

Appendix J

Urud-Amun and Ta-Nuat-Amun

One of the more confusing parts of the chronology of Egypt during the transition period from Dynasty XXV to Dynasty XXVI has been the confounding of the Kushite kings Urud-Amun (i.e., Urdamani, Urdamane, Rud-Amun, Rudaman, Urd-Amani, etc.) and Ta-Nuat-Amun (Tanuatamun, Tantamani, Tanwet-Aman, and so forth). Based solely on the fact that some of the records of Ta-Nuat-Amun have been found, Egyptologists have incorrectly merged his identity with a lesser known king named Urud-Amun (Rud-Amun), who is found only in the Assyrian records as a Kushite ruler of Egypt who took the throne of Tarkû II (Taharqa II) upon the latter's death.¹ A number of Egyptologists have even gone so far as to retranslate the name Urdamane in the Assyrian records to read Tantamani,² interpreted to mean Ta-Nuat-Amun, despite the fact that the cuneiform reading clearly has Urdamane (𐎲𐎠𐎺𐎠𐎠𐎺𐎠),³ i.e., Urud-Amun.

In the Assyrian records of Assurbanipal, we read that Urdamane, the son of Shabakû, came to a throne of Kush upon the death of Tarkû II (Taharqa II):

Tarkû, the terror of the weapon of Assur, my sovereign, overwhelmed him and the fate of his night (death) overtook him. Thereupon, Urdamane, the son of Shabakû (Shabaqo), seated himself on the royal throne. He made Ni' (Thebes) and Unu (Heliopolis) his fortress and arrayed his armed might. He assembled his forces. He mustered his battle(-experienced soldiers) to attack my troops, the Assyrians who were stationed at Memphis. He surrounded them and cut off their exits. A swift messenger came to Nineveh and told me about this.⁴

Other versions of this story prove that Taharqa II is now identified by the Assyrians only as "Tarkû, the king of Kush," i.e., part of Upper Egypt and northern Kush Proper,⁵ and no longer was "the king of Egypt and Kush."⁶ It

¹ HACL, pp. 47, l. 67, 52, l. 62, 53, l. 68, 55, l. 72.

² E.g., ARAB, 2, §§775-777, 845, 906, 944, 1117. ANET, pp. 295, 297, correctly uses "Urdamane"; HACL, p. 47, l. 67, p. 52, l. 62, p. 53, l. 68, p. 55, l. 72, uses "Ur-da-ma-ne-e" and translates the name to be "Rudammon," i.e., Rud-Amun.

³ HACL, pp. 47, l. 67, p. 52, l. 62, p. 53, l. 68, p. 55, l. 72.

⁴ *Rassam Cylinder*, see ANET, p. 295; ARAB, 2, §775.

⁵ See Chap. XI. Because the region of Thebes was now in the hands of the Assyrians, the name "Kush" applied rather than "*Meluhha*."

⁶ During his first campaign, when Assurbanipal defeated Taharqa II, he called him "the king of Egypt and Kush" (ARAB, 2, §§770f, 875). After Taharqa II had been driven back to Kush and

is indicative of the fact that the Kushites had lost Lower Egypt to the Assyrians. Thereby, when we subsequently read that after the death of Taharqa II, “Urdamane, the son of Shabakû, seated himself on the royal throne,” it is understood that he only took possession of a throne in Kush and part of Upper Egypt. Subsequently, Urdamane (Urud-Amun) invaded Egypt, which during that year was under the control of the Assyrians.

Assurbanipal adds that Urdamane was the son of Shabakû while his mother was Taharqa’s sister.⁷ With this marriage, the two royal families—that of Kashta, in the person of his son Shabaqo, and that of Alara, in the person of Piye’s daughter, the sister of Taharqa II—merged into a single royal line. In the Ethiopian King List, Kashta’s line was considered a direct descendant of Menelik I and claims that his bloodline had merged with the most famous Kushite ruler of all, Tsawi Terhaq (Terhak), i.e., Taharqa I (Piye). Indeed, the purpose of the Ethiopian King List, which mentions both Taharqa I (Piye) and the contemporary line of Kashta, was to prove that the more recent kings of Ethiopia, from whom Haile Selassie I (1930-1974 C.E.) later descended, were derived from these two important king lines. As a result, Haile Selassie was able to make the claim that he was descended from both the line of Alara, through the famous King Tirhaqah Piye, and King Menelik I, who was the son of King Solomon and the Kushite queen Makeda.⁸ Queen Makeda, they claim, was the famous Queen of Shaba (Saba, Sheba) who visited Solomon in Judah after the Temple of Yahweh and the Palace of Solomon were completed.⁹

then subsequently once more invaded Egypt, he is only called “the king of Kush” (ARAB, 2, §§772, 844, 892, 900–902, 906 (cf. 844f).

⁷ ARAB, 2, §775, “the son of Shabakû”; ARAB, 2, §1117, “son of the sister of Tarkû,” cf. 2, §§844f, 906, 944.

⁸ AENCC, p. 176.

⁹ 1 Kings 10:1–13; 2 Chron., 9:1–12. Josephus twice notes that she ruled as the “queen of Egypt and Ethiopia” (Jos., *Antiq.*, 8:6.2, 5), not just Shaba (Saba, Sheba) in Ethiopia (Nubia, Kush). In the NT she is identified as the “queen of the south” (Matt., 12:42; Luke, 11:31), a common expression for Egypt and Ethiopia. Josephus is even more specific when he writes, “Saba, the capital of the Ethiopian realm, which Cambyses later called Meroe after the name of his sister” (Jos., *Antiq.*, 2:10:2 §§249–253). The land of Shaba was named after Shaba (Saba), the son of Kush. From Shaba descended the Sabaeans (Jos., *Antiq.*, 1:6:2 §§134f). He adds that this branch of the “Ethiopians” were “neighbors of the Egyptians” (Jos., *Antiq.*, 2:10:1). It was from this region that, “the afore-mentioned woman as queen of Egypt and Ethiopia came to Solomon” (Jos., *Antiq.*, 8:6.2). Josephus adds that Herodotus called her “Nikau-le” (Jos., *Antiq.*, 8:6.2), and our present copies have Nitok-ri-s (Herodotus, 2:99f). Nikau-le (Nikau-re) is merely a dialectic form of Ma’ka-re^c or Maekau-re (the *n* and *m* and the *r* and *l* sounds being interchangeable in the Egyptian language). The Ethiopian King List calls her Makeda (= Make-ra, the *r* and *d* sounds being interchangeable), see CBN, p. 266, Dynasty III, no. LII; Kebra Nagast, 26. This point directly connects this queen to Queen Ma’ka-re^c Hashepsowe (Hatshepsut), the famous queen of Shaba and Egypt who came to the throne of Ethiopia during the first year of her co-regency with her brother Thutmose II. Her throne name Ma’ka-re^c is also transliterated as *Maatka-re* (e.g., HFP, pp. 99, 104, 264; AHENA, 1, p. xv), which explains the Greek form Nitok-ri-s. According to Josephus, the Pharaoh who was the father-in-law of Solomon was the last Egyptian king known only as “Pharaoh” in Scriptures (Jos., *Antiq.*, 8:6.2). In this regard, Thutmose II was the Pharaoh who lived contemporary with King Solomon and who gave one of his daughters in marriage to the Israelite king (1 Kings, 3:1, 7:8, 9:16, 11:1; 1 Chron., 8:11). After him appears the name Shishak, king of Egypt (Josephus “Σουσακος, Ἰσακον,” “Ἀσωχάιος”; LXX “Σουσακιμ”), 1 Kings, 11:40, 14:25; 2 Chron., 12:2–9; Jos., *Wars*, 6:10:1 §436, *Antiq.*, 7:5:3 §105, 8:8:8 §210, 8:10:2 §§253–255, 8:10:3 §258, 8:10:4 §263, i.e., Thutmose III, the son of Thutmose II. Popular chronology used today has greatly distorted the time of these kings.

Supporting the fact that these two royal families merged, we find inscriptions composed by later kings of this royal line proclaiming the glory of Alara as the dynasty's most important founder.¹⁰ It was Alara who gave them the powerful ruler Taharqa Piye, the only Ethiopian king to create a great empire that stretched across a large area of the Near East and North Africa.¹¹ The text also mentions the Kushite king Kashta, the descendant of Menelik I, who first settled in Upper Egypt and placed his own son, Shabaqo, as a Pharaoh of Upper Egypt.¹²

To fully understand who Urud-Amun and Ta-Nuat-Amun were, we must examine how recent scholars have mistakenly merged them into one person. The idea that King Urdamane of the Assyrian records was Ta-Nuat-Amun begins with the assumption that only one Kushite king could have ruled Upper Egypt after the death of Taharqa II. Three items of evidence are brought forward. First, no one has found any documents or inscriptions belonging to a Kushite king named Urdamane (Urud-Amun, Rud-Amun) in the records from either Egypt or Kush. This claim, though, is of little value since there are numerous kings from these regions whose records have not yet come to light and many otherwise unknown kings and queens whose records have only recently been discovered.

Second, Ta-Nuat-Amun is accredited 9 years of rulership over Thebes.¹³ Therefore, it is believed, Ta-Nuat-Amun must have reigned from the death of Taharqa II and to beyond the conquest of Thebes by Psamtik I during his 8th year (657 B.C.E.).¹⁴ Indeed, Psamtik I of Sais (Dynasty XXVI) recounts that by the 1st month of his 9th year he had already taken control of Thebes.¹⁵ This evidence makes the 9th year of both Psamtik I and Ta-Nuat-Amun the same year (656 B.C.E.). Both reigns would be counted from 663 B.C.E., the year following the 26th and last full year of Taharqa II.

Third, at the beginning of his Year 9 (655 B.C.E.), Psamtik I of Dynasty XXVI was able to force Amenirdis II, the daughter of Taharqa II, to adopt his eldest daughter, Nitocris, so that Nitocris would become the next divine votress, wife of the deity Amun in the temple in Thebes.¹⁶ This adoption legitimized Psamtik I's rule over Upper Egypt.¹⁷ He no longer called himself merely "Lord of the Two Lands," as he did in his Year 8 inscription,¹⁸ but, as well, "the King of Upper and Lower Egypt."¹⁹ At the same time, in an inscription of Ta-Nuat-Amun, dated to Year 8, 3rd month of Peret (i.e., 7th month of the

¹⁰ Especially see FHN, 2, Stela of Nastasen, Year 8, pp. 476f, l. 7–10, p. 478, l. 13–16; TK, p. 58, Kawa IX, l. 54. László Török writes, "Alara's memory was evoked by his fifth successor Taharqa as founder of his dynasty" (KK, p. 257); also see TK, p. 16, l. 15–18, p. 36, l. 22–24.

¹¹ See above App. H and Chap. XII.

¹² FHN, 2, p. 418, l. 115, p. 419, l. 116.

¹³ SAK, 10, p. 327, and figs 1, 2, pl. 20/a.

¹⁴ See App. K.

¹⁵ Adoption Stela, see LAIE, pp. 575–582, esp. p. 579, l. 6–11.

¹⁶ Adoption Stela, see LAIE, pp. 575–582.

¹⁷ See App. I.

¹⁸ LAIE, p. 583.

¹⁹ LAIE, p. 579, l. 6, 13, 14, 15.

year), he refers to himself as "the King of Upper and Lower Egypt."²⁰ A transfer of authority appears to have occurred when Psamtik I legitimized his rulership by placing his daughter as the deity's wife of Amun at Thebes. Ta-Nuat-Amun, thus, becomes the last Kushite king to actually rule Egypt.

From these details present-day scholars concluded that Ta-Nuat-Amun had to be identified with Urdamane of the Assyrian records. All of the relationships connected with Ta-Nuat-Amun were then grafted into the story based upon this assumed connection. Ta-Nuat-Amun, thus, became the son of Shabakû (or as others argue the son of Shebitku) and the sister of Taharqa II. Qalhata, the mother of Ta-Nuat-Amun, in turn, became the sister of Taharqa II.²¹ To smooth over their confounding of these two names, the composite name "Tantamanê" is theorized as an English translation to bridge the difference between Ta-Nuat-Amun and Urdamane (Urud-Amun, Rud-Amun, etc.). The problem with these various conclusions is that they are all largely conjectures, some points being real and others not. A close examination of the relevant records do not provide us any proof that both names belong to the same king.

There are several other important reasons why this popular reconstruction fails. To begin with, the reading of the name Urdamane (𐎠𐎢𐎠𐎢𐎠𐎢𐎠), given several times in the Assyrian texts,²² is clear and unequivocal. The Ur (𐎠) sign being unmistakable in the cuneiform and completely dissimilar to an Egyptian name which begins with "Tan," e.g., "𐎠𐎢 (Tan)." Yet Egyptologists, without any proof, simply decided to read the Ur sign as something like Tan, some rendering it as *Tandamani*, and others as *Tašdamani* or *Taltamani*.²³ Kenneth Kitchen, in this regard, gives the most positive spin possible regarding this issue when he wrote, "Ur-damani, PERHAPS to be read Tanatamani."²⁴ Yet as George Smith recognized many years ago, the Assyrian spelling should be understood as a rendering of the Egyptian name Rud-Ammoni,²⁵ i.e., Urud-Amun or Rud-Amun, an Egyptian name found in use during this very period.²⁶

Second, according to the Assyrians, the two fortress cities held in Egypt by Urud-Amun were Thebes and Heliopolis,²⁷ while the fortresses mentioned in the inscription of Ta-Nuat-Amun were Thebes and Memphis.²⁸ Third, Urud-

²⁰ Stela of Ankhnesites, *l.* 1; see LAIE, p. 573.

²¹ E.g., JEA, 35, pp. 146, no. 63, 147, no. 76; CRFAE, pp. 237, 240.

²² E.g., Harran Tablets, *l.* 67–71; Prism A, col. 2:22 (see ALAK, 2, pp. 14, 164, [also see pp. 140, 142, 226], and 3, p. 726, s.v. Tandamanê where Maximilian Streck admits that "tân-da-ma-ni-e" most likely is read "Urdamane?"). Likewise, see above n. 3.

²³ TIP, p. 149, n. 276.

²⁴ TIP, p. 149, §120.

²⁵ See above n. 3.

²⁶ E.g., see LPIE, p. 96 & ns. 29 & 30; RdE, 53, pp. 151–178, which shows fragments of a faience statuette from Hermopolis bearing the name of King Rud-Amun. This Rud-Amun was the name of the last king of Dynasty XXIII. He was the son of Osorkon III, the brother of Takelot III, and a contemporary of King Piye. Rud-Amun and Piye were recognized at Thebes at the same time. The sister of Rud-Amun was the votaress Shepenwepet I (see App. I).

²⁷ ARAB, 2, §§775, 845.

²⁸ LAIE, pp. 571f, *l.* 11, 24–28.

Amun did not continue to hold his conquest in Lower Egypt very long, being forced back to Kipkip in Kush by the Assyrians shortly after he had conquered the Delta (663 B.C.E.).²⁹ Ta-Nuat-Amun, on the other hand, is given 9 years of rulership over Thebes.³⁰

Fourth, in the Ethiopian King List, following the reference to Tsawi Terhaq (Terhak), i.e., Taharqa I, we find the names Erda-Amen Awseya (Urud-Amun Auseya), followed by Gasiyo Eskikatur—clearly an usurper who was quickly dispensed with, because no length of time is given for his reign—and then Nuat-meawn (Ta-Nuat-Amun).³¹ This list clearly shows that the two men—Urud-Amun and Ta-Nuat-Amun—were different kings.

The Ethiopian King List is further clarified by the number of kings mentioned when compared with the known names of Ethiopian kings from Ta-Nuat-Amun to Aspelta.³² As László Török points out, “The descent of Tanwetamani’s direct successors is attested to for five generations From the centuries following Aspelta’s reign (late 7th-early 6th century BC), the royal genealogy remains obscure and some of the titularies also seem to indicate dynastic changes.”³³

NAME IN INSCRIPTIONS	NAME IN ETHIOPIAN LIST	YEARS IN ETHIOPIAN LIST
Urud-Amun	Erda-Amen Awseya	6
	Gasiyo Eskikatur	—
Ta-Nuat-Amun	Nuat-meawn	4
Atlanersa	Tomadyon Piyankihi III	12
Senkamanisken	Amen Asero	16
Anlamani	Piyankihi IV (Awtet)	34
Aspelta	Zaware Nebret Aspurta	41

Accordingly, the Ethiopian claim is that a King Urud-Amun was ruling Kush just prior to Ta-Nuat-Amun. Also of interest, the total aggregate of years attributed to both kings is 10 years, which is remarkably close to the established 9 years already known for Ta-Nuat-Amun over Upper Egypt. Yet what everyone seems to miss is the fact that the 6 years for Urud-Amun and then the 4 years for Ta-Nuat-Amun were given only for their kingship over Kush, not in Egypt! As explained numerous times throughout our investigation, one cannot confound the years of rulership over one region with the separate dates of rulership in another.

In addition, the Year 9 inscription of Ta-Nuat-Amun found at Luxor would, as well, tend to prove that he was still considered a king of Upper

²⁹ ARAB, 2, §§776f.

³⁰ SAK, 10, p. 327, and figs. 1, 2, pl. 20/a. Interestingly, years 1 and 2 are missing at Thebes. We do have years 3, 4, 8, and 9, all found at Thebes (FHN, 1, p. 193). Year 1 as the king of Kush, on the other hand, is only found in Kush.

³¹ CBN, p. 266, Dynasty IV, no. xiv–xvi.

³² CBN, p. 266, Dynasty IV, no. xiv–xx.

³³ KK, p. 345.

Egypt during this 10th and last year. Such also indicates that some kind of agreement was reached between Psamtik I and Ta-Nuat-Amun allowing them to jointly reign in Upper Egypt. This joint reign is indicated not only by the acceptance of the adoption of Nitocris by the Ethiopian votaress Amenirdis II but also when Psamtik I wrote, "I shall not do the very thing that should not be done and expel an heir from HIS POSITION, because I am a king who loves Maat."³⁴ "His position" can only refer to Ta-Nuat-Amun's position, which indicates that some kind of accommodation had been made between the two kings. After the death of Ta-Nuat-Amun, meanwhile, the agreement no longer held any force for any new Ethiopian king.

More evidence comes from the Dream Stela of Ta-Nuat-Amun. According to this inscription, lines 9–10 and 20–22, the only genealogical evidence is that Ta-Nuat-Amun's sister-wife was Pi(ankh)ye-re and his mother was the sister-wife of a previous king:

The king's sister, king's wife, mistress of Black(-land)
(Egypt), Pi(ankh)ye-re, shaking the sistrum.³⁵

The king's sister, mistress of Bow-land (Nubia), *Q-l-
h-ta* (Qalhata), shaking the sistrum.³⁶

Qalhata's status as a Queen mother is confirmed in her tomb which bears the inscription "King's mother."³⁷ Beyond this, her parentage is unknown.³⁸

Statements to the effect that Qalhata was the daughter of Piye and the sister of Taharqa II, or that she was either a queen consort to her brother Shabaqo or to her brother Shebitku, are in reality based only upon an inference and have no real authority by themselves. All that is actually known is that she was a king's sister, a king's wife, and a king's mother. As Robert G. Morkot points out, besides the title "King's wife" and the objects inside her tomb being dated to the time of Ta-Nuat-Amun, "This is the closest to proof that we have, that Qalhata was mother of Tanwetamani."³⁹ There is also the detail that Qalhata's tomb was located next to that of Ta-Nuat-Amun,⁴⁰ which indicates a personal connection. The name Piye-re, meanwhile, does reflect some kind of heritage from the line of King Piye. More importantly, there is no mention in any inscription of the name of the former king who Ta-Nuat-Amun replaced. Only in the Ethiopian King List do we read that Nuat-meawn (Ta-Nuat-Amun) followed Erda-Amen (Urud-Amun) on the throne of Kush.

The Dream Stela, meanwhile, is not dated. It only refers back in time to regnal "Year 1" and the events that occurred during that period. Egyptologists have assumed that "Year 1" represents Ta-Nuat-Amun's 1st year over Egypt,

³⁴ LAIE, p. 578, l. 3f.

³⁵ FHN, 1, p. 194, l. 9–11.

³⁶ FHN, 1, p. 195, l. 20–22.

³⁷ BPENR, p. 293.

³⁸ FHN, 1, p. 121, "of unknown parentage."

³⁹ BPENR, p. 293.

⁴⁰ El-Kurru (Ku. 5 & 16), see BPENR, p. 293; JEA, 35, p. 146, no. 63, p. 147, no. 76.

although the story is actually about his official recognition as a king in Kush. The salient points in his inscription are the following. Written sometime after Year 1, Ta-Nuat-Amun looks back and reports:

The King-of-Upper-and-Lower-Egypt: Ba-ka-Rê, the Son-of-Rê, Ta-n-wa-ti-aman, beloved of Amûn of Napata. In regnal year 1, when he was made to appear as king [- —], his majesty saw a dream in the night, two serpents, one on his right, the other on his left.⁴¹

The first thing we notice is that in regnal Year 1, “when he was made to appear as king [- —],” Ta-Nuat-Amun had his dream of the two serpents. The question is, “King of what?” Based upon the short space for the missing words and the fact that he was made to appear in Napata, it can only mean the “king of Kush.” The text also states that when word came to Ta-Nuat-Amun and he was “made to appear as king,” he was living in Khemmis, about 79 miles northwest of Thebes, along the Nile River in Upper Egypt.⁴² In this year, as Horus on the throne, he immediately went to the temple of Amun in Napata, adding that there was no one standing in his way to the kingship:

Off went his majesty to Napata, there being none who stood (against) him.⁴³

Holding a great festival in which the deity Amun made his appearance in the procession, Ta-Nuat-Amun was recognized as a king by the deity Amûn of Napata, i.e., as the king of Kush.⁴⁴

The mere fact that Ta-Nuat-Amun mentions that there was no one who stood against him when he appeared as king in Kush indicates that, just previous to his leaving for Napata, there had been some sort of conflict over the throne. Yet by the time he had arrived in Napata that threat had been eliminated. Otherwise, there would have been no reason for his text to mention such a detail. This point matches the statement found in the Ethiopian King List that there was a man named Gasiyo Eskikatir (possibly an usurper) who attempted to take the throne just after the death of Urud-Amun (Erda-Amen) yet before the ascension to the throne of Ta-Nuat-Amun (Nuat-meawn). It is also of interest that the 49-year reign of Tsawi Terhaq Warada Nagash (Taharqa I Piye) as a king of Kush ended the same year as the death of Urud-Amun.⁴⁵ The death of this once powerful king and the waning of Kushite power would certainly create the atmosphere for an attempted rebellion.

⁴¹ FHN, 1, p. 196, l. 3f. Some translate T₃-n-w₃-t₁-ʾImn (Tanuati-Amun) as “Tanwetamani,” unnecessarily adding the *i* sound at the end in order to make the name conform to Urdamane.

⁴² FHN, 1, p. 197, l. 6.

⁴³ FHN, 1, pp. 197d, l. 7f. LAIE, p. 570, translates this verse to read, “His Majesty then came to Napata, with none standing [in] his advance.”

⁴⁴ FHN, 1, pp. 197d, l. 8f.

⁴⁵ CBN, p. 266, Dynasty IV, no. xiii, 49 years. That the first year of Taharqa I Piye as the king of Kush was 706 B.C.E., see App. D, with the discussion of Piye’s Jubilee year.

The difference in interpretation comes with the fact that the Ethiopian King List makes the attempt of Gasiyo Eskikatir to take the throne occur immediately after Urud-Amun had already reigned 6 years over Kush, i.e., in the year which also became the 1st year of Ta-Nuat-Amun as the sole ruler of this Kushite dynasty (657 B.C.E.). Modern opinion, on the other hand, makes Ta-Nuat-Amun come to the throne of Kush in 663 B.C.E., beginning the count of Ta-Nuat-Amun's reign in Upper Egypt from that same year that Taharqa II died. Yet the 6-year reign of Urud-Amun immediately after the death of Taharqa II assures us that the 1st year of Ta-Nuat-Amun as king over Kush could not have occurred until much later than 663 B.C.E.

Herein lies our first indication that the "Year 1" of Ta-Nuat-Amun, as mentioned in the Dream Stela, was dated by his rule as the king of Kush and not by his rulership as a king of Egypt. The context is easily explained by the detail that Ta-Nuat-Amun was made junior co-regent with Urud-Amun in Egypt in 663 B.C.E., shortly after Taharqa II died and Urud-Amun followed on the throne of Kush. That same year, Urud-Amun reconquered both Upper and Lower Egypt for the Ethiopians. It was at that time that Urud-Amun became the king of Kush while Ta-Nuat-Amun was given a place upon the Egyptian throne of Thebes. Nevertheless, later that year, Assurbanipal of Assyria drove the Kushites back into Kush. Interestingly, there is no record of Ta-Nuat-Amun in Upper Egypt for Year 1 or Year 2, which is explained by the fact that he and Urud-Amun were driven out of that region so quickly after retaking Egypt for Ethiopia. Ta-Nuat-Amun only is mentioned in the area of Thebes during Years 3, 4, 8 and 9.⁴⁶ This data merely reflects the fact that Ta-Nuat-Amun had been invited back into Upper Egypt by the Egyptians in Year 3 (661 B.C.E.) as Assyrian power began to wane in that region.

Next, the early statement in the inscription of the Dream Stela which gives Ta-Nuat-Amun the title as the king of both Upper and Lower Egypt is not relevant to his ascension to the throne of Kush but to the time when he later composed the Dream Stela.⁴⁷ This detail is true because at the time that he was crowned king in Napata, Kush, King Ta-Nuat-Amun had not yet conquered Lower Egypt. This fact is expressed in the very next passage, when the deity Amun responds to Ta-Nuat-Amun's inquiry about his dream:

"Why has this (dream) happened to me?" Then reply
was made to him, saying, Upper Egypt is yours
(already), (now) seize for yourself Lower Egypt.⁴⁸

This statement is key to understanding Ta-Nuat-Amun's claims. Before Ta-Nuat-Amun began to sit on the throne in Kush, he was already the king

⁴⁶ FHN, 1, p. 193.

⁴⁷ The Dream Stela was located at the Temple of Amun at Gebel Barkal in Napata, Kush. Therefore, since this text discusses the victory of Ta-Nuat-Amun while he was still in Memphis, the inscription could not have been composed until after he returned to Napata. No doubt it was written early in 656 B.C.E.

⁴⁸ LAIE, p. 570, l. 5. FHN, 1, p. 197, l. 5, calls Upper Egypt the "South-land" and Lower Egypt the "North-land."

of Upper Egypt. Under the evidence we have, he would have been designated the king of Upper Egypt for 6 years prior to taking the throne of Kush. Only after the ceremonies which confirmed the kingship in Kush to him did Ta-Nuat-Amun go further north and conquer Lower Egypt. In doing so, he became king of that region as well, returning the greater kingship of Upper and Lower Egypt to the king of Kush. This detail is further supported by the fact that at the time that Ta-Nuat-Amun was “made to appear as king” in Kush, he was living in Khemmis in Upper Egypt. Leaving this region of Egypt, he went directly south to Kush.⁴⁹ After the appearance of the deity Amun and ceremonies in Napata, which recognized him as king, he turned north and sailed to Elephantine. Here the deity of that region also appeared to him (i.e., recognized him as king).⁵⁰ He then continued north to Thebes and went to the Temple of Amûn-Rê, where that deity there made his appearance in the Procession.⁵¹ Only after these peaceful and joyous events did the new king of Kush advance much further north, making his way towards Memphis.⁵² It was only while he was in Memphis that Ta-Nuat-Amun began to fight the rebels of Lower Egypt:

There arrived his majesty at Memphis. Out came the children of rebellion to fight his majesty. His majesty made a great blood bath among them, their number (of dead) being unknown. After his majesty seized Memphis, he entered the temple-compound of Ptah South-of-his-wall, made an offering to his father Ptah-Sokar, and propitiated Sakhmet according to what she desires.⁵³

After taking Memphis and fulfilling some of his plans,⁵⁴ the king then pressed his advantage into the Delta, sailing “downstream to fight with the chiefs of Lower Egypt.”⁵⁵ Rather than coming out to fight, these leaders entered into their fortifications and resisted the siege for “many days.”⁵⁶ Ta-Nuat-Amun then sailed back upstream to Memphis and maintained himself on the throne in that city. Eventually, the various chiefs and petty dynasts came to Memphis and surrendered to Ta-Nuat-Amun.⁵⁷ He now rightfully carried the title, “king of Upper and Lower Egypt.” At this point we read:

Then they said before his majesty, “Let us go to our cities so that we can command our subjects and bring our dues to the Residence.” So his majesty <let> them

⁴⁹ LAIE, p. 570, l. 6f; FHN, 1, pp. 197f, l. 6f.

⁵⁰ LAIE, p. 570, l. 9–11; FHN, 1, pp. 198f, l. 9–11.

⁵¹ LAIE, pp. 570f, l. 11–13; FHN, 1, pp. 199f, l. 11–13.

⁵² LAIE, pp. 571, l. 14f; FHN, 1, p. 200, l. 14f.

⁵³ LAIE, p. 571, l. 16–18; FHN, 1, pp. 200f, l. 16–18.

⁵⁴ LAIE, p. 571, l. 18–24; FHN, 1, pp. 201f, l. 18–24.

⁵⁵ LAIE, p. 571, l. 24; FHN, 1, p. 202, l. 24.

⁵⁶ LAIE, p. 571, l. 25f; FHN, 1, p. 202, l. 25f.

⁵⁷ LAIE, pp. 571–573, l. 26–40; FHN, 1, pp. 202–206, l. 26–40.

go (back) to their cities, and they were (left) alive. (And from that time on) the southerners have been sailing northwards, the northerners southwards, to the place where his majesty is, with every good thing of Upper Egypt and every (kind of) provision of Lower Egypt, to propitiate his majesty's heart; while the King-of-Upper-and-Lower-Egypt: Ba-ka-Rê, Son-of-Rê, Ta-Nuat-Amun, let him live, be prosperous, and healthy, appears in glory upon the throne of Horus for ever!⁵⁸

This evidence shows that there were at least a couple of years that Ta-Nuat-Amun was able to maintain peaceful control over both Upper and Lower Egypt. This detail fits quite well with the data that shows that Psamtik I, as the king of Sais, did not return to Egypt and conquer all Egypt until the middle part of his 8th year (656 B.C.E.).⁵⁹ In that same year, Ta-Nuat-Amun was forced out of Memphis. Polyaeus, for example, who calls Ta-Nuat-Amun by the Greek name Tementes,⁶⁰ writes:

Psammetichus (Psamtik I) overthrew Tementes, king of Egypt, in the following way. Tementes consulted the oracle of Ammon about the kingship, and the oracle told him to beware of cocks. Psammetichus was informed by Pigres the Carian, who was his close friend, that the Carians were the first people who wore plumes of feathers on their helmets. He immediately understood the meaning of the oracle, and took into his service a large number of Carians, with whom he advanced against Memphis. Psammetichus defeated Tementes in a battle near the temple of Isis, which is about five *stadia*⁶¹ away from the palace. A part of Memphis is called Caro-Memphitae, taking its name from these Carians.⁶²

Notice that nothing is said about Tementes being killed, only that he was defeated in battle. With this victory, Psamtik I was able to move further south and into the region of Upper Egypt. By making an agreement with Ta-Nuat-Amun, both kings would rule Thebes and Upper Egypt together until the death of Ta-Nuat-Amun in 653 B.C.E.

Brothers

Ta-Nuat-Amun was in all likelihood the brother of Urud-Amun and both were the sons of Shabaqo and Queen Qalhata (the sister of Taharqa II and the

⁵⁸ LAIE, pp. 573, *l.* 40–42; FHN, 1, pp. 206f, *l.* 40–42.

⁵⁹ LAIE, pp. 582–584; and see discussion in App. K.

⁶⁰ JAOS, 127.4, p. 512; JE, 12, p. 148.

⁶¹ A *stadia* (stadia) is 606.75 feet. Five stadia = 3,033.75 feet (about .575 of a mile).

⁶² Polyaeus, *Strata*, 7:3.

daughter of Piye). This detail is indicated by the following details. To begin with, according to the Ethiopian King List, Ni-Kauta (Nicauta, Ni-Qauta; Qalhata, etc.) followed Shabaqo on the throne of Kush and reigned 10 years (695–686 B.C.E.). She was only a Queen in Kush and not in Egypt. Since Qalhata was the sister of Taharqa II, we can fairly give her age as approximately the same as her brother, give or take a year or two. Taharqa II was twenty years old when he took the throne at Memphis as co-regent with Shebitku in 689 B.C.E. That means he was born in about 709 B.C.E. Approximating his sister's age to about the same time, although her age could be even less, she would be about 14 years old when she was placed into position as a Queen of Kush (most likely as votaress in the temple of Amun in Napata, a post held by Qalhata). Her position as Kandake (queen mother) was required in order to satisfy the political arrangement which would allow a son of Shabaqo coming from this marriage to have legitimacy on Piye's throne in Kush and to merge the lines of King Kashta and King Alara. This alliance allowed Piye to set his own son, Taharqa II, on the throne of Memphis as a co-regent of Shebitku, the son of Shabaqo.

The end of Qalhata's 10-year queenship (686 B.C.E.), when she was about 24 years old, would have been marked by the birth of her first royal child, Urud-Amun. Urud-Amun would now become heir and would be associated with the throne. It is interesting that only 2 years later, at the end of Taharqa II's 6th year as co-regent of Shebitku in Memphis, Taharqa II poisoned Shebitku, leaving only his nephew, Urud-Amun, to eventually be the successor of Shabaqo on his throne. Yet Urud-Amun could not actually take the throne of Kush until Taharqa II died. Counting forward from Urud-Amun's birth until he succeeded the throne of Kush after the death of Taharqa II, Urud-Amun would have been about 22 years old. Then, 6 years later, Ta-Nuat-Amun succeeded his brother on the throne, being himself now about 27 years old.

The evidence, accordingly, indicates that when Taharqa II died he was succeeded on the throne of Kush by Urud-Amun, the son of Shabaqo and Queen Qalhata (Ni-Kauta, Qauta), the sister of Taharqa II. Urud-Amun, along with the priests and other leaders of Kush, in turn, placed Urud-Amun's younger brother, Ta-Nuat-Amun, on the throne of Upper Egypt, having him serve as his co-regent in Upper Egypt while Urud-Amun directly ruled Kush during the waning years of King Piye. The great Taharqa I Piye died in 657 B.C.E. having ruled Kush for 49 years. The death of Piye and the weakness of Kush which came at the end of Urud-Amun's reign led to a revolt by Gasiyo Eskikatur. Gasiyo Eskikatur most likely killed Urud-Amun immediately after the death of Piye but was quickly thereafter killed himself by the supporters of Shabaqo's family.

The leaders of Kush, upon the death of Urud-Amun (657 B.C.E.), now sent for Ta-Nuat-Amun, who at the time, as we have already stated, was living in Khemmis in Upper Egypt. He was "made to appear" in Napata as the king of Kush. The sister-wife of Ta-Nuat-Amun was Piye-re (a name reflecting her descent from King Piye). In this arrangement, Ta-Nuat-Amun reigned

in Kush for 4 years (657 through 654 B.C.E.) and continued his regnal count in Egypt for at least 9 years (663 through 655 B.C.E.). He died in 653 B.C.E. and was succeeded by Atlanersa (Tomadyon Piyankihi III), apparently the son of Ta-Nuat-Amun.⁶³ Atlanersa was only able to maintain rulership in Kush, thus ending any real connection with the kingship in Egypt. The lines of King Kashta and King Alara were thus merged and continued to rule Kush for many centuries.

⁶³ CRFAE, pp. 237f.