

## THE THEOCRATIC KINGDOM

---

PROVING THE PHYSICAL-ONLY NATURE OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD | SESSION 6 | PROPS 53-74

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.

*For propositions 53-58, see the handout for session 4*

### PROP. 59. THIS KINGDOM OF GOD, OFFERED TO THE JEWISH NATION, LEST THE PURPOSE OF GOD FAIL, IS TO BE GIVEN TO OTHERS WHO ARE ADOPTED.

---

*Obs. 4.* John the Baptist had already foreshown that the wisdom and power of God would be amply sufficient to carry out His own covenanted Purpose, even if the nation would reject Christ. Matthew 3:9.

- Being natural offspring was not enough. Repentance was also required.
- God is able to raise up (even miraculously) children who meet both requirements: children of Abraham *and* obedient.

*Obs. 6.* Do not mistakenly believe that the Kingdom being *taken from* them, will *never be given* to the nation again.

### PROP. 60. THIS KINGDOM OF GOD IS GIVEN, NOT TO NATIONS, BUT TO ONE NATION.

---

*Obs. 1.* Notice: the Kingdom is promised to the natural believing descendants of Abraham, and as the nation, then existing when the Kingdom was offered, refused to repent in order to receive it, God must now—to carry out His purpose—raise up a nation *unto* Abraham, *i.e.* a nation in some way *still related* to him. If a Gentile nation or nations (as many suppose) were chosen in place of the Jewish, this would *ignore* all the past assurances given, and *overthrow* the multiplied predictions of the prophets. It would *nullify* God's covenants, and make it appear that He undertook a Plan which, owing to human depravity, *He was unable* to perform. It would *lower* the power of the Divine administration, and make God subject *to change*. Gentile nations cannot *as nations* be substituted for the *one elect* Jewish nation

*Obs. 2.* the wall of partition between the Jewish nation, as such, and Gentile nations, as such, *is not removed* but *only between believers* of all nations and the Jewish nation.

*Obs. 5.* The original choice of one nation, and the continued selection of “a nation,” in some way identified with Abraham, enables us to appreciate the reason why God confined the acceptance of the Kingdom to *one* nation and ultimately gives it to *one* people.

*Obs. 6.* To no one Gentile nation is the Kingdom offered as it was to the Jewish, *viz.:* that on their national repentance the Kingdom of God would be established among or within it. This could not be done without doing violence to pledged covenants.

*Obs. 8.* It may be added, that this feature throws light upon the question of nationalized churches as representative of the Kingdom of God.

### PROPOSITIONS 61-63

---

From RW: These propositions are the weakest of Peter's propositions thus far. Though a solid premillennialist, Peter was not pretribulationist and held a view of the church that was a veiled form of replacement theology. While most of what he taught about the kingdom avoids this error, these three propositions do not.

- Prop. 61. The Kingdom which by promise exclusively belonged to the Jewish nation, the rightful seed of Abraham, was now to be given to an engrafted people.
  - *Note from RW:* This is one of Peter's most unfortunate points, in which he tried to make the grafted gentiles the new nation, going against his previous insistence on the nationality of the Jewish nation. His argumentation sounds allegorical and has sounds of replacement theology.
- Prop. 62. This people, to whom the Kingdom is to be given, gathered out of the nations, becomes the elect nation.
- Prop. 63. The present elect, to whom the Kingdom will be given, is the continuation of the previous election, chiefly in another engrafted people.

#### PROP. 64. THE KINGDOM BEING GIVEN TO THE ELECT ONLY, ANY ADOPTION INTO THAT ELECT PORTION MUST BE REVEALED BY EXPRESS DIVINE REVELATION.

---

*Obs. 3.* Various authors of eminence have unjustly accused the apostles, and especially Peter, of being "too Jewish" in their views respecting the call of the Gentiles. But Peter had *no right* to think otherwise until God revealed the matter to him how Gentiles could be engrafted and also become of the elect people without observing the rites and ceremonies of Judaism.

*Obs. 4.* The pronouncing, by Paul, of this election of Gentile believers as "*a mystery*,"—something, which, in view of the elected position of the Jews, was unexplained and to human reason inexplicable,—*confirms* our line of reasoning.

#### PROP. 65. BEFORE THIS KINGDOM CAN BE GIVEN TO THIS ELECT PEOPLE, THEY MUST FIRST BE GATHERED OUT.

---

*Obs. 1.* This final gathering of all the elect "from one end of heaven to the other," at the period of inheriting the Kingdom, is mentioned, *e.g.* Matthew 24:31; Mark 13:27; II Thessalonians 2:1, etc.

*Note from RW:* Having developed a theory that the new "elect nation" is believers of all ethnicities, Peter's then builds what appears to be the workings of a post-tribulation "rapture."

*Obs. 5.* This Kingdom is to be given to all of the elected nation, both believing Jews of natural descent and engrafted Gentiles, to all believers, therefore, that have ever lived; and it will be bestowed upon *both at the same time*, including the Patriarchs, ancient worthies, faithful Jews, and believing adopted Gentiles.

#### PROP. 66. THE KINGDOM THAT WAS GIVEN AT ONE TIME (VIZ.: AT THE FIRST ADVENT) TO THE JEWISH NATION, IS NOW REMOVED TO THE CLOSE OF ITS TRIBULATION

---

Note from RW: This is standard premillennial thought.

#### PROP. 67. THE KINGDOM COULD NOT THEREFORE HAVE BEEN SET UP AT THAT TIME, VIZ.: AT THE FIRST ADVENT.

---

The Kingdom being one with the Davidic throne and kingdom, *it was impossible* because of the prophesied rejection and punishment of the nation for a certain time, to establish it.

*Obs. 1.* The Kingdom was tendered to Israel on condition of repentance, and Christ's miraculous power evinced the ability to verify the offer of it.

### PROP. 68. THIS KINGDOM IS THEN ESSENTIALLY A JEWISH KINGDOM.

---

*Obs. 3.* It is certainly strange that the old prejudice [against the Jews] should be so deeply rooted in the minds of many at the present day so that everything that can be even remotely reduced to a so-called “Jewish form” or “Jewish husk” excites a degree of bitterness and hostility, which, to say the least, indicates something akin to the Gentile “*high-mindedness*,” against which we are cautioned by Paul (Romans 11).

### PROP. 69. THE DEATH OF JESUS DID NOT REMOVE THE NOTION ENTERTAINED BY THE DISCIPLES AND APOSTLES CONCERNING THE KINGDOM.

---

It is asserted in numerous works that the death of Jesus caused such an immediate revolution in the minds of the disciples that it destroyed *all their anticipations* of the expected restored Davidic Kingdom. This is done without due reflection, seeing that it is opposed by the plainest statement, found in Acts 1:6.

*Obs. 1.* It is true that the death of Jesus must have placed them in a perplexed attitude before His resurrection, and appeared contradictory to their expectations. The question *how* to reconcile this sad event with their *continued* view of covenant and prophecy pressed them heavily.

*Obs. 2.* If writers are correct in their deductions of the effects of Christ’s death in revolutionizing the minds of the disciples, then there ought to be a distinct announcement of the same in the New Testament. We ought to find (1) that they had been mistaken in their previous apprehensions of the Kingdom, and (2) that the death of Jesus and events following indicated this to them. But nothing of this kind is found in the record, and we are not at liberty to infer it.

*Obs. 4.* The conversation between Jesus and the disciples pertaining to the Kingdom, and the question of the latter just before the ascension (Acts 1:1-6), *most effectually disproves* the assertions of eminent writers that the Kingdom *was already* established sometime in the ministry or life of Jesus.

### PROP. 70. THE APOSTLES, AFTER CHRIST’S ASCENSION, DID NOT PREACH, EITHER TO JEWS OR GENTILES, THAT THE KINGDOM WAS ESTABLISHED.

---

*Obs. 5.* Additionally it may be said: (1) If the apostles preached that the covenanted, predicted Kingdom was established, why do they not *directly declare* this as a fact, and thus remove error and prevent the incoming pre-millennialism? Is there a single passage which *directly teaches* that the Christian church is the Kingdom? No such declaration or passage is to be found in all the apostolic writings. (2) Hence it is a fact which cannot be denied that those who hold to a present establishment of the Kingdom exclusively rely upon *inferential* proof. This feature alone—a doctrine derived from *pure inference*—should place the reader on his guard so that he may well consider whether such inferential testimony can possibly outweigh the previously given covenants and teachings of Jesus.

*Obs. 6.* Take the first sermons of Peter, and nothing is said of the establishment of the Kingdom, although multitudes inform us that it was *only then* manifested.

*Obs. 10.* The simple fact, running through the Epistles, is that *the Kingdom is spoken of as still future and constantly associated with the speedy Advent of Jesus*.

*Obs. 13.* That our Proposition is true appears from the immediate result of their preaching. The early church, the Apostolic Fathers, all that were nearest to the apostles and the Elders, *knew* of no established Kingdom but *looked for one to come at the Advent of Jesus*. This is evidenced by the intensely Chiliastic position of the Primitive Church.

*Obs.* 14. Others, seeing how this Kingdom is united with the Second Coming of Jesus, and unable to find consistently the establishment of the Kingdom under the preaching of the disciples, and yet, with their theory of a Kingdom, compelled to have some kind of a Kingdom in actual existence during this dispensation—resort to the most arbitrary spiritualistic interpretation to locate the Second Advent *in the past* so that a resultant Kingdom may logically be connected with it.

#### PROP. 71. THE LANGUAGE OF THE APOSTLES CONFIRMED THE JEWS IN THEIR MESSIANIC HOPES OF THE KINGDOM.

---

*Obs.* 2. After such appeals as the Apostles make to the Jewish hope; after linking the Jewish “Rest” with the Coming Messiah; after uniting the Jewish view of Judgeship and Judgment with the Second Advent of Jesus; after making the Millennial glory dependent upon the future Advent; after joining the restoration of the Jewish nation with Christ’s return; after endorsing and enforcing the Jewish first resurrection as preceding the glorious Messianic times; *after all these*, and similar points of union, it is difficult to see how men and women with Jewish views, holding *tenaciously to covenant and prophecy*, could possibly understand the apostles *in any other sense* than a Jewish or premillennialist one.

#### PROP. 72. THE DOCTRINE OF THE KINGDOM, AS PREACHED BY THE APOSTLES, WAS RECEIVED BY THE EARLY CHURCHES.

---

This is not only reasonable, but shown to be *a fact*, from the apostles having no occasion during their entire ministry to censure any orthodox believers or churches for misapprehending, or holding to a false view of, the Kingdom. The decided and convincing impression is made by the apostolic writings that these first Christian churches were *not ignorant of—but correctly understood—the important and cardinal subject of the Kingdom*.

#### PROP. 73. THE DOCTRINE OF THE KINGDOM PREACHED BY THE APOSTLES AND ELDERS, RAISED UP NO CONTROVERSY WITH THE JEWS.

---

*Obs.* 3. The early Jews, instead of accusing Christians of rejecting such a Kingdom, charged the early believers with entertaining such a view, and sought to bring them, on account of the same, into difficulties with the Roman Emperors.

#### PROP. 74. THE BELIEF IN THE SPEEDY ADVENT OF CHRIST, ENTERTAINED BOTH BY THE APOSTLES AND THE CHURCHES UNDER THEM, INDICATES WHAT KINGDOM WAS BELIEVED IN AND TAUGHT BY THE FIRST CHRISTIANS.

---

If it can be shown that the apostles and their converts believed in a speedy Advent, that they looked for it near at hand, as immediate and impending sooner or later, then it follows that the Alexandrian modern [and mystical] view of the Kingdom could not have been entertained by them.

*Obs.* 9. The apostles, *after* the resurrection and ascension of Jesus, *never used* the formula “*the Kingdom of heaven is at hand.*” For, instead of the previous formula, they now tell us that “*the Coming of the Lord draweth nigh,*” “*the Lord is at hand,*” etc. They guard us thus, by the very choice of words, against the notion that the Kingdom *was already* established, or that it possibly could be set up *during the absence* of the King.