

CHAPTER IV.

THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST.

The views of our standard writers variant and contradictory – Some advance none —False theories of the kingdom of Christ give rise to unscriptural and pernicious practices, and maladministration of the ordinances.—Views of Dr. Williams, Dr. Gardner, Dr. Dagg, Dr. Fish. —The author’s theory stated and illustrated.—A composite of the admissions of these authors.

THERE are, among Baptists, quite as many and as contradictory views of what constitutes “the kingdom of Christ” as there are concerning what is a Church of Christ. Scarce two authors take the same view, and hence the confusion of ideas that everywhere prevail among our people. Very few ministers, and scarce a member, if called upon, could give a clear definition of his own conception of what it is, having but an indefinable impression that it is **something**, or, possibly, several very different things—as Christ’s spiritual reign in the hearts of his subjects, or the Christian dispensation, or the family of the regenerate, or the regenerate who have been baptized, etc.

The majority of our authors who have given us “Church Manuals,” and able treatises on the church, and its polity and Communion, do not even mention the Kingdom of Christ, and only some few barely mention it without defining, or define it so indefinitely, that their readers can not apprehend what they really mean. Certainly no work on church polity is complete without a correct definition of the Kingdom, and of its relation to the churches.

It is but a natural consequence that unscriptural theories concerning the Kingdom of Christ inevitably give rise to unscriptural and pernicious practices, especially in administering the ordinances.

I submit the views of a few of our leading authors on Communion, and the practices, based on proof of my statements.

Dr. A.P. Williams, in his work on “Communion,” says:

1. “Jesus Christ has a kingdom on earth, and he has churches. No one of his churches is his kingdom, **but each one is an integral portion of the kingdom.**”

This, so far, is very clear. If a local church is an **integer** of the kingdom of Christ, then churches alone compose it, since its integral parts must be all of the **same denomination**. If churches are the **integers**, or **units** of its composition, **individuals cannot be**. This I accept.

But the rest, Dr. Williams says, only makes manifest the confusion of his own ideas of the kingdom:

2. “It is by faith and baptism that we enter his kingdom. The eunuch, from the moment of his baptism, belongs to the kingdom of Christ.

3. “Any one belonging to the kingdom of Christ is eligible to membership in any one of his churches. [Not by **right**, however, for he says.] But in order to become a member, the consent of both of himself and of **the church** is necessary.”—p. 92.

If the kingdom of Christ is composed of the local churches—a fact with which Dr. Williams starts—how can one become a subject of the kingdom without first having become a member of the **integral** portions of that kingdom? Impossible.

Dr. Gardner says:

“Baptism, therefore, is the **initiatory** ordinance into his **visible kingdom**, and the **vestibule to his churches in that kingdom**; and none have a divine right to cross the threshold and enter these sacred enclosures until they have received the print of the sacred name in the appointed way by a properly authorized administrator.”—p. 13.

He further says that “all ordained ministers are the accredited officers of Christ’s kingdom.”—page 203.

According to Dr. Gardner all the local churches are in the kingdom, and we know they can be in it only as its **constituencies**; or, as Dr. Williams says, “**integral** portions of it,” and if so, visible churches alone, as such, are members of Christ’s kingdom, and individuals, as such, can not be—therefore individuals can only be in the kingdom as units of the constituents or “**integral** portions of the kingdom,” as I can only be a member of this Republic by being a citizen of some one of the States. But these excellent brethren both hold and teach that the kingdom has one ordinance, at least, (baptism), and that all true ministers are the accredited officers of the kingdom to whom this ordinance is entrusted, and that by baptism they introduce individuals into the kingdom before they become members of a church; and, therefore, they may live and die good members of Christ’s kingdom and never become members of his church!

Here, then, we have two distinct and independent organizations, each having its laws, ordinances, and officers, and subjects, and, of course, separate jurisdiction, but the brethren fail to inform us how the officers of the one can officiate in the other!

Now the fatal defects of this theory, aside from its lack of Scripture warrant, are—

(1.) The kingdom of Christ has **no officer** save its one, King and Lawgiver, who never baptizes, and hence can not administer an ordinance to any one.

(2.) The kingdom of Christ has no ordinance, and therefore no one ever yet received baptism as an ordinance of the kingdom.

(3.) The kingdom of Christ is not composed of **persons**, as integral parts, but of **churches**, as kingdoms are of provinces, and therefore no person ever was, or can be, a member of it “only” as a member of one of Christ’s churches.

(4.) But, if one ordinance belongs to the kingdom, then both do, for what God hath joined together let not man attempt to sever. The advocates of this theory will not admit that the Supper belongs to the kingdom, but to the churches, and therefore baptism belongs to the churches, since both were delivered to the same organization—the local church.

(5.) But, if the theory be correct, then, when the church excludes a member, she can only put him back into the Kingdom, where she found him. Think of it—all her excluded members are in the Kingdom of Christ, and there is no authority on earth to put them out!

(6.) A member of the Kingdom by baptism, applies to a local church for membership, and is refused, he still remains where he was, a citizen of the Kingdom of Christ, and there is no power to exclude him from it, however unworthy!

(7.) And more, the churches have no disciplinary jurisdiction over ministers, since they belong to the Kingdom, if they can administer its ordinance. If these are distinct organizations, as these teach, one can not interfere with the subjects of the other!

(8.) These brethren can not find a command or exhortation to the members of the Kingdom to become members of Christ's church, or a reproof given to any one who failed to do so; and from what source can the members of the Kingdom learn that a further duty is required of them?

Thus we see that unscriptural theories inevitably beget unscriptural and harmful practices.

Those who accept and advocate the above theory, as a rule, teach consistently with it that the ordinances—baptism at least—was not delivered to the churches to guard and administer to those whose Christian experiences they can fellowship, but to the ministry to be controlled and administered by them when and where they please, and to whom **they** may judge qualified. They claim that it is their right to baptize applicants in a city filled with churches, as well as in remote rural districts where there are no churches, and to baptize in the very baptistery of those churches, if they can get the consent of the sexton, and even the members of one of those very churches, should they deem them unbaptized though the church does not, and would not give its consent if asked! If this is not presumptuously assuming the prerogatives of the local churches, I can not conceive what would be an usurpation, taking from them as it does the control of their own ordinance.

This theory compels its advocates to teach that persons, after their baptism, before they can be members, must make a formal application to some church, produce proof of their baptism, and be received by the unanimous vote of the church; that the vote of the church, **after baptism**, alone introduces into a local church. Now if this be so, then it follows that there is not a person on this continent, who is a member of a Baptist church, for there is no one, living or dead, who was ever so received, and the advocates of this theory are not themselves members of a Baptist church or entitled to come to the Lord's table, for they were not received into a church. And the last conclusion of this destructive theory is, that it annihilates every Baptist church from this continent, for "we have no such custom, neither have the churches of God."

But Dr. Dagg declares that both these authors are wrong, since their views are not authorized by the Scriptures:

"As theological writers have maintained that there is a 'visible Church Catholic,' distinct from the Spiritual Universal Church of the Scriptures, so some of them have maintained that there is a **visible kingdom** of Christ—a society of external organization, into which men enter by baptism. But the kingdom of Christ is not a society of men bound together by external organization, like a family, a nation, or a local church. This view of it is not authorized by the Holy Scriptures."—*Ch. Order*, p. 140.

He defines the kingdom of Christ thus:

"The kingdom of Christ is properly the **kingly authority** with which he is invested; and the phrase is used, by **metonymy**, to denote the subjects of his reign, and especially the obedient subjects, on whom the blessings of his reign are conferred. But the tie which binds these obedient subjects to their King, and his reign, is internal. The family, the nation, and the local church [*i.e.*, all the churches], are all institutions in his kingdom, or under his reign; and the external organization of these institutions should be regulated according to the will of the Sovereign King; but the kingdom itself **exists independent of all external organization.**"

I understand him to teach that Christ has no **visible kingdom** on earth, and, therefore, no visible constituents, no laws, ordinances or officers; but that Christ's reign in the hearts of men is his kingdom, and that all regenerated men on earth, and all holy angels in heaven, are the subjects of it.

Dr. Geo. B. Taylor says:

“The kingdom of God is that community of professed believers in Christ peculiar to the new dispensation. Baptism is the appointed act for professing allegiance to the kingdom of God, and thereby becoming a citizen of that kingdom. A profession of subjection to the kingdom of God, made by baptism, constitutes regular qualification for participation in the Lord's Supper.”

Since he holds that the Supper is a church ordinance, he must be understood as holding that baptism introduces into a local church, and that churches are the constituents of that **community** of believers peculiar to the New Testament.

Prof. Curtis defines it thus:

“The Christian Dispensation—all those living under the dominion of heavenly or spiritual principles; and all acknowledging one supreme head—Christ.”

If this definition does not fritter away every thing visible and tangible from the idea of kingdom of Christ, I will submit one that certainly does.

Dr. E.J. Fish, in his “Ecclesiology,” thus defines it:

“The kingdom is of such a nature that it may be spoken of as either **entering men**, or being entered by men. (Luke xvii: 21; Jno. iii: 5.) The kingdom is of such a nature that one **may enter when already in it** (!)—that is, enter it still more deeply. (1 Thess. ii: 12.)

“A man is born into the kingdom by the second birth. The kingdom, considered as a collection of spiritual intelligences, proposes nothing. It does not even elect its executive, the Church. It simply is, believes, loves expands, basks in glory. Stretching over the world's continents, islands and oceans, like an invisible empire of thought and experience, paying no regard to dynasties or powers earthly, it receives what Christ and the Church may impart!”

I could fill pages with such like definitions, but these are sufficient to show that there is no generally accepted definition of the term which we may call standard among Baptist writers and theologians. I propose a definition which will commend itself for three reasons—

1. It will embrace all the ground **truths** of the above contradictory theories, and harmonize them by omitting what is not truth; and—

2. It will have this advantage over them – agreement with the Scriptures and common sense; and—

3. Susceptible of being comprehended, at least, by the reader.

I. The term “kingdom,” in all languages, implies **organization**, and, consequently, **visibility**. No definition of kingdom is correct that wholly ignores the above notions—as Dr. Dagg's theory most certainly does, making the language meaningless.

2. Throughout the Scriptures, the kingdom of **Christ**, whether spoken of as “the kingdom of God,” or “of heaven,” is spoken of as something that **was to be**—brought, or was brought, into existence at Christ's advent; and that its locality is on this earth, and nowhere else (See Psalms 2). John, the herald of the kingdom, proclaimed to the expectant nation of Israel—“**The** kingdom of heaven has approached.” Christ's first proclamation was in the same words, which clearly imply, that, prior to that time, it had not existed.

Dr. Dagg's theory utterly ignores the prophecy of Daniel (ii: 44), because "the whole number of the saved" was never organized or "set up," and because the kingdom, as he defines it, existed from the days of Abel; and those were empty words uttered by Christ—"On this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell [even if it means death] shall not prevail against it"—for what could prevail, in any conceivable way, against the saved in heaven, or those God had ordained to save? This theory I can but esteem as violative of the laws of language, and the teachings of God's word.

THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST—WHAT IS IT?

I propose to construct it out of the ground truths admitted by our standard writers. Dr. A.P. Williams, the profoundest thinking Missouri has produced, says:

"The **churches** are each **integral parts** of the kingdom of Christ."

If so—and I accept it—the churches, as such are the **integers** of the kingdom of Christ. The local churches, then, compose the kingdom. Other able writers admit that a local church is not the kingdom, but a **constituent** of the kingdom, and I accept this also. Then, it follows that the **local churches** are the **constituents** of the kingdom of Christ. Then must the local churches constitute the kingdom of Christ—not **individuals** on earth or in heaven, but churches, are the units of which the kingdom is composed. And this is the fact to be kept in mind—

That the kingdom of Christ is not composed of INDIVIDUALS, as such, baptized or unbaptized; but of CHURCHES, as such, and only of individuals as composing local churches.

This conclusion incontrovertibly follows:

That the visible kingdom of Christ, which is also called "kingdom of God," "of heaven," "of God's dear Son," can not exist without one or more of its constituents—local churches; and, therefore, it did not exist on earth before, or independent of, a local church.

But "the kingdom of heaven" did exist, not only during, but "from the days of John the Baptist"—the commencement of his ministry.

This can not well be doubted, since he proclaimed that it had approached.

The first public proclamation by Christ was that it had approached.

Subsequently, he declared that, "from the days of John, it had been assaulted, and violent men sought to destroy it; and that the law and the prophets were until John, since which time the kingdom of heaven was proclaimed, and all men were **opposing** it"—not pressing into it, as our version has it (see Chap. —). We know it could not be assaulted and outraged unless visibly existing. Christ further says, That while scribe and priest were endeavoring to shut up the kingdom against men, publicans and harlots were going into the kingdom before their eyes; and, when asked "**where his** kingdom was," he answered, that it was "among them"—upon the soil of Judea, although the Jews did not apprehend it.

But since the kingdom can not exist without one or more of its integral parts, or constituencies, then there must have been **one** Church, at least, in existence "from the days of John the Baptist," and that one was the only manifestation of the kingdom until other churches were multiplied; and during this period the church visible, and the "kingdom of Christ," were one and the same institution, and practically synonymous terms.

The Christian Church, in connection with the kingdom of Christ, may be considered as a progressive institution, and developed in three periods:

I. In its **inchoate**, or formative period, embracing the period from the ministry of John the Baptist until the close of the first Pentecost after the ascension of Christ.

During this period, the little stone was cut out of the mountain without hands—creative agency—and commenced rolling onward toward the image which symbolized all earthly opposing kingdoms (Dan. ii). During this period the little mustard seed germinated, and blade and stalk, with its tender branches and leaves, appeared in the garden of Judea; but the time of its blossoming, and full expansion into tree-form and fruitage, was not yet, but it was none the less “a mustard tree,” or plant.

When Æneas, with his handful of heroes, having escaped from burning Troy, and the disasters of the sea, reached the Lavinian shore, and established his kingly jurisdiction, that little band was as much a Roman kingdom as it was when the legions of Cæsar had conquered all the known world.

Baptists have been tauntingly asked to show the semblance of a Church or kingdom of Christ before the days of Pentecost; and some of our writers have strangely conceded that there was neither before Pentecost. I think a kingdom can be found; and, if a kingdom, then a church, since the former can not exist without the latter. Let us carefully examine the inspired records.

John was sent to make ready a people prepared for the Lord, and he had a people in readiness for his Master, and the Lord accepted them and associated them as his disciples. In this body of disciples, under the authority of Christ, and obedient to his authority, we find all the elements of a Christian Church, viz.: Called out from the world by conversion and baptism, associated in a visible body according to the direction of Christ their only Head and King, and submitting in all things to his authority. This was Christ’s Church in its inceptive state; and John applied to it the very name given it in the Apocalypse of Christ—the Bride (Rev. xxi: 9); that is, one day to be “the Lamb’s wife.” The name Christ ere long gave to this body of disciples was significant—an assembly; a body that could, and **must often**, be assembled in one place for worship, and the transaction of business. He several times assembled these disciples before he gave them the title of his “assembly”—Church.

The first full church-meeting—a gathering together of his disciples into one place for general instruction – is recorded by Matthew (v:1):

“And seeing the multitude, he went up into a mountain, and having sat down his **disciples** came unto him, and he opened his mouth and taught **them**, saying.”

These “disciples” were not the twelve apostles, nor yet the seventy merely, for **they** had not yet been chosen from the whole body, but the multitude of his disciples. So Alford:

“The disciples, in the **wider sense**, including those of the apostles already **called**, and **all** who had, either for a longer or shorter time, attached themselves to him as hearers. **The discourse was spoken directly to the disciples,**” etc.

Here, then, is a **real church** meeting; a visible assembly of men, possessing certain qualifications, called out from the **oklos** (multitude) for a specific purpose, and this is the essential signification of ecclesia in Greek. We may add an organized assembly since they recognized the supreme authority of Christ over them. At this first general meeting of his disciples, which soon after he named his **ecclesia**—his assembly, church—he instructed them touching their individual Christian duties, and clearly indicated their mission as his assembly.

“Ye are the **light of the world**—a city set on a hill. Let your light so shine that men, seeing your good works, may glorify your Father who is in heaven.”

This I consider Christ’s first great commission to his Church, and by which he made it the great missionary agency for the gospel enlightenment of the whole world; for it was of the whole world he constituted his church to be the light.

Here was a **Church**, of which Christ was the living present Head, and the source of all law and government: but as yet there were no commissioned officers, since the apostles, nor the seventy were chosen for some time after this. (See Matt. ix: 9.)

The second general gathering together of his disciples into one place was by a special summons. Luke thus records it (vi: 12)—

“And it came to pass in those days, that he went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God. And when it was day, he called [summoned] his disciples [the whole body of them] to him....And having chosen from them twelve, whom he called also apostles. And having come down with them, he stood on a plain, and a **company of his disciples** [not all in this instance] and a great multitude of people from all Judea, etc., etc. And he lifted up his eyes on his disciples and said, Blessed are ye, poor ones: for yours is the kingdom of God.”

Those disciples at this time alone composed the kingdom of God, and it was indeed literally theirs, being entirely of them.

“After this (Luke x) Christ appointed seventy other [officers], and sent them, two by two, before his face into every place whether he himself was about to come.”

It is not much to infer that after these two general meetings of the whole or main body of the disciples, and the appointment of officers, that his disciples would understand Christ should he call them his **assembly**, and as constituting the **kingdom** which, as Messiah, he was to set up on this earth. This was soon formally announced:

“And I also say unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my assembly—church—and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the **kingdom** of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven,” etc.

There was a kingdom and a church in existence at this time, but not as separate organizations; for the kingdom included the church and the church composed the kingdom.

Soon after this the Lawgiver delivers to his church the fundamental law for dealing with all **personal** offenses among the members, which has never been modified or abrogated; and the giving of this law and the express mention of the body of his disciples as a **church**, puts it beyond all question that there was an organization at this time, since laws imply and necessitate organization.

The third general meeting of the brethren of his ecclesia was after his resurrection, where, at a place he appointed before his death, he met more than five hundred brethren at one time. (1 Cor. xv:6.)

The number with Christ as witness of his ascension is not told, but it seems that one hundred and twenty upon their return, held a church meeting in an upper room in Jerusalem, where they, by popular vote, elected Matthias to fill the place left vacant by the death of Judas.

The body of brethren which Christ had three times gathered into an assembly, and had designated as his church, and spoken of as his kingdom, the Holy Spirit expressly calls a church after the ascension of Christ. We have not the slightest intimation that there was the least

modification made in its organization, much less that a new and unheard of body was originated by the apostles. To the body which Christ left, the three thousand were added by baptism on the day of Pentecost; and it was to the church **then existing** that the saved were added daily for some time afterward. The closing days of this period were marked by great activity, since it entered with the zeal of a new convert upon the work assigned it by its risen Head; the gospel was preached, converts baptized in large numbers, and the Lord's Supper observed, the doctrine of the apostles steadfastly adhered to, and brotherly love abounded. Let this be borne in mind, that before the days of Pentecost and the great revival that marked those days, a church was in existence, and **that no church was organized during the days of Pentecost or afterwards in the city of Jerusalem**, and that this body of disciples constituted the kingdom of Christ during this period.

The Second Period of church development and extension of the kingdom of Christ, embraces the whole intervening space between the close of the first Pentecost, after the ascension, and the second advent and coronation of Christ upon the throne or his father David as "King of kings and Lord of lords." It is during this second period that the mustard plant of the last "becomes a great tree, so that the fowls of the air lodge in its branches"—that the prophetic stone reaches the feet of the image (Dan ii), crushes them and breaks the image in pieces.

Space does not allow me to trace at any length the development of the church Christ left on earth. We soon see it again exercising its democratic principles in electing seven deacons (Acts vi), to take the ministry of its **temporal** affairs that its ministers may the more fully give themselves to their **spiritual** vocations; and a little further on we see the church at Antioch clothed with, and exercising the full prerogatives of a complete and independent church, empowered to ordain and commission two of its members to go forth as foreign missionaries to carry the glad news of salvation into Asia and Greece.

The relation of the kingdom to the churches of Christ is thus indicated by Dr. Harvey in his late work, "*The Church*:"

"The church—[i.e. churches] is the visible, earthly form of the kingdom of Christ, and is the divine organization appointed for its advancement and triumph. Organized and governed by the laws of the invisible king, and composed of the subjects of the heavenly kingdom, who, by the symbol of fealty, have publicly professed allegiance to him, the church[es] fitly represents that kingdom. Hence the apostles in receiving authority to establish, under divine inspiration, the form and order of the church, received 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' Whenever they gathered disciples they organized a church; and at their death they left this as a distinctive and only visible form of the kingdom of Christ on earth."—pp. 24-25.

The Third Period of the church's history, in connection with the extension of Christ's kingdom, will commence with the coronation and enthronement of Christ as the "One whose right it is to rule," the subjugation of all the nations of earth to his absolute dominion, and the association of all his saints, now fully redeemed and glorified, with himself as heirs and joint heirs with himself in the government of the nation as kings and priests.

The following scriptures refer to the kingdom in its third universal and glorious extension—Luke ix: 27; xxii: 16, 18; Acts xiv: 22; 1 Cor. vi:9; xiii: 50; Rev. xii: 10; xi: 15; Matt. xiii: 41; xvi: 28; 2 Tim. iv: 1.

The Stone of Prophecy (Dan. ii) now becomes the great mountain [government] and fills the whole earth. The subjects of the kingdom in the former periods now inherit it, and become associated with their king in the administration of its government. All the nations and kingdoms of earth, as such, will become and constitute the kingdom of our Lord, and the subjects over

whom the saints, with Christ, rule and reign. (Dan. vii: 27; Rev. v: 10; xx:6.) Now will be fulfilled that prophecy “when the mountain [government] of the Lord’s House shall be established on the tops of the mountains [over all governments], and all nations shall flow unto it.” (Isa. ii: 2.)

It now remains to gather up the ground truths of the above standard authors, and construct a definition of kingdom of Christ that will be in accord with the teachings of scripture.

Dr. Williams says that “each local church is an **integral** portion of the kingdom.”

Dr. Taylor: “That the baptized alone are in the kingdom.”

Dr. Gardner: That all the true churches of Christ are in the kingdom of Christ.

Dr. Fish: The churches are the **executives** of the laws of the kingdom, and of course are in it. We must suppose he meant all the visible churches.

Dr. Harvey: That the church is the earthly form of the kingdom of Christ. The church fully represents that kingdom.

This, then, must be the definition to embrace all these propositions.

The kingdom of Christ, of God, of heaven, is constituted of the sum total of all his true visible churches as constituents, which churches are the sole judges and executives of the laws and ordinances of the kingdom.

From this we learn:

1. That all the officers, save the king, belong to the **churches**, and receive their authority to officiate from the churches.

2. That the churches being entrusted with the administration of the laws and ordinances, they must be administered under their supervision and upon their fellowship, since they can not delegate their trusts to others.

3. That, by baptism, we become citizens of the kingdom of Christ, only because it introduces us into one of its constituents—a local church—just as we become a citizen of this Republic only by becoming a citizen of some one of its constituents—a State.

4. We learn that all our church rights, privileges, and franchises are limited to the particular church of which we are members, as those of a citizen are limited to the State of which he is a citizen. Nor can one church constitutionally extend her franchises or privileges to persons without and beyond her jurisdiction, any more than one State can extend her franchises to citizens of other States.

5. That since the Supper is one of the ordinances, and committed to the guardianship and administration of each local church, no member of another church has the least right or title to partake of it only in the church of which he is a member; **since Christ has not given him the right**, and since Christ has not authorized his churches to legislate so as to change, in the least particular, his appointments, they can not grant, under the plea of “courtesy” or fellowship, a right or privilege which he has, for wise purposes, withheld.

OBJECTION.—That the kingdom of Christ had not come during the ministry of Christ, is evident from the prayer He taught his disciples to pray, which we call “The Lord’s Prayer.”

ANSWER.—Christ did not teach his disciples to pray that his Messianic kingdom might come—the prayer has no allusion to his kingdom—but that the Father’s kingdom might come and embrace this ruined earth as it now does the heavens.

Often we mislead ourselves by our misreading. The Prayer begins thus:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. **Thy kingdom** come. Thy will be done in earth as it is done in heaven.

When this prayer is answered, **God's** will will be done on this earth as it is in heaven, and then earth will be heaven. This will take place at the close of Christ's mediatorial reign with his saints on this earth, when he shall have consummated the work he undertook to do in the covenant of redemption—have redeemed and regenerated the whole physical earth (Rom. viii:) making new heavens and a new earth (2 Pet. iii:) and have redeemed and saved enough of Adam's race to people it. "Then (Paul tells us) cometh the end when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he [Christ] must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet." (1 Cor. xv: 24.)

It is for this ultimate triumph, and the ample re-establishment of the prestine kingdom of the Father over this earth, that Christ taught his disciples to desire and to pray in that prayer; and it is what every child of God does desire, and for which he should pray.