

THE KINGDOM WAS NOT POSTPONED BUT TRANSFERRED

Where in the teachings of Jesus is there a direct statement that He actually postponed the kingdom? It simply is not found in Scripture. Rather, Jesus took the kingdom away from physical Israel (1 Cor. 10:18, Gal. 4:21-31) and gave it to spiritual Israel (i.e. believers: Gal. 6:16; see also, Matt. 21:33-43, 46; 1 Pet. 2:4-12). “Therefore I say to you, the kingdom of God will be taken from you and given to a nation bearing the fruits of it” (Matt. 21:43). Peter affirmed this to be believers: “But you are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, His own special people, that you may proclaim the praises of Him who called you out of darkness into His marvelous light” (1 Pet. 2:9).

Prior to Jesus taking the kingdom away from Israel, he cursed the fig tree and said, “Let no fruit grow on you ever again” (Matt. 21:19). He concluded His thought by using a parable about Israel

taken from Isaiah 5:1-7, in which Isaiah declared that Israel was God's vineyard. The chief priests and the Pharisees realized that Jesus was talking about them (Matt. 21:45). Therefore, there can be no mistake as to the time-frame in which the parable was meant to take place and to whom it applied. It was on the basis of not receiving the fruits of the land that the landowner's Son (Jesus) took the kingdom away from Israel (Matt. 21:43) and gave it to a nation bringing forth the fruits. In so doing, Jesus took away all the vineyard rights that Israel had in their position under God. (We'll talk more about the land question, later)

Where in the Bible after this event does Jesus promise the kingdom will be given back to Israel? There is no such statement. Jesus' statement to Israel that "the kingdom of God would be taken from her [you]" is an admission that the kingdom of God existed in Israel when He came the first time. This kingdom was established in Israel when they came out of Egypt (Ex. 19:6). If there were no

such kingdom on earth at the time, how could Jesus take something away from Israel that did not exist? Peter continued to apply Isaiah 8:14 and 28:16 and Psalm 118:22 to the Church:

Therefore it is also contained in the Scripture, “Behold, I lay in Zion a chief cornerstone, elect, precious, and he who believes on Him will by no means be put to shame.” Therefore, to you who believe, He is precious; but to those who are disobedient, “the stone which the builders rejected has become the chief cornerstone.” And “a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense.” They stumble, being disobedient to the word, to which they also were appointed. (1 Pet. 2:6-8)

In this passage, Peter calls believers: (1) a chosen generation, (2) a royal priesthood, (3) a holy nation, and (4) His own special people. This is what Israel was called when they came out of Egypt (Ex. 19:6). Does this not tell us that believers of all nations have received the kingdom status, has inherited Israel’s promises, and is God’s true Israel (Gal. 6:15-16)? Can we not accept what the Bible says?

Dispensationalists claim these promises of the Old Testament belong to Israel and not to the Church. But here we have Peter writing by divine inspiration and applying them to believers. Because Christ was the foundation that was laid in Zion, Old Testament Zion had to be typical of (i.e. forecasting to) the New Covenant, as there was no other foundation that could be laid. “For no other foundation can anyone lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ” (1 Cor. 3:11). Paul further avers¹ this (Eph. 2:20).

¹ aver v: to declare or affirm solemnly and formally as true; "Before God I swear I am innocent" [syn: affirm, verify, assert, avow, aver, swan, swear]