

Of course any scholar must be allowed to accept opinions which he conscientiously adopts, but if they are one-sided, or at least strongly divergent from those of English scholarship, he can hardly expect that his work will be widely received as trustworthy. As a matter of fact McGiffert's interpretations are often anything but the apparent meaning of the passage. He seems to have such a prejudice against the author of Acts that he will seldom give him the advantage of a doubt, and in general with the exception of most of Paul's letters, there is very little certain material from apostolic sources from which to construct a history. Considering the recent utterances of Harnack, we do not know what recessional variations his opinion as to dates may soon undergo, so that in this period of flux it seems likely that a book written from a critical standpoint which is in a condition of constant change, will not have more than a very transient success. One is unconsciously led to judge from one's own preferences, but I feel sure that the book on the Apostolic Age abreast of the soundest and sanest scholarship of the day, remains to be written.

Akin to this subject is the posthumous work by Dr. Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*. This is one of the really great books of the year and should be studied carefully by all who are interested in the life of the early church. It is almost an impertinence to praise the work of a scholar like the late Professor of Divinity in Cambridge who perhaps surpassed even Lightfoot.

R. A. F.

Nay, dally not with time,
 The wise man's treasure,
 Though fools are lavish on't;—
 The fatal Fisher
 Hooks souls, while we waste moments.