

# ***YHBYH*, Incantation Bowls and the Tetragrammaton**

*By*

**Pilar B. Rivett**

*University of Oxford*

**Robert J. Wilkinson**

*Valley House, Temple Cloud, Somerset, United Kingdom*

**B**abylonian incantation bowls are a rare testimony of Jewish life in Sasanian Mesopotamia, a period for which we have no other witness in Jewish Aramaic, besides the Talmud. Despite an estimated 2,500 samples, only a few hundred incantations have been transcribed, edited and published to date.<sup>1</sup> This article brings to the fore the importance of divine onomastics for the apotropaic rituals prescribed in these bowls, focusing on a rare Hebrew theonym, *YHBYH*, first “discovered” in the text of an Aramaic incantation bowl from Nippur by James Montgomery. *YHBYH* has divided scholars’ opinions in the past: Montgomery and Isbell interpreted it as a reflection of the pronunciation of the Greek form Ἰαβέ; Naveh and Shaked contended that it was not a pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton, but just ‘another divine name’ of the type found in the Greek Magical Papyri

---

The authors are grateful to Roy Kotansky and Dan Levine for their support and useful suggestions.

<sup>1</sup> There are no witnesses of Rabbinic Babylonian Aramaic (RBA) literature dating from before the ninth century; of the later witnesses, very few were copied in Babylonia. The evidence stemming from the magic bowls is therefore particularly valuable for the study of RBA literature. See MORGENSTERN 2005. For a comprehensive state of the field, WALLER 2025; for materiality and magic, FRANKFURTER 2019, where material media is considered as one of the primary contexts for religious experience and as possessing and directing agency.

of late antiquity. They also argued in favour of interpreting *YHBYH* as a repetition of *YH*, with an intervening *b*, to be understood as *Yah-is-Yah* or *Yah-in-Yah*.<sup>2</sup> We shall examine both points below.

### 1. *Incantation Bowls and Theophoric Names*

In 1913, Montgomery published Aramaic incantation texts inscribed on earthenware bowls discovered in Nippur, Iraq.<sup>3</sup> Most of the bowls in his publication dated from the late Sasanian period (seventh century CE). Since then, many more examples have come to light, with an estimated 2,500 worldwide today.<sup>4</sup> Incantation bowls were inscribed in a number of Aramaic dialects within a very specific timeframe, between the fifth and seventh centuries CE, primarily in Mesopotamia.<sup>5</sup> They were intended for the protection of a named individual (the client) and his or her household and they were buried, usually upside down, in strategic locations in or around the house.<sup>6</sup> Personal names appearing on these bowls are a useful onomastic tool for the study of theonyms, because they contained the name of the god into whose custody the client was entrusted (they were ‘theophoric’); independently of onomastics, these personal names also afford scholars a glimpse into the complex world of seemingly multi-cultural communities.<sup>7</sup> Thus, the client named on Montgomery’s Bowl 9:4 was *Saradust bath Širin* (וּסְרָדוּסְתַּ בַּת שִׁירִין), and his name contained ‘*Zaradušt*’, a frequent form of the Persian *Zarathuštra*.<sup>8</sup> Conversely, the incantation inscribed on Bowl 12:1 aimed to protect husband and wife, *Dâdbeh* and *Dâdâ*, names of Semitic origin, but their family name, *Asmandûch*, is a Persian theophoric name, with a similarity to the Armenian *Samandûch*.<sup>9</sup> *Dâdbeh* commissioned two bowls in

<sup>2</sup> MONTGOMERY 1913, p. 209-211; ISBELL 1975, p. 89-90; NAVEH and SHAKED 1985, p. 164.

<sup>3</sup> In 1913, the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology held 150 magic bowls which had been unearthed in archaeological excavations at Nippur beginning in the 1850s. Today, the Museum holds 290 bowls. Montgomery selected forty bowls for his 1913 publication (30 in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, seven in Syriac, and three in Mandaic). For a summary of the excavations at Nippur, see HUNTER 2021.

<sup>4</sup> GROSS and ELITZUR-LEIMAN 2022, [omnia.sas.upenn.edu/story/story-bowls-tell](https://omnia.sas.upenn.edu/story/story-bowls-tell) (accessed 10 December 2025). The *Virtual Magic Bowl Archive* (VMBA) also provides online resources on 650 texts that comprise part of the Schøyen Collection, [exeter.ac.uk/research/projects/iaais/vmba/](https://exeter.ac.uk/research/projects/iaais/vmba/) accessed 10 January 2026.

<sup>5</sup> Some bowls were also recovered in what is today western Iran, near Susa, a key town in the Persian administration (SHAKED, FORD and BHAYRO 2013, p. 1 note 3) and in south-west Iran (MÜLLER-KESSLER 2017, p. 70); there are a dozen further documented findspots in Iraq, including Nineveh and Baghdad (WALLER 2025, p. 11-12). Incantations were written in either Syriac, Mandaic or Jewish Babylonian Aramaic (JBA), depending on the identity of the scribe. The language distribution of extant bowls is 62% JBA, 23% Mandaic and 13% Syriac (WALLER 2025, p. 3 note 1).

<sup>6</sup> Bowls were buried in courtyards or under thresholds, floors or under each of the four corners of a room (see instructions inscribed on Bowl 4, MONTGOMERY 1913, p. 133), see SHAKED 2000, p. 60-65. These were all “liminal points of danger”, where evil could pass through (LEVENE 2013, p. 379). For the domestic environment in which these bowls were found archaeologically, see MORIGGI 2023, who also offers a useful analysis of bowls in the context of materiality, the relationship of clay and text and the use of the Aramaic term *kbš* (“press”) as a technical term describing the action of “pressing”, “suppressing” and “repressing” spirits implied by the burying of the bowls.

<sup>7</sup> These names are known as ‘theophoric’, after a passage by Klearchos of Soli (c. third century BCE) in which he distinguished between ‘godless names’ (ἄθεα ὀνόματα) and ‘god-bearing names’ (θεοφόρα ὀνόματα), see Klearchos fragment 86 (WEHRLI 1967, *Die Schule Des Aristoteles*, III, ap. Athen., 448d-e). On this topic, see PARKER 2000, p. 53. Theophoric names are the largest group in the Judaeon onomasticon, according to Onomasticon.net ([www.onomasticon.net](http://www.onomasticon.net) accessed 6 August 2025) as well as GOLUB 2024, p. 139 and SIMONSON 2024, p. 511-530. For a collection of divine names from Greek and West Semitic epigraphy between 1000 BCE and 400 CE, see PALAMIDIS and BONNET 2024 and the project *Mapping Ancient Polytheisms* (MAP) 2017–2023, Patrimoine Littérature Histoire, University of Toulouse – Jean Jaurès.

<sup>8</sup> University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, CBS 9010. A similar case is found on bowl MC 77.233 of the Magnes Collection, published in MARCUS 2023, p. 415. Client names are Montgomery’s phonetic transcriptions, MONTGOMERY 1913, p. 161.

<sup>9</sup> University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, CBS 9009. For *Asmandûch*, see JUSTI 1895, p. 281. For the origin of *Dâdbeh*, MONTGOMERY 1913, p. 174. *Dâdbeh* appears on another two Syriac

Jewish Babylonian Aramaic for himself and his wife (Bowls 12 and 16), two in Syriac for himself (Bowl 31 and CBS 16019) and one Syriac bowl on behalf of his wife (Moriggi 38).<sup>10</sup> Syriac might be associated with the Christian communities in the region,<sup>11</sup> but one of *Dādbeh*'s Syriac incantation bowls (CBS 16019) invokes Rabbi Joshua, son of Perahia, and it is witness to a divorce formula (*geṭ*) which is almost identical to the formula in the Jewish Babylonian Aramaic CBS 9010 (Montgomery's Bowl 9).<sup>12</sup> In the past, the presence of these characteristics led Montgomery and Epstein to argue strongly in favour of a Jewish origin for this bowl.<sup>13</sup> However, based on references to 'signs', 'names' and 'blank spaces' in CBS 16019:6-7, which also occur in the Jewish Babylonian Aramaic bowls of the Schøyen collection; and considering a number of verbs which do not agree with their subjects in this bowl's incantation, Shaked argued, contrary to Montgomery, that the Syriac could be a transcription from a Jewish Aramaic model.<sup>14</sup> Moriggi, who agreed with Shaked, further remarked that the adoption of these formulae in the Syriac bowls was "the result of a sophisticated adaptation of the Jewish spell to the Syriac cultural *milieu*."<sup>15</sup> These brief examples underline how clients had contact with scribes of multiple linguistic and religious backgrounds and these scribes 'freely shared confessionally specific formulae with each other'.<sup>16</sup>

## 2. YHBYH: A Divine Name?

One of the Aramaic bowls found in Nippur, number 26 in Montgomery's publication (CBS 3997, figure 1), is witness to an interesting theophoric personal name, which has not received much attention in recent scholarship, despite its possible connection to the Hebrew Tetragrammaton (*YHWH*).<sup>17</sup> The incantation inscribed on this bowl aimed at protecting the client, whose name Montgomery transcribed as *Berik-Yahbêh bar Mame* (*brykyhbyh bar m'my*, בריכיהביה בר מאמי), and his wife, *Izpan-darmed bat H [...]* *dora* (איזפנדרמיד בת ה.דורא), from the female demon Lilith (*lylyt*, ליליתא).<sup>18</sup> Montgomery interpreted the husband's name, *brykyhbyh bar m'my* as an expansion of the personal name *brk* (ברכ) into *brwkyh* (ברוכיה) or *brykyh* (ברייכיה) in combination with the two key letters of the

---

bowls: n. 10 and 13 published in HAMILTON 1971, p. 112a and 115a. A '*Dādāy* daughter of *Dūdāy*' is mentioned in a JBA bowl housed at the Iraq Museum (IM 77781). See *editio princeps* by FARAJ 2023, p. 89-95.

<sup>10</sup> Montgomery's Bowl 12 is University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, CBS 9009 and Bowl 16 is CBS 2920. The Syriac bowl, Montgomery's n. 31 is CBS 9008, which was edited in MORIGGI 2014, as bowl n.3, lines 2, 6, 9 (p. 32-34). University of Pennsylvania bowl CBS 16019 is n. 5 lines 5, 10 and 13 in Moriggi's 2014 edition, p. 43-45. On CBS 16019, see MORIGGI 2015, p. 83-3. Lastly, Bowl 38 in MORIGGI 2014, p. 176, is Frau Professor Hilprecht Collection of Babylonian Antiquities, Jena (HS 3039).

<sup>11</sup> There are approximately one hundred and sixty five known incantation bowls in Syriac, whose text is inscribed in either Estrangela and Manichaean script, to express Syriac. MORIGGI 2021, p. 63 and 2014, p. 15-16.

<sup>12</sup> Some texts in the Jewish Babylonian Aramaic bowls define the incantations as "a bill of divorce" and the incantations themselves are structured in the fashion of a Jewish legal divorce formula. The divorce theme is one of the most common for banning demons in the bowls (SHAKED, BHAYRO and FORD 2013, p. 99). The regular occurrence of these formulae testifies to their popularity, as argued in SHAKED 1999, p. 173-196. For the occurrence of the Jewish divorce formula in Syriac bowls, MORIGGI 2015. Shaked explained that magic practitioners often used legal terminology in their formulae to establish greater authority and power. SHAKED, BHAYRO and FORD 2013, p. 99-273 is dedicated to bowls whose incantations use divorce texts. For parallels between these formulae and standard Jewish deeds of divorce, BHAYRO 2015b; for a study on the scribes who composed these formulae, MANEKIN-BAMBERGER 2020.

<sup>13</sup> MONTGOMERY 1913, p. 223; EPSTEIN 1922, p. 41-45.

<sup>14</sup> SHAKED 1999, p. 176-77.

<sup>15</sup> MORIGGI 2015, p. 91.

<sup>16</sup> GROSS 2024, p. 17.

<sup>17</sup> WILKINSON 2015 on the reception of YHWH among Western Christians remains the most authoritative and up-to-date source on the Tetragrammaton. For Jewish theology of the Tetragrammaton, see BEN-SASSON 2019.

<sup>18</sup> In this section, we follow Montgomery's phonetic transcription but also note that a more recent edition of the text is also available (ISBELL 1975, bowl n. 35, p. 89). We shall deal with the latter in the ensuing section.

Tetragrammaton, *YH*, יה. The latter was then further expanded by the addition of the particle *b* (ב) to read *yhbyh* (יהביה) or *brykyhbyh* (בריכיהביה). He viewed this expansion as a deliberate intention on the scribe's part to articulate the Ineffable Name in such a way as to create the very sound of it, presumably for greater magical effect.<sup>19</sup> Despite the fact that one cannot be certain of the Hebrew pronunciation of the Ineffable Name, Montgomery assumed that *YHBYH*, which he transcribed phonetically as *Yahbêh*, represented the vocalisation of the Tetragrammaton, attested in the Greek Ἰαβέ (Iabé) or Ἰαβη (Iabē) and, specifically, the pronunciation of its final vowel, which he considered similarly attested in the Greek Ἰαῆ (Iaē). Montgomery argued that Ἰαβέ represented the divine Name witnessed in Hellenistic magic, and he offered appropriate parallels in other Babylonian bowls for reading *-yh*, as it were, with a *šere*, as in Berik-Yahbēh.<sup>20</sup> Nonetheless, he also remarked that the Hebrew form witnessed in this bowl, which may be phonetically transcribed into Greek as Ἰαβη or Ἰαβέ, had no known Hebrew precedent.<sup>21</sup>

In the 1930s, Cyrus H. Gordon published texts from a wider array of incantation bowls held in the US, Europe and the Middle East and his work was expanded in 1975 by one of his students, Charles Isbell, who published incantations from seventy-two bowls, updating some of Montgomery's arguments to include more recent finds.<sup>22</sup> When considering the onomastics of בריכיהביה (*brykyhbyh*), Isbell recorded Gordon's suggestion that יהביה was a divine name, where ב was understood as predication of equivalence, and should therefore be transliterated as 'Yah-is-Yah'.<sup>23</sup> Isbell, however, favoured explaining the form 'more simply' as a reflex of the Greek vocalisation of the divine name, Ἰαβέ. In which case, Isbell argued, it would have been vocalised as יְהִיָּה (iabe).<sup>24</sup> The theophoric personal name *brykyhbyh* resurfaced years later in a bowl published in Naveh and Shaked's 1985 *Amulets and Magic Bowls*, where it featured as the name of a client within an incantation designed to silence one's enemies.<sup>25</sup> The client's name was given as *bryk yhbyh br mm* (בריך יהביה בר ממה) and it was therefore nearly identical to Montgomery's Bowl 26. Naveh and Shaked's translation rendered *bryk yhbyh* as a composite personal name, *Bërik-Yehabyah* and they suggested the latter might be considered as analogous to the Syriac ܒܪܝܟܝܗܒܝܗܗ ܒܪܡܡܐ *Bërik-šebyānēh*, 'His will be blessed', and so translated it as 'His share/load be blessed'.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>19</sup> According to Rabbinic tradition, the Name of God could only be pronounced within the Holy of Holies on Yom Kippur by the High Priest, when it was spoken ten times (m.Yoma 6.2). *YHWH* (יהוה) could only be uttered within the Temple, or as part of the Priestly Blessing; outside the Sanctuary, however, the Name had to be given the paraphrastic pronunciation 'Adonai, אֲדֹנָי (my Lord) (m.Sotah 7.6).

<sup>20</sup> See GORDON 2024, p. 225-227, for the scholarly debate on this final vowel in Samaritan vocalisation of the Tetragrammaton. Separately, Montgomery encountered the name יהו ביהו *yhw byhw*, on another bowl from Nippur: MONTGOMERY 1913, Bowl 7:8 (CBS 16007), p. 150-151.

<sup>21</sup> For Greek transcriptions of the Tetragrammaton, DEISSMANN 1909, p. 319-336, where he listed evidence of *iabé* and *iaba* in the Greek Magical Papyri (thereafter PGM); for Ἰαβέ in wider magic, p. 330-332 and for Ἰαη, p. 325. More recent scholarship can be found in KOTANSKY and SPIER 1995, p. 279, 315-337, 318 note 14. For the treatment of *YHWH* in Greek translation, VASILEIADIS 2015 is now the most comprehensive source.

<sup>22</sup> ISBELL 1975.

<sup>23</sup> For the predication of equivalence, see GESENIUS 1976, p. 379 (§119 i), where it is argued that ב can take the meaning "consisting of" after ideas of appearing, manifesting oneself and being. In this form, it would correspond to the *essentiae* of the earlier grammarians, analogous to the Greek *év* or the Latin *in*, cf. Exodus 6:3: 'I appeared unto Abraham ... ܒܫܗܘܘܢܐ ܥܡܝܢܐ as 'El Shaddai.'

<sup>24</sup> ISBELL 1975, p. 90.

<sup>25</sup> Bowl 6, line 2, now Israel Museum no. 80.1.2. NAVEH and SHAKED 1985, p. 164-168.

<sup>26</sup> *Bërik-šebyānēh* was the name of Mar Abbā's father (Mar Abbā II was Patriarch of the Church of the East between 741 and 751), see CHABOT 1898, p. 295-335. JASTROW 1972, p. 565: ܒܪܝܟܝܗܒܝܗܗ burden.

The authors refuted Montgomery's theory according to which *YHBYH* was a way of writing the Tetragrammaton, on the grounds that it was 'an appealing suggestion which lacks proof'.<sup>27</sup> They contended that *YHBYH* was 'just another divine name' and listed four examples of similar theonyms: (1) **yhbyh** in Amulet 4:15 from their publication (p. 54); (2) **yhwbyhw** in Bowl 7 of Montgomery's 1913 publication (p. 146); (3) **ywh byh** (Montgomery 1913, p. 178, Bowl 13:7) and (4) **byh byhy** found in the Geniza text TS K 23.3, line 5.<sup>28</sup> Their view that *YHBYH* was *not* a reflex of  $\text{I}\alpha\beta\epsilon$  has become the current consensus and when new evidence comes to light which includes this name, scholars refer to Naveh and Shaked's 1985 publication.<sup>29</sup> The consensus is, therefore, to view *YHBYH* as a rather ordinary 'magic' theonym, and it is this description from which we shall demur here.

### 3. *YHBYH: Not as Common as it May Seem*

Whilst we agree that *YHBYH* can be viewed as a divine name, it might not be as common as scholars assume. Having reviewed more than two hundred incantation bowls whose texts have been edited, as well as amulets in Naveh and Shaked's 1985 and 1993 publications, we are able to list only three additional examples of *YHBYH* to those already noted by Moberg (1914, 431, our note 29), Naveh and Shaked (1985, 164) and Shaked, Ford and Bhayro (2013, 111).<sup>30</sup> Our examples are as follows: (1) **yhbyh** in British Museum (BM) 103355:42, a late post-Sassanian incantation bowl which aims to protect Gadyay, son of Nigariduk, and his property, from evil spirits.<sup>31</sup> (2) **byh b'h 'yh** in Vorderasiatisches Museum VA.2416:15, a 'counter-charm' bowl, known as 'qybl' (*qivla* קיבלא), aimed at overturning any curse onto named antagonists on behalf of a client (in this instance, *Abba*, son of *Bar-kita*).<sup>32</sup> There are more examples of this kind of letter sequence;<sup>33</sup> indeed, Shaked, Ford and Bhayro

<sup>27</sup> NAVEH and SHAKED 1985, p. 165; MONTGOMERY 1911.

<sup>28</sup> The authors did concede that *YHBYH* was attested as part of a series of divine names, but they would rather interpret the name as a phrase, 'Yah-in-Yah' (not as Gordon's 'Yah-is-Yah'). Unfortunately, they did not suggest parallels to this type of formulation, nor did they explain what this rather puzzling onomasticon might signify. Thus, according to Naveh and Shaked, the name *bryk yhbyh* would mean 'Blessed is Yah-in-Yah.'

<sup>29</sup> For example, bowl JBA 15:9 contains the name *gd' bgd'*, published in SHAKED, FORD and BHAYRO 2013, p. 111, where the editors noted: "The name *gd' bgd'* recalls such magic names as *yh byh* (e.g. MSF Bowl 20:10), *'h b'h* (e.g. MS 2053/27) and *'hyh b'hyh* (e.g. JBA 55:9). Cf. the discussion in NAVEH and SHAKED 1985, p. 164-166" and JBA 55:9 *idem* p. 246, where they referred to *yh byh* as a "common magic name." Moberg, in his 1914 recension of Montgomery's publication, had already singled out *yh byh*, which scholars did not recognise as a divine name per se, but which occurred in a number of bowls from Nippur. He noted Montgomery's view that the name was an articulation of the Tetragrammaton *Yahbeh* (*labe*), and also remarked on the parallel between *yhbyh* and *byhwh* and *byh yhw* in Isaiah 26:4: בְּטָחָה בַּיהוָה עָדִיר (‘You have forever trusted in YHWH, for BYH YHWH is strength everlasting’ our translation) and in (Psalm 68:5(67:5)) where the righteous are encouraged to exalt the One who goes by the Name BYH (vocalised as *beyāh* in the MT): שִׁירוּ וְלֵאלֹהִים זַמְרוּ שְׁמוֹ סֵלוֹ לְרַקַּב בְּעֲרֹבוֹת בְּיָהּ שְׁמוֹ וְעֲלֵנוּ לְפָנָיו (‘Sing to God, sing praises to his Name, extol Him who rides on the clouds, BYH (is) his name and rejoice before Him’ our translation). MOBERG 1914, p. 430-431.

<sup>30</sup> For our methodology, see apparatus at the end of this article.

<sup>31</sup> The provenance is Iraq, dating sixth to eighth century, see SEGAL 2000, 048A. Digitised here: britishmuseum.org/collection/object/W\_1911-0408-45, accessed 13 August 2025.

<sup>32</sup> LEVENE 2013, p. 45-51. Editio princeps, WOHLSTEIN 1894, p. 11-27. A *qybl'* claims to remedy human conflict by 'returning adverse magical acts to their point of origin' (LEVENE 2011 and 2013, p. 11-12). As such, this 'counter-attack' is a more aggressive form of magic than the one utilised in BM.103355, which is defensive in nature (HARARI 1997b remains the most comprehensive treatment of Jewish aggressive magic between antiquity and the early modern period).

<sup>33</sup> Some of the divine names invoked in the bowls are not immediately recognisable, because they consist of a series of random letters. Sometime the letter series is associated with a bearer, yet sometimes it conveys no linguistic meaning. The latter example is known as *nomen barbarous*, which is a term used in SHAKED, FORD and BHAYRO 2013 and 2020. Anne Burberry attempted to categorise these names in the context of incantation bowls, suggesting that scribes might have viewed *nomina barbara* as ritually efficacious because in putting the strings together they imitated the process by which God created the universe. Our analysis explicitly avoids any attempt at categorising *nomina barbara*, firstly, because they remain a complex, yet elusive form of divine name, as Burberry has admitted; secondly, because unless one

listed three further examples in their 2013 publication: *yh byh* (e.g. Naveh and Shaked Bowl 20:10), *'h b'h* (e.g. VA 2053/27) and *'hyh b'hyh* (e.g. JBA 55:9), when they referred to *yh byh* as a “common magic name.”<sup>34</sup> (3) **yhbyh** in Vorderasiatisches Museum VA.3854:21, another ‘qybl’ bowl which, together with its duplicate, VA.3853, was written for the same client, *Aysal(hu)bab*, daughter of *Rimma*, to protect her from fevers.<sup>35</sup> In these bowls, *YHBYH* features as part of a sequence of ‘magic’ words for protection against a host of evil spirits and from demons.<sup>36</sup> Together with BM.103355, Montgomery’s Bowl 26 and Naveh and Shaked’s Bowl 6, VA.3854 and its duplicate VA.3853, are one of the very few examples of the name *YHBYH* acting independently, where its letters are not separated as single constituents of a letter sequence (eg., any letter permutation such as *yyyy hhhh bbbb yh* or *yh yh byh* or *yh b yh* or *byh yh*).

Whilst we agree with Naveh and Shaked, that *YHBYH* is a divine name; evidence of it appearing as a single independent theonym (ie, not in conjunction with a long string of letters) is scarce. This would suggest that the name is rather rarer than scholars have assumed thus far. However, because our sample set of reviewed bowls is less than 10% of total known bowls (2,500), it is not possible to reach a definitive conclusion on either point. As more evidence becomes available, both findings will need to be reassessed. In what follows, we shall revisit *YHBYH* and consider the likelihood of it being an authentic Semitic articulation of the Tetragrammaton with the sound represented by  $\text{I}\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}$ .

#### 4. *YHBYH: A Reflex of the Greek $\text{I}\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}$ ?*

As we saw, Montgomery and Isbell contended that the Hebrew *YHBYH* was a likely reflex of the Greek vocalisation of the divine name,  $\text{I}\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}$ . However, to speculate on the origin of the Name based on its Greek vocalisation is a delicate, indeed conjectural, matter given that the pronunciation of the Hebrew Tetragrammaton remains an open question.<sup>37</sup> From a morphological perspective, the explanation of the name *brykyhbyh br m'my* proposed by Montgomery has merit: it explains the expansion from a simpler and more normal  $\text{brwkyh}$  (ברוכיה) or  $\text{brykyh}$  (בריכיה) and provides plausible motivation in a desire fully to articulate the divine name for greater magical potency. But can one argue that the Hebrew *YHBYH* was articulated in a fashion only attested by a rather rare Greek divine name of quite uncertain provenance? Evidence from Greek magical texts of antiquity and late antiquity shows that the Tetragrammaton was utilised in incantations in a myriad of articulations, all of which may have represented different pronunciations of the Name.<sup>38</sup> These pronunciations include  $\text{I}\epsilon\omega\acute{\alpha}$ ,  $\text{I}\eta\sigma\acute{\alpha}$ ,  $\text{I}\alpha\omega\acute{\alpha}$ ,

---

had access to a very wide range of data, what may seem to constitute a name for some might be a *nomen barbarum* for others. In other words, there is an inherent lack of objectivity in the exercise. Therefore, our analysis merely states when *YHBYH* appears as part of a string of names or letters, avoiding any kind of categorisation of the latter. See BURBERRY 2025, p. 247 and 250. For examples of *nomina barbaria* in the Schøyen Collection see SHAKED, FORD and BHAYRO 2021, p. 289-300. For examples in Jewish magic from antiquity, BOHAK 2018, p. 258-265.

<sup>34</sup> SHAKED, FORD and BHAYRO, 2013, p. 246.

<sup>35</sup> Transcription and translation in LEVENE 2003 and a new edition in BHAYRO, FORD, LEVENE and SAAR 2018, p. 16-23.

<sup>36</sup> VA.3854:21-2: “21 *'lwhy lbyš byšmyh dyhbyh / 22 yh yh yhy yh yhw,*” translation, “unto him for evil. By the name of *yhbyh / 22 yh yh yhy yh yhw*” BHAYRO, FORD, LEVENE and SAAR 2018, p. 16-23.

<sup>37</sup> The pronunciation of *yhw* is a ‘scholarly guess’ (THOMPSON 1992, p. 1011a) since Hebrew Scripture was preserved in consonantal form until the common era.

<sup>38</sup> The majority of these texts are gathered in formularies such as the Greek Magical Papyri, composed between the second (or first) century BCE and the fifth century CE in Egypt. The standard edition of the Greek corpus is PREISENDANZ 1921 and 1973, followed by DANIEL and MALTOMINI 1990, 1992. A new edition of the texts found in Greek, Demotic and Coptic magical handbooks was the aim of the Transmission of Magical Knowledge in Antiquity project, headed by Faraone, Torallas Tovar and Nodar Domínguez. Their first publication is FARAONE, TORALLAS TOVAR 2022.

Ἰαωαί, Ἰαουούη, Ἰωά, Ἰαβώ, and Ἰαβέ, which might have stemmed from problems relating to the Greek translation of the Hebrew Pentateuch.<sup>39</sup>

One of the more forceful reasons why both scholars considered Ἰαβέ to be a pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton is a statement of the fifth-century Church Father Theodoret of Cyrrhus (423–457), according to whom: ‘Among the Hebrews [the Tetragrammaton] is known as the unspoken name; they are forbidden to utter it aloud. [...] The Samaritans call it “Iabe”, the Jews “Ia”.’<sup>40</sup> This passage provided considerable support for their position, for it indicated that there was a real *Semitic* tradition for this vocalisation, deriving from the Samaritans. Thus, it could be considered that the Greek Ἰαβέ was merely another witness to a vocalisation essentially transmitted within Hebrew Bible reading traditions. Ze’ev Ben-Hayyim, however, decisively refuted Montgomery’s claim that the Samaritans pronounced the Tetragrammaton ‘in the way it is written’ and that such an articulation was still a ‘living tradition’ among modern Samaritans.<sup>41</sup> More recently, Nehemia Gordon revisited these matters and confirmed Ben-Hayyim’s findings.<sup>42</sup> Both scholars showed evidence that the Samaritans have been pronouncing the Tetragrammaton as *shēma* (the Name) since the fourth century BCE (the earliest evidence for *shēma* is found in two poems by the fourth-century Samaritan author Marqē ban ‘Amram).<sup>43</sup>

### 5. Ἰαβέ: A vocalisation of YHWH or YHBYH?

Thus, Theodoret’s statement is deprived of a significant corroboration from within the Hebrew reading tradition. We may now ask, how do we account for the presence of Ἰαβέ in late antique magical texts and can we still consider it as a vocalisation of YHWH? Answering this question requires caution for many reasons, chief of which is the difference between the phonetic systems of the languages under review, Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek. The Greek alphabet is inadequate for rendering some Semitic sounds, as it lacks *inter alia* equivalents for Semitic gutturals and sibilants.<sup>44</sup> This problem was further compounded by the absence of vowel markings in pre-Masoretic Hebrew texts.<sup>45</sup> Moreover, Montgomery and Isbell did not consider that between 300 BCE and 200 CE, there was no fixed orthography in Hellenistic Greek, which was plagued by widespread changes in vowels and consonants.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>39</sup> VASILEIADIS 2015, p. 77-79.

<sup>40</sup> Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, Vol 1, §15 (FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS and SÁENZ-BADILLOS (eds.) 1979, p. 112). English translation, HILL and PETRUCCIONE 2007, p. 250-251. In Theodoret’s *Haereticarum fabularum compendium*, Book 5, Section 4, the name appears as Ἰαβαί (GLEEDE and BUELER 2020, p. 154).

<sup>41</sup> MONTGOMERY 1906, p. 49-54; BEN-HAYYIM 1954 and 1967.

<sup>42</sup> GORDON 2024, p. 223-252.

<sup>43</sup> See BEN-HAYYIM 1967, p. 15 and 258-262; also GORDON 2024, p. 229, note 28.

<sup>44</sup> “[F]undamental, inherent differences exist between the Indo-European and the Afroasiatic language families.” VASILEIADIS 2015, p. 59. Greek and Latin transcriptions of Hebrew names between 300 BCE and the fourth century CE are a useful source of pre-Masoretic Biblical Hebrew, particularly as there is much more data available about the phonology and pronunciation of these two languages than their Semitic counterparts. However, the phonology of Hebrew differs significantly from Greek and Latin, languages which do not possess graphemes capable of fully representing the sounds of Hebrew. We have no evidence of what decisions were made when transcribing Hebrew into these languages, but it is likely that the authors would have approached Hebrew from the phonological perspective of their own language. SÁENZ-BADILLOS 1993, p. 80.

<sup>45</sup> KRAŠOVEC 2010, p. 9-11. For different orthographic practices within the corpus of bowls and how ‘writtenness’ intersected with orality and memorisation in the transmission of scriptural citations for magic purposes, see MOLIN 2023.

<sup>46</sup> KRAŠOVEC 2010, p. 11.

There are four key practices of rendering the Hebrew Tetragrammaton in Greek over this period: non-translation; translation; transliteration and transcription.<sup>47</sup> According to this schema, the name Ἰαβέ might have been derived by way of *transliteration*, where each of the four Hebrew letters of the Tetragrammaton was transliterated into Greek as being either a vowel or a consonant.<sup>48</sup> In the case of Ἰαβέ, transliteration may have occurred during the Koine Greek period, when the pronunciation of β gradually changed from a plosive ‘b’ to a fricative ‘v.’<sup>49</sup> This consonant change may well explain a scribe’s uncertainty between the Hebrew ו (vav) of the Tetragrammaton and the resulting β in Ἰαβέ.<sup>50</sup> The latter, it seems, represents a unique vocalisation of the Name, that might have occurred between the third and fifth century CE, as we are about to see.

The earliest attestation of the Greek Ἰαβέ in magic is a third-century CE lead curse tablet (*defixio*) with Greek inscriptions found in Cumae on the Bay of Naples, Italy.<sup>51</sup> The tablet is a request for vengeance on an errant wife, Valeria Quadratilla, by her husband, Vitruvius, and it contains adjurations in the name of a deity and other magical names. The first adjuration includes a palindrome on line 7 (απαραραχαραρα), followed by Ἰαω Ἰαβεζεβυθ (*Iaō Iabezebyth*), where Ἰαβεζεβυθ can be interpreted as a compound of Ἰαβε+Σαβαώθ (*Sabaōth*).<sup>52</sup> Whereas one can argue in favour of a Jewish context for the JBA incantation bowls, the Cumaean curse tablet does not betray any evidence that it could have been written by or for a Jewish individual, despite the use of Hebrew theonyms. It also does not shed any light on the use of יהביח (*YHBYH*) in Montgomery’s Bowl 26. It does, however, suggest that in Graeco-Roman magic contexts, Ἰαβέ travelled with Σαβαώθ.<sup>53</sup> It is also a clear example of the use of a compound Hebrew theonym used in a region other than Mesopotamia and at a much earlier time.

<sup>47</sup> VASILEIADIS 2013, p. 5-21 and 2015, p. 66. See also TOV 1973, p. 504.

<sup>48</sup> Transliteration is one of the ways of translating proper names, where the name is mapped from one alphabet into another. Its aim is to represent the characters, not the sounds, accurately. There are factors that can affect the degree of fidelity of the transliteration of Hebrew names into Greek, relative to the putative Hebrew pronunciation. For example, the forms of the original terms themselves may not be stable, particularly in a corpus such as Scripture, which is written over a long period of time. There may also be grammatical changes in both languages over the time period. Thus, the letters of the Tetragrammaton could be transliterated as either consonant or vowel (including diphthongs), according to Vasileiadis, in a number of different ways. When using a letter-to-letter correspondence, this process could result in the following forms: Ἰεωέ, Ἰεουέ, Ἰεωά, Ἰαωά, Ἰευέ, Ἰεβέ, Ἰαβά, but also Ἰεούά, Ἰεουά, Ἰαουέ, Ἰεβά, Ἰοβά, Ἰαβέ, see VASILEIADIS 2015, p. 77-82. See also, KNOBLOCH 1995.

<sup>49</sup> This confusion might have been aggravated for a Greek-speaking Jew during this period, if we consider that the Hebrew consonant *bêt* (ב) could be pronounced either as a voiced stop, when a *dāgēš* is added to it (בּ), or a voiced spirant *b*, without a *dāgēš*. In the first instance, the consonant would have sounded like the Greek *beta* (β, plosive /b/), in the second instance, a fricative /v/. According to Kantor, in the Judeo-Palestinian Greek material, the fricativisation of β is visible already in the Hellenistic period (for instance, αὐδοκῶσου instead of ἀβδοκῶσου (CIIP 3635, 2nd/1st c. BCE)) He also lists examples in which Greek β is rendered with Hebrew vav ו (W or V) in loanwords in the Mishnah. KANTOR 2023, p. 50-52.

<sup>50</sup> By the first century CE, most regional varieties of Koine realised Greek β as a bilabial fricative [β]. “In both the Attic inscriptions and the catacombs of Rome, one might interpret the use of Greek β to represent Latin v in names like φλαβια (for Flavia) as evidence for the fricativisation of Greek β, but it is just as plausible that a stop [b] could be the nearest Greek equivalent of Latin v = [β] or [v].” KANTOR 2023, p. 51. For interchanges of fricative *bet* with *vav* in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, KHAN 2020, p. 154; for the occasional use of the Arabic letter *bā* to transcribe *vav*, suggesting scribal confusion see KHAN 2020, p. 174-175.

<sup>51</sup> The tablet is British Museum 2001,1105.1 ([britishmuseum.org/collection/object/G\\_2001-1105-1](http://britishmuseum.org/collection/object/G_2001-1105-1) accessed: 8 July 2025). *Editio princeps*, HENZEN 1846 and a modern edition is JORDAN 2003.

<sup>52</sup> Jordan noted that the palindrome was common in magical texts of Imperial times; PREISENDANZ (1949) presented some views on possible meanings of the palindrome, see JORDAN 2003, p. 674 notes on lines 7-9.

<sup>53</sup> Naveh and Shaked argued that YHBYH “was indeed the functional equivalent of Sabaot in Aramaic incantations”, citing the Geniza text TS K 23.3 line 5, ’dwn byh byhy yh yw yhw bh šb’ ’wt. See NAVEH and SHAKED 1985, p. 166.

A slightly later account by the fourth-century Epiphanius of Salamis (310–403 CE) describing a gnostic sect, the Archontics, mentions Ἰαβέ in connection with their heretical beliefs.<sup>54</sup> Examples that are largely contemporary with, or slightly later than Epiphanius are found in the Greek Magical Papyri (PGM), suggesting that by the fourth century, the name Ἰαβέ had been fully absorbed into pagan magic.<sup>55</sup> Our review of relevant PGM texts suggests that none of the spells which mention Ἰαβέ in these papyri can be said to have originated in a Jewish context.<sup>56</sup> By contrast, the Hebrew divine name which is most often used in the papyri is the Greek rendering of *YHW* (יהי), Ἰαω (also used in the Cumaean curse tablet), followed by *Adonai* and *Sabaoth*. *YHW* (יהי) was a rendering of the Tetragrammaton used by Jewish Egyptian communities such as the one living on the Upper Nile island of Elephantine as far back as the fifth century BCE and it is a likely predecessor of the Greek rendering Ἰαω.<sup>57</sup> The earliest known attestation of the name Ἰαω in the Greek world is Diodorus Siculus' *Bibliotheca Historica* (first century BCE), in which it is explained that Moses received 'his laws' from a god invoked as 'Ἰαὼ' (*Bibliotheca Historica*, I. 94, 2: '... παρὰ δὲ Ἰουδαίους Μωυσῆν τὸν Ἰαὼ ἐπικαλούμενον θεόν ...' Oldfather (trans.), 1933, 320–321). The fact that the use of the Hebrew *YHW* spread to Greek-speaking Jewish communities along the Mediterranean coast in the first century BCE is attested in the Septuagint papyrus fragment of Leviticus (3:12-13 and 4:27), 4QpapLXXLev<sup>b</sup> (4Q120), found in Qumran Cave 4 (Vasileiadis, 2017; Stegemann, 1969, 197 and Tov, 2003, 112–13). This document, which pre-dates later Christian manuscripts of the Septuagint, demonstrates that the Hebrew/Aramaic *YHW* was rendered into Greek as Ἰαὼ, which was evidently an acceptable equivalent for the Tetragrammaton in Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible. Some scholars have argued that 4Q120 also provides evidence that in some Greek and Aramaic-speaking communities, a pronounceable form of the Tetragrammaton was used, despite later prohibitions against this pronunciation.<sup>58</sup>

Differently from Montgomery and Isbell, one *could* also argue that Ἰαβέ may have originated from a Greek transliteration of the Hebrew *YHBYH*. This is a more difficult vocalisation to envisage, for the latter does not appear with the same frequency as *YHWH* or *YHW* in Jewish magical texts and the evidence in Hebrew for *YHBYH* is later than the evidence we find in Greek, and comes mostly in the form of the Aramaic incantation bowls, all of which can be dated to between the fifth and seventh centuries. This is not to say, however, that the formulae in the incantation bowls could not have originated in much earlier times. Thus, we conclude this section by remarking that if Ἰαβέ were a Greek spelling of a Semitic vocalisation of a Hebrew theonym, the evidence reviewed thus far suggests that the latter theonym is more likely to have been *YHWH* than *YHBYH*. This is on the basis that the latter appears rarely on its own (not in a string of names) and relatively late in the Hebrew/Aramaic sources, and must have been quite opaque to a non-Aramaic speaking practitioner.

<sup>54</sup> Epiphanius of Salamis was Bishop of Constantia (Salamis) in Cyprus, between 367 and 403. He mentioned the name Ἰαβέ in his *Panarion* 2.26.13 'Against the Archontics' in speaking of biblical names which were intended formerly only to enhance the glory of the one God, and not as denominators of separate powers, PG XLI (MIGNE 1863) col.685 (English translation in WILLIAMS 1994, French translation in POURKIER 2023).

<sup>55</sup> Examples include: PGM III.450 "IABE"; PGM IV.1800 "IABEZEBYTH"; PGM IV.1185 "IABE"; PGM IV.2000, "IABE"; PGM V.9 "SERIABEBOT"; PGM VII.420, "IABEZEBYTH" all in PREISENDANZ 1973.

<sup>56</sup> They do not contain any textual typology that can be said to be Jewish, such as a deed of divorce, a historiola based on Hebrew scripture, a personal name of Semitic origin. These are features described in SHAKED 1999.

<sup>57</sup> The earliest evidence for the Aramaic uses of the Tetragrammaton expressed as *YHW* and *YHH* (יהי) is found among the ostraca and papyri found in Elephantine. An example can be seen in one of the Mibtahiah papyri, B2.2, 4–6, where *YHW* is invoked as surety for property claims in a land dispute. In the Elephantine papyri, of which the 11 Mibtahiah papyri form part, the name *YHW* occurs 43 times (MEYER 2022, p. 55-71).

<sup>58</sup> VASILEIADIS 2017, p. 31-32; SKENAN 1980; WILKINSON 2015, p. 76, note 19. See ANGELINI 2024 for a survey of how the study of divine onomastic attributes has been approached by Septuagint scholarship

### 6. *YHBYH: A Rare Theonym and not Dependent on 'Iαβé*

With no recourse to reliable witnesses of a living tradition of vocalisation amongst Samaritans, we find ourselves in agreement with Naveh and Shaked: there is no evidence that *YHBYH* is a reflex in any way of 'Iαβé. Of course, as time goes by, greater data may become available for us to reassess this conclusion, since we cannot assume that the material which has survived thus far is fully representative of what actually occurred. What we know with certainty is that, within the magical/mystical space, there was a tendency for pagan, Christian and Jewish practitioners to borrow theonyms, angel names and formulae from each other's traditions; the PGM attest to this trend. However, the direction of borrowing is not easy to establish and, more importantly, these transfers do not always demonstrate influence of one culture on another.

We therefore agree with Naveh and Shaked's conclusion that *YHBYH* is a divine name, but our observation based on more than two hundred Jewish Babylonian Aramaic and Syriac bowls suggests that it does not appear frequently on its own, making it somewhat of a rarity compared to the Tetragrammaton. Having revisited Montgomery's and Isbell's argument, according to which *YHBYH* was a likely reflex of the Greek 'Iαβé, we showed that if the latter were a Greek spelling of a Semitic vocalisation of a Hebrew theonym, the latter is more likely to have been *YHWH* than *YHBYH*. In his deep concern with deciphering the vocalisation of the Tetragrammaton, Montgomery missed an opportunity to identify a unique biblical theonym; he was, of course, grossly misled by Theodoret's witness and did not have at his disposal the hundreds of bowl transcriptions which we can access today.

## *Apparatus*

### *Transcription vs Transliteration*

Our analysis provides, where possible, phonetic transcriptions of words from one type of script such as Greek to Latin and we follow the relevant editor's choices. In the case of Hebrew and Aramaic we use the relevant editor's choice or, when an edition is not available, we follow simple transliteration, mapping a word from one alphabet to the other.

Thus, in section two, in the example of Montgomery's bowl 12, the client's name appears as *Dâdbeh*, which is Montgomery's phonetic transcription. Using transliteration, the name would be written as *d'dbh*. We decided to follow Montgomery's transcription because this type of phonetic exercise is what ultimately could have caused him to focus on the vocalisation of the Tetragrammaton. In the same section, therefore, the reader will notice two different renderings of theophoric names: Montgomery's transcription, *Berik-Yahbêh bar Mame*, and what we view as a simpler and more accurate transliteration: *brykyhbyh bar m'my*. The latter is the method most widely used by modern editors of incantation bowls.

### *Samples reviewed*

We have reviewed a large number of bowls in search of *YHBYH*, and we present the publications which we used for this purpose in the table overleaf. Our aim was not to present an exhaustive list of all bowls that have been edited, but to collate enough information in order to arrive at a reasonable determination of how common *YHBYH* is within a large data sample. The data, however, is not exhaustive since we have not reviewed *every* available publication on incantation bowls, but enough to be able to generate a representative sample of what is available.

Where we identified the name *YHBYH*, we reviewed the text of the edition against photographic evidence of the relevant bowl, either online or in samples provided by the relevant institution.

Publication	Year	Bowls reviewed	Bowls mentioned here
MONTGOMERY, James A. <i>Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur</i> <sup>59</sup>	1913	42	Bowls 7, 9, 12, 13 16, 26, 31
ISBELL, Charles. D. <i>Corpus of the Aramaic Incantation Bowls</i>	1975	72	Bowl 35
NAVEH, Joseph and Shaul SHAKED. <i>Amulets and Magic Bowls: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity</i>	1985	13	Bowl 6, Amulet4
NAVEH, Joseph and Shaul SHAKED. <i>Magic Spells and Formulae: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity</i>	1993	27	Bowl 20
SEGAL, Judah B., and Erica C. D. HUNTER. <i>Catalogue of the Aramaic and Mandaic Incantation Bowls in the British Museum. London: British Museum</i> <sup>60</sup>	2000	6	BM 103355
LEVENE D., A. <i>Corpus of Magic Bowls: Incantation Texts in Jewish Aramaic from Late Antiquity</i>	2003	17	
SHAKED S., BHAYRO S., N. FORD. <i>Jewish Babylonian Aramaic Bowls, I, Magical and Religious Literature of Late Antiquity, Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection</i> <sup>61</sup>	2013	64	Bowl JBA 55
LEVENE D., A. <i>Jewish Aramaic Curse Texts from Late-Antique Mesopotamia</i>	2013	15	VA.2416
MORIGGI M. <i>A Corpus of Syriac Incantation Bowls</i>	2014	47	Bowls 3, 5, 38
SHAKED S. and S. BHAYRO, N. FORD, D. LEVENE, Ortal-Paz Saar. <i>Aramaic Magic Bowls in the Vorderasiatisches Museum in Berlin</i>	2018	16	VA.3854:21
BHAYRO S., N. FORD. <i>Jewish Babylonian Aramaic Bowls, II, Magical and Religious Literature of Late Antiquity, Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection</i>	2021	65	

<sup>59</sup> See EPSTEIN, 1921 and 1922 for a review of Montgomery

<sup>60</sup> Update and review in MÜLLER-KESSLER, 2001.

<sup>61</sup> Update in GZELLA, 2013 and FORD, 2014.



Fig. 1 *Montgomery (1913) Bowl 26*  
*Courtesy of the Penn Museum, object no. B3997*

**BIBLIOGRAPHY****Abbreviations**

LXX	<i>Septuaginta id est, Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes.</i> A. RAHLFS (ed.), Stuttgart, 1935.
MT	Masoretic Text, <i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.</i> K. ELLIGER and W. RUDOLPH (eds.), Stuttgart, 1987.
PGM	<i>Papyri Graecae Magicae</i> = Greek Magical Papyri.
VUL	<i>Biblia Sacra iuxta latinam Vulgatam Versionem,</i> Rome, 1926–1995.

Biblical citations in Hebrew are from *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*; Greek citations are from *Septuaginta id est, Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. The Babylonian Talmud is cited as “b.” followed by the relevant book and chapter. The Mishna is cited as “m.” followed by the relevant book and chapter.

**Printed Primary Sources****Bible**

*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.* Kurt ELLIGER and Wilhelm RUDOLPH (eds), Stuttgart, 1987.

*Biblia Sacra iuxta latinam vulgatam versionem. Textus ex interpretatione Sancti Hieronymi.* H. QUENTIN et al. (eds), 18 vols., Rome, 1926–1995.

*Septuaginta: id est, Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX Interpretes.* Alfred RAHLFS (ed.). Stuttgart, 1935, 1979.

*The Holy Bible Translated from the Latin Vulgate* (The ‘Douay–Rheims–Challoner’ Translation). J. CAREY (ed.), Turnhout, 1938.

**Mishnah and Talmud**

משניות עם שבע ושלשים הוספות שנוספו על כל המפרשים וההגהות שנדפסו בו עד כה  
13 volumes. Vilna: Romm Widow and Brothers, 1908-09.

*The Oxford Annotated Mishnah a New Translation of the Mishnah with Introductions and Notes.* S. J. D. COHEN, R. GOLDENBERG, and H. LAPIN (eds.), Oxford, 2022.

תלמוד בבלי *The Babylonian Talmud.* 22 volumes, Vilna, 1880-1886.

**Other**

Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca Historica*, Book I. C. H. OLDFATHER (editor and translator), Cambridge (Massachusetts), 1933 (Loeb Classical Library [LCL], 279).

Epiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion, introduction, texte grec révisé, traduction et notes.* Aline POURKIER (editor and translator), Paris, 2023.

— *The Panarion*, Books II and III (Sects 47-80, ‘De Fide’). Frank WILLIAMS (translator). Leiden, 1994.

- Theodoret, *Haereticarum fabularum compendium*. Benjamin GLEEDE, and Jonathan BIELER (eds), *Unterscheidung von Lüge und Wahrheit: Abriss über die üblen Märchen der Häretiker. Zusammenfassung der göttlichen Lehrsätze Anhang: Pseudo-Theodoret, Gegen Nestorius an Sporakios*, Berlin, 2020.
- *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*. Natalio Fernández Marcos and Angel Sáenz-Badillos (editor and translator). Madrid: Textos y estudios Cardenal Cisneros, 1979.
- *The Questions on the Octateuch*. Volume 1, *On Genesis and Exodus*. Robert C. HILL (translator), Washington D.C., 2007.

### Secondary Sources

- AHUVIA M., 2021: *On My Right Michael, On My Left Gabriel: Angels in Ancient Jewish Culture*, Oakland.
- 2018: ‘The Spatial and Social Dynamics of Jewish Babylonian Incantation Bowls’, in M. AHUVIA and A. KOCAR (eds), *Placing Ancient Texts: The Ritual and Rhetorical Use of Space*, Tübingen, p. 227-252.
- ANGELINI A., 2024: ‘Divine Names, Heavenly Bodies, and Human Visions: The Septuagint and the Transformation of Ancient Israelite Religion’, in A. PALAMIDIS and C. BONNET (eds), *What’s in a Divine Name? Religious Systems and Human Agency in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Berlin, p. 735-758.
- AUDOLLENT A., 1904: *Defixionum tabellae quotquot innotuerunt, tam in Graecis Orientis quam in totius Occidentis partibus praeter Atticas in Corpore inscriptionum atticarum editas*, Paris.
- AUSTIN J. L., 1965: *How to Do Things with Words: the William James Lectures Delivered at Harvard University in 1955*, New York - Oxford.
- BAR-ILAN M., 1987: *The Mysteries of Jewish Prayer and Hekhalot*, Ramat-Gan.
- BEN-HAYYIM Z., 1954: ‘ההוגים השומרונים את השם באותיותיו? ‘On the Pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton by the Samaritans’, *Eretz-Israel: Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies* ארץ-ישראל: מחקרים בידיעת הארץ ועתיקותיה, vol. ג-3, p. 147-154 (Hebrew).
- 1977a: עברית וארמית נוסח שומרון. *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans: Volume 4: The Words of the Pentateuch*, Jerusalem (Hebrew).
- 1977b: עברית וארמית נוסח שומרון. *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans: Volume 3, Part 2: The Recitation of Prayers and Hymns*, Jerusalem (Hebrew).
- BEN-SASSON H., 2019: *Understanding YHWH: The Name of God in Biblical, Rabbinic, and Medieval Jewish Thought*, Cham (Switzerland).
- BHAYRO S., 2015a: ‘On Early Jewish Literature and the Aramaic Magic Bowls’, *Aramaic Studies* 13.1, p. 54-68.
- 2015b: ‘Divorcing a Demon: Incantation Bowls and bt Gittin 85b’, in M. J. GELLER (ed.), *The Archaeology and Material Culture of the Babylonian Talmud*, Leiden, p. 121-132.
- BHAYRO S., FORD J. N., LEVENE D., ORTAL-PAAZ S., MORGENSTEIN M., 2018: *Aramaic Magic Bowls in the Vorderasiatisches Museum in Berlin. Descriptive List and Edition of Selected Texts*, Leiden.

- BOHAK G., 2008: *Ancient Jewish Magic: A History*, Cambridge.
- BOHAK G., HARARI Y., SHAKED S., 2011: *Continuity and innovation in the magical tradition*, Leiden.
- BONNER C., 1950: *Studies in Magical Amulets, Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian*, Ann Arbor (University of Michigan Studies. Humanistic Series, 49).
- BOUSTAN R., SANZO J. E., 2017: 'Christian Magicians, Jewish Magical Idioms, and the Shared Magical Culture of Late Antiquity', *The Harvard Theological Review* 110.2, p. 217-240.
- BURBERRY A., 2025: 'Toward a Classification of and Rationale for the Invocation of Names in Jewish Aramaic Magic Bowls' in A. W. MARCUS and J. S. MOKHTARIAN (eds), *Aramaic Incantation Bowls in Their Late Antique Jewish Contexts*, Providence, Rhode Island (Brown Judaic Studies), p. 221-272.
- CHABOT J.-B., 1898 : 'La Lettre du catholicos Mar Abbā II aux membres de l'École patriarcale de Séleucie', in E. LEROUX (ed.), *Actes du onzième congrès international des orientalistes Paris 1897, Quatrième section*, Paris, p. 295-335.
- DANIEL R. W., MALTOMINI F., 1990 and 1992: *Supplementum Magicum*, 2 volumes, Opladen.
- DEISSMANN A., GRIEVE A. J., 1909: *Bible Studies: Contributions, Chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions, to the History of the Language, the Literature, and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity*, second edition, Edinburgh.
- EPSTEIN J. N., 1921 : 'Gloses babylo-araméennes', *Revue des Études Juives* 73, 145, juillet-septembre, p. 27-58.
- 1922 : 'Gloses babylo-araméennes', *Revue des Études Juives* 74, 147, janvier-mars, p. 40-72.
- FALK D., 1999: 'Prayer in the Qumran Texts', in W. D. DAVIES, W. HORBURY and J. STURDY (eds), *The Cambridge History of Judaism: The Early Roman Period*, volume 3, Cambridge, p. 852-876.
- FARAJ A., 2023: 'Remarks on a New Aramaic Incantation Bowl IM 77781', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 68.1, p. 89-95.
- FARAONE C. A., TORALLAS TOVAR S. (eds), 2022: *Greek and Egyptian Magical Formularies: Text and Translation*, volume 1, Berkeley (California Classical Studies).
- FORD J. N., MÖRGENSTERN M., 2020: *Aramaic Incantation Bowls in Museum Collections: The Frau Professor Hilprecht Collection of Babylonian Antiquities, Jena*, volume 1, Leiden.
- FORD J. N., 2014: 'Notes on Some Recently Published Magic Bowls in the Schøyen Collection and Two New Parallels', *Aula Orientalis* 32, p. 235-264.
- 2006: 'A Corpus of Magic Bowls: Incantation Texts in Jewish Aramaic from Late Antiquity', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 51.1, p. 207-214.
- FOWLER J. D., 1988: *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew: A Comparative Study*, Sheffield.
- FRANKFURTER D., 2019: 'Magic and the Forces of Materiality' in D. FRANKFURTER (ed.), *Guide to the Study of Ancient Magic*, Leiden, p. 659-77.

- GESENIUS W., 2006: *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, third English edition, E. KAUTZSCH (ed.) and A. E. COWLEY (translator), Mineola - New York (second English edition, Oxford, 1976).
- GOLUB M. R., 2024: 'A Donation List from Elephantine: Judaeen and Non-Judaeen Onomastic Characteristics from the Persian Period in Egypt', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 69.1, p. 135-160.
- 2025: *Onomasticon.net: Personal Names from the Iron II Southern Levant*, <http://www.onomasticon.net>.
- GORDON N., 2024: 'Yahweh and the Samaritan Pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton', in József ZSENGELLÉR (ed.), *Samaritans Through the Ages: Studies on Samaritan History, Texts, Interpretation, Linguistics and Manuscripts*, Berlin (Société d'études samaritaines. International Congress, 10<sup>th</sup>, 2022, Budapest), p. 223-252.
- GROSS S., 2024: *Babylonian Jews and Sasanian Imperialism in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge.
- GROSS S., ELITZUR-LEIMAN R., 2022: 'The Story the Bowls Tell', *Omnia*, November 22, (<https://omnia.sas.upenn.edu/story/story-bowls-tell>)
- GZELLA O., 2018: 'Review of Shaked, Shaul, James N. Ford, and Siam Bhayro (with contributions from M. Morgenstern and N. Vilozny) Aramaic Bowl Spells. Jewish Babylonian Aramaic Bowls, Volume One', *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 75 (5-6), September-December 2018, p. 591-596.
- HÄBERL C. G., 2015: 'Aramaic incantation texts between orality and textuality', in J. RUBANOVICH (ed.), *Orality and Textuality in the Iranian World: Patterns of Interaction across the Centuries*, Leiden (Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture, 19), p. 365-399.
- HAMILTON V., 1971: *Syriac Incantation Bowls*, Brandeis University (Doctoral dissertation).
- HARARI Y. T. G., 1997: 'If You Wish to Kill a Man: Aggressive Magic and the Defense Against it in Ancient Jewish Magic', *Jewish Studies* 37, 111–142 (Hebrew).
- 2017: *Jewish Magic: Before the Rise of Kabbalah*, Detroit (Michigan).
- HARVIAINEN T., 1993: 'Syncretistic and Confessional Features in the Mesopotamian Incantation Bowls', *Studia Orientalia* 70, 29–37.
- 1995: 'Pagan Incantations in Aramaic Magic Bowls', in M. J. GELLER, J. C. GREENFIELD and M. P. WEITZMAN (eds), *Studia Aramaica: New Sources and New Approaches: Papers Delivered at the London Conference of the Institute of Jewish Studies, University College London, 26th-28th June 1991*, Oxford, p. 53-60.
- HENZEN G. B., 1845: 'Iscrizione greca sopra una lamina di piombo', *Annali dell' Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica* 18, p. 203-214.
- HUNTER E. C. D., 2021: 'Celebrating the Centenary of Incantation Bowls at Nippur', in M. ALTAWHEEL and C. HRITZ (eds), *From Sherds to Landscapes: Studies in the Ancient Near East in Honor of McGuire Gibson*, Chicago (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization [SAOC], 71), p. 133-144.
- 2000: 'The Typology of the Incantation Bowls: Physical Features and Decorative Aspects', in J. B. SEGAL and E. C. D. HUNTER, *Catalogue of the Aramaic and Mandaic Incantation Bowls in the British Museum*, London, p. 163-188.

- ISBELL C. D., 1975: *Corpus of the Aramaic Incantation Bowls*, first edition, Missoula (Montana) (Second edition, Ann Arbor, Mich, 1990. Third edition, Eugene (Oregon), 2008).
- JASTROW M., 1903: *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature: With an Index of Scriptural Quotations*, two volumes, London (Reprinted in 1950, New York and in 2005, Peabody, Massachusetts).
- JORDAN D. R., 2003: 'Remedium amoris: A Curse from Cumae', *Mnemosyne* 56.6, p. 666-679.
- JUUSOLA H., 1999: 'Who Wrote the Syriac Incantation Bowls?', *Studia Orientalia* 85, p. 75-92.
- JUSTI F., 1895: *Iranisches Namenbuch*, Marburg.
- KHAN G., 2020: *The Tiberian Pronunciation Tradition of Biblical Hebrew*. Volume 1, Cambridge.
- KNOBLOCH F. W., 1995: *Hebrew Sounds in Greek Script: Transcriptions and Related Phenomena in the Septuagint, with Special Focus on Genesis*, University of Pennsylvania (Doctoral dissertation).
- KOTANSKY R. D., 1994: *Greek Magical Amulets: The Inscribed Gold, Silver, Copper, and Bronze Lamellae. Part I: Published Texts of Known Provenance*, Wiesbaden (Papyrologica Coloniensia, 22/1).
- KOTANSKY R. D., NAVEH J., SHAKED S., 1992: 'A Greek-Aramaic silver amulet from Egypt in the Ashmolean Museum', *Le Muséon* 105 (1-2), p. 5-25.
- KOTANSKY R. D., SPIER J., 1995: 'The "Horned Hunter" on a lost gnostic gem', *Harvard Theological Review* 88.3, p. 315-337.
- KRAŠOVEC J., 2010: 'Transmission of Semitic Forms of Biblical Proper Names in Greek and Latin Linguistic Traditions', in A. LEMAIRE (ed.), *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007*, Leiden (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, 133), p. 1-26.
- LEVENE D., 2003a: *A Corpus of Magic Bowls: Incantation Texts in Jewish Aramaic from Late Antiquity*, London.
- 2003b: 'Heal O' Israel: A Pair of Duplicate Magic Bowls from the Pergamon Museum in Berlin', *Journal of Jewish Studies* 54.1, p. 104-121.
- 2011: "'This Is a Qybl' for Overturning Sorceries": Form, Formula – Threads in a Web of Transmission', in BOHAK, HARARI and SHAKED, *op. cit.*, p. 219-244.
- 2013: *Jewish Aramaic Curse Texts from Late Antique Mesopotamia: "May These Curses Go Out and Flee"*, Leiden.
- 2014: 'Gabriel is on their Right: Angelic Protection in Jewish Magic and Babylonian Lore' in M. DIETRICH et al (eds), *Studia Mesopotamica*, volume 1, Münster.
- LIEBERMAN S., 1965: *Greek in Jewish Palestine: Studies in the Life and Manners of Jewish Palestine in the II-IV Centuries C. E.*, second edition, New York.
- MANEKIN-BAMBERGER A., 2020: 'Who Were the Jewish "Magicians" Behind the Aramaic Incantation Bowls?', *Journal of Jewish Studies* 71.2, p. 235-254.
- MARCUS A. W., 2023: 'Body and Mind, Husband and Household, Collaborators and Communities: Centrifugal Spheres of Protection in an Aramaic Incantation Bowl (MC 77.233)', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 68.2, p. 415-471.
- MARCUS A. W., MOKHTARIAN J. S. (eds), 2025: *Aramaic Incantation Bowls in Their Late Antique Jewish Contexts*, Boston (Brown Judaic Studies).
- MCDONOUGH S. M., 1999: *YHWH at Patmos: Rev. 1:4 in its Hellenistic and Jewish Setting*, Tübingen.

- MEYER A., 2022: *Naming God in Early Judaism*, Leiden (Studies in Cultural Contexts of the Bible, 2).
- MINOV S., 2022: 'Christians, Jews, and Magic in the Sasanian Realm: Between Confrontation and Cooperation', *Entangled Religions* 13.3 (<https://er.ceres.rub.de/index.php/ER/article/view/9873>).
- MOBERG A., 1917: 'Review of Aramaic Incantation Texts, by J. Montgomery', *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 17, p. 425-432.
- MOLIN D., 2020: 'Biblical Quotations in the Aramaic Incantation Bowls and Their Contribution to the Study of the Babylonian Reading Tradition' in A. D. HORNKOHL and G. KHAN (eds), *Studies in Semitic Vocalisation and Reading Traditions*, Cambridge, p. 147-170.
- 2023: 'The Bible in the Aramaic Bowls: Between Memorization, Orality, and Writteness', *Journal of Biblical literature* 142.4, p. 609-631.
- MONTGOMERY J. A., 1906: 'Notes from the Samaritan', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 25, p. 49-54.
- 1911: 'Some Early Amulets from Palestine', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 31, p. 272-281.
- 1913: *Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur*, first edition, Philadelphia (Second edition, Cambridge, 2012).
- MORGENSTERN M., 2005: 'Linguistic Notes on Magic Bowls in the Moussaieff Collection', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 68.3, p. 349-367.
- MORIGGI M., 2014: *A Corpus of Syriac Incantation Bowls: Syriac Magical Texts from Late-Antique Mesopotamia*, first edition, Leiden.
- 2021: 'Syriac Incantation Bowls and the Mesopotamian Context: A Glimpse into Christian-Jewish Cultural Interactions' in M. MORIGGI, and S. BHAYRO (eds.), *Studies in the Syriac Magical Traditions*, Leiden, p. 57-76.
- 2023: 'Pottery and Magic: A Glimpse into Late-Antique Mesopotamian Religious Tradition and Its Materiality' in N. LANERI and S. R. STEADMAN (eds), *Bloomsbury Handbook of Material Religion in the Ancient Near East and Egypt*, London, p. 253-260.
- MORONY M. G., 2007: 'Religion and the Aramaic Incantation Bowls', *Religion Compass* 1.4, p. 414-429.
- MÜLLER-KESSLER C., 2001: 'Die Zauberschälensammlung Des British Museum', *Archiv Für Orientforschung* 48/49, p. 115-145.
- 2005: *Die Zauberschälentexte in der Hilprecht-Sammlung, Jena, und weitere Nippur-Texte anderer Sammlungen*, Wiesbaden.
- 2017: 'Zauberschalen und ihre Umwelt: Ein Überblick über das Schreibmedium Zauberschale' in J. KAMLAH, R. SCHAEFER, and M. WITTE (eds.), *Zauber und Magie im antiken Palästina und seiner Umwelt*, Wiesbaden, p. 59-94.
- NAVEH J., SHAKED S., 1985: *Amulets and Magic Bowls: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity*. Leiden (Further editions: Jerusalem, 1987 and 1998).
- 1993: *Magic Spells and Formulae: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity*, Jerusalem.
- PALAMIDIS A., BONNET C. (eds.), 2024: *What's in a Divine Name? Religious Systems and Human Agency in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Berlin.
- PARKER R., 2000: 'Theophoric Names and the History of Greek Religion', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 104, p. 53-79.
- PAYNE SMITH R., 1903: *Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, Oxford.

- PREISENDANZ K., 1949: 'Palindrom', in G. WISSOWA et al. (eds), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 18.2, Stuttgart, p. 133-139.
- 1973: *Papyri Graecae Magicae = Die griechischen Zauberpapyri (PGM)*, two volumes, second edition, Stuttgart (first edition, Leipzig, 1928).
- SÁENZ-BADILLOS A., 1993: *A History of the Hebrew Language* (translated by J. F. Elwolde), Cambridge.
- SCHOTT J., 2006: 'Heresiology as Universal History in Epiphanius's *Panarion*', *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum / Journal of Ancient Christianity* 10.3, p. 546-563.
- SEARLE J. R., 1979: 'A Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts', in J. R. SEARLE (ed.), *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*, Cambridge, p. 12-20.
- SEGAL J. B. (with E. C. D. HUNTER), 2000: *Catalogue of the Aramaic and Mandaic Incantation Bowls in the British Museum*, London.
- SHAKED S., 1999: 'The Poetics of Spells: Language and Structure in Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity: The Divorce Formula and Its Ramifications', in T. ABUSCH and K. VAN DER TOORN (eds), *Mesopotamian Magic: Textual, Historical, and Interpretative Perspectives*, Groningen, p. 173-196.
- 2000: 'Manichaean Incantation Bowls in Syriac', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 24, p. 58-92.
- 2005a: *Officina Magica: Essays on the Practice of Magic in Antiquity*, Leiden.
- 2005b: 'Transmission and Transformation of Spells: The Case of the Jewish Babylonian Aramaic Bowls', in S. SHAKED (ed.), *Officina Magica*, p. 188-216.
- 2006: 'Dramatis Personae in the Jewish Magic Texts: Some Differences Between Incantation Bowls and Geniza Magic', *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 13, p. 363-387.
- SHAKED S., FORD J. N., BHAYRO S. (eds), 2013: *Aramaic Bowl Spells: Jewish Babylonian Aramaic Bowls, Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection*, volume 1, Leiden (Magical and Religious Literature of Late Antiquity Series).
- 2021: *Aramaic Bowl Spells, Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection*, volume 2, Leiden (Magical and Religious Literature of Late Antiquity Series).
- SHAW F., 2014: *Earliest Non-Mystical Jewish Use of Ιαω*, Leuven - Paris - Walpole, MA (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology, 70).
- SIMONSON B., 2024: 'Theophoric Aramaic Personal Names as Onomastic Sequences in Diasporic and Cosmopolitan Communities', in A. PALAMIDIS and C. BONNET (eds.), *What's in a Divine Name? Religious Systems and Human Agency in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Berlin, p. 511-530.
- SKENAN P., 1980: 'The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint', *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 13, p. 14-44.
- STEGEMANN H., 1969: *KYPIOC ΘEOC und KYPIOC IHCOYC: Aufkommen und Ausbreitung des religiösen Gebrauchs von KYPIOC und seine Verwendung im Neuen Testament*, Bonn.
- STÜBE R., 1895: *Jüdisch-babylonische Zaubertexte*, Halle.
- SWARTZ M. D., 2018: *The Mechanics of Providence: The Workings of Ancient Jewish Magic and Mysticism*, Tübingen.
- THOMPSON H. O., 1992: 'Yahweh', in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Si – Z, New York, p. 1011a.
- TOV E., 1973: 'Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament. A Further Characteristic of the kaige-Th Revision?' *Textus*, 8.1, p. 78-92.

- 2003: ‘The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert’, in S. MCKENDRICK and O. O’SULLIVAN (eds), *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text*, London, p. 97-121.
- VASILEIADIS P. D., 2013: ‘The Pronunciation of the Sacred Tetragrammaton: An Overview of a *Nomen Revelatus* that Became a *Nomen Absconditus*’, *Judaica Ukranica, Annual Journal of Jewish Studies* 2, p. 5-21.
- 2015: ‘Aspects of Rendering the Sacred Tetragrammaton in Greek’, *Open Theology* (January), p. 56-88.
- 2017: ‘The god Iao and his connection with the Biblical God, with special emphasis on the manuscript 4QpapLXXLevb’, *Vetus Testamentum et Hellas* 4, p. 21-51.
- WALLER D. J., 2019: ‘Transferring Performativity from Speech to Writing: Illocutionary Acts and Incantation Bowls’, *Bulletin of SOAS* 82.2, p. 233-244.
- 2022: *The Bible in the Bowls: A Catalogue of Biblical Quotations in Published Jewish Babylonian Aramaic Magic Bowls*, Cambridge (Semitic Languages and Cultures, 16).
- 2025: ‘The Study of the Jewish Babylonian Aramaic Magic Bowls: State of the Art’ in A. W. MARCUS and J. S. MOKHTARIAN (eds), *Aramaic Incantation Bowls in Their Late Antique Jewish Contexts*, Boston (Brown Judaic Studies), p. 3-48.
- WILKINSON R. J., 2015: *Tetragrammaton: Western Christians and the Hebrew Name of God: From the Beginnings to the Seventeenth Century*, Leiden.
- WOHLSTEIN J., 1894: ‘Ueber einige aramäische Inschriften auf Thongefässen des Königlichen Museums zu Berlin’, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 9, p. 11-41.

**ABSTRACT**

This article examines a Hebrew divine name, *YHBYH*, which has divided scholars' opinions since appearing in the earliest editions of the Babylonian incantation bowls in the 1850s. Hundreds of bowls have been discovered since then and a greater number of editions have become available, making these texts more accessible. We consider whether *YHBYH* ought to be regarded a reflection of the Tetragrammaton, we reassess consensus and offer new perspectives on the origins of this name. Our analysis decouples the Semitic *YHBYH* from prior traditions linking it to Greek vocalisations of the Tetragrammaton, highlighting examples where it is used as an independent divine name. A system of magic knowledge emerges from our study, where clients had contact with scribes of multiple linguistic and religious backgrounds. This was a world in which magic defied religious and cultural boundaries, bringing together clients and scribes in pluri-confessional contexts.

**KEYWORDS**

1. Tetragrammaton (YHWH)
2. Onomastics
3. Babylonian Incantation Bowls
4. Theophoric Names
5. Magic