Chapter 35

Looking at Other Reconstructions of the 22nd to 25th Dynasties

To anticipate the closing words, this chapter illustrates the fluidity of opinion and method in this period of Egyptian chronology, which, with the use of current methods, will surely continue (even in the period since this chapter was penned).

While reporting a high degree of variance and speculation amongst scholars interested in this dynastic period, it also discusses, in some detail, items of recent evidence that contribute to the presentation of my final chapters of the Egyptian Chronology.

This chapter represents a contrast to my approach which identifies firm anchor points and reconstructs the chronology from documented evidence in the 22nd to 25th Dynasties. This chapter offers readers the opportunity to judge which methodology gives greater confidence for establishing an Egyptian chronology, one that will stand—despite the currents of changing opinion.

The chronology of the 22nd Dynasty may be established by taking into account the chronologies of the 23rd, 24th, and 25th Dynasties—these being concurrent with its latter period. A conclusion can only be proposed when all the relevant chronological data for each of the dynasties has been examined, and kings’ reigns and dates aligned. Dynasties 21–25 are known collectively as the Third Intermediate Period.

Sources

1. Manetho copied the dynastic lists of the 22nd to 25th Dynasties, which now exist in copies by Africanus (ca. 220 CE), Eusebius (early 4th century CE) and the latter’s Armenian version. The latter two now preserve only a portion of the original, but are still a significant help. Though suffering obvious corruption, the version of Africanus retains more information about the kings and the length of the 22nd Dynasty than those of Eusebius and the Armenian.

2. Inscriptional records that state unequivocally the actual length of the king’s reign are lacking in the 22nd Dynasty. Only the highest known year may be at our disposal, which may not be the king’s actual regnal year at death. Synchronisms, tying one king’s specifically dated regnal year to another, are very helpful. A few examples are discussed below.

3. A Heb Sed (royal jubilee) feast indicates the monarch reigned 30 years, and every three or four years thereafter.

4. Genealogies may determine the line of royal succession, but not all the kings’ lineages, or even parents, are known. Kings with similar personal names, such as Shoshenq or Osorkon, can be distinguished by their prenomen, such as Hedjkheperre or Usimare. The nomen epithet, Si-Bast, is associated with kings of Lower Egypt from the time of Osorkon II of the 22nd Dynasty, while the epithet, Si-Ese, at least from the time
of Osorkon III, is associated with kings of the 23rd Dynasty, though not without exception.1

5. Particularly valuable for the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties are the records of Nile inundations inscribed on the Karnak Quay wall, which are known as Nile Level Texts.

6. The annals of the priests at Karnak have information relating to the priesthood, in both formal records and graffiti, for the period of the 22nd to 25th Dynasties.

7. The Serapeum Stelae record Apis bull installations and burials giving the regnal years of kings and/or the bull’s lifespan.

8. The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon pertains to the reigns of Takeloth and Shoshenq III, and Prince Osorkon High Priest of Amun (HPA). The HPAs were powerful clerics of one of the most revered gods in ancient Egypt. They were responsible for the administration of daily rites in the god’s honor and virtual owners of enormous tracts of land throughout Egypt (particularly in Upper Egypt near Thebes). For much of the Third Intermediate Period the High Priests ruled most of Upper Egypt as military theocrats. Not reckoned as a Dynasty per se, these priests nevertheless governed southern Egypt during much of the Third Intermediate Period.

9. Also important for establishing the kings’ reigns are new moons dated to the Egyptian civil calendar, which are tied to specific regnal years. Several dates derive from festivals in the reigns of Shoshenq I, Takeloth II, and Shoshenq III of the 22nd Dynasty. Two dates of new moons relate to Pedubast I of the offshoot 23rd Dynasty, and to Shebitku of the 25th Dynasty. The conversion of an Egyptian civil year date (I šìmt 1 to IV šmwt 30) to a Julian date can anchor a king’s reign when his specific regnal year is known.

One new moon date by itself is not conclusive since dates varying by only one day may occur in a cycle of 25 years making the accuracy of the particular lunar date questionable. When new moon dates come from several reigns, and each matches the date and regnal year given for each king, they provide a much more reliable framework on which to reconstruct the chronology. Discussion about the calendars of Egypt during this period, and tables for new moons, assume a calendar having Thoth (I šìmt) as the first month of the year.

To aid in the discussion, the commonly assumed sequence of kings adopted by Kitchen and other Egyptologists for the four dynasties is given below in Table 35.1, with the approximate position when each dynasty started in relation to the others.

Table 35.1: Succession of kings for the 22nd, 23rd, 24th, and 25th Dynasties, based on Kitchen’s model in 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22nd Dynasty</th>
<th>23rd Dynasty</th>
<th>24th Dynasty</th>
<th>25th Dynasty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq I</td>
<td>Osorkon I</td>
<td>Shoshenq II</td>
<td>Osorkon II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(co-regency)</td>
<td>(Harsiese A, south)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Takeloth II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoshenq III</td>
<td>Pedubast I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoshenq VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Shoshenq III and Pedubast I use this epithet at least once, but they usually use the epithet Si-Bast, according to B. Muhls, “Partisan Royal Epithets in the Late Third Intermediate Period and the Dynastic Affiliations of Pedubast I and Iuput II,” JEA 84 (1998) 221-22.

Recent proposals that differ from this traditional sequence receive comment below. Traditionally, Dynasty 22 is thought to have started ca. 945 BCE, lasting some 230 years; Dynasty 23 some 200 years; Dynasty 24 some 12 years; and the 25th (from the reign of Piye/Pianky) some 83 years to the end of Taharqa’s reign in 664 BCE. My methods in succeeding chapters produce different dates and timeframes.

### Noting Known Synchronisms

A synchronism between the fifth year of Pedubast I (the first king of the 23rd Dynasty) and the 12th year of Shoshenq III (seventh king of the 22nd Dynasty) on Nile Level Text No. 24, provides an alignment that must have the same date in both dynasties. In turn, the 23rd Dynasty needs to be dated with the additional help of the 25th Dynasty. A synchronism between the 12th regnal year of Piye/Piankh of the 25th Dynasty is tied to the 19th year of an unnamed king of the 23rd Dynasty (Wadi Gasus inscription). Furthermore, according to Piye’s Victory stela, dated to the first day of Piye’s 21st year, it appears he invaded Egypt from Nubia in his 20th year, and caused the submission of Middle and Lower Egyptian kings/kinglets. These include Osorkon of Bubastis, understood by most scholars to be Osorkon IV, the last king of the 22nd Dynasty, and Iuput II of Leontopolis. Thus Piye’s 12th year must have the same date as the 19th year of an unnamed king of the 23rd Dynasty, and his 20th year must coincide with the submission of Osorkon [IV], Iuput II, and other kings of Middle and Lower Egypt.

Tied to the dates of the 25th Dynasty are those of the 24th Dynasty. After Piye’s invasion of Egypt in his 20th year, he returned to Nubia. In his absence, Tefnakht, a former chief of the Delta who had eventually submitted to Piye, took upon himself royal titles and founded the 24th Dynasty in Sais. This dynasty consisted of only two kings: Tefnakht and his successor, Bocchoris, otherwise known as Bakenranef. Bocchoris was reputedly burnt alive in his sixth year by Piye’s successor, Shabako, in the latter’s second year. An Apis bull that died in Shabako’s second year was embalmed and then buried in Bocchoris’s burial chamber before the vault was closed, giving the synchronism that Shabako’s second year coincides with the sixth year of Bocchoris.

Another certainty is that Shebitku (Shabataka), Shabako’s successor, must have been alive in 706 BCE when he extradited Iamani back to Sargon II of Assyria in the latter’s 16th year in 706 (Tang-i Var inscription).

These are all significant synchronisms and reign lengths of these kings, which must all concur with each other. Only when all these pieces of the puzzle fit, and the additional items of chronological information complete the picture, may we be confident of a credible chronology.

### The Kitchen and “Birmingham School” Dispute

When Kitchen revised his 1973 edition of TIP in 1986 with a supplement, the majority of scholars, at least in the English-speaking world, accepted his understanding

---

and order of Egyptian dynastic succession and chronology. Since then, various scholars have challenged his tenets, such as the “New Chronologists” who seek to reduce the overall conventional chronology by 200–250 years (David Rohl, Peter James, et al.). The viewpoint of these scholars is not commented on here due to the vast difference in interpretation of data and time periods proposed for the reconstructed chronology.

Another group of scholars (the “Birmingham School”) led by Anthony Leahy and David Aston, has suggested changes to the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties as previously reconstructed by Kitchen. Each of these viewpoints purport to use the dynastic lists handed down from Manetho.

The main points of disagreement affecting the chronology of the 22nd to 25th Dynasties in recent years, between Kitchen on the one hand and Aston on the other, are summarized below. Aston’s view is generally supported by scholars such as Jürgen von Beckerath, Karl Jansen-Winkeln, Aidan Dodson, and in part, Gerard Broekman.4

As an introductory overview, one may compare the conventional chronology (Kitchen’s) tabled above, and the Leahy/Aston chronology tabled below (Table 35.2). The main difference is that Takeloth II has been taken out of the 22nd Dynasty between Osorkon II and Shoshenq III and made the first king of a hypothetical Theban 23rd Dynasty, preceding Pedubast I listed by Manetho as first king of a Tanite dynasty.

This Tanite dynasty is then appended to the 22nd Dynasty (where Pedubast I becomes Pedubast II, Osorkon III becomes Osorkon IV, followed by the enigmatic Psammus and Zet). The Theban 23rd Dynasty is then provided with the names of a reconstructed 23rd Tanite Dynasty including the names of Pedubast [I] and Osorkon [III] as given by Manetho, but omitting Psammus and Zet.

Table 35.2: Leahy/Aston succession of Tanite? Kings for the 22nd, 23rd, 24th, and 25th Dynasties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22nd Dynasty</th>
<th>Theban 23rd Dynasty</th>
<th>24th Dynasty</th>
<th>25th Dynasty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon II</td>
<td>Takeloth II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq III</td>
<td>Pedubast I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq IV</td>
<td>Shoshenq VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimay</td>
<td>Osorkon III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq V</td>
<td>Takeloth III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedubast II</td>
<td>Rudamun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon IV</td>
<td>Pefijawuybast</td>
<td>Tefnakht</td>
<td>Piye/Piankhy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psammus</td>
<td>Bocchoris</td>
<td>Shabako</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zet</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shebitku/Shabataka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taharqa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kitchen proposes the following concepts, which continue to be challenged.5

1. Takeloth II was sixth king of the 22nd Dynasty as given by Manetho, based in Lower Egypt. He was succeeded by Shoshenq III.
2. Prince Osorkon, son of Takeloth II was High Priest of Amun in his father’s reign and that of Shoshenq III, but never became king.

---

3. The last king of the 22nd Dynasty was Osorkon IV.
4. The 23rd Dynasty was founded by Pedubast I in the eighth year of the reign of Shoshenq III, and located in Lower Egypt.
5. The last king of the 23rd Dynasty was Iuput II.

Aston et al. challenge these assumptions by asserting:6
1. Takeloth II was not a king of the 22nd Dynasty but founder of another 23rd Dynasty (different from the one given by Manetho). Its second king was Pedubast I. Takeloth II and Pedubast I led rival factions and their reigns overlapped. This 23rd Dynasty was probably based in Upper Egypt at Thebes, not in Lower Egypt.
2. Prince Osorkon, son of Takeloth II of the 22nd Dynasty, after being High Priest of Amun, became Osorkon III of the 23rd Dynasty.
3. The last king of the 22nd Dynasty was Shoshenq V.
4. Manetho’s 23rd Dynasty kings Pedubast and Osorkon are assumed to be Pedubast II and Osorkon IV.
5. The last king of the 23rd Dynasty was not Iuput II who lived in the Delta. Instead, Peftjauawybast of Middle Egypt is proposed by Aston, while a Shoshenq VII is proposed by Broekman.

Spencer

A short article by P.A. Spencer and A.J. Spencer appeared in 19867 and introduced the perceived problems of locating a 23rd Dynasty in Lower Egypt where the 22nd Dynasty had its residence. The authors note that the monuments of the 23rd Dynasty kings are concentrated in Upper Egypt and are lacking in Lower Egypt with the exception of Iuput II, who is known from Piye’s Victory stela to have lived in Ta-Remu (Leontopolis) in the Delta. There is no evidence, they say, that Iuput II had any connection with the 23rd Dynasty. Therefore, they write, “There is no justification, as yet, to assume that the kings of the Twenty-third Dynasty had a Delta centre, at Leontopolis or anywhere else.”8

Further on, they state: “The evidence available at present strongly suggests a division between the Twenty-second Dynasty territory in the eastern Delta and the Twenty-third Dynasty domain in Upper Egypt, with a boundary a little north of Heracleopolis. The residence of the Twenty-third Dynasty kings has yet to be identified, but Thebes is a strong possibility.”9

---

8 Ibid., 200.
9 Ibid., 201.
Leahy

In 1989, Leahy presented arguments building on the former views of Klaus Baer,\(^{10}\) and K.H. Priese,\(^ {11}\) that the 23rd Dynasty as given by Manetho was not a collateral line founded by Pedubast I in the eighth year of Shoshenq III of the 22nd Dynasty (based on Nile Level Text 24), but was a continuation of the 22nd Dynasty.\(^ {12}\) Manetho names four kings to the 23rd Dynasty in the version of Africanus: Pedubast, Osorkon, Psammus, and Zet. Leahy seeks to identify this Pedubast with a Sehetipibenre Pedubast who is conventionally identified with Pedubast II of the 7th century BCE, and places him after Shoshenq V in the 22nd Dynasty. Leahy then identifies the Osorkon with Osorkon IV as successor of Pedubast II, but usually regarded as Osorkon III—second king of the Tanite 23rd Dynasty. (Compare with Table 35.2).

Leahy then describes Psammus as “an ephemeral successor of Osorkon IV,” and Zet “should be regarded as an ‘irrelevant interpolation’.”\(^ {13}\) By placing Manetho’s Tanite 23rd Dynasty after the 22nd, Leahy clears the way for a Theban 23rd Dynasty to be contemporary with the latter part of the 22nd Dynasty. Leahy then assigns to a hypothetical Theban 23rd Dynasty the kings that Manetho assigned to the 23rd Tanite Dynasty; that is, Pedubast I and Osorkon III followed by Psammus and Zet. This is the same list that Leahy has already used for the continuation of the 22nd Dynasty by attributing to Pedubast and Osorkon a different identity.

Leahy and Kitchen both have Pedubast I, Shoshenq IV (now known as Shoshenq VI), Osorkon III, Takeloth III, and Rudamun for their respective 23rd Dynasties, but Kitchen has Iuput II for its last king, while Leahy sees Iuput II as a Delta king and does not assign him to his Theban 23rd Dynasty,\(^ {14}\) thus agreeing with the suggestion of P.A. and J.A. Spencer, as noted above.\(^ {15}\)

Aston

More support for Leahy came from David Aston’s 1989 article presenting his argument for an Upper Egyptian 23rd Dynasty. The main point of Aston’s article is the removal of Takeloth II from the 22nd Dynasty to become the founder of a 23rd Theban dynasty. Aston does not explain why Manetho would put Takeloth II in the 22nd Dynasty if he did not belong there, or why Pedubast would be identified as the first king of the 23rd Dynasty if he were preceded by Takeloth II.

Ignoring Manetho’s testimony, Aston argues that family relationships indicate that Takeloth II should be dated about 25 years later than the dates Kitchen gives him: from ca. 850–825 BCE down to ca. 825–800 BCE.\(^ {16}\) In order to down-date Takeloth II, Aston takes Takeloth out of the 22nd Dynasty to head a “Theban” 23rd Dynasty and makes Pedubast I, the leader of another supposed faction, appear in Takeloth II’s 11th year to become the second king of the dynasty. Pedubast’s accession is dated to Shoshenq III’s eighth year (from Nile Level Text [NLT] 24 equating Shoshenq III’s 12th year [22nd Dynasty] with Pedubast’s fifth) in 827 BCE. Pedubast I, allocated 25 years, dies about 10 years after Takeloth II.

---


\(^{13}\) Ibid., 189.

\(^{14}\) Ibid., 185-86.

\(^{15}\) Spencer and Spencer, “Notes on Late Libyan Egypt,” 198-201.

\(^{16}\) Aston, “Takeloth II…Theban Dynasty,” 142-43.
Aston next places Iuput I as king with his accession in Pedubast I’s 15th year (from NLT 26 with year 2 equated with Pedubast’s year 16) and the successor of the rival reign of Takeloth II, but with an unknown number of years. Aston identifies Shoshenq Meriamun with year four on a roof slab of the Khons Temple at Karnak, with Shoshenq IV (now VI), whom he suggests as a possible successor of Pedubast I but, nevertheless, leaves him out of the dynasty. Aston continues the dynasty with Osorkon III, Takeloth III, Rudamun (with an unsubstantiated 19 years to make him king of the Wadi Gasus inscription), and a king Iny. This Iny Si-eses Meryamun is attested with a year five on a roof slab of the Temple of Khons near that of Shoshenq IV/VI’s. Presuming him to be a Theban king because of the epithet Si-eses, Aston includes him in the 23rd Dynasty with five sole-reign years.

For the final king, Aston replaces Kitchen’s Iuput II with Peftjauawybast, son-in-law of Rudamun (married to his daughter, Irbastwedjanefu B). Peftjauawybast was king of Heracleopolis (Middle Egypt) at the time of Piye’s invasion, and assumed to be a better candidate for a Theban king than Iuput II, king of Leontopolis of the Delta.

Aston and Taylor

In 1990, Aston and Taylor explain Peftjauawybast’s inclusion as king on the premise that, “Since Thebes was already under the control of Piye by ca. 728 B.C.E. the Theban 23rd Dynasty probably shifted its base from Thebes to Heracleopolis sometime before that date,” that is, before Piye’s invasion in his 20th year. Peftjauawybast’s loyalty to Piye in the invasion, and the adoption of Piye’s daughter, Amenirdis, by Rudamun’s sister Shepenwepet I in Piye’s 12th year, as on the Wadi Gasus inscription, gives reason for them to think that Peftjauawybast was the last king of the 23rd Dynasty who, with his forebears, held “influential positions at Thebes under the Kushites.” In this scenario, a hypothetical Theban 23rd Dynasty appears to be given further legitimacy by the proposal that toward the end of the dynasty it moved its base from Thebes to Heracleopolis, an assumption made in order to include Peftjauawybast, not Iuput II, as the last king of the dynasty.

The chronology, as given by Aston for the 23rd Dynasty, is shown in Table 35.3, where Pedubast I’s fifth year, equated with Shoshenq III’s 12th year as on NLT No. 24, is calculated by Aston to be the dates 823 or 818 BCE. This provides the date for Takeloth II’s accession in ca. 838/833 BCE.

Table 35.3: Aston’s chronology for the 23rd Theban Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Dates BCE</th>
<th>Years reigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth II</td>
<td>ca. 838/33–812/807</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedubast I</td>
<td>ca. 827/22–802/797</td>
<td>25 with overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iuput I</td>
<td>ca. 812/807–797</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 See on Iuputy below, p. 27, given 12 years as his highest attested.
19 Ibid., 153.
20 Ibid., 152-53.
22 Ibid., 147.
24 Ibid., table p. 148.
25 These dates were subsequently updated by 2006, as seen in Broekman, “Once Again the Reign of Takeloth II,” 246.
Ramifications of the Aston and Taylor proposals

The removal of Takeloth II from his traditional place in the 22nd Dynasty to a so-far hypothetical 23rd ‘Theban’ Dynasty has ramifications.

1. Osorkon II is now succeeded by Shoshenq III not Takeloth II.

2. The “gap” in the chronology left by Takeloth’s removal had to be filled, so Aston assigns another 15–20 years to the preceding reign of Osorkon II in addition to the 30 or so already allocated to him, to give him 40–45 years. Kitchen, at this time, gave only 24–25 to Osorkon II. Aston gives six arguments for a longer reign than Kitchen allows. These are based, for example, on the number of generations of the “Fourth Prophets of Amun,” the family tree of the High Priests of Ptah at Memphis, the large number of High Priests of Amun, and indications that Osorkon II outlived his three known adult sons. None of these arguments is decisive in giving Osorkon II a reign of 40–45 years, though a reign of 30-plus years is quite feasible.

3. Takeloth II’s son, crown prince Osorkon whose tenure as HPA is recorded in The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon as beginning in Takeloth II’s 11th year, is also reported as serving down to the 29th year of Shoshenq III, with a reappearance in Shoshenq’s 39th (and last) year. However, in the surviving portions of the list there is a gap in the Chronicle’s tabulation of Prince Osorkon’s benefactions between the 24th year of Takeloth II (column 7) and the 22nd year of Shoshenq III (column 12). Aston proposes that the “gap of over twenty years between Prince Osorkon’s two periods of activity,” is not actually a gap but indicates that, “Shoshenq III acceded to the throne in Tanis, at the earliest, only three years after Takeloth II became King in the south. (That is, Year 22 of Sheshonq immediately following Takeloth’s highest known year date of 25.)” So apart from the first three years of Takeloth II’s reign, the two kings were contemporary for the length of Takeloth II’s (presumed) 25-year reign.

Consequently, Aston must propose that Prince Osorkon/Osorkon B’s years as HPA were numbered first by Takeloth II’s reign of the 23rd Dynasty for years 11–24, then when his father died, by Shoshenq III’s reign of the 22nd Dynasty for years 22–39. Aston calls this “a matter of administrative convenience.” If, as Kitchen has always proposed, Takeloth II had instead been succeeded by Shoshenq III, all of Osorkon B’s years as HPA would have been numbered by the two consecutive 22nd Dynasty kings, which is more feasible.

4. The supposed 22 years concurrent in the reigns of Takeloth II and Shoshenq III, with Prince Osorkon becoming HPA in Takeloth II’s 11th year (which is Shoshenq III’s eighth year), means that for Prince Osorkon’s first 15 years as HPA both kings were reigning concurrently, then from the 23rd to 39th year of Shoshenq III,
Osorkon officiated for another 16 years (see Table 35.4). Osorkon’s tenure of office as HPA amounts to just 31 years (8th to 39th years of Shoshenq III).

5. The presumed concurrency of the two kings, Takeloth II and Shoshenq III, suggests two main scenarios to Aston. One: Takeloth II can be seen as a rival of Pedubast I for control of Thebes. Nile Level Text No. 24 equates Shoshenq III’s year 12 with Pedubast I’s year five, so Pedubast became king of the 23rd Dynasty in Shoshenq III’s eighth year. According to Aston’s chronology this is also Takeloth II’s 11th year. He sees this as significant because the Chronicle records a rebellion in Takeloth II’s 11th year. Aston proposes that Pedubast, “in proclaiming himself king in opposition to Takeloth II, fomented the Theban rebellion that Osorkon B set out to conquer.”\(^{32}\) The rivalry is presumed to have continued until Takeloth II died. Aston does not produce any insessional evidence to support such a scenario, where, instead of having one Theban (or Upper Egyptian) 23rd Dynasty, there are two rival factions. The situation is represented in Table 35.4.\(^{33}\)

**Table 35.4: Aston’s correlation of Takeloth II, Shoshenq III, Pedubast I, and Prince Osorkon as High Priest of Amun (HPA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23rd Dynasty</th>
<th>Rival 23rd Dynasty</th>
<th>22nd Dynasty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth II</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoshenq III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedubast I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 (Osorkon HPA)</td>
<td>8 (Osorkon HPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Iuput I’s second year?</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq VI</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{32}\) Ibid., 149.

\(^{33}\) Compiled from Broekman, “Once Again the Reign of Takeloth II,” 251.
6. The second scenario posited by the concurrent rule of the three kings, and the supposed shortening of (Prince) Osorkon B’s tenure as HPA, is the assumption that Prince Osorkon became Osorkon III of the 23rd Dynasty. In the 39th year of Shoshenq III, Prince Osorkon and his brother General Bakenptah of Heracleopolis claimed that they had overthrown all who had fought against them. 34

This has been interpreted to mean that they overthrew and killed the king of Thebes, at that time Shoshenq VI. This 39th year is also seen as the last year of Shoshenq III’s reign (deduced from NLTs) after which Prince Osorkon is heard of no more.

Consequently, two new kings ascended the throne of the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties, respectively, within a short span of time. The new king of the 23rd Dynasty to succeed Shoshenq VI was an Osorkon who had also been an HPA, as recorded on a donation stela at Tehna. 35

Aston brings up the old idea that Osorkon III was none other than Prince Osorkon. Prince Osorkon’s supposed tenure of office as High Priest amounting to 31 years means that if he became HPA at an age of about 20, in the 11th year of Takeloth II, after 31 years he would be only 51 years old. However, Osorkon III, as king of the 23rd Dynasty reigned 28–29 years, so on Aston’s chronology, Prince Osorkon died at about 80.

In Kitchen’s chronology, in which Takeloth II’s 25 years and Shoshenq III’s 39 years are consecutive, the figures for Prince Osorkon are: 20 + 15 (11th to 25th year of Takeloth II) + 39 (Shoshenq III’s reign) = 74 + 28/29 (Osorkon III’s reign) = 102/103 years. Aston’s age for Osorkon III at demise is plausible, whereas Kitchen’s is less likely. In the latter instance, Prince Osorkon cannot have become Osorkon III and reigned a further 28 years, so they must be two different people. The religio-political situation at the time, as proposed by Kitchen, in which the Thebans hated Prince Osorkon, and would not have accepted him as king after the (assumed) murder of Shoshenq VI, also makes the identification of the two being one person highly dubious.

7. Aston supposes that Prince Osorkon became Osorkon III, which makes Takeloth II the father of Osorkon III, and the grandfather of Takeloth III and Rudamun. In an analysis of the above, and supposing that Takeloth II reigned 25 years, he would have died in the 22/23rd regnal year of Shoshenq III whom Prince Osorkon was serving as HPA (22nd Dynasty). Prince Osorkon did not succeed his father, as might be expected. Instead Iuput I is suggested as Takeloth II’s successor in the Theban 23rd Dynasty. Prince Osorkon remained loyal HPA committed to the 22nd Dynasty until the 39th year of Shoshenq III’s reign.

If Prince Osorkon had pretensions to the throne of the 23rd Dynasty he did not act on them before his father died, nor when Pedubast I of the supposed rival faction died 10 years later, succeeded by Shoshenq VI. (Broekman, in 2005, identified from his analysis of NLT No. 25 a Usimare Meriamun Shoshenq with a year six. 36 He rearranged
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34 Caminos, Chronicle of Prince Osorkon, 180.
Aston’s 1989 chronology to insert Shoshenq VI between Pedubast I and Osorkon III). Thus Pedubast I, with a supposed co-regent (Iuput I) and Shoshenq VI intervene with their rival faction between the death of Takeloth II and before his supposed son Osorkon III. Only when Shoshenq VI died, about six or seven years later, possibly at the instigation of Shoshenq III and Prince Osorkon, and perpetrated by the latter’s brother and army general Bakenptah, did Prince Osorkon supposedly claim the throne of the Theban 23rd Dynasty as successor and king of the rival faction, when he could have been, with a little patience, the successor of Shoshenq III who had already had a long reign, and to whose dynasty he belonged.

Even if Prince Osorkon and Bakenptah were responsible for the death of Shoshenq VI, it does not imply or seem reasonable that Prince Osorkon planned to succeed him, as Kitchen later points out. In Kitchen’s chronology, Takeloth II is followed by Shoshenq III, possibly a brother, both men having Prince Osorkon as HPA.

In Shoshenq III’s 39th year, after bragging about defeating their enemies at Thebes, Shoshenq III dies and Prince Osorkon is heard of no more. The throne of the 23rd Dynasty is filled by a former HPA, Osorkon, to become Osorkon III. Was there a counter attack from the 23rd Dynasty headed by the new king Osorkon III, in which Shoshenq III and Prince Osorkon were both killed? Shoshenq III was succeeded by Shoshenq IV.

The above ramifications are some of the results of taking Takeloth II out of the 22nd Dynasty.

Rohl and Dodson—"New King Shoshenq IV"

A completely different contribution to the chronology of the period was first suggested in 1985 by David Rohl, and elaborated by Aidan Dodson in 1993, in which they identify the “new” king, Shoshenq IV. His full name, Hedjkheperre Setepenre Shoshenq Meryamun Si-Bast Netjerheqaon, inscribed on a canopic jar, was found in the tomb of Shoshenq III. A donation stela of a chief of the Libu, Niumataped, was dated to the 10th year of the reign of Hedjkheperre Shoshenq, seen to be the same person as the Niumataped who was in office in the eighth year of Shoshenq V on another stela.

Thus a new Shoshenq, successor to Shoshenq III, has been accepted by most scholars as Shoshenq IV and the previous Shoshenq IV of the 23rd Dynasty is now the aforementioned Shoshenq VI. Shoshenq IV is now generally attributed 13 years of the 52 years formerly assigned just to Shoshenq III, leaving the latter with 39 years—this being his highest known regnal year found on NLT No. 22.

Dodson’s compilation of the 22nd Dynasty includes Shoshenq IV as successor of Shoshenq III, but he follows Aston’s chronology in deleting Takeloth II. He also inserts Sehetipibenre Pedubast (II) between Shoshenq V and Osorkon IV, as do Leahy and Aston.

42 Ibid., 58.
Jansen-Winkeln—Osorkon’s Father is Takeloth I
In another area, Karl Jansen-Winkeln made a significant contribution in 1987 in identifying Osorkon II’s father as Hedjkheperre Setepenre Takeloth Meriamun; that is, Takeloth I, whose prenomen was previously assigned to Takeloth II, Osorkon II’s son. They are now differentiated by the nomen epithet “Si-Ese” attached to the name of Takeloth II and possibly by a variant spelling of the name. The epithet “God, Ruler of Thebes” (ntr-hq3-W3st) added to his throne name has led some scholars to view this as an added argument for Takeloth II heading a Theban 23rd Dynasty.

Jansen-Winkeln’s article in 1995 supported Aston’s chronology in accepting two rival factions in the 23rd Dynasty, one led by Takeloth II and the other by Pedubast I, each with their own High Priests.

Von Beckerath
In 1995, Jürgen von Beckerath also gave his support to Aston’s chronology in removing Takeloth II from the 22nd Dynasty. He then identifies the “Takelothis,” named by Manetho via Africanus, as the sixth king of the dynasty as Takeloth I with 13 years. Manetho’s “Takelothis” was previously regarded as Takeloth II, although most scholars assumed him to have 25 regnal years. The “three other kings” that Africanus refers to between Osorkon (No. 3) and Takeloth (No. 6) are then interpreted by von Beckerath to mean that three kings come between Osorkon I and Takeloth I, not, as previously, between Osorkon I and Takeloth II. Takeloth II is no longer viewed in this dynasty. Von Beckerath also follows Leahy’s lead in adding, after the end of the 22nd Dynasty, Pedubast II and Osorkon IV as 23rd Dynasty kings, with Iuput II as their contemporary.

Kitchen’s Response
The discussion continued with Kitchen responding to the above changes to traditional understandings. In his 1996 edition of TIP, he added a preface to the 1986 book. Kitchen agrees with the insertion of the new Shoshenq IV after Shoshenq III as proposed first by Rohl, and then Dodson.

However, Kitchen completely rejected the idea that Takeloth II should be removed out of the 22nd Dynasty to head a Theban 23rd Dynasty. Nor did he accept the extension of Osorkon II’s reign by 15–20 years, asserting that 24 years was ample time to accommodate the High Priests known to have officiated during Osorkon II’s reign.

Kitchen describes as “wildly improbable” the insertion of a Sehetepibenre Pedubast into the 22nd Dynasty, pointing out that this prenomen is not used by 22nd Dynasty kings, but by kings of the 7th century BCE. He recognizes Manetho’s
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44 Ibid., 257; Kitchen, TIP, xxiii.
45 Aston, “Takeloth I…Theban Dynasty,” 142.
48 Kitchen, TIP, xxv-xxvi.
49 Ibid., xxiv, xxxii.
50 Ibid., xxv.
51 Ibid., xxvii; xxxi-xxxii. See also idem, “Regnal and Genealogical Data of Ancient Egypt (Absolute Chronology I) The Historical Chronology of Ancient Egypt, a Current Assessment,” SCIEM II (2000), 40.
Pedubast as Usimare Pedubast, founder of the 23rd Tanite Dynasty, though he says its capital was not Tanis—its actual location remains “a matter for investigation.”

He disdains the idea that Prince Osorkon became Osorkon III. He points out that the Thebans had rebelled and Osorkon and his brother Bakenptah had overthrown “all who had fought against them” in Shoshenq III’s 39th year, and would never have forgiven and accepted “the murderous old rogue” as their king.

Muhs on Epithets

A short article by Brian Muhs, in 1998, expanded on the use of the epithets “son of Isis” and “son of Bastet.” He notes, firstly, that kings of the Third Intermediate Period, having identical cartouche names, can be distinguished from each other by their different epithets, as, for example, Hedjkheperre Setepenre Meryamun Takeloth without the epithet referring to Takeloth I, and with the epithet “son of Isis” referring to Takeloth II, and Usimare Setepenamun Meryamun Osorkon “son of Bastet” referring to Osorkon II, and with the epithet “son of Isis” referring to Osorkon III. These distinctions, using the epithets, seem to be deliberate.

Secondly, Muhs notes: According to the reconstruction of the Twenty-second and Twenty-third Dynasties proposed by several scholars, the epithet ‘son of Isis’ was used primarily by kings of the Theban Twenty-third Dynasty, namely Takeloth II, Osorkon III, Takeloth III and Iny, whose monuments and authority were concentrated in Upper Egypt, while the epithet “son of Bastet” was used primarily by kings of the later Twenty-second Dynasty, namely Osorkon II, Sheshonq III, Pami and Sheshonq V, whose monuments and authority were concentrated in Lower Egypt.

Furthermore, Muhs states: “Correlations between the epithets, the dynasties and the primary deities of their hometowns given by Manetho … suggest that the reconstruction … proposed by Baer, Spencer and Spencer, Aston, Leahy and Taylor … is substantially more correct than Kitchen’s reconstruction.” He writes: Pedubast I used the epithet “son of Bastet” four times … and “son of Isis” just once on Karnak Nile Level Text 24 [suggesting] the possibility that Pedubast I was somehow related to the Twenty-second Dynasty, [and that] Iuput II used the epithet “son of Bastet” three times … which suggests the possibility that Iuput II was also somehow related to the Twenty-second Dynasty, perhaps even as the immediate successor of Sheshonq V.

The main objection to placing Iuput II in the Twenty-second Dynasty is that the Piankhy stela locates him in Taamu and Taremu, the latter being perhaps Tell el-Muqdam, whereas the sites most closely connected with the Twenty-second Dynasty were Tanis and Bubastis.

On the other hand, Iuput II is noted as having a year 21 credited to him by king Smendes of Mendes on a donation stela, and that he submitted to Piye in his invasion of Egypt as on Piye’s Victory stela, suggesting to Muhs a possible 22nd Dynasty

52 Ibid., xxviii-xxix.
53 Ibid., xxxi.
55 Ibid.
56 Ibid.
57 Ibid., 222.
58 Ibid., 223.
affiliation.\textsuperscript{59} From this we note that Takeloth II is associated with the Theban 23rd Dynasty not only on the proposal of the scholars named above, but also because he has the epithet “son of Isis”; whereas, 22nd Dynasty kings usually used the epithet “son of Bastet.” However, Muhs points out some exceptions to what seems to be the normal practice.\textsuperscript{60}

\textbf{Jansen-Winklen on Bickel et al. Regarding Pimay}

A discovery of a different kind published in 1998 by Susanne Bickel, Marc Gabolde, and Pierre Tallet,\textsuperscript{61} concerns the regnal years of Pimay or Pami successor to Shoshenq IV of the 22nd Dynasty. (It is not clear whether Pimay is the same person as Pami.) Inscribed on a reused stone wall block at Heliopolis, recording donations made yearly by Pami to various gods, a year seven can be clearly seen and a brief year eight is possible in the erased section.\textsuperscript{62} In 2006, Jansen-Winkeln writes, “For this king Pami, 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 … However the assumption of a mere 6–7 years is not really certain.”\textsuperscript{63}

Previously, the highest known regnal year for Pimay was year six of a votive stela.\textsuperscript{64} Therefore, one year, if not two or more, can be credited to Pimay/Pami’s reign.

\textbf{Frame and Redford on Shabataka/Shebitku}

A contention arose from an article by Grant Frame published in 1999,\textsuperscript{65} along with another by Donald. B. Redford,\textsuperscript{66} concerning the Assyrian inscription found at Tang-i Var in Iran, which says that Shabataka (that is, Shebitku) king or ruler of Melluha (Nubia) extradited Iamani of Ashdod back to Sargon in the latter’s 16th year, dateable to 706 BCE. Six years earlier, in 712, Iamani had rebelled against Assyrian forces and sought refuge with Shabako in Nubia. But, when Shabako died, Shebitku sought to appease the Assyrians and sent Iamani back to Sargon. Sargon subsequently died in battle in the following year in 705 BCE.\textsuperscript{67}

Until 1999, most scholars dated Shebitku’s accession from 702 to 690, but the new inscription raises Shebitku’s accession by four years, and consequently those for the preceding reigns of Shabako and Piye, affecting the synchronization of other reigns in the 22nd, 23rd, and 24th Dynasties.

Kitchen responded to this situation in 2000 as an Addendum\textsuperscript{68} to a paper previously published in 1996.\textsuperscript{69} He refuted Shebitku’s accession in 706 BCE, claiming
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\textsuperscript{59} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., 222.
\textsuperscript{62} See “Pami,” \url{http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pami}
\textsuperscript{63} Jansen-Winkeln, “Third Intermediate Period,” 245.
\textsuperscript{64} Kitchen, \textit{TIP}, 103 883.
that the Assyrian word *sharru* referred to one who was ruler of Nubia and not king of Egypt at the time. Therefore, Shebitku was Shabako’s *de facto* viceroy.

Alternatively, he conceded that if the correct date was 706 BCE, the four extra years could be accommodated by subtracting a year from, for example, Takeloth I and Osorkon I, and two years from Osorkon IV. But he preferred the first option, and reiterated these arguments in 2002, and again in 2006, 2007, and 2009.

**Broekman on Nile Level Texts, “Si-Ese,” and “King X”**

The chronology of the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties received new impetus with the publication of Gerard Broekman’s article in 2002 analyzing the NLTs at Karnak. He observed that the NLTs Nos. 16–21 form a chronological unit and name the High Priest (where legible) but do not give the king’s name (as on other NLTs), only his regnal year at the time of the recorded flood level. Broekman suggests that these texts belong to Takeloth I, and possibly his predecessor Shoshenq II who are otherwise not represented among the texts. The implications for chronology are discussed below.

Perhaps Broekman’s main contribution concerns NLTs Nos. 3 and 45. He proposed that the king’s name on NLT No. 3 could be read as Hedjkheperre Setepenre Shoshenq Si-Ese Meriamun. Hitherto, this name had been attributed to Shoshenq I, but that was now untenable because of the orthography of the word *hptj* (Hapi) used for “the Nile Flood” which Broekman demonstrated applied only to kings reigning after Shoshenq III. Also, the nomen epithet “Si-Ese” (“son of Isis”) was usually associated with kings of the 23rd Dynasty, not the 22nd. NLT No. 3 seemed to indicate a “new” king Shoshenq. This text showed a year five. Next to it is NLT No. 45, which Broekman observes has the same structure as No. 3 but with the name of the king illegible; however, it had a year number that could be 17, 18, or 25.

Broekman suggested that NLT 45 may also have named the same king as that of text No 3, the new Shoshenq, and been inscribed sometime after because of its position on the left side of No. 3 (writing being done from right to left). Furthermore, a king with regnal years 17, 18, or 25 could not fit into the 22nd Dynasty, but could be placed at the end of the 23rd Dynasty where a 19th year of an unnamed king coincided with Piye’s 12th year as recorded on the Wadi Gasus inscription in which Shepenupet I, daughter of Osorkon III, adopted Piye’s sister Amenirdis as God’s wife of Amun.

If the king of the “19th year” reigned another eight years to his 27th year, then he would be the king of the 23rd Dynasty who was reigning in Piye’s 20th year when the latter invaded Egypt and brought its kings into submission. The high year numbers of NLT No. 45 make the “owner,” dubbed “King X,” a distinct possibility as the last king of the 23rd Dynasty. In Kitchen’s chronology, the last king of the 23rd Dynasty is presumed to be Iuput II, and in Aston’s chronology, Peftjauawybast, kings of Lower and Middle Egypt, respectively, who submitted to Piye. Broekman follows Aston’s...
chronology in assigning Takeloth II to the 23rd Theban Dynasty, thus making Shoshenq III the successor of Osorkon II.\textsuperscript{76}

**Jaquet-Gordon on Iuputy (Iuput I)**

A volume published by the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago in 2003, authored by Helen Jacquet-Gordon, is dedicated to the graffiti on the roof slabs of the Khonsu Temple at Karnak.\textsuperscript{77} Of interest are three hieratic inscriptions (Graffiti Nos. 244 and 245A-B) engraved by the same person over a period of three years. On the earliest inscription, No. 244, the name of a king Iuputy is written without title and not surrounded by a cartouche, but presumed to be Iuput I. He is given a “Year nine, third month of summer.”\textsuperscript{78} In the second inscription, No. 245A, the king is given a “Year nine, second month of summer, day two,” indicating this inscription was incised a month earlier than the one above. In the third inscription “Year 12” is the highest attested. The last two inscriptions do not give the king’s name but Jacquet-Gordon is confident that they refer also to Iuput I.\textsuperscript{79} If these do indeed belong to Iuput I, they add to our sparse knowledge, for he is otherwise only known from NLT No. 26 in which his year two equates with Pedubast (I’s) year 16, these connecting to Shoshenq III’s 23rd regnal year.

**Payraudeau, Kaper, and Demarée on Takelot III**

In another area, in 2004, Frederic Payraudeau argued from four lines of evidence from the Papyrus Berlin 3048 that a year 14 referring to Takelot Si-Ese Meryamun should be applied to Takelot III not II to whom it had been previously attributed.\textsuperscript{80}

Until then only a year seven for Takeloth III was known from a graffito on the roof of the Temple of Khons.\textsuperscript{81} In 2005, Olaf Kaper and Robert Demarée published a report of a discovery made by U.S. excavators from the University of Columbia in February of that year.\textsuperscript{82} They recorded that a stela from the ruins of a temple in the western part of the Dakhla Oasis recorded a year 13 of a king’s reign. It is now conclusively identified as belonging to Takeloth III. In 2008, Payraudeau accepted the evidence of the 13 years for Takeloth III and attributed the 14 years to Takeloth II.\textsuperscript{83} The assigning of 13 years to Takeloth III means that chronologies formerly giving him seven years have to be changed.

**Perdu on Tefnakht II**

A paper published in 2004, written by Olivier Perdu,\textsuperscript{84} argues that Shepsesre Tefnakht attested on an Athens Donation stela with a year eight and identified by Kitchen as Tefnakht [I] who submitted to Piye in the latter’s 20th year,\textsuperscript{85} should instead
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be identified with Tefnakht II. Perdu notes that a recently discovered stela from the second year of Necho I of the 26th Dynasty is similar in style, text, and format with the Athens stela, demonstrating that Shpese Tefnakht was contemporary with Necho I, and therefore could not be Tefnakht I, founder of the 24th Dynasty.

Perdu’s identification had previously been made by Klaus Baer agreeing with Priese86 that Shpese Tefnakht must be Tefnakht II, whom he identifies as the son of Bocchoris, and with Manetho’s Stephinates of the 26th Saïs Dynasty, where he is given a reign of seven years.87

**Kahn Contends**

This identification is contrary to that previously made by D. Kahn in 1999 when he noted that of the two stelae mentioning Shpese Tefnakht, the first—the Athens stela—states that Shpese Tefnakht donated land in the vicinity of Saïs. But the other—in the Michailides collection—reports that he donated land in the eastern Delta, about nine kilometres northeast of Bubastis. Kahn says this indicates an expansion from Saïs in the west to the eastern borders of Egypt without a withdrawal of the Kushites.88

Therefore, he says, the Kushites and the Saïtic rule could not “fit together into the same time period” and Shpese Tefnakht ought to be identified with Tefnakht I, not Tefnakht II. Furthermore, other scholars note that the epigraphic style of the stelae and temple wall reliefs of Tefnakht are in use in the early 25th Nubian Dynasty, and in Tefnakht I’s “Chief of the Ma” donation stela of Shoshenq V’s year 38, and therefore, Shpese Tefnakht could refer to Tefnakht I.89 If the Athens stela with year eight belongs to Tefnakht I, the regnal years of Stephinates/Tefnakht II are not now attested.

**Broekman Favors Aston**

In 2005, Broekman elaborated on the different chronologies of Kitchen and Aston, finding in favor of Aston.90 The decisive factor for him seems to be that because Aston has removed Takeloth II (with his presumed 25 years) from the 22nd Dynasty there is now space to accommodate a long reign for Osorkon II (Usimare Setapanamun).

Broekman has demonstrated that the Year 29 on NLT No. 14 belongs to Osorkon II, particularly because the orthography used for the “Nile Flood” epithet ḫp must indicates a king who reigned before Shoshenq III. Broekman adjusts Osorkon II’s reign of 40–45 years given by Aston, to 34 years.91 The lack of any NLT attributable to Takeloth II’s presumed reign of 25 years, and the presumed gap in The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon between the year 25 of Takeloth II followed by year 22 of Shoshenq III (what looks like a gap of 22 years between them) can be resolved, writes Broekman, by telescoping the years of Takeloth II and Shoshenq III together.92

On the other hand, Kitchen identifies Usimare Setapanamun on NLT No. 14 as Osorkon III, not II, because he can give only 24 years to the latter, having retained Takeloth II’s (supposed) 25 years in the 22nd Dynasty.93 His chronology cannot accommodate another six years beyond what he has already assigned to its other kings. Kitchen’s and Aston’s chronologies of the 22nd Dynasty begin in 945 BCE with
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Shoshenq I’s accession, and end with Osorkon IV’s last year: 715/713 BCE in Kitchen’s chronology, and 720/715 BCE in Aston’s. Thus, both cover approximately the same time-span. Broekman prefers Aston’s chronology, which overlaps the reigns of Takeloth II and Pedubast I and gives space for a longer reign to Osorkon II.

Broekman on Shoshenq VII

Another article by Broekman, published in 2005, aimed “to find out how closely his [Shoshenq VII’s] chronological position might be determined”, that is, within the 23rd Dynasty. Broekman’s upper limit for Shoshenq VII is the end of the reign of Osorkon III. His lower limit takes into account the synchronism between King X’s 19th year and Piye’s 12th year as noted on the Wadi Gasus inscription when Piye’s sister, Amenirdis, was adopted.

After the adoption, and the death of King X, datelines were always written in the name of Piye. Therefore, Broekman proposes that, “The Wadi Gasus king X was the very last Upper Egyptian king to be mentioned in official Theban documents. Shoshenq VII then either must be identical with that king or he should be inserted between Takeloth III and King X.”

Broekman discusses the identification of King X from among four candidates: Rudamun, Shoshenq VII, Peftjauawybast (Peftiauawibast), and Nimlot. He eliminates Rudamun, and Nimlot, and Aston’s Peftjauawybast in favor of his own candidate, Shoshenq VII. Shoshenq VII, that is, Hedjkheperre Setepenre Shoshenq Si-Ese Meriamun on NLT No. 3, was assigned the numbering VIa at the Libyan Period conference held in Leiden in 2007.

Support for Shoshenq VII

Further support for Shoshenq VII is found in connection with an Iny Si-Ese Meriamun, mentioned in a graffito (No. 146 previously No. 11) on a roof slab of the Khons temple with a fifth regnal year and the date of II šmw 10. This graffito was carved by a certain Djedioh B. On a nearby slab is a graffito (No. 145, previously No. 10) of a Djedioh A, the presumed grandfather of Djedioh B, which mentions a Shoshenq Meriamun with a fourth regnal year and the date II šmw 26. Usually identified with Shoshenq VI, Broekman identifies this king with Shoshenq VII, because he positions Djedioh B contemporary with the Piye’s reign in the latter part of the 23rd Dynasty and not two generations earlier in the times of Djedioh A and Shoshenq VI.

This position for Shoshenq VII reinforces Broekman’s proposal that the Shoshenq named on NLT No. 3 and the king with the illegible name on NLT No. 45 with years 17, 18, or 25 refer to Shoshenq VII, making it probable that the unnamed king of the Wadi Gasus inscription with the 19th year refers to Shoshenq VII also.

Broekman’s chronology (following Aston’s) gives to Shoshenq VII 19–24 years and the dates 759–741/735 BCE, indicating that Shoshenq VII’s 19th year, equated with Piye’s 12th year, fell in 741 BCE. In Broekman’s adjustment of Kitchen’s chronology

94 This is according to Broekman’s representation of Aston’s chronology (“Reign of Takeloth II,” table p. 25).
96 Ibid., 79.
97 Ibid., 81-83.
98 Ibid., 82, 88.
100 Broekman, “Chronological Position,” 83; Jacquet-Gordon, Graffiti on the Khonsu Temple, 55.
101 Ibid., 83-84.
102 Ibid., 86-89.
(approved by Kitchen) he positions Shoshenq VII between Rudamun and Iuput II (its last king), with the 19 years for Shoshenq VII’s reign falling in 755-736, thus the latter date is Piye’s 12th year.

In order to insert Shoshenq VII’s 19 years into Kitchen’s chronology, Iuput II’s previously given 34–39 years (754–720/715 BCE) is reduced to 21 years (736–715 BCE). Consequently, Piye’s invasion of Egypt in his 20th year falls in 728, which equates with Iuput II’s eighth year. Iuput II reigns a further 13 years till 715, giving him 21 years, his highest attested.

SCIEM 2005
Papers from Kitchen and Broekman were presented in absentia at the SCIEM 2005 Egypt and Time Workshop held from 30 June to 2 July in Vienna, and published in 2006. The first part of Broekman’s paper consists of extracts from his 2005 article, “The Reign of Takeloth II, a Controversial Matter,” commented on above. The second part is a response to Kitchen’s article presented at the workshop, starting from Kitchen’s §10 where Kitchen sought to show again why his scheme of chronology is fully satisfactory, and on the other hand, making concessions to his chronology to provide an alternative.

The following are some of the more relevant points pertinent to our discussion from these papers.

Dead-reckoning
Kitchen continues to dead-reckon the years of the 22nd Dynasty kings, incorporating the dates afforded to the Assyrian Eponym Canon for the reign of Shalmaneser III of Assyria to gain dates for Ahab of Judah and Jehu of Israel to supply a date of 945 BCE for the beginning of the 22nd Dynasty. This date is also used by Broekman in his representation of Aston’s chronology.

Gaps Assumed
Broekman assumes there is a “gap” in the NLTs where they should have recorded the reign of Takeloth II had he reigned the (assumed) 25 years. Kitchen points out that there are 22 years not recorded between year six and year 28 of Osorkon III, and a 26-year gap between year nine of Taharqa and year 10 of Psamtek I (26th Dynasty), and a 26-year gap between year six of Shoshenq I and year 12 of Osorkon I. (This last example assumes a reign of 21 years for Shoshenq I. Had he reigned longer, then the “gap” would be extended by the corresponding amount.)

Are Prince Osorkon and King Osorkon III the Same Person?
Kitchen retains Takeloth II with 25 years in the 22nd Dynasty between Osorkon II and Shoshenq III and reiterates previous arguments against identifying Prince Osorkon with Osorkon III. His main points are: (i) the 71-year age required for Prince Osorkon in

103 Kitchen, “Regnal and Genealogical data,” table p. 50.
105 Kitchen, TIP, 580 §519.
108 §10 indicates Kitchen’s 1996 Preface to his Second Edition of TIP.
the 39th year of Shoshenq III is not unrealistic; (ii) Prince Osorkon’s long-standing enmity with the 23rd Dynasty precludes him being accepted as king of the 23rd Dynasty; (iii) evidence is lacking that Takeloth II was buried at Thebes; and (iv) Kitchen’s own belief that the epithet Si-ese proves nothing about the location of kings before the reign of Osorkon III and onwards, nor about the location of Takeloth II who had this epithet.  

Broekman counters by continuing to maintain that the 23rd Dynasty had two rival branches: one founded by Takeloth II, and the other by Pedubast I—and it was only the latter branch that Prince Osorkon shunned, not the Takelothid branch. Furthermore, he maintains the civil war was not between Osorkon and the Thebans, but between Prince Osorkon and Harsiese B (HPA), with the Thebans playing only an inferior part. In this scenario, nothing prohibits “identifying Prince Osorkon with king Osorkon III, all the more as the mother of each of them is named Ka(ro)mama.”  

**Generation Jumping**  
In 2005, Broekman argued that Kitchen’s chronology required a large number of individuals who lived to a very old age to cover the span of time required. Broekman says, “We have generation jumps occurring contemporaneously in three different families … too many to be credible.” But in Aston’s chronology, generations of people of average ages are all that are required to cover the span of time, which to Broekman was “much more realistic.”  

Kitchen responded, in 2006, that the children of siblings may marry at very different ages and have children born many years apart, especially those of large families. Thinking that the whole idea of a “generation jump” is “somehow abnormal” is itself a major conceptual error.  

**Pedubast II**  
Kitchen maintains that the title/style of Sehetepibenre Pedubast [II] does not belong in the later 22nd Dynasty between Shoshenq V and Osorkon IV (where Leahy/Aston/Broekman put him), but it belongs to Pedubast II the ruler of Tanis in the late 7th century BCE. He challenges Aston’s proposal that Pedubast II be given 10 years followed by Osorkon IV with 20 years, because the Apis bull, which was inducted in the 37th year of Shoshenq V and died in the fifth or sixth year of Bakenranef/Bocchoris in 715, would have lived from 745 to 715—a span of over 30 years. “No way!!” says Kitchen.  

**Kitchen’s Options A and B**  
Kitchen updated his previous chronologies of the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties given in 1986 and 2000 to provide two options, A and B, for each dynasty (see Tables 35.5 and 35.6).  

---

112 Ibid., 298.  
113 Broekman, “Once Again the Reign of Takeloth II,” 249.  
114 Ibid.  
115 Ibid., “Reign of Takeloth II,” 27.  
116 Ibid.  
118 Ibid.  
119 Kitchen, TIP, table p. 467.  
120 Ibid., “Regnal and Genealogical Data,” table p. 50.  
121 Ibid., “Strengths and Weaknesses,” 308. For a fuller presentation see tables on pp. 304-07.
Table 35.5: Kitchen’s revised chronology for the 22nd Dynasty (2006): Options A & B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years reigned</td>
<td>Dates BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq I</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>945–924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon I</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>924–890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Shoshenq II c/r)</td>
<td>(2?)</td>
<td>(c. 892/891)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth I</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>890–877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon II</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>877–852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsiese A</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>(c. 865)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth II</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>852–827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq III (part c/r in Option B)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>827–788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq IV</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>788–778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>778–772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq V</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>772–735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon IV</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>735–715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*= changes between the options; c/r = co-regency.

Table 35.6: Kitchen’s revised chronology for the 23rd Dynasty (2006): Options A & B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years reigned</td>
<td>Dates BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedubast I</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>820–795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Iuput I, c/r)</td>
<td>(2?)</td>
<td>(c. 806/805)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq VI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>795–789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon III</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>789–761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth III, part c/r</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>766–759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudamun</td>
<td>3+*</td>
<td>759–756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As in Option B</td>
<td>As in Option A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq VII</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>756–736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iuput II</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>736–715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*= changes between the options; c/r = co-regency.

The changes to the chronology were necessary for two basic reasons: (i) the update of Osorkon II’s 25 years in Option A to 30 years in Option B; and (ii) the inclusion of Shoshenq VII as second-to-last king of the 23rd Dynasty in both options. These also necessitated further changes to the reigns and dates of other kings.

In reconstructing his chronology Kitchen had to keep several things in mind: (1) the commencement of the 22nd Dynasty in 945 BCE; (2) the synchronism between Shoshenq III’s 12th year and Pedubast I’s fifth year (NLT No. 24) equating Shoshenq III’s eighth year with Pedubast I’s first; (3) an Apis bull that was installed in the 28th year of Shoshenq III died in the second year of Pimay after 26 years, indicating a reign of 39/40 years for Shoshenq III and 12/13 for his successor, Shoshenq IV, with another bull installed in the 37th year of Shoshenq V, which died in the fifth year of Bocchoris (24th Dynasty) and buried in his sixth year, equated with the second year of Shabako of the 25th Dynasty; (4) the 12th year of Piye of the 25th Dynasty had to equate with the 19th year of a king of the 23rd Dynasty, now identified as Shoshenq VII, fixing this sequence of rulers; and finally, (5) the 22nd Dynasty was understood to end in 715 BCE with the final appearance of Osorkon IV the previous year, 716 BCE, when he ([U]shilkanni of Assyrian records) had paid tribute to Sargon II, understood to be the second year of Shabako’s reconquest of Egypt (first as king of Egypt).
Making this a difficult exercise was the constraint of only 230 years between the fixed points of 945 and 715 BCE in the 22nd Dynasty, and that from the fifth year of Shoshenq III the 23rd Dynasty had the same number of years down to its assumed end also in 715 BCE, which was also the last year of the 24th Dynasty. Therefore, the chronologies of the 22nd, 23rd, 24th, and 25th Dynasties are inter-related and have to be correlated to concur with each other.

In the 23rd Dynasty, Shoshenq VII had to be inserted between Rudamun and Iuput II, as the latter is understood by Kitchen to be the last king of the Dynasty. Shoshenq VII’s insertion was possible by splitting the 34/39 year reign of Iuput II to give him only 21 years, his highest attested.\textsuperscript{122} Iuput II’s reign started in 736 and ended in 715 BCE to coincide with the end of the 22nd Dynasty date of Osorkon IV’s last year on the assumption that this was Shabako’s first year as king of Egypt and the second year since his accession in Nubia.\textsuperscript{123}

The 19th year of Shoshenq VII’s prior reign had to be the same year as Piye’s 12th year (Wadi Gasus inscription) attributed to either 738 or 737 BCE by Kitchen from his reconstruction of the 25th Dynasty. Therefore, Shoshenq VII’s 19th year is dated to 738/737 BCE, and his 20th year and Iuput II’s first year is the following year in 736 BCE.\textsuperscript{124} Shoshenq VII’s accession year is then 756, \textit{two years earlier} than what used to be the accession year for Iuput II when attributed 34/39 years beginning in 754 BCE.

In Option A, the preceding kings from Pedubast I down to Rudamun have the same years attributed to them as in 2000, but with the insertion of Shoshenq VII, Pedubast I’s reign is now updated with his reign beginning two years earlier, 820 instead of the former 818 BCE. This means that in the 22nd Dynasty, Shoshenq III’s first year has to be updated two years, (so that his eighth equals Pedubast’s first)—therefore, from 825 to 827—affecting dates before and after it. In 2000, Kitchen gave 15 years to Osorkon IV (730–715) but with the updating of Shoshenq III, and the last year of Shoshenq V in 735 BCE, he gave Osorkon IV 20 years (735–715),\textsuperscript{125} thus an increase of five years.

Between the accession of Shoshenq III in 827 BCE and the final year of Osorkon IV in 715, there are 112 years, made up of Shoshenq III 39, Shoshenq IV 10, Pimay 6, Shoshenq V 37, and Osorkon IV 20. As Kitchen has previously noted in \textit{TIP}, “We know from the records of the Apis-burials at Memphis that 52 years elapsed from the accession of Shoshenq III to that of Pimay.”\textsuperscript{126} An Apis bull that was installed in year 28 of Shoshenq III was buried 26 years later in the second year of Pimay as recorded on the Serapeum stela.\textsuperscript{127}

These 26 years depend on Shoshenq III having a 39 or 40-year reign followed by Shoshenq IV having 12 or 13 years. Shoshenq III’s highest attested year is his 39th on NLT No. 22 and further analysis demonstrates that 39 and 13 are the correct number of regnal years for each. In Option A, the 28th year of Shoshenq III is either 800/799 BCE and the second year of Pimay is 778/777, showing, at most, 23 years, not 26 years. Three of Shoshenq IV’s 13 years have been deleted leaving him with only 10, because the increase of 5 years to the reign of Osorkon IV has to be offset elsewhere in the dynasty, and 3 have been omitted here. The remaining 2 excess years have been deleted in the

\textsuperscript{122} Smendes V, son of Harnakht B of Mendes, dates to year 21 of Iuput II (Kitchen, \textit{TIP}, 580 §519).
\textsuperscript{123} Kitchen, “Strengths and Weaknesses,” 293, 297, 299.
\textsuperscript{124} The one-year difference comes from the variation in Kitchen’s tables shown in his Excursus I and Excursus II (“Strengths and Weaknesses,” tables 307, 308).
\textsuperscript{125} Kitchen, “Strengths and Weaknesses,” 294-95, 299, 301, tables 307, 308.
\textsuperscript{126} Idem, \textit{TIP}, xxvi §Y.
\textsuperscript{127} Ibid., 102 §82, 193 §155 and n. 22; idem, “Strengths and Weaknesses,” 294.
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dynasty by reducing (rounding down) Osorkon I’s 35 years to 34, and Takeloth I’s 15 years to 13—the latter offset 1 year by the addition of an extra year to the reign of Osorkon II, from 24 years (in 2000) to 25 years. Thus, the updating of 2 years in the 22nd Dynasty, along with the increase of 5 years to the reign of Osorkon IV, has caused problems in containing the extra years in the 22nd Dynasty and reconciling it with the 23rd Dynasty.

In Option B, Kitchen concedes that Broekman’s analysis of NLT No. 14 with a year 29 and version two for “the Nile flood” could refer to Osorkon II. Furthermore, the relief inscription giving Osorkon II a jubilee in his 22nd year, is now seen by Kitchen as a slip in transcribing from the hieratic numbers where a third “ten-sign” was damaged and now seen as two vertical strokes.128 Thus, in Option B, Kitchen attributes 30 years to Osorkon II, assuming he “probably died in his 31st year,”129 updated from his 25th year in Option A (24 years in 2000130), causing an increase of 5 years to Osorkon II’s reign from a previous 24 years in 2000 and 25 years in Option A.

Option B also has the addition of the 5 years to the reign of Osorkon IV. In this presentation, Shoshenq IV is given 12 years not 10 years (as in Option A), which updates Shoshenq III’s accession to the year 829 BCE so that his fifth and Pedubast I’s first year are in 822—the latter being 2 years earlier than in Option A. So there are 7 years more in Option B than in Option A, and there is 1 year—not 3—omitted in Shoshenq IV’s reign.

The kings preceding Osorkon II have the same years and dates in Option B as in Option A, which means that all the years for the dynasty between 945 and 730 BCE are accounted for. Consequently, Kitchen attributes an unattested co-regency/overlap of seven years to Takeloth II and Shoshenq III starting in Takeloth II’s 19th year (of an assumed 25 years) falling in 829/828 BCE. He proposes that Pedubast I “used his role at this funeral [Takeloth II’s] to claim to succeed him alongside Shoshenq III. The latter may not have approved; hence Pedubast moved out of Tanis, and set up court elsewhere (probably at Leontopolis).”131

However, Kitchen needs to explain why Shoshenq III would have become full co-regent in Takeloth II’s 19th year. He appeals to the political situation of the time, in which in year 15 of Takeloth II, “a cataclysm of revolt … burst upon the land … the years 15–19 probably saw the Thebans in danger of taking over the entire Nile valley south of Memphis.”132 He proposes that Shoshenq took control of the armed forces, stopped the opposition, negotiated peace, and assumed full co-regency with Takeloth II for nearly eight years until the latter died.133 The overlap of Shoshenq III with Takeloth II also allows a reduction in the age of Prince Osorkon in the 39th year of Shoshenq III, after which he is not heard of again, so that instead of dying at about the age of 71, he dies about 62/66 years old instead, which is considered to be more realistic.134


129 Ibid., 301.

130 Idem, “Regnal and Genealogical Data,” 50.


132 Ibid., 301.

133 Ibid. The actual overlap is 7 years not 8; 8 is mentioned because Takeloth II is attributed 26 years (table p. 305) whereas elsewhere Kitchen gives to him only 25 years. The 26th year of Takeloth may then be equated with the eighth year of Shoshenq III and the first year of Pedubast I, making the accession of Pedubast on the death of Takeloth II appear feasible.

134 Ibid., 301, 297-98.
**Broekman Responds Contradicting Kitchen**

Broekman’s response is to compare Aston’s chronology of the 22nd Dynasty with Kitchen’s new revised chronology. Broekman notes that in Option B Shoshenq II becomes co-regent in Takeloth II’s 18th or 19th year, which means that Takeloth II’s 25th and final year concurs with Shoshenq III’s eighth year when Pedubast I founded the 23rd Dynasty.\(^{135}\) According to NLT No. 26, Pedubast I’s 16th year was Iuput I’s second year, giving the following equation: Shoshenq III’s 22nd = Pedubast I’s 15th = Iuput I’s first as co-regent. In Kitchen’s chronology, Broekman can find no explanation for Iuput I becoming co-regent in Pedubast’s 15th year.\(^{136}\) On the other hand, using Aston’s chronology, Broekman notes that Iuput I’s first year equates with the 15th year of Pedubast I corresponding to the 25th (and presumed final) year of Takeloth II’s reign. Therefore, it seems that upon the death of Takeloth II, Iuput I became his successor, who, in Aston’s chronology, is presumed to have headed a faction in competition with one led by Pedubast for supremacy of the 23rd Dynasty.

The correlation of the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties as proposed by Broekman from Aston’s chronology, previously given in 2005,\(^ {137}\) and updated in 2006,\(^ {138}\) is shown in Table 35.7 and Table 35.8, and can be compared with Kitchen’s above (Tables 35.5 and 35.6).

**Table 35.7: Aston’s Chronology for the 22nd Dynasty as supplied by Broekman**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Years reigned</th>
<th>Dates BCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq I</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>945–924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon I</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>924–889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>889–874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon II</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>874–840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq III</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>840–801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq IV</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>801–788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>788–782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq V</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>782–745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedubast II</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>745–735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon IV</td>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>735–720/715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 35.8: Aston’s Chronology for the Theban 23rd Dynasty as supplied by Broekman**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Years reigned</th>
<th>Dates BCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth II</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>843–818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedubast I</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>832–807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iuput I</td>
<td>--?</td>
<td>817–?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq VI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>807–801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon III</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>801–773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth III</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>778–771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudamun</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>771–759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq VII</td>
<td>18–24</td>
<td>759–741/735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While no known inscription indicates that Takeloth II was alive during the reign of Pedubast I or that of Shoshenq III, Broekman weaves this scenario into *The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon*, supposing that it was Iuput I’s acceptance by both Prince Osorkon and his adversaries as a candidate to succeed Takeloth II that led to a temporary reconciliation of both parties and the return of Prince Osorkon as HPA to Thebes.\(^ {139}\)

---

\(^{135}\) Broekman, “Once Again the Reign of Takeloth II,” table p. 252.

\(^{136}\) Ibid., 251.


\(^{138}\) Idem, “Once Again the Reign of Takeloth II,” 246, 251.

\(^{139}\) Broekman, “Once Again the Reign of Takeloth II,” 253.
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Based on Aston’s chronology and his interpretation of it, Broekman writes:

The historical developments outlined above, from the death of Takeloth II until the end of the reign of Shoshenq III, start from a realistic explanation for Iuput I succeeding Takeloth II, and are perfectly in accord with the monumental evidence, notably the sequence of events recorded in the *Chronicle of Prince Osorkon* and the political situation reflected in it … The accession of Takeloth II preceding the death of Osorkon II by three years can perfectly be explained, as well as Pedubast I taking royal style in Takeloth II’s 11th year … This chronological reconstruction … is grounded purely on a historical basis, real political situations and realistic circumstances, as advocated by Kitchen, without anything contradicting it.  

None of Broekman’s speculations are credible if Kitchen’s insistence is correct that there was no Theban 23rd Dynasty.

**Takeloth III’s 14th year**

Not commented on by Kitchen or Broekman but seen in their tables, is the attribution of just seven years to Takeloth III: five as co-regent with his father Osorkon III, and two sole-reign years. This does not take into account the findings of a year 13 of Takeloth III seen in 2005 by the excavation team from the Colombia University at the Dakhla Oasis, published by Kaper and Demarée, noted above. Thus, all of Kitchen’s efforts to reconcile the 22nd Dynasty with the 23rd Dynasty after the inclusion of Shoshenq VII, in which he gives only two full-reign years to Takeloth III, founders on the omission of the extra years now attributable to Takeloth III.

**Pimay’s Seven or Eight Years**

Kitchen and Broekman also fail to comment on the year seven and possible year eight of Pimay/Pami on the reused block from Heliopolis, known since its publication in 1998 and noted above. Both scholars continue to give Pimay just six years.

**Shebitku Extradites Iamani in 706 BCE**

The Tang-i Var inscription relates that Shebitku of Melluha (Nubia) extradited Iamani of Ashdod back to Sargon II, a date that scholars set from Assyrian records at 706 BCE.

But Kitchen still insists, in 2006, that Shebitku’s reign started in 702 and not 706. He says Shebitku was ruler of Kush not Egypt because *sharru* was the term for a Kushite ruler, not for a king of Egypt. So, in 706, Shebitku was Shabako’s deputy, or ruler of Kush. Kitchen supports this by pointing out that the vast territory of Kush (or Nubia) and Egypt required a king plus his deputy to oversee the domain. Kitchen now provides Shebitku with 13 years as ruler of Kush as the deputy of Shabako, before becoming king himself of Egypt in 702 BCE. Table 35.9 also shows that while Shebitku ruled as king over Egypt, Taharqa was ruler in Kush, before becoming king of Egypt in 690. There is a precedent in this, in that Taharqa was summoned by his brother, Shebitku, to join the Egyptian and Nubian armies to fight Assyria in Palestine in 701, when Taharqa could not yet have been king of Egypt. Taharqa is cited in 2 Kgs 19:9 as if he is the head of the Ethiopian army.

---

140 Ibid., 254.
141 Ibid., 306, 308; Broekman, “Once Again the Reign of Takeloth II,” 245.
142 Ibid., 306, 308; Broekman, “Once Again the Reign of Takeloth II,” 246.
143 Ibid., 293-94. Capitalization his.
In Table 35.9 Kitchen gives the chronology for the 25th Dynasty kings from Piye to Taharqa in Egypt, attributing prior reigns to Shebitku and Taharqa in Kush/Nubia.\(^\text{144}\)

**Table 35.9: 25th Nubian Dynasty according to Kitchen (2006)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates BCE</th>
<th>Rulers in (N) Egypt</th>
<th>Years reigned</th>
<th>Adjoint rulers in Kush</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>749–716</td>
<td>Pi(ank)y (Kush &amp; Thebaid)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716–702</td>
<td>Shabako (715ff. in Egypt)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Shebitku (715–702)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702–690</td>
<td>Shebitku</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Taharqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690–664</td>
<td>Taharqa</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(X, then Tantamani? x/y to 664)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kitchen reckons that Shabako came north in 715 BCE just after Osorkon IV (the “Shilkanni” of Assyrian records) had sent gifts to Sargon II of Assyria in 716. He equates 716 with Piye’s last year and 715 with Osorkon IV’s final year.\(^\text{145}\) Since Shabako has a regnal year 15 attributed to him on the British Museum cube statue 24429 of a certain Ity,\(^\text{146}\) Shabako’s reign, if assumed to be just over 14 years, would begin in 716 and end in 702 when Shebitku’s would begin.

In Kitchen’s chronology, it is impossible for Shebitku to be ruling as king of *Egypt* in 706.\(^\text{147}\) On the other hand, as noted above, Frame and Kahn date Shebitku as king of Egypt in 706 with a 16-year reign ending in 690. If Shabako had 14–15 prior years, then his accession ought to have been in 721/720 at the end of Piye’s reign. There are two ways to interpret the Tangi-i Var inscription, depending on whether one recognizes Shebitku as king of Egypt, or only of Nubia, in 706 BCE.

**Length of the 24th Dynasty?**

Also tied up in the dating of Piye, Shabako, and Shebitku, is the length of the 24th Dynasty. In 2006, Kitchen gives the following table for the 24th Dynasty kings, Tefnakht and Bakenranef/Bocchoris (see Table 35.10).\(^\text{148}\)

**Table 35.10: 24th Dynasty kings, Tefnakht and Bakenranef/Bocchoris, according to Kitchen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates BCE</th>
<th>24th Saite Dynasty</th>
<th>Years reigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>728–720</td>
<td>Tefnakht</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720–715</td>
<td>Bakenranef/Bocchoris</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the information from Piye’s Victory stela, it is generally understood that the 24th Dynasty was founded by Tefnakht after Piye (Piankhy) returned to Kush in his 20th year. In Kitchen’s chronology, Piye’s 20th year invasion of Egypt occurred ca. 730–728 BCE.\(^\text{149}\) Using the year 728 as the presumed year when Tefnakht’s assumes kingship over the 24th Dynasty, and giving him eight years, Kitchen ends Tefnakht’s reign in 720. Then Bocchoris begins to reign.

Six years later, Shabako, in his second year, killed Bocchoris, dated to 715 BCE, when Shabako became *king of Egypt*.\(^\text{150}\) In this scenario, Kitchen assigns the eight years on the Athens stela of a Shepsesre Tefnakht to Tefnakht I, but that has now been challenged by Perdu as belonging to Tefnakht II not Tefnakht I, noted above. If Perdu is correct, Tefnakht I’s regnal years are not attested.

---

\(144\) Ibid., 308.
\(145\) Idem, *TIP*, 143-44 §115.
\(146\) Ibid., 153 §125.
\(147\) Idem, “Strengths and Weaknesses,” 293-94; 308.
\(148\) Ibid., table on 308.
\(149\) Ibid., 294, table on 308.
\(150\) Ibid., table p. 308.
This has consequences for the chronology of the 24th and 25th Dynasties, which are particularly crucial in dating Shabako and Shebitku, and their correlation with the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties. However, Kitchen continues to give Tefnakht I eight years in 2006. Broekman’s 2006 article does not extend to a discussion of the 24th Dynasty kings.

**Ancient Egyptian Chronology**

In 2006, *Ancient Egyptian Chronology* appeared with chapters written by various Egyptologists and other specialists in related fields. As with other Egyptian chronologies, the reliability of the Assyrian Eponym Canon is assumed and Shoshenq I’s accession is dated to ca. 945 BCE by most scholars on the basis of dead-reckoning. However, Krauss has amended the date by claiming that a *weresh* (wrš) feast designating a lunar month and/or a lunar day, possibly day one, falls within the first five days of a lunar month. Thus, he seeks a lunar match for the date of IV prt 25 for the fifth year of Shoshenq I and finds it has to fall in 939 giving an accession date of 943 BCE. Furthermore, Krauss and Warburton write:

The traditional date of 945 BC for Shoshenq I’s accession rests on a combination of Biblical and Egyptological information. There is, however, no basis for the projected Biblical dates, as no contemporary archaeological or epigraphical evidence provides any support for the generation counts in the Old Testament.

Thus they seek to down-date the 945 BCE date. But their arguments are just as applicable to an up-date for the commencement of the 22nd Dynasty. They wish to follow Aston’s chronology in assuming parallel dynasties under Takeloth II (Theban) and Shoshenq III (Memphite). They understand that lunar dates for the first month of Shomu yield dates of 845 for Shoshenq II, 841 for Shoshenq III, and 834 for Pedubast I. The chronology of the rival Theban 23rd Dynasty under Pedubast I (supposedly an enemy to Takeloth II and Iuput I as the presumed successor of Takeloth II) remains open, as does the Lower Egyptian 23rd Dynasty, assumed to follow the 22nd Dynasty.

In another area, Jansen-Winkeln omits reference to the year 13 referring to Takeloth III, found by the team from the University of Columbia on a stela from a temple in the Dakhla Oasis. Jansen-Winkeln also writes: “It is highly probable that the Nile level record no. 45 does not belong to Shoshenq VII … there does not remain any time for a year 17/19/25 of a sovereign in Thebes before the Nubians after Osorkon III” (emphasis his).

He attributes only the year five of NLT No. 3 to Shoshenq VII. Rejecting Kitchen’s explanation that Shebitku was a viceroy of Shabako when Iamani was extradited back to Sargon II, Jansen-Winkeln dates Shebitku’s accession to no later than 706 BCE. He dates Shabako’s prior 14- to 15-year reign to 722–721 with 720 as the latest date, and his second year, and Bocchoris’s sixth, is placed ca. 720 (721–719). He finds the reign of Piye uncertain, especially the date for his campaign into Egypt in

---

151 *Ancient Egyptian Chronology* (eds. E. Hornung, R. Krauss, D.A. Warburton; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006); abbreviated as *AEC*.
157 Ibid., 255, 256.
158 Ibid., 258-61.
his 20th year, compounded by the year eight recorded on the Athens stela for a Tefnakhte Shepsesre, whom he prefers to identify with Tefnakht I not Tefnakht II. He sets Piye’s campaign to between 734 and 726 BCE and his accession ca. 753–745 BCE. In conclusion, he asserts, referring to the Third Intermediate Period as a whole, “The highest known dates for these kings does not leave significant gaps. The general framework of the chronology of this age is certain.”

Notwithstanding the last comment, the complexities of the above discussion show there are real problems in knowing the chronology of the 22nd, 23rd, 24th, and 25th Dynasties. Generally, the problems can be attributed to the fact that there are few certain reigns for the kings. “Dead-reckoning” from the highest known regnal years has led to a minimum chronology, so that when extra years are found the collective reigns of the 22nd Dynasty cannot fit between the dates of 945 and 715 BCE—the latter date being also assigned to the end of the 23rd and 24th Dynasties.

If the 22nd Dynasty was longer, Osorkon II could be assigned 30 or more years and Takeloth II’s regnal years could also be contained within the 22nd Dynasty (contrary to Aston) without having to be overlapped with Shoshenq III (Kitchen, Option B). In the 23rd Dynasty, Takeloth III could be assigned 13 sole-reign years and not five co-regent years with his father, Osorkon III, followed by two sole-reign years. Shoshenq VII’s possible years 17, 18, or 25 on NLT No. 45 would not be excluded due to lack of space to accommodate his reign. The same applies to other kings whose reigns have not yet been discussed. Those mentioned above have received the most attention in recent times.

This chapter has described the fluidity of opinion and the methods employed within the assumed dating constraints of this period of Egyptian chronology. My approach in chapters 36 to 39 will be to identify firm anchor points and to reconstruct the chronology from documented evidence in the 22nd to 25th Dynasties enlightened by the fact that the 22nd Dynasty commenced with Shoshenq I in 998/997 BCE, not 945 BCE, as demonstrated in preceding chapters.

159 Ibid., 262-63.
160 Ibid., 264.