reviewed there.

[591] See also Montgomery 1913: 29; Naveh & Shaked 1985: 31-32 and III.1. *Notes on the Spelling.*

too, e.g. הדא איסקופתה חומרי זידניאתה 'impious amulet-spirits' (AIT 11:14); על הדא חתמתא ועל 'upon this sealing and upon this threshold' (AIT 9:11).

Some texts, such as AIT 3, employ א- as the sole form, and, on the other hand, other texts, as opposed to the majority of the bowls, prefer ה-. For instance, MB I uses ה- frequently and only exceptionally א-, e.g. בהדין שמה רבה 'by this great name' (line 1); עלמה 'the world/universe' (9); שבועתה 'oath' (10); ולילאתה 'Liliths' (11) as against ובחתמא הדין 'and by this seal' (20). One cannot observe any evident reason for the choice of the ending: ברזא הדין ובשמה הדין 'with this mystery and with this name' (MB I:21).

Some words, such ארעה 'earth,' א(י)נשה 'man' (e.g. N&Sh 5:6) commonly have ה- as their ending.[592]

The vacillation between ה- and א- is typical of Official Aramaic, whereas later dialects generally use regularly either ה- or א-.[593] The western dialects – excluding Palestinian Christian Aramaic – prefer ה-, while the eastern dialects nearly always have א-.[594] In accordance with the bowl texts, the Genesis Apocryphon tends to employ א- in the emphatic state and in the fem. sg. absolute state, but, nevertheless, both endings may be used indiscrimately in similar positions.[595] Similar trends are present in Palmyrene.[596]

As opposed to standard BTA, ה- is often used in Nedarim, in its variant readings, and in Geonic Aramaic.[597]

In the fem. sg. emphatic state, תי- appears sporadically alongside the regular ה/תא-, e.g. מלאכה רבתי דמיתותא 'the great angel of death' (GE C:9); ועד שעתא רבתי דפרקנא דראישיכון 'and to the great hour of the redemption of your heads' (AIT 4:5). Besides the word רבתי, no secure instances of *adjectives* with the ending תי- occur, though an occurrence of this ending is possible in AIT 13:11, where Epstein emends Montgomery's original אבליתי to כי אדליתי.[598] If so, we would have the root א/ידל used, as in Mandaic, instead of א/ילד.[599] The reading and its interpretation is possible – as noted by Levine – but remains uncertain.[600] Note that in the same line we have ולא ילדא, with the root ילד in its normal JA form.

---

[592] See also Naveh & Shaked 1985: 31-32.

[593] Kutscher 1957: 27-28.

[594] Ibid.

[595] Ibid. According to Kutscher, the Genesis Apocryphon also prefers א- in the pronouns (e.g. אנחנא) and suffixed pronouns, etc (ibid.). Similar trends are evident in the bowl texts. Note, for instance, the text analyzed above (AIT 1), which has the pronouns spelt with א-: הדא 'this' (lines 5, 7); אנחנא 'we' (14).

[596] Ibid.

[597] Rybak 1980: 114. See also above III.1. *Notes on the Spelling.*

[598] See Epstein 1921: 46.

[599] See ibid. and Levine 1970: 352.

The fem. ending יֽת- is attested in BTA.[601] It also appears in Mandaic as an 'ending of the adjectival status emphaticus.'[602] Nöldeke, followed by Macuch, argues that יֽת- is a special feature of BA.[603] According to Epstein, יֽת- is used in BTA with adjectives only,[604] and the same is true of Mandaic (see above). Nevertheless, in the bowl texts we have at least one secure example where this ending appears with a noun: וסבתי 'and a grandmother' (N&Sh 13:12).[605] Note also ברקתי in אנתי ברקתי דיכרא וניקבתא 'you, the male and female cataract' (N&Sh 25:9). Unfortunately, the reading is uncertain.

Plural

In the masc. absolute state, the form with the final *nun*, i.e. ין-, is well attested.[606] In addition, the form with the apocopation of the final *nun*, i.e. י-, appears commonly, too, though – as already pointed out – it is often uncertain whether masc. pl. forms ending with י- are to be understood as masc. pl. in the emphatic state or in the absolute state, with the apocopation of the final *nun*.[607] In any case, absolute forms with the ending ין- and those with י- appear side by side even in one and the same text, e.g. מן כל בגעין בישי 'from all evil plagues' (AIT 21:1) as against מן כל בגעין בישין in line 3.[608] Note also כל חלמי סנין 'all hated dreams,' which occurs several times in Ge A.

The ending ין- accords with the Aramaic dialects of the earlier periods, including TO and TJ,[609] and, in the Late Aramaic period, with the West Aramaic dialects.[610] Further, the final *nun* is generally preserved in Nedarim and Geonic Aramaic as opposed to standard BTA and Mandaic, with the deletion of the final *nun*.[611]

---

[600] Levine 1970: 352. Levine also gives another possible interpretation.

[601] Epstein 1960: 119.

[602] Macuch 1965: 213.

[603] Nöldeke 1875: 154, n. 2; Macuch 1965: 213.

[604] Epstein 1960: 119.

[605] The occurrence of יֽת- with this noun may be due to the fact that the lexeme is essentially an adjective.

[606] See the examples given above at the beginning of IV.8. *Inflection of Nouns*. Further examples of pl. forms are cited in IV.8.1. *States*.

[607] I have tried to separate these forms, whenever possible, with the aid of other forms in a given sequence. For instance, דרדקי in N&Sh 6:6 is evidently in the emphatic state, since it is immediately followed by ודרדוקתא, definitely in the emphatic state.

[608] The deletion of *nun* in line 1 is possibly a scribal error, but may, at least partly, result from the fact that the form with no ending was actually used in the vernacular.

[609] For TO and TJ, see Dalman 1905: 189.

[610] See, for instance, Dalman 1905: 189; Fassberg 1983: 203-204; 1990: 133-134; Schulthess 1924: 35; Müller-Kessler 1991: 109; Macuch 1982: 273ff.

[611] Rybak 1980: 86; Macuch 1965: 219.

The ending for the masc. pl. emphatic state is spelt י-, as in BTA.[612] The other East Aramaic dialects have the same ending, i.e. -*ē*, with differences in spelling,[613] and it appears alongside -*ayyā* in Palmyrene as well.[614] Importantly, the ending י- is infrequent in TJ,[615] TO,[616] and in all western texts, which regularly maintain the classical Aramaic ending -*ayyā*.[617] In BT, -*ayyā* appears, for instance, in the Aramaic of the early Amoraim, as opposed to standard BTA.[618]

The sporadic occurrences of -*ē* in TJ and TO are usually explained by the influence of BT.[619] By contrast, Abraham Tal argues that the ending -*ē* was a living linguistic trait in the Aramaic represented in TO and TJ, and it was employed especially for collective nouns.[620] The sporadic occurrences of י- in the western texts are likewise to be explained by the influence of BT,[621] though, in the case of Palestinian Christian Aramaic, we may explain the occurrence of -*ē* by the influence of Syriac.

In the bowl texts, the classical Aramaic ending -י/א/ה (-*ayyā*) frequently appears with some words, such as שמיא 'heaven' (e.g. AIT 12:1);[622] חרשיא 'curses' (N&Sh 4:6).[623] In addition, it is sporadically found with other words, too: דיבהון איתנכעו שמיא וארעה טוריא איעקרו 'whereby are humiliated heaven and earth, the mountains are uprooted' (AIT 9:6);[624] אסרין פתכריה 'bound are

---

[612]   See Epstein 1960: 116ff.

[613]   The Mandaic form is spelled -*y'* and the Syriac form -*'*. Nevertheless, both spellings reflect the basically same form -*ē*. The ending -*ē* appears already in Biblical Aramaic, where it is confined to gentilica, possibly in the story of Aḥiqar, in the Uruk inscription, and in the Aramaic of Hatra, which yields other East Aramaic features, too. See Muraoka 1997a: 206; Kutscher 1971a: c. 275; Cook 1986: 169-170; Tal 1975: 83. It is generally assumed that עממא ('peoples' ?) in the story of Aḥiqar is the earliest attestation of this ending in Aramaic. This assumption has, however, been contested by Muraoka, who argues that the spelling under discussion may represent a sg. form, instead. For details, see Muraoka 1997a: 206-207. Thus, it remains uncertain whether this emphatic state ending is really attested in the story of Aḥiqar.

[614]   See Cantineau 1935: 123-124.

[615]   In TJ, this ending is 'נדיר מאד.' Tal 1975: 83.

[616]   Dalman 1905: 189, 191.

[617]   Dalman 1905: 189, 191; Schulthess 1924: 35; Müller-Kessler 1991: 109, 114; Macuch 1982: 273-274; Levy 1974: 100; Fassberg 1983: 203; Fassberg 1990: 134; Cook 1986: 168-169.

[618]   Wajsberg 1997: 141-142.

[619]   Thus e.g. Cook 1986: 169-170.

[620]   See Tal 1975: 83-84. This theory was criticized by Cook (1986: 169-170).

[621]   See the discussion reviewed in Cook 1986: 169ff. and the literature given there.

[622]   The spelling שמיה is found, for instance, in N&Sh 13:14, 16.

[623]   Note also אך על פרסדוך ליטא לתהפכי חרשיא ולוטתא 'she also curses F. that you may turn away spells and curses' (N&Sh 4:6).

the idol-spirits' (N&Sh 8:4-5). It is likely that the ending *-ayyā* cannot be taken as a productive linguistic feature in the bowl texts, but as a more or less lexicalized vestige. Moreover, it is possible that at least some of the words ending in -יא/ה testify to the influence of the Mandaic spelling conventions and not to the survival of this classical Aramaic ending.[625]

The ending of the fem. pl. absolute state is -ן, which evidently indicates the form *-ān*. As is well known, *-ān* is standard in Aramaic. The reason why the masc. absolute ending -ין is so well attested in these texts is obscure, but the fem. form -ן is rarely found, even though fem. nouns are common. Most of the forms attested are participles.[626] It seems that the emphatic fem. ending is often used where – on the basis of the parallel masc. forms in the absolute state – one would assume the absolute state would be used. Note the following example with several masc. forms in the absolute state (with the ending -ין) and, possibly, two in the emphatic state (the ending -י), but fem. forms only in the emphatic state (the ending -תא):

וכל רוחין בישן ושידין ושיבטין ודיוין ופגעין וסטנין
ומשמתא ומבכלתא ועקרתא ותכלתא וחרשי ונידרי
ולוטתא ואשלמתא ויפתכרין וחומרין זידנין וטעין וטולנין ולילין

'and all evil spirits, demons, plagues, devils, afflictions, satans, bans, tormentors, spirits of barrenness, spirits of abortion, sorcerers, vows, curses, magic rites, idols, wicked pebble spirits, errant spirits, shadow spirits, Liliths' (N&Sh 4-6).

Note, however, that the adjective בישן is used as expected. חרשי and נידרי may be taken either as absolute state forms with the apocopation of the final *nun* or as emphatic state forms.

In the fem. pl. emphatic state, both the spelling -אתא/ה and -תא/ה appear frequently. Both of them indicate the standard Aramaic *-āṯā*. No consistency may be observed in the use of -אתא/ה *versus* -תא/ה,[627] though some texts, noticeably GE A, seem to use -אתא/ה quite consistently when a fem. pl. form is intended.

We have sporadic examples of the Hebrew fem. ending in an Aramaic context: חרשות ועבדין דמיתעבדין 'sorceries and charms which are made' (N&Sh 3:4).[628]

---

[624] Read according to the emendation by Epstein (1921: 38), which is plausible on the basis of a photograph of the text.

[625] As suggested by Montgomery (1913: 30, 208) and Rossell (1953: 36).

[626] For the examples, see below IV.10.4. *Participles.*

[627] Note, for instance, the following instance from N&Sh 23: וקבלאתא ורוחי בישתא 'and charms and evil spirits' (line 3).

[628] חרשות is obscure (cf. e.g. חרשין in N&Sh 12a:3 and חרשיא in N&Sh 4:6), but the reading is evident.

CONCLUSIONS

The inflection of the nouns and adjectives in the bowl texts present a complex picture. In the use of states, one should note, on the one hand, that the absolute state is employed more frequently than is regular in East Aramaic, especially in BTA. Inconsistencies are common as in the Aramaic of TO and TJ. It is noteworthy as well that as in the bowl texts, the absolute state is widespead in many 'different' passages of BT. On the other hand, in genitive constructions, the bowl texts follow the model of BTA, and disagree with TO and TJ. The fact that the fem. pl. absolute state is so rarely attested, even though the corresponding masc. form is common, remains a puzzle to me.

The endings attested in these texts basically tally with BTA, especially with the non-standard tractates such as the Nedarim type of Aramaic. Importantly, the masc. pl. emphatic state ending is regularly '- as in BTA, and as opposed to TO. In the masc. pl. absolute state, we have both '-, typical of standard BTA, and ן'-, typical of more conservative dialects, for instance Nedarim. Moreover, one should note the fem. sg. emphatic state ending ה'-, attested only in BTA and Mandaic.

The only major difference from standard BTA, besides the frequent use of ן'- alongside '-, is the fact that the final -*ā* in the masc. sg. emphatic state and in the fem. forms (both st. abs and emph.) is quite often expressed by *he*, though *'aleph* is more common. Inconsistencies are common as in the older strata of Aramaic. As noted, ה- is common in Nedarim and Geonic Aramaic, too. This feature and the use of ן'- alongside '- link our texts with the Nedarim type of Aramaic and Geonic Aramaic.

IV.9. NOTES ON PREPOSITIONS, CONJUNCTIONS, AND ADVERBS

In this chapter, no attempt is made to list all the prepositions, conjunctions, and adverbs attested in the bowl texts. Instead, the aim is to focus on some of the distinctive forms which are peculiar to the bowl texts in comparison with other relevant dialects. Therefore, for instance, such standard Aramaic prepositions as ב and ל, well attested in our texts, are beyond our scope here.[629] The study of conjunctions and adverbs is connected with the study of the lexicon, a question which deserves a study of its own. In this context, the aim is only to highlight some tendencies. Note that the study of conjunctions and adverbs is complicated by the fact that many forms common in other Aramaic dialects may be absent from our texts simply due to the fact that the contents and thereby the lexicon of the magical literature often differ from other types of literature. Therefore, even though many particles of stan-

---

[629] Basic prepositions, adverbs, and conjunctions attested in the bowl texts are listed and exemplified in Rossell 1953: 55ff.

dard BTA are absent here,[630] one should not hesitate to arrive at far-reaching con-
clusions.[631]

The prepositions require the following notes:

As pointed out already in III.2. *Laryngeals and Pharyngeals*, על, in contrast
with standard BTA,[632] is not replaced by א-. The spelling על is very common in
our texts, e.g. על אנפוהי 'upon his countenance' (N&Sh 21:11). The form על,
which is standard in Aramaic, also prevails in TO, TJ, Karaitic Aramaic, and it
'often remains' in Nedarim.[633] Furthermore, Geonic Aramaic prefers על, too.[634]

Similarly, the preposition equivalent to English 'under' is regularly תחות, as
in most Aramaic dialects, as opposed to the standard BTA תותי,[635] which is un-
attested in the bowl texts.

Further, the preposition בין is regularly written with the final *nun*, e.g.
בין ידענא שמה בין דלא ידענא שמה 'whether I know his name or not' (N&Sh
5:4); בינא ובין אבהתנא 'between us and our ancestors' (N&Sh 19:7-8). The
characteristic form in standard BTA is בי,[636] which is rarely attested in the magic
bowls. Yet, it occurs at least in AIT 29:11.

A special case is the preposition בבית: בבית אצבעתיה 'between his fin-
gers' (N&Sh 13:16). We possibly have here the fem. form of the preposition בין
combined with the preposition -ב. The 'fem.' form of בין is known in Mandaic (*bit*
in Mandaic) and Syriac, which never use it with suffixes.[637] In Mandaic, the form
binat, which equals the- בינת of BTA,[638] is employed with suffixes.[639]

The preposition קדם 'before' is regularly spelt with the *daleth* preserved, e.g.
מן קדמוהי '(from) before him' (N&Sh 3:4);[640] מן קדומוהי (12a:2); מן קדומיה
(AIT 7:12); מן קודם (AIT 25:2); לקדמיהון 'before them' (AIT 13:5). The forms
familiar from standard BTA are rarely found.[641] Note, however, קמה 'before her'
(N&Sh 13:8), קומה in the same line, and מן קמה in AIT 13:2.[642]

---

630 For instance, most of the BTA adverbs and conjunctions listed by Kutscher (1971a: c. 281)
   are absent from our texts.

631 Cf. Harviainen 1983: 12, where he states that 'the topics dealt with in bowls deviate
   considerably from those of the Talmudic literature.'

632 See Rybak 1980: 96.

633 See ibid., and the cross-references given there. The variant readings of Nedarim 'already
   demonstrate' the change of על to א- (ibid.).

634 Ibid. See also Epstein 1960: 135.

635 See Epstein 1960: 136.

636 בין is also found in BT, especially with personal suffixes, see Epstein 1960: 137.

637 See Macuch 1965: 236; Nöldeke 1898: 99.

638 Cf. Epstein 1960: 137.

639 Macuch 1965: 236.

640 The *waw* as a counterpart of */ā/* is discussed above in III.6.

641 See Epstein 1960: 136; Kutscher 1971: c. 281.

The preposition 'like' occurs in our texts both as -כ and כי, e.g. נשפין כי זיקא
ברקין כי ברקא 'blowing like the blast, lightening like the lightning' (AIT 12:8);
כצילמתא דמיתי 'like the forms of the dead' (N&Sh 13:12).[643] The former is
regular in Aramaic, while the latter is typical of standard BTA.[644]

NOTES ON ADVERBS, CONJUNCTIONS, AND PARTICLES:

(a) Direct object particle ית

The bowl texts frequently use the particle ית to indicate a direct object both with
nouns and with suffixed pronouns, e.g. ולנטרא ולשיזבא ית בידמיא בר מרתא
וית דודי בת קיימתא איתתיה 'both to preserve and save B. son of M. and D.
daughter of Q. his wife' (MB II:5); ולא תיכבשון יתיה 'you should not subdue
him' (N&Sh 25:8-9). The indication of the direct object is treated below in IV.10.6.
In this context, it is worth noting, however, that the frequent use of this particle
clearly deviates from the model of standard BTA, which prefers -ל or other con-
structions in this function.[645] The particle ית appears in BTA only in the statements
of the Palestinian rabbis.[646] By contrast, ית is common in TO, TJ, and Geonic
Aramaic.[647] Hence, the common use of ית combines the idiom of the bowl texts
with TO and Geonic Aramaic as against BTA inclusive of Nedarim, and other East
Aramaic dialects.[648]

(b) Predicators of existence

The predicators of existence (or quasi verbals) used in the bowl texts are the par-
ticles אית,[649] equalling English 'there is/are,' and its negation לית 'there is/are
not.' Both forms are frequently attested. Instead, the uncontracted form לא אית
is so far unattested. The particles לית/אית often occur with the preposition -ל
and a suffixed pronoun to express the notion of possession and its negation, e.g.
מלאכה דית ליה חדעסר שמין 'the angel who has eleven names' (N&Sh 2:6);

---

642 Furthermore, in AIT 26:6 Montgomery reads מן קדמיהון, but Epstein (1921: 54) corrects it
to מן קומיהון. Unfortunately, as interesting as the suggestion by Epstein may be, the text is
here too erased to be read, at least in the photograph at my disposal, and, consequently, we
cannot be sure whether a form of the type קומ- appears in that text.

643 -כ also in lines 17 and 18. Even though N&Sh 13 displays several isoglosses in common
with standard BTA, it nevertheless displays many conservative traits, too. For instance, the
preposition -כ is never spelt כי.

644 See Epstein 1960: 138; Kutscher 1971a: c. 281.

645 See Schlesinger 1928: 101ff.

646 Schlesinger 1928: 105. Rybak, however, argues that all the occurrences in Nedarim cannot
be attributed to Palestinian influence. Rybak 1980: 116, n. 184.

647 Rybak 1980: 116.

648 For details, see IV.10.6. *Indication of the Direct Object.*

649 אית is regular in the Middle Aramaic dialects, while in the older strata איתי is used. See Tal
1975: 41.

וכל בנין דאית להון 'all names that he has' (N&Sh 7:2-3); כל שמן דאית ליה 'and any children they have' (N&Sh 12a:8); וריגלי לית לך 'you have no feet' (N&Sh 21:7). לית may occur as a copula with a personal pronoun: לית אנא פתחא 'I shall not open' (N&Sh 12a:4). No instances showing a coalescence with suffixed pronouns are known to me. Such forms are frequent in many Aramaic dialects, such as TO/TJ, Syriac, BTA, and Samaritan Aramaic, e.g. ליתיה instead of לית הוא.[650] By contrast, Palestinian Christian Aramaic prefers independent personal pronouns, as in our instance (לית אנא פתחא).[651] More instances would be necessary for secure conclusions.

The bowl texts present a complex picture here: on the one hand, the regular forms of standard BTA, איכא 'there is/are' and ליכא 'there is/are not' are un-attested.[652] On the other hand, the 'fuller' form (i.e. uncontracted) לא אית is like-wise unattested. The contracted form לית occurs in BTA alongside ליכא,[653] whereas Nedarim and Geonic Aramaic prefer לא אית, though the standard ones, ליכא and לית also occur.[654] Importantly, a series typical of TO and TJ is indeed אית and לית, as in our texts.[655] Thus, the usage in the bowl texts basically follows the model of TO and TJ.

(c) Other conjunctions and adverbs

The opening particle תוב 'again' abounds in the bowl texts, e.g. תוב אסיר וחתים 'again, bound and sealed' (BOR 12); תוב אסירת ואחידת אנתי רוחא בישתא 'again, you (fem. sg.) evil spirit are bound and held' (AIT 26:3-4).[656] Instead, the variant typical of standard BTA, תו, is rarely met with in these texts, e.g. AB F:1, Ge D:12.[657] Note, however, that תוב probably has the variants תוף (Go 11:8, 14),[658] תובו (Go G:6), and תבו (Go G:11).[659] תוף could imply that /b/ could lose its voiceless character in a final position,[660] whereas תובו and תבו could indicate assimilation of /b/ to the preceding vowel (see above III.3. *Word-final Conso-*

---

650 See Cook 1986: 174-175 and the cross-references given there.

651 Ibid.

652 The same forms are familiar from Mandaic. See Macuch 1965: 377-378.

653 Rybak 1980: 97.

654 Rybak 1980: 97, 121; Epstein 1960: 14.

655 See Rybak 1980: 121; Tal 1975: 41, 49, 60; Dalman 1905: 108, 219.

656 See above III.3. *Word-final Consonants*, where further examples are listed.

657 Cf. Rybak 1980: 93.

658 תוב also occurs in the same phrase (line 7).

659 See also Rossell 1953: 61-62.

660 We have some examples showing confusion between *bet* and *pe*. See Rossell 1953: 16. Note, however, that all the other examples show *bet* for an expected *pe* in a labial phonetic surrounding. Due to the paucity of examples, the correct interpretation of the phenomenon remains problematic. We have no indication of the regular interchange between /p/ and /b/.

nants).[661] Since the text under discussion shows no other misspellings of this type, the forms remain enigmatic. The form peculiar to TO and TJ is עוד 'still, yet, again.'[662] This form is unattested in East Aramaic,[663] including our texts. תוב is common in Geonic Aramaic, and attested in the variant readings of Nedarim.[664]

Both כען 'now,' attested in Official Aramaic, Biblical Aramaic, TO and TJ,[665] and השתא, familiar from BTA,[666] are used in our texts.[667]

It has been argued repeatedly that the bowl texts attest to instances of the particle פ- 'and,' equal to the Arabic *fa-*.[668] In AIT 17:11, Montgomery reads פמטו and translates 'and now flee.' He argues that this conjunction may be 'a dialectic survival' in the bowl texts.[669] Epstein emends, however, to סמעו,[670] which is probably a more plausible reading, though one cannot be sure here, at least not on the basis of a photograph. Further instances are possible in Go 6:1, 7 (פקיניה 'and his property'),[671] and in F 1:4 (פחברתא 'and magic').[672] The reading and interpretation of these cases remain most uncertain. Even though this conjunction was used in some Aramaic dialects, including some Old Aramaic dialects,[673] Nabatean,[674] and possibly Palmyrene,[675] one should be careful here. Note that none of the occurrences in other Aramaic dialects are easily connected with a BJA dialect of the Late Aramaic period. Further instances are needed for secure conclusions, but, for the time being, I remain sceptical about the possibility that this conjunction is attested in our texts.

---

661   See also Rossell 1953: 62.

662   See Rybak 1980: 121; Cook 1986: 167.

663   Tal 1975: 52. Note that the same form has another use in Syriac. See ibid. and Nöldeke 1898: 98.

664   Rybak 1980: 93;

665   Tal 1975: 44, 51; Dalman 1905: 212; Cook 1986: 165. It is rare in West Aramaic, which prefers כדון. Ibid.

666   See Tal 1975: 60; Cook 1986: 162.

667   See Go G:11; AIT 3:9.

668   See Montgomery 1913: 192; Gordon 1941: 126, n. 1; Rossell 1953: 60; Franco 1979: 239.

669   Montgomery 1913: 192.

670   Epstein 1921: 48-49.

671   Gordon reads פקינוה as discussed in IV.3. *Suffixed Pronouns* and III.6. Waw *as a Counterpart of* */ā/* (qameṣ). He argues: 'the conjunction פ, common in Arabic and known in Ugaritic and the Zinjirli, Elephantine, Nabatean and Palmyrene dialects of Aramaic.' According to him, it may appear in the bowl texts as borrowed from Arabic. See Gordon 1941: 126.

672   See Franco 1979: 239. Reading is uncertain.

673   See Segert 1975: 225-226.

674   See Cantineau 1935: 139; Levinson 1974: 58-59.

675   The occurrence of פ- in Palmyrene is uncertain. Rosenthal states, 'Die Lesung פ Cb 11 scheint mir bedenklich' (Rosenthal 1936: 86).

כא occurs in N&Sh 5:5, 7 and AIT 17:10 in the combination לכא 'hither.'[676] כא is typically replaced by הכא in TO/TJ and the Late Aramaic dialects.[677]

תמן 'there,' which is common in Aramaic from Middle Aramaic on,[678] is sometimes attested in the bowl texts, e.g. AIT 14:7. Instead, התם used in BTA,[679] is apparently unattested here. Note, however, לאתם in Go A:2, which may re-present basically the same form.[680] The reading and interpretation (= 'thither'?) remain uncertain.

בכין is sporadically attested, e.g. ובכין סליקית 'therefore/thus I have risen up' (AIT 9:7). This particle is commonly attested in Middle Aramaic, including TJ and TO, and in West Aramaic.[681] In the East, it is found – as noted by Tal – only in the bowl texts.[682]

הכדין 'thus, so,' which is frequent in later dialects,[683] occurs in the bowl texts: דהכדין אמר 'for thus he has spoken' (AIT 17:10).[684] By contrast, it is unattested in BTA, though common in the West.[685] The regular form in BTA is הכיל,[686] unattested in our texts.

אף 'also' is quite commonly found, e.g. אף על פרטדוך ליטא 'she also curses Fr.' (N&Sh 4:6). אף is frequently attested in Aramaic dialects, such as Offi-cial Aramaic including Biblical Aramaic, TJ, but it is infrequent in East Aramaic.[687] West Aramaic prefers אוף.[688] BTA regularly uses נמי,[689] which is so far unat-tested in the bowl texts.

---

[676] לכא may appear twice in AIT 17:10. In the latter possible occurrence, Epstein corrects אתא לכא to אתא לנא, but in a photograph of the text it looks more probable that Mont-gomery's original interpretation (i.e. לכא) is correct. Of course, לכא may be a corruption of לנא, which, importantly, is attested in the parallel AIT 8. The first לכא in AIT 17:10 (אמר לכא) is obscure, though Montgomery's reading seems to be reliable. For this form, see also Montgomery 1913: 192.

[677] Cook 1986: 163-164.

[678] See Cook 1986: 167.

[679] See Tal 1975: 61.

[680] See also Rossell 1953: 59.

[681] For details, see Tal 1975: 54-55; Dalman 1905: 215. The form peculiar to Official Aramaic is אד(י)ן 'then.' See Tal 1975: 54; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 92.

[682] Tal 1975: 54, 60.

[683] It occurs as a minority form in TJ, too. Tal 1975: 55.

[684] It also occurs in N&Sh 21:8. Note also כיהכדין 'thus' (AIT 15:5) and בהיכדין in N&Sh 21:8.

[685] See Tal 1975: 55.

[686] Ibid.

[687] Tal 1975: 31, 36, 39.

[688] Cook 1986: 158; Tal 1975: 36.

[689] Tal 1975: 39; Kutscher 1971a: c. 281.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of only a few prepositions, adverbs, and conjunctions pointed out and discussed in this chapter, the bowl texts leave the impression of a mixed type of language: on the one hand, they yield conservative variants, often shared by TO and TJ, and actually by Official Aramaic. Note, for instance, קדם, בין, [690]תחות, על, -כ, the frequent use of ית,[691] אית and לית, כען, תמן, בכין, and אף. On the other hand, they present forms familiar from East Aramaic, notably BTA. Note, for instance, תו/תוב, כי, -בי, and השתא. Yet the forms which accord with BTA are in a minority, and, importantly, they mostly agree with Nedarim and Geonic Aramaic as opposed to standard BTA: תוב clearly predominates over תו, and בין over בי. Besides, some of the forms in common with TO and TJ agree with these 'non-standard' traditions of BTA, too, e.g. על, בין, ית. Furthermore, some forms of uncertain origin are attested, e.g. בבית, הכדין, and the possible use of פ-.

Even though the impression reflected by the bowl texts is based on the analysis of only a few select particles, we may assume that the same situation would prevail on the basis of a comprehensive study of all particles. This is evident in the light of the fact that the picture reflected here is well in keeping with the overall nature of the bowl texts: conservative and more developed linguistic features occur side by side, the former being in the evident majority. Note also that the particles selected are those in which dialectal variation is common within Aramaic dialects.

IV.10. VERBS

In the following, no attempt is made to give an exhaustive treatment of all verbal classes. Instead, the interest of the treatment is to pick up features which are important from the comparative point of view. Nevertheless, basic paradigms are given, especially with respect to tenses. Weak verbs are discussed only with respect to those aspects which are necessary for the comparison; the same applies to derived stems.

The main problem in the study of verbal forms in the texts is the fact that these texts are totally unpointed. Even though we try to utilize the inconsistent use of *matres lectionis* whenever possible, the lack of vocalization prevents us from evaluating several problems which could be studied in pointed texts. In addition, due to the lack of vocalization, different forms are sometimes indistinguishable. To give but one example, כתבנא could be taken either as 1st p. pl. perfect (/k(ə)tavnā/) or as a sg. active participle + 1st p. sg. enclitic personal pronoun (/kātev-nā/). Unfortu-

---

[690] תחת in Official Aramaic. See Muraoka & Porten 1998: 86; Segert 1975: 229.

[691] The *nota objecti* ית is unattested in Official Aramaic, but basically the same particle occurs in Old Aramaic. ית appears once in Biblical Aramaic. See Muraoka & Porten 1998: 262, n. 1050 and the literature given there. See also Segert 1975: 227-228.

nately, the context as well is often all too ambiguous to help us in making definite decisions.

The focus of the treatment lies on the morphology; yet the questions concerning the syntactic use of these forms are dealt with, too.

The inventory of verbal forms used in the bowl texts is basically that of other Middle and Late Aramaic dialects. Tenses are the perfect and imperfect, while the verbal nouns used consist of active and passive participles and the infinitive. The active participle is frequently used verbally as well, especially attached to enclitic personal pronouns, and could probably be taken as a tense, too. In addition, the imperative and vestiges of the jussive are found.

The bowl texts apparently attest to the usual stems known from other dialects, though in unpointed texts like ours, we can usually distinguish, for instance, *pe.* and *pa.* only by comparison with dialects with vocalization. In addition to the basic stem (*pe.*), these texts apparently use the intensive stem *pa.* and the causative *af.* A few instances of *haf.* alongside the regular *af.* are possible,[692] e.g. הפטרית in AIT 18:8, but at least some of the attested examples are suspect due to uncertain readings.[693] Moreover, we encounter reflexive or passive stems: *itpe.*, *itpa.*, and *ittaf.*, all of them well attested in other dialects. A few lexicalized vestiges of *ištaf.* are present as well, e.g. מישתעבדיתון ליה לאורוס 'you make yourselves slaves of 'O.' (N&Sh 13:17).[694]

IV.10.1. Perfect

The conjugation of the perfect according to person, number (sg. and pl.), and gender (masc. and fem.) is formed by suffixes added to the basis. As is well known from other dialects, the following perfect classes occur in the basic stem: (a) -קטל, evidently with the thematic vowel /a/; (b) -קטיל, with the thematic vowel /e/ or /i/; and (c) possibly also -קטול, with the thematic vowel /u/ or /o/.[695] Since the emphasis of the treatment here is on suffixes, the forms of different stems are often listed (and discussed) side by side. Consequently, the derived stems are treated – in passing – only from the comparative point of view. The perfect often appears to be used in the bowl texts to describe actions in the past, though it must be stressed that it is often difficult to ascertain whether a given section in a text refers to the past *versus* present time or even the future. Besides, there quite often occurs the so-

---

692 See also Rossell 1953: 54.

693 Note that instead of הפטרית, one finds in the parallel 11:7 possibly האפטרית or הא פטרית. Cf. Epstein 1921: 41.

694 מישתעבדיתון is an *ištaf.* masc. pl. participle (from the root עבד) combined with the enclitic personal pronoun of the 2nd p. pl. masc.

695 Cf. Epstein 1960: 33; Morag 1988: 123.

called performative perfect, e.g. אשבעית עליכו 'I invoke against you' (N&Sh 25:7).[696]

The suffixes are as follows. More common forms appear first when more than one form is attested:

1st p. sg.	ת(י)-; תי-[697]
2nd p. masc. sg.	---
2nd p. fem. sg.	---
3rd p. masc. sg.	Ø-
3rd p. fem. sg.	Ø-[698];-א/ה-; ת-
1st p. pl.	-נן; נא-
2nd p. masc. pl.	-(י)תון
2nd p. fem. pl.	---
3rd p. masc. pl.	-ון; -Ø; -ו
3rd p. fem. pl.	ן-[699]; ה-; אה-

SOME EXAMPLES:

1st p. c. sg.: אמרת 'I have said' (AIT 2:3);[700] אזלית ופגעית בהון 'I have come and smitten them' (AIT 2:2; 27:5-6); סליקית... ואמרית 'I went up... and said' (ZRL 6);[701] חתמית 'I seal' (AIT 15:7); אסרית וחתמית 'I bind and seal' (AIT 17: 11-12); אנא כתבית... ופטרית יתיכי 'I wrote... and divorced you' (SB 9); שמעית 'I heard' (N&Sh 2:8, 9); אשבעית עליכו 'I invoke against you' (N&Sh 25:7);[702] אנה דבעית כתבית לכין גיטא 'I have written for you a *geṭ*' (AIT 18:8); נקטית ודשאילית נסבת 'I, what I desire I grasp, and what I ask, I take' (AIT 4:6).

3rd p. masc. sg.: ושדר עלה יהושוע בר פרחיה 'and Y. son of P. sent against her' (N&Sh 5:6); שלח 'sent' (AIT 8:6; 17:8); בגיטא דאתה 'in the *geṭ* which came' (N&Sh 5:5); קרי ליה דקירית אישתא 'it has happened to him that the fire has happened' (N&Sh 7:3-4);[703] אמר 'he said' (N&Sh 21:13).

3rd p. fem. sg.: ולא קבילת 'and she did not accept' (N&Sh 5:6); ואישתא מן מרירת קברין ומן אמיתא נפקת 'and the fire came out of the bitterness of

---

[696]   A parallel use of the root שבע in the perfect is attested in Biblical Hebrew, e.g. Ct.2:7. For the performative perfect, see Joüon & Muraoka 1991: 362. See also Muraoka 1997b: 65.

[697]   Occurs only with *verba tertiae waw/yod*, see below.

[698]   The occurrence of this ending as well as of the form with no ending is uncertain (cf. below the discussion concerning the 3rd p. fem. sg.).

[699]   The occurrence of this ending is uncertain (cf. below the discussion concerning the 3rd p. fem. pl.).

[700]   אמרית in AIT 27:6.

[701]   I have no photograph of the text at my disposal, but in a facsimile the reading looks correct.

[702]   אשבעת in Go 5:10.

[703]   קירית is, of course, a fem. form.

tombs and from the darkness' (7:4); ילידת 'she gave birth' (12a:1); קמת וערקת 'she got up and fled' (12a:2); ואזלת 'and she went' (12a:2); לוטתא דלטת 'a curse which she made' (N&Sh 2:5-6); כד הות ההיא ליליתא 'there was that Lilith' (N&Sh 5:6).

1st p. pl.: אנחנא כתבנא 'we have written' (AIT 1:14-15).

2nd p. masc. pl.: ומן עובדי דאיתעבדתון 'and from the practices with which you have been bewitched' (G 10:4); על מא אתיתון 'why have you come?' (ZRL 6-7).[704]

3rd p. masc. pl.: ושדרו וחבילו 'they sent and injured' (N&Sh 2:9); ודלא פירישו לי 'which they did not disclose to me' (N&Sh 5:5); כריזו 'they announced' (N&Sh 5:7); ואמרו 'and they said' (N&Sh 12a:4); וקומו 'they stood up' (N&Sh 12a:6); דהוו 'who were' (N&Sh 13:10); דאתסרו ביה שבעה ככבין 'with which were charmed seven stars' (AIT 4:4);[705] איתעקרו 'they were uprooted' (AIT 9:6); דעבדו 'that they have worked' (Go 1:3); כיבשי עלמא לא איתכבישו אילא על 'everlasting presses which have only been pressed upon...' (AIT 28:2).

3rd p. fem. pl.: ורמתא בהין איתמסראה 'and by them (?) the heights surrendered (?)' (AIT 9:6-7).

COMMENTS

1st p. sg.

The ending ־(י)ת is regular for the 1st p. sg., e.g. שמעית 'I heard' (N&Sh 2:8,9); ושדרית 'I sent' (N&Sh 2:9); אשבעית 'I invoke' (N&Sh 25:5,7); עקרית 'I uproot' (AIT 8:15); סליקית עליהון 'I have mounted up over them' (AIT 9:7). The *plene* spelling (i.e. ית־) is clearly more commonly found than the *defective* (i.e. ת־). The ending ־תי is used only for *verba tertiae waw/yod*; it will be discussed further below ('Notes on weak verbs'). The ending ־(י)ת is standard in Aramaic, appearing in most dialects throughout the history of Aramaic.[706] The forms קטלי and קטילי, with the ending ־י, are absent from the bowl texts. These forms are familiar from standard BTA.[707] With the absence of קטלי and קטילי, the bowl texts side with TO and TJ against standard BTA. In BT, the form with the final ־ת preserved is rare, appearing mainly in pre-Amoraic sources.[708]

[704] I have no photograph of the text at my disposal, but in a facsimile the reading looks correct.

[705] As emended by Epstein, one should read ככבין instead of כוכבין. See Epstein 1921: 33.

[706] It occurs – spelled *defective* – already in Old Aramaic (Ancient Aramaic) and Official Aramaic. See Segert 1975: 265; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 97; Degen 1969: 68; Dion 1974: 181.

[707] See Kutscher 1962: 163-165; Epstein 1960: 34-35; Morag 1988: 125. The Yemenite reading tradition of BTA, has two opposite possibilities in the treatment of the spellings קטלי and קטילי: (1) According to one 'school,' all forms are understood as representing the pattern *qaṭli*, irrespective of whether the *ketiv* is קטלי or קטילי; (2) whereas another 'school' takes the forms written קטילי as representing the pattern *qəṭili*, as opposed to *qaṭli*, written קטלי.

The expected vocalization and structure of the 1st p. sg. is discussed in connection with the 3rd p. fem. sg. (see below).

2nd p. masc. and fem. sg.

In his grammatical sketch Rossell presents the ending ת- for both the 2nd p. masc. and the 2nd p. fem. sg. perfect, without giving examples.[709] ת- is of course the ending one would expect to encounter. However, no secure instances are known to me in the material of this study. Note that the expected spelling of this form is often identical with that of an active participle followed by an enclitic personal pronoun. For instance, פתחת 'you open' in N&Sh 21:3 could be understood either as a perfect in the 2nd p. sg. (*/pətaḥt/) or as a fem. active participle followed by an enclitic personal pronoun (*/pātəḥat/), the latter explanation being the correct one, as confirmed by an adjoining form (i.e. מרמזת).

The *3rd p. masc. sg.* is frequently attested and displays no peculiarities.

3rd p. fem. sg.

Forms of the 3rd p. fem. sg. occur quite commonly in the bowl texts. The ending ת- is generally preserved,[710] e.g. ולא קבילת 'and she did not receive' (N&Sh 5:6); ילידת 'she gave birth' (N&Sh 12a:1). Besides, the bowl texts seem to exhibit forms without the final ת-,[711] e.g. (ההוה) בעתה ואמרה (לי) 'that egg and said to me' (N&Sh 21:5).[712] These forms are in a clear minority, and, in most cases, the instances attested are open to discussion. In addition to אמרה, the following examples have been attested:

One possible case occurs in N&Sh 5: כד הות ההיא ליליתא ד(ה)נקא לבני אינשה 'there was that Lilith who strangled human beings' (N&Sh 5:6). However, for the following reasons, the example is not a persuasive one: first, the reading of נקא(ה) is uncertain. Secondly, all other 3rd p. fem. forms in N&Sh 5 are regular, i.e. הות and קבילת, with the ending ת- preserved. Thirdly, נקא(ה) may be understood as a fem. sg. participle, employed in a sense 'used to strangle.' Naveh and Shaked refer to a Mandaic parallel, where the verbal forms used are indeed fem. participles, e.g. lilita d*iatba*... u*gaṭla*... u*hanqa*.[713]

A further example is found in N&Sh 13, where one may read: ועל מלויתא חצימתא דלויא עים י. ועים ז. דקטלא מנהון בניהון ובנתהון 'and against an

---

[708] Wajsberg 1997: 137. According to Wajsberg (1997: 136), the type קטלית is very common with the root שמע in the passages relating to the first Babylonian Amoraim.

[709] See Rossell 1953: 47.

[710] Note that the ending *-t* is preserved in the 1st p. as well in contrast with standard BTA (see above).

[711] For this form, see Kutscher 1962: 168-169; 1971d: 36-38.

[712] Unfortunately the reading is not certain. As the translation implies, there seems to be something missing from the sentence.

[713] See Naveh & Shaked 1985: 162. Naveh and Shaked do not analyze נקא(ה) grammatically.

impudent female companion who accompanies Y. and Z., who kills their sons and daughters' (N&Sh 13:7-8). Here, again, it is plausible to understand קטלא as a fem. participle, denoting habitual action.

The form with a vocalic ending is typical of standard BTA, where the spelling קטלא/ה is standard; also the archaic קטלת and קטל – which is identical to the corresponding masc. form – appear.[714] קטלת is characteristic of Nedarim and Geonic Aramaic,[715] and regular also in those passages of BT dealing with pre-amoraic material and those of Palestinian origin.[716] Within East Aramaic dialects, Mandaic and Syriac preserve the ending ת-, too,[717] as do all the western dialects.[718]

It is also possible that one example of the form קטל is found in the bowl texts, since in AIT 29:3 – according to the emendation by Epstein – we may read דפסק חיותה,[719] which is translated by him 'dont la vie (l'haleine) a cessé,' and may be compared with נפקא חיותה in BT.[720] But the reading is most uncertain.

Can we say anything about the vocalization of the 1st p. sg. and 3rd p. fem sg., respectively, in the bowl texts?[721] Seeing that the structure of the 1st p. sg. and the 3rd p. fem. sg. is identical in Aramaic, it is justified to discuss these forms together in the same place.[722]

---

[714] For the BTA forms, see Kutscher 1962: 168-169; Kutscher 1971d: 36-38; Epstein 1960: 34; and Morag 1988: 124. The patterns of the Yemenite reading tradition are (a) *qətalat* – *qətelat*; (b) *qaṭlå*; (c) *qəṭal*. Some readers tend to 'correct' exceptional forms to the regular ones, e.g. ונפל מנרתא is read as if it were ונפלה מנרתא. Note that *qaṭlå* appears irrespective of whether the verb is of the type קטל or of the type קטיל. Morag 1988: 124.

[715] Rybak 1980: 91.

[716] Wajsberg 1997: 136.

[717] Macuch 1965: 262; Nöldeke 1898: 100.

[718] See. e.g. Dalman 1905: 254; Fassberg 1983: 232; 1990: 164; Schulthess 1924: 61; Müller-Kessler 1991: 152ff.; Macuch 1982: 143ff. In Samaritan, the Hebrew ending is also used (Macuch 1982: 145-146).

[719] The reading of Montgomery does not make any sense.

[720] See the discussion in Epstein 1921: 57.

[721] In his grammatical sketch, Rossell gives the following vocalizations for the 1st p. sg.: קְטַלַת and קְטֵלַת. No forms of the 3rd p. fem. sg. are listed on p. 69, though on p. 47, the ending ת- occurs for this form. See Rossell 1953: 47, 69. As far as I can guess, קְטָלַת is based on the models of Syriac and Mandaic (and also Biblical Aramaic), while קְטֵלַת follows a model familiar from TO and Biblical Aramaic. Note Rossell's comment on p. 11 where he states: '...an attempt will be made to arrive at a vocalization based on *matres lectionis*, with the additional help of the Eastern Masora, as well as the evidence of the Mandaic and Syriac.'

[722] Save the endings, the structure of the 1st p. sg. and 3rd p. fem. sg. is generally identical, e.g. in Biblical Aramaic *qiṭl* + ending and in the Geniza fragments of the Palestinian Targum *qaṭl* + ending. Therefore the forms of the 3rd p. fem. may be of importance when dealing with the structure of the 1st p. sg. and *vice versa*.

In the 1st. sg. the attested spellings are קטיל(י)ת קטל(י)ת (e.g. שמעית) and קטיל(י)ת (e.g. ילידת) קטילת (e.g. ערקת) and קטלת (e.g. סליקית), while in the 3rd p. sg. קטלת (e.g. ערקת) and קטילת (e.g. ילידת) predominate greatly. If we accept the appearance of the forms, such as חנקא (discussed above), we come across spellings of the type קטלא as well. In addition, we have to take into account an important *tertiae waw/yod* form קירית.[723]

The following patterns are used in other dialects: the Yemenite reading tradition of BTA employs the patterns *qəṭa/el-* (+ ending of the 1st p. or 3rd p. fem., respectively), *qəṭil-*, and *qaṭl-*,[724] whereas in the *vocalization* of TO and TJ only *qəṭa/el-*-occurs.[725] GA – at least as it is reflected in the Geniza fragments of the Palestinian Targum – has the pattern *qaṭl-*, too.[726] By contrast, Biblical Aramaic,[727] Mandaic,[728] and Syriac attest to *qi/eṭl-*.[729]

The spelling קטיל- implies that the pattern *qəṭel-* is reflected in these texts. Furthermore, *qəṭal-* is probable for the following reasons. First, the bowl texts share many common elements with the TO type of Aramaic as to the verbal patterns. Note, for instance, that the 1st p. sg. of *verba tertiae waw/yod* in the bowl texts is of the type בניתי, in keeping with TO (see below). The impression of agreement between TO and the form of Aramaic used in the bowl texts is further strengthened by the fact that in both of them the forms with the elision of the ending ת- are exceptional if at all attested. Hence, we may assume the pattern *qəṭal-* alongside *qəṭel-*, as in the vocalization of TO. Both forms – as confirmed by the Yemenite reading tradition – also appear in BTA, where they seem to be typical of those 'subdialects' which yield a conservative type of Aramaic, preserving the ending ת-. The generally conservative character of the Aramaic used in the bowl texts is evident.

---

[723] דקירית אישתא 'that the fire has happened' (N&Sh 7:3-4).

[724] See Morag 1988: 124-125. All patterns listed occur both in the 1st p. and in the 3rd p. except *qəṭil-* which appears only in the 1st p. sg., e.g. *šəqili*. The pattern *qəṭa/el-* is attested only with the ending ת- and with no ending, while *qaṭl-* and *qəṭil-* occur only with a vocalic ending. The pattern *qəṭil-* is possibly unattested in *Halakhot Pesuqot*, since the spelling קטילי is not found. See Ben-Asher 1970: 282. According to Ben-Asher, the spellings attested in *Halakhot Pesuqot* for the 1st p. sg. are קטלית and קטלי, and for the 3rd p. fem. sg. קטלת and קטלה(-א) (ibid.). Is קטילי really unattested in *Halakhot Pesuqot* for the 1st p. sg.?

[725] Dalman 1905: 256, 261; Tal 1975: 71.

[726] See Fassberg 1983: 252.

[727] Rosenthal 1974: 43. Alongside *qiṭl-*, Biblical Aramaic has an instance of the pattern *qəṭil-* attested in the 3rd p. fem. sg. for intransitive verbs: בְּטֵלַת in Ezr. 4:24. See also Kutscher 1962: 164. בְּטֵלַת is generally accepted as reflecting a Babylonian tradition. See e.g. Boyarin 1978: 146.

[728] Macuch 1965: 263-264.

[729] Nöldeke 1898: 105; Muraoka 1997b: 45; Kutscher 1962: 163.

Secondly, the pattern *qaṭl*-, unattested in TO, is found in BTA only with a vocalic ending, though, it must be admitted, the pattern *qaṭli* of the 1st p. – with all probability – goes back to *qaṭli/eṯ*,[730] known, as such, only in the west. Moreover, we have no instance of a spelling of the type קאט-, though this evidently proves little. We have no instance of קטאל- either, and, therefore, one could argue that its absence makes the occurrence of *qəṭal*- somewhat less plausible, but, significantly, /a/ in a medial position is rarely marked with *matres lectionis* in these texts, except in names and fem. pl. nominal endings.[731] The pattern *qaṭl*- is the expected one for spellings, such as חנקא, with a vocalic ending.[732] Yet, as noted, the appearance of such forms for the 3rd p. fem. sg. is uncertain, and, in any case, they cannot be taken as reliable witnesses to the normal language of the bowl texts.

Instead, the occurrence of *qiṭl*- is more probable, for, importantly, we have a *tertiae waw/yod* form קירית (see above) from the root קרי. This form may be argued as representing the pattern *qi/eṭl*-.[733] We might go even farther and argue that קירית proves that, perhaps, all the forms of the type קטל- represent the pattern *qi/eṭl*- in place of the *qəṭal*-. This theory resembles the formulation of Kutscher, who in his important article on BTA suggests that BTA employed the pattern *qiṭl*- alongside *qəṭi/el*-.[734] It should be noted as well that the pattern employed in Mandaic, Syriac, and Biblical Aramaic is indeed *qi/eṭl*-(see above).[735] Moreover, in his grammar of BTA, Epstein presents, alongside more common patterns,[736] some examples vocalized קְטָלַת,[737] all of them in Nedarim, a fact which may be of importance. Yet we may ask how reliable these instances are.[738]

---

730   Therefore, we cannot absolutely exclude the possibility that qaṭl- would appear here

731   See above III.1 and IV.8. It is noteworthy that in the BTA spelling too, the attempted vocalization of קטי- is marked by *yod*, but in the case of קט-, it remains difficult to be certain of the correct vocalization. See Epstein 1960: 33, 35; Kutscher 1962: 164. Due to the *ketiv* in BTA, Kutscher argued in his 1962 article that BTA exhibits the pattern *qəṭi/el*- for verbs of the type קטיל (i-stem) and the pattern *qiṭl*-for verbs of the type קטל (a-stem). This is in keeping with the Tiberian tradition of Biblical Aramaic. See Kutscher 1962: 163-164. Yet one should bear in mind that the Yemenite reading tradition does not employ *qiṭl*-.

732   As far I know, Aramaic shows no other pattern in the 3rd p. fem. with a vocalic ending.

733   As suggested by Naveh and Shaked (1985: 170).

734   Kutscher 1962: 163-164.

735   *Verba tertiae waw/yod* attest in Biblical Aramaic only to a pattern with the ending *-at*. See Rosenthal 1974: 66. This may be due to the fact that we have in Biblical Aramaic no instances of intransitive verbs appearing in the 3rd p. fem. See Rosenthal 1974: 51. At least in Syriac, the pattern of the type *ḥeḏyaṯ* occurs for intransitive verbs, while the pattern of the type *rmāṯ* is used for transitive verbs. See Nöldeke 1898: 116-118.

736   קְטָלַה is unattested.

737   See Epstein 1960: 34. By contrast, no forms of this type are given by Levias (1930: 131). In his grammar of BTA, Epstein gives one instance of a *tertiae waw/yod* form of this type: חֲזָיַת. Epstein 1960: 95.

As a counter-argument, one may maintain – in addition to the fact that *qi/eṭl-* is unknown in TO – that besides the afore-mentioned קירית, we have no example of the spelling קיטל- either in the 1st p. or in the 3rd p. fem. If the pattern *qi/eṭl-* were standard in these texts, one would expect more spellings of the type קיטל- to be found, given the frequent use of *yod* as a vowel letter (*mater lectionis*). Further, the 1st p. sg. in *verba tertiae waw/yod* is generally constructed according to the model of TO (קרית), which implies a pattern of the type *qəti/el-/qəṭal-* for the 3rd p. fem. sg.

קירית suggests, I believe, that patterns of diverse sorts are reflected in the bowl texts, and, consequently, one may maintain that differences point back to different times or places. Note that contrasting patterns are present in BTA as well, both as regards the 1st p. sg. and the 3rd. p. fem.[739] Still one possibility suggests itself: the form קירית may be a phonetic spelling of a *tertiae waw/yod* form of the type *qəṭet*, familiar, for instance, from the Yemenite reading tradition.[740] The expression of *shwa* by *yod* is commonplace in these texts, e.g. תישתקון (a *pa.* imperfect) in N&Sh 6:9 and a passive participle pl. כיפיתון in N&Sh 5:7.

Based both on the spellings attested in the bowl texts and on comparisons with other dialects, we may conclude that the bowl texts display – in accordance with the vocalization of TO – the type *qəta/i/el- versus qa/i/eṭl-* in most other dialects. Yet the occurrence of *qi/eṭl-* is plausible as well, at least in the 3rd p. fem. sg. of *verba tertiae waw/yod*. As suggested, divergent patterns may be attributed to regional dialectal varieties. We may propose that some BA dialects employed patterns of the type *qəta/i/el-*, while others had the pattern *qa/iṭl-*. Later, these forms, originally from different dialects, appeared side by side in literary works, such as Talmudic texts and bowl texts. According to Morag, the type *qa/iṭl-* is an eastern feature, while *qəta/i/el-*, for instance in the Yemenite tradition, is due to influence of TO.[741] Yet it is generally accepted that the vocalization of TO reflects a BA dialect, too.[742] Hence, the pronunciation assumed here for these forms in the bowl texts reflects that BA tradition (among other traditions) which is shared by the vocalization of TO.

---

[738] Note Kutscher's criticism of Epstein's grammar in his extensive review article (Kutscher 1962, especially pp. 150ff.).

[739] See the examples given in Epstein 1960: 34.

[740] See Morag 1988: 252.

[741] Morag 1988: 128.

[742] See Kutscher 1962: 164; Boyarin 1978: 146.

1st p. pl.

The sole reliable example of נַ- is the above-listed אֲנַחְנָא כְּתַבְנָא.[743] Moreover, we seem to have at least two instances of נַן-.[744] According to Gordon, נַן- occurs in a British Museum bowl (91776, line 6) published by him: סליקנן לאיגרא אמרינן להון 'we went up to the roof and we said to them.'[745] The bowl attests other typical traits of BTA too, such as אתו as an independent personal pronoun for the 2nd p. pl., a fact which supports the occurrence of the ending נַן- there. In AIT 17:13, Montgomery reads דפירקין להון and translates 'whom we have removed.' According to him, it is 'Pael, 1st pers. plural,'[746] but as pointed out by Epstein, the correct reading is apparently דפתחין להון.[747]

The ending נַ- is one of the conservative traits of the bowl texts. The same ending appears as a standard suffixed personal pronoun in these texts (see above IV.3). Old Aramaic and Official Aramaic attest to the spelling ן-,[748] which apparently stands for the pronunciation [nā], while in Biblical Aramaic only נַ- is found.[749] The same holds true for TO and TJ.[750] נַ- is known from Qumran Aramaic, too.[751] In West Aramaic, נַ- is apparently unknown.[752] In the east it is rare as well, occurring only in BTA. In BTA, it is typical of *'Edot*, which display a conservative type of language.[753] Within BT, נַ- is likewise attested in the Aramaic of the early Babylonian Amoraim, at least as regards the form הוינא for the regular הוינן.[754] By contrast, the perfect pattern קטלנא, with the ending נַ-, for the 1st p. pl. is unattested in standard BTA, even though spellings of the type קטלנא are common: the correct interpretation of spellings of the type קטלנא is קטלנה (= קטלן + ה- 'we have killed her') in stead of *qəṭalnā* ('we have killed').[755] The

---

743 These texts abound in spellings of the type קטלנא, but almost always the plausible interpretation of these is a combination of an active participle followed by an enclitic personal pronoun in the first person (*qāṭel-nā). Cf. IV.2. *Enclitic Personal Pronouns.*

744 Rossell, in his 1953 grammar, lists both נַ- and נַן- without giving any textual references one could check up on. Rossell 1953: 47.

745 See Gordon 1941: 342. I have no photograph of the bowl at my disposal.

746 Montgomery 1913: 192.

747 See Epstein 1921: 49.

748 Degen 1969: 64; Hug 1993: 76; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 97-98; Segert 1975: 248.

749 Segert 1975: 248.

750 Tal 1975: 71, 74.

751 Tal 1975: 74.

752 By contrast, נה- is attested in Palestinian Christian Aramaic and in Samaritan Aramaic alongside the regular ן-. For the West Aramaic forms, see Tal 1975: 74-75; Müller-Kessler 1991: 152; Macuch 1982: 143; Fassberg 1990: 166 and the cross-refernces given there.

753 Epstein 1960: 33, 35; Tal 1975: 77.

754 See Wajsberg 1997: 138.

755 Wajsberg 1997: 138; 1992: 158-159.

confusion of the spellings קטלנה and קטלנא in BTA is evidently connected with the weakness of /h/.

In lieu, standard BTA employs the endings ן- and ין-, and the occurrence of נן- is likely as well.[756] The patterns attested in the Yemenite reading tradition are (a) *qaṭlan*; (b) *qəṭalnā*; and (c) *qəṭelnan*.[757] The forms with the ending ין- are treated in the Yemenite reading tradition as participles with an enclitic personal pronoun of the 1st p. pl.[758] The fact that ין- is unattested in the Yemenite reading tradition of BTA as well as in *Halakhot Pesuqot* testifies to dialectal differences within BA.[759] Note also that according to Kutscher, נן- is rarely attested in BTA. As is well known, the Yemenite reading tradition and *Halakhot Pesuqot* yield a great degree of agreement both in their phonology and morphology.[760]

Given the very few secure occurrences of the 1st p. pl. in the bowl texts, we have to be careful when drawing conclusions, but, once again, it seems that the linguistic tradition of the bowl texts is a mixed one, displaying forms of both standard BTA and TO.

2nd p. masc. pl.

The question concerning the occurrence of this form in the bowl texts is rather complicated, for in unpointed texts like ours, 2nd p. masc. pl. forms and active participles with enclitic personal pronouns of the 2nd p. pl. often look identical. The instances given in Epstein's grammar of BTA show that the same problem is evident in the orthography of BTA as well.[761] For instance, נפקיתון in N&Sh 13:17, 18 could be either of these two forms. In this case the correct interpretation is confirmed by the adjoining verbal form, מישתעבדיתון, which is a participle. Unfortunately, the content of these texts is often too ambiguous to form a solid basis for correct analysis of a single verbal form. Therefore, I offer these observations with some hesitation.

In his grammatical sketch, Rossell gives the endings תון- and תו- for the 2nd p. masc. pl.[762] Based on my own observations, it seems that we have only a few reliable instances of the 2nd p. masc. pl. at our disposal. In addition to the cases listed above, we seem to have secure examples in two bowls published by Gordon:

---

[756] Kutscher 1962: 165; 1971: c. 280.

[757] Morag 1988: 127. As regards *qəṭalnā*, it apparently occurs in the Yemenite tradition in similar contexts as otherwise in BTA. Note, however, that Morag gives one instance of a form in which the *ketiv* is קלטן, but the *qere* of the ending [-nā].

[758] Morag 1988: 127, n. 22.

[759] According to Ben-Asher (1970: 282), *Halakhot Pesuqot* has the endings ן- and נן-.

[760] See e.g. Morag 1968: 76-77, 83, 86-87.

[761] See Epstein 1960: 35, 41. For instance, אמריתון is given as an example of both the 2nd p. pl. perfect and the participle pl. with the enclitic personal pronoun of the 2nd p. pl.

[762] See Rossell 1953: 47, 69.

הדרו ואזילו באורחא דאתתון בה ועולו לביתא דנפקתון מיניה 'return and go by the way on the which you have come and enter the house from which you went' (The Iraq Museum bowl No. 9731 line 10). I cannot check the reading, but basically the same text appears in ZRL,[763] which can also be read on the basis of a facsimile. In all the reliable cases, the ending is either תון- or יתון- (for *verba tertiae waw/yod*).

Our forms with the final *nun* are in accordance with TO and TJ, as opposed to standard BTA, where the final *nun* has been elided, e.g. כתביתו.[764] In Nedarim, the forms with *nun* appear alongside the standard BTA forms.[765] According to Rybak, a similar feature is standard in Geonic Aramaic, too.[766]

2nd p. fem. pl.

No reliable occurrences are known to me. One example might be in AIT 17:9 where we may read דאת שלחתן, which as such – given the presumption that את stands for אתון – could mean 'which you (fem. pl.) sent.' However, this is not reasonable in the context, and hence it is probable that דאת שלחתן is a corruption of something else.[767]

3rd p. masc. pl.

The standard ending in Aramaic for the 3rd p. masc. pl. is ו-, which generally represents either *-ū* or *-ō*.[768] As is well known, the loss of the final unstressed vowels is one of the characteristic features of East Aramaic.[769] Consequently, the final *-ū* of the 3rd masc. pl. perfect disappeared in Mandaic,[770] in Syriac, where it was re-

---

[763] הדרו באורחא דאתיתון בה ועולו לביתא דנפ(?)קתון מיניה (ZRL 9-10).

[764] Epstein 1960: 34-35; Rybak 1980: 88. In the Yemenite reading tradition יתון- appears only for *verba tertiae waw/yod* alongside יתו-, while in the regular verbs תון- is found. See Morag 1988: 127, especially, n. 18, 254-255.

[765] Rybak 1980: 88.

[766] Ibid. According to Ben-Asher (1970: 282), *Halakhot Pesuqot*, for instance, has only תו-.

[767] AIT 17 is 'an abbreviated and often incorrect replica' of AIT 8. See Montgomery 1913: 191. According to Montgomery (1913: 192), דאת שלחתן is 'a perversion.' Epstein, in his extensive review article, emends the reading of Montgomery to דאתשלחתו, which is translated by him 'dont vous avez reçu l'envoi (qui vous ont été envoyés).' Epstein's emendation, however, fails to convince me. First, on the basis of a photograph of the text, the last letter is far more likely *nun* than *waw*, though the distinction between terminal *nun* and *waw* is not always evident in the script. Secondly, there is a clear gap in the text between *taw* and *šin*, and, thirdly, אתשלחתו would apparently be *etpa.* (or *etpe.*) perfect, which according to the standard dictionaries has a passive meaning 'to be sent, etc.' See Jastrow 1903: 1580; Sokoloff 1990: 552; Drower & Macuch 1963: 466; Payne Smith 1903: 579. Thus, אתשלחתו here should mean something like 'you were sent' – not 'to whom was sent' – which does not make any sense here.

[768] For the distribution of the 3rd p. masc. pl. ending in different Aramaic dialects, see the tables in Fassberg 1983: 236-237 and 1990: 235-236.

[769] See e.g. Kutscher 1962: 165. See also above III.5.

tained only in the *ketiv*,[771] and most likely in BTA as well.[772] The trait is attested already in Palmyrene.[773] According to Kutscher, BTA employs the patterns קטלו, קטול, and probably also קטל.[774] He assumes that the ending ו- was, perhaps, used in BTA only as *ketiv*, in keeping with the spelling of Syriac.[775] The Yemenite reading tradition of BT exhibits the following patterns (1a) *qaṭalu-qəṭilu*;[776] (1b) *qaṭlu*;[777] and (2) *qəṭul*.[778] In addition to reliable MSS. of BT and the reading tradition of the Yemenite Jews, קטול is attested in *Halakhot Pesuqot*.[779] West Aramaic employs ון- alongside ו-.[780] Forms with final *nun* also exist in Mandaic and Syriac, alongside forms with no ending.[781]

The bowl texts abound in instances of the 3rd p. masc. pl. The ending has mostly been retained, at least in the orthography, e.g. איתבלעו שמיא וארעה 'heaven and earth are swallowed up' (AIT 9:6).

Only sporadically do we come across instances where the final ו- has been elided: מחיתנא עליכון שמתא וגזירתא ואחרמתא דאיתנח על חירמון טורא ועל ליויתן תנינא ועל סדום ועל עמורא 'I will bring down upon you the curses (masc. pl.) (lit. 'names') and the proscription (fem. sg.?) and the ban (fem. sg.?) which (all of them?) fell upon Mount Hermon and upon the monster Leviathan and upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah' (AIT 2:6).[782]

Another example is found in AIT 14:6, where the text runs: דאידכר שמיהון בכסא הדין וידלא אידכרית שמיהון בכסא הדין 'whose names (masc. pl.) are recorded in this bowl and whose names (masc. pl.) are not recorded in this bowl'

---

770   Nöldeke 1875: 33-34, 223.

771   Nöldeke 1898: 35, 100.

772   See Kutscher 1962: 165-167; 1971: c. 280.

773   See Cantineau 1935: 56-57; Kutscher 1962: 165.

774   Kutscher 1962: 165-167; 1971: c. 280.

775   Kutscher 1962: 167.

776   Morag 1988: 125. The distinction is made according to the spelling: forms written with *yod* after the first radical are generally pronounced [qəṭilu], and others [qaṭalu].

777   Morag 1988: 126. This pattern is less common than *qaṭalu* and appears mainly followed by a preposition + suffixed pronoun (e.g. נָפְלוּ בֵיהּ).

778   Ibid.

779   Boyarin 1976a: 175; Ben-Asher 1970: 282. For the different theories concerning the origin of the pattern קטול, see Epstein 1960: 35, n. 15 and, especially, Kutscher 1962: 165-166. Note that *Halakhot Pesuqot* offers basically the same forms as the Yemenite reading tradition (i.e. *qəṭalu* and *qəṭul*). See Ben-Asher 1970: 282.

780   Tal 1979: 167; Fassberg 1983: 233, 236; 1990: 236. According to Tal, the form with final *nun* is the rule in PTA, while, for instance, in Neophyti and Palestinian Christian Aramaic it is restricted to *verba tertiae waw/yod*. Tal 1975: 74-75.

781   Fassberg 1990: 236; Macuch 1965: 263; Nöldeke 1898: 100.

782   איתנח is an *itpe.* perfect from the root נוח. There remains the possibility that the verb איתנח refers only to אחרמתא. שמתא evidently stands for שמהתא. Cf. e.g. N&Sh 2:7.

(AIT 14:6). אידכרית is obscure and evidently a scribal error.[783] Both איתנה cited above and אידכר of this example probably demonstrate the loss of -ו. Note, however, the possibility which may explain the latter example: in BTA a sg. perfect form is sometimes used in place of the expected pl., when the verb precedes the subject.[784]

The most important single text testifying to the loss of the 3rd p. masc. pl. ending is N&Sh 13, as shown by the following sequences:

אתא (.masc. sg) מריא אתא גיס קריב (.masc. sg) עליהון על שידי ועל דיוי ועל ליליתא בישתא דשירא עים יויתאי בת חתאי ועל דנחיש ועל דיני ועל זכיא ועל פתכרא ועל ליליתא בישתא ועל מליתא חציפתא דלויא עים יויתאי בת חתאי ועים זוריגאי בר אימא דקטלא מינהון בניהון ובנתהון רמי (.masc. sg) לה פולקתא בפומה תבר (.masc. sg) שינה בפומה שפיד (.masc. sg) מוקרה קמה מחונה (.masc. pl) בחרבא דקטלא על מוקדה חביל (.masc. sg) קומה כל בישה בטילו (.masc. pl) אזה מן (N&Sh 13:6-9).

The sequence is translated by Naveh and Shaked: 'There came the lord, there came the troop. He came against them, against the demons, against the dēws, against the evil Lilith, who dwells with Yawitai d. of Hatai, against Danahiš, against the judges, against he who is acquitted, against the idol, against the evil Lilith, against the impudent female companion who accompanies Yawitai d. of Hatai and Zorigai son of Imma, who kills their sons and daughters. He cast a hatchet in her mouth, he broke her teeth in her mouth, he pierced her brain before her (i.e. before the client), they smote her on the top of her head with a sword of slaying, he destroyed all evil from her presence, they annihilated 'zh...'

The subject here is first of all מריא with גיס separately (אתא מריא אתא גיס), then later probably both together. Importantly, this sequence displays some verbs in the sg. (חביל, שפיד, תבר, רמי, קריב, אתא), while the others are in the pl. (מחונה 'they smote her,' בטילו). Moreover, רמי could also be read with the final *waw* instead of *yod*, i.e. רמו (masc. pl.), and, in the same manner, קריב and שפיד can possibly be read קרוב and שפוד,[785] respectively (cf. סחוף below in line 16). The letters *waw* and *yod* are hardly distinguishable, at least not on the basis of a photograph of the text. It seems that – with the exception of the verb אתא at the beginning – all the verbs are intended to be masc. pl. forms. Naturally one could argue that the verbal forms refer separately sometimes to מריא and sometimes to

---

[783] Montgomery (1913: 184) assumes that it is 'evidently a confusion between the passive and 1st person active.'

[784] See Schlesinger 1928: 51ff.

[785] According to Naveh and Shaked, שפיד is a *pa.* form. In Hebrew, it appears in *pa.* with this meaning. See Jastrow 1903: 1613. Is this meaning attested in JA? Yet, Syriac has the same meaning both in *pe.* and *pa.* See Payne Smith 1903: 590. Hence, שפיד/ו could be taken as a *pe.* form as well.

גֿיס, and when a pl. is used, the reference would be to both of them together. But while the text attests to several other instances of the fluctuation in number, it is most unlikely (see below).[786]

Similarly, in lines 13, 14 and 16-17 we have sequences where a form with no ending (masc. sg.) and a form with the ending ו- (masc. pl.) vary:

אתא (masc. sg.) עליכון מריא בגדנא כנשונכו (masc. pl.) כבשונכו
ואחיתונכו (masc. pl.) תחות טורא רב(ה) דפרזלא (N&Sh 13).

This sequence is translated by Naveh and Shaked as follows: 'There came to you the lord Bagdana. They gathered you, they suppressed you, they brought you down underneath the big mountain of iron.' Here all verbs but אתא at the beginning are in the plural.

א(ת)א (masc. sg.) דיוי נקש (masc. pl.) פרגוד רמנכו (masc. sg.) לכו
בליביכו אצמומי דפרזלא אחית (masc. sg.) עליכון טינרא רבה
דיגלל אטף (masc. sg.) עליכון ימא וכיפיה (N&Sh 14).

The translation of Naveh and Shaked is as follows: 'There came attendants (?),[787] they cast you, dēws, they struck against your hearts arrows of iron, he brought down upon you a large flint rock of unhewn stone, he caused the sea and its cliffs to flow over you.' In this sequence, all verbs are in the sg. except possibly the one followed by a pronominal suffix, i.e. רמנכו 'they/he cast you,' which, as noted by Naveh and Shaked, possibly stands for רמונכו, and may be compared with כנשונכו etc. in the former sequence.

A more persuasive example is attested in lines 16-17, where the text runs:

ואתא (masc. sg.) למיסחף בתי דאילהי וסחוף (masc. pl.) כל
איסתרתא ספונהו (masc. pl.) לפתורהו שדונהו (masc. pl.) לאגנהו
זלח (masc. sg.) להו חלבא בארבעא זויתא בסיא (?) לקרניהו
תברו (masc. pl.) לשיפורהו שויא (?) לחדותהו נסיסא (N&Sh 13:16-17).

This is translated by Naveh and Shaked: 'He came to wreck the houses of the gods, and he wrecked their table, they cast away their chalice, they sprinkled fat in the four corners, they trampled upon their horns, they broke their trumpets, they turned their joy into grief.'

In this section, all the verbs followed by a pronominal suffix are in the pl. (i.e. שדונהו and סחפונהו), even though there are no pl. nouns to which these pl. verbs could refer.[788] In addition, we have two other verbs in the pl. (i.e. סחוף and תברו) and likewise two in the sg. (i.e. אתא and זלח). As noted by Naveh and Shaked, בסיא and שויא are obscure. According to them, they look like singular feminine forms, but 'remain unexplained.'[789] Perhaps we should read: בסו אל קרניהו

---

[786] See the discussion in Naveh & Shaked 1985: 208-209.

[787] For the word פרגוד, see Naveh & Shaked 1985: 210-211.

[788] See Naveh & Shaked 1985: 209.

[789] Naveh & Shaked 1985: 208-209.

Here we come across verbal forms equivalent to the 3rd p. masc. sg. in connection with definitely pl. subjects (גברי ,אידי ,חילוותא, and קצירי). The sentences of this sequence may be compared with parallel sentences such as איתבלעו (masc. pl.) שמיא וארעה 'heaven and earth are swallowed up' (AIT 9:6). Generally, a pl. subject requires a predicate in the pl. Yet there remains one possibility: in BTA, a masc. sg. form – especially in the perfect – occurs sometimes in connection with a pl. or fem. subject when the predicate precedes the subject, e.g. אישתכח עליה תרי קורטי דמא ;נפק מילתא מבינייהו.[800] This is less common with a pl. subject (second example) than with a fem. subject (first example). However, given the frequency of the incongruencies attested in our text, it is not a plausible explanation here.

The evidence present in this text is indicative of the deletion of the masc. pl. ending unless followed by a suffix. The masc. pl. patterns in the tradition reflected in N&Sh 13 seem to be *qəṭulol* and, evidently also, *qəṭalil*. Both of them are familiar from BTA, though the latter is less well attested. There remains the possibility that a spelling of the type קטל would also represent the pattern *qəṭulol*. It is interesting that the deletion of the masc. pl. ending is so well attested in a bowl which clearly presents more isoglosses held in common with standard BTA than bowl texts in general.[801] Yet, the bowl under discussion also yields features in common with the majority of the bowl texts and as opposed to standard BTA.[802] One could argue that – for some reason – this text was written in a type of Aramaic which was closer to the actual vernacular of the era, though it still displays many conservative traits peculiar to the bowl texts.

Additionally, at least one example of a form with the final *nun* seems to appear in the material: אישתכחון 'they were found' (AIT 25:2).[803] AIT 25 presents other puzzling forms, too, such as mixed Hebrew-Aramaic forms and those typical of Mandaic.[804] If the reading is correct, the form under discussion agrees on the one hand with GA and on the other with Syriac and Mandaic, which also display 3rd p. pl. forms with the final *nun* (see above). While the final *nun* for the 3rd masc. pl. was first attached to *verba tertiae waw/yod* – as is evident on the basis of Qumran Aramaic – it should be noted that we have no examples of this element in the bowl texts for that group of verbs.[805] One should, however, note the possibility that איתעדון (from the root עדי) appears in AB D (see immediately below). In any

---

[800] This example and others are cited in Schlesinger 1928: 53ff.

[801] See V. *Conclusions*.

[802] See V.

[803] 3rd p. masc. pl. from the root שכח (in *etpe.* or *etpa.*) 'to be found.' See Jastrow 1903: 1572.

[804] Cf. the discussion in Epstein 1921: 53-54.

[805] Cf. Cook 1986: 178. TJ has some examples of the final *nun* added to the 3rd p. masc. pl., e.g. עלון. See Dalman 1905: 254-255.

case, אישתכחון is an inconclusive exception in these texts, and one wonders whether it might reflect the influence of Mandaic. It is possible as well that the final *nun* could have been present in some BJA dialects. Given the fact that it occurs as a by-form in both Mandaic and Syriac, that would not be surprising. Besides, in the 3rd p. fem. pl. standard BTA indeed has a form with the final *nun*, i.e. כתבן, alongside כתב.[806] The former is represented by *qaṭlån* in the Yemenite reading tradition.[807]

Another possible occurrence of a form with ן- is in AB D:4, where one may read either איתעדון or איתעדין 'so that unclean spirits be איתעדין טמאה בישה:איתעדין removed.' This uncertain form is discussed further below in connection with the 3rd p. fem. pl.

In sum, it is noteworthy that the bowl texts display so few instances with elision of final ן-. It is likely that in this respect these texts follow the conservative spelling tradition prevalent among the JA dialects (TO, TJ, and partly also BTA).[808] Further, it is possible or even probable that the instances with the elision of final ן- show influence from actual vernacular(s), where this ending had – in all probability – disappeared, as is evident in the light of Syriac, Mandaic, and also BTA.[809] However, one cannot exclude the possibility that some subdialects within BTA or BJA in general maintained this ending.

3rd p. fem. pl.

Only a few instances are attested.[810] In AIT 9, the text runs ורמתא בהין איתמסראה 'and by them (?) the heights surrendered (?)' (AIT 9:6-7), the reading of which is uncertain.[811] Hence, there is little upon which we could construct a description of the 3rd p. fem. pl. Yet, if the reading is correct, the spelling אה- evidently stands for the ending -*ā*,[812] attested in some Aramaic dialects. Another possible example is found in AIT 28: ונורייא כללה (AIT 28:3).[813] This prob-

---

[806] See Kutscher 1971a: c. 280. כתב has been identified by Kutscher (1962: 167-168).

[807] See Morag 1988: 127.

[808] TO and TJ preserve the final ן-. Dalman 1905: 254-255; Tal 1975: 71.

[809] Note the discussion of Kutscher on קטול. Kutscher 1962: 165-167. See also III.5. *Word-final Vowels*.

[810] No example of the 3rd p. fem. pl. is given in Rossell 1953.

[811] Montgomery reads ורמתא בהון איתמסי אה. The emendation by Epstein (1921: 38) goes ורמתא בהון איתמסראה. On the basis of a photograph, it seems that the reading of Epstein is otherwise correct, but I read with hesitation בהין in place of בהון. There is a tendency to distinguish between *waw* and *yod* in this text.

[812] According to Epstein (1921: 38), איתמסראה is 'une graphie pleine pour אתמסרה.'

[813] Epstein (1921: 56) points out that נור is of fem. gender in Syriac. Yet the pl. ending attested in Syriac is -*wāṭā*. See Payne Smith 1903: 334. In Mandaic, too, *nura* 'fire' is usually fem., the pl. form being indeed *nuria*. See Drower & Macuch 1963: 294. In GA, נור may be either masc. or fem. See Sokoloff 1990: 345.

lematic phrase is translated by Epstein 'et les lumières (du ciel) (rayons de soleil?) donnèrent leur bénédiction nuptiale.'[814]

In addition, we have a most uncertain example of the ending ‎‎‎‎‎‎ן-: אּיתעדין טמאה בישה 'so that unclean spirits be removed' (AB D:4). Geller reads טמאה, even though he admits that טמאה is a more probable reading.[815] He argues that טמאה is 'a common description in the Talmud for demons.'[816] If the reading is correct, we could assume that טמאה בישה would have been used as a collective, requiring a pl. predicate. Yet, טמאה בישה looks like a masc., suggesting, perhaps, that a masc. form איתעדון is to be read here instead of איתעדין. The other possibility, איתעדין, would be a fem. pl. from the same root (עדי).[817] It would accord with the regular BTA pattern for *verba tertiae waw/yod*, which is reflected as *qatyân* in the Yemenite reading tradition.[818]

The ending *-ā* occurs for the 3rd p. fem. pl. as the *qere* in Biblical Aramaic,[819] as the sole form in TO,[820] in TJ,[821] and in Qumran Aramaic.[822] Among the Late Aramaic dialects, *-ā* occurs only in BTA, where it is rarely attested.[823] The standard form in BTA is spelt קטלן,[824] pronounced [qaṭlân] in the Yemenite reading tradition.[825] קטל also occurs.[826] At least the latter is so far unattested in the bowl texts.

---

814 See Epstein 1921: 56. No translation is given by Montgomery.

815 Geller 1986: 113.

816 Ibid.

817 See also Geller 1986: 113.

818 See Morag 1988: 254.

819 Rosenthal 1974: 12, 43. The authenticity of the distinct morpheme *-ā* for the 3rd p. fem. pl. has been contested by several scholars, notably Z. Ben-Hayyim (1951). The problem lies in the fact that this morpheme is only attested in a handful of Aramaic dialects, including Biblical Aramaic (only *qere* as against the *ketiv*), TO/TJ, Qumran Aramaic, and BTA. Note that the *qere* in Biblical Aramaic evidently reflects Babylonian influence. See e.g. Kutscher 1971b: 378. Importantly, the specific 3rd p. pl. fem. form is unattested in all types of Official Aramaic and Old Aramaic, which employ the form equivalent to the corresponding masc. Yet from the comparative Semitic point of view, *-ā* is far from a surprise (cf. Moscati 1964: 137, 139-140). It is also noteworthy that the new evidence provided by the Qumran texts was not taken into account by Ben-Hayyim (cf. Muraoka & Porten 1998: 101, n. 461). For the discussion, see also Kutscher 1971b: 375-376; Ginsberg 1959: 143-145; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 101-102; Segert 1975: 248-249.

820 Dalman 1905: 255; Fassberg 1983: 236; 1990: 236.

821 Tal 1975: 71.

822 Fassberg 1983: 236; Tal 1975: 214.

823 Tal 1975: 77; Epstein 1960: 34-35. Epstein gives only one example of the ending *-ā*, appearing in a Geonic passage. For discussion of this form in BTA, see also Kutscher 1962: 167-168. Kutscher argues that the ending *-ā* may be used only as a *ketiv*, while in actual fact, the ending has been dropped.

824 Kutscher 1971a: c. 280; Epstein 1960: 34.

825 Morag 1988: 127. Other forms of the Yemenite reading tradition are *qəṭalâ* and *qəṭal* (ibid.).

826 Kutscher 1971a: c. 280.

In view of the fact that the ending found in the bowl texts is, on the one hand, typical of Middle Aramaic and, on the other, exceptional in Late Aramaic,[827] it must be understood as one of the conservative traits of the bowl texts. In his study of TJ, Abraham Tal has shown that the perfect ending *-ā* is one of the features of TJ that link TJ with older strata of Aramaic, by contrast with Late Aramaic.[828]

IV.10.1.1. NOTES ON WEAK VERBS

The following are the features that require comment in the area of weak verbs:

Verba tertiae waw/yod

As is common in many Aramaic dialects, the verbs may be divided into two perfect patterns in the 3rd p. masc. sg.: those which end in ־י and those which end in א־ (ה־),[829] e.g. רמי; קרי (N&Sh 13:8); אתא (N&Sh 13:8). Correspondingly, TO yields various patterns in the 3rd p. masc. pl.: ־ו, ־יו, and ־יאו.[830] The same is evident in Biblical Aramaic, where alongside *qǝṭō* (e.g. רמו in Dan. 3:21), a pattern with the ending ־יו occurs: אִשְׁתִּיו (Dan. 5:3).[831] The ending of the 3rd p. masc. pl. in the bowl texts is always ־ו, e.g. בני גיבורין דהוו חלישין 'sons of mighty ones who were weak' in N&Sh 13:10. The endings ־יו and ־יאו are absent, but while the verbs which are inclined to have these endings in other Aramaic dialects, such as the afore-mentioned שתי 'to drink,' do not happen to occur in our texts in the 3rd p. masc. pl., the absence of ־יו and ־יאו may be merely a coincidence. Yet, while the endings ־יו and ־יאו, in contrast with TO, do not occur in BTA,[832] one must bear in mind the possibility that the bowl texts would tally with BTA in this respect. However, when no reliable instances are available, this is a mere guess.

The 3rd p. fem. sg. presents a puzzling form, קירית (N&Sh 7:3), discussed earlier in this study (see above). In addition to קירית, only הות, which shows no peculiarities, is attested in the bowl texts (N&Sh 5:6).[833]

---

[827] For the endings of the 3rd p. fem. pl. in Late Aramaic (both the eastern and western branch), see also Tal 1975: 75, 77 and Fassberg 1990: 236.

[828] See Tal 1975: 213ff.

[829] The feature is attested e.g. in TO (see Dodi 1983: 190-191); BTA (Morag 1988: 251ff.); and PsJ (Cook 1986: 206), as opposed e.g. to the Geniza fragments of the Palestinian Targum. See Fassberg 1983: 278-279.

[830] See Dodi 1983: 191; Morag 1988: 254, where the the historical background of different patterns is also discussed. The endings ־יו and ־יאו appear for intransitive verbs (*i*-perfect). For this ending, see also Dalman 1905: 338; 343-344 and Dodi 1983: 193-194.

[831] See Rosenthal 1974: 66; Morag 1988: 254.

[832] See Epstein 1960: 96; Morag 1988: 253-254. The Yemenite reading tradition of BTA has the patterns *qǝṭu* and *qǝṭo* (ibid.).

[833] הות represents the classical pattern of Aramaic, familiar among others from Biblical Aramaic and TO. See Rosenthal 1974: 51; Morag 1988: 252.

קִירִית differs from the pattern (intransitive verbs) of TO, which has the ending ־יאת for the *tertiae waw/yod* verbs.[834] While *verba tertiae waw/yod* in the 1st p. sg. accord with the model of TO (see immediately below), it is interesting that the 3rd p. sg. form קִירִית presents a different picture. As already noted in this study, one parallel to קִירִית appears in Epstein's grammar of BTA, where, along-side more common types, חֲזִיַת is listed.[835] Further, a pattern of the type *qitlat* for *verba tertiae waw/yod* is familiar from Syriac, where we have one class (basically) for the transitive verbs and a class (basically) for the intransitive, e.g. /rəmāt̲/ *versus* /ḥed̲yat̲/.[836] Further examples are needed to make certain of the treatment of *verba tertiae waw/yod* for the 3rd p. fem. sg in these texts. It is important to note that patterns typical of standard BTA, especially קְטָאי (e.g. הֲוָאי), are absent from the bowl texts.[837] A possible exception is the spelling קִירִית, which, as noted earlier in this study (see above IV.10.1. *Perfect*), could *also* be understood as representing the pattern *qəṭeṭ*, known from the Yemenite reading tradition of BTA.

The suffix for the 1st p. sg. is generally ־תי,[838] e.g. אומיתי 'I adjure' (N&Sh 25:7; AIT 17:8; Go 2:6); ואיתיתי 'and I have brought' (AIT 9:7); ומניתי עליכון (AIT 15:5).[839] Sporadically, we encounter forms without the final *yod*, e.g. אומית (AIT 8:6).[840] Sometimes the form without *yod* may be a scribal error, as is prob-able in N&Sh 25, where in line 5 we may read אומית ואשבעית as opposed to אומיתי ואשבעית in line 7. The ending ־ית predominates in the history of Ara-maic,[841] whereas ־תי is a minor form.

---

[834] See Dalman 1905: 338; Dodi 1983: 192. The ending ־יאת is also attested in the Babylonian tradition of Biblical Aramaic as opposed to the Tiberian tradition. See Morag 1973b: 54.

[835] See Epstein 1960: 95. Note that חֲזָת and the regular BTA חֲזָאי also occur.

[836] See Nöldeke 1898: 116-118; Muraoka 1997b: 51-52.

[837] For the patterns of BTA, see Morag 1988: 252; Epstein 1960: 95 (includes only examples).

[838] See also Rossell 1953: 47.

[839] The meaning of ומניתי עליכון is uncertain. Montgomery reads כינתי ומניתי עליכון and translates 'I scan and rhyme (?) against you.' Epstein emends as follows: כין תוב אעומניתי עליכון. The rest of the sentence is translated by him 'ensuite je vous ai adjuré.' אעומניתי, according to him, is 'une faute de scribe pour אומיתי.' However, despite the fact that the phrase תוב אומיתי עליכון is frequent in these texts, it is unlikely here, since in a photo-graph of the text one cannot see any trace of א (or ב) left. There is not, in my opinion, room for the letters א and ב in the lacuna, either. Hence, I believe that the reading by Montgomery is, at least, closer to the original. Epstein has sometimes – despite the high quality of his emendations in general – a tendency to substitute more stereotyped phrases for exceptional variations.

[840] Since AIT 8 is partly quite faded, it is not certain that *yod* is missing, at least not in the photograph of the text.

[841] ־ית is evident already in Old Aramaic (Ancient Aramaic), as well as in Official and Biblical Aramaic. See Segert 1975: 298, 303; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 135; Hug 1993: 85; Degen 1969: 76. Note צְבִית 'I wished' in Dan. 7:19.

Montgomery, among others, maintains that the ending ‑תי in the bowl texts 'is hebraizing.'[842] The ending ‑תי is regular in TO, alongside ‑ית,[843] and also appears in TJ.[844] According to Dodi, ‑תי appears in TO as the sole form in the derived stems, while in the basic stem both ‑תי and ‑ית occur.[845] We may argue that in the bowl texts ‑ית is present in the derived stems, too, as opposed to TO, e.g. אומית (AIT 8:6). Yet, on the basis of this scant material, with several uncertain readings, this suggestion must be taken as tentative.

Later on, ‑ית for *verba teriae waw/yod* is absent from BTA, while ‑תי is employed alongside the standard ‑אי.[846] The latter is unattested in the bowl texts. The ending ‑תי is also attested in GA, alongside ‑ית, and in Samaritan Aramaic.[847] Kutscher argues that ‑תי does not repesent authentic BTA, for the instances known to him in BT appear, significantly, either in השבעות or in the passages of Palestinian origin.[848] However, it may be of importance that Mandaic attests the same ending 'with the enclitics,' e.g. *qritilh* 'I called him.'[849] This suggests, perhaps, that the ending was authentic in East Aramaic as well.[850] Most obscure is the occurrence of this ending in a Syriac bowl, where it appears in a *regular* (strong) verb: אנא כתבתי 'I have written' (N&Sh 26:13).[851] In a BJA text published by him Gordon reads אומיתי ואשבעיתי (Go 2:6); in a photograph of the text I can observe only אומיתי, while the reading of the latter word remains uncertain. If the reading is correct, אשבעיתי could, perhaps, be compared with כתבתי. Yet, it is more plausible that it testifies to the weakness of ע (see above III.2. *Laryngeals and Pharyngeals*).

For our purpose it is significant that the forms used in the bowl texts basically accord with TO, as contrast with BTA. Note, however, that the distribution of the

---

[842] Montgomery 1913: 164.

[843] See Dalman 1905: 338; Dodi 1983: 188-189.

[844] Tal 1975: 71, n. 1. According to Tal, ‑תי can be explained by the need to differentiate between the 1st p. sg. and the 2nd p. masc. sg.

[845] Dodi 1983: 188. Dodi points out that ‑תי appears in TO as a counterpart of the perfect form in the Hebrew original, while ‑ית corresponds to the consecutive imperfect in the Hebrew text. Therefore ‑תי is evidently due the influence of Hebrew (כנראה בהשפעת העברית'). Dodi 1983: 188, n. 7. Note the criticism of this theory by Cook (1986: 208).

[846] See Epstein 1960: 96, 98, 99, 100, 101; Morag 1988: 253ff. The patterns of the Yemenite reading tradition are (in *pe.*) *qatay* and *qateti*. Morag 1988: 253.

[847] See Dalman 1905: 343; Tal 1975: 71, n. 1. The ending ‑תי is evidently unattested in the Palestinian Targum. See Fassberg 1983: 280; 1990: 188; Golomb 1985: 154. In contrast, it appears often in PsJ, where it may be due to influence from TO (Cook 1986: 207-209).

[848] Kutscher 1962: 172, n. 51. See also Morag 1988: 253, n. 18.

[849] Macuch 1965: 334.

[850] See Nöldeke 1875: 257, n. 3.

[851] The same ending appears once for the root אמר in PsJ, where it 'is very likely a scribal slip.' See Cook 1986: 178.

forms may be different in the bowl texts as compared with TO: ‎ית-‎ occurs in the derived stems as well. The standard ending of BTA, ‎א'-‎, is unattested in these texts.

All in all, *verba tertiae waw/yod* attested in the bowl texts follow in some details the model of TO (1st p. sg.), while in some others (3rd p. masc. pl. and 3rd p. fem. sg) they, it seems, attest to a model of their own, with affinities with various Aramaic dialects. But, due to the paucity of the material, the overall picture remains dim. Only the accordance of 1st p. sg. with TO is evident.

IV.10.2. Imperfect

The imperfect occurs frequently in the bowl texts, especially for the 3rd p. sg. and pl. and 2nd p. pl. In contrast, some other persons, such as the 1st p. sg., appear only rarely. The imperfect is the tense preferred when commanding or forbidding malevolent demons, an action characteristic of the genre. It appears commonly after ‎ד/ד'‎ to express purpose. In addition to the 'jussive' function, the imperfect is used to express futurity and, sometimes, the present. Different functions of the imperfect are often difficult to distinguish in the texts.[852] The conjugation of the imperfect for person, number, and gender is as follows. In the list, more common forms appear first when more than one pattern is attested.

1st p. sg.	‎אי-‎
2nd p. masc. sg.	‎תי-‎
2nd p. fem. sg.	‎ת-ן; ‎ת)'(-'; ‎ת)'(-יּ ‎ן‎
3rd p. masc. sg.	‎ל)'(-; ‎נ)'(-; ‎'-‎
3rd p. fem. sg.	‎ת)'(-‎
1st p. pl.	‎נ)'(-‎
2nd p. masc. pl.	‎תי-ו; ‎ת)'(-ון‎
2nd p. fem.pl.	‎(ת-ן; ‎ת-יין)[853]
3rd p. masc. pl.	‎ל)'(-ון; ‎נ)'(-ון; ‎'-ון‎
3rd p. fem. pl.	‎('-ו)[854]

SOME EXAMPLES:

1st p. sg.
‎אנא לא איקטול ולא איחנוק ולא איחבול‎ 'I shall not kill, or strangle or injure' (N&Sh 12a:8; B1:8).

---

[852] For the use of the imperfect, see also Rossell 1953: 46-47.

[853] The appearance of 2nd p. fem. pl. is uncertain. The latter form is possibly attested for *verba tertiae waw/yod*. See the discussion below.

[854] The appearance of 3rd p. fem. pl. is uncertain. See the discussion below.

2nd p. masc. sg.

דלא תיקטול 'that you should not kill' (AIT 3:3).

2nd p. fem. sg.

אך על פרטדוך ליטא לתהפכי חרשיא ולוטתא 'she also curses F. that you may turn away spells and curses' (N&Sh 4:6);[855] ולא תידחלי מצוח 'and do not be afraid to shout' (N&Sh 7:6); ולא תשכבין 'and do not lie' (AIT 11:8); ולא תקטלין 'and do not kill' (AIT 11:8); ולא תיתחזין ליה 'and do not appear to him' (AIT 18:9-10); ולא תתחזן להון 'and do not appear to them' (AIT 26:4).

3rd p. masc. sg.

הוא יאסר 'may he place' (N&Sh 21:11);[856] ויתסי 'and may he be healed' (N&Sh 25:2; BOR 2);[857] דפומיה לא יאימר וליביה לא יאידע 'that his mouth shall not speak and his heart shall not know' (N&Sh 4:5); ויסת(כר) ויתנכיר ויתעכר לעיני כל חזוהי 'and may he be choked, become estranged, become disturbed to the eyes of all those who see him' (N&Sh 9:3-4); מיניהון [ה]דיז 'that there vanish from them' (AIT 25:1); ויתמסי רוקיה 'may his spittle dissolve' (N&Sh 9:2); וימות 'and may he die' (N&Sh 9:4); ולא יגע בהון כל מזיק 'and that no injurer may touch them' (AIT 16:4-5); שלם דלא שלם יהוי עליכון 'peace without peace shall be upon you' (N&Sh 13:14); ניהא בסיס חמריה דבורזבהרם בר דותאי דלא ניזריק[859] ניסתפף[858] ולא ניחת 'may the wine of B. son of D. be sweet, may it not be spilled, nor burn, nor go down' (N&Sh 24:5); דניבש לישנה בפומיה 'that his tongue may dry up in his mouth' (N&Sh 9:2); וניתי 'and may he come' (AIT 13:10); הדין כסא ניהוי לחתמתא 'may this bowl be for the sealing' (AIT 14:1); ניתחתם ביתא 'sealed is the house' (BOR 10); דלא ניהי להון שולטנא 'that they may not have power' (DMB:11); ניפקא כי ארזא וניצטרי כי בינא 'and there (AIT 6:11);[860] ולא ליהוי לה לאונא בת גיית תקנתא ולא פשרתא לעלם 'and there will be for her, for 'U. daughter of G. no remedy nor mitigation for ever' (Ober. II:4-5);[861] ליקדי ליקדי וליפוק (Ellis 5:2).[862]

---

855 Of the root הפך 'to turn;' *lamed* in the beginning is obscure, see discussion in Naveh & Shaked 1985: 156. Perhaps it is, as suggested by Naveh and Shaked, a scribal error for the expected ר-.

856 The basic meaning of the root אסר is of course 'to bind.'

857 *Etpe.* from the root אסי. Harviainen (1981: 5) translates more freely 'he will be *saved*.' דיתסי occurs in N&Sh 11:8.

858 This form is – according to Naveh & Shaked – of the root ספף, which occurs in Syriac and Mandaic. See Naveh & Shaked 1993: 136.

859 According to Naveh and Shaked (1993: 136), this form is: 'ithpe'el of *ZRQ* (for nizdereq).'

860 Read according to the emendation by Epstein (1921: 34), which is evident according to a photograph. He translates this sequence as follows: 'qu'il crève comme un cèdre et se fende comme un grain de blé' (ibid.). ניפקא appears for ניפקע.

861 Note that פשרתא and תקנתא should be of fem. gender.

3rd p. fem. sg.

אסותא דישמיא תהוי לה לביתיה דהורמיז בר ממא 'may there be salvation from heaven for the house of H. son of M.' (AIT 14:2).[863] תיקום ולא תילוט דלא 'that she may not avenge nor curse' (N&Sh 2:9); תיתי עליה שלהוביתא 'may a flame come upon him' (N&Sh 9:4); תיזח ותיתבטל 'may she fly and refrain' (AIT 11:2); דתיהוי להון אסותא טבתא מן שמיא 'may there be a good healing from heaven' (N&Sh 18:5); ולא תיהי ליה לא תברא בימאמה ולא <תב>(ב)רא בליליה 'and he should not have misfortune either by day or by night' (N&Sh 25:8);[864] ותינטר מן כל מידעם דתיתסי 'that she may be healed' (AIT 24:2);[865] שידא 'that it be healed from any demon' (WB 2-3).[866]

1st p. pl.

ניעול 'we will enter' (AIT 13:5); דוכתא דנעבר וניעול עלה 'this is a place to pass through and enter into' (N&Sh 12a:4, B1/2:4; J:5).

2nd p. pl.

כן תיתנו לי 'so shall you give me' (N&Sh 6:4); מיחטא לא תיחטון 'you may not sin' (AIT 4:2); דלא תיקרבון ליה 'so that you not will come to him' (BOR 12); דתישתקון 'that you may silence' (N&Sh 6:9); ותיחתמון ותירחקון 'may you be bound and sealed' (N&Sh 14:1-2); דלא תיתון עלוהי 'that you should not come upon him' (N&Sh 25:7); דלא תיעזקון 'may you not bind' (N&Sh 25:6);[867] ולא תיפקון 'and you should not come in' (N&Sh 25:8);[868] ולא תעלון 'and you should not go out' (N&Sh 25:8) ולא תנזקון יתון 'and you should not cause them harm' (N&Sh 19:8); ולא תיקטלון בניהון 'and that they would not kill their children' (AIT 6:10); ולא תיחטון בהון 'and do not sin against them' (SB 23); לילתה שמעו ופקו ולא תחוחון לה 'Liliths, hear and go forth, and do not accompany her' (AIT 17:6-7); ולא תישילטון 'and do not prevail' (Go 1:3).

---

[862] The text is read according to the emendation by Epstein (1921: 41-42), where the meaning of this line is also discussed.

[863] אסו[תא] מן שמיא תהי לה appears in AIT 24:1, 3.

[864] תברא is apparently taken as a fem. form here. Usually it should be of masc. gender. See Jastrow 1903: 1645-1646.

[865] Montgomery translates more freely 'that she be saved.'

[866] Geller divides the sentences in lines 2-3 in a slightly different way. Note his translation in Geller 1976: 426.

[867] From the root עזק 'to bind,' see Naveh & Shaked 1993: 271.

[868] ולא תיעלון in N&Sh 19:8.

3rd p. masc. pl.

ידמכון בעפרא חבילי נידרא 'may there lie in the dust the injuries of vows' (N&Sh 3:2); יתכבשון ויטמרון 'they will be pressed and hidden' (N&Sh 3:4);[869] דלא יתון עלהי דיזיחון ויפקון 'may they move away and go out' (N&Sh 15:7); יהוון אילמין בפומיהון 'so that they should not come upon him' (N&Sh 25:4);[870] ולא ימללון עלי מלל ביש 'may they be mute in their mouths' (N&Sh 6:6-7); ויבשון שקיה 'that they should not speak evil words against me' (N&Sh 6:10); וילקו גופיה 'and may his legs dry' (N&Sh 9:3); 'that his body may be struck' (N&Sh 9:3);[871] דיהון להון בנין ויחון ויתקימון ויתנטרון 'that they may have children and that they may live, be established and preserved' (AIT 12:3); ולא יבטלון חרשי בכון יחטון 'and (that) they would not sin against you' (AIT 7:10); אינון יתון ויסקון 'may the black arts cease/be annulled' (Go C:1-2);[872] (AIT 25:5-6);[873] ויתסון 'may they be healed' (N&Sh 19:2);[874] אינון מלאכין ירחמון ויחבבון 'may those angels pity and love' (AIT 13:4); דישתו ויפקו 'that they may drink and go out' (ZRL 10);[875] (כו)להון יסמכו עלוהי 'all should lean on him' (N&Sh 9:14).[876] וניתאסרון וניתמסרון כלהון וניחתמון וניתכבשון 'may they all be tied, surrendered, sealed, and pressed down (N&Sh 20:6); וניחידרון 'and may they go back'(N&Sh 23:8);[877] ולא נסכלון ביה 'and they shall not do folly against him' (AIT 4:2).[878] ניתסרון וניכמרון 'they will be bound and return' (BOR 7);[879] דניתבטלון מינה כל סטני בישי וחרשי בישי ומעבדי תקיפי 'so that there may be abolished from him all the bad satans and bad sorceries and mighty practices' (Go 5:8). דלא לישמעון עליה על אמטור בת שלתא ומן זרעיה ומן ביתיה [ ] קיניניה 'so that they cannot hear (anything) against 'A. daughter of Sh. and against her seed and against her house and against her property' (Go 6:1); דלא ליקרבון לאיסקופת ביתיה דייא בר מהדוך ובעיריה שדין ושפטין

---

869 יתכבשו in N&Sh 9:13.

870 From the root אתי 'to come.'

871 According to Naveh and Shaked (1985: 272), ילקן is an *af.* imperfect from the root לקי 'to srike.' Since the context seems here to require a passive form ('may his body be struck'), it would, perhaps, be possible to read ילקי, which would represent an *etpe.* (?) form /yilləqi/ (instead of יתלקי). Cf. Morag 1988: 264.

872 The reading is evident on the basis of a facsimile. יתבטלון appears in Go I:2.

873 Read according to the emendation by Epstein (1921: 54). He translates the sentence: 'qu'ils viennent et montent' (ibid.).

874 From the root אסי.

875 The reading is probable but not certain on the basis of a facsimile.

876 Instead of (כו)להון, one could read (כו)להו.

877 As read by Naveh and Shaked. If their reading is correct, ח would stand instead of ה. However, the reading is uncertain.

878 Apparently *af.* from the root סכל.

879 For the verb ניכמרון, see Harviainen 1981: 12.

ומזיקין ולילין 'in order that demons and plagues destroyers and Liliths may not approach the threshold of Y. son of M. and his livestock' (KHAB 4-5); ולא ליתיבון לה שינתא לעניה ולא ליתיבון לה ניחא בפגרה בחילמיה ובחיזוונה 'and let them not restore sleep to her eyes, nor restore ease in her body during her dreams or during her visions' (Ober. II:1-2).

DISCUSSION

Both the 1st p. sg. and the 2nd p. masc. sg. are rare and display no peculiarities.

2nd p. fem. sg.

As a rule it is difficult to say whether a given form in the texts is 2nd p. fem. sg. or 2nd p. masc. pl., since only seldom can one properly distinguish *waw* from *yod* in the script. For instance, in AIT 11 line 8 one could read either ולא תשכבין 'and do not lie' (2nd p. fem. sg.) or ולא תשכבון (2nd p. masc. pl.) and, respectively, in AIT 8:5 one may read either ולא תיתחזין or תיתחזון. Such examples abound in the texts.[880] Since it is often unclear whether the words in a given sentence or text are addressed to one demon or to a group of demons, the context does not help in this respect either. Therefore, the examples of the 2nd p. fem. sg. presented above – though some of the most promising cases have been selected – must be treated with a certain degree of caution.

However, it is evident that the regular form in the bowl texts is of the type קטלי(ת)ן, which is standard in Aramaic.[881] Besides, קטלי(ת), known from standard BTA,[882] occurs sporadically.[883] In Mandaic, the fem. form is replaced by the corresponding masc. form,[884] while Syriac employs the classical קטלי(ת)ן.[885] The non-standard tractates of BT, such as Nedarim, also attest the form with the final *nun*.[886] Some forms of 2nd p. fem. sg. are discussed below in IV.10.2.1. *Notes on Derived Stems and Weak Verbs.*

---

[880]   Cf. for instance GE A:6 where Geller reads דתיזחין ותפקין 'that you depart and go away.' These forms appear after a list of malevolent devils, of both the masc. and fem. gender. While the distinction between *waw* and *yod* is far from certain, it is more plausible to take the forms as masc. pl. and, consequently, to read דתיזחון ותפקון respectively.

[881]   The ending is spelt in Official Aramaic ן(י)-. See Segert 1975: 266; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 97. Later on, the ending -י'ן occurs for instance in TO and TJ (Dalman 1905: 265; Tal 1975: 71); and in GA, including Targum Neophyti (Dalman 1905: 265, 271; Golomb 1985: 126).

[882]   See Epstein 1960: 34, 36; Kutscher 1971a: c. 280.

[883]   Rossell (1953: 48) gives only the form with the final *nun*.

[884]   Macuch 1965: 271; Nöldeke 1875: 226.

[885]   Nöldeke 1898: 101, 105.

[886]   According to Epstein (1960: 34), ' – ת is standard in BTA, while ין – ת is 'dialectal' (דיאל').

3rd p. masc. sg. and pl.

The standard prefix of the 3rd p. masc. sg. and pl., respectively, is ‪-י‬, e.g. ‪דפומיה‬ ‪לא יאימר‬ 'that his mouth shall not speak' (N&Sh 4:5); ‪ודיהון להון בנין ויחון‬ ‪ויתקימון‬ 'and that they may have children, and may live, and be established' (AIT 16:4). In addition to the preferred ‪-י‬, ‪-נ‬ and also ‪-ל‬, which is rare in the material of this study, are attested. The *plene* spelling is common (i.e. ‪-ני‬; ‪-לי‬). According to Rossell, in the sg. both ‪-י‬ and ‪-נ‬ 'occur in a ratio of 2 to 1 to preformative ‪-ל‬.'[887] In pl., ‪-י‬ appears in a ratio of 3 to 1 to ‪-נ‬ and in a ratio of 7 to 1 for ‪-ל‬.[888] It seems that the prefix ‪-ל‬ is less common than Rossell estimated, ‪-נ‬ being clearly more usual.[889] Though, I must admit that ‪-ל‬ has been attested in many texts of which I have no photograph or facsimile at my disposal.[890] The prefix ‪-י‬ is also in sg., *pace* Rossell, more common than the prefix ‪-נ‬, especially if we take into account only the readings which are definite. All in all, it is essential that ‪-י‬ is the preferred prefix, alongside which both ‪-נ‬ and ‪-ל‬ occur. Rossell argues that ‪-י‬ and ‪-נ‬ are used to express 'present-future action or the Jussive,' whereas '‪-ל‬ seems to be limited to the Jussive.'[891] However, this conclusion is very difficult to ascertain, the distinction between jussive and 'present-future' action of the imperfect being very blurred in these texts.

Different prefixes may appear side by side in the same text, e.g. in N&Sh 9 several forms with the prefix ‪-י‬ are found alongside ‪ניבש‬,[892] which is the sole form with the prefix ‪-נ‬. But more commonly only one type of prefix is used in a single text. Nevertheless, even all three may appear in the same text: in Go 6, we have once ‪-ל‬ (‪לשמעון‬ in line 1), once ‪-נ‬ (‪ניחפטון‬ in line 3), and four certain occurrences of ‪-י‬ (‪ויתהפכון, יזלון, ישתרון, יהלכון‬).[893]

Importantly, ‪-י‬ as an imperfect prefix also appears in those texts which yield more standard BTA forms than the bowl texts in general. For instance N&Sh 13, with several isoglosses in common with standard BTA (see below V. *Conclusions*), attests only ‪-י‬ (‪יהוי‬ twice in line 14). In a similar way, ‪-נ‬ or ‪-ל‬, typical of standard BTA, occur in texts with no other salient standard BTA traits. The same verbs may employ both ‪-י‬ and ‪-נ‬, e.g. ‪יחון‬ (AIT 25:6) as against ‪וניחי‬ (AIT

---

887 Rossell 1953: 49.

888 Ibid.

889 One should naturally bear in mind that the corpus of the published bowls is remarkably larger today than at the beginning of the fifties.

890 These include for instance many texts published only in part by Gordon.

891 Rossell 1953: 49.

892 The *yod* in ‪ניבש‬ is uncertain.

893 In addition to these forms, Gordon reads ‪דיכלון‬ in line 7, though he admits that one could read ‪דיב<פ>לון‬ as well. See Gordon 1941: 127. Based on a photograph of the text, ‪דיכלון‬ is unlikely. One might read ‪דתי(?)לון‬. ‪לון‬ in the end is certain, as is ‪דת‬, in my view, at the beginning. The rest remains uncertain.

13:10); יהוי (N&Sh 13:14) as against נהוי (AIT 14:1); יחטון (AIT 7:10) as against ניחטון (Go 6:3). No lexicalization may be observed in this respect.

The final *nun* is generally preserved in the bowl texts, at least in the orthography, e.g. ידמכון 'may they lie' (N&Sh 3:2). Sporadically, we come across forms without it, e.g. יתכבשו (ה)דמאיהוא 'may his members be pressed down' (N&Sh 9:13).[894] The prefix -נ also frequently appears in those verbs with the final *nun* preserved. The presence of the final *nun* is in accordance with most Aramaic dialects, including the Nedarim type of tractates of BT, whereas its absence accords with standard BTA.[895]

As is well known, the prefixes -נ and -ל are typical of East Aramaic, appearing in BTA, Mandaic, and Syriac,[896] while -י appears in most other Aramaic dialects. In Biblical Aramaic, importantly, the verb הוה 'to be' uses the prefix -ל instead of the standard -י,[897] and the prefix -ל also appears in some Middle Aramaic texts, at least in the Aramaic of Hatra.[898]

Epstein thinks that the prefix -י survived in Mesopotamia as the sole form until the first century C.E. and alongside -נ until the beginning of the 3rd century C.E.[899] He concludes that it still appears in BTA as an archaic vestige.[900] Friedman, in his important paper on BTA, criticizes Epstein for explaining linguistic phenomena, e.g. the prefix -י, in BTA only either by terms of chronology or by local dialectal varieties.[901] According to Friedman, Epstein believes that the occurrence of -י in a certain passage of BT proves the antiquity of that passage.[902] Friedman points out *pace* Epstein that the occurrence of -י cannot be explained by 'time and place' ('הזמן והמקום אינם הקובעים').[903] Instead, the authentic occurrences of -י are restricted to contexts which are essentially literary in character, such as prayer (תפילה), poetry (שירה), and public or formal declarations (הצהרות

---

[894] The reading is uncertain. See Naveh & Shaked 1985: 179.

[895] For BTA, see Epstein 1960: 34; Kutscher 1971a: cc. 279-280.

[896] See, for instance, Rosenthal 1964: 173; Kutscher 1971a: c. 275. Syriac does not normally employ -ל, but it is found in at least one Syriac bowl text (N&Sh 26). For Syriac, see also Kutscher 1971a: cc. 276-277; Nöldeke 1898: 105. The prefix -י is still used in the earliest Syriac inscriptions, -נ being rarely attested. According to Drijvers (1972: xii-xiii), 'the transition from *j* to *n* took place about when the second century A.D. passed into the third.'

[897] Rosenthal 1974: 54.

[898] See Kutscher 1971a: c. 269; Rosenthal 1978: 87.

[899] Epstein 1960: 13.

[900] Ibid. Epstein (1960: 14) points out as well that the Aramaic bowl texts have both -נ and -י, while חרבא דמשה has only -י.

[901] Friedman 1974: 58ff. Friedman shows as well that many of the examples of -י cited by Epstein are suspect.

[902] Friedman 1974: 58.

[903] Ibid.

(פורמאליות).[904] The prefix -י is also typical of 'מסכת חלומות' (Berakhot 55b-56b) dealing with dreams.[905] All of these contexts are essentially literary. Moreover, -י occurs within BT, as is well known, in the material of Palestinian origin.[906] The Aramaic used for the literary passages of BT presented above has many features in common with Official Aramaic.[907] It is noteworthy as well that among the examples of 3rd p. pl. masc. from 'מסכת חלומות' cited by Friedman, in the forms with the prefix -י the final *nun* is present (ייגזרון, ימרון), in accordance with the bowl texts. The 'מסכת חלומות' thus presents forms which accord with those of the bowl texts.

As already pointed out by Harviainen,[908] some of the contexts where -י appears in BT are very similar to the contexts appearing in the bowl texts. Hence, we can suggest that the use of -י in the bowl texts as well is somehow related to the *genre*: incantations were written in a more or less formal literary dialect, with inclination to TO and, indeed, Official Aramaic. Yet, once again, a question remains: how is the occurrence of a later linguistic element, i.e. the prefixes -נ and -ל, side by side with -י best accounted for? In the case of 'מסכת חלומות' appearance of -י is evident in the MSS., but already many of the original occurrences have been replaced by the forms of standard BTA.[909] Perhaps, a parallel process could be suggested for the bowl texts as well: the original features of a formal language, such as the prefix -י, were little by little replaced in the hands of copyists – or on the lips of recitors? – by the forms of the actual vernacular. Unfortunately, it is practically impossible to show that, for instance, the appearance of the prefix -י is more common in the earlier texts.

3rd p. fem. sg.
The prefix is -ת, with no peculiarities.

1st p. pl.
This form appears only infrequently, the prefix being the standard Aramaic -נ.

2nd p. pl.
The form used for the 2nd p. masc. pl. is of the type קטלון(י)ת. As in other pl. forms and the 2nd. p. fem. sg., the final *nun* is normally preserved, the forms without it being exceptional (see above). No watertight examples of the specific fem. form of the 2nd p. pl. are found, at least not with the regular verbs.[910] Neither do

---

[904] Friedman 1974: 58-64.
[905] Friedman 1974: 61-62.
[906] Ibid.
[907] Friedman 1974: 58ff.
[908] Harviainen 1983: 108-109.
[909] Friedman 1974: 62.

we have secure examples where the masc. form is used referring to solely fem. subjects, a fact which would suggest the use of the masc. form instead of the fem., as common in Late Aramaic. The best example attested is לילתה שמעו ופקו ולא תחוחון לה 'Liliths, hear and go forth, and do not accompany her' (AIT 17:6-7). The example is read according to the emendation by Epstein, which looks evident in a photograph of the text.[911] If the reading is correct, the masc. תחוחון is used in place of the fem. Note, however, that one could also read:

לילתה שמעי (fem. sg.) ופקי (fem. sg.) ולא תחוחין (fem. sg.) לה,

but while earlier in this text words are addressed to a group of demons and later on in the same line the 2nd p. pl. personal pronoun אתין is used referring to these Liliths., the pl. form תחוחון is more plausible here, even though לילתה as such looks more like a sg. form.[912]

The subjects of pl. verbal forms in these texts consist mostly of a group of demons, of both masc. and fem. gender. Hence, we have only rarely cases where a fem. form is expected. Furthermore, it is often uncertain to which of the possible subjects a given verbal form refers.

Remnants of the specific fem. form are possibly found in *verba tertiae waw/ yod*: אתין לא תיתחזין 'you (pl.) should not not appear' (Go K:4). One should bear in mind that we could also read אתון לא תיתחזון, with masc. forms. The question concerning the occurrence of the specific fem. form thus remains open.

The specific fem. form of the 2nd p. pl. is typical of older strata of Aramaic.[913] The ending *-ān* is still used in TO and TJ,[914] while the Late Aramaic dialects, such as GA,[915] BTA,[916] and Mandaic,[917] generally employ the original masc. form for the fem. as well. In contrast, Syriac maintains the fem. form familiar from TO, alongside the masc.[918]

BTA – at least as it is preserved in the Yemenite reading tradition – occasion- ally preserves a special fem. form in *verba tertiae waw/yod*.[919] Interestingly, an

---

[910] According to the study of Rossell, fem. forms of the 2nd p. pl. are unattested as well. See Rossell 1953: 48.

[911] See Epstein 1921: 48. According to Epstein, תחוחון is 'l'imparfait de syr. חוח 's'associer à quelqu'un' (ibid.).

[912] No distinction is made in the script between *waw* and *yod*. Note that one might read אתון as well, but it is irrelevant for our purpose here. See also below IV.10.3. *Imperative*.

[913] The form is rare, but we encounter a few examples in Official Aramaic. See Segert 1975: 251; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 97, 102; Hug 1993: 76, 81, 82.

[914] Dalman 1905: 266; Tal 1975: 71.

[915] See Dalman 1905: 266;

[916] Epstein 1960: 34, 37; Kutscher 1971a: c. 280; Morag 1988: 130.

[917] Macuch 1965: 271. In Mandaic, the masc. form generally replaces the fem., but a special fem. form with the ending *-a(n)* 'would be admissible' (ibid.).

[918] See Nöldeke 1898: 101.

example cited by Morag (i.e. תיהוין ותצבין) is from 'נוסח של גט'.[920] The forms
תיהוין and תצבין accord with תיתחזין referred to above. As noted several times in
this study, the official documents, such as *gittim*, preserved in BT show many common linguistic traits with the bowl texts, by contrast with standard BTA. The form
with the ending *-yān* appears for *verba tertiae waw/yod* in TO,[921] too, a fact which
is in favour of its appearance in the bowl texts as well. If the readings suggested
here are correct, it seems that the bowl texts attest to both the replacement of the
specific fem. form by the corresponding masc. and to the preservation of the specific fem. form in *verba tertiae waw/yod*. Yet, more evidence is needed for secure
conclusions.

3rd p. fem. pl.

No reliable examples of the specific fem. forms are found. Instead, we have at least
one example where a masc. pl. is possibly used instead of the fem.: צילמתא יהוו
כצילמתא דמיתי 'forms will be like forms of the dead' (N&Sh 13:12).[922] In my
opinion, the reading suggested by Naveh and Shaked is somewhat uncertain. The
last letter is a longer stroke than the former one and could, therefore, represent the
final *nun*. Hence, it may be that the form under discussion is a corruption of the
fem. form יהוין.[923]

According to Morag, יהוין in BT is a western form; ליהוין also occurs.[924]
But if the correct reading is indeed יהוו, as read by Naveh and Shaked, it testifies to
the use of the masc. form for the anticipated feminine. יהוו may be compared with
Biblical Aramaic, where in the *ketiv* a masc. form sometimes replaces the fem.,
while the fem. form is retained in the *qere*, e.g. ידורון (*ketiv*) *versus* יְדֻרָן (*qere*)
in Dan. 4:9.[925] Note, however, לְהֵוְיָן in Dan. 5:17, with the specific fem. ending in
contrast with יהוו of our text.

Among the Middle and Late Aramaic dialects, the specific fem. form with the
ending *-ān* appears in various dialects, such as TO and TJ,[926] and within West
Aramaic in GA,[927] Samaritan Aramaic,[928] Palestinian Christian Aramaic,[929] and

---

[919] See Morag 1988: 256. No examples of a specific fem. form for *verba tertiae waw/yod* are
given in Epstein 1960, the fem. forms listed being identical with the masc. (e.g. תשתון).
See Epstein 1960: 96.

[920] Morag 1988: 256.

[921] Dalman 1905: 339, 347. No examples are given in Dodi 1983.

[922] One should note that the example is from *verba tertiae waw/yod*.

[923] I believe that we could read יהין or יהון.

[924] See Morag 1988: 256. Epstein gives no examples of the 3rd p. fem. pl. for *verba tertiae
waw/yod*.

[925] See Segert 1975: 251. The specific fem. also occurs in the *ketiv* of Biblical Aramaic (ibid.).

[926] Dalman 1905: 266, 273; Tal 1975: 71. See also Dodi 1983: 195.

PsJ.[930] The specific fem. form also occurs in the east, including BTA,[931] Mandaic,[932] and Syriac.[933] Nöldeke maintains that the masc. appears sometimes for the fem. in BTA.[934] While only a few parallels in other Aramaic dialects appear, it remains so far uncertain how the (possible) occurrence of יהוו here should be accounted for. Nevertheless, it is interesting to find a possible common tradition with the *ketiv* of Biblical Aramaic.

Cases of incongruence

The bowl texts yield instances where a masc. form appears for the expected fem. form,[935] *vice versa*, a sg. is used for the expected pl., or pl. appears for sg. As stated by Naveh and Shaked: 'Inconsistency as to gender is very common in these texts.'[936] The cases where a sg. form appears for the anticipated pl. are frequently met with in our texts, the opposite, by contrast, is less frequently attested. Below only some of the instances are given and discussed. As can be seen, some of the examples are open to discussion concerning their interpretation and reading.

SOME EXAMPLES:

masc. instead of expected fem.

דניבש לישנה בפומיה 'that his tongue may dry up in his mouth' (N&Sh 9:2). Since לשן should be of feminine gender in Aramaic, one would expect here a fem. imperfect form.[937] Yet, לשן is considered a masc. in N&Sh 6:10, too: ידבוק לישניהון. Note, however, that לישניהון is apparently a pl. form; therefore, the expected form is ידבקון or ידבקן.[938] Another example is found in a bowl published by Gordon: וניהדר כל ליליתא מבכלתא דלויא ליה 'and let return every Lilith and tormentor who accompanies him' (Go L:11-12).[939]

---

[927]   Dalman 1905: 266. The form is attested in the Geniza fragments of the Palestinian Targum, too. Fassberg 1983: 238; 1990: 166.

[928]   Macuch 1982: 147.

[929]   Schulthess 1924: 63; Müller-Kessler 1991: 156.

[930]   Cook 1986: 180.

[931]   Kutscher 1971a: c. 280; Epstein 1960: 34; Morag 1988: 256.

[932]   Nöldeke 1875: 228.

[933]   Nöldeke 1898: 101.

[934]   Nöldeke 1875: 228, n. 1.

[935]   Note also יהוו discussed immediately above.

[936]   Naveh & Shaked 1985: 178.

[937]   See ibid.

[938]   Cf. ויבשׁון שׁקיה 'and may his legs dry' in N&Sh 9:3.

[939]   Gordon reads ניהדר instead of ניהדר, but while no distinction is made between *he* and *ḥet*, there is no reason for this.

fem. instead of masc.

ולא תיהי ליה לא תברא בימאמה ולא <ת>(ב)רא בליליה 'and he should not have a misfortune either by day or by night' (N&Sh 25:8). The 3rd p. fem. sg. here may be an error for the corresponding masc. form, since תברא 'misfortune' should be of masc. gender. Cf. N&Sh 9:5: ותברא ידבקיה. According to Harviainen, ניהוין apppears in BOR as a masc. form: הלין מלאכי ניהוין 'these angels will be' (BOR 9).[940] ניהוין evidently refers to תלתא מלאכין mentioned in line 8. He argues further that 'ניהוין may result from a dialect in which genders were no longer distinguished in the plurals of the imperfect, i.e. ניהוין could be a pseudo-correct feature in this bowl text.'[941] It is probable, however, that we should here read ניהוון, as emended by Greenfield and Naveh.[942] ניהוון is a regular masc. pl. of *verba tertiae waw/yod* which may be compared with יהוון appearing in N&Sh 6:6.

a sg. form instead of expected pl.

וגופריתא ואישתא תידלק ביה 'and sulphur and fire may burn in him' (N&Sh 9:3).[943] דיזח ויתרחק מיניה דיוא בישא וסטנא בישא דמיתקרי צפעסק 'that from him may depart and remove the evil demon and the evil satan, called S.' (AIT 3:2); דיתבטל מינה חלמי שגושי רוחא בשת וסטאני בישי 'that there cease from her disturbing dreams, and the evils spirit, and evil satans' (AIT 24:4);[944] ויתחתם אידיה וחמריה וגידיה וגידדתא ועיזיה וחיותיה חזיריה וחזירתיה ותרנגליה 'sealed are his possessions, his donkey(s), male and female kid(s), his animals, pig(s) and sow(s), his cock(s)' (AB B:5-6); ידבוק לישניהון בפומיהון 'so that their tongues should cleave to their mouths' (N&Sh 6:10).

a pl. form instead of expected sg.

In N&Sh 9, Naveh and Shaked read and translate as follows: וילקו גופיה 'that his body may be struck' (N&Sh 9:3). According to Naveh and Shaked, ילקו is an *af.* imperfect from the root לקי 'to strike.'[945] Since the context, however, seems to require a passive form,[946] we should, perhaps, read וילקי גופיה. Even though there seems to be a tendency in this text to distinguish between *waw* and *yod*, this is far from the rule. Note, for instance, ויתמסי in line 2 which is written as if it were

---

[940] See Harviainen 1981: 21-22.

[941] Harviainen 1981: 22.

[942] See Greenfield & Naveh 1985: 103. Even though this text seems to distinguish *waw* and *yod* quite commonly, it is far from regular. In this word all the strokes indicating *waw* or *yod* are practically identical, permitting both suggested readings.

[943] Here a fem. sg. תידלק appears as a predicate referring to two fem. sg. nouns.

[944] בשת is read according to the emendation by Epstein. See Epstein 1921: 53.

[945] Naveh & Shaked 1985: 272.

[946] As is indeed evident in the light of the translation by Naveh and Shaked.

ותּמסי. The verbal form יַלקי (= [yilləqī]?), with the assumed assimilation of ת,
would occur for *יתלקי. Compare יבטלון חרשי 'may the black arts cease/be
annulled' (Go C:1-2) with דניתבטלון in Go 5:8.

All in all, incongruence is quite often encountered in the imperfect.[947] Some of the
examples may be explained by the fact that in BTA, a masc. form is sometimes used
instead of feminine when the verb precedes the subject, but this is not common in
imperfect.[948] Under similar conditions, a sg. form may appear for expected pl.
form. Again, this is more common in perfect than in imperfect.[949]

    However, it seems that we have no convincing linguistic explanation for all the
examples found in the bowl texts. It is common that a verbal form refers only to the
first of the subjects that follow it. In addition to the examples presented above, note,
for instance, an example in AIT 5:1-2, where we have first 3rd p. fem. sg. imperfect
followed, as expected, by a fem. sg. subject: ותינזח מנהון כל לילילתא בישתא
'and that there depart from them every evil Lilith.' Yet, the text continues with a
long list of other subjects, both in the pl. and the sg.: וכל שידי ודיוי ואסרי
ופתכרי ונדרא 'and all the demons, and devils, spells, and idol-spirits, and the
vow (etc.).' It seems that the grammar of an incantation is often constructed accord-
ing to the first malevolent spirit under 'treatment.'[950] In the example above this is
כל לילילתא בישתא, according to which the verbal form (i.e. תינזח) is chosen.
Both forms are evidently in the sg. fem., and correct. After the first item in the list,
the scribe writes down all other creatures (וכל שידי etc.) which were feared,
without trying to modify the grammar of the sentence for the whole entity. A similar
situation may be observed in connection with the participles, too (see below
IV.10.4. *Participles*).

    On the basis of these observations, we may argue that the scribes of the bowl
texts did not have at their disposal ready, perhaps literary, incantation formulae
which they just mechanically wrote down for every client.[951] Instead, it seems that

---

[947] Inconsistencies are attested in many other Aramaic dialects. Cf. for instance Cook 1986:
        221-222, where the phenomenon is discussed concerning PsJ. M. L. Folmer presents a
        profound and extensive investigation of the disagreement in number and gender (both in
        verbal and nominal clauses) in Official Aramaic and Biblical Aramaic in Folmer 1995: 429-
        496. See also Muraoka & Porten 1998: 278-284.

[948] See Schlesinger 1928: 51ff. The phenomenon is also discussed regarding the perfect in
        IV.10.1.

[949] See Schlesinger 1928: 51ff..

[950] A similar trend is also present in Official Aramaic where, too, in the case of multiple
        subjects, the verb often agrees only with the first subject, e.g. ימאת לי...אנת ואנתתך וברך
        'you, along with your wife and your son swore to me' (B2.2:4). This is typical when the
        verb *precedes* the subjects, a fact which is of importance, since in most of our cases, too, the
        verb precedes its subjects. For Official Aramaic, see Muraoka & Porten 1998: 281; Folmer
        1995: 455ff. As noted above, the same trend occurs in BTA.

a scribe first wrote down an incantation against a given malevolent spirit, after which he went on by listing other demons from which the client needed protection. In this kind of situation it is evident that grammatical correctness was in much greater danger than if the scribe had based his work on longer, and ready-made, incantation formulae. This assumption does not, of course, deny the evident fact that bowl texts were often copied mechanically from one text to another.

IV.10.2.1. Notes on Derived Stems and Weak Verbs

Notes on derived stems

In *pa.*, one comes across spellings of the type -יקטל- in which an imperfect prefix is followed by *yod* in place of the *shwa* of many vocalized Aramaic texts, such as the Tiberian tradition of Biblical Aramaic, e.g. תישתקון 'that you may silence' (N&Sh 6:9).[952] Only a few certain examples are present, and, by contrast, spellings of the type תנזקון, with no *yod*, are found as well.[953] The spelling with *yod* is in agreement with the BTA and Geonic literature, as it is reflected in reliable MSS. such as Talmudic MSS. from the Geniza (e.g. ליזבן).[954] In the Yemenite reading tradition, the vowel /i/ appears after the prefix only in the 3rd p. masc. sg. and pl., while in other persons, we find *shwa*.[955] In Mandaic as well, the prefix vowel in *pa.* is /i/.[956] According to Harviainen, *yod* in the prefixes of *pa.* appearing in the bowl texts 'indicates a 'full' vowel (*i*) as in Mandaic.'[957] Moreover, he argues that this trait is a phonetic spelling, which may be understood as one of the '*koiné*' features.[958] Harviainen's view is further supported by the fact that the trait is found in a Syriac bowl published by Naveh and Shaked: תישנון 'you will move' (N&Sh 10:10), in contrast with the regular Syriac orthography.[959] Nevertheless, given the

---

[951] I am indebted to Professor Harviainen for drawing my attention to this implication of the incongruencies discussed above.

[952] According to Naveh and Shaked (1985: 169), this form is 'to be vocalized *d-təšattəqūn*' and it is 'evidently in the *paʿʿel form*.' See also III.4. Yod *and* waw *as a Counterpart of* shwa.

[953] ולא תנזקון 'you shall not cause harm' (N&Sh 19:8). תנזקון is probably a *pa.* imperfect of the root נזק 'to cause harm.' Note that תנזקון could also be an *af.* form. Cf. Jastrow 1903: 892.

[954] See Morag 1973a: 64; 1988: 47. In the vocalization of *Halakhot Pesuqot*, the feature is standard in regular verbs (Morag 1973a: 65).

[955] Morag 1988: 47, 148.

[956] Nöldeke 1875: 29-30. See also Morag 1973a: 65.

[957] Harviainen 1981: 23. Harviainen finds several instances of the trait in BOR. See Harviainen 1981: 4, 8, 15, and 23. However, some of the alleged *pa.* forms, such as נינטרוניה in line 10, may be taken as *pe.* forms as well. As for נינטרוניה, cf. Jastrow 1903: 901.

[958] Harviainen 1981: 23. For '*koiné*' features see above I.2.4.1.

fact that *yod* occurs frequently in the bowl texts in place of *shwa* in many pointed Aramaic texts, it is also possible that *yod* represents vocalic *shwa* in all of the examples of the bowl texts.

At least one reliable parallel to תישתקון is found in participles. (see below IV.10.4).

Notes on weak verbs

(a) *Mediae waw/yod*

As in the case of the regular verbs of the derived stems discussed above, we come across spellings in which *yod* appears in place of the anticipated *shwa* in the prefixes of *verba mediae waw/yod*: ולא תילוט 'and (she may) not curse' (N&Sh 2:9). Parallels are found in BTA: note for instance תידוק (2nd p. masc. sg.) appearing in *Halakhot Pesuqot*.[960] In the Yemenite reading tradition, we encounter both -/e/- and -/ə/-,[961] which are distributed according to the *ketiv*: when *yod* is present in the *ketiv* (e.g. -תי), the prefix vowel is the former and when *yod* is absent, a *shwa* vowel is pronounced.[962] The vacillation between -/e/- and -/ə/- is evident in the Geniza fragments of TO, too.[963] Morag assumes that the pronunciation with -/e/- is borne out as an analogy to *verba primae yod*.[964] Forms with -/e/- as a prefix vowel are found in GA as well.[965]

(b) *Tertiae waw/yod*

The spelling תתחזן alongside תיתחזין (see above) for the 2nd p. fem. sg. may suggest that two different endings of the 2nd p. fem. sg. for *verba tertiae waw/ yod* are attested in the bowl texts: *-an* alongside *-īn*. The former is familiar from TO,[966] while the latter basically accords with the Syriac ending *-ēn*, e.g. /termēn/, /tetrəmēn/.[967] Few reliable instances of the 2nd p. fem. sg. (for *verba tertiae waw/*

---

[959] Cf. Nöldeke 1898: 105. The Syriac N&Sh 10 yields other non-Syriac traits as well, such as weakenings in pharyngeals and laryngeals (see Naveh & Shaked 1985: 182), *bnyh* 'his sons' for *bnwhy*, and the demonstrative pronoun *hdyn* (spelled with *ḥet*!) used with a fem. name. This text is discussed further at the beginning of this study (see especially I.2.4.1. '*Koiné*' *Features* and III.2. *Laryngeals and Pharyngeals*).

[960] See Ben-Asher 1970: 29. See also Epstein 1960: 89; Dalman 1905: 315-316, 320. Already Nöldeke (1875: 30) paid attention to the feature in BTA.

[961] The basic phonetic realization of *shwa* (/ə/) in the Yemenite reading tradition is an ultra-short *a*. See III.4.

[962] Morag 1988: 212-214.

[963] See Dodi: *Diqduq targum 'onqelos*, pp. 327, 331, as referred in Morag 1988: 212: c. 8. The unpublished (?) dissertation by Amos Dodi on the grammar of TO is not at my disposal.

[964] Morag 1988: 212.

[965] See Dalman 1905: 315-316, 320.

[966] Dalman 1905: 339, 346. E.g. תקרן.

[967] See Nöldeke 1898: 118.

yod) are known to me from standard BTA, but those attested yield the loss of the final *nun*, e.g. /tistafi/ and /təġalli/ in the Yemenite reading tradition.[968] Further, the Yemenite reading tradition has a couple of instances, such as /tihwəyin/, with the final *nun*,[969] but, importantly, these forms, which accord with ours, are from נוסח של גמ'.[970] As pointed out repeatedly in this study, the official documents preserved in BT and the bowl texts share many linguistic traits. Hence, the resemblance of our תיתחזין with /tihwəyin/ is most probable.

GA has the ending with the diphthong -*ay*, e.g. תחתיי.[971] In Mandaic, the gender distinction has merged, and the same ending is used for both genders.[972] It is possible as well, though less probable, that the spelling תתחזן is a *defective* spelling of תיתחזין and thus indicates the ending -*īn*, too. The instances quoted imply that in the bowl is reflected the model of TO alongside the model of the official documents of BT and, in this case, Syriac.

Remnants of the jussive form (the short imperfect form) appear alongside the normal imperfect (the long form) in the verb הוה 'to be,' as exemplified by the following instances: 3rd p. masc. sg. דיהי לה לאסו 'that it may be a healing for this one' (N&Sh 5:1); ניהא בסים חמריה דבורזבהרם בר דותאי 'may the wine of B. son of D. be sweet' (N&Sh 24:5). 3rd p. fem. sg. ולא תיהי ליה תברא בימאמה ולא <ת>(ב)רא בליליה 'and that he should not have a misfortune either by day or by night' (N&Sh 25:8); ו(אל) תהה (N&Sh 9:5); ולא תהא (N&Sh 9:6).

These forms may be compared with the normal forms, such as ניהוי and תהוי, which also occur in the bowl texts.[973] One finds it generally difficult to observe any functional differences between the jussive form (the short form) and the 'normal' imperfect form (the long form), as is evident in the light of the following two instances, where both the jussive תיהי and the regular תיהוי are used in the same text and in parallel contexts: דתיהוי ביה אסותא לה[ן]דין א[ן]פרה בר שברדוך ועים ולהדא בה[ן]מנדוך] בת סמא 'that there be salvation in it for...' (AIT 1:2-3); דתיהי להון אסותא 'that there be salvation for them.'[974]

Compare also אסותא דישמיא תהוי לה לביתיה דהורמיז בר ממא 'may there be salvation from heaven for the house of H. son of M.' (AIT 14:2) with אסו[תא] מן שמיא תהי לה (AIT 24:1, 3). Note, also, that both לא and אל may be used for negative commands with the jussive form, as exemplified above by the two occurrences in N&Sh 9.

[968] The former is an *etpe.* form and the latter is a *pa.* form. Morag 1988: 264, 268.
[969] Morag 1988: 256.
[970] Morag 1988: 256, n. 37.
[971] See Kutscher 1976: 46.
[972] See Nöldeke 1975: 258; Macuch 1965: 335, 344 (instances of the reflexive verbs).
[973] See the instances at the beginning of chapter IV.10.2.
[974] להון refers to the persons mentioned in the first example.

The jussive was differentiated from the normal imperfect in *verba tertiae waw/yod* in Old Aramaic (Ancient Aramaic) and Official Aramaic,[975] but during the latter period, the system began to break down.[976] Later on, remnants of the original jussive commonly appear with the verb הוה 'to be.' The short form form (יהי, etc.) predominates greatly in TO and TJ over the long form, which appears in TO generally only in the fem. pl. (e.g. יהוין), but also in other persons in TJ.[977] In contrast, GA employs the short and long imperfect side by side.[978] The long imperfect and the jussive form of the verb הוה are used side by side in BTA, too, at least in the 3rd p. masc. sg., where Epstein gives the following forms: ליהוי, נהוי, נהי, and יהא.[979] יהא accords with the 3rd p. form תהא in N&Sh 9. Remnants of the jussive are also present in the Palestinian Targum fragments, indeed in the verb הוה,[980] but the preferred form there is the long imperfect.[981] PsJ follows the model of TO.[982] It is noteworthy that the bowl texts clearly side with BTA and most other later dialects as against TO and TJ.

CONCLUSIONS

In general, the forms of the imperfect in the bowl texts present a clearly conservative picture when compared with standard BTA. By contrast with standard BTA, the bowl texts generally preserve the final *nun* in the 2nd p. fem. sg. and 2nd and 3rd p. pl. and use *yod* as the preferred prefix for the 3rd p. masc. sg. and pl., even though standard BTA forms also occur. In this respect, the bowl texts tally on the one hand with non-standard tractates of BT, such as Nedarim (the final *nun* preserved) and on the other hand with the Aramaic of the formal documents preserved in BT (*yod* as the imperfect prefix). Both of these traits are present in TO and TJ as

---

[975] In the 3rd p. sg. masc. and fem. (and the 2nd p. masc.), the jussive typically ends in *yod*, and the 'normal' (indicative) imperfect in *he*, e.g. יהוי *versus* יהוה. For details, see Segert 1975: 252; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 137-138; Degen 1969: 76-77.

[976] Segert 1975: 252.

[977] Dalman 1905: 353. Note that in Old Aramaic and Official Aramaic, the jussive form was spelled with the *waw* in the medial position, e.g. יהוי. In the later dialects, we find remnants of the 'jussive' (the short imperfect) form without the *waw* in the medial position (e.g. נהי; יהי; נהא) *versus* the 'indicative' (the long imperfect) with this *waw* in the orthography (e.g. יהוי; נהוי). It remains problematic whether the former is a genuine Aramaic form.

[978] Dalman 1905: 352.

[979] See Epstein 1960: 103. For 3rd p. fem. sg. Epstein gives only תהוי (ibid.). On the basis of a study by Ben-Asher, the short forms are unattested in *Halakhot Pesuqot*. See Ben-Asher 1970: 34. Instances of the short imperfect also occur in Syriac, where *nhē*, *thē*, etc. are found alongside the regular forms, such as *nehwē*. See Nöldeke 1898: 128.

[980] Fassberg 1983: 241; Fassberg 1990: 192.

[981] Cook 1986: 210.

[982] Ibid.

well, but, by contrast, TO and TJ show no standard BTA features, such as *nun* as an imperfect prefix.

Another conservative feature is the possible preservation of the specific fem. form for the 2nd p. pl. fem., a feature attested in the official documents of BT, too.

In contrast with the conservative traits presented above, the bowl texts yield some more developed features. These include spellings of the type תיקטלון in *pa.* where *yod* appears as a counterpart of the anticipated *shwa* and, especially, the possible replacement of the 3rd p. fem. pl. by the corresponding masc., with few parallels in other dialects. Of importance is also the fact that in contrast with TO, the bowl texts employ both the short and long imperfect of the verb הוה 'to be.' As for the imperfect in general, it is clear that the bowl texts differ here from the linguistic model of TO more than in many other areas.

IV.10.3. Imperatives

The imperative is used rather commonly in the bowl texts alongside the imperfect to command demons etc. Most of the forms attested are either 2nd p. fem. sg. or 2nd p. pl. By contrast, no secure instances of sg. masc. forms are known to me in the material of this study. Due to the difficulty in distinguishing *waw* and *yod* in the script, it is uncertain whether several imperative forms are to be understood as fem. sg. or as pl. forms, e.g. שמעי צותי ופוקי 'hear and shout and depart' in AIT 8:4 could be read with final *waw* as well.[983]

The endings are as follows:

2nd p. masc. sg.	?
2nd p. fem. sg.	ִי-; -Ø
2nd. p. masc. pl.	וּ-; -Ø; וּן-
2nd p. fem. pl.	-Ø; וּ-

EXAMPLES OF THE IMPERATIVE:

2nd p. fem. sg.: פולי עלוהי איכולי מן בישריה ואישתאי מן דמיה 'fall upon him, eat of his flesh, drink of his blood' (N&Sh 7:8);[984] דחלי ומררי 'frighten and afflict' (N&Sh 7:8);[985] זעי מן קומיהון ושקולי גיטכי 'flee from their presence and take your *get*' (AIT 26:6);[986] שמעי 'hear' (AIT 8:4); פתח לנא 'open for us' (N&Sh 12a:4).[987]

---

[983] Based on a photograph, one would read the forms under discussion with the final *yod* – as read by Montgomery – since the sign used is a short stroke, but the text often presents similar strokes where one – for grammatical reasons – would expect a *waw*.

[984] פולי is from the root נפל 'to fall.'

[985] דחלי and מררי are imperatives of *pa.*

2nd p. masc. pl.: חתמו ואסורו הדין ביתיה ודירתיה 'seal and bind this house and dwelling of his' (N&Sh 27:5-6); שקול גיטיכון וקביל מומתכון וקדחו 'take your *geṭ* and accept your exorcism and run away' (AIT 18:9).[988] זועו ואיתבהילו ואישתמתו מן קיטריכון ומן עובדי דאיתעבדתון 'depart and hurry, and be banished from your knots and (magical) practices... (?)' (Go 10:4); שמעו וקבילו 'hear and accept' (BOR 1).

2nd p. fem. pl.: פק אתין כו מן ביתה 'depart (you), then, from her house' (AIT 17:7); לילתה שמעו ופקו ולא תחוחון לה 'Liliths, hear and go forth, and do not accompany her' (AIT 17:6-7).

COMMENTS

2nd p. sg.

No secure instances of the 2nd p. masc. sg. are known to me.[989] The question is complicated by the fact that it is often uncertain whether a given imperative refers to a single word or to a group of words. Therefore, it sometimes remains problematic whether an imperative form of the type קטול is a masc. sg. (or even fem.) or a pl. form, with the apocopation of the final vowel. In any case, the 2nd p. masc. sg., if attested, shows no peculiarities.

The 2nd p. fem. yields forms with the final vowel (i.e. spelt with the ending - י) and, occasionally, those with no ending. In addition to the example given at the beginning of this chapter, note the following example with vacillation between forms ending in - י and those with no ending: כען שיקלי גיטכי וקבילי מומתיכי ויפרח ויקדח ופקי מן ביתיה 'now, take your divorce and receive your adjuration and fly and flee and get out of her house' (Go G:11-12).[990]

Due to the infrequency of the forms with no ending, they might be understood as scribal errors. On the other hand, the fem. form with no ending is known in BTA, alongside the form ending in -י.[991] This form is also familiar from Syriac,

---

986   Read as emended by Epstein (1921: 54). Epstein's reading looks correct on the basis of a photograph of the text.

987   פתח is definitely a fem. form, as is evident in the light of the answer to the command 'פתח לנא,' which is 'ואמרת להון לית אנא פתחא' (N&Sh 12a:4).

988   וקדחו is read according to the emendation by Epstein *pace* Montgomery, who reads וקרחו. See Epstein 1921: 41, 49 and Montgomery 1913: 194. Note also that קדחו appears in a Syriac text (N&Sh 10:11), which maintains a clear distinction between *resh* and *dalath*. See the discussion in Naveh & Shaked 1985: 183-184.

989   According to Rossell (1953: 50), masc. sg. is found in the bowl texts, but the only example given by him, i.e. קדח, is definitely a fem. form. See below.

990   Refers to מזדואי בת אמא. No photograph of the text is at my disposal, but in a facsimile, the reading seems correct.

991   See Morag 1988: 131; Tal 1975: 78. Note also Kutscher's remarks in his important review article (Kutscher 1962: 170.)

where it appears only as the *qere* (of a form spelt with the final *yod*).[992] Besides, in Mandaic the masc. form is used for the fem., too.[993] Hence, it is more than possible that forms identical with the Syriac *qere* were employed in the Aramaic dialect(s) represented in the bowl texts, too. Moreover, in pl. we have in these texts as well as in BTA side by side forms with the vocalic ending (spelt ו-) and those with no ending (see below).

In *verba tertiae waw/yod*, we encounter the ending *-ay* (for 2nd p. fem.), familiar from BTA: אישתאי 'drink' (N&Sh 7:8).[994] The same ending is used in Mandaic and Syriac,[995] but, by contrast, TO has *-ā*.[996]

2nd p. pl.

In the 2nd p. masc. pl. forms with the ending ו- appear alongside forms with no ending,[997] as exemplified by the following instance from ZRL 7-8:[998]

אם כפיניתון עול איכל איכול אם צחתון עול עול אישתו אם
חרביתון עול אידהן אם לא כפינין אתון ואם לא צחואתון ואם
לא חרביתון אתון איזדעזעו ופוקו מנהון

The sequence is translated by Gordon 'If ye are hungry, enter, eat, eat! If ye are thirsty, enter, enter, drink! If ye are dry, enter, be anointed! If ye are not hungry, and if ye are not thirsty, and if ye are not dry, move and get out from them.' In the sequence, אישתו, איזדעזעו, and פוקו appear with the final ו-, while the rest of the imperatives (both איכל and עול repeatedly) have no ending. The same text employs other imperatives with the final *waw* maintained in the orthography (הדרו in line 9 and כולו and עולו in line 10).

Additionally, these texts attest to few instances with the ending ון-. Note the following example: according to Franco, בטלון in F 1:3, 5 is *pe.* imperative from the root בטל.[999] The reading of this form as such in line 3 seems to be reliable,[1000] but while the preceding letters of the line are erased, the interpretation remains uncertain.[1001] In AIT 7:15 we find another imperative form from the same root:

---

[992] See Nöldeke 1898: 101.

[993] See Macuch 1965: 274-275.

[994] See Epstein 1960: 97; Morag 1988: 256-257.

[995] See Macuch 1965: 336; Nöldeke 1898: 117.

[996] See Dalman 1905: 339, 348.

[997] In his grammatical sketch, Rossell gives only ו- for the 2nd p. masc. pl.; the fem. pl. is unattested. Rossell 1953: 50.

[998] No photograph of the text is at my disposal, but in a facsimile the reading seems basically correct. Instead of צחואתון, as read by Gordon, I would rather read צחי אתון (*ṣāhē(n)* + *'attūn*), with the same meaning, cf. קריתון 'you call' in N&Sh 13:8.

[999] Franco 1979: 238.

[1000] Based on a photograph of the text, I have difficulties in reading the line 5.

בטילו ופוקו מן ביתיה 'disappear and go forth from his house.' On the basis of בטילו, בטלון may also be understood as a *pa.* imperative, which is probably more plausible.[1002]

Another possible example of an imperative with the final *nun* is attested in F 4:5, where one may read איתון אתון דישמיא 'come you who are in Heaven.' The same form is found in the preceding line as well. Even though the bowl is very fragmentary, the interpretation of these forms (i.e. איתון) as pl. imperatives seems at least possible. Note also AIT 8, where, according to Epstein's emendation, we have שומון 'obey' (AIT 8:10).[1003] Since the text is most uncertain, we cannot confirm the reading – at least not on the basis of a photograph.

The pl. masc. with ו- is standard throughout Aramaic, while the form with no ending (resembling the masc. sg. form) is familiar from BTA, where it appears alongside the form spelt with the ו-,[1004] from Mandaic, which commonly uses the masc. sg. throughout the paradigm,[1005] and from Syriac, in which the final *waw* appears only as the *ketiv*, the *qere* being identical with the masc. singular.[1006]

It is noteworthy that the masc. pl. imperatives with the final *nun* are unknown in BTA. Instead, they appear in Mandaic (infrequently),[1007] in Syriac,[1008] in Palestinian Christian Aramaic,[1009] and in GA.[1010] It is possible that the occurrences of this ending in the bowl texts may be textual borrowings from Mandaic.[1011] On the other hand, we may argue that this ending was used as a by-form in some BJA dialects. Note that in the fem. pl., the form with the final *nun* is well attested in BTA.[1012]

[1001] While *pe.* of this root is rare in the bowl texts – the normal stems being *pa.* and *itpa* – one wonders, whether the text should be emended to: דית[בטלון מנה כל חרשי or [א]בטלון, cf. N&Sh 13:20, N&Sh 10:12 (Syriac), and N&Sh 17:5 (Syriac).

[1002] If not to be emended to [א]בטלון.

[1003] See Epstein 1921: 42. According to Epstein, שומון is 'l'imper. pl. de שמע comme en mandéen' (ibid.).

[1004] Epstein (1960: 38) gives two examples of the forms with no ending: הדור and עטוף. The very same forms are accordingly pronounced without the final vowel in the Yemenite reading tradition of BTA. See Morag 1988: 131. At least one example, i.e. יהוב, is found in *Halakhot Pesuqot*, too. See Ben-Asher 1970: 283.

[1005] Macuch 1965: 274-275.

[1006] Nöldeke 1898: 101.

[1007] Macuch 1965: 275.

[1008] Nöldeke 1898: 101; Muraoka 1997b: 44.

[1009] Schulthess 1924: 62; Müller-Kessler 1991: 159.

[1010] Tal 1975: 75; Dalman 1905: 275, 277; Fassberg 1983: 242; 1990: 168.

[1011] Note the comment of Epstein (1921: 42) cited above.

[1012] See Epstein 1960: 38.

Special forms for the 2nd p. pl. fem. are so far unattested in the bowl texts. Instead, in the light of the following instance it seems that in the bowl texts, the original masc. form may be used for the fem.: לילתה שמעו ופקו ולא תחוחון לה 'Liliths, hear and go forth, and do not accompany her' (AIT 17:6-7). The example is read according to the emendation by Epstein, which looks evident on the basis of a photograph of the text.[1013]

In addition, the bowl texts yield a few possible instances of a form identical with the masc. sg. form used as a fem. pl., e.g. פק אתין כו מן ביתה 'go out from her house' (AIT 17:7).[1014] Note, however, that it is possible to read פק אתון, too. The whole question concerning the forms of the 2nd p. fem. pl. is highly complicated by the evident problems in the reading and interpretation of the forms attested. First, once again it must be stressed that due to the difficulties in distinguishing between *waw* and *yod*, it remains uncertain whether we should understand a given form as 2nd p. fem. sg. or plural. Moreover, it is often uncertain whether we should understand a pl. form as a masc. or as a feminine. Therefore, I have to present the above fem. forms with some hesitation.

In many Aramaic dialects, including, for instance, the dialect of TO, Syriac, and West Aramaic, a special fem. form for the 2nd p. pl. is employed.[1015] In BTA, a special fem. with the ending -ין appears alongside קטול, a form identical with the sg. masc. form.[1016] According to Epstein, BTA also has a fem. form with the end-

---

[1013] See Epstein 1921: 48. לילתה is probably used in a generic sense. Another possibility would be to take the forms as 2nd p. fem. sg. forms and, consequently, to read לילתה שמעי ופקי. However, later on in the same line 2nd p. pl. personal pronoun אתין is used as referring to these Liliths. Hence, the first explanation is more likely. Moreover, earlier in the same text, words are addressed to a group of demons. See also above IV.10.2. *Imperfect*.

[1014] Read according to the emendation by Epstein (1921: 48). Another possible case in AIT 17 is in line 9 where Montgomery reads וסיב לכין גיטיכין. According to him, סיב is 'f. pl. impr. of נסב.' See Montgomery 1913: 192. Epstein emends here יהיב לכין גיטיכין, and translates 'on vous donne vos actes de divorce.' See Epstein 1921: 48. Epstein's emendation is, in my opinion, very possible and clearly more convincing than Montgomery's original reading. ה is quite sure in a photograph of the text. יהיב is apparently understood as a participle form (?), though a pl. form would be more suitable. Note, however, that in *Halakhot Pesuqot* we have a masc. sg. imperative spelt יהוב. See Bar-Asher 1970: 283. Therefore, one might read here יהוב, too. Another possibility to be considered is והיב, cf. פק in line 7. Although the imperative from this root is mostly written (ו)הב, with an *a*-type of vowel, forms of the type (ו)היב are also attested in JA. Cf. Sokoloff 1990: 235. Nevertheless, the possibility of an *imperative* from the root יהב 'to give' is, perhaps, unlikely here, for it probably gives no sense in the context. Since AIT 17 is evidently a replica of AIT 8, it is also possible that this form in AIT 17 is a corruption of מתיב in AIT 8 where the text runs: מתיב לכי גיטכי (AIT 8:7).

[1015] See Dalman 1905: 275; Fassberg 1990: 168; Nöldeke 1898: 101; Cook 1986: 197. The fem. ending is -*ā* in TO, whereas GA has -*ēn*. In Syriac, there appear -*ēn* and a form with no ending (spelt with the final *yod*).

[1016] Kutscher 1971a: c. 280; Epstein 1960: 38. See also the table in Fassberg 1983: 242.

ing ‫-ו‬, corresponding to the pl. masculine.[1017] In Mandaic, sg. forms are mostly used for the plural.[1018]

Provided that the readings referred to above are correct, the form with no ending (e.g. ‫פק‬) accords with BTA and Mandaic, and ‫שמעו‬ and ‫פקו‬ (as fem. forms!) find a parallel in BTA, too. It is likely that the forms with no ending in BTA and in the bowls imply that the fem. pl. (and masc. pl.) were pronounced like the masc. sg. form (i.e. with no ending), at least in some BJA dialects.[1019] The obscure use of the masc. pl. for the fem. attested in the bowl texts as well as in BTA may, perhaps, point in the same direction: if the distinction between the sg. and pl. was neutralized, hyper- or pseudocorrect forms, such as ‫שמעו‬, are quite natural. Further evidence is provided by Mandaic, which, as noted, mostly uses the original masc. sg. for the pl. forms, too. The origin of special forms with the final *nun*, unknown in the older strata, in various East Aramaic dialects is possibly to be explained by the need to re-create a distinction between sg. and pl., and between masc. and fem.

CONCLUSIONS

The imperative forms in the bowl texts yield side by side classical Aramaic forms (in the 2nd p. fem. sg. and in the 2nd p. pl.) with the vocalic endings and those familiar from East Aramaic, notably from BTA. The latter forms show the apocopation of the final vocalic endings. In addition, in the 2nd p. masc. pl. we have instances, though uncertain, of the forms with the final *nun*. These forms are otherwise unattested in BJA, but familiar from Mandaic.

Importantly, the fem. pl. ending *-ā*, typical of TO, does not appear in the bowl texts. The divergence of the bowl texts from the Aramaic of TO (in this respect) is further confirmed by the fact that the periphrastic imperative, found in the western dialects, and, importantly, in TO, is unattested in our texts.[1020] All in all, it may be argued that in the imperative forms, the Aramaic represented in the bowl texts is closely linked with BTA.

[1017] Epstein 1960: 38. The same form is present in the Yemenite reading tradition of BTA. See Morag 1988: 131.

[1018] Macuch 1965: 274-275.

[1019] Note that in the fem. sg., forms resembling the masc. sg. also occur both in the bowl texts as well as in BTA (see above).

[1020] The periphrastic imperative is also attested in Official Aramaic. For the use of the periphrastic imperative in various Aramaic dialects, see Greenfield 1969; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 205-206; and Cook 1986: 197-198.

IV.10.4. Participles

Active participle of the basic stem (*pe.*)

masc. sg.	pl.
קט(י)ל	קטלי(ן)

fem. sg.	pl.
קטלא	קטלן

Passive participle of the basic stem (*pe.*)

masc. sg.	pl.
קט(י)ל	קטילי(ן)

fem. sg.	pl.
קטילא	קטילן ;(קטילא)[1021]

DISCUSSION

Both active and especially passive participles are frequently attested in the bowl texts. In addition to independent participle forms, they abound in combination with enclitic personal pronouns, e.g. בין דידענא שמה 'whether I know his name' (N&Sh 5:4).[1022] The active participle is generally used to express present or continuous and habitual action, as in other forms of Middle and Late Aramaic. By contrast with BTA, the bowl texts show no instances of the particle קא to introduce a participle form.[1023] As in other dialects of Aramaic, the passive participle is employed to indicate accomplished action.

The form of the *pe.* active participle in masc. sg. for regular verbs is apparently *qāṭe/il* (see examples immediately below), the standard form in Aramaic.[1024] Both *plene* (קטיל) and *defective* (קטל) spellings occur. Its feminine counterpart is spelt קטלא, evidently indicating the form *qāṭ(ə)lā*, the standard form throughout the history of Aramaic.[1025] In the masc. pl., the preferred ending is ‑ין, also being

---

[1021] The occurrence of the form קטילא is uncertain. See the discussion below.

[1022] ידענא is a sg. active participle as combined with the suffix of the 1st p. sg. (*yāḏaʿ-nā*). Further examples of participles with enclitic personal pronouns are listed and discussed above in IV.2. *Enclitic Personal Pronouns*.

[1023] In BTA e.g. קא מצויין. See Kutscher 1971a: c. 281. The same particle (*q-, qa-, qi-*) occurs in the late texts of Classical Mandaic and in Modern Mandaic. See Macuch 1965: 280, 430.

[1024] The pattern is evident throughout Aramaic. For various dialects, see for instance Rosenthal 1974: 61 (Biblical Aramaic); Dalman 1905: 282-283 (TO, GA); Nöldeke 1898: 105 (Syriac); and Epstein 1960: 39 (BTA). In the Yemenite reading tradition the regular pattern is *qaṭel* with *pataḥ*, probably as an analogy to *verba tertiae waw/yod*. See Morag 1988: 131-132.

regular in Aramaic.[1026] The spelling of the type קטלין implies the pattern *qāṭ(ə)līn*.[1027] In addition, we occasionally encounter a form without the final *nun*, the assumed pattern being either *qāṭəlī*, *qāṭəlē* or *qaṭlē*. These are familiar from standard BTA;[1028] the latter two are based on the models of the Yemenite reading tradition for BTA.[1029] It is noteworthy that Nedarim as well as the Geonic documents from the Cairo Geniza preserve the full form -ין as opposed to standard BTA.[1030] Pl. active participles appear in *st. constructus* without the final *nun*: פומה דכל בני אנשה כתבי סיפרי יתבי אקרי יתבי שוקי 'the mouth of all who write books, who sit in forts, who sit in market places' (N&Sh 6:9). The same trait is evident in TO, but, apparently, no morphological distinction between *status absolutus* and *status constructus* is observed in BTA as it is reflected in the Yemenite reading tradition.[1031]

While *waw* and *yod* are practically indistinguishable in the script used for the bowl texts, it is possible that the forms without the final *nun* are to be taken as representing the pattern *qāṭəlū* (instead of *qāṭəlī* etc.), which is otherwise attested only in BTA, e.g. שקלו.[1032] The ending -ו appears in the derived stems as well, and it is especially common with *verba tertiae waw/yod* both in the basic stem and in the derived stems.[1033] Some instances of this pattern for the derived stems occur in the bowl texts, too (see below).

[1025] The pattern *qāṭlā* is based on the model of Syriac, e.g. /ˤāvdā/ (cf. Muraoka 1987: 31), while Biblical Aramaic has the pattern *qāṭ(ə)lā* (cf. Rosenthal 1974: 61). For various dialects, see also Dalman 1905: 285; Cook 1986: 190; Nöldeke 1898: 105; Epstein 1960: 39. The Yemenite reading tradition has both the pattern *qåṭəlå* and *qaṭlå*. See Morag 1988: 132.

[1026] As far as I know, the only Aramaic dialect – Modern Aramaic excluded – which does not employ -ין as the regular ending is standard BTA.

[1027] The pattern *qāṭəlīn* is according to Biblical Aramaic and *qaṭlīn* reflects the Syriac model. Cf. Rosenthal 1974: 61 and Muraoka 1987: 31. The pronunciation of the Yemenite reading tradition follows the model of Biblical Aramaic when the final *nun* is preserved in the *ketiv*. See Morag 1988: 132.

[1028] See Epstein 1960: 39, where we find vocalizations such as שָׁקְלִי. For BTA, see also Kutscher 1971a: c. 280; Rybak 1980: 86. Occasional spellings of the type קטלי are found in TO. See Kutscher 1976: 43. קטלי is also typical of non-reliable GA texts, showing influence from BTA. Ibid.

[1029] Morag 1988: 133. Morag assumes that the ending -*ē* is borne out from the analogy to the masc. emphatic pl. ending, which is -*ē* (ibid.).

[1030] Rybak 1980: 86.

[1031] Cf. Morag 1988: 43.

[1032] See Morag 1973a: 68 where only derived stems are treated; Epstein 1960: 39.

[1033] Morag 1973a: 67-68; 1960: 44. According to Morag, the origin of the pattern is in *verba tertiae waw/yod*, in which *waw* appears commonly in the basic stem and likewise in the derived stems. It is probable that the pl. participle pattern קטו for *verba tertiae waw/yod* was born out of the analogy with the pl. perfect form קטו See Morag 1973a: 70. The pattern is also noted below in connection with *verba tertiae waw/yod*.

In the feminine pl., the attested form in the bowl texts is קטלן. It is possible that the masc. form is used for the fem. when a pl. participle is combined with an enclitic personal pronoun. In AIT AIT 8:11 Montgomery reads מיטול דחתימיתי בעיזקתיה דאל שדי 'because you are sealed with the signet of El Shaddai.' Note, however, that the masc. form חתימיתו is as possible as the fem. form חתימיתי, for no clear distinction is observed between *waw* and *yod*. Rossell, too, thinks that 'the masculine plural participle has displaced the feminine' when the active participle is combined with an enclitic personal pronoun.[1034] He gives לבישיתין (*ləvīšīn+tēn) as an example of the phenomenon,[1035] but as noted earlier in this study, the occurrence of the specific fem. pl. form is not certain (see above *2nd p. masc. and fem. pl.*), and, consequently, the reading לבישיתון is also possible. No reliable parallels are known to me in BTA: the only examples of fem. pl. participles attached to pl. enclitic personal pronouns given in Epstein's grammar are indeed from the bowl texts published by Montgomery.[1036] Instead, an example of the phenomenon is found in TO, where we have – according to Dalman – a form יָדְעָתִּין (Gen. 31:6) in a Tiberian punctuation.[1037] A parallel is found in Mandaic, where, when a participle is combined with an enclitic personal pronoun, the masc. form appears regularly for the fem. As Nöldeke states: 'Fast immer wird in diesen Formen das Fem. durch das Masc. vertreten.'[1038] On the basis of these comparisons, it is likely that the gender distinction is neutralized in these forms in BJA, too, including the bowl texts.

SOME EXAMPLES OF ACTIVE PARTICIPLES:

masc. sg.

גבריאל גבר תקיף דקטל כל גיברי 'G., the mighty hero, who kills all heroes' (N&Sh 5:8); מלאכא דעביד דחי אכיל 'that what is alive he eats' (N&Sh 13:4); רעותא דמרוהי 'the angel who does the will of his Lord' (AIT 12:6);[1039] דאינש מין איסוריה לא נפיק 'from whose charm none ever goes forth' (AIT 19:14); וקטיל ילדיא 'and kills children.' (Go H:3).[1040]

[1034] Rossell 1953: 51.

[1035] Ibid.

[1036] See Epstein 1960: 41 ('רבים גוף ב' נקבה נמצא רק בהשבעות).

[1037] Dalman 1905: 291.

[1038] Nöldeke 1875: 231.

[1039] For the use of מרוהי here, see Montgomery 1913: 176.

[1040] The reading is probable on the basis of the facsimile, though the end of the latter word is somewhat uncertain.

fem. sg.

נפלא קטלא דרדקי דרדקאתא '(that) falls upon and that kills boys and girls' (TB 4); ונפלא על בני אינושה 'and falls upon the sons of man' (Go H:11).[1041]

masc. pl.

(a) ין-: דכתבין 'who write' (AIT 11:8); עימה יתבין 'with her they will sit' (AIT 13:7).

(b) י-: וטורי כלהון צמחי בידמותיה 'and all the mountains shine with his shape' (N&Sh 13:20).

fem. pl.

ואילין אינ/ין דחנקן 'and others dance' (AIT 28:3);[1042] וחרוניאתא רקדן 'and these (are those) that strangle' (AB E:7);[1043] וליליאתא נפקן ובטלן 'and Liliths depart and are idle' (GE A:11).[1044]

SOME EXAMPLES OF PASSIVE PARTICIPLES:

masc. sg.

אסיר פתכרא 'bound is the idol' (N&Sh 12a:9); ואישתכח כתיב ביה 'there is found written in it' (AIT 8:7); אסר וחתים ומחאתם ביתא 'bound, sealed, and countersealed is the house' (AIT 30:1).[1045]

fem. sg.

הפיכא ליליתא אסירא 'overturned is the curse' (N&Sh 2:4); כבישה וחתימא מבכלתא 'bound is Lilith, bound is the tormentor' (N&Sh 12a:9); מן ביתיה 'it is pressed down and away from his house' (TB 4).

masc. pl.

(a) ין-: אסירין ויחתימין כול שידין 'bound and sealed are all demons' (N&Sh 2:8); אסירין ניקיטין צמידין כב(יש)ין דישין (עש)יפין כל פתיכרי דיכרי 'bound, seized, attached, pressed down, thrashed, exorcised are all the male idols' (N&Sh 23:1-2); כבישין כלהון בני חשוכה 'suppressed are all the sons of darkness'

[1041] The reading is probable on the basis of the facsimile.

[1042] Read according to the emendation by Epstein, which is probable. See Epstein 1921: 55-56.

[1043] The reading is uncertain, since the text is in a bad condition. Geller reads דחנקו, but the reading suggested here is more plausible. The last letter is quite long and thus represents final *nun*. Geller translates the phrase 'and these and those that strangle,' but this is unlikely, for אינ/ין evidently appears as a copula.

[1044] The reading is uncertain.

[1045] מחאתם is a *pa.* participle. This phrase with some variation is frequently used in the bowl texts, e.g. in Go 3:1 we have חתים ומחתם ביתיה ואיסקופתיה דאדק בר מחלפתה 'sealed and countersealed are the house and threshold of 'A. son of M.' Note the use of sg. forms (מחתם, חתים), which is common when sg. subjects are juxtaposed with the aid of the particle ו 'and.'

(AIT 16:7); וחירמין מן רבה יהוה 'and they are banned by the great YHWH' (AB B:4).

(b) י-: הפיכי כוכבי ומזלי 'overturned are the stars and the planets' (N&Sh 2:3); בני בתי חרבי בני כדי פסיסי 'sons of destroyed houses, sons of broken jars' (N&Sh 13:15); וביתרי עשר ראזי כ(ס)?/ו וחתימי וי(נ)טירי 'by the twelve hidden, sealed and guarded mysteries' (N&Sh 15:8); דאסירי ביה אהניך אחוי בישי 'with which are charmed those wicked brothers of his' (AIT 4:3);[1046] סכרי פומיהון 'closed are their mouths' (AIT 13:1); אתון אסירי 'you are charmed' (AIT 19:13).

fem. pl.

(a) ן-: נקיטן כדנא רוחי בישתא 'bound (by a bond) are evil spirits' (AIT 16:8);[1047] בטילן מבלטן כל מבכלתא 'thwarted and frustrated are all the tormentors' (AIT 17:13).[1048]

As may be noted, the same endings as in the active are standard for the *pe.* passive participle, where we probably have the following set: *qəṭīl* (masc. sg.);[1049] *qəṭīlā* (fem. sg.); *qəṭīlīn* (masc. pl.);[1050] *qəṭīlān* (fem. pl.). These forms are likewise standard in Aramaic.[1051] As in the active participle, in the masc. pl. we have forms without the final *nun*, testifying probably to the pattern *qəṭīlī* or *qəṭīlē*. The latter form is familiar from the Yemenite reading tradition of BTA.[1052] Both the form with the final *nun* and the one without it may occur in the same text, as may be noted for instance in N&Sh 2 (see the examples above). For some reasons, the forms with the vocalic ending (i.e. י-) are more common in the passive than they are in the active forms. *Defective* spellings are quite common, e.g. אסרין פתכריה 'bound are the idol-spirits' (N&Sh 8:4-5). Here אסרין appears for the expected אסירין. Correspondingly, חרבי appears for חריבי in N&Sh 13:15. We might, perhaps, argue that the spellings of the type אסרין or חרבי testify to the pattern *qaṭlīn/qaṭlē*, which could be explained as an analogous form to the active participle

---

[1046] Read according to the emendation by Epstein (1921: 33), which is doubtless correct.

[1047] כדנא is translated 'likewise' by Montgomery, but according to the plausible emendation by Epstein, it is a noun akin to Syriac *kdn* 'lien,' equivalent to the English word 'bond.' See Epstein 1921: 48.

[1048] For מבלטן, see Epstein 1921: 49. Montgomery reads מבטלן.

[1049] Note that in the orthography used for the bowl texts, both the active and passive participles of the masc. sg. are generally spelt likewise, i.e. קטיל. Therefore, these forms can be distinguished only by the context.

[1050] The *shwa* in the initial syllable is sometimes spelt with *yod*: אתון כיפיתון 'you are roped' (N&Sh 5:7).

[1051] For the different dialects, compare, for instance, Rosenthal 1974: 61 (Biblical Aramaic); Dalman 1905: 285 (TO, GA); Cook 1986: 190 (PsJ); Nöldeke 1898: 105 (Syriac).

[1052] Morag 1988: 136.

pattern *qaṭlē*, familiar from the Yemenite reading tradition (see above). However, this kind of passive pattern is – as far as I know – unattested in any Aramaic dialect, including the Yemenite reading tradition of BTA.[1053] Further, one wonders from the semantic point of view whether the active and passive participles could really be identical in a *living* language.[1054] Note, however, that in the Yemenite reading tradition we encounter identical patterns for active and passive participles.[1055] Yet, carelessness on the part of the scribes is probably the most likely explanation. In any case, spellings of the type חרבי are surprisingly well attested alongside the spellings with *yod* in the medial position.

In fem. pl., we may have instances of the pattern *qəṭīlā*, too, alongside the standard *qəṭīlān*, e.g. הפיכא ארעא הפיכא שמיא הפיכא כל מילי הפיכא לוטתא 'overturned is the earth, overturned is the heaven, overturned are all the words, overturned is/are the curse/curses' (Yam 4). This example is puzzling. All the participles are spelt alike הפיכא, despite the fact that ארעא should be a fem. sg. form, שמיא a masc. pl. form, and מילי fem. plural. לוטתא can be either fem. sg. (=/lawṭəṭā/?) or pl. (= /lawṭāṭā/?). Hence, only in the case of ארעא and לוטתא does the form used seem to be correct from the grammatical point of view.[1056]

The phrase may be compared with a partly parallel phrase in N&Sh 2:

הפיכא ארעא וי(שמ)יא הפיכי כוכבי ומזלי הפיכא שעתא דכול בני
אינשא הפיכא לוטתא דימא ויברתה דכלתא ויחמתה הפיכא לוטתא
(N&Sh 2:2-4).

In this section, the forms are grammatically as one would expect.[1057] As for the former example, one could argue that הפיכא in הפיכא כל מילי and in הפיכא לוטתא – assuming that לוטתא is a pl. form – could be explained by the assumption that it is a form of fem. pl. participle with a vocalic ending (i.e. *qəṭīlā*), familiar from Mandaic. The form of the fem. pl. participle employed in Mandaic is *brika(n)*.[1058] Actually, the same pattern appears sporadically in BTA, too, e.g. פריטא alongside פריטן and צריכא alongside צריכן.[1059] Hence, there remains a

---

[1053] For the forms of the Yemenite reading tradition, see Morag 1988: 136.

[1054] A parallel from the English would be if the words 'killer' and 'killed' were formed according to the same pattern.

[1055] For instance, the pattern *qəṭu* appears as both an active and a passive pl. form. See Morag 1988: 258, 262. Does this reflect a feature of a living dialect?

[1056] As for שמיא, it is of course possible that the congruence is *ad sensum*.

[1057] In case of הפיכא ארעא וי(שמ)יא, הפיכא evidently refers only to ארעא, which is closest. Cf. above.

[1058] See Macuch 1965: 278.

[1059] Boyarin 1976a: 173-174; Sokoloff 1971: 242. The form is also discussed in Kutscher 1962: 119. Three examples are given in Epstein 1960: 40 as well, even though, according to Boyarin (1976a: 173), these are questionable. The occurrence of the fem. pl. form with the vocalic ending for both the active and the passive participle is also noted in Kutscher 1971a: cc. 280-281.

possibility that הפיכא e.g. in the phrase הפיכא כל מילי represents the same pattern. Yet, we must be very careful in this respect until more convincing and less ambiguous instances occur, since it seems in general that at least some of the inconsistencies may be attributed to the carelessness of the scribes. Grammatical correctness was, perhaps, not a matter of primary importance for the scribes. Note, for instance, the following example with several (apparently) incorrect forms: In [1060].הפיכה שמיה הפיכין ארעה הפכי כוכבי הפיכי מילי הפיכא לוטתא contrast with the earlier example, מילי is treated here as a masc. (הפיכי מילי).

As for the fem. pl. spelt קטילן, it is not always clear whether a given form should be taken as a fem. pl. or as a corresponding masc. form, with a *defective* spelling (i.e. קטילן as well). An example ready to hand is found in AIT 16:11, where after a long list of both masc. and fem. malevolent creatures, there occur the passive participles אסירן כבישן ומשכבן. Now, it is uncertain whether these forms are fem. forms referring to the last item in the list – i.e. ושבע מבכלתא דליליה ודיממא 'and seven tormentors of night and day' – which is of fem. gender, or whether they are masc. forms – which is perhaps more likely – referring to all the creatures listed. Another example is evident in GE C, where the text runs as follows: אסירין כבישין דיוי נקיטן ברזא רוחי בישתא וחומרי זידניתא וטומאתא ורברבי דחשוכא (GE C:6-7). אסירין and כבישין are masc. pl. referring to דיוי, whereas נקיטן could be a fem. pl. referring to רוחי בישתא or a *defective* spelled masc. pl. referring to רוחי בישתא and to all the masc. and fem. items of the list that follow (חומרי זידניתא etc.)

Cases of incongruence

Inconsistencies as to gender and number are common:

(a) A sg. form is occasionally used with a pl. subject, especially when the subject consists of a group of sg. subjects connected by the particle ו- 'and,' e.g. חתים ומחתם ביתה ואיסקופתה דדודי בת אחת 'sealed and countersealed are the house and threshold of D., daughter of 'A.' (AIT 22:1). חתים ומחתם possibly refer here only to the first item, ביתה.[1061]

(b) Sporadically, a masc. form is used for the expected fem.: כבישין נשי חרשאתא אינין 'suppressed are those enchanting women' (TB 7). Harviainen concludes that this sporadic feature is attributable to the possible disappearance of the specific fem. pl. participles.[1062] This trait, which is otherwise unknown in Late

---

[1060] The phrase appears in a bowl from the British Museum (no. 19745) published only in part by Gordon. See Gordon 1941: 339. I cannot check the reading.

[1061] For the disagreement in number and gender between subject and predicate in Official Aramaic, see Folmer's important investigation in Folmer 1995: 429ff.

[1062] Harviainen 1981: 21-22.

Aramaic, is familiar from Modern East Aramaic and Modern Mandaic.[1063] The possibility that the masc. form replaced the fem. in some BA dialects may be supported by the fact that when the participles are attached to enclitic personal pronouns the masc. replaces the fem. in Mandaic and possibly also in BJA (see above). More instances are needed for secure conclusions. One should note, however, that the specific fem. form is otherwise attested in the bowl texts.

The passive participle may have a meaning indicating result or state, as common in Late Aramaic:[1064] אריא רכיבא מורניתא בידה נקיטא 'mounting a lion, holding a lance in her hand' (N&Sh 13:15);[1065] מיטול דשמיע עליכי/ון 'because it is announced to you' (= 'you hear') (AIT 8:5). Nevertheless, the syntagm *qǝṭīl l-*, employed with an active meaning in Syriac, Mandaic, and to a certain extent in BTA as well, is rare or totally unattested in the bowl texts.[1066] One possible occurrence might be in N&Sh 13:16, where the text runs as follows: דגברא מילבר אתא עליכון קנטיואל שמיה סכין גודדא בידיה נקיט לי<ה> 'that a man came against you from the outside; his name is Q. He held a cutting knife in his hand.'[1067] The last *he* is restored in the reading of Naveh and Shaked, but its absence may testify to weakness in the laryngeals.[1068] גודדא – which should be a participle used as a noun – is obscure. Does this form (in the emphatic state?) indicate rounding of the original */ā/? (see above III.6. *Waw as a Counterpart of */ā/*). If the interpretation and reading of the phrase is correct, it is of interest that this syntagm indeed appears in N&Sh 13, a text with many isoglosses in common with standard BTA, as opposed to the normal language of the bowl texts (see also below V. *Conclusions*).

Another possible occurrence of this syntagm is present in AIT 8, where the text runs – according to the emendation by Epstein – as follows: אנחנא ית מאי דשמיע להון מין רקיעא ולאבון שומון בישי (AIT 8:9-10). The translation of Epstein runs: 'Nous l'avons fait descendre, (tout) ce que eux(!) ont entendu du ciel, et obéi à notre père, mauvais.'[1069] On the basis of a photograph of AIT 8, I cannot decide whether Epstein's reading is correct, since the text is greatly erased in these

---

[1063] See Harviainen 1981: 21-22 and the literature given there.

[1064] Cf. Muraoka 1987: 44-45; Macuch 1965: 434.

[1065] Cf. Schlesinger 1928: 46. Note that נקיט – translated as 'haltend' – is among the examples listed by Schlesinger. Macuch, too, states that passive participles for verbs indicating 'holding' often have an active meaning, as in Syriac. Macuch 1965: 434.

[1066] For this syntagm and its occurrence in various Aramaic dialects, see Kutscher 1965: 135ff. and the literature given there; Folmer 1995: 376ff., where Official Aramaic in particular is treated. In the syntagm *qǝṭīl l-*, the subject of the action follows the preposition *l-*. See Muraoka 1987: 44-45.

[1067] Naveh and Shaked translate in the present: 'comes... holds.'

[1068] Based on the photograph of the text, there is no room in the text for *he*. See also III.2. *Laryngeals and Pharyngeals*.

[1069] Epstein 1921: 42.

sections. If the reading is correct, the syntagm appears here in connection with the standard BTA pronoun מאי 'what,' otherwise unattested in the bowl texts. The suffixed pronoun ך- is also typical of standard BTA and rare in our texts.[1070] The fact that the translation of Epstein does not make too much sense leaves room for suspecting that there is something wrong with the reading.[1071]

We may conclude that the occurrence of the syntagm *qaṭīl l-* in the bowl texts is doubtful.

IV.10.4.1. Notes on Weak Verbs and Derived Stems

Verba tertiae waw/yod

(a) Singular

The masc. sg. active participle is of the type *qāṭē/qaṭē* and the corresponding fem. form is *qāṭ(ə)yā/qaṭyā*, as is evident in the light of the examples listed below. The patterns *qāṭē* and *qāṭ(ə)yā* are classical forms in Aramaic,[1072] while the patterns *qaṭē* and *qaṭyā* are based on the models found in the Yemenite reading tradition of BTA.[1073]

Some examples:

masc. sg.: דלא מזיג שתי 'that which is unmixed he drinks'; דאיניש קיטריה לא שרי 'whose knot no man can untie' (N&Sh 23:11).

fem. sg.: וכול דלרעא קריא 'and all that is of the earth calls' (N&Sh 2:8);[1074] להדא (לי)/ליתא דשריא עים יויתאי בת חתאי 'for this Lilith who dwells with Y., daughter of H.' (N&Sh 13:1); לויתא חציפתא דלויא 'impudent female companion who accompanies' (N&Sh 13:7); כי איסתרא דליות אתיא ברישיכו 'like the goddess Deliwat coming at your head' (N&Sh 13:15).

(b) Plural

In masc. pl., the patterns *qāṭan, qaṭyān/qaṭyan*, and also *qāṭəyē/qaṭyē*, are probable. The pattern *qaṭū/qəṭū* is found in the passive participle of the basic stem as well as in the derived stems. These masc. forms and other possible interpretations (e.g. *qāṭēn*) of the attested spellings are discussed further below.

In the fem., we encounter only *qāṭəyān/qaṭyān*. The same endings are used in the basic stem as well as in the derived stems. The pattern *qāṭəyān* is the classical

---

[1070] See above IV.3 and IV.7.

[1071] Montgomery could not read the sentence either, save for a few words.

[1072] The forms *qāṭē* and *qāṭəyā* appear, for instance, in Biblical Aramaic (Rosenthal 1974: 51). In the fem., Syriac has *qāṭyā*. See Muraoka 1987: 31, 108.

[1073] See Morag 1988: 257-258.

[1074] קריא is historically from the *tertiae aleph* root קרא.

fem. pl. form for *verba tertiae waw/yod*, familiar from Biblical Aramaic (e.g.
שָׁנְיָן),[1075] while the variant *qaṭyān* appears at least in the Yemenite reading tradition
of BTA,[1076] in Mandaic,[1077] Samaritan Aramaic,[1078] and apparently in the Geniza
fragments of the Palestinian Targum, where the ending -*yan* appears both for the
active and passive participles of the fem. pl.[1079]

SOME EXAMPLES:

masc. pl.: וליליתא דיכרי וניקבתא דלוין עימהון 'and Liliths, male and
female, who dwell with them/attach to them' (AIT 6:2-3); ומן כל פידג(מי) דכסיי
סניי (ד)דחילי 'and from all the words which the frightening enemies are hiding'
(N&Sh 11:3-4).

fem.pl.: לכל ליליתא דמיתחזין להון 'for all the Liliths who appear to them'
(AIT 9:3).[1080]

The masculine patterns

(a) *qāṭan*

Masc. pl. participle (active and passive) of the type *qāṭan* is attested in many East
Aramaic dialects. According to Morag, it is found in the oral reading tradition of the
Yemenite Jews, in the vocalization of *Halakhot Pesuqot*, in the Geonic parts of
Halakhot Gedolot, in the Babylonian tradition of Biblical Aramaic,[1081] in TO, and
in the Geniza manuscripts of BT.[1082] It also occurs in TJ.[1083] Boyarin has pointed
out that the form *qāṭan* for the masc. pl. participle of *verba tertiae waw/yod* is one
of the traits which BJA shares with the vocalizations of TO and TJ.[1084] Moreover,
qāṭan is evident in the Palmyrene inscriptions.[1085] Hence, it is a rather common
trait in the Aramaic dialects of an eastern background.

[1075] Rosenthal 1974: 51. Moreover, it appears at least in TO (Dalman 1905: 350), while Syriac
apparently has *qāṭyān*. See Muraoka 1987: 31, 108; Nöldeke 1898: 118.

[1076] The form in the Yemenite reading tradition is pronounced [qaṭyån]. Morag 1988: 259.

[1077] Macuch 1965: 349. Mandaic also has the variant without the final *nun* (ibid.).

[1078] Macuch 1982: 209.

[1079] Fassberg 1983: 279; Fassberg 1990: 188.

[1080] מיתחזין is an *itpe.* fem. pl. participle from the root חזי. AIT 12 has the identical form:
ומן מבכלתא דמיתחזין להון 'and from tormentors who appear to them' (AIT 12:4-5).

[1081] ̄By contrast, the Tiberian tradition of Biblical Aramaic attests to the ending -*ayin*.
Rosenthal 1974: 51; Dodi 1983: 199.

[1082] Morag 1983: 352-353; 1973a: 69-70.

[1083] See Dodi 1983: 199. But in TJ the use of this ending is apparently not as consistent as in
TO. See Dalman 1905: 340.

[1084] Boyarin 1978: 146.

[1085] Rosenthal 1936: 69 gives the instance הון, which is also found in the bowl texts. See also
Boyarin 1976a: 176. Cantineau (1935: 94) assumes that the form הון is to be vocalized
/hāwēn/, as in Syriac.

The same pattern seems to appear in the bowl texts.[1086] An example may be found in a sequence from MB I, where all the pl. participles but the *tertiae infirmae* form מחן 'wipe out' are written with *yod* in the final syllable (i.e. ין-): ומחן ומחבלין וקטלין ומפקין (MB I:11).[1087] Thus, it is not likely that מחן is a *defective* spelling of מחין. Moreover, the text attests to several other regular pl. participles written with the ending ין-, e.g. נפקין וערקין (lines 12-13), while מחן is the only form written without *yod* in the last syllable (ן-).

More examples are evident in AIT 6, where this pattern seems to appear alongside the pattern *qaṭyān/qaṭyan*. The examples are as follows:

ולרוחי בישתא ולחומרי זידניתא ולגיסי וקיבלי ליליתא דיכרי
וניקבתא דלוין עימהון דאדק בר חאתוי ודאחת בת חאתוי דלוין
עימהון ודשרין בגו בתיהון ודרכין על איסכופתיהון ומידמן להון
בדמו דמו ומחן ורמן וקטלין
(AIT 6:2-4).[1088]

'upon evil spirits and impious amulet-spirits and familiar spirits (?) and counter-charms and Liliths, male and female, who dwell with 'A. son of H. and 'A. daughter of H., who dwell with them, who live inside their houses, and trample on their thresholds and appear to them in one form and another, and strike and cast down and kill' (AIT 6:2-4).

The underlined forms represent *qāṭan*, while לוין and שרין testify apparently to the pattern *qaṭyān/qaṭyan* to be discussed below. Note that the regular verbs (קטלין and דרכין) are spelt with the ending ין-.

Importantly, a duplicate appears in GE B,[1089] where we have the forms דלון, ומחן, ורמן, ומידמן, ודרכין, ושרן, and וקטלין (lines 3-4). In contrast with לוין and שרין in AIT 6, לון and שרן appear here without *yod*, suggesting perhaps that the patterns *qāṭan* and *qaṭyān/qaṭyan* are in free variation for *verba tertiae waw/yod*.[1090] One should note as well that the regular verbs are again written with the ending ין-.

According to Naveh and Shaked הון, appearing in N&Sh 6:6, is 'act. part. m. pl.':[1091]

והון גברי אינשי ודרדקי ודרדוקתא דקימין קובלי אנה בריך יהביה
בר ממא יהוון אילמין בפומיהון סמן בעיניהון (N&Sh 6:5-7).

[1086] The appearance of this pattern in the bowl texts is also pointed out in Morag 1973a: 70, n. 45 and Boyarin 1976a: 176.

[1087] I have no photograph at my disposal, but in a facsimile the reading looks correct.

[1088] Read according to the emendation by Epstein, which on the basis of a photograph is correct. See Epstein 1921: 34.

[1089] As already noted by Geller (1980: 58), GE B 'largely duplicates AIT 6.'

[1090] They appear side by side in many BTA documents (see below).

[1091] Naveh & Shaked 1985: 167.

'and the men and women, boys and girls, who stand against me, I, B.-Y.,
son of M, may they (i.e. the men and women, boys and girls mentioned
above) be mute in their mouths, blind in their eyes.'

Naveh and Shaked evidently assume that the participle הון is used here with
the future sense, as connected with the next line, where we have יהוון אילמין
בפומיהון 'may they (i.e. the men and women, boys and girls mentioned above) be
mute in their mouths etc.' The invocation begins with a participle form והון ('and
may the men etc. who stand against' the client of the bowl), and the idea continues
with the imperfect form יהוון ('may they be mute etc.'). Otherwise והון does not
make any sense in the context.[1092] Instead, it is also possible that והון should be
corrected in accordance with יהוון in the next line, even though there seems to be a
tendency to distinguish *waw* and *yod* in this text. If so, we might read the imperfect
יהון instead of the particle -ו 'and' followed by the pl. participle הון: יהון גברי
אינשי ודרדקי ודרדוקתא דקימין קובלי 'may the men and women, boys and
girls, who stand against me.' יהון would be a *defective* spelling of יהוון. Both read-
ings are possible in the context. Less likely is the possibility that הון is a corruption
of a demonstrative pronoun הלין ('and these men...'). סמן, which is an
adjective/participle pl. ('blind') from the root סמי,[1093] appears in the same para-
graph and testifies apparently to the pattern *qāṭan*, too. In any case, it remains un-
certain whether the pattern *qāṭan* is attested in this bowl with the verb הוי 'to be.'

By contrast, we have a good instance of הון as a pl. participle in N&Sh 12a:8
and its duplicates (B1/2:8; 12b:13): וכל בנין דאית להון ודהון להון 'and all the
children they have or will have.'[1094] דהון is also evident in a similar (but not
identical) phrase in AIT 3:5, 8. Montgomery understood הון as a pl. participle with
a future sense, but according to him, the form is /hāwēn/ as in Syriac.[1095] Yet, there
remains a possibility that דהון stands for a particle ד as combined with a pl. im-
perfect (*[dihwōn] < ד-יהון). This is, however, unlikely in the light of the fact that
a definite masc. participle is attested in a similar construction in AIT 6: ולא
תישילטון בכל קינינהון דאית להון ודהוי להון 'and that they have no power
over their property, what they have and what they shall have' (AIT 6:10-11).

The occurrence of the same ending in the derived stem may be exemplified by
the following instance: חתימין ומחתמין ומסגן 'they are sealed, countersealed,
and fortified (Go B:1, 5). As pointed out by Gordon, מסגן is probably a 'pael

---

[1092] It cannot be grammatically connected with the ideas presented in the previous line
('to silence etc.').

[1093] Cf. סְמֵי in BJA (Jastrow 1903: 999); *SMA* I in Mandaic (Drower & Macuch 1963: 332) and
smy in Syriac (Payne Smith 1903: 380).

[1094] The Bowl 12b has וידהון.

[1095] See Montgomery 1913: 131.

participle pass. m. pl. of סְגִי.'[1096] Note also מידמן in AIT 6 (see above), which is evidently an *etpe.* form of the root דמי.

(b) *qaṭyān/qaṭyan*

As already pointed out above, *qaṭyān/qaṭyan* is evident in the bowl texts for the basic stem (*pe.*) alongside *qāṭan*, e.g. דאינון שרין 'who live' (N&Sh 23:7). As expected, the same ending (*-yān/-yan*) occurs for the derived stems, too: דמידמין ליה 'that they appear' (N&Sh 25:9);[1097] בשבעה איסרין דלא מישתרין 'by the seven bonds which are not loosened' (HUN 4).[1098] It is one of the three main patterns of pl. masc. for *verba tertiae waw/yod* in BTA.[1099] In the pointed texts, one finds spellings of the type קָטְיָאן.[1100] In the Yemenite reading tradition, the pattern *qaṭyān*, which appears as [qaṭyån], is frequently used both for the fem. pl. as well as the masc. pl. of *verba tertiae waw/yod*.[1101] Thus in this pattern of the Yemenite reading tradition, the gender distinction was neutralized.

Instead of *qaṭyān/qaṭyan*, such spellings as לוין could also be understood to represent either the pattern *qāṭayin* or *qāṭēn*, but for the following reasons, I believe that *qaṭyān/qaṭyan* is the most probable pattern for the forms of the type לוין. First, it is typical of the bowl texts in general that they yield features of TO and those of BTA side by side. While *qāṭayīn* and *qāṭēn* are unattested in BTA, it is probable that *qaṭyān/qaṭyan* (and not *qāṭayīn* nor *qāṭēn*) indeed appears in the bowl texts alongside *qāṭan*. In this respect it is noteworthy that also the patterns *qaṭyē/qāṭəyē* and *qəṭū/qaṭū* which – to my knowledge – are exclusively BTA patterns, are found in the bowl texts (discussed below).

Secondly, if the pattern were *qāṭayin*, one would, perhaps, expect spellings of the type לויין, with two *yod*s, to be found, as is the case in GA, at least in the Palestinian Targum, which indeed has the pattern *qāṭayin*.[1102] In contrast, some other GA documents, such as the Palestinian Talmud fragments from the Cairo Geniza, attest to the ending *-ay*.[1103] Yet, it must be admitted that in BTA one finds spellings of the type קטיין (alongside קטיאן and קטין) which stand for the pattern *qaṭyān/qaṭyan*.[1104]

[1096] See Gordon 1934: 325. The readings are evident on the basis of a facsimile.

[1097] מידמין is an *etpe.* pl. participle from the root דמי.

[1098] מישתרין is an *etpe.* pl. participle from the root שרי.

[1099] The main patterns of BTA are spelled (a) קטו/קאטו; (b) קטן/קאטן; (c) קטין/קטיין/קטיאן. See Morag 1973a: 68-70. Most of the vocalized BTA fragments from the Cairo Geniza attest only to the patterns (a) and (c), the former being more widespread (ibid.).

[1100] Ibid., note especially p. 68, n. 41.

[1101] Morag 1988: 259-260.

[1102] See Fassberg 1983: 279; 1990: 188; Dalman 1905: 340. PsJ displays both GA and TO forms (Cook 1986: 209).

[1103] Kutscher 1976: 44ff.

One could argue in a different direction, too: the fact that we do not have spellings with two *yod*s in the bowl texts (i.e. קטײ) indicates that the pattern under discussion cannot be *qaṭyān/qaṭyan*. However, the use of double *yod* to express a consonantal /y/ is exceptional in the writing system of the bowl texts in general. Besides, BTA which frequently uses a double *yod* to express /y/ also has spellings such as קטין to represent the pattern *qaṭyān/qaṭyan*. In any case, the pattern *qāṭayin* is clearly a western pattern. In addition to the Palestinian Targum, *qāṭayin* appears in the Tiberian tradition of Biblical Aramaic.[1105] Thus, its occurrence in an eastern text is less probable than that of *qaṭyān/qaṭyan*, familiar from BTA.

The appearance of *qāṭēn* could be supported by the fact that spellings with and without *yod* in the last syllable appear in the bowl texts. As noted, we have for instance לוין alongside לון (see above). Both spellings could be argued as representing the very same pattern, *qāṭēn*. Yet, the pattern *qāṭēn* is found only in Syriac and in Samaritan Aramaic,[1106] and is for that reason less likely than the Babylonian *qaṭyān/qaṭyan* in our texts. Moreover, many other BTA documents attest various patterns side by side as well.[1107] Therefore, it is not at all surprising to find different patterns, such as *qāṭan* and *qaṭyān/qaṭyan*, in the bowl texts, too.

Earlier it was pointed out that the fem. pl. participle for *verba tertiae waw/yod* in these texts is either *qāṭəyān* or *qaṭyān* (see above). In the latter case, the distinction between the fem. form and the masc. form *qaṭyān/qaṭyan* would have been neutralized, as in the Yemenite reading tradition (see above). In contrast, the gender distinction was preserved in Biblical Aramaic (*qāṭayin* versus *qāṭəyān*), in TO (*qāṭan* versus *qāṭəyān*) and in Syriac (*qāṭēn* versus *qāṭyān*).[1108]

(c) *qaṭyē/qāṭəyē*

In N&Sh 11:3-4 the text runs as follows: ומן כל פידג(מי) דכסיי סניי (ד)דחילי 'and from all the words which the frightening enemies are hiding.' According to Naveh and Shaked, כסיי is an 'active participle plural masculine.'[1109] As pointed out by Naveh and Shaked, the inscription is 'badly effaced.'[1110] Yet, if the reading is correct, as it seems, the form כסיי could represent the pattern *qaṭyē/qāṭəyē*. This pattern is indeed found in the Yemenite reading tradition for BTA, where it appears as [qaṭye] or [qåṭəye].[1111] Forms with the *ketiv* of the type קטיי, which evidently

---

[1104] See Morag 1973a: 68ff; note especially p. 68, n. 41; Morag 1988: 259-260.

[1105] See Rosenthal 1974: 51; Dodi 1983: 199; Kutscher 1976: 43. For reasons unknown to me, Kutscher gives *qāṭayīn* istead of *qāṭayin*.

[1106] See Nöldeke 1898: 118; Macuch 1982: 209.

[1107] For instance, MS. Hamburg frequently employs both קטיאן-קטײ and קאטו-קטו. Morag 1973a: 69.

[1108] See Morag 1988: 259-260.

[1109] Naveh & Shaked 1985: 186.

[1110] Ibid.

yield the very same pattern, are also known from the Yemenite MSS. of BT, e.g. בעיי.[1112]

(d) *qǝṭūl/qaṭū*

In addition to the patterns discussed above, BTA also uses קטו/קאטו,[1113] represented by the pattern *qǝṭu/qaṭu* in the Yemenite reading tradition.[1114] This pattern is so far unattested in the bowl texts for the active participle, but it is attested for the passive participle both in *pe.* as well in the derived stems (see below). Interestingly, קטו/קאטו is probably the most common pattern in BTA, at least in the Geniza fragments and in the MS. Hamburg.[1115] By contrast, קטן/קאטן is widespread in *Halakhot Pesuqot*.[1116] Morag thinks that the fact that different documents of BJA employ varying patterns may tell something about actual dialectal differences within BJA.[1117] As is well known, *Halakhot Pesuqot* displays features of various BJA dialects, but, nevertheless, one might ask whether קטן/קאטן (=*qāṭan*) is indeed a Geonic pattern, in contrast with standard BTA. This suggestion may be further supported by the fact that the pattern *qāṭan* also occurs in the Geonic parts of *Halakhot Gedolot* (see above). If so, *qāṭan* would be – once again – an isogloss in common with the *vocalization* of TO, the Aramaic of the Geonim, and that of the bowl texts. In any case, the participle forms for *verba tertiae waw/yod* employed in the bowl texts are those of TO/TJ and BTA (or BJA in general).

When a *tertiae waw/yod* pl. participle is attached to an enclitic personal pronoun, it seems that the pattern is always *qāṭē* + suffix or *qǝṭē* + suffix, e.g. רמיתון 'you throw' (N&Sh 13:19). The pattern *qǝṭē* + suffix is based on a model of the Yemenite reading tradition.[1118] A parallel situation is evident in *Halakhot Pesuqot*, in which irrespective of the fact that in the pl. participles *qāṭan* (e.g. קרן) is the regular pattern (see above), almost only spellings of the type קרינן are attested in combinations with the enclitic personal pronouns.[1119] The only exception known to me is חזנן, but note that the spelling חזינן is also found, suggesting that חזנן is a *defective* spelling of the latter.[1120] The Yemenite reading tradition, too, solely dis-

---

[1111] See Morag 1988: 260.

[1112] Ibid.

[1113] E.g. בעו/באעו. See Morag 1973a: 68ff.

[1114] Morag 1988: 258.

[1115] Morag 1973a: 69.

[1116] Ibid. Ben-Asher, in his paper on the conjugation of the *tertiae waw/yod* verbs in *Halakhot Pesuqot*, gives only this pattern, e.g. קרן and שתן. Ben-Asher 1970: 31.

[1117] Morag 1973a: 70.

[1118] In the Yemenite reading tradition we have, for instance, the examples [bǝʿetu] and [damitu]. Morag 1988: 261. The fact that the basic realization of *shwa* in the Yemenite tradition is an ultrashort [a] is not indicated in my transcription – for technical reasons.

[1119] See Ben-Asher 1970: 31.

plays forms based on *qəṭe-/qaṭe-* in combinations with enclitics, even though several different patterns are present with pl. participles which are not attached to enclitics.[1121] In the bowl texts, one meets with spellings of the type חמתון and those of the type רמיתון. Even though it is plausible that חמתון is a *defective* spelling for *[ḥāmet(t)ūn], one should bear in mind the possibility that the *tertiae waw/yod* participle חמתון might stand for the pattern *qāṭa* + suffix (חמתון = *[ḥāmat(t)ūn]?).[1122] I must admit, however, that the pattern *qāṭa* + suffix is – as far I know – unattested in other dialects for *tertiae waw/yod* participles attached to enclitic personal pronouns. Nevertheless, there remains the possibility that the pattern *qāṭa* + suffix (based on the pl. *qāṭan* + suffix) may have been used in some BJA dialects.

Passive participle of verba tertiae waw/yod

Again, more than one pattern is attested: in addition to the pattern with the ending -*an* (e.g. מסגן), discussed above in connection with the active participles of *verba tertiae waw/yod*, we apparently find *qəṭū/qaṭū*.

In N&Sh 15:8, the text runs וביתרי עשר ראזי כ(ס)ו וחתימי וי(נ)טירי 'by the twelve hidden, sealed and guarded mysteries.' If the reading is correct, כ(ס)ו should be a passive participle masc. pl. of the root כסי. Naveh and Shaked read כ(ס)י, with the final *yod*, but it is more probable that we should read כ(ס)ו. The pattern *qəṭū/qaṭū* is found in BTA, for instance in the Yemenite reading tradion of BTA, where we have the pronunciations [qəṭu] and [qaṭu] respectively.[1123] The pattern appears as a passive participle masc. pl. for *verba tertiae waw/yod* alongside the regular *qaṭyån*.[1124]

Further examples with the ending ו- are attested in the derived stems: דאתון ממנו 'you who are appointed' (WB 10). Geller reads with the final *yod* (i.e. ממני), but since the context requires a pl. form, we should probably read ממנו, a form of *tertiae waw/yod pa.* pass. participle masc. pl., which is again familiar from BTA, e.g. [məʿallu] in the Yemenite reading tradition of BTA.[1125] The form read by Geller, ממני, would be a corresponding sg. form.[1126]

[1120] Ben-Asher 1970: 31.

[1121] See Morag 1988: 258-261.

[1122] חמתון (N&Sh 6:4) is a pl. participle from the root חמי 'to see,' attached to a 2nd p. masc. pl. enclitic personal pronoun. Compare חמתון with שמעיתון (= *[šāməʿittūn] ?) which, in contrast, has the ending יתון-. While N&Sh 6 otherwise uses *plene* spelling regularly for /ī/ or /ē/ and commonly for short vowels, too, it is possible that חמתון is not a *defective* spelling for [ḥāmēttūn], but represents a pronunciation of the type [ḥāmattūn].

[1123] Morag 1988: 262.

[1124] Ibid.

[1125] See Morag 1988: 269. See also Morag 1973a: 67-68.

The pattern *qəṭūl/qaṭū* is evident in N&Sh 13, where the text runs: נורא לבישין ונורא מכסו 'they are clad with fire and covered with fire' (N&Sh 13:21).[1127] Naveh and Shaked read מכסי, but from a grammatical point of view it is more likely that we should read מכסו (=[məkassu]), in accordance with ממנו quoted above.[1128] In the MS. Hamburg, one finds for the regular verbs in the derived stems both participles with the final *waw* and some with final *yod*, e.g. מכלמו *versus* מזבני.[1129] Instead, for *verba tertiae waw/yod*, *waw* is the regular ending, e.g. מצלו.[1130] In *Halakhot Pesuqot*, only *waw* appears for *verba tertiae waw/yod* and regularly *yod* (or י-) for other verbs.[1131] In the light of these comparisons, even though the forms discussed by Morag are apparently all active forms,[1132] it is plausible to read ממנו and מכסו respectively.

Moreover, we have at least one example where the pattern *qəṭūl/qaṭū* is possible for a *regular* verb in *pa.*:[1133] in N&Sh 13:13, we may read either נוולי דלא מתקנו '(in the shape of) unmended looms' or, as read by Naveh and Shaked, נוולי דלא מתקני.[1134] Both are also possible from the grammatical point of view, as is evident according to the comparison presented above. Hence, in our texts מכסו and ממנו are evident – being *verba tertiae waw/yod* – while both מתקני and מתקנו are possible. It should be noted that מכסו and מתקני/ו appear in N&Sh 13, which yields several BTA traits in contrast with the normal language of the bowl texts.

Furthermore, a fem. form with the ending -*yān* is probably found in JMLB 2, where we may read דממנין. Yet, the reading is uncertain. ממנין is apparently the *pa.* fem. pl. pass. participle from the root מני. In the Yemenite reading tradition we have for example [məʿallån] and [məšuppəyån].[1135]

[1126] See Morag 1988: 269. Cf. a Palestinian amulet published by Naveh and Shaked: בשם אברסכס דממני ע]ל 'in the name of Abrasax who is appointed over...' (Amulet 12:2).

[1127] The forms refer to מלאכי דאיתו.

[1128] It is also possible that מכסי is an *itpa.* or *itpe.* participle, to be pronounced [mikkassī] (these forms are discussed below in *Notes on derived stems*). Cf. also Jastrow 1903: 653, where in *itpa.* the meanings 'to be covered, hidden; to cover oneself, to conceal oneself, withdraw' are listed. Note that Jastrow cites a corresponding fem. form מְכַּסְיָא.

[1129] See Morag 1973a: 67-68.

[1130] Ibid.

[1131] Ibid.

[1132] This is not always clear, since the quotations are so brief. Morag speaks of צורות הרבים של בינוני.' Nevertheless, the pattern *qaṭu-qaṭu* is used, for instance, in the Yemenite reading tradition both for active and for passive participles. See Morag 1988: 269, where we have, for instance, מגלו *versus* the passive מעלו.

[1133] It was pointed out earlier that while no clear distinction between *waw* and *yod* is observed in the script of the bowl texts, it is possible that some of the pl. participles of the regular verbs in the basic stem that end with *yod*, are to be read with *waw* instead. For instance, we could read צמחו for צמחי in N&Sh 13:20.

[1134] מתקני/ו is a *pa.* pass. part. masc. pl. from the root תקן 'repair.'

Further notes on the participles of the derived stems

SOME EXAMPLES OF THE ACTIVE AND PASSIVE PARTICIPLES OF THE DERIVED STEMS:

etpe.: דמיקרי אבאבאי בר אבדימי 'who is called 'A. son of 'A.' (N&Sh 7:2); דמיתקריא 'who is called' (F 4:2); עבדין דמיתעבדין 'charms which are cast' (N&Sh 3:4); דמידמין ליה 'that they appear to him' (N&Sh 25:10).

pa.: דימקבלא 'which receives' (N&Sh 2:9); מידחלא (N&Sh 7:8);[1136]

pa.: passive ומחתם (N&Sh 14:5);[1137] מזמן הדין קמיעה 'this amulet is designated' (N&Sh 24:1); מזמנא הדא מילתא 'this incantation ('word') is appointed' (N&Sh 7:1);

af.: משבענא יתכון 'I adjure you' (N&Sh 6:8); תוב מומינא ומשמענא 'further, I adjure and invoke' (N&Sh 19:5).

ištaf.: מישתעבדיתון ליה לאורוס 'you make yourselves slaves of 'O.' (N&Sh 13:17).

The same endings are used as in the basic stem. As in other Aramaic dialects, prefixed מ- is added to the base. In addition to the phenomena discussed above in connection with other features of participles (active and passive), the following forms are deserving of comment:

In *etpe*., the participle forms with the assimilation of the infixed -ת- and those which preserve it interchange, e.g. מיקרי in N&Sh 7:2 *versus* דמיתקריא F 4:2 (see the examples above); דמידמין in N&Sh 25:10 *versus* מיתדמין later in the same line. Note also דכד מיכתיב שמיה ומיחתים 'while his name is written and sealed' (MB I:24-25). מיחתים shows that the assimilation may occur with /ḥ/ as well. Similar vacillation is evident in BTA as represented by the Yemenite reading tradition.[1138]

We have in the bowl texts at least one certain instance of the *pa*. pl. participle of *verba mediae waw/yod* with the prefixed מי-: מיזייחין (AIT 13:7).[1139] Parallel forms are found in *Halakhot Pesuqot*, e.g. מיקיים.[1140] It is possible that *yod*

[1135] See Morag 1988: 269. The Yemenite tradition attests to the patterns *məqaṭṭal* and *məquṭṭal* for the *pa*. pass. participle.

[1136] The verse בשום דיליד ומידחלא is translated by Naveh & Shaked: 'in the name of he who gives birth and frightens' (Naveh & Shaked 1985: 171).

[1137] מחתם appears in the common phrase חתים ומחתם, which with various formulations occurs frequently in the bowl texts, e.g. in N&Sh 14:5, where the text runs: חתים בשבעה חתמין ומחתם בתלתא שורין. מחתם is a *pa*. pass. part., usually translated either 'countersealed' or 'firmly sealed,' as opposed to the *pe*. part. חתים 'sealed.' The phrase also occurs in pl.: חתימין ומחתמין (e.g. in N&Sh 15:1-2).

[1138] Cf. Morag 1988: 144. Note for instance [mittəqil] and [miḥḥəsaq] as opposed to [mitqaṭle].

[1139] Epstein translates 'ils parent.' He compares this form with the Syriac *zwḥ*, which in the *pa*. means 'to celebrate, glorify, adorn.' See Payne Smith 1903: 112. The reading of Montgomery (מיזייהין with *hē* instead of *ḥet*), as admitted by Epstein (1921: 45), is also possible. For our purpose here, it is irrelevant which of the two readings is correct.

following the initial *mem* represents *shwa*. As already noted in this study, *yod* frequently appears in the bowl texts as a counterpart of *shwa* in many pointed Aramaic texts (see above III.4. Yod *and* waw *as a Counterpart of* shwa). Compare, for instance, spellings of the type תיקטלון in the *pa.* imperfect. In his article on *Halakhot Pesuqot*, Malone points out that Mandaic has /i/ in many categories where other Aramaic dialects have /ə/.[1141] Even though this is not the case in *pa.* participles, as Malone admits, the feature may be an isogloss in common with Mandaic and *Halakhot Pesuqot*.[1142] Therefore, we cannot exclude the possibility that in the bowl texts, too, *yod* stands for /i/ in forms such as מיזייחין. The possibility that *yod* in the bowl texts, at least in some categories, represents /i/ as in Mandaic is also noted and discussed by Harviainen.[1143] The question is discussed further above in IV.10.2.1.

Occasionally we come across spellings of the type מקאטל which strongly support the view that the pattern of the *pa.* passive participle is *məqattal*, e.g.

אסר וחתים ומחאתם ביתא 'bound, sealed, and countersealed is the house' (AIT 30:1).[1144] Instead, no spellings of the type מקוטל – indicating the pattern *məquttal* – are found. Given the fact that the use of *waw* as a vowel letter is so frequent in these texts, this apparently indicates that the pattern *məquttal* was not commonly employed in the Aramaic represented by the bowl texts; at least it was less common than *məqattal*. The pattern *məqattal*, as is well known, is standard in Aramaic, whereas *məquttal* appears in some East Aramaic dialects alongside *məqattal*: it occurs in the Babylonian tradition of Biblical Aramaic,[1145] in TO (both in *ketiv* and *qere*),[1146] in the Yemenite reading tradition of BTA,[1147] and in Mandaic, where only some remains of this pattern are extant.[1148] It occurs sporadically in the Talmudic MSS. from the Cairo Geniza, too, alongside the regular *məqattal*.[1149] In the west, it is familiar from Targum Neophyti.[1150]

N&Sh 12b:5 has the passive participle (?) מאחיד in contrast with מיחד of the duplicates in which the text runs: ואזלת לחד טורא דימיחד בעלמא שמיה 'and

---

[1140] See Malone 1973: 163.

[1141] Ibid.

[1142] Ibid.

[1143] See Harviainen 1981: 23.

[1144] Cf. e.g. מאשרה in a Talmudic MS. from the Cairo Geniza. See Morag 1973a: 73-74.

[1145] Morag 1973a: 73; 1973b: 50-51.

[1146] Ibid.; Dalman 1905: 253.

[1147] Morag 1973a: 73; 1988: 151.

[1148] Morag 1973a: 73; Nöldeke 1875: 132; Macuch 1965: 191. The regular pattern in Mandaic is *məqattal*.

[1149] Morag 1973a: 73-74.

[1150] See Morag 1988: 152 and the references given there.

she went to a mountain whose name is unique in the world' (N&Sh 12a:2-3; B1). While Naveh and Shaked think that bowl 12a here has the original version as against 12b,[1151] the spelling מאחיד is apparently a scribal error. In any case, מאחיד is obscure.

מתדנאן, which is translated by Naveh and Shaked as 'they judge,' possibly occurs in N&Sh 21:12. Yet, the context is most obscure and the reading uncertain.[1152] According to Naveh and Shaked, מתדנאן is an *itp.* pl. participle from the root דון 'to judge.'[1153] The form – given that the reading is correct – shows convincingly that the ending of the fem. pl. participle is indeed *-ān*, as already pointed out.[1154]

CONCLUSIONS

The participles attested in the bowl texts present a complex picture. On the one hand they yield conservative features. These include, for instance:

(a) the pl. endings ין- (masc.) and ן- (fem).
(b) absence of the particle קא to introduce a participle.
(c) the syntagm *qǝṭil l-* is rarely if at all attested.
(d) the *pa.* participle pattern *mǝqaṭṭal*.

These features tally with TO and other more conservative dialects. At least the first trait is common with Nedarim and Geonic Aramaic, too. On the other hand, features of BTA are evident, too, e.g.

(a) the pl. endings י- (masc.) and א- (fem.). The appearance of the latter is uncertain.
(b) in *verba tertiae waw/yod*, several BTA patterns are attested.
(c) the occurrence of *pa.* partiples of *verba mediae waw/yod* with the prefix מי-.

All in all, in the participles the bowl texts display more features in common with BTA (or BJA in general) than in many other areas of their linguistic structure. It should be noted, for instance, that in the masc. pl. passive participles the ending י- is, if not as common as ין-, at least quite frequently attested. Further, *verba tertiae waw/yod* yield several patterns which are rare if at all attested in other Aramaic dialects besides BJA. We may have some indication that within BJA, the forms present in the bowl texts tally with Geonic Aramaic and the *vocalization* of TO as

---

[1151] Naveh & Shaked 1985: 195.

[1152] See Naveh & Shaked 1993: 129.

[1153] See Naveh & Shaked 1993: 266. Note, however, that the translation 'they judge' is a little obscure for a reflex/passive verb. The translation is evidently based on the context.

[1154] Cf. also Morag 1988: 220.

opposed to standard BTA.[1155] Due to the paucity of the material, this suggestion must be taken as tentative.

IV.10.5. Infinitive

(a) Infinitive of the basic stem (*pe.*)

The consonantal forms used for the infinitive of the basic stem are *myqtl* and *mqtl*; both forms appear infrequently in the corpus. Moreover, we possibly have one occurrence of *mqtwl*. The infinitives of both the basic stem and the derived stems are generally preceded by the prefix *l-*. When used as a verbal noun, an infinitive form may be preceded by the temporal *k-* as well (see below).

SOME EXAMPLES:

mqtl: למעבד 'to make' (N&Sh 4:8);[1156] למשרי 'to untie' (PB 8).

myqtl: אתא למיסחף בתי דאילהי 'he came to wreck the houses of the gods' (N&Sh 13:16); מיטול למיכבש דוי 'in order to press down devils' (AIT 2:6);[1157] ומימסר בהדין קמיעה 'to rule over him' (DMB 11); למישלט ביה 'and transmitted in this amulet' (MB I:12).[1158]

Even in the same line, we encounter spellings both with and without *yod*: כמיפל חיסיא (x2)... ויכמבסק גובתא... ויכמדנח שימשא 'as rocks fall... as the hill rises... as the sun shines' (N&Sh 7:7).

DISCUSSION

The *yod* in *myqtl* suggests that the infinitive of the basic stem is of the type *mi/eqtal*,[1159] corresponding to the vocalization systems of TO,[1160] TJ,[1161] and Biblical Aramaic.[1162] The same pattern may be assumed for Qumran Aramaic.[1163]

[1155] For details, see above.

[1156] In the Geniza fragments of the Palestinian Targum, this verb is vocalized with *ṣere* in the final syllable: מעבֵד or מעבֵיד as opposed to Biblical Aramaic. See Tal 1983: 203. The vowel /e/ is an analogy of the thematic vowel of the imperfect. See Muraoka 1983: 78.

[1157] Montgomery reads למכבש without *yod*, but to my mind – at least on the basis of a photograph – the correct reading is למיכבש. מיטול דמיכבש is evident in Go 11:11, which partly duplicates AIT 2.

[1158] The reading is evident according to a facsimile.

[1159] While *plene* and *defective* writings interchange in these texts, the spelling *mqtl* is likely to be taken as *miqtal*, too.

[1160] Tal 1983: 202.

[1161] Tal 1975: 72.

[1162] Rosenthal 1974: 45. *Pace* Schulthess (1924: 64), who gives *meqtal*, Palestinian Christian Aramaic has *miqtol*. See Müller-Kessler 1991: 163.

[1163] Tal 1983: 208.

Among the East Aramaic dialects, the pattern *mi/eqtal* is standard in Syriac and Mandaic,[1164] and evident also in BTA, as confirmed by the reading tradition of the Yemenite Jews.[1165]

The infinitive with the ending *-ā*, i.e. *miqtəlā*, familiar from BTA and GA, is at least so far unattested in these texts.[1166] Interestingly, it appears in a Mandaic incantation published by Montgomery: מיעלא in AIT 34:10.[1167]

An interesting infinitive form מצוח appears in N&Sh 7: ולא תידחלי מצוח 'and do not be afraid to shout' (N&Sh 7).[1168] This form may be understood in different ways. Owing to the fact that *waw* in this root behaves generally like a regular consonant, and is not used as a *mater lectionis* for /ō/ or /ū/, it is most plausible that מצוח represents the regular pattern *mqtl* (*/miṣwaḥ/).[1169] This argument may be further supported by the fact that we have in the material another *mediae waw/yod* infinitive which, importantly, clearly contradicts מצוח: מיטלי דלמיכל מלאכין קדישין (AIT 4:1). מיכל is an infinitive from the root כול. The meaning of מיטלי here is uncertain.[1170] למיכל suggests that bowl texts accord in the treatment of the infinitive of *mediae waw/yod* with BTA, where this form is analogous to *verba primae yod*, e.g. לְמֵיקָם.[1171] Thus it is likely that מצוח is an exception in which *waw* behaves like a regular consonant.

However, other possibilities remain to be taken into account. While the form of *mediae waw/yod pe.* infinitive in GA is generally written either מקום or מיקום,[1172] corresponding to מצוח in our text, one may argue that מצוח, too, could represent the form *mqtwl* instead of *mqtl*. If so, מצוח would equal the pattern *meqtōl,* typical of GA including the Palestinian Targums.[1173] The vocalization with the preform-

---

[1164] Nöldeke 1898: 104; Macuch 1965: 284. Mandaic also attests to the type *miqtil*.

[1165] See Morag 1988: 137. For *pe.* infinitives in BTA, see also Epstein 1960: 38 and Ben-Asher 1970: 283. Morag (1988: 137) emphasizes that in this respect the traditions of BTA and TO are identical.

[1166] For the infinitive of the type *miqtəlā*, see Morag 1988: 138 and Dalman 1905: 281. Morag (1988: 138) thinks that this form in BTA may be of West Aramaic influence.

[1167] See Morag 1973a: 72, n. 59.

[1168] מצוח is from the root צוח. Naveh and Shaked maintain that מצוח is 'the absolute infinitive of peʿal.' See Naveh & Shaked 1985: 171. One would, however, expect a 'normal' infinitive, since מצוח is used here as a verbal complement. Therefore, it is possible that *lamed* is missing accidentally. On the other hand, cases where *lamed* is missing from an infinitive form used as a verbal complement are attested in various Palestinian Aramaic dialects, such as PTA, Samaritan Aramaic, and Palestinian Christian Aramaic, e.g. אין ברעותך משלחה ית אחונן. See Tal 1983: 208. According to Tal, this trait is late. Parallel forms are found in BTA as well. Cf. the examples enumerated by Schlesinger (1928: 196ff.).

[1169] Cf. Jastrow 1903: 1266; Dalman 1905: 318; Fassberg 1983: 272; Payne Smith 1903: 475.

[1170] For the solution suggested by, see Montgomery 1913: 134.

[1171] See Morag 1988: 218-219; Epstein 1960: 89.

[1172] See Dalman 1905: 321.

ative *me-* occurs in the Geniza fragments of the Palestinian Targum.[1174] מצוח is the only possible example of this pattern found in the bowl texts so far.

In addition, one must bear in mind the possibility that *waw* testifies here to rounding of original /ā/,[1175] a phenomenon attested sporadically in these texts.[1176]

The latter two explanations are less likely than the first one, but more examples are needed for secure conclusions to be reached.

In MB I, we come across a couple of instances spelt *myqṭyl*: וכד מיכתיב שמיהון 'and when their name is written' (MB I:18); דכד מיכתיב שמיה ומיחתים 'while his name is written and sealed' (MB I:24-25).[1177] We might argue that these spellings indicate the infinitive pattern *miqṭil*, familiar from Mandaic.[1178] But it is plausible to understand these forms as *etpe.* participles with the assimilation of ת-.[1179]

The infinitive of the basic stem may appear as an absolute infinitive: מיחטא לא תיחטון ביה 'you shall not sin against him' (AIT 4:2).[1180] מיחטא suggests that, as in TO, in *verba tertiae waw yod* and *'aleph*, the absolute infinitive ends in /ā/ as opposed to the normal infinitive, ending in /ē/, e.g. למשרי 'to untie' in PB line 8.[1181] Both in the basic stem and in the derived stems, the absolute infinitive is used to emphasize the action indicated by the main verb.

Notes on weak verbs

In addition to the aforementioned word מצוה, a note should be made of *tertiae waw/yod* infinitive למשרי 'to untie' (PB 8). משרי accords with the infinitive of *tertiae yod* verbs in TO, where the ending is also י-, e.g. למקטי.[1182] The same pattern is found in BTA, alongside other patterns.[1183]

[1173] Kutscher 1971a: c. 273; Tal 1983: 202. In the Geniza fragments of the Palestinian Targum, three types of *pe.* infinitive are known: מקטֹל, מקטֵל, and מקטַל. The theme vowel is normally identical with the theme vowel of the corresponding imperfect form. See ibid. and Muraoka 1983: 78. Basically the same situation prevails in PTA, but the pattern מקטֹל has become prevalent. Tal 1983: 206ff. In the important MS. Vat.Ebr. 30 of *Bereshit Rabba*, almost all relevant forms represent מקטֹל. See Kutscher 1976: 29.

[1174] Tal 1983: 202.

[1175] The form attested for instance in TO is vocalized with *qameṣ* in the final syllable. See Dalman 1905: 321.

[1176] For this phenomenon, see above III.6. Waw *as a Counterpart of* */āi̯* (qameṣ).

[1177] The readings are evident according to a facsimile.

[1178] See Macuch 1965: 284.

[1179] It is syntactically very unlikely that these forms are infinitives. For these forms, see also IV.10.4.1.

[1180] A duplicate of this phrase is evident in Go 11:12, 16. In Go 11:16 one may read ומחיטא. The *yod* is evidently an auxiliary vowel.

[1181] For TO, see Dalman 1905: 337-338. While מחטא is from the root חטא, it is within the range of possibility that it is a historical spelling in which *aleph* would indicate /ē/.

[1182] See Dodi 1983: 202.

According to Epstein, מימחי is found in a bowl published by Mongomery: ומי ומימחי חשי (AIT 7:13).[1184] The original reading of Montgomery runs: ומי מחראשי, which is translated by him: 'and enchanted Waters.' Based on a photograph of AIT 7, I would read with hesitation ומימחיא שי – with a gap between the א and ש – which gives no clear meaning. If the reading of Epstein is correct, מימחי is in keeping with the aforementioned משרי.

(b) Infinitive of the derived stems

Infinitives of the derived stems are likewise infrequent in the bowl texts. The consonantal forms attested are *qtl'* and *qtwly* for *pa.* and *'qtl'* and *'qtwly* for *af.*; other stems are so far rarely if at all attested. In the following, the forms of *pa.* are used as examples of the infinitive patterns. The type *qtwly* occurs more commonly in the corpus than other types.[1185] In addition to the aforementioned forms, we seem to encounter *qytwly*, *qtwl'/h*, and *mqtlw*. The latter is most uncertain.

EXAMPLES:

(a) *qtl'*

pa. (**qaṭṭālā*): לשתקא 'to silence' (N&Sh 6:5); ואיתיתי עליכון מחבלא לחבלא יתהון 'I have brought against you (?) a destroyer to destroy them' (AIT 9:7-8);[1186] לבטלא 'to annul' (AIT 6:13; 7:13; Go B:8);[1187] ולנטרא ולשיזבא ית בידמיא בר מרתא וית דודי בת קיימתא איתתיה 'both to preserve and save B. son of M. and D. daughter of Q. his wife' (MB II:5).[1188]

af. (**'aqṭālā*): לאזחא 'for removing' (N&Sh 20:3);[1189] ולאפקא ית [] 'and to bring out' (AIT 9:8).[1190]

(b) *qtwly*

pa. (**qaṭṭōlē* or **qaṭṭawlē*): לשתוקי ולסכורי 'to silence and to shut' (N&Sh 6:1); לבטולי 'to annul' (F 4:1).

itpe. (?): לאיתפוכי 'that may be turned away.'[1191]

[1183] See Morag 1988: 262-263.

[1184] See Epstein 1921: 35.

[1185] Rossell assumes that this 'vocalization occurs in a ratio of 4 to 1 over' *qtl'/'qtl'*, but he overstates the case. See Rossell 1953: 51.

[1186] Instead of יתהון and עליכון, one could also read יתחין and עליכין, respectively.

[1187] In a photograph of the text, לבטלא in AIT 6:13 is uncertain, since the text is very erased in that section. I have no photograph of Go B at my disposal. In a facsimile, the reading of Gordon seems secure.

[1188] לנטרא represents the pattern *qaṭṭālā* (/lənaṭṭārā/); ולשיזבא is of course a lexicalized exception, but it shows, nevertheless, the same basic pattern *-ā-ā-*.

[1189] *af.* inf. from the root זוח 'to remove.'

[1190] From the root נפק.

(c) *qyṭwly*

pa. (**qiṭṭōlē?*): לשימועיכין לחירודיכין 'to advise you and to terrify you' (AIT 8:7); לביסומיה 'for sweetening it' (N&Sh 24:1).

(d) *qṭwl'/h*

af (**'aqṭōlā*): לאפוקא 'to drive out' (N&Sh 20:3).

(e) *mqṭlw?*

pa. ?: למנטרנותיה (N&Sh 24)

DISCUSSION

To place the discussion of these forms in context, we may enumerate the types of infinitives of the derived stems which appear in other (relevant) Aramaic dialects.

The forms attested in JA

(a) *qaṭṭālā*[1192]

The infinitive with final -*ā*, is the classical form in Aramaic, being regular in Official Aramaic and Biblical Aramaic.[1193] Later on, *qaṭṭālā* is standard in TO and TJ,[1194] as well as in Qumran Aramaic.[1195] It appears sporadically in many later dialects of Aramaic.[1196]

(b) *qaṭṭō/ūlē*

The characteristic form in the vocalization of the Codex Paris 1402 of *Halakhot Gedolot* is *qaṭṭōlē*.[1197] It also occurs in TO and TJ alongside the regular *qaṭṭālā*, testifying to the transmission of these texts in Mesopotamia.[1198]

(c) *qaṭṭawlē*

The form with a diphthong in all the derived stems is attested in the oral tradition for reading BT preserved by the Yemenite Jews and in the vocalized text of *Halakhot Pesuqot*.[1199] In the latter, -/aw/- and -/åw/- interchange. In the Geniza manuscripts,

---

[1191] The form is found in a bowl (no. 9736, line 4) from the Iraq Museum published by Gordon (1941: 349-350). I cannot check the reading.

[1192] The corresponding form of *af.* would be *'aqṭālā*.

[1193] See Segert 1975: 261; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 108-110. For Old Aramaic, see Muraoka 1984: 99-101; Degen 1969: 68ff.

[1194] Morag 1983: 343; Dalman 1905: 278ff; Cook 1986: 193.

[1195] Segert 1975: 261; Tal 1983: 210-211. This form predominates in PsJ as well. See Cook 1986: 194.

[1196] The proportion of occurrences of this form differs from dialect to dialect. For the situation in some dialects, see e.g. Tal 1983: 211-212; Dalman 1905: 278ff.; Morag 1988: 152, 161.

[1197] Morag 1983: 343. The form with -*ū*- is also employed.

[1198] Ibid.; Dalman 1905: 279. The form occurs sporadically in PTA, too. See Dalman 1905: 75.

the forms with the diphthong are found alongside the forms containing /ū/ or /ō/ before the final syllable.[1200]

(d) qaṭṭālē

According to Morag, this form is found for the root חור in *Halakhot Pesuqot* and in *Sefer ha-Mitswot*, e.g. לחואַרי.[1201]

(e) mqaṭṭālā

The form typical of GA, including the Palestinian Targums, is *mqaṭṭālā*.[1202] The same form is attested in Samaritan Aramaic as well.[1203]

The forms attested in non-Jewish East Aramaic

(a) qaṭṭūlē; mqaṭṭūlē

Basically the same form as in BTA, *qaṭṭūlē*, is standard in Mandaic, too.[1204] Additionally, a form with the prefixed *m* is found, i.e. *mqaṭṭūlē*, but this is less common.[1205] Mandaic magic bowls attest to *qaṭṭūlē* as well; and an analogous form is also evident in Palmyrene.[1206] Moreover, *qaṭṭūlē* appears in *Halakhot Gedolot* alongside the preferred *qaṭṭōlē* and in a Geniza fragment.[1207] Modern East Aramaic dialects exhibit patterns parallel to the BTA and Mandaic *qaṭṭō/ūlē*.[1208]

(b) mqaṭṭālū

The characteristic form in Syriac is *mqaṭṭālū*.[1209] A similar form probably occurs in Palmyrene as well, alongside *qaṭṭō/ūlē*.[1210]

Based on this comparison it is evident that most of the forms found in the bowl texts agree either with *qaṭṭō/ūlē* or with *qaṭṭālā*. The form with the diphthong is also possible, but in the unpointed texts we scarcely have any possibility of deciding whether the form was *qaṭṭō/ūlē* or *qaṭṭawlē*.

[1199] Morag 1983: 342. The form is also represented in a 16th-century Yemenite manuscript (ibid., n. 19). See also Morag 1988: 152, 161.

[1200] Morag 1983: 343.

[1201] Morag 1983: 344.

[1202] Tal 1983: 211-214.

[1203] Tal 1983: 214.

[1204] Nöldeke 1875: 142-143; Macuch 1965: 284; Morag 1983: 344.

[1205] Nöldeke 1875: 142-144, 233-234; Macuch 1965: 284.

[1206] See Yamauchi 1967: 116, 121; Cantineau 1935: 89. Palmyrene Aramaic was influenced by East Aramaic.

[1207] Morag 1983: 344.

[1208] Morag 1983: 345 and references given there.

[1209] Nöldeke 1898: 104.

[1210] Morag, 1983: 345, n. 30.

However, it is evident that in the bowl texts, both the infinite of the basic stem and the infinitive of the derived stems mostly follow the traditions familiar from TO (*pe.* infinitive; *qaṭṭālā*) and from BTA (*qaṭṭō/ūlē* or *qaṭṭawlē*). No convincing explanation can be given for the mixture of forms in these texts: it is hard to say why *qaṭṭō/ūlē* (or *qaṭṭawlē*) and *qaṭṭālā* occur even in the same text. Díez-Macho has argued that the appearance of the archaic *qaṭṭālā* alongside the regular *mqaṭṭālā* in Targum Neophyti testifies to the influence of Imperial or literary Aramaic.[1211] We may assume that this is the case in the bowl texts as well.

Takamitsu Muraoka has shown that different types of infinitives in 'Targumic Aramaic' tend to appear in a morpho-syntactic complementary distribution.[1212] However, it seems that no clear-cut distribution can be observed in our corpus, at least not between the main forms, *qaṭṭālā* and *qaṭṭōlē*. Both forms appear in similar positions.

The form *qtwly* (*'qtwly*) appears rather frequently – without the prefixed /*l*-/ – as an absolute infinitive as well: אסורי אסירין וחתומי חתימין וקטורי קיטרין ולחושי לחן ישין] 'thoroughly bound, sealed, tied, and charmed' (N&Sh 14:1);[1213] אומאי מומינא לך ואשבועי משבענא עלך 'I do invoke you and I do adjure you' (AIT 3:3).[1214] Other infinitive patterns may also be used in this function: אסכולא לא תסכלון ביה 'you shall not injure him' (Go 11:12-13); In AIT 2:4, one may read דאם מידעם התחסתו חטיתון ביה 'that if you at all sin against him.'[1215] התחסתו is probably a corruption of the *hitpe.* (?) absolute infinitive from the root חטא/י.

In the derived stems, the bowl texts do not observe any formal distinction between the forms used as absolute infinitives and other infinitives.

When an infinite is followed by an objective suffix pronoun, this suffix may be attached either directly to the infinitive or to the object marker ית, as exemplified by the following instances לשימועיכין 'to advise you' (AIT 8:7); לחבלא יתהון 'to destroy them'(AIT 9:8). According to Muraoka, this kind of analytical and synthetic construction interchanges in TO as well.[1216] Note that *nun* is not inserted between an infinite and an objective pronoun.

[1211] Díez-Macho 1973: 186ff.

[1212] See Muraoka 1983: 76ff.

[1213] A duplicate is attested in AIT 5:1 where the text – according to the emendation by Epstein – runs as follows: אס]ורי אסירין חתומי חתימין וקטורי קיטרין לחושי לחושי לחוש. See Epstein 1921: 33. Perhaps we should read לחושי]' in place of לחוש. See above IV.10.1. *Perfect*.

[1214] Read according to the emendation by Epstein. See Epstein 1921: 32. Montgomery reads here אומו אומו מתאלך ואשבועי משבענא עלך, but on the basis of a photograph of the text, Epstein's reading is doubtless the correct one.

[1215] Montgomery reads התחסתו.

[1216] Muraoka 1983: 77.

As already noted, in addition to *qtl'* and *qtwly*, we have other forms in our corpus. As regards these forms, the following notes can be made: לחירודיכין and לשימועיכין in AIT 8:7 are peculiar.[1217] The *yod* in the first syllable gives a Palestinian impression. Montgomery assumes that these forms are 'pael infinitives with first syllable in *i*.'[1218] However, the expected vocalism of the *pa.* infinitive is *a-ō* and not *i-ō* (see above). Another possible occurrence of the same pattern is attested in N&Sh 24:1, where we have לביסומיה ולמנטרנותיה דחמריה 'for the sweetening and keeping of his wine.'[1219] Naveh and Shaked argue that ביסום is 'a term used frequently with wine.'[1220]

Importantly, parallels to our forms are found in Samaritan Aramaic, where the *pa.* form used with suffixed pronouns is *qiṭṭūl* as opposed to the regular (*pa.*) infinitive pattern *mqaṭṭālā*, e.g. בסיובכון, לבטולכון.[1221] Abraham Tal argues that *qiṭṭūl* is a nominal pattern which is unconnected with the verbal infinitive pattern.[1222] As is well known, many Aramaic dialects maintain a distinction between the infinitive form used with pronominal suffixes and the 'normal' infinitive form.[1223] Another possibility is that *mem, reš,* and *bet* have caused a labialization of the original vowel. In that case, we should read לשומעיכין, לחורודיכין, and לבוסומיה, respectively (**l-ḥurrō/ūḏē-; *l-šummō/ū'ē-; *l-bussō/ūmē-*).[1224] In the case of *reš*, at least, this possibility is rather problematic.

We encounter only a few, somewhat uncertain examples of the form *qtwl'/h*. לאפוקא 'to drive out' probably appears in N&Sh 20:3.[1225] The reading is uncertain since the text is rather erased and, moreover, *waw* seems to have been added above the line. The same pattern probably appears as an absolute infinitive in Go 11, where the text – as read by Gordon – runs אסכולא לא תסכלון ביה 'you shall not injure him' (Go 11:12-13).[1226] לאהפוכה has been attested in a bowl (no. 9736, line 9) from the Iraq Museum published by Gordon,[1227] but I cannot

---

[1217] Based on a photograph of the text, it seems that Montgomery's reading is correct, but owing to the poor condition of the text, one cannot be totally sure. Once again, כין- may also be read as כון-.

[1218] Montgomery 1913: 159.

[1219] Cf. Jastrow 1903: 179, where בָּסִּים 'to sweeten etc.' is given. למנטרנותיה is discussed immediately below.

[1220] Naveh & Shaked 1993: 135.

[1221] Tal 1983: 214-215.

[1222] Tal 1983: 215; *qiṭṭūl* is also well attested in Mishnaic Hebrew as the *pi.* verbal substantive. See e.g. Kutscher 1984: 128.

[1223] For discussion, see Tal 1983: 206ff.

[1224] Cf. the BTA and TO פום 'mouth' as opposed to the Western פים. See Kutscher 1976: 20ff.

[1225] אפוקא (**'appōqā*) is apparently an *af.* infinitive from the root נפק.

[1226] A photograph of Go 11 is not at my disposal, but in a facsimile, the reading seems secure.

check the reading. If the readings are correct, אפוקא etc. apparently display the pattern *qaṭṭōlā* (*'aqṭōlā* etc.) or *qaṭṭawlā* (*'aqṭawlā*). The latter possibility, indeed, may be supported by the fact that the Yemenite reading tradition of BTA gives one example of the type *qaṭṭawlā*.[1228]

As already cited above in N&Sh 24:1, the text runs לביסומיה ולמנטרנותיה דחמריה 'for the sweetening and keeping of his wine.' In addition to לביסומיה, מנטרנותיה is problematic, too. It could perhaps be a *pa.* infinitive with a pronominal suffix of the 3rd p. masculine.[1229] The *nun* inserted between the verb and the suffix is, if the above assumption is correct, an energic *nun* (see below IV.10.7. *Verbs with Object Suffixes*), though, importantly, one would rather expect the spelling מנטרותניה. Given that the assumption is correct, our form could represent either the pattern *mqaṭṭalū* or the pattern *mqaṭṭālā*. The *status pronominalis/constructus* of an infinitive ending in -*ā* is of the type -*ūt*- in Biblical Aramaic, TO, and in Qumran Aramaic.[1230] Note, for instance, להודעותני 'to let me know' in Biblical Aramaic.[1231] It must be stressed, however, that the infinitive of the derived stems in those traditions is without prefixed -מ, and, on the other hand, the infinitives of the type *mqaṭṭālā* (with prefixed -מ), familiar from West Aramaic, show -*ūt*- in the construct state only in infinitives with a nominal force and not with infinitives used as verbs.[1232] Therefore, *mqaṭṭalū* would be more likely here. The problem lies in the fact that *mqaṭṭalū* is unattested in BJA. In Mandaic, we have one rather good parallel, even though, I emphasize, without the energic *nun* and the -ת- of the construct state: *minaṭurih* 'guarding him.'[1233] In the light of the evident problems (discussed above) that are involved if we take מנטרנותיה as an exceptional infinitive form, it is apparent that מנטרנותיה in N&Sh 24 is a nominal pattern with no relation to the infinitive. We may compare מנטרנותיה with the Syriac *mṭrnwt'* 'storing up' and *mnṭrnwt'* 'care, guardianship' from the very same root.

אסכלי in AIT 4:5 could accord with *qaṭṭālē* attested rarely in the Yemenite reading tradition (see above), but it is more plausibly a *defective* spelling of the common *qaṭṭōlē*.[1234]

[1227] See Gordon 1941: 349-350. Gordon translates 'to upset.' The form is an *af.* infinitive from the root הפך.

[1228] See Morag 1988: 152.

[1229] Cf. Jastrow 1903: 901. It seems that Naveh and Shaked have understood it as a verbal form, since in the glossary of Naveh & Shaked 1993 it is listed under the root נטר, in contrast with נטרתא 'protection, preservation.' See Naveh & Shaked 1993: 270.

[1230] See Cook 1986: 28.

[1231] See Rosenthal 1974: 54.

[1232] See Cook 1986: 28.

[1233] See Macuch 1965: 377.

[1234] אסכלי נסכלון בהון 'they shall not do folly against them.' The reading is that of Epstein (1921: 33). אסכלי is an *af.* infinitive from the root סכל.

In AIT 7:17 Montgomery reads לשיציה 'to destroy, to finish' and argues that this form is 'Targumic but not Talmudic.'[1235] This judgment is as such correct, but – based on a photograph of the text – the correct reading is probably לשיצאה. As set out above, the infinitive form ending in *-ā* is common in TO, as opposed to BTA, where the regular ending is *-ē*.[1236] Note also ולשיזבא 'to save' in MB II:5, with the same pattern.

IV.10.6. Indication of the Direct Object

The bowl texts – as do many other Aramaic dialects – employ three means of indicating the direct object of the verb. In addition to the object suffixes attached to verbs, discussed below in the next chapter, the object is often expressed by the particle ית,[1237] and the preposition -ל is also used to denote the direct object. Though these texts prefer the indicator ית, the direct object may even be expressed by all three means in the very same text, i.e. by the object suffix, by -ל, and by the particle ית.[1238] Both -ל and ית may appear with a nominal object and with suffixes (see the examples below). As expected, suffixed object pronouns are unattested with participles.[1239] Further, a nominal object may follow the verb without any introductory particle, e.g. לאזחא ולאפ(ו)קא כל שידא 'to remove and drive out every demon' (N&Sh 20:3); כל מזיקי כלהון דברא אלהה דישראל 'all harmful spirits that the God of Israel created' (N&Sh 25:6).

SOME EXAMPLES FOLLOW:[1240]

ולא תשלילוהי/ו ...ולא תיכבשון יתיה 'nor chain him... nor subdue him' (N&Sh 25:8-9); דלא תיעזקון ליה למחוי בר אימא 'that you should bind (him) M. son of 'I.' (N&Sh 25:6-7); וכלהון קטל יתהון 'and he killed them all' (N&Sh 12a:1); וקטליה ליברה וחנק ועבדת לחרשין 'she performed sorceries' (N&Sh 12a:3); ואדריכו יותיה 'and he killed (him) her son and strangled him' (N&Sh 12a:5); יותיה 'and they found him' (N&Sh 12a:6); למיקטל יותיה ולמיחנק יותיה 'to kill him and to strangle him' (N&Sh 12a:7); תבר שינה 'he broke her teeth' (N&Sh 13:8); מחונה 'they smote her' (N&Sh 13:8); נקש לכו בליביכו 'they struck against your hearts' (N&Sh 13:14); חף כלהו לאילהי דחרשי 'they all covered

---

[1235] See Montgomery 1913: 153.

[1236] Note also the *pa.* (?) infinitive לשגיה 'to thwart' in AB B:2.

[1237] See also IV.9. *Notes on Prepositions, Conjunctions, and Adverbs.*

[1238] See the examples below, especially those from N&Sh 12a.

[1239] The only possible exception is the obscure form משדרינהון 'those who send' in N&Sh 23:9 and elsewhere (see below IV.10.7).

[1240] Further instances of suffixes attached to verbs (object suffixes) are listed below in IV.10.7.

the gods of sorceres' (N&Sh 13:15); תברו לשיפורדו 'they broke their trumpets'
(N&Sh 13:16); הרפתקא דדמא קטלא ית כולא 'a bloody destiny is killing all'
(N&Sh 13:22); ותרכית יתיכי אנתי ליליתא 'and I have dismissed you Lilith'
(AIT 17:3); ולנטרא ולשיזבא ית בידמיא בר מרתא 'both to preserve and save
B., son of M.' (MB II:5); דלא תיקטול ית אחת בת פרכי... ולא תיקטול ית
בניהון 'that you should not kill this 'A., daughter of P... and kill their sons' (AIT
3:4-5); מיטול דאסרנא לכון 'and when he hears it' (AIT 3:8-9); וכד שמע יתיה
'because I have charmed you' (AIT 4:3); ומבטילנא ית כל רזי חרשין 'and
annul all mysteries of sorcerers' (N&Sh 19:6); מבטילנא יתהון 'I annul them'
(N&Sh 19:7); ולא תנזקון יתהון 'and you shall not cause them harm' (N&Sh
19:8); דתינטרון ית בריך מריה בר ?... וית כל איסקופת ביתיהון 'that you
guard B. M. son of ?... and all the threshold of their house' (Go 7:7-8);
שמעית קלה דיתתא 'I heard the voice (her voice) of a lady' (N&Sh 2:9);
וחבילו יתה 'and injured her' (N&Sh 2:9); אסרתינון לראזי 'I bind (them) the
rocks' (N&Sh 5:2); דחנקא לבני אינשה 'that used to strangle human beings'
(N&Sh 5:6);[1241] כתבו שמה 'they wrote her name' (N&Sh 5:6); דלא ברינא
לכון ואנה רחימנא יתכון 'whom I have not created and whom I love' (N&Sh
6:3); משבענא יתכון 'I adjure you' (N&Sh 6:8-9); דאיניש קיטריה לא שרי
'whose knot no man can untie' (N&Sh 23:11).

The usage of the bowl texts requires following comments:

As already pointed out in IV.9., the frequent use of ית in these texts deviates from
standard BTA inclusive of Nedarim and links the bowl texts with TO/TJ and,[1242]
on the other hand, with Geonic Aramaic. Thus, it may be taken as one of the con-
servative elements typical of the linguistic profile of the bowl texts.[1243] One should
bear in mind that the particle ית as an object marker is infrequent in many Late
Aramaic dialects, especially in the Eastern branch, where it was no longer a living
element of the language.[1244] In BTA, when used, ית mostly became part of the

---

[1241] Compare וחנק יותיה listed above.

[1242] Note that in TO suffixed pronouns attached to verbs occur frequently. According to Bennett
(1985: 148, 151), ית appears only when directly translating the corresponding Hebrew
particle את with suffixes. As a matter of fact, Bennett overstates the case: ית is regularly
used in TO and TJ as a counterpart of the Hebrew את, but it also occurs in non-translation
passages. See Kutscher 1961: 130; Tal 1975: 28ff.

[1243] According to Rossell, the use of ית is 'literary influence from Biblical Aramaic and from
Targumim.' Rossell 1953: 11.

[1244] See Bennett 1985: 149-150; Nöldeke 1875: 390; Kutscher 1961: 129. The particle ית or its
cognates (אית and ות) are typical of Old Aramaic, some Middle Aramaic dialects such as TO
and TJ, and West Aramaic, whereas -ל marking direct object is peculiar to Egyptian Ara-
maic and East Aramaic. Many dialects employ both ית and -ל with varying disributions. In
West Aramaic, for instance, is ית used with pronominal suffixes, whereas -ל commonly
occurs with nouns. For details, see Kutscher 1961: 129-133; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 262,

verb, e.g. חַזְתַהּ (חֲזָא יתֵהּ >).[1245] By contrast, the use of יתֵ was common in some
Middle Aramaic dialects,[1246] and within Late Aramaic, it is frequent in the
Palestinian Targums and Midrashic texts.[1247]

Second, it is of importance that, once again, a conservative element (יתֵ) and
one typical of standard BTA (-לְ) are used side by side, even in the same text.
Martínez Borobio argues that the simultaneous use of both particles as means of
indicating the direct object is rarely met with in Aramaic.[1248] The simultaneous use
of both particles has been attested, for instance, in the Aramaic used in midrashic
sections of Palestinian Targums.[1249] With regard to these midrashic texts, Martínez
Borobio has suggested that they were first written 'according to the Aramaic of Bar
Kokhbas's letters,' resulting in the use of יתֵ.[1250] Later on, the particle -לְ was
introduced by scribes familiar with Talmudic literature, a fact which resulted in the
mixed usage typical of those texts.[1251] All in all, a mixed use of these elements is
typical of Aramaic documents with different redactional stages. Yet, in the case of
our texts, we cannot hypothesize such a development. Instead, it is more plausible
that the use of -לְ and that of the object suffixes reflect features of the vernacular,
while the use of יתֵ implies an attempt to employ '*Hochsprache*.'[1252] Some texts –
as opposed to the majority – prefer -לְ as an object indicator; these include N&Sh
13, a text with several features in common with standard BTA (see the instances
cited above).

IV.10.7. Verbs with Object Suffixes

Pronominal suffixes attached to verbs (object suffixes) are frustratingly rarely
attested in the bowl texts. This is partly due to the fact that an object is often
indicated with the aid of the particle יתֵ attached to a pronominal suffix (possessive
suffix), e.g. וַחֲבִילוּ יתֵהּ 'they injured her' (N&Sh 2:9) or with the aid of the

---

n. 1050; Tal 1975: 28-30; Folmer 1995: 340ff., especially 369-371 and the literature given
there.

[1245] Nöldeke 1875: 390.

[1246] By contrast, other Middle Aramaic dialects such as the Aramaic of Hatra do not use יתֵ. See
Folmer 1995: 369 and the cross-references given there.

[1247] Bennett 1985: 148ff.

[1248] Martínez Borobio 1987: 160. Martínez Borobio apparently means that these particles seldom
occur in similar contexts and functions, without any obvious distribution.

[1249] Ibid.

[1250] Martínez Borobio 1987: 162.

[1251] Ibid.

[1252] Importantly, the particle appears in Biblical Aramaic as one means of indicating the direct
object. Bennett 1985: 149.

preposition -ל likewise attached to a pronominal suffix (see above IV.10.6. *Indication of the Direct Object*).

The following suffixed pronouns attached to verbs (object suffixes) are attested in the bowl texts. The -*n*- element, discussed below, is part of the suffix whenever it appears. This is due to the fact that its nature is uncertain in each form (see below).

1st p. sg.	----
2nd p. masc. sg.	----
2nd p. fem. sg.	-כי; -יכי
3rd p. masc. sg.	-היו; -ניה; ה-; -יה
3rd p. fem. sg.	ה-; -נה
1st p. pl.	----
2nd p. masc. pl.	-נכו; -ינכו
2nd p. fem. pl.	-כין[1253]
3rd p. masc. pl.	-יניהון[1254]; -נהו; -ינהו; -ינון
3rd p. fem. pl.	-נין[1255]

The most reliable instances in the material are given below. In addition to these instances, the bowl texts attest several uncertain examples. For instance, in AIT 13:12 Montgomery reads אעיקיהי 'press it,' but, as noted by Epstein, this reading is uncertain.[1256]

(a) perfect

2nd p. fem. sg. איתכי אובלתיכי שלחתיכי ושדרתיכי ושגרתיכי 'I have brought you, I have led you and I have sent you and I have dispatched you and I have conveyed you' (N&Sh 7:5-6).[1257]

3rd p. masc. sg. וקטליה 'he killed him' (N&Sh 12a:5; 12b:8; B1/2:5);[1258] בההוא חתמא דחתמה אדם קדמאה 'with that seal with which the First Adam sealed' (AIT 10:3); נסבתיה ח[ד]ה] 'one took him' (AIT 28:3).[1259] וכבשה לגולית 'and he has subdued (him) Goliath' (N&Sh 21:10).

[1253] -כין appears only with infinitives.

[1254] Occurs only with a participle.

[1255] The occurrence of this suffix is uncertain.

[1256] See Epstein 1921: 46.

[1257] איתכי stands for איתיתיכי; the object suffix possibly refers to 'fire.' See Naveh & Shaked 1985: 171.

[1258] All these texts are parallels.

[1259] Read according to the emendation by Epstein. He translates 'une le prit,' implying that נסבתיה is 3rd p. fem. sg. + 3rd p. masc. sg. object suffix. See Epstein 1921: 55-56. Much of the text remains uncertain. It is also possible that נסבתיה is a combination of 3rd p.

3rd p. fem. sg. מחונה 'they smote her' (N&Sh 13:8).

2nd p. masc. pl. כנשונכו 'they gathered you' (N&Sh 13:13); כבשונכו ואחיתונכו 'they suppressed you and brought you down' (N&Sh 13:13); רמנכו 'they cast you' (N&Sh 13:14); דשדרינכו 'that sent you.'[1260]

3rd p. masc. pl. סחפונהו 'they wrecked them' (N&Sh 13:16); שדונהו 'they cast them away' (N&Sh 13:16); דעבדינהו 'who worked them;'[1261] אזלית וכבשתינון וכבשתינון ואסרתינון 'I have gone and pressed them down and pressed them down and tied them' (Go 11:12);[1262] כפתינון לכיפי ארעה ואסרתינון 'I have roped (them) the rocks of the earth, and tied down (them) the mysteries of heaven, I have suppressed them, I have roped (them), I have tied (them), I have suppressed (them) all demons' (N&Sh 5:2-3).

3rd p. fem. pl. ופרסתנין 'and she sprinkled them' (?) (AIT 28:3).[1263]

(b) Imperfect

3rd p. masc. sg. ולא ת(כ)פתוהי/ו ולא תשלילוהי/ו 'and you should not tie him up nor chain him' (N&Sh 25:7-8); ותברא ידבקיה 'and may a fracture catch him' (N&Sh 9:5); אינון נינטרוניה ונישיזבוניה וניפחזווניה וניכלכלוניה 'they will guard and save and encourage and maintain him' (BOR 9-10); ולא ת(כ)פתוהי 'and you should not tie him nor chain him' (N&Sh 25:7-8).

3rd p. fem. sg. מילבושהון ילבשונה ומיכסותהון יכסונה 'from their clothing they will clothe her and from their garments they will garb her' (AIT 13:6).

3rd p. masc. pl. נין[סחו]פינהו 'let us sweep them away' (N&Sh 13:19); נירדופינהו 'let us chase them' (N&Sh 13:19 twice); היא תיפרוסינ/ון 'she shall sprinkle them' (AIT 28:4).

(c) Participles and infinitives

For the sake of completeness I include the following instances of the object suffixes attached to participles and infinitives, even though the instances are very uncertain.

One instance of a participle is attested: משדרינהון 'those who send them' (N&Sh 23:9; AB B:4 and elsewhere).[1264] This example occurs several times in the

---

masc. sg. + ית + possessive suffix. The combination verb + ית is well attested in BTA. See above IV.10.6. *Indication of the Direct Object.*

[1260] The form may possibly be found in a British Museum bowl published by Gordon (No. 91776 line 11). See Gordon 1941: 343. I have no photograph or facsimile of the text at my disposal.

[1261] This form is possibly found in a British Museum bowl published by Gordon (No. 91776). See Gordon 1941: 343. I have no photograph or facsimile of the text at my disposal.

[1262] This reading of Gordon is evident on the basis of a facsimile. Instead of -תינון, one could read -תינין instead.

[1263] As emended by Epstein (1921: 55-56). Montgomery reads דפרסתנון. Unfortunately, since the text is poorly preserved, the reading remains uncertain.

bowl texts. The suffix -יהון is otherwise attested only as a possessive suffix (see above IV.3. *Suffixed Pronouns*). Hence, one may ask whether the suffix here is rather a possessive suffix, though the appearance of the energic *-n-* (?) is obscure and makes this possibility less probable.[1265] As an object suffix, -יניהון, with the *-n-* element, finds parallels in Mandaic and Palestinian Christian Aramaic, and it also closely resembles the BTA -ינהו.[1266] The *yod* before *he* in משדריניהון probably indicates a vocal *shwa*, since -ינהו is pronounced [innəhu] in the Yemenite reading tradition of BTA.[1267]

We have few examples of infinitives with a pronominal suffix: לשימועיכין לחירודיכין 'to advise you and to terrify you' (AIT 8:7); לביסומיה 'for sweetening it' (N&Sh 24:1). As noted above in IV.10.5, these forms probably represent nominal patterns unconnected with the infinitive proper. In addition to these examples, some other uncertain examples are found.

DISCUSSION

(a) The energic *nun*[1268]

Though the *-n-* element, which occurs before object suffixes, may historically be connected with *modus energeticus*, it is most unlikely that it has any real 'energic' aspects.[1269] Nevertheless, this *-n-* element is called energic here, as is customary in Aramaic studies.

Already in Old Aramaic (Ancient Aramaic) and more frequently in Official Aramaic, including Biblical Aramaic, an energic *-n-* (or *-nn-*) is inserted between an imperfect form and a suffixed pronoun (object suffix); the first instances are found in the inscriptions from *Sfire*.[1270]

[1264] A *pa.* participle from the root שדר.

[1265] The object suffix is exceptional with participles. Cf. Schlesinger 1928: 101; Muraoka 1997b: 77.

[1266] The suffixes are discussed below.

[1267] See Morag 1988: 291ff. The quality of *shwa* is unnoted here: it is marked by [ə], even though the standard counterpart of *shwa* in the Yemenite reading tradition is an ultra-short [a]. See above III.4. Yod *and* waw *as a Counterpart of* shwa.

[1268] For the energic *-n-* in Aramaic, in general, see Beyer 1984: 473, 476-479; Muraoka 1997a: 210-213 and the literature reviewed there.

[1269] See Moscati 1964: 136; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 106-107, 200-201; Degen 1969: 80.

[1270] See Segert 1975: 310-311; Degen 1969: 80; Bauer & Leander 1927: 122-124; Rosenthal 1974: 54-55. In Old Aramaic, the energic *-n-* only occurs with the 3rd p. masc. sg. suffix, whereas in Biblical Aramaic 'the use of the energic morpheme is universal.' Muraoka & Porten 1998: 147. Some instances of 'free-standing energics' also occur in Official Aramaic. Both the energic *-n-*, which occurs with object suffixes, and the 'free-standing energic' apparently have a common origin. See Muraoka & Porten 1998: 106-107, 200-201.

In TO/TJ, as in Official Aramaic, the energic -*n*- appears with imperfect forms,[1271] but not with the perfect.[1272] Hence, the tradition of these texts (i.e. TO/TJ) follows the model of Official Aramaic, in particular that of Biblical Aramaic: the energic -*n*- is used, as already noted, only in the imperfect and with all suffixes save the 3rd p. pl., 'which is not a true suffix form.'[1273] The same applies to Qumran Aramaic.[1274] Some instances are present in Palmyrene and Nabatean, too.[1275] By contrast, the inscriptions from Hatra yield no instances with the energic -*n*-.[1276]

During the Late Aramaic period, different dialects display varying patterns. On the one hand, the energic -*n*- becomes common in many dialects with the perfect as well: in PTA and Samaritan Aramaic, -*n*- is inserted between the verb and its object suffix irrespective of which tense is used; note, for instance, the perfect form עירתניה; the imperative form אחתניה, and the infinitive מזקופיניה.[1277]

Somewhat different kinds of innovations are peculiar to East Aramaic. Bennett goes so far as to argue that the loss of energic -*n*- before suffixes 'is a general Eastern Aramaic phenomenon,'[1278] though it occasionally appears at least in BTA. He is of the opinion that the energic -*n*- is used in East Aramaic with both the perfect and imperfect, but that it has lost its 'energic function,' being used as a simple binding element.[1279] In addition, 'the energic form was dropped altogether in Late Eastern Aramaic.'[1280] I am not convinced that either other dialects of Late Aramaic or even Middle Aramaic show any convincing evidence of the 'energic function.' As regards the occurrence of the energic -*n*-, it appears that various East Aramaic dialects show different kinds of developmental trends in this respect, as is the case in the West, too. It is hard to show clear differences as regards Early Eastern Aramaic *versus* Late Eastern Aramaic, whatever the terms may indicate. Perhaps Bennett refers to the fact that in Syriac, the energic -*n*- was still employed with the imperfect in the Old Syriac inscriptions, but that later texts typically lack evidence of this element.[1281] Note, however, that – as Bennett himself points out –

[1271] Note that cases without -*n*- are also found. See Bennett 1985: 198.

[1272] Bennett 1985: 193-194; Dalman 1905: 360-361, 368-369.

[1273] See Bennett 1985: 198.

[1274] Tal 1986: 446; Beyer 1984: 474ff. Beyer gives instances from Official Aramaic, too.

[1275] Bennett 1985: 144.

[1276] Bennett 1985: 316.

[1277] Tal 1986: 446-447. Note that some other Palestinian Aramaic dialects favour analytical constructions with the particle ית + possessive suffixes in place of suffixed pronouns (object pronouns) attached to verbs (see above IV.10.6. *Indication of the Direct Object*).

[1278] Bennett 1985: 307, 316.

[1279] Bennett 1985: 321.

[1280] Ibid.

[1281] Bennett 1985: 299, 316. Some instances are also present in early Syriac manuscripts. For the Syriac forms, see also Nöldeke 1898: 128ff.

the inscriptions from Hatra, a Middle Aramaic dialect with apparent East Aramaic influence (= representative of Early Eastern Aramaic?),[1282] have no instances of the energic -*n*- (see above). Nevertheless, it is apparent that in the East this element was used less than in the West.

In Mandaic, sg. suffixes are added to verbs directly.[1283] In the plural, -*n*- is inserted between the verb and the suffixed pronoun, both in the perfect and imperfect (-*in*- after a consonant and -*n*- after a vocal).[1284] It is probable that the 3rd p. pl. in Mandaic is also basically an enclitic pronoun instead of being a real suffix. In his grammar of Mandaic, Nöldeke points out features of the Mandaic pl. forms which are on the one hand shared with the Syriac 3rd. p. pl. forms and which, on the other hand, deviate from the sg. suffixes in Mandaic. He states:

> Aber die Pluralsuffixe verbinden sich nun auch im Mand. sämmtlich weniger eng mit dem Verbum und bewirken nicht solche Veränderungen wie die kurzen Suffixe des Singulars.[1285]

Hence, one may argue that in fact the original energic -*n*- element is unattested in Mandaic, the -*n*- of the pl. forms being historically connected with the personal pronouns of the 3rd p. plural, such as '*innūn* and *hinun* in Mandaic.[1286] In other words, the -*n*- element, unconnected with the energic -*n*-, would have expanded by analogy from the 3rd p. pl. form (-*inun*) to the 2nd p. plural (-*inkun*) and 1st p. pl. (-*inan*).[1287]

However, the question is complicated by the fact that in the 3rd p. pl., Mandaic has -*inhun* alongside -*inun*:[1288] the suffix -*inhun* could, in principle, be interpreted a 'real' suffix of the 3rd p. pl. with the -*n*- element.[1289] The same is true of -*inkun*, which may be compared with forms such as יִשְׁאֲלֻנְכוּן in Biblical Aramaic.[1290] The other possibility is that -*inhun* is, as Bennett suggests, related to '*innūn* and its cognates.[1291]

[1282] See e.g. Kutscher 1971a: c. 269.

[1283] See Nöldeke 1875: 269; Macuch 1965: 356.

[1284] Ibid.

[1285] The word 'auch' refers to Syriac.

[1286] If I have understood correctly, this theory would be in line with the views put forward by Bennett (1985: 135-136). For the development of the Mandaic pronoun *hinun* and its cognates, such as '*innūn* and '*inhū* of BTA, see Nöldeke 1875: 86, n. 3 and Brockelmann 1908: 306.

[1287] See Bennett 1985: 194. For the pl. suffixes in Mandaic, see Nöldeke 1875: 279ff.

[1288] See ibid.

[1289] The suffixed pronoun of the 3rd p. masc. pl. attached to nouns (possessive suffix) in Mandaic is -*hun*/-*un*. See Macuch 1965: 159.

[1290] See Segert 1975: 310-311.

[1291] See Bennett 1985: 135-136.

Nöldeke noted that in BTA, as in Mandaic, the *-n-* element is inserted only between the verb and the pl. suffixes.[1292] This fact is reflected in the Yemenite reading tradition of BTA, though some exceptions are found with the imperfect, where we find some instances of the *-n-* with sg. suffixes, too: *-inneh* alongside *-eh*; *-innah* alongside *-ah*; *-innak* alongside *-ak*, and, occasionally, with the perfect, too, e.g. ['afsədinnak].[1293] The exceptional suffixes with the imperfect accord with TO. The forms of the 3rd p. masc. pl. and 2nd p. masc. pl. are *-(i)nnəhu/-(i)nnun* and *-(i)nnəku*, respectively, and in the 1st p. pl., one finds *-(in)nan* alongside *-an*.[1294]

As discussed above regarding Mandaic, it is possible that the *-n-* element of the pl. suffixes is unconnected with the energic *-n-* of Official and Middle Aramaic.[1295] Note, however, that BTA shows, albeit seldom, instances of the *-n-* with sg. suffixes too, as exemplified above. This probably indicates that these forms with *-n-* are present as minority forms in Babylonian Jewish literature due to the influence of Targumic and Biblical Aramaic literature. As is well known, Talmudic texts, especially the Nedarim type of tractate, preserve plenty of Targumic forms.

For my part, I am inclined to believe that the suffix *-(in)nūn* is related, as suggested, to the personal pronoun *'innūn*. Moreover, it is probable that the 3rd p. forms *-inhun* in Mandaic and *-(i)nnəhū/-(i)nhū* in BTA are related to the independent personal pronouns.[1296] By contrast, it is not apparent whether the *-n-* in the 2nd and 1st. p. pl. forms, such as *-inkun* in Mandaic and *-(i)nnəkū/-(i)nkū* in BTA, is to be explained as an analogical expansion from the 3rd person or whether the *-n-* element is connected with the energic *-n-*. The latter possibility may be supported by the fact that Biblical Aramaic and Official Aramaic yield forms where *-n-* is attested with the 2nd p. pl. suffixes, e.g. ישׁיזבנכון, ירשׁונכם, and אגרנכם.[1297] These forms closely parallel those of the Late Aramaic dialects. On the other hand, the fact that the *-n-* element is rarely attested with sg. suffixes speaks in favour of the possibility that the *-n-* in the pl. cannot be connected with the energic *-n-* either.

[1292] Nöldeke 1875: 269.

[1293] The instances may be found in Morag 1988: 291ff. ['afsədinnak] is an *af.* perfect 3rd p. masc. with the 2nd p. masc. singular suffix. One wonders whether this form is Palestinian.

[1294] See ibid. Some forms with fem. pl. suffixes are also found, e.g. *-innehi* appears for the 3rd p. fem. plural.

[1295] Interestingly, in the Yemenite reading tradition of BTA we find [lišləqinnəhu] alongside [lišloqinnəhu]. In the former, the original *u/o* vowel is reduced and in the latter it is preserved. One of the facts which, according to Bennett (1985: 136), show that the 3rd p. pl. suffix is not a proper suffix is the preserving of the original short vowel before this suffix. The form with the reduced vowel may suggest that originally this suffix behaved differently than *-(i)nnūn*.

[1296] The question is further discussed immediately below when treating the actual forms occurring in the bowl texts. See also Muraoka & Porten 1998: 143, n. 670.

[1297] See Segert 1975: 310-311; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 146.

In any case, the trend typical of Mandaic and BJA is that in these dialects the original energic -*n*- was generally not used in the singular, and Syriac went even farther in this respect. It is also apparent that different analogy processes took place in the Late Aramaic period, a fact which makes it difficult to ascertain the origin of different -*n*- elements.

Our texts show perfect forms with -*n*- (or perhaps -*nn*-) and some without it, as shown below:[1298]

(1) with -*n*-

מחונה
כנשונכו
ואחיתונכו
כבשונכו
רמנכו
שדרינכו
עבדינהו
פרסתנין
אסרתינון
כבשתינון
כפתינון

(2) without -*n*-

שגרתיכי
שדרתיכי
אובלתיכי
איתכי
קטליה
סבתיה
כבשה
חתמה

In the imperfect, we likewise have instances with and without -*n*-:

(1) with -*n*-

ניכלכלוניה
וניפחזוניה
נישיזבוניה
נינטרוניה
ילבשונה
יכסונה

[1298] All the relevant instances are included, whatever the nature of -*n*-. See the discussion below.

נין[סחו]פינהו
נירדופינהו
תיפרוסיני/ון

(2) without -*n*-

ידבקיה
תשלילוהי
ת(כ)פתוהי

In addition, we have an uncertain instance of a participle with the energetic -*n*- and a few examples of infinitives without the -*n*- element. The forms are given above at the beginning of this chapter (IV.10.7).

It should be noted that the origin or nature of this -*n*- element is apparently not identical in all of the instances. As regards the forms of the type כפתינון and תיפרוסיני/ון, with the suffix -*innū/īn*, it is probable – as noted above – that the ending -*innū/īn* is a 3rd p. masc./fem. pl. enclitic personal pronoun annexed to verbs rather than a proper suffix.[1299] Note that in Biblical Aramaic as well as in Syriac, corresponding suffixes are constantly written separate from the verbal base.[1300] Bennett argues that the fact that with these suffixes – unlike other suffixes – the short vowels between the second and third radical remain unreduced (e.g. תכתובנון) indicates the 'secondary nature of these forms.'[1301] Moreover, unlike suffixes of other persons, the suffix of the 3rd p. pl. differs from the corresponding suffix used with nouns.[1302] Thus, it seems that the origin of -*n*- in these forms is different from that of the other suffixes,[1303] and, consequently, it is evident that the forms תיפרוסיני/ון – and כפתינון, כבשתינון, אסרתינון, פרסתנין – all with the suffix -*innū/īn* – yield no instance of the energic -*n*-.

Bennett concludes that the same is true concerning some other suffixed pronouns of the Late Aramaic period, notably -*(i)nhun* in Mandaic and -*(i)nnəhū/-inhū* in BTA.[1304] Note that אינהו appears in BTA as an independent personal pronoun, as is the case with אינון, for instance, in TO (see above IV.1. *Independent*

[1299] See Bennett 1985: 135ff., 195. In his grammar of JA, Dalman states concerning the 3rd p. pl. suffix that it is 'ein nur äusserlich angefügtes selbständiges Personalpronomen' (Dalman 1905: 368). Beyer too states: 'Jedoch wird vom Reichsaram. an (הם noch in Sfire, Assurbrief 17, Hermopolis, Ahiqar) an Stelle der Suffixe plur. 3.m.f. das Personalpronomen gebraucht' (Beyer 1984: 474). See also the discussion above.

[1300] See Rosenthal 1974: 19, 54; Nöldeke 1898: 46.

[1301] Bennett 1985: 136. See also Dalman 1905: 369 and Muraoka & Porten 1998: 143, n. 670.

[1302] In the 1st p. sg., as is well known, the object suffix contains -*n*- as opposed to the possessive suffix.

[1303] Cf. e.g. Brockelmann 1908: 306ff.; Nöldeke 1875: 269.

[1304] See discussion in Bennett 1985: 135ff.

Personal Pronouns). This possibility is further supported by the fact that the imperfect forms such as נירדופינהו in our texts are attested. As is the case with the instances of -(*i*)*nnū/īn*, the vowel between the second and third radical is unreduced.

It is possible as well that the -*n*- in the pl. suffixes of the 1st and 2nd p., such as -(*i*)*nkū*, is spread by analogy from the 3rd p. plural.[1305] Therefore we must bear in mind that it is at least possible that the -*n*- in them is unconnected with the energic -*n*-.

As regards the 3rd p. pl. imperfect forms with the object suffix,[1306] it is uncertain whether -*n*- should be regarded as an energic element or as part of the indicative suffix -*ūn*. One cannot say whether the *nun* under discussion is geminated or not.[1307] The fact that -*n*- appears with sg. suffixes only with the 3rd p. pl. forms favours the possibility that it is part of the indicative suffix (see the instances above).

מחונה is puzzling (see also below). The -*n*- may be understood either as the energic -*n*- or as part of the 3rd p. pl. suffix (cf. אישתכחון 'they were found,' discussed in IV.10.1).

Based on this discussion it is apparent that the bowl texts yield no certain instances of the energic -*n*-; all the relevant instances may be explained in various ways. Yet, it is important to bear in mind that we have to be careful in drawing conclusions, since these suffixes are rare, and what is more important, they come from only a handful of texts. For instance, most of the perfect forms with inserted -*n*- are from N&Sh 13.

Before drawing conclusions, we should take a closer look at the suffixes attested in the bowl texts:

(b) Comments on suffixes

1st p. sg.
Even though Rossell lists נ-,[1308] no instances are known to me in the material of this study.

2nd p. masc. sg.
The 2nd p. masc. sg. suffix, otherwise well attested in Aramaic, is so far unattested in our texts.

[1305] See Bennett 1985: 194 and elsewhere.

[1306] E.g. נישיזבוניה, וניפחזוניה, ניכלכלוניה, and נינטרוניה.

[1307] The same problem is evident in Official Aramaic. Cf. Muraoka & Porten 1998: 151.

[1308] Rossell 1953: 54.

2nd p. fem. sg.

The object suffix of the 2nd p. fem. sg. in the bowl texts is -יכִי/־כִי. This suffix is almost always spelt -כִי in Official Aramaic.[1309] Within Middle Aramaic, instances of the 2nd p. fem. sg. are attested in TO and TJ, which, importantly, have the spelling -יךְ/־ךְ,[1310] a fact which has been taken as indicative of the loss of the final *ī*.[1311]

In East Aramaic, only Syriac has *-ky*, though it appears only in the *ketiv*, the *qere* being *-[ek̲.]*[1312] Among the West Aramaic dialects, PsJ, which mostly follows TO/TJ, has both -יךְ and -כִי.[1313] Otherwise only *-ek* appears.[1314]

The only reliable occurrences of this suffix attached to verbs in the bowl texts are the perfect forms of the 1st p. sg. listed above, e.g. אובלתיכי (see above). Save for one instance, i.e. איתכי, the suffix is always -כִי, which – I believe – may be interpreted in two ways. First, one may propose that the *yod* which connects the verb to the 2nd p. fem. sg. suffix stands for a vocal *shwa*. As discussed earlier in this study, *yod* quite often occurs where one would expect a vocal *shwa* to appear (see above III.4. Yod *and* waw *as a Counterpart of* shwa). On the other hand, this *yod* may reflect the actual pronunciation, the final *yod* being preserved as a historical spelling, as is the case in Syriac, where the *ketiv* is *-ky*, the *qere* *-[ek̲.]*. Given the fact that our texts are so late, the latter possibility is plausible.[1315] Note also that in the 2nd p. fem. sg. suffix attached to nouns and prepositions, both -כִי and -יךְ/־ךְ appear (e.g. ליכי *versus* לךְ), a fact which suggests as well – one may argue – that the form with the final *yod* represents a historical spelling, and -יךְ/־ךְ, on the other hand, stands for the *qere* (see above IV.3. *Suffixed Pronouns*).[1316] This theory is further supported by the fact that in AIT 17:3 and SB 9 we have יתיכי,[1317] where

---

[1309] See Bennett 1985: 191 and Muraoka & Porten 1998: 145-146, where some exceptions are also listed. See also the charts in Segert 1975: 312ff.

[1310] Bennett 1985: 191; Dalman 1905: 360ff. Note, however, that -כִי is attested in TO/TJ as a suffixed pronoun attached to nouns. See above IV.3. *Suffixed Pronouns*.

[1311] See e.g. Bennett 1985: 317.

[1312] See Bennett 1985: 290; Muraoka 1987: 15, 38-39.

[1313] Cook 1986: 135. The general artificial nature of the Aramaic represented by PsJ underlines the apparent fact that -כִי was not a living linguistic feature in the Late Aramaic period. On PsJ, see Cook 1986: 281ff.

[1314] See Bennett 1985: 290.

[1315] Importantly, in Biblical Aramaic, when a suffixed pronoun ends with a vowel, as is the case in the 1st p. sg. and pl., the stress is penultimate (see Rosenthal 1974: 18), a fact which may support the interpretation given here.

[1316] A parallel is found in Official Aramaic – given that it is not a scribal error – where זיליכי is attested (AP 8:15). See Bennett 1985: 292. According to Bennett, this spelling shows a pronunciation *-[ikī]*, but the instance may, in contrast, imply that the final vowel was not pronounced, though in that period this may be less likely.

[1317] The spelling in TO is יתיךְ. See Bennett 1985: 149.

this peculiar *yod*,[1318] in all probability, cannot represent a vocal *shwa*. Note also that in the 3rd p. sg. in Palmyrene, both ־הי and ־יה appear after an originally long vowel, suggesting that ־הי is a historical spelling (see below).

All in all, the occurrence of the suffix with the final *yod* in our texts (and in Syriac) is apparently a mere archaic historical spelling., since ־כי is unattested attached to verbs in Middle Aramaic, notably TO, as well as in other representatives of Late Aramaic, excluding PsJ, our texts, and Syriac.[1319]

3rd p. masc. sg.

In the 3rd p. masc. sg., the bowl texts present a complex picture. On the one hand, we find the spelling ־ה(י) (e.g. ידבקיה, קטליה), which appears following a verb that ends with a consonant and ־הי/ו appearing on a verb that ends with an originally long vowel, e.g. תשלילוהי/ו. On the other hand, our texts attest to the suffix ־ניה, with the possible energic *-n-*, appearing after a vowel, e.g. נינטרוניה. As discussed earlier, it remains uncertain whether the *-n-* is connected with the energic *-n-* or whether it is a part of the indicative ending.

The first alternative with the allomorphs ־ה(י) and ־הי is basically in agreement with Official Aramaic and Middle Aramaic,[1320] including TO, which in general maintain the distinction between a suffix used after a consonant and one after a long vowel.[1321] The general assumption concerning the relation between the two allomorphs ־ה(י) and ־הי may be an over-simplification, since at least in Egyptian Aramaic we find forms which do not fit the supposed conditions.[1322] Moreover, Palmyrene yields a variety of forms after verbs ending with an originally long vowel: *-hy, -yh, -y,* and *-[y]hy*.[1323] Bennett thinks that these Palmyrene forms indicate an ongoing change in the Aramaic pronominal system during the Middle Aramaic period.[1324] He goes on to argue that some of the forms, notably *-hy*, are forms of the older Official Aramaic maintained as historical spellings, while others reflect features of the actual vernacular.[1325] The other Middle Aramaic dialects are more conservative in this respect.

[1318] These examples are listed above in IV.3. *Suffixed Pronouns.*

[1319] See the discussion in Bennett 1985: 290-292.

[1320] Provided that we read ־הי, with the final *yod*; the reading with final *waw*, ־הו, is also possible.

[1321] Official Aramaic has the spellings ־ה *versus* ־הי. In TO, the ending is ־הי with verbs ending with an expected long vowel, otherwise ־הי. See Segert 1975: 307ff.; Bennett 1985: 129-131, 192; Dalman 1905: 360ff.

[1322] For details, see Muraoka 1997a: 208-213.

[1323] Bennett 1985: 313.

[1324] Ibid.

[1325] Bennett 1985: 313-314.

In Late Aramaic, the basic pronominal suffix added to verbs ending in consonants is mostly ־ה/־הי, with differences in the pronunciation between various dialects.[1326] As regards the suffixes used after long vowels, ־הי is preserved only in Syriac (in the *ketiv*), which yields a variety of forms for the 3rd p. sg. masc., the pronunciation of which generally differ from the *ketiv*.[1327] For instance, *-why* is pronounced [ūy].[1328] Other dialects display a variety of individual developments: for instance, BTA, as it is reflected in the Yemenite reading tradition, has both *-h*, *-hu*, and *-(n)neh* after an originally long vowel (spelt ־ה, ־הו, and ־(נ)יה),[1329] while Samaritan has *-wwe*.[1330] In the light of the BTA suffix ־הו, it is possible that we should read תשלילוהו instead of תשלילוהי and ת(כ)פתוהו instead of ת(כ)פתוהי.[1331]

It is probable that the suffix ־הי represents an archaizing historical spelling.[1332] This assumption may be supported by the fact that in the Late Aramaic period this ending is preserved only in the Syriac *ketiv*, as opposed to the pronunciation. Moreover, other dialects do not preserve it in the spelling either. The consonantal *h* of these suffixes was possibly elided in the intervocalic position as early as in the Middle Aramaic period, at least in some dialects, including Palmyrene.[1333] It is possible, as well, that ־הו in BTA, which appears alongside ־ה, represents a similar kind of historical spelling as *-why* in Syriac.[1334]

3rd p. fem. sg.

In our texts, we have ־ה and ־נה. The latter is attested after a vowel, the former after a verb that ends with a consonant. The nature of *-n-* remains uncertain, as pointed out above. Importantly, the ending ־הא, familiar in particular from TO, where it appears after an originally long vowel,[1335] is unattested in the bowl texts. The ending ־ה, apparently indicating *-ah*, is standard throughout Aramaic.[1336]

[1326] See Bennett 1985: 301; Macuch 1965: 356ff.; Morag 1988: 291ff.; Nöldeke 1898: 46, 128ff.; Dalman 1905: 359ff.; Macuch 1982: 224ff. For instance, the form in Samaritan is pronounced [e].

[1327] See Nöldeke 1898: 46, 128ff.; Bennett 1985: 301.

[1328] The 3rd p. sg. suffix in Syriac is discussed in depth by J. Wesselius (1982: 251-254).

[1329] E.g. [šaqluh]; [qaṭluhu]; [liqṭəluhu]; [tiqrəʿunneh]. See Morag 1988: 291ff.

[1330] See Macuch 1982: 226.

[1331] The text in N&Sh 27 is too erased to be certain of the correct reading, at least on the basis of a photograph.

[1332] Cf. יגרוהי 'may they sue him' in Egyptian Aramaic. See Muraoka & Porten 1998: 146.

[1333] See Bennett 1985: 130-131 and the literature given there.

[1334] See Nöldeke 1875: 277, n. 3.

[1335] See Bennett 1985: 192-193. Some other Middle and Official Aramaic texts, such as the Genesis Apocryphon and the Hermopolis papyri, yield instances in which ־הה/א appears after a consonant. Bennett 1985: 314-315.

[1336] See e.g. Bennett 1985: 132; 302-304.

1st p. pl.

This form is so far unattested.

2nd p. masc. pl.

The forms attested in our texts are ‑וכנ after an originally long vowel and ‑וכני after a consonant.[1337] All of the occurrences are with the perfect (see the instances above).

The only appearance of the parallel suffix in Official Aramaic is apparently in Biblical Aramaic, where we have ‑וכנ with an *imperfect* form.[1338] Otherwise Official Aramaic yields ‑(נ)כם.[1339] The 2nd p. pl. suffix is rare in TO, the ending being ‑וכ in the perfect and ‑וכנ, with ‑*n*‑, in imperfect forms.[1340]

The use of the ‑*n*‑ element is common in Late Aramaic, whatever the origin of this element may be (see above). Among the West Aramaic dialects, it is attested in Palestinian Christian Aramaic (‑*nkwn*),[1341] in Samaritan Aramaic and PTA, in which this element is inserted between the verb and the basic suffix irrespective of which tense is used,[1342] and in PsJ, which also has the suffix form with the ‑*n*‑ element, i.e. ‑וכנ, attached to both perfect and imperfect forms.[1343] The Palestinian Targums, including Neophyti and the Palestinian Targum fragments from the Cairo Geniza, only exceptionally affix object suffixes to verbs.[1344]

Among the eastern dialects of the Late Aramaic period, the suffix is ‑(*i*)*nkun* in Mandaic,[1345] ‑(י)וכנ in standard BTA,[1346] and ‑*kōn* in Syriac.[1347] Thus, only Syriac does not employ ‑*n*‑. All of the forms in our texts agree with standard BTA. It should be noted, however, that all of the instances stem only from two bowls, and, consequently, we should not hesitate to claim that the normal language of the bowl texts accords in this respect with standard BTA.

[1337] רמנכו is apparently a scribal error for רמונכו.

[1338] See Segert 1975: 307ff.

[1339] Ibid.; Muraoka & Porten 1998: 146.

[1340] Bennett 1985: 193‑194.

[1341] Bennett 1985: 306. It should be stressed, however, that the pronominal object is rarely attached to verbs in Palestinian Christian Aramaic. See Tal 1986: 444.

[1342] Tal 1986: 446; Macuch 1982: 132‑133, 224ff. In Samaritan Aramaic, ‑וכנו, pronounced [innūkon], appears alongside ‑וכ.

[1343] Bennett 1985: 194; 318.

[1344] See Levy 1974: 75; Fassberg 1983: 173. See also Fassberg 1990: 252.

[1345] Bennett 1985: 306,

[1346] See Morag 1988: 191ff.

[1347] See Nöldeke 1898: 128ff.

2nd p. fem. pl.

The only instances attested are those with infinitives. The suffix is ‑כֵין, which lacks the ‑*n*‑ element. This accords in principle with TO,[1348] though examples of the 2nd p. fem. pl. are apparently unattested in TO.[1349] The expected ending with infinitives in BTA is ‑ינכי, which seems apparent due to the fact that the corresponding form, with frequent occurrence, in the 3rd p. pl. masc. is ‑ינהו.[1350] No examples of the 2nd p. pl. fem. (or even masc.) with the infinitive are known to me in BTA.[1351]

3rd p. masc. pl.

We are faced with a variety of forms: ‑ינון, ‑נהו, and ‑ינהו. The endings ‑ינון and ‑ינהו are attested as attached to perfect forms as well as to imperfect forms; ‑נהו only to the perfect (see the examples cited above). The forms with *yod*, i.e. ‑ינהו and ‑ינון, appear, it seems, after consonants, while ‑נהו occurs after an originally long vowel. A parallel situation is evident regarding the 2nd p. pl. suffixes (see above).

In Official Aramaic, including Biblical Aramaic, we have no certain instances of the 3rd p. masc. pl. suffix, the independent pronoun being normally used instead of a suffixed pronoun as the object of a verb.[1352]

The suffix ‑נון is found in Middle Aramaic, including at least Qumran Aramaic and Palmyrene.[1353] The standard form in TO is likewise ‑נון/ינון; the latter being used after a verb that ends with an expected long vowel.[1354] As pointed out above when discussing the energic ‑*n*‑, it is likely that the ending ‑*(i)nnūn* is a personal pronoun juxtaposed to the verbal form rather than a proper suffix. It is probable that ‑*(i)nnūn* is based on the 3rd p. masc. pl. independent personal pronoun אֶנּוּן, first attested in Biblical Aramaic.[1355]

Forms typical of Middle Aramaic are still common in many Late Aramaic dialects: GA has ‑ינון, Samaritan ‑(נ)ון,[1356] and ‑ינהון is found in Palestinian Christian Aramaic.[1357] The regular form in standard BTA is ‑(י)נהו;[1358] ‑(י)נון also occurs, though rarely.[1359] It is interesting to note that a fair number of the examples

---

[1348] See Dalman 1905: 377-379.

[1349] Cf. מפרקכון with the 2nd p. masculine suffix. See ibid.

[1350] See Morag 1988: 291ff.

[1351] ‑ינכו is well attested with the perfect and imperfect. See ibid.

[1352] See Bennett 1985: 134; Rosental 1974: 54.

[1353] See Bennett 1985: 134, 315.

[1354] Bennett 1985: 195-196, 318; Dalman 1905: 360ff.

[1355] See e.g. Bennett 1985: 315.

[1356] See Bennett 1985: 306; Macuch 1982: 224ff.; Dalman 1905: 359ff. Note, as already pointed out, that some Palestinian Aramaic dialects, such as the Palestinian Targums, do not generally add suffixed pronouns to verbs.

[1357] Bennett 1985: 306.

[1358] See Morag 1988: 291ff.

given by Levias and Morag where the suffix is ‑(')נון occur in the Nedarim type of tractate.[1360] Mandaic employs both -(*i)nun* and -(*i)nhun*,[1361] while Syriac, as already noted, constantly uses an independent personal pronoun instead of the of 3rd p. pl. pronominal suffix.

3rd p. fem. pl.

We have one uncertain instance of the 3rd p. fem. pl., with the ending ‑נין (= -*innīn*).[1362] The ending accords with TO.[1363] In BTA at least ‑נין is attested (see above).

CONCLUSIONS

The forms attested in the bowl texts present a complex picture. The following conclusions should be drawn:

In the perfect, the -*n*- element – whatever its origin – is restricted to pl. suffixes as typical of East Aramaic in general. Yet, one exception occurs: מחונה in N&Sh 13:8.[1364] מחונה is apparently a 3rd p. pl. perfect with the 3rd p. fem. sg. suffix from the *tertiae waw/yod* root מחי. It looks as if it were a Western Aramaic form, [1365] a fact which is rather obscure in a text with several typically standard BTA features. A few parallels, where -*n*- is used with a sg. suffix are found in BTA, e.g. ['afsǝḏinnak] in the Yemenite reading tradition,[1366] but the vast majority of BTA perfect forms do not use -*n*- with sg. suffixes.[1367] It is equally possible that -*n*- should be understood as a part of the verbal suffix (see above). Importantly, the expected ending in TO/TJ would be ‑הא, as noted.[1368]

נסבתיה and חתמה, קטליה, כבשה accord with both TO and BTA. By contrast, forms with the 2nd p. fem. suffixes, i.e. שלחיתיכי etc, yield the suffix ‑כי, familiar from Official Aramaic and Syriac (*ketiv*). The spelling ‑יכי, however, is exceptional, as already noted.

The forms with pl. suffixes of the type שדרינכו, כנשונכו and סחפונהו, accord with standard BTA, as opposed to forms with the suffixes ‑ינון and ‑נ/ו/ן. The

[1359] Morag 1988: 291ff.

[1360] See Levias 1930: 233-238; Morag 1988: 291ff.

[1361] Nöldeke 1875: 281ff.; Bennett 1985: 306; Macuch 1965: 356ff.

[1362] See above.

[1363] See Dalman 1905: 360.

[1364] מחונה may be compared with כבשה in N&Sh 21:10.

[1365] Cf. Dalman 1905: 367.

[1366] An *af.* perfect 3rd p. sg. masc. + the 2nd p. masc. sg. suffix. See Morag 1988: 302.

[1367] The expected *tertiae waw/yod* forms of the 3rd p. masc. pl. with the 3rd p. fem. sg. suffix are of the type [šaryuha], [šaḏyuha], as reflected in the Yemenite reading tradition. See Morag 1988: 323.

[1368] See also Dalman 1905: 361, 387.

suffixes -יֵנון and -נ/נון are well known from TO, but appear as minor forms in BTA, too, perhaps especially in the Nedarim type of Aramaic. It should be noted that almost all forms with the suffixes -(י)נכו and -נהו come from one text, N&Sh 13. It appears that the bowl texts show forms from different dialects and/or literary traditions. As typical elsewhere in their language, too, they reflect a mixture of conservative (-כי, -(י)נון) and more developed (-(י)נכו, -נהו) linguistic elements. The suffix -נה is hard to classify, but, in any case, it is hardly an archaic feature.

In the imperfect, as in the perfect, these texts display a mixed type of language. With sg. suffixes, they attest forms both with and without *-n-*. Forms with the suffix -נה and with the imperfect prefix *yod*, such as ילבשונה, are in accordance with Official and Middle Aramaic, notably TO. In addition, we have forms with the identical suffix but with the imperfect prefix *nun*, e.g. נינטרוניה. Such forms are found in BTA, but the majority form is of the type לניקטלוהו.[1369] By contrast, ירבקיה in N&Sh 9:5, with no *-n-* element tallies, in this respect, with the majority type of BTA.[1370] The forms with the ending -הו (if we read תשלילוהו) are likewise familiar from BTA, but note that the reading with the ending -הי (תשלילוהי) is also possible. Were this the correct reading, these forms, with the suffix -הי, would appear most archaic.

In pl., our texts have, as in the case of the perfect, both -ינהו and -ני/נון. The former is again found in N&Sh 13.

The infinitive forms with the suffixed pronoun appear without *-n-* as typical of TO.[1371] In BTA, instances of *-n-* occur, as expected, with pl. suffixes.[1372]

In sum, no coherent picture is reflected in our texts as regards the suffixed pronouns attached to verbs. They reflect either different dialects or literary traditions. On the one hand, forms typical of standard BTA are attested (e.g. -ינכו), and, on the other, we have a most conservative suffix -כי and suffixes familiar from TO. All this points in the direction of a mixed language. What differs here as compared with many other linguistic features of the bowl texts, e.g. infinitives and demonstrative pronouns, is the fact that no text attests to different forms side by side. It should be stressed, however, that the object suffixes attached to verbs are quite rarely attested in the bowl texts (see above IV.10.6. *Indication of the Direct Object*).

[1369] See Morag 1988: 291ff.

[1370] Note that the prefix *yod*, in contrast, differs from the model of standard BTA.

[1371] See Dalman 1905: 377-378.

[1372] See Morag 1988: 291ff.