

MANETHO'S 'THREE OTHER KINGS' BETWEEN OSORTHÔN AND TAKELÔTHIS, AND THEIR IMPORTANCE FOR THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE THIRD INTERMEDIATE PERIOD AND THE NEW KINGDOM

By Gerard P.F. Broekman

The Pasenhor stela, dated to year 37 of Shoshenq V, shows the family tree of the Memphite priest Pasenhor B, the dedicator of the stela, including the lineal descent Shoshenq I – Osorkon I – Takeloth I – Osorkon II, who consecutively reigned in the first part of the Twenty-second Dynasty.¹ Beside it, three more kings are known who may be considered to belong to the same period: Shoshenq IIa (*Hk3-hpr-R*)², Shoshenq IIb (*Twt-hpr-R*)³ and Shoshenq IIc (*M3-hpr-R*)⁴.

It has been argued by several scholars that they might have been the 'three other kings' Manetho places, according to the epitome of Africanus, between Osorthôn (Osorkon I) and Takelôthis (Takeloth I).⁵

In a recent article, the purpose of which is to establish a timeline for the New Kingdom and the Third Intermediate Period, Thomas Schneider, too, makes reference to those 'three other kings'.⁶ Schneider argues that in establishing a timeline for the Twenty-Second Dynasty 'The major difficulty are the three Manethonian kings with an alleged cumulative reign of 25 years'.⁷ After having discussed the views of Kitchen,⁸ Jansen-Winkeln, Aston and the present author about the three kings Shoshenq Heqakheperre, Tutkheperre and Maakheperre, he concludes that 'The different assumptions about the three ephemeral kings directly affect the chronology of the earlier New Kingdom'.⁹ From those dif-

ferent assumptions he presents four scenarios concerning the cumulative reign lengths of the three Manethonian kings: scenario 1) 0 years (Hypothesis Kitchen); scenario 2) 6 years (Aston, 1st option); scenario 3) 14 years (Aston, 2nd option) and scenario 4) 25 years (Manetho). Scenario 4 fits the requirements of the New Kingdom lunar dates of Thutmoses III and Ramesses II and would, with a 1-year adjustment for Horemheb, allow for an absolute dating of year 1 of Horemheb into 1314, and therefore it is this scenario 4 that is tentatively accepted by Schneider.¹⁰

However, we should be very suspicious with respect to Manetho's 25 years for the cumulative reign of our three kings.¹¹ This is only mentioned in the epitome of Africanus, who for Dynasty 22 further records 21 years for Sesônchis, 15 years for Ororthôn, 13 years for Takelôthis and 42 years for again three other kings, making altogether 116 years.¹² However, the actual length of the Twenty-second Dynasty as calculated from the monumental evidence is 197–201 years, exclusive of the kings Shoshenq Heqakheperre, Tutkheperre and Maakheperre.¹³ Moreover, whereas Africanus refers to only three other kings after Takelôthis (=Takeloth I), reigning for 42 years altogether, we have actually for this period Osorkon II, Shoshenq III, Shoshenq IV, Pamiu and Shoshenq V, who altogether reigned for at least (31+39+13+6+37=) 126 years.

¹ MALININE, POSENER, VERCOUTTER 1968, 30–31, Pl. 10.

² MONTET 1951, 36–51; BROEKMAN 2001.

³ LANGE 2004; JANSEN-WINKELN 2006, 236–238.

⁴ BECKERATH 1994, 84–87; JANSEN-WINKELN 1995, 145–148; BROEKMAN 2000.

⁵ JANSEN-WINKELN 2006a, 238; ASTON 2008, 21–22.

⁶ SCHNEIDER 2011.

⁷ SCHNEIDER 2011, 375.

⁸ It should be noticed that Schneider, in discussing Kitchen's view concerning the sequence of the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties kings (SCHNEIDER 2011, 375), made a few mistakes: 1. According to Kitchen 845/844 BCE is the end of the reign of Osorkon II instead of the year of his accession. See KITCHEN 2008, 171; 2. In Kitchen's view Shoshenq III did not ascend

the throne after Takeloth II but in about his year 18 or 19 (827/825 BCE). This mistake may be due to Kitchen's rather confusing formulation on page 171 (§ 24) in KITCHEN 2008.

⁹ SCHNEIDER 2011, 376. The mention of Takelot I instead of Takeloth II as the king whose accession Krauss' preferred lunar date option of 845 BCE and his alternative 834 BCE option relate to, is apparently a typing error.

¹⁰ SCHNEIDER 2011, 377.

¹¹ WADDELL 1940, 158–161.

¹² Note however, that Africanus mentions 120 years as the total for the Twenty-second Dynasty.

¹³ SCHNEIDER 2011, 374–375 (Table 2); BROEKMAN 2011, 49–53.

In fact only the length of the reign of Shoshenq I (Sesônchis) of 21 years given by Manetho (in all epitomes) is in accordance with his highest regnal year that is attested in the monumental evidence. For the rest the figures for the Twenty-second Dynasty in Manetho's extant text are completely unreliable. That means that there is no good reason for taking Manetho's 25 years for three other kings between Osorkon I and Takeloth I to be a useful element in establishing the timeline for the Twenty-second Dynasty.

Moreover, by inserting 25 years between these two kings several known genealogies of Theban priests and officials of the Twenty-second Dynasty are lengthened by about a full generation. Concerning the mean length of a generation there are different opinions. Kitchen calculates with an average of 20 years, allowing for a margin of 5 years.¹⁴ According to Bierbrier the mean length of a generation would be 20–25 years.¹⁵ In Jansen-Winkel's view *'the average length of a generation in Ancient Egypt might be nearer to 30 years than to 25 years.'*¹⁶ So an average length of about 27 years may be a plausible assumption.

Only two Theban genealogies are known that in the monumental evidence are chronologically linked to the royal line(s) as well before as after the alleged 25 years rule of the 'Three other kings':

1. In the genealogy of the so-called Nakhtefmut family we have four generations from Djedkhonsefankh A, who flourished at the end of the reign of Osorkon I (See Djedkhonsefankh's statue Cairo CG 559),¹⁷ till the joint reign of Osorkon III and Takeloth III, when Djedkhonsefankh's great-great-grandson Nakhtefmut B erected statue CG 42211 for his father Djedkhonsefankh C.¹⁸ The space of time for these four generations may be calculated for $4 \times 27 = 108$ years. In Schneider's tentatively accepted scenario 4 this period encompasses $25+13+35+39 = 112$ years till the death of Shoshenq III, and by adding 23 years for Osorkon III's sole reign we get a total of 135 years.¹⁹

That means that in Schneider's scenario 4 a full generation jump occurs in the Nakhtefmut family, assuming that the average length of a generation is 27 years.

2. In the Nespaqashuti family we find the Third Prophet of Amun Djedthutefankh A/i, whose wife Tashepenbast was a daughter of Shoshenq I, as appears from statue Cairo CG 42221 of Djedthutefankh's maternal grandson Nesperamun ii.²⁰ As Djedthutefankh's grandfather Nespaqashuti ii was in year 10 of Siamun a senior official we may assume that Djedthutefankh's father Amenemonet I – Nespaqashuti ii's son – was a contemporary of Shoshenq I.²¹ Consequently Djedthutefankh A/i was to all probability an adult at the time of Shoshenq's accession.

Djedthutefankh's son the Vizier Nespaqashuti A/iii dedicated statue Cairo CG 42232 in the initial years of Shoshenq III, as appears from the occurrence of his cartouches and the name and title of the High Priest Harsiese B on the shoulders of the statue.²² As Nespaqashuti's mother is not mentioned on the statue, it is highly probable that Nespaqashuti had been born from a second wife of Djedthutefankh, because if Nespaqashuti's mother had been a daughter of Shoshenq I, that fact would certainly have been stressed.²³

In Schneider's scenario 4 Shoshenq I reigned from 962–941 BC and the reign of Shoshenq III started in 833 BC. On the assumption that Djedthutefankh A/i was an adult at the accession of his father-in-law, he would have been born some 150 years before his son's statue CG 42232 was erected, a space of time encompassing more than five generations! Even if the statue was erected some time after Nespaqashuti's death, either he or his father would have attained an exceptionally great age, a too great age to be credible.

Of course, generation jumps do occur, and of course there are people who reach exceptionally great ages. However, it is highly improbable that these circumstances would occur simultaneously in

¹⁴ KITCHEN 1995, 79.

¹⁵ BIERBRIER 1975, 112–113.

¹⁶ JANSSEN-WINKELN 2006b, 271.

¹⁷ JANSSEN-WINKELN 2007, 95–98 (No. 17.17).

¹⁸ JANSSEN-WINKELN 2007, 320–323 (No. 30.7).

¹⁹ Though the chronological position of Osorkon III with respect to the Twenty-second Dynasty can not exactly be derived from the sources, it appears that he began to reign in or shortly after regnal year 39 of Shoshenq III, as Bierbrier

convincingly has shown from his genealogical investigations (BIERBRIER 1975, 100–101). As Bierbrier's view has been broadly accepted there is no need to review his argumentation here.

²⁰ JANSSEN-WINKELN 2007, 243–245 (25.51).

²¹ BIERBRIER 1975, 64.

²² JANSSEN-WINKELN 2007, 203–207 (22.44).

²³ BIERBRIER 1975, 65.

the family trees of the only two families that are clearly linked up with the royal line.

From the above we may ascertain:

- that we should not rely on Manetho in establishing the length of the reigns of the 'three other kings' between Ororthôn, and Takelôthis, referred to in Africanus' epitome,
- and that, as appears from the monumental evidence regarding the Nakhtefmut and Nespaqashuti families, the space of time between

Shoshenq I and Shoshenq III according to Schneider's preferred scenario 4 is much too long and should be shortened by about a generation. This can only be done by reducing the regnal years of the 'three other kings'.

As a result the year of accession of Shoshenq I as proposed by Schneider,²⁴ will considerably be lowered – by at most 25 year – which will accordingly affect the chronology of the New Kingdom.

Bibliography

- ASTON, D.
2008 *Takeloth II, a King of the Herakleopolitan/Theban Twenty-third Dynasty Revisited. The Chronology of Dynasties 22 and 23*, in: G. P.F. BROEKMAN, R. J. DEMARÉE and O. E. KAPER (eds), *The Libyan Period in Egypt: Historical and Cultural Studies into the 21st–24th Dynasties: Proceedings of a Conference at Leiden University, 25–27 October 2007*, Leiden.
- BECKERATH, J. VON
1994 Zur Rückeninschrift der Statuette Kairo CG 42192, *Or* 63.
- BIERBRIER, M. L.
1975 *The Late New Kingdom in Egypt (c.1300 – 664 B.C.) A Genealogical and Chronological Investigation*, Warminster.
- BROEKMAN, G.P.F.
2000 Shoshenq Maäkheperre and Shoshenq Heqakheperre, *GM* 176, 39–46.
2001 Once More Shoshenq Heqakheperre, *GM* 181, 27–37.
2011 The Egyptian Chronology from the Start of the Twenty-second until the End of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty: Facts, Suppositions and Arguments, *JEH* 4.1.
- JANSEN-WINKELN, K.
1995 Historische Probleme der 3. Zwischenzeit, *JEA* 81, 1995.
2006a *The Chronology of the Third Intermediate Period: Dyns. 22–24*, in: E. HORNING, R. KRAUSS and D. A. WARBURTON (eds), *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, Leiden/Boston.
- 2006b The Relevance of Genealogical Information for Egyptian Chronology, *E&L* 16.
- 2007 *Inschriften der Spätzeit, Teil II: Die 22.–24. Dynastie*, Wiesbaden.
- KITCHEN, K. A.
1995 *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100–650 B.C.)*³, Warminster.
2008 *The third Intermediate Period in Egypt: an Overview of Fact & Fiction*, in G. P.F. BROEKMAN, R. J. DEMARÉE and O. E. KAPER (eds), *The Libyan Period in Egypt: Historical and Cultural Studies into the 21st–24th Dynasties: Proceedings of a Conference at Leiden University, 25–27 October 2007*, Leiden.
- LANGE, E.
2004 Ein neuer König Schoschenk in Bubastis, *GM* 203, 65–72.
- MALININE, M. POSENER, G. VERCOUTTER, J.
1968 *Catalogue des stèles provenant du Serapeum*, Paris.
- MONTET, P.
1951 *Les Constructions et le Tombeau de Psousennès à Tanis*, Paris.
- SCHNEIDER, T.
2011 Contributions to the Chronology of the New Kingdom and the Third Intermediate Period, *E&L* 20, 373–403.
- WADDELL, W. G.
1940 *Manetho*, London/Cambridge, Mass.

²⁴ SCHNEIDER 2011, 403.

