

Group 2 Overview

By Adam Bradford (adam.bradford@gmail.com)

Table of Contents

Expansion of Group 2 - Participants	Page 1	Thomas Branch	Page 11
Ancestral Haplotypes of 2a and 2b	Page 2	Orangeville Branch	Page 12
Matthew of Pittsylvania – Trad'l Evidence	Page 3	Group 2b –Vance/Penquite	Page 12
DNA Analysis of Matthew, Abner, Robert	Page 6	MRCA/Branching Patterns	Page 14
David Vance of Carter Co, TN	Page 9	Conclusion / Summary	Page 15
Kinson McVeigh Vance	Page 10	Suggestions for Further Testing	Page 16

Expansion of Group 2

As a necessary preliminary to understanding the material contained in this report, please see *Special Report – Groups 2a and 2b*, which may be found at www.vancegenealogy.com in the Reports and Analysis section. In that report I go over the DNA evidence that suggests Groups 2a and 2b share a common genetic descent in a genealogical timeframe. Below I will summarize some of the conclusions arrived at in that report, but not in detail.

Group 2 Participants

Following are all the participants in Groups 2a and 2b, with the earliest known ancestor of each participant listed.

Group 2a

48374 Thomas Vance of Gallia Co, OH (b.c.1820)
72197 Thomas Vance of Caribou (b.1801, Ireland – d.1886, Caribou, ME)
N39890 George Vance of Orangeville (b.1753, Donegal – d.1847, PA)
82984 John Thomas Vance (b.c.1824 – d.1893, Hardin Co, OH)
85380 Abner Vance (d.1819, Abingdon, VA)
56883 Abner Vance (d.1819, Abingdon, VA)
94893 David Vance (b.1816, Carter Co, TN) m.Elizabeth Rose
68372 Matthew Vance of Pittsylvania (son Matthew)
71598 Matthew Vance of Pittsylvania (son Matthew)
80341 Matthew Vance of Pittsylvania (son Matthew)
72769 Matthew Vance of Pittsylvania (son John)
38105 Matthew Vance of Pittsylvania (son John)
75086 Matthew Vance of Pittsylvania (son John)
56954 ?George Vance of Mississippi (b.1780-1790, SC)

Group 2b

45791 Samuel Vance/Agnes Penquite (son James)
SOR2 Samuel Vance/Agnes Penquite (son James)
SOR3 Samuel Vance/Agnes Penquite (son James)
SOR4 Samuel Vance/Agnes Penquite (son James)
96768 John F. Vance of Smith Co, TN (1801) (son of Samuel/Agnes' son Thomas?)

Group 2 Overview

By Adam Bradford (adam.bradford@gmail.com)

Ancestral Haplotypes of Subgroups 2a and 2b

Following are the probable ancestral haplotypes for Groups 2a and 2b, as deduced in the *Special Report – Groups 2a and 2b*. These haplotypes are the likely haplotypes held by the most recent common ancestor (MRCA) of each subgroup. The markers on which the two haplotypes differ are highlighted.

Group 2a Probable Ancestral Haplotype

393	390	19	391	385a	385b	426	388	439	389i	392	389ii	
13	24	14	11	11	14	12	12	12	13	13	16	
458	459a	459b	455	454	447	437	448	449	464a	464b	464c	464d
19	9	10	11	11	25	15	19	30	15	16	16	17
460	GATA	YCA1	YCA2	456	607	576	570	CDYa	CDYb	442	438	
10	11	19	23	19	15	17	17	37	40	13	12	
531	578	395s1a	395s1b	590	537	641	472	406s1	511	425	413a	413b
11	9	15	16	9	10	10	8	11	11	12	23	23
557	594	436	490	534	450	444	481	520	446	617	568	487
18	10	12	12	15	8	14	22	19	13	13	11	13
572	640	492	565									
11	11	12	12									

Group 2b Probable Ancestral Haplotype

393	390	19	391	385a	385b	426	388	439	389i	392	389ii	
13	24	14	11	11	14	12	12	12	13	13	16	
458	459a	459b	455	454	447	437	448	449	464a	464b	464c	464d
19	9	10	11	11	25	15	19	31	15	16	16	17
460	GATA	YCA1	YCA2	456	607	576	570	CDYa	CDYb	442	438	
10	11	19	23	19	15	18	18	37	40	12	12	
531	578	395s1a	395s1b	590	537	641	472	406s1	511	425	413a	413b
11	9	15	16	9	10	10	8	11	11	12	23	23
557	594	436	490	534	450	444	481	520	446	617	568	487
18	10	12	12	15	8	14	22	19	13	13	11	13
572	640	492	565									
11	11	12	12									

Group 2 Overview

By Adam Bradford (adam.bradford@gmail.com)

Group 2 may be divided into two subgroups based on a genetic distance of 4 between the ancestral haplotype of the descendants of Samuel Vance/Agnes Penquite (Group 2b) and the probable ancestral haplotype of Group 2a. Group 2a may itself be *tentatively* divided into three branches based on possible shared mutations and/or on traditional evidence suggesting a closer relationship. I am dubbing these the Pittsylvania Branch, the Thomas Branch, and the Orangeville Branch.

Pittsylvania Branch

The Pittsylvania Branch is defined largely by the shared mutation of 20 at DYS456 which is held by the probable descendants of Matthew Vance of Pittsylvania. The inclusion of Abner and David Vance (wife Elizabeth Rose) of Russell Co. VA on this branch is not so much due to the DNA evidence as it is to the traditional evidence suggesting these men were closely related to Matthew.

Before I go any further, I need to address a conclusion too hastily reached in my first report on this group some months ago. I concluded in that report that Abner Vance was probably the son of Matthew of Pittsylvania. Shortly after issuing the report I withdrew that conclusion, preferring to wait until we could be sure of the value Abner held on DYS456. The traditional evidence still hints at a close relationship between Abner and Matthew of Pittsylvania and the DNA evidence confirms that they were related. However, now that we can be sure of Abner's value on DYS456, the DNA evidence does not support, and in fact tends to detract from, any claim of a specific father-son relationship between Matthew of Pittsylvania and Abner. The DNA evidence still does support the conclusion that Matthew of Greenville and John of Burke were sons of Matthew of Pittsylvania.

I will here reprint my summary of the traditional evidence relating to Matthew, Abner, &c, as contained in the last report, with a few minor corrections. Afterwards I will analyze the DNA evidence in greater detail as it relates to their lineages.

Matthew of Pittsylvania

We first meet with the elder Matthew Vance in Pittsylvania County, VA in 1767, on the list of tithables for that year. Later, on the 1773 tithable list for Pittsylvania, we find Matthew listed with a "son John." In 1777, Matthew appears on the list of those from Pittsylvania who subscribed the oath of allegiance to the new republic; an Abner Vance also appears on this list. These records reveal that Matthew Vance of Pittsylvania had a son named John, and indicate that an Abner Vance also lived in the county.

By 1783, Matthew had moved. In a deed from that year in Pittsylvania County, Matthew disposed of his Pittsylvania land after having moved out of the county. He is listed in the deed as Matthew Vance of Surry County, NC. A British mercantile claim from the same year (1783) pertaining to an old debt incurred by Matthew in Pittsylvania expands on his movements. The claim states that Matthew had removed to South Carolina somewhere

Group 2 Overview

By Adam Bradford (adam.bradford@gmail.com)

near the Tiger River; therefore on the 1790 census we might expect to find him settled in either Greenville or Spartanburg counties, where the Tiger River flows. Sure enough, on the 1790 census, in Spartanburg and Greenville counties, we find two individuals who might fit the bill: a Mathis Vance in Spartanburg and a Matthew Vance in Greenville.

Matthew Vance/Barbara

The Matthew Vance who appears on the Greenville County census in 1790 has been identified as Matthew Vance (b.1764) with wife Barbara (descendants claim she was a McVeigh). We can therefore guess that Mathis Vance of Spartanburg is probably Matthew Vance of Pittsylvania.

Aside from their proximity in South Carolina, there is other evidence hinting that Matthew of Greenville was the son of Matthew of Spartanburg. In a deed from Greenville County dated 1798 a Matthew Vance Sr. sells Matthew Vance Jr. a large quantity of goods and livestock in a bill of sale has all the appearance of being a transfer of inheritance. In fact, Matthew Sr. disappears from the census in 1800 and in that year we find an elderly woman (possibly the wife of Matthew Sr.) in the household of Matthew Jr. Very likely these two Matthews were related, and the most likely apparent explanation is that Matthew Sr. was the father of Matthew Jr. As there is no evidence of other Matthews in the area but the two on the 1790 census, it is also a fair guess that these Matthews in the 1798 deed are the same Matthews on the 1790 census.

Abner Vance

As mentioned above, Abner Vance is first noted in the 1777 oath of allegiance for Pittsylvania, placing him in the same county as Matthew Vance Sr. Later, in 1784, Abner appears on the tax list for Surry County, NC. His wife, Susannah Howard, was from Surry County; her father left a will there naming his daughter Susannah Vance. Recall that Matthew Vance of Pittsylvania was in Surry for a time around 1783 before moving on to the Tiger River in South Carolina, as he describes himself as “of Surry County” in a deed from that year.

I want to point out that the names Matthew and Abner are both rare among early Vances. Matthew Vance Jr. of South Carolina had a son named Abner. Robert Vance of Carter Co., TN also had a son named Abner, as well as a son named Matthew. Robert was himself likely a son of John Vance of Burke Co., NC., who also seems to have had a son named Matthew.

Robert Vance of Carter County, TN – John Vance of Burke County, NC

Robert has long been thought by descendants to be the son of John Vance of Burke Co., NC. This John first appears in Burke County in the early 1790s. He has been identified with the John Vance who purchased land around the same time in what is now Carter County, TN. John appears to have moved back and forth a bit between Carter and Burke during this period; this is not hard to imagine happening, since the counties were adjacent to each other. One of John's properties was near Thomas Carver, the father of Robert Vance's wife, Mary Carver. We further know from 1858 pension documents relating to Robert that Mary had known Robert since they were children. This makes sense if Robert

Group 2 Overview

By Adam Bradford (adam.bradford@gmail.com)

was the son of John, since John Vance and Thomas Carver were neighbors. Also, in Burke County in 1817 a Robert Vance is listed as working on a road crew. He and other Vances on this road crew (including a Matthew Vance) are presumed to be the sons of John Vance of Burke, who is the only known Vance head of household from that area during this period. There are other records to connect Robert with John, but the ones I've described provide the simplest evidence that is most suggestive of a relationship.

There is further circumstantial evidence tying John of Burke to Matthew of Pittsylvania. At first glance, when John Vance appears in Burke County it's not exactly clear where he came from. Until recently, there was nothing more to indicate a relationship between John and Matthew other than the presence of these names Abner and Matthew among John of Burke's family. This theory was doubly circumstantial because solid proof was lacking for the relationship of Matthew Jr. and Abner to Matthew of Pittsylvania. It was a circumstantial case based on other circumstantial cases. We now know, thanks to the 1774 Pittsylvania tax list uncovered by Barbara Cherep and Janice Vance, that Matthew Sr. definitely had a son named John. Still, given that John is such a common name, can we be sure he is the same man as John of Burke? Not quite, but what we can discover about the likely whereabouts of Matthew's son John does fit within the general narrative of John of Burke's life. In 1790, the same year we find Matthews Sr. and Jr. in South Carolina, we also find a John Vance listed on the census for Spartanburg Co., SC, the very county where Matthew Vance Sr. was listed. From later census records, we also know that Robert and probably other children of John of Burke were born in South Carolina. Also, John is not listed on the 1800 census in South Carolina, which is consistent with a move out of the state and which fits well with John's first appearance in Burke in 1792.

Further evidence tying this all together is that late in his life Matthew Vance Jr. of Greenville moved to Burke Co., NC very near John. Also, Robert Vance of Carter County in his old age moved to Russell County, where he lived near the descendants of Abner and where some of Robert and Abner's descendants intermarried.

Summary of Matthew of Pittsylvania Group

For the sake of brevity, I have only presented a portion of the available evidence and have not analyzed it in great depth. The evidence is admittedly circumstantial, but the coincidences are so numerous that it adds up to a good case that these families were all closely related. Indeed, many of those who have researched these men have been led to the hypothesis that John of Burke, Matthew of Greenville, and Abner of Russell might all be the sons of Matthew Vance of Pittsylvania. Yet, until now, the evidence has been lacking to tie this all together. Matthew Sr.'s deed of household goods to Matthew Jr. makes a convincing case, but Matthew Jr. is not explicitly named as a son in the deed. And while it's true that a John is named as the son of Matthew Sr. in 1774 Pittsylvania, there is no evidence directly identifying this John as John of Burke. In the case of Abner, the case is less convincing, since all we really have is the evidence of proximity in place and time and the incidence of the name Abner in John's and Matthew's families.

Group 2 Overview

By Adam Bradford (adam.bradford@gmail.com)

DNA results for these men's descendants may now provide the evidence which moves much of this theory from the realm of possibility further into the realm of proof. The DNA evidence strongly supports the conclusion that Robert of Carter and Matthew of Greenville share a common ancestor more recent than the ancestor of the whole group. In the case of Abner, although the DNA evidence is broadly supportive of an overall relationship with these men, it is not supportive of Abner having the same most recent common ancestor (MRCA) as Robert and Matthew.

DNA Analysis of Matthew Jr., Robert, Abner

The DNA analysis relating to Matthew Jr., Robert, and Abner has entirely to do with marker DYS456. We have been able to deduce that the ancestral value of all of Group 2a on DYS456 was probably 19 (see *Special Report – Groups 2a and 2b*). Since all the descendants of Matthew of Greenville and all the descendants of Robert of Carter share the value 20 on DYS456, we may infer that 20 was the value held by Robert himself and Matthew Jr. himself. There are two possible explanations for Robert and Matthew holding the same value on that marker. Either there were two independent mutations to 20 in each of their lineages or there was a single mutation that was passed on to both men. The latter explanation is by far the most likely, as it requires only one mutation rather than the same mutation happening at basically the same time in two different lines that just happened to coexist in proximity of place and time. Since the traditional evidence related above already points to a close relationship between these men, I feel confident stating that Matthew Jr. and Robert each probably inherited the value of 20 from the same ancestor - in other words, that the value 20 constitutes a mutation in their ancestor that was passed on to them. This means that they probably share a common ancestor more recent than the common ancestor of the group as a whole. This supports the traditional evidence that already suggested Matthew of Pittsylvania was the MRCA of these two men. Given all of the evidence presented above, the official stance of the Vance DNA Project is that Matthew Vance of Pittsylvania was the likely MRCA of Matthew Jr. of Greenville and Robert of Carter and he will be listed as such on the project website. This does not, however, mean it is a fact. People should not take our word for it, but accept or reject this conclusion for themselves based on a thorough understanding and analysis of all the evidence.

When it comes to Abner's relationship to the MRCA of Matthew Jr. and Robert (whether or not that MRCA was Matthew of Pittsylvania), we need to account for the fact that Abner himself had the value 19 on DYS456 while the MRCA of Matthew Jr. and Robert had the value 20. At the time of the last report on Group 2, we only had results for a single descendant of Abner, and that man had the value of 19 on DYS456; however, I couldn't be sure that Abner's descendant carried the value held by Abner himself. Subsequently, we tested another descendant of Abner who is descended from a different son of Abner; this man also has the value 19 at DYS456. By far the simplest explanation for this is that 19 was the value held by Abner himself, that he passed it on to both his sons, and that from those sons on down to their descendants in the project today the marker has not mutated. Further, since 19 was likely the value held by the common ancestor of Group 2a, the simplest explanation for Abner having the same value is that DYS456 had not mutated from the time of the MRCA of the whole group on down to

Group 2 Overview

By Adam Bradford (adam.bradford@gmail.com)

him. Conversely, for Abner to be descended from Matthew of Pittsylvania (or, if you will, the MRCA of Matthew Jr. and Robert) would require a very improbable circumstance – it would mean that after Matthew of Pittsylvania’s lineage split off genetically from Group 2a with the mutation to 20, a mutation then occurred in the DNA of Abner himself back to 19. This back mutation to 19, though possible, is extremely unlikely. To explain why it is so unlikely, I need to elaborate on the probabilities involved.

FTDNA has not released a mutation rate for the specific marker DYS456. Instead, the published mutation rate for that marker is the average for all 12 markers in the panel containing DYS456 – namely, 0.0075. Since this panel contains a large portion of the fastest moving markers, this FTDNA rate for DYS456 is probably somewhat skewed towards the fast end. Doug McDonald’s mutation rate for DYS456 specifically is .0053, so the actual mutation rate of DYS456 is probably slower than .0075. But even if we assume a rate of .0075, it is still a rare event for a mutation to occur on that marker. A rate of .0075 means essentially that there is a .75% chance (i.e., three-quarters of one per cent chance) for that marker to mutate every generation. Put another way, we might expect this marker to mutate once every 133 generations or so. For Abner to be descended from Matthew of Pittsylvania, instead of mutating just once in 133 generations, the marker would need to have mutated *twice* in probably 10 generations or less – once to the value 20 and then once again with Abner himself back to 19. Although not impossible, this is quite simply an extremely unlikely event.

Given this unlikelihood, if one accepts Matthew of Pittsylvania as the MRCA of Matthew Jr. and Robert, the DNA evidence does not tend to support Matthew of Pittsylvania as the father of Abner. It remains possible that Abner himself may have experienced a mutation back to the ancestral value of 19, but I can not accept that conclusion without stronger evidence of a specific father-son relationship. In my view the DNA evidence is not outweighed by the traditional evidence, which hints only at the fact of a relationship, not the specific nature of that relationship.

However, it seems probable that Abner and Matthew Sr. were closely related. Not only does the DNA evidence confirm that they share a common Vance descent, but they also lived in the same places, their descendants intermingled and knew each other, and some of Matthew’s descendants had children named Abner. Although the DNA evidence doesn’t support a specific father-son relationship between Matthew and Abner, it would be fully consistent with other relationships, such as uncle-nephew or first cousin once removed. In fact, I would go so far as to say that either of these latter two relationships is a good possibility based on the combination of DNA and traditional evidence.

Abner’s value of 19 happens to have the additional effect of strengthening the probability that Matthew of Greenville and John of Burke were sons of Matthew of Pittsylvania. After all, if Abner was closely related to Matthew (e.g., if their MRCA were either Matthew’s father or grandfather), that would mean that the mutation to 20 happened either with Matthew’s father or with Matthew himself. That basically narrows the range of possibilities for how Matthew of Greenville and John of Burke might have inherited

Group 2 Overview

By Adam Bradford (adam.bradford@gmail.com)

their value of 20 and makes Matthew of Pittsylvania appear even more attractive as a candidate for their father.

Matthew of Pittsylvania before 1767

In the records of the First Philadelphia Presbyterian Church a marriage is listed between a Matthew Vance and an Ann Jones on 5 June 1746. Given the rarity of the name Matthew among Vances, it was suspected that this Matthew might be the same man later found in Pittsylvania. Yet nobody knew the name of the wife of Matthew of Pittsylvania, so the evidence was lacking to make the connection firm. Now we know from Matthew's 1783 deed in Pittsylvania that his wife was named Ann, since she relinquished her dower rights to the land. This definitely strengthens the case that Matthew Vance of Pittsylvania is also Matthew Vance of Philadelphia.

A record from Lancaster County, PA, may shed further light on Matthew's family. A John Vance left a will dated 1754 in Lancaster County, in which he named a brother Matthew. Again, given the rarity of the name Matthew among Vances, and given Lancaster's general proximity to Philadelphia, where we find a Matthew Vance a decade before, there is a possibility that this Matthew is the same man. John also names a sister Margery and another sister, Naley Smith, who had yet to come to America. He is presumed to have died without issue, since he named no children in his will.

There are other records of a Matthew Vance in Virginia, occurring in time between the 1746 marriage in Philadelphia and Matthew's first appearance in Pittsylvania. In 1750, a Matthew Vance purchased 300 acres on the North River in Augusta County; in that year, he and a John Vance were involved in a suit relating to the death of a man in a canoe accident. Matthew Vance is also listed in Augusta County in 1754 as one of several men assigned to do road work and in 1755 appeared as a witness to the will of John Sproul of Augusta. If the above records relate to Matthew of Pittsylvania, then we have a rough narrative of his life in America from the 1740s on.

Group 2 Overview

By Adam Bradford (adam.bradford@gmail.com)

David Vance of Carter Co, TN (married Elizabeth Rose)

We have DNA results from a descendant (94893) of David Vance (wife Elizabeth Rose), who was born 1816 in Carter Co, TN, and lived later in life in Russell Co, VA. One theory of David's parentage has it that he was the son of another David Vance, who might have been the son of John Vance of Burke Co. Since David the younger was born in Carter Co, TN, and mixed with the family of Robert Vance, another theory has it that he was the son of Robert. However, the DNA evidence from David's descendant does not tend to support either of these conclusions.

On DYS456, participant 94893 has the value 19, the ancestral value of the whole group. Since the value held by Matthew of Pittsylvania was 20, the same arguments supplied above for Abner's descent from Matthew apply to David's. It would be an extremely unlikely event for a mutation to happen twice on that marker in such a short span of time, and therefore the DNA evidence does not support the conclusion that David is descended from Robert or from Matthew of Pittsylvania. As with Abner, the possibility remains that a mutation happened back to 19 either in David or in any one of his descendants on down to 94893 – it is just a very unlikely possibility. Ultimately, the only way to be sure that David himself had the value 19 would be to test a descendant from a different son.

Although 94893's results do not support a descent from Robert of Carter or John of Burke, they would be consistent with a descent from Abner Vance. To my knowledge nobody has ever suggested that possibility. However, I feel obliged to relate a story that tends to support that theory. Admittedly, this story belongs in the realm of hearsay, but it suddenly takes on added weight in light of the DNA evidence. The story comes from a great-granddaughter of Elijah Vance (b.c.1800), whose parentage is not proven but whose descendants have always claimed they were descended from Abner. Apparently, Elijah's grandson said that Abner had children who were sent to join relatives in Tennessee and who came back up to Russell Co, VA after Abner was executed. This would be consistent with what is known about David – namely that he grew up in Carter Co, TN, and eventually moved up to Russell Co, VA. Furthermore, there is a gap in years between the births of the known children of Abner during which other children might have been born. One could speculate that David is the son of one of these children and that his father was one of those sent by Abner to live with relatives (namely Robert Vance of Carter) in Tennessee. Then again, the missing children of Abner are so far entirely hypothetical and the story is so far just a story. I repeat it here only for those who might wish to pursue this line of inquiry further.

Group 2 Overview

By Adam Bradford (adam.bradford@gmail.com)

Kinson McVeigh Vance

Aside from the known descendants of Robert of Carter and Matthew of Greenville, one other participant has the value of 20 on DYS456, which, as we have seen, is peculiar to the descendants of Matthew of Pittsylvania. This participant is 56954, the great-grandson of Kinson McVeigh Vance, who was born between 1829 and 1840 in Mississippi. The 1880 census reveals that Kinson's father was born in South Carolina. The name Kinson McVeigh may provide a clue to his ancestry.

The name Kinson McVeigh/McVay is extremely rare. In fact, it seems to be unique. A search of census records on ancestry.com reveals only one man named Kinson McVay – and he is known to be the son of Hugh McVay, a contemporary of Matthew Jr. in Greenville County, SC in the late 1700s. Given the uniqueness of the name, it seems probable that there was some kind of relationship between Kinson McVay and Kinson McVeigh Vance, either a kin relationship or a close tie of friendship between families. This would place Kinson McVeigh Vance's ancestors at the very least in proximity to the family of Matthew Vance. Furthermore, descendants of Matthew Vance Jr. of Greenville Co., SC, name Matthew's wife as Barbara McVeigh, possibly of the same family as Hugh and Kinson McVeigh.

Marilyn McGaughey, a descendant of Kinson who has contributed all the material I'm using on him, believes the best candidate for Kinson's father is a certain George Vance. According to the 1840 census, George was born between 1780 and 1790. If he is a descendant of Matthew of Pittsylvania, he would thus have to be either a son born very late in Matthew's life, or the son of one of Matthew's sons. Due to the probable McVay/Greenville connection, the best candidate for his father would seem to be Matthew Vance Jr. One problem with this interpretation is that no George appears among the extensive list of Matthew's children as compiled by his descendants. They have Matthew Jr.'s marriage to Barbara occurring in 1790 and their oldest son as being born in 1795, whereas George seems to have been born between 1780 and 1790, at least according to the census. Yet the long-held picture of Matthew Jr's family may be incomplete. In the 1800 census, Matthew of Greenville has 1 male in his household who is aged 10-16. This child is too old to fit any of the known sons of Matthew, but his age is a perfect fit for George Vance of Mississippi. That is where things stand now with Kinson and George Vance. Hopefully further research will turn up more clues or evidence to confirm that George was Kinson's father and to find some evidence of descent from Matthew.

Group 2 Overview

By Adam Bradford (adam.bradford@gmail.com)

Thomas Branch

Thomas of Gallia (b.c.1820, OH) and Thomas of Caribou (1801-1886)

I am *tentatively* placing these two men on their own distinct branch of Group 2a based on their shared value of 12 on DYS392, which is a very slow moving marker with an estimated mutation rate of .0011. Given how closely they match across all the other markers, and the fact that Group 2a is relatively young, there is a good chance this shared value of 12 is a shared mutation, meaning that they are on their own subbranch of the Group 2a tree and share an MRCA more recent than the MRCA of the whole group. The fact that 72197 retains the ancestral value of 19 on DYS456 probably indicates that 48374's value of 18 on that marker is a mutation away from the ancestral value. It is probably not a shared mutation with N39890 and 82984, who also have the value 18 but who retain the ancestral value of 13 on DYS392. Note – it is not yet certain that these two men belong on their own distinct subbranch of Group 2a. Their possible shared mutation on DYS392 may be a clue, but it should be treated as a clue rather than a fact unless and until there is more evidence.

There were a few Thomas Vances in Gallia; participant 48374 is descended from the one who married Mary Ann Armstrong and who was born around 1820 in Ohio. [Note: Group 5 contains two descendants of another Thomas of Gallia (b.1791), genetically unrelated to this one, it turns out.] Participant 72197 is a descendant of another Thomas Vance, who died in Caribou, Maine in 1886 and was born 1801 in Ireland, possibly Fermanagh County.

Thomas of Gallia clearly belongs to the generation after Thomas of Caribou, but he is not a son. According to Mark Vance's article on Thomas of Caribou (VFA Newsletter, Oct. 1992), Thomas first emigrated to New Brunswick in Canada and didn't emigrate to America until the period 1840 to 1851. That is, Thomas of Caribou wasn't in Maine until thirty years after 1820, which is the year in which Thomas of Gallia was born in Ohio, far away from New Brunswick or Maine.

Evidence for Thomas of Caribou's place of birth comes from the 1900 census, in which one of his sons told the enumerator his father was born in Ireland. Mark Vance discovered a marriage in Mormon records, with a date of 15 Jan 1824, for a Thomas Vance and a Jane Keys in Fermanagh County, Ireland; it is supposed from this that Thomas might be from Fermanagh, as he was married to a woman named Jane, and as the date of the marriage also fits (Thomas of Caribou would have been about 23 at the time).

Group 2 Overview

By Adam Bradford (adam.bradford@gmail.com)

Orangeville Branch

George Vance of Orangeville, PA (1753-1847) and John Thomas Vance (b.c.1824, PA)

I am *tentatively* grouping participants N39890 and 82984 together due to the fact that they share the value 18 on DYS456, clearly a mutation away from the ancestral value of the whole group. It is not yet certain that this is a shared mutation, but it is a distinct possibility.

Participant N39890 is a descendant of George Vance of Orangeville, PA. In an article in the October 1993 issue of the VFA newsletter, James David Vance writes, “George Vance was born in Northwestern Ireland (Donegal or Tyrone county) in 1753. On August 18, 1804, he, his wife Martha, and their children emigrated to the United States and settled in Orangeville a few miles north of Bloomsburg in what is now Columbia County, Pennsylvania. Over the next two decades two other Vances, Alexander and John (called Senior), likely relatives, lived briefly near George and his family but soon moved on to parts unknown.”

Participant 82984’s earliest known ancestor is John Thomas Vance, who was born around 1824 in Pennsylvania (according to the census) and died in Hardin Co, OH in 1893. In the 1880 census, he named his father’s birthplace as Ireland. In 1860 he and his wife (Phebe Burdick) were in Delaware Co, OH and their oldest child (12) was listed as born in Ohio. That would put John in Ohio in 1848, at the age of 24. Phebe was born in Ohio, so presumably that is where they met and married. It is hard to tell at this point whether John came to Ohio as an adult or as a boy after being born in Pennsylvania. John is clearly not the son of George Vance of Orangeville, whose own son John is well accounted for. But perhaps he is the son of either Alexander or John Sr., who are possible relatives of George and who moved away from Orangeville (to Ohio?).

There was also a Thomas Vance of Orangeville, who was either a son of George or married to George’s daughter Martha. Thomas and Martha were living near George by 1813. There appear to be two large gaps between Thomas and Martha’s recorded children. Two were born in 1813 and 1814 and the next child wasn’t recorded until 1820. There is then another gap of 11 years between that child and their daughter Martha, born 1831. It is only speculation, but perhaps John Thomas Vance fits into one of these gaps? At the very least, this is a lead worth exploring.

Group 2b – Descendants of Samuel Vance/Agnes Penquite

Much has been written on Samuel Vance and Agnes Penquite and their son James Vance. James was the ancestor of 45791 and three men (SOR2, SOR3, and SOR5) whose DNA results are located in the database of the Sorensen Molecular Genealogy Foundation. Less is known for sure about what became of the other children of Samuel and Agnes. They are supposed to have also had sons John (b.1753), David (b.1755), Thomas (b.1759), and Samuel (b.1762). One of the suspected descendants of Samuel and Agnes is John F. Vance of Smith Co, TN, the ancestor of 96768.

Group 2 Overview

By Adam Bradford (adam.bradford@gmail.com)

In the Jan 1999 issue of the VFA Newsletter, Pat Janssen relates the contents of a letter written by Mitchell Vance of Chattanooga, TN: “John F. Vance and his brother Tom came to Smith County soon after 1801. . . They came from Maryland in a covered wagon.” This is consistent with a descent from Samuel and Agnes, who lived in Maryland.

The newsletter also has portions of a letter written in 1933 by John Vance of Provo, UT. He relates the contents of a sketch of the family written by his “uncle John.” He quotes uncle John’s account: “I, John Vance was the son of James Vance and Margaret Reno. I was born in Coke Co, Tenn, 3 of March 1794. At the age of two years [1796] my father moved to Davidson Co, West Tenn. near Nashville. Some two years after he moved to *Smith Co. middle Tenn. where I had an uncle Thomas Vance with a large family – a brother of my father.*” [Emphasis mine.] It is assumed that the Thomas Vance mentioned in the letter (who must be a son of Samuel and Agnes if the letter is correct) may be identified as one of the Thomas Vances present in Smith Co, TN, and that many of the other Vances there – including John F. Vance – may be from his family.

DNA results from the descendant of John F. Vance strongly support the conclusion that he is a descendant of Samuel Vance/Agnes Penquite. He is a 33/37 match with 45791. Both he and 45791 share the rare value of 19 on DYS456 and they share a variety of other values which distinguish them clearly from the participants in Group 2a, such as the value 31 on 449 and the value 12 on 442. These results are also fully consistent with an MRCA in relatively recent genealogical time. Given the strength of the circumstantial traditional evidence connecting their ancestors and the strength of the DNA evidence, a descent from Samuel Vance/Agnes Penquite is very likely. John lived in the second generation from Samuel and Agnes and it appears likely that Thomas was his father.

Group 2 Overview

By Adam Bradford (adam.bradford@gmail.com)

Common Ancestor of Group 2 / Branching Patterns Within the Group

Who was the most recent common ancestor (MRCA) of Group 2? Clearly, we aren't close to answering this question yet, but the DNA does hint strongly at how the individuals in the group might have branched away from each other and how long ago their MRCA might have lived. For a thorough analysis and discussion of the probable age of the subgroups and the group as a whole, see "Special Report on Group 2". I will here only state the conclusions arrived at in the analysis.

The MRCA of Group 2 probably lived around 1300 or earlier (the most confident estimate is between 900 and 1300 AD). He had at least two sons who gave rise to the two branches that would eventually produce the MRCAs of Groups 2a and 2b. The MRCA of Group 2b was likely Samuel Vance (wife Agnes Penquite), who was born in the early half of the 1700's and was said by his grandson to have been from Ireland. The MRCA of Group 2a may have been born sometime between 1400 and 1600. (Note, this is only our best estimate – he may have lived earlier). Given that at least four of the lineages in Group 2a trace back to Ireland, it also seems likely that the MRCA of Group 2a lived there.

There are potentially three distinct branches that arose from the MRCA of Group 2a:

Thomas Branch: One branch (based on a possible shared mutation to 12 at DYS392) might have given rise to the families of Thomas Vance of Caribou, ME, and Thomas Vance of Gallia Co, OH. Thomas Vance of Caribou was born in Ireland (possibly Fermanagh County), which reinforces the fact that the common ancestor of the whole group may have lived there.

Orangeville Branch: Another possible branch of 2a (based on a possible shared mutation to 18 at DYS456) gave rise to the family of George Vance of Orangeville, PA, who was born in Ireland; it may be that John Thomas Vance is on this branch and possibly closely related to George.

Pittsylvania Branch: A third branch probably contains the common ancestor of Matthew of Pittsylvania, Abner Vance, and David Vance (wife Elizabeth Rose). The descendants of Matthew himself are clearly defined by the mutation to 20 at DYS456. Abner's and David's haplotypes were likely identical to the haplotype of the ancestor of Group 2a. Still, I am placing them on the same branch with Matthew, given that the traditional evidence hints at a close relationship between them. It may be that the common ancestor of this branch was either the father or grandfather of Matthew and that the mutation to 20 happened either with Matthew himself or with his father. It is also possible (though the DNA evidence suggests it is unlikely) that Abner was a son of Matthew and that David was a great-grandson of Matthew via his son John and grandson Robert, as many researchers have suggested based on circumstantial evidence.

Group 2 Overview

By Adam Bradford (adam.bradford@gmail.com)

Conclusions

The DNA evidence for Group 2 has given rise to some new developments and conclusions, and yielded solid clues for further research:

- We have been able to deduce that Matthew Jr. of Greenville and John Vance of Burke Co. share a common ancestor more recent than the common ancestor of the whole group. Traditional evidence indicates that this ancestor was probably Matthew of Pittsylvania, who was probably their father.
- The DNA doesn't support Abner Vance being the son of Matthew of Pittsylvania, but would be consistent with him being a nephew or close cousin. It is still possible Abner was Matthew's son, but it is very unlikely in light of the DNA evidence.
- DNA evidence does not support the descent of David Vance (wife Elizabeth Rose) from Matthew of Pittsylvania. It would be consistent with a descent from Abner. It is still possible David was descended from Matthew Sr., but it is very unlikely in light of the DNA evidence.
- Kinson McVeigh Vance is probably a descendant of Matthew of Pittsylvania, possibly through his son Matthew of Greenville.
- Thomas Vance of Caribou and Thomas of Gallia might share a common ancestor more recent than that of the whole group.
 - o Since Thomas of Caribou may have been born in Fermanagh, Ireland, it might be fruitful to direct research there. Thomas of Caribou might also have left behind some Vance kin in New Brunswick, so perhaps research there and testing of other N.B. lineages could prove useful.
- George of Orangeville and John Thomas Vance might share a common ancestor more recent than that of the whole group: possible fathers for John Thomas Vance include the Thomas Vance who lived in Orangeville or the Alexander or John Sr. who lived in Orangeville for a time.
 - o The descendants of John Thomas Vance now have a solid clue to aid them in their research. The fact that J. T.'s descendant closely matches a descendant of George of Orangeville, that J.T. was born in Pennsylvania, and that they have what might be a shared mutation provides a solid lead. If I were searching for J.T. Vance's parentage, I would focus my initial efforts on Columbia Co, PA.
- DNA evidence confirms that John F. Vance of Smith Co, TN, is almost certainly a descendant of Samuel Vance/Agnes Penquite. The best candidate for his father is their son Thomas, as many have already suggested based on abundant traditional evidence.
- George of Orangeville and Thomas of Maine were both born in Ireland. John Thomas Vance's father was born in Ireland. Samuel Vance (wife Agnes) was from Ireland according to his grandson. All this would seem to indicate Ireland as the area where the common ancestor of the whole group lived. However, it is possible that the branches or groups split from one another before Ireland and that both happened to end up there. Here are a few tidbits that might prove useful to those attempting Irish research:

Group 2 Overview

By Adam Bradford (adam.bradford@gmail.com)

- If Thomas of Maine may be equated with the Thomas who married Jane Keys in Fermanagh, then research in that specific area of Ireland might be useful
- On the 1796 flax seed list for Ireland, the following Vances are listed for Fermanagh: John Vance of Aughavey, John Vance of Derryvilland, William Vance of Drumkeeran, and William Vance of Killeshar.
- Balbirnie notes the first appearance of a Matthew Vance in Ireland in 1753, county Tyrone.

Suggestions for Further Testing

- Since Groups 2a and 2b are for all intents and purposes identical on the 67-marker panel, I have not thought an upgrade necessary for those in Group 2a who have not upgraded. However, upgrades may be useful for participants 48374, 72197, and N39890 for the purpose of uncovering possible shared mutations. This is only marginally the case for N39890, whom the evidence suggests might be more closely related to 82984 (who has upgraded and is an exact match with the others on the 67-marker panel). If 72197 were to upgrade to 67 markers and if he wasn't identical with the others on that panel, then funding is available for an automatic upgrade for 48374 on whatever marker 72197 might happen to differ.
- I would like to find and test Vances who have lineages back to the 1700s in Fermanagh and Tyrone, Ireland, and New Brunswick, Canada.
- I would be interested in testing confirmed descendants of Thomas of Orangeville and the Alexander and John Sr of Orangeville, to see if they match and how they match.
- We may want to test another descendant of David Vance (wife Elizabeth Rose) from a different son, in order to confirm that David's value on DYS456 was 19. If that other descendant has the value 20 then that would tend to support his descent from Matthew of Pittsylvania. Conversely, if he came back with 19 that would tend to suggest he wasn't Matthew's descendant. Since 19 was the ancestral value, the chances are high that the value will come back as 19.