

## Appendix

### A Short History of Important Major Baptism Studies in the Grace Movement

By  
Dr. Dale S. Dewitt

The grace movement's non-practice of water baptism has produced several studies of the subject in exposition and defense of its views. Because this is only a very brief sketch, and because of its limited scope—to briefly note the contribution of each of several better known writers and studies—it will not be possible to give a full description of each contribution. The following were selected for this sketch because they are major contributions to the discussion as judged by length of time in print, extent of influence, quality of scholarship or uniqueness of perspective, even though some are only pamphlets. Use of these criteria is at bottom, however, the more or less subjective judgment of the author; readers should understand this qualification.

The grace movement, with its non-water view of baptism, began with J. C. O'Hair in the early years of the twentieth century. Historically, it seems impossible as yet to determine with certainty O'Hair's earliest written expression of his views on water baptism in the earliest period of his active ministry. A suggestion about the earliest expression will, however, appear in the course of the discussion. Lack of certainty is due to the fact that no chronology of O'Hair's works exists and only a few of his numerous books and pamphlets are dated. It is clear, though, that he was first put on the track toward his developed baptismal views after a conversation with a Pentecostal minister during a series of Indianapolis holiness meetings at which he spoke in 1920 or 1921.<sup>1</sup>

O'Hair's new baptism view sprang from a situation in which the meetings' leader, James Nipper (sp.?), asked O'Hair to speak on tongues and other signs. Clues in O'Hair's accounts suggest that Nipper may have been concerned about whether its own theology was pointing the holiness movement toward the new and rapidly developing Pentecostalism, and more locally that Pentecostals were disturbing the meetings. O'Hair developed a message—perhaps more than one—on why tongues, signs and wonders are not in God's program for the church. The message, he says, was entitled "Three Reasons Why Tongues Ceased When Paul Reached Rome."<sup>2</sup> Soon after this message was given, the Pentecostal preacher mentioned above told him he thought his argument against the

---

<sup>1</sup> O'Hair reports on the Indianapolis meeting in "The Answer of the Brethren and the Brethren (*sic?*)" p. 2. The pamphlet is formally undated, but comes from sometime after 1945 since he includes in it a letter dated to that year. He mentions the same meeting as a significant event in his theological life in a private tape recording made in Milwaukee by Charles Baker in 1955 in which he narrates his life story. The typed transcript numbers 19 total pages. The information here is drawn from both of these accounts. Hereafter I shall refer to the typescript of this oral account as "Transcript." The citation here is from Transcript, p. 11. "Holiness" here refers to certain American Wesleyan or Wesleyan-like bodies including, by O'Hair's account, The Christian and Missionary Alliance, Pentecostals and Nazarenes (p. 11). Allowance should be made in using these parallel accounts for memory lapses and possible later additions to the story reflecting O'Hair's later thinking or modes of expression.

<sup>2</sup> Transcript, p. 11.

sign-gifts also applied to water baptism. O’Hair replied to the man that he was mistaken in this comment (O’Hair was still committed to water baptism at the time.); but instead of dropping the matter, he went to his hotel room and studied far into the night in the wake of the man’s comment.<sup>3</sup> He finally concluded that the man was probably right. Since he relates this event as especially important to his own teaching of dispensational theology (as indeed it was), it seems appropriate to think of it as resulting in what we might call O’Hair’s “Indianapolis insight.” From it he seems to have continued with a thorough study of baptism in the Bible which confirmed his new perspective—based on his existing assumptions about the difference between Israel and the church: “I came to the conclusion that water baptism stands or falls with tongues, signs and visions.”<sup>4</sup> Although we do not know for certain the title of his earliest pamphlet on the subject, it is possible, even probable that it is the one entitled “Seven Questions on Water Baptism and the Second Coming of Christ.” In another booklet entitled “Have Ye Received the Holy Spirit since Ye Believed” he refers to the “Seven Questions . . .” pamphlet in a list of 20 “little booklets” he has written. At the end of “Have Ye Received . . .” is a letter “to a dear Christian Friend” dated January 1, 1929; on the back of the letter page he speaks of the “Seven Questions . . .” booklet among the 20 booklets in print at the time (there are actually about 26 titles listed here). This means that “Seven Questions . . .” already existed by 1929, and since it is the only booklet listed up to that time as a study on baptism, it could be his earliest on the subject.

A second conversation occurred during the same Indianapolis meetings some time after the message on signs and miracles. It was related to two publishing events of unequal magnitude in the first two decades of the twentieth century, and flowed into this Indianapolis situation and its implications. The first was the appearance of *The Scofield Reference Bible* (1909, 1917) with its strong emphasis in certain notes on differences between Israel and the church, and its notable premillennialism. Of lesser magnitude, but of decisive importance for the discussion at hand, was a just-published pamphlet by Central American missionary A. E. Bishop, entitled *Tongues, Signs and Visions, Not God’s Order for Today* (1920). Bishop, who had no previous connection with O’Hair but was related to Scofield’s Central American Mission, argued that tongues, signs and visions belonged to God’s dealings with Israel, but not to the church. O’Hair relates that after his tongues and signs message at Indianapolis, yet another man gave him a copy of the Bishop pamphlet with the remark, “. . . here’s a book that teaches almost what you teach.”<sup>5</sup> As an ongoing consequence, O’Hair’s writings of the 1920s and 1930s (and after) refer frequently to Bishop’s pamphlet with approval, while Scofield’s *Reference Bible* was steadily growing in public popularity in the larger context of the premillenarian renewal movement.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3. In this pamphlet, he expresses the same idea with an enlarged list of associated realities in the New Testament: “. . . After I searched and studied the Scriptures diligently, and saw that in every chapter of the Bible where water baptism is mentioned, there is a Jewish feast or holy day, a miracle, a sign-gift, or healing or tongues (p. 3).” This could justly be viewed as something of an overstatement. It might be more exactly said that water baptism is always associated with the rise of the messianic New Israel in the ministries of John the Baptist, Jesus and the twelve apostles, and in their message of the present and available Kingdom of God.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

Thus in general, such distinctions were not entirely original with O’Hair in the 1920s. Rather the series of Bible and prophetic conferences which began in America in 1878 had already been differentiating in various ways between Israel and the church as their published speeches show, and as came to fruition in the *Scofield Reference Bible*. In these conferences, the millenarian renewal movement was partly following the older premillenarian movement which began after 1620 with J. H. Alsted and Joseph Mede, and partly its more recent developments in J. N. Darby’s unique form of premillennialism along with what became Scofield’s expositions of 1909 and after. Several leaders of this more recent stage of the millenarian movement, still alive and active during O’Hair’s early ministry years, also made quite sharp pronouncements in their writings on the difference between Paul’s mission, and that of the original twelve apostles. O’Hair has to be understood in this context for any kind of fair evaluation of his teaching on baptism and other related topics. O’Hair traveled extensively in the northeast quadrant of the country before his pastorate at North Shore Congregational Church (Chicago) began in 1923. He cultivated many warm friendships with leading premillenarians including, for example, evangelical leaders like Louis Talbot (Talbot Theological Seminary), Harry Hager of Bethany Reformed Church, Chicago<sup>6</sup> and Harry Bultema of Muskegon, Michigan, to cite only a few examples.

We can also identify two more O’Hair pamphlets of the 1920s which gather Scriptural material on differences between Israel and the church, and between the twelve apostles and Paul; these two pamphlets are clearly related to the Indianapolis insight on water baptism and its theological substructure. We know of the early circulation of these O’Hair pamphlets from Cornelius Stam, an emerging leader of the early grace movement after 1930. About 1926, by Stam’s account,<sup>7</sup> a friend of the Stam family, who worked in New York (and/or Philadelphia) as an investment consultant and associate of Donald Grey Barnhouse’s ministry at Tenth Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, spoke to Stam’s father, Peter Stam, Sr, about the “one body” and “one baptism.” Peter Stam, a Dutch immigrant recently converted to Christ, had become superintendent of a rescue mission in Patterson, New Jersey. Later (Stam does not say how much later), the same gentleman gave his father copies of the two O’Hair pamphlets, *Jesus Christ the Minister of the Circumcision*, and *The Twelve Apostles and Paul*. Both pamphlets extend the distinctions of the Bishop pamphlet mentioned above. Stam’s account does not indicate any title of O’Hair on baptism already in existence in 1926; he only mentions these two pamphlets. *Jesus Christ the Minister of the Circumcision* makes the point that God had a special purpose for national Israel and that Christ never did anything but participate in and confirm that purpose. To make this point he collects Old and New Testament texts on the title’s theme, and on Paul’s differences from God’s purpose for Israel, by interspersing texts on Paul’s unique calling and Gentile mission. In the second pamphlet, *The Twelve Apostles and Paul*, O’Hair further extends this contrast into the book of Acts by collecting Acts’ Israel texts, and further Pauline statements about Israel and his independent Gentile mission under the call of God.

In 1931, O’Hair wrote—and then published in a booklet for public distribution—a letter to Albertus Pieters, a theological leader and probably by this time theology professor at the Reformed Church in America seminary at Holland, Michigan (Western

---

<sup>6</sup> For a discussion of the history of this long millenarian renewal movement, see Essay VII below.

<sup>7</sup> C. R. Stam, *The Controversy* (Chicago: Berean Bible Society, 1956), pp. 21-22.

Theological Seminary). In its booklet form, the letter was entitled *An Epistle to Mr. Albertus Pieters Concerning the How and Why of Water Baptism*. The letter shows that by this time O'Hair was discussing with other Evangelical-Fundamentalist leaders his view that water baptism had ceased with the mission of Paul and the establishment of the church. This letter is among the few of O'Hair's many published writings with any indication of date. I mentioned above O'Hair's relation with the Reformed Church pastor, Harry Hager. The Pieters letter mentions some details of O'Hair's relationship with Hager that included an invitation to O'Hair to conduct a series of meetings in Bethany Reformed Church of Roseland, Chicago, where Hager was in the early years of his long pastorate there; apparently O'Hair took this invitation and did speak at Bethany Church, the author's (DeWitt) childhood home church. The O'Hair-Hager connection is an example of the way in which O'Hair's outgoing, jovial spirit was an important ingredient in his notability as a popular evangelist and Bible teacher, and frequently, in his early years, across denominational lines. Such relations existed among many premillennialist pastors and teachers throughout the northeast quadrant of the United States, and to some extent beyond including Colorado and California.

In *Bible Study for Bereans*, a periodical O'Hair launched in September 1935, and in *The Unsearchable Riches of Christ* (1941), a series of 70 sermons and Bible studies, he included comments, messages and studies of varied sorts on baptism themes, but only in modest quantity. Some of these treatments contained shorter or longer lists of practices distinctive to Israel's life and culture in which Old and New Testament baptisms/washings were included, still following the signs-were-for-Israel thought of the Bishop pamphlet (which he sometimes referred to as the "Scofield-Moody-Bishop pamphlet" because Scofield wrote an endorsement in the "Introduction," and Moody Bible Institute was its publisher). In these lists of Jewish practices, O'Hair usually included or even emphasized baptism as having full part with signs and wonders in the twelve apostles' mission to Israel—a continuing reflection of the Indianapolis insight. In this respect, and in one sense, the most interesting and important of the studies in *Unsearchable Riches* is the first "message" in the book, entitled "The Dispensational Answer to Undispensational Religious Practices." On the very first page he lists no less than 30 Israelite and Jewish practices from both the Old and New Testaments which were being selectively kept or attempted by about twenty various contemporary Christian groups or denominations known to him. This way of discussing the baptism issue illustrates one of the ways in which O'Hair engaged the many Protestant denominations around him on the issue of baptism. The thirtieth item in the list of Jewish practices in this study is "30—Believers should be baptized with water for the remission of sins." Sometimes he discusses the traditional Reformed belief that baptism is a New Testament substitute for circumcision (Message 12, p. 58). Hence the "Indianapolis insight" continued to develop into a larger biblical-theological perspective: baptism ceased for the church of this dispensation when all other rituals and distinctive features (including the law, food rules, calendar observances, and signs and wonders) of the New Israel's national life ceased, i.e., in the era of the available messianic kingdom—the era of Jesus and the twelve apostles' mission.

In evaluation, two points might be made, one on O'Hair's argumentation and one on the state of the research into O'Hair's booklets and pamphlets that produced the

foregoing sketch of the origin of the grace movement's distinctive baptism view and its earliest expressions.

(1) It may be both possible and advisable to restructure the way the grace movement thinks of the cessation of water baptism and O'Hair's linkage of it to Israel and its New Testament signs and miracles. One problem is that the argument's most telling linkage of water baptism with Israel's miracles occurs in Mark 16:9-21, a passage that does not belong to Mark's gospel originally. O'Hair—and the grace movement in general down to the present time—has not recognized the text-critical problems of this passage. Another problem with O'Hair's argumentation is the way in which he overstates in absolute terms the linkage of water baptism with Jewish feasts or holy day celebrations. For example, this linkage does not appear clearly in the baptism of the Philippian jailer (Acts 16:25-33) even though the Corinthian baptisms of Acts 18:8 are related to the Jewish synagogue at Corinth and its leadership. It is not the case, however, that these details destroy the general force of the Israel-Jewish connection of New Testament baptism scenes. It is only that the form of the argument could be restructured to avoid these discrepancies in detail. Essays III and IV herein illustrate at least some ways the argument can be reshaped without loss of force.

(2) The question of where the views of the grace movement came from is a question about the history of ideas; it is called formally by theologians "historical theology" and thus takes its place among the world's Christian bodies who also have their own historical theologies—their accounts of the origins and development of their theological distinctives. In our case, J. C. O'Hair's thought-development, in the larger framework of his evangelism and pastoral ministries and the larger premillenarian renewal, is difficult to trace, as the above sketch suggests. The earliest details of his views and his growth in understanding the biblical implications of the Indianapolis insight are historically complex: the details involve many inter-related factors. In his booklets and pamphlets he sometimes alludes to events and contacts. Very few booklets or pamphlets are formally dated and their location in time within his ministry is a major problem in seeking his thought-history. The material discussed above is the firstfruit of what will become someone's research project beyond my own efforts. For the foreseeable future, I plan to continue an attempt at a rough chronology—perhaps first by classifying the few books and many booklets and pamphlets by decades—from 1920 through 1958. Once a by-decade classification is gained with reasonable certainty, further work will be possible to produce an approximate year-by-year classification.

Bultema Library at Grace Bible College possesses several collections of O'Hair's booklets and pamphlets, the most complete of which appears to be that of Paul Franzen who donated his collection to the Library. Franzen grouped the pamphlets by size, bound them roughly in size-groups with black tape and numbered the collection by bound groups into 37 volumes. For the time being, reference by Franzen's volumes is the only way we can hope to make a citation system—until that is, the pamphlets can be reclassified by chronological groupings. After a first attempt at surveying the materials while looking mainly for baptism pamphlets, I'm convinced that a chronological classification is a viable project because of the (relatively rare) chronological and event allusions in some pamphlets.

### *Subsequent Discussions of Baptism*

Cornelius Stam reports in the same chapter of *The Controversy* noted above that by 1932 or 1933 he (Stam) was in his first pastorate at Preakness, New Jersey. There he found it useful to write and publish a pamphlet for his congregation on baptism entitled *Water Baptism: Is It Included in God's Program for This Age?* This pamphlet is only sixteen pages in length and is now in its 9<sup>th</sup> printing (2012). Its arguments are familiar from O'Hair's early pamphlets: water baptism is only related to John the Baptist and Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom to Israel and the continuing mission of the original twelve apostles to Israel; John's baptism continued this connection as long as it was practiced. On the other hand, Paul is silent in his epistles about water baptism except for his one statement about baptizing only three Corinthian believers, and he never commands the church to practice it. Baptism and related terms in Paul's epistles refer to a non-water baptism of the Holy Spirit whereby believers are united with Christ and his church, are made complete in him, and are united and identified with him (Stam's descriptions). Thus water baptism is baptism into the New Israel (my term) and its manifest kingdom; Spirit baptism into the body of Christ belongs to the church. A second pamphlet, still in print (8<sup>th</sup> printing, 2012), was first published about 1943 with the title *Why Was Christ Baptized?* Here Stam makes the point that Jesus' explanation to John the Baptist on why he should be baptized—" . . . it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness (KJV, Matt 3:15)"—refers to Jesus being numbered with Israel's transgressors and bearing the blame and disgrace for its sins. Jesus' baptism by John is contrasted with his baptism into death (Luke 12:50), called by Stam "A Greater Baptism," and with "The Greatest Baptism"—our baptism into his death (Rom 6:1-4; 1 Cor 12:12-13 and parallel Pauline passages).

Finally, a larger booklet by Stam appeared in 1981 entitled *Baptism and the Bible*. The first chapter is something of a follow-on to *Water Baptism: Is It Included . . .*, but expands its basic distinction between the kingdom and the church on baptism by following water baptism from John the Baptist through Acts 19 in some detail. He shows how it does not change its significance in connection with Israel's repentance and forgiveness of sins as long as it was practiced in Acts. In other words there is no change from John's Jewish baptism to "Christian baptism." The change that does occur is that Paul ceases to practice any water baptism after Acts 19 as seen in Acts 20-28 and his later epistles. The second chapter assembles and examines the arguments of those fellowships who baptize infants, especially Roman Catholicism, and Reformed and Lutheran traditions. Chapter three examines arguments of immersionists and seeks to show that few if any biblical references to water baptism are to immersion; this denial of immersion in New Testament baptism texts became thematic in these treatments of the subject, and continued to be espoused by all later treatments discussed below. The final chapter expands on the beauties and power of the idea and reality of one baptism by the Holy Spirit found in the Pauline epistles.

During the 1950s Charles Baker issued *Real Baptism* as a Bible class, Sunday School class, or individual's study guide. This too was a booklet of modest size, but more detailed and systematic than any of the above. Its genius was that Baker examined and classified every use of the baptism word group in the New Testament. He found about a dozen different "baptisms" including a surprising number of metaphorical uses of

the terminology having nothing to do with water except by use of baptism imagery applied to other New Testament realities (“baptized with the Holy Spirit,” or, “baptized with fire”). The study was objective and thoroughly biblical with little theological warfare, and clearly reflecting Baker’s systematic theology training, knowledge of biblical languages, and methodology in establishing theological points from complete induction of biblical texts. This study adroitly set in place the reality that the baptism terminology of the New Testament was of considerably varied application and frequently non-literal, i.e., non-water. Thus, Baker showed that one cannot make any assumptions about the presence of water in many New Testament “baptism” texts, with the added implication that every text had to be dealt with free from water assumptions unless water was clearly mentioned, alluded to or entailed in specific contexts, especially in the Pauline epistles. From this outline of the varied uses of “baptism” in the New Testament, the list of different New Testament “baptisms” made its way into a kind of summary list of twelve biblical baptisms in his later *Dispensational Theology* (pp. 544-545), in Henry Hudson’s work of 1987 and Edward Wishart’s study of 2007. *Real Baptism* was the first systematized treatment of the subject in the grace movement; it became foundational for non-water baptism theology despite its limited scope and modest size. Baker’s skillful way of classifying and identifying variations in biblical usage of baptism terms forces readers to see the whole New Testament picture and thus to recognize differences.

In 1952, Harry Bultema published *The Bible and Baptism* at Muskegon, Michigan, but only at first in a mimeographed form for local distribution. Bultema and O’Hair had been personal friends and theological colleagues for many years. Bultema died later in 1952; but in 1955 the Bultema Memorial Publication Society of Muskegon published a hardback edition. This was the first full (167 pp.) scholarly treatment of the subject within the grace movement. Bultema too dealt with every use of the baptism word group in both testaments. He is also the first among writers discussed here to consider the washing practices in the Jewish Talmud wherein “baptisms” are self-performed unlike the water baptisms of the New Testament. Bultema was mainly interested in the use of biblical baptism language to describe the (non-water) union of believers with Christ and his body through the baptizing work of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 12:12-13). Like O’Hair, Stam and Baker, he found the “Real Baptism” in Paul’s (non-water) baptism language and union-with-Christ texts. At the outset (Introduction, p. 9) he identifies his readers’ understanding of believers’ union with Christ as his main purpose. Bultema follows O’Hair’s emphasis on water baptism’s connection with Israel’s sign-gifts and other Jewish practices. He tends to characterize Israel’s institutions and washing practices in particular as legalistic because prescribed in the Mosaic law. He also draws a very sharp contrast between John’s water baptism and Christ’s Spirit baptism, noting that Jesus is never said to baptize anyone in the gospel records.

Booklet discussion of the subject resumed in a short study by Vernon Schutz entitled *Water Baptism: Its History, Importance and Cessation* (1978). Schutz briefly reviewed major denominational variants on baptismal practice and meaning. He noticed confusing variations even within treatments of the subject by such Protestant denominations as Reformed and Baptist bodies. Schutz takes note of the non-baptizing views of both the Quaker tradition and the Salvation Army as parallels to the grace movement’s views. The study stresses biblical progressive revelation as the only way to rightly understand variant developments on baptism and other subjects in Scripture,

including developments within the New Testament itself. Schutz recognizes the role that accommodation to the Jews plays in Acts' Pauline baptizing scenes; in one brief and striking section he gathers texts in which Paul himself speaks of his adaptation to the Jews (p. 23), a point also explicitly made by Luke in his record of Timothy's circumcision by Paul (Acts 16:3). The reason Paul baptized at all was for the same reason he circumcised Timothy, i.e., in deference to Jews. This adaptive factor in Paul, however, is only one aspect of a larger and principled Pauline theology of Spirit baptism. Schutz also mentions the possible bearing of Jewish proselyte practice on Paul's lack of baptism instruction for his Gentile congregations (p. 23)—a point of potentially significant importance needing further research. He cites Jewish literature of the inter-testamental era as bearing on the discussion, and concludes that water baptism passed away along with other Israel-related miracles in yet another reflex of O'Hair's Indianapolis insight, although expressed in a more moderate way.

In *Baptism in the Bible* (1987), Henry Hudson again reviewed the whole of the biblical material on washings. This is a very thoughtful, tolerant and open-minded volume; it considers seriously major variant interpretations of biblical texts on the subject. The volume's special interest and plea is for tolerance of all viewpoints as a framework for discussion, and for the Bible as the only proper determinant for a truly valid view of baptism; this principle requires careful realistic exegesis and recognition of the actual sense of primary texts without theological pre-set schemes or creedal guidance. Hudson follows the above studies in pressing for recognition that the baptism terms do not always mean immersion. In fact he suggests that they never actually refer to immersion, but only sprinkling or pouring. While paying attention to baptismal practice at Qumran (the Dead Sea Scrolls site), he does not discuss the large number of Jewish *mikvaoth* (ritual bath tanks<sup>8</sup>) very recently recovered in archaeological excavations at Qumran, multiple Jerusalem locations and elsewhere. Many of the recovered *mikvaoth* date to the late Second Temple period—the New Testament era. This new knowledge of Jewish washing practices should be included in any further baptism studies produced by the grace movement with discussion of Jewish modes of baptism. Otherwise Hudson's study is a superb volume, greatly enriched by prolific citation of the most significant works from the history of the baptism discussion in recent centuries. The volume is notable for its open-minded fairness and irenic spirit. Future editions or reprints should include indices.

A very recent study of baptism in Scripture is by Edward Wishart, entitled *How Many Baptisms are There in the Bible?* This work of 150 pages is a series of sermons identifying twelve baptisms in Scripture. In a sense it is an expanded treatment of Baker's *Real Baptism*, although much of the expansion is extensive quotations of closely or remotely related portions of the Bible for each of the twelve different baptisms he isolates. Wishart concludes that there are more "baptisms" (i.e., uses of the term "baptism") of a non-watery nature in Scripture than water events (7 against 5 water

---

<sup>8</sup> Three distinctive features of *mikvaoth* are (1) steps for descending into the tank, (2) sufficient depth to easily cover the whole body, and (3) close conformity to talmudic measurements required for a valid *mikvah*; most are about the same dimensions, although standardized measurements may not have been finally established until after the fall of Jerusalem and the establishment of the rabbinic school at Jamnia. Not all water tanks at Qumran are *mikvaoth*; one may observe them in most photographs of details at Qumran. They are also visible in excavations near the southwest corner of the temple mount in Jerusalem, in the priestly homes to the west of the western wall, and around Caiphas' house farther to the southeast.



texts), a statistical generalization that sustains Baker's similar emphasis. A distinctive gain in this study is the sustained emphasis throughout on holiness, sanctification, cleansing or purification (Wishart uses all these terms more or less inter-changeably.) as the goal of all water and non-water baptisms in Scripture. Wishart means this in the sense of real holiness equipment for the people of God. He does not limit cleansing to realization in a "positional" or "standing" holiness as though it is another way to think of justification, but stresses that the purpose of all baptizing activity, symbolic or real, is actual, in-life holiness and progressive cleansing. Another distinctive contribution of this study is Wishart's attention to type-anti-type relations between Old and New Testament baptisms. The study seems to have abandoned the sustained grace movement use of the signs and wonders link with water baptism in the New Testament; in this respect the study may contribute to reshaping the way the movement explains its baptism views. It would be helpful to readers if the work could be rewritten in orthodox prose paragraph style to facilitate reading and progressive flow of the argument. The study could also eliminate the dispensationalist habit of a labored preliminary statement on hermeneutics. The holiness theme is entirely sufficient to sustain the argument in its own right. Despite these qualifications, this study remains valid, useful and insightful.

***This article is copyrighted 2012 and should not be reproduced without express permission from Dr. Dale S. Dewitt***