The Generation Game
Bob Porter replies to scholars' criticisms concerning TIP genealogies

One of Professor Kitchen's criticisms in his *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* review was that Rohl had never investigated the solid mass of parallel and often interlocking genealogies which span the 22nd to 26th Dynasties (as set forth in detail in his *Third Intermediate Period in Egypt*). Some genealogies were considered in *A Test of Time* but, in view of Kitchen's criticism, perhaps we should take a look at the ones that were not and which are to be found in Part 3 of Kitchen's book. Of the over 300 years that the New Chronology needs to lose from Egyptian history, about 60 years come from the period between Shoshenk I and Osorkon III and it is this reduction which will be considered here (Fig. 1).

Shoshenk I was the founder of the 22nd Dynasty, conventionally but wrongly identified as the biblical Shishak. In Appendix A of *A Test of Time*, Rohl dates the end of Shoshenk I's reign to c. 800 BC and the end of Osorkon III's reign to c. 700 BC, roughly 100 years from one to the other, or the equivalent of five generations of 20 years each. Twenty years per generation is probably as short as can reasonably be suggested for first born males in ancient Egypt. We do not know at what age upper class Egyptians normally got married but presumably it was in their teens rather than later. However, allowance must be made for the first child being female or dying in infancy. Also, the lines of descent given in the genealogies do not necessarily run through the eldest males, thus some generation steps could be substantially longer than 20 years. However, frequently eldest sons can be assumed because those listed succeeded to their fathers' offices. All generational calculations are approximate since actual ages are never given in these ancient sources.

There are a number of genealogies which appear to agree or disagree with the five generation time scale which the New Chronology needs from Shoshenk I to Osorkon III. The conventional chronology would have at least 160 years for the same period, which can be accommodated by having approximately 30 years per generation or by having a larger number of generations. Most of these genealogies have been assembled from the great cache of thousands of statues found at Karnak by George Legrain in 1903. One spin-off from Legrain's work was that, on analysing some of these genealogies, he realised that the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties overlapped, whereas formerly they had been made sequential. However, this did not make any difference to the length of the overall chronology because Shoshenk I was still fixed in the 10th century BC by the supposed biblical synchronism with Solomon and Rehoboam. So the dynasties were lengthened as well as overlapped thus giving the same overall timescale. Much the same thing is happening today on a smaller scale; there is growing acceptance amongst Egyptologists for overlapping two kings of the 22nd Dynasty, Takeloth II and Shoshenk III, thus saving about 23 years, and this also forms part of the *A Test of Time* scheme, but for most Egyptologists the overall timescale remains the same because Shoshenk I is still fixed in the 10th century.

So they have to add in extra years somewhere else; e.g. Aston proposed to largely bridge the gap by stretching the reign of Osorkon II by up to 20 years. Aston was criticised by Kitchen for this inappropriate increase.

Let us look now at the first genealogy, sometimes referred to as the Nakhteufmut genealogy. Kitchen's diagram covers from Shoshenk I at the top to Osorkon III at the bottom. It is named after Fourth Prophet of Amun (henceforth '4PA') Nakhteufmut who occupies a fairly central position in the genealogy. Nakhteufmut was actually a nickname, his real name being Djedthutefankh (these genealogies are complex enough without nicknames!).
Kitchen’s tables are very helpful, showing links to royal names (usually inscribed on the statue) and also the sources from which the information was derived; for example, C6 refers to a statue from the Cairo Catalogue, No. 42206. Some of this material is damaged and difficult to interpret and one has to be on guard against assumptions made in order to assemble these genealogies. Thus one might wonder if 4PA Djedkhonsefankh A and his son 4PA Nakhtefmut A might really be the same as the apparently later Djedkhonsefankh C, also 4PA, and his son Nakhtefmut B (not 4PA, at least not at the time he inscribed a statue for his father). In this case it seems that they really are separate pairs of father and son. Actually, there is not much of a problem with this particular genealogy. Although there are six generation steps from Shoresh 1 to Osorkon III, not five as we would like, the left line of descent continues to late in Osorkon III’s reign when his son Takeloth III was coregent, thereby allowing an extra half generation. Also, at least a further half a generation can be allowed in these genealogies because the last named descendant was typically commemorating his father (the previous name in the table) and can be considered to be at an earlier stage of his career than the rest of his listed ancestors or the contemporary monarch. In the right hand branch, also ending in the time of Osorkon III, three of the lines of descent are through females thus giving potentially even shorter generations if one assumes that the girls were married off in their mid teens. On the other hand these females need not be the eldest daughters in their families thus lengthening the genealogy. Note also that there may be scope for reinterpreting the statue T35 on which this lower right part of the genealogy is based. It may be possible to remove one generation overall by equating Neskhonspakered 1 with the earlier Neskhonspakered 1, and making Bakenkons son of Neskhonspakered 1/ii and brother-in-law of Harriese C. Either way, the Nakhtefmut genealogy is reasonably compatible with the New Chronology, in fact more so than with the conventional chronology. Not so with the next genealogy raised by Carl Jansen-Winkeln.

The Neseramun genealogy is also taken from Kitchen, 1996 (see Fig. 3). Here we appear to have 7 or 8 generation steps from Shoreshen 1 to Osorkon III, that is 2 or 3 more than our desired five which would mean that the A Test of Time scheme is impossibly short. This genealogy is again made up of statues from the Karnak cache supplemented by other sources. First a few words of caution concerning the royal names (this is not necessarily relevant to the genealogical discussion which follows): Takeloth II is uncertain as Kitchen’s note admits; Shoreshen 1 could be some other Shoreshen although we would hardly want to posit a later king as the diagram stands; and Siamun at the right, from a graffito at Deir el-Bahri, may be misplaced since the graffito merely gives a father-son relationship and there is a mis-
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**Fig. 2: The Nakhtefmut Genealogy (adapted from K. A. Kitchen, op. cit. [3], p. 220).**
match of titles. The genealogy is referred to by the name Neseramun as five Neseramuns occur in it. There are also no less than seven men named Hor, but that name crops up in other genealogies as well. Because of papyromy—naming a son after his grandfather—there are repeated sequences of Hor-Neseramun-Hor-Neseramun. You will remember that Jansen-Winkeln uses this repetition precisely to undermine the Khnemibre Genealogy, arguing that it suggests untrustworthiness. Kitchen’s scheme largely agrees with Lebrail’s original work 14 but it is in considerable disagreement with another expert on the subject, Herman Kees. 15 Kees wondered if Hor iii was really the same person as Hor vi, 16 and he produced a very different genealogy. 17 Both Hor iii and Hor vi shared the same obscure titles relating to the cults of former pharaohs, and both had fathers named Neseramun who were chief scribes of Amun. However, whereas Hor iii rose to chief scribe, Hor vi is not recorded as having risen above scribe, so they do seem to have been different people. This is a difficult and complex problem but Kitchen’s criticisms of Kees seem valid. 18 Rather than try to present Kees’ work or produce some other rearrangement of the genealogy, attention will be drawn to two problems raised by Kitchen himself which suggest
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**Fig. 3: The Neseramun Genealogy (adapted from K. A. Kitchen, op. cit. [3], p. 202 with additions from pp. 205-07).**

---
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that something is seriously wrong. The first is that there is an alternative line of descent with only five or six generation steps, and the second is that one of the statues appears to have been dedicated not by the man's son as was normal but by his great-great-grandson!

The first point – the alternative descent giving only 5 or 6 generation steps – is shown added to the right hand side of Fig. 3 where it runs through vizier Nesepakashuty and Sitamun. Kitchen devotes several pages to toyng with the idea of inserting an extra two generations into this line but concludes that it is unlikely, and instead, he argues for long generations on the right hand line and short ones on the left. This seems the best that can be done in the conventional chronology.

Concerning the second point, the statue apparently dedicated by a great-great-grandson is No. 42219, C19 on Fig. 3. This statue contributed to Kees' doubts mentioned above. It is apparently dedicated by Hor vi to his distant ancestor Hor iii. The main text dealing with Hor iii is on the front of the statue and includes his ancestry going back several generations. The part naming Hor vi, who apparently had the statue made, is on the back and gives his genealogy back to his grandfather Hor v, thus stopping short of a link up with Hor iii. A further oddity relates to the late Egyptian use of the hieroglyphs it nn. On the front of the statue they are considered to mean 'son of' (line a5), but on the back they mean 'made by' (i.e. the statue was made by Hor vi; line b). That this really is a dedication by a great-great-grandson is only apparent by comparison with two more statues, C22 and C24 on Fig. 3. These two are not independent sources since they were made by father and son, so any error in one would likely be repeated in the other. C24, made by Neseramun v at the very bottom of the table, is the longest on the chart covering 15 generations from the top of the chart to the bottom. C22 made by his father covered only six generations. One could speculate that in this era long genealogies were fashionable and were produced to impress rather than for accuracy (as Jansen-Winkeln himself has argued). At a later time, that of Herodotus in the 6th century BC, the temple priests were working out genealogies going back thousands of years and which were presumably almost wholly fictitious (Book 2:143-5). Mention should also be made of the Memphite Priest List (Berlin Genealogy) dating to Shoshenk V, shortly after the time of Osorkon III, which claims to go back to the 11th Dynasty. The question with such genealogies is not whether they are correct or incorrect, but how far are they correct – possibly only to three generations? Anyway, it is clear that there are good grounds for regarding the Neseramun genealogy as suspect, even though a flaw in Kitchen's reconstruction is not apparent.

Another genealogy which is a problem to the New Chronology is that of Pasenhor, given on an Apis bull stela and referred to as 'a famouous chronological key to this epoch'. It covers the length of the 22nd Dynasty from Shoshenk I to Shoshenk V's Year 37 in nine generation steps, and gives a further six generations prior to Shoshenk I. The first four kings of the early 22nd Dynasty were proudly included by Pasenhor in his ancestry. This stela does not mention Osorkon III, but his position is conventionally about one generation before Shoshenk V, so, like the Neseramun genealogy, we would again appear to have roughly 7 or 8 generation steps from Shoshenk I to Osorkon III (7 generations if one allows for the stela being dated at the end of the very long reign of Shoshenk V). Since this is a long genealogy and is the only source for the sequence of kings in the early 22nd Dynasty, the solution for the New Chronology is simply to reject it in its earlier parts. It dates from the period when long genealogies were becoming fashionable regardless, one suspects, of any historical basis. Some of the kings may not have had the father son succession given by Pasenhor. They may have reigned in parallel and have been completely unrelated, and since this late stela is the only basis for that sequence of kings we are free to consider other schemes. It must be emphasised that there is no other evidence that Shoshenk I was father of Osorkon I (e.g. Manetho does not specify a father-son relationship, it is not clear which Osorkon is meant, and the extant versions of Manetho are not reliable sources), and neither is there any evidence that Osorkon I was father of Takek. It does appear from the Tanis tombs that Takek was the father of Osorkon II, but it is debatable whether Takek I ever actually reigned over a significant part of Egypt, or whether he was merely given a cartouche when (re-)buried by his son.

Several other genealogies in Kitchen's book cover parts of the period we are considering; the Nebmetuer family, the family of another Nakhtefmut (this time a vizier), the Besenmut family and Montemhat's family. These are all compatible with the timescale proposed in A Test of Time.
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