

A Note on the Chronology of Dynasty 25 and the Inscription of Sargon II at Tang-i Var

Donald B. REDFORD

Lines 19 to 21 of the above inscription, with the new evidence they contain on matters Egyptian, will be of more than passing interest to scholars. It cannot now be doubted (a) that Shebitku (Šr-pa-ta-ku-ur¹), as Šar Meliūpa, was known to Assyrian scribes before the accession of Sennacherib, and (b) that it was Shebitku, not Shabaka, that extradiated Yamani to Assyria? The death of Sargon II is now the terminus ante quem for the appearance of Shebitku with a title indicating the status of a head of state. Since the stele most probably was inscribed in Sargon's final year (see above), the extradition of Yamani could have taken place as late as 706-705 B.C.

In spite of scholarly activity in recent years in trying to resolve the outstanding issues, the chronology of the 24th and 25th Dynasties before Taharqa's accession remains problematical. In the virtual absence of dated texts from his reign, estimates of the accession date of Shebitku have ranged widely in the literature: 695 B.C., 699 B.C., 701 B.C., 702 B.C.² The new information makes it possible to re-open the question of the trustworthiness of the versions of the Epitome of Manetho on Dyn. 25. It

¹ The reading, Dr. Frame assures me, is not in doubt. In later transmission the name Šr-bi-ur has undergone a confusing garbling, becoming Šr-pa-ur in Manetho (Waddell, *Manetho* [LCL 1940] 137), Šr-pa-ur in Eusebius (ed. Schwartz, *Chronicon* [LCL 1939] 100) and Šr-pa-ur in Hebrew (Gen. 10.6, cf. M. Astour, "Sabia and Sobem," *JBL* 84 [1965] 422-23). The Akkadian might suggest the Hebrew is close to the original pronunciation.

² It has usually been assumed that Shabaka did this; cf. T. G. H. James, *CAH* III/2 (Cambridge, 1907) 67.

³ A. Barton, *Diodorus Siculus Book I: A Commentary* (Leiden 1973) 194.

⁴ D. B. Redford, "Saïs and the Kushite Invasions of the Eighth Century B.C.," *JARCE* 22 (1985) 13.

⁵ J. G. Février, *Recherches sur les monuments hébraïques de la XXV. Dynastie dite égyptienne nubie* (London/New York 1966) 104.

⁶ H. von Zeissl, *Aethiopen und Assyrien in Ägypten* (Glücksstadt/Hamburg 1944) 27 (basing herself on Eusebius); K. A. Kitchen, "Egyptian Chronology in the Third Intermediate Period," *JNES* 13 (1954) 247.

⁷ M. C. G. B. G. G., "Sennacherib's Letter to God," *JNES* 13 (1954) 247-20 and n. 1 ("une douzaine d'années"); M. C. G. B. G. G., "Sennacherib's Letter to God," *JNES* 13 (1954) 247-20 and n. 1.

⁸ *JNES* 13 (1954) 247-20 and n. 1.

Or NS 68 (1999)

would now appear that, as in so many cases, Africanus's version (14 years) is to be preferred to that of Eusebius (12 years).

The as yet intractable problem in the chronology of the 25th Dynasty is the length of Shabaka's reign and, now, in particular, the date of his death. Dated texts, almost all with an Egyptian provenience⁸, range from year 2 through years 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 13 and 14, ending with the British Museum cube statue dated to year 15⁹. If Shabaka maintained the same sequence of regnal years from his accession, presumably on the death of Pi(ankh)y, and did not associate Shebitku with him as coregent, then the new evidence would oblige us to place his accession no later than 720 B.C., and possibly higher according as his reign exceeded 15 years. His conquest of Egypt, clearly accomplished by his year 2, and the consequent termination of the 24th Dynasty, could have fallen no later than 719 B.C. But this presents a major difficulty. For the decade preceding 713/12 B.C. the Assyrian and Biblical records contain several allusions to Egyptian rulers¹⁰, but none of them can be interpreted as allusion to a Kushite king ruling over Egypt. The individuals referred to must, in fact, be the ephemeral or otherwise unidentified rulers belonging to pre-25th Dynasty regimes. The implication, then, is that as late as 713 B.C., when Yamani sought aid from Pir'u, Shabaka's invasion had not yet taken place. It follows that Shabaka year 1 must fall in or after 713 B.C.¹¹, and his 15th in or after 699 B.C.

One solution might be to resuscitate the old theory of a "coregency" between Shabaka and Shebitku, although in the past such a notion has won

⁸ Counting back from 691 as his last full year, Africanus's "14" will have represented a round figure for the length of his reign, as has been shown by the case of Eusebius on Africanus, and the generally inferior nature of his transmission, has long been pointed out by H. Geizer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie* (Leipzig 1898) II 23-24, 196-98.

⁹ See J. Leclant, "Égypte et Kouah: la XXV. dynastie dite 'éthiopiennne'", in *Égypte de Nubie*, *Journ. de l'Égyptologie* 68 (1978) 69-85, 85-88.

¹⁰ "A propos de l'identification de la 'Kashyris' d'Hérodote avec la ville de Gaza", in: K. van Leberghe and A. Schoors (eds.), *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 65 (Leuven 1995) 259-60.

¹¹ BN 24429; H. Gautier, *Le livre des rois* IV, 14; J. Cerny, "Phiological and Etymological Notes on the Kings of the 25th Dynasty", in: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 81 (1997) 1-11.

¹² On Šar (II Kings 17:4; E. 724 B.C.) see now G. G., "The Problem of 'Saïs' King of Egypt" in *2 Kings* xvii, 4, 7, 42 (1992) 289-30; On Šikanni (c. 716 B.C.) see Redford, *Egypt, Canaan and Israel in Ancient Times* (Princeton 1992) 347; on Pir'u Šar, *Mitrayim* (c. 713 B.C.), see Redford, *JNES* 13 (1954) 247-20.

¹³ Na'an, "Sennacherib's Letter to God" on His Campaign to Judah," *BASOR* 214 (1974) 32 and n. 29.

¹⁴ On the date of the invasion of Egypt by Sennacherib, see Redford, *JNES* 13 (1954) 247-20. The period distinguish clearly between Egyptian pharaohs (Pir'u) and kings of Kush (Šar Meliūpa) Spalinger, "The Year 712 B.C. and its Implications for Egyptian History", *JARCE* 10, (1976), 100 and n. 36.

¹⁵ The date of 715 B.C. for Shabaka's conquest of Egypt, which is still encountered in some texts, is clearly impossible, cf. D. O'Connor, "The Third Intermediate Period, 1552-664 B.C.," in *Ancient Egypt: A Social History* (Cambridge 1983) 243; D. Vahelle, *L'état et les institutions en Égypte des premiers pharaons aux empereurs ro-*

only half-hearted acceptance.¹² One is struck by the fact that, while Shabaka's dated texts (in the main private documents from the business community or the chancery, and therefore liable to date by the years of the regime in power) are relatively plentiful from the Thebad to the Delta¹³, Shebitku's are conspicuous by their absence. Only the year 3 graffiti from the Karnak quay¹⁴ is a clearly attested text germane to the problem of a coregency¹⁵. It is conceivable that, with Shabaka's conquest of the lower Nile valley, and the subsequent removal of the royal administration to Memphis, the conqueror had created the necessity of a bifurcation in the government of his vast dominion. While his own reign provided the dating scheme, Shabaka had, by his 8th year, realized the need to separate off the administration of the Kushite heartland; and this he assigned to his nephew Shebitku, complete with the trappings of kingship. One of the latter's initial acts would have been the extradition of Yamani who, as the text says, had fled *ana zai Méridja*, and had been living there ever since.

The above is suggested with a diffidence born of the knowledge of how spotty is our historical record of the period in question. A number of other solutions are conceivable, and undoubtedly will be trotted out in due time. But it is difficult now to deny that already in 705 B.C. Shebitku was a power-holder whose name could be attached to as important a policy decision as extradition.

Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations
University of Toronto
4 Bancroft Avenue
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1
Canada

¹² W. J. Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies* (Chicago 1977), 189-90; Redford, review of W. J. Murnane, *Ancient Egyptian Coregencies*, *JEA* 69 (1983) 183; Kitchen, *RAE* 34, 67. The term as used to-day sometimes refers to parallel reigns with overlapping regnal years (rare), but is also used to denote the phenomenon of a second contemporary king with royal regalia and status. The latter is attested in the 18th century, but is not attested in the 19th. The former kind of "coregency" constitutes one of the ongoing problems of the Middle Kingdom. See J. von Beckerath, "Die Chronologie der XII. Dynastie und das Problem der Behauptung der Coregency in der 19. Dynastie," *Ägypten und Nubien III* (1976) 43 ff.; R. D. Duffin, "Doubts about Double Dates and Coregency," *JEA* 2 (1986) 113-20; C. Osburn, *Sudanese Prehistoric Chronology and the History of the Nile Valley* (Paris 1995) 137-47.

¹³ J. von Beckerath, "The Nile Level Records at Komak and their Importance for the History of the Libyan Period Dynasties XXII-XXIII," *JAFCE* 5 (1985) 53-55.

¹⁴ If Shabaka passed away in 699 B.C., Shebitku would have enjoyed 9 years of sole rule, dying in his 10th, or the 10th, since his elevation to authority in Kush. It has been claimed that a stela from the reign of Shebitku, from the tomb of the official Pashoma, *Die Ägyptischen Papyriensamer des Debes* (Wiesbaden 1974) 98 and n. 27) contains a date which is not in the stela where the date was carved is now broken.

Zum Text des Tagagalaga-Briefes: Abhijaua-Frage und Textkritik*

VICTOR PARKER

I.

Das aussagekräftigste Dokument im Corpus der hethitischen Texte betreffend Abhijaua ist ohne jeden Zweifel der Tagagalaga-Brief, den wir nach einer der wichtigsten in ihm vorkommenden Personen benennen. Der Informationsgehalt dieses Briefes, welchen, wie endlich klar ist, der hethitische König Hattusili III. um die Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts an seinen Wiedertäterpart in Abhijaua schrieb, überbietet all das, was wir aus anderen Texten über Abhijaua erfahren, das ja ein mykenischer Staat gewesen sein soll. Es überrascht also nicht, daß rund die Hälfte von Ferdinand Sommers Buch über die sogenannten Abhijaua-Urkunden allein dem Tagagalaga-Brief gewidmet ist! Auch wenn Sommer in seiner Auseinandersetzung mit Emil Forrer in der Hauptsache wohl Unrecht hatte, so bleibt sein Buch trotz allem als Monument höchster philologischer Geläufigkeit bestehen. Sommers Verdienste um das Hethitische sind über jeden Zweifel erhaben, und wir tragen diesem Umstand Rechnung, indem wir noch heute nach seiner Edition der Abhijaua-Texte zitieren.

* Dieser Aufsatz stellt die überarbeitete Fassung eines Vortrages dar, den ich an den Universitäten Heidelberg und Göttingen zu Beginn des Jahres 1987 gehalten habe. Er ist dem G. A. Lehmann (Göttingen) sehr zu Dank verpflichtet. Der Vortrag schenkte sich aus einer im Sommer 1984-85 am Heidelberger Seminar für Alte Geschichte abgehaltenen Lehrveranstaltung an der Universität Göttingen. Die Korrektur des Textes nahmen dabei meine Freunde Dr. Wolfgang Bissel und Hilmar Klinger, Xanten, unbewusstweise an. Verbleibende Fehler mögen aber mir allein zur Last gelegt werden.

F. Sommer, *Die Abhijaua-Urkunden* (ABAW, N.F. 6, 1932) besetzt vehement die von Forrer vertretene Meinung, daß Abhijaua mit dem mykenischen Griechenland (E. O. Forrer, "Vorbemerkung zu den Abhijaua-Texten", *OLZ* 27 (1924) 113-118). Die meisten Forscher sind heute eher geneigt, Forrers Gleichung – mit gewissen Einschränkungen – zu akzeptieren. Anders aber vor allem G. Steiner, "Die Abhijaua-Frage heute", *Sacculum* 13 (1964) 365-392, und "Neue Gedanken über die Abhijaua-Texte", *OLZ* 39 (1964) 232-239. Meinem eigenen Standpunkt habe ich an folgenden Orten abgetan: "Die Abhijaua-Texte und die mykenischen Beziehungen", im Band *Griechische Geschichte des Handbuchs der Altertumswissenschaften* (im Druck) und "Zu den Mykeniern in Westanatolien: Abhijaua und (noch) kein Mykenisches", in *Die Mykenische Welt* (Leipzig, 1984) 113-118. Dort weitere Bibliographie. In aller Kürze: das hethitische Abhijaua ist einer der mykenischen Staaten.