

A 4000–Year Old Descent from Antiquity: From the 12th Egyptian Dynasty to the Capetians and Beyond.

Compiled by F. A. Doria from postings to soc.medieval.gen,
1995–1998

Analysis of the descent by Chris Bennett

Comments and discussion by C. Settipani and N. Taylor

May 2001

1 The descent

The line goes as follows:¹

¹From an early 2000 post to the gen–med list by Chris Bennett: “I have recently come across an article which may be of interest (R. C. Steiner, “Bitte–Ya, daughter of Pharaoh, and Bint(i)–’Anat daughter of Ramses II,” *Biblica* **79:3** (1998) 394—*Biblica* is now available online at <http://www.bsw.org/project/biblica/index.htm>, but this particular article is the only article omitted from the 1998 online collection). Steiner discusses a certain Bithiah, daughter of pharaoh, mentioned as the wife of Mered in a collection of genealogies of the tribe of Judah. He argues that the name Bithiah disguises an original “Bint–Anath,” known as a daughter of Ramses II. Noting that the ancestor of the line discussed, Ezra, is in some way a relative of Caleb, who was a companion of Joshua, and that Mered’s grandsons were named as founders of the cities of Gedor, Socor and Zanoah, he argues that Mered must be dated to the 12/11th centuries BC. On this basis, he suggests that Bithiah was a D20 (20th Dynasty) princess Bint–Anath, perhaps a [grand]daughter of Ramses III.

FWIW there is at least one known case of an Egyptian princess, Nebetia daughter of the king’s son SiAtum, who was almost certainly a king’s granddaughter (likely, of Amenhotep III), bearing the title s3t nsw—“king’s daughter”—probably indicating that she was born in the lifetime of her grandfather. However I see no reason the Judahites would have conformed to this nicety of Egyptian practice, I think they would have been happy to accord the title to any descendant of a pharaoh.

Anyway, I’ve just been checking what Chronicles actually has to say about her. Its not much. The relevant text is as follows (KJV, King James Version):

(17) And the sons of Ezra were, Jether, and Mered, and Epher, and Jalon: and she bare Miriam, and Shammai, and Ishbah the father of Eshtemoa. (18) And his wife Jehudijah bare Jered the father of Gedor, and Heber the father of Socho, and Jekuthiel the father of Zanoah. And these are the sons of Bithiah the daughter of Pharaoh, which Mered took. (19) And the sons of his wife Hodiah the sister of Naham, the father of Keilah the Garmite, and Eshtemoa the Maachathite.

It is clear that she was a mother of Mered’s sons, but the wording is unclear (at least in the KJV and to me) as to exactly who they are, it rather looks like they have been elided at some point. However, one online interpretation I found suggests that Bithiah is the “she” of verse 17, and certainly this works if you assume the genealogies are constructed according to a

12th dynasty

1. *Sen-Wosret*, ancestor of the 12th Dynasty. Son:
2. *Amenemhat I*, d. 1962 b.C., first king, 12th Dynasty. Son:
3. *Sen-Wosret I*, co-regent and then sole ruler for 45 years. Son:
4. *Amenemhet II*, buried at Dahshur. Son:
5. *Sen-Wosret II*, built pyramid at Illahun. Son:
6. *Sen-Wosret III* fought in Palestine and Nubia. Father of:
7. NN. Father of:
8. *Amenemhet III*, d. 1797 b.C., ruled for 46 years. Father of:
 - NN. Follows.
 - NN. Father of:
 - *Amenemhet IV*, ruled for a brief time. Father of *Queen Sebeknefru*, last of the 12th Dynasty.
9. NN. Child:
10. NN. Child:

Intermediate period

11. *Kemi*, a daughter,² who married *Ha-Ankhef*, God's Father; parents of *Ha-Ankhef* were *Nehi* and *Senebtisi*. Son:
12. *Khaneferre Sebekhotep IV*, king c. 1737–1727. M. *Queen Tjani*. Child:
13. *Sebekhotep*, hereditary princess.³ M. *Senebhanef*, vizier under (probably) *Mernerferre Ay*, king of all Egypt c. 1713–1690.⁴ Child:

nesting principle. OTOH, Steiner clearly regards the descendants of Ishbah listed in verse 18 as descendants of a second wife of Mered, presumably Hodiah. Whatever, these genealogies are totally outside my expertise to evaluate and I present them solely FWIW.

Nevertheless, there does appear to be a prima facie case here for an Egyptian princess with descendants amongst the Judahites. Link her up to the line of David somehow, and the problem of an Egyptian DFA becomes reduced to that of a Davidic DFA. Whether we're better off or not is up to you to judge!"

²There is a *JAMS* article by C. Bennett where he presents a suggestion, based on the Westcar Papyrus, that *Kemi* may have been descended from *Amenemhat III* of the 12th dynasty. C. Bennett (CB, in the next footnotes) regards this as an interesting speculation rather than a serious case.

³A hereditary princess was not necessarily a king's daughter, but there are instances of this period where known king's daughters are only described by this title. Paternity of *Sebekhotep* depends on this supposition plus some chronological dead reckoning. *Tjani* was his wife but not necessarily the mother of *Sebekhotep* (CB).

⁴Probably identical with *Senebhanef*, controller of the hall, son of *Yauyebi*, vizier under (probably) *Wahibre Yauyebi*, king c. 1723–1713 and *Renressonb*, certainly daughter of *Id*, Herald of *Adhur-nakht* (CB).

14. *Mentuhotep*. Died during the reign of her husband.⁵ Husband, king *Sekhemre-mentawi Djehuti*, c. 1660 BC; reigned 3 years. Parents of:
15. One of three brothers: either *Sekhemre-se'ankhtawi Neferhotep III* (who reigned 1 year?), or *Sekhemre-seusertawi Sebekhotep VIII* (reigned for 16 years?—a 4th year is known inscriptionally) or even *Se'ankhenre Mentuhotep VII* (formerly VI) (reigned for a single year?).⁶ One of them is the father⁷ of:
16. *Sekhemre-shedtawi Sebekemsaf I* (formerly II), whose tomb was desecrated by 20th dynasty tomb robbers. M. *Queen Nubkhas*. Parents of:
17. *Nubkheperre Inyotef VII* (formerly V), king for at least 3 years (probably much more) c. 1600 b.C.⁸ M. *Queen Sebekemsaf*, almost certainly the daughter of *Horhorkhuwaytef*, governor of Edfu, and *Sebeknakht*, a king's daughter. Which king? *Se'ankhenre Mentuhotep VII* (see 15. above) or one of the other two candidates;⁹ mother is *Queen Salmut*, known to be wife of a Theban king Mentuhotep of this period.
- Parents of:
18. *Sekhenre-wahkhau Rahotep* (or, less likely, *Sekhenre-wadjkhau Sebekemsaf II* (formerly I), his predecessor).¹⁰

17th dynasty

M. *Tetisheri*.¹¹ Tetisheri was the daughter of *Cenna (Tenna)*, m. to *Neferu*; XVII Dynasty.¹²

⁵The connection to parents given here is virtually certain (CB).

⁶Brotherhood is supposed because of naming patterns and other genealogical indications in the later dynasty (CB).

⁷The next step on this line is based on the pattern of prenoms and the theory that the succession system in this dynasty was fratrilineal (CB).

⁸Almost certainly the brother of *Sekhemre-wepma'et Inyotef V* (formerly VI) (“the Elder”), who was certainly the son of a king (CB).

⁹The proposed identity of her father is based on chronological plausibility and a known association with Edfu.

¹⁰These kings, and their predecessors back to about 1660 b.C., ruled in Upper Egypt only. There is reason to believe that his principal wife was a queen *Sebekemsaf-Haanhkes*, king's wife, king's sister and king's daughter. Art-historical and collateral genealogical data place him in this period. Juggling the possibilities, we arrive as this as the most likely step (CB).

¹¹The theory that Tetisheri married *Ta'o I*, although of very long standing, is a pure guess, based solely on the facts that *Ta'o I* was probably *Ta'o II*'s immediate predecessor and that Tetisheri, the daughter of commoners, married a king. The only solid indicator of *Ta'o*'s position is that he was called *Ta'o-o*, meaning “*Ta'o* the Elder” (though one respected expert, Claude Vandersleyen, disputes the evidence that he was called *Ta'o* at all—hypercritically). By analogy with a slightly earlier king Inyotef “the Elder,” who was elder *brother* of a king Inyotef, *Ta'o I* was probably brother to *Ta'o II*.

It is a well-documented, if confusing, custom of the period to give many children the same name. But, Teti-sheri did marry a king. Who, we don't know. Here is the best guess (CB).

¹²Tetisheri's name (“little Teti”) suggests that she was related to a noble family of this period where the name *Teti* is prominent. *Tetihemet*, nurse of *Queen Ahmes-Nefertari*, the

Parents of:

19. *Seqenenre Tao II*, “The Brave,” married his sister ‘*Ahhotpe*, d. c. 1515 b.C., age 88 or 100.¹³

Parents of:

18th dynasty

- *Nebpehtyre ‘Ahmose*, King, 1550-1525 b.C.; married his sister ‘*Ahmose Nefertari*; founders of the XVIII dynasty.
 - *Ahmes-Sapair*, follows.
20. *Ahmes-Sapair*, heir-apparent to the minor *Amenhotep I* but died before him; married *Sensonb*.¹⁴ Son:
21. *Akheperkare Tuthmosis I*, General of Amenhotep I, co-King 1504–1492. Wife *Mutnefert* was the mother of *Akheperenre Tuthmosis II*; wife ‘*Ahmose* was the mother of *Makare Hatshepsut*.¹⁵
- Follows:
22. *Akheperenre Tuthmosis II*, King 1492–1479; m. half sister *Makare Hatshepsut*; had son by concubine Isis:
23. *Menkheperre Tuthmosis III*, Pharaoh 1479–1425 b.C., son by concubine Isis; m. his half sister *Meritre Hatshepset*, d. of God’s Votaress *Huy*. Son:
24. *Akheperure Amenhotep II*, Pharaoh 1427–1396 b.C., m. Tyo (Taaa, Tiaa). Son:
25. *Menkheperure Tuthmosis IV*, Pharaoh, m. *Mutemwia*, who was a probable daughter of *Yey*, Overseer of Horses, and *Tey*.¹⁶ Child:
26. *Nebmare Amenhotep III* m. *Tiye-Nefertari*, daughter of *Yuya*, Overseer of Horses, High Priest of Min at Akhmim; Yuya m. *Tuya*, Head of Amon’s Harem at Thebes; head of Min’s Harem at Akhmim; Yuya was a son of *Yey* and *Tey*.¹⁷

queen being Tetisheri’s granddaughter, also came from this family. While only fragments of the family’s genealogy are traceable, we can trace it from *Teti* son of *Minhotep*, an opponent of King *Nubkheperre Inyotef*. (CB).

¹³This appears in the DFA charts; it is not absolutely certain that Ta’o II was the father of Ahmose, next step, but its by far the most likely theory. Ahhotep, however, was not nearly this old at death—possibly the DFA chart has confused her with Tetisheri (CB).

¹⁴The mummy labelled as his in the cache of DB320 is that of a child, but all the other evidence points towards this relation, and there is a good case from X-ray studies that many if not most of the royal mummies were mislabelled (CB).

¹⁵Both wives were believed to be his half sisters; also to each other. But there is no evidence that Mutnefert was either a sister of Thutmosis or a daughter of Amenhotep I. The latter is most unlikely since he apparently succeeded very young (CB).

¹⁶Tuthmosis’ mother, Tia, may also have come from the same Akhmim family, closely related to the dynasty for the rest of its history (CB).

¹⁷Yuya’s parentage is not certainly known, though the suggestion given is probable. There

19th dynasty

27. (Daughter).¹⁸
28. *Sitre*, granddaughter¹⁹ of *Tiye–Nefertari* and *Nebmare Amenhotep III*, m. Ramses I (*Menpehtyre Ramesse*) son of *Sety*. Parents of:
29. *Sety I* m. *Tuya*, Heiress of the XVIII Dynasty, dau of *Tuya*, who m. *Reya*, Lieutenant of Chariotry; the latter *Tuya* was a granddaughter of *Tiye–Nefertari* and *Nebmare Amenhotep III* (see 26. above). Parents of:
30. *Ramses II* (*Usirmare Setepenre Ramesse*), b. 1314 b.C., Pharaoh of Egypt, 1290–1224 b.C.; d. 1224 b.C. Father of:

20th dynasty

31. *Setnakht* (*Usirkha'ure Setepenre Meryamun Sethnakte*), b. c. 1265 b.C.; Pharaoh of Egypt 1186–1184 b.C.; d 1184 b.C., m. *Tiye–Merenese*, a sister of *Seti II*.²⁰ Parents of:
32. *Ramses III* (*Usirmare Meryamun Ramesse*), b. c. 1225 b.C.; Pharaoh of Egypt, 1184–1153 b.C.; d. 1153 b.C. Son:

is an entertaining book by Ahmed Osman, *Stranger in the Valley of the Kings*, (San Francisco, 1987), which makes a case that Yuya was the biblical Joseph. Not to be taken too seriously, but he does have some interesting observations to make (CB).

¹⁸Directly quoting C. Bennett: “I have no idea where the DFA charts got this from—I know of absolutely no evidence for it. All the evidence I have seen of the ancestry of the 19th dynasty indicates that they were a provincial military family unconnected with the court. The 18/19 dynasty gap is the one in this descent which is most likely to be unbridgeable, because of the collapse of the 18th dynasty in the Atenist heresy. The most recent discussion I have seen suggests that the two chief wives of Ramses II may have been descended from the last two 18th dynasty pharaohs—Nefertari from Ay, because of a faience knob with his name found in her tomb, and because of several associations with Akhmim; and Isitnofret from Horemhab because of associations with his private tomb in Saqqara. But neither of these pharaohs were descended from the earlier kings, so far as is known, even though Ay’s ancestors appear to have provided queens for several generations. About the only possibility I can see based on current knowledge is to suppose that Nefertari was descended from a possible marriage between Ay and *Ankhes-en-amun*, widow of *Tutankhamen*, daughter of *Akhenaten* and (probably) Ay’s own granddaughter, which is pretty far-fetched.”

¹⁹Following the DFA charts.

²⁰Maybe, but there’s no evidence for it (perhaps some will emerge from the tomb of Ramses II’s sons). *Setnakht*’s own succession stela indicates that he was not in line for the throne, so if he was a son of Ramses II it was almost certainly by a minor concubine—another difficulty for an 18th dynasty descent. Most Egyptologists don’t consider the 19th and 20th dynasty to be related. The fact that neither *Setnakht* nor (more surprisingly) *Ramses III* state a connection is a good point, though hardly conclusive, since the formal Egyptian theory of succession seems to have been based on a revelatory ideal rather than any genealogical principle. But the use of common names (which is elsewhere argued to support a 20/21 dynasty connection), the large numbers of descendants of Ramses II, and the fact that *Hori*, grandson of crown prince *Khaemwese*, was vizier under the first two 20th dynasty kings all suggests to me that there was a connection. *Settipani* proposes a connection through *Tiye–Merenese*, possibly as a sister of *Seti II*, which is plausible but again a guess (CB).

33. *Ramses VIII (Sethirkhopsef Usirmare Akhenamun Ramesse)*, b. c. 1195 b.C., Pharaoh of Egypt 1129–1127 b.C.; d. 1127 b.C. Son:
34. *Ramses IX (Khaemwaset Neferkare Setepenre Ramesse)*, b. c. 1175 b.C.; Pharaoh of Egypt 1127–1109 b.C.; d. 1109 b.C.²¹ Follows:
35. *Ramses X (Amenhirkhopsef Khepermare Setepenre Ramesse)*, b. c. 1155 b.C.; Pharaoh of Egypt 1109–1099 b.C.; d. 1099 b.C.; m. *Tyti*.²² Follows:
36. *Ramses XI (Khaemwaset Menmare Setepenptah Ramesse)*, b. c. 1130 b.C.; Pharaoh of Egypt 1099–1069 b.C.; d. 1069 b.C. Daughter:

21st dynasty

37. *Henttawy*, b. 1105 b.C.; Princess of Egypt, m. *Hedjkheperre Setepenre Nesubanebdjed*, Pharaoh of Egypt 1069–1043 b.C.²³ Son:
38. *Psusennes I (Akheperre Setepenamun Psibkha'emne (Psusennes I))*, born in 1078 b.C.; Pharaoh of Egypt 1039–991 b.C.; d. 991 b.C. at Tanis; m. *Wiay*. Daughter:
39. *Istemkheb*, b. 1050 b.C., Princess of Egypt, m. *Menkheperre*, High Priest of the god Amon in Thebes 1045–992 b.C.²⁴ Son:
40. *Pinudjem II*, b. 1030 b.C.; High Priest of the god Amon in Thebes 990–969 b.C.; d. 969 b.C. Son:
41. *Psusennes II (Titkheperre Setepenre Har-Psibkhaemne)*, b. 995 b.C.; Pharaoh of Egypt 959–945 b.C.; d. 945 b.C.²⁵ Daughter:

²¹The parentage of Ramses IX is unknown. Kitchen has suggested that Ramses IX was the son of prince *Montuhirkhopsef*, then believed to be the son of Ramses III, since he has a son of the same name, but the current excavator of Montuhirkhopsef's tomb disputes this. Montuhirkhopsef is now known to be a son of *Ramses VI* (CB).

²²This filiation and the next depends on Kitchen's hypothesis that *Tyti*, king's daughter, king's wife and king's mother, was the wife of *Ramses X* (CB).

²³This is from Kitchen's 1972 reconstruction. He emended this in 1986 to propose instead that Henttawy married *Pinudjem I*, high priest of Amun at Thebes (1070–1055) and nominal king (1054–1032). Henttawy's parentage is not certain, though she was a king's daughter and Psusennes I had Ramessid connections in his name. Ramses XI seems the best reconstruction, but *Nesubanebdjed (Smendes)* is also a possibility (CB).

²⁴Menkheperre is known to be the son of Pinudjem I. His mother was probably Pinudjem's chief wife Henttawy. Istemkheb, his wife, was the daughter of Wiay and is probably identical with Istemkheb, daughter of *Psusennes I*, but its not absolutely certain (CB).

²⁵It is not certain that Psusennes, High Priest of Amun in Thebes, is identical with Psusennes II, king of Egypt. Kitchen (1972 edition) is inclined to believe they were not, though most scholars think they were the same. Dodson has argued that they were the same, and that Psusennes was, like Pinudjem I, a nominal king, coregent with *Shoshenq I*. If they were different, then *Maatkare's* ancestry (the daughter here) must be sought through the main line of the 21st dynasty, which is not nearly so well known as the High Priests of Amun (CB).

22nd dynasty

42. *Maatkare*, b. 955 B.C.; Princess of Egypt; d. after 940 b.C., m. *Sekhemkheperre Setepenre Osorkon I*, Pharaoh of Egypt 924–889 b.C.²⁶ Son:
43. *Heqakheperre Setepenre Shoshenk II*, b. 940 b.C.; High Priest of the god Amon in Thebes, 924–894 b.C.; Pharaoh of Egypt 890 b.C.; d. 890 b.C., m. *Nesitanebtashru*.²⁷ Son:
44. *Hedjkheperre Setepenamun Harsiese*, b. 920 b.C.; High Priest of the god Amon in Thebes 874 b.C.; Pharaoh of Egypt c. 870–c. 860 b.C.; d. c. 860 b.C. Father of:
45. *Karoma I*, b. c. 900; Princess of Egypt; d. after 852 b.C.; m. *Usermare Setepenamun Osorkon II*, Pharaoh of Egypt 874–850 b.C.²⁸ Son:
46. *Shoshenk*, b. 885 b.C.; Great Chief of Ma; High Priest of the god Ptah in Memphis c. 870–850 b.C.; d. 851 b.C. Son:
47. *Takelot*, b. 865 b.C.; Great Chief of Ma; High Priest of the god Ptah in Memphis (c. 830–c. 810 b.C.); d. c. 810 b.C., m. *Djedbastesankh*.²⁹ Daughter:

²⁶Stella BM 8, which records this marriage, does not specify which king *Osorkon* is involved. *Osorkon I* is generally accepted and seems the most reasonable candidate. However a recent proposal to collapse the chronology of the Third Intermediate Period identifies him as *Osorkon II*, making “*Maatkare*” an alternate form of *Karoma*. This proposal creates considerable genealogical complications; it requires the creation of parallel lines for both the High Priests of Amun and the High Priests of Memphis (CB).

²⁷The identity of *Shoshenk Meryamun*, High Priest of Amon, son of *Maatkare*, with king *Heqakheperre Setepenre Shoshenk II* is not absolutely certain, but is the simplest interpretation of the evidence (CB).

²⁸Not certain. Kitchen (rather surprisingly) does not have an opinion on the question. *Karoma*, wife of *Osorkon II*, is described as a king’s daughter. As *Settipani* points out, this makes her a daughter of *Takeloth I* (also the father of *Osorkon II*) or of *Harsiese*, and *Shoshenq II* should be added. *Settipani* notes that she is not called king’s sister, which in his view favours *Harsiesi*. If so, the marriage may have been part of an attempted political settlement of the regal pretensions of the Theban line of *Shoshenq II* and *Harsiesi*. However, the chronology of prince *Shoshenq* (next generation) requires that *Osorkon* married *Karoma* before *Harsiesi*’s nominal accession. Also, there is another *Karoma*, Divine Wife of Amun and king’s daughter, who is likely to be *Harsiesi*’s daughter, and multiple children of the same name seem to be less common in this period than in earlier times. If the absence of “king’s sister” is significant, then these factors favour *Shoshenq II* as her father; again, the marriage may be seen as part of an attempted political settlement, which presumably was blown up by *Harsiesi*.

On this theory, *Karoma* should be in the previous generation. In any case *Takeloth I* is unlikely to be her father, which makes her almost certainly a descendant of *Maatkare*.

It should be noted that none of the pharaohs of the 22/23 dynasties actually have a traceable ancestry to the marriage of *Osorkon I* with *Maatkare*. It is hard to believe that one didn’t exist, especially towards the end of the period, but at this point we don’t know what it was (CB).

²⁹As noted by *Settipani*, the evidence for *Djedbastesankh* as wife of *Takeloth* is ambiguous, in that she appears on a monument with both prince *Takeloth* and *Shoshenq III*; quite probably *Takeloth*’s daughter of the same name is meant. Probably her mother was *Takeloth*’s well-attested wife (and aunt) *Tjesbastperu*, daughter of *Osorkon II* by an *Istemkheb* of unknown

48. *Djed Bast es Ankh*, b. 840 b.C., d. after 807 b.C., m. *Usermare Setepenre Shoshenk III*, Pharaoh of Egypt 825–773 b.C. Son,
49. *Usermare Setepenre Pimay*, b. 830 b.C.; Great Chief of Ma; Prince of Sais; Pharaoh of Egypt 773–767 b.C.; d. 767 (?) b.C.³⁰ Son:
50. *Osorkon*, b. 805 b.C.; Great Chief of Ma; prophet of Neith; Prince of Sais c. 773–740 (?) b.C.; d. 740 b.C.³¹ Follows:

24th dynasty

51. *Shepsesre Tefnakhte I*, b. 780 b.C.; Great Chief of Ma; prophet of Neith; Prince of Sais 740–727 b.C.; Pharaoh of Egypt 727–720 B.C.; d 720 B.C.³² Son:
52. *Wahkare Bakenranef*, b. 755 b.C.; Pharaoh of Egypt 720–715 b.C.; d. 715 b.C., killed by *Shabaka* of the 25th dynasty. Son:
53. *Iribre Nekauba*, b. 735 b.C.; Prince of Sais 688–672 b.C.; d. 672 b.C.³³ Son:

26th dynasty

54. *Menkheperre Necho I*, b. 710 b.C.; King of Memphis and Sais 672–664 b.C.; d. 664 b.C. Follows:
55. *Wahibre Psamtek I*, b. 685 b.C.; Prince of Athribis 665 b.C., Prince of Sais 664 b.C.; Pharaoh of Egypt 664–610 b.C., d. 610 b.C. Father of:
56. *Wehemobre Necho II*, b. 660 b.C.; Pharaoh of Egypt 610–595 b.C.; d. 595 b.C. Two children to follow:

ancestry. The name Istemkheb is frequent in the 21st dynasty (Kitchen refers to a “plague of Istemkhebs”), so Settiani suggests that she was the descendent of the Maatkare union, but there is really no evidence for this (CB).

³⁰The name of Pimay’s mother is unknown—there is no reason to suppose it was Djed-bastesankh. Sheshonq’s chief queen was *Tentamenopet*, whose ancestry is unknown. Pimay was not the original crown prince, but if one has to guess his mother then Tentamenopet is probably the best guess. It is not certain that Pimay, son of Shoshenq III, prince of Sais, is the same as the later pharaoh Pimay (the name is spelled differently), but its likely (CB).

³¹The parentage of prince Osorkon is unknown, though Pimay is a reasonable guess as his father. Settiani distinguishes Osorkon, Great Chief of Ma, prince of Herakleopolis, from his namesake, Great Chief of Ma, prince of Sais. There seems no reason to do this (CB).

³²The parentage of Tefnakhte is unknown. Given the change in royal naming patterns, after two centuries of almost unmitigated Shoshenqs, Takeloths, Osorkons and Nimlots, one might well argue that he was from a different family, though several other new names (e.g. Pimay, Rudamon) make their appearance in the royal families in this period (CB).

³³The relationship of the 24th dynasty to the 26th, if any, is very uncertain. The only real source is Manetho. It appears that there were several princes of Sais between the two, one of which was arguably called Tefnakhte. Nekauba is the possibly legendary prince Nechepso. The prenomen Iribre (or Menibre) is just a suggestion of Kitchen’s. Settiani suggests here Iribre Tefnakhte (CB).

- *Neferibre Psamtek II*, follows;
- *Nitocris*, m. *Nebuchadnezzar II*, King of Babylon 605–562.³⁴

57. *Neferibre Psamtek II*, b. 630 b.C.; Pharaoh of Egypt 595–589 b.C.; d. 589 b.C. Follows:
58. *Wahibre Haibre*, b. 605 b.C.; Pharaoh of Egypt 589–570 b.C.; d. 568 b.C. Had daughter:
59. *Neithiyti*, b. 570 b.C., d. after 529 b.C., m. c. 546/545 b.C. *Kurush* (Cyrus II), King of Persia 559 b.C., who conquered Babylon and established himself as Babylonian king; d. 530 b.C. Cyrus belonged to the Achaemenes dynasty. This dynasty was founded in the year 668 b.C. by Achæmenes, the first King of Persia. Cyrus' maternal grandfather was Astyages, King of Media 585–561 b.C., and his father was Kyaxares, King of Media 625–585 b.C.³⁵ Daughter:
60. *Atossa*, b. 545 b.C., Princess of Persia, d. 480/465 (?) b.C. M. *Darayavahush* (Darius I), King of Persia 522–486 b.C.; d. 486 b.C.³⁶ Son:

³⁴The DFA charts adduce a hypothetical (and highly questionable) descent for *Andia*, mother of *Parysatis*, wife of Darius II and ancestress of the later Achemenids. This is based on a statement by Herodotus that a Queen Nitocris of Babylon married a king *Labynetus* and was the mother of another king Labynetus. One of these may be identified as *Nabonidus*. Since the name “Nitocris” is undoubtedly Egyptian, Dougherty proposed that she was a daughter of Nenuchadnezzar via a marriage to a d. of Necho II of unknown name. In view of the abhorrence that Egyptian kings showed for placing their daughters in foreign marriages, this theory is most unlikely. Lewy has made a more plausible suggestion, that “Nitocris” is Herodotus' misunderstanding of a form of *Naqia*, the wife of *Sennacherib*, and it may be noted that Nabonidus claimed descent from the Assyrian kings (CB).

I don't agree with this last solution. Phonetically, it is obvious that *Labynetus* is *Nabonidus*, and the “abhorrence” for exogamic marriage of daughters must always be qualified, cf. the case of muslim–nonmuslim marriages in Medieval Spain (FAD).

³⁵There is some doubt that Nitetis even existed. Herodotus reports that the Egyptians called Cambyses son of Nitetis, but this name represents the goddess *Neith*, and the title “son of Neith” was common among 26th dynasty pharaohs. For this reason, Settipani now doubts the Nitetis connection. C. Bennett's view is that she did exist, because Herodotus also reports a number of highly circumstantial stories about her told by the Persians. Herodotus reports that she was wife of Cambyses (in one place) and wife of Cyrus (shortly after); further that she was presented as the daughter of the usurper *Amasis* but was “really” the daughter of *Apries*, that is, *Haibre*. If she was in fact the daughter of Amasis then any Egyptian ancestry through her stops there, because nothing is known of her mother and virtually nothing of Amasis' ancestry, though it is possible that Amasis did marry a daughter of Apries. However, the Egyptian kings had a strong and explicitly attested tradition of not marrying their daughters abroad—the only likely exception is the bride of Solomon, who had no descendants known—so I think the most plausible theory is that Nitetis really was a daughter of Apries married to Cyrus by Amasis (CB).

³⁶It is exceedingly unlikely that she was the mother of Atossa. The case presented by Settipani is entirely circumstantial. He establishes that Atossa was most likely born around 545, that the period after Cyrus' conquest of Lydia in 547 is the most likely time, politically speaking, for a diplomatic marriage with Egypt, which allows Nitetis to be in her early 20s, and that *Cassandane* may have been out of favour with Cyrus at about the time of his marriage to Nitetis. This is all very well, but it discounts the evidence of Herodotus about the marriages of Cambyses, which is dismissed as legendary for no good reason. Herodotus says

that Cambyses married his full sisters. One of them died at his hands in Egypt; the other is Atossa, who went on to marry both *Smerdis* and Darius I, becoming the mother of Xerxes. Atossa is unknown in Persian sources and does not appear to have been Darius' favourite wife—that was *Artysone*, another daughter of Cyrus—but as the mother of Xerxes she was of very great interest to the Greeks (Aeschylus refers to her death in one of his plays.) It is hard to believe that Herodotus would not have known who her mother was.

Settipani presents us with another line of argument against Nitetis being Atossa's mother. Cyrus' principal wife was Cassandane, the mother of Cambyses, who died in Babylon in 539, shortly after Cyrus conquered it. She was the daughter of *Pharnaspes*. Diodorus has a corrupt ancestry of the kings of Cappadocia which begins with a "Pharnaces" who married an Atossa, sister of Cambyses I (hence the aunt of Cyrus). Settipani presents a good argument that this genealogy is mostly correct (with a straightforward emendation and one clear late interpolation), and that "Pharnaces" and his immediate descendants can be identified with known individuals in the family of this same Pharnaspes, with "Pharnaces" being Pharnaspes himself. But in this case Cassandane's mother was probably Atossa, the aunt of Cyrus. Cyrus' daughter Atossa was therefore almost certainly named after her maternal grandmother—and Cassandane was indeed her mother, just as Herodotus says.

So, if we rule out Nitetis, are there any other prospects of a descent from Egypt? There is only one that I know of, but it is very controversial and has many gaps. One of the Ptolemaic high priests of Memphis, *Pedubast III* (121–76 b.C.), was the son of *Psenptais II* and a certain *Berenike*, who is described as related ("sister" has been read, but this is disputed) to Ptolemy, "who men call *Alexander*." This would appear to be Ptolemy X *Alexander*, but the man concerned is not named as king. However, Ptolemy X was not king at the time of the marriage, and the king at the time of Pedubast's death was Ptolemy XII *Auletes*, son of Ptolemy IX *Lathyrus*, who was the brother and rival of Ptolemy X and who probably regarded him as a usurper. Also, if Berenike was sister of Ptolemy X, it is unclear why she was not named as either the sister of the (more acceptable?) Ptolemy IX, or daughter of their mutual father Ptolemy VIII *Physcon*, who presumably negotiated the marriage. Since Pedubast's son *Psenptais III* officiated at a coronation of Ptolemy XII in 76/75 b.C., it is hard to understand why the royal connections of his grandmother would be downplayed in this fashion.

On the other hand, Berenike and Ptolemy–Alexander certainly sound like they are Greek (though it has been noted that the names *Berenike* and *Arsinoe*, both deified queens, are attested amongst Egyptians at this time), and Ptolemy VIII and his successors did adopt a policy of rapprochement with the native Egyptian establishment, of which the high priests of Memphis were the head. Marriage of a royal daughter to the high priest of Memphis clearly fits in with such a policy. The coronation of Ptolemy XII by Psenptais is a highly unusual event, and probably represents a new settlement between the Ptolemies and the Egyptians made possible by the death of Pedubast shortly before. The immediately preceding political circumstances may have been sufficient strained to require the head of the Egyptian community to downplay his Greek connections.

On the Ptolemaic side, there are two rulers whose maternity is unknown: Ptolemy XII, and his daughter *Cleopatra VII*. In the case of Cleopatra, Bouche–Leclercq long ago made the case that her mother was probably Ptolemy XII's sister–wife Cleopatra V (and that "Cleopatra VI" did not exist); most recently this has been accepted by Peter Green. Imputations of illegitimacy made against her appear to be Roman propaganda, probably based on the much stronger indications that Ptolemy XII had problems with his legitimacy. It is possible that he was the son of Ptolemy IX by his sister–wife Cleopatra *Selene*, who did have two sons whose exact fate is unknown, but the widespread description of him as a bastard (genealogically, that is) makes most scholars think this is unlikely. The question is, what made him illegitimate? Sullivan has suggested that one explanation which would make Ptolemy XII acceptable to the Egyptian establishment while illegitimate to the Greeks could be that Ptolemy XII was the son of an Egyptian wife of Ptolemy IX—and it is hard to imagine any Egyptian wife being acceptable short of a daughter of the Memphite high priests.

If this is so, then Ptolemy's children (including Cleopatra) were descended from the high priests of Memphis. There is, unfortunately, a 'small' gap of some four centuries in our knowledge of this family, but based on known history it is very reasonable to suppose that the Ptolemaic high priests were descended some way or other from the Libyan high priests, such

Achaemenids

61. *Khshayarsha* (Xerxes I), b. 521 b.C.; King of Persia 486–465 b.C.; d. 465 b.C., m. *Amestris*. Parents of:
62. *Artakhshassa* (Artaxerxes I), b. 500 b.C.; King of Persia 465–424 b.C.; d. 424 b.C. Father of:
63. *Darayavahoush* (Darius II *Ochus*, that is, “Bastard,” son of concubine *Kosmartydene*, b. 475 b.C.; King of Persia 423–404 b.C.; d. 404 b.C., m. *Parysatis*. Son:
64. *Artakhshassa* (Artaxerxes II) *Abiyataka*, b. 456 b.C.; King of Persia 404–359 b.C.; d. 359 b.C. Father of:
65. *Apame*, b. 415 b.C.; Princess of Persia; d. 387/362 b.C.; m. *Pharnabazus*, Satrap of Daskyleion on the Hellespont 414–387 b.C. Parents of:
66. *Artabazus II*, b. 387 b.C.; Satrap of western Asia and Bithynia under Artaxerxes II, and of Baktria under *Alexander III the Great*; retired 328 b.C.; d. ca. 325 b.C. Father of:
67. (Daughter), b. 365 b.C., d. after 328 b.C., m. *Spitamana*, Satrap of Baktria 329–328 b.C. Parents of:

Seleucids

68. *Apama*, b. 345 b.C., d. after 280 b.C., m. Winter 324 b.C. *Seleukos I Nicator*, b. c. 355 b.C.; general of Alexander III the Great’s army; Satrap of Babylon 323 b.C.; King of Syria 305 b.C.; d. 281 b.C. Father of:
69. *Antiochus I Soter*, “the Savior,” b. 323 b.C.; King of Syria September 281 b.C.–2/6 261 b.C.; d. 2/6 261 b.C. Father of:
70. *Antiochos II Theos*, “the God,” b. 286 b.C.; King of Syria 2/6 261 b.C.–August 246 b.C.; d. August 246 b.C. Father of:
 - *Seleucus II Callinicus*, follows.
 - *Stratonike*, married to *Ariarathes III*, see Appendix A.
71. *Seleucus II Callinicus*, “the Beautiful,” b. 265 b.C.; King of Syria August 246 b.C.–226 b.C.; d. 226 b.C.; m. *Laodike II*. Parents of:

as prince Shoshenq or Takeloth (above). Ptolemy’s descendants can be traced only as far as Cleopatra’s grandchildren, in the 1st century a.D. However, queen Zenobia of Palmyra in the 3rd century claimed to be descended from Cleopatra. While this may well be hyperbole, there is nothing inherently implausible in the claim. Zenobia appears to have descendants in 4th century Rome, so it is not impossible that Cleopatra’s genes entered later European nobility through this path (CB).

72. *Antiochos III Megas*, “the Great,” b. 242 b.C.; King of Syria 223–4/6 187 b.C.; d 4/6 187 b.C.; m. *Laodike III*, a first cousin of his. Parents of:
73. *Seleucus IV Philopator*, “Friend of the Father,” b. 220 b.C.; King of Syria 4/6 187 b.C.–3/9 175 b.C.; d 3/9 175 b.C. Son:
74. *Demetrius I Soter*, “the Savior,” b. 186 b.C.; King of Syria 162–150 b.C.; d. 150 b.C. Follows:
75. *Demetrius II Nicator*, “the Victorious,” b. 165 b.C.; King of Syria 146–125 b.C.; d. 125 b.C.; m. *Cleopatra Thea*, daughter of *Ptolemy VI*. Parents of:
76. *Antiochus VIII Philometor Grypos*, b. c. 143 b.C.; King of Syria 125–96 b.C.; d. 96 b.C.; m. *Cleopatra Tryphaena*, daughter of *Ptolemy VIII*. Daughter:
77. *Laodike Thea Philadelphos*, b. 120 b.C.; m. *Mithridates I Kallinikos*, King of Commagene 90–70 b.C.; d. 63 b.C. Son:
78. *Antiochus I Theos Dikaios Epiphanes*, b. 95 b.C.; King of Commagene 70–36 b.C.; d 36 b.C.; m. *Isias Philostorgos*. Next:
79. (Daughter), b. 60 b.C., Princess of Commagene. m. *Artavasdes*, King of Atropatene 56–32 b.C. Father of:
80. *Darius*, b. 40 b.C.; Prince of Atropatene; m. a daughter of *Phraates IV*, King of Parthia. Son:

Arsacids

81. Vonones II, b. 10 b.C.; King of Atropatene 11/12 a.D.–51 a.D.; King of Parthia; d 54 a.D. Father of:
82. *Vologaeses I Darius*, b. 25 a.D.; King of Parthia 51–76/80; d. around 80. Father of:
83. *Vologaeses II*, b. 55; Prince or King of Parthia 77/80. Father of:
84. *Vologaeses III (II)*, b. 80; King of Parthia 105–147/148; d. around 148. Son:
85. *Vologaeses IV (V)*, b. 115; King of Parthia 148–192; d. 192.³⁷ Child:
86. *Vologaeses V (VI)*, b. 145; King of Parthia 192–208; d. 208; m. a daughter of *Pharasmenes III*, King of Iberia 135–185. Next:

³⁷It is now known, from an inscription discovered in Baghdad in 1984, that Vologaeses IV was the son of *Mithridates IV* (king or anti-king 128-147), and that Mithridates king of Characene 131–150 was son of the Parthian king *Pacorus II* (77–115), not of a mythical king “Phobas,” as had previously been thought. See J. Black, *Sumer* 43 230 (1984). The parentage of Mithridates IV remains unknown. Arsacid genealogy has been somewhat clarified by archaeology in recent decades, but there’s still quite a way to go (CB).

Kings of Armenia

87. *Khusraw I*, b. 175; King of Armenia 193–214; d. 214/217. Father of:
88. *Tiridat II*, b. 195; King of Armenia 217–252; d 252/253. Follows:
89. *Khusraw II*, “The Short,” or “The Valiant,” b. 230; King of Western Armenia 279–287; murdered by his brothers in 297. Son:
90. *Tiran Tiridates IV*, b. 265; King of Armenia 298–330; †330. First christian king of Armenia. Father of:
91. *Khusraw III*, b. 285; King of Armenia 330–339; †339. Daughter:
92. *Bambisn*, b. 310; Princess of Armenia; † after 348. m. *At’anakines Souren Pahlav*, son of *Yusuk I*, Primate of Armenia. Child:

Mamikonians of Armenia

93. *Saint Narse I (Nerseh Souren Pahlav)*, b. 335; patriarch of Armenia 353–359 and 367–373; †373. m. *Sandukht*, daughter of *Vardan I*, Prince of Mamikonids. Father of:
94. *Saint Isaac I (Sahak Souren Pahlav)*, b. 351 7/9; patriarch of Armenia 387–438; †438, 7/9. Father of the daughter:
95. *Sahakanoysh*, b. 375, † after 416, m. *Hamazasp I*, Mamikonian Prince, High Constable of Armenia after 387 until c. 416/432; †416/432. Son:
96. *Saint Hmayeak Mamikonian*, b. 410; Armenian ambassador to Greece 449; general 451; † in battle 451, 2/6; m. *Dzoyk*, daughter of *Vram*, Prince Artsrouni. Father of:
97. *Vard Mamikonian*, b. 450; Patrician of Armenia 505–509; † 509. Son:
98. *Hamyeak Mamikonian*, b. 490, † before 555. Next:
99. *Moushegh I Mamikonian*, b. 530; Constable, Viceroy of Armenia 591–593; †593. Follows:
100. *Vahan II (III) Mamikonian*, b. 555; Prince of Taraun c. 593–600; †600. Son:
101. *Dawith Mamikonian*, b. 580; nakharar in Taron (?) or priest?. Son:
102. *Hamazasp III Mamikonian*, b. 610; marzpan (viceroy) of Armenia; †658. Child:
103. *Artavazd Mamikonian*, b. 650/655; nakharar; † after 693. Father of:

104. *Hmayerak Mamikonian* (Theodoros Myakes), b. 680; patrician 703–712; † after 712. Father of:
105. *Artavazd Mamikonian*, b. 720; nakharar in Bragevan 771; strategos (general) of the Anatolians; migrated to Georgia 771; † after 778. Next:
106. *Hmayerak*, b. 755, † after 780/797; noble of Adrianople; m. a daughter of Emperor Leo V who † 820. Father of:

Emperors of Byzantium

107. *Konstantinos*, b. 785, † c. 828/840; noble of Adrianople. Son:
108. *Basileios I Makedonios*, b. 827; Emperor of Byzantium (East Roman Empire) 867, 24/9–886/889, 29/8; † 886/889, 29/8. Father of:
109. *Leo VI Philosophos* (“The Wise”), b. 866, 1/10; Emperor of Byzantium 889, 29/8–912, 11/5; † 912, 11/5; m. *Zoe Tzautzina*.³⁸ Daughter:

Late Carolingians

110. *Anna*, b. 886; Princess of Byzantium; †906/911. m. c. 900 *Louis III* (“The Blind”), King of Lower Burgundy 900–905; King of Italy 901/902; Roman Emperor 901; † 928, 5/6 in Arles. Parents of:
111. *Charles Constantine*, b. 901; Count of Vienne c. 926–962; †962, m. *Thietberga*, Countess of Troyes, † after 960. Daughter:

³⁸Leo VI *Philosophos*, b. 866 1/10; Emperor of Byzantium 889, 29/8–912, 11/5; †912, 11/5; m. *Zoe Tzautzina*. There is considerable doubt as to whether Leo VI was the son of *Basil I* or *Michael III*. CB is inclined to favour Michael III, though I also think its possible that not even Eudoxia Ingerina knew the truth at the time. Settapani’s position, which was also stressed in correspondence, is that it doesn’t really matter because a Mamikonian connection is traceable in either case. CB doesn’t agree with this. The connection through Basil I depends on a hypothesis advanced by Adontz in the 1930s that Basil’s paternal grandmother, the daughter “Leo, an Armenian,” was in fact the daughter of the future *Leo V*. The chronology required to make this happen is very tight. The table in Settapani’s book has the daughter of Leo V being born in 795, her son *Constantine* being born in 810 and Basil being born c. 830. Given what we know of Leo V’s career, this is the most we can stretch it out. But there is good reason to believe that Leo had a first wife, known to us only by the derogatory nickname “Barca,” the fat one. The future emperors Leo V, Michael I and the anti-emperor Thomas the Slav were all officers of a general *Bardanes Turcas* in the years after 802. In later histories it was said that there was a prophecy that two of Turcas’ officers would become emperors, so Turcas married his daughters to them. It is known that Michael I’s wife was a daughter of Turcas, so the other can only have married Leo V. But his empress, Theodosia, was not a daughter of Turcas, so he must have married Turcas’ daughter after 802 and divorced her sometime before 813. If Leo’s daughter was born after 802 it is extremely tight to make her the grandmother of a man born c. 830. The only ways to recover the earlier dating are (a) to challenge the existence of “Barca” (which some do) or (b) to postulate an even earlier marriage or liaison for Leo, for which there is absolutely no evidence. On this point, see W. Treadgold, *The Byzantine Revival 780–842*, Stanford 1988 (CB).

Bosonids

112. *Constantia*, b. 920; Countess of Vienne; † 963/966 (?), m. *Boson II*, Count of Avignon 935; Count of Arles 949; † 965/967. Parents of:
113. *Willelmus II*, “The Liberator,” b. 950; Count of Arles 970; Count of Provence 970; Count of Provence 979–993; †993; m. (2) *Adelaide (Blanche)* Countess of Anjou, †1026. Parents of:

Capetians, Kings of Portugal

114. *Constance*, b. 985; Countess of Provence, Queen of France; † 1001/1002; m. *Robert II* “The Pious,” b. 972, 27/3 in Orleans; Count of Paris; King of France 996–1031; †1031, 20/7 in Melun.³⁹ Next:
115. *Henry I*, b. 1008; Count of Paris; King of France 1031–1060; † 1060, 4/8 at Vitry-en-Brie. Next:
116. *Philip I*, King of France 1060–1108; m. *Bertha*, daughter of Florenz I, Count of Holland. Parents of:
117. *Louis VI*, King of France 1108–1137; m. *Adelaide*, daughter of Humbert II, Count of Savoy. Next:
118. *Louis VII*, King of France 1137–1180; m. *Alix de Champagne*, b. 1206 104. Parents of:
119. *Philip II Augustus*, King of France 1180–1223; m. *Isabella de Hainaut*. Son:
120. *Louis VIII*, King of France 1123–1226; m. *Blanche de Castille*. Then:
121. *Saint Louis IX*, King of France 1226–1270; m. *Marguerite de Provence*. And,
122. *Philip III*, King of France 1270–1285; m. *Marie de Brabant*, †1321.
And so on.

A From St. Arnulf of Metz to Antiochos II *Theos*

Here is a tentative line from St. Arnulf of Metz back to Antiochos II *Theos* of Syria. This line is taken mainly from a postscript in C. Settipani, *Les ancêtres de Charlemagne*, Paris (1989). In his book, Settipani discusses the strong and weak probabilities of the line, so refer to his work for details. We give it here as an ‘alternative route’ for the descent sketched above. It bypasses the difficulties

³⁹From here on the house of Burgundy, from whose dukes the kings of Portugal are descended.

present in the Armenian–Byzantium connection, but has obviously problems of its own. For details see Settipani’s book.

The line is:

St. Arnulf of Metz is a 33–generation descendant of Antiochos II *Theos*

Numbers in each generation follow *Ahnentafel* coding.

Generation 1 1. St. Arnulf of Metz, *maiordomus* in the kingdom of Austrasia (c.582–16.8.640). He married Dode (–?–), daughter of Arnold of Schelde, after 611.

Generation 2 2. Bodogisel, ambassador to Byzantium in 589.

Generation 3 4. Mummolin, *maiordomus* in 566 in Neustria.

Generation 4 9. NN. married to Munderic.

Generation 5 19. Artemie, married in 513 to Florentinus, bishop of Geneve.

Generation 6 38. Rustique, bishop of Lyon between 494 and 501

Generation 7 76. Rurice de Limoges, bishop of Limoges c. 485–507

Generation 8 152. NN.

Generation 9 304. Adelphius.

Generation 10 609. Anicia, married to Pontius.

Generation 11 1219. Turrenia Anicia Iuliana, married to Quintus Clodius Hermogenianus Olybrius, consul in 379.

Generation 12 2438. Anicius Auchenius Bassus, prefect in 382 in Rome, married to Turrenia Honorata.

Generation 13 4876. Amnius Manius Cæsonius Nicomachus Anicius Paulinus Honorius, consul in 334.

Generation 14 9752. Amnius Anicius Iulianus, consul in 322.

Generation 15 19504. Sextus Anicius Faustus, consul in 298.

Generation 16 39009. Asinia Iuliana Nichomacha, married to Quintus Anicius Faustus.

Generation 17 78018. Caius Asinius Nicomachus Iulianus, proconsul in Asia circa 250.

Generation 18 156036. Caius Asinius Quadratus Protimus, proconsul in Achaia circa 220.

- Generation 19** 312072. Caius Asinius Quadratus, historian, c. 200.
- Generation 20** 624144. Caius Iulius Asinius Quadratus.
- Generation 21** 1248288. Caius Iulius Quadratus Bassus, consul in 105, married to Asinia Marcella.
- Generation 22** 2496576. Caius Iulius Bassus, proconsul in Bithynia, 98.
- Generation 23** 4993152. Caius Iulius Severus, nobleman from Akmonia in Galatia.
- Generation 24** 9986304. Artemidoros, nobleman in Galatia.
- Generation 25** 19972608. Amyntas, tetrarcus of Trocmes.
- Generation 26** 39945217. NN., married to Brogitarix, king of Galatia c. 63–50 b.C.
- Generation 27** 79890435. Berenike, married to Deiotarix I, king of Galatia, 63–41 b.C.
- Generation 28** 159780871. NN. (daughter).
- Generation 29** 319561742. Attalos Philometor III, king of Pergamon, 138–133 b.C.
- Generation 30** 639123485. Stratonike of Kappadokia, married to Eumenes, king of Pergamon, 197–159 b.C.
- Generation 31** 1278246970. Ariarathes IV Eusebes Philopator, king of Cappadokia, 220–163 b.C.
- Generation 32** 2556493941. Stratonike, married to Ariarathes III.
- Generation 33** 5112987882. Antiochos II Theos I, king of Syria, 261–246 b.C., b. 290 b.C.

B Remarks on the Egyptian descent (posted by C. Bennett)

Francisco Antonio Doria wrote:

This has to do with the 1995 discussion on DFA, which I've just retrieved. The point is: are the 18th and 19th dynasties related? Kitchen presents a rather good discussion of Ramses II's ancestry, out of a rather obscure family—but I then recall having heard something (also mentioned by Chris) on a forced marriage between Ay and Ankhes-es-Amun.

Dear Chico:

I don't recall that discussion in detail, so I hope I'm not repeating myself.

There is no known relationship between D18 and D19. There is some speculation that both of Ramses II's principal wives, Nefertari and Isitnofret, were related to late D18 pharaohs, Ay and Horemhab respectively—see C Leblanc, "Isis-nofret, grande épouse de Ramses II: la reine, sa famille, et Nofretari," *Bulletin de l'institut francais d'archeologie orientale* (BIFAO) **93** (1993), p. 313. The grounds are rather weak. A faience knob naming Ay was found in Nefertari's tomb, and Nefertari and her daughter are well-evidenced in Akhmim, home of Ay's family, while Isitnofret is documented in Saqqara in the region of Horemhab's private tomb. Also, Aldred hypothesises in his book on Akhenaten that D18 queens after Hatshepsut came from a cognate line, descended from Ahmes-Nefertari, partly indicated by onomastic patterns, and that Ay and Tiye came from the same line; Nefertari obviously fits into this theory. But it is pure speculation AFAIK, there is no direct evidence for such a cognate line.

Even granting the existence of one or both of these links, there is no descent connection from the D18 main line, unless Aldred is right, in which case we might have a female-line descent from Ahmes to Nefertari. And, if D20 is descended from D19—a totally unproven though very reasonable speculation in my view—it was at best through a minor son of Ramses II, there is no reason to believe it was a descent through Nefertari or Isitnofret.

Doria again:

Another point: we have lots of genealogies of families of lesser officers in the Egyptian bureaucracy as registered in stellae; some of those extend for almost twenty (proven, no speculation) generations. Kitchen exhibits several of those in one of his books—I had it, it's misplaced now.

Can we *reasonably* connect those genealogies into larger pieces on non-royal lines? Even if the Egyptians weren't exogamous, can we relate them to similar non-royal families outside Egypt?

Not that I know. There are some examples of foreign families making successful careers in Egypt (I was reading about the descendants of a bureaucrat of Hurrian origin last night), but I haven't seen any evidence of exogamous marriages of this type.

Also, until late times, it was quite rare for non-royal families to advertise their connection with the royal family—late D18, with Yuya and Tuya, is quite unusual, though there are a few other cases. More typical is queen Tiye's brother, the HPA [high-priest of Amun] Anen, who is quite well-documented but whose relationship to Tiye is only known by a note on a coffin. I have a conjecture that the High Priests of Memphis married into D12—the first D12 HPM [high priest of Memphis], Sehetepibre-ankh, was the son of a man closely associated with Amenemhat I and his name incorporates Amenemhat's nomen,

so my conjecture is that he married a daughter of Amenemhat I, but I have absolutely no evidence to support it! However, marriages between the HPM family and D22 are well-documented. Although there are questionable areas in the HPM genealogy, there seems to be no reason to doubt that the D22 HPMS were descended from Sehetepibre-ankh as claimed.

Cheers,

Cris

C A discussion: C. Settipani, S. Baldwin, C. Bennett

The present discussion was held in the Usenet list Gen-Medieval from August to September 1998:

C.1 C. Settipani's remarks

[A preliminary remark was made by C. Bennett.] Anyone on this group who has looked at all seriously at the possibility of there being traceable descents from antiquity (DFA) is aware of Christian Settipani's book *Nos ancêtres de l'antiquité* (abbreviated by him as LGA, *Liens généalogiques avec l'antiquité*). A couple of years ago, as part of a discussion on another proposed DFA, Stewart Baldwin published a critique of some aspects of this work (available in the archives on DejaNews or RootWeb under the title: "Comments on 'Iberian route' DFA line" dated 8 June 1996). In particular, Stewart attacked his proposals to find an Arsacid descent from the Seleucids via the Commagenian kings. As I was in contact with M. Settipani at the time about other matters, I forwarded this to him for his interest. He has recently sent me a copy of the most recent addenda and corrigenda to his works, which includes an extensive discussion of the points raised by Stewart on the Commagenian link. With M. Settipani's permission I am posting a translation of this discussion. I should note that this response was written two years ago. He tells me that he regards it as perhaps a little heated, and that if he wrote it today it would be a little less personal. Also, while my translation has been approved by him, my French is certainly imperfect, and I apologise in advance both to him and to the group for any errors that exist. (Chris Bennett)

It is appropriate to comment here at greater length on the very interesting criticisms recently raised by Baldwin (1996) on genealogical ascendancies to antiquity in general, more particularly that proposed by Regula (1995) but also to our own work. As far as the "Iberian" route is concerned, we can only agree with the reservations he expresses. We have already written [LGA I, p73 n1] that the genealogy of the Iberian kings according to the Georgian chronicles

(now readily accessible in the translation of R. W. Thomson, 1996) is unacceptable. Toumanoff, the champion of their historicity, has of course explained each of the discrepancies between their data and the data provided by other sources, the greater part of which are contemporary, but it seems to us that the only reasonable attitude to take consists of removing the Georgian data before the end of the 8th century. We should return rather to the study of Marquart (1903, pp391–465, summary pp 431–3) augmented by new epigraphic data such as that made most recently Braund (1994)—see also Martin–Hisard, 1996. A DFA route through the Iberian kings thus seems quite hazardous, the filiation of the dynasty being ultimately incomplete and their links with the Arsacids or the Artaxiads, while probable, obscure.

As to ourselves, M. Baldwin essentially focusses on our generations 35 to 38 (LGA). We argue there that Vonones II, king of Media Atropatene, then of Parthia, was linked through his anonymous father, possibly a "Darius," to a marriage between the Median king Artavasdes and the daughter of Antiochus I, king of Commagene. Our basis for this is essentially the evidence of Strabo, who wrote, c18–19AD, that the kings of Media Atropatene, descendants of Atropates, reigned again after being successively linked in marriage to the Armenians, the Syrians, and more recently to the Parthians. M. Baldwin admits that Vonones II and Artabanus II must have been brothers, although this is, as we noted, unproven. He also admits that of the three Atropatenian marriages cited by Strabo, the first concerns the union of Mithridates with the daughter of Tigranes II of Armenia, and the third that of the (unknown) father of Artabanos II and Vonones II with a Parthian princess. On the other hand, he underscores that the whole filiation would break down if any of the following were true:

1. That the second marriage concerns an Atropatenian princess and not a prince.
2. That the "Syria" of which Strabo speaks is not Commagene.
3. That, even if we were correct on the above points, Antiochos was not the father of the princess.
4. Or if the prince were the son of a king other than Artavasdes.
5. Or if the father of Vonones II, be he prince or Median king, was not an issue of this union.

In truth, we will not seek here to deny the validity of the objections he has raised. Rather to the contrary, we willingly recognize that they are well-founded. None of these points are proven, and it suffices for any one of them to be in error for the whole linkage to break down. Yet this does not mean that we were wrong to pursue this path, nor is this absence of proof necessarily synonymous with a manifest error.

First, it is appropriate to review the evidence of Strabo, which is at the heart of the problem. If he had simply recounted that in the course of their history the dynasty of Media had concluded marital alliances with the dynasties of

Armenia, Syria and Parthia, we could legitimately doubt the exactitude which we have allowed ourselves to draw from him. But this is not exactly so. Here is what this author wrote in 18/9 AD:

Having been proclaimed king, Atropates organised Media as an independent state, and the dynasty descended from him maintains itself there in our own times, his successors having contracted marriages with the royal families of Armenia, Syria and, more recently, Parthia.

We must press further the exegesis of the Strabonian text. Strabo does not content himself to say that there had been marriages between the Median kings and their neighbours. He states this to explain the survival and longevity of the Median dynasty. If the Greek text does not explicitly note the point (the passage on the marriages is introduced by "further" [pros te]), the sequence of the two facts (survival of the dynasty and the glorious alliances that it has concluded) has certainly been understood by the majority of translators as indicating a cause-and-effect relationship. As a matter of fact:

- He gives the marriages in chronological order, as is proved by the phrase "and more recently" for the last.
- He means, and the context of the phrase shows it, since the marriages are precisely cited only to this sole end, that they played a role in the maintenance of the dynasty. From this one can legitimately suspect that these alliances concern the unions of Median kings with foreign princesses and not the reverse. Clearly, only in this sense could the Median dynasty have found a motive to pride itself on the marriages, and not in the fact of having furnished a Median princess to the harem of the Armenian, Syrian or Parthian kings. Further, one can suspect that the unions were fertile, since otherwise their political importance would be singularly reduced, and their mention would have much less justification.

[(On this obvious point, we may note that A. Tardieu has translated (interpreted in fact) the passage in question thusly (vol II Paris 1894, 449): "His dynasty has perpetuated itself to our times *thanks* to a succession of *fortunate* unions contracted by his descendants with *princesses* of Armenia and Syria, and more recently of Parthia." The words emphasized do not explicitly figure in the Greek text but have been logically inferred by the translator in his interpretation of the passage.]⁴⁰

⁴⁰Chris Bennett wrote a comment of the following remark by Don Stone:

If the Syrian marriage is to Ariobarzanes I in Gen. 2, it seems somewhat more likely that he married a sister rather than a daughter of Antiochus I of Commagene; however, the Seleucid descent through Antiochus's mother Laodice is presumably valid in either case. [Don Stone]

If it were a sister, then Settipani's objection to Baldwin's counter-proposal applies: in a polygamous society we have no a priori reason to favour one mother over another, in the absence of other indicators. So you would have the Commagenian link [and hence a poorly-

These considerations are not simply hypotheses or personal preferences, but are really the obvious meaning of Strabo's text placed in context. The principal commentator on this passage, Sullivan (1990, pp295–300) notes moreover, concerning the Syrian union: "But Strabo probably had in mind the well-known ones with effects still visible when he wrote" (op cit n. 62, p. 453). The only "visible" effect of a matrimonial alliance several decades later consists of the descendants who issued from it and/or any territorial or political gain which resulted from it. And indeed two of the three unions are identifiable, the first and the last.

So, what have we established? That they conform to the schema that we have deduced, in their chronological order, in the fact that they indeed consist of marriages between foreign princesses and Median kings, and finally in the fact that the following Median kings were their issue. This being said, we should note that, most often, diplomatic marital alliances were exchanges, and that it is therefore probable that, in the same fashion, Median princesses were given to Armenian, Syrian or Parthian kings. Moreover, we actually know of a (supposed) marriage between a king of Commagene and a Median princess. But if this marriage supports our identification of Commagene as actually being Syria, of which there is elsewhere a question, we do not believe it is the marriage mentioned in Strabo. Thus, while it remains possible that our precision is illusory, even "ridiculous" as M. Baldwin assesses it (p 10), we frankly do not believe so, and, indeed without being assured, it appears to us, to the contrary, that our position has a certain solidity.

Let us reply now to each of the points raised by M Baldwin's analysis:

1. We come to reply to the first point by noting that, in context, it is logical, and in fact extremely probable, that the unions mentioned by Strabo concern Atropatenian princes marrying foreign princesses, which is actually

documented Achaemenid one] but not necessarily the Seleucid link. While chronologically a sister certainly becomes a possibility with Ariobarzanes, these marriage exchanges tended to be of daughters unless none were available.

Don Stone then adds: Suppose Ariobarzanes I is the one who married the Syrian princess and that his bride is the sister of Antiochus I of Commagene. As far as I can see, this could very well involve a daughter rather than a sister of the reigning Commagenean monarch; the marriage probably took place some time around 75 to 70 BC, and Antiochus's father Mithradates I Kallinikos was king from ca. 100 to ca. 70.

In the following chart I am using the corrected estimated dates just supplied by Settipani. (Incidentally, these corrected dates go onto his chart on p. 94, not p. 100, at least in the copy that I have.)

1. Ariobarzanes, b. say 95, d. 65/56, m. N., sister of Antiochus I, King of Commagene from 70 to 36, Antiochus I born say 100. Parents of:
2. Artavazdes, King of Media, b. say 75, d. 20BC. M. ?? Parents of:
3. Darius?, b. say 35BC, married a Parthian princess.

Comments: This configuration is plausible chronologically; also it implements Strabo's "in later times." Ariobarzanes's marriage may well have taken place ca. 75–70, before Antiochus became king, in which case the bride would have been the daughter of the reigning monarch, Mithradates. There is a possible dau. of Mithradates and Laodice Thea Philadelphos named Philadelphie, mentioned in an inscription found at Nemrud Dagh (see Sullivan's Stemma 5 and the ref. cited there—IGLSyr 37).

verifiable in two of the cases.

2. We know precisely what Strabo meant by "Syria" since he defines it elsewhere. It consists of Commagene, Seleucid Syria, Coile-Syria and Emesa. Here again our choice does not depend on chance or an arbitrary decision to choose the solution which favours us (of which there are two of the four). Here again, Strabo's context serves as a guide. This Syrian alliance was concluded between the Armenian and Parthian alliances, between 95 and 15 BC, and more likely between 70 and 30 BC (see the following point). And it was politically important and beneficial to Media. This allows us to discard Coile-Syria, which is excluded since it did not have a hereditary dynasty. The same applies to Emesa, which some have sometimes considered a possibility. But it is only a generation later that the semitic dynasty of Emesa, of recent origin, began to ally itself to neighbouring dynasties. Around 40BC, the latest date for the marriage, their dynasty was not yet firmly established, and Strabo (XVI,2,10) still only knew their princes as phylarchs, and did not always give them a royal title. Their kingdom was still in the process of formation (Cf R Sullivan, 1990, p199-200). And, similarly for the Seleucids, whose dynasty was certainly most prestigious, but who were then politically non-existent and about to disappear completely. A diplomatic marriage with the Seleucids is very unlikely after 90, and almost certainly excluded after 65. Only Commagene remains. And it is indeed with a king of Commagene that the Median princess Iotape is joined at this moment.

3. The Armenian marriage concerns Mithridates of Media (67 to before 65) who had married a daughter of Tigranes II (95-56). The union is attested in 67, but we don't know when it took place. All the same, the name of the Median king Artavasdes (56-31) allows us to suppose that he was issue from it, since the name Artavasdes seems characteristic of the Armenian dynasty and the descendants of Artvazdes inherited the throne of Armenia [Pace M. Schottky, 1989, p73, one cannot reasonably assimilate "Artabazanes" with "Artavasdes"]. Artavasdes of Media, already king in 56, must be born towards 75. As we know that his father was called Ariobarzanes, it is the latter who must have been born to king Mithridates and the Armenian princess, thus towards 95 [we will correct therefore the dates of birth given in our table (p100) for Tigranes II (c130), his daughter (c110) and his son-in-law Mithridates of Media (c120)]. As to the Parthian marriage, if it indeed concerns the parents of Artabanos II and Vonones II, it occurred around 15BC, the likely birthdate of Artabanos considering his tumultuous career. Thus the second marriage is situated between these two dates. Two or three kings of Media Atropatene are known in this interval: Darius (after 67-65), [Ariobarzanes I (65-before 56)], Artavasdes (56-31). Whichever of these kings married a Commagenian princess, she was probably a daughter of the king of Commagene who reigned throughout this period, Antiochos I (70-36).

4. We have supposed that of these three kings it was Artavasdes who must have been the spouse of the Syrian princess. If it were in fact his father Ariobarzanes. This would change none of our conclusions. But it is true that it could also have been Darius, probable uncle of Artavasdes, who has no known posterity. We recognise that we don't know enough to be affirmative, and that the ensemble is weakened at this point. But the reign of Darius was very short, less than two years, and perhaps only a few months. He did not leave any known posterity. The likelihood that it was his marriage which was one of the glories of the dynasty seems extremely remote. It is also true that there remains the possibility that the king concerned was the successor of Artavasdes, i.e. Ariobarzanes II (20–8 BC). But what makes this possibility very unlikely is the fact that the third marriage seems to have been quite distant in time from the preceding ones. Strabo says that the Median kings formed unions with the Armenian, the Syrian, and "more recently" ("meta tauta") the Parthian kings. It does not seem therefore that the third union could be contemporary, or very close to, the second.
5. That being said, obviously nothing proves that the Median prince (or king), father of Artabanos and Vonones, was issue of the union concluded between one of his predecessors and the Syrian princess. We think so, not because it suits us, but because it is the best way to give full meaning to Strabo's phrase if the contemporary Median kings of whom he speaks were indeed issue of the three unions which he enumerates in connection with them. And again, it is actually verifiable for two of the three marriages which encourages us to accept the same principle for the third.

In this connection, M. Baldwin reproaches us for having invented the [Darius] who we give as father of Artabanos II and Vonones II. It is absolutely correct that this personage is hypothetical and that his name could have been anything else, or, better, that he was simply king Ariobarzanes II. It seems to us more prudent not to retain an identification in our table in order to show clearly that it is not necessary. Perhaps we were finally in error and at least we should leave this generation anonymous rather than to dress it up with the name [Darius].

In summary, the data which we deduced from Strabo's text goes well beyond what M. Baldwin considers as an arbitrary and preferential choice on our part, on the one hand because we studied this passage based on the text itself, and not in translation, and on the other hand because we have fully considered the context of the citation and the aims of the author.

We come now to the possibility proposed by M. Baldwin as an alternative to ours. It is certainly very interesting. Indeed we have already researched a similar route through the Mithridatids, without however adopting this solution, which is nevertheless one of the first which came to mind. The reason is simple, and is noted by M. Baldwin himself: we do not know if the daughter of Tigranes II who married Mithridates of Parthia was herself issue of the Mithridatid wife of Tigranes. Now, as M. Baldwin always reminds us, multiple marriages were the rule. To decide, then, in the absence of any indicator, that a given child was

born to a given mother is totally arbitrary, and risks giving rise to the following reflections: "It is rather disturbing that among all of the possible ways the one is chosen which gives the desired conclusion. It is not a proper use of evidence to take the most desirable possibility amongst the numerous alternatives." Not having found any argument in favour of this hypothesis, it is wiser to abstain from it. Even wiser when one considers the following calculation: Tigranes married the daughter of Mithridates in 89 or 93 (Sullivan, 1990, p346 n. 2). A daughter born of this union would thus see light of day at best in 92, and rather in 88. If this daughter was the link between the Armenian kings and the Atropatid dynasy, then Artavasdes I of Media descends from it and can only be her grandson. But Artavasdes was already king in 56 and his first children must have been born around 45/40 or later. It is hardly likely, in consequence, that Artavasdes was descended from the daughter of Mithridates of Pontus. On the other hand, the occurrence of the names of Mithridates and Ariobarzanes among the Atropatids could be an indication that one of their ancestors was a princess of Pontus. Strabo may not have mentioned this alliance because it was too distant, or because he did not know of it. On yet another tack, suppose that Vonones I of Parthia inherited Armenia because he was issue of a marriage between his father and Cleopatra, and that the latter was a descendant (grand-daughter?) of Tigranes II of Armenia and Cleopatra of Pontus. It remains to know whether Vonones II also descended (through his mother) of this marriage between Phraates IV and Cleopatra. Perhaps the phrase of Tacitus, noted by M. Baldwin and which escaped us, provides a pointer in this direction?

[...]

Finally, a more personal and more general note: it is surely difficult to remain absolutely impartial, no science being objective, and certainly not History, but I wish to reassure M. Baldwin of my intent to be so as far as possible. I know nothing of my ancestors beyond those who I have personally known, and it is therefore quite unimportant to me, in the last analysis, whether a DFA is proven or not. The only pleasure which I have found in it is that of research, and if I am not sparing of hypotheses, I try at least to justify them all and to avoid stacking them up without control. Now, I am certainly mistaken in different places. I am trying to maintain a list of them in these addenda. But, really, I do not believe that it is the generations incriminated here which are the weakest. They remain hypothetical, hence uncertain, but it seems to me with a good degree of probability. In truth, the two weakest points in my book lie elsewhere. In the first place, the ascendance towards Egypt. I ceased to believe in this myself a long time ago, the solution proposed here being possible, surely, but in fact quite improbable. It would be better to renounce it. Other ways may be possible and they should be reviewed. The second arguable point concerns the ascendance of Leo VI of Byzantium. I will return to this later (point 24 of the addenda). Here let us simply say that I remain persuaded that, logically, as a result of our data, he considered himself to be certainly the son of Michael III and therefore made tell of it. And the Mamikonian ascendance of the latter seems to me to be quite well established. All the same, logic is not always a good argument in genealogy, above all if one admits, which is likely, that the three imperial lovers

could have come together in the same bed. Chance would then play quite an important role. I judge that, even in this case, the conviction of the protagonists was based on some precise detail, such as a physical or other resemblance. But as I know nothing for sure, it would be better to consider that the paternity of Basil is at least equally likely. And on Basil's side things are less clear. I no longer believe at all today in the Mamikonian or Bagratid ascendance of Basil based on the presence of the names Hmayek or Bagrat in his family, as was said by Adontz or the late prince Toumanoff. This argument alone is too weak. There is on the other hand a real possibility of a link with Leo V, and whatever Signes Codoner may say, the latter is certainly linked to the Artsruni. All the same, I admit that the link between Basil and Leo V is hypothetical and there is a weakness there that one should not hide. I therefore remind M Baldwin that we could avoid this reef and recover a DFA which does not present this inconvenience, but which nevertheless concerns quite a large portion of western nobility, as noted by Wagner, through the Armenian ancestry of the house of Savoy, let alone some other paths [see Settipani, 1992, 37–8 and 41–3]

References

- [1] Baldwin (1996): S. Baldwin, "Comments on "Iberian route" DFA line," web, 8 june 1996.
- [2] Braund (1994): D. Braund, *Georgia in Antiquity. A history of Colchis and Transcaucasian Iberia 550 BC–AD 562*, Oxford 1994.
- [3] Marquart (1903): J. Marquart, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge. Ethnologische und historisch-topographische Studien zur Geschichte des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts (c. 840–940)*, Leipzig 1903
- [4] Martin–Hisard (1996 (a)): B. Martin–Hisard & N. Garsoian, Unité et diversité de la Caucasic médiévale (VIIe–XIe s.), in *Il Caucaso*, 1996, p. 275–348.
- [5] Regula (1995): W. Regula, *Genealogie* **22**, 3/4 (1995) (non vidimus).
- [6] Schottky (1989): M. Schottky, *Media Atropatene und Gross-Armenien in hellenistischer Zeit*, Bonn 1989.
- [7] Settipani (1992): C. Settipani, *La transition entre mythe et réalité*, *Archivum* **37** (1992), p. 27–67.
- [8] Signes Codoner (1991): J. Signes Codoner, "Los orígenes del emperador Leon el Armenio (813–820)," *Mnemosynum*. C. Codoner a discipulis oblatum, A. R. Guerreira, Salamanca 1991, p. 309–320.
- [9] Sullivan (1990): R. D. Sullivan, *Near Eastern Royalty and Rome 100–30 BC* Toronto 1990.

- [10] Thomson (1996): R. W. Thomson, *Rewriting Caucasian History. The Medieval Armenian Adaptation of the Georgian Chronicles*, Oxford 1996.