

England has never in any of her authoritative Formularies, adopted or even used the word. She did more and better than protest. She reformed herself authoritatively, rejecting the Papacy and its corruptions. Our readers will be interested to see no small support of these views in the following quotation in form of a lecture delivered by the celebrated Signor Gavazzi, on the Free Church of Italy, in Cook's Church, Toronto, as reported in the *Toronto Globe*, August 27th, 1872: "He would now make a statement which would startle many of them. They did not want to be Protestants; he had refused to be Protestant in Italy, because that meant to protest, and protesting was always the resort of the vanquished. . . . They were now victorious, and did not intend to protest against Rome. They would act with more purpose; they would destroy the Papal system."

The historical use of the word in the English Church, will next claim our attention. So far as it has been technically used in this Church, it was always in a definite sense—corresponding to that system of doctrine and worship established by law, and which the sovereign was pledged to profess and maintain. Surely it can require no argument to satisfy a reasonable man that it could not be seriously employed to cover the whole discordant mass of anti-papal sects. Of this it will be well to give a few illustrations. Archbishop Laud and King Charles the First, were barbarously murdered, under the semblance of law, on this ground, among others, viz., that they designed the subversion of Protestantism—meaning, of course, the system established by law. We need not

pause to note the horrid hypocrisy of the charge, made by men who successfully accomplished that overthrow. In his defence, the Archbishop solemnly pretested, "he never intended, much less endeavoured, the subversion of the laws of the Kingdom, nor the bringing in of Popish superstition upon the true Protestant religion, established by law in this Kingdom." And of the King, he said, "On my conscience I know him to be as guiltless of this charge as any man now living. I hold that he is as sound a Protestant, according to the religion by law established, as any man in his dominions; and that no one would more freely venture his life in defence of it." In his last will, the Archbishop declared that he died a true and faithful member of the Protestant Church of England. Here we see what the name Protestant imports in the mouth of an English Churchman.

Archbishop Bramhall, of Dublin, a learned anti-Roman controversialist, speaking of King James the First and the Lancashire people, who were largely Romanists, says, "By this prudent condescension, he gained the people from Popery to the Protestant Religion." Every one may see what it means here, before dissent had any toleration in England. Chillingworth's celebrated book, "The Religion of Protestants, a safe way to Salvation," had prefixed to it the "approbation" of the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, and that of the Divinity Professors of Oxford and Cambridge; affirming that they found nothing therein contrary to the English Church in doctrine or discipline, but much that is ably argued against the adversaries of our Church and of Catholic truth.