

would have paid for their labors with their lives. Had they suspected that their honest opinions would have been so passionately criticised in a far country and far distant age or that their conclusions were to bind a remote posterity in galling chains, their equanimity might have been disturbed. As they had undertaken to speak only for their own age in religion they could not feel themselves accountable for what men might suffer by turning their formulas into fetters. Still though they had heads that could be cut off and necks that could be stretched, their deliberations seem to have been as respectable even in manner as "the greatest doctrinal discussion ever held in this country."

As a proof of the treatment, which the Divines sometimes receive Dr. Schaff tells us that "the Westminster Assembly and Long Parliament were no more tolerant toward the Episcopalians and deprived at least two thousand of them of their livings." Thus they are not only classed with the Synod of Dort but bracketed with the Long Parliament in a transaction with which they had nothing to do. This could not have been done on religious grounds, as the English clergy were all nominally Episcopalians and no other frame of church government had been set up; though an ordinance had expelled the bishops from the House of Lords. It could be done only by the power that sanctioned the Assembly itself and claimed the right of reviewing all its legislation, whether that related to doctrine or discipline or worship. For the Assembly met under conditions that were purely Erastian. The deprivation was political and the Assembly had nothing to do with it. So that though "the days of persecution are gone" the days of misrepresentation are not ended.

It furnishes no explanation of the apparent discrepancy between those passages which speak of God's love for all mankind and those which speak of His hating and punishing others, to say that the one set of passages are obscure and must be interpreted by those that are clear. This rule of interpretation does not apply here; for none of the passages are obscure. Those called obscure are just as clear as the other. If God loves all men what is meant by His wrath being revealed from heaven against them—a fact which we daily witness? If he loves all men and will have all men to be saved then, why does He not save them or in other words why did He not decree to save them? Or why does He