



DAN'EL KAHN

WAS THERE A CO-REGENCY IN THE 25TH DYNASTY?*

The point of departure for the discussion is the mention of Shebitku in an inscription by Sargon II, dated to 706 BC (previously thought to have ascended the throne in 702 BC at the earliest). In order not to revise chronologies which were suggested by various scholars, the old theory of a coregency between Shabaka and Shebitku was resuscitated. The purpose of this article is to review the evidence for coregencies in the 25th Kushite dynasty. It will be shown that there is no religious basis for coregency in the Egypto-Kushite dynasty and that no evidence exists for a coregency between any two Kushite kings ruling in the 25th dynasty in Egypt.

Recently G. Frame republished a rock inscription and relief of Sargon II, King of Assyria¹ discovered in the Tang-i Var Pass in Iran and originally published in Farsī in 1968.² The text mentions the rebellion of Iamani, king of Ashdod, against Sargon II, King of Assyria (722–705 BC) in the year 712 BC and his flight to the king of Kush. According to the inscription, king Shebitku (=Shabatka) extradited Iamani to Sargon. The inscription can be dated quite certainly to 706 BC, not long before the death in battle of Sargon II. in the summer of 705 BC.³ Thus, the Tang-i Var inscription indicates that Shebitku was already king of Kush in 706 BC. This new date is at least four years earlier than has generally been thought. Frame continued and claimed that this is a "piece of information which will require Egyptologists to revise their current chronology for Egypt's twenty-fifth Dynasty", and added: "This would raise difficulties for the current Egyptian chronology".⁴

Frame's article was supplemented with a brief article by Redford. He considered the idea of shifting the dates of the 25th dynasty and fixing the accession of Shabaka to ca. 720 BC, and concluded that "this presents a major difficulty. For the decade preceding

713/12 BC the Assyrians and the biblical records contain several allusions to Egyptian rulers but none of them can be interpreted as allusions to a *Kushite* king ruling over *Egypt*." Redford then considered two additional possible solutions. One was to *resuscitate the old theory of a "coregency" between Shabaka and Shebitku*. Without giving a reason, this idea was rejected by him. The second solution that Redford proposed was a "'bifurcation in the government' of the vast domain of the Kingdom of Egypt-and-Kush. Redford maintained his earlier proposed chronology."⁵

In this article it is my intention to show that coregencies contradict the principals of the strongly Egyptian influenced Kushite religion and are used only in rare cases to stabilize the Kingdom like in the twelfth Dynasty. Then, I will review the evidence (or lack of it) concerning coregencies during the Kushite rule over Kush and Egypt from the reign of Piankhy in Egypt in 734 BC until the expulsion of the Kushites from Egypt under Tanutamun in 656 BC. I will deal with the solution of a divided rule over the kingdom of Egypt and Kush, which was suggested by Redford and adopted by many scholars elsewhere.

I. COREGENCY AND KUSHITE IDEOLOGY OF SUCCESSION

The Kushite royal ideology and rules of succession were basically similar to those practiced in Egypt.⁶ This means that the Kushite King, like his Egyptian counterpart, was seen as the earthly incarnation of the god Horus. On his death the king was identified with the god Osiris, king of the realm of the dead. His place as the earthly Horus was then occupied by his legitimate heir, normally his eldest son. According to this theology, the new king ascended the throne only on the death of his predecessor and

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

1 G. Frame: "The Inscription of Sargon II at Tang-i Var", *Or* 68 (1999) 31–57.

2 Frame, *Or* 68, 33, n. 2–5.

3 H. Tadmor, "The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological-Historical Study" *JCS* 12 (1958) 97. On the 12th of the month Abu Sennacherib ascended the throne.

4 Frame, *Or* 68, 52, 54.

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

6 See D. Kahn, "The Royal Succession in the 25th Dynasty", *Antike Sudan* 16 (2005) 143–163. For the Egyptian Mythical cycle of Osiris and Horus and the Egyptian kingship, see V.A. Tobin, *Theological Principles of Egyptian Religion*, New York, 1989, "The Egyptian Kingship", 93–95.



there was no place for a coregency and association between the two. In theological terms, there was a problem of having two Horuses acting simultaneously.⁷ However, Lorton has tried to solve this incompatibility between theory and reality and suggested that the Egyptian mind allowed the existence of several different manifestations of Horus. Thus, there is no possibility to prove that there existed a theological objection to the institute of coregency as has been practiced in Egypt,⁸ and for that matter also in Kush. The existences of specific coregencies still have to be proven or disproved based on facts.

In practice, the institute of coregency appeared at the beginning of the Middle Kingdom after the turbulent times of the First Intermediate Period.⁹ Only a handful of coregencies can be proven during the millennia of Egyptian history. It does not seem that the political instability that preceded the Middle Kingdom and the special circumstances that prompted coregencies in other periods can be detected in the Kushite kingdom of the eighth-seventh centuries BC.

2. THE EVIDENCE FOR COREGENCIES IN THE 25TH DYNASTY DURING THE 8TH AND 7TH CENT. BC
No written information of great historical value has come down to us from the reigns of the immediate predecessors of Piankhy, the conqueror of Egypt, let alone texts which mention a coregency.

2.1 *Piankhy and Shabaka*

British Museum cube statue of Ity (EA 24429) has sometimes been mentioned as an argument in favour of a coregency between Piankhy and Shabaka, for Piankhy is mentioned as *ḥnh dt* "living forever" in year 15 of Shabaka. It was shown, however, that the text only referred to the funerary cult of Piankhy and that the epithet *ḥnh dt* was also applied to dead kings.¹⁰ Thus, there is no evidence for a coregency between these two kings.¹¹

2.2 *Shabaka and Shebitku*

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

a. *Turin Stela no. 1467*

In Murnane's seminal work on co-regencies,¹² the author mentions a Stela in the Turin Museum (Turin Stela no. 1467) that depicts Shabaka and Shebitku (the one seated behind the other) on the left side facing two other persons across an offering table. This stela was considered as evidence for a coregency when acquired for the Turin Museum, which acknowledged it later to be a fake. Recently, R. Morkot and S. Quirke dealt with this stela again and reaffirmed that it is a *fake* and should not be used as evidence for a possible coregency between these two kings.¹³

b. *Evidence from the Serapeum*

Mariette discovered in the Serapeum in 1852 a small stela which mentions year 2 of Shabaka.¹⁴ On the same page Mariette notes that he copied in the same room the fragmentary end of the cartouche of Shebitku. It is not clear if this cartouche was written on another unpreserved monument or inscribed on the wall. Mohammed Ibrahim Aly, in his doctoral thesis,¹⁵ discusses the year two stela of Shabaka and the mention of Shebitku in the same place at the Serapeum. He proposes to emend the reading of the date on Shabaka's Stela from year 2 to year *[1]2. He then explains the occurrence of the name of Shebitku at the same place as evidence of a three year coregency between Shabaka and Shebitku. The (vague) description of Mariette does not support this conclusion.

c. *Karnak Quay Inscription no. 33*

In the Karnak quay inscription no. 33, recording the height of the Nile in Shebitku's regnal year 3, an elaborated statement about the legitimacy of the

7 D.B. Redford, "Review of Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies* (SAOC 40, Chicago 1977)", *JEA* 69 (1983) 182.

8 D. Lorton, "Terms of Coregency in the Middle Kingdom", *VA* 2 (1986) 118.

9 Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies* (SAOC 40; Chicago 1977).

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

11 Murnane, *Coregencies*, 188–189. See also R. Morkot, "Kingship and Kinship in the Empire of Kush", *Meroitica* 15 (1999) *Akten der 7. Internationalen Tagung für meroitische Forschungen vom 14. bis 19. September 1992 in Gosen/bei*

Berlin, St. Wenig (ed.), 207.

12 See n. 9 above, p. 190.

13 R.G. Morkot and S. Quirke, "Inventing the 25th Dynasty: Turin stela 1467 and the construction of his history", *Begegnungen – Antike Kulturen im Niltal. Festgabe für Erika Endesfelder, Karl-Heinz Priese, Walter Friedrich Reineke, Steffen Wenig* (Leipzig 2001), 349–363.

14 A. Mariette, *Le Sérapéum de Memphis*, (Paris 1882) (ed. by Maspero), 184. I thank Jean-Frédéric Brunet for this information

15 Mohamed Ibrahim Aly Sayed, "*Les Petits Souterrains du Sérapéum de Memphis, étude d'archéologie, religion et histoire*", Dissertation doctorale (unpublished), Université Lumière, Lyon 2, France, presented in September 1991, 309–311.



king was made.¹⁶ After mentioning the date and full titles, Shebitku mentioned his appearing (*h^ci*) in Thebes as king in the temple of Amun, and Amun's legitimization of his kingship over the *two lands* (*t3.wy*) = *Egypt* (?) or alternatively, he received the crown with two Uraei¹⁷ from Amun.

... *sk r:f h^c hm.f m nsw¹⁸ m hwt [n]t Imn rdi.n.f n.f [h^c].f n t3.wy i^r.ty mi Hr w hr nst R^c*

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

This inscription was taken to be a crowning inscription. The high level of the Nile was understood as a favorable omen by the god on Shebitku's crowning day (as sole ruler after a coregency?) in his third year. Von Beckerath compared this inscription with Nile

Inscription no. 30 from year 2 of Shabaka, the year Shabaka re-conquered Egypt.¹⁹ Thus, he concluded, the inscription recalls the arrival of Shebitku *for the first time in Egypt* to the temple of Amun where he was crowned by Amun. However, the verb *h^ci* does not necessarily denote the king's accession, crowning or appearance for the first time. This was demonstrated by Redford.²⁰ Murnane even stated that: "the text (i.e. quay inscription 33) need not refer to an accession or coronation at all. Rather, it seems simply to record an 'appearance' of Shebitku in the temple of Amun during his third year and to acknowledge the god's influence in securing his initial appearance as king. These two occasions (i.e. Shebitku's initial appearance as king and the appearance in his regnal year three) are not represented here as having been identical, and there is no reason to suppose that they were."²¹ The use of the verb *h^ci* in Napatan inscriptions is also very loose and can designate the accession of the king²² but also any appearance of him, especially on the throne of the gods forever, without specifying a precise occurrence.²³ It becomes clear,

16 J. von Beckerath, "The Nile Level Records at Karnak and their Importance for the History of the Libyan Period (Dynasties XXII and XXIII), *JARCE* 5 (1966) 53, no. 33. For recent comments, see T. Eide, T. Hägg, R.H. Pierce, and L. Török (eds.), *Fontes Historiae Nubiorum: Textual sources for the History of the Middle Nile Region between the Eighth Century BC and the Sixth Century AD*. Vol. I, *From the Eighth to the Mid-Fifth Century BC* (Bergen 1994) 129 (Henceforth *FHN*).

17 L. Török, *The Royal Crowns of Kush: A Study in Middle Nile Valley Regalia and Iconography in the 1st Millenia B.C. and A.D.*, *Cambridge Monographs in African Archaeology* 18 (Oxford 1987) 4 ff.

18 The words *m nsw* were omitted from the first copy made by von Beckerath. See J. von Beckerath, "The Nile Level Records at Karnak and their Importance for the History of the Libyan Period (Dynasties XXII and XXIII), *JARCE* 5 (1966) 53, no. 33 and idem. "Die Nilstandsinschrift vom 3. Jahr Schebitkus am Kai von Karnak", *GM* 136 (1993) 7–9.

19 Von Beckerath, *GM* 136 (1993) 7–9.

20 D.B. Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt*, (Toronto 1967) 4–6. However, in the following examples cited by Redford, *h^ci m nsw* is understood as the king's appearing at his accession (pp. 6–8). See also K.A. Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100–650 BC.)*, 2nd rev. ed., (Warminster 1996) 170 (Henceforth *ThIP*). "... this verb *h^ci* applies to any official 'epiphany' or official manifestation of the king to his 'public appearances' ...". See also J. von Beckerath, "Ägypten und der Feldzug Sanheribs im Jahre 701 v.Chr." *UF* 24 (1992) 5.

21 W.J. Murnane, *Coregencies*, 189.

22 A sample of the occurrences of the verb *h^ci* with the meaning of "accession": *h3t-sp tpy(?) nt sh^c m nswt [...]* "The first

year of his appearance as king." (*FHNI* 196: Dream Stela of Tanutamun 3, henceforth DS) It is not clear if the stroke (Gardiner Z1) is part of the indirect genitive *nt* or designates the number of regnal years. In the Piankhy Stela the word *nt* is written without stroke. The plural genitive *nw* is written twice with the stroke (lines 149, 154) and once without a stroke (l. 128). See N.-C. Grimal, *La stèle triomphale de Pt('ankh)y au musée du Caire* (*MIFAO* 105; Cairo 1981) 319; *wn hm.f h^c.(w) hr st Hr w m rnpt tn* "His Majesty had appeared on the throne of Horus in this year" (*FHNI* 197: DS 6); *k pw iri. n hm.f i.iri h^c m b3h it.f Imn-R^c nb nst t3.wy gm.n.f sdn.(w) nb.(w) nsw.w n Kš w3s.sn* "In entered His Majesty to appear before his father, Amon-Re, lord of the thrones of the two lands. It was before this god that he found all the crowns of the kings of Kush with their scepters". (*FHNI* 241: Election Stela of Aspelta 22 henceforth E) note the different analysis of the grammar). See also *FHNI* 242: E 24.

23 *di.n.i n.k h^ci m nswt hr st Hr w nt n^h.w mi r^c <r> dt* "I have caused you to appear as king on the Horus-throne of the living, like Re, forever" (*FHNI* 195, DS C13); *s3 R^c (Tanutamun) | n^h wd3 snb di n^h h^c hr st Hr w dt* "The son of Re, Tanutamun, given life, may he live, be prosperous and healthy, appearing on the throne of Horus forever." (*FHNI* 207: DS 42). *di.k n.f n^h w3s nb hri.k snb nb hri.k 3w ib nb hri.k h^c hr st Hr w dt* "May you give him all life and dominion from you, all happiness from you, while appearing on the throne of Horus forever" (*FHNI* 233: E C5). *di.i n.k h^c n R^c nswyt.f hr ns.t it* (E C7) "I give you the crown / appearing (*h^c*) of Re, his kingship on his(?) father's (*it.f*?) throne." (*FHNI* 233: E C7). Note that *h^c* is written without a crown determinative and that "his father" is written *Re* does not appear only at the accession of the king, but daily.



then, that the only certain thing that can be said about Quay inscription 33 is that Shebitku was in Thebes and received the affirmation and legitimization of the god Amun in his third year on that occasion.

d. A postulated coregency between Shabaka and Shebitku on chronological grounds

Kitchen suggested that Shabaka came to the throne in Kush in 717/6 BC and conquered Egypt in his second regnal year 716/5.²⁴ According to Kitchen's chronology, Shabaka would have ruled as pharaoh in Egypt and Kush until 702/1 BC and upon his death was succeeded by Shebitku in 702/1 BC. Kitchen did not support a coregency between Shabaka and Shebitku.

In 713/2 or 712/1 BC, Iamani of Ashdod rebelled against Assyria.²⁵ He attempted to muster support from Pir'u (Pharaoh), King of Egypt. When the Assyrians approached Ashdod in 712 BC, Iamani fled to Egypt, ending up at the border of Egypt with Kush.²⁶ He initially received asylum from the king of Kush, but was eventually sent back in shackles to Nineveh.

Spalinger has noted that when Iamani fled to Egypt he did not meet "Pir'u, King of Egypt," whom he had contacted before, but went south to Upper Egypt and finally met the king of Kush. Hence, Spalinger concluded that the Delta king, who was ruling in 713 BC, had disappeared in 712 BC, and that Shabaka had by that time conquered the Delta in the second year of his reign. The year 712 was thus treated as an "anchor

date" and the year 713 was regarded as the accession date of Shabaka. Since Shabaka's fifteenth year is mentioned,²⁷ it was assumed that he died in 698 BC.

Furthermore, two seal impressions with cartouches with the name of Shabaka and his image smiting an enemy were found in the ruins of Sennacherib's palace at Nineveh.²⁸ Scholars have attributed these to the correspondence between Sargon and Shabaka in relation to the Yamani affair.²⁹ Yurco, however, dates these seal impressions to the reign of Sennacherib, because they were found in Sennacherib's and not in Sargon's palace.³⁰ Since the entire West was in revolt prior to Sennacherib's campaign to the West in 701 BC, these seal impressions should be dated, according to Yurco, to the aftermath of Sennacherib's campaign, and thus prove that Shabaka was still in power after 701 BC.³¹ However, this assertion is not so simple, since only the seal impressions were found, and there is no proof that the letters which were sent by Shabaka to Sennacherib contained words of peace.³² The discovery of the seals in the palace of Sennacherib in Nineveh also does not prove that the correspondence was between Shabaka and Sennacherib' as important letters could be transferred from the archive of Dur Sharukin (Sargon's seat of power) to Nineveh.³³ It is not even clear if these seal impressions sealed a letter or an Amphora.³⁴

On the other hand, Kitchen proposed that Shebitku was elevated to be ruler of Kush before 701 BC. According to Taharqa's texts from Kawa, Shebitku

24 K.A. Kitchen, "Late-Egyptian Chronology and the Hebrew Monarchy: Critical Studies in Old Testament Mythology, I", *JANES* 5 (1973) 225–233; idem, *ThIP*, 378 ff., 553. Kitchen prefers the above dates because Sargon, King of Assyria, received a tribute of twelve horses from Shilkani (Osorkon), king of Egypt, and not from Shabaka in 716 BC. According to Kitchen, Shabaka had not yet conquered Egypt by then.

25 Tadmor, *JCS* 12 (1958) 79–84; A.J. Spalinger, "The Year 712 B.C. and its Implications for Egyptian History", *JARCE* 10 (1973) 95–101. For the dating of these events to 711 BC cf. A. Fuchs, *Die Inschriften Sargons II. aus Khorsabad* (Göttingen 1994) 381–382; idem, *Die Annalen des Jahres 711 v. Chr* (State Archives of Assyria Studies VIII; Helsinki 1998) 124–131.

26 *ana itê mat Musri ša pat mat Meluhha innabitma*. (Fuchs, *Die Inschriften*, 220, l. 103). Kitchen, *ThIP* 583: he (Iamani) fled "to the border of Egypt which is at the territory of Meluhha (Nubia)".

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

28 H.R. Hall, *Catalogue of Egyptian Scarabs in the British Museum*,

vol. I: *Royal Scarabs*, (London 1913) 290, nos. 2775 and 2776.

29 H. Tadmor, "Philistia under Assyrian Rule" *BA* 29 (1966) 94 and n. 34; Kitchen, *ThIP*, 380, n. 779; Spalinger, *JARCE* 10 (1973) 97, 100.

30 F. Yurco, "Sennacherib's Third Campaign and the Coregency of Shabaka and Shebitku", *Serapis* 6 (1980) 236.

31 Yurco, *loc cit*.

32 Note the motif of smiting the enemy on the seal. For letters between rulers which do not contain peaceful messages, cf. the letter exchanges between Tukulti Ninurta I and Kashtiliash in the Tukulti Ninurta Epic. See B.R. Foster, *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*, vol. I, (Bethesda 1993) 217 ff.; cf. also the letter which was sent by Shuppiluliuma to the King of Egypt (Tutankhamun?) Th.P. J van den Hout, "Der Falke und das Küken: der neue Pharao und der hethitische Prinz?", *ZA* 84 (1994) 60–88; cf. the words of Esarhaddon to the king of Shubria. See I. Eph'al, "Esarhaddon, Egypt and Shubria: Politics and Propaganda", *JCS* 57 (2005) 100, n. 4.

33 Cf. the letters sent to Amenhotep III in Thebes, which were found in the archive of Akhetaten (Tell el-Amarna).

34 B.U. Schipper, *Israel und Ägypten in der Königszeit: Die Kulturellen Kontakte von Salomo bis zum Fall Jerusalems*, (OBO 170; Freiburg Schweiz and Göttingen 1999) 203, n. 31



summoned Taharqa to join him with an army to wage war in the North, most probably against the Assyrians in 701 BC. Kitchen also noted that Shebitku adopted an aggressive policy reflected in his militaristic expansionistic titles.³⁵

This overlap of approximately three years between the conjectured accession date of Shebitku (701/2) and the calculated death of Shabaka in 698 led Spalinger and other scholars to postulate a coregency.³⁶

Yurco³⁷ introduced several new argumentations in favor of a coregency. According to the Assyrian accounts of the campaign of Sennacherib, king of Assyria (705–681 BC) to the West in 701 BC, the Ekronites appealed for help to the kings of Egypt, the bowmen, charioteers and cavalry of the king of Kush, who came to their aid. Sennacherib encountered this Egypto-Kushite force at the plain of Eltekeh. He took captive Egyptian princes and charioteers and Kushite charioteers. Yurco claimed that in the earliest account of the battle, the Rassam cylinder, dated to 700 BC, the King of Egypt was mentioned in singular, while in subsequent recensions this was changed to "Kings" of Egypt.³⁸ According to him, the change may reflect a belated recognition of the coregency of Shabaka and Shebitku.³⁹ However, Yurco failed to note that the term "*Kings of Egypt*" does not denote Shabaka and/or Shebitku but the many *Egyptian dynasts* from the Delta and Middle Egypt. The term *šar māt Meluhha* in the same paragraph denotes the "king of Kush" (written in the singular!), who did not attend the battle in person.

A second argument in favor of the postulated coregency was the reconstructed timetable for the events of the third campaign of Sennacherib and its compatibility to the regnal years of Shabaka and Shebitku as preserved in Manetho. According to Yurco's reconstruction, Shebitku was present in Thebes in mid february. This date coincided with the Egyptian new-year, which fell in 701 on the 15th of february.⁴⁰ Yurco considered this date as Shebitku's accession date as coregent. Thus, Shebitku reigned into his twelfth year, since Taharqa, Shebitku's successor, celebrated his first new year in 689 BC. Shabaka, Shebitku's predecessor, would have started his reign twelve years before in 713 (as Spalinger has suggested) and would

have ruled as sole ruler until 701 BC. These calculated regnal years would fit the information given in the versions of Manetho. The discrepancy between the versions would reflect ascribing the various years to one of the two coregents.⁴¹ However, now that Shebitku's accession is fixed to 706 at the earliest, it seems to me that none of Manetho's dates for the 25th Dynasty are correct.⁴²

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

- A. The fake Turin stela
- B. The poorly described information from the Serapeum
- C. The misinterpreted Karnak Quay inscription 33
- D. The wrong attribution of the "kings of Egypt" in the Assyrian sources to the King of Kush
- E. The seal impression of Shabaka at Nineveh
- F. Wrong information from later sources (Manetho as preserved in Africanus and Eusebius)

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

The Tang-i Var inscription accentuated the discrepancy between facts and theory. The text clearly indicates that Shebitku was on the throne in 706 BC. If Shabaka ascended the throne in 713 BC, he would have ended up ruling together with Shebitku for eight years (706–698). But no trace of double dating, texts with indication of joint rule or even reliefs with both rulers performing religious rites jointly exists on the monuments. Taking the facts at face value does not even hint at a coregency. However, for some reason, even people who did not accept a coregency or vice-regality initially, like Kitchen, Hoffmeier and von Beckerath accepted a coregency in order not to change their former in the words of Kitchen: "not (to) entail any change in the Best Egyptian chronology whatsoever ... In this case our chronology does

35 Cf. Kitchen, *ThIP* 154 ff; idem. "Egypt, the Levant and Assyria in 701 BC", in: M. Görg, (ed.) *Fontes Atque Pontes*, Festschrift Hellmut Brunner, (ÄUAT 5; Wiesbaden 1983) 245–246. See *FHNI* 138–139: Kawa IV lines 7–9.

36 Spalinger, *JARCE* 10 (1973) 98; D.B. Redford, "Sais and the Kushite Invasions of the Eighth Century BC", *JARCE* 22 (1985) 13, n. 61; idem. *Or* 68 (1999) 59–60, n. 12; Kitchen, *ThIP* xlii and 555–557.

37 F. Yurco, *Serapis* 6 (1980) 221–240.

38 E. Frahm, *Einleitung in die Sannacherib-Inschriften* (BAfo 26; Horn 1997) 54, l. 43, n. 3.

39 Yurco, *Serapis* 6 (1980), 225.

40 Yurco, *Serapis* 6 (1980), 228. The precise date is given in J. von Beckerath, *Chronologie des Pharaonischen Ägypten*, (MÄS 46; Mainz am Rhein 1997) 198.

41 Yurco, *Serapis* 6 (1980), 228–229. Cf. Redford, *Or* 68 (1999) 59.

42 D. Kahn, *Or* 70 (2001) 5, n. 23.



not change by a second (let alone 4 years)".⁴³ Thus, according to the cited facts at hand, there is *no objective evidence* for a coregency between Shabaka and Shebitku.

3.3. SHEBITKU AND TAHARQA⁴⁴

According to Macadam's reading of Kawa IV, 7–16 Shebitku summoned Taharqa in 689 BC (the date of Taharqa's accession is now 690 BC)⁴⁵ to Egypt and was immediately associated with Shebitku in the kingship as coregent, were he ruled together with him until his sixth regnal year. In this year Shebitku died and Taharqa ascended the throne as sole ruler. He then commenced to rebuild Kawa temple, which according to Macadam, was also the year of his mother's arrival in Memphis for his coronation.⁴⁶ This is clearly contrary to what is written in Kawa V, 15 where Taharqa received the crown only *after* the hawk flew to heaven, i.e. Shebitku died.⁴⁷ Clearly, a coregency between Shebitku and Taharqa is based on Macadam's wrong readings of the texts.⁴⁸

3.4. TAHARQA AND TANUTAMUN⁴⁹

3.4.1. *The Reliefs in the Chapel of Osiris-Ptah Neb 'Ankh*

Taharqa and Tanutamun are well represented in reliefs and accompanying epigraphs throughout the small chapel to Osiris-Ptah Neb 'Ankh in between the Amun and Mut temples in Karnak.⁵⁰ It was suggested by Schäfer that their appearance together may prove a coregency.⁵¹ However, as in many other cases of joint appearance on reliefs it is a case of completing

the former king's building projects.⁵²

3.4.2. *The Dream Stela of Tanutamun*

The Dream Stela of Tanutamun begins with the mention of a dream in his first regnal year, wherein he received the message from god that he will be king

h3t sp tp(y)t n sh^cf m nsw

"Regnal year 1 of causing his appearance as king"
(FHNI 196: Dream Stela l. 3)

The verb *sh^c(i)* is the causative of the verb *h^ci* "to appear" in the infinitive form. This means that, theoretically, somebody caused Tanutamun to appear as king. One option to identify the person who caused Tanutamun to appear as king was Taharqa, his predecessor, thus hinting at an accession of Tanutamun, while his predecessor was still alive.⁵³ Taharqa's role in Tanutamun's accession, however, is not mentioned in the Dream Stela. Kitchen suggested that the gods might have caused Tanutamun to appear as king.⁵⁴ However, the god's role is not mentioned in the text. The verb *sh^ci* is used in the same meaning as the intransitive verb *h^ci* "to appear" in the Piankhy Stela ll. 58–59.⁵⁵ Thus, nobody, neither former king, nor god, caused Tanutamun to appear as king, and this verb cannot be used to prove a coregency.

It should be noted that the dream of Tanutamun occurred in the year of his appearing as king (but before he actually became king). In his dream Tanutamun saw two serpents, one on his right, the other on his left (=of his forehead, i.e. the double uraei depicted on the Kushite crown). Tanutamun woke up and

43 K.A. Kitchen, "Regnal and Genealogical Data of Ancient Egypt (Absolute Chronology I): The Historical Chronology of Ancient Egypt, A Current Assessment", in: M. Bietak (ed.), *The Synchronisation of Civilisations in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Second Millennium BC*, (Wien, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2000) 50–51.

44 Morkot, *Meroitica* 15 (1999) 205.

45 Von Beckerath, *Chronologie*, 91 with earlier literature there.

46 M.F.L. Macadam, *The Temples of Kawa*, vol. I (London, 1949) 115–16, 18, n. 30.

47 J. Leclant and J. Yoyotte, "Notes d'histoire et de civilisation éthiopiennes. À propos d'un ouvrage récent", *BIFAO* 51 (1952) 24 ff. See also Kitchen, *ThIP* 164–170; A.F. Rainey, "Taharqa and Syntax" *Tel Aviv* 3 (1976): 38–41.

48 Murnane, *Coregencies*, 190–193.

49 Morkot, *Meroitica* 15 (1999) 204–205. *Pace* Morkot, it is nowhere stated that Tanutamun was in Egypt at the death of Taharqa.

50 For these, see A. Mariette, *Monuments divers recueillis en Égypte et en Nubie*, (Paris 1889) pls. 79–87; J. Leclant, *Recherches sur les monuments Thébains de la XXV^e dynastie dite éthiopienne* (BdE 36; Cairo 1965) 111–113; F. Breyer, *Tanutamani: Die Traumstela und ihr Umfeld* (ÄAT 57; Wiesbaden 2003) 373–404

51 H. Schäfer, "Zur Erklärung der 'Traumstela'", *ZÄS* 35 (1897) 67, commenting also on the Dream stela of Tanutamun (see below).

52 Török, *The Kingdom of Kush: Handbook of the Napatan-Meroitic Civilization* (HdO; Leiden 1997) 143.

53 Schäfer, *ZÄS* 35 (1897) 67–70.

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

55 Breyer, *Tanutamani*, 93.



did not understand the dream.⁵⁶ The text goes on explaining the dream:

iw n.k B rsi iti n.k B mh̄w

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

The time frame of this adverbial sentence of possession is not given and can be translated in the present and future.⁵⁷ Thus, it seems that, *before* ascending the throne,⁵⁸ Tanutamun was foretold that he will be king and wear the two Uraei, that the Southland will surely be his,⁵⁹ and that he should conquer also the North of Egypt which was in Assyrian hands in 664, the year of Tanutamun's coronation. Then, Tanutamun was crowned in the same year of the dream, thus fulfilling the oracle.⁶⁰ It would seem strange, if Tanutamun was already king while he dreamt his dream and that he did not understand what the two serpents, symbols of Kushite royalty *par excellence*, meant.

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

3.4.3. THE ROYAL INSCRIPTIONS OF ASHURBANIPAL, KING OF ASSYRIA

In Prisms A II 20–22 || C III 26–29 Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, describes his conquest of Egypt in the year 664, and states that the dread of Ashur's weapon befell on Taharqa at the place to where he fled and he went to his faith. Tanutamun, son of Shabaka (var. son of his [i.e. Taharqa's] sister) sat on the throne of his kingdom.⁶¹

The dates in the Tanutamun stela and the information in Ashurbanipal's prisms do not support a

coregency. On the contrary. It can be deduced from the Dream Stela that Tanutamun was not supposed to be the heir of Taharqa and got the command to rule through a dream. Taharqa's remaining children were probably too young when their father died and could not inherit his throne and lead a country in times of war.⁶² From the Assyrian inscriptions it becomes clear that Tanutamun ascended the throne after Taharqa's death, although, lack of knowledge⁶³ by the Assyrian scribe should be taken into consideration when dealing with Tanutamun's succession on Taharqa's throne.

In sum, there is not one shred of concrete evidence that coregency was ever practiced in the Kushite kingdom. The Kushite religious beliefs were based on the Egyptian beliefs, that the king ascended the throne on his father's / predecessor's death as the god Horus inherited the throne of Osiris his father on his death. No two incarnations of Horus were supposed to rule Egypt together in theory. In practice a small number of co-regencies occurred during the long history of Egypt⁶⁴ and more than one king could be crowned in Egypt in rival dynasties. It does not seem that the political instability that preceded the Middle Kingdom and the special circumstances that prompted co-regencies in other periods can be detected in the Kushite kingdom of the eighth-seventh centuries BC and beyond.

SUMMARY

In der Fachliteratur wurde verschiedentlich die Möglichkeit einer Koregentschaft von Königen der 25. Dyn. in Betracht gezogen. Der Artikel diskutiert ausführlich die einzelnen Quellen, die zur Unterstützung dieser These herangezogen wurden und kann das Modell der Koregentschaft für die Kuschiten ausschließen.

56 FHN I 197: DS 4–5 *m3.n hm.f rsw m grh hf 2 w^c hr inn.f ky hr ibb.f nhs pw iri.n hm.f n{n} gm.n.f st^r dd.n^r [hm.f] nn r.i hr m* "His Majesty saw a dream in the night, two serpents, one on his right, the other on his left. Up woke His Majesty but did not find them. Then said his Majesty: 'Why has this happened to me?'" Note that the translation of *n{n} gm.n.f st* differs from my translation. See also Breyer, *Tanutamani*, 95.

57 Cf. examples Allen, *Middle Egyptian: An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs* (Cambridge 2000) 113–114; A.H. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, 3rd ed. (Oxford 1988) 88. Breyer, *Tanutamani*, 97.

58 For a foretelling dream that Thutmose IV will become king, see B.M. Bryan, *The Reign of Thutmose IV*, (Baltimore 1991) 146. Note the similarities between the texts. See also: Murnane, *Coregencies*, 194–195.

59 One of the agreed upon uses of the particle *iw* is to denote

that the statement is temporarily true. See: J.P. Allen, *Middle Egyptian*, 110.

60 The identification of the verb forms and staves in this paragraph are not conclusive and could be interpreted in past tense. In this case the dream occurred while Tanutamun was already king. This is not the place to discuss the grammar of the text at length.

61 H.-U. Onasch, *Die Assyrischen Eroberungen Ägyptens, Teil I: Kommentare und Anmerkungen*, (ÄAT 27; Wiesbaden 1994) 120–121.

62 For the Kushite right of succession, see D. Kahn, *Der antike Sudan*. MittSAG 16 (2005) 143–163.

63 But hardly lack of interest, since the Assyrian scribe bothered to record Tanutamun's filiation and relation to Taharqa.

64 See Murnane, *Coregencies*; See recently K. Jansen-Winkel, "Zu den Koregenzen der 12. Dynastie" *SAK* 24 (1997) 115–135.