

*Appendix F*  
*Dating*  
*Dynasty XXV*

The total years of Dynasty XXV of Egypt can be reconstructed with a great deal of accuracy. Manetho defines Dynasty XXV as consisting of three Ethiopian kings who ruled as Pharaohs of Egypt: Sabakon (Shabaqo), "Sebichos (Shebitku) his son," and Tarakus (Taharqa, Tirhaqah, etc.).<sup>1</sup> According to Eusebius, the Old Chronicle, the Book of Sothis, as well as other sources using Manetho, these three kings ruled a total of no more than 44 years.<sup>2</sup> Inscriptions produced by these kings agree with this total. The highest date for the official regnal year found for each respective king is as follows:

Shabaqo	15 years <sup>3</sup>
Shebitku	3 years <sup>4</sup>
Taharqa	26 years <sup>5</sup>
Total:	44 years

Dynasty XXV of Manetho can be placed immediately on top of the reign of Psamtik (Psammetichus) I of Dynasty XXVI. As T. G. H. James remarks:

. . . the first king of the Saite Twenty-sixth Dynasty, Psammetichus, dated his reign from the time of Taharqa's demise. Thus Manetho, in the surviving epitomes, brings the Twenty-fifth Dynasty to an end with Taharqa's death.<sup>6</sup>

The 1st year of Psamtik I was 663 B.C.E.<sup>7</sup> As a result, the 1st year of Shabaqo, the first king of Dynasty XXV, is 707 B.C.E.

### Tang-i Var Pass Inscription

Despite the strong evidence that there was only a 44-year period for Dynasty XXV dominance in Egypt, from its beginning with its first king, Shabaqo, until the death of Nefertem Taharqa, there have been a number of Egyptologists

<sup>1</sup> Manetho, frags. 66, 67a & b.

<sup>2</sup> Manetho, frags. 67a & b; Old Chron. in Syncellus, 56f; Sothis, nos. 75–77; Eusebius, *Chron.*, pp. 147, 148; Sec. Hier. Cod., p. 34.

<sup>3</sup> Limestone cube statue of Ity, BM EA 24429; HdO, p. 261; TIP, p. 153 §125.

<sup>4</sup> Karnak Nile Level Text, no. 33; TIP, p. 154 §126; HdO, p. 258.

<sup>5</sup> LSDM, iii, pl. 36; Kush, 8, pp. 72; ARE, 4, §§959–962; CAW, p. 81; TIP, pp. 161f, §§130–131; HdO, p. 290; Kush, 8, pp. 267–269.

<sup>6</sup> CAH, 3.2, p. 701. FHN, 1, p. 192, "Psammetich I, whose reign started in 664 BC . . . counted his regnal years in direct continuation of those of Taharqa."

<sup>7</sup> See App. B & C.

who still desire to stretch this period further back in time. More recently, this endeavor has been exacerbated by a misinterpretation of a rock inscription found in 1968 at the Tang-i Var pass in northwest Iran.<sup>8</sup> The inscription from Tang-i Var reports that, at some point before Sargon's military campaign against Iran in the region of Karalla, Iamani (Yamani), the king of Ashdod, was handed over to Sargon by "Šá-pa-ta-ku-ru" (Shapatakoo), king of the land of Meluhha (Kush).<sup>9</sup> Shapatakoo sounds very much like Shebitku. Therefore, the interpretation arose that Shebitku, the son of Shabaqo, must have already been in power by the time that the war in Karalla was undertaken. If this is true, then the entire chronology for Dynasty XXV would be severely pushed back in time.

The Tang-i Var inscription is dated to Sargon's 15th year, sometime between the spring of 707 to the spring of 706 B.C.E.<sup>10</sup> The expedition against Karalla would have taken place during the summer or autumn of 707 B.C.E., since the Assyrians were traveling in the mountainous districts of Iran where (1) a spring campaign would be hindered by the wet and muddy weather and (2) a winter effort would be buffeted by the harsh mountain cold. The inscription itself would have been composed while the Assyrian army was returning home in the late autumn of that year. The story of Iamani's deportation to Assyria is also placed before the completion of the new Assyrian capital of Dur-Sharrukin (on the 6th day of the 2nd month of the 16th year of Sargon, i.e., in the spring of 706 B.C.E.).<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless, in these other mentionings of Iamani's deportation to Assyria, the name of the Kushite king is not given.<sup>12</sup>

On the other end of the equation, analysis of all the Assyrian texts from Sargon indicated that Iamani (Yamani) of Ashdod was turned over to Sargon sometime well before the spring of 706 B.C.E.<sup>13</sup> For example, during either Year 10 or Year 11 of Sargon (712 or 711 B.C.E.), the Assyrians invaded Palestia and made an assault on the city of Ashdod. As a result, Iamani, the king of Ashdod, fled to Egypt and then continued on to Meluhha (Kush) for safety.<sup>14</sup> At the same time, the episode of Iamani being sent to Assyria is not mentioned in any Assyrian records that can be dated to the 13th or 14th years of Sargon's reign.

As part of these calculations, we must also consider the travel time from Kush to Nineveh in order to deliver Iamani to the Assyrian king—at least 3½ and possibly as long as 4 to 5 months.<sup>15</sup> The *Display Inscription* from Room XIV,

<sup>8</sup> For the text and analysis, see *Orientalia*, NS, 68.1, pp. 31–57; *Orientalia*, NS, 68.1, pp. 58–61; *Orientalia*, NS, 70.1, pp. 1–18; *JEA*, 88, p. 182; *AeUL*, 16, pp. 275–291; *MittSAG*, 17, pp. 139f.

<sup>9</sup> Tang-i Var, l. 19f; see *Orientalia*, NS, 68.1, p. 36, l. 20; *DISK*, pp. 76, 308.

<sup>10</sup> *DISK*, pp. 76, 308.

<sup>11</sup> *Orientalia*, NS, 68.1, pp. 50f, 54.

<sup>12</sup> *Orientalia*, NS, 68.1, pp. 52; *ARAB*, 2, §§62f; *BPENR*, p. 202.

<sup>13</sup> *Orientalia*, NS, 68.1, pp. 31–57; *Orientalia*, NS, 70.1, pp. 1–18.

<sup>14</sup> *JCS*, 12.3, pp. 83, 92–96; *Orientalia*, NS, 68.1, p. 52; *ARAB*, 2, §195; *BPENR*, pp. 202f.

<sup>15</sup> The Assyrians point out that it was a journey of 1 month and 10 days from Memphis to Thebes for an army (*ARAB*, 2, §906). Piye informed us that he left Napata to go to Thebes on the 9th day of the 1st month of the year (FHN, 1, p. 79, l. 29) and expected to arrive in Thebes just before the "3rd month of the 1st season, the 2nd day" (FHN, 1, p. 77, l. 26), i.e., 53 days from

for example, refers to Iamani as leaving Kush and traveling “the long journey to Assyria (and) my presence.”<sup>16</sup> There can be little doubt that Iamani would have been delivered into the hands of the Assyrian king no later than the early or middle part of 707 B.C.E., placing his departure from Meluhha (Kush) sometime in late 708 to early 707 B.C.E. The records suggest that Iamani would have arrived in Assyria prior to the commencement of the Assyrian campaign against the mountainous districts of Iran, located just to the east of Assyria—although it is possible that Sargon received word of Iamani’s arrival during his eastern campaign. The extradition of the rebellious King Iamani to Assyria by the Kushite ruler would no doubt be in the context of a gift that came from a king who desired good diplomatic relations with the Assyrian Empire, whose forces were now located on the northeastern border of Egypt. The Kushite king clearly wanted to avoid complications for his own plans to conquer Lower Egypt, which subsequently took place in the 2nd year of Shabaqo, the son of Kashta (706 B.C.E.).<sup>17</sup>

The chronological problem regarding the Kushite kings ruling Egypt springs from the fact that, on the Tang-i Var inscription, the name of the king of Meluhha (Kush) sounds very close to the name Shebitku. As a result, it has been touted as proof that Shebitku, the son of Shabaqo, was already ruling Egypt by 707 or 706 B.C.E. At the same time, no one can push back the dates for Nefertem Taharqa, which is firmly established at 26 years and falls immediately before the 1st year of Psamtik I of Dynasty XXVI. These scholars had already moved back Taharqa II’s last year from 663 to 664 B.C.E.<sup>18</sup> This problem has forced the advocates of this new view of Egyptian chronology to turn their attention towards expanding the dates of Shebitku, the son of Shabaqo.

Prior to the discovery at Tang-i Var, historians readily accepted the idea that the Ethiopian king who returned Iamani to Sargon was Shabaqo.<sup>19</sup> Indeed, years ago clay seal-impressions bearing the titles of Shabaqo over his figure in a triumphal pose were discovered in Nineveh, one of the capital cities of Assyria.<sup>20</sup> As Kenneth Kitchen points out, these seals were most likely attached to papyrus documents of diplomatic import.<sup>21</sup> Nothing, on the other hand, has ever been found that connects Egyptian-Assyrian diplomacy with Shebitku, the son of Shabaqo. Yet with just one line from an Assyrian inscription left in Iran, Dynasty XXV’s chronology was totally rearranged. Shabaqo,

---

Napata to Memphis. Nevertheless, travel time for couriers escorting a captive would take a little less time. If we allow for 1½ months from Napata to Memphis and another 2 months from Memphis to Assyria, the journey would have taken approximately 3½ months. Nevertheless, the trip from Egypt to Assyria, due to weather and other reasons, may have lingered as long as an additional 30 to 60 days.

<sup>16</sup> *Orientalia*, NS, 68.1, p. 53.

<sup>17</sup> See the discussion below on pp. 490f.

<sup>18</sup> See App. C.

<sup>19</sup> E.g., CAH, 3.2, p. 692; TIP, p. 380 §341.

<sup>20</sup> LAIE, p. 499; CESBM, I, p. 290, nos. 2775, 2776; TIP, p. 380 §341, and n. 779; DRNB, p. 132 & fig.

<sup>21</sup> TIP, p. 380 §341.

rather than beginning his reign in Egypt in the year 707 B.C.E., was now made to die around 707 to early 706 B.C.E. so that Shebitku would be the ruler mentioned in the Tang-i Var inscription.<sup>22</sup>

To make these dates work, those advocating this new chronology totally ignored the context of the years provided by Manetho. In their effort, they pulled out the highest number of years given to Shebitku, i.e., the 14 years as mentioned by Africanus.<sup>23</sup> Then insisting that there were no co-regencies in Dynasty XXV,<sup>24</sup> they added these 14 years to the top of the 26-year reign of Taharqa II,<sup>25</sup> which they had already increased by one year from 689 to 690 B.C.E.<sup>26</sup> This process gave them the year 704 B.C.E., which is still well short of what was required for their interpretation of the Tang-i Var inscription. Since this technique did not work, they postulated “at least 16 years” out of thin air, arguing that these numbers were justified because of their interpretation of just this one inscription.<sup>27</sup> As a result, the highest known regnal date of only 3 years for Shebitku,<sup>28</sup> based upon their interpretation of the monument from Iran, was expanded from 3 to “at least 16 regnal years.”

Others became even more radical. Some have now argued that, despite the words of Manetho, Shebitku was not even the son of Shabaqo but actually ruled prior to him.<sup>29</sup> The problem with this view is that Herodotus, Diodorus, and Manetho all make Shabaqo the first Ethiopian king to rule Egypt, while Manetho reports that Shebitku was the “son” of Shabaqo, not his predecessor, and only followed Shabaqo on the throne in Egypt.<sup>30</sup> That Manetho would have both misplaced Shebitku’s reign and misidentified him as the son of Shabaqo is highly unlikely. In addition, Nefertem Taharqa reports that in his Year 6 (684 B.C.E.) he succeeded Shebitku, not Shabaqo, on the throne.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Orientalia, NS, 70.1, pp. 1–18; Orientalia, NS, 68.1, pp. 58–61; HdO, p. 258.

<sup>23</sup> Manetho, frag. 66.

<sup>24</sup> E.g., Karl Jansen-Winkel claims “there has never been the slightest hint at any form of coregency of the Nubian kings of Dynasty 25” (HdO, p. 258). Dan’el Kahn concludes, “In sum, there is not one shred of concrete evidence that coregency was ever practiced in the Kushite kingdom” (MittSAG, 17, p. 141). Cf. AEC, pp. 189–193, under the section entitled “Hypothetical Coregencies: Survey,” and pp. 235f. William Joseph Murnane states, “The texts adduced to support the coregency of Shebitku and Taharqa can be explained otherwise, and there is no other evidence for this coregency” (AEC, p. 236). They simply reduce the evidence from Kawa IV and V (see App. G) to the argument that it can also be explained in other ways and then they totally ignore the evidence from Manetho, which clearly demonstrates co-regencies.

<sup>25</sup> E.g., Orientalia, NS, 68.1, pp. 58f. Others used the 12-year figure. ARE, 4, §885, adds the 12 years to 688 B.C.E., beginning Shebitku in 700 B.C.E. FHN, 1, p. 127, adds the 12 years to 690 B.C.E. beginning Shebitku in 702 B.C.E.; cf. TIP, p. 589, Table 4.

<sup>26</sup> See App. C.

<sup>27</sup> E.g., HdO, p. 258; Orientalia, NS, 70.1, pp. 1–18.

<sup>28</sup> Karnak Nile Level Text, no. 33; FHN, 1, p. 128, l. 1.

<sup>29</sup> E.g., JACF, 10, pp. 26–34, esp. p. 29; GM, 245, pp. 17–31; GM, 251, pp. 13–20; JEH, 1.2, pp. 124–151. Broekman’s claim that Shabaqo’s Year 2 inscription overwrote on the edge of Shebitku’s Year 3 inscription, thus making Shabaqo reign after Shebitku, is neither real nor convincing.

<sup>30</sup> Herodotus, 2:137, 139; Diodorus, 1:65:2–8; and see below ns. 49–54, and cf. App. K.

<sup>31</sup> TK, pp. 15f, IV, Year 6 Stela of Taharqa, l. 8, specifically names Shebitku as the king whom Taharqa succeeded during his 6th year (cf. pp. 27f, V, Year 6 Stela of Taharqa, and the commentaries on pp. 17–20, 29f, 32, n. 51).

Furthermore, Shebitku, the son of Shabaqo, is identified only as a king of Egypt, more specifically, an Ethiopian ruler from Memphis in Lower Egypt. Not one piece of evidence even suggests that he had authority over Egypt beyond Karnak, let alone southernmost Egypt or Kush. Indeed, there is no sign that Shebitku ever ruled over any part of Kush. Neither is the name Shebitku found in the Ethiopian Kings List. Yet King Shapatakuu of the Tang-i Var inscription was not connected with Lower Egypt and was specifically identified by the Assyrians as the “king of the land of Meluhha (Kush).”

#### SHABAQO OR KASHTA?

Most have ignored the possibility that “Šá-pa-ta-ku-ru” (Shapatakuu), king of the land of Meluhha (Kush), was really a corrupt form of either the name Shabaqo or his throne name *Se-be-qa-ta-w-y*. What is even more probable is that Shapatakuu (if, as suspected, is an Assyrian form of the name Shebitku) is either a personal or throne name for Kashta, the father of Shabaqo. Let us examine both possibilities.

First, the Assyrians continuously butchered the pronunciation of Ethiopian and Egyptian names. Psamtik, for example, is called *Tushamilk*,<sup>32</sup> Osorkon is called *Ši-il-kan-ni*,<sup>33</sup> Taharqa (Tirhaqah, Terhaq) is called *Tarkû*, Nekau is called *Nikû*, Pedubast II is called *Putubishti*, Sheshonq (Shoshenq) is called *Susinku*,<sup>34</sup> the title “Pharaoh” is *Pir'u*,<sup>35</sup> and so forth. A number of historians have even argued that the Pharaoh who is named Shabakû, named as the father of Urdamane, who is found on an inscription of the Assyrian king Assurbanipal in a reference to his war against Egypt,<sup>36</sup> is really a form of the name Shebitku.<sup>37</sup> Kenneth Kitchen, for example, argues, “Most scholars prefer—perhaps correctly—to take the Assyrian ‘Shabaku’ as intended (or an error) for Shebitku.”<sup>38</sup> Jim Dunn, as another example, noting that the Assyrian “annalist wrote what he heard,” also writes, “The errant orthography can be explained by the fact that the name Shabaka is more properly vocalized as Shebitku. If so then the ‘t’ in the doubled consonant ‘tk’ in the name of Shebitku would easily be lost to a foreign ear.”<sup>39</sup> Neither should we dismiss the fact that the Greek and Latin texts reciting Manetho’s Egyptian list of kings referred to Shebitku as Σεβιχώς (Sebikhos),<sup>40</sup> Σεβήκων (Sebekos),<sup>41</sup> *Sebichos*,<sup>42</sup> *Sebichus*,<sup>43</sup> and the like, not only showing the interchangeability of

<sup>32</sup> ARAB, 2, §785; cf. EP, p. 353.

<sup>33</sup> JCS, 12.3, p. 78, l. 8; BASOR, 141, pp. 24f.

<sup>34</sup> ARAB, 2, §771.

<sup>35</sup> ARAB, 2, §§18, 55, 195.

<sup>36</sup> ARAB, 2, §775.

<sup>37</sup> JEA, 35, p. 147, no. 76; TIP, p. 150 §121; Kush, 8, p. 72. This interpretation is not the view of this study. Nevertheless, it demonstrates an acknowledgement by Egyptologists of the fluidity of the pronunciation of these Egyptian and Kushite names by the Assyrians.

<sup>38</sup> TIP, p. 150 §121.

<sup>39</sup> TLNK, p. 1.

<sup>40</sup> Manetho, frags. 66 & 66a; Eusebius, *Chron.*, p. 148.

<sup>41</sup> Sothis, no. 76.

<sup>42</sup> Manetho, frag. 66b.

<sup>43</sup> Sec. Hier. Cod., p. 34.

the *kh*, *k*, and *tk* sounds but lending support to the understanding that when the Assyrian scribe of Sargon wrote Shapatakuu he could easily have been referring to Shabakû (Shabaqo).

These examples clearly reveal the inability of the Assyrians to accurately pronounce Egyptian and Ethiopian names. To rely on a single Assyrian scribe who wrote down a name just one time based upon phonetic spelling (i.e., writing down a name based upon how his ear heard the sound of the name) is risky at best. There must be far more evidence before one could make the determination about who the Ethiopian king actually was. As we have demonstrated above, a number of Egyptologists even believe that the name Shabakû, found in an inscription of Assurbanipal (c.663 B.C.E.), was an errant reading for Shebitku. The opposite can just as well be true.

Accordingly, one of the interpretations for the identity of "Šá-pa-ta-ku-ru" (Shapatakuu), king of the land of Meluhha (Kush)," can be explained if the name Šá-pa-ta-ku-ru', the name found in the Tang-i Var inscription during the 15th year of Sargon (707 B.C.E.), means Shabaqo. A possibility is that Shapatakuu (Shabataku?) is nothing less than an Assyrian phonetic spelling for either Shabaqo (Shabakû, Shabaku, Shabaka, etc.) or for a form of his throne name *Se-be-qa-ta-w-y*.<sup>44</sup> To the foreign ear of Sargon's Assyrian scribe, he heard, *Sha-pa-tkuu*, the *pa* standing for the *ba* sound and the *tk* or *tak* standing for the *q/k* sound.<sup>45</sup> Under these circumstances, there is no need to speculate that Shebitku, the son of Shabaqo, was in power in 707 B.C.E. Indeed, the king who is named at Tang-i Var is only called the king of Meluhha (Kush) and not the king of Egypt. Shabaqo, meanwhile, held Meluhha (which included a large portion of Upper Egypt) in 707 B.C.E, and began his conquest of Lower Egypt the next year. Shebitku, the son of Shabaqo, on the other hand, is never called the king of Kush and only held the title as a king of Egypt. There are simply too many variables that would cast doubt on who exactly is intended as the king of Kush in the Tang-i Var inscription. Yet Shabaqo is a possibility.

<sup>44</sup> Another possibility comes from the fact that Neferkare Shabaqo had three other Egyptian throne names, that of the Horus, Golden Horus, and Golden Falcon. For almost all other Pharaohs, these three names were usually very different from their Prenomen and Nomen. Yet in the case of Shabaqo, all three names were the same, Shebeqtawy (Sebeqatawy, Sebeqtawy, etc.). This name can easily be heard in the ear of an Assyrian scribe as Shapatakuu (Shapatkuu) and in the Assyrian record at Tang-i Var, i.e., *Sha-pa-ta-ku-u* = *Se-be-qa-ta-w-y*. The double consonant "qa-taw" or "qtau" being heard as "ta-kuu" or "tku," the *tku* sound reflecting the *q(t)u* sound. Thus, Egyptian *She-be-qtaw-i* = Assyrian *Sha-pa-tku-u*. There is also the possibility that Kashta, the father of Shabaqo, was also known by a name which, to the Assyrians, sounded like Shapatakuu. Kashta was co-regent with Shabaqo during his first year as the king of Egypt and Kush but his several other names are presently unknown. For still another argument against identifying Shapatku with Shebitku, see LPIE, pp. 163f. In this case, Kenneth Kitchen accepts the identification with Shebitku but denies that Shebitku was anything more than a lesser ruler with his father, King Shabaqo. The most likely, of course, might be that Shapatkuu was merely the Assyrian scribe's attempt at Shabaqo/Shabakû.

<sup>45</sup> *Sha-ba-qu* could possibly have been heard by the ear of the Assyrian scribe as *Sha-pat-kuu*, running the sounds together. In either case, the result is the same.

Nevertheless, everyone seems to have missed the obvious. Only one of the various throne names of King Kashta, the father of Shabaqo, is even known, Nj-M<sup>3</sup> t-R<sup>4</sup> ("The Possessor of Truth is Rê"), an Egyptian-style royal title most likely taken when he ascended to an Egyptian throne.<sup>46</sup> The personal name Kashta, meanwhile, is more of a title, for it means "the Kushite."<sup>47</sup> No one has stopped to consider the higher probability that Shebitku was either an Ethiopian personal name or one of the throne names held by Kashta, who was the ruler of Meluhha (Kush) at the precise time that the Tang-i Var inscription was composed. This detail is also suggested by the fact that Shabaqo would likely have given one of his father's royal names to his own son, a son who would succeed him on the throne at Memphis in Lower Egypt.

Kashta also had a motive to return Iamani of Ashdod to the Assyrian king Sargon. In the year 707 B.C.E., Kashta, a Kushite ruler who had already been living in Upper Egypt for some time, ascended to a throne in Upper Egypt and made his son Shabaqo his co-regent. For that reason, nothing is known for Year 1 of Shabaqo, seeing that his father, Kashta, while he was still alive, was the real power. Returning King Iamani of Ashdod to the Assyrian King Sargon that same year, thereby, is explained as an attempt on Kashta's part to placate the Assyrians, who had already advanced to the Egyptian northeastern frontier. This gesture would keep the peace, at least until Ethiopian control over all Egypt had been firmly established. Kashta, thereby, took away any current Assyrian excuse to invade Egypt as part of an effort to recover Iamani. Shabaqo, the son of Kashta, also subsequently sent gifts to the Assyrians in order to maintain peace between the two military powers.<sup>48</sup>

The point is, there are a number of good possibilities for the source of the name Shapatakuu that was found on Tang-i Var inscription of 707 B.C.E. That Shapatakuu (Shebitku) was either a personal or a throne name belonging to Kashta, the grandfather of Shebitku II, the son of Shabaqo, is the simplest and most obvious conclusion. Kashta, therefore, is Shebitku I.

### Stacking Chronologies

The various attempts to push back the dates for the reigns of Shabaqo and Shebitku ignore the limits set on them by Manetho, the Egyptian inscriptions, and all other ancient records. To accomplish their task, as we have already pointed out, they first misused the records from Manetho by taking figures out of context in order to stack their own chronology. And when this attempt did not suffice, they ignored all records and proclaimed their own exaggerated dates. It thus behooves us to take a closer look at the information from Manetho to see exactly what he did say. Ancient inscriptions and the sources using Manetho are as follows:

<sup>46</sup> FHN, 1, p. 43.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.

<sup>48</sup> See above n. 20.

	Shabaqo	Shebitku	Taharqa	(Total)
Eusebius <sup>49</sup>	12	12	20	= 44
Armenian Eusebius <sup>50</sup>	12	12	20	= 44
Book of Sothis <sup>51</sup>	12	12	20	= 44
Jerome (Hieronymus) <sup>52</sup>	12	12	20	= 44
Interpretive Armenian <sup>53</sup>	10	12	20	= 42
Africanus <sup>54</sup>	8	14	18	= 40
Highest date, inscriptions <sup>55</sup>	15	3	26	= 44

The highest total from these sources is 44 years, the medium is 42 years, and the smallest is 40 years. These figures must now be contrasted with the new arrangement—one which denies any co-regencies. If the numbers for the new arrangement are allowed, we have at minimum 57 years (15 + 16 + 26). It would take much more than a mispronunciation of one name to accommodate such a large difference between 44 years and 57 years.

Manetho places a further limitation on these numbers by stating that Dynasty XXV came to power when Shabaqo captured and burned alive Bocchoris (Bakenranef), the last king of Dynasty XXIV.<sup>56</sup> The Old Chronicle states that Dynasty XXIV had "3 generations for 44 years."<sup>57</sup> In addition, in another version from Eusebius, we read that Dynasty XXIV, naming only its last king Bochchoris, continued for 46 years.<sup>58</sup> Africanus' version of Manetho is even more specific, giving its last king, Bochchoris, only 6 years.<sup>59</sup> This detail precisely fits the reports provided from ancient inscriptions. There are several Serapeum stela that give Year 5 and Year 6 for Bakenranef, Year 6 being his highest and last year.<sup>60</sup> We also know from these Serapeum inscriptions, which are found in the area of Memphis, that Year 2 of Shabaqo is equivalent to Year 6 of Bakenranef.<sup>61</sup> This data indicates that Shabaqo drove Bakenranef out of Memphis that year. Accordingly, these two Pharaohs reigned contemporarily for 2 years, each over his own piece of Egypt. Since Shabaqo had reached Memphis sometime during his Year 2, he no doubt continued to push north and by the end of that year had defeated and murdered King Bakenranef of Sais.

<sup>49</sup> Manetho, frag. 67a; Eusebius, *Chron.*, pp. 147, 148; Syncellus, 84.

<sup>50</sup> Manetho, frag. 67b.

<sup>51</sup> Sothis, nos. 75–77.

<sup>52</sup> Eusebius, *Chron. Can.*, pp. 83, 85, year of Abraham 1282–1325.

<sup>53</sup> Inter. Arm., p. 10.

<sup>54</sup> Manetho, frag. 66; Syncellus, 83.

<sup>55</sup> TIP, p. 551 §462.

<sup>56</sup> Manetho, frags. 66, 67a & b; Sothis, no. 75.

<sup>57</sup> Old Chron., p. 229. The records left from Manetho do not provide the names of the first two rulers of Dynasty XXIV. Yet other ancient sources tell us that the father of Bocchoris (Bakenranef) was King Tefnakht I, variously called Tnephachthus, Technactis, Tnephachthos, and so forth by various early Greek writers (e.g., Plutarch, *Isis*, 8; Diodorus, 1:45; Aelian, 12:3). The first of the three kings listed by Manetho has not yet been confirmed.

<sup>58</sup> Eusebius, *Chron. Can.*, pp. 77, 83, year of Abraham 1236–1281.

<sup>59</sup> Manetho, frag. 64; Syncellus, 82.

<sup>60</sup> CAW, p. 82; CAH, 3.2, p. 689; Kush, 8, pp. 65f; Orientalia, NS, 70.1, pp. 10f.

<sup>61</sup> Orientalia, NS, 70.1, pp. 10f; CAH, 3.2, p. 689; Kush, 8, p. 66; CAW, p. 82; LPIE, p. 141; HdO, p. 261, n. 189; TIP, pp. 141f.

Herodotus informs us that during the reign of a blind king named Anysis,<sup>62</sup> “Egypt,” by which he primarily means Lower Egypt, “was invaded by Shabaqo (Shabaqo), king of Ethiopia (Kush), and a great Ethiopian army.”<sup>63</sup> Almost nothing is known about Shabaqo’s first year,<sup>64</sup> but his Year 2 inscriptions indicated that during this period he had clearly begun his invasion of Lower Egypt. Besides his Year 2 inscription at the Serapeum in Memphis, donation stelas show a Year 2 at Pharbaithos (in the eastern Delta), a Year 3 from Bubastis, and a Year 6 from Sais (in the western Delta).<sup>65</sup> There are also stelas for Year 4 at Sau (Sais) and for Year 6 from the twin towns of Pe and Dep (Buto).<sup>66</sup>

As a result of this evidence, we can see that Manetho correctly gives both 12 years and 10 years for the first king of Dynasty XXV. Year 1 and Year 2 of Shabaqo equals Year 5 and Year 6 of Bakenranef. In agreement with these details, the 44-year period given for Dynasty XXIV ends when Shabaqo became the king of Egypt at Thebes (Year 1 of Shabaqo), i.e., 707 B.C.E. There is little doubt, as already noted, that Shabaqo conquered all of Lower Egypt by the end of his Year 2 (= Bakenranef Year 6). Thus the alternative figure of a 46-year period for Dynasty XXIV encompasses the 6th and last year of Bakenranef (706 B.C.E.). In turn, the beginning of Year 3 of Shabaqo (705 B.C.E.) is counted by Manetho as the beginning of Shabaqo’s full dominance over all of Lower Egypt.

### Co-regencies

Regarding the last half of Dynasty XXV, ancient inscriptions along with Manetho’s records demonstrate a 6-year co-regency of Shebitku and Taharqa II. In the Kawa inscriptions in Kush, for example, we read that when Taharqa II was a 20-year-old youth, Shebitku fetched him from Kush and brought him north to Thebes to be with him, i.e., to join him on the throne.<sup>67</sup> F. M. Laming Macadam remarks, “What happened at Thebes was tantamount then to an association of Taharqa on the throne with Shebitku.”<sup>68</sup> Macadam, who translated these texts from Kawa, writes:

<sup>62</sup> The identity of the town and king named Anysis (Anusis) are presently unknown, but the man was most probably a ruler from a city of the same name located in the Delta. The Delta region is indicated by the fact that, when Anysis fled Shabaqo, he hid on the island of Elbo located in the marshland (e.g., Herodotus, 2:137, 140; Thucydides, 1:110; Steph. Byn., s.v. Ἐλβώ). Anysis is said to have followed King Asukhin (Herodotus, 2:136f), whose name is usually identified with Shoshenq (BZS, 8, p. 50; Lloyd, *Her.*, pp. 87f), kings of that name having ruled dynasties located in the Delta. We agree with Dan’el Kahn, although for different reasons, that this Shoshenq is Shoshenq V (BZS, 8, p. 50).

<sup>63</sup> Herodotus, 2:137. FHN, 1, p. 122, states that Shabaqo was forced to “reconquer Egypt” in his 2nd regnal year, which is based upon the erroneous belief that Piye ruled before Shabaqo. The invasion by Shabaqo was actually the initial conquest of Lower Egypt by the Kushites.

<sup>64</sup> No inscription for Year 1 is known. During that year Shabaqo was co-regent with his father Kashta.

<sup>65</sup> CAH, 3.2, p. 690; TIP, p. 379 §340; FHN, 1, p. 125.

<sup>66</sup> BPENR, pp. 208, 318 n. 9.

<sup>67</sup> TK, p. 15, IV, l. 7–9, p. 28, V, l. 13f, 16f. Also see App. G.

<sup>68</sup> TK, p. 17, n. 17.

. . . Taharqa counted his regnal years from the time when, at the age of twenty, he was associated with Shebitku.<sup>69</sup>

The 1st year of this co-regency, therefore, was 689 B.C.E., being equivalent to the 1st year of Taharqa II's full 26-year reign. The kind words spoken by Taharqa II about Shebitku in these inscriptions, by the way, conceal the real political intrigue that was being played out. To begin with, it is now realized that Shebitku was the son of Shabaqo,<sup>70</sup> the son of Kashta,<sup>71</sup> while Taharqa II was the son of Piye,<sup>72</sup> the son of Alara.<sup>73</sup> For this reason, Manetho does not report that Taharqa II was the son of either Shabaqo or Shebitku. In addition, as Robert G. Morkot points out, "there is no evidence that they," that is, Alara and Kashta, "were brothers," as has been popularly assumed.<sup>74</sup> He correctly regards Alara and Kashta as scions from two different royal families.<sup>75</sup> Karl-Heinz Priese also contested any family connection.<sup>76</sup> This evidence reveals that when Shebitku died, he would be leaving his throne to someone other than one of his own sons, brothers, or family members. This detail raises the question as to why Taharqa II was chosen as co-regent.

Second, even though King Piye favored living in Napata, he was politically far more powerful over Kush and Egypt than either Shabaqo or Shebitku. He had not only conquered many foreign nations but had been firmly established as a Pharaoh of all Egypt since 696 B.C.E., thus, 7 years prior to Taharqa

<sup>69</sup> TK, p. 18, n. 30; EnBS, p. 301, "He began his reign at the age of 20."

<sup>70</sup> Manetho, frags. 66, 67a & b; BPENR, p. 224.

<sup>71</sup> JEA, 35, p. 147, no. 68; BPENR, p. 159, 313 n. 36; CRFAE, p. 235. As Robert G. Morkot points out (BPENR, p. 158), the fact that there is not one inscription which identifies Amenirdis I, the daughter of Kashta, as the sister of Piye further proves that Shabaqo and Piye were not brothers.

<sup>72</sup> Abar, the mother of Taharqa (Taharqo), called "the king's sister" and "Queen mother," was also the sister-wife of Piye. As a result, Piye was the father of Taharqa, see TK, Kawa V, l. 16f, 20f; FHN, 1, p. 131; KK, p. 134, n. 31, p. 260; BPENR, p. 176; THDAE, p. 237; EnBS, p. 301.

<sup>73</sup> Roberto B. Gozzoli (JEA, 95, p. 245) correctly recognized that Taharqa (Taharqo) II's grandmother was the sister-wife of Alara. Gozzoli more precisely translates Kawa VI, l. 22f, as stating: "His (Taharqa's) mother's mother was assigned to him by her older brother, the son of Re Alara, right of voice, saying, 'O beneficent god, the swift one, who comes to him who calls upon him, may you look after MY SISTER-WIFE for me, born with me from one womb.'" Robert K. Ritner understands the text in the same way, translating, "May you look after MY SISTER-WIFE for me, she who was born together with me in a single womb" (LAIE, p. 552, l. 23). The reference to a sister born together with me in a single womb might well imply that they were twins. Taharqa's mother was Abar, the sister-wife of his father Piye (see above n. 72). Since Taharqa's "mother's mother" (i.e., his grandmother) was the sister-wife of Alara, it stands to reason that Alara must be the father of Piye. This fact is supported by the oath Alara swore, as quoted by Taharqa, to look after his sister-wife, from whom the legitimate heir was to descend, i.e., the right coming down to Taharqa. The only known sister-wife of Alara was Kasaqa. Interestingly, Tabiry, another wife of Piye, was also the daughter of Alara and Kasaqa (KK, p. 123). Based upon common practice among the royal families during this period of brother-sister marriages, Tabiry would also be the sister-wife of Piye. László Török, as a result, interestingly speaks of "Taharqo's grandfather Alara" (KK, p. 61).

<sup>74</sup> Meroitica, 15, p. 208; KK, p. 260, "that Alara and Kashta were brothers, IS A GUESS"; BPENR, p. 157, "There is no clear evidence to support this assumption, and the reconstruction was influenced by the theory that the royal succession passed from brother to brother," a false premise; also see, p. 176, "no direct evidence to support it."

<sup>75</sup> Meroitica, 15, pp. 179–229; cf. KK, pp. 123f, n. 258.

<sup>76</sup> ZAS, 98, pp. 16–32.

II becoming the co-regent with Shebitku. Within this political backdrop, it is clear that Piye forced Shebitku to accept Taharqa II, Piye's 20-year-old son,<sup>77</sup> as his co-regent. Even more revealing, the official regnal years for Shebitku were discontinued after only 3 years. From this point on, official regnal years were allowed only to Taharqa II. This detail shows that the official duties were transferred to Taharqa II even during his co-regency with the older Shebitku.

Next, King Taharqa II, late in "Year 6" of his reign (684 B.C.E.), reports:

I received the crown in Memphis after the Hawk (Shebitku)<sup>78</sup> had soared to heaven and my father (the deity) Amun commanded me to place every land and country beneath my feet southward to Retekhu-Qabet (southern limits of Kush),<sup>79</sup> northward to Qebkh-Khor (the northern limit of the Egyptian Empire),<sup>80</sup> and eastward to the rising of the sun and westward to its setting.<sup>81</sup>

It was during this same year, by the way, that Pharaoh Piye placed Tefnakht II on the throne of Sais. Piye was clearly involved in the politics of Egypt during this period. Also notice that, unlike Piye's claims of great conquests,<sup>82</sup> nothing is said about Taharqa II actually conquering any of the northern lands. Regarding the southern regions, a statue has been found in the Sudan at Dangeil in the vicinity of the Fifth Cataract of the Nile. Its inscription was written in Egyptian hieroglyphs, stating:

*Ntr nfr* (Perfect deity)], Lord of the Two Lands, Lord of Action (ritual), King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Nefertum-Khu-Re, son of Re, Taharqa, [beloved] of Re-Harakhty who resides in Ms[...'] forever.<sup>83</sup>

In the Year 6 inscription mentioned above, Taharqa II does not claim that he conquered numerous foreign nations, as we find with King Piye. Rather he only reports that the deity Amun allowed him "to place every land and country beneath my feet." That is, Taharqa II was placed in control of countries that had previously been conquered. This statement refers to the fact that in 684 B.C.E. the Ethiopians still retained a good part of Piye's northern empire.<sup>84</sup>

<sup>77</sup> That he was 20 years old when he came to the throne, see Kawa, V, l. 17 (cf. IV, l. 7–9, 30). That Taharqa II was the son of Piye, see above ns. 72 & 73.

<sup>78</sup> Kawa, IV, l. 8 (TK, p. 15, l. 8; LAIE, p. 538, l. 8).

<sup>79</sup> LAIE, p. 545, n. 7, "An African tribe and later the designation of a portion of the world's ocean in the districts far south of Kush bordering on the ocean." It sets in contrast to the northern limits at the Black Sea (cf. below n. 80).

<sup>80</sup> TK, p. 31, n. 46; TK, p. 545, n. 8, "the northern limits of the inhabitable world." In context, since Taharqa Piye conquered Asia Minor (see App. H), the northern limit refers to the north ocean (Black Sea).

<sup>81</sup> Kawa, V, l. 15f; and see App. G.

<sup>82</sup> See below App. H and above Chap. XII.

<sup>83</sup> S&N, 13, pp. 76–88, esp. p. 81. Taharqa II's broken statue was found along with those of Senkamanisken and Aspelta, two of his successors in Kush (S&N, 13, pp. 84f).

<sup>84</sup> See App. H.

Tribute paid by these countries kept Piye in a very powerful position among the Ethiopian and Egyptian kings. These northern territories were subsequently lost during the 2nd regnal year of the Assyrian king Esarhaddon (679/678 B.C.E.), who as part of his first great campaign extended his empire as far southwest as to the border of Egypt.<sup>85</sup>

Regarding the above statements from Taharqa II, ancient writers claim that violence and intrigue were involved when Shebitku died. They note that Taharqa II killed Shebitku, apparently by poisoning him,<sup>86</sup> and subsequently took Shebitku's seat on the throne at Memphis.<sup>87</sup> A comment in Jerome's Chronicle, for example, reports:

. . . hic ab *Ethiopia* duxit exercitum atque *Sebiconem* occidit ipseque regnavit *Egyptiorum* (he [Taharqa II] led the army from *Ethiopia* to here and thus killed *Sebikon* [Shebitku] and he himself ruled *Egypt*).<sup>88</sup>

That 6 years had passed until the sole reign of Taharqa II is also reflected in his statements that, at first, he was brought north to Thebes to join Shebitku. Then after Shebitku's death during the latter part of Taharqa II's 6th year, Taharqa II was crowned as the sole monarch in Memphis.<sup>89</sup> It is obvious that since Taharqa II was not crowned until the end of his 6th year, he was co-regent with Shebitku for that same 6-year period. That Taharqa II was co-regent with Shebitku for 6 years was immediately recognized by Jozef M. A. Janssen and M. F. Laming Macadam.<sup>90</sup> Likewise, P. Van der Meer, speaking about Taharqa II, writes:

That he was crowned king at Memphis in his sixth year can mean nothing else than that he had been for six years with his brother Sabataqa.<sup>91</sup> If we subtract from his reign therefore the six years during which he was coregent, Sabataqa must have died in 684, and this is the year in which Taharqa came to the throne. . . . Taharqa became coregent in 689, and was twenty years old when he left his mother and moved to Lower Egypt with the king.<sup>92</sup>

Manetho supports this construct. He only gives Taharqa II 20 years. Yet Taharqa II claims 26 years in his inscriptions. When one excludes from the 26-year figure the 6 years of co-regency with Shebitku, this leaves the 20 years

<sup>85</sup> ABC, Chron. 14, l. 6–8. For the identification of Arza with Pelusium on the northeast border of Egypt, see our forthcoming text, *Mount Sinai* (Mt.S.); and see the discussion in App. H.

<sup>86</sup> Papyrus Vandier (Papyrus Lille 139), see LPV, pp. 39–97; CdE, 76, p. 35.

<sup>87</sup> For all the sources regarding this murder, see CdE, 76, pp. 30–47.

<sup>88</sup> Vatican Reginensis 560; see CM, p. 251; CdE, 76, p. 33.

<sup>89</sup> See Kawa IV and V; TK, pp. 15f, 23, 27f; LAIE, pp. 535–545.

<sup>90</sup> TK, p. 17, n. 17, p. 18–20, ns. 30 & 31, p. 32, n. 50; Biblica, 34.1, p. 26.

<sup>91</sup> That Taharqa II was a brother of Shebitku only in the sense of a marital connection, see App. G, n. 1.

<sup>92</sup> CAW, p. 82.

that are found in Manetho. Meanwhile, Manetho gives Shebitku 12 years, although only 3 regnal years are known from the inscriptions. The 3 regnal years and the 6 years of co-regency with Taharqa II accounts for 9 years. When we subtract these 9 years from the 12 years found in Manetho, we have 3 years yet to explain. On the other side of the equation, Shabaqo reigned 15 regnal years but Manetho only gives him 12 years (since coming to the throne in Thebes) and 10 years (since overthrowing Bocchoris of Sais at the end of his 2nd year). If we take 12 years from the time Shabaqo became king in Thebes from his known 15 regnal years, that leaves 3 years' co-regency with Shebitku. Accordingly, 3 years' co-regency with Shabaqo, plus 3 regnal years, plus a 6-year co-regency with Taharqa II equals 12 years ( $3 + 3 + 6 = 12$ ), precisely the number given by Manetho for Shebitku.

These details leave only the figures from Africanus to be explained. Africanus states that Manetho's records gave 8 years to Shabaqo, 14 years to Shebitku, and only 18 years to Taharqa II. When we add the 8 years of Shabaqo with the 14 years of Shebitku, we have 22 years, the same total that we find in the Interpretive Armenian text ( $10 + 12 = 22$ ). Shebitku cannot rule after his death (at the end of 684 B.C.E.), so the two sources used the same ending date. The difference is explained by Shebitku being associated with the throne in 697 B.C.E. (beginning the 14-year period) and then becoming crown prince in 695 B.C.E. (beginning the 12-year period).

Egyptologists of more recent date have greatly distorted these figures by taking out of context the 14-year figure found in Africanus for Shebitku. They ignore the shorter reigns of 8 years for Shabaqo and 18 years for Taharqa II that go with these 14 years. Counting back from the death of Shebitku, the 14 years for Shebitku and the 8 years for Shabaqo equal the same period of 22 years as found in the Interpretative Armenian text, which gives Shabaqo 10 and Shebitku 12 (= 22 years).

Finally, the 18 years for Taharqa II provided by Africanus is also easily explained. Counting 18 years after the year of the death of Shebitku (i.e., the last year of the 14-year period), we arrive at the year 666 B.C.E.<sup>93</sup> It was during this year that Assurbanipal, the king of Assyria, drove through Egypt and made it all the way south to Thebes.<sup>94</sup> Taharqa II was forced south, fleeing back to Kush.<sup>95</sup> Therefore, in this sense, 666 B.C.E. was the last year in which Taharqa II was counted as the king of Memphis and Thebes, for he no longer resided in these cities. Africanus merely indicates from the records of

<sup>93</sup> As of yet, there is no inscription or document found that gives the exact year and date for this military campaign, even in the records of Assurbanipal. The Assyrian Eponym List, for example, breaks off with the 6th year of Sennacherib (699/698 B.C.E.); Chron. 1 only takes us down to the accession year of Assurbanipal (669 B.C.E.) (ABC, 1, l. 34–38). Assurbanipal (668–626 B.C.E.), instead, only speaks of his campaigns, but does not date them. His Egyptian campaigns are labelled, "my first campaign" and "my second campaign" (ANET, pp. 294f). Yet the evidence used for the reconstructions of the chronology for the Assyrian period of Assurbanipal clearly points to 666 B.C.E., i.e., TIP, p. 553 §465, places the war between 667–665 B.C.; CAH, 3.2, p. 700, in 667/666.

<sup>94</sup> ANET, pp. 294.

<sup>95</sup> CRFAE, p. 235, states that Assurbanipal "drove Taharqa back to Napata."

Manetho that he recognized that Taharqa II's 18th year of sole rulership over Memphis and Thebes was his last while living in Egypt due to the conquest of Egypt by the Assyrians and his removal to Napata.

Nevertheless, after this devastating defeat of the Kushite Pharaoh, the local kings in Egypt broke their agreement with the Assyrian king and made another alliance with Taharqa II. Although he now held his primary residency in Napata, the Egyptians continued to recognize him as Pharaoh in Thebes and Upper Egypt as well as in a number of local districts of Lower Egypt.<sup>96</sup> As a result, Taharqa II continued to be recognized as a ruler of Egypt for two more years, that is, until his death (either very late in 664 B.C.E. or very early in 663 B.C.E.). At that time he was replaced on the throne of Kush by his nephew Urud-Amun (regarding whom we shall discuss in Appendix J). Since Psamtik I counted his reign from 663 B.C.E., Manetho gave Taharqa II until the end of 664 B.C.E., i.e., his 20th year as sole ruler over the Memphite throne and as the king of Kush and Egypt.

### Conclusion

Despite all of the evidence, when the facts came into conflict with the interpretation of more recent Egyptologists, they were ignored. The evidence for a co-regency between Taharqa II and Shebitku as found in the Kawa IV and V texts, for example, was glossed over as "fragile" and placed in the context of being only one possible interpretation.<sup>97</sup> Yet the hard evidence was irrefutable that Taharqa II only reigned 26 regnal years. Having already pushed back Taharqa II's first year from 689 to 690 B.C.E. by using a false interpretation of the Demotic *Papyrus Berlin* 13588,<sup>98</sup> the advocates for this new chronology were forced to concentrate on expanding Shebitku's reign.

For a new chronology for Dynasty XXV to work, it was theorized that Shebitku's short reign of only 3 regnal years, as found in the inscriptions, had to be a number far too low. In an attempt to extend his reign as far back as possible, they first borrowed from Africanus' version of Manetho, taking the highest number found for Shebitku, i.e., 14 years. To apply this number, they had to ignore the fact that they were using it out of context, stacking the 14 years on top of the 26-year reign of Taharqa II, bringing his starting year to 704 B.C.E.

Then when the Tang-i Var inscription was discovered, they misidentified the Kushite king named Šá-pa-ta-ku-ru' with Shebitku, the son of Shabaqo. This connection, they believed, placed the beginning of Shebitku's reign back to 706 B.C.E. Now, even the 14-year figure found in Africanus' version of Manetho was thrown aside as still not big enough. As a result, several chronologists sought reasons to increase Shebitku's regnal years by means of speculation, using 16 years as the new minimum. As we have demonstrated, these theories and speculations can all be proven incorrect or insufficient.

<sup>96</sup> ANET, pp. 294f.

<sup>97</sup> E.g., AEC, pp. 190–193.

<sup>98</sup> See above App. C.