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Chapter 4

The Chronology of the Third and Fourth Dynasties according to Manetho’s *Aegyptiaca*

**Roman Gundacker**

Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna

Abstract

Manetho’s *Aegyptiaca* is one of the most important sources for ancient Egyptian chronology. This applies particularly to Old Kingdom chronology, because the archaeological and inscriptional evidence is sparse and contradictory. Although the late date of its composition may provoke doubts about its historical accuracy, Wolfgang Helck has already identified genuine Egyptian historiographical sources which were used by Manetho. A reevaluation of previous results concerning the kings’ names and lengths of reign provided by Manetho allows for the following conclusions: Manetho made use of at least two different Egyptian historiographical accounts for his Third and Fourth Dynasties. One of these contained in part the number of census-cycles for the Fourth Dynasty, while the other contained only correctly converted numbers of regnal years. Manetho’s account of the Fourth Dynasty is therefore an important, but not yet fully recognized, source for the determination of the regularity of the census until the late Fifth Dynasty.

* I feel very much obliged to Peter Der Manuelian and Thomas Schneider for including this contribution in the present volume, and to JJ Shirley for her patience when editing it. Furthermore, I would like to express my sincere gratitude towards Janet H. Johnson, Boyo Ockinga, Joachim F. Quack, Helmut Satzinger, Martin Peters, Stefan Hagel and Anna-Maria Adaktylos for numerous valuable comments on the present paper and for proofreading it. However, needless to say, any mistakes and all errors of fact or judgement are my responsibility alone.

** Recipient of an APART-fellowship of the Austrian Academy of Sciences at the Institute for Oriental and European Archaeology, Department of Egypt and the Levant, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna.
Manetho1 was an autochthonous Egyptian priest—possibly born in Sebennytos2—and associated with the cult of Re at Heliopolis2—, who composed treatises

1 The name Manetho is still unexplained (cf. for exhaustive collections of etymologies: Griffiths, *De Iside et Osiride*, 79–80; Sterling, *Historiography*, 117–36; Verbrugghe and Wickes, *Berossos and Manetho*, 95; Lopilato, *Apotelesmatika*, 8–9; Gozzoli, *Writing of History*, 191), but Mrjj-nṯr-ꜤꜢ “beloved of the Great God” (Redford, “The Name Manetho,” 121) is a particularly promising attempt (consisting of the unstressed passive participle mrjj-~ *mărjŭj-* > *mă(j)*, cf. Fecht, *Wortakzent*, § 446; Osing, *Nominalbildung* 1, 235–42; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung*, 186–88 and “Ägyptische Nominalbildungslehre,” and the theonym nṯr-ꜤꜢ ~ *năṯăr-ꜤăˊꜢ* > *nĕt-ŏ́* (either with loss of ayin > *nĕt-ŏ́* or with metathesis *năṯăr-ꜤăˊꜢ* > *năt(ĕ)-Ꜥŏ́* (anking), because, in its proper position, the ayin would have averted the aspiration of -t, cf. Fecht, *Wortakzent*, §§ 332, 433; Quack, “Griechische und andere Dämonen”; Osing, *Nominalbildung* I, 143, 213; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung*, 155, 182 and “Ist Mythos,” 554–55). Manetho’s name was graecized as Μανέθω (uninflected, still found in several fragments, cf. Jacoby, *FrHistGr* 111C, no. 609 passim), but usually treated as a Greek n-stem Μανέθων, -ωνος (less frequently, an alternative nominative Μανέθως (uninflected?, cf. n. 57 below) or—perhaps corrupted, but cf. n. 3 below—Μάνεθος can be found); Μανέθωθ, which is found in only a single manuscript (cf. Jacoby, *FrHistGr* 111C, no. 609 F2), is probably a comparably late modification in order to connect Manetho’s name with that of the Egyptian god Thoth (cf. Verbrughe and Wickes, *Berossos and Manetho*, 95–96). For the problematic positioning of Greek accents on Egyptian words and names, cf. Clarysse, “Greek Accents”; Thissen, “Umgang.”

2 The Byzantine lexicon Σοῦδα (c. 970 A.D., Adler, *Suidae lexicon*) contains two relevant lemmata (cf. Jacoby, *FrHistGr* 111C, no. 609 T1, T2): (M.142) Μανέθως Μένδης τῆς Αἰγύπτου, ἀρχιερεύς. ἔγραψε περὶ κατασκευῆς κυφίων, ζήτει τὶ τὸ κῦφι “Manetho of Mendes in Egypt, archpriest; he wrote ‘On the Production of Kyphi’ , see what Kyphi is [cf. Σοῦδα (K.2797), quoted later in this footnote]” and (M.143) Μανέθως Διοσπόλεως τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἢ Σεβεννύτης. Φυσιο λογικά· Ἀποτελεσματικὰ δι᾽ ἐπῶν· καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ ἀστρονομούμενα “(Astrological) Effects in verse; and other astronomical (~ astrological) things more” (cf. Aufrère, “Manéthôn de Sebennytos, médiateur,” 321–24 and “Les deux notices”; Naïditch, “Manetho”; Koechly, *Manethonis Apotelesmaticorum*; Lopilato, *Apotelesmatika*). On the one hand, all three towns are located in the Nile Delta in close proximity to one another, which could be interpreted in favor of only a single person Manetho. But, on the other hand, the three toponyms could point towards a totally different solution:

(1) The mention of Mendes may be due to confusion of Manetho with Ptolemy of Mendes, who also compiled an Egyptian history (Ἀιγυπτιακά) in three books (Dihle, “Ptolemaios von Mendes”; Jacoby, *FrHistGr* 111C, no. 611), as was pointed out by Müller and Müller, *FrHistGr* 11, 512 (cf. Waddell, *Manetho*, x–xi).

(2) Similarly, Diospolis (inferior) may indicate that Manetho was mixed up with an early Hermetic astrologer, Anubio of Diospolis (magna, i.e., Thebes, cf. Lopilato,
Apotelesmatika, 8, with n. 51 [p. 15]), who wrote a didactic poem (second half of the 1st century ace; Obbink, “Anoubion” and Anubio. Carmen; cf. Gundel and Gundel, Astrologumena, 380; Bremmer, “Apion and Anoubion”; Heilen, “Anubio”). It is however notable that, in addition to Diospolis (inferior), the Σοῦδα gives a second toponym, Sebennytos. This may hint at two authors, either of whom could be called Manetho: on the one hand, Manetho of Sebennytos, who wrote on Egyptian history and religion (3rd century bce), and, on the other hand, an otherwise unknown Manetho of Diospolis (inferior), to whom some of the pseudepigraphic works might be attributed (above all books ii–iii, vi of the Ἀποτελεσματικά, cf. Kroll, “Manethon,” 1102–06, which depend on the lost astrological treatise of Νεχεψῶ and Πετόσιρις, cf. Riess, “Nechepsonis et Petosiridis”; Bouché-Leclercq, Astrologie; Heilen, “Anubio,” 134–38; Bohelke, “In Terms of Fate”). If the horoscope, which the author himself provides in book vi, 745–50 (cf. Koechly, Manethonis Apotelesmaticorum; Lopilato, Apotelesmatika; 140, 304), is to be taken seriously, his date of birth can be calculated as May 27th/28th, 80 ace (Garnett, “Ἀποτελεσματικά”; Neugebauer and van Hoesen, Greek Horoscopes, 92; Ypsilanti, “Apotelesmatica”); books ii–iii, vi may thus be dated to c. 130 ace (in the 3rd century ace, book iv was added, cf. Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 2546, Lopilato, Apotelesmatika, 3, and, finally, books i and v were appended some time prior to 415 ace, when Hephastio of Thebes quoted Manetho’s Ἀποτελεσματικά i, 167–69 in his own treatise, also called Ἀποτελεσματικά 2.4.27, cf. Pingree, Hephastionis libri; Lopilato, Apotelesmatika, 5). It is thus most likely that Manetho of Sebennytos, who was best known for his books on Egyptian religion, and the astrologer Manetho of Diospolis (inferior) were amalgamated, which advanced the association of Manetho with Thoth and his secret books, i.e., Hermetic writings (Jacoby, FrHistGr iii, no. 609 T11a–11b, F25; Aufrère, “Traces”) and the astrological opus of Νεχεψῶ and Πετόσιρις (cf. Heilen, “Anubio”; Rhyolt, “New Light”; cf. nn. 22–23). Cf. Verbrugghe and Wickersham, Berossos and Manetho, 96; Gozzoli, Writing of History, 191–93; Fowden, The Egyptian Hermes, 171. Its is also important to stress the clumsy character of both entries “Manetho” in the Σοῦδα: One should expect Μένδητος τῆς Αἰγύπτου “of Mendes in Egypt” instead of Μένδης τῆς Αἰγύπτου (cf. Hude, Historiae, s.v. II.42), and Σεβεννύτου “of Sebennytos” instead of Σεβεννύτης (cf. Meineke, Ethnicorum, 558; Billerbeck, Ethnica iv), which makes Διοσπόλεως τῆς Αἰγύπτου “of Diospolis (inferior)” the only correct expression of origin. In spite of their superficial similarity, Μένδης “of Mendes” and Σεβεννύτης “of Sebennytos” are the result of two entirely different mistakes. As far as it concerns toponyms, the author of the Σοῦδα closely followed the Εθνικά of Stephanus of Byzantium. This becomes obvious when Μένδης τῆς Αἰγύπτου “of Mendes in Egypt” is analyzed, because Stephanus of Byzantium mentions this town (Meineke, Ethnicorum, 444; Billerbeck, Ethnica 111), but he does not indicate its declension pattern. Therefore, the compiler of the Σοῦδα aligned the Egyptian town Μένδης with the toponym immediately preceding it in the Εθνικά, i.e., the Thracian town Μένδη, -ης (cf. Meineke, Ethnicorum, 444; Billerbeck, Ethnica 111), which is supported by several entries in the Σοῦδα: (A.4127) … τὸν ἐν Μένδη τράγον Πανὸς ἱερὸν κατέθυσε … “… he (scil. Ochus of Persia) sacrificed the sacred goat of Pan in Mende…” (M.592) Μενδαῖος: ο ἀπὸ τῆς Μένδης “Mendaeus: the man from Mende”—according to the Εθνικά (cf. Meineke, Ethnicorum, 444; Billerbeck, Ethnica 111), this adjective is exclusively used for persons and things connected
on Egyptian history and religion. He probably lived under Ptolemy I Soter (305–283 BCE), Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–246 BCE), and Ptolemy III to Μένδη in Thrace, s.v. (M.593) in the Σοῦδα, whereas the Egyptian town Μένδης was the source for Μενδήσιος and Μενδίτης, cf. (M.594) and (M.595) in the Σοῦδα—, (M.593) Μένδη: πόλις μία τῶν ἐν Πελλήνῃ Μένδα...“Mende: Menda [sic, perhaps ← “Méndē by harmonization with the preceding Μενδής] is one town of those in Pellene...” (cf. the lexicon of Valerius Harpocratio, s.v. Μένδη, which is obviously quoted in (M.593), Dindorf, Harpocrationis lexicon 1, 202), (M.594) Μένδην: οὕτω καλοῦσι τὸν Πᾶνα Αἰγύπτιοι ὡς τραγοπρόσωπον...ἡν δὲ καὶ ιερὸν τοῦ Μενδησίου παρ’ Αἰγύπτιοι...“Menden: Thus the Egyptians call Pan as goat-faced (deity)...and there was also a temple of the Mendesian (god) amongst the Egyptians”, (M.595) Μενδήσιον κέρας: τὸ τοῦ Νείλου στόμα “The Mendesian horn: the [Mendesian] mouth of the Nile” (cf. Herodotus II.17.5; Hude, Historiae, s.v. II.17.5). Σεβεννύτης “of Sebennytos”, however, cannot be explained that way, because Stephanus of Byzantium (Meineke, Ethnicorum, 558; Billerbeck, Ethnicna 111) calls this town Σεβέννυτος, undoubtedly a thematic ο-stem, and its citizen and its nome equivocally Σεβεννύτης (cf. also Claudius Ptolemaeus, Geographia, 4,5; Stückelberger and Graßhoff, Ptolemaicos 1, 420–43). Σεβεννύτης “of Sebennytos” should thus be analyzed as an interpolation, which was introduced because of the common association of Manetho with Sebennytos on grounds of Plutarch (De Iside et Osiride, 354C, 361F–362A; Jacoby, FrHistGr 111C, no. 609 T3, F19; cf. García Valdés, Plutarco, 72–73, 110–13; Griffiths, De Iside et Osiride, 130–31, 160–61, 393–401), the statements of George Synellus (Jacoby, FrHistGr 111C, no. 609 T1a–1lc), and the pseudepigraphic letter at the beginning of the Book of Sothis, which explicitly refers to Manetho as ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ γραμματεὺς τῶν κατ᾽ Αἴγυπτον ἱερῶν ἀδύτων, γένε Σεβεννύτης, ὑπ’ άρχων Ἡλιοπολίτης “archpriest and scribe of the sacred shrines throughout Egypt, Sebennyte by birth, a residing Heliopolite” (Jacoby, FrHistGr 111C, no. 609 F25; Waddell, Manetho, 210–11). It was perhaps the collection of chronographic fragments by George Synellus which triggered the introduction of Σεβεννύτης into the Σοῦδα or one of its sources (maybe an offshoot of the geographical section of the card index of Constantine vii Porphyrogenitus?; cf. Toynbee, Constantin, 575–605).

If this interpretation is correct, (M.142) Μανέθως Μένδης τῆς Αἰγύπτου “Manetho of Mendes in Egypt” deals with the Manetho (of Sebennytos), although he was mixed up with Ptolemy of Mendes, whereas (M.143) Μανέθως Διοσπόλεως τῆς Αἰγύπτου “Manetho of Diospolis in Egypt”—although it then remains unclear which Diospolis is meant (perhaps Diospolis inferior after all?)—records information about the author of the core of the Αποτελεσματικά, to whom Σεβεννύτης “the Sebennyte” was added by mistake. The attribution of the title ἀρχιερεύς “archpriest,” which is also found in the pseudepigraphic letter at the beginning of the Book of Sothis and in Περὶ κατασκευῆς κυφίων “On the Production of Kyphi,” the only authentic work of Manetho of Sebennytos (cf. section 2) mentioned in the Σοῦδα, to Manetho of Mendes strongly speaks in favor of this analysis. The lemma (K.2797) Κῦφι: τοῦτο Μάνεθως ὁ Αἰγύπτιος κατασκεύασε “Kyphi: Manetho the Egyptian used to prepare this” is also noteworthy insofar as it attributes the preparation of this compound incense to “Manetho the Egyptian,” thus avoiding any concrete association with an Egyptian town. Perhaps the compiler of the Σοῦδα was aware of some kind of problem with his entries (M.142) and (M.143), but his materials were insufficient to decide on this matter.
Euergetes (246–221 BCE). Manetho also seems to have been involved in installing the Graeco-Egyptian cult of Sarapis. He furthermore played an important

3 Cf. in general Hölbl, Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches. Most notably, there are at least four pieces of evidence linking Manetho to the first three Ptolemies: (1) Manetho and the Eumolpid Timotheus of Athens are said to have been the very priests who were able to interpret king Ptolemy's dream about the cult image of Sarapis, which was to be brought from Sinope to Alexandria. Those events are dated to the reign of Ptolemy I Soter by Plutarch (De Iside et Osiride, 361F–362A; Jacoby, FrHistGr 111C, no. 609 T3; cf. Garcia Valdés, Plutarco, 110–II, 245; Griffiths, De Iside et Osiride, 160–61, 393–401; Sfameni Gasparro, "Sarapide"; Quack, "Reiche," 10, n. 3), to the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus by Eusebius (Chronica [Armenian version] 125,4; Schoene, Eusebii Chronicorum, 120) and others, and to the reign of Ptolemy III Euergetes by Tacitus (Historiae 4, 83–84, cf. Borst, Ross, and Borst, Tacitus Historien). (2) The pseudopigraphic letter at the beginning of the Book of Sothis (Jacoby, FrHistGr 111C, no. 609 T1l) gives Ptolemy II Philadelphus as the addressee of Manetho's letter, which would simply be ludicrous if Manetho had not commonly been considered a contemporary of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (Laqueur, "Manethon," 1061). But one should keep in mind that Manetho was styled a pagan analogon to the seventy-two Jewish elders responsible for the translation of the Septuagint (cf. Wasserstein and Wasserstein, Septuagint, 284–88). (3) George Syncellus mentions several times that Manetho was a subject of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, although one has to admit that he considered The Book of Sothis the authentic Manethonian king-list (Jacoby, FrHistGr 111C, no. 609 T1l–11c; cf. Waddell, Manetho, xvii). (4) A papyrus found at el-Hibeh (Grenfell and Hunt, Hibe Papyri 1, no. 72, 6–7; Jacoby, FrHistGr 111C, no. 609 T4) mentions a high-ranking priest called Manetho (actually the dative ΜΑΝΕΘΩΙ, thus indicating a thematic o-stem *Μάνεθος; cf. also the following note and n. 1) in 241/240 BCE, i.e., early in the reign of Ptolemy III Euergetes. Although it cannot be proven that the Manetho known from the papyrus is the same as the famous priest and author, this is nevertheless at least possible given the chronological proximity and the rareness of the name Manetho, which is otherwise unattested. (5a–b) Two more, but somewhat vague references can be found in the youngest books of the Ἀποτελεσματικά: I, 1–2 Χαίροις, ῶ Πτολεμαῖε, λαχὼν βασιληΐδα τίμην || γαίης ἡμετέρης, κοσμοτρόφου Αἰγύπτοιο || "Be greeted, o Ptolemy, holding the royal power || of our land, of Egypt, which nurtures the all." and v, 1–11 Ἐξ ἀδύτων βίβλων, βασιλεύ Πτολεμαῖε, || καὶ κρυφίμων στηλῶν, ἃς ηὕρατο πάνσοφο Ἑρμῆς. || ἀντιτύπῳ κηρῷ γ' ἀπομαξάμενος κεκόμισαι || ἀνθολόγον Μούσης . . . || οὐ βαιὸς κάματος δ' οὗτος, Πτολεμαῖε, πέφυκεν. || "From sacred books of secret shrines, o king Ptolemy, || and concealed stelae, which all-wise Hermes devised || I, making impressions with figure-retaining wax, have recovered || the Muse's flowering compilation . . . || And this work, o Ptolemy, has not grown little." (cf. Koechly, Manethonis Apotelesmaticorum; Lopilato, Apotelesmatika, 99, 263, 394–402). However, it is currently impossible to determine Manetho’s dates of birth and death with greater accuracy (cf. Ryan, “Lebensdaten”; Gmirkin, Berossus and Genesis, 240–43), but the association of Manetho and the first three Ptolemyes can be viewed as historical fact (Huß, König, 123–29).
role in the early stages of the development of the ideology of the Ptolemaic state and royal ideology as well as the elaboration of official propaganda at the crossroads of Greek and Egyptian cultures.\(^5\) Paradoxically and ironically enough, Manetho's writings were totally ignored by classical Greek and Roman authors including geographers, ethnographers and historians.\(^6\) In this respect, Manetho became the victim of the Graeco-

---


centric view of historiography, and of pro- and anti-Jewish polemics, which over time must have “infected” his writings. It is thus inappropriate to reduce

7 It would seem that Greeks quoted authors of non-Greek descent only if there was no genuine Greek alternative. As with Manetho, Berossus, who wrote a history of Babylon (Βαβυλονιακά) dedicated to Antiochus I Soter (c. 290/278 BCE, Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIC, no. 680; cf. Gmirkin, Berossus and Genesis, 240–43), was quoted by only two genuine Greeks, neither of whom is prima facie a historian: (1) Clitarchus of Alexandria (early to mid-3rd century BCE; Jacoby, FrHistGr II, no. 137), who, in his Alexander History, relies on Berossus when describing the city of Babylon and its monuments, and (2) Alexander Polyhistor (Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIC, no. 273), who systematically compiled excerpts from Berossus’ Babyloniaca, which were subsequently used by Greek and Latin authors. Apart from these, Berossus’ writings were directly quoted only by Juba II (mid-1st century ACE, Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIC, no. 275), king of Mauretania, who was married to Cleopatra Selena, the daughter of Cleopatra VII Philopator and Marc Anthony (cf. Roller, Juba II and Cleopatra Selene), and by an unknown Jewish (to be exact: Samaritan) author (Pseudo-Eupolemus, perhaps 2nd century BCE; Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIC, no. 724). Cf. in general Schnabel, Berossos und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur; Burstein, Babyloniaca of Berossus; Haubold, et al., The World of Berossos; Heller, Babylonien der Spätzeit. Just as Berossus was neglected in favor of Ctesias of Cnidus (late 4th century BCE; Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIC, no. 688), Manetho could not prevail over Hecataeus of Abdera and Herodotus, who provided a less dry account of Egyptian culture, presenting it as being mythical and mysterious, which the Greek audience deemed more attractive (Waddel, Manetho, xxiv; cf. Burstein, “Images of Egypt,” 597–601; Gozzoli, Writing of History, 193–96; Brown, “Greek Sense,” 268; Johnson, “Chronological Writing”). One should furthermore mention that the Greeks had doubts about the value of ancient scriptures, which delivered historical events predating the earliest Greek historical records by centuries. This is explicitly expressed by Diodorus Siculus (perhaps quoting Hecataeus of Abdera, cf. Jacoby, “Hekataios”; Drews, “Diodorus”; Hornblower, Hieronymus, 20–39): ἡμῖν δὲ περὶ ἑκάστου τὰ κατὰ μέρος μακρὸν ἐν εἰς καὶ περίεργον γράφειν, ὡς ἐν τῶν πλείστων ἄχρηστοι περιειλημένων. “But for us it would be an enormous and futile labor to write of each (scil. of the 470 native Egyptian kings and five native Egyptian queens), because the most of everything encompassed is useless.” (Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIC, no. 264 F25; Oldfather, Diodorus Siculus 1, 158–59 [s.v. 44.5]). Herodotus also skipped most of the 343 kings and queens, of whose names he knew, although he did not explain why (Lloyd, Herodotus Book II, 1, 185–92 and 111, 1–6; cf. also n. 312).

8 Manetho and his writings became obviously more and more important to the population of Alexandria during the conflict between pagan Egyptians and Jews (in particular from the 1st century BCE onwards, cf. Wasserstein and Wasserstein, Septuagint, 275–90). After the translation of the Septuagint (Hanhart, “Fragen um die Entstehung”; Tilly, Septuaginta [with numerous references]; cf. also Larsson, “Chronology of the Pentateuch”; Gilbert, “Hellenization”; Stern, Greek and Latin Authors), there was, on the one hand, an increasing association of Manetho with Thoth (cf. nn. 1–2 above), and, on the other hand, there were the emerging attempts of Jewish scholars to align the Biblical and Manethonian chronologies (cf., e.g., Wacholder, “Biblical Chronology”; Cohen, “History and Historiography”; Jaeger, “Greeks and
Manetho to some kind of a Kunstfigur invented⁹ e nihilo in order to name the anonymous author of an account of Egyptian history produced early in Rome’s rule over Egypt.¹⁰ Especially when compared to the fate of the writings of other oriental and Levantine authors, who composed works about their homelands’ histories in Greek for a Greek audience,¹¹ the fate of Manetho’s writings is no longer a unique difficulty, but it becomes understandable. To conclude, the information on Manetho and his life may be summarized as regrettably sparse, but there is no compelling reason to deny the commonly assumed early Ptolemaic setting of Manetho and his writings.¹²

2 Manetho’s Writings—An Incomplete Mosaic

Ten works have been attributed to Manetho:¹³ (1) Αἰγυπτιακά “Egyptian Matters” in three books, which were devoted to Egyptian history;¹⁴ (2) Ἡ ἱερὰ βιβλίος "Jews”; cf. also a great number of remarkable points in Gmirkin, Berossus and Genesis, whose overall theory that the Pentateuch itself is the Jewish reaction on Berossus and Manetho is nevertheless untenable and thus to be discarded, cf., e.g., van Seeters, “Review of Berossus and Genesis”). Those developments may be identified as the starting point for a fatal chain of interpolations and tendentious emendations (cf. Laqueur, “Manethon”; Hornung, Krauss, and Warburton, “King-Lists,” 34–35; Feldman, “Pro- and Anti-Jewish”; Gruen, “Use and Abuse”; Hendel, “Exodus”; Krauss, Amarnazeit, 204–23; Bickerman, Jews; Rajak, Jewish Dialogue). Manetho’s Aegyptiaca thus became a battlefield in the conflict between the pagan and the Judaeo-Christian worlds (cf. P. Schäfer, “Manetho-Fragmente”; Collins, “Anti-Semitism”; Quack, “Reiche,” 8–9). Even though Manetho’s text may have contained anti-Semitic sections, he certainly could not promote crude polemics which would have imperiled the Ptolemies’ relations to the Jews and their dominion over Jewish territories (Feldman, Scholarship, 157–61; Levison and Wagner, “Introduction”; Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 206–07; Gruen, “Use and Abuse”; Hendel, “Exodus”; Krauss, Amarnazeit, 204–23; Bickerman, Jews; Rajak, Jewish Dialogue). For the reception of Manetho in Hermetic philosophy nn. 2–3 above, and nn. 22–23 and 130 below.

⁹ Thissen, “Der Name Manetho.”
¹⁰ Cf. Unger, Chronologie des Manetho, 3; Havet, Mémoire; Krauss, “Manethos Ägyptische Geschichte.”
¹¹ This is explicitly stated by Flavius Josephus (Contra Apionem 1, 73; Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIC, no. 609 T7a; cf. n. 26 below), cf. for Manetho Stephens, Seeing Double, 50, n. 96, 250, n. 43, cf. n. 274 below.
¹² Cf. furthermore Fraser, Ptolemaic Alexandria 1, 505–06; Huß, Der makedonische König, 124–25; Sterling, Historiography, 505–06.
¹⁴ Waddell, Manetho, 2–187; Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIC, no. 609 Fl–F12. The composition is dated to c. 285–280 BCE by Gmirkin, Berossus and Genesis, 240–43 (cf. Adler, Time Immemorial,
“The Sacred Book,” which dealt with Egyptian mythology and Egyptian cults;\(^{15}\) (3) Περὶ ἑορτῶν “On Festivals”;\(^{16}\) (4) Περὶ ἀρχαῖσμοῦ καὶ εὐσεβείας “On Ancient Ritual and Religion”;\(^{17}\) (5) Περὶ κατασκευῆς κυφίων “On the Production of Kyphi”\(^{18}\) —the last three titles, nos. (3)–(4) in particular, may be chapters of The Sacred Book\(^{19}\) —; and five more obviously pseudepigraphic works: (6) Πρὸς Ἡρόδοτον “Against Herodotus,” actually a secondary compilation of Manetho’s critical remarks on Herodotus as found in his Aegyptiaca;\(^{20}\) (7) Φυσικά or Φυσιολογικά “Physical Matters”;\(^{21}\) (8) a medical treatise of unknown title;\(^{22}\) (9) Ἡ βίβλος τῆς Σωθευτῆς ἢ ὁ κυνικὸς κυκλός The Book of Sothis or The Canicula Cycle, a historical account, partly dependent on Manetho’s Aegyptiaca and partly independent from it, which is composed as a king-list, and at the beginning of which a clearly fictitious letter relates that Manetho devoted this book

\(^{15}\) Waddell, Manetho, 188–95; Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIC, no. 609 F19–F23b; cf. Aufrère, “Manéthôn de Sebennytos et la traduction”.

\(^{16}\) Waddell, Manetho, 198–99; Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIC, no. 609 F15.

\(^{17}\) Waddell, Manetho, 198–203; Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIC, no. 609 F14.

\(^{18}\) Waddell, Manetho, 202–05; Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIC, no. 609 F16a–c.


\(^{20}\) Waddell, Manetho, 204–07; Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIC, no. 609 F13 (cf. Fl); cf. Mendels, “Polemical Character.” Manetho’s critique was certainly evoked by Herodotus’ Graeco-centric approach and by misapprehensions and errors, which Manetho recognized. One should also remember Plutarch’s De malignitate Herodoti “On the malice of Herodotus” (Cuvigny and Lachenaud, Plutarque: Œuvres morales), a similarly biased work discrediting Herodotus on the basis of a limited number of errors and blaming him for having produced an ill-willed and unjustifiably unfavorable history from the point of view of the Hellenic cities, e.g., Thebes (cf. Hershbell, “Plutarch and Herodotus”). The reasons for this harsh critique were Plutarch’s perception of Greek history and his aim of presenting Egypt as the source of religion and philosophy (cf. Griffiths, De Iside et Osiride, 18–33).

\(^{21}\) Waddell, Manetho, 196–99; Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIC, no. 609 F17–F18.

to Ptolemy II Philadelphus;23 and (10) Ἀποτελεσµατικά “(Astrological) Effects,” a hexametric poem in six books on astrological matters.24

Of these, nos. (2)–(8) are known from only a few scarce fragments, no. (9) is known to a large extent, and no. (10) is the only work preserved in its entirety. The most complex line of tradition is found with no. (1), the Aegyptiaca. As mentioned above, the Aegyptiaca suffered from pro- and anti-Jewish emendations and interpolations,25 which must have produced several conflicting versions. At some time (perhaps in the 1st century BCE?), the unabridged text of one such version of the Aegyptiaca was excerpted in order to produce the Epitome, which contains the Egyptian kings’ names and lengths of reign arranged in dynasties and supplemented with a few glosses on the most outstandingly important events. The original text is preserved in only a small number of quotations in Flavius Josephus’ Contra Apionem (late 1st century ACE),26 whereas the Epitome is found in full-length in the chronographic compilations by Sextus Julius Africanus (3rd century ACE) and Eusebius Pamphili of Caesarea (4th century ACE); both of these texts also suffered from a complex line of tradition.

---

23 Waddell, Manetho, 10–15, 208–11, 234–49; Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIC, no. 609 T11a, F25, F28; cf. n. 121 below. It is important to stress that the fictitious letter at the beginning of The Book of Sothis closely matches the Forecast of Neferty (cf. Helck, Prophezeiung des Neferti): the king (Ptolemy II Philadelphus—Snefru) asks a widely recognized sage (Manetho—Neferty) to foretell future events, which the sage does by considering and analyzing the past in order to extrapolate (cf. Winkler, Looking at the Future) the future; cf. Aufrère, “Traces.” Lopilato pointed out that this spurious letter and the dedication in books I and V of the Ἀποτελεσµατικά (cf. n. 3 above) are birds of a feather (Lopilato, Apotelesmatika, 7, 398; cf. Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIC, no. 609 T11a, with n. 56), because they both refer to secret tablets of Hermes as the principal sources of Manetho’s account (…παραφανήσεταί σοι ἃ ἔµαθον ἱερὰ βιβλία γραφέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ προπάτορος τρισµεγίστου Ἑρµοῦ…”)… I will place before you (scil. king Ptolemy II Philadelphus) the sacred books which I have studied, (those) which were written by (your) forefather Hermes Trismegistus…” Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIC, no. 609 F25, cf. T 11a–11c; Waddell, Manetho, 210–11). The Book of Sothis may thus be dated to the 3rd–4th century ACE (Waddell, Manetho, 234–35, n. 1), although Panodorus of Alexandria and Annianus of Alexandria have been suspected of being the actual authors (cf. Waddell, Manetho, 12, n. 1); cf. n. 121 below.

24 Koechly, Manethonis Apotelesmaticorum; Lopilato, Apotelesmatika; cf. Kroll, “Manethon,” II02–06; Gundel and Gundel, Astrologumenata, 155–64; Reed, “Pseudo-Manetho”; cf. also Aufrère, “Manéthôn de Sebennytos et la traduction” and “Traces”; cf. nn. 2–3 above.

25 Cf. n. 8 above, and in addition Verbrugghe and Wickersham, Berossos and Manetho, 118.

26 Labow, Flavius Josephus; Siegert, Über die Ursprünglichkeit; Barclay, Against Apion; cf. also Feldman and Levison, Josephus’ Contra Apionem.
The following investigation will thus be based on the Epitome according to Africanus and Eusebius, the Greek and the Armenian versions; The Book of Sothis; and the king-list, which is ascribed to Apollodorus of Athens, who is supposed to quote Eratosthenes of Cyrene (therefore Pseudo-Apollodorus or Pseudo-Eratosthenes). All these writings were collected by George Syncellus in his 'Εκλογή Χρονογραφίας "Selection of Chronography" (792 ACE), which is thus the most important historiographical source.

3 The Third and Fourth Dynasties according to Manetho's Aegyptiaca as Reflected in Quotations by Other Authors

The Third Dynasty according to the Epitome of Manetho's Aegyptiaca as transmitted by Sextus Julius Africanus and preserved in the Ἐκλογὴ Χρονογραφίας of George Syncellus, supplemented with critical notes after the version of Eusebius Pamphili of Caesarea, reads as follows:

Γρίτη δυναστεία Μεμφιτῶν βασιλέων ἐννέα(θ')

The Third Dynasty consists of nine Memphite kings, of whom was the

α' Νεχερωφής

εφ' οὗ Λίβυες ἀπέστησαν

Αιγυπτίων, καὶ τῆς σελήνης

παρὰ λόγων αὐξηθείσης διὰ
dέος ἑαυτῶς παρέδοσαν.

1. Necherophes: 28 years,

under whom the Libyans

revolted against the Egyptians,

and after the moon had waxed

beyond reckoning, they

surrendered in terror.

---

27 Jacoby, FrHistGr 11, no. 244 F85; cf. Jacoby, Chronik, 399–400; Waddell, Manetho, 212–25.


29 Greek text after Jacoby, FrHistGr 111C, no. 609 F3–F5; cf. Waddell, Manetho, 40–45; Orthographic variants are not recorded if they unambiguously occurred late and if they are irrelevant for the reconstruction of the Egyptian equivalents. Cf. also n. 28 above.
The Fourth Dynasty according to the Epitome of Manetho’s Aegyptiaca as transmitted by Sextus Julius Africanus and preserved in the Ἐκλογὴ Χρονογραφίας of George Syncellus, supplemented with critical notes after the version of Eusebius Pamphili of Caesarea, reads as follows:30

Τετάρτη δυναστεία Μεμφιτῶν συγγενείας ἔτερας βασιλεῖς ἡ’ (ὠκτώ)⁹.

The Fourth Dynasty were 8 kings from another bloodline of the Memphites.

---

30 Greek text after Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIC, no. 609 F3–F5; cf. Waddell, Manetho, 44–49; Orthographic variants are not recorded if they unambiguously occurred late and if they are irrelevant for the reconstruction of the Egyptian equivalents. Cf. also n. 28 above.
α’ Σώρις ἔτη κθ’  
β’ Σοῦφις ἔτη ξγ’  
ὃς τὴν μεγίστην ἥγειρεν πυραμίδα, ἣν φησιν Ἦρόδοτος ὑπὸ Χέοπος 
γεγονέναι, οὗτος δὲ καὶ ὑπερόπτης εἰς θεοὺς ἐγένετο, καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν συνέγραψε βιβλίον.  

γ’ Σοῦφις ἔτη ξς’  
δ’ Μενχέρης ἔτη ξγ’  
ε’ Ρατοίσης ἔτη κε’  
ζ’ Σεβερχέρης ἔτη ζ’  
η’ Θαμφθίς ἔτη θ’  

οἵ καὶ ἐβασίλευσαν ἓτεσιν υμῆ’  

1. Soris: 29 years;  
2. Souphis: 63 years, who built the largest pyramid, which, says Herodotus, was erected under Cheops. And he also developed arrogance towards the gods, and he wrote *The Sacred Book*.  
3. Souphis (II): 66 years;  
4. Mencheres: 63 years;  
5. Rhatoises: 25 years;  
6. Bicheris: 22 years;  
7. Sebercheres: 7 years;  
8. Thamphthis: 9 years; altogether: 277/274 years.

a Eusebius: ιζ’ “17”; b personal remark of Africanus: ἣν ὡς μέγα χρῆμα ἐν Ἀιγύπτῳ γεγονός ἐκτησάμην “which, because of its high esteem, I bought when in Egypt”; c Eusebius explicates: τρίτος Σοῦφις, ὁ τὴν μεγίστην πυραμίδα ἐγείρας, ἣν φησιν Ἦρόδοτος ὑπὸ Χέοπος γεγονέναι, ὃς καὶ ὑπερόπτης εἰς θεοὺς γέγονεν· ὡς μετανοήσαντα, αὐτὸν τὴν ἱερὰν συγγράψαι βιβλίον, ἣν ὡς μέγα χρῆμα Ἀιγύπτιοι περιέπουσι “The third was Souphis, the constructor of the largest pyramid, which, says Herodotus, was erected under Cheops, who also developed arrogance towards the gods; but, as if/when he had repented, he (is said) to have written *The Sacred Book*, which the Egyptians hold in high esteem”; d Μενχέρης [sic] according to the manuscripts; e–e Eusebius: τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν οὐδὲν ἀξιομνημόνευτον ἀνεγράφη “But of the remaining, there is nothing worth mentioning recorded”; f Correct: σπδ’ “284”; Eusebius: Οἱ καὶ ἐβασίλευσαν ἓτεσιν υμη’ “And they ruled for 448 years.”

The section on the Third and Fourth Dynasties according to the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes and preserved in the Ἐκλογὴ Χρονογραφίας of George Syncellus reads as follows:31

---

31 Jacoby, *FrHistGr* 11, no. 244 F85; *cf.* Waddell, *Manetho*, 212–25 and n. 121; Merely orthographic variants are not recorded, but the text of the this king-list has suffered even more than the Epitome of the *Aegyptiaca* according to Africanus and Eusebius (*cf.*, for additional conjectures of von Gutschmid, Gelzer, “Diorthose”). The particularly late and fantastic explanations of the kings’ names are left out for the sake of briefness.
Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσεν ς' Μομχειρὶ Μεμφίτης, ἔτη θ'.
As 6th ruled the Egyptian Thebans the Memphite Momcheiri, 79 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσεν ζ' Μόχμειρὶ Μεμφίτης, ἔτη γ'.
As 7th ruled the Egyptian Thebans Stoichos, his son, 6 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσεν δ' Γοσορμίης, ἔτη λ'.
As eighth ruled the Egyptian Thebans Gosormies, 30 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσεν θ' Μάρης, ἔτη κα'.
As 9th ruled the Egyptian Thebans Mares, his son, 26 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσεν ι' Ανωφίης, ἔτη ια'.
As 10th ruled the Egyptian Thebans Anoiphis, 20 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσε Σίριος, ἔτη ιβ'.
As 11th ruled the Egyptian Thebans Sirios, his son, 18 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσε Χνουβος <ἢ> Γνεύρος, ἔτη κβ'.
As 12th ruled the Egyptian Thebans Chnoubos <or> Gneuros, 22 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσε Ραυωσις, ἔτη ιγ'.
As 13th ruled the Egyptian Thebans Rhayosis, 13 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσε Βιύρης, ἔτη ιδ'.
As 14th ruled the Egyptian Thebans Biyres, 10 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσε Σαωφίς, ἔτη ιε'.
As 15th ruled the Egyptian Thebans Saophis, 29 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσε Μοσχερῆς, ἔτη ιζ'.
As 16th ruled the <Egyptian> Thebans Moschères, 27 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσε Μοσχερῆς, ἔτη λα'.
As 17th ruled the <Egyptian> Thebans Moschères, 31 years.

[...]

a An obscure gloss, τοιγὰρ ἄμαχος, before the king’s name should perhaps be transposed to the end of an exceptional remark following the
folk-etymological gloss after his name: ...περισσομελής, <τοιγάρ ἁμάχος> “...a man with exceedingly large limbs, thus irresistible” (cf. Waddell, *Manetho*, 216); as an alternative, von Gutschmid (Gelzer, “Diorrhose,” 268) conjectured two additional names, Τοισαράμ Ἄχος, but their position and interpretation would constitute an enigma of their own, and should thus be discarded. b conjecture, Bunsen, *Weltgeschichte* 11, 76–77; Waddell, *Manetho*, 218; cf. furthermore n. 134 further below.

**Excursus I  Old Kingdom Chronology according to Contemporary Data and the Old Kingdom Annals—A Plea in Favor of Regular Biennial Census-Cycles**

When reconstructing the chronology of the earliest phases of Egyptian history, one faces two major problems: on the one hand, there is a regrettably small number of dated texts preserved,32 and, on the other hand, the dating system was still evolving towards its final form, i.e., simply counting the regnal years of the actual king.

This process started in prehistoric times with years being named after the most prominent and most important events which took place in the course of each year. Of course, those events had to be predictable in order to allow for a consistent and distinctive name for each year from the respective new year’s day on.33 Among those events, regularly recurring ones, especially šmśw-Ḥrw “the following of Horus”34 and ṭnw.t (jḥ.w ṣwt nb.w Mḥwj ŠmꜤw) “the counting (of all cattle and livestock of Lower and Upper Egypt),” became predominant. This was without a doubt motivated precisely by their regular biennial recurrence,35 which left only every second year to be given individual year names beyond a common template. In the early reign of Snefru (prior to his sixth census), the system of naming years after eponymous events was finally altered to a system of counting biennial census-cycles.36 From then on, every even year was named *rnpt sp XY* (ṭnw.t jḥ.w ṣwt nb.w Mḥwj ŠmꜤw) “Year of the
XYth occurrence (of the counting of all cattle and livestock of Lower and Upper Egypt),” and every odd year rnp.t m-ḥt sp XY (tnw.t jḥ.w ʿw.t nb.w Mḥwj ŠmꜤw) “Year after the XYth occurrence (of the counting of all cattle and livestock of Lower and Upper Egypt).” The only exception to that mode was a king’s first incomplete year which lasted from the day following his predecessor’s death until the next new year’s day (rnp.t smꜤ-T3.wj “Year of the unification of the Two Lands”).

It was obviously the regularity of the census, which made it an appropriate point of reference in a simplified system of naming years. Accordingly, one should expect that the fragments of the Old Kingdom annals and the contemporaneous inscriptions provide a somehow balanced ratio between even (rnp.t sp XY) and odd years (rnp.t m-ḥt sp XY). However, as far as the Fourth and Fifth Dynasties are concerned, this is simply not the case. John Nolan thus

---


41 Nolan, “The Original Lunar Calendar” and “Lunar Intercalations and ‘Cattle Counts’.” According to Nolan, the cattle count was nothing but a ritual, but this can be proven wrong by the aid of the description of the census in the (auto)biography of Weni (Urk. 1, 106: 4–9) jṛj.kj n=f (m) jmj-rꜢ ŠmꜤw r hrw.t…jp=j jḥ.t nb.t jp.t(j) n ḫnw (m) ŠmꜤw pn (m) sp.wj šn.wj wnw.t nb.t jp.t(j) n ḫnw (m) ŠmꜤw pn (m) sp.wj šn.wj jṛj=j śrw.t=j jṛj.tj kd=j (m)
developed a special theory of two calendar systems, a lunar and a solar one, which were in use side by side. According to him, cattle counts and intercalary months were complementary elements so that the imbalance of even (\textit{rnp.t sp XY}) and odd years (\textit{rnp.t m-ḥt sp XY}) of almost 1:1.7 was inherently rooted in the Old Kingdom calendar(s): All (solar) years comprising twelve lunar months of the lunar calendar running in parallel were even years (\textit{rnp.t sp XY}), whereas all others containing thirteen lunar months were odd years (\textit{rnp.t m-ḥt sp XY}). The ratio between years without and years with a thirteenth intercalary month is exactly 1:1.7155. This approach has meanwhile found substantial critique,\textsuperscript{42} and in fact the evaluation of the basic data appears to be unsatisfactory.\textsuperscript{43}

All collections of Old Kingdom dates provide a so far unrecognized double imbalance: It is not only the case that attested even years (\textit{rnp.t sp XY}) outnumber attested odd years (\textit{rnp.t m-ḥt sp XY}), but even in those biennia for which either year is attested, the numbers of attestations of the even year (\textit{rnp.t sp XY}) usually outnumber the attestations of the odd year (\textit{rnp.t m-ḥt sp XY}) significantly. This, in turn, is a problem directly linked to the inscriptions collected: The majority of year dates from the Fourth and Fifth Dynasties are found with masons’ graffiti and administrative notes, which were intended for immediate or specifically short-term usage. One therefore has to reckon with

\begin{quote}
ŠmꜤw pn “I acted for him (scil. the king) as overseer of Upper Egypt to the (utmost) satisfaction . . . when I counted every good which was to be counted for the residence in this (country of) Upper Egypt two times, and every service which was to be counted for the residence in this (country of) Upper Egypt two times, I fulfilled my office so that my (good) reputation was established in this (country of) Upper Egypt.” (cf. Doret, Narrative, 35; Kloth, \textit{Die (auto-)biographischen Inschriften}, 10–12, 145–46 [with references]; Strudwick, \textit{Texts from the Pyramid Age}, 355–56, with n. 32 [p. 377]). Weni reports that he repeated the counting, but he does not tell why: either he counted twice to lay bare cases of tax evasion, or Weni just wanted to highlight his accuracy (cf. Gundacker, \textit{Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus}, 320; differently Gardiner, “Regnal Years,” 15, who thought that Weni piques himself on having levied the double amount of taxes, but this seems rather unlikely).
\end{quote}


masons’ graffiti and the vast majority of administrative papyri using abbreviated year formulae, which make mention of only the actual biennial census-cycle, but not the exact year within it.44 Dates of this kind must therefore be excluded from any further analysis. By doing so, a remarkable balance of 1:1 of even (rnp.t sp XY) and odd years (rnp.t m-ḫt sp XY) emerges from the remaining data from the time of Snefru to Newoserre, which derives from royal decrees, legal documents, (auto)biographical inscriptions, etc., all documents destined for long-term usage.45

44 Cf. for the masons’ graffiti found on blocks of the pyramid at Meidum, Posener-Kriéger, “Graffiti,” 19; Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus, 315, 323–30 and “Baugraffiti.” This system of abbreviated year dates is somewhat similar to late Roman and medieval dates according to the Diocletian indicationes, tax-cycles of originally 5 years (from 297 ACE until 312 ACE), which soon were revised to tax-cycles of 15 years (312 ACE) and numbered consecutively (the starting point of indicationes covering 15 years each was, however, conjectured to 3 BCE (western Europe), 48 BCE (Byzantium), 297 ACE (Egypt), etc., cf. Ginzel, Chronologie III, 148–55; Depuydt, “AD 297”; Blackburn and Holford-Stevens, Oxford Companion, 768–71). Furthermore, it became standard to mention only the year within the current indiction, but not the number of the indiction itself. E.g., the following date is found in the last will of Emperor Charles the Great (Pertz and Waltz, Vita Karoli Magni, 33; cf. Kasten, Herrscher- und Fürsten testamenten): “…anno ab incarnatione domini nostri Iesu Christi DCCCXI, anno vero regni eius in Francia XLIII, et in Italia xxxvi, imperii autem xi, indicatione IIII…” “in the year 811 since the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the 43rd year of his [scil. Charles’] reign in France, and the 36th in Italy, but the 11th of [his] imperial reign, in the indiction [year] four” (“indicatione IIII” is short for “anno quarto indicationis currentis” “in the fourth year of the current indiction”). It is only the additional dates which provide a point of reference for the determination of the number of the indiction itself: it was the 55th indiction since the fictitious installation in 3 BCE. Just as in this Roman system, where the number denoting the indiction was left out for the sake of briefness and because every contemporary was well aware of the indiction referred to, the Egyptians skipped the reference specifying the exact year within the biennial census-cycle. Especially with documents in use for only a very limited span of time (i.e., no longer than a few months), everyone was aware of the actual year; it was thus necessary to designate only the current census-cycle (cf. the masons’ graffiti found in Giza and discussed by Jánosi, Giza in der 4. Dynastie; Smith, “Inscriptional Evidence”). From the second half of the Fourth Dynasty onwards, dates of this kind, especially masons’ graffiti, may lack any kind of year-reference, i.e., they mention only month and day of composition (cf. the pyramids of the late Fourth to Sixth Dynasties, which hardly ever show year dates, Verner, “Archaeological Remarks”; Baud, “ Dynasties 6–8”). The difference between the Roman and the Egyptian systems is certainly founded in the very dissimilar length of census-cycles, which, in the Roman system, makes the indiction to which a certain date belongs self-evident, whereas, in the Egyptian system, the actual year of the census-cycle was patently obvious.

45 Cf. for a more detailed argumentation and a list of all year dates which remain according to those stricter conditions Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus, 323–30; cf. also Gundacker, “Baugraffiti” and “Mykerinos.”
From the late Fifth Dynasty onwards, the census-cycles which were originally biennial must have become more and more irregular, as is indicated by an inscription of Pepi I which reads \( rnp.t \, m-ḥt \, sp \, 18 \ldots \, sp \, tpj \, hšb-šd \) "Year after the 18th occurrence \ldots the first occurrence of the Sed-Festival." Although one cannot preclude that Pepi I celebrated his first Sed-Festival prior to the ideally expected 30th regnal year, one can at least be sure that he did not celebrate it later than in his 30th regnal year. A recognizable irregularity of biennial census-cycles in favor of more frequent annual census-cycles must therefore have started to evolve between the reigns of Menkauhor or Djedkare-Isesi and Pepi I. Finally, at some time during the First Intermediate Period, the census was no longer carried out at all, and the dating system switched to the counting of regnal years *stricto sensu*.

The only obstacle to this is an entry in the Palermo Stone, which indicates that the "Year of the 8th occurrence" \( (rnp.t \, sp \, 8) \) of Snefru immediately followed his "Year of the 7th occurrence" \( (rnp.t \, sp \, 7) \). This has been taken (a) as evidence for generally irregular census-cycles, (b) as an error which occurred during the compilation of the annals, and (c) as an exception, *e.g.*, because of increased financial constraints owing to the foundation of the Bent Pyramid.

46 Urk. 1, 93: 5–6; cf. Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 331, n. 1751; Baud, “Dynasties 6–8,” 147–51. Another inscription referring to the first Sed-Festival of Pepi I, whose date is usually read \( rnp.t \, sp \, 25 \) “Year of the 25th occurrence” (Urk. 1, 95: 14, 16), contains either a misspelled or damaged date; it should therefore be emended to \( rnp.t \, <m-ḥt> \, sp \, 18 \) “Year after the 18th occurrence.” Anyway, this single date is certainly not sufficient to propose two parallel dating systems (Spalinger, “Dated Texts,” 306; Baud, “Dynasties 6–8,” 149–50).


48 Cf. Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 327, n. 1736; Baud’s conclusion (Baud, “Dynasties 6–8”) that the royal annals of the Sixth Dynasty prove a census was held in strictly biennial intervals until the very end of the Old Kingdom is nevertheless questionable, because it cannot be proven that every census compartment of the South-Saqqara-Stone contained exactly two years.


52 O’Mara, *Palermo Stone*, 94.
at Dahshur. Whatever be the case, a single piece of evidence, which is not beyond doubt and cannot be explained with certainty, cannot function as the backbone of a theory. It is thus appropriate to adhere to the system of biennial census-cycles, conceivably with very few exceptions (prior to the late Fifth Dynasty), one of which may be recorded in the royal annals for Snefru’s 7th census-cycle, although different explanations may apply.

4 The Third Manethonian Dynasty

4.1 The Kings and Their Names

Contemporaneous documents of the Third Dynasty prefer a king’s Horus name; the nomen will be found only rarely. In contrast to this, later writings, including the Royal Canon of Turin and the king-lists of Abydos and Saqqara, usually mention a king’s nomen, and so does Manetho. The names of the Third Manethonian Dynasty have suffered from misinterpretation, misreading, and misspelling, perhaps also in part intentional reinterpretation or alteration over time. The following discussion of the kings’ names as given by Manetho will provide a brief summary of what changes they underwent.

---


Although this is not the place for a comprehensive description of Manetho’s orthographic conventions and of the process of degradation having affected his writings in
the course of tradition, it is nevertheless instructive to draw attention to a single issue, namely η and ι in Egyptian names graecized by Manetho. Interpreting η and ι is exceptionally difficult because their exact sound value differed in the Greek varieties and sociolects during the centuries around the turn of the eras. But the exact sound value of η, η/ηι, ει, and ε, on the one hand, is essential for the interpretation of the kings’ names according to Manetho and their Egyptian Vorlagen and, on the other hand, it is also indicative for the date when they were graecized. Alas, the picture was obscured by ancient and medieval copyists unfamiliar with the Egyptian kings’ names, which were thus easily misspelled. The standard correspondences of the vowels η, η/ηι, ει, and ε in Manetho’s Aegyptiaca are difficult to determine; only toponyms and kings’ names should be accepted as a firm basis, because the text proper in both, the glosses of the Epitome and the quotations found in Flavius Josephus’ Contra Apionem, were probably altered and corrected by later copyists. According to this data, Manetho’s transcriptions show η ~ *ē ~ *ει and ε ~ *ē ~ *ει (ηι is not found; the latter is especially remarkable insofar as itacistic spellings of toponyms and kings’ names with ει instead of ι are expected to remain in the text, because there was no orthographic tradition serving as a model after which ει could have been corrected to ι). Although this will require further research beyond the material of the Third and Fourth Manethonian Dynasties, one may tentatively conclude that Manetho adhered to an outspokenly conservative orthography typical for formal and learned vernaculars of the 3rd and early 2nd centuries BCE. Cf. for the phonology of the contemporary papyri Mayser, Grammatik 1; Mayser and Schmoll, Grammatik; Gignac, Grammar; Teodorsson, Phonology: frequent interchange ει ~ ι, passably frequent interchange η ~ ει ~ cf. also the Ptolemaic Homer papyri, which, in antepenultimate position, display very frequently the alternation -ηV- ~ -ειV- (S. West, Ptolemaic Papyri, 17), although, in the Epic dialect, this may be the outcome of different dialectal constituents, (Old-East) Ionic and Epic Aeolic; -ειV- is moreover ambiguous, because it could also represent systematic metrical lengthening by means of insertion of *-iːiː-: *-ειV- (scanned ~*η) → *-ειV- *-ēiːV- (scanned ~*ει) (cf. also Werner, η und ει). One should furthermore consider possible effects of the metacharacterismus in 403/402 bce (Old-Attic alphabet: E ~ *ē and *ē → Milesian alphabet E ~ *ει, E1 *ει, and H *ē; cf. Herzog, Umschrift; Goold, "Homer"; Chantraine, Grammaire Homerique 1, 5–16; Threatte, Attic Inscriptions 1, 211–13; West, Studies, 21–23; Reece, "Metacharacterism"), which contributed to this heterogeneous picture—, rather rare interchange η ~ ε and ει ~ ε indicating the emerging collapse of vowel quantities, and, somewhat delayed, the beginning interchange η ~ ι hinting at the beginning of itacism stricto sensu. It is nevertheless particularly difficult to judge the effects of the common Greek development of itacism, which must have affected the text of the Aegyptiaca and the Epitome (cf. for the background of Koine Greek, Thumb, Kieckers, and Scherer, Handbuch 1, 43–45, 11, 306–13; Hoffmann, Debrunner, and Scherer, Geschichte 11; Kreitschmer, Entstehung; Niehoff-Panagiotidis, Koine und Diglossie), vis-à-vis the genuine Egyptian interchange of *-ē(-) and *-ī(-) (Oising, Nominalbildung 1, 19–26; Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 231–32; cf. for the Egyptian influence on Koine Greek, e.g., Quaegebeur, "Phonology").

The names graecized by Manetho follow certain orthographic rules, among which the following are of special importance for the subsequent study: Whenever Egyptian words ended with a shwa-vowel, Manetho graecized them as i-stems -ις, -ιος or, rarely, as
The thematic o-stems -ι(ι)ος, -ι(ι)ου. Egyptian *-έ(-) and *-ι(-) are expected as -η- and -ι- respectively, which is crucial in the case of the theonym ṚꜤw because of its frequent occurrence as the last element of kings' names; name-final ṚꜤw ~ ṚꜤ(ē) > *Rī́(ĕ) > *Rī́(ĕ) (Osing, Nominalbildung 1, 20–21) is commonly rendered with -ης (*-ρους, s-stems, less plausibly *-ρου, thematic a-stems), but rarely and unexpectedly, and therefore probably by itacistic corruption, it is also found as -ρις (*-ριος, i-stems, rarely ← *-ρις?). Similarly, Herodotus transcribed Egyptian names as either i-stems (-ις, -ιος; later Greek authors followed an Atticistic fashion and preferred d-stems, -ις, -ιδος, cf. Plutarch's Περὶ Ἴσιδος καὶ Ὀσίριδος, García Valdés, Plutarco; Griffiths, De Iside et Osiride, cf. also the toponyms recorded in Stephanus of Byzantium’s his Εὐδοκά (6th century A.C.E), Meineke, Ethnicorum; Billerbeck, Ethnicá; sometimes, the model of πόλις, -εως “city, town” was followed, as one may anyway expect in the case of toponyms, cf. n. 311 below) or thematic o-stems (-ος, -ου or -ως < *-ο-ος, -ῶ < *-ό-ου, with Doric contraction, which could be a relic of the original Doric dialect of Halicarnassus which was superseded by Milesian Ionic by the early 5th century BCE (Rosén, Sprachform, 64–65; however, one may alternatively postulate -ως < *-ω-ος, -ῶ < *-ω-ου); occasionally, further inflectional patterns, e.g. a, n, s- (subtype à la -κλῆς < -έ-ης, -κλέους < -έ-ε-ος) and eu̯- stems, can be found; Rosén, Sprachform, 58–96; Thumb, Kieckers, and Scherer, Handbuch 11, 236–41; Clarysse, Eponymous Priests). Even though the degree of itacistic degradation having affected Manetho’s transcriptions is unclear, one may expect that it had effects on the names found in the Epitome. Manetho’s and Herodotus’ approaches of assigning graecized Egyptian names to certain Greek inflectional patterns were thus basically very similar, although future in-depth research may reveal differences in detail. To conclude, Manetho graecized most Egyptian names as i-stems; accordingly, most names should display -ις as their nominative desinence (Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 254). The nominative desinence -ης is only correct when it is the Greek equivalent of Egyptian word-final *-έ#; in all other instances, it should be considered an itacistic replacement of original -ις. As far as Greek accents on graecized Egyptian words are concerned, it is important to stress that they were added only according to Greek principles. Rules of Egyptian prosody and word stress were totally ignored, which renders Greek accents insignificant for the revocalization of ancient Egyptian (cf. Clarysse, “Greek Accents”; Thissen, “Umgang”; cf. also Rosén, Sprachform, 65).

It is furthermore remarkable that the Coptic alphabet (in its conservative reading with an opposition of vowel quantities (long vs. short vowels), Osing, Nominalbildung 1, 10–26; Kasser, “Coptic Alphabets” and “Alphabet in Coptic, Greek”; Satzinger, “Old Coptic,” “Koptische Vokalpheme,” and “Das Griechisch”; cf. for the alternative interpretation as an opposition of vowel qualities (high vs. low vowels) Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 199–216) displays the grapheme—phoneme standard correspondences ⲏ ~ *ẹ̀ (~, *ī), 1 ~ ei ~ *i (but ei is not used for unstressed *i, which is solely rendered t), and e ~ *ē, which is indicative for the 2nd century BCE (Mayer, Grammatik 1; Mayer and Schmoll, Grammatik; Gignac, Grammar; Clarysse, “Ethnic Diversity and Dialect”; cf. for Late Coptic Λ Lambdin, “Bivalence”; Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 228–30 and “Zur Aussprache des koptischen Eta”). The Coptic alphabet continues thus a practice of writing Egyptian with Greek characters, which started in the Ptolemaic Period (the earliest examples date from the 3rd century BCE: Papyrus Heidelberg 414; Quecke, “Wörterliste”; Quaigebeur,
Necherophos (Νεχέρωχις) is usually identified with Nebka (Nb-kꜢ).\textsuperscript{58} but this seems problematic, even though the Saqqara king-list already displays an expanded variant Nb-kꜢ-RꜢw.\textsuperscript{59} This should result in Greek *Neβ-/*Neφ(ε)-χοφις < *Nēb-kō-RēꜢ < *Nib-kāꜢ-RīꜢw,\textsuperscript{60} which is remarkably close to the largely unrecognized manuscript variant Necherophos. One may thus conclude that the consonants of *Neφ(ε)χοφις were mixed up by a Greek scribe or perhaps even by Manetho himself. Should the latter be the case, this is the result of conflating *Neφ(ε)χοφις ~ Nb-kꜢ-RꜢw and Djoser’s Horus name\textsuperscript{61} Nṯrj-ḥ.t ~ *Nîṯrĭj-ḥî́t > *Nĕtr̥-ḥĕ́ > *Neθερωχ,\textsuperscript{62} which resembles Eusebius’ Νεχέρωχις. One should also remember that Djoser is referred to as Nṯrj-ḥ.t Dṣr, with both names enclosed in a single cartouche, in Ahmose’s inscriptions (Twenty-Seventh Dynasty, Berlin 14765)\textsuperscript{63} and that both names were frequently used in combi-

\textsuperscript{58} E.g., Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 23; Swelim, Some Problems, 224; Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 236; Seidlmayr, “Dynasty 3,” 116.


\textsuperscript{60} Cf. for the individual elements’ vocalization Fecht, Wortakzent, §§ 153, n. 257, 176–78; Oising, Nominalbildung I, 20–21, 11, 380, n. 56; Edel, “Vokalisation,” 35 and Korrespondenz 11, 361–62; Gundacker, Studien 1, 291, n. 1835; cf. for the interchange of φ and β nn. 92, 117 below.

\textsuperscript{61} Von Beckerath, Handbuch der Königsnamen, 48–49.

\textsuperscript{62} Thus already O’Mara, “Manetho and the Turin Canon,” 61. Cf. for the individual elements’ vocalization Fecht, Wortakzent, §§ 117, n. 201, 258, n. 397; Oising, Nominalbildung 1, 315, 11, 409, n. 90; Schenkel, Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung, 182.

nation even in the Ptolemaic Period, e.g., on the Famine Stela. Conclusively, Djoser’s Horus name and nomen ought to be considered as commonly known in the last millennium BCE. It is thus plausible that one of Manetho’s sources rather close to the Saqqara king-list began the Third Dynasty with Nṯr-ḥt Dīr ~ *Nef(ε)ḫorhī Tōwṣī or perhaps *Nēthorhēkī Ṯ Tōwṣī, whereas another source rather close to the Royal Canon of Turin and the Abydos king-list gave Nb-kꜢ-RꜤw ~ *Nef(ε)ḫorhī as the first king. After the double entry *Nēthorhē (alité) Tōwṣī had been split up, which was perhaps triggered by a differing number of kings in the Vorlagen of the Aegyptiaca, Manetho blended Djoser’s Horus name *Nēthorhē and Nebka’s nomen *Nef(ε)ḫorhī. Although the original appearance of this amalgamate cannot be determined with certainty, it must nevertheless have been closer to Djoser’s Horus name, because names ending with -ḫīs were extremely common. A variant with the desinence -χῆς must therefore be viewed as the lectio difficilior, which later on was further distorted and resulted in Nεχερωφῆς and Nεχέρωχις. The variant form Mĭχειρĭ, which is found in the king-list according to Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes, is a late development of Nb-kꜢ-RꜤw ~ *Nĭb-kăꜢ-Rī́Ꜥŭw. As it seems, the first element *nĭb- was reduced to *nh-, which triggered the assimilatory process *nh- > *mh- > *mm- and the Greek rendering Mŏ; -χεί- is the unstressed outcome of kꜢ.w, which often and unpredictably interchanges with the singular kꜢ, and -φí obviously represents the theonym RꜤw, although some kind of misspelling

64 PM V, 252; Barguet, La stèle de la famine; Gernier, “Stèle de la famine”; cf. Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 85–91; Aufrère, “Imhotep et Djoser” and “La titulature.”
65 Cf. for the individual elements’ vocalization Fecht, Wortakzent, § 293, n. 429; Osing, Nominalbildung I, 129, 149; Schenkel, Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung, 154, 158.
66 Cf. for the unpredictable interchange of aspirates/spirants in Greek transcriptions of Egyptian names and words Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 15; Fecht, Wortakzent, § 293, n. 426 and “Review of Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho,” 122; Quaegbeur, “Considérations . . . Teëphthaphônukhos, 98; Thissen, “Ägyptologische Randbemerkungen,” 60; cf. n. 57 above.

The gloss attributed to Nεχερωφῆς/Nεχέρωχις is, however, insignificant; the first part may be traced back to a military event recorded in the royal annals (cf. Wilkinson, Royal Annals, 106; cf. also n. 316 below), but the second part remains a conundrum (cf. Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 86; Quack, “Reiche,” 4–7).
67 Cf. Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 22.
68 Unstressed kꜢ ~ *kăš, which should have been preserved as such, was analogically replaced with *kŏ; cf. Gundacker, Studien I, 291, n. 1835. In all other cases, the fluctuation of unstressed *-ē- and *-ŏ- may simply indicate an imperfect approximation to Egyptian shwa-vowels, cf. Lacau, Études I, 131–36; cf. n. 167 below.
must have resulted in the loss of word-final -ς (one may furthermore suppose an itacistic error *-ρις ← *-ρής).  

The second king of Manetho’s Third Dynasty appears to be Djoser, which seems corroborated by the gloss mentioning Imhotep.\(^70\) Τόσορβρός indeed does contain the element Δσρ,\(^71\) but the second element -θρος deserves closer attention. The king-lists provide two different extensions for king Djoser: -jt (Royal Canon of Turin)\(^73\) and -sꜢ (Abydos king-list),\(^74\) and Djoser’s successor bore the similar name Δσρ-ττj. Of these three additions, -ττj matches -θρος best, because, in Hieratic, -ττj could easily be misread as -τρj making Τόσορθρος an almost per-  

---

69 Cf., e.g., the Fourth Dynasty kings BꜢ-kꜢ=j → BꜢ-kꜢ-RꜤw > Βίχερις, Mn-kꜢ.w-RꜤw > Μεγχέρης, and ṢpꜢš-kꜢ=f → ṢpꜢš-kꜢ-RꜤw > Σεβερχέρης. Cf. Oising, Nominalbildung 1, 20–21; Edel, Korrespondenz II, 361–62; cf. also n. 57 above.

70 E.g., Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 23; Wildung, Imhotep, 33–32; Quack, “Reiche,” 15, with n. 47; Swelim, Some Problems, 224; Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 236; Seidlmayer, “Dynasty 3,” 116.

71 Von Beckerath, Handbuch der Königsnamen, 48–49; Like in all royal names which contain an adjective with final -r# as their first element, that -r# is unexpectedly preserved. It is thus possible that all those adjectives were replaced with adjective verb forms niꜢ-Śḏm=f in the Late Period (cf. Johnson, Thus wrote, § 60 and Verbal System, 21–22, 83–84; cf. also Spiegelberg, Demotische Grammatik, § 117; Sethe, “Nominalverben der Eigenschaftswörter”; Fecht, Wortakzent, § 398, n. 542; Schenkel, Einführung, 113 [4]). In the particular case of Djoser’s nomen, it is, however, also possible that an uninterrupted Aussprachetradition (cf. further below nn. 151–152) preserved its original form. His name may thus be analyzed differently; cf. furthermore nn. 73 and 78 below.

Σέσορθος, the variant according to Eusebius, was certainly influenced by the name of the famous king Σέσωστρις, cf. Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 22–23; Quack, “Sesostris”; cf. also n. 316 further below [s.v. (4)].

72 Cf. furthermore the list of Mehu (Saqqara, Ramesside; PM 111.2, 556; Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 74–76; Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 25), which gives the name as Δσr nbw. This is obviously a combination of Djoser’s nomen and his proto-variant of what later became the Gold Name, nbw (or RꜤw nbw or nbw(j) RꜤw, cf. von Beckerath, Handbuch der Königsnamen, 48–49; Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 75). It is plausible that a secondary addition like this became the starting point for the adjuncts, many of which may have come into being via misinterpretation and lapsus legendi vel calami.

73 According to Wildung, this may have been a Late Egyptian orthographic feature simply indicating that word-final -r# had not dropped (Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 96). If so, Djoser’s name should possibly be analyzed as a nomen agentis Δσrwr ~ *Δśrwr (*Δśśrw, cf. Oising, Nominalbildung I, 166–75; Schenkel, Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung, 167–69). Cf., however, the opposing evidence presented further below (cf. also n. 78).

74 Cf. Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 64.
fectly transmitted rendering of Djoser-teti’s name \( D\ddot{s}r-\text{ttj} \rightarrow D\ddot{s}r-trj \), for which one would expect \( *\text{Tososórðos} \). The same applies for the next, Manetho’s third name, \( \Upsilon\nu\varepsilon\iota\zeta \), which seems to be a twin of Djoser-teti’s distinguishing element \(-\text{ttj} \). If so, in all probability Tososórðos (\( *\text{Tososórðos} \)) and Túreis once formed only a single entry \( *\text{Tososórðos} \, \Upsilon\nu\varepsilon\iota\zeta \) (\( *\text{Tososórðos} \, \Upsilon\nu\varepsilon\iota\zeta \)), which explicitly consisted of two variant names. At this stage, one should also remember that Africanus explains the Third Manethonian Dynasty as consisting of nine kings, whereas Eusebius states expressis verbis that it contains only eight kings. Dissolving the entry \( *\text{Tososórðos} \, \Upsilon\nu\varepsilon\iota\zeta \) (\( *\text{Tososórðos} \, \Upsilon\nu\varepsilon\iota\zeta \)) into two separate entries was thus an individual error by Africanus (or one of his immediate forerunners). Eusebius’ version of the Manethonian king-list is thus definitely independent from Africanus’ version, even though Eusebius may have known a copy of Africanus’ chronographic work. In addition, \( *\text{Tososórðos} \, \Upsilon\nu\varepsilon\iota\zeta \) (\( *\text{Tososórðos} \, \Upsilon\nu\varepsilon\iota\zeta \)) must have been interpreted as Djoser already when the Epitome was compiled and when the glosses were added, in this case the gloss on Imhotep. Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes mentions this king as Στοῖχος, but one can only guess what may have happened to the name of Djoser-teti in this line of tradition; it may well be that folk-etymological plays on words of late hierogrammateis had an additional distorting effect on this name. If, however, the reconstruction \( D\ddot{s}r \sim *\ddot{D}\acute{a}s\ddot{e}r > *\text{Tós}\sigma(\iota) \) is accepted and if furthermore the rendering of king Teti’s name (Sixth Dynasty), \( Ttj \sim \)

---

75 Thus already Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 22; The variant \( D\ddot{s}r-\text{ttj} \) found in the Royal Canon of Turin may be a haplological or haplographical mistake for \( D\ddot{s}r-\text{ttj} \). Cf. Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 96, with n. 9. However, one should expect \( *\text{Tososórðos} \) instead of Tososórðos (cf. the subsequent discussion of \(-\text{ttj} \) and n. 79 below). The simplification \( *\text{Tososórðos} \rightarrow \text{Tososórðos} \) via reducing a sequence of four o-vowels may simply have occurred either by haplology/haplography or because of reasons of Greek euphony.

76 Cf. Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 93–100; Cf. for \( \upsilon \) in \( \Upsilon\nu\varepsilon\iota\zeta \) n. 79 below.

77 Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus, 80.

78 Cf. for the individual elements’ vocalization Fecht, Wortkzent, § 293, n. 429; Oising, Nominalbildung 1, 120–37, 147–55; Schenkel, Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung, 154–61; Secondarily, \( *\text{Tós}\sigma(\iota) \)- was perhaps also introduced in unstressed position instead of \( *\text{Tós}\sigma(\iota) \). In pre-tonic position, \( *\text{Tós}\sigma(\iota) \)- should not have displayed a word-final shwa-vowel, but it is impossible to judge whether a secondarily introduced variant \( *\text{Tós}\sigma(\iota) \)- would have retained its shwa-vowel or not (cf. for the late replacement of sta-

status constructi with status absoluti Fecht, Wortkzent, § 434 (3)). Moreover, one cannot exclude that Greek copyists analogically aligned several names to one another, which furthermore complicates the analysis of this detail.
*Tätij > *Θόθις (preserved as 'Θόθις in Africanus’ version of the Epitome due to the misspelling *οοο- → 000- and an itacistic corruption *-ις → -ης), 79 is kept

79 Jacoby, FrHistGr 111c, no. 609 F3; Waddell, Manetho, 52–53; cf. West, Textual Criticism, 25; Pöhlmann, Überlieferungsgeschichte 11, 43–46; Schubart, Palaeographie; Kenyon, Palaeography, table of alphabets (after p. 128); cf. furthermore nn. 56–57 above.

Compared to *Θόθις, Τύρεις appears as an unusual, maybe a rather colloquial rendering of Egyptian Ṭj, which was not graecized by Manetho himself. This assumption may be substantiated by the following two arguments:

(1) Τύρεις is the only name in Manetho’s king-list which contains υ as a rendering of Egyptian *-ό- or *-ú-. Although this is not uncommon a manner of transcribing Egyptian *-ό- and *-ú- with Greek characters, this cannot be explained as a phonological phenomenon of the Egyptian standard of the Greek Koine. It is important to notice that this practice considerably predates the Greek Koine, as is proven by, e.g., Σεβέννυτος ~ *Ṯĕbĕ-nū́tĕ < *Ṯv̆bv̆w-nā́ṯăr ~ Ṭb(w)-nṯr “Sebennytos” (cf. Helck, Die altägyptischen Gaue, 179; Peust, Toponyme, 80; cf. for the individual elements’ vocalization Osing, Nominalbildung 1, 315; Schenkel, Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung, 182). Σεβέννυτος is attested for the first time in Herodotus’ writings (Hude, Historiae, s.v. II.158), but it is untypical for his approach of graecizing Egyptian toponyms. This is revealed by the fact that, on the one hand, it is not included in the inflectional pattern of Greek i-stems, which was typical for Herodotus’ East Ionic (Milesian) dialect (Rosén, Sprachform, 85), and, on the other hand, it does not conform to the East Ionic standard υ ~ *ü, but to υ ~ *u instead (cf. for the common sound change υ ~ *u > *ü affecting the Ionic-Attic proto-dialect before its separation, Thumb, Kieckers, and Scherer, Handbuch 11, 251, 253; Solmsen, Wortforschung, 36–155, especially 36–37, 58–68; Chantaine, Grammaire Homerique 1, 50–51; Mendez-Dosuna, “Fonema κ y Ϙ”; Thraatte, Attic Inscriptions 1, 21–23, 216–17, 261–67). The phonological correspondence υ ~ *ü is furthermore demonstrated for Herodotus’ Greek by the transcriptions of Egyptian toponyms, e.g., Ἀνυσίς ~ *‘ănī̶́sĕ < *Ḥă-nn-‘ĭ́nsĕ < *Ḥăwăt-nw-ńj-nwsvw ~ Ḥw.t-n(w)-n(j)-ńjśwt “Heracleopolis parva” (cf. Helck, Die altägyptischen Gaue, 123, 189; Peust, Toponyme, 52, 97; Gomāa, “Herkleopolis parva” and “Herkleopolis magna”; cf. for the individual elements’ vocalization Fecht, Wortakzent, §§ 34, n. 74, 293, n. 428; Gundacker, Studien 1, 73–76, 97–103, 113–27; cf. Clédat, “Suez,” 173–79; Peust, “Zur Herkunft des Koptischen u”; Gundacker, “Etymology,” 66, n. 259, 69–70).

According to the papyri, Greek υ for Egyptian *-ό- and *-ú- or Greek *-o- and *-u- is an element of colloquial and non-standard vernaculars of the Egyptian variant of the Greek Koine, although υ for Egyptian *-ό- and *-ú- was rather ordinary in the contemporaneous transcriptions of personal names and toponyms during the Ptolemaic and Roman Periods. This is, however, insignificant for the determination of phonological variation because it had become a merely orthographic phenomenon. Keeping in mind the conventions of graecizing as applied by Herodotus, the origins of this peculiarity must be searched for before the 5th century BCE. The most promising starting point, then, is Cyrene, a colony of Thera founded in
c. 630 BCE (Boardman, *Greeks Overseas*, 153–56), which exercised significant influence on Egypt, and Cyrene’s local Doric dialect (with the conservative correspondence υ ~ *u*), which displays the very interchange υ ~ o (Dobias-Lalou, *Cyrene*, 24; Thumb, Kieckers, and Scherer, *Handbuch* 1, 173). One may thus conclude that Egypt was influenced by a Doric (Cyrenian) and an East Ionic (Milesian) dialectal variant—Naucratis was a colony of Miletus founded in c. 650 BCE or a little later (*cf*. Boardman, *Greeks Overseas*, 111–21)—in the 6th–4th centuries BCE, which resulted in differing orthographic traditions applied side by side (*cf*. for dialectal features in the Egyptian Koine Clarysse, “Ethnic Diversity and Dialect”; *cf*. n. 57 above; *cf*. for the Doric dialect of Alexandrian poets, above all Callimachus (3rd century BCE), who himself was of Cyrenian descent, Ruijgh, “Cyrénien d’Alexandrie”). Unsurprisingly, elements of the Ionic tradition, which closely matched the Koine, prevailed over Doric elements in more official and elevated vernaculars. Doric peculiarities were, however, preserved in “petrified” transcriptions, which had been graecized rather early and had thus become Panhellenic standard (*e.g.*, Σεβέννυτος), and they were also applied in less formal transcriptions of Egyptian personal names and toponyms for reasons of scribal and orthographic convention.

(2) It is delicate to judge the desinence -εις of Τυρεις, because -ει- instead of expected -ει- may simply be a late itacistic error (*cf*. n. 57 above), but it should, perhaps, be interpreted differently. Τυρεις is the only king’s name ending with -εις in the entire king-list of Manetho, which itself is noteworthy because this does not belong to any of the most prominent Greek declension patterns, into which the vast majority of graecized names was included (*cf*. Clarysse, “Greek Accents”). Therefore, -ει- ought to be viewed as the Egyptian word-final shwa, which was transformed into a Greek nominative by adding -ις (*Tj ~ *Tā́tij → Trj ~ *Tā́rē > *Tôrē ~ Τύρεις*). Accordingly, Τυρεις, or more precisely *Τυρεις*, matches perfectly *-θορος* (in *Τοσόρθος*) and *Θόθις* (*Τ- vs. Θ- is either the result of an Egyptian dialectal variation or merely accidental, *cf*. Schenkel, “Ist Mythos,” 554–55).

To conclude, Τυρεις (*Τυρεις*) may have belonged to a source different from Manetho’s Vorlagen A and B (*cf*. section 6 below), but this is rather implausible. Although it is uncertain when this variant name was introduced into the king-lists, its correctly assigned position within the king-list renders it highly plausible that it formed already part of Manetho’s Vorlage A when he made use of it in the course of the composition of the *Aegyptiaca*. One may furthermore speculate whether Τυρεις (*Τυρεις*) was already written with Greek characters in an otherwise Hieratic king-list (*Vorlage A, cf*. nn. 151, 274 below), which also may have contained Demotic glosses (*cf*. Osing, *Hieratische Papyri aus Tebtunis*, 44–52). Indeed, this is strongly supported by the fact that Manetho was expected to graecize Τρj as either *Θέρις* or *Θωρίς* (*cf*. Fecht, *Wortakzent*, §§ 95, 349) instead of Τυρεις (*Τυρεις*). In case this explanation is accepted, Τυρεις (*Τυρεις*) may moreover be identified as one of the oldest Greek/Pre-Old Coptic glosses (early 3rd century BCE, perhaps with Τυρεις representing the actual gloss, whereas the desinence -εις was added by Manetho himself) known to date (*cf*. Quaegebeur, “Pre-Old Coptic”; Satzinger, “Old Coptic,” 170; Osing, *Hieratische Papyri aus Tebtunis*; Quack, “Griechische und andere Dämonen”).
in mind, one may expect the following Greek rendering: *τωσθόθις/τωσθῶθις or, introduced into another Greek inflectional pattern, *τωσθόθιος/τωσθῶθος. This rendering must have been truncated, perhaps by haplology, to *τω-σθόθιος or *τωσθῶθος ~ *σωθόθιος with subsequent dissimilation of the sequence -θ-θ- (lex Grassmann), whereby the first -θ- was deaspirated and the second -θ- was shifted to -χ-. As a result, one gets *στόχιος, which by erroneous metathesis yields Στοίχος or *στόχος, which through the misreading *-ω- → -οι- yields also Στοίχος. Both of these explanations are, however, highly tentative, but, in any case, they hint at a line of tradition which never suffered from the old Hieratic mistake -ttj → -trj found in Manetho’s Aegyptiaca.

The fourth name of the Third Manethonian Dynasty is Μέσωχρις. According to Günter Dreyer, this name may be equated with the nomen Neferka, which, however, is otherwise unattested. If this assumption is correct, Neferka experienced the same expansion as Nebka (Nfr-kꜢ → Nfr-kꜢ-RꜤw). In this case, one would expect Nfr-kꜢ-RꜤw ~ *Näf-fr-kꜢ-RꜤw > *Näf-kꜢ-RꜤꜤ > *Nεψχορής, which can only give Μέσωχρις if a process like the following is accepted: First, n was assimilated to m under the influence of f (*Nεψ- ~ *nεψ- ~ *nεψ- > *nεψ- ~ *Μεψ-), and second, two scribal errors occurred (corruption of *-φ- → -ς and metathesis of -ο- ~ -ω- and -χ-), thus providing exactly Africanus’ Μέσωχρις, which furthermore may display an itacistic corruption (Μέσωχρις ← *Μεσωχρής

81 For the unpredictable interchange of aspirates/spirants in Greek transcriptions of Egyptian names and words, cf. Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 15; Fecht, Wortakzent, § 293, n. 426 and “Review of Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho,” 122; Quaegebeur, “Considérations… Teëphthaphônukhos,” 98; Thissen, “Ägyptologische Randbemerkungen,” 60; Gignac, Grammar I, 95–98; cf. furthermore n. 56 above.
82 A mistake very common in Greek uncial, cf. West, Textual Criticism, 25; Pöhlmann, Überlieferungsgeschichte 11, 43–46; Schubart, Palaeographie; Kenyon, Palaeography, table of alphabets (after p. 128); cf. furthermore n. 56 above and von Gutschmid’s unnecessary conjecture Στίχος (Gelzer, “Diorthose,” 268).
83 Dreyer, “Der erste König,” 34.
86 Perhaps a mistake in Greek uncial, which requires a partly damaged character in the Vorlage. Cf. West, Textual Criticism, 25; Pöhlmann, Überlieferungsgeschichte 11, 43–46; Schubart, Palaeographie; Kenyon, Palaeography, table of alphabets (after p. 128); cf. furthermore n. 56 above.
87 Cf. Fecht, Wortakzent, §§ 95, 349; cf. also n. 57 above.
Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes mentions this king as Μάρης, which again must be a truncated variant, as Wolfgang Helck has pointed out. One may thus propose the development *Μαφχορής → *Μαφχορής → *Μαφχορής → Μά[σχο]ρης, and one may even suggest that the vowel -α- in Μα- is a last faint trace of pretonic Nfr- ~ *Νάφ-. The almost homophonous names Nebka(re) and Neferka(re) were perhaps the main reason for the rearrangement of the king’s sequence with Nebka(re) placed before Djoser in the Abydos king-list and the Royal Canon of Turin.

Next Σώφις is mentioned, whom Helck equated with Djoser by assuming that this name originated from a source different from that providing Τόσορθρος. But there can be no doubt that Σώφις is a variant of Σοῦφις ~ Cheops as found in the Fourth Dynasty. This is furthermore corroborated by the fact that the eighth and ninth kings of Manetho’s Third Dynasty, Σήφουρις and Κερφέρης, have already been recognized as Snefru and Chephren respectively. Manetho has obviously included three kings in his Third Dynasty, whom he mentions a second time in his Fourth Dynasty. These entries will be considered below in the course of discussion of the Fourth Manethonian Dynasty.

Τοσέρτασις, the sixth king’s name according to the Epitome in Africanus’ version, obviously contains the element ḏśr. The second element -τασι- may be analyzed as a combination of -jt and -sꜢ, both secondarily ascribed to the nomen of Djoser in the Royal Canon of Turin and the Abydos king-list respectively.

88 Cf. Osing, Nominalbildung I, 20–21; Edel, Korrespondenz II, 361–62; cf. also n. 57 above.
89 Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 22–23.
90 As Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 23 stresses, Μάρης and Μασχερης, the somewhat faulty rendering of Mycerinus (Mn-kꜢ-w-RꜤw), share the same folk-etymological explanation ἡλιόδωρος “gift of the sun” (Jacoby, FrHistGr II, no. 244 F85; cf. Waddell, Manetho, 216–17). This is, however, only tenable if both names once looked very much the same or if they even were homophonous at a certain stage of the tradition (cf. n. 134 below).
91 Cf. Fecht, Wortakzent, §§ 95, 349 and Clarysse, “Greek Accents”; differently, however, the explanation offered by Widmer, “Maâ-Rê.”
93 Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 23.
94 Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 23; this has causelessly been doubted by von Beckerath, “IV. Dynastie,” 115, n. 12.
95 Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 236 proposed Τοσέρτασις to be the equivalent of Redjedef which was “modified to a form consonant with Τόσορθρος,” which is extremely unlikely.
Τοσέρτασις is thus to be identified with Djoser, who actually should have been associated with the gloss mentioning Imhotep. Helck\textsuperscript{96} pointed out that Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes mentions this king as Γοσορμίης, which certainly displays a scribal error *τ- → γ-,\textsuperscript{97} Γοσορ- ← *Τοσορ- thus evidently resembles the element Dér. The second element -μίη- must therefore represent -τασι- or something similar, but the chain of corruption, which possibly involves multiple Hieratic (and perhaps Demotic) and Greek errors, is too complex to be uncovered.

Ἄχης is usually identified with Huni,\textsuperscript{98} and this is certainly correct. Huni’s nomen,\textsuperscript{99} the Old Kingdom attestations of which should probably be read njśwt Ḥwj(w?),\textsuperscript{100} conspicuously resembles the Greek form Ἀχυῆς, although some kind of corruption must have affected it (perhaps an Akzentvariante of a nomen agentis Ἀχυῆς ← *Χαής ← Ḥăwĕ́ ← Ḥŭ́wjūw ~ Ḥwj(w), or alternatively Ἀχυῆς ← *Χαής ← Ḥăwĕ́ ~ Ḥŭ́wjūw ~ Ḥwj).\textsuperscript{101} The equivalent of Huni in the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes is Ἀνωὔφις. If once more an interchange -χ- ~ -φ- is assumed, which furthermore may have been triggered by the name Σαῶφις a few lines later, *Ἀνωὔφις may be explained as the result of a metathesis of the variant Ḥwj, which had been in use since the Middle Kingdom at the latest: Ḥwj ~ *Ḥăwănŭj > *ĕḥwṓnĕ > *ăḥwṓnĕ ~ *Ἀχυῶνις → *Ἀνωὔφις.\textsuperscript{102}

\textsuperscript{97} A mistake common in Greek uncial, cf. West, \textit{Textual Criticism}, 25; Pöhlmann, \textit{Überlieferungsgeschichte} 11, 43–46; Schubart, \textit{Palaographie}; Kenyon, \textit{Palaeography}, table of alphabets (after p. 128); cf. also n. 56 above.
\textsuperscript{100} Cf. for the ascertainment of this reading Borchardt, “König Huni?”; H. Schäfer, “König Huni”; Seidlmayer, “Dynasty 3,” I22, n. 28. Other reading attempts must be viewed as failed: Goedicke, “Pharaoh Ny-swth”; Meltzer, “A reconsideration”; Barta, “Zum altägyptischen Namen des Königs Aches”; Helck, ”Der Name des letzten Königs der 3. Dynastie.” In Middle Egyptian, Ḥwj “to beat, to strike” was partly replaced with an expanded formation Ḥwnj “to beat, to strike” (cf. Sethe, \textit{Das aegyptische Verbum} 11, §§ 117.4, 683.6c; Gardiner, \textit{Admonitions}, 83; Wb 111, 49: 5–8). As it seems, this younger variant of the verb Ḥwj intruded Huni’s name in some lines of tradition.
\textsuperscript{101} Nomina agentis of the type *šūḏmūw (type II.7) rather frequently display Akzentvarianten. Cf. Oising, \textit{Nominalbildung} 1, 120–37, 176–83; Schenkel, \textit{Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung}, 154–58, 171–73 and “Ägyptische Nominalbildungslehre.” There is, however, no reason to conjecture this name to Ἀνσο υφίς, as was proposed by von Gutschmid (Gelzer, “Diorthose,” 268). Cf. Oising, \textit{Nominalbildung} 1, 184–92; Schenkel, \textit{Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung}, 173–75. Hypothetically, it is also feasible to interpret -ω- as the Greek rendering of Egyptian -w- (cf. Fecht, \textit{Wortakzent}, § 95) and
A major point not yet addressed is the totally distorted sequence of kings, which mixes up kings of the Third and Fourth Dynasties. This, however, can be explained as a mistake in the reading order of the entries of a double column (before the entry *Τόσορθρος ἢ Τύρεις ← *Τοσόρθρος ἢ Τύρεις was split up):\textsuperscript{103}

(a) (1) Νεχερωφής ἔτη κη′
(b) (6) Τοσέρτασις ἔτη ιθ′
(c) (2–3) *Τόσορθρος ἢ Τύρεις ἔτη ζ′
(d) (7) Ἀχης ἔτη μβ′
(e) (4) Μέσωχρις ἔτη ιζ′
(f) (8) Σήφουρις ἔτη λ′
(g) (5) Σώϋφις ἔτη κς′
(h) (9) Κερφέρης ἔτη κς′

Sequence (a)–(h) provides the original order of kings, sequence (1)–(9) provides the series found in Africanus’ writings.

It is interesting that, according to this table, Μέσωχρις (Neferka) was placed at the very end of the Third Dynasty, but this is certainly due to the fact that one of the forerunners of Manetho learned about this name in a gloss. Neferka was left out in the Saqqara king-list; but in the Abydos king-list and in the Royal Canon of Turin, his name was replaced with degradations of the ancient Egyptian \textit{terminus technicus} “\textit{wśf}” “lost” of textual criticism, which was misinterpreted as the royal names Śḏś (Abydos king-list) and Ḥw-ḏfꜢ (Royal Canon of Turin) respectively.\textsuperscript{104} The Abydos king-list reintroduced the name \textit{Nfr-kꜢ-RꜤw} from a gloss \textit{in margine} or another king-list, but dropped Huni instead. The reason for this was the erroneous preservation of the entry of “king” Śḏś, which should have been replaced with \textit{Nfr-kꜢ-RꜤw}, and, furthermore, the effort of keeping a predefined number of kings. In Manetho’s king-list, Μέσωχρις

\textsuperscript{103} Gundacker, \textit{Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus}, 79–80.

\textsuperscript{104} The text critical remark, which indicated a lacuna or a deteriorated and consequently illegible passage, read perhaps šḏ \textit{wśf} (Helck, \textit{Untersuchungen zu Manetho}, 14–16, 85) or šḏ \textit{dꜢf} (cf. Goedicke, “King ḤwḏfꜢ”) “broken and (therefore) left out.” Written by means of an abbreviation, this \textit{terminus technicus} was, on the one hand, misread as Ḥw-ḏfꜢ “food and fare” and, on the other hand, as šḏ śj “it is broken.” Both these misreadings were then interpreted as kings’ names. Cf. furthermore Fecht, “Review of Helck, \textit{Untersuchungen zu Manetho},” 117; Redford, \textit{Pharaonic King-Lists}, 14–16; Ryholt, \textit{Political Situation}, 10–11 and “Turin King-List,” 147–48; cf. for textual criticism in ancient Egypt Zeidler, \textit{Pfortenbuchstudien} 1, 43–44; Goedicke, “King ḤwḏfꜢ.”
(Neferka) is thus an addendum which was attached to the Third Dynasty after the correct position of this king had become unknown.

A comparable scenario may also be proposed for the section of the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes concerning the Third Dynasty:

(a) (1) Μομχεϊρι ἔτη οθ’  
(b) (3) Γοσορμίης ἔτη λ’ 
(c) (2) Στοῖχος ἔτη ς’ 
(d) (4) Μάρης ἔτη κς’ 
(e) (5) Ἀνωψίς ἔτη χ’

Although this suggestion could explain why Στοῖχος (Djoser-teti) and Γοσορμίης (Djoser-it-sa) switched positions, there remain reasonable doubts. Both reading sequences, the original order (a)–(e) as well as the faulty order (1)–(5), would thus end with Ἀνωψίς (Huni). But this constitutes a substantial difficulty, because the last line of this double column thus contained only a single entry. Although George Syncellus\(^1\) states that this king-list covered only a single dynasty, it represents obviously a king-list comparable to that of Manetho, which originally consisted of more than one dynasty. It is thus appropriate to suppose that the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes once was organized in dynasties, which were given up for an unknown reason. If such a dynastic division once intervened between Ἀνωψίς and the first king of the Fourth Dynasty (Σίριος), the last line of the dynastic equivalent of the Third Dynasty according to Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes would indeed have contained only a single king’s name. This explanation remains, however, highly tentative, and one cannot exclude that the distorted sequence of kings is the result of some other kind of mistake in handing down this king-list.

4.2 The Lengths of Reign
The length of reign of 28 years ascribed to Νεχερωφής has probably been influenced by the figure given with Τοσέρτασις (19 years). In the Royal Canon of Turin, both kings are given 19 years, which were most likely the figures found by Manetho.\(^2\) He then attributed to Τοσέρτασις 19 years, but varied the

---

\(^1\) Jacoby, FrHistGr II, no. 244 F85; cf. Waddell, Manetho, 212–25.
\(^2\) However, the fragments of the royal annals indicate that Djoser actually ruled 29 years (Wilkinson, Royal Annals, 53; Hornung, Krauss, and Warburton, “Royal Annals,” 23–24), which means the loss of a ten either already before the compilation of the Royal Canon of Turin or in the course of handing it down until the present copy was produced (Nineteenth Dynasty). The intentional addition of tens renders it extremely difficult to uncover the numbers found by Manetho and Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes. According to Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 81–83, the most common additions
figure for Νεχερωφής by adding a ten resulting in *29 years. An additional reason for doing so was perhaps the wish to avoid two identical figures in immediate sequence. After the erroneous misreading of the double column and the splitting up of the double entry *Τόσορθρος ἢ Τύρεις/*Τοσόρθρος ἢ Τύρεις, Africanus (or one of his immediate forerunners) created the new figure of 29 years for Τόσορθρος by copying Νεχερωφής' *29 years. Moreover, in order to preclude two identical figures directly following one another, he varied Νεχερωφής' *29 years to 28 years. This is fully in line with Μομχειρί who according to Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes ruled 79 years, which of course must be seen as a figure intentionally raised by 60 (*19 → 79).107 Γοσομίης' 30 years are closely related to the 19 years of Manetho's Τοσέρτασις, if the addition of a ten and rounding up is accepted (*19 → *29 → 30).108

Τύρεις' 7 years thus continue the original figure of the double entry *Τόσορθρος ἢ Τύρεις/*Τοσόρθρος ἢ Τύρεις, which also fits the entry of the Royal Canon of Turin (6 years ← *6 years, XY months, AB days, rounded up to 7 years). The entry of Στοῖχος, whose length of reign is numbered 6 years by Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes, likewise mirrors that found in the Royal Canon of Turin (6 years ← *6 years, XY months, AB days, rounded down to 6 years, or with loss of months and days).

The length of reign of 17 years ascribed to Μέσωχρις appears like a duplicate of the preceding king's 7 years with the common addition of 10. But the Royal Canon of Turin confirms an original figure of 6 years, XY months, AB days rounded up to 7 years. This is furthermore corroborated by Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes, who attributes 26 years to Μάρης, which can be identified as the result of the addition of 20 to an original figure of *6 years, XY months, AB days, disregarding the months and days.109

'Ἄχης' length of reign of 42 years is, however, certainly incorrect. Helck110 supposed that a deliberate alteration *24 → 42 was applied, but due to the numerical systems in use, this cannot be viewed as a simple case of transposed digits. With Greek numerals, this kind of modification remains a mystery, because there is no plausible explanation for the change *κ.Δ. → ἵμβ., be it

---

109 Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 55–56.
intentional or unintentional; but with Egyptian numerals, a psychological mistake may be held responsible for this kind of transposed digits. In view of that, two tens and four units (*24 ~ 20) were erroneously changed to four tens and two units (42 ~ 20). This scenario is confirmed by the figure found in the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes, who attributes to Ἀνωφίς 20 years. This figure is almost certainly an original *24 years, which lost its units due to a scribal error (*24 → 20).

5 The Fourth Manethonian Dynasty

5.1 The Kings and Their Names

The identification of all kings (with the exception of Ṣωφίς) belonging to this Manethonian Dynasty with those known from contemporaneous evidence is commonly accepted. However, the exact phonological correspondence between Egyptian and Greek forms has not been described in detail.

According to the communis opinio, the first king of Manetho’s Fourth Dynasty, Σῶρις, and the eighth king of Manetho’s Third Dynasty, Σήφουρις, are to be identified with Snefru. This has finally been corroborated by Jürgen Osing, who identified Śnfrw as a nomen agentis *Śañfärūw thereby putting down the interpretation of a hypocoristic creation. Σῶφίς has nevertheless been regarded a defective Greek rendering with loss of the hieroglyph “heart and windpipe” (Gardiner sign-list 25F). In light of the interchange of q, b, and oγ, and the inability of the Greek alphabet to denote properly the sound

---

112 Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 23, 26; The duplicates found in Manetho’s Third Dynasty are largely ignored, cf., e.g., von Beckerath, Chronologie, 156–57; Verner, “Archaeological Remarks,” 365, “Contemporaneous Evidence,” 128, and “System of Dating.”
113 Osing, Nominalbildung 1, 185; Schenkel, Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung, 176; cf. already Vycichl, “Wie hieß”; Černý, “The True Form.” Cf. for the toponym Asfnis < ḫw.t-Śnfrw “domain of Snefru” n. 121 below.
114 Von Beckerath, Handbuch der Königsnamen, 52–53.
117 Cf., e.g., S£akwō < ⲡⲟⲩⲧ < ⲡⲟⲩⲧⲆⲧ < ḫw.t-Śnfrw “domain of Snefru” n. 121 below.
/w/ — which is left out or randomly rendered with о, ω, υ, ου or γ —, Σῶρις can be traced back to Snefru’s name: Ṣuşfrw ~ *Ṣânjfrw > *Ṣuşfrē > *Ṣēfrē > *Σώρē.118 Σήφουρις (perhaps ← *Σέφουρις) is thus the expected Greek equivalent of *Σέφουρις ~ *Σĕfrē,119 Σίριος, however, which is the variant given by Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes, matches, on the one hand, the consonantal skeleton of Σῶρις, but, on the other hand, its vowels seem to reflect some kind of folk-etymological reinterpretation.120 Two of the three graecized forms of Snefru’s name may thus be considered correct (Σήφουρις, Σῶρις), the third, which cannot be explained by scribal errors, as intentionally altered (Σίριος).121

118 Cf. von Beckerath, “IV. Dynastie,” 115: “… starke Kontraktion…”
119 Cf. for the facultative sound change *(−)fō− > *(−)fū−. Osing, Nominalbildung 1, 11; cf. for η as the Greek rendering of an Egyptian shwa-vowel Fecht, Wortakzent, §§ 187–89; Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 263–64, cf. for further references on the interchange η ~ ι known from Greek papyri n. 57 above; cf. also n. 121 below.
120 The folk-etymological gloss (Jacoby, FrHistGr 11, no. 244 F85; cf. Waddell, Manetho, 216–17) gives the explanation υἱὸς κόρης…ἀβάσκαντος “son of the iris (of the eye)”… [or] ‘of the unharmed (eye):’ The particular form Σίριος may thus have been reshaped after the theonym Osiris (in Greek rendering Ὄσιρις, Ὄσιρις, etc.), because the explanatory interpretations of Σίριος plainly allude to the Osirian myths. Nevertheless one has to admit that Horus would fit both explanations even better. The date of origin of both these explanations is, however, undecided, but they should perhaps be regarded as the product of a late hierogrammateus or folk-etymologist. Cf. n. 134 below.
121 Cf. Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Sноfru, 95–101. There may be two more, somewhat dubitable testimonies concerning Snefru:

(1) The Book of Sothis (Jacoby, FrHistGr 111C, no. 609 F28; Waddell, Manetho, 234–35) is quoted for the first time by two Egyptian monks, Panodorus of Alexandria and Annianus of Alexandria (c. 400 ACE, Waddell, Manetho, 12, n. 1), who sought to synchronize Chaldean, Egyptian, and Biblical chronologies. Although the Book of Sothis lacks any dynastic divisions, it does give an account of kings in a roughly chronological sequence. The fourth king of this king-list, Σπάνιος, ἔτη λς’ “Spanios, 36 years,” is the only king of the Old Kingdom, although, immediately after him, two more were left out erroneously (perhaps Cheops and Chephren?). However, the lost context and the overall problematic nature of the Book of Sothis render it difficult to draw any further conclusions concerning the name and the figure of Σπάνιος, though this name bears a faint resemblance to Snefru in its consonantal skeleton. Indeed, the toponym Ḥw.t-Ṣヌfrw ~ *Ḥāwāt-Ṣânjfrw > *Ḥā-Ṣânjfrē > *Ḥā-Ṣēfrē > *Ḥā-Ṣēfrē > Ἀσφυνις (Calderini and Daris, Dizionario 1.2, 250; Notitia dignitatum § 40, Seeck, Notitia dignitatum, 63, s.v. Or xxxi 11 (40, 11); cf. Neira Faleiro, Notitia dignitatum; Kulikowski, “Notitia Dignitatum”; cf. also Sahidic Ⲫⲱⲁⲧⲧⲡ, Westendorf, Koptisches Handwörterbuch, 480, and Arabic ʿAsfūn il-Maṭaʿ(ī)na, Peust, Toponyme, 12–13; cf. Černý, “The True Form”; Schenkel, “Hut-Snofru”) may be viewed as a piece of evidence in favor of this identification, because
Σπάνιος and Asfynis both underwent the sonorant shift *-n-r > *-n-n- and the reduction *-n-n- > *-a-n- (cf. for this kind of assimilatory and dissimilatory processes Fecht, Wortakzent, § 13, n. 26; Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 167; cf. nn. 79, 113–117 above).

(2) The chronicle of John of Nikiu (Carrié, Jean de Nikiou), which was composed in the late 7th century ACE either in Greek with some chapters on Egyptian history written in Coptic (Zotenberg, Chronique, 6–7), or entirely in Coptic (Spalinger, Epistolary), may contain another mention of Snefru. The text is preserved in an Ethiopic translation from 1602 ACE, which was produced from an Arabic translation of the original. Currently, two manuscripts, now in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, and in the British Museum, London (Zotenberg, Chronique, 8–9; Charles, John, Bishop of Nikiu, iv–v), and a portion of a Coptic papyrus, now in Berlin (Papyrus Berlin 9009, Charles, John, Bishop of Nikiu, 38–41; Jansen, Coptic Story; Spalinger, Epistolary), are known. Even though the chronicle has suffered from the loss of large portions and the distortion of names and passages, particularly in the last step from an obviously unpunctuated and incomplete Arabic copy to the Ethiopic version, it is nevertheless an important chronographical work. As far as the time between the two Persian dominations over Egypt (424–343 BCE) is concerned, all three manuscripts provide the following somewhat fantastic account (Charles, John, Bishop of Nikiu, 41):

“LI, 55. And there was an Egyptian who comforted (his people), a man of indefatigable energy, wise and virtuous, named Shenufij, which is by interpretation “good news”. 56. And this man was very vigilant in rebuilding the cities and villages and restoring the tillage of the land so that in a short time he rebuilt all the villages of Egypt. And he restored Egypt and made it as it had been before. And there was great prosperity in his days, and the Egyptians increased very much, and their cattle increased also. 57. And he reigned over them forty and eight years in happiness and peace because of the return of the Egyptians from captivity. And he went to rest full of honour. But before he died, he numbered the Egyptians, and their number was 500,000 men. 58. And after the death of Shenufij, the Egyptians remained for a long time without a king, but they paid taxes to the Persians and Assyrians at the same time. And they remained at peace till they appointed a second Pharaoh as king and paid the taxes to him.”

The setting of these events is of course unhistorical, and so are the events related, but the king’s name and his reign of 48 years are remarkable. Graefe pointed out that υβογυ/υβιογυ resembles Snefru’s name Śnfrw ~ *Śaṅīrāw (Graefe, "Reputation," 261–63; cf. nn. 113–117 above), although one would expect *sɛnəɣui/*sɛnəɣui or, with a phonological development similar to that of Asfynis, *sɛnəɣui/*sɛnəɣui. But Snefru’s name may have undergone a folk-etymological reinterpretation, Śnfrw ~ *Śaṅīrāw > *sɛnəɣui/*sɛnəɣui “benefactor” → υβογυ/υβιογυ “good things, good news” (the conditions for the assimilatory sound-change s > š are not found in this instance, cf. Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 168). Whether this was founded on a metathesis, e.g., *-ɣουι → *-ɣογυ, or on a
The second king of Manetho’s Fourth Dynasty is called Σοῦφις and is equated with Cheops in a gloss criticizing Herodotus. It is a well-known fact that Manetho intended to correct what he felt faulty in Herodotus’ account of Egypt,122 but he was nevertheless strongly influenced by Herodotus.123 This becomes particularly obvious in his account of the Fourth Dynasty, in which the three kings who built pyramids at Giza (Cheops, Chephren, Mycerinus) are grouped together, as is found for the first time in Herodotus’ writings;124 one may thus call these rather loose association with ηογη “good” remains unclear. But this process was presumably advanced by the fact that ś-causatives, which had not become lexicalized, were gradually replaced with analytic formations involving (r)dj “to give” from the Middle Kingdom onwards (cf. Schenkel, “ś-Kausativa”) and that śnfr “to make beautiful, perfect” had disappeared from the latest stages of the Egypto-Coptic lexicon (cf. Wb IV, 163: 1–13; Wilson, Ptolemaic Lexicon, 862).

Snefru’s esteem is already manifest in graffiti found in the temple of his pyramid at Meidum (First Intermediate Period; Rowe, Excavations, 18–19; Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 118–20; Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus, 101) and in the stories of Papyrus Westcar (Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 115–17; cf. nn. 248–250 below), and he was styled an affable king entitled njśwt mnḫ “beneficent king” (Instruction for Kagemni, Papyrus Prisse II.8, Jéquier, Papyrus Prisse; Gardiner, “Instruction”; Forecast of Neferty, E I; Helck, Prophezeiung des Neferti). This is very interesting because (njśwt) mnḫ was translated as (βασιλέυς) εὐεργέτης “beneficent (king)” in official Ptolemaic inscriptions (cf. Posener, Littérature et politique, 32), thus mirroring the literal meaning of Snefru’s name, which certainly was the basis for his good reputation and for his abiding cultic veneration until the Graeco-Roman Period (Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 148–52; Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus, 94). A common awareness of Snefru’s benevolent nature probably outlasted the end of the pagan cult in popular stories (Graefe, “Reputation”). John of Nikiu must have used such popular stories which, to some extent, contained authentic information. For that reason, όμηογη/ομηογη’s length of reign of 48 years must be taken seriously, because, it can neither be explained as a round number (e.g., 50) nor as a symbolic number (e.g., 7 × 7 = 49). The chronicle of John of Nikiu may thus preserve further evidence for Snefru’s reign lasting for 48 years.

One has, however, to admit that this interpretation still lacks confirmation because Greek, Coptic, Arabic, and Ethiopic numerals need to be checked for potential scribal errors (the text preserved gives the numbers written out in full, but this need not be true for all intermediate steps).

To conclude, the evidence of both these lines of tradition should be looked at with great caution until further investigation will allow for a more precise assessment (cf. Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus, 94, 97–98).

124 Hude, Historiae, s.v. 11.124–35.
three kings, arranged in this particular order, the “Herodotean Giza-group.” Although the Manethonian gloss stresses that the Herodotean variant Χέοψ is inferior to Manetho’s own, Σοῦφις, this is wrong. Hieroglyphic developed *Ḫwj=f-wj > *Ḫwwáfwîj > *Ḫwáfwê > *Ḫewáffe ~ Χέοψ, but at the stage *Ḫwáfwê, the initial consonant ḥ was palatalized in all Egyptian dialects except for Akhmimic. This line of development can adequately explain not only Cheops’ name as mentioned in the Fourth Manethonian Dynasty, but also the variants found in the Third Manethonian Dynasty, Σώφις, and in the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes, Σώφις: *Ḫwáfwê > *Σwáfwê ~ Σάωφις > *Σewốffe > *Σwốwfê (⇒ Σoῦφις. The inability of ancient Greek to denote w properly renders it

125 Hude, Historiae, s.v. II.124–27.
126 Von Beckerath, Handbuch der Königsnamen, 52–53.
127 Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus, 79; Quack, “Von Ḥwj=f-wj-H̱nmw zu Cheops.”
129 Cf. Till, Koptische Dialetgrammatik, § 10; Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 117–18, with n. 127.
130 Cf. for this kind of Umlaut Satzinger, “Koptische Vokalphoneme.” Among the alchemical and Hermetic writings (Χεμευτικά) attributed to Zosimus of Panopolis (4th–5th centuries C.E., cf. Wasserstein and Wasserstein, Septuagint, 275–90; Mertens, Introduction; Rémondon, Résistance; cf. von Lippman, Entstehung, 75–93; Lindsay, Origins), a book entitled Βίβλος ἀληθὴς Σοφῆς Αἰγυπτίου καὶ θείου Ἑβραίων κυρίου τῶν δυνάμεων Σαβαῶθ, Ζωσίμου Θεβαίου μυστικὴ βίβλος “The True Book of Sophe, the Egyptian, and of the Hebrews’ Divine Lord of Powers Sabaoth. A Secret Book of Zosimus of Thebes” can be found (Berthelot, Alchimistes Grecs 11; Mertens, Introduction). There is a longstanding tradition to identify Σοφῆ with Manetho’s Σοῦφις ~ Cheops (Berthelot, Les origines, 58, 158–59, 183 and Alchimistes Grecs 1, xvi, 27b, n. 2, 11, 205b, n. 2; Mertens, Introduction, lxvii) and furthermore to equate the book of Σοφῆ with ἡ ἱερὰ βίβλος “The Sacred Book” mentioned in the second part of the gloss on Σοῦφις ~ Cheops (Aufrère, “Manéthôn de Sebennytos, médiateur,” 331–32). The available data is, however, insufficient for such a conclusion, especially if one considers that ἡ ἱερὰ βίβλος “The Sacred Book,” according to its title and the reason for which it was allegedly composed—Cheops’ penitence following his hubris towards the gods—is not at all expected to be an alchemical treatise. Whatever kind of book this might have been, it must anyway be viewed as a late, pseudepigraphic composition (cf. the anatomical treatise ascribed to king ‘Αθωψῖς, cf. n. 316 below). One should also remember that the denigration of Cheops is simply an aetiological explanation, which originated from the enormous dimensions of his pyramid and which can already be found in Herodotus’ writings (Hude, Historiae, s.v. II.124–27, 133; cf. Zivie-Coche, “Nitocrits”) and, in the 2nd millennium BCE, in the stories of Papyrus Westcar (cf. Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer
impossible to determine whether *Šwòwfe was reduced to *Šòwfe via some kind of labial dissimilation or not. In any case, Šòwfe and Σòvfe contained a diphthong *-ŏµ- which was rendered *-ωυ- (→ -ου-, the dieresis was added only secondarily by a Byzantine scribe when, after the diphthong -ωυ- had become highly uncommon, he introduced diacritics into the epitome) and *-ου- (→ -οu-, which, without a doubt, represents a misunderstanding based on the fact that the digraph -ου- had become a monophthong, *-u-, in Greek; one should thus expect *Σòvfe as the properly graecized form).

The king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes adds this younger variant of Cheops’ name (Σαῶφις) together with the two other kings of

Könige, 159–61, 212; Hays, “Historicity”; Erman, Papyrus Westcar; Lepper, Untersuchungen; cf. n. 248 below). But besides this unfavorable view of Cheops, there existed also another line of tradition which knew Cheops as a pious and great king of the golden age (cf., e.g., the Foundation Inscription of the temple at Dendara explaining that the Ptolemaic structure is the renewal of a temple which was erected under Tuthmosis III in accordance with ancient scriptures from the time of Cheops, cf. PM VI, 90; Chassìnat, Daumas, and Caussile, Dendara VI, 158–60, 173, pl. 583; Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 189–92 (with additional examples); cf. also Burkard, “Frühgeschichte und Römerzeit”). It is thus imaginable that Zosimus attempted, on the one hand, to rehabilitate Cheops with his alchemical/Hermetic writings and, on the other hand, to provide his own treatise with an extraordinary authority. Furthermore, an openly anti-Judaic-Christian tone adheres to the title of this book which belongs among the pagan reaction against Christianity triumphant (Wasserstein and Wasserstein, Septuagint, 275–90; Rémondon, Résistance).

Σοφέ as such can indeed be explained as another correctly graecized form of Cheops’ name, which was not included in a Greek inflectional pattern, as is shown by two remarkable features: On the one hand, Σοφέ displays the uncommon desinence -ε#, obviously the representation of a word-final shwa. It is noteworthy that this rendering corresponds exactly to the orthographic conventions of the Sahidic and Akhmimic dialects spoken in Upper Egypt near Zosimus’ hometown Panopolis (Akhmim) (Shisha-Haley, “Sahidic,” 196; Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 253–54; Till, Koptische Dialektgrammatik, § 54; Kasser, “Akhmimic,” 22; cf. Till, Achmîmisch). On the other hand, the diphthong *-ŏµ- is simply rendered -o-, which indicates a basically Sahidic dialect (perhaps with Akhmimic impact) and the common Greek problems in denoting Egyptian w (or is this an instance of the so-called Akhmimic monophthongization *- ôµ- > *-oµ-? cf. Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 239; Lacau, Études I, 121–29; Oising, Nominalbildung II, 386, n. 73). But simple -o- was perhaps chosen intentionally on grounds of a learned allusion (Aufrère, “Manéthôn de Sebennytos, médiateur,” 331–32 [with nn. 59–62]) between Σοφέ and Greek σοφός “skilled, wise” (cf. also Σαῶφις in the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes and σωφρόν ~ σαοφρόν “wise, mentally sound,” Liddell and Scott, Greek Lexicon, 1622, 1751–52). Because of its overall appearance, Σοφέ must belong to an independent line of tradition. Its actual orthography renders it furthermore likely that Σοφέ was graecized by an Upper Egyptian writer, perhaps even by Zosimus himself.
the “Herodotean Giza-group” towards the end of the Fourth Dynasty, Cheops being the third from last. Consequently, Cheops, Chephren, and Mycerinus were removed from their proper places, but there remained one highly important trace. While nothing is left of Chephren’s original entry, Σίριος is followed by Χνοῦβος ἐ ᾿ Γνεύρος. This certainly reflects the first element of Cheops’ full name\textsuperscript{131} $Hwj=f-wj-Hnmw$, and Χνοῦβος is in fact a perfect rendering of the theonym Chnum\textsuperscript{132} $Hnmw ~ ^*\text{Hanāmūw}$ with the dissimilation of $m$ to $b$ in the neighborhood of $n$.\textsuperscript{133} It is uncertain how Γνεύρος has come into being, but it may be some kind of corruption of Χνοῦβος.\textsuperscript{134} A variant similar to this, Χέμμις, is found with Diodorus Siculus,\textsuperscript{135} whose account, in part, can be traced back to Herodotus and Hecataeus of Abdera. In this respect, Hecataeus of Abdera is independent from Herodotus and apparently relies on different Egyptian sources which are possibly related to those reflected in the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes.\textsuperscript{136} Nevertheless, Χέμμις is not an accurate

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{131} Von Beckerath, \textit{Handbuch der Königsnamen}, 52–53.
  \item \textsuperscript{132} Cf. Osing, \textit{Nominalbildung} I, 184–92; Schenkel, \textit{Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung}, 173–75.
  \item \textsuperscript{133} Cf. especially Peust, \textit{Egyptian Phonology}, 166.
  \item \textsuperscript{134} Cf. Helck, \textit{Untersuchungen zu Manetho}, 26; Γνεύρος perhaps suffered from the following misspellings in Greek uncials: $e \leftrightarrow o$ and $p \leftrightarrow b$ (maybe involving a damaged character in the Vorlage, cf. West, \textit{Textual Criticism}, 25; Pöhlmann, \textit{Überlieferungsgeschichte} 11, 43–46; Schubart, \textit{Palaeographie}, 13–14; Kenyon, \textit{Palaeography}, table of alphabets (after p. 128); cf. n. 56 above); initial $\Gamma$- instead of $X$- may be the result of some kind of phonological confusion $\gamma \sim /\lambda/ \leftrightarrow \chi \sim /x/ \leftrightarrow n\nu\rho\omega\upsilon\omicron$ “Golden One” or “son of the Golden One” (cf. for alternative conjectures Bunsen, \textit{Geschichte} 11, 76–77; Waddell, \textit{Manetho}, 218) corroborates this and even indicates that Γνεύρος came into being after the glosses had been added (5th century ACE?). These glosses are the product of hierogrammateis or folk-etymologists, who perhaps worked even without hieroglyphs: the explanation given for Χνοῦβος/Γνεύρος ignores the initial consonant and solely depends on a superficial homoeophony with $\textsuperscript{s.r.a.l.}
\textsuperscript{e.n.o.y}b < *\text{nábaw ~ nbw “gold,”}$ Crum, \textit{Coptic Dictionary}, 221b–222a; Westendorf, \textit{Koptisches Handwörterbuch}, 119; Černý, \textit{Coptic Dictionary}, 106; Vycichl, \textit{Dictionnaire}, 139–40; cf. Gundacker, “Etymology,” 65, n. 249; Osing, \textit{Nominalbildung} I, 216; Schenkel, \textit{Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung}, 181–82). The king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes in its final version must have been compiled from two manuscripts representing different lines of tradition independent from one another, one providing Χνοῦβος, the other corrupted Γνεύρος.
  \item \textsuperscript{135} Oldfather, \textit{Diodorus Siculus} I, 214–15, s.v. 1.63.2; cf. Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIA, no. 264 F25.
\end{itemize}
rendering, but it appears to be confused or, at least, contaminated with the town name (ʃḥj-bjt ~ ʃḥḫj-bajit) > *ḥš-bē ~ (*)ḥḥbīṣ and, with a different development of the consonant cluster in the compositional join, > *ḥw-bē > *ḥm-bē ~ ḥm-bē > *ḥm-mē ~ ẖm-mē.137

The second king called Σοῦφις, the third king of the Fourth Manethonian Dynasty, is Manetho’s equivalent for Chephren. This king is mentioned as Κεφέρης in the Third Manethonian Dynasty and as Σαῶφις β’ in the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes. Herodotus calls him Χεφρήν,138 Diodorus Siculus—relying on Herodotus and Hecataeus of Abdera—Κεφρήν and Χαβρύης.139 These six names can be assigned to two groups: Σοῦφις and Σαῶφις display the same palatalization as does Σοῦφις (Cheops), whose name must have served as a model for reshaping Chephren’s name.140 One may suppose that in ḫfš-m = ḫḥšf-Rśw141 the theonym Rśw was replaced with ṭj on the model of Cheops’ name, possibly after the initial consonant had been palatalized.142 *Ḫḥ†jaf-Rśw > *Ḫḥ∗jaf-Rśw > *Ḫḥ∗jaf-Rśw > *Ḫḥ∗jaf-Rśw > *Ḫḥjaf-Rśw > Χαβρύης143 > *Ḫḥjaf-Rśw > *Ḫḥjaf-Rśw > *Ḫḥjaf-Rśw > *Ḫḥjaf-Rśw > Χεφρήν/Κεφρήν and Χαβρύης are excellent renderings of the unchanged name ḫfš-m = ḫḥšf-Rśw = ḫḥšf-Rśw > *Ḫḥ∗jaf-Rśw > *Ḫḥ∗jaf-Rśw > *Ḫḥjaf-Rśw > Χαβρύης143 > *Ḫḥjaf-Rśw > Χεφρήν/Κεφρήν. Κεφέρης seems irregular, but it simply displays the rare and facultative sound change ḫ > ṭ144 and the development of an anaptyctic vowel: *Ḫḥjaf-Rśw > *Ḫḥjaf-Rśw ~ Κεφέρης.

---

137 Cf. the detailed analysis in Fecht, Wortakzent, §§ 49–53; cf. also Gundacker, Studien 1, 196–209 and Peust, Toponyme, 16 (with additional references); cf. for the Greek variants Herodotus II.91, 156 (cf. Hude, Historiae, s.v. II.91, 156), Stephanus of Byzantium (cf. Meineke, Ethniconum, 690–91; Billerbeck, Ethnica v), and Egyptian personal names rendered with Greek characters (e.g., Preisigke, Namenbuch, 58, 312; Foraboschi, Onomasticon I, 56; cf. also Spiegelberg, “Varia,” 181–82).

138 Hude, Historiae, s.v. II.127–28.

139 Oldfather, Diodorus Siculus 1, 218–19, s.v. 1.64.1; cf. Jacoby, FrHistGr II A, no. 264 F25.


141 Cf. for the verbal form, either subjunctive šḏm=f or perfective šḏm=f (in gnomic usage), Fecht, Wortakzent, §§ 139, 251, n. 356, 333; Sätzinger, Die negativen Konstruktionen, § 25; Osing, Papyrus BM 10808, 32–36; Schenkel, Einführung, 112–13; cf. also Osing, Nominalbildung 1, 20–21; Edel, Korrespondenz II, 361–62.

142 Cf. Till, Koptische Dialektgrammatik, § 10; Peust, Egyptian Phonology, I17–18, with n. 127.

143 Cf. for the interchange of f and b n. 117 above, cf. for Greek v ~ *i as rendering of Egyptian *i ~ *i Peust, “Zur Herkunft des Koptischen Ṽ,” 123–24; Gundacker Studien 1, 120 and “Etymology,” 66, n. 259; cf. nn. 57, 79 above.

144 Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 106.
The fourth king of Manetho’s Fourth Dynasty is Μεγχέρης, whom Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes calls Μοσχερῆς. Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus (once more relying on Herodotus and Hecataeus of Abdera) call this king equivocally Μυκερῖνος, although Diodorus Siculus explicitly refers to a variant Μεγχέρινος. Μυκερῖνος is a very accurate Greek rendering of Egyptian

\[ *Μη-κε-Ρί<*Μη-κε-Ρί<*Μη-κε-Ρί<*Μη-κε-Ρί<\]

Μεγχέρης and Μεγχέρινος represent a somewhat younger Egyptian variant

\[ *Μη-κε-Ρή~*Μη-κε-Ρί<*Μη-κε-Ρί<\]. Μοσχερῆς is actually closely related to Μεγχέρης, but it renders the syllabic nasal *-n̥- or some kind of shwa-vowel with -ο- instead of -ε--; the theonym RꜤw also appears in its younger variant *Rέ-. The most obvious difference between Μοσχερῆς and all other graecized forms of Mycerinus’ name is -ς- in place of -γ-, which can be explained only as a scribal error (*Γ → Σ/Ϲ). Μενχέρης, as is provided by the manuscripts in place of Μεγχέρης, displays either a lapsus calami which occurred in Byzantine minuscule in the time of George Syncellus or even later (*-γ- → -ν-), or it continues a spelling often found in ancient papyri.

---

145 Cf. for the individual elements’ vocalization Fecht, Wortakzent, §§ 81–84, 176–78; Osing, Nominalbildung 1, 20–21, 127, 11, 380, n. 56; Schenkel, Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung, 89, 162; Edel, Korrespondenz 11, 361–62; cf. for the tentative plural form kꜤ.w ~ *Ꜥ.w Gundacker, Studien 1, 119, n. 778; cf. for this kind of plural formation Osing, Nominalbildung 11, 419–21, n. 93, 498–99, n. 198; Schenkel, Aus der Arbeit, 205–08, 211–13 and the improvements proposed by Quack, “Gebrochene Plurale,” 547–48; Peust, Toponyme, 76; cf. nn. 68 above, 167 below.


147 Von Beckerath, Handbuch der Königsnamen, 54–55; cf. for Greek υ as rendering of Egyptian shwa-vowels Gundacker, Studien 1, 119.

148 Gundacker, Studien 1, 141.

149 The most likely candidate is a character looking like an angular variant of C, i.e., a transitional variant between the classical and monumental Σ and its younger and simplified variant C typical for Greek papyri. This error must have occurred in an individual hand producing rather angular uncial characters (typical for the 4th–3rd centuries BCE). Cf. West, Textual Criticism, 25; Pöhlmann, Überlieferungsgeschichte 11, 43–46; Schubart, Palaeographie, 13–14; Kenyon, Palaeography, table of alphabets (after p. 128); cf. also n. 56 above.

150 Cf. West, Textual Criticism, 25; Pöhlmann, Überlieferungsgeschichte 11, 43–46; Schubart, Palaeographie; Barbour, Greek Literary Hands; cf. furthermore n. 56 above.
Next, Manetho mentions Ṛατώςες, whom Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes calls Ῥαώςες. Both these names are correct renderings of Egyptian ṚꜤw-jḏd=f ~ ṚꜤw-jāḏāḏāf 151 ṚꜤw-ḏāḏāf ~ ṚꜤw-ḏāḏāf > ṚꜤw-ḏōdĕf > ṚꜤw-ḏōdĕf

151 Alternatively, the *verb*um Ⅲae infirmiae ḏḏj “to endure, to last” (cf. *Wb* v, 628: 6–629: 12; Hannig, *Handwörterbuch*, 1094; Allen, *Inflection*, § 738) may have switched from one verbal class (verba Ⅲae infirmiae) into another (verba biradicalia) by the time of the New Kingdom triggered by the *verb*um biradicales ḏḏj “to say” (cf. *Wb* v, 618: 9–625: 2; Hannig, *Handwörterbuch*, 1092–93), which dropped its word-final consonant ḏḏj > ḏ’dj, possibly because of some kind of dissimilation (Winand, *Études de néo-égyptien*, 47; Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 85, n. 72, 156–57; cf. Fecht, *Wortakzent*, §§ 201, 270, 285, n. 419). As a result, ḏḏj “to say” became a *verb*um Ⅱae infirmiae (this change of verbal classes was, however, insignificant). Original ḏḏj > ḏḏj “to endure, to last” thus may have become a *verb*um biradicales ḏḏj, which finally was introduced into the name of Redjedef (ṚꜤw-ḏḏj=f ~ ṚꜤw-ḏāḏāḏāf → ṚꜤw-ḏḏj=f ~ ṚꜤw-ḏāḏāḏāf < ṚꜤw-ḏōdĕf). Then, one would have to conclude that Redjedef’s name did not belong among those which were in persistent use as self-contained and stable forms in a constant *Aussprachetradition* (cf. Wildung, *Rolle ägyptischer Könige*, 193–99; Aufrère, “Remarques”) as can be proven for Snefru (cf. the *toponym* Ḥw.t-Śnfrw ~ Ḥăwăt-Śănfā́rŭw > Asfynis, (Černý, “The True Form”; Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 96–97; cf. n. 121 above), and for Cheops, Chephren, and Mycerinus, the kings of the “Herodotean Giza-group” (Brunner, “Zur Aussprache”). All of them—including Redjedef (cf., e.g., his role in Papyrus Westcar, Ryholt, *Political Situation*, 17–18, n. 32)—were venerated until the latest stages of Egyptian history (cf. Wildung, *Rolle ägyptischer Könige*; Zivie-Coche, *Giza*, 136–71), which strongly speaks in favor of an uninterrupted *Aussprachetradition*. This is corroborated by the fact that it was the names of rather unfamiliar kings which suffered from significant misreading already in Hieratic or Demotic king-lists (Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho, passion*; Fecht, “Review of Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho”). *Cf.* for the remains of Demotic king-lists Quack, “Papyrus CtYBR”; Ryholt “Egyptian Historical Literature”; and for Greek (Christian) king-lists Popko and Rücker, “Königsliste”; Colomo, et al., “Die älteste Weltchronik”; Weiβ, “Weltchronik”; Bilabel, *Griechische Papyri* (s.v. Papyrus Baden 4, no. 59); cf. also the next note.

152 Von Beckerath, *Handbuch der Königsnamen*, 52–53. It is remarkable that the names Chephren and Redjedef do not belong to the same grammatical pattern. One should therefore accept that both patterns—*theonym—šḏm=fcircumstantial* (e.g., Ranke, *Personennamen* 11, 257–58; Schweitzer, *Schrift und Sprache*, §§ 332, 413) and *šḏm=fnoun/perfective—*theonym* (e.g., Brunner, “Zur Aussprache”; Schenkel, *Tübinger Einführung*, 342–43)—were in use at the same time. Redjedef’s name in its preserved form is hence either a late *Neubildung* or it is the constant *Aussprachetradition* of this name, which was sufficient for preserving the grammatical pattern. The former is, however, highly improbable because the pattern *theonym—šḏm=fcircumstantial* was no longer productive in the late 2nd and 1st millennia BCE, and royal names starting with the *theonym* ṚꜤw were furthermore exceptionally rare (cf., e.g., Fecht, “Review of Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho,” 119). Consequently, one should expect that a name without a longstanding *Aussprache-


*Ῥάτωτις, whereby the loss of an Egyptian word-final labial immediately before the Greek inflectional ending -ς is not uncommon. In *Ῥάτωτις, the consonantal sequence -τ-τ- was dissimilated to -τ-σ-, thus providing *Ῥάτωτς, which was possibly endorsed by the Greek aversion (typical for Attic-Ionic and the Koine) against *-τί- (regularly *-τι- > *-σι-). In addition, *Ῥάτωτις suffered from the misspelling *-ο- → -οτ- and from an itacistic scribal error *-ις → -ης, which was perhaps triggered by Mycerinus' and Baka's names ending with (*)-ρης. In another line of tradition, *Ῥάτωτις was affected by the mistake *-ⲱ- → *ⲟⲓ- and from an itacistic scribal error *-ις → -ης, which was perhaps triggered by Mycerinus' and Baka's names ending with (*)-ρης. In *Ῥάτωτς, the conso-

According to Manetho, the fifth king of the Fourth Dynasty was called Βίχερς; Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes gives the variant Βιρης. Either of these forms can be traced back to Egyptian BꜢ-kꜢ=j, to which, again, the theonym RꜤw was added (BꜢ-kꜢ=j → BꜢ-kꜢ-RꜤw). One may thus reconstruct the following development: BꜢ-kꜢ-RꜤw ~ *BꜢ-kꜢ-RꜤw > *BꜢ-kꜢ-RꜤw > *BꜢ-kꜢ-RꜤw ~ *Βιχόρης.

tradition was integrated into a recent, productive, and commonly acknowledged pattern. The name RꜤw-jꜤd=f should thus have been transformed to Dd(j)=f-RꜤw, e.g., by analogy to the more common name HꜤj=f-RꜤw, but this did not happen. For the vocalization of Redjedef’s name and of the circumstantial šḏm=f, cf. the personal name Nb=j-wnn=f as preserved in the toponym TꜢ-hw.t-(nꜤt)nꜤb=j-wnn=f > Θουαβουνουν, wherein -nb=j-wnn=f may be reconstructed as *-nꜤb(w)Ꜥw-ăndꜤw (Fecht, Wortakzent, §§ 139, n. 231, 153, n. 257, 398, n. 452; Satzinger, Die negativen Konstruktionen, § 25; Schenkel, “Zur Formenbildung” and Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung, 89; Osing, Nominalbildung 1, 20–21, 127 and Tebtunis Papyri 1, 62; cf. also Quack, “Über die mit ’nḫ gebildeten Namenstypen”; Edel, Korrespondenz 11, 361–362; cf. also n. 251 below).

153 Fecht, Wortakzent, § 139, n. 231; Gundacker, Studien 1, 56, n. 307.

154 Redford’s emphatic statement (Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 237, n. 24) that “Ῥατοίσης is not Redjedef” is thus simply wrong.

155 For these mistakes, which are typical for Greek uncial, West, Textual Criticism, 25; Pohlmann, Überlieferungsgeschichte 11, 43–46; Schubart, Palaeographie; Kenyon, Palaeography, table of alphabets (after p. 128); cf. furthermore n. 56 above and the conjecture proposed by von Gutschmid (Gelzer, “Diorthose,” 269).

156 The reading of the first sign of this name, which was found in the step pyramid at Zawyet el-Aryan (PM 111.1, 313; Barsanti, “Zaouïet el-Aryân”; Lauer, “Sur l’âge”; Maragio-glò and Rinaldi, Piramide menfite v, 10–40), is, extremely controversial: concerning the “stork” (Gardiner sign-list G29) proposed by von Beckerath, Handbuch der Königsnamen, 54–55 and Chronologie, 158, numerous alternative readings have been suggested; cf. Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 211–12; Verner, “Archaeological Remarks,” 380; Jánosi, Giza in der 4. Dynastie, 64, n. 229; Theis, “Zu den an der Pyramide Lepsius.”

the replacement of the singular *-χο- with the plural *-χε- and an itacistic error which affected the word-final theonym -ρις ← *-ρης. The form preserved in the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes may have suffered from some kind of misspelling, possibly *-κ- → γ-,158 and the loss of a vowel (*Βιχόρης/*Βιχέρης → *Βιώρης/*Βιώρης → Βιώρης). It is, however, more likely that *Βιχόρης/*Βιχέρης was contaminated with the name of prince Baufre (BꜢw=f-RꜤw), who in some lines of popular tradition159—as reflected in a graffito found in the Wadi Hammamat160—was considered a king. The name of Baufre should have developed as follows: BꜢw=f-RꜤw ← *BꜢwꜢf-RꜤw > *BꜢwꜢf-Ri ̄́Ꜥŭw > *BꜢwf-Ri ̄́Ꜥĕ > *BꜢwf-RꜤf> *BꜢwꜢf-RꜤf > *Βιχέρης → *Βιώρης.161 It is thus plausible that the list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes was compiled from an Egyptian source which either was influenced by some such popular tradition and thus had amalgamated the historical Baka and “king” Baufre or which, perhaps, had replaced the name of king Baka (→ Bakare) with that of prince Baufre.162

The penultimate king of the Fourth Manethonian Dynasty is Σεβερχέρης, whom Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes omitted. The hieroglyphic equivalent is Špśś-kꜢ=f,163 which must have undergone a process of analogical alignment. Thereby, the suffix pronoun =f was replaced with the theonym RꜤw similar to the addition of this element164 found with other names of the Third and Fourth Dynasties.165 One may therefore propose that Shepseskaf’s name developed166 Špśś-kꜢ=f → Špśś-kꜢ-RꜤw ~ *Šŭpśĭś-kăꜢ-Rī́Ꜥŭw > *Šŭpśĭś-kĭꜢ-Rī́Ꜥĕ >

---

159 Prince Baufre, whose name was reshaped from RꜤw-bꜢ=f (Ranke, Personennamen 11, 257–58), also appears among the storytellers in Papyrus Westcar (cf. Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 159–61; Hays, “Historicity”; Ryholt, Political Situation, 17–18, n. 32; cf. Erman, Papyrus Westcar; Lepper, Untersuchungen).
160 Drioton, “Liste des rois.”
161 Cf. for the individual elements’ vocalization Oising, Nominalbildung 1, 20–21, 90, 11, 380, n. 56; Edel, Korrespondenz 11, 361–62; Smith, Papyrus BM 10507, 119; Gundacker, “Etymology,” 44; cf. for the interchange of f and w n. 117 above.
162 Cf. Excursus 11 and section 6 below.
165 Cf. Ryholt, “Seneferka,” 166–67. This may be explained as a process covering two phases: First, to the bipartite names was added the theonym RꜤw, and second, suffix pronouns, which referred to Re anyway, were also replaced with the theonym RꜤw.
166 Cf. Fecht, Wortakzent, §§ 176–78; Oising, Nominalbildung 1, 20–21, 11, 380, n. 56; Schenkel, Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung, 89; Edel, Korrespondenz 11, 361–62. The vowel pattern chosen for špś ~ *šūpsē is extremely tentative and selected only by analogy to the semantically identical and closely related adjective špṣj ~ *šūpsj, which later even may have replaced špśj; cf. Oising, Nominalbildung 1, 150; Schenkel, Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung, 159.
*Šĕpśĕś-kŏ-Řë̀ ~ *Σεψεσχόρης (or perhaps a simplified variant *Šĕpś-kŏ-Řë̀ ~ *Σεψχόρης). The outcome of this development was perhaps reshaped via the analogical replacement of the singular *-χο- with the plural *-χε-,\(^{167}\) simplified via the dissimilatory loss of one of the three consonants -σ-, and finally affected by some kind of scribal error *-ⲥ → -ⲣ.\(^{168}\) As a result, Špśś-kꜢ=f → Špśś-kꜢ-RꜤw > *Σεψεσχόρης was thus transformed to Σεβερχέρης as is preserved.\(^{169}\)

Manetho’s Fourth Dynasty includes yet another king, whom he calls Θαμφθίς; Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes knows of no such king. Due to the lack of hieroglyphic equivalents, this name can only be interpreted conjecturally. The most promising interpretation proposed to date is certainly ḏḏdj=f-Ptḥ,\(^{170}\) although Ptah is hardly ever attested prior to the Fifth Dynasty.\(^{171}\) If this interpretation is correct, one may propose the following development:\(^{172}\)

\(^{167}\) Cf. nn. 68 and 145 above. One should also remember the fluctuation of ε and o in Greek transcriptions in order to denote Egyptian shwa-vowels (Lacau, Études 1, 131–36) and the common scribal error e ~ o (cf. West, Textual Criticism, 25; Pöhlmann, Überlieferungsgeschichte 11, 43–46; Schubart, Palaeographie; Kenyon, Palaeography, table of alphabets (after p. 128); cf. furthermore n. 56 above).

\(^{168}\) Could this be viewed as a slip of memory, which occurred by way of shifting boundaries of some kind of a makeshift segmentation in order to memorize this name in the process of copying the Aegyptiaca or the Epitome *Σεψεσ-χερής → Σεβ-ερχέρ-ης?

\(^{169}\) It is instructive to point to king Shepseskare (Fifth Dynasty), whose name Špśś-kꜢ-RꜤw should also have resulted in *Σεψεσχόρης or—with preservation of *-ĭ or homogenization of unstressed vowels (especially *-i- and *-ă-) in the neighborhood of sibilants (cf. Fecht, Wortakzent, 248, n. 382; Oising, Nominalbildung 1, 14, 11, 386, n. 72, 880–81 (Nachtrag zu n. 163); Schenklen, Einführung, 88)—in *Σψχόρης, which was similarly truncated to *Σιψχόρης → Σισίρης according to Fecht, “Review of Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho,” 119. Cf. also the truncation which affected the name of Djoserteti: Ṣισιρές ← *Τσισιρές (cf. section 3.1 and, in particular, n. 75 above).

\(^{170}\) Reisner, Mycerinus, 244–46; Hayes, Scepter of Egypt 1, 66; Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 212; Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 25; von Beckerath, Chronologie, 159 and “IV. Dynastie,” 116; Jánosi, Giza in der 4. Dynastie, 75; In this name, ḏḏdj “to endure, last” is much more appealing for semantic reasons than ḏd “to say” (cf. Wb v, 618: 9–625: 2, 628: 6–629: 12; Hannig, Handwörterbuch, 1092–94; Allen, Inflection, §§ 728, 738). As opposed to Redjedef’s name, Djedefptah’s name looks like a late Neubildung; cf. n. 175 and Excursus 11 below. Differently O’Mara, who interpreted Θαμφθίς as the regular rendering of Ṣ焐jḏd=f (O’Mara, “Manetho and the Turin Canon,” 59), but this is in open contradiction to all the linguistic data available.

\(^{171}\) Begelsbacher-Fischer, Götterwelt, 141.

\(^{172}\) Cf. for the individual elements’ vocalization Fecht, Wortakzent, §§ 139, 251, n. 356, 333; Satzinger, Die negativen Konstruktionen, § 25; Oising, Papyrus BM 10808, 32–36 and Nominalbildung 1, 156; Schenkel, zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung, 165 and Einführung, 112–13.
Most probably, this was corrupted by several scribal errors, but all attempts to explain Manetho’s Θαμφθίς in greater detail remain highly tentative.

5.2 The Lengths of Reigns

The highest contemporaneous dates from Snefru’s reign belong to his 24th census (rnp.t sp 24). From the notoriously underrepresented odd years

---

173 Cf. for the Greek practice of rendering word-final -ισ with -ι(·) Fecht, Wortakzent, § 30, n. 58. The initial Θ- is, however, irregular—one would expect Τ- instead; perhaps some kind of assimilation *Τ- → Θ-, which was triggered by *-φθαϊς → -φθίς (cf. n. 175 below), operated. Cf. Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 79–90; Schenkel, “Ist Mythos,” 554–55; Gignac, “Pronunciation,” 196–97.

174 West, Textual Criticism, 25; Pöhlmann, Überlieferungsgeschichte 11, 43–46; Schubart, Palaeographie; Kenyon, Palaeography, table of alphabets (after p. 128); cf. furthermore n. 56 above.

175 First, -ⲧⲓ- was perhaps misunderstood as -ⲙ- (*Θατιφθαϊς → *Θαμφθαϊς), and second, the word-final group -ⲁⲓς# was misread as -ⲓς#, which in Greek is not possible in word-final position and was thus immediately conjectured to -ις# (*Θαμφθαϊς → *Θαμφθςς [sic] → Θαμφθίς). Alternatively, and more plausibly, a copyist may have interpreted -αις# as a misplaced and faulty dative plural ending, because the only other kings’ names ending with -αις# (cf. Waddell, Manetho, 28–35, 102–03, 108–09, 112–13, 116–19; Jacoby, FrHistGr III, no. 609 F2–F3) are Ὄὐσαφαίς (Den) in the First Dynasty and Ἄρμαϊς (Haremhab) in the Eighteenth Dynasty. Both of them suffered from scribal errors: Ὄὐσαφαίς was misspelled Ὄὐσαφα with a misplaced genitive in Africanus’ version, and it was erroneously replaced with the genitive Ὄὐσαφαδος in Eusebius’ version; Ἄρμαϊς was misspelled Ἀρμεσίς in Africanus’ version. This clearly indicates that names ending with -αις# were easily affected by mistakes in the course of textual transmission. Word-final -αις# was therefore probably reshaped in order to form an unambiguous nominative via eradication of -α- (-αις# → -ις#).

One should also remember that Ddj=f-Pth is certainly a late replacement of an earlier *Ptḥ-jḏd=f, which, perhaps during the New Kingdom (early Ramesside Period?), was created in order to replace the name of Ḥrw-jḏd=f in the king-lists of the Memphite tradition. Both *Ptḥ-jḏd=f and Ḥrw-jḏd=f may thus be expected in the Saqqara king-list (cf. Excursus 11 below). Whereas Ḥrw-jḏd=f was a name in constant Aussprachetradition because of the famous instruction circulating under this name (cf. nn. 151–152 above, and 222, 242, 253 below), *Ptḥ-jḏd=f obviously was not. It was thus replaced by a younger substitute which was created in the course of handing down the Egyptian king-lists (cf. nn. 151–152 and 159 above, 251 and 259 below).

176 Cf. for implicit hints favoring the explanation given in the preceding note section 6 below.

Because of the fact that it is unknown when Snefru carried out his first cattle count—in the year of his accession (rnp.t smꜢ-TꜢ.wj, for chronological purposes, this is year “0” of his reign),\textsuperscript{179} in his first, or in his second complete year—, every attempt to reconstruct the length of his reign remains somewhat precarious. One must also keep in mind the possible slip of an odd year between Snefru’s 7th and 8th census as the Palermo Stone might implicate. Furthermore, it is undecided whether Snefru’s rnp.t smꜢ-TꜢ.wj “Year of the unification of the Two Lands” and his year of death, which of course remained incomplete, were calculated accurately and converted into years, months and days, or whether only the accession year, or both his accession and last years, were dropped, or whether either of them was counted as if they were complete years of their own. There is thus a range of several years which cannot even be estimated.

On the basis of the contemporaneous data, it is at least possible to propose a simplified approximation of 24 census-cycles corresponding to almost 48 years.\textsuperscript{180} The 29 years found in the Fourth Manethonian Dynasty are usually

\textsuperscript{178} These are: rnp.t m-ḥt sp 6 (Palermo Stone, recto v1.2, cf. Wilkinson, Royal Annals, fig. 1; Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Sesostris, 9–10), rnp.t m-ḥt sp 10 (a graffito from the pyramid at Meidum, cf. Posener-Kriéger, “Graffiti,” 20, pl. 8 A.30; Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Sesostris, 39), rnp.t m-ḥt sp 13 (a graffito from the pyramid at Meidum, cf. Posener-Kriéger, “Graffiti,” pl. 8 A.32; Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Sesostris, 41), rnp.t m-ḥt sp 15 (a graffito from the pyramid at Meidum, cf. Petrie, Mackay, and Wainwright, Meydum and Memphis II, 9, pl. V.6; Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Sesostris, 42–43), rnp.t m-ḥt sp 16 (a graffito from the pyramid at Meidum, cf. Posener-Kriéger, “Graffiti,” 20, pl. 7 A.3; Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Sesostris, 43), and rnp.t m-ḥt sp 18 (a graffito from the pyramid at Meidum, cf. Posener-Kriéger, “Graffiti,” pl. 8 A.28; Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Sesostris, 45).

\textsuperscript{179} This is actually attested for the reign of Merenre (Sixth Dynasty; Baud and Dobrev, “De nouvelles annales,” 47), but the inscription is so badly worn that it is impossible to deduce whether this was counted as the first census or whether it was given some special name (e.g., ṯnw.t (rnp.t) smꜢ-TꜢ.wj “counting [scil. of cattle, etc.] (of the year?) of the unification of the Two Lands”). Unfortunately, this event is only known from this annalistic record: rnp.t smꜢ-TꜢ.wj ṯnw.t jḥ.w “Year of the unification of the Two Lands, counting of cattle” (This may, however, be viewed as a piece of evidence in favor of some kind of a special name for the census in the year of accession, because it lacks an ordinal number!). The first complete year of Merenre’s reign may thus have been his rnp.t m-ḥt sp 1 “Year after the first occurrence”; but if the census of his accession year was not counted as the first of his reign, it may have borne some special name hitherto unattested, e.g., *rnp.t m-ḥt smꜢ-TꜢ.wj “Year after the unification of the Two Lands” (Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Sesostris, 321; cf. Hornung, Krauss, and Warburton, “Royal Annals,” 24).

\textsuperscript{180} Cf., e.g., Stadelmann, “Länge der Regierung Sesostris”; Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Sesostris, 373–75.
explained as the result of a Greek scribal error κό ← *κε´ ~ 25 years. These 25 years are probably the result of an original *24 years, XY months, and AB days via rounding up, but in this case, of course, the “years” are simply unconverted census-cycles (maybe from a misunderstood date of death). It is remarkable that this is exactly the figure found in the Royal Canon of Turin.

According to Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes, Σίριος’ reign lasted 18 years, which does not fit the evidence found in the Fourth Manethonian Dynasty. The units make these 18 years suspect of being the result of an intentional reduction *48 → 18 years, and the same may be true for the 30 years found with Σήφουρις in Manetho’s Third Dynasty (*48 → *28 → 30 via rounding up).

The highest contemporaneous dates of Cheops’ reign are rnp.t m-ḥt sp 11 “Year after the 11th occurrence,” rnp.t m-ḥt sp 12 “Year after the 12th occurrence,” and rnp.t m-ḥt sp 13 “Year after the 13th occurrence.” One would thus expect—in a simplified mode of calculation—approximately 26 regnal years for Cheops. Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus (relying on Herodotus and Hecataeus of Abdera) both ascribe to Cheops 50 regnal years, which

---

1 A mistake common in Greek uncial; von Beckerath, Chronologie, 157; cf. West, Textual Criticism, 25; Pöhlmann, Überlieferungsgeschichte 11, 43–46; Schubart, Palaeographie; Kenyon, Palaeography, table of alphabets (after p. 128); cf. furthermore n. 56 above.

2 This particular instance of reduction may have formed part of a general process of nivellement of significantly differing figures which was triggered by a sequence of figures ranging between 10 and 29 containing only a few outliers. Alternatively, Jewish and Christian chronographers, who sought to align Egyptian and Biblical chronologies, should be considered as initiators of this kind of alteration at a large scale (cf., e.g., Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 81–83; Wacholder, “Biblical Chronology”; Cohen, “History and Historiography”; Jaeger, “Greeks and Jews”; Larsson, “Chronology of the Pentateuch”; Hornung, “Introduction,” 3–5). Cf. furthermore n. 121 above.

3 Abubakr and Mustafa, “Funerary Boat,” 11 fig. 6; this date is inscribed on one of the slabs which were used to cover one of the boat pits south of Cheops’ pyramid. Redjedef’s name, which is found on these blocks forming part of basilophilorous names of workmen gangs, tempted some scholars (e.g., Stadelmann, “Länge der Regierung Snofrus,” 239; Verner, “Archaeological Remarks,” 375; Vallogia, “La descenderie,” 419, 421, n. 9; Dobrev, “La IVe dynastie,” 19–20; Jánosi, Giza in der 4. Dynastie, 71–72; Verner, “Contemporaneous Evidence,” 132 and “System of Dating,” 27) to attribute this date to Redjedef. However, it would appear terribly strange if a king erected or at least sealed a boat pit containing the funerary barge or a sun boat of his predecessor 11 census-cycles after the funeral. It is thus more likely that the stone slabs were prepared by Cheops himself, to whom this date should thus be attributed, but that it was Redjedef who ordered his workmen crews to put them into place soon after Cheops’ funeral and thus early in his own reign (cf., e.g., Helck, Geschichte, 54, n. 6; Spalinger, “Dated Texts,” 215; Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus, 85).

4 Cf. for these inscriptions of expeditionary forces found in the Libyan desert, Kuhlmann, “Wasserberg.”

5 Differently, but certainly wrong, Lloyd, Herodotus Book II, 111, 72–73.
is clearly a figure displaying the secondary addition of multiples of 10 and the subsequent loss of the units. A comparable addition of tens happened to the 63 years which Manetho ascribes to Σοῦφις in his Fourth Dynasty, but, in this case, the units were correctly preserved. Owing to the introduction of the name Σαῶφις into the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes, his 29 regnal years are also suspect of belonging to this line of tradition. If so, they must have suffered from misspellings, e.g., *κϜ’ → κϐ’ (perhaps with intermediate steps). The common figure of 23 years also fits the one found in the Royal Canon of Turin, where Cheops is given 23 regnal years, which is suspect of an early addition of a ten, thus mirroring the 13 census-cycles attested.

To Σοῦφις’ duplicate Σώϑφις, which can be found in the Third Manethonian Dynasty, 16 years are assigned, and to Χνοῦβος, Cheops’ first and original equivalent in the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes, 22 years are ascribed, which can be traced back to *26 years (scribal error (*κϜ’ → κϐ’, perhaps with intermediate steps). The 16 years found with Σώϑφις can easily be traced back to an original *26 years if one assumes the loss of a ten (perhaps in late Hieratic, Third Intermediate Period or Late Period, ȇ → Ἄ). For Chephren, the following figures are preserved: Σοῦφις 66 years (Fourth Manethonian Dynasty), which is closely related to the 56 years mentioned by Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus (relying on Herodotus and Hecataeus of

---

186 Cf. Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 55; von Beckerath, “IV. Dynastie.”
187 It is particularly difficult to judge this figure because it may have been influenced by the figure of the Vorlage which was the source for the “Herodotean Giza-group” now found in the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes. Conclusively, these 29 years may have been altered after the model of Snefru’s figure in that Vorlage, or they are a distorted double of the original entry found with Χνοῦβος: (*κϜ’ → κϐ’ → κϑ’.
188 Perhaps (*κϜ’ → (*κε’ → κϑ’); Digamma lost its original Form F in the 3rd century BCE and started to develop towards its final form, so-called “stigma,” ς. The various appearances of digamma may have caused confusion when a king-list containing this sign in an archaic variant was copied after F had changed to ς and after the older variant F had fallen out of use. Then, it was totally up to the actual scribe to identify archaic F and to replace it with a contemporary equivalent. Cf. West, Textual Criticism, 25; Pöhlmann, Überlieferungsgeschichte 11, 43–46; Schubart, Palaeographie; cf. also n. 56 above.
189 Möller, Paläographie 11, nos. 623–624, 111, nos. 623–624. This scribal error, if accepted as a lapsus calami based on the similarity of the numerals involved, is confined to Hieratic (but the latest stages of Hieratic avoided ligatures and made use of almost Hieroglyphic numerals, cf. Möller, Paläographie, 111, 64, n. 1; moreover, the Demotic numerals 10 and 20 are also markedly distinctive, cf. Johnson, Thus wrote, § 72; Spiegelberg, Demotische Grammatik § 82). One may thus surmise that this mistake was made by a Late Period scribe who had problems with the ancient numerals when copying a manuscript from the late New Kingdom or the Third Intermediate Period.
Abdera),

Kερφέρης 26 years (Third Manethonian Dynasty), Σαῶφις β' 27 years (Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes). It is more than obvious that all these figures can be traced back to *26 years, XY months, and AB days. In some instances, 26 was altered by adding multiples of ten, but the 27 years of Σαῶφις β' are simply rounded up (from *26 years, XY months, and AB days).

The Royal Canon of Turin is unfortunately damaged in this place, but a figure of 26 years is furthermore supported by the contemporaneous evidence (the highest dates known for Chephren are rnp.t sp 12 “Year of the 12th occurrence” and rnp.t sp 13 “Year of the 13th occurrence”).

Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus (relying on Herodotus and Hecataeus of Abdera) both provide no explicit figure for the length of Mycerinus’ reign, they simply relate that Μυκερῖνος (Μεγχέρινος) eased the burden of pyramid building for the Egyptian people, which contradicted the gods’ will. He was then foretold that, because of his act of mercy towards the people, he would not reign as long as his predecessors, but would live for only six more years and die in the seventh. This is of course nothing more than an aetiological explanation for the fact that Mycerinus’ pyramid is significantly smaller than are those of his predecessors. Hence, Mycerinus’ reign can be numbered only x+6/7 years (with x ≤ 42/43). Manetho seemingly missed data on Mycerinus’ length of reign in his Vorlagen and therefore ascribed 63 years to Μεγχέρης. This is equally useless for chronological purposes, because Manetho seems to have simply repeated Cheops’ length of reign, thereby rejecting Herodotus’ aetiological myth and accusing him of being a liar. Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes ascribes 31 years to Μοσχερης, which is obviously a figure independent of those provided by Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus, and Manetho. However, this remains problematic, because the unfortunately damaged Royal

190 Differently, again, but certainly wrong, Lloyd, Herodotus Book II, 111, 74.
191 Cf. Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 55; von Beckerath, “IV. Dynastie.”
192 Differently Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 54, who supposed that this figure once belonged to a king of the Fifth Dynasty.
194 Hude, Historiae, s.v. 11.133.
195 Oldfather, Diodorus Siculus I, 220–23, (s.v. 1.64.7); cf. Jacoby, FrHistGr I1A, no. 264 F25.
197 Herodotus does not attribute 6/7 years to Mycerinus, as is wrongly claimed by most scholars, e.g., Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 6; Lloyd, Herodotus Book II, 111, 82; and many others. This is only the span of time remaining after he was informed about the will of the gods to which his behavior did not conform.
Canon of Turin attributes [1]8, [2]8 or [3]8 years to Mycerinus. And in view of the contemporaneous evidence—the highest dates are \( rnp.t\ sp\ I I \) “Year of the 11th occurrence,”\(^{198}\) \( rnp.t\ m-ht\ sp\ I I \) “Year after the 11th occurrence,”\(^ {199}\) and \( rnp.t\ sp\ I 2 \) “Year of the 12th occurrence”\(^ {200}\)—one is inclined to accept a length of reign of 28 years.\(^ {201}\) 31 cannot be traced back to 28 by assuming a simple scribal error, regardless of whether in a Hieratic/Demotic or a Greek document. It is thus necessary to assume a more complex origin, if one is willing to take this figure seriously at all. Helck\(^ {202}\) considered the 31 years a displaced figure of one of the kings of the Fifth Dynasty, who otherwise are totally neglected in this king-list. However, it is reasonable that the 31 years are actually a combination of Mycerinus’ and either Shepseskaf’s or Djedefptah’s figures. Their entries, or one of them, were possibly eliminated from the king-list when Cheops (\( \Sigma \alpha \omega \phi i \zeta \)) and Chephren (\( \Sigma \alpha \omega \phi i \zeta \beta \)) were relocated and finally inserted directly preceding Mycerinus in order to rearrange the kings to form the “Herodotean Giza-group.”\(^ {203}\) It is thus possible that to an original figure of *28 or—should an original *28 years, XY months, AB days have been rounded up—*29 years, the figure of Djedefptah was added, which, accordingly, can be determined as 2 years. Shepseskaf’s entry was subsequently lost, either in order to let the Fourth Dynasty correspond to the number of kings given by the Vorlage, or merely accidentally together with the entire Fifth Dynasty.

According to the Fourth Manethonian Dynasty, \( \Psi \alpha \tau \omega \iota \sigma \zeta \) ruled 25 years, \( \Psi \alpha \omega \iota \sigma \iota \zeta \), his equivalent according to the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/

---

\(^ {198}\) A mason’s graffito associated with workmen gangs whose basilophorous names contain the nomen of Mycerinus was found on a block which probably belonged to mastaba G.VI.5 = M.VII. However, the block bearing this inscription was not found in situ but displaced, and the attribution of this date is therefore not secured beyond doubt. Cf. Junker, Giza x, 75 fig. 35.10, 77 no. 9; Jánosi, Giza in der 4. Dynastie, 73, 255–58, 262.

\(^ {199}\) Gebelein rouleau 1v; Posener-Kriéger, “Les papyrus de Gebélein,” 215–16; cf. furthermore the concluding publication by Posener-Kriéger and Demichelis, Gebelein.


\(^ {201}\) E.g., Gardiner, Geschichte, 493; Arnold, “Überlegungen,” 28; von Beckerath, Chronologie, 159; Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus, 84, 379 and “Mykerinos.” By assumption of an irregular census, an 18 year reign has been proposed by, e.g., Barta, “Chronologie der 1. bis 5. Dynastie,” 23; Vernier, “Archaeological Remarks,” 383; Jánosi, Giza in der 4. Dynastie, 73 (albeit finally hesitant and ambivalent).

\(^ {202}\) Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 54.

\(^ {203}\) Cf. the conclusions in section 6 below.
Pseudo-Eratosthenes, 13 years. The Royal Canon of Turin assigns 8 years to Redjedef, which cannot be verified with contemporaneous data. The only dated inscription from Redjedef’s reign is a mason’s graffito found on a block of his pyramid at Abu Rowash which reads rnp.t sp l “Year of the 1st occurrence.” Manetho’s and Pseudo-Apollodorus’/Pseudo-Eratosthenes’ information can be traced back to a common figure, i.e., 15 years. In order to get the 25 years provided by Manetho, a ten was added to these 15 years, whereas the 13 years in the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes suffered from a scribal error (iti’ ← ie’ or—should the original figure *15 years, XY months, AB days have been rounded up to *16 years—iti’ ← it’).

Manetho assigns 22 years to Βίχερις, Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes 10 years to Βιρης. Wolfgang Helck already postulated that Manetho’s 22 years derived from an original 2 years improved by two tens; Pseudo-Apollodorus’/Pseudo-Eratosthenes’ 10 years should be interpreted as 2 years to which a ten was added before the units were lost (*2 → *12 → 10). The figure in the Royal Canon of Turin is lost, and there are not any known contemporaneous dates. All building activities at Baka’s pyramid at Zawyet el-Aryan stopped when the superstructure had hardly been started, so his reign must have been very short. Manetho’s figure thus preserves a hint for determining Baka’s true length of reign, which perhaps lasted for only approximately 1–2 years.

Shepseskaf (Σεβερχέρης) and Thamphthis (Θαμφθίς) are said to have ruled 7 years and 9 years respectively. Helck and Jürgen von Beckerath proposed a chain of exchanges which finally led to the figures attested for the last four kings of Manetho’s Fourth Dynasty:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Royal Canon of Turin</th>
<th>Manetho, Aegyptiaca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Ρατοίςης 8 &gt; 9</td>
<td>25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βίχερις *7</td>
<td>22 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σεβερχέρης 4 &gt; 5</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θαμφθίς 2</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>22 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This scenario is, however, rather doubtful because an inattentive scribe may have switched the figures of two kings in the process of copying—but how should two blocks of figures have swapped positions? Moreover, the figures

---

204 Vallogia, “La descenderie,” 419.
205 Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 53.
207 Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 53; von Beckerath, Chronologie, 157 and “IV. Dynastie,” 117.
of Redjedef and Baka have already been explained differently, and an original figure of 7 years for Baka seems unacceptably high.\textsuperscript{208} After all, an alternative explanation for Shepseska\’s and Djedefptah\’s figures is required. This alternative solution will, however, become evident only if the introduction of “king” Djedefptah, who actually never reigned, into the various Egyptian king-lists can be explained.\textsuperscript{209}

**Excursus II The Third and Fourth Dynasties in the Royal Canon of Turin**

The Royal Canon of Turin (Papyrus Turin 1874 verso)\textsuperscript{210} is the only extant ancient Egyptian king-list containing both the kings’ names and their lengths of reign. Unfortunately, the fragmentary state of preservation renders it particularly difficult, on the one hand, to reconstruct the sequence of kings and the lengths of their reigns and, on the other hand, to trace the line of tradition of the king-list itself. Kim Ryholt\textsuperscript{211} suggested that the historiographical sections\textsuperscript{212} of the Royal Canon of Turin were composed with the aid of five sources in the early New Kingdom (Eighteenth Dynasty):\textsuperscript{213}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Characteristics (reckoning of years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>First–Second Dynasties</td>
<td>years, months, days; age of king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Third–Sixth Dynasties</td>
<td>years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Seventh–Tenth Dynasties</td>
<td>years, months, days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Eleventh Dynasty</td>
<td>years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Twelfth–Eighteenth Dynasties</td>
<td>years, months, days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{209} Cf. Excursus II and section 6 below.


\textsuperscript{212} Cf. for the dynasties of gods, demigods, and spirits recounted before the human kings according to Egyptian tradition Sethe, *Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte*, 3–21; Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 1–8; Ryholt, “Turin King-List,” I39 (with further references).

\textsuperscript{213} If the king-list once covered Egyptian history down to the Nineteenth Dynasty (Málek, “Original Version”; Ryholt, *Political Situation*, 30), it is necessary either to assume a correspondingly late date of compilation or, which seems by far more plausible, to assume at least one stage of actualizing or expanding a *Rumpf­liste* by adding those kings who ruled in the more recent past.
Especially if one considers the immediate Vorlage, which can be reconstructed on the basis of the distribution of the formula\footnote{214} jrj.n=f m nįświjj.t “he exercised kingship,”\footnote{215} this appears too simple. With Djoser’s reign (col. 4.5), which actually opened a column in the deduced Vorlage, the words rnp.t “year,” šbd “month,” hrww “day,” and ‘ḫw=f m ‘nh “his lifetime,” are repeated. This makes sense only if the slavishly working copyist expected further data which would require these points of reference for ditto-marks. It is thus plausible that this scribe, or maybe already one of his immediate precursors, simply left out information on months and days of the lengths of reign and the kings’ lifespan in larger sections, perhaps resuming to include months and days after a break or the next day.\footnote{216} Moreover, it cannot be proven that all five sources were combined in a single act of composition. An older Rumpfliste which included only the kings until the early Middle Kingdom, which later on was supplemented in several steps, may thus be proposed already for the Twelfth Dynasty, in particular for the reign of Sesostris I.\footnote{217} This thesis is founded on two observations:

(1) The early Twelfth Dynasty in particular developed a substantial interest in the past in order to legitimate its own rule and to connect itself ideologically to the Old Kingdom.\footnote{218} This becomes obvious, \textit{e.g.}, in royal funerary architecture,\footnote{219} in the re-adoption of Pyramid


\footnote{215} This formula was found in the immediate Vorlage of the Royal Canon of Turin only with the first entry of a column or the first king of a dynasty, whereas all other entries displayed only a ditto-mark. The scribe who copied the Royal Canon of Turin inattentively reproduced his Vorlage without adjusting this formula’s position to the changed outline of his copy. Cf. Málek, “Original Version”; Ryholt, Political Situation, 30–31.

\footnote{216} This cannot, of course, replace Ryholt’s observation that changes in the mode of presenting lengths of reign and dynastic divisions largely coincide (the transitions themselves are, however, lost and there are exceptions contradicting Ryholt’s conclusions, \textit{e.g.}, king Teti at the beginning of the Sixth Dynasty), but it may supplement his proposal (cf. the immediately preceding note).

\footnote{217} Cf. Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus, 66, n. 372, 81, n. 433.

\footnote{218} Cf. Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige; Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 147–63.

\footnote{219} \textit{E.g.}, the mortuary temple of Sesostris I (Arnold, Lisht 1 and Lisht 3), which is an almost perfect copy of the mortuary temples built during the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties (Maragioglio and Rinaldi, Piramidi menfjite; Stadelmann, Pyramiden).
Texts arranged in an Old Kingdom manner,\textsuperscript{220} in numerous references to old and venerable sources when authoritative decisions concerning the administrative and political organization had to be made,\textsuperscript{221} and in literary texts, which mention a king or a legendary sage who lived (or is said to have lived) in the Old Kingdom, and establish thereby a setting in the “good old days.”\textsuperscript{222}

(2) It is important to point out two phenomena which until now have not received appropriate attention. On the one hand, Sesostris I imitated the mode of dating known from Old Kingdom documents, \textit{i.e.}, naming years after the census. One of his edifices belonging to the temple of Amun in Karnak bears an inscription which begins \textit{rnp.t-sp m-ḥt 9 ḫbd 4 prj.t św 24 “Regnal year after the 9th, fourth month of winter, day 24.”}\textsuperscript{223} This is evidently an unsuccessful attempt to proclaim a date in the fashion of the Old Kingdom, because \textit{m-ḥt “after” should have followed \textit{rnp.t “year} and preceded \textit{sp “occurrence.” The authors of this inscription were without a doubt unaware of the biennial nature of census-cycles,\textsuperscript{224} and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{220} \textit{E.g.}, the Pyramid Texts of Sesostris-ankh, which, in fact, are nothing but the reused text corpus of king Unas in its first draft (\textit{cf.} Hayes, \textit{Texts in the Mastaba of Seʾn-wosretʾ-ʾankh}; Kahl, “Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Verhältnis”). These texts were most probably prepared for king Sesostris I himself but abandoned for unknown reasons. Finally, they were used by Sesostris-ankh, who was probably responsible for research on and the preparation of this text corpus (Gundacker, “Königliche Pyramidentexte”).
\item \textsuperscript{221} \textit{E.g.}, land surveying and defining the boundaries of nomes and districts according to ancient writings as is recorded in the (auto)biography of Chnumhotep II of Beni Hasan (lin. 39–46, \textit{cf.} Newberry and Griffith, \textit{Beni Hasan I}, pl. xxv; \textit{Urk. VII}, 27: 11–16; Kamrin, \textit{Cosmos of Khnumhotep II}).
\item \textsuperscript{222} \textit{E.g.}, didactic literature such as the instructions said to be composed by Ptahhotep (Žába, \textit{Ptahhotep}; \textit{cf.} for the problem of authorship Moers, “Der ‗Autor‘ und sein ‗Werk‘”), Hordjedef (Helck, \textit{Lehre des Djedefhor}; Posener, “Lehre des Djedefhor”; \textit{cf.} n. 238 below), Kagemni (although the beginning is lost, one can conjecture that the instructing father and his addressed son share the name Kagemni; Jéquier, \textit{Papyrus Prasse}; Gardiner, “Instruction”), \textit{etc.}, or the \textit{Forecast of Neferty} (\textit{cf.} Helck, \textit{Prophezeiung des Neferti}). The \textit{Instruction for Kagemni} and the \textit{Forecast of Neferty} are set in the reign of Snefru, who, because of his name Śnfrw ~ “benefactor” (Osing, \textit{Nominalbildung I}, 185; Schenkel, \textit{Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung}, 176; \textit{cf.} n. 113–117 above), was worshipped as a philanthropic and charitable god (\textit{cf.} for the cult of Snefru, Wildung, \textit{Rolle ägyptischer Könige}, 104–52; Schnitz, \textit{Königssohn}, 141–58; Gundacker, \textit{Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snefrus}, 83–101, 247–52; \textit{cf.} also n. 121 above). \textit{Cf. AEL I}.
\item \textsuperscript{223} Gabolde, \textit{Grande château}, 40–42.
\item \textsuperscript{224} That knowledge of the nature of the eponymous census had ceased with the end of the Heracleopolitan Dynasties (\textit{i.e.}, Ninth to Tenth, \textit{cf.} Seidlmayer, “Zwei Anmerkungen”)
furthermore the word *rnp.t-sp*, in the Old Kingdom a genitival syntagma “Year of the occurrence,” had become a *terminus technicus* for “regnal year” via univerbation and lexicalization.\(^{225}\) It was therefore no longer feasible to split up the, now, *juxtaposition rnp.t-sp* in order to insert the preposition *m-ḥt* “after.” On the other hand, the Royal Canon of Turin displays a totally haphazard distribution of the words *rnp.t* “year” and *rnp.t-sp* “regnal year” when introducing the actual lengths of reign, which particularly affects the entries of the Third and Fourth Dynasties.\(^{226}\) This may have had its roots in two phenomena: (a) The king-list was compiled from different sources, some of which provided the actual lengths of reign as periods of time (thus introduced with simple *rnp.t* “year”), while others mentioned the kings’ dates of death (thus introduced with *rnp.t-sp* “regnal year,” originally *rnp.t sp* “Year of the occurrence” and *rnp.t m-ḥt sp* “Year after the occurrence”). (b) Inattentive scribes subsequently transmitting the king-list mixed up the words *rnp.t* “year” and *rnp.t-sp* “regnal year”. The most obvious reason for doing so was certainly that those figures denoting lengths of reign bore a great resemblance to proper dates and, at least to a certain degree, *rnp.t* “year” and *rnp.t-sp* “regnal year.” had become synonymous.\(^{227}\)

Furthermore becomes evident when an inscription of Tuthmosis III in his Jubilee Temple (*ḥ-mnw*) is considered (cf. Carlotti, L’Akh-menou; Pecoil, L’Akh-menou). At the very beginning of this inscription, the date recorded reads *rnp.t-sp m-ḥt 23* “Regnal year after the 23rd” (Urk. IV, 1251: 11; cf. Gardiner, “Regnal Years,” 16). The Jubilee Temple (*ḥ-mnw*) replaced an older building, possibly from the Middle Kingdom, and this inscription of Tuthmosis III is thus probably nothing but a slightly revised copy of a Middle Kingdom text. In fact, to a great extent, it is *verbatim* identical to the text from Sesostris I’s edifice which contains the already mentioned date *rnp.t-sp m-ḥt 9* “Regnal year after the 9th.” The date found with the inscription of Tuthmosis III is thus another (indirect) witness for the lack of knowledge of Middle Kingdom scribes concerned with the study of ancient texts and the composition of archaizing texts. But this inscription proves furthermore that all knowledge about the Old Kingdom system of counting census-cycles instead of regnal years had been lost irreversibly by the time of the Twelfth Dynasty and that this knowledge was never regained again.


\(^{226}\) Gardiner, *Royal Canon*, 15, n. i.17 b, 16, n. 111.2 b.

\(^{227}\) There is not the slightest trace of *rnp.t-sp* “regnal year” outside dates, *i.e.*, used in order to denote properly spans of time. It is, however, imaginable that the simple *rnp.t* “year” was at least used informally instead of *rnp.t-sp* “regnal year” in order to denote the year in dates. Cf. Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 334. In addition, Fecht emphasized that the “circular threshing floor covered with grain”
In fact, either phenomenon is easily imaginable, and most probably both took place in sequence: To begin with, diverse sources (Teillisten and archive materials) provided two fundamentally different sets of data for rather short sequences of kings. On the surface, these sets of data were only distinguishable through the variation \( rnp.t \) “year” (lengths of reign) vs. \( rnp.t-sp \) “regnal year” (dates of death).\(^{228}\) The significance thereof was minimal for all entries of kings belonging to the Middle Kingdom and later periods,\(^{229}\) and the regnal years of all kings belonging to the First to Third Dynasties, who did not count census-cycles, but instead named their regnal years after diverse eponymous events, needed to be counted anyway (e.g., from the royal annals or comparable year-lists).\(^{230}\) But the records of the kings of the Old Kingdom, i.e., the Fourth to Sixth Dynasties,\(^{231}\) were severely affected by this confusion of dates of death and lengths of reign: dates of death (census-cycles) should have been converted into lengths of reigns (regnal years), which, owing to the fact that already Sesostris I was unable


\(^{229}\) With respect to the kings of the Middle Kingdom, the then used system of ante-dating would cause a date of death mistakenly recognized as a length of reign to elongate the actual reign: If, e.g., a king died in his 10th regnal year, he actually reigned 8 full years [years 2–9] + the incomplete accession year [year 1 in the Middle Kingdom] + the incomplete year of death = c. 9 years. The date of death wrongly interpreted as a reign covering 10 full years plus the months and days defined by the date of death would yield a length of reign exceeding the historically correct length of reign by about one and a half years; exceptionally short accession and death years may increase this mistake to almost two years, rather long ones may diminish it towards nil). Cf. Gardiner, “Regnal Years”; von Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 10–11; Hornung, Krauss, and Warburton, “Methods of Dating,” 46.

\(^{230}\) It is unpredictable how periods like the Second Dynasty (Kahl, “Dynasties 0–2,” 107) were treated, which principally knew regular census-cycles and years named after them (even years), but in which all odd years were still named after a great variety of eponymous events (cf. the royal annals, Wilkinson, *Royal Annals, passim*; Baud, “Les frontiers”).

\(^{231}\) And probably also the kings of the early First Intermediate Period (Seventh to Tenth Dynasties), who adhered to the Memphite tradition, cf. Hornung, Krauss, and Warburton, “Methods of Dating,” 46; Fecht, “Lesung von Regierungsjahr.”
to correctly replicate an Old Kingdom date formula, cannot have been done in the Middle Kingdom. As a consequence, census-cycles were misinterpreted as regnal years, thereby shortening the actual lengths of reign—in the worst case by 50%. One should nevertheless keep in mind that there might have been short king-lists (Teillisten) covering rather limited sequences of kings, which were compiled prior to the Middle Kingdom and thus converted correctly, or corrected by means of comparison with excerpts from or copies of the Old Kingdom royal annals, although, at the moment, this remains mere speculation.232

An examination of the passage concerning the Third and Fourth Dynasties as found in the Royal Canon of Turin will reveal the importance of this observation:233

RCT 4.4  [njkswt-bjt Nb-kꜢ<kJ-
RꜤw> <jrj.m=f m njswij.t> 19 [rnp.wt-sp]
King of [Upper] and Lower Egypt Nebka<re>; <he exercised kingship for> 19 [regnal years].

RCT 4.5  njswt-bjt Ḍšr-jt jrj.m=f m njswij.t 19 rnp.wt-sp ḫbd.w hrww.w ḫꜤw=f m ḫnḫ [///]
King of Upper and Lower Egypt Djoser-it; <he exercised kingship for> 19 regnal years, XY months, AB days, his age: [///].

RCT 4.6  [njswt-bjt] Ḍšr-tj <jrj.m=f m njswij.t> 6 <rnp.wt-sp>
[King of Upper and Lower Egypt] Djoser-ti; <he exercised kingship for> 6 <regnal years>.

232 This is of particular importance if the change between the Old Kingdom mode of post-dating (accession year = mathematically year 0, counting of census-cycles) and the Middle Kingdom mode of ante-dating (accession year = year 1, counting of regnal years) is a difference between the Memphite-Heracleopolitan tradition (Fourth to Tenth Dynasties) and the Theban tradition (Eleventh to Twelfth Dynasties) as seems probable (Gardiner, “Regnal Years”; von Beckerath, Chronologie, 10–11; Hornung, Krauss, and Warburton, “Methods of Dating,” 46). The endeavor of the Twelfth Dynasty to connect itself to the Memphite-Heracleopolitan tradition may thus have caused some kind of fusion and confusion of those two main traditions. The Royal Canon of Turin is accordingly expected to contain elements of either line of tradition. Cf. section 6 below.

233 Gardiner, Royal Canon, pl. 11; Farina, Papiro, pl. 111; The designations of columns and lines follow Helck, “Anmerkungen” and Ryholt, Political Situation, 9, n. 9 and “Turin King-List,” 136. Cf. furthermore section 6 below.
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RCT 4.7  
\textit{njśwt-bjt} [\textit{Hw-}]dḫ3 \textit{jrj.n=f m njświj.t} 6 rnp.wt-sp
King of Upper and Lower Egypt “lost”; \textit{he exercised kingship for} 6 regnal years.

RCT 4.8  
[\textit{njśwt-}]bjt \textit{Hw[ŋ]} ěnh.w \textit{wdš.w šnb.w} \textit{jrj.n=f m njświj.t} 24 rnp.wt-sp [\textit{jw=f}] <\textit{m}> pȝ-jkdw Śšm-///
King of [Upper] and Lower Egypt Huni, may he live, be sound and healthy, \textit{he exercised kingship for} 24 regnal years; He is the builder of Seshem-///

RCT 4.9  
[\textit{njśwt-}]bjt Śnfr<\textit{w}> \textit{jrj.n=f m njświj.t} 24 rnp.wt-sp
King of [Upper] and Lower Egypt Snefru; \textit{he exercised kingship for} 24 regnal years.

RCT 4.10  
[\textit{njśwt-bjt} Hwʃ=f-wj<\textit{jrj.n=f m njświj.t} 23 rnp.wt-sp
[King of Upper and Lower Egypt Cheops;] \textit{he exercised kingship for} 23 regnal years.

RCT 4.11  
[\textit{njśwt-bjt} Rʃw-jdd=f<\textit{jrj.n=f m njświj.t} 8 rnp.wt-sp
[King of Upper and Lower Egypt Redjedef;] \textit{he exercised kingship for} 8 regnal years.

RCT 4.12  
[\textit{njśwt-bjt} Hʃʃ]=f-Rʃw<\textit{jrj.n=f m njświj.t} [26?] rnp.wt
[King of Upper and Lower Egypt Che[phren;] \textit{he exercised kingship for} [26?] years.

RCT 4.13  
\textit{njśwt-bjt} [\textit{Bš-kš-Rʃw}]<\textit{jrj.n=f m njświj.t} [2?] rnp.wt
[King of Upper and Lower Egypt Bakare;] \textit{he exercised kingship for} [2?] years.

RCT 4.14  
[\textit{njśwt-}]bjt [\textit{Mn-kš-w-Rʃw}] \textit{jrj.n=f m njświj.t} [2]8 rnp.wt
[King of Upper] and Lower Egypt [Mycerinus;] \textit{he exercised kingship for} [2]8 years.

RCT 4.15  
[\textit{njśwt-bjt} Špšš-kš-Rʃw]<\textit{jrj.n=f m njświj.t} 4 rnp.wt
[King of Upper and Lower Egypt Shepseskaf;] \textit{he exercised kingship for} 4 years.

RCT 4.16  
[\textit{njśwt-bjt} *Ptḥ-jdd=f]<\textit{jrj.n=f m njświj.t} 2 rnp.wt
[King of Upper and Lower Egypt Djedefptah;] \textit{he exercised kingship for} 2 years.
As was noted by Alan Gardiner, the Fourth Dynasty is divided into two groups, one of which is rather close to the Third Dynasty, displaying figures introduced with *rnp.t-sp* “regnal year” (Nebkare (4.4) to Redjedef (4.11)), while the other displays figures introduced with simple *rnp.t* “year” (Chephren (4.12) to Djedefptah (4.16)). It is of paramount importance to stress that these groups are reflected in both Manetho’s *Aegyptiaca* and Pseudo-Apollodorus’/Pseudo-Eratosthenes’ king-lists. The entries of the earlier group, at least those of Snefru to Redjedef, must therefore be regarded as containing figures which are actually census-cycles misinterpreted as plain years. In contrast, the figures of Chephren to Djedefptah reflect truthfully regnal years which have been converted correctly from census-cycles. These remarkable peculiarities allow one to get a first impression of what the process of composing the section of the Royal Canon of Turin which contains the entries on the Third and Fourth Dynasties may have looked like.

Unfortunately, the section of the Royal Canon of Turin on the Fourth Dynasty is preserved in a regrettably bad condition, which produces additional difficulties: First, the only names of kings belonging to the Fourth Dynasty which are preserved at least partially are those of Snefru (4.9) and Chephren (4.12). Nevertheless, the missing names can be reconstructed by aid of the contemporaneous evidence, which at least allows for the determination of the sequence of kings. Second, Nebka (4.4), Baka (4.13), and Shepseskaf (4.16) must have been mentioned by their younger name forms (*Nb-kꜢ* → *Nb-kꜢ-RꜤw*, *BꜢ-kꜢ=j* → *BꜢ-kꜢ-RꜤw*, *Špśś-kꜢ=f* → *Špśś-kꜢ-RꜤw*) based on the form of the entry of Userkaf, the first king of the Fifth Dynasty, whose name is preserved as *[Wašr-]kꜢ-[RꜤw] ← Wašr-

---

236 Cf. sections 4.2 and 5.2 above.
238 Cf. the additional conclusions in section 6.

There are a few king-lists from the Fourth and Fifth Dynasties themselves which are found on monuments of members of the royal family or of high officials. However, these have not been composed as historiographic documents, but for other individual purposes. Cf. the brief discussion in n. 321.

240 The “sun disk” (Gardiner sign-list N5) was left out erroneously together with the opening of the cartouche; cf. Farina, *Papiro*, 23–24; Wildung, *Rolle ägyptischer Könige*, 57; Ryholt, “Turin King-List,” 149; cf. furthermore n. 165 above.
Third, the Royal Canon of Turin unquestionably lists an additional king at the very end of the Fourth Dynasty, who followed Shepseskaf. Unfortunately, the name of this king is lost without a trace, but he is usually equated with Manetho’s (Djedefptah; ((*)Ddj=f-Pth ← *Pth-jdd=f)). This assumption should, however, be viewed critically as long as there are no comparable personal names which were graecized in a comparable manner.

The historicity and identity of Djedefptah are highly dubious, and, in fact, there probably never existed a king of this name. A crucial piece of evidence is the Prunkscheintür of Ptahshepses from Saqqara, which displays an early example of a(n) (auto)biographical inscription. This remarkable text is arranged in eight columns, each of which corresponds to a stage of Ptahshepses’ life. The composition and layout of this inscription suggest that each column was furthermore linked to the reign of a king under whom Ptahshepses lived. The names of the first four kings, (1) Mycerinus, (2) Shepseskaf, (3) Userkaf, and (4) Sahure, are preserved, those destroyed are (5) Neferirkare, (6) Shepseskare, (7) Neferefre, and (8) Newoserre. Ptahshepses was appointed priest in Newoserre’s solar temple, but most probably did not outlive the latter’s reign. Newoserre can thus be determined to be the last king mentioned in Ptahshepses’ (auto-)biography. The layout and intention of this inscription demonstrate that Ptahshepses included in his (auto)biographical inscription all the kings whose reigns he saw in order to demonstrate his exceptional renown and prestige at the royal court. One may therefore deduce that there was no king Djedefptah (Θαμφθίς) whose reign could have intervened between those of the kings Shepseskaf and Userkaf. Moreover, this is substantiated by the fact that not the slightest trace of Djedefptah has been found to date, no inscriptional

242 Baud’s suggestion (Baud, Famille royale II, no. 186 [p. 548]; cf. also Helck, “Gedanken”) that the Royal Canon of Turin mentioned Baufre and Hordjedef as the last two kings of the Fourth Dynasty must be rejected (cf. Ryholt, Political Situation, 17–18, n. 32). As long as there is no hint pointing to the omission of Shepseskaf, he should be considered as the penultimate king of the Fourth Dynasty according to the Royal Canon of Turin (cf. Jánosi, Giza in der 4. Dynastie, 64–65). This is moreover in line with the Manethonian tradition, which also adds only one king after Shepseskaf.
mention of him, of his funerary monument or any domain he founded, not even a single seal impression—simply nothing.\footnote{Von Beckerath, Chronologie, 159; Verner, “Archaeological Remarks,” 385.}

The origins of “king” Djedefptah (Θαμφθίς) must therefore be searched for elsewhere. It has indeed been suggested\footnote{E.g., Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 24–25, 52–53 and “Gedanken”; Roccati, Littérature, 55–56; Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 25, 237; Verner, “Archaeological Remarks,” 384–85; cf. the critical remarks of Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 159–61, 164–67, 212.} that this “king” originated in the popular tradition as manifest in the stories of Papyrus Westcar (Second Intermediate Period),\footnote{This particular version of the stories itself must predate this copy, but it is unclear when it was composed (perhaps in the Thirteenth Dynasty? cf. Franke, Heiligtum des Heqaib, 69–70 and n. 310 further below). Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 159–61, 212; Hays, “Historicity”; Mathieu, “Les contes du Papyrus Westcar”; Goedicke, “Thoughts”; Jenni, “Papyrus Westcar”; cf. also Erman, Papyrus Westcar; Lepper, Untersuchungen.} a graffito found in the Wadi Hammamat (Twelfth Dynasty),\footnote{Drioton, “Liste des rois”; Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 25.} and the Abusir king-list (Nineteenth Dynasty).\footnote{LD II, 152d; Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 25–26.} The graffito from the Wadi Hammamat mentions, in this sequence, the kings Cheops (Hwj=f-wj), Redjedef (RꜤw-jḏd=f), Chephren (ḪꜤj=f-RꜤw), Hordjedef (𝐇rw-jḏd=f),\footnote{This name can be assigned to the same grammatical pattern as Redjedef’s on grounds of its graecized form: Hrw-jḏd=f ~ *Hārūw-jạḏādăf > *Hārē-dādēf > *Hār-dōdēf ~ -aṛṭwṣ (preserved in Πετεαρτ ῦτης ~ PꜢ-ḏjw-Hrw-( j)ḏd=f, cf. Preisigke, Namenbuch, 312; Foraboschi, Onomasticum IV, 251; cf. for Demotic attestations Tait, Papyri from Tebtynis, 33–35; Aufrère, “Les anciens Égyptiens et leur notion de l’antiquité” and “Manéthôn de Sebennytos, médiateur,” 332–33). However, Hrw-jḏd=f must not be confused with Ḥrw-Dḥw’tj ~ *Hārūw-Dḥwāwtįj > *Hār-Dḥōwtē ~ ἀρδῶ(υ)τῆς, ἀρδῶ(υ)θῆς (Preisigke, Namenbuch, 47; Foraboschi, Onomasticum I, 47–48), which always displays an aspirate -δ- (< -dh-; cf. Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 84; Schenkel, “Ist Mythos,” 560, 573) but otherwise looks quite the same. Cf. Osing, Nominalbildung, 185; Schenkel, Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung, 174; cf. for the verbal form (circumstantial śdm=f) section 5.1 (in particular nn. 151–152) above and for the suppression of word-final labials in Greek transcriptions n. 153.} and Baufre (BꜢ<w>=f-RꜤw, but apparently spelled as if RꜤw-bꜢ=f was intended), which is almost exactly the sequence of dramatis personae in Papyrus Westcar: king Cheops listens to the stories of his sons, princes Redjedef, Chephren, Baufre, and Hordjedef.\footnote{Cf. Christophe, “Les quatre plus illustres fils”; Baud, Famille royale, 11, no. 186 [p. 548]; Ryholt, Political Situation, 17–18, n. 32; Seidlmayer, “Dynasty 3.”} Redjedef and Chephren actually ascended to the throne, Hordjedef was venerated as the author of an
instruction,253 but Baufre is otherwise unknown.254 If Hordjedef had already been viewed as king by the time of the Middle Kingdom (Twelfth Dynasty), one would expect him to be addressed as king in his instruction, which was part of the official Middle Kingdom corpus of literature. This is evidently not the case, so that neither Hordjedef nor Baufre are expected in the Middle Kingdom version of the Royal Canon of Turin. They may, however, have been incorporated in this king-list during the late Second Intermediate Period or New Kingdom. One would then expect Baka (BꜢꜢ-kꜢꜢ-f → BꜢꜢ-kꜢꜢ-RꜢw) and Baufre (BꜢw=f-RꜢw ← RꜢw-bꜢꜢ-f) to have been amalgamated because of the similarity of their names255 and that Hordjedef was added either in the position assigned to him in the Wadi Hammamat graffito or, even more likely, at the very end of the Fourth Dynasty. Accordingly, one would expect a “king” Hordjedef in the Royal Canon of Turin, but Helck256 pointed out that the dynasty of gods at the very beginning of the king-list must have undergone some kind of redactional adaptation in the New Kingdom (Ramesside Period). As a result, the goddesses of the Heliopolitan Ennead, who once formed part of the First Dynasty of gods, were deleted, and the supreme Memphite god Ptah was inserted in the first place as the universal creator god.257 In the course of this process, Hordjedef’s name was altered to Djedefptah by substituting Horus with Ptah.258


254 Cf. Jánosi, Giza in der 4. Dynastie, 64–65. There is, however, a wooden tablet from the late Eighteenth to early Nineteenth Dynasty in the Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien (KHM ÄOS 3924, verso 4; el-Kholi, Papyri und Ostraca, 59–61) which records in a list of personal names a man called BꜢw=f-RꜢw. Since this name and this type of personal names are otherwise unknown, this instance must represent an allusion to the stories found in Papyrus Westcar, even though the reason for this as well as the details of literary reception and tradition remain unknown.

255 This would require a rather early addition of the theonym RꜢw to Baka’s name, which is totally in line with the hypothesis proposed above that bipartite names were altered first. Cf. furthermore n. 165.

256 Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 4–8; cf. Lloyd, Herodotus Book II, 1, 186.

257 The theological concept described in the text known from the Shabaqa Stone (Sethe, Dramatische Texte), which is perhaps a creation of the Ramesside Period, similarly describes Ptah as the universal creator god substantiating all other cosmogonical myths as well. Cf., e.g., Luft, Historisierung der Götterwelt, 146–52; Allen, Genesis, 43–44; Hawary, Wortschöpfung, 92–111 (with numerous additional references).

258 Cf. Hayes, Scepter of Egypt 1, 66.
of this, Hordjedef \( \rightarrow \) Djedefptah (with at least one intermediate step),\(^{259}\) is still found in Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* (\( \Theta\alpha\mu\varphi\beta\iota\varsigma \)).\(^ {260}\)

With the inclusion of Hordjedef (\( \rightarrow \) Djedefptah) into an earlier version of the Royal Canon of Turin, another principal problem arose: This newly introduced king required a length of reign. There were basically three options for providing Hordjedef (\( \rightarrow \) Djedefptah) with a figure:

(a) the deletion of another king in order to assign the then spare figure to Hordjedef (\( \rightarrow \) Djedefptah),

(b) the division of another king's figure in order to assign him and the newly introduced Hordjedef (\( \rightarrow \) Djedefptah) the shares, which furthermore would have the advantage of keeping correct totals for the respective dynasties, and

(c) simply to invent a figure and to recalculate the totals afterwards.

Alternative (a) can be excluded because there is no king of the Fourth Dynasty missing, and alternative (c) is, although possible, unlikely with respect to the overall scrutiny with which the king-lists were treated. This leaves only alternative (b), and, in fact, there even is positive evidence in favor of this option: Shepseskaf's reign is numbered 4 years in the Royal Canon of Turin, but 7 years by Manetho. All contemporaneous evidence is, unfortunately, inconclusive, because the highest attested date is *rnp.t m-ḥt sp tpj* “Year after the first occurrence.”\(^ {261}\) Shepseskaf's funerary monument, the Mastaba Faraun,\(^ {262}\) is rather modest in size, but its superstructure, a Butic mastaba, and the mortuary temple were finished as intended.\(^ {263}\) The preparation of the building site and the subterranean chamber system, which in this case was built in an open pit prior to the erection of the superstructure, are usually considered as taking

\(^{259}\) Djedefptah (\( \mathcal{D}dj=f\cdotPtḥ \leftarrow \mathcal{P}tḥ-jḍḏ=f \leftarrow \mathcal{H}rw-jḍḏ=f \), cf. n. 175 above) is thus an apparent *Neubildung* of the New Kingdom (Ramesside Period?), which also replaced the older grammatical pattern *theonym-ṣḏm=f* circumstantial with the younger pattern *ṣḏm=f* subjunctive/perfective-theonym; cf. nn. 151–152 above.


two years.\textsuperscript{264} Even though the volume of masonry of the Mastaba Faraun is only one tenth of that of Mycerinus’ pyramid, it seems unachievable to finish the funerary complex within only two more years. It is thus plausible to assume that an original figure of *6 years, XY months, and AB days was first simplified to 6 years and then split up in the Royal Canon of Turin. Of these, 4 years were assigned to Shepseskaf, and 2 years were assigned to Hordjedef (→ Djedefptah). In another line of tradition, the original figure of *6 years, XY months, and AB days was rounded up, thus providing the 7 years recorded by Manetho.\textsuperscript{265}

The figures found in the Royal Canon of Turin require yet another remark: The lengths of reign assigned to the kings of the Third and early Fourth Dynasties influenced one another and finally produced pairs of equal figures: Nebka(re) (4.3) and Djoser-it (4.4) are each assigned 19 years, Djoser-ti (4.5) and the king (4.6) whose name was lost (“Hudjefa,” i.e., Neferka(re)) are each assigned 6 years, Huni (4.7) and Snefru (4.8) are each assigned 24 years; it is furthermore interesting that Cheops (4.9) is assigned 23 years, which may be influenced by the figures of his immediate predecessors. It is highly improbable that these six (seven) figures are accurate and chronologically correct as they stand. In fact, Djoser’s reign, which probably lasted for a period of 29 years,\textsuperscript{266} suffered the erroneous transfer of a ten to Nebka’s original 9 years. Huni’s reign may furthermore be traced back to an original 14 years, which then became wrongly aligned to Snefru’s 24 years (< census-cycles).\textsuperscript{267} It is unfortunately impossible to date these mistakes of nivellement or intentional alterations because the later king-lists of Manetho and Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes suffered persistently from the addition and subtraction of tens. However, at least some of them must already have occurred in the early stages of handing down the Middle Kingdom Rumpfliste of the Royal Canon of Turin.

\textsuperscript{264} Stadelmann, “Länge der Regierung Snofrus,” 234. It is unclear why the chamber system was left in an apparently unfinished state (this is emphasized as an argument in favor of a reign which lasted only 4 years by Verner, “Archaeological Remarks,” 384). Given that it was manageable to prepare the chamber system, after its shell had been finished and while the superstructure of the Butic mastaba was under construction, this unfinished state more probably indicates some kind of revision of the outline or the design of the chamber system than the inability of achieving the intended aim because of the king’s early death.

\textsuperscript{265} Cf. Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus, 86–87.


\textsuperscript{267} Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus, 79.
6  Manetho the Compiler and His Sources

The reexamination of the names and figures provided in the king-lists of Manetho’s Aegyptiaca, of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes, and of the Royal Canon of Turin revealed a notable discrepancy concerning the figures of Snefru, Cheops, and Redjedef. On the one hand, the kings of the Third Manethonian Dynasty, the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes, and—except for Snefru, Cheops, and Redjedef—the kings of the Fourth Manethonian Dynasty, and of the Third and Fourth Dynasties in the Royal Canon of Turin apparently show figures of regnal years which were correctly converted from census-cycles. But on the other hand, bare numbers of census-cycles are ascribed to Snefru, Cheops, and Redjedef in the Fourth Manethonian Dynasty and in the Royal Canon of Turin. This allows for the following provisional reconstruction of the sources used for the compilation of the king-lists of Manetho and Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes respectively (cf. Table 4.1).

This synopsis reveals that the Vorlagen used by Manetho for his Third and Fourth Dynasties were, on the one hand, closely related to the Vorlage of the king-list quoted by Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes and, on the other hand, to the Royal Canon of Turin. It becomes obvious from the names of the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes that the “Herodotean Giza-group” is a secondary alteration either by the compiler of this list or an early copyist. It is, however, remarkable that only the names of Cheops (Σαῶφις) and Chephren (Σαῶφις β’) were introduced anew, whereas the entry of Mycerinus was left in its correct position in the list. Mycerinus served thus as a fixed point, and it is for that reason that those three kings, now forming the “Herodotean Giza-group,” are located towards the end of the Fourth Dynasty. This, and the duplicate of Cheops (Χνοῦβος), which remained in place, allows for the conclusion that, even to the newly construed

268 During the Third Dynasty, the kings still named their regnal years after eponymous events. The lengths of reign were therefore not calculated, but determined by counting the years as recorded in archives, annals, etc.

269 Explanatory notes for Table 4.1: Numbers in brackets preceding the kings’ names allow for the equation of kings between the king-lists. The sequence of kings of the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes and of Manetho’s Vorlage follows the reconstructed double columns, cf. section 4.1 above.


271 On the contrary, Manetho used Cheops as the point of reference and thus kept him in place. He then relocated Chephren and Mycerinus and formed his “Herodotean Giza-group” right at the beginning of his Fourth Dynasty.
“Herodotean Giza-group,” the figures previously found with the original entries of Cheops and Chephren were assigned. Cheops’ original mention was then overlooked and erroneously remained in the text. As a consequence, one king, i.e., Djedefptah, needed to be dropped in order to keep a predefined number of kings. And ultimately, Shepseskaf’s mention was lost accidentally, perhaps when the entire Fifth Dynasty fell away for an unknown reason.

Manetho’s Vorlage A, although closely related to the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes, was independently emended as may be deduced from the position of Μέσωχρις when compared to that of Μάρης in the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes. Μάρης was reintroduced into the king-list in his proper place, thereby replacing the ancient Egyptian terminus technicus “wšf” “left out,” which is still found in the Royal Canon of Turin as “king” Ḥw-ḏfꜢ and in the Abydos king-list as “king” Śḏś; both names are faulty conjectures of a scribe who misread and misinterpreted this ancient Egyptian terminus technicus of textual criticism. Manetho’s Vorlage A, although closely related to the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes, was independently emended as may be deduced from the position of Μέσωχρις when compared to that of Μάρης in the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes. Μάρης was reintroduced into the king-list in his proper place, thereby replacing the ancient Egyptian terminus technicus “wšf” “left out,” which is still found in the Royal Canon of Turin as “king” Ḥw-ḏfꜢ and in the Abydos king-list as “king” Śḏś; both names are faulty conjectures of a scribe who misread and misinterpreted this ancient Egyptian terminus technicus of textual criticism.273

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Apollodorus/ Pseudo-Eratosthenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Μομχειρί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Γοσομιής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Στούχος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Μάρης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Άνωφρις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Σίρος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Χνόβος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Ῥαϊψίς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Chephren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Βιόρης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Μοχερῆς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Shepseskaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Djedefptah?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

272 Cf. section 4.2 above.
273 Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 14–16, 85; Goedicke, “King Ḥw⁻f<–w>”; Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 14–16; Fecht, “Review of Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho,” 117; Ryholt, Political Situation, 10–11 and “Turin King-List,” 147–48; cf. furthermore n. 104 above.
however, listed Μέσωχρις as the last king of the Third Dynasty, who was introduced either from a gloss in margin or from another king-list. The latter is more plausible insofar as the double entry *Τόσφρθρος ἢ Τύρεις/*Τοσφρθρος ἢ Τύρεις is certainly the product of collating two sources in the course of the compilation of Vorlage A itself. In light of Manetho’s orthographic conventions, Τύρεις’ Hieratic (or Demotic) entry was also supplied with an early Greek gloss. It is thus interesting to discover that Vorlage A itself did not conform with the dynastic divisions as found in Manetho’s text, but that one of the sources of Vorlage A must have done so, because otherwise the position of Μέσωχρις would be inexplicable. Moreover, this was the main reason why Manetho failed to divide the sequence of kings from Vorlage A correctly into two dynasties and, finally, why he included three kings of the historical Fourth Dynasty in his Third Dynasty. The sequence Σώφις—Κεφερής implies once more that, in Vorlage A, the kings of the Fourth Dynasty were also arranged according to the “Herodotean Giza-group” with Cheops as its fixed point. Consequently, one would expect to find at least Mycerinus and an additional king, in all probability Redjedef, to be the successors of Κεφερής according to Manetho’s Vorlage A, but Baka and Shepseskaf may also have formed part of this king-list.

Manetho’s Vorlage B is closely related to the Royal Canon of Turin, as is proven by the figures denoting unconverted numbers of census-cycles for Snefru, Cheops, and Redjedef. This resembles, furthermore, the correct historical sequence of kings and proves that the rearrangement of Cheops, Chephren, and Mycerinus in order to form the “Herodotean Giza-group” is the result of a late intervention.

274 It is highly probable that the “Herodotean Giza-group” is indeed the result of Herodotus’ histories (c. 450 BCE). The impact of his work on genuine Egyptian historiography cannot have occurred within a short time, and, in fact, some Hieratic or Demotic king-lists (Quack, “Papyrus CtYBR”; cf. nn. 79, 151 above) in Egyptian temple libraries (cf. Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 214–29; Osing, Tebtunis Papyri 1, 17–23) might never have been affected. It is, however, prudent to assume a considerable influence, even if only rather late, perhaps towards the end of the 4th century BCE, when Alexander the Great conquered Egypt and the Ptolemies founded their kingdom. Hecataeus of Abdera may have advanced this Herodotean phenomenon and one may therefore conclude that the immediate predecessors of Manetho, or perhaps he himself, reshaped some of the Egyptian king-lists. One may even doubt whether Manetho’s Vorlagen were Hieratic/Demotic papyri or early Greek transcriptions/translations of local king-lists. One may, however, infer that Manetho himself converted both his Vorlagen from Hieratic (with some Greek and Demotic glosses) into Greek, especially when one takes into account the various instances which explicitly mention Egyptian writings as Manetho’s sources (cf. Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 213–14), e.g.: γέγραφεν γὰρ Ἑλλάδι φωνῆ τὴν πάτριον ἱστορίαν ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων “for he wrote the history of his native country in Greek from the sacred <scriptures>” (Contra Apionem 1, 73; Jacoby, FrHistGr 111C, no. 609 T7a; cf. n. 26 above), ὁ γὰρ Μανεθὼς φύλαξ τὴν Ἀιγυπτιακὴν ἱστορίαν ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων μεθερμηνεύειν ὑπεσχεχένος “This, then, is
Above all it is puzzling that Manetho stopped including kings of the Fourth Dynasty into his Third Dynasty with Chephren, right in the middle of the “Herodotean Giza-group.” However, two reasons may have been decisive: On the one hand, Manetho may have kept to predefined numbers of kings (from Vorlage B) directing him towards the addition of three kings to his Third Dynasty.²⁷⁵ On the other hand, Vorlage A must have shown a change of pages between Chephren and Mycerinus because otherwise the misreading of the double column, which resulted in Manetho’s sequence of kings, would be inexplicable. In addition, Manetho failed to identify Snefru, Cheops, and

Manetho who faithfully translated Egyptian history from the sacred scriptures.” (Contra Apionem 1, 228 = Waddell, Manetho, 118–19; Jacoby, FrHistGr 111C, no. 609 T10a; cf. n. 26 above); Flavius Josephus confirms this even in polemical passages, e.g., Μανθών οὖς μέν ἠκολούθει ταῖς ἀρχαίαις ἀναγραφαῖς, οὐ πολὺ τῆς ἀληθείας διήμαρταν “as long as Manetho followed the ancient records, he did not go far astray from truth” (Contra Apionem 1, 287; Waddell, Manetho, 146–47; Jacoby, FrHistGr 111C, no. 609 F10a; cf. n. 26 above), etc. This is moreover supported by the consistent Manethonian orthography, which indicates that he graecized the entire king-list at once (cf. nn. 57, 79, 151 above). The original version of the king-list known from the writings of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes was perhaps one of the latest pieces of Egyptian historiography not having suffered from this particular Greek influence. Anyhow, even this king-list was finally adjusted to the communis opinio of Greek historiography, but neither the time nor the models—perhaps Manetho, genuine Greek authors (Herodotus, Hecataeus of Abdera) or otherwise unknown king-lists similar to the so-called Leipziger Weltchronik (cf. Popko and Rücker, “Königliste”; Colomo, et al., “Die älteste Weltchronik”; Weiß, “Weltchronik”; cf. also Bilabel, Griechische Papyri (s.v. Papyrus Baden 4, no. 59), etc.)—can be determined with certainty.

²⁷⁵ Redford’s assumption (Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 235–36; Gozzoli, Writing of History, 201) that Manetho added names to each dynasty of his first book more or less randomly and relentlessly, only seeking to get nine [sic] kings for each of his dynasties, can thus be rejected (the first six dynasties according to the Epitome of Manetho’s Aegyptiaca comprise 8 kings, 9 kings, 8 kings, 8 kings, 9 kings, and 6 kings respectively, cf. Waddell, Manetho, 26–57; Jacoby, FrHistGr 111C, no. 609 F2–F3; There is also no plausible explanation for the fact that Manetho did not assign 8/9 kings to his Seventh to Eleventh Dynasties, which also formed part of the first book of the Aegyptiaca). Helck and Fecht have already demonstrated with the examples of the First and Second Dynasties that Manetho felt obliged to keep numbers of kings already found in one of his Vorlagen (perhaps in Vorlage B). In order to do so, Manetho omitted those names which he perceived as erroneous duplicates (Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 9–19; Fecht, “Review of Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho,” 118), and combined the remaining names in a new king-list. The unparalleled number of 8 kings in Manetho’s Third Dynasty should accordingly be viewed as the result of Manetho’s failure to identify the names of Vorlage A with those of Vorlage B in combination with a change of pages in Vorlage A.
Chephren in Vorlage A with their counterparts in Vorlage B.\textsuperscript{276} Be that as it may, he chose the highest figures known to him for the kings of his Fourth Dynasty and thus dropped the figure of Mycerinus from Vorlage A.\textsuperscript{277} Manetho then copied the figure given with the name of Redjedef in Vorlage A in his Fourth Dynasty and assigned it correctly to Ὕπατοίς. Next he ascribed the figure found with Ὕπατοίς in Vorlage B, 9 years (< 8 years, XY months, AB days via rounding up), which matches closely the Royal Canon of Turin’s 8 years, to Djedefptah at the very end of the Fourth Manethonian Dynasty.\textsuperscript{278} The 7 years ascribed to Σεβερχέρης are also taken from Vorlage A, which can thereby be proven to cover the entire Fourth Dynasty, maybe with the exception of Djedefptah. Shepseskaf’s and Djedefptah’s figures in Vorlage B—possibly 4 years and 2 years respectively—were thus replaced with the figures of Vorlage A, 7 years and 9 years (a leftover from Redjedef’s entry) respectively. Manetho stopped using these two sources with the end of his Fourth Dynasty for an unknown reason. Maybe Vorlage A came to an end at this point, or Manetho succeeded in identifying the kings of both his Vorlagen from here onwards, but, ultimately, the exact reasons remain mere conjecture.\textsuperscript{279}

In summary, the following concluding reconstruction of the sources of the Vorlagen of the king-lists of Manetho and Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes may be provided (cf. Table 4.2):\textsuperscript{280}

\begin{enumerate}
\item alterantions prior to the Nineteenth Dynasty, i.e., around the time of the composition of the Royal Canon of Turin or in the subsequent course of copying it: Nebka(re) *9 → 19; Huni *14 → 24; Cheops *13 → 23; cf. also the loss of a ten in the case of Djoser *29
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{276} Perhaps because of Demotic glosses terminating with the end of this column/page? Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus, 80.

\textsuperscript{277} The reason for this was of course his rivalry with Herodotus, whom Manetho criticized explicitly with respect to Cheops’ name. He furthermore increased Cheops’ figure to 63 years and thus surpassed Herodotus again.

\textsuperscript{278} Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus, 91–92.

\textsuperscript{279} Cf. Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 19–26, 52–56, 85; Fecht, “Review of Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho,” II7, II9. One may suppose that, from Mycerinus onwards, the entries in the Hieratic Vorlage A no longer displayed Demotic (and, very exceptionally, Greek) glosses, which made it easier for Manetho to identify the plain Hieratic kings’ names as long as they were not misspelled.

\textsuperscript{280} The kings’ names are given in their final form after Manetho and Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes (cf. sections 4.1 and 5.1). Figures with an asterisk are corrected according to sections 4.2 and 5.2 above; for the majority of instances, it is impossible to determine when a certain number of tens was added and whether this was done at once or in a process consisting of several steps. The overall practice can, however, be identified as covering three phases, to which additions of tens may tentatively be assigned:
(1) Μομχειρί  *19  (1) Νεχερωφής  *19  (2a) Netjerichet  ??  (1) Nb-kꜢ<->R’w>  19
(2) Γωσομήνης  *19  (2) Τοσεράτας  19  (2b) Djoser  ??  (2) DꜢr-jt  19
(3) Στόχας  6  ή Τύρεις  7  (3) Djoser-teti  ??  (3) DꜢr-tj  6
(4) Μάρθης  *16  (5) Ἀχῆς  *24  (4) Neb/Neferkare  ??  (4) [Hw-]δβ3  6
(5) Ακωφίς  *24  (4) Μέσωχρις  17  (5) Huni  ??  (5) Hw[ŋ]  24
(6) Σίριτς  *48  (6) Σήφουρις  *48  (6) Σώφις  *25  (6) Śfr<->w>  24
(7) Χνούδος  *26  (7) Σώφις  *26  (7) Σώφις  *23  (7) [Hwƒ->ƒw]  23
(8) Ράθωσις  *15  (9) Κερφέρης  26  (9) Σώφις  *26  (8) [R’w-ddf=f]  8
(9) Chephren  27  (11) Mycerinus  ??  (11) Μεγέχερης  ??  (9) Ḥwƒ[f->f-R’w]  26
(10) Βύρης  *2  (8) Redjedef  *15  (8) Ρατοίσης  *9  (10) [Bš-kš-R’w]  *2
(11) Μαχθρής  *29  (10) Baka  *2  (10) Βίχερης  *2  (11) [Mn-kš.w-R’w]  *28
(12) Shepseskaf  ???  (12) Shepseskaf  *7  (12) Σεβερχέρης  *4  (12) [Śpśš-kš-R’w]  4
(13) Djeqefthah? *2? ???  (13) Θαμφής  *2  (13) [Pth-ʃdd=f]  2

Table 4.2
Pseudo-Apollodorus/ Pseudo-Eratosthenes  Manetho A (Third Dynasty)  Manetho B (Fourth Dynasty)  Royal Canon of Turin

(1) Μομχειρί  *19  (1) Νεχερωφής  *19  (2a) Netjerichet  ??  (1) Nb-kꜢ<->R’w>  19
(2) Γωσομήνης  *19  (2) Τοσεράτας  19  (2b) Djoser  ??  (2) DꜢr-jt  19
(3) Στόχας  6  ή Τύρεις  7  (3) Djoser-teti  ??  (3) DꜢr-tj  6
(4) Μάρθης  *16  (5) Ἀχῆς  *24  (4) Neb/Neferkare  ??  (4) [Hw-]δβ3  6
(5) Ακωφίς  *24  (4) Μέσωχρις  17  (5) Huni  ??  (5) Hw[ŋ]  24
(6) Σίριτς  *48  (6) Σήφουρις  *48  (6) Σώφις  *25  (6) Śfr<->w>  24
(7) Χνούδος  *26  (7) Σώφις  *26  (7) Σώφις  *23  (7) [Hwƒ->ƒw]  23
(8) Ράθωσις  *15  (9) Κερφέρης  26  (9) Σώφις  *26  (8) [R’w-ddf=f]  8
(9) Chephren  27  (11) Mycerinus  ??  (11) Μεγέχερης  ??  (9) Ḥwƒ[f->f-R’w]  26
(10) Βύρης  *2  (8) Redjedef  *15  (8) Ρατοίσης  *9  (10) [Bš-kš-R’w]  *2
(11) Μαχθρής  *29  (10) Baka  *2  (10) Βίχερης  *2  (11) [Mn-kš.w-R’w]  *28
(12) Shepseskaf  ???  (12) Shepseskaf  *7  (12) Σεβερχέρης  *4  (12) [Śpśš-kš-R’w]  4
(13) Djeqefthah? *2? ???  (13) Θαμφής  *2  (13) [Pth-ʃdd=f]  2

→ 19 (cf. the Royal Canon of Turin and Excursus II [end]), the alteration affecting the figure of Neferkare(re) *6 → 16 could belong here or to the next phase;

(2) the addition of tens before or around the time of the compilation of the writings of Greek historiographers; Herodotus: Cheops *23 → *53 → (with subsequent loss of the units) 50, Chephren *26 → 56, Manetho: Cheops *23 → 63, Chephren *26 → 66, etc., the alterations found in the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes: Nebka(re) *19 → 79, Djoser *19 + *29 → (with subsequent rounding up) 30, Neferkare(re) *16 → 26, Baka(re) *2 + *12 → (with subsequent loss of the units) 10, etc.;


One should also keep in mind that scribal errors and unintentional nivellament of figures which were somehow reminiscent of one another (e.g., because of identical units and close proximity or even immediate sequence within the king-list) may have contributed to the deterioration of the individual figures (cf. section 5.2 [end]). It is, however, extremely difficult to distinguish between intentional and unintentional alterations. Cf. in general Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 56, 81–83; Fecht, “Review of Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho,” 121; Ryholt, Political Situation, 9–33.
Excursus III  The Abydos and Saqqara King-Lists

The Abydos king-list is known from two copies, one in the temple of Sethos I and another in the temple of Ramesses II. Both copies are identical with respect to the first 76 kings of which Sethos I is the last, but Ramesses II added, of course, his own name. The Saqqara king-list is found in the tomb of Tjuloy, a contemporary of Ramesses II, and consists of 58 names copied in retrograde sequence. Both lists neglect, for the greater part, the First and Second Intermediate Periods, but the Abydos king-list mentions ten kings of the late Sixth to Eighth Dynasties, which even the Royal Canon of Turin lacks. It thus becomes obvious that the Abydos and Saqqara king-lists contain independent historiographical information, although their compilers may have used Teillisten which are also known from the Royal Canon of Turin. Both king-lists are only extracts of more elaborate king-lists, but they are highly valuable for the determination of Manetho’s sources for his Third and Fourth Dynasties (cf. Table 4.3).

In the case of the Third Dynasty, the Abydos king-list reveals once more that it was compiled from at least two sources. King Sedjes (Śḏś), whose name is the result of a misunderstood terminus technicus indicating a lacuna in the Vorlage, was correctly identified with Neferkare from another Vorlage rather close to the Saqqara king-list, but, perhaps by mishap, Sedjes (Śḏś) also remained in the king-list. As a result, Huni, the immediately subsequent king, was removed from the sequence of kings, possibly because of a predefined

---

282 PM V, 35; Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 20–21.
283 PM III.2, 666; Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 21–24; Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, passim; von Beckerath, Chronologie, 23–28, 216; Gardiner, Geschichte, 489–501.
284 Cf., e.g., Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 30–34; Fecht, “Review of Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho,” 119; Gardiner, Geschichte, 496–97; Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 19–24; von Beckerath, Chronologie, 148–49; Ryholt, Political Situation, 10–11 and “Turin King-List,” 144.
285 The Abydos and Saqqara tables of kings contain the names of those kings who were especially worshipped in the local ancestor cult, but they are based on king-lists proprio sensu. The Theban Table of Kings (PM II, 112; Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 29), which served the same purpose, was possibly a list of kings whose statues were present in the temple of Karnak, which deprives this table of kings of any historiographical value. Cf. Maspero, “Notes sur le rapport,” 281 and “Notes sur les objets,” 189–90; Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 60–62; Arnold, “Bemerkungen zu den frühen Tempeln von el-Tôd,” 178; Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 29–34.
286 Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 14–16, 85; Goedicke, “King ḤwḏfꜢ”; cf. also Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 14–16; Fecht, “Review of Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho,” 117; Ryholt, Political Situation, 10–11 and “Turin King-List,” 147–48; cf. n. 104 above.
number of kings. If this is correct, one has to conclude that the Abydos king-list is compiled from a Vorlage which, already by the time of the New Kingdom, knew a dynastic division between Huni and Snefru. The Saqqara king-list either never suffered from the lacuna in the Third Dynasty or it was emended correctly. Whatever the case, one would expect it to have displayed five kings, with Nebkare (← Nebka) and Neferkare (← Neferka) immediately preceding Huni. The layout of the present Saqqara copy suggests, however, that the scribe was running short of space and started skipping kings he had originally intended to include. Owing to the approximate homophony of Nebkare

---


Nebka ~ *Nēb-kō-RīꜤē and Neferkare (~ Neferka) ~ *Năf-kō-RīꜤē ~ *Nēf-kō-RīꜤē, he might thus have reduced them to a single entry. It is nevertheless unclear when the scribe noticed his troubles and started skipping kings. Obviously, he did not feel forced to do so in the Fourth Dynasty, and except for the absence of Neferkare (~ Nebkare) there is no hint that he did so at the end of the Third Dynasty. It is important to remember that he finally failed to conclude his retrograde king-list with the first king of the First Dynasty, Menes. Therefore, the scribe must have started skipping kings too late and hence he abridged the sequence of kings only from the Second Dynasty backwards, which also explains the lack of greater parts of the First Dynasty. The Third Dynasty may thus be viewed as complete when compared with the Vorlage, which means that the reduction of the almost homophonous entries of Nebka(re) and Neferka(re) must have occurred earlier and within the main line of tradition of the Saqqara branch. Nevertheless, taking the position of Neferkare and/ or Nebkare before Huni and the presence or absence of Nebkare (~ Nebka) immediately preceding Djoser as indicators for the relations between the king-lists should only be done with great caution and appropriate restraint, because, with the secondary reintroduction of Neferkare (~ Neferka) into the Abydos king-list, the local traditions were contaminated with one another anyway.289

The same seems true with regard to the name of Djoser-teti. It may be merely accidental that the Abydos king-list mentions this king as Teti (Τῇ) while the Saqqara king-list names him, similarly to the Royal Canon of Turin (Ḏśr- ayında), Djoser-teti (Ḏśr-ttj). Both variants are well-known from commemorative inscriptions,290 and it is thus impossible to decide which of the two variants was original to Manetho’s Vorlage. One is, however, inclined to deduce that the variant Τῷφεῖς ~ Τῇ is original to the Abydene line of tradition, to which Τῶσορβρὸς was added from another one, possibly the Memphite line

289 A truly instructive example is the section on the kings belonging to the late Sixth to Eighth Dynasties. The Abydos king-list provides ten names unknown to the Royal Canon of Turin, which, according to the space available, stated simply “wšf” “lost,” as if it were a single king whose entry had gone missing. This loss has recently been attributed to the immediate Vorlage of the Royal Canon of Turin (Ryholt, “Royal Canon,” 27 and “Late Old Kingdom”), but it must be considerably older because the Royal Canon of Turin does not display an irregularity in the distribution of the formula jrj.n=f m njśwjj.t “he exercised kingship.” It is thus the copyist of the Royal Canon of Turin’s immediate Vorlage who, at the least, must be held responsible for the representation of ten missing entries as a single remark, “wšf” “lost.” Cf. also Ryholt, Political Situation, 11; Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 29–32; Gardiner, Geschichte, 495–97; Málek, “Original Version”; cf. furthermore n. 104 above.

290 Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 96–100.
of tradition closely related to the Saqqara king-list. If this holds true, the following scenario may be supposed: An early version (Nineteenth Dynasty) of Manetho’s Vorlage A called Djoser-teti simply Teti (Ttj); to this, an alternative variant Djoser-teti (Ḏśr-tṯj) was secondarily introduced (New Kingdom?) from another, perhaps the Memphite line of tradition. The order of these two variants was reversed at an unknown point of time (*Ttj – Ḏśr-tṯj → Ḏśr-tṯj – Ttj), perhaps by a scribe who noticed that Teti (Ttj) is nothing but a hypocoristicum of Djoser-teti (Ḏśr-tṯj) (perhaps late New Kingdom, Third Intermediate Period?). Subsequently, the misspellings *Ḏśr-tṯj → Ḏśr-trj and *Ttj → Trj occurred, which are expected to have happened at the same time; it is, however, also possible that only Ḏśr-tṯj or Ttj were misspelled (either *Ḏśr-tṯj – Ttj → Ḏśr-trj – Ttj or Ḏśr-tṯj – Ttj → Ḏśr-tṯj – Trj), which was secondarily emended by an attentive scribe who noticed the unexpected discrepancy, but chose the corrupt variant as the model for his conjecture (Third Intermediate Period, Late Period?).

Finally, the gloss (*Τύρε(ϊς)—be it as an annotation in margine or as a supra-linear note—was added to Trj (4th/3rd centuries BCE), whereas Ḏśr-trj was transcribed by Manetho himself as *Τοσόρθορος (→ Τόσορθρος). In the case of the Fourth Dynasty, the Abydos king-list is obviously abridged, but it is impossible to determine with certainty how many kings and which kings were skipped. Most probably, however, only Baka is missing, perhaps because of the ephemeral nature of his reign; Djedefptah thus never formed part of the Abydos king-list. The Saqqara king-list contains nine compartments which are dedicated to the Fourth Dynasty, one more than any other king-list. This is even the more remarkable as, in its present appearance, the Saqqara king-list is the result of problems with space. Of those nine kings mentioned, the last five names have unfortunately been damaged, and it is only by conjecture that the

---

291 According to Möller, there are hardly any ligatures found in manuscripts postdating the Twenty-Second Dynasty (Möller, Paläographie 111, 64, n. 1). The alleged misreading of tt → tr must thus have occurred either before those ligatures fell out of use or some time after they had fallen out of use when a manuscript showing the ligature tt was copied by a scribe no longer used to apply such ligatures (Möller, Paläographie 11, nos. 38–39). The latter seems more plausible, especially if one considers the Twenty-Fifth and Twenty-Sixth Dynasties, which had developed a special interest in Egyptian classical literature (cf., e.g., Helck, Lehre des Djedefhor; Quack, “Aus einer spätägyptischen Sammelhandschrift”; Jasnow, Wisdom Text, 39, n. 52; Hoffmann and Quack, Anthologie, 234, n. 366, 290, n. 415; cf. Gestermann, “Bezeugungen” and Überlieferung; cf., also n. 257 above) and history (cf., e.g., Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 203–06; Tiradritti, Egyptian Renaissance (especially Liptay, “Past Imperfect”; Pischikova, “Pharaonic Renaissance”); Quack, “Reiche”).

292 Cf. n. 79 above.

293 Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 21–24; Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, passim; von Beckerath, Chronologie, 23–28, 216; Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 85.
sequence of kings may be reconstructed. It is, however, most likely that eight of the nine kings in the Saqqara king-list are identical with those eight kings known from Manetho’s king-list and the Royal Canon of Turin. The ninth king may thus be identified with another prince of the popular tradition reflected in the Wadi Hammamat graffito and the stories of Papyrus Westcar, i.e., either Baufre or Hordjedef. However, one would expect Baufre to have been merged with Baka (→ Bakare); if so, Hordjedef appeared twice in this king-list: once in the reshaped form of Djedefptah (← Ptahdjedef), which one also expects in an early variant of the Royal Canon of Turin (perhaps as *Ptahdjedef), and a second time as Hordjedef. This second mention was perhaps added secondarily from yet another king-list or possibly even directly from popular tradition after the first amendment had been changed to Djedefptah (← Ptahdjedef ← Hordjedef).

When the Royal Canon of Turin, the reconstructed Vorlagen A and B of Manetho’s king-list, the Vorlage of the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes, and the Abydos and Saqqara king-lists are compared to one another, the following relations between them can be observed.

First, Manetho’s Vorlage A and the Vorlage of the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes are closely related to each other and furthermore to the Abydos king-list. Although Manetho’s Vorlage A and the Vorlage of the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes share the figures for Snefru, Cheops, and Redjedef which were correctly converted from census-cycles, they nevertheless display the same lacuna in the Third Dynasty as all other king-lists. It is thus most likely that an early Middle Kingdom version of the Royal Canon of Turin came to Abydos as an official king-list, where it was adjusted by use of local archives and historiographical data. In the New Kingdom, the Abydene line of tradition was contaminated in a limited number of instances with the Memphite line of tradition close to the Saqqara king-list and resulted in the reintroduction of the name of Neferka(re). The most striking feature of the Abydene line of tradition is, after all, that even in Manetho’s reception, it provides the correct lengths of reign for all kings of the Fourth Dynasty, including Snefru, Cheops, and Redjedef.

Second, Manetho’s Vorlage B, the Saqqara king-list, and the Royal Canon of Turin are equally closely related to one another. The original version of the Royal

295 Cf. n. 175 above.
296 Cf. in particular Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 85.
298 Gundacker, Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus, 85, n. 433.
Canon of Turin represents a Heliopolitan tradition to judge from its dynasties of gods which originally began with the Great Ennead of Heliopolis. However, if the Royal Canon of Turin was compiled as an official king-list in the early Twelfth Dynasty, as was suggested above, this may have been motivated by the status of Heliopolis as the traditional center of annalistic writings.

At least one line of tradition was then adjusted to a Memphite background, as can be deduced from the rearrangement of the dynasties of gods in the actually preserved copy of the Royal Canon of Turin and in Manetho’s *Aegyptiaca* (Vorlage B). Based on the ninth king found in the Fourth Dynasty according to the Saqqara king-list, there must also have existed a genuine Memphite tradition, which possibly interacted continuously with the Heliopolitan tradition due to the close vicinity of Heliopolis and Memphis. This may be furthermore substantiated with the differences at the very beginning of the Third Dynasty, which began with Djoser according to Manetho’s Vorlage B and the Saqqara king-list, but with Nebka(re) according to the Royal Canon of Turin and the Abydos king-list. Manetho’s Vorlage B thus displays characteristics of the Saqqara king-list (Nebka(re) missing at the beginning of the Third Dynasty) and the Royal Canon of Turin (addition of Djedefptah only).

7 *Manetho’s Aegyptiaca—Chance and Peril*

As the preceding discussion has revealed, Manetho’s *Aegyptiaca* must be viewed as being extremely complex, from its compilation to its scattered remains as found in medieval manuscripts. Nevertheless, it is Manetho’s framework of thirty dynasties (at some stage, the Thirty-First Dynasty, i.e., the Second Persian Domination of Egypt, was added), which still forms the

---

300 Cf. the canonical scene depicting the king accompanied by Thoth and Seshat who inscribe his name, his length of reign, the number of Sed-Festivals to be celebrated by him, etc., on the leaves of the sacred *jšd*-tree in Heliopolis (Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists*, 81–82 [with further bibliographical references]).
backbone of ancient Egyptian chronology. This division of dynasties, as artificial as it may be, is itself rooted in genuine Egyptian historiography. Already the Royal Canon of Turin, which thereby reflects the earliest available stage, displays some such divisions, but the First to Fifth Manethonian Dynasties are still an undivided unit. As became evident in the course of the evaluation of the position of the kings Nebka(re) and Neferka(re) within the Third Dynasty according to the king-lists of Abydos and Saqqara, there must nevertheless also have existed a dynastic order already much more similar to that of Manetho by the time of the New Kingdom. Even if Manetho may have introduced one dynastic division or the other just in order to achieve an ideal total of thirty dynasties, the main reasons for creating dynasties were probably

(a) ruling families or houses according to Egyptian tradition,
(b) —especially for the Thinite Period and the Old Kingdom—the grouping of kings according to their burial places, and
(c) changes in the system of naming regnal years as reflected in the royal annals of the Old Kingdom.

60–65; Gmirkin, Berossus and Genesis, 240–43), or whether it was the result of practical conditions such as the average amount of text a papyrus scroll was capable of (cf. Pöhlmann, Überlieferungsgeschichte 1, 87–88; Schubart, Palaeographie, 57–58, 64–65), etc. Cf. Jacoby, FrHistGr iii, no. 609 F2, F3a–3b, F25; Waddell, Manetho, 2–25; Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 4–8; Redford, Pharaonic King-List, 229–339; Gozzoli, Writing of History, 196–97.

Cf. also n. 291 above.


Cf. Jacoby, FrHistGr III A, no. 264 F25; Oldfather, Diodorus Siculus 1, 160–61, [s.v. 1.45.3]); έξης δ’ ἄρξαι λέγεται τοῦ προειρημένου βασιλέως τούς ἀπογόνους δύο πρὸς τοῖς πεντήκοντα τούς ἐπανατας ἐτη πλείω τῶν χιλίων καὶ τετταράκοντα “And it is said that the descendants of the aforementioned king (scil. Menes), altogether 52, reigned, one after another, for more than 1040 years.” This remark indicates that, even at the dawn of the Ptolemaic Period, different and divergent dynastic systems existed side by side. It was perhaps the fame of Manetho’s framework of 30 dynasties which led to a uniform interpretation of Egyptian history and superseded all concurring models.

Ryholt, “Turin King-List,” 139–43 and “Royal Canon,” 27–29. A similarly unbroken line of kings—perhaps covering the First to Sixth/Eighth Dynasties—is mentioned in the writings of Diodoros Siculus (perhaps quoting Hecataeus of Abdera; Jacoby, FrHistGr III A, no. 264 F25; Oldfather, Diodorus Siculus 1, 160–61, [s.v. 1.45.3]): έξης δ’ ἄρξαι λέγεται τοῦ προειρημένου βασιλέως τούς ἀπογόνους δύο πρὸς τοῖς πεντήκοντα τούς ἐπανατας ἐτη πλείω τῶν χιλίων καὶ τετταράκοντα “And it is said that the descendants of the aforementioned king (scil. Menes), altogether 52, reigned, one after the other, for more than 1040 years.” This remark indicates that, even at the dawn of the Ptolemaic Period, different and divergent dynastic systems existed side by side. It was perhaps the fame of Manetho’s framework of 30 dynasties which led to a uniform interpretation of Egyptian history and superseded all concurring models.

Ryholt, “Turin King-List,” 139–43 and “Royal Canon,” 27–29; Gozzoli, Writing of History, 200. Cf. also the supposed “house of Cheti” (Fecht, Vorwurf, 174–75; cf. Franke, Heiligtum des Heqaib, 21; critical Gomáa, Besiedlung, 233, 356) and the conjectured “house of Sehetepibre” (Royal Canon of Turin, VI.4 = 7.4, Gardiner, Royal Canon, pl. 111; von Beckerath, Chronologie, 210).

Málek, “La division de l’histoire.”

It is thus difficult to judge the value of Manetho’s dynastic divisions and to explain their origins in detail, but they are certainly a piece of ancient Egyptian historiography.\textsuperscript{307} In this respect, the dynastic division separating the Fourth and Fifth Dynasties is a particularly instructive example: Manetho recorded Elephantine (Ꜣbw) as the place of origin of the Fifth Dynasty. This is certainly the result of some kind of corruption of his Vorlagen and may be traced back to Śḥbw,\textsuperscript{308} a town in the Nile Delta which is the place of origin of the Fifth Dynasty according to the stories of Papyrus Westcar.\textsuperscript{309} In the popular tradition found in those stories,\textsuperscript{310} a dynastic division between Shepseskaf and Userkaf must have been known in the Second Intermediate Period at the latest, when the stories of Papyrus Westcar were written down in their actual appearance.\textsuperscript{311}
In the Royal Canon of Turin, which was copied in the Nineteenth Dynasty, the First to Fifth Dynasties are still considered a single undivided Dynasty. Therefore, largely differing systems of dynastic order must have existed already during the Second Intermediate Period.

Similar to Herodotus’ account of Egyptian history,312 Manetho’s Aegyptiaca was basically a king-list with narrative sections on events assigned to the reigns

Herodotus states (Hude, Historiae, s.v. 11.100.1): μετά δὲ τούτον κατέλεγον οἱ ίρες ἐκ βύβλου ἄλλων βασιλέων τριηκοσίων τε καὶ τριήκοντα οὖν, ἐν τοσαύτῃ δὲ γενέσθαι ἀνθρώπων ὁκτωκαίδεκα μὲν Αἰθιόπες ἦσαν, μία δὲ γυνὴ ἐπιχωρίη, οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι ἄνδρες Αἰγύπτιοι. “And after him (scil. Menes), the priests read out of a book the names of another 330 kings. Among those generations of men were 18 Ethiopian kings, and one epichoric queen; but the others were Egyptian men.” Then Herodotus mentions 12 kings, including the “Herodotean Giza-group” (cf. Erbse, ”Vier Bemerkungen”), the Dodecarchy (Third Intermediate Period) and the Saite kings until the Persian conquest. Hude, Historiae, s.v. 11.99–111.13; Lloyd,
of the respective kings. The most important of those events were possibly also included in the Epitome in the form of glosses. Even though in the course of the transmission of the Epitome the glosses may have slipped into the wrong places because copyists worked thoughtlessly and too mechanically, they still reflect Egyptian historical consciousness, and they thus preserve snippets from genuine Egyptian sources. It is for that reason that Manetho's

Herodotus Book 11, 1, 185–92, 111, 1–6, passim; A similar statement is found with Diodorus Siculus, cf. nn. 7, 303, 316 s.v. (4).

313 Dillery, “Manetho and Greek Historiography”; Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 229–30.
314 Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 212–14; Gozzoli, Writing of History, 208–10.
315 The gloss on Imhotep found with Τὸσρὸς, the second king of the Third Manethonian Dynasty, is an example of a misattribution by Manetho himself (cf. Wildung, Imhotep, 33–32; Ryholt, “Late Old Kingdom” Quack, “Reiche,” 15, with n. 47; Aufrère, “Imhotep et Djoser”). Since it was Manetho himself who misread the double column of his Vorlage A, thus producing a totally confused sequence of kings, one may conclude that he furthermore misattributed the historical events found in his Vorlagen with Djoser’s name. If his Vorlage told him that the second king of this dynasty was a contemporary of Imhotep, he consequently would have treated Τὸσρὸς (Djoser-teti) as Τὸσερὰςις (Djoser). He also may have “corrected” the information of his Vorlagen, which he felt misleading and contradictory because of his own mistake. As a result, the compiler(s) of the Epitome must have found the information concerning Imhotep already in the wrong place. They then perpetuated Manetho’s erroneous attribution by faithfully adhering to it because they were unable to recognize his mishap. On the contrary, Eusebius, or one of the copyists of the line of tradition providing him with the Epitome, must have failed in identifying Cheops. According to Eusebius, the third king of the Fourth Manethonian Dynasty was called Χέοψ by Herodotus and was responsible for the erection of the Great Pyramid at Giza. It thus becomes obvious that one of the scribes copied the names of the king-list and then added the glosses in margine, thereby confusing the homonymous kings Σοῦφις ~ Cheops in second place and Σοῦφις ~ Chephren in third place. The attribution of glosses to a specific king should thus always be treated with great caution, especially if there are two or more similar-named or even homonymous kings within a single dynasty.

316 It has been stressed (Sethe, Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte, 121–28, 140; Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 82–89; Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 212–14; Gozzoli, Writing of History, 208–10) that the glosses of the kings of the First to Third Dynasties prove the existence of a somewhat garbled knowledge of the Old Kingdom royal annals as late as the Graeco-Roman Period. Eponymous events and heights of Nile floods (cf. Seidlmayer, Historische und moderne Nilstände) were, however, misinterpreted on their long journey through time until Manetho included them in his Aegyptiaca. The following examples may illustrate this complex process (cf. for further suggestions, Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 85–89):

1) The gloss on Menes (Μήνης), according to Eusebius, reads: οὗτος ύπερήφανον στρατεύει ἐπούρασε, καὶ ἐνδοξός έκριθεν. ὑπὸ δὲ ἱπποποτάμου ὄρησεν. “He made a foreign expedition and was considered renowned, but he was carried off by a
One may deduce that annalistic entries such as śḳj Jwntj.w “smiting the bowmen” (Palermo Stone, recto, 111.2, cf. Wilkinson, Royal Annals, 106, cf. also the first part of the gloss attributed to the first king of the Third Manethonian Dynasty, Nḫrwsffḥ, and n. 66 above) and šjt.t ḫḥb “shooting the hippopotamus” (Palermo Stone, recto, 111.8, cf. Wilkinson, Royal Annals, 112, 114) formed the basis of this gloss, but the details are still unclear. Cf. for the death of Menes according to Manetho, Vernus “Ménés”; cf. for the significance of the hippopotamus, le Pape, “Crocodile”; Pardey, “Nilpferd”; Behrmann, Nilpferd; Störk, “Nilpferd.”

(2) According to Africanus, Manetho recorded for Athothis (Ἄθωθις), the second king of his First Dynasty, the following gloss: ὁ τὰ ἐν Μέμφει βασίλεια οἰκοδομήσας, οὗ φέρονται βίβλοι ἀνατομικαί, ἰατρὸς γὰρ ἦν. “...who built the royal citadel in Memphis, (and) under whom anatomical books were compiled, because he was a physician.” (Waddell, Manetho, 28–29; Jacoby, FrHistGr III, no. 609 F2). Helck explained the first part of this gloss as a confusion of jtjḥ “sovereign” in a conjectured designation ḫw.t-jtjḥ “sovereign’s quarter” (or perhaps ḫ-bjtjḥ “sovereign’s quarter” or pr-ḥjtjḥ “sovereign’s house,” all unattested, cf. for Demotic attestations of ḫjtjḥ “sovereign” Johnson, Demotic Dictionary 111, 239; Erichsen, Glossar, 46; Smith, Papyrus BM 10507, 61, n. d) and Jt(t)j (Athothis) ~ Jt(t)jw (Djet), the nomina of the second to fourth kings of the historical First Dynasty according to Vorlage A. Manetho found apparently three (almost) homophonous names in one of his Vorlagen, which he combined in a single entry Ἀθωνίς (cf. von Beckerath, Handbuch der Königsnamen, 38–39 cf. Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 9–10; Fecht, Wortakzent, §§ 103–06; Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 20–21). The second part of this gloss, which is about the medical skills of Athothis, is probably based on an ancient Egyptian association of this king and certain medical writings. This ascription was perhaps made in order to increase the esteem of some kind of anatomical treatise, even though this attribution is totally unhistorical (cf. Grapow, von Deines, and Westendorf, Grundriß 11, 61; Nunn, Ancient Egyptian Medicine, 42, 121–22; Westendorf, Handbuch 1, 5, 27 n. 34).

(3) King Djer’s name according to Manetho’s Vorlage A was replaced with that of Wn-nfr (Οὐενέφης, cf. Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 17; Fecht, Wortakzent, §§ 85–109), which is significant insofar as his tomb at Abydos was explained as that of Osiris-Wennefer from the Middle Kingdom onwards (Effland, “Grabe” and “Das Grab”; Effland, Budka, and Effland, “Studien”). A Manethonian gloss after Africanus states ἐφ᾽ οὗ λιμὸς κατέσχε τὴν Αἴγυπτον μέγας. οὗτος τὰς περὶ Κωχώμην ἠγείρει πυραμίδας. “...under whom a great famine seized Egypt. He erected the pyramids at Cochem,” which is an inscription that resembles the Ptolemaic Famine Stela (PM v, 252; Barguet, La stèle de la famine; Gernier, “Stèle de la famine”; cf. Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 85–91; Aufrère, “Imhotep et Djoser”) and, perhaps, the year compartment Palermo Stone recto 111.4 (Sethe, “Die ägyptischen Ausdrücke für rechts und links,” 203; Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 86; cf. Wilkinson, Royal Annals, 108–10, fig. 1). Helck pointed out that the second part of this gloss refers to the tombs of the Early Dynastic kings at Abydos (Helck, Untersuchungen
zu Manetho, 86), but it was Fecht who demonstrated that Κωχώμη is nothing but a distorted spelling of *Χώκωμη (cf. the Armenian version of Eusebius: Քովաւանաւ "at) the town Chov," Aucher, Eusebii chronicon 1, 204–05; cf., Waddell, Manetho, 32–33; Schoene, Eusebii Chronicorum, 65, 252, n. 114) ← *Θῶ κωμή "Tho, the town" (cf. for the interchange of Greek aspirates/spirants n. 66 above). According to Fecht’s ingenious explanation (Fecht, “Review of Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho,” 122), *Θῶ is a rendering of *Θⲱ~*Θⲟ̀, the (Proto-)Bohairic equivalent of *Ⲱⲱ (cf. for the interchange of Greek aspirates/spirants n. 66 above). Even though the kings’ tombs at Abydos are anachronistically called pyramids, the basic information is thus proven historically correct. (4) In the Second Manethonian Dynasty according to Africanus, a gloss on Sesochris (Σέσωχρις, i.e., in all probability Neferkasokar, whose name was contaminated with that of Σέσωστρις, cf. Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 11–16; Fecht, “Review of Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho,” 118–19) reads ὃς ὕψος εἶχε πηχῶν ε´ παλαιστῶν γ´ "who was 5 cubits and 3 palms tall” (Waddell, Manetho, 36–37; Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIc, no. 609 F2). This is certainly a misinterpreted record of a Nile flood height, which finds its parallel in the writings of Diodorus Siculus (perhaps quoting Hecataeus of Abdera, Jacoby, FrHistGr IIIa, no. 264 F25; Oldfather, Diodorus Siculus 1, 158–59, s.v. 1.44.4): τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς χρόνους ἀπαντας διατελέσαι βασιλεύοντες τῆς χώρας ἐγχωρίους, ἄνδρας μὲν ἑβδομήκοντα πρὸς τοῖς τετρακοσίοις, γυναῖκας δὲ πέντε, περὶ ᾧ ἂν κατασκευασμένα ἀπὸ τῶν παλαιῶν χρόνων ἀπείκονισεν οἱ μὲν ἱερεῖς εἰς τὰς ἱεραῖς βιβλίας ἐγγίζοντες ἀπὸ τῶν χρόνων ἁπάντων ἐκ τῆς διαθήκης παραδοθέντας, ὁπλίτος ἐκατόσ τῶν ἑκατάκοσ ἐγένετο τῷ μεγέθει καὶ ὁποῖος τῇ φύσει καὶ τὰ κατὰ τοὺς ἱδίους χρόνους ἑκάστῳ πραχθέντα "And for the remaining time (scil. except for the Persian, Ethiopian and Greek Periods) it was natives ruling the country, 470 men and five women, about all of whom the priests held records in their sacred books from old times which were handed down continuously to their successors, (stating) however tall each of the kings had grown in height and of what kind his character was and what was accomplished by each of them during the respective reigns." This passage states explicitly that, even in the 1st century BCE (or the late 4th century BCE, if this is part the text of Hecataeus of Abdera), a late and partly misunderstood version of the royal annals was still known, possibly from papyrus copies (Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, 65–96 [with numerous references]). In contrast, the glosses attributed to later kings are mostly concerned with Egyptian—Greek (e.g., the Argivian myth of Io, cf. Aufrère, “Dualism”; Memnon, Eos’ son and king of
Aegyptiaca, however garbled and distorted the sparse remains may be, do supplement significantly all other chronologically relevant data available. As far as the Third Dynasty is concerned, critical evaluation of the contemporaneous evidence317 recently led to a more precise picture and revealed that the Third Dynasty consisted of five kings in the following sequence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nomen</th>
<th>Horus Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ḑšr</td>
<td>Nṯrj-h.t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḑšr-ttj</td>
<td>Śḥym-h.t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṇfr-k3 (?)</td>
<td>ḤꜤj-b3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nb-k3</td>
<td>Sš-nḥt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>njśwt Ḥwj(w)</td>
<td>KꜢj-ḥḏ.t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopting this sequence of kings and thus correcting inaccuracies in the sequence of kings as reflected in the royal annals’ fragments, the Egyptian king-lists, the Epitome of the Aegyptiaca, and the king-list according to Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes, one may propose the following tentative reconstruction of the Third historical Dynasty (cf. Table 4.4):


317 Dreyer, “Der erste König”; Baud, Djéser, 48–70; Seidlmayer, “Die staatliche Anlage” and “Dynasty 3”; Ćwiek, “History of the Third Dynasty”; Wilkinson, Early Dynastic Egypt; cf. also Swelim, Some Problems; Wellin, La 11e et la 111e Dynastie. The stela bearing the Horus name KꜢj-ḥḏ.t could be a piece of the Eighteenth Dynasty (Pätznik, “Qahedjet”) or of the Third Intermediate Period (Claus Jurman, personal communication).
Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third Dynasty Evidence (contemporaneous)</th>
<th>Manetho (Epitome)</th>
<th>Ps.-Apollodorus/ Ps.-Eratosthenes</th>
<th>Regnal length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ḏśr(-jt/sꜢ), Nṯrj-ḥ.t</td>
<td>Τοσέρτασις</td>
<td>Γοσσρέθις</td>
<td>29 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḏśr-tl, Ṣḥm-ḥ.t</td>
<td>Τσαορβόσ</td>
<td>Στούχος</td>
<td>6–7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nfr-kꜢ (?), ḤꜢj-ḫ.t</td>
<td>Μέσσωργις</td>
<td>Μάρης</td>
<td>6–7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nb-kꜢ, SꜢ-nḥt</td>
<td>Νεχερῳφής</td>
<td>Μοχειρί</td>
<td>8–9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>njswt Ḥwj(w), ḪꜢj-ḥd.t</td>
<td>Ἄχης</td>
<td>Ἄνωφίς</td>
<td>14 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One should also remember that the sequence of the kings of the Third Dynasty is furthermore reflected in the popular tradition as found in the stories of Papyrus Westcar.318 The stories told by Cheops’ sons are set in the time of Cheops’ predecessors; the first in Djoser’s reign and the second in Nebka’s reign. The relative position of Nebka within the Third Dynasty as found in the stories of Papyrus Westcar would—on its own—be insufficient for the determination of his actual position in the sequence of kings, but when regarded in light of the contemporaneous data and the other king-lists, this is an excellent example of source research, textual criticism, and critical evaluation. Even though the stories of Papyrus Westcar have sometimes been regarded as historically insignificant,319 historical facts and literary decorum are unquestionably blended together in the stories of Papyrus Westcar.

Due to the rearrangement of kings as found with the “Herodotean Giza-group,”320 the sequence of kings provided by Manetho and Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes is certainly not historically correct. The sequence of the kings of the Fourth Dynasty may, however, be reconstructed.

---


319 E.g., Wildung, Rolle ägyptischer Könige, 56.

320 It is, however, impossible to infer the misreading of a double column, as was done by Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho, 26, in order to improve Manetho’s sequence of kings:

Σώφις ΑΒC
Σώφις Σσβφίς
Μεγχέρης Ρατσίσις
Βύχερις Σσβφήρης
χΥZ Θσμβδίς

Which kings should have taken the positions marked with ABC and XYZ? This proposed double column cannot explain the sequence of kings as found in the Fourth Manethonian Dynasty, and it must therefore be discarded.
on the basis of, and with the aid of, the royal annals of the Old Kingdom and other contemporaneous data (cf. Table 4.5).\textsuperscript{321}

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnote{321 The sequence of kings is usually discussed within the broader context of dynastic and genealogical history: \textit{cf.}, e.g., Reisner, \textit{Mycerinus}, 239–56; Reisner and Smith, \textit{Hetepheres}, 1–12; von Beckerath, \textit{Chronologie}, 156–59; Jánosi, \textit{Giza in der 4. Dynastie}, 66–74; Gundacker, \textit{Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus}, 103–314, 371–72; Spalinger, "Dated Texts"; Verner, "Archaeological Remarks," "Contemporaneous Evidence," and "System of Dating"; Gundacker, "Genealogie" and "Genealogie Teil 2"; Callender, \textit{In Hathor’s Image}; cf. n. 239 above. In recent years, the genealogy of Reisner has lost its almost dogmatic authority, but the overall sequence of kings has nevertheless remained unchanged. It is thus not too daring to state that the historically correct sequence of kings has indeed been uncovered. Cf. also the following monuments of members of the royal family or of high officials recounting several kings in the historically correct sequence even though the chain of kings need not be uninterrupted (Baka is missing in all of them, perhaps because he failed to organize his mortuary cult in a way which would have allowed for the endowment of numerous cult personnel and an elaborate offering cult; cf. also n. 239 above):

(1) The “stela” of Meritites I mentioning her (quasi-)conjugal affiliation with Snefru and Cheops (\textit{wr.t-hḥs nj.t Šnfrw, wr.t-hḥs nj.t Ḫwj=f-wj} “the one great of admiration of Snefru, the one great of admiration of Cheops”) and her cultic reverence by Chephren (\textit{jmjḥw.t ḫr ḪꜤj=f-RꜤw} “revered by Chephren”) (PM II.1.1, 187; Jánosi, \textit{Königinnenpyramiden}, 10; Baud, “The Birth of Biography,” 96–97; Gundacker, \textit{Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus}, 265–70; Callender, \textit{In Hathor’s Image}, 53–62);

(2) a fragmentary inscription of an otherwise unknown official who was “overseer of the treasury of Snefru, overseer of the treasury of Cheops, overseer of the treasury of Redjedef, and overseer of the treasury of Chephren” (\textit{jmj-rꜤ ḫḏ nj Šnfrw, jmj-rꜤ ḫḏ nj Ḫwj=f-wj, jmj-rꜤ ḫḏ nj RꜤw-jḏd=f, jmj-rꜤ ḫḏ nj ḪꜤj=f-RꜤw}); the monument may have been donated by offspring of the unknown official (perhaps middle to late Fourth Dynasty, PM III.2, 760; Strudwick, \textit{Administration}, 169–70 and “Three Monuments,” 45–51, pl. iv; Fischer, \textit{Varia Nova}, 29–30, 39 [= pl. 5]);

(3) an inscription found in the tomb of prince Sekhemkare (LG 89 = G.8154) calling him “revered by his father, the king, by the Great God, by the king of Upper and Lower Egypt Chephren, by the king of Upper and Lower Egypt Mycerinus, by the king of Upper and Lower Egypt Shepseskaf, by the king of Upper and Lower Egypt Userkaf, and by the king of Upper and Lower Egypt Sahure” (\textit{jmjḥw ḫr ḫtj=f njšwꜤt, ḫr nṯr-Ꜥ ḫr njšwꜤt-bjt ḪꜤj=f-RꜤw, ḫr njšwꜤt-bjt Mn-kꜢ.w-RꜤw, ḫr njšwꜤt-bjt ŠꜢḥ-wj-RꜤw}) (PM III.1, 233–34; LD II, pl. 42a and LD—Text 1, 109–10; Urk. 1, 166; Junker, \textit{Giza I}, 32; Hassan, \textit{Giza IV}, 119–20; Schmitz, \textit{Königssohn}, 64; Strudwick, \textit{Administration}, 59; Harpur, \textit{Decoration}, 268; Baud, \textit{Famille royale I}, no. 218; Jánosi, \textit{Giza in der 4. Dynastie}, 375–79);

(4) an inscription of Nisutpunetjeri calling him “possessor of reverence by Redjedef, possessor of reverence by Chephren, possessor of reverence by Mycerinus, possessor of reverence by Shepseskaf, possessor of reverence by Userkaf, and possessor of reverence by Sahure” (\textit{nb jmjḥ ḫr ṫw-RꜤw-jḏd=f, nb jmjḥ ḫr ḪꜤj=f-RꜤw, nb jmjḥ ḫr Mn-kꜢ.w-RꜤw, nb jmjḥ ḫr ŠꜢḥ-wj-RꜤw, nb jmjḥ ḫr ṫw-RꜤw, nb jmjḥ ḫr ṫw-RꜤw, nb jmjḥ ḫr ṫw-RꜤw, nb jmjḥ ḫr ṫw-RꜤw})

\end{footnotesize}
Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nomen</th>
<th>Horus Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Śnfrw</td>
<td>Nb-mꜢꜢ.t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥwj=f-wj(-Hnmw)</td>
<td>Ṣddw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RꜤw-jddf=f</td>
<td>Ḥpr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḤꜤj=f-RꜤw</td>
<td>Wšr-jb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BꜢ-kꜢ=j</td>
<td>[unknown]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn-kꜢ.w-RꜤw</td>
<td>KꜢ-ẖ.t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Špśś-kꜢ=f</td>
<td>Špśś-ẖ.t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sequence of kings as given above is found in the Royal Canon of Turin, the Saqqara king-list, and the Abydos king-list, the latter of which, however, lacks Baka. Taking apart the “Herodotean Giza-group” and positioning the individual kings in their proper places will return the Epitome of the Aegyptiaca and the king-list according to Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes to the historically correct sequence of kings. Compared to the contemporaneous data, the

RꜤw) (PM III.1, 278; Urk. I, 166; Junker, Giza III, 51; Harpur, Decoration, 268, 582; Baud, Famille royale II, no. 138), and

(5)   the (auto)biographical inscription of Ptahshepses from Saqqara describing his life during the reigns of the kings Mycerinus, Shepseskaf, Userkaf, Sahure, Neferirkare, Shepseskare, Neferefre, and Newoserre (cf. Baud, Famille royale II, no. 68; Dorman, “Inscription of Ptahshepses”; cf. Excursus II and n. 243 above).

The last king mentioned in these inscriptions is indicative for dating them (the only exception being, perhaps, no. (2)).

322 Although Baka is usually considered the immediate successor of Chephren, he has recently been interpreted as Chephren’s predecessor on grounds of architectural similarities between his pyramid at Zawyet el-Aryan (cf. n. 206 above) and the pyramid of Redjedef at Abu Rowash (Edwards, “Chephren’s place”; Dobrev, “La IVe dynastie,” 20–21).

However, architectural features alone are insufficient for establishing the chronological sequence, as may be shown with the following examples: Redjedef’s pyramid resembles Snefru’s pyramid at Meidum more closely than the pyramid of Cheops, and Chephren’s pyramid resembles Cheops’ pyramid more closely than the pyramid of Redjedef. It is therefore audacious and adventurous to place Baka before Chephren solely on the grounds of his pyramid’s architecture and in contradiction to all king-lists. Cf. for a great variety of theories concerning the sequence of the kings of the Fourth Dynasty, the overview given by Reisner, Mycerinus, 242–45. Cf. also Verner, “Archaeological Remarks,” 380–81; Jánosi, Giza in der 4. Dynastie, 64–65; cf. also the beginning of n. 321 above.
royal annals, and the Abydos and Saqqara king-lists, this allows for the following tentative reconstruction of the Fourth historical Dynasty (cf. Table 6.6):\footnote{Djedefptah, who, according to the contemporaneous evidence and the scenario proposed above, never reigned (cf. Excursus II and section 6 above), is excluded from this table.}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\hline
Fourth Dynasty Evidence & Manetho & Ps.-Apollodorus/ & Regnal length \\
(contemporaneous) & (Epitome) & Ps.-Eratosthenes & \\
\hline
Śnfrw & Σήφουρις, & Śφοιρις & Σίριος & 48 years \\
& Σώρις & & & \\
Ḥwj=f-wj(-Hnmw) & Σώφις, & Χνούβος, & 26 years \\
& Σουφίς & & & \\
RꜤw-jdd=f & 'Ρατοίσης & 'Ραύστις & 15 years \\
ḤꜤj=f-RꜤw & Κερφέρης, & Σαώφις & & 26 years \\
& Σουφίς & & & \\
BꜢ-kꜢ=j & Βίχερις & Βιύρης & 1–2 years \\
Mn-kꜢ.w-RꜤw & Μεγχέρης & Μοσχερῆς & 28 years \\
Śpśś-kꜢ=f & Σεβερχέρης & [missing] & 7 years \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Fourth Dynasty Evidence}
\end{table}

In conclusion, Manetho's \textit{Aegyptiaca} must be considered an indispensable source for information on ancient Egyptian chronology. The complex history of the \textit{Aegyptiaca} and the scattered text transmitted demand that every investigation is carried out with great attention to detail. Only particularly careful examination will allow for the differentiation between historical facts and intrusions such as fabulous elements of popular tradition, politically motivated alterations, religiously aggravated amendments of pagan Egyptians—as well as Jews and Christians—, unintentional scribal errors of Egyptian and Greek scribes, simple misunderstandings, and folk-etymological or eloquent and learned reinterpretations. The results of such critical investigation will make accessible all the priceless information contained in Manetho's \textit{Aegyptiaca}. If then the \textit{Aegyptiaca} is viewed and analyzed together with all other data as a whole, it will contribute appreciably to the study of ancient Egyptian chronology.

Regardless of its later accretions, the very essence of Manetho's \textit{Aegyptiaca} is worth being searched for. It is thus an unparalleled challenge for Egyptologists and scholars of neighboring disciplines to examine it meticulously and, finally,
to strive to lift the veil of time which has fallen upon it. This decent task has possibly been best described by Murnane:\textsuperscript{324}

\textit{[T]he “Manethonian skeleton” is a genuine conceptual artifact from ancient Egypt itself. This doesn’t mean it’s perfect… [But] above all, let us not give up on the “old” problems (such as Manetho) while we are still in the process of exploring them.}

**Addendum**

Since the completion of this contribution, several studies have been published which advance some of the ideas put forward or develop alternative thoughts. From the latter group, two articles must be mentioned that deal with matters of the Third and Fourth Dynasties: Theis, “Bemerkungen zu Manetho” and “Pseudo-Eratosthenes.” Among the earlier group, Gundacker, “Eigennamen,” deals with the linguistic peculiarities of the names of the kings of the Fourth Dynasty in great detail, Gundacker, “The Names of the Kings,” does so with the names of the kings of the Fifth Dynasty, and Gundacker, “Fragment Berlin no. III6,” reconstructs a hitherto largely unrecognized king-list close to the Heliopolitan line of tradition as found in the Papyrus Westcar and the Wadi Hammamat graffito. The Egyptian king-lists thus prove to be a still unexhausted source of information on Egyptian history and chronology.

**Abbreviations**

All abbreviations not included in this list follow those used in the \textit{Lexikon der Ägyptologie}.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{AeLeo} \textit{Aegyptiaca Leodensia}
\item \textit{AfRg} \textit{Archiv für Religionsgeschichte}
\item \textit{AJT} \textit{American Journal of Theology}
\item \textit{ÄL} \textit{Ägypten und Levante}
\item \textit{ArOr} \textit{Archiv Orientální}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{324} Murnane, “Millennium Debate,” 17.
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