The XXII\textsuperscript{nd} and XXV\textsuperscript{th} Dynasties
Apis Burial Conundrum

The Serapeum of Memphis was a vast underground complex in which the sacred Apis bulls were buried. These bulls were living manifestations of the local supreme god Ptah and the focus of an extremely popular cult. The potential of this site as a chronological tool was discussed in the very first issue of this journal.\textsuperscript{1} It was also the focus of a lengthy article in the following issue.\textsuperscript{2} The various Apises buried within, or rather the conspicuously absent of such during the XXI\textsuperscript{st} and early XXII\textsuperscript{nd} Dynasties went on to form a major staple of David Rohl’s New Chronology (NG) along with various other revisionist schemes. In contrast, better documented burials, such as those occurring during the late XXII\textsuperscript{nd} and XXV\textsuperscript{th} Dynasties, have received comparatively little attention. Yet most revised chronologies that involve a drastic shortening of Egypt’s Third Intermediate Period necessarily require a substantial overlap of these two Dynasties. This paper will discuss the known burials for these two dynasties, assessing whether or not they allow for the proposed overlap.

JEAN-FRÉDÉRIC BRUNET

Archaeology of the Serapeum

Rediscovered by Auguste Mariette in 1851,\textsuperscript{3} the Serapeum was to be one of the first scientific excavations in the Nile Valley. Indeed, Mariette was different from the average treasure seeker. Fully understanding the scientific and historic value of the various documents he found, he claimed the numerous stelae he unearthed would change the face of Egyptology.\textsuperscript{4} Closer study of the artifacts soon proved him right as kings never heard of before (Rameses-Siptah, Pami, Shoshenq V. Khlobabash) and one previously known only from classical sources (Bocchoris) emerged. Closer scrutiny of the stelae would eventually shed light on XXI\textsuperscript{st} Dynasty genealogy and chronology. Yet, in retrospect, Mariette’s methods were at best archaic and his detailed notes have been missing for some one hundred and twenty years.\textsuperscript{5} As if this is not enough, about three hundred and seventy Serapeum stelae were destroyed when the Boulak Museum (Cairo) was flooded and, of those remaining (some eight hundred in the Louvre and about thirty in Cairo and Alexandria), many still await publication, over a century and a half after their discovery. The very useful first volume of the Catalogue des stèles du Serapeum de Memphis published in 1968 covered only two hundred and fifty-two stelae.\textsuperscript{6} The second volume still awaits publication.

While the later, Ptolemaic, section of the underground vaults (Greater Vaults) became a tourist attraction, the entrance to the earlier part of the site, known as the Lesser Vaults, was quickly covered by sand\textsuperscript{7} and forgotten for some one hundred and thirty years.

In the mid 1980s, as the Greater Vaults’ roof showed signs of weakness, the Egyptian Antiquities Organisation (EAO)\textsuperscript{8} under the supervision of Mohamed Ibrahim Aly reopened the Lesser Vaults and cleared its earlier, Ramesside, section. Unfortunately, the section of the Lesser Vaults that would have been the most relevant to the present study remains unreachable as the very ceiling collapse that led to the abandonment of the Lesser Vaults during the reign of Psamtek I of the XXVI\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty also stopped the EAO’s advance.\textsuperscript{9} Consolidation of the Greater Vaults is still under way and, to this author’s knowledge, no further archaeological excavations have happened since.

Of the utmost relevance for the present study, however, is the discovery by Ibrahim Aly and his team of a hoard of seventy-three stelae dating from the mid-XXII\textsuperscript{nd} Dynasty to the 21\textsuperscript{st} year of Psamtek I. This material had been used to fill the partition wall that separates a side chamber from the main hall of the Lesser Vaults.\textsuperscript{10} This side chamber, originally identified as Ramesside by Mariette is therefore more likely to have been the very last to have received the remains of a sacred bull in the Lesser Vaults, some time during the reign of Psamtek I. Among the stelae discovered in this wall and elsewhere in the Ramesside section of the Lesser Vaults, thirty were included in Ibrahim Aly’s doctoral thesis,\textsuperscript{11} defended in 1991 at the Université Lumière in Lyon.
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France. With but one exception these new stelae were never otherwise published.

The currently available data concerning Apis burials begins with Amenhotep III and continues without interruption to the end of the New Kingdom. Following this, we have a gap in the records spanning parts of Dynasties XXI and XXII, which would become so famous to NC proponents. Our evidence starts again with an attested burial in Year 23 of Pharaoh Osorkon II of the XXII\textsuperscript{nd} Dynasty. Then, after a relatively short period, comes a burial in Year 28 of Shoshenq III, from which our present analysis shall begin. After this, the burials succeed each other with seemingly very few interruptions until the end of the Ptolemaic Dynasty. Apis bulls are mentioned both before Amenhotep III (in fact, since the First Dynasty) as well as after Cleopatra, but the burial sites of these earlier and later bulls remain unknown.

**Known Burials under the late XXII\textsuperscript{nd} Dynasty (Bubastite branch)**

1. **Apis buried in Year 28 of Shoshenq III**

   The only information available on this bull is the year of its death and/or burial, which is recorded on a single stela.\(^1\)

   Two graffiti discovered in 1985 in the Ramesseum section of the Lesser Vaults were also dated to this year.\(^2\)

2. **Apis buried in Year 2 of Pami.**

   Known from at least five dated stelae\(^3\) from which we glean the following chronological information:

   - **Birth:** Year 28 of Shoshenq III.
   - **Sexual potency:** Year 28 of Shoshenq III.
   - **Installation:** Year 28 of Shoshenq III, II-Akhet 1.\(^4\)
   - **Earliest donation:** Year 2 of Pami, III-Akhet 13.
   - **Burial:** Year 2 of Pami, II-Peret 1.\(^5\)
   - **Age at death:** 26 years old.

3. **Apis buried in Year 4 of an unknown king.**

   Three stelae are dated simply to Year 4.\(^6\) No specific day, and, more importantly, no Pharaoh is mentioned. In whose Year 4, then, was this bull buried? To this question, Mariette, who remains the sole person to have both seen these burials and written about them, replied, apparently without any second thought, a king we now call Shoshenq V.\(^7\) But doubts were quickly raised, culminating in an article by Verouccter arguing the fourth year really belonged to Tahrarqa of the Kushite XXV\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty.\(^8\)

   Verouccter's position rests on two issues. First, the three stelae of Year 4 are of the same style as those dated to the later burial of Year 6 of Bakenranef (Apis 6 below). Second, a damaged date on a stela\(^9\) undoubtedly naming Tahrarqa could be restored as 'Year 5', consistent with a death late in Year 4, as recorded by the Year 4 stelae, followed by a burial early in Year 5. The first point is certainly valid and indicates temporal proximity between the Year 4 burial and that of Bakenranef. Indeed, one of these stelae\(^10\) was attributed to this second burial very early. The second, however, has been shown to be wrong as further study of the stela shows the correct reading to be Year 24.\(^11\)

   In his thesis, Ibrahim Aly nevertheless maintained the attribution of the Year 4 stela to Tahrarqa, for lack of any other post-Bakenranef alternative. Further stylistic analysis allowed Ibrahim Aly to propose that at least twelve other stelae should be dated to this same burial, whoever the ruling king might have been.\(^12\)

   Interestingly, some of these stelae had previously been attributed to the mid-to-late XXII\textsuperscript{nd} Dynasty by Mariette and others who also worked from stylistic analysis. For some of these stelae, this early dating was still accepted by the Catalogue's authors.\(^13\) Later we shall return to the subject of this mysterious Year 4 and its fifteen stelae. For now, let us only specify that no more chronological information (date of birth of the Apis nor its age) is known for this burial.

4. **Apis buried in Year 11 of Shoshenq V.**

   This Apis burial is known from at least six stelae.\(^14\) These give two dates, II-Akhet 18\(^15\) and II-Akhet 28,\(^16\) one of which could correspond to the bull's death or burial, but no specific event, nor any information as to the bull's age, is mentioned.

5. **Apis buried in Year 37 of Shoshenq V.**

   The last Apis of the XXII\textsuperscript{nd} Dynasty is recorded on at least fifteen dated stelae\(^17\) from which the following dates can be extracted:

   - **Birth:** Year 11 of Shoshenq V.
   - **Installation:** Year 12 of Shoshenq V, IV-Peret 4.
   - **Earliest donation:** Year 37 of Shoshenq V, I-Akhet 18.\(^18\)
   - **Burial:** Year 37 of Shoshenq V, III-Akhet 27.

   Two other fragmentary dates require mention. In both cases, the crucial indication of Year 37 of Shoshenq V is lost in a lacuna yet the two stelae can be firmly attributed to this burial on stylistic grounds. In the first case,\(^19\) the now generally erased first line of text ended with 'Peret day 4 of...'. The actual month of the season is lost, but, assuming the Catalogue's typesetting accurately represents the stela, then both months II and IV of the Peret season are acceptable reconstructions, the one remaining unit not being centred. Should the correct reading be month IV, then the date recorded on this stela is simply that of the bull's installation. If, however, month II is to be preferred, then another explanation must be sought. The other fragmentary date can be found on a stela discovered during the mid-1980s clearance.\(^20\) In this case, only the day is preserved, it is day 8. Perhaps a digit sign has been eroded and the reading should be 18, echoing the probable date of the bull's death?
7. Apis buried in Year 2 of Shabaka.

This burial is known strictly from a single crudely written stela reported only by Mariette.\(^{30}\)

In recent literature,\(^{31}\) these two burials are usually identified as if they were a single interment. This proposition is based on two different arguments. First, on an annotated plan drawn by Mariette, both burials are ascribed to the same burial chamber (the second-to-last on the left side, as one walks from the entrance at the south end). Second, from a chronological point of view, the second year of Shabaka, with the latter identified as the re-conqueror of Egypt, must necessarily fall very near Year 6 of Bakenranef. We must now investigate these two points.

It is not known precisely when Mariette annotated his plan,\(^{32}\) but it was certainly after the inventory he composed when the stelae were sent to the Louvre.\(^{33}\) Both this inventory and the earlier report he published in 1855 and 1856\(^{44}\) use a numerical notation for the burial chambers while the annotated plan uses letters, making equating one to the other often impossible to establish.\(^{35}\) And in the case that occupies us at present, the earlier published report flatly contradicts the plan. Indeed, in that article, Mariette states that a room bore the engraved cartouches of both Shoshenq V and Bakenranef. Furthermore, he writes that both Apis (Year 37 of Shoshenq V and Year 6 of Bakenranef) were buried in the same room.\(^{36}\) At one point, however, Mariette seems unsure of the exact number of bulls in the room, wondering if Shoshenq V and Bakenranef were not contemporaries under which only one Apis was in fact buried.\(^{37}\) From this we may conclude that he only discovered evidence for a single burial under both Shoshenq V and Bakenranef, but not under both Bakenranef and Shabaka. Alternatively, the designation 'room where the cartouches of Shoshenq V and Bakenranef were inscribed' was used by Mariette elsewhere in his published report.\(^{38}\) But this expression is nowhere to be found in the description of the stela of Year 2 of Shabaka, just a few pages later. As a matter of fact, the latter is rather said to have been discovered in a room where the inscribed name was the throne name of Shabatka,\(^{39}\) but not Shoshenq V nor Bakenranef. Given that most stelae were found scattered in the Serapeum’s halls and near its extremities, it seems unlikely that this stela would have found its way into this room by chance, confirming that both Shabaka and Shabatka were kings contemporary with this burial. Certainly then, our Apis 6 and 7 cannot have been buried in the same room and Mariette’s annotated plan is wrong.\(^{40}\)

The chronological argument, however, still stands. An Apis born very late in Year 5 of Bakenranef or early in his Year 6 would be aged only a couple years at the most by Year 2 of Shabaka, assuming the six-year reign of the former directly preceded Year 1 of the Kushite king, as per traditional chronology. As seen above, Mariette’s earlier description rules out the identification of these two Apises and their years. Moreover, if the room with the Year 2 stela had

 Known burials under the XXIV\(^{th}\) and XXV\(^{th}\) Dynasties

6. Apis buried in Year 6 of Bakenranef.

This burial is known from nine stelae dated to a Year 6, with only two of them specifying the Pharaoh, Bakenranef, the Bocchoris of classical literature.\(^{41}\) Only one complete date was preserved from this burial: I-Akhet 5, perhaps that of the burial itself. One more stela must be added as well.\(^{42}\) It has no date, but a cartouche on it, now illegible, could still be read as that of Bakenranef early in the 20\(^{th}\) century.
the name of Shabatka inscribed, it appears the burial occurred under that king rather than under Shabaka.

Discussing these matters, Ibrahim Aly suggested two possibilities: Mariette may have misread the name on the stela; perhaps it really mentioned Shabatka. This would explain the name written elsewhere in the room but it seems hard to accept, as Mariette was fully aware of the difference between the two Kushite kings’ cartouches. The other alternative, preferred by Ibrahim Aly on the basis that work around the Seerapeum certainly took place under Shabaka, is that Mariette perhaps rather misread the date. The correct reading, he proposes, would have been Year 12 of Shabaka. The other name written in the room would thus give us a proof of coregency between these two Kushite kings. But to suppose an error in a document that cannot be verified should always be a last resort.

Below, the latest ideas on the chronology of the XXVth Dynasty will therefore be briefly discussed. Then, once the list of Apises is complete, a solution harmonizing all the data will be proposed.

8. Apis buried in Year 14 of Taharqa.

This Apis was only confirmed through a stela found during Ibrahim Aly’s mid-1980s Seerapeum excavations as the two previously known stelae bearing a Year 14 did not mention any Pharaoh’s name. From these three stelae, we gather the following dates: III-Akhet, day lost and II-Peret perhaps 4. These dates can be made to fit some seventy days apart and could therefore relate respectively to the death and burial of the Apis. Yet no such confirmation comes from the texts as both simply record donations.


This last Apis of the XXVth Dynasty is known from five dated stelae. One of them records that the burial occurred on IV-Peret 23. Unlike all the previously dated stelae of Dynasties XXII, XXIV and XXV, with the sole exception of the Shabatka stela, one of these was actually discovered in a burial chamber, the very last one on the left (as one walks in from the south end). Another stela, dated on stylistic grounds, offers the incomplete date ‘Year [digit lost] + 4 of Taharqa, II-Peret 10 + [unit number lost]’, which could correspond with this bull’s death.

Recent developments in the chronology of the XXVth Dynasty

The chronology of Egypt is often considered fixed, within a year or less, from the beginning of the XXVth Dynasty, in 664 BC. Immediately prior to that, the twenty-six year reign of Taharqa can be set with confidence, if not certainty, to 690-664. This absolutely sets our Apises 8 and 9 to 677 and 667 BC respectively. Before that, a problem arises. Until the last decade, Shabatka was thought to have acceded to the Egyptian and Kushite thrones some time between 702 and 698 BC. His predecessor Shabaka would have become king in Kush between 716 and 712 then in Egypt itself the following year. In any case Shabaka must have ruled fourteen full years at the least. The highest year date available for Shabatka is only Year 3, but he must have ruled longer than three years.

This carefully crafted reconstruction tumbled down in 1999 when Grant Frame published the monumental inscription of Sargon II in Tang-i Var. In this inscription, datable to 705 BC at the latest, the famous Assyrian king claimed to have received a mighty gift from Shabatka, king of Kush. This gift was none other than the rebellious leader Yamani of Ashdod who had sought, in vain as it seems, refuge in Egypt. Shabatka must therefore have been on the throne by 705 BC and probably a few years earlier, considering the time it certainly took for the negotiations between the parties involved.

To account for this discovery, three solutions have been proposed. First, a long coregency might have taken place between Shabaka and Shabatka. The only proof of such a coregency comes from the Seerapeum, as discussed above, and would make Shabatka coregent from at least Year 2 of Shabaka. Yet we have seen how unlikely it is to have Year 2 of Shabaka so closely following Year 6 of Bakenranef.

Second, it is conceivable that Shabaka divided his kingdom and appointed Shabatka as ruler of Kush while he kept Egypt for himself. This would explain why Shabatka is only entitled ‘king of Kush’ by Sargon. Yet if Shabaka really was the senior king in this partnership as well as the ruler of Egypt where the rebel had fled, why wasn’t Yamani extradited under Shabatka’s supervision? The existence of Shabatka’s Egyptian titulature already under Shabaka, as seen in the Seerapeum, is also problematic, for such titles are not likely to have been bestowed upon a governor of Kush before his full accession in Egypt as well.

Thirdly, it was proposed that both Shabaka’s and Shabatka’s reigns should be shifted back in time, setting both kings’ accession in 721 and 707 respectively. This, however, flies in the face of the most recent Assyriological opinion that sets the (re)conquest of Egypt by these rulers to 711 at the earliest. It also does nothing to harmonize the Seerapeum data. Each of these solutions, therefore, has its problems.

A fourth solution was proposed on various internet chronology forums by this author, where it was eventually well received. It is as simple as it is bold: reverse the historical order of these kings, so that Shabatka becomes the (re)conqueror of Egypt in 711 and Shabaka, his successor, probably ruling from 704 to 690 BC, well after the Yamani affair. The arguments in favour of this reversal go much beyond the scope of this paper and will provide the material for a future article. As far as the Seerapeum is concerned, however, the advantage is immediately clear: Indeed, Year 2 of Shabaka now comes comfortably after Year 6 of Bakenranef.
XXII<sup>nd</sup> and XXV<sup>th</sup> Dynasties overlap in the New Chronology

Now that we have put forth our data, we can look at the latest dates advocated by David Rohl for our Serapeum kings.<sup>23</sup> Below are the NC absolute dates for the three relevant kings of the Bubastite branch of the XXII<sup>nd</sup> Dynasty followed, in brackets, by the relevant Apis burial dates.

Shoshenq III: 758-720 [Year 28 = 731]
Pinay: 706-701 [Year 2 = 705]
Shoshenq V: 700-644 [Years 4, 11 and 37 = 697, 690 and 664]

From these, it seems obvious Rohl has not made use of the new information concerning Pami’s reign length from the Annals, but this is a minor point. More striking is his drastic shortening of Shoshenq V’s reign by some twenty years. While it would be nice to have a feature article by Rohl about this period, it must be recognized that this has little influence on our present discussion. What must be addressed here is whether Apis burials in 731, 705, 690, 664 and possibly 657 BC are really a viable solution. None of the Shoshenq V dates correspond to the certain dates of Taharqa’s burials, 677 and 667 BC. Furthermore, the Apis of Year 37 of Shoshenq V died aged about 26 years. If this death occurred in 664 BC, as per Rohl, then no less than two other Apis dies in its lifetime. Could there have been more than one Apis living in the Temple of Ptah at one time? The problems do not end here. The dates proposed by Rohl for the XXIV<sup>th</sup> and XXV<sup>th</sup> Dynasty kings are now certainly wrong, as shown below, with the relevant Apis burial dates (including possible alternatives):

Bakenranef: 710-705 [Year 6 = 703]
Shabaka: 700-695 [Years 2, 4 and 12 = 705, 703 and 693]
Shabaka: 698-685 [Years 2 and 4 = 697 and 695]
Taharqa: 690-685 [Years 4, 14 and 24 = 687, 677 and 667].

The new evidence from Tang-i Var is still being ignored. But let us put this aside for a moment and analyze the proposed overlap. We have already seen that two bulls must have lived under Taharqa. Before that, the scheme could be limited to a single Apis if there were burials in 697 BC [Year 2 of Shabaka and Year 4 of Shoshenq V] and 705 BC [Year 6 of Bakenranef and Year 2 of Pami]. While I cannot see a problem, at least on the grounds of the Serapeum data, with an identification of Year 2 of Shabaka with Year 4 of Shoshenq V, problems arise with the other identification. Indeed, in this hypothetical year 705 a bull that lived over 25 years was buried on II Peret 1 [Year 2 of Pami] yet a donation had already been presented to the dead Apis on I Akhet 5 [Year 6 of Bakenranef], almost 5 months earlier. This embarrassing problem could be eliminated if these two kings used different starting points for their respective regnal years.<sup>55</sup> Worked out properly, this may allow a possibility that the Bakenranef Year 6 stela actually dates 7 months later. The donation could then commemorate either a very short lived Apis or, more interestingly, the discovery of his successor.<sup>56</sup>

Does the Tang-i Var inscription make these speculations obsolete? Not necessarily. Bakenranef’s reign might perhaps be pushed significantly within the Kushite period (allowing us to maintain the year 705 synchronism). Shabaka’s Year 2 might also be synchronized to this same year. But then, how could this single Apis be buried in two different rooms, as argued above? In other words, it might still be possible to keep up the synchronism suggested in the previous paragraph, but this does not appear very likely, as even more special pleading is now required. And the problem of multiple Apises under Taharqa remains.

Multiple Bulls?

Back in his 1988 article in JACF, Rohl showed the close association between Pharaoh and the Apis bull and wondered if each dynasty could have felt it necessary to have its own parallel line of bulls. He then gave the following warning:

...until it can be definitely shown otherwise, it would be expedient to build the chronological model for the TIP on the basis that there was only a single line of bulls, representing the kingship of Egypt as a whole, to whose burials dedicated stela from the representatives of more than one king were deposited in the vaults.<sup>49</sup>

As explained above, the current dates advocated by the same author require that at least two such Apis bull lines existed at the time of Taharqa and Shoshenq V, if not from a few decades earlier. One has to wonder, however, the practicalities arising from such a suggestion.

1. From the list of Apis bulls given above, we see that the kings under whom burials were dedicated do not go beyond two groups, the kings of the Bubastite branch of the mid-to-late XXII<sup>nd</sup> Dynasty on one side, and those of the Kushite kings and their Saite opponents (continuing through the XXVI<sup>th</sup> Dynasty burials) on the other. Our current knowledge of the period tells us the Kushites were really overlords of Egypt, suzerains over multiple local kings.<sup>50</sup> By isolating Bakenranef as the sole king of the XXIV<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, Manetho would appear to give him a similar role. In a revised chronology of the sort the NC proposes, the Bubastite kings, however, only form one such local dynasty, the likes of which were found in Thebes, Hermopolis, Herakleopolis and Leontopolis. That is without counting Great Chiefs of the Ma and other princes whose powers were just as considerable. Why then, do we find ourselves with only two lines of bulls? Why, indeed, are all the other lines of Kings and Great Chiefs of the Ma absent from the Serapeum record?
2. If two bulls were buried at the Serapeum in Memphis, then they must have lived in the same temple, whose personnel dedicated steles to bulls buried under both Taharqa and Shoshenq V. Certainly, two bulls would have needed more space than one and we should expect large building work at the temple at this time. While the remains of a very large structure have been discovered and the name of Shabaka was found on various blocks reused in an overlying structure, any link between those two discoveries and the Apis living quarter remains to be demonstrated. Herodotus, for example, credits the slightly later Psamtik I (who would certainly not have allowed multiple Apises) for this major construction work and Shabaka’s exact role cannot be known at this stage.

3. Another important issue arising from multiple bull lines is the timing. Why, in NC, does this not appear earlier? After all, NC would have more than one Pharaoh ruling over Egypt from practically the old age of Ramesses II. Why didn’t any other king before the rise of Dynasty XXV seek to have his own Apis line? This question also underscores a major inconsistency of the NC. Indeed, the absence of bulls for the XXIst and early XXIIst Dynasty kings is cited as evidence for these dynastic overlaps whereas a multiple bull scheme theory is needed to account for similar overlaps in a later period.

So, on the triple account of the absence of non-Manethonian, non-Bubastite pharaohs, limited evidence for major construction work under the Kushites and the suddenness of the supposed phenomena, the multiple bull lines theory lacks any serious foundation. The burden of proof therefore lies on the shoulder of its proponents. Until such a proof appears, the most reasonable way to construct a chronological model for the TIP is on the basis that there was only a single line of bulls, however expedient this may be thought to be. Now, let us see how it can be done.

A possible solution, part one

Let us first restate the following facts:  
1. Apis 6, buried in Year 6 of Bakenranef, was found in a room bearing the name of Shoshenq V as well as that of Bakenranef.
2. Mariette does not give any evidence for more than one burial in the room.
3. Mariette attributed, without discussion, a burial to Year 4 of Shoshenq V.
4. None of the Year 4 stele actually name a king. These dated steles and others very similar to them, however, display a style remarkably similar to those datable to Year 6 of Bakenranef, as well as some features corresponding to the middle of the XXIst Dynasty.

From facts number 1 and 2 above, we conclude that a burial occurred under the double supervision of kings Bakenranef and Shoshenq V, in Year 6 of the former. In his report, Mariette tells us that the associated year of Shoshenq V was his 37th. However, none of the steles dated to Year 37, and in fact, no dated stele at all, were found within the room inscribed with the names of Bakenranef and Shoshenq V. The only stele associated with this room actually bears no date or contemporary king’s name. The attribution of Year 37 as the year of this room’s burial is thus probably entirely dependant on the traditional view of Egyptian history. Rather than using chronological preconceptions, let facts 3 and 4 above speak for themselves. The burial of Year 6 of Bakenranef is one and the same as that of Shoshenq V’s fourth year.

Voila! When it is accepted that Year 6 of Bakenranef coincided with Year 4 of Shoshenq V, it can no longer be denied that the latter was a contemporary of the Kushite kings. Further stylistic comparison of Serapeum stele would also point in this same direction. Indeed, some were originally dated to the XXIIst Dynasty yet show, according to the Catalogue’s authors, features that could accommodate a later date, hence Kushite if not even Saite. The situation is exactly as required by the NC and other chronological revisions.

The publication of the Tang-i Var inscription combined with the rejection of the Bakenranef/Shabaka Serapeum synchronism, however, throws Bakenranef’s reign off of its firm absolute chronological mooring. Can the further two burials of Shoshenq V be fixed any more precisely within the Kushite burial sequence?

A possible solution, part two

From here, our self-imposed requirement of a single line of Apis bulls becomes really restrictive. We have a bull, Apis 5 of this article’s terminology, which was born in Year 11, lived over twenty-five years and died in year 37 of Shoshenq V. We have just shown, in the preceding section, that this very year falls thirty-three years after the 6th year of Bakenranef, a date that brings us into the XXVth Dynasty according to most chronologists. In this same period, we also have a bull (Apis 9) that lived for a maximum of ten years. Clearly, Apis 5 cannot fit into the ten years between the Apises 8 and 9, buried respectively in 677 and 667 BC. Can he be fitted later? It is known that Apis 9 was followed by a bull that died in Year 20 of Psamtik I, 645 BC. Again, we have less than the required twenty-six years separating these two Apises. Clearly, if there were only one Apis bull line, as argued here, either Shoshenq V’s Year 11 would have fallen in or after 645 BC or his 37th in or before Year 14 of Taharqa. Let us study both alternatives.

Could Shoshenq V’s Year 11 be as late as 645 BC? We could indeed propose that Apis 5 was born just after the death of the first Psamtik I bull, in this king’s 20th year, and died in Year 46 (619 BC) of this same king. This putative Apis would then have been buried in the room in the Ramesses section of Lesser Vault that was reused at that time. As neither age nor any certain date is associated with this last burial of the Lesser Vaults, identification with Apis 5 cannot be ruled out, at first. Certainly, Shoshenq V and his Apis cannot be re-dated any later, as the Greater Vaults then came into use. Problems, however, arise from this identification. First, it would place Year 4 of Shoshenq V within the lifetime of the bull that died in Year 20 of
Psamtik I, making this identification incompatible with the conclusions reached in the previous sections. Second, placing Shoshenq V’s accession in 655 BC in turn lowers Shoshenq III’s own accession to 713 BC at the latest. Such a drastic re-dating of the XXII Dynasty seems out of question to this author. And third, the above identification requires that Apis 5 be buried the Ramesside section room, yet stelae from its burial were discovered reused in the filling of the wall closing this room. Had this truly been made in Year 37 of Shoshenq V, those stelae would have been found on the wall, not in the wall. Clearly then, Apis 5 should be sought earlier, within the Kushite period itself, as suggested by the discussion in the previous section.

The other possible option for a re-dating of Apis 5 would be to place Shoshenq V’s reign so that his Year 37 falls in or before Year 14 of Taharqa, 677 BC. In what can be termed the ‘single Apis line minimal chronology’ (SAMinc), Apis 5 would thus be identified with Apis 8, or, in regnal years, Year 14 of Taharqa becomes identical, or at least partly overlaps, with Year 37 of Shoshenq V. This bull would have died on (or about) I-Akhet 18 of Shoshenq’s 37th and Taharqa’s 14th year and have been buried 70 days later on III-Akhet 27 of the same year. The one ‘lost day of III-Akhet of Year 14’ stela would then have been dedicated for the bull’s burial, not for his death as surmised earlier. But then, what of the donation made early in Month II-Peret, some 70 days later and earlier surmised to indicate the probable date of the Apis 8 burial? In the SAMinc, this becomes a late donation, perhaps dedicated as late as when Apis 9 was discovered. Two stelae dated stylistically to Shoshenq V’s 37th year but having incomplete dates were discussed above, following the certain dates of Apis 5. Given the problematic reading of both these two stelae dates and the recently discovered one from Year 14 of Taharqa, perhaps all three could really have been dedicated on II-Peret 8. In any case, there is some limited evidence for such late donations in Persian and Ptolemaic times, and it doesn’t seem too much of a stretch to think that the cult of Apis continued even during those short intervals during which no living incarnation was known. Should one be skeptical of this result, the alternative is to pursue a non-minimal chronology in which Year 37 of Shoshenq V falls some time before Year 14 of Taharqa.

If one accepts the SAMinc, Year 11 of Shoshenq V, that in which Apis 4 died and Apis 5 was born, is now set absolutely to 703 BC. This happens to coincide with Year 2 of Shabaka in the model proposed by this author who reversed the succession order of Shabaka and Shabata. If one prefers the traditional order and accepts that the text was misunderstood by Mariette, then 703 could be seen as Shabaka’s 12th year, falling during the coregency with Shabata, as required by the evidence. In both cases, the poorly attested Apis 7 becomes identical with Apis 4. Still earlier, Year 4 of Shoshenq V and Year 6 of Bakennaref fall in 710, setting these kings accensions to 713 and 715 respectively.

Having thus assigned minimal absolute dates to Shoshenq V (and with him, the rest of the Bubastite branch of the XXII Dynasty), we need only look at three other Serapeum stelae before our discussion is complete. First and second are the stelae of Merenptah and of his son Pethhotep. Mariette dated the first of these to the burial in Year 37 of Shoshenq V and the second one to that of Year 24 of Taharqa. In the orthodox chronology, too many years separate these two burials for such attributions to be correct. Under the SAMinc, however, only ten years now come between father and son, giving credibility to Mariette’s original observations. Thirdly, the stela of Ashakhet is among those dated by Mariette to the 6th year of Bakennaref yet showing stylistic features of the XXII Dynasty. It is important because of the long genealogy it records, spanning twelve generations in total. Of the cited ancestors, Ashakhet’s great-great-great-grandfather was the High Priest of Ptah Shedsuneferi, attested under both Shoshenq I and Siamun. Allowing between 20 and 25 years per generation and the 710 BC datum for Year 6 of Bakennaref, Mariette’s original attribution would place this well known High Priest around 860 to 830 BC. That comes much too late for conventional chronology but is fully consistent with revised chronologies such as the NC and the SAMinc proposed here.

Conclusion

In this paper, we have established, using almost exclusively material from the Serapeum of Memphis, the minimal acceptable chronology of some late Third Intermediate Period pharaohs while allowing for only a single Apis line. This chronology, the SAMinc, has established the contemporaneity of Shoshenq V of the Bubastite branch of the XXII Dynasty with the Kushite kings (XXV Dynasty). It gives the following dates:

**Shoshenq III**: 771-733(?)
Apis 1: buried in 744 BC.

**Shoshenq IV**: 733(?)-720(?)

**Pani**: 720-713
Apis 2: Buried in 719 BC.

**Shoshenq V**: 713-677(?)
Apis 3 = Apis 6: Buried in 710 BC.

**Bakennaref**: 715-709(?)

**Shabaka**: 715-701(? or 704-690)

**Shabatka**: 706(?)-690 or 712(?)-701(?)
Apis 4 = Apis 7: Buried in 703 BC.

**Taharqa**: 690-664.
Apis 5 = Apis 8: Buried in 677 BC.
Apis 9: Buried in 667 BC.

The SAMinc puts Shoshenq III’s accession in 771 BC, thirteen years before the NC dates published by David Rohl. The dating of earlier kings cannot be discussed from Serapeum data as sources are lacking. Still, assuming further research does not change the relative dating of previous kings of the XXII Dynasty, we can assume the shift of thirteen years also applies to Shoshenq I, the dynasty’s
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founder. As the currently published NC date for this king is 822 BC, a tentative SAMInC date would be 835 BC. Such a move in time threatens the NC’s proposed identity between this earliest of the Shoshenqs and the saviour who freed Israel from the grip of Aram in the reign of Jehoahaz, usually dated 814 to 798.\(^{9}\) Clearly, additional work is now needed to ascertain whether these relative dates for the earlier part of the dynasty are valid and if the interesting synchronism with biblical chronology can be maintained within the context of the SAMInC. If not, better alternatives will have to be proposed.

More work is also needed in the period where the SAMInC was itself first developed. Indeed, most kings of this period are not mentioned at all in the documents discovered in the Serapeum. These kings will need to find their place within the structure of the SAMInC. Nor, obviously, are the Serapeum documents the last word on the kings they do mention. Documents and monuments of all sorts have been discovered from this period and all must be taken into consideration. If any of them are found to conflict with the SAMInC, then serious doubts will have been cast on this new chronological model. Clearly then, this paper can only be seen as the first step into an undoubtedly long and arduous journey into the heart of Third Intermediate Period chronological material.
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