



Laying on of Hands on  
Baptized Believers, as such, 4  
no Counterfeit,

Tryed by the Touch-stone and  
found Gold.

• OR,

An Answer to Mr. *Edward Harrison's*  
TOUCH-STONE:

Wherein the truth of that Principle  
of the Doctrine of CHRIST is  
vindicated and cleared to  
be indeed one of Gods  
Oracles.

By JOHN GRIFFITH a Servant of Christ in  
the Gospel.

*Whosoever transgresseth; and abideth not in  
the Doctrine of Christ hath not God; he  
that abideth in the Doctrine of Christ hath  
both the Father and the Son, 2 John 9.*

---

• L O N D O N,

Printed for the Author and Francis Smith,  
and are to be sold in Gun-yard without  
Bishops-gate, and in Flying-Horse-  
Court in Fleet-street. 1654.

*An Answer to Mr. Edward Harrisons  
Touch-stone.*

**I**He days indeed wherein we live are the last days, as appears not onely by those grand Impostors called *Ranters*, *Quakers*, and the like, who denie the true Light, which is contained in the Scripture, and follow the ways of error and uncleanness, but also in as much as some who profess to be friends to *Sion*, and to the truths of God contained in the word of *Christ*, do oppose some truths therein; and this I confess is the envie and malignance of the old Serpent who stirreth up many instruments to effect his Design; and no sooner is a truth brought to light, but under some guise or other he will oppose, and that some plausible one too; otherwise it would not take place with men; neither could he be said to be transformed into an Angel of Light. Among *Ranters* and *Quakers*



his pretence is higher enjoyments, perfection in this life, &c. And amongst those that profess the Name of *Christ*, he sometimes hath a design to put out some light which others have and to thrust out of doors some practice which others practice from the light of the Word and of their own consciences.

And this opposition too must be shrouded under some specious pretence, as making divisions breach of love and Church-communion amongst Saints.

Whereas the Lord knows they who profess the truth in this particular, to wit, laying on of hands are not makers of divisions, neither do they break Church-communion; it is their disobedience who contend against it to *Christ* in this principle of his Doctrine, that is the maker of the breach.

To which opposition Mr. *Edward Harrison* hath contributed something in his book entituled *A Touch-stone, &c.* I will not say it's any wilfull opposition, but I could have wished he had been sparing in some words which I judg not very sober; but I shall pass that by a while; for my part it's the love bear to that truth, the people of the Lord and Mr. *Harrison*, that makes me set Pen to Paper so soon, I knowing that through silence advantage might be taken against the truth, hardened



hardned, and Gods people (some of them) weakned. Mr. *Harrison* is pleased to call [Laying on of Hands] a new Administration, although it is as old as the Primitive times taught by *Christ*, and practised by his Disciples.

What is this but the guise of the old Serpent, and old fire-bals he always used to throw against the truth, who hath cried out against Separation from the Church of *England*, and Dipping of Believers as New Light, and New Administrations. And therefore no marvel, though this Truth and the Professors thereof be branded with new Administrations, makers of Separation, and the like. But now to the business you say in the perusal and examination of the Historie of the new Testament, you finde that the Apostles and others laid their hands upon persons upon three several accounts.

First, for healing the sick, *Mark* 16.18. *Acts* 28.8.

Secondly, for setting apart persons to ministerial Offices *Acts* 6.6. 13.3. 1 *Tim.* 4.14. 5.22.

Thirdly, for the giving of the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost in a visible manner, *Acts* 8.17, 18. 19.6.

*Answ.* The two first I grant, but the last I have some exception against, I do not reade

In all the Scripture, that the giving of the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost in a visible manner was ever propounded as an end of Laying on of Hands; the Texts you allege are far from it, there being neither the term extraordinary nor visible in them, but that they might receive the Holy Spirit; when *Philip* had baptized men and women, *Acts 8.12*. The Apostles which were at *Jerusalem*, hearing that they of *Samaritania* had received the faith sent to them *Peter* and *John*, who when they were come down prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost, *ver. 15*. This Text onely propounds the reception of the Holy Ghost, not the extraordinary or visible gift thereof, but more of this hereafter.

In the next you convert the propositions in the Title-page into two Questions, *viz.*

*Quest. 1.* Whether it be the positive duty of all baptized believers, as such, to have Hands laid on them, in order to Church-fellowship, for the receiving of the gifts of the Spirit, or any other end.

*Quest. 2.* Whether submission to such a duty be absolutely necessary to Church-communication, and ought to go before Breaking of Bread.

*Ans.* First, I cannot but take notice how you have altered the first proposition in your

Title-page, [adding, in order to Church-fellowship] which is not in the proposition, wherein you have not dealt fairly with us, nor the truth; but passing that over I shall examine your Answer or rather your reason.

*Mr. Harrisons Answer to his first Question.*

To the first I answer, saith he negatively, my reason briefly is this: the Lord *Jesus Christ* did never by himself or by any of his Apostles require, command or enjoyn the performance of any such dutie, there is no institution of it in all the New Testament, as there is of other Ordinances, *viz.* Preaching, Prayer, Baptism, Breaking of Bread, setting apart Officers and Church-censures, in the ordaining and appointing of all which we have,

1. A general Precept exhibited.
2. This Precept as to the subjects and persons on whom it is laid, applied.
3. The proper ends for which in the due performance thereof are according to general promises to be attained, propounded, as might evidently be made to appear in the enumeration of particulars by clear Scripture-proofs, neither of which is to be found in the Administration of Laying on of Hands in the sense in the which it is taken in the Question.

*Griffith.* First, I answer to your Reason alleged,



(6)  
leged, and say, that the Lord *Christ* did both  
by himself and his Apostles require, command  
and enjoin the performance of this dutie, viz.  
Laying on of Hands on Dipped Believers, as  
such.

My Reason is, because the Apostles of  
*Christ* did administer such a thing on Dipped  
Believers, as such, as appears, *Acts* 8.15, 17,  
18.19.6. Now either they did administer it  
upon the account of *Christ's* requirement,  
command or injunction, or upon an account of  
their own.

But it was not upon an account of their  
own, therefore it was upon the account of  
*Christ's* requirement, command or injun-  
ction.

The *major* Proposition for ought I can see is  
undeniable: the *minor* is thus proved, to admi-  
nister any thing that is upon the account afore-  
said is will-worship and voluntary humilitie.

But it was not voluntary humilitie nor will-  
worship, therefore it was not upon the account  
of their own.

Will-worship and voluntary humility is in  
the Scripture-account contrary to Gods minde,  
*Col. 2.18.* to worship God according or after  
the traditions of men, hath a wo and a judg-  
ment attending of it, *Isai 29.13, 14.* *Matth.*  
*23.7, 8, 9.*

Secondly,

Secondly, that they laid hands on Believers Dipped, as such, is evident, and undeniable in the places before cited, but more of this hereafter.

You say, there is no institution of it in all the New Testament, as there is of other Ordinances as Preaching, &c. Do you mean in so many words? if so, I grant there is none, no more there is not for Laying on of Hands on Officers, in the ordaining and appointing of all which we have, say you, a general Precept exhibited, if you mean a Precept in so many words, I profess my self ignorant of it; but if you mean otherwise, I grant there is, as *Matth. 28. 20.* in these words teaching them to observe whatsoever I commanded you, where Laying on of Hands of Officers is included, and so is Laying on of hands on Believers dipped, as such. Also secondly, you say this Precept as to the subjects and persons on whom it is laid, applied. Admit so, Is it not applied in *Heb. 5. 12*, where the Apostle saith, They had need to be taught again what were the first principles of the Oracles of God, of which Laying on of Hands, is one, as appears, *Chap. 6. 2.* This Precept therefore is applied to the persons on whom it is laid, by teaching them; which that they were taught is as clear as the Light; for he saith, They had need to be taught again, which implies

plies, they were taught before, but through their dulness had need to be taught again, which were the first principles of the Oracles of God.

Thirdly, you say, the proper ends which in the due performance thereof are according to general promises to be attained and propounded. Admit that were so also, we are not without an end propounded in that service of Laying on of hands and that according to a general promise to be attained, as shall be made appear by plain Scripture-proofs, and that in the Administration of Laying on of Hands, and therefore your mistake in this case is evident; for that general promise of the Spirit, *Joel 2.28.* the reception of which promised Spirit is propounded as an end of that Administration: *Acts 8.15.*

*Mr. Harrison.* It's not to be found say you in the sense, in the which it is taken in the Question.

*J. Griffith.* Yes, in the sense it is taken in the question, if the words and sense of the question be one, there is found in the Administration of Laying on of Hands on baptized Believers, as such, a proper end which in the due performance thereof according to that general promise of the Spirit, *Joel 2.28.* is to be obtained, *Matth. 7.7, 8, 9, 10, 11.* *Luke 11.9, 10, 11, 12, 13.*



10, 11, 12, 13. propounded as an end of the Administration of that Laying on of Hands which is in the sense of the Question.

Mr. *Harrison*. You further conclude, first, there is no word of command that such a thing should be done.

*I. Griffith*. I have already shewed that there is; for the Apostles practised it from a command, *Matth. 28. 20*. And besides it being called a Principle of the Oracles of God, contributes much to enforce the truth of this Reason, *Heb. 5. 12*.

Moreover, it's said to be a Principle of *Christ's Doctrine*, if so then, that which *Christ* taught his Disciples to teach others to observe, and how much less than a command of God, the teachings and sayings of *Christ* are, will appear from *Acts 3. 22, 23*. *Iohn 12. 49*. *Mark 9. 7*.

Mr. *Harrison*. Secondly, you conclude for the application of a command to persons, the Scripture is wholly silent, &c.

*I. Griffith*. I answer, You are wholly mistaken, for I have already shewed it was applied by teaching, *Heb. 5. 12*. and for them to teach and practice that which they did not receive by command from *Christ*, were indeed to set their Posts by the Lords Posts, as you ignorantly say we do in this thing.

Mr.

**Mr. Harrison.** Thirdly, you say as to the end, there is no common end assigned, which by virtue of a promise persons may expect in the performance thereof.

**I. Griffith.** I answer, You err not knowing the Scriptures, there is an end which is common, assigned, *Acts* 8.15. and that by virtue of a promise to. *Joel* 2.28. which promise is in common to all Dipped Believers, *Acts* 2.38,39.

**Mr. Harrison.** You say, These particulars are all denied by you, and will be, untill the Assertors thereof be able to demonstrate the Affirmative by any plain Texts of Scripture.

**I. Griffith.** I hope you will now change your minde and receive satisfaction, seeing the Assertors have plain Texts of Scripture to demonstrate the Affirmative.

**Mr. Harrison.** Which though it hath been by some of them endeavoured, yet in my judgment and conscience it hath not been with the least shew of probabilitie, much less with the plainness of Scriptural demonstration performed or effected.

**I. Griffith.** I do not doubt but those that have endeavoured, have also demonstrated the truth of what they have affirmed, but whether to your conscience or no, I leave that to him that searcheth the heart. But peradventure you will call nothing plain Scripture-proof, unless  
it

it say, Lay hands on Dipped Believers, pray where is such a command for Laying on hands on Deacons or Elders or Messengers? all which was a Primitive practice, and owned by you, to have a general command exhibited for. Further, where is a command in so many words requiring any to believe the Resurrection of the Dead? not in all the Scripture, What must it not be believed therefore? There is no reason for it. But if Mr. *Harrison's* words be truth, there is much, for he saith, It will appear.

Mr. *Harrison*. And saith the first Scripture, which is the main Bulwark and chief Citie of Refuge to which they flie, and is frequently brought forth, as their great *Goliath* to maintain their cause is, *Heb. 6. 1, 2.*

*I. Griffith*. It is well that any part of the Word of the Lord is our Bulwark and Citie of Refuge. *David* trusted in the Word of the Lord, *Psalms 119. 42.* and the entrance of his words gave him light, *v. 130.*

But it is our great *Goliath*, you say, also to maintain our cause, that's a clear mistake, it's not our *Goliath* but our little *David* that maintains the Lords cause and ours, as far as we are concerned in it and obliged to the maintenance of it.

Mr. *Harrison*. You say, that we infer that it is a Doctrine.

*I. Griffith.*



*I. Griffith.* That it is a Principle of *Christ* his Doctrine, the Author to the *Hebrews* doth not onely infer, but affirm it.

*Mr. Harrison.* Oracle, Precept and Command.

*I. Griffith.* This likewise is not inferred but affirmed by the same Author, *Heb. 5. 12.*

It's like you may object and say, that Precept nor command is not there, I grant those terms are not, but between Gods Precepts and his Oracles: I must confess, I know little difference, especially such as were taught by *Christ*, as appears they being called, his Doctrine, *Heb. 6. 1.* and by his Apostles taught, as is clear *Heb. 5. 12.* and practised by them, *Acts 8. 17, 18. 19. 6.*

*Mr. Harrison.* Yea, a principle, a foundation, principle of *Christ* in the Gospel, that all Believers Dipped should have Hands laid on them by persons appointed and set apart for that end for the receiving of the gifts of the Spirit.

*I. Griffith.* What of all this is inferred, that is not plainly expressed? Is it not called a Principle, yea, a foundation, Principle? *Heb. 6. 1.* And had not all the Dipped Believers in *Samaria*, *Acts 8. 17, 18.* And all the Dipped Believers at *Ephesus*, *Acts 19. 6.* Hands laid on them? And is it not agreeable to Gods order in his Church, that Ordinances should be  
admi-

administred by persons set apart to that work? And was it not administred for that end, that they might receive the Spirit? *Acts* 8.15. To whom God had promised it, *Acts* 2.38. 5.32. What then is inferred or deducted more than what is natural from the Text?

*Mr. Harrison.* Which Wier-drawn deduction how cruelly that innocent Text is wrested, rackt and tormented to make it bear witness to?

*I. Griffith.* Do we, when we say no more than what the Text doth, Wier-draw it, rack, wrest, and torment it? I confess I am a Wier-drawer, but unskillfull in that work, I shall prefer *Mr. Harrison* before me in that respect, as one more skillfull in Wier-drawing the Scripture than I am, or any of the Assertors of this Truth, not onely in this case but divers others.

*Mr. Harrison.* Will evidently appear, if we consider first, that Laying on of Hands is onely mentioned in general.

*I. Griffith.* Where is it mentioned in general? not in *Heb.* 6.2. nor no where in the Scripture, as I know of. *Heb.* 6.2. doth mention one in particular, calling it Laying on of Hands, not Layings on of Hands, which if it had been in general, as you say it was, it must have been so. Therefore that mentioned *Heb.* 6.2. must be one of them onely, and which of them

them it is I shall afterwards shew. Here take notice that your flourish touching your having six Principles without seeking to us for our doth vanish like smoke, unless you can prove (which you have not done) that that which we practice is not that there mentioned; and also that you practice (if you practice any) be that there mentioned; till which time you had done well to have forbore calling it our new old Episcopal Administration; such closings do not become you, neither doth it add anything to enforce your Reason given, nor weaken the truth on our part; for what though the Bishops did imitate Baptism and Breaking Bread in the wrong Subjects, and after a false manner, Is that an argument sufficient to enforce any to cast off Baptism and Breaking Bread; so because they did imitate Laying on of Hands, Must we cast it off? Did the Whore blemish the Ordinances with such a deep stain that they cannot be wiped off? No *Christian* Ordinances being purely practiced are pure Ordinances; the Bishops for ought I know who did imitate Laying on of Hands may witness against you who wholly reject it.

*Mr. Harrison.* That by Laying on of Hands in this Text cannot be meant that which they contend for, and that for this Reason, *viz.* because it is no where do stringly delivered



not so much as promissively in a promise, much less preceptively by way of command either by *Christ* or by Apostles in all the New Testament.

*I. Griffith.* You say, It cannot be meant in this Text, that Laying on of Hands we contend for; and your Reason is, because it is no where doctrinally delivered. I have already shewn that that Laying on of Hands we practice and contend for, is doctrinal preceptively, which is binding as to duty and practice; and therefore this Reason is invalid also.

Not to trouble the Reader with reiterations, I shall give you a fresh Argument:

That practice which God bore witness to by the gift of his Spirit was doctrinally taught by *Christ*, but the practice of Laying on of Hands on Baptized Believers, as such, God bore witness to by the gift of his Spirit.

Therefore that Laying on of Hands was doctrinally taught by *Christ*.

The *major* proposition is undeniably clear from *Heb. 2. 4.* where the Author plainly affirmeth that what God did bear witness to by the gifts of the Holy Ghost was confirmed thereby to be such a word of *Christ* that might at no hand be neglected.

The *minor* Proposition is as clear from *Acts 8. 17, 18. 9. 6.*

*Mr. Harrison.* And therefore for the Apostle to assert that Laying on of Hands in their sense was a principle of the Doctrine of *Christ*, which yet was never doctrinally declared, had been a manifest contradiction in terms, and little less than untruth, which I dare not charge the Pen-man of holy Writ withall, and so put a Lie upon the Spirit of God.

*I. Gr.* Had the Apostle asserted that to be a principle of the Doctrine of *Christ* which was never doctrinally declared, would have been, I confess, a contradiction and an untruth, which fault the Pen-man of the Scripture is not guilty of.

But I pray, Is it not as great a contradiction and an untruth to practice that which was not doctrinally declared as to assert it?

The Apostles *Peter* and *John* with the consent of the rest at *Jerusalem* (for they sent them) did practice this, *viz.* Laying on of Hands on the Baptized, as such, *Acts* 8. 17, 18. Therefore it was doctrinally declared, and must be, so confessed to be by you, unless you will put a Lie upon the Spirit of God, which you say you dare not do.

*Mr. Harrison.* Here it will be queried what Laying on of Hands is here meant, if that be not. To which I answer, Such Laying on of Hands as was doctrinally declared by *Christ*.

or by his Apostles, viz. Laying on of hands for healing the sick, mentioned *Mark 16. 18.* they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.

*J. Griffith.* First I shall speak to your Answer, to shew unto you your mistake, and secondly I shall answer the *Querie*.

First, the laying on of hands mentioned *Marke 16. 18.* is only promissively taught, which is not binding as to duty and practice; for then it were a duty to drink deadly poyson, and to take up Serpents, &c. they being likewise promissively taught.

Secondly, the drinking of poyson, and taking up of Serpents might then be concluded to be each of them a principle of Christs Doctrine, as well as laying on of hands to heal the sick; and then how many Principles should we have?

Thirdly, not one of these distinctly by it selfe, nor all of them together was a Principle of that Doctrine of Christ mentioned, *Heb. 1. 2.*

First, because that which confirmed the word, and the word, were different; these were promised and given to confirm the word, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following Amen, *Mar. 16. 20.*

Secondly, these were the effects of that laying on of hands which the Apostles did practise by vertue of that preceptive Doctrine that Christ taught



taught them, for amongst the rest they should speak with new tongues, which was attained by laying on of hands on them as Believers baptized, as appears, *Act. 8. 17, 18. ch. 19. 6.*

Secondly, to your *Querie* I answer, that the laying on of hands mentioned, *Heb. 6. 2.* was the laying on of hands practised by the Apostles on baptized Believers, as such, *Act. 8. 17. 18. chap. 19. 6.* as appeareth not only from what is before-said, but also by these reasons.

First, because that laying on of hands, *Heb. 6. 2.* is one of the first Principles of the Oracles of God *Heb. 5. 12.* and the word of the begining of Christ: but the laying on of hands on the sick, by which the sick were healed, was a gift of that promised spirit, which was given to them by a laying on of hands that went before laying on of hands on the sick, casting out of Devils &c. might be a consequent of that, *Heb. 6. 2.* but not that.

Secondly, because that laying on of hands *Heb. 6. 2.* is a foundation principle so called and owned by the Author to be no less a foundation Principle then Repentance, Faith, Baptisme, Resurrection from the dead, and eternal judgement: but the laying on of hands, *Mar. 16. 18.* is not a Foundation-Principle, therefore not that mentioned, *Heb. 6. 2.* that the laying on of hands, *Mar. 16. 18.* is not a Foundation principle, appeareth first, because what are Foundation

Principles, all the Primitive Churches were built upon, *Eph. 2. 20* yea, and every particular Member thereof, but the laying on of hands *Mar. 16, 18.* every Member was not built upon: therefore no Foundation Principle; for Miracles being no Foundation for particular Members, nor Churches as is evident, *Luke 10. 19, 20.* they are not any part of the word of the beginning of *Christ*, but them by which the word was and is confirmed to us to be the steadfast word of *Christ*, the neglect of any part of which may be of dangerous consequence, *Mar. 16. 20. Heb. 2. 2, 3, 4.*

Secondly, because all did not work Miracles, *1 Cor. 12. 29.* Neither were all of them sick when they were to be built on the Foundation, which must be a qualification (if I may so call it) absolutely necessary to the participation of laying on of hands, as to the subjects, without which they were in no capacity to receive it, and therefore that could not be a Foundation-Principle, that Members ought to be built on, because they were not in capacity so to be.

*M. Harrison.* If any shall object, first, that laying on of hands, *Heb. 6.* is there immediately put after Baptisme, and that therefore it cannot be meant of laying on of hands for healing.

I answer, that our Lord *Christ* himselfe in  
 B 3 that

that great Commission given by him to the Apostles to preach and baptize, *Mar. 16.* Immediately annexeth the signs in generall, which by the Baptisme of the Spirit should follow them that beleeve, and in particular the laying on of hands for healing the sick.

*I. Griffith.* I perceive you see some strength in the objection, but to evade it you say, that the Laying on of hands to heale the sick is immediately annexed to Baptismes, in *Mark 16.*

I have shewed already, that the Lords giving the Spirit, by which as a gift thereof the Laid hands on the sick, and healed them, was not antecedent to, but a consequent of the laying on of hands we contend for [in a common way and therefore it's annexed promissively to such as doe beleeve, that is, such as have Faith so to doe and not annexed as a promise to persons who only have faith towards God, though baptize and under Imposition of hands also, which it were, it would follow that there were never Believer in the world unless they cast out Devils, speak with new tongues, tread on Serpents, drink deadly things, lay hands on the sick and they recover, or else God not faithfull in performance of his promise, which God forbid should once come into my thoughts to imagine.

As for what you observe touching the Principles, I observe you gladly would perswade



your selfe and others, that you have six Principles; but if you count againe, and reckon right, you will find you are short of one, if not of more.

And I also further observe, though I cannot doe it but with some sadness, that such is the bitterness of your spirit against this truth, that you cannot forbear speaking evill of it, calling it a B.shop-like Confirmation, viz. Laying on of hands on all baptized Believers; but this I am assured of, which is the use I make of your observation, that no rationall nor indifferent man but will judge that there is the old Bishop-like spirit remaining in you that was in them, who (as also doe ye) speak evill of the things they knew not.

Mr. *Harrison*. If any shall farther object that Laying on of hands for healing cannot be a Principle of the Doctrine of the Gospel of *Christ*, because it concerns not all persons, but such as are sick.

I answer with the Evangelist *Marke*, that by it as by other signs there mentioned, the Doctrine of the Gospel was confirmed to all, and remaineth ascertained unto us, and to all such who shall beleve on that word unto the end of the world, *Mark* 16.19,20.

I. *Griffith*. You say true, by those signs, *Marke* 16,17,18. the Doctrine of the Gospel,

pel was confirmed to all, and remaineth as-  
 certained unto us, and to all such who shall  
 beleeve on that word unto the end of the  
 world, *Mark 16.20.* But how impertinent  
 this Answer is to the Question, may easily be  
 perceived: For as much as the Doctrine of the  
 Gospel, and the signs by which it was confir-  
 med, were different things, and by this you may  
 see how clearly you have given up the cause, in  
 that you grant here that the signs, *Mark. 16.*  
*17, 18* among which laying on of hands on  
 the sick is not any part of Christs Doctrine  
 which is to be beleeved and practised to the  
 end of the world; but those signs by which  
 they were confirmed so to be; as to your An-  
 swer to your last Objection stated by your self.  
 I shall say onlie this, it being all one with  
 your Answer to the former, and are iterating  
 the same thing, that indeed those signs, *Mark.*  
*16, 17, 18.* doth strongly confirm the truths of  
 the New Testament to us, which amongst the  
 rest, laying on of hands on Believers baptized  
 as such was one; the Administration of which  
 service God being pleased to confirme by the  
 gift of his spirit, *Act. 8. 17, 18. Ch. 19. 6.* is as  
 much ours, and as properly belonging to us as  
 it did to them who were eye-witnesses of them  
 as to our Confirmation in the truth and pra-  
 ctise of all the Principles of the Doctrine of  
 Christ

Christ, of which Doctrine laying on of hands on Believers baptiz'd, as such, was one Principle, God bearing witness thereunto by the giving of his spirit, which is the proper end assigned, according to the saying of the Apostle, *Rom. 15. 4.*

Mr. *Harrison*. If any shall ask me, whether the giving the Holy Ghost, and laying on of hands in order thereunto be to be excluded from the six Principles before mentioned;

My Answer is no: but I doe clearly apprehend the same to bee comprehended under the Doctrine of Baptisme, whereof there was three sorts.

*J. Griffith*. How strongly in your Answer to this Question, you doe contradict your former Assertions is evident. For in your second Reason that you give to prove how we torment, &c. *Heb. 6. 1. 2.* to make it bear witness to our Assertions; you say that, by laying on of hands in that Text cannot be meant that which we contend for, and your Reason is, because it is no where doctrinallie declared, no not so much as in a Promise, much lesse by waie of Command.

But now here you say, it is not to be excluded from the six Principles before mentioned.

Assuredlie, if it must not be excluded, then



it is included; and then how is it you have endeavored all this while to exclude that from being a principle of the Doctrine of *Christ* that now our Pen is forced to confess is one, or at least included in one of them? You have need sure be humbled for calling that a new old Episcopal Administration, a Bishop-like Confirmation, that now you say is included in the six principles: but I spare you, desiring the Lord to let you see how little such expressions have the favour of grace in them. As for your apprehension of the comprehension of the Laying on of Hands on Baptized Believers to be in the Doctrine of Baptisms; if it be that you mean, unless you mean Laying on of Hands on the sick, for my part I see little clearness in it, and how you should be so clear in that which the Word of the Lord gives you no light in, is a paradox to me.

And as for the three sorts of Baptisms you speak of I have no exception against; onely this you say, that the Saints, especially the Apostles, were empowered to give the Holie Ghost unto others; and this you saie, is that which they are said by Laying on of Hands to bestow on others. For my part, I never in all that I have read in the Scripture, found that they had power to give the Holie Ghost; neither did I ever hear it said in the Scripture that they did bestow the Spirit

Spirit on any, I thought that your principles had led you to believe that everie good and perfect gift had come from the Father of Lights, and had not been in the power of any mortal man to bestow or give to any. I am perswaded that if I had affirmed such a thing, you would have said it had been free-will or worse. I shall therefore in a word shew that God alwaies and *Christ* kept that power in their hands, as appears, *Acts* 5 32. and therefore they were onely instruments by whom God was pleased to bestow the gift of his Spirit according to his promise, answering them in that waie he had appointed, *viz.* Praier and Laying on of Hands. As to what you further saie, it being nothing to the controversie in hand, I shall saie no more but onely this, that for what you said and by what I have said in answer thereunto, it appeareth that *Heb.* 6. 1, 2. is not Wier-drawn, rackt, wrested and tormented by any thing; we infer from it, to make it bear witness to what we contend for, and practice; neither is it a suborned witness but a true one in our cause, speaking much for us what the minde of the Spirit of God is, forced by a right interpretation.

Mr. *Harrison*. There remains no more to be examined with respect to the first Question, *viz.* whether it be a dutie incumbent on all Baptized

Baptized Believers to have Hands laid on them, &c. But the examining of their Arguments drawn from Examples, which will prove invalid, if we consider, First, Apostolical practice is not a Rule to walk by in all things.

*I. Griffith.* It is true, but doth it therefore follow that Apostolical practice is not a Rule to walk by in foundation things, which you must prove (or else your Reason given is invalid) and in particular this thing in controversy; for foundation-principles and many other things the Apostles practiced, is a Rule for us to walk by, *Phil. 4. 8, 9. 2 Thess. 2. 15. 1 Cor. 11. 1, 2.* The Church at *Ephesus* was built upon the foundation of the Apostles, &c. *Ephes. 2. 20.* They were foundation-layers; their practice therefore is a Rule for us to walk by. And when we go about to urge the doing of such things you call extraordinary without power, then you may say we are intolerably presumptuous; but while we do nothing but our dutie which we are conscious is incumbent upon us, we may expect a blessing from the Lord, and the performance of his promise to us made, *Acts 2. 38, 39.* to abilitate us as shall seem good to him.

*Mr. Harrison.* Secondly, Apostolical practice without precept was never held for the ground of the substance of a Gospel Ordinance.

*I: Griffith.*



*I. Griffith.* Here you beg the Question, and take it for granted, that Laying on of Hands on Baptized Believers, as such, is without precept; the contrary of which I having already proved, makes this Reason invalid also.

*Mr. Harrison.* There are many circumstances mentioned in those practices expressed, *Acts 8.* and *Acts 19.* the two onely Examples for what they contend for, *viz.* the Laying on of Hands upon all baptized Disciples, that in *Acts 9.* concerning *Ananias* Laying on his Hands on *Saul* (afterwards called *Paul*) being before his Baptism, as appeareth, *v. 17, 18.*) which evidently discovers these actions of theirs to be extraordinarie, and so no Example for our imitation.

*I. Griffith.* Can it possibly be imagined by any rational man, that such a circumstance as *Ananias* his Laying on of Hands on *Paul* before his Baptism should make void a principle of *Christ's* Doctrine, *Heb. 6. 2.* and an Apostolical practice? *Acts 8. 17, 18. Chap. 19. 6.* *Paul* had Hands laid on him that he might receive his sight, which was necessary he should do before he was baptized, it being not convenient that a man should go into the water blinde. And how doth this discover their Laying on of Hands on the Baptized, as such, to be extraordinarie? In your next you explain your self, and say;

*Mr. Harrison*

Mr. *Harrison*. First, not *Philip* who preached, converted and baptized; but *Peter* and *John* who were Apostles, and had received extraordinary power, and did extraordinary things.

*I. Griffith*. You seem to say, that the reason why the Apostles must be sent to *Samaritan* to lay on hands, was because of some extraordinary power they had to do extraordinary things: which could not be; the Reason is, because *Philip* himself was endued with as extraordinary a power, and did as extraordinary things as they, *Acts* 8. 5. 7. whence I note that the working of miracles, or the having any extraordinary gift doth not inright men to the administration of Gospel Ordinances, no nor to administer Laying on of Hands on the baptized, as such, as clearly appeareth by that which is now said. Therefore you are mistaken; this doth not prove that Laying on of Hands on the baptized, as such, is an extraordinary action.

Mr. *Harrison*. Secondly, as the persons who laid on hands were extraordinary, so the end propounded, and also accomplished, was extraordinary, and that in respect both of the gift conveyed, and the manner of its communication.

*I. Griffith*. First, their gifts they had, or power

power to work Miracles, &c. did not in right any as before, to administer Laying on of hands; for then *Philip* might have done it, seeing hee had the like gifts, *Act. 8. 6, 7.*

. Further, if the having power to work Miracles did in right men to administer, Laying on of hands, without which power none were authorised to the same, because they did worke Miracles, and so were extraordinary persons who did administer it: then we are to seek an Administrator, not only for Laying on of hands, but for all other Ordinances, because in our dayes we have no such extraordinary men in point of working Miracles as they were, and then no man may preach unless he be a miracle-worker, because they that preacht the word then were miracle-workers, nor administer baptism, unless he have power to work miracles, nor no other Gospel Ordinance, &c.

We may plainly see by this how men in making opposition against one principle of Christs doctrine, do by the same consequence oppose all.

Secondly, as to their persons they were not extraordinary, without you mean in respect of their place and office they were in; they were Apostles or Messengers, its true; so are some now; for God hath set in the Church, first Apostles



possibles, &c. 1 Cor. 12. 28. And he gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers, Eph. 4. 11. the Continuation of the Ministerial Office of all which, was to be till we all come in the unity of the faith, &c. And moreover by the same reason any should conclude there is no Messengers, they may conclude there is no Pastors nor Teachers, and consequently if no Ministers no Administrators.

Thirdly, that the end propounded in laying on of hands was extraordinary, is by me utterly denied. for the end propounded was the gift of the spirit, *Act. 8. 15.* which was not extraordinary but common to all baptized Believers, as such *Act. 2. 38. 39.* promised to many both Jew and Gentile, as the Lord our God shall call, which promised spirit was conveyed by Laying on of hands in more than common manner, as to the quantitie thereof, which is a powerfull confirmation to me of the truth and authoritie of the same. And therefore I do not denie, but that they at *Samaria* and *Ephesus* did receive the gift of Tongues, which filled them with joy and rejoycing, which confirmed them and me also, as to the belief, viz. that those who will receive the Spirit which God hath promised to the Baptized, *Acts 2. 38, 39* must suffer it to be asked for them of God by prayer.

prayer and Laying on of Hands, as they did; but you say.

*Mr. Harrison.* Yet to lay on hands now for the revealing of the mediate and consequential effects, when the immediate and original gift from whence those effects did flow, is denied, is very absurd and ridiculous.

*I. Griffith.* I cannot but wonder that you should no better consider, what you writ was the gift of Tongues, the immediate and original gift from whence those you call mediate and consequential effects did flow.

I think, nay I am ascertained, that Tongues was a consequential effect as well as any other gift of the Spirit, which Spirit was the original gift, from whence tongues and all other gifts did flow. This considered, we are neither absurd nor ridiculous, because the spirit, (which is the originall gift) is not denied now, but is promised to us as Believers baptized, and to all that are such to the end of the world, it being to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord shall call, *Act. 2. 39.* there are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit for it, divideth to every man severally as he will, *1 Cor. 12. 4, 11.* And as for the manner of its conveyance it being visible, as you saie, that standers by, though carnal men might see and take notice of it.

I answer, that they might see and take notice of it, and yet not so visibly, as to appear in some shape, as it did on Christ in the likeness of a Dove, *Mat. 3.* or as cloven tongues on the Disciples, *Act. 2.* But admit it were so, it is the more clear and greater Demonstration, and that from God, that Laying on of hands on the baptized, as such, is Gods appointment, as a means by which the gift of the promised Spirit was attained. Now the Premises considered, and rightlie weighed notwithstanding what you have said, it will appear to all sober and conscientious men, that there is both Precept given and common end assigned which may warrant the baptized, as such, at this time to submit to Laying on of hands upon that account I plead for it, and separate upon from those that will not submit unto it, and that the many reiterate (as you are pleased to call them) and confident cryings it up under the not notional, but solid and scripturall terms of Doctrine oracle, as command are upon good grounds, being presently alleged from *Heb. 6. 1, 2.* and those particular examples, *Act. 8. 15, 16, 17, 1 Ch. 19. 6.* those being in order to that common end, *viz.* the Reception of the Spirit which was promised in common to all baptized Believers as such, without any extraordinary



ends assigned, as I have already proved.

And as for any ones appropriating the prayers to the persons prayed for, as one end of Laying on of hands; for my part it's not my light, but that the end propounded, is the receiving of the Holie Ghost in the sense I have declared, which I take to be most rationall.

And if *Doctor Chamberlain* doe confound laying on of hands on all occasions, it's not my light neither, let him speak for himselfe, I not doubting, but he is able to vindicate the truth in this particulat, viz. Laying on of hands on baptized Believers, as such.

For my part I own laying on of hands on three severall accounts or ends, viz. First, on the baptized, as such to the end they might receive the Spirit,

Secondly; on the sick to the end they might recover.

Thirdly, one Ministers to the end they might be separated to the worke of the Ministry.

The first of these onely I have shewed to be meant, *Heb. 6. 1, 2.* and shall hereafter further shew God, willing in another piece almost ready for the Presse; and therefore I shall say no more at present, but only examine your Answer to your second main Question.

Mr. *Harrison*. I now come to the second

Question, viz. whether the subjecting to Imposition of Hands by all baptized persons be absolutely necessary to Church-communion.

To which I answer in the negative, my Reasons are these:

First, because I finde baptized Disciples added to a Church, and continuing stedfastly in the Apostles Doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of Bread, and in praier, before any such thing was practiced, as Laying on of Hands in the sense it is here taken:

*I. Griffith.* I marvel what should make you imagine that they should continue in the Apostles Doctrine, &c. and no such thing was practiced as Laying on of Hands. Could they continue in that Doctrine stedfastly (as they are there said to do) before they were in the practice of everie principle thereof, Laying on of Hands was a principle of that Doctrine, *Heb. 6.2.* Therefore they were in the practice of, and continued stedfastly in that, as well as in the rest of the principles of that Doctrine, as doth further appear by their being taught these principles of Gods Oracles, *Heb. 5.12.* which they had need to be taught again (because of their unprofitableness in them) which they were, and had need of milk, &c. That baptized Disciples were added to a Church, I nor none

none owning this principle (as I know) did ever denie. But this note, that this addition was somewhat else besides, and more than Baptism, for so much the Text doth implie: and being added, they continued in the Apostles Doctrine, &c. this Reason given to prove the negative is therefore invalid.

Mr. *Harrison*. Secondly, it is evident that some persons received the Holie Ghost in the sense before expressed, before Baptism, by Laying on of Hands, as *Saul*, &c. others before Baptism, without Laying on of Hands, as *Cornelius*, &c.

*I. Griffith*. First, that *Paul* did receive the Spirit before Baptism, by Laying on of Hands, is more than the Text doth saie, though it be true that *Ananias* was sent to him to that purpose, that he might receive the Spirit, yet all that is expressed in the Text is, that by Laying on of Hands before Baptism he received his sight, but that he had Hands laid on him to that end, or that he did receive the Spirit before Baptism, is more than the Text will prove. But admit it were so, yet he was under Laying on of Hands before he was admitted to Church-communion; therefore this Reason as to that is invalid also.

Secondly, You saie it was given before Baptism without Laying on of Hands, *Acts 10.*



I grant it was in that case, which was not usual for God to do, it being to confirm to *Peter* that great design that God had in hand, viz. the calling of the Gentiles.

But what doth this prove your negation? No, *Cornelius* must not be excused from his subjection to the appointments of *Christ's* notwithstanding but be dipped in water. And truly you might as well urge, that the subjection to Baptism is not of absolute necessity to Church-communion from this of *Cornelius*, as the other; and indeed there is the like reason for if we may have communion with those that disobey one principle of *Christ's* his Doctrine why not if they disobey another? And if *Cornelius* and his friends were communicable, without Laying on of Hands, Why might he not be communicable also without Baptism, seeing he had the Spirit? Thus may you see the invalidity of these Reasons as well as of the former, shall no more at present but leave what I have said to the judgment of the spiritual, who are the onely competent judges in these things, to trye and weigh in the ballance of the Sanctuarie, desiring also that their hearts might be set upon the searching after the knowledg of what is the good and acceptable will of *Christ* in this and all other truths that God hath in these last times spoken by his Son, who is that great

Prophie

Prophet whom we must hear in whatsoever he shall saie, who spoke not of himself but as the Father gave him commandment, *John 12.49.* whose friends we are, if we do whatsoever he commanded us; they are onely wise in his account that hear his sayings, and do them; such that so do shall stand in the time of tribulation; when the storms rise his house shall stand, because it's founded upon a Rock, viz. the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, *Christ* himself being the chief Corner-stone.

---

*FINIS.*

---

