

reached a second edition in 1906. Rarely has any book been written by a scholar of note so defective, so unsatisfactory from every point of view. All this apparently remains unknown to the author of these Lectures. We may add that early Christian Art receives inadequate recognition, as well as recent work in the field of Comparative Religion. In the account of Baptism, for example, no mention is made of the writings of Eisler. Or again, on p. 309, where Bousset and Harnack are quoted as authorities on Gnosticism, reference might have been made to the work of Bolland.

Finally, in the case of a subject that requires scholarship, we have a right to expect unusual attention to the accuracy of minor details, yet the present book is so far from being perfect in this respect that it may almost be described as slovenly. On p. 20 we read that the worship of Asklepios had been introduced at Rome in 290, although he already had a temple there in 291; the dates 111 (p. 1) and 61, 62 (p. 69) are given as if they were certain, which they are not; Tiberinus, Jubilees, Hierapolis, Colossae, Pandateria are mis-spelt. On p. 221 we hear of a temple erected to Isis, probably in the year 38 A.D., which won for the goddess a "permanent place in aristocratic favour." This result is to be credited not so much to this attempt of Caligula as to the much later one of Caracalla. To say that Juno was the special patroness of the Phoenician city of Carthage might mislead without a note of explanation. The word "college" has no connection with "ligo," as is implied on p. 173. We are told that the bishop must only be married once, on the ground of Titus i, 6, but this is not a necessary inference from that verse. It is quite incorrect to make Herodotus responsible for the statement that the Greek belief in immortality is borrowed from Egypt. Herodotus is speaking of the doctrine of reincarnation, and he says that not the Greeks, but certain Greek teachers, had borrowed this belief. Moreover, we are allowed to believe that Herodotus is a perfectly sufficient authority on the subject, which he is not. The translations "arrogant" and "sang in turn" are hardly satisfactory equivalents of the Latin words in the translation from Pliny (p. 1). We are told (p. 2) that the Christians retired to Pella, as though it were an undisputed historical fact. On p. 287, we are left under the impression that Hadrian was the first emperor to give public recognition to academic education; the measures of Vespasian are overlooked. The date of *De Præscriptione hæreticorum* is said on p. 210 to be about 199, but even this qualified statement is open to doubt. On p. 395, the verse Ep. 1 John iii, 9, is misunderstood. "Legate Proprietor with consular power" (p. 1), sounds awkwardly in English. On p. 308, Manichæism is called a heresy, as though it were merely an offshoot of Christianity. We must object, too, to the statement on p. 289 that the Johannine contrast between earthly and heavenly things, like that of the Apostle Paul between the things of time and sense, can be traced ultimately to Platonic idealism.