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II. 4 CONTEMPORANEOUS EVIDENCE FOR THE RELATIVE CHRONOLOGY OF DYNS. 4 AND 5

Miroslav Verner

The crucial problem for reconstructing the relative chronology of Dyns. 4 and 5 is our ignorance of how the system of dating according to the “year/occasion of the (cattle) count” (mpt zp) was employed. Ever since Gardiner’s paper, specialists have acknowledged that this census formed the basis for counting regnal years during the OK. The existence and use of the term mpt m-ḥt zp (“year after the count”) was taken as clear-cut evidence for a biennial census. However, the preponderance of mpt zp over mpt m-ḥt zp years among the burgeoning number of dates recovered in recent years from excavations, taken in conjunction with an entry on the Palermo Stone attesting the cattle count in two successive years of Snofru, indicates that the situation is much more complex. Nowadays, some Egyptologists maintain that the census was biennial during Snofru’s reign with the sole exception of the seventh and eighth counts which were conducted in successive years. Others are of the opinion that a biennial system was not employed under Snofru, while yet others equivocate. For subsequent reigns, opinions fluctuate from the presumption of a biennial system to the assumption that on certain occasions an “odd” count could have been ignored. Finally, there is also the theory that annual cattle counts became more and more frequent during the OK until they became the rule by the end of Dyn. 6.

Obviously the existence of the census per se is not at issue, but rather its regularity during the OK. However, a statistical review of documented

---

7 Beckerath, Chronologie, 147.
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dates, even if the list is incomplete and the attribution of some con-
tested, allows some conclusions. For example, from the beginning of
Dyn. 4 to the end of Dyn. 5, the years of the count and those fol-
lowing the count occurred in succession, and \textit{rpt m-bt zp} years were
consistently more frequently documented than \textit{rpt m-ht zp} years. Moreover,
no clear-cut tendency can be observed towards a marked decrease in
the number of years following the count throughout the period.\textsuperscript{8} On
the contrary, the evidence for \textit{rpt zp} and \textit{rpt m-ht zp} from Snofru’s
reign at the beginning of Dyn. 4 to Djedkare’s at the end of Dyn. 5
supports the opposite conclusion.

Could a cattle count take place in the year of a king’s accession to
the throne? Until quite recently, the opinion prevailed that the first cattle
count of any given king’s reign occurred during the first full year after
his accession. But an entry among the annals inscribed on the stone
recently discovered at South Saqqara casts doubt on this assumption,
since the text explicitly mentions a (cattle) count of the year of the
“Unification of the Two Lands” at the beginning of the reign of Merenre’s.\textsuperscript{9}

The potential usefulness of the series, though incomplete, of \textit{rpt zp}
and \textit{rpt m-ht zp} dates for Dyns. 4 and 5 is demonstrated by analysis
of the data for both Snofru and Djedkare. Down to the present, the
highest recorded number of \textit{rpt zp} years for Snofru is 24; only half of
them (viz., \textit{rpt zp} 2, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 23 and 24) are doc-
umented among the preserved dates. Can we assume that about the
same proportion—i.e., ca. half of the evidence for the intervening
\textit{rpt m-ht zp} years—remains to date unattested? If so, the number (three) of
such currently documented dates—\textit{rpt m-ht zp} 10, 13 and 18—should
be doubled. An estimate for the length of Snofru’s reign based on these
data would be 24 + 6 = 30 years. Using other arguments, Krauss\textsuperscript{10}
and, independently, Barta\textsuperscript{11} arrived at nearly the same length for the
king’s reign.

Djedkare’s highest documented census is the 21st (or possibly the
22nd). Thirteen other “occasions” are known: 1, 3, 4(?), 5, 6, 8, 9, 10,
11, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18. In this series, seven (and possibly eight)

\textsuperscript{8} Contra Beckerath, \textit{Chronologie}.
\textsuperscript{9} Baud & Dobrev, “Annales”, 47.
\textsuperscript{10} R. Krauss, “The Length of Sneferu’s reign and how long it took to build the
Red Pyramid”, \textit{JEA} 82 (1996), 48.
\textsuperscript{11} W. Barta, “Die Chronologie der 1. bis 5. Dynastie nach den Angaben des rekon-
mpt zp or about one-third of the total is still unattested. There are seven mpt m-bt zp dates preserved: 1, 3, 4, 7(?), 10, 14, and 17. Adding a third of this amount, or about two years, to the number of mpt zp (21 or 22?) and mpt m-bt zp (7) years actually attested yields 30 (or possibly 31) years for the reign. It must be emphasized, however, that for the present these calculations, since speculative, must be treated with reserve.

No matter how cautiously conclusions be drawn, the available data indicate that the dating system was irregular during Dyns. 4 and 5, and not principally biennial with few exceptions. In practice, annual cattle counts apparently prevailed. The theory that intervening years were omitted from the record under certain circumstances is contradicted by the so-called masons’ inscriptions which consistently refer only to mpt zp years. These short texts associated with the construction projects of the state are the most frequently preserved dated documents from Dyn. 4 and 5. Why should these inscriptions regularly omit every second year from the administrative record?

If an irregular dating system pertained during Dyns. 4 and 5, what economic and/or administrative necessity determined its irregularity? It is possible, for instance, that during the formative period of the bureaucracy the frequency of the census was linked to the financing of large projects—buildings, reclamation of land from the marshes, etc. Were consecutive census years occasioned by funding shortfalls? Were factors influencing the decision to organize the census annually or biennially always the same or did they differ?

A special problem is the discrepancy between the available contemporaneous evidence and the reign lengths recorded of Dyns. 4 and 5 rulers in the TC. By contrast to the Manethonian tradition, the TC was long considered by specialists to be the standard against which contemporaneous data should be measured. Reign lengths given in the papyrus were sometimes used as evidence for annual cattle counts and at other times, for a biennial census. The compiler was presumed to have omitted one or more signs from some figures and to have mistakenly duplicated entries. Obviously, comparison of data from the very damaged papyrus with contemporaneous evidence can hardly be expected to provide a definitive version of OK chronology. The names of only three Dyn. 4 and 5 kings survive in the papyrus out of a presumed 17; three more partially-preserved names can be reconstructed.

---

remaining eleven are lost. Furthermore, the sequences at the end of Dyn. 4 and in mid-Dyn. 5 are by no means certain. Nor does evidence from contemporaneous documents always inspire confidence. For example, there is only a single case where the precise date of a king’s death and the accession of his successor are known, viz. for Sahure’ followed by Neferirkare’.

Regardless, the exact length of Sahure’’s tenure still cannot be established, since we do not know how regularly the census was taken during his reign.

Disappointing as this may be, analysis of contemporaneous dates, both mpt zp and mpt m-ht zp, offers some stimulating insights. Assuming that the census was irregular throughout Dyns. 4 and 5, the minimum length of a given king’s reign should equal the total of the highest attested census year (mpt zp) and the number of attested intervening years (mpt m-ht zp). A comparison of the results of such calculations with the data recorded in the TC is represented in the table that follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Contemporaneous Evidence</th>
<th>TC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dyn. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snofru</td>
<td>27 + x years</td>
<td>24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheops (Khufu)</td>
<td>13 + x</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ra‘djedef</td>
<td>11 (10?) + x</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khephren (Ra‘kha‘ef)</td>
<td>15 + x</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicheris</td>
<td>not attested</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycerinus (Menkaure‘)</td>
<td>14 (?) + x</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepseskað</td>
<td>2 + x</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thampththis</td>
<td>not attested</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyn. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Userkaf</td>
<td>4 + x</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahure‘</td>
<td>8 + x</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neferirkare‘</td>
<td>5 + x</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepseskare‘</td>
<td>not attested</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ra‘neferef</td>
<td>1 + x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuserre‘</td>
<td>8(?) + x</td>
<td>11 + x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menkaúhor</td>
<td>not attested</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djedkare‘</td>
<td>28 (29 ?) + x</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenis</td>
<td>9 + x</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, the estimate for the length of Snofru’s reign exceeds the figure provided by the papyrus; the same is probably true for the reigns of Ra‘djedef and Djedkare‘. On the other hand, the entry in
the TC for Shepseskare⁴, if correctly associated with that king, does not reflect the contemporaneous record, since virtually no clear-cut evidence for this mysterious ruler has yet surfaced.¹³ Such discrepancies call into question the credibility of the papyrus for Dyns. 4 and 5.¹⁴

List of Contemporaneously Documented Dates, Dyns. 4–5

SNOFRU

TC III.9: 24 years
Manetho: Sôris—29 years
Beckerath, Chronologie, 159: 35 years (?)

\[ \text{r} \text{npt zp} \]
- 2 \( n \) \( ttnw; \) Cairo frg no. 4¹⁵
- 7 \( n \) \( ttnw; \) Palermo Stone, recto 6¹⁶
- 7, \( sbd III; \) Maidum pyramid¹⁷
- 8 \( (18 \, ?); \) \( sbd III \, smw, \sw \, 2; \) Maidum pyramid¹⁸
- 8 \( n \) \( ttnw; \) Palermo Stone, recto 7¹⁹
- 12, \( sbd IV \, smw, \sw \, 1 \, (?) \); Maidum pyramid²⁰
- 13, \( \ldots \) \( prt \, (?) \), \sw \, 10; Maidum pyramid²¹
- 13 \( (16 \, ?); \) \( sbd I \, smw, \sw \ldots \); Maidum pyramid²²
- 13, \( \ldots \) \( smw, \sw \ldots \); Maidum pyramid²³
- 13 \( (16 \, ?); \) \( \ldots \) \( smw, \sw \ldots \); Maidum pyramid²⁴
- 13; Maidum pyramid²⁵

¹³ M. Verner, “Who was Shepseskare, and when did he reign?”, in: M. Bárta, J. Krejči, eds., Abusir and Saqqara in the year 2000 (Prague, 2000), 581–602.
¹⁴ Verner, “Remarks”.
¹⁵ H. Gauthier, “Quatre nouveaux fragments de la pierre de Palerme”, in: G. Maspero, Le Musée égyptien III (Cairo, 1915), 50–52.
• 13; Maidum pyramid
• 14 (17 ?), šbd II šm wa, sw . . . ; Maidum pyramid
• 14 (17 ?), . . . pr; Maidum pyramid
• 14 (17 ?), šbd I + x; Maidum pyramid
• 15, šbd II pr; sw 14; Dahshur, Red Pyramid
• 15 (?), šbd III pr; Maidum pyramid
• 15 (?), šbd III šm wa, sw 10 + x; Maidum pyramid
• 15 (?), šbd IV šm wa (?), sw 10; Maidum pyramid
• 15 (?), . . . šm wa (?), sw . . . ; Maidum pyramid
• 15; Dahshur, Red Pyramid
• 16, šbd I šh, sw 13; Dahshur, quarry mark
• 16, šbd III šh; Dahshur, Red Pyramid
• 16, šbd IV šh, sw 14; Maidum pyramid
• 16, šbd II (?) šm wa, sw 12; Maidum pyramid
• 16 (?) , šbd . . . pr; sw 2; Dahshur, Red Pyramid
• 16 (?) , šbd I pr; Maidum pyramid
• 16 (?) , šbd III pr; Maidum pyramid
• 16; Maidum pyramid
• 17, šbd II pr, sw 10 + x; Maidum pyramid
• 17, šbd I pr, sw 20; Maidum pyramid

30 R. Stadelmann (n. 2), 234–235, fig. 2.
32 W. M. F. Petrie, E. J. H. Mackay & G. A. Wainwright, Meydum and Memphis III
35 Stadelmann (n. 2), 233–5, fig. 1.
36 LD II, I g.
37 Stadelmann (n. 2), 234–235, fig. 2.
38 A. Rowe, The Museum Journal 22 (1931), 26, pl. 38, fig. 2.
40 H. Sourouzian, MDAIK 38 (1982), 389–390, fig. 5.
41 Rowe (n. 38), 26.
44 Petrie et al. (n. 32), 9, pl. 5, 2 left.
• 17, $\text{bd}$ I $prt$, $sw$ 22; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{46}
• 17, $\text{bd}$ III $prt$, $sw$ ‘rq; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{47}
• 17, $\text{bd}$ III $prt$, $sw$ . . . ; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{48}
• 17, $\text{bd}$ III $\text{ht}$, . . . ; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{49}
• 17, . . . $prt$; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{50}
• 17, ($\text{bd}$) I + $x$ $prt$; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{51}
• 17, ($\text{bd}$) I + $x$; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{52}
• 17, $\text{bd}$ . . . ; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{53}
• 17; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{54}
• 18, $\text{bd}$ I $prt$, $sw$ 21; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{55}
• 23, $\text{bd}$ II $\text{smw}$; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{56}
• 24, $\text{bd}$ II $\text{ht}$, . . . (?); Dahshur, Red Pyramid\textsuperscript{57}
• 24, $\text{bd}$ . . . $prt$, . . . ; Dahshur, Red Pyramid\textsuperscript{58}

Damaged evidence of $\text{mpt}$ $zp$

• 10 + $x$, $\text{bd}$ IV $\text{smw}$; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{59}
• 10 + $x$; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{60}
• (1)6 (?), $\text{bd}$ I + $x$, $sw$ 12; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{61}
• (1)6 (?), $\text{bd}$ I + $x$, $\text{smw}$ (?), $sw$ 2; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{62}
• (1)7 (?), IV $\text{smw}$, $sw$ 21; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{63}
• . . . , $\text{bd}$ IV . . . , $sw$ . . . ; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{64}

\textsuperscript{47} Petrie et al. (n. 32), 9, pl. 5.4.
\textsuperscript{48} Petrie et al. (n. 32), 9, pl. 5, 3.
\textsuperscript{49} Posener-Krieger, “Graffiti”, pl. 7, A.12.
\textsuperscript{50} Posener-Krieger, “Graffiti”, pl. 7, A.16.
\textsuperscript{52} Posener-Krieger, “Graffiti”, pl. 7, A.18.
\textsuperscript{54} Posener-Krieger, “Graffiti”, pl. 7, A.19.
\textsuperscript{55} Posener-Krieger, “Graffiti”, pl. 8, A.29.
\textsuperscript{56} Posener-Krieger, “Graffiti”, pl. 9, A.42.
\textsuperscript{57} Reconstruction of a mason’s mark in LD Text I, 206 by Stadelmann (n. 2), 234–236, fig. 3.
\textsuperscript{58} Stadelmann (n. 2), 239–240, fig. 4.
\textsuperscript{59} Posener-Krieger, “Graffiti”, pl. 8, A.34.
\textsuperscript{60} Posener-Krieger, “Graffiti”, pl. 8, A.35.
\textsuperscript{63} Posener-Krieger, “Graffiti”, pl. 7, A.15.
\textsuperscript{64} Posener-Krieger, “Graffiti”, pl. 9, A.36.
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- \ldots, \textit{3bd} III \textsc{smw}, \textsc{sw} \ldots; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{65}
- \ldots, \textit{3bd} III \textsc{smw}, \ldots 10 + \textit{x}; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{66}

\textit{mpt} (\textit{m}-) \textit{xt} \textsc{zp}\textsuperscript{67}
- 10, \textit{3bd} I + \textit{x}; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{68}
- 13, \ldots; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{69}
- 18, \textit{3bd} IV \textsc{smw}, \textsc{sw} (?) 5; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{70}

damaged evidence of \textit{mpt} (\textit{m}-)\textit{ht} \textsc{zp}
- \ldots; Maidum pyramid\textsuperscript{71}

attested \textit{mpt} \textsc{zp}: 2; 7; 8; 12; 13; 14; 15; 16; 17; 18; 23; 24
attested \textit{mpt} (\textit{m}-)\textit{ht} \textsc{zp}: 10; 13; 18
\textit{mpt} \textsc{zp}: \textit{mpt} (\textit{m}-)\textit{ht} \textsc{zp}—12: 3

**CHEOPS (KHUFU)**

\textit{TC} III:10 (?): 23 years
Manetho: Súphis (I)—63 years
Beckerath, \textit{Chronologie}, 159: 23 years

\textit{mpt} \textsc{zp}
- 4 (?) \textit{3bd} \ldots; G 2130, Khentika\textsuperscript{72}
- 5, \ldots \textsc{smw} (?), \textsc{sw} 5; G 1203\textsuperscript{73}
- 8, \textit{3bd} I \textit{prt}, \ldots (?)\ldots; a loose (?) block found at the upper end of the
causeway, near the entrance to the king’s mortuary temple\textsuperscript{74}
- 8, \textit{3bd} III \textsc{smw}, \textsc{sw} 20; G 4000, Hemiunu\textsuperscript{75}
- 10, \textit{3bd} IV \textit{prt}, \textsc{sw} 23 (or 24); G 4000, Hemiunu\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{65} Posener-Kriéger, “Graffiti”, pl. 9, A.37.
\textsuperscript{66} Posener-Kriéger, “Graffiti”, pl. 9, A.41.
\textsuperscript{67} For the transcription of \textit{m-ht} see Edel, \textit{Grammatik}, 180.
\textsuperscript{68} Posener-Kriéger, “Graffiti”, pl. 8, A.30.
\textsuperscript{69} Posener-Kriéger, “Graffiti”, pl. 8, A.32.
\textsuperscript{70} Posener-Kriéger, “Graffiti”, pl. 8, A.28.
\textsuperscript{71} Posener-Kriéger, “Graffiti”, pl. 9, A.38.
\textsuperscript{72} Attributed to Khufu by Smith, “Evidence”, 118 fig. 6; 127 no. 4; so also Y. Harpur,
\textit{Decoration in Egyptian Tombs of the Old Kingdom} (London, 1987), 269.
\textsuperscript{73} Attributed to Khufu by Smith, “Evidence”, 118, fig. 6; 127 no. 2, and by G. A.
Reisner, \textit{A History of the Giza Necropolis} I (Cambridge, Mass., 1942), 76 n. 2 and 391/19/.
\textsuperscript{74} Attributed to Khufu by Smith, “Evidence”, 119 fig. 7; 126ff. no. 1; originally,
A. Rowe read this date “year 13”, see Reisner (n. 73), 71.
\textsuperscript{75} Attributed to Khufu by Junker, \textit{Giza} I, 159, fig. 24/10/., 161.
\textsuperscript{76} Junker, \textit{Giza} I, 161, no. 12.
- 10, ʿibd I šmw, sw 10 + x; G 4000, Hemiu nu
- 10, ʿibd II šmw, sw 10 + x; G 4000, Hemiu nu
- 12, ʿibd II šmw; G 2120, Seshatsekhentiu
- 12, ʿibd II . . . ; G 7130–40, Khufukhaf

rnpt (m-)ḥt zp
- 13

attested rnpt zp: 4, 5, 8, 10, 12
rnpt (m-)ḥt zp: 13
rnpt zp: rnpt (m-)ḥt zp—5: 1

RAʾDJEDDEF
TC III.11 (?): 8 years
Beckerath, Chronologie, 159: 9 years

rnpt zp
- 1, ʿibd III ṭr(t), . . . ; pyramid of Raʾdjedef
- 11 (or 10 ?), ʿibd I pr(t), sw 24 (?); boat pit, south side of Khos's pyramid

attested rnpt zp: 1, 11 (10 ?)
rnpt (m-)ḥt zp: not attested
rnpt zp: rnpt (m-)ḥt zp: 2: 0 (?)

---

77 Junker, Giza I, 158, 160; 159 fig. 24/1/.
78 Junker, Giza I, 159 fig. 24/2/; 160.
79 Attributed to Khufu by Smith, "Evidence", 118, fig. 6; 127 no. 3, and by Spalinger, "Texts", 283; according to N. Strudwick, The Administration of Egypt in the Old Kingdom (London, 1985), 117 no. 6, the reign of Khephren is also possible.
80 Attributed to Khufu by Smith, "Evidence", 119, fig. 7; 127 no. 8, and by W. K. Simpson, The Mastabas of Kawab, Khafkhu I and II (Boston, 1978), 9. This dating also accords with Stadelmann's theory that Khufukhaf I assumed the name Khephren after succeeding Raʾdjedef, see SMK 11 (1985), 165–172.
82 M. Vallogia, in: Études sur l'Ancien Empire et la nécropole de Saqqara dédiés à Jean-Philippe Lauer (Montpellier, 1997), 419.
83 According to I. E. S. Edwards, in: The Unbroken Reed: Studies in the Culture and Heritage of Ancient Egypt in honour of A. F. Shore (London, 1994), 101, 105 n. 20, Posener-Krieger read "year 10" (i.e. "year of the 10th cattle count"); see also R. Krauss, Orientalia 66 (1997), 3 n. 16. Both readings are possible; however, the reading of the left column with the date is not doubt-free, and the right column of the graffito is almost illegible, see A. M. Abubakr & A. Y. Mustafa, The Funerary Boat of Khufu, in: BABA 12 (1971), 11, fig. 6 bottom left.
KHEPHREN (RA'KHAEF)

TC III.12: 20 + x years
Manetho: Suphis (II) 66 years
Beckerath, Chronologie, 159: 26 years

mpt zp
- 1, 3bd IV 3ḥt, sw 5; ostracon from Helwan tomb 299 H 2
- 5, 3bd III prt, sw 22; ostracon from Helwan tomb 335 H 2
- 7, 3bd IV prt, sw 10; G 7530–40, Meresankh III
- 7, 3bd IV prt, sw 20; G 7530–40, Meresankh III
- 10, 3bd III 3ḏm, sw 24; ostracon Leiden J 429
- 10 (?), 3bd III 3ḏm, . . . ; G 7350, Hetepheres II (?)
- 12, 3bd II 3ḏm, sw 10; G 7650, Akhtihotep and his wife Meretites

---

84 Z. Saad, Royal Excavations at Saqqara and Helwan (1941–1945), Suppl. ASAE no. 3 (Cairo, 1947), 106, pl. 42 a left; as Spalinger notes, “Texts”, 287, Khephren’s cartouche in the inscription clinches its assignment to his reign.
85 Saad (n. 84), 107, pl. 43 at right; probably temp. of Khephren.
86 Attributed to Khephren by B. Dunham & W. K. Simpson, The Mastaba of Meresankh III (Boston, 1974), 3 fig. 1; see also Smith, “Evidence”, 127 no. 9, 119 fig. 7.
87 Attributed to Khephren by Dunham & Simpson (n. 86), 3 fig. 1; see also Smith, “Evidence”, 127 no. 9, 119 fig. 7. Anthropological examination of Meresankh III’s bones put her age at death at about fifty, see V. G. Callender, Egypt in the Old Kingdom (Melbourne, 1998), 172–173.
88 According to H. Goedicke, JEA 54 (1968), 24, 28–29, pl. 5 no. 4, the ostracon is of the same date as those of Helwan; thus mpt zp 10 probably refers to Khephren. Cf. also, idem, Old Hieratic Palaeography (Baltimore, 1988), pl. 16.
89 According to Reisner (n. 73), 73 n. 2; see also Smith, “Evidence”, 119 fig. 7, 127 no. 9. The date was inscribed on the back of a block from G 7350, purportedly built for Hetepheres II. However, Smith identified the figures in the relief on the front as Hetepheres II (?) and Meresankh III (?), and he dated it to the time of Shepseskaf (HESPOK, 1946, 164–165, 302, pl. 45 a). The attribution of G 7350 to Hetepheres II is not based on textual evidence. P. Jánosi, ZAS 123 (1996), 56–57, has questioned Smith’s conclusions. He suggests that the relief might have originally shown an anonymous prince followed by his mother and his wife. No doubt the attribution of the date is fraught with difficulties, regardless of the fact that a high date and Shepseskaf’s reign are mutually exclusive, which leaves either Khephren or Menkaure’s. Since Meresankh III was probably buried in the tomb intended originally for her mother at the beginning of Menkaure’s reign (see the dates mpt zp 1 and mpt (m-)ḥt zp 1 sub Menkaure’s), it would be surprising to find her represented with her mother in a tomb built as late as Menkaure’s reign. When considering the data from G 7350 and G 7530–40 and with due circumspection in view of the complex stratigraphy and unclear chronology of cemetery G 7000, one is inclined to assign the date to Khephren.
90 Attributed to Khephren by Smith, “Evidence”, 119 fig. 7, 127–128 no. 11 b; see also Reisner (n. 73), 73 n. 1. For doubts about the attribution to Khephren, and a still higher date of mpt zp 13 (see below) from the tomb of Akhtihotep, see P. Jánosi, Giza in der 4. Dynastie. (Wien 2005), 71–73, 443.
• 12 *Tnwt* . . . ; LG 87, *Nikaure*91
• 13, *šbd IV* . . . ; G 7650, Akhthotep and his wife Meretites92

\[ \textit{mpt} (m-)ht \textit{zp} \]
• 4 *Tnwt*, *šbd II šmw*, sw 3; ostracon from Helwan tomb 305 H 293
• 4 *Tnwt*, *šbd II šmw*, sw 4; ostracon from Helwan tomb 305 H 294
• 5, *šbd II šmw*, sw 8; ostracon from Helwan tomb 322 H 295
• 5, *šbd III prt*, sw 22; ostracon from Helwan tomb 335 H 296

attested \[ \textit{mpt} \textit{zp} \]: 1, 5, 7, 10, 12, 13
attested \[ \textit{mpt} (m-)ht \textit{zp} \]: 4, 5
\[ \textit{mpt} \textit{zp} \]: \[ \textit{mpt} \textit{(m-)ht \textit{zp}} \]: 6: 2

**BICHERIS**

*TC III.13* (?): . . . ? . . . years
Manetho: 22 years (Bicheris, preceded by Ratoises, was inserted by Manetho between Mycerinus and Shepseskaf.)
Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 159: 7 years

**MYCERINUS (MENKAURE*)**

*TC III.14* (?): 18 (28 ?) years
Manetho: Mencherés—63 years
Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 159: 28 years.

---

91 *Urk. I*, 16.14; see also H. Goedicke, *Die privaten Rechtsinschriften aus dem Alten Reich* (Wien, 1970), 21–22. There is no unanimity on the dating of the will of Khephren’s son Nikaura. For instance, Strudwick (n. 79; 107) concluded that Nikaura should have been born in Khephren’s reign, “and thus would be no older than twenty-two at the end of his father’s reign”. Consequently, \[ \textit{mpt} \textit{zp} \] 12 should then apply to Khephren’s successor Menkaure*. With reference to art historical criteria and the replacement of *Tnwt* by *ipt* in the date (the former being supposed by Goedicke, *Rechtsinschriften*, 22, to have disappeared by the beginning of Dyn. 5), Spalinger (“Texts”, 294) opts for Menkaure*, too. But Baud, *Ménès*, 128, argues that Khephren’s name occurs in Nikaura’s tomb with such an insistence that the date should refer to this king. Jánosi (n. 90), too, does not exclude the attribution of the date to Khephren, provided that Nikaura was born before his father ascended the throne. Taking all the arguments in account, including the possibility that Khephren might have become king later in his life, one is inclined to assign this date to him.92

92 Attributed to Khephren by Smith, “Evidence”, 119 fig. 7, 128 no. 11.

93 Saad (n. 84), 106–107, pl. 42 b right. For the translation and interpretation, see H. G. Fischer, *Orientalia* 29 (1960), 187–190; Spalinger, “Texts”, 287.

94 Saad (n. 84), 106–107, pl. 42 b left. For translation and the reference of the ostracon, see Fischer (n. 93), 187–90; see also Spalinger, “Texts”, 287.

95 Saad (n. 84), 107, pl. 43 a right; see Spalinger, “Texts”, 288.

96 Saad (n. 84), 106–107, pl. 43 b right; see Spalinger, “Texts”. 
The following dates from the Gebelein papyri can probably be attributed to Mycerinus:

\[ \text{rmpt zp} \]
- 2, \( sbd \text{ II prt, sw 22; G VI S} \)
- 2, \( sbd \text{ IV smw, sw 22; G 7530-40, Meresankh III} \)
- 11, \( sbd . . . , sw 10 + x; \text{ G VI S} \)

The dates can be attributed to Mycerinus:

\[ \text{rmpt (m-)at zp} \]
- 2, \( sbd . . . sht, sw 20; \text{ Gebelein, frag. A} \)
- 3, \( sbd \text{ III prt, sw 26; Gebelein, frag. B} \)
- 11, . . . ; \text{ Gebelein, rouleau IV} \)

attested \( \text{rmpt zp} \): 2, 11
attested \( \text{rmpt (m-)at zp} \): 2(?) , 3(?) , 11(?)
\( \text{rmpt zp} \): \( \text{rmpt (m-)at zp—2: 3(?)} \)

**SHEPSESKAF**

TC III.15 (?): 4 years
Manetho: Sebercheres—7 years
Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 159: 5 years

---

97 Junker, *Giza X*, 75, fig. 35.9, 78, no. 10. With regard to the occurrence of this date on some blocks at the site, Junker attributed the date to Menkaure because of the presence of his crew names.

98 Dunham & Simpson, (n. 86), 3, fig. 1 e; see also Smith, “Evidence”, 116 fig. 4, 126 no. 2. The date is inscribed to the north of the subsidiary niche, eastern façade, of the mastaba (from the date on the south side, only . . . prt, sw 17 survived). Reisner attributed the date to Khephren, see Smith, “Evidence”; Spalinger, “Texts”, 286, accepts this dating, though with some hesitation. However, Reisner's dating can be seriously questioned. If the tomb was built around the 7th census of Khephren, as indicated by two masons' inscriptions (Simpson & Dunham (n. 86), 3, Fig. 1 b, c), the lower date found on the mastaba's façade can hardly be earlier. But to which event did the date refer? The attribution of the date to Menkaure seems to be, therefore, more probable. For the complex, and the problem of its history, see Jánosi (n. 90), 500 and *idem*, *ZAS* 123 (1996), 46–62.

99 Junker, *Giza X*, 75 fig. 35.10, 77 no. 9; because Menkaure's crew names were found on some blocks at the site, Junker attributed the date to his reign.


101 Posener-Kríeger (n. 100; 1979), 318–331.


mpt zp

- Palermo Stone
- 3bd II šmw, sw 10;
- 3bd II šmw, sw 10; G 5552
- 3bd III šmw, sw . . .; G 7450
- 3bd IV šmw, sw 4; G 7450

mpt zp
- 1, 3bd 1 šmw, sw 21 (G 753040, Meresankh III)

mpt (m-)ḥt zp
- tpy, 3bd II ḫrt, sw 28
- 1 (n) ḫpt (!) iht ḫt nbt; edict of Shepseskaf for the pyramid of Mycerinus

attested mpt zp: 1
attested mpt (m-)ḥt zp: 1
mpt zp: mpt (m-)ḥt zp—1: 1

THAMPHTHIS

TC III, 16 (?): 2 years
Manetho: Thamphthis—9 years
Beckerath, Chronologie, 159: 2 years

USERKAF

TC III.I7: 7 years
Manetho: Usercherés—7 years
Beckerath, Chronologie, 159: 8 years

---

105 Attributed to Shepseskaf by Helck, in: Fs Goedicke, 107.
106 Attributed to Shepseskaf by Helck (n. 105), 107–108.
107 Attributed to Shepseskaf by Helck (n. 105), 107–108.
108 The date to the right of the entrance to Meresankh III’s chapel refers to the preparation of the queen’s burial. Reisner attributed it to Shepseskaf, see Smith, “Evidence”, 126, fig. 4, 118; Jánosi (n. 90), 501 concurs. But Dunham & Simpson (n. 86), 8, pl. 2 a, fig. 2, and also Spalinger, “Texts”, 288–289, assign it to Menkaure.
109 The date, inscribed on the left side of the entrance to Meresankh III’s chapel and referring to the completion of the queen’s burial, was attributed by Reisner to Shepseskaf, see Smith, “Evidence”, 126, fig. 4 on p. 118. Jánosi (n. 90), 501, attributes the date to Shepseskaf, too. On the other hand, Dunham & Simpson (n. 86), 8, pl. 2 a, and also Spalinger, “Texts”, 289, attribute the date to Menkaure.
111 Schäfer, “Annalen”, 34.
DYNASTIES 4 TO 5

\textit{mpt} \textit{zp}

- 3; Palermo Stone, verso 2\textsuperscript{112}
- 3, \textit{ṣbd III} \textit{prt}, \textit{sw} . . . ; sun temple of Userkaf\textsuperscript{113}

\textit{mpt (m)-xt} \textit{zp}

- 1 (\textit{n} \textit{tuwt}; Cairo frag. no. 1 recto 2\textsuperscript{114}

attested \textit{mpt} \textit{zp}: 3
attested \textit{mpt (m)-xt} \textit{zp}: 1
\textit{mpt zp}: \textit{mpt (m)-xt} \textit{zp}, 1: 1

\textbf{SAHURE\textsuperscript{c}}

\textit{TC} III 18 (?): 12 years
Manetho: Sephrés—13 years
Beckerath, \textit{Chronologie}, 155: 13 years

\textit{mpt} \textit{zp}

- 1; Cairo Frg. no. 1 verso 2\textsuperscript{115}
- 2, \textit{ṣbd I} \textit{ṣnw}, \textit{sw} 20; mason’s inscription, mortuary temple of Sahure\textsuperscript{116}
- 4, \textit{ṣbd IV} \textit{ṣḥt}, \textit{sw} 12; masons’ inscription, mortuary temple of Sahure\textsuperscript{117}
- 5, \textit{ṣbd I} \textit{ṣḥt}; sun temple of Userkaf, tablet A\textsuperscript{118}
- 5, \textit{ṣbd III} \textit{ṣpr}; sun temple of Userkaf, tablet B\textsuperscript{119}
- 5, \textit{ṣbd III} \textit{ṣmw}; sun temple of Userkaf, tablet C\textsuperscript{120}

\textit{mpt (m)-xt} \textit{zp}

- 2 (Palermo Stone, verso 3)\textsuperscript{121}
- 5, \textit{ṣbd II} \textit{ṣpr}; sun temple of Userkaf, tablet D\textsuperscript{122}
- 6; Palermo Stone, verso 4\textsuperscript{123}

\textsuperscript{112} Schäfer, “Annalen”, 34.
\textsuperscript{113} Haeny, in: \textit{BABA} 8 (1969), 41–42 no. 6.
\textsuperscript{114} Gauthier (n. 15), 45–46, pl. 26.
\textsuperscript{115} Gauthier (n. 15), 47.
\textsuperscript{117} Borchardt (n. 116), 89, M 29.
\textsuperscript{118} Probably to be attributed to Sahure\textsuperscript{c}, see Verner, “Remarks”, 386–390.
\textsuperscript{119} Probably to be attributed to Sahure\textsuperscript{c}, see Verner, “Remarks”, 386–390.
\textsuperscript{120} Probably to be attributed to Sahure\textsuperscript{c}, “Remarks”, 386–390.
\textsuperscript{121} Schäfer, “Annalen”, 36–37.
\textsuperscript{122} Probably to be attributed to Sahure\textsuperscript{c}, see Verner, “Remarks”, 386–390.
\textsuperscript{123} Schäfer, “Annalen”, 38–39. To date, this is the highest contemporaneous date attested for Sahure\textsuperscript{c}’s reign. A. Roccaci, \textit{La littérature historique sous l’Ancien Empire} (Paris, 1982), 48, for instance, read the worn signs as 7 and, provided the census was biennial, evidence for year 15 of Sahure’s reign. However, as pointed out by Wilkinson (\textit{Annals}, 168), 6 is a more likely reading than 7; in case of a biennial census, it would refer to year 13.
attested mpt zp: 1, 2, 4, 5
attested mpt (m)-xt zp: 2, 5, 6
mpt zp: mpt (m)-xt zp, 4: 3

**NEFERIRKARE**

TC III.19 (?): length of reign lost
Manetho: Nefercherés—20 years
Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 155: 20 years

mpt zmē tawy; Palermo Stone verso 4\(^{124}\)

mpt zp

- 5; Palermo Stone verso 5\(^{125}\)
- 5, ibd IV šḥt, sw 4; mason’s inscription, pyramid of Khentkaus II\(^{126}\)
- 5, ibd IV; mason’s inscription, pyramid of Neferirkare\(^{127}\)

attested mpt zp: 5
mpt m-ḥt zp: not attested
mpt zp: mpt m-ḥt zp—1: 0

**SHEPSESKARE**

TC III.20 (?): 7 years
Manetho: Sisirés—7 years
Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 155: 7 years

**RA’NEFEREF**

TC III.21 (?): 1 year
Manetho: Cherés—20 years
Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 155: 11 years

mpt zp

- tpy, ibd IV šḥt sw 4 + x; pyramid of Ra’neferenef\(^{128}\)

attested mpt zp: 1
mpt (m-ḥt) zp: not attested
mpt zp: mpt (m-ḥt) zp—1: 0

---


\(^{125}\) Schäfer, “Annalen”, 40.

\(^{126}\) Probably to be attributed to Neferirkare, see Verner, *ZAS* 107 (1980), 159, fig. 3; *idem* The Pyramid Complex of Khentkaus (Prague, 1995), 43–45.


\(^{128}\) Corrected copy: Verner, *ZAS* 126 (1999), 76, fig. 6.
NEUSERRE

TC III.22 (?): 11 (+ x years ?)
Manetho: Rathurès—44 years
Beckerath, Chronologie, 155: 31 years; cf. ibidem 208, where the figure 30—or 20 ? + 1 or 5 ?—is given

mpt zm3 (3t3wy)
- unpublished potsherd no. 763/1/84–x, mortuary temple of Ra‘neferef

mpt zp
- 1, 3bd I 3ht, sw 10 + x; unpublished potsherd no. 531/1/82, mortuary temple of Ra‘neferef
- 1, 3bd tpy 3ht, . . . ; unpublished potsherd no. 763/1/84–e, mortuary temple of Ra‘neferef
- 2, 3bd III 3m3w, sw 10; a potsherd found by Borchardt129 in (or to the west of ?) the mastaba of Djadjamankh in Abusir
- 5 (?), 3bd III 3pt, (sw) 3wpr; masons’ inscription, mastaba of Ptahshepses130
- 7, 3bd III 3ht, sw 1 (or 7 ?); jar for beef fat no. 531/1/82, mortuary temple of Ra‘neferef

mpt (m-)3ht zp
- 2, 3bd 3 3ht, sw 24; masonry block, found in the southern “Eckbau” of the mortuary temple of Neuserre131

attested mpt zp: 1, 2, 5(?), 7
attested mpt (m-)3ht zp: 2
mpt zp: mpt (m-)3ht zp—4(?): 1

MENKAUHOR

TC III.23: 8 years
Manetho: Mencherês—9 years
Beckerath, Chronologie, 155: 9 years

DJEDKARE

TC III.24: 28 years
Manetho: Tancherês—44 years
Beckerath, Chronologie, 155: 38 years

129 L. Borchardt, Das Grabdenkmal des Königs Ne-user-r’ (Leipzig, 1907), 139.
130 To be attributed to Neuserre: M. Verner, Baugraffiti der Ptahshepses Mastaba (Prague, 1992), 110, graffito no. 194.
131 Borchardt (n. 129), 145.
$\text{mrpt zn}' \text{ wwy}$

- *$\text{bd b III pr}$, *sw* 29; tomb of Wepemneferet$^{132}$
- *$\text{mrpt z'y}$
  - 1. *$\text{bd II szt}$, . . .; unp. pap., (mortuary temple) archive of Ra'nefer, pl. 51 A
  - *$\text{mrpt tpy (sic)}$, . . .; unp. pap., archive of Ra'nefer, pl. 76 A
  - 3. *$\text{bd IV szt}$, *sw* 25; papyrus archive, temple of Neferirkare$^{133}$
  - 5. *$\text{bd IV szt}$, . . .; unp. pap., archive of Ra'nefer, pl. 76 C
  - 6. *$\text{bd IV pr}$, *sw* 22; wooden box for linen found in the tomb of Nefer and Kahay$^{134}$
  - 8. *$\text{bd IV šm}w$; papyrus archive, mortuary temple of Neferirkare$^{135}$
  - 9; rock stela, Sinai$^{136}$
  - 10. *$\text{bd IV . . .}$, *sw* 24; papyrus archive, mortuary temple of Neferirkare$^{137}$
  - 11. *$\text{bd II szt}$, *sw* 11; papyrus archive, mortuary temple of Neferirkare$^{138}$
  - 14. *$\text{bd tpy šm}w$ ($\text{bd II šm}w$); papyrus archive, mortuary temple of Neferirkare$^{139}$

---

$^{132}$ The date, mentioned in Wepemneferet's will on a wall of his tomb (S. Hassan, *Giza II*, Cairo, 1936, fig. 219), was attributed by Spalinger (“Texts”, 302, with a reference to K. Baer, *Rank and Title in the Old Kingdom*, Chicago, 1960, 66) to Wenis. However, the persons mentioned in the tomb include a craftsman named Ra'nefer-anhk. If born in the reign of Ra’nefer, which seems probable, he could have been about 30 to 40 years old at the beginning of Djedkare’s reign. If this date be ascribed to Wenis, he would have been very old at the time of that king’s accession. The date should, therefore, refer to Djedkare rather than Wenis.


$^{134}$ H. Altenmüller & A. Moussa, *The Tomb of Nefer and Kahay* (Mainz: AV 5, 1971), 18, 43–44, fig. 11. The excavators assigned the date to Djedkare. However, Spalinger, “Texts”, 302 suggested either Ra’nefer or Neuserre. Surely Ra’nefer can be excluded (see above sub Ra’nefer!). The tomb seems to have been built in the time of Neuserre, as the excavators surmised; see also, e.g., N. Cherpion, *Mastabas et Hypogees de l’ancien Egypte* (Bruxelles, 1989), 135. However, as pointed out by Altenmüller & Moussa, the burial in shaft no. 8, where the box with the date was found, was the last one made in the tomb and should be contemporary with Nefer’s children. The dating of the inscription to the time of Djedkare is, therefore, very plausible.


15, \textit{ibd} IV \textit{prt}, (sw) \textit{wpw}; papyrus archive, mortuary temple of Neferirkare\textsuperscript{140}

15, \textit{ibd} IV \textit{sh\textbar t}, sw 27; unp. pap., archive of Ra\textquotesingle nefereref, pl. 20 B

15, \textit{ibd} IV \textit{sh\textbar t}, sw 28; unp. pap., archive of Ra\textquotesingle nefereref\textsuperscript{141}

15, \textit{ibd} I, . . .; unp. pap., archive of Ra\textquotesingle nefereref, pl. 21 L

15 (n) \textit{T(mot)}; unp. pap., archive of Ra\textquotesingle nefereref, pl. 3 A

16; papyrus archive, mortuary temple of Neferirkare\textsuperscript{142}

[1]6, \textit{ibd} IV \textit{\textbar smw}, sw 28\textsuperscript{143}

17, \textit{ibd} III; unp. pap., archive of Ra\textquotesingle nefereref, pl. 8 D

18, \textit{ibd} III \textit{\textbar smw}, sw \textit{\textbar rq}; unp. pap., archive of Ra\textquotesingle nefereref, pl. 45

18, \textit{ibd} IV \textit{\textbar smw}, sw \textit{\textbar rq}; unp. pap., archive of Ra\textquotesingle nefereref, pl. 63 A

21 (22 ?), \textit{ibd} IV \textit{sh\textbar t}, sw 12; papyrus archive, mortuary temple of Neferirkare\textsuperscript{144}

\textbf{damaged evidence of} \textit{mpt \textbar zp}

2 + x, \textit{ibd} I . . ., sw . . .; unp. pap., archive of Ra\textquotesingle nefereref, pl. 76 B

10 + x; unp. pap., archive of Ra\textquotesingle nefereref, pl. 85 C

11 + x \textit{TM\textbar w(t) \textbar th} (\textquoteleft \textit{wet nb}); unp. pap., archive of Ra\textquotesingle nefereref, pl. 1 A.

\textit{mpt} (m-\textit{\textbar ht}) \textit{zp}

1, \textit{ibd} IV \textit{sh\textbar t}, sw \textit{\textbar rq}; unp. pap., archive of Ra\textquotesingle nefereref, pl. 77 A

1, \textit{ibd} IV \textit{\textbar smw}, sw 1; unp. pap., archive of Ra\textquotesingle nefereref, pl. 77 B

\textit{\textbar th\textbar y}; unp. pap., archive of Ra\textquotesingle nefereref, pl. 82 0

3; rock stela, Sinai.\textsuperscript{145}

4, \textit{ibd} III \textit{\textbar smw}, sw 15; unp. pap., archive of Ra\textquotesingle nefereref, pl. 76 C.

4, \textit{ibd} III \textit{\textbar smw}; unp. pap., archive of Ra\textquotesingle nefereref, pl. 69 A

7 (?), \textit{ibd} I \textit{sh\textbar t}; unp. pap., archive of Ra\textquotesingle nefereref, pl. 76 D

10, \textit{ibd} IV \textit{\textbar smw}, sw 21; papyrus archive, mortuary temple of Neferirkare\textsuperscript{146}

\textsuperscript{140} Posener-Krieger & de Cenival, \textit{Abusir Papyri}, pls. 47, 47 A; Posener-Krieger, \textit{Archives} II, 490.


\textsuperscript{142} Posener-Krieger & de Cenival, \textit{Abusir Papyri}, pls. 1, 1 A; Posener-Krieger, \textit{Archives} II, 490.

\textsuperscript{143} Umk I, 63.11; W. S. Smith, “Evidence”, 113 n. 2; see also E. Eichler, \textit{SAK} 18 (1991), 146–147 (letter of Izezi to Senedjemib).

\textsuperscript{144} Posener-Krieger & de Cenival, \textit{Abusir Papyri}, pls. 41, 41 A; Posener-Krieger, \textit{Archives} II, 490. Posener-Krieger transcribed the numeral following \textit{mpt \textbar zp} as 21. There is, however, the trace of another vertical stroke which allows the reconstruction ‘22’.

\textsuperscript{145} Gardiner et al. (n. 136), I, pl. VII, no. 13; II, 60.

\textsuperscript{146} Posener-Krieger & de Cenival, \textit{Abusir Papyri}, pls. 14, 14 A; Posener-Krieger, \textit{Archives} II, 490.
damaged evidence of \textit{mpt (m)-xt zP}

- 4 + x, \textit{zbd I zht}; unpr. pap., mortuary temple archive of Ra'neferef, pl. 77 I
- 10 + x, ...; unpr. pap., mortuary temple archive of Ra'neferef, pl. 76 E

documents dating from the time of either Djedkare\textsuperscript{e} or Wenis:

- \textit{mpt zP} 4, \textit{zbd IV prt, sw} 2; papyrus archive, mortuary temple of Neferirkare\textsuperscript{e}\textsuperscript{148}
- \textit{mpt zP} 4, \textit{zbd I swnw, sw 'rq}; papyrus archive, mortuary temple of Neferirkare\textsuperscript{e}\textsuperscript{149}
- \textit{mpt zP} 11, \textit{zbd III prt, sw} 3 (?); mason's inscription, tomb of Rawer II\textsuperscript{150}

attested \textit{mpt zP}: 1, 3, 4(?), 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21 (22?)
attested \textit{mpt (m)-xt zP}: 1, 3, 4, 7 (?), 10, 14, 17
\textit{mpt zP}: \textit{mpt (m)-xt zP}, 15(?): 7(?)

\textbf{WENIS}

\textit{TC} III.25: 30 years

Manetho: Onnos—33 years

Beckerath, \textit{Chronologie}, 155: 20 years

\textsuperscript{147} M. Verner, \textit{SAK} 8 (1980), 258–260, pl. 16. A new examination of the badly damaged inscription showed that the date should be read \textit{mpt (m-)!ht zP} 17 rather than \textit{mpt zP} 14, as suggested shortly after the discovery of the tomb.

\textsuperscript{148} Posener-Krieger & de Cenival, \textit{Abusir Papyri}, pls. 11, 11 A; Posener-Krieger, \textit{Archives II}, 491, was hesitant about the attribution of this date to either Djedkare\textsuperscript{e} or Wenis.

\textsuperscript{149} Posener-Krieger & de Cenival, \textit{Abusir Papyri}, pls. 11, 11 A; Posener-Krieger, \textit{Archives II}, 491 was hesitant about the attribution of this date to either Djedkare\textsuperscript{e} or Wenis.

\textsuperscript{150} Junker, \textit{Giza} III, 223–235; \textit{idem Giza} VIII, 39f. Though a sealing bearing the name of Djedkare\textsuperscript{e} was found in the tomb, the attribution of the date to him is somewhat uncertain. Nevertheless Baer (n. 132), 98, assigned the tomb to the end of Dyn. 5, while Harpur (n. 72), 213, dates it mid-Djedkare\textsuperscript{e} to Wenis.
Concerning several dates whose attribution is uncertain (Djadkareš or Wenis), see above under Djadkareš.

attested \( mpt \) \( zp \): 3, 6, 8
attested \( mpt \) \( (m)-xt \) \( zp \): 4

Postscript.—Unfortunately, the edition of this volume has been delayed by four years. In the meantime, there has appeared some new information relating to the subject of my article to which I could not respond. For instance, a work by J. S. Nolan (The Original Lunar Calendar and Cattle Counts in Old Kingdom Egypt in: AH 17, 2003, 75–97) offering the explanation of the imbalance between the “years of an occasion” and “years after an occasion” in the contemporaneous Old Kingdom documents. Moreover, some new conclusions concerning the dated documents of the late Fifth Dynasty eventuated as a result of an examination of the papyri from Raneferef’s mortuary temple archive (see P. Posener-Kriéger, M. Verner, H. Vymazalová, The Pyramid Complex of Raneferef. The Papyrus Archive, in press). It is thus a matter of some regret that this article could not be as comprehensive as I would have liked.

---

151 M. Verner & V. Callender, Djedkareš’s Family Cemetery (Prague, 2002), 103.
152 Posener-Kriéger & de Cenival, Abusir Papyri, pls. 54 c, 54 A c; Posener-Kriéger, Archives II, 491.
153 Posener-Kriéger & de Cenival, Abusir Papyri, pls. 50, 50 A; Posener-Kriéger, Archives II, 491.