

D7 DAVIS, John. *Bedydd*. (Baptism.) *Merthyr Tydfil: J. Davis, Printer, [1849.]*

12 pp. 17 cm. *Welsh Mormon Writings* 31.

John Davis intended this publication on baptism to be the definitive word on the subject. The well-structured contents are presented under five major headings:

1. What is the primary purpose of baptism?
2. Who is subject to baptism?
3. How is baptism administered?
4. Was there any difference between the baptism of John and the baptism of Christ?
5. What does it mean to be born of water and of the spirit?

Davis devotes four pages to the second heading, five pages to the third, and a paragraph to each of the other three. He backs up his line of logic with numerous scriptures. Much had been written on the topic by other members of the Church by 1849; Davis appears to have availed himself of various sources.

BAPTISM.

MANY battles on the fields of paper and tongue have been fought about baptism. The men who fight them are sent, so they say, to administer the ordinance. It is a very surprising thing to the mind of a thoughtful man to see so many missionaries for God administering the ordinance of baptism, something that he set up, and all in disagreement concerning it. How can a preacher have been sent by God to baptize, if he does not know for certain how to baptize, and whom to baptize? It is impossible, we should think. The disciples of Christ, in the apostolic age, were well acquainted with baptism; consequently, it is not the accounts about baptism in the New Testament that furnish explanation about its administration, rather it is what is mentioned unintentionally. This is all the various denominations consider essential in order to administer it, instead of proper instruction from God, or through receiving it from those who knew. The scriptural historians did not intend to show how to administer baptism, nor to describe the things pertaining to it, rather they made this known accidentally. It is obvious, then, that they did not mean for anyone to take what they had written, *only*, as sufficient to receive the proper instruction to administer the ordinance, but they received the direction given by Christ traditionally. It is reasonable to believe that Christ gave a detailed description of the ordinance to his apostles; for there is no account of any misunderstanding about it in all the New Testament; but yet that description is not in writing, and consequently in this age we cannot obtain instruction except from God directly, or through tradition, apart from that which we gather from the scriptural historians when in passing they mention some things pertaining to baptism.

Having made that observation, it now seems incredible that no denomination of believers have dealt properly with baptism, and how it was set down by Christ. But lest we condemn anyone unintentionally, let us make a fair search of the incidental mentions about baptism in the New Testament; and if we find some denomination that corresponds

in its administration of baptism to that which we can gather from the New Testament, it will be quite likely that that denomination has been instructed by God directly, or through tradition; or, at least, it will appear as the most correct among the others. We can search, then, for Baptism as follows:—

I. WHAT IS THE PRIMARY PURPOSE OF BAPTISM?

Here is a question that is answered in many ways. Some say that it is a demonstration that the baptized professes the gospel. Others say it is a sign that he is justified before God. Some claim that it is an outward manifestation of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and others that it is a token, like the circumcision of old. But what does the scripture say about it? Well, it says that John baptized “for remission of sins” (see Mark i, 4; Luke iii, 3). Peter says on the day of Pentecost, “Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the *remission of sins*” (Acts ii, 38). That which Ananias says to Paul, namely “Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins,” shows that forgiveness comes through baptism. John the Baptist exhorted his listeners to bring forth “fruits meet for repentance,” and to “confess their sins” when they were baptized, showing clearly that in baptism there was a forgiveness of sins. This is what one is able to notice with a look at Peter on the day of Pentecost, when he tells the multitude to repent before being baptized. In view of all this it is very natural to determine that baptism is *for the remission of sins*.

II. WHO ARE THE SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM?

The greatest disagreement about this topic is whether infants are suitable subjects or not. Everyone says that believers are suitable. But no matter what anyone says, if baptism for the remission of sins is scriptural, infants are excluded, since they have not sinned; and believing, repentant men are the only subjects. But lest anyone suppose that there is a basis for baptizing infants, let us search into that which is brought forth as proof for that. It is said that Christ’s commandment to teach “*all nations*, baptizing them, &c.,” means that everyone in all the nations are subjects of baptism; and it is said that the words “all nations” are to be understood as the commission, the same kind as in Matt. xxv, 32—“And before him shall be gathered *all nations*.” There is nothing any more special in the words “all nations,” that they should mean *each nation*. If we were commanded to count all nations, we could obey the commandment without counting each individual in all the nations; but if we were

commanded to kill all nations, we could not do that without killing every person in all the nations. If we wished to convince all nations, there would be no use in our trying to convince infants, although the phrase is quite grammatical; but if we wished to drown all nations, we would have to drown the infants and everyone else. It is obvious, therefore, that the meaning of "all nations" depends entirely on what is connected with it. "Preaching the gospel to *every creature*" is also understood in the same way. But perhaps someone wishes to refuse the foregoing reasons, and decides that it is necessary to take all nations in the commission in the same meaning as all nations in Matt. xxv, 32— "And before him shall be gathered *all nations*." Let the defenders of infants be patient, and we shall see whether the last phrases containing *all nations*, are in the broader sense—yes, whether they contain infants or not. We read in Matt. xxv, 32, that all the elect will be gathered before the gathering of all the nations, and since infants are subjects of the kingdom of heaven, it is obvious that they will be gathered with the elect. But regardless of that, we can give proof that *infants* will not be in the gathering of all the nations; and it is as follows:—Christ says to all those on his right hand, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat, &c.;" and he says to those on his left hand, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, &c.; for I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat, &c." Read all the verses. Besides the good and the bad who compose all the nations, Christ speaks of another group, which, it seems, are the elect who were gathered previously; for he says about them, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren." Part of all the nations are rewarded unexpectedly for their good deeds; and the other part are condemned for their bad deeds. Infants do neither good nor bad; consequently, it is obvious, *that infants will not be in these "all nations."* We shall next look at the commission to see what all the nations who are baptized are commanded to do. It is said in Matthew xxviii, 19—"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them;" and in Mark xvi, 15—"Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." In the first, he commands to *teach*, or make disciples of all the nations there are, by baptizing them; and in the second, he commands that his gospel be preached to every creature that is, and those who believed and were baptized would be

saved. It is obvious that teaching or preaching the gospel is intended in both places and that those who received or believed what was taught or preached were subjects for baptism. Those who did not believe were not subjects for baptism, but were condemned; and this shows that not all nations, according to the meaning given to the words by some, were to be baptized. In the first wording of the commission, it is commanded "to teach all things" whatsoever he commanded to his apostles, in addition to that which had been taught to them before. It is clear that teaching the foremost principles of Christianity is what was meant by the first teaching, as Peter did on the day of Pentecost, namely, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." It is seen that Peter says, "Be baptized *every one* of you;" but only "they that gladly received his word were baptized." By the last teaching in the commission, namely "teaching all things," it is understood that the apostles and others gave that teaching to the believers in their letters and their visits to them. The first teaching is not appropriate for those who have become disciples, rather the second teaching; and the latter teaching is not appropriate for those who have not believed, rather the first. Teaching the first or the latter to an infant is foolishness, for it is a great task to teach him how to walk and talk before that; and consequently, it is in accordance with the commission to refrain from baptizing an infant until he has learned the first teaching, for were he to be baptized before that, the commission would be changed to "Baptize, teaching afterwards," as in the case of infants who are now baptized soon after they are born. Something that everyone acknowledges, perhaps, is that every reasonable creature is a subject for preaching, and if he believes that which is preached (but not without that), he is also a subject for baptizing; and consequently, it is seen from this that anyone can be a subject for preaching, when he is not a subject for baptism, by his continuing to be an unbeliever. But let us leave the commission to go to examples of baptizing, in order to see if infants were baptized anywhere. Perhaps someone is ready to shout that the family of the keeper of the prison was all baptized, and that the family contained infants. This is what is said in the account:—"And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to *all* that were in his house;" and it is also said about them, "And he rejoiced, *believing* in God, with *all* his house." Now, if there were infants there, they were preached to, and they believed. It is reasonable, therefore, to assume

that there were no infants there. What is there to say about the family of Lydia, then? Hardly anything. It is obvious that her family was baptized; but the only explanation to be had is that which is in Acts xvi, 40—“And when they [the apostles] went out of the prison, and entered into the house of Lydia: and when they had seen the *brethren*, they *comforted* them, and departed.” It is obvious, we think, that the *brethren* were the family of Lydia, and that they received comforting; at least, there is no suggestion that they had infants, and it is possible that a family can be composed without them. Furthermore, it is said about Crispus and his family—“And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, *believed* on the Lord with *all his house*” (Acts xviii, 8). Again infants were those who were able to believe. Perhaps, then, infants were among all those whom John baptized in the Jordan; but it appears that John’s baptism was entirely inappropriate for infants. About John’s baptism Paul says the following—“John verily baptized with the baptism of *repentance*, saying unto the people, that they should *believe* on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus” (Acts xix, 4). In Mark i, 4, the words *for the remission of sins* are added to “the baptism of repentance.” But, says the baptizer of infants, if all the foregoing examples are unfavorable to our little subjects, that which Christ said is sufficient in the face of all that was shown against them. Christ says about children, “Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God” (Mark x, 14; Math. xix, 14). Now it is argued, if Christ said that infants are subjects of the kingdom of heaven, why, in the name of reason, since they are so good, are they not worthy to be baptized, and come through the door of baptism into the church? Well, they are worthy to go to heaven, if they are infants, for Christ has bought them; but, despite that, Christ did not see those as subjects suitable to be baptized, because they had not sinned. The account shows us that they were blessed, but not baptized. Perhaps they were baptized sometime before that,—how do we know they were not? Well, it is no use for us to imagine about them, whether they were baptized or not; but we can reason, and if reason holds its ground, we are of the opinion that this circumstance will turn more against the baptizers of infants than anything mentioned thus far (except for baptizing “for the remission of sins”), and it will prove obvious that Christ and his disciples never baptized infants, at least, we can say, prior to the time that Christ blessed the little children in question. The way this is

proved is as follows:— We know that Jesus and his disciples practiced baptism at the same time that John baptized (see John iii, 22, 26; iv, 1, 2); and it is reasonable to assume that they began baptizing as early as they began preaching, and had gotten some to believe. Now, if the apostles baptized infants, or after seeing John the Baptist do that, why did they restrict the little children from coming to Christ? If it is thought that they baptized them previously, and that they were not coming to be blessed, then it is illogical to suppose that they would restrict those who had become their brethren, by their being baptized with the same baptism. It is seen from this that all that Christ did was to bless them; and if the defenders or the opposers of infant baptism do anything to them except to bless them, they do that for which our Lord did not set the example. Furthermore, it is seen clearly that those who believe the testimony of the servants of God, and repent of their sins, are the only subjects for the ordinance of baptism.

III. HOW IS BAPTISM ADMINISTERED?

To search out whether immersion or sprinkling is the correct manner of performing the ordinance, let us take the same path as was taken in the two previous topics. Without proceeding to give the opinion of the learned about BAPTIZO, let us look into that which is connected to the word *baptizing* in the Welsh New Testament, and we shall leave all the Greek to those who are “ever learning.” The first thing that deserves our attention is the baptism performed by John; and it is obvious that this one is the best to shed light on our topic. In Matt. iii, 1, it says— “John the Baptist came, preaching in the wilderness of Judea,” and, according to another gospel writer, in “all the country about Jordan,” which shows that by preaching he did not restrict himself to the same place, although it was all in the “wilderness.” “Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan: and were baptized of him *in Jordan*” (ver. 5, 6). “And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John *in Jordan*; and straightway *coming up out of the water*, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit like a dove descending upon him” (Mark i, 9, 10). If the foregoing phrases were new to the reader, and if he knew that immersion or sprinkling was being done, which one of the two would he suppose to be more consistent with the description? He can answer for himself. Some want to make “*in Jordan*” to mean the use of the water of the Jordan, and others to mean nothing more than the bank of the

Jordan. Some also insist on making “coming up *out of the water*,” to mean *from* the water. The Jordan, according to those who argue in that fashion, is made to be very icy, and of a depth along its banks totally unsuitable for immersion; and everything that is advantageous for baptizing by immersion, of necessity is far from it. Some, because it is said that John baptized in Bethabara, *beyond* Jordan, and that Jesus *abode* in that place (John i, 28; x, 40), try to prove that it was not *in* the Jordan that he baptized, rather *beyond* it; and consequently, the use of the water of the Jordan in Bethabara is what is meant by the “*in* Jordan.” Well, what can be said in favor of the use of immersion, and not sprinkling, by John? We say that he baptized *in* the Jordan, not because the word *in* cannot sometimes mean the bank of the river or near it, or “clean the house *in* the blood of the bird,” but because it is *incredible* that John came to the side of the river to sprinkle, and something credible that John went to the river to immerse. A better place was close to houses somewhere, so that he could get a pitcher of water conveniently, rather than take the people to the icy (?) banks of the Jordan, to get cold for no reason, and to suffer, if it was cold, the final icy sprinkles from the sprinkler! If John did not take his candidates for baptism down to the edge of the water, it is inappropriate to say, “coming up *from* the water,” much less *out of* the water; for if he baptized at some distance from the river, to use water from it, it would be much more appropriate to use the words—“Coming up from John,” but not without considering despite that, that John was in a valley, because of the “coming up.” It happens very awkwardly for those who judge that it was in Bethabara that baptisms were done, and that the use of the river by John to baptize there, was the meaning of “*in* Jordan—yes, it happens very awkwardly for them, I say, that Jesus “came straightway *up out of the water!*” The previous mention of Bethabara causes me to ask myself what is the meaning of the name; but with no cause to bother with that now, I remember hearing a famous sprinkler claim that its meaning is *passage*, or an entrance through. Now, if some set Bethabara so close to the Jordan that John could fetch water from there to baptize, we can set it, since *passage* is something likely in a river like this, on the bank of the Jordan, a village or town, or at least a place in which someone like Jesus could “*abide*,” i.e., lodge or dwell. We want to make the river shallow or fordable opposite Bethabara, so that it will be convenient for men and animals to cross over from the other side, since the place has been

named *passage*. If this is allowed, and there is reason for permitting it, we have John baptizing in the Jordan, and in Bethabara with respect to a place on its bank; much like it could be proclaimed that the Reverend Editor of the *Star of Gomer* baptizes in the Towy River, when it was in Carmarthen with respect to a place on its bank. The name Bethabara makes the river in that place not too deep for immersion, and places houses for changing clothes, and drying them, &c., or at least to answer many of the objections of the sprinklers. But, says someone, since Bethabara is *beyond* Jordan (see John i, 28), it cannot be on its bank. It can be answered that this *beyond* is the same as the *beyond* (other side) which is in John vi, 22, which means the other side. In the foregoing lines we thought we had only reason to prove that Bethabara was on the bank of the Jordan; but now that we think of it we have a scripture, yes, to prove that when John was baptizing in Bethabara he was baptizing in the Jordan. Let us read the first chapter of the gospel of John. We read that John the Baptist is being questioned by the Levites and the priests, and ver. 28 tells us that this took place "in Bethabara, beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing" at that time. There is the next verse that says—"The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," which, together with the following verses, indicate that Jesus was baptized at that time, and in that place (Bethabara). Furthermore, in Matt. iii, 13, it says—"Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him;" and in Mark i, 9, it says—"And he was baptized by John in Jordan." Everyone can see by now that common sense and scripture confirm that it was *in* the Jordan, but at Bethabara as the place, he was baptized, and that the river was convenient, houses were close by and sufficient of the Holy Ghost was with John to strengthen him to fulfill his task, in the face of changes of weather and the great number of his subjects for baptism. The whole thing, then, turns out favorable for immersion, and that in the Jordan. Next, we find that John also "was baptizing in Aenon, near to Salim," and in connection with that, it says—"Because there was much water there." To what purpose is "much water" mentioned here, if not to indicate that the place there was convenient to immerse as it was in the Jordan? That it was to point out a place for sprinkling is what appears doubtful. But, says someone, the word *there* shows that it was in Salim, and not in Aenon, there was "much water;" and furthermore, "much water" is not mentioned to indi-

cate there were places there convenient for immersing, rather that they were convenient for the multitudes to camp there. What is the distance between Aenon and Salim, I wonder? I do not know; but I know this, that it is very unlikely that John would baptize in Aenon, if in Salim was the more convenient place to camp; for it caused traveling from one place to the other which could more conveniently be omitted. By *camping* it is customary to have tents, and several other things for the purpose. That could be allowed, I suppose. But, can it be allowed that “all Judea, Jerusalem, and all the region round about Jordan,” took tents, &c., with them, when they went to John at Jordan, so that it would be convenient to change clothes, &c., when he baptized them? What do you say? *That it cannot?* Well, neither can I allow that they took anything with them to Salim to camp there. Now, since we fail to agree with respect to that matter, let us search for something else; and here is our sprinkler finding out that John did not immerse, because Jesus and all the people were baptized at the same time, and the proof is seen in Luke iii, 21, 22—“Now *when* all the people were baptized, it came to pass, that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased.” Now, if the baptizing was at the same time, it was also the same time that Christ prayed, the heaven was opened, the Holy Ghost descended, and the voice came from heaven. But that explanation of the words militates against facts; for it says in Matt. iii, 16—“And Jesus, *when* he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water; and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, &c.” (See also Mark i, 9, 10.) It is obvious by this, that the proof of our sprinklers does not mean any more than the remarkable things recorded as having happened in the time that John was baptizing the people, and Jesus also; for, if otherwise, one must go to great trouble—one must determine for “*all the people,*” namely all those who had come to John (according to the account) to *all* be sprinkled at the same time, yes, within the minute the Holy Ghost descended upon Jesus—that at the same time or with the same motion he sprinkled *all* of his candidates for baptism in the Jordan, and that he fulfilled his task there with only one *stroke*. He must have had a good device for sprinkling, before he could work such a remarkable feat. But it is obvious, if there was too great a number to immerse each one in several days, there were also too many to sprinkle

them all at the same time. Having failed in the foregoing proof for sprinkling, we are led to the impossibility that the keeper of the prison and his family were immersed at midnight, when the apostles were “bruised and battered,” and there was no mention that they had gone out of the prison. That which can be said is this:—They were “thrust into the inner prison,” (Acts xvi, 24), “and [he] brought them out” (ver. 30); and next we have the apostles speaking “unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were *in his* HOUSE: and he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway [that is, soon]. And when he had brought them *into his house*, he set meat before them,” &c. (ver. 32—33). It is obvious that they were not baptized in the inner prison, nor in the house; and it also obvious that the apostles spoke the word of the Lord “in his house,” before baptizing, and that they were brought back to the house after that. If they were sprinkled, it was more convenient to do that in the house; but if immersed, it was necessary to go out; and out they went, yes, “the same hour of the night,” and we know not where, and to *immerse*, most likely. The God who opened the prison was able to keep the “wounds” from worsening in the water; and the One who said “they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover,” always cares for those who obey him. I shall give my last attention to answer all the objections also against the immersion of Saul of Tarsus.—We have researched sufficiently, I would think, this topic by now; but I am of the opinion that before ending we must apply logic to the phrase, “Baptizing with water.” How is that to be interpreted as immersion? Inasmuch as various scholars prove that there are more than one meaning for the Greek word for baptism, we are led to believe that *baptism* is the name of the ordinance, instead of revealing the manner of administering it; and consequently, the reason for the “baptizing *with* water” is, that one is dealing with water in the ordinance, much like one is dealing with the Spirit when “baptizing with the Holy Ghost” takes place. Immersion in and of itself is not baptism; but the one who administers must be qualified for his office, the one being baptized must be obedient and repentant, and everything must be done in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Perhaps some are ready to argue that sprinkling must be the proper way, since it is said that the Spirit was poured out; but it is seen clearly from several places that the baptism of the Spirit differs in its manner (if this is the appropriate word) from sprinkling

baptism. It is described in Acts ii, 2—“And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and *it filled* all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all *filled* with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues.” What was the sound, I wonder? Was it not the same thing that filled the disciples, as whatever filled the house? The disciples were not filled with the tongues, rather with that which was present in the house, namely the Holy Ghost. It is readily obvious that this was the baptism of the Spirit; but what does it have in common with sprinkling or immersion? A man is not filled in the one manner or the other; but the baptism of the Spirit fills. But, says someone, the tongues that came upon them were the baptism. Well, then, look at the baptism with the Spirit that is described in Acts viii, 17; ix, 17; xix, 6, and it will be seen that there is no mention of the tongues. We shall leave the manner of administering the ordinance, at this time, by leaving the public to determine for themselves based on our research; and we shall hurry on to show,

IV. WHETHER THERE WAS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN JOHN’S BAPTISM AND CHRIST’S.

Some say the baptism of John was evangelical, and that no one was baptized after him; and others say that the apostles baptized some after him. To show that the baptism of John was not sufficient in place of the baptism of the apostles (or the baptism of Christ) we are led to the twelve that Paul baptized in Ephesus (see Acts xix, 1—7), of whom it is said were baptized “unto John’s baptism.” But we shall soon have proof that these were not baptized by John. We read that Paul asked the twelve, “Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?” and the answer he received was, “We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.” Paul replied, in surprise, I should think, “Unto what then were ye baptized?” They answered, “Unto John’s baptism.” “John,” said Paul, “verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus.” Could it be that these were baptized by the one who told his baptized followers to believe in the Son of God, and taught them that they would be baptized with the Holy Ghost? They were baptized by John, and did not even so much as know whether or not there was a-Holy Ghost!! It is contrary to all reason

to think that. Well, were they telling a lie, then? If they were, it is not likely they would have received the Holy Ghost so soon after being re-baptized. What should we think, then? We think they were baptized by one of John's imitators, who had no authority, and "knowing," like Apollos (Acts xviii, 25), "only the baptism of John." The twelve disciples, "when they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus; and when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied." They were not baptized, then, according to John. In John i, 35—37, it is seen that two of John's disciples became Christ's disciples, after John showed them that he was the Lamb of God. Now, before they could be John's disciples, they had to be baptized by him; and we learn that they were ordained apostles, but with no mention that they were baptized previously, for who would have baptized them but John? It is quite clear by now that John's baptism was exactly the same kind as Christ's baptism, and that Christ's baptism was the same kind as John's baptism—both baptism of repentance and for the remission of sins.

V. WHAT IS BEING BORN OF WATER AND OF THE SPIRIT?

It is clear that man is born of the water, when he is baptized for the remission of sins; and man is born of the Holy Ghost, when he receives the Spirit by the laying on of hands. The baptism of the Holy Ghost does not precede the baptism of water; but it comes after it, for at that time is the promise of the gift of the Spirit. See Acts ii, 38, 39. The eunuch did not receive the baptism of the Spirit from Phillip; and after he had baptized the Samaritans, they did not receive the Holy Ghost until the apostles came and laid hands on them (Acts viii, 14—17). It is certain that one must receive the baptism of water and the baptism of the Spirit, before one can enter into the kingdom of God.

Now, dear reader, you see that we have conducted a fair investigation into the New Testament about baptism, and that everything appears to favor the position that the purpose of baptism was for the remission of sins—that those who believed the testimony of the servants of God, and repented of their sins, are the only subjects of the ordinance—that immersion in water by authorized ministers is the correct way of administering it—that John's baptism and Christ's are the same thing, and that being born of water and of the Spirit is the baptism of water and the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and that one must have both before he can be saved.

D8 DAVIS, John. *Sylwadau ar yr hyn sydd o ran, a'r hyn sydd ber-fffaith.* (Observations on that which is in part, and that which is perfect.) *Merthyr Tydfil: Printed, published and for sale by J. Davis, Nantygwenith, Georgetown, 1850.*

16 pp. 17 cm. *Welsh Mormon Writings* 35.

The scripture quoted on the title page (1 Corinthians 13:8–10) is also quoted on the first page of text (p. 3). The phrase in the title comes from 1 Corinthians 13:10: “But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.” John Davis uses his line of logic to show that this scripture defends the existence of spiritual gifts. He explains that “that which is in part” has reference to the various spiritual gifts as practiced by imperfect Church members. As Church members go through the refining process of living the gospel and increasing in every sustaining joint, they will eventually become a “perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ” (Ephesians 4:13). At that point the spiritual gifts will be done away, for they will no longer be necessary.

A sixteen-line poem which sums up Davis’s argument is placed at the end of the text.

Two years later John Davis published a second edition of *Observations on that which is in part, and that which is perfect*. The contents of the two editions are identical; however, the typesetting was altered in the second edition, thereby resulting in a twelve-page pamphlet (see *Welsh Mormon Writings*, item 68).

