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Summary: Peftjauawybast, King of Nen-nesut. Genealogy, Art History, and the Chronology of Late Libyan Egypt

This paper argues in detail for the identification of Peftjauawybast, King of Nen-nesut (fl. 728/720 BC\(^1\)), with Peftjauawybast, High Priest of Ptah in Memphis (fl. c. 790–780 BC\(^2\)), known from the Apis stela of year 28 of Shoshenq III. This identification ties in with a significant lowering of the accepted dates for the kings from Shoshenq III, Osorkon III and Takeloth III to Shoshenq V, and the material culture associated with them. Such a shift seems to be supported by stylistic and genealogical evidence. As a consequence, it is further suggested that the Master of Shipping at Nen-nesut, Pediese i, was perhaps related by descent and marriage to the family of the High Priests of Memphis and King Peftjauawybast.
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Resumen: Peftjauawybast, rey de Nen-nesut. Genealogía, historia del arte, y la cronología del Egipto libio tardío

Este artículo argumenta detalladamente a favor de la identificación de Peftjauawybast, el rey de Nen-nesut (fl. 728/720 BC) con Peftjauawybast, el sumo sacerdote de Ptah

\(^1\) Article received: September 7\(^{th}\) 2009; approved: October 5\(^{th}\) 2009.

en Menfis (fl. c. 790–780 BC) conocido a partir de la estela de Apis del año 28 de Shoshenq III. Esta identificación concuerda con una significativa reducción de las fechas aceptadas para los reyes que van desde Shoshenq III, Osorkon III y Takelot hasta Shoshenq V, y con el material cultural asociado con ellos. Este cambio parece sustentarse con evidencia estilística y genealógica. Como consecuencia, se sugiere que el maestro de navegación de Nen-nesut, Pediese i, estaba quizás relacionado por descendencia y matrimonio con la familia de los sumos sacerdotes de Menfis y el rey Peftjauawybast.

**Palabras clave:** Peftjauawybast – estelas de Apis – Egipto – período libio tardío

**Peftjauawybast, King of Nen-nesut**

The “Victory Stela” of Piye, the Kushite conqueror of Egypt, is one of the most illuminating documents for the late Libyan period. It reveals in some detail the degree to which Egypt had become politically fragmented by the late 8th century BC, naming as it does no less than four northern kings, “uraeus bearers”, as well as over a dozen local chieftains of lesser stature. In doing so it provides a set of synchronisms between a number of rulers—notably Piye himself, his main opponent in the north Chief of the Libu Tefnakht of Sau (*Sais*), and four kings: Nimlot, Osorkon, Iuput and Peftjauawybast. The Stela thus provides one of the principal sources for reconstructing the chronology—both difficult and controversial—of this period.

The focus of the present article is one of the “uraeus bearers” recognised by Piye—Peftjauawybast, King of Nen-nesut (*Herakleopolis*). A loyal vassal of Piye, he was besieged within his city by the army of Tefnakht. Delivered by the army of Piye, Peftjauawybast’s encomium of the Kushite at Khmunu forms a section of the narrative of the “Victory Stela” (lines 70–76). Though Peftjauawybast is a relatively obscure figure, his many family connections—both attested and conjectural—lend themselves to chronological analysis: not only in terms of genealogical links, but from the artistic style of their monuments.

Peftjauawybast (*P³j.f-t³w-(m)-wj-B³stt*), or as earlier scholars preferred, Pefnefdiubast (*Pf-nf-di(w)-B³stt*), clearly possessed full kingship. Although his full titulary is not preserved, surviving monuments use nomen and prenomen with the titles *nb t³wy, nsw, nsw-bity, nṯr nfr, s³ R*, and *nb irḥt*.3 He is attested by a small number of monuments4:


1. The “Victory Stela” of Piye, dated to year 21.5
2. A gold statue of Herishef from Ehnasya (Boston MFA 06.2408): carries cartouches with nsw-bity Peftjaawybast and s3 R c Neferkare.6
3. The bronze statue (Boston MFA 1977.16) with the name Neferkare on the belt, was attributed to Peftjaawybast by Russmann and accepted by others.7 The features are certainly not Kushite, and the profile has similarities with those of Osorkon III and Takeloth III in the Heqa-djet chapel. The single uraeus also argues against a Kushite ruler. Leahy discusses the use of the “cap crown” on this bronze statue and the “Victory” stela.
4. Donation stela Cairo JdE 45348 of year 10.8 The prenomen is Neferkare and the text refers to a daughter, Iruatj, by his wife, the King’s daughter, Ta-sherit-en-ese, dedicated as Chantress of the Inner Abode of Amun at Thebes.
5. Donation stela Cairo TN 11/9/21/4 of year 10.9 Similar to the preceding, perhaps naming a second daughter by Ta-sherit-en-ese.
6. Sarcophagus fragment Berlin 2100 names his wife Ir-bast-wedja-nefu, daughter of Rudamun, their daughter ...b...h c c and her son [Pedi-amun]-neb-nesut-tawy10; see also Daressy for a related block from Medinet Habu with the “late” writing of the name of Osiris.11 A stone fragment from Abydos may also name Ir-bast-wedja-nefu.12
7. Sarcophagus inscription recorded by Robert Hay at Qurna naming Sopdet, a daughter of Peftjaawybast by his wife Ir-bast-wedja-nefu daughter of Rudamun.13

5 Grimal 1981 with full bibliography to that date. For discussion of the date of the campaign—year 4, 12 or (as more conventionally accepted) 19/20 see Morkot 2000: 172–174, 184, 200.
6 Russmann 1981: 154, figs. 8–9.
7 Russmann 1981: 150–151, figs. 1–6; see e.g. Leahy 1992a: 232.
8 Daressy 1917: 43–45.
9 Daressy 1921: 138–139.
10 PM I, 2: 678; LD III 284a; LD Text iii, 258; Jurman 2006: 71 G.
11 Daressy 1897: 20–21—now Cairo JE 33902; Leahy 1979: 142; Jurman 2006: 71 F.
13 Graefe 1990; Jurman 2006: 71 H.
The family of King Peftjauawybast

Peftjauawybast had at least two wives: Ta-sherit/hered-en-ese and Ir-bast-wedja-nefu (or Ir-bast-wedja-tjau). Ta-sherit-en-ese is attested by the year 10 stelae from Herakleopolis, on which she carries the title “King’s Daughter”. Given the time of Peftjauawybast’s rule, the number of kings that she could have been daughter of is rather large: Osorkon III (or “IV”), Takeloth III, Rudamun, Iuput, Nimlot, or one of the Kushites (Kashta or Piye). By Ta-sherit-en-ese, Peftjauawybast had a daughter, Iruatj, and perhaps a second. The second wife, Ir-bast-wedja-nefu, was daughter of Rudamun and mother of two daughters, Sopdet and ...b...hc. The latter was the mother of a [Pedi-amun]-neb-nesut-tawy.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bold</th>
<th>Kings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Italic</em></td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Osorkon III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(King X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudamun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta-hered/sherit-en-ese = <strong>Peftjauawybast</strong> = Ir-Bast-wedja-nefu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iruatj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...b...hc = -----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sopdet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Pedi-amun]-neb-nesut-tawy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.
The known relatives of King Peftjauawybast.

All of the king’s *known* children, and his grandson, lived at Thebes: Iruatj was installed as a chantress in the Inner Abode of Amun, as were daughters of other kings and Libyan chiefs. Nothing specific is known of Pedi-amun-neb-nesut-tawy other than that he was buried at Thebes.

Most writers have assumed that Peftjauawybast was somehow connected with one or other of the Libyan royal families by descent as well as marriage: no monuments, however, record his parentage. He is usually taken to be a slightly younger contemporary of Takeloth III and Rudamun on the grounds of his marriage with the latter’s daughter, and his reign at the time of Piye’s campaign.

**Chronological placement of Peftjauawybast**

The evidence for the length and chronological parameters for the reign of King Peftjauawybast is: the account of Piye’s conflict with Tefnakht of Sais; the stelae dated to the king’s 10th regnal year; and the fact that he does not appear as ruler of Nen-nesut (Hininsu) on the Assyrian list of vassals from the records of Assurbanipal, relating to 667/666 BC (conventionally accepted) or 671 BC (as argued by Verreth). There is an outside chance, as suggested by Leahy that the Nimlot king of Khmunu (Hermopolis) of the “Victory Stela” may have lived long enough to have been the Lamintu of Himuni mentioned in the same list.

Kitchen places the king’s reign around 728 BC (the date of Piye’s campaign, in his reckoning) but wonders how long after 720 BC he continued to reign. Aston and Taylor follow the same date for the campaign of Piye, and hence Peftjauawybast’s *floruit*. Obviously, Peftjauawybast’s absolute dates are affected by any changes in the dates ascribed to the reign of Piye and the campaign against Tefnakht.

Peftjauawybast’s throne name was Neferkare: this was also the throne name of Shabaqo. Were it not for the Piye stela, one might postulate that Peftjauawybast was installed by Shabaqo, but this would overturn the generally

---

16 Verreth 1999.
19 Aston and Taylor 1990.
accepted ordering and interpretation of events, and appears to have little in its favour. It is more likely that Neferkare is an archaising name common to both rulers, reflected also in the Kushite-period throne names Sekhemkare, Wahkare (Bakenranef), and Shepseskare (Gemenef-khonsu-bak).

Further stylistic evidence for the dating of King Peftjauawybast comes from the stelae of his year 10. Describing these, Daressy commented: “les personnages sont maigres, élancés, comme ils sont dans les représentations d’âge saïte” and suggested that they were contemporary with the reign of Shabaqo.21 The stelae, poorly preserved, have never been illustrated, but this “thin” type of figure is typical of donation stelae from the Delta of the time of Shoshenq V, Tefnakht, Shabaqo, and Taharqo. This style, also found on a stela of year 22 (Kitchen: 746 BC) of the reign of Shoshenq V from Atfih,22 has the “archaising” feature of prominent forward thigh for female figures (discussed further below). Within the conventional chronology this style would be stretched over a period of up to a century, and might be interpreted as a regional variation. This stylistic feature cannot be used to place Peftjauawybast’s reign more precisely—although it does raise a number of questions about style.

The difficulty of placing Piye’s campaign precisely—both within his reign, and in absolute terms—has already been noted. The parameters are roughly 730/728 and 715 depending on how long a reign (24 up to 40 years) and whether the conventional years 19/20 or a lower (year 4 or 12) date is adopted.23 A date around 725 BC will suffice for the purposes of the present article.

The Kingdom of Nen-nesut

Peftjauawybast was king of Nen-nesut (Herakleopolis), but the extent of the kingdom is unclear from Piye’s inscription, as the neighbouring towns and fortresses are said to have yielded to Tefnakht’s advance. The evidence from the Libyan period more generally, would suggest that the rulers of Nen-nesut controlled the entrance to the Fayum, including the fortress of Per-Sekhem-kheper-re, perhaps the Fayum itself, and key river fortresses such as Teudjoi

20 E.g. Morkot 2000.
21 Daressy 1917; 1921.
22 Peet 1920.
(el Hibeḥ), extending as far north as Atfih. This would embrace nomes 18 to 22, perhaps as far south as nome 17.

A serious problem with any interpretation of this period that assumes that the kingship of Peftjauawybast somehow represents a “legitimate” succession to the family of Takeloth III and Rudamun is that his “kingdom” is completely new, and lies well to the north of Theban territory. This is particularly significant for those who argue that Osorkon III, Takeloth III and Rudamun represent a “Theban Twenty-third Dynasty”. Kitchen, proposing a Leontopolite origin for this line, suggests that Peftjauawybast was installed in Nen-nesut when Takeloth III was made co-regent by Osorkon III.\(^\text{24}\) Kitchen implicitly assumes a blood relationship, as well as marriage, with that line. Aston and Taylor similarly argue for Peftjauawybast’s kingship as direct successor to Rudamun and the line of Osorkon III.\(^\text{25}\) They assume that Osorkon III, Takeloth III, and Rudamun had all died before the campaign of Piye, which they date to c.728 BC, and this results in some complex—and largely irrelevant—arguments over dating and political geography.

A way around the problem has been the recent relocation of the “Theban Twenty-third Dynasty” to become a “Herakleopolitan Twenty-third Dynasty”\(^\text{26}\), a solution with as little foundation as the earlier proposal.

The political geography of the Nile valley south of Memphis is much less clear than that of the Delta,\(^\text{27}\) and whilst it is certain that the Theban region had its own rulers at some points during the Libyan period, the fracturing of the entire region south of Memphis into independent kingdoms is a very late phenomenon. Nevertheless, as early as the reign of Osorkon I or Takeloth I, the High Priest of Amun, Iuwelot, (son of Osorkon I) acknowledged that his northern military boundary lay at the nome of Asyut.\(^\text{28}\) The northern boundaries of the Thebais in the late 25\(^{th}\)–26\(^{th}\) Dynasty and Ptolemaic period were slightly further south, with key centres at Tjeny and Ptolemais Hermiou. Although new as a kingdom, territorially Peftjauawybast’s rule appears to have been essentially the same as the Tanite/Bubastite power-base that controlled the entrance to the Fayum and southern access to Memphis and the Delta. Nen-nesut and the fortresses at Teudjoj (el-Hiba), and Per-Sekhem-kheper-

\(^{24}\) Kitchen 1986: 356.


\(^{26}\) Aston 2009.

\(^{27}\) See Leahy 1990.

re had been the seats of formidable royal representatives such as the Crown Prince Osorkon and may, with the region to north and south, have effectively been a unit for a considerable time.

Rather than being installed by Osorkon III or succeeding as “heir” to his line, it is equally—if not more—likely that Peftjauawybast was raised to kingship by the Kushites. The Sandstone stela of Piye attributes to the Kushite ruler the power to make and unmake kings and chiefs so Kashta or Piye may have installed Nimlot and Peftjauawybast as vassals, creating their new kingdoms as a buffer between the Theban province and the Delta.29

In searching for a possible origin for the king of Nen-nesut, the only obvious prominent individual with the same name is the royal scion and High Priest of Memphis, attested by an Apis stela of year 28 of Shoshenq III.31 Clearly on any conventional reading of the evidence he could not be the same person.32 However, challenging the exact chronology of late Libyan Egypt, and lowering the dates for a number of kings—notably Shoshenq III, Osorkon III and Takeloth III—so that they overlap the earlier 25th Dynasty, presents a totally different world.

Problems in the chronology and material culture of late-Libyan Egypt

In a number of recent papers Morkot has considered some aspects of changes in style during the Libyan–Kushite–early-Saite periods. “Archaism” seems to have had a northern Egyptian origin, and some of the Memphite models (such as the 5th Dynasty pyramid temple of Sahura at Abusir) are well known and have long been recognised. The influence of these Memphite models in Thebes is quite clear, but chronologically complex.33 Memphite models also influenced the monuments of a local Tanite dynasty that included the kings Pedubast II and Gemenef-khonsu-bak, who were contemporaries of the 25th Dynasty.34 There was also stylistic continuity from the later New Kingdom into the earlier Libyan period,35 and variation in depictions of

32 So Kitchen 1986, and, as far as we are aware, all other more recent writers.
35 Morkot 2007.
female form. In discussing these developments it is important to recognise that variation and change in style was regional as well as chronological and that it was not a simple linear-chronological process.

As things stand, there have been numerous problems in dating the material culture of the late-Libyan-Kushite-Saite periods. Artefacts are frequently dated on chronological and genealogical assumptions, and circular arguments: kings named on such artefacts are assumed to be (e.g. Takeloth) II or III because of the style of a coffin/stela which is itself dated by another one and genealogical/chronological presuppositions.

This material is extremely complex, and there is a huge amount of it. We are aware of that, and have no intention of denigrating the work of the numerous scholars who have made enormous contribution to our understanding of the period. It is clear, however, that many Egyptologists feel that refinement of the internal chronology of this period is necessary.

Notably, there is a considerable amount of evidence—genealogical and other—that suggests a lowering of the dates for Osorkon III and Takeloth III. Aston and Taylor commented on generation jumps, and “late” dates for statues, coffins and other artefacts associated with descendants of Takeloth III. In conclusion they observed that: “Since the latest estimates place Takeloth’s death c. 758 or 757 BC … his children would seem to have outlived him by two generations instead of one.”

Likewise Broekman:

“It appears that seven of the eight known children of Takeloth III survived into the last years of the eighth century BC and that, consequently, they seem to have outlived their father by two generations. A generation jump also occurred between Takeloth’s father Osorkon III and the latter’s daughter Shepenupet I, who was probably still alive during the reign of the Nubian King Shebitku, as appears from the inscriptions and reliefs in the Nubian part of the Chapel of Osiris Heqa-Djet at Karnak.”

36 Morkot 2006.
37 Morkot 2007.
38 E.g. Aston and Taylor 1990: 133, 142, 143.
40 Broekman 2009: 93.
If it were not for the constraints of the generally accepted model for TIP chronology, it would have been more logical simply to have assumed that the reign of Takeloth III (and hence that of Osorkon III) should be lowered by a generation; indeed, Taylor has more recently suggested that Takeloth III “survived into the 730s”\textsuperscript{41} Payraudeau has also suggested a lowering of Takeloth III’s \textit{floruit}, and an increase in its length to at least 14 years (perhaps to over 19, identifying him with the unnamed king associated with Shepenwepet I in the Wadi Gasus double-dated inscription).\textsuperscript{42} Yet as Jansen-Winkeln rightly notes: “\textit{However long he reigned, the problem of the ‘generation shift’ does not disappear...}”.\textsuperscript{43} Aston appears to have neither changed his position nor accepted the logic of his own arguments.\textsuperscript{44}

A close chronological proximity to the Kushites is indicated by the newly excavated stela from Dakhla, dated to year 13 of Takeloth III, which names the Chief of the Shamain, Nes-Djehuty. This man is also known (as “Great Chief of the Shamain”) from the Lesser Dakhla Stela of year 24 of Piye.\textsuperscript{45}

An additional factor in favour of a later dating for Osorkon III and Takeloth III is the choice of titulary and the sculptural style of the chapel of Osiris-Heqa-Djet at Karnak. Here, as Kitchen observed many years ago, Osorkon III combined a typically Libyan-period, Ramesside-derived, throne name—Usermaatre Setepen-amun—with archaising Nebty and Golden Horus names: $\text{\textit{St-ib-t\textasciitilde{}wy}}$ and $\text{\textit{Ms-ntrw}}$.\textsuperscript{46} Takeloth III followed the same style, also with Usermaatre (Setepen-amun) as throne name, but with $\text{\textit{W\textasciitilde{}d-t\textasciitilde{}wy}}$ for Horus, Nebty and Golden Horus names.\textsuperscript{47} The parallel with Shabaqo’s use of $\text{\textit{Sb(\~{i})\textasciitilde{}k-t\textasciitilde{}wy}}$ for the same three names cannot be ignored, although alongside a throne-name that had both Old Kingdom and Ramesside resonances.\textsuperscript{48} There are other uses of $\text{\textit{t\textasciitilde{}wy}}$ as part of the Horus name at this time\textsuperscript{49}: $\text{\textit{\textasciitilde{}n\textasciitilde{}h-t\textasciitilde{}wy}},$

\textsuperscript{41} Taylor 2006: 288, n. 74.
\textsuperscript{42} Payraudeau 2004.
\textsuperscript{43} Jansen-Winkeln 2006: 253.
\textsuperscript{44} Aston 2009: 25.
\textsuperscript{47} Bonhême 1987: 188–192.
\textsuperscript{48} Morkot 2007: 148.
\textsuperscript{49} Bonhême 1987: 222–223; Leahy 1990: 188.
perhaps by Gemenef-khonsu-bak, and \((shtp-t\delta wy)\) by Pedubast II, both Tanite kings and generally agreed to have ruled under the Kushites.

The reliefs of the Heqa-Djet chapel depict Takeloth III wearing the short kilt with broad pleats that “normally” characterises 25th Dynasty archaism. The figure of Takeloth is also notable for its proportions of broad shoulders, triangular torso and very narrow waist, but with long legs. The figure is thus closer to those of Shabaqo and Shebitqo than to the “top heavy” figures with low waist and rather short legs found in the images from Iuput, Tefnakht and Bakenranef to Taharqo. Leahy observes that a stela from Abydos (Cairo JE 30434) depicting Takeloth III (perhaps post-mortem) also shows archaising features. The extremely fragmentary stela of Osorkon III from Hermopolis also appears to belong to the “archaising” group.

The archaising features of style and titulary of the reigns of Osorkon III and Takeloth III are further reflected in the use of basiliphorous names with the form “Ankh+ kn”. The commonest forms are Ankh-Takeloth and Ankh-Osorkon, given to male children and grandchildren of those two kings, and persisting into later generations. The name Ankh-Shoshenq is well attested from Memphis (notably the Serapeum stelae), and some holders of the name were descended from Shoshenq III through his daughter, Ankhesen-Shoshenq. Other male forms are quite rare in the late Libyan period. Ankh-Nimlot may be associated with the ruler of Khmunu (Hermopolis), and Ankh-Pediese was a grandson of Pediese, Great Chief of the Ma and royal scion at Memphis. The name-form becomes quite common in the 26th Dynasty, using both nomen and prenomen.

Payraudeau’s redating of Berlin papyrus 3048 from the reign of Takeloth II to Takeloth III also raises some significant issues. The Berlin papyrus is written in abnormal hieratic, and the earliest known other documents in this form are papyri of years 21 and 22 of Piye. Broekman has already observed that changes in language begin at the end of, or follow, the reign of Shoshenq III, and are part of the archaising process that can now be certainly dated to

50 Morkot 2003: 84.
52 Leahy 1990: 171; see now Leahy 2009: 433, fig. 12 and 434–435.
that phase.\textsuperscript{56} Because of genealogical information, Payraudeau subsequently redated Berlin 3048 back to the reign of Takeloth II,\textsuperscript{57} creating an even greater problem regarding its use of abnormal hieratic. Likewise Ritner has shown that coffin CGC 41035, which uses the late form of the name Osiris known from the 25th Dynasty, belongs to a granddaughter of Takeloth II (and daughter of Crown Prince Osorkon), and not Takeloth III as suggested by Leahy and Aston and Taylor.\textsuperscript{58} Ritner also reconsidered the Turin Stela of a Shepenwepet who he also identifies as daughter of the HPA and Crown Prince Osorkon.\textsuperscript{59} Munro and de Meulenaere dated the stela stylistically to 720–700 BC or “not earlier than the end of the eighth century” respectively, and consequently Aston and Taylor proposed she was a grand-daughter of Takeloth III and daughter of Osorkon “F”.\textsuperscript{60}

These facts add considerable pressure to the chronological tension noted by Aston and Taylor from coffin styles and genealogies. The case is extremely strong for suggesting that the conventional dates for the reigns of Osorkon III (787–759 or 784–756 BC) and Takeloth III (764–757 or 761–754 BC) should be lowered \textit{at the very least} by 25 years. Less “generation jump” would then be required between the family of Takeloth III and individuals who can be dated after c. 700 BC. On a rather more radical reading of the evidence, the rise of Tefnakht of Sais would be attributed to the years following 36 and 38 of Shoshenq III, rather than Shoshenq V: this has already been suggested, tentatively,\textsuperscript{61} involving a downward shift of some 60 years.

It should be stated that we regard Osorkon III to be identical with the Crown Prince and High Priest of Amun well-documented in the reigns of his father Takeloth II and of Shoshenq III. This seems to be firmly established by the text of the Akoris Stela that identifies him as both king and as High Priest of Amun.\textsuperscript{62} This attractive identification, accepted by many earlier Egyptologists\textsuperscript{63} was rejected by Kitchen—his high chronology would place

\textsuperscript{56} Broekman 2002.
\textsuperscript{57} Payraudeau 2009.
\textsuperscript{58} Ritner 1999; Leahy 1979: 148; Aston and Taylor 1990: 132–133.
\textsuperscript{59} Ritner 1999: 358.
\textsuperscript{60} Aston and Taylor 1990: 133–134.
\textsuperscript{61} Morkot 2000: 181–182.
\textsuperscript{63} E.g. Hall 1954: 164–165 and see Baer 1973: 15–16.
almost a century between the beginning of Osorkon’s pontificate (c. 840 BC) and the end of Osorkon III’s reign (749 BC), giving him an impossibly long career if one individual. Although the identification of the two Osorkons was rejected by a number of writers, the idea was raised again by Leahy64 invoking the evidence of the Akoris Stela. Leahy pointed out that the King’s longevity was not a major issue, and that Helen Jacquet-Gordon’s suggestion that there was a substantial overlap of the reigns of Takeloth II and Shoshenq III reduced his life-span by a full decade. The overlap of reigns was also argued at the same time by Aston.65 The equation of the HPA Osorkon and Osorkon III was also defended by the present authors66 and is now widely accepted again.67

As proposed tentatively elsewhere we assume Takeloth II to have been the eldest son of the High Priest Nimlot (C), son of Osorkon II, an idea that now has wide currency.68 Accepting the identity of Osorkon III with the Bubastite High Priest and son of Takeloth II, we do not subscribe to the theory that Osorkon III and Takeloth III were rulers of a “Theban Twenty-third Dynasty”, but the continuation of the Bubastite family; hence he would have been the king Osorkon of Bubastis named on the Victory Stela of Piye’s year 21 (Kitchen: 728 BC). As Takeloth III is not named on the Stela he presumably became co-regent of Osorkon III after the invasion of Piye, and not some decades before it. Takeloth III would thus have been a contemporary of the Kushite ruler Shabaqo. Given that, the mass of otherwise anomalous data reviewed now becomes comprehensible, along with an almost incredible “mystery” envisaged by Kitchen:

“What happened to the high-priesthood of Amun of Thebes after the accession of Takeloth III remains a total mystery. While perhaps some record of a couple of incumbents for the 40 years down into the reign of Shabako remains to be found, yet the simplest explanation may well be that the office was actually left in abeyance ...”.69

---

65 Aston 1989.
The 40 years lay between the elevation of Takeloth G to kingship and HPA Haremakhet. He may have taken office in the reign of his father Shabaqo (Kitchen: 716–702 BC), although his statue inscription specifically associates him with Taharqo and Tanwetamani. Kitchen attempted to reduce this gap by introducing an Osorkon “F”\(^{70}\). However, Ritner has shown that there was no such individual.\(^{71}\) Rather, the late 8th-century BC style of a stela of lady Shepenwepet, daughter of an HPA Osorkon, used as part of the argument in the creation of Osorkon F\(^{72}\) should be taken as further evidence for a later dating of the Crown Prince/HPA and then pharaoh, Osorkon (III).

The dating of Osorkon III and Takeloth III is directly relevant to Peftjauawybast because of the marriage of that ruler to a daughter of Rudamun (another son of Osorkon III), and because of the link between Osorkon III and the Kushites through the God’s Wives of Amun, Shepenwepet I and Amenirdis I. Lowering the date of Osorkon III would also necessitate a significant reduction in the date for Shoshenq III—opening the possibility that the Peftjauawybast attested as HPM in his reign was the future king of Nen-nesut.

**The High Priest of Memphis, Peftjauawybast**

The evidence for the High Priest of Memphis, Peftjauawybast, is:
1. The stela recording the burial of the Apis bull in year 28 of Shoshenq III (798 BC in Kitchen’s calculation\(^{73}\)) (see Figs. 1 & 2).
2. A wooden statue, Berlin 11637.\(^{74}\) The statue in sycomore-fig wood depicts Peftjauawybast squatting, left leg raised, right leg folded. His head is shaven; details of collar and the text were added in black and yellow paint. The statue is of a type that is familiar from Theban examples in stone from the New Kingdom to Late Period.\(^{75}\)

---


\(^{71}\) Ritner 1999: 357–358.

\(^{72}\) Kitchen 1986: 565.

\(^{73}\) Kitchen 1986: 489.

\(^{74}\) PM VIII, 800 [801–743–200]; Staatliche Museen 1895: 18 and pl. 49.

\(^{75}\) E.g. Josephson and Eldamaty 1999: pl. 3 CG 48603 (Akhamenru); pl. 6 CG 48606 (Harwa); pl. 31 CG 486031 (Pediamennebnesuttawy).
The Apis stela shows him serving alongside his father, Pediese, and half-brother Takeloth D. However, at the burial of the next bull, in year 2 of Pimay, it is Peftjauawybast’s half-brother Harsiese H who officiated, but still with their father. It is generally assumed that Peftjauawybast and Takeloth D had died in the intervening 26 years, and been succeeded by their brother. Is it possible instead that the High Priest, and a senior member of the Bubastite royal house, had been installed by the Kushites as ruler of the key city of Nen-Nesut? Most Egyptologists would assume not: but only because the accepted chronology would not allow such a possibility.

The family of the High Priest of Memphis, Peftjauawybast

Peftjauawybast was the son of the High Priest of Ptah and Great Chief of the Ma, Pediese, who had himself succeeded his father, Takeloth B, and grandfather, Shoshenq D, in the office. Shoshenq D, Crown Prince and eldest son of Osorkon II and the Great Royal Wife Karoma, had been appointed High Priest of Ptah by his father. He is supposed to have presided over the burial of an Apis bull in year 23 of Osorkon II, although the inscription (SIM 3090) recording this does not specifically name him.

Ahmad Badawi excavated the tombs of this family at Memphis, although filiations were not given in all cases. The tomb of the Crown Prince Shoshenq D, son of Osorkon II, was the most imposing (now re-erected in the garden of the Egyptian Museum, Cairo), with sculptured decoration, a reused Ramesside sarcophagus, and a silver coffin. The other tombs belonged to Takeloth, Pediese and Harsiese, but lack full publication. No tomb for Peftjauawybast was identified.

Earlier reconstructions of the period suggested that Shoshenq D, the High Priest of Amun Nimlot C, and perhaps all other sons, predeceased Osorkon II:

76 Malinine et al. 1968, I: 19–20, no 21; II, pl.VII.
77 Malinine et al. 1968, I: 21–23; II, pl. VIII.
81 Badawi 1944; 1957; PM III2.2.3: 846–848.
82 Yoyotte 1961: 124, §5.7, 125, §5.8.
the King’s prayer clearly fears dynastic problems.83 Although the HPA Nimlot C certainly died before his father, the Crown Prince and HPM Shoshenq D was buried with udjat-amulets, one of which names Shoshenq III.84

The High Priest of Ptah and Great Chief of the Ma, Pediese, is known to have had three wives. Tairy, the mother of Peftjauawybast, was daughter of Takeloth B and hence full or half-sister of her husband. A second wife, Her-Bast, was the mother of Takeloth D. The \textit{wrt hnrw m Mn-nfr} [...]-Iret-irou was mother of Harsiese H who was serving as HPM in year 2 of Pimay.

Pediese’s own mother, Tjesbastperu, was a king’s daughter. This Tjesbastperu is assumed by Kitchen and others to have been a younger daughter of Osorkon II, so introducing a “generation drop”.85 The canopic jars in Vienna that are cited for this filiation name her \textit{only} as daughter of Osorkon si-Bast (i.e. II) and Istemkheb (G) and not as a wife or mother. According to the Apis stela of year 2 of Pimay, Pediese, as High Priest, \textit{sm}-priest, and Great Chief of the Ma, installed the Apis bull in year 28 of Shoshenq III along with his wife the \textit{s3t nsrw} Tjesbastperu.86 Thus, Pediese’s mother Tjestbastperu \textit{may} have been a “late” daughter of Osorkon II, but she could have been daughter of another king.

The Apis burial stela of year 28 of Shoshenq III87 shows Pediese, but gives him only one title, Great Chief of the Ma. Takeloth D, son of Pediese and Her-Bast, is accorded the title \textit{sm}-priest.

The Apis stelae of year 2 of Pimay88 names other members of the family: Harsiese H who was officiating as \textit{wr hrp hmmw} and \textit{sm} and was son of Pediese and the \textit{wrt hnrw m Mn-nfr} [...]-Iret-irou. Two additional lines of text name “his” (Harsiese H’s) sons: Takeloth, son of Ta-di-ta-neb-n—89 and Ankh-Pediese, son of Kapes-en-ha-ese.90 This Takeloth, now designated “H” is identified by Jurman with the \textit{sm}-priest and \textit{wr hrp hmmw} accompanying

85 Kitchen 1986: 102; and more cautiously 322, §281.
87 Malinine \textit{et al.} 1968: I, no. 21 (SIM 3749); Yoyotte 1961: 124, §5.3.
89 Cf. Ranke 1935: 347, 15: \textit{T3-dj-t-ti-3-nb.(t)-hn}.
90 \textit{K3ps-nh3-3s.t} : Ranke 1935: 342, 9.
a king Shoshenq on block Cairo JE 46915.\textsuperscript{91} He therefore dates his pontificate after that of Ankhefen-sakhmet B. Stylistically this block is important as the king uses a simple style, Shoshenq without epithets, and his figure has the broad shoulders, narrow waist and low belt found on the plaque of Iuput,\textsuperscript{92} and the goddess has the attenuated form, and prominent forward thigh found on donation stelae of Pimay (noted above).

Harsiese H’s son, Ankhefen-sakhmet B, is assumed by Kitchen\textsuperscript{93} to have been the High Priest of Memphis officiating in the reign of Shoshenq V, by his chronological position, not by any document. Ankhefen-sakhmet B is attested by a statue (Cairo CG 12120\textsuperscript{94}) which he dedicated to his father, both carrying the titles $r$-$p^c$ $hity^c$-$s m n Pth wr hrp $hmmw n Pth$. Ankhefen-sakhmet B’s mother is named as $wrt$ $hnr$ $B3$.\textsuperscript{95}

Working on a conventional chronology, Leahy observed that “there is a hiatus of perhaps a century in our knowledge of the high priests of Memphis between the reign of Shoshenq V and the Twenty-sixth dynasty.”\textsuperscript{96} The Saite sequence of High Priests appears to begin with Pedipep, to be dated within the reign of Psamtik I.\textsuperscript{97} In a recent reassessment of the evidence for the High Priesthood, Jurman too comments on the lack of clear evidence from the 25\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty, although noting that the “Gallatin Head” of a Memphite High Priest\textsuperscript{98} is certainly 25\textsuperscript{th} or early 26\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty.

A sister of the HPM Peftjauawybast, Taperet, and a line of her descendants, are documented by a monument (Cairo 36728: see Table 2), originally published by Legrain, republished by Vernus and commented on by others.\textsuperscript{99} Taperet, specified as daughter of the $sem$-priest and Chief of the Ma, Pediese, married a grandson of a king Shoshenq-meriamun, who is certainly Shoshenq III, and Queen Tentamunopet: their descendants continued to hold priestly offices at Memphis. Vernus was undecided about the date of monument and

\textsuperscript{91} Jurman 2009: 128, 134, figs. 3–4.

\textsuperscript{92} As noted by Fazzini 1997 and Jurman 2009.

\textsuperscript{93} Kitchen 1986: 194, 487.

\textsuperscript{94} Borchardt 1925: 110–111, pl. 17.

\textsuperscript{95} Ranke 1935: 89, 13.

\textsuperscript{96} Leahy 2006: 175 n. 20.

\textsuperscript{97} De Meulenaere 1985.

\textsuperscript{98} Cooney 1953, 14, no. 68, pls. 42–44; Jurman 2009.

\textsuperscript{99} Vernus 1976; see e.g. Yoyotte 1961: 124, §5.6; Kitchen 1986: 343; Leahy 1992b: 149.
was clearly influenced by the generational link with Shoshenq III and Pimay: his parameters were the reigns of Shabaqo, Taharqo to Psamtik I.

Table 2.
The family of the monument Cairo 36728.

The descent from Osorkon II, combined with the evidence of the Apis and other stelae, thus places HPM Peftjauawybast firmly in a genealogical and relative historical context (Table 3).

The Shipping Masters Pediese and Sematawytefnakht

The family of the “Masters of Shipping” (MS) of Nen-nesut is well-known from a range of monuments and the extended narrative of P. Rylands IX.\textsuperscript{100} It is clear from P. Rylands IX that the ‘\textit{n} mr “Master of Shipping”\textsuperscript{101} was responsible for the whole of Upper Egypt from the “southern guard-house of Memphis” to Aswan. He was resident in Memphis or Nen-nesut, and had a deputy who appears to have done much of the travelling from place-to-place.

\textsuperscript{100} Griffith 1909; Wessetsky 1962; Traunecker 2008.

\textsuperscript{101} Or “Master of Harbours”—Griffith 1909: 78, n. 1.
Although there are clear historical “problems” with the narrative of Rylands IX, MS Pediese i appears to have had his son Sematawytefnakht as his deputy. On his retirement, Pediese i is stated to have nominated his nephew Pediese ii as his successor, but in reality, it appears from the papyrus, Pediese ii acted as deputy to his cousin Sematawytefnakht. The title appears in Assyrian documents of the time of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal as *rab kari* “Master of the Quay”.

Table 3.
The family of the High Priest of Memphis, Peftjauawybast.
The progenitor of the family named in the P. Rylands IX was a prophet of Amenresonther (ḫm nṯr n ḫm n Imn-Rˁ nsw nṯrw), Ankh-Shoshenq, named as father of Pediese i. Kitchen and Leahy\(^\text{102}\) quote the statement of Pediese i in P. Rylands IX (5/19–20)\(^\text{103}\): that he was old by year 4 of Psamtik I (660 BC) and wished to resign his office. The papyrus (9/20–10/1) states that Pediese i died in year 18 (646 BC) of Psamtik I, but Griffith\(^\text{104}\) and others have argued that year 8 (656 BC) may be more likely. Kitchen proposes that Pediese i must therefore have become Shipping Master and (High) Priest of Herishef


\(^{103}\) Griffith 1909: 78.

\(^{104}\) Griffith 1909: 84, n. 7.
“sometime early in the reign” of Taharqo: he places one—or perhaps two—rulers between Pediese and King Peftjauawybast. Leahy suggests a *floruit* for Pediese in the late eighth and early seventh centuries. This would place Ankh-Shoshenq in the later eighth century.

Kienitz speculated that MS Sematawytefnakht, the son of Pediese i, was descended from King Peftjauawybast, but Kitchen strongly argued against such a connection, although with no evidence other than geographical (discussed below) and chronological assumptions. On the conventional picture for the origins of King Peftjauawybast there is no onomastic link possible with the Masters of Shipping family. However, on the model suggested here there are further names to investigate—as we have argued that the King was identical with HPM Peftjauawybast. The latter’s family offers conspicuous onomastic matches with that of the Masters of Shipping. The name of his brother-in-law Ankh-Shoshenq recurs as that of the progenitor of the family of the Masters of Shipping, and that of his father Pediese is one of their “family” names, borne by four officials.

Kitchen strongly argued against a connection between the Masters of Shipping and the family of Peftjauwaybast:

“It must be stressed that Somtutefnakht and his father Pediese i were a new “dynasty” in Heracleopolis, stemming from a Theban priest, and had nothing to do with earlier rulers in the north.”

However, Leahy correctly points out that holding a Theban priesthood does not indicate that Ankh-Shoshenq was Theban in origin. Leahy notes that the name Ankh-Shoshenq is predominantly Memphite: only this individual and the father (?) of a priest of Montju, User-Ptah, being certainly associated with Thebes. Otherwise there are 26 certainly attested individuals of this name from the north, mainly from the Serapeum stelae, most of whom were probably descendants of Shoshenq III.

Furthermore, P. Rylands IX itself is remarkably informative on the relationship between the clergy of the Theban temple and that of Amun of Teudjo. Rylands IX (5/13) tells us that Ankh-Shoshenq was a prophet of

105 Kienitz 1953.
Amenresonther and that his son Pediese i became prophet of Amun of Teudjoi, with additional priesthhoods of Herishef and Sobk in Nen-nesut. Pediese i’s nephew, Pediese ii son of Ieturou, became a priest of Herishef, of Sobk of Shedyt, of Amenresonther, of Osiris Lord of Abydos, of Anhur of Tjeny, and of Min (at either Coptos or Akhmim) showing a wide spread of offices in northern Upper Egypt (Rylands IX, 8/10–20—year 20 Psamtik).110 Pediese ii retired from Nen-nesut, not Teudjoi, to his ancestral home in Thebes (Rylands IX, 9/5–6; 9/18–20).111 By contrast, Pediese ii’s son-in-law, the Steward of the treasury of Amun of Thebes, Horwedja, was son of a Peftjauawybast, who had been a priest of Amun of Teudjoi: through Pediese ii’s intervention Horwedja received a priestly office in Teudjoi, invoking ancestral claims. At the end of reign of Psamtik II, the “sons” of Pediese ii were priests of Amun at Thebes.112

Further evidence for the complex interrelationship between the priesthoods of Thebes and the region of Nen-nesut comes from a statue from the Karnak cachette (CG 486032 JE 38012)113: dated by cartouches to the reign of Psamtik I and thus exactly contemporary with the family of Rylands IX. This statue represents Amenirdis son of Khu-Herishef, whose numerous priestly titles include Prophethoods of Herishef King of the Two Lands, of Sobek of Shedyt, of Osiris of Naref, of Hathor of Nen-nesut, and of Edjo of Nebt. Hetep-Herishef, grandfather of Amenirdis, was a priest of Amun-Re King of the gods, suggesting a Heracleopolitan connection or origin, but Theban office. He carried the additional titles of im.y-is.t and hsk. According to the inscriptions, Hetep-Herishef’s father, Ankhpakhered was a Vizier, and his grandfather, Osiris-nakht, Mayor, priest of Amun, wr diw, im.y-is.t and hsk: neither of these officials is otherwise attested. The titles im.y-is.t and hsk are commonly paired and do occur at Thebes, but in the Late Period are particularly associated with Abydos.114 Officials with both Theban and Abydene (and Thinite) titles and connections are well documented throughout the Libyan period.115

110 Griffith 1909: 83.
111 Griffith 1909: 84 and n. 2.
113 Azzam 2002; Josephson and Eldamaty 1999: 74–76, pl. 32.
King Peftjauwybast’s own son [Pedi-amun-]neb-nesut-tawy may also have held office at Thebes. Installing daughters in religious positions at Thebes (often as Chantresses of the “Inner Abode” of Amun) was a common practice of kings and Chiefs of the Ma in the later Libyan Period; king’s sons as priests (and of course High Priests) are also well documented, and it is possible that the practice was widespread. Nen-nesut and Teudjoi had also been seats of the earlier High Priests of Amun and Army Leaders, the Crown Prince Osorkon and his contemporaries and cousins, the junior line of descendants of Osorkon II’s son the High Priest of Amun Nimlot C, Ptah-wedja-ankhef to Pasenhor.

These considerations, showing the intimate relationship between the priesthoods of Nen-nesut and Thebes defuse Kitchen’s objection that the Master of Shipping Pediese i came from a Theban and not a Herakleopolitan family.

Pediese i’s son and successor, Sematawytefnakht, is well documented in the reign of Psamtik I being attested by the Nitoqert Adoption Stela and related blocks from Karnak as active in year 9 (656 BC). Sematawytefnakht is then documented from years 18 to a last attestation in year 31 of Psamtik I (633 BC). On his monuments, Sematawytefnakht states that his mother was a sīt-nsw n ḫt.f “bodily king’s daughter” and her name was Ta-hered-en-ta-ihet-[weret]. Kitchen assumes that she was daughter of Nekau I; however, the name suggests that an association with Atfih is a possibility. Pediese i’s titles show that the rulership of Nen-nesut extended into the Fayum and onto the east bank of the river, embracing the 22nd nome, which had Ipu (Atfih, Aphroditopolis) as its chief city. Is it possible that she was a daughter of King Peftjauwybast?

As noted above, Kitchen states emphatically that the family of Shipping Masters had nothing to do with King Peftjauwybast. However, the fragment of a block statue in Stockholm (NME 81) records a couple named Ankh-Shoshenq and Ta[…] as the parents of the ṭ-r-pˁ ḫty-[r] Pediese, Prophet and Overseer of Prophets of Herishef, King of the Two Lands; Prophet of Sobek of Shedyt; Prophet of Anubis; Prophet of Hathor of Ipu; wr m Ntrt. This Pediese, Griffith thought, was not the same as Pediese i of Rylands IX: arguing that the “titles do not at all agree” with those reputedly found on inscriptions of

---

116 Kitchen 1986: § 200–201; Morkot 2000: 300; but now note the controversy of dating these blocks (Broekman 2009: 101), although that has no impact on the chronology here.


118 As proposed in Morkot 2000: 275.
the reign of Psamtik and recorded in Rylands IX cols 21–23. As recorded there, the titles of Pediese were: First Prophet of Herishef King of the Two Lands; Prophet of Osiris of Naref; Overseer of Prophets of Sobk of Shedyt; Prophet of Amen-Re, the great of bleating (lord of the crag), with his Ennead of Gods; Master of the Shipping of the whole land. Griffith, however, is not alone in assuming that the Rylands “inscriptions” were fabricated or copied/ modelled on a monument of Sematawytefnakht. De Meulenaere argued for the identification of the two Pedieses and Ankh-Shoshenqs and Leahy implicitly accepts it.

Because of the presumed chronological divide, no-one has ever suggested that Ankh-Shoshenq, ancestor of the Teudjoi family was identical with Ankh-Shoshenq grandson of Shoshenq III and son-in-law of Pediese HPM. Even with a significant chronological revision, as proposed here, the monumental evidence seems to argue against it. The reading of the name of Pediese’s mother on the Stockholm statue is \( \text{nbt pr } T\text{i-w-(?)} \). Vittmann reads \( T\text{-hj} \) or \( T\text{lt} \), but the Memphite monument clearly gives \( \text{nbt pr } T\text{i-prt} \), as Ankh-Shoshenq’s wife. Women’s names beginning with \( t\text{i} \) are very common at this period. One could save the situation by proposing two wives both \( t\text{a-} \ldots \), or a faulty hieroglyphic text. However, there are other problems with the titles and place of residence of the family. The titles of the individuals recorded on the niche statue clearly associate Ankh-Shoshenq and his descendants with the temple of Ptah in Memphis, and not with the clergy of Amun at Thebes. Iuf-(er)-aa, son-in-law of Shoshenq III held various priestly offices that were transmitted to his descendants, and there is nothing in this inscription that indicates that they also held offices elsewhere. Again, it could be argued that the niche statue represents only one line and set of offices and is itself retrospective. Equally, the Rylands papyri are clearly an attempt to establish claims to a specific set of offices at Teudjoji, and refer to offices and individuals of several generations and some 200 years earlier.

Putting aside these very reasonable objections to the identification of Ankh-Shoshenq, father of Pediese I of Rylands IX with the like-named grand-

119 Griffith 1909: 77, n. 7.
122 Vernus 1976.
123 Vernus 1976.
son of Shoshenq III and his mother with the daughter of Pediese, High Priest of Memphis, what would be the fallout from the above speculations?

**Table 5.**
Speculative genealogy linking Peftjauawybast as HPM and as King with the family of the Shipping Master Pediese at Nen-nesut.
1. Pediese i was named after his maternal grandfather the Chief of the Ma and High Priest of Memphis.

2. Pediese i (perhaps) married a cousin, the daughter of King Peftjuawubast (accepting that King Peftjuawubast and the like-named HPM son of Pediese are the same). Even if the cousin-relationship is rejected, it is still possible that Ta-hered-en-ta-ihet-(weret) was a daughter of King Peftjuawubast rather than of a Saite ruler.

3. The rulers of Nen-nesut in the later Kushite period, although not styled as “kings” retained most of the powers of Peftjuawubast. The reasons for their diminution in status are hard to discern through lack of evidence; but the fact that Peftjuawubast seems to have had only daughters, and no attested male heir, may well be connected to this development.

**The Apis Bulls and their stelae**

Leaving aside the question of the later rulers of Nen-nesut, considerable evidence has been reviewed above for a significant lowering in date for HPM Peftjuawubast and his identification with the King of that name from the Piye Stela. How would this square with the evidence from the Apis Bull records on which HPM Peftjuawubast and his family are named as officiating?

The Apis bull buried in the year 28 of Shoshenq III is the first in the sequence that interconnects to those with royal dedications beginning with Psamtik I, and therefore is the starting point for a sound chronology. The Apis stelae tell us that the bull installed in year 28 of Shoshenq III and buried in year 2 of Pami/Pimay was 26 years old. The succeeding bull was buried in year 11 of Shoshenq V, but unfortunately its age was not recorded, introducing a degree of flexibility, but a period between 16 and 26 years is reasonable on the other Apis evidence. The bull installed as its successor in year 11 of Shoshenq V died 26 years later and was buried in that king’s 37th year. This sequence of bulls thus provides us with a skeleton chronology for the end of the 22nd Dynasty, covering the reigns Shoshenq III–Pimay–Shoshenq V. The conventional reconstruction of the history of this period, after Kitchen, places the death of Shoshenq III in 773 BC (his 53rd year) followed by the reigns of Pimay (773–767 BC) and Shoshenq V (767–730 BC), with the reign of Osorkon III (787–759 BC) and Takeloth III (764–757 BC) running alongside, the Kushite invasion of Upper Egypt and the conflict with Tefnakht taking place only somewhat later (727 BC). The pontificate of Peftjuawubast in Memphis is thus placed by Kitchen around 798 BC, some seventy years before the reign of Peftjuawubast in Nen-nesut.
We have argued here that the reign of Shoshenq III only slightly precedes the invasion of Piye in the 720s. The most significant fallout to arise from this is a dramatic lowering of the reign of Shoshenq V into the time of the 25th Dynasty, making him overlap with the Kushite Taharqo. The numerous problems associated with the evidence for the Apis bulls in the Libyan and Kushite periods have been well rehearsed, within a conventional framework by Vercoutter, Malinine et al. and Kitchen. The overall chronological framework has already been questioned by the present authors and some rough parameters suggested for lowering the sequence known from Shoshenq III–Pimay–Shoshenq V. Here we address the stylistic considerations of the stelae dedicated by the family of HPM Peftjauawybast.

The first stela dedicated by a king, and carrying the detailed biography of an Apis, is that of Psamtik I, but this has precursors in the stelae erected by the High Priests of Memphis in year 28 Shoshenq III and 2 Pimay (see Figs. 1–5). The stelae dedicated by Pediese and his sons Peftjauawybast, Takeloth D and Harsiese H are direct precursors of the later royal stelae, in that they give more details of the burial, installation, and age of the bull than surviving earlier stelae. Although in their general composition the stelae of Peftjauawybast and Harsiese are very similar, there are significant differences in execution and detail.

The stela of year 28 Shoshenq III depicts the three figures facing right, in front of the bull-headed human Apis (see Figs. 1–2). The execution is fair, but not especially formal. The style follows conventions, without attenuated figures or unusual proportions. The leader is Pediese, without any priestly costume, but with the feather of the Chief of the Ma on his head. Next is Peftjauawybast, with leopard skin, and most notably, a close fitting cap. Takeloth D appears as sem-priest with leopard skin and curling side-lock.

The two stelae of Pediese and Harsiese H are almost identical, one being slightly less finished and detailed (see Figs. 3–5). They are both notable for the style and proportions of the figures: broad shoulders, muscular triangular torso, but not especially “short” legs. Pediese again wears the distinctive feather of a Chief of the Ma. The robes are fuller than in the Shoshenq III stela, and more reminiscent of 25th-dynasty style. Pediese wears the leopard skin which he does not wear on the Shoshenq III stela. Pediese (and perhaps also Harsiese H) also appears to wear the bull’s tail, normally prerogative of a king: this feature is clearly not a part of the leopard skin, both in shape and

the fact that it is attached at the belt. Most significantly, the more finished stela displays the musculature of the legs, a detail that is well-known as a characteristic of “archaising” sculpture of the Kushite period, particularly associated with Taharqo, but found as early as the reign of Shabaqo (the Esna naos). It is also found on the plaque of Iuput, the reliefs of the Heqa-Djet chapel, and on works associated with the Saites.

The figure of the goddess Hathor is also remarkable for proportions that would normally be considered “Kushite”: broad shoulders tapering to a narrow waist, with prominent curved forward thigh. These are characteristics not normally associated with earlier Libyan period style. They can be found on Theban monuments such as the funerary chapel of Amenirdis I (erected by Shepenwepet II and therefore ~Taharqo), and in the reliefs of Taharqo’s temple at Kawa (probably first decade of the reign). Ultimately the style is related to Old Kingdom style, such as the Sahura reliefs from Abusir. There are slight differences in the goddesses: one has a long torso and low waist, but neither is like the long-legged high-waisted figures of the earlier Libyan period that continue New Kingdom traditions.

It has already been noted that “archaism” appears around the time of the rise of Sais and the Kushite invasions: the Tanite works of Shoshenq III continuing the earlier Libyan style. The stela from Mendes, dated to year 22 of Shoshenq III (Brooklyn 67.118) is stylistically very similar to the Apis stela of year 28. The Harsiese stelae allow us to date the appearance of these stylistic features more precisely: to the 26 years between year 28 Shoshenq III and 2 Pimay. On Kitchen’s chronology this would be between 798 and 772 BC —far earlier than art historical discussions have usually suggested. This period is also the time when archaising titularies appear (around the time of the co-regency of Osorkon III and Takeloth III), as well as basiliphorous names.

What is particularly striking about the Harsiese H stelae is the depiction of the goddesses, who are very close in style to figures of the reign of Taharqo, alongside male figures that are more like work of the time of Shabaqo or Shebitqo. This may reflect developments in archaism in the Memphite region.

Crucial to the proposition above would be the attribution of the burial in year 37 of Shoshenq V to a date considerably later than normally considered, during the Kushite period, and requiring that it is the same as a bull buried

---


in the reign of Taharqo. To offer further precision at this stage is unwise due to remaining uncertainties in 25th Dynasty chronology (i.e. the reign lengths of Kashta, Piye and Shebitqo and therefore the accession dates of these rulers plus Shabaqo), upon which everything else is dependent. In terms of precise calendrical chronology, Depuydt has rightly stressed (even if the theory of Sothic dating for the wider parameters of Egyptian chronology is correct) that the earliest “absolutely dated event” in Egyptian history belongs to the year 3 of Taharqo (688/687 BC).129

A new historical context?

The modifications to Kitchen’s accepted chronological scheme for this period proposed by Aston, Taylor and others130 are more concerned with internal relative chronologies than any major lowering of dates. This in itself has lead to the comments on descendants of Takeloth III “outliving” him by two generations—unnecessary if Takeloth himself is lowered by a generation, or more.

Given that the highest regnal year of Shoshenq III is 39, it is possible that the rise of Tefnakht—dated to years 36 and 38—should belong to this king rather than Shoshenq V.131 Lowering the reign of Takeloth III by 25+ years has a ripple-effect on his linked predecessors, Osorkon III, Takeloth II and Shoshenq III, irrespective of whether one accepts Aston’s lengthening of the reign of Osorkon II. Assuming Osorkon III to be the like-named Crown Prince and High Priest of Amun, son of Takeloth II, he can perhaps be identified with the biblical “Pharaoh So” of c. 725 BC—but more certainly with the Shilkanni king of Egypt known from Assyrian records of 716 BC and the Osorkon king of Bubastis from the Piye stela.132 The absence of a king in Tanis in the Piye list would be explained by an interregnum following the death of Shoshenq III and Saite expansion (the name of Bakenranef is found at Tanis). Most significantly, it means that there was a substantial overlap between the reigns of Osorkon III and Takeloth III and the Kushites. After all, it is generally accepted that the God’s Wife Shepenwepet I daughter of Osorkon III adopted Amenirdis I daughter of Kashta, who herself adopted Shepenwepet II daughter of Piye. Shepenwepet I and her heirs were certainly

alive in the reign of Shebitqo. Assuming that the princesses were installed by their fathers (as the evidence indicates), Kashta would have had some overlap with Osorkon III and/or Takeloth III. If, as argued by some, Amenirdis was installed by Piye, then he must have had some overlap with one or other of those kings (unless we are to assume that the GWA acted politically on her own behalf after the death of both rulers).

Altogether, these significant realignments account for “anomalies” in the material culture and present the “archaising” process in a radical political context following the death of Shoshenq III. Style is a complex issue as it can develop both chronologically and regionally (as already stressed), while our knowledge of regional styles is still limited. Nevertheless, we should be wary of any apparent “lack” of change, or seemingly slow change, which might be the result of imposed chronological reconstructions. In the New Kingdom, for example, styles changed and evolved constantly, and there is no reason to think that did not happen in the Third Intermediate Period. The style, with Old Kingdom precedents, that is discussed here as appearing at the close of the reign of Shoshenq III lasts, on the conventional chronology for well over a century. The revisions suggested—in accordance with the genealogical evidence and funerary material associated with the descendants of Osorkon III—would reduce this significantly, producing an arguably more realistic picture of the development and duration of this stylistic phase. This can be argued in its own right, but should not be treated in isolation from other lines of evidence from which it receives strong support. The genealogical evidence for the families of Osorkon III and Takeloth III (i.e. the “generation jumps”) is clearly a problem for the conventional model for this period of Third Intermediate Period history, as the burgeoning literature that touches on it attests (see above). A third problem, which needs to taken on board with these issues, concerns supposed “gaps” in Egyptian offices; we have highlighted above the conspicuous case of how the presently accepted chronology requires that the extremely important office of High Priest of Amun at Thebes was left vacant for some 40 years.

The essence of our case is that we no longer treat these in isolation, with ad hoc “solutions” for each problem; rather, a major restructuring of Third Intermediate Period history would bring harmony to all the strands of evidence. A further line of evidence is provided by the contexts of objects bearing the names of 22nd–23rd Dynasty pharaohs outside of Egypt. In every

case, when dated by (reasonable) local chronologies, they appear in contexts which are too “late” when compared to the standard chronology.134

Most recently Chapman has analysed the evidence for the original context of the Shoshenq stela from Megiddo, and suggested on stratigraphic grounds that it was erected not in the 10th century but the 9th.135 The identification of Shoshenq I, founder of the 22nd Dynasty with the biblical “king Shishak” who marched on Jerusalem c. 925 BC provides the very lynchpin of Third Intermediate Period chronology. It is through this identification, and reliance on biblical chronology, that the overall framework for the Third Intermediate Period has been set, and not by dead-reckoning backwards from the 25th/26th Dynasties.136 We have set out many reasons why this identification is shaky137 and it has since been doubted by other scholars.138

There is no room here to rehearse the arguments for a radical reconstruction of Third Intermediate Period chronology, already set out by the authors.139 Nor is there space to present a more detailed chronology for the period in question, i.e. the floruit of king Peftjauawybast and his contemporaries. A closer analysis of the chronological evidence from the Apis stelae will have to await further studies. At present we have tried to concentrate on a theoretical working model that attempts to answer some questions about the politics of Late Libyan Egypt, focussing on the material culture and textual evidence relating to one potentially key figure, in order to establish rough contemporaneity (see Table 6 below) as a first step—in what amounts to a proposed paradigm shift in Third Intermediate Period chronology. As a “preview” of our results, the Apis evidence certainly allows variant models. This is partly due to remaining uncertainties in the chronology of the Kushite 25th Dynasty before the reign of Taharqo (see above), but also due to the inconsistent and vague reporting of the (Apis) finds from the Serapeum, hurriedly excavated in the late 19th century, plus difficulties in the readings of certain texts. But one possible


135 Chapman 2009.


model offering a detailed chronology based on the overall parameters we have suggested is already in press.140

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Priest of Memphis</th>
<th>Bubastite line</th>
<th>Tanite kings</th>
<th>Kushite/Saite kings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq D</td>
<td>Osorkon II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth B</td>
<td>Takeloth II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pediese) Peftjauawybast</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoshenq III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsiese H</td>
<td>Osorkon III</td>
<td>Pimay</td>
<td>Piye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankhefensakhmet</td>
<td>Takeloth III</td>
<td>Shoshenq V</td>
<td>Shabaqo Shebitqo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taharqo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedipep</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedubast “II”</td>
<td>Tanwetamani/ Psamtik I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.
Proposed realignment of late Libyan and Kushite rulers and Memphite High Priests.

**Propositions and Conclusions**

The arguments presented allow a number of propositions and speculations, not all interdependent:

1. Identifying King Peftjauawybast with the HPM Peftjauawybast: this requires a significant chronological reduction, but this appears to be supported by stylistic features of the Apis stelae, and some genealogical evidence.

2. Identifying King Peftjauawybast with the father-in-law of the Master of Shipping Pediese i, by suggesting that he was father of Pediese’s wife, Ta-hered-en-ta-ihet-[weret]. If 3 is accepted Pediese i married a cousin. Even if the cousin-relationship is rejected, it is still possible that Ta-hered-en-ta-ihet-(weret) was a daughter of King Peftjauawybast rather than of a Saite ruler.

3. Suggesting that the Master of Shipping Pediese i was grandson of the HPM Pediese, and hence nephew of Peftjauawybast.

140 Thijs forthcoming.
4. The rulers of Nen-nesut in the later Kushite period, although not styled as “kings” retained most of the powers of Peftjaawybast.

5. The evidence suggests that the beginning of “archaising” features of artistic style, titulary and names characteristic during the Kushite period can be dated to the 26 years between year 28 of the reign of Shoshenq III and year 2 Pimay. The chronological realignment proposed here recommends, from a number of lines of evidence, lowering the start for this archaising style to (approximately) the time of the domination of Egypt by Piye.

Propositions 1 and 2 can stand independently.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This article is based on a presentation given by R.M. at the BICANE (“Bronze to Iron Age Chronology in the Near East”) seminar on Levantine chronology held in Cambridge, UK, July 25–27, 2008. We are grateful to Robert Porter and two anonymous Antiguo Oriente referees for reading drafts and suggesting improvements. Peter James gratefully acknowledges the generous support of the Mainwaring Archive Foundation during the preparation of this article.

CITED REFERENCES


Figure 1.
The Apis Stela of year 28 Shoshenq III
(from Malinine et al. 1968, II, pl. VII, SIM 3749).

Figure 2.
The figures of Pediese and his sons HPM Peftjauawybast and Takeloth D from the Apis Stela of year 28 Shoshenq III
(after Malinine et al. 1968, II, pl. VII, SIM 3749).
Figure 3.
Apis Stela of year 2 of Pimay
(from Malinine et al. 1968, II, pl. VIII, no. 22, SIM 3697).

Figure 4.
Second Apis Stela of year 2 of Pimay
(from Malinine et al. 1968, II, pl. VIII, no. 23, SIM 3736).
Figure 5.
Rough sketch of the figures of Pediese and Harsiese H from the Apis Stela year 2 of Pimay (after Malinine et al. 1968, II, pl. VIII, no. 23, SIM 3736).

Figure 6.
Left to right: Hathor from the Apis Stelae SIM 3697 and SIM 3736, both dedicated by Pediese and his son HPM Harsiese H, year 2, Pimay; Anuqet from the Shrine of Taharqo, Kawa (considerably reduced in scale).