

Let us still hope that many years of good service in another Church and country may be given to one whom we can ill afford to lose.

This Department struck a mine in the May issue. The proposal to establish a magazine on a wider basis than the MONTHLY seems to be attracting considerable attention. Letters have been received from quite a number of old friends of the MONTHLY, all expressing great satisfaction with the progress and present position of this humble venture. Whatever the future may bring to us: one thing is certain, the MONTHLY has been more sympathetically received and more widely read throughout the country during the past year than ever before. Not because it is any better as a magazine, but because it honestly tries to supply a long felt want. The hearty words of some whose words are usually few but full of meaning have done much to encourage us in the midst of what one correspondent calls "carping criticism."

Elsewhere in this number letters from two old editors of the MONTHLY are published. Both of these gentlemen have had much to do with the magazine from the beginning. One of them, if we mistake not, prepared the "Prospectus" for the first number, the substance of which is given in one of the letters. He and those who were associated with him are in the best position to know what objects the promoters of the MONTHLY had in view. The present editor knew nothing of the work in those early days, and so would not be so cocksure. It is just possible that they "dipped into the future" far enough to see, what the promoters of similar enterprises had not seen, that "a little college organ" would not be creditable to themselves or acceptable to their constituency. They aimed at the sky, perhaps, and although they did not score, they shot higher than those whose target was blackened by the powder.

This Department would prefer if these letters had been sent to the paper publishing the article referred to. No injustice, is done, however, except to the MONTHLY, inasmuch as readers of these letters have already seen the "Knoxonian" criticism, while many readers of that article know nothing about the MONTHLY except from its critic's statements. But its critic meant no harm. He meant to be fair—and funny. But his habit of hard hitting was, perhaps, too strong. He failed to distinguish between the real and hypothetical, and felt as free to drive his knife to the hilt into the throbbing heart of the human, as into the pulseless creatures called up from the "vasty deep" of his own imagination, and made to pass in grim procession round and round his study table, ghostly, grumpy, feckless fellows, born to give the satirist some sport and warn all mortal sinners of their doom.

We feel better now. Having found our way out of that last tortuous sentence we are ready to strike hands with "Knoxonian" or any one else and shout, "We're all such jolly good fellows." But, seriously, we would like to calm those good souls that are much exercised over the oracular utterances of the MONTHLY's critics. We all speak unadvisedly with our lips at times, newspaper men oftener than other people, perhaps. "Knoxonian" is not a sinner above all the rest of his craft. None of us can deny the soft impeachment—although some have not grace enough to confess it.