

Chapter 34

Revising the 21st Dynasty Once More

The Third Intermediate Period comprises the 21st Dynasty to the 26th Dynasty. The period is not as well documented with chronological data as the New Kingdom. It has only about a dozen lunar dates that can be used for dating the kings. Kitchen has revised his chronology of the period several times. Others continue revisionary efforts. I offer a further revision in keeping with the principles and periods of my chronology, anchored to lunar data in the inscriptions.

For the 21st Dynasty, the lack of chronological data from elsewhere is somewhat offset by Manetho, who, via his copyists has transmitted the names and regnal years of seven kings located at Tanis in Lower Egypt. The change of residence to Lower Egypt gave opportunity for the High Priests at Thebes to exert considerable influence. They effectively governed Middle and Upper Egypt, with some even having their names in cartouches and given the title of king. For example, Pinudjem I proclaimed himself “king” of Upper Egypt during the 15th–16th year of King Smendes of Lower Egypt.¹ However, according to Kitchen,² in rebuttal of Jansen-Winkel,³ they are not known to have appropriated regnal years for themselves, as these were always attributed to the kings at Tanis who had nominal rule over the whole of Egypt.⁴

Events were dated by the regnal years of the kings at Tanis recorded by Manetho. The records of the concurrently serving High Priests based at Thebes confirm the general length of the dynasty and in some cases assist in clarifying the chronology, such as the Karnak Priestly Annals. Manetho’s dynastic list for the 21st Dynasty kings is as follows:

- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| 1. Smendes, | 26 years |
| 2. Psusennes [I], | 46 years Africanus; 41 years Eusebius and the Armenian |
| 3. Nephercheres, | 4 years |
| 4. Amenophthis, | 9 years |
| 5. Osorchor | 6 years |
| 6. Psinaches | 9 years |
| 7. Psusennes [II] | 14 years Africanus; 35 years Eusebius and the Armenian ⁵ |

The versions all give the total as 130 years even though the reigns amount to only 114 years (giving Psusennes I 46 years and Psusennes II 14). Scholars usually emend

¹ K.A. Kitchen, *TIP*, 258-59, 262 §§216, 219.

² *Ibid.*, xvii-xviii §L.

³ K. Jansen-Winkel, “Das Ende des Neuen Reiches,” *ZÄS* 119 (1992) 22-37; and subsequent to Kitchen’s rebuttal, in “Dynasty 21,” *Ancient Egyptian Chronology* (eds. E. Hornung, R. Krauss, D. A. Warburton; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006) 229-31.

⁴ A year 48 attributed to the High Priest Menkheperre, which is without precedent as a regnal year for a pontiff, is better explained as the 48th year of Psusennes I in whose reign he officiated and in whose year 48 he probably died. See Kitchen, *TIP*, xvii-xviii §M; 36 §32 n. 152, 77 §62, 271 §228, 415 §377.

⁵ These are found in *Manetho* (trans. W.G. Waddell; Loeb Classical Library 350; London: William Heinemann Ltd. and Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1940) 154-57.

Psinaches' 9 years to 19 years by identifying him with Siamun from inscriptions, and attribute 124 years to the dynasty.

Identifying the Kings

The identification of several of these kings has been discussed by Egyptologists over the years. They have ascertained that Manetho's Nephhercheres is the same as Amenemnisu known from the monuments, Nephhercheres being his prenomen. Amenophthis is otherwise known as Amenemope.

Osorchor was previously not attested, but in 1963, Eric Young identified him as the Akheperre Setepenre from an inscription, differentiating him from Akheperre Setepenamun, the prenomen of Psusennes I.⁶

Osorchor, or Orsorkon, is often called Osorchor the Elder to differentiate him from Osorkons I–V of the 22nd Dynasty, who were all enumerated before Osorchor of the 21st Dynasty was identified.

Psinaches is a name unknown from the monuments, but he is understood by scholars to be the same as Siamun who does appear in inscriptions. Siamun is attested as having reigned at least 17 years, so it is assumed that the 9 years of Psinaches in *Manetho* should be amended to 19 years, supposing that an iota (ι = 10) has been dropped from the number in the Greek text.⁷ There are two kings with the name of Psusennes, dubbed Psusennes I and II.

The Period of the 21st Dynasty

In 2000, Karl Jansen-Winkel listed the *attested* regnal years for the seven kings.⁸ In the same year, Kitchen's revised chronology of the dynasty was published.⁹ These are shown in Table 34.1.

Table 34.1: 21st Dynasty published in 2000 by Jansen-Winkel and by Kitchen

King	Jansen-Winkel		Kitchen	
	Attested years	Deduced years	Deduced years	Dates BCE
1. Smendes	25	26	26	1070–1044
2. Nephhercheres/Amenemnisu	0	4	4	1044–1040
3. Psusennes [I]	49	48	48	1040–992
4. Amenemope	9	9 (2 CR)	19	994–985
5. Osorchor	2	6	6	985–979
6. Siamun	17	19	19	979–960
7 Psusennes [II]	13	15	15	960–945
Total	115	127 (125)	127 (125)	

CR = co-regent.

The number of the attested years does not necessarily reflect the final number of years the kings reigned. Kitchen's chronology has used the four years for Amenemnisu and six years for Osorchor as given by Manetho, and amended the 9 years to 19 for Siamun/Psinaches. Kitchen finishes the dynasty with the year 945 BCE, which is perceived to be the first year of Shoshenq I on the basis that his 20th year equated with Rehoboam of Judah's fifth year in 925 BCE, as derived by Edwin Thiele, discussed earlier in chapter 2. I asserted the date of 977 BCE as Rehoboam's fifth year in my *The*

⁶ E. Young, "Some Notes on the Chronology and Genealogy of the Twenty-First Dynasty," *JARCE* 2 (1963) 100.

⁷ Kitchen, *TIP*, 12 §9.

⁸ Jansen-Winkel, "Dynasty 21," 227.

⁹ K.A. Kitchen, "Regnal and Genealogical Data of Ancient Egypt (Absolute Chronology I): The Historical Chronology of Ancient Egypt, a Current Assessment," *SCIEM II* (2000) 50. The dates are all one year earlier than those tabled as "Preferred Dates" in *TIP*, 465.

*Reconstructed Chronology of the Divided Kingdom*¹⁰ by establishing the chronology of the kings of Israel and Judah. The incentive and focus of this present work is to establish Shoshenq I's 20th year in the chronology of Egyptian kings.

My dates proposed for the 12th Dynasty, and all the reigns of the 18th–20th Dynasties, are buttressed by the agreement of lunar and Sothic dates in the Julian calendar, assisted by Casperson's lunar tables. I have shown in the previous chapter that the 20th Dynasty ended in 1122 BCE. The beginning of the 22nd Dynasty under Shoshenq I is 998/997 BCE—a base date for the synchronism between Shoshenq I's 20th year and Rehoboam's fifth in 977 BCE. The 21st Dynasty covers 124 years, as shown in Table 34.2.

Table 34.2: 21st Dynasty Tanite kings

King	Regnal Yrs	Dates reigned	Lunar anchor points
Smendes		1122 to ?	Yr 25, Epiphi feast, III <i>šmw</i> 28 in 1097
Amenemnisu Nephercheres			Yr 4, Amun feast, new moon I <i>3ht</i> 1 in 1092
Psusennes I			None known
Amenemope Amenophthis			None known
Osorchor the Elder			Yr 2, induction of Nespaneferhor on new moon I <i>šmw</i> 20 in 1032.
Siamun Psinaches			Yr 17, induction of Hori on new moon I <i>šmw</i> 4 in 1011 (Jan. 1).
Psusennes II		? to 998/997	Yr 3, induction of Nesankhefenmaat, 2 days after new moon I <i>šmw</i> 13 in 1009; Yr 13, induction of a priest on new moon III <i>prt</i> 10 +[x] = 14th in 999; (Sync. Yr 19 Psu. II + Yr 5 Shoshenq I in 994; Yr 5 Shoshenq I, <i>wrš</i> feast IV <i>prt</i> 25–5 days after new moon on IV <i>prt</i> 20 in 994)
Total	124	1122–998/997	

I now determine the regnal years of the individual kings. Because of the scarcity of information and the absence of accession dates, the length of each king's reign must be considered approximate, though the new moons attached to regnal years provide anchors for five of the seven reigns.

Smendes (Hedjkheperre Setepenre)

In the Renaissance period at the end of the 20th Dynasty, a man named Nesbanebdjed, now known as Smendes, rose to power to become governor of Tanis.¹¹ His wife, Tentamun, was a daughter of Ramesses XI.¹² Smendes is featured in the “Report of Wenamun” dated to year five of the *whm-mswt* (Renaissance era), which equates to the 23rd year of Ramesses XI in 1127 BCE. Having buried Ramesses XI in his 29th regnal year, Smendes became king and began a new dynasty with its capital at Tanis. There was intermarriage between the branches of the families at Tanis and Thebes. However, tensions and rivalries were ever-present.

By the time of Smendes's 25th regnal year, rebellion had broken out at Thebes. The Banishment Stela of Menkheperre records how the king dealt with this revolt. The name of the king is not given, but most scholars conclude that it refers to the reign of Smendes. After Smendes's death, Amenemnisu assumed the throne. From dates mentioned on this stela, the reigns of these two kings may be dated.

¹⁰ M.C. Tetley, *The Reconstructed Chronology of the Divided Kingdom* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005).

¹¹ *Idem*, *TIP*, 8 §5.

¹² *Ibid.*, 49 §42.

Banishment Stela: Epiphi Feast on III šmw 29 in Year 25

The text of the Banishment Stela is similar to the Epiphi feast in the 25th year of the reign of Ramesses XI on III šmw 28 (previously discussed in chapter 33), which is mentioned in the Karnak oracle inscription. Line 1 of the Banishment Stela of Menkheperre reads in part, “Year 25, third month of the third season, day 29, corresponding to the feast of Amon-Re, king of the gods at his [beautiful] feast [of Epiphi...].”¹³

The text continues in line 4, referring to year 25, dated to I 3^{ht} 4 or 5,¹⁴ when Amun summons Menkheperre to Thebes. In line 7, Menkheperre arrives at Thebes, and, in line 8, Amun appears in a procession and establishes Menkheperre on the throne of his father as High Priest and Commander-in-Chief of the armies of Upper and Lower Egypt. Menkheperre put down opposition led by an unnamed foe and banished the leaders to the western oases.¹⁵

Referring back to line 1, the name of the feast is broken away, but Epiphi has been assumed by scholars since the feast fell in the third month of šmw. I noted in chapter 33, in the reign of Ramesses X, that the Epiphi feast included the day IV šmw 2, and in the reign of Ramesses XI the date of III šmw 28. Here, in the reign of Smendes, the date is III šmw 29, and the feast would have continued into IV šmw. The dates were associated with a new moon at the beginning of IV šmw. Consequently, we would expect to find in Smendes’s 25th year a new moon near the beginning of IV šmw. If Smendes’s first year was 1122 BCE, his 25th year would fall in 1097 or 1096 BCE. Casperson’s table (Table 34.3) shows that a new moon fell on IV šmw 2 in –1096 (1097 BCE), three days after the date recorded for the feast.

Table 34.3: Smendes’s 25th year in –1096 (new moon listing for –1096)

Tanis; Lat. 31.0, Long. 31.8; visibility coefficients: c1 = 11.5, c2 = 0.008																
Julian			Gregorian			Egyptian			DoW	ToD	Morning visibility					
Yr	Mo	D	Yr	Mo	D	Yr	Mo	D			-2	-1	0			
-1096	3	21	-1096	3	11	1685	11	2	3	19:27	6:11	270	6:10	141	6:09	69
Epiphi feast date falls on III šmw 29; new moon on IV šmw 2																
-1096	4	20	-1096	4	10	1685	12	2	5	7:22	5:43	207	5:42	102	5:41	29
-1096	5	19	-1096	5	9	1685	13	1	6	17:06	5:19	314	5:18	144	5:17	48

DoW = day of week; ToD = time of day.

Showing that the reported Epiphi feast occurred in 1097, Smendes’s 25th year, the table confirms that Smendes’s reign began in 1122 BCE, thus also the final year for the end of the reign of Ramesses XI and the 20th Dynasty.

Amenemnisu\Nephercheres (Neferkare)

The existence of Nephercheres, referred to by Manetho, was not attested until two gold bow-caps were found in the tomb of Psusennes [I] with twin cartouches of

¹³ R. Krauss, *Sothis- und Monddaten, Studien zur astronomischen und technischen Chronologie Altägyptens* (HÄB 20; Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1985) 151; A.J. Spalinger, in “Egyptian Festival Dating and the Moon,” *Under One Sky: Astronomy and Mathematics in the Ancient Near East* (eds. J.M. Steele and A. Imhausen; Alter Orient und Altes Testament; Münster: Ugarit, 2002) 393, has given the regnal year as 23 when it should be 25. The “5” is usually written as five vertical strokes but in lines 1 and 4 are written as a short horizontal stroke adjoining the top right of a vertical stroke; J. von Beckerath, “Die ‘Stele der Verbannten’ im Museum des Louvre,” *Rd’É* 20 (1968) 10.

¹⁴ Von Beckerath, “Die ‘Stele der Verbannten’,” 9, 33.

¹⁵ Kitchen, *TIP*, 260 §217; José Lull, “Beginning and End of the High Priest of Amun Menkheperre,” *The Libyan Period in Egypt: Historical and Cultural Studies into the 21st–24th Dynasties: Proceedings of a Conference at Leiden University, 25–27 October 2007* (eds. G.P.F. Broekman, R.J. Demarée, O.E. Kaper; Leiden: NINO, 2009) 241-43.

Psusennes' name and that of another King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Neferkare, having the prenomen of Amenemnisu.¹⁶

Manetho places Nephercheres as the *third* king of the 21st Dynasty at Tanis, and assigns him four years. However, the Berlin genealogical table puts him as the successor of Smendes.¹⁷ In 1994, von Beckerath argued that a year 49 followed by a year four found on a mummy bandage from Deir el-Bahri (Papyrus Brooklyn 16.205) should be assigned to Psusennes I and Amenemope, and not, as previously, to Shoshenq III and Pimay (Pami) of the 22nd Dynasty. The grounds stated were that “it is unlikely that private persons from Upper Egypt [would] refer to this late year of Shoshenq III.”¹⁸

The association of the bandage with Psusennes I and Amenemope was confirmed by the discovery of a hitherto unknown Shoshenq IV who reigned about 12–13 years after the 39th year of Shoshenq III.¹⁹ The 49 years could not have belonged to Shoshenq III and are attributed instead to Psusennes I with the year four to Amenemope. Thus, Amenemnisu must have preceded Psusennes I since he did not come between Psusennes I and Amenemope.

Line 7 of the above-mentioned Banishment Stela continues into line 8. The end of line 8 is broken away and unfortunately so, because it contained a *regnal year*. Von Beckerath is of the opinion that there could only be enough space for a small number, and suggests one to five.²⁰ If this is so it must refer to the reign of Smendes's successor, and Kitchen comments, “This low regnal figure would, perforce, belong to a successor of Smendes I—and preferably to a date as soon as possible after his 25th year. This consideration would favour Amenemnisu rather than Psusennes I, as the king in whose reign the final oracle was given and the stela erected.”²¹

Line 9, which follows the missing regnal year in line 8, was translated by Henry Breasted, as rendered here, but it is unfortunate that Breasted fails to indicate that a regnal year is missing at the beginning of this section:

[Now after] the fourth month of the third season, on the fifth day of the (feast), “Birth of Isis”, corresponding to the feast of Amon at the New Year, the majesty of this august god, lord of gods, Amon-Re, king of gods, appeared (in procession), came to the great halls of the house of Amon, and rested before the [enclosure wall] of Amon. The High Priest of Amon-Re, king of gods, commander in chief of the army, Menkheperre, triumphant, went to him and praised him exceedingly, exceedingly, many times...²²

From this we see that in the reign of Smendes's successor, understood to be Amenemnisu, an Amun feast had its fifth day on New Year's day, I *3ht* 1. The feast must have started on the second epagomenal in the reign of Amenemnisu for the fifth day to fall on New Year's Day.

Manetho credits Smendes with a reign of 26 years; thus, we would expect another year between Smendes 25th year and the accession of Amenemnisu. With Smendes' 25th year dated to –1096, his last and Amenemnisus' first year will have fallen

¹⁶ Ibid., 69 §56.

¹⁷ E. F. Wente, “On the Chronology of the Twenty-First Dynasty,” *JNES* 26 (1967) 155-56.

¹⁸ J. von Beckerath, “Zur Datierung des papyrus Brooklyn 16.205,” *GM* 140 (1994) 15-17.

¹⁹ Kitchen, *TIP*, xxvi. See further under 22nd Dynasty.

²⁰ Von Beckerath, “Die ‘Stele der Verbannten’,” 17, 8*d* and 33, n. 2.

²¹ Kitchen, *TIP*, 261 §218 n. 103, 15 §12.

²² “Stela of the Banishment of Menkheperre,” <http://www.specialtyinterests.net/maunier.html> citing J. Breasted, *Records Ancient Records of Egypt: Historical Documents from the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest* (1907) Vol. IV; von Beckerath, “Die ‘Stele der Verbannten’,” 9-14; Kitchen, *TIP*, 260-61 §§217-18. The result of Menkheperre's praise of Amun was that he found favor with Amun and obtained his permission for the return of the exiles.

on -1095. Four years later, Amenemnisu's fourth year would have fallen in -1091 (see Table 34.4). Thus, the amnesty referred to on the Banishment Stela occurred in one of the years -1095 to -1091.

Table 34.4: Amenemnisu's fourth year in -1091 (new moon listing for -1091)

Tanis; Lat. 31.0, Long. 31.8; visibility coefficients: c1 = 11.5, c2 = 0.008																
Julian			Gregorian			Egyptian			DoW	ToD	Morning visibility					
Yr	Mo	D	Yr	Mo	D	Yr	Mo	D			-2	-1	0			
-1091	4	24	-1091	4	14	1690	12	7	1	10:16	5:40	238	5:39	67	5:38	-17
In Amenemnisu's fourth year, a new moon fell on the fifth day of the Amun feast on I 3^{ht} 1																
-1091	5	23	-1091	5	13	1691	1	1	2	19:45	5:16	366	5:15	110	5:15	11
-1091	6	22	-1091	6	12	1691	2	1	4	7:03	5:00	190	5:00	65	5:00	-19

DoW = day of week; ToD = time of day.

Casperson's table for -1091 (Table 34.4) shows that a new moon fell on I 3^{ht} 1 at the beginning of a new 25-year lunar cycle, indicating that the feast began on the second epagomenal day. The missing regnal year number in line 8 of the Banishment Stela can be restored to year four and to the reign of Amenemnisu.²³ His first year can be confirmed as 1096 BCE—the 26th and final year of his predecessor, Smendes.

Apart from the identification of Amenemnisu as the king who followed Smendes and in whose fourth year the High Priest Menkheperre was able to bring back exiles banished to the western oasis, very little is known about Amenemnisu.²⁴ The four years given to him (i.e. Nephcheres) by Manetho is the only other indication of his reign.

Psusennes I and Amenemope (Amenophthis in *Manetho*)

Psusennes I's mother was Henuttawy, the daughter of Ramesses XI and Tentamun. His father was the High Priest Pinudjem I. His wife, Mutnedjmet, was likely his full sister.²⁵ Amenemope was the son of Psusennes I and Mutnedjmet.²⁶

Psusennes I has no known accession date. As noted above, a year 49 followed by a year four on Papyrus Brooklyn 16.205 previously assigned to Shoshenq III and Pimay are now assigned by scholars to the reigns of Psusennes I and Amenemope. Amenemope's highest attested year, according to Jansen-Winkel is his fifth with a year 10 that might be his or Siamun's (penultimate king of the 21st Dynasty).²⁷

Manetho's numbers

Africanus gives Psusennes I a reign of 46 years while Eusebius and the Armenian attribute him 41 years. The possibility of a co-regency between Psusennes I and Amenemope has been suggested by Kitchen on the basis of a fragment of a mummy bandage found at Deir el-Bahri. Kitchen states, "Daressy read: 'King of Upper & Lower Egypt, Amenemope: Regnal Year 49'."²⁸ However, Kitchen renders the bandage in keeping with the wording on other bandages to be understood as "part of a now

²³ Jansen-Winkel proposed that the High Priests may have had their own regnal year dating system and that the missing date in the Banishment Stela is the first year of the High Priest Menkheperre who granted an amnesty on New Year's Day to mark the transition from his father, Pinudjem, to himself as High Priest ("Dynasty 21," 229-31 and n. 73). Kitchen rebuts this, pointing out that there is no evidence that any but actual kings ever used regnal datings, and even the possible exception of the year 48 of Menkheperre on a linen bandage in all likelihood dates from Psusennes I's 48th year (*TIP*, xvii, 420 §387:46). See also, Lull, "Beginning and End of the High Priest of Amun Menkheperre," 245-46.

²⁴ Kitchen, *TIP*, 69-71 §56, 261 §218.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 49 §42, 264 §221.

²⁶ P. Clayton, *Chronicle of the Pharaohs* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1994) 178.

²⁷ Jansen-Winkel, "Dynasty 21," 227, citing Kitchen, *TIP*, 421 §388:55.

²⁸ Kitchen, *TIP*, 24 §22.

incomplete legend: ‘[Year x of] King Amenemope; Year 49 [of King Psusennes I]’, or the like.”²⁹

Kitchen suggests the following as the original text: “[Year 3 of] King Amenemope; Year 49 [of King Psusennes I]; linen made by the high priest of Amun, Smendes II son of Menkheperre for his lord Amun].” He continues, “This scheme would fit exactly the known structure of bandage-epigraphs.”³⁰ On Kitchen’s understanding, the bandage implies that the 49th year of Psusennes I, the year of his death, was the third year of the reign of Amenemope. However, this is a different reading from that given by Daressy whom Kitchen quotes. In the 12th Dynasty, we noted that the period of co-regency is attributed to the incumbent, not the older king, which is the opposite of what Kitchen is suggesting.

In this papyrus, Papyrus Brooklyn 16.205, year 49 followed by a year four may indicate the fourth year of Amenemope’s *sole* reign, coming four years after the death of Psusennes I. Amenemope is given nine years by Manetho.

Following the four years for Amenemnisu, we come to Psusennes I with either 49 sole-reign years or 46 years followed by a three-year co-regency with Amenemope (assuming such a co-regency occurred), and then Amenemope with nine sole years, and Osochor’s second year, for a total of approximately 59 years or 56 years. These parameters guide the further investigation.

Osochor (the Elder) and Siamun (Psinaches in *Manetho*)

Amenemope apparently died childless³¹ and was succeeded by Osochor, as named by Manetho. Manetho’s Osochor is often called “Osorkon the Elder,” to differentiate him from the Osorkons known from the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties, to avoid having to renumber them and create confusion.³² His relationship to Amenemope is unattested. Manetho gives to Osochor a reign of six years coming between Amenophthis (Amenemope) and Psinanaches (understood to be Siamun). His existence was unattested until 1963 when Eric Young proposed that a king named Akheperre Setepenre was different from the king Akheperre Setapenamun, that is, Psusennes I, with whom the former name had been associated.

High Priest Inductions

Young had noticed that in the Karnak Priestly Annals, fragment 3B, lines 1–3, mentions the induction of Nespaneferhor in the reign of Akheperre Setepenre in year two on I *šmw* 20.³³ And the same fragment, in lines 3–5, records that in year 17 of Siamun, Hori, the son of Nespaneferhor, was inducted on I *šmw* 1[?] with part of the day-number missing.³⁴ Young noted that the induction of father and son must be a generation apart, about 20–30 years, with both being young men at the time because they were inducted into office at the beginning of their respective careers.³⁵

That the two inducted high priests were father and son shows that Akheperre Setepenre must have preceded Siamun and could not have been Psusennes I with the prenomen Akheperre Setapenamun who would have reigned much earlier.

²⁹ Ibid., 29 §25.

³⁰ Ibid., 33 §29; see also 29 §25, 411-16 §§ 371-77, 531 §432.

³¹ Ibid., 574 §505.

³² Ibid., 573 §505.

³³ Young, “Some Notes on the Chronology,” 99-101; Kitchen, *TIP*, 422 §388:56.

³⁴ Ibid., 100; see also Kitchen, *TIP*, 423 §390:83.

³⁵ Ibid.

Young identified the Akheperre Setepenre of lines 1–3 with Manetho’s Osochor, and the Siamun in lines 3–5 with Manetho’s Psinaches.³⁶ The identification of Akheperre Setepenre as Manetho’s Osorchor was confirmed by Jean Yoyotte in 1976–1977. He noted that a Libyan king by the name of Osorkon was the son of Shoshenq A and a Lady Metenweshket who was given the title “King’s Mother” in a genealogical document.

Since no other King Osorkon had a mother known as Metenweshket, her son was identified as Manetho’s Osochor. Metenweshket was also the grandmother of Shoshenq I, first king of the 22nd Dynasty, for his father was her son Nimlot A, “Great Chief of the Meshwesh.”³⁷

Also referring to year 17 from the reign of Siamun is a date found on a graffito at Abydos where the day date is 10 +[x],³⁸ showing that the day was numbered from 11 to 19. However, there is no indication what this date was referring to, so it need not be a lunar date.

Krauss notes that the induction dates of Nespaneferhor and his son, Hori, are in I šmw indicating a *Tepi Shemu* feast day, that is, a feast day on or near the first day of the lunar month falling in the civil month of I šmw.³⁹ I šmw 20 in the second year of Osorchor should be followed a generation later in the 17th year of Siamun with a date also I šmw and an early day-date.

For Osochor’s second year, we may look for a new moon falling on or near I šmw 20 about 56 or 59 years after the date of Amenemnisu’s fourth year in 1092, thus in 1036/35 or 1033/32 depending on the length of final years. Taking the period from –1035 to –1030 into account, I see that a new moon did not fall on 1035, but it did occur on I šmw 20 equated to 22 January in –1031 (1032 BCE) as Casperson’s Table 34.5 shows.

Table 34.5: Years for locating I šmw 20 in years –1035 to –1030 for induction of Nespaneferhor (new moon listing from –1035 to –1030)

Tanis; Lat. 31.0, Long. 31.8; visibility coefficients: c1 = 11.5, c2 = 0.008																
Julian			Gregorian			Egyptian			DoW	ToD	Morning visibility					
Yr	Mo	D	Yr	Mo	D	Yr	Mo	D			-2		-1		0	
-1035	1	7	-1035	12	28	1746	9	4	6	16:06	7:01	232	7:01	133	7:01	51
-1035	2	6	-1035	1	27	1746	10	4	1	8:49	6:48	195	6:47	94	6:46	16
-1034	1	26	-1034	1	16	1747	9	23	5	10:46	6:55	190	6:54	93	6:53	17
-1034	2	25	-1034	2	15	1747	10	23	7	4:19	6:33	139	6:32	50	6:31	-19
-1033	1	15	-1033	1	5	1748	9	12	2	10:35	6:59	202	6:59	97	6:59	13
-1033	2	14	-1033	2	4	1748	10	12	4	4:35	6:42	138	6:41	47	6:41	-23
-1032	1	4	-1033	12	25	1749	9	1	6	15:29	7:01	271	7:01	133	7:01	30
-1032	2	3	-1032	1	24	1749	10	1	1	6:25	6:50	171	6:49	59	6:49	-21
-1031	1	22	-1031	1	12	1750	9	20	5	14:60	6:56	299	6:56	113	6:55	8
-1031	2	21	-1031	2	11	1750	10	20	7	3:07	6:36	141	6:35	29	6:34	-44
-1030	1	12	-1030	1	2	1751	9	10	3	5:19	7:00	232	7:00	77	7:00	-30
-1030	2	10	-1030	1	31	1751	10	9	4	15:10	6:45	348	6:44	95	6:43	-6

DoW = day of week; ToD = time of day.

³⁶ Ibid., 101.

³⁷ J. Yoyotte, “Osorkon fils de Mehytouskhé: Un pharaon oublié?” *Bulletin de las Société française d’egyptologie*, 77-78 (1976-77) 39-54 cited in “Osorkon the Elder,” http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Osorkon_the_Elder

³⁸ Young, “Some Notes on the Chronology,” 99-101; Kitchen, *TIP*, 423 §390:83-84.

³⁹ R. Krauss, “Lunar Dates,” *AEC*, 412-43. He references this to Kruchten, *Annales*, 45-48.

Coming on the first lunar day, the date satisfies Krauss's criterion for a *Tepi Shemu* feast day. This date falls in January 1032, Osochor's second year, so his accession year can be dated to 1034/1033 BCE. Thus, there were 58–59 years from the fourth year of Amenemnisu in 1092 to 1034/1033 and 49 years to be distributed to Psusennes I followed by 9 years for the reign of Amenemope with probably months to be added to the rounded down figures.

The dates prove that Psusennes I and Amenemope did not have a three-year co-regency (or any co-regency) and that the Papyrus Brooklyn 16.205, having a year 49 followed by a year four, was indicating the sole reign years of Psusennes I after which it recorded a year four in the reign of Amenemope.

Kitchen's rendering of the bandage fragment as "[Year 3 of] King Amenemope; Year 49 [of King Psusennes I]" on which the idea of the co-regency gained acceptance, is unwarranted.⁴⁰

Siamun

As noted above, Hori, son of Nespaneferhor, was inducted on I *šmw* 1[?] in Siamun's 17th year.⁴¹ The day date is uncertain. If Osochor reigned six years as given by Manetho, dying ca. 1028 BCE, Siamun's 17th year fell ca. 1011 (–1010). Casperson provides Table 34.6, showing that a new moon fell on I *šmw* 4, which could be the date that is now damaged in the text.

Table 34.6: Siamun's 17th year in –1010 (new moon listing from –1011 to –1010)

Tanis; Lat. 31.0, Long. 31.8; visibility coefficients: c1 = 11.5, c2 = 0.008																
Julian			Gregorian			Egyptian			DoW	ToD	Morning visibility					
Yr	Mo	D	Yr	Mo	D	Yr	Mo	D			–2		–1		0	
–1011	12	3	–1011	11	23	1771	8	5	2	3:22	6:42	184	6:42	80	6:43	–22
–1010	1	1	–1011	12	22	1771	9	4	3	18:28	6:49	282	6:49	138	6:49	28
–1010	1	31	–1010	1	21	1771	10	4	5	6:42	6:41	208	6:41	65	6:40	–29

DoW = day of week; ToD = time of day.

Since this date equates to 1 January, Siamun's 17th year must have started in –1011 (unless I *šmw* 4 was also his accession date). Because Osochor is attributed six regnal years by Manetho and his second year fell in –1031,⁴² it agrees with Siamun's 17th year in –1010 (1011 BCE).

Scholars have invariably attributed to Siamun a reign of 19 years based on the 9 years given by Manetho, understood to have dropped 10 years from his reign, since his 17th year is known. However, there is no attestation for Siamun having reigned 19 years. The following reconstruction of the regnal years of his successor, Psusennes II, having two lunar dates for the inductions of two priests, as well as dates for his successor, Shoshenq I, show unequivocally that Siamun reigned only 17 years.

Siamun and Solomon Dates

Various scholars have identified Siamun as the king of Egypt who captured the Canaanite city of Gezer, slew its inhabitants, and gave it as dowry to King Solomon of Judah for his daughter's marriage (1 Kgs 9:16). Obviously, if Siamun is the unnamed pharaoh mentioned, he must have been contemporary with Solomon.

⁴⁰ See Kitchen's comment referenced in footnote 30 above.

⁴¹ Kitchen, *TIP*, 423 §390:83.

⁴² Young has proposed that a year 14 in a fragment of the Karnak Priestly Annals also belonged to Osochor, so he must have reigned longer than six years ("Some Notes on the Chronology," 101). However, Kitchen has resolved this by noting that the section in which the number 14 is found refers to a *new* section of the annals (No. 33 line 2) and refers to the reign of Siamun (*TIP*, 11 §7, 423 §390:81).

In my *Reconstructed Chronology of the Divided Kingdom*, Solomon's son, Rehoboam, began to reign in 981, and his father began to reign 40 years earlier (1 Kgs 11:42), from 1021 to 981. The reigns of Siamun and Solomon were contemporaneous for the years 1021–1011 showing that Siamun was the king of Egypt who gave his daughter to Solomon as his wife. Significantly, it shows that the histories of Egypt and Judah/Israel are in accord both with the chronology presented in *The Reconstructed Chronology of the Divided Kingdom* and *The Reconstructed Chronology of the Egyptian Kings*. Following Solomon's death, the divided kingdom period began with separate kings in Judah and Israel in 981 BCE.

Psusennes II or Pasenbakenniut (Titkheperure/Tyetskheperre Setepenre)

The name Psusennes II is now giving way to Pasenbakenniut. Psusennes II was the son of Pinudjem II, a High Priest of Amun, who was grandson to Psusennes I (via Menkheperre and Istemkeb C). That made Psusennes II the great-grandson of Psusennes I.

This lineage gave Psusennes II a greater claim to the throne than his contemporary, Shoshenq [I], who was a nephew of Osorchor the Elder.⁴³ Shoshenq's father, Nimlot, and his brother, Osorchor the Elder, were both sons of the Lady Mehtenweskheth ("King's mother") inferred from now lost inscriptions from the Temple of Khons at Karnak.⁴⁴

Psusennes II succeeded Siamun. Psusennes II is identified as Titkheperure/Tyetskheperre Setepenre, given along with his titles as High Priest of Amun-Re-Sonter and Army Leader Psusennes Meriamun on a graffito found in the Temple of Abydos.⁴⁵ His name, without further titles, is also found on an Abydene potsherd from Umm el-Ga'ab. Following an oracle of Amun at Thebes, a graffito was written to commemorate the occasion of the visit of "The Great chief of the Ma;" that is, the future Shoshenq I, and King Psusennes II for "the inauguration of the statue-cult of Shoshenq's father Nimlot."⁴⁶ That this king could bear the titles of both King and High Priest "is indicated by a cane-top of the former Saurma collection."⁴⁷ This king is also known as Hor-Psusennes because of the element in his nomen: Hor-Pasebakhaenniut.⁴⁸

Psusennes II is given 14 years by Africanus, and 35 years by Eusebius and the Armenian version (thought to be in error for 15 years). Psusennes II has no known accession date. However, we can narrow it down by applying other dated information to his reign.

Karnak Priestly Annals Regarding Psusennes II and a High Priest Induction

In 2008, Frédéric Payraudeau published a recently discovered fragment of the Karnak Priestly Annals.⁴⁹ It has been designated as Block Karnak 94, CL 2149, and records that a priest named Nesankhefenmaat was inducted into the chapel of Amun-Re in Karnak on I šmw 13 in year 11 (or possibly year three) of a king Psusennes. This Psusennes can be identified with Psusennes II because the preceding line of the text records the induction of Nesamun, Nesankhefenmaat's father, into the same priesthood

⁴³ Kitchen, *TIP*, xxi-xxii.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 534-35 §437.

⁴⁵ A. Dodson, "Psusennes II," *Rd'É* 38 (1987) 49-51.

⁴⁶ Kitchen, *TIP*, xxi.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, xxi.

⁴⁸ Dodson, "Psusennes II," 49 n. 2.

⁴⁹ F. Payraudeau, De nouvelles annales sacerdotales de Siamon, psousennès II et osorkon Ier.," *BIFAO* 108 (2008) 294; cited in "Psusennes II," http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Psusennes_II

in the reign of Siamun (no date given). Then in the succeeding line, Hor, the son of Nesankhefenmaat (distinguished from earlier HP Hori, son of Nespamerhor) was similarly inducted on II *3ht* 14 in year two or three of a king whose name is damaged but attributed to Oso[r]k[on] I.⁵⁰

It is notable that three generations of priests cover the reigns of the four kings: Siamun, Psusennes II, Shoshenq I, and Osorkon I. Shoshenq I is not mentioned as having a priest inducted in his reign. According to Dodson, if a priest took up office in the end years of the reign of Psusennes II, he could encompass the 21-year reign of Shoshenq I and die or resign early in the reign of Osorkon I.⁵¹ This would mean that Hor's induction took place more than a generation after his father's. Dodson says that the name of the king is "almost certainly to be read as Osorkon," and, "that the latter two kings are Pasebkhanut II and Osorkon I is difficult to doubt."⁵²

But the length of Shoshenq I's reign is controversial (which I discuss extensively in chapter 36), some scholars attributing to him a much longer reign than 21 years, which would make the priestly service of Hor quite long.

In addition to the dates given above for Psusennes II and Osorkon I, another Karnak Priestly Annals' fragment, 3B line 6, refers to an induction in a year 13 III *pri* 10+[x], which comes after Siamun (mentioned in line 3) and most likely refers to the reign of Psusennes II.⁵³

Inductions Held on a New Moon

Previously, I noted that the dates of the Karnak Priestly Annals that were attributed to the induction of two priests fell on the new moon: Nespamerhor in the reign of Osorkon and his son Hori in the reign of Siamun. Krauss followed Vernus and Kruchten in asserting that inductions in the month of I *šmw* took place at a feast lasting five days from lunar day one.⁵⁴ Therefore, the above two dates of inductions in the reign of Psusennes II may also apply to new moons: year 11 (or possibly 3)⁵⁵ on I *šmw* 13, and year 13 on III *pri* 10+[x].

I have already dated Hori's earlier induction in Siamun's 17th year to the date of -1010 (1011 BCE). See Table 34.6. If it is conjectured that Siamun reigned 19 years, I would expect that Psusennes II's 11th year would fall about -998 or -997 (see Table 34.7). What are the implications?

Table 34.7: Psusennes II's 11th or 13th year -998? (new moon listing from -998 to -997)

Thebes; Lat. 25.7, Long. 32.6; visibility coefficients: c1 = 11.5, c2 = 0.008																
Julian			Gregorian			Egyptian			DoW	ToD	Morning visibility					
Yr	Mo	D	Yr	Mo	D	Yr	Mo	D			-2	-1	0			
-998	10	10	-998	10	1	1784	6	14	6	18:41	6:04	309	6:05	188	6:06	66
-998	11	9	-998	10	31	1784	7	14	1	5:60	6:27	238	6:28	121	6:28	3
-998	12	8	-998	11	29	1784	8	13	2	18:58	6:44	289	6:44	175	6:45	67
-997	1	7	-998	12	29	1784	9	13	4	9:47	6:49	227	6:49	119	6:48	25
-997	2	6	-997	1	28	1784	10	13	6	2:06	6:38	163	6:38	67	6:37	-14

DoW = day of week; ToD = time of day.

⁵⁰ Frederic Payraudeau, "De nouvelles annales sacerdotales de Siamon, psousennès II et osorkon Ier.," *BIFAO* 108 (2008) 294; cited in A. Dodson, "The Transition Between the 21st and 22nd Dynasties Revisited," *Libyan Period*, 103; see "Psusennes II," http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Psusennes_II

⁵¹ Dodson, "Transition," 103.

⁵² Ibid., 103. Psusennes II is now known also as Pasebkhanut II.

⁵³ Kitchen, *TIP*, 423 §391:86; see also 284 §238 and n. 240, 13 §10.

⁵⁴ Krauss, "Lunar Dates," 408-9.

⁵⁵ Cited by Dodson, "Transition," 103, whereas this alternative regnal year is not cited in "Psusennes II," http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Psusennes_II

Table 34.7 shows a new moon falling in 997 (7 January in the Julian calendar and 29 December 998 in the Gregorian calendar) being I *šmw* 13 (9 13) by Egyptian reckoning, which might support a reference to Psusennes II's 11th year. However, if the induction is that of a king, then it must be noted that the year 997 BCE is postulated throughout this book as the date of commencement of the reign of Shoshenq I (with 977 BCE being his 20th year). Nevertheless, there is another date for the 13th year of Psusennes II, based on other considerations, which I now explain.

Psusennes II's 13th Year is 998 BCE

The Karnak Priestly Annals gives a date of III *pṛt* 10 + [x] in year 13 of a king who came after Siamun, therefore Psusennes II or possibly Shoshenq I.⁵⁶ A year 13 of Psusennes II dating from Siamun's 17th year in -1010 places the High Priest's induction date ca. -998/-997. Casperson's Table 34.7 shows that a new moon fell on III *pṛt* 14 (7 14) in -998, which could be the original date for the induction, of which now only the ten-sign is legible. This date agrees with his 14th year being Psusennes' last before Shoshenq I's reign began in -997. However, the 11th year date of I *šmw* 13 cannot also fall in -998! For this date there was an alternative of the year three for Psusennes II so we turn to that now. Again giving to Siamun 17 years, Psusennes II's third regnal year should apply to the year -1009 or -1008 (see Table 34.8).

Table 34.8: Psusennes II's third year in -1009 to -1008 (new moon listing at turn of the year -1009 to -1008)

Thebes; Lat. 25.7, Long. 32.6; visibility coefficients: c1 = 11.5, c2 = 0.008																
Julian			Gregorian			Egyptian			DoW	ToD	Morning visibility					
Yr	Mo	D	Yr	Mo	D	Yr	Mo	D			-2	-1	0			
-1009	12	10	-1009	11	30	1773	8	12	4	23:39	6:45	268	6:45	151	6:45	50
-1008	1	9	-1009	12	30	1773	9	12	6	18:51	6:49	237	6:48	109	6:48	18
-1008	2	8	-1008	1	29	1773	10	12	1	12:28	6:37	186	6:37	74	6:36	0

DoW = day of week; ToD = time of day.

The new moon fell on I *šmw* 12, so the date of I *šmw* 13 was the next day, and applicable to a feast coming within five days of a new moon. It is also possible that the induction of Nesankhefenmaat was thought (by the Egyptians taking part) to have occurred on the new moon—as with the previous dates noted above—which it may have done since Table 34.8 shows, with the 109 visibility, that the moon would not have been far from being invisible.

The 17th year of Siamun includes the date of I *šmw* 4 (induction of Hori, son of Nspaneferhor), which equates to 1 January in 1011 BCE, and the third year of Psusennes II includes the date of I *šmw* 13 (induction of Nesankhefenmaat, son of Nesamun), which equates to 9 January in 1009 BCE. These dates are separated by two years and eight days which indicates that the changeover of regnal years fell between I *šmw* 4 and I *šmw* 13 when Siamun died and Psusennes II ascended the throne.

By assigning the induction of Nesankhefenmaat to year three of Psusennes II instead of year 11 of -997 (998 BCE), the problem of having year 11 in the same year as year 13 no longer pertains.⁵⁷ These dates and a confirming one in year five of Shoshenq I that fell in -992 makes it certain that Siamun reigned only 17 years, not 19.

The question arises why Manetho attributed nine years to Siamun (called Psinaches) if he reigned 17 years. I suggest that nine seen in hieroglyphs as nine vertical

⁵⁶ Kitchen, *TIP*, 423 §391:86.

⁵⁷ The assertion that the first conclusive date for king Psusennes II is revealed on the Block Karnak 94, CL 2149 for Year 11 and the date of I *šmw* 13 is incorrect (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Psusennes_II) as it rightly applies to year 3, and the date of 10 January, 1009 BCE.

strokes was originally a ten-sign followed by seven strokes. The two uprights of the ten-sign without the top, which joins them, were counted as two strokes. Thus, 17 was seen as 9 (or some other combination incorporating a ten-sign and seven strokes). See Figure 34.1.

∩ original becomes				
		original becomes		
		original becomes		

Figure 34.1: Possible explanation of discrepant numbering

Similarly, the year 11 or year three attributed to Psusennes II from Block Karnak 94, CL 2149, apparently unclear, is seen now to be year three. This suggests that three vertical strokes were thought to be one ten-sign plus two vertical strokes originally joined at the top to give the number 11, thus ||| was read as | ∩. The same type of damage may be attributed to Osorkon I of the 22nd Dynasty, where his 30th year jubilee, which would have been engraved as three ten-signs ∩∩∩, has been read as 22: || ∩∩ (other examples are cited in chapter 36).

A Co-regency between Psusennes II and Shoshenq I

Discussion has centered on whether Psusennes II is the same as a Psusennes III who was a High Priest of Amun, and after the death of his father Pinudjem II, succeeded him into office in the 10th year of Siamun.⁵⁸ The *High Priest* Psusennes is associated with a year five (or four) and a year 12 on bandage-epigraphs from Theban mummies.⁵⁹

Kitchen attributes the year 12 to Siamun, and the year five to Psusennes II.⁶⁰ This *presents the problem* of a High Priest having a regnal year, which is unprecedented. (The year 48 of the high priest Menkheperre almost certainly refers to the regnal years of Psusennes I). See footnote 23 on this.

Most scholars accept the view that Psusennes II is the same as the High Priest Psusennes III who was inducted in Siamun's 10th year. On the death of Siamun he then combined the offices of High Priest at Thebes and King at Tanis reigning over the whole realm as indicated by the graffito from Abydos, which was mentioned earlier.⁶¹

Kitchen explains the year five on the mummy bandage fragment referring to the Psusennes as the High Priest of Amun as the title by which the Thebans knew him while at the same time being in his fifth regnal year as king at Tanis.⁶² Kitchen quoted from Karnak Priestly Annal fragment four, "Regnal Year 2, 3rd month of Akhet, day 17, of the Great Chief of the Mā, Shoshe(n)q justified," and mentioned a throw-stick determinative-sign added to his name as for an alien, and no cartouches or pharaonic titles.⁶³ Apparently the Thebans did not initially recognize Shoshenq I as the new ruler, "But from Year 5 onwards, even reluctant Thebes acknowledged him officially as full pharaoh."⁶⁴

Dodson doubted this attribution, and in 2009 suggested that there may have been a co-regency between Psusennes II and Shoshenq I.⁶⁵ Referring to the same Karnak

⁵⁸ Kitchen, *TIP*, 78 §62.

⁵⁹ Dodson, "Transition," 104-8.

⁶⁰ Kitchen, *TIP*, xix.

⁶¹ See p. 476.

⁶² *Ibid.*, xxii.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 288 §242.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 288 §242.

⁶⁵ In 1987 Dodson suggested that Psusennes II may have been High Priest and "shadow-king" of Shoshenq I, with the latter being the direct successor of Siamun ("Psusennes II," *Rd'É* 38 [1987] 49-54).

Priestly Annal Fragment 4b, he proposes that Shoshenq I would be insulted by the use of his “Chief of the Ma” title if he was a sole-reign pharaoh and suggests that it may have been, “an exceptional recognition of an exceptional status within another’s reign” and that toward the end of his reign Psusennes II granted Shoshenq I “control over an area that included Thebes.”⁶⁶

How might this year five on the bandage following a year 12 assigned to Siamun be explained? Is there any stronger evidence for a co-regency between Psusennes II and Shoshenq I?

Concerning the chronology, we note that Psusennes II’s 13th year fell in 999 BCE as provided by the priestly induction dates in his third and 13th years. Manetho, via Africanus, attributes 14 years to Psusennes II, which ends his reign in 998 or 997 BCE and thus the date for the accession year of Shoshenq I.

Kitchen assigns Shoshenq I’s 20th regnal year to the fifth year of Rehoboam of Judah when Shoshenq I (biblical Shishak) invaded Israel and Judah as noted in 1 Kgs 14:25–26 and 2 Chr 12:2–5. As determined in my *The Reconstructed Chronology of the Divided Kingdom*, Rehoboam’s fifth year was in 977,⁶⁷ so 20 years earlier Shoshenq I’s accession would have fallen in 997 BCE. This date points to Psusennes II having 14 regnal years.

Court Dispute Dated to 19th Year of a King Psusennes

The Larger Dakhla Stela records a court dispute over ownership of land and water rights involving a well in the Dakhla Oasis belonging to Tewhunet, the mother of the claimant, Nysu-Bastet. The land-register is dated to the *19th year* of a Pharaoh Psusennes without identifying whether this was Psusennes I or II.⁶⁸

Most Egyptologists identify him as Psusennes II because Psusennes I’s reign, some 80 years earlier, was thought to be too early to be applicable.⁶⁹ A certain Wayheset, a son of a Chief of the Mā, was sent by *Shoshenq I* to restore order.⁷⁰ The *same stela* also records a *weresh* (*wrš*) feast and procession of the god Seth dated to IV *prt* 25 in the fifth year of Shoshenq I. This date can be used to determine Shoshenq I’s fifth year.

Krauss notes that, “According to other attestations, *wrš* designates the lunar month and/or a lunar day, possibly day 1.”⁷¹ Thus, he finds it feasible to identify an appropriate year near to a new moon day for the date of the procession. (In his chronology Krauss dates Shoshenq I’s fifth year to 943 BCE *at the latest*” (emphasis his) but only 5 December in 939 BCE matches IV *prt* 25 making his first year “in November 943 BC at the latest, and at the earliest in December 944 BC.”⁷²

In 2006, Kitchen denied a co-regency between Psusennes II and Shoshenq I on the grounds that because the Thebans used Shoshenq I’s regnal year 2 it meant Psusennes II had died and, therefore, they could not date by Psusennes II (“The Strengths and Weaknesses of Egyptian Chronology – A Reconsideration,” *Ä und L* 16 (2006) 302).

⁶⁶ Dodson, “Transition,” 108.

⁶⁷ M.C. Tetley, *The Reconstructed Chronology of the Divided Kingdom* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005) 178-84.

⁶⁸ A.H. Gardiner, “The Large Dakhla Stela,” *JEA* 19 (1930) 19-30, cited by Jansen-Winkel, “Dynasty 21,” 230.

⁶⁹ Kitchen (*TIP*, 290 §247) believes that this refers to Psusennes I.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 290 §247.

⁷¹ Krauss, “Lunar Dates,” 411. See sources of *wrš* feasts cited in pp. 411-12 and nn. 53-58.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 412. This is in conflict with Thiele’s chronology, which places Rehoboam of Judah’s 5th year in 925 BCE, thus the 20th year of Shoshenq I in 945 BCE. This discrepancy causes problems to chronologists working with commonly assumed dates.

According to our chronology, Psusennes II's 14th year fell in 997 so his 19th year fell on 994/993 BCE. If Shoshenq I's first year was in 997, Shoshenq I's fifth year will *also have fallen in 993/992 BCE*.

Casperson's table below (Table 34.9) shows that the *wrš* date of IV *prt* 25 fell five days after the new moon on IV *prt* 20 in -993 (19 December 19 in 994 BCE). In an Amun feast, it was typical for Amun to appear in a procession four or five days after the new moon, and this appears to be enacted here also with the god Seth.⁷³ The date of IV *prt* 25 falling in Shoshenq I's fifth year, which equates to Psusennes II's 19th year, would add credence to Psusennes II's 14th year and Shoshenq I's first year falling in 997 BCE, assuming a co-regency.

Table 34.9: Shoshenq I's fifth year *weresh* feast in -993 (new moon listing from -992 to -992)

Tanis; Lat. 31.0, Long. 31.8; visibility coefficients: c1 = 11.5, c2 = 0.008																
Julian			Gregorian			Egyptian			DoW	ToD	Morning visibility					
Yr	Mo	D	Yr	Mo	D	Yr	Mo	D			-2	-1	0			
-993	11	14	-993	11	5	1789	7	20	5	17:47	6:38	236	6:39	139	6:40	43
-993	12	14	-993	12	5	1789	8	20	7	11:43	6:58	215	6:58	105	6:58	6
-992	1	13	-992	1	4	1789	9	20	2	2:49	7:00	162	7:00	47	6:59	-42

DoW = day of week; ToD = time of day.

Most Egyptologists have assumed that the land-title mentioned in the Larger Dakhla stela went back several years to Psusennes II's 19th year before Shoshenq I's reign began. Krauss has assumed that because Psusennes II reigned longer than 14 years, his reign should be emended from 14 years to 24 years.⁷⁴ However, the above chronology demonstrates that the Larger Dakhla stela is recording regnal years for two kings in the same year both dated to -993. The two dates coming from the *same document* and the *same year* indicate some sort of a co-regency between Psusennes II and Shoshenq I.

The circumstances prevailing at the end of the 21st Dynasty make this co-regency quite feasible. Apparently, Psusennes II did not have a son to succeed him, and his intended successor was Shoshenq I who was already his Army Commander and who himself had claims to the throne through his father Nimlot A who was the brother of Osorchor "the Elder," grandsons of the Lady Mehtenweskheth who was "King's Mother."⁷⁵

As in most other co-regencies, the younger partner counted his regnal years from the time he was appointed co-regent,⁷⁶ thereby giving Psusennes a reign of 14 years.

⁷³ Kitchen did not want to move Shoshenq I's date of 945 BCE down to 943 BCE on the basis of Krauss's dates for the *weresh* festival, because this would make 945 BCE become Shoshenq I's 18th year and not 20 years before Rehoboam's fifth year in the (assumed) date of 925 BCE supplied by Thiele (*MNHK*). Kitchen wrote, "There is no evidence whatsoever that the *weresh*-feast date of the god Seth on the Dakhleh stela was a lunar feast (no mention of *pesdjentyu*, etc.) rather than an ordinary calendar-feast; hence it should not arbitrarily be so treated, and this imaginary lunar occurrence can be deleted, leaving us with the normal 945 date" (K.A. Kitchen, "The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt: An Overview of Fact and Fiction," *The Libyan Period in Egypt: Historical and Cultural Studies into the 21st-24th Dynasties: Proceedings of a Conference at Leiden University, 25-27 October 2007* [eds. G.P.F. Broekman, R.J. Demarée, and O.E. Kaper; Leiden: NINO, 2009] 167; also see p. 196). The evidence above shows that the *weresh* feast fell five days after a new moon date and was probably timed by it. This discounts Kitchen's assertion that it had no lunar connection.

⁷⁴ R. Krauss, "Das *wrš*-Datum aus Jahr 5 von Shoshenq [I]," *DE* 62 (2005) 43-48.

⁷⁵ Kitchen, *TIP*, 535 §437, from Yoyotte, "Osorkon fils," 39-54.

⁷⁶ The Nile Level Text 13 equates year 28 of Osorkon III with year 5 of his son Takeloth III. In this instance, Osorkon III seems to be credited with his 28 years, with the 5-year co-regency attributed to him, not to his son. See the discussion of Takeloth III's length of reign in chap. 38.

Since his fifth year would have been the 19th year of Psusennes II, and the year in which the latter died, Shoshenq I would then have assumed full kingly responsibilities as sole ruler, and have been acknowledged as king by the Thebans. In his second year, when Shoshenq I was referred to as “Chief of the Ma,” Psusennes II was still alive and it may be this that caused Shoshenq I to be described with the lesser title.

Referring back to the year five mummy bandage found with Psusennes II’s name as High Priest of Amun, it is possible to see the year five as belonging to Shoshenq I’s fifth year when Psusennes II died and was buried, giving to him his earlier title as High Priest of Amun by which he was known at Thebes.⁷⁷

The 14-year sole reign of Psusennes II can be dated from 1011 to 997 BCE, with another five years as co-regent with Shoshenq I to the year 992. The accession of Shoshenq I to the throne in 997 brought the 21st Dynasty to an end, ushering in the 22nd Dynasty.

The 21st Dynasty Tanite kings

The kings of the 21st Dynasty with their regnal years and dates provided by the preceding discussion are shown in Table 34.10.

Table 34.10: Tanite kings of the 21st Dynasty with regnal years and dates

King	Regnal years	Dates reigned BCE	Lunar anchor points
Smendes	26	1122–1096	Yr 25, Epiphi feast, III <i>šmw</i> 28 in 1097
Amenemnisu Nephercheres	4	1096–1092	Yr 4, Amun feast, new moon I <i>3ht</i> 1 in 1092
Psusennes I	49	1092–1043	None known
Amenemope Amenophthis	9	1043–1034	None known
Osorchor the Elder	6	1034–1028	Yr 2, induction of Nespaneferhor on new moon I <i>šmw</i> 20 in 1032
Siamun Psinaches	17	1028–1011	Yr 17, induction of Hori on new moon I <i>šmw</i> 4 in 1011 (1 January)
Psusennes II	14 (+ 5 CR) = 19	1011–998/997 (CR to 992)	Yr 3, induction of Nesankhefenmaat, 2 days after new moon I <i>šmw</i> 13 in 1009; Yr 13, induction of a priest on new moon III <i>prt</i> 10 +[x] = 14th in 999; (Sync. Yr 19 Psu. II + Yr 5 Shoshenq I in 994; Yr 5 Shoshenq I, <i>wrš</i> feast IV <i>prt</i> 25—5 days after new moon on IV <i>prt</i> 20 in 994)
Total	124	1122–998/997	

CR = co-regent.

The table shows that the 21st Dynasty lasted 124 years from 1122 to 998/997 BCE. Psusennes I had a co-regency with Amenemope for three years, thus Manetho via Africanus gives Psusennes I 46 years⁷⁸ and Amenemope 9 years. The lunar dates reveal that Siamun reigned only 17 years—not the 19 usually attributed to him. Psusennes II reigned 14 years with another 5 years as co-regent with Shoshenq I. The synchronism from the Large Dakhla stela giving the 19th year of Psusennes II and the fifth year of Shoshenq I, in conjunction with the lunar dates, proves conclusively that Psusennes II and Shoshenq I had a five-year co-regency. Fourteen sole-reign years are credited to Psusennes II, and the five years of the co-regency are attributed to the reign of Shoshenq I.

⁷⁷ Kitchen, *TIP*, xxi.

⁷⁸ The 41 years given to him by Eusebius and the Armenian is presumably the result of error in transmission.

The number of years given here for the 21st Dynasty and the individual reigns do not differ by more than a few years from the 124 or 125 given by other chronologies. The main difference is their allocation to Siamun of 19 years instead of 17 years. The dates, of course, are different.

Not discussed above are the service periods for the pontiffs of Thebes. These are not noted by Manetho. Their years of service do not alter the chronology of the kings, and have been discussed by other scholars.⁷⁹

⁷⁹ See Kitchen, *TIP*, 10-23, 77-81; idem, "Overview of Fact & Fiction," 191, 198; J. von Beckerath, *Chronologie des Pharaonischen Ägypten: Die Zeitbestimmung der ägyptischen Geschichte von der Vozeit bis 332 v. Chr.* (Mainz: von Zabern, 1997) 99-102; Jansen-Winkel, "Dynasty 21" 218-33.

