

THE TURIN KING-LIST¹

By Kim Ryholt

Papyrus Turin inv. 1874 verso – the Turin King-list or so-called “Royal Canon of Turin” – is the only true king-list from ancient Egypt prior to the Ptolemaic period. The designation “true king-list” is used here in the sense that the compiler of the document aimed at recording all the kings of Egypt together with their exact length of reign. This marks an important contrast to several other known lists of kings from ancient Egypt, such as the cultic assemblages of deceased kings engraved on the walls of the temples of Seti I and Ramesses II at Abydos and in the tomb of the priest Tjuloy at Saqqara.² These lists all have in common the fact that they include only a limited number of kings that were singled out according to some unstated principle and that none of them records the reign-length of the kings in question. The Turin King-list is, in other words, a unique document.

§1. Discovery and context

The papyrus was acquired around 1820 by Bernardino Drovetti, an Italian diplomat and antiquities collector. Conflicting stories about how and when the papyrus came into the possession of Drovetti have been published. According to Maspero:

”[le papyrus] fut achetée à Thèbes preque intacte par Drovetti vers 1818, et mutilée involontairement par lui pendant le transport. Les restes en furent acquis avec la collection par le gouvernement piémontais, en 1820, et déposés au

Musée de Turin, où Champollion les vit et les signala dès 1824.”³

Winlock, on the other hand, gives a different and rather more dramatic account:

“When the papyrus was found by Drovetti, either in 1823 or in 1824, it was apparently complete, and he put it into a jar which he tied about his waist, mounted his donkey, and proceeded to ride into town. The joggling which the jar got along the path was disastrous. When Drovetti opened it the extraordinary document had been reduced to mere scraps which have been arranged and rearranged during the past hundred years, but so much had disappeared in dust on that ride on donkey-back that only the barest outline of the original document remains today.”⁴

While Maspero’s version seems the more sober of the two, it is clear that the exact circumstances of the discovery are irretrievably lost and hence also the archaeological context.

If we venture into speculation about the origin of the papyrus, the possibility that it might have been found in a tomb might be considered likely. There is evidence that officials sometimes included among their burial equipment testimony of their scribal expertise, sometimes in the form of tablets with exercises and sometimes in the form of material that related directly to their professional duties.⁵ Whether the papyrus would have been kept specifically because of the king-list or the tax register is difficult to say. At the

¹ My work on the Turin King-list is the result of several detailed examinations of the original over the years, and I would like to express my gratitude towards Prof. A.M. Donadoni Roveri for kindly providing the necessary authorization. It is intended that the results will be published in the form of a new edition of the king-list in the *Catalogo del Museo Egizio di Torino*. The work is still in progress as the potential for making joins on the basis of the fibres is far from exhausted. The potential for such joins is amply illustrated by Prof. Osing’s careful assembly of large sections of the Tebtunis Onomasticon, which consists of about 750 fragments (OSING, *Hieratische Papyri aus Tebtunis I*, 25–218), and much more modestly by my own work on P. Petese

Tebt. A, where about 70 of 85 fragments could be fitted together (RYHOLT, *Story of Petese*). I would further like to thank Cary Martin for correcting my English.

² For the cultic lists of kings at Abydos and Saqqara, see REDFORD, *Pharaonic King-lists*, 18–24.

³ MASPERO, *Histoire ancienne*, I, 225, n. 5.

⁴ WINLOCK, *Rise and Fall*, 4.

⁵ Two well-known examples concerning papyri are the two documents designated P. Bulaq 18, which were found in a tomb at Dra Abu el-Naga, and the P. Reisner I–IV, which were found in a tomb at Naga ed-Der; cf. SIMPSON, *Papyrus Reisner I*, 17, and QUIRKE, *Administration of Egypt*, 10–12.

time when the papyrus was deposited, both texts would have been discarded from use. The tax register must have been obsolete already when the king-list was drawn up on its blank reverse. At some subsequent date a piece of the papyrus that had remained blank on the side of the tax register was cut away to be re-used for some other purpose,⁶ and as a result the last one or two columns of the king-list, which were inscribed on the other side, were lost already in antiquity. Nevertheless, the fact that the king-list was the later text might favor it being the focus of the papyrus. Possibly it was kept as the memento of an assignment and, even if the owner felt it necessary at one point to sacrifice a piece of the papyrus, it may still have retained its symbolic value. Since the context of the papyrus might thus have provided us with the identity of a person who at some point was involved with the king-list tradition, its loss is all the more regrettable.

§2. State of preservation

Apart from the piece that had been cut away in antiquity, the papyrus was presumably intact upon its discovery and only subsequently fell to pieces owing to the rough handling.⁷ It now consists of more than 300 fragments.

The state of the papyrus has deteriorated further since it was first seen and described by Champollion in 1824. In an attempt to preserve the papyrus it was pasted onto *papier végétal* by Seyffarth in 1826.⁸ This was removed again more than a century later, in 1930, by Hugo Ibscher,⁹ but the papyrus suffered evident damage during this process. A comparison between the early facsimiles of the text and the photographs published by Farina shows that numerous fragments were dam-

Column 1	Gardiner col. I
Column 2	Includes Frg. 41–42 (Gardiner col. IX), Frg. 150–152, and Frg. 22+? (Gardiner col. X)
Column 3	Gardiner col. II
Column 4	Gardiner col. III
Column 5	Gardiner col. IV
Column 6	Gardiner col. V
Column 7	Gardiner col. VI
Column 8	Gardiner col. VII
Column 9	Gardiner col. VIII
Column 10	Includes Frg. 105+108 (Gardiner col. IX), Frg. 138 (Gardiner col. X) and unnumbered fragments (Gardiner col. X.13–21)
Column 11	Gardiner col. XI

Table 1 Concordance between Gardiner's edition and the new reconstruction

aged along the edges and that many signs were lost in the process.

Through the efforts of several scholars over the last 150 years, it has been possible to join together most of the larger fragments. There are, however, still a number of important fragments whose exact position has not been established, and numerous smaller fragments, mostly rather tiny, have never been published at all.¹⁰ Much meticulous work remains to be done, especially since any attempt at a complete reconstruction must take into account not just the text of the king-list, but also that of the tax register on the reverse and, above all, the papyrus fibers.

The following description of the papyrus refers to the new reconstruction that is still in progress.¹¹ This approach has been considered more useful than reference to the earlier and less reliable arrangements that will be superseded when the new reconstruction is published. A concordance between Gardiner's edition and the new reconstruction is provided in Table 1.

⁶ Cf. RYHOLT, *Political Situation*, 9–10. Another example of a papyrus where the owner cut away a blank piece at one end is the literary composition known as the Tale of Woe, cf. CAMINOS, *Tale of Woe*, 11. There it was done in a manner that did not impair the text.

⁷ FARINA, *Il papiro dei re*, 7, refers to the account of the destruction of the papyrus as a legend but does not elaborate on the reasons for his scepticism. From its present state of preservation there can, in my experience, be little doubt that the papyrus was found intact and only subsequently damaged. It bears none of the hallmarks of naturally damaged papyrus such as insect holes, rubbed surfaces, distorted fibers and fractures along creases.

⁸ Cf. WIEDEMANN, *Ägyptische Geschichte*, 73, with references.

⁹ According to FARINA, *Il papiro dei re*, 11.

¹⁰ The existence of the unpublished fragments was kindly pointed out to me by R. Demarée several years ago, and in November 2000 the museum allowed me to remove them from their folders and place them under glass. Among the fragments are parts of royal names of both historical rulers and gods, figures relating to reigns of kings, and – perhaps most importantly – parts of headings and summations.

¹¹ The new arrangement of the section that covers the Second Intermediate Period (columns 7–11) is published in RYHOLT, *Political Situation*, 69–75, 94–97, 118–119, 151–159, 163–165.

§3. State of publication

The king-list was first studied by Champollion in 1824, shortly after its discovery, and his results were published that same year.¹² Several facsimiles and shorter studies were subsequently published, but despite the obvious importance of the document more than a century was to elapse until a full edition was finally published in 1938. This was produced by Farina and published under the title *Il papiro dei re* with the perhaps somewhat premature subtitle *restaurato*.¹³ Like the facsimiles published earlier, it included only the larger fragments. These were presented in transcription and translation with some commentary and a set of photographs. The tax register on the reverse was included in the photographs but not otherwise treated.

A new edition of the document, the only one that has appeared since Farina's, was published by Gardiner in 1959.¹⁴ This edition was more limited in its aim than its predecessor insofar as Gardiner was only concerned with the transcription of the document. Virtually all fragments that had hitherto been published were successfully transcribed, and only minor improvements have since been possible. Besides the advance in the transcription of the king-list, this edition included for the first time a transcription of the tax register. The edition includes no translation or commentaries, apart from brief notes relating to the transcription. The position of a few fragments was altered, but many where left they had been placed in the earlier edition although Gardiner felt skeptical about their arrangement.

The main factor that has prevented a more thorough reconstruction of the document is the lack of good reproductions. Facsimiles were published by Lepsius in 1842 and Wilkinson in 1851, but these cannot be used for collating purposes and matching of the fibers.¹⁵ They are, however, indispensable since they depict the fragments in a better state of preservation. The only complete set of photographs is found in Farina's edition which include both sides of the document.¹⁶ Those of the king-list can be used to some extent, but they are too reduced and coarse to check traces, and fibers cannot be made out at all. Those of the tax register are so reduced that they are rendered practically useless for any purpose. GARDINER's edition was published without photographic plates, nor did he have any large-scale photographs available for his studies.¹⁷

It is perhaps on account of its inadequate state of publication that only two studies on the nature of the king-list have been published. The first was by Redford in his study of king-lists, annals and day-books from 1986,¹⁸ and the other was by myself in 1997 in relation to my work on the Second Intermediate Period.¹⁹ Studies of the chronological implications of the document and new contributions towards its reconstruction have been more numerous. The most significant advances in the reconstruction concern the Late Old Kingdom, First Intermediate Period and the Second Intermediate Period, the latter of which occupies more than half of the section on historical kings.²⁰

§4. Purpose

The purpose of the king-list was evidently to be an

¹² For the history of the document, see MEYER, *Aegyptische Chronologie*, 105–111; FARINA, *Il papiro dei re*, 7–11; ROC-CATI, *LÄ VI*, 809.

¹³ FARINA, *Il papiro dei re*.

¹⁴ GARDINER, *Royal Canon of Turin*. The texts of the king-list and tax register are reproduced with only minor changes in KITCHEN, *Ramesside Inscriptions*, II, 815–844.

¹⁵ LEPSIUS, *Auswahl der wichtigsten Urkunden*, pls. 3–6; WILKINSON, *Fragments of the Hieratic Papyrus at Turin*.

¹⁶ In addition to these, a few publications include reduced photographs of isolated sections of the king-list. Photographs of column 5 may, for instance, be found in BORCHARDT, *Die Annalen und die zeitliche Festlegung*, pls. 4–6, and SCAMUZZI, *Museo Egizio di Torino*, pl. 66, and photographs of columns IX–X of FARINA and GARDINER's edition in SCHNEIDER, *Ausländer in Ägypten*, pl. 1–3.

¹⁷ Cf. GARDINER, *Royal Canon of Turin*, 11.

¹⁸ REDFORD, *Pharaonic King-lists*, 1–18.

¹⁹ RYHOLT, *Political Situation*, 9–33.

²⁰ Late Old Kingdom: RYHOLT, *ZÄS 127* (2000), 87–100. First Intermediate Period: VON BECKERATH, *ZÄS 93* (1966), 18–19. Second Intermediate Period: RYHOLT, *Political Situation*, 69–75, 94–97, 118–119, 151–159, 163–165. In relation to the latter study, Frg. 134 should perhaps rather be placed at the bottom of col. 8 than col. 10 as I originally suggested, cf. ALLEN, *BASOR 315* (1999), 49–50. Two very minor fragments which were already put in place by Ibscher, but which are overlooked by GARDINER, are discussed by VON BECKERATH, *GM 168* (1999), 19–21.

HELCK, *SAK 19* (1992), 150–216, proposes a series of new arrangements, but unfortunately none of them is based on a consultation of the original. I have not been able to verify any of these arrangements, whereas several of them can be rejected definitely, cf. RYHOLT, *Political Situation*, 21.

SCHNEIDER, *Ausländer in Ägypten*, 99–122, has recently devoted a long discussion to the kings recorded in

objective and complete record of every single Egyptian king with his exact position in time since the Creation. Ideally the document could be used to place the reign of any king precisely and to calculate the time-span from any other king or event. This may even have been the *raison d'être* for the document: to satisfy Ramesses II or one of his successors of their great and unrivaled heritage.

The document has often been referred to as a canon, but this designation is misleading. It implies that the list was official, that the kings might have been selected according to further principles besides the fact that they were kings, or that there may have been conflicting material available that was not included. The list was not official in the sense that it would have been publicly celebrated. On the contrary, it included numerous kings who had fallen into disrepute and who were officially suppressed. The kings were evidently included on no other principle than that they had ruled formally as kings in Egypt. No regard was made to ethnicity, gender, reputation, length of reign or any other secondary criteria, and not a single king can be shown to have been intentionally omitted.

Several other lists of kings are known, drawn up for various purposes, but none aims at being objective and none records the reign-lengths of the kings in question. They have in common that they are all lists of kings who had been singled out for some specific purpose and that this purpose was not primarily one of chronological concern.²¹ The Turin King-list is therefore unique for the Pharaonic period. In spite of this, it seems clear that the tradition of objective and comprehensive king-lists was continued for at least another millennium. Manetho's *Aigyptiaka* from

the early 3rd century displays remarkable similarities to the Turin King-list.²² It has – at least in its extant form – precisely the same structure: kings recorded by name and length of reign, arranged in groups which are listed in one, long sequence. To some extent it may therefore be regarded a matter of coincidence that not more than one such list has come down to us prior to the Ptolemaic period.

§5. Description

The king-list is written in the hieratic script on the reverse of a discarded tax register dating to the reign of Ramesses II, i.e. the 13th century BC.²³ When the king-list itself was written remains uncertain; possibly during the same reign, but it could have been during one of the succeeding reigns.

The papyrus measures 42 cm. in height which corresponds to the full-size format attested during the Ramesside Period.²⁴ The use of the full-size format is exceptional; most papyri were actually cut in half before use. The quality of the papyrus is second grade in so far as it had been damaged before it was ever used; somehow its upper half had been perforated with a sharp object while it was rolled up. As a result there was a series of holes at an interval of about every 16 cm towards the upper edge of the papyrus. These were mended with patches cut from another discarded papyrus where the original text had been washed off, i.e. a palimpsest.

The king-list consists today of 11 columns and measures about 1¾ m. in length. Originally it would have contained one or two further columns, but its final part was lost when a piece of papyrus was cut away in antiquity (§1).

columns IX and X of Farina and Gardiner's editions. Adopting a suggestion put forward by REDFORD, *Pharaonic King-lists*, 199–200, he argues, through an ingenious chain of proposed misinterpretations and *interpretatio aegyptiaca* of foreign words, that the names preserved in Frg. 41–42 and 151–152 represent a series of otherwise unattested "Vorgängern oder Zeitgenossen der 'großen Hyksos' aus dem palästinisch-syrischen Raum" (p. 121). The interpretation founders on the fact that the fragments in question in fact belong to column 2 and record mythological gods, including ordinary gods such as Seth and Horus (Frg. 150). It would also have been surprising that a series of foreign kings ruling outside Egypt should have been included in an Egyptian king-list in the first place,

embellished with the Egyptian royal title, cartouche and divine-determinative, especially since we see that the Hyksos themselves were denied this privilege in the very same list.

²¹ For these lists of kings, see REDFORD, *Pharaonic King-lists*, 18–64.

²² For Manetho's king-list, see conveniently WADDEL, *Manetho*, and, in more detail, JACOBY, *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, III, C, no. 609.

²³ Translations of the tax register can be found in HELCK, *SAK* 19 (1992), 194–205, and WARBURTON, *State and Economy in Ancient Egypt*, 159–164.

²⁴ ČERNÝ, *Paper & Books in Ancient Egypt*, 16–17; PARKINSON and QUIRKE, *Papyrus*, 16–17.

(1) Gods and demigods	c. 1½ columns	Columns 1–2 (bottom)
(2) Spirits	c. ½ column	Columns 2 (bottom) –3 (top half)
(3) Historical kings	8½ columns	Columns 3 (bottom half) –11

Table 2

§6. Overall arrangement

The king-list may be assumed originally to have been introduced by some form of heading, perhaps stating the nature of its contents, but it has so far not been possible to identify any trace of this.

The list itself consists of three main parts: god and demigod kings, spirit kings (*3h.w*), and historical or human kings.²⁵ The first covers most of two columns, the second about half a column, while the third covers the remainder of the extant part of the document, at least 8½ columns. In its present condition, the king-list ends towards the end of the Second Intermediate Period (c. 1800–1650) (Table 2).

§7. The mythological kings

The mythological kings consists of gods, demigods, and spirits. Unfortunately not a single heading from this section is preserved.

A noteworthy detail about the mythological section is the fact that some gods are recorded twice. This indicates that the document included two versions of a certain segment of the mythological kings. The gods in question are Horus, Seth and Thoth, who are recorded in both columns 1 and 2. Their order is slightly different in the two columns, and it is possible that they may have been recorded twice precisely because of this discrepancy.

Column 1 (Frg. 11)	Column 2 (Frg. 150)
9 Seth	9 Seth
9 Horus	9 The Doctor (i.e. Thoth)
9 Thoth	9 Horus

Somewhere below Frg. 150 belongs Frg. 152.²⁶ The nature of the names recorded in this fragment suggests that it marks the transition from gods to demigods.²⁷ The first name is “[...] does

not thirst” (*n ib [...]*).²⁸ This is followed by an illegible name, and the names “clod of the shore” (*pns.t n spt*),²⁹ “possessor of noble women” (*hw-hm.wt-šps.w[t]*) and “protector of [noble?] women” (*hw-hm.wt-[šps.wt?]*). None of these names is otherwise known, but this need cause no surprise since they may well be names of a purely aetiological nature made up in connection with an account of mythological kingship. The first name could be brought into relation with the primeval ocean, the time before land existed and water was everywhere. The name “clod of the shore” can hardly be other than a reference to the creation of life out of lifeless matter, earth. The two latter names could, perhaps, relate to the creation of women.

Further below, in the now lost part of column 2, there was a further transition from demigods to spirits, which continues in the first nine lines of column 3. The spirits have generally been interpreted as prehistoric kings, but it remains unclear how much historical importance should be attached to the information the king-list has to offer.³⁰

§8. The historical kings

The division of the historical kings is much clearer. Those listed in the extant part of the papyrus are divided into ten groups, which are arranged as follows in Table 3:

(1) Heading for 1st–10th Dynasty	3.10
1 st –5 th Dynasty	3.11–4.25
• Summation for 1 st –5 th Dynasty	4.26
(2) 6 th –8 th Dynasty	5.1–13
• Summation for 6 th –8 th Dynasty	5.14–15
• Summation for 1 st –8 th Dynasty	5.15–17
(3) 9 th –10 th Dynasty	5.18–6.9
• Summation for 9 th –10 th Dynasty	6.10

²⁵ The terminology is borrowed from Manetho, cf. WADDELL, *Manetho*, 2–19.

²⁶ The vertical arrangement of these fragments is assured by the fibers.

²⁷ Once again using the terminology of Manetho (‘6).

²⁸ Or: “[...] never thirsts”.

²⁹ So convincingly interpreted by VON BECKERATH, *Hand-*

buch der ägyptischen Königsnamen, 77, n. 6: “Erdklumpen des Ufers”.

³⁰ KAISER, *ZÄS* 86 (1961), 57–61; HELCK, *Untersuchungen zur Thinitenzeit*, 84–87; KAISER, *MDAIK* 46 (1990), 292–293, and VON DER WAY, *Untersuchungen zur Spätvor- und Frühgeschichte Unterägyptens*, 108–110.

(4)	Heading for 11th Dynasty	6.11
	11 th Dynasty	6.12–17
	• Summation for 11 th Dynasty	6.18
(5)	Heading for 12th Dynasty	6.19
	12 th Dynasty	6.20–7.2
	• Summation for 12 th Dynasty	7.3
(6)	Heading for 13th–14th Dynasty	7.4
	13 th Dynasty	7.5–8.27
	[• Summation for 13 th Dynasty	8.28 ?]
(7)	14 th Dynasty	9.1–c. 10.20
	• Summation for 14 th Dynasty	c. 10.21
(8)	[Heading for 15th Dynasty	c. 10.22]
	15 th Dynasty	c. 10.23–28]
	• Summation for 15 th Dynasty	c. 10.29
(9)	[Heading for 16th Dynasty	c. 10.30]
	16 th Dynasty	[c. 10.31] + 11.1–14
	• Summation for 16 th Dynasty	11.15
(10)	Unidentified dynasty	11.16–11.31 (end of papyrus)

Table 3 Arrangement of the Historical Kings

It is uncertain how many more kings were originally listed. At most the list would have recorded all kings up to and including the reign during which it was copied. Hence the piece of papyrus that was cut away in antiquity could have included the 17th, 18th and part of the 19th Dynasty.

§9. Formula for god kings, demigod kings and historical kings

God kings, demigod kings and historical kings are recorded in a similar manner. The formula for the individual entries reads:

“Dual King *Name(s)*. He acted in kingship *x* years, *x* months and *x* days.”

(*nsw.t-bi.ty NN ir.n=f m nsw.yt rnp.t x 3bd x hrw x*)

The kingship formula *ir.n=f m nsw.yt ...*, it may be noted, was not written out in full after each king, but mostly marked simply with ditto signs (§11).

In the section covering the Archaic Period, where the king’s age at death is included after the length of his reign, the following words are added:

“His lifetime, *x* years.”
(*ḥḥ=f m ḥḥ rnp.t x*)

§10. Formulae for spirit kings

In contrast to the god kings and historical kings who are individually recorded, the spirits are listed

only in the form of group summations. None of these is preserved intact, and there are clearly variations in the formula. Some reconstructed examples are:

“*x* spirits of *such-and-such*; their years, *x*, and their life-time, *x*” (3.1)

“*x* spirits of *such-and-such*; their kingship, their years and their life-time, *x*” (3.4)

“*x* spirits of *such-and-such*; they performed their kingship, *x* years, *x* months and *x* days” (3.2)

§11. Ditto marks

Returning to the god kings and historical kings, the scribes did not bother to write out the kingship formula in full after each royal name – obviously because there were more than 300 kings. In the original, from which the Turin version was copied, the kingship formula was only written out in full for the first king after a heading and at the top of each new column; below those entries ditto marks were used instead.³¹ The parts of the formula that were replaced by ditto marks are “He acted in kingship” and the words for “months” and “days”. The royal title was naturally never replaced by ditto marks, nor was the word for “year”.

The scribe who drew up the Turin version evidently did not pay particular attention to the nature of his original, and he simply made a slavish copy. Since his papyrus had a larger format than his source, the kingship formula was out of sync with the top of the columns where it belongs. Accordingly, ditto marks are often found at the top of the columns, where they obviously do not belong, and the kingship formula occurs at irregular positions within the columns. This arrangement is somewhat clumsy aesthetically, but it is significant since it allows us to reconstruct the layout of the original from which the Turin version was copied (§24).


§12. Rubra

Red ink was used to highlight certain words. The main purpose was to aid the reader in finding his way around the list with its more than 300 kings. Red ink was therefore used for headings and summations, where it is always just the initial word that was written in red. The initial word is only preserved in two headings and, not surprisingly, it

³¹ Ditto marks are first attested in papyri of the early 12th Dynasty and are used until the Roman period, cf. SIMP-

SON, *Papyrus Reisner I*, 24; OSING, *Hieratische Papyri aus Tebtunis I*, 35.

is both times the plural “kings”, followed by some qualification of the kings in question (6.11, 7.4). In the summations, the initial word is invariably “total”, here followed by the relevant figures and comments (4.26, 5.15, 17, 6.10, 7.3, and Frg. 44.1). On a single occasion, red is also used to highlight an entry that apparently was considered especially important, i.e. that of Djoser (§21).

Red ink was also used to highlight a series of notations of a different nature. The source from which the Turin King-list was copied was a damaged manuscript,³² and the lacunae that had arisen were duly marked by the abbreviated group  which may be translated with “lost” or “lacuna” (§26). The scribe responsible for these notations realized the importance of warning future users of the defects in the list, and hence the notations were highlighted with the use of red ink when used to mark the actual location of the lacunae (7.6, 9.12, 14; the scribe has accidentally written the notation in black on a single occasion, 11.8³³). In the summations, however, the word “lacuna” was written in black ink (5.15, 16, 6.18) since in this context it does not directly indicate a defect, but merely refers to a lacuna that has already been marked in the preceding text.

§13. Headings and Summations

The arrangement of the historical kings and the occurrence of headings and summations are shown in Table 3. It may be noted that while each group ends with a summation, it is not every group that is also preceded by a heading. Thus it seems that all the historical kings prior to the 11th Dynasty are recorded under one single heading, although they ruled an entire millennium according to the figures provided by the king-list itself and are arranged into shorter groups through summations. It is perhaps especially surprising that the Heracleopolitan kings of the First Inter-

mediate Period (7th–8th Dynasties) do not have a separate heading.

Other king-lists must have provided a more subtle arrangement of the same kings since we see in Manetho that the 1st and 2nd Dynasties are said to have ruled from This, the 3rd to 8th Dynasties from Memphis, and the 9th and 10th from Heracleopolis.³⁴

Similarly, the heading that follows the 12th Dynasty would seem to have designated not only the 13th but also the contemporary 14th Dynasty.

None of all the headings and summations is preserved intact. Translations and restorations of the better-preserved ones are offered below.³⁵

Heading for the 1st–10th Dynasties (3.10)

“[Kings of the house of (?)] king Menes.”

Summation for the 1st–5th Dynasties (4.26)

“Total of kings from Menes until [Unas: *x* amounting to 767 (or 768) years.]”³⁶

Summation for the 6th–8th Dynasties (5.14–15)

“[Total of] kings [until Neferirkare: *x*] amounting to 181 years, 6 months, 3 days, and a lacuna of 6 (years). Total: 1[87 years, 6 months, and 3 days].”

Summation for the 1st–8th Dynasties (5.15–17)

“[Total of] kings³⁷ [from] Menes; their kingship, their years, and a lacuna [thereto]: 9[4]9 years and 15 days, and a lacuna of 6 years. Total: [*x* kings amounting to] 955 years and 1[5] days.”

Summation for the 9th–10th Dynasties (6.10)

“Total: 18 kings ...” – *rest lost*

Heading for the 11th Dynasty (6.11)

“Kings of ...” – *rest lost*

Summation for the 11th Dynasty (6.18)

“[Total:] 6 kings who ruled 1[36 years] and a lacuna of 7 (years). Total 143 years.”

Heading for the 12th Dynasty (6.19)

“[Kings of] the residence *I_t-t₃wy*.”

Summation for the 12th Dynasty (7.3)

“Total of kings of the residence [*I_t-t₃wy*]: 8 who ruled 213 years, 1 month and 17 days.”

³² Whether this was the immediate source (*Vorlage*) or a more remote one is difficult to determine.

³³ It is not at all unusual that scribes accidentally wrote out words or passages that were supposed to be highlighted in black. Sometimes such words and passages were corrected by rewriting them in red ink over the black.

³⁴ The 5th Dynasty is, for obscure reasons, said to have ruled from Elephantine.

³⁵ REDFORD, *Pharaonic King-lists*, 11–13, and HELCK, *SAK* 19 (1992), 151–216, offer different restorations and translations. On the restoration of the summations for the 6th–8th and 1st–8th Dynasties, see BARTA, *MDAIK* 35 (1979), 13–14, and RYHOLT, *ZÄS* 127 (2000), 91,

94–96. I was unfortunately not aware of BARTA’s restoration when I published mine, and I am pleased to discover that our results, which are both modifications of FARINA’s restoration, are virtually identical. Also REDFORD and HELCK seem to have been aware of BARTA’s study.

³⁶ There is not enough space for this summation to have included years, months and days. It is even possible that the years might have been excluded and simply the number of kings recorded. The number of years is based on the summations for the 6th–8th Dynasties and 1st–8th Dynasties.

³⁷ The text reads “kingship”, but this is clearly an error.

Heading for the 13th–14th Dynasty (7.4)

“**Kings** [who were] after the children (?) [of Dual] King [Sehet]epibre.”³⁸

Summation for the 15th Dynasty (c. 10.29)

“[**Total:**] 6 [Hyk]sos. They ruled 1[0]8 [years].”

Summation for the 16th Dynasty (11.15)

“[**Total:**] <1>5 kings ...” – *rest lost*

§14. Details provided about the historical kings

The details provided about the individual kings can be assigned to seven categories:


- (1) Dynastic relation (in one case defined according to royal residence)
- (2) Title and other attributes of kingship
- (3) Identity
- (4) Patronym
- (5) Length of reign
- (6) Age at death
- (7) Remarks and emphasis

Besides the dynastic relation, which follows implicitly from the grouping of the individual kings, the only details consistently recorded for all kings are their title, identity and length of reign. Significant details such as overlapping dynasties and coregencies are unfortunately not provided, nor are details about origin or gender.

The kings are first and foremost divided into groups which are arranged in some form of chronological order. When two groups overlap, because they ruled concurrently in different parts of the country, one is simply placed after the other. Thus, for instance, the last kings recorded under the Heracleopolitan rulers of the First Intermediate Period (–6.9) would actually have ruled subsequent to the first kings recorded under the Theban rulers of the same period (6.12–), although these are listed in direct continuation of the former.

Similarly, the list does mark coregencies. These are typically cases where a king took a coregent in order to secure succession for one reason or another, and where the reigns of the two kings hence overlap for a number of years.³⁹ The extent to which coregencies were used in ancient Egypt is still debated, but in the case of the 12th Dynasty there is sufficient evidence to show that several of the kings took coregents.⁴⁰ Some of these coregencies lasted several years, but the scribe who was responsible for the summations for the individual groups of kings in the king-list does not seem to have been aware of this fact. Evidently he simply added together the full length of each individual reign in order to calculate the length of the dynasties.⁴¹ Since the overlapping reigns in the case of the 12th Dynasty probably account for as much as 20–25 years, the error involved in the summation of this dynasty was not insignificant.

Finally there are no remarks about origin and gender. It seems to have been taken for granted that all the kings would have been male Egyptians. The cities the kings came from were apparently of little significance. The 15th Dynasty, the Hyksos, form an exception since they are marked as foreign by the title *ḥk3-ḥ3swt* and by the use of the throwstick determinative after their names (§16). Curiously, however, the foreign extraction of the preceding 14th Dynasty seems to have been forgotten; it is, at any rate, not marked in any way. At least one female ruler was also included in the king-list, viz. Nofrusobk (7.2).⁴² Again her gender is not marked, but it is possible that this circumstance was simply forgotten rather than deliberately suppressed or ignored. There is unequivocal evidence that information about gender must have been present in other parts of the Egyptian king-list tradition, since Manetho explicitly refers to several ancient rulers as female.

³⁸ The sign after the preposition [*hr*]-*s3*, of which only two traces remain, has so far defied interpretation. A possible reading is , in which case the noun would be *hrd.w*, “children”.

³⁹ It has been suggested that the original of the king-list might have included information on coregencies and perhaps even the exact calendar dates of accession and death, cf. e.g. EATON-KRAUSS, *JSEA* 12 (1982), 18; FRANKE, *Orientalia* 57 (1988), 126–127. It seems inconceivable that such information would not have been recorded in the annals, but whether it was also present in king-lists in general and in the original of the Turin King-list in particular remains a moot point.

⁴⁰ BLUMENTHAL, *ZÄS* 110 (1983), 104–121; JANSEN-WINKELN, *SAK* 18 (1991), 241–264; IDEM, *SAK* 24 (1997), 115–135.

⁴¹ VON BECKERATH, *SAK* 4 (1976), 45–57, argued that the Turin King-list subtracted the period of coregency from the total duration of the individual reigns, but he has recently changed this view in *JEA* 81 (1995), 227.

⁴² A new arrangement of fragments indicates that Nitocris, who has hitherto been considered a woman on the basis of later tradition, may in fact have been a man; see RYHOLT, *ZÄS* 127 (2000), 92–93, 99–100.

§15. *Dynastic relation*

The dynastic relation of the individual kings is shown by their position within the groups in which they are arranged. Only the designations of two of these groups are sufficiently preserved to be restored with some degree of confidence. The 12th Dynasty was recorded as “[Kings of] the residence *It-ḫwy*”, and their successors apparently as “Kings [who were] after the children [of Dual] King [Sehet]epibre” (§13). Here we see that the first group is defined according to its royal residence, while the second is simply defined as its successor. There is no indication that any of the other groups were defined according to royal residence, though this might conceivably have been the case with the 11th Dynasty.

§16. *Royal title and other attributes of kingship*



With regard to the royal title and other attributes of kingship, the kings are recorded in a virtually identical manner. The only notable exception is the 15th Dynasty, which is discussed below and to which the following description does not apply.

All the royal names are preceded by the royal title which is used most frequently in contemporary texts, *nsw.t-ḫi.ty*. The title is conventionally translated “King of Upper and Lower Egypt”. A more accurate translation is “Dual King”, which has now been adopted by some scholars, since the title actually consists of two individual titles of kingship which do not literally refer to specific parts of Egypt.

As a rule the names of the kings are enclosed within the royal cartouche. An exception is formed by a number of kings recorded by both prenomen and nomen where the latter alone for some reason is written without a cartouche. The reasons for this phenomenon remain uncertain. After the cartouche, the scribe invariably adds the divine determinative, thus indicating the divinity of the deceased king.

The only variation lies in the presence or absence of the royal epithet *ḥnḫ.w wdḫ.w snb.w*, “May he live, prosper and be healthy!” The epithet is added, in its usual abbreviated form, after the divine determinative of only a few royal names. Apart from its use for Menes (3.10–11), the first historical king, and Huni (4.8), who is

the only ruler with a special remark after his name, it seems to be entirely fortuitous who is given this royal epithet. Thus, for instance, it is not found in relation to the renowned Amenemhet I, while it is used for certain entirely obscure and ephemeral rulers of the 14th Dynasty (9.13, 23). Moreover, among the gods it is only used for Thoth. Perhaps the scribe simply wrote out the epithet without thinking on these few accessions, since it was customary to write this epithet after royal names in cartouche. By analogy, he also seems to have written the divine element “Re” without thinking on a few occasions where he expected a royal prenominal (§28).

The exception to the mode of recording the kings just discussed is the 15th Dynasty, the so-called Hyksos, who were rulers of foreign extraction. The kings of the preceding 14th Dynasty were also of foreign extraction, but they were recorded in the conventional manner. The special treatment of the 15th Dynasty may therefore have been a direct result of what seems to have been deliberate attempt to obliterate the memory of their kingship after their defeat. Fortunately the author or compiler of the king-list aimed at producing a complete record and therefore included the 15th Dynasty as well. He did not even attempt to tone down their existence by simply stating their number and the duration of their rule, thus avoiding mentioning their names or identity. On the contrary, the kings were all listed by name – a noteworthy concession to historical fact – and merely deprived of any attribute of kingship; hence they are recorded without royal title, cartouche, divine determinative and epithet. In the place of the royal title, the title *ḥkḫ-ḫḫswt* (which became Hyksos in Manetho’s transcription) was used before their names. This title had in fact been used in the place of *nsw.t-ḫi.ty* by the rulers of the 15th Dynasty until the reign of a Khayan, during which it was replaced by the Egyptian title.⁴³ Behind the names, the divine determinative  was replaced by the throwstick determinative  which marked the kings as foreign.

§17. *Identity*

The king-list displays a surprising lack of consistency in the manner in which the identity of the

⁴³ RYHOLT, *Political Situation*, 123–125.

kings were recorded, although some general trends are discernable. In general the kings of the 1st–3rd Dynasty are recorded under their Diadem (*nbty*) name, while later kings are recorded under their prenomen. There are, however, frequent cases where both the prenomen and nomen were recorded or where the nomen was recorded in the place of the prenomen. It is not surprising that a preference was felt for the prenomen and the nomen since they were the two primary royal names during the New Kingdom. These names only came into systematic use during the Old Kingdom, and this can be regarded as the reason why the earlier kings are cited by their Diadem names instead.

In the large section following the 6th Dynasty, kings were recorded in an apparently haphazard manner by their prenomen, nomen or both. This is not just the case with the more obscure dynasties, but even the illustrious 12th Dynasty.⁴⁴ The various ways in which the identity of the kings are recorded are as follows:

- (1) Prenomen alone, in cartouche (passim)
- (5) Nomen alone, in cartouche (5.10, 21, 7.2, 7, 9, 15, 16; 9.1, 10.13, 14, 15, 11.5, 6)
- (2) Prenomen and nomen, both in same cartouche (7.19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 27, 8.2, 5, 6)
- (3) Prenomen and nomen, each in own cartouche (5.23, 8.7, 8)
- (4) Prenomen and nomen, the former in cartouche and the latter not in cartouche (5.7, 8, 7.21, 22, 8.22, 23, 9.25?, 26, 27, 28)

The inconsistency is curious; why did the scribe not simply list all kings by their prenomen? The approach adopted by the scribes responsible for the Abydos List was to include the nomen with the prenomen only when several kings held the same prenomen so that they might be distinguished from each another.⁴⁵

That is evidently not the case in the Turin King-list. Unfortunately no simple answer seems forthcoming. It may be significant that Manetho's *Aigyptiaka* shows a similar confusion between prenomina and nomina; in this king-list most kings are recorded by their nomen, but occasionally the prenomen is used instead.

§18. *Patronym*

The patronym or father's name is only added to the names of two kings in the extant parts of the king-list, both kings belonging to the 13th Dynasty, viz. Sobkhotep II (7.15) and Neferhotep I (7.25).⁴⁶ In both cases it is entered in the form "son of *name*" (*s3 NN*). It is unclear why this additional information is provided and why it is only provided for two kings. In the case of Neferhotep I, it is known that he made an effort – undoubtedly for political reasons – to proclaim his non-royal birth.⁴⁷ Hence virtually all of the royal seals and monuments of this king mention one or the other of his non-royal parents. This might explain why his father found his way into the king-list. However, his predecessor Sobkhotep III and his two brothers and successors, Sihathor and Sobkhotep IV, similarly proclaimed their non-royal parentage, but here the king-list does not provide this additional information. Moreover, Sobkhotep II, the other king whose father is recorded, is not known to have mentioned the name of his father on any of his monuments.

§19. *Length of reign*

The length of reign is recorded either precisely in years, months and days, or in round years alone.⁴⁸ The variation between these two modes of recording is not random, but rather a result of the nature of the source used for the kings in question. This issue is discussed in more detail below (§22).

⁴⁴ Out of the four surviving names, three are prenomina (Amenemhet I, Sesostris I and Amenemhet IV, 6.20–21, 7.1) while the fourth is a nomen (Nofrusobk, 7.2).

⁴⁵ Thus a Djedkare (32) is followed a Djedkare with nomen (44), and a Neferkare (42) is followed by several kings Neferkare with nomen (43, 45, 49, 51, 52).

⁴⁶ VON BECKERATH, ZÄS 93 (1966), 18–19, has suggested that one of the Heracleopolitan kings (5.23) was recorded by his nomen followed by the prenomen of his royal father, but the reading (sc. *ht[y s3] nfr-k3-r^c*) is based on an emendation and remains uncertain.

⁴⁷ RYHOLT, *Political Situation*, 225–227, 297–298.

⁴⁸ I earlier thought that a single exception to this mode of recording occurred in 5.3, presumably the entry of Neferirkare II, where I read "1½ years", cf. *Political Situation*, 12, and ZÄS 122 (2000), 91, 99. In doing so I did not take into account the ditto mark after *mp.t I*, which makes it clear that "1 year and half a month", i.e. one year and fifteen days, should be read. The writing *3bd gs* for *hrw 15* only occurs here in the king-list.

§20. Age at death

Information about the kings' age at death is recorded only for the Archaic Period (3.11–4.3) and is likely to derive from a single, common source, i.e. Section A (§22). The information should probably be regarded with due scepticism since the names transmitted in this source are far more corrupt than the others (§28). Moreover, the average age at death is somewhat higher than what might have been expected, c. 70 years. The preserved figures are (3.17–20, 22–25, 4.1–3): *mr-b3-pn* 94 years, *smsm* 72 years, *kbh* 73 years, *ntr-b3.w* 95 years, *ny-b3.w-ntr* 95 years, *w3d-ns* 70 years, *sd* 54 years, *3-k3* [error for *nfr-k3-r^c*] 70 years, *hw-df3* 34 years and *bbty* 40+x years;⁴⁹ *k3-k3.w*'s age at death (3.21) is, for some reason, left blank.⁵⁰

§21. Remarks and emphasis

Remarks and emphasis are, like patronyms, quite exceptional. The entry of a single king is emphasized by the use of red ink for his royal title. The king in question is Djoser (4.5), and there can hardly be any doubt that the emphasis of this entry is due to his outstanding reputation in later times.⁵¹

Similarly a special remark is preserved only once, in relation to king Huni (4.8). The remark is damaged, and only the words “the builder who lead ...” (*p3 kd s3m ...*) are preserved. It was once taken as a reference to Imhotep, but this identification was based on the assumption that Imhotep was mentioned in Frg. 40 as the son of Ptah and that this fragment belonged in column 3.⁵² These assumptions have since been rejected; the fragment rather records a royal nomen Siptah and belongs to the Late Old Kingdom section in column 4.⁵³ It was, moreover, apparently during the Late Period that Imhotep gained reputation as the son of Ptah, and it is in relation to Djoser that he is attested by contemporary sources and later literary tradition.⁵⁴

It is perhaps not without significance that the only two emphasized entries belong to a section

of the king-list that was derived from the same source (§22); emphasis is not found in the sections deriving from other sources.

§22. Sources

The inconsistency in the details provided about the individual kings in different sections of the Turin King-list indicates that it was compiled from a number of different sources (Table 4). This is hardly surprising since it may have covered as much as 1800 years in its original state, not including the mythological section.

It is noteworthy that it is the most remote historical kings, those of the Archaic Period, for whom most details are provided. Their reigns are recorded in years, months and days, and to this information their age at death is added (§20). It is, however, also in this section that the royal names have suffered the worst degree of corruption (§28). The details are therefore not necessarily an indication of superior source material.

The reigns of the remaining kings of the Old Kingdom until Pepi II are recorded in round years alone, thus indicating that a different source was used. Next follows the Late Old Kingdom and the Heracleopolitan kings of the First Intermediate Period, where the reigns are again recorded in years, months and day. The Theban section of the First Intermediate Period is recorded by years alone, and finally the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period are recorded once more by years, months and days.

On the basis of the manner in which the reigns of the historical kings were recorded and the absence or presence of their age, this part of the king-list may be divided into five sections (Table 4). These sections indicate that the king-list was compiled from at least five main sources. The actual number of sources may be greater. It is entirely possible two sources covering consecutive periods may have used the same level of detail and thus be indiscernible to us. Thus, for instance, the very large section covering the Mid-

⁴⁹ I.e. the latter is somewhere between 40 and 50 years.

⁵⁰ Since there is no note of a lacuna in this place, it is possible that some scribe simply overlooked it or that he could not decipher the figure and therefore simply left it blank.

⁵¹ WILDUNG, *Die Rolle ägyptischer Könige*, 58–92.

⁵² WILDUNG, *Imhotep und Amenhotep*, 30–32.

⁵³ RYHOLT, *ZÄS* 127 (2000), 89–90.

⁵⁴ This association lasted at least until Roman times. Djoser and Imhotep are the main characters in a Demotic narrative from the 1st or 2nd century AD. For a description of the story, see RYHOLT, in *Fs Larsen* (forthcoming); cf. also WILDUNG, *Die Rolle ägyptischer Könige*, 91–93, and IDEM, *Imhotep und Amenhotep*, 130–131.

Section	Period		Details provided about kings
A	Archaic Period	1 st –2 nd Dyn.	Years, months and days + Age at death
B	Old Kingdom	3 rd –6 th Dyn.	Years alone ⁵⁵
C	Late Old Kingdom	7 th –8 th Dyn.	Years, months and days
	First Int. Period (Heracleopolis)	9 th –10 th Dyn.	
D	First Intermediate Period (Thebes)	11 th Dyn.	Years alone
E	Middle Kingdom	12 th Dyn.	Years, months and days
	Second Intermediate Period	13 th –16 th Dyn.	

Table 4 The five sections of the Turin King-list based on the information about reign and age

dle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period could well have been based on more than one source. It is conceivable that the kings of foreign extraction, who ruled from Avaris, were not entered into the king-list of the contemporary Egyptian kings who ruled first from Memphis and later from Thebes, and *vice versa*.

Further sources may have supplied the information about the mythological kings. Here at least two sources seem to be discernable (§7).

§23. Dynastic Arrangement

The five sections discussed correspond to the dynastic arrangement adopted by Manetho for the list of kings he drew up in the early 3rd century BC. As indicated in Table 4, Section A corresponds to his 1st–2nd Dynasty, Section B to his 7th–10th Dynasties, Section C to his 11th Dynasty, Section D to his 12th Dynasty, and Section E to his 13th–16th Dynasties.

The correspondence is even more striking when the formal division of the kings into groups by headings and summations is taken into account. These correspond to Manetho's 1st–5th, 6th, 7th–8th, 9th–10th, 11th, 12th, 13th–14th, 15th, and 16th Dynasties.

Combining the arrangement indicated by the five sections and the formal groups, it is clear that a major part of Manetho's dynastic divisions of

the period prior to the New Kingdom was based on a tradition that extending at least one millennium back in time to the 13th century BC.

The main difference between Manetho and the Turin King-list is that in some cases the latter operates with larger groups of kings, i.e. the 1st–2nd Dynasties (Archaic Period), the 3rd–5th Dynasties (Memphis), the 7th–8th Dynasties (Memphis), the 9th–10th Dynasties (Heracleopolis), and the 13th–14th Dynasty (early SIP). While Manetho's division of the 1st–2nd, the 3rd–5th, and the 13th–14th Dynasties has been adopted in modern scholarship, since they correspond to significant political and cultural changes, the reasons for the division of the 7th–8th and 9th–10th Dynasties still remain less clear.⁵⁶

§24. The copyist and his source

The scribe who copied the Turin King-list was neither the most attentive nor the most careful. When writing the summations, which were much longer than the entries, he several times made the lines too long so that they encroached upon the position in which he would write the following columns. He therefore had to draw lines that would separate the text in the column from that of the following. There are at least three and possibly four instances of this (3.14, 6.15, Frg. 147 and perhaps also Frg. 4).⁵⁷

⁵⁵ Curiously, there are two exceptions within this section where both months and days are recorded as well. One is Teti (5.1.), and the other is the king (4.7) recorded between Sekhemkhet and Huni.

⁵⁶ Presumably the arrangement of the Heracleopolitan kings in two dynasties was also based on a contemporary political situation, the division being caused by the rise of the 11th Dynasty, cf. SEIDLMEYER, *GM* 157 (1997), 85. MALEK, *JEA* 68 (1982), 93, and BSFE 138 (1997), 14, suggests that these kings were rather divided between two dynasties by Manetho because they covered two columns

in his source, just as they do in the Turin King-list. The argument does not seem entirely consistent; if Manetho failed to realize that a shift in column did not necessarily indicate a dynastic shift, one would expect that he would also have cut into segments the other dynasties that happened to be carried over from one column to another, especially numerous kings belonging to the 13th and 14th Dynasties, but this is evidently not the case.

⁵⁷ GARDINER, *Royal Canon of Turin*, pl. IX, takes the line on Frg. 4 to be a figure in the hundreds but I am not entirely convinced by this reading.

More curious is the scribe's failure to understand the use of the kingship formula and the ditto marks which he slavishly copied (§11). Here the scribe's carelessness is to our advantage since it is on account of the kingship formula and the ditto marks that we can reconstruct the layout of the source from which the Turin King-list was copied. This important discovery was made by HELCK who observed that, when those cases where the kingship formula was used for the first king after a heading are disregarded, then the formula occurs at a regular interval of 13 to 16 lines.⁵⁸ The new reconstruction bears out this interpretation with the minor change that towards the end of the king-list this interval increases to 17 lines. This demonstrates that the Turin King-list was copied from an original that had 13 to 17 lines per column.⁵⁹ The extant parts of the Turin King-list would have taken up 21 columns in the original.⁶⁰ To this should be added the final one or two columns that were cut away from the king-list in antiquity (§1). In total the original would therefore have had 23 or 24 columns.



§25. Faults and errors

The main problem in evaluating the accuracy of the Turin King-list is the lack of independent source material with which to compare it. There are periods where the kings are relatively well attested and here some headway can be made, mostly with regard to their names and sequence, sometimes also in respect of their reign-lengths. It is, however, an inescapable fact that there is no clear independent indication of the reign-lengths

of the vast majority of the kings preserved in the list, and that a considerable number of them are not otherwise attested at all. This means that there could be much inaccurate information which we are simply not in the position to detect. Faults and errors in the king-list can be divided into two categories depending on their cause; those caused by physical damage (§§26–27) and those caused by human error or manipulation (§§28–35).

§26. Notation of lacunae

To start with faults caused by physical damage, it is clear from the notation of lacunae that the king-list descended from a lacuna-riddled original.⁶¹ Evidently this was not the immediate source, but a document further back in the chain of transmission. This is shown by the regular occurrence of the kingship formula (§24); if the lacunae had been present in the immediate source, this pattern would not have existed.

It was, fortunately, a conscientious scribe who copied the damaged document. Where the original had been damaged and information was lost, he used the group  to alert future users of the faults. The group is usually understood as an abbreviation of the verb  *wšf*, “idle” (Wb. I 357.2–11), but the reading – and hence the etymology – is not quite certain. An alternative reading *df* might be preferable (see below).⁶² In either case it is likely to be a participle meaning “lost” or similar, though I have mostly found the translation “lacuna” more convenient. The word is written in red ink when it signals the exact

⁵⁸ HELCK, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 83–84. REDFORD, *Pharaonic King-lists*, 9, rejects HELCK's interpretation, but his arguments are based on a misunderstanding; the kingship formula was not just used at the top of every column, but also for the first king after a heading where ditto marks would naturally be senseless. His own suggestion that the formula was used for kings that “stood out in the memory of the ancients” has little to commend it since it fails to account for the regular intervals at which the formula occurs and since the formula is used with well-known as well as obscure and ephemeral kings (e.g. 7.16, 9.4, 9.20).

⁵⁹ MALEK, *JEA* 68 (1982), 93–106, has suggested that the original had a constant number of 16 lines per column, a number that is achieved by assuming that some lines in the Turin King-list covered two lines in the original. On this premise, he draws far-reaching conclusions about length and nature of various dynasties. It was concluded that the 13th and 14th Dynasties, though one






was Egyptian and the other of foreign extraction, were not distinguished and that the scribe “simply listed the names of the rulers known to the compilers of the list”, and that Manetho's division of the 1st–5th Dynasties into five groups was “purely formal and unconnected with historical facts”. The analysis was soon rejected by BARTA, *GM* 64 (1983), 11–13, and VON BECKERATH, *SAK* 11 (1984), 49–57; cf. also RYHOLT, *Political Situation*, 29–30. MALEK changed his view on the constant number of lines in *BSFE* 138 (1997), 14.

⁶⁰ For details as to which columns in the original correspond to which section in the Turin King-list, see RYHOLT, *Political Situation*, 31.

⁶¹ The lacunae are discussed in RYHOLT, *Political Situation*, 10–12; IDEM, *ZÄS* 127 (2000), 96–98; VON BECKERATH, *JNES* 21 (1962), 140–147; and GOEDICKE, *JEA* 42 (1956), 50–53.

⁶² So GOEDICKE, *JEA* 42 (1956), 50–53.

place that had been damaged, but when it occurs in summations it was written in black ink.



Curiously the group is only used, at least in its abbreviated form, when an entire entry is lost or when part of a reign is lost; in several cases where a royal name had been damaged in the original the scribe simply copied what was left and made no effort to indicate that it was incomplete (§§27, 28). There may be two exceptions. Towards the end of what corresponds to the 2nd and 4th Dynasties, two kings are recorded as  (4.2) and  (4.7). HELCK and GOEDICKE have rightly pointed out that these cannot be names of historical kings, but must be understood as indications of damaged names.⁶³ Significantly, the Abydos List has in the place of the latter  which again is not the name of a historical king. HELCK has convincingly interpreted the contents of the cartouche as a scribal notation *sd s(y)*, “it is damaged”, signalling a damaged passage in the record from which the Abydos List was made.⁶⁴ The group  possibly represents the full writing of the abbreviation , and in this case *hw df3* may be understood as “stricken and lost”, the former being the verb *hwi*.⁶⁵

§27. *The extent of the damage*

The part of the king-list that seems to have suffered the most is the Late Old Kingdom section (7th–8th Dynasties). Here the entries of a group of ten consecutive kings are entirely lost, and the names of the two following kings are only partly preserved.⁶⁶ The lost kings are accounted for by the word “lacuna” in both the summation for the 6th–8th Dynasties and that covering the entire 1st–8th Dynasties. The lacuna would also have been recorded behind the entry after which the kings in question were lost, but unfortunately the papyrus is damaged in this place.⁶⁷

A single king, Monthhotep IV, is lost at the end

of the 11th Dynasty. His reign is similarly accounted for in the summation of the dynasty, but once again the papyrus is broken where the notation would be expected to have been recorded in the list itself, i.e. after the entry of Monthhotep III (6.17). In the 13th and 14th Dynasty sections, the notations of at least two lacunae are preserved within the lists of kings themselves. One is recorded after the entry of king Sonbef (7.6) and the other after king Nebsenire (8.14). It is not clear how many kings were lost in these lacunae, but at least one king can be identified by name in relation to the first, i.e. Nerikare.⁶⁸ Further kings may have been lost in the 13th and 14th Dynasty sections, but the extent is debatable.⁶⁹

Sporadic damage of less significance is attested throughout the document. As mentioned above, damaged names were mostly not marked as such. Besides the two names damaged in connection with the large lacuna in the Late Old Kingdom section, which are *nfr-k3* (5.8; from *nfr-k3-r^c*) and *nfr* (5.9; from *nfr-k3-mnw*), there is also *3-k3* (3.25; from *nfr-k3-r^c*), *nb-k3* (4.4; from *nb-k3-r^c*) and *dd* (4.24; from *dd-k3-r^c*). In the case of *3-k3* and *nb-k3*, the initial part of the cartouche is omitted as well (so too for *snfrw*, 4.9). This is somewhat curious. Even if the sign in question had been lost, the scribe ought to have realized that it was missing since he correctly copied the terminal part of the cartouches for these kings. It is also noteworthy that the incomplete prenom  (5.9) is written with phonetic determinatives that would not normally have been written out within a cartouche. Presumably the scribe felt that *  was too short and hence expanded the name by changing the orthography.

Finally, there are two instances where reign-lengths are partially damaged. One is *3w-ib-r^c* of the 14th Dynasty whose reign is recorded as “[*x* years], lacuna, 18 days” (9.12) and the other is

⁶³ HELCK, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 14–15, 20–21; GOEDICKE, *JEA* 42 (1956), 50–53.

⁶⁴ HELCK, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 14.

⁶⁵ HELCK, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho*, 15, derives *hw-df3* from an original notation *sd wsf*.

⁶⁶ VON BECKERATH, *JNES* 21 (1962), 140–147; RYHOLT, *ZÄS* 127 (2000), 96–99.

⁶⁷ I have found a small unpublished fragment preserving the kingship formula followed directly by the notation of a lacuna. Since the kingship formula is expected to have occurred in the entry of Nitocris (5.7) and the notation of the lacuna would have followed after the

formula (cf. VON BECKERATH, *op. cit.* 145; RYHOLT, *op. cit.* 97 and fig. 2), it is possible that the fragment in fact preserves the expected notation. Unfortunately, I have not had the opportunity to check the fibres since the fragment was deciphered, and it therefore cannot be excluded that the fragment belongs elsewhere.

⁶⁸ RYHOLT, *Political Situation*, 318.

⁶⁹ RYHOLT, *Political Situation*, 70 (13th Dynasty), 94–95 (14th Dynasty). Alternative interpretations have been presented by Bennet, *GM* 159 (1997), 11–17; ALLEN, *BASOR* 315 (1999), 50–51.

swsr-n-r^c of the 16th Dynasty with “12 years, *lacuna*, [*x*] days” (11.8).

§28. *Corrupt names*


The most severe corruption of royal names is found in Section A of the king-list which covers the kings of the 1st and 2nd Dynasties (§22). This is perhaps not surprising since these were the most remote historical kings, and many of their names were evidently no longer understood. The kings figure with the same corrupt name in the other extant king-lists, i.e. the contemporary Abydos and Saqqara lists and even in Manetho’s much later *Aigyptiaka*. This indicates that the mutations had taken place already at a relatively early date and that the names were canonized by the time of the early Ramesside Period, unfortunately on the basis of a very poor source. Ironically the corrupt forms of the names were from then on faithfully transmitted, without any major changes, for more than fifteen centuries.

As recorded in the king-list, none of the names in question is rendered in its correct orthography as known to us from contemporary attestations. A few are only slightly changed, while several are garbled beyond recognition. Although the Abydos List was based upon the same tradition, it evidently preserves the names in superior forms.⁷⁰ Significantly, the Turin King-list, the Saqqara List and the Abydos List all preserve the record of a lacuna towards the end of the list; the two former as *hw dʃ* and the latter as *sd sy* (§26).

Concerning the Old Kingdom section of the king-list, it is again clear that the Abydos List preserves the names in more correct forms even though fewer names are preserved in both lists and hence available for comparison. The king-list omits the final *-w* of *snfrw* (4.9), *wsr-k3=f* was changed to *wsr-k3-r^c* (4.17),⁷¹ the plural of *k3* was omitted in *mn-k3.w-hr* which thus became *mn-k3-hr* (4.23), and *nt-ikr* seems to be false etymology of *ntr-k3-r^c*

(5.7).⁷² In addition to these examples, a number of names had suffered damaged through lacunae, as noted above, i.e. *dd* for *dd-k3-r^c* (4.24), *nfr-k3* for *nfr-k3-r^c* (5.8), *nfr* for *nfr-k3-mnw* (5.9). Every one of these names is correctly written in the Abydos List.

What little remains of the Heracleopolitan Dynasty also conveys a confused impression, but since the names are so damaged it is unclear to what extent they are actually corrupt. Two kings seem to be recorded by prenomina without the element “Re” which is followed by a nomen (5.24, 25), but it is possible that they may occasionally have been written in this way in contemporary records and monuments.⁷³ Exceedingly few contemporary epigraphical sources preserve the titularies of the Heracleopolitan kings, presumably because their memory was persecuted after their defeat by the Theban kings. It is therefore almost entirely impossible to verify any information about this dynasty.

Later on in the king-list, in at least three cases and all within a short distance of each other, the divine element “Re” is erroneously added to royal nomina where it does not belong, i.e. “Nofrusobk-Re” (7.2), “Amenemhet-Re” (7.7) and “Sobkhotep-Re” (7.15). The element was almost certainly written out without thinking.⁷⁴ Each of the three nomina is recorded instead of a prenominal, and at this point in time all prenomina without exception began with this element graphically; the scribe would therefore have expected all cartouches to begin accordingly. Since there are other nomina listed in the place of prenomina where the intrusive “Re” is not added, it may be assumed that the scribe was simply careless.⁷⁵ Alternatively, the names in question could be interpreted as incompletely copied cartouches that originally had contained both prenominal and nomen, but where the scribe was not sure exactly what elements belonged together. Thus the erroneous *nfrw-sbk-r^c* (7.2) might be understood as  *sbk-*

⁷⁰ E.g. Abydos 5 has the sign twice where Turin 3.16 use the dual; Abydos 6 omits the obtrusive *-n* in Turin 3.17; Abydos 7 uses an ideogram where Turin 3.18 attempts a phonetic writing; Abydos 13 uses phonetic writing where Turin 3.24 instead uses an ideogram.

⁷¹ For this change and its nature, see RYHOLT, “King Seneferka in the King-lists” (forthcoming).


⁷² For the latter, see RYHOLT, *ZÄS* 127 (2000), 92–93.


⁷³ One of the very few contemporary objects from the Heracleopolitan Dynasty actually preserves the prenominal of a king Khety as *nb-k3.w*, i.e. without the

divine element “Re”, cf. PETRIE, *Hyksos and Israelite Cities*, 32, pl. XXXIIA, XXXIII.4.

⁷⁴ RYHOLT, *Political Situation*, 27.

⁷⁵ There is nothing to suggest that the scribe realized anything was wrong or made any attempt to correct his mistake. VALLOGIA, *RdE* 16 (1964), 52, has cautiously suggested that the intrusive “-Re” added to the name of queen Nofrusobk might have been crossed out by the scribe, but this is not the case, as AUFRÈRE, *BIFAO* 89 (1989), 2, correctly pointed out.

$k3-r^c$ *nfrw-sbk* >  *nfrw-sbk-r^c*. This interpretation would, however, seem to be invalidated by names such as *imn-m-h3t-r^c* (7.7) and *sbk-htp-r^c* (7.15). The scribe could hardly fail to realize that *imn-m-h3t* and *sbk-htp*, even in cartouches containing both prenomen and nomen, were actually the personal names of the kings since these names were still current and common in the Ramesside Period.

Further evidence of corrupt names is slight. The Semitic name *hndr* was misinterpreted as *ny-dr-r^c* (7.20), which it resembles graphically, and the prenomen of Siharnedjheritef, *htp-ib-r^c*, became *shtp-ib-r^c* (7.8) with the addition of an intrusive causative *s*. Both names thus came to resemble the prenomen of the renowned kings Amenemhet I (*ny-m3^c.t-r^c*) and Amenemhet III (*shtp-ib-r^c*).⁷⁶ The name of Sobkhotep III (7.24) is also garbled, although the reading remains uncertain, and  (9.2) is probably a mistake for *h^c-hrw-r^c*.⁷⁷

§29. The problematic 12th Dynasty

The 12th Dynasty section poses difficult chronological problems that have been much discussed. The figures preserved for two of the kings are considerably higher than the reign-lengths indicated by contemporary sources, and the total recorded for the dynasty similarly seems too high. The problem is rendered even more complex by the fact that the names of the second to fifth kings are no longer preserved.⁷⁸ There can hardly be doubt that the total is calculated from the full length of the individual reigns regardless of the coregencies which ought to have been subtracted. The total is therefore not reliable. As for the reigns of the individual kings, it has been suggested, in order to bring them into harmony with contemporary sources, that some of the kings

may have been interchanged. Thus it has been suggested both that Amenemhet II might have been incorrectly recorded after Sesostri II and III,⁷⁹ and that Sesostri II and III themselves may have been interchanged.⁸⁰ The latter requires the additional assumption that the reign of Sesostri II was incorrectly recorded. Most recently it has been argued that Sesostri III in fact was correctly listed and his reign correctly recorded; this solution implies a 20-year coregency between Sesostri III and Amenemhet III.⁸¹ There is presently no consensus as to the interpretation of the information supplied by the Turin King-list.



§30. Incorrect arrangement of kings

Besides the possible incorrect listing of one or two kings belonging to the 12th Dynasty, there is evidence to suggest that kings were interchanged on at least one and possibly two other occasions.⁸² The most certain instance concerns Sobkhotep I and Wegaf of the 13th Dynasty, and the other concerns Pepi I and Merenre of the 6th Dynasty. In both cases, the kings may have been confused because of their proximity to each other in the list and the similarity between their prenomen. Sobkhotep I and Wegaf would have been recorded more or less across from each other in adjacent columns in the source from which the king-list was copied, and they had the prenomen *shw-r^c-hw-t3wy* and *hw-t3wy-r^c*, thus sharing the elements *hw*, *t3wy* and *r^c*. Pepi I and Merenre were listed one after the other and had the prenomen *mry-r^c* and *mr.n-r^c*, thus sharing the elements *mr* and *r^c*.

§31. Exclusion of historical kings

There is no evidence to suggest that any kings were deliberately omitted from the king-list. It is, however, clear that some of the earliest known kings such as Scorpion and “Ka” are not present

⁷⁶ RYHOLT, *Political Situation*, 16–17.

⁷⁷ The confusion between  and  is not surprising since the two signs are sometimes identically written in hieratic and sometimes distinguished by a mere tick. It is also attested in other texts, e.g. the Teaching of Ani B 17.7 and 19.16, cf. QUACK, *Die Lehren des Ani*, 95, n. 37, 105, n. 74.

⁷⁸ The reigns of Amenemhet II through Amenemhet III are recorded on a fragment (Frg. 67) and their names are lost. Because these reigns do not seem to match what is known from contemporary sources, doubts about the validity of the arrangement of Frg. 67 have naturally been raised on occasion. It has not been

denied, however, since it has been realized that it is impossible to find room for reigns of the recorded length elsewhere in the king-list. I would like to dispel any doubts about the arrangement once and for all. Having examined the fibres on a light-table, I can state with absolute certainty that the position is correct; the vertical fibres match Frg. 64 perfectly.

⁷⁹ KRAUSS, *Sothis- und Monddaten*, 194–195; FRANKE, *Orientalia* 57 (1988), 126; HELCK, *SAK* 19 (1992), 172.

⁸⁰ OBSOMER, *Sésostri I^{er}*, 422–425.

⁸¹ WEGNER, *JNES* 55 (1996), 249–279.

⁸² RYHOLT, *Political Situation*, 13–14.

by name.⁸³ Whether or not Narmer was included by name depends on his possible identity with Menes, who is the first human or historical king recorded in the list.

As regards the early kings who are not included by name, it is possible that they – or some of them – are to be identified among the anonymous “spirits” recorded in the section immediately prior to the historical kings. From Aha onwards all kings seem to be included.

§32. *Inclusion of fictitious kings*

Evidence for the inclusion of fictitious kings is equally slight. The only certain case is “Monthotep I”, the father of the founder of the 11th Dynasty. There is no indication that this Monthotep ever adopted titles of kingship himself. Rather, he was posthumously awarded royal titles by his heirs, perhaps in an attempt to match the age of their royal house with that of the rival dynasty at Heracleopolis.⁸⁴ In the Karnak List, Monthotep I is given the befitting though fictitious Horus name “The Forefather” (*tpy-ꜥ*). It is not clear how he was recorded in the Turin King-list; he evidently had an entry (6.12), but the name is lost except for a trace of the first sign.

The royal name Neferkasokar (4.1) is unlikely to be historical, but whether it represent a false etymology of a name that can no longer be identified or whether it is fictitious cannot be determined. It later appears alongside the names of Djoser and Cheops in the Late Period composition now known as the Book of the Temple.⁸⁵

§33. *Incorrect reign-lengths*

The most difficult issue to assess is the extent of the king-list’s credibility as regards reign-lengths, since the relevant contemporary source material is so exceedingly scarce. The problems of the 12th Dynasty have already been mentioned above. This dynasty aside, it is perhaps the case of Snofru that

best illustrates some of the further difficulties involved. Inscriptions in ink on stone blocks from his monumental projects that have been recorded or re-interpreted in recent years indicate that his reign might have lasted considerably longer than the 24 years recorded in the king-list (4.9).⁸⁶ The 18th census is the highest year attested with absolute certainty and, if it is assumed that there were a yearly census after the 8th instead of a biennial one, as it has been proposed by W. S. Smith,⁸⁷ then the 18th census would correspond to the king’s 24th regnal-year. This would not pose a problem in relation to the king-list, but readings of a 23rd and 24th census also been suggested and if they are correct the king-list figure cannot possibly be defended.

It would not be surprising if there were many more errors in the recorded reign-lengths since the king-list was the product of a long tradition during which it had been copied and recopied over and over again. If a royal name was incompletely copied, the scribe might notice that it made little sense and hence suspect that it was corrupt. The same logic does not apply to figures. Even if a scribe discovered that a total did not match the sum of the recorded reigns, the error may lie anywhere; in any of the reigns specified or in the total itself. It would, in other words, be virtually impossible to correct the mistake.

§34. *Imprecise reckoning of reigns*

A more direct problem is posed by the reigns recorded in round years, i.e. those of the 3rd–6th and 9th–10th Dynasties. It remains uncertain how these figures were rounded off. There are three possibilities; they may have been rounded off to the nearest round figure, or they may consistently have been rounded either up or down. It is even uncertain if all the reigns are treated in the same manner. The 3rd–6th Dynasties do not derive from the same source as the 9th–10th Dynasties,

⁸³ For these two kings, see now WILKINSON, *Early Dynastic Egypt*, 56–58.

⁸⁴ SEIDLMAYER, *GM* 157 (1997), 82.

⁸⁵ This composition, which is preserved in a great number of manuscripts, is presently being prepared for publication by J. F. QUACK. A preliminary account of the historical section is published by QUACK, in *Literatur und Politik*, 267–278, and an account of the composition in general by IDEM, *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 2 (2000), 1–20. The name is further attested twice on a cylinder-seal published by KAPLONY, *Die Rollsiegel des*

Alten Reichs, II, 1–2, pl. 1. The date of the seal remains uncertain, but it is clearly not contemporary with the Archaic Period; the royal name is enclosed within a cartouche, and the divine element “Sokar” is not written in honorific transposition in one of the two cartouches, both features that are without parallel for this period.

⁸⁶ STADELMANN, *MDAIK* 43 (1986), 229–240; POSENER-KRIEGER, in: EL-KHOULI, *Meidum*, 17–21; KRAUSS, *JEA* 82 (1996), 43–50.

⁸⁷ SMITH, *JNES* 11 (1952), 123–124.

and the possibility of inconsistencies within the same source may also be considered. There is not presently enough data available to settle these questions.

The round years that relate to kings whose identity was lost through lacunae are more troublesome. Here there is some evidence to suggest that the figures in question may be estimates made by a copyist in order to avoid chronological gaps in the king-list.⁸⁸ This would explain why figures are always present despite the lacunae, even when the names of as many as ten kings were entirely lost, as it is the case in the Late Old Kingdom section (§27), and also why the figures relating to lacunae are consistently rounded off, even when the other figures in the same section of the papyrus are precisely recorded to the day.

§35. *Inaccurate reckoning of totals*

The reliability of the totals given in the summations is closely related to the accuracy with which the individual reigns were recorded. The problem of the total duration recorded for the 12th Dynasty is discussed above (§29). The only other totals that survive intact or in a reconstructable form are those of the 1st–8th, 6th–8th, 11th, and 15th Dynasties.

The total of the 11th Dynasty is recorded in round years only, obviously because the kings were also recorded in this manner. Since the fractions of each individual reigns are omitted, the total is inevitably approximate and has an error margin of a few years. The error might be more significant if the “Monthhotep I”, who is not a historical king, was assigned a fictitious reign-length. Finally, in relation to Monthhotep IV, there is the general question of the reliability of the reign-lengths ascribed to kings whose records had been lost through lacunae (§34).

The totals provided for the 1st–8th and 6th–8th are affected by the same factors. They include reigns recorded in round years as well as reigns precisely recorded, and both also include a lacuna. Among the kings who are summed up in the total provided for the 1st–8th Dynasties, the reigns of no less than 26 are merely recorded in round years. Depending of the size of the omitted fractions, the error margin here might amount to several years.

The question of the accuracy with which the

individual reigns were copied over the centuries and the possibility of coregencies are other factors that must be considered. All in all, it can therefore be expected that the error-margin in connection with totals might not be insignificant.

§36. *Assessment of the Turin King-list*

Despite its unique status and potential historical value, the Turin King-list is in several ways not an ideal source. Its incomplete state of preservation and inadequate publication are external aspects that prevent full access to the information it once contained and what now remains. There are also several aspects of an internal nature that detract from its source value.

The king-list was not copied in a manner that indicates that it was meant to be preserved as a formal document in a temple or palace library. On the contrary, it was written on waste paper of inferior quality, and it was copied in a rather careless manner. The scribe made no effort to convert the format of his source to the format of the papyrus before him, which led to a somewhat senseless use of ditto marks. The columns were spaced too closely, which meant that he at times felt it necessary to draw inelegant lines to indicate that a certain bit of text did not belong to the column where it was written, but instead to the preceding column. And through carelessness he several times copied names incorrectly, thus adding to the process of corruption.

In addition to these points, the source from which the scribe copied was anything but perfect. It was based on a lacuna-riddled original where many entries had been damaged, and at least twelve kings can be shown to have been lost. Moreover, although the reigns of most kings were precisely recorded with years, months and days, there are sections where the reigns were recorded by years alone.

It is noteworthy that no attempt seems to have been made to supply missing or incomplete information from other sources. More reliable sources were certainly available. This is above all demonstrated by the Abydos List, but also to some extent by the Saqqara List. The Abydos List generally preserves the royal names in forms that are superior to those of the Turin King-list. Equally significant, the ten kings whose names were entirely lost

⁸⁸ RYHOLT, *Political Situation*, 15–16.

in the Late Old Kingdom section and the two following kings whose names were damaged and only partly preserved are all recorded with intact names in the more or less contemporary Abydos List in the temples of Seti I and Ramesses II. Similarly, the prenomen of Nofrusobk was known to the scribe who drew up the Saqqara List.

It is also the cause of some concern that some of the information supplied about the 12th Dynasty is difficult to bring into harmony with available, contemporary source material, especially since this is the best documented period among those covered by the king-list.

In short the king-list preserved in the Turin papyrus can be described as a copy that was drawn

up in a somewhat careless manner on waste paper on the basis of a damaged and imperfect original. Moreover, owing to a dearth of contemporary material, it is still not possible to verify the accuracy of most of the figures it provides. This is obviously not an ideal assessment and it forewarns us that there may be errors lurking in parts of the document that we are presently unable to verify. Accordingly, the text should be treated with due caution. The general purpose of the king-list has been discussed above (§4). However, the manner in which the copy was produced also raises the very difficult question of the purpose for which this specific copy was intended.⁸⁹ I shall leave this question open.

Bibliography

- ALLEN, J.P.
1999 The Turin King-list, 48–53, in: D. BEN-TOR, *Seals and Kings*, BASOR 315, 47–74.
- AUFRÈRE, S.
1989 Remarques sur la transmission des noms royaux par les traditions orale et écrite, BIFAO 89, 1–14.
- BARTA, W.
1979 Bemerkungen zu den Summenangaben des Turiner Königspapyrus für die Frühzeit und das Alte Reich, MDAIK 35, 11–14.
1983 Bemerkungen zur Rekonstruktion der Vorlage des Turiner Königspapyrus, GM 64, 11–13.
- VON BECKERATH, J.
1962 The Date of the End of the Old Kingdom of Egypt, JNES 21, 140–147.
1966 Die Dynastie der Herakleopoliten (9./10. Dynastie), ZÄS 93, 13–20.
1976 Die Chronologie der XII. Dynastie und das Problem der Behandlung gleichzeitiger Regierungen in der ägyptischen Überlieferung, SAK 4, 45–57.
1984 *Handbuch der ägyptischen Königsnamen*, MÄS 20, München.
1984 Bemerkungen zum Turiner Königspapyrus und zu den Dynastien der ägyptischen Geschichte, SAK 11, 49–57.
1995 Some Remarks on Helck's „Anmerkungen zum Turiner Königspapyrus“, JEA 81, 225–227.
1999 Anmerkung zu zwei unbeachteten Fragmenten des Turiner Königspapyrus, GM 168, 19–21.
- BENNETT, CH.
1997 King Qemau: A Reconsideration, GM 159, 11–17.
- BLUMENTHAL, E.
1983 Die erste Koregenz der 12. Dynastie, ZÄS 110, 104–121.
- BORCHARDT, L.
1917 *Die Annalen und die zeitliche Festlegung des Alten Reiches der ägyptischen Geschichte*, Berlin.
- CAMINOS, R.A.
1977 *A Tale of Woe*, Oxford.
- ČERNÝ, J.
1952 *Paper & Books in Ancient Egypt*, London.
- EATON-KRAUSS, M.
1982 Middle Kingdom Coregencies and the Turin Canon, JSSEA 12, 17–20.
- FARINA, G.
1938 *Il papiro dei re*, Pubblicazioni egittologiche del R. Museo di Torino 1, Roma.
- FRANKE, D.
1988 Zur Chronologie des Mittleren Reiches (12.–18. Dynastie). Teil 1: Die 12. Dynastie, *Orientalia* 57, 113–138.
- GARDINER, A.H.
1959 *The Royal Canon of Turin*, Oxford.
- GOEDICKE, H.
1956 King *hwdʿʿ?*, JEA 42, 50–53.

⁸⁹ ROCCATI, LÄ VI, 809, suggests that it was meant for private use (*Privatgebrauch*), but it is not clear for what purpose the document might have been privately used.

Few others seem to have commented on the possible purpose for the specific copy preserved in the Turin papyrus.

- HELCK, W.
 1956 *Untersuchungen zu Manetho und den ägyptischen Königslisten*, UGAÄ 18, Berlin.
 1987 *Untersuchungen zur Thinitenzeit*, ÄA 45, Wiesbaden.
 1992 Anmerkungen zum Turiner Königspapyrus, *SAK* 19, 150–216.
- JACOBY, F.
 1958 *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, III, Leiden.
- JANSEN-WINKELN, K.
 1991 Das Attentat auf Amenemhet I. und die erste ägyptische Koregentschaft, *SAK* 18, 241–264.
 1997 Zu den Koregenzen der 12. Dynastie, *SAK* 24, 115–135.
- KAISER, W.
 1961 Einige Bemerkungen zur ägyptischen Frühzeit II. Zur Frage einer über Menes hinausreichenden ägyptischen Geschichtsüberlieferung, *ZÄS* 86, 39–61.
 1990 Zur Entstehung des gesamtägyptischen Staates, *MDAIK* 46, 287–299.
- KAPLONY, P.
 1981 *Die Rollsiegel des Alten Reichs II. Katalog der Rollsiegel*, Monumenta Aegyptiaca 3, Bruxelles.
- EL-KHOULI, A.
 1991 *Meidum*, G.T. MARTIN (ed.), The Australian Centre for Egyptology, Reports 3, Sydney.
- KITCHEN, K. A.
 1979 *Ramesside Inscriptions. Historical and Biographical*, II, Oxford.
- KRAUSS, R.
 1985 *Sothis- und Monddaten. Studien zur astronomischen und technischen Chronologie Altägyptens*, HÄB 20, Hildesheim.
 1996 The Length of Sneferu's Reign and How Long it Took to Build the "Red Pyramid", *JEA* 82, 43–50.
- LEPSIUS, R.
 1842 *Auswahl der wichtigsten Urkunden des ägyptischen Alterthums theils zum ersten Male, theils nach den Denkmälern berichtet*, Leipzig.
- MALEK, J.
 1982 The Original Version of the Royal Canon of Turin, *JEA* 68, 93–106.
 1997 La division de l'histoire d'Égypte et l'égyptologie moderne, *BSFE* 138, 6–17.
- MASPERO, G.
 1895 *Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'orient classique, I. Les origines. Égypte & Chaldée*, Paris.
- MEYER, E.
 1904 *Aegyptische Chronologie*, Berlin.
- OBSOMER, C.
 1995 *Sésostris I^{er}. Étude chronologique et historique du règne*. Connaissance de l'Égypte ancienne, Etude 5, Bruxelles.
- OSING, J.
 1998 *Hieratische Papyri aus Tebtunis I*. The Carlsberg Papyri 2 = CNI Publications 17, Copenhagen.
- PARKINSON, R., and QUIRKE, S.
 1995 *Papyrus*, London.
- PETRIE, W.M.F.
 1906 *Hyksos and Israelite Cities*, BSAE 12, London.
- QUACK, J.F.
 1994 *Die Lehren des Ani*, OBO 141, Freiburg Schweiz.
 1999 Der historische Abschnitt des Buches vom Tempel, *Literatur und Politik im pharaonischen und ptolemäischen Ägypten*, 267–278, J. ASSMANN and E. BLUMENTHAL (eds.), Bibliothèque d'Étude, Kairo.
 2000 Das Buch vom Tempel und verwandte Texte. Ein Vorbericht, *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 2, 1–20.
- QUIRKE, S.
 1990 *The Administration of Egypt in the Late Middle Kingdom. The Hieratic Documents*, New Malden.
- REDFORD, D.B.
 1986 *Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day-Books. A Contribution to the Study of the Egyptian Sense of History*, SSEA Publication 4, Mississauga.
- ROCCATI, A.
 1986 Turiner Königspapyrus, *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, VI, Wiesbaden.
- RYHOLT, K.
 1997 *The Political Situation in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period, 1800–1550 BC*, CNI Publications 20, Copenhagen.
 1999 *The Story of Petese, Son of Petetum, and Seventy Other Good and Bad Stories*, The Carlsberg Papyri 4, CNI Publications 23, Copenhagen.
 2000 The Late Old Kingdom in the Turin King-list and the Identity of Nitocris, *ZÄS* 127, 87–100.
 2004 The Assyrian Invasion of Egypt in Egyptian Literary Tradition, 481–511, in: J.G. DERCKSEN (ed.), *Assyria and Beyond. Studies Presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen*, Leiden.
- forthc. *King Seneferka in the King-lists*.
- SCAMUZZI, E.
 1963 *Museo Egizio di Torino*, Torino.
- SCHNEIDER, T.
 1998 *Ausländer in Ägypten während des Mittleren Reiches und der Hyksoszeit. Teil I. Dis ausländischen Könige*, ÄAT 42, Wiesbaden.
- SEIDLMAYER, S.J.
 1997 Zwei Anmerkungen zur Dynastie der Herakleopoliten, *GM* 157, 81–90.
- SIMPSON, W.K.
 1963 *Papyrus Reisner I*, Boston.
- SMITH, W.S.
 1952 Inscriptional Evidence for the History of the Fourth Dynasty, *JNES* 11, 123–124.
- STADELMANN, R.
 1986 Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alten Reiches, *MDAIK* 43, 229–240.
- VALLOGIA, M.
 1964 Remarques sur les noms de la reine Sébek-ka-rê Néferou-sébek, *RdE* 16, 45–53.

WADDELL, W.G.

1940 *Manetho*, The Loeb Classical Library. London.

WARBURTON, D.A.

1997 *State and Economy in Ancient Egypt. Fiscal Vocabulary of the New Kingdom*, OBO 151, Fribourg Schweiz/Göttingen.

VON DER WAY, T.

1993 *Untersuchungen zur Spätvor- und Frühgeschichte Unterägyptens*, SAGA.

WEGNER, J.W.

1996 The Nature and Chronology of the Senwosret III–Amenemhat III Regnal Succession: Some Considerations Based on New Evidence from the Mortuary Temple of Senwosret III at Abydos, *JNES* 55, 249–279.

WIEDEMANN, A.

1884 *Ägyptische Geschichte, 1. Abteilung: Von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Tode Tutmes' III*, Gotha.

WILDUNG, D.

1969 *Die Rolle ägyptischer Könige im Bewußtsein ihrer Nachwelt I*, MÄS 17, Berlin.

1977 *Imhotep und Amenhotep. Gottwerdung im alten Ägypten*, MÄS 36, München/Berlin.

WILKINSON, J.G.

1851 *The Fragments of the Hieratic Papyrus at Turin, containing the Names of Egyptian Kings, with the Hieratic Inscription at the Back*, London.

WILKINSON, T.A.H.

1999 *Early Dynastic Egypt*, London and New York.

WINLOCK, H.E.

1947 *The Rise and Fall of the Middle Kingdom in Thebes*, New York.

