Multiplicity of Shoshenqs
in the Early Twenty-second Dynasty
A Good Reason to Apply Ockham’s Razor Principle
In one of the reference books by Karol Myśliwiec, *Royal Portraiture of the Dynasties XXI–XXX*, the entry: ‘Shoshenq II’ is divided between two candidates: 1° the son of Osorkon I, High Priest of Amun, Shoshenq, whose name sometimes appears in a cartouche, and 2° the King Heqa-kheper-Re Shoshenq, whose burial was found in the vestibule of the tomb of Psusennes I in Tanis.¹ The fact, revealed by the study of Myśliwiec, that only the former person can be recorded in iconographic sources, is meaningful enough to raise some doubts as to the regnal entity of the latter one. However, since the mummy of Heqa-kheper-Re Shoshenq remains the physical fact, his royal name should be explained. Most of the modern Egyptologists believe that this ‘Shoshenq II’ was reigning as co-ruler, referring to the unquestionable authority of K.A. Kitchen.² In October 2007 in Leiden, during the conference on the Libyan Period in Egypt, I had honor and pleasure to meet Professor Kitchen, and to hear his remarks during the discussion closing the debate. One of the topics was then a proposition to introduce a standardized numbering of the kings called Shoshenq, because *the existing variety in the numbering /.../ is highly confusing.*³ K.A. Kitchen has declared himself happy to accept the resolution, since *…the Shoshenqs multiply like rabbits,* and this comment has even provoked somebody to make a suggestion: *Kill rabbits!* The tenor of this article is an attempt at realizing this postulate; the idea of such a solution may have been formulated as long ago as in the fourteenth century and is traditionally attributed to the philosopher William of Ockham: *Pluralitas non est ponenda sine necessitate.*⁴

What seems most embarrassing to all the researchers into the period of the early Twenty-second Dynasty, is a number of similarly constructed cartouche names: *X-hpr-Rc stp.n-Y* (= prenomen), accompanied by the name Shoshenq in the second cartouche (= nomen). Three names of this structure have, according to the resolution adopted during the above-mentioned conference in Leiden, been given the identification with the ‘King Shoshenq II’:

1. *Hk3-hpr-Rc stp.n-Rc* Shoshenq IIA

This name appears both on the silver coffin found in 1939 in the vestibule of the tomb of Psusennes I in Tanis, on the cartonnage discovered inside this coffin, and on two objects found on the mummy.⁵

---

¹ K. MYŚLIWIEC, Royal Portraiture of the Dynasties XXI–XXX, Mainz a/Rhein 1988, p. 16.
2. *Twt-hpr-Rc* stp.n-Jmn  Shoshenq IIb
   The name appears on a fragment of pottery vase in the Louvre Museum, inv. No. E 31866, from the excavations by Amélineau in Abydos, and on a limestone architectural fragment No. H/3.9 discovered in the ruins of the great temple in Bubastis.

3. *Mh-hpr-Rc* stp.n-Rc  Shoshenq Iic
   The cartouche with this name is engraved on the Cairo Egyptian Museum porphyre statuette inv. JE 37005 (CG 42192), usurped from Thutmose III, originating from the Karnak ‘favissa’ discovered by Legrain in 1904.

Scholars have so far presented several various explanations of the identity of these candidates for the royal status of Shoshenq II. Thus, *Hk3-hpr-Rc* may be: 1. identified with the son of Osorkon I, the High Priest Shoshenq; 2. may have been an unknown son of the King Shoshenq I; 3. may have been an (unknown) son of the King Takeloth I; 4. may be identified with the King Shoshenq I. *Twt-hpr-Rc* has first been identified with the King

---

9 MONTET, Les constructions, pp. 62–63 was the first Egyptologist who considered such a possibility. He hinted at the family relations of the High Priest Shoshenq, who was grandson of the last King of the Twenty-first Dynasty, Psusennes II, and some objects of the burial equipment of the last-mentioned King (and perhaps also his mummy) were found in the same place as the mummy of *Hk3-hpr-Rc* in the vestibule of the tomb of Psusennes I at Tanis. *KITCHEN*, TIP, pp. 118–120 has agreed with this view, suggesting that the High Priest Shoshenq became a co-regent of Osorkon I, adapting the name *Hk3-hpr-Rc*, but he died before his father. The same interpretation offer W. HELCK, Geschichte des Alten Ägypten, Leiden 1981, p. 225; M.L. BIERBRIER, *s.v. Scheschong I-V., LÄ* V, 585; J. Yoyotte, C. Ziegler (Eds), Tanis. L’or des pharaons, Paris 1987 [= Tanis], p. 70; A. DODSON, Some Notes Concerning the Royal Tombs at Tanis, *CdÉ* 63, 1988, p. 226; Id., The Canopic Equipment of the Kings of Egypt, London 1994, p. 85; Id., The prophet of Amun Iuput and his distinguished ancestors, *JEA* 95, 2009, pp. 63–64, and T. SCHNEIDER, Lexikon der Pharaonen, Munich 1996, p. 391. G.P.F. BROEKMAN, who has done the most profound analysis of the source material and its interpretation – cf. On the Identity of King Shoshenq buried in the vestibule of the tomb of Psusennes I in Tanis (NRT III), *GM* 211, 2006, pp. 11–20, and: On the Identity of King Shoshenq Buried in the Vestibule of the Tomb of Psusennes I in Tanis (NRT III), Part II, *GM* 212, 2007, pp. 9–26 – in the conclusion (p. 26) does not reject this possibility either.
11 This theory is supported by J. VON BECKERATH, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Libyerzeit, *GM* 144, 1995, pp. 8–9, and N. DAUTZENBERG, Bemerkungen zu Shoshenq II., Takeloth II. und Pedubastis II., *GM* 144, 1995, pp. 22–23. However, the successor of Takeloth I was his son Osorkon II, and this king was buried in own tomb in Tanis. It would have, therefore, been rather strange that another son of Takeloth who was a king, too, was placed not in the tomb of his brother, but elsewhere. Similarly skeptical towards the hypothesis remains BROEKMAN, *GM* 212, 2007, p. 16.
12 This solution was considered as possible by A. GARDNER, Egypt of the Pharaohs, Oxford 1961, p. 448, I.E.S. EDWARDS, Egypt: From the Twenty Second to the Twenty Fourth Dynasty, [in:] CAH III/1, Cambridge
Psusennes II, whose first cartouche name is somewhat similar: *Tjt-hprw-Rc* (var. *Tjt-hpr-twtt-Rc*),\(^{13}\) however actually he is supposed to have been an independent ruler of the early Twenty-second Dynasty,\(^{14}\) tentatively placed between Osorkon I and Takeloth I.\(^{15}\) The name *M3'c-hpr-Rc* has previously been regarded as a variant of the coronation name of Shoshenq I who dedicated the statue Cairo CG 42192 to his predecessor on the throne, the King Psusennes II,\(^{16}\) however it has recently been newly interpreted as a variant of the name of Shoshenq the High Priest of Amun, son of Osorkon I.\(^{17}\)

Unquestionably, the structure of the three above-discussed names linked by various authors with the ‘King Shoshenq II’ is similar to that of the prenomen of the founder of the Twenty-second Dynasty Shoshenq I: *Hdj-hpr-Rc*. The reign of this ruler took a remarkable place in the Egyptian history. The change of the reigning family and the enthronement of a foreigner was the most delicate operation that needed much diplomacy, especially towards Thebes and the conservative noblemen of the Upper Egypt; a memory of the civil war – being most probably a consequence of an unexpected accession of Osorkon the Elder some 35 years earlier\(^{18}\) – may have been still alive. It was King Psusennes II who prepared the induction of Shoshenq I. The King came personally to Thebes, accompanying the Chief of the Libyan tribe, Shoshenq, whose official purpose was an address to the oracle of Amun with a plea to let him erect in the temple of Abydos a statue of his dead father. The positive answer of Amun meant a sacralisation of the line of ancestors of Shoshenq, making him, in the eyes of people, a good candidate for the throne as successor of Psusennes. The words spoken on that occasion by the King, and especially the epithets used by him when addressing Shoshenq: *the prince of princes, my great one* are meaningful in this respect.\(^ {19}\)

For the subject treated in this article it seems important, how strong were ties linking Shoshenq I both with Psusennes II (whose daughter later married the son and successor of Shoshenq I, Osorkon I), and with the two localities: Thebes as the residence of Amun and Abydos as the residence of Osiris and the divinized royal ancestors of Shoshenq and Psusennes.

---

13 Dodson, Die Dauer der Dritten Zwischenzeit, p. 77.
15 LadR III, p. 316; M.-A. Bonhême, Noms royaux dans l’Égypte de la troisième période intermédiaire, Cairo 1987, p. 103.
17 A. Niwiński, Le passage de la XXe à la XXIIe dynastie. Chronologie et histoire politique, BIFAO 95, 1995, p. 354.
The whole reign of Shoshenq I was characterized by reverence for the traditional signs of Egyptian greatness, with the accentuation of the idea of the new beginning, combined with novelties in the spheres of administration and religion. The emphasis laid on ideological links with the great pharaohs of the New Kingdom and the Twenty-first Dynasty is reflected in the royal protocol of Shoshenq I, and in his imperial style activity in the foreign policy and temple buildings. The names of his protocol repeat some fragments of that of Smendes – the founder of the Twenty-first Dynasty, and the author of the new beginning (whm mswt Era) in the north of the country. Thus, first parts of Smendes’s Horus- and Nebty-names are repeated in the Horus- and Golden Horus-names of Shoshenq I, the first cartouche of both rulers is identical, and the epithet: ‘beloved by Amun’ precedes the own name in the second cartouche. In choosing Smendes’s prenomen: $Hd-hpr-R^c$ stp.n-R$^c$, Shoshenq not only stresses his identical position as the founder of a new historical period, but also emphasized his ideological ties with the great pharaohs of the imperial times of the New Kingdom: the great conquerors Thutmose I $\zeta\cdot hpr-k\cdot R^c$, Thutmose III $Mn-hpr-R^c$, and Amenhotep II $\zeta\cdot hprw-R^c$, and another founder of a new Era Horemheb $Dsr-hprw-R^c$, who was the first pharaoh invoking the God’s decision of choosing him as king: stp.n-R$^c$.

The structure of the first cartouche name clearly shows, at the same time, Shoshenq I’s idea of proving that his reign can be understood as continuation of the Twenty-first Dynasty; not only his name repeats that of Smendes, but also recalls those of Pinudjem I $Hpr-hw-R^c$ stp.n-Jmn, Psusennes I $\zeta\cdot hpr-R^c$ stp.n-Jmn, Siamon Ntrj-hpr-R$^c$ stp.n-Jmn and Psusennes II
Shoshenq I’s political, administrative and building activities are well known and thoroughly commented. Some his achievements, however, especially towards the end of his reign (the military and economically successful campaign in Palestine in his 20th year, and construction of the court with colonnades in Amun’s temple in Karnak, and a similar court in the temple of Ptah in Memphis) were unparalleled in Egypt of those days, being an obvious reference to the past times of the glory. These activities, although referring to the past, may have been understood as novelties by the people. To the same category belongs the development of new residential centres, being traditional Libyan nests in Lower and Middle Egypt: Bubastis and Heracleopolis. Although Tanis with its necropolis of the Twenty-first Dynasty rulers was an area of his building activity, too (Fig. 1), his burial place is discussed. Recently T.L. Sagrillo has devoted a part of his article to this subject, arguing that Shoshenq I’s tomb should be localized within the temenos of the principal temple of residence city, which he would like to situate at Memphis, if not at Heracleopolis, but not at Bubastis or Tanis. I can agree only with the first statement (the burial within a temple precinct), however not with the other suggestions. Heracleopolis was new residence, but it was the son of Shoshenq I, Nimlot, who was resident there, and the hypothesis of the foundation of the new royal cemetery at this military post seems little convincing. Memphis seems better localization, but the building of the festive court there was never accomplished. With his reverence for tradition Shoshenq I could choose Tanis, but in such a case the excavations of P. Montet could have brought to light more traces of a monumental tomb, in which such a great pharaoh intended to repose. Like in the case of all the Egyptian rulers, his decision of building the tomb certainly belonged to the first ones. In this situation Bubastis seems to be the most probable place: the royal tomb and the beginning of new tradition would have add splendour to the city being the old Libyan nest.

Bubastis like all the ancient centres situated in the Delta was since the Roman period an area of the intensive exploitation of limestone, and only sad remains of the great temple survived. It is, however, interesting to recall Herodotus who visited this temple in the fifth

---

20 Niwiński, BIFAO 95, 1995, p. 354 and n. 117. The king ‘s-hpr-R stp.n-R may have been a pharaoh elected in Thebes as an opponent of the northern King of the Libyan origin. The civil war that erupted in this reign may have been consequence of such a rivalry.


22 In., The geographic origins of the “Bubastite” Dynasty and possible locations for the royal residence and burial place of Shoshenq I, [in:] Broekman, Demarée, Kaper (Eds), Libyan Period [= Geographic origins], pp. 341–359.

23 Such location is considered as probable by A. Dodson, Some Notes Concerning the Royal Tombs at Tanis, CdE 63, 1988, p. 231.
century BC, saying that no other temple is more beautiful than this one. In his time the main temple was placed on a kind of island, surrounded by two broad canals. According to Herodotus, the temple was situated in the lowest place in the centre of the town.\footnote{Hdt. II. 138-139.} As the town was founded on the Tanite branch of the Nile, the whole temple precinct was potentially threatened by water in case of an unusually high inundation.

Such catastrophic flood occurred in the third regnal year of Osorkon III, \textit{c.} 775 BC, and the inscriptions in the Theban temples pictured the situation as follows: \textit{the land became see, and the temples became marsh;}\footnote{T. Schneider, Lexikon der Pharaonen, Munich 1996, p. 287.} \textit{the flood swells over the dikes of the entire land as in the First Time it rose over the riverbanks /.../ no man-made dam can hold off its ravage.}\footnote{S. Bickel, The inundation inscription in Luxor Temple, \textit{in:}}\footnote{Broekman, Demarée, Kaper (Eds), Libyan Period, pp. 51–55.} It seems quite feasible that the royal cemetery within the precinct of the main temple at Bubastis was flooded, too. The partly destroyed coffins and burial equipment of some Libyan kings including Shoshenq I may have been transferred to another cemetery with traditions, situated on the higher level, out of flood danger. The royal necropolis at Tanis fulfills these conditions. In such a situation it was imposing to organize a secondary burial of Shoshenq I in the old tomb of Psusennes I, where burials of other Twenty-first Dynasty rulers: Amenemope, Siamon and Psusennes II had already been deposited, especially as the links of the founder of the Twenty-second Dynasty with his predecessors on the Egyptian throne were well known. The burial of \textit{HkJ3-hpr-Rc stp.n-Rc Mry-Jmn-S$nk} taking a distinguished place on a stone pedestal in the vestibule of the tomb of Psusennes well corresponds with this scenario. In spite of all the opinions sharing the doubts of K.A. Kitchen, I do assume the identity of \textit{HkJ3-hpr-Rc} with Shoshenq I. The only base of Kitchen’s objections is the difference of the name. Before a proposition, how to omit this obstacle, will be presented in the conclusion, I would first like to recall some archaeological observations concerning the burial of \textit{HkJ3-hpr-Rc}.

First note concerns the evidence of the secondary character of the burial and the damage of various objects of its funeral equipment caused by water. The lid of the silver coffin was not riveted to the lower part of the coffin, but it was simply put on top of it.\footnote{G. Brunton, Some notes on the burial of Shashanq Heqa-kheper-Re, \textit{ASAE} 39, 1939, p. 543; Broekman, GM 211, 2006, p. 12.} This was a typical proceeding often observed in the burials, especially of the late Twenty-first Dynasty, that only the inner coffin with the mummy was closed, while the heavier outer one was not (which was probably caused simply by technical reasons); this was lowered into the tomb in two pieces (separately the lid and the case), and after the inner coffin had been placed in the outer case, the outer lid was only placed upon it without closing. The silver coffin of Shoshenq evidently played the role of the outer coffin. It was probably completely immersed in water, which penetrated not only through the broken foot end of the coffin, but also through the not riveted openings, bringing the total deterioration of the contents.\footnote{D.E. Derry, Note on the remains of Shashanq, \textit{ASAE} 39, 1939, p. 549: It was evident that water had found access not only to the tomb but to the interior of the coffin.}
Four silver coffinettes belonging to the burial, which had previously stood inside the holes of the canopic chest, must have had a contact with water, too, as their bottoms are deteriorated.\footnote{Yoyotte, Ziegler (Eds), Tanis, p. 216.} These coffinettes, each inscribed with the nomen *Mry-Jmn-\textit{\text{"S}nk*}, constitute, with their form, an evident imitation of the royal style of the canopic equipment known from the New Kingdom, to which the set of canopics of Tutankhamun belongs. These coffinettes were found placed secondarily in some vases, and no canopic chest was accompanying the burial of *Hk3-hpr-Rc*\footnote{BROEKMAN, *GM* 212, 2007, pp. 17–19.}. However, a calcite canopic chest inscribed with the pair of the cartouches of Shoshenq I: *Hd-hpr-Rc stp.n-Jmn Mry-Jmn-\textit{\text{"S}nk* was purchased in 1891 by the Egyptian Museum in Berlin (inv. No. ÄS 11000). The measurements of the coffinettes’ size (26cm high, 8cm broad) and that of the holes in the canopic chest (35cm high, 15cm in diameter) reveal that the canopic chest of Sheshonq I could have contained the coffinettes found in Tanis.\footnote{A. DODSON, The Canopic Equipment of the Kings of Egypt, London 1994, p. 84, Pls 38–39.} The heavy chest had probably been left in the original burial place of Shoshenq I (in Bubastis?), where it was found towards the end of the nineteenth century. This object has been commented in the following way by A. Dodson: *The form, iconography and material of the canopic chest of Sheshonq I closely echo the chests of the kings of the New Kingdom. In its incorporation of the cavetto cornice and torus moulding, the exterior of the lid follows royal New Kingdom practice.*\footnote{To my opinion, the calcite chest in Berlin and the coffinettes from Tanis belong together, and their form reveals one more link with the New Kingdom rulers, Shoshenq I intended to stress even in the mortuary sphere.} These objects may have been executed many years before his death, however the set of the mummy containers and mummy adornments represents novelty in the royal funerary equipment, which can suggest later production. From the descriptions made by P. Montet and G. Brunton the following picture of the consecutive adornment and packaging of the mummy emerges:

\textbf{(1)} The mummy examined by D.E. Derry was in the state of skeleton, and water destroyed completely the tissues of the body and the wrappings. However traces of a typical embalming process (the extraction of brain by breaking into the cranial cavity through the roof of the nose) have been revealed.\footnote{DERRY, *ASAE* 39, 1939, pp. 549–551.} The mummy was probably enveloped in a large number of bandages and shrouds, since the edges of the main collar were found not fixed together, which, according to G. Brunton, can be explained by the fact that *the bandaged body had been too bulky to allow this to be done.*\footnote{Brunton, *ASAE* 39, 1939, p. 545.} All these mummy-wrappings and tissues changed into a *thick brown deposit* mistakenly interpreted by G. Brunton as remains of a wooden coffin.\footnote{Ibid., p. 544.} It would have been strange, if a wooden coffin, even after a long-lasting contact with water, was destroyed so completely, and even more strange that a royal coffin was not provided with inlaid eyes, nor gilding. Homogeneity of this brown deposit is thus informative as to the art of embalming of Shoshenq. It seems that little, if any, resin was
used, otherwise at least some parts of the mummy would have been protected from being destroyed by water. The best art of mumification of the Twenty-first Dynasty was probably performed, because G. Brunton mentions the presence of mud among the king’s bones; this may have been used to stuff the corps, according to the custom of that period. The traditional incision on the left side was probably done, too, since the golden amulet in the form of two fingers has been found nearby.

A number of precious objects were deposited on the mummy. The golden mask covering the face was originally accompanied by the faience uraeus and the cartonnage beard and nemes-headdress painted gold and blue, probably also with the cartonnage usekh-collar. When compared with the golden masks of Tutankhamun, Psusennes I and Amenemope, one perceives impoverishment in the early Twenty-second Dynasty, however this can be considered as rich in contrast to the two other royal burials found in the vestibule of the Psusennes I’s tomb, probably belonging to the last two rulers of the Twenty-first Dynasty: Siamun and Psusennes II. The mummy of Shoshenq – under the bandages – was also equipped with golden fingers- and toes-cases, golden sandals, seven golden bracelets, two golden rings, and also two golden amulets. It is significant that on none of these objects, treated as personal adornments of the dead, the name Hk3-hpr-Rc appears. On the contrary, on two bracelets prepared as a pair to be worn on two arms (the central motif: the udjat-eye is differently orientated) the prenomen and nomen of Shoshenq I appear. Some other objects are inscribed with the names of Thutmose III Mn-hpr-Rc, as well as with private names: Dd-Pth-jwf-‘nh and Hr-m-jnb. Djed-Ptah-iuf-ankh may have been the same person, closely related with Shoshenq I, who died in the 11th regnal year of this ruler. The other dignitary is not known, however the two bracelets may have been gifts received by the King Shoshenq I from his courtiers. The inscription: Mn-hpr-Rc who tramples the Asiatics well corresponds with Shoshenq I’s expedition to Palestine. It is not excluded, either, that the Akkadian cylinder bead attached to another bracelet was brought from this country as booty, if it had not been presented by an oriental monarch. A similar use of an oriental antiquity (an Assyrian bead) has been revealed in the burial equipment of Psusennes I. All these connections of the objects mentioned above with Shoshenq I are well known, however all are interpreted as ‘heirlooms’ just inherited by Hk3-hpr-Rc.

37 Montet, Les constructions, Pl. XXI.
38 Yoyotte, Ziegler (Eds), Tanis, pp. 270–271.
40 Montet, Les constructions, Pls XXIX–XXXIII; Yoyotte, Ziegler (Eds), Tanis, pp. 221, 262–266, 268–269.
41 Montet, Les constructions, p. 44 Fig. 13, Pl. XXIX; Yoyotte, Ziegler (Eds), Tanis, pp. 264–265.
42 Montet, Les constructions, p. 46.
43 Ibid., pp. 44, 46–49; Yoyotte, Ziegler (Eds), Tanis, pp. 264–266.
44 Yoyotte, Ziegler (Eds), Tanis, pp. 244–245.
To my opinion, the number of these alleged ‘heirlooms’ of the great pharaoh Shoshenq I used by an ephemeral kinglet is much too large to support the theory of his identity with the High Priest of Amun, son of Osorkon I.

And this series of ‘heirlooms’ is continued, as the objects placed over the upper mummy shroud are considered. Two of three pectorals found there very neatly associate with Shoshenq I. On one of these the name ‘Shoshenk son of Nimlot’ appears, and this object was long used during lifetime, both by the young Shoshenq, before his accession, and later, by him as King, which caused some deterioration. The same concerns the golden pendant composed of chains and lotus flowers. The form of another pectoral offers a cryptogram $Hd\cdot hpr-R^r$. On the golden belt only the nomen of Shoshenq appears, which is neutral like the aforementioned coffinettes. Beside this one ‘neutral’ object and at least six other that are directly or symbolically linked with Shoshenq I, only two other objects found on the mummy bear the prenomen $Hk3\cdot hpr-R^r$: the big golden pectoral hanging on the neck and the iron headrest-amulet found under the head. Unfortunately, we shall never know, which variant of the name was chosen to be composed of small faience beads of various colours, used to form the central part of the rhomboid pattern net attached to the mummy and covering it from shoulders down to the ankles. In any case, the use of the bead network marks an important novelty in the burial equipment.

(2) Another novelty was the introduction of the cartonnage container of the mummy, playing the role of an inner coffin, and thus replacing the wooden (or metal) royal inner coffins known from the New Kingdom and the Twenty-first Dynasty. The figures and inscriptions of the cartonnage were covered with gold foil. The mask represented falcon’s head, which was yet another novelty, to the traditional identification of the deceased with Osiris adding another symbolism, identifying the dead King with Re-Horus (Re-Horakhty). The combination of the Osirian and solar resurrection idea may have also been visually expressed by a kind of ritual, during which the mummy of the dead ruler, already closed in its (inner) coffin or cartonnage would have been inserted in vertical position into a container filled with earth, from which a fresh grass would have grown; the obelisks as solar resurrection symbols may have accompanied the scene. Perhaps some scenes encountered on the Twenty-second Dynasty coffins (Fig. 2) can illustrate this ritual, which would be another novelty introduced by Shoshenq I. In any case, assuming this can be true, we could gain

---

46 Montet, Les constructions, p. 44; Yoyotte, Ziegler (Eds), Tanis, p. 64.
47 Montet, Les constructions, p. 42, Pl. XXV; Brunton, ASAE 39, 1939, p. 546.
48 Yoyotte, Ziegler (Eds), Tanis, pp. 242–243.
49 Ibid., pp. 252–253.
50 Montet, Les constructions, Pls XXVI–XXVII.
51 Ibid., Pl. XXXIII.
an explanation of the presence of fine (grass) rootlets found on the bones of the lower limbs of the mummy of Shoshenq.\textsuperscript{55}

\textbf{(3)} The cartonnage was finally inserted into the silver coffin, very similar in form and decoration,\textsuperscript{56} and falcon-headed, too. Both on the cartonnage and the coffin the name of the deceased has its new form: \textit{Hk3-hpr-Re}, which may be regarded as similar novelty as the falcon-headed shape of the mummy container, the bead-network and the cartonnage – the new forms of the burial equipment of the mummy. The dead ruler, becoming Osiris-Re-Horakhty, obtained a new quality, which may have found its expression in giving him the new prenomen that would have accompany him at the last – very short – part of his glorious presence among the living: during the burial ceremonies. True, this would have been a new occurrence, but just one more novelty besides many others.

It seems to me quite feasible that creation of several slightly different variants of own prenomen would have been in harmony with the activities of ambitious and realistic Shoshenq I who \textit{was undoubtedly one of the most shrewd and astute personalities to ascend}

\textsuperscript{55} \textsc{Derry}, \textit{ASAE} 39, 1939, p. 549; \textsc{Brunton}, \textit{ASAE} 39, 1939, p. 547.

\textsuperscript{56} \textsc{Montet}, Les constructions, pp. 37–38, Pls XVII–XX; \textsc{Brunton}, \textit{ASAE} 39, 1939, p. 543.
the Egyptian throne.\textsuperscript{57} Such changes of a detail of the name without harm to its basic and well recognizable structure could have been used as important tool in the internal policy of balancing of Egyptian against Libyan social and cultural elements, of tradition against novelty, of local patriotism of various centres against the political matter of the State.

Some changes within the first cartouche of Shoshenq I are well known and understood as used in given political or ritual situations. Thus, beside the basic variant of the second part of the prenomen: \textit{stp.n-Rā}, other variants are attested: \textit{stp.n-Ptḥ} (a column from Memphis)\textsuperscript{58} and \textit{stp.n-Jmn} (the statue JE 37429 from Karnak).\textsuperscript{59} The structure of the first part of the prenomen informs that the King is a form (transformation) of Re, and one additional sign determines a character of this hypostasis,\textsuperscript{60} this being described as ‘bright (like the White Crown \textit{hd})’, ‘governing’ (\textit{hk3}), ‘complete’ (\textit{twt}) or ‘righteous’ (\textit{m3'}).

I cannot see anything extraordinary in a situation that the King Shoshenq I, certainly on important occasions involving his personal presence and a special celebration, was acting as the ‘complete form of Re’ (perhaps accentuating the idea that only with his (= Libyan) kingship the transformation of the God became complete?) in the traditional centre of the cult of all the past rulers of Egypt (= \textit{twt-hpr-Rā} in Abydos), or in his own family nest (= \textit{twt-hpr-Rā} in Bubastis).\textsuperscript{61} Also his reverence both for his ideological paragon Thutmos III and his direct predecessor (and patron) who had born (= created him\textsuperscript{62}) Psusennes II could have understandably been expressed in dedication of an old statue of Thutmose for Psusennes; on this occasion Shoshenq not only presented himself as ‘righteous / loyal / rightful’ (\textit{mAa}),\textsuperscript{63} but also changed the name of Psusennes, adding the predicate ‘assembled united / complete / entire’ (\textit{twt}).\textsuperscript{64} With this I only recall the old interpretation of the name \textit{M3'-hpr-Rā} by H. Gauthier and M.-A. Bonhême.\textsuperscript{65}

To support this theory, one can hint at some analogous proceedings done in the Egyptian history by some kings who changed their prenomen during own reign. The examples of Mentuhotep, Akhnaten or Tutankhamun are too well known to speak about. Another example is the case of Ahmose I who unexpectedly appears in Abydos with a \textit{prenomen Hk3-t3wy mry-Wsīr}, which is completely different from his \textit{Nb-phtj-Rā}.\textsuperscript{66} What is common

\textsuperscript{57} Kitch, TIP, p. 287.
\textsuperscript{58} LdR III, p. 312.
\textsuperscript{59} Ibidem.
\textsuperscript{60} Bonhême, BSFE 134, 1995, p. 68.
\textsuperscript{61} On \textit{twt-hpr-Rā} as a potential prenomen of Shosheng I, see A. Dodson, \textit{in:} Broekman, Demaré, Kaper (Eds), Libyan Period, pp. 107–110.
\textsuperscript{62} FCD, p. 116; I am skeptical towards the translation of the word \textit{ms} proposed by Jansen-Winkeln, Historische Probleme, p. 147 as ‘beget’ (erzeugen), because it may be literally understood in its secondary, sexual meaning.
\textsuperscript{63} FCD, p. 101.
\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., p. 295.
\textsuperscript{65} See supra, n. 16.
for all these kings is their status of founder of a new era; Shoshenq I belongs to this category, too. It was him, who – when changing his name on several occasions – can be identified with all the three allegedly independent rulers labelled as ‘Shoshenq IIa, b, c’. The only candidate for the position: ‘Shoshenq II’ remains the son of Osorkon, High Priest of Amun, whose name occasionally appears in a cartouche. He may have been a co-regent of Osorkon I who died before his father, which is commonly presumed, however he was not identical with Hk3-hpr-R’, neither with twt-hpr-R’, nor with Ms’-hpr-R’.
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