

THE FOURTH
PRINCIPLE
 OF
Christs Doctrine
VINDICATED.

BEING

A Brief Answer to Mr. H. Danvers Book, Intituled,
A Treatise of Laying on of Hands.

Plainly Evincing the true Antiquity and Perpetuity
 of that Despised Ministration of Prayer, with
 Imposition of Hands for the Promise
 of the SPIRIT.

To which is added,

A Discourse of the Successors of the Apostles,
 wherein the Office of the Messengers of Christ and the
 Church is Asserted to be Perpetual, and of Divine
 Authority, in the same Nature as
Bishops, Elders, &c.

By **THO. GRANTHAM.**

Pf. 119. 173. Let thine hand help me, for I have chosen thy Precepts.

LONDON, Printed in the Year, 1674.



THE EPISTLE DEDICATORY.

To all the Pastors of the Baptized Churches,
more especially to those who either omit, or
are indifferent about the Fourth Principle,
Heb. 6. 2.

Brethren and Fathers,

YOU must needs have a greater sence of the matters
Treated on in this Book then other men, and are more
Eminently concern'd to consider what is to be done in
them. God hath made you the Stewards of his Mysteries, and
among the rest, hath committed the Fourth Principle, Heb.
6. 2. to your Trust; a necessity therefore lieth upon you to be as
Faithful in that as in the Rest.

I shall upon this occasion offer a few things to your Enquiry and
Consideration, and the first is this.

Whether ever it entered into your Hearts to Teach with Dili-
gence, and to handle distinctly the Duties and Blessings which
concern this Principle, so that the Breasts of your Churches have
afforded the sincere Milk of this Word or Principle, as well as
of the rest? And if not, then whether the true Reason be not,
because you know not what to say or do about it?

2. Whether sleightly to pass over one Principle or Foundation
Doctrine, do not endanger making the rest like it, and whether
we can well support our other Principles against such an Adversary
as should take us upon the Account of our neglect in this particular.

The Epistle Dedicatory.

3. Whether the neglect of this Principle do not lead Christians too much to neglect one of the greatest Blessings of the New Covenant, even the Sealing Spirit of Promise, whiles the means once so useful to obtain it, is by you wholly laid aside.

I humbly beseech you to consider these things, as also what I have here presented to you in the ensuing Discourses; To the Penning whereof, had I not been constrained by the unnecessary and unseasonable oppositions made against the Truths contended for; I should more gladly have spared this Labour, for to me it is nothing Pleasant but very Grievous, that when many are seeking for those things that might make for Peace, still new occasions do Intervene to Revive (if not to augment) the Controversie.

How seasonably Mr. Danvers was intreated to forbear Writing against his Brethren, some of you are not ignorant, and how little he hath gained by his unnecessary undertaking, will be yet more evident; and if his Zeal shall yet inforce further opposition, he may rationally believe those that make Conscience of this Truth, cannot but endeavour to defend it.

God hath endued some of you with moderate and healing Spirits, I intreat all such to stand up for Peace, to do what they can to prevent these publick Fars, I desire to be so happy, as to see an end of this Controversy.

What I have written, is my judgment and Conscience, I have not writ for Discourse sake. Nor have I injured the sence of any Author I meddle with, so far as I know, but have dealt with all good Conscience therein, what I faile in by reason of humane frailty, I know every good Christian will Pardon me therein. I am

Your Brother and Fellow Servant.

THOMAS GRANTHAM.



THE FOURTH
PRINCIPLE
OF
CHRISTS DOCTRINE
VINDICATED.

How hard a thing it is to bring those Sacred Truths of the Gospel to their due Use and Estimation in the Church, which have been abused by the Corruption of the Ages past, those cannot be ignorant, whose Lot it hath been to Labour in that glorious Undertaking, which yet is more particularly made manifest at this time by a late Book Intituled, *A Treatise of Laying on of Hands*; wherein the Churches adhearing to that Principle, are not only represented to the World as founded in Sin, Schism, Errour, and Ignorance, By Mr. D. But the Principle it self also rendred Erronious, * and presented to the world with such a Robe of Folly put upon it by the Vauity of Men in many Ages past, as may expose it to the Mockage of the ignorant, who know not to distinguish between Truth and mens sinful Adjuncts wherewith it hath been incumbred, any more then the *Soldiers* who cloathed *Christ* in a Purple Robe, and when they had done derided him. By which kind of dealing it were easie for the Adversaries of other Truths as *Baptism* and the *Table of the Lord*, to disgrace them to the World, sith they also have been as much attended with *Chrism*s, *Crossings*, *Creamings*, *Exorcisms*, *Exsufflations*, *Sponsors*, *Spirings*, *Saltings*, and *Superstitions*, or *Idolatrous Adorations*, as this despised Truth of Prayer with Imposition of Hands for the promised Spirit.

* The Principle is this, viz. The promise of the Holy Spirit which God hath made, and Christ obtained for the Church under the New-Testament, and Prayer with the Laying on of hands as the way of God for his people wherein to obtain it.

The Fourth Principle of

Spirit. All which Sacred (and in their places precious) Truths shall yet be more fully restored to their Integrity and Esteem in the Churches of Christ *Maugre* opposition.

Towards the advancing a work of which import, Mr. H. D. hath had a prize put into his hand, but wanted a heart to make use of it, with respect to the Fourth Principle of Christs Doctrine, chusing rather to disgrace it what in him lay, whereby he hath as much ignobled himself, as he justly advanced his repute in the Churches, by his useful Labours in his late *Treatise of Baptism*. Of which being seasonably admonished, he must expect now to be more sharply reprov'd.

His Book consists of two General Parts, the first *Historical*, shewing the opinion of other men concerning the Laying on of Hands: The second *Polemical*, shewing his own opinion in opposition to most men in sundry important Particulars.

1. From the Historical part with the Title page there is somewhat gain'd for the Truth which he would destroy, whilst he tells us, *An account is given both from Scripture and Antiquity, how it hath been practised in all Ages since Christ*. And beginning with the Scripture, he plainly sets down the use of that service by the Apostles in several places, only he minceth the matter in respect of the end for which they observed it as hereafter is shewed.

2. He proceeds to other Authorities, about whom he deals not so fair as might be wished, and likewise he seems too bold.

1. Not fair, because he begins with a spurious Author, who would besmear the Truth in question, with *Unction* or *Chrism* in the first Age, and chiefly he insists upon such Authors, and such passages in those Authors, who express something of their own or others Vanities, in conjunction with Prayer and laying on of Hands; thereby designing (I fear) to make the thing in question the less acceptable to the Reader; and having done thus, he labours to impeach the Imposition of hands, (as now contended for) as if Antiquity were not on our side in this Controversie. For the first Testimony of any credit (in his own Judgment) which is brought by him, is that of *Calixtus* (alias *Calistus*) and having made him the Author of *Confirmation*, (which indeed he was not) he puts the Mark of Pope upon him, to make the cause he opposes still the more hateful, whereas, though he were Bishop of the Roman Church about the year 221. *useb. Hist.*
b.6. c.20, yet it is certain the Popedom (as now commonly understood) had

Christ's Doctrine Vindicated.

3

had then no being in that Church. True it is, *Calistus* had his mistakes or errors, as well as other Fathers, and yet some whom Mr. D. mentions with greater Estimation, had as great (or greater) mistakes then he. However, all that can fairly be said in this case against *Calistus*, is, that he helped forward the use of Oyle in the Service of Prayer with Imposition of Hands, but laying on of Hands, (called by some Confirmation) was in use in the Churches long before, as now I shall shew.

For sith we have the Scriptures, *Acts* 8. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. *Acts* 19. 6. 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. *Heb.* 6. 2. most clearly shewing the practice of Prayer with Imposition of Hands for the promised spirit, (as we shall more full demonstrate in our second Part) we shall not need to produce any other witness for that Age, and for the second, we have better evidence than *Dynis*, or *Justin Martyrs Responses*; for *Tertullian* (whom Mr. D. tells us he had quoted, pag. 26. but strangely mistakes himself, having not mentioned him, nor any sentence out of him) is our witness for the second Century in which he lived and flourished in the year 202. in the profession of Christianity, under *Severus* and *Antoninus*, and wrote an Apology about that time for the Christians, and therefore must needs be able to give an account of the usage of the Church in the second Century, his words are these. *When we are come out of the Laver, [meaning Baptism] Tertul. de* afterward the hand is laid on by Blessing [meaning by Prayer] calling *Baptismo.* upon, and inviting the Holy Ghost. And again, *Like as in Baptism the* Flesh is washed, that the Soul may be made clean; so in Laying on of *Tertul. de* Hands the Flesh is over-shadowed, that the Soul may be illuminated by *Resurrecti.* the Holy Spirit.

Moreover, we find in *Euseb.* expressly, Prayer and Laying on of Hands, on persons to be united to the Church, called, The ANTIENT MANNER, and this was about the middle of this Century or Age wherein *Tertullian* Lived, being in the days of *Stephen* Bishop of the Roman Church, Anno 256. and here is not the least mention of *Chrysm*, * or any vain Ceremony. Sith then this Service is said to be Antient at that time, it may well refer to the Apostolical Century, being but about 150. years upward; however, its full evidence for the practice in the second Century, which is sufficient to our present purpose.

These witnesses may also serve for the Third Century, living (as before) both in the second and third, to whom we may add

Eusebius
lib. 7. cap. 2.

*And for the
Unction men-
tioned in
Tertul. de Bap-
tism shewed by
the Learned
Protestants,
to be that
which was
used at Bap-
tism, and not
at laying on
of Hands.

Urban

The Fourth Principle of

Urban Bishop of the Roman Church, whose words as cited by Mr. D. are very harmless words (abating the terme Sacrament, &c.) which be these, *That the Sacrament of Confirmation be immediately given after Baptism, and that all the faithful are to wait for the Spirit by the Imposition of the B. Hands.*

Cyprian also who flourished about the middle of the 300, gives Testimony to the Practise now contended for, saying, *It is to little purpose to lay hands on them [that returned from Heresie] unless they receive also the Baptism of the Church, for then at the length they may be sanctified perfectly, &c.*

For the Fourth Century, though enough is done by Mr. D. to shew they were for Prayer with Imposition of hands after Baptism, for the Spirit of Promise; yet sith their witness may be more clearly set down, I will add somewhat in that behalf.

And however Melchiades is * Popified by Mr. D. yet his Doctrine is not so dangerous as is pretended, for when he saith, *Baptism and Imposition of Hands are to be joyned together*, he is very consonant to the Apostles practise, *Acts 8.* and to their Writings, *Heb. 6. 2.* And when he saith, *The one is not to be done without the other*, his meaning may be honest, as if a man should say, you ought not to observe one Ordinance alone, but keep them all. And his saying, *The one is not perfect alone*; if he mean, that the perfection of one Ordinance is not such but that we have need of the rest, all is well enough still, but if he mean Baptism, as such is not perfect

without the other, then for my part I think otherwise; but supposing him mistaken in some things touching this matter, yet sure his Errours were as tollerable as theirs that would destroy the thing altogether.

Jerome (who flourished Anno 390. under *Valentinian Junior*, does not only say, *That it is the Custom of the Church, that upon the Baptized hands should be Imposed [as Mr. D.]* but he also saith, *Its an observation Apostolical*, (which he might well say, *Acts 8. Acts 19. 2 Tim. 1. 6.*) and plainly saith, *It is found in the Acts of the Apostles.*

Augustine, who lived Anno 395. in the Reign of *Theodosius*, informs us, *That bands was laid upon Hereticks (returning to the Church) for the uniting of Charity, which is the greatest gift of the Holy Ghost,*

* Sure I am, in this Mans dayes, both Christians and all men had free Liberty to serve God as they saw they ought, this man not seeking to hinder it, which is not like the Popes of our days. He governed the Roman Church, Anno 312. and it certainly gratifies the Papists too much, to acknowledge Popes to have been ever since the time of *Clement*, as Mr. D. is pleased to do, pag. 7.

Christs Doctrine Vindicated.

5

Ghost, which well agrees with Mr. D. who brings him in saying, *Imposition of hands after Baptism was necessary for the gifts of the Spirit.*

Thus much for the Fathers, we shall now observe briefly what Mr. D. hath brought out of the *Councils* touching the Point in Controversy.

And first, I observe he fronts his List of them, with the Council of *Laodicea*, An. 315. rather then with the *Council of Eliberius*, which bears date, even from his own Pen, five years before the other ; The reason is manifest, for though the first set down, speaks not a word of Imposition of hands, or *Confirmation*, yet it mentions *Chrism*, and the other speaks plainly of *Imposition of hands*, but mentions not *Chrism* ; therefore that the Reader might more stumble at the truth in hand, he hath occasion given to do so by the strange phrases of the Council of *Laodicea*, and yet Mr. D. Pretends to take up the stumbling blocks out of the way of Gods People.

Well, for matter of Fact, however these Councils may witness for the Imposition of hands (at least that of *Eliberius*) in the third and fourth hundreds, they living the greatest Part of their time (probably) in the 300. That we have much elder evidence then this, may I conceive be fairely collected (yet I will speak under Correction) from the 72. Epistle of *Ciprian* written to *Stephen* Bishop of the *Roman Church* about 50. years before the Council of *Eliberius*, in which one reason rendered why the Council of *Carthage*, before that time, had concluded for the Baptizing of returning Hereticks, is grounded upon the unprofitableness of imposition of hands without it ; which shews that both this Council and *Ciprian* approved thereof ; now add that forecited out of *Eusebius*, that in the dayes of this writing between *Ciprian* and *Stephen*, prayer with imposition of hands was called the *Antient Manner*, &c. then we infer, that here were Fathers in this Council with *Ciprian*, who were sufficient evidence for the practise contended for, for the second hundred, for if there were any at that Council aged 70. or 80. years, they then had lived so much of their time in the second Century as to be able to attest of their own knowledge the practice now called *Antient*. And for the first Century the Scripture is our *Cannon*. So then, we have sufficient evidence from Scripture, and good Antiquity that this Truth began to be practised in the Apostles days, and continued in the Churches for four hundred years together,

The Fourth Principle of

gether, (not without Corruption creeping into it, I grant, and alas that was the case of most Truths, as well as of that.)

It were needless to proceed to the following Ages, from which more plenty of Testimonies may be produced, the Church encreasing, and Records being more carefully preserved then they could be in the first Ages, yet here I will add that notable testimony of the Council of *Mentz*, or *Meguntine*, who

|| *Sacramentum Confirmationis ab initia sola manum impositione, exlubitur: Nam cum initio Spiritus Sanctus, ad evidentiorum recentis ad hinc fidei Confirmationem signo visibili influerit confirmatis externa Unctione, tum opus non erat.*

saith, || In the beginning the Sacrament of Confirmation was exhibited only by the Imposition of Hands, the Holy Ghost appearing by evident signs there was no need of outward anointing. The same is testified *Intervit. chap. 16. The Sacrament of Confirmation was Celebrated in the beginning only, with the laying on of Hands, and saith Alex. de Hales, The Apostles Confirmed with the only Imposition of Hands, without any certain form of words or outward*

Element. Thus the Purity of Truth in this, as in other cases, is evidenced even by those that have not kept it in the Purity thereof. Now whereas I said Mr. D. was too bold, &c. my meaning is in this, that he so confidently tells us the Greek Church did reject Imposition of Hands, &c. and that the *Waldenses* did the like, for such Negatives are hard to be demonstrated; for what if some or many of them did reject it, yet if many, or some of them did receive it, what then is become of this Negation? That they did reject (or at least many of them) the Popish Sacrament of Confirmation, in respect of divers usages therein, I can readily believe, but that they did reject Prayer, with the laying on of Hands, for the Promised Spirit, I see no good reason to Believe, partly for that we have an account from a great Antiquary of the form of words, and of

|| The form of words used in their Confirmation are so far from a rejection of all that the Papists hold in that Point that they seem to have too great affinity therewith, viz. *Sigillatos primo, scilicet unctos unguento Chrismae & signantes eos dicimus sigillum doni Spiritus Sancti.*

the Prayer used by the Greek Church in their Imposition of Hands Translated out of the Greek *Euchologion*. *Αυτός δεσποτα, &c. Thou O Lord, the most Compassionate and great King of all, graciously impart to this Person the gift of thy Holy, Almighty, and adorable Spirit, || partly for that some of the Grecian Bishops are certainly found to approve of Prayer, with laying on of Hands, as Eusebius for example, who not only Records it, (as I shewed before) for the Antient Manner of the Church, but also rec-*

kons

kons it amongst the Errors of *Novatus*, for that he sleighted the Imposition of Hands for the obtaining the Holy Spirit, *lib. 6. chap. 42.* from whose neglect, it's like his followers (whom Mr. D. so highly commends) did also lightly esteem it to their own reproach, and the ill example of Mr. D. and others, in this and former ages.

Again, *Gregory Nazianzen* and *Theodoret*, both *Grecians*, are alleadged by the said *Antiquary*, as giving evidence for the truth in Controversie, calling it, *A holy Myltagogy, wherein they that are initiated, receive as in a shaddow the Invisible grace of the most holy Spirit.*

I have not the History whence Mr. D. fetches the Testimony concerning the *Waldensian Brethren*, their rejecting Imposition of hands, nor need much be said to it, sith from the very passage alleadged by Mr. D. it appears not that they were Enemies to Prayer, with putting on of Hands for the promised Spirit, but only of those vanities wherewith it was incumbered in the Papacy.

For, to say nothing of the slender Evasion of that Testimony born by some of them to that Truth, alleadged by Mr. D. p. 27. which is no better an Argument then if he would prove us his Brethren, not to be of the Baptized Churches, because we presented to *King CHARLES the Second* an Apology or Confession of Faith, wherein we asserted Laying on of Hands, and the general point, or Christs Death for all men; when yet divers of our Christian Brethren, no less fearing God then our selves, do oppose us in both particulars, and Print against us, yea, in their Addresses to Authorities do present (perhaps) something contrary to us in these particulars. What then? are either they or we therefore to be accounted none of the Baptized Churches? God forbid. In like manner those called *Hussites* are not to be denied to be *Waldenses*, because of some variation about Imposition of hands, sith its evident such diversities have befallen in one thing or other, the most serious Christians in every age. But I say to let this pass,

The very passage cited out of *Paul Perrin, pag. 329. &c.* proves not that for which it is brought, for the things denied in that sentence are, First, That the Sacrament of Confirmation was Instituted by Christ, meaning the Popish Sacrament, they having occasion only to witness against that. 2. That Christ was not Confir-

mod in his own Person. Meaning in the Popish way of Chrism, &c. [for that he prayed, and that the Father (who only could Seal him) did Seal him with the Holy Ghost immediately after

Luk. 3. 21,
22.

Joh. 6. 27. his Baptism is evident, and so he was confirmed in his own person.] 3. *That Baptism is perfect without that Sacrament.* Hereby only rejecting their conceit that think or make it an appurtenance of Baptism. That this only is their meaning is evident, for say they, *God is Blasphemed by it.* 2. *It was introduced by the Instigation of the Devil to seduce the People, and deprive them of the Faith of the Church.* 3. *To draw them to believe Ceremonies, and the necessity of Bishops,* [meaning doubtless Lord Bishop, &c. and not the Overseers of Christs poor people.]

But surely no man can imagine that those *Waldenses* were so mad-headed, to say or think that Prayer with Imposition of Hands for the Spirit of Promise, according to the Example of the Apostles, simply so considered, and as the next priviledge to holy Baptism, was introduced by the Devil! No, Mr. D. himself is not offended thereat, *pag. 51.* and truly should the *Waldenses* have had such a meaning, their Testimony for our Churches succession would be very inconsiderable.

Wherefore, (to suppose some of them ignorant of what some Churches in this Age do know concerning the simplicity of this practise, having so continuall occasion from the Papists to be scandalized against it) shall this plead for you to follow them in that particular? I trow not, our Fore-Fathers may find that tollerable in the day of Judgment which we shall not find so, having the advantages which they were not acquainted with. Wherefore, though it be the unworthy design of Mr. D. in the Historical part of his Book, to make the Imposition of Hands (as now contended for by his Brethren) to be originally a *Papistical, Babylonish, and Antichristian Ceremony*, not used by the Greeks or any other Churches differing from the Papists, (except our late Reformers some of them) yet this being little more then his bare word, It may be sufficient to ballance him with the Testimony of Dr. *Jer. Taylor*, who saith,

That Laying on of Hands, was firmly believed by all the Primitive Church, and became an Universal Practise in all Ages; the Latine Church and the Greek alwayes did use it, ---- It was Antient and long before Popery entered into the World, and this Rite hath been more abused by Popery then any thing, and to this day the Bigots (or Jesuites) of the Roman

Roman Church) are the greatest Enemies to it, and from them the Presbyterians.

Yea, such is the evidence of this Despised Truth, that Mr. Calvin, a man sufficiently (and yet justly) sharp against *Cherism*, and such vanities; yet is constrained to own the primitive use of this Ordinance (so I call it) and desires once and again, it were restored, and because Mr. D. hath not fully set down his words, I will here recite them. *Such Laying on of Hands*, (saith he) *as is done simply, instead of Blessing, I praise, and would that it were at this day restored to the pure use thereof.* And again, *I would to God we did keep still the manner which I have said to have been in old time*, Cal. Instit. l. 4. c. 19. S. 4. and S. 13. To whose good desires we may joyn those of *Hommius*, and the *Leyden Professors*, set down by Mr. D. pag. 27. viz. *That this business of Confirmation were drained from Antichristian mixtures, both as to Name, Nature, Matter, Form, Administrator, and Subject also.* From all which its remarkable, that there hath been as holy Breathings after the Restoration of this precious Truth, as other of the paths of Righteousness, and therefore the more intollerable is it for Mr. D. or any other now to oppose themselves against it, being now as graciously Restored to its pure use in many Churches of Christ, as any other Ordinance whatsoever.

So that by this time I hope its apparent, how little reason Mr. D. had to ask this insinuating Question, pag. 32. *Is there not good ground think you to suspect the Justice and Truth of that Cause that cannot otherwise be defended nor maintained but by suborned witnesses, and Knights of the Post?* For truly, as these witnesses are not suborned, but in the rank of Humane Testimonies for matter of Fact very considerable, so neither is it true, that there are no better ways to maintain this Truth, seeing the Divine Authority of this Sacred Truth standeth not upon man, but upon the Word of God, as we have in some former Treatises; and shall now again in our second part further demonstrate.

The

The Fourth Principle of

The Second Part.

TO say nothing here of Mr. Ds. Exceptions against the grounds and ends for, or from which, others beside the Baptized Christians do observe Prayer with Imposition of hands but to leave them to their own Defence; we shall consider briefly the force of his opposition against his Brethren, among whom, respecting the Practice of Prayer, with the Laying on of Hands, he very well observes.

1. First, *The Name which we* (or rather the Lord) *gives this Rite, viz. Laying on of Hands.*
2. Second, *The Subjects, viz. All Baptized Believers, Men and Women,* [even as God hath made his Promise of the Spirit to both Men and Women.]
3. Third, *The Administrators, viz. The Elders or Presbyters,* [or Messengers of Christ and his Churches, who, as they are all Stewards of the Mysteries of God, of which this of laying on of Hands was one, they must needs be Dispencers of it with the Rest.
4. Fourth, *The end for the Promised Spirit to Confirm the Baptized, and orderly to admit into the Church,* [to Confirm, only as the ways of God do, all help to Edifice, and strengthen Gods People.]
5. Fifth, *The Time or Order in which this is Administred, betwixt Baptism and the Supper, or presently after Baptism. ||*
6. Sixth, *The Principal Ground upon which they assert it, viz. The Scripture, especially from Heb. 6. 2. Act. 8. 17. & 19. 2. 6.*

If no imer-
gency re-
quire some
iteration.

When Mr. D. comes to oppose us in these Particulars, p. 40. he inverts the order here propounded, and begins with the last particular in the first place, but first he premises several things. And first he is pleased to say.

That we do not affirm, or deliver our opinion upon Heb. 6. 2. with so much modesty or Sobriety as the Presbyterians or Independants, and the reason is onely, because we determine plainly what Laying on of Hands is meant, Heb. 6. 2. and pass it not only as a probability, or to this purpose.

To this I answer, That this is so far from Insobriety, that there is a necessity that we be positive in this Case, else it must be granted that this first Principle cannot be known, and then it supposes no man able to teach another, which be the first Principles

Christ's Doctrine Vindicated.

11

Principles of the Oracles of God. And indeed, upon this Rock hath Mr. D. run himself, after all his Expositions on *Heb. 6. 2.* and is forced *pag. 49.* to suppose that he is not able to tell us what laying on of Hands is intended, *Heb. 6. 2.* || and gives this as a reason of his supposition, *viz. There are many things in Pauls Epistles which are hard and difficult to be understood, which (says he) the Ignorant do wrest.* Which sentence he hath verified, for not knowing what to say, concerning *Heb. 6. 2.* certainly, he hath by saying many things at a venture, exceedingly wrested this place, and first by supposing this Laying on of Hands to be one of the *hard things in Pauls Epistles.* The contrary being most plain, for these Principles *Heb. 6. 1. 2.* are opposed to the things that are hard to be uttered, *Heb. 5.* being also called Milk for Babes, and not strong Meat. As also because the Hebrew Christians are blamed, for that they might have been (and were not) teachers of these Principles, but needed to be taught again which were the first Principles. Yea verily, this is to make all things in Christianity hard and difficult, for if the first Rudiments be so, what can be easie?

It is high time therefore for Mr. D. and others with him, to see the vanity of these pretences, and speedily to consider, that there is as much need to be positive in the business of the fourth Principle, *Heb. 6. 2.* as any of the rest, and that a Teacher may with as much ground and credit, plead ignorance to them all, as to any one of them; and how dangerous it is to make Principles (or any of them) but probabilities only, a man that hath but half an eye may easily perceive.

Secondly, Mr. D. sets down two Principles (as he calls them) to be as a Line to carry us through the work, * *viz.*

1. That to every Ordinance of Christ there must be some plain positive word of Institution to Confirm it.
2. To practice any thing in the worship of God, for an Ordinance of his, without an Institution, is Will-worship and Superstition.

But surely the first of these propositions is not to taken without some such exposition as this, *viz. That what any Man affirms to be a solemn part of the worship of God, for the Church of God, it must be warranted by the holy Scriptures without wresting them.* But Mr. D. taking the first proposition in a ridged sence, counts all we say from *Heb.*

|| But alas, its more than a supposition, for if I do know infallibly what it is, why doth he not tell us which it is, why are we counted in modest for shewing positively, unless he arrogate more to himself then he will allow to u

* As if Mr. D. his Principles were more Infallible then those in *Heb. 6.*

The Fourth Principle of

2. as nothing, unless we can shew where it's said, *Let all Baptized Beleivers have hands laid on them, with as much plainness as its said, Let all Beleivers be Baptized, and eat the Lords Supper.* But this is very irrational to imagin, that every institution of Christ must be expressed in the Scripture with *equall Plainness*, for if they be but *found there*, it is Sufficient. Nay, the very ordinances he mentions, are not equall in their plainness, in respect of the Individuals that are to partake of them, Precept and President being in that behalfe much plainer for Baptism then the Lords Table. Again the goverment of the Church by *Messengers, Bishops, and Deacons, &c.* is an Institution of Christ. But if I ask for a precept in *terminis* that in the ordination of these officers, prayer and imposition of hands must be used, I dare say Mr. D. cannot shew it. Neither is he able shew me any President that any but the Apostles Laid Hands on Deacons, Nor any President at all, of any one Elder of any particuler Church that was ordained by Prayer with the Laying on of Hands, yet surely there is sufficient in the Scriptures to warrant us in these things, respectively; and thus we shall come to consider more Particularly what Mr. D. hath done to cleare the same of *Heb. 6.* as he promises in his title page, and yet in his lines pretendes it cannot be cleared, as I have shewed, whilst the most he himself arrives at, or allows us (with his Good liking) to attain to, is but probability. P. 40.

eb, 6. 1. 2.

For the ground of our practice in praying to the Lord with the imposition of Hands; The Connexion of the Principles or the order wherein they are propounded to us, is eminently considerable, because, principles, or first rudiments of Religion, both in faith and practice (as they are practicall) do Equally, concern individuals, both in respect of the things so denominated, and the order of them (except in cases of immurgency) as is more fully shewed in our *S. for peace, Part. the Second.*

Mr. D. P. 41. denies that there is the Least warranty in this text for the faith or practise of the Church, in praying with the imposition of hands &c. and yet in the next page he tells us it is very true the Doctrine of Laying on of hands is here reckoned among the principles of the Doctrine of Christ; But withall he denies laying on of hands on all Baptized Beleivers to be taught or practised by Christ, observing from the Waldenses, that John did not lay hands upon Christ after he Baptized him. &c.

I Answer, Christ himself being he that was sent of God to Baptize with the Holy Ghost, as the great Author of that Donation, from

from the Father it was not meet that *John* should pray for Christ, yet behold the very order wherein Christ received the Spirit is very teachable to the Saints in their waiting upon God for that Heavenly gift, for when he was Baptized then he prayed, and the holy Ghost defended upon him, being then sealed by God the Father, who also by voyce from Heaven declared him to be his beloved Son, *Math. 3. 16. 17. Luk. 3. 21. John 6. 27.* How Suitable therefore is it, to the example of Christ, for all such as are Baptized, speedily to waite upon God for the gift of his holy Spirit, with Prayer and Imposition of Hands, haveing the Apostles walking in that very path before us, and God Almighty Crowning that way by giving a blessing to his Children, even then sealing them also, to the day of Redemption, by the Spirit of Promise, *Acts 19. 6. Ephes. 1. 13. and 4. 30.*

But saith *Mr. D.* we find not that Christ taught this laying on of hands, &c. To which it were sufficient to say that we do not finde where Christ either taught or practised Laying on of hands on Deacons, or other officers, all that we finde is, that he Lift up his hands and Blessed his Apostles, and yet who dare doubt, but that the Apostles were taught of God how to ordain his Ministers, and there is the same reason to beleive they were taught of God to pray with Laying on of hands for the promised Spirit, specially when God so signally owned them in that undertaking, *Acts 8. 17.*

Mr. D. names many Churches that are not said to have hands Laid on them, and that to be reckoned among their principles which is so frivolous an objection as I marvel he should use it, he knows there be some Churches who are not said to be Baptized nor to have the Lords Table among them, nor any Church save one to have had Deacons ordained by Laying on of hands, and yet finding these things religiously held in some Churches, we safely conclude other Churches had the like. And why may not the example of two or three Churches, in the case of prayer with Laying on of hands for the promised Spirit satisfie, as well as the example of one Church only in another case?

Mr. D. p. 43. puts this objection, why should Laying on of hands be reckoned among the beginning principles, if it was not to be practised by all, &c. which he answers after this manner, your Argument is fallacious, as though no act done upon or practised by others, might be matter of Doctrine to us without being engaged to do the same.

The Fourth Principle of

But I reply, That the Argument being used, only with respect to things Fundamental, or the first Principles of the Christian Religion, is very sound and concluding (and therefore not answered nor touched by Mr. Ds. extending it to all other acts, but disingeniously abused) for both the Doctrine and practise of all the Principles, *Heb. 6. 1. 2.* belongs equally to all, otherwise it will follow that the first Churches had the Principles of Religion both in the Doctrinal and Practick parts, but we have only the Theory, we must learn them, but not practise them, for thus saith Mr. D. p. 45. *Believers must be taught it*, meaning Laying on of hands, *but that they are obliged therefore to practise it, is not here (i. e. in Heb. 6.) or else where to be found.* Surely this is the way to destroy such Principles as are practically, to leave nothing of them in the Churches now but talking of them only.

Mr. D. being pressed by the consideration of Laying on of Hands, as it is Milk for Babes in Christ, undertakes to shew that some other Laying on of hands may be that also; and names the imposition of hands to heal the Sick *Mark 16. 18.*

Ans^r.

Surely he may with as much truth and reason tell us that the drinking any deadly poyson, *Mark. 16. 18.* is Milk for Babes in Christ also, this is the effect of mens stumbling at truth, they make themselves ridiculous, for who would think that so judicious a person should make that a Principle, and such an one too as belongs to all Christians equally, as it is a Principle, which indeed scarce belongs to one often thousand? Again, Laying on of hands to heale the sick belongs to them that are without (the sick persons in the Church having a speciall ordinance provided for there comfort in sickness, *Jam. 5.*) and therefore not to be called Milk for Babes in the Church. But suppose that Laying on of hands to heal the Sick, do at all belong to the Church, yet the oldest Christian, is as much concerned in it as the youngest Christian, who being sick may seek for cure that way as well as the other. Neither is this laying on of hands properly called *Confirmation*, as Mr. D. Imagines P. 44. for the word was confirmed with signes which followed prayer and Preaching, as well as laying on of hands on the sick, yea prayer and laying on of Hands on Baptized Believers had signes also following it, so then all these may as properly be called *Confirmation* as any one of them, and yet Mr. D. will not allow Imposition of hands for the holy Spirit to be properly so called. But,

Similie

Similie Similis est ratio. And to conclude this, note further that seeing Imposition of hands for the holy Spirit is for the obtaining of Spirituall Gifts; and the Imposition of hands on the sick for the exercise of Spirituall gifts received, the first is even therefore much more like to be Milk for Babes then the latter.

Mr. D. further saith, Laying on of hands Heb. 6. 2. contains that for the investiture of Church Officers, and his reason is because these Principles are very Comprehensive, he saith also that the Lords Supper may pass for a beginning Teaching as well as Baptism. He tells us also that the Laying on of hands, Heb. 6. 2. is as plurall as Baptism, P. 43. 50. 51.

1. I answer, to make Imposition of hands on Deacons and other officers, a Principle appertaining to the begining of a Christian Man, is very absurd, because first Principiles are necessary to the being of Churches; whereas the Imposition of hands on officers, presupposes a Church already founded, and as such to have made their election of some to mannage their affaires as a Church, after which election, the Laying on of hands to ratifie it is to be performed.

Secondly, Mr. D. faithfulness in thus expounding, Heb. 6. 2. may well be suspected, for doth he indeed make it his work to Preach that Laying on of hands, which is the next Principle to Babbtisme, Heb. 6. Is the Imposition of hands on Deacons, &c. doth he I say Teach the Babes this, as he Teacheth the other five Principles? I believe if he do so, he is singular; sure I am, before the controversy arose about Laying on of hands for the promised Spirit, none of them (that I could ever hear of) said any thing at all about the Imposition of hands, Heb. 6. 2. And as I have reason to believe that there is not one Minister in those Churches, not under the fourth Principle, as by us urged, that doth teach the babes that they must receive as that Principle, Heb. 6. that Doctrine touching the Investiture of Church officers; so if they did Teach thus, I would gladly know the ground of such Doctrine at least from some example in that case, and I am sure all the objections made by them against us, would be far more forceable against themselves.

Thirdly, I grant the Principles Heb. 6. to be very Comprehensive, yet as Principles to be owned by Babes in Christ, I say they do not containe all Christian performances, for if so, it would follow that few or none have yet Learned their Principles; and then why the Apostle should make it so strange that the Hebrews should

The Fourth Principle of

should need to be taught these Principles, I can see no reason, so then the Principles *Heb. 6. 1. 2.* may be duly Learned, where many things in point of Christian faith and practice are not yet attained. The foundation I grant hath relation to the Superstructure, but yet the foundation may be perfectly laid where the superstructure is yet wanting. The seed time and planting, leads to the Harvest and time of Fruit, but yet these things are truly Separable.

Fourthly, To make the Lords Supper pass for a beginning Teaching as well as Baptism, is presumption indeed, the one appertaining only to the new borne for admission into the Church; the other to the most grown Christian (as well as others) for his edification, And one would think that Mr. D. who must have such plain Scripture for what we urge, as beginning Principles, should not thus vary from his owne Rule when he assignes any thing for such.

Fifthly, I fear Mr. D. is some what guilty -- of pertinacity, in saying the Laying on of hands, *Heb. 6. 2.* is as plural as Baptisms, seeing he cannot be ignorant how Mr. Fisher hath unvail'd that mistake in answer to a Query wherein I think Mr. D. was concerned; which, as he terms a *greivous and gross mistake*, so he shews that the *Laying on*, *Heb. 6. 2.* is a substantive of the singular number both in the Greek and English, and some of the Learned and Judicious of his owne party, have (to my knowledge) confessed that to be an *egregious mistake*, and sith he gives no reason for his persisting in his former opinion, but barely contradicts his opponents, it is to me very Suspicious, that he hath nothing to defend himselfe withal, save his *Sic volo, sic jubeo*.

And here let me note, that seeing *Heb. 6. 2.* speaks but of one Laying on of Hand, there is a necessity that we determine which it is, else we must confess none can know the first Principles. But to take off the force of our Arguments for the necessity of Imposition of hands with prayer for the holy Spirit as a Principle in the more compleat Constitution of Christian Churches, Mr. D. is pleas'd to aske this question.

If every one of these Principles in Heb. 6. are so absolutely to be taken in by Babes, and without which we are not esteeme them communicable, what do you say to the Doctrine of Baptisms in the text, one of the Principles and foundations of the Gospell, must be all Baptised with the Baptism of the holy Ghost and of sufferings also, or not to be received into Communion?

The

The reception of the holy Spirit according to the promise *Ans. 1.* made to the Church, is not a thing in our power; but the means to seek for it is in our power; we must believe and pray for the promise, so must we also believe and wait for the Resurrection and the Eternal judgment. And so must we believe and expect sufferings for Christ, else we have not rightly laid the foundation in respect of the Doctrine of Baptismes, but now to argue from the things which are in our power to do to the things which are only in the power and disposing of the Almighty, is irrational and dangerous, and may be retorted upon Mr. D. after this manner. Seeing you suppose a man may be admitted to communion without two Baptisms of the three, *Heb. 6.* 2. why do you make the other so absolutely necessary; now let him defend him selfe for that practical part of the doctrine of Baptisms, and thereby he will defend me for that practick part of the fourth principle.

2. But if any shall deny the promise of the spirit, with which all Christians are to pray that they may be baptized [contrary to the late dangerous doctrine of some, who would restrain the Baptism of the Spirit to miraculous gifts, operations or signes, &c. and perswade us the Baptism of the Spirit is ceased] or that shall deny the doctrine of Sufferings, or Sufferings themselves as not pertaining to them; or if any shall teach others to deny these truths, as you teach others to deny prayer, with imposition of hands, and will needs persist in opposing themselves against all endeavours used to reform and amend them, I say, such may lawfully be denied communion in the Churches of God, and thus we have considered Mr. D. his several expositions upon *Heb. 6. 2.*

Of the Laying on of Hands, 2 Tim. 1. 6.

Neither hath Mr. D. wrote advisedly *P. 48.* where he teacheth that the imposition of Hands, *2 Tim. 1. 6.* and *1 Tim. 4. 14.* are both one, for as much as they are evidently distinguished in three respects, as first,

In respect of the persons administering them. That in *2 Tim. 1. 6.* being performed by Paul only, the laying on of my Hands, the other by more then he, *1 Tim. 4. 14.* *The Laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery,* surely, if more had acted in the first then Paul himself,

The Fourth Principle of

self, he would not have arrogated the whole service to himself, as if the blessing received came by what he did, and the rest stood but for Ciphers; no, this is nothing like that humble Apostle who was less in his own eye, then the least of all Saints; neither can it be proved that he was one of the Presbytery that Ordained Timothy, (though Mr. D. concludes he was) though perhaps he might be one of them.

2. *The Gifts are clearly distinguished*, Those 2 Tim. 1. 6. being the Gifts which are common to all Saints, as much as to Timothy, namely, 1. The Spirit of Love, which all that are born of God, do share in by the Holy Ghost, Rom. 5. 5. 2. Power or strength *divinus virtutis*, not *divina potestatis*, authority, and this strength all Saints have need of. 3. *σωφροσύνη* sobriety, or soundness of mind, which also every true Christian should have, hence its plain, that the Gift of God which Timothy received by the Laying on of Hands, 2 Tim. 1. 6. in every part of it is that which is common to all Saints, insomuch as he that hath not the Spirit of Christ in these respects may well fear he is none of his.

On the other side, it is evident to all men that Paul in 1 Tim. 4. 14. speaks of the Ministerial Gift, Authority, or Trust, which was committed to Timothy by the consent of the Prophets, and by the Laying on of the hands of the Eldership.

3. *From the Scope of the Apostle in these places respectively*, for in 1 Tim. 4. 14. Paul is clearly in hand with the matters of Timotheus Office, *vers. 11.* to the end. But in 2 Tim. 1. 6. he speaks to him as he might have spoke to any other Christian, Man or Woman, for finding him under some Temptation and Fears he comforts him, by telling him he hoped his Faith was unfeigned, and supports him against Fear, by noting, that it was not the effect of the Spirit which God gave him, by the putting on of his Hands, and therefore exhorts him not to be ashamed of the Testimony of the Lord, nor of Paul the Lords Prisoner, but to be a partaker of the affliction according to the Power of God. Then he moves him to consider how free the grace of God was, by which he is saved, and not to be valued by the works of righteousness which he had done; and thus he speaks from *vers. 1.* to *vers. 13.* and then begins to treat of the business of his Office, the whole matter and contexture of the former part of the Chapter, being such as touched not his Office, but his State as a Christian. This Text being duly considered, helps more to the opening Heb. 6. 2.

then

then any other place, in this respect, viz. for that it plainly shews the common graces of the Spirit, was as really the end of Prayer with the Imposition of Hands as the gifts which are notified by many.

Nor is it material which some object in this Case, that *δυναμεις* is interpreted elsewhere of Miraculous gifts, &c. Because 1. If the Interpreter had so done, he had forsaken the proper scope of the Apostle, whose business being to support Timothy against fear, &c. The Spirit of inward grace and fortitude, was most suitable to be insisted on, to that purpose. 2. Because the word *δυναμεις* is frequently used to express inward strength or fortitude of mind; for Example, 1 Cor. 12. 10. *δυναστος εσμι, potens sum*, I am strong, or when I am weak, then I am strong, Ephes. 6. 10. *ἐν δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου* confortamini in Domino, be strong in the Lord.

Of the meaning of Acts 8. 15, 17, & 19. 2. 6.

How clear places these are that the Apostles prayed with laying on of hands, for the newly Baptized, indifferently, even for both Men and Women, that they might receive the Spirit of Promise; and that as generally as Baptism it self was performed in the Cities of *Samaria*, and *Ephesus*, and by consequence first at *Jerusalem*, and so in other places also, I need say but little in this place, having fully spoken to these things in my *S. for Peace, and Pedobapt. Apol.* which are yet unanswered; yet I shall endeavour to shew the mistakes of Mr. D. concerning them; And first,

He will needs suppose *Peter* and *John* to perform Prayer with Imposition of hands at *Samaria*, by virtue of their extraordinary gifts, not being willing to allow their Office as Ministers or Apostles, to have any thing to do with that action; But this is far from Truth, for if extraordinary gifts had sufficiently capacitated men to do this work without Ministerial authority, *Philip* the Deacon, being eminently gifted that way, might have imposed hands for the Promised Spirit, as well as *Peter* and *John*, yet he meddles not with this Service at all, neither his Office as a Deacon, nor his gifts to do wonders, empowering him thereto in his own Judgment, for had he been otherwise minded, or understood his priviledge to be such as Mr. D. supposed it to be, he had opportunity and occasion enough to do that work as well as any other; but his forbearance is an argument he knew it did

not

The Fourth Principle of

not belong to his Ministry, in an ordinary way, sith there was a Ministry to be had, to whom that and other things for the Settlement of the Church did more properly belong. Wherefore we must needs reject that passage of Mr. D. pag. 6. where he tells us the *Administrator of Laying on of hands was any gifted Believer, &c.* by which conceit even Women, from whom extraordinary gifts are not withheld, might administer this Service.

But that this was an act of Office, appears partly by what is already said, and partly for that the Church at *Jerusalem* sent not gifted Brethren only, but men endowed with Authority, to set in order such things as were wanting in that Church, which though much prepared for settlement, by the Labours of *Philip*, yet cannot rationally be supposed to be so settled as was meet, for it is said, *only they were Baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus*: And the first thing we hear they do for them, is to pray that they may receive the Holy Ghost, &c. And this they did for them all, both Men and Women, as is in part granted by Mr. D. whiles he grants it to be performed upon those on whom the Holy Ghost was not fallen, and saith the Text, *He was fallen on none of them*. Yet Mr. D. would make an Exception of some of them, because *Simon* was found in the gaul of bitterness. But this corruption appearing not till after the Service of Prayer, with laying on of Hands was performed, it concludes not at all, but that *Simon* might be included in the Prayer of the Apostles, and have hands laid on him also, yea, and receive of those gifts too, seeing God doth not withhold them from *Hypocrites*. And beside, the words of *Peter* denying him to *have any Part or Lot in that matter*, refers to the Administration of the Ordinance, and not to his submission to it; *Give me this power also, that on whomsoever I Lay my hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost*; In this matter *Peter* denies *Simon* to have any part.

Furthermore, Mr. D. doth certainly mistake, *Act. 19. 2.* in saying the Twelve Disciples at *Ephesus* were of the Church, whereas the Scripture, and Reason, do both inform us they could not be Imbodied with the Church there, as yet, because they are now said to be found, and called certain Disciples, the words implying they were hitherto unknown, for otherwise why should they be said to be found by *Paul*, more then the whole Church, if indeed they had been a part of the Church. Again, their great ignorance of the Holy Ghost shews

shews plainly they were not united to the Body or Church at Ephesus, where doubtless *Acquilla* and *Priscilla* had not been wanting to teach the way of the Lord perfectly. And Lastly, their being Baptized again, shews plainly they were not of the Church, || for if they had, why must not the Church also be Baptized again as well as they?

Now therefore, let it be considered, that had there been 120. instead of these 12. persons, in the same case with themselves, the Question of the Apostle, *Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye Believed?* had concern'd them all; and then he must be but a partial Minister that would refuse to pray for all, seeing all wanted the same Blessing, and had equal right to it, by virtue of the same promise. And that *Paul* had an eye to the Promise, as it is general, is most plain, by his next Question, *Unto what then were ye Baptized?* as if he should say, your very Baptism if it be right, did inform you of, and intitle to the promise of the Holy Ghost, into whose name also ye ought to be Baptized.

Thus I trust we have sufficiently cleared the first ground of our Religious observation of Prayer, with the Imposition of Hands for the Promised Spirit, 1. From the consideration of the Nature, Order, or Connexion of the Principles, as they are contained and propounded, *Heb. 6. 1, 2.* 2. From the care of the Apostles, in the seeking to

God in the use of this * Ordinance, that the Churches might enjoy the benefit of the Promise of the Holy Spirit, which they knew belonged to them as they were the called of the Lord. And because the Nature and extent of that great Gospel Promise is a weighty consideration whereupon to ground the practice of Prayer with the Imposition of Hands, and without which the practice would be very insignificant, I

shall therefore add something, to shew the perpetual Right of the Church to that blessed Promise, even to the end of the

|| You see I do adhere to the Antient Exposition of this place, rather then to our late Curtail'd Expositions made by the Pædobaptists, who because they are unwilling to mend their Errours in Baptism, would fain have *Paul* to be of their mind, but they should remember that Reformation or amendment is no Errour.

* So I call it for five Causes, 1. Because of Prayer, the Moral part. 2. Because of Imposition of Hands the Ritual part. 3. Because of the Promise to which it refers, as the blessing signified by it. 4. Because it is placed among the Fundamentals of Religion, or called a Principle of the Doctrine of Christ. 5. Because it will bear the denomination of an Ordinance, as well as Imposition of Hands on Deacons, or other Officers of Christ's Church.