

## THE THEOCRATIC KINGDOM

---

PROVING THE PHYSICAL-ONLY NATURE OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD | SESSION 5 | PROPS 45-58

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. 45. THE PHRASES “KINGDOM OF HEAVEN” “KINGDOM OF GOD” “KINGDOM OF CHRIST” ETC., DENOTE THE SAME KINGDOM.**

---

*Obs.* 1. Now attention is called to the fact that they are used as synonymous in the New Testament What Matthew pronounces “the Kingdom of heaven,” is said by Mark, Luke, and John to be “the Kingdom of God,”

- Matthew 5:3 – Luke 6:20
- Matthew 13:11 – Mark 4:11
- So also “the Father’s Kingdom” and Christ’s are represented as identical. Matthew 13:41–43 - Ephesians 5:5; Matthew 26:29 - 2 Peter 1:11

### **PROP. 46. THE KINGDOM ANTICIPATED BY THE JEWS AT THE FIRST ADVENT IS BASED ON THE ABRAHAMIC AND DAVIDIC COVENANTS.**

---

See Luke 1:32, 33, 55, 72, 73 (among others) for Biblical evidence.

*Obs.* 1. The covenants are the basis of the Jewish nation’s fundamental belief of final Salvation in Messiah’s Kingdom.

*Obs.* 2. Let it be observed that in approaching the covenants we are not at liberty to *receive* one and *reject* another, nor are we authorized to take *just as much* as may suit our Theological views out of one and refuse to believe in the rest. Here is where many Theological writings make *the fatal mistake*: they are willing to receive the Abrahamic covenant as a perpetual one, but not the Davidic, when *the same perpetuity is asserted of both*; they are agreed to receive *part* of the Abrahamic, or *part* of the Davidic covenant, but *not all that is written*.

### **PROP. 47. THE JEWS HAD THE STRONGEST POSSIBLE ASSURANCE GIVEN TO THEM THAT THE KINGDOM BASED ON THESE COVENANTS WOULD BE REALIZED.**

---

*Obs.* 1. Hence it follows: that the Jews were not so grossly ignorant as many Gentiles now think; that they were correct in their apprehensions concerning the Messiah’s Kingdom being identified with the restored Davidic. *Language could not possibly make it any plainer or stronger*. The sun may refuse to shine, the moon and the stars may depart, the sea may no longer war with its waves, day and night may not alternate in their season, the ordinances of heaven and earth may be repealed (comp. *e.g.* Jeremiah 33:17–26, Isaiah 54:9, Jeremiah 31:35–36, Psalm 89:36–37, etc.), but *the promises of God shall not fail in restoring the overthrown Davidic Kingdom*; God will perform the promises made to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, and the Prophets, respecting the Jewish nation.

*Obs.* 2. Let the reader place himself in the period before the First Advent, with the Old Testament in his hands. Now *what* would be his belief in the Kingdom, with those covenants and prophecies, *confirmed* by oath and most expressive assurances? Surely it would be *identical* with that of the Jews themselves; it could not be otherwise

*Obs. 4.* A class of writers has arisen, who, professing to be very critical, tell us that Abraham's life, and indeed the whole Bible, must be subjected to "Historical Criticism." To this there could be no objection, if honestly conducted; but in the hands of this class, this phrase, stripped of its applied generalities and pretentious adjuncts, simply means to receive *just as much* as any one pleases to accept.

#### PROP. 48. THE KINGDOM BEING BASED ON THE COVENANTS, THE COVENANTS MUST BE CAREFULLY EXAMINED, AND (PROP. 4) THE LITERAL LANGUAGE OF THE SAME MUST BE MAINTAINED.

---

In all earthly transactions, when a promise, agreement, or contract is entered into by which one party gives a promise of value to another, it is *universally* the custom to explain such a relationship and its promises *by the well-known laws of language* contained in our grammars or in common usage. It would be regarded absurd to view them in any other light.

*Obs. 3.* Our Proposition is confirmed by the indisputable fact that God has stamped the grammatical sense as the correct one by *literally fulfilling* a portion of the covenants...A *sufficiency* is found in the history of the past to show that these covenants contain a *real, substantial, verified grammatical meaning*. Hence we are not allowed to change it for something else.

*Obs. 4.* The promises in the covenants are *not typical*, as many argue (impelled to it by not seeing a present fulfillment, and by a disbelief in a future fulfillment), for a typical character is *opposed* to the very nature of a covenant. It would in a great measure make the real truth unrecognizable until the appearance of the antitype, and the result would be to enshroud the covenants themselves in conjecture and mystery, which is opposed to the simple fact that God appeals to the covenants as to promises *well comprehended*.

#### PROP. 49. THE COVENANTS BEING, BY REVELATION, THE FOUNDATION OF THE KINGDOM, MUST FIRST BE STUDIED AND APPRECIATED. <sup>1</sup>

---

- I. The Covenant with Abraham: Genesis 12:1–3, 7; 13:14–17; 15:4–21; 17:4–16; 22:15–18.
  - a. God promised a physical inheritance yet gave **absolutely none** of it to Abraham. Acts 7:5
  - b. The Jewish people understood a physical inheritance from Abraham through the New Testament, and understood that this promise would be fulfilled in the future. (Paul connected the promise of a physical inheritance with the resurrection – Acts 26:6-8)
  - c. Micah 7:20 (and others) promise God's faithful fulfillment of His promises to Abraham.
- II. The Covenant in Sinai:
  - a. *Obs. 1.* The Sinaitic Covenant is *an outgrowth* of the Abrahamic covenant, and embraces an offer to the Jews nationally of a complete verification of the blessings tendered under the original promises. This procedure of erecting a Theocracy indicates that it was contemplated in the covenant with Abraham, as preparatory to the future realization of the promises.
- III. The Covenant with David – 2 Samuel 7:10-16
  - a. The Davidic Covenant of a perpetual theocracy with a Divine Monarch grows out of the Abrahamic and Sinaitic covenants.
  - b. David, the Prophets, and the Apostles uniformly announce that a Son of David will physically sit on the Davidic throne and restore the Davidic Kingdom.
  - c. The covenant was confirmed in the clearest of terms: Psalm 132:11.

---

<sup>1</sup> *proposition paraphrased* – This segment covers 27 pages of Volume 1, and the student who wants to know more about the Covenants should study these pages closely.

- d. The covenant could be *postponed* but not *cancelled*. Psalm 89:30-37.

## PROP. 50. THE KINGDOM WILL BE THE OUTGROWTH OF THE RENEWED ABRAHAMIC COVENANT, UNDER WHICH RENEWAL WE NOW LIVE.

---

The Abrahamic covenant is *renewed or re-confirmed* in this dispensation, under which re-confirmation we now live.

*Obs. 1.* This, indeed, might already be inferred by the reflection, that the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom being overthrown, and the Mosaic institutions abrogated, and the covenant made with David being held in abeyance, *the original Abrahamic covenant*, from which the others spring, in consequence *alone remains* in complete force. The covenant of this dispensation, called the New Testament, or the New Covenant, is none other than the Abrahamic *renewed or confirmed* by Jesus the Christ.

- Note: this is a common dispensational teaching, but one which I personally reject. See my lessons on the New Covenant here: <https://randywhiteministries.org/course/the-new-covenant/>

*Obs. 4.* Persons are apt to be misled by the use of the word “*new*,” thinking that it necessarily means something entirely new, different from what preceded. They forget that in Bible usage it frequently means *renewed, restored again, newly confirmed*, etc., as in new heart, new moon, new creature, new heavens and new earth, new commandment, drink new (Matthew 26:29), etc.

- Here Peter’s seems to break his own rule of a literal interpretation

*Obs. 8.* [This observation explains Peter’s point of view that the New Covenant must be the *renewed* covenant of Abraham.] Holding to those covenants as *written*, clinging to those promises *without changing* them, believing that they will *all, as recorded*, be finally realized through Jesus Christ,—*leads necessarily to Chiliasm* [millennialism – the belief in a 1,000 year future Kingdom]. The history of the Church conclusively shows, that just as Chiliasm in its purity prevailed, in that proportion were *the covenants upheld and exalted* as signal landmarks; and just as the Origenistic, Popish, and Mystical interpretation extended so were these covenants ignored as non-essential, or else spiritualized so as to make them scarcely recognizable.

- Peter’s rightly recognized that the ideas of Origin, adopted into Catholicism and mysticism, made a “New Covenant” which was disconnected to the Abrahamic / Sinaitic / Davidic covenants.
- To counter this, he made the church age a *renewal* of the Abrahamic covenant rather than a *replacement*, as the Catholics had done.
- He did not recognize a third option: that the New Covenant is still future and that the church age is *not* under a covenant at all, but under the Mediator [middle man] of the covenants.

*Obs. 9.* Those who advocate that *an entire new* covenant was given and confirmed by the death of Jesus *differ very much* as to the nature and meaning of this alleged covenant.

*Obs. 10.* It follows, then, that it is a grave misapprehension of Scripture teaching to say, as some do, that all the older covenants *ended* in Christ.

Note: Peter’s gives 24 Observations on this point, all well argued from his point of view that the Abrahamic Covenant renewed is the covenant of this dispensation. The force of his argument against a catholic and amillennial view that disconnects the covenants with the Kingdom is good, and the length of his argument testifies to the importance of the subject. Had Peter’s recognized the third option of “no

covenant” for this age, his argument would have avoided the need to stretch the meaning of some words (like “new”) and would have given much more clarity to the situation.

#### PROP. 51. THE RELATION THAT THE KINGDOM SUSTAINS TO “THE COVENANTS OF PROMISE,” ENABLES US TO APPRECIATE THE PROPHECIES PERTAINING TO THE KINGDOM.

---

*Obs. 7.* One reason why so many Messianic predictions in the Old Testament, especially in the Psalms, are explained away as relating to David, Solomon, Hezekiah, etc., arises from the fact that the prophecies do not agree with the writers’ preconceived notions of the covenants and of a spiritual Kingdom.

#### PROP. 52. THE PROMISES PERTAINING TO THE KINGDOM, AS GIVEN IN THE COVENANTS, WILL BE STRICTLY FULFILLED.

---

*Obs. 1.* Among the promises that remain unfulfilled, but which we claim shall be fully realized in their *plain grammatical sense*, one is selected that is either generally denied or totally explained away. We refer to the express, most explicit promise in the Davidic covenant that David’s Son (viz.: Jesus Christ, as the Scriptures testify) should *personally occupy and reign on David’s throne and in David’s Kingdom, i.e.* He should appear as *the Theocratic King over the restored Theocratic Kingdom.*

- Isaiah 9:6–7, Jeremiah 33:14–16, Luke 1:30–33

*Obs. 4.* No fallacious arguments in spiritualizing, symbolizing, or typicalizing *can transmute* the promise of the Davidic throne and Kingdom into something else, as *e.g.* into the Father’s throne, the Divine Sovereignty, the Kingdom of Grace, Gospel Dispensation, etc., for the simple reason that *the identical* throne and Kingdom, *now overturned, is the one that is promised to the Messiah to be re-established* by Himself. See Amos 9:11.

- The Theocratic crown *cast down*, the Theocratic throne *overturned*, the Theocratic Kingdom *overthrown*, is *the* crown, throne, and Kingdom that the Christ *is to restore.*

*Obs. 7.* This feature again reminds us that “*the keystone* of the whole system” (*i.e.* millennialism) is not to be found in the pre-Millennial Advent (however indispensable), but *in the covenants.* The promises are not in the Second Advent, but in the covenants and prophecies based on them; the Advent being only *the necessary means* toward their accomplishment.

*Obs. 9.* The extremely guarded language of Scripture on this point, so as not to conflict with the covenanted promise, should lead the student to reflection.

- Compare Revelation 3:21 to Mark 11:10

*Obs. 12.* The assumption that David’s throne and Kingdom must denote some other throne and Kingdom in the third heaven never meets the contradictions that it involves, viz.: that David’s throne, etc. was never in heaven, never extended over another world, and is not fitted from its *alleged* “fleeting earthly” condition to designate an eternally existing throne, and that if logically carried out (from which, however, our opponents recoil), then David’s throne being “the Father’s throne,” where Christ is, David himself (for the throne is expressly identified with him) must also represent the Father! Who would be so rash as to adopt such an interpretation? and yet simple consistency demands it.

*Obs. 15.* The covenanted Davidic throne and Kingdom, allied as it is with the Jewish, necessarily requires, in order to a future restoration, *a preservation* of the nation.

### PROP. 53. THE GENEALOGIES OF OUR LORD FORM AN IMPORTANT LINK IN THE COMPREHENSION OF THIS KINGDOM.

---

*Obs. 2.* If the Savior was merely to descend from David to take human nature in that line for the purpose of redemptive work at the First Advent, and then that was to be the finale of the matter, *why* lay so much stress on descent from *the royal line*?

### PROP. 54. THE PREACHING OF THE KINGDOM BY JOHN, JESUS, AND THE DISCIPLES, WAS CONFINED TO THE JEWISH NATION.

---

*Obs. 1.* The confinement of the Kingdom in its re-establishment to the descendants of Abraham in their national capacity, *demanding such a restriction* of the distinctive offer of the Kingdom to the Jews. It could not possibly be otherwise, unless God *violates* His solemnly pledged Word. So carefully does the Sacred Record guard this restrictive feature—*necessary* in the very nature of the case—that the only time Jesus left the Jews for Samaria, John *apologizes* for the same by urging its necessity (John 4:4), informing us, “He must *needs go* through Samaria.”

*Obs. 2.* When the Kingdom is preached, express charges and admonitions are given *to avoid* the Gentiles.

*Obs. 3.* Even after the call to the Gentiles was made out, the apostles still affirmed this covenanted position of the Jews, so that Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13:46) said to the unbelieving Hebrews: “*it was necessary that the Word of God should first have been spoken to you.*”

*Obs. 7.* If the Kingdom of God is really what the multitude affirm it to be, viz.: the Church, or the reign of God in the heart, etc., what consistent and valid reasons *can possibly* be assigned for its being thus restricted *nationally* to one people?

*Obs. 10.* The Kingdom was ultimately to be extended from the Jews so that it would embrace the Gentiles also, as indicated plainly by the prophecies. This opinion was held by the Jews, as the titles given to the Messiah showed (*e.g.* 2 Maccabees 7:9, “the King of the World”). But this ordering did *not interfere* with the Davidic covenanted basis, or with the predicted supremacy of the nation.

### PROP. 55. IT WAS NECESSARY THAT JESUS AND HIS DISCIPLES SHOULD AT FIRST PREACH THE KINGDOM AS NIGH TO THE JEWISH NATION.

---

*Obs. 3.* The Kingdom was *offered as nigh, on the condition of repentance.*

*Obs. 4.* It was left, we find, to the moral freedom of the representative men of the nation to receive or refuse it. The phrase “*nigh at hand*” is indicative of a tender, which, if necessary, can be withdrawn.

### PROP. 56. THE KINGDOM WAS NOT ESTABLISHED DURING THE MINISTRY OF CHRIST.

---

*Obs. 1.* The men who were *the preachers* of this very Kingdom, and who, above all others (especially modern theologians), ought to have known whether it was instituted or not, *had no knowledge* whatever of its being thus erected.

*Obs. 3.* Jesus, before His death, declared the Kingdom to be still future (Matt. 26:64).

*Obs.* 4. The significant fact that our opponents cannot tell *when* this promised Kingdom was set up, although professing that it was established, is corroborative evidence in our favor.

*Obs.* 7. The reader will observe that there is not a single declaration of Christ's which asserts that the Kingdom was *then* in actual existence.

PROP. 57. THIS KINGDOM WAS OFFERED TO THE JEWISH NATION, BUT THE NATION REJECTED IT.

---

*Obs.* 1. Nationally, through the nation's highest officials and council, the Kingdom was rejected on account of *the imposed condition*, repentance, although individual Jews repenting were received as believers.

*Obs.* 4. This Kingdom was offered to the nation in good faith, *i.e.* it would have been bestowed *provided* the nation had repented

PROP. 58. JESUS, TOWARD THE CLOSE OF HIS MINISTRY, PREACHED THAT THE KINGDOM WAS NOT NIGH.

---

*Obs.* 3. The evidence on this point is strong and cumulative, and there are given even clearer exhibitions than the preceding. In Luke 21:31 is something decisive, when apprehended in the light of the immediate context.

*Obs.* 4. Luke 19:11–27 forcibly demonstrates our Proposition. Jesus uttered this parable "*because they thought that the Kingdom of God should immediately appear.*"

