

Querist's Column.

[All matter intended for this column should be addressed to E. C. Ford, Port Williams, Kings County, N. S. Questions touching the meaning of scriptures will be gladly received.]

Please answer the following queries through THE CHRISTIAN :

1st. How do you reconcile I. John i. 8-9 and I. John iii. 8-9?

2nd. Explain Matthew xxviii. 19. Go ye therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. 1st. Is the above translation correct? 2nd. If so, what is the antecedent of them?

3rd. Does a disciple of Christ necessarily mean one who has been baptized into Christ?

The answers to the above will be thankfully read by
A BROTHER IN CHRIST.

P. E. I.

1st. The passages referred to read: "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." And again: "He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God."

In the first chapter of this epistle the apostle is stating a fact of which all who would live godly in Christ Jesus, are painfully conscious; i. e., in us, because of the weakness of the flesh, there is a tendency to sin; that evil is present with us; that like Paul, we must keep under the body, "and bring it into subjection." If any man says he is under no such influence, is not "subject to like passions," hence has no need of the blood of Christ, nor the means provided for our cleansing, he is deceived, and the very truth that teaches us this lesson, is not in him.

Our experience, also, as well as the truth, teaches us that even in our best efforts to "walk in the light," we too frequently fail; hence the comforting assurance, that while thus "walking in the light, as he is in the light," if we "confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins," etc., thus making provision for our weakness, and for our probable mistakes while fighting the "good fight of faith."

But in the third chapter of this epistle the inspired writer is looking at another side of this question. Having spoken of our weakness, and of our dependence upon Christ, he now contemplates the man as living a life of faith in the Son of God. He is contrasting the children of God, and the children of the devil. The man that is born of God is not living a sinful life. Indeed he cannot as long as the word of God, which is the seed of the kingdom, remains in him. Christ came to "destroy the works of the devil," among which is the love of sin. Thus when we are born again, when Christ is received into our hearts, the love of sin must be destroyed; for we cannot love Christ, and love sin at the same time. So long then as the word of God remains in us, so long we will live righteously. It would be contrary to our new natures to live lives of sin.

He that thus lives, who follows unrighteousness, is simply a child of the devil, no matter though he may profess to be a child of God. His manner of living will decide this question. The man that is born of God may be "overtaken in a fault;" provision has been made for this; he may make his mistakes; some of the apostles did this; but he cannot, as long as the word of God remains in him, lead a sinful, or an unrighteous life.

2nd. Since the R. V., as well as the weight of the scholarship of our day, accepts this translation, we are safe in saying it is correct.

Both the grammatical construction, and the sense of this passage warrant the conclusion that the word "disciples" is the antecedent of "them." The commission is: "Go make disciples" —, "baptizing them;" or as some good authorities render it: "by baptizing them." "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put him on. Gal. iii. 26 27. According to this baptism is a part of the process of making disciples.

As there is no mention, in the word of God, of an unbaptized disciple of Christ, and as baptism is a part of the process of getting into Christ, the conclusion must be that a disciple of Christ must "necessarily" be one who has "been baptized into Christ." But as the meaning of the word disciple is "a learner," "a follower," there is much more involved in being, or becoming, a disciple of Christ, than our baptism. It implies first, a hearty faith, and love to God. "If a man loves me he will keep my words," says the Saviour. This faith and love is first manifested in his willingness to obey. It also implies a complete consecration of the whole man to the service of Christ. We become the disciples of our Lord by our faith in Him, and our obedience to His commandments, and continue in this relationship by "observing all things" that He has commanded. The man who accepted the gospel, but continues not in the all things our Lord has commanded, is no more a disciple of Christ than the man who hears the gospel and even believes it, but refuses to obey its commandments.

In your answer to my question as to whether Judas was present when the Lord's supper was instituted, you base your reason for thinking he was not from the fact that he went out from the passover supper before the institution of the Lord's supper; in proof of which you quote John xiii. 30. Now I understand that this was not the passover supper, but a supper in Bethany a few days before the passover. Would you give a little more fully your reasons for thinking that this is the passover of which John is speaking in this chapter?

H. E. C.

Because some of the same events recorded in Matt. xxvi., Mark xiv. and Luke xxii., where the last passover is particularly spoken of, and in connection with this supper, are also recorded in connection with the supper spoken of in John xiii. Reference is here made to the prediction of the betrayal of Judas, and of the denial of Peter. There is no room for doubt that the first three witnesses associate these events with the last passover supper. And when it is seen that John records the same events in connection with the supper of which he is writing in this 13th chapter, it is very evident that the four witnesses are speaking of the same supper.

This is further evident from the fact that the first three witnesses agree that from this passover supper, after our Lord had instituted the Lord's supper, they went to the garden of Gethsemane. From John xviii. 1, we learn that "when Jesus had spoken these words, he went forth with his disciples over the brook Cedron, where was a garden"

Now all the events recorded beginning with the 13th chapter of this book, and ending with the 17th, are spoken of in connection with this supper in John xiii. And as, according to Matt., Mark and Luke, our Lord went from the passover supper to the garden; and according to John's testimony He went from this supper of which he was writing to the garden, it is still more evident that the four writers are speaking of the same passover supper.

This being true, and as it is plain that Judas went out while they were yet eating the passover, John xiii. 21 30, and before the institution of the Lord's supper, it is very plain that he was not present on this solemn occasion.

However, it is not proposed to follow this any further. If any can think that Jesus, who knows

the hearts of all men, would tolerate the likes of Judas, when He would institute this feast of love, thus encouraging bad men to sit around the Lord's table, they must be left to the freedom of their own opinions.

When thou art come unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it, and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are about me; thou shalt in anywise set him king over thee whom the Lord thy God shall choose; one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee; thou mayest not set a stranger over thee which is not thy brother. But he shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses; forasmuch as the Lord hath said unto you, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way. Neither shall he multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away; neither shall he multiply to himself silver and gold.—Deut. xvii. 14-17.

Was Samuel acquainted with this passage? If so, how do you explain his course of action when the people asked for a king? E. B. B.

Brought up as Samuel was, to "minister before the Lord" from his childhood, it could hardly be supposed that he was not acquainted with this passage. But when it is understood that Moses spoke prophetically, and neither sanctioned, nor recommended the asking for a king, but simply provided for this emergency when it should arise, it will be seen that there is nothing in the action of Samuel that conflicts with this passage.

It must be noticed that asking for a king did not only displease Samuel, but it displeased the Lord as well. There may have been a touch of the human in him, and he may have complained to the Lord that the people were rejecting him; but the Lord said: "they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me." But from all the words of Samuel spoken on this occasion, it is evident that his great concern was that their king would not be like the one Moses had said they must have, but would be like the kings of the nations. Hence the Lord said: "protest solemnly unto them, and shew them the manner of the king that shall reign over them." This was just the kind of a king that Moses had said they must not have. This, we think, gives a satisfactory explanation of Samuel's actions "when the people asked for a king."

Home Mission Notes.

Place.	Preachers.	Additions.
Sterling Depot, Ill.,	Hall and Hutto,	144
Warronburg, Mo.,	Boyer and Brown,	192
Jackson, O.,	J. P. Ewing,	106
Saugus, Iowa,	R. B. Brown,	117
Winchester, Ky.,	I. J. Spencer,	122
Woodland, Cal.,	W. A. Foster,	180
Columbus, Ind.,	Sweeney and Snall,	233
Valparaiso, Ind.,	J. H. O. Smith,	182

We are glad to know these large meetings still go on.

Those who know Bro. Romig do not wonder at the success that attends his preaching.

NEWTON, Kan., April 9 — We closed a five weeks' meeting at Ness City last night, and organized a church, with ninety-nine members. There were about 135 public confessions, but many were hindered from obeying the gospel by home influences. Sixty-nine were baptized during the meeting. There were eight or ten skeptics and infidels, gamblers and jointists among the number.—J. A. L. ROMIG.

A GOOD MEETING.—None of our brethren had ever preached in Saugus, Iowa. Bro. R. B. Brown went there and found two Disciples. He began to preach, and in eighteen days there was 119 Disciples. How those two must have rejoiced over 117 additions!

WAS IT RIGHT? Sister Sarah McCoy went to Marcelline, Ill., to help in the Sunday-school,