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In JACF 2 Aidan Dodson put forward objections to an overlap between the 21st and 22nd Dynasties based on a series of genealogical links, primarily between the kings and High Priest of Amun for the period. He lists 20 points which he believes constitute an unbroken series starting with the son of HPA Herihor and ending with the High Priest contemporary with Osorkon II. Those links are as listed in the table opposite.

Points 1 to 5, 8 to 11, 16 & 17, and 19 & 20 need not be discussed here, as they are all consistent with the revised chronology, just as in the orthodox scheme. Numbers 14 and 15 have already been dealt with in the main part of this paper (page 56). This leaves us with just points 6, 7, 12, 13 and 18 to deal with. Point 6 is simply answered: as I have identified king Akheperre Pasebakaahennit with Manetho’s Piscnaches, this Pusennes becomes a contemporary of Osorkon II (from the latter’s 7th year onwards). An HPA Smendes, ‘son’ of a king Osorkon, is associated with two Nile Level Texts recorded on the West Quay at Karnak. The NLT regnal dates are 8 and 14 of an unnamed monarch whom I propose to identify as Osorkon II. On these grounds there is no longer a need to interpolate an ephemeral HPA Smendes, ‘son’ of HPA Menkheperre, between Menkheperre and his more illustrious ‘son’, HPA Pinudjem II. The bracelet bearing the name of the HPA Smendes is simply the funerary gift of the current High Priest during the second decade of the reign of Osorkon II, the senior monarch. In ancient Egypt no distinction was made between a natural born son and a son-in-law - they were both ‘sons’ of the ‘father’. Thus it is not out of the question for HPA Smendes to be associated with two ‘fathers’.

I cite the example of another High Priest of the period, Pinudjem II, who claims to be the ‘son’ of both the HPA Menkheperre and king Pasebakaahennit. HPA Smendes is then perhaps a natural son of Osorkon II and the son-in-law of Menkheperre.

Point 7 is a slightly different proposition. By
removing the first HPA Smendes from history, we have to explain the appearance of the name HPA Smendes on the pendant of mummy 135 from the Bab el-Gasus (Deir el-Bahri), the braces of which bore the cartouches of Amenemopet. In our new model, Amenemopet would have died some six years before Smendes became High Priest. We would therefore need to postulate that mummy 135 was placed in the priests’ cache at Deir el-Bahri during the early years of Osorkon II, when Smendes was HPA, but that the mummy braces were prepared for the owner during the reign of Amenemopet, a few years earlier. The association of braces and pendant on a mummy does not necessarily imply that the two objects were made simultaneously. One can easily imagine officials ordering funerary regalia for themselves (bearing the current ruler’s cartouches) in anticipation of their day of burial.

With regard to point 12, the identification of HPA Psusennes with Manetho’s king Psusennes II, we are confronted with three possibilities: (a) that indeed this is the case, or (b) that the High Priest and king are entirely different people, and therefore (c) that king Psusennes II of Manetho could also be identified with the Hedjheka[...]

Table 1: The list of relationships which Dodson has proposed in order to demonstrate that a substantial overlap between the 21st and 22nd Dynasties is impossible.

1. HPA Piankh is a contemporary of the last king of the 20th Dynasty, Ramesses XI.  
2. HPA Pinudjem I is the son of HPA Piankh.  
3. HPA Pinudjem I becomes king Pinudjem I of Thebes.  
4. HPA Masharhta is the son of king Pinudjem I.  
5. HPA Menkeheperre is the son of king Pinudjem I.  
6. HPA Smendes, son of Menkeheperre, is a contemporary of the Tanite king, Akheperre Psusennes I.  
7. HPA Smendes is a contemporary of the Tanite king, Amenemopet.  
8. HPA Pinudjem II is the son of HPA Menkeheperre.  
9. HPA Pinudjem II is also a contemporary of the Tanite king, Amenemopet.  
10. HPA Pinudjem II is a contemporary of king Siamun.  
11. HPA Psusennes II is the son of HPA Pinudjem II.  
12. HPA Psusennes II becomes king Tjetkheperre Har-Psusennes II of Tanis.  
13. King Psusennes II is a contemporary of the 22nd Dynasty founder, king Hedjheka Shoshenkh I.  
14. Mehytweishekhet is the mother of king Osorkon ‘The Elder’ - the Osorcho of Manetho’s 21st Dynasty.  
15. Chief of Ma Nilmot is the father of the Chief of Ma Shoshenkh who becomes king Shoshenkh I.  
16. King Psusennes II is the father of Maatkare who is in turn the mother of HPA Shoshenkh.  
17. King Osorkon I is later than king Shoshenkh I.  
18. King Osorkon I is the father of HPA Shoshenkh.  
19. HPA Harsiese is the son of HPA Shoshenkh.  
20. HPA Harsiese becomes the Theban king, Harsiese, and is a contemporary of king Osorkon II.

Pasebakhænëniut rather than Tjetkheperre. There is no conclusive way to my knowledge that a choice can be made between these three possibilities.

When we come to the crucial point of the exercise (no. 13) - the link between the end of the 21st Dynasty and the beginning of the 22nd Dynasty - Dodson offers the following:

I have recently reviewed all available material relating to [‘Tjetkheperre] Psusennes II, and have concluded that it all points to the latter having never had an independent reign, in all probability being a ‘shadow’ of Shoshenkh I.6

I would ask for this statement to be supported by some actual evidence, since the phrase ‘all available material’ does not tell us anything. May I also further suggest that a statement of such ambiguity is employed precisely because Dodson is really unable to demonstrate unequivocally that there was indeed continuity between the two dynasties; we cannot simply rely on ‘probability’ to argue for a connection between Psusennes II and Shoshenkh I, indeed, the new scheme already proposes that Tjetkheperre (Psusennes) and Hedjheka Shoshenkh were contemporaries - but both near the beginning of their respective dynasties.

Finally, there is point 18. Dodson accepts that, on the BM 8 stature, there is no prenomen for the Osorkon, father of HPA Shoshenkh, but he then goes on to say that his identity with Sekhemkheperre is clear from the genealogies cited in (17) above’ - i.e. the genealogies of Nakhtefmut.7 This fact, as far as I can determine, is, on the contrary, not at all clear from the data published by Kitchen on the Nakhtefmut family. The genealogies of this individual merely show us that Sekhemkheperre Osorkon I came one generation after Hedjheka Shoshenkh I; HPA Shoshenkh is not mentioned in any part of the genealogy8 and there is therefore no link between him and Osorkon I. Dodson’s statement is entirely misleading in this respect, or have I failed to understand his argument properly?

It is therefore quite possible to incorporate all Dodson’s valid points within the New Chronology.

Notes and References

4. Pinudjem was married to Isthmehkheb, daughter of HPA Menkeheperre; see K. A. Kitchen: op. cit. [3], p. 64.