

we stand
opulians.
at we say
ve exper-

h in the
ould have
ist." But
it of Ply-
hers and
d States,
there is
at would
n as the

leads to.
ys, "No
r of the
ter; AS
an be in-
ording to
on, page

e ONLY
churches.
es; those
and have
ought to
ngs, and
hings are
are mem-
l to those
hold, the
mediately
ainst their
their will,
children
ause they
ause they
Dr. Ly-

man Abbott say, "WE CONGREGATIONALISTS ARE NOT LOGICAL," and truly has he also said, "THE BAPTISTS ARE MORE LOGICAL."

I suppose the Dr *meant* that the Baptists are more "SCRIPTURAL," but that would be granting them a little too much, and would belittle his own body beyond endurance. Nevertheless any child can see that is the logical conclusion one must draw from the doctor's premises.

That great English Congregationalist Dr. John Campbell, in a "PRIZE ESSAY" for which he was awarded one hundred guineas by the Committee of the English "Congregational Union" declared that "AS THINGS NOW GENERALLY STAND, THE PEDO-BAPTIST THEORY IS ALTOGETHER WITHOUT A PARTICLE OF PRACTICE, BEYOND THE EFFUSION OF WATER; IT IS EVERY WAY UNPROFITABLE, AND NOTHING SUPPORTS IT BUT BLIND CUSTOM."

Now why did not Dr. Campbell give up that "BLIND CUSTOM," and practise what he believed to be the baptism of the New Testament? And why does not Dr. Abbott honor his conscience and obey the Word of God, by practising what he knows to be the ONLY baptism in the New Testament? The only guess I can make that seems a good one, is that, "BY A WISE EXERCISE OF CHRISTIAN FREEDOM," Dr. Abbott prefers his twenty thousand dollars a year and alliance with error, to a quarter that sum with the New Testament on his side.