
The Miracle Play of "Crucifixio Cristi" in the York Cycle

Author(s): J. P. R. Wallis

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (Oct., 1917), pp. 494-495

Published by: [Modern Humanities Research Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3714836>

Accessed: 25/06/2014 01:08

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Modern Humanities Research Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Modern Language Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

midnight, at cock-crow; any hour of the day or night, as *at six, eight, ten o'clock, at the third hour*; any year of age, as *at fourteen, forty years*; any meal time, as *at dinner*; any definite day of the year, as *at New Year's, at Easter, at Christmas, at that day, at the last day*. In fact, it is this unusually common use of *at* with definite periods or points of time which makes me feel sure we may accept Chaucer's *at afterdiner, at aftersoper, at aftermete* as early examples of a similar use.

If all the assumptions of Dr Craigie regarding Ohthere are to be accepted—especially his correct charting of the whole North Atlantic—I think all must agree he could not have made an error in his statements about Ireland. Therein lies the problem, and it cannot be answered, it seems to me, either by begging the question, or by trying to brush away all that can be said on the other side.

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.

CLEVELAND, U.S.A.

THE MIRACLE PLAY OF 'CRUCIFIXIO CRISTI' IN THE YORK CYCLE.

The assignment of parts in ll. 97–108 of the York play of *Crucifixio Cristi* presents some difficulty. The passage is printed below from Miss Lucy Toulmin Smith's edition [Oxford, 1885, p. 352]. Under (A) the speakers are indicated as in the MS., under (B) as in Miss Toulmin Smith's text, and under (C) according to the present writer's suggested emendations:

(A)	(B)		(C)
i Mil.	i Mil.	Sir knyghtis, saie, howe wirke we nowe?	97. i Mil.
ii "	ii Mil.	Zis, certis, I hope I holde pis hande.	ii "
iii "	iii Mil.	And to þe boore I haue it brought,	99.
		Full boxumly with-outen bande.	
ii "	?iv Mil. ¹	Strike on þan harde, for hym þe boght.	101. i "
ii "	?i Mil. ¹	Zis, here is a stubbe will stiffely stande,	ii "
		Thurgh bones & senous it schall be soght.	103.
		This werke is well, I will warande.	
i "	ii Mil.*	Saie, sir, howe do we pore,	105. i "
		pis bargayne may not blyne.	
iii "	iii Mil.	It failis a foote and more,	107. iii "
		þe senous are so gone ynne.	108.

The mistakes in (A) are clear. In ascribing ll. 99–100 to iii^{us} *Miles* the scribe breaks a speech (ll. 98–100) plainly intended for one speaker. The error in either of ll. 101–102 is obvious. Miss Toulmin Smith allows the first error to stand, but makes changes in ll. 101, 102 and 105,

giving the grounds for them in a footnote to l. 101, 'Here the rubricator put twice ii *Miles*. As the previous order of the soldiers in speaking has been 1, 2, 3, 4, I have altered these two so as to continue that order, making what was i *Miles* at * [l. 105] to accord with it.' But the numerical order of speakers, regularly maintained up to l. 96, breaks down at l. 108, if not at l. 97, so that the basis of Miss Toulmin Smith's changes seems unstable. Reference to the play as a whole shows that the details of the Crucifixion are presented with great precision of detail, greater indeed than in any extant Miracle-play on the same theme in English. *Primus Miles* is clearly in charge of the party: he orders the other three to bring the cross (l. 78) and then stations himself at its head, whence he directs the work. *Secundus Miles* takes the right hand (ll. 81–82), *Tertius Miles* the left (l. 83) and *Quartus Miles* the legs (l. 85). I suggest that the dialogue in ll. 97–106 refers wholly to the fixing of the right hand to the cross, and is entirely between i *Miles* and ii *Miles*, ll. 107–108 being given to iii *Miles*, and referring to the left arm. My allocation of lines is given under (C). Briefly the action runs thus: the knight in charge calls the party to the work in hand (97). *Secundus Miles* takes the right hand and brings it to the 'bore' (98–100). The leader bids him fix it (101) which is done (102–104). The first knight turns to him who has charge of the left arm (iii *Miles*) and asks him how matters stand with him, who answers that the left hand is 'a foote and more' short of the 'bore' (107–108). Reading the passage in this way reveals the orderly and natural development of the action, and moreover, keeps nearer to the MS. reading than the Oxford text.

In another passage, ll. 181–184, a slight change improves the text:

ii Mil.	We twoo schall see tille aythir side,	181
	For ellis pis werke 'will wrie all wrang.	
iii Mil.	We are redy, in Gode, sirs, abide	
	And let me first his fete up fang.	184

As has been shown, iii^{us} *Miles* has charge of the left arm, and so could not utter l. 184. Moreover there is evident contradiction between the first and second halves of l. 183, which is almost surely to be divided, the words

Sirs, abide
And let me first his fete up fang

being given to iv^{us} *Miles*, who has Christ's feet in charge (cp. ll. 179–180). Lines divided between two or more speakers are common (cp. ll. 186, 188 etc.).

J. P. R. WALLIS.

LIVERPOOL.