

# ONCE AGAIN THE REIGN OF TAKELOTH II; ANOTHER VIEW ON THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE MID 22<sup>nd</sup> DYNASTY

By Gerard P.F. Broekman

## A. INTRODUCTION

The chronological position and the dynastic affiliation of king Takeloth II was once again at issue at the Egypt & Time Workshop by SCIEEM 2000, on June 30 to July 2, 2005, in Vienna.

Regrettably, I could not personally attend this conference and, instead, I sent in my paper “The Reign of Takeloth II, a Controversial Matter”, published in June 2005.<sup>1</sup>

Kitchen, who also was invited to participate in the “Egypt & Time” Workshop and, just like me, could not personally attend it, sent in a paper, to be discussed at the workshop, entitled “The Strengths and Weaknesses of Egyptian Chronology – an Abrégé”, and most kindly sent me a copy of it.

In my paper I presented an abstract of the theories of K.A. Kitchen and D.A. Aston about the reign of Takeloth II and of the arguments on which their views were based.

In the first edition of his monumental work *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt*,<sup>2</sup> issued in 1973, KITCHEN argued, notably on the ground of the “Chronicle of Prince Osorkon”, that Takeloth II belonged to the 22<sup>nd</sup> Dynasty and that he must have reigned between Osorkon II and Shoshenq III.

In his genealogical work *The Late New Kingdom in Egypt (c. 1300 – 664 B.C.)*, issued in 1975, BIERBRIER followed in general Kitchen’s chronology, though he repeatedly brought Takeloth II’s chronological position up for discussion, as well as the space of time between Takeloth’s reign and that of Osorkon III.<sup>3</sup> Bierbrier’s suggestion that year 21 referred to on a stela from Mendes should

be attributed to Iuput II instead of Iuput I, was adopted by Kitchen, the reign of Iuput I was reduced to a few years coregency alongside Pedubast I, and the reigns of the latter’s successors were raised by ten years.

In 1989 Aston published his article “Takeloth II – A King of the “Theban Twenty-Third Dynasty?”<sup>4</sup>, in which he explained his theory that Takeloth II was not a Tanite king who succeeded his father Osorkon II but that he was a Theban king who reigned for the most part contemporarily with Shoshenq III, thus challenging Kitchen’s broadly accepted position for the composition and dating of the 22<sup>nd</sup> Dynasty.

In the following years others adopted Aston’s view, for instance DODSON in a paper entitled “A New King Shoshenq Confirmed?”, in which he proposed to insert a new king Shoshenq in the 22<sup>nd</sup> Dynasty between Shoshenq III and Pimay.<sup>5</sup>

Von Beckerath endorsed Aston’s opinion<sup>6</sup> and so did JANSEN-WINKELN in his article “Historische Probleme der 3. Zwischenzeit”.<sup>7</sup> In this paper he further elaborated Aston’s theory, advancing new ideas concerning the parentage of Takeloth II, the position of the High Priest Harsiese B and the character of the “Theban 23<sup>rd</sup> Dynasty”.

Kitchen rejected Aston’s new chronology completely as well as his proposition to remove Takeloth II from the 22<sup>nd</sup> Dynasty’s kingly line and to make him a Theban king.<sup>8</sup>

The following tables may be presented as chronological representations of the conceptions of Kitchen (Chronology K) and Aston (Chronology A) respectively (Table 1):<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> BROEKMAN 2005.

<sup>2</sup> KITCHEN 1973/96.

<sup>3</sup> BIERBRIER 1975, 76–77, 83–84, 85 end, 100.

<sup>4</sup> ASTON 1989, 139–153

<sup>5</sup> DODSON 1993.

<sup>6</sup> VON BECKERATH 1995.

<sup>7</sup> JANSEN-WINKELN 1995.

<sup>8</sup> KITCHEN 1973/96, revised 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., xxiii–xxv.

<sup>9</sup> Both chronologies have been adjusted on the basis of more recent views, referred to in BROEKMAN 2005, 24 & notes 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25.

Chronology K Dynasty 22		Chronology A Dynasty 22	
Shoshenq I	945–924	Shoshenq I	945–924
Osorkon I	924–889	Osorkon I	924–889
Takeloth I	889–874	Takeloth I	889–874
Osorkon II	874–850	Osorkon II	874–840
Takeloth II	850–825	Shoshenq III	840–801
Shoshenq III	825–786	Shoshenq IV	801–788
Shoshenq IV	786–773	Pimay	788–782
Pimay	773–767	Shoshenq V	782–745
Shoshenq V	767–730	Pedubast II	745–735
Osorkon IV	730–715?/713?	Osorkon IV	735–720/715
Dynasty 23		(Upper Egyptian) Dynasty 23 (A + B)	
Pedubast I	818–793	Takeloth II	843–818
Iuput I	804–803?	Pedubast I	832–807
Shoshenq VI	793–787	Iuput I	817–?
Osorkon III	787–759	Shoshenq VI	807–801
Takeloth III	764–757	Osorkon III	801–773
Rudamon	757–755	Takeloth III	778–771
Shoshenq VII	755–736	Rudamon	771–759
Iuput II	736–715	Shoshenq VII	759–741/735

Table 1

Further examination of Theban monumental evidence might confirm that Chronology A is preferable to Chronology K.

**B. THE CHRONICLE OF PRINCE OSORKON,<sup>10</sup>  
THE NILE LEVEL TEXTS,<sup>11</sup> THE KARNAK PRIESTLY  
ANNALS<sup>12</sup> AND OTHER THEBAN SOURCES**

The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon, engraved on the Bubastide Portal at Karnak, records the actions of Osorkon B, the eldest son of Takeloth II, from the latter's 11<sup>th</sup> regnal year until year 29 of Shoshenq III. From this text it is clear that Osorkon B was in Thebes in his capacity of High Priest of Amun in Takeloth II's 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> regnal years and that in regnal year 15 a rebellion broke out (A. 18, B. 1, B. 7). Further on in the text it says that a compilation should be made of the benefactions performed by Prince Osorkon "beginning with the regnal year 11 under the Majesty of my (Prince Osorkon's) august father, the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, son of Re, [Takeloth] beloved of Amun [son of Isis] until the regnal year 28 under the Majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Usermaatre Setepenre, son of Re, Shoshenq beloved of Amun, son

of Bastet, given life for ever" (C, 6–7). In the first part of the list of offerings (C. 8–11) Takeloth II's year 24 is explicitly mentioned. The second part of the list is preceded by the heading "Compilation of items instituted as (something) new by the first prophet of Amun-Re, king of the gods, the leader Osorkon, beginning with the regnal year 22 until the regnal year 28" (C. 11–12). The years 23, 24 and 25, explicitly mentioned in this part of the list (C. 12–20), obviously refer to Shoshenq III. The highest date referred to in the Chronicle is regnal year 29, recording new offerings to Amun-Re.

Starting from the first king of the 22<sup>nd</sup> Dynasty, Shoshenq I, until the first king of the 26<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, Psammetik I, almost all kings who were recognized in Thebes, are represented in the series of Nile Level Records on the quay wall at Karnak. Only Takeloth II, who reigned as long as 25 years, is not represented amongst the kings referred to in the Nile Level Records.

Consequently, in Chronology K we have a gap of over twenty-five years in the series of Nile texts. According to this chronology Osorkon II would have reigned for 24 years and Nile level

<sup>10</sup> CAMINOS 1958.

<sup>11</sup> LEGRAIN 1896; VON BECKERATH 1966; BROEKMAN 2002.

<sup>12</sup> KRUCHTEN 1989.

text no. 12, mentioning his 22<sup>nd</sup> regnal year would have been the last Nile text referring to him. The next Nile text, in chronological order, is no. 23, referring to the 6<sup>th</sup> year of Shoshenq III. So, between these two texts we have a gap of  $2+25+5=32$  years.

In Chronology A, on the contrary, a reign of 34 years is assigned to Osorkon II and Nile level text no. 14 is here the last one referring to him, mentioning his 29<sup>th</sup> regnal year.<sup>13</sup> As in this chronology Takeloth II's 25 years reign is totally overlapped by the reigns of Osorkon II and Shoshenq III (by 3 years and 22 years respectively), there is only a space of  $5+5=10$  years between the Nile texts nos. 14 and 23.

In the Karnak Priestly Annals we may find just a few references to Takeloth II. Fragment no. 26/27 refers to year 11 of a king Takeloth who might be Takeloth II.<sup>14</sup> Kruchten also attributes fragment no. 5.d, referring to a year 11, to Takeloth II, as it chronologically follows fragment 5.c, that might refer to Osorkon II's 23<sup>rd</sup> regnal year.<sup>15</sup> However, this is quite uncertain. In Fragment no. 7, referring to regnal year 39 of Shoshenq III, it says that the High Priest of Amun, governor of Upper Egypt, the commander Osorkon (B), son of king Meriamun Takeloth (II), has come to Thebes together with his brother, the general of Heracleopolis Bakenptah, after they had overcome those who had rebelled against them.<sup>16</sup> Prince Osorkon's presence in Thebes in that year in his capacity of High Priest is confirmed by Nile level record No. 22.

Besides the references to Takeloth II's reign mentioned above we have two further Theban references: a graffito on a bloc from the Akh-menu temple at Karnak (Paris E 3336) referring to Takeloth's year 11, and a donation stela (Cairo JE 36159) in favour of his daughter Karomat E, dated to year 25 of Takeloth (II) in the time of the High Priest Osorkon (B).<sup>17</sup>

All dated references on Theban monuments for the Dynasties 22 and 23 concerning the period from the start of Takeloth II's reign until the end of the reign of Shoshenq III are recorded in two diagrams: Table 2 applicable to Chronology K, and Table 3, relative to Chronology A.

From this monumental evidence we learn that Table 2, applicable to Chronology K, does not only show a gap in the "Chronicle of Prince Osorkon" – referred to by Aston – spanning the initial 22 regnal years of Shoshenq III, but also reveals a gap in the series of Nile level records, spanning the entire 25-years reign of Takeloth II. In Table 3 however, showing Chronology A, both gaps are closed by telescoping the reign of Takeloth II into that of Shoshenq III and, as a result, the dated references are much more equally spread over the whole period at issue in comparison with Table 2.

I would not claim, as Kitchen suggests,<sup>18</sup> that the gap in the series of Nile texts would make a sole reign of Takeloth II illusory. It only confirms in addition to the gap in the "Chronicle", that the chronology rendered in Table 3 is preferable to the one shown in Table 2.

As I concluded in my paper (BROEKMAN 2005), the preference for Chronology A to Chronology K, appearing from the monumental and genealogical evidence, might be invigorated by a new interpretation of Nile level record no. 14, which in my opinion should be considered to furnish compelling evidence for a long reign of Osorkon II. Formerly this Nile text, referring to the 29<sup>th</sup> regnal year of a king Usermaatse Setepenamun, was attributed to Shoshenq III by von Beckerath<sup>19</sup> and to Osorkon III by Kitchen.<sup>20</sup> However, von Beckerath as well as Kitchen started from a wrong assumption when dating the text. The former unjustly started from a short reign (a decade at the most) of Osorkon III and, consequently, in his opinion the text must refer to either Osorkon II or Shoshenq III. He assumed that text no. 14 should refer rather to Shoshenq III, as a dating to a sole reign of Osorkon II seems difficult to accept after the double dating of his year 28, recorded in text no. 13, which in von Beckerath's conception referred to Osorkon II.

Kitchen, implicitly rejecting the possibility that Nile level record no. 14 might refer to Osorkon II, supposed that this text might better be attributed to Osorkon III than to Shoshenq III because, as Kitchen says, "Shoshenq III is qualified as Setepenre in one such text of year 29 already clearly

<sup>13</sup> See below.

<sup>14</sup> KRUCHTEN 1989, 121–122.

<sup>15</sup> KRUCHTEN 1989, 55.

<sup>16</sup> KRUCHTEN 1989, 59–63.

<sup>17</sup> KITCHEN 1973/96, 329 & n. 474.

<sup>18</sup> KITCHEN 2006, 298–299.

<sup>19</sup> VON BECKERATH 1966, 45–46.

<sup>20</sup> KITCHEN 1973/96, 353, n. 627.

dated to him (no. 22), whereas the king of no. 14 is Setepenamun, the invariable epithet of Osorkon III". However, Kitchen erroneously attributed Nile level record no. 22 to Shoshenq III's year 29 instead of his 39<sup>th</sup> year.<sup>21</sup>

On the ground of the orthography of the word Hapj, "Nile flood", used in text no. 14, this text can not possibly be attributed to Osorkon III.<sup>22</sup> Besides, one would not expect to find a text like this in Osorkon III's twenty-ninth year, following the double dated text no. 13 of his year 28 (see above von Beckerath's argumentation against attributing this text to Osorkon II!). Attribution of the text to Shoshenq III might be possible, as it appears from the Chronicle of prince Osorkon, that the latter was in Thebes in his capacity of High Priest of Amun in year 29 of Shoshenq III, by whose regnal years he dated after the death of Takeloth II. This text, then, would chronologically follow text no. 27, referring to year 19 of Pedubast I, and precede text no. 29, referring to the latter's 23<sup>rd</sup> year. However, as Pedubast's prenomen was also Usermaatre Setepenamun, Shoshenq III's nomen undoubtedly would have been mentioned in text no. 14 and not only his prenomen, homonymous to the one of his colleague Pedubast I. Moreover, during the reign of Shoshenq III almost all Nile texts mention the officiating High Priest of Amun and as it appears from the Chronicle of prince Osorkon, that in Shoshenq III's years 28 and 29 the High Priest Harsiese was expelled from Thebes, whereas Osorkon B occupied that post in those years, it would be highly improbable that the latter would not have been mentioned in a text dated to Shoshenq III's year 29. That means that Nile level record no. 14 to all probability should be attributed to Osorkon II, because there is no further king belonging to Dynasty 22 or 23 named Usermaatre Setepenamun, who might have reigned for 29 years or more during the period the orthography of the word Hapj used in text no. 14 was the vogue. Moreover, Osorkon II was the first king of the 22<sup>nd</sup> Dynasty to use the prenomen Usermaatre Setepenamun and, though as a rule also his nomen was mentioned, the mere recording of the prenomen was sufficient to distinguish him from other kings.

So the evidence from Nile level record no. 14, in particular its orthographic aspect, unmistakably points to the fact that Osorkon II reigned for at least 29 years.

### C. ANOTHER VIEW CONCERNING TAKELOTH II'S POSITION

In § 10 of KITCHEN 2006 it says that "it is only proper (however briefly) to do two things. (i) To show – again – why the normal scheme is perfectly sufficient, and the contrary "reasons" are needless. But (ii) to explore whether, in fact, adjustments are feasible in the mid 22<sup>nd</sup> Dynasty to eliminate the supposed problems in a *positive* fashion."

As to the arguments for attempting to overlap Takeloth II with Shoshenq III (and in consequence, lengthening the reign of Osorkon II), Kitchen admits, that generation jumps occurring simultaneously in three different families,<sup>23</sup> might be considered to be a weak point in his chronological framework.

After having challenged all other arguments that had been proffered for changing the royal succession from Osorkon II to at least early Shoshenq III, and concluding that his basic chronology with a 25-years' reign for Takeloth II between Osorkon II and Shoshenq III is perfectly OK, he continues with an investigation "if an adjustment *can* profitably be made to the dating of the 22<sup>nd</sup>/23<sup>rd</sup> Dynasties.....".<sup>24</sup> He starts from the principle that we need to be able to say why one king overlapped with another at any particular juncture, and that we need real political situations to justify the choices considered.

It has been established that Pedubast I began his reign in year 8 of Shoshenq III, and Kitchen assumes that he took royal style following the death of Takeloth II in his 25<sup>th</sup> regnal year, and that he might have been entitled to do so from his participation in the funeral of the latter. Consequently, the reign of Shoshenq III must have started in Takeloth II's 18<sup>th</sup> regnal year.<sup>25</sup> Shoshenq III's motive for seeking to become king at that time might have been, according to Kitchen, the cataclysm in the 15<sup>th</sup> regnal year of Takeloth II, referred to in the Chronicle of Prince Osorkon. "In this crisis", thus Kitchen, "the

<sup>21</sup> KITCHEN, 1973/96, 339, n. 531; 353, n. 627.

<sup>22</sup> BROEKMAN 2002, 88, 174.

<sup>23</sup> BROEKMAN 2005, 26–27.

<sup>24</sup> KITCHEN 2006, 300.

<sup>25</sup> KITCHEN 2006, 301.

younger man Shoshenq seized control of the armed forces, pushed his father (?Takeloth II) and brother (?Prince Osorkon) aside, and took two forms of action: (i) stopped the opposition in their tracks, and (ii) negotiated a peace, to the satisfaction of the Thebans. Little wonder that Prince Osorkon was in limbo for some years, while Harsiese B took control in the South. Having saved the day, Shoshenq (III) then assumed the kingship as full coregent of Takeloth II – an arrangement that then lasted nearly 8 years, quite a good overlap.”<sup>26</sup>

As for the reign of Osorkon II, Kitchen is obviously willing to accept my thesis on the different versions of the spelling of Hapj and the attribution of Nile level record no. 14 to the 29<sup>th</sup> regnal year of Osorkon II. In that connection he suggests that the dateline of year 22 in the jubilee-reliefs of Osorkon II from Bubastis is a slip in transcribing from the hieratic, resulting in “22” for “30”, the normal year for a *sed*-festival. This suggestion would confirm a 30-year reign for Osorkon II, who might have died in his 31<sup>st</sup> year.<sup>27</sup>

Kitchen’s thus revised chronology (New Chronology K) is rendered in Table 4.

Obviously Kitchen persists to his opinion that Takeloth II was Osorkon II’s immediate successor in the main line of the 22<sup>nd</sup> Dynasty and that Prince Osorkon (B) and king Osorkon III were two distinct individuals. However, Kitchen’s arguments are not convincing, as may appear from the following:

Even though there are no burials of Shoshenq I, Osorkon I, Pimay,<sup>28</sup> Shoshenq V and Osorkon IV known in Tanis, these kings are clearly attested as rulers in Lower-Egypt, in contrast to Takeloth II, who did not leave any monuments there, despite his 25 years reign.

From the Chronicle of prince Osorkon it is evident that Takeloth II died before the 22<sup>nd</sup> regnal year of Shoshenq III. However it does not give any indication whatsoever, that they would belong to the same (branch of the 22<sup>nd</sup>) Dynasty.

The fact that Takeloth II was linked by marriage with the line of Osorkon II as the husband

of the latter’s granddaughter does not mean that he was his successor.

Kitchen’s statement that Takeloth II’s son prince Osorkon “absolutely shunned the 23<sup>rd</sup> Dynasty, dating *always* by the 22<sup>nd</sup>”, creates the impression that there were just two rivalling dynasties. However, that is only the case if Takeloth II did belong to the 22<sup>nd</sup> Dynasty, and that is the very thing Kitchen wants to prove. In Chronology A, on the contrary, there was one mainline, the 22<sup>nd</sup> Dynasty (Osorkon II–Shoshenq III), from which sprang two Upper-Egyptian collateral branches, one of them founded by Takeloth II and the other by Pedubast I.<sup>29</sup> Prince Osorkon dated to the line of Takeloth II and after his death to the Dynastic mainline (Shoshenq III), and it was only the dynastic branch of Pedubast that he shunned.

In Kitchen’s opinion it is a near-impossible scenario that the same Thebans, who for many years had opposed Prince Osorkon and had been suppressed by him, would have welcomed “this very same man once he took cartouches as king Osorkon (III)”.<sup>30</sup> However, the civil war recorded in the “Chronicle” was not a war made by Prince Osorkon against the Thebans, but was a struggle for power being fought out between Prince Osorkon and Harsiese B (later Takeloth E), in which the Theban people played but an inferior part. Anyhow, their feelings did not matter.<sup>31</sup> Therefore nothing prohibits us from identifying Prince Osorkon with king Osorkon III, all the more as the mother of each of them is named Ka(ro)mama.

Further, there remain some points of weakness adhering to Kitchen’s previous chronology (Chronology K) that have not been eliminated in his New Chronology K:

(1) According to the Chronicle of Prince Osorkon, the parties involved in the civil war reconciled in Takeloth II’s 24<sup>th</sup> year, and Egypt was in peace for some time (B. 8 – C. 1). But then again, a rebellion broke out and so it happened that Prince Osorkon was there quite alone, there was not a friend (C.2). According to Kitchen, this new (third) rebellion would correspond with Pedubast

<sup>26</sup> KITCHEN 2006, 301.

<sup>27</sup> KITCHEN 2006, 301.

<sup>28</sup> There are some indications, that Pimay might have been buried in Tanis in tomb NRT II. See YOYOTTE 1988.

<sup>29</sup> These collateral lines are designated by Jansen-Winkeln as Dynasties 23 (A) and 23 (B); see JANSEN-WINKELN 1995, 149.

<sup>30</sup> KITCHEN 2006, 298.

<sup>31</sup> JANSEN-WINKELN 2006, 243.

Dynasty 22 Regnal years	Dynasty 23 Regnal years	Nile level records	Karnak Priestly Annals	Chronicle Prince Osorkon	Other Theban Sources
Osorkon II					
22	–	–	12	–	–
24	–	–	–	–	–
Takeloth II					
1	–	–	–	–	–
11	–	–	–	5.d/26–27(?)	X
12	–	–	–	–	X
15	–	–	–	–	X
24	–	–	–	–	X
25	–	–	–	–	–
Shoshenq III					
1	–	–	–	–	–
6	–	–	23	–	–
7	Pedubast I	–	–	–	–
8	1	–	–	–	–
12	5	–	24	–	–
14	7	–	–	1.b	–
15	8	–	–	1.c/2	–
21	14	Iuput I	–	–	–
22	15	1	–	–	X
23	16	2	26	–	X
24	17	3	–	–	X
25	18	?	28	–	X
26	19	–	27	–	–
28	21	–	–	–	X
29	22	–	–	–	X
30	23	–	29	–	–
32	25	–	–	–	–
Shoshenq VI					
33	1	–	–	–	–
38	6	–	25	–	–
39	?	–	22	7	–

Table 2 Chronology K. Dates for Dynasties 22 and 23 from the final years of Osorkon II until the end of the reign of Shoshenq III according to Kitchen's old chronology: KITCHEN 1973/96

I's years 2–14 (Shoshenq III's years 9–21). The next event recorded in the Chronicle (C. 2–7) is Prince Osorkon's returning to Thebes after he was told: "Be happy, you have no enemies". According to Kitchen this return would have occurred in Year 15 of Pedubast I, equalling year 1 of Iuput I (Shoshenq III's year 22), but in that year Osorkon's main antagonist, Harsiese B, was still alive, as he reappeared later on in Nile level records 28 and 27, dating to Pedubast I's years 18 and 19.

(2) As Harsiese B was obviously back in Thebes as High Priest during both last mentioned years (Shoshenq III's years 25 and 26), it

seems that a fourth rebellion had broken out and that Prince Osorkon was again driven out of Thebes. However, this is in contradiction with the Chronicle, recording only three rebellions: the first one in Takeloth II's year 11 (A. 22–23), the second one in his 15<sup>th</sup> regnal year (B. 7) and the third one some time after his year 24 (C. 2). After this third rebellion Osorkon returned to Thebes and no further opposition against him is recorded in the Chronicle, ending by year 29 of Shoshenq III (C. 22).

Kitchen's 'adjusted' chronology presents another point of weakness, resulting from his

Dynasty 22 Regnal years	Dynasty 23 A Regnal years	Dynasty 23 B Regnal years	Nile level records	Karnak Priestly Annals	Chronicle Prince Osorkon	Other Theban Sources
Osorkon II						
29	–	–	14	–	–	–
30	Takeloth II	–	–	–	–	–
32	1	–	–	–	–	–
34	3	–	–	–	–	–
Shoshenq III						
1	4	–	–	–	–	–
6	9	–	23	–	–	–
7	10	Pedubast I	–	–	–	–
8	11	1	–	5.d/26–27(?)	X	X
9	12	2	–	–	X	–
12	15	5	24	–	X	–
14	17	7	–	1.b	–	–
15	18	8	–	1.c/2	–	–
21	24	14	–	–	X	–
22	25	15	–	–	–	X
Iuput I						
22	1	15	–	–	X	–
23	2	16	26	–	X	–
24	3	17	–	–	X	–
25	4	18	28	–	X	–
26	?	19	27	–	–	–
28	–	21	–	–	X	–
29	–	22	–	–	X	–
30	–	23	29	–	–	–
32	–	25	–	–	–	–
Shoshenq VI						
33	–	1	–	–	–	–
38	–	6	25	–	–	–
39	–	?	22	7	–	–

Table 3 Chronology A. Dates for Dynasties 22 and 23 (A + B) from the final years of Osorkon II until the end of the reign of Shoshenq III according to Aston's chronology

assumption that Pedubast I was the successor of Takeloth II.

(3) Takeloth II died in his 25<sup>th</sup> year and it appears from Nile level text no. 24 that Pedubast's year 1 equalled year 8 of Shoshenq III. From that derive the quite arbitrary year 18 of Takeloth II for the year of accession of Shoshenq III and the even more arbitrary year of accession of Iuput I alongside Pedubast I in de latter's 15<sup>th</sup> regnal year (equalling year 22 of Shoshenq III).

In Kitchen's view prince Shoshenq (the later king Shoshenq III) made an end to the rebellion

that broke out in year 15 of Takeloth II. Thereupon he would have assumed kingship as the latter's full coregent in Year 18. If this is what really happened, it is likely, indeed, that some time elapsed from the outbreak of the rebellion until the moment Shoshenq became king, however it is not clear why this happened in that very year 18. As to the accession of Iuput I, there is, to my opinion, not any explanation to be devised why in New Chronology K Iuput I would have become king alongside Pedubast I in the latter's year 15.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>32</sup> It should be noticed that Iuput I was not ephemeral. His years 9 and 12 are attested in graffiti on the roof of the temple of Khonsu at Karnak; see JACQUET-GORDON 2003, 84, 85.

	Dynasty 22 Regnal years	Dynasty 23 Regnal years	Nile level records	Karnak Priest- ly Annals	Chronicle Prince Osorkon	Other The- ban Sources
Osorkon II						
29	-	-	14	-	-	-
31	-	-	-	-	-	-
Takeloth II						
1	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	-	-	-	5.d/26-27(?)	X	X
12	Shoshenq III (c/r.)	-	-	-	X	-
15		-	-	-	X	-
18	1	-	-	-	-	-
19	2	-	-	-	-	-
20	3	-	-	-	-	-
21	4	-	-	-	-	-
22	5	-	-	-	-	-
23	6	-	23	-	-	-
24	7	Pedubast I	-	-	X	-
25	8	1	-	-	-	X
-	9	2	-	-	-	-
-	10	3	-	-	-	-
-	11	4	-	-	-	-
-	12	5	-	24	-	-
-	13	6	-	-	-	-
-	14	7	-	-	1.b	-
-	15	8	-	-	1.c/2	-
-	21	14	Iuput I (c/r.)	-	-	-
-	22	15	1	-	X	-
-	23	16	2	26	X	-
-	24	17	-	-	X	-
-	25	18	-	28	X	-
-	26	19	-	27	-	-
-	28	21	-	-	X	-
-	29	22	-	-	X	-
-	30	23	-	29	-	-
-	31	24	-	-	-	-
-	32	25	-	-	-	-
-		Shoshenq VI				
-	33	1	-	-	-	-
-	38	6	-	25	-	-
-	39	-	-	22	7	-

Table 4 New Chronology K. Dates for Dynasties 22 and 23 from the final years of Osorkon II until the end of the reign of Shoshenq III according to Kitchen's new chronology: SCIEM 2000 Vienna Conference 2005 "Egypt & Time"

#### D. CHRONOLOGY A AGAINST NEW CHRONOLOGY K

Only a chronology based on Iuput I succeeding Takeloth II, is fully in accordance with the monumental evidence, notably the Chronicle of Prince Osorkon.<sup>33</sup>

To all probability Takeloth II died in his 25<sup>th</sup> regnal year, and as it appears from Nile level text no. 26 that Iuput I's 2<sup>nd</sup> year equals year 16 of Pedubast I, the latter's year 15 (equal to year 22 of Shoshenq III) coincides with Takeloth year 25. Iuput I may have been accepted by Prince

<sup>33</sup> See also JANSEN-WINKELN 1995, 139-142.



Osorkon as well as by his adversaries as a suitable candidate to succeed Takeloth II, and this may have led to the (temporary) reconciliation of both parties, resulting in the return of Prince Osorkon as High Priest of Amun in Thebes. However, some years later, in Pedubast I's years 18 and 19, Harsiese B was back in Thebes again as High Priest and that might be reflected by the rebellion referred to in Part C. 2 of the Chronicle. After the last-mentioned year nothing is heard any more about Harsiese B: he may have died. So, Prince Osorkon had indeed no enemies (for the time being) and reappeared in Thebes as High Priest, making offerings for Amun in the years 28 and 29 of Shoshenq III. With this the Chronicle of Prince Osorkon ends. From Nile level text no. 29, recording year 23 of Pedubast I (equal to year 30 of Shoshenq III), it appears that in that year a new man, Takeloth E, was High Priest in Thebes. This High Priest is also mentioned in Nile text 25, referring to year 6 of a king Shoshenq (VI) Meriamun Usermaat Meriamun, obviously the successor of Pedubast. This year 6 probably coincides with the 37<sup>th</sup> or 38<sup>th</sup> year of Shoshenq III. Finally, Nile level text no. 22 mentions Prince Osorkon as High Priest in Shoshenq III's year 39, and fragment 7 of the Karnak Priestly annals of that same year enunciates Prince Osorkon's victory over all his adversaries.<sup>34</sup>

As said before, Takeloth II died after a 25 years reign in year 15 of Pedubast I, equal to year 22 of Shoshenq III. Consequently the latter began to reign in year 4 of Takeloth II, and one of them must have been the successor of Osorkon II, and to all probability that was Shoshenq III, because Takeloth II succeeding Osorkon II would make the accession of Shoshenq III three years later fully inexplicable. That means that Takeloth II became king three years before the death of Osorkon II. This has to be explained.

During the reign of Osorkon II we find in Thebes Harsiese (A) taking full royal style. Harsiese, the length of whose reign is not known, might have been a son of the High Priest Shoshenq, son of Osorkon I.<sup>35</sup> However, it is more likely that he was a son of the High Priest

Smendes III (the latter being also a son of Osorkon I), as Smendes' wife is called "Queen's mother", and Harsiese A is the most suitable candidate to be her royal son.<sup>36</sup> From Harsiese manifesting himself as a king it may be assumed that king Osorkon II had to face developments in the heart of the royal family affecting the balance of power. That may be reflected by Osorkon II's prayer to Amun, inscribed on a stela held by a statue of himself:<sup>37</sup> "[You will fashion] my issue, the seed that comes forth from my limbs, [to be] great [rulers] of Egypt, princes, high priests of Amenresonter, great chiefs of the Ma, [great chiefs of] foreigners, and prophets of Arsaphes..... You will turn their hearts towards the Son of Re, Osorkon II, you will cause them [to walk] on my path. You will establish my children in the [posts which] I have given them, so that brother is not jealous (?) of brothe[r]. As for the Great Royal Wife ....] Karoama, you will cause her to stand before me in all my jubilee festivals... You will cause her children, male and [female], to live."<sup>38</sup>

It is not improbable that Harsiese A, before proclaiming himself king, had been High Priest of Amun in the early years of Osorkon II, though there is no evidence for this. Anyhow, after Harsiese took royal style Osorkon II appointed his son Nimlot (C) to be High Priest of Amun in Thebes. As appears from the decoration of chapel J in Karnak-east, the latter's son Takeloth (F) officiated as High Priest in Osorkon II's reign as the successor of his father.<sup>39</sup> This Takeloth F is probably identical with the later king Takeloth II, who was married to Nimlot's daughter Karomama Merymut (II), and that means that he was married to his own (half-)sister.<sup>40</sup> After the death of Harsiese A – either immediately or some time later – Takeloth F proclaimed himself king (in southern Egypt) following in the footsteps of Harsiese, probably with the consent of his royal grandfather. Possibly he claimed his right to succeed Harsiese from having participated, in his capacity of High Priest, in Harsiese's funeral.

As Jansen-Winkel showed, the High Priest Harsiese B, for the first time attested for certain in

<sup>34</sup> KRUCHTEN 1989, 59 ff.

<sup>35</sup> KITCHEN 1973/96, 314; JANSEN-WINKELN 1995, 132.

<sup>36</sup> JANSEN-WINKELN 2006, 241, n. 64.

<sup>37</sup> Cairo Cat. 1040.

<sup>38</sup> KITCHEN 1973/96, 317.

<sup>39</sup> KEES 1964, 113, REDFORD 1986, 14; JANSEN-WINKELN 1995, 138.

<sup>40</sup> JANSEN-WINKELN 1995, 138–139; DAUTZENBERG 1995, 24–25.

Nile level text 23 of year 6 of Shoshenq III, was to all probability already in function during the later years of Osorkon II.<sup>41</sup> This Harsiese B might have been a descendent of Harsiese A, perhaps his grandson, as Kitchen suggests,<sup>42</sup> and it is not unlikely that he became High Priest of Amun in Thebes as the successor of Takeloth F at the time of the latter's accession as king Takeloth (II) Meryamun Si-Ese Hedjkheperre Setepenre.

In year 16 of Osorkon II his son Nimlot C was still High Priest of Harsaphes in Heracleopolis, great chief of Pi-Sekhemkheperre, general and army-leader, and it is broadly accepted that he only at a later moment became High Priest in Thebes,<sup>43</sup> possibly about Osorkon II's 18<sup>th</sup> year. Harsiese A's reign began about the same time, and if he reigned for some 14 years, he died not later than in Osorkon II's 32<sup>nd</sup> regnal year, the very year Takeloth II ascended the throne in Upper-Egypt and was succeeded by Harsiese B as High Priest.

The death of Osorkon II and the accession of Shoshenq III did not bring any dramatic political changes. Conspicuously, however, Harsiese B boldly had his name and High Priestly title been recorded in Nile level text no. 23 in Shoshenq III's 6<sup>th</sup> regnal year, implicitly claiming that he himself, in his capacity of representative of the God Amun, factually was the highest authority in Thebes. A few years later, in Shoshenq III's year 8, equalling year 11 of Takeloth II, Pedubast I proclaimed himself king. As this king is attested in Lower-Egypt as well as in Upper-Egypt, Jansen-Winkel may be right suggesting that Pedubast was ruler of Hermopolis, trying to restore the united Egyptian kingdom and that the Theban rebellion in regnal year 11 of Takeloth II, recorded in the 'Chronicle' (A. 22–23), was in fact the recognition of this Hermopolitan king.<sup>44</sup> From the 'Chronicle' (A. 23–53) it appears that in that same year prince Osorkon, travelling south, suppressed his enemies and carried out building activities in Hermopolis, and, at his

arrival in Thebes, had himself installed as High Priest, punished the rebels and issued several decrees.

In Takeloth II's year 12 Prince Osorkon is still master in Thebes (Chronicle, B. 1 - 6), but in year 15 a second rebellion breaks out (Chronicle B. 7), and Harsiese B returns, undoubtedly with the support of Pedubast I, to Thebes, as is shown in Nile text no. 24 of that year, equalling year 5 of Pedubast I (= year 12 of Shoshenq III). From the Karnak Priestly Annals, fragments 1. b, 1. c and 2 it appears that Pedubast I was recognized in Thebes in his years 7 and 8 (years 17 and 18 of Takeloth II), and that in the last-mentioned year Harsiese B was still in function as High Priest. Only in year 24 of Takeloth II (Chronicle C. 7) Prince Osorkon is back in Thebes, making offerings to Amun. Obviously conciliation had been brought about,<sup>45</sup> possibly in connection with the death of Takeloth II being expected, and Iuput I being accepted in advance as his successor by both rivalling parties.<sup>46</sup>

The historical developments outlined above, from the death of Takeloth II until the end of the reign of Shoshenq III, start from a realistic explanation for Iuput I succeeding Takelot II, and are perfectly in accordance with the monumental evidence, notably the sequence of events recorded in the Chronicle of Prince Osorkon and the political situation reflected in it.

Likewise, from the accession of Takeloth II until his death we have a sequence of events in line with the monumental evidence. The accession of Takeloth II preceding the death of Osorkon II by three years can perfectly be explained, as well as Pedubast I taking royal style in Takeloth II's 11<sup>th</sup> year.

In short, this chronological reconstruction of the period at issue, mainly in accordance with Jansen-Winkel's conception,<sup>47</sup> is grounded purely on a historical basis, real political situations and realistic circumstances, as advocated by Kitchen,<sup>48</sup> without anything contradicting it.

<sup>41</sup> JANSEN-WINKELN 1995, 135–136. See also Dautzenberg 1995, 25–26.

<sup>42</sup> KITCHEN 1973/96, 330.

<sup>43</sup> KITCHEN 1973/96, 316; JANSEN-WINKELN 1995, 138.

<sup>44</sup> JANSEN-WINKELN 1995, 142; JANSEN-WINKELN 2006, 248.

<sup>45</sup> KITCHEN 1973/96, 331–332; JANSEN-WINKELN 1995, 140 & n. 77.

<sup>46</sup> JANSEN-WINKELN 1995, 140–141 & n. 79.

<sup>47</sup> Shown in JANSEN-WINKELN 1995, 129–145.

<sup>48</sup> KITCHEN 2006, 297 and 300.

**Bibliography**

- ASTON, D.A.  
1989 Takeloth II – A King of the “Theban Twenty-Third Dynasty”?, *JEA* 75, 139–153.
- BECKERATH, J. VON  
1966 The Nile Level Records at Karnak and their Importance for the History of the Libyan Period (Dynasties XXII and XXIII), *JARCE* 5, 43–55.  
1995 Beiträge zur Geschichte der Libyerzeit; 1. Die neuen Rekonstruktionsvorschläge und Manethos XXII. Dynastie, *GM* 144, 7–13.
- BIERBRIER, M.L.,  
1975 *The Late New Kingdom in Egypt (c. 1300 – 664 B.C.)*, Warminster.
- BROEKMAN, G.P.F.  
2002 The Nile Level Records of the Twenty-Second and Twenty-Third Dynasties in Karnak: a Reconsideration of their Chronological Order, *JEA* 88, 163–178.  
2005 The Reign of Takeloth II, a Controversial Matter, *GM* 205, 21–33.
- CAMINOS, R.A.  
1958 *The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon*, *OrAn* 37, Rome.
- DAUTZENBERG, N.  
1995 Bemerkungen zu Schoschenq II., Takeloth II. und Pedubastis II. *GM* 144, 21–29.
- DODSON, A.  
1993 A New King Shoshenq Confirmed?, *GM* 137, 53–58.
- JACQUET-GORDON, H.  
2003 *The graffiti on the Khonsu Temple roof at Karnak: a manifestation of personal piety*, Chicago.
- JANSEN-WINKELN, K.  
1995 Historische Probleme der 3. Zwischenzeit, *JEA* 81, 129–149.  
2006 Chronology of the Third Intermediate Period: the 22<sup>nd</sup>–24<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, in: E. HORNUNG R. KRAUSS and D.R. WARBURTON, *Handbook of Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, Leiden.
- KEES, H.  
1964 *Die Hohenpriester des Amun von Karnak von Herihor bis zum Ende der Äthiopenzeit*, PÄ, Leiden.
- KITCHEN, K.A.  
1973/96 *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt*, Warminster, 1<sup>st</sup> ed., 1973; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1986; revised 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1996.  
2006 The Strengths and Weaknesses of Egyptian Chronology – an Abrégé, in: *Egypt & Time*, SCIEM 2000 Publication, *E&L* 16, 293–308.
- KRUCHTEN, J.-M.  
1989 *Les Annales des prêtres de Karnak*, *OLA* 32, Leuven.
- LEGRAIN, G.  
1896 Textes gravés sur le quai de Karnak, *ZÄS* 34, 111–121.
- REDFORD, D.B.  
1986 New Light on Temple J at Karnak, *Or* 55, 1–15.
- YOYOTTE, J.  
1988 Des Lions et des Chats, *RdE* 39, 166–168.

