

**DNA Confirms that Thomas JOY of Hingham, Massachusetts
is not an
Immigrant Ancestor
to the JAY Family in America**

By Vince King and Guy Perry III

Recent DNA results have confirmed what experienced JAY family researchers have thought for many years; Thomas JOY of Hingham, Massachusetts is not the immigrant ancestor of any of the known colonial JAY families in America.

Both the JAY and JOY families in America started DNA projects several years ago and have been testing individuals in an effort to determine the origins and possible kinship of their specific lines. One of the goals was to determine if the JAY and the JOY families were actually related by a common ancestor. More specifically, the JAY DNA project was attempting to prove or disprove a relationship to Thomas JOY of Hingham, MA who migrated to America in 1635.

While testing will continue and more confirming data will be discovered over the upcoming years, it can now be unequivocally stated no JAY family in America descended from Thomas JOY of Hingham, MA.

The man that married Joan Gallop was Thomas JOY

The man who married Joan Gallop in Boston in 1637 was named Thomas JOY. The American immigrant Thomas JOY was well documented both historically and biographically long before JAY family research

began in earnest. ^[1] None of the original period works by JOY family descendants spell the name JAY or reference any American connection to the JAY family.

While there were a few instances (out of scores of examples) where the surname was ‘corrupted’ and transcribed incorrectly as JAY ^[2], JOY descendant biographers were not confused by this. All documented descendants spelled and pronounced their name JOY. Additionally, they had a MA family tradition and inherently KNEW the surname was JOY, as opposed to the ‘transcriptionists’ who were merely guessing at the spelling.

For more detailed information about Thomas JOY of Hingham, MA and the original writings of his descendants please see [Exhibit A](#).

Why did anyone ever think that the man who married Joan Gallup was Thomas JAY?

Well, they didn’t before 1928. However, between the period of 1917-1928, Cassius Milton JAY (1886-1953) began to focus and theorize on the immigrant ancestor of his JAY family. During that period C.M. JAY researched from California with limited published texts, noted the few JOY transcription errors (spelled JAY) and accepted those as fact and assumed the surname was spelled JAY. He therefore consistently labeled the man who married Joan Gallop...Thomas JAY... and postulated a theory where he attempted to establish that:



- The man who married Mercy Bartlett in Boston was named John JAY (I) (in lieu of IVEY/JOY) and that this man was the son of Thomas JOY and Joan Gallop who was born in 1641.
- John JAY (I) and Mercy Bartlett had a son John JAY (II) born 1672 and he lived to be an adult.
- Mercy Bartlett JAY had relatives who were Baptists who went to southern NJ.
- The John JAY documented at Alloway's Creek in Salem Co. NJ was the same as John JAY (II) because he lived around Baptists who had migrated from MA.
- The Baptists moved west to Pennsylvania where Alice (Glover) Brundsen Vestal (grandmother of Mary Vestal who married William Jay) was baptized about 1696/1697. Therefore giving rise to the ability for descendants to meet and marry.

In 1928 C.M. JAY published a response to a JAY family query which appeared in "The Bulletin"^[3] which stated that the immigrant ancestor of the South Carolina Quaker JAY line was Thomas JAY of Hingham, MA. He presented no linking documentation to establish a tie between the relationships nor did he state that the 'lineage' was speculation.

His writing did come across as authoritative; however, his theory lacked the fundamental proof documents or extensive body of evidence a seasoned researcher would expect or require. In fact at the time this lineage was put forward, Mr. JAY was the only person attempting to identify the origins of the JAY family in America. As a result, those theories carried an air of legitimacy, were found in print "for the first time" and became subtly engrained in JAY family 'tradition' over the next 75 years.

In summary, Cassius Milton JAY's statements concerning a connection between the (his) JAY family and Thomas JOY of Hingham, MA were speculation. From California he was working with a limited amount of documentation and this was obviously the best theory he could develop with the information he had available. We can also rest assured that he was sincere in his efforts and beliefs.

For those wishing to read further, the evolution of this theory can be clearly seen by reading the correspondence between Mr. JAY and Gilbert Cope in [Exhibit B](#).

2008/2009 DNA Results

In November of 2008, the JOY DNA Project received results from a descendant of Warren JOY born 1792 in MA. This Warren JOY descends from Thomas JOY as follows...

*Thomas JOY bca1610 > Joseph JOY Sr. 1645 > Joseph JOY Jr. 1668 >
Simon JOY 1697 > Isaac JOY 1732 > Asa JOY 1754 > Warren JOY 1792*

The following is a list of the uniquely identified Colonial JAY lines that have been identified by DNA as of this date. The number in [] beside each line is the marker mismatch to the descendant of Thomas JOY of Hingham, MA. If a four (4) DNA marker mismatch (or greater) occurs, it can be stated those particular family lines are not kin.

- [33] Line of William JAY bca1711 of Frederick Co. VA (also Joseph JAY of Burlington NJ)
- [13] Line of Thomas JAY bca1779 of Bedford Co. PA
- [15] Line of William JAY b1767 m. Anne King (s/o David JAY/GEE)
- [16] Line of Moses JAY of Sussex Co. NJ (also John GEE of Westchester Co. NY)
- [14] Line of John F. JAY of PA

As can be seen by the marker mismatches, the descendant of Thomas JOY of Hingham, MA is not related to any of the tested JAY lines. It should also be noted that at this time only one sample from the Thomas JOY line has been tested; however, his sample does match another previously tested JOY lines thus proving that his single sample is not an "outlier".

The JAY/JOY DNA marker results can be seen by clicking this [DNA link](#) or accessed through the JFA website www.jayfamily.org.

Websites and Posted Genealogies that Connect the JAY line to Hingham, MA

The internet has been a marvelous vehicle for genealogy. However, it has drawbacks also. While it makes it very simple to find cousins and share information, it allows for the unintentional dissemination of incorrect information as well. Obviously, no one posts incorrect information to the internet to mislead others...but incorrect information finds its way to the world-wide-web in any event.

A large majority of family history enthusiasts do not have the research knowledge or experience to discern the difference between good or faulty information. This is not their fault...but it is the truth. Many times it can take years of work to undo a mistake that subtly became engrained into a family tradition or went unchallenged over a period of decades. As an example, there are currently OVER 400 JAY family lineages posted on RootsWeb alone that “tie-back” to Thomas JOY of Hingham, MA.

For all of these reasons, any JFA member who currently has any internet postings linking any Colonial JAY line to Joan Gallop, Thomas JOY or a Thomas JAY of Hingham, MA is urged to correct their websites or other published information. DNA has proven this theory to be incorrect and we owe it to our descendants have the most accurate non-confusing information available for their use.



[1] The ancestry of the Chief Justice John Jay is an exception to this statement. His pedigree and descendants were well known at this time. The Quaker Jay family of interest to Eli and Cassius Milton Jay are not connected to the family of Chief Justice John Jay.

[2] The surname corruption involves the baptismal records of the children of Thomas JOY and wife Joan from the First Church in Boston vs. the Boston Town records. Seven (7) of eight (8) of the Boston Town birth record transcriptions read JOY, five (5) of eight (8) of the First Church baptismal records were transcribed JAY. Most deed records and other documents of importance are transcribed JOY. Most importantly the JOY family of Boston has direct confirmable tradition (not theory) and documentation tying them to Thomas JOY. Birth and Baptismal Source: *Boston Births, Baptisms, Marriages and Deaths, 1630-1699*; Boston Municipal Printing Office 1908. <http://www.archive.org/details/bostonbirthsbapt00bosto>

[3] “The Bulletin” California State Society Sons of the Revolution, Volume II, #4, November 1928. It should be noted that Cassius M. Jay was the editor of this publication.