

This study is based on the three volume book, *The Theocratic Kingdom*, by George N.H. Peters. Written in 1883, these volumes contain 206 propositions about the Kingdom of God. The work is the most exhaustive work on the Kingdom ever published. The three-volume set is available from [www.DispensationalPublishing.com](http://www.DispensationalPublishing.com).

The entirety of the outline is either a quote, partial quote, or paraphrase of the words of George Peters.

## PROP. 14. SOME THINGS PERTAINING TO THE KINGDOM NOT SO EASILY COMPREHENDED AS MANY SUPPOSE.

---

*Obs. 1.* Taking the word “mystery” to denote something revealed that was before unknown, Revelation itself must be carefully scanned and compared to appreciate the mystery. At the same time, while mystery may reveal a fact, the reason *why* it will, or *the manner* in which it may be accomplished is either not explained or merely hinted at, thus leaving large room for attentive study and reflection. Besides this, many things relating to the Kingdom are still in the shape of unfulfilled prophecy and promise.

*Obs. 2.* Some persons confidently tell us that “*the Gospel of the Kingdom*” is readily understood by all men, forgetting how *variously* it is interpreted and preached

*Obs. 3.* There is no systematic statement of the doctrine of the Kingdom in the Bible. It is given in brief covenants, in separate prophecies, in detached portions, in fragments, in hints, in promises, in concise outlines, and to bring all these together in their regular order much labor is requisite. Without *diligent comparison*, no progress can be made.

*Obs. 5.* “*The Gospel of the Kingdom*,” as intimated, includes “the mystery of God,” *i.e.* the final, closing act as presented Revelation 10:7, and thus is not fully revealed.

## PROP. 15. THE DOCTRINE OF THE KINGDOM CAN BECOME BETTER UNDERSTOOD AND APPRECIATED.

## PROP. 16. THIS KINGDOM CANNOT BE PROPERLY COMPREHENDED WITHOUT ACKNOWLEDGING AN INTIMATE AND INTERNAL CONNECTION EXISTING BETWEEN THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

---

“The doctrine of the Kingdom it is *taken for granted* in the New Testament as a subject derived from the Old Testament and *well understood*; for the kingdom is preached without any appended explanation.”

*Obs. 1.* This Proposition is the more needed, since some have made efforts to depreciate the value of the Old Testament as an instructor, telling us that it *is far inferior* to the New Testament.

*Obs. 3.* The criticism, then, of Ernesti and others, that the Old Testament might indeed have been of some use to the Jews, but certainly was not intended for all mankind, is *sadly defective and demoralizing*, seeing that on the fulfillment of the Old Testament promises depends our completed Salvation, our hope of perfected Redemption, the expectation of the final restitution of all things. The Old Testament is full of anticipated, covenanted, prophesied Salvation; the New is full of the inestimable provision made for the same; *both unite* in showing how and when it will be fully accomplished.

## PROP. 17. WITHOUT STUDY OF THE PROPHECIES, NO ADEQUATE IDEA CAN BE OBTAINED OF THE KINGDOM.

---

*Obs. 4.* The prophecies referring to the Kingdom of God, as now interpreted by the large majority of Christians, afford the strongest leverage employed by unbelievers against Christianity. Unfortunately, unbelief is often logically correct. Thus e.g. it eagerly points to the predictions pertaining to David’s Son, showing that, if language has any legitimate meaning, and words are adequate to express an idea, they

unmistakably predict the restoration of David's throne and kingdom, etc., and then triumphantly declare that it was not realized

- Note: Amillennialism and other views that reject the physical nature of the Kingdom of God are an unbeliever's greatest dream if their desire is to refute Christianity.

*Obs.* 5. Multitudes are found, who deliberately and persistently refuse to study the Prophecies.

*Obs.* 7. The nature, characteristics, etc., of the Kingdom, should not be determined by one, two, or even more, predictions, unless very specific, but by a comparison of all, or at least a large number of, the predictions relating to it.

#### PROP. 18. THE PROPHECIES RELATING TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD ARE BOTH CONDITIONED AND UNCONDITIONED.

---

They are conditioned on the fulfillment of preceding and foundational prophecies and unconditioned in their ultimate fulfillment.

#### PROP. 19. THE NEW TESTAMENT BEGINS THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE KINGDOM IN TERMS EXPRESSIVE OF ITS BEING PREVIOUSLY WELL KNOWN.

---

*Obs.* 1. On the face of the opening pages of the New Testament it is taken *for granted* that the Kingdom was something *well known, already the object of faith and hope.*

- “Theologians generally, either unable to reconcile this with their church theories, or deeming it unimportant while acknowledging the fact, pass it by in silence, or give us some apologetics to account for it, which are derogatory to the age, to the believers then living, and to the Word.”

*Obs.* 4. If the Kingdom, as multitudes maintain, was not thus known; if it is correct to assert that the Jews and the disciples at first utterly misapprehended its meaning; if the announcement denoted one thing to the hearers and yet contained in itself a spiritual idea which the future was to develop—*how* comes it, then, that Christ *could send out disciples to preach the Kingdom without previous instruction* as to its real meaning; and even invite strangers (Luke 9:56–57, 60) to “*Go and preach the Kingdom of God.*”

#### PROP. 20. TO COMPREHEND THE SUBJECT OF THE KINGDOM, IT IS NECESSARY TO NOTICE THE BELIEF AND THE EXPECTATIONS OF THE MORE PIOUS PORTION OF THE JEWS.

---

-Consider Luke 1:32-33, the beliefs of Mary and Joseph.

*Obs.* 1. It is universally admitted that the Jews, including the pious, held to *a personal* coming of the Messiah, *the literal* restoration of the Davidic throne and kingdom, the personal reign of Messiah *on David's throne, the resultant* exaltation of Jerusalem and the Jewish nation, and *the fulfillment* of the Millennial descriptions in that reign.

*Obs.* 2. It is noticeable, that in all the rebukes given to the Jews by John the Baptist, by Jesus and the apostles, not one refers to their belief and expectations concerning the Kingdom.

*Obs.* 6. Many theologians, to make the ancient Jewish faith unreliable and inapplicable, fully admit the same, but then gravely misjudge the Jewish belief by pointing to the result, *i.e. the non-realization* of their faith, as evidence that the Jews were *mistaken* and wholly *ignorant* of the true idea of the Kingdom.

#### PROP. 21. THE PROPHECIES OF THE KINGDOM, INTERPRETED LITERALLY, SUSTAIN THE EXPECTATIONS AND HOPES OF THE PIOUS JEWS.

---

The belief in this Kingdom had a preservative influence upon the Jewish nation. For, inspired by the hopes set forth in prophecy, it preserved them even under the most adverse circumstances. They had a tenacious trust which contributed to keeping them from the unnerving influences and the idolatry of neighboring nations.

Obs. 3. Is it reasonable to suppose that God would give utterances by His prophets respecting a Kingdom, which, taken in their usual literal sense...and yet that all these assurances must be taken in a different sense?

#### PROP. 22. JOHN THE BAPTIST, JESUS, AND THE DISCIPLES, EMPLOYED THE PHRASES "KINGDOM OF HEAVEN" "KINGDOM OF GOD," ETC., IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE USAGE OF THE JEWS.

---

Obs. 1. The Prop. needs no proof, for the fact is self-evident.

Obs. 2. It would, if the Jews were in error on *so fundamental* a point, be simply cruel to adopt their expressive language and *thus confirm* them in an alleged blunder, a vital mistake.

Obs. 5. This point is a proof of the early origin of the Gospels. If the Gospels were written after the time of Constantine (as the liberals propose), they would have never accepted the "Jewish form" of the Kingdom.

#### PROP. 23. THERE MUST BE SOME SUBSTANTIAL REASON WHY THE PHRASES "KINGDOM OF GOD" ETC., WERE THUS ADOPTED.

---

Obs. 1. The attacks of Rationalistic criticism has induced the advocacy, by many, of the accommodation theory.

- "It is but *a sorry refuge* in the end, seeing that it teaches...that the Jews held one notion of the Kingdom and Christ entertained another; and that for fear of the Jews, who were unprepared through prejudice to appreciate the Kingdom, Jesus adopted their language, saying *one thing*, but all the time meaning *something else*."

Obs. 5. Another theory is that the disciples and Apostles were simply wrong in their belief. Their reputation and scriptural standing as *inspired* teachers, suffers in many a sentence written by the adherents of this theory, and a devout believer of the Word arises from the perusal of this kind of work with a deep feeling, that if Christianity needs a defense so *depressingly apologetic*, and so *shockingly degrading* to the first teachers of it, then something is *radically wrong* in its fundamental source.

Jerome simply categorized those who held to a Jewish (literal) view of the Kingdom as "Judaizers," saying, "Let the wise and Christian reader take this rule for prophetic promises, that those things which the Jews hold to be going to take place carnally, we should teach to have already taken place spiritually, lest by occasion of fables and inexplicable questions of that sort, we should be compelled to Judaize." Peters responds, "What an admirable guide! Under the plea of carnality, which is made to cover the grammatical sense and literal fulfillment, the prophecies are to be spiritualized, no matter how, only so that they teach nothing which may be accounted 'Jewish.'"

Obs. 7. All these methods assume as fundamental, that the Jews and early believers were certainly mistaken and deluded.

#### PROP. 24. THE KINGDOM IS OFFERED TO AN ELECT NATION, VIZ.: THE JEWISH NATION.

---

Obs. 1. The Kingdom itself thus offered to them is a *divine-political* (church and state united) dominion, over which *God Himself*, as an *earthly Ruler*, presides or rules as the Supreme.

Obs. 4. Recent writers (e.g. Fairbairn, *On Proph.*, p. 60) speak very disparagingly of reckoning *the natural descent* from Abraham as part of the election, stating that the election had sole reference to a higher, viz.: a spiritual distinction and significance. But this is *antagonistic* to the Word and the facts as given. How comes it, then, that the covenants are given *to* the Jewish race? That this election is *confined to the Jewish race and those adopted into* that race? That the election is traced directly *through the descendants* of Abraham and those incorporated as *Abraham's seed*? That all the prophets, all the inspired teachers, Jesus and the apostles, *are Jews*? That the election of the nation is recognized *by* Jesus and the apostles, and that the Gentiles were only afterward admitted *by special revelation*, and then *only as the*

*acknowledged children of Abraham?* These and similar questions must first be answered before we can possibly accept of such a theory

*Obs. 5.* The saying of Augustine, quoted with such evident approbation by Fairbairn, “The faith of Abraham is the seed of Abraham,” has been received by multitudes as containing the whole sum of truth, when, in point of fact, it simply grazes the truth.

- “The Jew, if faithful, was of the election; the Jew, if unfaithful, was reckoned as a heathen; but it was still the Jew, the actual descendant of Abraham, that was saved. Why the Jew? Because God made a covenant with their ancestor, and gave certain promises through that covenant pertaining to that ancestor’s seed. If any one says (as, alas, many do), perverting the language of Paul applicable to another feature, that the having the blood of Abraham in their veins amounted to nothing (which is true, when accompanied by unbelief, as Jesus taught), he simply fails to recognize the plain fact that Jews were called, and not Gentiles; a covenant was made with Jews, and not with Gentiles; the promises were given to Jews, and not to Gentiles; that salvation is of the Jews, and not of the Gentiles; that this salvation is yet to be openly manifested through the Jews, and not through the Gentiles; and that Gentiles receive and inherit with the natural descendants of Abraham only as they are incorporated. If some, or many, of the Jews made themselves unworthy to receive the promises, that does not alter the unchangeable fact, that the worthy descendants, and engrafted ones, of Abraham do obtain them. Hence we dare not say: “Their condition did not essentially differ from that of the heathen,” because facts are against it.”

*Obs. 6.* Therefore it is inconsistent to make (as *e.g.* Fairbairn, Whately and others) this elect people *a type* of others—the type of a future people—thus misapplying the word “Israel.” The reason is apparent: a type prefigures or foreshadows something that is to be accomplished or realized in the future, but the election made out an accomplished, constantly realized fact; for *they themselves* were chosen, and not typically chosen to represent some future choosing

---

## A CONCLUDING THOUGHT

---

One of the distinguishing differences between a fundamentalist and an evangelical is their view of the Kingdom. An “already/not yet” Kingdom is almost unheard of among fundamentalists, and almost accepted as “the gospel truth” among evangelicals.

Evangelical poster-child Russell Moore says, “*The Kingdom understandings that previously kept fundamentalists isolated have now been corrected by a more biblical portrait of the Kingdom and its relationship to the future reign of Christ, the present reality of the church, and the cosmic scope of salvation.*”

When a fundamentalist accepts an evangelical view of the Kingdom, he has begun a dangerous leftward journey.

