

Another Look at the Mandaic Incantation Bowl BM 91715

J. N. FORD

Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

Among the incantation bowls in the British Museum recently published by J. B. Segal is an interesting Mandaic specimen from Kutha (BM 91715) which contains two independent incantations separated by a line: a historiola relating the expulsion of a particular lilith and the report of a dream purportedly dreamt by the client, Bašniray daughter of Šahafrid.¹ The historiola also occurs in another Mandaic bowl from Kutha written in a different hand for the same client (BM 91780:1ff.)² and in a Mandaic bowl of unknown provenance in the Martin Schøyen collection soon to be published by S. Shaked (MS 2054/122:14ff.). A late version of the dream report occurs in DC (= MS. Drower) 37(R). The parallel suggests that this was not an actual dream, but a once well-known magical motif. Segal's edition of the two British Museum bowls contains a number of inaccuracies in both the transcriptions and the translations. The present author will thus propose a new transcription and annotated translation of BM 91715 based on the published photographs. A new transcription and translation of BM 91780 based on the published photographs and an edition of the parallel section of DC 37(R) will be presented in appendices.³ For photographs of the bowls, the reader is requested to refer to Segal's study.

I would like to thank Professor S. Shaked of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem for kindly discussing a number of problems relating to the texts studied below and for permission to cite from unpublished bowls in the Martin Schøyen collection. I would also like to thank Dr. M. Morgenstern of the University of Haifa for several helpful comments. The present author is solely responsible for the views expressed herein. This study was supported by grants from the Department of Hebrew Language of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and the Kreitman Foundation of Ben-Gurion University of the Negev. The photograph of DC 37(R):399–414 is published with the kind permission of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford. The following museum/collection abbreviations have been used: BM = British Museum; DC (= MS. Drower) = Drower Collection, Bodleian Library, University of Oxford; Louvre AO = Musée du Louvre, Département des Antiquités Orientales; MS = Martin Schøyen collection.

1. J. B. Segal, *Catalogue of the Aramaic and Mandaic Incantation Bowls in the British Museum* (London, 2000), Bowl 084M (pp. 111–13 and plates 88 and 89). Segal, p. 112, claims that the text comprises three incantations, but what he considers to be the second incantation (line 12) is actually the closing statement of the first, as is indicated by the dividing line after line 12.

2. *Ibid.*, Bowl 085M (pp. 113–14 and plates 90 and 91). The final portion of the text is poorly preserved, but it does not appear to parallel BM 91715.

3. The corrections to the readings of both bowls and a translation of BM 91715 may also be found in my review article of Segal (J. N. Ford, "Notes on the Mandaic Incantation Bowls in the British Museum," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 26 [2002], 246–49). After the present study was submitted for publication, a transcription of BM 91715:14–16 by Ch. Müller-Kessler *apud* S. Shaked, "'Peace be Upon You, Exalted Angels': On Hekhalot, Liturgy and Incantation Bowls," *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 2 (1995),

1. BM 91715:

a. Text:

(1) בשומאיון ךַּ חייה אסותא (2) וחתמתא וזרותא ונאטרותא וזכותא תיחולה לפגרה (3) רוחה ונישימתה
 ךַּ באשניראי פת שחפריד ולזוה וילדה (4) חלבה זוה ובנה ובנאתה וארסה וביסאדיה 'א'זאט 'ש'ן'מ'ךַּ
 'ראר'ואזאט (5) קריליךַּ זוטארתיא ךַּ אחואתא וקאשישתא ךַּ עסטראתא נוקבאתא מידכאר דכרית
 (6) עו עימדכוריא עידכרײךַּ על כײךַּ שאמיש תאגא לגאט ומלכותא⁴ קאביל תלתמא ושיתין (7) וחד
 שניא אכאל וחדאךַּ מן בא'תה אפקוריא וחדאךַּ אנתא ליליתא בישתא מאגא⁵ <לגא>טת ומלכותא
 (8) קאבילת תלתמא ושיתין וחד שניא אכאלת וחדאךַּ מן באיתךַּ אפקוךַּ ותאנולײךַּ קופתךַּ על
 רישךַּ (9) וקופאת לדוניךַּ על ריש מלוגיךַּ ומלוגיךַּ בעידיךַּ אלגטוךַּ ואפקוךַּ מן ארקא ךַּ מיצראיא
 ואמרית אנתא חעיא (10) ליליתא ךַּ חטייתוכון בבנה ךַּ אדאם סדימית וחרימית ועכיסית ומאכסית
 וסדימית וחרימית ראזיא ךַּ בפומיךַּ (11) ופכיריא עבריךַּ לעחוריא גמביךַּ וגביבא קומתךַּ לארקא
 ומכראךַּ עליךַּ חבלא רבתיא ךַּ פרזלא ועסירית בחניךַּ ראזיא ךַּ אבאחאיא⁶ ךַּ אבחתךַּ (12) בגואיון
 עסיריא ואסותא וחתמתא וזרותא ונאטרותא תיחולה לחלבה זוה ובנה ובנאתה ולארסה וביסאדיה

(13) אסותא וחתמתא וזרותא תיחולה לבאשניראי פת שחפריד ולילדתה חלבה זוה ובנה ובנאתה
 אתואת-א> ךַּ אנתא באשניראי חזיאנתא בחילמאי וחדאזיליא¹ רכישא ומרכשא רכישא (14) ברכאשיא ךַּ
 פרזלא ותניא בתנאיא ךַּ נירבא על אנפא חא סחיפא תותיא ארסא ךַּ פרזלא נחאשא ונירבא ומליאליא
 במאיון ךַּ שחריא ורישא רמיליא על קרקפאתין ךַּ ליליתא מן (15) סמאלאי טופיא ךַּ מיא ומן יאמינאי
 אפלא סכינא סכינן סופא תוקפא וחבילא ומן עסאדאי אכלא ךַּ זיוא ומן 'ל'יגראי נארגא רבא ךַּ
 שריאתא ומן עלאיא ריש'אי¹ גירא (16) [עבראיא]⁷

Exterior:

(17) דיוא ךַּ מן יאמינאי ניתיא ניבלא באכלא רבא ךַּ זיוא דיוא ךַּ מן סמאלאי ניתיא ניבלא בסיכניא סכינ
 סופא תוקפא וחבילא דיוא ךַּ מן עסאדאי אתיא באלא בנארגא רבא ךַּ שריאתא (18) דיוא ךַּ מן
 עלאיא רישא אתיא באלא בגירא עבראיא כביש חישוכא מן קודאם נחורא וכביש חבילא מן
 קודאם בינאנתא וכביש טעיא מן קודאם שרארא וכבישא (19) מיחתא מן קודאם אסותא ואסותא
 לבאשניראי פת שחפריד תיחולה ותישאכאב על חילמאי טאביא ושאפיריא ועל חילמאי סאינאי
 לעשאכאב סאנאי פיטירותא (20) ךַּ סאניאליא וחיא זאכין

Base:

(21) עסירא (22) אתואתא

b. Translation:

(1) In the name of Life. May there be healing (2) and sealing and arming and protection and
 victory for the body, (3) spirit and soul of Bašniray daughter of Šahafriđ and for her spouse
 and her (infant) child, (4) her milk, her spouse and her sons and her daughters and her bed
 and her pillow. Your name is Azaṭ and you are called Arwazaṭ, (5) O youngest of (your) sis-
 ters and eldest of the female goddesses. You surely remember, (6) or I shall indeed remind you:
 when Šamiš took the crown and received the kingship, he reigned three hundred and sixty (7)
 one years. Then they expelled him from his house. Then you, evil lilit, <too>k the crown and
 received the kingship (8) (and) reigned three hundred and sixty one years. Then they expelled
 you from your house and they placed your cash box upon your head (9) and the cash box of

215, n. 100, which contains several readings paralleling corrections proposed below, came to the attention of the present author and should be accorded priority.

4. The initial *w* would appear to have been corrected from an original *l* (Segal transcribes: *lmlkwṭ*[?]). Cf. *wmlkwṭ*[?] in the parallel phrase in line 7. BM 91780:6 and MS 2054/122:15 read *wmlkwṭ*[?] and *wmṭlkwṭ*[?], respectively.

5. Read: *l'g'*.

6. The *y* is poorly written. There is a mark above the line which, if significant, may be a rewriting of the *y* or a correction of the spelling to [?]*b'h'yy*[?]. The expected spelling is [?]*b'h'ṭ*[?].

7. Traces of the word remain, but the angle of the photograph makes the reading difficult. They do not, however, appear to contradict the reconstruction, which is required by the parallel expression in line 18.

your dowry upon your *mlūg*-property and made you take your *mlūg*-property in your hands and expelled you from the land of the Egyptians. And you said: I am (10) the lilith who has harmed the children of Adam. You are shackled and banned and rebuked and reproved. The mysteries that are in your mouth are shackled and banned. (11) Your arms are tied behind your back, your frame is bent to the earth and a great cord of iron is wrapped about you. You are bound by those mysteries that the fathers of your fathers (12) are bound within them. May there be healing and sealing and arming and protection for her milk, her spouse and her sons and her daughters and for her bed and her pillow.

(13) May there be healing and sealing and arming for Bašniray daughter of Šahafrid and for her (infant) child, her milk, her spouse, and her sons and her daughters. The signs that I, Bašniray, saw in my dream: it seemed I was strapped and doubly strapped, strapped (14) with straps of iron and *chained* with *chains* of *lead*, indeed thrown face down beneath a bed of iron, copper and *lead*, and I was *filled with the water* of *sahras* and (my) head was placed upon the skulls of liliths. On my (15) left were torrents of water. On my right was a knife, a knife of death, violence (and) destruction. At my pillow was a mace of radiance. At my feet was a great axe of exorcisms. Above my head was an (16) [extraordinary] arrow. (17) The *dēw* which will come against me from the right shall be smitten by the great mace of radiance! The *dēw* which will come against me from the left shall be smitten by the knife, the knife of death, violence (and) destruction! The *dēw* that comes against me at my pillow will be smitten by the great axe of exorcisms! (18) The *dēw* that comes (against me) above (my) head will be smitten by the extraordinary arrow! Suppressed, suppressed is darkness before light, and suppressed is destruction before construction, and suppressed is error before truth and suppressed are (19) wound(s) before healing. And for Bašniray daughter of Šahafrid may there be healing and may she lie down for good and pleasant dreams—but for hateful dreams may my hater, the *piṭyarūta*-demon (20) that hates me, lie down. And Life is victorious!

[As a label:] (21) “Bound are (22) the signs.”

c. Comments:

Line 4:

***hlbh* “her milk”:** Segal identifies *hlbh* (Segal: *hlb*⁷) as the husband of the feminine *yldh* (var. *yld⁷th*), the latter translated “her (infant) child” in the present study, but interpreted by Segal as the “child” (of marriageable age) of either Bašniray or her alleged second husband.⁸ He bases his interpretation on the analysis of the following word *zwh* “her spouse,” here and in line 13, as standing in apposition to *hlbh*(⁷), i.e., “Halba her spouse.” In line 12, however, *hlbh*(⁷) *zwh* is interpreted by Segal as “Halba, his (Halba’s—JNF) spouse.” Furthermore, in BM 91708, the same *hlbh*(⁷) consistently occurs with no matronym or identification by means of a reference to a relation with respect to any other person (lines 9 and 13), which would be unusual for a name of a client. It thus seems preferable to interpret *hlbh* as “her milk.” Bašniray had presumably recently given birth and was particularly concerned about the well-being of her baby, including a sufficient supply of mother’s milk (cf. the references to Hebrew *yld* “child” in contexts of nursing in Gen. 21:7–8 and Exod. 2:7–9). Although not otherwise known by the present author to occur in such lists of people/objects for whom/which protection is specifically requested in Mandaic or Jewish Aramaic incantations, note the reference to demonic activity directed against a woman’s milk (in collocation with a reference to *yldy*⁷ “[young] male children” // *drdqwny*⁷ “young girls”) in the Mandaic incantation bowl MS 1928/53:15–16:

8. See especially Segal’s note to BM 91708(Segal 083M):9 (p. 111).

רוחא בישתא ד מחנקא ילדיא אכראת תרנאוליא ודרדקוניאתא אכראת תרנאולאתא אזלא ושארריא על
חדיאיהין ד ענשיא ד ממצא ונאסבא ⁽¹⁶⁾ חלבאיהין מינאיהין ומטנפאליא ומציאלחין

The evil spirit that strangles (young) male children like roosters and young girls like hens, (and) goes around and haunts the breasts of women that it sucks and takes (16) their milk from them and pollutes it and sucks them.

ז'ז' "Azaṭ": Contrary to Segal, who reads *yz'ṭ* (Izaṭ), *Azaṭ* // *Arwazaṭ* is the name of the lilith, not of one of the clients. In particular, she is certainly not Bašniray's (second) spouse, as proposed by Segal, p. 112b, for in addition to the incongruity in gender, Bašniray's well attested husband, Abdara<h>man⁹ son of Mišoya, is twice mentioned in the parallel bowl BM 91780 (lines 12 and 14), which also refers to *Azaṭ* // *Arwazaṭ* (see below, appendix 1).

Lines 4–5:

A ṣ'ṣ[ʷ]ṣ'ṣ'ṣ' B qrylyk "Your name is A and you are called B": Segal failed to recognize this expression. A late parallel occurs in DC 43(R), G:12: *ṭlyt' ṣwm'k wdhys' q'ryl'k* "your name is *ṭlyt'* (the girl) and you are called *dhys'* (the trampled one)." In the Drower Collection text, *q'ry* is clearly an impersonal plural active participle with a passive meaning. The same may be true for *qry* in BM 91715 as well, although the spelling without *aleph* would suggest a singular passive participle.

Line 7:

ṣ'ṣ' "reigned": Segal's translation, "(they) devoured," based on the common Semitic verb ³KL "to eat," clearly does not accord with the context. The present interpretation follows M. Lidzbarski, who renders the same verb occurring in a similar context of the length of reigns of various kings in *Ginza Yamina* (ed. Petermann), 382–84, *passim*, as "regierte (dauerte)."¹⁰ Cf. Haran Gawaita (ed. Drower), 134–37, 186–88:

חאיזאך מיתניסבא מן בנאין ד בניא ארדבאן מאלכא מאלכותא מן באגדאד חארדאבאייא נאסבילא
על מאלכותא פאשיון בגאווה ⁽¹³⁶⁾ ד באגדאד עמא ושובין דראבשיא ובימאנדיא חאיזאך אכיל מאלכא
ד חארדאבאייא תלאמא ושיתין ⁽¹³⁷⁾ עשניא חאיזאך מאמליך ברה ד שחאט אראבאייא אבראלא . . .
אפריש ⁽¹⁸⁷⁾ חיביל זורא לדנאב אלמא כך אכיל ברה ד שחאט ארבאייא אראב אלפייא עשניא נאפיק
אבאתרה משיחא ⁽¹⁸⁸⁾ כאדאבא בר מאריאם

Then kingship was taken from (135) Baghdad from the sons of the sons of Artabanus the king. The Hardabaeans took the kingship. There remained in (136) Baghdad one hundred and seventy banners and cult-huts. Then the king of the Hardabaeans **reigned** three hundred and sixty (137) years. Then 'Abdallāh, the son of Šhaṭ the Arab, became king. . . . Hibil Ziwa (187) instructed at the end of the ages, when the son of Šhaṭ the Arab **had reigned** four thousand years. After him appeared the false (188) christ, son of Maryam.

Note the similar use of *h'yz'k* "then" (Segal misreads *wh'yz'k* "and then" as *hw'yz'k*, which he interprets as the name of the lilith) and the typological number 360, which parallels 361 in BM 91715 (see lines 6–8).

9. ²*bd'r'm'n*, elsewhere written ²*bdrhm'n* (Abdrahman).

10. M. Lidzbarski, *Ginza: der Schatz oder das grosse Buch der Mandäer* (Göttingen/Leipzig, 1925), 411. E. S. Drower and R. Macuch, *A Mandaic Dictionary* (Oxford, 1963), 17a, s.v. AKL II, translate this verb in a similar context (Haran Gawaita, cited below) as "lasted." Following Nöldeke, they suggest that the verb is probably related to KWL "to measure, hold, contain." This derivation can now be confirmed by a comparison with Akkadian *šarrūta kullu* "to exercise kingship" (see CAD K, s.v. *kullu*, meaning 3c [p. 513]).

m'g' <lg'>tt “you <too>k the crown”: *m'g'* is a scribal error for *t'g'* “crown,” caused by the similarity between *m* and *t* in the Mandaic script. The letters *lg'* were omitted by haplography. Segal’s alleged denominative verb *m'g'tt* “you are divorced” is thus at present nonexistent in Mandaic.¹¹ The reading is confirmed by both the structure of the text and MS 2054/122:16, which correctly reads *t'g' lg'tt*. The phrase is also confused in BM 91780:8, which reads: *<t'>g' l'g'tt*¹ (not *wl'lgwt* “and repudiation,” as claimed by Segal). In the latter text, *t'* was omitted by haplography. The spelling *lg'tt*, if correctly read (see below, n. 75), is most likely not a “scribal error” for *lg'tt*, but the result of an assimilation of *t* to *t*.¹²

Lines 8–9:

mn b'ytyk 'pqwk . . . 'pqwk mn 'rq' d-mysr'yy' “they expelled you from your house . . . they expelled you from the land of the Egyptians”: The *lilith* is reminded of the precedent, according to which she was expelled as if she were being divorced. Compare NPQ (Af^eel) “to expel” with the Akkadian interdialectal equivalent *wašû* (Š) “to expel” in a marriage contract envisaging the possibility of the expulsion of the first wife after taking a second in marriage (JEN 434:12–16 [cf. CAD A/2, 374b]):

(12) [šum-m]a mI-za-an-nu-ri aš-ša-ta ša-ni-ta (13) [i-i]h-ḥa-az ḫA-ki-im-ni-nu (14) [uš-t]u É-ti-šu ú-še-eš-ši (15) [1 MA.N]A KÙ.BABBAR 1 MA.NA KÙ.GI mI-za-an-nu-ri (16) [a-na f]A-[k]i-im-ni-nu ú-ma-al-la

[If] ^mPN takes a second wife and expells ^fPN₂ [from] his house, ^mPN shall pay ^fPN₂ [1 mina] of silver (and) 1 mina of gold.

The divorce motif is otherwise known from a considerable number of Jewish Aramaic incantation bowls (or Mandaic bowls patterned upon the Jewish Aramaic bowls) directed against *lilith*(s) and other classes of demons, in which the demon is ordered to accept a bill of divorce (*gyt'*).¹³ In the present text there is no mention of a bill of divorce, but the occurrence of the divorce motif is confirmed by the reference to the return of the *lilith*'s “marital property.” The parallel texts have a number of variant readings:

BM 91715:8–9:

ותאנולין קפתין על רישין וקפאת לדוניך על ריש מלוגין ומלוגין בעדיך אלגטוך

and they placed your cash box upon your head and the cash box of your dowry upon your *mlüg*-property and made you take your *mlüg*-property in your hands.

BM 91780:9–10:

ואתנאל'ך קפתין ערישין [ך] וקפאתין לידניך (10) על רישין ומלוג'ין בעדיך אלגטוך

11. As noted by Segal, however, the noun *gyt'* (var. *g't'*) “bill of divorce” is attested in Mandaic incantation bowls (see BM 103358:11 and BM 91769:9).

12. Cf. E. M. Yamauchi, *Mandaic Incantation Texts*, AOS 49 (New Haven, 1967), bowl 5:14: *P'tyn* “you have cursed” (for *P'tyn*).

13. See S. Shaked, “The Poetics of Spells. Language and Structure in Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity I: The Divorce Formula and its Ramifications,” in T. Abusch and K. van der Toorn, eds., *Mesopotamian Magic: Textual, Historical, and Interpretative Perspectives*, Ancient Magic and Divination 1 (Groningen, 1999), 173–95.

and (they) placed your cash box upon [your] head and the cash box of your dowry (text: your cash boxes your dowry) upon your head and made you take your *mlüg*-property in your hands.

MS 2054/122:16:

את'נר'ליך 'קופ'תיך על רישך ולידניך על ריש 'מול'גין

they placed your cash box upon your head and your dowry upon your *mlüg*-property.

The three terms referring to the demon's property are all derived from, or cognate with Akkadian (and Rabbinic Hebrew or Jewish Babylonian Aramaic) technical terms relating to the marital property of a woman.

***qwptyk* “your cash box”**: The basic meaning of *qwpt*¹⁴ is “basket,”¹⁴ as translated by Segal, but in the present text the Mandaic term exhibits the same semantic development as Rabbinic Hebrew *qwph* “a box in which the woman of Mishnaic times kept money to be spent on perfumes and other personal articles”¹⁵ and Akkadian (Neo-Babylonian) *quppu* “cash box holding a woman's peculium,”¹⁶ both originally signifying “basket” as well. This is proven by the collocation of *qwptyk* “your *qwpt*” with *mlwgyk* “your *mlüg*-property” and *ldwnyk* “your dowry” (see below), which parallels the collocation of Akkadian *quppu* “(woman's) cash box” with *mulügu* “*mulügu*-property” in two Neo-Babylonian texts relating to marital property¹⁷ and references to the *quppu* “(woman's) cash box” as part of, or in conjunction with, the *nudunnû* “dowry” in six Neo-Babylonian documents of similar nature.¹⁸ Whatever the precise etymological relation of Mandaic *qwpt*¹⁴ and Hebrew *qwph* to Akkadian *quppu* may be, the occurrence of the meaning “(woman's) cash box” for *quppu* precisely in Neo-Babylonian indicates that the Akkadian semantic development “basket” > “(woman's) cash box” is interrelated with the parallel semantic development in Mandaic and Hebrew.¹⁹

***ldwnyk* (var. *lydnyk*) “your dowry”**: Segal reads *l'k¹wnyk* “that . . . may cover you” (< KNN), but the letter in question is clearly *d*. *ldwnyk* (var. *lydnyk*) surely derives from Akkadian *nudunnû* “dowry.”²⁰ Cf. Jewish Babylonian Aramaic *ndwny*³ “dowry,”²¹ also from Akkadian.²² Th. Nöldeke cites possible additional cases of *n* >

14. Drower and Macuch, *Dictionary*, 409b.

15. B. A. Levine, “*Mulügu/Melüg*: The Origins of a Talmudic Legal Institution,” *JAOS* 88 (1968), 279 n. 50.

16. *CAD* Q, 310, meaning 3c; see further Levine, “*Mulügu/Melüg*,” 279–80.

17. *VAS* 4 46 and *VAS* 5 43/44 (see Levine, “*Mulügu/Melüg*,” 279–80, who refers to the latter text as *VS* 5:53, and M. T. Roth, “The Material Composition of the Neo-Babylonian Dowry,” *Afo* 36/37 [1989/90], 15–16).

18. See Roth, *ibid.*, 6–8.

19. S. A. Kaufman, *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*, *AS* 19 (Chicago, 1974), 86, doubts that Akkadian *quppu* was borrowed into Aramaic or Hebrew, but suggests probable Akkadian influence with respect to the meaning “money box.” He does not, however, make specific note of the technical usage with reference to marital property common to Akkadian, Hebrew, and now, a dialect of Aramaic.

20. *CAD* N/2, 310–12.

21. M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods* (Ramat-Gan, 2002), 730b.

22. See Sokoloff, *ibid.*, with additional bibliography. For *nudunnû* as a loanword in Biblical Hebrew, see P. V. Mankowski, *Akkadian Loanwords in Biblical Hebrew*, *HSS* 47 (Winona Lake, 2000), 100–101.

l in Mandaic.²³ The same phonetic phenomenon is also attested in other Aramaic dialects.²⁴ The collocation of *ldwnyk* and *mlwgyk* “your *mlūg*-property” (see below) conclusively establishes the meaning of the former term in light of the hendiadys *mulūgi u nudunnê* “*mulūgu*-property and dowry” in a Middle Babylonian *kudurru* inscription (King, *BBSt.*, 9, 1:15–16) and the reference to *mulūgu*-property as part of a *nudunnû* “dowry” in a Neo-Babylonian marriage contract (TMH II/III, 1).²⁵

***mlwgyk* (var. *mwlgyk*) “your *mlūg*-property”:** This term corresponds to Rabbinic Hebrew *mlwg*, which was part of the dowry and referred to the “property received by a woman from her father or brothers for which she retains liability after her marriage.”²⁶ Both are etymologically and semantically related to Middle and Neo-Babylonian *mulūgu*, which Westbrook describes as “property of various kinds (including land) given by a father to his daughter on the occasion of, or in consideration of her marriage and it is for her children from the marriage. . . . It is therefore a component of the dowry, occasionally synonymous with it, issuing exclusively from the bride’s father’s house and distinguished from the rest of the dowry by its legal and not its material content.”²⁷ An equivalent term, *mlg*, also occurs in Ugaritic in the hendiadys *tlh wmlgh* “her dowry and her *mulūgu*-property” (CAT 1.24:47),²⁸ which surely parallels Akkadian *mulūgi u nudunnê* “*mulūgu*-property and dowry,” cited above.²⁹ Levine considers Hebrew *mlwg* to derive from Akkadian.³⁰ Kaufman, on the contrary, points out that *mulūgu* is first attested in peripheral Akkadian and in Ugaritic, only later occurring in Mesopotamian Akkadian, and concludes that the Hebrew and Akkadian terms were borrowed from a foreign source through separate

23. Th. Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik* (Halle an der Saale, 1875 [repr. Darmstadt, 1964]), 54 n. 4.

24. See, e.g., Biblical Aramaic *ndn* “sheath” (Dan. 7:15) vs. Targumic *ldn* “sheath” (1 Chr. 21:27 // Hebrew *ndn* “sheath”), derived from Persian **nidāni* (Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, 1926–27, with additional bibliography), and the generally accepted correspondence of Akkadian *Nuḫašše* and Ugaritic *ngt* with the Old Aramaic toponym *l’s* (KAI 202:1) [see H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften. Band II: Kommentar* (Wiesbaden, 1973), 206, and G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, *Diccionario de la lengua ugarítica*, Aula Orientalis—Supplementa, 7/8 (Barcelona, 1996/2000), 321b, with additional bibliography]. For the opposite phenomenon in Eastern Aramaic in general, i.e., the replacement of original *l* by *n*, see Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, 54, and cf. Kaufman, *Akkadian Influences*, 144. With respect to Kaufman’s claim that the change from *l* to *n* in *tarlugallu* (Akk.) > *trnwgl* (Aram.) occurred in Aramaic, however, note that the form *tarnugallu* is already attested in Neo-Assyrian (see J. Black et al. [eds.], *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian*, *SANTAG* 5 [Wiesbaden, 2000], 400b, s.v. *tarlugallu*).

25. For a discussion of these texts, see Levine, “*Mulūgu/Melūg*,” 278. For the *nudunnû* “dowry” in general, see Roth, “Material Composition,” and R. Westbrook, *Old Babylonian Marriage Law*, *AfO Beiheft* 23 (Horn, 1988), 24–28, 95–96, 99, with additional bibliography.

26. Levine, “*Mulūgu/Melūg*,” 280. Segal renders *mlwgyk* as “your packages,” apparently relating the term to Jewish Babylonian Aramaic *mlwg* “a type of container” (Sokoloff, *DJBA*, 677; cf. Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 787b: “a hairless skin, bag”).

27. Westbrook, *Old Babylonian Marriage Law*, 27.

28. Cf. Levine, “*Mulūgu/Melūg*,” 273. See most recently M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *Studien zu den ugaritischen Texten, I: Mythos und Ritual in KTU 1.12, 1.24, 1.96, 1.100 und 1.114*, *AOAT* 269/1 (Münster, 2000), 199–203, 213–15. Del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *Diccionario*, 274b, believe *mlg* to be part of a divine name, *mlghy*; according to J. C. de Moor, this alleged divine name is to be interpreted as *Mulugu-hiya* “Her Dowry” (see del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, loc. cit.).

29. Cf. R. Westbrook, “Mitgift,” *RIA* 8, 274.

30. Levine, “*Mulūgu/Melūg*,” 271–72.

channels.³¹ Whatever the case may be, with respect to the new Aramaic documentation, the fact that the word is at present attested only in a late Aramaic dialect, and in Mandaic in particular, suggests that *mlwg(yk)* is most likely a loanword from Akkadian in the same manner as *ldwn(yk)* “(your) dowry.”³²

In ancient Mesopotamia, the dowry, including the *mulūgu*-property, was intended for the support of the wife after her husband’s death. According to Westbrook, “[i]f the marriage is terminated by divorce, the fate of the dowry depends on whether it was the wife’s fault or not. A man who divorces his wife without grounds must, *inter alia*, restore her dowry. . . . The property to be restored or returned . . . is the *šeriktu*, her share of the paternal estate. . . . There is no explicit evidence of what happens to the dowry when a husband divorces his wife on good grounds, but CH §141 rules that he need give her nothing, not divorce-money nor even provisions for the way, which suggests that he could keep her dowry as well.”³³ The Middle and Neo-Babylonian *mulūgu* would seem to have been the equivalent of the Old-Babylonian *šeriktu*.³⁴ The (money in the) *quppu*, too, clearly derived from the paternal estate and, moreover, remained under the control of the wife, and it thus stands to reason that in the case of a man divorcing his wife without grounds, the woman would have also taken the (money in the) *quppu* with her. In the Mandaic text, the demon is hardly “divorced” without grounds, as she herself admits to having “harmed the children of Adam” (lines 10–11). Yet she is nevertheless accorded the return of all her “marital property.” This may reflect a more egalitarian divorce custom prevalent at the time of the composition of the Mandaic incantation,³⁵ or it may be an expedient to ensure the demon’s compliance, much like the gifts given to Lamaštu in order to induce her to depart in several Akkadian incantations.³⁶

Line 10:

w’mryt . . . sdymyt . . . “And you said. . . . You are shackled . . .”: Segal interprets these as 1 c. s. perf. forms, which makes little sense in the context. They should be understood, rather, as a 2 c. s. active participle form *q’tlyt* (*’mryt*) followed by a series of 2 c. s. passive participle forms *qtylyt* (*sdymyt*, etc.).³⁷

hrymyt / hrymy’ “you/they are banned”: Segal reads *hdymyt / hdymy’*. He interprets the verb as HDM “to seal,” for which Drower and Macuch list only a sole attestation in the late magical text DC 44(R):1818–19: *sdymy’ hdymy’ wrgyly’ wm’zyhy’*

31. Kaufman, *Akkadian Influences*, 73.

32. For Akkadian *mulūgu* and its cognates, see further Levine, “*Mulūgu/Melūg*”; M. J. Geller, “New Sources for the Origins of the Rabbinic Ketubah,” *HUCA* 49 (1978), 237–40; Roth, “Material Composition,” 15–17; and Westbrook, *RIA* 8, 274–75.

33. Westbrook, *ibid.*, 277

34. Westbrook, *Old Babylonian Marriage Law*, 27.

35. Cf. the Aramaic marriage contracts from Elephantine, according to which, in the case of divorce, the wife had the right to the return of the property that she had brought with her (from her father’s house) into the marriage, regardless of which party initiated the proceedings and, apparently, regardless of the circumstances leading to the divorce. See, for example, B. Porten and A. Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt, 2: Contracts* (Jerusalem, 1989), 78, lines 21–28 (translation p. 82).

36. E.g., SBTU III 84, 62–78 (for a translation, see B. R. Foster, *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*, 2nd ed. [Bethesda, 1996], 849).

37. For these forms, see Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, 232.

“shackled (and) *hdymy*’ and bound and expelled.”³⁸ The occurrence of *hdymy*’ in DC 44(R), however, may be a late corruption from *hrymy*’ due to the similarity between *r* and *d* in the Mandaic script.³⁹ In BM 91715, it is difficult to distinguish between *r* and *d*, but compare particularly the letter in question in *hrymy*’ with the *r* in *ryšyk* (line 8) and *ryš* (line 9). Furthermore, *r* would appear to be the preferable reading in the corresponding words in BM 91780 (three occurrences in lines 12 and 13) and in MS 2054/122. The reading *hrymyt* / *hrymy*’, based on a well attested verb, thus seems preferable in BM 91715 as well.

Line 11:

pkryy’ *bryk l’hwry*’ *gmbyk* “Your arms are tied behind your back”: Cf. the binding of the witch in Maqlû III, 99: *aktasi idiki ana arkiki* “I have bound your arms behind you.”

Line 14:

tn’yy’ *d-nyrb*’ “chains of lead”: The meaning and etymology of *tn’yy*’ are not clear. Segal suggests “coils.” Here it is tentatively translated “chains” based on the parallel with *rk’šy*’ “bonds, straps.” *nyrb*’ is known to refer to a metal, but the precise identification remains disputed.⁴⁰ Segal renders the term “brass.” E. C. D. Hunter opts for “lead”⁴¹ whereas Ch. Müller-Kessler hesitantly suggests either “lead” or “purified (silver).”⁴² The interpretation of *nyrb*’ as “lead” proposed by Hunter and Müller-Kessler is based on the analysis of *nyrb*’ as a corrupted form of *šyrb*’ “lead” due to the graphic similarity of *wnyrb*’ (“and *nyrb*”) and *šyrb*’ “lead” in the Mandaic script.⁴³ The identification of *šyrb*’ as “lead,” in turn, is based on the proposed derivation of the latter term from Persian *surb* “lead.”⁴⁴ This derivation is problematic, since Mandaic *š* does not normally correspond to Persian *s*.⁴⁵ In Modern Mandaic,

38. Drower and Macuch, *Dictionary*, 131b. Note that Drower and Macuch’s citation of the text incorrectly omits *wrgyly*’.

39. DC 44(R) parallels DC 15(R) and J. de Morgan, *Études Linguistiques, IIe partie: Textes mandaïtes*, Mission scientifique en Perse, V (Paris, 1904), 255–70. In neither of the parallel texts is there a correspondent to the occurrence of *hdymy*’ in DC 44(R):1818. The same word, however, also occurs in DC 44(R) in similar contexts in lines 1823 (*hdymy*’) and 1828 (*hdym*). The parallel texts offer no correspondent to *hdym* in line 1828, but the passage in DC 15(R) paralleling DC 44(R):1823 likewise reads *hdymy*’, whereas Morg. 269/28:8 reads *hrymy*’. *hrymy*’ also occurs in DC 29(R):359–62 in a context paralleling BM 91780:11–12 (cf. E. S. Drower, “Shafta d Pishra d Ainia,” *JRAS* [1937], 595, lines 30–32):

פּשִׁירִיא חָא(360)רְשִׁיא וּסְדִימִיא חֲרִימִיא וּכְסִימִיא עִ(361)כִּיִּסִיא וּמֵאֲכִיִּסִיא וּמִשְׂאֲמַתִּיא וּמְבֵא (362)טְלִיא זִיחִיא
וּמֵאֲזִיחִיא זִימִיא וּמֵאֲזִימִיא

The witchcraft is exorcized (360) and shackled, banned and admonished, (361) rebuked and reproved and anathematized and annulled, (362) expelled and driven out, curbed and restrained.

40. Drower and Macuch, *Dictionary*, 299b, s.v. *nirba* 2.

41. E. C. D. Hunter, “Two Mandaic Incantation Bowls from Nippur,” *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 25 (1994), 615.

42. Ch. Müller-Kessler, “Puzzling Words and Spellings in Babylonian Aramaic Magic Bowls,” *BSOAS* 62 (1999), 113–14.

43. Cf. *ibid.*, 114.

44. See Drower and Macuch, *Dictionary*, 394b.

45. Müller-Kessler, “Puzzling Words and Spellings,” 114.

however, *ṣ* tends to be pronounced as *s*.⁴⁶ If this tendency goes back to an earlier period, it may explain the irregular phonetic correspondence between *ṣyrbʿ* and *surb*. The contextual evidence is difficult to evaluate, but may support the identification of *nyrbʿ* as “lead.” If *mʿyyʿ* “chains” has been correctly interpreted, the pair *mʿyyʿ d-nyrbʿ* “chains of *nyrbʿ*” // *rkʿšyʿ d-przlʿ* “straps of iron” would appear to be an approximate semantic equivalent of the pair *šwšlʿtʿ d-ʿbʿrʿ* “chains of lead” // *sʿddyʿ d-przlʿ* “fettors of iron” in another Mandaic incantation bowl (Yamauchi, *MIT*, Bowl 17:5–6 [// Bowl 24:5]). This suggests that *nyrbʿ* may be a synonym of *ʿbʿrʿ* “lead,” as both parallel *przlʿ* “iron” in similar contexts. This possibility is supported by the expression *šwšyltʿ dprzlʿ wnyrbʿ* “a chain of iron and *nyrbʿ*” in the Jewish Aramaic incantation bowl Louvre AO 1177:4.⁴⁷ In the latter text, *nyrbʿ* and *przlʿ* “iron” are explicitly said to be materials out of which is made a *šwšyltʿ* “chain,” as is *ʿbʿrʿ* “lead” (// *przlʿ* “iron”) in Yamauchi, *MIT*, Bowl 17:5–6.

***wmlyʿlyʿ bmʿywn d-shryʿ* “and I was filled with the water of sahras”:** *mlyʿlyʿ bmʿywn* is interpreted following an alternative suggestion by Segal,⁴⁸ but the sense of the passage is not clear to the present author. *mʿywn* (// *qrqpʿtyw* “their skulls”) could theoretically be interpreted as “their intestines”⁴⁹ or emended to <z>*mʿywn* “their blood,” but neither offers a more satisfactory meaning.

Line 15:

***ṭwpyʿ d-myʿ* “torrents of water”:** Cf. *ṭʿwpyʿ myʿ*, cited by Drower and Macuch, *Dictionary*, 173b, s.v. *ṭaupia* “floods, (sur)face of waters.” DC 37(R):403 employs an equivalent phrase: *rwkbʿ rbʿ d-myʿ* “a great stream of water.”

***sykynʿ skyn swpʿ twqpʿ whbylʿ* “a knife, a knife of death, violence and destruction”:** Segal (p. 113b) remarks that *swpʿ* “end” possibly recalls *sypʿ* “sabre.” In fact, the expression was reinterpreted along this line in DC 37(R):402–3: *sykynʿ wsypʿ wtwpqʿ hbylʿ* “a knife and a sword and violence (and) destruction.” In lines 404–5, which parallel lines 402–3, the reinterpretation leads to a grammatical difficulty, as the original *status constructus* form *sykyn*, corresponding to *skyn* in BM 91715, remains (*sykynʿ sykyn wsypʿ* . . . “the knife, the knife of, and the sword . . .”).

***ʿklʿ rbʿ d-zywʿ* . . . *nʿrgʿ rbʿ d-šryʿtʿ* “a mace of radiance . . . a great axe of exorcisms”:** For these magical tools, see Ch. Müller-Kessler, “Phraseology in Mandaic Incantations and its Rendering in Various Eastern Aramaic Dialects. A Collection of Magic Terminology,” *ARAM* 11–12 (1999–2000), 305–6. Müller-Kessler, *ibid.*, translates *nʿrgʿ rbʿ d-šryʿtʿ* as “the great axe of loosening,” but Drower and Macuch’s “the great axe of exorcisms”⁵⁰ would appear to be more idiomatic, since the magical context suggests that *šryʿtʿ* “loosenings, freeings, counterspells, exorcisms”⁵¹ here has a technical sense. As noted by Drower and Macuch, *šryʿtʿ* is derived from the verb *šRʿ* (Pe.) “to loosen, untie, let loose, . . . dissolve, unbind . . . exorcize.”⁵² The semantic

46. R. Macuch, *Handbook of Classical and Modern Mandaic* (Berlin, 1965), 70.

47. For the reading, see Müller-Kessler, “Puzzling Words and Spellings,” 113.

48. Segal, *Catalogue*, 113b.

49. See *maia* 2 (Drower and Macuch, *Dictionary*, 242a).

50. *Ibid.*, 463b.

51. *Ibid.*, 463b.

52. *Ibid.*, 474.

development “to loosen, dissolve” > “to exorcize” is also apparent in Mandaic *pyšr* “loosing or breaking a spell, exorcism”⁵³ < PŠR (Pe.) “to melt, dissolve, free from, solve, loosen, exorcise.”⁵⁴ In Akkadian magical texts, the same technical usage with respect to the exorcism of spells and curses and the like occurs with the semantically equivalent verbs *pašāru* “to release, free”⁵⁵ and *paṭāru* “to loosen, release.”⁵⁶ Cf., for example, Maqlū VI, 117: *puṭri kišpīya ṭabtu puššuri ruḫēa* “undo the witchcraft (against) me, O salt, dispel the *ruḫū*-magic (against) me!”⁵⁷

Line 16:

[*brʿyy*] “**extraordinary**”: Segal also restores *brʿyy*,⁵⁸ which he interprets as a *nisbe* adjective formed from *bʿr* “lead.” Although magical instruments made of various metals are frequently mentioned in Mandaic texts, such expressions are almost always based on genitival constructions. In the present text, cf. *rkʿšy d-pʿrzl* “straps of iron” (line 14), *tnʿyy d-nyrb* “chains of lead” (line 14) and *ʿrs d-pʿrzl nhʿš wnyrb* “a bed of iron, copper and lead” (line 14). Cf. also *šwšlʿ d-bʿr* “chains of lead,” cited above. *brʿyy* is therefore identified with *bʿr* 1 “outer, external, foreign,”⁵⁹ hence the proposed translation “extraordinary.” The term is most likely identical to Drower and Macuch’s *braia* “creative?, exorcist?”⁶⁰ and *baraia* 2 “exorcizer, exorcizing.”⁶¹ In a Jewish Aramaic incantation bowl, an awesome divine being who combats demons is similarly said to be *mylbr* “from the outside”⁶²:

לא ידעיתוך⁶³ דיוי דגברא מילבר אתא עליכון⁽¹⁸⁾ נוריאל רבה נוריאל שמייה נורא לביש ונורא מכסי
שלהביחא דנורא נפקא מיפומיה

Do you not know, O *dēws*, that a man from the outside came against you, (18) the great Nuriel, Nuriel is his name. He is clad with fire (*nūrā*) and is covered with fire (and) a flame of fire comes out of his mouth.

53. *Ibid.*, 372b.

54. *Ibid.*, 383a.

55. J. Black et al. (eds.), *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian*, 269, s.v. *pašāru(m)*. Cf. *ibid.*, meaning 4: “undo, release” spell, curse, oath.”

56. *Ibid.*, 271a, s.v. *paṭāru(m)*. Cf. *ibid.*, meaning 4: “‘clear, dispel’ evil, sin, punishment, illness . . .” and meaning 7: “‘dispel, break’ . . . mag. knot, power; sin, curse.”

57. For “the identical semantic development of semantically equivalent terms even if they are etymologically distinct” and the importance of distinguishing between general and technical meanings of individual terms, as principles 7 and 5, respectively, of the “Held Method,” see C. Cohen, “The ‘Held Method’ for Comparative Semitic Philology,” *JANES* 19 (1989), 17–20, 14.

58. Segal, *Catalogue*, 113 (see his note to *gyr* [line 15]).

59. Drower and Macuch, *Dictionary*, 50a.

60. *Ibid.*, 341a.

61. *Ibid.*, 50a. Drower and Macuch’s interpretation of *baraia* 2 as “exorciser, exorcizing” does not accord with the derivation which they propose from Akkadian *bārū*, as the Akkadian term refers not to exorcists (Akkadian *āšīpu*), i.e., individuals engaged in (white) magic (cf. Mandaic AŠP [Peʿal] “to use magical arts, exorcize, read incantations” [Drower and Macuch, *ibid.*, 41a]), but to diviners (see *CAD* B, 121–25). Cf. Kaufman, *Akkadian Influences*, 41, who notes that Akkadian *bārū* would be expected to occur in Mandaic as **bʿry*.

62. J. Naveh and S. Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity*, 3rd ed. (Jerusalem, 1998), bowl 13:17–18 (// lines 15–16 and 19–20).

63. Naveh and Shaked read: *ydyʿytwn*.

Line 17:

nybl’ “shall be smitten”: Segal translates “will swallow,” based on BLA I (< *BL^c), meaning (a) “to swallow up, devour.”⁶⁴ His interpretation, however, involves a problematic use of the preposition *b* and does not accord with the context, as it implies that each *dyw*’ “*dēw*, devil,” typically a hostile force, here serves as a protective demon for the client. It is rather the various (magical) weapons that protect the client from the attacking *dēws*. A similar list of weapons directed against *dēws* occurs in DC 43(R), J:109–14:

וכול דאיוא דַּ חאזין (110) ראזא גיפוך חאלין עומאמאתא גיכאדיב גנישואר לחאזין נאטרא גייתחמיה
באכלא (111) רבא דַּ זיוא ובנארגא רבא דַּ שיריאתא וברוכבא עפיכא דַּ מיא ולגורמאזיא (112) דַּ מיא
ובגאראזא דַּ רוגזא ובקורנאסא רבא דַּ חבילא ועסקאן חאב ובמאכאבא סיאוא (113) ובסיכיא סיכיא
סוף דַּ חבילא דַּ עתימחובה סאחריא קאדמאייא בניא דַּ סימאיל (114) סאטאנא

And every *dēw* that (110) does not honor this mystery, belies these oaths and disregards this protective (charm) shall be smitten by a great (111) mace of radiance and by a great axe of exorcisms and by an overwhelming stream of water and by a club of (112) water and by a rod of wrath and by a great hammer of destruction and . . . and by a black . . .⁶⁶ (113) and by a knife, a deadly knife of destruction by which were smitten the primeval *sahras*, the children of Simi’il (114) the Satan.

The same verb in the corresponding passage in DC 37(R) was correctly interpreted by Drower and Macuch as “shall be wounded/smitten.”⁶⁷ Note the independent occurrence of BL^c + *beth instrumentalis* + name of weapon (*p^rzł^l* “iron weapon”) with this meaning in AM 63:penult.⁶⁸ The same usage is attested for the Syriac cognate *bla^c* “to be struck, smitten, beaten, wounded.”⁶⁹ Cf. Jewish Babylonian Aramaic *bl^c qwlpy/gwlpy* “to receive blows.”⁷⁰

Lines 18–19:

kbyš hyšwk’ mn qwd’m nhwr’ . . . “suppressed is darkness before light . . .”: Segal compares this formula with BM 117872(Segal 079M):4. Lines 3–4 of that text should be read as follows:

כביןש חישובא מינקודאם נחורא וכביש] (4) כולה חילה דַּ חישובא מינקודאם כולה חילה דַּ נחורא רבא
suppre[ssed is darkness before light and suppressed is] (4) all the power of darkness before all
the power of great light.⁷¹

Cf. the Jewish Aramaic incantation bowl BM 139524(Segal 023A):4–5:

64. Drower and Macuch, *Dictionary*, 65a.

65. Read: *wbgwrm²yz²*.

66. Drower and Macuch, *Dictionary*, 242b, hesitantly render *m²k²b² sy²w²* as “black melancholy,” but the context requires some sort of weapon.

67. Drower and Macuch, *ibid.*, 65a, s.v. BLA I, meaning (b) “to be wounded, smitten, beaten, injured.”

68. Cited in *ibid.*

69. J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (Oxford, 1903), 47a. Payne Smith gives an example of *bla^c + beth instrumentalis + saypō* “sword.” For similar examples with *gērō* “arrow” (exactly paralleling *b²l² bgyr² ‘br²yy²* [line 18]), *ḥutrē* “staves” and *šabṭō* “rod,” see R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus* (Oxford, 1879–97), col. 537.

70. Sokoloff, *DJBA*, 221b–22a.

71. See Ford, “Notes,” 079M.

דכביש חשוכה תחות נהורא מחתא תחות אסותא (5) סיתרא תחות בינינה חבלתא תחות שויתא רוגזא
תחות ניהא

who suppresses darkness beneath light, wound(s) beneath healing, (5) demolition beneath construction, destruction beneath creation, anger beneath calm.⁷²

Virtually the same set of parallel terms as in BM 91715 occurs in a non-magical context in Ginza Yamina (ed. Petermann) 207, 15–19 (and parallels):

אנא חו חייא בַּ חוֹן מֶן לֵאקֵאדמִיא אֵנא חו כּוּשְטֵא בַּ חוּא מֶן קוֹדֵאם בְּרִישָא אֵנא חו זִיּוּא אֵנא חו נַחורֵא
אֵנא חו מוֹרְתָא אֵנא חו חִיִּיא אֵנא חו חֲשׁוּכָא אֵנא חו נַחורֵא אֵנא חו טַעִיא אֵנא חו שְׂרָאֵרָא אֵנא חו חֲבִילָא
אֵנא חו בִּינִיאֵנָא אֵנא חו מַחִיתָא אֵנא חו אֲסוֹתָא

I am Life which existed from of old, I am Truth which existed of yore, at the Beginning. I am radiance, I am light, I am death, I am life, I am darkness, I am light, I am error, I am truth, I am destruction, I am construction, I am wound(s), I am healing.

lʿškʿb “**may . . . lie down**”: Segal reads *ldškʿb* “may she [Bašniray] not lie down,” understanding *dškʿb* as a variant of *iškʿb*. Based on the published photograph, Segal’s reading seems epigraphically possible. The voicing *t > d* proposed by Segal is indeed attested in Mandaic,⁷³ but the occurrences listed by Nöldeke (see the preceding note) are limited to the second radical of the root. Segal’s analysis, moreover, leaves the following words (*sʿnʿy pyṯyrwtʿ d-sʿnyʿly*) “my hater, the *piṯyarūta*-demon that hates me” [Segal: “My haters! The malice of those that hate me!”] isolated with no clear relation to the context. The present author would thus hesitantly propose reading *lʿškʿb* “may he lie down,” referring to *sʿnʿy* “my hater.”

pyṯyrwtʿ “**the piṯyarūta-demon**”: *pyṯyrwtʿ*, lit. “hatred, enmity,” occurs as the feminine counterpart of *pyṯyʿrʿ* “enemy, hateful one” in lists of demons in incantations.⁷⁴

Line 21:

‘*syʿrʿ twʿtʿ*’ “**bound are the signs**”: This phrase serves as a label for the bowl. Such labels often consist of the opening words (i.e., the title) of the incantation. With respect to the present bowl, the label is derived from the opening line of the second incantation (line 13): *ʿtwʿtʿ <ʿ> d-ʿnʿ bʿšnyʿy hzyʿnʿ bhylymʿy* “The signs that I, Bašniray, saw in my dream.”

2. Appendix 1: BM 91780:

a. Text:

אסותא תיחווילה (2) לביהַ בַּ בשניראי פת (3) שאח[פ]ריד אַזאַט שומיך ואר׳א זאַט קריליך
(4) זוּטֵארְתִיא בַּ אַ[ח]אֵרָא חוּאֵתָא וּקְשִישָאֵתָא בַּ עֲסֵרֵאֵתָא (5) נוקבֵאתָא מִדְכָאֵר דְכִירִית עו יֵאֲדוּרִיא
יֵדְכִרִית כַּבַּ (6) שֵׁאֲמִישׁ תֵּאֲגָא לְגֵ׳אֵי׳ וּמְלִכוּאֵתָא קֵאֲבִיל תְּלַחֲמָא וְשִׁיתִינִן׳ וְחֵאֲדִ׳ (7) שְׁנִיא אֲכֵאל

72. The technical use of verbal and nominal derivatives of the root KBŠ is well attested in Jewish Aramaic magical texts. See further J. Naveh, “‘A Good Subduing, There Is None Like It’ [in Hebrew],” *Tarbiz* 54/3 (1985), 367–82, esp. 369, and J. Naveh and S. Shaked, *Magic Spells and Formulae: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity* (Jerusalem, 1993), 47.

73. See Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, §45.

74. See, e.g., DC 43(R), E:30–31,32–33, etc. (written *pyṯyʿrwtʿ*). For *pyṯyʿrʿ*, see S. Shaked, *apud* J. C. Greenfield and J. Naveh, “A Mandaic Lead Amulet with Four Incantations [in Hebrew],” *Eretz-Israel* 18 (1985), 106.

והאיזאך מן בית'ה] אפ'ק'ויא ואטרוריא ותיזאך אנתא ליליתא (8) <תא>גא לג'את' 75 וּמְלֻכּוּתָא
 קאבילת תלתמ'א' ושיתיך וחי'א'ד שניא אכא'ל'ית] והאיזאך (9) אנתא ליליתא מן] ביתך
 אפקוך 76 ואטרוך ואתנאל'ך' קופתיך עריש'ך] וקופאתיך לידניך (10) על רישיך ומוליג'ך בעדיך
 אלגטוך ואגלוך בגלותא בגעלוא'ייא' וא'פ'קוך מן א'קא ב' מיצר'א'יא' (11) ואמאראת אנת ח'עי'א
 ליליתא וסחורא ודיוא ב' ח'טי'ת' [בוך?] בבניא א'נאי'ש'י'א] ובבניא ב' בשניאראי סדימית (12) 'וח'רימית
 ועכיסית ומכסית ומשמאתית ומ]באטלית] ומזיחית מ'י'ן' בית'ה ו'פג'ר]ה] ב' אבדארא'מ'אן בר
 (13) [מן]שוויא ומן ב'שנ'י'ראין] זוה' 'סד'י'מית] וחרמית 'סדימ'י'א [וח'רימ'י'א] 'ראז'י'א] ב' פומיך
 תיב'י'רא] ופכיר'א] 'עדיך לעחור'י'א] גוביך (14) . . . 'מינה ב' 'אבדא'ר' 'אחמאן] ג'ברא ו]בישנאראי
 ע'תא' זוה ומן 'בני'א'יחורן] 'זי'כריא [ו]מ'ן] בנאתון גוקבאתא] . . . 'ש'תא ב' פרזלא גביבא
 קאמאת'יך' . . . בישנאראי ומ]כראך על'חא' (15) חבל'א ר]ב'א] ב' פרז'לא עסרית' . . .
 . . . קדמאייא עסירא וחתי'מא' חומר'ת'א' ו'מ'נאכלתא] . . . (16)

Exterior:

. . . (18) . . . ליליתא מן 'האיז'ך' . . . 'באית' (19) . . . (20) . . .

b. Translation:

(1) May there be healing (2) for the house of Bašniray daughter of (3) Šahafrid. Your name is Azaṭ and you are called Arwazaṭ, (4) O youngest of (your) sisters and eldest of the female (5) goddesses. You surely remember, or <I shall> indeed remind <you>: when (6) Šamiš took the crown and received the kingship (text: kingdoms), he reigned three hundred and sixty one (7) years. Then they expelled him from his house and drove him away. Then you, lilith, (8) took the <cro>wn and received the kingship (and) reigned three hundred and sixty one years. Then (9) you, lilith, they expelled you from your house and drove you away and they placed your cash box upon your head and the cash box of your dowry (text: your cash boxes your dowry) (10) upon your head and made you take your *mlūg*-property in your hands and exiled you into exile among the exiles, and expelled you from the land of the Egyptians. (11) And you said: I am the lilith and the *sahra* and the *dēw* who has harmed humans and the children of Bašniray. You are shackled (12) and banned and rebuked and reproved and anathematized and [annul]led and expelled from the house and body of Abdara<h>man son of (13) Mišoya and from Bašn[iray], his spouse. You are sha[ckled] and banned. The mysteries of your mouth are shackled and banned. Your hands are bro[ken] and tied behind your back. (14) . . . from Abdar[ahman, the ma]n, and Bašniray, the woman, his spouse, and from [their] male sons [and (from) their female daughters] . . . of iron. Your frame is bent down . . . Bašniray and (15) a great cord [of] iron is wrapped about it. You are bound . . . (16) . . . the primeval. . . Bound and sealed are the humartas and the g[uileful spirit] . . . (17) . . . (18) . . . lilith from this . . . house . . . (19) . . . (20) . . .

3. Appendix 2: DC (= MS. Drower) 37(R):399–414:

The Drower Collection in the Bodleian Library contains a considerable number of late Mandaic manuscripts of a magical nature. DC 37(R) apparently dates to ca. 1800 C.E., as the scribe who copied it is the son of the scribe who copied DC 12(R), dated to 1782 C.E. Much of the content of these manuscripts, however, goes back to a far earlier period. A. Caquot, for example, discusses parallels between DC 43(R) [copied by the same scribe as DC 37(R)] and a Mandaic lead roll from Late Antiquity.⁷⁷ Similar parallels can be cited from the Mandaic incantation bowls.⁷⁸ The text

75. Only faint traces of the *t* are visible, but they seem to exclude *ṭ*.

76. The *k* is written over *y*' (cf. *ṣpqwy*' [line 7]).

77. A. Caquot, "Un phylactère mandéen en plomb," *Semitica* 22 (1972), 67–87, pls. I–IV.

78. For example, BM 103356 (Segal, 102M) and BM 136205 (Segal, 111M) parallel DC 40(R):1086–1114; BM 136203 (Segal, 104M) and BM 108824 (Segal, 106M) parallel DC 44(R):252–326; BM 91708 (Segal 083M) parallels DC 43(R), B. See provisionally my notes to these bowls in Ford, "Notes," ad loc.

presented below is admittedly not an exact parallel of BM 91715:13ff., but there is a clear literary dependence between the two which unequivocally indicates the antiquity of the magical tradition related in the Drower manuscript.

a. Text:

על ארסא ד כושטא גנינא אנא יאחיא ביחראם
 (400) בר חואר סימאת באסארא ד חאימאנותא ובאסאדאי
 תראצליא אתותיא ליגראי נארגא רבא ד שרארא
 עסאדאי אכלא רבא ד זיוא קאדמאיי סיכינא וסיפא
 ותוקפא חבילא בסאדאי רוכבא רבא ד מיא עלאואי
 אכלא רבא ד גלאלא ד אתיא ניבלא בסיכינא סיכין וסיפא
 (405) תוקפא חבילא ד אתיא מן עוחראי ניבלא ברוכבא
 ד מיא ד אתיא מן אתותיא ליגראי ניבלא בנארגא
 רבא ד שרארא ד שיריאתא ד אתיא מן עלאואי
 ניבלא באכלא רבא ד גלאלא ד אתיא מן קודאמאי
 ניבלא בשוטא ד נורא עסירא וחתימא חואר
 (410) נישמתאי דיליא יאחיא ביחראם בר חואר
 סימאת חתימנא בעסקאת יוזאטאק מאנדא
 ד חייא בשאבא שאייה ד עומאמא בשאבא שאייה
 ד ליליא ושומא ד מאנדא ד חייה מאדכאר עלאי
 דיליא יאחיא ביחראם בר' ח'א'א'א' סימאת
 א_____ס

b. Translation:

Upon a bed of truth I repose, I, Yahya-Bihram
 (400) son of Hawa-Simat, (bound) with a bond of faith. At my pillow
 is set up for me <a . . .>. Beneath my feet is a great axe of steadfastness.
 (At) my pillow is a great mace of primeval radiance, a knife and a sword
 and violence (and) destruction. At my pillow is a great stream of water. Above me is
 a great mace of stone. He who comes (against me) shall be smitten by the knife, the knife of
 (*sic*), and the sword
 (405) (and) the violence (and) the destruction. He who comes against me from behind shall
 be smitten by the stream
 of water. He who comes (against me) from beneath my feet shall be smitten by the great
 axe of steadfastness of exorcisms. He who comes against me from above
 shall be smitten by the great mace of stone. He who comes against me from in front
 shall be smitten by the scourge of fire. Bound and sealed is this
 (410) soul of mine, Yahya-Bihram son of Hawa-
 Simat. I am sealed by the signet-ring of Yuzataq Manda
 d-Hiia during the seven hours of the day (and) during the seven hours
 of the night, and the name of Manda d-Hiia is invoked over me,
 Yahya-Bihram son of Hawa-Simat.

c. Comments:

Line 402:

zyw' q'dm'y' “primeval radiance”: *q'dm'y'* may well be a corruption of *qwd'm'y'*
 “before me,” beginning a new phrase (“before me is a knife . . .”). Cf. lines 408–9.
 The expression *zyw' q'dm'y'* “primeval radiance,” however, is otherwise attested. See,

Cf. also Ch. Müller-Kessler and T. Kwasman, “A Unique Talmudic Aramaic Incantation Bowl,” *JAOS* 120 (2000), 164, who discuss parallels between DC 21(R) [Shafta d-Pishra d-Ainia] and incantations from Late Antiquity in Jewish Aramaic (an incantation bowl) and Mandaic (lead rolls).

for example, Ginza Yamina (ed. Petermann) 276, 14–15: *zyw' hw q'dm'y' nhwr' d-s'k' lytlh* “It is primeval radiance, light that has no limit.”

Line 404:

sykyn wsyp' “the knife of (*sic*), and the sword”: See above, note to BM 91715, line 15.

Lines 406–7:

n'rg' rb' d-šr'r' d-šry't' “great axe of steadfastness of exorcisms”: This phrase would appear to be a conflation of *n'rg' rb' d-šry't'* “great axe of exorcisms” (as in BM 91715:16,17) with *n'rg' rb' d-šr'r'* “great axe of steadfastness” (as in DC 37[R]:401). In fact, the same phrase occurs in a different context in DC 44(R):522–23, where *d-šr'r'* is marked by the scribe with dots indicating text to be deleted: *n'rg' rb' d-šr'.r' d-šry't'*.⁷⁹

Addendum

Two new articles containing studies of BM 91715 became available only when the proofs of the present article were already being prepared: Ch. Müller-Kessler, “Die aramäische Beschwörung und ihre Rezeption in den mandäisch-magischen Texten: am Beispiel ausgewählter aramäischer Beschwörungsformulare,” *Res Orientales* 14 (2002), 193–208 (see 203–5); idem, “Die Zauberschälensammlung des British Museum,” *AfO* 48/49 (2001/2002), 115–45 (see 132–33). The latter article also contains a transcription and translation of BM 91780 (133–34). Note that Müller-Kessler also reads *l'šk'b* in BM 91715:19.

79. As noted above (n. 39), DC 44(R) parallels DC 15(R) and a manuscript published by de Morgan, *Études Linguistiques, II^e partie*, 255–70. The de Morgan manuscript (259/9:3–4) and DC 15(R) read *n'rg' rb' d-šry't'* (DC 15[R]: *šryryt'*), without the extraneous *d-šr'r'*.

