









I 3/4

Spell 75

	S1C	S2C	S14C	T3C	B3C	B1B0	B1C	B2L	B1P	B6C	M3C	M20C	B4C
a													
b													
c													

3/5, 2* follows.

	M4C	M5C	M6C	M18C	MAnn	G/T	A/C	BH2C
a								
b	25 [Hieroglyphs]	100 [Hatched]	78 [Hieroglyphs]	4* [Hieroglyphs]	3* [Hieroglyphs]	[350] [Hieroglyphs]	332 [Hieroglyphs]	42 [Hieroglyphs]
c	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑

1* ~~It~~ is always intentionally erased on this side of the coffin.















2* Is this really the beginning of Spell 75? The continuation does not suit.



What follows is another Spell, perhaps the beginning of BD 78.

3* This MS. is now lost. It was published twice by A. Kamal. My text is a reproduction of Kamal's text in *Ann. du Serv. XII* 124 ff. The variants of his second edition (*Ann. du Serv. XIV* 50 ff. M. Ann. ⁶²) are given in the notes.

4* This MS. is now lost. My text is a compilation of the text published by Daressy, *Rec. de Trav. XVI* 130 and the corrections published by Lacau, *Sarcophages I* 127 f.

	S1C	S1C	S1C	T3C	B3C	B1B0	B1C	B1C	B1P	B6C	M3C	M10C
a												
b												
c												

	MNC	M5C	M6C	M2BC	M-Ann.	GIT	AIC	BH2C
a								
b								
c								

1* *nn* is a later addition.

2* In the original the signs are arranged thus

3* Obviously a few words were erroneously written twice in the original. DiMogr. of *hpr.ni m h^c* or *hpr.ni m h^c n n* fills the lacuna well; *hpr.ni m h^c n n* seems too much. At the point marked 3* the MS. inserts:



4* The proposed reconstruction of this line, which assumes a homoteleton *hpr(nj ntr hpr) ds.f etc.* is too long. There are so many possibilities of omissions etc. in this passage that it seems impossible to reconstruct the original with certainty.

5* M. Ann.^{tes} omits —.

6* M. Ann.^{tes} inserts

7* In the original the signs are arranged thus ; see 321b

	M4C	M5C	M6C	M28C	M. Ann. C1T	A1C	BH2C
a							
b							
c							

1* See 317, 2*.

2* Lacau's reading of 319a (with query)
 is probably a misprint for (So
 Daressy)

3* M. Ann.














4* M. Ann. , M. Ann.

5* M. Ann.

6* M. Ann.

7* M. Ann. reads

8* M. Ann.

	S1C	S2C	S4C	T3C	B3C	B1B0	B1C	B2C	B1P	B6C	M3C	M20C
α												
β												
γ												

	MvC	MSC	M6C	M28C	M-Ann	CIT	AIC	BH2C
a								
b								
c								

1* The original continues:



2* for this form of Reg. BIP 302.

3* The reading seems inevitable.

4* This line is too short.

5* M. Ann.^{tes} omits .

6* M. Ann.^{tes} gives for and for .

7* See 317, 7*