Errata in York

REED’s York volumes have been in print for over a year, and various errors have been noticed by those working with York material. Since our concern is to present the material as accurately as possible, we are publishing this list now and invite our users to inform us of other mistakes that they have spotted in York or in any subsequent volumes. A general statement requesting such corrections will appear as a standard item in the front matter of all our publications, beginning with the Coventry volume being typeset. I am particularly grateful to Martin Stevens for pointing out the error in the reading from the York play manuscript, to Meg Twycross for her work with the names on the station lists (although in two cases I have concluded that neither our reading nor hers was accurate), and to Peter Meredith for his sharp eye for sums.

Typesetting errors
1 Contents page: read Guild for Guilds. This has led to the same error in the display heading p. 628
2 p. 487: line numbers have been omitted
3 p. 619: lines 13-14 the excrescences on the thorns not erased

Typographical errors
1 Acknowledgements: Wilmshurst for Whilmshurst
3 p. xlii: Appendix IV for Appendix VI
4 p. 110, line 35: Memorandum for Memorandum
5 p. 478, line 32: BI : PR Y/J 17 for BI : PR Y/I
6 p. 658: under ‘Pageant 3’ second entry first parenthesis: Pageant 35 for Pageant 34
7 p. 666: under 1554: bits for buts
8 p. 674: under ‘Pageant 38’: 1432 for 1421-2 (cf pp. 48-50)
9 p. 691: Ruddestan for Ruddeston (cf p. 5, line 23)
10 p. 845: Cardmakers, third last line: ‘to the pageant’ for ‘to be pageant’
11 p. 853: Ilez for Izles (cf p. 631, line 23)

Misreadings
1 p. 93, line 29: Swathe for Wathe
2 p. 180, line 28: Thuaytez for Thuayter
3 pp. 220, lines 24, 32 and 224, lines 24, 35: Radulpho Powle for Ricardo Powle
   Paulo Gillour for Paulo Gills (Gilli)
4 p. 228, line 16: Myres for Myers
5 p. 258, line 32: (Bowers) iij s iiiij d for iiiij s iiiij d
One of the most challenging of all paleographical problems is the correct transcriptions of names. In the York material this challenge was made even more formidable by the many lists of those who rented playing stations, the condition of the Chamberlains' Rolls, the early names and the nature of the scribal hand, and the entries in the Chamberlains' Books for the 1520s and 1530s. Those who have used Meg Twycross' fascinating study of the station lists (REEDN 1978:2, 10-33) and compared it with the lists as they are published in York will find various discrepancies. I have checked all the readings against the microfilms of the manuscripts in the REED archives. Those which are clearly wrong in our text appear above, but others are more problematic. Although minor disagreements, such as the presence of an internal 'c' or the 'y/i' variation, are of little consequence, major discrepancies remain problems. In the Chamberlains' Rolls the following occur:

1454 Station 4 Twycross: Tubbac; REED: Tubbar. The manuscript, very faded, has resulted in a very faint microfilm. The tail of the 'r' is not visible on the film, but the form is not completely compatible with a 'c'.

1462 Station 9 Twycross: Scalby; REED: Stalby. Again the manuscript and film are faint. However, the letter form appears to be crossed as a 't' rather than a 'c'. On the other hand, we agree that a man called Scalby rented station eleven, which, as Mrs. Twycross points out, was in the same place (the market in Petergate) in 1468 and 1475.

1475 Station 3 Twycross: Toller; REED: Tollerer. We agree that the station was rented by the widow Toller in 1468. A brevigraph for 'er' does follow, however, the formed letters.

1499 Station 4 Twycross: de la River; REED: de la Kyver. Here the second letter is a 'y'. The capital is peculiar in that all other capital 'R's' in this entry begin with an upward sweeping stroke before the down-stroke. There are no capital 'K's' for comparison. Since Mrs. Twycross has found an Edward de la River as a grocer in the Freemen's List, the weight of the evidence must be for 'R'. The correct reading should then probably be 'de la Ryver'.

1501 Station 11 Twycross: [Caton]; REED: Catterton. On p. 15 of her article Mrs. Twycross states that William Caton held a lease of Station 11 'for 5 s a year between 1499 and 1508'. We have four entries for those years. The sum is always 5s, but the indenture is mentioned only in 1499 where the station holder is named as Nicholas Caton. William Caton is named in 1506 and 1508. The name the scribe wrote is Catterton, which may be an error since the holder of the first station is William Catterton. The evidence does not seem to me unequivocal enough to make the emendations.

1506 Station 4 Twycross: Parker; REED: Parke. Here again we have a roll that is hard to decipher, and the manuscript appears very mottled in the microfilm.
The letters 'Park' are clear, followed by what we have all taken to be 'e'. There is no 'r' visible on the line. A smudge on the film slightly to the right and above the line may represent a superlineated 'r'. If that is the case, what we and Mrs. Twycross have read as 'e' must be 'o' and the man's name spelled 'Parkour'. We agree that a Parcourt rented this station in 1508.

1516 Station 5 Twycross: Stringer; REED: Strins. This list is washed away on the right-hand side. Much of it is illegible, and the version we print is full of ellipses. We would probably have been wise not to try to complete them. 'Strin' is clear, followed by a letter whose tail is visible on the microfilm and whose form above the line is very shadowy. Reading the original we chose 's'. Mrs. Twycross has chosen 'g' with a superlineated flourish for 'er'.

Four of these seven discrepancies are caused by the state of the manuscripts and the corresponding faintness of the microfilms, but the fact that we can magnify the letters on our microfilm readers does help us to decipher some letter forms. Scribal vagaries account for two of the discrepancies. Possibly we should have treated the flourish after 'Toller' in 1475 as otiose. We should perhaps not have expected strict consistency in forming 'R' when the scribe wrote 'de la Ryver' in 1499. The last discrepancy is an editorial emendation and not a disputed reading.

Problems of a different kind face us in the entries in the Chamberlains' Book. The scribe for the period 1520-42 wrote a difficult and crabbed early Tudor secretarial hand. In only one list during this period (1538) is there no disagreement between Mrs. Twycross and ourselves. This list is written in the hand of the clerk who succeeds the older man after 1542. If the books were indeed written by the Common Clerk, we have Miles Newton to blame for all our woes. The letter forms are sloppy, some barely formed at all. The spelling of names is as erratic as the spelling of other words. Since this is a period where we have a few consecutive years' lists, names do recur again and again—but rarely in the same guise.

1521, 1522, 1523 Station 2 Twycross: Myres Myres Myres; REED: Myrni Myers Myers. We have accepted the reading of Myres for 1522 (see above, under Misreadings), but Myers occurs in 1523. The 1521 reading remains the problem. The terminal letter looks very like the final 'i' after 'Iohanni' although it could be a modified form of terminal 's' in this hand. The letter before it, however, does not appear to be an 'e', as it is two minims. An unusual but possible variant reading is 'Myrus'.

1522, 1524, 1527 Station 7 Twycross: Reginald Beislay, Ranalde Beslay, Raginald Beysley; REED: Riginald Berlay, Ranalde Berlay, Raginaldo Beysley. We appear to agree that a Reginald turned to a Ronald turned back to a Reginald. We also concur on the spelling of the 1527 entry. The problem is how to read the letter before the 'l'. In the 1524 entry it resembles the long 'r' more than the long 's'. There is no hook rising above the smaller letters to correspond with the other 's's' in this entry, such as the 's' in 'lyster' in the entry for the twelfth station. In the 1522 entry, although there does appear to be
an 'i' after the 'e', the next letter form again has no hook. The way it is connected to the following 'l', however, resembles the connections of the other internal 's's' on this page rather than of the internal 'r's'.

1522, 1523, 1525 Stations 11, 12 and 13 Twycross: Galland, Galland, Galland; REED: Galland, Balland, Galland. The letter form in the 1523 entry is peculiar. On balance it would seem that Galland is correct, but, in abstract, the letter form seems to be as much like a 'B' as a 'G'.

1524, 1526, 1527, 1528 Station 4 Twycross: Chipton Chypton Chypton Shipton; REED: Shipton Shypton Shypton Shipton. Here the disagreement is over the letter form in the hand of the scribe who is writing the Chamberlains' Book entries. The entry for 1528 is in a roll in a different hand. The initial capital is not the carefully crossed 'C' used by this scribe in 'Corporus' elsewhere in the entries or in 'Coram' in the 1527 entry.

1520 Station 12 Twycross: Johnson; REED: Jameson. Mrs. Twycross has mistaken the very sprawling 'a' for 'oh'.

1542 Station 11 Twycross: Wod; REED: Wad. This is the last list in the hand of the troublesome scribe. The form of the vowel is not rounded but distinctly flat on the right side. On the other hand, it is not an 'a' form either.

The REED policy has been a conservative one that tries to determine forms from examples in the same entry wherever possible. Mrs. Twycross has brought other evidence to bear and has been prepared to accept letter forms—such as the 's' for a more probable 'r' in Berlay/Beslay—because they make larger sense. Perhaps we have both erred in our methods. Miles Newton (if it is his hand) made mistakes or was careless in his copying. REED has followed his vagaries, while Mrs. Twycross has tried to sort out the truth from his error. York is the first of the REED series and definitely not without warts. What Mrs. Twycross' work has suggested is that future REED volumes should take greater care of the names that appear. I feel we should never again print in the text a reading we are unsure of but, instead, make suggestions in footnotes or end-notes. We should also do everything we can to help our users by providing end-notes and index entries of correct variant spellings of the same name.

Ghosts will appear in every project that attempts to edit records. Perhaps what we should aim for is a text based on conservative principles but an apparatus sufficiently interpretive to prevent such ghosts living on in index entries to haunt future generations of scholars.