HAVE WE TOO MANY MISSIONARY PERIODICALS?

[Editorial.—J. M. S.]

The Publishers of this Review recently sent a letter to some of our prominent ministers, asking for a brief expression of opinion as to its scope and merits. The response in every instance was kind and encouraging. We venture, on our editorial responsibility, to give here the reply of our respected and beloved brother, Dr. Cuyler, of Brooklyn, who expressed a "fear" that may have occurred to other minds, and one that we deem pertinent and worthy of consideration.

Says Dr. Cuyler:

"The Missionary Review of the World is a powerful periodical; but I have one fear, viz.: that since about all the Foreign Mission enterprises are conducted by *denominational* boards or societies, and all of these have their missionary journals, will the good people find time to *read them* and *yours* also? Do we not need to have *more reading* of the *present* journals, rather than the addition of more new periodicals?"

We have great respect for Dr. Cuyler's judgment, on this as on other matters in which he takes a deep interest. And still we think his opinion in this case is based on a superficial and hasty view of the question. And we will state in brief some reasons for so thinking:

1. So far as known to the writer, Dr. Cuyler stands quite *alone* in this opinion. The editors and publishers have received (literally) *thousands* of expressions from leading pastors of all denominations, from the secretaries of missionary societies in all parts of the world, from intelligent and influential laymen, from our missionaries in every land, from woman's boards of missions, from youthful bands of missionary workers, from student volunteers, from Y. M. C. Associations, from heads of families, from professors in colleges and theological seminaries, and from the leading religious papers and missionary periodicals of Christendom—and from all these sources of intelligent judgment and disinterested opinion not one expression has met our eye or ear other than that of warmest commendation and God-speed. Even on the platform of the World's great Conference in London, The Missionary Review of the World (then but a few months old) was several times referred to with warmest praise and thanksgiving to God. Very many of these testimonials have deeply touched our hearts, and stimulated our zeal and courage in the enterprise to which we have committed ourselves in obedience to what seemed to Dr. Pierson and myself a plain call of God. Thus the weight of testimony is decidedly *against* our good brother's opinion, so far as least as this Review is concerned.

In response to the same publishers' circular, sent to some fifty persons in all, came very strong words, from some of the most intelligent and prominent men in the Christian church. As they present various phases of the subject, and their judgment is entitled to consideration, we trust it will not be thought immodest in us if we give a few of them in this connection. We want it distinctly understood by our readers that we are not engaged in any private personal enterprise for selfish ends. The cause of this Review is simply the cause of Christian missions, conducted for the honor of Christ.

OPINIONS OF EMINENT MINISTERS:

Rev. C. H. Parkhurst, D.D., New York: "No one who desires to hold in bird's-eye view the movement which the militant church at large is making upon the enemy's territory can afford to dispense with The Missionary Review of the World. Each of its departments is full of carefully edited instruction, and the magazine in its entirety leaves little to be desired either as regards the separate fields in which missionary work is being done, or as relates to the general problems of missionary interest."

Rt. Rev. F. D. Huntington, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Central New York: "In the widespread and ever-increasing interest felt