

college and seminary and Y. M. C. A's, and our public libraries? When individual self-denial and heroic courage, without aid or promise from any of the boards or other organizations of the church, were made willing in God's providence to put brains, hard work and push into such an undertaking, from simple love to the cause, in order to supply a felt need—to elevate and make attractive missionary literature—may they not reasonably look for friendly recognition and co-operation from pastors like Dr. Cuyler, filling high positions in the church and lamenting the want of practical interest in the missionary literature furnished by the old missionary journals? Is it, as a matter of enlightened policy or of Christian ethics, a wise thing to do to deprecate and discourage the circulation among his people of a missionary magazine of a new order—one which he is pleased to characterize as a "powerful periodical"—on the ground that it might interfere with the organ of his own church board? Would it not seem highly proper to give his people a fair chance to judge for themselves, as many who do not "find time" to read the denominational journal might perchance find time and have the will to read one of entirely a different order—as we know some of them do in spite of the pastor's position? Doubtless there are scores of other godly men and women in his great congregation who never read the ordinary "missionary journals," who might be induced to take and read one that has received the highest commendation of those abundantly qualified to judge. It is quite possible that fifty or a hundred copies of it, circulated monthly in his church, and read and quoted and talked of in the family and in prayer and missionary circles, might increase the missionary zeal and liberality even of Dr. Cuyler's generous people, and help to excite and train some of his young people to be missionaries.

Say what we will, "denominational" and even literary "organs" have seldom proved a success in any department of literature, as every intelligent man knows, and missionary journals controlled by boards, or societies, or church organizations, are no exception. Somehow the machinery is cumbersome and does not work well. In spite of all efforts to the contrary, the mechanical and the perfunctory prevail. The genius of our people, who love freedom, liberty, independence, freshness, enterprise, revolts at such organs. Why, Dr. Cuyler has a forcible illustration of this fact in his own denomination. The Presbyterian Church has made a stupendous effort to establish and sustain a "denominational" missionary journal that should meet fully the demands of the times and the needs of the great body it represents. No other magazine, religious or secular, excited so much forethought, discussion, and anxious interest, in the matter of its inception. One General Assembly after another brooded over the proposal, discussed it in all its relations and bearings, and appointed large committees of its wise and dignified doctors and judges, and senators—and the issue finally was *The Church at Home and Abroad*.

A liberally-paid editor was chosen to conduct it, with the aid of the secretaries of the eight boards of the church. It was made the official organ of the denomination. Its pages were ample, the price made ridiculously low, and the good wishes, the loyalty, and the resources of this large, intelligent, and wealthy church were behind it. Every pastor was expected to act as its agent, and commend it to his people from the pulpit and urge it upon his people, as Dr. Cuyler, we know, has done, and a thousand other Presbyterian pastors.

Such an experiment, judging from general principles, we should say, was bound to succeed. But it has not proved a success, even in the judgment of its friends and originators. Its failure has been assignal, as conspicuous, as