

**Research Committee Report**  
**October 6, 2007 Williamsburg Reunion**  
With Additions Since the Reunion  
By Alex A. Waldrop III

## Introduction

### DNA Study Developments:

#### BACKGROUND:

DNA is the genetic material and is found in chromosomes. It is a double stranded molecule with base pairs connecting the strands. It resembles a spiral staircase with the base pairs being the steps. The genetic information in DNA is contained in the sequence of the base pairs. The bases that make up the base pairs in DNA are A (adenine), G (guanine), C (cytidine), and T (thymine). In normal DNA A only pairs with T and T with A; G pairs only with C and C pairs only with G. Thus there is a complementary relationship between the two strands of DNA; if you have an A on one strand, on the other strand you must have a T to form the base pair. As a result, if you have the sequence of bases for one strand, you can easily deduce the sequence of the complementary strand. Most humans contain 46 chromosomes (23 pairs) in their cells. One pair is the sex chromosomes: X and X in females, X and Y in males.

In most west European cultures surnames are inherited from father to son and thus follow the direct male line. The Y-chromosome in humans is the male-determining chromosome; only males have a Y-chromosome. Naturally, a man's Y-chromosome is inherited from his biological father and is virtually identical to his biological father's Y-chromosome. Thus surname inheritance is parallel to Y-chromosome inheritance, except when a male's surname is not the same as his biological father's surname for whatever reason. The shorthand phrase used to describe such a situation is "a non-paternity event." Y-chromosome tests generally look at a number of sites on the DNA. Most of these sites were originally selected for their utility in forensic applications. Researchers have identified and named a large number of these. The company we are using for the tests, Family Tree DNA (FT DNA), now looks at up to sixty-seven sites. You can order a 12-marker, a 25-marker, a 37-marker test, or a 67-marker test. If you originally ordered a 12-marker test, you can later order an expansion or refinement to a 25-, 37- or 67-marker test. These marker sites are short tandem repeats. In a short tandem repeat (STR) the DNA has a small sequence of bases that is repeated several times next to each other. For example, the following sequence is a short tandem repeat:

TAGTACCTAGTACCTAGTACCTAGTACCTAGTACCTAGTACCTAGTACC; this STR has 7 repeats of the sequence TAGTACC. The test determines at each of the marker sites the number of repeats of the marker sequence found. For the Family Tree DNA 25-marker test the names of the sites are DYS numbers, such as DYS # 390. The results are reported as a set of 12, 25, 37, or 67 numbers. The term used to describe the pattern of results for these tests is **haplotype**. A haplotype result can refer to any number of markers, but here I will most often refer to a 12-, 25-, 37-, or 67-marker haplotype. Do NOT confuse haplotype with **haplogroup**. I discuss haplogroups later in this report. One of the properties that makes STR sites useful is that occasionally when the DNA is copied, the number of repeats can be increased or reduced by one or more repeats. If you have ever tried to type a document where a word or phrase is repeated several times in close proximity, you know how easy it is to make that type of error. These types of mutations in the DNA are more frequent than some other types of mutations, such as if the "DNA copier" puts an A where a C was the correct base. Another useful property of STR's is that a change in the number of repeats results in a change in the length of the DNA. It is generally easier and cheaper to detect a change in DNA length than a change in the sequence by a single base.

#### ORIGINAL DESIGN:

The original plan for this study was to identify and recruit two donors from each of four families. The major aim of the study was to determine which, if any, of these families shared a direct male line ancestor. The four families that were the initial focus were:

- 1) the descendants of William Claiborne of Virginia, son of Thomas Cleyborne of King's Lynn, County Norfolk, England.
- 2) the descendants of the Westmorland family of Cliburn Hall in England.
- 3) the descendants of John Cliborn/Clyborn of Old Henrico [NOTE: This family has often been referred to as the John of Dale Parish line.]
- 4) the descendants of John Clibborn born in Durham, England who went to Moate, Ireland around 1640; John Clibborn later became a Quaker.

As the study has progressed other families have been added to the study:

- 5) Descendants of the Clayburns of Yorkshire that apparently originated in the Howden area of the East Riding of Yorkshire, England.
- 6) A control family without a Claiborne-like surname
- 7) Descendants of Richard Claiborne (1755-1819)
- 8) Descendants of Alfred Charles Cliburn who was born in 1873 in Brighton, Sussex, England.
- 9) Descendants of William Cliburn (1750 to after 1820). Many of these Clyburns settled in South Carolina.
- 10) Descendants of Nathaniel Britton Claborn/Cliborn (1803-1902) born in South Carolina and later moved to Alabama.
- 11) Descendants of John Clayburn (1820-?) of Manchester, England
- 12) Descendants of another Alabama Claborn
- 13) Descendants of Alfred Clayborn of Weakley County, Tennessee

As the results accumulated I decided to assign these families to the following major groups to simplify comparisons of related families and to make it easier to identify subgroups and branches. The Durham group is family 4. The Norfolk group has families 1 and 7. The original Westmorland group has been subdivided into three subgroups. The Westmorland1 subgroup has families 2, 3, and 11. Westmorland2 subgroup has extended family 9; all of the donors in this group are descendants of men with a Clyburn or Claybourn-like surname that lived in or near Robeson County, NC in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Westmorland3 subgroup has family 13. The other families are classified as Not Grouped.

#### Results Summary:

Below are two tables that summarize the progress of the study from 2005 to 2007.

Summary October 2005	Donors	Markers Tested				Predicted Haplogroup	Tested Haplogroup
		12	25	37	67		
Durham	2	2	2	0	0	R1b1	0
Norfolk	6	6	6	0	0	I	0
Westmorland1	8	8	8	0	0	R1b1	0
Westmorland 2	3	3	1	0	0	R1b1	0
Westmorland 3	1	1	1	0	0	R1b1	0
Not Grouped	4	4	0	0	0		0
Total	24	24	18	0	0		0

Markers Tested

Summary October 2007	Donors	12	25	37	67	Predicted Haplogroup	Tested Haplogroup	
Durham	2	2	2	0	0	<b>R1b1</b>	0	
Norfolk	9	9	9	2	0	<b>I</b>	0	
Westmorland1	10	10	10	5	3	<b>R1b1</b>	2	<b>R1b1c</b>
Westmorland 2	6	6	6	1	0	<b>R1b1</b>	0	
Westmorland 3	2	2	1	1	1	<b>R1b1</b>	1	<b>R1b1c</b>
Not Grouped	9	9	5	4	1		1	<b>E3a</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>		<b>4</b>	
Not Grouped	1					<b>J2</b>		
	1					<b>I</b>		
	1					<b>R1b1c</b>		
	3					<b>R1b1</b>		
	2					<b>R1b1c9a</b>	2	<b>R1b1c9a</b>
	1					<b>E3a</b>	1	<b>E3a</b>

From <http://freepages.genealogy.rootsweb.com/~dgarvey/DNA/markers.htm> is a good general explanation of haplogroups for the Y-chromosome. I have inserted some explanatory sections for clarity.

“The types of Y-chromosome markers measured by genealogical genetic testing labs are known as [STRs](#). Genealogists are interested in finding connections between families on a time scale of centuries, and the mutation rate of STRs is such that they are a good choice for that kind of work. Population geneticists are interested in tracking the movements of groups of humans over time scales of 1000's or 10,000's of years. Therefore their studies usually involve a different type of Y-chromosome marker known as SNPs (along with insertions and deletions), which have a much slower mutation rate than STRs. [Haplogroups](#) are defined by patterns seen in the alleles of these slowly mutating SNP markers. Identification of your Y-chromosome haplogroup can provide an interesting glimpse into the deep ancestry of your paternal line.

A SNP test would be the only way of identifying one's haplogroup for certain. However some conclusions can be drawn about haplogroup classification by looking just at the STR marker value patterns.” In the tables above the predicted haplogroups are based on the pattern (haplotype) of STR results. The tested haplogroup is a direct test for one or more SNP's.

A SNP is a single nucleotide polymorphism, meaning that one of the nucleotides in the DNA sequence has been substituted by one of the other nucleotides. [Note: Above I referred to the sequence of bases in DNA; each of the bases discussed there is actually a part of a corresponding nucleotide. Staying with the staircase analogy, the base pairs form the steps of the double helix. So a base is a portion of a step. A nucleotide includes the base and part of the strand, including the groups that connect together to form the strand. Thus the nucleotide has a portion of a step (base) and a section of the railing and the connectors to join each step to the next one to complete the spiral/helical staircase. For most purposes the sequences of bases is the same as the sequence of nucleotides and the shorthand abbreviations A, C, G, and T can refer to bases or to nucleotides.] The mutation rates for SNP's are so low that another name for them is UEP for unique event polymorphism. This reflects the assumption that within the timeframe of human evolution these events happened only one time.

See this site for more detail: <http://freepages.genealogy.rootsweb.com/~dgarvey/DNA/hg/definitons.html>

From the glossary page at Family Tree DNA is the following definition of haplogroup (<http://www.familytreedna.com/glossary.html#H>):





34) where there are 4 different values seen across the subgroups, so four color variants are seen: red for the Cliburn Hall donor and those that match him at that site, green, light green, and striped green for those that do not match him. Note that both of these markers rapidly mutate.

## **ANALYSIS and DISCUSSION of RESULTS**

The two Clibborn donors match each other at 24 of the 25 markers tested. In the Norfolk group both donors in family 7 differ from the other Norfolk donors at site 3. At the other markers through 25 they match the reference value. Only one donor from family 7 and one from family 1 have currently expanded to 37 markers. They match at all sites except site 34. Until more members of this group go to 37 markers it is impossible to say if either of these values matches a reference value covering all the donors in the group. At sites 1 to 12 the only mismatches seen so far are the already discussed mismatches at site 3. At sites 13 to 25 mismatches have been found at three sites (13, 17 and 21). Note that 13 and 21 are rapidly mutating markers. At site 13 donors 8 and 9 match only each other. They are both descendants of Augustine Claiborne, son of Thomas of Sweet Hall. This mismatch seems to distinguish them from the other descendants of William Claiborne. Donor 3 matches none of the other Norfolk donors at site 13. The mismatch for donor 4 at site 17 and the mismatches at site 21 for donors 7 and 8 are currently unique in this group. The overall conclusion is that the DNA results indicate that all 9 of the Norfolk donors share a common direct line male ancestor. For donors 3 to 9 the MRCA is clearly William Claiborne. For donors 1 and 2 William Claiborne is almost certainly their ancestor, but there is a remote possibility that they descend from a different immigrant who must have been a relative of William.

The results for the Westmorland group illustrate the power of DNA testing to show both near and distant relatedness. Look at the first 25 markers for all three subgroups. With a total of 18 donors there are few mismatches except for ones that distinguish a subgroup or a branch within a subgroup. The single occurrence (so far) mismatches are at sites 8, 12, 15, 22, and two independent, different mismatches at marker 24. The mismatch at site 25 for donor 10 of the West1 subgroup is with little doubt independent of the identical mismatch for donor 2 of the West2 subgroup. This is based on the fact that family 11 has never lived outside England or Ireland and family 9 has lived in North America since 1700 or earlier. The mismatch at site 5 for the Weakley County donors separates this group from the others. The mismatch for donor 2 at site 15 may be a distinguishing mismatch, but until donor 1 of the West3 subgroup expands to 25 or 37 markers, we do not know that. The mismatch at site 19 for donors 1 and 6 of the West2 subgroup identifies a branch of this subgroup. The mismatches at sites 21 and 25 distinguish the West2 subgroup from the other Westmorland subgroups, but there are additional mismatches at site 25 that make this situation more complex. My analysis is that the haplotype (pattern of results) for the MRCA of the donors in West2 was the same as donors 3 and 4. Donor 1 has 1 mismatch from them at site 19. Donor 2 has one mismatch at site 25. Donor 5 has 1 mismatch at site 24. Donor 6 has three mismatches: sites 12, 19, and 25. Since donor 1 matches this MRCA of West2 subgroup at sites 12 and 25, these mutations apparently occurred in one of donor 6's ancestors who is a descendant of James Clyburn (1822 to 1881). Based on these results it was clear that all of these donors were connected by direct male line descent with the family that lived at Cliburn Hall.

Now consider the results for those donors in the Westmorland group who have gone to 37 or more markers. In markers 26 to 37 there are 2 to 4 mismatches between the four donors in family 3 and the Cliburn Hall donor. There are 4 mismatches between the one family 9 donor and the Cliburn Hall donor; he has only one mismatch with two of the family 3 donors (donors 6 and 7). Initially, the results for the West3 subgroup donor were very surprising. In this 12-marker set he only matches the Cliburn Hall donor at 3 sites. He also has nine mismatches with donors 6 and 7 in the West1 subgroup. Based on both the DNA results and the known genealogies of the donors, I conclude that the 37-marker haplotype for donors 6 and 7 in the West1 subgroup is the haplotype of the MRCA of family 3 – John of Dale Parish. Donor 5 has one mismatch at site 35. Donor 9 has two matches in this region at sites 34 and 36. Donor 6 of West2 has one mismatch with this haplotype in this region at site 26. It now appears certain that the West3 subgroup donors must descend from an immigrant different from the immigrant(s) that founded family 3 and family 9. At present the DNA evidence is consistent with family 3 and family 9 descending from the same immigrant or from two separate immigrants. Because of

the large number of mismatches between family 13 and family 2 these families must have branched apart many centuries ago. Families 3 and 9 probably branched from family 2 in the 1500's or 1600's.

## **NOT GROUPED DONORS**

Two of the nine donors placed here are related to each other. The other seven donors do not match closely anyone else in the study. I do not have time or space here to go further into these results. I may discuss them in a future newsletter.

## **FUTURE AIMS FOR THE DNA STUDY**

We always welcome new donors to the study, but there are a few donors we would especially like to find and recruit. William Claiborne had four sons: William, John, Thomas, and Leonard. Leonard did not have any known sons. John's known family disappears from the surviving records after the 1720's. All of the donors in family 1 up to now are descendants of Thomas Claiborne through his son, Thomas of Sweet Hall. Where do the donors of family 7 fit? There is currently no evidence that Richard Claiborne (1755 to 1819) is a descendant of the second generation William Claiborne. If a donor with known descent from this William joined the study, his results should help determine where Richard and his descendants fit. Since the reunion I have found some leads to at least one family that may have a living male with the Claiborne surname (or variant thereof) with a direct male line descent from the second generation William Claiborne. John Cliborn of Dale Parish (abt. 1712 to 1764/5) had four sons: Jonas, John, George, and Thomas. We have donors that descend from Jonas, from John, and from George. We would like to have at least one donor who descends from Thomas. We would also like to have a donor that descends from Lasley Cliborn and his wife Cynthia Hopper. Lasley was the youngest son of John (1760 to aft. 1840) and Mary Cliborn. We would like to find more donors from the UK or Ireland (or Europe) with a Claiborne-like surname. Donors from Australia would also be good to find.

At the 2007 reunion a motion to encourage and assist donors to upgrade to 37 markers was passed. Among the reasons for doing this is that we have already found for the Westmorland group that the results for markers 26 to 37 have helped to identify different branches within that group. For the Norfolk group with only two donors that have gone to 37 markers we have one mismatch in that region. Is that mismatch one that distinguishes between family 1 and family 7? Is it a mismatch within family 1 or within family 7? Is it more complex?

## **THE FRENCH CONNECTION**

In Sue Cliborn Forbes' recently updated [Ancestral Lines of Cliburn, Westmorland](#), which traces the genealogy of the Cliburn Hall family, she starts the family with Adam le Franceys [1] who appears in the Pipe Roll in 1200. In the third generation is Robert le Franceys de Cliburn [3] who is living in 1259; he is the first one in this genealogy referred to as "de Cliburn." In generation eight is a John le Franceys de Cliburn [8] who lived during the mid 1300's. He is the last member of this family genealogy to have "le Franceys as part of his name. So one branch of the le Franceys family became the Cliburn family. Sue mentions that another branch of the family became the Vernons of Rutland. It is easy to see that other branches of this family might have taken the surname French. Clai Bachman gave a very nice presentation on the Westmorland ancestry of the Cliburn Hall family at the reunion. Early in the Claiborne DNA study several close matches with men with the French surname were found. In the French study they are in Group 1. Since the R1b1 haplogroup is the most frequent Western European haplogroup, close matches, even at 25 markers, might have been a chance match and might not reflect having a direct male line ancestor within the time frame that surnames have been used, roughly within the last 1000 years. Some of these French donors had gone to 37 markers. The first donors in our study to expand to 37 markers were in the West1 subgroup in late 2005 and in 2006. They had 9 mismatches with the appropriate French donors in markers 26 to 37. At the time I concluded that this meant that the families were not connected. During this period I had communicated with the person running the French study. Only one of their donors could trace his line back to the 1600's and none could trace back earlier than the 1600's. During this year's reunion I mentioned to some people this potential connection to the French family. After the reunion one of them asked me to elaborate on this and that prompted me to compare the West3 results with the French

results. There was only 1 mismatch in the 26 to 37 marker set for most of the Group 1 French donors. With several of these donors the West3 donor had only two mismatches with them over 37 markers. This West3 donor has gone to 67 markers. Three of the Group 1 donors have expanded to 67 markers. Two of these are very close matches with our West3 donor; one has 4 and the other 5 mismatches out of 67 markers. Interestingly they both mismatch the West3 donor at sites 59 and 60. At those sites the two French donors match the 3 West1 donors who have gone to 67 markers. One of the French donors mismatches these 3 West1 donors only at site 50 in sites 38 to 67. The other one also has a mismatch at site 43. Both of these French donors have only two mismatches in the first 25 markers with two of the West1 donors who have gone to 67 markers: at sites 5 and 15. Summarizing, most Group 1 French donors are very good matches with the one West3 donor that has gone to 67 markers over all 67 markers. They are also good matches with the West1 donors who have gone to 67 markers except for the nine mismatches in markers 26 to 37. In light of the medieval genealogy of the Cliburn Hall family, this data supports this genealogy and suggests that the immigrant for the West3 subgroup branched away from the Cliburn Hall line soon after taking the Cliburn surname. The family that lived at Cliburn Hall gradually accumulated mutations in the 26 to 37-marker region. The West3 ancestors kept the ancestral number of repeats, as did the ancestors of French Group 1. The immigrant for family 3 and the immigrant for family 9 branched from the Cliburn Hall line only after the mutations we now see in this region had occurred. Note that the immigrant for family 3 and for family 9 may or may not be the same individual. I shared this analysis with the West3 donor. He searched some other DNA databases and found that he is a good match to two other families that claim descent from a le Franceys family. The surnames are Stanley and Marple. The Vernon family by medieval genealogy is connected to the le Franceys family, but apparently has not yet done any DNA testing of the Y-chromosome or at least neither the West3 donor nor I found any indication that they have.

To assist those who want to delve further into the results of the study I am providing here the pedigrees of the donors. When the study began I promised the donors I would protect their privacy. That is why the tables do not contain the numerical results and why the pedigrees do not include anyone born in the twentieth century.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:**

This study would not have been possible without the support, financial and otherwise, from a large number of people. First, let me thank the Claiborne Society that provided initial funding of the study. I want to thank the donors and their families for participating in the study and donating their DNA; many of the donors paid for their tests. Several individuals have provided financial, research, and/or recruiting help. Among those in this category are: Sue Forbes, Curly Moore, Duain Claiborne, Elsa Diamond, Mr. and Mrs. Huw Price, Mr. and Mrs. John Janeway, Major General Gerald Maloney, Susan Rura, Patricia Clayborn, Angela Clyburn, and Mr. and Mrs. Chris Strachan. I also want to thank the Presidents of the Claiborne Society and the Board members who have consistently supported this research.

Pedigrees of the donors:

Durham Group Family 4

John Clibborn of Moate (1623 to 1705), born in Durham, Eng.; moved to Moate, Ireland [1]. Note: The number in brackets indicates the generation number.

Joshua Clibborn (1665 to 1727) [2].

James Clibborn (1710 to 1783) [3].

Barclay Clibborn (1739 to ?) [4]. Most recent common ancestor (MRCA) of the two donors.

Donor 1 descends from John Barclay Clibborn (1770 to 1850) [5].

Donor 2 descends from William Clibborn [5].

Norfolk Group Family 1

Thomas Cleyborne (1525/30 to 1581) [B]. Mayor of King's Lynn, Norfolk, England in 1573.

Thomas Clayborne (abt. 1557 to 1607) [A]. Mayor of King's Lynn in 1592.  
William Claiborne (1600 to 1676/9) [1].  
Thomas Claiborne (1647 to 1683) [2].  
Thomas Claiborne (1681 to 1732) of Sweet Hall [3]. MRCA of the family 1 donors.  
Donor 4 descends from Nathaniel Claiborne (abt. 1716 to 1756) [4].  
Donor 5 descends from a Leonard Claiborne (1762 to ?) [6?], who is, with little doubt, a descendant of Thomas of Sweet Hall [3], probably a grandson of Leonard Claiborne (abt. 1701 to 1785) [4] by his son Burnell [5] or his son Leonard (? to 1775) [5].  
Donors 3, 6 and 7 descend from Leonard Claiborne (abt. 1701 to 1785) [4].  
Donor 3 descends from Richard Claiborne (? to 1776) [5].  
Donor 6 descends from Augustine Claiborne (1787 to 1839), [7] son of Thomas B. Claiborne (1747 to 1811) [6], grandson of Leonard Claiborne [4] by his son Burnell [5].  
Donor 7 descends from George Herbert Ravenscroft Claiborne (1782 to 1834), [7] son of Thomas B. Claiborne [6], grandson of Leonard Claiborne [4] by his son Burnell [5].  
Donors 8 and 9 descend from Augustine Claiborne (1721 to 1787) [4].  
Donor 8 descends from Buller Claiborne (1755 to 1804) [5].  
Donor 9 descends from Herbert Claiborne (1746 to 1814) [5].

## Family 7

Donors 1 and 2 descend from Richard Claiborne (1755 to 1819) [1]. I classify them as family 7 because we do not know from which son of William Claiborne he descends. It is remotely possible that Richard descends from a different immigrant who must have been a relative of William Claiborne.  
Donors 1 and 2 descend from Richard B. Claiborne (abt. 1800 to 1879) [2] and Charles B. E. Claiborne (1830 to 1889) [3].  
Donor 1 descends from Charles F. Claiborne (1873 to 1970) [4].  
Donor 2 descends from James B. Claiborne (1878 to 1966) [4].

## Westmorland Group

### West1 Family 3

John Clyborn (1650/1658 to 1685) [1].  
John Clyborn (1682 to 1712) [2].  
John Clyborn (abt. 1712 to 1764/5) i.e. John of Dale Parish [3] MRCA.  
Donors 1, 3, 5, and 7 descend from John Cliborn (abt. 1735 to 1782/3) [4].  
Donor 5 descends from Daniel Brown Cliborn (1767 to 1865) [5].  
Donors 1, 3, and 7 descend from John Cliborn (abt. 1760 to abt. 1840) [5].  
Donor 1 descends from John Cliborn, Jr. (abt 1784 to 1840) [6].  
Donors 3 and 7 descend from Jubal Cliborn (abt. 1780 to abt.1838) [6].  
Donor 3 descends from Henry S. R. Cliborn (1835 to 1900) [7].  
Donor 7 descends from William Cliborn (1820 to 1901) [7].  
Donors 2, 4, and 6 descend from George Cliborne (1742 to 1811) [4] and from William Cliborne, Sr. (1766 to 1845) [5].  
Donor 2 descends from George Cliborne (abt. 1796 to ?) [6].  
Donors 4 and 6 descend from William Cliborne, Jr. (abt. 1787 to 1860/70) [6].  
Donor 4 descends from Nathaniel Theophilus Cliborne (abt. 1816 to aft. 1880) [7].  
Donor 6 descends from James Augustine Cliborne (1814 to 1889) [7].  
Donor 9 descends from Jonas Cliborn (1733 to 1795) [4].

## Family 2

Donor 8 descends from Adam le Frances (listed on pipe roll for 1200) [1].

Donor 8 descends from Thomas Clayburne, esq. (1580-1640) [18].  
Donor 8 descends from Dr. Christopher-James Cleborne (1838 to 1909) [25].

#### Family 11

Donor 10 descends from Thomas Clayburn of Manchester, England (1831 to 1903).

#### West2 Family 9

John Clyburn (abt. 1705 to 1785) [1]; he is the LIKELY MRCA and father of the men in generation 2 below.  
Donors 1 and 6 descend from Ephraim Cliburn (abt. 1746 to aft. Sept. 1823) [2], William Clyburn (1786 to 1868) [3], and James Clyburn (1822 to aft. 1881) [4].

Donor 1 descends from Stephen Clyburn (1858 to 1907) [5].

Donor 6 descends from Ira Louis Clyburn (1862 to 1930) [5].

Donors 2, 3, and 4 descend from William Cliburn, Sr. (1750 to aft. 16 April 1821) [2].

Donor 2 descends from Louis (or Lewis) Clyburn (abt. 1778 to 1857) [3].

Donor 3 descends from William Clyburn, Jr. (1774 to aft. 1829) [3].

Donor 4 descends from James Cliburn (1793 to 1845) [3].

Donor 5 descends from Joshua Clyburn (abt. 1738 to bef. 20 October 1798) [2].

#### West3 Family 13

Alfred Clayborn(e) (1805 to 1858) [1] MRCA.

Donor 1 descends from Benjamin B. Claborn (1841 to 1897) [2].

Donor 2 descends from Alfred Lafayette Clayborne (1832 to 1889) [2].

For more on the families see the articles by Sue Cliborn Forbes that originally appeared in the Claiborne Society newsletter from June 2002 to March 2003 that can now be read on the Claiborne Society website. Also check the references that Sue cited and the ones listed on this web page: <http://www.claibornesociety.org/research/>

The article on William Claiborne:

[http://www.claibornesociety.org/research/WILLIAM\\_CLAIBORNE\\_biography\\_for\\_Rodona.shtml](http://www.claibornesociety.org/research/WILLIAM_CLAIBORNE_biography_for_Rodona.shtml)

on John Clyborn of Old Henrico Co VA:

[http://www.claibornesociety.org/research/john\\_cliborn\\_newsletter\\_article.shtml](http://www.claibornesociety.org/research/john_cliborn_newsletter_article.shtml)

on John Clibborn of Durham, England and Moate, Ireland:

[http://www.claibornesociety.org/research/clibborn\\_article\\_mar\\_2003\\_newsletter.shtml](http://www.claibornesociety.org/research/clibborn_article_mar_2003_newsletter.shtml)

on Dr. Christopher James Cleborne:

[http://www.claibornesociety.org/research/CJC\\_article\\_Dec\\_2002\\_newsletter.shtml](http://www.claibornesociety.org/research/CJC_article_Dec_2002_newsletter.shtml)

Contact information for Alex:

Dr. Alex A. Waldrop III  
260 Westbrook St. # 10  
South Portland, ME 04106

E-mail address: [alexw3@hotmail.com](mailto:alexw3@hotmail.com)