

### **Relationship of AT1, AT2 and AT3:**

This paragraph sums up the nature of the relationships between individuals in these Ancestral Types. It is interesting that the test results indicate common ancestry that would fix a date for their common ancestor during the lifetime of John Payn of Wymondham or his son, Robert, who died after the year 1445. The report points out that only one of the genealogies in Ancestral Type 1 or 3 could possibly descend from Sir Robert Payne (1573-1631) of Huntingdonshire. As I have already pointed out in earlier notes and to the lab, I believe the results and the genealogical evidence make it possible to remove Ancestral Type 1 as possible descendants of Sir Robert, leaving only Ancestral Type 3. If George Payne was in fact (as it would appear) a descendant of the immigrant John Payne, then this would be in keeping with family tradition that John Payne had been a son of Sir Robert Payne. Once again I should point out the error in "Paynes of Virginia" when it is stated by the College of Arms that Sir Robert did not have children or close relatives named John Payne. While it has yet to be confirmed that Sir Robert did have a son by the name of John, we at least now know that Sir Robert had 2 sons previously unknown to us born after 1613 [also keeping with the 1615 birth date for the immigrant John Payne]. Furthermore, Sir Robert did have a brother by the name of John Payne, of Southoe, Huntingdonshire, where he had been rector of the church in 1600. These facts can be confirmed by the inscription on Sir Roberts tomb and in the genealogical sketch for Sir Robert Payne which was provided to me by Dr. Andrew Thrush, editor of "The History of Parliament." The sketch is not expected to be published until 2009, but as the sketch for Sir Robert had been completed, Dr. Thrush was kind enough to release it to me after I had made an inquiry to him regarding Sir Robert. Dr. Thrush has been extraordinarily kind in this regard.

If we accept the combination of DNA results, family tradition, and record evidence, then I believe a fairly clear genealogy emerges, although some holes remain to be filled. I am confident that further DNA testing of descendants from these families will eventually help us to fill these holes.

In the scenario presented by this combination of research and tradition, the immigrant John Payne (d. 1689/90) would have been a younger son of Sir Robert Payne of Huntingdonshire. This would result in the Paynes of Virginia giving up claim to the Arms as born by Baron Lavington (gules, a fesse between two lions passant argent). Sir Robert had his own Arms, which bore no similarity [and is a much more attractive blazon in my opinion]. The confusion with these Arms can be easily explained by the relationship that existed between the Huntingdonshire family [including the immigrant John Payne] with the Payn family of Jersey from which Ralph and his son Thomas of Virginia are believed to descend. If anyone has claim to the Arms of Baron Lavington, it would appear to lie with the descendants of Payne Lineage 1, Ancestral Type 1, which would include Ralph Payne and his son Thomas of Virginia (945J), Thomas Payne of Maryland (945O), Charles Payne (945A) and possibly William Payne (945T). As pointed out in my research, Baron Lavington and his family had a great amount of association with the Paynes of Huntingdonshire and descendants of the line are known to have settled within easy reach of St. Neots. This scenario would not only clear up the genealogical picture surrounding these families, but it would also explain why a man such as John Payne, with

no particular outstanding qualities [as a carpenter and relatively minor planter] would have been constantly referred to as “Mr.” and his family accepted into a social circle which comprised of the cream of Virginia society.

The task remaining for us is to continue with our project and genealogical research to determine the exact nature of the relationship between the Huntingdonshire, Jersey and later Bedfordshire families. Were they related through a common descent from John Payne of Wymondham, Norfolk, as the DNA evidence suggests? The current genealogy does not indicate that a later relationship was possible and this conforms to the DNA results. The 10 individuals mentioned as being related on Page 2 of the report would all fit into this scenario. No other genealogy has been previously suggested for them that presents us with this degree of clarity. This scenario would also require us to believe that the Jersey, Suffolk and Huntingdonshire branches of the family had been cousins of one another. Again, this supports both DNA and record evidence. To complete (or at least add a great deal of support) the picture, it is necessary for us to fit the Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk, family into the DNA picture by testing known descendants of that family. If testing proves that such a relationship did not exist with this Suffolk family, then this scenario as presented here would not fit at all. But we have already established the majority of the picture through this first round of testing and the Suffolk branch represents the remaining link to complete it. I hope that the Payne research community will take this to task and not fail to investigate it vigorously.

This completes my notes on Payne Lineage 1, which comprises nearly half of the 23 participants we had in this round of testing. That is a large percentage and by far the most prominent group in our study.

### **Payne Lineage 2:**

Lineage 2 consists of 5 individuals and represents the next largest group in our study. Their ancestry does not indicate any relationship with members of Lineage 1. Unlike Lineage 1, however, this group is much easier to analyze as, with the exception of one participant, their DNA signatures were identical, matching in 24 of 24 Alleles. The one exception has only one mutation in his DNA at DYS462. The report suggest that “the genetic evidence would support the pairs of William (945S) and Thomas (945Q), John (945B) and Jesse (945V), as being brothers or first cousins to each other.” The descendant of Samuel Payne (945D), shares a common ancestor with the 4 above and the MRCA calculation suggests the year of birth for this common ancestor as 1815.