

# Towards a New History for the Egyptian Old Kingdom

*Perspectives on the Pyramid Age*

*Edited by*

Peter Der Manuelian and Thomas Schneider



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

# Contents

Editor's Introduction VII

Preface VIII

- 1 Ancient Egyptian History as an Example of Punctuated Equilibrium:  
An Outline 1

*Miroslav Bárta*

- 2 Economic Implications of the Menkaure Triads 18

*Florence Dunn Friedman*

- 3 Did the Old Kingdom Collapse? A New View of the First  
Intermediate Period 60

*John Gee*

- 4 The Chronology of the Third and Fourth Dynasties according to  
Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* 76

*Roman Gundacker*

- 5 The Entextualization of the Pyramid Texts and the Religious History of  
the Old Kingdom 200

*Harold M. Hays<sup>†</sup>*

- 6 Shareholders: The Menkaure Valley Temple Occupation in Context 227

*Mark Lehner*

- 7 Harvard University–Boston Museum of Fine Arts Expedition  
Contributions to Old Kingdom History at Giza: Some Rights and  
Wrongs 315

*Peter Der Manuelian*

- 8 Cattle, Kings and Priests: Phyle Rotations and Old Kingdom Civil  
Dates 337

*John S. Nolan*

- 9 The *Sed*-Festival of Niuserra and the Fifth Dynasty Sun Temples 366

*Massimiliano Nuzzolo*

- 10 **The State of Egypt in the Eighth Dynasty** 393  
*Hratch Papazian*
- 11 **The Old Kingdom Abroad: An Epistemological Perspective  
With Remarks on the Biography of Iny and the Kingdom of  
Dugurasu** 429  
*Thomas Schneider*
- 12 **The Dawn of Osiris and the Dusk of the Sun-Temples: Religious  
History at the End of the Fifth Dynasty** 456  
*Racheli Shalomi-Hen*
- 13 **Centralized Taxation during the Old Kingdom** 470  
*Leslie Anne Warden*
- Index** 497

## 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.

## 1 Manetho the Egyptian

Manetho<sup>1</sup> was an autochthonous Egyptian priest—possibly born in Sebennytos and associated with the cult of Re at Heliopolis<sup>2</sup>—, 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 Wickersham, *Berosos and Manetho*, 95; Lopilato, *Apotelesmatika*, 8–9; Gozzoli, *Writing of History*, 191), but *Mrjī-ntr-ʿ* “beloved of the Great God” (Redford, “The Name Manetho,” 121) is a particularly promising attempt (consisting of the unstressed passive participle *mrjī- ~ \*märrjū- > \*mä(j)-*, *cf.* Fecht, *Wortakzent*, § 446; Osing, *Nominalbildung* 1, 235–42; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbale Nominalbildung*, 186–88 and “Ägyptische Nominalbildungslehre,” and the theonym *ntr-ʿ ~ \*nätär-ʿáʿ > \*nēt-ʿó* (either with loss of ayin *> \*nēt-ʿó* or with metathesis *\*nätär-ʿáʿ > \*nät(ē)-ʿó(ʿ) > \*nēt-ʿó*, 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* 1, 143, 213; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbale Nominalbildung*, 155, 182 and “Ist Mythos,” 554–55). Manetho’s name was graecized as Μανέθω (uninflected, still found in several fragments, *cf.* Jacoby, *FrHistGr* IIIC, 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* IIIC, no. 609 F2), is probably a comparably late modification in order to connect Manetho’s name with that of the Egyptian god Thoth (*cf.* Verbrugghe and Wickersham, *Berosos 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 ACE, Adler, *Suidae lexicon*) contains two relevant lemmata (*cf.* Jacoby, *FrHistGr* IIIC, no. 609 T1, T2): (M.142) Μανέθως Μένδης τῆς Αἰγύπτου, ἀρχιερεὺς. ἐγραψε περὶ κατασκευῆς κυφίων, ζῆται τὶ τὸ κύφι “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 Σεβέννυτης. Φυσιολογικά· Ἀποτελεσματικά δι’ ἐπῶν καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ ἀστρονομούμενα “Manetho of Diospolis (*scil.* inferior, Waddell, *Manetho*, x–xi) in Egypt or of Sebennytos; ‘Physiological Matters’; ‘(Astrological) Effects’ in verse; and other astronomical (~ astrological) things more” (*cf.* Aufrère, “Manéthôn de Sebennytos, médiateur,” 321–24 and “Les deux notices”; Naiditch, “Manetho”; Koehly, *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 (Αἰγυπτιακά) in three books (Dihle, “Ptolemaios von Mendes”; Jacoby, *FrHistGr* IIIC, no. 611), as was pointed out by Müller and Müller, *FrHistGr* II, 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. Koehly, *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 Hephaestio of Thebes quoted Manetho’s Ἀποτελεσματικά I, 167–69 in his own treatise, also called Ἀποτελεσματικά 2.4.27, cf. Pingree, *Hephaestionis 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 C, no. 609 TIIa–IIb, F25; Aufrère, “Traces”) and the astrological *opus* of Νεχεψῶ and Πετόσιρις (cf. Heilen, “Anubio”; Ryholt, “New Light”; cf. nn. 22–23). Cf. Verbrugghe and Wickersham, *Berosos and Manetho*, 96; Gozzoli, *Writing of History*, 191–93; Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes*, 171.

It 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) in Egypt” 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 Ἐθνικά 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* III), 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 Ἐθνικά, i.e., the Thracian town Μένδη, -ης (cf. Meineke, *Ethnicorum*, 444; Billerbeck, *Ethnica* III), which is supported by several entries in the Σοῦδα: (A.4127) ... τὸν ἐν Μένδῃ τράγον Πανὸς ἱερὸν κατέθυσε ... “... he (scil. Ochus of Persia) sacrificed the sacred goat of Pan in Mende...”, (M.592) Μενδαῖος: ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς Μένδης “Mendaeus: the man from Mende”—according to the Ἐθνικά (cf. Meineke, *Ethnicorum*, 444; Billerbeck, *Ethnica* III), 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 ← \*Μένδη by harmonization with the preceding Μενδαίος] is one town of those in Pellene . . .” (cf. the lexicon of Valerius Harpocratio, s.v. Μένδη, which is obviously quoted in (M.593), Dindorf, *Harpocratonis lexicon* 1, 202), (M.594) Μένδην: οὕτω καλοῦσι τὸν Πᾶνα Αἰγύπτιοι ὡς τραγοπρόσωπον . . . ἣν δὲ καὶ ἱερὸν τοῦ Μενδησίου παρ’ Αἰγυπτίων . . . “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 11.17.5; Hude, *Historiae*, s.v. 11.17.5). Σεβεννύτης “of Sebennytos”, however, cannot be explained that way, because Stephanus of Byzantium (Meineke, *Ethnicorum*, 558; Billerbeck, *Ethnica* 111) calls this town Σεβέννυτος, undoubtedly a thematic *o*-stem, and its citizen and its nome equivocally Σεβεννύτης (cf. also Claudius Ptolemaeus, *Geographia*, 4.5; Stückelberger and Graßhoff, *Ptolemaios* 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 Syncellus (Jacoby, *FrHistGr* 111C, no. 609 T11a–11c), 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, γένει Σεβεννύτης, ὑπάρχων Ἡλίουπολίτης “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 Syncellus 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, *Constantine*, 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 Ἀποτελεσματικά, to whom Σεβεννύτης “the Sebennyte” was added by mistake. The attribution of the title ἀρχιερεὺς “archpriest,” which is also found in the pseudepigraphic letter at the beginning of the *Book of Sothis* and in Περί 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) Κύφι: τοῦτο Μάνεθως ὁ Αἰγύπτιος κατεσκεύαζε “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).<sup>3</sup> Manetho also seems to have been involved in installing the Graeco-Egyptian cult of Sarapis.<sup>4</sup> 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. García Valdés, *Plutarcho*, 110–11, 245; Griffiths, *De Iside et Osiride*, 160–61, 393–401; Sfamini Gasparro, “Serapide”; 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 T11a) 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 T11a–11c; cf. Waddell, *Manetho*, xvii). (4) A papyrus found at el-Hibeh (Grenfell and Hunt, *Hibeh Papyri* I, 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, ὦ Πτολεμαίε, λαχὼν βασιληΐδα τίμην || γαίης ἡμετέρης, κοσμοτρόφου Αἰγύπτου || “Be greeted, o Ptolemy, holding the royal power || of our land, of Egypt, which nurtures the all.” and V, 1–11 Ἐξ ἀδύτων ἱερῶν βίβλων, βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαίε, || καὶ κρυφίμων στηλῶν, ἃς ἡῤατο πάνσοφος Ἑρμῆς. || ... || ἀντιτύπῳ κηρῷ γ' ἀπομαζόμενος κεκόμισμαι || ἀνθολόγον Μούσης ... || ... || οὐ βαιὶς κάματος δ' οὗτος, Πτολεμαίε, 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. Koehly, *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, *Berosus and Genesis*, 240–43), but the association of Manetho and the first three Ptolemies can be viewed as historical fact (Huß, König, 123–29).
- 4 It is once more important to point to the episode of the cult image of Sarapis brought to Alexandria from Sinope, because it displays all features of what is traditionally called an



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.<sup>5</sup>

Paradoxically and ironically enough, Manetho's writings were totally ignored by classical Greek and Roman authors including geographers, ethnographers and historians.<sup>6</sup> In this respect, Manetho became the victim of the Graeco-

---

"Egyptian *Königsnovelle*" (Hermann, *Königsnovelle*; Loprieno, "King's Novel"; cf. for further critical remarks concerning the genre *Königsnovelle* Quack, "Pharao und Hofstaat" and "Political Ritual"; Redford "Writing"; Schneider "History as Festival"), as was shown by Ryan, "Lebensdaten." One should also mention that the *topos* of returning a statue to Egypt (which usually is said to have been brought abroad by the Persians) is very common during the Ptolemaic Period (cf., e.g., the Mendes Stela, *Urk.* 11, 81–105; de Meulenaere and Mackay, *Mendes 11*; Hölbl, *Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches*, 73–83; cf. Aufrère, "Les destructions"). The content and the literary form of this episode are thus an excellent example for genuine Egyptian elements in Greek reception. Despite all the chronological problems concerning the installation of the cult of Sarapis—which must have been a long-lasting process (Stiehl, "The Origin"; Stambaugh, *Sarapis under the Early Ptolemies*, 61–65; Jouguet, "Politique intérieure"; Sfameni Gasparro, "Serapide"; Borgeaud and Volokhine, "La formation"; Stephens, *Seeing Double*, 15–16; cf. for the cult of Sarapis Hani, *La religion égyptienne*; Merkelbach, *Isis regina—Zeus Sarapis*; Takács, *Isis and Sarapis*)—, it must have been viewed as closely connected to Manetho. This assumption finds particular support in the base of a marble bust found in the temple of Sarapis at Carthage bearing the inscription MANEΘΩΝ (Jacoby, *FrHistGr* 111C, no. 609 T5; cf. Aufrère, "Manéthôn de Sebennytos et la traduction," 17–19; Beschauouch, "Topographie de Carthage"). The donor (sponsor) or initiator, his motives, and the exact circumstances which led to the erection of this monument remain unknown.

- 5 Cf. Hölbl, *Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches*, 69–109; Stephens, *Seeing Double*, 14–15; Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists*, 203–06; In this respect, Manetho represents the continuation of Hecataeus of Abdera (Jacoby, *FrHistGr* 111A, no. 264), who wrote an account of Egyptian culture and history for Ptolemy I Soter; cf. Gozzoli, *Writing of History*, 193–96; Sterling, *Historiography*; Murray, "Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship"; Murray and Stern, "Hecataeus of Abdera"; Burstein, "Hecataeus of Abdera"; Lloyd, "Nationalist Propaganda"; Dillery, "Manetho and Greek Historiography"; Legras, "Experts"; Sterling, *Historiography*.
- 6 The comprehensive, almost encyclopedic works of Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, and Pliny the Elder do not mention Manetho. The first native Greek author to quote Manetho (but not his historiographical *Aegyptiaca*!) is Plutarch (c. 120 ACE, cf. Jacoby, *FrHistGr* 111C, no. 609). Cf. Unger, *Chronologie des Manetho*, 3; Verbrughe and Wickersham, *Berosos and Manetho*, 115–20; Krauss, "Manethos Ägyptische Geschichte," 227; Hornung, Krauss, and Warburton, "King-Lists," 34. The first author relying on Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* is possibly Apion of Oasis (mid-1st century ACE, cf. Jacoby, *FrHistGr* 111C, no. 616 F4a, F15a, no. 609 T1 (with notes); cf. also Aufrère, "Dualism," 43, n. 29; Quack, "Reiche," 5, with n. 14) followed by Flavius Josephus in his *Contra Apionem* (mid- to late 1st century ACE, cf. n. 26 below).

centric view of historiography,<sup>7</sup> and of pro- and anti-Jewish polemics, which over time must have “infected” his writings.<sup>8</sup> 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 (Βαβυλωνιακά) dedicated to Antiochus I Soter (c. 290/278 BCE, Jacoby, *FrHistGr* IIIC, no. 680; cf. Gmirkin, *Berosus 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* IIIA, 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* IIIA, 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 Kleopatra 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, *Berosus und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur*; Burstein, *Babyloniaca of Berossus*; Haubold, *et al.*, *The World of Berossus*; 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 ἐκάστου τὰ κατὰ μέρος μακρὸν ἂν εἴη καὶ περιέργον γράφειν, ὥς ἂν τῶν πλείστων ἀχρήστων περιειλημμένων. “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* IIIA, no. 264 F25; Oldfather, *Diodorus Siculus* I, 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*, I, 185–92 and III, 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* invented<sup>9</sup> *e nihilo* in order to name the anonymous author of an account of Egyptian history produced early in Rome's rule over Egypt.<sup>10</sup> 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,<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup>

## 2 Manetho's Writings—An Incomplete Mosaic

Ten works have been attributed to Manetho:<sup>13</sup> (1) Αἰγυπτιακά “Egyptian Matters” in three books, which were devoted to Egyptian history;<sup>14</sup> (2) Ἡ ἱερὰ βίβλος

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, 276–96; Schneider, *Ausländer* 1, 86–91). Cf. 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.

13 Waddell, *Manetho*, xiv; Laqueur, “Manethon,” 1063, 1099–1101; Kroll, “Manethon,” 1102–06. Recently, Aufrère announced a new critical edition entitled “Manéthôn de Sebennytos” (Aufrère, “Dualism,” 36, n. 1).

14 Waddell, *Manetho*, 2–187; Jacoby, *FrHistGr* IIIC, no. 609 F1–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;<sup>15</sup> (3) *Περὶ ἑορτῶν* “On Festivals”;<sup>16</sup> (4) *Περὶ ἀρχαΐσμου καὶ εὐσεβείας* “On Ancient Ritual and Religion”;<sup>17</sup> (5) *Περὶ κατασκευῆς κυφίων* “On the Production of Kyphi”<sup>18</sup>—the last three titles, nos. (3)–(4) in particular, may be chapters of *The Sacred Book*<sup>19</sup>—; 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*;<sup>20</sup> (7) *Φυσικά* or *Φυσιολογικά* “Physical Matters”;<sup>21</sup> (8) a medical treatise of unknown title;<sup>22</sup> (9) *Ἡ βίβλος τῆς Σώθews ἥ ὁ κυνικὸς κυκλὸς* *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

---

60–65), but to c. 270 BCE by Unger, *Chronologie des Manetho*, 2 (cf. Aufrère, “Manéthôn de Sebennytos et la traduction” and “Manéthôn de Sebennytos, médiateur”); either assumption fits the linguistic data fairly well, cf. n. 57 below.

- 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.
- 19 Otto, *Priester und Tempel* II, 215, n. 4; cf. Waddell, *Manetho*, xv; Laqueur, “Manethon,” 1099.
- 20 Waddell, *Manetho*, 204–07; Jacoby, *FrHistGr* IIIC, no. 609 F13 (cf. F1); 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.
- 22 Cf. Kind, “Manethon,” 1101–02; A medieval catalog of ancient physicians (Codex Laurentianus 73, 1 folium 142v, 9th century ACE, Jacoby, *FrHistGr* IIIC, no. 609 T13) reads (orthography corrected): *nomina auctorum medicinae . . . Hermes Trismegistus, Manethos, Nechepso, Cleopatra regina . . .* “Names of authors of medical treatises: . . . Hermes Trismegistus, Manetho, Nechepso and queen Cleopatra [VII Philopator]. . .” In addition, Paulus of Aegina (c. 650 ACE, *De re medica* IV, 40.3, cf. VII, 19.4, cf. Heiberg, *Paulus Aegineta* I, 360, II, 324) records: *καθαρῶν μὲν ὄντων τῶν ἐλκῶν . . . ἐστὶ . . . τὸ Μανέθωνος <ξηρίον> διὰ σφέκλῃς . . .* “If the wounds are clean, . . . there is . . . the <desiccative powder> of Manetho with salts of tartar . . .” (cf. also n. 2 above).

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

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,<sup>25</sup> 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),<sup>26</sup> 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 TIIa, 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 TIIa, with n. 56), because they both refer to secret tablets of Hermes as the principal sources of Manetho’s account (... παραφανήσεται 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 IIa–IIc; 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,” 1102–06; Gundel and Gundel, *Astrologumena*, 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, *Berosos 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).<sup>27</sup> All these writings were collected by George Syncellus in his *Ἐκλογή Χρονογραφίας* “Selection of Chronography” (792 ACE), which is thus the most important historiographical source.<sup>28</sup>

### 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 *Ἐκλογή Χρονογραφίας* of George Syncellus, supplemented with critical notes after the version of Eusebius Pamphili of Caesarea, reads as follows:<sup>29</sup>

Τρίτη δυναστεία Μεμφιτῶν βασιλέων ἐννέα(θ)<sup>a</sup>, ὧν

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

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>α' Νεχερωφῆς<sup>b</sup> ἔτη κη'<br/>ἐφ' οὗ Λίβυες ἀπέστησαν<br/>Αἰγυπτίων, καὶ τῆς σελήνης<br/>παρὰ λόγον αὐξηθείσης διὰ<br/>δέος ἑαυτοὺς παρέδωσαν.</p> | <p>1. Necherophes: 28 years,<br/>under whom the Libyans<br/>revolted against the Egyptians,<br/>and after the moon had waxed<br/>beyond reckoning, they<br/>surrendered in terror.</p> |
|--|--|

<sup>27</sup> Jacoby, *FrHistGr* 11, no. 244 F85; cf. Jacoby, *Chronik*, 399–400; Waddell, *Manetho*, 212–25.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Waddell, *Manetho*, xv–xx; Unger, *Chronologie des Manetho*, 1–43; Laqueur, “Manethon”; von Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 35–38; cf. for the compilation of Africanus: Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus*; Wallraff, *Julius Africanus and Sextus Iulius Africanus*; cf. for the chronicle of Eusebius: Aucher, *Eusebii chronicon*; Schoene, *Eusebii chroniconum*; Mosshammer, *Chronicle of Eusebius*; cf. for the *Ἐκλογή Χρονογραφίας* of George Syncellus: Mosshammer, *Georgii Syncelli Ecloga chronographica*; Adler and Tuffin, *Chronography of George Synkellos*; cf. for Christian chronographers in general: Adler, *Time Immemorial*; Wallraff, *Welt-Zeit*; Burgess and Kulikowski, *Mosaics of Time*.

<sup>29</sup> 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.



- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>β' Τόσορθρος<sup>c</sup> ἔτη καθ'<br/>         &lt;ἐφ' οὗ Ἰμούθης,&gt;<sup>d</sup> οὗτος<br/>         Ἀσκληπιὸς &lt;τοῖς&gt;<sup>d</sup><br/>         Αἰγυπτίοις κατὰ τὴν<br/>         ἰατρικὴν νενόμισται,<sup>e</sup> καὶ<br/>         τὴν διὰ ξεστῶν λίθων<br/>         οἰκοδομίαν εὗρατο, ἀλλὰ<br/>         καὶ γραφῆς ἐπεμελήθη.</p> | <p>2. Tosorthros: 29 years,<br/>         &lt;under whom lived Imhotep;&gt;<br/>         he is regarded as Asclepius<br/>         &lt;by the&gt; Egyptians because<br/>         of his medical skills; and he<br/>         invented the art of building<br/>         with hewn stone, and he<br/>         moreover was devoted to<br/>         writing.</p> |
| <p>γ' ἑΤύρεις ἔτη ζ'</p>   | <p>3. Tyreis: 7 years;</p>   |
| <p>δ' Μέσωχρις ἔτη ιζ'</p>   | <p>4. Mesochris: 17 years;</p>   |
| <p>ε' Σώϋφισ ἔτη ις'</p>   | <p>5. Soyphis: 16 years;</p>   |
| <p>ς' Τοσέρτασις ἔτη ιθ'</p>   | <p>6. Tosertasis: 19 years;</p>  |
| <p>ζ' Ἀχης ἔτη μβ'</p>   | <p>7. Aches: 42 years;</p>   |
| <p>η' Σήφουρις &lt;ἔτη&gt; λ'</p>  | <p>8. Sephouris: 30 years;</p>   |
| <p>θ' Κερφέρνης ἔτη κς'<sup>f</sup><br/>         ὁμοῦ ἔτη σιδ'<sup>g</sup></p>   | <p>9. Kerperhes: 26 years;<br/>         altogether: 214 years.</p>   |

<sup>a</sup> Eusebius: ὀκτώ(η') "eight"; <sup>b</sup> manuscript variant: Νεχερόφης; Eusebius: Νεχέρωχis, Նեխրոփիս *Nek<sup>h</sup>erōk<sup>h</sup>is* (Armenian version); <sup>c</sup> Eusebius: Σέσορθος, Սեսորթոս *Sesorthos* (Armenian version); <sup>d</sup> conjecture, cf. Sethe, "Imhotep," III (παρά is superfluous); <sup>e</sup> Eusebius: <ἐφ' οὗ Ἰμούθης,> ὃς Ἀσκληπιὸς παρὰ <τοῖς> Αἰγυπτίοις ἐκλήθη "(<under whom lived Imhotep,> who is called Asclepius among <the> Egyptians," conjecture, cf. Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 77; <sup>f-f</sup> Eusebius: οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐξ οὐδὲν ἀξιωμακρόνεντον ἔπραξαν "But the remaining six did nothing worth mentioning"; <sup>g</sup> Eusebius: οἱ καὶ ἐβασίλευσαν ἔτεσιν ροη' "And they ruled for 198 years," 197 years (Armenian version).

The Fourth Dynasty according to the Epitome of Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* as transmitted by Sextus Julius Africanus and preserved in the Ἐκλογή Χρονογραφίας of George Syncellus, supplemented with critical notes after the version of Eusebius Pamphili of Caesarea, reads as follows:<sup>30</sup>

Τετάρτη δυναστεία Μεμφιτῶν συγγενείας ἐτέρας βασιλεῖς η' (ὀκτώ)<sup>a</sup>.  
 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' Σῶρις ἔτη κθ'	1. Soris: 29 years;
β' Σοῦφισ ἔτη ξγ'	2. Souphis: 63 years,
ὃς τὴν μεγίστην ἤγειρε πυραμίδα, ἣν φησιν Ἡρόδοτος ὑπὸ Χέοπος γεγονέναι. οὗτος δὲ καὶ ὑπερόπτης εἰς θεοὺς ἐγένετο, καὶ τὴν ἱεράν συνέγραψε βίβλον. <sup>b</sup>	who built the largest pyramid, which, says Herodotus, was erected under Cheops. And he also developed arrogance towards the gods, and he wrote <i>The Sacred Book</i> .
γ' Σοῦφισ ἔτη ξς <sup>c</sup>	3. Souphis (11): 66 years;
δ' Ἐμεγχέρης <sup>d</sup> ἔτη ξγ'	4. Mencheres: 63 years;
ε' Ῥατοίσης ἔτη κε'	5. Rhatoises: 25 years;
ς' Βίχερις ἔτη κβ'	6. Bicheris: 22 years;
ζ' Σεβερχέρης ἔτη ζ'	7. Sebercheres: 7 years;
η' Θαμφθίς ἔτη θ <sup>e</sup>	8. Thamphthis: 9 years;
ὁμοῦ ἔτη σοζ'/σοδ <sup>f</sup>	altogether: 277/274 years.

<sup>a</sup> Eusebius: ιζ' "17"; <sup>b</sup> personal remark of Africanus: ἦν ὡς μέγα χρήμα ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ γενόμενος ἐκτησάμην "which, because of its high esteem, I bought when in Egypt"; <sup>c</sup> Eusebius explicates: τρίτος Σοῦφισ, ὁ τὴν μεγίστην πυραμίδα ἐγείρας, ἣν φησιν Ἡρόδοτος ὑπὸ Χέοπος γεγονέναι, ὃς καὶ ὑπερόπτης εἰς θεοὺς γέγονεν ὡς μετανοήσαντα, αὐτὸν τὴν ἱεράν συγγράφαι βίβλον, ἣν ὡς μέγα χρήμα Αἰγύπτιοι 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"; <sup>d</sup> Μενχέρης [*sic*] according to the manuscripts; <sup>e-e</sup> Eusebius: τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν οὐδὲν ἀξιομνημόνευτον ἀνεγράφη "But of the remaining, there is nothing worth mentioning recorded"; <sup>f</sup> Correct: σπδ' "284"; Eusebius: Οἱ καὶ ἐβασίλευσαν ἔτεσιν 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:<sup>31</sup>

31 Jacoby, *FrHistGr* II, 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 brevity.



[...]

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσεν ς' Μομχειρί<sup>a</sup> Μεμφίτης, ἔτη οθ'.

As 6th ruled the Egyptian Thebans the Memphite Momcheiri, 79 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσεν ζ' Στοῖχος, υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, ἔτη ς'.

As 7th ruled the Egyptian Thebans Stoichos, his son, 6 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσεν ὄγδοος Γοσορμής, ἔτη λ'.

As eighth ruled the Egyptian Thebans Gosormies, 30 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσεν θ' Μάρης, υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, ἔτη κς'.

As 9th ruled the Egyptian Thebans Mares, his son, 26 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ι' ἐβασίλευσεν Ἀνωϋφίς, ἔτη κ'.

As 10th ruled the Egyptian Thebans Anoyphis, 20 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ια' ἐβασίλευσε Σίριος, υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, ἔτη ιη'.

As 11th ruled the Egyptian Thebans Sirios, his son, 18 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ιβ' ἐβασίλευσε Χνουῦβος <ἥ><sup>b</sup> Γνεῦρος, ἔτη κβ'.

As 12th ruled the Egyptian Thebans Chnoubos <or> Gneuros, 22 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ιγ' ἐβασίλευσε Ῥαϋώσις, ἔτη ιγ'.

As 13th ruled the Egyptian Thebans Rhayosis, 13 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ιδ' ἐβασίλευσε Βιϋρης, ἔτη ι'.

As 14th ruled the Egyptian Thebans Biyres, 10 years.

Θηβαίων Αἰγυπτίων ιε' ἐβασίλευσε Σαῶφίς, ἔτη κθ'.

As 15th ruled the Egyptian Thebans Saophis, 29 years.

Θηβαίων <Αἰγυπτίων> ις' ἐβασίλευσε Σαῶφίς β', ἔτη κζ'.

As 16th ruled the <Egyptian> Thebans Saophis II, 27 years.

Θηβαίων <Αἰγυπτίων> ιζ' ἐβασίλευσε Μοσχερής, ἔτη λα'.

As 17th ruled the <Egyptian> Thebans Moscheres, 31 years.

[...]

<sup>a</sup> An obscure gloss, τοιγάρ 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 ἄμαχος> “... (a man) with exceedingly large limbs, thus irresistible” (cf. Waddell, *Manetho*, 216); as an alternative, von Gutschmid (Gelzer, “Diorthose,” 268) conjectured two additional names, Τοισαράμ Ἄχος, but their position and interpretation would constitute an enigma of their own, and should thus be discarded. <sup>b</sup> conjecture, Bunsen, *Weltgeschichte* II, 76–77; Waddell, *Manetho*, 218; cf. furthermore n. 134 further below.

*Excursus 1 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,<sup>32</sup> 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.<sup>33</sup> Among those events, regularly recurring ones, especially *šmšw-ḥrw* “the following of Horus”<sup>34</sup> and *tnw.t (jḥ.w ʿw.t nb.w Mḥwj Šmʿw)* “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,<sup>35</sup> 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.<sup>36</sup> From then on, every even year was named *rnp.t sp XY (tnw.t jḥ.w ʿw.t nb.w Mḥwj Šmʿw)* “Year of the

32 Spalinger, “Dated Texts”; Verner, “Archaeological Remarks,” “Contemporaneous Evidence,” and “System of Dating”; Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 327.

33 This does *not* imply that the events recorded in the royal annals are of only limited historical significance, or even none at all; cf. Navrátilová, “Review of Wilkinson, *Royal Annals*”; Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 6; Baud, “Les frontières,” 45–46; Quack, “Reiche,” 17, n. 56 *contra* Wilkinson, *Royal Annals*, 66.

34 Cf. *e.g.*, Sethe, *Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte*, 3–21; Kees, “Horusdiener”; Helck “Horusgeleit”; von Beckerath “*šmšw-ḥrw*” and “Horusgeleit”; Kaiser, “Frühzeit 1”; Wilkinson, *Early Dynastic Egypt*, 189, 220–21.

35 Thus already Sethe, *Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte*, 75–81.

36 Cf. for this development Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 315–22, 338; Baud, “Ménès, la mémoire monarchique” and “Les frontières”; Hornung, Krauss, and Warburton, “Methods of Dating.”

XY<sup>th</sup> occurrence (of the counting of all cattle and livestock of Lower and Upper Egypt),” and every odd year *rnp.t m-ḥt sp XY* (*ṯnw.t jḥ.t.w ʿw.t nb.w Mḥwj Šmʿw*) “Year after the XY<sup>th</sup> occurrence (of the counting of all cattle and livestock of Lower and Upper Egypt).”<sup>37</sup> 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 sm³-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<sup>38</sup> and the contemporaneous inscriptions<sup>39</sup> 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.<sup>40</sup> John Nolan<sup>41</sup> thus

37 Edel, “Regierungsjahr” and *Altägyptische Grammatik* I, §§ 412–13; Barta, “Das Jahr in Datumsangaben” and “Zur Bezeichnung”; Sethe, *Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte*, 60–99; Gardiner, “Regnal Years” and “Reading of the Word”; Mattha, “Dating Group”; von Beckerath, “Lesung”; cf. for the correct reading of the word for regnal year as *rnp.t-sp* Fecht, “Lesung von Regierungsjahr” and Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 319–21, 331–38.

38 Wilkinson, *Royal Annals*; cf. Helck, “Palermostein”; Hornung, Krauss, and Warburton, “Royal Annals.” Cf. for the individual fragments: (a) *Palermo Stone*: de Rougé, *Recherches*; Pellegrini, “Nota”; H. Schäfer, “Bruchstück”; Naville, “Pierre de Palerme”; Sethe, *Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte*, 42–59; Giustolisi, “Pietra di Palermo”; (b)–(e) *Cairo Fragments I–IV*: Gauthier, “Quatre fragments” and “Quatre fragments...Musée du Caire”; Daressy, “Pierre de Palerme”; (f) *Cairo Fragment v = Fragment de Cénival*: de Cénival, “Un nouveau fragment”; (g) *London Fragment*: Reeves, “Fragment”; Stewart, *Egyptian stelae* II, 6, pl. 3.I. Cf. for additional attempts to reconstruct the royal annals, von Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 13–19, 204–05; Borchardt, *Die Annalen und die zeitliche Festlegung*; Kaiser, “Frühzeit I” and “Frühzeit II”; Helck, “Bemerkungen zum Annalenstein”; Barta, “Chronologie der 1. bis 5. Dynastie”; Baud, “Ménès, la mémoire monarchique.” Cf. for the date of origin, perhaps the reign of Newoserre, Caminos and Fischer, *Epigraphy*, 48; Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 6–7, 363, n. 1962; Gardiner, *Geschichte*, 64; von Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 14; cf. for the annals of the Sixth Dynasty, Baud and Dobrev, “De nouvelles annales” and “Le verso des annales.” And for a recent translation of the Old Kingdom annals, cf. Strudwick, *Texts from the Pyramid Age*, 65–77.

39 Spalinger, “Dated Texts”; Verner, “Archaeological Remarks,” “Contemporaneous Evidence,” and “System of Dating.”

40 Spalinger, “Dated Texts”; Verner, “Archaeological Remarks,” “Contemporaneous Evidence,” and “System of Dating”; cf., however, Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 327.

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.* I, 106: 4–9) *jrj.kj n=f (m) jmj-r³ Šmʿw r hrw.t...jp=j jḥ.t nb.t jp.t(j) n ḥnw (m) Šmʿw pn (m) sp.wj sn.wj wnw.t nb.t jp.t(j) n ḥnw (m) Šmʿw pn (m) sp.wj sn.wj jrj=j šrw.t=j jrj.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 (*rnp.t sp XY*) and odd years (*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 (*rnp.t sp XY*), whereas all others containing thirteen lunar months were odd years (*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,<sup>42</sup> and in fact the evaluation of the basic data appears to be unsatisfactory.<sup>43</sup>

All collections of Old Kingdom dates provide a so far unrecognized *double* imbalance: It is not only the case that attested even years (*rnp.t sp XY*) outnumber attested odd years (*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 (*rnp.t sp XY*) usually outnumber the attestations of the odd year (*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

---

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, *Die (auto-)biographischen Inschriften*, 10–12, 145–46 [with references]; Strudwick, *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, *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).

42 Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 324–26; Verner, "System of Dating," 39–43.

43 Several recent studies prefer a system of irregular census-cycles: Krauss, "Length of Snefru's Reign," "Chronologie und Pyramidenbau," and "Berechnung der Bauzeit"; Nolan, "The Original Lunar Calendar" and "Lunar Intercalations and 'Cattle Counts'"; Spalinger, "Dated Texts"; Verner, "Archaeological Remarks," "Contemporaneous Evidence," and "System of Dating." The main proponents of regular biennial census-cycles are Sethe, *Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte*, 60–99; Gardiner, "Regnal Years"; Edel, "Regierungsjahr" and *Altägyptische Grammatik* 1, §§ 412–13; Stadelmann, "Länge der Regierung Snofrus"; von Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 147–63 (except for the reign of Snefru, p. 157); Baud, "Les frontiers"; Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 315–38, "Baugraffiti," and "Mykerinos."

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.<sup>44</sup> 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-ht 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.<sup>45</sup>

44 Cf. for the masons' graffiti found on blocks of the pyramid at Meidum, Posener-Krieger, "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 *indictiones*, 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 *indictiones* 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-Strevens, *Oxford Companion*, 768–71). Furthermore, it became standard to mention only the year within the current *indictio*, but not the number of the *indictio* 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 Fürstentestamente*): "... anno ab incarnatione domini nostri Iesu Christi DCCCXI, anno vero regni eius in Francia XLIII, et in Italia XXXVI, imperii autem XI, indictione 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 *indictio* [year] four" ("*indictione IIII*" is short for "*anno quarto indictionis currentis*" "in the fourth year of the current *indictio*"). It is only the additional dates which provide a point of reference for the determination of the number of the *indictio* itself: it was the 55th *indictio* since the fictitious installation in 3 BCE. Just as in this Roman system, where the number denoting the *indictio* was left out for the sake of briefness and because every contemporary was well aware of the *indictio* 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 *indictio* 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-ht sp 18 . . . sp tpj h3b-sd* “Year after the 18th occurrence . . . the first occurrence of the *Sed*-Festival.”<sup>46</sup> 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.<sup>47</sup> 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.<sup>48</sup> 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*.<sup>49</sup>

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*).<sup>50</sup> This has been taken (a) as evidence for generally irregular census-cycles,<sup>51</sup> (b) as an error which occurred during the compilation of the annals,<sup>52</sup> 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-ht> 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).

47 Cf. Hornung and Staehelin, *Sedfest*; Hornung, “Introduction” (with numerous references).

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.

49 Cf. Gardiner, “Regnal Years,” 14–16; Hayes, “Royal Decrees,” 13; Spalinger, “Dated Texts,” 312; Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 331–34; Baud, “Dynasties 6–8,” 158.

50 Palermo Stone, recto vi.3–4; cf. Wilkinson, *Royal Annals*, 143–46, fig. 1.

51 *E.g.*, Arnold, “Überlegungen,” 27; von Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 157; Helck, *Geschichte*, 52; Krauss, “Length of Snefru’s Reign,” “Chronologie und Pyramidenbau,” and “Berechnung der Bauzeit”; Nolan, “The Original Lunar Calendar” and “Lunar Intercalations and ‘Cattle Counts’”; Spalinger, “Dated Texts”; Verner, “Archaeological Remarks,” “Contemporaneous Evidence,” and “System of Dating.”

52 O’Mara, *Palermo Stone*, 94.



at Dahshur.<sup>53</sup> 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<sup>54</sup> and the king-lists of Abydos and Saqqara,<sup>55</sup> usually mention a king's *nomen*, and so does Manetho. The names of the Third Manethonian Dynasty have suffered from misinterpretation, misreading, and misspelling,<sup>56</sup> 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.<sup>57</sup>

53 E.g., Sethe, *Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte*, 83; Stadelmann, "Länge der Regierung Snofrus," 236; Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 21.

54 Farina, *Papiro*, pl. III; Gardiner, *Royal Canon*, pl. II, col. III (= col. 4 according to Helck, "Anmerkungen"; Ryholt, "Turin King-List"); cf. Excursus II below.

55 Cf. von Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 215–16.

56 Cf. for an overview of common mistakes West, *Textual Criticism*, 25; Pöhlmann, *Überlieferungsgeschichte* II, 43–46; Schubart, *Palaeographie*; cf. also Merkelbach and van Thiel, *Griechisches Leseheft*; Harrauer, *Handbuch*. It is also important to distinguish between scribal errors which occurred in Greek uncials (300 BCE until the 9th century ACE, cf. Cavallo and Maehler, *Greek Bookhands and Hellenistic Bookhands*; Turner and Parsons, *Greek Manuscripts*; Seider, *Paläographie*; Roberts, *Literary Hands*; Kenyon, *Palaeography*) and scribal errors which occurred (cf. for manuscripts written in a transitional script, late 8th–early 9th centuries ACE, Cavallo, "La ϰοινή") in Greek minuscule (from the 9th century ACE onwards, Barbour, *Greek Literary Hands*; Witteke, *Album*; Lake and Lake, *Dated Manuscripts*; Spatharakis, *Illuminated Greek Manuscripts*).

57 Cf. for basic information on Greek transcriptions of Egyptian personal names Brunsch, "Untersuchungen" and "Bemerkungen"; Quaegebeur, "Study of Egyptian Proper Names," "Pre-Old Coptic," and "Greek Transcriptions"; Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 71 (with numerous references); Schenkel, "Ist Mythos." Cf. also the collections of transcribed names: Parthey, *Personennamen*; Preisigke, *Namenbuch*; Foraboschi, *Onomasticum*.

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  $\eta$  and  $\iota$  in Egyptian names graecized by Manetho. Interpreting  $\eta$  and  $\iota$  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  $\eta$ ,  $\eta/\eta\iota$ ,  $\epsilon\iota$ , and  $\epsilon$ , 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  $\eta$ ,  $\eta/\eta\iota$ ,  $\epsilon\iota$ , and  $\epsilon$  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  $\eta \sim *ē \sim *\bar{e}$  and  $\epsilon \sim *ē \sim *\bar{e}$  ( $\eta/\eta\iota$  and  $\epsilon\iota$  are not found; the latter is especially remarkable insofar as itacistic spellings of toponyms and kings' names with  $\epsilon\iota$  instead of  $\iota$  are expected to remain in the text, because there was no orthographic tradition serving as a model after which  $\epsilon\iota$  could have been corrected to  $\iota$ ). 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* I; Mayser and Schmoll, *Grammatik*; Gignac, *Grammar*; Teodorsson, *Phonology*: frequent interchange  $\epsilon\iota \sim \iota$ , passably frequent interchange  $\eta \sim \epsilon\iota$  – cf. also the Ptolemaic Homer papyri, which, in antevocalic position, display very frequently the alternation  $-\eta V- \sim -\epsilon\iota V-$  (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;  $-\epsilon\iota V-$  is moreover ambiguous, because it could also represent systematic metrical lengthening by means of insertion of  $*-i\bar{i}-$ :  $*-\epsilon V-$  (scanned  $\sim$ )  $\rightarrow *-\epsilon\iota V-$   $*-\bar{e}i\bar{i} V-$  (scanned  $\sim$ ) (cf. also Werner,  *$\eta$  und  $\epsilon\iota$* ). One should furthermore consider possible effects of the *metacharacterismus* in 403/402 BCE (Old-Attic alphabet:  $E \sim *\bar{e}$  and  $*\bar{e} \rightarrow$  Milesian alphabet  $E \sim *\bar{e}$ ,  $E\iota \sim *\bar{e}$ , and  $H \sim *\bar{e}$ ; cf. Herzog, *Umschrift*; Goold, "Homer"; Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique* I, 5–16; Threatte, *Attic Inscriptions* I, 211–13; West, *Studies*, 21–23; Reece, "Metacharacterism"), which contributed to this heterogeneous picture—, rather rare interchange  $\eta \sim \epsilon$  and  $\epsilon\iota \sim \epsilon$  indicating the emerging collapse of vowel quantities, and, somewhat delayed, the beginning interchange  $\eta \sim \iota$  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* I, 43–45, II, 306–13; Hoffmann, Debrunner, and Scherer, *Geschichte* II; Kretschmer, *Entstehung*; Niehoff-Panagiotidis, *Koine und Diglossie*), vis-à-vis the genuine Egyptian interchange of  $*-\bar{e}(-)$  and  $*-\bar{i}(-)$  (Osing, *Nominalbildung* I, 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  $-\iota\varsigma$ ,  $-\iota\omicron\varsigma$  or, rarely, as



thematic *o*-stems  $-(\iota)\sigma$ ,  $-(\iota)\sigma\upsilon$ . Egyptian  $*-\acute{e}(-)$  and  $*-\acute{i}(-)$  are expected as  $-\eta$ - and  $-\bar{\iota}$ - respectively, which is crucial in the case of the theonym  $R^w$  because of its frequent occurrence as the last element of kings' names; name-final  $R^w \sim *R\acute{i}w > *R\acute{i}(\acute{e}) > *R\acute{e}(\acute{e})$  (Osing, *Nominalbildung* 1, 20–21) is commonly rendered with  $-\rho\eta\varsigma$  ( $*-\rho\sigma$ , *s*-stems, less plausibly  $*-\rho\sigma\upsilon$ , thematic  $\bar{a}$ -stems), but rarely and unexpectedly, and therefore probably by itacistic corruption, it is also found as  $-\rho\iota\varsigma$  ( $*-\rho\iota\sigma$ , *i*-stems, rarely  $\leftarrow *-\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma?$ ). Similarly, Herodotus transcribed Egyptian names as either *i*-stems ( $-\iota\varsigma$ ,  $-\iota\sigma$ ; later Greek authors followed an Atticistic fashion and preferred *d*-stems,  $-\iota\varsigma$ ,  $-\iota\delta\sigma$ , cf. Plutarch's *Περὶ Ἰσιδος καὶ Ὀσίριδος*, García Valdés, *Plutarcho*; Griffiths, *De Iside et Osiride*, cf. also the toponyms recorded in Stephanus of Byzantium's his *Ἑθνικά* (6th century ACE), Meineke, *Ethnicorum*; Billerbeck, *Ethnica*; sometimes, the model of  $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\varsigma$ ,  $-\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  "city, town" was followed, as one may anyway expect in the case of toponyms, cf. n. 311 below) or thematic *o*-stems ( $-\sigma$ ,  $-\sigma\upsilon$  or  $-\omega\varsigma < *-\sigma-\sigma$ ,  $-\hat{\omega} < *-\acute{o}-\sigma\upsilon$ , 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  $-\omega\varsigma < *-\omega-\sigma$ ,  $-\hat{\omega} < *-\acute{\omega}-\sigma\upsilon$ ); occasionally, further inflectional patterns, e.g.,  $\bar{a}$ -, *n*-, *s*- (subtype à la  $-\chi\lambda\eta\varsigma < -\acute{e}-\eta\varsigma$ ,  $-\chi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\upsilon\varsigma < -\acute{e}-\epsilon-\sigma$ ) and *eu*-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  $-\iota\varsigma$  as their nominative desinence (Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 254). The nominative desinence  $-\eta\varsigma$  is only correct when it is the Greek equivalent of Egyptian word-final  $*-\acute{e}\#$ ; in all other instances, it should be considered an itacistic replacement of original  $-\iota\varsigma$ . 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 Vokalphoneme," 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  $\eta \sim *^{\acute{e}} (\sim *^{\acute{i}})$ ,  $\iota \sim \epsilon\iota \sim *^{\acute{i}}$  (but  $\epsilon\iota$  is not used for unstressed  $*^{\acute{i}}$ , which is solely rendered  $\iota$ ), and  $\epsilon \sim *^{\acute{e}}$ , which is indicative for the 2nd century BCE (Mayser, *Grammatik* 1; Mayser and Schmoll, *Grammatik*; Gignac, *Grammar*; Clarysse, "Ethnic Diversity and Dialect"; cf. for Late Coptic  $\eta$  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"; Quaegebeur,

Νεχέρωφης (Νεχέρωχης) is usually identified with Nebka (*Nb-k3*),<sup>58</sup> but this seems problematic, even though the Saqqara king-list already displays an expanded variant *Nb-k3-Rʿw*.<sup>59</sup> This should result in Greek \*Νεβ-/Νεφ(ε)-χορής < \**Nēb-kō-Rēʿ* < \**Nib-kā3-Rīʿūw*,<sup>60</sup> which is remarkably close to the largely unrecognized manuscript variant Νεχερόφης. One may thus conclude that the consonants of \*Νεφ(ε)χορής 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 \*Νεφ(ε)χορής ~ *Nb-k3-Rʿw* and Djoser's Horus name<sup>61</sup> *Ntrj-h.t* ~ \**Nītrīj-ḥīt* > \**Nētrj-ḥē* > \*Νεθερωχίς,<sup>62</sup> which resembles Eusebius' Νεχέρωχης. One should also remember that Djoser is referred to as *Ntrj-h.t* *Dśr*, with both names enclosed in a single cartouche, in Ahmose's inscriptions (Twenty-Seventh Dynasty, Berlin 14765)<sup>63</sup> and that both names were frequently used in combi-

---

"Pre-Old Coptic," 190; cf. n. 79 below). An Egyptian graffito of the nationalist counter-king Horwennefer found in the temple of Sethos I at Abydos (201 BCE, Hölbl, *Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches*, 137; Clarysse, "De grote opstand"; Lefebvre and Perdrizet, *Les graffiti*, no. 74; Lacau, "Un graffito"; Pestman, "Haronnophris"; Pestman, Quaegebeur, and Vos, *Recueil* II, no. 11; Clarysse, "Hurgonaphor et Chaonnophris"; Zauzich, "Neue Namen"), which is written in Greek characters (with consistent orthography!), proves beyond doubt that this practice had become customary. The Coptic alphabet is thus the derivative of a petrified Greek alphabet of the 2nd century BCE, to which additional characters were added in order to allow for the proper designation of typically Egyptian/Coptic consonants foreign to Greek (cf. Quaegebeur, "Préhistoire"; Satzinger, "Die altkoptischen Texte").

Greenberg largely neglected all matters of Egyptian and Greek philology, linguistics, and palaeography (Greenberg, *Manetho*, 183–203 (on the Third and Fourth Dynasties), 204–12 (on potential mistakes; in this simplifying section, practically everything is explained as *parablepsis/aberratio oculi*; cf., e.g., for the Middle Kingdom, the critique by Schneider, "Das Ende," 307–09) and thus cannot arrive at firm results. His investigation will thus be largely passed over, as will be done with the problematic approach of O'Mara (O'Mara, "Manetho and the Turin Canon" and *Palermo Stone*).

58 E.g., Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 23; Swelim, *Some Problems*, 224; Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists*, 236; Seidlmayer, "Dynasty 3," 116.

59 Von Beckerath, *Handbuch der Königsnamen*, 48–49; Ryholt, "Seneferka," 166–67.

60 Cf. for the individual elements' vocalization Fecht, *Wortakzent*, §§ 153, n. 257, 176–78; Osing, *Nominalbildung* I, 20–21, II, 380, n. 56; Edel, "Vokalisation," 35 and *Korrespondenz* II, 361–62; Gundacker, *Studien* I, 291, n. 1835; cf. for the interchange of φ and β nn. 92, 117 below.

61 Von Beckerath, *Handbuch der Königsnamen*, 48–49.

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; Osing, *Nominalbildung* I, 315, II, 409, n. 90; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung*, 182.

63 Wildung, *Rolle ägyptischer Könige*, 79–83; von Beckerath, *Handbuch der Königsnamen*, 48–49; cf. furthermore Aufrère, "Remarques," 8.

nation even in the Ptolemaic Period, *e.g.*, on the *Famine Stela*.<sup>64</sup> 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 *Ntrj-h.t Dšr* ~ \*Νεφ(ε)χορής Τῶσις or perhaps \*Νεθερωχής ἥ Τῶσις,<sup>65</sup> whereas another source rather close to the Royal Canon of Turin and the Abydos king-list gave *Nb-k3-Rʿw* ~ \*Νεφ(ε)χορής as the first king. After the double entry \*Νεθερωχής (ἥ) Τῶσις 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 \*Νεθερωχής and Nebka's *nomen* \*Νεφ(ε)χορής. 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 -ρης were extremely common. A variant with the desinence -χης must therefore be viewed as the *lectio difficilior*, which later on was further distorted and resulted in Νεχερωφής and Νεχέρωχis.<sup>66</sup> The variant form Μομχειρί, which is found in the king-list according to Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes,<sup>67</sup> is a late development of *Nb-k3-Rʿw* ~ \**Nīb-kā3-Rīʿūw*. As it seems, the first element \**nīb-* was reduced to \**nḫ-*, which triggered the assimilatory process \**nḫ-* > \**mḫ-* > \**mḥ-* and the Greek rendering Μομ-; -χει- is the unstressed outcome of *k3.w*, which often and unpredictably interchanges with the singular *k3*;<sup>68</sup> and -ρί obviously represents the theonym *Rʿw*, 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; Quaegebeur, "Considérations... Teēphthaphōnukhos," 98; Thissen, "Ägyptologische Randbemerkungen," 60; *cf.* n. 57 above.

The gloss attributed to Νεχερωφής/Νεχέρωχis 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 *k3* ~ \**kā3*, which should have been preserved as such, was analogically replaced with \**kō3*; *cf.* Gundacker, *Studien* I, 291, n. 1835. In all other cases, the fluctuation of unstressed \*-ē- and \*-ō- 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 \*-ρῖς ← \*-ρῆς).<sup>69</sup>

The second king of Manetho's Third Dynasty appears to be Djoser, which seems corroborated by the gloss mentioning Imhotep.<sup>70</sup> Τόσορθρος indeed does contain the element *Dśr*,<sup>71</sup> but the second element -θρος deserves closer attention. The king-lists provide two different extensions for king Djoser:<sup>72</sup> -jt (Royal Canon of Turin)<sup>73</sup> and -sʒ (Abydos king-list),<sup>74</sup> and Djoser's successor bore the similar name *Dśr-ttj*. Of these three additions, -ttj matches -θρος best, because, in Hieratic, -ttj could easily be misread as -trj making Τόσορθρος an almost per-

69 Cf., e.g., the Fourth Dynasty kings *Bʒ-kʒ=j* → *Bʒ-kʒ-Rʕw* > *Bῖχρεῖς*, *Mn-kʒ.w-Rʕw* > *Μεγχέρης*, and *Špsš-kʒ=f* → *Špsš-kʒ-Rʕw* > *Σεβερχέρης*. Cf. Osing, *Nominalbildung* 1, 20–21; Edel, *Korrespondenz* 11, 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 *nʒ-šdm=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, Ramesseid; PM 111.2, 556; Wildung, *Rolle ägyptischer Könige*, 74–76; Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists*, 25), which gives the name as *Dśr nbw*. This is obviously a combination of Djoser's *nomen* and his proto-variant of what later became the Gold Name, *nbw* (or *Rʕw nbw* or *nbw(.j) Rʕw*, 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* *Dśrw* ~ *\*Dśrřw* (*\*Dśrřw*, cf. Osing, *Nominalbildung* 1, 166–75; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbale Nominalbildung*, 167–69). Cf., however, the opposing evidence presented further below (cf. also n. 78).

74 Cf. Wildung, *Rolle ägyptischer Könige*, 64.

flectly transmitted rendering of Djoser-teti's *nomen* *Dśr-ttj* → *Dśr-trj*,<sup>75</sup> for which one would expect \*Τοσόρθορος. The same applies for the next, Manetho's third name, Τύρεις, which seems to be a twin of Djoser-teti's distinguishing element -*ttj*.<sup>76</sup> If so, in all probability Τόσορθορος (\*Τοσόρθορος) and Τύρεις once formed only a single entry \*Τόσορθορος ἢ Τύρεις (\*Τοσόρθορος ἢ Τύρεϊς), 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.<sup>77</sup> Dissolving the entry \*Τόσορθορος ἢ Τύρεις (\*Τοσόρθορος ἢ Τύρεϊς) into two separate ones 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, \*Τόσορθορος ἢ Τύρεις (\*Τοσόρθορος ἢ Τύρεϊς) 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 Στοιχος, 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 hieroglyphic had an additional distorting effect on this name. If, however, the reconstruction *Dśr* ~ \**Dáśīr* > \**Tóσ(ι)*-<sup>78</sup> is accepted and if furthermore the rendering of king Teti's name (Sixth Dynasty), *Ttj* ~

75 Thus already Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 22; The variant *Dśr-tj* found in the Royal Canon of Turin may be a haplological or haplographical mistake for *Dśr-ttj*, cf. Wildung, *Rolle ägyptischer Könige*, 96, with n. 9. However, one should expect \*Τοσόρθορος instead of Τόσορθορος (cf. the subsequent discussion of -*ttj* and n. 79 below). The simplification \*Τοσόρθορος → Τόσορθορος 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 *υ* in Τύρεις n. 79 below.

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

78 Cf. for the individual elements' vocalization Fecht, *Wortakzent*, § 293, n. 429; Osing, *Nominalbildung* I, 120–37, 147–55; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung*, 154–61; Secondly, \**Tóσ(ι)*- was perhaps also introduced in unstressed position instead of \**Τασ(ι)*-. In pre-tonic position, \**Τασ(ι)*- should not have displayed a word-final *shwa*-vowel, but it is impossible to judge whether a secondarily introduced variant \**Tóσ(ι)*- would have retained its *shwa*-vowel or not (cf. for the late replacement of *status constructi* with *status absoluti* Fecht, *Wortakzent*, § 434 (3)). Moreover, one cannot exclude that Greek copyists analogically aligned several names to one another, which furthermore complicates the analysis of this detail.

\**Tātj* > \*Θόθις (preserved as Ὀθόης in Africanus' version of the Epitome due to the misspelling \*θθθ → θθο- and an itacistic corruption \*-ις → -ης),<sup>79</sup> is kept

79 Jacoby, *FrHistGr* IIIC, no. 609 F3; Waddell, *Manetho*, 52–53; cf. West, *Textual Criticism*, 25; Pöhlmann, *Überlieferungsgeschichte* II, 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 *Tj*, 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 \*-ó- or \*-ú-. Although this is not uncommon a manner of transcribing Egyptian \*-ó- 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 ~ \**Tēbē-nūtē* < \**Tḃbḥw-nátār* ~ *Tb(w)-ntr* "Sebennytos" (cf. Helck, *Die altägyptischen Gaue*, 179; Peust, *Toponyme*, 80; cf. for the individual elements' vocalization Osing, *Nominalbildung* I, 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* II, 251, 253; Solmsen, *Wortforschung*, 36–155, especially 36–37, 58–68; Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique* I, 50–51; Mendez-Dosuna, "Fonema x y Q"; Threatte, *Attic Inscriptions* I, 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 ~ \**ānsē* < \**Hā-nn-īnsē* < \**Hāwāt-nḥw-nj-jīnsḥw* ~ *Hwt-n(w)-n(j)-njswt* "Heracleopolis parva" (cf. Helck, *Die altägyptischen Gaue*, 123, 189; Peust, *Toponyme*, 52, 97; Gomaa, "Heracleopolis parva" and "Heracleopolis magna"; cf. for the individual elements' vocalization Fecht, *Wortakzent*, §§ 34, n. 74, 293, n. 428; Gundacker, *Studien* I, 73–76, 97–103, 113–27; cf. Clédat, "Suez," 173–79; Peust, "Zur Herkunft des Koptischen n"; Gundacker, "Etymology," 66, n. 259, 69–70). According to the papyri, Greek υ for Egyptian \*-ó- 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 \*-ó- 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  $\upsilon \sim *u$ ), which displays the very interchange  $\upsilon \sim \omicron$  (Dobias-Lalou, *Cyrène*, 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 Τύρεις, because -ει- instead of expected -ι- may simply be a late itacistic error (cf. n. 57 above), but it should, perhaps, be interpreted differently. Τύρεις 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 ( $Tlj \sim *T\acute{a}lj \rightarrow Trj \sim *T\acute{a}r\acute{e} > *T\acute{o}r\acute{e} \sim \text{Τύρεις}$ ). Accordingly, Τύρεις, or more precisely \*Τύρείς, matches perfectly \*-θορος (in \*Τοσόθορος) and \*Θόθις (T- vs. Θ- is either the result of an Egyptian dialectal variation or merely accidental, cf. Schenkel, “Ist Mythos,” 554–55).

To conclude, Τύρεις (\*Τύρείς) 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 Τύρεις (\*Τύρείς) 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 *Trj* as either \*Θόρις or \*Θῶρις (cf. Fecht, *Wortakzent*, §§ 95, 349) instead of Τύρεις (\*Τύρείς). In case this explanation is accepted, Τύρεις (\*Τύρείς) may moreover be identified as one of the oldest Greek/Pre-Old Coptic glosses (early 3rd century BCE, perhaps with Τύρε- representing the actual gloss, whereas the desinence -ις 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/Τωσθῶθιος. This rendering must have been truncated, perhaps by haplology, to \*[Τω-]σθόθιος ~ \*Σθόθιος or \*[Τω]σθῶθιος ~ \*Σθῶθιος with subsequent dissimilation of the sequence -θ-θ- (lex Grassmann),<sup>80</sup> whereby the first -θ- was deaspirated and the second -θ- was shifted to -χ-.<sup>81</sup> As a result, one gets \*Στόχιος, which by erroneous metathesis yields Στοιχος, or \*Στῶχος, which through the misreading \*-ω- → -οι- yields also Στοιχος.<sup>82</sup> 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 -*tj* → -*trj* found in Manetho's *Aegyptiaca*.

The fourth name of the Third Manethonian Dynasty is Μέσωχρις. According to Günter Dreyer,<sup>83</sup> 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-k3* → *Nfr-k3-R'w*).<sup>84</sup> In this case, one would expect *Nfr-k3-R'w* ~ \**Nāfir-kā3-Rī'ūw* > \**Nāf-kō-Rī'ē* > \**Νεφχορής*,<sup>85</sup> which can only give Μέσωχρις if a process like the following is accepted: First, *n* was assimilated to *m* under the influence of *f* (\**Νεφ*- ~ \**nef*- ~ \**nf*- > \**mf*- ~ \**Μεφ*-), and second, two scribal errors occurred (corruption of \*-φ- → -c-<sup>86</sup> and metathesis of -ο- ~ -ω-<sup>87</sup> and -χ-), thus providing exactly Africanus' Μέσωχρις, which furthermore may display an itacistic corruption (Μέσωχρις ← \**Μεσωχρής*

80 Cf. Gignac, "Pronunciation," 196–97; Schenkel, "Ist Mythos," 554–55, 567.

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. 66 above.

82 A mistake very common in Greek uncial, cf. West, *Textual Criticism*, 25; Pöhlmann, *Überlieferungsgeschichte* II, 43–46; Schubart, *Palaeographie*; Kenyon, *Palaeography*, table of alphabets (after p. 128); cf. furthermore n. 56 above and von Gutschmid's unnecessary conjecture Σδοιχος (Gelzer, "Diorthose," 268).

83 Dreyer, "Der erste König," 34.

84 Von Beckerath, *Handbuch der Königsnamen*, 48–49; Ryholt, "Seneferka," 166–67.

85 Cf. for the individual elements' vocalization Fecht, *Wortakzent*, §§ 176–78; Edel, "Vokalisation," 35; Osing, *Nominalbildung* I, 20–21, 128, II, 380, n. 56; Edel, *Korrespondenz* II, 361–62; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung*, 154.

86 Perhaps a mistake in Greek uncial, which requires a partly damaged character in the *Vorlage*. Cf. West, *Textual Criticism*, 25; Pöhlmann, *Überlieferungsgeschichte* II, 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.



← \*Μεφχορής < \*Νεφχορής).<sup>88</sup> Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes mentions this king as Μάρης, which again must be a truncated variant, as Wolfgang Helck<sup>89</sup> has pointed out. One may thus propose the development \*Ναφχορής > \*Μαφχορής → \*Μασχορής<sup>90</sup> → Μά[σχο]ρης, and one may even suggest that the vowel -α- in Μα- is a last faint trace of pretonic *Nfr-* ~ \**Nǎf-*.<sup>91</sup> The almost homophonous names Nebka(re) and Neferka(re)<sup>92</sup> 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 Σώϋφις is mentioned, whom Helck<sup>93</sup> equated with Djoser by assuming that this name originated from a source different from that providing Τόσορθρος. But there can be no doubt that Σώϋφις 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.<sup>94</sup> 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 *Dśr*.<sup>95</sup> The second element -τασι- may be analyzed as a combination of -jt and -sʒ, both secondarily ascribed to the *nomen* of Djoser in the Royal Canon of Turin and the Abydos king-list respectively.

88 Cf. Osing, *Nominalbildung* 1, 20–21; Edel, *Korrespondenz* 11, 361–62; cf. also n. 57 above.

89 Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 22–23.

90 As Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 23 stresses, Μάρης and Μοσχερής, the somewhat faulty rendering of Mycerinus (*Mn-kʒ.w-Rʿw*), share the same folk-etymological explanation ἡλιόδωρος “gift of the sun” (Jacoby, *FrHistGr* 11, 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.”

92 Seidlmayer, “Dynasty 3,” 120 suggests that *Nb-kʒ-Rʿw* and *Nfr-kʒ-Rʿw* are simply corruptions of *Nb-kʒ*, which is indeed possible in light of the interchangeability of unstressed *nfr-* ~ \**nǎf-* ~ \**něf-* and *nb-* ~ \**nīb-* ~ \**něb-* (with *b* ~ /β/, cf. Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 135–37 and “Zur Aussprache des Beta”; Gundacker, “Etymology,” 75) from the time of the New Kingdom onwards (Krauss, *Ende der Amarnazeit*, 11; cf. for additional bibliographical references Gabolde, *D'Akhénatón*, 194–96; Breyer, *Ägypten und Anatolien*, 163–202).

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.

Τοσέπρασις is thus to be identified with Djoser, who actually should have been associated with the gloss mentioning Imhotep. Helck<sup>96</sup> pointed out that Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes mentions this king as Τοσορμής, which certainly displays a scribal error \*τ- → ρ-;<sup>97</sup> Τοσορ- ← \*Τοσορ- thus evidently resembles the element *Dśr*. The second element -μή- 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.

\*Αχης is usually identified with Huni,<sup>98</sup> and this is certainly correct. Huni's *nomen*,<sup>99</sup> the Old Kingdom attestations of which should probably be read *njswt Ḥwj(wʔ)*,<sup>100</sup> conspicuously resembles the Greek form \*Αχης, although some kind of corruption must have affected it (perhaps an *Akzentvariante* of a *nomen agentis* \*Αχης ← \*Χαής ~ \*Ḥāwwé < \*Ḥūwwé < \*Ḥūwwé < \*Ḥūwjūw ~ Ḥwj(w), or alternatively \*Αχης ← \*Χαής ~ \*Ḥāwé < \*Ḥāwé < \*Ḥāwǝj ~ Ḥwj).<sup>101</sup> The equivalent of Huni in the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes is Ἀνωϋφίς. If once more an interchange -χ- ~ -φ- is assumed, which furthermore may have been triggered by the name Σαῶφίς a few lines later, \*Ἀνωϋχίς may be explained as the result of a metathesis of the variant *Ḥwnj*, which had been in use since the Middle Kingdom at the latest: *Ḥwnj* ~ \*Ḥāwānǝj > \*ǝḥwóně > \*ǎḥwóně ~ \*Αχυνίς → \*Ἀνωϋχίς.<sup>102</sup>

96 Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 22–23; cf. already Gelzer “Diorthose,” 268.

97 A mistake common in Greek uncial, cf. West, *Textual Criticism*, 25; Pöhlmann, *Überlieferungsgeschichte* II, 43–46; Schubart, *Palaeographie*; Kenyon, *Palaeography*, table of alphabets (after p. 128); cf. also n. 56 above.

98 Cf. Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 23; Seidlmayer, “Dynasty 3,” 117.

99 Von Beckerath, *Handbuch der Königsnamen*, 48–49.

100 Cf. for the ascertainment of this reading Borchardt, “König Huni?”; H. Schäfer, “König Huni”; Seidlmayer, “Dynasty 3,” 122, 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, *Das ägyptische Verbum* II, §§ 117.4, 683.6c; Gardiner, *Admonitions*, 83; *Wb* III, 49: 5–8). As it seems, this younger variant of the verb *ḥwj* intruded Huni's name in some lines of tradition.

101 *Nomina agentis* of the type \*śūdmūw (type 11.7) rather frequently display *Akzentvarianten*. Cf. Osing, *Nominalbildung* I, 120–37, 176–83; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung*, 154–58, 171–73 and “Ägyptische Nominalbildungslehre.”

102 There is, however, no reason to conjecture this name to Ἀνωϋφίς, as was proposed by von Gutschmid (Gelzer, “Diorthose,” 268). Cf. Osing, *Nominalbildung* I, 184–92; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung*, 173–75. Hypothetically, it is also feasible to interpret -ω- as the Greek rendering of Egyptian -w- (cf. Fecht, *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 ← \*Τοσόρθορος ἢ Τύρεῖς was split up):<sup>103</sup>

(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 ις'	(h)	(9) Κερφέρνης	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 *terminus technicus* “wśf” “lost” of textual criticism, which was misinterpreted as the royal names Śdś (Abydos king-list) and Hw-ḏf (Royal Canon of Turin) respectively.<sup>104</sup> The Abydos king-list reintroduced the name Nfr-k3-R'w from a gloss *in margine* or another king-list, but dropped Huni instead. The reason for this was the erroneous preservation of the entry of “king” Śdś, which should have been replaced with Nfr-k3-R'w, and, furthermore, the effort of keeping a predefined number of kings. In Manetho's king-list, Μέσωχρις

-v- as that of Egyptian \*-ś- under the influence of the Greek dialect of Cyrene (cf. Gundacker, “Etymology,” 66, n. 259; Dobias-Lalou, *Cyrène*, 24; cf. also n. 79 above and Clarysse, “Ethnic Diversity and Dialect”). Cf. furthermore Vergote, *Grammaire Copte* I.1, § 38; Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 205.

103 Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 79–80.

104 The text critical remark, which indicated a lacuna or a deteriorated and consequently illegible passage, read perhaps śd wśf (Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 14–16, 85) or śd ḏf (cf. Goedicke, “King Hwḏf”) “broken and (therefore) left out.” Written by means of an abbreviation, this *terminus technicus* was, on the one hand, misread as hw-ḏf “food and fare” and, on the other hand, as śd śj “it is broken.” Both these misreadings were then interpreted as kings' names. Cf. furthermore Fecht, “Review of Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*,” 117; Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists*, 14–16; Ryholt, *Political Situation*, 10–11 and “Turin King-List,” 147–48; cf. for textual criticism in ancient Egypt Zeidler, *Pfortenbuchstudien* 1, 43–44; Goedicke, “King Hwḏf.”

(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) | Μομχειρι | ἔτη οθ' | (c) | (2) | Στοῖχος | ἔτη ς'  |
| (b) | (3) | Γοσορμής | ἔτη λ'  | (d) | (4) | Μάρης   | ἔτη κς' |
| (e) | (5) | Ἀνωϋφίς  | ἔτη κ'  |     |     |         |         |

Although this suggestion could explain why Στοῖχος (Djoser-teti) and Γοσορμής (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 Ἀνωϋφίς (Huni). But this constitutes a substantial difficulty, because the last line of this double column thus contained only a single entry. Although George Syncellus<sup>105</sup> 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 Ἀνωϋφίς 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.<sup>106</sup> He then attributed to Τοσέρτασις 19 years, but varied the

105 Jacoby, *FrHistGr* II, no. 244 F85; cf. Waddell, *Manetho*, 212–25.

106 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 Τύρεϊς, 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).<sup>107</sup> Γοσορμής' 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).<sup>108</sup>

Τύρεις' 7 years thus continue the original figure of the double entry \*Τόσορθρος ἢ Τύρεις/\*Τοσόρθρος ἢ Τύρεϊς, 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 Στοιχος, 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.<sup>109</sup>

"Αχης' length of reign of 42 years is, however, certainly incorrect. Helck<sup>110</sup> 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 \*ΚΔ' → †ΜΒ', be it

---

were 10, 20, and multiples of 20, which would allow for the determination of 19 years attributed to the first and second kings of the Third Dynasty (Νεχερωφής 19+10 = Μομχειρί 19+60 and Τοσέρτασις 19 = Γοσορμής 19+10 > 30); cf. furthermore n. 280 below.

107 Cf. Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 56, 81–83; Fecht, "Review of Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*," 121.

108 Cf. Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 55–56.

109 Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 55–56.

110 Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 56; cf. Barta, "Chronologie der 1. bis 5. Dynastie," 21.

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 ~ 𐩔𐩐𐩩𐩩𐩩) were erroneously changed to four tens and two units (42 ~ 𐩔𐩔𐩔𐩔𐩩). 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 Θαμφθίς) belonging to this Manethonian Dynasty with those known from contemporaneous evidence is commonly accepted.<sup>111</sup> 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.<sup>112</sup> This has finally been corroborated by Jürgen Osing,<sup>113</sup> who identified *Šnfrw*<sup>114</sup> as a *nomen agentis* \**Šanḫárūw* thereby putting down the interpretation of a hypocoristic creation.<sup>115</sup> Σῶρις has nevertheless been regarded a defective Greek rendering<sup>116</sup> with loss of the hieroglyph “heart and windpipe” (Gardiner sign-list 25F). In light of the interchange of ϣ, ϐ, and ογ,<sup>117</sup> and the inability of the Greek alphabet to denote properly the sound

<sup>111</sup> Cf., e.g., Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 24–24; von Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 156–59 and “iv. Dynastie”; Spalinger, “Dated Texts”; Verner, “Archaeological Remarks,” “Contemporaneous Evidence,” and “System of Dating”; Verbrugge and Wickersham, *Berosos and Manetho*, 190–91.

<sup>112</sup> 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.”

<sup>113</sup> Osing, *Nominalbildung* 1, 185; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung*, 176; cf. already Vycichl, “Wie hieß”; Černý, “The True Form.” Cf. for the toponym *Asfynis* < *Hwt-Šnfrw* “domain of Snefru” n. 121 below.

<sup>114</sup> Von Beckerath, *Handbuch der Königsnamen*, 52–53.

<sup>115</sup> Von Beckerath, *Handbuch der Königsnamen* (1st edition), 52; Graefe, “Reputation,” 260, n. 18.

<sup>116</sup> Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 28; Vycichl, “Wie hieß,” 126–27.

<sup>117</sup> Cf., e.g., <sup>S.F.</sup>𐩔𐩐𐩩𐩩𐩩 ~ 𐩔𐩐𐩩𐩩𐩩 ~ 𐩔𐩐𐩩𐩩𐩩 ~ 𐩔𐩐𐩩𐩩𐩩, etc. < *ff* “hair” Crum, *Coptic Dictionary*, 623a–623b; Westendorf, *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*, 345; Černý, *Coptic Dictionary*, 265; Vycichl, *Dictionnaire*, 280; cf. Gundacker, “Etymology,” 45.



/w/—which is left out or randomly rendered with ο, ω, υ, ου or γ—, Σῶρις can be traced back to Snefru's name: *Šnfrw* ~ \**Šānfārūw* > \**Šn̄fārē* > \**Šēřfōrē* > \**Šwōrē*.<sup>118</sup> Σήφουρις (perhaps ← \*Σέφουρις) is thus the expected Greek equivalent of \**Šēřfōrē* ~ \**Šēřūrē*;<sup>119</sup> 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.<sup>120</sup> 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).<sup>121</sup>

118 Cf. von Beckerath, "IV. Dynastie," 115: "... starke Kontraktion ..."

119 Cf. for the facultative sound change \*(-)ř- > \*(-)ūr- 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 ~ ε 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... ἀβέσκααντος "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 Ὀσίρις, Ὠσίρις, 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 Snofrus*, 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 *Hwt-Šnfrw* ~ \**Hāwāt-Šānfārūw* > \**Hā'-Šānfānā* > \**Hā-Šn̄fānē* > \**Hā-Šfōnē* ~ *Asfynis* ~ Ἀσφυνίς (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 ⲉⲃⲱⲛ, Westendorf, *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*, 480, and Arabic *Asfun il-Maṭa' (i)-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- > \*-θ-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 Shenufi, 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 Shenufi, 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 *ⲩⲉⲛⲟⲩⲩⲓ/ⲩⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲩⲓ* resembles Snefru's name *Šnfrw ~ \*Šānfārūw* (Graefe, “Reputation,” 261–63; cf. nn. 113–117 above), although one would expect *\*ⲩⲉⲛⲟⲩⲩⲓ/\*ⲩⲛⲟⲩⲩⲓ* or, with a phonological development similar to that of *Asfynis*, *\*ⲩⲉⲛⲟⲩⲩⲓ/\*ⲩⲟⲩⲩⲓ*. But Snefru's name may have undergone a folk-etymological reinterpretation, *Šnfrw ~ \*Šānfārūw > \*ⲩⲉⲛⲟⲩⲩⲓ/\*ⲩⲟⲩⲩⲓ* “benefactor” → *ⲩⲉⲛⲟⲩⲩⲓ/ⲩⲉⲛⲛⲟⲩⲩⲓ* “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., *\*-ⲟⲩⲩⲓ → \*-ⲛⲟⲩⲩⲓ*, 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,<sup>122</sup> but he was nevertheless strongly influenced by Herodotus.<sup>123</sup> 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;<sup>124</sup> one may thus call these

---

rather loose association with νοϣϣι "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 *njswt mnḥ* "beneficent king" (*Instruction for Kagemni*, Papyrus Prisse 11.8, Jéquier, *Papyrus Prisse*; Gardiner, "Instruction"; *Forecast of Neferty*, E 1; Helck, *Prophezeiung des Neferti*). This is very interesting because (*njswt*) *mnḥ* was translated as (βασιλεὺς) 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, ϣϣϣϣϣϣ/ϣϣϣϣϣϣ'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).

122 Cf. Mendels, "Polemical Character"; Burstein, "Images of Egypt," 599–601.

123 Cf. Dillery, "Manetho and Greek Historiography"; Gozzoli, *Writing of History*, 193–96.

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  $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\psi$ <sup>125</sup> is inferior to Manetho’s own,  $\Sigma\omicron\upsilon\phi\iota\varsigma$ , this is wrong. Hieroglyphic<sup>126</sup>  $\text{Hwj}=f\text{-wj}$  developed<sup>127</sup>  $*\text{H}\check{\text{a}}\text{w}\check{\text{j}}\check{\text{á}}\text{f}\text{w}\check{\text{j}} > *\text{H}\check{\text{a}}\text{w}\check{\text{w}}\check{\text{á}}\text{f}\text{w}\check{\text{j}} > *\text{H}\check{\text{a}}\text{w}\check{\text{á}}\text{f}\text{w}\check{\text{e}} > *\text{H}\check{\text{e}}\text{w}\check{\text{ó}}\text{f}\check{\text{f}}\check{\text{e}} \sim \chi\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\psi$ ,<sup>128</sup> but at the stage  $*\text{H}\check{\text{a}}\text{w}\check{\text{á}}\text{f}\text{w}\check{\text{e}}$ , the initial consonant  $h$  was palatalized in all Egyptian dialects except for Akhmimic.<sup>129</sup> 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,  $\Sigma\acute{\omega}\ddot{\upsilon}\phi\iota\varsigma$ , and in the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes,  $\Sigma\alpha\acute{\omega}\phi\iota\varsigma$ :  $*\text{H}\check{\text{a}}\text{w}\check{\text{á}}\text{f}\text{w}\check{\text{e}} > *\text{Š}\check{\text{a}}\text{w}\check{\text{á}}\text{f}\text{w}\check{\text{e}} > *\text{Š}\check{\text{a}}\text{w}\check{\text{ó}}\text{f}\text{w}\check{\text{e}} \sim \Sigma\alpha\acute{\omega}\phi\iota\varsigma > *\text{Š}\check{\text{e}}\text{w}\check{\text{ó}}\text{f}\text{w}\check{\text{e}} > *\text{Š}\check{\text{w}}\check{\text{ó}}\text{w}\check{\text{f}}\check{\text{e}} (> *\text{Š}\check{\text{ó}}\text{w}\check{\text{f}}\check{\text{e}}) \sim \Sigma\acute{\omega}\ddot{\upsilon}\phi\iota\varsigma \sim \Sigma\omicron\upsilon\phi\iota\varsigma$ .<sup>130</sup> The inability of ancient Greek to denote  $w$  properly renders it

125 Hude, *Historiae*, s.v. 11.124–27.

126 Von Beckerath, *Handbuch der Königsnamen*, 52–53.

127 Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 79; Quack, “Von  $\text{Hwj}=f\text{-wj-Hnmw}$  zu Cheops.”

128 Cf. for the verbal form, either subjunctive  $\acute{s}dm=f$  or perfective  $\acute{s}dm=f$  (in gnomic usage), Fecht, *Wortakzent*, §§ 139, 251, n. 356, 333; Satzinger, *Die negativen Konstruktionen*, § 25; Osing, *Papyrus BM 10808*, 32–36; Schenkel, *Einführung*, 112–13; cf. also Gundacker, “Etymology,” 57–58; Lloyd, *Herodotus Book 11*, 111, 62–63.

129 Cf. Till, *Koptische Dialektgrammatik*, § 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 ACE, cf. Wasserstein and Wasserstein, *Septuagint*, 275–90; Mertens, *Introduction*; Rémondon, *Résistance*; cf. von Lippman, *Entstehung*, 75–93; Lindsay, *Origins*), a book entitled Βίβλος ἀληθῆς Σοφῆ Αἰγυπτίου καὶ θείου Ἑβραίων κυρίου τῶν δυνάμεων Σαβαώθ. Ζωσίμου Θεβαίου μυστικῇ 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, 27<sup>b</sup>, n. 2, 11, 205<sup>b</sup>, n. 2; Mertens, *Introduction*, lxxvii) 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 Ἀθωθις, 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. 11.124–27, 133; cf. Zivie-Coche, “Nitocris”) and, in the 2nd millennium BCE, in the stories of Papyrus Westcar (cf. Wildung, *Rolle ägyptischer*

impossible to determine whether \*Šwófě was reduced to \*Šófě via some kind of labial dissimilation or not. In any case, Σώϕις and Σοϕις contained a diphthong \*-ôu-, which was rendered \*-ωυ- (→ -ώϛ-, 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- (→ -οϛ-, 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 \*Σόϕις 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; Chassinat, Dumas, and Cauville, *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-Judaeo-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-Halevy, "Sahidic," 196; Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 253–54; Till, *Koptische Dialektgrammatik*, § 54; Kasser, "Akhmimic," 22; cf. Till, *Achmimisch*). On the other hand, the diphthong \*-ôu- is simply rendered -ο-, 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 \*-ôu- > \*-ô-? cf. Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 239; Lacau, *Études* I, 121–29; Osing, *Nominalbildung* II, 386, n. 73). But simple -ο- 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 σωφρών ~ σαοφρών "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 ἢ Γνεῦρος. This certainly reflects the first element of Cheops’ full name<sup>131</sup> *Hwj=f-wj-Hnmw*, and Χνοῦβος is in fact a perfect rendering of the theonym Chnum<sup>132</sup> *Hnmw* ~ \**Hǎnámǝw* with the dissimilation of *m* to *b* in the neighborhood of *n*.<sup>133</sup> It is uncertain how Γνεῦρος has come into being, but it may be some kind of corruption of Χνοῦβος.<sup>134</sup> A variant similar to this, Χέμμης, is found with Diodorus Siculus,<sup>135</sup> 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.<sup>136</sup> Nevertheless, Χέμμης is not an accurate

131 Von Beckerath, *Handbuch der Königsnamen*, 52–53.

132 Cf. Osing, *Nominalbildung* 1, 184–92; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbale Nominalbildung*, 173–75.

133 Cf. especially Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 166.

134 Cf. Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 26; Γνεῦρος perhaps suffered from the following misspellings in Greek uncials: ε ← ο and π ← β (maybe involving a damaged character in the *Vorlage*, cf. West, *Textual Criticism*, 25; Pöhlmann, *Überlieferungsgeschichte* 11, 43–46; Schubart, *Palaeographie*, 13–14; Kenyon, *Palaeography*, table of alphabets (after p. 128); cf. n. 56 above); initial Γ- instead of Χ- may be the result of some kind of phonological confusion γ ~ |γ| ← χ ~ |x| (cf. already Gelzer, “Diorthose,” 268; Mayser, *Grammatik* 1, 167–68; Mayser and Schmoll, *Grammatik*, 141, 145; cf. also Gignac, *Grammar*; Teodorsson, *Phonology*; Niehoff-Panagiotidis, *Koine und Diglossie*). The folk-etymological gloss Χρῦσος <ἢ> Χρῦσου υἱός “‘Golden One’ <or> ‘son of the Golden One’” (cf. for alternative conjectures Bunsen, *Weltgeschichte* 11, 76–77; Waddell, *Manetho*, 218) corroborates this and even indicates that Γνεῦρος 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/Γνεῦρος ignores the initial consonant and solely depends on a superficial homoeophony with S.B.A.L.F.Oc. **NOYB** < \**nábāw* ~ *nbw* “gold,” Crum, *Coptic Dictionary*, 221b–222a; Westendorf, *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*, 119; Černý, *Coptic Dictionary*, 106; Vycichl, *Dictionnaire*, 139–40; cf. Gundacker, “Etymology,” 65, n. 249; Osing, *Nominalbildung* 1, 216; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbale 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 Γνεῦρος.

135 Oldfather, *Diodorus Siculus* 1, 214–15, s.v. 1.63.2; cf. Jacoby, *FrHistGr* 111A, no. 264 F25.

136 Burstein, “Hecataeus of Abdera,” 46–48; Burton, *Diodorus Siculus*, 25–29, 187; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* 1, 497.



rendering, but it appears to be confused or, at least, contaminated with the town name (*J*)*ḥj-bjt* ~ \**Jăḥj-băjt* > \**ḥé-bě* ~ (\*)*Xḥβις* and, with a different development of the consonant cluster in the compositional join, > \**ḥéw-bě* > \**ḥéb-bě* > \**ḥém-bě* ~ *Xémβις* > \**ḥém-mě* ~ *Xémμις*.<sup>137</sup>

The second king called Σοῦφις, the third king of the Fourth Manethonian Dynasty, is Manetho's equivalent for Chephren. This king is mentioned as Κερφέρνης in the Third Manethonian Dynasty and as Σαῶφις β' in the king-list of Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes. Herodotus calls him Χερρήν,<sup>138</sup> Diodorus Siculus—relying on Herodotus and Hecataeus of Abdera—Κερρήν and Χαβρύης.<sup>139</sup> 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.<sup>140</sup> One may suppose that in *Hʿj=f-Rʿw* ~ *Hăʿjăf-Ríʿűw*<sup>141</sup> the theonym *Rʿw* was replaced with *wj* on the model of Cheops' name, possibly after the initial consonant had been palatalized:<sup>142</sup> \**Hăʿjăf-Ríʿűw* > \**Hăʿʿăf-Ríʿě* > \**Šăʿăf-Ríʿě* → \**Šěʿőf-wě* ~ Σαῶφις > \**Šʿ(ʿ)őwf-ě* ~ Σοῦφις. Κερφέρνης, Χερρήν/Κερρήν and Χαβρύης are excellent renderings of the unchanged name *Hʿj=f-Rʿw* ~ \**Hăʿjăf-Ríʿűw* > \**Hăʿʿăf-Ríʿě* > \**Hěʿăf-Ríʿě* > \**Hʿ(ʿ)ăf-Ríʿě* ~ Χαβρύης<sup>143</sup> > \**Hʿ(ʿ)ěf-Réʿ* ~ Χερρήν/Κερρήν. Κερφέρνης seems irregular, but it simply displays the rare and facultative sound change ʿ > *r*<sup>144</sup> and the development of an anaptyctic vowel: \**Hěʿăf-Ríʿě* > \**Hěrfě-Réʿ* ~ Κερφέρνης.

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 11.91, 156 (cf. Hude, *Historiae*, s.v. 11.91, 156), Stephanus of Byzantium (cf. Meineke, *Ethnicorum*, 690–91; Billerbeck, *Ethnica* v), and Egyptian personal names rendered with Greek characters (e.g., Preisigke, *Namenbuch*, 58, 312; Foraboschi, *Onomasticon* 1, 56; cf. also Spiegelberg, “Varia,” 181–82).

138 Hude, *Historiae*, s.v. 11.127–28.

139 Oldfather, *Diodorus Siculus* 1, 218–19, s.v. 1.64.1; cf. Jacoby, *FrHistGr* 111A, no. 264 F25.

140 Von Beckerath, *Handbuch der Königsnamen*, 54–55; Lloyd, *Herodotus Book II*, 111, 63–64, 74.

141 Cf. for the verbal form, either subjunctive *šdm=f* or perfective *šdm=f* (in gnomic usage), Fecht, *Wortakzent*, §§ 139, 251, n. 356, 333; Satzinger, *Die negativen Konstruktionen*, § 25; Osing, *Papyrus BM 10808*, 32–36; Schenkel, *Einführung*, 112–13; cf. also Osing, *Nominalbildung* 1, 20–21; Edel, *Korrespondenz* 11, 361–62.

142 Cf. Till, *Koptische Dialektgrammatik*, § 10; Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 117–18, with n. 127.

143 Cf. for the interchange of *f* and *b* n. 117 above, cf. for Greek *υ* ~ \**ü* as rendering of Egyptian \**i* ~ \**i* Peust, “Zur Herkunft des Koptischen *u*,” 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 Μοσχερής. 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<sup>145</sup> \*Mḡ-kě-Rī̄ < \*Mě̄n-kě-Rī̄ < \*Mī̄n-kūw-Rī̄ < \*Mī̄n-kū̄āw-Rī̄ ũw ~ Mn-k̄.w-R̄w.<sup>146</sup> Μεγχέρης and Μεγχέρινος represent a somewhat younger Egyptian variant \*Mě̄n-kě-Ré̄ < \*Mě̄n-kě-Rī̄ < \*Mḡ-kě-Rī̄. Μοσχερής is actually closely related to Μεγχέρης,<sup>147</sup> but it renders the syllabic nasal \*-ḡ- or some kind of *shwa*-vowel with -o-<sup>148</sup> instead of -ε-; the theonym R̄w also appears in its younger variant \*Ré̄. The most obvious difference between Μοσχερής 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/C).<sup>149</sup> Μεγχέρης, 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.<sup>150</sup>

145 Cf. for the individual elements' vocalization Fecht, *Wortakzent*, §§ 81–84, 176–78; Osing, *Nominalbildung* I, 20–21, 127, II, 380, n. 56; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbale Nominalbildung*, 89, 162; Edel, *Korrespondenz* II, 361–62; cf. for the tentative plural form k̄.w ~ \*kū̄āw Gundacker, *Studien* I, 119, n. 778; cf. for this kind of plural formation Osing, *Nominalbildung* II, 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.

146 Cf. for a possible confusion of Bocchoris and Mycerinus Möller, “Zu Herodots ägyptischen Geschichten,” 76–77; Wallinga, “The Structure”; cf. Hude, *Historiae*, s.v. II.129–33, 136.

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

148 Gundacker, *Studien* I, 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* II, 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* II, 43–46; Schubart, *Palaeographie*; Barbour, *Greek Literary Hands*; cf. furthermore n. 56 above.

Next, Manetho mentions Πατοίσης, whom Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes calls Παῦσις. Both these names are correct renderings of Egyptian  $R^{\text{rw}}\text{-jdd=f} \sim *Ri^{\text{rw}}\text{-jā́dā́f}$ <sup>151</sup>  $*Ri^{\text{r}}\text{-dā́dā́f}$ <sup>152</sup> >  $*Rē\text{-dā́dēf}$  >  $*Rā\text{-dṓdēf} \sim$

151 Alternatively, the *verbum* IIIae infirmae *ddj* “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 infirmae) into another (*verba biradicalia*) by the time of the New Kingdom triggered by the *verbum biradicale* *dd* “to say” (cf. *Wb* v, 618: 9–625: 2; Hannig, *Handwörterbuch*, 1092–93), which dropped its word-final consonant *dd* > *d*, 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, *dd* “to say” became a *verbum* IIae infirmae (this change of verbal classes was, however, insignificant). Original *ddj* > *ddj* “to endure, to last” thus may have become a *verbum biradicale* *dd*, which finally was introduced into the name of Redjedef ( $R^{\text{rw}}\text{-ddj=f} \sim *Ri^{\text{rw}}\text{-dā́dā́f} \rightarrow R^{\text{rw}}\text{-dd=f} \sim *Ri^{\text{rw}}\text{-dā́dā́f} > *Rā\text{-dṓdēf} \sim *Pā\text{-tōtis}$ ). 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  $Hwt\text{-}Šnfrw \sim *Hāwāt\text{-}Šān\text{-}fārūw > Asfynis$ , (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*, *passim*; 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”; Weiß, “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*—*šdm=f*<sup>circumstantial</sup> (e.g., Ranke, *Personennamen* II, 257–58; Schweitzer, *Schrift und Sprache*, §§ 332, 413) and *šdm=f*<sup>subjunctive/perfective</sup>—*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*—*šdm=f*<sup>circumstantial</sup> was no longer productive in the late 2nd and 1st millennia BCE, and royal names starting with the theonym  $R^{\text{rw}}$  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*-

\**Πάτωτις*, whereby the loss of an Egyptian word-final labial immediately before the Greek inflectional ending *-ς* is not uncommon.<sup>153</sup> In \**Πάτωτις*, the consonantal sequence *-τ-τ-* was dissimilated to *-τ-σ-*, thus providing \**Πάτωτις*, which was possibly endorsed by the Greek aversion (typical for Attic-Ionic and the Koine) against \**-ti-* (regularly \**-ti-* > \**-si-*). In addition, \**Πάτωτις* suffered from the misspelling \**-ω-* → *-οι-* and from an itacistic scribal error \**-ις* → *-ης*, which was perhaps triggered by Mycerinus' and Baka's names ending with (\**-*)*ρης*.<sup>154</sup> In another line of tradition, \**Πάτωτις* was affected by the mistake \**-τ-* → *-Υ-*<sup>155</sup> thus producing Pseudo-Apollodorus'/Pseudo-Eratosthenes' variant *Πάϋωσις*.

According to Manetho, the fifth king of the Fourth Dynasty was called *Βίχερις*; Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes gives the variant *Βιϋρης*. Either of these forms can be traced back to Egyptian<sup>156</sup> *B3-k3=j*, to which, again, the theonym *R'w* was added (*B3-k3=j* → *B3-k3-R'w*). One may thus reconstruct the following development:<sup>157</sup> *B3-k3-R'w* ~ \**Bĩ3-kǎ3-Rĩ'úw* > \**Bĩ3-kǎ3-Rĩ'ě* > \**Bĩ-kǎ-Rĩ'* > \**Bĩ-kǎ-Rě'* ~ \**Βιχόρης*. Accordingly, Manetho's *Βίχερις* shows only

*tradition* was integrated into a recent, productive, and commonly acknowledged pattern. The name *R'w-jdd=f* should thus have been transformed to *Dd(j)=f-R'w*, e.g., by analogy to the more common name *H'j=f-R'w*, but this did not happen. For the vocalization of Redjedef's name and of the *circumstantial* *śdm=f*, cf. the personal name *Nb=j-wnn=f* as preserved in the toponym *T3-ḥwt-(nj.t)nb=j-wnn=f* > Θυναβουνουν, wherein *-nb=j-wnn=f* may be reconstructed as \**-nib(w)ij-wánánǎf* > *-ναβουνουν* (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 'nh 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 "*Πατολης* is not Redjedef" is thus simply wrong.

155 Cf. for these mistakes, which are typical for Greek uncial, 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 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 III.1, 313; Barsanti, "Zaouié el-Aryân"; Lauer, "Sur l'âge"; Maragioglio and Rinaldi, *Piramidi 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."

157 Cf. for the individual elements' vocalization Fecht, *Wortakzent*, §§ 150–54, 176–78; Osing, *Nominalbildung* 1, 20–21, 11, 380, n. 56; Edel, *Korrespondenz* 11, 361–62. Cf. for the addition of the theonym *R'w* Ryholt, "Seneferka," 166–67; cf. also n. 68 above, and nn. 165 and 167 below.

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 \*-x- → -γ-,<sup>158</sup> and the loss of a vowel (\*Βιχόρης/\*Βιχέρης → \*Βιούρης/\*Βιούρης → Βιούρης). It is, however, more likely that \*Βιχόρης/\*Βιχέρης was contaminated with the name of prince Baufre (B3w=f-R'w), who in some lines of popular tradition<sup>159</sup>—as reflected in a graffito found in the Wadi Hammamat<sup>160</sup>—was considered a king. The name of Baufre should have developed as follows: B3w=f-R'w ~ \*Bĩwĩf-Rĩ'ũw > \*Bĩwĩf-Rĩ'ẽ > \*Bĩwĩf-Rĩ'ẽ > \*Bĩff-Rĩ'ẽ ~ \*Bĩφρης ~ Βιούρης.<sup>161</sup> 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.<sup>162</sup>

The penultimate king of the Fourth Manethonian Dynasty is Σεβερχέρης, whom Pseudo-Apollodorus/Pseudo-Eratosthenes omitted. The hieroglyphic equivalent is špśś-k3=f,<sup>163</sup> which must have undergone a process of analogical alignment. Thereby, the suffix pronoun =f was replaced with the theonym R'w similar to the addition of this element<sup>164</sup> found with other names of the Third and Fourth Dynasties.<sup>165</sup> One may therefore propose that Shepseskaf's name developed<sup>166</sup> špśś-k3=f → špśś-k3-R'w ~ \*šũpśĩs-kā3-Rĩ'ũw > \*šũpśĩs-kō3-Rĩ'ẽ >

158 Cf. Fecht, “Review of Helck, Untersuchungen zu Manetho,” 119.

159 Prince Baufre, whose name was reshaped from R'w-b3=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 Osing, *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.

163 Von Beckerath, *Handbuch der Königsnamen*, 54–55.

164 Von Beckerath, “1v. Dynastie,” 115; Ryholt, “Turin King-List,” 149 and “Seneferka,” 166–67.

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 R'w, and second, suffix pronouns, which referred to Re anyway, were also replaced with the theonym R'w.

166 Cf. Fecht, *Wortakzent*, §§ 176–78; Osing, *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 špśś ~ \*šũpśĩs is extremely tentative and selected only by analogy to the semantically identical and closely related adjective špśj ~ \*šũpśĩj, which later even may have replaced špśś; cf. Osing, *Nominalbildung* 1, 150; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung*, 159.

\*Šěpsēs-kō-Ré<sup>c</sup> ~ \*Σεψεσχόρης (or perhaps a simplified variant \*Šěps-kō-Ré<sup>c</sup> ~ \*Σεψχόρης). The outcome of this development was perhaps reshaped via the analogical replacement of the singular \*-χο- with the plural \*-χε-,<sup>167</sup> simplified via the dissimilatory loss of one of the three consonants -σ-, and finally affected by some kind of scribal error \*-c- → -p-.<sup>168</sup> As a result, Špsēs-kz=f → Špsēs-kz-Rʷ > \*Σεψεσχόρης was thus transformed to Σεβερχέρης as is preserved.<sup>169</sup>

Manetho's Fourth Dynasty includes yet another king, whom he calls Θαμφίς; 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 *Ddj=f-Pth*,<sup>170</sup> although Ptah is hardly ever attested prior to the Fifth Dynasty.<sup>171</sup> If this interpretation is correct, one may propose the following development:<sup>172</sup>

- 167 Cf. nn. 68 and 145 above. One should also remember the fluctuation of ε and ο in Greek transcriptions in order to denote Egyptian *shwa*-vowels (Lacau, *Études* 1, 131–36) and the common scribal error ε ~ ο (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-χερή-ς → Σεβ-ερχέ-ρης?
- 169 It is instructive to point to king Shepseskare (Fifth Dynasty), whose name Špsēs-kz-Rʷ should also have resulted in \*Σεψεσχόρης or—with preservation of \*-ř- or homogenization of unstressed vowels (especially \*-ř- and \*-ũ-) in the neighborhood of sibilants (cf. Fecht, *Wortakzent*, 248, n. 382; Osing, *Nominalbildung* 1, 14, 11, 386, n. 72, 880–81 (Nachtrag zu n. 163); Schenkel, *Einführung*, 88)—in \*Σιψισχόρης, which was similarly truncated to \*Σισχόρης → Σισίρης according to Fecht, “Review of Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*,” 119. Cf. also the truncation which affected the name of Djoser-teti: Τόσορθος ← \*Τοσόρθος (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, *ddj* “to endure, last” is much more appealing for semantic reasons than *dd* “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 Θαμφίς as the regular rendering of Rʷw-jdd=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; Osing, *Papyrus BM 10808*, 32–36 and *Nominalbildung* 1, 156; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung*, 165 and *Einführung*, 112–13.



(\*)*Ddj=f-Pth* ~ \**Dṽdjṽf-Pitáḥ* > \**Dṽdjṽf-Pitáḥ* > \**Dādṽppitáḥ* > \**Dādṽptáḥ* ~ \**Θατιφθαῖς*.<sup>173</sup> Most probably, this was corrupted by several scribal errors,<sup>174</sup> but all attempts to explain Manetho's *Θαμφθίς* in greater detail<sup>175</sup> remain highly tentative.<sup>176</sup>

## 5.2 The Lengths of Reigns

The highest contemporaneous dates from Snefru's reign belong to his 24th census (*rnp.t sp 24*).<sup>177</sup> From the notoriously underrepresented odd years

173 Cf. for the Greek practice of rendering word-final *-h*# with *-ι(-)* Fecht, *Wortakzent*, § 30, n. 58. The initial *Θ-* is, however, irregular—one would expect *T-* instead; perhaps some kind of assimilation \**T-* → *Θ-*, which was triggered by \**-φθαῖς* → *-φθίς* (cf. n. 175 below), operated. Cf. Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 79–90; Schenkel, “1st 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, *-τι-* was perhaps misunderstood as *-ι-* (\**Θατιφθαῖς* → \**Θαμφθαῖς*), and second, the word-final group *-αις*# was misread as *-αις*#, which in Greek is not possible in word-final position and was thus immediately conjectured to *-αις*# (\**Θαμφθαῖς* → \**Θαμφθίς* [*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* 111C, no. 609 F2–F3) are *Οὐσαφαῖς* (Den) in the First Dynasty and *Ἄρμωῖς* (Haremhab) in the Eighteenth Dynasty. Both of them suffered from scribal errors: *Οὐσαφαῖς* was misspelled *Οὐσαφωῖς* in one of the manuscripts transmitting Eusebius' version, and it was erroneously replaced with the genitive *Οὐσαφαῖδος* in Africanus' version; *Ἄρμωῖς* was misspelled *Ἄρμεσις* 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 *-αις* (*-αις*# → *-ίς*#).

One should also remember that *Ddj=f-Pth* is certainly a late replacement of an earlier \**Pth-jdd=f*, which, perhaps during the New Kingdom (early Rameside Period?), was created in order to replace the name of *Hrw-jdd=f* in the king-lists of the Memphite tradition. Both \**Pth-jdd=f* and *Hrw-jdd=f* may thus be expected in the Saqqara king-list (cf. Excursus 11 below). Whereas *Hrw-jdd=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), \**Pth-jdd=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.

177 All of them were found at the Red Pyramid; cf. LD—Text 1, 206; Stadelmann, “Länge der Regierung Snofrus,” 234–35, 240; Sourouzian, “Marques et Graffiti,” 389–90; Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 54–56. Cf. also Verner, “Archaeological Remarks,” 367, “Contemporaneous Evidence,” 130, and “System of Dating,” 26.

(*rnp.t m-ht sp*), six are unambiguously attested.<sup>178</sup> Because of the fact that it is unknown when Snefru carried out his first cattle count—in the year of his accession (*rnp.t sm3-T3.wj*, for chronological purposes, this is year “0” of his reign),<sup>179</sup> 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 sm3-T3.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.<sup>180</sup> The 29 years found in the Fourth Manethonian Dynasty are usually

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

<sup>179</sup> 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., *tnw.t (rnp.t) sm3-T3.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 sm3-T3.wj tnw.t jh.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-ht 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-ht sm3-T3.wj* “Year after the unification of the Two Lands” (Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 321; cf. Hornung, Krauss, and Warburton, “Royal Annals,” 24).

<sup>180</sup> Cf., e.g., Stadelmann, “Länge der Regierung Snofrus”; Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 373–75.

explained as the result of a Greek scribal error  $\kappa\theta' \leftarrow * \kappa\epsilon' \sim 25$  years.<sup>181</sup> 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).<sup>182</sup>

The highest contemporaneous dates of Cheops’ reign are *rnp.t m-ht sp 11* “Year after the 11th occurrence,”<sup>183</sup> *rnp.t m-ht sp 12* “Year after the 12th occurrence,” and *rnp.t m-ht sp 13* “Year after the 13th occurrence.”<sup>184</sup> 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,<sup>185</sup> which

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

182 This particular instance of reduction may have formed part of a general process of *niv-ellement* 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.

183 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 basilophorous 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 IV<sup>e</sup> 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).

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

185 Differently, but certainly wrong, Lloyd, *Herodotus Book II*, III, 72–73.

is clearly a figure displaying the secondary addition of multiples of 10 and the subsequent loss of the units.<sup>186</sup> 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.*, \*κρ' → κθ' (perhaps with intermediate steps).<sup>187</sup> 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 Σῶφις, 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 (\*κρ' → κβ', perhaps with intermediate steps).<sup>188</sup> The 16 years found with Σῶφις 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, 𐤊 → 𐤌).<sup>189</sup>

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: (\*κρ' → κβ' → κθ'.

188 Perhaps (\*κρ' → (\*κϵ' → κβ'; Digamma lost its original Form F in the 3rd century BCE and started to develop towards its final form, so-called "stigma," Ϛ. 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 Ϛ 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* II, 43–46; Schubart, *Palaeographie*; cf. also n. 56 above.

189 Möller, *Paläographie* II, nos. 623–624, III, 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*, III, 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),<sup>190</sup> Κερφέρης 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,<sup>191</sup> but the 27 years of Σαῶφις β' are simply rounded up (from \*26 years, XY months, and AB days).<sup>192</sup> 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").<sup>193</sup>

Herodotus<sup>194</sup> and Diodorus Siculus (relying on Herodotus and Hecataeus of Abdera)<sup>195</sup> both provide no explicit figure for the length of Mycerinus' reign, they simply relate that Μυκερῖνος (Μεγχερίνος) 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.<sup>196</sup> Hence, Mycerinus' reign can be numbered only  $x+6/7$  years (with  $x \leq 42/43$ ).<sup>197</sup> Manetho seemingly missed data on Mycerinus' length of reign in his *Vorlagen* and therefore ascribed 63 years to Μεγχερίης. 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 Μοσχερῆς, 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*, III, 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.

193 Masons' graffiti found on blocks belonging to the mastaba of Akhtihotep and Meritites, G.7650; Smith, "Inscriptional Evidence," 119, 127–28; cf. Jánosi, *Giza in der 4. Dynastie*, 71–73, 96–98, 288.

194 Hude, *Historiae*, s.v. II.133.

195 Oldfather, *Diodorus Siculus I*, 220–23, (s.v. I.64.7); cf. Jacoby, *FrHistGr IIIA*, no. 264 F25.

196 Cf. Lloyd, *Herodotus Book II*, III, 83–84.

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*, III, 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 11* “Year of the 11th occurrence,”<sup>198</sup> *rnp.t m-ht sp 11* “Year after the 11th occurrence,”<sup>199</sup> and *rnp.t sp 12* “Year of the 12th occurrence”<sup>200</sup>—one is inclined to accept a length of reign of 28 years.<sup>201</sup> 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<sup>202</sup> 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 (Σαῶφις) and Chephren (Σαῶφις β’) were relocated and finally inserted directly preceding Mycerinus in order to rearrange the kings to form the “Herodotean Giza-group.”<sup>203</sup> 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, Πατοίσης ruled 25 years, Παῶσις, 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.S = 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 IV; Posener-Kriéger, “Les papyrus de Gébélein,” 215–16; cf. furthermore the concluding publication by Posener-Kriéger and Demichelis, *Gebelein*.

200 Testament of Nikaure in Rock tomb LG 87 = G.8I58; PM III.1, 232–33; Jánosi, *Giza in der 4. Dynastie*, 368–72. Cf. for the attribution to Mycerinus’ reign Goedicke, *Rechtsinschriften*, 21–23; Strudwick, *Administration*, 107; Spalinger, “Dated Texts,” 294; Gundacker, “Mykerinos,” 32–33; cf. for an alternative attribution to Chephren’s reign Baud, “Les frontières,” 128; Verner, “Archaeological Remarks,” 378, n. 139, “Contemporaneous Evidence,” 134, n. 91, and “System of Dating,” 28, n. 10.

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; Verner, “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 *mp.t sp 1* "Year of the 1st occurrence."<sup>204</sup> 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 ( $\text{ir}' \leftarrow \text{*ie}'$  or—should the original figure \*15 years, XY months, AB days have been rounded up to \*16 years— $\text{ir}' \leftarrow \text{*if}'$ ).

Manetho assigns 22 years to Βίχερης, Pseudo-Apollodorus'/Pseudo-Eratosthenes 10 years to Βιϋρης. Wolfgang Helck<sup>205</sup> 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 ( $*2 \rightarrow *12 \rightarrow 10$ ). 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,<sup>206</sup> 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:<sup>207</sup>

Royal Canon of Turin				Manetho, <i>Aegyptiaca</i>			
Ῥατοίσις	8 > 9		7	]	X	[	25 years
Βίχερης	*7		9				22 years
Σεβερχέρης	4 > 5	→	25	]	X	[	7 years
Θαμφθίς	2	→	22				9 years

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

<sup>204</sup> Vallogia, "La descenderie," 419.

<sup>205</sup> Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 53.

<sup>206</sup> PM III.1, 313; Barsanti, "Zaouiét el-Aryân"; Lauer, "Sur l'âge"; Stadelmann, *Pyramiden*, 140–41; Verner, "Archaeological Remarks," 380–81.

<sup>207</sup> 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.<sup>208</sup> After all, an alternative explanation for Shepseskaf'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.<sup>209</sup>

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

The Royal Canon of Turin (Papyrus Turin 1874 *verso*)<sup>210</sup> 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<sup>211</sup> suggested that the historiographical sections<sup>212</sup> of the Royal Canon of Turin were composed with the aid of five sources in the early New Kingdom (Eighteenth Dynasty):<sup>213</sup>

Source	Period	Characteristics (reckoning of years)
A	First–Second Dynasties	years, months, days; age of king
B	Third–Sixth Dynasties	years
C	Seventh–Tenth Dynasties	years, months, days
D	Eleventh Dynasty	years
E	Twelfth–Eighteenth Dynasties	years, months, days

208 Von Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 159; Verner, "Archaeological Remarks," 380–81.  
209 Cf. Excursus II and section 6 below.  
210 Farina, *Papiro*; Gardiner, *Royal Canon*; Ryholt announced a new edition of and commentary on the Royal Canon of Turin, but this study is still in preparation. Cf. furthermore Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists*, 1–18; Roccati, "Turiner Königspapyrus"; cf. also Málek, "Original Version"; Helck, "Anmerkungen"; von Beckerath, "Bemerkungen"; Ryholt, *Political Situation*, 9–33, "Turin King-List," and "Royal Canon."  
211 Ryholt, *Political Situation*, 32–33, "Turin King-List," 145–47 and "Royal Canon," 28–30.  
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," 139 (with further references).  
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<sup>214</sup> *jrj.n=f m njšwjj.t* “he exercised kingship,”<sup>215</sup> 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,” *3bd* “month,” *hrww* “day,” and *ḥꜥw=f m nḥ* “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.<sup>216</sup> 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 Sesostriis I.<sup>217</sup> 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.<sup>218</sup> This becomes obvious, *e.g.*, in royal funerary architecture,<sup>219</sup> in the re-adoption of Pyramid

214 Cf. Castle, “Further Observations.” The grammatical interpretation depends on that of the dedication formula *jrj.n=f m mnw=f* “He made (as) his monument,” which is disputed (Leahy, “Predicates”; Castle, “Dedication Formula”; Vittmann, “Weiheformel”; Kruchten, “Phrase Coupée” vs. Grallert, “Bauen,” 39–40; Jansen-Winkeln, “Objekt,” “Vermerke,” *Text und Sprache*, 82–90, and *Spätmittelägyptische Grammatik*, § 165; Peust “Wie fokussiert”).

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.

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, *e.g.*, king Teti at the beginning of the Sixth Dynasty), but it may supplement his proposal (cf. the immediately preceding note).

217 Cf. Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 66, n. 372, 81, n. 433.

218 Cf. Wildung, *Rolle ägyptischer Könige*; Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists*, 147–63.

219 *E.g.*, the mortuary temple of Sesostriis I (Arnold, *Lisht I and Lisht 3*), which is an almost perfect copy of the mortuary temples built during the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties (Maragioglio and Rinaldi, *Piramidi menfite*; Stadelmann, *Pyramiden*).

Texts arranged in an Old Kingdom manner,<sup>220</sup> in numerous references to old and venerable sources when authoritative decisions concerning the administrative and political organization had to be made,<sup>221</sup> 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.”<sup>222</sup>

- (2) It is important to point out two phenomena which until now have not received appropriate attention. On the one hand, Sesostri I imitated the mode of dating known from Old Kingdom documents, *i.e.*, naming years after the census. One of his edifices belonging to the temple of Amun in Karnak bears an inscription which begins *rnp.t-sp m-ḥt 9 3bd 4 prj.t šw 24* “Regnal year after the 9th, fourth month of winter, day 24.”<sup>223</sup> This is evidently an unsuccessful attempt to proclaim a date in the fashion of the Old Kingdom, because *m-ḥt* “after” should have followed *rnp.t* “year” and preceded *sp* “occurrence.” The authors of this inscription were without a doubt unaware of the biennial nature of census-cycles,<sup>224</sup> and

220 *E.g.*, the Pyramid Texts of Sesostri-ankh, which, in fact, are nothing but the reused text corpus of king Unas in its first draft (*cf.* Hayes, *Texts in the Mastaba of Se'n-wosret-ankh*; Kahl, “Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Verhältnis”). These texts were most probably prepared for king Sesostri I himself but abandoned for unknown reasons. Finally, they were used by Sesostri-ankh, who was probably responsible for research on and the preparation of this text corpus (Gundacker, “Königliche Pyramidentexte”).

221 *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, *cf.* Newberry and Griffith, *Beni Hasan* I, pl. xxv; *Urk.* VII, 27: 11–16; Kamrin, *Cosmos of Khnumhotep II*).

222 *E.g.*, didactic literature such as the instructions said to be composed by Ptahhotep (Žába, *Ptahhotep*; *cf.* for the problem of authorship Moers, “Der ‘Autor’ und sein ‘Werk’”), Hordjedef (Helck, *Lehre des Djedefhor*; Posener, “Lehre des Djedefhor”; *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, *Papyrus Prisse*; Gardiner, “Instruction”), *etc.*, or the *Forecast of Neferty* (*cf.* Helck, *Prophezeiung des Neferti*). The *Instruction for Kagemni* and the *Forecast of Neferty* are set in the reign of Snefru, who, because of his name *Šnfrw* ~ “benefactor” (Osing, *Nominalbildung* I, 185; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung*, 176; *cf.* nn. 113–117 above), was worshipped as a philanthropic and charitable god (*cf.* for the cult of Snefru, Wildung, *Rolle ägyptischer Könige*, 104–52; Schmitz, *Königssohn*, 141–58; Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 83–101, 247–52; *cf.* also n. 121 above). *cf.* AEL I.

223 Gabolde, *Grande château*, 40–42.

224 That knowledge of the nature of the eponymous census had ceased with the end of the Heracleopolitan Dynasties (*i.e.*, Ninth to Tenth, *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.<sup>225</sup> It was therefore no longer feasible to split up the, now, *juxtapositum* *rnp.t-sp* in order to insert the preposition *m-ht* “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.<sup>226</sup> 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-ht 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.<sup>227</sup>

---

furthermore becomes evident when an inscription of Tuthmosis III in his Jubilee Temple (*3h-mnw*) is considered (cf. Carloti, *L'Akh-menou*; Pecoil, *L'Akh-menou*). At the very beginning of this inscription, the date recorded reads *rnp.t-sp m-ht* 23 “Regnal year after the 23rd” (*Urk.* IV, 1251: II; cf. Gardiner, “Regnal Years,” 16). The Jubilee Temple (*3h-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 Sesostri's edifice which contains the already mentioned date *rnp.t-sp m-ht* 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.

225 Cf. Fecht, “Lesung von Regierungsjahr”; Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 331–38.

226 Gardiner, *Royal Canon*, 15, n. I.17 b, 16, n. III.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 *mnp.t* “year” (lengths of reign) vs. *mnp.t-sp* “regnal year” (dates of death).<sup>228</sup> The significance thereof was minimal for all entries of kings belonging to the Middle Kingdom and later periods,<sup>229</sup> 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).<sup>230</sup> But the records of the kings of the Old Kingdom, *i.e.*, the Fourth to Sixth Dynasties,<sup>231</sup> 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 Sesostri I was unable

---

(Gardiner sign-list O50) may easily have been confused with the “sun disk” (Gardiner sign-list N5), which indeed would be an appropriate determinative (Fecht, “Lesung von Regierungsjahr,” 90). It is thus difficult to decide whether, in the Royal Canon of Turin, *mnp.t-sp* “regnal year” was used to denote the lengths of reigns or whether it was included by error, because current knowledge of the *termini technici* of Middle and New Kingdom chronography and of their application is too sketchy.

228 Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 66–67.

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 reinterpreted 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 frontières”).

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.<sup>232</sup>

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:<sup>233</sup>

RCT 4.4 [n]šwt-]b]t Nb-k³<-Rʿw> <jr].n=f m n]šwjj.t> 19 [rnp.wt-sp]  
King of [Upper] and Lower Egypt Nebka<re>; <he exercised  
kingship for> 19 [regnal years].

RCT 4.5 n]šwt-b]t Dšr-jt jr].n=f m n]šwjj.t 19 rnp.wt-sp 3bd.w hrww.w  
ʿhʿw=f m ʿnh [///]  
King of Upper and Lower Egypt Djoser-it; he exercised king-  
ship for 19 regnal years, XY months, AB days, his age: [///].

RCT 4.6 [n]šwt-b]t] Dšr-tj <jr].n=f m n]šwjj.t> 6 <rnp.wt-sp>  
[King of Upper and Lower Egypt] Djoser-ti; <he exercised  
kingship for> 6 <regnal years>.

<sup>232</sup> 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.

<sup>233</sup> Gardiner, *Royal Canon*, pl. II; Farina, *Papiro*, pl. III; 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.

- RCT 4.7 *njswt-bjt [Hw-]df3 <jrj.n=f m njswjj.t> 6 rnp.wt-sp*  
 King of Upper and Lower Egypt “lost”; <he exercised kingship  
 for> 6 regnal years.
- RCT 4.8 *[njswt-]bjt Hw[nj] ḥh.w wd3.w snb.w <jrj.n=f m njswjj.t> 24*  
*rnp.wt-sp [jw=f] <m> p3-jkdw Ššm-[///]*  
 King of [Upper] and Lower Egypt Huni, may he live, be sound  
 and healthy, <he exercised kingship for> 24 regnal years; He  
 is the builder of Seshem-[///]
- RCT 4.9 *[njswt-]bjt Šnfr<w> <jrj.n=f m njswjj.t> 24 rnp.wt-sp*  
 King of [Upper] and Lower Egypt Snefru; <he exercised king-  
 ship for> 24 regnal years.
- RCT 4.10 *[njswt-bjt Hwj=f-wj] <jrj.n=f m njswjj.t> 23 rnp.wt-sp*  
 [King of Upper and Lower Egypt Cheops;] <he exercised  
 kingship for> 23 regnal years.
- RCT 4.11 *[njswt-bjt Rʿw-jdd=f] <jrj.n=f m njswjj.t> 8 rnp.wt-sp*  
 [King of Upper and Lower Egypt Redjedef;] <he exercised  
 kingship for> 8 regnal years.
- RCT 4.12 *[njswt-bjt] Hʿj[=f-Rʿw] <jrj.n=f m njswjj.t> [26?] rnp.wt*  
 [King of Upper and Lower Egypt] Che[phren;] <he exercised  
 kingship for> [26?] years.
- RCT 4.13 *njswt-bjt [B3-k3-Rʿw] <jrj.n=f m njswjj.t> [2?] rnp.wt*  
 King of Upper and Lower Egypt [Bakare;] <he exercised king-  
 ship for> [2?] years.
- RCT 4.14 *[njswt-]bjt [Mn-k3.w-Rʿw] <jrj.n=f m njswjj.t> [2]8 rnp.wt*  
 [King of Upper] and Lower Egypt [Mycerinus;] <he exercised  
 kingship for> [2]8 years.
- RCT 4.15 *[njswt-bjt Špšs-k3-Rʿw] <jrj.n=f m njswjj.t> 4 rnp.wt*  
 [King of Upper and Lower Egypt Shepseskaf;] <he exercised  
 kingship for> 4 years.
- RCT 4.16 *[njswt-bjt \*Pth-jdd=f] <jrj.n=f m njswjj.t> 2 rnp.wt*  
 [King of Upper and Lower Egypt Djedefptah;] <he exercised  
 kingship for> 2 years.

As was noted by Alan Gardiner,<sup>234</sup> the Fourth Dynasty is divided into two groups, one of which is rather close to the Third Dynasty, displaying figures introduced with *mp.t-sp* “regnal year” (Nebkare (4.4) to Redjedef (4.11)), while the other displays figures introduced with simple *mp.t* “year” (Chephren (4.12) to Djedefptah (4.16)).<sup>235</sup> It is of paramount importance to stress that these groups are reflected in both Manetho’s *Aegyptiaca* and Pseudo-Apollodorus’/Pseudo-Eratosthenes’ king-lists.<sup>236</sup> 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.<sup>237</sup> 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.<sup>238</sup>

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.<sup>239</sup> Second, Nebka (4.4), Baka (4.13), and Shepseskaf (4.16) must have been mentioned by their younger name forms (*Nb-k3* → *Nb-k3-Rw*,<sup>240</sup> *B3-k3=j* → *B3-k3-Rw*, *Špšš-k3=f* → *Špšš-k3-Rw*) based on the form of the entry of Userkaf, the first king of the Fifth Dynasty, whose name is preserved as [*Wsr-*]*k3*-[*Rw*] ← *Wsr-*

<sup>234</sup> Gardiner, *Royal Canon*, 15, n. I.17 b, 16, n. III.2 b.

<sup>235</sup> Cf. Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 66, n. 372, 85, n. 433.

<sup>236</sup> Cf. sections 4.2 and 5.2 above.

<sup>237</sup> Cf. Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 89–92.

<sup>238</sup> Cf. the additional conclusions in section 6.

<sup>239</sup> Cf. Reisner, *Mycerinus*, 239–56; Reisner and Smith, *Hetepheres*, 1–12; von Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 156–59; Jánosi, *Giza in der 4. Dynastie*, 66–74; Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 103–314, 371–72, “Genealogie” and “Genealogie Teil 2”; Spalinger, “Dated Texts”; Verner, “Archaeological Remarks,” “Contemporaneous Evidence,” and “System of Dating”; Callender, *In Hathor’s Image*.

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.

<sup>240</sup> 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.

$k3=f$ .<sup>241</sup> 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 Θαμφθίς (Djedefptah; <sup>(\*)</sup> $\underline{Ddj}=f.Pth \leftarrow *Pth.jdd=f$ ).<sup>242</sup> 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<sup>243</sup> 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.<sup>244</sup> 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.<sup>245</sup> Moreover, this is substantiated by the fact that not the slightest trace of Djedefptah has been found to date, no inscriptional

241 Royal Canon of Turin 4.17, cf. von Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 209; Ryholt, "Turin King-List," 149 and "Seneferka," 166–67.

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.

243 PM III.2, 464; Mariette, *Mastabas*, 112–13, 451–53; Urk. I, 51: 11–53: 13; Baud, *Famille royale* II, no. 68; James, *Hieroglyphic Texts*, 17, pl. xvii; Dorman, "Inscription of Ptahshepses"; Kloth, *Die (auto-)biographischen Inschriften*, 15–16, 52, 86, 113, 129–33, 151–54, 157, 159, 161–63, 237, 243, 247, 251, 258–60, 284–85; Baud, "The Birth of Biography," 95–96.

244 Dorman, "Inscription of Ptahshepses," 107–10.

245 Cf. Verner, "Archaeological Remarks," 384–85; Jánosi, *Giza in der 4. Dynastie*, 74.

mention of him, of his funerary monument or any domain he founded, not even a single seal impression—simply nothing.<sup>246</sup>

The origins of “king” Djedefptah (Θαμφοθίς) must therefore be searched for elsewhere. It has indeed been suggested<sup>247</sup> that this “king” originated in the popular tradition as manifest in the stories of Papyrus Westcar (Second Intermediate Period),<sup>248</sup> a graffito found in the Wadi Hammamat (Twelfth Dynasty),<sup>249</sup> and the Abusir king-list (Nineteenth Dynasty).<sup>250</sup> The graffito from the Wadi Hammamat mentions, in this sequence, the kings Cheops (Ḥwꜥ=fwꜥ), Redjedef (Rꜥw-jdd=f), Chephren (Ḥꜥj=f-Rꜥw), Hordjedef (Ḥrw-jdd=f),<sup>251</sup> and Baufre (Bꜥ<w>=f-Rꜥw, but apparently spelled as if Rꜥw-bꜥ=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.<sup>252</sup> Redjedef and Chephren actually ascended to the throne, Hordjedef was venerated as the author of an

246 Von Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 159; Verner, “Archaeological Remarks,” 385.

247 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.

248 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*.

249 Drioton, “Liste des rois”; Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists*, 25.

250 LD II, 152d; Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists*, 25–26.

251 This name can be assigned to the same grammatical pattern as Redjedef’s on grounds of its graecized form: Ḥrw-jdd=f ~ \*Ḥārūw-jāḏādāf > \*Ḥārē-ḏāḏāf > \*Ḥār-dāḏēf > \*Ḥār-dōḏēf ~ -αρτώτης (preserved in Πετεαρτώτης ~ Pꜥ-djw-Ḥrw-(j)dd=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, Ḥrw-jdd=f must not be confused with Ḥrw-Dḥwtj ~ \*Ḥārūw-Dḥāwtj > \*Ḥār-Dḥōwtē ~ Ἀρθώ(υ)της, Ἀρθώ(υ)θης (Preisigke, *Namenbuch*, 47; Foraboschi, *Onomasticum* I, 47–48), which always displays an aspirate -θ- (< -dh-, cf. Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 84; Schenkel, “Ist Mythos,” 560, 573) but otherwise looks quite the same. Cf. Osing, *Nominalbildung* I, 185; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbale Nominalbildung*, 174; cf. for the verbal form (circumstantial ṣḏm=f) section 5.1 (in particular nn. 151–152) above and for the suppression of word-final labials in Greek transcriptions n. 153.

252 Cf. Christophe, “Les quatre plus illustres fils”; Baud, *Famille royale* II, no. 186 [p. 548]; Ryholt, *Political Situation*, 17–18, n. 32; Seidlmayer, “Dynasty 3.”

instruction,<sup>253</sup> but Baufre is otherwise unknown.<sup>254</sup> 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 ( $B\bar{z}-k\bar{z}=j \rightarrow B\bar{z}-k\bar{z}-R^{\epsilon}w$ ) and Baufre ( $B\bar{z}w=f-R^{\epsilon}w \leftarrow R^{\epsilon}w-b\bar{z}=f$ ) to have been amalgamated because of the similarity of their names<sup>255</sup> 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 Helck<sup>256</sup> 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.<sup>257</sup> In the course of this process, Hordjedef’s name was altered to Djedefptah by substituting Horus with Ptah.<sup>258</sup> The result

253 Helck, *Lehre des Djedefhor*; Posener, “Lehre des Djedefhor.” A divine cult in favor of Hordjedef had started at his tomb in Giza (mastaba G.7210/20) already in the late Old Kingdom, cf. Junker, *Giza* VII, 26–27 and “Ein neuer Nachweis”; Goedicke, “Verehrer des Weisen *Ddfr*”; von Beckerath, “Djedefhor”; Ritter, “Hordjedef.”

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  $B\bar{z}w=f-R^{\epsilon}w$ . 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  $R^{\epsilon}w$  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*, I, 186.

257 The theological concept described in the text known from the Shabaka 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* I, 66.



of this, Hordjedef → Djedefptah (with at least one intermediate step),<sup>259</sup> is still found in Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* (Θαμφθίς).<sup>260</sup>

With the inclusion of Hordjedef (→ 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 (→ Djedefptah) with a figure:

- (a) the deletion of another king in order to assign the then spare figure to Hordjedef (→ Djedefptah),
- (b) the division of another king's figure in order to assign him and the newly introduced Hordjedef (→ 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 *mp.t m-ht sp tpj* "Year after the first occurrence."<sup>261</sup> Shepseskaf's funerary monument, the Mastaba Faraun,<sup>262</sup> is rather modest in size, but its superstructure, a Butic mastaba, and the mortuary temple were finished as intended.<sup>263</sup> 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 (*Ddj=f-Pth* ← *\*Pth-jdd=f* ← *Hrw-jdd=f*, cf. n. 175 above) is thus an apparent *Neubildung* of the New Kingdom (Ramesside Period?), which also replaced the older grammatical pattern *theonym-šdm=f*<sup>circumstantial</sup> with the younger pattern *šdm=f*<sup>subjunctive/perfective</sup>-*theonym*; cf. nn. 151–152 above.

260 Redford's suggestion (Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists*, 237) that Thamphthis is yet an additional person of popular tradition is thus proven wrong. Cf. Wildung, *Rolle ägyptischer Könige*, 164–67, 212; Christophe, "Les quatre plus illustres fils."

261 Decree in favor of Mycerinus' pyramid complex, cf. *Urk.* 1, 160; *KD*, 13–20; Reisner, *Mycerinus*, 15, 31, 103, 278 no. 1, pl. 19b; Verner, "Archaeological Remarks," 383; Jánosi, "Schepseskaf" and *Giza*, 73–74.

262 PM III.2, 433–34; Jéquier, *Le Mastabat Faraoun*; Maragioglio and Rinaldi, *Piramidi men-fite* vi, 134–66.

263 Thus Stadelmann, *Pyramiden*, 154 *contra* Verner, "Archaeological Remarks," 384.

two years.<sup>264</sup> 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.<sup>265</sup>

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,<sup>266</sup> 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).<sup>267</sup> 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.

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.

265 Cf. Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 86–87.

266 Wilkinson, *Royal Annals*, 53; Hornung, Krauss, and Warburton, "Royal Annals," 23–24.

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<sup>268</sup> 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).<sup>269</sup>

This synopsis reveals that the *Vorlagen* used by Manetho<sup>270</sup> 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.<sup>271</sup> 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* A follow the reconstructed double columns, cf. section 4.1 above.

270 Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 19–26, 52–56, 85; Fecht, “Review of Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*,” 117, 119.

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.

TABLE 4.1

Pseudo-Apollodorus/ Pseudo-Eratosthenes	Manetho A (Third Dynasty)	Manetho B (Fourth Dynasty)	Royal Canon of Turin	
(1) Μομχειρί	79 (1) Νεχερωφής	28 (2a) <i>Netjerichet</i>	?? (1) <i>Nb-k3&lt;-Rʿw&gt;</i>	19
(2) Γοσορμίνης	30 (2) Τοσέρτασις (3) Τόσορθρος	19 (2b) <i>Djoser</i>	?? (2) <i>Dśr-jt</i>	19
(3) Στοιχος	6 ἡ Τύρεις	7 (3) <i>Djoser-teti</i>	?? (3) <i>Dśr-tj</i>	6
(4) Μάρης	26 (5) Ἀχης	42 (4) <i>Neb/Neferkare</i>	?? (4) [ <i>Hw-]</i> <i>df̣</i>	6
(5) Ἀνωϋφίς	20 (4) Μέσωχρις	17 (5) <i>Huni</i>	?? (5) <i>Hw[nj]</i>	24
(6) Σίριος	18 (6) Σήφουρις	30 (6) Σῶρις	29 (6) <i>Śnfr&lt;w&gt;</i>	24
(7) Χνοῦβος	22 (7) Σῶϋφίς	16 (7) Σοῦφίς	63 (7) [ <i>Hwj=f-wj</i> ]	23
(8) Παῦωσις	13 (9) Κερφέρης	26 (9) Σοῦφίς	66 (8) [ <i>Rʿw-jdd=f</i> ]	8
(9) <i>Chephren</i>	27 (11) <i>Mycerinus</i>	?? (11) Μεγχερης	63 (9) <i>Hʿj[=f-Rʿw]</i>	??
(10) Βιῦρης	10 (8) <i>Redjedef</i>	?? (8) Πατοίσις	25 (10) [ <i>B3-k3-Rʿw</i> ]	??
(11) Μοσχερής	31 (10) <i>Baka</i>	?? (10) Βίχερις	22 (11) [ <i>Mn-k3.w-Rʿw</i> ]	?8
(12) <i>Shepseskaf</i>	?? (12) <i>Shepseskaf</i>	?? (12) Σεβερχέρης	7 (12) [ <i>Špsš-k3-Rʿw</i> ]	4
(13) <i>Djedefptah?</i>	?? ???	(13) Θαμφθίς	9 (13) [ <i>*Pth-jdd=f</i> ]	2

“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<sup>272</sup> 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* “*wśf*” “left out,” which is still found in the Royal Canon of Turin as “king” *Hw-df̣* and in the Abydos king-list as “king” *Śdš*; both names are faulty conjectures of a scribe who misread and misinterpreted this ancient Egyptian *terminus technicus* of textual criticism.<sup>273</sup> Manetho’s *Vorlage* A,

272 Cf. section 4.2 above.

273 Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 14–16, 85; Goedicke, “King *Hwdf̣*”; 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 margine* or from another king-list. The latter is more plausible insofar as the double entry \*Τόσορθρος ἢ Τύρεις/\*Τοσόρθρος ἢ Τύρεῖς 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 Σώϋφις—Κερφέρνης 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 Κερφέρνης 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.<sup>274</sup>

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 φωνῇ τὴν πατρίον ἱστορίαν ἐκ τε τῶν ἱερῶν <γραμμάτων> "for he wrote the history of his native country in Greek from the sacred <scriptures>" (*Contra Apionem* 1, 73; Jacoby, *FrHistGr* IIIC, no. 609 T7a; cf. n. 26 above), ὁ γὰρ Μανεθῶς οὗτος ὁ τὴν Αἰγυπτιακὴν ἱστορίαν ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων μεθερμηνεύειν ὑπεσχημένος "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.<sup>275</sup> 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 F10a; cf. n. 26 above); Flavius Josephus confirms this even in polemical passages, e.g., Μανεθῶς ἕως μὲν ἡκολούθει ταῖς ἀρχαίαις ἀναγραφαῖς, οὐ πολὺ τῆς ἀληθείας διημάρτανεν “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, “Königsliste”; 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.<sup>276</sup> 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.<sup>277</sup> Manetho then copied the figure given with the name of Redjedef in *Vorlage* A in his Fourth Dynasty and assigned it correctly to Πατοίσης. Next he ascribed the figure found with Πατοίσης 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.<sup>278</sup> 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.<sup>279</sup>

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):<sup>280</sup>

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

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.

278 Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 91–92.

279 *Cf.* Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 19–26, 52–56, 85; Fecht, "Review of Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*," 117, 119. 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.

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) alterations 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

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) <i>Netjerichet</i>	?? (1) <i>Nb-k3&lt;-R'w&gt;</i> 19
(2) Γοσορμήης	*19 (2) Τοσέρτασις (3) Τόσορθρος	19 (2b) <i>Djoser</i>	?? (2) <i>Dśr-jt</i> 19
(3) Στοίχος	6 ἡ Τύρεις	7 (3) <i>Djoser-teti</i>	?? (3) <i>Dśr-tj</i> 6
(4) Μάρης	*16 (5) Ἀχης	*24 (4) <i>Neb/Neferkare</i>	?? (4) [ <i>Hw-]</i> <i>df3</i> 6
(5) Ἀνωϋίς	*24 (4) Μέσωχρις	17 (5) <i>Huni</i>	?? (5) <i>Hw[ny]</i> 24
(6) Σίριος	*48 (6) Σήφουρις	*48 (6) Σῶρις	*25 (6) <i>Śnfr&lt;w&gt;</i> 24
(7) Χνοῦβος	*26 (7) Σῶϋφις	*26 (7) Σοῦφις	*23 (7) [ <i>Hwj=f-wj</i> ] 23
(8) Παῦωσις	*15 (9) Κερφέρης	26 (9) Σοῦφις	*26 (8) [ <i>R'w-ddj=f</i> ] 8
(9) <i>Chephren</i>	27 (11) <i>Mycerinus</i>	?? (11) Μεγχερης	?? (9) <i>H'j[=f-R'w]</i> *26
(10) Βιῦρης	*2 (8) <i>Redjedef</i>	*15 (8) Πατοίσις	*9 (10) [ <i>B3-k3-R'w</i> ] *2
(11) Μοσχερής	*29 (10) <i>Baka</i>	*2 (10) Βίχερις	*2 (11) [ <i>Mn-k3.w-R'w</i> ] *28
(12) <i>Shepseskaf</i>	?? (12) <i>Shepseskaf</i>	*7 (12) Σεβερχέρης	*4 (12) [ <i>Špsś-k3-R'w</i> ] 4
(13) <i>Djedefptah?</i>	*2? ???	(13) Θαμφθίς	*2 (13) [ <i>*Pth-jdd=f</i> ] 2

→ 19 (*cf.* the Royal Canon of Turin and Excursus II [end]), the alteration affecting the figure of Neferka(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, Neferka(re) \*16 → 26, Baka(re) \*2 → \*12 → (with subsequent loss of the units) 10, *etc.*;
- (3) interventions by Jewish and Christian chronographers in order to align the Biblical and Egyptian chronologies (*cf.* Wacholder, “Biblical Chronology”; Cohen, “History and Historiography”; Jaeger, “Greeks and Jews”; Larsson, “Chronology of the Pentateuch”; Hornung, “Introduction,” 3–5; *cf.* also Gruen, *Heritage*; Gager, “Some Thoughts”), among which at least some of the remaining additions must belong.

One should also keep in mind that scribal errors and unintentional *nivellement* 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<sup>281</sup> and another in the temple of Ramesses II.<sup>282</sup> 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,<sup>283</sup> 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.<sup>284</sup> 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<sup>285</sup> 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 (𓇗𓇗𓇗), whose name is the result of a misunderstood *terminus technicus* indicating a lacuna in the *Vorlage*,<sup>286</sup> was correctly identified with Neferkare from another *Vorlage* rather close to the Saqqara king-list, but, perhaps by mishap, Sedjes (𓇗𓇗𓇗) 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

281 PM V, 25; Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists*, 18–20; Wildung, *Rolle ägyptischer Könige, passim*; von Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 23–28, 215; Gardiner, *Geschichte*, 489–501.

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-Töd,” 178; Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists*, 29–34.

286 Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 14–16, 85; Goedicke, “King 𓇗𓇗𓇗”; 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.

TABLE 4.3

Abydos king-list	Saqqara king-list
Third Dynasty	Third Dynasty
(15) <i>njšwt Nb-k3</i>	
(16) <i>njšwt [///] Dśr-s3</i>	(12) <i>njšwt Dśr</i>
(17) <i>njšwt Ttj</i>	(13) <i>njšwt Dśr-ttj</i>
(18) <i>njšwt Šdš</i>	(14) <i>njšwt Nb-k3-Rʿw</i>
(19) <i>njšwt Nfr-k3-Rʿw</i>	(15) <i>njšwt Hwnj</i>
Fourth Dynasty	Fourth Dynasty
(20) <i>njšwt Šnfrw</i>	(16) <i>njšwt Šnfrw</i>
(21) <i>njšwt H&lt;wj&gt;=f-wj</i>	(17) <i>njšwt H&lt;wj&gt;=f-wj {f}</i>
(22) <i>njšwt-Rʿw-jdd=f</i>	(18) <i>njšwt-Rʿw-jdd=f</i>
(23) <i>njšwt Hʿj=f-Rʿw</i>	(19) <i>njšwt Hʿj=f-Rʿw</i>
(24) <i>njšwt Mn-k3.w-Rʿw</i>	(20) [ <i>njšwt B3-k3-Rʿw</i> ]
(25) <i>njšwt Špśś-k3=f</i>	(21) [ <i>njšwt Mn-k3.w-Rʿw</i> ]
	(22) [ <i>njšwt Špśś-k3=f</i> ]
	(23) [ <i>njšwt *Pth-jdd=f</i> ]
	(24) [ <i>njšwt *Hrw-jdd=f</i> ]

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<sup>287</sup> and started skipping kings he had originally intended to include. Owing to the approximate homophony<sup>288</sup> of Nebkare

<sup>287</sup> Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists*, 21–24; Wildung, *Rolle ägyptischer Könige, passim*; von Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 23–28, 216; Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 85.

<sup>288</sup> Cf. Seidlmayer, “Die staatliche Anlage,” 198–99 and “Dynasty 3,” 120; cf. section 4.1 with n. 92.

(← Nebka) ~ \**Něb-kō-Rīčě* and Neferkare (← Neferka) ~ \**Năf-kō-Rīčě* ~ \**Něf-kō-Rīčě*, 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.<sup>289</sup>

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 (*Ttj*) while the Saqqara king-list names him, similarly to the Royal Canon of Turin (*Ḍśr-tj*), Djoser-teti (*Ḍśr-ttj*). Both variants are well-known from commemorative inscriptions,<sup>290</sup> and it is thus impossible to decide which of the two variants was original to Manetho's *Vorlage* A. One is, however, inclined to deduce that the variant Τύρεις ~ *Trj* ← *Ttj* is original to the Abydene line of tradition, to which Τόσορθρος 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 njšwjj.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 (*Dśr-ttj*) 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 – Dśr-ttj → \*Dśr-ttj – Ttj*), perhaps by a scribe who noticed that Teti (*Ttj*) is nothing but a *hypocoristicum* of Djoser-teti (*Dśr-ttj*) (perhaps late New Kingdom, Third Intermediate Period?). Subsequently, the misspellings *\*Dśr-ttj → Dśr-trj* and *\*Ttj → Trj* occurred, which are expected to have happened at the same time; it is, however, also possible that only *Dśr-ttj* or *Ttj* were misspelled (either *\*Dśr-ttj – Ttj → \*Dśr-trj – Ttj* or *\*Dśr-ttj – Ttj → \*Dśr-ttj – 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?).<sup>291</sup> Finally, the gloss (\*Τύρε(ῖς)—be it as an annotation *in margine* or as a supra-linear note—was added to *Trj* (4th/3rd centuries BCE), whereas *Dśr-trj* was transcribed by Manetho himself as \*Τοσόρθορος (→ Τόσορθος).<sup>292</sup>

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.<sup>293</sup> 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* III, 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* II, 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 späthieratischen 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<sup>294</sup> 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).<sup>295</sup>

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.<sup>296</sup>

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.<sup>297</sup> 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.<sup>298</sup>

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

294 Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 24–25, 52–53 and “Gedanken”; Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists*, 25–26; Wildung, *Rolle ägyptischer Könige*, 211; Hays, “Historicity”; Drioton, “Liste des rois.”

295 Cf. n. 175 above.

296 Cf. in particular Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 85.

297 Cf. Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 66, n. 372.

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.<sup>299</sup> 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.<sup>300</sup> 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),<sup>301</sup> which still forms the

299 Cf. Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 4–8.

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 *šd*-tree in Heliopolis (Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists*, 81–82 [with further bibliographical references]).

301 Lloyd, "Manetho and the thirty-first dynasty"; Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* consisted of three books (cf. Jacoby, *FrHistGr* IIIc, no. 609 F2, F3a–3b; Waddell, *Manetho*, 62–65, 152–55, 184–87). The first of these covered the dynasties of gods, demigods, spirits, and the First to Eleventh Dynasties of men, the second the Twelfth to Nineteenth Dynasties of men, the third the Twentieth to Thirtieth/Thirty-first Dynasties of men. It is, however, unclear whether the division into three books was intentional, and if so, which reasons were decisive (*e.g.*, Manetho may have followed the model of Berossus' *Babyloniaca* in the rivalry of the early Seleucid and Ptolemaic Empires and their quest for cultural and political hegemony, cf. *e.g.*, Waddell, *Manetho*, x; Verbrugge and Wickersham, *Berossos and Manetho*, 95–97; Gozzoli, *Writing of History*, 195–96; against this assumption Adler, *Time Immemorial*,

backbone of ancient Egyptian chronology. This division of dynasties, as artificial as it may be,<sup>302</sup> 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.<sup>303</sup> 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,<sup>304</sup>
- (b) —especially for the Thinite Period and the Old Kingdom—the grouping of kings according to their burial places,<sup>305</sup> and
- (c) changes in the system of naming regnal years as reflected in the royal annals of the Old Kingdom.<sup>306</sup>

60–65; Gmirkin, *Berosus 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 C, no. 609 F2, F3a–3b, F25; Waddell, *Manetho*, 2–25; Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 4–8; Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists*, 229–339; Gozzoli, *Writing of History*, 196–97.

302 Gozzoli, *Writing of History*, 198–202; Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists*, 241, n. 41; Málek, “La division de l’histoire”; Redford, “Writing”; Schneider, “History as Festival,” “Periodisierung,” and “Periodizing Egyptian History”; cf. also n. 291 above.

303 Cf. Ryholt, *Political Situation*, 32–33, “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]): ἐξῆς δ’ ἄρξαι λέγεται τοῦ προειρημένου βασιλέως τοὺς ἀπογόνους δύο πρὸς τοῖς πεντήκοντα τοὺς ἅπαντας ἔτη πλείω τῶν χιλίων καὶ τετραράκοντα “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.

304 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 Gomaa, *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).

305 Málek, “La division de l’histoire.”

306 Baud, “Ménès, la mémoire monarchique,” 114–15 and “Les frontières,” 39–43; Ryholt, “Royal Canon,” 31.

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.<sup>307</sup> In this respect, the dynastic division separating the Fourth and Fifth Dynasties is a particularly instructive example: Manetho recorded Elephantine (*ḥbw*) 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 *Ḥḥbw*,<sup>308</sup> a town in the Nile Delta which is the place of origin of the Fifth Dynasty according to the stories of Papyrus Westcar.<sup>309</sup> In the popular tradition found in those stories,<sup>310</sup> 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.<sup>311</sup>

307 Málek, "La division de l'histoire"; Mathieu, "Les contes du Papyrus Westcar."

308 Von Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 153; cf. Erman, *Papyrus Westcar*, pl. ix.9.10.17.22; cf. also Sethe, *Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte*, 140; Brunner, "Sachebu."

309 Cf. Hays, "Historicity"; Mathieu, "Les contes du Papyrus Westcar"; Goedicke, "Thoughts"; Jenni, "Papyrus Westcar"; Erman, *Papyrus Westcar*; Lepper, *Untersuchungen*.

310 The story telling of the birth of the divine triplets must itself be viewed as the combination of two variants of a single literary topic because, at first, Djedi foretells only two of the triplets to ascend to the throne, whereas the third is destined to become the high-priest of Re in Heliopolis (Erman, *Papyrus Westcar*, pl. ix.10–11), but, later on, when their mother Rudjdjedet gives birth to them, all three boys are welcomed by the gods as future kings of Egypt (Erman, *Papyrus Westcar*, pl. x.17–x1.1). This second interpretation may be founded on some kind of historical parallel in the Thirteenth Dynasty, when this actual version of the stories was probably composed and when three brothers reigned one after the other: kings Neferhotep I, Sahathor, and Sobekhotep IV (Franke, *Heiligtum des Heqaib*, 69–70; Parkinson, *Poetry*, 182, 192, 295–96). Cf. for the historical background of the two homonymous queens, Chentkaus I and Chentkaus II, either of whom was the mother of two kings, and for additional references Baud, *Famille royale* II, nos. 186–87; Callender, *In Hathor's Image*, s.v. Khentkaus I, Khentkaus II.

311 Manetho's account of the Fifth Dynasty may have been even further influenced by this popular tradition. According to Fecht, "Review of Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*," 119, the name of Newoserre was replaced with Rewoser's, who is known as the husband of Rudjdjedet and thus the stepfather of the divine triplets in the stories of Papyrus Westcar (cf. Morenz, *Beiträge*, 118, who suggests that Rewoser's name was created in order to allude to that of king Newoserre representing the prototypical king of the Fifth Dynasty). Most probably, Rewoser's name was originally a special kind of nominal sentence (pattern *substantive—adjective*, cf. Edel, *Altägyptische Grammatik* II, § 948; cf. for the cuneiform rendering of the Egyptian personal name *Rʿw-nfr* ~ *\*Riʿūw-nāfīr* > *\*Ri/ēʿā-nāfī* as *\*Ri/e-a-na-pa* Ranke, *Keilschriftliches Material*, 18), but the adjective was secondarily replaced with a *pseudoparticipial*: *Rʿw-wsr* → *Rʿw-wsr.w* ~ *\*Riʿūw-wāśrāw* > *\*Rēʿ-wāśrē* > *\*Rāʿ-wāśrē* ~ *\*Παύσις* → *Παθούρης* (with misspelling *\*-yoc* → *\*-yoo*, metathesis *\*-yoo* → *-ooy* and itacistic corruption *\*-is* → *-ης*; cf. West, *Textual Criticism*, 25; Pöhlmann,

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,<sup>312</sup> Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* was basically a king-list with narrative sections on events assigned to the reigns

*Überlieferungsgeschichte* 11, 43–46; Schubart, *Palaeographie*; Kenyon, *Palaeography*, table of alphabets (after p. 128); cf. furthermore n. 56 above; cf. for the individual elements' vocalization Fecht, *Wortakzent*, §§ 348–54; Osing, *Nominalbildung* 1, 20–21 and *Papyrus BM 10808*, 28; Edel, *Korrespondenz* 11, 361–62). It is, however, more plausible that the names of Rewoser and Newoserre had become homophonous, because the correct reading of Newoserre's name was incontestably *Nj-Rʿw-wsr* “the strength belongs to Re” (cf. Satzinger, “Syntax der Präpositionsadjektive”; Jansen-Winkeln, “Nisbeadjektiv und Partizip”; Jenni, “Zugehörigkeit und Besitz”; this also touches the so-called *Lameres-Problem*, which cannot be discussed here, cf. most recently Buchberger, *Transformation*, 619–31): *Nj-Rʿw-wsr* → *Nj-Rʿw-wsrw* – one has to suggest a secondary replacement of *wsr* with synonymous *wsrw*, cf. *Mn-nfr* ~ \**Mīn-nāfār* > \**Mīnāfā* > \**Mīnfā* > \**Mēmḥē* ~ Μέμφης, and with replacement of *nfr* with *nfrw*, *Mn-nfrw* ~ \**Mīn-nāfṛw* > \**Mīn-nāfṛū* > \**Mēn-nāfṛā* > \**Mēn-nōfṛē* ~ Μενόφρεως (genitive, nominative \**Ménoφpṛis*, cf. for the individual elements' vocalization Fecht, *Wortakzent*, §§ 81–84; Osing, *Nominalbildung* 1, 36–48, 72, 127; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbale Nominalbildung*, 162, 195; cf. also Popko and Rücker, “Königsliste,” 48–49; cf. for the Greek inflectional pattern, which speaks in favor of a toponym and thus declines the interpretation of \**Ménoφpṛis* as a king's name, n. 57) – *Nj-Rʿw-wsrw* ~ \*(*Jā*)*nj-Riʿūw-wāsrūw* > \**nī-Riʿē-wāsrē* > \**ḡ-Rēʿ-wāsrē* > \**ē-Rāʿ-wōsrē* > \**Rāʿ-wōsrē* ~ \**Παυόσιpṛis* → \**Ῥαθούpṛis* (cf. for the individual elements' vocalization Fecht, *Wortakzent*, §§ 32–33; Buchberger, *Transformation*, 624–30; Osing, *Nominalbildung* 1, 20–21, 64–77, 314; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbale Nominalbildung*, 194–97; Edel, *Korrespondenz* 11, 361–62; cf. for the reduction and, finally, loss of the unstressed nisba (*j*)*nj* in initial position *Nj-św-b3-nb-Dd(w).t* ~ \*(*Jā*)*nj-śūw-bi3-nib-Dūdwt* > \**nī-ś-bi-nib-Dūdē* > \**ḡ-ś-b-ḡb-Dédē* > \**ē-ś-b-ḡ-Dédē* ~ \**Ἐσβενδητίς* > \**ś-m-ḡ-Dédē* ~ Σμένδης, cf. for the individual elements' vocalization Preisigke, *Namenbuch*, 108; Fecht, “Namen ägyptischer Fürsten und Städte,” 114, n. 3, and *Wortakzent*, §§ 150–54, 176–78, 219, n. 352; Osing, *Nominalbildung* 1, 265–67, 314; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbale Nominalbildung*, 202 and “Ist Mythos,” 555; Buchberger, *Transformation*, 624–30). *Ῥαθούpṛis* is thus most probably an amalgamation of Newoserre and Rewoser.

- 312 Herodotus states (Hude, *Historiae*, s.v. 11.100.1): μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον κατέλεγον οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐκ βύβλου ἄλλων βασιλέων τριηκοσίων τε καὶ τριήκοντα οὐνόματα. ἐν τοσαύτῃσι δὲ γενεῇσι ἀνθρώπων ὀκτωκαίδεκα μὲν Αἰθιοπες ἦσαν, μία δὲ γυνὴ ἐπιχωρὶή, 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.<sup>313</sup> The most important of those events were possibly also included in the Epitome in the form of glosses.<sup>314</sup> 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,<sup>315</sup> they still reflect Egyptian historical consciousness, and they thus preserve snippets from genuine Egyptian sources.<sup>316</sup> It is for that reason that Manetho's

---

*Herodotus Book II*, I, 185–92, III, 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 Τόσορθρος, 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 Τόσορθρος (Djoser-teti) as Τοσέρτασις (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 ὑπερόριον στρατεῖαν ἐποιήσατο, καὶ ἐνδοξος ἐκρίθη. ὑπὸ δὲ ἰπποποτάμου ἡρπάσθη. “He made a foreign expedition and was considered renowned, but he was carried off by a



- hippopotamus." (Waddell, *Manetho*, 30–31; Jacoby, *FrHistGr* 111C, no. 609 F3b). One may deduce that annalistic entries such as *škj 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, Νεχερωφής, and n. 66 above) and *štj.t h3b* "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 ("Αθωθις), the second king of his First Dynasty, the following gloss: . . . ὁ τὰ ἐν Μέμφει βασιλεια οἰκοδομήσας, οὗ φέρονται βίβλοι ἀνατομικαί, ἱατρὸς 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* 111C, no. 609 F2). Helck explained the first part of this gloss as a confusion of *jtj* "sovereign" in a conjectured designation *\*hwt-jtj* "sovereign's quarter" (or perhaps *\*h-jtj* "sovereign's palace" or *\*pr-jtj* "sovereign's house," all unattested, cf. for Demotic attestations of *jtj* "sovereign" Johnson, *Demotic Dictionary* 111, 239; Erichsen, *Glossar*, 46; Smith, *Papyrus BM 10507*, 61, n. d) and *Jt(t)j* (Athothis) ~ *Jtj* (Djer) ~ *Jtjw* (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 "Αθωθις (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 λιμός κατέσχε τὴν Αἴγυπτον μέγας. οὗτος τὰς περὶ Κωχώμην ἤγειρε πυραμίδας. "... under whom a great famine seized Egypt. He erected the pyramids at Cochoe." The first part of this gloss 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 \*Χῶ κῶμη (cf. the Armenian version of Eusebius: Բով ւաւանաւն *Kho*’ *awanawn* “(at) the town Chov,” Aucher, *Eusebii chronicon* 1, 204–05; cf., Waddell, *Manetho*, 32–33; Schoene, *Eusebii Chronicorum*, 65, 252, n. 114) ← \*Θῶ κῶμη “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 \*ΘΩΥ ~ \*T<sup>h</sup>ῶw, the (Proto-)Bohairic equivalent of (-)ταυ ~ \*Tāw, which is the late remnant of the old toponym T3-wrj “great/high land” (in Οὐσορεταύ “Osiris in Tawer (Abydos),” attested in a graffito of the nationalist Egyptian counter-king Horwennefer in the temple of Sethos I at Abydos, Lefebvre and Perdrizet, *Les graffiti*, no. 74; Lacau, “Un graffito”; Pestman, “Haronnophris”; Pestman, Quaegebeur, and Vos, *Recueil* 11, no. 11; Clarysse, “Hurgonaphor et Chaonnophris”; Zauzich, “Neue Namen”; cf. for the individual elements’ vocalization Osing, *Nominalbildung* 1, 149; Schenkel, *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung*, 158; Fecht, *Wortakzent*, §§ 21–24, 68, n. 123): T3-wrj ~ \*Tā3-wūrj > \*Tā3-wūrē > \*Tāwūr > \*Tāwūw > \*Tāw ~ (-)ταυ > \*Tōw ~ \*T<sup>h</sup>ῶw ~ \*ΘΩΥ ~ \*Θῶ “great/high land.” This toponym denoted both the town Abydos and its nome, which necessitated the addition of the distinctive expression κῶμη “unwalled village” (cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek Lexicon*, 1017–18). 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* 111C, 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* 111A, no. 264 F25; Oldfather, *Diodorus Siculus* 1, 158–59, s.v. 1.44.4): τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς χρόνους ἅπαντας διατελέσαι βασιλεύοντας τῆς χώρας ἑγχωρίους, ἄνδρας μὲν ἐβδομήκοντα πρὸς τοῖς τετρακοσίοις, γυναῖκας δὲ πέντε, περὶ ὧν ἁπάντων οἱ μὲν ἱερεῖς εἶχον ἀναγραφὰς ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν χρόνων αἱ τοῖς διαδόχοις παραδεδομένας, ὀπηλίκος ἕκαστος τῶν βασιλευσάντων ἐγένετο τῷ μεγέθει καὶ ὁποῖός τις τῇ φύσει καὶ τὰ κατὰ τοὺς ἰδίους χρόνους ἐκάστῳ 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) how-ever 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 evidence<sup>317</sup> recently led to a more precise picture and revealed that the Third Dynasty consisted of five kings in the following sequence:

<i>Nomen</i>	Horus Name
<i>Dśr</i>	<i>Ntrj-h.t</i>
<i>Dśr-ttj</i>	<i>Šhm-h.t</i>
<i>Nfr-k3 (?)</i>	<i>H3j-b3</i>
<i>Nb-k3</i>	<i>S3-nht</i>
<i>njśwt Hwj(w)</i>	<i>K3j-hd.t</i>

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):

Ethiopia who supported Troy and was associated with the sounding colossi of Amenophis III; cf. Griffith "Origin"; Hartmann, *Relikt*, 202–10; Bernand and Bernand, *Inscriptions*; Rosenmeyer, *Julia Balbilla*; or the fall of Troy, cf. Moyer, *Egypt*, 112–13) or Egyptian—Biblical synchronisms (above all, the themes of Israel in Egypt and of the Exodus, cf., e.g., Cohen, "History and Historiography"; Jaeger, "Greeks and Jews"; Feldman, "Pro- and Anti-Jewish"; Gruen, "Use and Abuse" and *Heritage*; Hendel, "Exodus"; Collins, "Reinventing Exodus"; Raspe, "Manetho on the Exodus"; Pucci Ben Zeev, "Reliability"; P. Schäfer, "Exodus Tradition"; Gager, "Some Thoughts"; cf. n. 26 above; cf. for early manifestations of anti-Semitism Assmann, "Antijudaismus"; Laqueur, "Manethon"; P. Schäfer "Manetho-Fragmente" and *Judaeophobia*; Collins, "Anti-Semitism"; cf. for Jews in Egypt Meleze Modrzejewski, *Jews of Egypt* and for Egypt as reflected in the Old Testament Russel, *Images of Egypt*; Levy, Schneider, and Propp, *Israel's Exodus* [with numerous bibliographical references]), and are thus essentially different; cf. Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists*, 207–13; Gozzoli, *Writing of History*, 208–11; Lloyd, *Herodotus Book II*, I, 185–92; Quack, "Reiche," 4–7.

- 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*; Weill, *La 11<sup>e</sup> et la 111<sup>e</sup> Dynastie*. The stela bearing the Horus name *K3j-hd.t* could be a piece of the Eighteenth Dynasty (Pätznik, "Qahedjet") or of the Third Intermediate Period (Claus Jurman, personal communication).

TABLE 4.4

Third Dynasty Evidence (contemporaneous)	Manetho (Epitome)	Ps.-Apollodorus/ Ps.-Eratosthenes	Regnal length
<i>Dśr(-jt/sʒ), Ntrj-ḥ.t</i>	Τοσέρτασις	Γοσορμής	29 years
<i>Dśr-ttj, Śhm-ḥ.t</i>	Τόσορθρος ἢ Τύρεις	Στοῖχος	6–7 years
<i>Nfr-kʒ (?), Hʿj-bʒ</i>	Μέσωχρις	Μάρης	6–7 years
<i>Nb-kʒ, Sʒ-nḥt</i>	Νεχερωφής	Μομχειρί	8–9 years
<i>njśwt Hwj(w), Kʒj-ḥd.t</i>	Ἀχης	Ἀνωϋφίς	14 years

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.<sup>318</sup> 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,<sup>319</sup> 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,”<sup>320</sup> 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

<sup>318</sup> Seidlmayer, “Dynasty 3,” 116, 118.

<sup>319</sup> E.g., Wildung, *Rolle ägyptischer Könige*, 56.

<sup>320</sup> 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:

Σῶρις	ABC
Σοῦφις	Σοῦφις
Μεγχέρης	Ῥατοίσης
Βίχερις	Σεβερχέρης
XYZ	Θαμφθίς

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).<sup>321</sup>

321 The sequence of kings is usually discussed within the broader context of dynastic and genealogical history: cf., e.g., Reisner, *Mycerinus*, 239–56; Reisner and Smith, *Hetepheres*, 1–12; von Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 156–59; Jánosi, *Giza in der 4. Dynastie*, 66–74; Gundacker, *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, *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 (*wr.t-hts nj.t Šnfrw, wr.t-hts nj.t Hwj=f-wj* “‘the one great of admiration’ of Snefru, ‘the one great of admiration’ of Cheops”) and her cultic reverence by Chephren (*jm3hw.t hr Hʿj=f-Rʿw* “revered by Chephren”) (PM III.1, 187; Jánosi, *Königinnenpyramiden*, 10; Baud, “The Birth of Biography,” 96–97; Gundacker, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*, 265–70; Callender, *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” (*jmj-r3 pr-hd nj Šnfrw, jmj-r3 pr-hd nj Hwj=f-wj, jmj-r3 pr-hd nj Rʿw-jdd=f, jmj-r3 pr-hd nj Hʿj=f-Rʿw*); the monument may have been donated by offspring of the unknown official (perhaps middle to late Fourth Dynasty, PM III.2, 760; Strudwick, *Administration*, 169–70 and “Three Monuments,” 45–51, pl. iv; Fischer, *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” (*jm3hw hr jtj=f njšwt, hr ntr-ʿ3, hr njšwt-bjt Hʿj=f-Rʿw, hr njšwt-bjt Mn-k3.w-Rʿw, hr njšwt-bjt Špsš-k3=f, hr njšwt-bjt Wsr-k3=f, hr njšwt-bjt Š3h-wj-Rʿw*) (PM III.1, 233–34; LD II, pl. 42a and LD—Text I, 109–10; Urk. I, 166; Junker, *Giza* II, 32; Hassan, *Giza* IV, 119–20; Schmitz, *Königssohn*, 64; Strudwick, *Administration*, 59; Harpur, *Decoration*, 268; Baud, *Famille royale* II, no. 218; Jánosi, *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” (*nb jm3h hr Rʿw-jdd=f, nb jm3h hr Hʿj=f-Rʿw, nb jm3h hr Mn-k3.w-Rʿw, nb jm3h hr Špsš-k3=f, nb jm3h hr Wsr-k3=f, nb jm3h hr Š3h-wj*

TABLE 4.5

<i>Nomen</i>	Horus Name
<i>Šnfrw</i>	<i>Nb-mʒ<sup>c</sup>.t</i>
<i>Hwj=f-wj(-Hnmw)</i>	<i>Mḏdw</i>
<i>R<sup>c</sup>w-jḏd=f</i>	<i>Hpr</i>
<i>Hj=f-R<sup>c</sup>w</i>	<i>Wśr-jb</i>
<i>Bʒ-kʒ=j</i>	[ <i>unknown</i> ] <sup>322</sup>
<i>Mn-kʒ.w-R<sup>c</sup>w</i>	<i>Kʒ-ḥ.t</i>
<i>Špśś-kʒ=f</i>	<i>Špśś-ḥ.t</i>

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

*R<sup>c</sup>w*) (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 IV<sup>e</sup> 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):<sup>323</sup>

TABLE 6.6

Fourth Dynasty Evidence (contemporaneous)	Manetho (Epitome)	Ps.-Apollodorus/ Ps.-Eratosthenes	Regnal length
<i>Snfrw</i>	Σήφουρις, Σῶρις	Σίριος	48 years
<i>Hwj=f-wj(-Hnmw)</i>	Σώϋφις, Σοῦφις	Χνοῦβος, Σαῶφις	26 years
<i>Rʿw-jdd=f</i> <i>Hʿj=f-Rʿw</i>	Ῥατοίσης Κερφέρης, Σοῦφις	Ῥαῦωσις	15 years
<i>B3-k3=j</i>	Βίχερις	Σαῶφις Βιῦρης	26 years
<i>Mn-k3.w-Rʿw</i>	Μεγχέρης	Μοσχέρης	1–2 years
<i>Špss-k3=f</i>	Σεβερχέρης	[missing]	28 years
			7 years

In conclusion, Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* must be considered an indispensable source for information on ancient Egyptian chronology. The complex history of the *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 *Aegyptiaca*. If then the *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 *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,

323 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.

to strive to lift the veil of time which has fallen upon it. This decent task has possibly been best described by Murnane:<sup>324</sup>

[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. 1116,” 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 *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*.

<i>AEL I</i>	M. Lichtheim. <i>Ancient Egyptian Literature</i> . Volume I: <i>The Old and Middle Kingdoms</i> . Reprint of the first edition with a new foreword by A. Loprieno. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 2006.
<i>AeLeo</i>	<i>Aegyptiaca Leodensia</i>
<i>AfRg</i>	<i>Archiv für Religionsgeschichte</i>
<i>AJT</i>	<i>American Journal of Theology</i>
<i>ÄL</i>	<i>Ägypten und Levante</i>
<i>ArOr</i>	<i>Archiv Orientalní</i>

---

<sup>324</sup> Murnane, “Millennium Debate,” 17.

ASS	<i>Archivio Storico Siciliano</i>
BASP	<i>Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists</i>
BN	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
CHE	<i>Cahiers d'histoire égyptienne</i>
ÉAO	<i>Égypte, Afrique &amp; Orient</i>
EdP	<i>Études de papyrologie</i>
EHR	<i>Europäische Hochschulschriften</i>
EQÄ	<i>Einführungen und Quellentexte der Ägyptologie</i>
Gardiner sign-list	A.H. Gardiner. <i>Egyptian Grammar</i> . 3rd edition, revised. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.
HA	<i>Histoire Antique</i>
HaT	<i>History and Theory</i>
HoR	<i>History of Religion</i>
HTR	<i>The Harvard Theological Review</i>
JAJ	<i>Journal of Ancient Judaism</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JEgH	<i>Journal of Egyptian History</i>
JÖByz	<i>Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik</i>
JoPh	<i>Journal of Philology</i>
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSQ	<i>Jewish Studies Quarterly</i>
KD	H. Goedicke. <i>Königliche Dokumente aus dem Alten Reich</i> . ÄA 14. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1967.
LCM	<i>Liverpool Classical Monthly</i>
LD	C.R. Lepsius. <i>Denkmäler aus Ägypten und Äthiopien</i> . 6 vols. Berlin: Nicolaische Buchhandlung, 1849–1859.
LD—Text	C.R. Lepsius. <i>Denkmaeler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien—Text</i> . 5 vols., E. Naville, K. Sethe, and W. Wreszinski, eds. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1897–1913.
LdÄ	E. Otto, W. Westendorf, and W. Helck, eds. <i>Lexikon der Ägyptologie</i> . 7 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1975–1991.
LingAeg	<i>Lingua Aegyptia, Journal of Egyptian Language Studies</i>
Or NS	<i>Orientalia Nova Seria</i>
PLBat	<i>Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava</i>
PM	B. Porter and R.L.B. Moss. <i>Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings</i> . 8 vols. in part 2nd edition revised and augmented by J. Málek, ed. Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press and Oxford University Press, 1928–2010.
PMJ	<i>Pennsylvania Museum Journal</i>
RhM NS	<i>Rheinisches Museum, Nova Seria</i>

<i>SicAr</i>	<i>Sicilia Archeologica</i>
<i>sSEA</i>	Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities
<i>ThLAe</i>	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae</i>
<i>TJR</i>	<i>The Journal of Religion</i>
<i>TPAPA</i>	<i>Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association</i>
<i>Urk. I</i>	K. Sethe. <i>Urkunden des Alten Reiches</i> . Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums I. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1933.
<i>Urk. II</i>	K. Sethe. <i>Hieroglyphische Urkunden der griechisch-römischen Zeit</i> . Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums II. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1904.
<i>Urk. IV</i>	K. Sethe and W. Helck. <i>Urkunden der 18. Dynastie</i> . Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums IV. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1914–1961.
<i>Urk. VII</i>	K. Sethe. <i>Urkunden des Mittleren Reiches</i> . Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums VII. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1935.
<i>WA</i>	Writings from the Ancient World
<i>Wb</i>	Erman, A. and H. Grapow, eds. <i>Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache</i> . 6 vols., reprint, Berlin/Leipzig: Akademie Verlag, 1982.

### Bibliography

- Abubakr, A.M. and A.Y. Mustafa. "The Funerary Boat of Khufu." In *Zum Geburtstag von Herbert Ricke*, G. Haeny, ed., 1–16. BBf 12. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1972.
- Adler, A. *Suidae lexicon*. 5 vols. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1928–1938 (cf. the annotated online-edition at <http://www.stoa.org/sol/>).
- Adler, W. *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1989.
- and P. Tuffin. *The Chronography of George Synkellos: A Byzantine Chronicle of Universal History from the Creation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Allen, J.P. *Genesis in Egypt: The Philosophy of Ancient Egyptian Creation Accounts*. YES 2. New Haven: Yale Egyptological Seminar, Department of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures, The Graduate School, Yale University, 1988.
- . *The Inflection of the Verb in the Pyramid Texts*. BiAeg 2. Malibu: Undena Press, 1984.
- Arnold, D. "Bemerkungen zu den frühen Tempeln von El-Tôd." *MDAIK* 31 (1975): 175–186.
- . *The South Cemeteries of Lisht I. The pyramid of Senwosret I*. PMMA 22. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1988.

- . *The South Cemeteries of Lisht 3. The Pyramid Complex of Senwosret I.* PMMA 25. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992.
- . "Überlegungen zum Problem des Pyramidenbaues." In *Festschrift Labib Habachi*, MDAIK 37 (1981): 15–28.
- Assmann, J. "Antijudaismus oder Antimonotheismus? Hellenistische Exoduserzählungen." In *Das Judentum im Spiegel seiner kulturellen Umwelten. Symposium zu Ehren von Saul Friedländer*, D. Borchmeyer and H. Kiesel, eds., 33–54. Neckargemünd: Edition Mnemosyne, 2002.
- Aucher, P. *Eusebii Pamphili Caesariensis Episcopi Chronicon Bipartitum nunc primum ex Armeniaco textu in Latinum conversum adnotationibus auctum Graecis fragmentis exornatum*. 2 vols. Venice: Typis Coenobii PP. Armeniorum in insula S. Lazari, 1818.
- Aufrère, S.H. "Les anciens Égyptiens et leur notion de l'antiquité. Une quête archéologique et historiographique du passé." *Méditerranées* 6 (1998): 11–55.
- . "Les destructions des Perses en Égypte et de Cambyse en particulier. *Topos ou réalité?*" In *Iconoclasme et vandalisme. La violence de l'image*, J.-M. Marconot and G. Tabuce, eds., 115–158. Montpellier: Université Paul Valéry Montpellier III, 2005.
- . "Les deux notices « Manéthôs » de la *Souda* et un nouveau fragment de Manéthôn." Forthcoming.
- . "Dualism and Focalization in Alexandrian Religious Thought in Egypt at the Beginning of the Ptolemaic Period." In *Light Against Darkness: Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World*, A. Lange, E.M. Meyers, B. Reynolds, and R.G. Styers, eds., 36–54. JAJ Supplements 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- . "Imhotep et Djoser dans la région de la cataracte. De Memphis à Éléphantine." *BIFAO* 104 (2004): 1–20.
- . "Manéthôn de Sebennyts et la traduction en grec de l'épistémè sacerdotale de l'Égypte sous le règne de Ptolémée Philadelphie: quelques réflexions." In « *Dieu parle la langue des hommes.* » *Études sur la transmission des textes religieux (I<sup>er</sup> millénaire)*, B. Bakhouch and P. Lemoigne, eds., 13–49. Histoire du Texte Biblique 8. Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2007.
- . "Manéthôn de Sebennyts, médiateur de la culture sacerdotale du Livre sacré? Questions diverses concernant l'origine, le contenu et la datation des *Ægyptiaca*." In *Transferts culturels et droits dans le monde grec et hellénistique. Actes du colloque international (Reims, 14–17 mai 2008)*, B. Legras, ed., 321–352. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 2012.
- . "Remarques sur la transmission des noms royaux par les traditions orale et écrite." *BIFAO* 89 (1989): 1–14.
- . "La titulature de Djoser dans la Stèle de la Famine. La redécouverte du vrai nom du constructeur de la pyramide à degrés." In *Séhel entre Égypte et Nubie. Inscriptions rupestres et graffiti de l'époque pharaonique : Actes du colloque international, 31 mai–*

- 1<sup>er</sup> juin 2002, *Université Paule Valéry, Montpellier*, A. Gasse and V. Rondot, eds., 41–52.  
OrMon 13. Montpellier: Université Paul Valéry Montpellier III, 2004.
- . “Traces of Hermeneutics in Late Ancient Egyptian Literature? From Thoth as Hermeneutes to his so-called heir, the esoteric Manetho of Sebennyto (Sothis Book).” In *Hermeneutics in the Ancient World. Vienna, October 31st–November 1st*, A. Lange and G. Selz, eds. Forthcoming.
- Barbour, R. *Greek Literary Hands, AD 400–1600*. Oxford Palaeographical Handbooks. Oxford/New York: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- Barclay, J.M.G. *Flavius Josephus. Translation and Commentary*. Vol. x. *Against Apion*. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 2007.
- Barguet, P. *La stèle de la famine à Sehel*. BdÉ 24. Cairo: IFAO, 1953.
- Barsanti, A. “Fouilles de Zaouiét el-Aryân.” *ASAE* 7 (1906): 285–286.
- Barta, W. “Die Chronologie der 1. bis 5. Dynastie nach den Angaben des rekonstruierten Annalensteines.” *ZÄS* 108 (1981): 11–23.
- . “Das Jahr in Datumsangaben und seine Bezeichnungen.” In *Festschrift Elmar Edel* 12. März 1979, M. Görg and E. Pusch, eds., 35–41. ÄAT 1. Bamberg: Harrassowitz, 1979.
- . “Zum altägyptischen Namen des Königs Aches.” *MDAIK* 29 (1973): 1–4.
- . “Zur Bezeichnung des Jahres in Datumsangaben.” *ZÄS* 113 (1986): 89–92.
- Baud, M. “The Birth of Biography in Ancient Egypt. Text, Format and Context in the 14th Dynasty.” In *Texte und Denkmäler des ägyptischen Alten Reiches*, J. Seidlmayer, ed., 91–124. ThLAe 3. Berlin: Achet Verlag, 2005.
- . *Djéser et la 111<sup>e</sup> dynastie*. Paris: Pygmalion/Gérard Watelet, 2003.
- . “Dynasties 6–8.” In *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, E. Hornung, R. Krauss, and D.A. Warburton, eds., 144–158. HdO 83. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006.
- . *Famille royale et pouvoir dans l’Ancien Empire égyptien*. 2 vols. BdÉ 126. Cairo: IFAO, 1999.
- . “Les frontières des quatre premières dynasties. Annales royales et historiographie égyptiennes.” *BSFE* 149 (2000): 32–46.
- . “Ménès, la mémoire monarchique et la chronologie du 111<sup>e</sup> millénaire.” *Archéo-Nil* 9 (1999): 109–147.
- and V. Dobrev. “De nouvelles annales de l’ancien empire égyptien. Une « Pierre de Palerme » pour la 1<sup>re</sup> dynastie.” *BIFAO* 95 (1995): 23–92.
- . “Le verso des annales de la 1<sup>re</sup> dynastie. Pierre de Saqqara-Sud.” *BIFAO* 97 (1997): 35–42.
- Beckerath, J. von. “Bemerkungen zum Turiner Königspapyrus und zu den Dynastien der ägyptischen Geschichte.” *SAK* 11 (1984): 49–59.
- . *Chronologie des pharaonischen Ägypten. Die Zeitbestimmung der ägyptischen Geschichte von der Vorzeit bis 332 v. Chr.* MÄS 46. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1997.
- . “Djedefhor.” In *LdÄ* 1, 1100.
- . *Handbuch der ägyptischen Königsnamen*. MÄS 20. 1st ed. München/Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1984.



- . *Handbuch der ägyptischen Königsnamen*. MÄS 49. 2nd ed. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1999. (If not indicated otherwise, the 2nd edition is quoted.)
- . “Horusgeleit.” In *LdÄ* 111, 51–52.
- . “Die Lesung von ‘Regierungsjahr’: Ein neuer Vorschlag.” *ZÄS* 95 (1969): 88–91.
- . “šmšw-ḥrw in der ägyptischen Vor- und Frühzeit.” *MDAIK* 14 (1956): 1–10.
- . “Die IV. Dynastie Ägyptens in der griechischen Überlieferung.” *BN* 115 (2000): 113–117.
- Begelsbacher-Fischer, B. *Untersuchungen zur Götterwelt des Alten Reiches im Spiegel der Privatgräber der IV. und V. Dynastie*. OBO 37. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.
- Behrmann, A. *Das Nilpferd in der Vorstellungswelt der Alten Ägypter*. 2 vols. EHR 38, Archäologie 22. Frankfurt am Main/Bern/New York/Paris: Lang Verlag, 1986–1996.
- Bernand, A. and E. Bernand. *Les inscriptions grecques et latines du Colosse de Memnon*. Cairo: IFAO, 1960.
- Berthelot, M. *Collection des anciens Alchimistes Grecs*. 4 vols. Paris: Georges Steinheil, 1888–1889.
- . *Les origines de l'alchimie*. Paris: Georges Steinheil, 1885.
- Beschaouch, A. “Topographie de Carthage romaine: sur la localization du temple d’Isis.” *CRAIBL* 1991 (1991): 323–330.
- Bickerman, E.J. *The Jews in the Greek Age*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Bilabel, F. *Griechische Papyri*. 2 vols. Veröffentlichungen aus den badischen Papyrus-Sammlungen 11, 14. Heidelberg: Winter, 1923–1924.
- Billerbeck, M. (in part together with C. Zuber and A. Neumann-Hartmann; in part with the collaboration of J.F. Gaertner, B. Wyss, and G. Lentini), ed. *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica*. 4 vols. (vol. v announced for 2016). Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae—Series Berolinensis 43/1–4. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2006–2015.
- Blackburn, B. and L. Holford-Strevens. *The Oxford Companion to the Year: An Exploration of Calendar Customs and Time-Reckoning*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Boardman, J. *The Greeks Overseas. Their Early Colonies and Trade*. 4th edition. London: Thames & Hudson, 2000.
- Bohelke, B. “In Terms of Fate. A Survey of the Indigenous Egyptian Contribution to Ancient Astrology in Light of Papyrus CtYBR inv. 1132(B).” *SAK* 23 (1996): 11–46.
- Borchardt, L. *Die Annalen und die zeitliche Festlegung des Alten Reiches der ägyptischen Geschichte*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Zeitbestimmung der ägyptischen Geschichte 1. Berlin: von Behrend, 1917.
- . “König Huni?” *ZÄS* 46 (1909): 12–13.
- Borgeaud, P. and Y. Volokhine. “Le formation de la légende de Sarapis: une approche transculturelle.” *AfRg* 2 (2000): 37–76.
- Borst, J., H. Ross, and H. Borst. *P. Cornelius Tacitus. Historiae / Historien. Lateinisch-Deutsch*. 6th edition. München/Zürich: Artemis und Winkler, 2002.
- Bouché-Leclercq, A. *L’astrologie Grecque*. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1899.

- Bremmer, J.N. "Foolish Egyptians: Apion and Anoubion in the Pseudo-Clementines." In *The Wisdom of Egypt. Jewish, Early Christian, and Gnostic Essays in Honour of Gerard P. Luttikhuisen*. A. Hilhorst and G.H. van Kooten, eds., 311–330. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Breyer, F. *Ägypten und Anatolien: politische, kulturelle und sprachliche Kontakte zwischen dem Niltal und Kleinasien im 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* CCEM 25 = DÖAW 63. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2010.
- Brown, T.S. "The Greek Sense of Time in History as Suggested by Their Accounts of Egypt." *Historia* 11 (1962): 257–270.
- Brunner, H. "Sachebu." In *LdÄ* v, 323.
- . "Zur Aussprache der Namen Chephren und Djedefhor." *zÄs* 102 (1975): 94–99.
- Brunsch, W. "Einige vorläufige Bemerkungen zur demotischen Wiedergabe griechischer Personennamen." *Enchoria* 11 (1982): 7–10.
- . "Untersuchungen zu den griechischen Wiedergaben ägyptischer Personennamen." *Enchoria* 8 (1978): 1–142.
- Buchberger, H. *Transformation und Transformat. Sargtextstudien I.* ÄA 52. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1993.
- Bunsen, C.C.J. *Aegyptens Stelle in der Weltgeschichte. Geschichtliche Untersuchung in fünf Büchern*. 5 vols. Hamburg/Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1844–1857.
- Burgess, R.W. and M. Kulikowski. *Mosaics of Time. The Latin Chronicle Traditions from the First Century BC to the Sixth Century AD*. Vol. 1, *A Historical Introduction to the Chronicle Genre from its Origins to the High Middle Ages*. Turnhout: Brepols Publishing, 2013.
- Burkard, G. "Frühgeschichte und Römerzeit: P. Berlin 23071 vso." *SAK* 17 (1990): 107–133.
- Burstein, S.M. *The Babyloniaca of Berossus*. SMANE 5.1. Malibu: Undena Publications, 1978.
- . "Hecataeus of Abdera's History of Egypt." In *Life in a Multi-Cultural Society. Egypt from Cambyse to Constantine and Beyond*. J.H. Johnson, ed., 45–50. SAOC 51. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1992.
- . "Images of Egypt in Greek Historiography." In *Ancient Egyptian Literature. History and Forms*, A. Loprieno, ed., 591–604. PdÄ 10. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1996.
- Burton, A. *Diodorus Siculus. Book I: A Commentary*. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1972.
- Calderini, A. and S. Daris. *Dizionario dei nomi geografici e topografici dell'Egitto Greco-Romano*. 5 vols. and 5 supplements. Cairo: Società Reale di geografia d'Egitto; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas Instituto "Antonio de Nebrija"; Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt Verlag; Pisa: Cisalpino—Goliadica; Rome: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 1935–2010.
- Callender, V.G. *In Hathor's Image I. The Wives and Mothers of Egyptian Kings from Dynasties I–VI*. Prague: Czech Institute of Egyptology, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague, 2011.

- Caminos, R. and H.G. Fischer. *Ancient Egyptian Epigraphy and Paleography*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1976.
- Carlotti, J.-F. *L'Akh-menou de Thoutmosis III à Karnak. Étude architecturale*. 2 vols. Cairo: Ed. Recherche sur les Civilisations, 2001.
- Carrié, J.-M. "Jean de Nikiou et sa Chronique: une écriture 'égyptienne' de l'histoire." In *Événement, récit, histoire officielle. L'écriture de l'histoire dans les monarchies antiques*, N. Grimal and M. Baud, eds., 155–172. ÉdÉ 3. Paris: Cybele, 2003.
- Castle, E.W. "The Dedication Formula *ḥ.n.f m mnw.f*." *JEA* 79 (1993): 99–120.
- . "Further Observations on the Dedication Formula *ḥ.n.f m mnw.f*." *JEA* 80 (1994): 187–191.
- Cavallo, G. "La κοινή scrittoria greco-romana nella prassi documentale di età bizantina." *JÖByz* 19 (1970): 1–31.
- and H. Maehler, eds. *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period: AD 300–800*. BICS Supplement 47. London: University of London, Institute of Classical Studies, 1987.
- . *Hellenistic Bookhands*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- Cenival, J. de. "Une nouveau fragment de la pierre de Palerme." *BSFE* 44 (1965): 13–17.
- Černý, J. *Coptic Etymological Dictionary*. Cambridge/New York etc.: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- . "The True Form of the Name of King Snofru." *RSO* 38 (1968): 89–92.
- Chantraine, P. *Grammaire Homérique*. 2 vols. 2nd edition. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1958–1963.
- Charles, R.H. *The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu. Translated from Zotenberg's Ethiopic Text*. London/Oxford: Williams and Norgate, 1916.
- Chassinat, É., F. Dumas, and S. Cauville. *Le Temple de Dendara*. Vol. 7: Salles des offrandes. Nos.1–2: Text and Plates. Cairo: IFAO, 1972, 1974.
- Christophe, L.A. "Les quatre plus illustres fils de Chéops." *CHE* 7 (1975): 213–222.
- Clarysse, W. (with the assistance of S.P. Vleeming). *The Eponymous Priests of Ptolemaic Egypt. Chronological Lists of the Priests of Alexandria and Ptolemais with a Study of the Demotic Transcriptions of their Names*. PLBat 24. Leiden/New York: Brill.
- . "Ethnic Diversity and Dialect Among the Greeks of Hellenistic Egypt." In *The two Faces of Graeco-Roman Egypt. Greek and Demotic and Greek-Demotic Texts and Studies Presented to P.W. Pestman*, A.M.F.W. Verhoogt, ed., 1–13. PLBat 30. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 1998.
- . "Greek Accents on Egyptian Names." *ZPE* 119 (1997): 177–194.
- . "De grote opstand der Egyptenaren (205–186 v.Chr.)." In *Zij schreven geschiedenis. Historische documenten uit het Oude Nabije Oosten (2500–100 v. Chr.)*, R.J. Demarée, ed., 448–458. Ex Oriente Lux 33. Louvain: Peeters, 2003.
- . "Hurgonaphor et Chaonnophris, les derniers pharaon indigènes." *CdE* 53 (1978): 243–253.

- Clédat, J. "Notes sur l'isthme de Suez. (§ XIX)." *BIFAO* 23 (1923): 135–189, pl. I–IV.
- Cohen, S.J.D. "History and Historiography in the *Against Apion* of Josephus." *HaT* 27 (1988): 1–11.
- Collins, J.J. "Anti-Semitism in Antiquity? The Case of Alexandria." *AfRg* 7 (2005): 86–101.
- . "Reinventing Exodus: Exegesis and Legends in Hellenistic Egypt." In *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism and Early Christianity, Festschrift for George. W.E. Nickelsburg*, R.A. Argall, B.A. Bow, and R.A. Werline, eds., 52–62. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity International Press, 2000.
- Colomo, D., L. Popko, M. Rücker, and R. Scholl. "Die älteste Weltchronik. Europa, die Sintflut und das Lamm." *APF* 56 (2010): 1–25.
- Crum, W.E. *A Coptic Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939.
- Cuvigny, M. and G. Lachenaud. *Plutarque: Œuvres morales*. Vol. XII.1: *De vitando aere alieno, Vitae decem oratorum, Aristophanis et Menandri comparatio, De malignitate Herodoti*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1981.
- Ćwiek, A. "History of the Third Dynasty, another update on the kings and monuments." In *Chronology and Archaeology in Ancient Egypt (The Third Millennium B.C.)*, H. Vymazalová and M. Bárta, eds., 87–103. Prague: Czech Institute of Egyptology, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague, 2008.
- Daressy, G. "La Pierre de Palerme et la Chronologie de l'Ancien Empire." *BIFAO* 12 (1916): 161–214.
- Depuydt, L. "AD 297 as the Beginning of the First Indiction Cycle." *BASP* 24 (1987): 137–139.
- Dihle, A. "Ptolemaios von Mendes." In *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung*, Erste Reihe Band XXIII.2 (= Halbband 46), G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, K. Mittelhaus, and K. Ziegler, eds., 1861. Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag, 1959.
- Dillery, J. "The First Egyptian Narrative History: Manetho and Greek Historiography." *ZPE* 127 (1999): 93–116.
- Dindorf, W. *Harpocratonis lexicon in decem oratores atticos*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1853.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. *Le Dialecte des Inscriptions Grecques de Cyrène*. Karthago. Revue d'archéologie méditerranéenne 25. Paris: Université de Paris Sorbonne, Centre d'études archéologiques de la Méditerranée, Institut d'art et d'archéologie, 2000.
- Dobrev, V. "La IV<sup>e</sup> dynastie : nouveau regard." *ÉAO* 15 (1999): 2–28.
- Doret, E. *The Narrative Verbal System of Old and Middle Egyptian*. Cahiers Orientales XII. Geneva: Patrick Cramer Éditeur, 1986.
- Dorman, P. "The Biographical Inscription of Ptahshepses from Saqqara: A Newly Identified Fragment." *JEA* 88 (2002): 85–109.
- Drews, R. "Diodorus and his Sources." *AJP* 83 (1962): 383–392.

- Dreyer, G. "Der erste König der 3. Dynastie." In *Stationen. Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte Ägyptens. Rainer Stadelmann gewidmet*, H. Guksch and D. Polz, eds., 34–43, pl. 1. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1998.
- Drioton, É. "Une liste des rois de la IV<sup>e</sup> dynastie dans l'Ouadi Hammamât." *BSFE* 16 (1954): 41–49.
- Edel, E. *Die ägyptisch-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi in babylonischer und hethitischer Sprache*. 2 vols. ARWAW 77. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1994.
- . *Altägyptische Grammatik*. 2 vols. AnOr 34/39. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1955–1964.
- . "Zur Lesung von 'Regierungsjahr.'" *JNES* 8 (1949): 35–39.
- . "Zur Vokalisation des Neuägyptischen." *MIO* 2 (1954): 30–43.
- Edwards, I.E.S. "Chephren's Place among the Kings of the Fourth Dynasty." In *The Unbroken Reed. Studies in the Culture and Heritage of Ancient Egypt in Honour of A. F. Shore*, C. Eyre, ed., 97–105. Occasional Publications 11. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1994.
- Effland, U. "Das Grab des Gottes Osiris in Umm el-Qa'āb/Abydos." In *Sanktuar und Ritual: Heilige Plätze im archäologischen Befund. Ein Zwischenbericht aus der Clusterforschung des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts 2006–2009*, I. Gerlach and D. Raue, eds. Rahden: Verlag Marie Leidorf, 2013.
- . "Grabe im Zentrum des erstbesten Grabes ...' – Mittelalterliche Schatzsucher in Abydos." In *Zeichen aus dem Sand. Streiflichter aus Ägyptens Geschichte zu Ehren von Günter Dreyer*, E.-M. Engel, V. Müller, and U. Hartung, eds. 71–82. Menes 5. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008.
- , J. Budka, and A. Effland. "Studien zum Osiriskult in Umm el-Qaab/Abydos: Ein Vorbericht." *MDAIK* 66 (2013): 19–91.
- Erbse, H. "Vier Bemerkungen zu Herodot." *RhM* ns 98 (1955): 99–120.
- Erichsen, W. *Demotisches Glossar*. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1954.
- Erman, A. *Die Märchen des Papyrus Westcar*. 2 vols. Mitteilungen aus den Orientalischen Sammlungen. Hefte v–vi. Berlin: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, 1890.
- Farina, G. *Il Papiro dei Re restaurato*. Rome: Bardi, 1936.
- Fecht, G. "Die Lesung von 'Regierungsjahr' als *rnpt-zp*." In *Dauer und Wandel. Symposium anlässlich des 75-jährigen Bestehens des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo am 10. und 11. Oktober 1982*, 85–96. SDAIK 18. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1985.
- . "Review of Wolfgang Helck: Untersuchungen zu Manetho und den ägyptischen Königslisten (Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ägyptens Bd. 18), Berlin: Akademie Verlag 1956: 91S., 4<sup>o</sup>, DM 26." *ZDMG* 110 (1960): 114–123.
- . *Der Vorwurf an Gott in den "Mahnworten des Ipu-wer": Zur geistigen Krise der ersten Zwischenzeit und ihrer Bewältigung*. AHAW, phil.-hist. Klasse 1972, Abhandlung 1. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1972.

- . *Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der ägyptischen Sprache*. ÄF 21. Glückstadt/Hamburg/New York: J.J. Augustin, 1960.
- . “Zu den Namen ägyptischer Fürsten und Städte in den Annalen des Assurbanipal und der Chronik des Asarhaddon.” In *Festschrift Hermann Junker*, *MDAIK* 16 (1958): 112–116.
- Feldman, L.H. “Pro-Jewish Imitations and Anti-Jewish Remarks in Josephus’ ‘Against Apion.’” *JQR* 78 (1988): 187–251.
- and J.R. Levison, eds. *Josephus’ Contra Apionem. Studies in Its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Christentums 34. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 1996.
- Fischer, H.G. *Egyptian Studies 111. Varia Nova*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1996.
- Foraboschi, D. *Onomasticum Alterum Papyrologicum. Supplemento al Namenbuch di F. Preisigke*. 4 vols. Testi e Documenti per lo Studio dell’Antichità xvi, Serie papirologica 11. Milan/Varese: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1972.
- Fowden, G. *The Egyptian Hermes. A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind*. Princeton/Chichester: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Franke, D. *Das Heiligtum des Heqaib auf Elephantine: Geschichte eines Provinzheiligtums im Mittleren Reich*. SAGA 9. Heidelberg: Heidelberger Orientverlag, 1994.
- Fraser, P.M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Gabolde, L. *Le « grand château d’Amon » de Sésostris Ier à Karnak. La décoration du temple d’Amon-Rê au Moyen Empire*. MAIBL NS 17. Paris: De Boccard, 1998.
- Gabolde, M. *D’Akhenaton à Toutânkhamon*. Collection de l’Institut d’Archéologie et d’Histoire de l’Antiquité 3. Lyon: Université Lumière-Lyon 2, Institut d’Archéologie et d’Histoire de l’Antiquité; Paris: De Boccard, 1999.
- Gager, J. G. “Some Thoughts on Greco-Roman Versions of the Exodus Story.” *Jewish History* 12 (1998): 129–132.
- García Valdés, M. *Plutarco. De Iside et Osiride. Introducción, texto crítico, traducción y comentario*. Testi e commenti 13. Pisa/Roma: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 1995.
- Gardiner, A.H. *The Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1909.
- . *Geschichte des Alten Ägypten*. Reprint. Augsburg: Weltbild Verlag GmbH, 1994.
- . “The Instruction Addressed to Kagemni and his Brethren.” *JEA* 32 (1946): 71–74.
- . “The Reading of the Word for ‘Regnal Year.’” *JNES* 8 (1949): 165–171.
- . “Regnal Years and Civil Calendar in Pharaonic Egypt.” *JEA* 31 (1945): 11–28.
- . *The Royal Canon of Turin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Garnett, R. “On the Date of the Ἀποτελεσματικά of Manetho.” *JoPh* 23 (1895): 238–240.



- Gauthier, H. "Quatre fragments nouveaux de la pierre de Palerme." In *Le Musée Égyptien*, III, G. Maspero, ed., 29–53, pl. XXIV–XXXI. Cairo: IFAO, 1915.
- . "Quatre fragments nouveaux de la pierre de Palerme au Musée du Caire." *CRAIBL* 1914 (1914): 489–496.
- Gelzer, H. *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*. 2 vols., Leipzig: Gerstenberg, 1885–1888.
- . "Von Gutschmids Diorthose der ägyptischen Königsliste des Eratosthenes." *RhM NS* 44 (1889): 267–270.
- Gernier, J.-C. "Autour de la Stèle de la Famine, de sa datation réelle et de sa date fictive." In *Séhel entre Égypte et Nubie. Inscriptions rupestres et graffiti de l'époque pharaonique : Actes du colloque international, 31 mai–1<sup>er</sup> juin 2002, Université Paule Valéry, Montpellier*, A. Gasse and V. Rondot, eds., 81–88. OrMon 13. Montpellier: Université Paul Valéry Montpellier III, 2004.
- Gestermann, L. *Die Überlieferung ausgewählter Texte altägyptischer Totenliteratur („Sargtexte“) in spätzeitlichen Grabanlagen*. ÄA 68. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005.
- . "Zu den spätzeitlichen Bezeugungen der Sargtexte." *SAK* 19 (1992): 117–132.
- Gignac, F.T. *A grammar of the Greek papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods*. 2 vols. Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità 55. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino—La Goliardica, 1976–1982.
- . "The pronunciation of Greek stops in the papyri." *TPAPA* 101 (1970): 185–202.
- Gilbert, G.H. "The Hellenization of the Jews between 334 BC and 70 AD." *AJT* 13 (1909): 520–540.
- Ginzl, F.K. *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie. Das Zeitrechnungswesen der Völker*. 3 vols. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906–1914.
- Giustolisi, V. "La 'Pietra di Palermo' e la cronologia dell' Antico Regno." *SicAr* 1.4 (1968): 5–14, *SicAr* 1.5 (1968): 38–55; *SicAr* 11.6 (1969): 21–38.
- Gmirkin, R.E. *Berosus and Genesis, Manetho and Exodus. Hellenistic Histories and the Date of the Pentateuch*. Library of Hebrew/Old Testament Studies 433. London/New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Goedicke, H. "King Ḥwdf?" *JEA* 42 (1956): 50–53.
- . "The Pharaoh Ny-swth." *ZÄs* 81 (1956): 19–24.
- . *Die privaten Rechtsinschriften aus dem Alten Reich*. WZKM Beihefte 5. Wien: Verlag des Notrings der Wissenschaftlichen Verbände Österreichs, 1970.
- . "Thoughts about the Papyrus Westcar." *ZÄs* 120 (1993): 23–36.
- . "Ein Verehrer des Weisen Ddfhr aus dem späten Alten Reich." *ASAE* 55 (1958): 35–55.
- Gomaà, F. *Die Besiedlung Ägyptens während des Mittleren Reiches*. BTAVO Reihe B Nr. 66.1–2, 2 vols. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1986–1987.

- . “Herakleopolis magna.” In *LdÄ* 111, 1124–1127.
- . “Herakleopolis parva.” In *LdÄ* 111, 1127.
- Goold, G.P. “Homer and the Alphabet.” *TPAPA* 91 (1960): 272–291.
- Gozzoli, R.B. *The Writing of History in Ancient Egypt during the First Millenium BC (ca. 1070–180 BC). Trends and Perspectives*. Golden House Publications, Egyptology 5. London: Golden House, 2006.
- Graefe, E. “Die gute Reputation des Königs ‚Snofru‘.” In *Studies in Egyptology Presented to Miriam Lichtheim*, vol. 1, S. Israelit-Groll, ed., 257–263. Jerusalem: Magna Press 1990.
- Grallert, S. *Bauen—Stiften—Weißen. Ägyptische Bau- und Restaurierunginschriften von den Anfängen bis zur 30. Dynastie*. 2 vols. *ADAIK* 18. Berlin: Achet Verlag, 2001.
- Grapow, H., H. von Deines, and W. Westendorf. *Grundriß der Medizin des Alten Ägypten*. 9 vols. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1954–1973.
- Greenberg, G. *Manetho: A Study in Egyptian Chronology. How Ancient Scribes Garbled an Accurate Chronology of Dynastic Egypt*. Marco Polo Monographs 8. Warren Center, Pennsylvania: Shangri La Publications, 2003/2004.
- Grenfell, B.P. and A.S. Hunt. *The Hibe Papyri*. Part. 1. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, Graeco-Roman Branch 1, 1906.
- Griffith, R.D. “The Origin of Memnon.” *Classical Antiquity* 17 (1988): 212–234.
- Griffiths, J.G. *Plutarch's De Iside et Osiride*. Cambridge: University of Wales Press, 1970.
- Gruen, E.S. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 30. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 1998.
- . “The Use and Abuse of the Exodus Story.” *Jewish History* 12 (1998): 93–122.
- Gundacker, R. “Ausgewählte Baugraffiti der Pyramide von Meidum.” *Sokar* 15 (2007): 24–30.
- . “Die Eigennamen der Könige der IV. Dynastie. Ihre Struktur und Bedeutung gemäß ägyptischen und griechischen Graphien.” *LingAeg* 21 (2013): 35–130.
- . “Ein Beitrag zur Genealogie der 4. Dynastie.” *Sokar* 16 (2008): 22–51.
- . “Ein Beitrag zur Genealogie der 4. Dynastie Teil 2: Die späte und ausgehende 4. Dynastie.” *Sokar* 20 (2010): 32–46.
- . “Das Fragment *Ägyptisches Museum Berlin no. III6* als Teil einer bislang verkannten Königsliste: ‚Die Königsliste von Abusir.‘” *wzKM* 105 (2015): 34–67.
- . “Königliche Pyramidentexte im Mittleren Reich? Zur Herkunft und zu einigen Besonderheiten der Pyramidentexte Sesostrisanchs.” *SAK* 39 (2010): 121–140.
- . “Materialien zur Länge der Regierung des Mykerinos.” *Sokar* 21 (2010): 30–43.
- . “The Names of the Kings of the Fifth Dynasty according to Manetho's *Aegyptiaca*.” To appear in *The Proceedings of the Conference Old Kingdom Art and Archaeology*, Warsaw 2–6 July 2014, ca. 50 pages (manuscript); forthcoming.
- . “On the Etymology of the Egyptian Crown Name *mṛsw.t*. An ‘Irregular’ Subgroup of *m*-Prefix Formations.” *LingAeg* 19 (2011): 37–86.

- . *Studien zur Genese und inneren chronologischen Schichtung der Pyramidentexte*. 2 vols., PhD Dissertation. University of Vienna, 2009.
- . *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Herrschaft Snofrus*. BÄ 22 = VIAÄ 104. Wien: Verein zur Förderung und Publikation wissenschaftlicher Arbeiten aus den Fächern Ägyptologie und Afrikanistik, AFRO-PUB, 2006.
- Gundel, W. and H.G. Gundel. *Astrologumena. Die astrologische Literatur in der Antike und ihre Geschichte*. Wiesbaden: Steiner Verlag, 1966.
- Hanhart, R. "Fragen um die Entstehung der LXX." *VT* 12 (1962): 139–163.
- Hani, J. *La Religion égyptienne dans la pensée de Plutarque*. Paris: Les Belles lettres, 1976.
- Hannig, R. *Großes Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch-Deutsch. Die Sprache der Pharaonen (2800–950 v.Chr.), Marburger Edition*. Kulturgeschichte der Antiken Welt 64. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 2006.
- Harpur, Y. *Decoration in Egyptian Tombs of the Old Kingdom. Studies in Orientation and Scene Content*. London/New York: KPI, 1987.
- Harrauer, H. *Handbuch der griechischen Paläographie: Textband—Tafelband*. 2 vols. Bibliothek des Buchwesens 20–21. Stuttgart: Hierseemann, 2010.
- Hartmann, A. *Zwischen Relikt und Reliquie. Objektbezogene Erinnerungspraktiken in Antiken Gesellschaften*. Studien zur Alten Geschichte 11. Berlin: Verlag Antike e.K., 2010.
- Hassan, S. *Excavations at Giza*. 10 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press; Cairo: Government Press, 1930–1960.
- Haubold, J., G.B. Lanfranchi, R. Rollinger, and J. Steele, eds. *The World of Berossos. Proceedings of the 4th International Colloquium on 'The Ancient Near East between Classical and Ancient Oriental Traditions', Hatfield College, Durham 7th–9th July 2010*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2013.
- Havet, E. *Mémoire sur les écrits qui portent les noms de Bérose et de Manéthon*. Paris: Hachette, 1873.
- el-Hawary, A. *Wortschöpfung. Die Memphitische Theologie und die Siegesstele des Pije—Zwei Zeugen kultureller Repräsentation in der 25. Dynastie*. OBO 243. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg, Schweiz; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.
- Hayes, W.C. "Royal Decrees from the Temple of Min at Coptos." *JEA* 32 (1946): 3–23.
- . *The Scepter of Egypt. A background for the study of the Egyptian antiquities in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. Volume 1: *From the earliest times to the end of the Middle Kingdom*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1953.
- . *The Texts in the Mastabeh of Se'n-wosret-'ankh at Lisht*. PMMA 12. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1937.
- Hays, H.M. "The Historicity of Papyrus Westcar." *zÄs* 129 (2002): 20–30.
- Heiberg, I.L. *Paulus Aegineta. Coprus Medicorum Graecorum IX*. 2 vols. Leipzig/Berlin: B.G. Teubner, 1921–1924.
- Heilen, S. "Anubio Reconsidered." *Aestimatio* 7 (2010): 127–192.

- Helck, W. *Die altägyptischen Gaue*. BTAVO Reihe B Nr. 5. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1974.
- . “Anmerkungen zum Turiner Königspapyrus.” *SAK* 19 (1992): 151–216.
- . “Bemerkungen zum Annalenstein.” *MDAIK* 30 (1974): 31–35.
- . “Gedanken zum Mord an König Teti.” In *Essays in Honor of Hans Goedicke*, B.M. Bryan and D. Lorton, eds., 103–112. San Antonio: Van Siclen Books, 1994.
- . *Geschichte des Alten Ägypten*. HdO 3. 2nd edition. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1981.
- . “Das Horusgeleit.” *ArOr* 18/3 (1950): 120–142.
- . *Die Lehre des Djedefhor und die Lehre eines Vaters an seinen Sohn*. KÄT 9. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1984.
- . “Der Name des letzten Königs der 3. Dynastie und die Stadt Ehnas.” *SAK* 4 (1976): 125–130.
- . “Palermostein.” In *LdÄ* iv, 652–654.
- . *Die Prophezeiung des Neferti*. KÄT 2. 2nd edition. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1992.
- . *Untersuchungen zu Manetho und den ägyptischen Königslisten*. UGAÄ 18. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1956.
- Heller, A. *Das Babylonien der Spätzeit (7.–4. Jh.) in den klassischen und keilschriftlichen Quellen*. Oikumene, Studien zur Antiken Weltgeschichte 7. Berlin: Verlag Antike e.K., 2010.
- Hendel, R. “The Exodus in Biblical Memory.” *JBL* 120/4 (2001): 601–622.
- Hermann, A. *Die ägyptische Königsnovelle*. LÄS 10. Glückstadt/Hamburg/New York: J.J. Augustin, 1940.
- Hershbelt, J.P. “Plutarch and Herodotus—The Beetle in the Rose.” *RhM NS* 136 (1993): 143–163.
- Herzog, R. *Die Umschrift der älteren griechischen Literatur in das Ionische Alphabet*. Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Universitätsdruckerei, 1912.
- Hoffmann, F. and J.F. Quack. *Anthologie der demotischen Literatur*. EQÄ 4. Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2007.
- Hoffmann, O., A. Debrunner, and A. Scherer. *Geschichte der Griechischen Sprache*. Vol. I: *Bis zum Ausgang der klassischen Zeit*. Vol. II: *Grundlagen und Grundzüge des nachklassischen Griechisch*. 2nd edition. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969.
- Hölbl, G. *Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches. Politik, Ideologie und religiöse Kultur von Alexander dem Großen bis zur römischen Eroberung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1994.
- Hornblower, J. *Hieronymus of Cardia*. Oxford Classical and Philosophical Monographs, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Hornung, E. “Introduction.” In *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, E. Hornung, R. Krauss, and D.A. Warburton, eds., 1–16. HdO 83. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006.
- and E. Staehelin. *Neue Studien zum Sedfest*. Basel: Schwabe Verlag, 2006.

- , R. Krauss, and D.A. Warburton. "King-Lists and Manetho's *Aigyptiaka*." In *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, E. Hornung, R. Krauss, and D.A. Warburton, eds., 33–36. HdO 83. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006.
- . "Methods of Dating and the Egyptian Calendar." In *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, E. Hornung, R. Krauss, and D.A. Warburton, eds., 45–51. HdO 83. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006.
- . "Royal Annals." In *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, E. Hornung, R. Krauss, and D.A. Warburton, eds., 19–25. HdO 83. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006.
- Hude, C. *Herodoti Historiae*. 2 vols. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. 3rd edition. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1927.
- Huß, W. *Der makedonische König und der ägyptische Priester*. Historia, Einzelschriften 85. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1994.
- Jacoby, F. *Apollodors Chronik. Eine Sammlung der Fragmente*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1902.
- . *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. 3 tomes in 13 vols. Berlin: Weidmann; Leiden: Brill, 1923–1958.
- . "Hekataios von Abdera." In *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung*, Erste Reihe VII.2 (= Halbband 14), G. Wissowa, ed., 2750–2769. Stuttgart: Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1912.
- Jaeger, W. "Greeks and Jews: The First Greek Records of Jewish Religion and Civilization." *TJR* 18 (1938): 127–143.
- James, T.G.H. *British Museum. Hieroglyphic Texts from Egyptian Stelae etc*. Vol. 1. 2nd edition. London: The Trustees of the British Museum London, 1961.
- Jánosi, P.C. "Bemerkungen zur Regierung des Schepseskaf." *GM* 141 (1994): 49–54.
- . *Giza in der 4. Dynastie. Die Baugeschichte und Belegung der Nekropole des Alten Reiches*. Band I: *Die Mastabas der Kernfriedhöfe und die Felsgräber*. ÖAWD 30. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005.
- . *Die Pyramidenanlagen der Königinnen. Untersuchungen zu einem Grabtyp des Alten und Mittleren Reiches*. ÖAWD 13. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996.
- Jansen, H.L. *The Coptic Story of Cambyzes' Invasion of Egypt. A Critical Analysis of its Literary Form and its Historical Purpose*. Avhandling utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse 1950 Nr. 2, Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1950.
- Jansen-Winkeln, K. "Hervorgehobenes Objekt und königliche Widmungsformel." *Or ns* (1997): 15–33.
- . "Nisbeadjektiv und Partizip." *LingAeg* 3 (1993): 7–16.
- . *Spätmittelägyptische Grammatik der Texte der 3. Zwischenzeit*. ÄAT 23. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996.
- . *Text und Sprache in der 3. Zwischenzeit. Vorarbeiten zu einer spätmittelägyptischen Grammatik*. ÄAT 26. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1994.

- . “Vermerke: Zum Verständnis kurzer und formelhafter Inschriften auf ägyptischen Denkmälern.” *MDAIK* 46 (1990): 127–156.
- Jasnow, R. *A Late Period Hieratic Wisdom Text (P Brooklyn 47.218.135)*. SAOC 52. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1992.
- Jenni, H. “Der Papyrus Westcar.” *SAK* 25 (1998): 114–141.
- . “Sätze zum Ausdruck von Zugehörigkeit und Besitz im Ägyptischen.” *LingAeg* 12 (2004): 123–131.
- Jéquier, G. *Le Mastabat Faraoun*. Fouilles à Saqqarah 10. Cairo: IFAO, 1928.
- . *Le Papyrus Prisse et ses variants. Papyrus de la Bibliothèque Nationale (N° 183 à 194), Papyrus 10371 et 104735 de British Museum, Tablette Carnarvon au Musée du Caire*. Paris: Librairie Paul Geuthner, 1911.
- Johnson, J.H. ed. *The Demotic Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. 30 vols. Chicago. Accessed January 15, 2013. <https://oi.uchicago.edu/research/publications/demotic-dictionary-oriental-institute-university-chicago>
- . *Thus wrote ‘Onkhsheshonqy. An Introductory Grammar of Demotic*. SAOC 45. 3rd edition. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2000.
- . *The Verbal System of Demotic*. SAOC 38. 2nd edition. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2004.
- Johnson, J.W. “Chronological Writing: Its Concepts and Development.” *HaT* 2 (1962): 124–145.
- Jouguet, P. “La politique intérieure du premier Ptolémée.” *BIFAO* 30 (1931): 513–536.
- Junker, H. *Giza. Bericht über die von der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien auf gemeinsame Kosten mit Dr. Wilhelm Pelizaeus unternommenen Grabungen auf dem Friedhof des Alten Reiches bei den Pyramiden von Giza*. 12 vols. (among them ÖAWD 69.1, 71.1–2, 72.1, 72.3, 73.1–2, 74.1–2, 75.2), Vienna/Leipzig: Akademie der Wissenschaften, Hölder – Pichler – Tempsky in Kommission (vols. I–VII); Vienna: Akademie der Wissenschaften/Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Rudolf M. Rohrer in Kommission (vols. VIII–XII), 1929–1955.
- . “Ein neuer Nachweis des Weisen Ddfhr.” In *Studi in memoria di Ippolito Rosellini, nel primo centenario della morte, 4 Giugno 1843–4 Giugno 1943*, vol. 2, 131–140. Pisa: Lischi, 1955.
- Kahl, J. “Dynasties 0–2.” In *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, E. Hornung, R. Krauss, and D.A. Warburton, eds., 94–115. HdO 83. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006.
- . “Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Verhältnis von Unas und Sesostrianch am Beispiel von PT 302–312.” *SAK* 22 (1995): 195–209.
- Kaiser, W. “Einige Bemerkungen zur ägyptischen Frühzeit I: Zu den šmsw Hr.” *ZÄs* 84 (1959): 119–132; *ZÄs* 85 (1960): 118–137.
- . “Einige Bemerkungen zur ägyptischen Frühzeit II: Zur Frage einer über Menes hinausreichenden ägyptischen Geschichtsüberlieferung.” *ZÄs* 86 (1961): 39–61.
- Kamrin, J. *The Cosmos of Khnumhotep II at Beni Hasan*. London: KPI, 1999.



- Kasser, R. "Akhmimic." In *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. VIII, A. Atiya, ed., 19–29. New York/Oxford/Singapore/Sydney: Maxwell Macmillan International, 1991.
- . "Alphabet in Coptic, Greek." In *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. VIII, A. Atiya, ed., 30–32. New York/Oxford/Singapore/Sydney: Maxwell Macmillan International, 1991.
- . "Coptic Alphabets." In *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. VIII, A. Atiya, ed., 32–33. New York/Oxford/Singapore/Sydney: Maxwell Macmillan International, 1991.
- Kasten, B., ed. *Herrscher- und Fürstentestamente im westeuropäischen Mittelalter. Norm und Struktur. Studien zum sozialen Wandel in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit*. Köln/Weimar/Wien: Böhlau Verlag GmbH, 2008.
- Kees, H. "Zum Ursprung der sogenannten Horusdiener." *NAWG* 1927 (1927): 196–207.
- Kenyon, F.G. *The Palaeography of Greek Papyri*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899.
- el-Kholi, M.S. *Papyri und Ostraka aus der Ramessidenzeit mit Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Istituto Internazionale del Papiro–Museo del Papiro; Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien–Ägyptisch-Orientalische Sammlung; Monografie del Museo del Papiro 5. Siracusa: Tipografia Grafica Saturnia, 2006.
- Kind, F.E. "Manethon." In *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung*, Erste Reihe XIV.1 (= Halbband 27), G. Wissowa, ed., 1101–1102. Stuttgart: Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1928.
- Kloth, N. *Die (auto-) biographischen Inschriften des ägyptischen Alten Reiches: Untersuchungen zu Phraseologie und Entwicklung*. SAK Beihefte 8. Hamburg: Buske Verlag, 2002.
- Koehly, A. *Manethonis Apotelesmaticorum qui feruntur libri VI*. Corpus poetarum epicorum Graecorum 7. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1858.
- Krauss, R. "Chronologie und Pyramidenbau in der 4. Dynastie." *Or ns* 66 (1997): 1–14.
- . *Das Ende der Amarnazeit. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Chronologie des Neuen Reiches*. HÄB 7. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg Verlag, 1978.
- . "The Length of Snefru's Reign and How Long It Took to Build the 'Red Pyramid'." *JEA* 82 (1996): 43–50.
- . "Manethos Ägyptische Geschichte—eine ptolemäische oder römische Kompilation?" In *Timelines. Studies in Honour of Manfred Bietak*, E. Czerny, I. Hein, H. Hunger, D. Melman, and A. Schwab, eds., vol. 3, 227–234. OLA 149. Louvain: Peeters, 2006.
- . "Zur Berechnung der Bauzeit an Snofrus Roter Pyramide." *zÄs* 125 (1998): 29–37.
- Kretschmer, P. *Die Entstehung der Koine*. SKAW 140, x. Abhandlung. Wien: Carl Gerold's Sohn, 1901.
- Kroll, W. "Manethon (Astrologe)." In *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung*, Erste Reihe XIV.1 (= Halbband 27), G. Wissowa, ed., 1101–1106. Stuttgart: Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1928.

- Kruchten, J.-M. "Deux cas particuliers de phrase coupée sans l'opérateur énonciatif in." *JEA* 82 (1996): 51–63.
- Kuhlmann, K.-P. "Der 'Wasserberg des Djedefre' (Chufu 01/1). Ein Lagerplatz mit Expeditionsinschriften der 4. Dynastie im Raum der Oase Dachla." *MDAIK* 61 (2005): 243–289, pl. 42.
- Kulikowski, M. "The Notitia Dignitatum as a historical source." *Historia* 49 (2000): 358–377.
- Labow, D. *Flavius Josephus. Contra Apionem Buch 1. Einleitung, Text, textkritischer Apparat, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. BWANT 167. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2005.
- Lacau, P. *Études d'Égyptologie*. 2 vols. BdÉ 41, 60. Cairo: IFAO, 1970–1972.
- . "Un graffiti d'Abydos écrit en lettres grecques." *EdP* 2 (1934): 229–246.
- Lake, K. and S. Lake. *Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200*. 11 vols. Boston: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1934–1945.
- Lambdin, T.O. "The Bivalence of Coptic *Eta* and related problems in the vocalization of Egyptian." *JNES* 17 (1958): 177–193.
- Laqueur, R. "Manethon." In *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung, Erste Reihe xiv.1 (= Halbband 27)*, G. Wissowa, ed., 1060–1101. Stuttgart: Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1928.
- Larsson, G. "The Chronology of the Pentateuch: A Comparison of the MT and LXX." *JBL* 102 (1983): 401–409.
- Lauer, P. "Sur l'âge et l'attribution possible de l'excavation monumentale de Zaouié el-Aryân." *RdÉ* 14 (1962): 21–36.
- Leahy, A. "Multiple adverbial predicates in ancient Egypt (The formula *jr.n.f m mnw.f*)." In *Lingua sapientissima; a seminar in honour of H.J. Polotsky organised by the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge and the Faculty of Oriental Studies in 1984*, H.J. Polotsky and J.D. Ray, eds., 57–64, Cambridge: Faculty of Oriental Studies, 1987.
- Lefebvre, G. and P. Perdrizet. *Les graffites grecs du Memnonion d'Abydos*. Nancy: Berger-Levrault, 1919.
- Legras, B. "Les experts égyptiens à la cour des Ptolémées." *Revue Historique* 127/3 (2002): 963–991.
- Lepper, V.M. *Untersuchungen zu pWestcar: Eine philologische und literaturwissenschaftliche (Neu-) Analyse*. ÄA 70. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008.
- Lepsius, C.R. *Denkmaeler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien nach den Zeichnungen der von Seiner Majestät dem Koenige von Preußen Friedrich Wilhelm IV. nach diesen Ländern gesendeten und in den Jahren 1842–1845 ausgeführten wissenschaftlichen Expedition*. 6 Abtheilungen, 10 vols. Berlin: Nicolaische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1848–1859.
- . *Denkmaeler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien—Text*. 5 vols., E. Naville, K. Sethe, and W. Wreszinski, eds. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1897–1913.
- Levison, J.R. and J.R. Wagner. "Introduction. The Character and Context of Josephus' *Contra Apionem*." In *Josephus' Contra Apionem. Studies in Its Character and Context*

- with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek, L.H. Feldman and J.R. Levison, eds., 1–48. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Christentums* 34. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 1996.
- Levy, T.E., T. Schneider, and W.H.C. Propp, eds. *Israel's Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective. Text, Archaeology, Culture, and Geoscience*. Quantitative Methods in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Heidelberg/New York/Dordrecht/London: Springer, 2015.
- Liddell, H.G. and R. Scott. *A Greek English Lexicon*. Revised and augmented by Sir H.S. Jones and R. McKenzie. 9th edition. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Lindsay, J. *The Origins of Alchemy in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. London: Muller, 1970.
- Lippmann, E.O. von. *Entstehung und Ausbreitung der Alchemie. Mit einem Anhang: Zur älteren Geschichte der Metalle. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte*. Berlin: Verlag Julius Springer, 1919.
- Liptay, É. "Past Imperfect—Attitudes Towards the Past in the Third Intermediate Period." In *Egyptian Renaissance. Pharaonic Renaissance. Archaism and the Sense of History in Ancient Egypt. Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest, August 8–November 9 2008*, F. Tiradritti, ed., 67–79. Ljubljana: Cankarjev dom, kulturni in kongresni center, 2008.
- Lloyd, A.B. *Herodotus Book II*. 3 vols. Leiden/New York/København/Köln: Brill, 1975–1988.
- . "Manetho and the thirty-first dynasty" In *Pyramid studies and other essays presented to I.E.S. Edwards*, J. Baines, ed., 154–160. Occasional Publications 7. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1988.
- . "Nationalist Propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt." *Historia* 31 (1982): 33–55.
- Lopilato, R. *The 'Apotelesmatika' of Manetho*. PhD Dissertation. Brown University, 1998.
- Loprieno, A. "The 'King's Novel'." In *Ancient Egyptian Literature. History and Forms*, A. Loprieno, ed., 277–296. Pp. 10. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1996.
- Luft, U. *Beiträge zur Historisierung der Götterwelt und Mythenschreibung*. StudAeg iv. Budapest: ELTE, 1978.
- Málek, J. "La division de l'histoire d'Égypte et l'égyptologie moderne." *BSFE* 138 (1997): 6–17.
- . "The Original Version of the Royal Canon of Turin." *JEA* 68 (1982): 93–106.
- Maragioglio, V. and C. Rinaldi. *L'architettura delle piramidi Menfite*. 8 [7] vols. Turin: Arlate, 1963–1975.
- Mariette, A. *Les Mastabas de l'Ancien Empire. Fragment du dernier ouvrage de A. Mariette, publié d'après le manuscrit de l'auteur par G. Maspero*. Paris: F. Vieweg, Libraire-éditeur, 1885.
- Maspero, G. "Notes sur le rapport de M. Legrain." *ASAE* 2 (1902): 281–284.
- . "Notes sur les objets recueillis sous la pyramide d'Ounas." *ASAE* 3 (1903): 185–190.

- Mathieu, B. "Les contes du Papyrus Westcar. Une interpretation." *ÉAO* 15 (1999): 29–40.
- Mattha, G. "The Value *ḥsb.t* for the Dating Group in Egyptian Documents instead of *ḥ3.t-sp.*" *BFAC* 20 (1962): 17–20.
- Mayser, E. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluß der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfaßten Inschriften*. 3 vols. Berlin/Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1923–1934.
- and H. Schmoll. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluß der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfaßten Inschriften*. Vol. 1, revised edition. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970.
- Meineke, A. *Stephani Byzantii Ethnicorum quae supersunt*. Berlin: Impensis G. Reimeri, 1849.
- Meleze Modrzejewski, M. *The Jews of Egypt from Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian*. 2nd edition. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Meltzer, E. "A reconsideration of *njswt-Ḥwj.*" *JEA* 57 (1971): 202–203.
- Mendels, D. "The Polemical Character of Manetho's *Aegyptiaca*." In *Purposes of History. Studies in Historiography from the Fourth to the Second Centuries BC*, H. Verdin, G. Schepens, and E. de Keyser, eds., 91–110. *Studia Hellenistica* 30. Louvain: Orientaliste, 1990.
- Mendez-Dosuna, J.V. "Los Griegos y la Realidad Psicologica del Fonema *κ* y *ϕ* en los Alfabetos Arcaicos." *Kadmos* 32.2 (1993): 97–126.
- Merkelbach, R. *Isis regina—Zeus Sarapis. Die griechisch-ägyptische Religion nach den Quellen dargestellt*. München/Leipzig: Saur Verlag, 2001.
- and H. van Thiel. *Griechisches Leseheft zur Einführung in die Paläographie und Textkritik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.
- Mertens, M. *Introduction à les alchimistes grecs*. Tome IV: *Zosime de Panopolis. Mémoires authentiques*. 2 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1995.
- Meulenaere, H. de and P. Mackay. *Mendes II*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips Limited, 1976.
- Moers, G. "Der 'Autor' und sein 'Werk'. Der Beginn der Lehre des Ptahhotep in der Tradition des Neuen Reiches." In *Theben—Texte—Tonfragmente. Festschrift für Günter Burkard*, D. Kessler, ed., 319–332. *ÄAT* 76. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2009.
- Möller, G. *Hieratische Paläographie. Die ägyptische Buchschrift in ihrer Entwicklung von der Fünften Dynastie bis zur römischen Kaiserzeit*. 4 vols. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1909–1936.
- . "Zu Herodots ägyptischen Geschichten." *ZÄS* 56 (1920): 76–79.
- Morenz, L. *Beiträge zur ägyptischen Schriftlichkeitskultur des Mittleren Reiches und der Zweiten Zwischenzeit*. *ÄAT* 29. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1996.
- Mosshammer, A.A. *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Presses, 1979.

- . *Georgii Syncelli Ecloga chronographica*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1984.
- Moyer, I.S. *Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism*. Cambridge/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Müller, K. and T. Müller. *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. 5 vols. Paris: A. Firmin Didot, 1841–1885.
- Murnane, W.J. “Millennium Debate. Response to D.B. Redford.” In *Egyptology at the Dawn of the Twenty-First Century: Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Egyptologists, Cairo, 2000*, Vol. II, Z.A. Hawass, ed., 15–19. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 2003.
- Murray, O. “Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship.” *JEA* 56 (1970): 141–171.
- and M. Stern. “Hecataeus of Abdera and Theophrastus on Jews and Egyptians.” *JEA* 59 (1973): 159–168.
- Naiditch, P.G. “Augustan Manetho.” *LCM* 14/7 (1989): 104–106.
- Naville, E. “La Pierre de Palerme.” *RecTrav* xxv (1903): 64–81.
- Navrátilová, H. “Review of Toby H. Wilkinson, *Royal Annals of Ancient Egypt, The Palermo Stone and its Associated Fragments*, London – New York, KPI, 2000, 211p., 111l.” *ArOr* 70 (2002): 441–442.
- Neira Faleiro, C. *La Notitia dignitatum. Nueva edición crítica y comentario histórico*. Nueva Roma 25. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2005.
- Neugebauer, O. and H.B. van Hoesen. *Greek Horoscopes*. MAPS 48. Philadelphia, The American Philosophical Society, 1959 (reprint 1987).
- Newberry, P.E. and F.L. Griffith. *Beni Hasan*. 4 vols. ASE 1–2, 5, 7. London: Gilbert and Rivington Limited, 1893–1900.
- Niehoff-Panagiotidis, J. *Koine und Diglossie*. Mediterranean Language and Culture Monograph Series 10. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1994.
- Nolan, J.S. “Lunar Intercalations and ‘Cattle Counts’ during the Old Kingdom: The Hebsed in Context.” In *Chronology and Archaeology in Ancient Egypt (The Third Millennium B.C.)*, H. Vymazalová and M. Bárta, eds., 44–60. Prague: Czech Institute of Egyptology, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague, 2008.
- . “The Original Lunar Calendar and Cattle Counts in Old Kingdom Egypt.” In *Basel Egyptology Prize I: Junior Research in Egyptian History, Archaeology, and Philology*, S. Bickel and A. Loprieno, eds., 75–97. AH 17. Basel: Schwabe & Co., 2003.
- Nunn, J.F. *Ancient Egyptian Medicine*. London: The British Museum Press, 1996.
- O’Mara, P. “Manetho and the Turin Canon. A Comparison of Regnal Years.” *GM* 158 (1997): 49–61.
- . *The Palermo Stone and the Archaic Kings of Egypt. Studies in the structural archaeology of ancient Egypt*. La Canada: Paulette Publications, 1979.
- Obbink, D. *Anubio. Carmen astrologicum elegiacum*. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Berlin/Leipzig: K.G. Saur Verlag, 2006.

- . “Anoubion, Elegiacs (nos. 4503–7).” In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. LXVI, N. Gonis, J. Chapa, W.E.H. Cockle, D. Obbink, P.J. Parsons, J.D. Thomas, J.L. Calvo Martinez, T. Finney, E.W. Handley, D. Montserrat, U. Schlag, P. Schubert, and A. Syrcou, eds., 67–109. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1999.
- Oldfather, C. *Diodorus Siculus, The Library of History*. 12 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989–2000 [reprint].
- Osing, J. *Hieratische Papyri aus Tebtunis 1. The Carlsberg Papyri 2*. 2 vols. CNIP 17. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 1991.
- . *Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen*. 2 vols. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1976.
- . *Der spätägyptische Papyrus BM 10808*. ÄA 33. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1976.
- Otto, W. *Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Ägypten*. 2 vols. Leipzig/Berlin: B.G. Teubner, 1905–1908.
- Pape, Y. le. “Crocodile et hippopotame.” *HA* 31 (2007): 22–25.
- Pardey, E. “Das Nilpferd.” In *Ägypten. Ein Tempel der Tiere. Begleitbuch zur gleichnamigen Ausstellung vom 15. Juli bis 17. September 2006 im Zoologischen Garten Berlin*. M. Gander, E.R. Lange, M. Loth, D. Rosenow, and V. Vaelske, eds., 69–73. Berlin: Achet Düring, 2006.
- Parkinson, R.B. *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt. A Dark Side to Perfection*. Athlone Publications in Egyptology and Ancient Near Eastern Studies. London/New York: Continuum, 2002.
- Parthey, G. *Ägyptische Personennamen bei den Klassikern, in Papyrusrollen, in Inschriften*. Berlin: Nicolaische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1864.
- Pätznick, J.-P. “L’Horus Qahedjet: Souverain de la 3e Dynastie?” In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Egyptology, Actes du neuvième Congrès International des Égyptologues, Grenoble, 6–12 Septembre 2004*, vol. II, J.-C. Goyon and C. Cardin, eds., 1455–1471. *OLA* 150.2. Leuven/Paris/Dudley: Peeters, 2007.
- Pecoil, J.-F. *L’Akh-menou de Thoutmosis III à Karnak—La Heret-ib et les chapelles attenantes : Relevés épigraphiques*. Paris: Ed. Recherche sur les Civilisations, 2001.
- Pellegrini, A. “Nota sopra un ‘iscrizione egizia del Museo di Palermo.’” *Ass* XX (1895): 297–316.
- Pertz, G.H. and G. Waltz. *Einhardi Vita Karoli Magni*. *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum ex monumentis Germaniae historicis separatim editi*. 6th edition. Hannover/Leipzig: Hahn, 1911.
- Petrie, W.M.F., E. Mackay, and G. Wainwright. *Meydum and Memphis III*. BSAE 18. London: University College and B. Quaritch, 1910.
- Pestman, P.W. “Haronnophris and Chaonnophris. Two indigenous Pharaohs in Ptolemaic Egypt (205–186 BC).” In *Hundred-Gated Thebes: Acts of a Colloquium on Thebes and the Theban Area in the Graeco-Roman Period*, S.P. Vleeming, ed., 101–137. PLBat 27. Leiden: Brill, 1995.



- , J. Quaegebeur, and R.L. Vos. *Recueil de Textes Démotiques et Bilingues*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Peust, C. *Egyptian Phonology. An Introduction to the Phonology of a Dead Language*. MonÄS 2. Göttingen, Peust & Gutschmidt Verlag, 1999.
- . *Die Toponyme vorarabischen Ursprungs im modernen Ägypten. Ein Katalog*. GM Beihefte 8. Göttingen: Seminar für Ägyptologie und Koptologie der Universität Göttingen, 2010.
- . “Wie fokussiert man im Ägyptischen ein direktes Objekt?” *zÄs* 135 (2008): 78–87.
- . “Zur Aussprache des Beta im Koptischen. Evidenz aus der Toponymie.” *LingAeg* 18 (2010): 209–215.
- . “Zur Aussprache des koptischen Eta nach dem Zeugnis spätbohairischer gereimter Texte.” In *Liber amicorum. Jürgen Horn zum Dank*, A. Giewekemeyer, G. Moers, and K. Widmaier, eds., 89–98. GM Beihefte 5. Göttingen: Seminar für Ägyptologie und Koptologie der Universität Göttingen, 2009.
- . “Zur Herkunft des Koptischen η.” *LingAeg* 2 (1992): 117–125.
- Pingree, D. *Hephaestionis Thebani Apotelesmaticorum libri tres*. 2 vols. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1973–1974.
- Pischikova, E.V. “The Pharaonic Renaissance (25th and 26th Dynasties).” In *Egyptian Renaissance. Pharaonic Renaissance. Archaism and the Sense of History in Ancient Egypt. Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest, August 8–November 9 2008*, F. Tiradritti, ed., 81–89. Ljubljana: Cankarjev dom, kulturni in kongresni center, 2008.
- Pöhlmann, E., ed. *Einführung in die Überlieferungsgeschichte und in die Textkritik der antiken Literatur*. 2 vols. Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1994.
- Popko, L. and M. Rücker. “P.Lips. Inv. 1228 und 590: Eine neue ägyptische Königsliste in griechischer Sprache.” *zÄs* 138 (2011): 43–62, pl. I–III.
- Posener, G. “Lehre des Djedefhor.” In *LdÄ* III, 979–981.
- . *Littérature et politique dans l'Égypte de la XII<sup>e</sup> dynastie*. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études 307. Paris: Librairie ancienne Honoré Champion, 1956.
- Posener-Kriéger, P. “Graffiti on the Revetment Blocks of the Pyramid.” In *Meidum*, A. Khouli, ed., 17–21, pl. 7–12. ACER 3. Sydney: The Australian Center for Egyptology, 1991.
- . “Les papyrus de Gébélein. Remarques préliminaires.” *RdÉ* 27 (1975): 211–221.
- † and S. Demichelis. *I papiri di Gebelein. Scavi G. Farina 1935 / Edizione a cura di Sara Demichelis*. Studi del Museo Egizio di Torino. Turin: Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali, Soprintendenza al Museo delle Antichità Egizie, 2004.
- Preisigke, F. *Namenbuch, enthaltend alle griechischen, lateinischen, ägyptischen, hebräischen, arabischen und sonstigen semitischen und nichtsemitischen Menschnennamen, soweit sie in griechischen Urkunden (Papyri, Ostraka, Inschriften, Mumienbildern usw.) Ägyptens sich vorfinden*. Heidelberg: Selbstverlag F. Preisigke, 1920.

- Pucci Ben Zeev, M. "The reliability of Josephus Flavius: The case of Hecataeus' and Manetho's accounts of Jews and Judaism. Fifteen years of contemporary research (1974–1990)." *Jsj* 24 (1993): 215–234.
- Quack, J.F. "Aus einer späthieratischen Sammelhandschrift." *zÄs* 130 (2003): 182–185, pl. XLV.
- . "Gebrochene Plurale im Ägyptischen?" In *From Beyond the Mediterranean. Akten des 7. internationalen Semitohamitistenkongresses (VII ISHAK), Berlin, 13. bis 15. September 2004*, R. Voigt, ed., 533–572. *Semitica et Semitohamitica Berolinensia* 5. Aachen: Shaker, 2007.
- . "Griechische und andere Dämonen in den spätdemotischen magischen Texten." In *Das Ägyptische und die Sprachen Vorderasiens, Nordafrikas und der Ägäis. Akten des Basler Kolloquiums zum ägyptisch-nichtsemitischen Sprachkontakt. Basel 9.–11. Juli 2003*, T. Schneider, ed., 427–507. *AOAT* 310. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2004.
- . "Papyrus CtYBR 2885 rt.: Reste einer demotischen Königsliste auf Papyrus?" *JEGH* 2.1 (2009): 107–113.
- . "Pharao und Hofstaat, Palast und Tempel: Entscheidungsfindung, Öffentlichkeit und Entscheidungsveröffentlichung im Alten Ägypten." In *Politische Kommunikation und öffentliche Meinung in der antiken Welt*, C. Kuhn, ed., 277–295. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2012.
- . "Political Ritual. Sense and Nonsense of a Term and its Application to Ancient Egypt." In *Ritual Dynamics and the Science of Ritual. Vol. III. State, Power, and Violence*, A. Michaels, ed., 215–230. Wiesbaden: Otto Harassowitz Verlag, 2010.
- . "Reiche, Dynastien... und auch Chroniken? Zum Bewußtsein der eigenen Vergangenheit im Alten Ägypten." In *Periodisierung und Epochenbewusstsein im Alten Testament und in seinem Umfeld*, J. Wiesehöfer and T. Krause, eds., 9–37. *Oriens et Occidens* 20. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2012.
- . "Sesostris. Ein Held und sein Name." *Sokar* 9 (2004): 46–48.
- . "Über die mit 'nh gebildeten Namenstypen und die Vokalisation einiger Verbalformen." *GM* 123 (1991), 91–100.
- . "Von *Hwj=f-wj-Hnmw* zu Cheops." *Sokar* 8 (2004): 3–6.
- Quaegebeur, J. "Considérations sur le nom propre égyptien Teéphthaphônukhos." *OLP* 4 (1973): 85–100.
- . "De la préhistoire de l'écriture copte." *OLP* 13 (1982): 125–136.
- . "Greek Transcriptions." In *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. VIII, A. Atiya, ed., 141–142. New York/Oxford/Singapore/Sydney: Maxwell Macmillan International, 1991.
- . "Phonology of the Greek of Egypt, Influence of Coptic on the." In *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. VIII, A. Atiya, ed., 186–188. New York/Oxford/Singapore/Sydney: Maxwell Macmillan International, 1991.

- . “Pre-Old Coptic.” In *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. VIII, A. Atiya, ed., 190–191. New York/Oxford/Singapore/Sydney: Maxwell Macmillan International, 1991.
- . “The Study of Egyptian Proper Names in Greek Transcription.” *Onoma* 18 (1974): 403–420.
- Quecke, H. “Eine griechisch-ägyptische Wörterliste vermutlich des 3. Jh. v. Chr. (P. Heid. Inv.-Nr. G 414).” *ZPE* 116 (1997): 67–80.
- Rajak, T. *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Ranke, H. *Die altägyptischen Personennamen*. 2 vols. Glückstadt: J.J. Augustin, 1935–1952.
- . *Keilschriftliches Material zur altägyptischen Vokalisation*. Berlin: Verlag der königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1910.
- Raspe, L. “Manetho on the Exodus: A Reappraisal.” *JSQ* 5 (1998): 124–155.
- Redford, D.B. “The Name Manetho.” In *Egyptological Studies in Honor of Richard A. Parker*, L.H. Lesko, ed., 118–121. Hannover/London: Brown University Press, 1986.
- . *Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day-Books. A Contribution to the Study of the Egyptian Sense of History*. SSEA Publication 4. Mississauga: Benben Publications, 1986.
- . “The Writing of the History of Ancient Egypt.” In *Egyptology at the Dawn of the Twenty-First Century: Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Egyptologists, Cairo, 2000*, vol. 11, Z.A. Hawass, ed., 1–11. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 2003.
- Reece, S.T. “Metacharakterismos.” In *Homeric Encyclopedia*, vol. 11, M. Finkelberg, ed., 533–534. Malden (Mass.): Wiley Ltd.; Oxford/Chichester: Blackwell, 2011.
- Reed, J.D. 1997. “Pseudo-Manetho and the Influence of Bion of Smyrna.” *RhM* NS 140 (1997): 91–93.
- Reeves, N. “A Fragment of Fifth Dynasty Annals at University College London.” *GM* 32 (1979): 47–51.
- Reisner, G.A. *Mycerinus. The Temples of the Third Pyramid at Giza*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931.
- . and W.S. Smith. *A History of the Giza Necropolis. Vol II: The tomb of Hetep-Heres, the mother of Cheops*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955.
- Rémondon, R. “L’Égypte et la suprême résistance au christianisme (v<sup>e</sup>–VII<sup>e</sup> siècles).” *BIFAO* 51 (1952): 63–78.
- Riess, E. “Nechepsonis et Petosiridis fragmenta magica.” *Philologus supplementum* 6 (1891–1893): 332–387.
- Ritter, V. “Hordjedef ou le glorieux destin d’un prince oublié.” *EgAfor* 15 (1999): 41–50.
- Roberts, C.H. *Greek Literary Hands, 350 BC–AD 400*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.
- Roccati, A. *La littérature historique sous l’Ancien Empire égyptien*. Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient 11. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1982.
- . “Turiner Königspapyrus.” In *LdÄ* 1, 809–810.

- Roller, D.W. *The World of Juba II and Kleopatra Selene. Royal Scholarship on Rome's African Frontier*. Routledge Classical Monographs. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Rosén, H.B. *Eine Laut- und Formenlehre der Herodotischen Sprachform*. Indogermanische Bibliothek I.1. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1962.
- Rosenmeyer, P.A. *Julia Balbilla*. Women of the Ancient World Series. London: Routledge, 2010.
- Rougé, E. de. *Recherches sur les monuments qu'on peut attribuer aux six premières dynasties de Manéthon*. MAIBL XXV. Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1866.
- Rowe, A. *The Eckley B. Coxe Jr. Expedition Excavations at Meydûm 1929–1930*. PMJ 22. 1931.
- Ruijgh, C.H. "Le Dorien de Théocrite: dialecte cyrénien d'Alexandrie et d'Égypte." *Mnemosyne* 37 (1984): 56–88.
- Russel, S. *Images of Egypt in Early Biblical Literature. Cisjordan-Israelite, Transjordan-Israelite and Judahite Portrayals*. Beiheft zur ZAW 403. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.
- Ryan, F.X. "Die Lebensdaten Manethos." *GM* 176 (2000): 85–88.
- Ryholt, K. "Egyptian Historical Literature from the Greco-Roman Period" In *Das Ereignis. Geschichtsschreibung zwischen Vorfall und Befund*, M. Fitzenreiter, ed., 231–238. *IBÄs* 10. London: Golden House Publications, 2010.
- . "King Seneferka in the king-list and his position in the Early Dynastic Period." *JEGH* 1.1 (2008): 159–173.
- . "The Late Old Kingdom in the Turin King-List and the Identity of Nitocris." *ZÄS* 127 (2000): 87–100.
- . "New Light on the Legendary king Nechepsos of Egypt." *JEA* 97 (2011): 61–72.
- . *The Political Situation in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period c. 1800–1550 BC* CNIP 20. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 1997.
- . "The Royal Canon of Turin." In *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, E. Hornung, R. Krauss, and D.A. Warburton, eds., 26–30. HdO 83. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006.
- . "The Turin King-List." *ÄL* 14 (2004): 135–155.
- Satzinger, H. "Die altkoptischen Texte als Zeugnisse der Beziehungen zwischen Ägyptern und Griechen." In *Graeco-Coptica. Griechen und Kopten im byzantinischen Ägypten. Referate der V. Koptol. Arbeitskonferenz, 25.–27. Mai 1983*, P. Nagel, ed., 137–146. Wissenschaftliche Beiträge der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg 48. Halle-Wittenberg: Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, 1984.
- . "Das Griechisch, aus dem die koptischen Alphabete stammen." In *Sprache und Geist. Peter Nagel zum 65. Geburtstag*, W. Beltz, U. Pietruschka, and J. Tubach, eds., 201–213. Hallesche Beiträge zur Orientwissenschaft 35. Halle an der Saale: Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, 2003.
- . "Koptische Vokalphoneme und ägyptische Pluralformation." In *Schrifttum, Sprache und Gedankenwelt. Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit. Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologenkongresses, Münster, 20.–26. Juli 1996*, vol. 11,

- S. Emmel, M. Krause, S.G. Richter, and S. Schaten, eds., 365–374. Sprachen und Kulturen des christlichen Orients 6. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1999.
- . *Die negativen Konstruktionen des Alt- und Mittelägyptischen*. MÄS 12. Berlin: Verlag Bruno Hessling, 1968.
- . “Old Coptic.” In *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. VIII, A. Atiya, ed., 169–175. New York/Oxford/Singapore/Sydney: Maxwell Macmillan International, 1991.
- . “Syntax der Präpositionsadjektive (Präpositionsnsiben).” *ZÄS* 113 (1986): 141–153.
- Schäfer, H. *Ein Bruchstück altägyptischer Annalen*. APAW 1902. Berlin: Verlag der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1902.
- . “König Huni.” *ZÄS* 52 (1914): 98–100.
- Schäfer, P. “The Exodus Tradition in Pagan Greco-Roman Literature.” In *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World. Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern*, I.M. Gafni, A. Oppenheimer, and D.R. Schwartz, eds., 9\*–38\*. Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1996.
- . *Judaeophobia: Attitudes Toward the Jews in the Ancient World*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- . “Die Manetho-Fragmente bei Josephus und die Anfänge des antiken ‘Antisemitismus.’” In *Collecting Fragments. Fragmente sammeln*, G.W. Most, ed., 186–206. Aporemata 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997.
- Schenkel, W. “Die ägyptische Nominalbildungslehre und die Realität der hieroglyphischen Graphien der Sargtexte II. Weitere Nominalbildungsklassen mit einer Endung -w/y/i (A II 5–10, A III 4–6 und A I 7/8/10).” *LingAeg* 16 (2008): 153–170.
- . *Aus der Arbeit an einer Konkordanz zu den altägyptischen Sargtexten. Teil I: Zur Transkription des Hieroglyphisch-Ägyptischen (unter Mitarbeit von R. Hannig). Teil II: Zur Pluralbildung des Ägyptischen*. GOF IV. REIHE, vol. 12, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983.
- . *Einführung in die altägyptische Sprachwissenschaft*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990.
- . “Ist Mythos ein griechisches Lehnwort aus dem Ägyptischen?” In *Jn.t dr.w Festschrift für Friedrich Junge*, vol. 1, G. Moers, H. Behlmer, K. Demusz, and K. Widmaier, eds., 547–580. Göttingen: Seminar für Ägyptologie und Koptologie der Universität Göttingen, 2006.
- . “Hut-Snofru.” In *LdÄ* III, 90.
- . “*ś*-Kausativa, *ṯ*-Kausativa und ‘innere’ Kausativa. Die *ś*-Kausativa der Verben I.*ś* in den Sargtexten.” *SAK* 27 (1999): 313–352.
- . *Tübinger Einführung in die klassisch-ägyptische Sprache und Schrift*. Tübingen: Pagina GmbH Tübingen, 2005.
- . “Zur Formenbildung des prädikativen *šçm=f* der Verben II.gem., vornehmlich nach dem Zeugnis der Sargtexte.” *GM* 189 (2002): 89–98.
- . *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbalen Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen*. GOF IV. Reihe, vol. 13. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983.

- Schmitz, B. *Untersuchungen zum Titel S3-NJSWT "Königsson"*. Habelts Dissertationsdrucke: Reihe Ägyptologie 2. Bonn: Habelt Verlag, 1976.
- Schnabel, P. *Berosus und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur*. Leipzig/Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1923.
- Schneider, T. *Ausländer in Ägypten während des Mittleren Reiches und der Hyksoszeit*. 2 vols. ÄAT 42. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998–2002.
- . "Das Ende der kurzen Chronologie: Eine kritische Bilanz der Debatte zur absoluten Datierung des Mittleren Reiches und der Zweiten Zwischenzeit." *ÄL* 18 (2008): 275–313.
- . "History as Festival? A Reassessment of Egypt's Use of the Past and the Place of Historiography." In *Thinking, Recording, and Writing History in the Ancient World*, K. Raaflaub, ed., 117–143. The Ancient World: Comparative Histories. Malden (Mass.): Wiley Ltd.; Oxford/Chichester: Blackwell, 2014.
- . "Die Periodisierung der ägyptischen Geschichte. Problem und Perspektive für den Historiker." In *Menschenbilder—Bildermenschen. Kunst und Kultur im Alten Ägypten, Festschrift für Erika Feucht*, T. Hofmann and A. Sturm, eds., 241–256. Norderstedt: Books on Demand GmbH, 2003.
- . "Periodizing Egyptian History: Manetho, Convention, and Beyond." In *Historiographie in der Antike*, K.-P. Adam, ed., 181–195. Beiheft zur ZAW 373. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- Schoene, A., ed. *Eusebii Chronicorum libri duo*. (continens A. Schoene, "Graeca fragmenta collegit et recognovit appendices chronographicas sex"; A. Schoene, "Hieronymi versionem e libris manuscriptis"; H. Petermann, "Armeniam versionem Latine factam ad libros manuscriptos"; E. Rödinger, "Syriacam epitomen Latine factam e libro Londiniensi"). 2 vols. Berlin: Regii typis, 1866–1875.
- Schubart, W. *Griechische Palaeographie*. HdA I.4.1. München: C.H. Beck, 1925.
- Schweitzer, S.D. *Schrift und Sprache der 4. Dynastie*. Menes 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005.
- Seeck, O. *Notitia dignitatum. Accedunt notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae et laterculi provinciarum*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1876.
- Seeters, J. van. "Review of Berosus and Genesis, Manetho and Exodus: Hellenistic Histories and the Date of the Pentateuch. By RUSSELL E. GMIRKIN. Pp. xii&332. (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies, 433; Copenhagen International Series, 15.) New York and London: T & T Clark, 2006. ISBN 978 0 567 02592 0. £75." *JTs* 63 (2012): 212–214.
- Seider, R. *Paläographie der griechischen Papyri in drei Bänden*. 3 vols. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1967–1990.
- Seidlmayer, S.J. "Dynasty 3." In *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, E. Hornung, R. Krauss, and D.A. Warburton, eds., 116–123. HdO 83. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006.



- . *Historische und moderne Nilstände. Untersuchungen zu den Pegelablesungen des Nils von der Frühzeit bis zur Gegenwart*. Achet. Schriften zur Ägyptologie 1. Berlin: Achet, 2001.
- . “Die staatliche Anlage der 3. Dyn. in der Nordweststadt von Elephantine, archäologische und historische Probleme.” In *Haus und Palast im Alten Ägypten. Internationales Symposium 8. bis 11. April 1992 in Kairo*, M. Bietak, ed., 195–214. Untersuchungen der Zweigstelle Kairo des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes 14. ÖAWD 14. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996.
- . “Zwei Anmerkungen zur Dynastie der Herakleopoliten.” *GM* 157 (1997): 81–90.
- Sethe, K. *Das ägyptische Verbum im Altaegyptischen, Neuägyptischen und Koptischen*. 3 vols. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1899–1903.
- . “Die ägyptischen Ausdrücke für rechts und links und die Hieroglyphenzeichen für Westen und Osten.” *NGWG* 1922 (1922): 197–242.
- . *Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte Ägyptens*. UGAÄ 3. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1903.
- . *Dramatische Texte zu altägyptischen Mysterienspielen*. UGAÄ 10. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1928.
- . “Imhotep, der Asklepios der Ägypter, ein vergöttlichter Mensch aus der Zeit des Königs Dośer.” *UGAÄ* 2 (1902): 95–119.
- . “Zur Erklärung der koptischen Nominalverben der Eigenschaftswörter.” *zÄs* 64 (1929): 63–64.
- Sfameni Gasparro, G. “Nuovi dèi per uomini nuovi: Serapide e il sogno di Tolomeo.” In *Faraoni come dei, Tolomei come faraoni. Atti del v Congresso Internazionale Italo-Egiziano, Torino, Archivio di Stato, 8–12 dicembre 2001*, vol. 1, N. Bonacasa and A.M. Donadoni Roveri, eds., 133–147. Palermo/Turin: Punto Grafica Picc. Soc. Coop, 2003.
- Shisha-Halevy, A. “Sahidic.” In *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, vol. VIII, A. Atiya, ed., 194–202. New York/Oxford/Singapore/Sydney: Maxwell Macmillan International, 1991.
- Siebert, F. *Flavius Josephus: Über die Ursprünglichkeit des Judentums. (Contra Apionem)*. 2 vols., Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- Smith, M. *The Mortuary Texts of Papyrus BM 10507*. Catalogue of Demotic Papyri in the British Museum, vol. 3. London: The British Museum Press, 1987.
- Smith, W.S. “Inscriptional Evidence for the History of the Fourth Dynasty.” *JNES* 11 (1952): 113–128.
- Solmsen, F. *Beiträge zur griechischen Wortforschung*. Strasbourg: Karl J. Tübner, 1909.
- Sourouzian, H. “Marques et graffiti à Dahchour Nord.” *MDAIK* 38 (1982): 387–393.
- Spalinger, A. “Dated Texts of the Old Kingdom.” *SAK* 21 (1994): 276–319.

- . “The Epistolary τόπος and War.” In *From Illahun to Djeme. Papers Presented in Honour of Ulrich Luft*, E. Bechtold, A. Gulyás, and A. Hasznos, eds., 269–278. BAR 15 2311. Oxford: Archaeopress Publishers of British Archaeological Reports Gordon House, 2011.
- Spatharakis, I. *Corpus of the Dated Illuminated Greek Manuscripts to the Year 1453*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Spiegelberg, W. *Demotische Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1925.
- . “Varia.” *RecTrav* 28 (1906): 161–187.
- Stadelmann, R. *Die ägyptischen Pyramiden. Vom Ziegelbau zum Weltwunder*. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1997.
- . “Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alten Reiches. Die Länge der Regierung des Snofru.” *MDAIK* 43 (1986): 229–240.
- Stambaugh, J.E. *Sarapis under the Early Ptolemies*. EPRO 25. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1972.
- Stephens, S.A. *Seeing Double. Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 37. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 2003.
- Sterling, G.E. *Historiography and Self-Definition. Josephus, Luke–Acts and Apologetic Historiography*. Novum Testamentum Supplementum 64. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1992.
- Stern, M. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. 3 vols. Fontes ad res Judaicas spectantes. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1976–1984.
- Stewart, H.M. *Egyptian stela, reliefs and paintings from the Petrie Collection*. Vol. II: *Archaic Period to Second Intermediate Period*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1979.
- Stiehl, R. “The Origin of the Cult of Sarapis.” *HoR* 3 (1963): 21–33.
- Störk, L. “Nilpferd.” In *LdÄ* IV, 501–506.
- Strudwick, N. *The Administration of Egypt in the Old Kingdom: the highest titles and their holders*. Studies in Egyptology. London/Boston: KPI, 1985.
- . *Texts from the Pyramid Age*. WA 16. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- . “Three Monuments of Old Kingdom Treasury Officials.” *JEA* 71 (1985): 43–51, pl. III–IV.
- Stückelberger, A. and G. Graßhoff, eds. *Ptolemaios. Handbuch der Geographie*. 3 vols. Basel: Schwabe Verlag, 2006–2009.
- Swelim, N. *Some Problems on the History of the Third Dynasty*. Alexandria: Archaeological Society of Alexandria, 1983.
- Tait, W.J. *Papyri from Tebtynis in Egyptian and in Greek. Texts from Excavations*. EEF 3rd Memoir. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1998.
- Takács, S.A. *Isis and Sarapis in the Roman World*. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1995.
- Teodorsson, S.-T. *The Phonology of Ptolemaic Koine*. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 36. Goteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1977.
- Theis, C. “Bemerkungen zu Manetho und zur manethonischen Tradition I: Die III. Dynastie.” *WdO* 44 (2014): 109–125.

- . “Pseudo-Eratosthenes und seine vierte Dynastie.” *CdÉ* 89 (2014): 34–50.
- . “Zu den an der Pyramide Lepsius XIII gefundenen Namen. Die Frage nach *B3-k3* and *Nfr-k3*” *SAK* 43 (2014): 423–438.
- Thissen, H.J. “Ägyptologische Randbemerkungen.” *RhM* ns 145 (2002): 46–61.
- . “Der Name Manetho.” *Enchoria* 15 (1980): 105–125.
- . “‘... αἰγυπτιαῖζων τῇ φωνῇ...’: Zum Umgang mit der ägyptischen Sprache in der griechisch-römischen Antike.” *ZPE* 97 (1993): 239–252.
- Threatte, L. *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*. 2 vols. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1980–1996.
- Thumb, A., E. Kieckers, and A. Scherer. *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*. 2 vols. Indogermanische Bibliothek, Abt. 1, 1. Reihe: Grammatiken, Bd. 8. 2nd edition. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1932–1959.
- Till, W.C. *Achmîmisch-Koptische Grammatik mit Chrestomathie und Wörterbuch*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1928.
- . *Koptische Dialektgrammatik mit Lesestücken und Wörterbuch*. 2nd edition. Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1961.
- Tilly, M., ed. *Einführung in die Septuaginta*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005.
- Tiradritti, F., ed. *Egyptian Renaissance. Pharaonic Renaissance. Archaism and the Sense of History in Ancient Egypt. Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest, August 8–November 9 2008*. Ljubljana: Cankarjev dom, kulturni in kongresni center, 2008.
- Toynbee, A.J. *Constantine Porphyrogenitus and His World*. Oxford/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Turner, E.G. and P.J. Parsons. *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*. BICS Supplement 46. 2nd revised edition. London: University of London, Institute of Classical Studies, 1987.
- Unger, G.F. *Chronologie des Manetho*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1867.
- Vallogia, M. “La descenderie de la pyramide de Radjedef à Abu Rawash.” In *Études sur l'Ancien Empire et la nécropole de Saqqara dédiées à Jean-Philippe Lauer*, vol. 2, C. Berger and B. Mathieu, eds., 417–428. Montpellier: Université Paul Valéry–Montpellier III, 1997.
- Verbrugghe, G.P. and J.M. Wickersham. *Berosos and Manetho. Native Traditions in Ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2001.
- Vergote, J. *Grammaire Copte*. 4 vols. Louvain: Peeters, 1973–1983.
- Verner, M. “Archaeological Remarks on the 4th and 5th Dynasty Chronology.” *ArOr* 69 (2001): 363–418.
- . “Contemporaneous Evidence for the Relative Chronology of Dyns. 4 and 5.” In *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, E. Hornung, R. Krauss, and D.A. Warburton, eds., 124–143. HdO 83. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006.
- . “The System of Dating in the Old Kingdom.” In *Chronology and Archaeology in Ancient Egypt (The Third Millennium B.C.)*, H. Vymazalová and M. Bárta, eds., 23–43.

- Prague: Czech Institute of Egyptology, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague, 2008.
- Vernus, P. "Ménés, Achtoès, l'hippopotame et le crocodile—lecture structurale de l'historiographie égyptienne." In *Religion und Philosophie im Alten Ägypten. Festgabe für Philippe Derchain zu seinem 65. Geburtstag am 24. Juni 1991*, U. Verhoeven and E. Graefe, eds., 331–340. OLA 39. Louvain: Peeters, 1991.
- Vittmann, G. "Zum Verständnis der Weihformel *jrjnf m mnwf*." *WZKM* 69 (1977): 21–32.
- Vycichl, W. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte*. Louvain: Peeters, 1983.
- . "Wie hieß König Snofru wirklich?" *RSO* 35 (1960): 123–127.
- Wacholder, B.Z. "Biblical Chronology in the Hellenistic World Chronicles." *HTR* 61 (1968): 451–481.
- Waddell, W.G. *Manetho*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, 1980.
- Wallinga, H.T. "The Structure of Herodotus II 99–142." *Mnemosyne* 12 (1959), 204–223.
- Wallraff, M., ed. *Julius Africanus und die christliche Weltchronistik*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 157. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006.
- . *Sextus Iulius Africanus: Chronographiae. The Extant Fragments*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.
- . *Welt-Zeit. Christliche Weltchronistik aus zwei Jahrtausenden in Beständen der Thüringer Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Jena*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.
- Wasserstein, A. and D.J. Wasserstein. *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Weill, R. *Les origines de l'Égypte pharaonique. Première partie. Des monuments et de l'histoire des 11<sup>e</sup> et 111<sup>e</sup> dynasties égyptiennes*. Annales du Muset Guimet. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1908.
- Weiß, A. "Die Leipziger Weltchronik—die älteste christliche Weltchronik?" *APF* 56 (2010): 26–37.
- Werner, R. *η und εΙ vor Vokal bei Homer*. Freiburg: Paulusdruckerei, 1948.
- West, M.L. *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*. München/Leipzig: K.G. Saur Verlag, 2001.
- . *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique applicable to Greek and Latin Texts*. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1973.
- West, S. *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer*. Papyrologica Coloniensia 3. Köln/Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1967.
- Westendorf, W. *Handbuch der altägyptischen Medizin*. HdO 36. 2 vols. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 1996.
- . *Koptisches Handwörterbuch. Bearbeitet auf Grund des Koptischen Handwörterbuchs von Wilhelm Spiegelberg*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1965–1977.

- Widmer, G. "Pharaoh Maâ-Rê, Pharaoh Amenemhat and Sesostri: Three figures from Egypt's past as seen in sources of the Graeco-Roman period." In *Acts of the Seventh International Conference of Demotic Studies. Copenhagen, 23–27 August 1999*, K. Ryholt, ed., 377–393. CNIP 27. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2002.
- Wildung, D. *Imhotep und Amenhotep. Gottwerdung im alten Ägypten*. MÄS 36. München/Berlin: Verlag Bruno Hessling, 1977.
- . *Die Rolle ägyptischer Könige im Bewußtsein ihrer Nachwelt. Teil I: Posthume Quellen über die Könige der ersten vier Dynastien*. MÄS 17. Berlin: Verlag Bruno Hessling, 1969.
- Wilkinson, T.A.H. *Early Dynastic Egypt*. London/New York: Routledge, 1999.
- . *Royal Annals of Ancient Egypt: The Palermo Stone and its Associated Fragments*. London/New York: KPI, 2000.
- Wilson, P. A Ptolemaic Lexikon. A lexicographical Study of the Texts in the Temple of Edfu. OLA 78, Leuven: Peeters, 1997.
- Winand, J. *Études de néo-égyptien 1 : La morphologie verbale*. AeLeo 2. Liège: Centre Informatique de Philosophie et Lettres, 1992.
- Winkler, A. *Looking at the Future. Divination and Astrology in Ancient Egypt*. PhD Dissertation. Uppsala University, 2012.
- Wittek, M. *Album de paléographie grecque. Spécimens d'écritures livresques du III<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J.C. au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, conservés dans les collections Belges*. Gent: E. Story-Scientia, 1967.
- Ypsilanti, M. "Apotelesmatica 2. (1) 14–140: Sources and Models." *RhM* ns 149 (2006): 65–98.
- Žába, Z. *Les Maximes de Ptahhotep*. Prague: Éditions de l'Académie Tchèque des Sciences, 1956.
- Zauzich, K.-T. "Neue Namen für die Könige Harmachis und Anchmachis." *GM* 29 (1978): 157–158.
- Zeidler, J. *Pfortenbuchstudien*. 2 vols. GOF IV. Reihe, Bd. 36. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999.
- Zivie-Coche, C. *Giza au premier millénaire. Autour du temple d'Isis Dame des Pyramides*. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1991.
- . "Nitocris, Rhodopis et la troisième pyramide de Giza." *BIFAO* 72 (1972): 115–138.
- Zotenberg, H. *Chronique de Jean, évêque de Nikiou. Texte Éthiopien*. Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale xxiv. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1883.