

# Notes on some Aramaic and Mandaic Magic Bowls

JONAS C. GREENFIELD  
Hebrew University, Jerusalem

The student of Semitic epigraphy is indebted to T. H. Gaster for his work in many aspects of that field. From pioneering articles on Ugaritic texts to his ever-enlightening *Thespis*; from random articles dealing with myth and legend to his recent *Myth, Legend and Custom in the Old Testament*, a constant interest in what can be garnered from epigraphic texts and understood in a broader context is easily documented in Gaster's work. Gaster's masterful article on the Arslan Tash amulet is a model for the study of both the background and survival of the material that goes into a "magic" text.<sup>1</sup> It was in this study that a thread of continuity was woven from amulet to magic bowl.

After the publication of Montgomery's *Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur*<sup>2</sup> and the thorough review article by J. N. Epstein<sup>3</sup> there was a pause in the interest in this material. Then, during the thirties and forties, Cyrus Gordon assiduously tracked down and published magic bowls scattered throughout many collections in various parts of the world. A renewed interest in these bowls is witnessed by the publication of W. S. McCullough's *Jewish and Mandaean Incantation Bowls in the Royal Ontario Museum*<sup>4</sup> and E. M. Yamauchi's *Mandaic Incantation Texts*.<sup>5</sup> This material has elicited an important study by Baruch Levine. Levine is

---

1 *Orientalia* 11 (1942), 41-79. Gaster has added further notes on the subject in his Prolegomenon (pp. xxiv-xxxv) to the Ktav reprint of his father's *Studies and Texts in Folklore, Magic, etc.* (New York, 1971).

2 (Philadelphia, 1913). This work is an excellent summary of what was known of the subject at the time of publication. Montgomery was an excellent Aramaist and biblical scholar and was able to correct many of the errors of his predecessors and to put the bowls into a new perspective (henceforth cited as *AIT*).

3 "Glosses babylo-araméenes," *RÉJ* 73 (1921), 27-58; *RÉJ* 74 (1922), 40-72, henceforth cited as *Epstein*. Epstein was both a great Talmudist and a well-trained Semitist who was actively interested in every branch of Aramaic philology. He was thus able to correct, on the basis of his broad knowledge and incisive analysis, the texts published by Montgomery. It was simply a matter of greater familiarity with the literature that served as a contemporary setting for the bowls, rather than a fault of judgment on Montgomery's part, that stood Epstein in such good stead. In many of Epstein's later books and articles there are references to various philological questions, especially of a lexicographical nature, that are pertinent to the language of the magic bowls.

4 *University of Toronto Near and Middle East Series*, no. 5 (Toronto, 1967), henceforth cited as *McCullough*.

5 *American Oriental Series*, vol. 49 (New Haven, 1967). Cf. the reviews of Morton Smith *AJA* 73 (1969), 95-97; and M. Sokoloff, *Orientalia* 40 (1971), 448-58, henceforth quoted as *Yamauchi*. Yamauchi has also written a useful survey of recent publications, "Aramaic Magic Bowls," *JAOS* 85 (1965), 511-23.

the first scholar in years to use the review article, mentioned above, by J. N. Epstein.<sup>6</sup> The neglect of this article has meant the repetition of mistakes and misunderstandings and a lack of awareness on the part of most scholars of some basic insights.<sup>7</sup>

It has become almost a dogma in this field of research, and this writer is also guilty of having believed it, that the use of a particular script—Jewish, Mandaic, Syriac, etc.—indicated that the scribe and the person for whom the bowl was written adhered to a particular religion. The occurrence of certain formulae in a variety of script types was taken to indicate that there were shared syncretic magic beliefs common to all these religions, and a free borrowing of formulae, especially from the “Jewish magician.” There can be no doubt that there is a degree of truth to this. It may be doubted that a Jew would use a Syriac bowl that is obviously Christian or that a Christian would use a Mandaic bowl in which the elements of the Mandaean religion are clearly set forth. Yet, J. N. Epstein noted that certain bowls agreed literally with each other even though the script was different. He therefore reached the conclusion that “ce que peut être décisif, ce sont les *dates* de ces textes: les *noms* des clients pour qui ils sont écrits” and was able to show that various “Syriac” bowls published by Montgomery were Jewish in origin.<sup>8</sup> It may be noted that some texts are so pagan in content that despite their being in Jewish script one would best attribute them to a pagan source (*AIT* no. 19) and we shall see a Mandaic text below that in all likelihood is Jewish in origin.

Another interesting point that must now be taken into consideration in examining the content of these bowls is their relationship to the Merkaba tradition. We owe to Professor Gershom Scholem this important insight, for he has pointed out how certain references to Metatron in the bowls stem from the Jewish esoteric tradition.<sup>9</sup> I have tried elsewhere to see in the bowls a witness to the transmission of this esoteric tradition in Babylon.<sup>10</sup>

### 1. Enochian echoes in the magic bowls

J. T. Milik, who has been entrusted with the edition of the Enoch material from Qumran, has recently claimed that there are reflexes of the Enoch tradition in the magic bowls.<sup>11</sup> Despite Milik’s ingenuous presentation of this as an original insight, the possibility was already

6 “*The Language of the Magic Bowls*,” an appendix to vol. 5 of Jacob Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia* (Leiden, 1970), henceforth cited as *Levine*.

7 Epstein is not mentioned by either W. H. Rossell, *A Handbook of Aramaic Magical Texts* (Skylands, 1953), or by Yamauchi.

8 Cf. Epstein (1922), 41-43.

9 Cf. G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition*, rev. ed. (New York, 1965), 48, 131.

10 Cf. the Prolegomenon to the Ktav reprint of H. Odeberg’s edition of “3 Enoch” (New York, 1973). An interesting example of the use of Jewish esoteric tradition in a magic bowl was pointed out by L. H. Schiffman, “A Forty-two Letter Divine Name in the Aramaic Magic Bowls,” in the *Bulletin of the Institute of Jewish Studies* 1 (1973), 97-102. Schiffman is right that “these incantations and the attendant magical practices could not have had the approval of the rabbinic authorities” (p. 97). But even if there was no approval, these practices were condoned and tolerated. [Cf. Addendum].

11 Cf. his article, “Problèmes de la littérature hénochique à la lumière des fragments araméens de Qumran,” *HTR* 64 (1971), 333-78, in particular, 369.

raised by Montgomery. He noted, when commenting on the phrase (*AIT* 2:6): *mḥytn' lykwn šmt' wgzrt' w'ḥrmt' d'ytnḥ l ḥyrmwn twr' w'l lywytn tny'n' w'l sdwm w'l 'mwr'* "I will bring down upon you the curse and the proscription and the ban which fell upon Mount Hermon and upon the monster Leviathan and upon Sodom and Gomorrah," that this was a reminiscence of the myth of the confederation of the fallen angels upon Mt. Hermon.<sup>12</sup> Montgomery naturally referred to Enoch 6:5f., where there is an obvious play on the root *ḥrm*. He also collected important material from such distant sources, in both time and place, as Philo of Byblos and Hilary of Potiers. The reference to Philo of Byblos is of importance, for he would know nothing of the Enoch tradition but would, rather, be quite cognizant of the ancient traditions about the Titans that fed both the pagan mythographers of the Hellenistic and Roman periods and the Jewish authors whose works were molded into the Enoch tradition.<sup>13</sup> Now, Professor S. Spiegel, in an excursus called "Danel in the Book of Enoch," has noted that, besides, the wordplay on Hermon, there is one on mourning in Abeline, in Enoch 13:9.<sup>14</sup> As Spiegel pointed out, this must, in all likelihood, be an allusion to the role of the city *ablm* in the Aqhat tale from Ugarit. Earlier in this bowl (lines 3-4) the exorciser threatens the demons with the spell that was used against Yam and Leviathan. This is naturally an allusion to a very ancient myth which must be connected with the story of Ba'al's victory over Yam as familiar to us from Ugarit.<sup>15</sup> This threat is followed by another: "I will bend the bow against you and I will stretch the bow-string at you" (lines 4-5). Montgomery pointed to the use of the bow against Tiamat in the *Enuma elish* as the referent for the second threat.<sup>16</sup> Be that as it may, this is all clearly ancient material that the exorciser is using. There is, therefore, no need to have recourse to Enoch for the curse that fell upon Mt. Hermon, especially when it is accompanied by such ancient curses as that upon Leviathan and that upon Sodom and Gomorrah.

Beside this supposed reference to Enoch, Milik would find in *AIT* 4:3 a reference to a *byt ḥnwkw* which, with a little sleight of hand, easily becomes an "Ecole d'Hénoch." The reading *ḥnwkw* was Montgomery's but he read *byb* not *byt*; the correct reading and explanation of this line was given by Epstein, who read *ḥnyk* "these," a demonstrative pronoun well known from both Babylonian Aramaic and Mandaic. Epstein translated the line as "I have bound you with the spells that bind these evil brothers." Epstein noted that this particular bowl, despite the fact that it was written in the Jewish script, had a Mandaean flavor; and the reference to the seven stars and the zodiacal signs, such as *kakkabe* and *malwaše*, is an indication of this. Enoch has no place in Mandaean thought. Milik would also find a *byt ḥnwkw* in *AIT* 19:

12 *AIT*, 126. The translation is that of Montgomery.

13 Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 1, 10:7.

14 S. Spiegel, "Noah, Daniel and Job" *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume* (New York, 1945), 305-55. The excursus is on pp. 336-41. Spiegel suggests the curse on Hermon may reflect I Aqhat i:42f.

15 Cf. *UT* 68 and the translation of H. L. Ginsberg in *ANET*, 130-31 (unless the boast of Anat to have done in Yam and Lotan is taken seriously). Cf., too, the comments of T. H. Gaster, *Thespis*, 1st ed., 154-60. As Gaster noted, Kothar-and-Khasis, who provided the bludgeons to be used against Yam, was also the inventor of the art of composing incantations.

16 *AIT*, 125. The references would be different today. There remains the possibility that in some account of the defeat of Yam and Leviathan both mace and bow were used, as in the case of Tiamat. As T. Jacobsen has shown, the Marduk-Tiamat battle has its origin in the West: see *JAOS* 88 (1968), 104-8. Note that in the myth that must stand behind Hab. 3:8-14, Yam is defeated by use of mace and bow.

17, but the pagan character of that bowl, alongside the obvious palaeographic difficulties of such a reading, militates against this.<sup>17</sup> The culmination of such unfounded speculations about a “house of Enoch” or a “school of Enoch” may be found in Milik’s remarks: “on s’imaginait donc le Sage antediluvien entouré de disciples, tout comme un rabbin savant d’une académie juive en Mésopotamie.”<sup>18</sup>

There is, however, a reference in one of the bowls published by Cyrus Gordon to an aspect of the Enoch story that has gone unnoticed even by those interested in the subject.<sup>19</sup> In Gordon’s Text D, 11:10-11 we read: *kwlbwn šbytyn wbtlylyn mn mymryb d’l qn’ wnwqym bw dšlb ‘z’ w’z’l wmyttrwn ‘ysr’ rb’ dkwsy* “may they all be checked and annulled by the word of the ‘jealous and vengeful God’—He who sent ‘Uzza and ‘Azrael and Metatron, the great prince of the throne.” As is well known, Uzza and Azrael are the later names for the pair of leaders of the fallen angels whom we first meet as Shemjaza and Azazel in the Ethiopic version of Enoch.<sup>20</sup> (We now know from the Qumran fragments that the original form of these names are ŠMYHZH and ŠH’L—Šemiḥaza and ‘Asah’el.)<sup>21</sup> The use of the verb *šēlaḥ* ‘sent’, and the association with Metatron does not fit what is known of Uzza and Azrael as alluded to in Talmudic tradition (TB *Yoma* 67b) and reported in greater detail in the later Midrashim.<sup>22</sup> We must assume that the word *šēlaḥ* refers to the legend that they were sent down to earth for testing after they decried man’s sinfulness. They themselves did not withstand temptation, and as “fallen angels” they sinned with the “daughters of man.”<sup>23</sup> This tale must be assimilated to that told of Shemḥazai and Azazel (related in the *Yalqut*)<sup>24</sup> in which Metatron is sent to punish them for their sins. There remains the possibility that the reference is to the relatively innocent opposition of Uzza and Azrael to the elevation of Enoch-Metatron as told in “3 Enoch.” Be that as it may, it is interesting to find an *actual* reference to an aspect of the developed Enoch theme in the magic bowls.

This is, however, not the sole reference. Shemḥazai himself occurs on a magic bowl. There is an obscure reference to Shemḥazai and his son ḤYH (Oḥyah) in the Talmud (TB *Niddah*

17 My examination of this text preceded Milik’s publication and thus the reading *ḥmwk* for Montgomery’s *ḥmwn* was not considered by me at that time. My notes indicate that the reading *ḥmwn* was doubtful.

18 It is true that very late material does make a sage with a scholastic following of Enoch but nothing of this is known in pseudepigraphic or rabbinic sources as Ginzberg has pointed out (*Legends of the Jews*, 5:157, n. 59). Milik has performed a misleading sleight of hand when he writes “le sorcier qui s’identifie avec Hermès-Métatron-Hénoch, etc.,” since we never find this three-sided equation in the bowls.

19 Published in *Archiv Orientalni* 6 (1934), 328-30. The phrase *šbytyn wbtlylyn* has been discussed most recently by Levine, 359, while the title of Metatron was discussed by Scholem, *Gnosticism*, 48, and Levine, 356. For Uzza and Azrael, Gordon refers simply to Jastrow.

20 For the fallen angels, cf. B. J. Bamberger, *Fallen Angels* (Philadelphia, 1952).

21 Cf. Milik, *Problèmes*, 348 and passim in his study, “Turfan et Qumran,” *Tradition und Glaube*, Festgabe für K. G. Kuhn, (Göttingen, 1972), 117-27. [Cf. Addendum].

22 Cf. the material noted by Ginzberg, *Legends*, 152, n. 56, etc., and 169, n. 10. Cf., too, Bamberger, *Fallen Angels*, especially pp. 128-32.

23 The tale is best found in *Aggadat Beresbit* (ed. S. S. Buber), 30.

24 Cf. *Yalqut Shm’oni*, Bereshit, s.44 (p. 15a of the Salonica editio princeps, [reprint: Jerusalem, 1968]). This tale has been reprinted in a variety of later collections.

61a). In the abovementioned text found in the Yalqut the two sons are mentioned with the names Hiyva and Hivva.<sup>25</sup> Thanks to the texts whose contents have recently been revealed by Milik we know that the name of the sons in the Aramaic Enoch fragments are *'WHYH* (Ohyah) and *'HHYH* (Hahyah). It is clear that in the course of transmission these names have also undergone change. The following phrase is found on a magic bowl, in Syriac script, published by Montgomery and commented on by J. Epstein: *wḥtymyn b'yzqtyb dšmḥyz' mry' bgdn'* "and they are sealed with the ring of Šamḥiza [=Šemihaza-Šemhazai], the lord, Bagdana."<sup>26</sup> It is difficult to determine what the exact meaning of this title might be. An Iranian derivation for *bagdana* has been proposed but this is far from established.<sup>27</sup> In *AIT* 19, a text with strong pagan overtones, we find *bšwm ṭwl'kyry mry' rb' dbgdny* "in the name of ʾT the great lord of the *bagdane*" (line 6). In line 13 the phrase is slightly longer: *wḥšwm 'ylb' gbr' wmry' rb' dbgdny* "in the name of the mighty god and great lord of the *bagdane*" and there is in this text a reference to the seven *kwmry rmy* 'high priests' of *bagdana* (line 10). Cyrus Gordon, in editing a text in the Baghdad Museum, gave in tabulated form a series of texts with similar wording. In these texts *bgdn'* appears to be a divine name, for it is accompanied by the phrase: *mlkybwn dšydy wddywy wšlyt' rb' dlylyt'* "king of demons and devils, and great ruler of the liliths"; it is in these texts, in their Mandaic form, that *bgdn'* is replaced by *'bwgdn'* (read Abugdana), a name known from other Mandaic texts.<sup>28</sup>

It is quite possible that the proper interpretation of the titles given *ŠMHYZ'* in the text published by Montgomery can now be offered on the basis of a text, a lead amulet, very recently published by André Caquot.<sup>29</sup> In this text, which has its close parallels in a Mandaic codex quoted by Caquot, Abugdana is called *mrida* 'rebel' (line 36'), while a female Abugdanita

25 Cf. Spiegel's interesting remarks concerning these names in his essay referred to in n. 14. Milik, "Litterature hénochique," 367-68 and "Turfan et Qumran," 118, claims that a heretical work titled *Liber de Ogia gigante* refers to a book named after 'Ohya the son of Šemihaza. But Milik ignored the fact that Eusebius, *Prep. Evang.*, Book 10, chapter 10, recorded earlier material concerning an antediluvian Ogyes, and that, according to a legend, recorded in *TB Niddab* 61a, Og was the son of 'HYH, son of Shemhazai. There is no need to assume that 'HYH became Ogia in Latin, when a good referent is at hand.

26 "A Magical Bowl and the Original Script of the Manichaeans," *JAOS* 32 (1912), 434-38. Epstein's notes are in *JAOS* 33 (1913), 279-80. This bowl, formerly in the possession of W. T. Ellis, has been in the Yale Babylonian Collection for many years. Thanks to the kindness of W. W. Hallo, Curator of that collection, I was able to examine this and other bowls. I hope to deal with it in detail elsewhere.

27 Montgomery commented on its Iranian origin and in *JAOS* 33, 285, Louis H. Gray proposed a rather far fetched Iranian etymology. My colleague, Professor Shaul Shaked, with whom I discussed this problem, was not familiar with *bagdana* as a personal name or title from Iranian sources. He drew my attention to W. B. Henning's discussion of *bagadan* as "sanctuary" in *BSOAS* 18 (1956), 366-67.

28 Cf. C. Gordon, "An Aramaic Exorcism," in *Archiv Orientalni* 6 (1934), 466-74. The Mandaic references to Abugdana were gathered by Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris*, 1:103, n. 7. As Lidzbarski noted, Abugdana is called *mara elaba Abugdana* in Pognon 25. The name also occurs in *Yamauchi*, no. 33, 4 (p. 296). *Yamauchi* (p. 364) translates the name as "Pater Fortunatus" but this is not plausible.

29 Cf. A. Caquot, "Un phylactère mandéen en plomb," in *Semitica* 22, 67-87, particularly 77-78. For another occurrence of Abugdana on a lead amulet, cf. R. Macuch, "Altmandäische Bleirollen," in F. Altheim and R. Stiehl, eds., *Die Araber in der Alten Welt*, (Berlin, 1968), 5/1:34-72; cf. for the text p. 36 and discussion on pp. 55-56. In my Prolegomenon to the Ktav reprint of "3 Enoch" I referred to the Mani Codex recently discussed by A. Heinrichs-L. Koenen in the *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 5 (1970),

is called *mridta*. I would propose that the original meaning of *bgdn*' was 'treacherous', 'rebellious', a title that would well fit ŠMYḤZH-Šemḥazay. This is still reflected in the epithet *mrida* found in the Mandaic amulets. In the tradition of the magic bowls this was already forgotten and Šemḥazay's role as a *leader* of a dissident group was emphasized; the title *mry*' 'lord' is a reinterpretation of *mrd*' 'rebel'—due perhaps to a folk-etymology of *bgdn*' connecting it with Iranian *baga* 'god'.

## 2. A Mandaic bowl with Jewish overtones

*McCullough* Text D is a good example of a text that has all the outward signs of belonging to one cultural group but whose origin must be sought elsewhere.<sup>30</sup> This text has been dealt with by Baruch Levine and his comments would lead to the same conclusion that, although it was written in Mandaic, possibly for a Mandaean, it was clearly the work of a Jewish scribe.<sup>31</sup> Indeed, it is the most Jewish of Mandaean bowls known to me. The text begins with a call for the health (or healing) and soundness of the household of X son of Y, and his wife. Then a curious thing happens in the text. We find the word *bšwm* 'in the name of' followed by 'yl, then *YH* is given seven times, followed by the epithet *q'dwš*, all set off in boxes. The repetition of *YH* seven times is known to me from two other texts—the first is the "Syriac" text published by Montgomery and referred to above, and the second is *AIT* 32:10. Epstein has insisted on the Jewish origins of these two texts.<sup>32</sup> Although the individual elements *YH*, 'yl, and *q'dwš* have various uses in other Mandaic texts their being set aside in boxes here surely indicates that they are a positive rather than a negative element. This is then followed by the word *mlkwt*'=*malkūtā*. Now this use of *bšwm* and *mlkwt*' is important for it is not, to my knowledge, found elsewhere in Mandaic, at least not in the published bowls. It is highly reminiscent of the phrase *bšem umalkūt*, well known from Jewish liturgical rules; a *bērākā* must be *bšem umalkūt*, that is, the *berākā* must have the divine name and the designation of God as ruler of the universe. One may say that the boxed-in series between *šwm* and *mlkwt*' serves as a commentary on *šwm* 'name'.

The text continues with *wbšwm' dmyttrwn ḥldḥ dbw mš'myš qdym brgwd*' "and in the name of Metatron ḤLDḤ who serves before the curtain." Both Levine and Morton Smith have associated this enigmatic word with Hebrew *ḥeled*, 'world', as a form of Metatron's title "prince of the world," but this is at best only an attempt to make some sense out of an otherwise unknown word. The idea of a *br gwd*' a 'curtain' for the firmament, is a familiar concept in Mandaic literature<sup>33</sup> but Metatron is definitely not. Metatron's association with the *pargod* stems from the Merkaba tradition and is known from the Midrash Tanhuma and elsewhere.<sup>34</sup>

---

97-216. M. Philonenko has now noted "Une citation manichéenne du Livre d'Hénoch" in the *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 52 (1972/73), 337-40. It is clear that Enoch in Aramaic was known in Mesopotamia but one must be cautious in attributing references to him.

30 *McCullough*, 28-47.

31 *Levine*, 358-59.

32 *Epstein* (1922), 43.

33 For *bar guda*, cf. Drower-Macuch, *A Mandaic Dictionary*, 69a.

34 Cf. Tanhuma *Ve'etḥanan*, sec. 6 (Ed. Buber, p. 12).

In "3 Enoch," a work contemporaneous with the bowls, Metatron shows R. Ishmael the *par-god*.<sup>35</sup> Levine has already noted that Metatron has the title *šammāša rēhīmā* 'beloved servant' in Merkaba texts. After some cryptic lines, which were not understood by McCullough, we read that *q'l zyn' wšwht' wmšwt'* "the sound of weapons, shouts and strife" alongside of a variety of demons are "to cease and to be banished" (another Jewish expression) from the house of X son of Y.

In lines 9-10 the angels Gabriel, Michael, Ziel, Nadriel and YHDel are called upon to cleanse the house of X son of Y. Of this group only Gabriel is known from Mandaic literature, the rest are clearly borrowed from Jewish angelology.<sup>36</sup> After a line or so of conventional formulae the incantator calls upon an unknown *'drb'n*, a name that is to occur again toward the end of the line and which remains enigmatic for the present. We then read *mšb rbwt' 'n' mšb km'dhy'yl h'yl wzywy'yl zyw' whdry'l hdr' lbyš wšdy'yl hsd' lbyš*. McCullough translated the first words as "Moses of the Myriads, I, myself am Moses." But this I fear is fantasy, for *mšb rbwt'* has nothing to do with Moses but is the standard Targumic rendition of *šemen ba-mišbā* 'oil of anointment', a phrase not known in Mandaic.<sup>37</sup> The line then must mean "and I am anointed with the oil of anointment just as Hayel is clothed with strength and Zywiel with splendor and Hadariel with glory and Hasdiel with constancy." As could be expected none of these are otherwise known in Mandaic. The incantator is anointed (and thus qualified or purified) just as these angels are garbed in their particular attributes. McCullough, who had realized that this text had a strong Jewish component, suggested as a possible explanation, "another possibility is that this text was written by a Jewish magician who was versatile enough to know Mandaic." This is surely correct. We would add that this "magician" was well rooted in Jewish 'gnostic' tradition.

### 3. Merkaba Tradition

We have just noted the reflexes of the Merkaba material in a Mandaic bowl. It is not at all surprising that this material is present in Jewish bowls.<sup>38</sup> Indeed, Scholem has noted some of these elements in *Gnosticism*, etc., and he has been followed by Levine. In *AIT* 25 the elements of this tradition exist but *not* in the readings offered by Montgomery. In line 2 we read, following Epstein: *'tb šwn bmrwm wmrkbt' l kl h'wpnym* "you dwell on high and your *merkaba*

35 Cf. chapter 45 of "3 Enoch," and for the date, this writer's Prolegomenon in the Ktav reprint. For Metatron, cf. G. Scholem's article in the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*.

36 Cf. the lists in Reuben Margulies, *Mala'kē Elyon*, 2nd ed. (Jerusalem, 1964), and the amateurish but interesting collection by Gustav Davidson, *A Dictionary of Angels including the Fallen Angels* (New York, 1967). All the angels mentioned here can be found in these sources or in Jewish magic bowls.

37 Morton Smith, who has proposed interesting, but not convincing, translations for difficult lines in this text, proposes the following translation for this line, presuming a different reading or parsing of the words: "in the name of the Master of the Spirits amen, Moses our master, I myself am Moses, as he who is clothed with strength is Hiel, etc." The end of the line would mean, "in the name of our master, our mighty master."

38 An interesting text which belongs to the same tradition is that published by Wohlstein with the Berlin Museum no. 2416, cf. J. Wohlstein, *Über einige aramäische Inschriften auf Thongefässen, etc.* (Munich, 1894), 29-45.

(chariot-throne) is over all the Ophanim.”<sup>39</sup> The following lines are rather obscure and are poorly preserved. But with line 4 we have a clear reference to three angels who, as Scholem has shown, were assimilated to Metatron: *bšwm YWPY’L šmk YHW’L qrn lk ŠSNGY’L* “in the name of Yofiel, your name is Yehoel, they call you Shasangiel.”<sup>40</sup> This is followed by *YHWH*, which may be the tetragrammaton, but this does not join well with the previous words, although we do find *brwk ’th YHWH* in the previous line. This is then followed by *wkn yrt šmbthwn [d’]rmsb myttrwn yb* “and so, too, the rest of the names [of He] rmes Metatron Yah.” The three names Yophiel, Yahoel and Shasnagiel figure prominently in the various lists of the names of Metatron and it is therefore not surprising to see them together with Metatron in this bowl.

With the hindsight provided by Scholem’s important study of the daimon, Sesengen bar Pharanges, this name can now be read in the cryptic remains of the last word of line 4 and the first of line 5, the beginning of a short list of minor angels. As Scholem pointed out, the name occurs in *AIT* 7:12 but in the form Pharangen bar Pharangen.<sup>41</sup> We are indebted to Scholem for the insight that *AIT* 7 is thoroughly Jewish, and if correctly interpreted, is without a shade of polytheistic or syncretistic ideas.<sup>42</sup> The same is true of *AIT* 25. They both bear witness to an important strand in the “magic bowls,” one which drew from the theurgic side of the Merkaba tradition.

Addendum to note 10: Cf. too the magic bowl published by S. Kaufman, *JNES* 32 (1973), 170-74. This unique bowl whose text contains only biblical verses and their Targum is a good example of the use of exoteric material for magical purposes.

Addendum to note 21: The form ‘zz’l for the name of the second fallen angel is now known from a text published by J. T. Milik on pp. 112-13 of his article “Milkî-reša’ et Milkî-Şedeq dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens,” *JJS* 33 (1972), 95-144.

---

39 This is surely a line from a *piyyut* or a Merkaba hymn.

40 Montgomery read *YHY’L* but noted the possible reading *YHW’L*. There are a host of variations for *ŠSNGY’L*; indeed, in the same text different spellings are to be found. Is this the name *SSNGN*, referred to below, with the element *el* added?

41 Scholem, *Gnosticism*, 94-100.

42 *Idem*, 93.