

icans one step towards proving the Lambeth consecration. With respect to this latter, there are many reasons why the Register cannot be admitted in evidence; and as it is necessary to refresh the Church Editor's memory, I will now give him some of these reasons.

1. Fifty-three years elapsed between the said consecration and the first public reference by Mason to the Record; yet Anglican ordinations had been contested from the very infancy of the church. Had the Register existed, would it have been left 'under a bushel' all this time?

Not only was the validity but the fact of Parker's consecration denied. The assertion indeed was frequently made, that the first Bishops (Parker, Horn, &c.) were consecrated without any ceremony. This assertion could never have been repeated nor would the Protestant clergy have remained silent during 53 years, without any public reference to the Register, had such Register existed.

2. Upon the publication of the Nag's Head story, in 1603, had the Lambeth Register existed at the time, it certainly would have been referred to. It was not, however, all ten years after this that the world was made aware of the existence of the document.

3. According to Mason, whose statement must be bound up with the register, Parker was elected about December 1559, but in an authentic Royal Commission of 20th October, he was styled absolutely "Archbishop of Canterbury" two months before he was said to have been elected!

4. According to Hollinshed, Parker was in possession of Lambeth Palace and was "Bishop of Canterbury" in November 1559; he had therefore obtained the restoration of his temporalities at that time; a restoration which was never made till after consecration; hence Parker's consecration, if he had any, must have been previous to December 1559. It is not pretended however that he had any before the 17th of this month.

5. Parker is called "Archbishop elect of Canterbury" in a royal commission of 9th September, but in another commission of 20th October, before mentioned, he is addressed absolutely "the most Reverend Father in Christ, Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury." Now as this commission of 20th October was issued, to empower the persons therein named to present the oath of supremacy to all persons ecclesiastical, or lay, within their respective jurisdictions; it follows that Parker, Grindall and Coxe, named therein, must have been then regarded as Bishops. Whatever consecration therefore Parker received must have been between the 9th September and 20th of the following October.

6. The pretended commission of 6th December, from which it is said followed the consecration of Parker, on the 17th December, had no mark, by which Rymer could distinguish it from spurious documents; it must consequently be rejected, as not authentic.

7.—Upon the "birth" of the Register in 1613, so great importance was attached to it, that the then Archbishop of Canterbury, with six Bishops, had the same paraded before a few Catholic priests, taken from their prisons, to satisfy them of its existence;—when however, these priests desired a second look at the Register, it was denied them.—This fact of itself is almost proof positive of the spurious character of the document!

8.—The Register is suspicious, in that the wording differs from all entries that precede and follow it;—and because those who quote it, give us five different accounts of the same facts,—it is suspicious too, because it enters into particulars altogether out of place, and improbable. Thus it tells us of "a red cloth on the floor," "Tapistry," Miles Coverdale's "woolen gown," &c. &c. while there was a concourse of people, &c. although the

ceremony commenced two or three hours before daylight! Yet this was at a time when no importance whatever was attached to the rite of episcopal consecration.

Lastly, let it be borne in mind, that Mason was chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury; as such it was both in his power to falsify the records at Lambeth and his interest to do so, and then, let the acknowledgment of the Protestant Whitaker also be borne in mind. FORGERY, I BLUSH FOR THE HONOUR OF PROTESTANTISM. WHILE I WRITE IT, SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN PECULIAR TO THE REFORMED.' (Vindication of Mary Q. of Scots.)

But enough, all that I have here said will be found fully stated and supported, in Bishop Kenrick's book on 'Anglican Ordinations,' to which admirable work I would refer your readers; in the meantime however, I think it will be granted, that if the objections above given, do not wholly nullify the testimony of the Lambeth Register, they at all events render it more than extremely doubtful; and consequently not to be depended on in a matter of such vital importance.

In conclusion, I would observe, that as it is not at all necessary to disprove Parker's consecration, in order to defeat the Anglican's claim to a commission or succession; so, Catholics have no interest whatever in denying that it took place. They do not deny the consecration of Downham, or Stanley or May, altho' no records exist of these. They do not deny that of Parker, solely because they believe the Register spurious; but they deny it because all the facts of the case go to show its extreme improbability at least if not its impossibility.

Parker's consecration, be it remembered, unlike that of Downham, Stanley, or May, was contested from the first by Catholics; while Protestants were suspiciously silent upon the subject for the space of fifty-three years. Parker, moreover, was the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury. His consecration therefore requires to be PROVED. Before Anglicans attempt to support the validity of their orders, they must establish the fact of Parker's orders. This we say they cannot do. They cannot even show probability on their side. Their Bishops, then, (even setting aside the question of validity) are at best improbable Bishops, and their claim to Apostolic Succession vain and foolish.

Believe me, Rev. Sir,  
Yours Respectfully,  
A LAYMAN.

Kingston, March 20, 1813.

**ORIGIN OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.**

Or the American Branch of "the English church Catholic."

Mr. Editor,—Our separated brethren of the "Protestant Episcopal Church," in part, seem ashamed of this name. In right of their English Mother, they now claim to be a branch of the "English Church Catholic." Certainly they are welcome to the honor of the descent. T. Babington Macaulay, one of the ablest Protestant writers of the day, in the *Edinburg Review*, for 1828, gives the following history of the origin of this same "English Church Catholic." After stating that "the work which had been begun by Henry, the murderer of his wives, was continued by Somerset, the murderer of his brother, and completed by Elizabeth, the murderer of her guest," he continues as follows:

"Mr. Hallam has been severely censured for saying, with his usual placid severity, that if we weigh the character of this prelate (Cranmer) in an equal bal-

ance, he will appear far indeed removed from the turpitude imputed to him by his enemies. Yet not entitled to any extraordinary veneration, we will venture to expand the sense of Mr. Hallam, and to comment on it thus: If we consider Cranmer morally as a statesman, he will not appear a much worse man than Wolsey, Gardiner, Cromwell, or Somerset. But when an attempt is made to set him up as a saint, it is scarcely possible for any man of sense, who knows the history of the times well, to preserve his gravity.

..... The shameful origin of his history, common enough in the scandalous chronicles of courts, seems strangely out of place in a hagiology. Cranmer rose into favor, by serving Henry in a disgraceful affair of his first divorce. He promoted the marriage of Anne Boleyn with the King, and on a frivolous pretence, he pronounced it null and void. On a pretence, if possible, still more frivolous, he dissolved the ties which bound the shameless tyrant to Anne of Cleves. He attached himself to Cromwell, while the fortunes of Cromwell flourished. He voted for cutting off his head, without a trial, when the tide of royal favor turned. He conformed backwards and forwards as the king changed his mind. While Henry lived, he assisted in condemning to the flames those who denied the doctrine of transubstantiation. When Henry died, he found out that the doctrine was false. He was however, not at a loss for people to burn. The authority of his station, and of his gray hairs was employed to overcome the disgust with which an intelligent and virtuous child regarded persecution.

Intolerance is always bad. But the sanguinary intolerance of a man who thus wavered in his creed, excites a loathing to which it is difficult to give vent, without calling foul names. Equally false to political and religious obligations, he was first the tool of Somerset, and then the tool of Northumberland. When the former wished to put his own brother to death, without even the form of a trial, he found a ready instrument in Cranmer. In spite of the canon law, which forbade a churchman to take any part in matters of blood, the Archbishop signed the warrant for the atrocious sentence. When Somerset had been in his turn destroyed, his destroyer received the support of Cranmer, in his attempt to change the course of the succession.

The apology made for him by his admirers, only renders his conduct more contemptible. He complied, it is said against his better judgment, because he could not resist the entreaties of Edward! A holy prelate of sixty, one would think might be better employed by the bedside of a dying child, than in committing crimes at the request of his disciples. If he had shown half as much fairness when Edward requested him to commit treason, as he had before shown when Edward requested him not to commit murder, he might have saved the country from one of the greatest misfortunes that it ever underwent. He became, from whatever motive, the accomplice of the worthless Dudley. The virtuous scruples of ano-

ther young and amiable mind were to be overcome. As Edward had been forced into persecution, Jane was to be seduced into usurpation. No transaction in our annals is more unjustifiable than this. If a hereditary title were to be respected, Mary possessed it. If a parliamentary title were preferable, Mary possessed that also. If the interest of the Protestant religion required a departure from the ordinary rule of succession, that interest would have been best served by raising Elizabeth to the throne. If the foreign relations of the kingdom were considered, still stronger reasons might be found for preferring Elizabeth to Jane. There was great doubt whether Jane or the Queen of Scotland had the better claim; and that doubt would in all probability have produced a war both with Scotland & France, if the project of Northumberland had not been blasted in its infancy. That Elizabeth had a better claim than the Queen of Scotland, was indisputable.\* To the part which Cranmer, and unfortunately some better men than Cranmer, took in this most reprehensive scheme, much of the severity, with which the Protestants were afterwards treated, must in fairness be ascribed.

The plot failed; Popery (Catholicism) triumphed; and Cranmer recanted. Most people look on his recantation as a single blemish on an honorable life, the frailty of an unguarded moment. But in fact it was in strict accordance with the system on which he had uniformly acted. It was part of a regular habit. It was not the first recantation that he had made; and in all probability, if it had answered its purpose it would not have been the last. We do not blame him for not choosing to be burnt alive. It is no very severe reproach to any person, that he does not possess heroic fortitude. But surely a man who liked the fire so little, should have had some sympathy for others. A persecutor who inflicts nothing which he is not ready to endure, deserves some respect. But when a man, who loves his doctrines more than the lives of his neighbours—loves his own little finger better than his doctrines—a very simple argument a fortiori, will enable us to estimate the amount of his benevolence.

But his martyrdom, it is said, redeemed every thing. It is extraordinary that so much ignorance should exist on this subject. The fact is, that if a martyr be a man who chooses to die rather than to renounce his opinions, Cranmer was no more a martyr than Dr. Dod. He died solely because he could not help it. He never retracted his recantation, till he found he had made it in vain. The Queen was fully resolved, that Catholic or Protestant, he should burn. Then he spoke out, as people generally speak out when they are at the point of death, and have nothing to hope or to fear on earth. If Mary had suffered him to live, we suspect that he would have heard mass, and received absolution, like a good Catholic, till the accession of Elizabeth; and that he would then have purchased by another apostasy, the power of burning men, better and braver than himself.

\* This however is not true.—Ed.  
(Continued on Page 230.)