



Gospel Highway
www.ghmag.net

GH2022-4: Introduction To The Theology Of Daniel King by Boon-Sing Poh

(Punctuations and spellings have been modernised, except in some places indicated by [sic]. Contents within square brackets are my comments. Page-references are according to the 1656 edition of the book, accessible at: <https://archive.org/details/waytosionsoughto00king>.)

Daniel King was a key leader among the Particular Baptists of the 17th century. He played a leading role in the formation of the Midlands Association.¹ In his book, which we are considering here, “A Way To Zion”, he describes himself as “Preacher of the Word near [sic] Coventry”. The Association Records of the Midlands show that he was the pastor of the church at Warwick.²

The book

King’s book “A Way To Zion” was first published in London in 1650, and republished in Edinburgh in 1656. The book, of 306 pages, consists of three main parts, together with a Postscript, a Foreword, and a Preface. The Preface was written by four leading Particular Baptists leaders, viz. Thomas Patient, William Kiffin, John Spilsbury, and John Pearson. The book defends the baptism of believers by immersion in water, as practised by the Particular Baptists. The endorsement of King’s book by the four leading Particular Baptists is telling. It begins by setting forth the three offices of Jesus Christ — Priest, Prophet, and King, and our need to be reconciled to God, to learn the truth, and to be delivered from Satan and sin. Nearly half a century later, the 1689 Confession was published by the Particular Baptists, in which the three offices of Christ, and our need of them, are stated clearly in Chapter 8:9 & 10, Of Christ The Mediator. These two articles of the Confession are not found in the Westminster Confession of the Savoy Declaration. Instead, they are taken from the Baptist Confession of 1646.

The Preface states the purpose of the book, and introduces Daniel King as “a faithful and painful [careful and diligent] minister of Jesus Christ”. His method of handling the subject is described as “to follow the apostles’ rule, to prove everything by the evidence of Scripture-light, expounding Scripture by Scripture...” The Particular Baptists had had to engage in controversy over the baptism of believers on many fronts — against the paedobaptist (notably the Anglicans), against the Quakers whose claim on the “inward light” managed to draw away many Baptists, against the Ranters and Seekers who claimed a baptism of the Spirit over against the water baptism of the Baptists, against the Open Communion Particular Baptists who did not require baptism before partaking the Lord’s Supper and church membership.³ In this book, King focuses on countering the claim of the Seekers that the gospel ordinances have ceased, having been replaced by life in the Spirit, from Pentecost onwards.

In the first part of the book, consisting of 100 pages, King expounds positively on the continuance of the gospel ordinances — including baptism, the Lord’s Supper, preaching, prayer, and the reading of Scripture. In the second part, consisting of 36 pages, he interacts closely with the thirteen “Exceptions” raised against water baptism by John Saltmarsh, in his book “The Smoak [sic] In The Temple”. John Saltmarsh belonged to the group called the ‘Seekers’, who claimed that baptism by water and the Lord’s Supper are no longer to be continued since Christ has come in the Spirit after His resurrection and ascension. According to Saltmarsh, believers are baptised by the Spirit to live a higher spiritual life in a church in which are no more officers, for they have been discontinued together with the ordinances. The third part of King’s book consists of 109 pages in which further objections from, and inconsistencies in, John Saltmarsh’s other book, “Some Beams of the Bright Morning Star”, are countered. The Postscript, of 30 pages, gives further exposition on the laying of hands (already covered briefly earlier, on pages 132-133, of the book), followed by answers to another writer called G. Tomlinson in his book, “Laying on of hands, a foundation principle”. The Postscript ends with another main argument to show the continuance of the ordinances of God.

From King’s book, “A Way To Zion”, we may draw some quite clear conclusions about his theology.

Scripture

To King, every point controverted must be settled by Scripture. His arguments for, and against, any point of doctrine are supported with ample scriptures. In his refutation of the necessity of laying on of hands to receive the gifts of the Spirit, King uses expressions such as these:

“Show me that from Scripture, and then I shall further consider of it [p. 266].”

“But if he could show me but one command of Christ, or His apostles, for laying on of hands on every believer, in order to church-communion [church-membership], etc. as I can show him both commands of Christ, and His apostles, and clear example for baptizing with water, in order to church-communion, the contest were ended [p. 267].”

Scripture teaches by commands as well as by examples. To the claim that one use of the laying on of hands is to the congregating [constituting] of baptised disciples so that they may proceed to function as a church, King answers as follows:

“It is not to be used to the congregating of believers, because we have no command nor example tending thereunto; but rather against it: which appears, because the hundred and twenty congregated, Acts 1, were a church before laying on of hands; nay, we read not of laying on of hands, Acts 2:1ff. That they were a church, appears, because the three thousand, Acts 2, were added to them; and they are called a church, last verse [p. 260].”

The examples of Scripture must be correctly understood and applied. King holds to the view expressed by John Owen that an apostolic example “hath the force of a divine institution”⁴, and, “extraordinary cases are accompanied with a warranty in themselves for extraordinary actings and duties”⁵. The Lord laying hands on children is not a command or example to lay

hands on disciples in order that they might receive the Holy Spirit [p. 261]. To crassly follow the examples of the apostles without correctly understanding the teaching or principle involved will lead us to ridiculous conclusions. Said King:

“If in all things we are to do so, then we must sometimes have handkerchiefs carried from unto the sick, that they may be recovered; and when men dissemble and lie to the Holy Ghost, strike them dead with our word: and when men pervert the pure ways of God, strike them blind, as the apostles did [p. 265].”

The types in Scripture must be distinguished from the ordinances of the New Testament. Saltmarsh had claimed that no distinction should be made between the “legal ordinances” of the Old Testament and the “gospel ordinances” of the New Testament, for they “are all alike literal, outward, and visible”. The purpose for making no distinction between them was to conclude that the coming of Christ in the Spirit on Pentecost has done away with all visible ordinances. Daniel King answers, saying, “Though they be all outward, that will never prove them to be the same: circumcision was outward, and baptism outward, yet not the same. The preaching of the law by Moses, and the preaching of Christ by the apostles, both outward, yet not the same [p. 215].” King goes on to say,

“Neither do they figure out one and the same thing. The one were shadows of Christ to come in the flesh, of His death, sufferings, etc. The other remembrance of the same done, fulfilled and perfected, as in 1 Cor. 11, concerning the Supper, and that not till He come in the flesh to suffer, but till He come in person, the second time to judgement [p. 215].”

The “legal ordinances” of the Old Testament were types of Christ, fulfilled by His coming in the flesh. King says, “...the priests, etc. were types of Christ, and His coming in the flesh was to put an end to them... [p. 233].” The “gospel ordinances” are new signs of the New Covenant. This counters the likes of Saltmarsh who argued for the abolition of the gospel ordinances, and also the attempts of modern paedobaptists who argue that infant sprinkling replaces/fulfils circumcision. Note also that Spirit and word are inseparably linked together.

Covenant Theology

In the first part of the book, King positively put forward the truth that there has always been a people who belong to God through the ages, who kept the ordinances, to a greater or smaller degree. He expounds Isaiah 59:21 with great dexterity, showing the way of salvation revealed in the Covenant of Grace. Isaiah 59:21 says,

As for me, this *is* my covenant with them, saith the Lord;
My spirit that *is* upon thee,
and my words which I have put in thy mouth,
shall not depart out of thy mouth,
nor out of the mouth of thy seed,
nor out of the mouth of thy seed’s seed,
saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever. [AKJV]

King begins by giving an overview of the book of Isaiah, in which is shown that Isaiah deals with three things: (i) the doctrine of the two Tables; (ii) the threatenings for disobedience;

(iii) the Covenant of Grace and Reconciliation grounded upon Christ. Various known, and anticipated, objections, are answered. The following conclusion is drawn out:

From the time of Christ's coming in the flesh, and revealing the new covenant, throughout all ages to the world's end, there has been, and shall be a succession of believers that have the Spirit of God, and the word of God communicated to them, and be enabled in some measure to declare it [p. 32].

According to King, the Scripture mentions only two covenants between God and man [pp. 8-9]. Both hold forth life to be had, but in a different way. In one, by doing, in the other, by believing. One is Legal, the other is Evangelical (Gal. 4:24-26). The Gentiles and the Jews are in the Evangelical Covenant (Gal. 4:26-28, 31), the Jerusalem that is above (cf. Rev. 21:1-2).

Whenever God made a covenant with man, it was confirmed with blood (Gen. 17; Exod. 24:8; Heb. 9:16-22) [pp. 10-11]. So also the gospel covenant is confirmed with the blood of Christ (Heb. 9:13-16). This is none other than the covenant mentioned in Heb. 8:8-12; 9:16; 10:16-17. The dividing wall between Jew and Gentile has been broken down (Eph. 2:12-16).

This covenant is in force with us Gentiles, or else Christ must shed His blood again, or it must be confirmed by some other blood. Heb. 8:6 says "He IS (not was, or shall be) Mediator of a better covenant. Christ has died, so it is in force at this day (Heb. 9:17). Furthermore, if there were two covenants, one for Jews and another for Gentiles, there must be two Mediators, but there is but one Mediator (1 Tim. 2:5). If Christ is given for a covenant to the people (Isa. 42:6), and all things in Christ are ours (1 Cor. 3:21-23), the covenant of Heb. 8 is ours as well as the Jews [p. 12].

With powerful arguments such as the above, Covenant Theology is opened up. This is followed by the Explication, the Confirmation, and the Application [pp. 23ff]. King's burden is to show that the world, in all ages, has had believers, whom God has accounted for His people, and who have been endowed with the Spirit of Christ, and of the word of Christ, and enabled in some measure to declare it [pp. 23-24]. The book of Revelation is relied upon heavily, supported by other prophetic passages from Zechariah, Daniel, Ezekiel, and Paul's epistles, to bring out these three "successions"— of believers, of Spirit and word, and of preaching. From these, and his answers to the thirteen Exceptions of Saltmarsh against the water baptism of the Baptists, in the second part of his book, we are able to see quite clearly Daniel King's ecclesiology and eschatology. Along the way, we are able to see also his views on spiritual gifts and missions.

Ecclesiology

As a Particular Baptist, Daniel King held to the concept of the gathered church of baptised believers. On pp. 51-52 of his book, he says, "Now the next thing that I would prove, is, that this church, or these believers, have power to reassume, or take up any ordinance of God, and practise it among themselves (I mean any ordinance that they see to be held forth in Scripture, and that they have been deprived of through the corruption of times) whensoever God reveals it to them to be His ordinance."

Saltmarsh argued that, "The primitive ministry is ceased, because we have lost the power of them, and the glory that was in them, together with the offices, qualifications of the persons

and ministers thereof; as first, they were endued with power from on high, commanding and authorising them [p. 201].” King’s answer is that there is no need for the extraordinary officers now, for they were given to lay the foundation, 1 Corinthians 3, and we are to build upon it. “But there were offices, qualifications, and ministers in the first times, which are to continue till the coming of Christ to judge quick and dead; as appears in the first Epistle to Timothy, and those we are to have still...[p. 201].”

Others, including Saltmarsh, claimed that today’s “pastors and teachers” are not the same as those of Eph. 4:11, who were extraordinary officers and no longer found. Daniel King argues that the “pastors and teachers” are ordinary officers who will continue in the church. His arguments are:

- (i) The teachers, like Timothy, did not teach infallibly but what was revealed by the apostles (1 Tim. 1:3; 5:21; 2 Tim. 2:2; 3:14-15).
- (ii) His prohibition of women to teach, in opposition to men, shows that men did not teach infallibly, for some women did speak infallibly by the inspiration of the Spirit.
- (iii) The qualifications required of bishops, elders, and deacons (1 Tim. 3:2-8; Tit. 1:5-10) show that they had the ordinary gift of teaching (cf. Acts 8:26; 10:46; 19:6).
- (iv) The bishops and deacons need to be similarly proved (1 Tim. 3:8). They do not serve by the need of an infallible Spirit.
- (v) The exhortations of Paul to Timothy and Titus show that they were giving ordinary teaching from the Scripture, not by the direct inspiration (“pure anointing”) of the Spirit (1 Tim. 3:15; 4:11, 12, 13-15; 2 Tim. 2:14; 3:14-15; Tit. 2:7-8, 15; 3:8-9).

In answer to the question, “What officers are to be in the church?” King says [p. 58],

“The officers in a church, seem to me, to be ranked into two sorts, or heads in general, which Paul calls bishops and deacons, Phil. 1:1. And Paul names the same, 1 Tim. 3; and Rom. 12:6, 7. He sets them down under the general heads of prophesying and ministering, and he distributes them into particulars.

Now the bishop is he which the Scripture in other places calls the elders, Tit. 1:5, 6, 7. And it is a general name to teachers, pastors, or overseers, as the Scriptures make clear, Acts 20:17, with 28. And this word elder, or bishop, is a general name to all that feed the church, and takes in as well apostles as others into the work of overseeing, or feeding, 1 Pet. 5:1, 2; 2 John 1; 3 John 1. Yea, sometimes Christ Himself, 1 Pet. 2:25.

Again, these two are distributed into particulars, as the bishop or elder, is distributed into pastor and teacher, and ruling elder, or he who rules, 1 Tim. 5:17; Rom. 12:7, 8. There we have a distribution of two generals into particulars: He that prophesies, v. 6, into teacher, exhorter, and ruler. And he that ministers, into giver, and shower of mercy.”

In answer to the next question, “What their offices are?” King says [p. 59].

“The pastor’s office is to feed the flock, Jer. 3:15, which is a prophecy of gospel-times, (That God will give them pastors to FEED them, etc)... And this man is to administer other ordinances, as baptism and the Supper, in the church; because it is

the church's right, and so a part of feeding, Matt. 24:45. The ruler over the house must give his fellow-servants their meat, Luke 12:42...

But I conceive pastor and teacher may be understood for one and the same, and may perform the same offices in the church; but only where the church is large and multifarious, they may choose more officers for the better ordering of things, and to have several titles given them according to their several gifts, and they fall both under the general name of bishop or elder.

The ruling elder is to feed, guide, or go before, and no otherwise to rule, Matt. 2:6; 1 Tim. 3:5 and 5:17; Heb. 13:7, 17. To oversee the manners and lives of men, that none walk disorderly, and to warn them that do; and to see where any are disconsolate, and to comfort them; and to assist in censures, if any be to be called out, 1 Thess. 5:14. But I conceive the ruling elders are to be, only in the necessity of the church, being many, and spread abroad; for otherwise, all these things the preaching elder may do..."

I have shown elsewhere that Daniel King, and virtually all the Particular Baptists of his time, shared the same view of the eldership as John Owen,⁶ infant baptism excepted. King's view differs from the so-called Parity/Equality view of quite many Calvinistic Baptist churches today.

Spiritual gifts and officers

On the spiritual gifts, Daniel King holds to what would be called Cessationism today. This is the view that the extraordinary officers of apostles, prophets, and evangelists of Ephesians 4:11 have been withdrawn, and the miraculous gifts of tongue-speaking, healing, and miracles have ceased [pp. 55-59]. Note that the 'evangelists' of Ephesians 4:11 is a reference to apostolic representatives like Timothy and Philip. The 'pastors and teachers' remain in the churches today, who carry out the ordinances of preaching, prayer, baptism, and the Lord's Supper. Similarly, other disciples of Christ may preach, and baptise when authorised by the church, based on the Commission of Matthew 28:18-20. The cessation of the gifts and the extraordinary officers is made clear by Daniel King in such statements as these:

"There is not one that is judged to have the fruits of the Spirit, or to be a believer, but he has some gift of the Spirit that is manifest, though not those extraordinary gifts, which some had in the apostles' days [p. 216]."

"...the giving the gifts of the Holy Ghost, was only for that time: and by the apostles only, or men extraordinarily gifted...[p. 253-254]"

"If it be meant laying on of hands, for the giving of the gifts of the Holy Ghost; it does not follow: because that was peculiar to those that were extraordinary messengers, as the apostles, and Ananias who had an immediate call from God. And the apostles did many things which are no rule to us in these days, for ordinary ministers to do the like [p. 258]."

To prove that miracles are not essential to the believer, and so not to the church, the following arguments are given [pp. 69-71]:

1. People became believers before they heard of, or could perform, miracles (Acts 2:41; 19:1-2; Mark 16:17; Matt. 4:18ff; 10:1-2; 28:18).
2. Not all but only some, worked miracles (1 Cor. 12:7-9, 28-30; Mark 16:15).
3. Many who worked miracles did not believe, and some were enemies of the faith (Matt. 7:22-23; 24:24; 1 Thess. 2:9; Rev. 13:14; 16:14).
4. Miracles are no help towards faith (Rom. 10:17; 1:17; Luke 16:31; Heb. 1:1-2).
5. Miracles are rather a hindrance to faith (Judg. 6:22; Matt. 16:4).

To prove that the working of miracles have ceased (in the outward visible way), the following arguments are used [pp. 71-72]:

1. The major premise: Whatever was given upon a special reason that concerned not all men, at all times, that reason ceasing, the dispensation ceases also.
: The minor premise: Miracles were given upon a special reason, which reason now has ceased. Therefore, miracles in that outward way have ceased.
2. The major premise may be proved from circumcision of Abraham's children (Gen. 17). The true children are those who have faith (Rom. 9:6-8; John 8:33, 37; Matt. 3; Gal. 3:7). The physical seed ceased, so also the command to circumcise ceased. The seventh day Sabbath (Exod. 31:13) was given as a sign of the covenant between God and His people. That dispensation ceased when they were broken off from being God's people, therefore the sign of the seventh day Sabbath ceased also (Col. 2:16-17).
: The minor premise follows: miracles were given for the confirmation of the doctrine preached by the apostles (Mark. 16:20; Heb. 2:4). Now that the doctrine is committed to writing, with a curse to those who add anything to it, or preach another gospel (Rev. 22:18; Gal. 1:8), there is no need of miracles to confirm any new doctrine. This doctrine in the Scripture, committed to writing, being confirmed by those miracles, is the standard by which we test all doctrines.
3. God has nowhere in the NT required us to heed the voice of miracles, as He did Israel in Egypt, but to hear the voice of His Son (Heb. 1:2; Matt. 17:5). Now Christ speaks to us in the word of truth, and not by miracles. Therefore this word is to continue, and miracles to cease.
: But there is no special reason given of baptism and the Lord's Supper being confined to those times, or officers either, neither did miracles confirmed them. Therefore miracles ceased while the ordinances and the officers continue.

To prove that all these miracles are made good among believers, and in the church still, in the Scripture-sense [spiritual and intended sense], the following arguments are given [pp. 71-79]:

1. In John 14:13, Christ cured diseases while on earth, He does still, now spiritually and more invisibly, through the preaching of God's word. So also, believers are doing what the Lord does. Examples of Christ curing, first corporally, then spiritually, include the following.
 - (i) Physical healing (John 5:3-8), metaphorical healing (Mic. 4:6-7; Zeph. 3:19), and spiritually (Ps. 38:16-18; Jer. 20:10; Isa. 30:21).
 - (ii) Christ cured the physically lame (Matt. 11:5; 15:30; 21:14). The apostles and disciples cured the physically lame (Acts 8:7). Christ cured the spiritually lame (Isa. 35:5-7 cf. Heb. 12:12-13). He cured them who were lame by reason of affliction, discouragement, and sin (Jer. 31:8-9). In that sense, His saints do the same (Job, 29:15).
 - (iii) Christ cured the physically blind (Matt. 11:5; 12:13). He cured the spiritually blind (Luke 4:18; Rev. 3:17; Isa. 42:7).

2. Objection: But now there are few or none who are physically possessed. How shall they do what the Lord did? Answer: There are more devils in the Scripture-sense, than the wicked spirits that caused physical problems.
 : Sometimes idols are called devils (Lev. 17:7; Ps. 106:37-38; 1 Cor. 10:20). Have not the people of God been the means and instruments to cast out devils in this sense? Recovering them from idolatry, to embrace the gospel? 1 Cor. 10:2, 20; 1 Thess. 1:9.
 : There are doctrines that are called “doctrines of the devils (demons)” (1 Tim. 4:1). Have not the saints been the means to beat down false seducing doctrines and corrupt ways of worship? See Rev. 16:14; 12:9-11.
- Objection: In Mark 16:17, it is “new tongues” and not “strange tongues”. Answer: In Acts 2:4; 1 Cor. 14:21, etc. we read of tongues, strange tongues, our own tongues, and other tongues, because they were to preach to people of diverse countries, all nations, according to the commission of Matt. 28.
 : A new tongue is not the same as strange tongue. It is about doctrine connected with the mystery of the gospel (Mark 1:27; Acts 17:19), just as the new song (Rev. 5:9; 14:3). Strange tongues are called “our own tongues” by some men (Acts 2:6, 11), but new tongue is altogether new to the world.
 - Objection: In Mark 16:17, they shall take up serpents, are we to do the same? Answer: We do not find in Scripture where this is literally performed. In Acts 28:5, Paul did not deliberately pick up the serpent, he did not handle it with his hand, but he shook it off.
 : In our passage, the plural “serpents” is used, making it ridiculous to expect disciples to pick up serpents.
 : Serpents in Scripture sometimes refer to wicked cruel men, of a serpentine disposition — the Assyrians (Isa. 14:29 cf. vv. 24-28), Pharaoh of Egypt (Ezek. 29:3), the Babylonians (Jer. 8:17), the Pharisees (Matt. 23:33), wicked men who shall be tamed by the knowledge of the Lord (Isa. 11:8-9). The enemies of truth will be overcome (Luke 10:19-20; 2 Cor. 10:4-5).
 - Objection: In Mark 16:17, they who drink any deadly thing will not be hurt by it, are we to do the same? Answer: Scripture is silent about any disciple who drank any deadly thing.
 : Taken spiritually, there are many references to sin (Prov. 7:26-27). David drank deep and was not destroyed but it worked for his good (Rom. 8:28). Peter denied the Lord but was not hurt, while Judas was. The faith of believers was the antidote to the poison. So the incestuous fornicator (1 Cor. 5 cf. 2 Cor. 2).
 - Objection: Lastly, they lay their hands on the sick and heal them, are we to do the same? Answer: The text does not say sick in their bodies of fever, aches, palsies, dropsies, etc.
 : The Scripture speaks of diverse sickness. Sick of love (Song 5:8), meaning the church’s longing for Christ.
 : The Scripture speaks of corruption, causing disorder (Isa. 1:5, 16-17). Paul to the jailor about to kill himself, is an example. God blames the shepherds for not performing their duty, to heal the sick by instruction, doctrine, etc.
 : There is a sickness from famine (Jer. 14:18). Do not the saints lay their hands on these and heal them? Breaking bread to them to supply their wants? Acts 11:28-30, etc.
 : There is another sickness, i.e. to be in great distress and trouble (Hos. 5:13; 1 Cor. 1:11; Matt. 9:12; John 6:63). While the apostles literally healed at times (Acts 9:33-34; 5:15) but not always (2 Tim. 4:2), the Lord means spiritual healing in Mark 16.

Daniel King uses 1 Corinthians 13 to support the cessation of the miraculous gifts, but not the completion of Scripture. Instead, the completion of Scripture is argued from passages such as Rev. 22:18-19. The ‘perfection’ of 1 Corinthians 13:10 is not Christ [p. 199], but “when we

are perfectly glorified after this life” [p. 199]. In other words, it is not a person (Christ), not a thing (Scripture), but a state (our glorification). [I, and others besides, have argued that the ‘perfection’ is the completion of Scripture, in “Cessationism or Continuationism?”⁷]

Missions

Daniel King argues that water baptism is an ordinance that continues because it is a command of Christ, as appears in Matt. 28:18-20, and supported by passages such as Acts 2:38 and 8:16 [pp. 147-149]. It was baptism with water and not the Spirit, for the Holy Spirit had not fallen on the disciples, as in Acts 10:48 and 19:5. It is argued that Matt. 28:18-20 is a standing Commission for preaching, and baptising, to the end of the world. The command is to preach, baptise, and teach. The command is not to pass on gifts or miracles, but it was promised that they would enjoy those gifts. A distinction must be made between a command and a promise. The command is to continue to all ages, while the promise was given to the apostles and those who accompanied them.

From this, it is clear that King holds to the view that the Great Commission continues until the end of the age, i.e. until Christ returns to judge the world. A peculiarity, however, appears in the understanding of King on missions. He claims that there is no necessity for disciples of subsequent generations to bring the gospel to other nations, of other tongues, because the miraculous power to speak in other tongues has been withdrawn after the apostolic generation. This peculiarity is seen in his answer to an objection [p. 149]:

“But some object, Christ did give a command to work miracles, Matt. 10:8, heal the sick, etc. I answer, It was their gift at that time, therefore it is said, ‘He gave them power over unclean spirits, etc.’ And the text tells us plainly, Matt. 10:1, Mark 3:15, Luke 9:1. He gave POWER, and then commanded them to heal, etc. (And it was but a command to use that power that He had given them.) **But where He restrains that power, it cannot be done;** but that hinders not, but the saints may do that which God has given them power to do, and which lies in the Commission, to preach and baptise. Nay, it shows they ought.” [Bold emphasis added.]

“So may we meet together, seek the Lord, instruct one another, choose church-officers, carry on ordinances in our own country, **though we have not the gift of tongues to go to other nations.** Nay, Christ commanding His disciples to tarry in Jerusalem, and not go out to preach till they had those gifts, **is a sufficient rule to us, not to go to men of strange languages, since this power was restrained; and is not communicated to us.**”

This peculiarity is seen again in the Postscript of his book [p. 259]:

“And I conceive we are no more bound to follow the apostles in this, while we want the power; than we are to go teach all nations, wanting the power to speak in their languages. And as they were forbidden to go to the nations, till they were indued with power from above, Luke 24:49, so (I take it) the Lord that restrains the power; does prohibit the thing to be done while that is wanting.”

The hesitation on the part of King on this point is to be noted — “And I conceive”, “I take it”. King is saying that the apostles and their companions were given the gifts of tongues to preach to all the nations in their time, and since the gift of tongues has been withdrawn, the

subsequent generations of disciples are not required to bring the gospel to people of other languages. It is up to the believers of the various nations, already reached by the apostles and their companions, to preach to their own people. In other words, cross-cultural missions is not needed anymore. We need only to evangelise those in our own country, who speak the same language. This view of missions is contrary to the view of the other Particular Baptists, as can be seen from the 1689 Confession, which says,

“The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old), and the New Testament in Greek (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations), being immediately inspired by God, and by His singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic, so that in all controversies of religion, the church is finally to appeal to them. **But because these original tongues are not known to all the people of God who have a right unto, and interest in, the Scriptures, and are commanded in the fear of God to read and search them, therefore they are to be translated into the common language of every nation to which they come.** In that way, the word of God dwells plentifully in all, that they may worship Him in an acceptable manner, and through patience and comfort of the Scriptures may have hope.” [1689:1:8. Bold emphasis added.]

“The revelation of the gospel to sinners, made in various times and diverse places, together with the promises and precepts which belong to gospel obedience, to the nations and persons to whom it is granted, is merely of the sovereign will and good pleasure of God. This revelation of the gospel is not given by virtue of any foreseen good done by men’s natural abilities, or by human wisdom, which none ever did, or can do. **Therefore in all ages, the preaching of the gospel has been granted unto persons and nations,** to greater or smaller extent, in various degrees, according to the counsel of the will of God.” [1689:20:3. Bold emphasis added.]

What accounts for the peculiar view of Daniel King on missions, that is at odds with the view of the other Particular Baptists? The peculiarity arises from wrongly linking the power to speak in tongues (i.e. languages) with the power to carry out the Great Commission. True, the early disciples were told to tarry in Jerusalem until power was given to them (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:8). True, the giving of the Holy Spirit was accompanied by speaking in tongues, i.e. languages (Acts 2). However, the tongue-speaking was only incidental to the giving of the Holy Spirit. The sign was to be distinguished from the reality. The sound of rushing wind, the tongues of fire, and tongue-speaking, were signs to mark the beginning of the gospel age, when the Great Commission began to be executed, as explained by Peter when he quoted Joel’s prophecy (Acts 2:16-21). While the pouring out of the Spirit on the New Testament church was a one-off event, the Great Commission is an abiding command. The nations present at Pentecost, who heard the gospel in their respective tongue, were the firstfruits of the gospel age. The miraculous gift of tongue-speaking is not essential to the execution of the Great Commission. Languages can be learned, and cultures transcended, to reach out to the nations. Furthermore, many nations (i.e. ethnic groups) may be reached by the ‘lingua franca’ of the location.

In connection with King’s view on missions, his intriguing view on the baptism of sufferings should be noted [pp. 251-252]. He gives a concise and powerful explication of this subject in the Postscript of his book. The baptism spoken of by the Lord in Matt. 20:22; Mark 10:38;

Luke 12:50 concerns suffering to death (Rom. 6:4). One use of the expression “laying on of hands” denotes persecution by threats, reproaches, beatings, imprisonments, etc. but not unto death (Luke 21:12; Acts 21:27; 5:18; 21:27). The other use of the expression is in ordaining men to the ministry. Hebrews 6:2 speaks of “the doctrine of baptisms [plural]”, which include baptism with water, baptism of the Spirit, and baptism of sufferings. One is to be acted, the other enjoyed, and the last endured and undergone.

Eschatology

The Puritans, including the Particular Baptists, regarded the Medieval Age, when the Roman Catholic Church held sway, as the age of the Antichrist, or mystical Babylon. The 1689 Confession states that, “The Pope of Rome cannot in any sense be head of the church, but is that Antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, who exalts himself in the church against Christ, and all that is called God, whom the Lord shall destroy with the brightness of His coming.” This is reflected in Daniel King’s eschatology.

The Reformation of the sixteenth century, during which many lost ordinances of the gospel were recovered, is compared to the return of Israel from exile in Babylon. Daniel King says [p. 233-234], “Israel being recovered from Babylon, built her temple again, and set up her administrations: and though God was gone... yet He came again when it was built again. So the Israel of God recovering from mystical Babylon, may take up her ordinances again, though they have been corrupted by Antichrist, and God gone in that respect: till Christ reveal otherwise.”

The Antichrist is also the Man of Sin. In response to the claim that the Man of Sin had destroyed the ordinances for good, Daniel King says [p. 235], “Did it follow, that because the Babylonians of old prevailed over the people of Israel, and destroyed their temple, and worships; that therefore it was God’s mind to have it utterly destroyed forever? No such matter. Neither does it follow, that because the Man of Sin prevailed through the negligence of the church, therefore God would have His ordinances in the first purity destroyed.” This is reaffirmed in the Postscript [p. 273]: “2 Thess. 2, 3, 4, 5 show only the prevailing of the Man of Sin, for the corrupting of God’s worships for a time; not the abolishing of them.”

Daniel King explains “the end of the world” as when Christ returns in judgement and melting down all things to make them new [p. 273-274]. The Scripture shows that there are three worlds — the old world before the flood (2 Pet. 2:5), the present world that has been since the Flood, which will be consumed by fire, as the old world was by water (2 Pet. 3:7). This is the world’s end that is meant by Christ in Matt. 28:20, “the end of the age”. Similarly in Matt. 13:39-42. Then, there is the world to come (Luke 18:30; Heb. 2:5), when all things are put under Christ (1 Cor. 15:25-26).

The new heavens and the new earth, spoken of in 2 Pet. 3:13 is equated with the condition described in Isa. 65:17-25, in which will be “the church of the Jews called in, and converted to the faith, in the latter days, together with the abundance of the Gentiles flowing in to them [p. 276].” Until then, Christ’s priesthood and Christ’s law — of preaching, baptising, and observing all His ordinances — must remain, while the priesthood of Aaron and the law of the Old Testament have been done away with [p. 277]. “For the priesthood being changed, of necessity there is also a change of the law (Heb. 7:13).”

What is Daniel King's millennial view as revealed by this book? There is sufficient indication that he is an amillennialist. This claim is based on the following reasons:

- i. There is no mention that the 1,000 years of Revelation 20 is literal, despite the extensive reference made to the book of Revelation. That silence speaks for itself — there is no literal 1,000 years.
- ii. The emphasis is made that numbers concerning time are not literal. The woman of Revelation is the church, first in the glory of her pure doctrine during the apostolic age (the primitive church), then in the wilderness for 1,260 days, or “a time and times and half a time” (Rev. 12:1, 6, 14). The 1,260 days corresponds to the 42 months when the holy city is trodden under foot (Rev. 11:2). The woman in the wilderness is “the state of the church under the emperors, and the pope both” [p. 27], i.e. the church in the medieval age. “Now therefore the days or months must needs be prophetic, a year for a day, according to Num. 14:34; Ezek. 4:6 [p. 28].” If a definite time is assigned, the 1,260 days would be 1,260 years. Daniel King goes on to say “...when this account began, I shall not be curious in searching out [p. 28]...” What matters is the conclusion that “there has been believers in all ages, even in the darkest times of Antichrist's rage and reign [p. 28].” Since the 42 months and its equivalents are not to be understood literally, the 1,000 years of Rev. 20 must not be taken literally.
- iii. King shows that, of the three “worlds” found in Scripture, the present world stretches from the Flood to the end of the age, when Christ will return to melt it down, to usher in “the world to come” (Heb. 2:5). Throughout the period, and indeed even in the old world before the Flood, there had been true believers who kept the ordinances of God. The coming of the Son of God to the world ended the Old Covenant and began the New Covenant. The types in the Old Covenant have been fulfilled by the coming of Christ. From the coming of Christ to the end of the age, there will be true believers who keep His ordinances. This is shown from the Great Commission of Matth. 28:18-20. Even in the age of the Antichrist, there were the two witnesses who preached God's word (Rev. 11). King says, “...the two witnesses were men that did prophesy against Antichrist all this time of the 42 months...[p. 47].” They were killed, and lay dead for three days and a half, which “according to prophetic speaking, three years and a half, or some short time. And they rose and ascended by the Spirit of life from God, and by the help of some good magistrates that called them up, and so came to a higher degree of purity in doctrine and worship, than before they were slain, which is meant by ascending into heaven [pp. 48-49].” There is no golden age of gospel prosperity, answering to a literal millennium.

While it is known that some of the leading Particular Baptists of the time (e.g. Hanserd Knollys, Vavasor Powell, Paul Hobson, Thomas Gower) were Fifth Monarchists, Daniel King was not numbered among them. The Fifth Monarchist movement believed that the Fifth Monarchy — the rule of Christ and His saints — was at hand, following the Assyrian, Persian, Greek and Roman empires (Dan. 7). Hanserd Knollys was committed to the millenarianism of the Fifth Monarchists, but not to their militancy. King, on his part, was closely associated with the likes of William Kiffin, Thomas Patient, John Spilsbury, and John Pearson who wrote the endorsement for his book. Their amillenarianism is reflected in the last two chapters of the 1689 Confession.

Conclusion

The eminent scholar, Joseph Angus said, “Two peculiarities distinguish the Baptist history of the seventeenth century. It was an age of public disputation; and ministers devoted a large

amount of time to evangelistic work.”⁸ Daniel King defended the Particular Baptist belief and practice of recovering the lost ordinances of the gathered church, preaching, baptism, the Lord’s Supper, church government, and missions. Had his book been known earlier, his arguments for the cessation of the sign gifts and the withdrawal of the extraordinary officers of the church would have helped conservative, evangelical, churches to counter the rise of the charismatic movement from the 1960s. The spread of the Parity/Equality view of the church eldership among Calvinistic Baptist churches (including Reformed Baptists) from the 1980s, has caused no small amount of distress among those who hold to the 1689 Confession of Faith. King’s clear delineation of the eldership and gospel ministry will help us to be convinced, one way or the other, the belief of the Particular Baptists, as found in the 1689 Confession.

References:

- 1, White, 1966, The Organization of the Particular Baptists, 1644-1660. Journal of Ecclesiastical History. Vol. XVII, No. 2.
- 2 White, Pt. 1:20. Association Records of the Particular Baptists of England, Wales and Ireland to 1660, 3 Vols. The Baptist Historical Society.
3. Poh, BS. A Garden Enclosed, pp. 30-52. Good News Enterprise.
4. Owen, J. Works, Vol. 16, p. 197. Banner of Truth Trust.
5. Owen, J. Works, Vol. 16, p. 54. Banner of Truth Trust.
6. Poh, BS. A Garden Enclosed, Chap. 4. Good News Enterprise.
7. Poh, BS. Cessationism of Continuationism? Good News Enterprise.
8. Angus, J. 1895. Baptist Authors and History, 1527-1800, pp. 183-190.

~~~~~