

More on puzzling words and spellings in Aramaic incantation bowls and related texts

Christa Müller-Kessler

Friedrich-Schiller-Universität, Jena

christa.kessler@uni-jena.de

Abstract

The corpus of Aramaic incantation bowls and their related texts opens a new approach to the lexicographical study of the Aramaic dialects in Babylonia of late antiquity. Some of these texts were copies of “Vorlagen” that the scribes no longer understood. Nevertheless, they are more reliable text sources than one supposes. Errors, garbled spellings, miscomprehensions and misreadings are always feasible, and are typical phenomena of copied texts. In the case of new text variants one can approach the puzzling words and text passages anew. This study deals first and foremost with words that are obvious corrupted spellings or scribal errors caused by text transmissions. There are also cases of the breakdown of standard spellings and orthographic conventions from the dialect of “Vorlage” that hide the lexical assignment of a word. Since one is dealing here with the earliest text material of the late Aramaic period, they can be taken as a significant contribution to the placing of many lexemes in existing dictionaries.

Keywords: Aramaic, Incantation bowls, Lexemes, Mandaic, Scribal errors

In the years since the study “Puzzling words and spellings in Babylonian Aramaic magic bowls”,¹ the number of published incantation bowl and metal amulet texts has increased considerably. Three editions of public collections: British Museum (2000);² Museo Nazionale d’Arte Orientale (2001);³ and the Hilprecht-Sammlung (2005)⁴ appeared shortly after that article was written. In addition, some specimens from private collections have come to our attention: the Moussaieff Collection (1995, 1999, 2003, 2005, 2006, 2007);⁵ the Paolo Costa Collection (2005),⁶ and the Martin Schøyen Collection (1999, 2000, 2003, 2005, 2006).⁷ However, puzzling words and *hapax legomena* are still extant from previous editions of these incantation texts and have not been corrected or etymologically placed, although better variants have been published in the meantime. A considerable number of these “ghost words” found their

1 See Müller-Kessler 1999a.

2 See Segal 2000.

3 See Moriggi 2001.

4 See Müller-Kessler 2005a.

5 See Shaked 1995, 1999, 2005, 2006; Levene 1999, 2003b, 2007.

6 See Moriggi 2005.

7 See Shaked 1999, 2000, 2005, 2006; Levene 2003b.

way into the latest *Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic* by Michael Sokoloff (2002).

It should be pointed out that in many instances it is not a matter of misread words, but rather corrupted spellings or scribal errors caused by text transmission or translation of incantation formulas from one Aramaic dialect to another.⁸ There are also cases of the breakdown of “standard spellings” causing deviating graphic forms.⁹ Often, a single missing letter may lead editors and lexicographers astray. The result in such cases is the complete incomprehension of the whole text passage on account of a misinterpreted word or a garbled spelling.¹⁰ However, Morgenstern (2005: 350) is certainly right when he points out: “Accordingly, it seems that one must be particularly wary of correcting supposed ‘mistakes’ in the language of the magic bowls. Frequently, these ‘mistakes’ are nothing but phonetic or dialectal variants of the more formal written language”. Still, certain “ghost words” are in need of being eliminated to keep faulty and non-existent lexemes out of future studies.

The new set of puzzling words presented here is arranged according to the alphabetic sequence of their first published reading. Accordingly, the article deals mostly with obscure spellings, or misread examples, and to a far lesser extent with misinterpreted meanings. However, the majority of the lexemes under discussion do not belong to the group of non-standard spellings where weakening of gutturals, apocope and other phonetic matters caused deviating forms. This study is not concerned with proper names, such as those of gods, angels and demons, or with various magical abbreviations, many of which still elude our understanding.

1. אזה in, PN בת PN מן ובטילו אזה כל בישה קומה “he destroyed all evil from her presence, they annihilated ’zh from PN bat PN” (AMB B13: 8–9) can now be emended and corrected, on account of a parallel passage presented below, to

8 The most prominent formula in Aramaic script appears on the Borsippa bowl published by Harviainen (1981). Since then two variants in Syriac and three in Mandaic (Greenfield and Naveh 1985; Müller-Kessler 1998, 2005a: 148–50) of the same incantation have come to light. This Borsippa bowl text is significant for the demonstration of errors and misunderstandings which were caused through intertranslation. The scribe was unable to handle quite a number of lexemes (see below).

9 In Morgenstern (2007b) such phenomena as the weakening of gutturals, apocope of final consonants and certain signs of assimilation are discussed and compared to other Rabbinic text sources. Morgenstern seeks to pin down most of the discussed features to a hidden colloquialism of the scribes. However, many are of a graphical and not of a phonetic nature. From a methodological point of view one wonders why he does not go into the matter of in how many magic bowl texts such features are actually attested, and how many of them maintain standard spellings. One cannot simply speak of phonetic features to be found “in a wide variety of Aramaic magic bowls”. In most instances he picks some of the specimens which I chose for my study on the *koiné* Aramaic bowls and not the standard literary Aramaic texts. Some of the magic bowl texts have obviously not been collated by him for his article: p. 255 reads ואתיה וקיניניה דהד(י)ן יניא בר ניון instead of ביתיה וקיניניה הין זיזא בר ניון (Paola Costa 1: 11); p. 258 reads כמה דכתבין שידי גישי instead of כמה דכבין שידי גישי (IM 114988: 7 = 18 N 18, not IM 1149880 (a photograph of the object is published in the Nippur report by McGuire Gibson 2001/2002: oi.uchicago.edu/pdf/01-02_nippur.pdf).

10 The incantation bowl text MSF B23 (edited by Naveh and Shaked 1993) shows a considerable number of erroneous spellings which cannot be declared to be non-standard spellings.

PN חביל קומ(ת)ה בלבישה ובטיל ראוה^{sic} מן PN בת PN “destroy the body in her garment and annul the mystery from PN bat PN”. The space between ראוה and ובטיל is quite large, therefore the badly executed *resh* is not part of ובטיל.¹¹ The plene spelling of ראוה is obviously induced by a Mandaic “Vorlage”, since only this Aramaic dialect tends here to spellings with *aleph*; compare other attestations, e.g. in a KBA bowl also dependent on a Mandaic text ראוה תחתא “and by the seven lower mysteries” (Moussaieff 102: 13). Apart from the orthography of ראוה, the assumption of a Mandaic prototype for the formula of AMB B13 is supported by many other indicators (concepts of the Aramaic incantation type, demon story, lexemes, orthography; see below). Several similarities with Mandaic have already been pointed out (Naveh and Shaked 1985: 204–14).

חביל קומתיהו בלבישהו ובטיל ראוה מן ביתיה ומן דירתיה ד PN בר PN “destroy their body in their garment and annul the mystery in the house and the dwelling of PN bar PN” (Christie’s bowl, l. 6). The succession of verbs “throw her a bridle into her mouth break ... pour out ... wound her ... destroy ... and annul the mystery” (AMB B13: 8–9; collated reading) are clear masculine singular imperatives on account of the indicating מחינה “smite her” instead of מחונה “they smote him” (Naveh and Shaked 1985: 198–9). The imperatives are introduced by an imperfect second singular חתי “you shall bring” in l. 6 (see below under חתי, no. 70).

2. “fates”, in אידי שמה (איבטל) “the evil fates of the sky ... (were annulled)” (AMB B13: 14, 20) can hardly be derived from Hebrew אידי as suggested by Naveh and Shaked (1985: 200–03), since a Hebrew lexeme in a good Eastern Aramaic phrase is less plausible. One would at least expect the eastern term גד for “fate”. Because of hidden Mandaic concepts in the whole incantation formula, אידי could be read אורי “lights” with *resh* instead of *dalet* and *waw* instead of *yod* corresponding to Mandaic ‘wry’,¹² which would better accord with the context. Another option might be the alternative reading אירי that would be based on Mandaic ‘yry’ “watchers”, as in the corrupted spelling אירי^{sic} (Borsippa bowl l. 9 [KBA]; see below under אירי). Then אירי can be taken for a dissimilated variant of עירי* comparable to the weakening of ‘ayin as in ואלמיני (AMB B13: 19; see below).¹³ There are

11 Correct Juisola (1999: 165) accordingly. Read the preceding verb מחינה “smite her” instead of מחונה, since a second person singular masculine is addressed (see also below under גיס).

12 Drower and Macuch 1963: 346a.

13 Spellings with *aleph* instead of ‘ayin, or without ‘ayin, are a salient graphic feature of certain magic bowl texts. The Aramaic square script texts often employ ‘ayin for the long vowels \bar{h} / or \bar{e} / as *mater lectionis*, even before *yod*, although the ‘ayin is not etymological, e.g. זעקא “storm, wind” (CBS 16018: 17 = AIT 19 [SLBA]), זעקי “storms” (Moussaieff 107: 7) < זיקא (AMB B13: 3) < Akkadian *zīqu* corresponding Syriac spelling conventions in the bowl texts (Müller-Kessler 2005b: 227; 2006b: 266); עישפא (MSF B23: 4) (KBA), ‘šp’ (MSF B26: 2) (KS) < אישפא “spell” < Akkadian (*w*)*ašāpu*. One can hardly call it “parasitic ‘ayin”, as does Juisola (1999: 37–8) following Naveh and Shaked (1985: 162), when its function is of a purely orthographic nature. Juisola (1999: 32–40) and Morgenstern (2007b: 249–51) might have stressed that this

two possible translations שמיה (אירי/) אריבטל אורי “annulled (*itpa'al*) are the lights/(watchers) of heaven”.¹⁴

3. “is (?)”, in אריבטל (דאיכא ב) גיתא “vow, calamity, curse, affliction that is (?) in the world” (MSF B23: 4) was translated by Naveh and Shaked (1993: 132) with a question mark. Thus it is not included in their glossary. However, there is nothing peculiar about the spelling and meaning of אריבטל, since it is the expected particle of existence “there is”, the augmented variant in Central Babylonian Aramaic (Babylonian Talmudic Aramaic, Mandaic). For the first time אריבטל occurs in a *koiné* Babylonian Aramaic bowl text, and was not integrated in Juusola (1999) as a peculiarity for the bowl texts.¹⁵ The passage can be read and translated, אריבטל ושיקופיתא (א) “and vow and imprecation and curse and affliction that exist inside” (see below under גיתא). In the meantime another attestation¹⁶ of אריבטל came to our

phenomenon is limited to certain bowl texts, often with a Mandaic Vorlage. They follow its orthographic conventions and are composed in an Aramaic dialect type of Babylonia termed *koiné* by Harviainen, but never randomly. Most of them show the eastern *n-/l-*preformative instead of SLA *y-* (except AMB B13), infinitive patterns *qittūlē*, *aqtūlē*, the long imperfect of הוי “to be”, object suffixes, *-yh* for the pronominal suffix third masculine singular on plural nouns and prepositions constructed like plural nouns as a common feature, and the conjunction *-d*. The relevant bowl texts showing such features are, AMB B7, AMB B13 (only *y-*preformatives), Borsippa bowl, CBS 2945 + CBS 2923 (= AIT 2 + 4), CBS 16041 (= AIT 27; incompletely published), CBS 2916 (= AIT 6 (only stock phrases)), CBS 2937 + CBS 2977 (unpubl.); CBS 2972 (= AIT 28); BM 91771; BM 91776; BM 91767 (only certain fixed passages); BM 135563 (BTA); K 2080 (= Gordon 8); MSF B23, Moussaieff 6 (only stock phrases); Moussaieff 102, Moussaieff 145 (BTA); VA 2492 (unpubl.); YBC 2393; YBC 2393; now obviously Chaya 13. The lists of Juusola (1999) and Morgenstern (2007b) concerning the categories of weakening of gutturals are not complete. Add for ‘*ayin*, עלי < אלי “against me” (BM 135563:5 = CAMIB 049A); עילין < אילין “they entered” (Borsippa bowl l. 10); דערל < דיקית “I extinguished” (BM 91776: b1 = CAMIB 036A); עמיל < אמיתא “darkness, to be dim” (AMB B7: 4); צבעו < צבו “colour, dye” (MSF B25: 10) as in Mandaic *sybwṭ*’ (Müller-Kessler 2007: 79–80; correct Sokoloff 2002: 950 under צבותא); recent examples are שב < שבעא “seven” (Moussaieff 164: 11; Moussaieff 4: ? [3.2]); עבדו < תיאבדו “you would make” (Moussaieff 4: ? [3.2]). Delete עברל < ניתברון “they will pass by” (Borsippa bowl l. 8), which is derived from תברל “they will be broken/torn away” on account of the Syriac and Mandaic parallels speaking of “removing, annulling” (see Müller-Kessler 1998: 343).

- 14 Delete discussion in Juusola 1999: 63, correct in Sokoloff 2002: 110, add accordingly.
 15 Juusola (1999: 149) still maintains that this regular form of standard BTA is unattested, despite recent attestations. See for an extensive discussion Müller-Kessler 2003: 641–6.
 16 In contrast to the statement by Morgenstern (2007a: 19) that Mandaic (Drower and Macuch 1963: 15) shows only ‘*k*’ is not correct. The texts in Classic Mandaic and pre-Classic Mandaic have both variants ‘*k*’ and ‘*k*’ which I presented in my study of the particle of existence ‘*yk*’ and ‘*lyk*’ in connection with Iraqi Arabic *aku* and *māku* (Müller-Kessler 2003). For example, it occurs as “אכא” in *q-’k’ bgwh’ bhzy’ s’ry*^{sic} “that exist in these magical bonds” (7Bb120–22 = Lidzbarski lead roll ll. 234–5); *q-’k’ bmy’ sy’wy’* “that exist in the black sea” (Ligabue lead roll ll. 34/5), with a variant “עכא” in *q-’yk’ b[m]y’ sy’wy’* (Macuch 1 a 31–2); *wmn kwl q-’k’ bbyth[h]* “and from everyone who is in his house” (BM 91781: 14 = CAMIB 093M), and its parallel *wmn kwl q-’k’ bbyth* (BM 91731: 9 = CAMIB 090M) (unfortunately, several corrections of

notice: דילן בחילן דילן “where exists understanding/nature in our own power” (BM 91767:11 = CAMIB 040A).¹⁷

4. אילן, in כשורי אילן “these boards” (Moussaieff 145: 11) (BTA) is a tentative translation by Levene (2003b: 103) that can be corrected to “beams of wood”. אילן appears here in the absolute state of the genitive of material (see below under [מיצחן]).¹⁸

5. קלהון דהנין אינשי קרה צנף ילול in, אינשי “The voice of these men called out: the howl shrieked!” (Pearson bowl ll. 6–7) is not “men” as understood by Geller (1986: 102–03), but “women”, since it refers to the preceding group of female family members who are cursing ויהמתא דרהיקתא אפיכה לוטתא דאימא וברתא דכלייתא וקרביתא דקימא בדברה וקימא במתה “overturned is the curse of the mother and daughter, of the daughter-in-law and the mother-in-law, of the far and the near female relative that exists [קיים] in the desert and in the town” (Pearson bowl ll. 2–3). The homonymous spelling אינשי occurs again in גברי ואינשי “and be men and women” (AMB B6: 6) and in a recently published KBA text גברי ודאינשי ... כל חרשי “all sorcery ... of men and women” (BM 91771: 6–7 = Müller-Kessler 2001/02: 125). It is the graphic equivalent of Mandaic ‘ynšy’. אינשי is also attested in a variant without *aleph* גברי ודינשי “the curse of men and women that exist [קיים] in the desert town” (AMB B2: 4) and again דגברי ודינשי (BM 91723: 1 = CAMIB 034A). The Pearson bowl passage can now to be read and translated “the voice of those women²⁰ shouted,²¹ shrieked, (and) howled”. This also explains the “deviating” demonstrative pronoun דהנין, which is in fact a deictic pronoun of distance “those”, and not of nearness, “these”.²²

6. אתו אלי חרשי בישי in, אלי “the evil sorcerers came to me” (BM 135563: 5–6 = Müller-Kessler and Kwasman 2000: 162)²³ is hesitantly explained by Nebe as a deictic pronoun plural of nearness “es kamen diese Zauberer”.²⁴ This could be

the galley proofs remained in the transliteration). A new attestation is *mn šwrbt' d-šb' yhyh d-'k' b'rq'* “from the tribes of the planets that exist on earth” (Munic lead roll IIa18–9).

17 Add to Sokoloff 2002: 113.

18 Delete in Sokoloff 2002: 116 and add to p. 446.

19 It is not a case of a *shwa* marked by *yod*, as Juusola (1999: 45) understood it. Compare other attestations without *aleph* in the same bowl text דיתליה < *דיתליה “he has” (AMB B2: 6); קלה דאיתתא < *קלה דאיתתא “the voice of the wife” (AMB B2: 6), etc., or in another example ו(א)שלמתא < *שלמתא (BM 91771: 1–2 = CAMIB 039A).

20 In לוטתא דהנין אינשי ll. 3/4, 6, however, final *he* = /ē/ is written for *yod*. Compare this spelling convention with אינשי ביתא, “wives of the house”, not “my wife” in the Babylonian Talmud.

21 On the new reading see Hunter 2000: 144.

22 Juusola (1999: 120) considered דהנין and דהנין as peculiar, and that they are not attested in any other incantation, since he took דהנין to mean “these” on p. 104. Correct and add in Nebe (2006: 261) under 7.1.1; add to Sokoloff 2002: 120.

23 Translated according to Müller-Kessler and Kwasman 2000: 162.

24 Nebe 2006: 252–73. The other forms listed, אלי, אילי, and אילה (AIT 25: 2, 5), which have been quoted by Juusola (1999: 121) are hardly demonstrative pronouns plural in this text,

an option to place the unexpected preposition אל < *על in this unique BTA text. However, על אתי is a common idiomatic expression in Aramaic incantations. It is attested in a bowl text with BTA dialectical overtones (עליכון/עליהון) “he (Gabra, Lord Bagdana) came against them/(you)” (AMB B13: 9, 13) and recently in the *af’el*, מחבלה, עליכון “I brought upon you destruction” (Moussaieff 50: 4) (SLBA), לא תיתון עליה “do not come against her” (Moussaieff 101: 7) (SLBA), אתי עליכון “I shall bring against you” (Moussaieff 164: 10, 11; BTA overtones).²⁵ Dissimilated variants and calques from translations of other Aramaic dialects are always feasible, and to be expected, as Müller-Kessler and Kwasman (2000: 163) pointed out. Cf. also אליכו “against you” (see no. 29 below).²⁶

על אתי is also at home in the Mandaic magic phraseology. The idiom describes demons who come to do harm against someone. It can be found in quite a number of Mandaic magic stories *bhn’t’ gbr’ swr’yḥ m’wmy’n lkwn ḏ-srh{’} w’t’ lykwn w’skhy’nkwn kwkwn* “By that Suraian (scribal error for *nwkr’yḥ* ‘alien’) Gabra I adjured you, by the one who threw himself down and came against you and discovered you all” (13Aa16–19 = BM 135791 I; unpubl.); *kḏ’ tyt’ l’ n’ gw b’q ryš ml’k’ w’z bnh ḏ-bwzn’y ml’kywn ḏ-kwlhyn* “When I, Gubaq-Dew, the chief angel (and) Uz, the sons of Buznay, the king of all, came against her” (YBC 2364: 24–5 = Müller-Kessler 1996: 188, 190); *w’syr[’] wrgy’l’ l’gr’ywn ḏ-l’ n’twn l’ p’yr nwkr’y’ gbr’* w’l’ m’m’y pt m’rt’ ntt’ “and boun[d] and hobbled are their feet so that they cannot come against (Pir Nukraya, the man) and Mamay pat Martha, the woman” (5Bb12–14 = BM 132955 + ; unpubl.). Further examples are to be noted in late Mandaic magical sources.²⁷

7. ניקטול סבי באסניהו ואלמיני באישכריהו נין[סחו]פינהו לדן[ד]קי בשוקי in, אלימיני “let us kill the old in their granaries, and the dumb in their wagons; let us sweep away the children in the market places” (AMB B13: 19) is not derived from the adjective אילם “mute”, as suggested (Naveh and Shaked 1985: 203, 213), which only occurs in פומיהון “mute in their mouths” (AMB B6: 7). It is a dissimilated spelling of עולימיני “the young ones”. Compare the Mandaic spelling conventions, *’lm’ny’* as a variant of *’(w)lym’ny’*,²⁸ but also etymologically written *’wlymyḥ* (Christie’s lead roll l. 35; see below). However, in l. 12 of AMB B13 one finds the historical spelling, עולימא ועולמתא “the young boy and girl”. The *nun* before the emphatic plural ending י- in אלימיני indicates the plural-forming suffix *-ān*, sometimes *>-ōn*, and not the diminutive. This old plural formation, productive in most Semitic languages, is randomly added in Aramaic before the external plural ending of certain word categories.²⁹ Recent attested examples are: groups of people, *drdqwny’* “male children” (BM 103358: 6 = CAMIB

but variants of the preposition אל and the noun אלהא. See also for relevant demonstrative pronouns in SLBA texts Müller-Kessler 2011a: 230–32. If others occur it is a question of a different dialect (KBA, BTA) or restricted to the introductory formula.

25 Published in Levene 2007: 62.

26 One cannot simply list isolated forms without considering the contextual usage.

27 See Drower and Macuch 1963: 42a.

28 See Drower and Macuch 1963: 21, 351.

29 See Nöldeke 1875: 169–70; Brockelmann 1908: 451.

099M) (M); *šly:ṭny'* “rulers” (Ex 15: 15) (CPA); plants, parts of them, and their products, ביזר(ו)ני < ברזרעוני* “seeds” (*Gitṭin* 68b) (BTA),³⁰ *b'zrwny'* (M), *bzrwnh* (MS 1928/54: 7) (KS); *pyqwny'* “blossoms” (M), *bs:mny* “balsam” (Mark 16: 1P^c) (CPA); *y'rqwny'* “greeneries” (M); *nṣ:ny'* “blossoms” (Cyril of Jerusalem 9: 10) (CPA); materials, *šybwnyh* “dyes” (Christie’s lead roll I. 70) (M), *myšknyn* “leathers” (Hebr. 11: 37) (CPA); other terms, *ḥwdr'nh* “his circumferences” (Khuzistan lead roll b31) (M), *ḥdrnwh:y* (AO 17.284: 6) (BS); מעינה “her intestines” (Moussaieff 155: 9) (SLBA); מיצרניה “his borders” (*Bava Batra* 68a) (BTA). There are plenty of further examples in other dialects.

The reference to the small, the young, and the older ones belongs to the topos of Aramaic magical stories, e.g., for the first time it appears in the Uruk incantation, *ma-[a-a] qu-da-am ra-[ab]-ra-bé-e ú-ma-'* [*dar*]-*da-qé-e [ni-še]-e u ga-ba-re-e* “what is before the great and the small ones, the women and the men” (recto ll. 10–12);³¹ in Mandaic *d-mhnqy' y'ldy' wg'tly' l'tly' ḥḥy' w'lym'ny' wm'wly' s'by'* “who strangle the infants and kill the children and the young ones, and carry off the old ones” (Ligabue lead roll 87–90; unpubl.); variant *hynwn d-mhnqy' wgtly' <l'tly'> 'wlym'ny' wmwly' s'by'* (Macuch lead roll 1a73–75; collated);³² *kḏ y'n'qyḥ w'p 'wlymyḥ ws'by' l' šbqyt* “while you neither spare the infants nor the young ones nor the old ones” (Christie’s lead roll ll. 34–6). מיעולימיהון ועד סביהון מירברביהון ועד דערדקיהון “from the great to the small ones and from the young to the old ones” (Christie’s bowl ll. 4–5).³³ The passage in AMB B13: 19, therefore, has to be understood as follows: “let us kill the old ones in their granaries and the young ones in their fields,³⁴ let us sweep away the children in the market streets”.³⁵

8. אסרתא “band (?), bundle”, in Sokoloff 2002: 151; see below under דסותא.

9. אסירתא (עיל)את ברזון וכהעאזר אס[יר] [...] [אסיר](תא) עילאת, in אסירתא אסיר אספדים עילאה באספדים [...] באס[ור] (ד)עולאם and *kh'zr* bound is [...] bound is 'yl't, bound is the supreme Aspades with Aspades [...] in the bond of eternity” (Paolo Costa Collection bowl 2: 1–3). אסירתא cannot be a passive participle, but only a concrete noun “binding”. The passage was completely misread by Moriggi 2005: 52. It reads אסיר רזא עילאה ברזא תחתאה אסיר רזא תחתאה ברזא עילאה אסיר אספדים עילאה באספדים תחתאה אסיר אספדים עילאה באספדים עילאה ברזי עילאי וברזי תחתאי ובשבעה רזי עילאי ובשבעה ראזי תחתאי (Moussaieff 102: 12–13). The phrase is obviously based on a Mandaic theme, found in a magical bowl in similar words, *'syr{'} r'z' 'ly' br'z' tt'y'*

30 See Sokoloff 2002: 195.

31 Cited according to the edition of Müller-Kessler 2002: 196–201.

32 Corrected reading of Macuch 1967: 118. The text parallels will be published with improved readings in Müller-Kessler (in preparation).

33 Better variant of AMB B5.

34 Already corrected by Sokoloff 2002: 126.

35 Correct in Sokoloff 2002: 116 and p. 126 under אישכרא.

'syr r'z' tt'y' br'z' l'y' 'syr r'z' d-'wspyr' l'y' br'z' d-'wspyr' tty' 'syr r'z' d-'wspyr' tt'y' br'z' d-'wspyr' l'y' (Princeton bowl ll. 4–10),³⁶ and in a more elaborate text in the later magical source (DC 43 J 179–80, 183–5; unpubl.), which is in parts also identical to the Paolo Costa Collection bowl 2, אסיר רוזא דשימשה ברזא דסיהרא אסיר רוזא דסיהרא ברזא דשימשה (l. 3), and corresponds again to 'syr r'z' d-š'myš br'z' d-syr' { 'syr' 'syr' 'syr' } 'syr r'z' d-syr' br'z' d-š'myš (DC 43 J 181–3; unpubl.). The Princeton text deviates after d-'wspyr' l'y' from the Aramaic square script version.³⁷

10. אספדיס “Aspades”, in אספדיס עילאה באספדיס “bound is the supreme Aspades with Aspades” (Paolo Costa Collection bowl 2: 2) is not to be read with *dalet* as in Moriggi 2005: 52, but with *resh*. It must be a Greek accusative or dative form of σφαῖρα “sphere”. אספריס has not been attested so far in the various Jewish Aramaic dialects,³⁸ only in Mandaic as (w)sp(y)r' in pre-Classical Mandaic bkšwr'yhyn lygtyt w'sr[y]^t^ qwmb't r'q'yh' {brb} bmr{d} w'lygt' w'syr' 'wspyr' “I grasped and bound the arc of the firmament in the west by their [= goddesses] beams; and grasped and bound was the sphere” (1Cf7–9 = BM 134699; unpubl.), tyšt'g š'kwlh' 'wspyr' d-šwmy' “you shall stir up each sphere of heaven” (Munic lead roll Ia33–4; unpubl.); for its appearance in context see above under אסירתא. However, אספריס is treated here as masculine, as in the early Mandaic Princeton text, l. 10 (br'z' d-'wspyr' l'y'), and in other early Mandaic examples cited above, despite its being feminine in Greek, but the late Mandaic parallel shows, br'z' d-'syr' l'yt' (DC 43 J 184).³⁹

11. אצמומי, in אצמומי “arrows of iron” (AMB B13: 14) as translated (Naveh and Shaked 1985: 200–01, 213) is either a corrupted spelling of איצטמומיה “his spear” (Moussaieff 4:? [2.4] = Shaked 2006: 373), or an assimilated variant of איסטמומי < στόμωμα as found in איסטמומי פרזלא “spears of iron” (BM 91776: b2 = CAMIB 036A), or in Mandiac 'štmwm' d-zyw' “spear of radiance” (7Bb33 = Lidzbarski lead roll 147), 'sry' hrby' syppy^{sic} w'stmwmy' d-by(l)db'by' “swords, scimitars, and spears of the enemies” (McCullough bowl C4–5; collated reading),⁴⁰ and later among other examples with regressive assimilation in hrby' sypy' w'stmwmy' wskyny' (Ginzā yamīnā 143: 19). A similar explanation was given by the Geonim, respectively. The ל in the Talmudic passage אריסותא לפרזלא (Berachoth 62b) is employed as a genitive particle. Another variant appears in a Syriac magical context 'štmw:m' “spears” (syriacque I52 = Gignoux 1987: 14).⁴¹

12. אריסותא, in אריסותא ומן אריסותא ומן אשלתא ומן לוטתא ומן לוטתא “and from curses and from spells and from submission (?)” (AMB B11: 4) reads אריסותא instead. The scribe obviously wanted to start again by analogy with *aleph*.⁴²

36 Similarly, Ashmolean lead roll 1931.474b b3–11.

37 Add attestations to Sokoloff 2002, accordingly.

38 Only to be found under the spelling ספירא “ball” (Jastrow 1903: 1014).

39 Add this new Greek loan word to Sokoloff 2002, accordingly.

40 The parallel has only 'sry' h'rby' sypy' d-byldb'by' (BM 91775: 4 = CAMIB 086M).

41 Correct in Sokoloff 2002: 147 under אסטמא, p. 798 under אריסותא, and combine all under the better variant אריסטמומא.

42 Delete in Sokoloff 2002: 167 and add on p. 449.

13. ארני, in ארני, in דמות אסא שוניה וארני “(in) the shape of myrtle, tree of chastity and pines” (AMB B13: 12) is hardly “pine”. No etymology is given by Naveh and Shaked 1985. In this spelling the word has not been attested in the dictionaries. The first tree אסא is doubtless “myrtle” and borrowed from Akkadian *asû*. The second is שוניה “chaste tree” and is derived from Akkadian *šunû*. The third ארני is problematic. Sokoloff (2002: 391) connects it with Syriac *rw'n* by explaining it through a complicated development to *הרענא, since in *Šabbat* 35b for הרני a variant אדאני is found. It is conceivable that ארני is borrowed from Akkadian as well, i.e. *erēnu* “cedar”, although the common Aramaic term for “cedar” ארזא occurs, according to Naveh and Shaked, in the same line. This, however, reads איבא as in the parallel מיתחזתון ליה בדמות איבא ואילנא “and you appear to him in the image of a cloud and tree” (Christie’s bowl l. 9). The parallel variant by the same scribe shows וארא שוניה וארא “myrtle, chaste tree, and bay tree” (Christie’s bowl l. 10). Also this tree name is a loan or cognate with Akkadian *ēru* “bay tree”, listed under ערא (Sokoloff 2002: 878), and is attested for the first time in Mandaic as *dlyb't wkyw'n 'st'pw b'r* “Delibat and Kewan were gathering in a bay tree” (Munic lead roll IIc12–13; unpubl.).

14. ביבי “canal?”, in כרסיה ימא דלא ביבי “his belly is a lake without canals” (AMB B13: 6) is the correct meaning of ביבא, as suggested by Naveh and Shaked 1985: 200–01, but was doubted by Sokoloff 2002: 199. The word is also attested in a Syriac bowl text among the client’s belongings, *dbythy <w>dbybhy dPN br PN* “of the house (and) of the canal (= gutter?) of PN bar PN” (AO 17.284: 1–2) (BS). ביבא or in Classical Syriac *bwb'* is a loan from Akkadian *bību*; see Müller-Kessler 2006b: 267. That the spelling in the Syriac bowl text does not conform to Classical Syriac can clearly be demonstrated by the deviating vocalization, which is often the case in such Syriac bowl texts.⁴³

15. *bḥzw' “?”*, in ... *šwḥt' qll' wbḥzw' ḥtyn' dptkr': wnydr' d'lh': mllt' dnyq:bt'* “... the shouting, the contempt, and ... the harm of the Patikars and the vow of the (male) gods, the speech of the female (goddesses)” (AO 17.284: 3–4) (BS) is an odd spelling. It was misunderstood as “Schande” (Müller-Kessler 1998: 335) and followed by *b'wz'* “visioni” (Moriggi 2004: 292). By taking into account all of the available text parallels, the etymological placing of this noun can be put right. In the Mandaic variants *bḥzw'* is written *byzy'* (Macuch lead roll Ia12) or *b'z'hy'* “הבוז (?)” (Khuzistan lead roll b10–11). The *koiné* Syriac version from Nippur has [*b*]wzḥ' (IM 60960: 5 = TMH 7 3A) and the KBA variant shows another noun pattern ביזיונא (Borsippa bowl l. 5). *bḥzw'* is an obvious scribal error for *bwzḥ'* that can clearly be assigned to the Aramaic root √*bzḥ* “to mock” on the basis of the *koiné* Syriac Nippur variants such as [*b*]wzḥ' (IM 60960: 5 = TMH 7 3A) and in another incantation formula *bwzḥ'* (HS 3039: 4 = TMH 7 35).⁴⁴ The Mandaic form *b'z'hy'* confirms again that historical spellings were still extant in the pre-Classic language stage. No attestations of the root and its derivation are registered yet in the

43 Correct and add to Sokoloff 2002: 199. Also attested in the Copper Scroll 12: 8.

44 This word is missing in the Philadelphia parallel CBS 9008 (= AIT 31).

Mandaic dictionary.⁴⁵ A spelling without *het*⁴⁶ is to be noted in SLBA bowl texts, מרי בווא וקללא “lord of mockery and disgrace” (CBS 2952: 3 = AIT 5) and in the parallel מרי בווא וקללא (MSF B14: 5).⁴⁷

16. בישמיש, in מיתקרייתון {מי} בישמיש “you are called by Shamish(?)” (AMB B13: 11) is not in need of correction and has to be differently divided, בישמי בישמי on account of a parallel variant that has מיתקרייתון שמי “by the names of his name you are called” (Christie’s bowl l. 8).⁴⁸ The *he* of the suffix 3 masculine singular was omitted by the scribe as later in the text <נקיט *ליה > נקיט לי (l. 16).⁴⁹

17. *byt 'klk'*: in *'drwn' gwt'y' dbyt 'klk'*: “the inner room of the dining hall” (MS 1928/54: external) and *wl' nyḥṭwn bbyth wbmzwnh wb'bwrh 'nšh wbyrwnh wby't *'klky': dywy' br ršnyndwk* (MS 1928/54: 7–8) “and that they cannot harm the house, the food, the corn, the people, the outside court(?), and the dining hall of Yawi'a son of Rašnendukh” (Shaked 2000: 63, 75–7). I opted for reading *byt 'kly'* “dining hall” instead.⁵⁰ However, the first reading by Shaked does seem to be correct, since *byt *'klk'*: fits even better into the context. *'klk'*: is well attested in the Babylonian Talmud as (א)כלכא “storehouse for grain”, a loan from Akkadian *kalakku*,⁵¹ which occurs as *bīt kalakki* in Neo-Babylonian.⁵² Read and translate now, *'drwn' gwt'y' dbyt 'klk'*: “the inner room of the storehouses” and *wl' nyḥṭwn bbyth wbmzwnh wb'bwrh 'nšh wbyrwnh wby't *'klk': dPN br PN* “and they shall not harm the house and the food and the corn and the seed and the storehouses of PN bar PN”. Shaked’s interpretation of the Pahlavi inscription has to be reconsidered.

18. בסיא “trampled”, in וסחוף כל איסרתא סחפונהי לפתורהו שדונהו לאגנהו זלח להו “and he wrecked all the goddesses, they 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” (AMB B13: 16–7) is clearly to be read כסיא instead of בסיא (Naveh and Shaked 1985: 200–01) as in the parallel (Christie’s bowl l. 14). Sokoloff (2002: 224) rightly points out that the connection with Mandaic $\sqrt{\text{bsy}}$ “to trample on” is doubtful.

45 See also Müller-Kessler 2006b: 270.

46 This is a good example of the weakening of *het* in Aramaic square script bowl texts and would have served the section in Morgenstern 2007b: 256. Two scribal errors {גנ} וזנק (AMB 12Bb: 8) and {אינ} איהנק do not give any hint of such a phenomenon, since scribes tend to start writing words again when they are not satisfied with the letters. See in the same text a similar scribal slip {ויגע} ויגעוע (AMB 12Bb: 11).

47 Correct etymology of 1# בוי > בוה and of בוינא in Sokoloff 2002: 194, 200. Delete 1# ביא n.m. booty on p. 200. Note that the etymological parallel from Nahum 3:1 quoted by Sokoloff is an absolute form and not an emphatic.

48 This example was not considered by Juusola (1999: 35) and Morgenstern (2007b: 253) treating this feature.

49 The variant shows the same spelling and is written as one word נקיטלי בידה (Christie’s bowl l. 13).

50 See Müller-Kessler 2006a: 117.

51 See Sokoloff 2002: 583.

52 See CAD K, p. 64.

22. גיס, in מריא אתא גוס קריב עליהון “There came the lord, there came the troop. He came against them” (AMB B13: 6–7) is not an absolute form of גיסא “robber band”, as Naveh and Shaked (1985: 207) assumed, but has to be taken here as an imperative *pe’al* of גוס. This verb is loaned from Akkadian *gāšu*. It is in use in BTA and Mandaic.⁵⁸ Translate את מריא אתא גוס קריב עליהון “you, lord, come, meet, (and) fight against them” (< BTA).⁵⁹

23. גיתא “the inhabited world”, in (דאיכא ב)גיתא “affliction that is(?) in the world” (MSF B23: 4) is not derived from Iranian *gētik* as Naveh and Shaked (1993: 132–3) understood it, but is in fact the feminine Aramaic word וכל לוטתא “inside”. The whole passage can be translated, דאיכא בגותא “and every curse ... and plague that exists in the inside (of PN bar PN)”. The reason that it can only be גותא here is that the client asks to be free of all kinds of evil entities, which can be deduced from the succeeding sentence, PN בר PN ¹ו(צעקתא דאית לי הוה דילי אנה בר PN “and the speaking, the calling, and the countercharm, (and) the screaming which I have, I had, I, PN bar PN” (MSF B23: 4–5).⁶⁰

24. דוריגי ונידרי ולוטתא ושיקופיתא וזיגוריתא “ladders (?) and vows and curses and afflictions and ...”⁶¹ (MSF B23: 2). The term is neither obscure nor connected with Babylonian Aramaic דרגא “step, ladder” as suggested by Naveh and Shaked (1993: 132–3), but was misread for חיטיני “harms”. A meaning such as “step, ladder” hardly fits into the context of evil actions. Compare a similar account of negative human characteristics occurring in a *koiné* Syriac bowl text, *bzywn’ whytwn’ wnydr’ wnwsy’ wsgdt’ w’slmt’* “mockery and harming and vow and trial and adoration and treachery” (IM 44107: 11–12)(KS).^{62,63}

25. ראישיה ראישא דאריא ככיה ככי דדיבתה שיניה שיני דנמרא in דדיבתה “his head is the head of a lion, his molar teeth are the molar teeth of a she-wolf, his teeth⁶⁴ are the teeth of a tiger” (AMB B13: 4) reads correctly בדיבוזה. The parallel text shows דבוזא “of the goat” (Christie’s bowl l. 3). The AMB bowl reading can now be emended to דיבוזה {ב}דבוזא. בוזא is a loan from Iranian, probably Middle Persian, *buz* (MacKenzie 1971: 20). It is attested for the first time in Aramaic,⁶⁵ but already occurs in the compound כרבוז “oryx” *Hullin* 59b (Aruch) < Middle Persian *xarbuzz*.⁶⁶

58 See Sokoloff 2002: 270.

59 Add to Sokoloff 2002: 270 under 2# גוס and delete on p. 282 under 3# גיסא. Correct also Jusuola 1999: 165.

60 Delete and correct in Sokoloff 2002: 284.

61 See below on its understanding.

62 See Harviainen 1978: 9, where the transliteration of Teixidor 1962 was corrected. Instead of Teixidor’s and Harviainen’s tentative reading (*wyrd’*) the text shows clearly *wnwsy’*. Correct in Moriggi 2004: 254.

63 Delete דוריגי in Sokoloff 2002: 322. Add חיטיני “harms” on p. 452. חיטינא is not a “type of demon, lit. one who injures” as classified by Sokoloff, but a term of misbehaviour among others (slander, evil talk, envy, etc.). Now attested again as חיטינא in Moussaieff 103: 2; 119: 2, 3.

64 See below.

65 Add to Sokoloff 2002.

66 See Sokoloff 2002: 598b.

26. דמם “to come to rest”, in ונידימין עלה ד- “and may they come to rest upon” (Moussaieff 102: 9) (KBA) need not be derived from a root *mediae geminatae* דמם as Levene (2003b: 142) suggests. I propose connecting it with $\sqrt{\text{דמי}}$ ⁶⁷ however, it could be $\Pi\text{-w/y}$ as well. דמם as verbal root has not yet been attested in the Jewish Aramaic dialects. If one reads *resh* instead of *dalet* and *waw* instead of *yod* in the second syllable, it is a *pe'al* of $\sqrt{\text{רום}}$ “to rise upon”, גירומון. The verb רום would better accord with the context PN וד PN ד “and evil sorcerers will be lifted⁶⁸ (דלי) upon them and will raise against PN and PN” instead of Levene’s “may evil sorceries be drawn against them, and may they come to rest upon Ahatoi and Awirta”.⁶⁹

27. דני “jars”, in אקרקפה דני (Moussaieff 101: 12) (SLBA) is hardly a plural in the emphatic state of דנא “jar” as proposed by Levene (2003b: 41), since this meaning does not make sense in this context. דני must still be considered unclear. The same is true for the text variants דני (HS 3010: 6 = TMH 7 6) and דיני (HS 3033: 7 = TMH 7 7).

28. דסתרא, in ובחתמתא דסתרא דארעה “and with the seal(ing) of the band of the earth” (Borsippa bowl 1. 11) (KBA) as read by Harviainen (1981: 5) and emended to סרתא <א> by Sokoloff (2002: 151), who analysed it as a feminine noun with the meaning “band(?), bundle”. The correct reading of the clearly legible passage is ובחתמא דסדנא דארעה “and with the seal of the anvil of the earth”.⁷⁰ Compare the Syriac variants, *wh̄tm sdn’ d’r’* (IM 60960: 13–4 = TMH 7 3A) (KS) and *bh̄tm:y sdn’ d’r’* (AO 17.284: 10) (BS). A recent attestation is ברזא דארעה ובסדנא דרקיעה “by the mystery of the earth and by the anvil of the firmament” (MS 1911/1: 4 = Shaked 2006: 377). This expression is a well-known concept of the Gnostic world.⁷¹

29. לא הניה אהניה לא הניה אהניה מיטול דמשיפנא אנין מיכול דשייף מיכול דנסי מיכול, in הניה, “Not these over these, and not these over these. For I rub them from all that is rubbed, from all that is removed, from all that is broken. For the soul is not rubbed, not removed, not broken” (Moussaieff 4: [2.7–2.9], Shaked 2006: 374) cannot be a demonstrative pronoun plural of nearness and has not been attested in this spelling in Aramaic. A demonstrative pronoun cannot be negated by לא. This subclause of cause needs in the main sentence a finite verb. Read and translate, לא הניה אהניה ולא הניה אהניה מיטול דמשיפנא אנין מיכול דשייף מיכול, “It did not affect him, it will affect him; it did not affect him, it will affect him, because I desiccated them; of all that he desiccated, of all that he took [BTA נסבך; hardly נסל], of all that he broke; on account of the soul he did not desiccate, he did not take, and he did not break”.⁷²

67 In the review of Levene, see Müller-Kessler 2005b: 234.

68 *tyd’lwn* (1Cc20 = BM 134699); see on this additional vowel phenomenon Nöldeke 1875: 26–7, and now Morgenstern 2005: 355–6.

69 See Morgenstern 2005: 355–6. Add to Sokoloff 2002: 1065.

70 The reading has been corrected in the meantime by Müller-Kessler 1998: 345.

71 For more examples see Drower and Macuch 1963: 309. Delete סרתא (א) in Sokoloff 2002: 151, and add Bo 106: 11 to סנא on p. 788b.

72 My colleague Theodore Kwasman drew my attention to two possible BTA lexemes. The first option could be 2# הני “to adhere” occurring in two noteworthy passages of magic

Further down in the same incantation text Shaked considers הניה a singular feminine demonstrative pronoun “this” next to the regular BTA form אי הנייה מומתא תיאברו והא שבועתא לא תקבלו תיהוי אליכוה אחרמתא וגזירתא דהוי אחרמן טורא “if you trespass against this adjuration, and if you do not accept this oath, may there be against you a ban and a decree, which is on Mount Hermon” (Moussaieff 4:?[3.2] Shaked 2006: 374), although the first part of the conditional clause needs here a perfect. Read and translate, אי הניה מומתא, ⁷³“if it affected him (the great primordial father), you would make [עבד] an adjuration and you would not receive this oath, (and) there would be⁷⁴ this ban and decree against you [chiasmus], which was⁷⁵ on Mount Hermon”. This sentence and the following one is a curse formula reminiscent of the ones found in Sfire, Tell Fekheriye and now the Bukān inscription.

30. ה[ד]ין אסרה הדין חתמ[ה] הע[ע] ומדין וקימין לעולם ולאפ[פ](ו)קא in [הע] ומדין. “This is the binding, this is the sealing that exists and subsists for ever, for removing and driving out” (MSF B20: 2/3; KBA). The reading and addition by Naveh and Shaked (1993: 126–7) is unlikely, since a Hebrew active participle and a Hebrew relative clause construction are hardly to be expected in a good Aramaic sentence. The text reads here הדין חתמה דעמידין וקימין לעולם ולאפקא ⁷⁶“This bond (and) this seal that exist and subsist for ever” to expel and drive out ...” (SLBA). עמידין וקימין לעולם is a Standard Western Aramaic phrase and can also appear in the text frame of an Eastern incantation. Despite the Hebrew loan of עמד, it shows the expected Aramaic morpheme, a participle active /qātil/ with the plural ending ין.⁷⁷

31. נטריא והרמגוני אינון ניטרוניה in “...”, והרמגוני “they will be guard and (+ one word) for him” (Borsippa bowl l. 9–10) (KBA) was the first reading by Harviainen (1981: 5). Greenfield and Naveh (1985: 103) divided into אגר instead. It has to be read מגיני אירי¹, on account of the parallels in the Syriac bowl version *nṭwr’*: *ʿywr’*: *wmgyn’*: (AO 17.284: 8) and Mandaic *n’try’* *ʿry’* *wmg’ny’* (Macuch lead roll Ia48–9).⁷⁸ The diverse Aramaic text variants prove that אירי¹ can be only a dissimilated variant (/ʿ < /) and corrupted spelling of the Syriac form *ʿywr’* “watchers” (*ʿwr*) and its Mandaic counterpart *ʿry’*. It parallels נטרי “protectors” and its synonym מגיני “keepers”, a *nomen*

קא מיזדהר בנפשיה אזרי לא הוה קא מהניה ביה משום דוה (Pesachim 110b, Me’ila 7a). The other verb could be שייף, a secondary verb שוף of שוב “to wither, desiccate”.

73 It is a case of haplography.

74 In this Aramaic conditional clause the protasis requires a perfect and the apodosis an imperfect. Compare in the same text without the conjunction, דחטי בה נורא תיחטי ביה, ודחביל בה הרבא; “that if he harmed her (= the soul), the fire would harm him” [2.10]; ודחביל בה תיחביל ביה “and that if he injured her [= the soul], the sword would injure him” [2.11].

75 It is a perfect of היל “to be”, not the copula. In this BTA passage one would expect the spelling הוה or הוה.

76 Even לעולם is not a Hebrew spelling, since the short vowel merged, /a/ > /o/ in /le’olām/.

77 Cf. Müller-Kessler (in preparation). Correct קא(ו) in Sokoloff 2002: 739 under 2# Naveh Af., respectively. Add to עמד vb. dialectal on p. 869.

78 See the synopsis in Müller-Kessler 1998: 344.

agentis of נטר/ “to protect”,⁷⁹ of which another attestation, מגיני, is to be noted in an Aramaic bowl text (AMB B13: 15).⁸⁰

32. “et qu’ell vieilisse de cinq cents (ans)” (private collection l. 2, 3). This misread passage by Gorea (2003: 79–80) is a well-known introductory phrase in Aramaic magic formulas and reads ברחמי שמיא “you may be healed by the mercy of heaven”. It occurs frequently, e.g., ויתסי ברחמי שמיא (Borsippa bowl l. 2, 3), דיתסי ברחמי שמיא (AMB B11: 8) etc.

33. ואם לא אתי עליכון מיה מיפום שבע, in “people with gonorrhoea/discharge”, זבין “and if not I shall bring against you water from the mouths of seven people with gonorrhoea/discharge” (Moussaieff 164: 11) as interpreted by Levene (2007: 62) is loaned from Akkadian *zābu* “to stream”, and means “river, stream” as in Mandaic. It recently occurred in an Aramaic magic bowl text for the first time: עופא רבא דזיבי “the great bird(s) of the rivers” (Moussaieff 145: 10) (BTA). The sentence should be translated “and if I do not bring water from the mouth of seven rivers/streams”.⁸¹

34. “...”, in “and vows and curses and afflictions and ...” (MSF B23: 2) (KBA) is not “wasp” or unclear as Naveh and Shaked (1993: 132–3) understand it. If *dalet* is read instead of *resh*, it is זיגודיתא “adoration”, a noun derived from זגדל < זגדל. ⁸² The variant form *sgdt’* occurs in Syriac bowl texts, *wnydr’ wnwswy’ wsgdt’ w’slmt’* “and the vow and the temptation and the adoration and the treachery” (Helsinki bowl l. 12) (KS), *wnydr’ wnsy’ wsgdt’ w’slmt’* (IM 44107: 12) (KS).⁸³ One might also consider an emendation to <מ>זיגודיתא with an identical meaning. This noun has been attested in Mandaic, *m’sgwt’*,⁸⁴ in a *koiné* Syriac bowl text, *msgwdyt’* (HS 3039:5 = TMH 7 35), and in comparable accounts of evil entities, e.g. in a KBA incantation text ונידרי ולוטתא ושיקופתא ומזגיתא (BM 91771: 7 = Müller-Kessler 2001/02: 125).⁸⁵

35. “and they have caused rings of divination (?) to descend on their chests” (Moussaieff 6: 11) (KBA) as suggested by Shaked (1995: 213–15) should be read and translated: והומרי “and they laid beads of shining glass on their chest”.⁸⁶ זוכיחא occurs in BTA as זוכיחא חירתי “white (translucent) glass” (*Gittin* 68a) and זוכיחא רומיתא (*Hullin* 84b) as a variant of זוגיתא.⁸⁷ It proves

79 See Hamilton 1971: 117a. *sgdt’* was corrected by Harviainen 1978: 9; *nsy’* is the reading of the present author.

80 Delete הרמגוני in Sokoloff 2002: 390 and add מגיני on p. 663 to מיינא including the Mandaic and Syriac variants, respectively; add עירא אירי under new lemma [qattāl] n. m. “watcher” (↓ עירל) on p. 860.

81 Add new lemma to Sokoloff 2002.

82 Compare also זגדית “I prostrated” (Moussaieff 145: 13) in Levene 2003b: 101.

83 According to Harviainen 1978: 8–9.

84 See Drower and Macuch 1963: 249.

85 Delete in Sokoloff 2002: 406, and add either זיגודיתא or זיגודיתא, accordingly.

86 In l. 13 מללתא והומרי should be understood as “forged amulets”, and not as Shaked suggested “rings of spells”. הומרי as *nomen unitatis* requires an adjective with feminine plural ending.

87 See Sokoloff 2002: 412. The Aramaic variants with *kaf* are not taken into account by Mankowski 2000: 52–4, although Targum Job 28: 17 has זוכיחא. Also the discussion

that the BTA variants זכוכיתא cannot be taken as corrupt, but that they are phonetic spellings of Mandaic *zg'gyt'* and Syriac *zgwgyt'*, corresponding to Akkadian *zakakātu, zukukūtu* “glass”. The other two variants, BTA זוגיתא and Mandaic *zg'wyt'*, are correct too, since they are based on the same intervocalic elision of /g/ as in Mandaic *trn'wl'* “cock” and *z'w'* “spouse”.⁸⁸ Shaked’s reading and interpretation hardly fit into the context, since, when “the angels adorn themselves with shining garments and a sparkling crown”, why should “they have caused rings of divination (?) to descend on their chests at the same time”?⁸⁹

36. באדא אכלא רבא דזיוא {סורא} ספסי {פ} (ר)א רבא דזלעיקא א זלעיקא. “with a great mace of splendour, a great sword of ray” (CBS 16041: 15 = AIT 27; unpubl. passage) (KBA)⁹⁰ is probably identical to Mandaic and Syriac *zlyq'*. It is spelled here with the *mater lectionis* ‘ayin before *yod*, comparable to Mandaic graphic conventions to indicate long vowels /ī/, /ē/, /ū/. The whole passage is obviously a translation of a Mandaic “Vorlage”, therefore the KBA dialect style.⁹¹

37. בשום טיטיוס הי חי מן פגרי רעש ופגרי רגש, in חי חי מן. “In the name ȚȚTNWS ȚȚ ȚȚ MŞ bodies of commotion and bodies of tumult” (Moussaieff 101: 11–12) according to Levene (2003b: 40–41), for which Morgenstern (2005: 352) suggested the reading מן הוהי, can be understood through its text parallels which constantly show רגש ופגרי רעש ופגרי רגש “In the name of Țiṭinos my life turned sour, my body reacted, and my body trembled” HS 3005: 5, HS 3010: 4, HS 3033: 5 = TMH 7 5–7); (Istanbul 1167: 8–9); (BM 117824: 18 = Müller-Kessler 2001/02: 123).⁹²

38. ובישמיה דיי רבא מלאכה דיתליה, in דיי רבא. Read also דיורבא מלאכה דאית ליה. ובשמה דיורבא רבא מלאכה דאית ליה. This Jewish angel name occurs frequently in Mandaic incantation texts and is based on a Jewish concept, see now ‘*stkyt whwz'yth lywrb' kd y'tyb bškynt' d-npš[h wl]ml'ky' d-mnhry' škyntḥ d-q'ymy'* (BM 117880: 8–9 with Müller-Kessler 2001/02: 131; Ford 2002: 242–3).

39. גיפחזוניה יפרזון. see under גיפחזוניה.

40. הפיכי כוני “planet”, in הפיכי כוני (BM 91727: 5 = CAMIB 009A) according to Sokoloff (2002: 564) reads הפיכי כוכבי.⁹³ The planet Kewan כיון is attested once in a bowl (BM 91771: 5 = Müller-Kessler 2001/2: 125) and twice in similar

about the Proto-Semitic background of /z/ in Aramaic of this word is obsolete, since all variants are based on a direct loan from Akkadian as in the case of זיבי (Moussaieff 145: 10), זבין (Moussaieff 164: 11) < *zābū* “rivers” (s. o.), although the two lexemes would require a /d/ if they were derived from an Aramaic root \sqrt{dky} and $\sqrt{d'b}$.

88 There is more on this phonetic feature in Nöldeke 1875: 41, n. 6.

89 Add to Sokoloff 2002: 401, 412.

90 See Müller-Kessler (in preparation).

91 Add new lemma זלעיקא to Sokoloff 2002.

92 See Müller-Kessler 2005a: 25–6; Neither Levene nor Morgenstern considered the published parallels.

93 Segal (2000: 50) is correct in his reading.

formulas (YBC 2393: 3; VA 2492: 5 [unpubl.]). The spelling כוני would be rather unusual for כיון.⁹⁴

41. (כ)פידיה גילגלי בעננא (כ)פידיה “his shoulders are the spheres in a cloud” (AMB B13: 5) clearly reads קוליה and in parallel קליה (Christie’s bowl l. 4). The compound “kp-yd” as proposed by Naveh and Shaked (1985: 207), is not feasible in Aramaic.⁹⁵ גילגלי is employed here as a *plurale tantum* corresponding to Mandaic *g’rgwly*’ in the sense “rumbling, thunder”.⁹⁶ The passage has to be understood as: “his voice is the thunder/rumbling in a cloud”.⁹⁷

42. *l’pwly*’ in *l’pwly*’ *bny*’ *n’s*’ “to prostrate humankind” (BM 117880: 10 = CAMIB 081M) is a scribal error for *l’p(d)wly*’. This emendation is possible on account of similar usage in *wb’y*’ *lpdwly*’ *t’t’ mn gbr*’ “and she tries to separate wife from man” instead of emended *lprw{l}(t)y*’ (YBC 2364: 23–4). The parallel has *w’n[tt’ mn] gbr’ lypdwly*’ (6Ba70–71 = BM 132948),⁹⁸ and in another bowl the variant appears: *d-’tt’ mn gbr’ t’pl’d* (MS 1928/5: 13; unpubl.).⁹⁹ This verbal root *pdl* is obviously a shortened variant of $\sqrt{pndl} = \sqrt{pndn}$ corresponding to Syriac \sqrt{plhd} “to separate, tear off, disperse”.¹⁰⁰ Although the root is not yet attested in Babylonian Talmudic Aramaic, it belongs to the lexical geography of Babylonia. A Mandaic parallel shows a synonym instead, *af’el* of \sqrt{npq} , *l’npwqy*’ “to drive out” (1London bowl l. 11 = Müller-Kessler 2001/02: 131).

43. לימ(ג. . .)א. (“...”) (Moussaieff 145: 4) instead of Levene 2003b: 100, is to be read לימעביא “to accumulate”, as in the parallel לימ(ע)ביא (MS 2053/159:4). It is an infinitive *pe’al* of עביל “to be thick, dense”.¹⁰¹

44. מגזא “...”, in הרשא טפא ומגנא ומגזא (MSF B24: 4) cannot be derived from \sqrt{gz} or the expected spelling would be מגזיא. The verbal root is \sqrt{gz} “to cut off”. The verb preceding ומגזא reads ומגזא, and not ומגנא as Naveh and Shaked (1993: 134, 136) suggested. It is obviously a case of dittography.

45. מדובקא see under מרובין.

94 Delete כוני and add כיון to Sokoloff 2002: 564. Since no proper names (with the exception of demon names) were integrated into the dictionary, כיון has no place in this dictionary.

95 New formations of compounds in Semitic languages are limited to the old and known compound-forming elements as there are in Aramaic בית “house”, בר “son”, בת “daughter”, and a few others (Nöldeke 1898: 83–4). They should not be construed according to the requirements of text interpretation. Some are compounds and some are only genitive constructions. When they are real compounds the second member determines gender and number בת קלא “voice (masc.)”, בני ארעא מקטלא, “the inhabitants kill (fem., sing.)” (AMB B13: 10), but when they are simply genitive constructions it is the first of member (*regens*) which denotes the gender and number, e.g. רוח מלאכה רבתי “the great spirit of the angel” (BM 139524: 8 = CAMIB 023A).

96 This meaning was already suggested by the editors in the commentary.

97 Add meaning גילגלי “rumbling, thunder” under Bo 78: 5 in Sokoloff 2002: 285 under גלגלא, which is also the understanding of ענני דאתין בגלגלא “clouds by clouds that come with thunder (= thunderstorm)” (Berachot 59a).

98 The lead roll has obviously *lyplwdy*’ instead of *lyprwdy*’ as first read by Müller-Kessler (1996: 188).

99 Shaul Shaked put photos of the bowl at my disposal.

100 Correct and add in Drower and Macuch 1963: 375, accordingly.

101 Add to Sokoloff 2002: 840 under עבי 1#.

46. מולה, in “and smites the brain and the earlap from her ear” (Moussaieff 1: 5) is not feasible according to Shaked (1995: 209). A translation “smites” needs to be spelled מְחִיא for a participle of the verbs III-y. It is, however, an active participle *af‘el* of נָחַת¹⁰² מולה is definitely an active participle *af‘el* of יָבַלְ < יוּלְ, as in the Mandaic extant root יוּלְ (Drower and Macuch 1963: 188) by intervocalic shift /w/ < /b/ (see also below under מקבלתא, קבלאתא). Translate now “(Ruḥa) places (it) on her brain und takes it from her ear” (SLBA).¹⁰³

47. מיצחו, in “and the crown of his forehead stands upright on their heads” (Moussaieff 6: 11) is translated by Shaked (1995: 213–14). מיצחו is a nominal form with the abstract forming suffix ו- derived from צָחַח “to shine, sparkle” and can be understood as “and they erected a crown of splendour on their heads”. A Hebrew lexeme (?) in an Aramaic sentence is in general not the rule in eastern magical texts. There is also a clear Mandaic concept behind the incantation formula.¹⁰⁴

Such an absolute state is employed in Aramaic to describe the material out of which objects are made, named genitive of material, e.g. in אטור גלל “on a mountain of stone” (Moussaieff 145: 1), כשורי אילן “beams of wood” (Moussaieff 145: 11), שוסטמין דברזל (ב)ריחיה דברזל ושושן ד[אבר, “shackles of iron, bolts¹⁰⁵ of iron and chains of [lead]” (Wiseman bowl 9 = TMH 7 11d),¹⁰⁶ but far more frequent is the alternative construction with the genitive particle and emphatic state, ואשנא רבתא דגללא² “and on a great rock of stone” (Moussaieff 145: 1), ואטורא, “a rock of stone” (AMB B13: 14), and וגביה גבא דגללא “and his back is a back of stone” (Christie’s bowl, l. 4), which can be clearly read.¹⁰⁷ Even if there is a tendency to avoid the absolute and replace it in later eastern Aramaic texts by the emphatic, the early texts still employ correct forms, and show very few deviations.¹⁰⁸ Another option for expressing the genitive of material is to use an adjective formed with the suffix *-āy* (Zugehörigkeitsadjektiv), as found in a pre-Classic Mandaic text ‘n’ [ʔwr] rb’ d-gl’l’ wgwrmyz’ r[b]’ d-przl’y’ “I am the great mountain of rock and the great fist of iron” (Christie’s lead roll ll. 3–5), and in a BTA bowl example, וקר {ק} פ(ד)נא רבא דניסכאיא “a great warrior of cast (iron)” (Moussaieff 145: 12).

102 Add to Sokoloff 2002: 743 under נָחַת Af. mng. 13.

103 Add to Sokoloff 2002: 522 under יָבַלְ.

104 Add new lemma to Sokoloff 2002.

105 The emendation is conceivable on account of new text sources, which employ Targumic expressions that are kept in Hebrew as can be seen in another bowl text בריחי ברזל “bolts of iron” (Moussaieff 145: 7).

106 The text was originally published by Geller (1976: 425–6), and presented again with new readings by Shaked (1999: 190), partially corrected by Müller-Kessler (2000: 225), and completely in Müller-Kessler 2005a: 58–60.

107 Naveh and Shaked 1985: 200 read וכיפיה ימא עליכון אטף דיגלל רבה טינרא רבה דיגלל אטף, but the *aleph* belongs to דיגללא, since there is a large space between *aleph* and *tet*; compare also the Christie’s parallel text. Translate: “he placed a great rock of stone upon you and flooded you, the sea and its shores”. It is obviously a case of haplography (א) דיגללא טף. Correct in Sokoloff 2002: 288, accordingly.

108 See Nöldeke 1875: 302–3.

48. מהרין, in מללא בישא, “and from mighty spells and from evil speech” (AMB B11: 3)¹⁰⁹ reads מסרין “treachery”. It is an abstract plural noun of מסר and is attested in the bowl text K 3449: 6 too. Another variant shows a plene spelling in the emphatic plural מאסרי (Geller D5: 9).¹¹⁰

49. ואילין משמתין ומנידין גזירין ותבירין, in מנידין, “and these are anathematized and thrust away, cut off and broken” (BM 91723: 2 = CAMIB 034A) is a continuous *falsa lectio* from Rodwell (1873) (מנודין), Halévy 1877, Chwolson 1882, Schwab 1890, Jeruzalmi 1963, Isbell 1975, and recently Segal 2000. The word clearly reads ומנזרין “and excommunicated”, a *pa’el* of the SLA lexeme נזר. It accords here far better with the row of banning verbs.¹¹¹

50. מקבלתא, in מקבלתא דאובהתא (Borsippa bowl l. 5–6) (KBA) is a garbled writing of *תקבלתא דאורחתא* as can be seen by the Syriac variant *tqblt’ dhršt’* (AO 17.284: 4 according to the handcopy of Fuÿe 1924). *tqblt’* is derived by the merging of intervocalic /b/ </w/ from **tqwlt’* as also attested for KBA, BTA גישתוש, נישתוש /w/ </b/ >/m/ (Moussaieff 102: 11; 145: 8) and other examples.¹¹² The Mandaic variants provide the missing link for this lexeme, *t’qblt’* {*d*-} *d-’whr’t’* “stumbling blocks of the road” (Macuch lead roll Ia17–18) and *wtyqlt’ d-’whr’t’* (Khuzistan lead roll b14–15).¹¹³ *Mem* and *taw* can easily be confused in the Mandaic script and may have caused just such a puzzling spelling in the transmission of the text formula; see also below under קבלתא.¹¹⁴

51. מרובין “educators (?)” in וטולנין ולילין וימרובין “shadow spirits, liliths, educators (?)” (MSF B15: 6)¹¹⁵ occurs again as מריבין (Geller A18) and as מדובקי (Geller A7).¹¹⁶ All three can clearly be read מרובין “gutter-demons”. מרובין also appears in the Moriah bowl l. 25.¹¹⁷ Another attestation מרזביא is found in the unedited Nippur bowl (12 N 387: 3),¹¹⁸ and now רוח מ{זר}{רז}יבי “spirit of gutter demons” (Moussaieff 1: 6).¹¹⁹ The latest attestation is מרזביא (VA 3854: 5).¹²⁰ מרובין is a phonetic variant of נרזבין¹²¹ as found in other bowl texts ניר(ז)בי (K 2080: 8)¹²²

109 Naveh and Shaked 1985: 184–7.

110 Both texts were published by Geller (1980: 58, 60). This interpretation makes Morgenstern’s (2007b: 250) alternative suggestion, to derive it from the root אסר, obsolete. The noun מ(א)סרין “binding(s)” does not exist. This would be אס(ו)רין. Delete lemma מהרא in Sokoloff 2002: 645 and under 2# מסרא p. 693, and add new lemma מסרין n.m.pl. “treachery” on p. 693.

111 Add to Sokoloff 2002: 740 under נזר Pa.

112 See on this geographical vocalic shift Morgenstern 2005: 355 and Müller-Kessler 2005b: 226.

113 See Müller-Kessler 1998: 343 for the synopsis.

114 Correct in Sokoloff 2002: 701, accordingly.

115 See Naveh and Shaked 1993: 115–16, 270 who took it to mean “educator”.

116 According to Geller 1980: 49, 51.

117 See Gordon 1984: 222, 224, who translated this demon group as “male monsters”.

118 See photo in McCown and Haines 1967. *Nippur* I, fig. 80, 1a.

119 See Shaked 1995: 210, n. 65 concerning this misspelling. It was correctly analysed in Sokoloff 2002: 705.

120 To be read instead of מרזביא in Levene 2003a: 105.

121 See Sokoloff 2002: 777.

122 Collated reading of bowl no. 8 in Gordon 1941: 129–30.

and נרזבי “gutters, roof sprouts” (Gordon H3).¹²³ Both נרזבין and מרזבין are well-known demon groups that frequently appear in Mandaic incantation formulas.¹²⁴ The eastern attestations and Qumran Aramaic מרזבין “sluice” (Enoch^c 238: 16)¹²⁵ are definite loans from Akkadian *nan/mšabu* “gutter”¹²⁶ and show a dissimilated form in Aramaic.¹²⁷

52. מרזקופתא “hanging”, in ונידרי ולוטתא ושיקופתא ומזגדתא ומרזקופתא (BM 91771: 7 = CAMIB 039A) reads מרזקהפתא “...” instead. It is a nominal form of the *saf’el* “to hasten, to be angry” based on the sound shifts /z/ < /s/ and /p/ < /b/.¹²⁸

53. משישבי, in נהורא חשיכית בבי אחדית משישבי סכרית “the light I darkened, the doors I closed, the windows I shut” (BM 91776: 14 = CAMIB 036A), better read as משישבי. It could be a nominal form of the Akkadian *šaf’el* stem of *wašābu*, a loan in Aramaic; cf. also *mūšabtu* “a part of a house?” from *Šumma ālu* (tablet 46).¹²⁹ משישבי is attested next to this KBA bowl in Mandaic, where it puzzled Drower and Macuch (1963: 280), who interpreted *mšasbia* as “window”. A preferable interpretation is to take it to mean “door in a gate” or “porter’s lodge”. One could also consider a connection with Qumran Aramaic שפש “door in a gate” 5Q I i 8 and the Talmudic Hebrew word משופש.¹³⁰

54. נינרונה ונישיזבניה ניפחזניה וניכלכלונה ל... “they will guard and save and encourage and maintain...” (Borsippa bowl l. 10) (KBA) is a misspelling of ניפ(ר)הזניה “they shall abstain him”.¹³¹ It can be corrected after Mandaic parallels *n’prhzwñh* (Khuzistan lead roll c8) and *nypr[h]zwn [n]* (Macuch lead roll Ia50–51) and the Syriac variants *nprhzwñwn* (IM 60960: 10 = TMH 7 3A), with metathesis *nprhẓwn* (AO 17.284: 8), which provide the expected spelling.¹³² Another corrupted form is יפרזון, but without *he* in ויפרחון וייעון ויגערון ויפרון (BM 131669: 2–3 = CAMIB 020A). The verb is of Iranian origin and probably loaned from Middle Persian *phrēz* I “to abstain, restrain” into Central Babylonian Aramaic. In the Mandaic dictionary it is connected with Modern Persian *parhiz*.¹³³ Obviously Mandaic *’prwz l’hy’* (DC 40: 491; unpubl.)¹³⁴ is a short form of *prhz* as well, and not a loan from Hebrew.¹³⁵

123 See Gordon 1937: 86.

124 See Drower and Macuch 1963: 286 for Mandaic attestations, *n’rzwby’ = m’rzwby’*, and under *m’rzwby’* p. 254.

125 Beyer (1984: 693) listed מרזב under a root *רזב based on the suggestion by Jastrow 1903: 840. However, he took it as a conceivable loan.

126 *AHW*, pp. 757–8; *CAD* N II, p. 52.

127 Delete in Sokoloff 2002: 777 and add to p. 705. Sokoloff rejected a connection with Syriac *mrwby’* “educator”.

128 Add new lemma to Sokoloff 2002.

129 See *CAD* M II, p. 250.

130 See Drower and Macuch 1963: 378b. Add new lemma to Sokoloff 2002.

131 Harviainen (1981: 5–6, 15) connected it with the Syriac verb *phz* “to be reckless”.

132 Cf. Müller-Kessler 1998: 344.

133 On this *hapax legomenon*, see *CAD* M II, p. 250b.

134 See Drower and Macuch 1963: 379a.

135 See on the correct placing of this verb Shaked 1985: 106. In another article, Shaked (1993: 153–4) dealt with the infinitives פרהוי and פרהודי in BTA, but did not mention

55. עברא,¹³⁶ in [תא על מחו]... תא על ליביה כן “and sit like a slave on his heart, like a . . . on his brain” (BM 91767: 4–5 = CAMIB 040A) is clearly to be read גירבא, and not with ‘*ayin* and *resh* עברא “bolt” as suggested by Ford in Morgenstern 2007a: 13. The letter ‘*ayin* is always well executed by the scribe in this bowl text.¹³⁷ It is an obvious misspelling of צירבא “lead or purified silver” (AO 1177: 4). Read ותיבי כי גירבא על ליביה כן [פר]זלא על מחי “and sit like lead on his heart, like iron¹³⁸ on his brain”.¹³⁹

56. סגמה, in סגמה פומה “(that spirit) shuts up her mouth” (Moussaieff 1: 11)¹⁴⁰ is a puzzling root from an etymological point of view, since the verb \sqrt{sgm} does not exist in Aramaic. It has been correctly translated by the editor as “shuts up” for obvious contextual reasons. Sokoloff did not integrate this verbal root in his JBA dictionary on account of doubt. However, the same spelling can frequently be found in Mandaic in the passive participles *pe'al* and *pa'el*: ‘*syr*’ *wsdym*’ *wmsg'm*’ *wrgyl*’ ‘*str*’ *rbty*’ “bound and fettered, and shackled and hobbled is the great Ištar” (CBS 2941: 10 = AIT 39), in an enlarged version: ‘*syr*’ *wsdym*’ *whdym*’ *wsgym*’ *wmsg'm*’ *wrgyl*’ *wmr'gl*’ ‘*str*’ *rbty*’ (1London bowl ll. 21–2; unpubl.); and in a very short variant ‘*syr*’ ‘*str*’ *rbyty*’ *d-byt*’ *bwg'd'n*’ (1Ba255–6 = BM 132947+; unpubl.), it is missing. According to the Mandaic dictionary there is another passage with an imperfect *l'sgwm* *lyspyh'twn* (DC 44; unpubl.).¹⁴¹ All spellings of the verb *sgm* are graphic errors for *štm* “to shackle, stop up”, as *gimel* and *ṭet* can be easily confused in the Mandaic script. The two characters are often not clearly distinguished by the scribes, as the present author experienced while deciphering Mandaic metal amulets.¹⁴²

57. באדא אכלא רבא דזיוא {סורא} ספסי {פ} {ר} רבא דזלעיקא, in ספסיפא “with a great mace of splendour, a great sword of ray” (CBS 16041: 15 = AIT 27; unpubl.)

his earlier suggestion. At the same time Gignoux (1987: 43) independently reached the same conclusion. Delete 2# פזו in Sokoloff 2002: 895 and add under פרהז p. 928.

136 Read in Müller-Kessler 2001/02: 128.

137 The same is true for the correction of ויליביה (Segal 2000) or ויליביה (Müller-Kessler 2001/02) to עלויבה by Morgenstern (2007a: 7–8), which is not convincing, since there is no clear ‘*ayin* at the beginning, although it would make good sense.

138 The passage after *כ* is damaged. No *ṭet* can be seen after *kaph*. The misplaced *ṭet* from the line above does not fit into this narrow space. It belongs to the damaged name [זו]ט[ר]א of l. 4 above and not to a hypothetical טענא as claimed by Morgenstern (2007a: 6, 13), quoting a written suggestion by J. N. Ford. There is no indication that the letter before the *aleph* could be *nun* as Ford suggested for a reading ט(ע)נא. Only the bottom part of *zain* and *lamed* are visible in פרזלא. Two metals make more sense in this description. The context here is not of binding, as Morgenstern assumes by quoting deviating Mandaic passages, but of a heavy load in the form of metals sitting on heart and brain.

139 Add to Sokoloff 2002: 753. How can Morgenstern (2007a: 13) find the reading of גירבא on the base of Louvre bowl (AO 1177: 4) “not compelling” when he has not seen the original text? Even the BM 91767 text does not show עברא, since the first letter is not an ‘*ayin*.

140 Published in Shaked 1995: 207, 210.

141 See Drower and Macuch 1963: 318.

142 Add secondary root סגמב with cross-reference to סטמב to Sokoloff 2002: 788.

passage) is an obvious scribal error for Iranian ספסירא “sword”. It is frequently attested in BTA texts and occurs once in Mandaic as *s'bsyr'* in *Shafta d-Pishra d-Ainia* (= DC 21: 201).¹⁴³

58. עד אמה דנינדי מוקרייה על גללי in עד אמה ד- “until his brain was bespattered on the stones” (Moussaieff 163: 24) is a misspelling of the conjunction עדמא ד- “until”, and not of עד אימת(י) “until comes time and season so that there is understanding” (BM 91767: 11 = CAMIB 040A) it might simply be considered as a plene spelling of עדמא.¹⁴⁵

59. *'dylt'*, in *wdkwl dš't' (my') mn [..] (w)'dylt' wb(')q' dndryn lh l_* “and anyone who drinks water (?) from ... and the accusation and convulsion that they pour down on ...” (MSF B26: 3) (KS) is not possible. The whole passage is to be read: *wdkwl dš't' my' mn nhr' w [kl] gblyt' wm[ny]' dndryn lh l_* “and everyone who drinks water from the river and e[ats] dough, and the vessels that one vows to him ...”.

60. פולקתא, in פולקתא בפומה “He cast a hatchet into her mouth” (AMB B13: 8) and similarly in the variant רמי להו פולקתא בפומיהו (Christie’s bowl l. 6). Naveh and Shaked (1985: 208) connected it with *p(y)lg'* “axe”, attested in Syriac and Mandaic. However, the feminine ending in פולקתא makes this doubtful. I wonder if it is not an error for Mandaic *pygwdt' bpwmh'* “bridle in his mouth” (DC 43 J 149; unpubl.),¹⁴⁶ but without a Mandaic parallel, פולקתא remains enigmatic. Translate “cast him/them a bridle into her/their mouth”.

61. ולא כולה פלגוד ... ולא כולה משריתך ... ולא כולה מרכבתך in פלגוד “and not the whole *plgwd* ... , and not the whole of your camp ... and not the whole of your chariot” (Moussaieff 6: 19) according to Shaked (1995: 213–5) reads פלגיד “your phalanx”, and also in l. 16, where the scribe erred, since it should be read פלגיה, on account of succeeding מרכבתה. ומן כולה משריתיה ... ומן כולה מרכבתה. A recent attestation is לפלגא דשידי “for the phalanx of Šedas” (Moussaieff 145: 4).¹⁴⁷

62. הלין מלאכי ניהוון פרחוני ומיצרי בניי טב לביש in פרחוני “these angels will be exorcists (??) and boundaries between good and evil” (Borsippa bowl l. 9 [KBA])¹⁴⁸ is an error for פרשוני “divisions” according to the only extant variant in Mandaic *lhwwlh'*¹⁴⁹ *pw{r}rš'n' myšry b'ny' byš' l't'b'* “(the four angels) may be for him division (and) borders between bad and good” (Macuch lead roll Ia45–7). Also the scribe of the Syriac text variant erred, *nhw' pr(š)wn' wmyšr' byny dbyš': wltb'* (IM 60960:10 = TMH 7 3A).¹⁵⁰

143 Add to Sokoloff 2002: 826.

144 On the correct interpretation see Müller-Kessler 2005b: 244.

145 See Morgenstern 2007a: 19 for this reading and suggestion.

146 See Drower and Macuch 1963: 370.

147 Add new lemma 4# פלגא n.m. (<φάλαγξ; Sy *plg'* II LS 571, Ma *plng' d-n'n'y* (1Ba239' = BM 132947+), *pl'ng' mn'y* (BM 91777: 21 = CAMIB 109M (Segal 2000: 139 read *pl'nt'*)), MD 373 to Sokoloff 2002.

148 According to Harviainen 1981: 5; ניהוון is a preferable reading to ניהוין.

149 Read instead *lhwwn* as in Müller-Kessler 1998: 344.

150 Add new lemma פרשונא to Sokoloff 2002.

63. פיריוטי, in פיריוטי בישי ופיריוטי תקיפי בעלדבבי “mighty enemies, evil pirates” (K 3449: 6), can hardly have the meaning “pirates” as suggested by Geller (1980: 60). Although the reading of the text could not be checked, the interpretation of פיריוטי as “pirates”, from Greek *πειρατής*, is impossible in a Mesopotamian magic text of that period. פיריוטי is obviously a spelling mistake for פִּיטוּרִי. The word is of Iranian origin and was explained by Shaked (1985: 106) as being borrowed from Middle Persian *paityārak-*. Shaked did not mention the earlier Mandaic attestations *piṭiara* for which Furlani (1954), followed by Drower and Macuch (1963: 370b) had proposed a derivation from $\sqrt{pṭr}$. פִּיטוּרִי frequently occurs in Mandaic magic texts. It is employed as the Iranian counterpart of the Akkadian loanword בעלדבבי “enemy”. In the Mesopotamian Aramaic incantation type Iranian terms are often juxtaposed with Akkadian ones, פתכרי – אלהי – דיוי, שידי – דיוי, and there are more examples in Aramaic demon lists to be noted.

64. ונידרי ולוטתא ושיקופיתא וזיגוריתא¹⁵¹ וקבלאתא, in קבלאתא, “and vows and curses and afflictions and . . . and charms” (MSF B23: 2–3) is a *hapax legomenon*. קבלאתא can hardly be an unattested plural of קיבלא “countercharm” as Naveh and Shaked (1993: 132) interpreted it, but is obviously a corruption of “stumbling blocks” תקולאתא </b/ </w/, see above under מקבלתא.¹⁵²

65. קומה “from her presence” (AMB B13: 8) as read and translated by Naveh and Shaked (1985: 198–9) would be a *hapax* form of the preposition קודם “before” in the period of Late Aramaic from Babylonia. For its obvious correct interpretation see above under אזה.¹⁵³ However, the preceding קמה in שפיך מוקרה in קמה “spill out [not שפיך pierced; imperative not perfect] her brain before her” (AMB B13: 8) and in the variant שפיך מוקריהו קמיהו “spill out¹⁵⁴ their brain before them” (Christie’s bowl l. 6) is the expected BTA form of קודם. The preposition appears again in דחתימה ליה נפשיה מיטול דחתימה ליה נפשיה לאבא רבה קדמאה “for his soul is sealed for him, for his soul is sealed for the great primordial Father, and (the soul) is erected before him as a shield/protector of pure steel, and it is erected before him, for the great primordial Father” (Moussaieff 4: [2.1–2.3] = Shaked 2006: 373).¹⁵⁵

66. קינא, in קינא ימא אכיף ימא קינא “I am standing upon the shore of the sea” (Moussaieff 145: 9) – in the parallel text קאינה (MS 2053/159:9) – is neither a misspelling nor a verbal form of \sqrt{qm} with elision of /m/ and a shortened suffix of the independent personal pronoun first singular אנה-, as translated by Levene (2003b: 103). Morgenstern (2007b: 265) still maintains the suggestion that

151 For a new solution for וזיגוריתא see above.

152 Correct in Juusola 1999: 32 and add to Sokoloff 2002, accordingly.

153 Delete in Juusola 1999: 61, 63 under the phonetic feature and under the preposition on p. 147.

154 Both text variants show a clear final *kaph*.

155 Shaked’s translation: “For his soul is sealed, because his soul is sealed, (the soul of) the Great Primordial Father. In front of him there stands upright a shield of pure steel, it stands upright in front of the Great Primordial Father” cannot be correct, since only the soul is the feminine subject here.

both forms represent phonetic spellings for historical קאימנא by apocope of /m/ as to be found in BTA. However, קאינה/קינא is not a verb here, but a case of a noun IIIy, which by epenthesis of קניא “reed” becomes קאינא. קאינא was obviously borrowed in this spelling from Mandaic *q’yn’*,¹⁵⁶ as is to be noted in other examples in this text that certain orthographic features, lexemes, and concepts speak for a Mandaic forerunner. ימא קינא corresponds to *y’m’ q-swp* in Mandaic. The other reason why the interpretation as a verb cannot be correct is that, according to the structure of the text, a finite verb – third person and not first person – should start the sentence “he bend down the reed sea”. The anonymous speaker opens the magical story in direct speech in l. 1 (אטור גלל קינא “I stood on a mountain of stone”) and continues then at the end of l. 9, אמנליה דזיבי משיילנא ליה מומינא ליה לעופא רבא דזיבי “I said, asked (and) adjured the great bird of the rivers”.^{157,158}

67. *qrd’n’*, in *wmn bwršh q-qrd’n’ q-sykyn’ w’swq’ q-przl’* “and from the edge of the corrosion of a knife and a splinter of iron” (Christie’s lead roll, 60–62)¹⁵⁹ is a *hapax legomenon* in Mandaic. It is obviously derived from the verb \sqrt{qrd} “to corrode” plus the noun-forming suffix *-ān*. Although the Mandaic dictionary lists a verb \sqrt{qrd} and connects it with the *pa’el* of \sqrt{qrd} in Syriac (Drower and Macuch 1963: 415), Brockelmann (1928: 693a) doubted the reading and suggested \sqrt{bdr} instead. The root could be cognate with Arabic \sqrt{qrd} “to corrode”. An alternative solution may be that this is a case of *n/l* interchange, and then it would be connected with Syriac *qrdl’* “hanging pot”, borrowed from Greek *καλδάρτιον*. In this case the passage would have to be translated “and from the edge of a hanging pot, of a knife, and a splinter of iron”. Another possibility could be a confusion of letters in the script, i.e. one might read *mem* instead of *qof*, which can easily be confused in Mandaic script. *mrd’n’* would be then “spindle”, as attested in Geonic Aramaic and Syriac (Sokoloff 2002: 704).

68. {רכיבי}, in אריא רכיבא מורניתא בידה נקיטא {רכיבי} “like the goddess Deliwat (who) comes at your head, mounting a lion, holding a lance in her hand, handing over a *zargona* to the gods and a *zargona* to the goddesses” (AMB B13: 15). The passage is not in need of emendation, as Naveh and Shaked (1985: 212) claimed: “{rkyby}, {gwn’ Pylhy} in both cases the scribe seems to have corrected himself without crossing out the wrong words”. The text itself makes good sense, if read: מורניתא בידה נקיטא מנסבא גונא לאילהי {זרגונא לאילהי} זרגונא לאיסרתא הפכלהו לאילהי “coming like the Ištar-Delibat with a head(s) of stars (Strahlenkranz), riding a lion, holding a lance in her hand, handing over a ... to the gods and a golden coloured (star) to the goddesses, he overturns the gods with sorcery”.

156 See Drower and Macuch 1963: 400.

157 Compare a similarly structured Mandaic magic story in Müller-Kessler 1999b: 443–4 (2Ab = BM 135794 II’).

158 Add to Sokoloff 2002: 1013 under 3# קינא, which is not “crossbeam”, but “reed”.

159 Müller-Kessler 1999b: 442. The text parallel in 1Aa60 (= BM 135791 I) shows a clear *qof* (as does the handcopy executed by R. Pientka).

There is only one case of dittography {זורגונא לאילהי} to be noted and a scribal error in כבי ככי.¹⁶⁰

The description of the deity Delibat is reminiscent of the Late Babylonian concept of the warlike Ištar in Mesopotamian iconography, where she is considered the hypostasis of Ištar, and therefore one calls her Ištar-Delibat.¹⁶¹ She is quite a controversial goddess, known to have a lion and a weapon as her divine symbols. Her astral function is that of a venus deity, hence the mention of a head of stars (Strahlenkranz). Further, it is supported by the Mandaic concept, *ṣ'hm' d-dlyb't* “the radiance of Delibat” (Khuzistan lead roll d6–7 = Naveh and Greenfield 1985: 98).

The cult of Delibat and her Aramaic background can be traced back to her rise as deity in the Late Achaeminid and Hellenistic periods according to the cuneiform sources, where her name occurs in the onomasticon from Uruk.¹⁶² Later she merged with the Iranian deity Anāhīd.¹⁶³ Her Akkadian epithet *ezzetu* “awe-inspiring” – only the Urukain Ištar carries it – is in Aramaic “*zyzt*”, which became the Arabian al-‘Uzzā, “the Venus-star”,¹⁶⁴ the Arabic relative form of ‘*zyt*’. She features in many Mandaic magical texts as goddess of love, *lyb't m'rty' šwpr' wrg'g'* “Libat, mistress of beauty and desire” (DC 46 226: 7)¹⁶⁵ and square script bowl texts as well, “and in the name of the awe-inspiring Delibat, lady¹ of the mysteries of love” (CBS 2937 + CBS 2977: 1 = Müller-Kessler (in preparation)).

69. ואם לא איתי עליכון קניא שב גובי דשב נשי הרשתא “their ghosts”, in שולניתהון “and if not I shall bring against you a rod of seven pieces that seven sorcerous women are riding and their eight ghosts” (Moussaieff 164: 11). שולניתהון is identical to שלניתה in שולניתה וחטיפיתה “you are Lilith, Lilith of the desert, the robbing one and the snatching one” (CBS 16020: 2 = TMH 7 11a). The meaning “ghost” taken up by Levene (2007: 62) is derived from an emendation of שלניתה by Scholem to טולניתה*, which found its way into Sokoloff’s JBA dictionary; however, all text passages read שלניתה/ה.¹⁶⁶ As the root שלל is not productive in Aramaic, it must be a loan from Hebrew or Akkadian.¹⁶⁷ The text passage should be read and translated

160 The parallel deviates from the expected *zyzt* “as the Ištar-Delibat, coming with heads of stars (Strahlenkranz), riding a lion, holding a lance in her hand, handing over a . . . to the gods and a golden coloured (star) to the goddesses. He overturned the gods with sorcery” (Christie’s bowl II. 12–3).

161 Compare the female client name אסתר אנהיד “Ištar-Anahid” (BM 136204: 5 = CAMIB 068A). The generic use of אסתר would be “goddess Deliwat”.

162 See the theophoric names ¹Mannu-ki-^dDilbat in Hellenistic Uruk, e.g., BRM 2 4 24; 10 1; 11 27; 13 27; 46 24; OECT 9 58 8; Stolper 1993 A2–8, 18; A2–9, 19; TCL 13 235 31; 248 19; Weisberg 1991 text 34:18, 22; 22:4, 9, but also Riḥat-^dDilbat BRM 2 42:1.

163 See Boyce 1985: 1003–06.

164 Montgomery (1913: 217) was the first to propose this connection.

165 See Drower 1943: 226; in the *Book of Black Magic* edited by Drower 1943: 162–5, 168, and *lyb't 'zyzt* “the awe-inspiring Libat” in the unpublished scroll DC 40: 643 (unpubl.).

166 See Sokoloff 2002: 505 and its correction list available through CAL.

167 See Müller-Kessler 2005a: 47.

“and if he does not bring upon you a reed of seven pieces of seven sorceresses who see him and their eight robbing ones”.

70. שיפורי, in שיפורי ושמהתא (Gordon D2) and in שיפורי ואשלמתא ושפורה (VA 2416: 10 = Wohlstein 1894: 11; collated) has no connection with the Hebrew word שיפורא “shofar, trumpet”, as Sokoloff (2002: 1139) would like to understand it by following previous editors. Although homonymous, they are both shortened variants of שופהרי, meaning something like “exorcism” or “slander”. The noun seems to have an original *h*; compare other variant spellings in KBA [corrected] ו(א)שלאמתא שופהרי (BM 91771: 1–2 = Müller-Kessler 2001/2: 125),¹⁶⁸ in Mandaic, *šwp'ry' w'wbdy'* “exorcisms and magical practices” (2Bb10–11 = BM 132956 +; unpubl.), and *br špwhr' w'l'hy' wp'tykry'* (DC 47 Drower 1946: 331).¹⁶⁹

71. שיקא “Šiqa-demon”, in הפיך היפיכה ארעה היפיכה שיקא (Pearson bowl l. 1) and again in הפיך היפיכה {ארע} ארעה היפיכה שיקא (IM 9726: 1) is not an unattested “Šiqa-demon”,¹⁷⁰ but is probably a corrupted spelling of ש(ו)מיא “heaven”, as already pointed out by Geller (1986: 104). Thus the feminine form היפיכה,¹⁷¹ since ש(ו)מיא is considered singular and feminine in the Late Aramaic dialects of the East; compare now the new parallels הפיכה הפיכה ארעה “overturned, overturned, overturned is the heaven and overturned is the earth” (BM 91745: 1 = CAMIB 005A), הפיכה הפיכה (BM 91713:1–2 = CAMIB 001A).¹⁷²

72. תברא “misfortune”, in ת(ב)רא בליליה ולא תברא בימאמה ולא תברא ת(ב)רא בליליה (MSF B25: 8) was suggested by Naveh and Shaked (1993: 137–8). This ghost word תברא has to be read here in the first instance as חברא “companion” and in the second צותא “escort”. It can now be translated “and ולא תיהיליה לא חברא בימאמה ולא צותא בליליה” and you (fem. sing.) shall not be¹⁷³ for him a companion at daytime and an escort at

168 Segal 2000: 79 read שופהרי.

169 Correct in Sokoloff 2002: 1139 under Bo 56 and Bo 120: 8, respectively.

170 Hunter 2000: 141–2.

171 אופיכה instead of היפיכה is based on vowel harmony, and the variant אופיכה, not אופיכה, is formed from the doublette \sqrt{pk} , an interchangeable spelling of a phonetic nature, which has been attested since Early Aramaic. It is a known feature, even for conservatively spelled Aramaic dialects such as CPA (early stratum), and is not a novelty in the Rabbinic texts of the east and Mandaic as presented in Morgenstern 2007b: 251–3. The contemporary bowl texts in Syriac scripts complicate the matter, as they often employ in this case *het* instead of *he* – one grapheme for two phonemes – see Moriggi 2004: 116–8; additions in Müller-Kessler 2006b: 267. A comparable shift of initial *he* to *aleph* in Aramaic is that the original causative stem *haf'el* became *af'el*, since /h/ is a weak phoneme.

172 My colleague T. Kwasman drew my attention to Hebrew שחק “heaven, third heaven”, but then one would have to explain the missing *het* and why the noun is treated here as feminine.

173 Has to be read as a ligature, since the whole text passage is always addressing a second masculine plural.

night”); compare a similar parallel from Nippur בליליה וצותא בריממא ולא (HS 3016: 5–6 = TMH 7 11), and a shortened version ודיממה דליליה (Moussaieff 156: 9), and a Mandaic example *wl' thw(y)lh šwt' bym'm' wl' lwy' blyly'* (Christie's lead roll ll. 92–3).¹⁷⁴

73. תי{ת}י, in הרבא דקטלא “he(?) comes and in his hand there is a sword of slaying” (AMB B13: 6) is not a scribal slip, but correct, since with תי{ת}י “you shall come” opens the direct speech after the description of מריא בגדנא “lord Bagdana”. This mighty and great lord Bagdana is summoned to kill an anonymous Lilith and other demons. The act of killing is described from l. 8 onwards in the form of imperatives (see above under no. 1). The parallel shows דייקטלא הרבא דייקטלא תי{ת}י “you shall come with a sword that kills” (Christie's bowl l. 4).¹⁷⁵

74. תמרורתיה, in תמרורתיה ולא תי(מ)ירון בתמרורתיה (MSF B25:8)¹⁷⁶ is a tautological phrase¹⁷⁷ and should be read and emended to ב{תמ}דירתיה (SLBA lexeme) or better to ב{ת}מדורתיה (CBA lexeme) “and you (fem.) shall not dwell in his dwelling”. L. 11 shows the SLA lexeme דירתיה.¹⁷⁸

Abbreviations

All Assyriological abbreviations follow the *CAD*

<i>AHw</i> :	von Soden 1965–81
AIT:	Montgomery 1913
AMB B:	Naveh and Shaked 1985
AO 17.284:	Müller-Kessler 1998: 334
Borsippa bowl:	Harviainen 1981
BS:	Bowl Syriac
BTA:	Babylonian Talmudic Aramaic
<i>CAD</i> :	Oppenheim 1956–
CAMIB:	Segal 2000
Christie's lead roll:	Müller-Kessler 1999b
Christie's bowl:	Christie's New York Antiquities Friday 7 December 2000, lot 734 (A Mesopotamian Incantation Bowl) by the same scribe as of AMB B13
CPA:	Christian Palestinian Aramaic

174 Delete in Sokoloff 2002: 1192 under תברא, mng. 2 and add to תברא p. 429 and צותא p. 955. Correct in Juusola 1999: 30; see for the latest reading Müller-Kessler 2007: 79, 85.

175 See, for the earliest example, the Uruk incantation and the Aramaic magical text stories in general (Müller-Kessler 1999b, 2002a, 2002b).

176 Naveh and Shaked (1993: 137) read תמרורתיה ב{ת}ירון בתמרורתיה.

177 Other tautological phrases are found in תמיתא בהומרי טמיתא “he (= Šamiš) fought (*pa'el*) against Šedas and slaughtered (*pa'el*) impure Humartas” (AMB B13: 22) instead of Naveh and Shaked (1985: 202) “the battle against the demons is approaching, the slaughter of impure amulet-spirits is killing”. Add *pa'el* attestations of קטל and of קרב to Sokoloff 2002: 1007, 1038.

178 See Müller-Kessler 2007: 85 on this new interpretation.

CSA:	Central South Babylonian Aramaic
Gordon D:	Gordon 1934
KBA:	<i>koiné</i> Babylonian Aramaic
Khuzistan lead roll:	Greenfield and Naveh 1985
KS:	<i>Koiné</i> Syriac
MS:	Martin Schøyen Collection
Macuch lead roll I b:	Müller-Kessler 1998
MSF B:	Naveh and Shaked 1993
SLBA:	Standard Literary Babylonian Aramaic
TMH 7:	Müller-Kessler, 2005a

References

- Beyer, K. 1984. *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*. Göttingen.
- Boyce, M. I. 1985. “*Ardwīsūr Anāhīd*”, in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. Vol. I. London, 1003–06.
- Brockelmann, C. 1908. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*. Vol. I. Berlin.
- Brockelmann, C. 1928. *Lexicon Syriacum*. Halle.
- Chwolson, D. 1882. “Die Inschriften auf den babylonischen Thongefäßen”, *Corpus Inscriptionum Hebraicarum*. St Petersburg, col. 103–120.
- Drower, E.S. 1943. “A Mandaean book of black magic”, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 149–81.
- Drower, E.S. 1946. “A phylactery for rue (An invocation of the personified herb)”, *Orientalia Nova Series* 15, 324–46.
- Drower, E.S. and R. Macuch. 1963. *A Mandaic Dictionary*. Oxford.
- Ford, J.N. 2002. “Notes on the Mandaic incantation bowls in the British Museum”, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 26, 237–72.
- Furlani, G. 1954. “I nomi dele classi dei demōni i presso i mandei”, in *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei anno CCCLI – 1954. Memorie. Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Serie VIII Vol. IXn*, 389–435.
- de la Fuÿe, A. 1924. “Une coupe magique en écriture manichéenne”, *Comptes rendus des séances de l’année. Académie des Inscriptions & Belles-Lettres*, 388–99.
- Geller, M.J. 1976. “Two incantation bowls inscribed in Syriac and Aramaic”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 39, 422–27.
- Geller, M.J. 1980. “Four Aramaic incantation bowls”, in G. Rendsburg et al. (eds), *The Bible World. Essays in Honor of Cyrus H. Gordon*. New York, 47–60.
- Geller, M.J. 1986. “Eight incantation bowls”, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 17, 101–17.
- Gignoux, P. 1987. *Incantations magiques syriaques*. Louvain.
- Gordon, C.H. 1934. “Aramaic magical bowls in the Istanbul and Baghdad Museums”, *Archiv Orientální* 6, 319–334, pls. X–XV.
- Gordon, C.H. 1937. “Aramaic and Mandaic magical bowls”, *Archiv Orientální* 9, 84–106, pls. II–XIII.
- Gordon, C.H. 1941. “Aramaic incantation bowls”, *Orientalia Nova Series* 10, 116–41, 339–60.
- Gordon, C.H. 1984. “Magic bowls in the Moriah Collection”, *Orientalia Nova Series* 53, 220–39.

- Gorea, M. 2003. "Trois nouvelles coupes magiques araméennes", *Semitica* 51, 53–73.
- Greenfield, J.C. and J. Naveh. 1985. "A Mandaic lead amulet with four incantations", *Erets Israel* 18, 98–108 [in Hebrew].
- Greenfield, J.C. and M. Sokoloff. 1992. "The contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Aramaic vocabulary", in T. Muraoka (ed.), *Studies in Qumran Aramaic* (Abr-Nahrain Suppl. 3. Louvain), 78–98.
- Halévy, J. 1877. "Observation sur un vase judéo-babylonien du British Museum?" *Comptes-Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, 288–293.
- Hamilton, V.P. 1971. "Syriac incantation bowls" (Unpublished dissertation, Brandeis University).
- Harviainen, T. 1978. "A Syriac incantation bowl in the Finnish National Museum, Helsinki", *Studia Orientalia* 51/1, 3–28, pl. 2.
- Harviainen, T. 1981. "An Aramaic incantation bowl from Borsippa", *Studia Orientalia* 51/14, 3–15.
- Hunter, E.C.D. 2000. "Two incantation bowls from Babylon", *Iraq* 62, 139–47.
- Jastrow, M. 1903. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Jerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. London.
- Juusola, H. 1999. *Linguistic Peculiarities in the Aramaic Magic Bowl Texts*. Studia Orientalia 86. Helsinki.
- Levene, D. 1999. "'... and by the name of Jesus ...'. An unpublished magic bowl in Jewish Aramaic", *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 6, 283–308.
- Levene, D. 2003a. "Heal O' Israel: A pair of duplicate magic bowls from the Pergamon Museum in Berlin", *Journal of Jewish Studies* 54, 104–20.
- Levene, D. 2003b. *A Corpus of Magic Bowls: Incantation Texts in Jewish Aramaic from Late Antiquity*. London.
- Levene, D. 2007. "'If you appear as a pig': Another incantation bowl (Moussaieff 164)", *Journal of Semitic Studies* 52, 59–67, pls. 1–3.
- MacKenzie, D.N. 1971. *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*. London.
- Macuch, R. 1967. "Altmandäische Bleirollen (Erster Teil)", in F. Altheim and R. Stiehl (eds), *Die Araber in der Alten Welt*, Bd. 4. Berlin, 91–203.
- Mankowski, P.V. 2000. *Akkadian Loanwords in Biblical Hebrew* (HSS 47). Winona Lake, IN.
- McCown, D.E. and D. Haines. 1967. *Nippur I. Temple of Enlil, Scribal Quarter, and Soundings*. (Oriental Institute Publications 78.) Chicago.
- Montgomery, J.A. 1913. *Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur*. (Publications of the Babylonian Section 3.) Philadelphia.
- Morgenstern, M. 2005. "Linguistic notes on magic bowls in the Moussaieff Collection", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 68, 349–67.
- Morgenstern, M. 2007a. "The Jewish Babylonian Aramaic magic bowl BM 91767 reconsidered", *Le Muséon* 120, 5–27.
- Morgenstern, M. 2007b. "On some non-standard spellings in the Aramaic magic bowls and their linguistic significance", *Journal of Semitic Studies* 52, 245–77.
- Moriggi, M. 2001. "Aramaean demons in Rome: incantation bowls in the Museo Nazionale d'Arte Orientale", *East and West* 51, 205–28.
- Moriggi, M. 2004. *La lingua delle coppe magiche siriache*. Dipartimento di Linguistica Università di Firenze. Florence.
- Moriggi, M. 2005. "Two new incantation bowls from Rome (Italy)", *Aramaic Studies* 3, 43–58.

- Müller-Kessler, C. 1996. "The story of Bguzan-Lilit, daughter of Zanay-Lilit", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 116, 185–95.
- Müller-Kessler, C. 1998. "Aramäische Koine – Ein Beschwörungsformular aus Mesopotamien", *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 29, 331–48.
- Müller-Kessler, C. 1999a. "Puzzling words and spellings in Babylonian Aramaic magic bowls", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 62, 111–14.
- Müller-Kessler, C. 1999b. "Aramäische Beschwörungen und astronomische Omina in nachbabylonischer Zeit – Das Fortleben mesopotamischer Kultur im Vorderen Orient", in J. Renger (ed.), *Babylon: Focus mesopotamischer Geschichte, Wiege früher Gelehrsamkeit, Mythos in der Moderne* (2. Internationales Colloquium der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 1998 in Berlin.) Saarbrücken, 427–43.
- Müller-Kessler, C. 2000. "SŠTM, ŠSTM, ŠŠTM, SŠTM or ŠŠTM: A technical term for shackling demons. Contributions to the Babylonian Aramaic dictionary", *Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 37, 224–28.
- Müller-Kessler, C. 2001/02. "Die Zauberschalen des British Museum", *Archiv für Orientforschung* 48/49, 115–45.
- Müller-Kessler, C. 2002. "Die aramäische Beschwörung und ihre Rezeption in den mandäisch-magischen Texten am Beispiel ausgewählter aramäischer Beschwörungs-formulare", in R. Gyselen (ed.), *Charmes et sortilèges, magie et magiciens* (Res Orientales XIV.) Leuven, 193–208.
- Müller-Kessler, C. 2003. "Aramaic 'k', lyk' and Iraqi Arabic 'aku, māku: The Mesopotamian particles of existence", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 123, 641–6.
- Müller-Kessler, C. 2005a. *Die Zauberschalentexte in der Hilprecht-Sammlung, Jena und weitere Nippur-Texte anderer Sammlungen* (Texte und Materialien der Frau Professor-Hilprecht-Sammlung 7.) Wiesbaden.
- Müller-Kessler, C. 2005b. "Of Jesus, Darius, Marduk . . . : Aramaic magic bowls in the Moussaieff Collection", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 125, 219–40.
- Müller-Kessler, C. 2006a. "Syrische Zauberschalen – Korrekturen und Nachträge", *Welt des Orients* 36, 116–30.
- Müller-Kessler, C. 2006b. "Review of M. Moriggi, *La lingua delle coppe magiche siriane* (Firenze 2004)", *Welt des Orients* 36, 265–72.
- Müller-Kessler, C. 2007. "Die Beschwörung gegen die Glaukom-Dämonin. Eine Neubearbeitung der aramäischen Zauberschale aus dem Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C. (MSF B25)", *Welt des Orients* 37, 78–89.
- Müller-Kessler, C. 2011a. "The linguistic heritage of Qumran Aramaic", in A. Lange, E. Tov and M. Weigold (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context. Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures*. Leiden, 215–59.
- Müller-Kessler, C. 2011b. "Beiträge zum Babylonisch-Talmudisch-Aramäischen Wörterbuch", *Orientalia Nova Series* 80, 214–51.
- Müller-Kessler, C. [in press]. "Mehr zu den Mondämonen Sidrus-Sira und Sin-Dew", *Orientalia Nova Series*.
- Müller-Kessler, C. [in preparation]. *A Handbook of Magic Bowls in Koiné Babylonian Aramaic*.
- Müller-Kessler, C. and T. Kwasman. 2000. "A unique Talmudic Aramaic incantation bowl", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 120, 159–65.
- Naveh, J. and S. Shaked. 1985. *Amulets and Magic Bowls*. Jerusalem.
- Naveh, J. and S. Shaked. 1993. *Magic Spells and Formulae*. Jerusalem.

- Nebe, G.W. 2006. "Zu den Bausteinen der deiktischen Pronomina in babylonisch-talmudischen Aramäischen", in R. Reichman (ed.), *Der Odem des Menschen ist eine Leuchte des Herrn*. Aharon Agus zum Gedenken. Heidelberg, 252–73.
- Nöldeke, T. 1875. *Mandäische Grammatik*. Halle.
- Nöldeke, T. 1898. *Kurzgefaßte syrische Grammatik*. Leipzig.
- Oppenheim, L. 1956–. *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Glückstadt.
- Rodwell, J.M. 1873. "Remarks on a terra-cotta vase", *Transactions of the Society for Biblical Archaeology* 2, 114–8.
- Schwab, M. 1890. "Les coupes magiques et l'hydromancie dans l'antiquité orientale", *Proceedings of the Society for Biblical Archaeology*, 292–342.
- Segal, J.B. 2000. *Catalogue of Aramaic and Mandaic Incantation Bowls*. London.
- Shaked, S. 1985. "Appendix", in J. C. Greenfield and J. Naveh, "A Mandaic lead amulet with four incantations", *Erets Israel* 18, 106–07 [in Hebrew].
- Shaked, S. 1993. "Iranian elements in Middle Aramaic: some particles and verbs" in W. Skalmowski and A. van Tongerloo (eds), *Medioiranica* (Leuven), 147–56.
- Shaked, S. 1995. "'Peace be Upon You, exalted Angels': on Hekhalot, liturgy and incantation bowls", *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 2/3, 197–9.
- Shaked, S. 1999. "The poetics of spells. Language and structure in Aramaic incantations of Late Antiquity 1: The divorce formula and its ramifications", in T. Abusch and K. van der Toorn (eds), *Mesopotamian Magic*. (Ancient Magic and Divination 1.) Groningen, 173–95.
- Shaked, S. 2000. "Manichaean incantation bowls in Syriac", *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 24, 58–92.
- Shaked, S. 2005. "Form and purpose in Aramaic spells: some Jewish themes", in S. Shaked (ed.), *Officina Magica*. Leiden, 1–30.
- Shaked, S. 2006. "'Dramatis personae' in the Jewish magic texts: some differences between incantation bowls and Geniza magic", *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 13, 363–87.
- von Soden, W. 1965–81. *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. Wiesbaden.
- Sokoloff, M. 2002. *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic*. Ramat-Gan.
- Teixidor, J. 1962. "The Syriac incantation bowls in the Iraq museum", *Sumer* 18, 51–62.
- Weisberg, D.B. 1991. *The Late Babylonian Texts of the Oriental Institute Collection*. (Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 24.) Malibu.
- Wohlstein, J. 1894. "Ueber einige aramäische Inschriften auf Thongefässen des Königlichen Museums zu Berlin", *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 9, 11–41.