

but Gregory himself had not grown from a parish priest into a prelate. His success as a missionary did not create a new order in the ministry. He had no power to consecrate others, at the close of his career, with which he was not invested at the outset.

A. McKNIGHT.

*THE ENGLISH BIBLE: ITS HISTORICAL PLACE IN
THE LANGUAGE.*

BIBLE-STUDY is receiving unwonted attention. Not a little has been said and written, during the past season, as to giving the English Bible a place as a text-book along with Hodge, Kurtz, Alexander, *et al.*, in the list of studies enjoined on the worthies whose organ is the Theologue. The subject surely does deserve attention. The writer rejoices with others in this discussion as an index of the happy tendency to adapt our means more squarely to the end in view; to think, not less of the theoretical, but more of the practical; to become skilled with the sling and stones before staggering under a badly fitting coat of mail.

Meanwhile let us not overlook the fact that, so far as the reading and relative study, in its primary stages, of the several books of the English Bible are concerned, this much is foundation work. There are bibles within the bible. These call for a comparative study. To "sail" through from Genesis to Revelation is almost on a par with a to-be-continued reading from A to Z of the Encyclopædia Britannica. What is wanted in the first instance, I take it, is not devotional reading, so-called, nor yet a minute and systematic study, such as would rather fall under the category of Exegesis; but first, a knowledge of bible facts—the contents of its several books, and, secondly, their historical place and connection. The English text and a hand-book of the right kind are sufficient for the purpose. But even this much may, perchance, be left undone, or left, in the doing, beautifully indefinite. Is there a whereby for securing it, apart from its insertion in the college time-table? It is and should be, to the