

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

Table of Contents

Project Summary	Page 1	Group III Analysis	Page 18
Legend of Vance Descent	Page 1	Group IV Analysis	Page 19
Recruitment	Page 2	Group V Analysis	Page 20
Funding Participants	Page 3	Possibly Related Participants	Page 20
Catalog of Participants	Page 4	Ungrouped Participants	Page 21
Group I Analysis	Pages 5-15	Pending Results	Page 22
Group II Analysis	Pages 15-18		

Summary of the Project

The Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project currently has 39 participants. Of these 39 participants, results are in for 34. We have been able to determine that 6 of these 34 participants are not genetically related to any of the other participants in the project. Another 5 may be related to others in the project, but we can't say for sure until we can compare them on more markers. We have divided the remaining 23 participants into 5 groups, based on the probability of the individuals in any one group sharing a common Vance descent. In the course of this report, I'll cover all these participants in greater detail.

It's been 5 months since our initial report on the project, and a fair amount has happened since then. While we don't have any truly surprising breakthroughs to report, we have been able to make some progress in several areas: we've been able to confirm theories on some lineages and open up new lines of research for others. We've also witnessed another cross-Atlantic genetic connection in an American and an Irish Vance whose lines may converge in 18th century Donegal. I'll discuss these developments and others throughout the report.

Genetic Evidence and the Legend of Vance Descent

Before discussing what specific genealogical information or clues we have gleaned from the results, I'd like to acknowledge the one outstanding, proven fact that has emerged from the project: not all Vances are related genetically to each other. It was only after reading through past newsletters of the Vance Family Association (VFA) that the significance of this fact really hit home. It has always been assumed that all Vances descend from the Vaus and de Vaux of Scotland and England, and before them possibly from the de Baux of Provence, and perhaps before that from some Visigothic chief or nobleman. While I have always had my doubts about various aspects of the Vance legend, I'd like to point out that just because a participant doesn't match the Barnbarroch group, that doesn't mean that's not where his Vance ancestors hailed from.

We all know about the possibility of what are called "false paternity events" occurring – these are simply occasions when the transmission of the surname is not accompanied by the transmission of the Y chromosome. This can happen for many reasons - adultery, adoption, etc. – but it does happen. A lot of surname projects with a substantial number of participants have uncovered instances of these so-called "false paternity events," and it stands to reason that the longer a surname has been around, the more there will be. We haven't been able to identify any of these events, but that doesn't necessarily mean they didn't happen.

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

Keeping in mind this possibility of “false paternity events”, I would like to point out the corollary possibility that there may be Vances in the project who don’t match any other Vances, but whose genealogical lineage might still be traced to other Vances in the project. If there was a false paternity event at some point, the genetic relationship would not accord with the genealogical evidence. This goes for whole groups of related participants as well as individuals. The DNA evidence for any particular group of related participants only reveals a relationship descending from the most recent ancestor of that group. It is always possible that at some point before the most recent ancestor there was a false paternity event – maybe 100 years ago, maybe 500, maybe 1000 or more. This is something to bear in mind when looking at the project as a whole.

Recruitment

We’ve done a fair job at recruitment, but I believe we can do better. After a year in existence, the project currently has 39 participants, which is good; but we’ve gained most of these participants in spite of ourselves. Since our initial postings to various message boards, and our targeted emails to several individuals in the first months of the project, we have not made any significant efforts. News of the project has largely spread on its own, by word of mouth. In time, the VFA became aware of our project, and we are now in frequent contact with a few of its historians past and present, who support the project, actively follow it, and help us out with genealogical information. They and several of the most engaged participants themselves have been a huge help with finding other Vances to test, in giving ideas for lines that would be worth testing for the project – and with educating us about Vance genealogy. Our website began to show up on Google searches, and several participants found out about us that way. Two of our participants (who don’t have the surname Vance) tested before the Vance project began and transferred into the project later in order to test a theory of Vance descent due to a “false paternity event”. Five participants transferred into the project after first testing with the National Geographic Project. The four participants known as SOR1, SOR2, SOR3, and SOR5, are not technically participants; we culled their results from the Sorensen Molecular Genealogy Foundation’s database.

I thought it might interest many of you to see how many people have joined the project in any given month. This chart won’t be entirely accurate, since the number refers to the month when kits were returned, not when they were mailed. Still, it’s largely correct.

June 2005	1	Jan 2006	1
Jul 2005	1	Feb 2006	3
Aug 2005	2	Mar 2006	6
Sept 2005	3	Apr 2006	1
Oct 2005	1	May 2006	3
Nov 2005	2	Jun 2006	1
Dec 2005	4	Jul 2006	4
Total 2005	14	Total 2006	19

As you can see, about 36% more participants joined in the 6 months we’ve around in 2006 as joined in the 6 months we were around in 2005. You can also see that we’ve had a fairly steady stream of participants joining the project since it started. Not a month has gone by where at least one new participant hasn’t joined. A whopping 6 participants joined in March

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

2006, after our first project report. Many became convinced after that report that we were serious about the project, and that we have the wherewithal to use this evidence to further Vance genealogy. We feel positively about our project's history of attracting new participants, but we'd like to improve upon it if we can.

We welcome any ideas as to how we might better recruit participants. Of course, we welcome any and all Vances, Vans, Vaux, etc., to join our project any time. But we are most interested in having participants who can trace their ancestry back at least to the 18th century; their results have the potential to do the most good for the greatest number of participants. We also need more Scottish, Irish, and English participants. Even though virtually all our current participants trace their ancestry back to Ireland and Scotland, we only have two participants who live across the Atlantic. At some point, we will need to get the word out about the project to genealogical communities overseas. We also need one or more Wentz Vances – there were several German families in early America whose surname Wentz became converted to Vance within a generation or two. Indeed, there may well be Vances in our project right now who were once Wentzs. I want to stress that Vances of the Wentz variety are just as welcome here as any other Vances. I have also recently acquired the entire back issue catalog of VFA newsletters. As I read through them to educate myself about more Vance lineages, I hope to gain better ideas of which Vance lines would benefit the project most. And, of course, we will continue to find gain new participants through the efforts of our engaged network of current participants and passionate Vance genealogists who are supportive of the project.

A Word About Money

As administrators, one of the things we often wrestle with is the ability or willingness of people to pay for Y-DNA testing. Each of the administrators has contributed his own money to the project in order to fund testing by Vances who are not from their lineage. In the beginning this was necessary, in order to get the project on its feet. We have also received a generous donation from another individual, and have used that money to help participants who would like to join but who are unable to pay for testing. It's probably too much to hope that others might be forthcoming with donations; but I do hope you will consider it if you have the means. I assure you we'll put the money to good use. If you'd like to restrict your donation for use on specific lineages, we would respect your wishes in that regard.

There are other ways of diminishing the cost. It has always seemed to me that the best way to pay for testing a lineage with numerous living descendants is to spread the cost out among as many descendants as are willing to pay. A 12 marker test costs \$99, and a 37 marker test currently costs \$189. That's a lot for a single person to spend on genealogy. But if the cost is spread among more people, the individual costs diminish. I realize organizing such a method of payment may be difficult, but I wanted to mention it as one possible way of lessening the cost for testing a lineage. We welcome other suggestions.

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

Catalog of Participants

<u>Participant</u>	<u>Classification</u>	<u>Earliest Vance Ancestor</u>
• 39200	Group I	John Vaus of Barnbarroch (d.aft.1384)
• 54198	Group I	William M. Vance (b.1826) m.Nancy E. Wortham
• 39128	Group I	James Vance (d.1751, VA) m.Elizabeth Glass
• 44166	Group I	Maj. William Vance (b.1718, Scot. - d.1788, PA)
• 44884	Group I	Samuel Vance (d.1793, Orange Co., NY)
• 43864	Group I	Samuel Vance of Surry Co., NC (d.1789)
• 57216	Group I	Patrick Vance (d.1803, Knox Co., TN)
• 39459	Group I	Patrick Vance (d.1803, Knox Co., TN)
• N20182	Group I	Robert Vance (b.c.1810, TN) m.Sina Brewer
• N21545	Group I	Samuel Vance (d.1789, Washington Co., VA)
• 61862	Group I	Samuel Vance (d.1789, Washington Co., VA)
• 38105	Group II	Robert Vance of Roan Mt. (1784-1855)
• Sor1	Group II	Robert Vance of Roan Mt. (1784-1855)
• 56883	Group II	Abner Vance (b.bef.1761 – d.1819, Wash. Co., VA)
• 56954	Group II	George Vance (b.1780/90, SC - d.1845-50, MS)
• 45791	Group III	Samuel Vance/Agnes Penquite
• Sor2	Group III	Samuel Vance/Agnes Penquite
• Sor3	Group III	Samuel Vance/Agnes Penquite
• Sor5	Group III	Samuel Vance/Agnes Penquite
• 44944	Group IV	John Vance (b.c.1760, Ire.) m.Mary Allison
• 56896	Group IV	Alexander Vance (b.1800s, Donegal)
• 10000	Group V	????
• 15403	Group V	????
• 48374	Possibly Related	Thomas Vance of Gallia Co., OH (b.c.1820)
• 47531	Possibly Related	John Vance (b.1773, Frederick Co., VA)
• 62079	Possibly Related	LINEAGE UNKNOWN
• N22887	Possibly Related	LINEAGE UNKNOWN
• N3804	Possibly Related	Thomas Vance (b.c.1878, MS) m.Ann
• 39021	Ungrouped	David Vance (d.1880, Butler Co., PA)
• 47042	Ungrouped	Hugh Vance (d.1839, Knox Co., TN)
• N8118	Ungrouped	Patrick Vance (d.c.1805, Henderson Co., KY)
• 4828	Ungrouped	Jeptha Israel (?son of David Vance of Buncombe?)
• 48973	Ungrouped	John Vance (d.1860/70, Washington Co., AR)
• 61703	Ungrouped	William Vance (b.1779, PA - d.1854, OH)
• 60509	Results Pending	LINEAGE UNKNOWN
• 65717	Results Pending	Andrew Vance (b.c.1735, VA) m.Ann Ramey
• 67952	Results Pending	John Vance (d.1760, VA) m.Elizabeth (Colville?)
• 68372	Results Pending	Matthew Vance (b.1764-d.1835) m. Barbara McVeigh
• 68535	Results Pending	William Vance (b.1833, TN - d.1917, TX)

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

Group I: The Barnbarroch Group

This group consists of probable descendants of the Barnbarroch Vaus/Vans. This conclusion is based on the entire group's genetic relationship to participant 39200, a confirmed descendant of the original John Vaus of Barnbarroch. You may recall that in our first report we held off from stating that all of Group I were descended from the Vaus of Barnbarroch. However, we did write: "It is possible (in fact, we think it likely) that a participant might join in the future whose results bridge the genetic distance between [39200] and the others." I'm happy to report this has happened. Two new participants in Group I are within a genetic distance of 3 from 39200, the confirmed Barnbarroch descendant, and also within 3 from the rest of Group I. They have provided the missing link, so to speak. We are therefore now comfortable stating that any of the lineages we place in Group I very probably come from the Barnbarroch line or its antecedents. When it comes to determining exactly how they are related, matters are necessarily more complicated; but, bit by bit, the picture is becoming clearer, and parts of it are coming into focus.

Some of you may recall from the last report that I pointed out a few of the possible ways the lineages in this group might have branched off from one another genetically. Some of those interpretations excluded other possible interpretations, and it was impossible to tell which was correct, or if either were, and so I listed them all. At that time, I also briefly discussed the reason for these varying interpretations - *parallel mutations*, which is how we refer to the phenomenon whereby two people who descend from a common ancestor share the same value on a certain marker, but where the mutation happened separately in each of their lineages. These pesky parallel mutations have the effect of making two people appear more closely related genetically than they actually are. What's more, we're not always able to tell when parallel mutations have occurred. Even worse, when it comes to looking at the whole group, each parallel mutation makes the number of possible interpretations grow exponentially.

The amount of potential parallel mutations in this group has now grown to the point where, if I wanted to present all the possible ways this group might be related genetically, I would not have to merely draw 2 trees, as in the last report, but something like 10 or more. I fear doing so would only create more confusion. For that reason, I'm going to hold off on making any phylogenetic trees in this report. Instead I will try to point out those cases we believe are likely parallel mutations, and in general try to indicate all instances where there might be parallel mutations – but without exploring all the alternate possibilities. On a happier note, the amount of varying interpretations won't always increase over time; in fact, it is certain to diminish in the future as we make better determinations of which mutations are shared mutations, and which are parallel. Later I'll touch on some ways we might help this process along.

Before I begin my analysis of this group, I want to warn everybody that there's going to be a lot of technical talk involved, much more than in the last report because there's more evidence available. As in the last report, I've tried to explain things as clearly as possible; but given all the possible interpretations, and given that much of the talk is going to be about modal values, and parallel mutations, and such, and less about what we normally think of as

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

genealogy, I wanted you to be forewarned. If you'd rather stick to what we've been able to conclude genealogically, I've bolded our conclusions when we've arrived at them, and also presented a summary of them all at the end of the analysis. You can skip to those if you like. Or if you're interested only in particular participants, you can search for them and only read those parts. However, be warned that some parts won't make sense without reading the whole. I do apologize for the length and denseness of what will follow. But I wanted above all to show you *how* we do this, so you know we're in earnest and so you can follow our logic. This is not an arcane mystery, though it can get rather involved at times – in that respect it's really no different from some other genealogical analyses. The only reason we go through the complicated DNA analysis at all is to try to arrive at the soundest possible genealogical conclusions – after all, that is the entire purpose of the project.

Modal Haplotype of Group I

As before, our first task was to determine the *modal haplotype* of this group, which is simply the series of marker values that are most common to the whole group. The *modal haplotype* is the presumed haplotype of the most recent common ancestor (MRCA) of the whole group. It is not necessarily the actual haplotype of the MRCA, which is known as the *ancestral haplotype*. But if not precisely the same, the modal haplotype and the ancestral haplotype will inevitably prove to be identical on most of the markers. If the value of determining the ancestral haplotype is not yet evident, it should become more so as you read on.

Our first step in determining the modal value is to find those markers where all of Group I share an identical value. It is extremely likely that these values were present in the ancestral haplotype; the likeliest explanation for why all of this group shares these values is simply that they haven't mutated since the MRCA in any of the lineages. We can then remove these markers from our analysis. After doing so, we are left with 9 markers out of 37 where there is some sort of discrepancy between the participants in the group. It is these 9 markers which we hope will reveal branching patterns and shared mutations which are peculiar to some, but not all, of the participants. These shared mutations will allow us to theorize, and in some cases determine, whether particular individuals in this group are more closely related to other individuals in the group. At the very least, these shared mutations may open up avenues for further research.

The 9 markers, and the values each participant has on them, are listed in the chart below. You'll probably want to refer back to this chart periodically as you read on.

[Marker values that differ from the modal are bolded.]

		390	458	459b	464c	607	576	570	CDYa	CDYb
39200	John Vaus of Barnbarroch (1300s)	23	19	10	17	16	18	17	39	40
54198	Wm. M. Vance (b.1826, VA; d.MO)	24	19	10	17	16	17	17	39	40
39128	Jas. Vance of Frederick (d.c.1751, VA)	24	18	10	17	15	19	17	38	39
44166	Maj. Wm Vance (d.1788, PA)	24	18	10	17	15	17	17	38	39
44884	Saml. Vance (d.1793, Orange Co., NY)	24	19	10	16	15	18	18	38	39
43864	Saml. Vance (d.1789, Surry Co., NC)	24	19	9	15	15	18	17	38	39
57216	Patrick Vance (d.1803, Knox Co., TN)	24	18	10	17	15	17	18	38	39
39459	Patrick Vance (d.1803, Knox Co., TN)	24	19	10	17	15	17	18	38	41
N20182	Robert Vance (b.c.1810, TN)	24	19	10	17	15	17	18	38	40
N21545	Samuel Vance (d.1778, Wash. Co., VA)	24	19	10	17	15	18	17	39	39
61862	Samuel Vance (d.1778, Wash. Co., VA)	24	19	10	17	14	19	17	38	39

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

Our object with these 9 markers is the same as with the markers on which all the participants are identical. We are continuing our attempt to find the modal haplotype of the group, which again consists simply of the values on each particular marker which are most common to the whole group. The stronger the modality is on a particular marker (i.e., if one value on a marker is overwhelmingly in the majority) the greater the possibility that value was the value held by the common ancestor. Further, whenever a participant's value deviates from the modal, and when two or more participants share one of these values, we take a closer look to see if it might be a shared mutation, or whether there is a possibility they had the mutation independently, which would constitute a parallel mutation. [It's extremely important to realize that a shared value may not be a shared mutation.] If it *is* a shared mutation, that means they are more closely related to each other than to the other participants. Again, it's these shared mutations that allow us to make progress in determining the likelihood of specific relationships.

Following is a table showing the different values held on each marker, and the ratios of those values.

Marker	Values	Ratio	Probable Ancestral Value
390:	24/23	10/1	24
458:	19/18	8/3	19
459b:	10/9	10/1	10
464c:	17/16/15	9/1/1	17
607:	15/16/14	8/2/1	15
576:	17/18/19	5/4/2	our guess 18
570:	17/18	7/4	our guess 17
CDYa:	38/39	8/3	38
CDYb:	39/40/41	7/3/1	our guess 39

Our standard for determining the probable ancestral value (the value probably held by the MRCA of the whole group) is for one value to be present in about 75% (roughly 8) of the participants. This may not be the ancestral value, but it's our best guess given the evidence before us. Briefly, we feel we can immediately establish the probable ancestral value on all the markers but three: 576, 570 and CDYb. We have our guesses as to the ancestral values on these three markers, but they still present something of a problem in our analysis. Not coincidentally they are the greatest contributors to the proliferation of possible interpretations of the evidence, and are the scene of the greatest number of potential parallel mutations.

Marker DYS 576: ancestral value undetermined, but probably 18

On DYS 576, the values 17, 18 and 19 are all present, though 19 in so small a quantity as to virtually rule it out as the ancestral value. More participants have 17 than 18, but neither value is in the majority. Even though the value 17 is present in more lines than 18, we feel the ancestral value of DYS 576 will prove to be 18. We have a few reasons for believing this. First, 18 is also the value held by 39200, thought by tradition and by the DNA evidence to be more distantly related to the other lines in the project. (If more distant branches tend to share the same value, that lends greater weight to the possibility of it being the ancestral value.) Also, we have two descendants of Samuel Vance of Washington Co., VA in the project, one

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

with the value 18 and one with the value 19. Since 19 is only present in 2 of the participants, we think 18 is probably the value held by Samuel himself, which would lend more weight to 18 being the ancestral value of the whole group (i.e., if Samuel himself had the value 18, it would allow us to remove 61862's 19 from consideration, replacing it with an 18). Similarly, 54198 and 39128 are both descended from whoever was the father of Maj. William and James Vance (more on that below); one has the value 17 and the other 19. The more conservative explanation for this discrepancy is that each mutated away from 18, rather than that one experienced two mutations to 19. Again, if this were true, it would allow us to replace the 17 and 19 with two 18s. Obviously there are a lot of assumptions involved here, which is precisely why we don't feel comfortable yet stating that the ancestral value is 18.

There definitely appear to be a few parallel mutations on this marker, and this complicates any attempt to compare certain participants one-on-one. For instance, we might assume from looking at the shared value of 19 at DYS 576 between 39128 and 61862, that these participants are more closely related to each other than to others in the group. Yet we know that 39128 is more closely related to 54198, who has the value 17. And we know 61862 is more closely related to N21545, who has the value 18. This seems to be a clear case of a parallel mutation happening: participants 39128 and 61862 appear to be more closely related than they are due to the shared value of 19, yet chances are their DYS 576 mutated to 19 separately, by chance. Whether it mutated from 18 or from 17 is still anybody's guess. We guess 18.

Marker DYS 570: ancestral value undetermined, but probably 17

On DYS 570, we believe that the modal value of 17 (shared by 7 of the participants) is the probable value in the ancestral haplotype. Two of the four instances of the single, alternate value 18 occur in the descendants of Patrick Vance, and a third instance in a man we believe for other reasons may be descended from Patrick Vance or from a recent ancestor of Patrick's. This could mean that 18 might be largely confined to the Patrick Vance branch of the Barnbarroch tree. If this is true, it could end up being a great help, in that it might allow us to use 18 as a defining marker for Patrick's line (provided other evidence accords and as long as we can rule out the possibility of a parallel mutation).

The fourth instance of the value 18 is in 44884, the descendant of Samuel Vance of Orange County, NY. Given the amount of other markers on which he doesn't match the other three who are 18 at DYS 570, we're simply not sure if this is a shared mutation, which would mean he is more closely related to Patrick, or if it is a parallel mutation. Either interpretation is possible. Still, given that half the 18s occur in descendants of Patrick, and one third of them on a line that we believe is probably descended from or closely related to Patrick – that means that 17 has the greater spread among different lineages. For that reason, we guess 17 is the ancestral value for this marker.

Marker DYS CDYb: ancestral value undetermined, but probably 39

On DYS CDYb, we believe the modal value of 39 (shared by 7 of the participants) is the probable value in the ancestral haplotype. Three of the participants have the alternate value 40. One of these is 39200, the proven ancestor of the original John Vaus of Barnbarroch. Another is 54198, who matches 39200 on several other markers which are peculiar to those two. Due to their several shared values and general genetic closeness, **we believe 54198**

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

shares a common ancestor with 39200 more recent than the common ancestor of the whole group. Again, if this is true, it means half the instances of values other than 39 can be accounted for by a single branch. Participant N20182 also has the value 40, but as we'll explain further below, we believe this was a parallel mutation and that **N20182 is likely more closely related to the Patrick Vance descendants** than to 39200. Another of Patrick's descendants has the value 41 at this marker (the only instance of this value), which is clearly a mutation from the ancestral haplotype. Given the possible close relationship of 39200 and 54198 (who are both 40 at CDYb), we think the value 39 has the greater spread among different lineages, and for that reason we think 39 is the ancestral value. However, it is still possible that 40 was the ancestral value, and that all the Americans but 54198 are from a branch that mutated to 39. We'll have more to say about this possibility near the end of our analysis of Group I.

Other Parallel Mutations

There are several other examples of what look like parallel mutations happening even on markers where there is a strong modality. Take a look at DYS 458. In all likelihood, 19 is the ancestral value, since 8 out of 11 participants have that value. That being the case, one would expect that all three of the participants who have the value 18 might be more closely related to each other than to others in the project. It turns out this is partially true, but not completely. **Participants 39128 and 44166 each have the value 18 on this marker; their ancestors have long been thought to be brothers, and the DNA evidence supports this interpretation.** Given what we know about their genealogy, their shared value of 18 at DYS 458 confirms a closer relationship between them than between each of them and the rest of the group. Now, participant 57216 (a descendant of Patrick Vance) also has the value of 18. Yet we know he is more closely related to 39459 (another Patrick descendant), who has the modal value 19. It's far more likely that the value held by Patrick Vance himself was 19, the modal value of the whole group. So it would seem that 57216 probably experienced a parallel mutation to 18, which has the effect of making him seem more closely related to 39128 and 44166 than he actually is. The alternative interpretation on DYS 458 is that Patrick did have the value 18, and that 39459's line experienced a mutation back to the ancestral value. As this latter scenario involves two mutations rather than one, that makes it a less likely possibility. Nevertheless, we can't yet rule it out.

Now, take a deep breath. We've just about covered all the possible parallel mutations. The worst of these are on the pesky DYS 576, where we believe there is a good possibility of three separate parallel mutations to 17 in the lines of 54198, 44166 and in our two Patrick descendants (57216 & 39459).

If you're a bit confused by all of this, you're not alone. It took me days of staring at the evidence before it started to make sense. There are numerous uncertainties involved, and many of our guesses may turn out to be wrong. (Again, they are our best guesses based on the evidence at hand.) This array of possible interpretations is an inevitable byproduct of attempting to look at the group as a whole, rather than comparing participants one-on-one. But I'd like to point out that this kind of confusion often precedes clarity in genealogy, as any one who has done this kind of research for a long time well knows. One starts off in the dark, then things become clearer until new confusions arise, and those are cleared up in turn – and that's how progress is made. We are certain that this method of comparing a whole group

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

before comparing individuals is the better way to proceed, because it actually allows us to spot parallel mutations that we might otherwise assume were shared mutations. In some cases, we've been able to determine where parallel mutations occurred, and in most other cases we have good guesses as to whether a particular shared value is the result of a shared mutation or a parallel mutation. And the good news is that there are ways for us to diminish this confusion, and ultimately there are ways for us to make a pretty good determination of the ancestral haplotype of the whole group. Once we have the ancestral haplotype we will be in a much better position for distinguishing between shared and parallel mutations, and will be that much closer to being able to determine how closely the ancestors themselves were related to each other. Even now we've still been able to establish some solid genealogical conclusions and clues from the results.

Subsidiary Ancestral Haplotypes

We are lucky enough to have three pairs of individuals in the Barnbarroch group (6 out of the 11 participants in the group) who are known to descend from a common ancestor more recent than that of the whole group. With these pairs it is possible to make an attempt at determining the haplotype of their MRCA. The benefit of this should be self-evident. Once we have an ancestral haplotype for these pairs, we can start using that haplotype to represent both their lineages. We always tell people that it's better to test the oldest person in the family, because there's less chance for more mutations to have occurred. Imagine if the oldest person in the family was your ancestor from the 1700s! That's the beauty of discovering the ancestral haplotype – it's almost like you've tested your ancestor.

Pair I: Major William Vance and James Vance of Frederick County, VA

The first of these pairs is 39128 and 44166. **It has long been believed, based on strong circumstantial evidence, that Major William Vance who died 1788 in Pennsylvania was the brother of James Vance who left will dated 1751 in Frederick County, Virginia. The DNA evidence supports this theory.** These two differ by a genetic distance of 2, but on only one marker, the highly mutable DYS 576. Further, they each share the value of 18 at DYS 458, which is a rare value for this group. This effectively means we have determined the haplotype of James and William's father on all but one marker, DYS 576. Either the ancestral value on DYS 576 was 17, and 39128's lineage experienced a mutation to 19, or the value was 18, and one mutated to 17 and the other to 19. We think it highly unlikely that the ancestral value was 19, since 17 and 18 are the values in 9 of the 11 participants in this group. The most conservative interpretation is that the value was 18; this would require just a single mutation in each line, rather than two mutations in a single line to get from 17 to 19. Still, we can't be sure right now. To make a final determination of the ancestral haplotype for this pair – whether 17 or 18 - we will need to test a descendant of a brother of Major William and James. It turns out one might be available whom we would want to test in any case, even without considerations of finding the ancestral haplotype.

It is generally believed, based on a solid preponderance of circumstantial evidence, that James and William's brother was David Vance who died 1767/1768 in Hampshire Co., VA. We would like to confirm this through DNA testing. Furthermore, if we test one of David's descendants, and if, as expected, he closely matches 39128 and 44166, especially on DYS 458, then we will have more genealogical proof of their brotherhood and might also be able to determine the ancestral value of their father on DYS 576. If David's descendant has the

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

value 17, we could safely conclude that 17 was the ancestral value of his father. If he has the value 18, then we would tend to believe the ancestral value was 18. We doubt he would have the value of 19. Once we have the ancestral haplotype for this trio, we will be that much closer to determining the probable ancestral haplotype for the whole group.

Pair II: Patrick Vance of Falling Springs, PA

The second pair consists of 57216 and 39459, both descendants of Patrick Vance of Falling Springs, PA, who emigrated from Ireland and ended up late in life in Knox County, TN, where he died in 1803. These two descendants of Patrick's differ on two markers. In the case of DYS 458, we believe the ancestral value is 19, the modal value of the whole group, and that 57216 experienced a mutation to 18. [This would be a mutation to 18 independent of the mutation experienced in the Maj. William/James line as described above.] On DYS CDYb, we are facing two equally plausible possibilities: either the ancestral value was 39, the modal value of the whole group, and 39459's line experienced a mutation from 39 to 41; or the ancestral value was 40, and each line experienced a single mutation away from 40 (with 57216's 39 being a parallel mutation). If we had a third descendant of Patrick's from a third son, chances are we would be able to determine the ancestral haplotype with greater certainty. A lot hinges on which of our two interpretations of CDYb is correct. If the latter is correct, that would indicate that Patrick Vance might be more closely related to 39200/54198 due to a shared mutation, and it could open up the possibility that 40 was the ancestral value of the whole group at CDYb. It would also mean that N20182's haplotype would be an exact match with the ancestral haplotype of Patrick Vance. Even setting aside Patrick's ancestral haplotype, the two Patrick descendants are the closest genetically to N20182, who is a genetic distance of 1 from 39459 and a genetic distance of 2 from 57216.

Participant N20182 traces his ancestry back to Robert Vance who married Sina Brewer. Robert was born around 1810 in Tennessee. His birthplace is based on census records, so it is unknown where specifically in Tenn. he was born. However, given his close match with the descendants of Patrick Vance, who died in Knox County, Tenn., **we think there's a distinct possibility Robert may be descended from Patrick.** Robert is of the right age to have been a grandson of Patrick, or even a great-grandson of Patrick through one of his older sons. Therefore, it might be profitable for N20182 to seek a Robert Vance among the children of Patrick's sons, or even among the grandchildren of Patrick's eldest sons. It is possible their shared ancestor is farther back than Patrick. But at the very least **the DNA evidence suggests that Robert and Patrick share an MRCA more recent than the MRCA of the whole group**, whether that ancestor was Patrick or someone slightly farther back in time.

Pair III: Samuel Vance of Washington Co., VA

This pair consists of N21545 and 61862, two descendants of Samuel and Sarah (Colville) Vance. These two differ on three markers. We believe Samuel had the value 15 at DYS 607 and 39 at DYS CDYa; these are both strong modal values for the whole Barnbarroch group. Assuming these are the ancestral values, it is far more likely that Samuel's descendants simply mutated away from these values rather than that they mutated back after some initial mutation away from the ancestral values. The third difference between this pair is on - you guessed it - DYS 576, where N21545 has the value 18 and 61862 has the value 19. We believe the ancestral value is 18, since the value 19 is present in only one other participant, whom we happen to know is more closely related to 39128 than to either Samuel Vance

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

descendant. (This shared value of 19 is a prime example of a probable parallel mutation.) However, the only way to be sure of Samuel's ancestral haplotype is to test another descendant from a third son of Samuel. If he has the value 18 at DYS 576, that will pretty much settle matters as regards Samuel Vance's ancestral haplotype.

A Special Case: Participants 54198 and 39200

Participant 54198 is the closest match yet with 39200. They both share the value 16 at DYS 607, which no other of the group has. They also both share the values 39 and 40 at CDY_a and CDY_b, which are not present in most of the group. Given the small genetic distance of 2 between them, and given the number of unique values they share, **we think it very likely that 54198's line split off from the Barnbarroch line later than all the rest of the branches represented in the project, and that he and 39200 share an MRCA more recent than the MRCA of the whole group.**

The traditional Vance genealogy may help with clues. The following tree is culled mostly from Alec and Jamie Vans' *The Origin of the Irish Vances*. The line of descent from Alexander to Thomas/Lancelot to John of Coagh is mostly conjecture. [In deference to the authors, it is a fair conjecture based on the evidence. And as you'll shortly discover, I am a big believer in conjecture. If the truth is hiding, one might as well poke around to try and find it.] Further, John of Coagh did have a son Andrew who emigrated to America, but there's very little proof that this Andrew was the same Andrew the immigrant who was father of Samuel Vance of Washington County. In fact, there's very little proof Andrew Vance the immigrant even existed. [I'm saving a fuller discussion of this Andrew for a later report.] Therefore, I present this tree not as fact, but only for the purpose of trying out the exercise of seeing how it might accord with the DNA evidence.

1. Alexander Vans of Barnbarroch (b.bef.1635 – d.1709)
 2. Unknown Thomas (Lancelot) Vans (d.bef.1709)
 3. John Vance of Coagh
 4. Andrew Vance
 5. Samuel Vance (1716-1778) (ancestor of N21545 & 61862)
 - m. Sarah Colville
2. Col. Patrick Vans of Barnbarroch (b.bef.1694 – d.1733)
 3. John Vans Agnew of Barnbarroch (1724-1780) (ancestor of 39200)

First, it's critical to note that participant 39200's ancestor John Vans of Barnbarroch (1724-1780) adopted the surname Vans Agnew. Since 54198 is not a Vans Agnew, that means the MRCA of him and 39200 must have been at the very least in the generation prior to John Vans Agnew (1724-1780), whose father was Col. Patrick Vans (d.1733). Secondly, N21545 and 61862's ancestor Samuel Vance is thought to be the son of Andrew Vance the immigrant, who is generally believed to be the son of John of Coagh (Balbirnie states that John's son Andrew emigrated to America). John of Coagh is thought by some to be the grandson of Alexander Vans of Barnbarroch, who was father of Col. Patrick Vans (d.1733). Now, since 54198 appears to be more closely related to 39200 than to N21545 or 61862, *it is likely that he shares an ancestor with 39200 who is more recent than the ancestor he shares with N21545 or 61862.* If the tree above is accurate (again, this is far from certain), that leaves just one possibility for the MRCA of 39200 and 54198 – Col. Patrick Vans of

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

Barnbarroch (d.1733). Col. Patrick Vans had several sons who must have kept the name Vans. It may be that 54198's line comes from one of these other sons of Col. Patrick. If this theory is accurate, and given that 54198's ancestor was born around 1826, we think he would be in the fourth, fifth or sixth generation from Col. Patrick.

There is a further possibility arising from this theory, and it has the potential to change our entire analysis of this group. Participant 54198 and 39200 differ from the modal haplotype on the same three markers, which is what makes us think they're more closely related to each other than the rest of the group. However, participants N21545 and 61862, the descendants of Samuel Vance, hold the modal values on those markers, as do nearly all the other participants in Group I. If the modals represent the ancestral value, as we've theorized, that would require three mutations to have happened in Col. Patrick's DNA, since the modals would have to have been present in Col. Patrick's father for them to have been present in Samuel Vance, but not present in Col. Patrick's son John Vans Agnew, the ancestor of 39200. Three mutations in one generation is a virtual impossibility.

Since it's virtually impossible for Col. Patrick's DNA to have undergone three mutations in a single generation, certain conclusions follow. If the above tree and the resulting theory of 54198's line of descent are true (by no means certain), it would mean that 54198's and 39200's values on 607, CDYa, and CDYb, are probably the ancestral values, and that all the rest of the participants in this group have values which are mutations from the modal. Given the unlikelihood of parallel mutations happening away from the modal on all the other lines, that means that they all probably descend from Thomas (Lancelot) Vance somehow. The modal values would only appear to be the ancestral values to us because the whole group happens to be heavily weighted with participants from a single line that mutated. This is certainly a possibility. However, it's also true that almost every generation in the entire line of descent in the tree above from Alexander on down to Samuel is open to question. Also, there are competing theories which hold that some participants in this group descend from Vances who split off before Alexander. I'll save these other theories for a later report; but right now it looks like, if these other theories are true, then there must be an error somewhere in the above tree.

The theory we just laid out is only conjecture at this point, but I do think this has been a useful exercise. It can't hurt to try elaborating on a theory by attempting to incorporate DNA evidence into it. It tends to open up possibilities and get one thinking about the traditional Vance genealogy in a different way. We have seen that it has the potential to reveal that if one thing is true, another thing must be false, which is something we wouldn't have known before. And now we can envision a point at which the DNA evidence might allow us to gauge whether there's a chance of various lines of descent being possible, and whether some might be ruled out. In the future, we might just stumble upon the truth by exercises like this. Who knows – we may have already done so without knowing it. It goes without saying that having an Irish Vance in the project with a proven line back to John Vance of Coagh would help matters tremendously as regards testing this theory.

Participants 44884 and 43864

As we stated in the first report, it is possible that 44884 (Samuel Vance of Orange County, NY) and 43864 (Samuel Vance of Surry County, NC) share a common ancestor who is more

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

recent than the common ancestor of the whole group. This would be due to a shared mutation at 464c from 17 to 16 for both, then from 16 to 15 for 43864. These two participants are also a genetic distance of 3 from each other, which is as short as genetic distance gets for these two participants so far.

Participant 44884 is also a genetic distance of 3 from 57216, a descendant of Patrick Vance, and from N20182 (Robert Vance), whom we believe might also be a descendant of Patrick. This may indicate that 44884 is more closely related to Patrick Vance, but it's difficult to know without being able to determine if any of 44884's values are the result of a parallel mutation.

Likewise, participant 43864 is a genetic distance of 3 from N21545 (Samuel Vance of Washington County, VA). But, again, without knowing if parallel mutations have occurred, we're unable to determine whether there's a greater likelihood of Samuel Vance of Surry County being more closely related to Samuel Vance of Washington County than to others.

Summary of Conclusions and Clues

For now, we feel we have gained the following solid conclusions or clues from the DNA evidence relating to the Barnbarroch group:

- 1) We believe all the participants in this group are descended from the Vaus line of Barnbarroch or its antecedents.
- 2) DNA evidence provides further support to the conclusion that Maj William Vance and James Vance (1751, Fred. Co., VA) were brothers.
- 3) The line of William M. Vance (b.1826) appears to have branched off from the Barnbarroch line later than the other American Vance lines in the project.
- 4) Participant N20182's ancestor Robert Vance (b.c.1810, TN) may be a descendant of Patrick Vance of Knox Co., TN, either a grandson, or possibly a great-grandson through one of Patrick's older sons. If these possibilities don't pan out, we still feel based on what is suggested by the DNA evidence that N20182 is probably more closely related to Patrick than to others in the Barnbarroch group.

We also feel an analysis of this group would benefit from having the following individuals represented in the project:

- Descendant of John Vance of Falling Springs, PA, brother of Patrick.
- Descendant of James Alexander Vance of Chester County, SC (thought to be a cousin of Patrick)
- Descendant of Adam Vance (d.1777, York County, PA) (may be related to the above James Alexander Vance)
- Descendant of John Vance of York County, PA (may be related to the above Adam Vance)
- Descendant of David Vance (purported brother of James and Wm)

For the purpose of better determining ancestral haplotypes, we also feel an analysis of this group would benefit from having the following individuals represented in the project:

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

- Third descendant of Samuel Vance/Sarah Colville through different son.
- Second descendant of Samuel Vance/Alie Carr
- Second descendant of Samuel Vance of Orange County, NY

And, of course, it is almost certain that we will be surprised by a future addition to this group which we can't yet envision, but which will fill out the picture yet further. If the general theory of Frederick County Vance descent is accurate, our newest participants 65717 and 67952 (thought to descend from Andrew Vance of Frederick County) should end up in this group. If the legends of the mysterious immigrant Andrew Vance are true, we might expect them to match closely with N21545 and 61862 – all four of these participants are thought to be descendants of the shadowy Andrew, who is often identified as the son of John Vance of Coagh.

A Final Word

Before I move on to a discussion of Groups II and III, I should mention something about their possible relationship to Group I. Though for the present we are discussing these three groups as though they are not related to each other, the possibility of a relationship between them is not out of the question. The genetic distance between Group I and either Group II or III is roughly 9. Yet, fully a third of the genetic distance can be accounted for by a single marker, DYS 456. Group I all have the value 16, and the participants in Group II and Group III have the value 19 or 20. By the *stepwise model* of reckoning mutations, we would assume that the distance from 16 to 19 is covered by three mutations; but there is an alternate model, the *infinite alleles* model, which deems it possible for one marker to mutate several steps in a single event. It is possible that Group I and Group II do share a common ancestor, and that there was a single mutation from 16 to 19. This would make the genetic distance between them about 7 rather than about 9. A genetic distance of 7 is still too distant for us to comfortably say they are related, but it is certainly possible given the long time frame involved with the Vance/Vans/Vaux/Vaus surname. Note that as of the first project report, 39200 was a genetic distance of 6 from the other participants in Group I, and later participants joined who bridged the gap. If we ever gain a participant who bridges the genetic distance between these three groups, their common Vance descent would appear to be a possibility. We will cross that bridge if we come to it.

Group II

At the time of our last project report, this group consisted of two descendants of Robert Vance of Carter Co., TN, and four descendants of James Vance of McDonough Co., IL. We grouped them together at that time due to the presence of several unusual values they share on certain markers, in particular due to the values 19 and 20 on DYS 456, the value 10 on DYS 460, and the value 16 on DYS 464b and DYS 464c. We personally still think they probably share a common Vance ancestor; however, the genetic distance between them is around 5 or 6, which is too large for confidence. And now we have two new participants who closely match the descendants of Robert Vance, but who have not bridged the genetic distance to the James Vance descendants. We therefore feel that (for now at least) a more cautious interpretation of the evidence is warranted, and so we have separated out the James Vance descendants into a different group, Group III.

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

We can't presently compare Group II and Group III satisfactorily, because only one of the James Vance descendants is actually in the project (45791). The others (SOR 2, 3, and 5) have yet to test with FTDNA, so we can't compare them on all the markers available to us. It may be that 45791's line experienced a few mutations away from James Vance of McDonough's ancestral haplotype, and that his mutations account for a lot of the genetic distance. We are attempting to have SOR2, 3, or 5, tested with FTDNA, which may enable us to make a final determination of James Vance of McDonough's ancestral haplotype on all the FTDNA markers. This will allow us to make a better determination of the likelihood of these two groups sharing a common Vance descent.

Since the last report, two other participants have joined the project who we've determined are related to the Robert Vance descendants. These new participants are 56883, a descendant of Abner Vance who was hanged in Abingdon, VA, in 1819; and 56954, a descendant of George Vance (b.1780/90, SC – d.1845-1850, MS).

Just as we did with Group I, we attempted to determine the ancestral haplotype of this group. Again, we removed from consideration all those markers on which the participants are the same, as these likely haven't mutated since their MRCA. Following is a chart representing the markers on which they differ:

		385b	389i	456	CDYb
56883	Abner Vance/Susannah Howard	14	13	19	40
38105	Robert Vance of Carter County, TN	14	13	20	39
Sor1	Robert Vance of Carter County, TN	13	13	20	??
56954	George Vance (b.1780/90, SC - d.1845-50, MS)	14	14	20	40
Group III	James Vance of McDonough	14	13	19	??

Since SOR1 has not yet been tested with FTDNA, there are 5 markers on which we can't compare him with the others. Technically, those markers should be included in the above chart, because there may be differences on those markers between SOR1 and the others. And if SOR1 were from a unique lineage, we would have included them. However, since he and 38105 both descend from Robert Vance, if 38105's marker values are the same as the other two, we can be confident those are probably the values held by the common ancestor of the whole group. There is one marker we don't have for SOR1, marker CDYb, on which there is some difference between the other three participants. It is the only marker on which we can't determine Group II's modal value.

We don't yet have enough participants in this group to warrant equating the modal value with the ancestral value on markers where this group differs. It's true that three out of four does meet the 75% standard we used for Group I; but the number of participants is too small for the standard to be meaningful. However, when thinking about this group, we have our eye always on Group III, which we believe will turn out to be related to Group II. If Group III has a modal value which is a 3 out of 4 modal value in Group II, then we feel that will probably prove to be the ancestral value. If, as we believe, these groups are related, it is clear that Group III is somewhat distantly related to Group II. Therefore, the fact that they share a modal value would be more significant. This may become clearer once we have another descendant of James Vance of McDonough tested with FTDNA.

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

Briefly, we feel we can determine the probable ancestral value on all but two markers – 456 and CDYb. On DYS 456, we've determined that James Vance of McDonough had the value 19. This is the value held by Abner's descendant 56883, but not by the other 3 in Group II. On CDYb, we've been unable to determine James Vance of McDonough's ancestral value, due to four out of five of Group III having no results on those markers. In Group II, we are also missing SOR1's value on that marker, so we can't even determine the modal value.

We can make a few significant conclusions about this group based on the DNA evidence:

It has long been thought that Abner Vance was related to Robert Vance of Carter Co., Tennessee. Y-DNA results now confirm they were kin. Their descendants differ on only two markers and share several values unusual for the R1b haplogroup. Robert Vance is thought to be a son of John Vance of Carter County, TN, who is thought to be a brother of Abner Vance, and also a brother of the Matthew Vance who married Barbara McVeigh. **We can't yet speak to the precise relationship between Abner and Robert, but we may say that the DNA evidence is compatible with Abner being Robert's uncle.**

George Vance (b.1780/90, SC – d.1845-50, MS) was clearly kin to Abner and Robert. His descendant differs from 56883 and 38105 by only 2 or 3 mutations. George's birthplace, and the name of George's son may provide clues which lend further weight to their relationship, and may in the end lead us to it. George was born in South Carolina, and he had a son Kinson McVeigh Vance. Perhaps not coincidentally, the purported brother of Abner Vance (and of Robert's probable father John) was Matthew Vance who married a Barbara McVeigh. There is no known George among Matthew and Barbara's children, but not all of their children are necessarily accounted for. Given George's age, if he was Matthew's son, he would have to have been one of his oldest sons. There is also a certain Kinson McVay, born in South Carolina, who is thought to be the son of Hugh McVay. Hugh McVay was a sheriff in Greenville, SC., the same area in South Carolina where Matthew Vance lived before moving up to Burke County, NC. Further, the given name Hugh also appears in one of George Vance's descendants. With this evidence, so far nothing can be proven; but there are certainly some tantalizing clues here for this group to work on. In a future report, I intend to focus more intently on this group, and present a summary of all the pertinent genealogical evidence and theories as relayed to me by the participants in this group and by others. We are awaiting 37 marker results from participant 68372, a descendant of Matthew Vance/Barbara McVeigh. If the theory regarding Abner and Matthew's brotherhood is correct, 68372 should match with this group.

For now, we feel we have gained the following significant conclusions or clues from the DNA evidence relating to this group:

- 1) DNA evidence confirms that Robert Vance of Carter Co., TN was kin to Abner Vance of SW Virginia. It supports, but does not confirm, the conclusion that Abner was Robert's uncle.
- 2) DNA evidence has revealed that George Vance was kin to Robert and Abner. Genealogical clues gleaned from George's birthplace, and the name of his son, also tend to point towards a close relationship between them.

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

We feel an analysis of this group would benefit from having the following individuals represented in the project:

- Second descendant of Abner, for determining Abner's ancestral haplotype.
- Full FTDNA results for either SOR 2, 3, or 5, for better determining Group II's likely relationship to Group III.
- Descendant of Alexander Vance of Greene Co., KY (thought by some to be kin to this group)
- Descendants of others who were thought to be sons of John Vance, the purported father of Robert Vance.
- Descendant of David Vance (b.1757, Winchester, VA) who fought in the Revolution, moved to SC after the war, then later on to Tennessee, Missouri, and then Arkansas, where he filed for his Revolutionary war pension. He has been thought by some to be related to the Carter County, TN, Vances.
- Descendant of George Campbell Vance, son of Thomas Vance of Union County, SC.
- Descendant of Patrick Vance and Sarah Harrington. This Patrick Vance is another South Carolina Vance. His son Jordan intermarried with Mary Vance, the daughter of 65717.

Possible Relation of Group II to Group I

Please see our paragraph at the end of the Group I analysis for our discussion for Group II's possible relationship to the Barnbarroch group.

Group III

In this report, we are not including a discussion of Group III, since we don't have any new information to report. We think Group III may turn out to be related to Group II, but we will need to test one or more of the SOR participants with FTDNA to better determine this. Hopefully we'll have one of them tested before the next analysis so we have something to report. Please see our paragraph at the end of the Group I analysis for our discussion for Group III's possible relationship to the Barnbarroch group.

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

Group IV

This group consists of two participants who we've determined are not related to any of the other participants in the project. They are both R1b, and are an exact match on 12 markers with each other. Unlike with Groups I, II, and III, with this group we feel 12 markers is sufficient to establish the simple fact of a relationship. Unlike with Groups I, II and III, their haplotype is relatively rare. They both share values on certain markers in the 12 marker panel that are found in a very small percentage of the total R1b population. Here are the rare values they share, using marker frequencies as identified by Whit Athey in his excellent study <http://www.worldfamilies.net/Super%20Western%20Atlantic%20Modal%20Haplotype.htm>

<u>Marker</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Frequency in Total R1b</u>
385b	13	8%
388	13	1%
389b	18	2%

Even if they didn't both have the surname Vance, this kind of rarity would make us take note. What's more, both men trace their ancestry back to Donegal, and the same given names (Alexander, Robert, and Matthew) appear in each one's lineage. If more participants end up matching this group, it might become useful for them all to upgrade to help us gain clues as to how they might be related. But, for the simple fact of a relationship, we have deemed 12 markers sufficient for these two.

Participant 44944

1. John Vance (b.c.1760, prob. in Ireland)
m. Mary Allison
2. Robert Vance (b.1805, Ireland)
m. Mary Ramsey
3. Alexander Vance (b.1831, Donegal, Ireland – d.1920, Branch Co., MI)
m. Mary Barnhill
4. Matthew Vance (b.1865, MI – d.1953, MI)
m. Rose Steele
5. PRIVATE
6. 44944

Participant 56896 (an Irishman currently living in Scotland)

1. Alexander Vance (b. Donegal, 1800s)
2. Robert Vance (b.1903, Ireland – d.1965)
3. PRIVATE
4. 56896

Note: the name Matthew also appears in 56896's family.

If anyone has any insight into how these two might be related, we would love to hear from you. At the very least, we know that their most recent common ancestor must have lived prior to 44994's ancestor Alexander Vance, since Alexander emigrated to America while 56896's line remained in Ireland.

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

Group V

We are not including a discussion of this group, since we don't have any new information to report. They are a father/son pair who have reason to believe they are Vance descendants. Since the last report, they have discovered a close genetic relationship with someone of a different surname, and are now exploring that as a possibility. Until they discover something to disprove or heavily discount a Vance connection, they will remain in the project.

Possibly Related Participants

48374 (12 markers) - Thomas Vance (b.c.1820, prob. Gallia Co., OH)

This participant is a genetic distance of 1 from Group I, II and III, and a genetic distance of 2 from 47531 (see below). He might be a member of any one of these groups, but we can't tell unless we can compare him on 37 markers.

N22887 (12 markers) – LINEAGE UNKNOWN

This participant is a genetic distance of 1 from Group I, II and III. He might be a member of any one of these groups, but we can't tell unless we can compare him on 37 markers. This participant transferred into the project from the National Geographic Project. We have received no response after repeated attempts to contact him.

62079 (37 markers) – LINEAGE UNKNOWN

This participant's closest match on 12 markers is with participant 47531 (see directly below). They are a genetic distance of 1 from each other, revealing that they may share a common Vance ancestor in the direct male line. Participant 62079 is a genetic distance of two from participants in Group I and Group II, but 37 marker results reveal a genetic distance never less than 14 from those groups, indicating he is not related to them in genealogical time. After repeated attempts, we have not received this participant's lineage.

47531 (12 markers) – John Vance (b.1773, Frederick Co., VA) m.Lydia Reese

This participant is a genetic distance of 1 from 62079 (see directly above), and a genetic distance of 2 from 48374 (see farther above). It is possible he is related to 48374, but we would need to compare them on more markers to be sure. There is a distinct possibility he is related to 62079, but without knowing 62079's lineage we can't tell. He is a genetic distance of 3 from Groups I & II, which doesn't completely rule out a relationship, but makes it unlikely.

N3804 (12 markers) – possibly Jacob M. Vance (b.c.1848, MS, father born SC; m.Julia Ann)

This participant is a genetic distance of 3 from Group I and Group II. I have observed instances in other surname projects where participants who were a genetic distance of 3 on 12 markers turned out to be closely related after comparing them on 37 markers. Given the time frame involved with the Vance surname and its variants, we are not prepared to rule out N3804's relationship to other Vances in the project. Nevertheless, we don't think a relationship is likely and for that reason have not recommended that this participant upgrade.

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

Ungrouped Participants

The following participants are probably not related to any other participants in the project. We have explained why we think this for each of them.

39021 (25 markers) - David Vance, b.1815, Ireland; immigrated to Baltimore, 1831

This participant's closest match on 12 markers is 10/12 with 15403, a member of Group V. His 25 marker results have further revealed a genetic distance of 10 between them, too distant to be considered related. His next closest match is a genetic distance of 4; at that distance we can be pretty confident he does not share a common direct male ancestor with the other participants.

47042 (37 markers) – Hugh Vance (1807-1839) of Knox Co., TN

This participant's closest match on 12 markers is 8/12, a genetic distance of 4. At this distance we can be pretty confident he does not share a common direct male ancestor with any of the other participants.

N8118 (37 markers) – Patrick Vance, d.1805, Henderson Co., KY

This participant's closest match on 12 markers is 8/12, a genetic distance of 4. At this distance we were pretty confident he doesn't share a common direct male ancestor with any of the other participants. Our prediction has been borne out by his 25 and 37 marker upgrades, in which his closest match in the project is a genetic distance of 8 on 25 markers and 12 on 37 markers.

4828 (25 markers) – [??] Col. David Vance of Buncombe Co., NC (d.1844)

This participant, who does not have the surname Vance, has reason to suspect that his ancestor was an illegitimate child of Col. David Vance of Buncombe Co., NC. His closest match on 12 markers is 8/12, a genetic distance of 4. At this distance, we can be pretty confident he does not share a common direct male ancestor with any of the other participants. Given his genetic distance of 6 on 25 markers from N21545 and 61862 (the descendants of Samuel Vance of Washington County, VA) we can also be pretty confident that he is not a direct male descendant of Col. David Vance, who was Samuel's son.

48973 (12 markers) – John Vance (b.1796, TN - d.1860/70, AR)

This participant's closest match on 12 markers is 8/12, a genetic distance of 4. At this distance we can be pretty confident he does not share a common direct male ancestor with any of the other participants.

61703 (12 markers) – William Vance (b.1779, Fayette Co., PA – d.1854, Highland Co., OH)

This participant's closest match on 12 markers is a genetic distance of 8. At this distance we are very confident he does not share a common direct male ancestor with any of the other participants.

Vance/Vans Y-DNA Project – Analysis of Results

Results Pending

60509 (12 markers pending) – LINEAGE UNKNOWN

This participant joined the project back in April 2006, yet the lab has not received his kit and we have not received a response after repeated attempts to contact him.

65717 (37 markers pending) – Andrew Vance/Ann Ramey

This participant's ancestor was the son of Andrew Vance who left will dated 1754 in Frederick Co., VA.

67952 (12 markers pending) – John Vance (d.1760, Frederick Co., VA) m.Elizabeth

This participant's ancestor is thought by some to be the son of Andrew Vance who left will dated 1754 in Frederick Co., VA.

68372 (37 markers pending) – Matthew Vance (b.1764 - d.1835) m.Barbara McVeigh

68535 (37 markers pending) – William Vance (b.1833, McMinn Co., TN - d.1917, Austin, TX)