

## Appendix B

### Hedjkheppere Sheshonk – A Reevaluation

As early as the year 2000<sup>1</sup>, this author came to the conclusion that a king named Hedjkheperre Sheshonk ruled in the north of Egypt between Sheshonk III (712-673) and Pemapu (660-654 B.C.) That conclusion was unavoidable for three reasons.

1. In the first place the revised history being developed in the online version of *Nebuchadnezzar & the Egyptian Exile* had already determined that the 22<sup>nd</sup> dynasty king Sheshonk III ruled in Egypt during the years 712-673 B.C. Several Serapeum stela demanded that a gap of 26 years must exist between the 28<sup>th</sup> year of this king and the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of one of his successors, named Pemapu, whose reign lasted at least six years.<sup>2</sup> This necessitated assigning to Pemapu the regnal years 660-654 B.C., leaving a gap of 13 years in the chronology of the “22<sup>nd</sup> dynasty” that needed to be filled. Since much of this gap (673-660 B.C.) overlapped the first ten years of the Assyrian occupation of Egypt, and since the Assyrian annals of Ashurbanipal named a “*Su-si-in-qu, king of Bu-si-ru*” as one of the appointed rulers in the north of Egypt during these years, it followed that this otherwise unknown Sheshonk must be the missing king. At this point the second consideration came into play.

2. Our revised chronology had already determined that the 22<sup>nd</sup> dynasty did not begin in Egypt around the year 945 B.C. as argued by traditionalist Egyptologists. Its dates had to be reduced, minimally, by the identical 121 years applied to the 23<sup>rd</sup> through 26<sup>th</sup> dynasties, a reduction supported by a book full of evidence. This meant, in turn, that the king Sheshonk I from the Pasenhor genealogy could not be the biblical Sheshak who attacked Jerusalem in the days of Rehoboam, son of Solomon, in the late 10<sup>th</sup> century. Of necessity the 22<sup>nd</sup> dynasty began, at the earliest, well over a century later. It followed from these considerations that there were absolutely no grounds for maintaining the fiction that the king Hedjkheperre Sheshonk who authored the Bubastite wall inscription must be identified as Sheshonk I. But if he was not Sheshonk I, then where did he fit into our revised historical sequence, and what was the nature of the attack on Palestinian cities described on his wall inscription? One consideration at least

---

<sup>1</sup>The online publication of *Nebuchadnezzar & the Egyptian Exile* was begun on May 1, 2000 and was completed Dec. 31 that same year.

<sup>2</sup>See note 64, page 58 in the printed version of *Nebuchadnezzar* published earlier this year (A.D. 2008).

suggested that the wall inscription was inscribed around the end of the first quarter of the 7<sup>th</sup> century. If so, then Hedjkheperre Sheshonk, its author, must have reigned in this time frame. What was this consideration?

At least a year before composing the third chapter of the first book in A.D. 2000, I became convinced that both sides of the Bubastite wall/gate complex (the section between the 2nd pylon and the small temple of Ramses III) were inscribed within a short time of one another, and likely very soon after its construction - the inside by Prince Osorkon (whose revised dates before he assumed the kingship are c.a.705-673) and the outside by Hedjkheperre Sheshonk, who must have been a contemporary of Prince Osorkon. [Traditionalist Egyptologists must explain why the outside of the wall was inscribed first, supposedly in ca. 940 B.C., while the inside of the wall, that which is typically inscribed first, was left blank for well over a century, from the time of Shishak till the time of prince Osorkon (c.a. 800 B.C.)].

The Sheshonk inscription, in my opinion, predates the Chronicle of prince Osorkon by at most a few months. It may even have been inscribed slightly later. The Chronicle was composed in the last years of Osorkon's tenure as HPA, thus shortly before 673 B.C. The Bubastite wall had just been completed, or was in the process of completion. The inscription of king Hedjkheperre Sheshonk, which adorned the outside of the gateway portal, was very likely part of the finishing work of the construction. It must also date around 673 B.C. It no doubt predates the 671 B.C. conquest by Esarhaddon, and perhaps records cities subjugated by Egypt in the immediate aftermath of the brief but illusory Egyptian victory over Esarhaddon in 674 B.C. Other interpretations, of course, are possible.

3. A final consideration, that which early on convinced this author absolutely that the king Sheshonk who ruled in the interval between Sheshonk III and Peme was named Hedjkheperre, is the data on the Pasenhor genealogy discussed in our Appendix A. Based on the alternative interpretation given to the Petrie version of the genealogy, we had already determined the possibility that a king named Hedjkheperre Sheshonk, with most of the family connections wrongly assigned to Sheshonk I in the traditional history, lived and ruled in Egypt early in the second quarter of the 7<sup>th</sup> century. Pasenhor's stele was erected in the 37<sup>th</sup> year of Sheshonk V (654-618 B.C.), thus in the last year of that king's life (618 B.C.). On the assumption that Pasenhor was at the time a young priest, say 20 years of age, and that a generation in priestly circles amounted to roughly 20 years, then Pasenhor

must have been born around 638 B.C. and Nimlot, in the 5<sup>th</sup> generation back, was born around 738 B.C. The birth of Hedjkheperre Sheshonk, the son of Nimlot, would therefore date around 718 B.C., and he would have been around 45 years of age when he replaced Sheshonk III in Bubastis in 673 B.C., if indeed he ruled in Bubastis. These calculation are admittedly crude, but well within reason.

Having reached these conclusions early in the year 2000 it was particularly gratifying to hear, three years later, that an influential Egyptologist had independently come to the same conclusion, using other evidence.<sup>3</sup> In 1993 Aidan Dodson published an article in the journal *Gottinger Miszellen* entitled “A new King Shoshenq confirmed?”<sup>4</sup>, in which he argued the existence of a “second” Hedjkheperre Sheshonk ruling precisely in the interval between Sheshonk III and Pemay (his Pami). We leave it to our readers to peruse the article and follow the gist of his reasoning for themselves. Sufficient here to note the one aspect of his argument with which we strongly disagree. Dodson maintains the traditionalist view that the first king of the 22<sup>nd</sup> dynasty was also named Hedjkheperre Sheshonk, that this king authored the Bubastite inscription and must be identified with the king Sheshak who attacked Jerusalem in the days of Rehoboam. Nothing essential has changed in the traditional history, which still believes that the 22<sup>nd</sup> dynasty began with the reign of this “first” Hedjkheperre Sheshonk in the latter half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century. The “newly discovered” Hedjkheperre is a namesake king only, whose pedigree is yet to be determined. Egyptologists, who have universally endorsed Dodson’s argument, now refer to this newly discovered king as Sheshonk IV, renumbering the obscure king who formerly bore this number as Sheshonk VI.

Shortly after the publication of chapter 3 of *Nebuchadnezzar* I received an e-mail from one critic informing me that I had not incorporated into my chronological outline Dodson’s second king Hedjkheperre Sheshonk. My online response to that criticism is reproduced below.

“I am aware of Dodson's recent claim that a 2nd Hedjkheperre Sheshonk ruled in Egypt following Sheshonk III. The fact that I make no mention of this king in *Nebuchadnezzar & the Egyptian Exile* is consistent with the summary treatment of the entire 22nd dynasty provided in that revision. I avoid all 22nd dynasty history prior to Osorkon II and I had no intention of opening a Pandora's box by identifying the conjectured successor of Sheshonk

---

<sup>3</sup>It has recently come to this author’s attention that the historical revisionist David Rohl, several years earlier than 2000, had already concluded that there existed a second Hedjkheperre Sheshonk ruling after Sheshonk III. What is unique to this revision is the time frame in which this king lived and perhaps our conclusions regarding the pedigree of this king.

<sup>4</sup>GM 137 (1993) 53-58.

III, so I left a gap of 13 years between the death of Sheshonk III in ca. 673 B.C. and the beginning of the reign of Pemay in c.a. 660 B.C. But I am well aware that another Sheshonk ruled in that time slot (along with multiple other local dynasts throughout Egypt). That time frame corresponds to the beginning of the Assyrian occupation and it is clear from the Assyrian annals that a "Su-si-in-qu, king of Bu-si-ru" governed the north central delta from Busiris during those critical years, precisely in the interval between the death of Sheshonk III and the advent of Pemay. The conclusion that this king is the Hedjkheperre Sheshonk identified by Aidan Dodson is inescapable. What will be more surprising to you, and to traditionalist and revisionist historians alike, is my belief that this Hedjkheperre is the author of the inscription on the Bubastite Portal of the Karnak temple, that which is typically credited to Hedjkheperre Sheshonk I and which (wrongly) serves to identify him as the 10th century contemporary of Rehoboam of Judah. The matter will be discussed briefly in my second book.

In the recently revised and published paper version of *Nebuchadnezzar & the Egyptian Exile* (2008) the table outlining the kings of the 22<sup>nd</sup> dynasty is left precisely as it was published on-line in the year 2000. The blank between Sheshonk III and Pemay is left unfilled, save for question marks and a note at the bottom of the page stating that "A name will be supplied in the second book of our series".

We might conclude this discussion at this point save for two features of the reign of our Hedjkheperre Sheshonk which are sure to provoke a response from the critics. The first concerns his reign length and the second relates to our earlier discussion regarding the bodies in DB320. We briefly discuss these two issues, in the order cited.

The Reign Length of the second Hedjkheperre. We have argued that Hedjkheperre Sheshonk ruled in Busiris during the first ten years of the Assyrian domination of Egypt and that he must therefore be the king who fills the thirteen year gap between the death of Sheshonk III and the beginning of the reign of Pemay (673-660 B.C.). We have further argued that he authored the Bubastite gate inscription around the beginning of this time frame. All would be well and good save for several inscriptions bearing his name that assign to him upwards of 21 regnal years, and one in particular, the so-called Silsila stela (see above, p. 286) which suggests that the Bubastite wall/gate construction must be dated sometime around his 21<sup>st</sup> year. These two scenarios are clearly not compatible. How do we solve this problem?

The most straightforward solution is to assume that Hedjkheperre actually began ruling in Egypt as early as 694 B.C., though certainly not in Bubastis, the seat of government for the 22<sup>nd</sup> dynasty king Sheshonk III. His "reign" may have been

nothing more than an auxiliary position in support of his relative<sup>5</sup>, and was perhaps located in nearby Busiris, where the Assyrians later positioned him as a regional governmental official. We remind the reader that the whole of Egypt at this time was in turmoil. It was a chaotic period we termed the “great disruption” in the first book of our series. Multiple claimants for kingships and high priesthoods struggled for power. Kings from four different dynasties, the 20<sup>th</sup> through the 23<sup>rd</sup>, claimed parts of Egypt as their own, each amounting to little more than a nomarchy. According to our admittedly crude calculation on page 296 above, Hedjkheperre Sheshonk was born around 718 B.C. In 694 he would be around 24 years old., a reasonable age for an ambitious young man to reckon himself a king.

But if Hedjkheperre conceived of his reign as beginning in 694 B.C., and if he is the Sheshonk who ruled in Busiris during the Assyrian occupation, then his reign continued at least through the year 667, the time when the Assyrian annals records that name. Thus his reign lasted at least into his 28<sup>th</sup> year. Where are the documents attesting this extended reign? If he ruled through to the time of Pemalech in 660, his 35<sup>th</sup> year, the difficulty is compounded. How do we explain the absence of monuments beyond his 21<sup>st</sup> year? Again the answer is straightforward.

Very few of the Egyptian “kings and regents” listed in the Assyrian annals have recorded these years of captivity, and small wonder. They may have been called kings by the Assyrians, but they had limited power. We assume they authored few, if any, monuments. The king named Limintu in the Assyrian annals, who ruled in Hermopolis, may well be a known son of our Hedjkheperre Sheshonk named Nimlot, who functioned during the earlier years of his father in nearby Heracleopolis as “Leader of the entire army” (TIP 246-7). No records have been found documenting an Assyrian king by this name. Certainly none which entitle him as a king. Another Assyrian conscript is named “Buaima (or Puaima) king of Pitinti”. If this is Pemalech, son and successor of Sheshonk III, as we suspect, then Pemalech did not regard these years under Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal as worthy of mention. For reasons unknown he began counting his years as of 660 B.C. We assume, though we cannot prove, that Sheshonk IV (Hedjkheperre) considered his reign to have effectively ended when in 671 B.C. Esarhaddon invaded Egypt and dispossessed its kings. How long he served under the Assyrians is unknown.

---

<sup>5</sup>We have adopted the position that Sheshonk III and Takeloth II, both of whom ruled in parts of Egypt in 694 B.C., were both sons of Osorkon II. Our Sheshonk IV was a maternal grandson of Osorkon II according to our interpretation of the Pasenhor stele.

The Bodies in DB320. Many times already we have referred to the bodies of famous dynastic kings hidden by the “21<sup>st</sup> dynasty” Theban priest/kings in a tomb near Deir el-Bahri near Thebes. The first and only time we described this cache we quoted from Gardiner regarding its discovery and extent (see above, p. 145). Gardiner’s concluding remarks bear repeating.

Among the latest burials were those of Pinudjem II and his already-mentioned spouse Neskhnons. After them the cache was sealed up in the tenth year of the Tanite king Siamun, but *was reopened once more in the reign of King Shoshenk I in order to inter a priest of Amun named Djedptahef’onkh.* EP320-21 (italics added)

Our concern at this time is with the 3<sup>rd</sup> prophet of Amun named Djedptahefankh. His remains have spawned an extensive debate among students of Egyptian history, both professional and otherwise. The debate concerns not so much the identity of this individual, as it does the implications of his presence in the tomb on the timeline of the final days of the DB320 cache, as well as argument regarding the original owner of the tomb itself. Curiously, these questions do not concern us here. Instead we wonder about the accuracy of Gardiner’s final remarks, and the precise identity of this priest. Who is he? And why was he deemed so important that the DB320 tomb, supposedly sealed near the end of the 21<sup>st</sup> dynasty, was reopened early in the reign of Sheshonk I of the 22<sup>nd</sup> dynasty, with the sole purpose of depositing his body. We speak here, of course, from the point of view of the traditional history? Critics supportive of that history argue from his presence that the 22<sup>nd</sup> dynasty king Sheshonk I followed successively on the heels of the 21<sup>st</sup> dynasty, a counter-argument to our present thesis. What is our response to this potential criticism of our revised timeline?

There is no problem providing the answer. A single sentence should suffice. *Djedptahefankh was not the last body deposited in the DB320 tomb.* He may even have been among the first. Gardiner is mistaken in his quoted comment. The body of Djedptahefankh was buried deep within the DB320 tomb. The arrangement of bodies and coffers in the shaft tomb, when it was first accessed by authorities, totally contradicts Gardiner’s claim the the body of the 3<sup>rd</sup> prophet was a late intrusion. At minimum critics may argue that many of the DB320 bodies were moved from other locations into DB320, along with that of Djedptahefankh, this taking place sometime during the reign of Sheshonk I. But even this notion would deny the critic’s claim that the death of Djedptahefankh necessarily postdates the death of Pinudjem II, or other late 21<sup>st</sup> Theban dynasty dignitaries who are also

cached in this tomb, and often very much nearer the tomb entrance. Our thesis that Djedkheperre died early, probably before the Assyrian invasion, is in no way contradicted by the evidence in the tomb. If anything, the location of the bodies argues in favor of the fact that Hedjkheperre Sheshonk, who inscribed several of the bandages on the mummy of Djedptahefankh, must precede in time the reign of Pinudjem II..<sup>6</sup>

As mentioned, the connection of Djedkheperre with Hedjkheperre Sheshonk IV (not I) derives from several of the bandage wrappings on the mummy, which contain inscriptions stating that the linen was made by, or dedicated by, king Hedjkheperre Sheshonk (both names are present) and by his high priestly son Iupet. The dates on the bandages range from year 5 to year 11. This implies that Djedptahefankh died sometime soon after the 11<sup>th</sup> year of Hedjkheperre Sheshonk, in the revised history 684 B.C. on the assumption that 694 B.C. was his first regnal year.

Though Hedjkheperre Sheshonk IV ruled in the north of Egypt, his son Iupet was apparently the high priest of Amun in the south, and Djedptahefankh, as 3<sup>rd</sup> prophet of Amun would be a functionary under Iupet in the Theban temple. It is therefore not surprising that when this dignitary died his superior performed the burial rites, using materials provided by and endorsed by himself. He undoubtedly added the inscriptions in his father's name. Thirty years later, perhaps more, Djedptahefankh's tomb was robbed by the Theban priest/kings, relatives of Menkheperre. The body was removed and deposited either in DB320 or elsewhere, whence it arrived at its present location.

---

<sup>6</sup>Apparently late in the 20<sup>th</sup> century the revisionist David Rohl argued this very thesis and was severely criticized for his efforts. Unfortunately I am unaware of the precise context of his remarks.