


V304

Spell 443

	BIBo ^a	SIVC ^a	SIC ^a	SIC ^b	SIVC ^b	BIBo ^b	MAXC	B4C ^a	B4C ^b
a									
b									
c									


1* Chiselmark —, exactly like mn.
 2* Indistinct traces suit.
 3* ~~U~~, ~~U~~?
 4* Sic, probably \ominus was added later.
 5* Traces seem to suit.
 6* is a correction over deleted signs.



1* Possibly traces of a bird, ~~etc.~~
 2* Traces may suit ~~etc.~~
 3* See p.303, n.10*. The text of the parallels may have filled the lacuna, if the scribe used N. in stead of the suffix.

V306

Spell 443



1* suits.
 2* traces of 44?
 3* 306a precedes.
 4* probably
 5* The restoration of 306e fills the lacuna, but there are, of course, other possibilities.
 6* See p.303, n.10*. The text of the parallels - even with N. in stead of the suffix - is too short for the lacuna. Did B4C^a contain 306d or e?
 7* See p.304, n.6*. It is of course not at all certain that this is the right place of hm.