

II. 10 THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE THIRD INTERMEDIATE PERIOD: DYNs. 22-24

Karl Jansen-Winkel

The prevailing conditions and patterns of rule during Dyns. 22-23 were basically similar to the state of Egypt during Dyn. 21. UE—with the important centers Thebes and Herakleopolis—was administered by a military governor who was simultaneously the High Priest of Amun; LE was directly governed by the king with residences in Memphis and Tanis (and in Bubastis as well, since Osorkon I). With the aid of their sons, the first kings of Dyn. 22 maintained their rule over the entire country. However, since the reign of Osorkon II at the latest, they gradually lost out to the powers of decentralisation, when (due to a divided inheritance?) clearly defined and separate spheres of power and local potentates appeared, particularly in LE.¹ In the same fashion, the separation of UE and LE remains tangible under Libyan rule.²

The most important chronological sources for UE are the records of the Nile levels,³ the annals of the priests at Karnak,⁴ the “Chronicle of Prince Osorkon”,⁵ and the statues (and other objects) belonging to dignitaries from certain families which permit detailed and extensive genealogies;⁶ for LE, we only have the donation stelae⁷ and the stelae from the Serapeum.⁸ Altogether, there are relatively few actual dates

¹ It is not clear whether this regionalisation only came into existence at this time, or whether it existed earlier, i.e., already perhaps in Dyn. 21, but only became clear in the sources at this time (the most important sources are the donation stelae, and these only become abundant from later Dyn. 22, being totally absent in Dyn. 21). It is probable that there were at least incipient developments in this direction, which became more strongly expressed later.

² In fact, this division led to different cursive scripts used in the administration: the “anormal” hieratic in UE, and “Demotic” in LE.

³ *PM* II², 21-22; J.v. Beckerath, *JARCE* 5 (1966), 43-55; G. Broekman, *JEA* 88 (2002), 163-178.

⁴ *PM* II², 108; G. Legrain, *RT* 22 (1900), 51-63; Kruchten, *Annales*.

⁵ *PM* II², 35-36; Reliefs III, pl. 16-22; Caminos, *Chronicle*.

⁶ Cf. *TIP*, §§ 157-205; Bierbrier, *LNK*, passim.

⁷ See Meeks, *Donations*.

⁸ See *CSSM*; *PM* III², 780ff.

surviving from this period. As a rule—in contrast to the NK⁹—we lack a continuous series (or even relatively complete chain) of dates for any given sovereign, and thus by no means can we confidently suggest that the highest known date for any reign reflects its actual length. Given this paucity of dates, the chronology of this era is imprecise and uncertain in many respects.

The actual means of dating was presumably the same as that of the NK,¹⁰ as is suggested by the dates from one Serapeum stela.¹¹ These affirm that an apis bull, born in year 28 of Shoshenq III, was introduced on 1/II/*Akhet* of the same year: if the year began on 1/I/*Akhet*, the Apis would have been a month old at the most—and this is highly unlikely.¹² Furthermore, his predecessor was buried in the same year,¹³ and there are generally several months between the burial of the previous Apis and the introduction of the new one.¹⁴ It follows that the regnal year still began with the accession of the king; unfortunately, there are no surviving accession dates for the TIP.

1. *The Rulers of Unified Egypt of Early Dyn. 22*

According to Manetho, following Africanus, Dyn. 22 consisted of 9 kings from Bubastis who ruled for 120 years: Sesonchis (21 years), Osorthon (15), three others (25), Takelotis (13) and three more (42).¹⁵ The family tree in the Serapeum stela of Pasenhor from year 37 of Shoshenq V (*3-hpr-R*)¹⁶ includes a reference to a King Osorkon who ruled six generations earlier, whose father, grandfather and great-grandfather were kings named Takelot, Osorkon und Shoshenq, while their forefathers were not kings, but rather Libyan princes. The non-royal origins of the earliest named king, Shoshenq, the exact correspondence of the names of the kings with those listed by Manetho for

⁹ Cf. *KRI*, VIII, 70–84.

¹⁰ Thus also Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 10. It is *a priori* probable that the MK concept of “predating” was among the anachronisms introduced during Dyns. 25–26.

¹¹ Louvre SIM 3697, cf. CSSM, 21–22; pl. VIII (no. 22). R. Krauss drew my attention to the importance of these dates.

¹² Cf. E. Winter, *Der Apiskult im Alten Ägypten* (Mainz, 1983), 18.

¹³ Stela Louvre SIM 3749, CSSM 19–20; pl. VII (no. 21).

¹⁴ See L. Depuydt, *JNES* 54 (1995), 123; Kienitz, *Geschichte*, 155.

¹⁵ According to Eusebius only 3 kings in 49 years, namely Sesonchosis (21), Osorthon (15) und Takelothis (13).

¹⁶ Louvre SIM 2846, cf. CSSM 30–31; pl. X (no. 31).

this dynasty, and the period of time separating Pasenhor (nine generations to year 37 of Shoshenq V) clearly reveal that these were the first kings of Dyn. 22. In addition, the grandparents of this oldest Shoshenq link him to Dyn. 21, as he is the nephew of the third to the last king of that dynasty, Osorkon (Osochor).¹⁷ This gives a sequence of 4 kings, each pair being father and son, for the start of Dyn. 22: Shoshenq I (*Hd-hpr-R^c*), Osorkon I (*Shm-hpr-R^c*), Takelot I (*Hd-hpr-R^c*) and Osorkon II (*z³ B3stt Wsr-m²t-R^c*).¹⁸

Although each king is the son of a former king, this does not necessarily mean that each son immediately followed his father in office. It is entirely possible that other sovereigns can be fitted into the sequence. According to Africanus, Manetho inserts three other kings, and the following are candidates for this:

a) On his own documents, and in the patronymic of his son (a priest of Amun named Osorkon), the HPA, Shoshenq, son of Osorkon I and grandson of Psusennes II is designated as HP and Generalissimo and not as king.¹⁹ Only on the London statue BM 8 does he enclose his name (in the titulary of HP) in a cartouche, adding the epithet *mjj-Imn*.²⁰

b) The statue Cairo CG 41292 from Karnak²¹ was re-inscribed by a king Shoshenq with the throne-name *M²-hpr-R^c Stp-n-R^c*, and to the benefit of his “begetter” (*msj sw*) Psusennes II. It is entirely possible that this is an otherwise completely unknown son of Psusennes II,²² but it seems more reasonable to assume that this is the (earlier?) high priest and son of Osorkon I,²³ who could easily have designated himself as “begotten” by Psusennes, his grandfather.²⁴

¹⁷ J. Yoyotte, *BSFE* 77–78 (1977), 39–54; cf. above Jansen-Winkel, Chapter II. 9.

¹⁸ The throne-names were not listed on the stela of Pasenhor. Assigning the kings with these throne-names to the first kings of the dynasty results from a (i.a.) comparison with the kings appearing in the family tree of the Theban Nakhtefmut family, cf. *TIP*, § 88. For the throne-name of Takelot I, cf. *VA* 3 (1987), 253–258; *TIP*³, XXII–XXIII.

¹⁹ The catalogue of these monuments (all from UE): K. Jansen-Winkel, “Historische Probleme der 3. Zwischenzeit”, *JEA* 81 (1995), 145–146.

²⁰ S. PM II², 289.

²¹ G. Legrain, *Statues et statuettes de rois et de particuliers*, III (Cairo, 1914), 1–2; pl. 1; J.v. Beckerath, *Orientalia* 63 (1994), 84–87; K. Jansen-Winkel (n. 19), 147–148; pl. XIII.

²² G. Broekman, *GM* 176 (2000), 39–46, considers Shoshenq *M²-hpr-R^c* to be a son of Psusennes II who was able to assert his claims to be the royal successor of his father in Thebes at least, while Shoshenq I was recognized in LE (and dates in Thebes followed his reign).

²³ Thus also Beckerath (n. 21), 86; N. Dautzenberg, *GM* 144 (1995), 21.

²⁴ As *jj* and *z³* can mean “grandfather” and “grandson”.

c) A number of kings were subsequently interred in the antechamber of the tomb of Psusennes I at Tanis, including two anonymous mummies²⁵ and a Shoshenq *Hqꜣ-hꜥr-Rꜥ Stꜥ-n-Rꜥ*,²⁶ who was presumably already more than 50 years of age²⁷ and whose throne-name bore a form reminiscent of early Dyn. 22 (before Osorkon II),²⁸ and the same applies to the iconographic details of his shabtis.²⁹ The interment also included a pectoral of the great chief of the Ma, Shoshenq A, and a bracelet of Shoshenq I³⁰—and thus the same person before and after the accession. As the individuals interred in the royal tombs often bore objects belonging to their parents,³¹ this king is probably a son of Shoshenq I.³² The commonly assumed identification of this king with the (earlier) HP and son of Osorkon I³³ does not appear to be very probable.

d) A king Shoshenq with the throne-name *Twt-hꜥr-Rꜥ* is known from the sherd Louvre E.31886 from Abydos,³⁴ and apparently also from a fragmentary relief from Tell Basta.³⁵ This is evidently a king of the entire country and not a minor UE king or a local ruler. The form of the throne-name implies that he too belongs near the start of Dyn. 22.

²⁵ Possibly Siamun and Psusennes II, cf. J. Yoyotte in *Tanis: L'or des pharaons* (Paris, 1987), 48.

²⁶ Montet, *Tanis II*, 36–51

²⁷ D. E. Derry, *ASAE* 39 (1939), 549–551.

²⁸ *TIP*, § 93.

²⁹ G. Broekman, *GM* 181 (2001), 29–31.

³⁰ Montet (n. 26), 43–45 (219; 226/227); fig.13.

³¹ *TIP*, § 93; K. Jansen-Winkeln, *VA* 3 (1987), 256–257; D. Aston, “Takeklot II—A King of the ‘Theban Twenty-Third Dynasty?’”, *JEA* 75 (1989), 139–153, esp. 143–144.

³² In addition he also bore the ring of a *Dd-Pth-jw.f-nꜥ* (Montet [n. 26], 44, fig. 13; 46 [228]), perhaps his brother: a prince und 2nd/3rd Prophet of Amun of this name was interred in the cachette of Deir el-Bahri in year 11 of Shoshenq I (G. Maspero, *Les momies royales de Deir el-Bahari* (Paris 1889), 572–574; *GLR*, III, 284, n.2). He was presumably a son of Shoshenq I.

³³ *TIP*, §§ 93–94; 452; most recently with new arguments Broekman (n. 29), 27–37. Rather than identifying Shoshenq *Hqꜣ-hꜥr-Rꜥ* with the son of Osorkon I and grandson of Psusennes II, and thus being obliged to reckon with yet another new and hitherto unknown son of Psusennes, it appears more reasonable to identify the grandson of Psusennes II with the donor of *CG* 42192 and to identify Schoschenk *Hqꜣ-hꜥr-Rꜥ* as a son of Shoshenq I, based upon his grave goods.

³⁴ According to the reading of J. Yoyotte, cf. M.-A. Bonhême, *BSFE* 134 (1995), 53.

³⁵ E. Lange, *GM* 203 (2004), 65–72. The arrangement of the cartouches does not allow one to deduce a coregency of *Twt-hꜥr-Rꜥ* (= Psusennes II) and Shoshenq (I) as Dodson does (*BES* 14 [2000], 9–10). Aside from this, Osorkon I is thus far considered to be the first sovereign of the TIP documented in Bubastis.

The HP Shoshenq ("II") is presumably identical with Shoshenq *M^b-hpr-R^c*, but most certainly did not have an independent reign, but rather was responsible for UE during the reign of his father. Shoshenq *Hq³-hpr-R^c* may have ruled briefly after his father, if Shoshenq I was his father, or perhaps after his brother Osorkon I. He could thus have been one of the "three other kings" Manetho places between Osorkon (I) and Takelot (I).³⁶ The same applies to Shoshenq *Twt-hpr-R^c* who should most probably be put between Osorkon I and Takelot I. In contrast to his father and his son, not one single royal monument is known for Takelot I;³⁷ his brothers in UE probably dated according to his reign (cf. below), but they do not name him. This could indicate that his rule was undisputed.

For the first part of Dyn. 22 we would thus have the following kings, and dates:

1. Shoshenq I; documented years 2, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 21³⁸
2. Osorkon I: regnal years [1]-4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 23, 33³⁹
3. Shoshenq *Hq³-hpr-R^c*: no dates
4. Shoshenq *Twt-hpr-R^c*: no dates
5. Takelot I: years: 9,⁴⁰ dubious 5, 8, 13/14, 14 (cf. below)
6. Osorkon II: years 12, 16, 21, 22, 23,⁴¹ 29(?)⁴²

For Shoshenq I, Manetho's 21 years appear to be possible, and a reign of 35 years is quite probable for Osorkon I.⁴³ Only a year 9 is certain for Takelot I. The Nile level records nos. 16–21 are generally assigned to his reign: nos. 16 (year 5) and 20–21 (years lost) belong to the HP

³⁶ Takelot II cannot be implied, as he was an UE sovereign, cf. below.

³⁷ Cf. also *TIP*, §§ 95; 270.

³⁸ The highest regnal year on the rock stela of Gebel Silsila, cf. *JEA* 38 (1952), pl. XIII.

³⁹ Of these, only the year 10 in lines 2–3 of the "stèle de l'apanage" (*ZÄS* 35 [1897], 14) and year 12 of the Nile level record no. 2 (Beckerath [n. 3], 49) are explicitly related to Osorkon. Regnal year 33 is on the mummy wrappings of a burial, which also had a "counterweight" bearing the name and throne-name of Osorkon I, cf. J. E. Quibell, *The Ramessum* (London 1998), 10–11; pl. XVIII.

⁴⁰ G. Daressy, *RT* 18 (1896), 52–53, earlier ascribed to Takelot II, cf. now Aston (n. 31), 144; *TIP*³, XXIII.

⁴¹ Serapeum stela Louvre SIM 3090, s. CSSM, 17; pl. VI (no. 18).

⁴² Nile level record no. 14, cf. below.

⁴³ Were one to follow Manetho here, we would still be obliged to emend 15 years to 35. Aside from the 33 which should in all probability to assigned to Osorkon I (cf. above), there are further indications of a long reign, cf. *TIP* § 89.

Iuwelot who was still a youth in year 10 of the reign of his father, Osorkon I.⁴⁴ The year 5 must therefore relate to a successor of Osorkon I.⁴⁵ The records nos. 17–19 are from the HP Smendes III, doubtless the brother and successor of Iuwelot;⁴⁶ no. 17 is from year 8, no. 18 from year 13 or 14. A block, presumably from the Serapeum, bears the names of Takelot I and the HP of Memphis, Merenptah;⁴⁷ Mariette noted that this was found together with a stela from a year 14.⁴⁸ This might be a stela in Alexandria dated to a year 14 (without a royal name), and originally came from the Serapeum, as the inscription suggests.⁴⁹ This would thus support Manetho's 13 (full) years for Takelot. His possible predecessors (see above) have not left many traces and assuredly did not reign for a long period.⁵⁰ Thus for Takelot and the others, 15 years is a reasonable suggestion.⁵¹ One can therefore adopt Kitchen's suggestion of 21 + 35 + 15 years for the first 3 to 5 kings of Dyn. 22. However, these dates should be viewed as the minimum to which a few more years might be added.

The length of the reign of Osorkon II is a matter of debate, and Manetho cannot aid here. The highest date which can with certainty be assigned to his reign is year 23 (see above), linked to an Apis burial, where his son, the Crown Prince and HP of Memphis, Shoshenq D apparently also took part.⁵² Shoshenq D will thus have died after that time, but apparently before his father,⁵³ and thus Kitchen assigned Osorkon II 24–25 full years, to allow a margin for these events.⁵⁴

⁴⁴ Lines 2–3 of the "stèle de l'apanage", cf. *ZAS* 35 (1897), 14.

⁴⁵ But certainly not to Osorkon II, whose Nile level records take a different form, cf. Broekman (n. 3), 171.

⁴⁶ These records have exactly the same form as those of Iuwelot and differ from all others, cf. most recently Broekman (n. 3), 164; 170–171.

⁴⁷ CSSM, 18; pl. VII (no. 19).

⁴⁸ Mariette's remarks are, however, rather doubtful, cf. n. 47.

⁴⁹ G. Daressy, *ASAE* 5 (1904), 121 [XXIV]. The stela Louvre SIM 2810 (CSSM, 18–19; pl. VII [no. 20]) of a *Dd-Pth-jw.f-nh* of a year 10 [+ X] (without royal name) dates to a later époque, cf. A. Leahy, *SAK* 7 (1979), 149.

⁵⁰ If there was a conflict over the throne, it is conceivable, that some of them ruled parallel to Takelot.

⁵¹ If there really was an Apis burial in year 14 of Takelot, and the Apis buried in year 23 of Osorkon II was the successor of this bull (which is, of course, uncertain) it would favour placing year 14 towards the end of the reign of Takelot, as 26 years are the longest documented life of an Apis bull.

⁵² Can no longer be verified, cf. *TIP*, § 81, with n. 77; *GM* 207 (2005), 76, n. 16.

⁵³ This was generally assumed because he is also designated as Crown Prince (*wp't wr thj n hm.f*) in his tomb.

⁵⁴ *TIP*, § 87.

This logic is no longer tenable since Shoshenq D did in fact outlive his father. In his undisturbed burial was a chain of 8 *Wdꜣt*-amulettes (Cairo JE 86786), and one of them bore the name of Shoshenq III (*Wsr-mꜣt-Rꜥ Stp-n-ꜥmn Mrꜣꜣ-ꜥmn ꜣ Bꜣstt Ššnq*).⁵⁵

On the other hand, Aston has produced arguments that Osorkon II's reign was clearly longer than previously assumed, and perhaps even 40–45 years.⁵⁶ Aston's argument is based on the family trees of two Theban families which reveal that several generations lived in the reign of Osorkon II; other genealogical data likewise allegedly favours a longer reign; furthermore, there would be a whole series of HPA belonging to the reign of Osorkon II, and his three known sons would all have predeceased him. Of these arguments, only the family tree of the Nakhtefmut family⁵⁷ is really reliable, but this actually supports a relatively long reign for Osorkon II. Whether the genealogy of the Nebneteru-family⁵⁸ must also be understood in this sense is more debatable: the statue Cairo CG 42225 was erected after the death of its owner, so that the name of the king and the high priest there could relate to the date of erection and not necessarily hint at the lifetime or term of office of the statue's owner. The other genealogical data which Aston introduces does favour a long life, but not necessarily a long reign for Osorkon II. As HPA under Osorkon II only his son Nimlot C, his grandson Takelot F⁵⁹ and Harsiese B are documented.⁶⁰ Of the sons of Osorkon II, Harnakht C died as a child, Shoshenq D probably did outlive his father (see above), and thus effectively only Nimlot C predeceased him.⁶¹ Nevertheless, I consider the basic sense of Aston's arguments to be correct. There is a Nile level record (no. 14)

⁵⁵ K. Jansen-Winkel, "Der Prinz und Hohepriester Schoschenk (D)", *GM* 207 (2005), 77–78. It is conceivable (although rather improbable) that Osorkon II died immediately after his son, and thus his successor may have been able to arrange for a gift for the burial. In this case, it would be certain that Shoshenq III was the immediate successor of Osorkon II (cf. below).

⁵⁶ Aston (n. 31), 145–148.

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, 145.

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*, 146.

⁵⁹ Presumably the later Takelot II, cf. K. Jansen-Winkel (n. 19), 138–139; Dautzenberg (n. 23), 24.

⁶⁰ Jansen-Winkel (n. 19), 135–139.

⁶¹ It is interesting to note incidentally that this HPA did leave hardly any traces in Thebes, being almost exclusively recorded in the genealogical records of his descendants there, and even there he is consistently designated as HPA and General of Herakleopolis.

from the year 29 of an *Wsr-mš't-R^c*, who is most probably Osorkon II and not Shoshenq III or Osorkon III.⁶² At the very least, the family tree of the Nakhtefmut-family clearly supports a reign for Osorkon II of more than the 24 or 25 years Kitchen allows him. In addition, it must be recalled that it is precisely from the reign of Osorkon II that we have comparatively numerous monuments, both royal and private: far more than from the eras of Shoshenq I, Osorkon I and Shoshenq III who are otherwise the best documented of the TIP. It is therefore not too bold to suggest a reign of at least 30–40 years for Osorkon II. In this era, it is hardly surprising that we do not have any dates from the final decade of the reign.

The king Harsiese (A) also belongs to the period of Osorkon II: on the stelaphoric statue Cairo CG 42208 we see the complete titulary of Osorkon II, but the statue was dedicated “by the grace” of Harsiese.⁶³ This Harsiese is known only from UE,⁶⁴ and was buried in Thebes. There are no known regnal years relating to him, and dating in his era presumably followed Osorkon II.⁶⁵ His reign should probably be assigned to the beginning of the reign of Osorkon II;⁶⁶ in any case, it is not chronologically relevant.

The period from Shoshenq I to Osorkon II should have lasted about 100–111 years (21 + 35 + 15 + 30–40), and would be ca. 945/40–844/29.

⁶² Cf. Broekman (n. 3), 174–5.

⁶³ K. Jansen-Winkeln, *Ägyptische Biographien der 22. und 23. Dynastie* (Wiesbaden: ÄUAT 8, 1985), 453.

⁶⁴ Jansen-Winkeln (n. 19), 133–5. He is only documented as king, contrary to the common view, he is not documented as HPA even one single time. Earlier, he was viewed as the son of the HPA Shoshenq (II); but since it became evident that this was based on a mistaken reading (ibidem, 129–132), he has become an orphan. In the necropolis of the TIP at Herakleopolis was the burial of a woman named *T3-nt-Jmn*, in Tomb 4. According to the inscriptions of the tomb and grave goods (M. Perez-Die/P. Vernus, *Excavaciones en Ehnasya el Medina* (Madrid 1992), 50–59; 128–132; 156–159; Docs. 21–26), she was *wrt hnt n Hrj-s.f*, her father was the *hm-ntr tpy (n) Jmn mr mš'c h'wty Ns-bš-nb-Ddt*, and her mother was *βst-βhbjt* or *Jhy* (shortened version) and she is designated as *mwet ntr*. Represented together with *T3-nt-Jmn* was a man named Osorkon, who was *wr ? n <pr>-Šhm-hpr-R^c*. It necessarily follows that the HP Smendes, the father of *T3-nt-Jmn*, cannot have been Smendes II of Dyn. 21. If this is not an HP Smendes unknown from other sources, the only candidate is Smendes III of Dyn. 22. As his wife is designated a “king’s mother” (*mwet ntr* cannot be a sacerdotal title here), Smendes III must have had a son who became king, and who belongs to the generation of Osorkon II. Harsiese is the obvious candidate.

⁶⁵ However, the lack of dates could simply be the result of the type of documents which are preserved.

⁶⁶ Jansen-Winkeln (n. 19), 135.

2. *Takelot II*

Related to the length of the reign of Osorkon II and equally controversial is the question of the identity of his successor; the stela of Paserhor has nothing to say on the matter. The HP Osorkon (B) who left a long inscription (“The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon”) was a son of Takelot II (throne-name *Hd-hpr-R^c* as with Takelot I), his mother was a daughter of the HP Nimlot (C) and a granddaughter of Osorkon II. In the inscription, the donations are at first dated according to the reign of Takelot II (until year 24), and then according to the reign of Shoshenq III (years 22–29), and thus a sequence of Osorkon II—Takelot II—Shoshenq III was deduced.⁶⁷

D. Aston has dismissed this long established chronology for several reasons:⁶⁸ (1) Takelot II is only known in UE; (2) he has the epithet *ntr hq³ W³st* in his throne-name; (3) his consort and children do not reveal any known links to LE either; (4) the genealogical details of his dependents hint that he belonged to the generation of the grandchildren of Osorkon II; (5) in the “Chronicle of Prince Osorkon”, the years 22–29 of Shoshenq III follow years 11–24 of Takelot II: were Takelot the predecessor of Shoshenq III, we would face a lacuna of more than two decades. Aston thus assumes that Takelot was a “Theban” ruler whose realm was restricted to UE, and thus that he ruled parallel to a LE sovereign. This would have major chronological consequences.

K. A. Kitchen has strongly rejected this approach by attempting to disprove or disarm Aston’s arguments:⁶⁹ Takelot II left relatively few traces in Thebes; other kings who definitely lived in a Delta residence had relations with Thebes; the epithet *ntr hq³ W³st* was also borne by Shoshenq V (in Tanis); other kings of the TIP, such as Osochor, Psusennes II or Osorkon IV were rarely or not attested in LE, although they actually resided there. On the other hand, he suggests that the scenario leading to this “Theban” Takelot II is historically excluded: the Thebans would hardly have accepted a king in Thebes but rejected

⁶⁷ TIP, § 86; as noted already in principle by R. Lepsius (*Über die XXII. ägyptische Königsdynastie*, Berlin 1856, 271–274), who inserted yet another Shoshenq (“II”, our Shoshenq D) between Osorkon II and Takelot II.

⁶⁸ Aston (n. 31), 140–144.

⁶⁹ TIP³, XXIII–XXIV; *JEA* 85 (1999), 247; *BiOr* 58 (2001), 383.

and opposed his son as HP, and they would never have tolerated this HP as the later king Osorkon III. This argumentation is not convincing. Takelot II and his son definitely belonged to a common "party" in the civil war; had Osorkon B been expelled from Thebes, the same would be true of his father. And it is rather doubtful that the opinion of the people (the "Thebans") would have had any role to play. Kitchen's repique does not dispose of the really decisive point: Takelot II and his entire family are attested only in UE and not at all in the Delta, and this point cannot be dismissed by references to such ephemeral rulers as Osochor, Psusennes II or Osorkon IV. The period from Osorkon II to Shoshenq III is the best documented of the TIP and both kings are demonstrably present in LE. That anyone else reigned in the same place for a quarter of a century, of whom (and whose dependents) no trace can be found, must be excluded. The genealogical connections of Takelot II and the sequence of years in the "Chronicle of Prince Osorkon" are likewise very clear. In addition, the HP Osorkon B disappears at the very moment (year 39 of Shoshenq III) when an otherwise unknown Osorkon appears as a new king; this is the only sovereign of Dyn. 22 who occasionally uses the title of HP in his royal name,⁷⁰ and his mother has the same name as the mother of the HP. It therefore follows that Osorkon B and Osorkon III are the same person, and that also demands that Takelot II must be placed parallel with Shoshenq III. There is thus a whole set of reasons supporting Aston's assumption, and nothing which contradicts it. Therefore, I consider the point to be certain.

3. *The LE Sovereigns of Dyn. 22 to Shoshenq V*

This would thus mean that Shoshenq III was the immediate successor of Osorkon II, and there is not the slightest hint of any other hitherto unknown king between them.⁷¹ With Shoshenq III and his successors until Shoshenq V, we stand on firmer ground chronologically. For

⁷⁰ The Paleological Association of Japan, Akoris. Report of the Excavations at Akoris in Middle Egypt 1981–92 (Kyoto, 1995), 301–305; pl. 116; idem, Preliminary Report. Second Season of the Excavations at the Site of Akoris, Egypt 1982 (Kyoto, 1983), 14–15; pl. 11. No other HPA is known from the period before Osorkon III with this name, aside from Osorkon B.

⁷¹ Cf. also Aston (n. 31), 144.

Shoshenq III, recorded years include: 3, 5(?), 6, 12, 14, 15, 18(?), 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 38, and 39.⁷² An Apis-bull was buried in his year 28, and a stela commemorating the event⁷³ was erected for the great chief of the Ma and HP of Memphis⁷⁴ *P3-dj-3st*, who was the grandson (through his mother *Iz-B3stt-prt*) and at the same time the great-grandson (through his father Vater *Tkjt*) of Osorkon II. The successor of this Apis bull (introduced in the same year year, 1/II/*Akhet*) in turn died in year 2 (II/*Peret*) of Pami, after reaching the age of 26 years.⁷⁵ Year 2 of Pami thus lies 26 years after year 28 of Shoshenq III. Were Pami the successor of Shoshenq III, the latter would have had a reign of no less than 52 years. In fact, however, it would appear highly probable that another king Shoshenq with the throne name *Hd-hpr-Rc* should be inserted here,⁷⁶ who was buried in the tomb of his predecessor. The most important piece of evidence here is a donation stela of year 10 from a King Shoshenq *Hd-hpr-Rc*,⁷⁷ mentioning a Great Prince of the Libu named Niumateped, and a man apparently bearing the same name and title is documented from year 8 of Shoshenq V.⁷⁸ If, as would appear reasonable, this is the same person, then a king Shoshenq *Hd-hpr-Rc* should be placed here, who reigned not long before Shoshenq V, but after Shoshenq III. As Shoshenq V probably reigned immediately after or following a very short interval after his father Pami, yet 13 years lay between year 39 of Shoshenq III and year 2 of Pami, for which we have no dates for Shoshenq III, then everything favours placing a 10–13 year reign of this Shoshenq *Hd-hpr-Rc* into this period.⁷⁹ The precise length of his reign is chronologically not very important since the total for the period between year

⁷² Nile level record no. 22, cf. Beckerath (n. 3), 51; Annals of the priests, no.7, cf. Kruchten, *Annales*, pl. 4; 19.

⁷³ Louvre SIM 3749, cf. CSSM, 19–20; pl. VII (no. 21).

⁷⁴ His son *P3jf-13w-(m)-f-wj-B3stt* likewise bears the title of HP of Memphis on this stela.

⁷⁵ Louvre SIM 3697, CSSM 21–22; pl. VIII (no. 22); cf. also the Stelae Louvre SIM 3736 and 4205, *ibidem*, 22–24; pl. VIII–IX (nos. 23/24).

⁷⁶ A. Dodson, GM 137 (1993), 53–58; *TIP*³, XXV–XXVI.

⁷⁷ Meeks, *Donations*, 666 (22.1.10).

⁷⁸ While in year 31 of Shoshenq III, yet another great chief by the name *Jnj-Jmn-n3j-f-nbw* is documented, cf. J. Yoyotte, in: *Mélanges Maspero I*, *Orient ancien* 4 (Cairo 1961), 143 (§ 31).

⁷⁹ Numbered variously in the literature: Ib, IIIa, IV or “quartus”; IIIa would be preferable, as this would eliminate all possible sources of misunderstanding.

28 of Shoshenq III and year 2 of Pami is certain. For this king Pami,⁸⁰ the years 2, 4, 5, and 6 are documented; from the structure of the text on his “annals” in Heliopolis, the presence of the years 3 and 7 can be deduced.⁸¹ Were these “annals” to have covered the entire reign of Pami,⁸² this would confirm Kitchen’s assessment of 6 full years for the reign.⁸³ This assumption of a rather short reign for Pami is supported by the paucity of monuments he has left, and further by the fact that the reign of his son was quite long. However, the assumption of a mere 6–7 years is not really certain. His son Shoshenq V followed Pami, probably as his immediate successor: a stela from the Serapeum from year 37 of Shoshenq V bears the name of the same (still living) donor as in year 2 of Pami.⁸⁴ It is thus improbable that this long period can be stretched any further. But, it cannot be excluded that another king (e.g., an older son of Pami) may have ruled between Pami and Shoshenq V, but then if at all, only very briefly.⁸⁵

For Shoshenq V, the years 7, 8, 11, 15, 17, 19, 22, 36, 37, and 38 are documented,⁸⁶ and the interval between year 28 of Shoshenq III and year 2 of Pami is 26 years long. If 6 full years are assigned to Pami, and Shoshenq V was his immediate successor, the period from Shoshenq III to year 38 of Shoshenq V would be $27/28 + 26 + 4/5 + 37$ years, and thus 94–96 years depending upon exactly when that Apis which died under Pami was introduced under Shoshenq III and when it died under Pami. The interval is probably 95 years.

4. *The Successors of Shoshenq V*

Shoshenq V is not among the rulers named on Piye’s victory stela. He was probably already dead at the time. Appearing on a dedicatory stela

⁸⁰ See J. Yoyotte, *RdE* 39 (1988), 160–169.

⁸¹ S. Bickel, L. Gabolde & P. Tallet, *BIFAO* 98 (1998), 31–56, esp. 41.

⁸² Cf. *ibidem*, 42.

⁸³ *TIP*, § 83.

⁸⁴ Louvre SIM 3441 and 3091, cf. CSSM, 24–25; pl. IX (no. 25); 41; pl. XIII (no. 42), cf. *TIP*, § 84, n. 97.

⁸⁵ However, the documented lifetime of the Apis-bulls do allow a somewhat longer period between Pami and Shoshenq V. A bull was buried in year 11 of Shoshenq V; between this one and the last known predecessor, buried in year 2 of Pami, are only 15–16 years if Shoshenq V immediately followed Pami.

⁸⁶ PM III², 787–789.

of his year 36⁸⁷ is Tefnakhte, the Great Chief of the Ma, commander and prince of the Libu, and again on another of year 38, that same Tefnakhte is called "Great Prince of the entire land".⁸⁸ The extension of this prince's power, which later obliged Piye to intervene, was thus already apparent at this time. It thus follows that the interval between the last years of Shoshenq V and Piye's campaign was not long. Shoshenq V is documented in Memphis and in diverse areas of the Delta, including Tanis, Bubastis, Buto and Kom Firin. On Piye's stela, Tefnakhte is lord of Memphis, Buto and Kom Firin; Iuput II rules in Leontopolis,⁸⁹ Osorkon IV in Bubastis and the region of Tanis.⁹⁰ Osorkon IV would thus be spatially and temporally the successor of Shoshenq V, and the contemporary documents do not provide any reason to assign him to another dynasty.⁹¹

On the issue of the identity of Shoshenq's immediate successors, the temporal and spatial position of Manetho's Dyn. 23 could play a role. If Petubaste I and Osorkon III were UE rulers (cf. below, section 5), then Manetho certainly did not take them into consideration. Thus they could not be those kings whom he assigned to his Dyn. 23 of Tanis (consisting of Petubaste, Osorkon, "Psammus" and "Zet"). Priese⁹² thus suggested that Osorkon IV (rather than III) be assigned to Manetho's Dyn. 23, A. Leahy has further elaborated on this idea.⁹³ Thus, Osorkon IV would be the successor of the ephemeral Petubaste, *Shtp-jb(-n)-R^c*,

⁸⁷ From Buto (former collection Farouk), cf. Yoyotte (n. 78), 153, § 48; Meeks, *Donations*, 670 (22.10.36).

⁸⁸ From Tell Farain (in the storeroom?), cf. S. Sauneron, *BSFE* 24 (1957), 51; 53–54, figs. 1–2. The cartouches were left blank, but it unquestionably concerns the year 38 of Shoshenq V, cf. *TIP*, § 84. The king is omitted on the other stela as well, which only has the year.

⁸⁹ A regnal year 21 is documented (J.-L. Chappaz, *Genava* 30 [1982], 71–81), but neither predecessors nor successors are known and thus he cannot be linked to any dynasty.

⁹⁰ If *R^c-nfr* is to be understood in this way, cf. Yoyotte (n. 78), 129, n. 2; F. Gomaa, *Die libyschen Fürstentümer des Deltas* (Wiesbaden: Beihefte TAVO B, 6, 1974), 132–134. If not, then it means that, astonishingly, Tanis—one of the most prominent cities of the TIP—was not mentioned on the stela of Piye. This could only be explained if the rulers of Tanis declined to submit to the Nubian king.

⁹¹ Leahy's interpretation, that "there is nothing to warrant his inclusion in . . . Manetho's Twenty-second Dynasty" (*Libya*, 189) is thus not entirely convincing. Incidentally, Osorkon IV is only documented with certainty on the stela of Piye: the other references could also be assigned to Osochor of Dyn. 21, cf. Leahy, *Libya*, 189; F. Payraudeau, *GM* 178 (2000), 75–80.

⁹² *ZAS* 98 (1972), 20, n. 23.

⁹³ *Libya*, 186ff.

who is known from Memphis and Tanis (among other places),⁹⁴ and otherwise identified with Putubišti of the annals of Assurbanipal.⁹⁵ Aston⁹⁶ and Beckerath⁹⁷ have both followed him. At the very least, this would be a means of integrating Manetho's Dyn. 23 into the previously known, although identifying Petubaste *Štḥp-jb-R^c* with the Putubišti of the Assyrians is at least equally plausible. In any case, the result would be that Manetho's Dyn. 23 would be nothing but a continuation of Dyn. 22.⁹⁸

As regnal years have not been preserved from the reign of either Osorkon IV, nor of his supposed predecessor, Petubaste *Štḥp-jb-R^c*, and the transition from Shoshenq V (—Petubaste)—Osorkon IV is to be dated to before Piye's campaign, this possible insertion of a Petubaste (Manethonis gratia) is not of chronological significance. Osorkon IV is only dated through the campaign of Piye. Were he the king Shilkanni who paid tribute to Sargon II (cf. below), then he will still have been in office around 715/716.

5. *UE Kings and Dynasties from Takelot II to Dyn. 25*

Along with two Lower Egyptian rulers, the stela of Piye names two Upper Egyptians: Nimlot D of Hermopolis and Pefjtjau'awybast of Herakleopolis. At this time, Thebes itself will have already been under Nubian control, but before this time we find Harsiese A and Takelot II (cf. above, section 2) as UE kings who ruled Thebes. Of Kitchen's Dyn. 23 (Petubaste I, Iuput I, Shoshenq IV, Osorkon III, Takelot III, Rudamun und Iuput II, as well as perhaps also Shoshenq VI;⁹⁹ Residence:

⁹⁴ Cf. Habachi, *ZÄS* 93 (1966), 69–74; pls. V–VI; P. Montet, *Le lac sacré de Tanis* (Paris, 1966), 63–5; pl. XXX.

⁹⁵ Cf. *TIP*, § 357.

⁹⁶ Aston (n. 31), 140.

⁹⁷ *Chronologie*, 99.

⁹⁸ This could have been another branch of the family, with deeper roots in Tanis than Bubastis. In any case, according to our present knowledge, Manetho's king list of Dyn. 23 is more or less useless for the historical (and chronological) reconstruction: the last two of his four kings are virtual phantoms, the first two cannot be identified with certainty, and the note that the first Olympiad took place during the reign of Petubaste is generally dismissed as a later invention, calculated by the Christian chronographers who used Manetho, cf. *TIP*, § 419, n. 134; Redford, *King-lists*, 311–312; Beckerath, *GM* 147 (1995), 9.

⁹⁹ Shoshenq VI (*W3s-nṯr-R^c*, cf. *TIP*, §§ 67; 110; 146; 336; M.-A. Bonhême, *Les noms royaux de l'Égypte de la Troisième Période Intermédiaire* [Cairo: BdE 98, 1987], 140–141) is not considered in the following, since his very existence is debatable, and there is in any case no indication of where he should be placed chronologically.

Leontopolis)¹⁰⁰ Iuput II is only documented in LE, Petubaste I mainly in UE, but a few times in LE; the others are known exclusively from Upper and Middle Egypt. Osorkon III is the father of Takelot III and Rudamun, and the later is the father-in-law of Pefjtaw'awybast. All of the members of this family are known exclusively from UE sources.¹⁰¹ They are doubtless UE rulers in the tradition of Harsiese A and Takelot II, and thus are not Manetho's Dyn. 23. The issue is thus the temporal relationship of those kings known from UE sources to one another and to the kings of Dyn. 22. The sources allow for the following synchronisms:

a) In the "Chronicle of Prince Osorkon", years 22–29 of Shoshenq III follow year 24 of Takelot II.¹⁰² This suggests that Takelot II became king in UE during the reign of Osorkon II (as Harsiese A before him, but with his own count of regnal years) and that in his year 4, Shoshenq III became the successor of Osorkon II (in LE).

b) The year 12 of a king who can only be Shoshenq III corresponds to the year 5 of Petubaste I, with Harsiese (B) as HPA.¹⁰³ Petubaste I thus began his reign in year 8 of Shoshenq III (= year 11 of Takelot II) and HP Harsiese (B) is linked to this regency. Harsiese (B) is subsequently documented in the years 18 and 19 of Petubaste (= years 25 and 26 of Shoshenq III),¹⁰⁴ and previously in year 6 of Shoshenq III,¹⁰⁵ and already under Osorkon II.¹⁰⁶ A Takelot (E) was HP at the latest from year 23 of Petubaste,¹⁰⁷ who then assumes Harsiese's post.

It is therefore highly probable that the "rebellion" of year 11 of Takelot II mentioned in the "Chronicle of Prince Osorkon" was the accession to the throne of Petubastis,¹⁰⁸ which was understood as a usurpation, as he thus became a kind of rival king to Takelot II. The

¹⁰⁰ *TIP*, §§ 102; 297; 519; p. 588.

¹⁰¹ And the same applies, as described above, to Takelot II, the father of Osorkon III.

¹⁰² *Reliefs*, III, pl. 22, Z.7–22.

¹⁰³ Nile level record no. 24, cf. Beckerath (n. 3), 51. On the identification of the unnamed king as Shoshenq III, cf. *TIP*, §§ 106–107. On purely technical grounds, following the chronology proposed by Aston, Takelot II could also be considered, but historically, he is out of the question, as an opponent of Petubaste and Harsiese B.

¹⁰⁴ Nile level record nos. 28 and 27, cf. Beckerath (n. 3), 52.

¹⁰⁵ Nile level record no. 23, cf. Beckerath (n. 3), 51.

¹⁰⁶ On the statue, Cairo CG 42225, for this, cf. Jansen-Winkel (n. 19), 135–6.

¹⁰⁷ Nile level record no. 29, cf. Beckerath (n. 3), 52.

¹⁰⁸ *Chronicle of Prince Osorkon*, A, 22ff., cf. *Reliefs*, III, pl. 16; 18.

HP Osorkon B is documented for years 11 and 12 in Thebes,¹⁰⁹ whereas Petubaste I and Harsiese B are not, but another revolt erupts in year 15 of Takelot,¹¹⁰ and exactly in this year, Petubaste and Harsiese B reappear in the Theban sources.¹¹¹ In year 24 and 25 of Takelot (= 14 and 15 of Petubaste I), Osorkon B donated offerings in Thebes, and at this time Petubaste and Harsiese are not documented here. Evidently, there were two parties in this civil war: Osorkon B and his father Takelot II on the one hand, and Petubaste I and the HP Harsiese B, later Takelot E, on the other.¹¹² This Takelot is also mentioned in the year 6 of a king Shoshenq *Wsr-mš^ct-R^c Mrj-jmn*,¹¹³ who cannot be Shoshenq III,¹¹⁴ but must rather be another (certainly UE) King *Wsr-mš^ct-R^c Shoshenq (IV)*.¹¹⁵

c) The highest documented regnal year for Takelot II is year 25,¹¹⁶ and as in the donation lists of the "Chronicle of Prince Osorkon", year 24 of Takelot II is followed by year 22 of Shoshenq III, it was apparently his last.¹¹⁷ Despite publicly announced claims,¹¹⁸ the successor of Takelot II was not his son Osorkon B: the latter is still General and HP in year 39 of Shoshenq III.¹¹⁹ It was presumably Iuput I who was

¹⁰⁹ The son of Takelot II who commissioned the Chronicle of Prince Osorkon.

¹¹⁰ Chronicle of Prince Osorkon, B,7, s. *Reliefs*, III, pl. 21.

¹¹¹ Nile level record no. 24, cf. Beckerath (n. 3), 51.

¹¹² The role played by Shoshenq III in these events is not evident.

¹¹³ Nile level record no. 25, cf. Beckerath (n. 3), 52.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Aston (n. 31), 151: Shoshenq III does not use the epithet *Mrj-jmn* in his throne-name, and there is already a Nile level record (no. 23) for his year 6, naming HPA Harsiese.

¹¹⁵ The latest documented date for him is year 6, cf. Beckerath (n. 3), 52. (Nile level record no. 25); Jacquet-Gordon, *Graffiti*, 40–41 (no. 100).

¹¹⁶ Donation stela Cairo JE 36159, cf. *ASAE* 4 (1903), 183.

¹¹⁷ The years 24 and 26 (without the king's name, cf. Capart, *BMRAH*, 3. série, 13, 1941, 26), are recorded on the mummy wrapping Brussels E.7047b/c of a *mrj-jmn* named *Ns-ps-ntr-n-R^c* var. *Ns-ntr-ps-R^c*. As the father of this man is *Ns-r-jmn* (Cartonage Berlin 30, cf. *ÄIB* II, 381–382), Kitchen (*TIP* § 86, n.115; 294) and Bierbrier (*LNK*, 71) have both identified him as *Ns-ps-R^c*, son of *Ns-r-jmn* (I), the donor of the statue Cairo CG 42221, whose family tree (*TIP*, § 166) suggests that he belongs roughly in the period of Takelot II, and they have thus deduced a year 26 of Takelot II. Since, however, both the name (*Ns-ps-ntr-n-ps-R^c* vs. *Ns-ps-R^c*, cf. M. Thirion, *RdE* 46 [1995], 181–182) and the title (*mrj-jmn* vs. *hm-ntr n jmn-R^c njswt ntrw jmj-3bd.f n pr jmn hr z thj*) of these individuals differ, this identification (and thus a possible source for a year 26 of Takelot II) cannot be maintained.

¹¹⁸ Chronicle of Prince Osorkon, A, 53, cf. *Reliefs*, III, pl. 16; 17; *CPO*, §§ 101–102.

¹¹⁹ Nile level record Karnak no. 22, cf. Beckerath (n. 3), 51; *Annals of the Priests at Karnak*, no. 7, cf. Legrain (n. 4), 55–56; Kruchten, *Annales*, pl. 4; 19.

the successor, for year 16 of Petubaste I corresponds to year 2 of a king Iuput (I),¹²⁰ and thus his year 1 (corresponding to year 15 of Petubaste and year 22 of Shoshenq III) follows immediately on the last full year of Takelot II. As these dates match, it is more probable that Iuput I was the successor of Takelot, and not a “short-lived coregent” of Petubaste.¹²¹ On the other hand, Shoshenq IV may have been the successor of Petubaste as Petubaste appears initially together more frequently with the HP Harsiese B, and then with Takelot E, who himself is then named likewise together with Shoshenq IV (cf. above). These synchronisms produce the relations presented in Fig. II. 10.1.¹²²

King Petubaste is documented in Thebes with the throne-name *Wsr-m3'4-Rc Stp-n-Jmn* and with the unique epithet *3' 3st*.¹²³ A king with the same prenomen and throne-name, but with the epithet *3' B'stt* is known from a donation stela from Memphis (year 6),¹²⁴ from Herakleopolis or the eastern Delta (?),¹²⁵ and Bubastis (year 23),¹²⁶ as well as on a statue of uncertain provenance.¹²⁷ This has been interpreted as being two different kings with the same prenomen and throne-name,¹²⁸ but this is hardly plausible.¹²⁹ The idea that both the UE and LE Petubaste would have the same highest known date of 23 years appears rather suspicious. In addition, one of the Theban retainers of Petubaste, the

¹²⁰ Nile level record no. 26, cf. Beckerath (n. 3), 52.

¹²¹ In *TIP*, § 448; cf. also Aston (n. 31), 151. Against this, one could argue that all of the other synchronisms in the Nile level records give only the links between the rulers of one “party” to the LE king (Shoshenq III). If Iuput I was the successor of Takelot II, he should have belonged to the foes of Petubaste. However, from the Chronicle of Prince Osorkon (B,7ff.) it is evident that at this time, there was a temporary unity among the various rivals in the civil war (cf. Jansen-Winkelen [n. 19], 140–141 on this).

¹²² Abbreviations: NLR, Nile Level Records, cf. Beckerath (n. 3), 43–55; OC = Caminos, *Chronicle*; OC, A = *Reliefs*, III, pl. 16–19; B = ibidem, pl. 21; C = ibidem, pl. 22; AP = Annals of the Priests at Karnak, cf. Legrain (n. 4), 51–63; Kruchten, *Annales*; Stela 22.8.26 = Meeks, *Donations*, 669 [22.8.26]. Years in brackets are postulated.

¹²³ Nile level record no. 24; Beckerath (n. 3), 51.

¹²⁴ Cairo JE 45530, cf. Schulman, *JARCE* 5 (1966), 33–41; pl. 13.

¹²⁵ Copenhagen Ny Carlsberg AEIN 917, cf. O. Koefoed-Petersen, *Recueil des inscriptions hiéroglyphiques*, pl. 5; J. Yoyotte, *BIFAO* 58 (1959), 97 (2); Meeks, *Donations*, 671 (23.1.00).

¹²⁶ Florence 7207, cf. R. A. Caminos, *Centaurus* 14 (1969), 42–46; pl. 1–2.

¹²⁷ Gulbenkian Museum Lisbon, cf. M. Hill, *Royal Bronze Statuary from Ancient Egypt* (Leiden/Boston, 2004), 155–156; pl. 18 (12).

¹²⁸ E.g., A. S. Schulman, *JARCE* 5 (1966), 37–39; Beckerath, *GM* 147 (1995), 9–13.

¹²⁹ Cf. B. Muhs, *JEA* 84 (1998), 223; J.v. Beckerath in: *Es werde niedergelegt als Schriftstück: Festschrift für Hartwig Altenmüller zum 65. Geburtstag* (Hamburg 2003), 31–36.

Fig. II. 10.1

Dyn. 22	Dyn. 23 (UE)	Rival Kings	High Priests	Sources
Osorkon II			Harsiese B	CG 42225,a
	Takelot II			
Shoshenq III				
year (1)	(4)			
6	(9)	Petubaste I	Harsiese B	NLR, no. 23
(8)	11	(1)	Osorkon B	OC, A 18-53: 1st "rebellion"
(9)	12	(2)	Osorkon B	OC, B 1-6
12	15	5	Osorkon B/ Harsiese B	NLR, no. 24; OC, B 7; 2nd "rebellion"
(14)	(17)	7		AP, no. 1, 1.1
(15)	(18)	8	Harsiese B	AP, no. 1, 1.2; no. 2, 11.1/3
(21)	24	(14)	Osorkon B	OC, C 7 (cf. B 7-C1)
22	25	(15)	Osorkon B	OC, C 12 (year 22); ASAE 4, 183
	Iuput I			
	(1)			
23	2	16	Osorkon B	NLR, no. 26 (y. 2/16); OC, C 12
24	(3)	(17)	Osorkon B	OC, C 13-16
25	(4)	18	Osorkon B/ Harsiese B	NLR no. 28; OC, C 1-2; 17: 3rd "rebellion"
26	(5)	19	Harsiese B	NLR, no. 27; Stela 22.8.26
28	(7)	(21)	Osorkon B	OC, C 12; 17
29	(8)	(22)	Osorkon B	OC, C 22
(30)	(9)	(23)	Takelot E	NLR, no. 29
		Shoshenq IV		Jacquet-Gordon, Graffiti, 85
(33)	12	(?)		
(?)	(?)	6	Takelot E	NLR, no. 25
39	(18)		Osorkon B	NLR, no. 22; PA, no. 7, 11.1-3
(39?)	Osorkon III			
	(1)			

prophet of Amun and royal scribe *Hr* (IX), is unexpectedly documented at Memphis,¹³⁰ and perhaps also in Tell el-Balamun.¹³¹ There can only be one single king Petubaste, who used the epithet *zʿ Bstt* in LE. He may have been a rival king who attempted to re-establish a unified kingship over the entire land, a situation which had ceased to exist at the very latest by Takelot II. Regardless, the “dynasty” of Petubaste is not chronologically relevant. It is not known when Shoshenq IV succeeded Petubaste, the length of whose reign is likewise unknown. This dynasty presumably ended in year 39 of Shoshenq III, at the latest.¹³² By contrast, the dynasty of Takelot II can be followed: a year 12 is documented for his presumed successor, Iuput I (cf. above),¹³³ and his successor can only have been Osorkon B/III. He appears for the last time in year 39 of Shoshenq III, as High Priest. As he had this office since year 11 of Takelot II (= year 8 of Shoshenq III), and then reigned for 28 years as king, he must have become king in or shortly after year 39 of Shoshenq III. If he, as is probable, followed immediately after Iuput I, the latter must have reigned for at least 17 years.

For Osorkon III, the regnal years 1(?), 3, 5, 6, 14(?), 15, x + 6, 23(?) and 28 are documented, with his regnal year 28 being equal to year 5 of his son Takelot III,¹³⁴ the only completely unambiguous coregency in the TIP.¹³⁵ For Osorkon III, 23 full years can be accounted for, and for Takelot III, years 5, 6, and 7 are clearly attested.¹³⁶ If Osorkon

¹³⁰ K. Jansen-Winkel, SAK 27 (1999), 123–139; pls. 1–4.

¹³¹ A. J. Spencer, *Excavations at Tell el-Balamun 1995–1998* (London 1999), 13–15; 83–86; 90–91.

¹³² In this year, the HPA Osorkon B claimed that he and his brother defeated all of those with whom they fought, cf. Legrain (n. 4), 55–56; Kruchten, *Annales*, pl. 4; 19. It would still be conceivable that the later “dynasty” of Hermopolis (Nimlot D and Thotemhat) continued that of Petubaste, as Hermopolis could have been a major center in Petubaste’s “rebellion”, cf. Jansen-Winkel (n. 19), 142. However, there does not appear to be any trace of a temporal link between these regents.

¹³³ Aside from the graffito of year 9 of Iuput, the same priest also left graffiti from years 9 and 12 (without the name of a king), cf. Jacquet-Gordon, *Graffiti*, 84–85 (nos. 244–245).

¹³⁴ Nile level record no. 13; Beckerath (n. 3), 50. For the uncertain numbers, cf. Jacquet-Gordon, *Graffiti*, 41 (nos. 101: year 1); 68–9 (no. 190: year 14); 69 (no. 191: year 23).

¹³⁵ This coregency is also confirmed by the statue Cairo CG 42211, dated by the cartouches of *njswt-bjt Mrrj-jmn zʿ ʿst Tkr* and *zʿ Rʿ Mrrj-jmn zʿ ʿst Wsrkn*, cf. Jansen-Winkel (n. 63), 470.

¹³⁶ Daressy (n. 40), 51–52.

III ascended the throne in year 39 of Shoshenq III, then the temporal relationship between Dyn. 22 and the UE rulers of the line of Takelot II will have been that presented in Fig. III. 10.2. If he became king at a later date (year 40 or 41), then the dynasty must be pressed down a bit, but this can hardly be a matter of more than a few years.¹³⁷ Of his successors, only his well documented son Takelot III spatially and temporally anchored in Thebes. The length of the reign remains unclear: he is occasionally assigned a reign of more than 6 full years, and not least because several of his children were still alive shortly before 700 as the family trees of their descendents and the style of their tombs reveal.¹³⁸ F. Payraudeau has recently attempted to link a year 14 of a Takelot *z̅ 3st* in P. Berlin 3048 to Takelot III rather than Takelot II.¹³⁹ This is possible but by no means certain.¹⁴⁰ However long he reigned, the problem of the “generation shift” does not disappear: perhaps Takelot III and/or Osorkon III only became fathers late in their lives.

At the very latest, after the reign of Takelot III the situation in UE becomes quite obscure. At the time of the Piye campaign, the Nubians ruled the Thebaid, while other UE kings were in Hermopolis and Herakleopolis. The later successors of Osorkon III were thus driven out of Thebes. There is no clear indication of when this happened, but at the very latest the inauguration of Amenirdis I as the adoptive daughter and heir of the Divine Wife Shepenupet I marks that Thebes was definitely governed by the Nubians. According to Kitchen, it was Piye, the brother of Amenirdis, who ordered the adoption,¹⁴¹ but Morkot

¹³⁷ On the condition that the HPA Osorkon B and Osorkon III were in fact one and the same person, cf. above, section 3.

¹³⁸ Cf. Aston & Taylor, in: Leahy, *Libya*, 138–143.

¹³⁹ *GM* 198 (2004), 82–85. Palaeographically it appears probable that on the same papyrus (debt note) one should read year 23 (rather than 13), cf. S. Vleeming, *OMRO* 61 (1980), 3, n. 14; B. Menu, *CRIPEL* 1 (1973), 89–90; K. Donker van Heel, in: K. Ryholt, ed., *Acts of the Seventh International Conference of Demotic Studies* (Copenhagen: CNI Publications 27, 2002), 142.

¹⁴⁰ The palaeography can hardly aid with the date as there are already very cursive texts in Dyn. 21, cf. M. Malinine, in: *Textes et langages de l'Égypte pharaonique* I (Cairo, 1973), 31. The identification of some ancestors of the scribe with individuals from dated contexts is unreliable in the extreme, or would even favour a date under Takelot II (as with the vizier *Hḥj*). Nor can an argument be made using the Overseers of the Treasury, as four of them appear in this one Papyrus (cf. Donker van Heel [n. 139], 143).

¹⁴¹ *TIP*, § 122.

Fig. III. 10.2 (Abbreviations: see Fig. III. 10.1)

Shoshenq III		Takelot II	
Year 1		Year 4	
21		24	
22		25	
		Iuput I	
		1	
33		12	
39		(18)	
		Osorkon III	
		1	
Shoshenq IIIa		2	
1			
13		14	
Pami		15	
1			
6		20	
7			
Shoshenq V			
1		21	
3		23	
4		24 =	1 Takelot III
8		28 =	5
10			7 (sole rule)

has convincingly shown that it was probably her father Kashta who installed her.¹⁴² This would mean that the successors of Osorkon III were swiftly removed from Thebes. If Piye's campaign (in his year 20) took place within five years of the death of Shoshenq V (see below, section 7), then his reign must have begun at the latest in year 25 of Shoshenq V, and probably somewhat earlier. The inauguration of Amenirdis could thus have taken place in years 20–24 of Shoshenq V. As year 28 was probably the final year of Osorkon III, and corresponds to year 8 of Shoshenq V, at the earliest (cf. above), his successors have a mere 10–15 year in Thebes, before they had to withdraw to the North. All of their dated sources from Thebes must be assigned to this short period.

¹⁴² In: S. Wenig, "Studien zum antiken Sudan", *Meroitica* 15 (1999), 194–196.

Aside from Takelot III, the following UE kings are known from the period after Osorkon III.

- Rudamun, the brother of Takelot;¹⁴³ no known regnal years.
- Peftjau'awybast, the son-in-law of Rudamun, king of Herakleopolis at the time of Piye's campaign;¹⁴⁴ regnal year 10 is documented.¹⁴⁵
- G. Broekman has recently shown that it is highly probable that there was an UE king Shoshenq ("VII") with the epithet *z3 3st* and the throne-name *Hd-hpr-Rc Stp.n-Rc*;¹⁴⁶ who was recognized as king in Thebes in his regnal year 5,¹⁴⁷ and who is to be inserted after Shoshenq III and thus also after Takelot III.
- Another candidate would be the king Iny who is documented several times in Thebes (including a regnal year 5) and perhaps also in Abydos.¹⁴⁸
- In addition, there is a dynasty residing in Hermopolis, whose most prominent member, Nimlot D, is chronologically anchored in the stela of Piye. His predecessor or (more probably) successor could have been Thotemhat,¹⁴⁹ and a later successor may have been Padinemeti(?).¹⁵⁰

¹⁴³ Cf. O. Perdu, *RdE* 53 (2002), 157–178, for this person.

¹⁴⁴ Even if his power was restricted to the Herakleopolis region, during this period when the Nubians controlled the Thebaid and there appeared yet another UE kingdom, he could still have been the heir of an UE dynasty with a much larger realm. In Herakleopolis and the surrounding area at least, the dynasty of Takelot II is well documented, e.g. the HPA Osorkon B (cf. Caminos, *Chronicle*, §§ 28–30) and the later Takelot III (*ASAE* 37 [1937], 16–24). Payraudeau's ([n. 139], 79–81) attempt to distinguish the general of Herakleopolis from the son of Osorkon III, who bears the same name, cannot be accepted in view of the fact that both are HPA and had a mother with the same rather uncommon name.

¹⁴⁵ Donation stelae Cairo JE 45948 and 11/9/21/14, cf. G. Daressy, *ASAE* 17 (1917), 43–45; *ASAE* 21 (1921), 138–139.

¹⁴⁶ Broekman (n. 3), 163–78, esp. 176–177.

¹⁴⁷ The only certain document is the Nile level record no. 3; Beckerath (n. 3), 49, hitherto assigned to Shoshenq I. However, one cannot exclude a possible reference to Shoshenq IIIa; his predecessor Shoshenq III is in fact mentioned in his last (or next to last) year in the Nile level records, cf. Broekman (n. 3), 176. It is conceivable that there was still resistance after Osorkon III ascended the throne, and that one of his enemies was able to establish himself briefly in Thebes, and dated according to the LE king. It is highly probable that the Nile level record no. 45 does *not* belong to Shoshenq VII (cf. Broekman [n. 3], 177); there does not remain any time for a year 17/19/25 of a sovereign in Thebes before the Nubians after Osorkon III (cf. above).

¹⁴⁸ J. Yoyotte, *CRIPPEL* 11 (1989), 113–131; pl. 14.

¹⁴⁹ For him, cf. H. Wild, *RdE* 24 (1972), 209–215; P. Spencer & A. Spencer, *JEA* 72 (1986), 198–199; pl. 21; Bierbrier, *LNK*, 84.

¹⁵⁰ For him most recently, cf. A. Leahy, *JEA* 85 (1999), 230–232.

As the brother of Takelot III, Rudamun was most probably his successor, as is generally assumed. It is, however, remarkable, that he is better documented in Hermopolis than in Thebes.¹⁵¹ It is thus also conceivable that Rudamun became king in Hermopolis after the death of his father, alongside his brother Takelot in Thebes (and Herakleopolis?). The Libyan period does reveal a tendency to multiply both rulers and principalities. The line of Takelot would then have been reduced to Herakleopolis after the Nubian intervention. Shoshenq "VII" is only documented in Thebes, with a year 5. He too can belong only to the dynasty of Osorkon III (as a son of Takelot III?). If Rudamun was the successor of Takelot III (in Thebes), Shoshenq VII would most probably have been a successor of Rudamun, although a sequence of Takelot—Shoshenq—Rudamun cannot be excluded.¹⁵² If Rudamun was a local ruler in Hermopolis, then Shoshenq VII would have followed immediately after Takelot. The year 5 of king Iny should be situated roughly two generations after year 4 of a king Shoshenq;¹⁵³ and this may have been Shoshenq III, IV or VII. Were it Shoshenq III, the reign of Iny would fall under the reign of Osorkon III, and that is improbable. Otherwise, he should be assigned either to the period after Takelot III (successor of Shoshenq VII?), or indeed placed in Dyn. 25. Unusually his name was effaced, and thus he might have been a pretender (during the reign of Osorkon III or Dyn. 25),¹⁵⁴ in which case the reign would be of no chronological relevance.

In any case, the rulers of the house of Osorkon III were swiftly evicted from Thebes. The Pefjtjau'awybast of Herakleopolis named on the stela of Piye is the last of this line. The "dynasty" of Hermopolis (whether from Rudamun or by another line) may have been founded by descendents of Osorkon III, but it could equally easily have been the late revival of the rival dynasty of Petubaste.

¹⁵¹ Cf. Perdu (n. 143), 169–170.

¹⁵² Cf. G. Broekman, "The Chronological Position of King Shoshenq Mentioned in Nile Level Record No. 3 on the Quay Wall of the Great Temple of Amun at Karnak", *SAK* 33 (2005), 75–89.

¹⁵³ Graffito no. 11 from the roof of the temple of Khonsu, cf. H. Jacquet-Gordon, in: *Hommages à la mémoire de Serge Sauneron I* (Cairo, 1979), 174–183; pl. 27–28; Yoyotte (n. 148), 115.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Yoyotte (n. 148), 131. A "reign" of at least 4 years for a rival king could be possible, but it would be quite unusual, and particularly so in Dyn. 25.

The chronology of the UE kings after Osorkon III thus remains quite uncertain: there are only a few (low) dates, and it is unclear which kings reigned in parallel and which in succession. Of the kings attested on the stela of Piye, Nimlot D cannot be linked to either a predecessor or a successor,¹⁵⁵ and Pefjtjau'awybast can only be identified genealogically as the son-in-law of Rudamun.

The familiar "graffito" from Wadi Gasus could offer a chronological connection with the following Dyn. 25.¹⁵⁶ To the right is the cartouche of the Divine Adoratrice Amenirdis (I), above which is regnal year 12, to the left the cartouche of the Divine Wife Shepenupet (I), above which is regnal year 19, both names have the epithet "living" (*nh.tj*). It is today agreed that the year 12 of Amenirdis can only be related to Piye,¹⁵⁷ and thus the year 19 should be assigned to one of the UE rulers recognized by Piye. It is thus immediately clear that Takelot III cannot possibly be the king designated by the year 19 of the graffito¹⁵⁸ since his year 19 must have corresponded to year 22(-25, or so) of Shoshenq V (cf. above, Fig. III. 10. 2), and thus clearly before year 12 of Piye in whose year 20 the campaign to the North took place, Shoshenq V, who reigned at least 37 years, no longer in office.

Rudamun would only be a candidate for the year 19 if he was not the predecessor of Shoshenq VII, as they were certainly not dating in Thebes according to the dynasty of Osorkon III 19 + 5 years after Takelot III (cf. above). The year 19 can also be linked to Shoshenq VII or Pefjtjau'awybast. In any case, it should certainly be someone relatively close to Piye's house: an ally. Nimlot D of Hermopolis would thus also be a candidate. He appears in an ambivalent fashion on the stela of Piye: on the one hand the Nubian king expresses his particular irritation over the alliance with Tefnakhte of Sais, while on the other, he is given preferential treatment.¹⁵⁹ This can be most easily explained by the fact that he was an ally of the Nubians who then

¹⁵⁵ No regnal year is preserved, and the same is true of several other members of this dynasty: Rudamun, Thotemhat, and Padinemeti; for the latter two, not even the exact position in the sequence of the "dynasty" is known.

¹⁵⁶ L.-A. Christophe, *BIE* 35 (1952/53; 1954), 141-152.

¹⁵⁷ *TIP*, §§ 143-145.

¹⁵⁸ Thus Payraudeau (n. 139), 85-86.

¹⁵⁹ He is the only prince admitted into the Palace to Piye, cf. the great stela of victory, ll. 148-53 (*Urk.* III, 54) and is the only one pictured standing, but actually like a woman, with a sistrum in his hand.

switched sides.¹⁶⁰ As an ally before these events, he would have been a suitable candidate for the double dating, and in fact he does appear a second time with the Divine Wives Shepenupet I and Amenirdis I.¹⁶¹ Nimlot D thus appears to me to be a particularly suitable candidate for the year 19 in this graffito. Chronologically, however, this does not aid at all: in temporal terms, neither Nimlot D nor the other possible candidates can be pinned down to sufficiently narrow slots in time so as to allow a direct link with between the house of Osorkon III and Dyn. 25.

A somewhat more precise knot making a temporal link between the Libyan and Nubian periods is possible only via Dyns. 22 and 24, and possible fixpoints can only be gained for Dyn. 25.

6. *The Chronological Framework for Dyn. 25*

The beginning of the reign of Taharqa lies in year 690 BC, and this is not disputed.¹⁶² For a long time, his predecessor Shebitku (highest date is year 3¹⁶³ was assigned a reign of 8–12 years, and at the most 13 regnal years.¹⁶⁴ However, the inscription of Sargon II at Tang-i Var reveals that Shebitku was already (at the latest) king in 706,¹⁶⁵ and thus reigned for at least 16 years. As his predecessor Shabaka ruled for at least 14 full years (cf. below), the beginning of his reign would be at the latest in 720 BC. Since one had once assumed that there were good reasons for believing that the Nubian rule in Egypt could not have begun before 716 or indeed 712 (cf. below), it was suggested a number of times that Shebitku was only (co)regent in Nubia while his senior partner, Shabaka (with dates according to his reign) ruled in Egypt.¹⁶⁶ This is historically quite improbable, aside from the fact that there has never been the slightest hint at any form of coregency of the

¹⁶⁰ Opposing D. Kessler, *SAK* 9 (1981), 238.

¹⁶¹ On the fragment of a vessel in the Museo Barracco in Rome, cf. L. Bongrani Fanfoni, *OrAnt* 26 (1987), 65–71; pls. 2–3.

¹⁶² Cf. *TIP*, §§ 130–131; Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 91.

¹⁶³ Nile level record no. 33, cf. most recently J.v. Beckerath, *GM* 136 (1993), 7–9.

¹⁶⁴ *TIP*, §§ 126; 468; Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 92.

¹⁶⁵ G. Frame, *Orientalia* 68 (1999), 31–57; cf. D. Kahn, *Orientalia* 70 (2001), 1–3. Cf. also N. Na'aman, *N.A.B.U.* 1999, Nr. 3, 63 (65).

¹⁶⁶ So Redford, *Orientalia* 68 (1999), 58–60; Beckerath, *SAK* 29 (2001), 3–6; Kitchen, in: Bietak, ed., *SCIEM Handorf 1996/98*, 50–51.

Nubian kings of Dyn. 25. Had Shabaka been ruler of Egypt in the year 707/706 and Shebitku his "viceroys" in Nubia, one would definitely expect that the opening of diplomatic relations with Assur as well as the capture and extradition of Yamani would have been part of Shabaka's responsibility. Sargon can also be expected to have named the regent of Egypt and senior king, rather than the distant viceroy Shebitku. If, on the other hand, Shebitku was already Shabaka's successor in 707/706, the reports of the Yamani affair become clearer and make more sense. It had hitherto been assumed that the Nubian king (Shabaka) handed over Yamani more or less immediately after his flight to Egypt.¹⁶⁷ Now it appears to be certain that Yamani was only turned over to the Assyrians a couple of years later.¹⁶⁸ It then becomes much more probable that Shabaka awarded him asylum, but that Shebitku did not feel bound by his predecessor's word and that he desired to make a gesture of good will towards the Assyrians at the start of his reign, and that he extradited Yamani.¹⁶⁹ This interpretation also matches with the peculiar insertion into Sargon's large "ceremonial inscription" in Khorsabad where the king of Nubia is described as residing in a very distant, inaccessible land.¹⁷⁰ The formulation of his Nile level record (no. 33) also supports the idea that Shebitku only came to Egypt in his year 3.¹⁷¹

Shabaka must, therefore, have already been dead in 707/706. The "international" reasons which have hitherto been used to justify placing his reign in Egypt after 716 or even 712 cannot therefore be correct, and in fact they are wrong. The events of the years (around) 725 (when Hosea of Israel addresses an appeal for aid to a "So, King of Egypt")¹⁷² and around 720 (when an unknown Egyptian sovereign sends a general named Re'e leading an army into Palestine to support a revolt against the Assyrians only to be defeated at Raphia),¹⁷³ are not

¹⁶⁷ Cf. e.g., *TIP*, § 341.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. A. Fuchs, "Die Annalen des Jahres 711 v. Chr.," *State Archives of Assyria Studies* VIII, 127-31. The actual text of the Assyrian reports recording that Yamani lived in Egypt "like a thief" likewise indicate a prolonged stay.

¹⁶⁹ Had Shabaka himself extradited Yamani after having granted him asylum for years, that would have been an inconvertible sign of weakness.

¹⁷⁰ A. Fuchs, *Die Inschriften Sargons II. aus Khorsabad* (Göttingen 1994), 221-222; 348-349; Frame (n. 165), 53.

¹⁷¹ Cf. Beckerath (n. 163), 7-9.

¹⁷² 2 Kgs. 17,4.

¹⁷³ Annals of Sargon II from Khorsabad, ll. 53-5, cf. Fuchs, *Inschriften*, 90; 315; cf. also the threshold inscriptions from Khorsabad, ll. 38-41, *ibidem*, 262; 360; and a clay cylinder from Khorsabad, l. 19, *ibidem*, 34; 290.

relevant for the dating of the Nubian rule in Egypt.¹⁷⁴ In the year 716, Sargon II extends his sphere of control further south, and receives tribute (or the like) “from Pharaoh, the king of the Land of Egypt”.¹⁷⁵ Another source is more precise, recording that Shilkanni, the king of Egypt, sent 12 large steeds as a greeting present.¹⁷⁶ Shilkanni could be Osorkon IV,¹⁷⁷ but he is in any case a LE and not a Nubian king. In the case of the Yamani-affair (711–706)¹⁷⁸ the city of Ashdod asks “Pharaoh, the king of Egypt, a prince, who could not rescue it” for an alliance, apparently in vain. As the Assyrians attack, Yamani flees “to the border of Egypt in the area of Nubia”,¹⁷⁹ where he lives “(secretly) like a thief”, until extradited by Shebitku. Neither the events of 716 nor 711 can possibly serve as a *terminus post quem* for the beginning of Nubian rule. The pharaoh whose alliance was requested in 712/711 can only be either Shabaka or a Delta Prince, but even in the latter case, it would not imply that Shabaka had not yet been recognized in Memphis. Shilkanni apparently had good reasons for trying to reassure the Assyrians; but this does not solve the issue of who had the upper hand in Egypt. In the account of his third campaign, Sennacherib reports that at the battle at Eltekeh (701), Hezekiah made appeals to “the kings of Egypt” and the troops of the King of Nubia (Shebitku). On this occasion, the Assyrian king captured “the charioteers and the sons of the kings of Egypt” and “the charioteers of the king of Nubia”.¹⁸⁰ From the Assyrian point of view, the enemies are perceived primarily as a kind of coalition, and this may have correspond to the facts, for

¹⁷⁴ There is one hint that Nubian soldiers took part in the battle at Raphia (cf. Kahn, *Orientalia* 70, 11–12), but these could have been mercenaries.

¹⁷⁵ Annals of Sargons II from Khorsabad, ll. 123–4, cf. Fuchs, *Inschriften* 110; 320.

¹⁷⁶ Assur Prisma, cf. Fuchs, *Annalen*, 28–29; 57.

¹⁷⁷ This is, however, by no means certain, a name such as Šykn or the like would be more reasonable, cf. J. Yoyotte, *Kēmi* 21 (1971), 51–52.

¹⁷⁸ Mentioned in the following inscriptions: Annals of Sargon II from Khorsabad, ll. 241–254, cf. Fuchs, *Inschriften*, 132–5; 326; small ceremonial inscription from Khorsabad, ll. 11–14, cf. Fuchs, *Inschriften*, 76; 308; *Orientalia* 68 (1999), 52–53; large ceremonial inscription from Khorsabad, ll. 90–112, cf. Fuchs, *Inschriften*, 219–222; 348–9; *Orientalia* 68, 53; Niniveh Prisma VIIB, cf. Fuchs, *Annalen*, 44–6; 73–4; inscription from Tang-i Var, cf. Frame (n. 165), 31–57.

¹⁷⁹ This frequently discussed phrase (cf. most recently L. Depuydt, *JEA* 79 [1993], 272, n. 24; Fuchs, *Inschriften*, 220; 348; 452; Frame (n. 165), 52, n. 24) seems to mean something like “to that part of Egypt, which was under the direct control of the Nubians”.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. E. Frahm, “Einleitung in die Sanherib-Inschriften”, *AfO Beiheft* 26 (1997), 54; 59. On the 3rd campaign of Sennacheribs as a whole, cf. *ibidem* 10–11.

even under Asarhaddon and Assurbanipal the princes of the Delta are represented as acting independently on the international stage. It is thus inadmissible to use evidence of such activities as a base for defining the beginning of Dyn. 25.

There are no obstacles to ending the reign of Shabaka in 706 at the latest; on the contrary, everything suggests that Shebitku ruled alone from 707/706 to 690. Year 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15¹⁸¹ are documented for Shabaka, and he is generally assigned 14 full years. An indirect confirmation of this can be found in Manetho, if one allows for a slip,¹⁸² by assigning the 14 years Africanus gives to Shebitku to Shabaka. However, in view of the unreliability of the Manetho tradition concerning Dyn. 25¹⁸³ this does not mean much. A possibility for calculating can also be deduced from two stelae from Kawa where Taharqa states that he was 20 years old when Shebitku called upon him to go from Nubia to Egypt.¹⁸⁴ As this will doubtless have taken place in the course of the preparations for the campaign which led to the battle at Eltekeh where Taharqa saw action,¹⁸⁵ he must have been born ca. 722/721. If he was a son of Piye's (as is generally assumed),¹⁸⁶ the latter must have lived until at least 723 and perhaps a bit longer.¹⁸⁷ However, it is by no means certain that Taharqa was really the biological brother of Shepenupet II and thus the son of Piye.¹⁸⁸ Nevertheless, a reign of 14–15 years for Shabaka remains highly probable. Favouring this is also the fact that there is a relatively complete coverage of dates from the second decade of his reign (10, 12, 13, 14, 15), and a large hole would be improbable. He must thus have come to the throne at the latest in 720, or more probably 721 or 722. His second year would thus be ca. 720 (721–719), and also year 6 of Bocchoris.¹⁸⁹ It is calculating

¹⁸¹ Block statue BM 24429, cf. Leclant, *Enquêtes*, 15–27; pl. 5–6.

¹⁸² Thus Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 92; *TIP*, § 421.

¹⁸³ Cf. *TIP*, § 468.

¹⁸⁴ Stela IV, ll. 7–9; V, ll. 16–7, cf. Macadam, *Kawa* I, 15; 28; pl. 7–10.

¹⁸⁵ *TIP*, § 127–9; 133.

¹⁸⁶ According to the stela of Nitokris, ll. 3–4 (cf. *JEA* 50 [1964], 74; pl. VIII) the Divine Wife Shepenupet II, a daughter of Piye, was his sister, cf. *TIP*, §§ 120–121.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. D. Kahn, *Orientalia* 70 (2001), 7.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. A. Leahy, *GM* 83 (1984), 43–45.

¹⁸⁹ An inscription from year 2 of Shabaka was found in the Serapeum, and this—despite some inconsistencies in the secondary literature—should be related to the same Apis burial as the stelae from the beginning of year 6 of Bocchoris, cf. *TIP*, § 114; J. Vercouter, *Kush* 8 (1960), 62–67; *PM* III², 789. That year 2 of Shabaka was either the same as, or close to, year 6 of Bocchoris is clear from the sources: Manetho assigns

the regnal years of Piye, the predecessor of Shabaka, which is uncertain, and thus likewise the link to the major campaign of year 20.¹⁹⁰ In Egypt, the years 20(?), 21, 22, and 24 are documented,¹⁹¹ but he is generally assigned a reign of 31 years as a few years must be inserted for Tefnakhte before the reign of Bocchoris his successor. This rests on the correct assumption that the various rulers of Egypt listed on the stela of Piye are actually identified by their rightful titles—including the foes of the Nubian king. If Tefnakhte is not designated a king there,¹⁹² he will thus have become such only after the campaign of Piye. As a year 8 is recorded for Tefnakhte as king,¹⁹³ at least an additional 7 years must have passed between Bocchoris's accession to the throne (ca. 725, cf. above) and the campaign of Piye,¹⁹⁴ and thus the campaign will have taken place shortly before ca. 732, perhaps 733/734. This is possible, but not compelling. Tefnakhte's predecessors were not kings,¹⁹⁵ and on two donation stelae from years 36 and 38 of Shoshenq V—certainly only a few years before the campaign of Piye¹⁹⁶—he himself does not yet bear the royal title,¹⁹⁷ and dates himself according to

Bocchoris 6 years (following Africanus), and reports that Shabaka burnt him alive. Shabaka himself is only known in Egypt (even LE) in his regnal year 2.

¹⁹⁰ Only the erection of the stela with the record of this campaign is dated, in the first month of year 21. It is generally agreed that the campaign must have taken place in the previous year.

¹⁹¹ *JEA* 54 (1968), 165–172; pl. XXV; for the alleged year 30 on the mummy wrapping London BM 6640 cf. D. B. Redford, *JARCE* 22 (1985), 9–12; figs. 1–2, according to which it can be read as either 20 or 40.

¹⁹² In ll. 19–20 he is named “Great Prince of the West”, along with a few of his other titles; in general, however, he is merely the “Chief of the Ma” (ll. 28; 80; 126).

¹⁹³ A hieratic donation stela in Athens, cf. R. el-Sayed, *Documents relatifs à Saïs et ses divinités*, *BdE* 69 (1975), 37–53; pl. 7. K.-H. Priese (*ZAS* 98 [1972], 19–21) and K. Baer (*JNES* 32 [1973], 23–24) have disputed that the king Tefnakhte with the throne-name *Šps-Rc* is the same as the Prince Tefnakhte on the stela of Piye. They assume instead that this is the first king of Dyn. 26 (before the predecessor of Neco I) mentioned by Manetho (“Stephinales”), and thus a local prince of Saïs. Opposing this stance is the fact that one of the stelae of *Šps-Rc* Tefnakhte actually probably comes from the eastern Delta (cf. Yoyotte [n. 177], 37–40), which was most assuredly not under the control of the local princes ruling in Saïs during Dyn. 25. Furthermore, Diodor (I, 43) specifies that the king Tefnakhte, predecessor of the sage Bokchoris, undertook an expedition to “Arabia”, and this would only have been possible from the eastern Delta.

¹⁹⁴ The possibility that Tefnakhte only became king after the campaign, but that his regnal years were then post facto extended back to a point in time before the campaign is rejected by Kitchen (*TIP*, § 112).

¹⁹⁵ J. Yoyotte, *BSFE* 31 (1960), 13–22; *TIP*, § 113; 468.

¹⁹⁶ Cf. above, section 4.

¹⁹⁷ The unusual designation, “Great Prince of the Entire Land” reveals that his ambition (and certainly also his power) extended far beyond that of the ordinary Libyan local princes.

Shoshenq V. If he became king shortly thereafter, e.g., after the death of Shoshenq V, this could only have taken place on the basis of his own power. As one very conscious of legitimacy, Piye would thus not have had the slightest reason to have designated someone as a king if that person had only just shortly before proclaimed himself king, and even less so if this person was his major opponent.¹⁹⁸ It would thus be possible to set the campaign of Piye somewhat closer to the accession of Bocchoris, perhaps, between 734 and 726 BC; his accession to the throne would thus be ca. 753–745 BC.

7. *Connecting Dyns. 22 and 25*

Shoshenq V died before the campaign of Piye, but not long before, since Tefnakhte claims the title “Great Prince of the Entire Land” in year 38. On the other hand, however, Shoshenq’s rule was apparently uncontested in Memphis in his year 37, and thus Tefnakhte’s expansion was not as advanced as at the beginning of the campaign of Piye. In addition, there may be another king Petubaste (cf. above) to insert before Osorkon IV who reigned in Bubastis and Tanis during the campaign. A period of about 5 years between the death of Shoshenq V and year 20 of Piye would appear reasonable.

For the kings from Shoshenq I to Takelot I we can reckon at least 21 + 35 + 15 years, for Osorkon II at least 30 years, as a year 29 is very probably documented and the genealogical data favours a long reign (cf. above, section 1). For the kings Shoshenq III, Shoshenq IIIa, Pami and Shoshenq V, we have made a minimal period of 95 years (cf. above, section 3). If we start with year 945 as the beginning of Dyn. 22, the year 38 of Shoshenq V is to be set in 749 *at the earliest*. The campaign of Piye can be placed in the years 734–726 (cf. above, section 6); 10–18 years would remain to bridge the period between the campaign and year 38 (+ 5) of Shoshenq V. This result is also realistic as those reigns the duration of which is not certain were assigned minimal values here. Where these missing years must be placed is a

¹⁹⁸ On his “small stela” (Khartoum 1851, G. A. Reisner, *ZAS* 66 [1931] 89–100; pls. V–VI) Piye clearly enunciates that only that person is king whom he makes king, and not those whom he forbids. This could apply to Tefnakhte, nor does he call Tefnakhte “Great Prince of the Entire Land”, but rather “Chief of the Ma”.

matter of speculation, but there are several possibilities.¹⁹⁹ First of all, the year 945 is not certain. If the campaign of Shoshenq in Palestine (926/925 in year 5 of Rehabeam) did not take place in his year 20, but rather a few years earlier—as is entirely possible²⁰⁰—the beginning of the reign must accordingly be placed somewhat later. Candidates for a somewhat longer reign are Shoshenq V himself and Osorkon II. Likewise, Pami may have reigned for more than 6 years,²⁰¹ if his “annals” were not written posthumously (cf. above, section 3), and Osorkon I and his successors could have ruled longer than we have assumed above.²⁰² In any case, a very slight extension of a few reigns is just as unproblematic as setting the beginning of Dyn. 22 marginally later in history.

8. Conclusion

For the chronology of the TIP, Egyptian sources only supply the year 690 as a certain point of departure. Additionally, the date of the campaign of Shoshenq I, presumably towards the end of his reign, can be placed with the aid of Near Eastern chronology in 925/926.²⁰³ Between these two there is not one single firm date, but the sequence of kings and the highest known dates for these kings does not leave significant gaps. The general framework of the chronology of this age is certain. Additional finds of dated monuments from this period will hopefully add to the previous discoveries, and lead to an even higher degree of resolution, leaving still less uncertainty.

¹⁹⁹ Assigning the entire sum of years to the reign of Osorkon II, as Aston (n. 31; 145–148) does, is not necessarily the most logical possibility.

²⁰⁰ Cf. above, Jansen-Winkel, Chapter II. 9.

²⁰¹ Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 98, assigns him 11 years.

²⁰² The usual numbers still depend to a great extent upon the very doubtful figures for this period provided by the copyists of Manetho.

²⁰³ Cf. above, n. 200. Following alternative and acceptable calculations in OT studies, the year 5 of Rehabeam would not have been 926/5, but rather 922/1 (H. Donner, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grundzügen*, 2 [1995], 274); and this would correspond to the Egyptian dates quite well. A “chronological problem” noted by Donner *ibidem*, 321, n. 14) does not exist in this fashion: the Egyptian chronology is absolutely dependent upon Near Eastern chronology. If one follows Begrich/Jepsen and not Thiele, one simply shifts the accession of Shoshenq I by the same margin.