

Seven Aspects of ‘the Greek’ – from Dr Donald Waite and *The DBS, Dead Bible Society*
by Alan O’Reilly. Citations by Dr Waite are from his pdf book *A WARNING!!*

1. A single, definitive Greek text does not exist¹. Dr Waite has his definitive Greek text (somewhere) but other Greek expositors have theirs.
2. New Testament Greek is a dead language. See Question 7 listed in **Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration**. Even Dr DiVietro² is forced to admit that “*Biblical Greek is a dead language.*” He appears to consider its demise as “*irrelevant.*” On the contrary, it is most relevant, as 1 Peter 1:23 shows, “***The word of God...liveth and abideth for ever.***” Dr DiVietro espouses the error in this part of his book of supposing that contemporary non-Biblical literature can be used to find the meanings of how words are used in scripture, e.g. Shakespeare for the AV1611. Dr Hills³ states.

“The English of the King James Version is not the English of the early 17th century. To be exact, it is not a type of English that was ever spoken anywhere. It is biblical English, which was not used on ordinary occasions even by the translators who produced the King James Version. As H. Wheeler Robinson (1940) pointed out, one need only compare the preface written by the translators with the text of their translation to feel the difference in style. And the observations of W. A. Irwin (1952) are to the same purport. The King James Version, he reminds us, owes its merit, not to 17th-century English — which was very different — but to its faithful translation of the original. Its style is that of the Hebrew and of the New Testament Greek. Even in their use of thee and thou the translators were not following 17th-century English usage but biblical usage, for at the time these translators were doing their work these singular forms had already been replaced by the plural you in polite conversation.”

David W. Norris⁴ has this to say. “*Shakespeare certainly knew how to use English, but he also knew how to be vulgar, suggestive, and anything but pure-minded in his writing. Rather than being so much influenced itself by the language around it, the Authorised Version has given to the English language many words, phrases, and proverbs...[it has] had an impact on English prose that remains to this day.*

“The 1611 Bible was never the ‘modern version’ of its day. The Authorised Version possesses its own unique English. It gave to English far more than it took from it...”

*“Bible words must be defined for us by the way they are used in the Bible itself. Scripture is its own lexicon [see *The Language of the King James Bible* and *In Awe of Thy Word*, Parts 1-4, both by Dr Mrs Riplinger]...It is for preachers of the Word to explain and expound these words according to their very specific biblical usage, which will often be different from their secular use. For example, dikaosune is translated ‘righteousness’ in our Authorised Version, but in English translations of the Greek philosopher, Plato, the same word is translated ‘justice’. Dikaosune when used in Scripture means to be right before God, to be as we ought before God, to stand in a right relationship to Him. Used in Plato, it means to be right with our fellowmen, to be as we ought with other men. In Scripture, the word is directed towards God, in Plato towards men.”*

Note in the above that “**comparing spiritual things with spiritual**” 1 Corinthians 2:13 in an English 1611 Holy Bible will define how words are used in the scriptures. See discussion on “**ouches**” in **Dr Waite and Dr Mrs Riplinger – Preliminary Observations**. Dr Waite’s method, as outlined on p 32 “*When I preach God’s Words, I do not criticize or change the English King James Bible. I illuminate and give many other acceptable and accurate meanings that the translators could have written down*” is neither necessary (especially not for a non-Koine Greek-speaking congregation, which is 100% of present day congregations) nor safe, as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in *Hazardous Materials* and as David Norris has outlined above.

3. New Testament Greek was a stage in the development of the scriptures, Psalm 12:6, 7. See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comment below from *In Awe of Thy Word* p 956 and **Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print**, with respect to God’s bringing forth of vernacular Bibles in many languages; Latin, Syriac, Gothic, German and English etc. That stage

has been superseded by the Biblical English of the AV1611. Dr Mrs Riplinger's comment follows, this writer's emphasis.

"The desire to appear intelligent or superior by referring to 'the Greek' and downplaying the common man's Bible, exposes a naivety concerning textual history and those documents which today's pseudo-intellectuals call 'the critical text,' 'the original Greek,' the 'Majority Text,' or the 'Textus Receptus.' There existed a true original Greek (i.e. Majority Text, Textus Receptus). It is not in print and never will be, because it is unnecessary. No one on the planet speaks first century Koine Greek, so God is finished with it. He needs no 'Dead Bible Society' to translate it into "everyday English," using the same corrupt secularised lexicons used by the TNIV, NIV, NASB and HCSB [Holman Christian Standard Bible]. God has not called readers to check his Holy Bible for errors. He has called his Holy Bible to check us for errors."

4. No command exists anywhere in scripture that requires the Christian to return to "*the Original Sacred Tongues*" to find out what God said. Neither Dr Waite's exposition of "*PASA GRAPHE THEOPNEUSTOS*" p 59 nor his opinions on once-only inspiration constitute such a command to all Bible readers, certainly not for this author. See **Dr Waite and 'Originals Only' Inspiration**.
5. Unless the Christian undertakes intensive study over a protracted period, in order to become conversant with New Testament Greek, he must rely on a vernacular translation, otherwise he will encounter the dangers of which Dr Mrs Riplinger has warned in *Hazardous Materials* or be compelled to look towards 'illuminators' like Dr Waite and others as 'Protestant popes,'* or both. Either way, he is 'back to square one,' as the saying goes. *Like 33rd Degree Royal Arch Masons, i.e. only those who've been inducted into 'the mysteries' know 'the truth,' a denial of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9.
6. This author estimates that, all things considered, the ordinary church-goer would have to spend up to eighteen months to two years of intensive study to acquire a working knowledge of New Testament Greek (and more for Hebrew and Aramaic). What then? Is he going to give scripture readings in Greek, teach Bible classes in Greek or encourage young people to memorise verses in Greek, which would still have to be acknowledged as a dead language as in Point 2 above? All of which seems impractical to this author, in the light of 1 Corinthians 14:9, "*So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air.*"
7. Dr DiVietro's calumny notwithstanding, Dr Mrs Riplinger's work *Hazardous Materials* contains many detailed warnings about the untrustworthy nature of contemporary Greek sources. Her conclusions have received independent support from the work of David Norris in the UK. See Point 2 above. The Christian would therefore be wise to avoid these sources in seeking to know "*the scripture of truth*" Daniel 10:21, especially in that the expression "*in the Greek*" occurs only once in scripture, in Revelation 9:11 (!) *in relation to "Apollyon" and "the bottomless pit."* That is the real source of contemporary 'Greekolatry.'

References

- ¹ "*O Biblos*" *The Book* by Alan O'Reilly, Covenant Books, 2001, pp 36-37
- ² *Cleaning Up Hazardous Materials* by Kirk DiVietro, The Dean Burgon Society, 2010, pp 139-140
- ³ *The King James Version Defended* by Edward F. Hills, Chapter 8, wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html
- ⁴ *The Big Picture* by David W. Norris, Authentic Word, 2004, pp 372, 384-385