

emperor's position before his elevation (§ 13 : τὴν πρώτην τεταγμένος ὅπως ἔτυχε ταχθείς) refer not to the lowest office (*advocatus fisci*, Keil), but to the highest—namely, the praetorian prefecture. J. B. B.

Dr. Justus Leo's excellent monograph on *Die Entwicklung des ältesten japanischen Seelenlebens* (Leipzig: Voigtländer, 1907) is a study of the *uta* (lays) in the *Kojiki*, the *Nihongi*, and the *Manyōshū*. It is more than doubtful whether any of the *uta* are earlier in their present form than the fourth or fifth century of our era—that is, all of them have been manipulated in a more or less Chinese spirit. The real division of them, therefore, is into lays which have least, those which have more, and those which have most, of the Chinese element in them. The first category are what the author calls 'typical,' and, roughly, may be ascribed to the two centuries preceding the sixth century. These are found mainly in the *Kojiki* and *Nihongi*, into the texts of which they have been inserted as more or less illustrative of the passages they are connected with. But very often they are but barely so; probably in very few cases were they composed, so to speak, *ad hoc*. Sometimes the text may have been written up to the interpolated *uta*; more often, perhaps, these were ancient chants (or parts thereof), the true significance and occasion of which were forgotten, adapted in various ways to the passages where they occur. In the seventh century the polity of China was taken over in block; it was an anticipation, analogically at least, of what nearly took place in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and actually did take place in the nineteenth. The *uta* of the seventh and eighth centuries, of which the *Manyōshū* is the earliest collection, are more and more distinctly Chinese in tone and character. In the *Manyōshū* there are many *shi* (poems in Chinese), and even prose compositions in pure Chinese. The later the *uta* are, the more Buddhist do they become; the earliest are less *shintō* than mikadoist in character, the mikado being honoured not so much as the successor of his foregoers as being a direct incarnation of the divine powers, which were also the makers of the Japanese islands and all that in them is. It is only when Chinese influences become predominant that what we commonly regard as the distinctive decoration of Japanese poetry, later of Japanese art, is found—the extremely limited comprehension of natural beauty that soon became a still narrower conventionalism, pleasing in itself, but so destructive in effect that by the end of the eighth century Japanese poetry was dead, never to be revived. This course is well shown by the author. The defect of the monograph is that the uncertainty of the texts and the difficulties of the interpretation (based almost wholly on the guesses of much later commentators) are not sufficiently considered. The translations of the *uta* are founded upon those contained in Mr. Chamberlain's version of the *Kojiki* and Dr. Aston's version of the *Nihongi*; but these translations require an extended revision. F. V. D.

In *St. George, Champion of Christendom and Patron Saint of England* (London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1907), Mrs. Gordon essays to substantiate the literal accuracy of the legend that has accumulated round the name of St. George: the main point left undecided by

her is whether the dragon slain by him was a 'crocodile' (p. 15) or a 'worm' (p. 16). Those who wish to read a sober and discreet attempt to unravel the actual history of the three heroes that bore the name of George—the Arian archbishop, the tribune, and the martyr—will prefer to consult Miss F. Arnold-Forster's *Studies in Church Dedications; or, England's Patron Saints*, ii. 464–74. As to the illustrations, we may notice a picture on p. 5 of the 'remains of churches erected by Constantine and Richard I over the tomb of St. George at Lydda, photographed by the Palestine Exploration Society.' But this society, in the *Survey of Western Palestine*, ii. 268, whence the photograph is taken, give reasons to show 'that the story that it was rebuilt by Richard is impossible.' On p. 85 is a photograph of what is stated to be 'an original portrait of Edward III,' though the painting is manifestly of the Jacobean period. On p. 91 is a picture of the round table in the hall of Winchester Castle, which is stated to have been painted in green and white by Henry VIII, 'green being the colour of the livery of the British order.' Green and white were the Tudor livery colours. In the Latin quotations there are some queer-looking words, *adhuts* (p. 31), *beati Georgii moritis* (p. 39), *digriantier* (p. 46), *nessit* (p. 94), *soleune* (p. 107). When we come to the account of the founding of St. George's Chapel at Windsor, p. 74, we are told that Edward III 'appears in his new order to have been desirous of commemorating the merits of the patron saint as the champion of religious liberty.' 'Naturally, therefore, the first step the royal founder took was to secure religious liberty for his fraternity, by obtaining from Pope Clement VI (1348) a papal bull declaring the Chapel of St. George a *free* chapel—that is, *free* of papal control and jurisdiction.' It is not stated where this interesting bull is to be found. Clement VI on 12 February 1351 issued a bull

eximere perpetuo [the chapel and its ministers] ab omni ordinaria iurisdictione, dominio, et superioritate qualibet archiepiscoporum, episcoporum, archidiaconorum, et aliorum quorumlibet iudicium et officialium ipsorum ecclesiasticorum, illaque omnia ad ius et proprietatem beati Petri et sub protectione sedis apostolice et nostra suscipere.

On pp. 74, 75 are what purport to be quotations from the statutes of the college, which were drawn up by William, bishop of Winchester, 23 November 1352. The bishop however was not William of Wykeham, as implied on pp. 73, 86, but William of Edington, his predecessor in that see; and the quotations appear to be taken from the injunctions of Edward VI rather than from the statutes of Edward III. The chapel too of Edward III was in another place than that now occupied by the present Chapel of St. George, which latter was in building during the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII. Hence it is impossible that 'ten of the original Garter plates of the heroes of Crecy are still to be seen on the stalls they were the first to occupy' (p. 84). The Horse Shoe Cloisters, at the western end of the present chapel, are not of Edward III's date at all; neither did 'Sir Gilbert Scott ever develop from two old Edwardian houses in the Horse Shoe Cloisters a most lovely choristers' school' (p. 75). A knight of the Garter is usually

designated as K.G., not as K.C.G. (p. 102). On p. 124 a list of the officers of the Garter 'at the present time' includes Garter king, Sir Albert Woods, and the usher of the black rod, Sir Michael Biddulph, who have both been dead some years. On p. 138 the names of 'the authorities consulted for the story of St. George' are given, without however any specification of the works referred to, and the well-known Tighe and Davis appear as Tighe and Davey. G.

In the *History of the Langobards*, by Paul the Deacon, translated by Dr. William Dudley Foulke (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1907), we have the first English version of Paul's history, a work of doubtful utility, since it is difficult to think that anyone unable to read Latin would be sufficiently interested in the subject to want it. The introduction, notes, and appendices are a careful compilation from modern writers, whose names are cited even for the simplest matters; the few notes for which no such authority is given are generally superfluous, and sometimes wrong, as where Childebert is said to have been cousin of Chlothar 'on the mother's side' (p. 153), and where the adoption of the name Flavius is said to have signified succession to the imperial dignity (p. 114). The supposition that *sabbatum paschale* could mean Easter Sunday (p. 233) shows scanty knowledge of ecclesiastical terms, and Dr. Hodgkin's authority is wrongly cited for the strange assertion that Gunthram was 'more properly king of Burgundy' (p. 147). The translation is on the whole well done, but the constant introduction of 'indeed' is not English, it is comical to find Plinius Secundus appearing as 'Pliny the Second,' and 'quite distinguished' does not translate *eminentiores* (p. 142). Commas are strewn about in profusion, with the odd result that on p. 380 Paul is quoted as the authority for the fact that Kiepert made a map for Mommsen. There are four useful maps, but they are all taken from other books. E. W. B.

Mr. J. H. Round's paper on *The Chronology of Henry II's Charters* (*Archaeological Journal*, lxiv. 63-79) contains a sharp criticism of M. Delisle's memoir which we noticed last July (p. 614), and succeeds in pointing out a good many weak places in the eminent French scholar's armour. The main result of his examination is that the number of exceptions that have to be taken into account, whether due to irregularity in the chancery or to errors of transcription, is so large as to render the test laid down by M. Delisle—the absence or presence of the formula *Dei gratia*—inconclusive as evidence of date. Most of Mr. Round's, or of M. Delisle's, examples are taken from transcripts, but at the end of the paper we find a note mentioning that originals which have been examined for the purpose include indisputable exceptions to M. Delisle's rule. We hope the question will be made the subject of fuller discussion. R. L. P.

*Jung Heinrich, König von England, Sohn König Heinrichs II.*, by Dr. C. E. Hodgson (Jena: Kämpfe, 1906), is a doctoral dissertation which the author has composed under the direction of Professor Cartellieri, the biographer of Philip Augustus. It is a succinct and lucid *précis* of the