

## A (Coffin) Text Puzzle

### لغز أحد نصوص (التوابيت)

Alessandro Roccati\*

#### ملخص

اشترى آلان جاردنر ثلاث برديات هيراطيقية من القاهرة، ثم أهداها إلى ثلاثة مراكز أبحاث ذات مكانة مرموقة في علم المصريات، وهي المتحف البريطاني، والمعهد الشرقي بشيكاغو، ومتحف اللوفر. وبالرغم من تضمين هذه البرديات في مشروع 'نصوص التوابيت'، ثم قيام أ. دي بوك بنشرها في نسختها الهيروغليفية، جنباً إلى جنب مع النصوص المشابهة لها، فإن هذه البرديات الهيراطيقية - نصوص التوابيت - قد سببت لغزاً وحيرة لدى علماء اللغة المصرية القديمة بشأن طبيعتها وتاريخها؛ إذ إن مكان وظروف العثور على تلك البرديات غير معلوم لنا، لذا فإن أي تفسير حول مغزى تلك النصوص يجب أن يعتمد على التحليل المباشر لمضمونها وسياقها.

لقد كُتبت تلك البرديات في شكل صفوف رأسية على ورقات طويلة بطريقة تشبه بشكل كبير نصوص الأهرامات، لكنها كتبت بالخط الهيراطيقي، وهو الخط الذي استخدم خلال عصر الدولة القديمة للأغراض الإدارية والخاصة. ومن المعروف أن معرفتنا بخصائص الخط الهيراطيقي أثناء الألفية الثالثة قبل الميلاد، قد ازدادت في السنوات الأخيرة من خلال إتاحة ونشر لعديد من برديات الأسرة الرابعة. على أية حال، فإن التصميم التقليدي للبرديات الهيراطيقية التي اشتراها جاردنر لا توحى بشكل أساسي أنها تشير إلى صلتها بنصوص التوابيت، بغض النظر عن العلاقة بين نصوص التوابيت ونصوص الأهرامات.

ووفقاً لما قمت به من البحث الدقيق لبعض الخصائص المبتكرة في هجاء نصوص التوابيت، فقد لاحظت أن البرديات الهيراطيقية التي اشتراها جاردنر لا تحمل أية ميزة فريدة، لكنها تتشارك بعض الخصائص الهجائية التي تعود لفترة الانتقال الأول، واحتفظت بها نصوص التوابيت إلى فترة الأسرة العشرين وما بعدها، وهي خصائص لم تكن معروفة في فترة الدولة القديمة.

Three similar hieratic papyrus rolls, purchased by Alan H. Gardiner in Cairo, were bestowed by him on three first rank Egyptian collections and research centers, namely the British Museum, the Chicago Oriental Institute and the Louvre<sup>1</sup>. Although these texts were embodied in the *Coffin Texts* project and published by Adriaan de Buck in hieroglyphic transcription along with the available parallels in related evidence, they happen to have embarrassed scholars about their nature and date. Their provenance is unknown, as well as the circumstances of their discovery, at the beginning of the Twentieth Century, so that any clue about their purport must rely on considerations drawn directly from the extant writings. However, pertaining to the pattern of the labelled *Coffin Texts*, the contents of the Gardiner papyri is distinguished for a range of unique spells, hitherto lacking extensive correspondences with the inscribed coffins, even though they are also reproductions of the same texts<sup>2</sup>, and at the same time not involving any *Pyramid Texts*<sup>3</sup>. Moreover, even if it is well known that the *Coffin Texts* were copied from papyri<sup>4</sup>, and some of these papyri are still preserved, the Gardiner papyri do not show any peculiar feature assisting to date them, because the style of their writing looks rather ancient and likely before the Heracleopolitan period, where they sometimes were cited<sup>5</sup>. More texts on papyri of magic and ritual nature are known from the Middle Kingdom, which have only indirect connections with the *Coffin Texts*<sup>6</sup> and later evidence may definitely date back to the Old Kingdom<sup>7</sup>. Meanwhile, the works of a French team at Saqqara are discovering more unknown spells of *Pyramid Texts*<sup>8</sup>.

Actually the Gardiner papyri are inscribed in vertical lines on long sheets, in a way similar to the *Pyramid Texts*, but their writing indeed is hieratic,

the script foreseen for administrative and private purposes in the Old Kingdom. Our knowledge of hieratic during the third millennium BCE has progressed greatly in recent years, after relevant documents from as early as the Fourth Dynasty have become available, allowing to spread the growing evidence over a long span of time. At any rate, the archaic feature of the layout of the Gardiner papyri, does not preclude that their main correspondences are with *Coffin Texts*<sup>9</sup>, regardless of some links of *Coffin Texts* with *Pyramid Texts*. The Gardiner papyri already show rubrics to mark headings for the spells, as usual in the *Coffin Texts*<sup>10</sup>. Additional help may come from details of grammar and graphic features, which can offer some useful insight. Following a research the author made on some innovating features in the orthography of *Coffin Texts*<sup>11</sup>, the Gardiner papyri have nothing remarkable, but they share some devices typical of the First Intermediate Period and maintained on some *Coffin Texts* copies until the Twelfth Dynasty and even later, which are unknown in the Old Kingdom. One of these is the writing *nwi* of the dependent pronoun of the 1<sup>st</sup> singular person after the plural suffixes *.tn* and *.sn*<sup>12</sup>.

Unlike the Gardiner papyri, the Turin coffin G 1 T discovered in regular excavations at Gebelein, shows a rather similar early layout, but displays several orthographic features, which argue for a location of the extant copy may be during the reign of Ammenemes III and are resumed below<sup>13</sup>:

1. the writing of the passive suffix as *tw*<sup>14</sup>;
2. the writing *iw* instead of *i* at the beginning of words<sup>15</sup>;
3. the writing of the word *h3wt* (in *Coffin T. III 322 h*)<sup>16</sup>;

4. some writing of the personal suffix of the 1<sup>st</sup> person in the plural with a determinative of the sitting man, which is shared only by some late Coffins<sup>17</sup>;
5. the writing of the *w3g* feast as *w3gi* typical for the reign of Ammenemes III<sup>18</sup>;
6. the writing  for *pzn* appears already at the beginning of the Middle Kingdom, but is shared by a variety of manuscripts as a hypercorrection<sup>19</sup>.

Harco Willems with his harsh judgement<sup>20</sup> failed to realize that *Coffin Texts* manuscripts could undergo the same tradition routes as all kind of literature, in which either typology or palaeography sometimes do not agree with the ‘true’ dating, both of the chronological setting of the concerned manuscript or of the (earlier) composition of its text<sup>21</sup>. Even grammatical or lexical features may be unreliable for the dating of a composition in its entirety<sup>22</sup>. Unlike the Turin coffins found in Gebelein, the Gardiner papyri are no late copies but likely older manuscripts. The tracing of their hieratic script may be an imitation of earlier records, but the quoted orthographic issues ensure that they were written not before the end of the Old Kingdom, whereas the Gebelein copies were made not before the second half of the Twelfth Dynasty. Neither the Gardiner papyri nor the Gebelein *Turin Coffin Texts* do embody any *Pyramid Texts*<sup>23</sup>, unlike most other Middle Kingdom coffins.

Even in the domain of religious literature some steps of redactional intervention should be envisaged, which left traces throughout the preserved documents. One major step can be hypothesized somewhere at the beginning of the Middle Kingdom, when pieces of oral literature (like the *Wisdom of Ptahhotep*<sup>24</sup> and the *Wisdom*

*of Kairsu*<sup>25</sup>) received one (or more?) standard written records (editions). The plot of the *Tale of the Eloquent Peasant* may preserve some memory of such events, as it shows the astonishment of a learned, although illiterate, low class advocate in front of the unexpected recording of his speeches. We do not know whether such recording was also sometimes operated during meetings, where officials boasted about their oratorical skills<sup>26</sup>, but in the *Prophecies of Neferti* the Pharaoh himself was believed to write down what the magician foretold him<sup>27</sup>, while the wise Ptahhotep was prompted by the Pharaoh Isesi in the Fifth Dynasty to provide his advice without mentioning any recording in script (even allowing that this prologue may be a later addition)<sup>28</sup>. Unlike Ptahhotep’s teachings, the *Prophecies of Neferti* and the *Tale of the Eloquent Peasant* definitely belong to the world of writing, and eloquence triggered to achievement in the social relations is enhanced in the *Teaching of a Man for his Son*<sup>29</sup>.

A remake of a sentence in the *Teachings of Ptahhotep* (*qsn mdt r kzt nb* ‘speech is the hardest work’)<sup>30</sup> is the statement in the *Teaching for Merikarê* (P 32) *qn mdt r ‘h3 nb* ‘speech is the most effective weapon’<sup>31</sup>, which is likely to represent an updating of a proverbial utterance, but where one may also find a reference to the execration rituals. Actually, numerous changes are witnessed in the manuscripts of the Middle Kingdom, which generate a conceptual transformation of writing in that period towards a ‘book script’, especially in the ‘hieratic’ counterpart. The differences between the writings of the Old Kingdom and those of the Middle Kingdom lie not so much on grammar, but rather in shifts of meaning and

writing devices. While the *phonetic* writing of the Old Kingdom stuck at recording the voice or the pronunciation of words and sentences, the *graphic* (or *textual*) writing of the Middle Kingdom endeavored to help reading and understanding of texts, which might be not so familiar to their users, unlike the Old Kingdom priests. There is an increase in the number of word determinatives, some vocalic endings (as the suffix pronoun of 1<sup>st</sup> person singular *.i*) are more and more registered both phonetically (*f. i.* with the sign , representing a vowel) or by means of ideograms (, or the combination of both  ) in a way similar to the use of  as determinative for all towns later on<sup>32</sup>. The mechanical addition of the latter mark of the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular in all pronominal sets and even in the stative<sup>33</sup> is evidence that the Gardiner papyri were reworked copies of older originals, which were submitted to an editing common to most *Coffin Texts* manuscripts. Otherwise similar changes concern in course of time the writing of the passive ending as *.tw* (where *w* has no phonetic value), the creation of a new phonetic sign  to render some vowel at the end of suffixes or endings), eventually standardizing the regular orthography of words<sup>34</sup> and turning to horizontal lines of writing inscribed inside ‘pages’. Copies of texts were gradually updated adding such details, providing thereby a useful key to knowing the time of their making. Likewise in the wisdom field a uniform editing has been surmised

before the Ramesside Period<sup>35</sup>, to which period go back many preserved copies.

Even if all that is known is from direct observations of sources, scholars have to be aware that we deal with materials that were worked out again and again under circumstances to be better acknowledged but which cannot be overlooked. The changes look rather as trends than rules, but a certain coherence in following new patterns is shown in the instance of G 1 T manuscript. The manufacture of this funerary collection of spells in the second half of the Twelfth Dynasty should be a warning against construing a cultural background based on unchecked evidence. The link between the contents of the *Turin Coffin Texts* and their find spot in a tomb at Gebelein does not involve their origin, but rather the choice of relevant spells. Even the star-clock calendar inscribed under the coffin lid of these coffins shows some peculiar features, however without relevance for dating<sup>36</sup>.

Thus the Gebelein inscribed coffins were entombed less than one century before the Hyksos rulers established there a military outpost<sup>37</sup>, and this gap may be farther reduced. It is possible that the hints in favor of a late dating of these manuscripts basically represent only a *terminus ante quem non* and no absolute time reference. Given the skilled copying of the archaic shaped texts layout, even a date beyond the Twelfth Dynasty is not to be discarded, and that would open an unpredictable scenario if the historical environment could be better determined<sup>38</sup>, these (Coffin) manuscripts being roughly contemporary with the Ramesseum papyri<sup>39</sup> that might have been gathered at Gebelein<sup>40</sup>. Regardless of the literary roll with the stories of Sinuhe and of the Peasant, some ‘magical’ spells are connected here too with Ramesside offshoots<sup>41</sup>.

One cannot say whether the more recent features were introduced by the scribe who wrote on the boards of the Turin coffin, or they were already found in the scroll(s) the texts were copied from. Even the light planks of the inner coffin G 1 T might have been inscribed anywhere. None of these innovating features is noticed in A 1 C (the ‘coffin of Heqata’ studied by Willems), the closest manuscript to G 1 T, which is likely to be somewhat older in time<sup>42</sup>. No other *Coffin Texts* of such extent are available from the area between Thebes and Aswan, while the Berlin coffin from Gebelein (G 1 Be) bears short and conventional texts. Yet in Thebes the best correspondences are with the most ancient (royal) *Coffin Texts* from the burial place of Deir el-Bahari (T 3 C). It is likely that particulars took over such texts of royal rank only after a dynastic change<sup>43</sup>. Subsequently in Thebes during the Twelfth Dynasty a totally different model of *Coffin Texts* collections will lead towards the birth of the *Book of the Dead*, whose earliest witness is considered the coffin of Queen Mentuhotep, a contemporary of the Hyksos<sup>44</sup>.

Connections between the reigns of Sesostri I and Ammenemes III in the epigraphic field are well exemplified by the patchwork on the stela of Sehetepibre<sup>45</sup>, partly dependent on the funerary monument of Vizier Mentuhotep<sup>46</sup>, at Abydos, and partly on other known sources as the *Teaching of Kairsu*<sup>47</sup>.

Anyhow a few spells of G 1 T (and A 1 C)<sup>48</sup> besides G 2 T<sup>49</sup>, are shared with the Gardiner Papyri ensuring thereby that their scribes also drew from very old sources, while neglecting any *Pyramid Texts* as well<sup>50</sup>. Due to the striking old fashioned features of the lay-out of G 1 T (and A 1 C) one might perhaps question whether their owners were keen to obtain ancient and rare texts, as it

was probably often done in ancient Egypt, all be it under different circumstances, even if it was not always explicitly stated. However G 1 T, unlike A 1 C, has been shown to share some contents with one of the stories imbedded in the narrative of *Westcar Papyrus*<sup>51</sup>. In one of these tales, referred to Pharaoh Snefru, as well as in the afore quoted *Prophecies of Neferti*, word plays on the topic of *nfr* ‘accomplished’ can also be noticed<sup>52</sup>.

These tales are otherwise known by the *Westcar Papyrus* alone, which is currently dated to the Hyksos period, but holds older stuff even allowing for some claim to decrease its date to the early New Kingdom<sup>53</sup>. As it refers to a scenery in the Pyramid Age of the Old Kingdom, it has been considered the offspring of ancient traditions, in spite of its developed language outlook, which might have been updated in course of time. This view has been challenged<sup>54</sup> by showing a range of cultural interconnections in the construction of the plot of the Cheops story. However, if the links with the *Turin Coffin Texts* are to be credited, some pieces of the puzzle must go back to that layer of Middle Kingdom literature, inasmuch the materials used for G 1 T are truly reminiscent of a common tradition witnessed by the *Westcar Papyrus*. On another hand, there are issues linking the *Coffin Texts* to the New Kingdom, both the Eighteenth Dynasty and the Ramesside Period<sup>55</sup>. The papyrus is likely to be a copy, which happened to survive, as well as the texts embodied in the frame of one late coffin G 1 T, which represent a borderline witness of rare subjects. All that underscores the relation to the search by learned people resumed in the figure of Prince Hardedef, as it has been so ably pointed out by Spalinger.

Otherwise we owe to Anthony Spalinger some enlightening remarks about the contents of the *Rhind*

*Mathematical Papyrus*, that should reflect different redaction layers, in the period between the Middle and the New Kingdoms<sup>56</sup>. By his own words ‘the fractional divisions (of Book 1) go back to a bygone age of the Egyptian civilization’<sup>57</sup> unlike Books 2 and 3 of the same papyrus, which were correctly dated by Griffith later than the Twelfth Dynasty. Therefore, a unique roll could encompass sources of different age and its physical date was of course the most recent one. Comparable is the issue of literary works whenever their (alleged) composition date is known, to which must return the contents of the concerned copies, independently from their chronology, ruling out all interpolations<sup>58</sup>.

The questions at issue do not look so different from a case study brilliantly treated by Joachim Friedrich Quack, with concern of a religious book preserved only in a manuscript written under the Ptolemies<sup>59</sup>. Indeed the Apopis Ritual in pBremner Rhind at London, copied at the beginning of the Ptolemaic period as well, has been identified in a papyrus roll at Turin datable to the Twentieth Dynasty<sup>60</sup>, with a very similar rendering of its text except a few details, giving thereby a support to Quack’s proposal for the supposed date of the archetype of *Papyrus Jumilhac*. Like this latter, but in quite another setting, G 1 T is a late witness of much earlier texts, which were not otherwise preserved, in the same way as the Gardiner papyri hold the early record of texts, that were not resumed later on. Realizing these rather long and interwoven threads is indispensable in order to grasp the likely links with different pieces of literature and cultural settings.

## Notes

\* Emeritus Professor of Egyptology, University of Turin, Italy; sheshonk1941@libero.it.

- 1 A fourth roll, the so-called papyrus of Sedekh, perhaps of the same origin, is now in Berlin.
- 2 *Coffin T*. VII, 150–219.
- 3 According to J.P. Allen, *Middle Kingdom Copies of Pyramid Texts (The Egyptian Coffin Texts vol. 8, OIP 132)*, Chicago 2006. See, however, B. Mathieu, ‘La distinction entre Textes des Pyramides et Textes des Sarcophages est-elle légitime?’, in S. Bickel, B. Mathieu (eds.), *D’un monde à l’autre. Textes des Pyramides & Textes des Sarcophages. Actes de la table ronde internationale ‘Textes des Pyramides versus Textes des Sarcophages’ Ifao 24–26 septembre 2001, BdE 139* (Cairo, 2004), 247–261, 250 (concerning Coffin T. II 144c-149 f: S 1 C, S 2 C, G 2 T, P. Gard. II and III, already available in all pyramids of the Sixth Dynasty).
- 4 W. Schenkel, ‘Zur Redaktions- und Überlieferungsgeschichte des Spruchs 335 A der Sargtexte’, in (W. Westendorf ed.) *Göttinger Totenbuchstudien. Beiträge zum 17. Kapitel (GOF IV, 3)* (Wiesbaden, 1975), 37–79; G. Lapp, ‘Die Papyrusvorlagen der Sargtexte’, *SAK* 16 (1989), 171–202 (G 1 T is quoted on p. 179).
- 5 H. Goedicke, *Hieratic Paleography* (Baltimore, 1988).
- 6 One example is CGT 54003, I discovered among the papyri of the Egyptian Museum at Turin, see A. Roccati, *Papiro ieratico n. 54003. Estratti magici e rituali del primo Medio Regno, Catalogo del Museo Egizio di Torino, Serie I Monumenti e testi*, vol. 2 (Turin, 1970).
- 7 See A. Roccati, ‘Σαλμεσχοινακά’, in (G. Bakowska and R. Czerner eds.) *Greco-Roman Cities at the Crossroads of Cultures, The 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Polish-Egyptian Conservation Mission at Marina el-Alamein*, (Oxford, 2019), 207–212.
- 8 J. Leclant (ed.), *Les textes de la pyramide de Pépy I<sup>er</sup>. MIFAO 118* (Cairo, 2001); Mathieu, ‘La distinction’. 248.
- 9 Rune Nyord, ‘Scribes of the Gods in the Coffin Texts’, in (G. Miniaci e W. Grajetzki eds.) *The World of Middle Kingdom Egypt (2000-1550 BC)* (London, 2015), 273–307.
- 10 The assumption that royal texts need no headings is discussed in Mathieu, ‘La distinction’, 254.

- 11 A. Roccati, ‘Sulla tradizione dei ‘sarcofagi’’, *Oriens Antiquus*, VI (1967), 169–180 .
- 12 Roccati, *Oriens Antiquus*, VI, 173–179.
- 13 See also Roccati, *Ghost Tomb*, quoted fn. 55.
- 14 Roccati, *Oriens Antiquus*, VI, 169–180.
- 15 Heerma van Voss, *De oudste Versie van Dodenboek 17. a. Coffin Texts spreuk 335 a* (Leiden, 1964), 9–10; and Roccati, *Oriens Antiquus*, VI, 173: first dated example is Hamm. 108, 7 (Year 19 of Ammenemes III).
- 16 A. Roccati, ‘Liste alimentari nella tradizione di testi religiosi egizi’, in L. Milano (ed.), *Drinking in Ancient Societies*, *HANE VI* (Padua, 1994), 441–469, 436.
- 17 W. Schenkel, ‘Graphien der 1. Person Plural mit Personendeterminativ in den Sargtexten’, *GM* 165 (1998), 91–98; also Willems, *The Coffin of Heqata*, 24, n. 60.
- 18 U. Luft, *Urkunden zur Chronologie der späten 12. Dynastie: Briefe aus Illahun* (Vienna, 2006), 31.
- 19 *Coffin Texts VII*, 143 (139 p), see *RdE* 21 (1969), 151–153.
- 20 H. Willems, *The Coffin of Heqata (Cairo JdE 36418) (OLA 70)* (Leuven, 1996), 23 fn. 56.
- 21 Mathieu, ‘La distinction’, 250; A. Roccati, ‘La scrittura testuale nell’Egitto del II millennio a.C. e la datazione dei testi’, in *Parcourir l’éternité*, *Hommages à Jean Yoyotte* (Leuven, 2012), 939–946.
- 22 Pace A. Stauder, *Linguistic Dating of Middle Egyptian Literary Texts* (Hamburg, 2013), who would establish the date of composition of literary works on some grammatical features found in their (late) copies.
- 23 See footnote 3.
- 24 See Roccati, *Or.* 83, 238 (quoted fn. 28).
- 25 See Verhoeven, *ZÄS* 136, 87-90 (quoted fn. 46)
- 26 M. Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Autobiographies chiefly of the Middle Kingdom*, *OBO 84* (Fribourg – Göttingen, 1980); Ph. Derchain, ‘Éloquence et politique. L’opinion d’Akhtoy’, *RdE* 40 (1989), 37–47; L. Coulon, ‘Véracité et rhétorique dans les autobiographies égyptiennes de la Première Période Intermédiaire’, *BIFAO* 97 (1997), 109–38. Maybe *the Complaints of Khakheperre-seneb* come out from that practice or are a collection of themes, cf. Chr. Barbotin, ‘Le dialogue de Khâkheperresonb avec son ba. Tablet British Museum EA 5645/ ostracon Caire JE 50249 + papyri Amherst III & Berlin 3024’, *RdE* 63 (2012), 1–20. Also Maxim n° 27 (verse 415 ff.) in the *Teachings of Ptahhotep*.
- 27 Cf. Chr. J. Eyre, ‘Why was Egyptian Literature?’, *VI Congresso Internazionale di Egittologia, Atti*, II (Torino, 1993), 115–120.
- 28 Cf. A. Roccati, ‘Dating Ptahhotep’s Maxims (Note Letterarie VI)’, *Or.* 83 (2014), 238–240.
- 29 H.-W. Fischer-Elfert, *Die Lehre eines Mannes für seinen Sohn. Eine Etappe auf dem ‘Gottesweg’ des loyalen und solidarischen Beamten des Mittleren Reiches* (Wiesbaden, 1999), 28–44 (§ 1).
- 30 Z. Žaba, *L’enseignement de Ptahhotep* (Prague, 1956), Maxim n° 24, verse 368.
- 31 See Fischer-Elfert, *Lehre*, 35. About the linkages between Ptahhotep and Merikarê, see D. Kurth, ‘Zum Anfang der Lehre für Merikarê (E 1–4)’, in (A.I. Blöbaum, M. Eaton-Krauss and A. Wüthrich eds.): *Pérégrinations avec Erhart Graefe. Festschrift zu seinem 75. Geburtstag*, *ÄAT* 87 (Münster, 2018), 313–316.
- 32 Ex. *Coffin T.* III 52 e (B 1 C); IV 41 a (B 2 L); 41 f (B 1 C); 279 a (L 1 NY, L 3 Li, T 3 Be, M 57 C, M 1 NY); 336 a, b (M 7 C, M 8 C); 336 e (T 2 Be); 385 i (B 1 C); V 279 b (B 4 C); VII 111 a (Sq 10 C); VIII 56 b (T 1 Be).
- 33 Already in the Gardiner papyri, f. i. spell 479 (*Coffin T.* VI 37 ff.).
- 34 E. Dévaud, *La datation des manuscrits littéraires égyptiens d’après les graphies de certains mots* (Paris, 1924); W. Schenkel, *Frühmittelägyptische Studien* (Bonn, 1962); G. Rosati, ‘Note e proposte per la datazione delle stele del Medio Regno’, *Oriens Antiquus* 19 (1980), 269–278.
- 35 G. Moers, ‘Der «Autor» und sein «Werk». Der Beginn der Lehre des Ptahhotep in der Tradition



- avec Erhart Graefe. *Festschrift zu seinem 75. Geburtstag*, *ÄAT* 87 (Münster 2018), 487–498; W. Westendorf, ‘Die Qualitäten des weisen Neferti (zu Neferti 10-11)’, *GM* 4 (1973), 41–44; A. Roccati, ‘Note letterarie VIII. L’onniscienza del faraone, ovvero un caso di meritocrazia’, *Quaderni del Museo del Papiro XV* (2018), 29–33. Major points of contact between the *Stories of pWestcar* and the *Prophecies of Neferti* are dealt with by H.M. Hays, ‘Historicity of pWestcar’, *ZÄS* 129 (2002), 20–30 (26–28).
- 53 C. Barocas, ‘Les contes du Papyrus Westcar’, *Akten des Vierten Internationalen Ägyptologen Kongresses München 1985*, *BSAK* 3 (Hamburg, 1989), 121–129. The *Prophecies of Neferti* are preserved by an Eighteenth Dynasty papyrus in the Hermitage at St. Petersburg (dated to Amenhotep II), but also by a lot of ostraca of the Ramesside period. A quotation is already found in a text of Senenmut: Ph. Derchain, ‘Intelligenz als Karriere (Neferti, 10–11)’, *GM* 3 (1972), 9–14; and pBeatty IV vs., III 7 places Neferti among the wise men of the Middle Kingdom.
- 54 A. Spalinger, ‘Osiris, Re and Cheops’, *ZÄS* 134 (2007), 173–184.
- 55 A. Roccati, ‘A Ghost Tomb and a Torn Papyrus with Coffin Texts at Turin’, *The World of the Coffin Texts* (Leiden 1996), 109–113, 111–113.
- 56 A. Spalinger, ‘Dates in Ancient Egypt’, *SAK* 15 (1988), 255–276.
- 57 Spalinger, *SAK* 15, 261.
- 58 Roccati, *Or.* 83, 238.
- 59 J.F. Quack, ‘Corpus oder membra disiecta? Zur Sprach- und Redaktionskritik des Papyrus Jumilhac’, in (Wolfgang Waitkus ed.), *Diener des Horus, Festschrift für Dieter Kurth. Aegyptiaca hamburgensia*, 1 (Hamburg, 2008), 203–228.
- 60 CGT 54065 rt, (unpublished) reconstructed by the author and S. Demichelis, cf. A. Roccati, *Aspetti di dio nella civiltà egizia: Dio nella Bibbia e nelle civiltà ad essa contemporanee e connesse* (Torino, 1977), 218–231, and S. Demichelis, ‘La divination par l’huile à l’époque ramesside’, in Y. Koenig (ed), *La magie en Égypte, Actes du colloque* (Paris, 2002), 149–163. See also A. Roccati, ‘Note Letterarie VII. Lingue e letterature nell’Egitto faraonico’, *Studi in onore di Guido Bastianini, Papyrologica Florentina XLV*, (Florence, 2016), 325–329.