

have assumed the liberty to celebrate this Memorial at various times—weekly, monthly, quarterly, etc., but in harmony with the early church we understand our Lord to mean that we should celebrate this as we celebrate any other event—on its anniversary; just as we now might say. As oft as the Fourth of July is celebrated it shows forth the Independence of this nation.

Those who celebrate our Lord's death in the "Last Supper" at noon every Sunday, mistake it for the weekly "Love Feast" or "Breaking of Bread" practiced every Lord's Day by the early church in memory of our Lord's resurrection and his opening of the eyes of their understanding in the breaking of bread. Rightly understood, nothing in these weekly feasts of joy resembled the annual commemoration of our Master's sorrow and death—nor is the "cup" ever mentioned in connection with them.

The church at Allegheny will celebrate the Memorial Supper commemorative of our Redeemer's death for us, and of our Pass-over from death unto life through the merit of his sacrifice, and of our consecration to "be dead with him"—to drink his "cup"—on the evening of April 12th at 7:30 o'clock at Bible House chapel, Allegheny, Pa. Friends of the truth who can make it convenient to meet with us will be welcomed cordially; but we advise that wherever there are home-meetings or wherever such gatherings seem possible they be not deserted. No other season seems so favorable for the drawing of the hearts of the Lord's people closely together;—even as it seems also to be specially an hour of temptation to all professing to be the Lord's followers, who like Peter of old seem to be specially sifted at this season of the year.

The advice of our Lord to the early disciples, at this time of the year, seems still specially appropriate, "Watch and pray lest ye enter into temptation." And recognizing this the older systems Roman Catholic and Episcopalian still preceded the Memorial with a fast or Lenten season—which entered into not formally but in the spirit we believe is a very helpful custom to many—not only physically but spiritually.

"Good Friday" was substituted for the Memorial Supper as originally observed by the Lord's people—the system of counting being slightly changed. The more frequent celebrations of the Lord's Supper by Protestants are based upon Papacy's celebration of the "Mass," an institution which both in fact and theory is an abomination to our Lord—denying as it does the fullness of the efficacy of the original sacrifice at Calvary.

We trust that the Lord's people everywhere will "do this" in remembrance of the great sin-sacrifice—not merely as an outward memorial but also and specially at the same time feeding on the Lord by faith in their hearts, and afresh pledging their consecration unto death with him while partaking of the "cup." For further particulars see our issue of March 1, 1898.

We will be glad to have prompt postal card reports from the appointed secretary or scribe of each little group—wherever "two or three" meet in his dear name to do this. Make all your arrangements beforehand that the precious season of heart "communion" be not disturbed by business affairs. Let us not only unite in prayer and communion, but also so far as practicable in our songs of praise—using numbers 23, 122 and 1 of *Hymns of Dawn*.

AVOID FLATTERY

In a recent letter one of the "Pilgrims," after giving particulars respecting his efforts to feed the Lord's sheep and lambs concludes thus:—

"Pray for me, dear brother, that I may be kept a 'servant.'"

Could you not in some way through the TOWER suggest to the friends not to praise a 'pilgrim' to his face: they do not know what 'offences' they sometimes cause, what feelings of latent pride they arouse."

VOL. XXI

ALLEGHENY, PA., MARCH 15 AND APRIL 1, 1900

NOS. 6 AND 7

WHICH IS THE TRUE GOSPEL?

"I am not Ashamed of the Gospel of Christ."—Rom. 1:16.

A Discourse by Pastor C. T. Russell of Allegheny, Pa., delivered at The Florida Chautauqua Assembly, Defuniak Springs, Fla., March 4, 1900, as reported by the Associated Press.

No apology seems necessary for our subject—"Which is the true Gospel of which the Apostle was not ashamed?" If time and thought may be profitably expended in the study of the earthly sciences—sociology, finance, etc., etc., built largely upon human inferences and conjectures—surely none could dispute the propriety of studying the science of divine revelation. If it be profitable to investigate the physical diseases of mankind and their causes, and the laws of medicine and of sanitation for the offset of these, it surely cannot be disputed that the Gospel which God has presented as the antidote for soul-sickness and soul-death, and as the science pertaining to life eternal, is worthy of still greater and more profound consideration.

The greatest minds, the noblest specimens of our race, have admitted our topic to be the one above all others in importance, and have weighed it carefully—whether as a result they accepted or rejected it. We are not now discussing the weight of mental acumen enlisted for and against the Gospel: we are merely noting the fact that all men of ability have recognized that the subject is worthy of their careful consideration, and as having claims upon their attention paramount to any and all others. Indeed, it may be set down as a fact that whoever has given the subject of religion no consideration is one of three things,—a novice in mental exercise, or a near relative to "the fool who hath said in his heart, There is no God," or a coward, preyed upon by fears, instigated by Satan to hinder honest investigation of the divine message of love and mercy.

Even a hasty glance into the intelligent faces of this large audience assures me that you all have given some thought to our theme;—though experience assures me that comparatively few of you have ever reached conclusions on this subject fully satisfactory to yourselves. Hence your faith and love and zeal toward God and your zeal for the Gospel are less strong than you could desire. Let us hope that as we reason together on this great subject to-day, we may, by God's grace, see more clearly than ever before which is the true

Gospel—the one of which the Apostle was not ashamed, and of which, therefore, none of us need feel ashamed,—the Gospel, therefore, which should move and more move and energize us as the power of God unto salvation.

No one of intelligence will dispute the meaning of the word "Gospel;" it signifies "good tidings," good news,—a good message. Nevertheless, in some unaccountable manner, by common consent, "a real Gospel sermon" is almost universally understood to signify bad tidings—tidings of eternal misery to the great mass of our race—to all except the little flock of God's faithful people. As a consequence the preacher of a "Gospel sermon" is expected to figuratively shake the congregation over an abyss of everlasting torture, making as strong an effort as possible to intimidate them thereby to a thorough reformation of life, in hope of thus escaping an awful eternity.

True, this that we might term "the Gospel (!) of damnation" is not so generally preached as it once was, because more enlightened minds of cultured people repudiate it as a fetish of the past. Yet this perversion of the Gospel is still to be heard in country places, at camp meetings, occasionally in the city pulpit, and universally in Salvation Army meetings. Nothing is further from our intention than a criticism of the consciences and honesty of intention of those who thus preach. It is no part of our mission to criticize persons and motives, but "With malice toward none and with charity toward all" we consider it not only our privilege but our duty to criticize doctrines, that thereby the truth may be more freely established, and error brought into disrepute.

Before we proceed to the consideration of the Gospel of which the Apostle was not ashamed—the Gospel set forth in the Scriptures—it will be expedient for us to take a glance at the different gospels set forth by the various denominations of Christendom. It is not our thought that each denomination represents a different gospel, for the differences in many instances are chiefly respecting ceremonies, forms, methods of government, name, etc., and not in respect to the