Corrections to Previous Issues[1]

*Foundations (2004) **1** (4): 299-300* *© Copyright FMG*

The Dukedom of Norfolk

*[Foundations (2004) **1** (3): 145-160]*

The editor is grateful to Chris Phillips for pointing out a number of transcription and typographic errors in Round's article on the Dukedom of Norfolk. The online version of the article has been corrected. Readers are reminded that the original manuscript, handwritten by J H Round, can be viewed on the Users' Area[2] of the FMG Website (password needed for access).

p. 147, French extract in the first paragraph: read "*roy*", instead of "*roij*".

p. 147, start of 2nd paragraph: "*hereditary*", not "*hereditrary*".

p. 148, Latin extract on lines 16-21:

line 16: "*egregiam*"; line 18: "*virorum*"; line 19: "*quam*" (not "*quem*");
line 20: "*exiamias*" and possibly "*perpendentes*" (though difficult to read).

p. 148, four lines from the bottom of the page: "*Strathallan*", not "*Strathallow*" (see C[okayne], 1910-98, Vol.12(1), p.374 for the case).

p. 149, Latin extract on lines 14-18:

line 14: "*cuncta*", "*mero*" (not "*niero*"), "*praefatum*" and "*Thomam*";
line 15: "*insignimus*"; line 16: final word is probably "*tano*", a variant of "*thano*", so "*in tano*" means something like "*in theinage*".

p. 150, Latin extract at bottom: "*filio*", not "*filis*".

p. 151, line 3: "*nepos*".

p. 151, extract on Augmentations (third line): "*flowered*", not "*flavered*".

p. 151, Latin extract at bottom (third line): "*medietatem*".

p. 152, Latin tag halfway down: not clear in MS, but probably should be "*custodiet*".

p. 156, Latin extract on lines 5-7:

line 6: "*p'* ", not "*fo'* "; line 7: "*auctoritatem*".

p. 156, Latin extract on lines 23-24:

line 23: "*suum*", "*Thomam*" and "*marescallum*"; line 24: "*Ducem*".

p. 158, about halfway down: "*assumption*", not "*asssumption*".

---

[1] Further additions and corrections to material in any issue are welcomed and should be sent to the editors (see inside front cover for contact details).

[2] http://fmg.ac/Users/ - You must be a Member or Registered User of the FMG to access this area, using the username and password that you were provided when you registered.

The Robessart Tomb in Westminster Abbey[3]

*[Foundations (2004) **1** (3): 178-192]*

An apparent error in the Robessart article was pointed out by Doug Smith on soc.genealogy.medieval. The author (Prof Cecil Humphery-Smith) agrees and has asked us to publish the correction, although as he points out the *Complete Peerage* is not always reliable. In the pedigree on p.189, the parents of John, Duke of Northumberland, are given as Sir Edmund Sutton and Joyce (Sir Edmund being the son of John de Sutton and Elizabeth [Berkeley]). But according to the *Complete Peerage* account (C[okayne], 1910-98, Vol.4, p.480), John's father was another Edmund, the nephew of the Edmund shown. So this part of the chart should read:

[1] John de Sutton = Elizabeth [daughter of Sir John Berkeley]

[2] (younger son) John = Elizabeth Bramshot

[3] Edmund = Elizabeth, Baroness Lisle

Brice Clagett offers the following additional corrections:

On the chart on page 189 the Duke's son Robert was surnamed Dudley, not Guldeford, and he was not Lord Dudley.

Page 191 is also in error in calling William Bourchier Earl of Essex. He had the courtesy title Viscount Bourchier and predeceased his father.

Reference

C[okayne], G E (1910-1998). *The Complete Peerage*, 2nd ed. London: St Catherine Press.

---

[3] See also the article by Nathaniel Taylor elsewhere in this issue.