

The Compositions and Relationships of Late Dynasty 6, Dynasties 7–10, and Early Dynasty 11

Bieke Mahieu – École biblique et archéologique française de Jérusalem

[The late Old Kingdom and the First Intermediate Period are obscure ages due to the paucity and disparateness of their material. The compositions and relationships of the dynasties that ruled during these periods are still debated. Regarding the last three Memphite dynasties, this article argues that Dynasty 7 was contemporary with late Dynasty 6, and that Dynasty 8 began when this shared government ended. Near the end of Dynasty 8, Intef the Elder revolted at Thebes; he was defeated, and Memphis regained its control of the South. Dynasty 8 was replaced shortly after by the power of Heracleopolis. The third Heracleopolitan king, Neferkara, faced a new Theban insurrection and deposed Intef I, a great overlord who had recently proclaimed himself king. The fourth and last king of Dynasty 9, Merikara, encountered the Thebans as well and had to recognise the kingship of Intef II. The Heracleopolitan Dynasty 10 commenced on that occasion. It reigned in parallel with the Theban Dynasty 11 until Mentuhotep II reunited the country.]

Keywords: Dynasties 6–11 – First Intermediate Period – Heracleopolis – Memphis – Thebes.

The compositions and relationships of Dynasties 6–11 still need clarification. The present study attempts to amplify the historical understanding of the period by reconsidering the available material and the ways it has been interpreted. The first section will study the compositions of late Dynasty 6 and Dynasties 7–10, while the second will attempt to reconstruct the relationships between these dynasties, until the arrival of Dynasty 11, at the beginning of Dynasty 10.

Section 1: The Compositions of Late Dynasty 6 and Dynasties 7–10

1.1. *Dynasties 6–10 in the Epigraphical and Papyrological King Lists*

The compositions of late Dynasty 6 and Dynasties 7–10 have not been definitely established, thus far. For tracing the identity and sequence of the rulers of these dynasties, the epigraphical and papyrological king lists offer important data. These lists do not group kings into dynasties, but they have the merit of listing kings by name and in order. Five such lists bear on the late Old Kingdom and the First Intermediate Period:¹

1. For a presentation of the *KKL*, *SKL*, *AKL*, and *TKL*, see Redford 1986, 1–24, 29–34; von Beckerath 1997, 19–28, 149, 207–213, 215–216.

1) The *South Saqqara Stone* (hereafter *SSS*)² was reused as the lid of the sarcophagus of Ankhenespepy IV. It records the annals of kings who can be set in the conventional Dynasty 6. It is kept in the Egyptian Museum of Cairo (JdE 65908).

2) The *Karnak King List (KKL)*³ was inscribed by Thutmose III in his festival hall at Karnak and is now preserved in the Louvre (E.13481bis, *Chambre des Ancêtres*). The list depicts kings that are commonly set in Dynasties 4–6, 11–13, and 16–17, but it is lacunary (some 40 out of 61 kings can be identified).

3) The *Saqqara King List (SKL)*⁴ was inscribed in the tomb of Tjuloy (or Tjuneroy), an official in the days of Ramesses II. It is exhibited at Cairo (CG 34516 = JdE 11335). It lists 58 kings, from Adjib until Ramesses II.

4) The *Abydos King List (AKL)*⁵ was inscribed by Sety I in his mortuary temple at Abydos and is still *in situ*. It records 76 kings, from Menes until Sety I. Ramesses II copied the list in his temple at Abydos, adding two cartouches with his names. This latter version is more fragmentary and is now in the British Museum (BM EA 117).

5) The *Turin King List (TKL)*⁶ is a hieratic papyrus, preserved in the Museo Egizio in Turin (pTurin 1874 verso), that was redacted in the reign of Ramesses II, when it was copied from an earlier manuscript.⁷ It begins with Menes and ends with Dynasty 17.⁸

Table 1 gives a survey of the five lists. Names that have not been preserved on the extant fragments but that originally must have been recorded—on the evidence of spatial or other criteria—are placed between square brackets. The parallel between *AKL* 34–56 and *TKL* 5/1–13 follows the reconstruction made by Ryholt (2000, 99 [table 1]) and will be further discussed in this paper.

<i>SSS</i>	<i>KKL</i>	<i>SKL</i>	<i>AKL</i>	<i>TKL</i>
Teti	2/6: 'Teti'	26: Teti	34: Teti	5/1: [Teti], [x years], 6 months, 21 days
[Userkara]			35: Userkara	5/2: [Userkara]
Pepy (I)	2/7: 'Pepy' (I/II)	25: Pepy (I)	36: Meryra (Pepy I)	5/3: [Pepy I], 20 years ⁹
[Merenra I]	2/8: Merenra (I/II)	24: Merenra (I)	37: Merenra (I)	5/4: [Merenra I], [x+]4 years
[Pepy II]		23: Neferkara (Pepy II)	38: Neferkara (Pepy II)	5/5: [Pepy II], 90 years

2. Baud and Dobrev 1995; Baud and Dobrev 1997.

3. *Urk.* IV, 607–610 (no. 198); Burkhardt *et al.* 1984, 167–171.

4. *KRI* III, 481–482; *KRITA* III, 340–342 (217.3).

5. *KRI* I, 178–179; II, 539–541; *KRITA* I, 153–156 (77.iii); II, 348–349 (206).

6. Farina 1938; Gardiner 1959; Ryholt 2000, 87–91. The present article numbers the columns of the *TKL* according to the revision made by Ryholt 1997, 19–27. Ryholt splits Farina's and Gardiner's col. I into two, and so the subsequent columns are numbered one figure higher in Ryholt's reconstruction (*i.e.*, Ryholt's cols. 3–6 = Farina's and Gardiner's cols. II–V). For *TKL* 5/7–8, table 1 follows Ryholt (2000, 87–91), who inserts fr. 40 here (the fragment was left unplaced by Gardiner 1959, 17, pl. ix). For *TKL* 5/18–6/10, it follows von Beckerath 1966, 17–20. In *TKL* 5/22–26, von Beckerath joins frs. 36+48 to fr. 47. This option is followed by Gomaà 1980, 130; Ryholt 1997, 20; Ryholt 2000, 89; Brovarski 2018, 24, but it is rejected by Gardiner (1959, 16 [note to IV/22]), who leaves frs. 36+48 unplaced (1959, 17–18, pl. ix).

7. Ryholt 1997, 9, 29–31. On the reliability of the *TKL*, see Ryholt 2004.

8. Mahieu 2021, 178–180.

9. Ryholt (1997, 13–14; 2000, 91, 98) proposes the sequence Pepy I → Merenra I, or Merenra I → Pepy I, for *TKL* 5/3–4, given that contemporary data implies that Pepy I ruled for more than 20 years.

			39: Merenra Djefaemsaf (II)	5/6: [Merenra II], 1 year, 1 month
			40: Netjerkara	5/7: Neitiqerty Siptah, he acted [in kingship]
			41: Menkara	
			42: Neferkara	
			43: Neferkara Neby	
			44: Djedkara Shemai	
			45: Neferkara Khendu	
			46: Merenhor	
			47: Neferkamin ¹⁰	
			48: Nikara	
			49: Neferkara Tereru	
			50: Neferkahor	
			51: Neferkara Pepyseneb	5/8: Neferka Kheredseneb
			52: Neferkamin Anu	5/9: Nefer
			53: Qakaura	5/10: Ibi, 2 years, 1 month, 1 day ¹¹
			54: Neferkaura	5/11: [Neferkaura], 4 years, 2 months
			55: Neferkauhor	5/12: [Neferkauhor], 2 years, 1 month, 1 day
			56: Neferirkara (II)	5/13: [Neferirkara II], 1 year and a half ¹²
				5/14–15: Total from [Teti] until Neferirkara II: 181 years, 6 months, 3 days + 6 years = 1[87 years, 6 months, 3 days]
				5/15–17: Total from Menes until Neferirkara II:

10. The throne names in *AKL* 47 and 52 are both written Sneferka and are supposed to stand for Neferkamin: Sethe 1912, 718 n. 1; Helck 1956, 30; von Beckerath 1999, 66 n. 5; cf. Brovarski 2018, 10 n. 30. However, the king's name Sneferka found on a rattle in the Michailides collection in Cairo might imply that the correct reading of the names is Sneferka: Brovarski 2018, 13–14.

11. Von Beckerath (1962, 142–144) and Ryholt (2000, 88–89) moved fr. 43 (with kings' names) from *TKL* 5/8–11 to 5/7–10 and kept fr. 61 (with reign lengths) in 5/10–13, such that these four reign lengths are now assigned to Ibi and his three successors instead of to Nefer, Ibi, and their two successors (Gardiner's proposal).

12. Farina (1938, 32 [IV/14]), Helck (1992, 168 [IV/13]), and von Beckerath (1997, 148, 209 [IV/13]) read 8 (months). Gardiner (1959, 16 [IV/13]) opts for — (gs "half"). Borchardt (1917, 143) interprets the sign as half a day, while von Beckerath (1962, 143) and Ryholt (1997, 12 [table 2, 5/13]; 2000, 91, 99) propose half a year. Ryholt (2004, 144 n. 48) later opted for half a month.

			[94]9 years, 15 days + 6 years = 955 years, 1[5] days
			5/18: []
			5/19: []
			5/20: Neferkara
			5/21: Khety
			5/22: <i>Snn</i> [], ¹³ he acted [in kingship]
			5/23: Khet[y, son of] Neferkara
			5/24: Mer[] Khety
			5/25: Shed[]y
			5/26: <i>H</i> [], 0 years, [x] months
			6/1: []
			6/2: <i>S(?)</i> [] ¹⁴
			6/3: []
			6/4: <i>Wsr(?)</i> [] ¹⁵
			6/5: []
			6/6: []
			6/7: []
			6/8: []
			6/9: []
			6/10: Total: 18 kings []

Table 1: Dynasties 6–10 in the epigraphical and papyrological king lists

The comparison of the five lists reveals the following peculiarities:

- The *SSS*, *KKL* (probably), and *SKL* do not record any king after Pepy II for the period here concerned.
- The *AKL* (41–50) has an additional ten reigns between *TKL* 5/7 and 5/8.
- The Heracleopolitan rulers are absent from the *AKL*.

1.2. Dynasties 6–10 in the King Lists in Literary Works

In addition to the five king lists presented above, which comprise inscriptions (*SSS*, *KKL*, *SKL*, and *AKL*) and a papyrus (*TKL*), further information on the reigns of the late Old Kingdom and the First Intermediate Period is provided by king lists in literary works transmitted via manuscripts. The main source of this type is Manetho's *Aegyptiaca*.¹⁶ It was composed in Greek in the third century BC and originally covered the entire period of ancient Egyptian history. The work itself has been lost and is only indirectly known via its use by later writers, mainly the Christian chronographers Sextus Julius Africanus (second–third century AD) and Eusebius of Caesarea

13. Farina 1938, 34–35 (IV/23): *Stwl*[]; Gardiner 1959, pl. ii: *Sn(?)n(?)h3-[]*; von Beckerath 1966, 19: *Snn-h3-[]*; von Beckerath 1999, 72–73 (no. 5): *Snn-[]*.

14. Farina 1938, 34 (V/2); von Beckerath 1966, 20. Absent from Gardiner 1959, pl. ii (V/2).

15. As a possibility in Gardiner 1959, 16 (V/4); von Beckerath 1966, 20. Absent from Farina 1938, 34 (V/4).

16. Waddell 1940; Jacoby 1958, 5–112 (*FGH* 609). For an introduction to Manetho and an English translation of the fragments, see Verbrugghe and Wickersham 1996. For a study on Manetho and his works, see Gundacker 2018.

(third–fourth century AD), who both copied an epitome of the *Aegyptiaca* that was circulating in their times. The originals of their Greek epitomes have not been preserved. Africanus' *Chronographiae* has reached us via Syncellus' *Ecloga chronographica* (eighth–ninth century).¹⁷ Eusebius' *Chronographia* is known from an Armenian translation¹⁸ and its use in Syncellus' *Ecloga*.¹⁹ Africanus' and Eusebius' epitomes were used in other chronographic works, such as those of John Malalas (sixth century), John of Antioch (seventh century), the *Chronicon Paschale* (seventh century), the *Excerpta Latina Barbari* (eighth century), and Cedrenus (eleventh century). Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* further constituted the basis for the redaction of two additional lists of Egyptian kings: the *Book of Sothis* and the *Old Chronicle*, which have both been transmitted via Syncellus. Important extracts of the *Aegyptiaca* are also found in Josephus' *Contra Apionem* (first century AD).²⁰

In contradistinction to the epigraphic king lists, which record individuals without any grouping, and to the papyrus of the *TKL*, which arranges individuals in large groups, Manetho classifies kings according to dynasties. His Dynasties 6–10 belong in the late Old Kingdom and the First Intermediate Period. Dynasty 6 is recorded differently in Africanus' and Eusebius' epitomes:

- Africanus assigns six kings of Memphis to Dynasty 6: Othoes ruling 30 years, Phios 53 years, Methusuphis 7 years, Phiops from his 6th until 100th year, Menthesuphis 1 year, and Queen Nitocris 12 years; 203 years in all.
- Eusebius mentions Queen Nitocris for Dynasty 6 and gives the dynasty's duration as 3 or 203 years. Two kings of Africanus' Dynasty 6 are found in Eusebius' Dynasty 5: Eusebius assigns 31 kings of Elephantine to Dynasty 5, with Othoes as its first king (without years) and Phiops (reigning from his 6th until 100th year) as its fourth king.

For Dynasties 7–10, Africanus and Eusebius only give summary descriptions, without individual kings (except for Achthoes, the founder of Dynasty 9):

- Dynasty 7: 70 kings of Memphis ruling 70 days (Africanus), or 5 kings of Memphis ruling 75 days (Eusebius in Syncellus), or 5 kings of Memphis ruling 75 years (Eusebius in the Armenian version).
- Dynasty 8: 27 kings of Memphis ruling 146 years (Africanus), or 5 kings of Memphis ruling 100 years (Eusebius).
- Dynasty 9: 19 kings of Heracleopolis ruling 409 years (Africanus), or 4 kings of Heracleopolis ruling 100 years (Eusebius).
- Dynasty 10: 19 kings of Heracleopolis ruling 185 years (Africanus and Eusebius).

17. Mosshammer 1984. Syncellus' *Ecloga* combines many sources and does not cite them separately.

18. Karst 1911, 1–143. The text is followed by the *series regum* on pp. 144–155.

19. Eusebius' *Chronici canones* lists Egyptian reigns in parallel to those of other nations. It is mainly known from a Latin translation by Jerome (fourth–fifth century AD, Helm 1984: Dynasties 16–30 on pp. 20b–121), and from an Armenian translation (Karst 1911, 156–227: Dynasties 18–30 on pp. 156–197).

20. An outline of the transmission of Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* is found in Verbrugghe and Wickersham 1996, 118 (fig. 1).

Though the *Aegyptiaca* is only fragmentarily preserved and was written a considerable time after the Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period, it still contains useful information on the epoch. Also, Manetho's dynastic divisions have become standard in Egyptology.

Another literary work that enumerates Egyptian kings is (Pseudo)-Eratosthenes' *Anagraphai*,²¹ which was likewise transmitted via Syncellus. Its origins are disputed, but it seems to represent a tradition separate from that of Manetho.²² It lists 38 "Theban" kings, from Menes until Amuthartaeus. Three kings (nos. 20–22) can be identified with the last three rulers of Manetho's Dynasty 6: Apappus (ruling 100 years), Echeskosokaras (one year), and Nitocris (six years) correspond to Manetho's Phiops, Methusuphis, and Nitocris. The next nine kings (nos. 23–31)—immediately before Stammenemes I (no. 32, *i.e.*, Ammenemhat I of Dynasty 12)—might belong to the late Old Kingdom and the First Intermediate Period:²³ Myrtaeus, Uosimares, Sethinilus/Thirillus, Semphrurcrates, Chuther, Meures, Chomaephtha, Soicunius, and Peteathyres.

1.3. Late Dynasty 6

On the basis of the king lists and other data, one can attempt to reconstruct the compositions of the dynasties of the late Old Kingdom and the First Intermediate Period. For Dynasty 6, the identification of Manetho's penultimate king, Menthesuphis (ruling one year), with Merenra Djefaemsaf (II, *AKL* 39) and with a king ruling one year and one month (*TKL* 5/6) is generally accepted, but the identification of Manetho's ultimate ruler, Queen Nitocris, is disputed:

- Von Beckerath (1962, 140–141, 143; 1997, 148–149, followed by Helck 1992, 167) and Brose (2018) identify Nitocris with Neitiqerty (*TKL* 5/7), which name would be a birth name, and not with Netjerkara (*AKL* 40).²⁴ Von Beckerath (1997, 148)²⁵ and Brose (2018, 48–49) suppose that Nitocris is absent from the *AKL* because she was a woman; Queen Sobekneferu of Dynasty 12 is similarly absent from the *AKL* (while present in *SKL* 22 and *TKL* 7/2).
 - Petrie (1924, 117–118) and Zivie-Coche (1972, 122–130, followed by Wimmer 2021, 319–320) equate the name Nitocris with the birth name Neitiqerty, and they identify her with Menkara in the *AKL* (41): Manetho credits Nitocris with the construction of the third pyramid, and this error would have resulted from a confusion of her throne name Menkara with that of Menkaura of Dynasty 4, the constructor of the third pyramid at Giza.
 - Goedicke (1962, 245–246), Ryholt (2000, 92–93), and Brovarski (2007, 145–146; 2018, 9) suppose that Neitiqerty is a corrupted form of the throne name Netjerkara.²⁶ They argue that Netjerkara was a man and that Queen Nitocris never existed.
 - Allen (in Ryholt 2000, 99–100) proposes that Netjerkara is the throne name of Neitiqerty.

21. Waddell 1940, 212–225; Jacoby 1958, 112–118 (*FGH* 610).

22. Helck 1956, 89–91.

23. Helck 1956, 33–34; *cf.* Petrie 1924, 130.

24. Callender (2011a, 315–316; 2011b, 252–254), similarly, argues that Neitiqerty is a woman's name and hard to link with the name Netjerkara.

25. Formerly, von Beckerath (1962, 140) had proposed that Nitocris is absent from the *AKL* because she was a regent and had not been crowned as king.

26. *Cf.* Baud 2006, 156: Neitiqerty is possibly the same person as Netjerkara.

The search for the identity of Neitiqerty changed when Ryholt (2000, 87–91) could join fr. 40 to fr. 43, in *TKL* 5/7–8. This added the phrase *s3 Pth* (fr. 40) to Neitiqerty (fr. 43), and Seneb (fr. 40) to Neferka Khered (fr. 43). Ryholt (2000, 93, followed by Papazian 2015, 399) supposes that *s3 Pth*, Siptah, represents a birth name, that of Netjerkara (*AKL* 40), with Netjerkara being erroneously rendered as Neitiqerty in *TKL* 5/7. In response to Ryholt, Brose (2018, 48–49) notes that the form *s3 Pth* is not found before the Middle Kingdom and that its use in the *TKL* might be a fabrication by the redactor or copyist of the *TKL*.²⁷ He proposes that it is an epithet, with the male form *s3* showing a tendency to masculinise Queen Neitiqerty. Callender (2011b, 256), likewise, states that Queen Neitiqerty could have used a male title. Brovarski (2007, 146–148; 2018, 16) also takes *s3 Pth* for an epithet, but for a male ruler, Netjerkara, and he identifies this “son of Ptah” with King Imhotep, given that the expression “son of Ptah” is an epithet of the deified sage Imhotep. Imhotep would be the actual birth name of Netjerkara.²⁸ Brovarski adds that a graffito in the Wadi Shatt er-Rigal which records the birth name Hotep and a damaged throne name which could perhaps be read Netjerkara²⁹ argues for the identification of Netjerkara with (Im)hotep.³⁰

With Brovarski, the present study holds that Netjerkara can be identified with (Im)hotep, but we do not follow him in his identification of Netjerkara Imhotep with Neitiqerty Siptah. With Petrie, von Beckerath, Zivie-Coche, and Brose, we hold that the tradition of Nitocris is too strong to suppress the queen’s existence, and we identify her with Neitiqerty Siptah. And with Petrie and Zivie-Coche, we propose Menkara for Neitiqerty’s throne name. Two individuals seem to be concerned: Netjerkara Imhotep (who will be set in Dynasty 7: see §1.4) and Menkara Neitiqerty Siptah (Nitocris of Dynasty 6).

Dynasty 6 is generally supposed to end with Neitiqerty (*TKL* 5/7), whether or not this ruler is identified with Nitocris or Netjerkara. Papazian (2015, 399, 416 [table 10.2]), however, extends Dynasty 6 until Neby (*AKL* 43), because Neby is supposed to be a son of Pepy II of Dynasty 6 (see §2.1). Yet, Papazian himself does not apply this filial criterion in an absolute way: he includes Pepyseneb among the offspring of Pepy II (2015, 415, 421), but he assigns Pepyseneb to Dynasty 7 (2015, 416).

1.4. *Dynasty 7*

In Manetho, Dynasty 7 comprises 70 kings of Memphis ruling 70 days (Africanus), or 5 kings of Memphis ruling 75 days (Eusebius in Syncellus) or 75 years (Eusebius in the Armenian version). The ephemerality of the dynasty made von Beckerath (1997, 143 n. 634; 1999, 66 n. 1) suppress Dynasty 7 altogether. Papazian (2015, 395, 414–416) considers such an approach too radical and assigns the kings from Djedkara Shemai until Neferkamin Anu (*AKL* 44–52)—the last king with two names in the *AKL*—to Dynasty 7. Schenkel (1962, 134–136), Redford (1986, 238), and Brovarski (2018, 18) identify Dynasty 7 with *AKL* 41–50 (kings who are not mentioned in the

27. Brovarski (2007, 148 n. 6; 2018, 16 n. 98), likewise, considers the possibility that the Ramesside scribe of the *TKL* added the epithet *s3 Pth*.

28. Brovarski (2018, 16) suggests that Siptah’s actual birth name, Imhotep, was lost in the *Vorlage* of the *TKL*.

29. Legrain 1903, 220; Caminos and Osing 2021, 59–60, 157 (46.A).

30. Von Beckerath (1999, 70 n. 3), similarly, proposes that Hotep might be a hypocoristic for Imhotep, while Papazian (2015, 403–404) identifies them as two individuals.

TKL) and with six years that are explicitly missing in the *TKL*.³¹ These six years are recorded in the totals found in *TKL* 5/14–17 (trans. Ryholt 2004, 141):

TKL 5/14–15: [Total of] kings [until Neferirkara: x] amounting to 181 years, 6 months, 3 days, and a lacuna of 6 (years). Total: 1[87 years, 6 months, and 3 days].

TKL 5/15–17: [Total of] kings [from] Menes; their kingship, their years, and a lacuna [thereto]: [94]9 years and 15 days, and a lacuna of 6 years. Total: [x kings amounting to] 955 years and 1[5] days.

The two totals record the same “lacuna of 6 years.” The word “lacuna” translates the Egyptian , read *wsf* or *df3*, the meaning of which is debated. It could represent years that had been deliberately omitted,³² or years that had been lost owing to a lacuna (a damaged passage) in a *Vorlage* of the *TKL*.³³ In either scenario, it concerns missing years. We might plausibly equate these six missing years with the reigns that are reported in the *AKL* but missing from the *TKL*.³⁴

The number of kings that reigned during these six years depends on the identification of Neitiqerty. Since von Beckerath does not identify Neitiqerty (*TKL* 5/7) with Netjerkara (*AKL* 40), he concludes that the *TKL* omits eleven kings (though set in Dynasty 8), from Netjerkara until Neferkahor (*AKL* 40–50).³⁵ Ryholt and Brovarski, on the other hand, trace back the name Neitiqerty to a corrupted form of Netjerkara, and therefore suppose that the *TKL* omits ten kings, from Menkara until Neferkahor (*AKL* 41–50).³⁶ Like von Beckerath, the present study differentiates Neitiqerty from Netjerkara. Dynasty 7 would begin with Netjerkara. A setting of Netjerkara Imhotep at the head of Dynasty 7 might find contextual support. An inscription of Djaty, the “eldest son” of King Imhotep, reports an insurrection (Wadi Hammamat M 206, ll. 2–3).³⁷ “I was welcoming(?) to those who submitted on the day of battle, by my counsel I foretold when the day of attack approached.”³⁸ Brovarski (2007, 147; 2018, 16) argues that these hostilities could testify to a triumph by a collateral branch of Dynasty 6, led by Imhotep. From another perspective, these troubles could as well represent tensions that surrounded the foundation of a new dynasty, Dynasty 7, with Imhotep as its first king. Scholars indeed generally set Imhotep after Dynasty 6.

31. Von Beckerath (1962, 143, 145) identifies the reigns of *AKL* 40–50 with the six missing years, but he assigns these kings to Dynasty 8.

32. Redford 1986, 15: “In all probability the term read *wsf* is to be construed as a technical expression for ‘suppressed,’ or ‘(intentionally) omitted,’ and inspite [sic] of some scholars’ rejection of the idea, may even have denoted to contemporaries a ‘kingless’ (literally ‘vacant, unoccupied’) period”; Bennett 1995, 11: “*Wsf* entries occur at several points in the kinglist, and their exact significance is debated, but the most likely meaning appears to be that they represent a period of time where the throne was either vacant or was held by one or more kings usually regarded as illegitimate in later tradition.”

33. Ryholt 2000, 96–98; Ryholt 2004, 147–148.

34. Ryholt 2000, 97.

35. Von Beckerath 1962, 143; von Beckerath 1997, 148–149. He is followed by Helck 1992, 167.

36. Ryholt 2000, 97, 99 (table 1); Brovarski 2018, 18.

37. Couyat and Montet 1912, 103–104; Schenkel 1965, 27–28 (no. 17).

38. Trans. Brovarski 2018, 16. Goedicke (1990, 77) translates as “[Djaty] who was alert to the troops on the day of fighting, who announced the arrival of the day of storming in the (war-)council” (with a discussion of his translation on pp. 79–81); Strudwick (2005, 143 [no. 65]) proposes “[Djaty] who is concerned for his subordinates on the day of fighting and who foretells the coming of the day of attack through his council.”

As the present study follows Petrie and Zivie-Coche in their identification of Menkara with Neitiqerty, the *AKL* would list Netjerkara (Imhotep, *AKL* 40) of Dynasty 7 before Menkara (Neitiqerty/Nitocris, *AKL* 41) of Dynasty 6. The reason why a ruler of Dynasty 7 was put before a ruler of Dynasty 6 will be explored in §2.1. If Netjerkara introduces Dynasty 7 and Menkara still belongs to Dynasty 6, Dynasty 7 counts ten kings (*AKL* 40, 42–50). The number ten can possibly be related to the numbers for Dynasty 7 found in the Manethonian tradition: 70 kings of Memphis ruling 70 days (Africanus), or 5 kings of Memphis ruling 75 days or 75 years (Eusebius). Eusebius seems to have known the tradition of 70 rulers as well: Eusebius' 75 days/years obviously result from 70 reigns (Africanus) + 5 reigns (Eusebius). These seventy rulers may have numbered ten in the original version of Manetho. The Greek text of Africanus reads Ἐβδόμη δυναστεία Μεμφιτῶν βασιλέων ο' οἱ ἐβασίλευσαν ἡμέρας ο', with ο' standing for "seventy." It is noteworthy that the omicron of βασιλέων ο' is immediately followed by the omicron of the relative pronoun οἱ. Confusion of the first omicron with the letters of this pronoun οἱ may have resulted in an erroneous numeral: an original ι' οἱ may have been changed into ο' οἱ. If so, an original ten (ι') was turned into seventy (ο').

For four of these ten kings, the *AKL* records a birth name: Neby (*AKL* 43), Shemai (*AKL* 44), Khendu (*AKL* 45), and Tereru (*AKL* 49). The birth names of the remaining six kings can be traced with the help of the contemporary material. Eight names of kings who seem to belong to the period of Dynasties 6–8 and who are absent from the king lists have been discovered in the finds: Sekhemkara (or Ankhkara), Wadjkara, Ity, Imhotep, Hotep, Khui, Isu (via the basilophoric name Isu-Ankh), and Iytjenu (via the basilophoric name Sat-Iytjenu). Von Beckerath (1999, 70–71 [nos. a–h]; cf. Papazian 2015, 401–405) proposes that these eight kings belong to Dynasty 8 and that they correspond (in part) with the kings found in *AKL* 40–56. He opts for Dynasty 8 because he suppresses Dynasty 7. As the present study accepts the existence of Dynasty 7, the kings can be considered as members of that dynasty. The study equates Dynasty 7 with *AKL* 40, 42–50 and assigns the birth name (Im)hotep (nos. d–e) to Netjerkara (*AKL* 40; see n. 30 above). As for the four other birth names (Ity, Khui, Isu, and Iytjenu), the name Ity (no. c) might belong to Userkara, the second king of Dynasty 6³⁹ (though this has also been questioned).⁴⁰ It seems, in any case, unlikely that Ity was one of the ephemeral rulers of Dynasty 7 since he built a pyramid (named *B3w-Ity*, Wadi Hammamat M 169).⁴¹ Thus, Ity can be excluded from the list of candidates for Dynasty 7. It follows that Khui (Khuiquer),⁴² Isu, and Iytjenu⁴³ (nos. f–h) remain as possible birth

39. Maspero 1895, 56–64; Petrie 1924, 101–102. For more authors, see Theis 2010, 329 n. 49. Spalinger (1994, 313 and n. 104) proposed that Ity was the birth name of Neferirkara II of Dynasty 8, but Text A in Shemai's tomb has since revealed that the latter's birth name is Pepy (see §1.5).

40. Goedicke 1990, 75–76; Baud and Dobrev 1995, 60.

41. See Couyat and Montet 1912, 94; Schenkel 1965, 26 (no. 14); Strudwick 2005, 140 (no. 63); Theis 2010, 329–330. M 169 records an expedition in year 1 in view of the construction of Ity's pyramid.

42. Gomaà (1980, 97–98) dates Khui to Dynasty 8; Kanawati (1992, 170–172) to the end of Pepy II's reign or shortly after; Gourdon (2016, 315–318) to late Dynasty 8. Brovarski (2018, 38–40) identifies Khui with "Horus Merut the good god Khuiquer"—who is attested on a lintel from Abydos (Penn Museum E 17316 A–B) and whose name points to the First Intermediate Period (Ryholt 1997, 163 n. 595)—and proposes Dynasty 10. However, Khui/Khuiquer may well belong to the family that descended from Khui, the father-in-law of Pepy I, and that was related to Dynasties 6 and 8 and resided at Abydos, which could argue for a setting in the time of Dynasty 7 rather than Dynasty 10. On this family, see Papazian 2015, 406–410. Von Beckerath, on the other hand, differentiates Khui from Khuiquer, and assigns Khuiquer to Dynasty 13 (1999, 106–107 [no. p]).

names for kings of Dynasty 7. The king's name Uny, attested on a relief block from Ezbet Rushdi,⁴⁴ may be added to this list.⁴⁵ If so, nine birth names are known for the ten kings of Dynasty 7: (Im)hotep, Isu, Iytjenu, Khendu, Khuiquer, Neby, Shemai, Tereru, and Uny.

With regard to the two throne names that are absent from the king lists, no candidate could thus far be found for Sekhemkara (no. a), mentioned in pBerlin 10523.⁴⁶ The second name, Wadjkara (no. b), is recorded at the very end of a decree from Koptos, Koptos R, which was issued by Horus Demedjibtawy.⁴⁷ The cartouche of Wadjkara (without "King of Upper and Lower Egypt") immediately follows the phrase *pr-^c3 mr hnt-š h3b*. Two word groups are concerned: *pr-^c3 mr hnt-š* "the overseer of the *khenty-she* of the Great House," and *h3b W3d-k3-R^c*. With regard to the latter, *h3b* has been supposed to be part of a pyramid's name, Hab-Wadjkara,⁴⁸ or to be the name of the father of a person with the basilophoric name Wadjkara-[],⁴⁹ or to be a verb with Wadjkara as subject.⁵⁰ In all these options, "Wadjkara" testifies to the existence of a king named Wadjkara who lived at the latest by the time of King Demedjibtawy. Different proposals exist on the identity of Wadjkara:

- Hayes (1948, 115) and Brovarski (2018, 15, 19–20) assign the name Wadjkara to the immediate predecessor of Neferkauhor (*AKL* 55): *AKL* 54 would mistakenly name this predecessor Neferkaura instead of Wadjkara.⁵¹
- Von Beckerath (1999, 70–71 [no. b]), Postel (2004, 380), and Papazian (2015, 401–403) identify Wadjkara with Demedjibtawy, a supposed ruler of Dynasty 8.
- Aufrère (1982, 52–53, 57) proposes that Unas, the last king of Dynasty 5, bore the throne name Wadjkara. Unas would have alluded to the throne name of his predecessor Djedkara Izezi. Moreover, Unas' Horus name Wadjtawy, Nebty name Wadjemnebty, and Golden Horus name Biknebuwadj are similar to the name Wadjkara, which argues for assigning the latter name to Unas. Wadjkara of Koptos R, a king of Dynasty 8, would have copied the throne name of the earlier king Unas.

In addition to Koptos R, the name Wadjkara is found in a graffito at Khor-Dehmit, together with *b3k-nbw* Ankh and *s3 R^c* Segersenti.⁵² Postel (2004, 380) and Brovarski (2018, 15) identify this ruler Wadjkara with Wadjkara of Koptos R (and differentiate him from Segersenti), while Williams (2013) argues that Wadjkara is the throne name of Segersenti, a ruler of Lower Nubia in the time of early Dynasty 12 who copied the name of the Egyptian king Wadjkara. In any case, the

43. Brovarski (2018, 17–18) assigns Iytjenu to Dynasty 7 or early Dynasty 9.

44. Jánosi 1998, 60–61 (no. 4).

45. Brovarski 2018, 18.

46. Brovarski 2018, 17.

47. Schenkel 1965, 23–24 (no. 12); Goedicke 1967, 214–225; Strudwick 2005, 123–124 (no. 39).

48. Weill 1912, 64–65.

49. Sethe 1912, 721: "*H3b* ('s Sohn) *W3d-k3-r^c*[-*snb* (o. ä.)]," followed by Hayes 1946, 20; Schenkel 1965, 24 (no. 12); Goedicke 1967, 215.

50. Strudwick 2005, 124: "whom Wadjkare ... sent ..."

51. Hayes (1946, 20–21), followed by Schenkel (1962, 138 [§57.e]), at first proposed the opposite: Koptos R would have erroneously rendered the name as Wadjkara, while the reading Neferkaura of *AKL* 54 would have been correct.

52. Roeder 1911, vol. 1, 115 (§307); vol. 2, pl. 108c.

name Wadjkara must have been known in Lower Nubia. Unas left an inscription at Elephantine (*Urk.* I, 69),⁵³ which suggests that he came into contact with Nubia. This could support Aufrère's proposal that Unas' throne name is Wadjkara, since both Wadjkara and Unas would relate to Nubia.

Assigning the name Wadjkara to Unas also explains why Wadjkara is absent from the *AKL*: King Unas is recorded with his birth name Unas in *AKL* 33. In contrast, the kings of Dynasties 7–8 are all listed with their throne names in the *AKL* (sometimes provided with a birth name), and none of these corresponds to Wadjkara. This makes it unlikely that Wadjkara belongs to Dynasties 7–8. Hence, there seems to have been only one Egyptian king named Wadjkara, Unas. Koptos R would refer back to Wadjkara Unas (contrary to Aufrère's differentiation into Wadjkara of Dynasty 5 and Wadjkara of Dynasty 8).

1.5. *Dynasty 8*

The reconstruction of the composition of Dynasty 8 relates to the proposals made for the compositions of Dynasties 6–7. Given that von Beckerath ends Dynasty 6 with Nitocris = Neitiqerty (distinguished from Netjerkara, *AKL* 40) and suppresses Dynasty 7, he (1962, 141, 143; 1997, 148, 188; 1999, 66–69) assigns the kings from Netjerkara until Neferirkara II to Dynasty 8, that is, seventeen kings in all (*AKL* 40–56). Papazian (2015, 401–405, 416 [table 10.2]) ends Dynasty 7 with Neferkamin Anu (*AKL* 53; *TKL* 5/9) and therefore begins Dynasty 8 with Anu's successor in the king lists, Qakara Ibi (*AKL* 54; *TKL* 5/10). He ends Dynasty 8 with Neferkauhor (*AKL* 55)⁵⁴ and the anonymous reign of 1½ years (*TKL* 5/13), and he includes the eight kings whose names are only found in the contemporary material (*i.e.*, nos. a–h presented above). Brovarski (2018, 18) ends Dynasty 7 with Neferkauhor (*AKL* 50) and thus begins Dynasty 8 with Neferkauhor's successor in the king lists, Neferkara Pepyseneb/Kheredseneb (*AKL* 51; *TKL* 5/8), so that Dynasty 8 = *AKL* 51–56 = *TKL* 5/8–13. The present study will propose the same members for Dynasty 8.

Following Neferkauhor, the last king of Dynasty 7, the *AKL* and *TKL* mention six more reigns for the relevant period.⁵⁵ Ryholt (2000, 99 [table 1]) equates them as follows:

<i>AKL</i>	<i>TKL</i>
51: Neferkara Pepyseneb	5/8: Neferka Kheredseneb
52: Neferkamin Anu	5/9: Nefer
53: Qakaura	5/10: Ibi, 2 years, 1 month, 1 day
54: Neferkaura	5/11: [Neferkaura], 4 years, 2 months
55: Neferkauhor	5/12: [Neferkauhor], 2 years, 1 month, 1 day
56: Neferirkara (II)	5/13: [Neferirkara II], 1 year and a half

Table 2: The equation of *AKL* 51–56 with *TKL* 5/8–13.

The equations are confirmed by several means. The name Kheredseneb in *TKL* 5/8 seems to be an alternative form of Pepyseneb (*AKL* 51). Allen (in Ryholt 2000, 100) considers the

53. Strudwick 2005, 133 (no. 48).

54. Papazian assigns Neferirkara II of *AKL* 56 to Dynasty “?”.

55. The next kings in the *AKL* are Nebhepetra (Mentuhotep II, *AKL* 57) and Sankhkara (Mentuhotep III, *AKL* 58) of Dynasty 11. *TKL* 5/14–17 gives summaries.

possibility that the actual full name was Pepykherseneb, “Pepy junior (called) Seneb,” with the element Pepy having been lost in the damaged *Vorlage* of the *TKL*. Ryholt (2000, 94) proposes either that the form Kherdseneb is due to a damaged *Vorlage*, or that it alludes to Pepy II’s young age at his accession. Papazian (2015, 415, 421) assigns the young age to Pepyseneb himself.

The name of the second king, Neferkamin Anu (*AKL* 52), may have been damaged in the *Vorlage* of the *TKL* and therefore appear as Nefer in the *TKL* (5/9).⁵⁶

The equations of the next four kings are approved by epigraphical finds. At Saqqara, in Ibi’s pyramid, the throne name Qakara is found together with the birth name Ibi,⁵⁷ which shows that *AKL* 53 (Qakaura) concerns the same person as *TKL* 5/10 (Ibi).

At Koptos, inscriptions on limestone slabs were discovered in the early twentieth century, the Koptos decrees. Koptos H⁵⁸ was issued by Horus Kha[]—who is probably Neferkaura, the immediate predecessor of Neferkauhor⁵⁹—in the year *rnpt sp* 4. Hayes (1946, 13 n. 7) states that this date likely represents the regnal year 4 rather than “the year of the fourth occasion” (which would yield a higher regnal year).⁶⁰ If so, the regnal year 4 accords with the reign length found in *TKL* 5/11 (4 years, 2 months), which corroborates the identification of Neferkaura (*AKL* 54) with the king of *TKL* 5/11.

As for Netjerbau Neferkauhor, scholars assign nine Koptos decrees in all to him (Koptos I, J, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q).⁶¹ Koptos P is dated to II Peret 20 in the year *rnpt sm³ t³wy*,⁶² and the nine documents are generally supposed to have been all issued on that date.⁶³ Given that the expression *rnpt sm³ t³wy* is an abbreviation of the formulation “Year of Appearance of the *nswt*-king; appearance of the *bity*-king; uniting Upper and Lower Egypt; encircling the Wall (*i.e.*, Memphis),” which is attested for the first year of a king during the Old Kingdom,⁶⁴ the year *rnpt sm³ t³wy* of Neferkauhor is generally identified with his accession year, year 1.⁶⁵ A further year attestation for Neferkauhor comes from Shemai’s tomb at Kom el-Koffar, about 1 km south of Koptos. There, block QM 289 records the date of I Akhet 4 in *rnpt sp* 2 of Neferkauhor.⁶⁶ The expression *rnpt sp* 2 could again represent a regnal year. This highest date known for Neferkauhor is in agreement with the reign length found in *TKL* 5/12 (2 years, 1 month, 1 day), and so supports an equation of Neferkauhor’s reign (*AKL* 55) with the one in *TKL* 5/12. The birth name of Neferkauhor is found in

56. Ryholt 2000, 97.

57. Jéquier 1935, 20–22; von Beckerath 1999, 68–69 (no. 14).

58. Hayes 1946, 11–13; Schenkel 1965, 11–12 (no. 1); Goedicke 1967, 163–164; Strudwick 2005, 116 (no. 30).

59. Hayes 1946, 21 (“= Neferkaure?”); Goedicke 1967, 164; von Beckerath 1999, 68–69 (no. 15); Strudwick 2005, 116; Papazian 2015, 400 (no. 54); Brovarski 2018, 15.

60. Gourdon (2016, 313, 370 n. 43) considers both interpretations possible and proposes year 4 or year 8.

61. Goedicke 1967, 165–202, 206–213; Strudwick 2005, 117–123 (nos. 31–38). The fragmentary decree Koptos S+T can be added to this list: Goedicke 1967, 203–205. The Horus name Netjerbau is (partly) preserved in Koptos J col. 1, K col. 1, L col. 1, M col. 1, O col. 1; and the throne name Neferkauhor is found in Koptos J col. (x+)11, L col. 5. Hayes (1946, 21) assigns Koptos I to King Horus Kha[] of Koptos H; cf. Schenkel 1965, 14–23 (nos. 3–11).

62. The date of II Peret 20 (without *rnpt sm³ t³wy*) is (partly) preserved in Koptos K col. 18, L col. 14, N col. 1, O col. 1, Q col. 10.

63. Hayes 1946, 19–20; Goedicke 1967, 196; Strudwick 2005, 117; Mostafa 2014, 116.

64. Baines 1995, 126. The abbreviation is, for instance, found in the tomb of Wepemneferet in late Dynasty 5: Verner 2001, 405 and n. 304; Strudwick 2005, 203 (no. 116).

65. Hayes 1946, 17 n. 2, 20; Goedicke 1967, 196; Strudwick 2005, 117.

66. Mostafa 1987, 171 n. 1; Mostafa 2014, 97 (fig. 15), 99, 306–307 (pls. xxib, xxii).

Koptos J,⁶⁷ but its reading is debated:⁶⁸ proposals vary between Kapuib(i),⁶⁹ Khuika,⁷⁰ and Khuihapy.⁷¹

Shemai's tomb provides information on the next king, Neferirkara II, as well. Text A in the tomb⁷² reveals that Neferirkara II's birth name is Pepy: line 1 fragmentarily preserves cartouches with the king's name 'Pepy Neferkara'. Given that Text A was issued after the death of Shemai (a contemporary of Neferkauhor) and that the upper spaces of the cartouches in line 1 are not preserved, Mostafa (2005, 173–174; 2014, 159, followed by Brovarski 2018, 10 and n. 34) adds the sign ω *ir* in the cartouche of the praenomen and identifies this king Nefer[ir]kara Pepy with Neferirkara II, the successor of Neferkauhor. Shemai's tomb also provides a regnal year for this king. Text A reports the transport of a sarcophagus coming from Elephantine. The same sarcophagus is found on block QM 288, which is dated to I Shemu 3 in an anonymous year 1.⁷³ Thus, year 1 likely belongs to Nefer[ir]kara, who is mentioned in Text A. This highest date known for Neferirkara II favours the identification of Neferirkara II (*AKL* 56) with the king of *TKL* 5/13, who ruled for one year and a half.

In addition, it can be noted that the five kings that Eusebius records for Dynasty 8 (in both Syncellus and the Armenian version) number one king less than the lists of six kings in *AKL* 51–56 = *TKL* 5/8–13.⁷⁴ At the same time, the nineteen kings of Manetho's next two dynasties, the Heracleopolitan Dynasties 9–10, are one number higher than their actual number, eighteen, as the next part will show. This leads to the hypothesis that one king of Dynasty 8 was mistakenly attributed to the Heracleopolitan house in the Manethonian tradition. This explanation seems all the more feasible if one considers the fact that Manetho does not mention the kings of Dynasties 8–10 by name. The number for Dynasty 8 would have decreased from six to five in Eusebius, while the number for Dynasties 9–10 increased from eighteen to nineteen.

1.6. *Dynasty 9 and Dynasty 10*

Out of all the epigraphical and papyrological king lists, the Heracleopolitan rulers only appear in the *TKL*. This list fragmentarily enumerates eighteen kings (*TKL* 5/18–26 + 6/1–9), followed by a summary (6/10). Manetho, on the other hand, distinguishes two Heracleopolitan dynasties:

- 1) Dynasty 9 comprises nineteen kings of Heracleopolis ruling 409 years (Africanus), or four kings of Heracleopolis ruling 100 years (Eusebius).
- 2) Dynasty 10 comprises nineteen kings of Heracleopolis ruling 185 years (Africanus and Eusebius).

67. On a now unlocated block: Goedicke 1967, 197–202; Strudwick 2005, 118–119 (no. 32).

68. On the difficulty of the name's reading, see Ryholt 2000, 99 n. b.

69. Hayes 1946, 16 (n. 13). Brovarski (2018, 11 and n. 41) mentions Kapuib(i) in the main text and adds Khuika and Khuihapy as other possibilities in the footnote.

70. Goedicke 1967, 197, 201.

71. Von Beckerath 1999, 68–69 (no. 16). Cf. Papazian 2015, 404 (no. f): Khuika or Khuihapy.

72. Mostafa 2005, 172–173, 194–195 (pls. iii–iv); Mostafa 2014, 156 (fig. 21), 158.

73. Mostafa 2005, 161–162, 192–193 (pls. i–ii); Mostafa 2014, 142 (fig. 20a), 144, 311–312 (pls. xxvi–xxvii).

74. Africanus assigns twenty-seven kings to Dynasty 8.

The nineteen kings that Africanus assigns to both Dynasty 9 and Dynasty 10 are obviously the same kings and do not represent thirty-eight kings in all. Analogously, Eusebius' four kings for Dynasty 9 are part of his nineteen kings for Dynasty 10.⁷⁵ The difference between the eighteen kings in the *TKL* and the nineteen kings in Manetho has been explained as a scribal error in Manetho,⁷⁶ or as a double count in Manetho for the two cartouches found in *TKL* 5/23,⁷⁷ or as an omission of the nineteenth king in the *TKL*—similarly to Mentuhotep IV, the last king of Dynasty 11, who is absent from the *TKL*.⁷⁸ However, Manetho's extra king may actually belong in Dynasty 8, which lacks one member in Eusebius' version (see §1.5).

Since Manetho's Dynasty 10 is in great part a doubling of his Dynasty 9 and since the *TKL* lists the Heracleopolitan kings without any split, it has sometimes been assumed that there was only one Heracleopolitan dynasty, contrary to Manetho's two dynasties.⁷⁹ Yet, the earlier dynasties are likewise grouped together in the *TKL*: Manetho's Dynasties 1–5 are summarised in *TKL* 4/26, his Dynasties 6–8 in 5/14–15, and his Dynasties 1–8 in 5/15–17, without any breaks within these groups. Hence, the *TKL* does not exclude the possibility that there were two Heracleopolitan dynasties.

Eusebius may help us localise the split between Dynasties 9 and 10 in the continuous list of rulers found in the *TKL*. Given that Eusebius has four kings for Dynasty 9, Dynasty 9 may consist of the first four Heracleopolitan entries in the *TKL*, 5/18–21. Dynasty 10 would begin with *Snn[]* (5/22).⁸⁰ Goedicke (1969, 137), Málek (1982, 96, 105; 1997, 14), and Seidlmayer (1997, 82; 2006, 164), on the other hand, argue that the Manethonian tradition introduced a split after the first four kings because *TKL* 5/22 contains the formula *ir.n.f m nswyt* “he acted in kingship.” This formula has two different functions:⁸¹ (1) it is repeated every 13 to 18 lines in reference to the top of each column of the *Vorlage* of the *TKL*, and (2) it is mentioned with the first king of every group in the *TKL*. The Manethonian tradition would have interpreted the formula in *TKL* 5/22 as standing for a new group/dynasty, whereas it would actually have indicated the top of a new column in the *Vorlage*.⁸²

Three observations can, however, be made in reply. First, the argumentation supposes that Manetho (or Eusebius) was working with a document identical to (the *Vorlage* of) the *TKL*, which cannot be proven.⁸³ Second, Manetho's introduction of Dynasty 10 cannot be simply ascribed to the layout of (the *Vorlage* of) the *TKL*. The formula “he acted in kingship” is, for instance, found with Amenemhat IV as well (in *TKL* 7/1), but none of the Manethonian versions splits Dynasty 12

75. Seidlmayer 1997, 87.

76. Goedicke 1969, 137.

77. Málek 1982, 105.

78. Seidlmayer 1997, 87; Seidlmayer 2006, 164.

79. See the scholars enumerated by Brovarski 2018, 24 nn. 181–182; Pitkin 2023, 21 (table 3), 26 nn. 74–80.

80. Brovarski 2018, 25, 40. Demidchik (2016, 109–111) begins Dynasty 10 in *TKL* 5/23 (“Khet[y, son of] Neferkara”), because he supposes that the patronym “[son of] Neferkara” marks a new line. However, in the two similar cases that Demidchik mentions for the addition of a patronym in the *TKL* (7/15 “Sobek[hote]p{ra}, son of []” and 7/25 “Kha[]ra Neferhotep, son of Haankhef”), the two kings do not introduce a new dynasty; they continue Dynasty 13.

81. See Mahieu 2021, 175.

82. *TKL* 5/22 comes 15 lines after the preceding formula in 5/7, and 15 lines before the heading of Dynasty 11 in 6/11: Ryholt 1997, 31; cf. Helck 1992, 184.

83. Cf. Brovarski 2018, 24–25.

into two dynasties at this instance.⁸⁴ Third, there may be a reason why the *Vorlage* of the *TKL* put the first four Heracleopolitan kings in a column differing from that of the next fourteen kings. The split between the four and fourteen kings may have intended to separate the Heracleopolitan kings who reigned the whole of Egypt (the first four kings) from those who had to share the country with Dynasty 11 (the next fourteen kings). The split would point to the loss of the South.⁸⁵ Several scholars are of the opinion that Dynasty 9 ruled a united Egypt, and that Dynasty 10 shared the government of the country with early Dynasty 11.⁸⁶

The identities and succession order of the Heracleopolitan rulers are still debated. Apart from the fragmentary names in *TKL* 5/22–6/9,⁸⁷ few data exists on the kings of Dynasty 10. More data is available for Dynasty 9 (5/18–21), and an identification of its four members can be attempted.

1.6.1. *The Founder of Dynasty 9*

Manetho reports that Achthoes founded the Heracleopolitan Dynasty 9 and that he committed atrocities and was killed by a crocodile.⁸⁸ Achthoes is the sole king whom Manetho mentions by name for Dynasties 7–11. The name Achthoes stands for Khety, a common name in the Heracleopolitan house.

We might be able to trace his Horus name. Horus Demedjibtawy issued the decree Koptos R.⁸⁹ This king Demedjibtawy must come after Neferkauhor, the penultimate king of Dynasty 8, given that Koptos R is addressed to the vizier Idi and that Idi held a position lower than that of vizier in Neferkauhor's days (see §2.2.1). Demedjibtawy has often been identified with Neferkauhor's successor in Dynasty 8, Neferirkara II.⁹⁰ Goedicke (1967, 215; 1969, 143 and n. 4, followed by Brovarski 2018, 25–26), on the other hand, proposes that Horus Demedjibtawy should be a Heracleopolitan ruler because his name resembles that of Horus Meryibawy (Meryibra Khety). Brovarski adds that Demedjibtawy might be the founder of Dynasty 9 since the name Demedjibtawy (with *dmd* “to unite” and *t3wy* “the Two Lands”) suits a founder.⁹¹ If so, Demedjibtawy was the Horus name of Khety I (Achthoes).

84. Similarly, Ryholt 2004, 146 n. 56.

85. Brovarski 2018, 25. Cf. Schenkel 1962, 157 (§61.c): “Es wäre sehr gut möglich, daß die 4 Könige [in Eusebius] die sind, die vor Begründung der 11. Dynastie, d.h. formell unbestritten über ganz Ägypten regiert haben.”

86. For a survey of scholars' opinions on the extent of the Heracleopolitan power, see Pitkin 2023, 21 (table 3). Barta (1981, 32) assigns 49 years to the period between Dynasty 8 and Dynasty 11, identified with Dynasty 9. Mostafa (2014, 215) proposes 25–40 years. Brovarski (2018, 36, 459, 464) opts for 80–100 years (cf. 2018, 453: four generations).

87. The fragments on the Heracleopolitan kings in the *TKL* (5/18–6/10) are currently being studied by Ryholt. See his presentation “The Heracleopolitan Dynasty in the Turin King-List” at the IFAO Conference *Chronologies and Contexts of the First Intermediate Period*, Cairo, 7–10 April 2021.

88. Waddell 1940, 60–63 (frs. 27–28); Jacoby 1958, 28–29 (*FGH* 609 F2–3b).

89. Schenkel 1965, 23–24 (no. 12); Goedicke 1967, 214–225; Strudwick 2005, 123–124 (no. 39).

90. For instance, Hayes 1946, 20; Schenkel 1962, 138 (§57.g); Spalinger 1994, 313 n. 104; Mostafa 2005, 174; Mostafa 2014, 160.

91. Brovarski 2018, 26: “In addition, the meaning of the name [Demedjibtawy] ‘He who reassembles the hearts of the Two Lands,’ would be appropriate to the founder of a new dynasty, and *Mry-ib-t3wy*, ‘Beloved of the hearts of the Two Lands,’ may well ring a change on it.”

1.6.2. *The Second King of Dynasty 9*

Only two (of the preserved) names of the Heracleopolitan kings contain the element -tawy: Horus Demedjibtawy and Horus Meryibtawy. These two names not only share the element -tawy but also the element -ib-. The similarity of the names could indicate that the two kings were near in time, possibly successive.⁹² Brovarski (2018, 26) notes that a graffito at Hatnub (no. IX)⁹³ might indicate that Meryibtawy Meryibra Khety came second among the Heracleopolitan kings. The graffito may mention King Meryibra (rather than the royal name Meryhathor),⁹⁴ and it belongs to Djehutynakht (son of Djehutynakht), who seems to have governed the Hare nome in the early Heracleopolitan period.⁹⁵ Given that Meryibtawy Meryibra Khety cannot be the first or third Heracleopolitan king (identified as Demedjibtawy and Neferkara, respectively), he could be the second.⁹⁶

Meryibra's inclusion in Dynasty 9 might find more epigraphical support. Sayce (1892, 333) and Hayes (1971, 464) state that an inscription at Aswan indicates that the reign of Meryibra Khety was recognised in the South: it mentions "Khety, justified(?), son(?) of the wab priest of Sekhmet, Meribra."⁹⁷ The names of these two individuals seem to be basilophoric and could refer to King Meryibra Khety.⁹⁸ This would imply that Meryibra reigned at a time when southernmost Egypt was still loyal to the Heracleopolitan dynasty, that is, in Dynasty 9, before the foundation of the Theban kingdom in the days of early Dynasty 10.⁹⁹

Further, Meryibra Khety is the sole Heracleopolitan king for whom the full Egyptian titulature of five names is attested, and this, moreover, together with the epithet *nb t3wy* (on JdE 42835).¹⁰⁰ Meryibra's elaborate titulature—which alludes to that of Pepy I¹⁰¹—and his epithet show his importance and might confirm that he ruled when the Heracleopolitans were still in control of the entire country, in Dynasty 9.

1.6.3. *The Third King of Dynasty 9*

The name of the third Heracleopolitan king is given as Neferkara in *TKL* 5/20. This king is attested as Kaneferra in the tomb of Ankhtify at Mo'alla (see n. 192 below).

92. Though name patterns have to be treated with caution for the reconstruction of positions of kings, they can be instructive: see Aufrère 1982 (on Dynasties 1–12); Siesse 2015 (on Dynasties 13–17).

93. Anthes 1928, 14, pl. 7.

94. Brovarski 1981, 22, 23 (fig. 1).

95. The Hare nome (nome 15 of Upper Egypt) seems to have been closely related to the Heracleopolitan royal house, as several of its kings are attested there: Khety (possibly: Anthes 1928, 14, pl. 6 [no. Xb]) and Meryibra at Hatnub, and Wahkara Khety posthumously at Deir el-Bersha (on the outer coffin of the steward Nefri [B16C, CG 28088 = JdE 32869: Allen 1976], which might date to about the time of Senusret II–III [Sherbiny 2017, 21 (table 3)]).

96. Baly (1932, 174), Schenkel (1962, 143 [§58.g]), and Hayes (1971, 464–465) identify Meryibra Khety with the founder of the Heracleopolitan kingdom, but Goedicke (1969, 141), Gomaà (1980, 131–133), and von Beckerath (1999, 74 n. 5) object that Meryibra is not necessarily the first king.

97. Petrie 1888, pl. viii (no. 232). Transliteration and translation in Gomaà 1980, 132; Brovarski 2018, 27.

98. The names *Mr-ib-R^c* and *Mry-ib-R^c* probably represent the same king: Brovarski 2018, 27–28.

99. Gomaà (1980, 132–133), on the contrary, proposes that Meribra was either a Hyksos king, or a Heracleopolitan king not to be identified with Meryibra.

100. Kamal 1910; von Beckerath 1999, 74–75 (no. e).

101. Postel 2004, 285; Giewekemeyer 2022, 193.

1.6.4. *The Fourth King of Dynasty 9*

The fourth Heracleopolitan king is called Khety in *TKL* 5/21. A candidate may be Merikara, whose birth name is not definitely known. Málek (1994, 206) and Demidchik (2016, 111–112) have argued that a scribe's palette with the basilophoric name Warkau-Khety and the cartouche of Merikara (Louvre E.10500) may indicate that Merikara's birth name was Khety. Though the evidence is not conclusive, it is at the least suggestive, especially given that many Heracleopolitan kings bore the name Khety. Thus, Merikara could be the Khety of *TKL* 5/21. Most scholars, however, do not set Merikara in that position, as they suppose that Merikara reigned near the end of the Heracleopolitan period.¹⁰² Nevertheless, Demidchik (2016, 99–108) has convincingly shown that the conventional arguments for a late setting of Merikara are not compelling and that several pieces of data point to an earlier setting.¹⁰³

Merikara is especially known from the *Instruction for Merikara* (hereafter *Merikara*), in which his father, an anonymous king, gives instructions to him. Though this literary work should be treated with caution for historical interpretations¹⁰⁴—especially given its possible late date of composition¹⁰⁵—it might provide information on the period.¹⁰⁶ Particularly the names of the kings involved may have been correctly transmitted by later generations. Three names are (partially) found in *Merikara*:

- 1) The “justified” king named Khety to whom Merikara's father refers as the author of a teaching (*Merikara* 109) could be the founder of Dynasty 9, Khety I.¹⁰⁷
- 2) The name 'Mer'[yib]ra has been reconstructed for the traces of a cartouche in *Merikara* 74 that names a “justified” king.¹⁰⁸ If correct, then Khety I's immediate successor (according to this study), Meryibra Khety II, would be mentioned in *Merikara* as well.¹⁰⁹
- 3) It follows that Merikara's father himself, the orator of the teaching, could be the third Heracleopolitan king, with Merikara as the fourth. *Merikara* 1 seems to render the name of Merikara's father as [Khet]y.¹¹⁰ If both the reading of this name and the identification with the third king are correct, then the birth name of Neferkara was Khety (III).

102. For instance, Goedicke 1969, 138; Gomaà 1980, 131; Quack 1992, 112; von Beckerath 1999, 74 n. 7; Seidlmayer 2006, 165; Brovarski 2018, 40; Moreno García 2022, 94.

103. Demidchik (2016, 108–112) proposes situating Merikara in *TKL* 5/24. Málek (1994, 207) supposes that Merikara came “some time, perhaps considerable” before the end of the Heracleopolitan government.

104. Björkman (1964, 13–33) criticises the use of *Merikara* for historical reconstructions.

105. Gnirs (2006) dates *Merikara* as late as the reigns of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III. Stauder (2013, 175–199), similarly, favours early Dynasty 18. Demidchik (2011), on the contrary, argues for the Heracleopolitan period. For a survey of scholars' opinions on the composition date of *Merikara*, see Brovarski 2018, 42–44.

106. Darnell 1997, 107. Cf. Moreno García 2022, 90: “There are later literary compositions such as the ‘Teaching for Merykara,’ a text which was inspired by the Herakleopolitan king of that name and which may draw on events that occurred during his reign but were recorded much later.” Gnirs (2006, 257) speaks about “die Verknüpfung historischen Wissens bzw. kultureller Erinnerung mit aktuellen politischen und gesellschaftlichen Erfahrungen und Herausforderungen” and “Pseudo-Historisierung.”

107. Hayes 1971, 464–465. Vandersleyen (1995, 6 n. 6), however, states that there is no proof for this.

108. Scharff 1936, 18, 23 n. 9; Helck 1977, 43–44; Gomaà 1980, 148 n. 19; Franke 1987, 52. The reading *Mr* is questioned by Lopez 1973, 184. Von Beckerath (1966, 15) states that it is uncertain whether *Mr...R^c* represents Meryibra.

109. Lopez (1973, 186) differentiates the king in *Merikara* 109 from the king in *Merikara* 74.

110. Helck 1977, 3; Tobin in Simpson 2003, 153. The reading is questioned by Lopez 1973, 185.

Identifying Merikara with the last, fourth king of Dynasty 9 agrees with more data found in *Merikara*. Merikara's father seems to have reigned at a time when the Heracleopolitans still controlled the South and thus before Dynasty 10 (*Merikara* 75–76): “You [i.e., Merikara] are on good terms with the southern territory, / Which comes to you bearing gifts and tribute. / The same thing was done for me by (their) ancestors” (trans. Tobin). Merikara apparently made an agreement of peaceful coexistence with the South (*Merikara* 71):¹¹¹ “Do not be too stern with the southern territory, / For you know what the Residence advises about it.” Such a situation aligns with the context of the end of Dynasty 9: the Heracleopolitans henceforth had to share the country with Dynasty 11, and they must have made arrangements with them. The wish, “May you be called ‘Destroyer of the Time of Evil’ / By those who are among the descendants of the house of Khety” (*Merikara* 142–143), may allude to the end of conflicts by the pact with Thebes.¹¹² Historical evidence for setting Merikara at the end of Dynasty 9 will be presented in §2.3.1 and §2.4.

1.7. Comparison of Scholars' Proposals for the Compositions of Late Dynasty 6 and Dynasties 7–10

As a conclusion to section 1, table 3 compares the present proposal for the compositions of late Dynasty 6 and Dynasties 7–10 to the reconstructions made by selected scholars.¹¹³

	von Beckerath	Papazian	Brovarski	Present proposal
Late Dynasty 6	1 king: Neitiqerty = Nitocris	4 kings: Netjerkara = Neitiqerty Siptah (no Nitocris) Menkara Neferkara Neferkara Neby	1 king: Netjerkara (Im)hotep = Neitiqerty Siptah (no Nitocris)	1 king: Menkara Neitiqerty Siptah = Nitocris
Dynasty 7	Suppressed	9 kings: Djedkara Shemai Neferkara Khendu Merenhor Neferkamin Nikara Neferkara Tereru Neferkahor Neferkara Pepyseneb Neferkamin Anu	10 kings: Menkara Neferkara Pepy III Neferkara Neby Djedkara Shemai Neferkara Khendu Merenhor Neferkamin Nikara Neferkara Tereru Neferkahor with Ity, Isu, Iytjenu, Uny as possible birth names	10 kings: Netjerkara (Im)hotep Neferkara Neferkara Neby Djedkara Shemai Neferkara Khendu Merenhor Neferkamin Nikara Neferkara Tereru Neferkahor with Khuiquer, Isu, Iytjenu, Uny as possible birth names

111. Hayes 1971, 467; Brovarski 2018, 49.

112. Giewekemeyer (2022, 447), on the other hand, interprets the evil either as the capture of Thinis by Merikara's father (mentioned in *Merikara* 72–73) or as a topos characteristic for a period of kingly succession.

113. Von Beckerath 1997, 149, 188; von Beckerath 1999, 64–75; Papazian 2015, 399–405, 416 (table 10.2); Brovarski 2018, 8–10, 15–18, 26, 40, 464.

Dynasty 8	17 kings: Netjerkara Menkara Neferkara Neferkara Neby Djedkara Shemai Neferkara Khendu Merenhor Neferkamin Nikara Neferkara Tereru Neferkahor Neferkara Pepyseneb	4 kings:	6 kings:	6 kings:
	Neferkamin Anu Qakara Ibi Kha[] Neferkaura	Qakara Ibi Kha[] Neferkaura	Neferkara Pepyseneb Neferkamin Anu Qakara Ibi Kha[] Neferkaura = Wadjkara	Neferkara Pepyseneb (Pepy III) Neferkamin Anu Qakara Ibi Kha[] Neferkaura
	Netjerbau Neferkauhor Khuihapy	Netjerbau Neferkauhor Khuihapy/Khuika	Netjerbau Neferkauhor Kapuib(i)(?)	Netjerbau Neferkauhor Khuihapy(?)
	Neferirkara II	an unidentified king (Neferirkara II in Dynasty “?”)	Neferirkara II Pepy	Neferirkara II Pepy IV
	possibly: Sekhemkara, Demedjibtawy Wadjkara, Ity, (Im)hotep, Khui, Isu, Iytjenu	possibly: Sekhemkara, Demedjibtawy Wadjkara, Ity, Imhotep, Hotep, Khui, Isu, Iytjenu		
Dynasty 9	Dynasty 9 = 10 18 kings Khety I as first	(absent)	4 kings: Demedjibtawy Khety Meryibtawy Meryibra Khety Neferkara	4 kings: Demedjibtawy Khety I Meryibtawy Meryibra Khety II Neferkara Khety III Merikara Khety IV
Dynasty 10	Merikara near the end	(absent)	14 kings, including Khuiquer Merikara at the end	14 kings

Table 3: The compositions of late Dynasty 6 and Dynasties 7–10

The survey shows that the present reconstruction is closest to Brovarski's. For Dynasties 6–7, the proposals differ on the identification of Neitiqerty: Neitiqerty Siptah is now identified with both Menkara and Nitocris, as the last ruler of Dynasty 6, and differentiated from Netjerkara (Im)hotep,

the first ruler of Dynasty 7, whereas Brovanski identifies the latter with Neitiqerty (rejecting the existence of Nitocris) and therefore situates Netjerkara (Im)hotep in late Dynasty 6. Moreover, Ity is proposed to be Userkara of Dynasty 6 rather than a ruler of Dynasty 7, and Khuiqer is set in Dynasty 7 instead of Dynasty 10.¹¹⁴ For Dynasties 8–10, the present and Brovanski's reconstructions differ on the identity of Wadjkara and the position of Merikara: Wadjkara is now identified with Unas of Dynasty 5 instead of Neferkaura of Dynasty 8, and Merikara is set at the end of Dynasty 9 instead of the end of Dynasty 10.

Section 2: The Relationships between Late Dynasty 6, Dynasties 7–10, and Early Dynasty 11

Now that the compositions of late Dynasty 6 and Dynasties 7–10 have been studied, the investigation will try to relate these dynasties and reconstruct their historical contexts.

2.1. *The Contemporaneity of Late Dynasty 6 and Dynasty 7*

It has been proposed in §1.4 that the *AKL* (40–41) lists Netjerkara (Imhotep) of Dynasty 7 before Menkara (Neitiqerty/Nitocris) of Dynasty 6. This sheds light on the relationship between these two dynasties. If the first ruler of Dynasty 7 was listed before the last ruler of Dynasty 6, then Dynasty 7 and late Dynasty 6 were likely contemporary. The contemporaneity is also hinted at by the durations of the respective reigns. The six missing years (found in the totals in *TKL* 5/14–17) that have been assigned to Dynasty 7 can be linked with the reign lengths that later traditions record for Nitocris. Though traditional reign lengths are often inaccurate, one can note that the reign length for Nitocris' immediate predecessor—one year in both Manetho (for Menthesuphis) and the *Anagraphai* of (Pseudo)-Eratosthenes (for Echeskosokaras)—is in agreement with the reign length found in *TKL* 5/6—one year and one month (for [Merena II])¹¹⁵—and so the traditional reign lengths for Nitocris could be valid as well. (Pseudo)-Eratosthenes records six years for Nitocris.¹¹⁶ These six years are exactly the same in length as the six years of Dynasty 7, which could indicate that both reigns were contemporary.¹¹⁷ Moreover, Africanus records twelve years for Nitocris,¹¹⁸ and these twelve years could be the sum of two parallel governments: six years for

114. A further difference is the identification of Pepy II's (grand)son named Neferkara: Pepy II's (grand)son will be identified with Neferkara Pepyseneb of Dynasty 8 instead of Neferkara Pepy III of Dynasty 7 (Brovanski's proposal: see n. 127 below).

115. The fact that King Merena II has no contemporary material confirms the brevity of his reign. He might be attested twice before his kingship (Brovanski 2018, 8): (1) as the “eldest King’s son” Nemtyemsaf in a decree of Pepy II (Goedicke 1967, 148–154; Strudwick 2005, 106–107 [no. 23]), and (2) as the “eldest [King’s son]” Nemtyemsaf on a fragment of a false door from South Saqqara (Jéquier 1933, 55).

116. Trans. Waddell 1940, 221 (fr. 22): “The twenty-second ruler of Thebes was Nitōcris, a queen, not a king. Her name means ‘Athēna the victorious,’ and she reigned for 6 years. Anno mundi 3570”; Jacoby 1958, 114 (ll. 10–11, *FGH* 610 F1).

117. Callender (2011a, 307; 2011b, 257) considers the possibility that (Pseudo)-Eratosthenes did not understand the word *wsf* “missing” in the phrase *wsf rnpt 6* on the record that he consulted, and that he assigned these six years to Nitocris. Ryholt (2000, 97–98, followed by Baud 2006, 157) argues that the six missing years found in the *TKL* might represent the average duration of a reign and not an actual period. Even if so, the correspondence between this symbolic duration and Nitocris’ reign length would still hold.

118. Waddell 1940, 54–55 (Fr. 20); Jacoby 1958, 26 (*FGH* 609 F2), 70 (Anlage II, no. 49).

Nitocris + six years for Dynasty 7.¹¹⁹ The double line could also be reflected in the number of kings that Eusebius (in Syncellus) records for Dynasty 7: five kings instead of the actual ten kings. Here, the number may have been halved, as a consequence of the double line.

An additional literary source might speak for the contemporaneity of Nitocris and Dynasty 7. Herodotus (II, 100) states that Nitocris was the sister of the (anonymous) king who preceded her and that, upon the latter's liquidation, she took vengeance on his murderers by killing them, and then committed suicide. Notwithstanding its confusion,¹²⁰ the story might have some historical basis¹²¹ and testify that several people (the "murderers") were in power in Nitocris' days. These reigns would have ended at the same time as that of Nitocris, at her alleged murder and suicide. Such a scenario fits with the present proposal that the reigns of Nitocris of Dynasty 6 and her contemporaries of Dynasty 7 began and ended at the same time.

Further, there was apparently not only contemporaneity between late Dynasty 6 and Dynasty 7, but also between the ten members of Dynasty 7. The fact that Dynasty 7 only ruled six years, a period suspiciously short for ten successive reigns, suggests that these reigns were contemporaneous.¹²² The ten kings of Dynasty 7 seem to have reigned as a decarchy.

The supposed contemporaneity between late Dynasty 6 and Dynasty 7 raises the question of the relationship between these two powers. The ten kings of Dynasty 7 were not necessarily rivals to Nitocris. A cooperation between Dynasties 6 and 7 would explain why Manetho could situate the two dynasties at the same location, Memphis. If Queen Nitocris succeeded Merenra II in late Dynasty 6, she might have leagued with male rulers (*i.e.*, Dynasty 7) to render acceptable the situation of a woman holding power. Former high officials and family members of Pepy II and Merenra II would have received kingly positions, as members of Dynasty 7, for assisting Nitocris in the government.¹²³ Such a background can be traced for Imhotep. Gauthier (1923, 198 [no. 20]), Brovarski (2007, 147; 2018, 16), and Gourdon (2016, 312) suppose that "the hereditary prince and eldest son of the king" Imhotep (Wadi Hammamat M 188)¹²⁴ can be identified with King Imhotep. His eminent position would explain why he could ascend the throne in Dynasty 7. Similarly, King Khuiquer could be a member of a high-ranking family from Abydos (see n. 42 above), and King Shemai may be related to the later vizier Shemai of Dynasty 8.

The beginning of Manetho's Dynasty 8 can be set at the end of this joint government of Dynasties 6 and 7. There was again only one Memphite dynasty ruling. According to the present analysis, Dynasty 8 comprised six kings: Neferkara Pepyseneb (Pepy III), Neferkamin Anu, Qakara Ibi, Neferkaura, Neferkauhor Khuihapy(?), and Neferirkara II Pepy IV. The birth names Pepyseneb and Pepy IV point to a relationship with Pepy I and Pepy II of Dynasty 6. Pepyseneb may even

119. Callender (2011a, 307–308; 2011b, 257 n. 15) proposes that the six years in (Pseudo)-Eratosthenes might apply the double dating system of the cattle counts and represent twelve years, the number found in Africanus.

120. Callender (2011a, 311) characterises Herodotus' passage as "embroidered"; Brovarski (2018, 8 n. 15) as "fanciful."

121. Cf. Callender 2011b, 247: "Whilst the details of this garish tale may rightly be questioned, let us observe that Herodotus heard it from the Egyptian priests who read the information from one of the rolls usually kept in the temple. It appears, therefore, that in the fifth century BC, this information was considered to have some historical legitimacy."

122. To solve the problem of the short period, von Beckerath (1997, 151–152) emends the 6 years into <2>6 years.

123. Brovarski (2018, 11–13) has refuted former proposals that some of the individuals in *AKL* 41–52 were not kings (Goedicke 1962, 247–251) or that these rulers were foreign invaders (Petrie 1924, 119–125).

124. Couyat and Montet 1912, 96–97; Schenkel 1965, 27 (no. 16).

have been a son or grandson of Pepy II.¹²⁵ This is suggested when we reconsider the ownership of the pyramid named Djed-ankh-Neferkara. This name figures on a stela from the tomb of Ankhenespepy IV at Saqqara, the mother or grandmother of the relevant king Neferkara and the wife of Pepy II.¹²⁶ The stela, very fragmentarily, ends Neferkara's birth name with . Jéquier (1933, 54), the excavator of the tomb, proposed to identify Neferkara with Neferka<ra> Khered of *TKL* 5/8, who would be a grandson of Pepy II: he argued that Ankhenespepy IV was likely Neferkara's grandmother (rather than his mother) given the exceptional spelling (instead of) for her title of king's mother. Later scholars preferred to identify Neferkara as a son of Pepy II and as Neferkara Neby (*AKL* 43), whose birth name ends on -y and who comes five reigns after Pepy II (*AKL* 38), whereas twelve reigns (*AKL* 39–50) come in between Pepy II and Neferkara Khered/Pepyseneb (*AKL* 51).¹²⁷ The present reconstruction—with Pepyseneb ascending the throne seven years after Pepy II's death (one year for Merenra II + six years for Nitocris and Dynasty 7)—reinstates Jéquier's proposal. The pyramid Djed-ankh-Neferkara could belong to Neferkara Pepyseneb, with representing the end of the birth name Pepy(seneb). Pepyseneb of Dynasty 8 is, in any case, a more feasible candidate than Neby of Dynasty 7, as it is doubtful that the ephemeral kings of Dynasty 7 built pyramids.¹²⁸ Pepyseneb's descent from Pepy II would confirm that the same royal house reigned in Dynasties 6 and 8. There had only been an interlude, caused by the exceptional situation that a woman was in power in late Dynasty 6, assisted by Dynasty 7.

2.2. Late Dynasty 8 and the First Insurrection of Thebes

2.2.1. *Shemai, Idi, Tjauti-iqer, and User in conflict with Thebes*

Near the end of Dynasty 8, Thebes seems to have attempted to seize power for the first time. This is suggested by studying the careers of the overseers of Upper Egypt.

Shemai is attested as overseer of Upper Egypt in year 4 of Horus Kha[] (in Koptos H), that is, in the last year of King Neferkaura (see §1.5). In the following year, on II Peret 20 in year 1 of Neferkauhor, Shemai became vizier (Koptos I), and Shemai's son Idi became overseer of nomes 1–7 in Upper Egypt (Koptos M, O).

A combination of data shows that the overseer Tjauti-iqer can be dated to year 1 of Neferkauhor as well. The inscriptions M 147, 149, 152 in the Wadi Hammamat¹²⁹ record two expeditions for stone for the overseer of Upper Egypt Tjauti-iqer: a first one on III Shemu 2 in year

125. Callender (2011a, 311–312), similarly, proposes that Neferka Khered of *TKL* 5/8 is a son of Pepy II or Ankhenespepy III or IV, and a half-brother of Merenra II.

126. Jéquier 1933, 53.

127. Von Beckerath 1999, 66 n. 4; Theis 2010, 326–327; Callender 2011a, 302; Papazian 2015, 399 (no. 43); Stasser 2017, 246–247. Roth (2001, 167–168) considers both Neby and Neferka<ra> Khered to be candidates. Gourdon (2016, 306) opts for Neby or “un nouveau [Pépy].” Brovarski (2018, 10) favours Neferkara of *AKL* 42, for whom he proposes the birth name Pepy III.

128. For possible contemporary items for the kings listed in *AKL* 40, 42–50, see von Beckerath 1999, 66–69 (nos. 1, 3–11); Brovarski 2018, 13–15.

129. Couyat and Montet 1912, 90–92; Schenkel 1965, 32–33 (nos. 22–24); Mostafa 1987, 174–175; Mostafa 2014, 109–111.

[1]¹³⁰ (without the king's name: M 152), and a second one on IV Shemu 3 (without a regnal year or king's name: M 147, 149). The three inscriptions can be related to an inscription in Shemai's tomb that records an expedition to the Wadi Hammamat "for the second time," which departed on IV Shemu 2 in year 1 of *'Nfr'-k3(w)-Hrw* and arrived there on "day 3" (block *MŠ*).¹³¹ Mostafa (1987, 177–179; 2014, 111–112) has convincingly argued that this expedition to the Wadi Hammamat "for the second time" (*MŠ*) can be equated with the second expedition of Tjauti-iqer to the Wadi Hammamat (M 147, 149). Not only the date (IV Shemu 3) but also the number of stones correspond: M 147 and 149 mention "two stones," and *MŠ* twice depicts a dragging of stones.¹³² Furthermore, another inscription in Shemai's tomb, on block QM 289¹³³—which joins *MŠ*,¹³⁴—reports that the mission was back at Koptos on I Akhet 4 in year 2 of *Nfr-k3w-'Hrw*.¹³⁵ Thus, the second expedition took place from the last month (IV Shemu) in Neferkauhor's year 1 until the first month (I Akhet) in year 2. Given that the two expeditions were both undertaken for the overseer of Upper Egypt Tjauti-iqer, it follows that the latter was overseer by III Shemu 2 in year 1 of Neferkauhor (the date of the first expedition). More material exists for Tjauti-iqer. An overseer with a similar name is known from two sources: a false door of the overseer of Upper Egypt Tjauti from Khozam (CG 57201),¹³⁶ and an inscription of the overseer of Upper Egypt Tjauti at Gebel Tjauti, at the 'Alamat Tal Road (in nome 5 of Upper Egypt).¹³⁷ Tjauti-iqer of the Wadi Hammamat can obviously be identified with Tjauti of Khozam and Tjauti of Gebel Tjauti.¹³⁸

Still a fourth overseer of Upper Egypt belongs in this context. User is attested as overseer of Upper Egypt on block QM 305 in Shemai's tomb.¹³⁹ This block joins QM 288, which is dated to I Shemu 3 in an anonymous year 1.¹⁴⁰ QM 288+305 reports the arrival of a sarcophagus from Elephantine at Koptos. This Elephantine sarcophagus is also found in Text A in Shemai's tomb,¹⁴¹ which mentions King Nefer[ir]kara II Pepy (see §1.5), the last king of Dynasty 8. Thus, year 1 on

130. Schenkel (1965, 32 and n. b) and Mostafa (1987, 174; 2014, 109) propose year 1. The reading is questioned by Brovarski 2018, 23.

131. Mostafa 1987, 177; Strudwick 2005, 346 (no. 249, "Date in the Pillared Hall"); Mostafa 2014, 84 (fig. 14), 88–90, 304 (pl. xix).

132. Brovarski (2018, 22–23), however, doubts the equation of the expedition found in M 147, 149 with the one found in *MŠ*.

133. Mostafa 1987, 171 n. 1; Mostafa 2014, 97 (fig. 15), 99, 306–307 (pls. xxib, xxii).

134. Mostafa 2014, 82 (fig. 13), 309 (pl. xxiv).

135. Mostafa (2014, 115–116) concludes that the expedition took about one month and proposes nineteen days (reported in *MŠ*, col. 6) for cutting and loading the stone (IV Shemu 3–22), followed by seventeen days of transport (IV Shemu 22 – I Akhet 4, including the five epagomenal days).

136. Fischer 1964, 47–48 (no. 14); Mostafa 2014, 201.

137. Darnell and Darnell 1997, 243–246; Darnell 2002, 30–37 (no. 6); Mostafa 2014, 200–201. For the locations, see the map in Darnell 2002, 4 (fig. 1a).

138. Brovarski 2013, 104; Mostafa 2014, 133–136, 179, 200–204; Brovarski 2018, 30–31, 33. Cf. Kanawati 1980, 118; Mostafa 1987, 180–181: Tjauti of Khozam is identified with Tjauti-iqer of the Wadi Hammamat. Brovarski (2013, 104; 2018, 33) restores the name at Gebel Tjauti as *T3w3t-i[qr]*. Darnell (2002, 34 and n. 136) identifies Tjauti of Khozam with Tjauti of Gebel Tjauti, but not with Tjauti-iqer of the Wadi Hammamat.

139. Mostafa 2014, 152–153.

140. Mostafa 2005, 161–162, 192–193 (pls. i–ii); Mostafa 2014, 142 (fig. 20a), 144, 311–312 (pls. xxvi–xxvii).

141. Mostafa 2005, 172–173, 194–195 (pls. iii–iv); Mostafa 2014, 156 (fig. 21), 158.

QM 288 likely belongs to that king. Mostafa (2014, 185) therefore sets the overseer User at the close of Dynasty 8.

The sequence Shemai (overseer) → Shemai (vizier) and Idi (overseer) → Tjauti-iqer (overseer) → User (overseer) seems established, but it faces the difficulty that Idi was at first “overseer of Upper Egypt” (on II Peret 20 in year 1 of Neferkauhor), while about five months later (in III–IV Shemu in year 1 of Neferkauhor) only “overseer of cattle,” “sealer of the King of Lower Egypt,” “sole companion,” “inspector of priests,” “privy to the secret of the god’s treasure” (Wadi Hammamat M 149, 152). To explain Idi’s demotion, Mostafa (1987, 178–182; 2005, 171 n. 104; 2014, 131–133) proposes that Shemai and his son Idi fell into disgrace in the second half of year 1 of Neferkauhor, who promoted Tjauti-iqer in their stead. One could add the possibility that the change in positions resulted from Shemai’s death.

Evidence that Shemai was dead by the months of III–IV Shemu in year 1 of Neferkauhor comes from the Wadi Hammamat. There, an (undated) inscription, M 150,¹⁴² is situated immediately below M 149 (dated to IV Shemu 3), the inscription of Idi during his second mission for the overseer Tjauti-iqer.¹⁴³ The close connection between M 149 and M 150¹⁴⁴ suggests that both inscriptions were made at about the same time.¹⁴⁵ M 150 was issued for the “sealer of the King of Lower Egypt,” “sole companion,” “lector priest,” “senior overseer of scribes” Shemai, asking the “living ones” to recite offerings on his behalf. This request, together with the connection with M 149, reveals that Shemai was dead by the month of IV Shemu in year 1 of Neferkauhor, the time of the second expedition. He apparently died before III Shemu, when Tjauti-iqer is first attested as overseer. Shemai had been replaced by Tjauti-iqer (without the title of vizier), and Idi had become the latter’s subordinate (after having been Shemai’s subordinate).¹⁴⁶

Shemai died in a context of troubles. An inscription in Shemai’s tomb (Text B)¹⁴⁷ reports that damage was done to Shemai’s tomb and its statues, and that his son Idi took vengeance on his father’s enemies. These tensions seem to have occurred shortly after Shemai’s appointment as vizier: on the basis of Idi’s titles, Mostafa (1987, 171–172, 183 [table 1]; 2014, 130–131) concludes that Text B comes between Koptos I, O, M, Q (dated to II Peret 20 in year 1 of Neferkauhor, at Shemai’s appointment as vizier) and Koptos R (in the days of Demedjibtawy [Khety I]). Text B further informs us that the governors of nomes 1–7 in Upper Egypt were involved in these troubles. Line 1 reads *sʒt wrw htyw spʒwt Hnw[t?]*. This has been translated as “that which caused talking of the great ones who are in the nomes of Upper Egypt” (a causative of *wʒ*)¹⁴⁸ or “that which the great ones...dislike” (the verb *sʒ*).¹⁴⁹ *Hnw[t?]* apparently stands for *Hnw-*

142. Couyat and Montet 1912, 91–92; Schenkel 1965, 34 (no. 25); Shubert 2007, 98 (FIP.37).

143. See the photograph in Couyat and Montet 1912, pl. xxxv (nos. 149–150).

144. Cf. Couyat and Montet 1912, 91: “La technique est à peu près la même, cependant les signes sont un peu plus réguliers [in M 150].”

145. Farout (1994, 160) makes M 150 part of the expeditions reported in M 147, 149, 152.

146. Gourdon (2016, 314–315), on the contrary, argues on the basis of M 150 that Tjauti-iqer preceded Shemai because Shemai’s titles in M 150 (*i.e.*, in the days of the overseer Tjauti-iqer) are lesser than his titles in the Koptos decrees. However, it has been demonstrated above that these Koptos decrees precede the inscriptions in the Wadi Hammamat.

147. Mostafa 1987, 169–170, pl. i; Mostafa 2014, 117–118, 119 (fig. 19), 310 (pl. xxv).

148. Mostafa 1987, 169; Mostafa 2014, 118.

149. Fischer 1991, 26.

Nhn, a term that probably denotes nomes 1–7 of Upper Egypt.¹⁵⁰ Hence, the nomarchs of nomes 1–7 seem to have been agitated. Moreover, like Shemai, Tjauti-iqer had to face nomarchal tension. In the Gebel Tjauti inscription, he reports that “the ruler (*hk3*) of another nome” had closed the crossing of the gebel and that a battle ensued. Thus, it seems that Shemai died in a conflict with a nomarch and that Tjauti-iqer subsequently encountered that nomarch as well.¹⁵¹

Given the location of Gebel Tjauti, in nome 5 of Upper Egypt, the relevant nomarch likely governed Thebes, nome 4. Conflict with Thebes is also hinted at by more material for Tjauti and his successor User. For both Tjauti (CG 57201) and User (CG 1442),¹⁵² a false door was found at Khozam. Fischer (1964, 42) and Kanawati (1992, 168) suppose that in Tjauti’s and User’s days the residence of the South had moved to Khozam, probably because of troubles with Thebes. Khozam is situated c. 25 km to the south of Koptos, close to the border of the Theban nome. The move ensured a close supervision of the area. The stela of Khenemsu (Chicago OIM 12105, from Naqada)¹⁵³ might testify to this tension between Khozam and Thebes: it reports the destruction and reconstruction of *Iw-šnšn* (probably Khozam),¹⁵⁴ and this destruction may have been at the hands of the Thebans.¹⁵⁵ This would have happened in the days of Tjauti and User, as the latter are the sole overseers attested at Khozam. Since User comes after Tjauti and since User could still reside at Khozam, the town would have been destroyed in User’s days.

The present study sets Tjauti and User in the reigns of Neferkauhor and Neferirkara II, the last two kings of Dynasty 8. The proposal that a nomarch was residing at Thebes in late Dynasty 8 seems possible according to the material evidence. The Theban tomb TT186 of the nomarch Ihy, which has been dated to late Dynasty 6,¹⁵⁶ shows that Thebes was a seat of power by the time of the late Old Kingdom.¹⁵⁷ Fischer (1964, 42–43) and Brovarski (2018, 30–32), on the other hand, date User and Tjauti to the Heracleopolitan period because User and Tjauti’s situation would resemble that of Ankhtify, a nomarch in Heracleopolitan times who had to face an alliance between Koptos and Thebes.¹⁵⁸ User and Tjauti would have resided at Khozam to separate Koptos from Thebes. Mostafa (2014, 204–206), similarly, sets User in the days of Ankhtify, and Tjauti in the time of the supposedly subsequent destruction of Khozam. However, the residence at Khozam suggests that a conflict with Thebes alone is at issue, and not with Koptos as well. It is unlikely that User and Tjauti would have opted for a location where they were surrounded by two enemies.¹⁵⁹ The present setting of User and Tjauti in late Dynasty 8, at a time when only Thebes was posing problems, seems more appropriate. Moreover, Tjauti can hardly be dated as late as Dynasties 9–10 given that

150. Fischer 1968, 67–68; Gabra 1976, 49–50 n. k; Mostafa 2014, 120–121 n. c.

151. Mostafa (2014, 133, 203 n. 203), on the other hand, identifies Shemai’s main rival with Tjauti.

152. Fischer 1964, 43–47 (no. 13), pl. 13; Mostafa 2014, 180–181.

153. Fischer 1964, 64–65 (no. 17); Schenkel 1965, 31–32 (no. 21).

154. Fischer 1964, 65; Gomaà 1980, 54; Gomaà 1986, 160–161; Mostafa 2014, 17–19.

155. Fischer 1964, 61–62; Mostafa 2014, 204–206. Rodríguez-Lázaro (1992–1994, 43), on the contrary, proposes that *Iw-šnšn* was destroyed by descendants of Shemai and Idi, who were opposing Tjauti.

156. Saleh 1977, 23–26; Fischer 1979, 30–31; cf. Brovarski 2013, 99.

157. Kubisch 2000, 262.

158. Pitkin (2023, 28, 61), likewise, sets User and Tjauti in the Heracleopolitan period. For a survey of the time settings that scholars propose for User and Tjauti, see Mostafa 2014, 181–185, 201–204.

159. Cf. Kanawati 1980, 111–112: “[Fischer’s] reconstruction of the events does not take into account the fact that *Wsr* and after him *T3wtj* could not have been placed at Khozam, right between the two allies, unless their coalition had already been broken and at least nome 5 regained.”

he governed during the reign of Neferkauhor (M 147, 149, with *MŠ*), that is, before User (during the reign of Neferirkara II: QM 288+305, with Text A). Mostafa (2014, 203–204) has to suppose that Tjauti was removed from his position by Neferirkara II and later reinstated by the Heracleopolitans, in order to explain Tjauti's setting in Dynasties 9–10. The present date for Tjauti's conflict with Thebes, in Neferkauhor's days, removes the need for such a reinstatement. Tjauti's government ended for good with the appointment of User.

The revolt of the Theban nomarch was the first emergence of Thebes, but the insurrection failed: Idi could take vengeance on Shemai's enemies. Moreover, the transport of the sarcophagus from Elephantine to Koptos in Neferirkara II's and User's days (Text A and QM 288+305) shows that there were no opponents in the region south of Koptos at that time.¹⁶⁰ The stela of Fegu (Strasbourg 344, from Naqada),¹⁶¹ similarly, reports that Fegu was sent by the overseer of priests User on all kinds of missions and could return safely. These missions were probably military operations in the days of the overseer of Upper Egypt User.¹⁶² Thus, by the time of Neferirkara II and User, travelling was safe, and the Theban rebellion seems to have been suppressed. This suppression must have come after the destruction of Khozam, which likely happened in User's days (see two paragraphs above). The troubles apparently continued until User's time and were subdued during his government. The fact that User is mentioned at Koptos on QM 288+305 might imply that he returned there after the conflict had ended and Khozam had been destroyed.

In this context of re-established control of the South, Idi seems to have been promoted to vizier. Idi had been appointed overseer of Upper Egypt on II Peret 20 in year 1 of Neferkauhor (Koptos M, O), but he had lost that position by the end of year 1 of Neferkauhor (M 149, 152). In Koptos R,¹⁶³ in the time of Demedjibtawy (Khety I), Idi is called vizier. It is the sole attestation for Idi's vizierate. Hence, Idi was probably appointed vizier by the king who ruled between Neferkauhor and Khety I, that is, by Neferirkara II.¹⁶⁴

2.2.2. *The First Theban Ruler = The Nomarch Intef the Elder, Son of Iku(i)*

One person should still be identified: the Theban nomarch whom the overseers of Upper Egypt encountered. He could be the Intef who was *hry-tp c3 n W3st* “great overlord of the Theban (nome)” (CG 20009).¹⁶⁵ Intef was also *mh-ib n nswt m r3-c3 g3w h3st rsy* (“trustee of the King at the narrow doorway of the desert of the South,” CG 20009). This title is similar to a title of Tjauti, *mh-ib n nswt m r3-c3 h3st Šm* (“trustee of the King at the doorway of the desert of Upper Egypt,” CG 57201).¹⁶⁶ The similarity suggests that Intef and Tjauti contested for the control of the same

160. Mostafa 2005, 170, 189; Mostafa 2014, 152, 154, 175.

161. Fischer 1964, 62–64 (no. 16); Schenkel 1965, 201–202 (no. 308); Lichtheim 1988, 35–36 (no. 14).

162. Kanawati 1992, 168. Fischer (1964, 60, followed by Mostafa 2014, 199, 210 n. 249) and Pitkin (2023, 95–97), likewise, assume that the overseer of priests User (on Strasbourg 344) is the same person as the overseer of Upper Egypt User (on CG 1442).

163. Schenkel 1965, 23–24 (no. 12); Goedicke 1967, 214–225; Strudwick 2005, 123–124 (no. 39).

164. Brovarski 2013, 101; Brovarski 2018, 21. Mostafa (2014, 130) dates the promotion to the time of Demedjibtawy, whom she identifies with Neferirkara II instead of with Khety I (see n. 90 above).

165. Schenkel 1965, 64–65 (no. 43); Lichtheim 1988, 36–37 (no. 15); Postel 2004, 300–301 (no. 1); Mostafa 2014, 193–194. The tomb of the nomarch Intef has not yet been identified, but it should be located in western Thebes, given that CG 20009 was found there: Gomaà 1980, 128 and n. 20.

166. On the meaning of these titles, see Darnell and Darnell 1997, 247–248 and nn. 14–16; Darnell 2002, 35 and nn. 141–143; Postel 2004, 8 and n. 33.

passage,¹⁶⁷ which would make Intef and Tjauti contemporaries.¹⁶⁸ Moreover, the iconography and text of CG 20009 express some royal claims,¹⁶⁹ which shows that Intef was an important governor. This agrees with the proposal that he tried to extend Thebes' power, thus coming into conflict with the overseers of Upper Egypt. Scholars have set Intef of CG 20009 in the time of the transition from Dynasty 6 to Dynasty 8,¹⁷⁰ or in the context of the end of Dynasty 8,¹⁷¹ Dynasty 9,¹⁷² or a Heracleopolitan reign,¹⁷³ mainly on the basis of the dates that they propose for Ankhtify. This study, however, will separate Intef of CG 20009 from Ankhtify in time and will situate Ankhtify, a Heracleopolitan ally, after Intef (see §2.3.1 and §2.4). Hence, the nomarch Intef may have governed before the Heracleopolitan period, in late Dynasty 8.

Intef of CG 20009 might be mentioned in non-contemporary sources as well. Later material refers back to a governor named In/Intef-^c 3:¹⁷⁴

- MMA 14.2.7 (the stela of Maaty, probably dating to the time of Intef III or the early reign of Mentuhotep II,¹⁷⁵ from el-Tarif,¹⁷⁶ col. 5):¹⁷⁷ “In-^c 3, born of Iku.”
- CG 42005 = JdE 33797 (a statue made by Senusret I, from Karnak, l. 3):¹⁷⁸ “the hereditary prince Intef-^c 3, born of Iku.”
- KKL 2/5 (in the days of Thutmose III): “the hereditary prince [] In[tef-^c 3].”

This Intef was called ^c 3 “the Elder” by later generations because he was the first ruler named Intef. Mentuhotep I is similarly called Mentuhotep-^c 3 on the statue Aswan 1357.¹⁷⁹ CG 42005 reveals that Intef-^c 3 enjoyed a mortuary cult at Karnak in the days of Senusret I, as an ancestor and possibly as the founder of the cult of Amun at Thebes (given that Intef-^c 3 is called “honoured by Amun, Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands”).¹⁸⁰ The KKL, engraved by Thutmose III at Karnak,

167. Cf. Darnell and Darnell 1997, 249; Darnell 2002, 35–36.

168. Darnell and Darnell (1997, 251, 253) and Darnell (2002, 39), followed by Pitkin (2023, 32), identify the anonymous nomarch with King Intef I because another inscription, a few yards away from the Gebel Tjauti inscription, reads “the assault troops of the son of Ra Intef” (Darnell and Darnell 1997, 251–253; Darnell 2002, 38–46 [no. 7]), who would be King Intef I. This is doubted by Postel (2004, 55, 317 [no. 57] and n. 1317), given that Intef I is never found as king in sources contemporary with his reign (see §2.3.2). Moreover, Tjauti encountered a nomarch, not a king. Mostafa (2014, 212–213) separates the two inscriptions and argues that the inscription with the assault troops might belong to Intef I, Intef II, or Intef III, but she retains the identification of the anonymous nomarch with (the future) Intef I.

169. Morenz 2003.

170. Kanawati 1992, 162.

171. Martin-Pardey 1976, 209 n. 1; Gomaà 1980, 128, 140, 146; Mostafa 2014, 195.

172. Brovarski 2018, 33.

173. Fischer 1968, 130; Darnell and Darnell 1997, 248 and n. 21; Darnell 2002, 35 and n. 149.

174. Intef’s mother Iku might also be attested on CG 20506 (Schenkel 1965, 299–300 [no. 501]), as “the sole royal ornament Iku”: Brovarski 2018, 115 n. 96.

175. Postel 2004, 15 and n. 76.

176. Winlock 1915, 15 (no. 2).

177. Schenkel 1965, 110–111 (no. 79); Postel 2004, 302 (no. 6).

178. Legrain 1900; Hirsch 2004, 236 (no. 123); Postel 2004, 302 (no. 7).

179. For a presentation of Aswan 1357, see §2.3.3. On the meaning “the Elder” for ^c 3 in the cases of Intef-^c 3, son of Iku(i), and Mentuhotep-^c 3, see Postel 2001, 74; Postel 2004, 85.

180. Hirsch 2004, 46; Giewekemeyer 2022, 285 (no. 4), 336–338.

lists the statues of the ancestors who were venerated at Thebes since the time of Senusret I, including Intef-^cȝ.¹⁸¹

Intef the Elder never received kingly honours: CG 42005 depicts him in the attitude of a scribe, without regalia. This shows that he is a person different from Sehertawy Intef I, who was venerated as a king (see §2.3.2).¹⁸² Moreover, *KKL* clearly distinguishes “the hereditary prince [] In[tef-^cȝ]” (2/5) from “[Se]ȝ[ertawy] In[tef]” (2/3).¹⁸³ A feasible candidate for Intef the Elder is the nomarch Intef of CG 20009: the latter’s funerary stela shows that he died as a nomarch, and so he never became a king. In addition, Intef bears the title *iry-p^ct* on CG 20009, just as Intef-^cȝ does on CG 42005 and in *KKL* 2/5 (he appears without titles on MMA 14.2.7).¹⁸⁴

2.3. *Dynasty 9 and the Second Insurrection of Thebes*

2.3.1. *Abihu, Ankhtify, and Neferkara Khety III in conflict with Thebes*

Intef the Elder governed in the time of late Dynasty 8. The Memphite Dynasty 8 ended shortly after his insurrection and was succeeded by the Heracleopolitan Dynasty 9. With the end of Dynasty 8, the control of the South moved to the Heracleopolitans. The first Heracleopolitan king exercised authority in the South: Demedjibtawy (Khety I) gave orders to protect the funerary foundations of the vizier Idi at Koptos (according to Koptos R).¹⁸⁵

The residence of the South returned to Abydos during Dynasty 9.¹⁸⁶ This is clear from inscriptions in the tomb of Ankhtify at Mo‘alla, c. 35 km south of Luxor.¹⁸⁷ One inscription records that Ankhtify invited “the council of the overseer of Upper Egypt, which resides in the Thinite nome” to his home.¹⁸⁸ Another inscription contains a cartouche with the name Kanefera,¹⁸⁹ which probably stands for Neferkara.¹⁹⁰ Some scholars suppose that Abydos was no longer a seat of administration after Dynasty 6 and therefore situate Ankhtify in the days of Dynasty 6, with Kanefera being Neferkara Pepy II.¹⁹¹ On the basis of other criteria (iconography, palaeography, and philology), most scholars date Ankhtify to the Heracleopolitan period, with Kanefera being

181. Postel 2004, 16; Grimal 2010.

182. Gestermann 1987, 26; Giewekemeyer 2022, 111 n. 144.

183. The *KKL* mentions In[tef-^cȝ] without a cartouche (2/5), and In[tef] (I) within a cartouche (2/3).

184. Von Beckerath (1975, 300) and Mostafa (2014, 196–197) identify Intef-^cȝ, son of Iku(i), with Intef of CG 20009, while Gomaà (1980, 143–144) identifies him with King Intef I.

185. Brovarski (2013, 101–102; 2018, 22) links this decree with the damage that Shemai’s tomb had suffered (reported in Text B at Kom el-Koffar).

186. Barta 1981, 29: “Die Herakleopoliten hätten danach also den Amtssitz des Vorstehers von Oberägypten von Koptos nach Thinis zurückverlegt, nämlich dorthin, wo er sich bei Einrichtung des Amtes in der 5. Dynastie bereits befunden hatte.”

187. Ankhtify resided at Hefat (*Hȝȝt*); Mo‘alla was its necropolis. The exact location of Hefat is debated: Manassa 2009, 76–77.

188. Vandier 1950, 185–198 (inscription 5, II.δ.1); Schenkel 1965, 47–49 (37.B–C); Lichtheim 1988, 26 (7.5).

189. Vandier 1950, 263 (inscription 16, §18).

190. A similar metathesis of the element *kȝ* is attested for Merykara, whose name is written Kameryra in *Siut* IV/3, 9, 22: Schenkel 1962, 150 (§60.d).

191. Von Beckerath 1962, 147; Kanawati 1980, 105–107; cf. Kanawati 1992, 159, 161–162.

Neferkara of *TKL 5/20*.¹⁹² If so, Abydos had regained its status of residence by the time of the third Heracleopolitan king. The return to Abydos may have occurred as early as the days of Demedjibtawy: Koptos no longer appears as a residence in Koptos R.¹⁹³

During Dynasty 9, troubles between Heracleopolis and the South emerged. Ankhtify reports that Koptos and Thebes joined forces and were encountered by him near Armant.¹⁹⁴ The recent return of the seat of the South from Koptos to Abydos likely made Koptos join Thebes in its revolt against Heracleopolis.¹⁹⁵ The coalition caused a division of the South:

- Nomes 1–3 were under the control of Ankhtify, loyal to Heracleopolis.¹⁹⁶
- Nomes 4–5 were opposing Heracleopolis.
- Nomes 6–8 were under the control of Abihu, loyal to Heracleopolis. Abihu was the “true overseer of Upper Egypt, chancellor of the King of Lower Egypt, sole companion, great overlord of the Thinite, Denderite, and Diospolite nomes” (*JdE 38551*, right jambs cols. 3–4, trans. Fischer 1968, 205).

Inscriptions in Ankhtify’s tomb inform us that Ankhtify provided grain for nomes 1–3, nome 6, and as far north as nome 8.¹⁹⁷ Kanawati (1992, 159–160) therefore concludes that Ankhtify and Abihu were allies. Abihu’s involvement in Ankhtify’s conflict with Koptos and Thebes is further suggested by Abihu’s residence. Fischer (1968, 129, 202 and n. 801) proposes that Abihu first resided in the Thinite nome, his main nome, and later moved to Dendera (in nome 6), where he was buried.¹⁹⁸ The change in residence would point to a particular situation: tension with Koptos and Thebes made Abihu move from Abydos to Dendera, to reside closer to his opponents.¹⁹⁹ The coalition of Dendera and Thinis against Koptos and Thebes might also be alluded to on an architrave of Hornakht (*JdE 46048*, from Dendera), which mentions a hostility of Dendera “with” Thinis.²⁰⁰ Given that the preposition *hn^c* (“together with”) cannot express a conflict of Dendera

192. Vandier 1950, 40; Hayes 1971, 465; Barta 1981, 29; Spaniel 1984, 89; Lorton 1987, 23, 26; Seidlmayer 1997, 83; Demidchik 2003, 35; Seidlmayer 2006, 165; Mostafa 2014, 197, 210 (no. 7); Brovarski 2018, 28; Giewekemeyer 2022, 107–108; Pitkin 2023, 27–28. Schenkel (1962, 150–151 [§60.e]) considers both Pepy II and Neferkara of *TKL 5/20* to be candidates.

193. Cf. Hayes 1946, 23: “Decree (*r*), which deals not at all with the interests of the Pharaoh, but only with the extensive funerary foundations of his Coptite vizier, is [...] an astounding document.”

194. Vandier 1950, 198–202 (inscription 6, II.δ.4–ζ.2); Schenkel 1965, 49 (37.D).

195. Fischer (1964, 42; cf. Hayes 1971, 473–474) supposes that Koptos was the main instigator of the revolt: “[...] the Coptites allied themselves with, and probably instigated, the Theban revolt, and apparently did so because, as beneficiaries of the last Memphite kings, they resented the upstart Heracleopolitans.”

196. Ankhtify refers to the three nomes in inscriptions 3 (I.β.3) and 12 (V.β.1) in his tomb: Vandier 1950, 171–179, 239–242; Schenkel 1965, 46 (37.A), 53 (37.G).

197. Vandier 1950, 220–231 (inscription 10, IV.15), 239–242 (inscription 12, V.β.2); Schenkel 1965, 53–55 (37.G and I).

198. The fact that the name Abihu is otherwise unknown at Dendera, whereas it is found at Abydos and Thinis, speaks in favour of Thinite origins for Abihu: Fischer 1968, 202 and n. 802; Brovarski 2013, 104–105 and n. 134.

199. Fischer 1968, 202–203: “In the case of *c b-ḥhw*, on the other hand, the move may have been motivated by his own desire, as effective Overseer of Upper Egypt, to keep closer surveillance over the discord that probably had been brewing in Coptos and Thebes since the end of the Eighth Dynasty. Such an action would doubtless have been sanctioned by the Heracleopolitan rulers, and may have been ordered by them”; Kanawati 1992, 153.

200. Abdalla 1993, 249–253; Franke 2006, 167–172; Musacchio 2006, 75–77.

“against” Thinis, it follows that Dendera and Thinis were engaged together in a conflict, probably against Koptos and Thebes.²⁰¹

The troops of Koptos and Thebes seem to have advanced northwards and not southwards: Ankhtify reports that he defeated the Koptites and Thebans in the region immediately south of Thebes, and that the Thebans then avoided combat with him.²⁰² The Koptites and Thebans avoided fighting in the south and focused on the north, Abihu’s dominion (nomes 6–8), and were apparently successful. The loss of Dendera to the Koptites and Thebans might be reflected in the new title that Gebelein received in about that time. Gebelein is attested as *Iwn(w)t*, a second Dendera, beginning from the First Intermediate Period.²⁰³ The first attestations are found in an inscription of Ankhtify²⁰⁴ and one of his (likely) contemporaries, Iti (Stela CG 20001, col. 7),²⁰⁵ with Gebelein as *Iwni* in both cases. Gebelein belonged to Ankhtify’s domain. The loss of access to Dendera may have caused the refoundation of Gebelein as a second Dendera.

The Koptite and Theban assault apparently made Neferkara—the Heracleopolitan king contemporary with Ankhtify (see n. 192 above)—react. A king named Neferkara is attested in the region of Abydos, Abihu’s former territory. At Sheikh Farag, a cemetery of Naga ed-Deir, near Abydos, a jar stand that mentions King Neferkara has been found (Boston MFA 13.3791),²⁰⁶ and this Neferkara can likely be identified with the third king of Dynasty 9.²⁰⁷ Moreover, a jar lid with the cartouche of a king named Neferkara scratched on it (MFA 13.3876) was found at Sheikh Farag as well and could belong to the same king. The two attestations may testify to the Heracleopolitan king’s presence in the region.

Neferkara’s intervention in the Thinite region can possibly be related to a passage in a later source, the *Instruction for Merikara*. According to this composition, Merikara’s father captured Thinis (*Merikara* 72–73). Contemporary material may confirm that this site was taken by Merikara’s father. Given that Khety II of Asyut was contemporary with King Merikara (*Siut* IV/3, 9, 22), Iti-ibi, the father of Khety II (*Siut* IV/19, 23),²⁰⁸ was presumably a contemporary of Merikara’s father.²⁰⁹ According to an inscription in Iti-ibi’s tomb, Iti-ibi repelled an attack by the southern nomes and then sailed, after another successful repulse, against Upper Egyptian enemies (*Siut* III/16–37).²¹⁰ Hayes (1971, 466–467) and Gomaà (1980, 149–150) identify these campaigns with the attack on Thinis by Merikara’s father.²¹¹ The fact that Iti-ibi’s autobiography in *Siut* III was left incomplete and then hidden from view by a layer of plaster overwritten with a politically neutral inscription²¹² might confirm that Iti-ibi was involved in the capture of Thinis: the conquest

201. Musacchio 2006, 82–83 (a conflict of Dendera and Thinis against Thebes).

202. Vandier 1950, 198–206 (inscriptions 6–7, II.8.4–0.3); Schenkel 1965, 49–50 (37.D–E).

203. Gomaà 1986, 78–80; Postel 2004, 143; Morenz 2010, 108–109, 114–115.

204. Vandier 1950, 242–251 (inscription 13, VI.a.5, identifying *Iwni* with Armant); Schenkel 1965, 55 (37.J, Armant).

205. Vandier 1934 (Armant); Schenkel 1965, 57–58 (no. 39, Armant); Lichtheim 1988, 31–32 (no. 10, Armant); Morenz 2010, 305–310 (Gebelein).

206. Simpson 1981.

207. Simpson 1981, 175; Brovarski 2018, 28.

208. Brunner 1937, 27–35; Schenkel 1965, 86–89 (no. 64); El-Khadragy 2008, 221–226.

209. Franke 1987, 52; Brovarski 2018, 47.

210. Brunner 1937, 17–26; Schenkel 1965, 75–81 (no. 60).

211. Cf. Brovarski 2018, 47 n. 414: “It is not entirely certain that *It.(i)-ib.(i)* led the Heracleopolitan army that captured Thinis, although the assumption is frequently made.”

212. Kahl 2007, 76.

of Thinis was later perceived as sacrilegious (*Merikara* 119–123) and thus had to be removed from memory.²¹³

If the Heracleopolitan capture of Thinis by Merikara's father can be equated with Neferkara's intervention in the South, it would follow that Merikara's father is Neferkara (Khety III) of *TKL* 5/20, as has been proposed in §1.6.4. The exceptional addition of a patronym ("[son of] Neferkara") for the sixth Heracleopolitan king, in *TKL* 5/23—referring back to Neferkara of *TKL* 5/20,—expresses Neferkara's fame and could confirm that Neferkara was the king of the southern campaign, which, according to Iti-ibi's account, had been successful.

Following Neferkara's devastating campaign against Thinis, Asyut seems to have become the seat of the great overlord of Upper Egypt (see §2.3.2), while Ankhtify kept his position in the most southern nomes.

2.3.2. *The Second Theban Ruler = The Great Overlord of Upper Egypt Intef = King Sehertawy Intef I*

As with the first Theban insurrection, we might attempt to identify the Theban ruler who rebelled at the second insurrection. It is still debated whether there were one or more great overlords with the name Intef.²¹⁴ The four contemporary sources that have been found for a great overlord named Intef²¹⁵ are sometimes assigned to two individuals:²¹⁶

- 1) CG 20009²¹⁷ and Florence 6380:²¹⁸ CG 20009 belongs to "the great overlord of the Theban (nome)...Intef"; Florence 6380 records the titles *iry-p^ct*, *h³ty-^c*, and *imy-r³ hm(w)-ntr* for Intef, which are also found on CG 20009.
- 2) RT 11/5/18/7²¹⁹ and Strasbourg 345 + Florence 7595:²²⁰ both stelae mention "the great overlord of Upper Egypt Intef."

Given that the first great overlord has been identified with the first Theban rebel, Intef the Elder (see §2.2.2), the second great overlord might be concerned here. RT 11/5/18/7 comes from Dendera and mentions a commission for the "great overlord of Upper Egypt" Intef. Thus, Dendera recognised this second overlord, whereas Abihu had formerly been the "true overseer of Upper

213. Iti-ibi's victory at Thinis later lost significance, when Thebes conquered Thinis; however, given that other Heracleopolitan victories were not removed at Asyut, the change of fortune is not likely to be the reason for the autobiography's concealment. Cf. Giewekemeyer 2022, 445: "die Existenz einer unzerstörten Kampfesschilderung im Grab Chetis (II.) von Assiut (Siut IV), in der auch dessen Dienstherr, König Merikare, erwähnt wird und aus der ersichtlich ist, dass herakleopolitanische Siegesberichte keineswegs konsequent getilgt wurden."

214. For a summary of the proposed identifications of the great overlord/s, see Schneider 2002, 74–75; Postel 2004, 12–15.

215. Postel 2004, 300–301 (nos. 1–4). Postel (2004, 14, 302 n. 1294) argues that the *iry-p^ct In-*it.f*{-i}* mentioned on a fragment of a stela or lintel from Tôd (Tôd 1589 = SA 72: Postel 2004, 302 [no. 5]) is a private individual of the First Intermediate Period or the early Middle Kingdom rather than a nomarch.

216. Von Beckerath (1975, 300; 1999, 76 [no. 2] and n. 4), Gomaà (1980, 141–144), Gundlach (1999, 28, 31), and Mostafa (2014, 211–212) identify Intef of CG 20009 with a mere nomarch; and Intef of RT 11/5/18/7 and Strasbourg 345 + Florence 7595 with (the future) king Intef I. Fischer (1968, 203 and n. 805) likewise differentiates Intef of CG 20009 from Intef of RT 11/5/18/7. Gestermann (1987, 24) suggests that RT 11/5/18/7 and Strasbourg 345 + Florence 7595 may testify to a later stage in the career of Intef of CG 20009, but CG 20009 is probably a funerary stela.

217. Schenkel 1965, 64–65 (no. 43); Lichtheim 1988, 36–37 (no. 15); Postel 2004, 300–301 (no. 1); Mostafa 2014, 193–194.

218. Schenkel 1965, 65–66 (no. 45); Postel 2004, 301 (no. 3).

219. Schenkel 1965, 66 (no. 46); Fischer 1968, 129 n. 571; Postel 2004, 301 (no. 4).

220. Schenkel 1965, 65 (no. 44); Fischer 1996, 83–88, 90; Postel 2004, 301 (no. 2); Morenz 2010, 510.

Egypt” and “great overlord of the Thinite, Denderite, and Diospolite nomes” (JdE 38551, right jams cols. 3–4). This change in allegiance suggests that Intef took Dendera from Abihu. The Theban ruler who took Abihu’s territory at the second insurrection would thus be the great overlord of Upper Egypt Intef.

Following his annexation of Dendera, this great overlord Intef may have proclaimed himself king. RT 11/5/18/7 reports that its owner “performed a commission [for the Hereditary Prince] and Great Overlord of Upper Egypt *In-īt.f*” and for(?) the Priest (or Priestess?) of Hathor Mistress of Dendera” (trans. Fischer 1968, 129 n. 571).²²¹ This shows the importance of Hathor’s cult for Intef. As lord of Dendera, Intef supervised her cult and became the “son of Hathor,” Horus.²²² This granted Intef to call himself Horus Sehertawy.²²³ Similarly, the solar cult of Ra at Thebes legitimised his use of the title *sȝ Rȝ*.²²⁴ Intef I’s accession was a true novelty. It was the first time in Egyptian history that a royal house was centered in the South, and, moreover, a house that had to share the kingship of Egypt with a house in the North, the Heracleopolitans. This break with tradition required a strong foundation, provided (in part) by the cults of Hathor and Ra. The new ruler could present himself as “Horus,” owing to the veneration of Hathor at Dendera, and as “son of Ra,” owing to the cult of Ra at Thebes. This Horus and son of Ra in the South counterbalanced the Horus and son of Ra in the North, whose kingship was based on the cults of Horus and Ra at Heliopolis.²²⁵

The procedure of Intef I’s kingly accession might be attested to on Strasbourg 345 + Florence 7595. The general Intef reports that he “went downstream and upstream (*hdī hnty*) on a mission for the Hereditary Prince, Count, Great Overlord of Upper Egypt *In-īt.f* to the place to which the chiefs (*hqȝw*) of Upper and Lower Egypt (*Šmȝ w mhwt*) (were going). Every chief, having arrived there, then rejoiced on meeting me, because I was good of speech” (trans. Fischer 1996, 85). The expression *Šmȝ w mhwt* could mean “northern Upper Egypt”²²⁶ and denote the Thinite region.²²⁷ If so, the commission would represent the negotiations that prepared for the installment of the great overlord Intef as king following his annexation of Abihu’s territory, including the Thinite region.²²⁸ The general Intef travelled downstream, from Thebes, to that northern region.

The stela of Iti (CG 20001, cols. 7–8: see n. 205 above) can be related to that meeting. It reports that “the Theban nome [fared north] and south. Never did I let Imyotru fare north and south

221. Transliteration and French translation in Postel 2004, 13 and n. 61.

222. Gundlach 1999, 26, 32–33.

223. Given the ideological implication of the name Sehertawy (“He who has appeased the Two Lands”) and the fact that the name is only found in later sources (see n. 238 below), Postel (2004, 64, 291) proposes that Intef I himself may not have used this Horus name, and that he may have been turned into a king posthumously, possibly in the reign of Mentuhotep II, when the name first appears and when royal ancestral propaganda became prominent. Gundlach (1999, 34 [b]) considers the possibility that the Horus name Sehertawy was introduced by Intef II, because Intef I would have died shortly after his capture of Dendera. Giewekemeyer (2022, 111 n. 146) questions Postel’s interpretation.

224. Cf. Gundlach 1999, 36–37, 40–41.

225. The counterbalance would result in the name “southern Heliopolis” for Thebes, which is first attested in Dynasty 18: see Kees 1949, 433–435; Gabolde 1998, 143 (§222).

226. Thus translated by Brovarski 2018, 35–36.

227. Cf. Fischer 1996, 83 n. f, 86–87 n. g.

228. Cf. Roccati 2000, 214; Brovarski 2018, 36 (though without identifying the great overlord of Upper Egypt Intef with Intef I): “It may or may not be too much to infer that one of the matters under discussion was the union of the south under Theban leadership and a declaration of independence from the Heracleopolitan regime.”

(*hdj hnty*) to another nome!” (trans. Lichtheim 1988, 31). This could be the same event as the downstream and upstream journey reported on Strasbourg 345 + Florence 7595.²²⁹ Since Imyotru was situated in the Theban nome (CG 20001, col. 3), near its southern border,²³⁰ the territory south of Thebes did not participate in the gathering. A similar situation is found in Ankhtify’s inscriptions. Ankhtify states that the entire country had become like a locust, travelling downstream and upstream, whereas he did not permit anyone to go to another nome.²³¹ This might again pertain to the same gathering.²³² These observations lead to the conclusion that nomes 1–3 of Upper Egypt were still in control of Ankhtify in the context of Intef I’s accession; Intef I only became king of nomes 4–8. Indirect evidence might confirm the contemporaneity of Ankhtify and Intef I: the paintings in Ankhtify’s tomb are akin to those found in the tomb of Ini and his wife Neferu at Gebelein (Turin Suppl. 14354/01–28), and the latter tomb is a *saff*-tomb and thus no earlier than the reign of Intef I.²³³

A possible counterargument to the identification of the great overlord of Upper Egypt Intef with King Sehertawy Intef I is that the former is called *‘3* on RT 11/5/18/7. This could argue for an identification of the great overlord with Intef the Elder (Intef-*‘3*) instead of with Intef I. However, in distinction to Intef the Elder, who is only called *‘3* “the Elder” in later sources (on MMA 14.2.7 and CG 42005: see §2.2.2), the epithet *‘3* in the contemporary source RT 11/5/18/7 cannot have the meaning “the Elder” (as one could not know at that time whether another Intef would still follow) but must have the sense of “the Great.”²³⁴ Similarly, both Intef II and Intef III used the epithet *‘3* “the Great” in most of their royal contemporary documents.²³⁵ We might suppose that Intef I did the same in his documents, which unfortunately are missing.²³⁶ If so, the great overlord of Upper Egypt Intef-*‘3* might well be the later King Intef I.

There are few sources on Intef I’s kingship. Intef I is not attested as king in sources that date to the time of his government, and he is never found with the title *nswt-bity*.²³⁷ There are only two later attestations for his Horus name Sehertawy and title *s3 R‘*:²³⁸

229. Roccati 2000, 214 (as a possibility).

230. Gomaà 1986, 122–125.

231. Vandier 1950, 220–231 (inscription 10, IV.28–30); Schenkel 1965, 53–55 (37.I).

232. The travels mentioned in inscription 10 have generally been interpreted as a search for food, because of the famine described earlier in that inscription; for instance, Vandier 1950, 230, who adds that the locust traditionally stands for hordes of enemies. According to the present interpretation, this would fit with the turbulated context of Intef I’s accession.

233. Cf. Kubisch 2000, 262–263.

234. Postel 2001, 73; Postel 2004, 13 n. 64: “...il se pourrait que dans le cas du *hry-tp ‘3 n Šm‘ w* Antef-âa [on RT 11/5/18/7] le qualificatif *‘3* exprime réellement un rang social : si le personnage appartient bien à la lignée des futurs souverains de la XIe dynastie, elle préfigurerait l’usage de la même épithète dans les titulatures des rois Ouahânh et Naklhtnebtepénéfer [sic] Antef.”

235. Postel 2004, 83–87, 123.

236. The sole two—both non-contemporary—attestations for Intef I write his name without *‘3* (see n. 238 below). Intef II and Intef III likewise appear without *‘3* in the later material: Postel 2004, 83–84, 123.

237. For a survey of the titles attested for the kings of Dynasty 11, see Gundlach 1999, 33 (fig. 2).

238. Postel 2004, 55, 303–304 (nos. 12–13). No. 11 (Strasbourg 346) mentions Sehertawy, but the fragment likely belongs to Sehertawy Ameny Intef Amenemhat of Dynasty 13: Postel 2004, 303 n. 1296; Schmitt 2004. In addition, Farina (1938, 35–36 [V/13]) reconstructs traces of *‘3* (‘S’[ankhibra]) in *TKL* 6/13. These could stand for ‘Se’[hertawy],

- 1) Blocks from Tôd (JdE 66331–66332, in the days of Mentuhotep II):²³⁹ “Horus Sehertawy son of Ra Intef” (with “son of Ra Intef” in a cartouche).
- 2) KKL 2/3 (in the days of Thutmose III): “Horus [Se]’h’[ertawy] In[tef]” (with “In[tef]” in a cartouche).

The absence of contemporary documents on Intef I’s kingship suggests that his kingship was brief. Intef I was apparently soon deposed by Neferkara. Following the gathering in the Thinite region that prepared for Intef I’s accession, Neferkara descended to Thinis, to overthrow the newly installed Theban king.

Intef I’s deposition might be testified to by the titulary found at Asyut. Intef (RT 11/5/18/7 and Strasbourg 345 + Florence 7595) and Khety II (*Siut* IV/23, 54), the ally of the Heracleopolitan king Merikara (Neferkara’s son in the present study), are the sole persons who are attested as *hry-tp cʒ n Šm c w* “great overlord of Upper Egypt” in the available material.²⁴⁰ This suggests that Intef and Khety II were close in time. Following Intef I’s overthrow, the Heracleopolitans may have conferred the title on Khety II in place of Intef I. Khety II must in any case have governed at a time when no Theban king was in power, given that a Heracleopolitan ally would not have been called “great overlord of Upper Egypt” when Thebes was in control of the South. *Siut* IV/1–19 (see n. 208 above) reports that Merikara installed Khety II after a period of upheaval, and these troubles could be related to the royal accession and deposition of Intef I and to Neferkara and Iti-ibi’s assault on Thinis.

Following his defeat, Intef I was buried in Saff el-Dawaba. The kings Intef I, Intef II, and Intef III are generally supposed to have been buried at el-Tarif, in three nearby tombs of similar structure. The anonymous tomb Saff el-Dawaba has been attributed to Intef I since it must belong to a ruler who preceded Intef II.²⁴¹

2.3.3. *The Non-Kingly Status of Mentuhotep I*

If Dynasty 11 emerged as a royal power in the days of Intef I, then the dynasty’s foundation did not happen in the days of Mentuhotep I, the traditional first king of Dynasty 11. This raises the question of the kingly status of Mentuhotep I. Mentuhotep I is known from two sources:²⁴²

- 1) Statue Aswan 1357 (from the sanctuary of Heqaib at Elephantine):²⁴³ “the father of the gods (*it ntrw*), Mentuhotep-*cʒ*, beloved of Satis, lady of Elephantine” (with the entire phrase in a cartouche).
- 2) KKL 2/4: “Horus *tp-c* Men[tuhotep-*cʒ*]” (with “Men[tuhotep-*cʒ*]” in a cartouche).

but the traces are absent from Gardiner 1959, pl. ii (V/13). Moreover, *TKL* 6/13 is introduced by *nswt bity* and therefore is unlikely to be a Horus name.

239. Habachi 1963, 46; Schenkel 1965, 210–211 (no. 328); Postel 2004, 304 (no. 12). For a detailed description of the blocks from Tôd—which depict (Nakhtnebtepnefer) Intef III, ‘Wah’ankh Intef II, and Sehertawy Intef I behind Mentuhotep II (who is standing between a goddess and Montu)—see Giewekemeyer 2022, 334–336.

240. Gomaà 1980, 100; Kanawati 1992, 173; El-Khadragy 2008, 230. For a study of the title recorded in *Siut* IV/54, see Edel 1984, 77–80.

241. Intef I was buried in Saff el-Dawaba, Intef II in Saff el-Kisasiya, and Intef III in Saff el-Baqr: Arnold 1976, 22.

242. Postel 2004, 27, 303 (nos. 9–10). Mentuhotep I’s name is sometimes restored in the lacuna of *TKL* 6/12: Habachi 1958, 184; Schenkel 1962, 148 (§59.e.1); Gestermann 1987, 22 n. 5; Helck 1992, 171.

243. Habachi 1985, 109–110 (no. 97).

The material from Aswan has been used to reconstruct the lineage of early Dynasty 11. In addition to Aswan 1357, another statue in the sanctuary (Aswan 1359, with exactly the same costume and pose) mentions “his son” Wahankh Intef II.²⁴⁴ The third statue of the ensemble (Aswan 1358) depicts a king in a *heb sed* attire, apparently Intef II.²⁴⁵ The title *it ntrw* on Aswan 1357 has often been interpreted to mean that Mentuhotep I was the father of two kings, Intef I and Intef II.²⁴⁶ However, the use of the plural  *ntrw* (and not the dual) suggests at least three kingly sons for Mentuhotep I.²⁴⁷ Moreover, Aswan 1357–1359 probably postdate the reign of Intef III.²⁴⁸ Rather than referring to genuine sons, the title *it ntrw* honours Mentuhotep I as the ancestor of Dynasty 11, the father of all the kings that would follow him.²⁴⁹

Since King Mentuhotep I is not found in any source contemporary with his supposed reign, his historical existence is doubted.²⁵⁰ The *KKL*, from the days of Thutmose III, long after Dynasty 11, is the only source that assigns a kingly title to Mentuhotep I. Its Horus name *tp-c* (“the ancestor”) is obviously posthumous—as one would not call himself “ancestor” during his lifetime (*cf.* the use of *c3* for “the Elder”: see nn. 177–178 above)—and is generally considered to be a New Kingdom fabrication.²⁵¹ Mentuhotep I, if he existed, seems never to have been king.²⁵² Since Mentuhotep I was not the actual first king of Dynasty 11, that honour goes to King Sehertawy Intef I.

2.4. Late Dynasty 9 and the Third Insurrection of Thebes, by King Wahankh Intef II

Following Intef I’s deposition by Neferkara, the Heracleopolitans could maintain the re-established control of the South only briefly. They soon lost the South for good. Neferkara’s son, Merikara, had to face a new, third insurrection led by Thebes. This assumption results from a study of several pieces of data, in particular a passage in Ankhtify’s tomb. According to that inscription, Ankhtify summoned the council of Abydos to his home “to speak with” (*nd mdt m-c*)²⁵³ Hetep, a nomarch of nome 3 of Upper Egypt. Hetep has often been supposed to be Ankhtify’s predecessor at Mo‘alla.²⁵⁴ On the contrary, Berlev (1981, 369), Roccati (2000, 214), and Demidchik (2003, 35) identify Hetep with Hetepi, a nomarch known from a funerary stela from el-Kab, in nome 3.²⁵⁵ The

244. Habachi 1985, 110 (no. 98); Postel 2004, 310–311 (no. 34).

245. Blumenthal 1987, 21; Postel 2004, 28.

246. For instance, Habachi 1985, 110 (no. 99); Blumenthal 1987, 22; Vandersleyen 1995, 13; Roth 2001, 185.

247. Berlev 1981, 369; Postel 2004, 50.

248. On the basis of additional observations, Postel (2004, 27–45; *cf.* Postel 2001, 79) argues that the three statues were likely made during the reign of Mentuhotep II. Giewekemeyer (2022, 340 and n. 1058) accepts a date after Intef III, but she adds that the statues may have been made in the time of Dynasty 12, even as late as the reign of Senusret II.

249. Postel 2004, 48–53. *Cf.* Giewekemeyer 2022, 285: “Die Ansprache des Mentuhotep als ‚Vater der Götter‘ könnte bedeuten, dass Letzterer nicht nur als königlicher Vater des Wahanch-Antef, sondern zudem als Vater auch der anderen, nachfolgenden Könige verehrt wurde,” 341–342.

250. Morenz 2003, 230 n. 7; Giewekemeyer 2022, 110, 342–343; Moreno García 2022, 81.

251. Von Beckerath 1997, 141; von Beckerath 1999, 76 n. 3; Postel 2004, 46–47.

252. Von Beckerath 1999, 76 n. 2; Postel 2004, 54, 291; Morenz 2005, 117–120.

253. Vandier 1950, 187 (inscription 5, II.δ.2) and 196 n. z: “prendre l’avis de,” “demander (conseil) à”; Schenkel 1965, 48 (37.C) and n. h: “inspirieren”; Lichtheim 1988, 26 (7.5): “to confer with.”

254. Vandier 1950, 14, 187; Fischer 1968, 202; Kanawati 1992, 157; Mostafa 2014, 198, 210 (no. 6); Brovarski 2018, 34.

255. Hetepi’s titles are not preserved on the stela, but his activities show that he was in charge of nome 3: Gabra 1976, 55.

stela describes—before a capture of Thinis (l. 5)—the South as containing the entity of nomes 1–3 (l. 5) and as comprising “the seven nomes of *Hnw-Nhn*, and Abydos in *T3-wr*” (ll. 4–5).²⁵⁶ This topographical division corresponds to the situation in Ankhtify’s days: Ankhtify controlled nomes 1–3 of Upper Egypt (see §2.3.1), and nomes 1–7 of Upper Egypt are explicitly attested as a unity in late Dynasty 8 (in Koptos M).²⁵⁷

According to his stela, Hetepi was the sole official in nomes 1–3 who was loyal to Thebes (l. 5). Hetepi mentions by name the Theban ruler whom he supported: Wahankh Intef (l. 1). It would follow that, if the present reconstruction is correct, Ankhtify (in a later stage of his career) was contemporary with Wahankh Intef II.²⁵⁸ It has been argued above (see §2.3.1) that in his early career Ankhtify had been a contemporary of Neferkara, the third Heracleopolitan king and Merikara’s father; thus he might have been a contemporary of Merikara in his later career. If so, Intef II, the late opponent of Ankhtify, would have lived in the days of Merikara. That Merikara and Intef II were contemporaries is indicated by data from Asyut. In a conflict with the southern nomes, King Merikara (*Siut* IV/3, 9, 22) and the great overlord of Upper Egypt Khety II (*Siut* IV/23, 54) descended to Hypselis (*Siut* IV/15),²⁵⁹ the metropolis of nome 11 of Upper Egypt. Several sources show that Intef II set the northern limit of his territory in nome 10, that is, just below Hypselis in nome 11:²⁶⁰

- A stela of Djari (JdE 41437 = RT 12/4/22/9),²⁶¹ servant of Wahankh Intef, reports that Djari fought against the house of Khety in the west of Thinis (l. 3), that Intef II possessed the region from Elephantine up to Aphroditopolis (l. 4), and that the border was set at the Wadi Hesy (col. 6) in a conflict with Khety (l. 5).
- The Dog Stela (CG 20512)²⁶² informs us that Wahankh Intef II first set his boundary at the Wadi Hesy in the nome of Aphroditopolis (*i.e.*, in nome 10) and then took the Thinite nome (col. 3).
- A stela of Rediu-Khnum (CG 20543 = JdE 32138),²⁶³ a servant of Neferukayet—probably the wife of Intef II²⁶⁴—mentions a territory from Elephantine up to Aphroditopolis (l. 10).

256. Gabra 1976, 47.

257. Gabra (1976, 51–54) argues that Hetepi was a contemporary of Ankhtify.

258. Aufrère (2000, 12) makes Ankhtify and Intef II contemporaries. Quack (1992, 99) opts for Ankhtify’s heir as Intef II’s opponent. Most scholars make Ankhtify a contemporary of Intef of CG 20009: Fischer 1968, 130–131; Martin-Pardey 1976, 219; Kanawati 1980, 107; Gomaà 1980, 128, 140; Kanawati 1992, 162–163; Brovarski 2018, 33.

259. For a study of *Siut* IV/15–16, see Edel 1984, 178–183.

260. The stela of Tjetji, differently, reports that Intef II possessed the region extending from Elephantine in the South to Thinis in the North (BM EA 614, 1. 4): Schenkel 1965, 103–107 (no. 75); Lichtheim 1988, 46–49 (no. 19); Postel 2004, 306 (no. 20), 311–312 (no. 37). The stela of Hetepi, likewise, mentions nomes 1–8 of Upper Egypt together in the days of Intef II (ll. 4–5): Gabra 1976, 47. Brovarski (2018, 41) proposes that these two stelae may point to a reversal for Intef II, the loss of nomes 9–10, though he does not consider the evidence to be imposing.

261. Schenkel 1965, 99–100 (no. 72); Lichtheim 1988, 40–41 (no. 16); Postel 2004, 306 (no. 19).

262. Schenkel 1965, 92–96 (no. 69); Postel 2004, 304–305 (no. 14); Polz 2019.

263. Schenkel 1965, 112–115 (no. 81); Lichtheim 1988, 42–46 (no. 18); González León 2018.

264. Lichtheim 1988, 45–46 n. 14; Roth 2001, 186–189; Postel 2004, 92–93, 106, 215 n. 972; Brovarski 2018, 41. González León (2018, 60–62) proposes that Neferukayet was the wife of Intef III (though with Rediu-Khnum already serving in the days of Intef II as well).

Franke (1987, 52–53) identifies Intef II's border with the border mentioned in *Siut* IV/15, though he dates the events in *Siut* IV to the time of Mentuhotep II, Merikara's supposed opponent. In agreement with the present analysis, Demidchik (2003, 35–36; 2016, 112) supposes that Merikara encountered Intef II.²⁶⁵

If the proposed links between Ankhtify, Hetep(i), Merikara, and Intef II are correct, we can reconstruct the historical development as follows. With the support of Hetep(i), Intef II took control of Ankhtify's territory (nomes 1–3). Intef II then turned northwards and clashed with Merikara and Khety II near Hypselis. Following this encounter, Intef II took Thinis (if the Dog Stela presents a correct order of events: see n. 262 above).²⁶⁶ Intef II's success provided the occasion for taking kingly titles, *Hr Wahankh* and *nswt-bity s3 R^c Intef*.²⁶⁷ Like Intef I, he based his royal status on the cults of Ra and Hathor. The importance of these two deities for Intef II is particularly clear from the stela MMA 13.182.3 (found in his tomb at el-Tarif), which records a hymn to Ra (associated with Atum) and a hymn to Hathor.²⁶⁸ The first hymn states, “you have made me a lord-of-life who does not die” (l. 4)²⁶⁹ and confirms that Intef II founded his kingship on the cult of Ra. In addition, the fragment Turin Suppl. 1310, which might pertain to the reign of Intef II,²⁷⁰ reports that the (anonymous) king received the kingship from Hathor.²⁷¹

In the aftermath of the encounter between Merikara and Intef II, the Heracleopolitans lost the control of the South for good. They would no longer attack the Thebans, and had to accept the coexistence with Dynasty 11. The Heracleopolitan Dynasty 9 became Dynasty 10 as a result of this new situation. The parallel government of Dynasties 10 and 11 continued until Mentuhotep II reunified the country.

3. Conclusion

As a conclusion to the present study, table 4 gives a survey of the proposed relationships between Dynasties 6–11.

265. Brovarski (2018, 47–48 and n. 416) rejects Demidchik's proposal that Merikara ruled in the days of Intef II and sets both Merikara and his father in the days of Mentuhotep II. Hayes (1971, 466–467) makes Merikara's father contemporary with Intef II, and Merikara with Mentuhotep II. Gardiner (1914, 23), Darnell (1997, 106–107), and Pitkin (2023, 32–33), likewise, set Merikara's father in the days of Intef II.

266. A newly found stela at Abydos, belonging to the Lower Nubian ruler Idudju-iqer, relates to Intef II's conquest of the Abydene region: Wegner 2017–2018. The stela of Djemi (MMA 65.107, probably from Gebelein: Schenkel 1965: 116–117 [no. 83]; Morenz 2010: 316–321) might pertain to the same conquest: it mentions a conquest of Abydos and Nubian soldiers. Morenz (2010: 317, 321) dates MMA 65.107 to the time of Ankhtify or early Dynasty 11; Kubisch (2000: 263) to early Dynasty 11.

267. Though Intef II and Intef III used the title *nswt bity*, they did not take a throne name: Postel 2004, 304–306, 308–315 (nos. 14, 17–20, 24, 26–30, 33–37, 39, 43–46, 48–49, 51).

268. Schenkel 1965, 96–99 (no. 70); Goedicke 1991; Postel 2004, 305 (no. 15).

269. Trans. Goedicke 1991, 236.

270. Postel 2004, 12 n. 57 (Intef II or Intef III); Mathieu 2008, 66 n. 5 (Intef II). Vandier (1964, 11–13) opts for Intef I.

271. Vandier 1964, 10; Mathieu 2008, 66.

Dynasty 6 Memphis	
Teti, Userkara (Ity), Pepy I, Merenra I, Pepy II, Merenra II	
Late Dynasty 6 Memphis	Dynasty 7 Memphis
Nitocris = Menkara Neitiqerty Siptah	10 kings
Dynasty 8 Memphis	
Neferkara Pepyseneb (Pepy III)	
Neferkamin Anu	
Qakara Ibi	
Kha[] Neferkaura	overseer of Upper Egypt: Shemai (Koptos)
Netjerbau Neferkauhor Khuihapy(?)	vizier: Shemai; overseer of Upper Egypt: Idi (Koptos) overseer of Upper Egypt: Tjauti-iqer (Khozam) nomarch: Intef the Elder (Thebes)
Neferirkara II Pepy IV	vizier: Idi; overseer of Upper Egypt: User (Khozam and Koptos)
Dynasty 9 Heracleopolis	
Demedjibtawy Khety I	
Meryibawy Meryibra Khety II	
Neferkara Khety III	overseer of Upper Egypt: Abihu (Abydos and later Dendera) great overlord of Upper Egypt: Sehertawy Intef I (Thebes) nomarch: Ankhtify (Mo‘alla)
Merikara Khety IV	great overlord of Upper Egypt: Khety II (Asyut) nomarchs: Ankhtify (Mo‘alla), Hetep(i) (el-Kab)
Dynasty 10 Heracleopolis	Dynasty 11 Thebes
14 kings	Intef II, Intef III
Dynasty 11 Thebes	
Mentuhotep II, Mentuhotep III, Mentuhotep IV	

Table 4: The proposed relationships between Dynasties 6–11

The survey shows that Dynasty 7 reigned in parallel to the last ruler of Dynasty 6, Queen Nitocris. At the end of this shared government, there was again only one Memphite dynasty, Dynasty 8. In late Dynasty 8, the Theban nomarch Intef the Elder clashed with Shemai, Idi, Tjauti-iqer, and User, and he was defeated. When Dynasty 8 was succeeded by Dynasty 9, the latter took over the control of the South. The third Heracleopolitan king faced the insurrection of the great overlord of Upper Egypt Intef, who claimed kingship following his annexation of Dendera and

Abydos, as Sehertawy Intef I. Intef I was deposed, but tensions with Thebes soon re-emerged. The fourth, last king of Dynasty 9 clashed with Intef II and had to recognise the kingship of Dynasty 11. The Heracleopolitan government changed from Dynasty 9 to Dynasty 10 on that occasion. Dynasty 10 ended when Mentuhotep II reunified the country.

4. Abbreviations

AKL *Abydos King List.* (1) Ed. *KRI I*, 178–179; II, 539–541; trans. *KRITA I*, 153–156 (77.iii); II, 348–349 (206). (2) Ed. and trans. into German by von Beckerath 1997, 26–28, 149, 215.

Herodotus Herodotus, *Histories*. Ed. and trans. A.D. Godley. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library 117–120. London: Heinemann, 1920–1925. Rev. ed. of vols. 1–2, London: Heinemann, 1926–1938.

KKL *Karnak King List.* (1) Ed. *Urk. IV*, 607–610 (no. 198). (2) Trans. into German by Burkhardt *et al.* 1984, 167–171.

Koptos Koptos Decrees. (1) Ed. and trans. Goedicke 1967, 87–147, 163–225, 227–230. (2) Trans. Strudwick 2005, 105–124.

KRI Kitchen, K.A. 1969–1990. *Ramesside Inscriptions: Historical and Biographical*. 8 vols. Oxford: Blackwell.

KRITA Kitchen, K.A. 1993–2014. *Ramesside Inscriptions: Translated & Annotated: Translations*. 7 vols. Oxford: Blackwell.

Manetho Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*. (1) Ed. and trans. Waddell 1940. (2) Ed. Jacoby 1958, 5–112 (FGH 609).

Merikara Instruction for Merikara. (1) Trans. Gardiner 1914. (2) Ed. and trans. into German by Helck 1977. (3) Transliterated and trans. into German by Quack 1992. (4) Trans. V.A. Tobin in Simpson 2003, 152–165.

(Pseudo)-Eratosthenes (Pseudo)-Eratosthenes, *Anagraphai*. (1) Ed. and trans. Waddell 1940, 212–225. (2) Ed. Jacoby 1958, 112–118 (FGH 610).

SKL *Saqqara King List.* (1) Ed. *KRI III*, 481–482; trans. *KRITA III*, 340–342 (217.3). (2) Ed. and trans. into German by von Beckerath 1997, 26–28, 216.

TKL *Turin King List.* (1) Ed. and trans. into Italian by Farina 1938. (2) Ed. Gardiner 1959. (3) Col. 5 ed. and trans. Ryholt 2000, 87–91.

Urk. I Sethe, K. 1932–1933. *Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums*. Abt. I: *Urkunden des Alten Reichs*. 4 fascs. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Urk. IV Sethe, K. and Helck, W. 1927–1958. *Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums*. Abt. IV: *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie*. 22 fascs. 2nd ed. of fascs. 1–16. Leipzig: Hinrichs; Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

5. Bibliography

ABDALLA, A. 1993. “Two Monuments of Eleventh Dynasty Date from Dendera in the Cairo Museum.” *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 79, 248–254.

ALLEN, J.P. 1976. “The Funerary Texts of King Wahkare Akhtoy on a Middle Kingdom Coffin.” In *Studies in Honor of George R. Hughes, January 12, 1977*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 39. Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press, 1–29.

ANTHES, R. 1928. *Die Felseninschriften von Hatnub: Nach den Aufnahmen Georg Möllers. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ägyptens* 9. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

ARNOLD, D. 1976. *Gräber des Alten und Mittleren Reiches in El-Tarif*. Archäologische Veröffentlichungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts: Abteilung Kairo 17. Mainz am Rhein: von Zabern.

AUFRÈRE, S. 1982. “Contribution à l’étude de la morphologie du protocole ‘classique.’” *Bulletin de l’Institut français d’archéologie orientale* 82, 19–73.

AUFRÈRE, S. 2000. "Le nomarque Ânkhtyfy et la situation politique en Haute-Égypte avant le règne d'Antef II." *Égypte Afrique & Orient* 18, 7–14.

BAINES, J. 1995. "Origins of Egyptian Kingship." In D. O'Connor and D.P. Silverman (eds.), *Ancient Egyptian Kingship*. Probleme der Ägyptologie 9. Leiden: Brill, 95–156.

BALY, T.J.C. 1932. "The Relations of the Eleventh Dynasty and the Heracleopolitans." *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 18, 173–176.

BÁRTA, W. 1981. "Bemerkungen zur Chronologie der 6. bis 11. Dynastie." *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 108, 23–33.

BAUD, M. 2006. "The Relative Chronology of Dynasties 6 and 8." In E. Hornung, R. Krauss, and D.A. Warburton (eds.), *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*. Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section 1: The Near and Middle East 83. Leiden: Brill, 144–158.

BAUD, M. and DOBREV, V. 1995. "De nouvelles annales de l'Ancien Empire égyptien : une 'Pierre de Palerme' pour la VI^e dynastie." *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* 95, 23–92.

BAUD, M. and DOBREV, V. 1997. "Le verso des annales de la VI^e dynastie : Pierre de Saqqara-Sud." *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* 97, 35–42.

BECKERATH, J. VON. 1962. "The Date of the End of the Old Kingdom of Egypt." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 21, 140–147.

BECKERATH, J. VON. 1966. "Die Dynastie der Herakleopoliten (9./10. Dynastie)." *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 93, 13–20.

BECKERATH, J. VON. 1975. "Antef." In W. Helck and E. Otto (eds.), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*. Vol. 1: *A – Ernte*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, cols. 300–301.

BECKERATH, J. VON. 1997. *Chronologie des pharaonischen Ägypten: Die Zeitbestimmung der ägyptischen Geschichte von der Vorzeit bis 332 v. Chr.* Münchener ägyptologische Studien 46. Mainz am Rhein: von Zabern.

BECKERATH, J. VON. 1999. *Handbuch der ägyptischen Königsnamen*. 2nd ed. Münchener ägyptologische Studien 49. Mainz am Rhein: von Zabern.

BENNETT, CH.J. 1995. "Bridging the Second Intermediate Period." *Journal of Ancient and Medieval Studies* 12, 1–24.

BERLEV, O. 1981. "The Eleventh Dynasty in the Dynastic History of Egypt." In D.W. Young (ed.), *Studies Presented to Hans Jakob Polotsky*. East Gloucester MA: Pirtle & Polson, 361–377.

BJÖRKMAN, G. 1964. "Egyptology and Historical Method." *Orientalia Suecana* 13, 9–33.

BLUMENTHAL, E. 1987. "Die 'Gottesväter' des Alten und Mittleren Reiches." *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 114, 10–35.

BORCHARDT, L. 1917. *Die Annalen und die zeitliche Festlegung des alten Reiches der ägyptischen Geschichte*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Zeitbestimmung der ägyptischen Geschichte 1. Berlin: von Behrend.

BROSE, M. 2018. "Neue Fragen zur (Nicht-)Existenz der Königin Nitokris." *Göttinger Miszellen* 254, 37–52.

BROVARSKI, E. 1981. "Ahanakht of Bersheh and the Hare Nome in the First Intermediate Period and Middle Kingdom." In W.K. Simpson and W.M. Davis (eds.), *Studies in Ancient Egypt, the Aegean, and the Sudan: Essays in Honor of Dows Dunham on the Occasion of His 90th Birthday, June 1, 1980*. Boston MA: Museum of Fine Arts, 14–30.

BROVARSKI, E. 2007. "King *Ntr-k3-R^c Tjm-htp s3-Pth*?" In Z.A. Hawass and J. Richards (eds.), *The Archaeology and Art of Ancient Egypt: Essays in Honor of David B. O'Connor*. Vol. 1. Supplément aux Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte, Cahier 36/1. Cairo: Conseil suprême des antiquités de l'Égypte, 145–149.

BROVARSKI, E. 2013. "Overseers of Upper Egypt in the Old to Middle Kingdoms: Part 1." *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 140, 91–111.

BROVARSKI, E. 2018. *Naga ed-Dér in the First Intermediate Period*. Atlanta GA: Lockwood.

BRUNNER, H. 1937. *Die Texte aus den Gräbern der Herakleopolitenzeit von Siut: Mit Übersetzung und Erläuterungen*. Ägyptologische Forschungen 5. Glückstadt: Augustin.

BURKHARDT, A., BLUMENTHAL, E., MÜLLER, I., and REINEKE, W.F. 1984. *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie: Übersetzung zu den Heften 5–16. Urk. IV*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

CALLENDER, V.G. 2011a. *In Hathor's Image*. Vol. 1: *The Wives and Mothers of Egyptian Kings from Dynasties I–VI*. Prague: Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Arts.

CALLENDER, V.G. 2011b. "Queen Neit-ikrety/Nitokris." In M. Bárta, F. Coppens, and J. Krejčí (eds.), *Abusir and Saqqara in the Year 2010*. Vol. 1. Prague: Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Arts, 246–260.

†CAMINOS, R.A., and OSING, J. 2021. *The Wadi Shatt el-Rigal*. Egypt Exploration Society Excavation Memoir 118. London: Egypt Exploration Society.

COUYAT, J. and MONTET, P. 1912. *Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouâdi Hammâmât*. Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire 34. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.

DARNELL, J.C. 1997. "The Message of King Wahankh Antef II to Khety, Ruler of Heracleopolis." *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 124, 101–108.

DARNELL, J.C. 2002. *Theban Desert Road Survey in the Egyptian Western Desert*. Vol. 1: *Gebel Tjauti Rock Inscriptions 1–45 and Wadi el-Hôl Inscriptions 1–45*. With the assistance of D. Darnell and contributions by D. Darnell, R. Friedman, and S. Hendrickx. Oriental Institute Publications 119. Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.

DARNELL, J.C. and DARNELL, D. 1997. "New Inscriptions of the Late First Intermediate Period from the Theban Western Desert and the Beginnings of the Northern Expansion of the Eleventh Dynasty." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 56, 241–258.

DEMIDCHIK, A. 2003. "The Reign of Merikare Khety." *Göttinger Miszellen* 192, 25–36.

DEMIDCHIK, A. 2011. "The Date of the 'Teaching for Merikare'." In E. Kormysheva, E. Fantusati, and D. Michaux-Colombot (eds.), *Cultural Heritage of Egypt and Christian Orient*. Vol. 6: *Egypt and Near Eastern Countries, III Mill. B.C. – I Mill. A.D.* Moscow: Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, 49–70.

DEMIDCHIK, A. 2016. "The Sixth Heracleopolitan King Merikare Khety." *Journal of Egyptian History* 9, 97–120.

EDEL, E. 1984. *Die Inschriften der Grabfronten der Siut-Gräber in Mittelägypten aus der Herakleopolitenzeit: Eine Wiederherstellung nach den Zeichnungen der Description de l'Égypte*. Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 71. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

EL-KHADRAY, M. 2008. "The Decoration in the Rock-cut Chapel of Khety II at Asyut." *Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur* 37, 219–241.

FARINA, G. 1938. *Il papiro dei re: Restaurato*. Rome: Bardi.

FAROUT, D. 1994. "La carrière du wḥmw Ameny et l'organisation des expéditions au ouadi Hammamat au Moyen Empire." *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* 94, 143–172.

FISCHER, H.G. 1964. *Inscriptions from the Coptic Nome: Dynasties VI–XI*. Analecta Orientalia 40. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.

FISCHER, H.G. 1968. *Dendera in the Third Millennium B.C.: Down to the Theban Domination of Upper Egypt*. Locust Valley NY: Augustin.

FISCHER, H.G. 1979. “Boekbespreking of Three Old-Kingdom Tombs at Thebes: I. The Tomb of Unas-Ankh no. 413; II. The Tomb of Khenty no. 405; III. The Tomb of Ihy no. 186, by M. Saleh.” *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 36, 29–32.

FISCHER, H.G. 1991. “Marginalia.” *Göttinger Miszellen* 122, 21–30.

FISCHER, H.G. 1996. *Egyptian Studies*. Vol. 3: *Varia nova*. New York NY: Metropolitan Museum of Art.

FRANKE, D. 1987. “Zwischen Herakleopolis und Theben: Neues zu den Gräbern von Assiut.” *Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur* 14, 49–60.

FRANKE, D. 2006. “Fürsorge und Patronat in der Ersten Zwischenzeit und im Mittleren Reich.” *Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur* 34, 159–185.

GABOLDE, L. 1998. *Le « Grand château d'Amon » de Sésostris I^{er} à Karnak : la décoration du temple d'Amon-Rê au Moyen Empire*. Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres 17. Paris: de Boccard.

GABRA, G. 1976. “Preliminary Report on the Stela of *Htpi* from El-Kab from the Time of Wahankh Inyôtef II.” *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts: Abteilung Kairo* 32, 45–56.

GARDINER, A.H. 1914. “New Literary Works from Ancient Egypt.” *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 1, 20–36.

GARDINER, A.H. 1959. *The Royal Canon of Turin*. Oxford: Griffith Institute.

GAUTHIER, H. 1923. “Quelques additions au ‘Livre des rois d’Égypte’ (Ancien et Moyen Empire).” *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l’archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes* 40, 177–204.

GESTERMANN, L. 1987. *Kontinuität und Wandel in Politik und Verwaltung des frühen Mittleren Reiches in Ägypten*. Göttinger Orientforschungen IV/18. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

GIEWEKEMEYER, A. 2022. *Wer schreibt die Geschichte(n)?: Die 8. bis frühe 12. Dynastie im Licht ägyptologischer und ägyptischer Sinnbildungen*. Lingua Aegyptia: Studia Monographica 27. Hamburg: Widmaier.

GNIRS, A.M. 2006. “Das Motiv des Bürgerkriegs in Merikare und Neferti: Zur Literatur der 18. Dynastie.” In G. Moers, H. Behlmer, K. Demuß, and K. Widmaier (eds.), jn.t dr.w: *Festschrift für Friedrich Junge*. Vol. 1. Göttingen: Seminar für Ägyptologie und Koptologie, 207–265.

GOEDICKE, H. 1962. “Zur Chronologie der sogenannten ‘Ersten Zwischenzeit.’” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 112, 239–254.

GOEDICKE, H. 1967. *Königliche Dokumente aus dem Alten Reich*. Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 14. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

GOEDICKE, H. 1969. “Probleme der Herakleopolitenzeit.” *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts: Abteilung Kairo* 24, 136–143.

GOEDICKE, H. 1990. “Two Mining Records from the Wadi Hammamat.” *Revue d’gyptologie* 41, 65–93.

GOEDICKE, H. 1991. “The Prayers of Wakh-‘ankh-Antef-‘Aa.” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 50, 235–253.

GOMAÀ, F. 1980. *Ägypten während der Ersten Zwischenzeit*. Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients B 27. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

GOMAÀ, F. 1986. *Die Besiedlung Ägyptens während des Mittleren Reiches*. Vol. 1: *Oberägypten und das Fayyūm*. Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients B 66/1. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

GONZÁLEZ LEÓN, D. 2018. “La estela de Rediukhnum de Dendera y la reorganización administrativa del Estado egipcio a finales del III milenio a.C.” *Revista del Instituto de Historia Antigua Oriental* 19, 49–79.

GORDON, Y. 2016. *Pépy I^e et la VI^e dynastie*. Les grands pharaons. Paris: Pygmalion.

GRIMAL, N. 2010. “Les ancêtres de Karnak.” *Comptes rendus des séances de l’Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* 154, 343–370.

GUNDACKER, R. 2018. “Manetho.” WiBiLex. bibelwissenschaft.de/stichwort/25466

GUNDLACH, R. 1999. “Die Neubegründung des Königtums in der 11. Dynastie.” In R. Gundlach and W. Seipel (eds.), *Das frühe ägyptische Königtum: Akten des 2. Symposiums zur ägyptischen Königsideologie in Wien 24.–26. 9. 1997*. Ägypten und Altes Testament 36/2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 21–41.

HABACHI, L. 1958. “God’s Fathers and the Role They Played in the History of the First Intermediate Period.” *Annales du Service des antiquités de l’Égypte* 55, 167–190.

HABACHI, L. 1963. “King Nebhepetre Menthuhotp: His Monuments, Place in History, Deification and Unusual Representations in the Form of Gods.” *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts: Abteilung Kairo* 19, 16–52.

HABACHI, L. 1985. *Elephantine*. Vol. 4/1: *The Sanctuary of Heqaib: Text*. Archäologische Veröffentlichungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts: Abteilung Kairo 33/1. Mainz am Rhein: von Zabern.

HAYES, W.CH. 1946. “Royal Decrees from the Temple of Min at Coptus.” *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 32, 3–23.

HAYES, W.CH. 1948. “King Wadjkarē of Dynasty VIII.” *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 34, 115–116.

HAYES, W.CH. 1971. “The Middle Kingdom in Egypt: Internal History from the Rise of the Heracleopolitans to the Death of Ammenemes III.” In I.E.S. Edwards, C.J. Gadd, and N.G.L. Hammond (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol. 1/2: *Early History of the Middle East*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 464–531.

HELCK, W. 1956. *Untersuchungen zu Manetho und den ägyptischen Königslisten*. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ägyptens 18. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

HELCK, W. 1977. *Die Lehre für König Merikare*. Kleine ägyptische Texte. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

HELCK, W. 1992. “Anmerkungen zum Turiner Königspapyrus.” *Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur* 19, 151–216.

HELM, R. 1984. *Eusebius Werke*. Vol. 7: *Die Chronik des Hieronymus: Hieronymi chronicon*. 3rd ed., rev. by U. True. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 47. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

HIRSCH, E. 2004. *Kultpolitik und Tempelbauprogramme der 12. Dynastie: Untersuchungen zu den Göttertempeln im Alten Ägypten*. ACHET A 3. Berlin: Achet Verlag.

JACOBY, F. 1958. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (FGH)*. Vol. 3/3/1 (IIIC1): *Geschichte von Städten und Völkern (Horographie und Ethnographie): Autoren über einzelne Länder (Nr. 608a–856)*; *Ägypten–Geten (Nr. 608a–708)*. Leiden: Brill.

JÁNOSI, P. 1998. “Reliefierte Kalksteinblöcke aus dem Tempel der 12. Dynastie bei ‘Ezbet Rushdi el-Saghira (Tell el-Dab‘a).” *Ägypten und Levante* 8, 51–81.

JÉQUIER, G. 1933. *Les pyramides des reines Neit et Apouit*. Service des antiquités de l'Égypte : fouilles à Saqqarah 13. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.

JÉQUIER, G. 1935. *La pyramide d'Aba*. Service des antiquités de l'Égypte : fouilles à Saqqarah 14. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.

KAHL, J. 2007. *Ancient Asyut: The First Synthesis after 300 Years of Research*. The Asyut Project 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

KAMAL, A. 1910. "Un monument nouveau du pharaon Khatouî." *Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte* 10, 185–186.

KANAWATI, N. 1980. *Governmental Reforms in Old Kingdom Egypt*. Modern Egyptology. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.

KANAWATI, N. 1992. *Akhmim in the Old Kingdom*. Part 1: *Chronology and Administration*. With a chapter by A. McFarlane. The Australian Centre for Egyptology: Studies 2. Sydney: Australian Centre for Egyptology.

KARST, J. 1911. *Eusebius Werke*. Vol. 5: *Die Chronik aus dem armenischen übersetzt mit textkritischem Commentar*. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte 20. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

KEES, H. 1949. "Ein Sonnenheiligtum im Amonstempel von Karnak." *Orientalia* 18, 427–442.

KUBISCH, S. 2000. "Die Stelen der I. Zwischenzeit aus Gebelein." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts: Abteilung Kairo* 56, 239–265.

LEGRAIN, G. 1900. "Notes prises à Karnak. III : Statue votive d'Ousertesen I^{er} à son ancêtre, le prince Antef-aa." *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes* 22, 64.

LEGRAIN, G. 1903. "Notes d'inspection. VII : Le Shatt er Rigal (Sabah Rigaleh)." *Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte* 4, 220–223.

LICHTHEIM, M. 1988. *Ancient Egyptian Autobiographies Chiefly of the Middle Kingdom: A Study and an Anthology*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 84. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag.

LÓPEZ, J. 1973. "L'auteur de l'enseignement pour Mérikarê." *Revue d'égyptologie* 25, 178–191.

LORTON, D. 1987. "The Internal History of the Herakleopolitan Period." *Discussions in Egyptology* 8, 21–28.

MAHIEU, B. 2021. "The Identities of the Second Intermediate Period Dynasties in Egypt." *Journal of Egyptian History* 14, 170–202.

MÁLEK, J. 1982. "The Original Version of the Royal Canon of Turin." *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 68, 93–106.

MÁLEK, J. 1994. "King Merykare and His Pyramid." In C. Berger, G. Clerc, and N. Grimal (eds.), *Hommages à Jean Leclant*. Vol. 4. Bibliothèque d'étude 106/4. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 203–214.

MÁLEK, J. 1997. "La division de l'histoire d'Égypte et l'égyptologie moderne." *Bulletin de la Société française d'égyptologie* 138, 6–17.

MANASSA, C. 2009. "Preliminary Report for the 2008–2009 Season of the Mo'alla Survey Project." *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 45, 57–77.

MARTIN-PARDEY, E. 1976. *Untersuchungen zur ägyptischen Provinzialverwaltung bis zum Ende des Alten Reiches*. Hildesheimer ägyptologische Beiträge 1. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg.

MASPERO, G. 1895. "Notes sur différents points de grammaire et d'histoire." *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes* 17, 56–78.

MATHIEU, B. 2008. "Le lasso d'Hathor : relecture de la stèle Turin Suppl. 1310." With the collaboration of J. Romion. *Göttinger Miszellen* 219, 65–72.

MORENO GARCÍA, J.C. 2022. "Egypt in the First Intermediate Period." In K. Radner, N. Moeller, and D.T. Potts (eds.), *The Oxford History of the Ancient Near East*. Vol. 2: *From the End of the Third Millennium BC to the Fall of Babylon*. New York NY: Oxford University Press, 47–120.

MORENZ, L.D. 2003. "Lesbarkeit der Macht: Die Stele des Antef (Kairo, CG 20009) als Monument eines frühthebanischen lokalen Herrschers." *Aula Orientalis* 21, 229–242.

MORENZ, L.D. 2005. "Die doppelte Benutzung von Genealogie im Rahmen der Legitimierungsstrategie für Menthu-hotep (II.) als gesamtägyptischer Herrscher." In M. Fitznerreiter (ed.), *Genealogie – Realität und Fiktion von Identität: Workshop am 04. und 05. Juni 2004*. Internet-Beiträge zur Ägyptologie und Sudanarchäologie 5. London: Golden House, 109–123.

MORENZ, L.D. 2010. *Die Zeit der Regionen im Spiegel der Gebelein-Region: Kulturgechichtliche Re-Konstruktionen*. Probleme der Ägyptologie 27. Leiden: Brill.

MOSSHAMMER, A.A. 1984. *Georgii Syncelli Ecloga chronographica*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner.

MOSTAFA, M.F. 1987. "Kom el-Koffar. Teil II: Datierung und historische Interpretation des Textes B." *Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte* 71, 169–184.

MOSTAFA, M.F. 2005. "The Autobiography 'A' and a Related Text (Block 52) from the Tomb of Shemai at Kom el-Koffar/Qift." In Kh. Daoud, Sh. Bedier, and S. Abd el-Fatah (eds.), *Studies in Honor of Ali Radwan*. Vol. 2. Supplément aux Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte, Cahier 34/2. Cairo: Conseil suprême des antiquités de l'Égypte, 161–195.

MOSTAFA, M.F. 2014. *The Mastaba of Sm3j at Nag' Kom el-Koffar, Qift*. Vol. 1: *Autobiographies and Related Scenes and Texts*. Cairo: Ministry of Antiquities and Heritage.

MUSACCHIO, T. 2006. "An Epigraphic Reanalysis of Two Stelae from First Intermediate Period Dendera in the Cairo Museum." *Antiguo Oriente* 4, 67–86.

PAPAZIAN, H. 2015. "The State of Egypt in the Eighth Dynasty." In P. Der Manuelian and Th. Schneider (eds.), *Towards a New History for the Egyptian Kingdom: Perspectives on the Pyramid Age*. Harvard Egyptological Studies 1. Leiden: Brill, 393–428.

PETRIE, W.M.F. 1888. *A Season in Egypt, 1887*. London: Field & Tuer.

PETRIE, W.M.F. 1924. *A History of Egypt*. Vol. 1: *From the Earliest Times to the XVIth Dynasty*. 11th ed. London: Methuen.

PITKIN, M. 2023. *Egypt in the First Intermediate Period: The History and Chronology of its False Doors and Stelae*. Middle Kingdom Studies 13. London: Golden House.

POLZ, D. 2019. *Die sogenannte Hundestele des Königs Wah-Anch Intef aus el-Tārif: Eine Forschungsgeschichte*. Sonderschriften des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts: Abteilung Kairo 42. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

POSTEL, L. 2001. "La titulature des rois Antef de la XI^e dynastie : état des questions et nouvelles perspectives." *Kyphi* 3, 65–81.

POSTEL, L. 2004. *Protocole des souverains égyptiens et dogme monarchique au début du Moyen Empire : des premiers Antef au début du règne d'Amenemhat I^r*. Monographies Reine Élisabeth 10. Turnhout: Fondation égyptologique Reine Élisabeth.

QUACK, J.F. 1992. *Studien zur Lehre für Merikare*. Göttinger Orientforschungen IV/23. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

REDFORD, D. 1986. *Pharaonic King-lists, Annals and Day-books: A Contribution to the Study of the Egyptian Sense of History*. Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities Publications 4. Mississauga ON: Benben.

ROCCATI, A. 2000. “Una stela di Firenze recentemente ricomposta.” In S. Russo (ed.), *Atti del V Convegno Nazionale di Egittologia e Papirologia, Firenze, 10–12 dicembre 1999*. Florence: Istituto papirologico “G. Vitelli,” 213–215.

RODRÍGUEZ-LÁZARO, J. 1992–1994. “Yu-Shenshen durante la IX dinastía.” *Boletín de la Asociación Española de Egiptología* 4–5, 39–46.

ROEDER, G. 1911. *Debod bis Bab Kalabsche*. Vols. 1–2. Les temples immersés de la Nubie. Cairo: Institut français d’archéologie orientale.

ROTH, S. 2001. *Die Königsmütter des Alten Ägypten von der Frühzeit bis zum Ende der 12. Dynastie*. Ägypten und Altes Testament 46. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

RYHOLT, K.S.B. 1997. *The Political Situation in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period, c. 1800–1550 B.C.* Carsten Niebuhr Institute Publications 20. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum.

RYHOLT, K.S.B. 2000. “The Late Old Kingdom in the Turin King-list and the Identity of Nitocris.” *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 127, 87–100.

RYHOLT, K.S.B. 2004. “The Turin King-list.” *Ägypten und Levante* 14, 135–155.

SALEH, M. 1977. *Three Old-Kingdom Tombs at Thebes: I. The Tomb of Unas-Ankh no. 413; II. The Tomb of Khenty no. 405; III. The Tomb of Ihy no. 186*. Archäologische Veröffentlichungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts: Abteilung Kairo 14. Mainz am Rhein: von Zabern.

SAYCE, A.H. 1892. “Letter from Egypt.” *The Academy: A Weekly Review of Literature, Science, and Art* 1039, 332–333.

SCHARFF, A. 1936. *Der historische Abschnitt der Lehre für König Merikarê*. Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-historische Klasse 1936/8. Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

SCHENKEL, W. 1962. *Frühmittelägyptische Studien*. Bonner Orientalische Studien: Neue Serie 13. Bonn: Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Seminars der Universität Bonn.

SCHENKEL, W. 1965. *Memphis. Herakleopolis. Theben: Die epigraphischen Zeugnisse der 7.–11. Dynastie Ägyptens*. Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 12. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

SCHMITT, L. 2004. “Un bloc inédit au nom d’un Horus Sehertaouy à l’Université Marc Bloch de Strasbourg (IES 346).” *Revue d’égyptologie* 55, 172–181.

SCHNEIDER, TH. 2002. *Lexikon der Pharaonen*. Düsseldorf: Albatros.

SEIDLAYER, S.J. 1997. “Zwei Anmerkungen zur Dynastie der Herakleopoliten.” *Göttinger Miszellen* 157, 81–90.

SEIDLAYER, S.J. 2006. “The Relative Chronology of the First Intermediate Period.” In E. Hornung, R. Krauss, and D.A. Warburton (eds.), *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*. Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section 1: The Near and Middle East 83. Leiden: Brill, 159–167.

SETHE, K. 1912. “Rezension of *Les décrets royaux de l’Ancien Empire égyptien* by R. Weill.” *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 174, 705–726.

SHERBINY, W. 2017. *Through Hermopolitan Lenses: Studies on the So-Called Book of Two Ways in Ancient Egypt*. Probleme der Ägyptologie 33. Leiden: Brill.

SHUBERT, S.B. 2007. *Those Who (Still) Live on Earth: A Study of the Ancient Egyptian Appeal to the Living Texts*. PhD Dissertation. University of Toronto.

SISSÉ, J. 2015. “Throne Name Patterns as a Clue for the Internal Chronology of the 13th to 17th Dynasties (Late Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period).” *Göttinger Miszellen* 246, 75–97.

SIMPSON, W.K. 1981. “The Memphite Epistolary Formula on a Jar Stand of the First Intermediate Period from Naga Ed-Deir.” In W.K. Simpson and W.M. Davis (eds.), *Studies in*

Ancient Egypt, the Aegean, and the Sudan: Essays in Honor of Dows Dunham on the Occasion of His 90th Birthday, June 1, 1980. Boston MA: Museum of Fine Arts, 173–179.

SIMPSON, W.K., ed., 2003. *The Literature of Ancient Egypt: An Anthology of Stories, Instructions, Stelae, Autobiographies, and Poetry*. 3rd ed. New Haven CT: Yale University Press.

SPALINGER, A.J. 1994. “Dated Texts of the Old Kingdom.” *Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur* 21, 275–319.

SPANEL, D. 1984. “The Date of Ankhtifi of Mo‘alla.” *Göttinger Miszellen* 78, 87–94.

STASSER, TH. 2017. “Deux reines Ankhnespépy pour Pépy II Neferkarê?” *Res Antiquae* 14, 237–249.

STAUDER, A. 2013. *Linguistic Dating of Middle Egyptian Literary Texts*. Lingua Aegyptia: Studia Monographica 12. Hamburg: Widmaier.

STRUDWICK, N.C. 2005. *Texts from the Pyramid Age*. Ed. R.J. Leprohon. Society of Biblical Literature: Writings from the Ancient World 16. Atlanta GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

THEIS, CH. 2010. “Die Pyramiden der Ersten Zwischenzeit: Nach philologischen und archäologischen Quellen.” *Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur* 39, 321–339.

VANDERSLEYEN, C. 1995. *L’Égypte et la vallée du Nil*. Vol. 2: *De la fin de l’Ancien Empire à la fin du Nouvel Empire*. Nouvelle Clio. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

VANDIER, J. 1934. “La stèle 20.001 du Musée du Caire.” In P. Jouguet (ed.), *Mélanges Maspero*. Vol. 1/1: *Orient ancien*. Mémoires publiés par les membres de l’Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire 66/1. Cairo: Institut français d’archéologie orientale, fascicle 1, 137–145.

VANDIER, J. 1950. *Mo‘alla : la tombe d’Ankhtifi et la tombe de Sébekhotep*. Bibliothèque d’étude 18. Cairo: Institut français d’archéologie orientale.

VANDIER, J. 1964. “Une inscription historique de la Première Période Intermédiaire.” In H.B. Rosén (ed.), *Studies in Egyptology and Linguistics in Honour of H.J. Polotsky*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 9–16.

VERBRUGGHE, G.P. and WICKERSHAM, J.M. 1996. *Berossos and Manetho, Introduced and Translated: Native Traditions in Ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt*. Ann Arbor MI: University of Michigan Press.

VERNER, M. 2001. “Archaeological Remarks on the 4th and 5th Dynasty Chronology.” *Archiv orientální* 69, 363–418.

WADDELL, W. 1940. *Manetho*. Loeb Classical Library 350. London: Heinemann.

WEGNER, J.W. 2017–2018. “The Stela of Idudju-Iker: Foremost-One of the Chiefs of Wawat: New Evidence on the Conquest of Thinis under Wahankh Antef II.” *Revue d’gyptologie* 68, 153–209.

WEILL, R. 1912. *Les décrets royaux de l’Ancien Empire égyptien : étude sur les décrets royaux trouvés à Koptos au cours des travaux de la Société française des fouilles archéologiques (campagnes de 1910 et 1911) et sur les documents similaires d’autres provenances*. Paris: Geuthner.

WILLIAMS, B. 2013. “Three Rulers in Nubia and the Early Middle Kingdom in Egypt.” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 72, 1–10.

WIMMER, S.J. 2021. “Von Königin Nitokris bis zur Königin von Saba.” In M. Ullmann, G. Pieke, F. Hoffmann, and Ch. Bayer (eds.), *Up and Down the Nile – ägyptologische Studien für Regine Schulz*. With the collaboration of S. Gebhardt. Ägypten und Altes Testament 97. Münster: Zaphon, 315–322.

WINLOCK, H.E. 1915. “The Theban Necropolis in the Middle Kingdom.” *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 32, 1–37.

ZIVIE-COCHE, CH. 1972. “Nitocris, Rhodopis et la troisième pyramide de Giza.” *Bulletin de l’Institut français d’archéologie orientale* 72, 115–138.