

# THE WORD OF TRUTH

OTIS Q. SELLERS, Editor October, 1958

## VOL. XV, NO. 4

\*\*\*\*\*

### Table of Contents

- \* What Does Basileia Mean
- \* The Foundation of The World
  - \* In Addition
  - \* His Feet Shall Stand
  - \* He Has Come
- \* The Editor To His Friends

\*\*\*\*\*

## WHAT DOES *BASILEIA* MEAN

If the reader will permit, I would like to introduce him to a large and very interesting family of New Testament Greek words. These words are related because they all have the same progenitor. The element *basil* is found in each one of them. They are *basileia*, *basileus*, *basileion*, *basileios*, *basileuo*, *basilikos*, *basilissa*, and *sumbasileuo*. Other members of this family are found in Classical Greek writings, but these are not of primary interest to us. In the N.T. these words occur and are translated as follows:

*Basileia*-162 times, translated kingdom 161 times and reigneth one time. (See Rev. 17:18)

*Basileus*-118 times, translated king each time.

*Basileion*-1 time, translated king's court in Luke 7:25.

*Basileios*-1 time, translated royal in I Pet. 2:9.

*Basileuo*-21 times, translated reign 20, and king 1 time (I Tim.6:15) .

*Basilikos*-5 times, translated nobleman 2, royal 2, and king's country 1 time (See Acts 12:21)

*Basilissa*-4 times, translated queen each time.

*Sumbasileuo*-2 times, translated reign with in I Cor. 4:8 and II Tim. 2:12.

It is the first two words listed above, *basileia* and *basileus*, that are of primary interest to us in this study. It is said that the first of these means "kingdom" and the second means "king." With this I am willing to declare my wholehearted agreement, providing that all who seek the truth will try to come to an honest agreement as to what the words "king" and "kingdom" mean.

Some may scoff at this, insisting that the meaning of *king* and *kingdom* are so simple, so fixed, so well established by usage that it is casting dust into the air to ask what these words mean. However,

the learned editors of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* would hardly agree with them. They say:

**KING**, a title, in its actual use generally implying sovereignty of the most exalted rank. Any inclusive definition of the word "king" is, however, impossible. It always implies sovereignty, but in no special degree or sense; *e.g.*, the sovereigns of the British Empire and of Siam are both kings, and so too, at least in popular parlance, are the chiefs of many barbarous people, *e.g.*, the Zulus. The use of the title is, in fact, involved in considerable confusion, largely the result of historic causes. It is used to translate the Homeric *anax* equally with the Athenian *basileus* or the Roman *rex*. Yet the Homeric "kings" were but tribal chiefs; while the Athenian and Roman kings were kings in something more than the modern sense, as supreme priests as well as supreme rulers and lawgivers. In the English Bible, too, the title of king is given indiscriminately to the great king of Persia and to potentates who were little more than oriental sheikhs.

In view of these facts it is certainly an illogical assumption for anyone to say that a first century Greek reading the New Testament would get the same idea when he came upon *basileus* that the present day Britisher or American does when he hears the word "king."

If the corresponding Hebrew word (*melek*) is considered along with its Chaldee counterpart it will be found to be a term applied to anyone who was in a place of absolute authority over men. A *meleik* had no peer among the men who composed his state or group and none was above him. When any body of men came to a final head in one man or being, the term *melek* was used of him. It was used of God, and it was also used of tribal chiefs who may not have ruled more than a hundred men.

It seems that there are some who think that if a ruler wore a crown, sat on a throne, and wore expensive robes that he was then called *melek* or king, but this designation was never connected with the accouterments of a ruler. If his government was absolute, then the governor was called *melek*.

In the days when Israel first came out of Egypt, Jehovah reserved the monarchical position for Himself.

The word *monarchy* signifies the sovereignty, the rule, the government of a single person, the supreme power of a single person in a state, or the undivided rule of a single person. The word comes from the Greek *monos* alone, and *archon* ruler. Hence this term can only be properly applied to states in which the supreme authority is vested in a single person, the monarch, who in his own right is the permanent head of the state. Today this word is used somewhat loosely of states ruled over by hereditary sovereigns, and to justify this misuse of the term, men have invented certain phrases such as "limited monarchy" or "constitutional monarchy" but these are a contradiction and they make no sense semantically. One may as well speak of a powerless potentate as to speak of a limited monarchy.

The term *melek* is found more than 2,500 times in the Old Testament. It is translated "king" in almost every occurrence, but if these occurrences are examined it will be found that it is applied only to those who were monarchs in the truest sense of this word. They may not have worn a metallic crown, they may not have gone through an elaborate inauguration ceremony called coronation, they may not have been of so-called royal birth, but they were called *melek* if their rule was absolute.

This word was never used of Moses, Joshua, or any of the Judges in Israel. The position which this word described was reserved by Jehovah for Himself, and He governed through Moses, Joshua, and the Judges. This was why the sin of Israel was so great when they said to Samuel:

**Make us a king to judge us like all the nations. I Sam. 8:5.**

The nations had rulers who were "permitted to walk after their own ways." Being free to do so,

they could yield to the wishes and desires of the people under them. They could repeal unpopular laws and replace them with laws more acceptable. The leaders in Israel could not do this, since they were not monarchs. Israel wanted a king to judge them *like other nations*. To this God answered:

**Harken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign (be king) over them. I Sam. 8:7.**

In seeking for an honest English symbol or word that will correctly represent the word *melek* and make plain what it means I have used the some what neutral terms of *governor* or *ruler*. I do not say that I would translate it this way. I simply say that this is the way I understand it. These words being neutral it is possible to read into them the exact ideas set forth in the word *melek* as used in the Old Testament. A governor or ruler can have supreme authority and be a monarch in the true meaning of this word.

However, it seems there are some who think that "king" and "kingdom" are divine words given by inspiration and any failure to use them of Jesus Christ is to "rob the Savior of His Crown rights." We are further told "that God's conception of rule is still as it has always been, a Kingdom."

It does not seem that God's conception of rule in the days of Moses, Joshua, the Judges, or even in the time of Saul was "a kingdom." Nevertheless, I am inclined to agree that God's program for His coming rule of the earth is to be a kingdom, providing we can agree upon the meaning of the word. Furthermore, I do not think that God's word for a monarch is the English word "king." We can raise no objection if some should say emperor, czar, kaiser, sultan, or shah. They would be following their customary titles, even as the British do in the word "king."

In the N.T. the word *basileus* follows the same pattern as the word *melek*. This is to be expected since they are used interchangeably by the Holy Spirit. In the 118 occurrences of this word, translated "king" each time, it always signifies a monarch whose authority within his realm is absolute. Some may be inclined to question this in the cases of King Herod and King Agrippa, but their authority was supreme in their own realms over their subjects. A Roman citizen could appeal from them to Caesar, but their own subjects could not.

However, it is the word *basileia* that attracts our attention at this point. As stated before, this word occurs 162 times in the N.T. and is translated "kingdom" in all but one occurrence. I make no objection at all to using the word kingdom as a translation of *basi/eia*. This is an abstract word, not a concrete term, and according to present day usages can best be represented by our word government.

The English word kingdom has gone through many transitions and has ended up not meaning much more than a country whose ceremonial chief is called a king. This too is the result of historical causes. The word itself is inclined to reveal its original and true meaning.

The suffix *dom* comes from *doom*, a word which originally meant a statute, law, decree or judgment, and a king's doom was nothing more than a king's laws, decrees, statutes, and judgments, that is, a king's government. It was only natural that this word would be transferred to a territory or country over which the king's laws held sway, but this was not the original meaning.

In view of this I understand the term "the kingdom of God" to mean the government of God, that is, God's government. If I am wrong in this, then let someone marshal the facts which will disprove it. I refuse to be swayed by the emotional argument that in believing this I am "trifling with the crown rights of Him who comes 'to reign' and to 'sit upon a throne' " as has been charged. The kingdom of God is the government of God, manifested in the person of Christ, creating and developing a people governed by Him, and resulting in realms in which the power of His government is seen and realized. As Gustaf Dalman has said: "No doubt can be entertained that both in the Old Testament and in Jewish literature *malekuth*, when applied to God, means always the

kingly rule, never the kingdom as if it meant to suggest the territory governed by Him." And as E. W. Bullinger has said: "We quite understand that *basileia*, kingdom, means not the material country or the subjects, but the *sovereignty* or *administrative* rule of the King."

There are certain clear illustrations of this abstract meaning of *basileia* in the New Testament. When Jesus came to Jerusalem, many thought that the kingdom of God was to appear immediately. He told them of a nobleman who went into a far country to receive *basileia* and then to return. His subjects hated him and sent an embassy after him saying they did not want this man to reign over them. When the nobleman returned having obtained his *basileia*, he at once exercised his new authority by rewarding the faithful and punishing the rebellious. It is evident here that the *basileia* he received was neither land nor people, but the authority to govern in the land over its people (Luke 19: 11-27).

In saying that ***basileia* means government**, I intend that the word government shall mean all that it rightfully can mean, especially so when it is found in such terms as the government of God. The word *govern* (which means etymologically, to steer as a pilot) may imply any kind of power or authority over men exercised for the purpose of keeping all those (or that) which is directed or controlled in a straight course or in a smooth operation, where perils are avoided and the good of the individual or of the whole is achieved. This includes the power to lay down laws which shall determine the actions of others or to issue commands which must be obeyed. If this is done by a monarch, then that monarch is truly reigning. The one who does not govern does not reign.

Due to the fact that most sovereigns today are ceremonial heads of states, a distinction has been imagined between ruling and reigning. Man would like to attach to the word *reign* the idea of "living regally," but this distinction will not fit into the Word of God. True, the word *reign* is used as a figure of speech as in I Cor. 4:8 but this does not alter its literal meaning. To reign is to rule, and the king who does not rule, does not reign.

A comparison of Hebrews 1:8 with Psalm 45:6 will show that the Greek word *basileia* and the Hebrew word *malekuth* are exact equivalents. The word *malekuth* is translated (combining both the Hebrew and Chaldee forms) kingdom 95 times, realm 7 times, reign 25 times, royal 14 times, kingly and empire one time each. In view of the fact that these words are used interchangeably by the Holy Spirit, the proper procedure is to find what the Hebrew word means, then carry this meaning into the New Testament word. A study of all passages will show that the idea of government is found in every passage and in many of them no other thought is possible. Examples of these have been given in Vol. XII, No.6, of THE WORD OF TRUTH. An additional pertinent example will be apropos here.

**The Lord hath prepared His throne in the heavens; and His kingdom ruleth over all. Psalm 103:19.**

In interpreting this passage I understand the Lord to be Jehovah; His throne to mean not some ornamental chair but the seat and center of government; His kingdom to mean not the realm ruled but the government, for here it is the kingdom that rules; and ruleth to mean to have dominion or authority. In view of this, I would paraphrase this passage as follows:

Jehovah has established His throne in the heavens, and His government has dominion over all.

To have dominion is one thing, and to take and exercise that dominion is another thing. The exercise of dominion or authority is government. In Revelation we read of the great peon of praise that bursts from the lips of the twenty-four elders:

**We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to' come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. Rev. 11:17.**

The word *ebasileusas*, here translated "hast reigned," is the aorist and should read "dost reign" or "didst begin to reign." But no matter how we translate the aorist here, we have positive proof that the Lord is reigning before His second coming. In the order of events His second coming for the thousand year reign takes place later. Therefore, He will be reigning as King of this earth before He comes back again.

Commentators on Revelation who insist that there can be no kingdom until the king is upon the earth have a way of jumping over and ignoring this passage in their writings: Little wonder since this is such a strong argument for the reign of Christ from heaven before He comes back to reign upon the earth.

As a concluding statement, in regard to which I do not want to be too dogmatic, I would like to say that all believers need to exercise care lest they be found trying to decorate Christ with some human tinsel. I may be wrong, but I do not feel that Jesus Christ will ever wear a metallic tiara studded with gems, commonly called a crown. Neither do I feel that He will be found sitting in some highly ornamented and gilded chair called a throne. I recently made a study of human thrones and crowns and was surprised at what I found. Solomon's throne was of ivory overlaid with the best gold. There were two figures of lions at the sides, with two other lions at each of the six steps. There was not the like of it in any kingdom. See I Kings 10:18-20. A throne such as this probably added quite a bit to Solomon's glory and it gave him pleasure when he sat upon it. The Persian throne made for Abbas the Great was of white marble. This monarch in 1605 presented a throne to the Russian Tsar Boris, covered with sheets of gold and decorated with precious stones and pearls. One of the glories of Delhi, until it was sacked by Nadir Shah, was the peacock throne, which was ascended by silver steps and stood on golden feet set with jewels. It was adorned with two open peacocks' tails composed of magnificent diamonds, rubies and other stones. A pretentious display such as this probably added much to the glory of the little men who sat upon it, but not even a throne greater than the peacock throne could add one whit to the glory of Jesus Christ.

I doubt if Jesus Christ will ever wear any crown made of metal and set with gems. This statement is made in full recognition of the fact that it says "on His head were many crowns" (Rev. 19:12). The very idea of "many crowns" upon His head is enough to suggest the need of further study.

**The End**

\*\*\*\*\*

## ***THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD***

The phrase "the foundation of the world" is found ten times in the King James Version of the New Testament. Most commentators seem to treat this as if it meant nothing more than the creation of the earth as recorded in Genesis 1: 1, but other more meticulous students of the Bible are convinced that it does not mean this and they have set themselves to the task of discovering what it does mean. Such efforts are almost sure to result in numerous divergent opinions. It could also be that none of these opinions are the final and definitive truth. Yet they could all be steps toward final truth if it were not for the fact that an opinion is apt to become the fixed tenet of a group, firmly held by all members of that group, and anyone who dares to examine or even question this is declared to be a heretic who must be shunned.

In order to follow this study, the reader will need to have some degree of familiarity with the ten

passages in which this phrase is found. This can be gained by the simple expedient of careful reading, therefore these passages will be quoted in full.

**That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world. Matt. 13:35.**

**Then shall the King say unto them on His right hand, Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Matt. 25:34.**

**That the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation. Luke 11:50.**

**Father, I will that they also, whom thou has given Me, be with Me where I am; that they may behold My glory, which thou hast given Me, for thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world. John 17:24.**

**According as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love. Eph. 1:4.**

**For we which have believed do enter into rest, as He said, As I have sworn in My wrath, if they shall enter into My rest: although the works were finished from the foundation of the world. Heb. 4:3.**

**For then must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. Heb. 9:26.**

**Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you. I Peter 1:20.**

**And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. Rev. 13:8.**

**The beast that thou sawest was, and is not; and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition: and they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world, when they behold the beast that was, and is not, and yet is. Rev. 17:8.**

The careful reader will have noted that all the occurrences of *foundation of the world* are preceded either by the word *before* or the word *from* (or, since). This is in harmony with the Greek. Thus in a cursory examination we find that certain truths were kept secret from the foundation of the world (Matt. 13:35); that the kingdom was prepared for certain people before the foundation of the world (Matt. 25:34); that blood of the prophets was shed from the foundation of the world (Luke 11:50); that the Father loved the Son before the foundation of the world (John 17:24); that a company of people were chosen in Him before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1:4); that certain words of God were finished from the foundation of the world (Heb. 4:3); that if Christ had offered Himself many times He would have suffered often from the foundation of the world (Heb. 9:26); that Christ was foreordained before the foundation of the world (I Pet. 1:20); and that the names of some were not written in the book of life since the foundation of the world (Rev. 13:8 and 17:8). In Rev. 13:8, I

understand the title of the book to be "The Book of Life of the Lamb Slain", and *from the foundation of the world* to refer to *names not written*.

Every one of these passages lays a very heavy burden upon the honest interpreter of the Sacred Scriptures. These are difficult and obscure statements, and anyone who underestimates the problems imposed in interpreting these passages stamps himself as an untrustworthy expositor. It can be seen at once that whatever meaning we give to "the foundation of the world" it must be one which will not be repugnant to the passages in which it is found. It should enlighten and explain these passages, not add to their obscurity. The meaning of this phrase must make sense when that meaning is read into the passages where it is found.

The phrase "before the foundation of the world" *is* just three words in the Greek, *pro kataboles kosmou*, and the phrase "from (or, since) the foundation of the world" *is* also three words in the Greek, *apo kataboles kosmou*.

More than twenty years ago I was attracted by a statement in *The Companion Bible* (Appendix 146) that the first of these refers "to the Mystery and *is* connected with the purpose of God" and that the other refers to the kingdom and *is* connected with "the counsels of God." Being a lover of sharp distinctions and right divisions, I tried for several years to understand this but finally gave *it* up as hopeless. It *is* quite evident that the three occurrences of "before the foundation" are connected with the love of the Father for Christ (John 17:24), with the choice of certain believers to be "holy and without blame before Him" (Eph. 1:4), and with the fact that the sacrificial work of Christ was foreknown before the foundation (I Pet. 1:20).

Nevertheless, I did at that *time* accept from *The Companion Bible* the idea that *katabole* meant "casting 'down" or "overthrow", and that each occurrence of this word in connection with *kosmos* (world) is a reference to that cataclysm which must have taken place to bring about the condition of the earth described in Genesis 1: 2 (without form and void). As this event will be referred to quite often in this study, a word here concerning it will be apropos.

In Genesis 1:1 we read of creation and in Genesis 1:2 we read of chaos. The superficial reader is apt to think that God created a chaos, but this cannot be. Moses describes the earth as "without form" (*tohu*), and Isaiah tells us that God created *it* not in vain (*tohu*) Isa.45:18. There is no contradiction here, since the word translated "was" in Genesis 1: 2 donates *became* and should read, "And the earth became a chaos and vacant." Thus we know that the earth as created in Gen. 1:1 was not created in the condition described in Genesis 1:2. Between these two verses there was a cataclysm of some kind.

That there was a great cataclysm which brought about profound physical changes in the earth, resulting in the earth becoming "without form and void" is not in question in this study. I have held this to be the truth and declared it as the truth for almost forty years. Throughout this study it will be referred to as *the disruption*. There are those who hold that every occurrence of *kataboles kosmou* in the New Testament is a reference to this disruption, telling us of things that happened before the disruption and things that happened since the disruption.

There are some who think that the whole matter is settled if it is shown that *katabole* could mean disruption or overthrow or that it does actually signify this. This is not so, for even if it could be shown that this word means overthrow, casting down, disruption and nothing else, the passages in which it is found would still not speak of that disruption that took place between the first two verses of Genesis. Such an interpretation stultifies every passage and will not make sense in any of them. This may seem to be a harsh statement but the truth of it can be demonstrated.

Admitting, for the sake of the discussion, that this phrase does refer to the pre-Adamic disruption, then the first reference in the New Testament would have to do with truths that were kept secret since the disruption. This would seem to indicate that the truths set forth in the parables were open and known before the disruption, then locked up and sealed when the disruption took place, but made known again through the ministry of Jesus Christ. If this is not what it means then the statement is meaningless, for it would have been enough to say that they were "kept secret" without setting some time or event from which they were kept secret. If the truths set forth in parables were known before the disruption, then the kingdom was in view and part of the divine plan at that time. How then can the kingdom be something that was planned since the disruption, as so many insist? Thus the whole matter is highly confused, and the confusion increases when we learn that the word *world* (*kosmos*) is omitted here by most textual critics.

In the next reference (Matt. 25:34) we would have the idea of certain faithful nations being invited to participate in a kingdom made ready for them since the disruption. To say that the kingdom was made ready "since the disruption" would certainly be pointing out the obvious. I fail to see how this statement can have any meaning if *katabo/es kosmou* means the cataclysm that disrupted the pre-Adamic earth.

The third occurrence (Luke 11:50) would speak of the blood of all the prophets which has been shed since the disruption of the original creation. Inasmuch as Abel was the first prophet, as Luke 11:51 indicates, it seems strange that the dating here would go back even beyond the creation of Adam. Since no prophets existed between the disruption and Abel, it seems meaningless to speak of prophets whose blood was shed "from the disruption:

The next occurrence (John 17:24) would make Christ to say that the Father loved Him before the disruption of the world. This makes no sense at all to me. While this may be due to my inability to understand, it cannot be charged to any unwillingness on my part. I cannot see any connection between the love of God for Christ and the disruption that caused the earth to become a chaos. One could take any event in the Word of God and say that the Father loved Christ before it, and one could go right on to say that He loved Christ just the same after it. If I should declare that I loved my wife before we were married, it would make some sense, since there is a definite relation between love and marriage; but if I should say that I loved her before I wrecked my automobile, or before our house was torn down, it would make no sense, there being no possible connection between my love for her and these things. Even so, at present, I am unable to see any relationship between God's love for Christ and the pre-Adamic disruption of the earth.

The next passage (Eph. 1:4) would then say that we were chosen in Christ before that cataclysm that made the earth waste and empty. This may make sense to some who have swallowed without thinking the Calvinistic theories of election and predestination, but it makes no sense to me. I did not even exist when that cataclysm took place. In every instance when the Bible speaks of God electing men, choosing them, foreordaining them, or predestinating them, it speaks of something which God does in the lifetime of these individuals. Any choice that God makes of you or of me is related to the service we will perform, and that choice will be made during our lifetime. This, of necessity, would make this *kataboles kosmou* (whatever it may mean) to be something that is still future.

The remaining passages give the same evidence as those already examined. Not a single statement made in any passage where "the foundation of the world" is found has any relationship or bearing upon the disruption that took place between the first two verses of Genesis.

One thing that might cause the student to approach the study of "the foundation of the world" with



strong misconception is the fact that in all ten occurrences of this term the definite article is found both before "foundation" and "world." This would seem to indicate that one definite event and only one event can be "the foundation of the world." This would probably be true if the definite articles were found in the Greek text. As a matter of fact, in the Greek there are no definite articles in any of the occurrences, the exact Greek words being *kataboles kosmou*. These words, therefore, could refer to a number of events, some past and some future. I reject the idea that these words can refer to only one event. It is evident that any understanding of this phrase is going to depend to a certain extent on discovering what *katabole* means.

### What Does *Katabole* Mean

In seeking the meaning of any Greek word which is in dispute, every possible approach should be tried. To me, a basic approach is to break the word up into its elements, then analyze these.

The word *katabole* is formed of two words, *kata* and *ballo*. There is no question but that *kata* means down. However, this simple definition has led many to go wrong. We are apt to think of *down* as signifying the opposite of *up*. The word *kata* is found 481 times in the New Testament and is translated "down" only three times. This is because this word does not mean *down* as the opposite of *up*. It is translated "according to" 107 times. This is a much better indication of its true meaning which is "down along" in the sense of according to or parallel with. This meaning is seen in our own familiar phrases such as down the street, down the aisle, or down the path. The street or floor may be perfectly level, but we say "down" because we move along certain fixed lines, that is, according to the lines of the buildings that make the street, or the seats that make the aisle.

The word *ballo* means to **cast**. Out of 125 occurrences in the New Testament it is rendered cast 86 times, put 13, thrust 5, cast out 4, lay 3, lie 2, and 12 other miscellaneous renderings. Having considered all occurrences in this context, I would declare emphatically that we would make a serious mistake if we read into this word the idea of a forcible or violent throwing or casting. Such meaning would have to come from the context in which the word is found as no such meaning is inherent in it.

Consider the following occurrences of *ballo*.

**Matt. 4:18-casting a net into the sea.**

**Matt. 8: 6 -my servant *lieth* at home sick**

**Matt. 8:14-his wife's mother *laid*, and sick**

**Matt. 9:17-Neither *do* men *po/t* new wine into**

**Matt. 27:16-for *to* put them into the treasury**

**Mark 12:42-she *threw* in two mites**

**John 5:7-to *put* me into the pool**

**John 13:5-He *poureth* water into a basin**

**Jas. 3:3-we *put* bits in the horses' mouths**

**Rev. 6:13-as a fig tree *casteth* her untimely figs**

All these passages, and many more, indicate a very gentle casting or throwing.

Another student could just as easily set forth an equal number of passages that indicate a violent and forcible casting, but such a list would only prove my contention, not disprove it. I insist that if the casting is forcible or gentle it must be indicated by the action described in the sentence in which *ballo* is found. The ideas of gentleness or violence are not inherent in the word. It can be used of

both types of action.

Thus it is that judging from the two words that are combined to make up the word *katabole*, and judging from the New Testament usage of these words, it would seem to indicate a casting, laying, or placing along certain fixed lines, that is, to give something a fixed form or position along certain fixed or predetermined lines.

The second step to be taken in determining the meaning of a N.T. Greek word is to see if it can be found in some sentence where its meaning is indicated by the context. The word *katabole* occurs eleven times, and since ten of these occurrences do not clearly indicate what it means, this leaves us with one reference where it does not seem that disrupt, overthrow, or casting down can possibly be the meaning. This passage is Hebrew 11:11 where it is translated "conceive."

**Through faith also Sara herself received strength to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child when she was past age. Heb. 11:11.**

I can see no meaning in this except that Sarah received ability and strength for laying down a seed along a line that God had fixed. God had declared in advance that it was to be a male. This is not the place to attempt a full interpretation of this passage. It is sufficient for this study to say that it shows that *katabole* here does not mean a disruption or overthrow. It is translated "founding" in this passage by Rotherham and Cunnington.

Our next step will be to consider other forms of this word in the New Testament. The noun *katabole* is derived from the verb *kataballo* which, according to the *Englishman's Greek Concordance*, is found three times, as follows:

**II Cor. 4:9-cast down, but not destroyed**

**Hebrews 6:1-not laying again the foundation**

**Rev. 12:10-the accuser of our brethren is cast down**

A quick glance at these references could easily lead to false conclusions, so we must reserve any final judgment for a closer examination.

In II Cor. 4:9 Paul's statement *is* that he was "laid down" not thrown or cast down. This *is* one of four contrasts: afflicted, but not distressed; perplexed, but not despairing; persecuted, but not forsaken, laid down, but not destroyed. Anyone of these first conditions could easily lead to the other. In fact the second would be the natural and expected result of the first.

To understand "laid down" here we need to note the gradation in this portion. It paints a picture step by step of Paul pressed on every side, but never hemmed in; being at a loss, but never losing out; pursued, but never abandoned; laid down, but not destroyed. Thus he describes his constant experience. Pressed into a narrow place, at a loss which way to flee, chased, caught and laid down. If we seek an example of this in Paul's experience we find it when he was stoned at Lystra as recorded in Acts 14:19.

In all executions there are certain preliminary steps that seem to be associated with them, probably because it is the last thing that takes place. To give the details would be macabre, so it will suffice to mention adjusting the noose when a man dies by hanging, the blind-folding when he faces the firing squad, the strapping in the chair when electrocuted. In stoning the final act was to lay the victim down with chest turned up. This could be with great violence if the victim resisted, but there is no evidence that Paul put up a fight or struggled against it. Such a "laying down" took place in Paul's

life, but he did not perish. The aim was to end his ministry, but it continued the next day as before. In view of these facts, I am convinced that the *kataballo* of II Cor. 4:9 was a laying down, not a casting down or an overthrow.

In the next occurrence of the verb *kataballo* there can be no question but that it means a "laying down" and cannot mean a disruption or overthrow.

**Therefore, leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God. Heb. 6:1.**

In this passage *kataballo* is translated "laying" and is so related to "foundation" (*themelios*) that its significance is plain. Even the most fervent contenders for the idea that it means "overthrow" are forced to admit it means "laying down" here.

The performance of multifarious works which have no relationship to God has always been characteristic of men who know not the true way of worship and service. The Hebrews had been deeply involved in these "dead works," but had put down a good foundation by repenting or yielding in relationship to them. This was an act that need never be repeated. Having laid this foundation, they were not to lay it again.

In Revelation 12:10 we might be inclined to imagine a violent physical action and think of Satan being literally cast out of heaven. Even if this were true, we will need to remember that the word here is not *kataballo*, but simply *ballo*. Although listed in the *Englishman's Greek Concordance* as *kataballo*, all the textual critics are agreed that it should be *ballo*. Most translators supply the word "out" here since it is evident that Satan is "cast out" of heaven.

So far our investigation has been confined to the New Testament, which is as it should be. So far no evidence has been found to support the idea that *katabole* ever means an overthrow or a disruption. All evidence up to this point suggests it means a laying down or a founding. We are now ready to consider other courses.

### **The Septuagint Testimony**

The noun *katabole* is not found in the Septuagint. The verb *kataballo* from which it is derived is found twenty-nine times. Any attempt to try to fix some meaning upon *kataballo* from these occurrences is difficult indeed. The Septuagint translators seem to have been capricious in their use of this word, having used it about twenty times to render the causative conjugation occurrences of the verb *naphal*, but they use eleven other Greek words to render the same form.

In many of the twenty-nine occurrences it is most evident that there is a premeditated purpose in the action, and that the purpose is to lay the thing or person down along certain lines. In II Sam. 20:15 where we read that Joab battered the wall, *to throw it down*, the Hebrew says that he undermined or sapped the wall to cause the wall to fall. If they were careless, the wall could have fallen upon those who were undermining it.

In II Kings 3:19, 25 and 6:5 the word is used of *felling* trees. It makes no difference whether one fells a tree to get rid of it or to use it for lumber, it should be felled or laid down along certain predetermined lines.

Those who insist upon the Septuagint usage that *katabole* means "overthrow" should take the next

logical step and insist that *kosmos* means ornaments, for that is what it does mean in Septuagint usage. There is far too much evidence that the verb means to lay down along certain lines and that the noun means laying down or founding. In every occurrence of *kataboles kosmou* we should begin with the basic truth that it means "world founding" and go on from there to interpret the passages in which it is found.

Since Peter speaks of "the world that then was, being overflowed with water perished" (II Pet. 3:6), it is evident that more than one world is recognized in the Bible. Since the word *kosmos* means basically an order, an arrangement, or a system, it is simple to point to numerous such things in the Bible.

There is the order or arrangement that God laid down in the beginning when God created the heavens and earth.

There is the order that God laid down when He restored the earth and finished the six days' work. Man was central in this order.

There is the order that had to do with human society. This was the order or arrangement that Cain violated when he killed Abel.

There is the new order that followed the flood.

There is the order or arrangement that God founded when He called Abraham and developed the nation of Israel.

There is the order that God established in Israel when He founded the Davidic dynasty.

There is the new order of thing that will yet be when the kingdom of God becomes a reality upon this earth.

All these things have to be considered in interpreting any of the ten passages where *kataboles kosmou* is found. We must in each one determine which world is in view. The understanding of the phrase must come from an understanding of the passage in which it is found. The understanding of the passage must come from the portion in which it is found. The labor involved in this is left to the individual student.

The passage that is of great personal interest to us is the one declaring that God chooses us in Christ before founding His order (Eph. 1:4). I believe that the founding or laying down of this order is future. As surely as God exists, the day is coming when He will take the reins of government in His own hands and the kingdom of God will be a reality upon earth. We have been chosen in advance of the laying down of this order because we are to have a highly exalted place in it.

**The End**

\*\*\*\*\*

***IN ADDITION***

**More on Philippians 3:20**

The Bible student who writes upon things set forth in the Word of God must never say *ne plus ultra* when he has finished an article. This Latin phrase means not more beyond, and it speaks of the uttermost point attainable. This is what Hillary could well have said when he reached the top of

Everest and there was not left one more step higher that he could go. No man has yet reached the summit in regard to any matter that is revealed in the Word of God.

In the previous issue I wrote on Philippians 3:20, but, as in every study, there is always more beyond. The setting down in writing of what is known serves only as a resting place while we wait for the mists to clear so that we can see more steps ahead.

I was giving thought to the character of the Apostle Paul as it is revealed by many inspired statements. As I traced through his epistles these things came to mind. He was intelligent, educated, courageous, confident, unashamed, benign, gentle, polite, gracious, sympathetic, contented, satisfied, honest, humble, strong, and forgiving. Many more could be added, and the student can find passages in Paul's epistles that will prove each aspect of his character that has been listed.

I was seeking for a noun that would sum up and express Paul's character, or for an adjective that would describe it in one word. After much thought it seemed that the only word I could find was the word *urbane*. To check my own understanding of this word I opened my dictionary and found that this word as applied to men means courteous in manner, polite, refined, elegant, cultured. Indeed the Apostle Paul was an urbane man, in the finest and highest meaning of this word.

As a student of words I could not help but note the presence of the element "urb" in urbane. This always has to do with a city, as can be seen in the words *urban* and *suburban*. It became evident at once that the noun *urbanity*, which means the state or quality of being urbane, is an almost exact equivalent of the Greek word *politeuma*, the word translated "conversation" in the KJV of Philippians 3:20. In further study I noted how well this fits into the context of this passage.

In an exceedingly bold statement that precedes this, Paul exhorts the Philippian brethren to be joint-imitators of him, and to be noting those who are thus walking "so as ye have us for an example" (a model). The idea here is "be joint-imitators," not "become." The sense is "ever be" as you now are, and not "get to be" as you have not been hitherto. They are not only exhorted to be jointed together in imitating his manner of conduct and character, but they are also to note those who also walk as they have Paul for a model, since he is one of a great number who are to serve as an example. This is then followed by a parenthetical portion concerning some who walk otherwise, then the matter of walk is resumed in verse 20, which I now translate as follows:

For the urbanity which is ours is inherent among celestials, out from which we are ardently awaiting also a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ. Who will transfigure the body of our humiliation, to conform it to the body of His glory.

Paul's body does not seem to have been equal to his character. The celestials or heavens are looked upon here as a class of beings. Paul's urbanity was not the shallow sophistication that marks the so-called urban of this world. His urbanity was inherent among celestial beings.

**The End**

\*\*\*\*\*

## ***HIS FEET SHALL STAND***

### **A Note on Zechariah 14:4**

It may sound like great fidelity to the Word of God to insist that it is all literally true, but no such statement will ever be made by those who know the true character of God's Word. The statement,

"All flesh is grass" (Isa. 40: 6) is not literally true. We must always exercise care lest we turn figures into facts and thus lose altogether the meaning God intended to convey. Whenever something is said in a peculiar way we must always be alert to check and see if it is fact or figure.

In the statement "And His feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives which is before Jerusalem on the east. . ." (Zach. 14:4) no great damage will be done if we take the statement literally, unless we should go too far and insist that only His feet will stand there and not the Lord Himself. The facts are that His feet have already stood upon the Mount of Olives many times and they may stand upon it many times in the future, so we will experience no problems if we take these words literally. However, we may lose the message God intended to convey.

Many take this to be a reference to the second coming of Christ. They hold that He will descend from heaven until His feet touches the earth at that hallowed spot. However, if one wishes to do so he can make out a good case that this refers to and was fulfilled at His first coming, since much of His earthly ministry was associated with this place. Of course many will say that this cannot be since the balance of the passage, which says "the Mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst" was not fulfilled at that time. But this shows failure to give due consideration to the character of, many Old Testament prophecies. It is a well known fact that in numerous passages part of the prediction has been fulfilled and part still awaits fulfillment. The manner in which the Lord quoted Scripture is proof of this. In Luke he stopped with "the acceptable year of the Lord" in quoting Isaiah 61:1-2 and did not go on to add "the day of the vengeance of our God." In view of this let no one say there could not be a break in Zechariah 14:4.

In regard to this passage we need to face the question, What is meant by "His feet shall stand"? Is this just the same as saying "He shall stand"? It is my own opinion that these words have no reference either to the first or the second coming of Christ, but that they speak of a day to come when the Mount of Olives will in some special manner be "under the feet" of Jesus Christ. In view of the fact that all is to be put "under His feet" there is some special reason why the Mount of Olives is singled out and the statement made that His feet shall stand upon it. This to me means it shall be under His feet.

The Mount of Olives was a piece of ground which was not subject to allotment and could not be bought or sold. In olden times "to have a place for your feet" meant that you possessed a certain spot of land. See Acts 7:5. It seems that God has already announced His purpose to claim the Mount of Olives for Himself, for some special use, when He governs Israel.

**The End**

\*\*\*\*\*

***HE HAS COME***

**A Note on Ezekiel 21:21**

The writer is one who believes and who confesses "that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh" (II John 1:7). The fact that the Son of God has come is a foundational truth that must always be preeminent in our minds when we study the Sacred Scriptures. We must ever guard against putting so much emphasis on the second coming of Christ that we tend to lose sight of the fact that He has already come. We must be careful that we do not force the fact of His second coming into passages which speak of His first coming. This is especially true when we deal with passages in the Old Testament which speak of the second coming of Christ. We must not interpret these as if the first coming of Christ were a meaningless event that could not possibly be considered as a fulfillment of these

prophecies. For example, in **Ezekiel 21:27** we read the words of Jehovah that declare:

**I will overturn, overturn, overturn, it: and it shall be no more, until he comes whose right it is: and I will give it him.**

The context of this passage indicates these words were spoken to Zedekiah, the "profane wicked prince of Israel," at the time of Nebuchadnezzar's invasion. The crown and the diadem were both to be removed, and there was to be a divine overturning until one comes whose right it is to rule, then the government in Israel was to be given to him.

It has been said that these words exclude all possibility of there being divine government in Israel before the second coming of Christ. It is said that there will be nothing but "overturning until He comes" and that the word *until* "allows of no kingdom before the millennium."

The only way the word "until" in this passage could exclude the possibility of a kingdom before the millennium would be for it to read "until He comes TWICE whose right it is," but it does not say this. We need to keep in mind that this prophecy is not found in Revelation which was written after the first advent of Christ, but in the prophecy of Ezekiel which was written six centuries before the birth of the Messiah.

It has also been said that "this can refer to none but Christ Himself and His Second Coming."

That it refers to Christ, I heartily agree, but that it refers to His second coming, I do not agree. Bullinger rightly says that this refers to "the promised Messiah," but it is wrong for any to insist that it demands two comings of that Messiah.

Concerning His first coming we read in Luke's gospel:

**He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David: and He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of His kingdom there shall be no end. Luke 1:32-33.**

The angel Gabriel said nothing about another coming that had to take place before David's throne would be given to Christ.

At the close of His earthly ministry our Lord declared:

**All authority is given to Me in heaven and in earth. Matt. 28:18.**

This included the "throne of His father David." That throne is now His, even though He has not yet taken to Himself His great power, nor has He reigned. See Rev. 11:17.

The promised Messiah has come. The throne of David has been given to Him. He does not need to come again to get it. The divine overturning which kept David's descendants from the throne ceased when the promised One came. The present chaos is not due to any divine overturning. The results of the throne of David having been given to Christ have been delayed due to the insertion into God's program of the present dispensation.

**The End**

\*\*\*\*\*

## **THE EDITOR TO HIS FRIENDS**

\*\*\*\*The final words of this issue of THE WORD OF TRUTH are being written just a few days before Mrs. Sellers and I leave for the FALL CONFERENCE TOUR. We will be gone for eleven weeks, and when this magazine reaches you we will be somewhere on our tour holding the meetings which have been announced to all our readers. When we are traveling the work goes on as usual. The mail is forwarded to us regularly. We carry one piece of luggage which we call "the office." This contains all the supplies we need to care for the work while we are traveling. All orders for literature will be filled by Mr. Baudistel during our absence. Send all communications to us at our home address, 647 South June Street, Los Angeles 5, California.

\*\*\*\*In the previous issue we made reference to the material needs of this witness and later made a definite request when we sent out the Study Material on Ephesians. Many, many thanks for your generous response to our appeal.

\*\*\*\*Word has been received from KREGEL PUBLICATIONS that they are bringing back into print THE EMPHASIZED VERSION of the Bible by Joseph Bryant Rotherham, more popularly known as THE ROTHERHAM VERSION. When Mr. Robert Kregel asked my opinion in regard to re-printing this, I strongly urged him to do it and make it available to Bible readers again. I believe this Version should be in the hands of everyone interested in the Word of God. The least anyone can do before he finds an idea or belief on any statement in the King James Version is to read the passage in some other Version and see how they compare. If there is a wide discrepancy, he should find out why before he bases too much on the passage.

\*\*\*\*HONORARY AGENTS OF THE WORD OF TRUTH GREAT BRITAIN. Mr. Leslie F. Green, 57 Melbury Ave., Norwood Green, SOUTHALL, Middx. England. Contact Mr. Green in regard to all matters pertaining to the printed page ministry.  
GREAT BRITAIN. Mr. Norman C. Cooper, 101 Turves Green, Northfield, BIRMINGHAM 31, England. Contact Mr. Cooper in regard to our tape-recorded ministry.

**End Vol. XV, No. 4**