

out of 1,020 consecrations performed between the years 597 and 1533, only 485 can be traced to Anglican prelates; 192 were due to Roman; while the source of 338 is unknown. Twenty-seven separate Popes, and sixteen Italian, otherwise Roman Cardinals, have consecrated in foreign parts bishops for the English Church. Of the 68 Bishops of Canterbury from Augustine to Pole, 50 are recorded as having received their palls from Rome, while four more went to Rome, where doubtless they received their palls, and two were ordained at Rome, and doubtless received their palls at the same time. In all, out of the said 68 Archbishops of the Anglican Church prior to the Reformation, 56 may be said to have been confirmed by the see of Rome. The Anglican Church owes her orders entirely to Rome, never having come into contact with those of the ancient British, which is more likely to have received her orders from a Roman than a Grecian source. Both Ireland and Scotland originally received their orders from Rome. In fact the Church of England is more indebted to Rome than her members ordinarily imagine. The proof of what I have said above will be given in detail in the work I am preparing, together with the two Charts, one showing the succession of the Canterbury prelates, with their consecrations, etc., and the other giving the entire Anglican Episcopal succession, with the consecrators of each bishop, forming what I hope will be a valuable work when finished.

ARTHUR E. WHATHAM, Rector.

The End of the Controversy.

SIR,—Mr. Mackenzie has brought the discussion which he raised as to the teaching of the *Teacher's Assistant and Institute Leaflet* to a most satisfactory conclusion—a conclusion in which I am sure all our staff of writers will concur: "If the *Institute Leaflet* teaches that the Church of Christ is built upon Petros the Rock, and that immersion is the (only) right mode for baptism, I, for one, must conscientiously give it up; but I don't believe it has intended to teach, nor will teach, either." Yes, "this will end the matter." J. D. CAYLEY.

Toronto Hospital and Gaol Chaplaincy.

LETTER II.

SIR,—On January 1st, 1888, I began my work as Chaplain at the General Hospital and City Gaol, the Rectors having united in requesting the Bishop to license me to this new work. Unity of action by the clergy was most important, and as a sign and token of this unity, the mover and seconder of the resolution by which I was appointed to the position were from opposite quarters of the theological camp. Both sides alike have united to maintain the chaplaincy, as a glance at the last financial report will clearly show; and it has always been a great satisfaction to me and an encouragement in my work that all alike have had confidence in me. This has led me to be extremely careful not to abuse it. Thus in the conduct of Divine service, although of late years there have been various developments of practices to which people generally are getting now accustomed, I have, nevertheless, thought it right to have but the plain simple service to which the majority of our parishes are still accustomed, and as to vestments I use the long surplice and black stole which were once universal throughout the Anglican communion, and read the service in the natural voice. The office for the Visitation of the Sick in the Book of Common Prayer is the best guide and directory for the hospital chaplain. Holy Scripture instructs the sick to send for the elders of the Church. The Visitation Office shows what duties the Church expects of them when attending upon the sick brother or sister. We are, of course, by no means confined to the use of that office alone. Varieties of needs arise which have to be met frequently by extemporaneous prayer. Other prayers from the Prayer Book are also constantly required, as well as some from other books of devotion. Occasionally prayers may be offered in a ward for all to unite in; but as a general thing the ministrations have to be for one or sometimes two patients together. And how different hospital visiting is from that of the ordinary parish priest, especially in the country! The latter knows his people, has been acquainted with them perhaps from their childhood; whereas the chaplain sees them in the hospital for the first time. He knows nothing of them or of their spiritual condition, except what they may choose to tell him, whereas the parish priest knows a good deal more, and can be guided by this knowledge in his dealing with his sick brother or sister. Then, again, what a multitude of sick people is gathered together here! The average number of Church of England patients for each of the last three years has been 847, the average number at any given time being about 80. Eighty sick people to be looked after! Eighty persons on the chaplain's mind and heart to be cared for, consoled, encouraged, or it may be warned to make

haste and prepare for the other world before it be too late, when precious years have been squandered in carelessness, sin and vice. More than 70 of these sick Church of England people die every year in the hospital; about six every month; and it is often a great shock to the chaplain, after constant attendance upon some sick person, to call around some morning and find the bed empty, or possibly a new patient already occupying it, quite unconscious of the sad event which has so recently occurred. Here are no mourning friends and relations to be comforted; they must be sought, perhaps, at the other end of the city, or away in the country. The scene has completely changed like a dissolving view in a magic lantern; not a trace of the former scene remains. It is true that very often the Chaplain can be with the dying person up to the last. It is his wish always to be there at any time of day or night, and if some liberal Christian friend would provide him with a telephone, he would be better able to be always on hand at the last, as well as visiting during a long sickness. The greater number of deaths occur during the night. There are no less than sixty-six wards in the hospital, besides those in the Burnside Lying-in Hospital, some intended only for one patient at a time, others holding 25 or more. Some are surgical wards, some medical, some for eye or ear complaints, some for consumptives, others for contagious cases. In every case there is much to enlist the sympathy and care of the Chaplain, and the friendly intercourse thus begun is not forgotten. I seldom walk anywhere in the city without meeting some former patient and receiving a friendly recognition or greeting. Only recently I was stopped and spoken to by a young man coming from his work in a large factory, who had been visited by me no less than five years ago in a diphtheria ward in the General Hospital, and I had never seen him since that time. As I have ministered to 6,300 Church of England patients in seven and a half years, it is not surprising that I frequently meet them, since 5,000 of them have their homes in the city.

ROBT. C. CASWALL.

Acknowledgment.

SIR,—Will you kindly allow me a short space in your valuable paper to gratefully acknowledge the following sums towards our Church Building Fund: J. F. Roberts, Parkdale, Ont., \$2; H. M. Morrison, Ayr, Ont., 50c. We have to pay \$100 as a first instalment on our lumber on the 15th of June, also \$50 for freight on the same; we have in hand towards this just \$100. Thanking you in anticipation.

REV. A. TANSEY.

Somerset, Man.

Three Handfuls of Earth.

SIR,—A week or so ago I sent you a note on the "Three Handfuls of Earth" constituting a sufficient burial. Will you let me give another "pointer" as to the mode of baptism. In Titus, chapter 3, verse 5, we read, "He saved us by the washing of regeneration, etc." The revised version has more correctly "through" not "by"—i.e., through the instrumentality of. In the margin we read for "washing" the word "laver." Luther in the German version has translated it "bath," as does also the Syriac version. Now St. Paul uses the Greek word "loutron," which was a kind of bath in which no one, not even a well-grown child of five or six years old of the biggest size, could be "immersed" or covered over with the water. The shape of this "loutron" was that of our ordinary fonts, only having the bowl of much larger diameter, but not greater depth. I do not think St. Paul's words here would "unquestionably" suggest immersion as the only valid mode of baptism. Can anybody see an indication of the doctrine regarding the benefits of baptism, if the words St. Paul actually wrote are carefully considered?

W. E. COOPER.

Campbellford, May, 1895.

Anglican Fallacies.

SIR,—The two following fallacies have so frequently led good Churchmen, as well as others, to take false positions, that it appears to me to be urgently necessary that the matter should be set right. 1st. The Easter of the British Church is assumed to have had its origin in the East. 2nd. The Anglican Church is assumed to be the unbroken successor of the Ancient British Church. Now while both the above assumptions are thoroughly believed in by the majority of Anglicans, they are absolutely contrary to historical evidence. In order, however, that my confident assertion may not prejudice my readers before they examine the basis of my contention, let me say that Prof. Wells, writing in *The Church Eclectic*, after reviewing some of my M.S. on this point, says: "Many of the books on this subject are defaced with such errors that those who have once compared them with the originals, as Rev.

Mr. Whatham has done, will agree with him that they are not trustworthy."

Fallacy 1. The Eastern origin of the British Church has been claimed upon the understanding that the British and Irish Christians observed the Easter Festival according to the custom adopted by the Eastern Church. That is to say, "on the eve of the 14th day of the moon corresponding to that of the month Nisan." On the assumption of its oriental Easter, the founders of the ancient British Church have been traced either directly to the Churches superintended by the Apostle St. John, or else to the Church of Lyons presided over by Irenaeus, a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of St. John. The truth of the matter is, however, that the British Church observed the Easter Festival according to the method "which they had originally received from Rome" (Canon Venables, *Ency. Brit.*, Easter.) It would appear that "before the Council of Nice the practice of the British Church harmonized with that of the Roman Church, the most ancient table for Easter agreeing with that of the British Church" (Warren, *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*.) Canon Brown further tells us that "The Council of Arles, in 314, had found that the West, Britain included, was unanimous in its computation of Easter" (The Christian Church in these islands before Augustine.) From the above it will be seen that Canon Venables' assertion in the article already referred to, viz., that "false inferences are drawn as to the eastern origin of the British Church" from the stigma of the Quartodecimans heresy unfairly attempted to be fixed upon them by their opponents, is abundantly warranted. Yet Mr. Soames in his "Latin Church," tries to argue for this eastern origin, but his attempt forces him into a somewhat amusing position. He tells us that the opposition of the British Church to Augustine in the matter of Easter, "could scarcely have happened" had all the British congregations fallen in with the decision of the Council of Arles that Easter was to be observed uniformly. He gathers from this opposition that only those congregations in the see cities of the British prelates who signed the canons of Arles, agreed with its decision in the matter of Easter; while those congregations dwelling without those cities, in other words the provincial congregations of the British Church of that period, repudiated what their representatives have done. And as proof of his contention he asks "Why did Britain side with the Eastern Church?" But Britain did not side with the Eastern Church, but with the custom which she had originally received from the Church of Rome, the cause of the difference at that time being as follows: After the Council of Arles, on account of errors arising from the use of the cycle of 84 years, which all the Churches at that time adopted, the Church of Rome obtained from Victorius, of Aquitaine, in 457, and from Dionysius Exiguus in 525, a more accurate basis of calculation. In 541 the Council of Orleans agreed that this new cycle was the one to be uniformly followed, but the British and Irish Churches steadily refused to give up the previous one of 84 years. The importance of the above explanation will readily be seen from the following quotation from Bishop Dowden's "Celtic Church in Scotland": "In past times there were mistakes among students as to the nature of the differences on this subject (Easter) between the Celtic and Roman Churches. Some erroneously imagined that the Scotch Church followed the practice of the 'Quartodecimans' in the second century. But this is now known to be an entirely incorrect view." From the above it will be seen that in refusing to adopt Augustine's time of celebrating Easter, the British Church did not side with the Eastern Church as Mr. Soames would have us believe, but with the Church of Rome's former method of calculation, a very important difference. Before leaving this matter I may add that the British and Irish Churches, as well as differing from the Church of Rome at this period in the matter of Easter, are supposed to have differed from each other. It is, however, a difficult matter to decide as to what this difference was, or even if it actually existed. Palmer in his "Origines Liturgicae" informs us, quoting from Aldhelm, abbas Meldensis, "that the British and Irish derived their paschal from that of Severus Sulpitius." Aldhelm, however, in the very passage to which Palmer refers, mentions both Anatolius and Sulpitius as the possible sources from which the British and Irish may have derived their Easter. This is an important point, as Canon Brown tells us, that the Irish Church used the cycle of Anatolius, a Bishop of Laodicea, in the third century; while the British Church used the cycle arranged by Sulpitius Severus, the disciple of Martin of Tours, about 410. Mr. Olden, however, in his recent "History of Ireland," informs us that "the Irish used the ancient cycle of eighty-four years usually attributed to Sulpitius Severus, but really of earlier date." There is a grave mistake here somewhere, since the cycle of Anatolius, according to Hensley in "Smith's Dict. of Antic," was a 19 year cycle and not an 84 one. Thus if the Irish used a cycle of 84 years according