

# DIVIDED KINGDOM, CO-REGENCY, OR SOLE RULE IN THE KINGDOM(S) OF EGYPT-AND-KUSH?\*

By Dan'el Kahn\*\*

Recently G. Frame republished a rock inscription and relief of Sargon II, King of Assyria<sup>1</sup> discovered in the Tang-i Var Pass in Iran and originally published in Farsī in 1968.<sup>2</sup> The text mentions the rebellion of Iamani, king of Ashdod, against Sargon II, King of Assyria (722–705 B.C.) in the year 712 B.C. and his flight to the king of Kush. According to the inscription, king Shebitku (=Shabatka) extradited Iamani to Sargon. The inscription can be dated quite certainly to 706 B.C., not long before the death in battle of Sargon II in the summer of 705 B.C.<sup>3</sup> Thus, the Tang-i Var inscription indicates that Shebitku was already king of Kush in 706 B.C. This new date is at least four years earlier than has generally been thought. Frame continued and claimed that this is a “piece of information which will require Egyptologists to revise their current chronology for Egypt’s twenty-fifth Dynasty”, and added: “This would raise difficulties for the current Egyptian chronology”.<sup>4</sup>

Frame’s article was supplemented with a brief article by Redford. He considered the idea of shifting the dates of the 25<sup>th</sup> dynasty and fixing the accession of Shabaka to *ca.* 720 B.C., and concluded that “this presents a major difficulty. For the decade preceding 713/12 B.C. the Assyrians

and the biblical records contain several allusions to Egyptian rulers but none of them can be interpreted as allusions to a *Kushite* king ruling over *Egypt*.” Redford then considered two additional possible solutions. One was to resuscitate the old theory of a “coregency” between Shabaka and Shebitku. Without giving a reason, this idea was rejected by him. The second solution that Redford proposed was a “bifurcation in the government’ of the vast domain of the Kingdom of Egypt-and-Kush. Shabaka had ... realized the need to separate off the administration of the Kushite heartland; and he assigned to his nephew Shebitku, complete with the trappings of kingship (in Kush).” Redford maintained his earlier proposed chronology.<sup>5</sup>

It seems that the works of Schipper,<sup>6</sup> Morkot<sup>7</sup> and Younger<sup>8</sup> added the information of the Tang-i Var Inscription just before the publication of their work but did not really consider the historical implications of this text.

Kitchen suggested “not (to) entail any change in the Best Egyptian chronology whatsoever...” (i.e. *his* proposed chronology [D.K.]). According to Kitchen, Shabaka ascended the throne in Kush in 717 B.C. and ruled for 15 years until 702 B.C.<sup>9</sup>

\* I would like to thank Prof. Dr. K. Zibelius-Chen for reading my article and suggesting useful comments. All errors are, however, my responsibility.

\*\* *University of Haifa*

<sup>1</sup> G. FRAME, The Inscription of Sargon II at Tang-i Var, *Or* 68 (1999) 31–57.

<sup>2</sup> FRAME, *Or* 68, 33, n. 2–5.

<sup>3</sup> H. TADMOR, The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological– Historical Study, *JCS* 12 (1958) 97. On the 12<sup>th</sup> of the month Abu Sennacherib ascended the throne.

<sup>4</sup> FRAME, *Or* 68, 52, 54.

<sup>5</sup> D.B. REDFORD, A note on the Chronology of Dynasty 25 and the Inscription of Sargon II at Tang-i Var, *Or* 68 (1999) 58–60.

<sup>6</sup> B.U. SCHIPPER, *Israel und Ägypten in der Königszeit: Die Kulturellen Kontakte von Salomo bis zum Fall Jerusalems*, OBO 170, Freiburg Schweiz and Göttingen 1999, 201–2.

<sup>7</sup> R.G. MORKOT, *The Black Pharaohs: Egypt’s Nubian Rulers*,

London 2000, 224 ff., 319 n. 6. Morkot seems to prefer the lower chronology and date Shebitku’s accession as sole ruler after 701 B.C. As for the impact of the Tang-i Var inscription, Morkot laconically notes: “The recently published inscription of Sargon II at Tang-i Var indicates that Shebitku was ruling Kush before 706 B.C., while Shabako was in Egypt. He may have become co-regent in the last years of Shabako’s reign, although there is no clear evidence to support the idea.”

<sup>8</sup> K.L. YOUNGER, “Assyrian Involvement in the Southern Levant at the End of the Eighth Century B.C.E.”, in: A.G. VAUGHN and E. KILLEBREW (eds.), *Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology: The First Temple Period*, Atlanta 2003, 244.

<sup>9</sup> K.A. KITCHEN, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100–650 BC.)*, 2<sup>nd</sup> rev. ed., Warminster, 1996, 383 (henceforth *ThIP*). He does not dismiss, however, the possibility that Shabaka ascended the throne of Kush in 713 B.C. and reigned until 699. K.A. KITCHEN, *ThIP*, 552–559.

He explained that “Sargon II is merely using the Akkadian term *sharru* (in this text written with the logogram MAN) *not* in the precise meaning of ‘king’=monarch, but with the wider (not to say sloppy, inexact) meaning of ‘ruler’ – just as Ashurbanipal did later in enumerating the variety of Delta Dynasts, almost none of whom were actually ‘kings’ in local Egyptian terms, but simply chiefs of the Ma, city governors, etc. In this case Shebitku in 706 is simply Shabako’s *de facto* viceroy for Nubia... firm evidence is totally lacking at this point. In this case our chronology does not change by a second (let alone 4 years), but we do see that there was a practical division of top administration between the Nubian Pharaoh in Memphis and Egypt and his deputy in Napata and Nubia as foreseen by Dr. Redford (Redford 1999, 60).”<sup>10</sup> Von Beckerath suggests the same solution and also maintains his earlier proposed chronology.<sup>11</sup>

Hoffmeier also addressed the issue of Shebitku’s mention in the Tang-i Var inscription.<sup>12</sup> Basically, he accepts Kitchen’s chronology.<sup>13</sup> Hoffmeier notes that a coregency between Shabaka and Shebitku as discussed by Murnane and Yurco was not widely accepted as can be surmised from his proposed date for the accession of Shebitku to 702 B.C. Initially, he rejected a coregency between the two kings. However, now that the Tang-i Var inscription mentions Shebitku as king of Meluhha (Kush) in 706, he accepts a coregency between Shabaka and Shebitku, although he probably meant that Shabaka and Shebitku split the vast territory of Egypt and Kush between them (as Redford suggested).<sup>14</sup> He then maintains that the mention of Shebitku as king of Meluhha could be explained according to the

Egyptian New Kingdom practice of appointing a *s3 nsw n Kš* “son of the King of Kush”, translated as “Viceroy of Kush”. Shebitku, thus, controlled Nubia, while Shabaka controlled Egypt. He notes that Shebitku is neither called Pharaoh, nor king of Egypt, but only “šar Meluhha” – “King of Kush”. According to Hoffmeier, Shebitku continued this practice and appointed Taharqa as “Viceroy” in Kush in 701 B.C.<sup>15</sup>

In a recent article, I suggested that Shebitku ascended the throne of Egypt and Kush as sole ruler in late 707 or early 706 B.C. I tried to show that Shebitku could not have been a coregent of Shabaka, nor that they divided the kingdom between them.<sup>16</sup>

Zibeliuss-Chen adopted the theory that Shebitku ascended the throne as sole ruler in 707 B.C. She noted, rightly, that there is no evidence of a divided monarchy in the reigns of Piankhy and Taharqa even though they ruled the whole territory of Egypt and Kush as well. Furthermore, according to Zibeliuss-Chen, it would also be astonishing that the Assyrians mentioned the extradition of Iamani by the junior ruler Shebitku and not by the more prestigious senior ruler, Shabaka.<sup>17</sup> Hoffmeier mentions the existence of my article,<sup>18</sup> but does not tackle with any of the issues raised by me against a coregency or a divided monarchy in the United Kingdom of Egypt-and-Kush.

Dodson also accepted the year 707 B.C. as the accession year of Shebitku and states: “I reject any *ad hoc* invention of a coregency between the two kings purely to rescue a preconceived chronology”<sup>19</sup>

Kitchen considered the idea that Shebitku was sole ruler over Kush and Egypt in 706 creating a shift of *ca.* 4 years in his proposed chronology of

<sup>10</sup> K.A. KITCHEN, Regnal and Genealogical Data of Ancient Egypt (Absolute Chronology I): The Historical Chronology of Ancient Egypt, A Current Assessment, in: M. BIETAK (ed.), *The Synchronisation of Civilisations in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Second Millennium B.C.*, CChEM 1, 50–51.

<sup>11</sup> J. VON BECKERATH, Zur XXV. Dynastie, SAK 29 (2001) 4.

<sup>12</sup> J.K. HOFFMEIER, Egypt’s Role in the Events of 701 B.C. in Jerusalem, in: A. G. VAUGHN and E. KILLEBREW (eds.), *Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology: The First Temple Period*, (Atlanta, 2003a) 219–234 and in the same volume: Egypt’s Role in the Events of 701 B.C.: A Rejoinder to J.J.M. Roberts, 286–287 (henceforth 2003b).

<sup>13</sup> As also accepted by L. TÖRÖK, *The Kingdom of Kush: Handbook of the Napatan-Meroitic Civilization* (Leiden 1997) 166 ff.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. J.K. HOFFMEIER, (2003b), 287: “The coregency option makes good sense...”.

<sup>15</sup> J.K. HOFFMEIER, (2003a) 227–232.

<sup>16</sup> D. KHAN, The Inscription of Sargon II at Tang-i Var and the Chronology of Dynasty 25, *Or* 70 (2001), 1–18.

<sup>17</sup> K. ZIBELIUS-CHEN, Die Chronologie der mittleren 25. Dynastie bis zum Ende des Reiches von Meroe, in: E. HORNING and R. KRAUSS (eds.), *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, (forthcoming).

<sup>18</sup> J.K. HOFFMEIER, (2003a) 219–234 and idem. (2003b), 286.

<sup>19</sup> A. DODSON, The Problem of Amenirdis II and the Heirs to the Office of God’s Wife of Amun during the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, *JEA* 88 (2002) 182, n. 24.

the 25<sup>th</sup> dynasty. He did not reject it, but prefers to maintain his chronology.<sup>20</sup>

Yurco, who advanced the coregency theory,<sup>21</sup> also maintained his previous views. He stressed that the regnal dates in Manetho for Shabaka and Shebitku (as preserved in Africanus and Eusebius) should not be ignored, that the anchor date of Shabaka's conquest in 712 should be maintained, and that the coregency between Shabaka and Shebitku must have already started in 706 B.C.<sup>22</sup> Thus, every scholar, who wrote about the chronology of the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty before the publication of the Tang-i Var Inscription, and commented on its implications for Egyptian chronology maintained his earlier view without changing his preferred chronology, and explained the appearance of Shebitku, King of Kush, as a coregent of Shabaka or as ruler over the territory of Kush in a divided monarchy.

It seems that my case to prove that Shebitku ascended the throne as sole ruler in 707/6 B.C. and that a coregency or division of the Kingdom of Egypt-and-Kush between Shabaka and Shebitku did not occur was not strong enough. Thus, in the following pages I feel compelled to review the evidence (or lack of it) concerning coregencies and division of the Kushite kingdom during the Kushite rule over Kush and Egypt from the reign of Piankhy in Egypt in 734 B.C. until their expulsion from Egypt forever under Tanutamun in 656 B.C. At the end I will briefly deal with the problem of communication and control over the vast territory of Egypt and Kush. But first, I shall deal with the evidence concerning coregencies in Kush between *ca.* 750 B.C. and 656 B.C.

## 1. WAS THERE A COREGENCY IN THE UNITED KINGDOM OF EGYPT-AND-KUSH?

### 1.1. Coregency and Kushite Ideology of Succession

The Kushite royal ideology and rules of succession were basically similar to those practiced in Egypt.<sup>23</sup> This means that the Kushite King, like his Egyptian

counterpart was seen as the earthly incarnation of the god Horus. On his death the king was identified with the god Osiris, king of the realm of the dead. His place as the earthly Horus was then occupied by his legitimate heir, normally his eldest son. According to this theology, the new king ascended the throne only on the death of his predecessor and there was no place for a coregency and association between the two. In theological terms, there was a problem of having two Horuses acting simultaneously.<sup>24</sup> However, Lorton has tried to solve this incompatibility between theory and reality and suggested that the Egyptian mind allowed the existence of several different manifestations of Horus. Thus, there is no possibility to prove that there existed a theological objection to the institute of coregency as has been practiced in Egypt,<sup>25</sup> and for that matter also in Kush. The existence of specific coregencies still have to be proven or disproven based on facts.

In practice, the institute of coregency appeared at the beginning of the Middle Kingdom after the turbulent times of the First Intermediate Period.<sup>26</sup> Only a handful of coregencies can be proven during the millennia of Egyptian History. It does not seem that the political instability that preceded the Middle Kingdom and the special circumstances that prompted co-regencies in other periods can be detected in the Kushite Kingdom of the Eighth-Seventh centuries B.C.

### 1.2. The evidence for coregencies in the 25<sup>th</sup> dynasty during the 8<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> c. B.C.

No written information of great historical value has come down to us from the reigns of the immediate predecessors of Piankhy, the conqueror of Egypt, let alone texts which mention a coregency.

#### 1.2.1. *Piankhy and Shabaka*

British Museum cube statue of Ity (EA 24429) has sometimes been mentioned as an argument in favour of a coregency between Piankhy and Shabaka, for Piankhy is mentioned as *ꜥnh dt*

<sup>20</sup> KITCHEN, *Regnal and Genealogical Data*, 50–51.

<sup>21</sup> F. YURCO, *Sennacherib's Third Campaign and the Coregency of Shabaka and Shebitku*, *Serapis* 6 (1980) 221–240.

<sup>22</sup> Private communication in 2000.

<sup>23</sup> See D. KAHN, *The Royal Succession in the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty*, *Antike Sudan* 16, (2005) 143–163. For the Egyptian Mythical cycle of Osiris and Horus and the Egyptian kingship, see V.A. TOBIN, *Theological Princi-*

*ples of Egyptian Religion*, New York, 1989, "The Egyptian Kingship", 93–95.

<sup>24</sup> D.B. REDFORD, *Review of MURNANE, Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, SAOC 40, Chicago 1977, *JEA* 69 (1983) 182.

<sup>25</sup> D. LORTON, *Terms of Coregency in the Middle Kingdom*, *VA* 2 (1986) 118.

<sup>26</sup> MURNANE, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, SAOC 40; Chicago 1977.

“living forever” in year 15 of Shabaka. It was shown, however, that the text only referred to the funerary cult of Piankhy and that the epithet *ḥnḥ dt* was also applied to dead kings.<sup>27</sup> Thus, there is no evidence for a coregency between these two kings.<sup>28</sup>

### 1.2.2. *Shabaka and Shebitku*

A coregency between Shabaka and Shebitku was proposed on several grounds:

#### 1.2.2.1. *Turin Stela no. 1467*

In Murnane's seminal work on co-regencies,<sup>29</sup> the author mentions a Stela in the Turin Museum (Turin Stela no. 1467) that depicts Shabaka and Shebitku (the one seated behind the other) on the left side facing two other persons across an offering table. This stela was considered as evidence for a coregency when acquired for the Turin Museum, which acknowledged it later to be a fake. Recently, R. Morkot and S. Quirke dealt with this stela again and reaffirmed that it is a *fake* and should not be used as evidence for a possible coregency between these two kings.<sup>30</sup>

#### 1.2.2.2. *Karnak Quay Inscription no. 33*

In the Karnak quay inscription no. 33, recording the height of the Nile in Shebitku's regnal year 3, an elaborated statement about the legitimacy of the king was made.<sup>31</sup> After mentioning the date and full titles, Shebitku mentioned his appearing (*ḥi*) in Thebes as king in the temple of Amun,

and Amun's legitimization of his kingship over the *two lands* (*t3.wy*) = *Egypt*(?) or alternatively, he received the crown with two Uraei<sup>32</sup> from Amun.

... *sk r.f ḥi ḥm.f m nsw<sup>33</sup> m ḥwt [n]t Imn rdi.n.f n.f [ḥ]i n t3.wy/i'r.ty mi Ḥrw ḥr nst R<sup>c</sup>*

“...Now, his majesty appeared as king in the compound of Amun, after he (=Amun) granted him that he will appear to the two lands/gave him the crown with two uraei like Horus on the throne of Re...”

This inscription was taken to be a crowning inscription. The high level of the Nile was understood as a favorable omen by the god on Shebitku's crowning day (as sole ruler after a coregency?) in his third year. Von Beckerath compared this inscription with Nile Inscription no. 30 from year 2 of Shabaka, the year Shabaka re-conquered Egypt.<sup>34</sup> Thus, he concluded, the inscription recalls the arrival of Shebitku *for the first time in Egypt* to the temple of Amun where he was crowned by Amun. However, the verb *ḥi* does not necessarily denote the king's accession, crowning or appearance for the first time. This was demonstrated by Redford.<sup>35</sup> Murnane even stated that: “the text (i.e. quay inscription 33) need not refer to an accession or coronation at all. Rather, it seems simply to record an ‘appearance’ of Shebitku in the temple of Amun during his third year and to acknowledge the god's influence in securing his initial appearance as king. These two occasions (i.e. Shebitku's

<sup>27</sup> J. LECLANT, *Enquêtes sur les sacerdoxes et les sanctuaires égyptiens à l'époque dite éthiopienne* (XXV<sup>e</sup> Dynastie), BdE 17; Cairo 1964, 15–27. I thank Jean-Frédéric Brunet for reminding me the relevance of this statue to the coregency debate.

<sup>28</sup> MURNANE, *Coregencies*, 188–189. See also R. MORKOT, *Kingship and Kinship in the Empire of Kush*, in: ST. WENIG (ed.), *Akten der 7. Internationalen Tagung für meroitische Forschungen vom 14. bis 19. September 1992 in Gosen/ bei Berlin, Meroitica* 15 (1999), 207.

<sup>29</sup> See n. 36 above, p. 190.

<sup>30</sup> R.G. MORKOT and S. QUIRKE, *Inventing the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty: Turin stela 1467 and the construction of history*, *Begegnungen – Antike Kulturen im Niltal Festgabe für Erika Endesfelder, Karl-Heinz Priese, Walter Friedrich Reineke, Steffen Wenig*, Leipzig 2001, 349–363.

<sup>31</sup> J. VON BECKERATH, *The Nile Level Records at Karnak and their Importance for the History of the Libyan Period (Dynasties XXII and XXIII)*, *JARCE* 5 (1966) 53, no. 33. For recent comments, see T. EIDE, T. HÄGG, R.H. PIERCE, and L. TÖRÖK (eds.), *Fontes Historiae Nubiorum: Textual sources for the History of the Middle Nile Region*

*between the Eighth Century BC and the Sixth Century AD*. Vol. I, *From the Eighth to the Mid-Fifth Century BC*, Bergen 1994, 129 (henceforth *FHNI*).

<sup>32</sup> L. TÖRÖK, *The Royal Crowns of Kush: A Study in Middle Nile Valley Regalia and Iconography in the 1<sup>st</sup> Millenia B.C. and A.D.*, Cambridge Monographs in African Archaeology 18, Oxford 1987, 4 ff.

<sup>33</sup> The words *m nsw* were omitted from the first copy made by VON BECKERATH in *JARCE* 6 (1966) 53, no. 33. See J. VON BECKERATH, *Die Nilstandsinschrift vom 3. Jahr Schebitkus am Kai von Karnak*, *GM* 136 (1993) 7–9.

<sup>34</sup> VON BECKERATH, *GM* 136 (1993) 7–9.

<sup>35</sup> D.B. REDFORD, *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt*, Toronto, 1967, 4–6. However, in the following examples cited by REDFORD, *ḥi m nsw* is understood as the king's appearing at his accession (pp. 6–8). See also KITCHEN, *ThIP* 170. “...this verb *ḥi* applies to any official ‘epiphany’ or official manifestation of the king to his ‘public appearances’ ...”. See also J. VON BECKERATH, *Ägypten und der Feldzug Sanheribs im Jahre 701 v. Chr.*, *UF* 24 (1992) 5.

initial appearance as king and the appearance in his regnal year three) are not represented here as having been identical, and there is no reason to suppose that they were.<sup>36</sup> The use of the verb *ḥꜥi* in Napatán inscriptions is also very loose and can designate the accession of the king<sup>37</sup> but also any appearance of him, especially on the throne of the gods forever, without specifying a precise occurrence.<sup>38</sup> It becomes clear, then, that the only certain thing that can be said about Quay inscription 33 is that Shebitku was in Thebes and received the affirmation and legitimatization of the god Amun in his third year on that occasion.

### 1.2.2.3. A postulated coregency between Shabaka and Shebitku on chronological grounds

Kitchen suggested that Shabaka came to the throne in Kush in 717/6 B.C. and conquered Egypt in his second regnal year 716/5.<sup>39</sup> According to Kitchen's chronology, Shabaka would have ruled as Pharaoh in Egypt and Kush until 702/1 B.C. and upon his death was succeeded by

Shebitku in 702/1 B.C. Kitchen did not support a coregency between Shabaka and Shebitku.

In 713/2 or 712/1 B.C. Iamani of Ashdod rebelled against Assyria.<sup>40</sup> He attempted to muster support from Pir'u (Pharaoh), King of Egypt. When the Assyrians approached Ashdod in 712 B.C., Iamani fled to Egypt, ending up at the border of Egypt with Kush.<sup>41</sup> He initially received asylum from the king of Kush, but was eventually sent back in shackles to Nineveh.

Spalinger has noted that when Iamani fled to Egypt he did not meet "Pir'u, King of Egypt," whom he had contacted before, but went south to Upper Egypt and finally met the king of Kush. Hence, Spalinger concluded that the Delta king, who was ruling in 713 B.C., had disappeared in 712 B.C., and that Shabaka had by that time conquered the Delta in the second year of his reign. The year 712 was thus treated as an "anchor date" and the year 713 was regarded as the accession date of Shabaka. Since Shabaka's fifteenth year is mentioned,<sup>42</sup> it was assumed that he died in 698 B.C.

<sup>36</sup> W.J. MURNANE, *Coregencies*, 189.

<sup>37</sup> A sample of the occurrences of the verb *ḥꜥi* with the meaning of "accession": *ḥ3t-sp tpy(?) nt shꜥ m nswt [...]*"The first year of his appearance as king." (FHN I 196: Dream Stela of Tanutamun 1.3, henceforth DS). It is not clear if the stroke (GARDINER Z1) is part of the indirect genitive *nt* or designates the number of regnal years. In the Piankhy Stela the word *nt* is written without stroke. The plural genitive *nw* is written twice with the stroke (lines 149, 154) and once without a stroke (l. 128). See N.-C. GRIMAL, *La stèle triomphale de Pi('ankh)y au musée du Caire*, MIFAO 105, Cairo 1981, 319; *wn ḥm.f ḥꜥ(w) ḥr st Ḥrw m rnpt tn* "His Majesty had appeared on the throne of Horus in this year" (FHN I 197: DS 6); *ꜥꜥ pw iri.n ḥm.f i.iri ḥꜥ m b3ḥ it.f Imn-Rꜥ nb nst ʔ.wy gm.n.f sdn.(w) nb.(w) nsw.w n Kš w3s.sn* "In entered His Majesty to appear before his father, Amon-Re, lord of the thrones of the two lands. It was before this god that he found all the crowns of the kings of Kush with their scepters". (FHN I 241: Election Stela of Aspelta 22 henceforth E) note the different analysis of the grammar). See also FHN I 242: E 24.

<sup>38</sup> *di.n.i n.k ḥꜥi m nswt ḥr st Ḥrw nt ḥḥ.w mi rꜥ <r> dt* "I have caused you to appear as king on the Horus-throne of the living, like Re, forever" (FHN I 195, DS C13); *s3 Rꜥ (Tanutamun) | ḥḥ wꜥ3 snb ḥꜥ ḥr st Ḥrw dt* "The son of Re, Tanutamun, may he live, be prosperous and healthy, appearing on the throne of Horus forever." (FHN I 207: DS 42). *di.k nf ḥḥ w3s nb ḥri.k snb nb ḥri.k ʔw ib nb ḥri.k ḥꜥ ḥr st Ḥrw dt* Inthronisation Stela May you give him all life and dominion from you, all happiness from you, while

appearing on the throne of Horus forever" (FHN I 233: C. 5). *di.i n.k ḥꜥ n Rꜥ nswt.f ḥr ns.t it (E C7)* "I give you the crown / appearing (*ḥꜥ*) of Re, his kingship on his(?) father's (*it.f*) throne." (FHN I 233: E C7). Note that *ḥꜥ* is written without a crown determinative and that "his father" is written. Re does not appear only at the accession of the king, but daily.

<sup>39</sup> K.A. KITCHEN, Late-Egyptian Chronology and the Hebrew Monarchy: Critical Studies in Old Testament Mythology, I, *JANES* 5 (1973) 225–233. Idem, *ThIP* 143–144. Kitchen prefers the above dates because Sargon, King of Assyria received a tribute of twelve horses from Shilkani (Osorkon), king of Egypt and not from Shabaka in 716 B.C. According to Kitchen, Shabaka had not yet conquered Egypt by then.

<sup>40</sup> TADMOR, *JCS* 12 (19958) 79–84; A.J. SPALINGER, The Year 712 B. C. and its Implications for Egyptian History, *JARCE* 10 (1973) 95–101. For the dating of these events to 711 B.C. cf. A. FUCHS, *Die Inschriften Sargons II. aus Khorsabad* (Göttingen 1994) 381–382; idem, *Die Annalen des Jahres 711 v. Chr.*, State Archives of Assyria Studies VIII; Helsinki 1998, 124–131.

<sup>41</sup> *ana itē mat Mušri ša pat mat Meluhha innabitma.* (FUCHS, *Die Inschriften*, 220, l. 103). KITCHEN, *ThIP* 583: he (Iamani) fled "to the border of Egypt which is at the territory of Meluhha (Nubia)".

<sup>42</sup> Shabaka ruled for at least fourteen full years. His last dated monument is from year 15, month of *Painy* (2 *šmw*), day 11 i.e. eighty-four days before he completed fifteen full years. J. ČERNÝ Philological and Etymological Notes, *ASAE* 51 (1951) 441–446.

On the other hand, Kitchen proposed that Shebitku was elevated to be ruler of Kush before 701 B.C. According to Taharqa's texts from Kawa, Shebitku summoned Taharqa to join him with an army to wage war in the North, most probably against the Assyrians in 701 B.C. Kitchen also noted that Shebitku adopted an aggressive policy reflected in his militaristic expansionistic titles.<sup>43</sup>

This overlap of approximately three years between the conjectured accession date of Shebitku (701/2) and the calculated death of Shabaka in 698 led Spalinger and other scholars to postulate a coregency.<sup>44</sup>

Yurco<sup>45</sup> introduced several new argumentations in favor of a coregency. According to the Assyrian accounts of the campaign of Sennacherib, king of Assyria (705-681 B.C.) to the West in 701 B.C., the Ekronites appealed for help to the kings of Egypt, the bowmen, charioteers and cavalry of the king of Kush, who came to their aid. Sennacherib encountered this Egypto-Kushite force at the plain of Eltekeh. He took captive Egyptian princes and charioteers and Kushite charioteers. Yurco claimed that in the earliest account of the battle, the Rassam cylinder, dated to 700 B.C., the King of Egypt was mentioned in singular, while in subsequent recensions this was changed to "Kings" of Egypt.<sup>46</sup> According to him, the change may reflect a belated recognition of the coregency of Shabaka and Shebitku.<sup>47</sup> However, Yurco failed to note that the term "*Kings of Egypt*" does not denote Shabaka and/or Shebitku but the many *Egyptian dynasts* from the Delta and Middle Egypt. The term *šar māṭ Meluhha* in the same paragraph denotes the "King of Kush" (written in the singular!), who did not attend the battle in person.

A second argument in favor of the postulated coregency was the reconstructed timetable for the events of the third campaign of Sennacherib and its compatibility to the regnal years of Shabaka and Shebitku as preserved in Manetho. According to Yurco's reconstruction, Shebitku was present in

Thebes in mid February. This date coincided with the Egyptian new-year, which fell in 701 on the 15<sup>th</sup> of February.<sup>48</sup> Yurco considered this date as Shebitku's accession date as coregent. Thus, Shebitku reigned into his twelfth year, since Taharqa, Shebitku's successor, celebrated his first new year in 689 B.C. Shabaka, Shebitku's predecessor, would have started his reign twelve years before in 713 (as Spalinger has suggested) and would have ruled as sole ruler until 701 B.C. These calculated regnal years would fit the information given in the versions of Manetho. The discrepancy between the versions would reflect ascribing the various years to one of the two coregents.<sup>49</sup> However, now that Shebitku's accession is fixed to 706 at the earliest, it seems to me that none of Manetho's dates for the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty are correct.<sup>50</sup>

The solution of coregency between the two rulers was proposed in order to solve a discrepancy between interpretations of several historical data that did not fit together, namely: The supposed anchor date of 712 B.C., for the length of Shabaka's reign and the kingship of Shebitku in 701 B.C.<sup>51</sup> Problematic data was used to prove the coregency:

- A. The misinterpreted Karnak Quay inscription 33
- B. The mention of the "kings of Egypt" in the Assyrian sources
- C. Wrong information from later sources (Manetho as preserved in Africanus and Eusebius)
- D. The fake Turin stela

It did not occur to scholars that their interpretation of the texts might be wrong.

The Tang-i Var inscription accentuated the discrepancy between facts and theory. The text clearly indicates that Shebitku was on the throne in 706 B.C. If Shabaka ascended the throne in 713 B.C., he would have ended up ruling together with Shebitku for eight years (706-698). But no trace of double dating, texts with indication of

<sup>43</sup> Cf. KITCHEN, *ThIP* 154 ff; idem., Egypt, the Levant and Assyria in 701 B.C., 245-246, in: M. GÖRG, (ed.) *Fontes Atque Pontes*, Festschrift Hellmut Brunner, ÄUAT 5, Wiesbaden 1983. See *FHN* I 138-139: Kawa stela IV lines 7-9.

<sup>44</sup> SPALINGER, *JARCE* 10 (1973) 98; D.B. REDFORD, Sais and the Kushite Invasions of the Eighth Century B.C., *JARCE* 22 (1985) 13, n. 61; idem. *Or* 68 (1999) 59-60, n. 12; KITCHEN, *ThIP* xlii and 555-557.

<sup>45</sup> F. YURCO, *Serapis* 6 (1980) 221-240.

<sup>46</sup> E. FRAHM, *Einleitung in die Sanherib-Inschriften*, BAfo 26; HORN 1997, 54, l. 43, n.3.

<sup>47</sup> YURCO, *Serapis* 6 (1980), 225.

<sup>48</sup> YURCO, *Serapis* 6 (1980), 228. The precise date is given in J. VON BECKERATH, *Chronologie des Pharaonischen Ägypten*, Mainz am Rhein, 1997, 198.

<sup>49</sup> YURCO, *Serapis* 6 (1980), 228-229. Cf. REDFORD, *Or* 68 (1999) 59.

<sup>50</sup> D. KAHN, *Or* 70 (2001) 5, n. 23.

<sup>51</sup> More on this in paragraphs 2.2, 2.3 below.

joint rule or even reliefs with both rulers performing religious rites jointly exists on the monuments. Taking the facts at face value does not even hint at a coregency. However, for some reason, even people who did not accept a coregency or vice-regality initially, like Kitchen, Hoffmeier and von Beckerath accepted a coregency in order not to change their former reconstructed Chronology. In the words of Kitchen: “not (to) entail any change in the Best Egyptian chronology whatsoever ... In this case our chronology does not change by a second (let alone 4 years)”.<sup>52</sup> Thus, according to the cited facts at hand, there is *no objective evidence* for a coregency between Shabaka and Shebitku.

### 1.2.3. Shebitku and Taharqa<sup>53</sup>

According to Macadam’s reading of Kawa IV 7–16 Shebitku summoned Taharqa in 689 B.C. (the date of Taharqa’s accession is now 690 B.C.)<sup>54</sup> to Egypt and was immediately associated with Shebitku in the kingship as coregent, were he ruled together with him until his sixth regnal year. In this year Shebitku died and Taharqa ascended the throne as sole ruler. He then commenced to rebuild Kawa Temple, which according to Macadam, was also the year of his mother’s arrival in Memphis for his coronation.<sup>55</sup> This is clearly contrary to what is written in Kawa V 15 where Taharqa received the crown only *after* the hawk flew to heaven, i.e. Shebitku died.<sup>56</sup> Clearly, a coregency between Shebitku and Taharqa is based on Macadam’s wrong readings of the texts.<sup>57</sup>

### 1.2.4. Taharqa and Tanutamun<sup>58</sup>

#### 1.2.4.1. The Dream Stela of Tanutamun

The Dream Stela of Tanutamun begins with the

mention of a dream in his first regnal year, where-in he received the message from god that he will be king

*ḥ3t sp tp(y)t n sh<sup>c</sup>.f m nsw*

“Regnal year 1 of causing his appearance as king” (FHNI 196: DS 3)

The verb *sh<sup>c</sup>(i)* is the causative of the verb *ḥ<sup>i</sup>* “to appear” in the infinitive form. This means that, theoretically, somebody caused Tanutamun to appear as king. One option to identify the person who caused Tanutamun to appear as king was Taharqa, his predecessor, thus hinting at an accession of Tanutamun, while his predecessor was still alive.<sup>59</sup> Taharqa’s role in Tanutamun’s accession, however, is not mentioned in the Dream Stela. Furthermore, the verb *sh<sup>c</sup>i* is used in the same meaning as the intransitive verb *ḥ<sup>i</sup>* “to appear” in the Piankhy Stela ll. 58–59.<sup>60</sup> Kitchen suggested that the gods might have caused Tanutamun to appear as king. The god’s role is not mentioned in the text.<sup>61</sup> This might be the case, since Amun-Re of Gebel Barkal says in the lunette the all so common phrase: *di.ni n.k ḥ<sup>c</sup> m nsw bity* “I jhave given you appearing as king of Upper and Lower Egypt”. The giving of kingship or causing to appear as king by Amun-Re can hardly prove a coregency. The transitive verb *sh<sup>c</sup>i* in the body of the text appears in the construction *rdi* + intransitive *ḥ<sup>i</sup>* in the lunette.

It should be noted that the dream of Tanutamun occurred in the year of his appearing as king (but before he actually became king). In his dream Tanutamun saw two serpents, one on his right, the other on his left (=of his forehead, i.e. the double uraei depicted on the Kushite crown). Tanutamun woke up and did not understand the dream.<sup>62</sup> The text goes on explaining the dream:

<sup>52</sup> KITCHEN, Regnal and Genealogical Data, 50–51.

<sup>53</sup> MORKOT, *Meroitica* 15 (1999) 205.

<sup>54</sup> VON BECKERATH, *Chronologie*, 91 with earlier literature there.

<sup>55</sup> M.F.L. MACADAM, *The Temples of Kawa*, vol. I (London, 1949) 115–16, 18, n. 30.

<sup>56</sup> J. LECLANT and J. YOYOTTE, Notes d’histoire et de civilisation éthiopiennes. À propos d’un ouvrage récent, *BIFAO* 51 (1952) 24 ff. See also KITCHEN, *ThIP* 164–170; A.F. RAINEY, Taharqa and Syntax, *Tel Aviv* 3 (1976): 38–41.

<sup>57</sup> MURNANE, *Coregencies*, 190–193.

<sup>58</sup> MORKOT, *Meroitica* 15 (1999) 204–205. Pace MORKOT, it is nowhere stated that Tanutamun was in Egypt at the death of Taharqa.

<sup>59</sup> H. SCHÄFER, Zur Erklärung der ‚Traumstela‘, *ZÄS* 35 (1897) 67–70.

<sup>60</sup> F. BREYER, *Tanutamani: die Traumstela und ihr Umfeld*, *ÄAT* 57, Wiesbaden 2003, 93.

<sup>61</sup> KITCHEN, *ThIP* 173. In the Ancient Near East when the god makes a king ruler usually the successor of the king is not the designated heir. See A. BIRAN and J. NAVEH, The Tel Dan Inscription: A New Fragment, *IEJ* 45 /2 (1995) 15. One might wonder how Tanutamun, who was not son of the former king became king and needed the divine legitimization.

<sup>62</sup> FHNI 197: DS 4–5 *m3.n ḥm.f rsw m grḥ ḥf 2 w<sup>c</sup> ḥr imn.f ky ḥr i3b.f nhs pw iri.n ḥm.f n{n} gm.n.f st ʿdd.n<sup>1</sup> [ḥm.f] nn r.i ḥr m* “His Majesty saw a dream in the night, two serpents, one on his right, the other on his left. Up woke His Majesty but did not find them. Then said his Majesty: ‘Why has this happened to me?’ “ Note that

*iw n.k t3 rsi iti n.k t3 mhꜣw*

“Yours is (will be?) the Southland, take (by force) for yourself the Northland”

The time frame of this adverbial sentence of possession is not given and can be translated in the present and future.<sup>63</sup> Thus, it seems that, *before* ascending the throne,<sup>64</sup> Tanutamun was foretold that he will be king and wear the two Uraei, that the Southland will surely be his,<sup>65</sup> and that he should conquer also the North of Egypt which was in Assyrian hands in 664, the year of Tanutamun's coronation. Then, Tanutamun was crowned in the same year of the dream, thus fulfilling the oracle.<sup>66</sup> It would seem strange, if Tanutamun was already king while he dreamt his dream and that he did not understand what the two serpents, symbols of Kushite royalty *par excellence*, meant.

Additional corroboration that Tanutamun ascended the throne of Kush *after* the death of his predecessor can be found in the Assyrian annals.

#### 1.2.4.2. *The royal inscriptions of Ashurbanipal, King of Assyria*

In Prisms A II 20–22 || C III 26–29 Ashurbanipal, King of Assyria, describes his conquest of Egypt in the year 664, and states that the dread of Ashur's weapon befell on Taharqa at the place to where he fled and he went to his faith. Tanutamun, son of Shabaka (var. son of his [i.e. Taharqa's] sister) sat on the throne of his kingdom.<sup>67</sup>

The dates in the Dream Stela and the information in Ashurbanipal's prisms do not support a coregency, On the contrary. It can be deduced from the DS that Tanutamun was not supposed to be the heir of Taharqa and got the command to rule through a dream. Taharqa's remaining chil-

dren were probably too young when their father died and could not inherit his throne and lead a country in times of war.<sup>68</sup> From the Assyrian inscriptions it becomes clear that Tanutamun ascended the throne after Taharqa's death, although, lack of knowledge<sup>69</sup> by the Assyrian scribe should be taken into consideration when dealing with Tanutamun's succession on Taharqa's throne.

In sum, there is not one shred of concrete evidence that coregency was ever practiced in the Kushite kingdom. The Kushite Religious beliefs were based on the Egyptian beliefs, that the king ascended the throne on his father's/predecessor's death as the god Horus inherited the throne of Osiris his father on his death. No two incarnations of Horus were supposed to rule Egypt together in theory. In practice a small number of co-regencies occurred during the long history of Egypt<sup>70</sup> and more than one king could be crowned in Egypt in rival dynasties. It does not seem that the political instability that preceded the Middle Kingdom and the special circumstances that prompted co-regencies in other periods can be detected in the Kushite Kingdom of the eighth-Seventh centuries B.C. and beyond.

## 2. WAS THE KINGDOM OF EGYPT-AND-KUSH DIVIDED?

In the following pages I intend to review the second proposed solution, namely the division of kingdom between a senior king and his presumed heir. According to this theory, the senior king ruled Egypt, while the Junior king functioned as viceroy or local king in Kush, possibly using cartouches, termed 'prince' or a civil title without counting his own regnal years.<sup>71</sup>

In this section I will forward textual and

the translation of *n{n} gm.nf st* differs from my translation. See also BREYER, *Tanutamani*, 95.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. examples J.P. ALLEN, *Middle Egyptian: An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs*, Cambridge 2000, 113–114; A.H. GARDINER, *Egyptian Grammar*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Oxford 1988) 88. BREYER, *Tanutamani*, 97.

<sup>64</sup> For a foretelling dream that Thutmose IV will become king, see B.M. BRYAN, *The Reign of Thutmose IV*, Baltimore, 1991, 146. Note the similarities between the texts. See also: MURNANE, *Coregencies*, 194–195.

<sup>65</sup> One of the agreed upon uses of the particle *iw* is to denote that the statement is temporarily true. See: ALLEN, *Middle Egyptian*, 110.

<sup>66</sup> The identification of the verb forms and staves in this paragraph are not conclusive and could be interpreted in past tense. In this case the dream occurred while

Tanutamun was already king. This is not the place to discuss the grammar of the text at length.

<sup>67</sup> H.-U. ONASCH, *Die Assyrischen Eroberungen Ägyptens, Teil I: Kommentare und Anmerkungen*, ÄAT 27, Wiesbaden 1994, 120–121.

<sup>68</sup> For the Kushite right of succession, see D. KAHN, *The Royal Succession in the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty*, *Antike Sudan* 16 (2005) 143–163.

<sup>69</sup> But hardly lack of interest, since the Assyrian scribe bothered to record Tanutamun's filiation and relation to Taharqa.

<sup>70</sup> See MURNANE, *Coregencies*.

<sup>71</sup> REDFORD, *Or* 68 (1999) 60; KITCHEN, *Regnal and Genealogical Data*, 50–51; VON BECKERATH, *SAK* 29, (2001) 3–4; HOFFMEIER (2003a) 229; idem (2003b) 287.



archaeological evidence concerning the postulated division of Egypt and Kush into two. The evidence will be comprised of ideological statements of rule over Egypt and Kush sanctified by divine will. These statements are sometimes vague or generalized, and do not necessarily prove that the King did rule over the entire area designated in these statements, but it does strengthen the notion that the King, and he alone, is to be the ruler over the entire Kingdom. This notion of sole rule will be corroborated by more factual writings as well as archaeological evidence from Egypt and Kush.

### 2.1. Piankhy

Piankhy ruled probably from Meroe<sup>72</sup> up to Middle Egypt from the early years of his reign. There is no evidence that he shared his power with a viceroy as can be deduced from his monuments. His name in cartouche can be found in Kush as well as in Dakhleh Oasis, Egypt.<sup>73</sup> His Horus name is *ḥꜥ m Npt* “appearing in Napata” (*FHN I 58*: Sand stone Stele of Piankhy (=SSS), l. 1.) as well as *ḥꜥ m W3st* “appearing in Thebes” and *ḥk3 Kmt* “ruler of Egypt” (*FHN I 54*: Obelisk of Piankhy from Kadakol, Letti Basin, Sudan). If he would have ruled only in one part of the kingdom, he would have allowed his counterpart king to appear as king in the other part of the divided kingdom.

The Sand Stone Stele of Piankhy is a very important source regarding how Piankhy perceived his legitimacy as given him by the gods and how he executed his authority in the land.

His rule over Egypt was predestined by Amun with the words: *iw.k r ḥk3 n Kmt* “You will rule over Egypt” (*FHN I, 55*: SSS 3). Amun of Napata has granted Piankhy to be ruler over every foreign country (*ḥk3 n ḥ3st nb*), while Amun of Thebes (*Imn m W3st*) has granted Piankhy to be ruler over Egypt. In the Lunette of the stele the ram-headed Amun gives the Kushite cap-crown and the lower Egyptian red crown to Piankhy, and the god Khonsu says: “Receive the two Uraei from the hand of your father Amun”. It is clear that, according to Kushite ideology, Piankhy’s authori-

ty stretched over Kush, all foreign countries and Egypt. He received the Kingship from Amun and no one was to share it with him (*nm pš.f r ḥnꜥ.k*). His authority over all the territory is total. No one would share it with him (*FHN I, 56*: SSS 8, 11–12).<sup>74</sup> He was the one who appointed kings, and chiefs. His destiny is to expand the boundaries of Kush *alone!* (*wꜥ wꜥty swsh Kš FHN I, 59*: SSS l. 3).

In his Great Triumphal Stele (GTS), Piankhy expands his rule over the whole of Egypt. In his 20<sup>th</sup> regnal year Nimlot, ruler of Hermopolis defected and Joined Tefnakht, ruler of Sais (GTS 6 ff.). Piankhy, who heard the news in distant Napata (?) immediately responded to Nimlot’s defection (GTS 8 ff.) and sent his counts (*ḥ3ty.wꜥ*) and generals (*ts.w*) who were in Egypt. If, as some scholars maintain, the kingdom was too great for Piankhy to control, as it was supposed to be for his two immediate successors, he would have sent his presumed counterpart to quell the rebellion. This is not stated in the text. There was no such viceroy or king of Egypt under the sovereignty of Piankhy. He distinguished quit well between the different petty rulers in Egypt and recorded their correct titles. Why did he not do the same for his viceroy/ coregent, not mention his name, while his commanders were mentioned by their military rank and private names (*FHN I 69*: GTS 8)? In his thrust northward, the people of Meidum submitted to Piankhy without fight, saying: *ntk t3.wy ntk imy.sn ntk nb ntt ḥr s3 t3* “Yours are the two lands (=Egypt), yours is what is therein. Yours is all that is on Earth (*FHN I 90*: 84).

After conquering the Delta and receiving homage from the Egyptian petty rulers, Piankhy returned home to Kush, and again, no mention of appointing a junior ruler over Egypt is mentioned. If there was a coregent or junior king responsible over Egypt, he sure did not fulfill the purpose of his job and thus was redundant. The pattern of a senior king residing in Napata and a junior king residing in Egypt is also opposed to the evidence in the GTS of Piankhy, since it was Piankhy, the \*senior ruler who was the active party in the supposed joint rule. He heard the

<sup>72</sup> See L. TÖRÖK, *The Birth of an Ancient African Kingdom: Kush and her Myth of the State in the First Millennium BC*, CRIPEL suppl. 4; Lille 1995, 44–45.

<sup>73</sup> J.J. JANSSEN, The Smaller Dakhla Stela (Ashmolean Museum no. 1894. 107b), *JEA* 54 (1968) 165–172.

<sup>74</sup> K. ZIBELIUS-CHEN, Theorie und Realität im Königtum der 25. Dynastie, in: *Selbsterständnis und Realität: Akten des Symposiums zur ägyptischen Königsideologie in Mainz 15–17.6.1995*, ÄUAT 36, 1, Wiesbaden 1997, 92.

news in Kush, conquered Egypt and returned to Kush almost with all the spoils of war. What would have been left for the supposed junior king in Egypt?

It is clear from the evidence just cited, that in the days of Piankhy no coregency and no division of the kingdom existed. Piankhy could manage quit well to subjugate his vast kingdom all by himself.

## 2.2. Shabaka

On the ideological level, Shabaka boasted in his commemorative Scarab that he has slain the rebels in the south, and the north and in every foreign country, (*FHNI* 124), thus pacifying ideologically the extremes of his Empire.

On the factual level, things are not different, as I will try to prove below. According to Redford's *reconstruction of events* in Shabaka's days, Shabaka separated the administration and rule of Egypt from the Nubian heartland in his eighth regnal year, assigning the latter to his son Shebitku. Thus, Shabaka would have ruled and administered Egypt, while Shebitku would have ruled Kush.

If this assumption were correct we would not find monuments of both kings in the same administrative area from the period of the alleged division of power. Thus, Shebitku's Karnak quay graffito dating to his year 3<sup>75</sup> would indicate that his rule extended over a vast area from Kush to Thebes, leaving to the senior ruler, Shabaka, the rule over Middle Egypt and the Delta. Theoretically, this is possible. However, at the alleged time of this divided administration lasting from the eighth to fifteenth year of Shabaka, when we expect to find Shebitku as sole ruler at Thebes (*c.* 703 B.C.), we find monuments and papyri of

Shabaka dating to year 10<sup>76</sup> (\*703! B.C. according to Redford's, Spalinger's and Yurco's chronology), and to year 15<sup>77</sup> (\*698 B.C.) and originating from Thebes. It is inconceivable that in a divided kingdom or during a coregency, two rulers would simultaneously administer Thebes and use different dating methods. However, if Shebitku did not use his own regnal years as von Beckerath and Kitchen maintain, this argument loses its validity and Shebitku would be a mere administrator of Kush for his father, Shabaka, who resided in Egypt. Would, in this case, the Assyrians bother to mention that Shebitku extradited Iamani, if the real power in Egypt-and-Kush was Shabaka.<sup>78</sup> Could Shebitku's policy be different from his senior's policy? If so, could he carry it out and extradite Iamani without Shabaka's consent?

## 2.3. Shebitku

On the ideological level, Amun-Re gave Shebitku as he gave Piankhy and Shabaka before him, the authority over the north and south alike: "I grant thee thy power like Montu! ... I give thee the southerners to thy Great Crown, the northerners to the red crown ... King of Egypt, ruler of foreign lands, sovereign who seizes all lands".<sup>79</sup> Shebitku was perceived as ruler of the entire Kushite sphere of influence.

### 2.3.1. The Akkadian term *Šarru*: King or (co-)Regent

In the Tang-i Var inscription Shebitku appears as <sup>m</sup>Šá-*pa-ta-ku-<sup>l</sup>u MAN<sup>l</sup>KUR *me-luh-ha* (Shebitk<sup>l</sup>u, king<sup>l</sup> of the land Kush).<sup>80</sup> As seen above, scholars interpreted the term "šar(ru)" with the wider (not to say sloppy, inexact) meaning of "ruler" and not in the precise meaning of "king"=monarch, *de facto* Viceroy for Nubia,<sup>81</sup> Shabako's deputy, ruling in Kush, while the senior man – Shabako – was*

<sup>75</sup> VON BECKERATH, *GM* 136 (1993) 7–9.

<sup>76</sup> P. Louvre 3228 E was written in Upper Egyptian abnormal hieratic script. ABD EL-MOHSEN BAKIR, *Slavery in Pharaonic Egypt*, Cairo, 1952, pls. XIII–XIV; M. MALININE, *Choix de textes juridiques en hiératic "anormal" en démocratique (XXV<sup>e</sup>–XXVI<sup>e</sup> dynasties)*, Paris 1953, 35–42; B. MENU, Cessions de services et engagements pour dette sous les rois kouchites et saïtes, *RdE* 36 (1985) 76; J. QUAEGBEUR, A propos de l'identification de la 'Kadytis' d'Hérodote avec la ville de Gaza, *Immigration and Emigration within the Ancient Near East*, Fs. E. Lipiński, OLA 65, Leuven 1995, 245–270. An additional linen fragment dated to year 10 of Shabaka was found in the tomb of the fourth priest of Amun, Wedjahor. See N.

STRUDWICK, The Fourth Priest of Amun, Wedjahor, *GM* 148 (1995) 91–93. Initially the number 10 was assigned to the '10<sup>th</sup> day of the month', but Strudwick changed his reading and assigned the shroud to the 10<sup>th</sup> regnal year of Shabaka. Private communication from 09/06/2001 referring to TT99 web site: [www.newton.cam.ac.uk/egypt/tt99](http://www.newton.cam.ac.uk/egypt/tt99)

<sup>77</sup> See note 42.

<sup>78</sup> ZIBELIUS-CHEN, see n. 177 above.

<sup>79</sup> D.B. REDFORD, *From Slave to Pharaoh: the Black Experience of Ancient Egypt*, Baltimore 2004, 98.

<sup>80</sup> FRAME, *Or* 68 (1999) 36, l. 20

<sup>81</sup> KITCHEN, *Regnal and Genealogical Data*, 50–51.

the real king (“pharaoh”) in Egypt proper,<sup>82</sup> “Regent von Nubien... ohne Zählung eigener Regierungsjahre”,<sup>83</sup> or coregent, Viceroy of Kush following the New Kingdom practice of the King ruling from Memphis, while the “Viceroy of Kush” governed Nubia” (Cf. the NK title *imy-r ḥ3s.wt rsywt s3 nsw k3ḫ* – “the overseer of southern foreign lands, King’s son of Kush”).<sup>84</sup> This term is *not* attested in Kush or later than *ca.* 775–750 B.C. in Egypt. It was by then a title without much substance.<sup>85</sup>

It was suggested by Kitchen, that the term *šarru* is used in the same way as the designation of all the Egyptian rulers mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions of Ashurbanipal, even those that did not bear the Egyptian royal title *nsw*.<sup>86</sup> The King (*šar*) of the land (KUR/ *māt*) Meluhha, was, however, a ruler of a vast territory, in fact, an entire kingdom. He can not be compared with a local ruler of a town (URU) or two (Necho I governed the towns (URU/ *ālu*) Sais and Memphis and held authority over local Delta rulers such as the ruler of Sebennytos).<sup>87</sup> The Assyrian determinatives differ and make this fact clear. Shebitku’s title is the same as Taharqa’s title in Ashurbanipal’s inscriptions, where Taharqa is called King (*šar*) of the land (KUR/ *māt*) Meluhha in some of his inscriptions, while in others he is also referred to as King of Egypt.<sup>88</sup> Would anyone deny that Taharqa was King of Kush and Egypt based on his appearance as “King of Kush” in Ashurbanipal’s inscriptions?

### 2.3.2. *The distinction between Pharaoh and the King of Kush and the alleged “anchor date” of 712*

As mentioned above, Iamani of Ashdod rebelled against Assyria in 713/2 or 712/1 B.C.<sup>89</sup> Spalinger noted that Iamani attempted to muster support

from Pir’u, (Pharaoh) King of Egypt, but when the Assyrians approached Ashdod in 712 B.C., he fled to Kush. Spalinger stressed that when Iamani fled to Egypt he did not meet “Pir’u, King of Egypt,” whom he had contacted before, but met the king of Kush. Hence, he concluded that the Delta king, who was ruling in 713 B.C., had disappeared in 712 B.C., and that Shabaka had by that time conquered the Delta in the second year of his reign.

A closer look at the Assyrian inscriptions of Sargon reveals that this is not the case. It seems that Spalinger’s observation that Pharaoh had disappeared and the King of Kush took his place is not precise. The only Assyrian text where Pharaoh is mentioned in the episode dealing with Iamani, is in Sargon’s annals from the year 711 B.C.<sup>90</sup> This is the earliest version of the affair, and by far the most extended version. The destination of Iamani’s flight is not preserved, and his extradition by the Kushite king had not occurred at the time of writing the annals. In all subsequent versions, which were composed in 707 and 706 B.C.,<sup>91</sup> the narrative has been cut short and kept to the necessary minimum, deleting Iamani’s instigating letters to his neighboring kingdoms and his appeal to Pharaoh for assistance, only described his rebellion, flight to the border of Kush, and eventually, his extradition.<sup>92</sup> No text of Sargon which deals with the Iamani affair preserves the accounts of Iamani’s appeal to Pharaoh and Iamani’s extradition by the King of Kush together. It is not legitimate to deduce that these were two different persons. Thus, the alleged evidence for proving the “anchor date” of Egypt’s conquest in 712 by the Kushite King is based on

<sup>82</sup> KITCHEN, Preprint of “The Strengths and Weaknesses of Egyptian Chronology – an Abrégé”, distributed at the conference “Egypt & Time, SCIEEM 2000 Workshop on Precision and Accuracy of the Egyptian Historical Chronology”, held in Vienna, 30 June–2 July 2005 (to be published in this volume).

<sup>83</sup> VON BECKERATH, SAK 29 (2001) 4.

<sup>84</sup> HOFFMEIER (2003a) 229; idem (2003b) 287.

<sup>85</sup> D.A. ASTON, and J.H. TAYLOR, The Family of Takeloth III and the ‘Theban’ Twenty-third Dynasty, in: A. LEAHY, (ed.), *Libya and Egypt c. 1300–750 BC*, London 1990, 147–148.

<sup>86</sup> KITCHEN, Regnal and Genealogical Data, 50. ONASCH, *Die Assyrischen Eroberungen II, Text in Umschrift*, 106–111.

<sup>87</sup> For the control over Memphis and Sais, see ONASCH,

*Die Assyrischen Eroberungen I*, 36, 38. For Sebennytos, see O. PERDU, La chefferie de Sébennytos de Piankhi à Psammétique I<sup>er</sup>, *RdE* 55 (2004) 101.

<sup>88</sup> A.J. SPALINGER, Esarhaddon and Egypt: An Analysis of the First Invasion of Egypt, *Or* 43 (1974) 322–323.

<sup>89</sup> See n. 40 above.

<sup>90</sup> FUCHS, *Die Annalen*, 124–125.

<sup>91</sup> For the inscriptions, see E.F. WEIDNER, Silkan(he)ni, König von Muṣri, ein Zeitgenosse Sargons II., *Afo* 14 (1941–44) 50; A. FUCHS, *Die Inschriften*, 348: Prunk 90–96; 308: XIV 11–14; Prunk 90–111; 326: Ann. 241–254.

<sup>92</sup> Note that in Sargon’s annals, 251–252 Iamani’s flight and extradition are omitted and only his capture is reported. FUCHS, *Die Inschriften*, 326, n. 308.

incorrect interpretation of the evidence. One has to ask, if the change in terminology of Pharaoh into King of Kush bears any significance.

Kitchen, claims that Meluhha is Kush, NOT Egypt, and that in 706 B.C. Shebitku is recognized as ruler of Kush, and NOT of Egypt! This distinction is not valid as will be shown in the following selected examples.<sup>93</sup>

Piankhy, who conquered Egypt in his 20<sup>th</sup> regnal year, but returned to Napata after his victory over the Egyptian dynasts, considers himself an Egyptian Pharaoh, *nsw bity* with the whole set of royal names.<sup>94</sup> According to Kitchen, he should have been just king of Kush.

In Sargon's inscriptions describing his war in the Levant in 720 B.C. he boasts using a pun, that he defeated in pitched battle Re', the general (Turtanu) of the Egyptian king and caused him to flee away alone like a shepherd (Re'u), who has lost his flock. In the reliefs from room V in Sargon's palace at Khorsabad, this episode is depicted. It can be seen that the so-called Egyptian army consists of Kushite soldiers. According to my proposed chronology, the Egyptian king was Shabaka, the successor of Piankhy, and the Kushite soldiers do not have to be considered mercenaries in service of the Egyptian army or an anachronistic depiction of the reality in 707 B.C., the date of the inauguration of the palace.<sup>95</sup>

A similar phenomenon can be found in Shebitku's case, Shabaka's successor. In the biblical account of the events of 701 B.C. Rabshakeh describes Pharaoh, king of Egypt as a broken reed staff, which should better not be relied upon. ( II kings 18:21). Eventually, in II kings 19:9 Tirhaqa king of Kush was the foe of the Assyrians.<sup>96</sup> In the Assyrian version the king of Kush was mentioned in the singular, while there were many kings of Egypt present at the battle.<sup>97</sup> Would Taharqa be mentioned in the Biblical and Assyrian records as king of Kush, viceroy of Shebitku, king of Egypt, while Shebitku, the overlord of Egypt and Kush was mentioned in the same breath as the kinglets of Egypt, his vassals?

Taharqa and Tanutamun are designated in some of the Assyrian inscriptions as "King of

Egypt and Kush", while in other inscriptions, which describe the same events, they appears simply with the title "King of Kush".<sup>98</sup> If only the texts, which designate Taharqa and Tanutamun as "King of Kush", would have survived we could have come to the conclusion that he did not rule over Egypt.

From the selected previous examples, I think it is clear that all the relevant kings of kush could also be designated as king of Egypt in biblical and Assyrian sources as they depicted themselves in the Egyptian records. None of these kings ever considered himself as simply king of Kush.

#### 2.4. Shebitku and Taharqa

In Kawa inscription IV 7–10 (*FHN* I 138–139) mention is made of Taharqa's arrival in the North together with an army:

*Is hm.f m T3 Sty m hwn nfr sn nsw bnr mr(wt) Tw pw iri.n.f m (8) hd r W3st m kb hwn.w nfr.whb.n hm.f nsw Š3-b3-t3-k3 m3c hrw m s3.sn r T3 Sty wnn.f (9) im hn.c f mr.n.f sw r snw.f nb sw3.f GN...hn.c (10) mšc n hm.f hd r-hn.c f...*

"Then, his Majesty was in Nubia as a goodly youth, a king's brother, sweet of love. He sailed (8) north to Thebes in the midst of goodly youths. It was (9b) because he loved him more than all his brethren (8b) that his majesty, the late King Shebitku, had sent for them from Nubia in order that he (Taharqa) might be (9a) there with him. He has passed GN ... together with (10) the army of his Majesty that had sailed north with him."

In Kawa V 13–17 (*FHN* I 153–154) the same event is described as follows:

*ii.n.<i> m T3 Sty m kb sn.w nsw ts.n hm.f (14) im wnn.i hn.f mr.n.f wi r snw.f nb{t} r msw.{t}f nb tn.kw(i) r.sn hr hm.f ... (16)... is grt hr.n. (17) i hr.s(t) m hwn n 20 rnpt m iw n.i hn.c hm.f r T3 mh.t*

"I came from Nubia in the midst in the midst of the king's brothers whom his Majesty has enlisted (14) there ... (16) ...I had departed (17) from her (i.e. Taharqa's mother) as a goodly youth of 20 years when I came together with his Majesty to the North-land (Delta)"

Kitchen associated these events with the arrival

<sup>93</sup> See n. 82 above.

<sup>94</sup> *FHNI*, 48–52.

<sup>95</sup> D. KAHN, *Or* 70 (2001) 10–13.

<sup>96</sup> As Kitchen so vigorously claimed for decades, until it effected his proposed chronology. See KITCHEN, *ThIP*,

553–554. Now Kitchen designates Taharqa as "his (Shebitku's) Nubian lieutenant...". See n. 82 above.

<sup>97</sup> See n. 46 above.

<sup>98</sup> SPALINGER, *Or* 43 (1974) 322.

of the Kushite army to wage war against Sennacherib in the Levant in 701 B.C.<sup>99</sup> If we accept the chronology proposed by Spalinger, Redford, Yurco and others (Shabaka 713–698; Shebitku 702–690) and their recent proposal of a divided Kingdom between a senior Pharaoh in Egypt and a viceroy/ junior king in Nubia, then Taharqa would have been enlisted by the viceroy, who is described as “His Majesty”, while the senior king is not even mentioned, although the army was under his principal authority and traveling through the territory under his jurisdiction. Thus, the senior Pharaoh would not have been even mentioned although he was the head of state, at least *de jure*.

If, on the other hand, we accept the chronology of Kitchen for Shabaka (\*717–\*702) and Shebitku (\*702–\*690) and do not accept a coregency between the two in 701 B.C. (as Kitchen postulated for years), Shebitku would have been sole ruler and opponent of Sennacherib. Hoffmeier proposed that the same division of power between senior and junior kings existed also in 701 B.C. as was suggested for Shabaka and Shebitku after the publication of the Tang-i Var inscription and that Taharqa’s title “Melek Kush” (King of Kush) in II Kings 19:9 reflects his real position as viceroy in Kush and heir apparent of Shebitku in 701.<sup>100</sup>

However, several objections can be made to this suggestion:

- a. The biblical inscription was written after 681, when Taharqa indeed was king (Sennacherib’s murder which occurred in 681 is mentioned in the text).
- b. Taharqa was not the legitimate heir of Shebitku and thus was not the first choice to

be king of Kush.<sup>101</sup>

- c. Taharqa, as supposed viceroy and ruler of entire Kush, designates himself as goodly youth, a king’s brother, and sweet of love in the midst of goodly youths.<sup>102</sup> Was Taharqa so modest or absentminded that he forgot to boast that he was the *de facto* ruler of Kush and showed off as first between equals?
- d. There is no attestation of a title “King of Kush” in any Egyptian text.

## 2.5. Taharqa

### 2.5.1. Egyptian Data

Taharqa was considered Pharaoh and King of Egypt on his monuments and in administrative documents in Egypt. He resided in Egypt (Memphis) and was crowned there. He further boasted that Amun had ordered for him: “that every low land and every mountainous land be placed under the soles of my feet, south to <sup>+</sup>Retehu-Qebet<sup>+</sup>, and north to Qebeh- Horus,<sup>103</sup> east to the rising of Re and west to the place in which he sets” (*FHNI*, 153: Kawa V, 15–16), thus, encompassing the four corners of the earth without division of authority.

According to Taharqa’s inscription in the peristyle court north of Pylon VI at Karnak, Amun gave him the rule over Egypt (*FHN I*, 184, l. 4), but he was also active in Nubia (*FHN I*, 186, l. 15 *T Imn p3 iri.i n p3 b3 nhs ...* “Oh Amun, what I did in the land of Nubia [...]). Many of his monuments can be found in Egypt<sup>104</sup> and also in Nubia.<sup>105</sup> It is clear that Taharqa held the same authority in Egypt as in Nubia. He did not need Assyrian approval to be considered King of Egypt or Pharaoh.<sup>106</sup>

<sup>99</sup> Cf. KITCHEN, *ThIP* 154 ff.; idem. Further Thoughts on Egyptian Chronology in the Third Intermediate Period, *RdE* 34 (1982–3) 65; idem, Egypt, the Levant and Assyria, 245–246. Contra REDFORD, *From Slave to Pharaoh*, 93–95; VON BECKERATH, *UF* 24 (1992) 7; idem, *SAK* 29 (2001) 5.

<sup>100</sup> HOFFMEIER (2003a) 229; idem (2003b) 287.

<sup>101</sup> D. KAHN, *Antike Sudan* 16 (2005) 160–162.

<sup>102</sup> Note, however, that also Irike-Amanote was a *hwn nfr* before he became king. See *FHN II*, 400. In this case too, it was not clear to the people that Irike-Amanote was the designated heir and would become king after his predecessor’s death. The god Amun, however, did predestine Irike-Amanote to kingship.

<sup>103</sup> MACADAM, *The Temples of Kawa I*, 31, n. 46. See also K.

ZIBELIUS, *Afrikanische Orts- und Völkernamen in hieroglyphischen und hieratischen Texten*, Beihefte TAVO, Wiesbaden 1972, 159.

<sup>104</sup> A.J. SPALINGER, The Foreign Policy of Egypt Preceding the Assyrian Conquest, *CdE* 53 (1978) 44–47. To these inscriptions add: Year 21: A.M. MOUSSA, A Stela from the Desert Road at Dahshur, *MDAIK* 37 (1981) 332–337. Year 7 is recorded in a donation stela from Ashmunein: MEEKS, *Les donations*, 673 (25.6.7).

<sup>105</sup> P. WOLF, *Die archäologischen Quellen der Taharqozeit im nubischen Niltal*, unpublished diss.; Berlin, 1990.

<sup>106</sup> Year 17: S. I. HODJASH, O.D. BERLEV, A New Document from the Times of the Wars with Assyria, in: E. FREIER-W.F. REINEKE (eds.), *Karl Richard Lepsius (1810–1884): Akten der Tagung anlässlich seines 100. Todestages*,

### 2.5.2. Assyrian Data

In Esarhaddon's chronicle Taharqa's name is preserved in the events of the year 667, the first regnal year of Shamash-shuma-ukin. His title is partly preserved as *šar ša māt M[i-šir...]* "King of E[gypt ...]".<sup>107</sup> In the Sendjirli Stela l. 38 Taharqa is called *šar māt Mušur u māt Kusi* "King of Egypt and Kush".<sup>108</sup> In the Stela from Nahr el Kalb and in Fragment F, l. 12 he is called "King of Kush".<sup>109</sup> In Ashurbanipal's inscriptions Taharqa appears as King of Kush, and as King of Egypt and Kush, as Spalinger has proposed.<sup>110</sup> The title "King of Kush" alone might have resulted from propagandistic reasons, to stress his foreignness to Egypt. He is never called "Pharaoh" or only "King of Egypt" in the Assyrian records.

### 2.5.3. Taharqa's involvement in the Levant

According to the Egyptian texts, Taharqa even acted in the Levant. Stela Kawa III<sup>111</sup> recounts that in year eight (683 BC), Taharqa donated to the temple of Amun at Kawa a bronze statue of the king smiting foreign countries, alluding to some hostile activity abroad.<sup>112</sup> According to Kawa III, 21 acacia, cedar and juniper wood, which grow in the Levant (particularly in Lebanon), were donated to the temple of Amun. In Kawa VI, 18-21 (*FHN* I 171-172) cedar and Asiatic bronze were donated to the temple of Amun and gardeners from the *Mnty.w Sitti.w* were brought from Asia to Nubia to cultivate his vineyards. Clearly, Taharqa controlled Egypt and Kush entirely and even extended his (military or economic) activity to the Lebanon.

In his inscription in the peristyle court north of Pylon VI at Karnak Taharqa has claimed to have lost the inw of Kharu (*FHN* I 186: col. 15) and requested Amun to let him do with the Lev-

ant the same as he has let him do with Nubia (*t3 nḥsy*).

Further evidence for Taharqa's involvement in the Levant can be found in the Assyrian texts. Taharqa, Ashkelon and Tyre are mentioned in a broken context in the Nahr el Kalb Stela of Esarhaddon,<sup>113</sup> and Ba'al king of Tyre and Taharqa are again mentioned in Fragment F, l. 12.<sup>114</sup> Taharqa was active and responsible on both fronts and did not have any problems ruling the whole area without an additional King.

Taharqa's heir apparent Ushanhuru (Egyptian *Ns-Inhrt*), on the other hand, was captured by Esarhaddon's armies in Memphis.<sup>115</sup> He was not called "King of Egypt" and did not share the kingship with his father. He was not the dominant figure in Levantine politics as can be seen in the Assyrian texts mentioned above, nor did he rule over Kush, as was suggested in the theory of a divided kingdom, where the senior king stayed in Egypt, while the junior king reigned over Kush. In Taharqa's reign too, there is no evidence for a coregency or a divided kingdom with his presumed heir. Taharqa ruled over the entire kingdom alone.

## 2.6. Tanutamun

In the Dream Stela of Tanutamun, the destined king saw two serpents in a dream. These serpents symbolize the dual kingdom of Egypt and Kush. Thus, he was destined to rule the whole of Egypt-and-Kush. The southern part of his kingdom i.e. Kush and Upper Egypt would be under his authority on the death of Taharqa. Lower Egypt would have to be conquered by Tanutamun. Again, if the kingdom would have been divided and the senior king would have ruled in Egypt, Tanutamun would not have been residing some-

10-12.7.1984 in Halle, Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients; Berlin, 1988, 247-259. Year 19 and 26: K. DONKER VAN HEEL, Papyrus Louvre E 7852: A Land Lease from the Reign of Taharka, *RdE* 48 (1997) 81-93; idem, Papyrus Louvre E 78526 Verso and Recto: Leasing Land in the Reign of Taharka, *RdE* 49 (1998) 91-102; idem, Papyrus Louvre E 78526 Verso and Recto: Leasing Land in the Reign of Taharka, *RdE* 49 (1998) 91-102; idem, Papyrus Louvre E 7851 Verso and Recto Two More Land Leases from the Reign of Taharka, *RdE* 50 (1999) 135-144.

<sup>107</sup> A.K. GRAYSON, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (TCS V; Locust Valley, New York 1975) 128, Chron. 14, 42. The

context is to broken to reconstruct the rest. It might be that he also bore the title king of Kush, while Necho appeared in l. 44 only with the title king of Egypt.

<sup>108</sup> H.-U. ONASCH, *Die Assyrischen Eroberungen*, 24.

<sup>109</sup> R. BORGER, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons, Königs von Assyrien*, BAFO 9; Graz 1956, 101; Frg. F, 112, l. 12.

<sup>110</sup> See references in SPALINGER, *Or* 43 (1974) 322.

<sup>111</sup> MACADAM, *The Temples of Kawa*, [Text] 8 and [plates] pl. 6: Kawa III.

<sup>112</sup> MACADAM, *Temples of Kawa I*, [plates] pl. 6: Kawa III, 15.

<sup>113</sup> BORGER, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons*, 102, l. 31-33.

<sup>114</sup> BORGER, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons*, 112.

<sup>115</sup> ONASCH, *Die Assyrischen Eroberungen*, 24.

where in Kush and travel to Napata to be crowned, but would be crowned in Egypt, like Taharqa was crowned in Memphis. (*FHNI* I 1 53: Kawa V, 15). In the interpretation of Tanutamun's dream it is clearly stated that the land will be given to him in its breadth and its length without any other sharing it with him (*FHNI* I 197: DS 6 *rdi.(w) n.k t3 m 3w.f ws[h].f [nn] (6) ky psš.f hn<sup>c</sup>.k*). Again, the ideology of the Kushite kingship was against dividing and sharing the reign with anybody, be they coregents, viceroys or opponents.

In Ashurbanipal's prisms A and C II 22–23 it is said:<sup>116</sup>

*Arkanu Tašdamane mar Šabakû ušib ina kussî šarrutišu (23) Ne' Unu ana dannutišu iškun*

“Later, Tanutamun, son of Shabaka sat on the throne of his (Taharqa's) kingship (23) No (Thebes) and Unu (Heliopolis) he made as his fortresses.”

In Ashurbanipal's prism F col. I 37 Tanutamun is called *šar māt Mušur u māt Kusi* “King of Egypt and Kush”,<sup>117</sup> although the reports of the Assyrian campaigns are conflated and might have originally referred to Taharqa.

It seems that also in Assyrian eyes, Tanutamun had the same royal status and territorial control after Taharqa's death. Thebes as well as Heliopolis were considered his fortified cities, and no mention is made of the territory or existence of a postulated Kushite Junior king.

The well-known petition of Padiese preserved in Papyrus Rylands IX, recalling his family's history mentions Padiese, Shipmaster of Herakleopolis, who was in charge of *P3-t-rsy* from the southern guard-house of Memphis unto Aswan in Psammetichus' regnal year 4.<sup>118</sup> Since Padiese and his son were allies of Psammetichus and were commissioned by pharaoh, it was inferred that Psammetichus subjugated Upper Egypt entirely already in his fourth regnal year.<sup>119</sup> This information from Papyrus Rylands seemingly contradicts the evi-

dence from Upper Egypt, as Tanutamun's regnal years 2,3,4,8 are attested in Thebes and *he* and not Psammetichus was recognized as the legitimate king in Thebes in those years.<sup>120</sup> This piece of information might be wrong since it was written retrospectively *c.*140 years later.<sup>121</sup> However, it seems that the author is simply backdating retrospectively according to Psammetichus' regnal years in Lower Egypt, disregarding Tanutamun's sovereignty in Upper Egypt.<sup>122</sup> The geographical vast territory from Aswan to the South of Memphis inspected by Padiese in Psammetichus' 4<sup>th</sup> year (661 B.C.) would then have been under Tanutamun's control. Again, the Kushite ruler controlled the vast territory of Kush and almost all of Egypt without a joint king to control the north for him.

### 3. COMMUNICATION AND CONTROL

Kitchen asserts that a division of the vast kingdom of Egypt-and-Kush has excellent reasons. In the following paragraph I will quote his reasoning from his preprint cited in n. 82 (The article will be published in this volume). Kitchen claims that “Long before (the 25<sup>th</sup> Dyn.) the New-Kingdom pharaohs of Egypt found it impossible to rule both Egypt *and* Kush in person all the way from the Mediterranean coast well over 2,000 miles (well over 3.200 km) to Napata and the 4<sup>th</sup> cataract of the Nile. The 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty had exactly the same problem, albeit technically in reverse. We too easily forget that *nobody* then had mobile phones, jet aircraft or any form of fast communication – it took up to 3 weeks to sail from Memphis to Thebes alone, and surely up to 3 months to go from Memphis to Napata – or, 6 months (half a year!) to send up and have a reply! So, development of local authority was essential as much in the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty as in the New Kingdom. Pi(ankh)y would not do this, so he in practice abandoned all of Egypt after his great campaign except for religiously important Thebes to Aswan, closest to his southern domains.”

<sup>116</sup> ONASCH, *Die Assyrischen Eroberungen*, 122–123.

<sup>117</sup> ONASCH, *Die Assyrischen Eroberungen*, 124; SPALINGER, *Or* 43 (1974) 322.

<sup>118</sup> F.L.L. GRIFFITH, *Catalogue of the Demotic Papyri, Rylands Library* III esp. IX, 5/13, p. 77

<sup>119</sup> H. DE MEULENAERE, De Vestiging van de Saitische Dynastie, *Orientalia Gandensia* I (1964) 99–101. KITCHEN, *ThIP* 403 ignores Padiese's claim altogether.

<sup>120</sup> G. VITTMANN, Zwei Priestereinführunginschriften der 25. Dynastie aus Luxor (Berlin 2006 und 2007), *SAK* 29

(2001) 357–370. The stela of year 3 were dated to 1 February 661. For additional dates, see *FHNI*, 193.

<sup>121</sup> KITCHEN, *ThIP*, 235. It misinforms also on the role of Somtuefnakht in Heracleopolis.

<sup>122</sup> Cf. the dates of Cambyses in the same petition. See L. DEPUYDT, Egyptian Regnal Dating under Cambyses and the Date of the Persian Conquest, in: P. DER MANUELIAN (ed.) *Studies in Honor of William Kelly Simpson* I (Boston 1996) 182. Cf. J. VON BECKERATH, Nochmals die Eroberung Ägyptens durch Kambyses, *ZÄS* 129 (2002) 2.

In the following paragraphs I will not maintain the Kushites had mobile phones or jet aircrafts. I will, however, try to show, from the scanty information we have about communication and administration in the 25<sup>th</sup> dyn., that although these problems clearly existed, they did not hinder the kushite king to be the supreme ruler of this vast territory and even included the Levant up to the Euphrates, thus adding several km. to the territories under his authority.

### 3.1. Piankhy

In the Great Triumphal Stela of Piankhy, at least 11 times messengers were sent from Egypt to Napata and back to inform the king on the progress of the military campaign and to receive new orders from the king. Grimal has calculated the length of the journey from Thebes to Napata as 3 months,<sup>123</sup> the same figure as Kitchen mentions. In a review of Grimal's study, J. von Beckerath argued that this figure is wrong and should be about slightly more than a month.<sup>124</sup> This can be deduced from the GTS of Piankhy. Piankhy left Napata by boat on the first month of Akhet, day 9 (GTS l. 29) and arrived in Thebes to celebrate the Opet Festival. This Festival started in the New Kingdom on II Akhet 15 or 19<sup>125</sup> and there is no indication that this date changed in the 25<sup>th</sup> dynasty, although it can not be ruled out. Thus, Piankhy's journey from Napata to Thebes lasted 39 days at the most and not 3 months.<sup>126</sup> Kitchen asserts that it took up to 3 weeks to sail from Memphis to Thebes. This data is also exaggerated, and shorter periods of time are attested for this journey. In the Nitocris Adoption Stela the time to travel the distance between Memphis (or possibly Tanis) and Thebes by boat (*c.* 700 km or more for Tanis) is 16 days.<sup>127</sup> It might, possibly,

even be reduced to 9 days.<sup>128</sup> Thus, the time span that elapsed from issuing an order at Napata until it arrived by boat in Egypt can be considerably shortened. This, clearly, was no hindrance to send messengers and inform the king at court in Napata about the developments in Egypt. Although we have no information about the royal communication systems in Egypt and Kush, quicker means of delivering messages on horseback or chariots surely existed from the New Kingdom onwards.<sup>129</sup>

Kitchen claims that "he (Piankhy) in practice abandoned all of Egypt after his great campaign except for religiously important Thebes to Aswan, closest to his southern domains". This statement is accepted by almost all scholars,<sup>130</sup> and no serious evidence suggests otherwise. But, if Piankhy controlled Thebes, would he abandon control over Lower Egypt just because a message would arrive 2-3 weeks later at its destination? Did Piankhy not receive numerous messages from middle Egypt when he was still in Napata? Messages were sent in times of war and orders were sent back. After the subjugation of Egypt communication could only be better and less urgent. Piankhy did not leave Egypt because the postman was not efficient enough. The reason for abandoning Egypt must be sought elsewhere.

According to the GTS of Piankhy, he left only after entire Egypt was subdued and even Tefnakht, his archrival, came to terms with him. Basically he kept the way of government in Egypt as existed before the onslaught of his campaign- one of an overlord and his loyal vassals and not of direct rule.

### 3.2. Shebitku

The practice of sending messengers<sup>131</sup> was also used when Taharqa was recruited in far away Kush

<sup>123</sup> GRIMAL, *La stèle triomphale de Pi('ankh)y*, 225, n. 668.

<sup>124</sup> J. VON BECKERATH, Review of Grimal, N.-C., *La stèle triomphale de Pi('ankh)y au Musée du Caire (MIFAO 105)*, Cairo, 1981, *BiOr* 42 (1985) 74.

<sup>125</sup> W. MURNANE, *Opetfest, LÄ IV* (1981) 574-579.

<sup>126</sup> See the estimated figure calculated by YURCO, *Serapis* 6 (1980) 227, n. 53.

<sup>127</sup> R.A. CAMINOS, *The Nitocris Adoption Stela, JEA* 50 (1964) 81-84

<sup>128</sup> J. DEGAS, *Navigation sur le Nil au Nouvel Empire*, in: B. MENU (ed.), *Les problèmes institutionnels de l'eau en Égypte ancienne et dans l'Antiquité méditerranéenne*, BdE 110, Paris 1992, 141-146.

<sup>129</sup> Just to mention the messenger that Kamose's troops captured on the desert road west of the Nile between Avaris and Kush. See also A.R. SCHULMAN, *Egyptian Representations of Horsemen and Riding in the New Kingdom, JNES* 16 (1957) 263-271.

<sup>130</sup> But cf. ZIBELIUS-CHEN, *OLZ* 98 (2003) 442.

<sup>131</sup> On messages that were sent to report about enemy actions, cf. A.J. SPALINGER, *Aspects of the Military Documents of the Ancient Egyptians* (New Haven, 1982) 1-33; K.A. KITCHEN, Review of A.J. Spalinger, *Aspects of the Military Documents of the Ancient Egyptians* (New Haven, 1982), *BiOr* 44 (1987) 638.



by Shebitku to wage war in the north (most probably at Eltekeh in Central Israel), even though the arrival of the Kushite reinforcement would only be of help months later (*FHNI* 139: Kawa IV, l. 8).<sup>132</sup>

### 3.3. Ashurbanipal

Years later, when Lower Egypt was in Assyrian hands in *ca.* 667 B.C., Taharqa reconquered Memphis from the Assyrians. A messenger was sent from Memphis to Nineveh,<sup>133</sup> which lay *ca.* 1850 km away. The message probably arrived weeks after the fall of Memphis. An army was then assembled (obviously not in one day!) and sent to Egypt – 62 or 74 (2–2.5 months!) marching days from Nineveh to Memphis at a rate of 30 or 25 km daily respectively without days of rest which were obviously needed, fighting, negotiations, siege, looting and a further month and 10 days advancement South toward Thebes (*ca.* 700 km), and then back again.<sup>134</sup> Thus, the Assyrian counterattack against Taharqa's forces was postponed by some months.<sup>135</sup> This did not deter them from trying to control Egypt as well.

The reaction time of the Assyrian Empire, as well as of the Kushite ruler, to local rebellions could be long and thus mislead the rebels. The harsh and devastating reaction did eventually come in most cases. All efforts were made to pacify a rebellious region and firmly control it, no matter how far away it lay, and how long it would take to suppress the rebellion as long as the region was designated a "priority region".

### CONCLUSIONS

1. There is no evidence for any coregency between any of the Kushite kings who ruled Egypt and Kush and their successor.
2. There is no evidence of a divided Kingship between a senior King and a junior king, coregent, regent, viceroy, deputy, lieutenant or vizier with kingly authority.
3. Admittedly, problems in communication can create the need to divide an empire into smaller administrative units. In the remaining records, however, there is *no* clear evidence for communication problems between Egypt and Kush in the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, on the contrary. Messages, orders and updates were being sent from Kush to Egypt and back. The time estimates for a message to arrive at its destiny and return to the sender with an answer is much lower than the time calculated by Grimal and by Kitchen, and was less of a hindrance than suggested.

Thus, we should accept that Shebitku was sole King of Egypt and Kush in 706 B.C. with the historical and chronological implications that derive from the evidence of the Tang-i Var inscription.<sup>136</sup> The Anchor date of 690 B.C. for the accession of Taharqa can now be pushed back in time. The earliest secure absolute date for the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty can be determined as the accession date of Shabaka in 721 B.C.

<sup>132</sup> YURCO, *Serapis* 6 (1980) 226–228.

<sup>133</sup> ONASCH, *Die Assyrischen Eroberungen*, 117: Prism C col. I, l. 62.

<sup>134</sup> I. EPH'AL, On Warfare and Military Control in the Ancient Near Eastern Empires: A Research Outline, in:

H. TADMOR, and M. WEINFELD (eds.), *History, Historiography and Interpretations*, Jerusalem 1983, 99.

<sup>135</sup> EPH'AL, On Warfare and Military Control, 96–97.

<sup>136</sup> See D. KAHN, *Or* 70 (2001) 1–18.

