

WHITE PAPER - CYAN 5
FTDNA VAUGHAN DNA PROJECT
Subgroup 05 Cyan

It is more important to get the facts right than to be right.

Prior to reading this, please read:

White Paper Cyan 1 - Two James Vaughan

White Paper Cyan 2 - Two Alexander Vaughan

White Paper Cyan 3 - Joshua Vaughan

White Paper Cyan 4 - William "T" Vaughan

Preface

My name is David Robertson. I have been actively researching genealogy for over 40 years. In the "bad old days" we did research the hard way. We looked through a few published books. There simply weren't that many. Copy machines were few and far between and the costs to use them was very high. We had not even dreamed of fax machines, email, the Internet, personal computers, cell phone cameras, online searches, Ancestry, DNA and the like. (The cartoon character Dick Tracy had a wrist radio and even that was far fetched.)

Most of the time, we would look at something and write down what we found by hand! We passed along family tree research by hand written letters, but most often skipped the sources, quite frankly because cause no one had them. Once in awhile we might get to visit an archives and cram as much research as we could in way too little time. We made a lot of assumptions with far too little data to back them up. We developed a lot of theories, some of them well thought out, but a lot of them were simply rubbish.

Today is a whole new world in genealogy, one we never dreamed of.

There have been many theories on William "T" Vaughan. I have had the luxury of seeing most all of them over the years. Lately, the prevailing wisdom is that he was b. about 1705 and was m. to Julia Green. This theory has simply been passed along more than the others, eventually drowning out the competition. If you hunt through Ancestry and the Genealogies tab of www.familysearch.org you will find many of them. Unfortunately, all are just theories and most of the content is just opinion — not fact.

Scope of research. I have done extensive research in the twenty some odd counties of Southside Virginia. This research is posted at: <https://www.genealogyfacts.org/>

The various files organized by county contain references to original records, almost all of which can be viewed at www.familysearch.org. [Matters in brackets are either notes or my thoughts]. The Vaughan Roster files make some minimal assumptions in an attempt to assemble records by person. The Vaughan Wiki files are my conclusions.

Preliminary DNA Comments

What We Have Learned from yDNA about the Vaughan Family of Prince George County, Virginia

Back in the "bad ole days" before DNA we *thought* we had it all figured out. William Vaughan d. in Charles City Co., VA. He had seven sons who were in Prince George Co., VA which was formed out of Charles City Co. Dinwiddie Co., VA, Amelia Co. and Nottoway Co. were later formed out of Prince

George Co. The area was loaded with Vaughans that looked like they all descended from William Vaughan of Charles City Co. It all fit so nicely. yDNA from FTDNA has shattered our naivete.

This writing is an attempt to summarize what we know from traditional genealogy research as further illuminated by yDNA. There are now clearly four *known* Vaughan families mixed together in the above defined area.

1. Several members of the FTDNA Vaughan DNA Project that are descendants of Nicholas Vaughan have been tested and are found to be within the *new* Group 11A Orange. Others in the 11A group are very close in relation. This means that William Vaughan of Charles City Co. *and all of his descendants must be orange coded*. This also means that *none* of the 05 Cyan Group descend from William Vaughan. Most if not all of Group 05 Cyan members are of the second Vaughan Family.
2. Now there is another member of the Group 11B Orange that proves back to Salathiel Vaughan and has significant number of descendants in Dinwiddie Co. Unfortunately, the genetic distance to proven Nicholas Vaughan descendants is at least 4 at 37 markers. This statistically points to Salathiel Vaughan *not* being a descendant of William Vaughan of Charles City Co., hence we have a third Vaughan Family. Admittedly, it is very remotely possible, *but not very likely*, that Salathiel Vaughan is a descendant of William.
3. William Vaughan who m. Priscilla has no color assigned to him yet. There are two test results for his descendants that only match each other. No one else is even close.
4. The eldest member of the FTDNA Vaughan DNA Project Cyan Group appears to be Daniel Vaughan m. to Elizabeth. Daniel lived in Bristol Parish. There are others in early Bristol Parish records that we have no knowledge as to whether they are Cyan or Orange Group descendants. It would seem that his Daniel's father would have appeared in the earliest records if he had been there. At this time, we are presuming (famously and tragically often wrong) that Daniel is the progenitor of the Cyan Group. However, he may have had siblings. We will adjust our assumptions when needed. *We have not found any evidence of any member of the Cyan Group originating from anywhere in the U.S. other than Prince George Co.*

Understanding Cyan Group yDNA is Easier If You Look at How We Reached Our Conclusions

1. Many years ago, long before DNA for genealogy became a reality, I made a crucial error and mixed up the two James Vaughan. This error was fortuitous as will be explained later.
2. The next step is rather easy. An analysis of the yDNA of several descendants of Nicholas Vaughan of Amelia County was very conclusive and spurred the formation of Subgroup 11A Orange. This totally altered our thinking about the Cyan Group as it is impossible for William of Charles City to be the ancestor of any of the Cyan Group.
3. With the two James switched up in our analysis it was impossible to figure out how James the son of William "T" Vaughan could have a positive match with Alexander Vaughan, without having more descendants of William "T" Vaughan showing a positive match.
4. Many of you know Chuck Vaughan. He made an observation that totally turned things inside out leading to many answers. Many years ago I had traced my James Vaughan who d. in Oglethorpe

Co., GA back to Mecklenburg Co., VA and determined he was the son of William “T” Vaughan. I was right about Mecklenburg County, but wrong about William “T” Vaughan being his father. Chuck looked at the early tax digests and pointed out there were two James Vaughan and that he thought I had them switched. A closer examination proved he was right. This is why I think my error was fortuitous. I had racked my brain trying to figure out any way the data would fit and it could not.

4. One of the sons of James Vaughan of Oglethorpe County was Alexander Vaughan of Elbert Co., GA. Both of them shared a genetic marker with Alexander Vaughan of Richmond Co., GA. It was simply impossible to come up with a plausible idea of how they were related, if James Vaughan of Oglethorpe County was the son of William “T” Vaughan. They just wouldn’t fit.
5. So then the question became, who is the father of James Vaughan, if it was not William “T” Vaughan? Eventually the answer appeared. Joshua Vaughan and his wife Sarah, formerly of Dinwiddie Co. moved to Mecklenburg County and lived very close to William “T” Vaughan. My James was most likely his son and carried the marker shared with Alexander Vaughan. The nickname for this common marker is the “Joshua Gene”.
6. This opened the possibility that Daniel Vaughan, who m. Elizabeth of Bristol Parish might be the common ancestor of the Cyan Group in Virginia. But, there was a big problem! Numerous sources conclude that William “T” Vaughan was b. about 1705. This could make him older than Daniel, or at least the same age. A review of original sources for the birth dates and marriage dates of William “T” Vaughan and each of his children yielded absolutely *nothing*. In other words, all of the dates are a product of speculation of many genealogists built up over the years, passed on from one to another so many times that they became believed as fact.
7. Now, why did Joshua Vaughan and his wife Sarah, formerly of Dinwiddie Co. move next to William “T” Vaughan in Mecklenburg Co? I submit that it is because they are brothers, Joshua b. 14 Dec 1722 and William b. 14 Aug 1724 in Bristol Parish, both the sons of Daniel and Elizabeth Vaughan..
8. Daniel and Elizabeth also had sons Isham and Peter. We had a few members we thought descended from Isham Vaughan. We encouraged folks to upgrade to 111 marker test, which slowly happened. As more and more people upgraded, we discovered the “Isham Gene” that tied together a lot of people previously not known to be related. We are stunned to now have eight members test positive for the Isham Gene and five more members that should test positive, once they upgrade.

**DINWIDDIE COUNTY
VAUGHAN FAMILY
Bristol Parish Register
Sorted by Father and Date**

Father	Mother	Child	Sex	Date
In this Time Frame Prior to 1735 Bristol Parish Covered Present Day Prince George, Amelia, Dinwiddie, Nottoway and Prince Edward Counties (and Perhaps a Small Part of Brunswick County)				
John Vaughan (Son of William?)	Elinor	Abigal	Dau	23 Feb 1720 Died Age 6
Nicholas Vaughan (Son of William)	Ann	Luis	Son	20 Feb 1719
		Abraham	Son	16 Mar 1721
		Elizabeth	Dau	18 Apr 1727
		Nicholas	Son	20 Feb 1728
Richard Vaughan (Son of Richard, Grandson of William)	Alice	James	Son	23 Jan 1721/2
		Martha	Dau	18 Nov 1724
		Richard	Son	16 Oct 1726
William Vaughan	Ann	Elizabeth	Dau	14 Sep 1721
William Vaughan	Priscilla	Pearce	Son	15 Mar 1722
		William	Son	05 Aug 1724
		James	Son	06 Mar 1725
		Susannah	Dau	25 Dec 1727
		Mary	Dau	12 Nov 1732
William Vaughan	Julia	Jane Negro Belonging to William, Sr.		25 Nov 1724
		Sipio M. Slave of William Vaughan & Julia		31 Dec 1726
		Peter M. Slave of William Vaughan & Julia		14 Feb 1734

**DINWIDDIE COUNTY
VAUGHAN FAMILY
Bristol Parish Register
Sorted by Father and Date**

Daniel Vaughan	Elizabeth	Joss(hua)	Son	14 Dec 1722
		William	Son	14 Aug 1724
		Isham	Son	04 Feb 1725
		Ann	Dau	15 Dec 1727
		Peter	Son	28 Sep 1730
	Sarah Vaughan	James Thompson	Son	24 Sep 1726
William Vaughan	Mable	Abigal	Dau	15 Jan 1729
		Caleb	Son	25 Jan 1731
		Abner	Son	25 Feb 1733
		Mable	Dau	12 Jan 1740
Family Groups Known to Be in Amelia County/Raleigh Parish. Both Isham and Robert Were in Amelia County Very Shortly after it Was Formed and Likely Were There When it Was Still Part of Prince George County				
Isham Vaughan	Temperance	Wilmott	Dau	03 Mar 1732
Robert Vaughan	Martha	Phoebe	Dau	18 May 1732
		Nicholas	Son	21 Nov 1734
Family Groups Left after Amelia County/Raleigh Parish Split off in 1735. Includes All of Present Day Dinwiddie County. During this Time, All Residents of Amelia County Would Drop off of the Bristol Parish Register. Bristol Parish Would Include All of Dinwiddie County.				
William Vaughan	Mary	Anne	Dau	7 Jan 1735
		Anne	Dau	20 Jan 1741/2
Nathaniel Vaughan	Anith	Ruth	Dau	28 Dec 1741

**DINWIDDIE COUNTY
VAUGHAN FAMILY
Bristol Parish Register
Sorted by Father and Date**

Family Groups Left after Bath Parish Split off in 1742.

Includes Eastern Side of Present Day Dinwiddie County. Bristol Parish Was Reduced to a Relatively Small Area up Close to Petersburg. A Large Portion of Residents of Dinwiddie County Would No Longer Be in Bristol Parish. The Approximate Boundary of Bristol Parish Started on the Appomattox River Just West of Petersburg; Thence in a Straight Line to Roughly the Mouth of Butterwood Cr. at Stony Creek; Thence down Stony Creek to the Sussex County Line; Thence to the Prince George County Line; Thence to and Including the Portions of the City of Peterburg That Fall Within Prince George County.

Daniel Vaughan	Ann	Ann	Dau	10 Oct 1732
		Mary	Dau	01 Jan 1734
		Phoebe	Dau	12 Nov 1743
Morris Vaughan	Rebecca	Henry	Son	14 Dec 1734
		David	Son	01 Jan 1741
		Martha	Dau	10 Mar 1743/4
		Jemima	Dau	21 Jun 1752 Bapt
Samuel Vaughan	Margaret	Sarah	Dau	29 Jul 1735
		Sylvania	Dau	1 Aug 1742
		Sylvester	Son	14 Mar 1744/5
Peter Vaughan	Ann	Abraham	Son	11 Mar 1741/2
Thomas Vaughan	Elizabeth	Thomas	Son	12 Jul 1742
Salathiel Vaughan	Anne	Phoebe	Dau	23 Nov 1743
		William	Son	16 Feb 1745
		David	Son	04 Mar 1749/50 Bapt
Joshua Vaughan	Sarah	James	Son	22 Jan 1745
		Jesse	Son	28 Apr 1751 Bapt
Henry Vaughan	Elizabeth	Ezekial	Son	29 Dec 1750
William Vaughan	Elinor	Mary	Dau	26 Jul 1752
Enoch Vaughan	Mary	Robert Winn	Son	03 Apr 1793

**DINWIDDIE COUNTY
VAUGHAN FAMILY
Bristol Parish Register
Sorted by Father and Date**

Drury Vaughan	Susannah	Mary Ann Elizabeth	Dau	21 Apr 1793
Churchill Gibson Chamberlayne, <i>The Vestry Book and Register of Bristol Parish, Virginia, 1720-1789</i>				
Compiled By: David H. Robertson, 159 Hickory St., Roswell, GA 30075 davidhr@hushmail.com				

Negative Search Results

Sometimes, what you *don't* find is very instructive. None of the known children of William "T" appear in the birth register. We have already established that the Cyan Group of Vaughan *all* appear to come from Dinwiddie Co. So where is he and his family? The answer lies in the formation of Bath Parish in 1742. One logical conclusion is that he lived in the area that became Bath Parish, and his children were b. after Bath Parish was formed in 1742.

Additional Sources

Extensive additional Vaughan research covering Southside Virginia up to 1850 is posted at: <https://www.genealogyfacts.org/> Please feel free to contact me with any questions. David Robertson.

Lastly, I want extend an enormous thank you and acknowledge the full collaboration of Chuck Vaughan in arriving at these results. We talk regularly and his input as been invaluable. Chuck moderates a private Facebook Group for Vaughan researchers. Drop him an email (Chuck Vaughan <hobby1964pw@yahoo.com>), if you would like to join.

VAUGHAN DNA PROJECT
Subgroup 05 Cyan
Significant DNA Markers - a Work in Progress As of November 1, 2019

Gene Nickname Common Ancestor	yDNA 11 Marker Panel	yDNA 25 Marker Panel	yDNA 37 Marker Panel	yDNA67 Marker Panel	yDNA 111 Marker Panel
Isham Gene *5* Isham Vaughan (1725-1795) Son of Daniel Vaughan (<1701-1757) and Elizabeth <i>See notes to the "Brunswick, VA Gene below."</i>					DYS552=25 (Pink) and NOT DYS643=9 (Blue)
David Gene *5* <i>Requires Both Markers</i> David Smith Vaughan (<1761-1825) *1*, of Lunenburg Co., VA Son of Isham Vaughan (1725-1795) Grandson of Daniel Vaughan (<1701-1757) and Elizabeth	DYS390=25 (Pink)				DYS552=25 (Pink)
Joshua Gene *6* Joshua Vaughan (1722-) Son of Daniel Vaughan (<1701-1757) and Elizabeth of Dinwiddie Co.				DYS413=22-23 (Blue)	
John Gene *4* John Vaughan (1825-1897) *3* and Celia Ann Murphy of Garrard Co., KY and Owen Co., IN Three members have proven family trees back to John and Celia. All three descend from John and Celia through different children. Therefore this marker starts with John Vaughan.					DYS710=33 (Blue) and NOT DYS552=25 (Pink)
Sizemore Gene *4* Daniel Sizemore (1764-1842) *1* The two members tested are relatively closely related. We need a third test subject, not closely related to the other two members to better determine who the common ancestor is.				DYS534=16 (Pink)	

<p>Brunswick, VA Gene *4* <i>Requires Both Markers</i></p> <p><i>This gene is still being explored</i></p> <p>This group is the latest to be discovered. There are three members in this group. Two members match exactly and a third matches other markers. The DYS552=25 (Pink) marker is a “convergence”. It is not believed to be a branch of the “Isham Gene” even though both share the DYS552=25 (Pink) marker. The earliest two proven ancestors are James Vaughan of Yarbrough Cr., b. 1730-1745, d. 1798, Mecklenburg Co., VA, m. Lucy ____; and James Vaughan, the “Overseer”, b. 1756 Brunswick Co, VA, d. 1835 Brunswick Co, VA.</p>					<p>DYS552=25 (Pink) and DYS643=9 (Blue)</p>
<p>*1* Common ancestor may be a more recent ancestor *2* Common ancestor may be a more recent or more distant ancestor *3* Common ancestor may be a more distant ancestor</p>	<p>*4* This conclusion is supported by traditional research. *5* This conclusion is supported by <i>very strong</i> circumstantial evidence. *6* This conclusion is supported by <i>strong</i> circumstantial evidence.</p>				
<p>Cyan Members With No Distinctive Matching Markers</p> <p>Here is a little speculation based upon the DNA results and the Bristol Parish Register. Mind you I <i>hate</i> speculation. But sometimes it is all that we have. There are a few of our Cyan members with very few unique markers for which we cannot match. The most likely scenario is that they are descendants of either William “T” Vaughan; Peter Vaughan, son of Daniel and Elizabeth Vaughan; or some other unknown son of Daniel and Elizabeth Vaughan. We will most likely never know the answer with any degree of certainty, but we will never stop searching for the answers.</p>					
<p>This chart is a work in progress and may be updated at any time based upon additional testing; or modification of family trees as a result of additional traditional research or correction of existing research. yDNA can be skewed by convergence (two people match markers by accident who are not actually closely related) or reversions (a marker reverts back to a former value in a subsequent generation) and other factors beyond our volunteer levels of expertise. The conclusions herein have been made by David Robertson, combining DNA with traditional research, in close consultation with Chuck Vaughan. April 29, 2020</p>					