Abstract

Rare evidences were found for the Cat King (789-784 B.C) who is variously spelled as, Pami, Pemu, or Pamiu. There is a misconception transcription of his name as Pimay (P3-m3i) which means a lion. The term was used by past historians based on the misreading of a small statu-ary group (CG 9430). Furthermore, there is no guarantee that the group belongs to King Pami. Hence, there is no evidence that he was son of King Shoshenq III (841–803B.C). It is highly probable that another king Shoshenq, called Shoshenq IIIa or Shoshenq Ib (?- 790 B.C) with the Throne name hd-hpr-Rc, must be inserted here between Shoshenq III and Pami. Shoshenq III and his successor King Shoshenq IIIa filled the fifty two years which were estimated before Shoshenq III only, and that accords to the Apis bull’s twenty six years lifespan from the twenty eighth years of Shoshenq III to the second year of Pami. The full length of Pami’s reign at Tanis is not certain. It is not certain that another king (e.g., an older son of Pami) has ruled between Pami and Shoshenq V (783-746B.C). Finally, it is likely that Pami was buried in one of the vaults of the royal necropolis of Tanis, according to the meager remains that were collected from the tomb NRT II.
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Introduction:

The Third Intermediate Period\(^1\) (c. 1076-c. 723 BC)\(^2\), which is also known as the ‘Libyan Period’\(^3\), constitutes in a large degree a distinct cycle in Egypt’s history. It is defined by a passage from the loss of unity at the end of the New Kingdom to the restoration of centralized authority under Ps matek I.\(^4\) The 22\(^{nd}\) Dynasty is considered a unique chapter in the Third Intermediate Period. Manetho listed three kings of this dynasty as all being from Bubastis in the eastern Delta\(^5\), with an alleged cumulative reign of twenty five years.\(^6\) The Libyan element is evident in the founder of the dynasty ‘Shoshenq I’, who shortly after marching his army into Thebes, proclaimed himself pharaoh with the divine approval of the oracle of Amun, and thus successfully founded the 22\(^{nd}\) Dynasty.\(^7\) His reign (c. 945-924 BCE)\(^8\) was characterized by a change in attitude of the king towards the integrity of the country.\(^9\)

After the reigns of Shoshenq I, Osorkon I, Takeloth I, and Osorkon II, new generations of Libyan commanders sprang up in the important administrative and religious centers, each vying for a piece of the crown.\(^10\) The successors in the 22\(^{nd}\) Dynasty tried to unify the realm, but the re-growth of the provincial power-bases increasingly weakened royal control, and once again led to the division of the country.\(^11\) The reign of Takeloth II heralded a period of conflict, the major cause

\(^{(1)}\)Although the term ‘Intermediate’ is used to describe the political decline that took place during this period, it does not reflect the cultural development that continued under individual district administration. ‘Kitchen’ who published an extensive study of this historical period suggested that a more suitable term for this period would be ‘Post- Imperial epoch’, rather than being categorized with the First or Second Intermediate Period which were characterized by chaos and disorder; A. K. Kitchen, the Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100-650 B.C.) (Wiltshire, 1986), xi-xii; Other scholars like ‘Leahy’ suggested other names such as the ‘late New Kingdom’ and the ‘Libyan Period’; this is descriptive, not simply sequential, and it embodies the most important change, namely, the arrival of the Libyans in power; A. Leahy, ‘the Libyan Period in Egypt: an essay in interpretation’, Libyan Studies 16 (1985), 53; It is interesting to note that Kitchen’s or Leahy’s suggestions, although more accurate, have not been widely used by scholars and the term ‘Third Intermediate Period’ is still highly featured in studies and publications; A. H. Eladany, A study of A selected Group of Third Intermediate Period Mummies in the British Museum (Ph. D. diss., University of Manchester, 2011), 40.

\(^{(2)}\)Modern historians mention different dates for the beginning of this period. ‘Kitchen’ and ‘Taylor’ believes that 1069 BC, the year that Smendes I ascended the throne, marks the start of the 21st Dynasty and the Third Intermediate Period, while a more recent study by ‘Hornung et al’ mentioned the year 1076 BC as the beginning of the 21st Dynasty and the Third Intermediate Period. The same problem applies to the date that marks the end of this period as well. ‘Taylor’ suggests that the end of the 25th Dynasty and the Third Intermediate Period was c. 664 BC, while ‘Hornung et al’ suggest that this should be c. 723 BC, marked by the end of the 24th Dynasty and the 25th Dynasty belongs to the Late Period according to ‘Hornung et al’; Kitchen, The Third Intermediate Period, 465; E. Hornung, R. Krauss, and D. A. Warburton, Ancient Egyptian Chronology, HDO 83 (Leiden, 2006), 493; H. J. Taylor, The Third Intermediate Period (1069–664 BC), in Ian Shaw, The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt (Oxford and New York, 2000), 324; Eladany, A study of A selected Group, 40.

\(^{(3)}\)Eladany, A study of A selected Group, 40-41. Where the ruling families were of Libyan tribal origins during the larger part of this Period; O. E. Kaper, ‘The Libyan Period in Egypt’, EA 32 (2008) 38.


\(^{(5)}\)M. Ch. Tetley, the Reconstructed Chronology of the Egyptian Kings (New Zealand, 2014), 511-512, Table 36.1. 2; these found in Manéthon, trans. W.G. Waddell (Cambridge, 1971), 158-161.

\(^{(6)}\)Schneider, Ägypten und Levante 20 (2011), 375.

\(^{(7)}\)Tetley, the Reconstructed Chronology, 511-562.

\(^{(8)}\)Hornung et al, give Shoshenq I and his Successors dates began from 943 BCE not from 945 BCE. See, Hornung et al, HDO 83 (2006), 493.

\(^{(9)}\)Taylor, in Ian Shaw, the Oxford History of Ancient Egypt, 335; L. Swart, ‘The Transition from the 21\(^{st}\) to the 22\(^{nd}\) Dynasty in Thebes, Egypt as Manifested in Changes in the Wooden Funerary Stelae of the Dynasty’, Journal for Semitics 16/2 (2007), 521.


of which was the appointment of his son Osorkon\textsuperscript{12}, as the High Priest of Amun.\textsuperscript{13} From the inauguration of Shoshenq III, he had evidently usurped the throne from the High Priest Osorkon, and the kingship became split between different candidates: Pedubast I, of the 23\textsuperscript{rd} Dynasty, was recognized alongside Shoshenq III from 22\textsuperscript{nd} dynasty,\textsuperscript{14} then Osorkon III ruled the south parallel to Shoshenq IIIa, Pami and Shoshenq V in the north.\textsuperscript{15}

This paper will discuss the chronology of one of these pharaohs who ruled during the split of the kingship between different candidates. This pharaoh is called ‘Pami’, based on Manetho’s records for the 22\textsuperscript{nd} Dynasty; although such records suffered damage and loss in transmission, resulting in that only three of its kings were named. The texts of the Nile level on the quay wall of the temple of Amun at Karnak record the maximum height of the Nile in various kings’ reign years. It is a valuable aid to the chronology. The analyses of these texts help define the length of some rulers’ reigns.\textsuperscript{16} Furthermore, Lunar dates which are taken from records of inductions of priests at Amun festivals, and the enthronement of twoApis bulls also assist.

Pami ‘Wsr m3’t R°-Stp n Imn’ (789–784 BC):

\[ \text{Pami, his birth name which means he who belongs to the Cat ‘Bastet’}^{17}, \text{while his Throne name is ‘Wsr m3’t R°- Stp n Imn’ ‘Powerful is the Justice of Re, Chosen of Amun’}^{18}. \]

Pami\textsuperscript{19} is variously spelled as Pemu\textsuperscript{20}, or Pamiu.\textsuperscript{21} Pami’s name was transcribed as Pimay\textsuperscript{22} ‘P3-mi1’, which means a lion\textsuperscript{23}, by past historians based on a misreading of the text of a small statuary group (CG 9430) in the Egyptian Museum, which was found in Sais (pl. 1).\textsuperscript{24}

\begin{table}[h]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Year} & \textbf{Event} & \textbf{Note} \\
\hline
1784 & \text{Death of Osorkon II} & \text{At Gebel el-Silsila, Egypt} \\
\hline
1781 & \text{Pami I becomes High Priest of Amun} & \text{At Karnak Temple, Egypt} \\
\hline
1780 & \text{Pami I becomes Pharaoh} & \text{At Memphis, Egypt} \\
\hline
1777 & \text{Pedubast I becomes High Priest of Amun} & \text{At Karnak Temple, Egypt} \\
\hline
1774 & \text{Pedubast I becomes Pharaoh} & \text{At Memphis, Egypt} \\
\hline
1771 & \text{Osorkon III becomes High Priest of Amun} & \text{At Karnak Temple, Egypt} \\
\hline
1768 & \text{Osorkon III becomes Pharaoh} & \text{At Memphis, Egypt} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{16} Tetley, \textit{the Reconstructed Chronology}, 511-512, Table 36 (1, 2).


\textsuperscript{18} Clayton, \textit{Chronicle of the Pharaohs}, 185; Tetley, \textit{The Reconstructed Chronology}, 512. Usermaatre Setepenamun was the throne name for Osorkon II, Pedubast, Iput I, Osorkon III, Takeloth III, and Rudamun, while Usermaatre-Setepenre was the throne name of Shoshenq III and Pami. See, J. James, \textit{Embodied Persons in the North Abydos Votive Zone during the Third Intermediate- Late Period (1069-332BCE): Constructing Social Identities with Osteology and Mortuary Behaviour} (Ph. D. diss., University of Toronto, 2018), 178 n. 20.

\textsuperscript{19} Jansen-Winkeln, in E. Hornung (ed.), \textit{Ancient Egyptian Chronology}, 244.

\textsuperscript{20} PM VIII, 136 Nr. 800–781–400.

\textsuperscript{21} Kitchen, \textit{Third Intermediate Period}, 102.

\textsuperscript{22} Clayton, \textit{Chronicle of the Pharaohs}, 185.

\textsuperscript{23} The system of transliterating ’i’ by ‘a’ and ’j’ by ‘a’ (with or without a diacritic sign) has make this confusion between ’cats’ and ’lions’. For more see, J. Yoyotte,’Des lions et des chats Contribution à la prosopographie de l’époque libyenne’, \textit{RdE} 39 (1988), 155-160.

\textsuperscript{24} G. Daressy, \textit{Textes et Dessins Magiques; CGC (Nr. 9401-9449)} (Le Caire, 1903), 37-39, pl. xi Nr. 9430.
mentions a royal son named Pami.\(^{25}\) Kitchen made a mistake in the orthography of the name of this prince, when he thought it had been written by using the lion sign. This differs from king Pami ‘P3-mlw’ which is written by using a cat sign.\(^{26}\)

\[\text{[1]} \text{Wr-m P3-mlw s3 n nb tawy Swsnk mry-Imn.}\]

‘Chief the Ma, Pami ‘Pamu’, Son of the Lord of the Two Lands, Shoshenq Meryamun’

The name of the prince is written on this object, using the signs showing the sitting cat ‘feline’. It is usually used in the cat name.\(^{28}\) Pemay is recognized to be an erroneous translation of this king’s name, which should rather be written as Pami or Pamu according to another kneeling statue in the British Museum ‘EA 32747’ that depicts him offering ‘nw’ pots with cartouches (pl. 2).\(^{29}\)

[1] On belt and left shoulder:

‘Wsr-m3r-Rc Stp-n-Rc’

[2] On right shoulder:

Mr(y)-Imn s3 B3stt P(3)-mlw ntr hhk?

Beloved of Amun, Son of Bastet, Pami (Pamu), Good God?.

Another conflict appears here; some scholars identify Pami ‘Pamu’ as the third son of Shoshenq III\(^{30}\), where others thought he was a different man, whose parentage is unknown.\(^{31}\) The identification of Pami as the third son of Shoshenq III is based on the dedication of the small statuary group (CG 9430)\(^{32}\), but of course there is no guarantee that the Shoshenq of these monuments is ‘Shoshenq III’ rather than any of Nos. I, III, IV or V.\(^{33}\) So this cartridge is not readable enough to establish the kinship between Shoshenq III and Pami; hence there no guarantee that his son is King Pami.

Is Pami the Successor of Shoshenq III?

According to the Apis-bull who was buried in the twenty-eighth year of Shoshenq III, and according to the stela which was commemorated, this event is for the great chief of the Ma (the High Priest of Memphis) ‘P3-dl-ist’.\(^{34}\) The successor of this Apis bull was introduced in the same year (II/Akhet), then it died in the second year (Peret) of Pami after reaching the age of twenty-six years.\(^{35}\) The second year of Pami thus lies twenty-six years after the year twenty eighth of Shoshenq III. That means if King Pami is the successor of Shoshenq III, the latter would have a reign of no less than fifty-two years.\(^{36}\) Barker also emphasized this assumption based on the Brooklyn papyrus Nr. 16. 205 (pl. 3)\(^{37}\), where


\(^{27}\)G. Daressy, ‘Notes sur les XXII, XXIII, et XXIV Dynasties’, \textit{RT} 35 (1913), 137 no. 3; G. Daressy, ‘Notes et Remarques’, \textit{RT} 16 (1895), 48.


\(^{30}\)Daressy, \textit{RT} 35 (1913), 129-150, 137 no. 3.

\(^{31}\)Tetley, \textit{the Reconstructed Chronology}, 512, 559.


\(^{37}\)Papyrus Inscribed in Hieratic, ca. 991-982 B.C.E. Papyrus, ink, 9 1/16 x 35 1/16 in. (23 x 89 cm). Brooklyn Museum, Gift of Evangeline Wilbour Blashfield, Theodora Wilbour, and Victor Wilbour; R.
the text consists of four memoranda; the first three of which are judicial oracular judgments, all in favor of one Ikeni, and the last is a record of certain payments by the same man. The third memorandum is dated to year four, II Smw eight, of an unnamed king. Parker assumed that Pami is of the twenty second dynasty. The first and second memoranda record judgments delivered on the same day but the date is not given and is presumably earlier than that of third memorandum because different gods are involved. All three disputes concern the purchase of land by Ikeni in a forty ninth year known as the bad time and the charge that he did not make payment. The gods declare that he did. Barker assumed the text was after the nineteenth dynasty and Ramses II, where the only succeeding king who had the certain forty ninth years was Shoshenq III. However, it is highly probable that another king called ‘Shoshenq IIIa’ with the Throne name ‘ḥd-hpr-Rˁ’ whom he dubbed ‘Shoshenq Ib’ should be inserted here. He has recently been assigned on the basis of a new proposal that there were two kings named (Hedjkheperre Setepenre Shoshenq Meryamun), one being Shoshenq I, and the other a much later king, which is also recognized now as ‘Shoshenq IV’, who was buried in the tomb of his predecessor ‘Shoshenq III’ at Tanis, and perhaps being the unnamed king of Karnak Nile Text twenty forth, whose twelfth year corresponded to Pedubast’s fifth year.

This possibility depends on some considerations:

- The most important piece of evidence here is a donation stela, from the tenth year of King ‘Shoshenq ḡd-hpr-Rˁ’. It mentions a Great Prince of the Libu named ‘Niumateped’ and a man apparently bearing the same name with a title documented from the eighth year of ‘Shoshenq V’.

- Secondly, the second un-inscribed sarcophagus which was found in the tomb of Shoshenq III at Tanis (NRT V). They found a canopic jar in the debris, with the full name of ‘Hedjkheperre Setepenre Shoshenq Meryamun si-Bast Netjerheqaon’. The use of the nomen epithet Netjerheqaon ‘god, ruler of Heliopolis’ on the jar was never used by kings before Shoshenq III. So it could not refer to Shoshenq I or IIa.

---


[38] Parker, A *saite Oracle Papyrus*, 49.


Thirdly, although the reign of Shoshenq III lasted around fifty-two years, the highest year attested for Shoshenq III is the thirty-ninth year, assigning him texts at Karnak, placing a ten to thirteen years reign of this Shoshenq ḫd-hpr- Rc into this period, which means that Shoshenq III and his successor ‘Shoshenq IIIa’ reigned the whole fifty-two years of Shoshenq III, and accords also with the Apis bull’s twenty-six years of lifespan from the twenty-eighth year of Shoshenq III to the second year of Pami.

In accordance with these evidences, Dodson, Kitchen, and other scholars, now we can assume that Shoshenq IV ‘Shoshenq IIIa’ is the successor of Shoshenq III. Anyway the precise length of Shoshenq IV’s reign is chronologically not very important since the whole period, between the year 28 of Shoshenq III and year 2 of Pami, is certain.

**Pami’s Reign:**

The full length of Pami’s reign at Tanis is not known for certain, especially that his monuments are few. Six years will be allowed here beyond the second year in Apis stela and the fourth year of Brooklyn papyrus ‘16.205’.

There is only the sixth year of a votive stela in the Louvre ‘C 275’; presumably Memphite reports a religious ceremony dated with the sixth year of Pami (pl. 4). It was so far the date of the highest reign known for this king until 1998, where a reused block from a doorway in Heliopolis was published. It was found as a part of a medieval Islamic fortification in old Cairo called Bab El Nasr (pl. 5), which preserves a section chronicling Pami’s donations to local gods, a seventh reignal year is clearly visible for Pami in it:

\[ [ḥ3t]- \text{sp} ] [7] s3 Rc ḫmmlw \text{[br].n.f] m mnw[f] (line 35 pl. 6)\]

The seventh year can be added to Pami’s reign according to the structure of the text, if his ‘annals’ were not written posthumously, and this would confirm Kitchen’s assessment.

---


3. Eladany, *A Study of A Selected Group*, 55; Bickel et al, *BIFAO* 98 (1998), 31; Perhaps a sector of the temple at Heliopolis in which annals inscriptions had been grouped was broken up and its blocks were removed in the Middle Ages. The less durable material of the Pami inscription may suggest that numerous such inscriptions had existed, with this one happening not to have been destroyed. See, V. Müller und U. Hartung, *Zeichen aus dem Sand Streiflichter aus Ägyptens Geschichte zu Ehren von Günter Dreyer Herausgegeben von Eva-Marie Engel* (Wiesbaden, 2008), 19-21.

4. Bickel et al, *BIFAO* 98 (1998), 37; Tetley, *The Reconstructed Chronology*, 559. This stone is 104 cm long, 64 cm wide and 36.5 cm thick. It carries a text hieroglyphic written from left to right and arranged in two horizontal lines that separate in two sections written in columns of a width of 2.5 cm each. From registration placed above the two lines, only traces of some signs remain. On the bottom and the two short sides of the block, the surface of the stone disappeared as a result of its reuse. It therefore only partially preserved the central part of the inscription on a width of about 25 columns. The entire block should have some forty columns, stopping above an incised line 13 cm from the lower edge columns (27-29) and taken from the text. The presence, at the top of columns 19 and 22, two years of reign, the fourth and the fifth of a king whose cartridges were hammered out, clearly shows that this document is a fragment of annals of which it is difficult to estimate the original extension; Bickel et al, *BIFAO* 98 (1998), 31-32.
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of full sixth years.\(^{(62)}\) This assumption of a rather short reign for Pami is further supported also by the fact that the reign of his son was quite long. So Pami may have reigned for more than six years.

Shoshenq V followed Pami according to one of the Serapeum stelae from the eleventh year of Shoshenq V Akheperre (783–ca. 746BC). It gives his names as ‘Akheperre, son of Re, Shoshenq, son of Pami’.\(^{(63)}\) While another stela from the Serapeum from the thirty seventh year of Shoshenq V bears the name of the same (still living) donor as in the second year of Pami.\(^{(64)}\) It is thus improbable that this long period can be stretched any further. But, it is not sure that another king (e.g., an older son of Pami) may have ruled between Pami and Shoshenq V, but then if at all, only very briefly.\(^{(65)}\)

In opposite, Osorkon III ruled the south in parallel to Shoshenq IIIa, Shoshenq Ib, Pami and Shoshenq V in the north.\(^{(66)}\) Finally, it is likely that Pami was buried in one of the vaults of the royal necropolis of Tanis according to the meager remains that were collected in the tomb NRT II (pl. 7).\(^{(67)}\)

**Conclusion:**

The research sheds light on the synchronization of two dynasties; the twenty second in Tanis and the twenty third in Leontopolis, where the chronology of these dynasties is extremely confusing, since all the relationships between the many rulers are not clear. The Cat King (789-784 BC) is mostly the eighth pharaoh of the 22\(^{nd}\) Dynasty. His correct name, is ‘\(P\text{-miw}\)’ which is written with a sitting feline \(\text{\text{\u03b6}}\). There is no a reliable evidence that he was the son of Shoshenq III, and the cartridge in the statuary group (CG 9430) is not enough readable to establish the kinship between him and Shoshenq III. There is another Shoshenq III called Shoshenq Ib ruled after Shoshenq III and before Pami, his reign estimates between ten and thirteen years. Pami’s reign almost estimated between six or seven years not more. It may be that his son Shoshenq V (783- 746BC) is not the direct successor.

In conclusion, we may provide revised tables of the Tanite Libyan kings and the dates of the second half of 22\(^{nd}\) Dynasty broadly basing the assumption upon all those pervious considerations:

---


\(^{(64)}\) Malinine et al, *Catalogue des stèles*, docs. 24, 25, 41.

\(^{(65)}\) Jansen-Winkeln, in E. Hornung (ed.), *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, 245.

\(^{(66)}\) Eladany, *A study of A selected Group*, 58; Jansen-Winkeln, in E. Hornung (ed.), *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*, 254 fig. III.

\(^{(67)}\) Bickel et al. *BIFAO* 98 (1998), 41; Yoyotte, *RdE* 39 (1988),156, 166-168, fig. 5, pl. 6 a, b, c.
### The Chronology of the Cat King (Pami)

#### Tab. 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyn. 22</th>
<th>943–746 BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shoshenq I Hedjkheperre Setepenre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Osorkon I Sekhemkheperre Setepenre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Takelot I Usermaatre Setepenamun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shoshenq II Heqakheperre Setepenre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Osorkon II Usermaatre Setepenamun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Shoshenq III Usermaatre Setepenre/amun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shoshenq IIIa Hedjkheperre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pami Usermaatre Setepenre/amun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Shoshenq V Akheperre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Tab. 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Half of 22nd Dynasty</th>
<th>highest year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq III</td>
<td>39 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq <em>Hedjkheperre</em></td>
<td>10 to 13 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>His reign length of 13 years can be calculated from data regarding an Apis bull according to which 26 years elapsed between year 28 of Shoshenq III and year 2 of Pami: (26 - ([39-28] + 2) = 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pami</td>
<td>6 to 7 years according to Heliopolis annals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshenq V</td>
<td>38 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dies some time before the conquest of Egypt by Piankhi; ca. 3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, second half**: 97 years
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التأريخ للملك القط (بامي) وفقاً للآثار.
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الملخص:

تعتبر الأدلة التي عثر عليها للتاريخ للملك "بامي" (874-789 ق.م.); والذي يذكر اسمه بصيغ مختلفة من "بامي، أو بامي، أو بامي، أو بامي، أو بامي" (Nader, 1997). فعند سبيل المثال تم تداول الصيغة الأخيرة من الاسم "بامي" والتي تعني "الأسد" من قبل عدد من المؤرخين السابقين وفقاً لقراءة خاطئة لمجموعة التماثيل الصغيرة التي توجد بالمتحف المصري برقم (CG 9430). كما يظهر عائق آخر في التأريخ لهذا الملك هو أنه من المحتمل أن يكون هناك ملك آخر يدعى "Shoshenq Ib" أو "Shoshenq IIIa" (940-790 ق.م.); ربما تتوسط فترة حكم الملك "Shoshenq الثالث" والملك "بامي"، بل يمتد الأمر إلى أن هذا الملك المستحدث ربما يشكل مع الملك "Shoshenq الثالث" كخليفته الفترة الزمنية التي امتدت حوالي اثنتين وخمسين عامًا، والتي يقدرها البعض كمدة حكم الملك "بامي" بمبلغ تجاوز 50 سنة. أيضاً تمتد صعوبة التاريخ للملك "بامي" إلى نقاط عديدة منها أولًا: مدة حكمه في تانيس؛ فهي مدة غير معروفة على وجه اليقين، ثانياً: هل هناك مثبت وجود ملك آخر (على سبيل المثال: الابن الأكبر لبامي) حكم في الفترة ما بين "بامي" والملك "شوشنق الخامس" (783-734 ق.م.)، ثالثًا: المكان الحقيقي لدفن الملك.

الكلمات الرئيسية:

بامي، بامي، بامي، بامي، القط، الأسد، الأسرة الثانية والعشرون.