Of the bowls presented in this first part, two, VA.2416 and VA.2417, were published by Wohlstein in the late 19th century. They have, however, been included in this first section as the new edition here is significantly different both in reading and comments. This is in no way a comment on the significance of the achievement of Wohlstein well over a century ago, despite the fact that the tools at his disposal were much sparser than those at ours.

Signs Used in the Transliteration of Texts

( ) Uncertain readings
[ ] Restoration of lost writing
⟨ ⟩ Omitted by the scribe by mistake
˕˕ Only part of the letter is visible
{ } Superfluous writing in the text
^^ Written above the line
↓↓ Written below the line

This magic bowl was made as one of a pair that were joined together to produce one object—a qyblʾ form. Its partner is the following text VA.2509. As they were written by the same scribe and for the same client some of the comments below will cover both texts.

**Type:** This bowl states itself to be a qyblʾ (line 18). It is concerned with the repelling of a Yaror and sending it back to the named human whom it claims activated it.

**Physical location:** VAM.

**Dimensions:** 15 cm × 4.5 cm

**Physical description:** This bowl consists of five fragments that are glued together and constitute the great majority of the bowl. Most of the text is therefore present and generally well preserved. The text that is absent is due to a small chip that is missing from beyond line 17, and a somewhat larger section of bowl that is also missing from beyond lines 19 and 20. There are also some small areas upon the surface of the bowl that appear to be scuffed in which bits of text have either been obliterated or have irrevocably faded. It is partly to do with this and the fact that there are no known parallels to some of the readings that have been made for line 23 and beyond that the text has a more tentative feel from this point on. There are three sets of pairs of bitumen markings on the outer rim of the bowl. A fourth pair would have existed on the earthenware segment that is missing. These sets of pairs of daubs are spaced at roughly equal intervals from each other. There are a further four little daubs of bitumen at the bowl’s apex. These markings are a testament to the fact that this bowl was made as one of a pair, which together constituted a qyblʾ form. Its compliment is VA.2509.

**The layout of the text:** Despite its modest size the inside of this bowl contains 27 lines of a very small but neat script that spirals in a clockwise fashion from the centre of the concave side of the bowl towards its outer rim and ends about 3–5 mm from the rim of the bowl. There is a small circle at the centre of the text and a larger one encircling and separating it from the rim of the bowl. There is no writing on the convex side of the bowl.

**Notes on scribal characteristics and peculiarities:** The hand of this scribe is generally very neat. Rather minor exceptions are the first line which is very tight and not as tidily and clearly written, and what appears to be a tiny smudge on the het of תיזח in line 11. Although it is by no means clear in most of the text, it seems that in some instances the scribe appears to write bet and kaf in a distinctly different manner; the latter being somewhat rounder. An example of this is the word דלאה in line 6, where the kaf is distinctly rounder than the bet. Likewise, dallet and resh are on occasion distinguished. There are instances, such as in the word דהתדר in line 6, where the resh is distinctly rounder than the two dallets. Furthermore, there are instances where there appears to be a distinction between the waw and the yod, such as in הדיר in line 14, where the former is clearly longer than the latter. In the case of the waw and yod it is safe to say that they are not distinguished throughout the text, though one might consider the fact that, as this is a rather small bowl, upon which the scribe very expertly crammed a copious amount of text, that, try though he might have to distinguish the two; the thickness of the reed, the tiny letters and the closeness of the lines to each other made it difficult for him to be consistent. On the other hand het and heh are not distinguished in any perceptible sense. There are no obvious orthographic peculiarities in this text. The scribe is also generally accurate but on the odd occasion misses one or a number of letters such as dropping the samekh in דסמך in line 4, the last four letters of ידרות in line 23 and the dallet in דניקפ in line 7—though the latter might be an elision