

TESTIMONY TO THE WONDERFUL POWER OF A MUSICAL SERVICE.

The late Henry Ward Beecher, who visited England a few years since, in one of his letters gave the following graphic description of the effect upon himself, in listening to the choral service of the Church of England:—

"The services began. You know my mother was, until her marriage, in the communion of the Episcopal Church; this thought hardly left me as I sat, grateful for the privilege of worshipping God through a service that had expressed so often her devotions. *I cannot tell you how much I was affected. I had never had such a trance of worship, and I shall never have such another view until I gain the gate.*

"I am so ignorant of the Church service, that I cannot tell the various parts by their right names; but the portions which most affected me were the *prayers and responses which the choir sang.* I had never heard any part of a supplication—a direct prayer—sung by the choir: and it seemed as though I had heard not with my ear, but with my soul. I was dissolved—my whole being seemed to be wafted gratefully toward God. The Divine presence rose before me in wondrous majesty, but ineffable gentleness and goodness; and I seemed irresistibly, yet gently drawn toward God. My soul, then thou didst magnify the Lord, and rejoice in the God of thy salvation! And then came to my mind the many exaltations of the Psalms of David, and never before were the expressions and figures so noble and so necessary to express what I felt. I had risen, it seemed to me, so high, that I was where David was when he conceived the things which he wrote. Throughout the service—and it was an hour and a quarter long—where ever an 'Anthem' occurred, it was given by the choir, accompanied by the organ and the congregation.

"Oh! that swell and solemn cadence yet ring in my ears. Not, once, not a single time, did it occur in that service, from beginning to end, without bringing tears from my eyes. I stood like a shrub in a spring morning—every leaf covered with dew, and every breeze shook down some drops. I trembled so much at times that I was obliged to sit down. Oh! when in the prayers breathed forth in the strains of sweet, simple, solemn music, the *love of Christ* was recognized, how I then longed to give utterance to what that love seemed to me! There was a moment when the heavens seemed opened to me, and I saw the glory of God! All the earth seemed to me a storehouse of images, made to set forth the Redeemer, and I could scarcely keep from crying out. I never knew, I never dreamed before, of what heart there was in the word Amen. Every time it swelled forth and died away solemnly, not my lips, not my mind, but my whole being said: Saviour, so let it be."

"I LIKED THAT SERMON TO-DAY."

BY THE REV. D. D. CHAPIN.

One hears such a remark as this, sometimes; perhaps more often may be heard—although the clergyman does not hear it—"I did not like that sermon," even young children may be heard to say such things, imitating their elders if not their "betters."

Such sayings are worth thinking about, both by preachers and people. Why is one sermon "liked," and another "not liked," or why does one person "like" a sermon and another "dislike" the same? Why are such terms used at all? Let us talk about it a little.

What is a sermon, or what should it be? and by what standard should it be measured and judged?

If we say we like or dislike anything, we measure it by something within us, our taste or choice or preference, as we may a dish at dinner, or a picture or poem or song; in the latter regard the value of our "like" or "dislike" depends upon our ability and culture as critics; but when we come to think about it we shall see that a sermon ought to be measured and judged by another standard altogether, for a sermon is not a matter of sentiment or feeling, to be judged of by taste or preference or choice, but is, or ought to be, a message, as the preacher is, or ought to be, a messenger, and that which he brings is not, or ought not to be, his own word, but the word of Him that sent him.

Now the message brought is either true or untrue. A great responsibility here rests upon the messenger. It is his business, under penalty, to deliver a true message, and it is the business of hearers, under penalty, to receive it as such, if it be true. There is no "choice" or "preference," otherwise, about it.

We see then that "like" and "dislike" have nothing to do with it, at least so far as the subject of a sermon is concerned. The manner in which the message is delivered may (or may not) be a fit subject of criticism, we may or may not, perhaps, "like" that; but we are not talking about delivery, but about sermons.

The question is, Is the message a true message? does the sermon reflect (albeit faintly and weakly it may, perhaps must, be) a portion of God's word or message to man? If it does (and it is fair to presume it does) we certainly shall not presume to say we "like" or "dislike" it. There is much, very much, of God's truth that ordinary human nature does not "like" any way, if that is the test; it goes against the grain, it vexes us, it stops us, it shows us to be what we are, which we do not always like to see; our wills and God's will do not run the same way; so we do not "like" the message. Consequently right here is a sore temptation to the preacher often to smooth down and fix up and sugar-coat the "message" to suit the "likes" and "dislikes" of his hearers, especially if he is dependent upon them, as most preachers are (alas!), for his daily bread. This must be confessed; but the conscientious messenger will not ask what will please those to whom he is sent, what they "like" or "dislike," but what will please his Lord and Master who has sent him.

Kind readers, who with good intention sometimes tell your pastor that you "liked his sermon to-day," perhaps implying that you did not like it last Sunday, have you ever thought of this? You are not asked to like his sermons, but to profit by them; they are intended to help you, to teach you, to do you good. Like wholesome, but withal, it may be, sometimes, bitter and disagreeable medicine for those who have just confessed that they are "miserable sinners" and "there is no health in us;" sermons are not to please and tickle the palate, but to help to a better, a purer and stronger life. If a sermon does not do this, it is no part of the message from God. By this test, and not by the likes and dislikes of men, it shall be judged.—*Living Church.*

A pastor in a State adjoining Virginia, preaching from the text, "Beware of covetousness," said, "Last Sunday night the collection in this house amounted to \$1.80, and the dollar was thrown in by a Baptist brother from Richmond, Va., who happened to be here and did not know any better. The other 600 of you dropped in the eighty cents.—*Richmond Religious Herald.*

"I know," says Paul, "I know" is the language of all positive Christian experience.

NEWS FROM THE HOME FIELD.

DIOCESE OF NOVA SCOTIA.

AMHERST.—*Rural Deanery.*—The Chapter of this Rural Deanery will meet (D.V.) at River John on June 15th. Appointed preacher, Rev. J. R. S. Parkinson, Rector of Londonderry. First service June 14th at 7.30 p.m.

KING'S COLLEGE AND THE LATE BISHOP.—On Sunday morning, May 8, the Reverend, the President of King's College, at the usual service in the Hensley Memorial Chapel, preached on the words, "I heard a voice from Heaven, saying unto me, write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors, and their works do follow them." (Rev. xiv, 13). After stating that these words were read on the Friday afternoon preceding in the presence of an immense concourse of mourners and deeply interesting spectators at the grave of the Right Rev. Bishop of the Diocese and Visitor of the University, and were most fitting words to be spoken on such an occasion, at the close of such a life, the preacher proceeded to unfold the text, and at the close of his sermon alluded in beautiful and touching terms to the late Bishop, and to his arduous labors extending over 37 years in this extensive diocese. But, said the preacher, now he rests from his labors, and his works do follow him.

Now he is gone, he will be appreciated at his true worth. Now will be seen the greatness of the work which he accomplished for this part of our Master's vineyard. Now, his great executive ability, his administrative talent, his large and most unostentatious charity, and his unwearied labors for Christ and His Church in this diocese, will be valued as they deserve. If at times his manner was stern, those who knew him best, knew that beneath that outward sternness there beat a heart kind and true as steel. And in this College, we have special need ever to remember, with the deepest gratitude, our Bishop. There was a time, as one of the Governors of this University said to me last week, when almost alone he bore the burden of this Institution. He carried it through difficulties in the past that would simply have appalled a man less brave, less determined, less heroic. The new Endowment Fund, as also the Restoration Fund, were largely aided by his liberality. Our Bishop was ever ready to promote measures which he conscientiously believed would advance the interests of the College, and increase its efficiency.

I trust that before long we may have in this our Collegiate Chapel a fitting memorial window sacred to the memory of our Bishop. The Archdeacon was here yesterday, he admired much the improved appearance of our Chapel, and kindly promised me \$25 as a start towards such a memorial window."

RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY OF KING'S COLLEGE

transmitted after the funeral to Mrs. Binney:—

"The Faculty of King's College, at this their first meeting after the deeply lamented death of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Nova Scotia, Visitor of this University, desires to place on record their sense of the greatness of the loss which this College has sustained by the removal of the late Bishop.

They would gratefully acknowledge the deep, abiding, and vigilant interest he ever took in the welfare of this Institution. He spared not his time, his money, or his counsel in behalf of King's College; all were ungrudgingly given to advance what he considered conducive to the highest well-being of the Institution, founded by one of his predecessors, the first Bishop of Nova Scotia.

That Faculty of King's College feel that in losing the late Bishop of this diocese, they have lost a firm friend and a wise counsellor. They