

G.P.F. Broekman, R.J. Demarée and O.E. Kaper (eds.), *The Libyan Period in Egypt. Historical and Cultural Studies into the 21<sup>st</sup>–24<sup>th</sup> Dynasties: Proceedings of a Conference at Leiden University, 25–27 October 2007* (Egyptologische uitgaven XXIII), Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, Leiden & Peeters, Leuven, 2009, x + 457 pp.

Until quite recent decades, practically the 1960's, the 21<sup>st</sup>–24<sup>th</sup> Dynasties were largely disregarded in Egyptian historical studies. A new impetus was given by the three editions of K.A. Kitchen's seminal work *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt* (Warminster 1972, 1986, 1995) and by the controversies raised around his chronology, especially by D. Aston, K. Jansen-Winkel, A. Leahy, and J. Taylor. A proper handbook edition of the inscriptions dating from this period, on the model of K. Sethe – W. Helck's *Urkunden* for the 18<sup>th</sup> Dynasty and K.A. Kitchen's *Ramesside Inscriptions*, was published in 2007–2009 by K. Jansen-Winkel, *Inschriften der Spätzeit I. Die 21. Dynastie*, Wiesbaden 2007, II. *Die 22.–24. Dynastie*, Wiesbaden 2007, and III. *Die 25. Dynastie*, Wiesbaden 2009. A gathering dedicated to this period was organized in 2007 at Leiden University. The volume under review contains the proceedings of this conference held in October 2007. Its topic was the so-called Libyan period in Egypt, belonging to the Third Intermediate Period, the chronology of which has become stuck in controversies, shaking the foundations of the synthesis presented and progressively improved by K.A. Kitchen.

Chronological issues surrounding Dynasties 21–24 – the main focus of the conference – have a great importance also for the chronology of Phoenicia, Judah, and Israel, as the Old Byblian inscriptions of Abibaal and Elibaal are engraved, respectively, on the base of a statue of Shoshenq I and on a statue of Osorkon I, while the mention of Shoshenq I's campaign in Canaan in the fifth year of Rehoboam's reign at Jerusalem is an irreplaceable basis for the early chronology of both Judah and Israel. Later mentions of Egyptian kings in the 8<sup>th</sup> century B.C., both in Assyrian inscriptions and in Hebrew literary texts, also have a direct relation to chronology. The reviewer will focus below on these side aspects of Egyptian chronology in the Libyan period, since he recently dealt with related questions in his monograph *On the Skirts of Canaan in the Iron Age* (*Orientalia Lovaniensia. Analecta* 153), Leuven 2006, pp. 95–148. Comparisons and some up-dating seem, in fact, appropriate. The monograph in question will thus be quoted as *OLA 153* in the second part of the review after presenting, in its first part, the contents of this rich volume on *The Libyan Period in Egypt*.

## I. Contents

Chronology constitutes the central subject of the volume, but it also contains several valuable contributions on recent archaeological finds from the period in question. The proceedings nevertheless follow the alphabetic order of the Authors' names after a short introduction with a sympathetic photograph of the participants.

D.A. Aston, who already twenty years ago raised serious doubts about the chronology presented in K.A. Kitchen's book on *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt*, renews his criticism, focusing on Takeloth II: *Takeloth II, a King of the Herakleopolitan/Theban Twenty-Third Dynasty Revisited: The Chronology of Dynasties 22 and 23* (pp. 1–28). He lists the sources for a relative chronology, offering a useful conspectus of highest known regnal year dates, and comments on the new chronology with two options proposed by K.A. Kitchen in 2006: *The Strengths and Weaknesses of Egyptian Chronology – a Reconsideration*, in *Ägypten und Levante* 16 (2006), pp. 293–308. He also presents the alternative two chronologies of R. Krauss in E. Hornung *et al.* (eds.), *Handbook of Ancient Egyptian Chronology* (Leiden 2006). After a lengthy discussion, Aston suggests to date the beginning of the reign of Takeloth II in 834 B.C., instead of Krauss' preferred date *ca.* 845 B.C. and Kitchen's dates 852 or 847 B.C.

In her carefully illustrated contribution M.F. Ayad examines *The Transition from Libyan to Nubian Rule: The Role of the God's Wife of Amun* (pp. 29–49). She deals in particular with Shepenupet I and her immediate successor, Amenirdis I, and comments on a few selected scenes preserved in the first room of a small chapel in East Karnak, dedicated to Osiris, Ruler of Eternity. The article shows the passage from the Libyan Wife of Amon, Shepenupet I, to the Nubian one, Amenirdis I, who does not refer to her predecessor as her “mother”.

S. Bickel deals with *The Inundation Inscription in Luxor Temple* (pp. 51–55). This long inscription in hieratic script, inscribed in the reign of Osorkon III, centres entirely on a catastrophically high Nile flood in Year 3 of Osorkon III and, in an exceptional way, conveys the popular reaction to the calamity, as well as the ritual actions undertaken to protect the city and the temple. In the next paper, very well illustrated, H. Brandl attempts to date statues from the Libyan period by means of stylistic criteria: *Bemerkungen zur Datierung von libyerzeitlichen Statuen aufgrund stilistischer Kriterien* (pp. 57–89).

Chronology comes again to the foreground with the article of G.P.F. Broekman, *Takeloth III and the End of the 23<sup>rd</sup> Dynasty* (pp. 91–101). Referring to the publication of new inscriptions, he considerably lowers the reign of Takeloth III to 769–757 or 754 B.C. *The Transition between the 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> Dynasties Revisited* (pp. 103–112) is the subject of A. Dodson's contribution. Contrary to his previous opinion, he now admits that Psusennes II was a real Tanite king with a reign that was recognized at Thebes. C. Jurman deals then with another transition problem: *From the Libyan Dynasties to the Kushites in Memphis: Historical Problems and Cultural Issues* (pp. 113–138). This well illustrated article shows that the later Libyan period was an age of great cultural dynamics, making it difficult to date the beginning of the so-called “Age of Archaism” and to attribute monuments to particular reigns by means of stylistic analysis. He thus defends an opinion contrary to the one advocated by H. Brandl (pp. 57–89).

*The Transition from Libyan to Nubian Rule in Egypt: Revisiting the Reign of Tefnakht*, such is the title of D. Kahn's contribution (pp. 139–148), which aims at showing, against O. Perdu's hypothesis, that Shepses-Re Tefnakht, mentioned on two steles (p. 139,

n. 5–6), should be distinguished from Manetho's founder of the 26<sup>th</sup> Dynasty. He should instead be identified with Tefnakht, Chief of the Meshwesh and Libu tribes, the adversary of Piankhy. O.E. Kaper then examines the *Epigraphic Evidence from the Dakhleh Oasis in the Libyan Period* (pp. 149–159), which shows that the oasis was never loose from Theban control.

In a long article, entitled *The Third Intermediary Period in Egypt: an Overview of Fact & Fiction* (pp. 161–202), K.A. Kitchen maintains his slightly revised position, as explained in *Ägypten und Levante* 16 (2006), quoted above. There is a particular attention to “failed hypotheses” and “fallacies to be discarded”, and an “interim chronology” of Libyan dynasties is presented on p. 202.

E. Lange deals with *The Sed-Festival Reliefs of Osorkon II at Bubastis: New Investigation* (pp. 203–218), presenting perfect drawings of the bas-reliefs and inscriptions, and commenting on the Sed-Festival of the great temple of Bastet, enlarged and embellished by Osorkon I and Osorkon II. In the following contribution, M. LOTH re-examines the *Thebanische Totenstelen der Dritten Zwischenzeit: Ikonographie und Datierung* (pp. 219–230). Four reproduced figures illustrate his distinction of four chronologically distinguishable groups among the some 170 published steles, rarely higher than 30 cm. R. Lucarelli then examines *Popular Beliefs in Demons in the Libyan Period: The Evidence of the Oracular Amuletic Decrees* (pp. 231–239). The purpose of these religious documents, produced at Thebes during the first part of the Libyan period, is magical: they address *akhu*-spirits, male or female, *wrt*-demons, “decan-gods”, “slaughterers”, and demons “causing terror”. These beings were considered to be causes of evil in daily life. J. Lull deals thereafter with the *Beginning and End of the High Priest Menkheperre* (pp. 241–249), whose career at Thebes is reconstructed with the help of various written documents. M. Müller then examines *The ‘El-Hibeh’-Archive. Introduction & Preliminary Information* (pp. 251–264). A team of several scholars tries to reconstruct this archive from the second half of the 11<sup>th</sup> century B.C., parts of which are scattered across nine collections and only 10% so far published. El-Ahaiwah is proposed as the real provenance of the archive, but this new location is problematic according to K. Jansen-Winkel (p. 441). B. Mahs deals in the next paper with *Oracular Property Decrees in Their Historical and Chronological Context* (pp. 265–275). These decrees appear as an innovation of the 21<sup>st</sup> and early 22<sup>nd</sup> Dynasties, which aimed at confirming people and institutions in their ownership of property. This practice was short-lived and apparently applied only to properties of the royal family and of the high clergy of Amun-Re. A. Niwiński presents archaeological findings related to *The Tomb Protection in the Theban 21<sup>st</sup> Dynasty* (pp. 277–289), while F. Payraudéau deals with *Takeloth III: Considerations on Old and New Documents* (pp. 291–302). With recent discoveries duly taken into account by the Author, the reign of Takeloth III acquires additional importance, the more so because we have to reckon now with at least twelve complete years of Takeloth III's reign. P. Berlin 348 v<sup>o</sup> should nevertheless be dated from Takeloth II's reign instead of Takeloth III's, a dating opposed by K. Jansen-Winkel (p. 443).

M.C. Pérez Die presents the results of Spanish excavations of *The Third Intermediate Period Necropolis at Herakleopolis Magna* (pp. 303–326). This well illustrated contribution deals with the architecture of the tombs and with the documents uncovered. R. Ritner then discusses political *Fragmentation and Re-integration in the Third Intermediate Period* (pp. 327–340), starting from O'Connor's model of nomadic society.

T.L. Sagrillo deals with *The Geographic Origins of the 'Bubastite' Dynasty and Possible Locations for the Royal Residence and Burial Place of Shoshenq I* (pp. 341–359). This contribution is derived in part from the Author's doctoral dissertation to be published as *The Reign of Shoshenq I: Textual and Historical Analyses*. The Author suggests that Shoshenq I's residence was located in the Memphite area and that he has been buried at Mit Rahina. C.M. Sheikholeslami deals with *The End of the Libyan Period and the Resurgence of the Cult of Montu* (pp. 361–374). Her article pays a particular attention to some relatively well-documented families associated with the cult of Montu at Thebes in the time of the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty. J.H. Taylor then examines *Coffins as Evidence for a 'North-South Divide' in the 22<sup>nd</sup>–25<sup>th</sup> Dynasties* (pp. 375–415). Numerous photographs of anthropomorphic coffins illustrate the Author's distinction of a southern and a northern group. *Dating Stelae of the Libyan Period from Abydos* (pp. 417–440) is the aim of A. Leahy's contribution. The stelae discussed are thus dated between 1100 and 700 B.C. in nine distinct groupings.

A summary of the discussion sessions during the conference is presented on pp. 441–447 with a final resolution agreed by the participants and concerning the mention of the kings called Shoshenq. The kings of the 22<sup>nd</sup> Dynasty main line, bearing distinct first names, will be numbered as follows: Shoshenq I, Shoshenq IIa, Shoshenq IIb, Shoshenq IIc, Shoshenq III, Shoshenq IV, Shoshenq V. Besides, the kings of the 23<sup>rd</sup> Dynasty collateral line will be numbered Shoshenq VI and Shoshenq VIa. Very useful indexes of place names and of proper names close the volume (pp. 449–457), the importance of which does not need to be stressed. Its excellent presentation, with full footnotes at the bottom of the concerned pages, underscores its scientific value and aim.

## II. The Libyan period and the Levant

As shown by R. Krauss, *Das wś-Datum aus Jahr 5 von Shoshenq [I]*, in *Discussions in Egyptology* 62 (2005), pp. 43–48, it seems certain from a lunar date recorded on a stela of Shoshenq I, found in Dakhleh, that Shoshenq I's Year 1 correlates to 943 rather than 945 B.C., as was commonly assumed. Krauss' proposal has found an almost general acceptance, also by Chr. Bennett, *Egyptian Lunar Dates and Temple Service Months*, in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 65 (2008), col. 525–554, notwithstanding a small correction he suggested (col. 548). K.A. Kitchen nevertheless maintains 945 B.C. as the beginning of Shoshenq I's reign in his "interim chronology" (p. 202, cf. p. 167). The argument is the alleged lack of evidence for the lunar character of the *weresh*-feast referred to, but

the main reason seems to be the famous synchronism with Rehoboam, king of Judah, whose 5<sup>th</sup> year coincides with Shoshenq I's campaign in Canaan according to I Kings 14, 25-26. This campaign is dated hypothetically to Shoshenq I's penultimate regnal year, i.e. to Year 20. However, there is no prove that Rehoboam's Year 1 corresponds to 930/929 B.C., as taken for granted by K.A. Kitchen. On the contrary, in his chronology of ancient Israel and Judah, H. Tadmor proposed 928/7 B.C. as Rehoboam's Year 1 and this dating is generally followed by Israeli scholars: H. Tadmor, *Krōnōlōgyah*, in *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (in Hebrew) IV, Jerusalem 1962, col. 245–310 (see col. 301). Rehoboam's Year 5 would then correspond to 924/3 B.C., exactly to Shoshenq I's Year 20, if the latter reigned in 943–923 B.C. A longer reign is attributed to Shoshenq I by G.P.F. Broekman, who suggests dating it to 943–919 B.C. (pp. 95–96). He rightly notices that there is no *a priori* reason to assume that Shoshenq I's highest attested regnal year is at the same time his final year, but a longer reign is so far a sheer hypothesis.

The Phoenician inscription of Abibaal, king of Byblos, inscribed on the base of a statue of Shoshenq I, shows that the latter's relations with the Levant were not limited to his campaign in Canaan, as far as Megiddo. His campaign in the Negeb, recorded on the Bubastite Portal, was most likely a different one and the one in the area of Gezer, recorded as well, was probably an earlier one, alluded to in I Kings 9, 16. The reviewer has discussed these problems in *OLA 153*, pp. 99–104, and there is no need to re-examine them here.

The reign of Shoshenq I came to an abrupt end and Egyptian sources shade no light on Osorkon I's (923–890 B.C.) relations with his eastern neighbours. Like his father, he gave a bust of himself to the king of Byblos, Elibaal, who followed the example of Abibaal by dedicating the figure to the Lady of Byblos. Also Osorkon II maintained relations with Byblos, where a fragment of his statue was found, and with Israel, where Osorkon II's cartouches on parts of a large alabaster vase from Samaria witness diplomatic exchanges at the time of Ahab (*OLA 153*, pp. 130–132). Lower dates proposed for Osorkon II, 874–ca. 840 B.C. by K.A. Kitchen (p. 202), 875/872–842 B.C. or 864/861–831 by R. Krauss (pp. 22 and 26), and 872–842 by G.P.F. Broekman (p. 92), may exclude the time of Omri. This depends on the length of the reigns of Takeloth I and of the kings Shoshenq IIa, Shoshenq IIb, and Shoshenq IIc, placed between Osorkon I and Takeloth I (cf. pp. 21–22). At any rate, a correction is required in *OLA 153*, p. 133.

The alabaster vases with the cartouches of Osorkon II, Takeloth II, and Shoshenq III, found at Almuñécar, Spain, in graves from the 7<sup>th</sup> century B.C., may have been brought from Phoenicia, where they had possibly been sent as gifts to a Levantine king by the Libyan pharaohs of the 9<sup>th</sup> century B.C. This scenario is suggested by the alabaster vase with the cartouche of a 22<sup>nd</sup>-Dynasty king, brought from Sidon by Esarhaddon (VA. Ass 2258). However, the cartouche of the Hyksos king '3-*wsr-R*' Apophis and the name of the princess *T3w3.t* from the first half of the second millennium B.C. appear on other alabaster vases from Almuñécar. It is likely therefore that they all came directly from Tanis or other sites in the eastern Nile Delta, like some similar Egyptian alabaster vases found in southern Spain.

As for the Egyptian “tribute” sent to Shalmaneser III after 841 B.C., it can further be linked to Takeloth II, even if the latter’s reign is dated to *ca.* 834–810 B.C., but the reign of Harsiese A becomes an alternative, if the latter is placed in *?-ca.* 834 B.C. (p. 26).

The Tang-i Var inscription of Sargon II, published by G. Frame, *The Inscription of Sargon II at Tang-i Var*, in *Orientalia* 68 (1999), pp. 31–57, indicates that Shebitko was already king of Egypt in 707/6 B.C. K.A. Kitchen’s discussion of this inscription (pp. 162–164) aims obviously at defending his chronology of the 25<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, for which he distinguishes a rule of Shebitko in Egypt (702–690 B.C.) from his rule in Cush (715–702 B.C.). This is repeated in various publications, also in the collective work *The Books of Kings* (SVT 129), Leiden 2010, pp. 379–380. Evidence shows nevertheless that Assyrian scribes called “king of Meluhha” the Cushite ruler of Egypt, not the king of distant Nubia, eventually requested by Sargon II to extradite Yamani of Ashdod, who had fled to Egypt in 712 B.C. This does not mean of course that the Assyrians had no knowledge of the Cushite empire in Sudan, since even biblical texts, datable to the 8<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C., allude to the far-away land of Saba/Soba (cf. *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 5 [1992], pp. 141–142). However, Sargon’s request in 707/6 B.C. makes more sense if this was Shebitko’s accession year. In fact, one may surmise that earlier Assyrian attempts to extradite Yamani, made at the time of Shabako, have been unsuccessful. Year 707/6 B.C. is thus rightly regarded as Year 1 of Shebitko, without resorting to Kitchen’s purely speculative distinction of Cushite and Egyptian regnal periods.

Since Shebitko was king in 707/6–690 B.C., Shabako, who reigned for fifteen years, acceded to the throne in 722/1 (p. 20) or rather in 721/20 B.C. At that time, however, there was still a king at Tanis, namely Osorkon IV, who found it expedient in 716 B.C. to send a tributary gift of horses to Sargon II, to buy him off. He cannot be identified with “So, king of Egypt”, as claimed by K.A. Kitchen (p. 161 and *The Books of Kings*, p. 378), because the Septuagint indicates that an earlier version of II Kings 17, 4 read “to Sais, the city of the king of Egypt” (*OLA* 153, pp. 133–134). The king in question must have been Tefnakht I, Piankhy’s adversary. As a matter of fact, K.A. Kitchen continues to call Piye the Cushite ruler Piankhy (pp. 161–162), despite the rehabilitation of the ancient reading “Piankhy” by C. Rilly, *Une nouvelle interprétation du nom royal Piankhy*, in *Bulletin de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale* 101 (2001), pp. 351–368.

K.A. Kitchen’s tendentious interpretation of the title “king of Meluhha” reappears in the case of Taharqo (pp. 161–164), who became king in 690 B.C. and could not lead the Egyptian army at Eltekeh, in 701 B.C., as written in II Kings 19, 9 and Is. 37, 9. Besides, nothing justifies D. Kahn’s hypothesis that Taharqo was sent to Philistia by his brother Shebitko (cf. p. 145). Sennacherib’s annals indicate clearly that “the king of Meluhha” headed a coalition of “kings of Egypt”, his vassals. There can be no doubt that this was Shebitko in person. Should Taharqo have led Egyptian troops in the battle of Eltekeh, he would at least have mentioned it in his inscriptions, just as he recorded his journey to Thebes and his coming to Lower Egypt. The mention of Taharqo in II Kings 19, 9 and Is. 37, 9 is therefore an error, easily explainable by the fact that the

account was written later, under the assumption that Taharqo was already king of Egypt in 701 B.C. (*OLA 153*, pp. 144–145). He was well-known in the Levant, since he even imported cedar and juniper wood from Lebanon (cf. p. 146 with former D. Kahn's publications): Taharqo's setback in Egypt occurred only in 671 B.C., following the Assyrian invasion. He retired then to Nubia. The discovery of inscribed evidence with the name of Taharqo inside the exceptional pyramid W T1 at Sedeinga, to the north of the third cataract, suggests that he has been buried there. His mention in the II Kings 19, 9 and in the parallel passage of Is. 37, 9 is thus based on an account apparently postdating the events of 701 B.C. by several years. Taharqo's name could no longer be spelled properly at that time (*OLA 153*, p. 144, n. 271).

K.A. Kitchen's translation of "king of Meluhha/Cush" by "prince in Nubia" (p. 163) and D. Kahn's hypothesis of Taharqo's command at Eltekeh seem to aim at defending, at any cost, the historicity of a detail in the biblical account. The use of the term "Cush" in this context corresponds to the terminology of Gen. 10, 7 and I Chron. 1, 9, where Shebitko (*Sbtk'*) is listed among the sons of Cush, probably after Shabako (*Sbth*, a possible misspelling for *Sbkh*).

*The Libyan Period in Egypt* is undoubtedly an important tool for all scholars dealing with Egypt in the 10<sup>th</sup>–7<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C. Not only chronology, but also history of art, law, and religion are treated in valuable contributions, published less than two years after the Leiden conference. The editors and the publisher should be thanked for their endeavour and congratulated.

*Edward Lipiński*

Zygmunt Frajzyngier, *Studies in Chadic Morphology and Syntax* (Collection Afrique et Langage 4), Peeters, Louvain-Paris 2002, XII + 295 pp.

Zygmunt Frajzyngier is a well-known specialist of Chadic languages, working since almost half a century on these idioms, which constitute the largest family of the Afro-Asiatic phylum. His first publication, known to the reviewer, appeared in "Rocznik Orientalistyczny" 29/2 (1965), pp. 31–51. Its subject was the intensive form in Hausa verbs. The volume under review reproduces fourteen comparative and descriptive studies dealing with the syntax and morphology of the simple clause in Chadic, first published between 1977 and 1987 in various journals, proceedings of conferences, and collective works. Among the issues discussed in the volume is the basic or underlying form of verbs in West Chadic (pp. 1–26). The Author proposes that it was made of the consonants and of one vowel, thus having one of the forms CV, CVC, CVCC, or CCVC. This is an important issue, which also concerns the Semitic verbs, for the reviewer regards the current conception of three-, eventually two-consonantal roots as inadequate. The following paper on *West Chadic Verb Classes* (pp. 27–42) provides support for the hypothesis about