



Descendants of the Illegitimate Sons and Daughters of the Kings of Britain

INFORMATION FOR APPLICANTS

Revised 28 April 2025

HOW TO JOIN

The Descendants welcome applications from all who share our interests and objectives.

Membership is open to any individual who

- (1) proves descent from an illegitimate child, grandchild, or great-grandchild of a king of England, Scotland, Great Britain, or the United Kingdom; and who
- (2) documents that descent in a lineage paper meeting the Descendants' scholarly standard, essentially equivalent to the Genealogical Proof Standard.

Applying to, and joining, the Descendants should be a significant educational experience.

To initiate an application, the applicant sends a summary of the proposed line from bastard to applicant (bare names and spouses in each generation will usually suffice), especially noting emigrant ancestors who take the line from Britain to elsewhere, usually to the United States or a predecessor colony, by email to the Secretary-Treasurer at info@royalbastards.org. Format is not important at the preliminary stage. The applicant may receive an invitation to proceed at this point, or may be informed that the line is known to be invalid; an alternate line may or may not be suggested. If invited to proceed, the applicant will receive the lineage paper, described below, along with these guidelines and a set of sample lineage paper generations. The lineage paper is to be completed and sent, together with supporting documentation, digitally to the Secretary-Treasurer (usually by file transfer, rather than email attachment, given the large size of evidence dossier PDFs). Applications are to be submitted digitally (paper is only acceptable by prior arrangement). When the application is submitted, fees (see below) are to be mailed to the Descendants at the mailing address listed on the website.

For an application to be accepted, the Heralds-Genealogists must be satisfied not only with the correctness of the line, but also that it meets the Descendants' scholarly standard of identification of probative evidence for all generations of the lineage.

APPLICATION FEE AND LIFE MEMBER DUES

Fees consist of the application review fee and life member dues, with amounts set by the council. Both fees are payable at the time of application, as two checks payable to "DISDKB" and sent to the Descendants at the mailing address listed on the website (royalbastards.org).

Applicants receive a letter of review summarizing the principal strengths and shortcomings of the application. If an application is not approved, it may be revised and resubmitted, with no additional review fee, up to one year after the initial review. The dues, but not the review fee, are refunded if an applicant is not admitted to membership.

LINEAGE PAPER: GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

An application consists of the multi-page lineage paper, together with copies of all documentation cited to substantiate each statement in the application. The form is to be filled out using Microsoft Word, then submitted digitally as a Word file or PDF (or on paper by prior arrangement). Proofs should be submitted digitally as a single organized PDF dossier (or on paper by prior arrangement).

Page 1 is the applicant information section. It requires the applicant's full name, contact information and signature. The section marked "For Officers' Use" should be left blank.

Page 2 covers generation 1—the ancestral monarch. In the first space, enter the name of the monarch, followed by known birth, marriage (or non-marital partnership) and death data for the monarch and spouse or partner (parent of generation 2). Information on the monarch need not be documented, but all other data (beginning with partner information) should be documented as described below.

Page 3 is for generation 2, and so forth down to the last generation which includes the applicant (discard unused pages). Each generation contains blanks for the line carrier (line 1) and spouse or partner (line 5), and five line items for birth, death, and marriage place and date for the line carrier and partner (lines 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7). Drop-down fields are to be used with events ("born/baptized," "died/buried") and dates ("on," "about," "before," and "after") as well as to identify non-marital partnerships ("married/did not marry") in any relevant generation.

LINEAGE PAPER: EVIDENCE FIELDS

Evidence for all information (names, filiation, vital dates and places) must be identified and cited. There is no required citation format for citing evidence. Put simply: *be clear* and *be consistent*.

On each page (after page 2), evidence field 1 corresponds to the line carrier's name. This field should identify the evidence that the adult line carrier is the child of the couple on the previous page. In a modern generation, you might say "death certificate names her parents"; the death certificate would again be cited in line 3 (evidence for his/her death date and place). To prove filiation in a medieval generation, you might note that the person succeeded a parent to a peerage title, citing the entry in the *Complete Peerage*, or was named in a parent's will, or some other brief statement of the basis for the deduction. Line 5 on each page is for evidence of the name of the line carrier's spouse or partner (the other parent of the line carrier in the next generation); this may duplicate the evidence and citation for their marriage place and date (if information is known) from line 4.

If it is necessary to summarize *indirect* evidence of filiation in a proof statement, this may be done in the relevant evidence line if one or two sentences suffice. If more space is needed, include a proof argument on a separate page and cite in line 1.

Dates: baptism, burial, probate, and the like, may be substituted for birth and death dates. For date of probate or other death date proxies, one can insert an appreviation such as "wp" (=will proved) in the date field or "IPM" (=inquisitio post mortem), and also note in the evidence line what is used to approximate the death date. An analytical secondary source which deduces a date range for a birth, death, or marriage can be cited to support a date such as "1375–1389" or "after 1644." For example, Sir Thomas de Munchensy died between 1375 and 1389; the evidence field might state: "Living in 1375; his son Sir Thomas succeeded him using a different seal by 1389 (*Complete Peerage* 9:417, citing

documents from each of these two years).”

Any secondary source used *must identify the evidence that supports a genealogical statement* (birth, death, or marriage, place or date, or kinship) so this can be stated on the application. A fact is not sufficiently documented if the secondary source includes a string of information followed by a group of undifferentiated citations (as is the case for entries in Richardson’s *Royal Ancestry*; see below).

There is no list of pre-approved gateway ancestors or pre-approved generations, and no list of pre-approved sources of evidence. Some family histories and compiled genealogies identify and discuss the evidence sufficient to establish facts; if so, they can be used. Many typical genealogical compilations of pre-modern lines do not meet the Descendants’ standards for documentation, and cannot be cited as the sole support of statements in an application. This includes reference works accepted as standard in other hereditary societies, including Richardson’s *Royal Ancestry* or Weis-Shepard’s *Ancestral Roots* and *Magna Carta Sureties*, or Roberts’ *Royal Descents*. Richardson’s *Royal Ancestry* cites primary and secondary sources all together for each generation, but evidence is not identified to support individual statements (birth, marriage, death, and filiation). Richardson’s works, even for generations correctly summarized, do not satisfy the obligation of proof: the applicant must identify the basis (direct evidence or deduction from indirect evidence) for each fact asserted.

Include copies of all cited evidence (primary and secondary). Notarized copies are not required. There are certain exceptions:

- Primary evidence documents identified and cited in analytical secondary sources (such as documents discussed and cited in a *Complete Peerage* entry or in a genealogical journal article) do not need to be provided, but the evidence does need to be stated in the application’s *evidence* field.
- Copies of entries in *Complete Peerage* or *Scots Peerage* do not need to be provided.
- Applicants who are close kin of members whose applications were recently approved by the Heralds-Genealogists must identify the evidence and citations in the all generations in their own lineage paper, but do not need to resubmit evidence copies also submitted by their kin.

Sources in a language not known to the Heralds-Genealogists should be submitted together with English translations. If in doubt, ask the Heralds-Genealogists.

SHARING EXISTING LINEAGE PAPERS

Since research meeting the necessary standard on royal lines above many gateway ancestors is not conveniently available in accessible compendia, the Heralds-Genealogists are prepared to identify lineage papers approved in or after 2013 (which use newer, more detailed forms) using the same lines. With permission of current members, these papers, including evidence, may be shared with applicants seeking to join on shared generations of the same line. Current members who so desire may be put in contact with applicants for consultation on their shared lines.

CLOSE KIN OF CURRENT OR DECEASED MEMBERS

Applications by close kin of current or deceased members are welcomed. However, each application requires completion of the current lineage form including all generations from the king to the new applicant. For close kin of members (living or deceased) who seek to join, the Heralds-Genealogists will share copies of the lineage papers and evidence documents (if available) of their kin. (Unfortunately, for some members who joined before 2013, only the lineage papers are now available in the Descendants' archive, but no evidence documents.)

Lineage papers of members who joined before 2013, however, are insufficient to meet the Bastards' current genealogical standard. In such cases, additional research will be required. In some such cases, a newer lineage paper on file (not from close kin) may include fuller research on, say, the same gateway ancestor. If relevant recent lineage papers are available (pending permission from current members), they may be shared, and in some cases, members who share the same gateway line may be available for consultation with new applicants (see above, "Sharing Existing Lineage Papers").

WHAT TO EXPECT

We expect to review all applications within three months. (Some have recently taken considerably longer for reasons external to the applications.)

Applications are often not approved on first submission. This can include applications substantially similar to those previously approved for the same applicant by other hereditary societies. Applications on a line considered potentially genealogically sound by the Heralds-Genealogists, but presented without meeting the proof standard, may be revised and resubmitted. Applications declined with a problematic line of descent may be revised and resubmitted following a different line if one is known.

The Heralds-Genealogists will not do independent research to confirm insufficiently proved assertions. We do, however, encourage questions to clarify and aid in the process.

Applying to, and joining, the Descendants should be a significant educational experience.





Descendants of the Illegitimate Sons and Daughters of the Kings of Britain

GUIDELINE ADDENDUM: LINEAGE PAPER SAMPLE GENERATIONS

Revised 24 April 2025

The application form of Nov. 2023 requests not only separate citation of evidence for each datum, but also a statement describing each piece of evidence (not just citing the page on which it is found).

In each case where genealogical information is filled in at the top of the page, the numbered evidence field below must be filled in with both (1) a description of the evidence; and (2) a citation. There is no single correct format. Clarity is paramount; consistency is a close second.

In addition, the first evidence field in each generation is for a **statement of the evidence by which the line carrier is proved to be a child of the line carrier in the previous generation**. For recent generations, the simplest evidence is the statement of the parents of an adult in a record of the adult's marriage or death. Note that the statement of parents of a child in a birth or baptismal record does not meet the burden of proof that the adult with that name is the same as the child born to the parents in the previous generation. So for recent generations, if a marriage or death record does not supply the parental link, additional information to demonstrate the link is required, such as an obituary or probate record naming the adult child in connection to the deceased line carrier in the earlier generation.

Some generations from a recent lineage paper are presented as samples. The first example is "generation 29," a woman living from 1855 to 1917. The abbreviation in evidence field 1 ("D/C has pars, mnm") shows that her own death certificate, supplied, bears her **parents' names** including the **maiden name of her mother**: highly specific evidence of the lineage link to gen. 28 (not shown here).

The second example is from the seventeenth century, generations 20–22, concerning a well known gateway immigrant, Col. Sir Thomas Lunsford (gen. 21). Lunsford's genealogical details are complex and indirect evidence is mentioned. Complete sentences are sometimes used in the evidence field. Some evidence fields cross-reference things cited in other fields.

The third example is from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and concerns the English baronage, generations 13–14. Details are drawn mostly from *Complete Peerage*. The basis for each date is given by noting whether *Complete Peerage* refers to a chronicle, public record, or other piece of evidence. Female inheritance is the key linking generations. Sometimes, even *Complete Peerage* **does not clearly indicate the evidence for a detail**. In Generation 13, line 6, the estimated birth year for William de Beauchamp, Lord Abergavenny, is not found in CP but is in some other works; its basis is not clear. **Good-faith effort** should be made to identify the **evidence for all details**, but some applications include at least one or two dates, etc., whose evidence cannot be identified. It is critical, however, that the application identify evidence **proving each line carrier's parents**.

sample 1: generation 29:

a 19th-20th-century American generation
citing and including modern vital records

APPLICATION OF

Generation 29.

leave blank

Their daughter,

Meta Lomax Stuart ^{1.}

name and title, alias or territorial designation

born at "Panorama," King George Co., VA on 9 Jul 1855 ^{2.}

died at Albemarle Co., VA on 29 Apr 1917 ^{3.}

married at Alexandria, VA on 4 May 1881 ^{4.}

Bartlett Bolling ^{5.}

name and title, alias or territorial designation

born at Petersburg, VA on 6 Feb 1845 ^{6.}

died at Albemarle Co., VA on 8 Feb 1926 ^{7.}

Evidence for statements 1–7 above:

1. Her D/C has pars, mnm.

2. G/S (photo), Grace Episcopal Church Cem., Cismont, Albemarle Co., VA, has dates of birth and death (no places).

3. Her D/C (pars mnm), places of death (birthplace: "Virginia"). Her obit. has parentage and birthplace ("Panorama," King George Co.). G/S (photo), Grace Episcopal Church Cem., Cismont, Albemarle Co., VA, has dates of birth and death (no places).

4. M/R (pars)

5. Spouse per M/R, obits, etc.

6. G/S (photo), Grace Episcopal Church Cem., Cismont, Albemarle Co., VA, has dates of birth and death (no places).

7. D/C (birth and death places). G/S (photo), Grace Episcopal Church Cem., Cismont, Albemarle Co., VA, has dates of birth and death (no places). Obit. (names son Albert, next gen.).

Use the first footnote (no. 1) to substantiate the claim that the individual on the top line is a child of the previous generation.

sample 2: generations 20–22:

a complex gateway
ancestor (17th century)
with indirect evidence

APPLICATION OF

Generation 20.

leave blank

Their son,

Thomas Lunsford, Esq.^{1.}

name and title, alias or territorial designation

born at

about [say 1580]^{2.}

buried at Greenwich, Kent

on 4 Nov 1637^{3.}

married at Bearsted, Kent

on 7 Mar 1602/3^{4.}

Katherine Fludd^{5.}

name and title, alias or territorial designation

born at

on ^{6.}

buried at East Hoathly, Sussex

on 19 May 1642^{7.}

Evidence for statements 1–7 above:

1. Son and heir of father, so named in detailed Lunsford pedigree by George Owen, ca. 1658 et seq., published with editorial additions in *Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica* 4 (1837): 140-142.
2. Say date based on estimated marr. at age 25, likely by say 1605 based on records of children in additions to ca. 1658 Lunsford pedigree (note 1).
3. Burial at Greenwich, Kent, in editorial additions to ca. 1658 Lunsford pedigree (note 1).
4. Bearsted, Kent, PR transcriptions (modern MS), index and images, Findmypast. Date reported in Richardson, *Royal Ancestry* 3:676, not citing.
5. Identified as daughter of Sir Thomas Fludd of Milgate, Kent, in ca. 1658 Lunsford pedigree (note 1). Fludd's HOP biography states he had several daughters but does not name Katherine nor her Lunsford husband.
- 6.
7. Burial at East Hoathley, Sussex, in editorial additions to ca. 1658 Lunsford pedigree (note 1).

Use the first footnote (no. 1) to substantiate the claim that the individual on the top line is a child of the previous generation.

APPLICATION OF

Generation 21.

leave blank

Their son,

Col. Sir Thomas Lunsford¹.

name and title, alias or territorial designation

born at

about 1610².

died at Virginia

before 11 Jan. 165[3/4]³.

married at (his 3rd, her 2nd)

after 1650⁴.

Elizabeth [—]⁵.

name and title, alias or territorial designation

born at

on

⁶.

died at

after 1656⁷.

Evidence for statements 1–7 above:

1. Identified as child and heir of father in (near-contemporary) pedigree of ca. 1658 (cit. prev. gen.)..
2. "Say" date based on siblings with identifiable baptism / burial records (ca. 1606-1610) and assuming age 25 at 1st marr. likely shortly before his 1st w. bur. East Hoathley 28 Nov. 1638 (per additions to detailed Lunsford pedigree by George Owen, ca. 1658 et seq., in *Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica* 4 (1837): 142.
3. On 11 Jan. 1654 [New Style] an order was "made for Sir John Thorowgood to maintain the three children of Sir Thomas Lunsford who married [his 2d wife] Katherine Nevill, daughter of Dame Elizabeth, now wife of Sir John Thorowgood. The said children, Elizabeth, Phillipa and Mary Lunsford, were carried away by their parents to Virginia and remained there until their parents' demise. They were then sent back to the parish of St. Andrew, Holborn [London]" (Coldham, *Complete Book of Emigrants, 1607-1660* [GPC, 1987], 269, citing "MCROS").
4. She m. (1) Richard Kemp, Councilor and Acting Gov., whose made his will 4 Jan 1649/50; not proved until 1656 (PCC), but Kemp is first referred to as deceased on 23 March 1650/1 in a patent to Thomas Breeman (Nugent, *Cavaliers and Pioneers* 1:212).
5. Widow of Richard Kemp. Her identity as a Wormeley long alleged on the basis of Richard Kemp naming uncle Ralph Wormeley in his will; but her identity not established.
- 6.
7. As "Elizabeth Kemp alias Lunsford" she proved her 1st husband Richard Kemp's will 6 Dec. 1656 (PCC wills 455 Berkeley, f. 338r). She was referred to as "Lady Lunsford" in an account settlement receipt dated 1 Dec 1656, recorded 7 Jan. 1656/7 in Lancaster Co. (quoted, "Sir Thomas Lunsford," WMQ 8 [1900]:185). Subsequent (3rd) marriage to Robert Smith of Middlesex Co., probably in 1658-59, is inferred based on Robert Smith's succession to her in tithables lists from 1659 forward, and in occupation of the plantation "Brandon" which she had patented in 1656. (Discussed by Thomas Daniel Knight, unpublished MS on Wormeley kin.)

Use the first footnote (no. 1) to substantiate the claim that the individual on the top line is a child of the previous generation.

APPLICATION OF

Generation 22.

leave blank

Their daughter,

Katherine Lunsford ^{1.}

name and title, alias or territorial designation

born at

on

^{2.}

died at Middlesex Co., VA

on 17 May 1685 ^{3.}

married at [her 2nd marr]

about say 1672 ^{4.}

Actg. Gov. Ralph Wormeley ^{5.}

name and title, alias or territorial designation

born at

on

^{6.}

died at Middlesex Co., VA

before wp 7 April 1701 ^{7.}

Evidence for statements 1–7 above:

1. On 12 Oct. 1670, "Mrs. Katherine Lunsford one of the daughters of the said Sir Thomas [Lunsford Knight Baronet]" petitioned the Va. general court for possession of "such part of the said land" (i.e. "three or four thousand acres . . . in the freshes of Rappa[hannock] River commonly called Portobacco," prev. patented to Lunsford) "as this court should think fitt." Quoted in "Sir Thomas Lunsford" WMQ 8 (1900): 185. Combine with 1707 deed cited next gen., note 1.
- 2.
3. "The Honorable Lady Madam Katherine Wormeley wife to the Honble Ralph Wormeley Esqr Departed this Life 17th of May 1685 & was buried in the Chancell of the Great Church between the Hon . . . Chickley & . . .": The Parish Register of Christ Church, Middlesex County, Va. from 1653 to 1812 (Richmond, 1897), 8.
4. She m. (1) after 12 Oct 1670 (when she was called "Mrs. Katherine Lunsford", see note 1), Peter Jenings, member of the Council and Attorney General. Jenings died sometime before 23 March 167[1/2] when administration granted on his estate; appraised 7 April 1672 ("Council and General Court Records," VA Mag. 8 [1900]:409). See also Thomas Daniel Knight, "The Yorkshire Family of Edmund1 Jenings and Peter1 Jenings of Virginia," TAG 87 (2014-2015):162-63 and notes 7-8.
5. Wormeley's identity established by Katherine's epitaph.
- 6.
7. Middlesex Co., Va., Will Book 1, p. 87 (probate clause), FS DGS 7645441, image 690/776. (Death date of 5 Dec 1713 from Middlesex Parish Register, pub. ed., 84, pertains to a younger Ralph Wormeley.)

Use the first footnote (no. 1) to substantiate the claim that the individual on the top line is a child of the previous generation.

sample 3: generations 13–14:
English baronial families in the
14th and 15th centuries
involving female inheritance

APPLICATION OF

Generation 13.

leave blank

Their daughter,

Joan [Fitzalan or de Arundel] ^{1.}

name and title, alias or territorial designation

born at

before 1375 ^{2.}

died at

on 14 Nov 1435 ^{3.}

married at

on ^{4.}

William de Beauchamp, KG, 1st Baron Abergavenny ^{5.}

name and title, alias or territorial designation

born at

about [1343] ^{6.}

died at

on 8 May 1411 ^{7.}

Evidence for statements 1–7 above:

1. Co-heir (among 4 sisters) to her brother in 1415 for the earldom of Arundel (CP 1:246 note d and chart 1:253).
2. Age "30 and more" in 1415 IPM of her brother Thomas, Earl of Arundel. (CIPMs vol. 20: Henry V [1995], at British History Online).
3. CP 1:26 gives date of death and date and probate of will (citing Testamenta Vetusta, 1:224-230).
- 4.
5. Husband of Joan identified in 1415 IPM for her brother Earl Thomas.
6. Date given in other secondary sources (not CP 1:26) not tied to a source.
7. CP 1:26 cites his IPM for death date.

Use the first footnote (no. 1) to substantiate the claim that the individual on the top line is a child of the previous generation.

APPLICATION OF

Generation 14.

leave blank

Their daughter,

Joan Beauchamp^{1.}

name and title, alias or territorial designation

born at

on

^{2.}

died at

on 3 or 5 Aug 1430^{3.}

married at

on or bef 28 Aug 1413^{4.}

James Butler, 4th Earl of Ormond^{5.}

name and title, alias or territorial designation

born at

about summer 1390^{6.}

died at Ardee, Louth, Ireland

on 23 Aug 1452^{7.}

Evidence for statements 1–7 above:

1. CP 10:125, note d: will of Joan, Lady Bergavenny (gen. 13) names three sons of the Earl of Ormond as her grandsons, proving the identity of (her daughter) Joan, wife of James Butler, 4th Earl of Ormond.
- 2.
3. CP 10:125 note e, citing discrepant chronicles.
4. CP 10:125 note c cites CPR 1413-1416, p. 93.
5. See note 1.
6. CP 1:123 note d on statements of age and probable birth in 1390, with proof of age 8 Aug. 1411.
7. CP 1:126 note a cites his IPM, 31 Hen VI, no. 11.

Use the first footnote (no. 1) to substantiate the claim that the individual on the top line is a child of the previous generation.