Chapter 36
Framing the 22nd Dynasty

This chapter and the next are devoted to the 22nd Dynasty. This chapter reflects Manetho’s framework; the following chapter completes the reconstruction.

Shoshenq I is the first 22nd Dynasty king. He began his reign with a five-year co-regency with Psusennes II. The Dynasty has distinctives that aid its construction. Manetho’s records for the 22nd Dynasty have suffered damage and loss in transmission, so only 3 of its 11 kings (9 according to Manetho) are named. Nevertheless, the information it contains is a valuable aid to chronology. Nile Level Texts found on the quay wall of the temple of Amun at Karnak record the maximum height of the Nile in various kings’ regnal years. The analyses of these texts help define the length of some rulers’ reigns. Lunar dates taken from records of inductions of priests at Amun festivals, and the enthronement of two Apis bulls also assist. Lunar dates from the 23rd and 25th Dynasties and important synchronisms between the 22nd, 23rd, 24th, and 25th Dynasties anchor the reigns of eight kings. The invasion of the Nubian king, Piye, in his 20th year, causing the submission of Egypt’s kings and “kinglets,” brought the 22nd, 23rd, and 24th Dynasties virtually to an end.

In earlier years, Heqakheperre Shoshenq was known as Shoshenq II, and Hedjkheperrre Shoshenq Siese was known as Shoshenq VII. The numbering of Shoshenq IIb, Shoshenq IIc, and Shoshenq VIa does not imply acceptance of their existence by all scholars.

Kings of the 22nd Dynasty
The order of the kings of the 22nd Dynasty, as recognized by most scholars at the present time, are shown in Table 36.1 (early period) and Table 36.2 (later period). Because Manetho has totals for the early and later periods, a line in the table for this framework figure is provided. In keeping with my method, lunar anchor periods or year periods are noted.

Table 36.1: Early period of 22nd Dynasty kings with anchor points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Regnal years</th>
<th>Dates reigned</th>
<th>Lunar anchor points or year periods BCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq I</td>
<td>Yr 2, Shoshenq I “justified” at feast III 3ḫt 14; new moon III 3ḫt 13 in 996.</td>
<td>Yr 5, weresh feast IV prt 25; new moon IV prt 20 in 994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon I</td>
<td>Yr 1 bequests beginning on I šmw 7 is new moon in 957 (and lasting 3 yrs 3 mths and 16 days till Yr 4 on IV šmw 25). Yr 3 induction of Hor, II 3ḫt 14; new moon II 3ḫt 11, 954</td>
<td>NLT 16 appears to give him 5 yrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq IIa</td>
<td>NLT = Nile Level Texts.</td>
<td>Serapeum stela with 14 yrs and NLT 18 with 13 or 14 yrs is probably his</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth I</td>
<td>125 years (emended from Manetho’s subtotal [1]25 ends in 872, last year of Osorkon II’s reign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manetho Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NLT = Nile Level Texts.

The Reconstructed Chronology of the Egyptian Kings, M. Christine Tetley

Table 36.2: Later period of 22nd Dynasty kings with anchor points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Regnal years</th>
<th>Dates reigned</th>
<th>Lunar anchor points or year periods BCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Starts to reign 125 years after 997.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11th yr, Amun feast new moon on I šmw 11 in 860.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yr 28 installation of Apis bull in Yr 28 on II 3ḫt 1 date of full moon in 810.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This Apis bull died after 26 years in the second yr of Pimay in 784.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yr 39 Amun feast on I šmw 26 on third day after new moon on I šmw 24 in 800.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None known. A Yr 10 attested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pami or Pimay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In second yr, 785/784, Apis bull died that was installed 26 years earlier in 28th yr of Shoshenq III in 810.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yr 12 installation of Apis bull on IV prt 4 full moon date in 769.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present at Leontopolis at invasion of Egypt in Piye’s 20th year in 730. End of dynasty in 730 is 142 years from Takeloth’s accession in 872, and 267 years from beginning of dynasty in 998/997.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous chapter canvassed the various opinions and problems with this list. Some year periods were taken into account, but not all. Relevant lunar anchor points have not figured to the extent they should have in the discussion of most Egyptologists in recent decades. Our procedure will encompass all available evidence.

“New” Kings Named Shoshenq

Several “new” kings with the name Shoshenq have been identified, besides those already well known, raising questions where they might fit into the chronology. An international conference held in Leiden in 2007 to discuss the “Libyan Period” agreed upon a temporary numbering system for these kings who are distinguishable by their prenomens.

Table 36.3: Numbering of 22nd Dynasty kings according to prenomens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prenomener</th>
<th>Identifying King number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hedjkheperre Shoshenq</td>
<td>Shoshenq I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heqakheperre Shoshenq</td>
<td>Shoshenq II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutkheperre Shoshenq</td>
<td>Shoshenq IIa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maakheperre Shoshenq</td>
<td>Shoshenq IIb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usermaatre Shoshenq Sibast</td>
<td>Shoshenq III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedjkheperre Shoshenq Sibast</td>
<td>Shoshenq IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aakheperre Shoshenq</td>
<td>Shoshenq V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36.4: King names from 23rd Dynasty (or the so-called “Upper Egyptian collateral line”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prenomener</th>
<th>Identifying King number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usermaatre Meryamun Shoshenq</td>
<td>Shoshenq VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedjkheperre Shoshenq Siese</td>
<td>Shoshenq VIa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manetho’s Lists of the 22nd Dynasty Kings

Africanus attributes nine kings to the 22nd Dynasty, whereas Eusebius and the Armenian give only the three names found in all three lists. They are set out in Table 36.5.²


³ Manetho, 158-61.
Table 36.5: The nine kings of Bubastus in the 22nd Dynasty (fragment 60 [from Syncellus] according to Africanus)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Kings and no. of years reigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sesônchis, for 21 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Osorthôn, for 15 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4, 5</td>
<td>Three other kings, for 25 [29] yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Takelôthis, for 13 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 8, 9</td>
<td>Three other kings, for 42 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 120 yr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36.6 shows the two versions of 22nd Dynasty kings from Eusebius (fragment 61a [from Syncellus] and the Armenian (the latter fragment 61b).

Table 36.6: The three kings of Bubastus in the 22nd Dynasty (via Syncellus: according to Eusebius [fragment 61a], and the Armenian [fragment 61b])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Kings and no. of years reigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sesônchôsis, for 21 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Osorthôn, for 15 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Takelôthis, for 13 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 49 yr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two shorter versions have deleted the two references to “three other kings” for kings three, four, and five; and seven, eight, and nine. The totals, 120 and 49 years, respectively, are secondary additions gained from adding up the numbers. Presumably, the original list once recorded all the kings’ names and their regnal years. Africanus has the best preserved copy.

The first two kings, Sesônchis and Osorthôn, are recognizable as Shoshenq I and Osorkon I. Then the list appears to indicate that kings three, four, and five reigned collectively for 25 [29] years. Then king no. 6, Takelothis, is identified as Takeloth II, followed by kings seven, eight, and nine, who apparently reigned collectively for 42 years.

Referring to this list in 1986, Kitchen wrote, “The surviving text of Manetho’s Epitome very quickly passes from closest accuracy [in the 21st Dynasty] into a state of corruption and over-abbreviation. The one indisputable datum is the first given: 21 years for Shoshenq I, directly comparable with the Year 21 of his Silsila stela ordering the works at Karnak that were never finished.”

Kitchen then presents a table comparing the kings and reigns he assigns to the 22nd Dynasty, and gives his interpretation of Manetho’s figures. He suggests that the total for the first “three other kings” could be emended from 29 to 49 years and the second entry of “three other kings for 42 years” is “totally corrupt, because the irreducible minimum is 95 years.” He asserts, “It is clear that (except for Shoshenq I) the surviving text of Manetho does not begin to do justice to the 22nd Dynasty as it is now known to us.”

---

4 The Book of Sothis is found in Manetho. It also gives the three kings. See further explanation later in this chapter, pp. 523ff.
5 The [29] has been inserted to bring the total to the stated 120 years, which otherwise amounts to only 116 years.
7 Ibid., 450 §418.
8 Ibid.
“Three Other Kings” Convey Regnal Data

Allowing for transmission error, the numbers can be explained quite plausibly, and provide very important data in the establishment of the chronology for the 22nd Dynasty. It becomes obvious that Manetho’s twice given “three other kings” for a total of 25 and 42 years, respectively, are insufficient to represent the regnal years for kings three to five and seven to nine. For example, in TIP, Kitchen assigned 24–25 years to Osorkon II, and his reign takes up the 25 years assigned to the “three other kings,” leaving no years available for kings three and four. This indicates that the numbers as they are now, are too low. They must have been greater once. If the two numbers are added they amount to 67 years.

According to our analysis, the 22nd Dynasty began in 997 BCE. Kitchen, in 2006, proposed the dates 730–728 for Piye’s 20th year invasion of Egypt. If the dynasty ended in 730, there were 267 years to the 22nd Dynasty, which gives us a clue as to the correct numbers for the twice-stated “three other kings.”

These have wrongly been interpreted to refer to just the kings whose names and regnal years have not been preserved, when originally the years must have referred to sub-totals for two halves of the dynasty. The emended subtotals provided for the 22nd Dynasty indicates it was divided into two periods; its first lasting for [1]25 years and its second for [1]42 years, giving 267 years and the dates 997–872 BCE and 872–730 BCE, respectively.

Manetho regarded the first king of the second period as a Takelothis, who can be identified with Takeloth II, son and successor of Osorkon II, the latter recognized as the last king of the first period. The disruption to the dynasty at about the time of the reigns of Osorkon II and Takeloth II is supported by the politico–religious situation known to have arisen between the ruling family in Tanis in the north, and the priests of Amun at Thebes in the south, as related in The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon.

Referring to fragmentation during the 22nd Dynasty, Kitchen wrote in 1996:

The first real crack appears when Harsiese obtains a shadow-kingship at Thebes under Osorkon II. Theban disenchantment grew apace under the regime of Takeloth II and Prince Osorkon, leading first to the emergence of rival Theban-based high priests. Shoshenq III proved unable to retain a unified monarchy, A probable sibling Pedubast I split off; founding what Manetho calls the 23rd Dynasty.

The 23rd Dynasty coexisted with the 22nd Dynasty until they both came to an end with the invasion of the 25th Dynasty king, Piye, ca. 730 BCE. Manetho’s numbers for the 22nd Dynasty can be credibly understood when the correct figures of 125 years and 142 years are reinstated, giving 267 years to the dynasty

Nile Level Texts

During the 22nd to 26th Dynasties, the height of the Nile flood was recorded at Thebes in various years of most of the kings’ reigns. These records, known as the Nile Level Texts, were engraved on the quay wall of the temple of Amun at Karnak covering a distance of about eight meters. The majority of the texts give the name of the king and his regnal year, though one group of texts omits the king and gives the name of the High Priest instead. Sometimes the name of another concurrently reigning king of another

---

dynasty is given, providing an important synchronism. A few times, the name of the king’s mother, as well as various other items of information, are added. Some kings have more than one text.

The texts of the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties number from 1 to 29 and from 43 to 45, and are to the left of the engravings for the 25th and 26th Dynasties numbering from 30 to 42 inscribed on the right-hand section of the wall. The latter are more extensive in their details.

The Nile Level Texts were published briefly by Georges Legrain in 1896, giving a diagram of their positioning on the quay wall and a commentary on the texts.13 Many of the texts were damaged and in various stages of illegibility, especially Nos. 15 and 44, which are known only from Legrain’s publication, but their place on the quay wall is not recorded.14

In 1953, Jürgen von Beckerath visited the quay and re-collated the texts. He discovered that Legrain’s arrangements of the texts were not numbered in their historical order.15 Von Beckerath gives a commentary on the texts and a hieroglyphic representation of each.16

In 2002, Gerard Broekman provided a full analysis of the texts of the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties, including their position on the quay wall, their orthography, their structure, a commentary on the individual texts focusing on the chronological issues, a presentation of the hieroglyphic inscriptions arranged in groups, and his conclusions.17

He noted that consecutive numbers do not necessarily indicate chronological continuity, nor does proximity, though there is a general recognition that texts belonging to one king may have been loosely grouped together, with the texts of later kings sometimes coming between them. It is not known why the Nile Level Texts were engraved in some years and not others.18

Two Versions of “Nile Flood”

A particularly important point concerns the orthography. As Broekman explains, the structure of the Nile Level Texts show two different versions for the words p3 h'pj “the Nile flood” appearing at the beginning of each text.19 Version One has three alternative hieroglyphic renderings for the word h'pj, distinct from Version Two written only one way. Broekman concluded that texts having Version One belong to kings who reigned before the 39th year of Shoshenq III, at which time the texts change from Version One to Version Two.20 The only exception is Text No. 5 giving year three of

16 Ibid., 49-55.
17 Broekman, “Nile Level Records,” 165.
18 Ibid., 181.
19 Ibid., 166.
20 Kitchen says the difference in spellings of Hapi “may be the product of varying scribes, rather than chronological fashions; hence they are not definitive proof without other evidence” (“Strengths and Weaknesses,” 299).
Osorkon III, rendered in Version One.\textsuperscript{21} He suggests that this can probably be accounted for by the transitional nature of the orthography at this time.\textsuperscript{22}

The kings named and represented by Version One are Shoshenq I (No. 1), Osorkon I (No. 2) and Osorkon II (Nos. 8, 9, 11, 12, and 14). Also reigning before Shoshenq III were Shoshenq IIa, (questionable Shoshenq IIb and IIc), Takeloth I and Takeloth II, but these kings’ names do not appear. However, there are some texts that do not name the king but do give the name of the High Priest, while some texts are illegible, and these kings may have been represented by these texts.

Broekman notes that from the time of Osorkon II the kings’ names became more complex with the optional addition of \textit{Si Ese} to the names of the kings of Upper Egypt, which was subsequently extended to add the epithet \textit{Netjerheqaawast} (God, ruler of Thebes), whereas kings of Lower Egypt added \textit{Si-Bast} and the epithet \textit{Netjerheqaon} (God, ruler of Heliopolis).

Broekman regards \textit{Si Ese} and \textit{Si-Bast} as indicative of dynastic affiliation when the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties coexisted, and the epithets also indicating the additional “place of origin of the objects on which they occur.”\textsuperscript{23} These distinctions are used by Broekman in seeking to identify kings who used the same prenomen and nomen. While Broekman favors the idea of a Theban 23rd Dynasty using the epithet \textit{Si-Ese}, Kitchen argues that the epithet does not indicate that there was a 23rd Dynasty headed by Takeloth II residing at Thebes.\textsuperscript{24} In 2009, Kitchen asserted that “Son of Isis” was used for new rulers in Leontopolis, and that it corresponded to the “Si-Bast” epithets used by their “cousins” in Bubastis and Tanis, arguing again that the epithet did not indicate a Theban 23rd Dynasty.\textsuperscript{25} This difference of view affects the subsequent analysis of the Nile Level Texts.

A schematic diagram of the position of the texts on the quay wall is provided below (Figure 36.1) as presented by Broekman. The approximate length of the texts is indicated by the distances between the square brackets. The different writings of the numbers indicate the several groups in which the texts are clustered in Broekman’s paper.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{21} Broekman notes Nile Level Text No. 3 with Version Two, previously thought to belong to Shoshenq I, but now that the significance of Version Two has been observed, combined with other criteria, he now attributes this text to Shoshenq II (“Nile Level Records,” 164, 167, 169, 174-78). See further discussion below.

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 167.

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 168.

\textsuperscript{24} In 2006, Kitchen argued that, “The epithet Si-Ese (even as studied by Muhs) proves absolutely nothing about the location of kings or dynasties,” noting that it can belong to kings of both the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties. (Emphasis his). (“Strengths and Weaknesses,” 298). The reference to Muhs is: Brian Muhs, “Partisan Royal Epithets in the late Third Intermediate Period and the Dynastic Affiliations of Pedubast I and Iuput II,” \textit{JEA} 84 (1998) 220-23.


\textsuperscript{26} Broekman, “Nile Level Records,” 165.
KEY:
(Between rounded brackets): the earliest texts;
**Bold**: the sons of Osorkon I;
*Italic*: the texts of Osorkon II;
_Underline_: the time of Shoshenq III and _The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon_;
**Bold, underlined**: the texts of Osorkon III and his son Takeloth III;
*Italic, underlined*: the remaining texts.

Table 36.7 and Table 36.8 give a summary of the information provided by Broekman, and is arranged in a chronological format within the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties to give greater clarity to some issues discussed below.

**Table 36.7: Nile Level Text (NLT) data for the 22nd Dynasty, according to Broekman**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order and identification of kings</th>
<th>King named</th>
<th>No. of NLT</th>
<th>Regnal year</th>
<th>Version of hapi “Nile Flood”</th>
<th>HP/other comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Shoshenq I</td>
<td>Hedjkheperre Setepenre Shoshenq Meryamun = Shoshenq I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2 have identical structure; 2 cartouches, prenomen &amp; nomen shown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Osorkon I</td>
<td>Sekhemkheperre Setepenre Osorkon Meryamun = Osorkon I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Shoshenq IIa</td>
<td>Name not given. [Reign of Shoshenq II?]</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HP Iuwelot, son of Osorkon [I]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name not given. [Reign of Shoshenq II or Takeloth I?]
17 Not legible

Name not given. [Reign of Shoshenq II or Takeloth I?]
21 Not legible Not legible HP not legible

4. Takeloth I                     | Name not given. [Reign of Takeloth I?] | 17 | 8 | 1 | HP Smendes III, son of Osorkon |

Name not given. [Probably reign of Takeloth I] | 18 | 13 or 14 | 1 | HP Smendes III, son of Osorkon |

Name not given. [Reign of Takeloth I?] | 19 | Not legible | 1 | HP Smendes III, son of Osorkon |

---

27 Ibid., 163-78.
5. Osorkon II

Osorkon II

8 12 1

Nos. 8, 9, 11, 12 are one unit; 2 cartouches, prenomen & nomen shown

Osorkon II

9 12 1

Possibly correcting Nile level of No. 8

Osorkon II

11 21 1

As above

Osorkon II

12 22 1

As above

Usimare Setapenamun = Osorkon II

14 29 1

First use of prenomen Usimare Setapenamun; only one cartouche

Unknown

15 Not legible Not legible

2 cartouches; nothing legible. Short text

6. [Takeloth II]

[Takeloth II’s reign coming between Osorkon II and Shoshenq III not represented by NLTs unless on now illegible texts, e.g. No. 15]

[?]

7. Shoshenq III

Shoshenq III

23 6 1

HP Harsiese B

Shoshenq III / Pedubast [I]

24 Shq. 12 / Ped. 5 1

HP Harsiese B

Shoshenq [III]

22 39 2

HP Osorkon (Prince Osorkon)

HP = High Priest; Ped. = Pedubast; Shq. = Shoshenq.

Table 36.8: Nile Level Texts (NLT) data for the 23rd Dynasty, according to Broekman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order and identification of kings</th>
<th>King named</th>
<th>No. of NLT</th>
<th>Regnal year</th>
<th>Version of hapi “Nile Flood”</th>
<th>HP/other comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pedubast</td>
<td>Pedubast [I] / Iuput [I]</td>
<td>26 Ped. 16 = Lu. 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 kings, no HP named</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedubast [I]</td>
<td>28 Ped. 18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HP Harsiese B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedubast [I]</td>
<td>27 Ped. 19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HP Harsiese B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shoshenq [III] / Pedubast [I]</td>
<td>29 Ped. 23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HP Takeloth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shoshenq VI</td>
<td>Usimare Meryamun = Shoshenq VI</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Not legible Not legible</td>
<td>A HP’s name illegible. Text most closely resembles No. 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usimare Meryamun = Shoshenq VI</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HP Takeloth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Osorkon III</td>
<td>Osorkon Meriamun = Osorkon III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Osorkon's mother in cartouche. &quot;Whose mother is the Chief Queen […]&quot; Wish for eternal life follows name of king Osorkon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usimare Osorkon [III] (no epithet)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nos. 6 &amp; 7 have same structure, and “Whose mother was the Chief Queen Kamama Meryt-mut.” Is in cartouche. Similar structure to No. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usimare Osorkon [III] (no epithet)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>See No. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Takeloth III</td>
<td>Osorkon Si-Ese Netjerheqawasat (god, ruler of Thebes) and Takeloth Si-Ese Netjerheqawasat</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Osk’s Year 28 = Tak’s Year 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5-year co-regency indicated by synchronism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takeloth Meryamun Si-Ese = Takeloth III</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;Whose mother is Tentsai&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usimare Meryamun</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5, 6, 13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>One cartouche; same structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 Kitchen, *TIP*, 92 §73.
29 Ibid., 93 §74.
30 Ibid., 95 §76.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Rudamun</th>
<th>Meryamun</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1 cartouche; 1 nomen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Shoshenq VIIa</td>
<td>Hedjkheperre Setepenre Shoshenq Si-Ese Meryamun = Shoshenq VIIa [SAK 33, p. 75–76]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Two cartouches, prenomen &amp; nomen; same structure as No. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meryamun (in nomen cartouche): Shoshenq VII?</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17, 18 or 25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Same structure as No. 3, but no part of prenomen is legible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HP = High Priest; Iu = Iuput; Osk = Osorkon; Ped = Pedubast; Tak = Takeloth.

22nd Dynasty Kings

Manetho identifies the 22nd Dynasty rulers as kings of Bubastus (Bubastis). These Delta kings were of Libyan descent, said to be descendants of people captured by Ramesses II and III. The genealogy of a Memphite priest named Pasenhor found on a stela from the Serapeum, lists the following sequence of kings: Shoshenq I, Osorkon I, Takelot I, and Osorkon II, which helps to confirm the order of these kings of the early period known from other sources, though it does not include Shoshenq IIa.

Shoshenq I (Hedjkheperre Setepenre Shoshenq Meryamun)

Shoshenq I was discussed in chapter 34 relative to the reign of Psusennes II. Shoshenq I’s father was Nimlot [A], brother to Osorkon the Elder, third-to-last king of the 21st Dynasty, and his mother was Tentshepeh [A]. Shoshenq’s wife, Karomama, bore him his first son, Osorkon (to become Osorkon I). Osorkon married Psusennes II’s daughter, Maätkare.

Psusennes II had no heir, so Shoshenq I, after a five-year co-regency, succeeded him to become the first king of the 22nd Dynasty. The Larger Dakhla Stela dates a land-register dispute to the 19th year of Psusennes II as well as a weresh festival date on IV prt 25 in the fifth year of Shoshenq I, referred to earlier. These both date to the year 994, so Shoshenq I’s first year dates to 997 BCE (see the fuller explanation in chapter 34 pages 477–480, and note the explanation of dates below the following table).

Shoshenq I’s second regnal year also has a date in the Karnak Priestly Annals fragment No. 4, noted in the previous reference in chapter 34, which begins a paragraph with the notation: “Regnal Year 2, 3rd month of Akhet, day 17, of the Great chief of the Mā, Shoshe(n)q, justified.” The date of III 3ḥt 13 in Shoshenq I’s second regnal year coincides with a new moon day, seen in Casperson’s Table 36.9 for the year ~995 (996 BCE). The date of III 3ḥt 14 falling on the day of conjunction is likely to be the day that the Egyptians recognized as the first day of the lunar month. (It is not unusual for the Egyptian date to fall on the day of conjunction rather than on the previous day of the new moon—as determined by the computer computations).

31 Ibid., 244-45 §206, 285 §239.
33 For family connections see Kitchen, TIP, 111-16 §90.
34 Ibid., 541 §445.
35 Ibid., 60-61 §49.
36 Ibid., 288 §242.
Available information makes no mention of a new moon on III 3ḫt 17, but as an auspicious occasion for Shoshenq I when he was “justified,” it would be appropriate for a feast falling over five days to include the day of a new moon. It is consistent with the date of III prt 10 + x for the 13th year of Psusennes II on November 8 in −998, and the weresh feast date in Shoshenq I’s fifth year on IV prt 25 in −993, which equates to 19 December, falling five days after a new moon on the 20th.37

Since Shoshenq I’s second year date fell in 996, his first year had to begin sometime before III 3ḫt 17, which equates to 14 July in 997 BCE. However, the beginning of his fifth year includes the weresh feast date on IV prt 25 or 19 December in −993 (994 BCE) placing his first year in −997/996 (998/997 BCE).

The dating data means that the accession of Shoshenq I took place before IV prt 25, the latter equating to 20 December in 998 BCE. I return to this when discussing the accession of Osorkon I, below, where it seems that Shoshenq I’s co-regency started fairly late in the year 998 BCE, possibly on the anniversary of Psusennes II’s own accession. With Shoshenq I’s accession occurring late in 998 BCE, and most of his first year falling in 997, the 125 years of the early period of the 22nd Dynasty (the [1]25 years of Manetho) must have ended in 872 BCE.

The following 142 years for the later period would have ended in 730 BCE, a date associated with the invasion of the Nubian king, Piye, in his 20th year, when the Egyptian kings submitted to him. Therefore, the dates for Shoshenq I’s first five years as co-regent with Psusennes II are established for the beginning of the 22nd Dynasty.

The Length of Shoshenq I’s Reign

Shoshenq I has the distinction of being the first king to have a Nile flood height recorded in his reign on the Karnak temple quay wall, but it refers only to his regnal year six so of no help in determining his reign length. His tomb has never been found, nor is his mummy, so his age at death cannot be estimated.

Manetho’s list of the 22nd Dynasty has a Sesonch(os)is with a reign of 21 years as its first king, understood to be Shoshenq I. Kitchen equates Shoshenq I’s plundering of Jerusalem’s temple and palace in his 20th regnal year with Rehoboam of Judah’s fifth year (1 Kgs 14:25–26; 2 Chr 12:1–12). This synchronism is proven correct.

Returning to Egypt in his 21st year, Shoshenq celebrated his victory by commissioning imposing works at Karnak, especially his great triumphal relief.38 It is engraved on the outer wall of a gateway known as the Bubastite Portal, in the south-east corner of Shoshenq I’s enclosure at Karnak.39 It has a list of 50 cities of Judah and Israel including Megiddo,40 but Jerusalem is not mentioned in its extant part. Jerusalem might

37 Kitchen dismisses this date as having any reference to a new moon (“Overview of Fact & Fiction,” 167). See Casperson’s Table 34.9, ch. 34, p. 479.
38 Kitchen, TIP, 75-76 §60, 301-02 §260.
39 I.E.S. Edwards, “Egypt from the Twenty-Second Dynasty to the Twenty-Fourth Dynasty,” CAH, 545.
have been named in the original text in the badly damaged Row IV. Or, because Jerusalem was not conquered it was not included in the list.\textsuperscript{41}

The campaign is further attested by a scene at El-Hiba,\textsuperscript{42} another stela at Karnak,\textsuperscript{43} and a stela from Megiddo.\textsuperscript{44} Referring to Manetho’s list of 22nd Dynasty kings, Kitchen writes, “The one indisputable datum is the first given: 21 years for Shoshenq I, directly comparable with the Year 21 of his Silsila stela ordering the works at Karnak that were never finished.”\textsuperscript{45} Since the length of Shoshenq I’s reign is disputed,\textsuperscript{46} none of the kings have indisputable regnal years! How long Shoshenq I reigned after his return from Judah and Israel in his 20th year remains to be known.

\section*{Kitchen & Wente Dispute}

Kitchen writes:
Late in Year 21 … work began in the sandstone quarries at Gebel Silsila … at Karnak, before Pylon II of the great temple of Amun, a vast court with later colonnades was duly built … along the south face of Pylon II, was engraved the huge formal triumph-scene of the king smiting his Palestinian foes before Amun … Above all this, a long rhetorical text … vaunted the king’s prowess in appropriately traditional terms—but Amun also compliments Shoshenq on his great building project … Next to this famed scene and list … the great gateway now known as the “Bubastite Gate” was built … engraved in large-scale and highly competent work … no pharaoh had wrought in Karnak on this vast scale for almost four centuries. Then, suddenly, Shoshenq died. His works were left practically all unfinished, his wishes for jubilee-festivals unfulfilled, and all his grandiose schemes died with him.”\textsuperscript{47}

Kitchen’s announcement of Shoshenq’s sudden death was challenged. In reviewing the 1973 edition of \textit{TIP} in 1976, Edward Wente questioned the 21 years as the length of Shoshenq I’s reign on the basis of the works at Karnak. He writes,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If one examines the masonry of the Bubastite court, he finds that it is all well dressed with the exception of stones just adjacent to the existing first pylon. Similarly the west wall of the repository temple of Sethos II, just behind the first pylon, shows very rough masonry. Such coarse masonry in the court and on the repository temple is certainly not the original masonry, and consequently one is not justified in concluding that Shoshenq I left the construction of the court incomplete.\textsuperscript{48}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Wente suggests that a first pylon collapsed due to poor foundations and that it is the replacement pylon with its rough masonry that is unfinished.\textsuperscript{49} But Kitchen reaffirmed the incomplete state of Shoshenq I’s buildings in a 2001 article. He says:

The great triumph-scene was the only part to be completed (or nearly so, depending on one’s interpretation of its kingly figure); the Bubastite Gate was completely built, but

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid.; 302 §260; idem, “Ancient Egyptian,” 7.
\textsuperscript{43} Idem, “Ancient Egyptian,” 7.
\textsuperscript{44} Idem, \textit{TIP}, 299 §257 and nn. 302, 303; idem, “Ancient Egyptian,” 7.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., 450 §418, cf. 73-76 §§58-60, 301-02 §260. Kitchen also writes, “... there is no reason to believe that he [Shoshenq I] reigned beyond his incomplete 22nd year” (73 §58).
\textsuperscript{48} Wente, “Review of TIP,” 277.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 277.
only slightly decorated and inscribed; the long colonnades of the court were merely built in the rough, and (at the king’s death) left rough and never completed.50

Jubilee Evidence

The length of Shoshenq I’s reign was also questioned by Wente due to the Gebel es-Silsileh inscription (no. 100) which, in addition to the record that the quarrying for Shoshenq I’s buildings at Karnak began in Shoshenq I’s 21st year, it also has an inscription that indicates that the Karnak court was built to celebrate a jubilee.

On the west pilaster of the Bubastite portal, an inscription reads, “sp tpy whm hb-sd,” which Wente translates as, “First occasion and repetition of the jubilee”51 (emphasis added). Wente continues: “Earlier instances of this expression, as distinct from sp tpy (n) hb-sd, ‘First occasion of the jubilee,’ indicate that a king had already celebrated one jubilee and was about to celebrate his second” (emphasis added). Kitchen translates the words similarly as: “first occasion of repeating the jubilee-festival” to which he adds the remainder, “may there be made for him many more, like Re forever.” The phrase is also repeated on the architrave.52 Kitchen wrote, in 1986, that this formula “does not indicate a second jubilee—in contrast to the proper and well-authenticated formula, whm hb-wd; rather it is merely an anticipatory formula, without any historical value,”53 so disagreeing with Wente’s interpretation.

But, reinforcing his argument, Wente referred to the priest Nakhtefmut’s mummy found at the Ramesseum having a bandage with a year 33 and another bandage having a year three. He says that these should be attributed to Shoshenq I rather than Osorkon I. He writes, “Since a reference to a second jubilee of Shoshenq I is found on the Bubastite portal and since The Book of Sothis gives him a reign of thirty-four years, might not one assign the Year 33 bandage on Nakhtefmut’s mummy to Shoshenq I and the Year 3 bandage to Osorkon I?”54 Wente then suggests that the year three bandage might indicate a co-regency between Shoshenq I and Osorkon I and that it “might explain the scenes of Osorkon I on a pilaster of the Bubastite portal that complement those of Shoshenq I. Beneath Osorkon I’s scenes one reads [whm] hbw-[s]d, ‘Repetition of jubilees’.”

Wente interprets the lack of space to account for what he assumes is an aberrant formula because of the absence, he says, of “either sp tpy alone or sp tpy whm which on monuments regularly introduce the formulas designating the first and second jubilees respectively.” He suspects that “it is merely a wish that he [Osorkon I] may celebrate many jubilees after the manner of his father and co-regent”.55 Wente attributes to Osorkon I a reign of 12 years, because a year 12 is the highest attested for him,56 and assigns 34 years to the reign of Shoshenq I.57

Kitchen, responded in 1986:

Furthermore, the tag [whm] hb-w-[s]d apparently applied to Osorkon I ... is the known specific formula that is actually used for real second jubilees! This is so for Amenophis III and especially Ramesses II.58 ... As a first jubilee would fall in Year 30, and a second

52 Kitchen, TIP, 302 §260 n. 322.
53 Ibid., 544 §451.
54 Wente, “Review of TIP,” 277. The 34 years given in The Book of Sothis is found in Manetho, 246-47.
55 Ibid., 277.
56 A reference to year 12 found on Nile Level Text 2.
57 Wente, “Review of TIP,” 278.
58 Kitchen, TIP, 544 §451.
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jubilee in Year 33 or 34, this would imply a minimal reign of 32/33 years for Osorkon I, exactly in accord with the Year 33 bandage, with Manetho’s 35 years (emended from erroneous 15), and with a group of other indications for a relatively long reign of Osorkon I.59

Nakhtefmut’s mummy with the bandage having the “Year 33 Second Heb Sed” inscription, also had a bracelet that bore the prenomen Sekhemkheperre, by which one assumes that the year 33 refers to Osorkon I, and not to Shoshenq I whose prenomen is Hedjkheperre. Thus it is almost certain that Osorkon I reigned for at least 33 years.

However, scholars have recently pointed out that the year three on the separate bandage may have been re-used (as was the practice) and have no bearing on any co-regency with his successor.60

The allocation of the year 33 on the bandage to Osorkon I, does not, however, mean that the reference to the second jubilee on the Bubastite portal cannot refer to a reign of Shoshenq I of at least 33/34 years, as the bandage and the portal have no connection with each other. Indeed, my chronology shows that Shoshenq had a jubilee and its repetition attested by the Bubastite portal, and so did Osorkon I attested by the bandage. This is a possibility that neither Kitchen’s nor Wente’s incorrectly shortened chronology would have suggested to them.

The Book of Sothis,61 referred to above by Wente, gives a list of 86 ancient Egyptian kings in a very confused order with many kings missing and others unidentifiable from those named in Manetho’s lists. Manetho also includes dynasties for which no specific names or years of kings are now recorded.

Names preceding No. 60 in The Book of Sothis have some similarities to those of earlier dynasties, especially Manetho’s 18th, 19th, and 20th Dynasties. Wente has suggested that Shoshenq I might be the king Susakeim who was given 34 years. He is listed as No. 62.

The Book of Sothis

In the list from The Book of Sothis below, Nos. 59, 60, and 61 are listed as the second, third, and fourth kings of the first Dynasty by Eusebius and the Armenian with names and regnal years as shown in Figure 36.2, although Africanus gives them alternative years: Athothis 57 years, Kenkenes 31 years, and Uenephes 23 years. These are preceded by Menes the first king in Manetho’s 1st Dynasty.

---

59 Ibid., 544 §451, see 110-11 §89.
61 Found at the end of Manetho’s Aegyptiaca translated by Waddell. (1940).
But in The Book of Sothis, Athothis is preceded by a Thuoris, probably indicating a juncture between the 58 names that precede Athothis, Athothis himself, and the kings that succeed him. In Manetho’s lists, the fifth king is not Susakeim, but a king called Usaphaidos or Usaphais with 20 years. This could be a badly transmitted name of the same man, both having a common “usa.” Has an “S” dropped out from the name in the latter two? However, Susakeim is given 34 years not 20 years. If Susakeim is not to be identified as belonging to the 1st Dynasty, might he then belong to the next set of kings as listed in The Book of Sothis beginning with No. 63: Psusenus?

The right-hand dynastic allocations have been added. Analysing the list, it may be seen that Nos. 63–67 refer to some of the kings of the 21st Dynasty, Nos. 68–70 to the 23rd Dynasty, Nos. 71–73 to the 22nd Dynasty (where Concharis may be seen as Shoshenq phonetically spelled backwards), No. 74 to the 24th Dynasty, Nos. 75–77 to the 25th Dynasty, and Nos. 78–86 to the 26th Dynasty. A possible explanation for the order of the dynasties might be that they were written down from a list with two columns
across the page, and then copied down vertically from the first column (say 21st and 23rd Dynasties) before returning to the top to copy down the second column (say 22nd and 24th Dynasties). Then the 25th and 26th Dynasties were copied onto another page. Since these are the last two dynasties given, whether they were across the page or down the page, they would have been copied consecutively.

**Nothing to Identify Susakeim with Shoshenq**

While these kings do not represent all the kings of the dynasties, their names allow them to be attributed to a dynasty. If Susakeim was another name for Shoshenq I he is not expected to be placed before the name of Psusennes who was the second king of the 21st Dynasty, but in position No. 71, as the first king of the 22nd Dynasty, a position now occupied by Concharis, who appears as Shoshenq I spelt backwards (phonetically).

This identification is supported by the fact that he is given the same 21 years as “Sesonchis/Sesonchosis” of the 22nd Dynasty by Manetho and followed by Osorthon (Osorkon) with 15 years, and Tacalophis (Takeloth) with 13 years. In a chronological order, the 22nd Dynasty kings, Nos. 71–73, should have been placed between the 21st and 23rd Dynasty kings, Nos. 63–67. But this would still not place Susakeim next to the other 22nd Dynasty kings. The added note, “This king brought up Libyans, Ethiopians, and Trögloydes before Jerusalem,” appears to be referring to 2 Chr 12:3, which speaks of Shoshenq (Shishak) bringing with him from Egypt to Jerusalem “Libyans, Sukkiim and Ethiopians.”

However, this is almost certainly a secondary addition as are various other annotations found in Manetho’s lists and one that has been transmitted to The Book of Sothis. There is nothing to identify Susakeim with Shoshenq I of the 22nd Dynasty. Equating these two kings or their 34 regnal years is highly dubious.

The accession of Shoshenq I’s son and successor, Osorkon I, must be anchored before the length of Shoshenq I’s reign can be finally determined.

**Osorkon I (Sekhemkheperre Setepenre Osorkon Meryamun)**

Osorthon, the second king of Manetho’s list, is there attributed 15 regnal years. He is identified by scholars as Osorkon I, eldest son of Shoshenq I and his wife Karomama, as indicated on the Serapeum stela of the Memphite priest Pasenhor B. The stela notes Tashedkhons as the mother of Takeloth I, but Osorkon I’s principal wife, Maätkare, is not mentioned, nor is her assumed son, Shoshenq Ila.

Osorkon I’s highest known regnal year is year 12 on Nile Level Text No. 2 (situated to the left of Shoshenq I’s Nile Level Text). Kitchen discusses four lines of evidence for a reign for Osorkon I longer than 12 or 15 years.

Firstly, Kitchen assigns the 33 years noted on the bandage of the priest Nakhtefmut to Osorkon I because the mummy also has braces with a *menat*-tab with the name of Osorkon Sekhemkheperre on it. Kitchen writes, “This Year 33 suggests a minimum reign of 32 years and that Manetho’s figure should indeed be taken as a corruption of 15 from 35 years.”

---

62 Ibid., 246-47.
63 For the equivalences in Egyptian see Kitchen, *TIP*, 295 §253 and nn. 290, 291, 292.
64 Note No. 74 in Manetho’s list (Fig. 36.2), “in his reign a lamb spoke”! Manetho, 165, 167. That is not to imply that all annotations are not original. No. 75 recording that Bocchoris was burnt alive by Sabacon (Shabako) may be historical.
66 Ibid., 110 §89; see Wente, “Review of *TIP,*” 277.
Secondly, Kitchen notes that Iuwelot, son of Osorkon I, and brother to Shoshenq IIa, was but a youth in year 10 of Osorkon’s reign, but had become a High Priest, army commander, and governor of southern Upper Egypt in year five of Takelot I’s reign. Therefore, Iuwelot would more likely have been appointed to this responsible position when he was 40 rather than 20, indicating a longer reign for Osorkon I than Manetho’s 15 years.

Thirdly, the bandage of year three on the mummy of Nakhtefmut along with the bandage of year 33 led Kitchen to suggest a three-year co-regency of Osorkon I and Shoshenq IIa. On the assumption that Shoshenq IIa was only co-regent and predeceased his assumed father Osorkon I aged in his 50s—judging from the apparent age of his mummy—Kitchen surmises that, “Osorkon I died aged about 70 or more,” suggesting a longer not a shorter reign for Osorkon I.

Finally, Kitchen argues that the series of Third and Fourth prophets of Amun, “is only easily accommodated within a long reign of Osorkon I, and would border on the unrealistic if crammed into a 15-year reign for that king.” So Kitchen argues for attributing to Shoshenq I 21 regnal years and to Osorkon I 35 years emended from Manetho’s 15 years. But Wente wanted to attribute [wḥm] ḫbw-[s]d, the “repetition of jubilees” formula under a scene of Osorkon I on a pillar of the Bubastite portal, to an anticipatory formula, because there was no room for the full formula used for first and second jubilees. He sees this as aberrant, and attributes it to a co-regency between Shoshenq I and Osorkon I with the latter hoping to celebrate “many jubilees after the manner of his father and co-regent who was celebrating his second jubilee.”

But Kitchen writes, “The tag [wḥm] ḫbw sd apparently applied to Osorkon I … is the known specific formula that is actually used for real second jubilees!” Yet Kitchen can attribute the formula for Shoshenq I, sp tpy wḥm ḫb-sd “First occasion and repetition of the jubilee” as an anticipatory wish, having “no independent historical value,” and says it does not indicate a second jubilee! This is patently contradictory.

It seems that the words alone cannot resolve whether these are celebratory or anticipatory wishes. The interpretation depends on the bias and assumptions of the individual. Kitchen wanted to assign only 21 years to Shoshenq I and 35 years to Osorkon I, whereas Wente wanted to assign 34 years to Shoshenq I and only 12 years to Osorkon I.

Neither scholar can attribute a jubilee to both kings because this would put Shoshenq’s accession before the date of 945 BCE (Kitchen) and 948 BCE (Wente) and destroy the synchronism with Rehoboam’s fifth year, which they date to 925 BCE and 928 BCE, respectively. Yet, that is a consequence of their incorrectly perceived term of the early period of the 22nd Dynasty and their erroneous date of Rehoboam’s fifth year, which is properly dated to 977 BCE.

Kitchen’s arguments for a long reign of Osorkon I of 35 years is 20 years longer than the 15 years given him by Manetho, intimating that the latter number is damaged. Egyptian numerals are usually written in two rows in a single line of writing and are read from right to left.

---

68 Kitchen, TIP, 111 §89.
69 Ibid., 111 §89.
71 Kitchen, TIP, 544 §451.
72 Ibid., 544 §451.
Applying this practice, 15 and 35 would appear in hieroglyphics as shown in Figure 36.3.

Figure 36.3: Hieroglyphics of 15 and 35.

If the two ten-signs (arches) on the right are broken away, miscopied, or so damaged as to be illegible, the number 15 remains. This may have happened to the number for Osorkon I’s regnal years as seen by Manetho when recording the dynastic lists from their original display.

If Osorkon I’s years can be increased by 20 as claimed by Kitchen, then cannot Shoshenq I’s years be increased also to accommodate the arguments for a longer reign than 21 years put forward by Wente? Supposing that Shoshenq I’s regnal years were also deficient by two ten-signs, the number would originally have been written as 41 (see Figure 36.4).

Figure 36.4: Hieroglyphics of 41 using two additional ten-signs.

When the two ten-signs were lost, only | n would remain: the number 21. Manetho’s list provides one other example of regnal years: the 13 attributed to Takeloth II, first ruler of the later period of the 22nd Dynasty. Kitchen assigned 25 years to Takeloth II, his Year 24 noted in The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon. But using the same application as above, it cannot be seen how 25 could become 13 by eliminating two ten-signs, but it could become 13 if the original number was 33 (see Figure 36.5).

Figure 36.5: Hieroglyphics of 33.

Thus, 33 could have become | n (13). From the examples of Osorkon I and Takeloth II who could be demonstrated to have reigned past 15 and 13 years, respectively, the same may be applied to Shoshenq I.

Reinstating two ten-signs to Shoshenq I would give him 41 regnal years, a quite plausible total. Kitchen noted that “Late in Year 21 ... work began in the sandstone quarries at Gebel Silsila,” and that “no pharaoh had wrought in Karnak on this vast scale for almost four centuries.” However, he presumes that Shoshenq I died the following year. Is it not far more credible that the vast amount of construction took place over some 20 years (when it hadn’t been achieved in the previous 400 years) than to think it all took place in less than a year? From the above discussion it is feasible to attribute 35 regnal years to Osorkon I, but confirmation is needed.

Priestly Inductions at New Moon

The recently discovered Block Karnak 94, CL 2149 mentions the date of I šmw 13 either in year 11 or year three of Psusennes II. The favored date is year three, because it exactly matches the date of a new moon on that date for the induction of the priest Nesankhefenmaat.

On the same block is a date for the second and third year of a king whose name is damaged but identified as Osorkon I. It refers to an induction of Hor, the son of

74 Kitchen, TIP, 107 §86.
75 See n. 47 above. See also, idem, “Strengths and Weaknesses,” 296.
Nesankhefenmaat, into the priesthood on II 3ḫt 14. Other similar inductions, already mentioned, fall within five days of a new moon, which implies that this date also comes within five days of a lunar Day One. If Shoshenq I reigned 41 years from 997/996 BCE, his reign would end and Osorkon I’s begin ca. 958/957 BCE (depending on the length of Shoshenq I’s final year), and his third year ca. 955/954 BCE (−954/−953). Casperson provides Table 36.10 for −953.

Table 36.10: Osorkon I’s third year −953 (new moon listing for −953)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian</th>
<th>Gregorian</th>
<th>Egyptian</th>
<th>DoW</th>
<th>ToD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr</td>
<td>Mo</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Yr</td>
<td>Mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−953</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>−953</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−953</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>−953</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−953</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>−953</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

In −953 (954 BCE) there was a new moon on II 3ḫt 11. That date infers that the induction of Hor took place three days later, at the end of Osorkon I’s third year. If it had been at the beginning, his first year would have begun in the year 956 BCE, which would create a gap of about one year between the end of the 41st year of Shoshenq I ending in 958 or 957 BCE (again depending on the length of his final year). A date of I–IV prt in Shoshenq I’s first year is about as early as it could be, while keeping IV prt 25 in his fifth year.

Dates Correlated for Psusennes II, Shoshenq, and Osorkon I

Psusennes II’s 14th year cannot end earlier than III prt 10–19 because his 13th year included those dates for the induction of Nesankhefenmaat. Psusennes II’s 14th year, if beginning soon after III prt 10–19, would begin his 15th year at about the same time as Shoshenq I’s first year, which has to begin before IV prt 25. Therefore, the accession of Shoshenq I is close to the end of Psusennes II’s 14th year, and one can speculate that Shoshenq I began his co-regency on the accession date of Psusennes II about the beginning of IV prt.

Osorkon I’s Accession in 957 BCE and Shoshenq I’s Length of Reign

Returning to the reign of Osorkon I, the very latest date for his third year would be II 3ḫt 14, the date of the induction of Hor, after which his fourth year would begin on II 3ḫt 15. Therefore, his accession could not be earlier than II 3ḫt 15 just over three years previously in 957 BCE. Our foregoing analysis indicates that the accession of Shoshenq I likely took place in IV prt before day 25 the latter equating to 20 December in 998 BCE. Most of Shoshenq I’s first year occurred over 997, and his 20th year in 977 was the same as Rehoboam of Judah’s fifth year.

Shoshenq I’s 41st year would have ended in III or IV prt, but his reign did not end until Osorkon I’s accession after III 3ḫt 14, thus Shoshenq I reigned about six months of his 42nd year. This would round down to 41 years. Beginning to reign possibly in the latter half of III prt down to sometime before IV prt 25, would equate to mid-November to late December. Shoshenq I may be assigned the years 998/997 to 957 BCE.

Corroboration of Osorkon I’s Accession Year from Bubastis

The accession year of Osorkon I is further confirmed by a list of his donations at
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76 The various 21st and 34th years proposed by scholars for Shoshenq I’s reign do not accommodate a date of II 3ḫt 14 being near a new moon date on the above timeframe.
Bubastis. Redford, seeking to illustrate that regnal years were counted from a king’s accession date and not from the beginning of the year in the New Kingdom, writes:

This text reviews the list of royal bequests “which H. M. gave to all the temples and shrines of the gods in Upper and Lower Egypt from regnal year 1, first month <shomu> day 9 [sic]" to regnal year 1, fourth month of <shomu>, day 25, making 3 years, 3 months and 16 days.”

These bequests were made up of “handsome gifts of gold and silver vessels and furnishings upon the temples of the major deities of Egypt” as reported by Kitchen.

Of particular interest here is the date šmw 9 for his first year. This year fell in −957 according to our date for Osorkon I’s third year in 954 BCE. Table 36.11 provides Casperson’s lunar table for the year −956.

Table 36.11: Osorkon I’s first year −956 (new moon listing from −956 to −955)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian</th>
<th>Gregorian</th>
<th>Egyptian</th>
<th>DoW</th>
<th>ToD</th>
<th>Morning visibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr</td>
<td>Mo</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Yr</td>
<td>Mo</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−956</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>−956</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−956</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>−956</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−955</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>−955</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

In −956, the new moon fell on I šmw 9, precisely the date given for the start of the bestowal of the precious gifts, probably indicating that it was the beginning of an Amun Tepi Shomu feast, and the bestowal went on for 3 years, 3 months, and 16 days—a magnificent start to Osorkon I’s reign!

Presumably, the date was chosen because it was the beginning of a lunar month, or the day of the new moon. As noted, the date falls after II 3ḫt 15 of the year −956, possibly about seven months into his first regnal year. The coincidence of this date falling on −956 (957 BCE) determined to be Osorkon I’s first year after Shoshenq I’s reign of 41 years lends further credence to the length of the latter’s reign.

Osorkon Reigned 35 Years

Earlier evidence has supported the fact that Osorkon I achieved a 30-year reign marked by a Jubilee, and also the 3 or 4 more years that are recognized by a repetition of the Jubilee. It is almost certain that Osorkon I reigned for at least 33 years, and my chronology proposes the number as 35 years.

One might object that the priestly office of Hor’s father, Nesankhefenmaat, beginning in the third (not 11th) year of the reign of Psusennes II in 1008 would extend his incumbency down to 954 BCE, or an unlikely lengthy period of 54 years. Nesankhefenmaat might have been quite young when inducted. That may be borne out by the pontificate of his father, Nesamun, who was inducted into office in the reign of Siamun (Block Karnak 94, CL 2149). In the Karnak Priestly Annals, the father of Nesankhefenmaat is named as Hori. If Nesamun is the same person as Hori, then his induction took place in Siamun’s 17th year in 1012. Preceding Hori’s/Nesamun’s induction his father, Nespaneferhor, was inducted in year two of Osorchor the Elder in 1035. From these dates we learn that Nespaneferhor officiated from 1035 to 1012 BCE."
for 23 years, Hori/Nesamun from 1012 to 1008 BCE for 4 years, and Nesankhefenmaat from 1008 to 954 BCE for 54 years.

The very short pontificate of Hori/Nesamun compared with the preceding 24 years and the succeeding 54 years indicates that two generations cover the latter two pontificates. The short pontificate of Hori/Nesamun is offset by the long one of Nesankhefenmaat implying that the latter must have taken over the duties when he was relatively young. Attributing to Nesankhefenmaat a pontificate of 54 years is not a real problem.

Shoshenq I’s reign contributed 41 years to the first division of the 22nd Dynasty, from 998/997 to 957 BCE, leaving 84 of the 125 years to be distributed to the remaining kings. Of these, Osorkon I can be attributed 35 years, 957–922 BCE, leaving 49–50 years down to the date of 872 BCE.

**Shoshenq IIa (Heqakheperre Setepenre Shoshenq Meryamun)**

Shoshenq IIa is not mentioned in Manetho’s list of the 22nd Dynasty kings, nor is he named on the Pasenhor stela genealogy. However, he is generally identified as the first of the “three other kings” referred to by Africanus. Yet issues of his identity have been controversial, and due to recency, are reported, unfortunately, at some length.

At Tanis in 1939, Pierre Montet discovered, in the antechamber of the tomb of Psusennes I—the only unviolated tomb of the 21st Dynasty—the mummy of a Shoshenq Heqakheperre in a silver coffin with a falcon’s head. Examination by Douglas Derry of the Cairo Museum’s Anatomy Department in 1939 showed evidence of rootlets in the leg bones of the mummy having penetrated through the damaged end of the coffin, suggesting that it had been moved from a waterlogged original burial site, and reburied in Psusennes I’s tomb.

The king had a severe head injury indicating that he died of massive infection. He was judged to be in his 50s at death. As evidence of the coffin’s reburial, Dodson confirmed that the coffin had suffered damage through “rough handling in antiquity.” In the funerary equipment were jewelry and priceless pectorals, including one of Shoshenq I before he became king, that is, “The great Chief of the Ma, Chief of Chiefs, Shoshenq,” and a couple of bracelets naming Shoshenq I as king. But the tomb did not have any object naming Osorkon I. Some scholars consider this strange if Shoshenq II was the son of Osorkon I. So some suggest that he may have been the son of Shoshenq I. That would make him a brother or half-brother to Osorkon I. Kitchen identified this Shoshenq Heqakheperre as the High Priest of Amun (HPA), Shoshenq C, son of Osorkon I and his wife Maätkare B, the daughter of Psusennes II. In this case, Shoshenq Heqakheperre would have been the half-brother of Takeloth I who was also the son of Osorkon I—by his second wife, Tashedkhons.

Kitchen notes that Shoshenq C used a cartouche while still High Priest, indicating expectations to the throne. From the inscription on the rear of the statue of the god Bes, he says it was dedicated by the High Priest Harsiese to his father High Priest Shoshenq C. Kitchen notes that Harsiese merely called himself “son of the pontiff and army-chief,” and Kitchen uses this designation to support his claim that Shoshenq Hekakheperre (IIa)
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was only a co-regent with his father,\(^{86}\) whereas, if his father had been king, he would have called himself the son of the king.\(^ {87}\) (Harsiese, the High Priest of Amun, is identified as Harsiese B to distinguish him from Takeloth I’s son, known as Harsiese A, who later became king of Thebes, while Osorkon II reigned in Tanis.)

Kitchen also sides with the views of several earlier scholars (Montet, Driotton, and Vandier) in assuming that Shoshenq II predeceased his father,\(^ {88}\) and therefore could only have been co-regent, never sole-reign king.\(^ {89}\) He also claims that had Shoshenq II ruled as sole-reign king he would not have been succeeded by Takeloth I, his half-brother, but by his son Harsiese.\(^ {90}\) Kitchen continued to maintain this position in 2009.

Broekman gave cogent reasons in 2000 and 2001 why Shoshenq Heqakheperre should be identified with the HPA Shoshenq C, son of Osorkon and Maätkare B\(^ {91}\) (thus agreeing with Kitchen). For example, Shoshenq’s unique prenomen, Heqakheperre, is based on the model of kings using original names at the beginning of the 22nd Dynasty, and not after the reign of Takeloth I when previously used names were adopted.\(^ {92}\) Furthermore, in the funeral equipment of Shoshenq Heqakheperre were found items such as bracelets and a pectoral belonging to Shoshenq I and none that could be dated later.\(^ {93}\)

Broekman observes that Shoshenq II, as son of Osorkon I of the 22nd Dynasty and Maätkare, his mother, of the 21st Dynasty, was in a strong position to succeed his father as king, the female line being considered very important. Broekman writes, “Especially during the 21st dynasty the high ranking ladies played a significant role and the maternal line greatly influenced the succession in the leading positions.”\(^ {94}\) He had no need to trace his descent back a further generation to Psusennus II to prove his claim to kingship.\(^ {95}\)

Significantly, in 2001, Broekman pointed out that seven inscriptions describe the HPA Shoshenq C as the son of King Osorkon I. Three of them include the name of the mother of HPA Shoshenq, Maätkare. Two of them name her as daughter of king Psusennes II.\(^ {96}\) It would be extremely unusual for a Shoshenq and a Maätkare to have
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\(^{86}\) In 1975, Helen Jacquet-Gordon questioned Kitchen’s attribution of Shoshenq II as the king portrayed on the Bes statue as the co-regent of Osorkon I, because she noted that the 1st prophet (High Priest) Harsiese could only have officiated either while his father was co-regent or after he had died since they couldn’t both be 1st prophet at the same time. Since he did not call his father king in the Bes statue, only 1st prophet, she said it indicated Shoshenq held no pretensions to the throne and could not have become King Heqakheperre Shoshenq (H. Jacquet-Gordon, “Review of K.A. Kitchen’s ‘The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt(1100-650 BC),’” Bibliotheca Orientalis 32 [1975] 359). But, in 1995, Karl Jansen-Winkeln showed that Jacquet-Gordon had misread the Bes inscription, pointing out that it refers to the HPA Shoshenq and his son the prophet of Amun, Harsiese (“Historische Probleme der 3. Zwischenheit,” JEA 81 [1995] 130, 132). Since the inscription appears to have been dedicated while Shoshenq was High Priest, Shoshenq HPA could have become king later (G.P.F. Broekman, “Shoshenq Maäkheperre and Shoshenq Heqakheperre,” GM 176 [2000] 39).

\(^{87}\) Ibid., 119 §94.

\(^{88}\) Ibid., 119 §94, n. 170.


\(^{90}\) Idem, TIP, 119-20 §94.


\(^{92}\) Ibid., 40; idem, “Once More Shoshenq,” 29.


\(^{94}\) Ibid., 29.


two sons called Shoshenq, so the conclusion is that HPA Shoshenq C is Shoshenq Heqakheperre (Shoshenq II).

Broekman’s analysis of shabtis attributable to Shoshenq Heqakheperre compared with others buried in tombs at Tanis, indicate Shoshenq Heqakheperre lived in the early part of the 22nd Dynasty, not in the latter part (noted above). Shoshenq Heqakheperre’s silver coffin was found reburied in the tomb of Psusennes I (NRT III) on a platform in the vestibule with mummies and funerary equipment of two other coffins that had decayed except for their bronze parts, suggesting that the mummies were of royal blood.

Yoyotte had identified them as Siamun on the left of Shoshenq Heqakheperre, and Psusennes II on the right. Unlike tombs of the 18th to 20th Dynasties made only for one king, the tombs of the 21st Dynasty were family tombs. In the reburial of Shoshenq II he was placed with four kings of the 21st Dynasty: Psusennes I, Amenemope, Siamun (whose descent is uncertain), and Psusennes II; all of Psusennes I’s dynastic successors except Osorkor the Elder, who may have been buried in a new cemetery.

Shoshenq Heqakheperre’s reburial in a family tomb resembles the mummies buried later in the family tomb of Osorkon II at Tanis (NRT I), in which also were laid to rest Takeloth I (Osorkon II’s father), and Osorkon II’s son, Harnakh HPA. Dodson suggests that the 21st and 22nd Dynasty kings down to Takeloth I had previously been in a new cemetery—location unknown—and that Osorkon II, perhaps to save them from groundwater problems, had them removed to Tanis, where he kept Shoshenq II with his 21st Dynasty predecessors, and his (Osorkon II’s) own family of the 22nd Dynasty not connected to the 21st Dynasty, in his own family tomb.

Shoshenq II’s reburial with 21st Dynasty kings reinforces his claim to the throne through his presumed mother Maätkare, and also through his presumed father Osorkon I, and also as grandson of Shoshenq I. Thus Shoshenq II’s burial in the anteroom of Psusennes I’s tomb is consistent with him being the HPA, son of Osorkon I and Maätkare, daughter of Psusennes II.

Broekman concludes that Shoshenq Heqakheperre succeeded Osorkon I, his father. After the deep wound to his head from which he appears to have died, Shoshenq II was succeeded by Takeloth I, his (presumed) half-brother, son of Osorkon I by his lesser wife, Tashedkhons. This conclusion accords with Kitchen’s position.

Maäkheperre Setepenre Shoshenq Meryamun

Scholars’ discussions about the identity of Shoshenq Heqakheperre did not rest with Kitchen’s identity of him as the HPA Shoshenq C, son of Osorkon I and Maätkare, but also involved the identity of a king whose name was mentioned on an inscription on the back of the Cairo statue CG 42192. The statue had earlier been used by Thutmose III.
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97 The Royal Tombs at Tanis are designated as NRT-I to VII. The discoveries were reported in a series of volumes entitled La nécropole royale de Tanis by Jean Pierre Marie Montet. Volume 1 was published in 1947.
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It speaks of a king who was begotten by a king of Upper and Lower Egypt, named Tyetkheperre Setepenre Hor-Pasbakaenniut Meryamun; that is, Psusennes II. Broekman translates:

… (a work made by the lord of) the strength, lord of accomplishing benefactions (?), whom Amon himself had chosen, Maäkheperre Setepenre, son of Re from his own flesh, beloved by him, lord of Appearances Shoshenq Meryamun, which his majesty made as a monument for his father Amun (?) (after having renewed) its name on the one who has begotten him, the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, lord of the two lands, lord of the ritual, Tyetkheperre Setepenre, the son of Re, lord of appearances Hor-Pasbakaenniut Meryamun, to whom may be given all live [sic], stability and dominion and all health, forever like Re (?).

This inscription makes clear that Maäkheperre laid claim to the throne by being chosen by Amun and begotten of Psusennes II. Prior to 1990, this Shoshenq had been identified as Shoshenq I, but then Malte Römer pointed out that the king named is Shoshenq Maäkheperre spelt with a Maä feather, not Shoshenq Hedjkheperre (Shoshenq I) written with a Hedj, white crown sign, which for him eliminated Shoshenq I—more so because he was not a son of Psusennes II.

Römer concluded that Heqakheperre found in the tomb of Psusennes II was the same as Maäkheperre of the Cairo statue CG 42192, though he had to assume that there had been an error in the writing of the name Maäkheperre and Heqakheperre (the latter having a heqa scepter sign). Subsequently, however, because it was thought improbable that the names had been incorrectly inscribed, especially unlikely on the tomb of a king, various scholars concluded that Shoshenq Heqakheperre and Shoshenq Maäkheperre were different individuals, and a new king Shoshenq Maäkheperre should be recognized. His father was assumed to be the HPA Shoshenq C son of Osorkon I and Maätkare B, having Psusennes II as his maternal grandfather.

This identification meant that Shoshenq Heqakheperre could not also be the son of Osorkon I and Maätkare B as Kitchen had proposed, as it would mean that the couple had two sons both named Shoshenq, which was improbable. The fact that no items belonging to Osorkon I had been found in the tomb of Shoshenq Heqakheperre (who was assumed to have predeceased and been buried by his father—according to Kitchen’s assertion that Shoshenq II was co-regent with Osorkon I), was cited as evidence that Hekakheperre was not the son of Osorkon I, but possibly the son of Shoshenq I since near his tomb was found a pectoral of the great chief of the Ma, Shoshenq A, before he became king, as well as a bracelet naming Shoshenq after he became king. Since kings were often buried with objects belonging to their parents, it is proposed by some scholars (e.g. Jansen-Winkeln) that Shoshenq Hekakheperre was a son of Shoshenq I. This identification meant a position had to be found for him in the early 22nd Dynasty where his unique prenomen Heqakheperre indicated he belonged, because after Takeloth I there was no originality in throne names.

Jürgen von Beckerath suggested that if Maäkheperre is not the same as Heqakheperre, then Heqakheperre might be the son of Takeloth I having a short reign before that of Osorkon II. Scholars who don’t identify Shoshenq Heqakheperre as being the son of HPA Shoshenq C, and son of Osorkon I, place him two generations later as a person whose lineage and right to the throne is unknown.

Dodson’s view that Shoshenq II’s hawk-headed coffin (Cairo JE 72154) was similar to the hawk-headed coffin lid of the granite tomb of Harsiese (JE 60137) from Medinet Habu, which was made for Ramesses II’s sister Henmutmire, has been cited as evidence that Shoshenq II and Harsiese A were contemporaries.

Unfortunately, no burial item of Osorkon I has been discovered by which to compare them. Items of Shoshenq I found in Shoshenq Heqakheperre’s tomb were then explained as heirlooms and not suggestive of an immediate filial link. But Broekman believes that if Shoshenq Heqakheperre had been contemporary with Osorkon II, then objects belonging to kings later than Shoshenq I would have been found in his tomb.

The identity of Shoshenq Maäkheperre was newly explained by Broekman in 2000 when he proposed that Shoshenq Maäkheperre could be the actual son of Psusennes II as he claimed on the Cairo Statue CG 42192 in order to boost his right as heir to the throne. Broekman notes that the name Shoshenq occurs in the 21st Dynasty among the ancestors of Psusennes II or his wife. Shoshenq Maäkheperre could claim his descent from his great-grandparents, Shoshenq A and his wife Mehtenweskhet, his grandfather Osorkon the Elder, and his father, Psusennes II.

Shoshenq Heqakheperre, on the other hand, could claim his descent from Shoshenq A and Mehtenweskhet his great-great-grandparents, his great-grandfather Nimlot A, his grandfather Shoshenq B (Shoshenq I), and his father Osorkon I. If Heqakheperre is Shoshenq II, son of Osorkon I and Maätkare, and succeeded his father, where and when did Shoshenq Maäkheperre, presumed son of Psusennes II, have his reign, since Psusennes was succeeded by Shoshenq I?

Broekman notes from the Karnak Priestly Annals fragment 4, that Shoshenq I was not yet recognized as king in Thebes in his second regnal year, being called only “Great Chief of the Ma.” Broekman proposes that it is probable that Shoshenq Maäkheperre’s claim to kingship was supported in Thebes.

However, as discussed above, there was a five-year co-regency between Psusennes II and Shoshenq I indicating the absence of a son to succeed Psusennes II, so Broekman’s idea can be set aside. That leaves us with a Maäkheperre Shoshenq of no
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known origin. The Cairo statue CG 42192 is the sole attestation of a king with this name. However, he is not the only newly discovered “Shoshenq.”

**Tutkheperre Meryamun Shoshenq**

In 2004, Eva Lange suggested the possibility of another hitherto unidentified king with the name of Tutkheperre Shoshenq. She referred to a damaged lintel fragment from the Great Temple of Bubastis discovered in 1994 by an expedition from the University of Potsdam. The fragment, found in the western part of the central courtyard (classification H/3.9), shows the topmost part of a king’s titular, which appears to have originally been six columns, but with only five now remaining. Column three contains the prenomen Tutkheperre (*twt hpr rʿw*) in vertical writing and to its right in column four, clearly the nomen Shoshenq.

Dodson, who referred to this inscription in 2002, thought that the Tutkheperre referred to is Psusennes II who had this prenomen, and the “Shoshenq” was his successor, Shoshenq I. But Lange points out that the spelling of the *tjt* (*Tut*) in Psusennes II’s prenomen is different from the *twt* spelling in the lintel. Ascribing them to the one king is problematical. But she acknowledges that the *twt* spelling is used in the prenomen of Psusennes II on the Cairo Statue CG 42192 from Karnak.

Assuming that the two cartouches belong to the one person, she points out that none of the Shoshenqs I–V has the prenomen Tutkheperre. As added evidence for a new king Tutkheperre Shoshenq, she notes an inscription first published by E. Amelinéau in 1897–1898. The inscription was on a fragment of a receptacle from Abydos and had two incompletely preserved cartouches one beginning with the prenomen Tutkheperre and in the other the lower part of the damaged name [*[…]amun*; that is, Meryamun.

In 1995, M.A. Bonheme examined the ostraca, now in the Louvre Museum, and read the same Tutkheperre [Meri]amun written in black ink. He adds that the ostraca had been discovered near the 1st Dynasty tomb of Osiris at Abydos among votive deposits of varying dates beginning with the New Kingdom (18th Dynasty). It was assumed that the writer had mistakenly inscribed the chick symbol for Tut (*twt*) instead of the red crown sign for Hedj as for Hedjkheperre Shoshenq; that is, Shoshenq I.

When Yoyotte examined the original fragment, he read in the lower part of the damaged cartouche the nomen “Shoshenq,” thus giving the reading Tutkheperre Meryamun Shoshenq. Lange emphasizes that these cartouches belong to only one king. She refers also to two cartouches having a prenomen and nomen of a Shoshenq, which were found earlier on a receptacle from Abydos by E. Naville, published in 1891. Lange suggests that these might also have referred to Tutkheperre Shoshenq. She notes the scarcity of attestation. On the advice of K. Jansen-Winkeln, she suggests that Tutkheperre Shoshenq reigned in the first half of the 22nd Dynasty.
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In 2009, Kitchen proposed that Maatkheperre was the name used by Shoshenq I in order “to adopt a titular style acceptable to the latently hostile Theban authorities, very soon after his accession.”\textsuperscript{131} Kitchen appeals to the fact that Shoshenq I was still just “Great Chief of the Ma” in his year two. Kitchen has not recognized that Psusennes II had a co-regency with Shoshenq I in the last five years of his reign, which would account for the use of his old designation. However, according to Kitchen, the name Maatkheperre did not impress the Thebans so Shoshenq I changed his name from Maatkheperre to Tyetkheper(u)re, the prenomen of Psusennes II, to make himself “a direct reincarnation.”\textsuperscript{132} However, this gambit also failed, so Shoshenq I adopted the prenomen Hedjkheperre, that of Smendes, the founder of the 21st Dynasty—the dynasty he was replacing.\textsuperscript{133}

Thus, Shoshenq IIb and IIc are none other than Shoshenq I with prenomens he used in the early years of his reign to “win hearts and influence people.” Kitchen says that Shoshenq I is not known by his prenomen Hedjkheperre before his fifth year.\textsuperscript{134}

The elimination of Tutkhheperre Shoshenq IIb and Maakheperre Shoshenq IIc just leaves Hedjkheperre Shoshenq I and his probable grandson, Heqakheperre Shoshenq IIa as kings with the name of Shoshenq in the early period of the 22nd Dynasty.

**Shoshenq IIa’s Length of Reign**

In the Nile Level Texts, just above the earliest texts, those of Shoshenq I (No. 1 with year 6) and Osorkon I (No. 2 with year 12), is a text (No. 16) with just the name of the High Priest Iuwelot and “son of the king, the lord of the two lands (\textit{nb t3wy}) Osorkon” with a year 5.\textsuperscript{135}

Since Iuwelot was a youth in year 10 of his father, Osorkon I, he must have been HPA in the reign of his successor, either Shoshenq IIa or Takeloth I.\textsuperscript{136} The position of No. 16 close to Nos. 1 and 2 is appropriate for the son and grandson of the previous two, whose texts were the first to be engraved on the quay wall.

Most scholars seem agreed that this text belongs to Shoshenq IIa, in which case it is possible to attribute to him a reign at least \textit{into his fifth year} in our chronology. Kitchen regards Shoshenq IIa as a \textit{co-regent} with Osorkon I, reasoning that if Shoshenq IIa had been sole king, his descendants—and not those of his brother Takeloth I—would have succeeded to the throne.

Kitchen gives Shoshenq IIa ca. two years, and the dates of ca. 892–890 BCE subsumed under Osorkon I’s reign dated to 924–889 BCE.\textsuperscript{137} It is necessary for Kitchen to make Shoshenq IIa a co-regent because there are \textit{no available years} to give him a place as a sole-reign king in his chronology with an upper limit of 945 BCE for the accession of Shoshenq I. The fact that Shoshenq IIa is not mentioned in the Pasenhor genealogy can be explained by the fact that the genealogy passed down from Shoshenq I’s daughter-in-law, Tashedkhons, the daughter of Psusennes II married to Osorkon I, and the mother of Takeloth I, and on to Osorkon II, most likely continued with Takeloth II and the kings of the 22nd Dynasty.\textsuperscript{138} On the other hand, Shoshenq IIa was the son of Maatkare, Osorkon I’s first wife, and his son Harsiese was only a local king of Thebes

\textsuperscript{131} Kitchen, “Overview of Fact & Fiction,” 172.
\textsuperscript{132} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{133} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{134} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{135} Broekman, “Nile Level records,” 164, 166, 169, 170.
\textsuperscript{136} Ibid., 170, 173.
\textsuperscript{138} Recorded by Kitchen himself, \textit{TIP}, 106-07, §§85-86.
and did not continue the dynastic line. Just because he is not mentioned on the stela is no reason to assume that Shoshenq Iia cannot have had regnal years of his own. The year five attributed to him on the Nile Level Text presumes a fifth year.

Giving Osorkon I a reign of 35 years dates him to 957–922 BCE, and Shoshenq Iia with a provisional reign of five years will give him the dates 922–917 BCE. Thus, to the end of the first period of the 22nd Dynasty in 872 BCE, there are no more than 45 years to accommodate the remaining kings.

**Takeloth I (Hedjkheperre Setepenre Takeloth Meryamun)**

Takeloth I was the son of Osorkon I and his lesser wife Queen Tashedkhons, presumed half-brother to Shoshenq Iia. He is identified here as the second of Manetho’s “three other kings” in the early period of the 22nd Dynasty.

In 1939, Pierre Montet discovered in the tomb of Osorkon II, the burial of a king whose coffin was inscribed with two cartouches: Hedjkheperre Setepenre and Takeloth Meryamun, as well as other items bearing the name of Takeloth Meryamun. Knowing this to be the name of Takeloth II, the coffin was presumed by Montet and other scholars to be that of Takeloth II, son of Osorkon II. When Kitchen discussed Takeloth I in his 1973 and 1986 editions of *TIP*, Takeloth’s prenomen was not known, so distinguishing Takeloth I from Takeloth II was then difficult.

However, in 1987, Karl Jansen-Winkeln was able to demonstrate that Hedjkheperre Setepenre Takeloth Meryamun was the name of Takeloth I; whereas the name of Takeloth II had the additional nomen epithet “Si-Ese” (son of Isis). Jansen-Winkeln reported that on the east wall of Room III near the burial of Osorkon II and Takeloth is a scene of the two kings. On the left is a king with two cartouches above him identifying him as Usimare Setapenamun Osorkon Meryamun, that is Osorkon II, and the text “a son, furbishing the one who created him.” On the right, separated by four columns of text appear an Osiris figure (god of the dead) and an Udjo (or Wedjet) figure (raised cobra as protector of the pharaoh).

Jansen-Winkeln identified the Osiris figure as the deceased Takeloth I. The text between the figures, using Kitchen’s translation, reads:

[Made?] by the King of the South and North Egypt, Lord of Both Lands, *Usimare Setepenamun*, Son of Re, Lord of Crowns, *Osorkon II Meryamun*, [to furbish?] the Osiris King (2) *Takeloth Meryamun*, in his Mansion which is [an abode] of the Sun-disc: “I have caused him to rest in this Mansion, in the vicinity of (3) “Hidden-of-Name” (= Amun), according to the doing by a son of benefactions for his father, [to] furbish the one who made his fortune(?), in conformity with what Horus-Son-of-Isis commanded (4) for his father Wennufer. How pleasant (it is) in my heart, for the Lord of the Gods!

The scene shows Osorkon II clearly honouring his father at his reburial in his (Osorkon II’s) own tomb. So the nearby coffin belonging to Hedjkheperre Setepenre

---

139 Kitchen, *TIP*, 95 §76, 106 §85.
140 Scholars who follow David Aston’s chronology delete Takeloth II from the 22nd Dynasty, where he is in sixth place in Manetho’s list, and then assume that Manetho’s sixth king, Takelothis, is Takeloth I, not II. See D. Aston, “Takeloth II: A King of the Theban 23rd Dynasty?” *JEA* 75 (1989) 139-53. This means they seek to identify “three other kings” between Osorkon I and Takeloth I; whereas Manetho indicates “three other kings” after Osorkon I and before “Takelothis”; that is, Takeloth II. This is why in some Wikipedia websites Takeloth I is designated and not Takeloth II.
143 Ibid., xxii. Emphasis his.
Takeloth Meryamun in Osorkon II’s tomb could only belong to Takeloth I.\textsuperscript{145}

Further evidence that it really was the coffin of Takeloth I and not Takeloth II came from the discovery of a \textit{shabti} in the tomb of Tashedkhons, Takeloth I’s mother, and a heart scarab of “Takeloth Meriamum” without the epithet “Si-ese.”\textsuperscript{146} Jansen-Winkeln also observes that Takeloth I’s name is spelled with a vertical \textit{t} sign; whereas Takeloth II or Takeloth III (of the 23rd Dynasty) is spelt with a small loaf \textit{t} sign and the rope-tether sign, which, when combined with other evidence, distinguishes Takeloth I from Takeloth II and III.\textsuperscript{147}

Based on this new evidence, Kitchen (in 1996) assigned to Takeloth I items that had previously been attributed to Takeloth II: “a donation stela of Year 9 (from Bubastis), another from Berlin (also from Bubastis) and a fragment in the former Grant collection.”\textsuperscript{148}

Concerning the length of Takeloth I’s reign Jansen-Winkeln writes:

A block, presumably from the Serapeum, bears the names of Takelot I and the HP of Memphis, Merenptah; Mariette noted that this was found together with a stela from a Year 14. This might be a stela in Alexandria dated to a Year 14 (without a royal name), and originally came from the Serapeum, as the inscription suggests.\textsuperscript{149}

He comments that if an Apis bull was buried in the 14th year of Takeloth and its successor was the bull buried in the 23rd year of Osorkon II, the year 14 would have to come near the end of Takeloth I’s reign, since the longest known age for an Apis bull is 26 years.

Thus more than 3 years could be attributed to the 14 years known, if the year 14 from the stela found at the Serapeum indeed refers to the reign of Takeloth I. On \textit{this} evidence the \textit{longest} that can be attributed to Takeloth I is a reign of 16–17 years, since it is unlikely that another Apis bull could have come between Takeloth I and Osorkon II as the shortest length known for an Apis bull’s life is 12 years.\textsuperscript{150}

The length of Takeloth I’s reign and those of his predecessor, Shoshenq IIa, and his successor, Osorkon II, have to be considered together because they must fit the years that remain for the early period of the 22nd Dynasty.

\textbf{Nile Level Texts for Takeloth I?}

The Nile Level Texts, which comprise the chronological unit of Nos. 16–21, show a name (where legible) of a High Priest, and a regnal year of an unnamed king who is a son of Osorkon I. Since Shoshenq IIa and Takeloth I were sons of Osorkon I, it is plausible that Takeloth I may be represented in Nile Level Texts 16–21.

Already noted is No. 16 with a year five attributed to Shoshenq IIa. No. 20 is situated above No. 16, and No. 21 engraved below and to the left of Nos. 1 and 2 belonging to Shoshenq I and Osorkon I—the grandfather and father, respectively. Unfortunately, Nos. 20 and 21 are illegible as to the name of the High Priest or the king’s regnal year. Nos. 17, 18, and 19 occupy the central lower levels, with No. 19 being the lowest of all the texts.

\begin{itemize}
  \item Ibid., 257; Kitchen, \textit{TIP}, xxii.
  \item Ibid., 257; Kitchen, \textit{TIP}, xxii.
  \item Kitchen, \textit{TIP}, xxii; see 2nd ed. 327 n. 463.
  \item Jansen-Winkeln, “Third Intermediate Period,” 239. He says that Mariette’s remarks are “rather doubtful,” n. 48.
  \item Ibid., 239 n. 51; see Kitchen, \textit{TIP}, 489 table 20.
  \item The Apis bull that died in the second year of Shabako had a successor that died in his 14th year, so aged about 12 years (Kitchen, \textit{TIP}, 156 §(iii)).
\end{itemize}
These latter three have the name of the High Priest Smendes, presumed to be a younger brother of High Priest Iuwelot, indicating that the latter three are later than No. 16. Of these, No. 17 has a year eight, and No. 18 a year 13 or 14. In No. 19 the year is illegible, but the space for the number in the sketches is less than that for Nos. 17 and 18 and could indicate a number less than eight. Because of the other evidence for a year 14 for Takeloth I, one is inclined to attribute No. 18 with its 13 or 14 years to Takeloth I. The Year eight on No. 17 could then refer to an earlier flood level in his reign, and possibly an even earlier one on No. 19.

That leaves Nos. 20 and 21 without any obvious king to whom they might belong. No. 20 is unusual in adding a wish for eternal life to the name of King Osorkon. Text No. 21 does not have this addition. In the chronological unit of Nos. 16–21, Nos. 17, 18, and 19 are notably written the same; whereas in the legible portion of Nos. 20 and 21, in the part that remains after the damaged first half, the first few hieroglyphs in both texts resemble each other but are different from the hieroglyphs appearing in the same place in Nos. 17, 18, and 19—but are the same as No. 16 to which they are closer on the quay wall.

This suggests that they too might be assigned to Shoshenq IIa, in which case he would have three texts representing him. If his year five on Nile Level Text No. 16 is his highest regnal year, then the other two texts, if referring to him, must represent earlier years. It is peculiar that a king reigning only five years should have three texts assigned to him, but then the rationale for engraving flood heights in various years on the quay wall is not known.

The length of Osorkon II’s reign has a bearing on whether Shoshenq IIa reigned five years, and whether Takeloth I reigned 14 years. Provisionally, assigned a reign of 14 years, Takeloth I’s dates would be 917–903 BCE.

Osorkon II (Usimare Setepenamun Osorkon Meryamun)

Osorkon II is not named by Manetho, but understood here to be the last of the “three other kings” that follow Osorkon I; that is, the fifth and last king of the early period of the 22nd Dynasty. Osorkon II was successor and son of Takeloth I and Queen Kapes. The highest known regnal year for Osorkon II comes from Nile Level Text No. 14, which refers to a year 29 of a king Usimare Setepenamun.

According to Broekman, the orthography of the text uses Version One of ḫpj (Nile flood) indicating a king who reigned prior to Shoshenq III’s 39th year when the Second Version of ḫpj is first attested (Nile Level Text No. 22). This limits the choice to Osorkon II and Shoshenq III who both used the prenomen Usimare Setepenamun.

Broekman thinks it could refer to Shoshenq III but notes that it is not in the expected position between texts Nos. 27 and 29 of Pedubast I’s 19th and 23rd years (of the concurrent 23rd Dynasty), equated with Shoshenq III’s 26th and 30th years, respectively. He also thinks that if it had belonged to Shoshenq III, his name together with that of Prince Osorkon as High Priest, would be expected. Broekman then writes, “It is probable that Osorkon II is the king mentioned in text No. 14, because he was the
first king of the Twenty-second Dynasty to use this phemen; no further indication was needed to distinguish him from preceding kings.\textsuperscript{156}

Nile Level Text No. 14 refers to a year 29. There is no reason to suppose it was a final year. Other evidence shows a 30-year royal jubilee, or \textit{Heb Sed} festival, when the regnal powers of kings were renewed. Among his major building works at Tanis and later at Bubastis, Osorkon II constructed for himself a \textit{sed}-festival hall,\textsuperscript{157} normally indicative of an upcoming 30th year. An inscription from Bubastis appears to record a jubilee celebration in Osorkon II’s 22\textit{nd} year. The relevant part of the inscription is translated as:

Year 22, fourth month of the first season (occurred) the appearance of the king in the temple of Amon, which is in the jubilee-hall, resting on the portable throne; and the assumption of the protection of the two Lands by the king, the protection of the sacred women of the house of Amon, and the protection of all the women of his city … Lo, his majesty sought great benefactions for his father, Amon-Re, when he (Amon) decreed the first jubilee for his son, who rests upon his throne, that he might decree for him a great multitude (of jubilees) in Thebes, mistress of the Nine Bows.\textsuperscript{158}

However, scholars have long noted that the inscription is almost identical to one written for the first \textit{Heb Sed} festival of Amenhotep III. Anthony Spalinger writes: “A well-known inscription from Bubastis dealing with his [Osorkon II’s] \textit{heb-sed} (or Jubilee) festival is actually a copy of an earlier text of Amenhotep III.”\textsuperscript{159} This inscription is dated, though, to Amenhotep III’s year 30, on day one of the 10th month (II \textit{šmw} 1).\textsuperscript{160}

José M. Galan translates the pertinent text:

Year 30, second month of Shemu. Appearing in Amun’s temple, which is in the precinct of the \textit{sed}-festival sitting on the southern litter and starting the protection (\textit{hw}) of the two Lands, by the King. (Consisting of) the protection (\textit{hw}) of the musicians and singers of Amun, and the protection (\textit{hw}) of every woman of the town … Now his majesty is seeking a great deal of magnificence] for his father Amun-Re, as he proclaims the first \textit{sed}-festival of his son, who is sitting on his throne, [and as he announces for him very many (\textit{sed}-festivals) in Thebes, mistress of the Nine Bows.\textsuperscript{161}

The similarity of the two texts, and the fact that \textit{Heb Sed} festivals are celebrated in the 30th year of a king\textsuperscript{162} suggests to Edward Wente, “A mistake that could easily have been made especially if the upper part of the final ten-sign were damaged,” or “that the Year 22 is an error of the modern copyist.”\textsuperscript{163} I earlier reported Kitchen’s 2006 proposal of two alternative chronologies for the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties. In Option A, he continued to give Osorkon II 25 years as he had given him in 2000.\textsuperscript{164} In Option B, he

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{156} Ibid., 174-75.
\textsuperscript{157} Kitchen, \textit{TIP}, 317-19 §§276-80.
\textsuperscript{159} A.J. Spalinger, “Egypt, History of (Dyn. 21-26),” \textit{ABD}, 357. See also van Siclen, “The Accession date,” 296.
\textsuperscript{160} The translation and commentary comparing the texts is found in Van Siclen III, “The Accession date,” 296-98; see also J.M. Galan, “The Ancient Egyptian Sed-Festival and Exemption from Corvee,” \textit{JNES} 59 (2000) 255-56.
\textsuperscript{161} Galan, “Ancient Egyptian Sed-Festival,” 255-56.
\textsuperscript{163} Wente, “Review of \textit{TIP},” 278.
\textsuperscript{164} Kitchen, “Regnal and Genealogical Data,” 50.
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joined other scholars in attributing Nile Level Text No. 14 to Osorkon II with its 29 years, and on the recognition that he celebrated a 30-year jubilee, assigned him 30 years, dying in his 31st year.¹⁶⁵

Like Wente and others before him, the mistake would be that three “ten-signs” (∩∩∩) were misread as two “ten” signs with the third “ten” sign damaged at the top so that it read like two vertical strokes, thus seen as 22. In order to accommodate the extra five years now assigned to Osorkon II, Kitchen overlaps Takeloth II and Shoshenq III by seven years, and subtracts the excess two years from the reign of Shoshenq IV to give him 10 years not 12.¹⁶⁶ Kitchen cannot fit the 30-year reign of Osorkon II into the limited years of his chronology without the overlap theory. In 2009, Kitchen gives Osorkon II 22 years minimum and 30/32 years maximum.¹⁶⁷

Further possible support for Osorkon II celebrating a 30-year jubilee comes from a small stela published by von Beckerath in 1996. It reads, “Regnal Year 22 under the majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Usermaatre Setapenamun (i.e., Osorkon II), son of Re, the appearance of the beloved Osorkon Meryamun in the presence of the deities Osiris, Horus and Isis.”¹⁶⁸

Von Beckerath maintains that because this stela from Osorkon II’s 22nd year does not mention a Heb Sed festival,¹⁶⁹ it implies that Osorkon II did not celebrate a jubilee in this year, for if he had, it would almost certainly have been mentioned.

Recognition of Regnal Years

Assuming that Osorkon II celebrated a 30-year jubilee, and his reign ended in 872 BCE (end of the early period of the 22nd Dynasty), his first year cannot be later than 902. Previously, we gave Takeloth I at least 14 years and the provisional dates of 917–903 BCE, apparently just one year between Takeloth I and Osorkon II, suggesting that Osorkon II had 31 years from 903 to 872 BCE. Recognizing that Shoshenq I had 41 years, Osorkon I 35 years, Shoshenq II 5 years, Takeloth I 14 years, and Osorkon II 31 years, this totals 126 years, or taking rounding-up into full years into account, 125 years for the first division of the 22nd Dynasty. There are no known lunar dates for the last three kings that might have anchored any of their reigns. To eliminate the extra year, I have assigned to Shoshenq IIA 4½ years and to Takeloth I 13½ years, leaving Osorkon II with the 31 years of 903–872 BCE.

Synchronism of Osorkon II with Shalmaneser III of Assyria and Ahab of Israel

Kitchen and other scholars identify Osorkon II as the unnamed “king of Musri,” meaning Egypt, who allied himself with the kings of Hamath, Damascus, and Israel to fight the troops of Shalmaneser III of Assyria at the Battle of Qarqar when Ahab was king of Israel.¹⁷⁰ This identification is consistent with the discovery in Ahab’s palace of a large alabaster vase, a presentation vessel, which had traces of Osorkon II’s cartouche on it.¹⁷¹ If Osorkon II was the unnamed king of Egypt, one of his regnal years must synchronize with the sixth year of Shalmaneser III when the battle of Qarqar was fought. His actual regnal year is not recorded. In my chronology in the
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¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 301; see Excurses I and II and Options A and B on pp. 304-08.
¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 22.
¹⁷¹ Ibid., 284; idem, “Strengths and Weaknesses,” 296; Redford, Egypt, Canaan and Israel, 339-40.
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Chronology of the Divided Kingdom, Shalmaneser’s sixth year dates to 897 BCE—being also Ahab of Israel’s last year. Thus Osorkon II’s accession, dating no earlier than 903, is consistent with his identification as the king of Egypt participating in the Battle of Qarqar in 897 BCE.

Osorkon II and Harsiese

Said to be the last great pharaoh of the 22nd Dynasty, Osorkon II had at least one rival claimant to the throne in the person of Harsiese, the son of Shoshenq IIa. The relationship of Shoshenq IIa to Harsiese is confirmed by the Bes statue inscription, noted earlier, which refers to Shoshenq, first prophet, as son of Osorkon, king of the Two Lands, and his son Harsiese, prophet of Amun. Broekman notes that the inscription was engraved while Shoshenq was still HPA, so that Harsiese could have become HPA after the inscription was carved. Kitchen considers that a HPA Harsiese on the Karnak statue Cairo Cat. 42225 referring to a Nebneteru who bears the cartouches of Osorkon II to be Harsiese A.

When Shoshenq II died the throne went to Takeloth, Shoshenq’s half-brother and not to his son Harsiese. It is proposed by various scholars that after the death of Takeloth I and the accession of Osorkon II in Tanis, Harsiese A aspired to the throne and competed with Osorkon II for recognition as an independent king at Thebes. That Osorkon II and Harsiese were contemporaries is noted by Kitchen, “established by the statue of Nakhtefmut from Karnak (Cairo Cat. 42208) bearing the full titulary of Osorkon II, but given by favor of king Harsiese.”

Kitchen, on the other hand, views Harsiese as being appointed High Priest by Osorkon II, who himself had been High Priest before becoming king, continuing a father-to-son succession of priests (Osorkon I to Shoshenq C to Harsiese A), a breach of principle, eventually leading to long-lasting civil war between the royal line and the priestly line.

Harsiese was not content with being High Priest but took upon himself full royal titulary, adopting the prenomen Hedjkheperre Setepenamun, and acted as king in Thebes. It is speculated that the conflict with Harsiese A as ruler of Thebes and Osorkon II as King of Upper and Lower Egypt was not resolved until Osorkon II’s 12th regnal year when the Nile Level Texts recommence naming the kings starting with Osorkon II’s year 12 in Nos. eight and nine (both texts), by which time it is thought that Harsiese A had died.

Harsiese’s coffin was found at Medinet Habu in the trough of a granite coffin made for Henmutmire, the sister of Ramesses II. It has a hawk-headed lid in a style similar to that of his presumed father Shoshenq II, and also that of Osorkon II. Harsiese’s skull shows a hole had been bored, possibly due to a surgical procedure, which he apparently survived as evidenced by new growth, but which may have ultimately led to his death.

172 Tetley, Divided Kingdom, 166-68, 182, 184.
173 Jansen-Winkeln, however, says that Harsiese was never HPA or the son of HPA (Shoshenq II): this identification being based on a wrong reading [of the Bes statue], (“Historische,” 129-32). He prefers to view Shoshenq II as the son of Shoshenq I. (“Third Intermediate Period,” 236-37).
175 Kitchen, TIP, 108 §87, 315 §274.
176 Ibid., 108 §87.
177 Ibid., 314-17 §§272-75.
178 Dodson, Canopic Equipment, 88-89 and n. 68. Dodson also reports that nothing is known of the burial of Osorkon I (p. 89).
A son, whose name is mostly lost except for the remaining letters ...di/... is presumed to have been inducted High Priest of Amun by his father. Some scholars speculate that this refers to the later king Pedubast I, founder of the 23rd Dynasty.

Harsiese’s reign does not contribute to the chronology of the 22nd Dynasty because his reign was confined to Thebes, but it does give background to the politico-religious situation at the time of Osorkon II’s reign and conjures up possible reasons why Manetho felt it appropriate to divide the dynasty at the junction of the reigns of Osorkon II and Takeloth II.

**Conclusion**

Manetho divided the 22nd Dynasty into two divisions, each with a subtotal (now corrupt). The early period comprised five kings collectively reigning 125 years: Shoshenq I 41 years, Osorkon I 35 years, Shoshenq IIa ca. 5 years, Takeloth I ca. 14 years, and Osorkon II ca. 31 years. The inscriptive references to Tutkheperre Shoshenq (Ilb), and Maakheperre Shoshenq (Ilc) are probably early designations for Shoshenq I before being known as Hedjkheperre Shoshenq, and therefore they did not exist as separate identities with any regnal years or parts thereof. The lack of any significant space for them in the chronology also points in this direction. Table 36.12 can be proposed for the kings of the early period of the 22nd Dynasty with anchor points from written and lunar records.

**Table 36.12: The early period of 22nd Dynasty kings with regnal years and dates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Regnal years</th>
<th>Dates reigned BCE</th>
<th>Lunar anchor points or year periods BCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq I</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>998/997–957</td>
<td>Yr 2, Shoshenq I “justified” at feast III Šmût 14; new moon III 3šmût 13 in 996.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yr 5, wersesh feast IV prt 25; new moon IV prt 20 in 994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon I</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>957–922</td>
<td>Yr 1 bequests beginning on I šmût 7 is new moon in 957 (and lasting 3 yrs 3 mths and 16 days till Yr 4 on IV šmût 25).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yr 3 induction of Hor, II 3šmût 14; new moon II 3šmût 11, 954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq IIa</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>922–917</td>
<td>Nile Level Text 16 appears to give him 5 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth I</td>
<td>13½</td>
<td>917–903</td>
<td>Serapeum stela with 14 yrs, and Nile Level Text 18 with 13 or 14 yrs is probably his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon II</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>903–872</td>
<td>125 years (emended from Manetho’s subtotal [1]25 ends in 872, last year of Osorkon II’s reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manetho Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>125 yrs</strong></td>
<td><strong>998/997–872</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By comparison, Kitchen’s chronology starts the 22nd Dynasty with the year 945 BCE being 43 years after the actual date. He followed Edwin Thiele’s invention for Rehoboam of Judah’s fifth year in 925 using hypothetical dating systems and the Assyrian Eponym Canon. These errors remove 52 years from the chronology of the 22nd Dynasty at its inception. The effect is felt not only in the 22nd Dynasty but down to the end of the 25th Dynasty. Kitchen appears unaware that lunar data can be applied to this dynasty in the reigns of Shoshenq I and Osorkon I. He has not considered the damaged subtotals that Manetho provides via Africanus, which has suggested that the length of the early period of the 22nd dynasty was 125 years. Consequently, Kitchen has to press the known years of a minimal chronology into the years available within his own construct, giving 21 years to Shoshenq I, not realizing that he reigned 41 years. To Osorkon I he correctly gives 35 years, to Shoshenq IIa only 2 co-regent years (therefore, none to the length of the dynasty), to Takeloth I 15 years (not attested, but possible) and to Osorkon II 32/34 years. In all, he gives 103–105 years to the early period: 945–ca. 840 BCE.
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The latter date, 840, is now 32 years lower than it should be at 872 BCE. This impacts on his attempt to date the later period of the 22nd Dynasty.

(13/15 years) and Osorkon II minimally 22 years, more probably (corrected jubilee-date?) just over 30/32 years. Minimal total, 97 years, maximal total 103 years.”