

REVIEWS.

L'ANNÉE SOCIOLOGIQUE, publiée sous la direction de Émile Durkheim, Professeur de Sociologie à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Bordeaux. Quatrième Année (1899-1900). Paris: Félix Alcan. 1901.

THE high standard of learning and criticism set up by Professor Durkheim and his collaborators in the first year's issue of *L'Année Sociologique* has been fully maintained, though only one of the "Mémoires Originaux" comprised in the fourth volume is directly interesting to students of folklore. The subject of sociology is a wide one; and students of the folklore side have no ground for complaint that other aspects than that in which they are specially interested are also studied here. The second part of the volume contains, among other things, the best annual bibliography of folklore with which I am acquainted; and critical analyses of most of the important books and articles in periodicals are also supplied.

The "Mémoire" with which we are immediately concerned is that by M. Bouglé on Caste. The author sets himself to inquire, first, whether Caste is a phenomenon peculiar to India, or whether it is universal; and, secondly, what are the relations between it and analogous social forms, such as the guild, the clan, the class. He begins by citing the Abbé Dubois, Professor Max Müller, Mr. W. Crooke, and other authorities who insist on the analogy between Caste and the social institutions and class hatreds of other countries. In opposition to them he sets the opinions of M. Senart and Mr. Risley, for whom Caste is, at least in its developments, purely Indian. To decide between these two views it is necessary to define accurately what is meant by Caste. He decides that Caste is distinguished by three characteristics: mutual repulsion, a hierarchy of class privileges and responsibilities, and hereditary specialisation. Mutual repulsion of castes implies that within the caste men are drawn together, and that the caste is endogamous. Hereditary specialisation means that the occupations of the parents descend to the children, and are

obligatory upon them. Such occupations entail a certain rank. They entail also on the one hand monopoly, and on the other, obligations towards other Castes and occupations. Status is inexorably determined from father to son by Caste. Heredity is of the essence of the system, and it is impossible to escape from it.

Caste as thus defined is found only in India. But this is not to say that there are not elsewhere elements and scattered traits of it. The exclusiveness of classes and coteries in western society, the clergy with their vast claims and close corporate selfishness, the feudal system, all betray in various ways traces of the spirit of Caste. In none of them, however, is the rule of Caste complete. The exclusiveness of classes and coteries is in nowise consecrated by law, and in practice is breached in a thousand places. Clerical succession is not perpetuated by heredity. The feudal system was erected not on an original ancestral or social distinction, but on the relation of the individual to the land. This might change. Throughout the Middle Age, when feudalism reigned, it did change often. The tendency of the system was not to cut society up into small, compact, mutually repellent, groups; it was individualist. Even ancient Egyptian society, which of all known societies bears most resemblance to that created by Caste, does not seem in the light of recent discoveries to be a case of perfect analogy. Hereditary specialisation, if usual, was not absolute; and the social hierarchy was far from being petrified. From early times examples are found of men rising by talents or by favour from one rank of life to another. The king always had it in his power to upset the ordinary course of things. As a rule the transmission of land and of titles was hereditary; but in the feudalism of Egypt, investiture by Pharaoh was an indispensable condition to the status of baron. Pharaoh, by granting lands or appointing to office, could create nobles. Moreover, so far from the history of the Egyptian civilisation revealing that mutual repugnance of classes which has proved the political and social bane of India, nothing is more certain than that Egypt is one of those countries where the administrative organisation most quickly effaced the spontaneous divisions of the population. The necessities of the country demanded a strong central government, with efficient and cohesive organisation, which could never have been attained under the rule of Caste, and in fact was contrary to its spirit.

In India, on the other hand, the reign of Caste was opposed neither by a strong monarchy nor by a strong democracy. Nowhere is there greater specialisation. Nowhere are the distinctions so wide. Nowhere do they entail so much either of contempt or of respect. Every observer is struck by the fact that the force which animates the entire system is one of repulsion. This it is which maintains the isolation of the different groups. In the eyes of an orthodox Hindu every caste but his own is in a sense impure. It is impossible of course for men of different castes entirely to avoid coming into contact with one another; but there are certain acts which, more than others, imply contamination, that of eating, for example. The scruples in this respect are naturally more lively in the higher castes, but they pervade the whole of Indian society from the top to the bottom. In time of famine, a Santal would rather die than touch food prepared by Brahmans. To eat food prohibited by one's caste is to become an outcast. Still higher barriers prevent the intermarriage of caste and caste, in spite of the exceptions introduced by the custom called by Mr. Risley "hypergamy," and by that of the Jâts, noted by Mr. Crooke. Jâts frequently marry girls of low caste. But girls chosen for this purpose are first of all made to pass for maidens of their own stock. This very fiction is thus a testimony to the potency of Caste.

Anthropometry shows that in spite of prohibitions the mixture of blood has in fact been very great. Yet it remains true that the separatist tendency is inherent in Indian society; and the best proof is the multiplicity of the groups into which it is divided. The witness of the sacred books as to the number of castes in antiquity is not to be trusted. Mann declares there are only four castes—Brahmans, Kshatriyas, Vaisyas, and Sudras; but there are indications of a much larger number even in those times. An examination of Buddhist and other ancient literature yields the same results. Moreover, of the four castes just named, three have practically disappeared, for the pretensions of the Rajputs, who claim to represent the Kshatriyas, are manifestly false. The Brahmans are the only caste which retains any semblance of continued existence, and even they are divided up into a crowd of castes, all closed one against another. The fact is that the castes have to be reckoned not by the unit but by the thousand.

A long and interesting argument follows, to show that Caste has received, not its origin, but its special orientation, from industry; that a number of economic causes, similar to those which produced the guild in Mediæval Europe, have been operating from time immemorial in India, to unite together all whose occupation was the same. It is pointed out that the guilds were organised like a large family with common worship, sacrifices, feasts, and burial. The form which they then took was not indeed economic. It was determined by tradition, and was due to the influence of religion. Powerful, however, as was the guild, it never obtained over its members the absolute empire of Caste. If it be impossible to explain all the peculiarities of the guild from economic causes, *à fortiori* it will be impossible thus to explain all the peculiarities of the caste system. The survivals of family religion, not the exigencies of industry, are responsible for the features of resemblance between the guild and the caste. The guild was organised like a family, or rather perhaps like a clan. But it was never pretended that its members, though they regarded one another as brethren, were literally akin. The caste, on the other hand, is founded on the clan. Not that the members are in reality consanguine. According to primitive ideas actual consanguinity is not necessary to kinship. It often seems to be derived from union in one cult, from simple identity of name, or even from dwelling together in one place. All that is necessary is the sentiment of relationship. It is on this sentiment of relationship, and not on actual blood-kinship, that the caste is founded.

The weak spot in the theory which derives the caste from the clan is, that the caste is endogamous while the clan is usually exogamous. M. Bouglé is conscious of the difficulty, and he endeavours to meet it by arguing that, strictly speaking, it is the family only that is exogamous. The *gens*, like the *gotra* of India, is exogamous. But the caste is an assemblage of *gotras*, as the clan and the tribe are an assemblage of several families or *gentes*. They are thus endogamous, while the families, the *gotras*, are exogamous. This is a question to some extent of terminology. But M. Bouglé seems not to have a very clear notion of clan-organisation, or of the very wide differences of custom in respect to marriage characteristic of savages, even within comparatively limited districts. And he expressly declines to determine whether the true germ of the clan is to be found in the clan or in the

tribe, on the ground that the different types of primitive society are not yet clearly enough defined for this purpose. The main point is, he says, that the caste is animated by the spirit of these primitive (by which he means savage) societies, and that the religious scruples and the taboos of all sorts which lead these savage societies to repel one another, explain, in a natural manner, such customs as operate to-day in India to isolate the castes.

The domination of archaic exclusiveness may thus prevent the castes from mingling and producing a firmly welded society: it does not explain the hierarchy of castes. The chief riddle after all is, why the Brahmans are at the top? Nor is it a difficult riddle to read. Given the hereditary priest, given the preternatural seriousness with which he takes himself, as all priests do, and the exaggerated and, according to our view, topsy-turvy value he sets on ceremonial purity, given savage ideas on the nature of sacrifice and the qualities of the officiant, leading to an elaboration of rite surpassing that of most other peoples—given all these, and the wonder would be if, among an ignorant people largely preoccupied with religious matters, the Brahman did *not* “come out on top.”

The rule of Caste, as thus defined by M. Bouglé, bears all its fruit only in India. Its roots, however, are to be found in savage society everywhere. When society attains a certain degree of civilisation, Caste begins to bud. But everywhere else than in India various causes have combined to stunt its development and to cause its decay. India alone has suffered a sort of arrested sociological development. What has elsewhere dissolved she has ossified. Where other peoples have unified, mobilised, levelled, she has continued to divide, to specialise, to hierarchise. To what concurrence of circumstances this special direction of Hindu civilisation is due, what influences, ethnic or telluric, and what historical occurrences, have determined this social evolution, the author does not venture to say. Science has as yet no answer for these questions.

M. Bouglé's is thus a very interesting article. It is lucid and judicial, and if not so important as some of its predecessors, it will help to clear the minds of students and prepare the way for further inquiries.

E. SIDNEY HARTLAND.

THE LEGEND OF SIR LANCELOT DU LAC. By JESSIE L. WESTON.
(Grimm Library, vol. xii.) D. NUTT. 1901.

THE able study of the Gawain legend which appeared a few years ago from the pen of Miss Weston, should insure among all interested in Arthurian criticism an eager welcome for the present volume, in which the author has made bold to attack what is, alike from its intrinsically complex nature and from the comparative inaccessibility of some of the texts, perhaps the most formidable of the branches of Arthurian romance. The present study may at once and unhesitatingly be pronounced fully worthy of the wide knowledge and sound critical instinct of its author, and the results attained are none the less important from the fact that they are necessarily in many cases of a tentative character. That on certain points it is impossible to speak with any attempt at finality Miss Weston fully recognises. "Until a critical text [of the *Lancelot*] based on a comparison of *all* the available versions is in our hands, it will be quite impossible to do more than form a tentative hypothesis, or advance a guarded suggestion as to the gradual growth and formation of the completed legend." This is alike modest and critically sound, and it would be an admirable thing were writers on the Arthurian romances generally to adopt an equally guarded attitude. But if in the very nature of the case it is impossible to arrive at results which shall have the quality of finality, there is yet room for good work in the way of clearing the ground and presenting in orderly form such evidence as is at present available, and much good work of this nature will be found in Miss Weston's book.

It is impossible here to do more than pass in review the general results, and call attention to a few points which appear for one reason or another to possess particular importance. In the course of doing so I shall, however, I believe, be able to bring to bear on the question of the relation of the texts of the prose *Lancelot* some items of evidence which have somewhat unaccountably escaped the attention of the author.

The extant literature dealing with *Lancelot* may be roughly divided into two classes: on the one hand the vast compilation known as the prose *Lancelot*, consisting of the two parts of the *Lancelot* proper, the *Queste* and the *Mort Artur*; on the other, various smaller romances or independent *lais* which sometimes

present a very different legend from that of the great cyclic compilation. Of these two divisions, the former may be held to be of demonstrably late origin, the distinctive features being unknown to earlier Arthurian tradition; though it is probable that some of the other cyclic romances, such as the *Merlin* and the *Grand S. Graal*, have been at least worked over with a view to making them agree with the *Lancelot*. The independent romances offer a rather more hopeful field of investigation as regards the original legend, though the inquiry still presents very considerable difficulties.

The first romance examined by Miss Weston is the *Lanzelet* of Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, a work the exact date of which it is impossible to fix, but which probably belongs to the opening years of the thirteenth century, and is consequently later than Chrestien de Troyes. It is, however, highly probable, if not exactly provable, that the tradition represented is as a whole earlier than that of any other romance dealing with the hero, since the story of his *liaison* with Guenevere, which later obtained such universal popularity, is wholly unknown. The poem contains the *enfances* of the hero in a primitive though probably not original form, followed by a variety of adventures relating to his later life which in all probability represent the working over of a number of independent *lais* so as to form something of a biographical romance. It is very doubtful whether any of these *lais* were originally connected with Lancelot at all; in any case they form a highly incongruous whole, and involve the preposterous supposition that the hero was at least three, probably four, times married, one of the ceremonies taking place after his union with the lady who retains the position of wife at the end of the poem. The portion dealing with the *enfances* is important, since Miss Weston adduces strong reasons for supposing that in it we find the real aboriginal germ of the Lancelot legend. Throughout Arthurian tradition—and unlike other legends, we have no literary remains of the Lancelot legend in the stage before it became connected with the court of Arthur—Lancelot remains Lancelot *du Lac*. It is the one attribute which never varies, and the one feature common to all versions of the *enfances* is his residence in the kingdom of the mysterious Lady of the Lake. In Ulrich's poem the lady is represented as a water fairy (*mer-seine*), and her domain is the land of maidens, the *Maide-lant*. This has the appearance of an original or at least a primitive trait, but the

character of the Lady of the Lake is perhaps the most puzzling of the whole cycle, and the probability of the influence of Gawain's Castle of Maidens warns the critic to be careful. In its origin there is a good reason to believe that the land in question was an other-world kingdom, and Miss Weston puts forward the suggestion that Lancelot may in the first instance have been the lover of its queen, a connection which, supposing its existence and survival, may have recommended him to fill the rôle of lover to Guenevere. One of the later portions of the poem relates how, when a certain King Valerín or Falerín lays claim to Guenevere, he is challenged and defeated by Lanzelet; when, however, he afterwards carries off the queen, Lanzelet is by no means particularly instrumental in recovering her; unless indeed one could identify the mysterious Malduz, the magician who helps to that end, with the other magician Mâbûz, the son of the Lady of the Lake, whom Lanzelet had previously benefited. This incident has an obvious likeness to the Meleagant adventure, though the similarity with that related in the *Tristan* (a character known to Ulrich) bids us again beware how we consider it as in any way particularly connected with Lancelot. On the other hand, it is rather difficult altogether to agree with Miss Weston, who in her anxiety to show that Ulrich knew nothing of the distinctive *liaison motif*, endeavours to minimise Lanzelet's share in the rescue.

The next romance to be examined is an episode, only known as occurring in the Dutch *Lancelot*, but which there can be little doubt represents some French *lai* of an episodic character. Miss Weston calls it the *Cerf au pied blanc*, and points out that in it we find the thoroughly 'Arthurised' form of the well-known *lai* of *Tyolet*, which she regards with great plausibility as a transformation legend; while the special form which the adventure assumes involves the widely-diffused 'False Claimant' *motif*, which is well known from the *Tristan*, and actually occurs a second time in the Dutch compilation, namely in the Morien adventure. In any case the *Cerf au pied blanc* represents a late and debased version, and the existence of the *lai* enables us to state definitely what we might in any case have surmised with probability, namely, that the adventure cannot have formed any part of the original Lancelot tradition.

Next comes Chrestien de Troyes and his *Chevalier de la Charrette*, the earliest text which knows anything of the love of

the hero for the wife of his lord. The manner in which this romance is regarded will depend largely upon the view taken of Chrestien's methods of authorship generally; and in the fifth chapter Miss Weston descends into the arena of controversial criticism on the question of the relation of that writer's work to his sources, and attacks the theory advocated by Chrestien's most recent editor, Professor Foerster; a theory which has met with a good deal of favour among German scholars, namely that which would regard Chrestien as largely an original author and place the genesis of the *romantic* as opposed to the *historical* Arthurian tradition on continental ground. Miss Weston enters into a careful examination of the evidence of names and places with respect to the light they throw upon the locality of *cristalisation*, and endeavours to show the impossibility of regarding Chrestien's work as original, owing to the marked folklore features it contains; a line of investigation which has only recently been applied to the legends, and which promises some interesting results. A good deal of clear logic, too, is brought to bear on some of the arguments of the advocates of the 'continental' theory, in particular Professor Foerster's; with a total result that a very fair case is made out for the insular origin of most of the romances refashioned by the French poet.

We now pass to the great prose *Lancelot*. As already stated, Miss Weston points out that a thorough investigation of the legend is impossible until the Herculean task of preparing a critical edition of this compilation, involving the comparison of innumerable and widely-scattered MSS. and printed editions, has been undertaken and brought to a satisfactory conclusion. At present it is only possible to treat detached sections of the story, and these only tentatively—a general criticism is out of the question. The *enfances*, the Guenevere *liaison*, and the Grail adventure, are the points chosen for special study by Miss Weston. The second of these possesses the most general interest, and is dealt with in a singularly able chapter. The following points seem established as surely as the nature of the evidence available in such cases admits. In the first place, the loves of Lancelot and Guenevere form part neither of the original Arthur nor the original Lancelot legends. Secondly, Lancelot does not, as Miss Weston in her earlier work supposed, take over the *rôle* previously belonging to Mordred. Thirdly, the story appears to have been

introduced in accordance with the taste of contemporary court life, and to have been developed under the influence of the popular Tristram legend, which in its turn was influenced by the *Lancelot*. The chief difficulty is to find any reason for Lancelot being selected for the post of lover, and on this point it is only possible to offer a more or less plausible conjecture.

Leaving on one side the Melwas-Meleagant abduction episode, rightly regarded as an other-world rescue tale, Miss Weston gives the following sequence among Guenevere's lovers. Original lover Gawain, replaced by Mordred, probably created for the purpose when the position was regarded as inconsistent with Gawain's high reputation as a knight. Later, the queen is represented as repulsing the advances of Mordred, her character undergoing the same process of clearing as Gawain's. Lastly comes the introduction of the Lancelot *motif*, due to social conditions, and to the popularity of the *Tristan*. Miss Weston also suggests that to the intermediate whitewashing stage belongs the introduction of that mysterious character, the 'false Guenevere,' but the evidence available is of far too scanty a nature to allow of much importance being attached to the suggestion. With regard to the position ascribed to Gawain, it also behoves us to be cautious. He is essentially a folklore character, and it is quite possible that he may represent a Cuchulinn-Diarmid-Conlaoch hero, and as such belong to the family of the Arician priest; but even if the two characters are not exactly incompatible, it is not very easy to see how this would come to be combined with the position of sun-hero ascribed to him in Miss Weston's former study.

We pass on to the very intricate subject of *Queste* redactions, and at once find ourselves in a maze of hypothesis—for the most part, it must be admitted, *not* of Miss Weston's devising. The general transition from a Perceval to a Galahad *Queste* has of course been long recognised, but the present author brings forward strong reasons for supposing the existence of a Perceval-Lancelot *Queste* intermediate between the two. One point on which Miss Weston very rightly insists is the absolute futility of the Galahad Quest, *quâ* quest, and consequently the necessity of regarding it as a mere branch of the legend of Lancelot, for whose glorification alone it was composed. It *can* only have existed in the cyclic form, although its aggressively conventual tone stamps it as the work of a different hand from the *Lancelot* proper and the *Mort Artur*.

The remainder of the volume is devoted to a detailed comparison of the various versions of the great cyclic romance of Lancelot, including as it does nearly the whole of the later history of Arthur and the Round Table. This is important as being the first attempt at a scientific examination of the legend; and the results being of a less hypothetical character than those of the other portions of the volume, they deserve somewhat closer consideration in this place. The basis of comparison is afforded by the following texts: first, the Dutch *Lancelot*, an analysis of which is also given in the appendix (referred to as D. L.); secondly, the Lenoire edition printed at Paris in 1533, preserved in the Bodleian, and unknown to Dr. Sommer (referred to as 1533); thirdly, Dr. Sommer's analysis of the prose Lancelot founded on the edition of 1513, said by him to correspond with the versions contained in the twelve MSS. and two other printed editions in the British Museum, and compared with Malory's text in the third volume of his edition of the *Morte d'Arthur* (S.); fourthly, the *Queste* edited by Dr. Furnival for the Roxburghe Club from MS. Royal 14 E iii. (Q.); fifthly, Malory's *Morte d'Arthur* (M.); and sixthly, the Welsh *Queste* in the Rev. R. Williams' translation (W.).

At the outset Miss Weston announces what she conceives to be the result attained by this comparison. "The point I desire to prove is that the versions D. L. and 1533 represent a text radically different from that consulted by Dr. Sommer, and that, in conjunction with Malory, they may be held to represent a family of MSS. hitherto unregarded or unsuspected." Thus it appears that the only knowledge Miss Weston possesses of the text represented by Dr. Sommer's analysis, and from which, according to him, the twelve Museum MSS. and other printed editions *differ in "details of style and phraseology" only*, is derived from the Doctor's analysis itself. However, a few pages further on Miss Weston writes, "I assume throughout that Dr. Sommer's summary correctly represents his text, but I admit that I have my doubts on this point; certainly in the *Queste* section he gives some most mistaken readings." One would have thought that under the circumstances Miss Weston would have found it worth while to check Dr. Sommer's analysis by a few test-references to such an accessible work as the 1513 *Lancelot*; had she done so the result might well have surprised her. What is the position as represented by her comparison? We find, as above stated, a general agreement between D. L., 1533, and M., as against the twelve MSS. and

three printed editions in the British Museum examined by Dr. Sommer. Now, that a version, or more properly a type, of text of such wide diffusion as to underlie three texts in three different languages, between which there is no external hint of connection and each of which introduces matter not found in the other two—that such a version should be represented by no single text among the fifteen preserved at the Museum is in itself all but an impossibility, and should have at once aroused suspicion. Having had experience for my own part of the singular blunders of which Dr. Sommer was capable in critical work unconnected with Arthurian romance, I determined to consult some of the editions and MSS. which he claimed to have examined, and very soon became convinced that for purposes of comparison his analysis was worse than useless. Here, in the first place, are a few of the results obtained by bringing that analysis alongside of his original of 1513. It must be understood that the comparison was only made as regards certain test points; the results obtained show that further comparison would be waste of time, the whole work requires doing afresh. Thus at the top of page 181 of Dr. Sommer's *Studies* we read of “forty ‘glaives,’ forty-five shields, and five spears.” Miss Weston notes (p. 152) that D. L. speaks of “lx. (? xl.) shields and helmets and xl. swords”, 1533 of “forty-five helmets, forty-five swords, and more than forty-five shields.” Malory merely mentions “many fayre sheldes.” Now will any serious reader believe me when I say that the text of 1513, that which Dr. Sommer is supposed to be representing, reads “plus de quarante et cinq glaives & plus de quarâte & cinq escus et plus de quarante & cinq heaulmes & quarâte et cinq espees”? Again (p. 153), Miss Weston points out that both D. L. and 1533 differ from S. (p. 183) in saying that it was the Queen and not the King of Soresan who had seized the lands of the daughter of the Duke of Rochedon. Here again Dr. Sommer has misrepresented his original, which distinctly speaks of the queen. On p. 154 Miss Weston remarks that when Lancelot and his companions separate in search of Hector and Lionel there were seven knights in the company and not six as S. represents. This is true; but here, however, Dr. Sommer is merely following the 1513 text which says ‘six.’ On p. 187 of the *Studies*, on the other hand, Dr. Sommer asserts that the 1513 text agrees with Malory in saying that Lancelot having no horse rides off on that

of Gaheret after the slaying of Turquyne. This is incorrect; 1513 agrees with D. L. and 1533 as against M., in making Lancelot ride off on his own horse, no mention being made of Gaheret's. Again, on the same page Dr. Sommer's analysis is, as Miss Weston suspects (p. 154), a "hasty summary which does not represent the text." S. has, "the knights exchange Terriquen's castle for horses, though not very good ones." Here D. L. evidently has an abridged version which may be left out of account. 1533 "says that 'Keux du Parc' has a 'brother' prisoner: delighted at his safety he gives them all horses, very good to Arthur's knights, not so good to the others. Out of gratitude they offer him the castle." This really agrees with 1513, in which 'Ireu (an evident misprint for Keu) du parc,' whose brother had been prisoner "si fist venir a chascun cheualier ung cheual de la maison du roy artus bon & fort & donna aux aultres des cheuaulx, mais ilz nestoyent point si tres bons," after which Arthur's knights give him the castle in guerdon. Slightly different is the text presented by MS. Royal 19 C xiii.: "si fist uenir à ceaus qui estoient de la meson lo roi artur cheuax & armes & il li doñent p lō comun conteil ceu chastel en geredon de ceu seruise qui estoit beaus & forz." The reading of this MS. is very interesting in another way. The 'Keux du Parc' appears in D. L. as 'Die grave van den Pale,' and Miss Weston conjectures that in *Keux* we should see some equivalent to *grave* (= count). Now this MS. verifies her conjecture and puts the matter beyond doubt by reading "li qñs (*i.e.* quens) deu parc." It may be mentioned incidentally that Dr. Sommer finding himself confronted by the obviously corrupt *Ireu* of 1513, omitted all mention of the name.

To pass to another section of the work, namely, the *Mort Artur*. On p. 223 of the *Studies*, Dr. Sommer says that at the tournament at Winchester "The people think the two knights cannot be the sons of the lord of the castle of 'escalot.'" Miss Weston (p. 195) remarks that in D. L. and 1533 it is Gawain who doubts. With this agree both 1513 and MS. Royal 14 E iii., the magnificent illuminated MS. (the *Quest* section of which was edited by Dr. Furnival), of which the *Mort Artur* section is unfortunately imperfect. Lower down on the same page S. says that Gawain meets a wounded knight: 1513, however, describes the knight as "mort nouuellement," which agrees with 1533. With regard to the words of Arthur a few lines later, "it was not the first time he took trouble

without result," Miss Weston points out that 1533 and D. L. add "through that knight." The text of 1513 reads, "pas la premiere peine que vous *en* auez eue," which comes to the same thing. On p. 228 of the *Studies* occurs an important passage concerning the manner in which Lancelot hears of Guenevere's danger from Madoc de la Porte. According to S., Lancelot meets a knight who informs him of the situation. "A day after this conversation Lancelot meets Hector by chance, and reveals his intention of going to Kamalot." This is pure fiction on Dr. Sommer's part. The edition of 1513 has "et quant le cheualier fust eslognie de luy il regarde entrauers et vit uenir ung cheualier arme et lancelot la deuisa congneut tantost que cestoit hector du maris son frere;" it is also Hector, not Lancelot, who "reveals his intention of going to Kamalot." With 1513 and 1533 agrees MS. Add. 17443. MS. Royal 14 E iii. on the other hand says, "mais il not gaires cheuauchie qnt il en contra boort et hector. & ii. escuiers auoec eus." They tell him the news and he says he already knows it. This agrees with D. L. as summarised by Miss Weston (p. 198); a noteworthy point, considering the general agreement reported between 1533 and D. L. as against the *Quest* section of the MS. edited by Dr. Furnival. On p. 255 of the *Studies* occurs, however, the most astounding and damning of Dr. Sommer's blunders. He here makes Lancelot send messengers to King Ban of Benoyc. As Miss Weston points out (p. 200), King Ban (Lancelot's father) had died long before, and D. L. and 1533 have "the barons of Benoyc." By this time it may *not* surprise readers to learn that the edition of 1513 (that, remember, summarised by Dr. Sommer), reads "Quât lancelot entendit ces nouuelles il print ung messaige et enuoya au royaume de benoic & manda a ses barons que ils garnissent les chasteaulx," &c. ! With this, MS. Royal 14 E iii. agrees, and breaks off abruptly a few columns further on. Is it necessary to quote further instances? I will only refer to one or two more particularly blatant errors. On page 256, at the bottom, S. asserts that 1513 agrees with M. in making Boors overthrow Arthur. It does nothing of the kind; it agrees with 1533 and P. L. in ascribing the feat to Hector. Finally, on the opposite page, S. makes 'Ector' offer to fight Gawain, while 1513 again agrees with the other versions in ascribing the challenge to Boors!

This then is the famed German Criticism, this is the kind of investigation on which other critics, such as Professor Foerster, possessed of no first-hand knowledge, rely, when they announce that "Der überall seine Quellen und zwar nur seine Quellen und obendrein noch treu wiedergebende Malory ist ein Phantasiegeschöpf der Walliser und Engländer"! German scholarship has an honoured name the world over; how many of its followers of to-day, one begins to wonder, are going to make it their life's work to trail that name in the dust?

The result of the inquiry has so far been to make the divergence between the texts of 1513 and 1533 far less than Miss Weston, relying on Dr. Sommer's analysis, was led to believe. It must not, however, be supposed that the divergence does not exist, or even that it is of minor importance. For instance, the note in 1533 recorded by Miss Weston (p. 160), "Ainsi prend fin le premier volume," &c., finds no parallel at this point in 1513, while in the account of Elayne's leaving the court (Sommer, p. 196; Weston, p. 161) 1513 and M. agree in making Arthur escort her, as against D. L. and 1533, in which he does not, and which latter at this point apparently have the support of MS. Royal 19 C xiii.

Nor must it be supposed that the various MSS. agree in any constant or consistent manner with either of the printed texts. There are twelve MSS. in the British Museum which represent either the whole or parts of the 1513 text. Of these Dr. Sommer gives a table showing the correspondences, which he is careful to inform us was set up in type from the original drawn by himself. This is well, and the result is useful, only he might certainly have drawn it with greater care. Thus in the numbers of the various books of Malory given at the top of the table, "Book xviii." is apparently a misprint for "Book xix;," Book xi., chapters 1-3, should be inserted between the two portions of Book vi. to correspond to folios 313-315 (1513, vol. ii., folios 105-107), as appears from page 190 (note) of the *Studies*; MS. Royal 14 E iii. should be marked as breaking off in the middle of the *Mort Artur*, and the dotted lines between volumes i. and ii. of the 1513 edition should be drawn at folio 208, not about folio 195.

I do not pretend to have examined all these MSS., but one or two points will make it clear what may be expected from a careful comparison. It will be noticed that there are two MSS., Royal

14 E iii. and Add. 17443, which correspond to the *Quest* and *Mort* only. These appear to agree closely together, and I have already quoted readings from them. I will only add here that they usually agree with 1513 and 1533 in points where D. L. differs, and also against M., as where (Sommer, p. 230) they and 1513 give Guenevere forty days' respite against M.'s fifteen. In MS. Add. 17443, however, there is an interesting variation, the exact bearing of which I leave to more expert students than myself to determine. Dr. Sommer notes on p. 209, that in 1513 there is a contradiction, Galahad being spoken of as the son of "la fille le roy pescheoure" and "la fille au roi pelles" within the compass of a few lines. The MS. in question reads "la fille au riche roi pescheor" in *both* cases, which, however, is such an obvious correction that it by no means makes it certain that the printed text is not really the more original.

A yet more interesting MS. is Royal 19 C xiii., which covers the whole of the prose *Lancelot* text, though in parts it appears to offer a very condensed version. Thus when Lancelot leaves the castle of Turquyne, according to 1513 and 1533, "si virent venir troi varletz qui amenoiēt trois sommiers chargez de venoison," while M. and D. L. agree in speaking of "a foster with four horses lade with fatte veneson." Here the MS. merely says, "si uoiet uenir .iii. roncins chargez de uenoison." Again, when Arthur announces the tournament at Winchester, (Sommer, p. 195), the MS. makes no mention of the news spreading to Scotland, Ireland, &c., though a few lines further down it clears up a confusion in M. We there read how Elayne took with her twenty knights and ten ladies "to the nombre of an hondred horses," while 1513 merely speaks of ladies and damsels to the number of eighty. The MS. is unfortunately a very difficult one to read, but it certainly adds "& seriāz (*i.e.* serjants) asez," together with some hieroglyphics which I interpret to mean "et c. cheuaux." Later on (Sommer, p. 201, Weston, p. 163) we find the MS. agreeing with D. L. and M. as against 1513 and 1533 in making Lancelot strike the shield as if *ten* and not *twelve* knights did it, and further down on the same page of the *Studies*, where D. L. differs from 1513 and 1533 in representing Lancelot as chained by the ankles and not feet and hands, the MS. speaks of "petiz aneaul es jambes" only.

Thus it appears that the theory of the opposing groups of D. L.

1533, and M. on the one hand, and all the B. M. texts on the other, is a pure phantasm, the result of imperfect comparison and careless analysis on Dr. Sommer's part. My own impression is that the MSS. and printed editions alike are full of the most puzzling cross links which it will take a vast deal of labour and care to unravel.

So far then as concerns the acceptance of the results arrived at by Miss Weston in the ninth and eleventh chapters of her study (for the tenth she luckily had Dr. Furnival's edition of the *Queste*), caution will be needed. Of her work as a whole, as a piece of patient, careful, and honest investigation, it is not easy to speak too highly, and such is the value of these qualifications in all literary inquiry, that it is impossible not to regret that the author should have allowed herself to be misled in an important section of her work, when a very few hours spent in examining the British Museum texts would have revealed to her the true character and value of Dr. Sommer's analysis.

WALTER W. GREG.

STORIES OF THE HIGH-PRIESTS OF MEMPHIS. By F. LI. GRIFFITH.
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1900.

MR. GRIFFITH'S handsomely got-up book will interest two classes of readers. One is the philologist, the other is the folklorist. For the one, there are the best translations yet produced of two demotic Egyptian texts; for the other, fragments of the ancient folklore of Egypt. Both "stories" relate to Setne Khamuas, the priestly son of Ramses II., whose later fame rested on his supposed magical knowledge and powers. The first of them is contained in a papyrus which was first edited and translated by Brugsch, the second is written on the back of two Greek documents which are dated in the seventh year of the Emperor Claudius (A.D. 46-47), and has not been published before.

The first tale describes the efforts of Khamuas to get possession of a magic book which gave the owner power over the whole universe. It had been written by Thoth himself, and had been stolen from its original resting-place by a certain Ne-nefer-ka-Ptah, the son of an early Pharaoh, who had in consequence been drowned in the Nile along with his wife Ahure and only child.

The ghost of Ahure endeavours to dissuade Khamuas from following the example of her husband by relating his disastrous fate. All was in vain, however, and Khamuas succeeded in identifying and entering the tomb of Ne-nefer-ka-Ptah ; but the ghost of the latter refused to give up the book unless Khamuas won it from him at a game of draughts. But so far from doing this, Khamuas lost game after game and found himself in consequence sinking into the ground "up to his ears." From this perilous situation he was rescued by his brother, who brought him the "amulets of Ptah" and his books of magic.

After this Khamuas carried away his prize in triumph. But a terrible misfortune soon overtook him. The ghost of Ne-nefer-ka-Ptah assumed the form of a beautiful girl with whom Khamuas fell in love. At her bidding he gave her all his possessions and put his children to death. Then suddenly she vanished, and behold, it was all a dream. But Khamuas was lying naked on the ground in the presence of Pharaoh and his court.

The second tale records how "Setme" Khamuas had a son whom he called Si-Osiri ("the son of Osiris"). The son grew rapidly in wisdom and the knowledge of magic. When he was still but a child he transported his father to Hades in order that he might see there the rich and the wicked tormented, while the virtuous poor were rewarded for their deeds.

When Si-Osiri was twelve years old he was wiser than the wisest of the scribes. Then there arrived an Ethiopian magician with the object of humbling Egypt. Si-Osiri, however, read the writing that was within his unopened letter, which described the contests in magic that had been carried on in old days between the magicians of Egypt and Ethiopia. Of the three Ethiopian magicians the most formidable had been "Hor the son of the Negress." But he was defeated by the Egyptian Hor the son of Pa-neshe, when the final struggle took place between them in the presence of the Pharaoh, and among other miracles the Ethiopian had caused a thick darkness to overspread the land. Eventually "Hor the son of the Negress" engaged not to come again to Egypt for 1,500 years.

The fifteen hundred years were now fulfilled, and the Ethiopian messenger was "the son of the Negress" himself. As soon as his real character was unmasked he was destroyed by magical fire, and then Si-Osiri revealed himself as a re-incarnation of Hor

the son of Pa-neshe, who had been allowed by Osiris to return to this earth in order to overthrow the designs of the Ethiopian enemy. The revelation having been made, Si-Osiri disappeared from view and went back once more to Hades.

Setne or Setme is a priestly title, the old Egyptian *Sem*, and Mr. Griffith suggests that we may see in it the name of Sethôs, who, according to Herodotus, defeated the army of Sennacherib with the help of the mice. If, however, we are to identify Sethôs with a prince of the 19th dynasty, it would be simpler to make him Seti, the feeble grandson of Ramses II. More attractive are the parallelisms that have been pointed out between certain incidents in the story of Si-Osiri and passages in the Old and New Testaments. The account of the rich and the poor man and their respective fates in the next world curiously resembles the parable of Dives and Lazarus, and the contest between Si-Osiri and the Ethiopian sorcerers reminds us of that between Moses and the Egyptian magicians. We know from the reference to Jannes and Jambres in 2 Tim. iii. 8, 9 that a similar story must have been current among the Jews before the time of St. Paul. That the Hebrew narrative of the Exodus was not unknown to the writer of the Egyptian tale is clear, not only from the mention of the plague of darkness which was brought upon Egypt by the sorceries of the Ethiopian, but still more from the words put into the mouth of Si-Osiri: "Ho, thou impious Ethiopian, art thou not Hor the son of the Negress whom I saved in the reeds (?) of Ra, as well as thy companion of Ethiopia that was with thee, when ye were drowning in the water, being cast down from upon the hill on the east of On?" Long before the reign of the Emperor Claudius a large population of Jews had settled in Egypt, some of them being established as far south as Assuân, and the Greek language which they used enabled any educated Egyptian who chose to become acquainted with their literature. It is generally recognised that the parable of Dives and Lazarus is derived from Jewish sources. As for the assertion that when Si-Osiri was twelve years of age his wisdom already exceeded that of the most learned scribes, little can be inferred from it. Twelve is the age at which the Oriental boy begins to ripen into manhood, and it is therefore the period of life at which he would naturally be considered first fit to associate and argue with older men. The doctrine of re-incarnation was probably derived from India; it

differs essentially from the old Egyptian belief in the power of the soul, or indeed of the magician himself, to assume other forms. Re-birth was an Indian and not an Egyptian idea.

A. H. SAYCE.

DE DIIS IN LOCIS EDITIS CULTIS APUD GRÆCOS. Casparus
Albers. Zutphaniæ, W. J. Thieme & Cie., 1901.

LIKE Dr. de Visser, whose thesis on the Greek gods having other forms than human was noticed in these pages a few months ago, Dr. Albers has recognised the validity of the anthropological method of approaching questions relating to mythology and religion, and has chosen for his thesis for the degree of doctor a similar subject. The custom of worshipping in high places is very widespread. Dr. von Andrian in his work, *Der Höhencultus Asiatischer und Europäischer Völker*, treated of the cult of high places among many peoples, but he unaccountably neglected among European peoples the Greeks and Romans. Though Beer afterwards attempted to fill the gap thus left, he did so in a perfunctory manner. Dr. Albers, therefore, found the material practically untouched, and he determined to devote his inquiries to the Greek divinities, using the Roman customs merely by way of illustration. In a few words, before plunging into his theme, he repudiates the interpretation of the myths as humanisations of the story of the heavens, of day and night, summer and winter, tempest and sunshine, and the narrow school of Indo-Germanic scholars who wielded the philological method; a method which, as he notes incidentally, is still in favour in Germany. Dr. Albers, however, avows himself a disciple of the school founded in England by Professor Tylor, and now slowly but surely extending its influence over the rest of the learned world, the school that seeks to reach the origin and meaning of myths by the historical and comparative method, not divorcing mythology from worship, nor custom from belief and story, but bringing them side by side in order to ascertain what light every one of these can throw upon the others.

Guided by the principles of the anthropological school, Dr. Albers passes in review the references in classical authors and the

inscriptions exhibiting the cult of the various Greek divinities practised on mountain-tops or declivities, or other high places. From this inquiry references to gods having temples in the citadels of the Greek cities are excluded, for the obvious reason that the citadel was simply the safest and most conspicuous position for the temple of a great deity, and therefore was not of necessity chosen as the site of his shrine on account of its height. In the course of the examination many shrewd observations are made. The uncertainty of the identity of Mount Olympus is ingeniously made an argument to prove that the worship of a god who was held to rule the world from some mountain height was very widespread among the Greek peoples. The god named Zeus absorbed the cult of all other such gods and effaced the memory of most of them, but probably each locality had originally its own high divinity. In a similar spirit the author deals with the Arcadian worship of Artemis and other goddesses identified with her. Arcadia was the most backward country of Greece. And it is there that we find the worship of Artemis most firmly established in high places, with every mark of barbarism and antiquity.

From his collection of examples Dr. Albers concludes that the Greeks worshipped from immemorial time on high places, that such worship was chiefly dedicated to gods thought to dwell in heaven, and that it was not derived from Semitic or other foreign intercourse, but was indigenous. For the last-named of these conclusions he also adduces the authority of Mr. Lang. The original god worshipped in many of the shrines can, he thinks, be identified. Many monasteries throughout Greece dedicated to the prophet Elias are found on the mountain-tops or ridges. Of these a large number occupy the sites of shrines of Zeus. Some of the sites, however, were dedicated to the Sun, *Ἡλῖος*. That dedication, indeed, is known to have been in many cases superseded by Zeus, or other divinities, as in the case of Acrocorinth, by Aphrodite. Dr. Albers adopts Wachsmuth's conjecture, which is now generally accepted, that St. Elias was substituted by Christianity for Helios as an object of adoration; and he is of opinion that wherever a shrine of St. Elias is found occupying a site once sacred to some other god than Helios, we may suspect an original dedication to the Sun. The cult of Helios, he thinks, probably lingered on among the country people in spite of the supersession of his place by Zeus or any other deity, and when in the decline

of paganism the splendour of these great official gods began to wane, the pristine worship revived, to be finally merged or metamorphosed into the new cult of St. Elias. It seems to me, however, that this hypothesis will have to be considered in connection with the Russian cult of St. Elias. The Russians, of course, received the saint with Byzantine Christianity, and his cult is now very widespread. But the old Slavonic god, whose attributes and legends have been transferred to St. Elias, was Perun or Perkunos. In such a case there could have been no similarity of name to facilitate the supersession. And it may very well have been that in many Greek examples the change took place without any such aid.

Dr. Albers has done excellent service to students by his compilation of references and by his comments upon them. Works like those of Dr. de Visser and himself are to be welcomed as evidence that the influence of the philological school of mythology is giving away among continental scholars to a more truly scientific method.

E. SIDNEY HARTLAND.

FABLES AND FOLKTALES FROM AN EASTERN FOREST. By
W. SKEAT. Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.

THE Folklore Society knows that Mr. Skeat has recently returned from an exploring expedition in the Malay States. He and his company have brought with them, we understand, large collections of the kind which interest us; and whilst these are being got into shape, Mr. Skeat has kindly presented us with this pretty book, containing twenty-six stories and legends. To students we can cordially recommend them. The stories have not received any doctoring, and they appear exactly as they were told, although in one case the *dissecta membra* of a story had to be recovered from different sources. Mr. Skeat got them all at first-hand, and we believe none of them have been printed before.

A few notes are added, which give the source of each tale, and a good classified index completes the book.

It will not be out of place briefly to indicate the contents. The

reader will be interested to find a new variety of Brer Rabbit in the skin of a pretty little creature called the Mouse-deer. Though weak in body, he is great of wit, and nearly always gets the better of crocodiles and such monsters if they try conclusions with him. Some of the stories have parallels in the Indian peninsula. *The Pelican's Punishment* reappears in the Jātaka as *Nandajātāka*, No. 39. *The Tiger gets his deserts* turns on the same point as *The Foolish Fish* (cf. *The Talking Thrush*, p. 65); and in the same book (p. 130) is a variant of the *Tiger and the Shadow*. In *Father Follow-my-Nose* comes the episode of a man who was induced to bury four priests, by the pretence that the corpse had returned from the grave; this is widespread in the Levant and the East. King Solomon appears in one tale; there is a Deluge Legend, and several which are intended to account for natural phenomena, the shape of plants, and so forth. Indeed, there is a taste of everything, and all good. It should be mentioned that the book is daintily got up, and illustrated with a number of capital pictures.

INDIAN FABLES. By RAMASWAMI RAJU. Swan Sonnenschein. 5s.

THIS is a delightful gift-book for children, who will enjoy the stories and their morals none the less for a trifle of sententiousness. The morals, indeed, are generally pithy and often proverbial in form; but the tales are not quite naturally expressed to an English ear. A fuller command of strong colloquial English would have made a better book of it, but who can now step into the shoes of L'Estrange? We hasten to add that readers may be daunted by the preface, which is verbose, and not quite intelligible; but if they read further they will be rewarded. From our point of view the book is not adequate, since it gives no authorities. There is one of the Gotham stories on p. 61 (which turns on counting a dozen), a Jātaka story on p. 88 (the Crane and the Crab), and one on p. 83 with the same motive as the *Talking Thrush*, p. 65, but there is nothing to show where the variants come from.

RECORDS OF WOMEN'S CONFERENCE ON THE HOME LIFE OF
CHINESE WOMEN. November, 1900.

WHEN, last year, missionaries from all parts of China fled to the treaty ports, advantage was taken of the presence in Shanghai of workers from all parts of China to hold a Conference of English-speaking ladies, Chinese as well as foreigners, to compare notes on the home-life of Chinese women. It was, of course, essentially a missionary Conference, and the scientific interest of its records is therefore subordinated to the missionary interest. In other words, the attention of those who took part in it was directed rather to the way to remedy, or at all events alleviate, the evils complained of than to describe the customs and superstitions minutely or dispassionately. Still a considerable amount of information was brought together and is placed on record in the pamphlet containing the transactions of the Conference. Certainly much of the information is not new. This was to be expected. Moreover, the Records require to be used with discretion. China is an enormous country, consisting of many provinces, the customs of which have a general likeness but very many differences of detail. The speakers, men as well as women (for the Conference was not entirely confined to women), coming from various districts, all relate their experiences, and care must be taken by the reader to discriminate the localities of the observances mentioned. These observances are necessarily dealt with, too, in a fragmentary way, and much is assumed to be already known. An illustration of this is found on p. 70, where a Chinese lady, reporting a custom presumably belonging to Honan and Hupeh, says, "A man with a big hat [Why a big hat? How is it significant, and what is its form?] asks each one in the crowd, 'To what tribe, or stem, do you belong?' Chinese don't ask, 'How old are you?' but what is your tribe—dog, monkey, rabbit, dragon, or other of the twelve stems." The explanation is here only half given. It is referable to the custom of naming the years, and has no relation to the clan or family of the person addressed. This may be inferred from the sentence following; but it is not made clear in the report, and hasty reading might lead to misunderstanding.

As against criticisms of this kind, however, it must be remembered that for the primary purpose of the Conference they are comparatively unimportant. It is only when the Records are

used for scientific purposes that the criticisms become serious. The chief value of the Conference lies in the fact that its success determined the promoters to organise a permanent committee for the purpose of collecting information all over China. This was a decision of the most happy augury; and the ladies chosen on the committee, so far as can be judged from the parts they took in the Conference, are admirably qualified for the work. I should like to urge upon them that in order that their publications may have real value, it is of the first importance that the customs and beliefs they record should be set down accurately and minutely, that the locality should always be specified, and that the aboriginal tribes should by no means be neglected in the survey. The only real knowledge is accurate knowledge. If the object be to understand the native women, their customs, traditions, and conditions, for the purpose of facilitating Christian work among them, then vague, inaccurate information will very often be worse than none at all. If, beyond that, the committee wish the record to be of scientific value, and to serve as a monument for future ages of the state of things in China when Christian missions entered there, the duty of exactitude and fulness, glossing nothing and shirking nothing, is not less plain. *Notes and Queries on Anthropology*, issued by the British Association, would afford them valuable hints; and both the Folklore Society and the Anthropological Institute would doubtless be glad to render them, if they need it, assistance, such as has been recognised as useful by many missionaries in various parts of the world. Finally, the information thus collected and compiled should be issued in a form which will render it accessible to all who may be interested in the subject, whether from a missionary or a scientific point of view.

I congratulate the organisers of the Conference on its success, and on the beginning of a work the value of which, if carried out in the manner I have indicated, it will be difficult to overestimate. With energy, care, and determination on the part of the committee, and the willing co-operation they are hoping to secure "all over China," the task, though laborious, will be amply repaid by its results and by the gratitude of those who succeed them in their devoted efforts for the benefit of the millions of China, as well as by the students of civilisation and of man.

E. SIDNEY HARTLAND.