
ERRATA

Edward De Vere Newsletter No. 8 has the following error:

And immediately beneath the name Cranmer Brooke in the pedigree appears the note "Ar fil. et haeres" ("Arthur, son and heir").

‘Ar’ in the pedigree is likely not an abbreviation for the Christian name ‘Arthur’, but rather an abbreviation for the Latin ‘armiger’, and the translation should therefore read:

Cranmer Brooke, esquire, son and heir.

The same Newsletter has a paragraph containing two additional errors (highlighted in bold below for ease of reference):

*Three "nephews" **are mentioned in the 1558 will** of George Brooke, 7th Lord Cobham (McKeen 68). . . . Finally, as stated earlier, **George Brooke's will of 1558 mentions three "nephews"** related to his late brother Thomas. The word "nephew" covered a broader range of relationships in Elizabethan times than it does today; it could certainly have included **a great-nephew, which was what Arthur Brooke was to George Brooke, 7th Lord Cobham.***

It should be noted that the numbering of the Cobham baronies differs depending on the source consulted, and the 7th Baron Cobham referred to in the preceding paragraph is the same person as the 9th Baron Cobham referred to below.

McKeen’s discussion of the 1551 and 1558 wills of George Brooke (c.1497 – 29 September 1558), 9th Baron Cobham, implies that three nephews are specifically mentioned in one or both wills:

[William Brooke’s] father named, besides the disgraced Elizabeth Brooke, seven younger sons and another daughter, as well as a number of nephews, William’s late uncle’s three sons.

See McKeen, David, *A Memory of Honour: The Life of William Brooke, Lord Cobham*, (Salzburg: Institut Fur Anglistik Und Amerikanistik, 1986), p. 68.

McKeen calls these three nephews ‘William’s late uncle’s three sons’, thus identifying them as the sons of the 9th Baron Cobham’s brother, Thomas Brooke (d.1547) and his wife, Susan (nee Cranmer), niece of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer. See McKeen, *supra*, pp. 16, 27, 68, 701.

Contrary to the impression given by McKeen’s discussion, however, there is no specific mention of three nephews in either of the 9th Baron Cobham’s wills, although there is a

general mention of his nephews, i.e. the sons of his brother, Thomas Brooke (d.1547), in this clause in an entail in his 1558 will, TNA PROB 11/43/628:

And for lack of such issue I will that all the same manors, lands, tenements and premises with their appurtenances shall wholly remain to the heirs males of the body of my brother, Thomas Brooke, lawfully begotten and to the heirs males of their bodies lawfully begotten.

The 9th Baron's earlier will, Harley Charter 57. H.7, dated 31 March 1551, contains a similar clause in an entail:

[A]nd for default of such issue, the remainder thereof unto th' heirs males of the body of my brother, Thomas Brooke, lawfully begotten.

It is thus unclear where McKeen obtained the information that Thomas Brooke (d.1547) had three sons, as specific mention of three nephews it is not found in either of the wills of the 9th Baron Cobham.

It should also be noted that since the publication of this Newsletter, the author of this website has tentatively reached the conclusion that Arthur Brooke was a younger son of Thomas Brooke (d.1547), born after he made his will in 1544. This would make Arthur Brooke a nephew of George Brooke, 9th Baron Cobham, not a great-nephew.

It should also be noted that similar errors to those discussed in connection with this Newsletter also appear in the author's article in *The Oxfordian*. Green, Nina, 'Who Was Arthur Brooke?', *The Oxfordian*, 2000, Vol. III, pp. 59-70, available online.

Edward De Vere Newsletter No. 32 has the following error:

. . . one of Oxford's early tutors was Lawrence Nowell, Dean of Lichfield,

Oxford's tutor was the antiquary, Laurence Nowell (c.1530-c.1570), not the Laurence Nowell who was Dean of Lichfield. From the *ODNB*:

Nowell, Laurence (1530–c. 1570), antiquary Thomas Randolph had recommended Nowell as a scholar and cartographer to Cecil, who by June 1563 appointed Nowell as the tutor of his ward and future son-in-law, Edward de Vere, seventeenth earl of Oxford. . . . Until recently, Laurence Nowell the antiquary has been confused with Laurence Nowell (c. 1516–1576), who became dean of Lichfield, and who had the same paternal grandparents.

In **Edward De Vere Newsletter No. 39** for *Leonard* Saunders read *Lawrence* Saunders.

In the pedigree in **Edward de Vere Newsletter No. 40**, the name of Alice Camoys' mother is incorrect. Although numerous sources state that Alice Camoys was Sir Thomas Camoys' daughter by his second wife, Elizabeth Mortimer (widow of 'Hotspur'), Alice Camoys was actually Sir Thomas Camoys' daughter by his first wife, Elizabeth Louches, the daughter of William Louches of Great Milton and Chiselhampton, Oxfordshire. See Richardson, Douglas, *Magna Carta Ancestry*, 2nd ed., Vol. I, (Salt Lake City, 2011), pp. 398-9).

Edward de Vere Newsletter No. 42 has the following error:

In 1604, Anne Spencer married a third husband, Robert Sackville, Lord Buckhurst.

Anne Spencer married Robert Sackville in 1592. From the ODNB:

[O]n 4 December 1592, Sackville married Anne (d. 1618), daughter of Sir John Spencer of Althorp. . . . From 1604, when his father was elevated to the earldom of Dorset, Robert Sackville was styled Baron Buckhurst.

Edward De Vere Newsletter No. 46 has the following:

In a pedigree of the Verney family given in the Visitation of Hertfordshire, Sir John Verney is said to have been cup-bearer to Queen Anne Boleyn (23).

A John Verney is listed as Queen Anne Boleyn's cupbearer at the Field of Cloth of Gold in 1520. See:

'Henry VIII: March 1520, 21-30', in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 3, 1519-1523*, ed. J S Brewer (London, 1867), pp. 231-249. *British History Online* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol3/pp231-249> [accessed 26 May 2018].

However the statement in the Verney pedigree referenced above is clearly erroneous. The Sir John Verney, husband of Margaret Whittington, stated in the pedigree to have been Queen Anne Boleyn's cupbearer, died in 1505.

In **Edward De Vere Newsletter No. 46** this paragraph should now read (corrections in italics):

Sir Edward Don and Anne Verney had only one child, a daughter Elizabeth (d. before 1551), who married Sir Thomas Jones (d.1559) of Abermarlais, sheriff of Carmarthen and Cardigan. Sir Thomas Jones and Elizabeth Don had two daughters, Anne and Frances (Newton Dunn 16). Anne *Jones* married John Cotton of Whittington, Gloucestershire and had three sons -- Richard, William and Ralph (only Ralph appears to have had an heir,

Don Cotton, who, in a pedigree of 1623, is shown as having two daughters) (Maclean 45 6). Frances *Jones* married Ralph Lee of Saunderton, and had a daughter, Anne (who married George *Ashby* of Harefield, Middlesex), and a son, Edward Don (or Dunn) Lee (d.1598), who married Anne, daughter of Richard Heywood (Meyrick 199).

Edward De Vere Newsletter No. 47 has this statement:

Sir Griffith Don married Elizabeth Roche-Eden (d.1541)

The pedigree in McFarlane, K.B., *Hans Memling*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971) is in error in stating that Elizabeth died in 1541. Her death is mentioned in both the bill and answer in a Chancery suit during Sir Thomas More's tenure as Lord Chancellor, TNA C 1/625/13 and 14, and it is thus clear that Elizabeth had died before Sir Thomas More's tenure as Lord Chancellor ended in May 1532.

Moreover as a result of research in May and June 2018, the material in Edward de Vere Newsletter No. 47 concerning Elizabeth can now be supplemented as follows:

Sir Griffith Don (c.1487 – 8 January 1543) married a widow named Elizabeth whose maiden name is unknown. Elizabeth had married firstly Brian Roche (d. May 1514), by whom she had a son, Nicholas Roche, and a daughter, Grissel Roche (buried 26 February 1582), who married Sir John Boteler (d.1576). Elizabeth married secondly Henry Eden (d.1518), Merchant of the Staple at Calais, by whom she had two sons, the translator Richard Eden (c.1516-1576), for whom see the *ODNB* entry, and John Eden (mentioned in the will of Sir Griffith Don). See the will of Brian Roche (d. May 1514), TNA PROB 11/17/555, and the inquisition post mortem taken after his death, TNA C 142/31/65; the will of Henry Eden (d.1518), TNA PROB 11/19/176; a Chancery suit from the period 1529-32, TNA C 1/625/13, brought by Sir Griffith Don against Richard Eden, Archdeacon of Middlesex, executor of Henry Eden; the will of Sir Griffith Don, TNA PROB 11/30/109, and the inquisition post mortem taken after his death, TNA C 142/69/79; the will of Sir John Boteler (d.1576), TNA PROB 11/58/211; a Chancery suit, TNA C 1/746/55, dating from the period 1532-1538 brought against Sir Griffith Don by John Butler and Griselda his wife, 'daughter and heir of Brian Roche and of Elizabeth, his wife, afterwards the wife of Griffith Donne, knight', concerning the manors of Lamer, Butlers and Brydell [=Bride Hill] and other lands in Wheathampstead, Harpenden, Standridge and Luton in Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire. See also Brigg, William, ed., *The Herts Genealogist and Antiquary*, Vol. I, (Harpenden: William Brigg, 1895), p. 150 at:

<https://archive.org/stream/hertsgenealogist01brig#page/n311/mode/2up>

1540 Michaelmas term, 32 Henry VIII

Edmund Broket esq and Edm. Bardolf esq: Tho. Eden esq son and heir of Henry Eden, and Rich. Eden gent. Manor of Howe and lands and rent in Harpenden, Whetehampsted and Redburn.

For the translator Richard Eden's relationship to Grissel Roche, wife of Sir John Boteler, see also Arber, Edward, ed., *The First Three English Books on America*, (Birmingham, 1885), p. xlv at:

<https://archive.org/stream/firstthreeenglis00arberich#page/n47/mode/2up>

Richard Eden, an Englishman, born of a respectable family in Herefordshire, -- where he still has a sister living, well known to Her Majesty, being the wife of a knight, John Butler of Lamer, -- was well educated as a boy, studied at Cambridge for ten years under that most learned man, Sir Thomas Smyth, now Her Majesty's Secretary [of State], who can testify to his erudition and blameless character.