

## Menonite DNA Project Y Chromosome Data Discussion

by Tim Janzen, March 2011

[tjanzen@comcast.net](mailto:tjanzen@comcast.net)

The comments below apply to the currently available Y chromosome marker results pertaining to the Low German Menonite DNA project. Individual surnames are commented on only if there are results for a least one person from two or more unconnected lineages with that surname. It should be kept in mind that the data for many men who have been tested by the SMGF is incomplete and that as more complete haplotypes become available for these men the conclusions based on the currently available partial haplotypes could potentially change. The numbers referred to for people in the comments are their Grandma numbers as they currently appear in the Grandma database. The abbreviation "NPE" stands for "non-parental event". A non-parental event is a situation where a boy does not inherit the Y chromosome of the male head of household he is raised with due to an adoption, an illegitimate birth, or a name change. A haplotype is a set of marker results for a given individual. The term recombinational loss of heterozygosity (RecLOH) is also used. See <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RecLOH> for more information about this term. For a more complete glossary of terms used in genetic genealogy see <http://www.smgf.org/glossary.jsp> or [http://www.isogg.org/wiki/Genetics\\_Glossary](http://www.isogg.org/wiki/Genetics_Glossary).

1. Abrahams. There are at results back for 2 different unconnected Abrahams families. The haplotypes are potentially consistent with each other but have mismatches at 4 markers, suggesting that these families likely descend from the same Abrahams progenitor, but there is at least some uncertainty about this and they may share a common progenitor before the time that surnames came into existence (ca 1500).
2. Bartel. The results are available for two male Bartels. One is a descendent of David Bartel (1800-1849) #11880 and the other is a descendent of Leonard Bartel (b. 30 Jan 1897) #208248. The haplotype of the descendent of Leonard Bartel #208248 is inconsistent with the haplotype of the descendent of David Bartel #11880. This suggests that either there were two original Bartel progenitors, one for each lineage, or that there was a NPE that occurred at some point in one of the two lineages.
3. Berg. There are at least partial results back for 5 different unconnected Berg families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families all descend from the same Berg progenitor. Note that the Bergs have a different progenitor than the Bergens.
4. Bergen. There are at least partial results back for 6 different unconnected Bergen families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that the 6 different Bergen families all descend from the same Bergen progenitor. Note that the Bergens have a different progenitor than the Bergs.
5. Born. There are results back for 2 different unconnected Born families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Born progenitor.
6. Boschman. There are at least partial results back for 3 different unconnected Boschman families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations

which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Boschman progenitor.

7. Braun. There are at least partial results back for 9 different unconnected Braun families. The haplotypes of 8 different unconnected Braun families are consistent with each other, suggesting that the 8 different families all descend from the same Braun progenitor. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception that the haplotype of the descendent of Dirk Johan Braun (b. ca 1761) #197948 is inconsistent with the haplotype of the other 8 Braun lineages that have been tested. This suggests that either there were two original Braun progenitors, one for Dirk Johan Braun's (b. ca 1761) #197948 lineage and one for the other Braun lineages, or that there was a NPE that occurred at some point in Dirk Johan Braun's (b. ca 1761) #197948 lineage. There appears to have been a recombinational loss of heterozygosity (recLOH) event at markers DYS 459 and DYS 464 in the descendent of Diedrich Braun (1766-1851) #196157 who has been tested since he has values of 8 and 8 for DYS 459 and 14, 14, 14, and 14 for DYS 464 whereas the other Brauns typically have values of 8 and 10 for DYS 459 and 11, 14, 14, and 16 for DYS 464. A descendent of Johann Gerhard Braun (1836-1911) #158115 has been tested and his results match those of a descendent of Gerhard Braun (1755-1801). Both of these people have a value of 13 for DYS 393 whereas all of the other Brauns tested for this marker have a value of 14 for DYS 393. This suggests that Johann Braun (1836-1911) #158115 was likely a descendent of Nicholas Braun #431313. If so, then Johann Braun's (1836-1911) #158115 father Gerhard Braun was likely a son of Gerhard Braun (b. ca 1777) #196197.
8. Doerksen. There are at least partial results back for 6 different unconnected Doerksen families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception that the haplotype of a grandson of Abraham Dirksen (b. 28 Mar 1883) #33906 is inconsistent with the haplotypes of the other 5 Doerksen and Dirks lineages that have been tested. This suggests that either there were two original Doerksen progenitors, one for Abraham Dirksen (b. 28 Mar 1883) #33906 who was a descendent of Kornelius Duerksen (1750-1840) #70539 and one for the other Doerksen lineages, or that there was a NPE that occurred at some point in Abraham Dirksen's (b. 28 Mar 1883) #33906 lineage.
9. Dyck (and Dueck). There are at least partial results back for 16 different unconnected Dyck and Dueck families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that the 16 different Dyck families all descend from the same Dyck progenitor. The descendents of Philip Dyck (b. ca 1733) #159444, Philip van Dijck (b. ca 1564) #12831, Peter Van Dycke (b. 1632) #65041, Peter Dyck (1749-1808) #266403, Jacob Dyck (b. 17 Mar 1828) #182126, and Johann Dyck (b. 17 Nov 1857) #24376 who have been tested all have a value of 14 at DYS 19 whereas the other Dycks who have been tested all have a value of 15 at DYS 19. This would suggest that Philip Dyck (b. ca 1733) #159444, Peter Dyck (b. ca 1730) #705322 and Peter Dyck (1749-1808) #266403 were closely related to each other. Johann Dyck (b. 17 Nov 1857) #24376 may have been the descendent of one of these three men. The descendents of Heinrich Dyck (b. ca 1759) #44214, Jacob Dyck (b. ca 1754) #198078, and Johann Johann Dyck (b. 4 Oct 1837) #383899 who have been tested all have a value of 30 at DYS 389-2 whereas the other Dycks who have been tested most commonly have a value of 31 at DYS 389-2. This would suggest that Heinrich Dyck (b. ca 1759) #44214 and Jacob Dyck (b. ca 1754) #198078 were closely related to

each other and Johann Johann Dyck (b. 4 Oct 1837) #383899 may have been a descendent of one of them.

10. Eitzen. The results are available for two male Eitzens. One is a descendent of Abraham Eidse (b. ca 1720) #63776. The other is a descendent of Nicholas Edse (d. 1776) #917045. The haplotype of the descendent of Nicholas Edse #917045 is inconsistent with the haplotype of descendent of Abraham Eidse #63776. This suggests that either there were two original Eitzen progenitors, one for each lineage, or that there was a NPE that occurred at some point in one of the two lineages.
11. Enns. There are at least partial results back for 8 different unconnected Enns families. The haplotypes of the descendents of Dietrich Ens (1750-1825) #118136, Cornelius Enns (1788-1826) #50113, Abraham Enns (1787-1854) #265390, Isaak Enns (b. ca 1746) #196363, Johann Enns (b. 22 Aug 1853) #171191, Franz Enns (b. 19 Oct 1844) #185152, and Gerhard Ens (ca 1755-1806) #199341 are consistent with each other, suggesting that they descend from the same Enns progenitor. The descendents of Dietrich Ens (1750-1825) #118136 and Cornelius Enns (1788-1826) #50113 who have been tested all have a value of 14 at DYS 389-1 whereas the other Ennses who have been tested have a value of 13 at DYS 389-1. This would suggest that Dietrich Ens (1750-1825) #118136 and Cornelius Enns (1788-1826) #50113 were closely related to each other. The haplotype of the descendent of Johann Enz (b. 17 Jan 1828) #405788 who has been tested is inconsistent with the haplotype of the other 6 Enns males who have been tested. This is not entirely surprising because Johann Enz #405788 is known to have been born illegitimately and he took the surname of his mother Maria Enz (1789-1832).
12. Epp. There are at least partial results back for 6 different unconnected Epp families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of the haplotype of the descendent of Peter Epp (b. 1862) #684212, which is inconsistent with the haplotypes of the other 5 Epp lineages that have been tested. This suggests that either there were two original Epp progenitors, one for Peter Epp (b. 1862) #684212 and one for the other Epp lineages, or that there was a NPE that occurred at some point in Peter Epp's (b. 1862) #684212 lineage. Note that the haplotype of the descendent of Peter Epp (b. 1862) #684212 is a close match to the Walls. The results for a grandson of Johann Epp #800426 are almost an exact match to the results for a descendent of Bernhard Epp (b. 1805) #946091. This suggests that Johann Epp #800426 was either a descendent of Bernhard Epp (b. 1805) #946091 or that they were at least distantly related.
13. Esau. There are at least partial results back for 6 different unconnected Esau families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of the haplotype of the descendent of Johann Esau (b. 30 Jul 1900) #224521, which is inconsistent with the haplotypes of the other 5 Esau lineages that have been tested. This suggests that either there were two original Esau progenitors, one for Aron Jacob Esau (b. ca 1783) #44916 and one for the other Esau lineages, or that there was a NPE that occurred at some point in Aron Jacob Esau's (b. ca 1783) #44916 lineage.
14. Fast. There are at least partial results back for 5 different unconnected Fast families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Fast progenitor.
15. Flaming. There are at least partial results back for 2 different unconnected Flaming families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other, suggesting that these Flaming families both descend from the same Flaming progenitor. There appears to have been a

recombinational loss of heterozygosity (recLOH) event at marker DYS 464 in one of the sons of Hugo Flaming (b. 10 Mar 1901) #7414 who has been tested since his results for this marker are 17, 17, 19, and 19 whereas the results for his brother and the other Flaming who has been tested are 15, 15, 17, 19.

16. Friesen. There are at least partial results back for 23 different unconnected Friesen families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception that the haplotype of the grandson of Jacob Friesen (b. 11 Mar 1894) #326749 is inconsistent with the haplotypes of the other 22 Friesen lineages that have been tested. This suggests that either there were two original Friesen progenitors, one for Jacob Friesen (b. 11 Mar 1894) #326749 who was a descendent of Jacob Friesen (ca 1734-1776) #3748 and one for the other Friesen lineages, or that there was a NPE that occurred at some point in Jacob Friesen's (b. 11 Mar 1894) #326749 lineage. The haplotype of a descendent of Martin Johann Friesen (b. 3 Jan 1858) #494115 is an exact match to the haplotype of the descendents of Isbrandt Johann Friesen (1765-1848) #196698, suggesting that Martin Johann Friesen (b. 3 Jan 1858) #494115 may have been a descendent of Isbrandt Johann Friesen (1765-1848) #196698.
17. Froese. There are at least partial results back for 5 different unconnected Froese families. There are at least 2 different subgroups for this surname based on the results currently available. It appears that Cornelius Froese (d. 1834) #61794 and Cornelius Froese (1759-1794) #110605 descend from the same Froese progenitor. The haplotype of the descendents of Jacob Froese (b. 21 Jul 1863) #939205 may be consistent with the haplotypes of the descendents of Peter Abram Froese (1755-1806) #173745 and Abraham Abram Froese (b. 1754) #104047 who have been tested, but it is also possible that Jacob Froese's (b. 21 Jul 1863) #939205 lineage is unrelated to the lineages of Peter Abram Froese (1755-1806) #173745 and Abraham Abram Froese (b. 1754) #104047 and that Jacob Froese (b. 21 Jul 1863) #939205 descends from a third Froese progenitor or that there was an NPE somewhere in Jacob Froese's descendent's lineage.
18. Funk. There are at least partial results back for 5 different unconnected Funk families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception that the haplotypes of the descendents of Hans Funk (ca 1749-1795) #219693 are inconsistent with the haplotypes of the other 4 Funk lineages that have been tested. This suggests that either there were two original Funk progenitors, one for the lineage of Hans Funk (b. ca 1749-1795) #219693 and one for the other Funk lineages, or that there was a NPE that occurred at some point in Hans Funk's #219693 lineage. Note that the haplotypes of the descendents of Hans Funk (ca 1749-1795) #219693 are a reasonably close match to the haplotype of the grandson of Aron Ediger (b. 16 Jun 1898) #63757.
19. Gerbrandt. There are at least partial results back for 2 different unconnected Gerbrandt families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Gerbrandt progenitor.
20. Giesbrecht. There are at least partial results back for 5 different unconnected Giesbrecht families. There are two different subgroups for this surname based on the results currently available. The haplotypes of the descendents of Wilhelm Giesbrecht (1701-1776) #266431 and Wilhelm Jacob Giesbrecht (1865-1919) #363715 are consistent with each other and form the first subgroup. Wilhelm Jacob Giesbrecht (1865-1919) #363715 is thus likely to be a descendent of Wilhelm Giesbrecht (1701-1776) #266431. The

haplotypes of the descendents of David Giesbrecht (1750-1802) #227280, Abraham Giesbrecht (ca 1739-1814) #158646 and Peter Giesbrecht (b. 28 Nov 1829) #182757 are consistent with each other and form a second subgroup.

21. Ginter. There are at least partial results back for 3 different unconnected Ginter families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Ginter progenitor.
22. Goertzen (Goertz). There are at least partial results back for 5 different unconnected Goertzen, Goerzen, or Goertz families. There appear to be 4 different subgroups for this surname based on the results currently available. The haplotype of the descendents of David Goerzen (1859-1934) #946287 is clearly inconsistent with the results of the other groups and thus forms the first subgroup. The haplotypes of the descendents of Stephan Goertz (ca 1748-1815) #353602 and Heinrich Goertz (b. 1830) #106364 are consistent with each other and they are part of a second subgroup. The haplotype of the descendent of Peter Gertz (ca 1787-1835) #52034 is inconsistent with the haplotypes of the other groups and forms a third subgroup. The haplotype of the descendents of Heinrich Goertz (ca 1739-1792) #312056 is inconsistent with the haplotypes of the other groups and forms a fourth subgroup.
23. Goossen. There are at least partial results back for 2 different unconnected Goossen families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Goossen progenitor.
24. Hamm. The results are available for two male Hamms. One is a descendent of Jacob Peter Hamm (1860-ca 1912) #439515. The other is a descendent of Jacob Hamm (1827-1895) #179688. The haplotypes are inconsistent with each other. This suggests that either there were two original Hamm progenitors, one for each lineage, or that there was a NPE that occurred at some point in one of the two lineages.
25. Harder. There are at least partial results back for 8 different unconnected Harder families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families all descend from the same Harder progenitor.
26. Hein. There are at least partial results back for 2 different unconnected Hein families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Hein progenitor. Note that the Heins lineages have a different progenitor than the Heinrichs lineages.
27. Heinrichs. There are at least partial results back for 3 different unconnected Heinrichs families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Heinrichs progenitor. Note that the Heinrichs lineages have a different progenitor than the Heins lineages.
28. Hiebert. There are at least partial results back for 13 different unconnected Hiebert families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception that the haplotypes of two descendents of Jacob Hiebert (b. 22 Sep 1833) #185479 through his sons Peter Hiebert (b. 2 May 1881) #194276 and David Hiebert (b. 15 Jan 1883) #194277 and the haplotype of a descendent of Peter Hiebert (b. ca 1780) #144981 don't match the haplotypes of the other Hieberts. A descendent of Jacob Hiebert's #185479 purported

brother Abraham Hiebert (b. 7 Aug 1823) #184697 has been tested and this descendent's haplotype matches those of the other Hieberts who have been tested. This suggests that a NPE has occurred in regard to Jacob Hiebert #185479. A comparison of Jacob Hiebert's descendents' haplotypes to other Mennonite haplotypes demonstrates that they are a close match to the modal Penner haplotype. This suggests that the father of Jacob Hiebert #185479 was really a Penner. It is not known whether Jacob Hiebert was born illegitimately to Helena Siemens (b. 1 May 1804) #186874 or whether he was adopted into Abraham Hiebert's (b. ca 1799) #186873 and Helena Siemens' family. Either the lineage of Peter Hiebert (b. ca 1780) #144981 represents its own subgroup or there was a NPE that occurred at some point in his lineage.

29. Hildebrand. There are partial results back for 2 different unconnected Hildebrand families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Hildebrand progenitor.
30. Isaac. There are partial results back for 2 different unconnected Isaac families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Isaac progenitor. Note that the haplotypes of the Isaacs are a reasonably close match to the haplotype of the son of Peter Peters (b. 2 Dec 1903) #234294.
31. Janzen. There are at least partial results back for 15 different unconnected Janzen families. There are 5 different subgroups for this surname based on the results currently available. The haplotypes of the descendents of Jacob Franz Janzen (b. ca 1730) #580914, Julius Janzen (b. ca 1730) #199118, Peter Peter Janzen (b. 13 Jul 1854) #507887, Abram Janzen (b. ca 1885) #953109, Peter Franz Janzen (1859-1920) #340831, Heinrich Peter Janzen (b. 1 Feb 1847) #265794, Peter Julius Janzen #945629, Franz Janzen (b. 9 Nov 1808) #514291, Peter Janzen (1817-1884) #467872, and Johann Janzen (b. ca 1736) #311369 are consistent with each other and form the first subgroup. This group of Janzens belonged to Frisian Mennonite churches in W. Prussia. Peter Julius Janzen #945629 is likely a descendent of Julius Janzen (b. ca 1730) #199118, probably through his grandson Julius Janzen (b. ca 1781) #199133. The haplotype of the descendent of Paul Janzen (1704-1765) #11942 forms a second subgroup. Paul Janzen #11942 was a member of the Neugarten Frisian Mennonite Church in W. Prussia. The haplotype of the descendent of Peter Janzen (b. ca 1762) #69404 forms a third subgroup. The haplotype of the descendents of David Janzen (b. 4 Oct 1872) #174079 forms a fourth subgroup. The haplotype of the descendents of Heinrich Janzen (b. ca 23 Dec 1727) #174079 forms a fifth subgroup. The haplotype of the descendent of Peter Jantz (b. 1650) #39121 forms a sixth subgroup. Peter Jantz #39121 was a member of the Przechowka Mennonite Church in Prussia.
32. Jost/Just. Results are available for descendents of Martin Just (1817-1877) #17082 and Martin Gerhard Jost (b. ca 1791) #21953. The haplotypes are inconsistent with each other. This suggests that either there were two original Jost/Just progenitors, one for each lineage or that there was a NPE that occurred at some point in one of the two lineages. Martin Just (1817-1877) #17082 is known to have been of Lutheran ancestry and thus it seems highly probable that there was never any connection between the Martin Just's (1817-1877) #17082 paternal lineage and Martin Gerhard Jost's (b. ca 1791) paternal lineage.

33. Klassen. There are at least partial results back for 14 different unconnected Klassen families. There are 3 different subgroups for this surname based on the results currently available. The haplotypes of the descendants of Abraham Jacob Klaassen (1790-1851) #3062, Heinrich Klassen (1862-1933) #164637, Abraham Klaassen (1722-1788) #134053, Abram Klassen (b. ca 1835) #454229, Gerhard Jakob Klassen (b. ca 1769) #529329, Herman Classen (b. 30 Apr 1904) #169070, Abraham Claassen (1717-1775) #374949, David Klassen (1739-1804) #102635, Hans Klaassen (1665-1731) #505609, Abraham Klassen (1828-1904) #749558, and Wilhelm Klassen (1830-1913) #945774 are consistent with each other and form the first subgroup. The haplotypes of the descendants of Chonert Klassen (b. ca 1750) #811454 and Peter Johann Klassen (1860-1910) #682842 form a second subgroup. Peter Klassen (1860-1910) #682842 was likely a descendent of Chonert Klassen (b. ca 1750) #811454. The haplotype of the descendent of Peter Isaac Klassen (b. ca 1792) #44071 forms a third subgroup. It should be noted that the marker value for DYS 464b for the descendent of Abraham Jacob Klaassen (1790-1851) #3062 who was tested may not actually be 15 as is shown on the table of the results. This person was tested by Family Tree DNA, a company which doesn't report microvariants (short tandem repeat values that contain a partial repeat) for the markers it tests. The corresponding value for DYS 464b for 5 Klassens who were tested by the SMGF is 14.3, which is probably the true result for this marker for the descendent of Abraham Jacob Klaassen #3062 as well.
34. Klippenstein. There are at least partial results back for 2 different unconnected Klippenstein families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Klippenstein progenitor. Johan Johann Klippenstein (b. 1865) #249515 was likely a descendent of Jacob Klippenstein (b. 1655) #195796.
35. Koop. There are at least partial results back for 2 different unconnected Koop families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Koop progenitor.
36. Krahn. There are at least partial results back for 3 different unconnected Krahn families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families all descend from the same Krahn progenitor.
37. Krause. There are at least partial results back for 2 different unconnected Krause families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Krause progenitor.
38. Kroeker. There are at least partial results back for 5 different unconnected Kroeker families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other, suggesting that these families all descend from the same Kroeker progenitor. Of interest is the fact that a grandson of Herbert Engbrecht (b. 20 Aug 1911) #396222 has a haplotype that matches 40 of the 43 marker results for the Kroeker haplotype, suggesting that the two surnames originated in the same area of Europe within the past 500 to 1000 years. Note that the Kroeker lineages have a different progenitor than the Krueger lineages.
39. Loewen. There are at least partial results back for 10 different unconnected Loewen families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families all descend from the same Loewen progenitor.

40. Martens. The results are available for 3 different unconnected Martens families. One line descends from Johann Frank Martens (b. ca 1865) #758639. Another line descends from Heinrich Johann Martens (b. ca 1787) #396792. A third line descends from Peter Martens (b. ca 1769) #486885. The haplotypes of three lineages are inconsistent with each other. This suggests that either there were three original Martens progenitors, one for each lineage, or that there was a NPE that occurred at some point in one or more of the 3 lineages.
41. Neufeld. There are at least partial results back for 14 different unconnected Neufeld families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families all descend from the same Neufeld progenitor. The descendants of Abraham Neufeld (1736-1815) #100650 and Johan Neufeldt (d. ca 1794) #197028 who have been tested all have a value of 16 at DYS 458 whereas the other Neufelds who have been tested have a value of 15 at DYS 458. This would suggest that Abraham Neufeld (1736-1815) #100650 and Johan Neufeldt (d. ca 1794) #197028 were closely related to each other.
42. Nickel. There are at least partial results back for 3 different unconnected Nickel families. The haplotypes are potentially consistent with each other, but additional marker values are needed for these different Nickel descendants before it can be determined if these families all descend from the same Nickel progenitor.
43. Olfert. There are at least partial results back for 2 different unconnected Olfert families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Olfert progenitor. Abram Aron Olfert (b. 13 Nov 1899) #816748 was likely a descendent of Abram Olfert (b. ca 1740) #46195.
44. Pektou. There are at least partial results back for 3 different unconnected Pektou families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Pektou progenitor.
45. Penner. There are at least partial results back for 44 different unconnected Penner families. The haplotypes of 40 different unconnected Penner families are consistent with each other, suggesting that the 40 different families all descend from the same Penner progenitor, a man who likely lived 400-600 years ago. The haplotypes of the descendants of Abraham Penner (1826-1907) #1072395, Julius Heinrich Penner (1846-1922) #30504, Abraham Abraham Penner (b. ca 1783) #62047, and Jacob Jacob Wilhelm Penner (1854-1922) #500238 are all inconsistent with each other, as well as being inconsistent with the largest group of Penners. This suggests that either there was more than one original Penner progenitor, one each for the four above mentioned Penner lineages, or that there was a NPE that occurred at some point in one or more of these four lineages. Abraham Penner (1826-1907) #1072395 is known to have been born illegitimately and he took the surname of his mother Anna Penner #1122537, so it seems quite probable that his father was not a Penner. The haplotypes of the descendants of Abraham Penner (b. ca 1783) #62047 are a close match to the haplotype of a great grandson of Gerhard Siemens (1889-1964) #58893, which would suggest that a NPE probably has occurred somewhere in the lineage of Abraham Penner #62047 and that men in this lineage who were tested actually descend from a male Siemens. There is a discrepancy between the results from Family Tree DNA and the Sorenson Foundation for one of the four values of the multi-copy marker DYS 464 for a son of Heinrich Penner (b. 30 Nov 1901) #216304. FTDNA gives

a value of 14 and the SMGF gives a value of 17 for one of the copies of this marker. To denote this discrepancy this marker value is highlighted in light green in the accompanying spreadsheet and the value 14 has been entered until the discrepancy can be resolved through additional testing. There are results available for at least 37 markers for most of the 44 different unconnected Penner families that have haplotypes that are consistent with each other. Not surprisingly, the markers that most frequently have mismatches among this group of Penners are DYS 458, CDY a, and CDY b. These are all known to be markers that generally mutate faster than the other markers. Attempting to group all of the Penners into family clusters based on similar haplotypes is somewhat tricky and must be done carefully due to the fact that the same mutation, particularly for the above three markers, may have occurred more than once in the lineages of these different Penner families relative to the original Penner progenitor's haplotype. The haplotypes of the descendants of Heinrich Penner (1753-1815) #57878, Abraham Penner (d. bef. 1890) #229032, and Edward Penner (1887-1982) #43515 are all very similar, each having a value of 19 for DYS 458, a value of 31 for DYS 449, and a value of 15 for DYS 456. This would suggest that Abraham Penner (d. bef. 1890) #229032 was likely a grandson of Heinrich Penner (1753-1815) #57878. This would not be surprising given that Abraham Penner #229032 is known to have been from Schoenhorst, Chortitza Colony and given that Heinrich Penner (1753-1815) #57878 also lived in Schoenhorst. Edward Penner (1887-1982) #43515 and Heinrich Penner (1753-1815) #57878 were likely descended from a Penner male who lived in the late 1600s or early 1700s in Prussia. Other conclusions about probable relationships will likely be possible once additional marker results are available and/or single nucleotide polymorphisms unique to specific Penner families are discovered.

46. Peters. There are at least partial results back for 10 different unconnected Peters families. There are at least 4 different subgroups for this surname based on the results currently available. The haplotypes of the descendants of Elias Peters (d. 1786) #176995 match and form the first subgroup. The haplotype of the descendent of Arend Peters (1783-1846) #159456 is potentially consistent with the haplotypes of the descendants of Elias Peters (d. 1786) #176995 and thus may also belong in the first subgroup. However, it is also possible that the lineage of Elias Peters (d. 1786) #176995 and the lineage of Arend Peters (1783-1846) #159456 share a common progenitor before the time that surnames came into existence (ca 1500). The haplotypes of the descendants of Jacob Peters (b. ca 1810) #188316, Gerhard Peters (1772-1848) #18759, Aron Peters (ca 1733-1784) #117398, Jacob Peters (b. 1755) #138255, and Abraham Jacob Peters (b. 1762) #70191 form a second subgroup. The haplotype of the descendent of Peter Peters (1777-1841) #176734 represents a third subgroup. The haplotypes of the descendants of Aron Peters (ca 1745-1802) #198928 and Hermann Peters (b. ca 1744) #149662 represent a fourth subgroup.
47. Poetker. There are results back for 2 different unconnected Poetker families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families all descend from the same Poetker progenitor. Johann Johann Poetker (b. 15 Oct 1850) #954971 was probably a descendent of Johan Poetker (b. ca 1762) #412754.
48. Quiring. There are results back for 5 different unconnected Quiring families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have

occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families all descend from the same Quiring progenitor.

49. Rahn. There are at least partial results back for 2 different unconnected Rahn families. Two of the people tested are descendents of Jacob Rahn (1750-1820) #132712. A descendent of Isebrandt Rahn (1683-1749) #951242 has also been tested. The haplotype of the descendent of Isebrandt Rahn #951242 is inconsistent with the haplotype of descendent of Jacob Rahn #132712. This suggests that either there were two original Rahn progenitors, one for each lineage, or that there was a NPE that occurred at some point in one of the two lineages.
50. Ratzlaff. There are at least partial results back for 2 different unconnected Ratzlaff families. The haplotypes are for the two descendents of Bernhard Ratzlaff (ca 1834-1881) #479270 who have been tested are consistent with each other. The haplotype of a grandson of Heinrich Ratzlaff (b. 1861) #896571 who has been tested and who is a descendent of Hans Ratzlaff (b. ca 1590) #36101 through Hans Ratzlaff's grandson Berent Ratzlaff (1660-ca 1717) #32092 is consistent with the haplotype of the two descendents of Bernhard Ratzlaff #479270. However, the haplotype of a different descendent of Hans Ratzlaff (b. ca 1590) #36101 through Berent Ratzlaff's #32092 brother Hans Ratzlaff (b. 1 Jan 1661) #36105 is inconsistent with the haplotype of the two descendents of Bernhard Ratzlaff #479270. This suggests that a NPE has occurred somewhere in the lineage of the descendent of Hans Ratzlaff (b. 1661) #36105 who was tested and his purported ancestor. Additional testing of male Ratzlaffs who descend from Hans Ratzlaff (b. 1 Jan 1661) #36105 on different lines of descent is needed to help sort where the NPE has occurred in one of the Ratzlaff lineages.
51. Redekopp. There are at least partial results back for 2 different unconnected Redekopp families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Redekopp progenitor.
52. Regier. There are at least partial results back for 6 different unconnected Regier families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other, suggesting that these families all descend from the same Regier progenitor.
53. Reimer. There are at least partial results back for 7 different unconnected Reimer families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception that the haplotype of the descendent of Johann Reimer (ca 1770-1819) #46407 is inconsistent with the haplotypes of the other 6 Reimer lineages that have been tested. This suggests that either there were two original Reimer progenitors, one for the lineage of Johann Reimer (ca 1770-1819) #46407 and one for the other Reimer lineages, or that there was a NPE that occurred at some point in Johann Reimer's (ca 1770-1819) #46407 lineage.
54. Rempel. There are at least partial results back for 7 different unconnected Rempel families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families all descend from the same Rempel progenitor. The descendents of Bernhard Rempel (1763-1806) #101361, Peter Rempel (b. 6 Jul 1735) #198954, and Jacob Gerhard Rempel (b. 10 May 1862) #341796 who have been tested all have a value of 13 at DYS 442 whereas the other Rempels who have been tested have a value of 14 at DYS 442. This would suggest that Bernhard Rempel (1763-1806) #101361, Peter Rempel (b. 6 Jul 1735) #198954, and Jacob Gerhard Rempel (b. 10 May 1862) #341796 were more closely related to each other than to the other Rempels who have been tested. It should be noted that the marker

value for DYS 448 for the descendent of Bernhard Rempel (1763-1806) #101361 who was tested may not actually be 20 as is shown on the table of the results. This person was tested by Family Tree DNA, a company which doesn't report microvariants (short tandem repeat values that contain a partial repeat) for the markers it tests. The corresponding value for DYS 448 for 5 Rempels who were tested by the SMGF is 19.2, which is probably the true result for this marker for the descendent of Bernhard Rempel #101361 as well.

55. Riediger. There are results back for 2 different unconnected Riediger families. The haplotypes are potentially consistent with each other but have mismatches at 4 markers, suggesting that these families likely descend from the same Riediger progenitor, but there is at least some uncertainty about this and they may share a common progenitor before the time that surnames came into existence (ca 1500).
56. Sawatzky. There are at least partial results back for 2 different unconnected Sawatzky families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Sawatzky progenitor.
57. Schellenberg. There are results back for 2 different unconnected Schellenberg families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Schellenberg progenitor.
58. Schmidt. There are at least partial results back for 4 different unconnected Schmidt families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of the haplotype of the descendent of Martin Schmidt (b. 9 Apr 1766) #1059540, which is inconsistent with the haplotype of the other 3 Schmidt lineages that have been tested. This suggests that either there were two original Schmidt progenitors, one for Martin Schmidt (b. 9 Apr 1766) #1059540 and one for the other Schmidt lineages, or that there was a NPE that occurred at some point in Martin Schmidt (b. 9 Apr 1766) #1059540 lineage.
59. Schroeder. There are results for 7 different unconnected Schroeder families. There are three different subgroups for this surname based on the results currently available. The haplotypes of the descendents of Wilhelm Schroeder (1761-1829) #275130 and Simon Schroeder (1751-1808) #788737 are consistent with each other and form the first subgroup. The haplotype of the descendent of Isaac Schroeder (1738-1789) #222095 represents a second subgroup. The haplotypes of the descendents of Peter Schroeder (1718-1802) #694669, Peter Schroeder (b. ca 1740) #351305, David Schroeder (b. ca. 1775) #44460, and David Schroeder (1796-1855) #1018188 are consistent with each other and form the third subgroup.
60. Siemens. There are at least partial results back for 5 different unconnected Siemens families. There are 2 different subgroups for this surname based on the results currently available. The haplotypes of the descendents of Peter Siemens (b. ca 1790) #58879, Jacob Siemens (b. 18 May 1764) #2169, and Jakob Siemens (d. 1944) #1007967 are consistent with each other and form the first subgroup. The haplotypes of the descendents of Peter Siemens (b. ca 1845) #951210 are consistent with the haplotypes of the descendents of Jacob Siemens (b. bef. 1740, d. ca 1786) #159479 and form a second subgroup. This suggests that either there were two original Siemens progenitors, one for

each subgroup, or that there was a NPE that occurred early on in one of the Siemens lineages.

61. Suderman. There are at least partial results back for 3 different unconnected Suderman families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that either all 3 of these families descend from the same Suderman progenitor or that Daniel Suderman (ca 1756-1818) #266837 and/or Abraham Sudermann (1740-1800) #12776 was a descendent of Abraham Suderman (ca 1680-1715) #16088.
62. Thiessen. There are at least partial results back for 8 different unconnected Thiessen families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception that the haplotype of the descendent of Johann Aron Thiessen (b. 31 May 1869) #342798 is inconsistent with the haplotypes of the other 7 Thiessen lineages that have been tested. This suggests that either there were two original Thiessen progenitors, one for the lineage of Johann Aron Thiessen (b. 31 May 1869) #342798 and one for the other Thiessen lineages, or that there was a NPE that occurred at some point in Johann Aron Thiessen's (b. 31 May 1869) #342798 lineage. It is possible that Francis Thijssen #341198 was the progenitor of all of the Mennonite Thiessens except for the lineage of Johann Aron Thiessen (b. 31 May 1869) #342798.
63. Toews. There are at least partial results back for 4 different unconnected Toews families. The haplotype of a grandson of Eugene Toews (b. 4 Jul 1905) #789666 who has been tested and who is a descendent of Martin Toews (1724-1775) #132706 through his son Johann Toews (1743-1811) #225388 is consistent with the haplotypes of the three descendents of Julius Toews (1741-1780) #187161 who have been tested and a descendent of Peter Toews (b. ca 1770) #914897. However, the haplotypes of two descendents of Gerhard Toews (b. 15 Oct 1860) #351537 and a grandson of Johann Toews (b. 23 Feb 1876) #132684, all of whom are supposedly descended from Martin Toews (1724-1775) #132706 through his son Isaak Toews (1746-1803) #132700, are inconsistent with the haplotype of the grandson of Eugene Toews #789666. This suggests that a NPE has occurred somewhere in the lineage of the Isaak Toews' (1746-1803) #132700 descendents. This NPE must have occurred either with Isaak Toews (1746-1803) #132700, with his son Abraham Toews (1781-1826) #51732, or with Abraham Toews' son Aron Toews (1815-1901) #51736. Additional testing of Toews males who descend from Abraham Toews (1781-1826) #51732 on different lines of descent is needed to help sort out where the NPE has occurred in this Toews lineage.
64. Unger. There are results back for 2 different unconnected Unger families. The haplotypes are potentially consistent with each other but have mismatches at 4 markers, suggesting that these families likely descend from the same Unger progenitor, but there is at least some uncertainty about this and they may share a common progenitor before the time that surnames came into existence (ca 1500).
65. Unrau/Unruh. There are at least partial results back for 2 different unconnected Unrau and Unruh families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Unrau/Unruh progenitor.
66. Voth. There are at least partial results back for 2 different unconnected Voth families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which

have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Voth progenitor.

67. Wall. There are results back for 5 different unconnected Wall families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families all descend from the same Wall progenitor.
68. Warkentin. There are at least partial results back for 8 different unconnected Warkentin families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other with the exception of mutations which have occurred at some markers, suggesting that these families all descend from the same Warkentin progenitor.
69. Wedel. There are at least partial results back for 2 different unconnected Wedel families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other, suggesting that these families all descend from the same Wedel progenitor.
70. Wiebe. There are results back for 16 different unconnected Wiebe families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other, suggesting that the 14 different families all descend from the same Wiebe progenitor. Some of the families have a marker value of 30 for DYS 449 and the rest have a marker value of 31. Those families with the same value for this marker are likely more closely related to each other than those who don't have the same marker value.
71. Wieler. There are results back for 6 different unconnected Wieler families. There are 2 different subgroups for this surname based on the results currently available. The haplotypes of the descendants of Johann Wieler (b. 1771) #127055, Cornelius Wieler (1765-1807) #487640, Johan Heinrich Wieler (1758-1802) #197280, Peter Peter Wieler (1778-1850) #187168, and Abraham Wieler (1741-1805) #1009756 are consistent with each other and form the first subgroup. The haplotype of the descendent of Jacob Klaas Wieler (1794-1815) #55032 represents a second subgroup. This suggests that either there were two original Wieler progenitors, one for the lineage of Klaas Wieler (1794-1815) #55032 and one for the other Wieler lineages, or that there was a NPE that occurred at some point in Klaas Wieler's (1794-1815) #55032 lineage. The Wieliers in subgroup one have a marker value of 23 at YCA IIb where as the descendent of Abraham Wieler #1009756 has a value of 19 at that marker. This would suggest that there must have been a deletion of a relatively large portion of the short tandem repeat at this marker location, likely as the result of a recombinational loss of heterozygosity (RecLOH).
72. Wiens. There are at least partial results back for 8 different unconnected Wiens families. There are 2 different subgroups for this surname based on the results currently available. The haplotypes of the descendants of Abram Wiens (b. ca 1735) #198228, Abram Wiens (b. 13 Aug 1896) #990794, Heinrich Wiens (1847-1921) #755624, Abraham Wiens (b. ca 1846) #45656, Johann Wiens (b. ca 1748) #47044, and Peter Wiens (1773-1823) #341095 are consistent with each other and form the first subgroup. The haplotypes of the descendants of Jacob Johann Wiens (b. ca 1762) #47010 and Gerhard Jacob Wiens (16 Nov 1859) #513463 form a second subgroup. This suggests that either there were two original Wiens progenitors, one for the lineage of Jacob Johann Wiens (b. ca 1762) #47010 and Gerhard Jacob Wiens (16 Nov 1859) #513463 and one for the other Wiens lineages, or that there was a NPE that occurred at some point in the lineage of Jacob Johann Wiens (b. ca 1762) #47010 and Gerhard Jacob Wiens (16 Nov 1859) #513463. Gerhard Jacob Wiens (16 Nov 1859) #513463 was probably a descendent of Jacob Johann Wiens (b. ca 1762) #47010.

73. Zacharias. There are at least partial results back for 2 different unconnected Zacharias families. The haplotypes are consistent with each other, suggesting that these families both descend from the same Zacharias progenitor. Jakob Zacharias (1885-1933) #945779 was likely a descendent of Wilhelm Zacharias (b. ca 1700) #8772.