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## The "extensions"; Subdivisions in T. ${ }^{1}$

An unexplained difference between T and M in connection with the sum numbers must be pointed out: not all the dynasties of Manetho match with those of the Turin Papyrus. A similarity can be found in the Fifth, and probably also in the Sixth, the Eleventh, Twelfth, and Fifteenth dynasties, that is, wherever the contemporaries have already spoken of a dynasty, as we did for the Heracleopolitan period with the name of the "House of Khety". But until the end of the Fifth Dynasty, T does not give sums or dynastic headings, but seems to indicate subdivisions by adding the words "ruled as a king" (even in the Third Dynasty "his lifetime"). However, these subdivisions are elsewhere than in M: they begin with Miebis, Zoser (especially emphasized by rubrum!), and $n f r-i r-k 3-r^{c}$. This change is striking because we know from Pap. Westcar that the transition from the Fourth to the Fifth dynasty was seen as a strong division already at that time. This raises the conjecture that we are not dealing with dynastic divisions here. If we look at the intermediate spaces according to which the written comments stand, the result is a striking match:

| Menes to hasp.ti | 6 lines |
| :---: | :---: |
| Miebis to $\mathrm{Nb}-\mathrm{k}$ ? | 13 lines |
| Djoser to Sahure | 14 lines |
| $n f r-i r-k 3-r^{c}$ to [wsr-k3-r ${ }^{c}$ ] | 9 lines (and a sum) |
| $m r i-r$ ' to ' $16 i$ | 11 lines and 4 lines total (see above!) |
| (Col. IV 9) to $\mathrm{V}_{4}$ | 13 lines |
| $\mathrm{V}_{5}$ to 18 | 14 lines (including 2 sums and one heading) |
| V 19 to VI 3 (12th dynasty) | 10 lines |
| VI 4 to 15 | 12 lines (and the note "omitted") |
| VI 16 to VII 2 | 14 lines |
| VII 3 to (16) | 14 lines |
| (VII 17) to VIII 3 | 15 lines |
| VIII 4 to 19 | 16 lines |
| VIII 20 to (IX 4) | 15 lines |
| (IX 5) to 19 | 15 lines |
| IX 20 to ( $\mathrm{X}_{2}$ ) | 15 lines |
| $\left(\mathrm{X}_{3}\right)$ to x ? | Disruption apparently caused by the explicit |
| x to x 30 ? | introduction of the Hyksos; together 28 lines. |
| X 31 to XI ${ }_{5} 5$ | 16 lines |
| XI 16 to XI 30 | 15 lines |
| XI 31 to ? | incomplete |

[^0]Therefore, there is a striking preference for the numbers 13 to 16 , with an increasing tendency to be recognized. I did not consider the two cases $\mathrm{VI}_{1}$ and IV 1 , ie in the first line of the page. As you might expect, the writer has inserted the full text at the top of the page. Could not the full writing be because it was copied from a vorlage ${ }^{2}$ that had between $13 / 6$ lines per page, in the same way the number of lines increase in the Pap. Turin itself, where Col. II begins with 25 lines and Col. IX has 32 lines? The writer of T would then have copied as he read it in his template without considering that the full line spelling actually belonged only to the head of the page - which he has also inserted twice. We have still to add the lines for the dynasty of gods of the template above Menes to $h s p . t j$.

[^1]
[^0]:    1 The Royal Canon of Turin is abbreviated as T by Helck.

[^1]:    2 German for "template, prototype or prior version of a manuscript".

