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Overview

Most people with a lot of New England ancestry descend from one or more ‘gateway’ ancestors – i.e., early colonists who descend, themselves, from English kings, primarily the Plantagenets. The latter, in turn, have their own gateway ancestors, through whom we derive our longest possible ‘ancestral lines’ – into the Dark Ages (roughly A.D. 450-750), and perhaps (though far more conjecturally) even the Classical (Greco-Roman) and Ancient (Egyptian, Babylonian, and Persian) worlds.

ALL such descents are hypothetical – that is, all entail many filiative links that are not, in fact, attested in writing, but postulated by scholars on the basis of an assessment of the known chronology, ethno-political situation, and onomastic patterns of the relevant era, locale, and race. In short, ‘ancient’ pedigrees have many ‘dotted lines,’ which are plausible, even likely, but NOT susceptible to proof. (If you’re allergic to dotted lines, now would be a good time to leave!)

Unfortunately, popular American genealogical literature is rife with supposed ‘ancient’ pedigrees which are neither likely nor plausible, and in some cases provably bogus, passing, as they do, through long chains of supposed personages who never existed. How, short of acquiring a comprehensive knowledge of many phases of world and national history, half a dozen ancient and modern languages, the various branches of philology, and an immense (and highly specialized) research literature (surely a job for several lifetimes!), is the ‘lay’ reader to tell the plausible from the preposterous, the reasonable from the ridiculous?

For those who find themselves far up the proverbial creek, this talk and syllabus should serve as a paddle. The talk will identify the major geographic areas, ethnicities, and pre-Plantagenet ‘gateway’ ancestors through whom we MIGHT descend from Dark Age, Classical, or Ancient kings, warlords, consuls, emperors, and pharaohs, and will outline the major sources of data and forms of reasoning upon which such descents are predicated. It will also draw your attention to proposed ‘ancient’ descents which are known to be false, or have been seriously questioned, and identify the absolute historical limits beyond which it will never be possible to go. The syllabus provides an area-by-area list of the best or most interesting or exemplary books and articles which have come my way. (Readers are encouraged to send me more.)
Please note that a one-hour talk covering such a vast subject cannot but resemble the Rio Grande (‘a mile wide and an inch deep’). Likewise, this syllabus doesn’t even pretend to be exhaustive. (In fact, several sources are listed precisely because they contain excellent and far more extensive bibliographies.) Take talk and syllabus as a modest, even cursory introduction – and always follow up footnotes!

**Outline**

**INTRODUCTION**

‘COLONIAL’ TO ‘PLANTAGENET’

‘ANCIENT’ ANCESTRY

**SCANDINAVIA**

+ **Sweden**: Ynglingar (‘Peace Kings’ of Uppsala)
+ **Denmark**: Skjoldungr (largely bogus)

**BRITISH ISLES**

+ **Angles, Saxons and Jutes**: (a) Cerdic of Wessex (with possible links to Theuderic/?Makhir and Merovingians, v. inf.); (b) Hengist of Kent; (c) ‘Woden’ lines
+ **Britons & Britanno-Romans**: (a) Welsh dynasties (Coel Han, Cunedda, Ceredig/Coroticus); (b) semi-mythic figures (Vortigern, Ambrosius Aurelianus, Arthur, & Magnus Maximus); (c) the Catuvellauanian house
+ **Gaelic Celts**: (a) Scottish (Dalriadan) kings > ‘high kings’ of Ireland; (b) kings of Leinster
+ **Picts** (Cruithni)

**GAUL**

+ **Franks**: (a) Ripuarian; (b) Salic (= Merovingian); (c) ‘proto-Merovingian’ > Gennebaud I … >Maroboduus?
+ **Theuderic/?Makhir/?Natronai ben Nehemiah**: > (a) Jewish Exiliarchs, Persarmenia, & Ancient world, or > Merovingians again?
+ **Gallo-Romans**: (a) Ruricius > Anicii (& Ceionii?); (b) Syagrii & Tonantii Ferreoli; (c) Remigius of Rheims
+ **Goths**: (a) Visi- (>Artavazd >Mamikonids?); (b) Ostro-
+ **Gepids**: > Huns (= ‘Hsiung-nu’?) > Chinese (Han Dynasty) Emperors?

**IMPERIAL ROME**

+ **Gallo-Romans** > Anicii (& Ceionii?) > Classical & Ancient worlds
ARABIC & ‘MOHAMMED’ LINES
+ Banu Qasi of Spain; Zadan Zara; Cordova & Seville; ‘Sarracina’;
Byzantium > Emirs of Mosul (unsatisfactory); various > Mohammed
(all bogus)

EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN
+ Byzantium: (a) Rurikids; (b) Charles Constantine > Anna >
Armenia > Parthia > Seleucids, Ptolemids, & other eastern
Mediterranean principalities > classical Greece & Persia, Babylonia,
& Egypt
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Various eds. *Prosopographia Imperii Romani. Saeculi I. II. III.* [series 1, slowly being superseded by series 2] [Basic list of known Romans, AD 1-800.]
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