

Flotsam Flush
Re: *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials* by Kirk DiVietro

Alan James O'Reilly

Acknowledgement

The unfailing prayer support of Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger, Mrs Nadine Stratford and Bro's Peter Heisey and Brent Logan, together with Bro. Heisey's and Sister Riplinger's many helpful comments and suggested amendments have been essential to this work. It is gratefully acknowledged as being from the Lord Jesus Christ.

“Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us” Ephesians 3:20.

<i>Contents</i>	<i>Page</i>
Author's Overview.....	vi
A Time-Honoured Warning.....	1
Introduction.....	1
<i>Preface and Introduction</i>	3
Setting Up the 'Clean-Up'.....	11
Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint.....	15
Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint.....	27
Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint.....	51
Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint.....	71
Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint.....	98
Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint.....	116
Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint.....	134
Challenges #1-#7 – Overview.....	156
Quotes and Comments, Point-Counterpoint.....	183
<i>Quotes 105-141, An Overview</i>	469
Addendum to <i>Quotes 166-170</i>	567
Quotes Overall Summary.....	730
Response to David Cloud's Criticisms of <i>In Awe of Thy Word</i>	732
Purification of " <i>The words of the LORD</i> " Psalm 12:6, 7 – Summary.....	761
References.....	763

<i>Tables</i>		<i>Page</i>
1	<i>“Hell” versus “hades” – AV1611 versus New Bibles... ‘the Greek’</i>	31
2	<i>Greek Grammar versus KJB Readings on Salvation etc.....</i>	244
3	<i>Gender-Specific Terms, AV1611 versus Modern Versions.....</i>	251
4	<i>Errors from Lexicon Editors, Chapters 9-16 Hazardous Materials.....</i>	277
5	<i>Alteration of the Word “hell” from the AV1611 Old Testament etc.....</i>	284
6	<i>Variations from the Word “hell” in the AV1611 Old Testament etc.....</i>	285
7	<i>RV Changes to the AV1611 Condoned by Drs DiVietro and Waite etc..</i>	491
8	<i>OT Variant Readings in the KJB Compared to the Letteris (1866) Text</i>	570
9	<i>English Reformation to Last Days Apostasy etc.....</i>	678
10	<i>Wycliffe’s Bible Mss.: KJB/Old Latin Readings versus Jerome etc.....</i>	746

<i>Figures</i>		<i>Page</i>
1	Earth and “ <i>The Nether Parts of the Earth</i> ”.....	193
2	Earth’s Interior – from the Nevada Seismological Lab.....	194
3	<i>The Attack</i>	203
4	The Gates of Argonath.....	293
5	Sharia Zone.....	297
6	“ <i>The High Arm Shall Be Broken</i> ”.....	298
7	“ <i>IT’S <u>ONLY</u> WRITTEN BY MEN!</i> ”.....	314
8	Donald Waite Jr’s Letter to Edward Carrington.....	320
9	<i>The Original 1611 King James New Testament</i> etc.....	456
10	Inquisition and <i>The Godfathers</i>	464
n.a.	“ <i>The LORD rained upon Sodom...fire from the LORD</i> ” Genesis 19:24....	591
11	Hoskier’s <i>Genesis of the Versions</i>	617
12	The Western Front 1914-1918.....	638
13	Pocket Testaments I.....	640
14	Pocket Testaments II.....	641
15	<i>Baptist Encyclopedia</i> by William Cathcart, Lifeline Philippines.....	659
16	<i>An American Bible: A History of the Good Book in the United States</i> etc.	661
17	<i>Colonial Policy of the British Empire, Languages of the British Empire...</i>	668
18	<i>BBC, A History of the World, The King James Bible (Authorised)</i>	670
19	Pure Bible Press.....	684
20	Spanish Valera 1602 Purificada Bible.....	687
21	<i>The Presbyterian Review</i> , Vol. 2, No. 6, 1881, pp 238, 245.....	710
22	<i>John Wycliffe, The Dawn of the Reformation</i> by David Fountain etc.....	723
23	<i>Wycklyffes wycket: whych he made in Kyng Rychards days</i> etc.....	724

Author's Overview

The book *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials* by Dr Kirk DiVietro of the DBS, Dean Burgon Society, Executive Committee is an attack on the book *Hazardous Materials* by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger because Sister Riplinger believes that the 1611 Holy Bible is **“all scripture”** that **“is given by inspiration of God”** 2 Timothy 3:16.

By contrast, Dr DiVietro is a Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek ‘originals-onlyist.’ He does not have **“all scripture”** that **“is given by inspiration of God”** because he cannot specify where these words are **“in the Greek”** and **“in the Hebrew”** Revelation 9:11 in a BOOK (the association instead being with **“the angel of the bottomless pit”**). He demeans the AV1611 as only **“the word of men”** 1 Thessalonians 2:13, even if correctly translated (though he changes Ephesians 1:5, cutting out **“of children”**).

Dr DiVietro therefore does not have **“the word of God”** 1 Thessalonians 2:13 in a single book, certainly not one called a Holy Bible. His word of God and that of the DBS Executive Committee is merely what they superimpose on the AV1611 from any preferred source e.g. lexicon, interlinear, critical edition, commentary etc., supposedly to ‘clarify’ or ‘elucidate,’ Dr DiVietro’s terms, the English Bible for anyone (like this author) who would answer no to the question, **“Canst thou speak Greek?”** Acts 21:37. That is what Dr DiVietro uses his vast library for, as Dr Ruckman indicates in *Manuscript Evidence* with respect to Dr A. T. Robertson –what God ‘really’ said is in there, somewhere... That is also why Dr DiVietro attacks Sister Riplinger.

The only way that Dr DiVietro could prove his stance is by producing the original manuscripts, which he can’t, because he has no written equivalent authority to the original writings by which he can put hand on heart and truthfully declare that it is the original. Everything else is just **“evil surmisings”** on his part 1 Timothy 6:4. Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee are today’s Nicolaitans, Revelation 2:6, 15 and differ only from Kutilek, White, Hudson, Hymers etc. in that they don’t adopt modern versions but prefer what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their anvil, as the Epistle Dedicatory says, using the Greek and the Hebrew so-called.

In short, according to the DBS Executive Committee, no-one today really has **“the word of God.”** By their standards, no-one after the 1st century ever had it or knew that they had it. No-one, for example, according to the DBS Executive Committee ever really had the word of God during the Dark Ages, when Rome persecuted Bible believers like the Waldenses and certainly no-one has it now on the mission field or can ever get it as a single book in any non-Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek source.

Dr DiVietro tries to overcome that glaring deficiency by putting forward the two-tier word of God stance; one inspired (which he won’t specify exactly where it is) and the other uninspired, preserved intact but lifeless, like frozen woolly mammoths in Siberia. That kind of stance, like his ‘originals-onlyism’ stance, is clearly futile.

Dr DiVietro’s criticisms of *Hazardous Materials* by means of his book *Cleaning-Up* are therefore just so much circumlocution, aka evil surmisings and like all related DBS Executive Committee edicts, repeated violations of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. The graphic following illustrates the real source of the evil:

“Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said...?” Genesis 3:1.



news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2007/12/photogalleries/biggest-cobra/

*“They have sharpened their tongues like a serpent; adders’ poison is under their lips.
Selah” Psalm 140:3.*

Flushing the Flotsam

A Biblical Response to *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials*

A Time-Honoured Warning

“Ye are brought unto fountains of living water which ye digged not; do not cast earth into them with the Philistines, neither prefer broken pits before them with the wicked Jews. [Gen 26:15. Jer 2:13.] Others have laboured, and you may enter into their labours; O receive not so great things in vain, O despise not so great salvation! Be not like swine to tread under foot so precious things, neither yet like dogs to tear and abuse holy things...”¹

This time-honoured warning has been repeatedly ignored by the writer of *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials* and his colleagues, as this work will show.

Introduction

Dr Kirk DiVietro, colleague of Dr D.A. Waite, has written a 416-page book entitled *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials, A Refutation of Gail Riplinger’s Hazardous Materials*. The title of Dr DiVietro’s book is self-explanatory and this work is a Biblical response to Dr DiVietro’s criticisms of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s research.

This author believes that such a response is necessary because like Dr Waite, Dr DiVietro denies that the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible is **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”** 2 Timothy 3:16 and insists that ‘the Greek’ (along with ‘the Hebrew/Aramaic’) is *the* final authority for all scripture² and the ‘inspired’ scripture. This is the central issue and that is why Dr DiVietro has attacked *Hazardous Materials*.

However, also like Dr Waite, Dr DiVietro does not specify exactly *where* ‘the Greek’ (and ‘the Hebrew/Aramaic’) is available in *any single* current publication as **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”** and finally authoritative. It is apparent therefore, as this author showed in an earlier work³ that Drs Waite, DiVietro and their fellow travellers are *themselves* the source of ‘the Greek etc.’ to which they demand that King James Bible believers meekly submit under pain of falling into error and false doctrine if they don’t.

Ordinary Bible believers like this author are not about to bow down to that kind of Nicolaitan blackmail and tyranny, Revelation 2:6, 15.

As Charles Haddon Spurgeon⁴ rightly said many years ago, *not* about ‘the Greek etc.,’ this author’s emphases:

“We shall gradually be so bedoubted and becriticized, that only a few of the most profound will know what is Bible, and what is not, and they will dictate to all the rest of us. I have no more faith in their mercy than in their accuracy: they will rob us of all that we hold most dear, and glory in the cruel deed. This same reign of terror we shall not endure, for we still believe that God revealeth himself rather to babes than to the wise and prudent, and we are fully assured that our own old English version of the Scriptures is sufficient for plain men for all purposes of life, salvation, and godliness. We do not despise learning, but we will never say of culture or criticism. “These be thy gods, O Israel!”

“Do you see why men would lower the degree of inspiration in Holy Writ, and would fain reduce it to an infinitesimal quantity? It is because the truth of God is to be supplanted... Whenever a man begins to lower your view of inspiration, it is because he has a trick to play, which is not easily performed in the light. He would hold a séance of evil spirits, and therefore he cries, “Let the lights be lowered.” We, brethren, are willing to ascribe to the Word of God all the inspiration that can possibly be ascribed to it; and we say boldly that if our preaching is not according to this Word, it is because there is no light in it. We are willing

to be tried and tested by it in every way, and we count those to be the noblest of our hearers who search the Scriptures daily to see whether these things be so; but to those who belittle inspiration we will give place by subjection, no, not for an hour."

Neither will today's believers in "*the scripture of truth*" Daniel 10:21, none other than "*our own old English version of the Scriptures,*" the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible, our own "*sound words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ*" 1 Timothy 6:3.

To any and all of its detractors, therefore, "*our own old English version of the scriptures*" surely says, "*I will turn my hand upon thee, and thoroughly purge away thy dross*" Isaiah 1:25.

That is why this work is entitled *Flushing the Flotsam - A Biblical Response to Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials*.

Dr DiVietro's book contains a lengthy *Appendix* of nearly 100 pages that chronicles much of the material found in Dr Waite's recent book⁵. This material includes aspects of Dr Mrs Riplinger's personal past, overviews of correspondence with Dr Mrs Riplinger by Mrs Waite, testimonial statements against Dr Mrs Riplinger by some of her detractors, including Mrs Waite and Donald Waite Jnr and Scrivener's Appendix A⁶. These items are not directly related to Dr DiVietro's criticisms of *Hazardous Materials* and therefore won't be addressed in this work.

Dr DiVietro devotes about a quarter of his book to answering the seven challenges that Dr Mrs Riplinger sets out in just two pages of her 1200-page work⁷. He then comments on selected quotes from her book in a further 160+ pages. This work will mainly address those aspects of Dr DiVietro's book, together with parts of his *Preface* and *Introduction* and Dr David Cloud's two-page criticism of Dr Mrs Riplinger's book *In Awe of Thy Word*, found in the *Appendix* of Dr DiVietro's book.

Once again, this author will seek as far as possible to cite the 1611 English Holy Bible, "*the scripture of truth*" Daniel 10:21 as the principal response to Dr DiVietro and others who would deny it as such.

The terms "*Holy Bible,*" "*the word of God*" 1 Samuel 9:27, "*scripture of truth,*" "*the holy scriptures*" 2 Timothy 3:15 and "*all scripture...given by inspiration of God*" will also be taken as interchangeable because that is how this author understands them, along with the expression "*finally authoritative.*" God's word must be finally authoritative because, as all Bible critics of any persuasion agree, there is no higher authority than God. See *The Creed of the Alexandrian Cult* in any issue of *The Bible Believer's Bulletin*.

"And the LORD do that which seemeth him good" 2 Samuel 10:12b.

Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials – Preface and Introduction

The *Preface* to Dr DiVietro’s book, authored by Dr H. D. Williams of The Dean Burgon Society, explicitly denies that the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible, or any Bible translation is **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God,”** e.g. p v. Dr Williams condemns belief in the 1611 English Holy Bible as **“the holy scriptures”** 2 Timothy 3:15 as false doctrine and uses Dr Waite’s exposition of **“theopneustos”** in ‘the Greek’ underlying 2 Timothy 3:16 to support this condemnation. It is interesting in this respect that Dr Williams lists Dr Waite’s qualifications as a Hebrew, Greek and other languages linguist in some detail, p iii, as Dr Waite does in his own book⁸ against Dr Mrs Riplinger’s. Drs Waite and Williams would probably argue from the context of the listing that Dr Mrs Riplinger provoked them to make these revelations.

However, they could reflect upon Dr Mrs Riplinger’s⁹ personal assessment of her academic qualifications and achievements.

“God said, “that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God”. I have just paraded my abominations before my readers. Academic credentials have never been God’s criteria for using a person. Moses did not go to Desert State for forty years.”

Noting that the validity of Dr Waite’s exposition of **“theopneustos”** with its centrepiece that **“is given by inspiration of God”** should read **“God-breathed”** is predicated on the extent of Dr Waite’s mastery of Koine Greek, it is appropriate to review briefly the expertise of one of the best-known King James translators, John Bois¹⁰. Bois began to read Hebrew at the age of five and was admitted to St John’s College, Cambridge at the age of fourteen, where he distinguished himself as a Greek scholar, customarily studying in the library from 4 a.m. until 8 p.m., during which sessions he studied *standing*. He became the chief lecturer in Greek at his college, a post he retained for ten years and was one of the six translators chosen to review the whole work on the new Bible after completion of the first draft. This painstaking task took nine months.

And Dr Waite is going to come up with a superior rendering for **“theopneustos”** than John Bois and his colleagues?

As a certain well-remembered movie character¹¹ once said, *“Not hardly.”*

See also remarks on the distinguished translator Dr John Spencer, who helped translate the Pauline Epistles, in this author’s earlier work¹².

Dr Williams also condemns Dr Mrs Riplinger’s belief in the AV1611 as **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”** because she is said to have ‘implied’ that the King James translators received God’s words in English in the same way that the original writers received the scriptures, p i. Like Dr Waite¹³, Dr Williams does not say where Dr Mrs Riplinger implied this but asserts that the *Preface* to the AV1611 reports the opposite.

Yet see **A Time-Honoured Warning** above. Dr Smith warned with respect to the new translation of 1611 *“Be not like swine to tread under foot so precious things, neither yet like dogs to tear and abuse holy things...”*

By his complete denial of inspiration for the Holy Bible that the Lord has magnified above all His name, Psalm 138:2 and which could therefore like the Lord Himself be perceived as **“that holy thing”** Luke 1:35, Dr Williams has certainly abused **“holy things.”** His at least implicit denial that God would or even could preserve the translators from error amounts to further abuse.

He then uses Dr Waite's opinion of the phrase "**is given**" in Matthew 28:18 to 'prove' that the same expression in 2 Timothy 3:16 refers to a once-only giving-by-inspiration of the 'original Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek' and seeks to reinforce this notion by allusion to the expression "**was once delivered**" in Jude 3.

Dr Waite's opinions of "*theopneustos*," "**is given**" in Matthew 28:18 and "**once delivered**" in Jude 3 have been addressed in this author's earlier work¹⁴. It is sufficient to state here that Dr Waite's opinions in these respects cannot, by inspection, be "**sufficient for plain men for all purposes of life, salvation, and godliness**" or indeed "**profitable...that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works**" 2 Timothy 3:16, 17, like, for example, encouraging believers to memorize scripture, as David urged in Psalm 119:9, 11.

"Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? by taking heed thereto according to thy word...Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee."

Do Drs Waite, DiVietro, Williams and Cloud seriously believe that the average English speaker may only "**cleanse his way**" by means of memorizing Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek? Bible believers like this author are convinced that the Author of "**the holy scriptures**" has made much more generous provision in this respect than those of The Dean Burgon Society "**who seemed to be pillars**" Galatians 2:9 would credit Him with.

Dr Williams claims, pp ii-iii that Dr Mrs Riplinger has 'misunderstood' 2 Timothy 3:16 in her explanation of "**is given**" on p 1145 of *Hazardous Materials*, possibly because this explanation highlights Dr Williams's confusion of present and past tenses with respect to 2 Timothy 3:16 and Jude 3 in his book *The Miracle of Inspiration: A Refutation of Perfection of Translation*. See above. He insists that Dr Mrs Riplinger herself concedes that "**all scripture...was once delivered unto the saints**" according to Jude 3 and therefore this 'proves' that no translation can be 'inspired.'

However, Dr Williams contradicts himself by then stating that the words of God, from the 'original' scriptures, can then be translated into the languages of the world. Yet, surely they cannot be the words of God, if by translation they lose the quality of inspiration and become simply the words of men, as Dr Waite so robustly declares¹⁵, this author's under-lining.

"Neither the DBS Executive Committee or the DBS Advisory Council will ever call the King James Bible "inspired of God," "given by inspiration of God," "verbally inspired," "inspired," or "God-breathed" at any time or in any place."

They will at the Judgement Seat of Christ, Romans 14:10.

If Dr Williams had read Dr Mrs Riplinger's 'fine print' on p 1145 of *Hazardous Materials* as carefully as he urges others to do, he would have seen that she distinguishes between the words spoken by the apostles Peter and Paul, Jude 3, 17 and those penned specifically as scripture by writers such as Jude, which are not "*time sensitive*," as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows on p 1146ff, which pages Dr Williams appears not to have bothered reading.

The 1611 English Holy Bible is, as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows, "*a living document*" of scripture that cannot be confined to the original languages in order to be "**profitable**." See remarks above.

In passing, it should be noted that while Dr Williams levels criticism at Dr Mrs Riplinger for her explanation of "**is given**" on p 1145 of her work, he bypasses without comment the statement by a certain Phil Pins that Dr Mrs Riplinger cites to the effect that "**is given**" in 2 Timothy 3:16 "*seems incorrect*." Dr Williams appears quite ready to condone a charge of error against the AV1611 so long as he is able to denigrate belief in it as the "**pure words**" of the Lord, Psalm 12:6.

Dr Williams then lists a total of 30 specific charges against Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work but he does not substantiate them with explicit citations from any of her books, so this work will bypass them.

Dr Williams then concludes his *Preface* with the statement that Dr Mrs Riplinger did honour her word in forwarding some promised material to Dr DiVietro, even if not in the precise form that he had requested. In the light of Dr Williams's calumny against Dr Mrs Riplinger, his ultimate acknowledgement of her integrity, even if grudging, should be kept in mind as this work is read.

Dr DiVietro's 11-page *Introduction* condenses Dr Williams's 30 charges against Dr Mrs Riplinger to 10, pp 9-10 that he states he will substantiate in his answers to Dr Mrs Riplinger's seven challenges on pp 1193-1194 of *Hazardous Materials* and in his subsequent comments. See this author's **Introduction** above. Dr DiVietro affirms in his *Introduction* that he will rebut Dr Mrs Riplinger's main thesis, namely that the 1611 English Holy Bible is "*all scripture...given by inspiration of God.*"

It is ironic that Dr DiVietro castigates writers who use padding, or 'fluff' to expand their works, p 10. He indicates that he has a 'fluff' detector and that in his view, most of *Hazardous Materials* is 'fluff.' However, Dr DiVietro refers explicitly to Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work on only 4 of the 11 pages of his *Introduction*, i.e. pp 3, 9-11 and a considerable portion of his *Appendix*, approximately 80+ pages, has no direct bearing on *Hazardous Materials* at all. See remarks in this author's **Introduction**.

With such an appreciable proportion of his book devoted to extraneous subjects, Dr DiVietro seems not to be immune to padding or 'fluffing' himself. The expression 'pots and kettles' comes to mind.

It is also noteworthy that Dr DiVietro introduces extensive quotes from Dr Mrs Riplinger's work, especially *Hazardous Materials* but he typically responds to only a small part of the quote. See pp 14-15 of *Cleaning-Up*, where he inserts a detailed statement from *Hazardous Materials* p 1105 about the Gothic Bible but makes only the passing comment that maybe Luther and Tyndale didn't translate their Bibles but only refined early German or English Bibles. This false notion of Dr DiVietro's is addressed later. See the next section of this work, entitled *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials – Setting Up the 'Clean-Up'*. Dr DiVietro therefore appears to be resorting to the same 'fluff' tactic that he condemns p 10. See pp 24-25, 27-29 of *Cleaning-Up* for further examples.

By comparison with a 'fluff detector,' as an ex-academic, this author has a 'flannel' detector. 'Flannel' in the UK roughly translates as 'hokum' in the US (circa 1930s), or as 'bunkum.' This is interesting, because according to *The Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, 'bunkum' derives from the member for Buncombe in North Carolina (1819-1821) who was given to speaking needlessly in Congress to impress his constituents. This author's 'flannel' detector will be referenced from time to time in this work.

Dr DiVietro also unnecessarily repeats Dr Waite's exposition of "*theopneustos*" from the *Preface* and Dr Williams's reference to "*is given*" in Matthew 28:18, see remarks above. This DBS triumvirate appears to be trying to convince each of its members about 'originals only' i.e. 'original words only' inspiration¹⁶ but Dr DiVietro's stance on 2 Timothy 3:16 leads him to the bizarre accusation that, according to Dr Mrs Riplinger, God continues to 're-inspire' the 1611 English Holy Bible and might at any time 'inspire' some new scriptures hitherto unknown, p 3.

Dr DiVietro's accusation is wholly unfounded, as Dr Mrs Riplinger's own work shows.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states¹⁷, her emphases ““Seven” times “they purge...and purify it...” (Ezek. 43:26) – not eight. The KJV translators did **not** see their translation as one in the midst of a chain of ever evolving translations. They wanted their Bible to be one of which no one could justly say, ‘It is good, **except** this word or **that** word...’ They planned¹⁸:

““...to make...out of many good ones [Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops’], one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, that our mark.”

“The “mark” to which the KJV translators strove was to retain and polish the “perfection of the scriptures” seen in earlier editions. Tyndale himself said of his own edition... “count it as a thing not having his full shape...a thing begun rather than finished...to seek in certain places more proper English”...

“The KJV translators wrote of their final “perfected” work,

““Yet for all that, as nothing is begun and perfited [perfected] at the same time, and the later thoughts are thought to be the wiser: so, if we building upon their foundation that went before us, and being holpen by their labours, do endeavor to make that better which they left so good; no man, we are sure, hath cause to mislike us; they, we persuade ourselves, if they were alive, would thank us...the same will shine as gold more brightly, being rubbed and polished...””

The 1611 English Holy Bible or indeed any vernacular translation faithful to the English Text, clearly does not need to be ‘re-inspired’ as it is already “**all scripture...given by inspiration of God**” and no further ‘new’ inspiration of scriptures hitherto unknown will ever take place, as the scripture itself testifies.

“**For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book**” Revelation 22:18.

Had Dr DiVietro spent a little more than three days, p 10, studying Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work, he might have formed a more accurate assessment of her stance on inspiration and the 1611 English Holy Bible.

But strangely, in his criticism of Dr Mrs Riplinger, Dr DiVietro displays the same peculiar ambivalence to the AV1611 that his colleague Dr Waite exhibits¹⁹. On p 3 of his *Introduction*, Dr DiVietro insists that the AV1611 is perfect, such that it cannot be changed or improved*. He insists further, p 7 that any changes in the AV1611 that were made between 1611 and the appearance of the final standard Text of 1769 were minor and can be discounted.

*Dr DiVietro is almost certainly citing his view of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s perception of the 1611 Holy Bible with this statement. If that is the case, he does not take issue with her perception of the 1611 Holy Bible and the context of Dr DiVietro’s statement is that he does not anticipate that any further changes to the text of the 1611 Holy Bible are warranted with that text having been stabilised in 1769, *Cleaning-Up* p 7. Dr DiVietro’s statement on p 3 of *Cleaning-Up* will therefore be taken for this work as his acknowledgement at this point in his book that Dr Mrs Riplinger’s perception of the 1611 Holy Bible as perfect, such that it cannot be changed or improved upon, is correct.

Yet when it suits Dr DiVietro to attack Dr Mrs Riplinger and *Hazardous Materials* for her belief in the 1611 English Holy Bible as “**all scripture...given by inspiration of God,**” these minor changes between successive editions of the AV1611 suddenly assume overwhelming importance, just as they did with Dr Waite. Dr DiVietro, like Dr Waite, protests that surely

no ‘inspired’ translation could exhibit such changes between editions and therefore Dr Mrs Riplinger’s entire thesis of *Hazardous Materials* must be wrong?

Dr DiVietro has overlooked Isaiah 53:7-8 and Acts 8:32-33, which passages effectively stifle his protest.

“He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living:”

“The place of the scripture which he read was this, He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his mouth: In his humiliation his judgment was taken away: and who shall declare his generation? for his life is taken from the earth.”

By inspection, the passages are different, not least with respect to the transformation of the lamb into a sheep in the first figure and the female sheep into a male lamb in the second. Yet the Ethiopian in Acts 8 is said to have been reading ***“Esaias the prophet”*** Acts 8:28. It appears that in ***“the scripture of truth”*** Daniel 10:21, therefore, God can ‘inspire’ the same passage of scripture to read differently from ‘the original’ and even as a translation. See examples cited in this author’s earlier work²⁰.

The Bible believer, therefore, should not be concerned about individual editions of the AV1611 reading differently. According to the examples of scripture given above, the various editions of the AV1611 can still be ‘inspired,’ even if such blemishes as printers’ errors must be corrected²¹.

It is even possible that with the successive editions of the AV1611, God was implementing successive inspiration as He did in the time of Jeremiah. See Jeremiah 36:32 and comments in this author’s earlier work²² from Drs Gipp and Ruckman.

“Then took Jeremiah another roll, and gave it to Baruch the scribe, the son of Neriah; who wrote therein from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of the book which Jehoiakim king of Judah had burned in the fire: and there were added besides unto them many like words.”

God’s successive inspiration included more words than its original predecessor. Almost the same happened with the AV1611 Editions. Setting aside changes in spelling, punctuation, marginal notes and italics and by-passing the Apocrypha, inspection of Scrivener’s list²³ of changes between the first and subsequent editions of the AV1611 shows that, approximately, 118 additions of words are made (92 in Appendix A, 26 in Appendix C) as against 26 deletions (16 in Appendix A, 10 in Appendix C).

Overall, God required that the earlier, more primitive editions of the AV1611 needed adding to, not taking from. This result could have an important lesson for the Bible believer with respect to Bible manuscripts:

Inferior manuscripts will show net deletions from, not additions to the text of scripture.

Corrupt codices & Aleph and B Vaticanus are cases in point, along with other Alexandrian-style manuscripts. They are notorious for serious omissions²⁴ from the Old and New Testaments, together with some unwarranted additions in the form of Apocryphal books.

God’s procedure for refining the AV1611 Editions appears to illustrate the Lord’s view of using manuscript sources; replace the shorter ones with the longer ones and discard anything extra-biblical i.e. the Apocrypha. That conclusion would certainly support the AV1611 Text

against any of the modern versions and the illustration may therefore be of some value to the Bible believer.

That possibility doesn't seem to have occurred to Drs Waite, Williams, DiVietro et al.

It should be noted that, in the wake of Dr Scrivener, a present-day academic, Professor David Norton, has produced probably the definitive contemporary review of differences between the AV1611 editions entitled *A Textual History of the King James Bible*. Professor Norton is editor of *The New Cambridge Paragraph Bible with the Apocrypha*²⁵, NCPB, which consists of the King James Text as edited by Dr Scrivener for the original *Cambridge Paragraph Bible* with some further amendments by Professor Norton. Professor Norton's *Textual History* contains a lot of valuable information but in it he refers²⁶ to the text of the current 1611 English Holy Bible, i.e. Professor Blayney's 1769 Text, as found in the *Cambridge Wide Margin Cameo Edition* and the *Cambridge Concord Edition* as "fossilised" and "mutated," in urgent need of much improvement with respect to spelling, punctuation and presentation.

For that reason, Professor Norton dismisses as "nonsense" the conclusion of the American Bible Society in 1852, namely "“*There is not one [variation] which mars the integrity of the text, or affects any doctrine or precept of the Bible...The English Bible as left by the translators has come down to us unaltered in respect of its text...With the exception of typographical errors and changes required by the progress of orthography in the English language, the text of our present Bibles remains unchanged, and without variation from the original copy as left by the translators...The present copies of the Bible accord throughout with the edition of 1611.*””

However, apart from the kind of differences mentioned by the society, Professor Norton does not provide any examples of serious variation between the various AV1611 editions that would mar the integrity of the AV1611 Text, so Bible believers are urged to remain faithful to the current copies of the AV1611 that they already possess. Scrivener's original *Cambridge Paragraph Bible* did not receive wide circulation compared with extant AV1611s and in this author's view, neither will any successor to it. Professor Norton's perception of the AV1611 is further apparent in his note²⁷ on Proverbs 27:26, where he changes the current AV1611 reading "***the field***" back to the 1611 AV1611 reading "*thy field*" for his NCPB. He states that a superior reading to "***the field***" would be "*a field*" as found in the NRSV.

The same reading "*a field*" is found in other modern versions; NASV, NIV, NKJV.

What Professor Norton and the modern editors missed is that "***the field is the world***" Matthew 13:38, the goats provide goats' milk, Proverbs 27:27 and believers are urged to "***desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby***" 1 Peter 2:2. "***The sincere milk of the word***" is well worth "***the price of the field***" Proverbs 27:26 because the Lord Jesus Christ said of His disciples "***I have given them thy word; and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.***"

Devotionally speaking, receiving God's word is well worth the price of the world's hatred.

Readers may draw their own conclusions about whether or not God has called Professor Norton to 'improve' the 1611 English Holy Bible.

It may well be that God does not want His Book excessively 'gone over' any more than the fields, vineyards and olive groves of the Israelites, Deuteronomy 24:19-21. The residue is for the 'poor folks' (gnat-straining academics, figuratively speaking, who though admirably adept at documenting fine detail, then devote themselves to picking at non-essentials), the produce is for "***my sons and daughters***" 2 Corinthians 6:18 to enjoy, as in Psalm 104:15:

“And wine that maketh glad the heart of man, and oil to make his face to shine, and bread which strengtheneth man's heart.”

And as in Zechariah 9:17:

“For how great is his goodness, and how great is his beauty! corn shall make the young men cheerful, and new wine the maids.”

All of which illustrates the fruits of the 1611 English Holy Bible, according to Jeremiah 15:16:

“Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart: for I am called by thy name, O LORD God of hosts.”

None of which is found in the dissertations of academics like Dr Scrivener and Professor Norton about the AV1611 but such fruits are the produce of currently available AV1611s, such as the *Cambridge Wide Margin Cameo Edition* and the *Cambridge Concord Edition*, at least as far as this author can testify, who, like Yale University's Professor of English Literature, William Lyon Phelps²⁸, believes that the AV1611 is “*inspired*.”

“We Anglo-Saxons have a better Bible than the French or Germans or the Italians or the Spanish; our English translation is even better than the original Hebrew and Greek. There is only one way to explain this; I have no theory to account for the so-called “inspiration of the Bible,” but I am confident that the Authorized Version was inspired.”

The above explanations would not, of course, satisfy Drs Waite, DiVietro, Williams and their followers. As Spurgeon said, see above, “*they will rob us of all that we hold most dear, and glory in the cruel deed*” and would fain strip the 1611 English Holy Bible of its quality of inspiration as eagerly as Joseph's brothers stripped him of “*his coat of many colours*” Genesis 37:23, if they could.

In sum, it may be observed from Dr DiVietro's *Preface and Introduction* that:

1. Like Dr Waite, Drs Williams and DiVietro each deny that the AV1611 is “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God.*”
2. They each base their denial on Dr Waite's exposition of “*theopneustos*” and therefore insist that no translation can truly be the inspired word of God. They forget that the King's men, arguably the foremost Greek expositors of all time, came up with a different reading for “*theopneustos*” that God has honoured in the 1611 English Holy Bible for 400 years and which *does* allow for the freshest KJB copy right off the printing press to be truly the inspired word of God.
3. Dr Williams then inconsistently claims that the words of God, from the ‘original’ scriptures, can then be translated into the languages of the world. However, they can't be if by translation these words then lose the quality of inspiration.
4. Dr DiVietro in his *Introduction* accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of believing in ‘re-inspiration,’ namely that God could ‘inspire’ ‘new’ scriptures at any time. However, Dr Mrs Riplinger's own statements from *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 560ff show that this accusation is baseless.
5. Dr DiVietro then displays further inconsistency in that he states that the AV1611 is a perfect translation, such that any revisions that later editions underwent, even though printers' errors had to be corrected, were minor and can be ignored. Yet he later uses these minor revisions as supposed evidence to prove that the AV1611 cannot possibly be inspired.

6. This work has therefore already revealed significant inconsistencies in Dr DiVietro's book and more will emerge as this work progresses.

The responses to Dr DiVietro's answers to Dr Mrs Riplinger's seven challenges and his subsequent comments against her work, will now follow, citing as far as possible the 1611 English Holy Bible against Dr DiVietro's criticisms of Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work.

Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials – Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’

As a basis for his answers to and criticisms of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work, Dr DiVietro²⁹ summarises his perception* of the main thesis of *Hazardous Materials*; namely that contemporary Bible study aids, i.e. dictionaries, lexicons and interlinear testaments do not enable the student to understand the scriptures and may be counterproductive in this respect. He does this in his chapter entitled *A New Premise*, pp 12-18.

*Although note that Dr DiVietro has already intimated on p 10 of his book that the main thesis of *Hazardous Materials* is what he terms the false doctrine, pp 2-3 that the 1611 English Holy Bible is **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God.”** See comments above in ***Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials – Preface and Introduction***. This work will proceed on the basis of Dr DiVietro’s altered perception of the main thesis of *Hazardous Materials*, as outlined above.

Like his colleague Dr Waite, Dr DiVietro should check out the AV Publications web site, www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html, shopping link, where he would find several Bible study aids listed for purchase³⁰. Even if Dr Mrs Riplinger would advise caution in the use of these study aids, the fact that AV Publications makes them available shows that Dr DiVietro’s perception of the main thesis of *Hazardous Materials* is distorted. His challenges and comments stemming from his perception are likewise likely to be distorted, as this author’s earlier work has shown³¹.

That work described how Dr DiVietro’s use of ‘the Greek’ in his expositions of the words *oinos* (“wine”) and *baptizo* (“baptize”) and of John 11:33 had if anything been a hindrance to his own understanding of these particular subjects. Dr DiVietro takes Dr Mrs Riplinger to task, p 14, for the methods she sets forth in *In Awe of Thy Word* for determining the meanings of Biblical words but had he been humble enough to employ those methods, including **“comparing spiritual things with spiritual”** 1 Corinthians 2:13b or scripture with scripture, he might have done a better job of exegesis of the words *oinos*, John 11:33 and *baptizo*. See this author’s analyses of those subjects using in part Dr Mrs Riplinger’s suggested approach.

Dr DiVietro asserts that Dr Mrs Riplinger cites only a crude ‘rule of thumb’ for this purpose, i.e. checking ten words before and after the word in question. His assertion is entirely misleading, as a careful reading of Chapter 1 of *In Awe of Thy Word* will show. Perhaps Dr DiVietro had insufficient time for such a reading, in the three days he had to spare, p 10, for *Hazardous Materials*. See remarks in ***Preface and Introduction***. Again ironically, Dr DiVietro is not above resorting to a crude rule of thumb himself, p 15, where he insists that it is a fundamental rule of Bible study that anything new is not true and vice versa. Dr DiVietro gives no support from scripture for this ‘rule,’ which suggests that the actual ‘rule’ is that any kind of Bible study (such as *In Awe of Thy Word*, Chapter 1) must be wrong if the DBS Executive Committee didn’t think of it first. The august members of the committee seem to have forgotten that **“God is no respecter of persons”** Acts 10:34.

Dr DiVietro may rest his Bible study rule of thumb on Ecclesiastes 1:9 **“there is no new thing under the sun”** but Solomon’s worldly observations do not prevent God from implementing **“a new thing”** Isaiah 43:9, like **“the new testament”** 2 Corinthians 3:6. Dr DiVietro would do well to consider the dying words of Pastor John Robinson, of the Mayflower group³².

“I bewail the condition of the Reformed churches...the Lutherans cannot be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw. And the Calvinists as you see, stick where Calvin left them...Luther and Calvin were precious shining lights in their times. Yet God did not reveal His whole will

to them...I am very confident that the Lord hath more truth and light yet to break forth out of His Holy Word.””

As part of more truth and light from His Holy word, God certainly showed Dr Mrs Riplinger how to apply 1 Corinthians 2:13b, see above, with respect to the meanings of Biblical words. See *In Awe of Thy Word*, Part 1 and Dr Mrs Riplinger’s earlier work, *The Language of the King James Bible*. God has of course been revealing these insights to His faithful servants for centuries, as Wycliffe himself declares³³, this author’s under-lining. *“In Holy Scripture is all truth; one part of Scripture explains another.”*

Yet it appears that God did not give the same insights to the DBS Executive Committee. They seem to be Burgonists, who stick where Burgon left them.

Further support for Dr Mrs Riplinger’s biblical approach to determining the meanings of Bible words through the AV1611’s built-in dictionary emerges from a book by John M. Asquith, also available from AV Publications, entitled *Further Thoughts on the Word of God*. In Chapters 8, 9, he recommends use of the *Oxford English Dictionary* to interpret words in the AV1611 but cautions, pp 94, 106 that the *OED* is “not perfect” and includes examples of where it is deficient.

All of which leads the Bible reader back to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s biblical approach to determining the meanings of Bible words through the AV1611’s built-in dictionary. (This author³⁴ has found that *The Concise Oxford English Dictionary* is, however, often useful as an aid to understanding Bible words, though it cannot replace the AV1611’s own built-in dictionary.)

Dr DiVietro reiterates in this chapter, pp 17-18, his belief that the AV1611 is not “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God.*” Yet like his colleague Dr Williams, see remarks in *Preface* and *Introduction*, he contradicts himself by stating, p 18, that an accurate translation from the Hebrew and Greek *is* the word of God. If such a translation *is* the word of God, it *must* by definition be “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God.*”

Yet it can’t be, according to Drs Waite, DiVietro and Williams, who are united in their dogmatic assertion that inspiration *cannot* apply to *any* Bible translation *anywhere* at *any* time. See *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials*, p 2. Inspiration, they claim, can only apply to the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek originals, even though Dr DiVietro states that these are *dead languages*, which is mystifying to this author how they can then still be ‘inspired,’ pp iii-iv, 2-3, 7, 16. See remarks on fossilisation³⁵ in this author’s earlier work.

At the time of writing, these apparent contradictions on the part of Drs Waite, DiVietro and Williams are unresolved. 2 Timothy 2:25 comes to mind.

“In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth.”

It is hoped that God will be merciful in that respect because the DBS Executive Committee has in effect changed the very definition and description of “*the word of God*” into something unbiblical and like the Pharisees of old has made it of “*none effect*” Mark 7:13.

Using quotes from *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 542, 620-622 and *Hazardous Materials*, p 1105, Dr DiVietro, pp 12, 14-16, further accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of stating that The King James translators did not translate the scriptures from Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek sources into English but, along with Luther and Tyndale, only purified earlier Germanic or English Bibles that they believed to be ‘inspired.’

In levelling these accusations, Dr DiVietro carefully – and dishonestly- edits his quotes to avoid mentioning any of the numerous researchers that Dr Mrs Riplinger cites³⁶, including

the distinguished Herman Hoskier, who believed that the early New Testament translations, e.g. in Latin and Syriac, were concurrent with the Greek originals. Dr Mrs Riplinger also lists many Bibles that were largely translated from earlier vernacular editions and notes from Scrivener that Luther used both Gothic and Latin Bibles in his work, besides Erasmus's first Greek edition (that initially led Luther astray in causing him to omit 1 John 5:7, restored in later editions of both Erasmus and Luther's New Testaments). Dr Mrs Riplinger also alludes to Tyndale's use of Erasmus's New Testament to "*polish*" the English translation. Dr DiVietro has clearly been most duplicitous in his denunciation of Dr Mrs Riplinger in these respects.

Dr DiVietro admits, p 16 that the King James translations used a variety of sources besides Hebrew and Greek but he then quotes from *The Translators to the Reader* to show that the AV1611 is indeed a translation and not mere purification, according to Dr Miles Smith's statement that "*Translation it is that openeth the window, to let in the light; that breaketh the shell, that we may eat the kernel...*" See this author's earlier work, where this statement has also been cited³⁷. This statement, Dr DiVietro insists, proves his accusation against Dr Mrs Riplinger.

Dr DiVietro does not tell his readers, however, that Dr Mrs Riplinger inserts the same quote from Dr Smith in p 549 of *In Awe of Thy Word* and rightly concludes, her emphases that "*There are no verses that teach that the Bible ceases to be the inspired word of God when it is in a language other than Greek or Hebrew. Translation is not a barrier to inspiration. God inspired his word; he promised to preserve it; therefore it is still inspired:*

"...his judgments are in all the earth...the word which he commanded to a thousand generations" (see 1 Chron. 16:14, 15; Ps. 12:6, 7, 105:7, 105:8, 33:4, 33:11, 45:17, 100:5)."

If God is able to command His word "*to a thousand generations,*" why is He not able to inspire translations of His word? Apart from their "*private interpretation*" 2 Peter 1:20 of "*theopneustos,*" Drs Waite, DiVietro and Williams have not shown from scripture why God cannot do so. That God *can* inspire translations is shown from Dr Gipp's analyses, given in this author's earlier work³⁸.

In sum, an honest inspection of *In Awe of Thy Word* shows that Dr Mrs Riplinger *does* acknowledge that the 1611 English Holy Bible is a translation. But she also shows that it is a purification *as well*, in Chapter 3 of *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 17, 129ff, entitled *From The Bishops' Bible of 1568 to The King James Bible of 1611, Rubbing & Polishing Where Substance is Sound*.

Dr DiVietro appears to have overlooked this chapter (he should perhaps have spent not *three* but *four* days reading Dr Mrs Riplinger's work) as well as the citation from Dr Smith that Dr Mrs Riplinger included on p 131 of *In Awe of Thy Word*, this author's emphases.

"Whatsoever is sound already (and all is sound for substance, in one or other of our editions...) the same will shine as gold more brightly, being rubbed and polished."

In sum, it may be observed from Dr DiVietro's **Setting Up the 'Clean-Up'**:

1. Dr DiVietro has identified two main themes of *Hazardous Materials*, which he perceives as heresies, namely that the 1611 English Holy Bible is "*all scripture...given by inspiration of God*" and that contemporary Bible study aids, i.e. dictionaries, lexicons and interlinear testaments do not enable the student to understand the scriptures.
2. Dr DiVietro has overlooked the AV Publications catalogue, where several such aids are listed. Even though Dr Mrs Riplinger would advise caution in the use of these

aids, the AV Publications catalogue shows that Dr DiVietro has a distorted perception of the purpose of *Hazardous Materials*.

3. *Hazardous Materials* does of course strongly warn against using these aids to ‘correct’ or ‘improve’ the AV1611. This warning is vindicated by Dr DiVietro’s use of ‘the Greek’ with respect to his expositions of *oinos* (“**wine**”), *baptizo* (“**baptize**”) and John 11:33, by which he reached erroneous conclusions.
4. Dr DiVietro contradicts himself in this chapter by asserting first that the AV1611 is not “**all scripture...given by inspiration of God**” but then on the same page stating that wherever the correct Hebrew and Greek texts are accurately translated, the reader has the very words of God, which of course he can’t have if translation has prevented these words from being inspired. But just as a Catholic priest can ‘explain’ how the wafer at the mass *is* Christ though it *isn’t*, the Nicolaitan priests of the DBS Executive Committee appear able to assert that the 1611 English Holy Bible *is* the word of God though to them it simultaneously *isn’t*.
5. The DBS stance, therefore, as revealed once again by Dr DiVietro in this chapter, is that *no-one* has “**the words of God**” Numbers 24:4 (N.B. first mention of the expression) unless the DBS Executive Committee condescends to reveal it *through the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek ‘originals,’* the pure, finally authoritative contemporary sources of which are, apparently, known only to the august members of the DBS Executive Committee. This attitude is totally opposed to scripture. Balaam speaks “**the words of God**” (first mention, Numbers 24:4) i.e. that which God speaks and can be heard, Numbers 23:5, 18, throughout Numbers 22-24, in a language *that cannot have been either Hebrew/Aramaic or Greek,* especially insofar as Balaam, *who is not an Israelite* exhorts Balak, *who is a Moabite,* to “**Rise up, Balak, and hear.**” It also follows that wherever God, Balaam or Balak speak in Numbers 22-24, the Hebrew ‘original’ *must itself have been an inspired translation, even though the DBS insists, Cleaning-Up, p 2 that no such work has ever existed.* Contrary to the DBS, though, “**the scripture of truth**” Daniel 10:21 shows that Numbers 22-24 is another example of the inspired translations alluded to in this author’s earlier work³⁹.
6. Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of stating that the King James translators did not translate their work but only purified earlier Anglo-Germanic bibles. Inspection of her book *In Awe of Thy Word* shows that they both translated their original language sources and refined the texts of those translations that preceded their work, such as the Bishops’ Bible.
7. As well as self-contradiction, Dr DiVietro’s book is showing signs of misrepresentation and dissimulation with respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work. See Point 5 above.

This work will continue with the responses to Dr DiVietro’s criticisms of *Hazardous Materials* in turn, with reference as far as possible to that which is “**More to be desired...than much fine gold**” Psalm 19:10 that Dr DiVietro and his co-saboteurs have sought so shockingly to tarnish.

Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials – Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint

Dr Mrs Riplinger's⁴⁰ Challenge #1 is to define the specific text when the expression "in the Greek" or "in the Hebrew" is used, "with full bibliographical information."

Dr DiVietro⁴¹ spends 14 pages trying to discredit the above challenge and fails to answer it.

If this author was confronted with Challenge #1, his answer would simply be as follows, with respect to the sources in his possession, which would be used only as witnesses for (or against) the contents of English texts, including the 1611 English Holy Bible and definitely *not* as any authority *over* the 1611 English Holy Bible.

1. *The Interlinear Bible Hebrew/English, Volumes 1-3*, edited by Jay P. Green Snr., Baker Book House, 1983
2. *The RSV Interlinear Greek-English New Testament*, Nestle's 21st Edition, Samuel Bagster, 1985
3. *The Interlinear Greek-English New Testament*, George Ricker Berry, from Stephens 1550 Edition, Regency Reference Library, n.d.

Simple, really.

Moreover, Dr Mrs Riplinger has given full bibliographical information⁴² on all three of the above sources and all others of any significance in her detailed evaluation of them. That is all she is asking for from her opponents.

It is therefore exceedingly mean-spirited of Dr DiVietro, p 22, to complain, as he does, that Dr Mrs Riplinger's book doesn't include a full bibliography at the end, or that the citations she gives are hard to read because they are in small print. That isn't the issue of Challenge #1. The Hebrew and Greek sources that supposedly 'clarify,' i.e. override, the AV1611 are the issue.

If Dr DiVietro has trouble reading the small print in Dr Mrs Riplinger's work, he should get himself a magnifying glass. He and his august Christian colleagues, Drs Waite and Williams etc., had no trouble putting Dr Mrs Riplinger's personal life under intense magnification, as Dr DiVietro's own work shows⁴³.

Dr DiVietro lists several of the main Greek New Testament Received Texts in his answer to Challenge #1, namely those of Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza and Scrivener. He insists, pp 20-21 that these texts overwhelmingly match each other and the AV1611. Dr Mrs Riplinger, he declares, is unreasonably emphasising the minor differences* between these texts to undermine the Hebrew and Greek bases for the scriptures.

*Although minor differences between various editions of the AV1611, less than 200 worthy of mention⁴⁴, *can* be used according to Drs Waite and DiVietro when it suits them to deny inspiration of the 1611 English Holy Bible. That strikes this author as "***a false balance***" Proverbs 11:1. See remarks in ***Preface and Introduction***.

Dr DiVietro states further that in all the places where editions of the Greek Received Texts agree, they are God's inspired words and that is the criterion by which these texts may be judged as such. Ironically, although Dr DiVietro insists that the Nestle-Aland Greek Text is a corruption of the word of God, pp 24-25, by Dr DiVietro's own criterion, even the Nestle-Aland Text would also be 'inspired' wherever it agreed with all the editions of the Received Texts. However, Dr DiVietro doesn't address this particular anomaly.

In sum, nevertheless, Dr DiVietro's statements about the Received Text appear to provide at least a partial answer to some of the questions for Dr Waite that this author posed in his earlier work⁴⁵. For simplicity, the questions have been re-numbered in simple succession.

1. Are the Ben Chayyim and Scrivener texts “*“inspired?”*”
2. If the Ben Chayyim and Scrivener texts are “*“inspired,”*” is Beza's 1598 5th Edition, also “*“inspired,”*” at least where it matches Scrivener's text?
3. If the Ben Chayyim and Scrivener texts are “*“inspired,”*” are any other Hebrew and Greek texts “*“inspired?”*” where they match the Ben Chayyim and Scrivener texts, even Nestle's?

Dr DiVietro's answer to all of the above, including the various Hebrew Old Testament editions, would appear to be, yes, where all readings agree with each other, between editions.

Some difficulties remain, unfortunately.

First, Dr DiVietro makes the incredible statement, p 20 that the few variations between different editions of the Received Greek Text can be resolved by back-translation of the AV1611. Yet, like his colleague Dr Waite⁴⁶, he elsewhere disavows⁴⁷ any notion that Scrivener did this, as though such a procedure should be perceived as unscholarly.

Nevertheless, according to Dr DiVietro's approach, therefore, the result would then have to be a *fully inspired* Greek New Testament, *dependent for its full inspiration on an uninspired English translation*. That state of affairs seems truly weird to this author and it is suggested that this author's earlier work be consulted for discussion of this bizarre situation⁴⁸.

Second, Dr DiVietro then admits that no *printed* Greek Text was *ever* the final authority for the New Testament, but he then insists that some *unprinted and unpublished* Greek Text *was* the final authority for the words of the New Testament. (Dr DiVietro may be implying that it *is* the final authority *now* because he says that the original Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek words of the Old and New Testaments still *are* given because they once *were* given, p 2 but he does not say so in the discussion on pp 20-21 of his book.)

But it is difficult to understand how even this *unprinted and unpublished* Greek Text could be finally authoritative and therefore, of necessity, 'inspired' (or vice versa) insofar as it consists of a dead language, as Dr DiVietro himself acknowledges, pp 6, 16. See remarks in *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials – Setting Up the 'Clean-Up'*.

But since Dr DiVietro has failed to identify this *unprinted and unpublished* 'inspired' Greek Text in a single volume, he has therefore failed to meet Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #1.

Third, a further complication exists for Drs Waite, DiVietro, Williams and the DBS Executive Committee. Even where the Greek texts *agree* with one another, they don't always agree with the 'correctly translated' 1611 English Holy Bible. Dr Mrs Riplinger⁴⁹ has shown that extant Greek editions agree with each other in omitting the first “*Jesus*” from Mark 2:15 *and that they are 'united in error' in this respect*. She shows that the King's men used pre-1611 vernacular Bibles and the Old Latin to confirm the correct reading. This form of textual anomaly does not seem to have occurred to Drs Waite, DiVietro, Williams and the DBS Executive Committee.

Ironically and awkwardly for Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee, Dr Mrs Riplinger and missionary Peter Heisey⁵⁰ have shown that numerous readings exist in the KJB that are *not* found in what is usually called “*the TR,*” i.e. Scrivener's and Ricker Berry's editions but *are found in the critical texts like Nestle's that Dr DiVietro deems to be corrupt*. See remarks above. These readings include Mark 13:37, 14:43, Luke 23:34, 46, John 12:26,

18:1, Acts 2:22, 13:15, 24:25, 26:6, Romans 7:6, Ephesians 3:1, Philippians 2:5, 2:21, Revelation 13:10, 18:23. Dr DiVietro's work is insufficiently advanced to address this textual anomaly either.

He nevertheless makes certain accusations against Dr Mrs Riplinger, which should, in fairness to her, be answered.

Dr DiVietro declares, pp 21-22 that it is fallacious of Dr Mrs Riplinger to claim that early translations, such as the Itala, Aramaic and Gothic, were inspired independently of translation from the Greek. He states that this cannot be proved because it cannot be shown that the original texts of these vernacular translations were perfectly consistent with each other, the Greek original and the AV1611.

He doesn't seem to allow that wherever they do agree, these texts could at least be inspired, by his own criterion (even though the languages, e.g. Latin, are dead) in the same way that he insists that the unprinted and unpublished finally authoritative Greek text was inspired. Moreover, Dr DiVietro provides no bibliographical details of where Dr Mrs Riplinger is supposed to have made this claim.

That seems to this author evidence of a double standard, which brings to mind Deuteronomy 25:13-16.

“Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small...For all that do such things, and all that do unrighteously, are an abomination unto the LORD thy God.”

Though he would of course deny that any of the vernacular translations could be inspired even where they did agree with one another, because no translation can be inspired, *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3, *even though*, in Dr DiVietro's own words, p 18, we *can* have the words of God wherever the genuine Hebrew and Greek texts (Masoretic and Received, respectively, where the various editions agree with each other) *are correctly translated*. The *only* extant Bible to do this, Dr DiVietro tells us, is the AV1611, although on the same page, he assures his readers that it is *not* inspired i.e. it is the words of *men*, not *God*, as Dr Waite insists⁵¹.

This author will not attempt to resolve what appears to be a totally self-contradictory position on the part of Dr DiVietro with respect to the Hebrew and Greek, the final authority, the words of God, either translated or un-translated and inspiration. It is Dr DiVietro's responsibility to clarify his position.

With respect to Dr DiVietro's accusation against Dr Mrs Riplinger about her evaluation of early vernacular Bibles, she does not, as Dr DiVietro asserts, claim that these early Bibles were separately inspired without being translated. Citing Herman Hoskier, what Dr Mrs Riplinger actually says⁵² is that early New Testament texts in Greek, Latin, Aramaic (Syriac), Coptic and others were concurrent such that the non-Greek texts would have to have been translated from Greek originals at a very early date.

Citing other authorities, including *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, she explains that the Goths were among the language groups that received the Gospel message in Acts 2 but that the Gothic Bible itself was a *translation*, faithful to the Antiochian Traditional Greek Text and the Old Latin.

It is clear therefore that Dr Mrs Riplinger is not, as Dr DiVietro accuses her, guilty of urging her readers to deny two millennia of belief that the New Testament was at first written in Greek. She is simply stating, using detailed sources that Dr DiVietro chooses to ignore, that early vernacular translations were practically contemporaneous with Greek originals.

Dr DiVietro then accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of making William Tyndale a liar because she says that Tyndale did not translate his New Testament but only purified an existing English Bible. Dr DiVietro gives no reference for this supposed claim by Dr Mrs Riplinger (after accusing her of omitting important bibliographical details) and his accusation is entirely false. Dr Mrs Riplinger⁵³ cites Tyndale as stating “*“The Newe Testament dylygently corrected and compared with the Greke by Willyam Tindale”*” and describes him as a *translator*, not merely an editor.

What Dr DiVietro missed in his superficial reading of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s books is that she cites Tyndale as warning *against* an *over-emphasis* on Hebrew and Greek and as exhorting that the true meaning of scripture can be found from the *English Bible’s* built-in dictionary. This is the emphasis of that part of *In Awe of Thy Word* on Tyndale, which Dr DiVietro overlooked in his persecuting zeal against Dr Mrs Riplinger, Philippians 3:6.

Dr DiVietro (and Dr Waite before him) also overlooked Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments on the Bible translators of the Reformation who “*described their vernacular translations as “scripture,” whose author was God.*” She states that “*Martyr and Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, wrote in his Prologue to the Great Bible that it was “given” by the “holy spirit.”*”

Contrary to the opinions of the DBS Executive Committee therefore, Cranmer (martyred), Tyndale (martyred), Coverdale, Rogers (martyred) and the other Bible translators of the English Reformation, plus Wycliffe before them⁵⁴, believed that they had in their hands “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God*” in English. In contrast to the apostates described in Romans 1:18, they believed they held the truth in *righteousness*. This inspired English scripture reached its final purified stage with the Holy Bible of 1611, Psalm 12:6, 7, thereby superseding in both inspiration and authority the earlier English versions. See also *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1165-1167. How did Dr DiVietro miss this material, apart from a vicious prejudice against the Holy Bible and its believers?

It is therefore easy to see who the liars are in this context. They are not William Tyndale or Dr Mrs Riplinger.

See also comments under **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’** and Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks on purification of the scriptures in **Preface and Introduction**.

Dr DiVietro then accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of being one of only a recent few who have stated that the 1611 English Holy Bible is “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God.*”

This is an outrageous lie on the part of Dr DiVietro. See above for Dr Mrs Riplinger’s citation of Archbishop Cranmer and his stance on the Great Bible, which was a faithful precursor to the 1611 English Holy Bible.

See also this author’s earlier work⁵⁵ with respect to *Testimonies to the Inspiration of the AV1611* and especially Bishop Ryle’s remarks on the English Reformers of the 18th century, emphases are the author’s and note the unequivocal stance on the inspiration of the 1611 English Holy Bible as the Book of God, this author’s under-lining.

“*“The spiritual reformers of the last century taught constantly **the sufficiency and supremacy of Holy Scripture**. The Bible, whole and un mutilated, was their sole rule of faith and practice. They accepted all its statements without question or dispute. They knew nothing of any part of Scripture being uninspired. They never allowed that man has any “verifying faculty” within him, by which Scripture statements may be weighed, rejected or received. They never flinched from asserting that there can be no error in the Word of God; and that when we cannot understand or reconcile some part of its contents, the fault is in the interpreter and not in the text. In all their preaching they were eminently men of one book. To that book they*

were content to pin their faith, and by it to stand or fall. This was one grand characteristic of their preaching. They honoured, they loved, they revered the Bible.””

Belief in the inspiration of the 1611 English Holy Bible is certainly not recent. Neither, as this author’s earlier work shows, is it limited to a supposed small minority of contemporary individuals such as Dr Mrs Riplinger (and this author), who believe that the 1611 English Holy Bible is indeed **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God.”**

“In all these instances the Bible means the translation authorised by King James the First...to this day the common human Britisher or citizen of the United States of North America accepts and worships it as a single book by a single author, the book being the Book of Books and the author being God” – George Bernard Shaw

Note that this author’s ‘flannel’ detector has been recording steadily throughout this study of Dr DiVietro’s book and shows no sign of slackening. See remarks under **Preface and Introduction**.

Dr DiVietro, pp 27-29, then takes issue with Dr Mrs Riplinger’s disclosure in *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1016-1017 that the First Edition of ben Chayim’s Hebrew Old Testament omitted Joshua 21:36, 37. Dr Mrs Riplinger has drawn attention to the claim of Ginsburg, editor of today’s TBS Hebrew Old Testament that he followed ben Chayim’s First Edition, which is not true because Ginsburg’s Old Testament *includes* Joshua 21:36, 37. Dr DiVietro complains that Dr Mrs Riplinger has not revealed whether or not later editions of ben Chayim’s Old Testament contained the verses. If they did, he insists, then Dr Mrs Riplinger should not criticize Ginsburg for having used these later editions, even though he said he only used the First.

Dr DiVietro has missed the point of this chapter, Chapter 28, of *Hazardous Materials*. The point of the chapter is to show that *no* published Hebrew Old Testament available today precisely matches⁵⁶ *“the “Originall” used by the KJB translators.”* No extant Hebrew Old Testament exhibits perfect one-to-one correspondence with all the readings of the KJB Old Testament.

No available Hebrew Old Testament, therefore, can be used in authority *over* the 1611 English Bible to change or even ‘clarify’ its Old Testament readings. These Old Testaments are subordinate to the 1611 English Holy Bible for that reason.

Neither can the editors, such as Ginsburg, lay claim to the existence of a *single, authoritative extant source* for the Old Testament Hebrew underlying the AV1611. The non-existence of such a source is highlighted by Ginsburg’s need to use another authority for Joshua 21:36, 37, which he himself has to admit, as shown by Dr Mrs Riplinger on p 1017 of *Hazardous Materials*, of which statement Dr DiVietro studiously avoided informing his readers.

That the King James translators *did* insert Joshua 21:36, 37 shows, as Dr Mrs Riplinger points out that they were *not* limited to one Old Testament source (ben Chayim’s First Edition) but the sources that they used (known only in part today) *did* result in an Old Testament Text that God has honoured for the last 400 years. This is why, as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in detail in Chapter 28 of *Hazardous Materials* that only *one* Old Testament is worthy of total trust as truly God’s words not corrupted by any one man’s editorial imperfections - the AV1611 Old Testament *in English*.

This conclusion is clearly at odds with the notions of the DBS Executive Committee, which explains the current backlash from Dr Waite and Dr DiVietro.

After listing several of the Hebrew sources that contain the verses from *Hazardous Materials*, Dr DiVietro then makes the strange supposition that, although he believes that Joshua 21:36,

37 are legitimate verses, neither Dr Mrs Riplinger nor anyone else can really know that the King James translators did not make these verses up. The uncertainty arises, he says, because the translators' notes were destroyed in the Great Fire of London of 1666.

It doesn't seem to have occurred to Dr DiVietro that God did not see fit to preserve the translators' notes because the translators' work was in print by then and preserved "*to the uttermost*" Hebrews 7:25 "*the certainty of the words of truth*" Proverbs 22:21, including Joshua 21:36, 37.

It is difficult to believe that Dr DiVietro's supposition has any substance because two of the faithful precursors⁵⁷ to the AV1611, the Bishops' and the Geneva Bibles, each contain Joshua 21:36, 37 and read essentially as the AV1611. Coverdale's Bible reads similarly to the AV1611.

Dr DiVietro then makes the puzzling accusation that Dr Mrs Riplinger is inconsistent in accusing Scrivener of back-translation, *Hazardous Materials*, Chapter 18, because she is supposed to have used back-translation from English to determine, by conjecture that Joshua 21:36, 37 rightly exist in the Hebrew Old Testament. Yet he lists the Hebrew sources that Dr Mrs Riplinger cites in *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1016-1017. Comparison of these various sources that Dr Mrs Riplinger has carried out (and no-one in the DBS Executive Committee appears to have done) is not back-translation but simply collation.

Dr DiVietro, p 30, now skips back to p 578 of *Hazardous Materials* and quotes the sentence "*Easily shattered is myth that there exists only one Greek text or that one can carelessly say, 'The Greek says...'*"

From this single, brief quote, Dr DiVietro then insists that it is not a myth that God gave an original inspired New Testament text in Greek, which must not be confused with printed Greek editions that do differ from each other *and are the work of men though they are inspired where they agree**. See pp 20-21 of *Cleaning-Up* and comments at the beginning of this section. Dr DiVietro then accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of repudiating any notion that there is an accurate, inerrant, infallible Greek text inspired of God, that she is careless in the study of Greek manuscripts and texts and that she cuts the student off from any sound basis for the Bible by supposedly insisting that the AV1611 New Testament was separately inspired of God independently of any Greek basis.

*Although it should be remembered that Dr DiVietro has not accounted for passages where the Greek sources may be united in error, e.g. the omission of the first "**Jesus**" in Mark 2:15. See comments above.

By inspection of the above, it is ironic indeed that Dr DiVietro has accused Dr Mrs Riplinger of conjecture on the previous page of his book. At this point, he fails to furnish any statements from Dr Mrs Riplinger's work to substantiate his raft of accusations, which in this author's view is highly discourteous to Dr Mrs Riplinger and to Dr DiVietro's readers.

He has in addition missed the main point of this section of Dr Mrs Riplinger's work, Part III, which describes in detail the deficiencies of the available printed Greek texts; Scrivener's, Ricker Berry's Edition of Stephanus's 1550 Edition, the so-called Majority Text and the errors in the Greek manuscripts of the Orthodox Church, from which the Received Text editions have largely been derived. The errors in these manuscripts are few compared with those of \aleph and B, from which most modern versions have been derived such as the NIV but are nevertheless serious, for example the omission of Acts 8:37 and 1 John 5:7.

Dr Mrs Riplinger's information, therefore, shows clearly that no pastor can truthfully stand in a pulpit and refer to 'the Greek' as a single, definitive source, which in this author's experi-

ence is invariably the case when such a reference is made. The misleading nature of ‘the Greek’ is made worse when, as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in Parts I, II of *Hazardous Materials* that English equivalents of ‘the Greek’ may often be in error because the English meanings found in lexicons, bible dictionaries and interlinears were set down by unsaved men such as Liddell and Scott, whose secular definitions of Biblical words influenced the Unitarian Thayer and in turn the ASV of James Strong, in which the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ is denied in a note on John 9:38. See *Hazardous Materials*, p 171, The Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ is further denied in Ricker Berry’s *Interlinear* where “*servant*” is substituted for “*Son*” in Acts 3:13, 26 and for “*child*” in Acts 4:27, 30. The same errors are found in the NKJV, based on the Majority Text, so-called. Ricker Berry’s *Interlinear* is also seriously in error in Matthew 27:4, Acts 7:45, 12:4, 1 Timothy 6:5, 10, 20, Titus 2:13, 2 Peter 1:1, as is the NKJV. Dr Mrs Riplinger provides many more examples of errors in Ricker Berry’s *Interlinear* in both Greek and English in Chapter 19 of *Hazardous Materials* and that is the substance of her warning on p 578.

Dr DiVietro should have discerned that this was Dr Mrs Riplinger’s purpose in compiling Part III because on that very page she cites Philip Schaff, who lists “*at least 666 different printed Greek New Testament editions, edited between 1514 and 1883.*”

At this point, Dr DiVietro’s accusations on p 30 against Dr Mrs Riplinger become somewhat baffling to this author. On pp 20-21, as indicated above, Dr DiVietro states that where the Greek texts agree, then although no printed edition is finally authoritative, they are nevertheless the inspired words of God. However, he now relegates them to the status of the un-inspired words of men. See comments above on Dr DiVietro’s inconsistency in this respect.

But Dr DiVietro insists that a pure, inspired Greek text *does* exist (even if not one of the 666+ available editions), although as yet he has not disclosed its location between two covers to the reader, which this author views as yet another discourtesy on the part of Dr DiVietro.

1 Corinthians 14:33 comes to mind.

“For God is not the author of confusion...”

Spurgeon’s warning also comes to mind. See remarks under **A Time-Honoured Warning**.

“We shall gradually be so bedoubted and becriticized, that only a few of the most profound will know what is Bible, and what is not, and they will dictate to all the rest of us. I have no more faith in their mercy than in their accuracy: they will rob us of all that we hold most dear, and glory in the cruel deed.”

Exactly. As their part of the “*glory*,” Drs Waite and Williams have even urged Dr DiVietro’s so-called *Cleaning-Up* exercise on the rest of the Body of Christ as something needful.

Further, how can Dr Mrs Riplinger be accused of carelessness and wilful ignorance with respect to Greek manuscripts and texts, when A.V. Publications provides – and commends - the following works by Dr J.A. Moorman, published originally by none other than the DBS’s companion ministry, *The Bible for Today*?

1. *A Closer Look: Early Manuscripts and the A.V.*
2. *When the KJV Departs from the Majority*
3. *Early Church Fathers and the A.V.*

See also the Hebrew and Greek sources available from A.V. Publications listed in this author’s earlier work⁵⁸. How, then, can Dr DiVietro accuse Dr Mrs Riplinger of insisting that

the 1611 English Holy Bible has no Greek textual basis? Yet he repeats this unfounded accusation on p 31 of his book.

Note Dr Mrs Riplinger's analysis from *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 950-956, with respect to the following extracts from her most detailed analysis of Greek New Testaments available today.

Emphases and [] insertion are the author's in the first extract.

"Scrivener's Greek New Testament is sold today as the Trinitarian Bible Society's Greek Textus Receptus. Its preface states that it,

*"...follows the text of Beza's 1598 edition as the **primary** [not complete] authority, and corresponds with "The New Testament in **the Original Greek** according to the text followed in the Authorized Version," **edited** by F.H.A. Scrivener..."*

*"The words "primary" (not complete) and "edited" [changed] are glossed over by many readers, who fall upon the presumptuous word, "the Original Greek." In fact, it is **not** the text of Beza precisely; it is Scrivener's text. It is **not** precisely the Greek text followed by the KJV translators, but only those Greek readings to which Scrivener had access. Therefore it is not, in the minutiae "the Originall Greeke," cited on the preface page of the KJV."*

Note the statement *"It is **not** precisely the Greek text followed by the KJV translators."* This statement gives the lie to Dr DiVietro's accusations that according to Dr Mrs Riplinger, the 1611 English Holy Bible has no Greek basis. It has no *extant* basis that is a perfect counterpart to the English Text, as the second extract from Dr Mrs Riplinger's work explains.

The second extract has this author's emphases, see also the earlier work, **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society**, pp 31-32.

*"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."***

That the 1611 English Holy Bible *is* **"all scripture...given by inspiration of God"** (regardless of any Greek counterpart) has been shown to have been the position of faith taken by numerous distinguished witnesses down through the centuries since its initial publication (regardless of the contrary position taken by the DBS Executive Committee). See this author's earlier work⁵⁹.

Spiritually, John 6:63, God had His own way of 'inspiring' the 1611 English Holy Bible, just as He had His own way of 'inspiring' or breathing life *into* Adam, Genesis 2:7. The Lord Jesus Christ said in John 3:8:

"The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

So it is with the 1611 English Holy Bible (and its vernacular counterparts today). Spiritually, God imparts **"the breath of life"** – see 1 Peter 1:23 - into every copy that comes from the printing presses. Everything else is a dead book. The Lord said in Jeremiah 23:28:

“He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the LORD.”

Nothing. Likewise the DBS’s ‘the Greek etc. in-the-mind-only’ or ‘collective consciousness-only’ version of ‘the God-breathed originals’ by comparison with ***“the scripture of truth”*** Daniel 10:21.

Like his colleague Dr Waite, Dr DiVietro should therefore pay careful attention to Romans 13:9 (in the King’s English).

“Thou shalt not bear false witness.”

Dr DiVietro continues with his accusations against Dr Mrs Riplinger, once again discourteously providing any citations in this section to substantiate his charges.

First, in spite of having earlier warned about ‘fluff,’ p 10, Dr DiVietro, pp 30-31, reiterates his complaint about the supposed lack of bibliographical information in Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work and about how hard it is to read the documentation at the end of the citations that she gives.

See this author’s response to these complaints at the beginning of this section.

Dr DiVietro then repeats the dogma that Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work must be wrong because according to his own crude rule of thumb, p 15, anything new in Bible study is not true and vice versa. As indicated earlier, the application of this rule is undoubtedly that anything from Bible study that is hitherto unknown must be wrong if the DBS Executive Committee didn’t think of it first.

As Job said to his three dogmatic friends in Job 12:2:

“No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you.”

Dr DiVietro then makes the astounding insinuation (***“great plainness of speech”*** 2 Corinthians 3:12 is not his strong point) that in effect, because Dr Mrs Riplinger believes the 1611 English Holy Bible to be ***“all scripture...given by inspiration of God,”*** she is the founder of a heretical cult.

Here, therefore, is a reminder of the supplication by another cult member⁶⁰.

“Oh, give me that book! At any price give me the book of God!” – John Wesley.

If that is the testimony of a cult member according to the DBS, then God give us more cult members, in spades.

After making further unsubstantiated insinuations that Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work is flawed, Dr DiVietro then repeats the statement, p 31 that he made on pp 20-21, namely that wherever the printed Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek texts agree with each other, they are the words of God. See remarks at the beginning of this section and above. He still has not explained why, therefore, God saw fit to preserve a single, definitive *English* Text (in print) instead of a Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek one (not in print), which English Text *then becomes the final ‘un-inspired’ arbiter of what should be in the ‘inspired’ Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text* where available printed editions don’t agree with each other.

As indicated, this failure on the part Dr DiVietro amounts to a failure to respond satisfactorily to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #1.

He then displays a distinct narrow-mindedness in making a further accusation against Dr Mrs Riplinger, p 32, to the effect that she doesn’t believe that God has preserved His words in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. (It should be emphasised yet again that neither Drs Waite nor

DiVietro nor any other member of the DBS Executive Committee has yet disclosed precisely *where* God has preserved these words perfectly between two covers.)

Dr DiVietro's narrow-mindedness in this respect is apparent from the wise words of Rev J.A. Moorman⁶¹ (from none other than a BFT publication), who reveals the true source of preservation for God's words, by definition therefore, God's *inspired* (not fossilized⁶²) words.

In this author's view, Dr Moorman's sage analysis applies to printed Greek editions, as well as to Greek manuscripts, under-linings are the author's.

"Our extant MSS reflect but do not determine the text of Scripture. The text was determined by God in the beginning (Psa. 119:89, Jude 3)..."

"When a version has been the standard for as long as the Authorized Version, and when that version has demonstrated its power in the conversion of sinners, building up of believers, sending forth of preachers and missionaries on a scale not achieved by all other versions and foreign language combined; the hand of God is at work. Such a version must not be tampered with. And in those comparatively few places where it seems to depart from the majority reading, it would be far more honouring to God's promises of preservation to believe that the Greek and not the English had strayed from the original!"

God has preserved enough of the ancient sources for them to be overwhelmingly *witnesses in favour of* the Text of the 1611 English Holy Bible. But as Dr Moorman observes, these witnesses do not *determine* the true text of scripture. The true text of scripture is that which *"has been the standard for as long as the Authorized Version"* and is the Authorized Version.

The DBS Executive Committee cannot produce another standard that has in turn yielded the results that Dr Moorman describes for the Authorized Version. Isaiah 41:24 comes to mind for the Burgonists, therefore (with apologies to the good Dean, who was ever ***"valiant for the truth"*** Jeremiah 9:3).

"Behold, ye are of nothing, and your work of nought: an abomination is he that chooseth you."

Dr DiVietro's final word with respect to Challenge #1, which also doesn't address Challenge #1, is that the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek must be studied to clear up any 'confusion' or 'ambiguity' in the 1611 English Holy Bible and to give a fuller understanding of the 'inspired' Hebrew/Aramaic/ Greek words in English (although inspiration is then lost in translation, according to the DBS).

All of which Dr DiVietro failed to do, with respect to the examples he includes in *Cleaning-Up* pp 94-95, which suggests more 'flannel' on his part. See remarks in ***Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials – Setting Up the 'Clean-Up'***.

In sum, for Challenge #1:

1. This author would cite Green's Hebrew/English interlinear and Nestle's 21st and Ricker Berry's Greek/English interlinears in answer to the challenge. They would be cited only as witnesses for or against the Text of the 1611 English Holy Bible, never as a means of 'clarifying' it or in authority over it. It should always be remembered that *"the TR,"* i.e. Scrivener's and Ricker Berry's editions, actually departs from the 1611 English Holy Bible in numerous verses, e.g. Mark 13:37, 14:43, Luke 23:34, 46, John 12:26, 18:1, Acts 2:22, 13:15, 24:25, 26:6, Romans 7:6, Ephesians 3:1, Philippians 2:5, 2:21, Revelation 13:10, 18:23, where critical texts, e.g. Nestle's, actually

agree with the AV1611. *No* published Greek (or Hebrew) text can *ever*, therefore, be taken as an authority over the words of the 1611 English Holy Bible.

2. Although he lists several Greek New Testament editions, Dr DiVietro *does not state unequivocally anywhere in his response to Challenge #1 which definitive* Hebrew or Greek source that he would use if he were to refer to “*the Hebrew*” or “*the Greek.*” He therefore evades Challenge #1, by complaining that Dr Mrs Riplinger doesn’t give full bibliographical details in her books and that such details as are given are in small print. In answer to his first complaint, Dr Mrs Riplinger does give full bibliographical details of the Hebrew and Greek editions that she addresses in Parts III-V of *Hazardous Materials*, so this complaint is baseless. Concerning the second complaint, he should get a magnifying glass, like the one he used to put Sister Riplinger’s personal past life under scrutiny.
3. Dr DiVietro asserts that where extant Greek and/or Hebrew texts agree, then these passages are the pure, inspired word of God. Yet he then states that the discrepancies must be resolved by ‘back translation’ from the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible. Dr DiVietro makes this statement in spite of later disavowing that Scrivener did this to produce his Greek edition and in spite of thereby admitting that an ‘un-inspired’ text i.e. the KJB, according to the DBS Executive Committee, may be used to determine the content of the ‘inspired’ original language texts. That is, man’s words determine God’s words, a wholly unscriptural attitude, according to Amos 4:13, “*For, lo, he that formeth the mountains, and createth the wind, and declareth unto man what is his thought, that maketh the morning darkness, and treadeth upon the high places of the earth, The LORD, The God of hosts, is his name.*”
4. Regrettably for Dr DiVietro, if he used the KJB to resolve discrepancies in the Greek editions, he would have to alter all such printed editions in Mark 2:15, because Dr Mrs Riplinger has shown that all omit the first “*Jesus*” in the verse. So Dr DiVietro’s position of inspiration-by-majority-Greek-rule plus the KJB as necessary is not a safe one. He would do better to drop the first part of that stipulation.
5. Nevertheless, it is apparent once again from Dr DiVietro’s comments in his response to Challenge #1 that, as with Dr Waite, *the* Greek text (or Hebrew/Aramaic text) exists only in his mind, or in the collective consciousness of the Burgonists of The DBS Executive Committee. See this author’s remarks in the **Introduction** to this work.
6. Dr DiVietro then makes a number of false accusations against Dr Mrs Riplinger, all of which, it should be noted are without reference to any actual statement of hers in any of her books. He claims, pp 22-23 for example that Dr Mrs Riplinger believes that vernacular translations were inspired separately from translation. However, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s citation of Hoskier and others shows that vernacular translations, e.g. Latin, Syriac, etc., followed very quickly from the Greek originals so that they were virtually concurrent with them. This accusation of Dr DiVietro’s is therefore false.
7. Dr DiVietro then accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of being one of only a recent few who believe that the 1611 English Holy Bible is the pure word of God. That Dr DiVietro has lied in this respect is proven by Dr Mrs Riplinger’s citations of the Bible translators of the Reformation, including the martyred Archbishop Cranmer who believed that “*the Great Bible...was “given” by the “holy spirit.”*” This author has also documented in his response to Dr Waite’s *A WARNING!!* several outstanding servants of God from history, including Whitefield and Wesley, who believed in the inspiration of the 1611 English Holy Bible. Their testimonies invalidate this accusation of Dr DiVietro’s

against Dr Mrs Riplinger. That does not prevent him, of course, from insinuating that, like Dr Mrs Riplinger, they were members of a heretical cult.

8. Dr DiVietro then accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of trying to cut students off from 'the Greek' (and the Hebrew/Aramaic) by means of her insistence that the AV1611 was inspired of God independently of any original language sources. God *did* inspire the AV1611, in a manner spiritually equivalent to God's 'inspiration' of Adam, Genesis 2:7 but the fact that A.V. Publications lists Greek and Hebrew sources for purchase, along with analyses of important passages of scripture by means of manuscript evidence shows that Dr DiVietro has once again falsely accused Sister Riplinger. What Dr Mrs Riplinger has done to draw down this accusation against her has been to point out in Parts II-V of *Hazardous Materials* the very real deficiencies of available Greek and Hebrew sources and of the accompanying Bible dictionaries and lexicons etc., which may give misleading English meanings because these works were compiled by unregenerate authors. They *cannot* be used to expound the 1611 English Holy Bible. See next point.
9. Dr DiVietro continues to insist that the study of Greek and Hebrew is necessary to 'clarify' the 1611 English Holy Bible and to clear up any confusion and/or ambiguities in certain passages. As has been shown, see remarks immediately preceding this summary section, Dr DiVietro has signally failed to do this for the examples he cited on pp 94-95 of *Cleaning-Up*. As also shown in this author's earlier work, Dr DiVietro would have done better to "***Search the scriptures***" John 5:39 instead of 'the Greek.' His insistence and that of the DBS Executive Committee on the study of Greek and Hebrew to 'clarify' the 1611 English Holy Bible is in fact grossly unscriptural because it flatly denies the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:9, Revelation 1:6.
10. Finally, as the foregoing shows, Dr DiVietro has failed to meet Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #1. He has, however, provided steady readings for this author's 'flannel' detector. See Points 1-9 above to substantiate this observation.

***Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials* – Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**

Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #2 is to give the Christian testimony of the editor of any currently available Greek lexicon.

This author's answer to Challenge #2 is simple. I can't. However, I don't bother with lexicons, so the problem doesn't arise.

This time, though, Dr DiVietro takes up to 37 pages of his book, pp 33-69, in failing to answer Dr Mrs Riplinger's second challenge.

As before, when he failed to answer Dr Mrs Riplinger's first challenge, Dr DiVietro also makes a number of false accusations against Dr Mrs Riplinger that again, in fairness to her, should be answered.

Dr DiVietro's first accusation is that *Hazardous Materials* consists largely of *ad hominem* attacks on authors and editors of Bible study aids, without giving any examples of errors in their English definitions of Greek or Hebrew words in the scriptures.

He reproduces Dr Mrs Riplinger's summary description of James Strong of *Strong's Concordance*, p 161 of *Hazardous Materials*, in an effort to substantiate this accusation and further accuses of Dr Mrs Riplinger of a double standard because on p 200 of *Hazardous Materials*, she refers to her own use of *Strong's Concordance*, pp 33, 35-36.

That Dr DiVietro has been both careless and vindictive in his accusations against Dr Mrs Riplinger is revealed by inspection of point 2 in the very summary description of James Strong that he copied from *Hazardous Materials*. This point reveals that Strong was on the committee of the ASV that identified the Lord Jesus Christ as a creature instead of the Creator and Dr Mrs Riplinger gives details on p 171 of *Hazardous Materials*, alluding to the ASV's marginal note for John 9:38 designating the Lord Jesus Christ as a creature, not the Creator. See remarks in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

It is Dr DiVietro's responsibility to show that James Strong distanced himself from this heretical note and Dr DiVietro fails to do so in his answer to Challenge #2. Moreover, it should be noted that Dr DiVietro doesn't refute any of the warnings about James Strong that Dr Mrs Riplinger issues.

On p 173 of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr Mrs Riplinger provides a table of important Biblical words such as "**Godhead**," "**charity**," "**heresy**," "**hell**," "**devils**," and "**Lucifer**" that she contrasts with Strong's corrupt lexical definitions that then find their way into the apostate ASV of 1901, the unbiblical readings of which Strong clearly condoned. Dr Mrs Riplinger then provides⁶³ an extensive table contrasting readings from the AV1611 and the ASV, showing how the latter version repeatedly attacks major doctrines such as the Deity of Christ. The heretical ASV readings, Dr Mrs Riplinger explains, were condoned by both Strong and his Unitarian colleague and co-committee member, J. Henry Thayer, author of a Greek-English lexicon that underlies many subsequent similar works.

Corrupt lexical definitions are clearly associated with a corrupt text.

In the chapter on Vine's *Expository Dictionary*, Dr Mrs Riplinger provides another table showing how pure KJB words such as "**abundance**," "**righteousness**" and "**full assurance**" have been adulterated by Vine's corrupt definitions that match the word usage in Westcott and Hort's RV. Vine's dictionary, she explains, derives from the earlier works of unsaved heretics such as Thayer, Trench, Moulton and Milligan. Her examples from Vine, therefore, serve as examples of the misleading nature of these works as well.

Parts III-V of *Hazardous Materials* is replete with examples of scriptures upon which unsaved or apostate academics cast doubts or proposed alterations stemming from their tainted study aids that in turn could mislead the ordinary Bible believer and reader. See especially Chapter 17 on the textual heresies of none other than the DBS icon, Dr Frederick Scrivener, set out in detail from his own writings.

Dr DiVietro's accusation that Dr Mrs Riplinger provided no examples to substantiate her concerns about Greek/Hebrew lexicon editors is therefore shown to be a malicious lie. He clearly did not give *Hazardous Materials* a 'strong' enough evaluation in his three-day canter through it, p 10 of *Cleaning-Up*.

Dr DiVietro's accusation of a double standard on Dr Mrs Riplinger's part with respect to her use of *Strong's Concordance* is also malicious. Although Dr DiVietro reproduces large portions of *Hazardous Materials* in *Cleaning-Up*, he avoids informing his readers of what Dr Mrs Riplinger said on p 200, which includes the following statement. Capitalization is the author's.

"Strong's heresy is a Christian's warning to "withdraw thyself" from the Greek and Hebrew "private interpretation" in the back of Strong's Concordance. The front matter of his concordance, in which Strong lists the PLACES where a given word is used, is still perhaps the most valuable tool Christians have to "compare spiritual things with spiritual.""

Location of references containing particular Bible words is a purely mechanical process at which Bible critics have been adept for centuries. James White who wrote *The King James Only Controversy* had no difficulty locating 250 verses in the AV1611 where he repeatedly sought to criticize its wording⁶⁴. That another critic of the Holy Bible like James Strong could locate Bible words on a much greater scale in order to compile a concordance should come as no surprise. Inspection of Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement above, however, shows that Dr DiVietro's accusation against her of a double standard (a term used repeatedly by James White in denigrating Bible believers) is highly devious, which by now should come as no surprise to the reader either.

Dr DiVietro's next accusation against Dr Mrs Riplinger, pp 36-38, is with respect to her application of Bible numerics to 1 John 5:7, *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1182-1184. He compares her analysis to the concoction of false Bible codes, which he says, can be worked up for any book and accuses her of more inconsistency because, he says, she warns against the occultism of some study aids editors but resorts to mysticism herself to prove inspiration for the 1611 English Holy Bible.

He further insists that her Bible numerics approach cannot be used for textual criticism, is essentially cabbalistic in nature and leaves open the question of which language to use, Greek or English.

Dr DiVietro fails to mention that Dr Mrs Riplinger is citing the work of Periander A. Esplana, a Christian from Camarines Norte, Philippines. He has written two extensive works, entitled *The Bible Formula*⁶⁵ and *The Mathematical Perfection of the King James Bible*⁶⁶.

If Dr DiVietro wishes to refute the Bible numerics that Dr Mrs Riplinger has cited with respect to 1 John 5:7, it is incumbent upon him to refute Periander Esplana's thesis. He cannot airily dismiss it out of hand, as he does. That is unreasonable and in turn it is a poor reflection on his level of spiritual maturity. As a very wise saint⁶⁷ of God once said:

"Beware of unreasonable people. Good men are always reasonable."

It is clear from Mr Esplana's work that he is focussing on the 1611 English Holy Bible for the development of his formula, or at least single-language vernacular Bibles, so Dr DiVietro's

issue about which language to use is a non-problem. Moreover, Dr Mrs Riplinger states that application of Mr Esplana's method to other books, such as "*other English Bible versions, or do-it-yourself translations from Greek and Hebrew lexicons*" will not produce coherent results as are found for the 1611 English Holy Bible with respect to 1 John 5:7. It is Dr DiVietro's responsibility to prove otherwise. He cannot reasonably merely assert otherwise.

Dr DiVietro's criticism of Dr Mrs Riplinger's use of Bible numerics shows further mean-spiritedness on his part because Dr Mrs Riplinger is unequivocal in her stance that 1 John 5:7 is genuinely a verse of scripture. Dr DiVietro is so anxious to denigrate Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work that he fails to declare in this part of his book whether or not he believes 1 John 5:7 to be genuine. He would do well to consider John 14:23.

"If a man love me, he will keep my words."

Dr Mrs Riplinger is clearly committed to keep God's words, including 1 John 5:7. Dr DiVietro does not here show the same level of commitment but he cannot, of course, accept Mr Esplana's thesis because that would be an admission that the AV1611 is "*all scripture...given by inspiration of God*" whereas Dr DiVietro's denies that it is. See *Cleaning-Up*, p 18. Dr DiVietro's preconceived notions in this respect must therefore inevitably colour his response to any analysis that supports inspiration of the AV1611.

Dr Mrs Riplinger warns of the occult practises of study aids editors in Chapters 10, 11 of *Hazardous Materials*, about Trench, Moulton and Milligan. She also warns of false Bible codes such as the Da Vinci code in Chapter 15 and writes extensively in Chapters 28, 29, pp 1061-1092, against the cabbalistic methods of Johannes Reuchlin, a Catholic occultist, who delved into Greek and Hebrew sources "*for mystical meaning which could re-interpret the words of the Bible,*" author's emphasis. Dr DiVietro refers to Bullinger as using false Bible numerics but he neglects to inform his readers that Dr Mrs Riplinger includes Bullinger among the users of cabbalistic systems.

Inspection of Dr Mrs Riplinger's research in Chapters 15, 28, 29 of *Hazardous Materials* shows that the occult practices that she exposes bear absolutely no relation to Mr Esplana's work.

It is entirely inexcusable of Dr DiVietro therefore to liken the satanic leanings of Trench, Moulton, Milligan, Reuchlin and Bullinger to Mr Esplana's analysis. Dr DiVietro chooses to reject this work out of hand but it is not mystical, it is clearly mathematical and Dr DiVietro is once again being mean-spirited in attempting to imply otherwise by means of innuendo and insinuation.

He asserts that Dr Mrs Riplinger should try the spirits with respect to her interest in Bible numerics (1 John 4:1, though Dr DiVietro doesn't give the reference). In reality, it is his own spirit that could do with being tried, 2 Corinthians 7:1.

"Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God."

It is also extremely ironic of Dr DiVietro to imply that Dr Mrs Riplinger is tending towards cultic and cabbalistic practices, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 31, 38, when he himself is wholly committed to a small select group of "*heady, highminded*" academics 2 Timothy 3:4 who perceive themselves as effectively the sole custodians of "*all the words of the Lord*" Exodus 4:28 secreted in an unidentified, unpublished and inaccessible-except-by-the-DBS-Executive-Committee exclusive repository of purportedly 'God-breathed Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek originals.' See remarks in **Introduction**.

Dr DiVietro then devotes approximately four pages of his work, pp 38-42, to reproducing citations from *Hazardous Materials* where Dr Mrs Riplinger warns against the satanic inclinations of 19th century Greek editors such as Liddell, Trench, Moulton and Thayer, pp 207, 221-222, 331-332, 333, 334, 337, 348-349, 359, 361, 363, 410-411.

All that Dr DiVietro can offer by way of comment on this extensive quote from Dr Mrs Riplinger's work is that the editors mentioned were not necessarily godly but their works are valuable, although not finally authoritative and that she is only making *ad hominem* attacks against these authors.

Where the authority of their works begins and ends, Dr DiVietro does not tell his readers but it appears that *the* final authority' remains 'the bright elusive butterfly' of the never-in-print Greek text extant only within the mindset of the DBS Executive Committee Conclave.

Or Cabal.

Although declaring that the works of Liddell etc. are valuable study aids, Dr DiVietro ignores the very statements from *Hazardous Materials* that he quotes about Trench secularizing Bible words, p 361 and the pagan philosophers whom Thayer consulted for his lexicon, p 337. He also ignores his citation from *Hazardous Materials* about the heresy trial of ASV/RV chairman Philip Schaff, pp 348-349, who "*hoped all Protestants would be brought into "true Catholic union."*"

Dr DiVietro's superficial treatment of the extensive statements that he extracted from *Hazardous Materials* therefore resulted in some serious oversights on his part. As Dr Mrs Riplinger explains on p 336 of *Hazardous Materials*, the AV1611 has the term "**Godhead**" in Acts 17:29, Romans 1:20 and Colossians 2:9. Thayer's Unitarian influence on the ASV led to the substitution of the weaker word "*divinity*" in Romans 1:20 and, even if only indirectly, cast its sinister shadow on later translations. For example, the term "**Godhead**" has been entirely removed from the popular NIV and the NKJV, favoured by more 'conservative' fundamentalists, has substituted the term "*Divine Nature*" in Acts 17:29. Christians can partake of "*the divine nature*" 2 Peter 1:4 but they can never be part of the Godhead, which consists exclusively of "*the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost*" 1 John 5:7.

Moreover, as Dr Mrs Riplinger mentions, Ricker Berry's *Interlinear* substitutes "*that which is divine*" and "*divinity*" for "**Godhead**" in Acts 17:29 and Romans 1:20 respectively, once again betraying the dead hand of Joseph Henry Thayer.

Vindicating Dr Mrs Riplinger's warning about Schaff, Benjamin Wilkinson lists 44 readings⁶⁸, comprising 46 verses that Westcott and Hort's RV altered from the 1611 readings in order to support Romish or modernistic, i.e. anti-biblical, doctrines. The equivalent readings of Schaff's ASV repeatedly match those of the Romish RV. Dr DiVietro fails to mention any of these references and shows that he has therefore missed the full import of Dr Mrs Riplinger's warning about Schaff.

Concerning Dr Mrs Riplinger's warning about Trench, Dr DiVietro once again missed some vital information. On p 363 of *Hazardous Materials*, she reveals that Trench wished to capitalize "**vengeance**" in Acts 28:4, in order to personify the word as the Greek goddess of that name. Schaff's ASV substitutes the word "*Justice*" but capitalised as shown in Acts 28:4 according to Trench's influence. The NASV, NRSV and NKJV all have "*justice*," not capitalised but the NASV has a footnote that states "*Or Justice, i.e. the personification of a goddess*," indicating that Trench's Greek idolatry lived on long after him, adversely influencing later generations of version editors and their readers, *especially insofar as the popular NIV has "Justice" in Acts 28:4, capitalised*, reading identically with the infamous 1901 ASV.

Dr Mrs Riplinger shows further, p 382 that Trench was also responsible for eliminating Paul's rebuke to the Athenians of being *"too superstitious"* in Acts 17:22 by substituting *"very religious"* as found in the ASV, NASV, NRSV (*"extremely religious"*) NIV, NKJV. Trench's substitution, followed by all the new bibles, could easily be used to justify legislation outlawing criticism of someone else's 'religion' and in turn hindering Christian witness. Such sinister trends are already discernible in the USA⁶⁹. Dr Mrs Riplinger gives more warnings about Trench's verse-tampering on pp 388ff, with respect to Luke 14:18-19, 17:4, 6, Romans 1:20, 2 Corinthians 2:14, 17, Colossians 2:8, James 3:5 and other readings, including his transliteration of *"hades,"* instead of translation into *"hell,"* a pusillanimous and deceitful practice, carried forward by all the new bibles and Ricker Berry's *Interlinear, RB Int'l*. See **Table 1**.

Table 1
"Hell" versus "hades" – AV1611 versus New Bibles Ricker Berry's 'the Greek'

Verse	AV1611	ASV	NASV	NRSV	NIV	NKJV	RB Int'l
Matthew 11:23	<i>hell</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>depths</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>hades</i>
Matthew 16:18	<i>hell</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>hades</i>
Luke 10:15	<i>hell</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>depths</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>hades</i>
Luke 16:23	<i>hell</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>hell</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>hades</i>
Acts 2:27	<i>hell</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>hades</i>
Acts 2:31	<i>hell</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>hades</i>
Revelation 1:18	<i>hell</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>hades</i>
Revelation 6:8	<i>Hell</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>hades</i>
Revelation 20:13	<i>hell</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>hades</i>
Revelation 20:14	<i>hell</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>Hades</i>	<i>hades</i>

Table 1 shows that with the sole exception of the NIV in Luke 16:23, the new bibles uniformly reject the well-known and well-understood translated English word *"hell"* in favour of the vague and far less familiar transliteration *"Hades"* or, as with the NIV, other weak or misleading substitutes such as *"depths"* or *"grave."* 'The Greek,' as found in Ricker Berry's *Interlinear*, is not much help either.

This malicious kind of tampering with the definitive word *"hell,"* to which Trench was clearly prone, is ready-made for the cruelly heretical doctrine of possible eventual salvation after death, as Dr Mrs Riplinger explains in *New Age Versions*, Chapter 18, *Judgement or Interment?*

"The open door to hades in new versions merely vents the views of their editors. 'New' Greek editor F.J.A. Hort called purgatory, "a great and important truth." His American counterpart Philip Schaff believed in an "extension of the period of grace for non-Christians beyond the limits of the grave.""

The reader should note especially the statement of the heretic Philip Schaff, about whom Dr Mrs Riplinger has warned above. No doubt his crony Trench collaborated with Schaff's *"doctrines of devils"* 1 Timothy 4:1.

And Dr DiVietro insists that the work of individuals such as Schaff, Thayer, Trench et al is valuable for understanding the scriptures? He should read James 3:12.

“Can the fig tree, my brethren, bear olive berries? either a vine, figs? so can no fountain both yield salt water and fresh.”

And neither can ***“the enemies of the cross of Christ”*** Philipians 3:18 elucidate ***“wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ”*** 1 Timothy 6:3.

“Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one” Job 14:4.

In passing, it should be observed that the AV1611 correctly capitalises ***“Hell”*** in Revelation 6:8, as inspection of the context will confirm. The new bibles and ‘the Greek’ are too crudely constructed to incorporate this particular fine distinction, although the new bibles deem ***“Hades”*** worthy of capitalisation in Luke 10:15 but not ***“heaven.”***

The reader should note again that Dr DiVietro addressed none of the essential material above following his extended quotes from Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work. He was interested only in furthering his innuendo against her. The above shows that Dr Mrs Riplinger is exposing the errors of the Greek editors that follow from their beliefs e.g. Thayer’s Unitarianism. She is not making *ad hominem* attacks as Dr DiVietro falsely claims.

Dr DiVietro then spends the next ten pages of his book, pp 43-52 inclusive, justifying the use of lexicons and castigating Dr Mrs Riplinger for emphasising the use of the 1611 English Holy Bible to define its own words.

Dr DiVietro forgot Wycliffe’s exhortation⁷⁰, this author’s under-lining.

“In Holy Scripture is all truth; one part of Scripture explains another.”

See **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’**.

Dr DiVietro also forgot Tyndale’s exhortation⁷¹, emphases and [] insert are Dr Mrs Riplinger’s

““And in many places, where the text seemeth at the first chop hard to be understood, yet the circustaces [surrounding words and verses] **before and after, and often reading together, make it plain enough.**””

And Coverdale’s, emphases and [] inserts are Dr Mrs Riplinger’s.

““[L]et **one text expound another** unto thee...[L]et the **plain text** be thy guide, and the spirit of God (which is the author thereof) shall lead thee in all truth.””

Most of all, Dr DiVietro forgot 1 Corinthians 2:13.

“Which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth [lexicons etc.], **but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.**”

Dr DiVietro’s praise of lexical usage, pp 49-52 did not help him very much in his exposition of *oinos*, *baptizo* and John 11:33. See remarks in **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’**.

But these pages of *Cleaning-Up* contain statements of Dr DiVietro’s that are breath-taking in their naivety.

He makes the incredible statement on p 49 that a corrupt heart will find corrupt meanings of Biblical words from lexicons but a good heart will find correct meanings, evidently from the same lexical sources. In addition to failing to substantiate this statement, Dr DiVietro again forgot James 3:12.

“Can the fig tree, my brethren, bear olive berries? either a vine, figs? so can no fountain both yield salt water and fresh.”

How, therefore, does a corrupt lexicon *unequivocally* provide true *Biblical* meanings for the words in the underlying Greek and Hebrew texts? It appears that they don’t, or obscure them with associated *non-Biblical* meanings, as Dr Mrs Riplinger⁷² has observed in a detailed discussion of the term *monogenes* i.e. ***“only begotten”*** in John 1:14, 18, 3:16, 18, 1 John 4:9, with respect to the Lord Jesus Christ.

“New version editors and advocates seem to pick the pagan lexical definition, time after time.” See remarks above on the term ***“vengeance,”*** showing how a *“pagan lexical definition”* has influenced modern editors, including those of the recent 2004 HCSB, Holman Christian Standard Bible, which has ***“Justice”*** capitalized in Acts 28:4 and the footnote ***“Gk dike (!) a goddess of justice.”***

If modern version editors, supposedly familiar with ‘the Hebrew and the Greek’ can therefore be deceived into adopting unbiblical word definitions, how, then, is the ordinary student supposed to identify a correct Biblical meaning in a tainted lexical source, *even if such a meaning is included in that source?* Dr DiVietro says it is a matter of heart attitude but he doesn’t help the student in this respect because he doesn’t say *how* the heart is to be made good.

It appears that he has forgotten Proverbs 20:9, Jeremiah 17:9, Luke 8:15 and John 15:3.

“Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?”

“The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?”

“But that on the good ground are they, which in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience.”

Note carefully in Luke 8:15 above the past tense, showing that *only the word heard* has made or can make the heart honest and good. A healthy heart condition is then sustained by *keeping* the word heard. Observe how the NIV, NKJV *change the wording to imply that the heart can be made good independently of the word heard, which it cannot be.* See John 15:3 below.

“Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you.”

See also Matthew 15:18-20, Mark 7:20-23. If Dr DiVietro thinks he is exempt by means of his lexical expertise, he is wrong, 1 John 1:8.

“If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.”

Spurgeon’s⁷³ exhortation is good.

“Some say, ‘I have my faults, but at the bottom I have a good heart.’ Alas! It is this that deceives you, for your heart is the worst part of you.”

Dr DiVietro should ask God to do some heart-searching on his behalf, in the light of Jeremiah 17:10.

“I the LORD search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings.”

In sum, however, the scriptures and exhortations cited above render the use of lexicons unnecessary.

On pp 50-51, Dr DiVietro states that lexicons must be updated to keep abreast of changes in the English language so that, in effect, the words in the original languages of the Biblical texts can continue to be understood.

This is the same argument that is used to justify the rash of modern versions published in the last 100 years or so, well over 200⁷⁴.

“Another reason for revision of the King James Version is afforded by changes in English usage” – RSV Preface, 1946.

“A present-day translation is not enhanced by forms that in the time of the King James Version were used in everyday speech” – NIV Preface, 1978.

“The Revised Authorised Version [NKJV]...[unlocks] for today’s readers the spiritual treasures found especially in the Authorised Version of the Holy Scriptures” – NKJV Preface, 1982.

“English is...the world’s most rapidly changing language. The HCSB seeks to reflect recent changes in English... The HCSB is a new translation for today’s generation” – HCSB Introduction, 2004.

The same *“changes in English usage”* scam has been in operation for a long time and is continuing.

Dr DiVietro’s attitude to the 1611 English Holy Bible is therefore basically no different from that of the modern version editors. They use corrupt sources (e.g. lexicons) to change *“the holy scriptures”* 2 Timothy 3:15 directly. Dr DiVietro uses corrupt sources (e.g. lexicons) to change *“the holy scriptures”* indirectly, supposedly to ‘clarify’ them, which he does not. See remarks above on *oinos* etc.

Dr Hills’s⁷⁵ remarks on the supposed *“changes in English usage”* should be repeated.

“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.”

The word that the Lord has magnified above all His name, Psalm 138:2, in *Biblical English*, is unaffected by changes (usually degenerative, like those of the visible heavens, Isaiah 51:6) in contemporary English, regardless of Dr DiVietro’s apparent opinion to the contrary.

On p 52, Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of being prejudiced because she cites Gerhard Kittel as a war criminal, *Hazardous Materials* pp 81-82 but does not specify anything anti-Semitic in his lexicon. Dr DiVietro’s accusation in this respect does nothing but reveal his on-going prejudice against Dr Mrs Riplinger. Had he bothered to read all of p 82, he would have seen the citation for *New Age Versions*, Chapter 42, which documents numerous examples of Kittel’s anti-Semitism that has influenced modern editors, e.g. Acts 23:12, 26:17. The NASV, NIV and the recent 2004 HCSB read *“the Jews”* as a whole instead of *“certain of the Jews”* as in the AV1611. In Acts 26:17, the NASV, NKJV read *“the Jewish people”* instead of simply *“the people”* as in the AV1611. Kittel was attempting to infer a murderous spirit among Jews as a whole that some modern editors have carried forward in varying degrees.

Dr Mrs Riplinger also shows that though not directly associated with anti-Semitism, Kittel helped to concoct the erroneous distinction between *phileo* and *agapao*, which are each translated as “*love*” in the New Testament. *Phileo* is supposed to specify friendliness and *agapao* God’s sacrificial love, except that they don’t, as *agapao* in Luke 11:43 most definitely reveals. This author has, however, heard the *agapao/phileo* falsehood repeated on at least 3 occasions by independent preachers over the years*, showing that Kittel’s devious influence persists to this day.

*Especially with respect to John 21:15-17, even though verse 17 contains the expression “*the third time*” not once but *twice*, as though to emphasise that the *agapao/phileo* distinction is false. Yet Ricker Berry’s *Interlinear*, though not Nestle’s, perpetuates Kittel’s falsehood by changing “*lovest*” to “*have (hast) affection for*” in verses 16 and 17, where *phileo* occurs.

Dr DiVietro, pp 53-55, then criticizes Dr Mrs Riplinger for her warning about lexicons based on the corrupt texts of Westcott and Hort, Nestle-Aland and the UBS, United Bible Society. See *Hazardous Materials*, p 70. She gives the example of Revelation 15:3, where these lexicons will give the words for “*ages*” or “*nations*” that should be in Revelation 15:3 according to ‘the Greek’ instead of “*saints*” as in the AV1611. Dr DiVietro states that this example is invalid because the student would simply consult *Strong’s Concordance* and get the correct word because Strong’s numbers are based on the King James vocabulary.

However, Dr DiVietro has headed this sub-section of his book *The Reason(s) the Church Needs Teachers*. He insists, based on his own researches that good teaching in textual matters and in the Greek and Hebrew languages will easily overcome the problems that Dr Mrs Riplinger envisages.

That view is optimistic to say the least.

This is what one PhD with 20 years experience of teaching New Testament Greek said in writing to this author some years ago about John 1:18 and the readings “*only begotten Son*” AV1611 versus “*God the one and only*” NIV⁷⁶.

““*Both external evidence (Most reliable manuscripts and the earliest fathers) and internal evidence (A later scribe has clearly harmonised with other passages in John which read “only” or “only begotten” Son...) plainly indicate that John originally wrote “God” not “Son.”*”

““*This is another example where the KJV (here using a defective manuscript and not at this point being guilty of incorrect translation as in 2 Peter and Titus) fails to affirm that Jesus is God.*”

““*Much scholarly discussion has centred around whether monogenes means “only begotten” or “only”...I am inclined to believe that the better translation is “only”, this indicating Christ’s uniqueness.*””

That kind of false teaching is all-pervasive today. It is interesting to note that the recent 2004 HCSB has the reading “*the One and Only Son*” in John 1:18, perpetuating the heretical interpretation of *monogenes*. Dr DiVietro has failed to grasp Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warning that the so-called Bible study aids that she has listed, based on Westcott and Hort etc. continue to compound the kind of errors found in the new versions such as occur in John 1:18 and Revelation 15:3. Dr Mrs Riplinger’s illustration of Revelation 15:3 is therefore entirely valid, regardless of Dr DiVietro’s off-handed dismissal of it.

The ‘good teaching’ to which Dr DiVietro refers would simply pit one Greek authority against another. How is the student supposed to choose between them? Dr DiVietro would

probably urge him to trust the DBS Executive Committee but that then makes men the final authority instead of the scripture.

Moreover, these ‘aids’ (!) will not help the student get a good heart according to Luke 8:15 for discerning correct word meanings. Likewise any others that Dr DiVietro might suggest. Only the word heard and kept will achieve that, according to Isaiah 7:15.

“Butter [Isaiah 7:22, 1 Peter 2:2] and honey [Psalm 119:103] shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good.”

On that basis, like Proverbs 20:9, Jeremiah 17:9, Luke 8:15 and John 15:3 above, this scripture too would make lexicons etc. irrelevant.

Now 23 pages into his answer to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #2 without having answered it, Dr DiVietro, pp 55-57, next accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of distorting the facts about lexicons because she illustrates through the compilation by a certain Barclay M. Newman that lexicon editors take word definitions from corrupt bible versions. Newman’s sources, it appears, included the now defunct RSV. See *Hazardous Materials* pp 77-80. Dr DiVietro insists that proper lexicons are compiled in advance of any translations, for which they are then used as an aid to translation. Lexicons like Newman’s, he declares, are not general lexicons but are prepared only for specific translations and are of little value.

Dr DiVietro’s vehemence with respect to this accusation is such that it would be easy to overlook a couple of salient shortcomings in his response. First, he does not at this point state where ‘proper’ or general lexicons get their word meanings from. This is another discourtesy to the reader and to Dr Mrs Riplinger, who at least gives her readers some insights into how lexicons are put together, even if her information has upset Dr DiVietro.

This author’s view is that if lexicons or bible dictionaries get word definitions from non-biblical sources, then they are ungodly and have no place for the Bible believer who seeks **“to understand...the words of the wise”** Proverbs 1:6. In his eagerness to attack Sister Riplinger, Dr DiVietro forgot Isaiah 55:8-9.

“For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.”

It appears from *Cleaning-Up* pp 43, 59 that Dr DiVietro lives in a welter of thousands of mostly unbiblical books. He therefore seems to have forgotten a lot of the Holy Bible. See remarks above with respect to Proverbs 20:9, Isaiah 7:15, Jeremiah 17:9, Luke 8:15 and John 15:3.

Second, Dr DiVietro demands (in capital letters) that the title of Newman’s lexicon should be read in order to show that it is not a general lexicon but one written for a specific translation and for giving the meanings of words found in modern translations (again, capitalized).

By inspection, Dr DiVietro’s statement above is inconsistent. A lexicon written for a specific modern *translation*, singular, by definition cannot be perceived as a lexicon written for modern *translations*, plural. The inconsistency on Dr DiVietro’s part arises because the quotes he gives from *Hazardous Materials* make reference to no fewer than four English translations as the basis for Newman’s lexicon; the RV, RSV, Goodspeed and Good News New Testament. He therefore has to modify his initial charge about Newman’s lexicon being specific to one version to make it ‘stick’ against Sister Riplinger (which of course it doesn’t).

Dr DiVietro nevertheless insists that the *title* of Newman’s lexicon proves that it is not a general lexicon and therefore Dr Mrs Riplinger is misleading her readers.

Interestingly, Dr DiVietro doesn't give the title of Newman's lexicon, although he must have read it because the title is found on p 78 of *Hazardous Materials*, from which Dr DiVietro extracted a quote.

The title of Newman's lexicon is *A Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament*. The title clearly does not indicate that Newman's work is anything other than a general lexicon, at least for what he and his academic colleagues thought of as the New Testament i.e. the Westcott-Hort text, as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows and as Dr DiVietro quotes.

Any ordinary student of 'the Greek' could therefore be deceived (via Newman's or similar works) into thinking that the Westcott-Hort text *is* the New Testament text. Many are, as shown by the depressingly large proportion of NIV-based 'fundamentalist' churches in the UK.

On p 57, Dr DiVietro takes a swipe at Sister Riplinger for implying, supposedly that lexicons are used to find the 'original' text. He even accuses her of being 'inflammatory.' Such is his level of bile against Sister Riplinger at this point (it surfaces more and more as his book proceeds) that he has misunderstood what she actually said. The relevant part of quote from p 79 of *Hazardous Materials*, which Dr DiVietro includes, is as follows.

"Metzger's definitions...came originally from a corrupt text and the vilest new versions in print. Yet how many naively look to Metzger's Concise Greek-English Dictionary definitions for the 'original.'"

By inspection, the dictionary is not being consulted for the 'original' text. It is being consulted for the *definitions* of words believed (perhaps wrongly) to have been *used* in the 'original' text.

It is therefore easy to see who is being 'inflammatory.' It is not Sister Riplinger.

Dr DiVietro's graceless attitude throughout this section of his book calls to mind John 11:46, 53, following the raising of Lazarus.

"But some of them went their ways to the Pharisees, and told them what things Jesus had done."

"Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put him to death."

Anything to get rid of the challenge to their power base and the Challenger. Pharisaic efforts did not die out in 33 AD.

On p 58 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro part-repeats a quote from p 81 of *Hazardous Materials* found on p 51 of his book. Emphasis is Dr Mrs Riplinger's.

"Did God express his opinion of the German to English Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature? In 1952 its tentative notes made a trip to Germany. The ship which carried them, the Flying Enterprise, sank and the notes were buried in Davy Jones locker...Back to the drawing board!"

In his initial comment on the above statement, Dr DiVietro says that Dr Mrs Riplinger is totally wrong to believe that God sank the *Flying Enterprise*. In this author's view, Dr DiVietro is totally wrong to disbelieve Psalm 148:8 and Mark 4:39.

"Fire, and hail; snow, and vapour; stormy wind fulfilling his word:"

"And he arose, and rebuked the wind, and said unto the sea, Peace, be still. And the wind ceased, and there was a great calm."

Dr DiVietro should appreciate that the elements do what God tells them to do, whether for storm or calm. The English people believed this back in the summer of 1588⁷⁷.

“Elizabeth I also recognised that England’s victory was down to the weather but she believed that it was because God was on England’s side and a special medal was struck to commemorate England’s victory. The medal was inscribed with the words “Flavit Jehovah et Dissipati Sunt” – God blew and they were scattered. The defeat of the Spanish Armada was a divine victory, or so the English people believed.”

They had good reason to and it did not include the use of lexicons. Dr DiVietro should note that God blessed their faith. Theirs was the generation from which came the 1611 English Holy Bible a little over 20 years later. Dr DiVietro should therefore not despise *“the day of small things”* Zechariah 4:10 and certainly not the day of larger things, like God’s *“terrible majesty”* Job 37:22 in ordering the weather. 2 Chronicles 20:35-37 is another example.

“And after this did Jehoshaphat king of Judah join himself with Ahaziah king of Israel, who did very wickedly: And he joined himself with him to make ships to go to Tarshish: and they made the ships in Eziongeber. Then Eliezer the son of Dodavah of Mareshah prophesied against Jehoshaphat, saying, Because thou hast joined thyself with Ahaziah, the LORD hath broken thy works. And the ships were broken, that they were not able to go to Tarshish.”

Dr DiVietro then repeats the claim, *Cleaning-Up* pp 58-60 based on the rest of p 81 of *Hazardous Materials* that Dr Mrs Riplinger is falsely asserting that lexicons take their definitions from corrupt bible translations and that she even insists that lexicons be ‘inspired.’

He does so in order to reiterate his perception of the proper use of lexicons but once again fails to inform his readers precisely how a general lexicon is correctly compiled, none of which, it should be noted once again has anything to do with answering Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #2. On p 18 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro mocks Dr Mrs Riplinger for, in his opinion, resembling a poor lawyer in setting out her support for the 1611 English Holy Bible. Dr DiVietro’s repeated evasion with respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s challenges so far would not serve him well in any properly constituted court of law. He has almost earned the nickname ‘Dr Deviation.’

Dr DiVietro does not show from *Hazardous Materials* pp 81-82 where Dr Mrs Riplinger has stipulated that lexicons should be ‘inspired.’ This claim is simply more insinuation on his part. His denial that lexicons take their definitions from corrupt bible versions is refuted in Chapter 12 of *Hazardous Materials* pp 428ff, which provides numerous examples of how Vine’s *Expository Dictionary* made use of the apostate RV for its word definitions. Moreover, Dr Mrs Riplinger also shows in earlier chapters, 9-11, how noted lexicon and bible dictionary editors such as Thayer, Trench, Moulton and Milligan used abominably heathen Greek mythological sources for their word definitions.

Dr DiVietro fails to address this grim subject and its sinister implications. He merely parrots the notion, pp 52, 56, 60 that lexicons give the full range of word meanings from which an informed reader (presumably one with a heart made right by means that Dr DiVietro has not disclosed) will make the right choice. The well-known example of the proverbial needle-in-the-haystack comes to mind.

As does Jeremiah 23:28.

“He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the LORD.”

Dr Ruckman⁷⁸ provides a good example of *“chaff to the wheat”* in his comments on Acts 1:3.

*“The Greek word for **“infallible proofs”** is τεκμηρίοις [tekmērion]. Plato, Aristotle, and Lysias used it for a ‘convincing, sure, certain, demonstrative’ proof. Something can be ‘convincing’ and be ‘false.’ You can have “many proofs” for a lie (e.g. evolution). Something can be ‘demonstrated’ to you so that you are ‘sure’ and ‘certain beyond a doubt’, and yet that thing may not be so. But the word **“infallible”** tells you that the thing is ‘absolutely true, without error or deception.’”*

The word **“infallible”** focuses on the nature of the **“proofs,”** not on their effect on hearers or readers, which is what words like *“convincing”* or *“demonstrative”* convey. **“Infallible”** is clearly the Biblical sense. What need is there of any other sense? If a word such as *tekmērion* is translated differently elsewhere in scripture, then again the scripture, not the lexicons etc. will give the correct sense. Any lexical source that provides additional meanings that include definitions from heathen Greek sources would only serve to confuse.

Yet Dr DiVietro makes the astounding statement, pp 58-59 that the notorious Septuagint makes an invaluable contribution to understanding Hebrew thinking behind Greek New Testament words because, supposedly, it was produced by bilingual Hebrew writers.

As Dr DiVietro no doubt well knows, today’s Septuagint or LXX is the edition of Sir Lancelot Brenton and consists mainly of the infamous Vaticanus manuscript, Codex B, supplemented where necessary by another Alexandrian manuscript, Codex A or Alexandrinus. The Septuagint, like Vaticanus, contains the Old Testament Apocrypha as part of the Old Testament. Its writers⁷⁹ were Aquilla, Symmachus, Theodotian and Origen. These individuals were Ebionites, who believed in salvation by following the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount and denied the doctrines of salvation that the Spirit of God revealed to Paul, Galatians 1:8-11. See also Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments on Origen in *Hazardous Materials*, pp 93-94. Unlike Dr DiVietro, the scripture does not exhort the Bible believer to learn from such individuals, quite the opposite.

“Go from the presence of a foolish man, when thou perceivest not in him the lips of knowledge” Proverbs 14:7.

It is up to Dr DiVietro to show how these unregenerate writers contributed anything valuable to understanding the New Testament, or either testament for that matter. He does not do so in this part of his book. The scripture’s comment is simple and to the point.

“The LORD knoweth the thoughts of man, that they are vanity” Psalm 94:11.

That scripture would cover a lot of Dr DiVietro’s thoughts as expressed in his book so far, summed up, as indicated, by the word ‘flannel.’ See comments under **Preface and Introduction**.

On pp 61-62, Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of ranting and compounding her *ad hominem* attacks on lexical editors by her criticisms of Liddell and Scott. Dr DiVietro claims to have refuted these so-called *ad hominem* attacks, which he has not. See comments earlier in this section. He quotes from *Hazardous Materials* pp 83, 90, from which citations he is forced to acknowledge that the Liddell-Scott definitions did indeed come from *“crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks.”*

Throughout his book, as a perusal of the foregoing pages will reveal, Dr DiVietro has been engaged in an extensive exercise of defending the indefensible. What follows is one of Dr DiVietro’s most striking exhibitions of this futile strategy.

The errors of Liddell and Scott, he insists, must be excused because their lexicon has been repeatedly revised and the revisers may be likened to good doctors who succeeded in making

sick folks healthier, i.e. Liddell, Scott and their lexicon were sick. Contemporary lexicographers, however, have concluded that, despite considerable ministrations, the patients are still sick, very sick. Citing Lee, who in turn cites the distinguished scholar Chadwick, Dr Mrs Riplinger states, her emphases, on p 85 of *Hazardous Materials*, a page that Dr DiVietro must have skipped over in his three-day canter through the work that “““*It is about time that Greek scholars recognized the need for a thorough overhaul of this indispensable tool.*”””

The physicians still seem keen to resuscitate the patients when in reality, palliative care would seem to be a better option.

Dr DiVietro further insists that Biblical meanings of New Testament Greek words can only be understood by means of contemporary study aids (AIDS?) that are the next best thing to immersing oneself in the society that spoke the language i.e. Koine Greek. That is, the student is supposed to immerse himself in “*crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks*” in order to understand the “*pure words*” of the Lord, Psalm 12:6 and the “*wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ*” 1 Timothy 6:3.

Dr DiVietro, who substantiates nothing in this part of his book, seems to think that “*the washing of water by the word*” Ephesians 5:26 can be understood by means of a metaphorical swim in a sewer. Flannel, sheer flannel. He evidently hasn’t read 1 Corinthians 15:33 recently.

“Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners.”

And again, he forgot Job 14:4.

“Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.”

Dr DiVietro then concludes this section of his book with the eye-watering assertion that God took the words the early Greeks used (evidently from the “*crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks*”) and invested them with Biblical meanings.

Chapter and verse? Dr DiVietro cannot provide chapter and verse to substantiate this assertion, not even from the Greek ‘original,’ the source of which remains known only the DBS Executive Committee.

God’s use of heathen Greek writers is limited to a mere six words* in the New Testament, cited by the Apostle Paul.

“For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring” Acts 17:28.

*Or a mere 15, if the Cretian statement in Titus 1:12 is included.

“One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies.”

Had Dr DiVietro confined himself to this Greek source, he could have saved a considerable amount of cash from the Lord’s resources, in that “*for all things come of thee, and of thine own have we given thee*” 1 Chronicles 29:14, used for purchasing his library of books, *Cleaning-Up* pp 43, 59 and donated it to KJB-based missions (none would be Koine Greek-based).

If he thinks that he needs such vast resources to understand the scriptures, he should take careful note of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s admonition in this respect⁸⁰.

“It is scandalous for rich Americans to have ten versions of the bible, instead of just one...Many tribes and peoples around the world have no King James Bible type bibles at all; the Albanian bible was destroyed during the communist regime. Many of the tribes in New Guinea do not have a bible in their language. But, these countries have no money to pay the publishers. The publishers are not interested in giving these people bibles; they are just interested in making bibles that can produce a profit for their operation.”

Publishers of bible study aids could well fall into the same category.

Dr DiVietro continues on pp 63-64 of *Cleaning-Up* with a quote from pp 90-91 of *Hazardous Materials*, which concludes with the question *“If we can not be sure what Homer meant (and Homer himself did not know), why are we using his writings to define Bible words?”*

Dr DiVietro evades the question. His feeble response to the quote is that KJB words are the same as those found in Shakespeare and therefore Shakespeare should be studied to help find the meanings of KJB words. He admits that Biblical Greek is a dead language – see remarks in **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’** - but then tries to turn that admission on its head by claiming that lexicons are therefore necessary so that the student can learn Biblical Greek words in the way that a child growing up during the era of Koine Greek would learn the meanings of its own common language.

Again, Dr DiVietro substantiates none of his comments. It remains a mystery why he would suppose that a dead language can give the students of today any useful insights into *“the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever”* 1 Peter 1:23. See remarks in this author’s response to Dr Waite⁸¹.

Dr DiVietro is wrong about the words of the KJB and Shakespeare being equivalent and he is wrong about learning the meanings of Biblical words (in English, since English, unlike dead Koine Greek, is a living language) from common, everyday usage.

The extract below is taken from an earlier work⁸² of this author’s and includes a communication from the Trinitarian Bible Society. Note that the critic in the context, like Dr DiVietro, substantiated nothing. Also like Dr DiVietro, this critic put forward the old familiar Shakespearean argument, although from a negative stance because he favoured the NIV. Both Dr DiVietro and this critic have the same objective, however; subjugate the words of the 1611 English Holy Bible to the words of men, e.g. playwrights (Shakespeare), novelists (Geoffrey Chaucer, to whom Dr DiVietro also alludes in this context) and Athenian children who lived between 330 BC and 330 AD⁸³ in order to justify the existence of lexical editors and their supporters, like Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee.

The extract from this author’s earlier work follows.

“Our critic also states in this sub-section “Insistence on the supremacy of the KJV is a reversal of the Holy Spirit’s action by insisting that the best idiom for the Word of God should not be the modern living colloquial idiom but the classical language of Shakespeare.”

“...One is surely entitled to ask for ‘Chapter and verse’ with respect to such “action”. Unfortunately, our critic does not provide any...

“His assertion is answered by G.W. Anderson, Editorial Manager of the TBS:

““The Authorised Version - following its predecessors, including Tyndale - was written in the common language of its time, although in a literary rather than colloquial style. It was not written in “the classical language of Shakespeare”. The literary style used by the translators is what has enabled the Authorised Version to stand the test of time. It must also be

remembered that the edition of the Authorised Version which is used today is the 1769 revision, which is indeed closer to us than it is to Shakespeare.””

Dr Hills’s⁸⁴ remarks, which bear on Biblical English versus everyday English of the time, should be repeated. See remarks earlier in this section. Dr DiVietro, *Cleaning-Up* p 67 does acknowledge that the language of the KJB was not a spoken language in the early 17th century although it was well understood. However, he adds nothing to Dr Hills’s explanation.

“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.”*

*A point that Dr DiVietro is forced to concede in *Cleaning-Up*, p 67.

That is, neither Shakespeare nor 17th-century colloquial English usage, both of which are time-limited, can be used to understand the words of the KJB, which are the thoughts of God written down and therefore timeless.

“The counsel of the LORD standeth for ever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations”
Psalm 33:11.

It is significant that Dr DiVietro failed to include the remainder of p 91 of *Hazardous Materials*, which includes this statement, pp 91-92, *“One of today’s leading authorities on Homer is James I. Porter, professor of classics and contemporary literature at the University of California...Classicists, such as Porter, would not define Homer’s words using contexts from Plato, much less hold New Testament words hostage to such contexts.”*

A useful illustration of Biblical versus everyday English is helpfully provided by none other than Dr DiVietro himself, with respect to the word “gay.” The word appears once in the KJB.

“And ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place; and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool:”
James 2:3.

The definition of “gay” is found in the preceding verse – with the definition of “apparel” - and “raiment” - in the *next* verse, James 2:3.

“For if there come unto your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment;” James 2:2.

The wearer of “*the gay clothing*” or “*goodly apparel*” is clearly one of the “*rich men*” James 2:6, in contrast to “*a poor man*” James 2:3. “*Goodly*” is “*of great price*” Matthew 13:45. It is also of “*outward adorning*” Luke 21:5, 1 Peter 3:3, 4, which is “*of great price*” in the eyes of the world but not “*in the sight of God.*”

That is how the word “gay” is used in scripture and the full meaning, *especially with respect to God*, will *not* emerge from a study of everyday usage, whether in the 1st, 17th or 21st centu-

ries. That is one reason why the Lord Jesus Christ said *“my words shall not pass away”* Matthew 24:35. God determines the Biblical usage of His words and they are independent of man’s fluctuating usage, whether in the time of Koine Greek, the time of Shakespeare or the time (hastening to its close with the nearness of the Lord’s Return) of the DBS Executive Committee. It is true that the scripture contains many ordinary words, e.g. *“clothing”* in James 2:3 with meanings that are fixed in both Biblical and common usage but the words of the Holy Bible are still not subject to common usage because God, not common usage at any time in history, determines the meanings of words in His Book.

“I have not spoken in secret, in a dark place of the earth: I said not unto the seed of Jacob, Seek ye me in vain: I the LORD speak righteousness, I declare things that are right” Isaiah 45:19.

See also Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments on pp 31-32 of *Hazardous Materials*.

The Biblical procedure for finding word meanings, along with more vindication of Sister Riplinger’s explanation of the Bible’s built-in dictionary, may be illustrated with respect to the terms *“anon”* and *“by and by”*. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* meanings of *“soon”* and *“before long”* are not far removed from Biblical usage but they do illustrate how everyday usage for a word can diverge from Biblical usage. Scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, including the use of parallel passages, gives the precise meaning *“immediately,”* with synonyms. Note the emphasized words. Definitions or synonyms for other words are also found in the verses:

*“But he that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the word, and **anon** with joy receiveth it; Yet hath he not root in himself, but dureth for a while: for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, **by and by** he is offended”* Matthew 13:20, 21.

*“And these are they likewise which are sown on stony ground; who, when they have heard the word, **immediately** receive it with gladness; And have no root in themselves, and so endure but for a time: afterward, when affliction or persecution ariseth for the word’s sake, **immediately** they are offended”* Mark 4:16, 17.

*“And she came in **straightway with haste** unto the king, and asked, saying, I will that thou give me **by and by** in a charger the head of John the Baptist...And **immediately** the king sent an executioner, and commanded his head to be brought: and he went and beheaded him in the prison”* Mark 6:25, 27.

The dictionary notes that *“anon”* is from the Old English term *“on ane,”* which has the meaning *“in one moment”* i.e. the Biblical meaning, which in turn illustrates how Biblical usage of a word remains constant despite language changes, i.e. Old English metamorphosis into modern English.

Another example is the word *“alleging.”* The Biblical meaning of this word remains constant, even though it has a different, or changed meaning in modern English.

Like the word *“gay,”* *“alleging”* occurs only once in the KJB, in Acts 17:3.

“Opening and alleging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ.”

The word *“alleging”* today has the meaning of asserting or declaring without proof, as in making an allegation. No doubt for this reason the NIV, NKJV replace *“alleging”* with *“proving”* and *“demonstrating”* respectively in Acts 17:3. However, the new versions miss the Biblical meaning of *“alleging,”* which is explained in the previous verse and indicated by

the word “*opening*” in Acts 17:3. See the underlined words. (Observe how the term “*opened*” is used with respect to “*the scriptures*” in similar passages in Luke 24:32, 45.)

“And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures” Acts 17:2.

The Biblical meaning of “*alleging*” is highlighted further in a nearby passage describing a similar incident, Acts 18:28 and illustrating once again how Biblical word meanings can be determined by means of parallel or related passages, such as in the citations for the parable of the sower above.

“For he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publickly, shewing by the scriptures that Jesus was Christ.”

The term “*alleging*” therefore means to reason “*out of the scriptures*” or “*shewing by the scriptures*.” The NIV, NKJV are not explicit in this respect.

Naturally, Dr DiVietro missed all of this in his persecuting zeal against Sister Riplinger.

These examples of “*anon*,” “*by and by*” and “*alleging*” have been provided to show that this author is willing to substantiate written statements, unlike Dr DiVietro.

Dr DiVietro now accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of being absurd, blind, foolish, prejudiced and inconsistent, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 64-66 (while insisting he is not making *ad hominem* attacks on her (!)) because she warns that lexicon editors have used early Church ‘Fathers,’ who were the source of Catholic heresies, early secular historians e.g. Josephus and pagan Greeks to determine “*Christian meanings*” *Hazardous Materials*, pp 92, 100, which pages Dr DiVietro cites in part.

He explains that he uses the works of these early heretics and heathen to learn about the Greek language. Again, Dr DiVietro gives no indication about how these unbiblical writers have helped him learn about the language of the 1611 English Holy Bible.

Moreover, he fails to inform his readers that on p 93 of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals that Clement, whom Dr DiVietro cites as having helped him learn Greek, “*denied that Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost were part of the Godhead, calling them created beings.*”

Dr DiVietro admits that he wouldn’t go to Clement or any other Alexandrian academic, e.g. Origen, for theology. Ephesians 5:11, however, is not limited to theology.

“And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.”

Sister Riplinger has obeyed this command of scripture. Dr DiVietro has not.

Moreover, Dr DiVietro’s treatise is too sketchy to address the detailed warning that Dr Mrs Riplinger has given with respect to the all-important Biblical term “*only begotten*” from *monogenes*, the meaning of which is abominably distorted by pagan Greek writers. The following extract from Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work⁸⁵ also shows that the uncomplimentary epithets listed above that Dr DiVietro bestowed on her are indeed nothing more than a sheer *ad hominem* or personal attack.

Emphases are Dr Mrs Riplinger’s.

*““There is a bird which is named the Phoenix...the **only one**...makes for itself a coffin of frankincense and myrrh...then dies. But as the **flesh rots**, a certain **worm** is engendered which is nurtured from the moisture of the dead **creature** and puts forth wings...It takes up that coffin where are the bones of its parent, and carrying them, it journeys...to the place called the City of the Sun.”*

“This depraved pagan parody of the death, burial, and resurrection of our precious Saviour is given by NIV editor Richard Longenecker to ‘help’ us understand WHY the NIV translates John 1:14 and 1:18 as “One and Only” instead of “only BEGOTTEN” (see *The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation*, pp. 119-126). He points also to such occult literature as the magical papyri’s “One”, Plato’s (Critias) “one,” and the Orphic Hymn’s (gnostic) “only one”. He cites numerous other early Greek writers, like Parmenides, head of the Eleatic School. He brought **pantheism** to the West after his trips to India and initiation into the Greek mysteries. Do we look to a pantheist and their god ‘the One’ to alter **our** view of God?

“Longenecker chides the KJV’s “begotten Son” because “it neglects the current [time of Christ] usage for the word.” Current usage amongst PAGAN OCCULTISTS should **not change** how Christians use words! He and the NIV translators have broadened the “semantic range of meaning” (Longenecker p. 122) to include the broad way that leadeth to destruction. The translators of the **King James Version** were so highly educated that they not only **knew** of these Greek quotes, but knew **who** Parmenides was and what he taught. They wouldn’t touch such pagan sources. Either the NIV translators are **ignorant** of the philosophies of those they cite, like Aeschylus, Plato and Parmenides, and the Orphic Hymns **or** they are **sympathetic** to such ideas. (The “begotten God” seen in John 1:18 in the NASB comes directly from lexical support from the occult tome *The Trimorphic Proitenoia!*)”

This is the reason for Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warnings on pp 92, 100 of *Hazardous Materials*. The NIV error “one and only” continues to be perpetuated in its latest edition, in the TNIV and in the 2004 HCSB.

Dr DiVietro overlooked this important material. See also earlier comments on *monogenes*.

His half-page citation from p 100 of *Hazardous Materials* includes the brief statement “Definitions are guessed by looking at the word in context, examining ten words before and ten words after.”

Dr DiVietro’s only coherent statement on the citation is with reference to the above sentence, about which he mistakenly says that this is how Dr Mrs Riplinger believes that KJB words are defined.

A careful reading of the citation shows that Dr Mrs Riplinger is actually describing how English-speaking researchers glean word meanings from secular Greek writings and then apply the resulting definitions, wrongly, to the Holy Bible. Dr DiVietro’s misreading of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work at this point reflects no great credit on the quality of his own research. He also ignores the remainder of this chapter of *Hazardous Materials*, no less than 20 pages, where Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in considerable detail how noted lexicographers e.g. Briggs, Danker, have actually *resisted* high and holy definitions for Biblical words, dismissing them as “churchly.” Danker, for example, replaces the godly word “**grace**,” which first occurs in Genesis 6:8 and is associated with God, with the worldly term “**generosity**.” The remainder of this chapter in *Hazardous Materials* is replete with examples of this nature.

Dr DiVietro refuses to discuss any of them in this part of his book.

Most of what remains of this chapter of *Cleaning-Up*, pp 67-69, is a potted history of translation procedures and of how the KJB came into being and was conveyed to the American colonies and into the wider world. These matters are not connected with Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #2 and need no comment.

However, on the very last page of this chapter, Dr DiVietro repeats the dogma that an in-depth study of Hebrew and Greek will enable the student get a much better understanding of

English, i.e. King James English, in order to get ‘light’ on the KJB, never to ‘correct’ it, of course.

It won’t. See comments earlier on Dr DiVietro’s exposition of *oinos* etc. and in **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’**. See also the concluding remarks before the summary in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

Also on the very last page of this chapter, Dr DiVietro is forced to acknowledge, grudgingly that the meanings of Bible words *can* be determined by studying all the uses of those words in scripture. He is even forced to admit therefore that Dr Mrs Riplinger is correct when on p 100 of *Hazardous Materials*, she effectively urges students of the scripture “*to define Bible words using only the context of the Bible.*”

Dr DiVietro nevertheless can’t resist one last swipe at Dr Mrs Riplinger as he ends this chapter. He states that although her method, i.e. the Biblical method 1 Corinthians 2:13, can be used for determining the meanings of Bible words it can’t be used to produce a translation.

Again, Dr DiVietro has set forth yet another piece of dogma without substantiation.

The purpose of the method described in 1 Corinthians 2:13, which Dr Mrs Riplinger has addressed in her books, is indeed for the student to understand the words “*which...the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual*” according to the promise the Lord gave to His disciples in John 16:13.

“Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come.”

Nevertheless, concerning translations, Dr DiVietro missed Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 456ff, which show that “*comparing spiritual things with spiritual*” not only enables understanding of word meanings *within* a vernacular Bible such as the KJB but also *between* vernacular Bibles of different languages, at least where alphabetical letter symbols are used. See also *Whitewashed, A Critique of James White*, p 237. Emphases are Dr Mrs Riplinger’s. Under-lining is this author’s.

“Jesus Christ, “the Word” and even “the ending” letter (Rev. 1:8) speaks and spells words in similar ways to the Greek, English, German, French, Italian, and Hebrew (Yiddish). The KJV is the only English Bible that speaks and spells like all of these language groups. Wise missionaries love the KJV...

*“The amazing thing about the KJV’s ‘est’ and ‘eth’ endings is that they **match** the verb endings in most of the languages of the world. These **too** have an ‘s’ in the second person and a ‘t’ in the third person verb endings! The KJV’s ‘becamest’ is wurdest’ in **Modern German...***

“The KJV is international English and is God’s bridge to reach a world now clamouring to learn English.”

Rather than take advantage of God’s English KJB bridge, it appears that Dr DiVietro would prefer that missionary outreach trek the long way round to some murky Greek shallows instead, the exact location of which is known only to the Burgonista elite of the DBS Executive Committee.

In sum, for Challenge #2:

1. Dr DiVietro takes up 37 pages of his book, pp 33-69 inclusive, in failing to answer Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #2.
2. Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of *ad hominem* attacks against lexicon editors like James Strong but ignores the evidence that Dr Mrs Riplinger provides in Chapter 7 of *Hazardous Materials* of Strong's corrupt lexical definitions for essential Bible words such as "**Godhead**," "**charity**," "**heresy**," "**hell**," "**devils**," and "**Lucifer**."
3. Dr DiVietro ridicules Dr Mrs Riplinger's application of Bible numerics to 1 John 5:7, *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1182-1184. However, he fails to mention that she is citing the work of Periander A. Esplana, a Christian from Camarines Norte, Philippines. He has written two extensive works, entitled *The Bible Formula* and *The Mathematical Perfection of the King James Bible*. If Dr DiVietro wishes to take issue with Dr Mrs Riplinger's use of Periander Esplana's work, then he must refute both of Mr Esplana's books. Dr DiVietro has so far failed to do so.
4. Dr DiVietro repeats his accusation of *ad hominem* arguments against Dr Mrs Riplinger with respect to her comments on lexicon editors such as Liddell, Trench, Moulton and Thayer. Once again, see point 1 above, he has ignored the substance of her comments, where, for example, Dr Mrs Riplinger shows that where the AV1611 has the term "**Godhead**" in Acts 17:29, Romans 1:20 and Colossians 2:9, Thayer's Unitarian influence on the ASV led to the substitution of the weaker word "*divinity*" in Romans 1:20. Thayer's ungodly influence persists in later translations. The NIV, TNIV have removed the word "**Godhead**" entirely and the NKJV has substituted "*Divine Nature*" in Acts 17:29. The 2004 HCSB changes "**Godhead**" to "*divine nature*" in Acts 17:29, Romans 1:20 and "*God's nature*" in Colossians 2:9. See also **Table 1**, which lists the verses where Trench substituted the transliteration "*hades*" for the word "**hell**." Dr Mrs Riplinger is right to warn about Thayer, Trench et al and Dr DiVietro is wrong to ignore her warnings.
5. Dr DiVietro spends 10 pages of his book pp 43-52 inclusive, justifying the use of lexicons and castigating Dr Mrs Riplinger for emphasising the use of the 1611 English Holy Bible to define its own words. He forgot Wycliffe's exhortation, which states that "*In Holy Scripture is all truth; one part of Scripture explains another*" and similar exhortations from other prominent Bible translators of the 16th century such as Tyndale and Coverdale.
6. Dr DiVietro insists that in spite of ungodly word meanings contained in lexicons compiled by unsaved individuals, the correct Biblical meanings may still be gleaned by means of the right heart attitude. He fails to substantiate this statement and gives no indication of how the right heart attitude is to be achieved. He has failed to appreciate Luke 8:15, which shows that *only the word heard and kept* has made or can make the heart honest and good. Given the availability of the pure heart-cleanser, John 15:3, "**Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you**," the use of lexicons is rendered unnecessary and even counter-productive, as the above points show.
7. Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of prejudice against Gerhard Kittel because he was a Nazi war criminal but he fails to comment on Dr Mrs Riplinger's extensive treatment of Kittel in *New Age Versions*, Chapter 42, which documents numerous examples of Kittel's anti-Semitism that has influenced modern editors, e.g. Acts 23:12, 26:17. The NASV, NIV and the recent 2004 HCSB read "*the Jews*" as a whole in-

stead of “*certain of the Jews*” as in the AV1611. In Acts 26:17, the NASV, NKJV read “*the Jewish people*” instead of simply “*the people*” as in the AV1611. Kittel was attempting to infer a murderous spirit among Jews as a whole that some modern editors have carried forward in varying degrees.

8. Dr DiVietro criticizes Dr Mrs Riplinger for her warning about lexicons based on the corrupt texts of Westcott and Hort, Nestle-Aland and the UBS, United Bible Society. See *Hazardous Materials*, p 70. She gives the example of Revelation 15:3, where these lexicons will give the words for “*ages*” or “*nations*” that should be in Revelation 15:3 according to ‘the Greek’ instead of “*saints*” as in the AV1611. Dr DiVietro states that this example is invalid because the student would simply consult *Strong’s Concordance* and get the correct word because Strong’s numbers are based on the King James vocabulary. Dr DiVietro is naive, however, to suppose that students will necessarily receive God-given guidance with respect to use of *lexicons*. Many exponents of ‘the Greek’ will readily change “*saints*” to “*ages*” or “*nations*” in Revelation 15:3 and the all-pervasive nature of their false teaching is reflected in new bibles such as the NIV, TNIV and HCSB. These false teachers will also resort to ‘the Greek’ to change “*only begotten*” in John 1:18 to “*One and Only*,” another serious error found in the NIV, TNIV and HCSB. That has been this author’s experience.
9. Dr DiVietro repeatedly accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of distorting the facts about the sources she identifies for word definitions found in lexicons, which include corrupt bible versions. Dr DiVietro insists that such versions are only used for ‘version-specific’ lexicons, not general lexicons. However, the one example that he cites, from Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work, is Newman’s, which has the title *A Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament*. Any ordinary student would take this title to mean a general lexicon, not one that is ‘version specific,’ so Dr DiVietro’s accusation against Dr Mrs Riplinger is, to say the least, both discourteous and uncalled-for. He does not at this point specify precisely where general lexicons get their word definitions, which is a further discourtesy to Dr Mrs Riplinger and to the reader.
10. Dr DiVietro is, however, later forced to admit that one source for general lexical word definitions is in fact early secular authors or heretical church writers such as Josephus, Philo, Clement and Origen (although he avoids addressing Dr Mrs Riplinger’s material in Chapters, 9-11 of *Hazardous Materials*, which show how noted lexicon and bible dictionary editors such as Thayer, Trench, Moulton and Milligan used abominably heathen Greek mythological sources for their word definitions). He nevertheless defends these early writers by insisting that their works, including the notorious Septuagint, LXX, of which Origen was a major contributor, give invaluable insight into the meanings of New Testament words. Dr DiVietro fails to substantiate this astounding claim and has ignored Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments on Origen in *Hazardous Materials*, pp 93-94. As Psalm 94:11 states, which Dr DiVietro also ignored, “***The LORD knoweth the thoughts of man, that they are vanity.***”

Although Dr DiVietro alludes to the early writers listed above as having helped him learn Greek, he does not say how they helped him learn the language of the 1611 English Holy Bible. He states that he would not consult Clement, Origen etc. for his theology but he has still disobeyed Ephesians 5:11, “***And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.***”

11. Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of ranting and compounding her *ad hominem* attacks on lexical editors by her criticisms of Liddell and Scott. He tries to justify their efforts by stating that their lexicon has of necessity been repeatedly revised but

he fails to notice Dr Mrs Riplinger's citation of the distinguished scholar Chadwick on p 85 of *Hazardous Materials*, who insists that, although he greatly values Liddell and Scott's lexicon, it is desperately in need of "a thorough overhaul." So what use is Liddell and Scott's lexicon to the Bible student of today? Dr DiVietro does not specify. Yet it would appear that he would still have the student immerse himself in "crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks," from which came the Liddell-Scott definitions, in order to learn the scriptures via 'the Greek.'

12. Dr DiVietro insists, therefore that God took words from these ungodly sources and imparted Biblical meanings to them. He fails to substantiate this outrageous claim, even though he admits that Koine Greek is a dead language and forgets that God's use of heathen Greek writers is limited to a mere six words in the New Testament, cited by the Apostle Paul. "***For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring***" Acts 17:28. This total will rise to a mere 15 words if the Cretian statement of Titus 1:12 is included, "***One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies.***"
13. Dr DiVietro then claims that KJB words are the same as those found in Shakespeare and therefore Shakespeare should be studied to help find the meanings of KJB words. This is not true, as explained to this author many years ago by the then Editorial Manager of the Trinitarian Bible Society in London. "“*The Authorised Version - following its predecessors, including Tyndale - was written in the common language of its time, although in a literary rather than colloquial style. It was not written in “the classical language of Shakespeare”. The literary style used by the translators is what has enabled the Authorised Version to stand the test of time. It must also be remembered that the edition of the Authorised Version which is used today is the 1769 revision, which is indeed closer to us than it is to Shakespeare.*””

The words of the KJB are not time-dependent like those of Shakespeare, as Psalm 33:11 reveals. "***The counsel of the LORD standeth for ever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations.***" God has determined the meanings of particular Biblical words that are independent of language changes in every day usage, which is one reason why the Lord Jesus Christ said in Matthew 24:35 "***Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.***" A simple example is the word "gay," to which Dr DiVietro alludes but without scriptural comment. This word is found only once in the AV1611, in James 2:3. Its meaning in that verse is of "***outward adorning***" Luke 21:5, 1 Peter 3:3, 4, which is "***of great price***" in the eyes of the world but not "***in the sight of God.***" This meaning could not be gleaned from Shakespeare or any lexical source.

14. On the last page of this chapter of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro repeats the dogma that an in-depth study of Hebrew and Greek will enable the student get a much better understanding of English, i.e. King James English, in order to get 'light' on the KJB, never to 'correct' it, of course.

It won't. See comments earlier on Dr DiVietro's exposition of *oinos* etc. and in **Setting Up the 'Clean-Up'**. See also the concluding remarks before the summary in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

15. Also on this last page, Dr DiVietro finally admits that Dr Mrs Riplinger's application of 1 Corinthians 2:13, "***comparing spiritual things with spiritual,***" will enable the

student to determine meanings of words in the KJB (!) but he insists that this application will not enable a Bible translation to be carried out.

In answer, Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals the opposite in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 456ff, a most profound and uplifting revelation that Dr DiVietro fails to address.

“Jesus Christ, “the Word” and even “the ending” letter (Rev. 1:8) speaks and spells words in similar ways to the Greek, English, German, French, Italian, and Hebrew (Yiddish). The KJV is the only English Bible that speaks and spells like all of these language groups. Wise missionaries love the KJV...

“The KJV is international English and is God’s bridge to reach a world now clamouring to learn English.”

That would be a far better way forward than floundering in a 3rd century lexical philosophical Alexandrian Greek swamp.

Note again that this entire chapter of Dr DiVietro’s has really had nothing to do with answering Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #2. Dr DiVietro should give careful consideration to the time-honoured exhortation:

“When you’re in a hole, stop digging.”

Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials – Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #3 is, her emphasis, to “give one Bible verse” and one only “that states that these man-made lexicons and critical editions are in authority **above** the Holy Bible.”

This particular challenge must have struck a nerve with Dr DiVietro after the manner of the old saying, “A hit dog yells...”

Dr DiVietro dismisses this challenge as foolish because no such verse exists, *Cleaning-Up* p 70. However, he has clearly elevated Hebrew and Greek sources over the 1611 English Holy Bible on pp 32, 69 and 94-95 in order, supposedly, to ‘clarify’ its ambiguities and confusing grammar. See comments earlier on his expositions of *oinos* (“**wine**”) and *baptizo* (“**baptize**”) and of John 11:33 in **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’** and in the previous section.

In so doing, Dr DiVietro has gone against Isaiah 42:8 and Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #3 has possibly left him with a bad conscience.

“I am the LORD: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images.”

Nor to manmade published works that supposedly ‘clarify’ His Book, as Proverbs 8:8, 9 shows.

“All the words of my mouth are in righteousness; there is nothing froward or perverse in them. They are all plain to him that understandeth, and right to them that find knowledge.”

Knowledge and understanding come from “***the words of my mouth***” Proverbs 8:13, not the “***froward or perverse***” words of unsaved or carnal lexicographers.

Dr DiVietro likens Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #3 to asking for a verse where the Lord Jesus Christ explicitly says “*I am God*” or verses that explicitly use the words *Trinity* or *Rapture*. In this way, Dr DiVietro attempts to associate Dr Mrs Riplinger with unsaved, even malicious Bible critics like Jehovah’s Witnesses and Muslims. This is after accusing her repeatedly of *ad hominem* attacks. See previous section.

It may be that Dr DiVietro doesn’t often get the opportunity to field Bible questions. With respect to the questions that he has posed, the Lord Jesus Christ gave an even more explicit answer than the unregenerate critics ask for and He gave it to a particularly astute critical audience who understood exactly the import of the Lord’s words.

“Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am. Then took they up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by” John 8:58, 59.

The Biblical word for *Trinity* is “***Godhead***” and it occurs *three* times in the scripture; Acts 17:29, Romans 1:20, Colossians 2:9. The Godhead is, of course, delineated in 1 John 5:7.

“For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.”

Note in passing that even though the *Tri* in the word *Trinity* denotes three, the Biblical term “***Godhead***” is more explicit with respect to “***the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost.***” For example, the Devil can be a trinity, Revelation 16:13. As such, he is typified by an ungodly trinity, Numbers 22:41. Man is a trinity, 1 Thessalonians 5:23 and he is assailed by a trinity of worldly enemies, 1 John 2:16. The term “***Godhead***,” however, is clearly exclusive to the three Persons of the Godhead.

The *Rapture* is “*a mystery*” 1 Corinthians 15:51, first revealed as such to Paul.

Dr DiVietro would no doubt agree with the above material but he could have at least included it, if only in summary form, as a means of practical guidance for his readers, especially insofar as he makes what is for him the astounding concession that correct Bible teaching can simply be determined by comparing scripture with scripture.

So can the correct meanings of Bible words. See **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’** and remarks in the previous section on “*comparing spiritual things with spiritual*” 1 Corinthians 2:13.

If Dr DiVietro had been willing to make this concession as well, he could have avoided the onerous task of amassing 400+ pages of ‘flannel’ against one of God’s most devoted fellow servants.

On pp 70-74 of *Cleaning-Up*, he returns to his ostensibly favourite topic, that of belabouring Sister Riplinger for her condemnation of ungodly lexicographers and “*all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed...against him*” Jude 15, in this case by way of publication of supposed Bible study aids based on “*crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks.*” See *Hazardous Materials*, p 90. Dr DiVietro inserts quotes from pp 233, 719, 90, 101, 81-82 in turn of *Hazardous Materials* and then censures Dr Mrs Riplinger for her conviction that Bible words are special words with meanings that cannot be deduced from contemporary secular writings but only from the scriptures themselves. Dr DiVietro insists, p 73 that God did not create the words of scripture in isolation from the surrounding Greek and Hebrew environments but enabled the original writers of scripture to use everyday terms that God imbued with heavenly significance.

Hebrew and Greek, Dr DiVietro maintains, are therefore nothing more than everyday earthly, not heavenly languages that God created specifically to write the Bible (in the original text).

In which case, Hebrew and Greek would fall short of the “*Biblical English*” of the KJB. See the previous section for Dr Hills’s comments with respect to the special nature of the English of the KJB, even though much of its vocabulary is familiar to English speakers.

Moreover, Dr DiVietro also forgot that since the third verse in the entire scripture begins with “*And God said*” Genesis 1:3, language begins with God. Even words that have familiar, everyday meanings will have been created by God with the intention of having a primary meaning in scripture, not the other way round as Dr DiVietro implies. One such word is “*light*” as found in Genesis 1:3 that God says is “*good.*” The everyday meaning is simply the medium in which sight is possible, without any godly quality such as goodness. As Genesis 1:3 shows, the everyday meaning is not the primary meaning that God bestowed upon the word “*light.*”

In addition, Dr DiVietro has overlooked the scriptural reference that strongly implies the heavenly nature of Biblical Hebrew, even though Dr DiVietro has declared it to be a dead language, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 7, 16. Perhaps his verdict in this respect hasn’t filtered up to “*the third heaven*” yet, 2 Corinthians 12:2.

“*And when we were all fallen to the earth, I heard a voice speaking unto me, and saying in the Hebrew tongue, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks*” Acts 26:14.

The voice was that of “*the Lord from heaven*” 1 Corinthians 15:47. Paul and his companions were confronted by “*a light from heaven*” Acts 9:3, 22:6, 26:13, associated with “*him that speaketh from heaven*” Hebrews 12:25. Hebrew is the only language that the scripture

specifies as emanating from a heavenly source and therefore this author believes it is a heavenly language.

However, this author believes that two heavenly languages may exist, the other being the “*Biblical English*” of the 1611 English Holy Bible.

“...I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea” Revelation 1:11.

What follows is based on the similarities⁸⁶ between “*the Word*” John 1:14, the Lord Jesus Christ and “*the word*” Psalm 68:11, “*the holy scriptures*” 2 Timothy 3:15. For example, God gave both, Psalm 68:11, John 3:16.

Biblical Hebrew was the first Biblical language. Biblical English is most likely the last. Even if John writes originally in Greek to the historical churches of Asia Minor, he is no doubt writing prophetically to the Church from the end of the 1st century AD to the Second Advent⁸⁷. Ever since the 17th century, these writings have been conveyed to the Church throughout the world by “*a book*” that became “*the book*” Revelation 3:5, 5:2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13:8, 17:8, 20:12, 15, 22:19, i.e. 14 occurrences or over half of the 27 occurrences of the term in the New Testament and the Text of which in turn becomes the basis for all faithful vernacular Bibles since that time⁸⁸. Note that it is “*the book*” that is being referred to, not “*the original text*,” which has never existed as a single document that could be opened and read.

Only one Book qualifies as “*the book*” and it will not pass away, Matthew 24:35.

It should be noted that Dr DiVietro fails to provide one single example of relevant lexical use to counter any of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statements that he has cited in this part of his book. Therefore, this author will freely summarise what appears to be Dr DiVietro’s stance on the application of contemporary secular Koine Greek word usage to determine Greek New Testament word meanings, from the extracts in *Hazardous Materials* that he has listed from pp 233, 719, 90, 101, 81-82 in turn.

Dr DiVietro says that Dr Mrs Riplinger thinks that lexicons are evil. He bases his statement on the extracts from pp 233, 719 in *Hazardous Materials* that read in part, the author’s emphasis, “*A Greek lexicon, which held up Plato and the Greek myths as **the** source for meaning and truth, **higher** than the Holy Bible, could not help but place Greek philosophy on a pedestal shadowing the Bible itself...[But] the Holy Bible [KJB] is a living book...it lives in the light of day, not in dusty library shelves.*”

Although Dr DiVietro declares on p 70 of *Cleaning-Up* that he knows of no statement that puts any lexicon in authority over the Holy Bible (he does not specify if this work is the AV1611 or the DBS-undisclosed-once-only-‘original’-inspired-exclusive-to-the-DBS-version), Dr DiVietro does not challenge the content of the above extract. He apparently has no problem with lexicographers elevating Plato and Greek myths above the authority of the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible.

Dr DiVietro then states that Dr Mrs Riplinger believes that lexicon editors should only use the Bible for meanings of words. He cites p 90 of *Hazardous Materials*, which contains the statement “*all Bible study tools, new Bible versions, and lexicon authors gathered [their] word meanings from the same crumbling Greek ruins which show God’s judgment upon that ancient Greek empire and no less upon the German nation which likewise relied on the pagan Greeks to support their shaky German-Latin lexicons.*”

Dr DiVietro does not challenge that statement directly. It appears therefore that he not only accepts it as true but also condones the ungodly method described by means of which “*all Bible study tools, new Bible versions, and lexicon authors gathered [their] word meanings.*”

It should be remembered that, as reported in *Cleaning-Up* p xiii, Dr Mrs Riplinger wrote to Dr DiVietro on October 16th 2009 and urged that they work together as brother and sister in Christ, with respect to the content of *Hazardous Materials*. Dr DiVietro’s reaction to Sister Riplinger’s kind invitation strongly suggests that he would rather work with the authors of “*bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks.*”

Dr DiVietro says next that Dr Mrs Riplinger believes that Biblical words are special, not of earth but of heaven and therefore it is dangerous to search the non-Biblical literature of the time to determine the everyday meanings of these words. The quote from p 101 of *Hazardous Materials*, on which he bases his statement, includes the following sentence that Dr DiVietro has emphasised.

“The English definitions and translation choices in lexicons are highly secularized, that is, they are the words which men’s wisdom teacheth,” not those special separate from sinners words which God instilled early in the English Bible.”

Again, Dr DiVietro does not directly challenge Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments. In this case, that is probably because he is careful not to include the first part of the paragraph from which the above extract has been taken, which states in part as follows.

“The words of the King James Bible are often higher, ‘special’ words, not defiled or defined by worldly use. Danker dislikes these, calling them “churchly” words; lexicographers avoid them, calling them “ecclesiastical” words. These include words such as ‘hell,’ ‘heaven,’ ‘preach,’ ‘grace,’ ‘gospel,’ ‘mercy,’ ‘lust,’ ‘carnal,’ ‘charity,’ ‘salvation,’ ‘sanctification,’ ‘heathen,’ ‘heresy,’ ‘superstition,’ ‘heretick,’ redemption,’ ‘righteousness,’ ‘salvation,’ ‘repent,’ ‘judgment,’ ‘covetousness,’ ‘ungodly,’ and ‘tribulation.’ One will be hard pressed to find these words in most new versions and Bible study tools.”

Dr DiVietro does not explain how everyday usage of these words or their underlying Greek forms serves as a basis for investing them with the correct Biblical meanings. Even words like ‘hell,’ ‘lust,’ ‘carnal,’ ‘heathen,’ ‘heresy,’ ‘superstition,’ ‘heretick’ must be defined from God’s perspective, not man’s. A “**heretick**,” for example, is a subversive, self-condemned sinner, who spreads false teaching for personal gain, Titus 1:10, 11, 3:10, 11. He is to be admonished and that only once or twice, not repeatedly, which is one reason why the Lord condemns “**debate**” in Romans 1:29. It leads to “**strifes**” 2 Corinthians 12:20.

How, therefore, is this correct meaning of “**heretick**” and its association with “**debate**” and “**strifes**” to be gleaned from secular sources? Dr DiVietro does not explain. Instead, in his guise as Dr Deviation, he evades the issue by professing to believe Psalm 12:6, 7 in the KJB, insisting that the words of “**the holy scriptures**” 2 Timothy 3:15 were tried by fire seven times before they became scripture – though only in the Hebrew and Greek. It is in their Greek and Hebrew identity, Dr DiVietro affirms, *Cleaning-Up* p 73 that the original writers composed these words from their familiar, everyday surroundings and God took these words and gave them heavenly meanings.

As indicated above, Dr DiVietro fails to provide a single example of any words that were refined by the above process in order to become scripture. Nor does he cite any lexical source to show how this word-refining process works, or any passage of scripture, apart from his misuse of Psalm 12:6, 7. In fact, the citations in this chapter of *Cleaning-Up* and indeed in most of the book that relate to *Hazardous Materials* are Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statements and

verses of scripture, e.g. Psalm 12:6, 7 *in the 1611 English Holy Bible, not in 'the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek.'*

Although he does not say so and probably wouldn't say so, Dr DiVietro's lexicographical allies don't seem able to give him any more support than Zedekiah's servants gave him.

"But the army of the Chaldeans pursued after the king, and overtook Zedekiah in the plains of Jericho; and all his army was scattered from him" Jeremiah 52:8.

Dr DiVietro also fails to elaborate on how Psalm 12:6, 7 has worked out with respect to the English Bible. Dr Mrs Riplinger could have enlightened him. She states⁸⁹, her emphases *"Seven" times "they purge...and purify it..." (Ezek. 43:26) – not eight. The KJV translators did **not** see their translation as one in the midst of a chain of ever evolving translations. They wanted their Bible to be one of which no one could justly say, 'It is good, **except** this word or **that** word...' They planned⁹⁰:*

"...to make...out of many good ones [Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops'], one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, that our mark."

See remarks in ***Preface and Introduction***. Dr Mrs Riplinger⁹¹ also documents the development of the seven purifications of the English Bible from its earliest inception:

- The Gothic
- The Anglo-Saxon
- The Pre-Wycliffe
- The Wycliffe
- The Tyndale/Coverdale/Great/Geneva
- The Bishops'
- The King James Bible

Moreover, Dr Vance⁹² has shown how Psalm 12:6, 7 was fulfilled in the broad sweep of history by means of:

- A received Hebrew text, 1800 BC to 389 BC
- A received Aramaic text at the same time (Genesis, Daniel, etc.)
- A received Greek text from AD 40 to AD 90
- A received Syrian text from AD 120 to AD 200
- A received Latin text from AD 150 to AD 1500
- A received German text from AD 1500 to AD 2006
- A received English text from AD 1611 to AD 2006 (2010+)

Dr DiVietro clearly lacks this historical perspective, both with respect to the English Bibles and all their historical predecessors. (Note that the pre-1611 texts were each brought to a stage of purification by means of which God initiated revival and reformation, e.g. via Wycliffe, Luther, Tyndale/Coverdale/Great/Geneva and then progressed ***"the holy scriptures"*** 2 Timothy 3:15 to the next stage of purification. These successive stages were not required for removal of impure readings that could lead to heresy (there were none in the non-Catholic Bibles) but to reflect genuine changes in language and to refine aspects of letter sounds, grammatical elements and word order, as the King James translators themselves said, "as

nothing is begun and perfected [perfected] at the same time, and the later thoughts are thought to be the wiser: so, if we building upon their foundation that went before us, and being holpen by their labours, do endeavor to make that better which they left so good; no man, we are sure, hath cause to mislike us; they, we persuade ourselves, if they were alive, would thank us...the same will shine as gold more brightly, being rubbed and polished....” See *In Awe of Thy Word*, Chapters 3, 4 and remarks in *Preface and Introduction*.)

It may now easily be shown that Dr DiVietro’s unsubstantiated notion that God took common, everyday words and gave them heavenly meanings runs contrary to scripture. See remarks in previous section with respect to Isaiah 55:8-9 and in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to Jeremiah 23:28.

“For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD, For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.”

“He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the LORD.”

See also Psalm 119:89, ***“For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven,”*** not in everyday earthly usage.

The New Testament writers had the same stance with respect to ***“the chaff”*** of men’s words as their Old Testament counterparts.

“But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men, And needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man” John 2:24-25.

“And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man’s wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power” 1 Corinthians 2:4.

“For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God” 1 Corinthians 2:11.

“Which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual” 1 Corinthians 2:13 (again).

“It is written...The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain” 1 Corinthians 3:20. See remarks above on Psalm 94:11 and in the previous section.

The above scriptures show overwhelmingly that God’s words do not derive in any way from man’s words. Dr DiVietro is totally at odds with that ***“which the Holy Ghost teacheth”*** to claim otherwise.

To suppose that God did what Dr DiVietro says He did with respect to Biblical words such as those that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists is to deny Isaiah 8:20.

“To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.”

God, according to Dr DiVietro, is supposed to merge ***“Thy word...a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path”*** Psalm 119:105, with ***“the unfruitful works of darkness”*** Ephesians 5:11.

Not according to 2 Corinthians 6:14.

“...for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?”

None at all. The manner in which **“the Lord gave the word”** Psalm 68:11 by-passed contemporary usage because it is set out prophetically **“to all generations”** Psalm 33:11 in Revelation 1:11. See remarks above.

“...I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last; and, What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea.”

Only one Book now qualifies as the standard for **“the word which he commanded to a thousand generations”** 1 Chronicles 16:15, Psalm 105:8, spanning the church age and stretching beyond. That Book is the 1611 English Holy Bible, which is exclusively **“the thoughts of his heart to all generations”** Psalm 33:11, not the deified vain **“thoughts of man”** Psalm 94:11, 1 Corinthians 3:20. See remarks on Psalm 33:11, 94:11 in the previous section.

Citing pp 81-82 of *Hazardous Materials*, which includes the statement, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphasis, **“Danker admits there are hazards in semantic [word] transference from one language to another,”** Dr DiVietro says that Dr Mrs Riplinger insists that a lexicographer work directly from one of the original languages i.e. Hebrew/Aramaic and/or Greek to English without any intermediate stage e.g. German. Dr DiVietro assures his readers that a Greek-English dictionary obtained via a German intermediary translation is still a satisfactory Bible study aid and declares that the very hazards that Dr Mrs Riplinger mentions prove the need for lexicons to give correct Greek-English equivalents.

Dr DiVietro fails to mention Dr Mrs Riplinger’s reference on p 82 of *Hazardous Materials* to Chapter 42 of *New Age Versions* that documents the ungodly word meanings from German sources, e.g. Gerhard Kittel, **“Adolph Hitler’s propaganda high priest, promoting the genocide of the Jews during World War II,”** Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphasis, which have influenced numerous new bibles; NIV, TNIV, NKJV, HCSB etc. See the previous section for comments on Acts 23:12, 26:17 and Kittel’s insinuations against the Jewish people that would have contributed in no small way to the furnaces of Auschwitz and the other extermination camps in mainly Catholic Poland during WW2.

In sum, Kittel’s slight changes in these two New Testament verses alone therefore give James 3:5 a new and terrible significance.

“Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth!”

Dr DiVietro seems unmoved by the fearful implications of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warnings about Germanic language-based Bible study aids. He should appreciate that they did not aid European Jews in WW2. They are not likely to assist God’s saints, whether Jewish or Gentile, to any greater extent either now or up until the Second Advent. In Chapter 16 of *Hazardous Materials*, for example, Dr Mrs Riplinger documents how lexicographer Danker’s heretical beliefs repeatedly led him to corrupt New Testament scriptures that impinged on major doctrine.

Danker denied 1 Timothy 3:16 in the AV1611, **“God was manifest in the flesh”** and thereby influenced the corrupt reading of the NIV, TNIV, HCSB, which is found as a footnote in the NKJV. Editors of both versions used Danker’s lexicon.

Danker also denied the Messianic references in Hebrews 4:8 and 7:21, influencing the NIV, TNIV, NKJV and HCSB, all of which wrongly insert **“Joshua”** in Hebrews 4:8 (and in Acts 7:45) and cut out, NIV, TNIV, HCSB, or dispute, NKJV, **“after the order of Melchisedec”** in Hebrews 7:21. Hebrews 4:8, it should be noted is a reference to the pre-incarnate **“Jesus”** as found in Joshua 5:13-15 and **“the priesthood being changed”** Hebrews 7:12, is a major

theme of the Book of Hebrews, weakened by the verse tampering of Hebrews 7:21, through Danker's influence.

Danker further denied the Lord's Deity by his support for the omission of "*who created all things by Jesus Christ*" Ephesians 3:9, the alteration of "*Joseph and his mother*" to "*his father and his mother*" in Luke 2:33, the alteration of "*God and our Saviour Jesus Christ*" to the New Age reading "*Our God and Savior Jesus Christ*" in 2 Peter 1:1 and the entire omission of Acts 8:37, which emphasises that belief on the Lord Jesus Christ is essential for salvation, not water baptism. Danker, however, declares that "*the water of baptism saves Christians*" and airily dismisses what he terms "*the curious reading*" of Acts 8:37.

Concerning 2 Peter 1:1, Dr Thomas Holland⁹³ explains how the King James translators followed the reading of Beza's 4th and 5th Editions, 1589, 1598 respectively, in 2 Peter 1:1, which states:

Tou theou emon kai soteris emon Iesou Christou.

This statement appears as "*God and our Saviour Jesus Christ*" in the AV1611.

Dr Holland explains that "*We find an additional emon (our) at 2 Peter 1:1...[so that] the translation of Beza's text is correct in the Authorized Version.*"

Stephanus's Edition does not have this additional *emon* and Ricker Berry's *Interlinear* therefore contains the New Age reading of the new bibles. However, Ricker Berry notes that Elzevir's TR Edition, like Beza's, does contain the additional *emon*. This example lends added emphasis to the risk of submitting to 'the Greek.' How many Greek editions must the student purchase in order to be sure of having all of God's 'inspired' New Testament in 'the Greek' and *specifically* which ones? Neither Dr DiVietro nor any of his DBS Executive Committee colleagues address these crucial questions in any coherent fashion. The dilemma facing the student is exemplified by Dr Scrivener's comments⁹⁴, "*Out of the 252 passages examined in Appendix E, where the differences between the texts of these books is sufficient to affect, however slightly, the language of the version, our translators abide with Beza against Stephen in 113 places, with Stephen against Beza in 59, with the Complutensian, Erasmus, or the Vulgate against both Stephen and Beza in 80....*" Dr DiVietro still has not identified the single definitive 'inspired' Greek text that resolves all these discrepancies and is a perfect match for the 'uninspired' KJB*. It should be remembered in this respect Scrivener's Greek New Testament is emphatically *not* this single definitive 'inspired' Greek text⁹⁵.

*That nevertheless is the standard for the content of the as yet undisclosed 'inspired' single Greek New Testament between two covers. See remarks in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

Returning to Danker, he also denied the strong wording of the AV1611 in Romans 10:9, "*That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus.*" (Note that the AV1611 is similarly explicit in 1 Corinthians 12:3, with the expression "*Jesus is the Lord.*" The NIV, TNIV, NKJV, HCSB all omit the definite article, resulting in the weaker reading "*Jesus is Lord.*")

The NIV, TNIV, HCSB all support the above omissions or alterations (the HCSB brackets Acts 8:37 in its text). The NKJV has the altered reading for 2 Peter 1:1 in its text and supports the other alterations or omissions in its footnotes, apart from that for Romans 10:9. Danker's corrupting influence and that of like-minded lexicographers whom Dr Mrs Riplinger has documented, has clearly spread far and wide and adversely influenced many professing Christians, gravely weakening their grasp on "*the scripture of truth*" Daniel 10:21.

Solomon rightly observed in Ecclesiastes 9:18 that "*One sinner destroyeth much good.*"

And Dr DiVietro thinks that lexicographers like Danker are actually an aid to the Body Of Christ? Apparently, he does. He should consider the following⁹⁶. Emphases are the author's.

“Acts 9:1 – When dealing with a bunch of humanistic, subjective, Bible correctors, remember this: when they produce a source for **changing**** the AV text, come up with one for **retaining** the AV text. After all, with no authority higher than their own **preferences and opinions**, any source is just as good as any other one. When Dr. A.T. Robertson (the greatest Greek scholar America ever produced) appeals to citations by **Plato** [see comments from pp 233, 719 in *Hazardous Materials* above and later from *In Awe of Thy Word*] and **Aeschylus** to get Saul “breathing in” instead of **“breathing out,”** I just exchange **his** Greek authority for **mine**. Euripides says “breathing out” – just like the King James.”*

*or ‘clarifiers.’

**or ‘clarifying’ it.

See remarks on 2 Peter 1:1 above for an example of Dr Ruckman's approach to ‘the Greek.’

‘The Greek’ (even the TR ‘Greek’) can clearly be used to ‘clarify’ anything the ‘clarifiers’ want to ‘clarify,’ like Drs Waite and his colleagues of the DBS Executive Committee did for “*theopneustos*,” *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-iv.

On p 74 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro claims to have answered Challenge #3 by means of Nehemiah 8:8.

“So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading.”

Dr DiVietro says that Ezra and his associates verbally translated the Hebrew scriptures as they were read out into Aramaic for the Aramaic-speaking audience from the captivity and thereby carried out the function of a ‘good’ lexicon, to give the meanings of the words from the original languages.

That wasn't what the challenge said. The challenge said to give one Bible verse “*that states that these man-made lexicons and critical editions are in authority **above** the Holy Bible.*”

Dr DiVietro has given a Bible verse that said that the scripture readers of the time read the scriptures aloud and explained their meaning to the listeners. As Dr DiVietro indicates, this would be by translation or re-statement of the words of Hebrew into “**words easy to be understood**” 1 Corinthians 14:9 by the hearers, e.g. in Aramaic, Babylonian or Persian (all of which would have to be ‘inspired’ translations, though Dr DiVietro does not address this implication of his explanation of Nehemiah 8:8). Translation would be followed by the expounding, or opening of the scriptures, Luke 24:27, 32, Acts 28:23⁹⁷.

None of which answers Challenge #3.

As Nehemiah 8:9 shows, any translated words from the Hebrew scriptures are still “**the words of the law**” and that law is “**the law of God.**” Nothing in Nehemiah 8 refers to man-made word meanings being set out in authority above the Holy Bible of that time, “**the law of God.**” Moreover, any word meanings being given at the time were clearly drawn directly from “**the law of God**” according to Nehemiah 8:8 and not from familiar, everyday non-Biblical usage or meanings in the way that Dr DiVietro describes in *Cleaning-Up*, p 73. Nothing in Nehemiah 8 indicates otherwise and therefore the spoken ‘lexicon’ of Nehemiah 8 was radically different from the kind of Bible study aid that Dr DiVietro has been advocating from p 1 of his book. By his comparison of the two, it is therefore Dr DiVietro, not Dr Mrs

Riplinger, who is comparing refrigerators with screw drivers on p 75 of *Cleaning-Up*. See comments immediately following.

On pp 75-76 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of absurdity because she insists that readers must choose between the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible and lexicons. He fails to document his accusation but repeats the dogma that a 'good' lexicon (here unspecified by Dr DiVietro) will enable the student to understand the KJB by showing how its words were used in the worldly environment of the 17th century. Again, Dr DiVietro fails to provide any examples to back up this claim. See remarks above with respect to 1 Corinthians 3:20 and Psalm 94:11 for the Biblical response to Dr DiVietro's accusation.

"It is written...The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain."

What Dr Mrs Riplinger does say, which Dr DiVietro did not tell his readers, is found in *Hazardous Materials* at the end of Chapter 16, on Danker and other German lexicographers, her emphasis.

"The title of the Bauer-Danker Lexicon is A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Just what "Literature" does Danker use to define Bible terms? Recall that to Bauer, "Christian" meant 'heretic' and "Heresy" meant "Christian." So, to study the book of Luke they cite from the "Pseudepigrapha" [pseudo means false; grapha means writings] books such as Assumption of Moses, Martyrdom of Isaiah, and The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Danker says, "Luke, who displays other familiarity with the apocrypha, thought of the parallel with Judith and assumed that his readers would do likewise." Neither the Holy Ghost, nor Luke, nor any true Bible readers will be interested in the Catholic book of 'Judith.'

"So Danker would leave his lexicon readers with Judith, and Priscilla, whom Danker thinks wrote the book of Hebrews. Oh, I almost forgot - and the woman priest (black robe with white squared collar and all), that he shows at the end of his book, No Room in the Brotherhood.

"No thank you, I'll take the Holy Bible."

So would this author. The choice is clear when all the relevant facts are presented. As usual, Dr DiVietro has been economical with the truth in this respect.

On pp 76-77 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of not understanding how to use a lexicon and of being shallow in believing that the 1611 English Holy Bible defines its own terms. He states that she is therefore placing her own understanding of Bible words above the scriptures and that therefore she could be criticized for her past life in the way that she warns of the unbiblical attitudes of various lexicographers such as Bauer, Danker, Kittel etc.

Dr DiVietro then inserts a quote from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1195-1196 in which Dr Mrs Riplinger states in part, her emphasis that *"Greek and Hebrew study tools...elevate the English words in lexicons by unsaved liberals above the English words in our Holy Bible, demote the words of the Holy Bible...establish an elevated priest-class of a few Greek and Hebrew scholars and [incite] a rebellious anarchism in the pews, where everyman's own interpretation, taken from stacks of software, supersedes that in the Holy Bible..."*

That has certainly been this author's experience, by and large, in the 40+ years that he has attended churches in the Antipodes and the UK.

Dr DiVietro has failed to address any of the material in the above citation but he asserts once again that his allusion to Nehemiah 8:8 answers Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #3 and all the statements from *Hazardous Materials* that he has quoted in this chapter of *Cleaning-Up*.

If 'evasion' can be perceived as a synonym for 'answer,' then Dr DiVietro is speaking the truth. If not, then he isn't. The content of this response to Dr DiVietro's 'answer' to Challenge #3 includes considerable documentation from Dr Mrs Riplinger's works that shows that she has substantiated the underhanded manner in which "*unsaved liberals*" have sought to subvert the Holy Bible and Dr DiVietro has repeatedly bypassed this documentation. His allusion to Nehemiah 8:8 is a bogus answer to Challenge #3, as shown above. It should also be noted in this respect that Ezra and his associates were not "*unsaved liberals*."

Dr DiVietro's quote from *Hazardous Materials* pp 1195-1196 ends as follows.

"Isn't it strange that only the current weak and carnal Laodicean-type church has had wide access to Greek and Hebrew study tools (Revelation 3:14)? Could it be they are weak for this very reason? The martyrs throughout history loved the word of God and actually died rather than re-define it."

Dr DiVietro doesn't answer either of the above questions. Nor does he make any comment about the Bible-believing martyrs that Dr Mrs Riplinger mentions – and documents⁹⁸; Ralph Allerton, John Cavel, Thomas Cranmer, John Philpot, Richard Wilmot, Reginald Peacock, John Hooper, John Bradford and many more.

Perhaps Dr DiVietro felt that they were too 'shallow' to be worthy of comment. It appears that his perception of shallowness extends to the following as well⁹⁹. Emphases and explanatory notes in regular type in square brackets, [], are the author's.

*"Inasmuch as all truth is in Holy Scripture, it is clear that every disputation, every **signification of terms**, or linguistic science which does not have its origin in Holy Scripture is profane...cursed, that is to say, unholy or sacrilegious. It is at a distance, as it were, from that which is consecrated..."* – John Wycliffe.

*"I wonder likewise, why you attribute so little to the **diligent reading of the Scriptures and conferring of places**...And as touching your opinion of those questions, it seemeth to me **neither to have any ground of the word of God**, nor of the primitive church. And, to say the truth, the schoolmen have spoken diversely of them, and **do not agree** therein among themselves..."* – Thomas Cranmer (addressing a Catholic priest, not Dr DiVietro).

*"But the true interpretation and meaning of it [holy Scriptures] they did corrupt [Jewish Pharisees], as you [today's scholars] have done and do; and therefore the persecution which they stirred up against the prophets and Christ, was not for the law, but for the **interpretation of it**: for they taught as you do now, that we must **fetch the interpretation of the Scriptures at your hand**"* – John Bradford.

*"I receive not in the scripture the **private interpretation of any man's brain**...[T]he fleshy-minded hypocrites stop up the veins of life, which are in the Scriptures, with the earth of **their traditions, false similitudes [definitions]**"* – William Tyndale.

*"[I]t were more hardly done, if that you, or a few which can read in one or two languages (as **Greek and Latin**), the word of God,...should pull away the English books from the rest which only understand English; and would have only your letters of **Greek and Latin in estimation**, and blind all them which understand not these languages, from the knowledge of God's word. And indeed, my lord, by your saying they have just occasion to **suspect** what is meant..."* – Thomas Cromwell.

““‘To speak with tongue,’ said I, ‘is to speak with a strange tongue, as Latin or **Greek**’ etc., and so to speak, is **not to speak unto men...[it is] ‘to speak unto the wind’**” – John Rogers.

““[T]here cometh more knowledge and **understanding** of the scriptures by their sundry **translations [in different verses]**, than by all the glosses [definitions] of our sophistical doctors. For that one [scripture] interpreteth [translates] something obscurely in **one place**, the same translateth another [place] more manifestly by a more plain vocable [word] of the same meaning in **another place**...[He gave several examples of the built-in dictionary]...[T]he **interpreters have done so before me**...Only our hearts desire unto God, is, that his people be not blinded in their **understanding**”” – Miles Coverdale.

““[U]nderstand Christ’s words...according to the order and phrase of speech, **comparing phrase with phrase**, according to the analogy of the Scripture...The very words which **follow**, sufficiently **declare the true meaning**”” – John Frith.

““My chief fear is that with the revival of **Greek literature** [e.g. lexicon citations of Greek writers such as Origen, Plato, [see Dr Ruckman’s remarks above – AJO’R] etc.] there may be a revival of paganism. There are Christians who are Christians only in name...[T]he study of **Hebrew** may lead to Judaism, which would be worse still. I wish there would be an end of scholastic subtleties”” – Desiderius Erasmus.

Dr Mrs Riplinger adds that, her emphases, “Erasmus was a man before his time...Bainton said, Erasmus forewarned five-hundred years ago, that if lexicons cited pagan definitions, strong words like “church” would become “**assembly**” and “heresy would be **faction**.” Surprise! Surprise! New versions have done it. The new versions make the following ‘politically correct’ change in 1 Cor. 11:19:

“ KJV	NKJV	NASB	ESV	HCSB
“ heresies	factions	factions	factions	factions ”

It should be noted that the NIV, TNIV each has “*differences*” in 1 Corinthians 11:19, displaying more political correctness. It should also be noted that Dr DiVietro provides no examples of the advantageous use of lexicons in this chapter of *Cleaning-Up*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger continues.

“As Erasmus warned, secularized lexicons allow the new versions (i.e. Acts 7:38, 45, Hebrews 4:8) to erase the pre-incarnate **Christ** and his pre-figured **church** from the Old Testament.

“**KJV**

“**church** in the wilderness...**Jesus**”

“**TNIV**

“assembly in the desert...Joshua””

The NIV, TNIV, NKJV and HCSB all change the word “**church**” (“assembly” NIV, TNIV, “congregation” NKJV, HCSB) and wrongly insert “Joshua” instead of “**Jesus**” in Acts 7:45 and Hebrews 4:8.

These are some more of God’s servants who Dr DiVietro would apparently perceive as ‘shallow.’ See remarks in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**, this author’s under-lining.

““The spiritual reformers of the last century taught constantly **the sufficiency and supremacy of Holy Scripture**. The Bible, whole and unmutilated, was their sole rule of faith and practice. They accepted all its statements without question or dispute. They knew nothing of

any part of Scripture being uninspired. They never allowed that man has any “verifying faculty” within him, by which Scripture statements may be weighed, rejected or received. They never flinched from asserting that there can be no error in the Word of God; and that when we cannot understand or reconcile some part of its contents, the fault is in the interpreter and not in the text. In all their preaching they were eminently men of one book. To that book they were content to pin their faith, and by it to stand or fall. This was one grand characteristic of their preaching. They honoured, they loved, they revered the Bible.””

By his own admission, *Cleaning-Up* p 49, Dr DiVietro uses a “verifying faculty” within him, by which Scripture statements may be weighed, rejected or received” every day, in that he consults his lexicons every day, in order to displace the **“wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ”** 1 Timothy 6:3 with the ‘clarified’ version.

If this procedure is ‘deep’ in contrast to ‘shallow,’ then it is **“the depths of Satan”** Revelation 2:24. Dr DiVietro should prayerfully consider Proverbs 25:26.

“A righteous man falling down before the wicked is as a troubled fountain, and a corrupt spring.”

On pp 78-79 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro takes two cuts at Dr Mrs Riplinger. The first of these is in reference to his quote from *Hazardous Materials*, p 719, found on p 71 of *Cleaning-Up*. Dr DiVietro states that Dr Mrs Riplinger is entirely wrong to equate interpretation with translation in Genesis 40:8 because Joseph was simply giving Pharaoh the meaning of the dreams he had described.

Dr DiVietro appeals to the law of first mention in scripture to define the meaning of a word and then allows that the meaning could be extended with later use. This is a correct application of the law of first mention but nevertheless, Dr DiVietro didn’t read the relevant part of the verse very carefully.

“Do not interpretations belong to God?”

The verse did *not* say “Do not interpretations of dreams belong to God?”

All “interpretations” belong to God, whether **“understanding in all visions and dreams”** Daniel 1:17 *or languages*, as Dr DiVietro would have seen if he had taken time off from denigrating Sister Riplinger in order to **“search the scriptures”** John 5:39.

“Then was the part of the hand sent from him; and this writing was written. And this is the writing that was written, MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN. This is the interpretation of the thing; MENE; God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it. TEKEL; Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting. PERES; Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians” Daniel 5:24-28.

“The interpretation of the thing” is clearly a *translation*, as Dr Mrs Riplinger pointed out on pp 717-718 of *Hazardous Materials* with a list of 17 verses that Dr DiVietro obviously skipped over in his fixation with berating Sister Riplinger. The verses are Matthew 1:23, Mark 5:41, 15:22, 34, John 1:38, 41, 42, Acts 4:36, 9:7, 36, 13:8, 1 Corinthians 12:10, 14:26, Hebrews 7:1, 2, 2 Peter 1:19, 21.

Dr DiVietro is grossly in error both with respect to his self-imposed limitation on the application of the scriptural term **“interpretation”** and his condemnation of Sister Riplinger.

Dr Ruckman’s¹⁰⁰ comments on Genesis 40:8 are instructive, author’s emphases, this author’s under-lining.

“What God reveals to the humblest believer by the Holy Spirit (who compares scripture with scripture – 1 Cor. 2:13) cannot be ascertained or verified or comprehended by the greatest Greek and Hebrew scholar who ever lived, if he attempted to usurp the Holy Spirit as “Interpreter” with lexicons and learning (1 Cor. 2:10-15, Luke 24:45).”

By his own admission, see remarks above, Dr DiVietro does so on a daily basis.

Dr DiVietro then dismisses the letter meanings summarised in the Appendix of *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 1114ff as Cabalistic mysticism. He has clearly not read the Appendix very thoroughly, because Dr Mrs Riplinger distinguishes between authentic and bogus research into letter meanings, her emphases.

*“Bible meanings for each of the 26 letters of the English alphabet are documented on the following pages. Each letter meaning was compiled by examining **Genesis 1** for each letter’s first usages as an initial letter...**The ‘letter meanings,’ found by computational linguistic researchers, are shown to agree 100% with meanings ascribed to letters in Genesis.** The findings of classical etymologists, such as Skeat and the compilers of the unabridged Oxford English Dictionary reinforce these meanings...”*

“To gather insights about the subject from linguists who have already explored this vast and new scientific field of letter meanings, search the internet for the following words: linguistics, computational linguistics, quantitative linguistics, phonaesthesia, phonsemanics, phonsemanic dictionary, sound symbolism, psycho-linguistics, semantics, phonesthemic, phonological clusters, linguistlist.org, phonetic symbolism, bibliography, linguist list 9.1106.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warning about Cabalistic misuse of letter meanings follows. It is in small print so perhaps Dr DiVietro missed it for that reason.

“Be careful to limit your study to that of verifiable science; avoid mystical New Age information that counterfeits the truth of God (e.g. Kabbalah)...”

It is Dr DiVietro’s responsibility to address Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warning about New Age counterfeits of letter meanings. He must also show whether or not the disciplines listed above are *themselves* New Age or Cabalistic counterfeits before he can accuse Dr Mrs Riplinger of Cabalism, just as he must refute the work of Periander A. Esplana on Bible numerics before he take issue with her on this subject as well. See **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.

In this author’s view, it is most unlikely that Dr DiVietro will do either.

Author’s note. Dr Mrs Riplinger has kindly forwarded the following information with respect to Biblical letter meanings versus Cabalism.

“The Cabala really has nothing to do with letter meanings. One author, Margaret Mangus, did twist real meanings and tried to give them New Age, not Cabalistic connotations, but any uses of letters in the Cabala itself has absolutely nothing to do with the meanings found in Genesis or in computational linguistics. So when DiVietro says the letter meanings are from the Cabala, he is demonstrating that he does not even know what the Cabala is. He is getting this from a nutty article by Barbara Aho, who pretends this. But neither of them demonstrates one single instance of anything in Cabalistic literature that is even remotely similar to what computational linguists have found.”

As indicated, it is Dr DiVietro’s responsibility to prove otherwise.

His accusation of Cabalism against Sister Riplinger betrays a certain carelessness on Dr DiVietro’s part because thus far in his book, he appears to have overlooked Chapters 28, 29 in *Hazardous Materials*, in which Dr Mrs Riplinger states that, pp 9-10, “C. Ginsburg...was a

follower of the wicked Kabbala and Luciferian Helena P. Blavatsky. [Chapter 29] exposes Reuchlin, the founder of Greek and Hebrew study, and his use of the wicked Kabbala."

If Dr DiVietro had given *Hazardous Materials* a fair reading, he would have quickly found (in the first 10 pages of the book) that Dr Mrs Riplinger is totally opposed to the Cabalistic heresy. That he failed to do so in itself shows that Dr DiVietro has not assessed Dr Mrs Riplinger's research in a fair, objective and responsible manner.

Dr DiVietro's parting shot at Dr Mrs Riplinger in this chapter, p 80 of *Cleaning-Up*, is to liken her warnings about lexical meanings from unregenerate editors using ungodly sources to a warning about cars being evil because they are assembled by, in many cases, unsaved sinners.

If so, then Dr Mrs Riplinger may have a point. Prophetically, motor vehicles don't receive a very good 'press' in scripture, their now-universal use notwithstanding:

"The chariots shall rage in the streets, they shall jostle one against another in the broad ways: they shall seem like torches, they shall run like the lightnings" Nahum 2:4.

See Luke 10:18 (!) for God's perception on lightning or electricity, physically the highest quality of energy as ***"the God of forces"*** Daniel 11:38*, which is Satan in the spiritual realm, 2 Corinthians 4:4.

*changed in the new bibles, naturally; NKJV, NIV, TNIV, HCSB etc., to cover up for the Devil.

"And he said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven."

Ironically, Dr DiVietro's allusion to use of cars as an example of use of lexicons is in direct conflict with his criticism on the page immediately preceding this allusion of Dr Mrs Riplinger's description of letter meanings. On p 79 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of being Cabalistic because *some* use is made of letter meanings for propagating New Age or Cabalistic doctrine, *even though* Dr DiVietro had Dr Mrs Riplinger's warning to this effect on p 1116 of *In Awe of Thy Word* right in front of him. See citation above. Either Dr DiVietro carelessly overlooked this warning or he arrogantly decided to ignore it.

On the very next page of his book, Dr DiVietro does a complete about-face and ridicules Dr Mrs Riplinger's warnings about lexicons because Christians still use cars even though they are assembled by unsaved sinners, so therefore it is all right to use lexicons.

Dr DiVietro's inconsistent attitude when confronted with scriptural truth that God did not show *him* is not new. The Lord Jesus Christ encountered the same inconsistency during His earthly ministry, with respect to the presentation of spiritual or scriptural truth. Only the entrenched determination to *reject* that truth was consistent.

"And the Lord said, Whereunto then shall I liken the men of this generation? and to what are they like? They are like unto children sitting in the marketplace, and calling one to another, and saying, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned to you, and ye have not wept. For John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine; and ye say, He hath a devil. The Son of man is come eating and drinking; and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners!" Luke 7:31-34.

However, both Dr DiVietro's mockery of Dr Mrs Riplinger by means of his car analogy and his inconsistency have nothing to do with answering her Challenge #3, which he has not answered. Nor has he seriously substantiated any of his objections to Challenge #3.

In sum, for Challenge #3:

1. Dr DiVietro has evaded Challenge #3 by likening it to asking for a verse where the Lord Jesus Christ explicitly says “*I am God*” or verses that explicitly use the words *Trinity* or *Rapture*. In this way, Dr DiVietro attempts to associate Dr Mrs Riplinger with unsaved, even malicious Bible critics like Jehovah’s Witnesses and Muslims. This is after accusing her repeatedly of *ad hominem* attacks. His excuses are invalid because the Lord Jesus Christ reveals His Deity plainly in John 8:58, 59. The “**God-head**” (Trinity) is revealed in Acts 17:29, Romans 1:20, Colossians 2:9 and the Rapture is set forth as “**a mystery**” in 1 Corinthians 15:51, first revealed to Paul. Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #3 is clearly not like the questions that Dr DiVietro uses to evade it.
2. Inserting quotes from pp 233, 719, 90, 101, 81-82 in turn of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr DiVietro continues to attack Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work. It should be noted that Dr DiVietro fails to provide one single example of relevant lexical use to counter any of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statements that he has cited in this part of his book. It is straightforward, therefore, to summarise freely what appears to be Dr DiVietro’s stance on the application of contemporary secular Koine Greek word usage to determine Greek New Testament word meanings, as follows.
3. Dr DiVietro maintains that Hebrew and Greek are earthly, not heavenly languages that God created specifically to write the Bible (in the original text) using everyday terms drawn from the secular environments of the times. He denies that Bible words are special words with meanings that cannot be deduced from contemporary secular writings but only from the scriptures themselves. Dr DiVietro has overlooked the scriptural reference, Acts 24:16 that strongly implies the heavenly nature of Biblical Hebrew, even though Dr DiVietro has declared it to be a dead language, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 7, 16. Hebrew would not appear to be dead in heaven. It is this author’s considered view that “**the king’s word**” 2 Samuel 24:4 in the form of the 1611 English Holy Bible is not dead there either and never will be, Matthew 24:35, because it is “**the book**” Revelation 3:5, 5:2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13:8, 17:8, 20:12, 15, 22:19 of the End Times. But this is beyond the scope of Dr DiVietro’s (temporary) book.
4. Dr DiVietro does not specifically challenge the quote from pp 233, 719 in *Hazardous Materials*, author’s emphases “*a Greek lexicon, which held up Plato and the Greek myths as **the** source for meaning and truth, **higher** than the Holy Bible, could not help but place Greek philosophy on a pedestal shadowing the Bible itself.*” It appears that he would therefore hold Plato and the Greek myths as found in the lexicons above the Holy Bible.
5. Dr DiVietro does not specifically challenge the quote from p 90 in *Hazardous Materials*, “*all Bible study tools, new Bible versions, and lexicon authors gathered [their] word meanings crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks.*” It appears that he would therefore approve of such Bible study aids.
6. Dr DiVietro does not specifically challenge the quote from p 101 in *Hazardous Materials*, “*The English definitions and translation choices in lexicons are highly secularized, that is, “they are the words which men’s wisdom teacheth,” not those special separate from sinners words which God instilled early in the English Bible.*” It appears that he would therefore approve of such secularized definitions.

7. Citing pp 81-82 of *Hazardous Materials*, which includes the statement, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphasis, "*Danker admits there are hazards in semantic [word] transference from one language to another,*" Dr DiVietro says that Dr Mrs Riplinger insists that a lexicographer work directly from one of the original languages i.e. Hebrew/Aramaic and/or Greek to English without any intermediate stage e.g. German. Dr DiVietro assures his readers that a Greek-English dictionary obtained via a German intermediary translation is still a satisfactory Bible study aid and declares that the very hazards that Dr Mrs Riplinger mentions prove the need for lexicons to give correct Greek-English equivalents.

However, Dr DiVietro failed to mention Dr Mrs Riplinger's reference on p 82 of *Hazardous Materials* to Chapter 42 of *New Age Versions* that documents the ungodly word meanings from German sources, e.g. Gerhard Kittel, "*Adolph Hitler's propaganda high priest, promoting the genocide of the Jews during World War II,*" Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphasis, which have influenced numerous new bibles; NIV, TNIV, NKJV, HCSB etc. e.g. with respect to Acts 23:12, 26:17. Kittel's insinuations against the Jewish people would have contributed in no small way to the furnaces of Auschwitz and the other extermination camps in mainly Catholic Poland during WW2. Kittel's sinister influence therefore imparts a new and terrible significance to James 3:5. "*Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth!*"

8. On p 74 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro claims to have answered Challenge #3 by means of Nehemiah 8:8. "*So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading.*" Dr DiVietro says that Ezra and his associates verbally translated the Hebrew scriptures as they were read out into Aramaic for the Aramaic-speaking audience from the captivity and thereby carried out the function of a 'good' lexicon, to give the meanings of the words from the original languages. However, as Nehemiah 8:9 shows, any translated words from the Hebrew scriptures are still "*the words of the law*" and that law is "*the law of God.*" Nothing in Nehemiah 8 refers to manmade word meanings being set out in authority above the Holy Bible of that time, "*the law of God.*" Moreover, any word meanings being given at the time were clearly drawn directly from "*the law of God*" according to Nehemiah 8:8 and not from familiar, everyday non-Biblical usage in the way that Dr DiVietro describes in *Cleaning-Up*, p 73. Nothing in Nehemiah 8 indicates otherwise and therefore the spoken 'lexicon' of Nehemiah was radically different from the kind of Bible study aid that Dr DiVietro has been advocating from p 1 of his book. By his comparison of the two, it is therefore Dr DiVietro, not Dr Mrs Riplinger, who is comparing refrigerators with screw drivers on p 75 of *Cleaning-Up*.
9. On pp 75-76 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of absurdity because she insists that readers must choose between the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible and lexicons. He fails to document his accusation but repeats the dogma that a 'good' lexicon (here unspecified by Dr DiVietro) will enable the student to understand the KJB by showing how its words were used in the worldly environment of the 17th century. Again, Dr DiVietro fails to provide any examples to back up this claim.

He also fails to inform his readers about what Dr Mrs Riplinger actually said about unregenerate lexicographers and their lexical concoctions, found at the end of Chapter 16 of *Hazardous Materials*.

"*The title of the Bauer-Danker Lexicon is A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Just what "Literature" does Danker use to define Bible terms? Recall that to Bauer, "Christian" meant 'heretic' and*

“Heresy” meant “Christian.” So, to study the book of Luke they cite from the “Pseudepigrapha” [pseudo means false; grapha means writings] books such as Assumption of Moses, Martyrdom of Isaiah, and The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs...No thank you, I’ll take the Holy Bible.”

So would this author. The choice is clear when all the relevant facts are presented. As usual, Dr DiVietro has been economical with the truth in this respect.

10. On pp 76-77 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of not understanding how to use a lexicon and of being shallow in believing that the 1611 English Holy Bible defines its own terms. He inserts a quote from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1195-1196 in which Dr Mrs Riplinger states in part, her emphasis that *“Greek and Hebrew study tools...elevate the English words in lexicons by unsaved liberals above the English words in our Holy Bible, demote the words of the Holy Bible...establish an elevated priest-class of a few Greek and Hebrew scholars and [incite] a rebellious anarchism in the pews, where everyman’s own interpretation, taken from stacks of software, supersedes that in the Holy Bible...”*

Dr DiVietro does not directly challenge that statement. It would appear, therefore that he approves of the manner in which *“Greek and Hebrew study tools...elevate the English words in lexicons by unsaved liberals above the English words in our Holy Bible”* and *“an elevated priest-class of a few Greek and Hebrew scholars”* who *“[incite] a rebellious anarchism in the pews, where everyman’s own interpretation, taken from stacks of software, supersedes that in the Holy Bible...”*

Dr DiVietro’s quote from *Hazardous Materials* pp 1195-1196 ends as follows.

“Isn’t it strange that only the current weak and carnal Laodicean-type church has had wide access to Greek and Hebrew study tools (Revelation 3:14)? Could it be they are weak for this very reason? The martyrs throughout history loved the word of God and actually died rather than re-define it.”

Dr DiVietro doesn’t answer either of the above questions. Nor does he make any comment about the Bible-believing martyrs that Dr Mrs Riplinger mentions – and documents; Ralph Allerton, John Cavel, Thomas Cranmer, John Philpot, Richard Wilmot, Reginald Peacock, John Hooper, John Bradford and many more.

Perhaps Dr DiVietro felt that they were too ‘shallow’ to be worthy of comment.

11. Dr DiVietro states that Dr Mrs Riplinger is entirely wrong to equate interpretation with translation in Genesis 40:8 because Joseph was simply giving Pharaoh the meaning of the dreams he had described. He didn’t read the relevant part of the verse very carefully. It said **“Do not interpretations belong to God?”** not *“Do not interpretations of dreams belong to God?”*

All “interpretations” belong to God, whether *“understanding in all visions and dreams”* Daniel 1:17 *or languages.*

“Then was the part of the hand sent from him; and this writing was written. And this is the writing that was written, MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN. This is the interpretation of the thing: MENE; God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it. TEKEL; Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting. PERES; Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians” Daniel 5:24-28.

“The interpretation of the thing” is clearly a *translation*, as Dr Mrs Riplinger pointed out on pp 717-718 of *Hazardous Materials* with a list of 17 verses that Dr DiVietro obviously skipped over in his fixation with berating Sister Riplinger. The verses are Matthew 1:23, Mark 5:41, 15:22, 34, John 1:38, 41, 42, Acts 4:36, 9:7, 36, 13:8, 1 Corinthians 12:10, 14:26, Hebrews 7:1, 2, 2 Peter 1:19, 21.

Dr DiVietro is grossly in error both with respect to his self-imposed limitation on the application of the scriptural term **“interpretation”** and his condemnation of Sister Riplinger.

12. Dr DiVietro then dismisses the letter meanings summarised in the Appendix of *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 1114ff as Cabalistic mysticism. He has clearly not read the Appendix very thoroughly, because Dr Mrs Riplinger distinguishes between authentic and bogus research into letter meanings, her emphases.

*“Bible meanings for each of the 26 letters of the English alphabet are documented on the following pages. Each letter meaning was compiled by examining **Genesis 1** for each letter’s first usages as an initial letter...The ‘letter meanings,’ found by computational linguistic researchers, are shown to agree 100% with meanings ascribed to letters in Genesis. The findings of classical etymologists, such as Skeat and the compilers of the unabridged Oxford English Dictionary reinforce these meanings...”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warning about Cabalistic misuse of letter meanings follows. It is in small print so perhaps Dr DiVietro missed it for that reason.

“Be careful to limit your study to that of verifiable science; avoid mystical New Age information that counterfeits the truth of God (e.g. Kabbalah)...”

It is Dr DiVietro’s responsibility to address Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warning about New Age counterfeits of letter meanings. He must also show that the disciplines listed above are *themselves* New Age or Cabalistic counterfeits before he can accuse Dr Mrs Riplinger of cabalism, just as he must refute the work of Periander A. Esplana on Bible numerics before he take issue with her on this subject as well. See **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has kindly forwarded to this author additional information on the Cabala that shows it to be unconnected with letter meanings as found in Genesis. Dr DiVietro appears to be wilfully ignorant of this distinction and is therefore unable to provide even one example from Cabalistic literature that even hints at any association between Cabalism and Computational Linguistics. 1 Corinthians 14:38 applies.

“But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant.”

13. Dr DiVietro’s parting shot at Dr Mrs Riplinger in this chapter, p 80 of *Cleaning-Up*, is to liken her warnings about lexical meanings from unregenerate editors using ungodly sources to a warning about cars being evil because they are assembled by, in many cases, unsaved sinners.

Ironically, Dr DiVietro’s allusion to use of cars as an example of use of lexicons is in direct conflict with his criticism on the page immediately preceding this allusion of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s description of letter meanings. On p 79 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of being Cabalistic because *some* use is made of letter meanings for propagating New Age or Cabalistic doctrine, *even though* Dr DiVietro had Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warning to this effect on p 1116 of *In Awe of Thy Word* right in front of him. See citation above. Either Dr DiVietro carelessly overlooked this warning or he arrogantly decided to ignore it.

On the very next page of his book, Dr DiVietro does a complete about-face and ridicules Dr Mrs Riplinger's warnings about lexicons because Christians still use cars even though they are assembled by unsaved sinners, so therefore it is all right to use lexicons.

Dr DiVietro's inconsistent attitude when confronted with scriptural truth that God did not show *him* is not new. The Lord Jesus Christ encountered the same inconsistency during His earthly ministry, with respect to the presentation of spiritual or scriptural truth. Only the entrenched determination to *reject* that truth was consistent.

“And the Lord said, Whereunto then shall I liken the men of this generation? and to what are they like? They are like unto children sitting in the marketplace, and calling one to another, and saying, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned to you, and ye have not wept. For John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine; and ye say, He hath a devil. The Son of man is come eating and drinking; and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners!” Luke 7:31-34.

Overall, in conclusion, Dr DiVietro has not answered Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #3.

Instead, he continues to mount accusations against her but repeatedly without any substance worthy of the name. Dr DiVietro is at least consistent in these respects.

The wisdom of Solomon is apposite at this point, with respect to Dr DiVietro's on-going diatribe against Sister Riplinger.

Proverbs 26:2 ***“As the bird by wandering, as the swallow by flying, so the curse causeless shall not come.”***

***Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials* – Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**

Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #4 is to "give one Bible verse that says that the New Testament was originally written to the Greeks only."

Dr DiVietro's ire against Sister Riplinger continues unabated in this response (the shortest of the seven, occupying only 4 pages of *Cleaning-Up*, pp 81-84 inclusive*) because he accuses her, p 81, of deliberately misleading her readers. As usual, however, it is Dr DiVietro who ends up misleading the reader.

*This response to Dr DiVietro is, however, the longest thus far, because this particular chapter of *Cleaning-Up* raises several important issues beyond its author's denial of Dr Mrs Riplinger's insights that should be addressed.

Dr DiVietro states, pp 81, 84 that no learned person believes that the New Testament was only written to the Greeks and that no verse of scripture makes this claim. Although he omits the word "originally" in his answer, he hasn't overlooked it because he redrafts the challenge into a question that asks if it is reasonable to believe that the New Testament books were *originally* written in Greek.

Dr DiVietro has, in this author's view, taken an unwarranted liberty with Dr Mrs Riplinger's work by means of this redraft of her Challenge #4 but he clearly does so in an effort to belabour Sister Riplinger yet again.

It should first be noted that Dr DiVietro does not provide a Bible verse to back up even his redrafted challenge/question. Provision of an appropriate passage of scripture is germane to Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #4, however it may be reinterpreted, so Dr DiVietro has failed to answer it.

However, he answers that yes, it is reasonable to believe that the New Testament books were *originally* written in Greek. This enables him then to denigrate Dr Mrs Riplinger for stating that the New Testament books were directly given by inspiration in other ancient languages besides Greek, *as originals*.

He includes a statement from *Hazardous Materials* pp 114-115 to back up his criticism of Dr Mrs Riplinger. It reads in part, "Only God can place the proper translation equivalency in the proper context. This chapter has proven the absolute necessity of having one inspired Holy Bible for each language. God would not inspire Greek originals (which few would ever see) and cast the translation of the great mass of Holy Bibles (which billions would see) to a panoply of opinions."

Dr DiVietro insists, *Cleaning-Up*, p 82 that no evidence exists of any inspired translations, certainly not immediately after Acts 2.

His comments on pp 3-6 of *Cleaning-Up* should be reviewed in this context. Dr DiVietro states here that a good Latin translation, for example, was indeed the word of God but God didn't re-inspire it. According to Dr DiVietro, therefore, Latin-speaking believers did not have "all scripture...given by inspiration of God" but "all scripture" not "given by inspiration of God."

It should be understood, therefore that Dr DiVietro has thus revealed to the student a 'two-tier' deposit of the scriptures, one 'inspired' and the other 'un-inspired.' (The DBS Executive Committee members appear to be the sole custodians of the first (like the pope, who now has oversight of the notorious Turin Shroud¹⁰¹), while ordinary believers, including those who suffered under "the iron heel of the papacy"¹⁰² during the centuries-long period of the Dark Ages – see remarks later – have had to make do with the second.)

Acts 13:10 springs to mind.

“O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?”

Dr DiVietro should have read a little further on p 115 of *Hazardous Materials*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states, *“Yet God’s inspired words can still be found for those who seek them, in Bibles such as the Spanish Valera 1602 Purificada, the Morrison Chinese Bible, Bible King James Française and others. Anyone who suggests that a translation cannot be inspired knows little of the wide and wild theological heresies which have been generated using the Greek words which are common to all Greek texts. For example, in the NKJV, as well as in all new versions, with a swift kick from a lexicon, Jesus slips down from God’s “Son” and “child” to merely a ‘servant’ like Phebe (e.g. see Acts 3:13, 3:26, 4:27, 4:30)...In the modern versions Jesus not only moves down the ladder and becomes a servant, but Phebe moves up from a servant to a deaconess (e.g. NIV, NRSV...)...We know that the KJB has made the right choices by “comparing spiritual things with spiritual.” Deacons might have wives, which Phebe would not have (1 Tim. 3:8-12). Only the KJB paints with such a fine brush. Liberals can carve a man-centered modern version by simply ignoring context...”*

See remarks in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint** on Ricker’s *Berry Interlinear* about the incorrect substitution of “servant” for “**Son**” and “**child**” in Acts 3:13, 26, 4:27, 30.

Would Dr DiVietro be prepared to write to Spanish, Chinese and French believers, who are most likely under more intense pressure with respect to their faith than believers in English-speaking countries, to admonish them like he does Sister Riplinger for believing that they have ***“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”***? Would he then insist *in writing* that they learn Hebrew/Aramaic and Koine Greek if they want to know what God *really* said, or submit to the collective wisdom of the DBS Executive Committee in this respect?

Why didn’t he address the obvious implication of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement that the King James translators were God-guided in their selection of words, so that in that sense certainly, their work should rightly be described as ***“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”***?

Dr DiVietro doesn’t address these questions because no doubt they would cut the ground from under his on-going calumny against Sister Riplinger.

Moreover, he does not here comment on the extensive work of Herman Hoskier, a distinguished colleague of the DBS’s namesake no less, that Dr Mrs Riplinger has described in detail in Chapter 30 of *Hazardous Materials* pp 1097ff, *even though* Hoskier’s research *impinges directly* on Dr DiVietro’s accusations against Sister Riplinger in this chapter of *Clean-Up*.

It is *Herman Hoskier*, not Dr Mrs Riplinger, who stated originally that *“Some or all of the first originals may have been in languages other than Greek”* and that *“Multiple language editions were available immediately and were concurrent with Greek editions.”*

See additional remarks on Herman Hoskier’s research in **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’**.

Note that Dr Mrs Riplinger is quick to disavow, her emphases, *“the liberal theory that the original gospel of Matthew was written **exclusively** in Aramaic, a theory which has been fomented by Catholics.”* She explains that *“It is important to see McClintock, Strong and Hoskier’s observations that the originals may not have been written **strictly** in Greek and vernacular editions born out of Acts 2 accompanied the originals immediately.”*

Moreover, Dr Vance’s outline in the previous section of the preservation and development of the Biblical text down through the centuries, shows that the Syrian and Latin texts overlap

each other and the Greek text precedes them only by about 30-60 years. This would tend to support Herman Hoskier's thesis, insofar as the time spans listed are approximate.

It is Dr DiVietro's responsibility to refute Herman Hoskier's conclusions about the New Testament original documents before he is entitled to level criticisms at Sister Riplinger in this respect. Thus far, he has not done so, which in itself invalidates these criticisms of his against her. See remarks in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint** to the effect that Dr Mrs Riplinger is not guilty of urging her readers to deny two millennia of belief that the New Testament was at first written in Greek. She is simply stating, using detailed sources that Dr DiVietro chooses to ignore, that early vernacular translations were practically contemporaneous with Greek originals. It should be emphasised that neither Herman Hoskier nor Dr Mrs Riplinger speak absolutely about any originals being in something other than Greek even though Hoskier raises the possibility, *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1096ff.

Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, does take issue with Dr Mrs Riplinger's citations from Hoskier on pp 252ff of *Cleaning-Up* in his comments against *Hazardous Materials*. On pp 255-256 of *Cleaning-Up*, he basically accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of lying and states that he is attempting to ascertain what Herman Hoskier *really* said, in the firm belief that he will be able to prove that Dr Mrs Riplinger has misrepresented Hoskier. Just in case she hasn't, he adds that even a great scholar can be wrong, i.e. when the results of his work contradict the diktats of the DBS Executive Committee.

Dr DiVietro's book was published in February 2010. He must have begun his search for Herman Hoskier's statements up to a year ago. Thus far, nothing has emerged from the DBS Executive Committee camp about the results of this search, which is strange, considering the collective DBS venom directed at Sister Riplinger.

Dr DiVietro's comments concerning the citations from Hoskier will be answered when that section of *Cleaning-Up* is addressed. For now, the response of this work to Dr DiVietro's denial of Challenge #4 will continue.

It has already been noted from *Cleaning-Up* pp 15, 66 that Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of setting forth a crude rule of thumb to determine word meanings in scripture by examining ten words before and after the word in question. See comments in **Setting Up the 'Clean-Up'** and **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**. However, on p 116 of *Hazardous Materials*, i.e. the *very next page* from Dr DiVietro's quote from the book, Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals that *this procedure actually forms part of the method* given by *The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of the English Language* for determination of dictionary definitions. She then shows, pp 117-118, how the method can, with careful use, have application to scripture by means of the example of the word "**hell**" *but the procedure is not Dr Mrs Riplinger's originally*. (Note that the ten-words-before-and-after rule is not hard and fast, as Dr Mrs Riplinger also shows.)

Yet Dr DiVietro has tried to imply that it is. He therefore attempts to discredit Dr Mrs Riplinger by casting aspersions at the work of other authors, which he hasn't studied himself but which Sister Riplinger has used or cited, in good faith. Readers will note that Dr DiVietro did the same with the research of Herman Hoskier, with the work of Periander A. Esplana on Bible numerics and with the burgeoning field of Computational Linguistics, compounding his accusations in the last two instances with insinuations against Sister Riplinger of Cabalistic heresy. See remarks above and in the previous section. This duplicity on Dr DiVietro's part strongly suggests that his primary aim is not an objective critique of *Hazardous Materials* at all. Instead, it appears to be a personal vendetta against Sister Riplinger because God has given her insights into the scriptures that He has not given Dr DiVietro. See remarks at the

beginning of the previous section, with respect to John 8:58, 59 and the terms “*Trinity*” and “*Rapture*.”

While still on the subject of inspired translations, which Dr DiVietro denies, careful attention should be paid to the words of Benjamin Wilkinson¹⁰³ with respect to the transmission of the Received Text to the Waldensian Church and the preservation of the true scriptures during the Dark Ages. Under-linings are this author’s.

“In the silent watches of the night, along the lonely paths of Asia Minor where robbers and wild beasts lurked, might have been seen the noble missionaries carrying manuscripts, and verifying documents from the churches of Judea to encourage their struggling brethren under the iron heel of the Papacy...”

“The Scriptures of the apostle John and his associates, the traditional text – the Textus Receptus, if you please – arose from the place of humiliation forced on it by Origen’s Bible in the hands of Constantine and became the Received Text of Greek Christianity. And when the Greek East for one thousand years was completely shut off from the Latin West, the noble Waldenses in northern Italy still possessed in Latin the Received Text.”

“To Christians such as these, preserving apostolic Christianity, the world owes gratitude for the true text of the Bible. It is not true, as the Roman Church claims, that she gave the Bible to the world. What she gave was an impure text, a text with thousands of verses so changed as to make way for her unscriptural doctrines. While upon those who possessed the veritable Word of God, she poured out through long centuries her stream of cruel persecution. Or in the words of [Nolan]:”

““The Waldenses were among the first of the peoples of Europe to obtain a translation of the Holy Scriptures. Hundreds of years before the Reformation, they possessed the Bible in manuscript in their native tongue. They had the truth unadulterated, and this rendered them the special objects of hatred and persecution...Here for a thousand years, witnesses for the truth maintained the ancient faith...In a most wonderful manner it (the Word of Truth) was preserved uncorrupted through all the ages of darkness.””

Benjamin Wilkinson and before him the distinguished theologian Frederick Nolan¹⁰⁴ equated the Waldensian “*translation of the Holy Scriptures*” with “*The Word of truth*.” The expression “*the word of truth*” occurs 5 times in scripture; Psalm 119:43, 2 Corinthians 6:7, Ephesians 1:13, 2 Timothy 2:15, James 1:18 (the plural form, “*the words of truth*” occurs three times, in Proverbs 22:21, twice and in Acts 26:25). In Ephesians 1:13 “*the word of truth*” is associated with “*the gospel of your salvation*,” in 2 Timothy 2:15 it is to be studied in order in order “*to shew thyself approved unto God*” and in James 1:18 it is capable of begetting spiritual life. “*The word of truth*” clearly shares common attributes with “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God*” and in its entirety must be “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God*.”

Not according to Dr DiVietro, however. According to Dr DiVietro, not only were Wilkinson and Nolan deceived in their conviction that the Latin Bibles of the Waldenses were *inspired translations* but so were “*the noble Waldenses*” who endured long centuries of papal persecution in their faithful preservation of “*the word of truth*.”

That seems most unlikely to this author, who wonders how Dr DiVietro and his DBS Executive Committee colleagues will give account of these matters at “*the judgment seat of Christ*” Romans 14:10, assuming that they are all there.

Especially when they will give account in front of the multitudes of Waldensian and other Dark Age believers who suffered martyrdom at the hands of Rome for their devotion to **“the word of truth.”**

That is, **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God,”** in the form of *translations*, yet still as **“the holy scriptures”** 2 Timothy 3:15.

Dr DiVietro says further that Dr Mrs Riplinger’s claim requires that the Old Testament scriptures be inspired into languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic immediately after the events of Acts 2 as well. He states that no evidence exists to show that such inspiration happened, insisting, *Cleaning-Up*, p 114 that the gift of tongues had only to do with speaking and nothing to do with producing inspired translations, in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek.

Dr DiVietro appears to have overlooked the obvious. For a start, Paul’s missionary companion Luke, Luke 1:1-4, Acts 1:1, did *write down* what was spoken in Acts 2, which, like the rest of **“the new testament,”** 2 Corinthians 3:6, is considered by Christian believers to be inspired *written* scripture *and a translation*, into Koine Greek, derived from the Hebrew ‘original.’

It will be appreciated that the inspired translations in Acts 2 differ somewhat from the inspired originals from which the translations were derived and the differences will be addressed below. For now, it should be remembered that **“the word of God is not bound”** 2 Timothy 2:9, however much the DBS Executive Committee may wish to bind it to the supposed ‘once-only-God-breathed-originals.’

Dr DiVietro would no doubt sternly remind one and all that a Koine Greek *translation* can be ‘*inspired*’ because Koine Greek is one of the ‘inspired, original languages,’ *Cleaning-Up*, pp 2-6, but consider the following.

As indicated above, Peter quotes extensively from **“the old testament”** 2 Corinthians 3:14 in Acts 2 *but not verbatim*. The red-shaded portions in the passages below show where the New Testament quotation departs from the precise wording of the Old Testament ‘original.’

Acts 2:16-21:

“And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: And on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy: And I will shew wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath; blood, and fire, and vapour of smoke: The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before that great and notable day of the Lord come: And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved.”

Joel 2:28-32:

“And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: And also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit. And I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and the terrible day of the LORD come. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the LORD shall be delivered:”

Note especially the change from “*spirit*” Joel 2:28, 29 to “*Spirit*” Acts 2:17, 18, with the Deity of the Spirit of God fully manifest in the New Testament, Acts 5:3, 4.

Acts 2:25-28:

“For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved: Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope: Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. Thou hast made known to me the ways of life; thou shalt make me full of joy with thy countenance.”

Psalms 16:8-11:

“I have set the LORD always before me: because he is at my right hand, I shall not be moved. Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth: my flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. Thou wilt shew me the path of life: in thy presence is fulness of joy;”

These Old Testament passages of the scriptures, or Peter’s citations of them, it should be remembered, went into the languages of “*every nation under heaven,*” with respect to all that Peter said in the preceding verses and as Acts 2:37 shows, achieved life-changing results that only “*the scripture of truth*” could achieve, Jeremiah 23:29, *even though Peter’s citations were not verbatim from their Hebrew Old Testament sources.*

“Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?”

The further significance of the changes in wording between the Old and New Testaments for the above passages will be developed below. For now, consider another example, namely that of the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8, which strongly suggests that written portions of the Old Testament in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic existed soon after the time of Acts 2 and before the conversion of Paul in Acts 9:5, 6. These portions were *not* part of the Septuagint, LXX, which was compiled between 100 and 260 AD¹⁰⁵.

“And he arose and went: and, behold, a man of Ethiopia, an eunuch of great authority under Candace queen of the Ethiopians, who had the charge of all her treasure, and had come to Jerusalem for to worship, Was returning, and sitting in his chariot read Esaias the prophet” Acts 8:27-28.

Observe that this portion of Isaiah does not precisely match the Hebrew ‘original.’ Note again the red-shaded parts of the passage and compare with the blue-shaded parts of Isaiah 53:7-8.

“The place of the scripture which he read was this, He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his mouth: In his humiliation his judgment was taken away; and who shall declare his generation? for his life is taken from the earth” Acts 8:32-33.

“He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living:” Isaiah 53:7-8.

By inspection, the two passages read differently, like Peter’s quotations in Acts 2 with respect to their Old Testament counterparts. Yet they are *both* “*The place of the scripture which he read...Esaias the prophet.*”

This author therefore makes the following observations with respect to the New Testament sets of Old Testament citations in Acts 2:16-21, 25-28, 8:32-33 and the sets of their Old Testament counterparts, Joel 2:28-32, Psalm 16:8-11, Isaiah 53:7-8.

Note especially Point 12 below. Point 12 would probably have the DBS Executive Committee in an uproar if and when they read it but it is up to them to disprove it – *from the King James New Testament that they say is accurate, Cleaning-Up*, p 18, not by sleight of hand with ‘the Greek.’

1. The New Testament passages read differently from their Old Testament counterparts.
2. The New Testament passages became *written* Old Testament citations, as Acts 8:28 shows.
3. Both sets of passages, New Testament citations and their Old Testament counterparts are **“The place of scripture.”**
4. Acts 2:16-21, 25-28 i.e. the passages of the scriptures drawn from Joel 2:28-32, Psalm 16:8-11, went into the languages of **“every nation under heaven,”** not just Koine Greek, according to Acts 2:5-11.
5. Acts 8:32-33 i.e. Isaiah 53:7-8, *went into a language that the Ethiopian eunuch could read*, even though its meaning had to be explained to him.
6. *Neither the Acts 2 nor the Acts 8 passages were part of the Septuagint, LXX.* They pre-dated the LXX by over half a century and the Acts 8 passage unequivocally did so *in writing*.
7. *It cannot be assumed that the Ethiopian eunuch spoke Koine Greek.* Dr DiVietro obligingly informs the reader that Koine Greek *extended into Africa only as far as Egypt, Cleaning-Up*, p 82. In other words, it cannot be assumed that the Ethiopian eunuch was reading a portion of Isaiah translated into Koine Greek.
8. Although Ethiopia is not one of the nations listed in Acts 2:9-11, it is understandable that the Lord would provide portions of the scriptures for visitors even from this remote region, in fulfilment of Isaiah 56:3, **“neither let the eunuch say I am a dry tree.”** Dr Moorman¹⁰⁶ concludes that the Ethiopic Bible stemmed from the eunuch’s conversion in Acts 8 i.e. in the language of Ethiopia, *not* Koine Greek or Hebrew. This conclusion is reinforced by an historical overview¹⁰⁷ of the Hebrew language, which shows that it wasn’t ever established in Ethiopia.
9. Whether or not a full *Ethiopic* Old Testament ever existed in the early centuries of the church is unknown (at least to this author). Acts 8:32-33 suggest, however, that portions may have existed, *which were not the ‘original’ Hebrew scriptures because they read differently*, at least in Isaiah 53. Yet they were *nevertheless* **“The place of scripture,”** Dr DiVietro’s denial of inspired translations notwithstanding. Point 12 below enlarges upon this possibility. In the meantime, it should be noted that on the basis of Acts 2:5, the Ethiopian eunuch *could* have been reading a portion of Isaiah *inspired in and translated into his own language, namely Ethiopic*. That particular possibility cannot be dismissed lightly.
10. The Lord Jesus Christ said, in a passage closely related to Isaiah 53:7-8, **“And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me”** John 12:32. He could do this in part by means of **“ambassadors...vessels of bulrushes...paper reeds”** Isaiah 18:2, 19:7, i.e. *possibly written* portions of *translated* key scriptures such as Isaiah 53:7-8, from which the Gospel could be preached (as Philip did in Acts 8:35) and progressed

as *“ambassadors by the sea...upon the waters,”* carried by missionaries even to the Britannic Isles and beyond (see Dr Ruckman’s comments later). (The foregoing is, of course, not the context of Isaiah 18:2, 19:7, though *“Ethiopia”* is mentioned in Isaiah 18:1 but the terms used in those verses are strikingly descriptive of written communications that will probably never be fully supplanted by electronic means.)

Acts 8:32-33/Isaiah 53:7-8, Acts 2:16-21/Joel 2:28-32, Acts 2:25-28/Psalm 16:8-11 could be described as key portions of scripture, such as are used in today’s Gospel tracts, e.g. Chick’s, because they refer respectively to the 1st Advent, 2nd Advent and the believer’s walk all the way in between where *“God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble”* Psalm 46:1.

A similar passage is Acts 3:22-23, with its equivalent Old Testament passage Deuteronomy 18:15, 19. As before, the red and blue-shaded portions highlight the differences between the passages.

“For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people” Acts 3:22-23.

The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken; According to all that thou desiredst of the LORD thy God...And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him” Deuteronomy 18:15, 19.

Peter’s audience on this occasion consisted of *“Ye men of Israel”* Acts 3:12, 25. However, in Acts 5:28, *“the high priest”* Acts 5:27 declared *“behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine.”* It is realistic to conclude, therefore that Peter’s quotation of Acts 3:22-23/Deuteronomy 18:15, 19 was circulated to members of the different language groups listed in Acts 2:9-11 as yet one more instance of *“the place of the scripture”* Acts 8:32.

Combined with Acts 8:32-33/Isaiah 53:7-8, Acts 2:16-21/Joel 2:28-32, Acts 2:25-28/Psalm 16:8-11, Acts 3:22-23/Deuteronomy 18:15, 19 becomes more significant because these passages together represent the major prophets, the minor prophets, the Psalms and the Law of Moses, as the Lord Jesus Christ outlined all of the then scriptures in Luke 24:44, *“These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me.”*

This observation will be developed later.

11. Given that God can inspire Gentile kings to send written edicts to their subjects *“according to the language of every people”* Esther 1:20, 22, the possibility certainly exists that God could enable these key portions of Old Testament scripture to be written in the languages of *“every nation under heaven,”* including Ethiopic, for the edification of *His* subjects, insofar as *“the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men”* Daniel 4:17. (See later remarks on the word *“publish”* and Esther 1:20, 22, 3:14, 8:13, Daniel 4:1, 6:25.) If this happened, they would have to be *inspired* scripture if they were to sustain new converts like the Ethiopian eunuch, 1 Peter 2:2 and they appear to have been inspired directly from Peter’s quotations in Acts 2, *“after the manner that holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost”* 2 Peter (!) 1:21, Acts 2:4, not obtained by direct translation of extant Hebrew scriptures, although this

means was no doubt used subsequently for other parts of the Old Testament. See remarks on the scholar Helvidius below and Point 12, which immediately follows. God is not limited by the ‘mono-inspiration’ dogma of the DBS Executive Committee, as Jeremiah indicates in Jeremiah 32:17 **“Ah Lord God!...there is nothing too hard for thee.”** In addition, as indicated above, **“the word of God is not bound”** 2 Timothy 2:9. The Lord is free to edit and even re-inspire His own work¹⁰⁸, again regardless of the DBS Executive Committee *but He nevertheless used rigid Jewish scribal tradition to His own advantage.* See the next point.

12. *Crucially*, the differences between the New Testament sets of Old Testament citations in Acts 2:16-21, 25-28, 3:22-23, 8:32-33 and their Old Testament counterparts show that the New Testament passages must have been **“given by inspiration”** in languages other than Hebrew because Jewish scribes were required to make perfect copies of their Old Testament manuscripts. Even minor blemishes could require that the entire copy had to be destroyed and the manuscript recopied to perfection¹⁰⁹. See also Dr Waite’s excellent summary of the strict rules that governed the copying of Old Testament manuscripts¹¹⁰. Acts 2:16-21, 25-28, 3:22-23, 8:32-33 could therefore never have ‘passed muster’ according to Jewish scribes *but they did according to the Spirit of God*, Acts 2:4, 8:29, 39.

“O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!” Romans 11:33.

This author believes, therefore, contrary to Dr DiVietro that the Lord Jesus Christ has sufficient grace, mercy, wisdom and power to provide *written inspired* portions of Old Testament scriptures at least soon after Acts 2, *directly inspired* from an apostle’s ‘free’ quotations from the Old Testament *in languages other than Hebrew*. The differences between the New Testament citations of the Old Testament in Acts 2, 3, 8 and their Old Testament counterparts show that these portions were in languages other than Hebrew but they were no less **“The place of scripture”** for that. As the Hebrew Old Testament became more widely circulated* in the ensuing centuries of the church, these early inspired translated portions of scripture appear to have passed from the scene, preserved only in the New Testament citations such as Acts 2, 3, 8 but they clearly fulfilled the purpose the Lord had for them.

“For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it” Isaiah 55:10-11.

*Hebrew Old Testament manuscripts, for example, had reached England by the time of Wycliffe in the 14th century¹¹¹. Better late than never.

Dr DiVietro would naturally utterly reject this analysis but, as indicated, it will be interesting to see what happens at **“the judgment seat of Christ”** Romans 14:10. If he was to reject this analysis, he would then have to explain why the scribes who copied the Old Testament were able to break their rigid scribal tradition with respect to making manuscript copies, e.g. with respect to Acts 8:32-33. See Point 12 above and comments below on Luke 4:18-19.

With respect to Dr DiVietro’s denial of **“other tongues”** Acts 2:4-11 as a basis for **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”** in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 82, 113-114, Dr Mrs Riplinger has kindly forwarded some insightful material that Dr DiVietro has failed to consider. This author’s overview of Sister Riplinger’s insights is as follows.

Sister Riplinger focuses upon the terms **“word,” “word of God”** and **“word of the Lord”** and states that *“All throughout the book of Acts we see the word of God being glorified, growing, and spreading. DiVietro acts as if Acts 2 had nothing to do with the word of God but the Biblical approach is that the languages given in Acts 2 were to spread the gospel. Remember they were told to wait for the gift of the Holy Ghost, which they got in Acts 2, before they could go into all the world and preach the Gospel. Why are they called the four ‘Gospels’? So the book of Acts itself testifies that the gift of tongues was for the spreading of the word of God.”*

With respect to *“the four ‘Gospels’,”* God was clearly concerned **“first of all”** 1 Corinthians 15:3 to get **“the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God...into all the world”** Mark 1:1, 16:15 and so the Books of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John occupy first place in the New Testament, each with a statement of the Great Commission at or near their conclusion; Matthew 28:18-20, Mark 16:15, Luke 24:46-49, John 20:21. Observe in passing that the four Gospels match **“the four corners of the earth”** Revelation 7:1, i.e. the four points of the compass¹¹². Note further that the word **“gospel”** is literally **“God’s word”** as Dr Mrs Riplinger has shown¹¹³, not simply ‘good news.’ The term **“gospel”** is therefore associated in scripture with **“the word of the Lord”** Acts 8:25 and **“the word of God”** Romans 10:16-17, 2 Corinthians 4:2-3 and 2 Timothy 2:8-9.

As Dr Mrs Riplinger indicates, the Book of Acts charts the initial progress of the Great Commission, especially with respect to its association with the terms **“word,” “word of God”** and **“word of the Lord.”** That progress is striking, as the following analyses reveal.

Word searches in the scripture for the terms **“word,” “word of God,” “word of the Lord”** and related terms support Dr Mrs Riplinger’s observation that Acts 2 was the launching ground for the preaching of the Gospel in multiple languages and ultimately **“the whole counsel of God”** Acts 20:27, in fulfilment of the Great Commission. With respect to Acts 2 as the instigation of the preaching of the Gospel in multiple languages, note Acts 2:4, mentioned above under Point 11.

“And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.”

All that Peter and the apostles speak in the rest of Acts 2 e.g. **“his word”** Acts 2:41, in whatever language, have to be **“the words of God”** John 3:34, according to 2 Samuel 23:2.

“The Spirit of the LORD spake by me, and his word was in my tongue.”

Unless Dr DiVietro can prove from scripture that the words of **“The Spirit of the LORD”** in Acts 2 are somehow only man’s words if not in Hebrew/Aramaic and/or Greek, then the words spoken in all the languages listed in Acts 2:9-11 are **“the words of God”** that declare **“the wonderful works of God”** Acts 2:11 and are **“given by inspiration of God.”** Up to this point in *Cleaning-Up*, he has not done so.

It should be noted that Acts 2:16-21/Joel 2:28-32 are evidence of **“the wonderful works of God,”** as described by **“the words of God.”**

The word search results are as follows.

The term **“word”** occurs 40 times in the Book of Acts; Acts 2:41, 4:4, 29, 31, 6:2, 4, 7, 8:4, 14, 25, 10:36, 37, 44, 11:1, 16, 19, 12:24, 13:5, 7, 15, 26, 44, 46, 48, 49, 14:3, 25, 15:7, 35, 36, 16:6, 32, 17:11, 13, 18:11, 19:10, 20, 20:32, 22:22, 28:25.

By comparison, the word **“word”** (**“word”** and **“Word”** in the Gospel of John) in Matthew, Mark, Luke and John occurs 19, 14, 20 and 22 times respectively.

The Book of Acts therefore clearly shows the burgeoning fulfilment of the Great Commission as *word in progress*, from the Lord's promise in Acts 1:8.

“But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.”

In sum with respect to the Great Commission in the Book of Acts, beginning at Acts 2, ***“But the word of God grew and multiplied”*** Acts 12:24.

It most certainly did, as the following comparisons show, with respect to the Lord's word, preaching the Lord's word and preaching the Gospel.

The expression ***“the word of God”*** occurs 13 times in the Book of Acts; Acts 4:31, 6:2, 7, 8:14, 11:1, 12:24, 13:5, 7, 44, 46, 17:13, 18:11, 19:20, almost twice as often as in all four Gospels combined, where the expression is found 7 times; Mark 7:13, Luke 3:2, 5:1, 8:11, 21, 11:28, 10:35.

The expression ***“the word of the Lord”*** occurs 8 times in the Book of Acts; Acts 8:25, 11:16, 13:48, 49, 15:35, 36, 16:32, 19:10. It occurs but once in the Gospels; Luke 22:61.

The expression ***“preach the word”*** occurs only twice in the entire Bible, one of those times being in the Book of Acts, Acts 16:6, the other being in 2 Timothy 4:2.

The expression ***“preaching the word”*** occurs 3 times in the entire Bible, each time in the Book of Acts; Acts 8:4, 11:19, 15:35.

The expression ***“preached the word”*** occurs 5 times in the entire Bible, 4 times in the Book of Acts; Acts 8:25, 13:5, 14:25, 15:36, the remaining occurrence being in Mark 2:2.

Expressions such as ***“preach the gospel”*** occur 44 times in the New Testament, 12 of which are in the Gospels and 4 in the Book of Acts; Acts 8:25, 14:7, 21, 16:10 but the Acts references are the first in the scripture to show the Lord's Great Commission to ***“preach the Gospel”*** Mark 16:15 *in operation outside of Jerusalem and Judea and in at least one other language besides Hebrew and Greek, i.e. “the speech of Lycaonia”* Acts 14:11.

Acts 8:25 ***“And they, when they had testified and preached the word of the Lord, returned to Jerusalem, and preached the gospel in many villages of the Samaritans.”***

Acts 14:7 ***“And there they preached the gospel.”***

Acts 14:21 ***“And when they had preached the gospel to that city, and had taught many, they returned again to Lystra, and to Iconium, and Antioch.”***

Acts 16:10 ***“And after he had seen the vision, immediately we endeavoured to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering that the Lord had called us for to preach the gospel unto them.”***

Dr DiVietro's opinion to the contrary notwithstanding, as Sister Riplinger has pointed out, the above scriptures confirm that Acts 2 is germane to ***“the word of God,” “the gospel”*** and their propagation as Acts 2:41-42 show, introducing another key term associated with ***“the word,”*** namely ***“doctrine.”***

“Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.”

Word searches in the scripture with respect to the terms ***“word”*** and ***“doctrine”*** reveal further interesting results.

The terms “*word*” or “*words*” and “*doctrine*” occur together in 6 verses of scripture; Luke 4:32, 1 Timothy 4:6, 5:17, 6:3, 2 Timothy 4:2, Titus 1:9.

Of the 51 occasions where the word “*doctrine*” occurs in the scriptures, 45 are found in the New Testament. Of the 39 New Testament verses where “*doctrine*” occurs without “*word*” or “*words*,” the word is nevertheless repeatedly associated with what the Lord Jesus Christ or the apostles *said* or *taught*. For example:

“And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine” Matthew 7:28.

“Saying, Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name? and, behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us” Acts 5:28.

In other words, throughout the New Testament and therefore for 90% of the occurrences in scripture of the word “*doctrine*,” it is associated with “*the word of God*.” Acts 2:41-42, therefore, provide added confirmation through the occurrence of the word “*doctrine*” that Acts 2 *is* about “*the word of God*,” in spite of Dr DiVietro’s denial to this effect.

And Acts 2 is about “*the word of God*” in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek, as Acts 2:5-11 indicates (as the term is used in the early chapters of Acts e.g. Acts 4:31, 6:2, 7, 8:14 before the completion of the New Testament and, as Acts 2:5-11 indicates, for evidently ‘re-inspired’ Old Testament portions of scripture such as Acts 2:16-21/Joel 2:28-32, Acts 2:25-28/Psalm 16:8-11, Acts 3:22-23/Deuteronomy 18:15, 19, Acts 8:32-33/Isaiah 53:7-8). Further evidence to this effect arises from a study of the word “*publish*” and its derivatives, found 32 times in the scripture, twice in the Book of Acts.

Acts 10:37 ***“That word, I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judaea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached.”***

Acts 13:49 ***“And the word of the Lord was published throughout all the region.”***

Acts 13:49 is of particular interest because “*the region*” in the verse is at least that of Phrygia, as any Bible dictionary or atlas will show and Phrygia is one of the language groups mentioned in Acts 2. The city where Paul preached in Acts 13 is called after its common name of the time, “*Antioch in Pisidia*” Acts 13:14, though its exact location is said to have been Phrygia¹¹⁴. However, the term “*all the region*” may refer to the whole area around “*Antioch in Pisidia*,” which could have included all or most of Asia Minor, of which several language groups are mentioned in Acts 2:8-10. See under-linings and note that Paul and his companions had been in “*Perga in Pamphylia*” Acts 13:13 before they came to “*Antioch in Pisidia*.” It seems likely therefore that the publishing of the word of God* would not have neglected Pamphylia that Paul had so recently visited. The publishing of the word of God* probably extended beyond Phrygia, therefore and would have been extant in more than one language group. *To the extent that it existed at the time of Acts 13. See comments below.

“And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born? Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judaea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes” Acts 2:8-10.

Some mention should be made at this point of what most likely constituted the published word of God as it spread through Asia Minor. Note in this respect that Colossians 4:16 indicates that the apostolic churches circulated written scriptures among themselves, “*And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea.*”

Acts 19:8, 10 is a helpful reference point because it refers to the time when the Lord's word had advanced throughout that region. Dr Ruckman¹¹⁵ gives a date for the events of Acts 19 as A.D. 54-56.

“And he went into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God....And this continued by the space of two years; so that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks.”

“The word of the Lord Jesus,” it should be noted, must include the Old Testament scriptures that the Lord refers to in Luke 24:44, ***“These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me.”***

At a minimum, therefore the published word of God at that time would have consisted of ***“the law of Moses...the prophets, and...the psalms,”*** the apparently ‘re-inspired’ portions of the Old Testament such as Acts 2:16-21/Joel 2:28-32, Acts 2:25-28/Psalm 16:8-11, Acts 3:22-23/Deuteronomy 18:15, 19, Acts 8:32-33/Isaiah 53:7-8 and, again according to the dates from Dr Ruckman's work, the Books of Matthew, A.D. 37, 1 Thessalonians, A.D. 51-52, 2 Thessalonians, A.D. 53-54, Hebrews, A.D. 35, James, A.D. 37-39. Dr Ruckman states that Paul wrote 1 Corinthians in about A.D. 57-58, not long after the events of Acts 19 and 1 Corinthians of course contains the important summation of the Gospel of Christ, 1 Corinthians 15:3, 4.

The events of Acts 13 took place about A.D. 44-45, so by inspection, some parts of the New Testament would have been available even at that earlier time. Old Testament portions in Aramaic (besides Daniel 2:4b-7:28, see remarks later on the possible existence of other portions of the Old Testament in Aramaic during the Lord's earthly ministry) and Syriac may also have existed at that time. See comments below.

Dr DiVietro would probably insist nevertheless that any publication of ***“the word of the Lord”*** as portions of the New Testament in this region would be in Koine Greek but the scripture shows otherwise with respect to ***“the king's word”*** 2 Samuel 24:4, 1 Chronicles 21:4, 6, Daniel 3:28 and certainly, by implication, with respect to the word of ***“the King of kings, and Lord of lords”*** 1 Timothy 6:15. ***“The King of kings, and Lord of lords,”*** it should be noted, can even change the word of the most powerful of earthly kings, Daniel 3:28.

The scripture reveals the following associations between the word ***“publish”*** and ***“the king's word.”***

1. Although the word ***“publish”*** may refer to a verbal proclamation, e.g. Mark 1:45, ***“publish”*** with respect to ***“the king's word”*** typically refers to a *written* proclamation in the scripture.
2. Such written proclamations can be in *many* languages, not solely Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek.

Esther 1:20, 22 ***“And when the king's decree which he shall make shall be published throughout all his empire, (for it is great,) all the wives shall give to their husbands honour, both to great and small... For he sent letters into all the king's provinces, into every province according to the writing thereof, and to every people after their language, that every man should bear rule in his own house, and that it should be published according to the language of every people.”***

Esther 3:14 ***“The copy of the writing for a commandment to be given in every province was published unto all people, that they should be ready against that day.”***

Esther 8:13 ***“The copy of the writing for a commandment to be given in every province was published unto all people, and that the Jews should be ready against that day to avenge themselves on their enemies.”***

Four additional scriptures are important in this context and with respect to Acts 12:24 above, ***“But the word of God grew and multiplied.”***

“Nebuchadnezzar the king, unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth; Peace be multiplied unto you” Daniel 4:1.

“Then king Darius wrote unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth; Peace be multiplied unto you” Daniel 6:25.

“And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!” Romans 10:15.

“And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace;” Ephesians 6:15.

These references show that ***“the king’s word”*** in the Old Testament multiplies peace to its recipients in that it is sent *in writing* to a multiplicity of peoples or ***“a multitude of nations”*** Genesis 48:19 *in their respective languages*. ***“The king’s word”*** in the New Testament becomes the word of ***“the King of kings, and Lord of lords”*** 1 Timothy 6:15 in the form of ***“the gospel of peace”*** in its ministry of reconciliation. See 2 Corinthians 5:19, Ephesians 2:16-18. Assuredly then, ***“the gospel of peace”*** must eventually go *in writing* to ***“a multitude of nations”*** *in their respective languages* if, as is the case, ***“the King of kings, and Lord of lords”*** is at least as mindful of His subjects as saved Gentile Old Testament kings were mindful of theirs.

Isaiah 45:22 shows that He is.

“Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else.”

Overall, therefore, these verses refer to *written* publications of ***“the king’s word”*** in a variety of languages. This author believes, therefore that Acts 13:49 can refer to *written* publications of the *inspired* word* of ***“the King of kings, and Lord of lords”*** in a variety of languages stemming from ***“the word of God”*** imparted to the language groups in Acts 2 on the Day of Pentecost. *As understood by what constituted the published word of God at the time of Acts 13. See comments above.

Note Dr Ruckman’s detailed comments to this effect¹¹⁶.

In sum, when the terms ***“word,” “word of God,” “word of the Lord”*** and related terms ***“preach,” “gospel,” “doctrine”*** and ***“publish”*** are studied in relation to each other in the scriptures, the indication in the Book of Acts of the existence of multiple language translations stemming from the language groups of Acts 2 becomes very strong. That indication is strong enough to convince this author that such translations existed, even if Koine Greek, Old Latin and Syriac were or later became dominant in the early church.

That ***“the word of God”*** was propagated in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek in the early church is further noted by Dr Mrs Riplinger in a remarkable reference from one particular servant of God whom the Body of Christ would perceive as a most trusted source. Emphases are Dr Mrs Riplinger’s.

“In Foxes Book of Martyrs, Vol. 4, pp. 671-675, Foxe quotes an old “treatise.” To him, who lived in the 1500s, “old” would definitely be well before the 1400s certainly, probably much, much older than that. It said, “Also the four evangelists wrote the gospel in divers languages, as Matthew in Judea, Mark in Italy, Luke in Achaia, and John in Asia. And all these wrote in the languages of the same countries...” It goes on to say, “since Christ commanded his apostles to preach his gospel unto all the world, and excepted no people or language.” Such an old witness, through a man as highly esteemed as Foxe, can hardly be dismissed.”

It would certainly be the height of presumption on the part of the DBS Executive Committee to do so.

Dr Mrs Riplinger¹¹⁷ has compiled further evidence in support of *inspired* New and Old Testament portions of the scriptures in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek, her emphases. These portions included translations of the Old Testament into Old Latin.

*“Wycliffe said that the scripture is given by the Holy Ghost in all languages. To those who charge that inspiration is lost with translation [Drs DiVietro, Waite, Williams, Cleaning-Up, p 18], Wycliffe says, “...such a charge is a condemnation of the **Holy Ghost**, who first gave the **Scriptures** in tongues to the Apostles of Christ, to speak that word in all languages that were ordained under heaven”...*

*“The myth that Wycliffe had no access to the original languages is discounted by Wycliffe himself who said that he had access to **Hebrew** Old Testament manuscripts which were in “complete agreement” with the Old Latin text he followed. He adds, “[T]he Jews were dispersed among the nations, taking with them their Hebrew manuscripts. Now this happened...that we might have recourse to their manuscripts as witnesses to the fact that there is no difference in the sense found in our Latin books and those Hebrew ones.”*

*“He also makes references to manuscripts being “corrected according to the **Greek** exemplar.” Once Jerome’s text was **corrected**, there was “complete agreement of his translation [Wycliffe’s] with the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts.””*

Concerning other very early translations of the Old Testament in languages in addition to Old Latin, Dr Moorman¹¹⁸ notes that *“The ruling house of Adiabene, a kingdom situated east of the Tigris, was converted to Judaism about A.D. 40...They needed the Hebrew scriptures in a language they could understand – i.e. Syriac, so it is probable that parts of the Old Testament, and at first the Pentateuch, were translated into Syriac in the middle of the 1st century.”*

This author thinks it is possible that the scriptures that the Lord studied during His earthly ministry and read from in Luke 4:18-19 included at least parts of an Aramaic Old Testament. Daniel 2:4b-7:28 was first written in Aramaic¹¹⁹, which shows that the Jews accepted Aramaic as a Biblical language and it is likely that the Lord customarily spoke Aramaic, as well as knowing Hebrew and Greek. The scripture shows that He used Aramaic expressions; **“Talitha cumi”** Mark 5:41, **“Ephphatha”** Mark 7:34, **“Abba”** Mark 14:36 and **“Eloi, Eloi, lamasabachthani”** Matthew 27:46, Mark 15:34 and according to *The New Compact Bible Dictionary*, an Aramaic Old Testament is said to have existed in the 1st Century. It is possible therefore that the Old Testament Book in use in Nazareth during the Lord’s lifetime was an Aramaic one, which was also accepted for public reading in the synagogue, Luke 4:16-17 for all parts of the Old Testament in which it was extant, besides Daniel 2:4b-7:28. Luke 4:18-19 suggests this possibility because these verses differ appreciably from Isaiah 61:1, 2. See the comparison below. As with the comparisons for Acts 2:16-21/Joel 2:28-32, Acts 2:25-28/Psalm 16:8-11, Acts 3:22-23/Deuteronomy 18:15, 19, Acts 8:32-33/Isaiah 53:7-8,

the differences are highlighted in the red and blue-shaded portions of the passages. (It is noted that the Lord stopped reading in the middle of Isaiah 61:2¹²⁰ because the remainder of the verse describes the Second Advent but that *is* a separate study.)

“The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, To preach the acceptable year of the Lord” Luke 4:18-19.

“The Spirit of the Lord GOD is upon me; because the LORD hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; To proclaim the acceptable year of the LORD, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn;” Isaiah 61:1-2.

Inspection of the two passages suggests that even though the word **“GOD”** is omitted, the Aramaic version, if such it was, had been extended from the Hebrew original by means of the added phrase ***“recovering of sight to the blind.”*** The insertion of this phrase in Isaiah 61:1-2 would be an example of Jeremiah 36:32 in operation, where to ***“all the words of the book which Jehoiakim king of Judah had burned in the fire:...there were added besides unto them many like words.”***

In sum, Luke 4:16-19 together with Daniel 2:4b-7:28 and the likelihood of Aramaic as a common language in Nazareth during the Lord’s lifetime *and an accepted Biblical language* point strongly to an Old Testament written in Aramaic *that was accepted by both the people of the time and the Lord Himself as an inspired translation of “all scripture...given by inspiration of God.”*

If such was the case, then the original Greek of Luke 4:18, 19 would have to have been an inspired translation of the original Aramaic, which in turn would have to have been an inspired translation of the original Hebrew. That would be an example of triple inspiration, with the Editor-in-Chief making edits in His own work as He saw fit¹²¹ and that example appears to fit with scripture.

Those conclusions merit prayerful reflection.

John Wycliffe¹²² has this further word about *inspired* New and Old Testament portions of the scriptures in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek, this author’s emphases. (What follows is what Wycliffe said. Dr DiVietro could save himself the trouble of trying to ‘prove’ that this author has ‘misrepresented’ Wycliffe.)

“The laity ought to understand the faith, and as the doctrines of our faith are in the Scriptures, believers ought to have the Scriptures in a language familiar to the people, and to this end indeed did the Holy Spirit endue [Christ and his Apostles] with the knowledge of all tongues. If it is heresy to read the Bible, then the Holy Ghost is himself condemned who gave in tongues to the Apostles of Christ to speak the Word of God in all languages that were ordained of God under heaven. If Christ was so merciful as to send the Holy Ghost to the heathen men to make them partakers of his blessed word, why should it be taken from us in this land that be Christian men? If you deny Christ’s words as heresy, then you make Christ a heretic. If you condemn the Word of God in any language as heresy, then you condemn God for a heretic that spake the word [Drs DiVietro, Waite, Williams, *Cleaning-Up*, p 18], for he and his word are all one; and if his word is the life of the world how may any Anti-Christ take it away from us that are Christian men, and allow the people to die for hunger in heresy [Drs DiVietro, Waite and Williams do so by insisting that only the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek originals are ‘inspired’ *Cleaning-Up*, pp 2-3].”

Dr DiVietro insists once again, p 84 that inspiration of translations is found nowhere in the New Testament. In this author's considered view, the above analyses for Luke 4:18, 19, Acts 2:16-21, 25-28, 3:22, 23, 8:32-33 and their Old Testament counterparts and the terms "**word**," "**word of God**" and "**word of the Lord**" in the Book of Acts give the lie to Dr DiVietro's opinion in this respect. See also remarks with respect to John 19:19, 20, Acts 14:11, 21:40 in this author's earlier work¹²³. If Koine Greek is taken to be the original language of the New Testament, as Dr DiVietro would perceive it, these verses reveal:

1. An inspired *written* 'original' in *Latin* translated into Koine Greek, John 19:19, 20.
2. An inspired *spoken* 'original' "***in the speech of Lycaonia***" translated into 'Koine' Greek, Acts 14:11.
3. An inspired spoken 'original' in Hebrew translated into 'Koine' Greek, Acts 21:40, *as an example of 'multiple inspiration' that the DBS Executive Committee abhors*, if it insists that both the 'donor' (Hebrew) and 'receptor' languages (Koine Greek) are inspired.

Other examples include Matthew 21:13, Mark 11:17, Luke 19:46, where the Lord Jesus Christ contravenes Jewish scribal tradition again by 'updating' and retranslating by inspiration "***an house of prayer***" in Isaiah 56:7 to "***the house of prayer***" because "***the Lord***" had "***suddenly come to his temple***" Malachi 3:1. Though He later had to forsake it, He will come to it again and never forsake it, Luke 13:35, Ezekiel 48:35.

The New Testament reveals even more startling information on 'inspired translations. See Revelation 5:13 *and note that the events described are still future.*

"And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever."

Because Revelation 5:13 is yet future, "***every creature***" will not have spoken Koine Greek, even if that was the language in which John originally wrote down the statement "***Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.***" Whatever languages the creatures did speak must, like the Lycaonian language of Acts 14:11, have been *spoken* 'inspired originals' that were spontaneously translated in the third heaven 2 Corinthians 12:2 into Koine Greek, say, so that John could understand and record what the voices had said in unison.

If so, then Revelation 5:13 is more evidence that gives the lie to Dr DiVietro's notion that inspiration of translations is found nowhere in the New Testament. The implications of Revelation 5:13 with respect to inspiration of translations are even more striking and will be explained below but for now, consider another example.

See Revelation 14:6-7.

"And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, Saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters."

Like Revelation 5:13, the literal fulfilment of these verses is yet future. When they are fulfilled, the angel's words in Revelation 14:7 cannot be spoken in Koine Greek, which is now a dead language¹²⁴, as even Dr DiVietro admits, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 7, 16. No-one would understand it.

That observation leads to a striking conclusion.

Even if the angel will have the power to speak more than one language simultaneously, he will have to include King James English, as the *Biblical* language of the End Times or the *scriptural lingua franca*. See comments in this author's earlier work¹²⁵ on questions for Dr Waite to answer. See also Dr Mrs Riplinger's work¹²⁶ on *The Missionary Bible KJV*.

What now follows is most compelling for anyone who believes what God said in Isaiah 46:9-10.

“Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me, Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure:”

If John wrote down what he saw and heard in the prophetic vision of Revelation 14:6-7 in Koine Greek as inspired scripture (and the DBS Executive Committee would unanimously declare that he did), *then John's Koine Greek 'original' must have been an inspired translation of an inspired spoken original at least in part in King James English because, as indicated above, the angel's words in Revelation 14:7 are yet future. Similar remarks apply to Revelation 5:13. Most, if not all, of the creatures, including peoples in Revelation 14:6, will not be able to speak Koine Greek but many of them will be able to speak King James English, as the Biblical lingua franca of the End Times! In God's timing, wisdom and power, the spoken inspired King James English 'original' that John received prophetically almost 2,000 years ago became the written inspired 1611 Authorized King James English Holy Bible historically and to the present day. (With **“his mouth as the mouth of a lion”** Revelation 13:2, even **“the beast”** has to speak English¹²⁷.)*

This is also an additional proof that a translation can be inspired given that John's Koine Greek 'original' was in fact a translation of the language (or various languages) he heard spoken by the angel.

That conclusion merits prayerful reflection, James 1:5.

Dr DiVietro devotes pp 82-84 of his book to a potted history of the spread of Koine Greek from Egypt to India and concludes his response to Challenge #4 by reiterating, essentially that Dr Mrs Riplinger is wrong to equate interpretation with translation, according to 2 Timothy 3:16 and Job 32:8, which are the only references to **“inspiration”** in scripture. He says that Dr Mrs Riplinger's approach to understanding the meanings of Biblical words (i.e. by **“comparing spiritual things with spiritual”** 1 Corinthians 2:13) is inadequate to give a complete understanding of the word **“inspiration.”**

Although he does not explicitly say so, Dr DiVietro's final point in this chapter appears to refer back to his denial of interpretation as ever being equivalent to translation in his answer to Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #3. See previous section for remarks on Genesis 40:8 and the material following.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's outline of the spread of Koine Greek, including its evident popularity in Rome and with the Caesars, two basic problems arise that Dr DiVietro overlooked, with respect to the propagation of the Gospel and the spread of the scriptures.

1. He is headed in the wrong direction.
2. He has ended up in the wrong place (Rome).

It should be noted first that most of the regions that Dr DiVietro describes as having been blessed with an overspreading of Koine Greek are now in Muslim hands and most likely will be until the Second Advent. 'The Greek' therefore didn't help the inhabitants of these areas

much, especially insofar as Dr DiVietro fails to mention one single nation among those areas that has been noted for either spiritual greatness or initiating missionary outreach for the last two thousand years. To the contrary, these areas remain some of the most difficult in the world for missionaries to reach with the Gospel to the present day.

It should also be noted that in addition to orchestrating the deaths of Peter and Paul, which Dr DiVietro is forced to acknowledge, *Cleaning-Up*, p 82, Rome, especially *papal* Rome, is described prophetically in scripture as **“MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH”** Revelation 17:5.

‘The Greek’ therefore doesn’t appear to have helped Rome much, either, considering the scripture’s unwavering and eternally damning verdict on her and her eventual fate, at the Second Advent, Revelation 18. Indeed, far from supporting Dr DiVietro’s ringing endorsement of Koine Greek as the language of the theatre in ancient Rome, Revelation 17, 18 appear to be in much closer agreement with Sister Riplinger’s warning about, this author’s emphasis, *“crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks.”* See remarks in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** and p 90 of *Hazardous Materials*.

Then, note again the comments of Benjamin Wilkinson, cited above.

“In the silent watches of the night, along the lonely paths of Asia Minor where robbers and wild beasts lurked, might have been seen the noble missionaries carrying manuscripts, and verifying documents from the churches of Judea to encourage their struggling brethren under the iron heel of the Papacy...”

Wilkinson’s comments point to a movement of the Spirit of God and the scriptures in the *opposite* direction overall from that which Dr DiVietro indicates for Koine Greek i.e. Greece to Egypt to India and looping back to Rome, at least following the completion of the New Testament canon.

Though Dr DiVietro would probably reject them on an *ad hominem* basis, Dr Ruckman’s comments¹²⁸ are instructive. A simple and informative map illustrating Dr Ruckman’s comments, together with one that depicts the enemy response to the westward spread of the Gospel and the scriptures, may be found in his work *The Monarch Of The Books*, p 6.

“Rome and Jerusalem are the focal points in church history until the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. under Titus. Since all history moves East to West..., Jerusalem practically drops out of sight after 70 A.D. and the narrative of church history moves us into Asia Minor (Rev. 1-3) and thence to Greece (Acts 16, 17) and then finally – not at the start, or near the start – to Rome (Acts 28). The Bible has clearly identified Rome and things “Roman”...Rome, as a spiritual or religious entity, cannot be credited with one righteous or moral act (in the Biblical sense) since the city was founded, if we are to believe the God-given record (Matt. 2) as given to us by the Holy Ghost (Acts 12:1-5, 18:2). If “all roads lead to Rome,” then the road to Hell will have to be paved with Alexandrian manuscripts and Christian scholarship.”

Having pointed out the direction of the Spirit of God in church history (while Dr DiVietro heads in the opposite direction, in pursuit of ‘the Greek’) and summarising the Biblical perspective on Rome, Dr Ruckman continues, his emphases.

“It is truly remarkable...that the Goths, up on the Northwest side of the Black Sea, had their own Bible in their own language (350 A.D.) before Augustine pronounced a curse on the Donatists; and while Jerome was getting his Alexandrian Cult Vulgate printed on the Holy Virgin Press at Rome (400 A.D.), a missionary in England (Patricus) was getting adults

saved right and left and baptizing them. So many of the Germanic warriors were professing faith in Christ that Latourette is driven to confess that the word “Christian” is not the same as the word “Catholic.” Latourette says that the **Burgundians** (Southeast France) became “CHRISTIANS” when the **Visigoths** invaded their country; before this they had been “Catholics”...

“When Clovis (465-511 A.D.), the Frankish ruler, professed faith in Christ (Dec. 25, 496), many of his troops followed suit. He undoubtedly heard the gospel from hundreds of Christians who were in Gaul (France).

“The Lord had said “to the ends of the earth” and to the ends of the earth the gospel went. The barbarian invasions of Gaul and North Italy only served to reproduce thousands of anti-Catholic Christians who were anti-Roman in every way; many of them settled in those parts and were anathematized as “Albigenses” and Waldenses or Cathari and “Paulicians.” Persecution from Catholics also drove the Donatists, Novatians, Montanists, Messalines, and Paterines along the shores of the Mediterranean out of Africa and through Spain into France and out of Asia Minor up into Switzerland and the Balkans via the Danube; eventually thousands of them cropped up in Silesia, Bohemia, and Moravia (Germany). Maintaining purity of practice and baptism of adult believers only, these “Baptist” groups understood throughout their lifetimes that no “kingdom was coming,” as prophesied in the extravagant fiction by Augustine...”

The above citations show that both the scripture e.g. as the Gothic Bible and the Gospel generally moved westwards, i.e. away from the direction taken by Koine Greek according to Dr DiVietro. It should also be noted that many conversions to Bible-based i.e. non-Catholic Christian belief were taking place in the 4th and 5th centuries, after Koine Greek had lapsed into a dead language by about 330 AD¹²⁹. See remarks on Revelation 5:13, 14:6, 7 above.

Dr Ruckman continues.

“In the Thyatira period the truth of God makes an “end run” around Rome, going up through the Balkans from Asia Minor into Germany, on the right flank and on the left flank going around Spain to Ireland, and coming back through England to Germany (Friesland: Belgium and Holland). God will send nothing through Rome but corruption; absolutely **nothing**. The pure truths of the Bible preserved in Italy are preserved in North Italy, but not even these truths come northward **through** Rome; they come westward from **Asia Minor** and Antioch. The truths of the word of God that are found in Gaul (France) in the Dark Ages do not come from anywhere near Rome; they come westward from the Piedmont Valley, the Po Valley, and the Italian Alps. Furthermore, the scriptural truths that crop up in Bohemia centuries later, do not come northward from Italy; they come northwest from the Bogomiles and Paulicians in the **Balkans**. What pure Christianity North Ireland has today it certainly never got from Rome. It got its Biblical Christianity from Old Latin manuscripts that originated in **Syria** and from the son of a married deacon who was less Roman in his “catholicism” than Ridley and Latimer (burned at the stake under Bloody Mary, [October 1555]).”

Dr Ruckman adds that “The lesser lights that lit up Europe for the next 1,000 years (ten centuries!) were energized before the pages of the Book that God wrote – the Holy Bible. This Book had an **Old Latin version** for believers, an **Old Syriac version** for believers, a **koine Greek version** for believers, and an **Old Gothic version** for believers. Thus, its contents were available for anyone who could read throughout the entire empire. Those fortunate enough to obtain copies of the Book copied it by hand, reverently and carefully, and preserved it by the grace of God (Ps. 12:6, 7) till it became such a potent force that it split Unholy Mother Church right down to the seat of her bloody jeans (Chapter 14, 15).”

As Dr Ruckman's analysis indicates, Koine Greek had its place in propagating the scriptures but the evidence of church history, which Dr DiVietro did *not* address, is that during the "**perilous times**" 2 Timothy 3:1 of the Dark Ages, Koine Greek never had precedence in either inspiration or authority over the other languages of that period which also served as vehicles for the transmission of the scriptures, i.e. Latin, Syriac and Gothic, as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1096ff.

Dr DiVietro demeans Dark Age believers by implying that the non-Greek speakers among them who suffered for centuries "*under the iron heel of the Papacy*" would have to have learnt Koine Greek in order to have "**all scripture...given by inspiration of God**" and to know what God *really* said. He also demeans the Persons of the Godhead, 1 John 5:7, by implying that They were unable to provide the *inspired* scriptures in "**words easy to understand**" 1 Corinthians 14:9 for these Dark Age saints and martyrs.

Especially when God could 'inspire' a world emperor "**Nebuchadnezzar the king**" Daniel 4:1, to write "**unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth; Peace be multiplied unto you.**" God is clearly not restricted to Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek in writing "**unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth.**" See Points 11, 12 above.

Who, then, is Dr DiVietro to countermand "**the word of a king**" Ecclesiastes 8:4, in this case "**the King of kings**" 1 Timothy 6:15, as he does? He would do well to reflect seriously on Proverbs 16:14.

"The wrath of a king is as messengers of death: but a wise man will pacify it."

And pray for wisdom, James 1:5. As indicated, "**the word of God is not bound**" 2 Timothy 2:9 by the constraints of 'the Greek' as imposed by the DBS Executive Committee.

Dr Ruckman continues.

"There were German congregations of Christians in the upper and lower Rhine as far back as the time of Irenaeus (120-192 A.D.), and if these congregations had access to any Bible, of course it was the Old Latin of the Albigenses and Waldenses...As in the case of England, Germany had been evangelized by anti-Catholic, Bible-believing missionaries long before the papal "nuncio" Boniface (718 A.D.) showed up to "consolidate" their work. Severinus was going up and down the Danube into Bavaria and Asia Minor in the fifth century. The Irish and Scotch missionaries from Iona had penetrated into south Germany and eastern Switzerland years before Boniface was born. The Holy Spirit thus indicates that the "way of truth and righteousness" for Europe is around Rome, eastwards from Antioch and Constantinople, and around Rome westward, from Iona and England: never THROUGH Rome...

"The words attributed to Horace Greeley, "Go West, young man, go West," were the words of advice given by the Holy Spirit more than 1800 years before Horace Greeley was born.... With the spiritual explosion in Europe, accompanied by the social, economic, and political frustrations of a populace caught between warring religious units, many Europeans began to cross the ocean blue. God had "made a way to escape that they might be able to bear it," and exactly as the Huns, Vandals, Visigoths, Ostrogoths, and others drove civilization from Byzantium and Asia Minor into Germany and England, so the Hellish Mother Whore of Catholicism was now driving the "poor and huddled masses" to the coasts of the Americas...As the Holy Spirit moved from east to west...the vacuum behind was filled with Culture (1700-1800) and the eventual apostasy (1800-1900) and then Paganism (1900-1980)..."

Dr Ruckman continues this westward theme in his next volume¹³⁰.

*“The Christians in Europe who still believe in a local church separated from the state are about to desert the “alte Heimat” [“old home”] and search for new horizons. If they go **north** they will freeze in Siberia, Spitsbergen, Novaya Zemlya, Iceland and Greenland; if they go **south** they will be back in Africa where the Catholic church started...; if they go **east** they will run smack into the Turks, Saracens and Moslems who will consider it a privilege to kill them or make slaves out of them; and if they stay where they are they will either have to sprinkle their babies or go to jail, or they will have to give up reading their Bibles unless they get permission from a Roman Catholic bishop...”*

Note especially the conclusion that *“if they go **east** they will run smack into the Turks, Saracens and Moslems who will consider it a privilege to kill them or make slaves out of them.”* This is precisely the area of which Dr DiVietro informs the reader that Koine Greek had spread into. Koine Greek, the language of the Roman theatre and ‘the originals’ according to Dr DiVietro, was clearly not strong enough to resist the Islamic invasion.

Dr Ruckman continues.

*“Only one escape hatch is open: it is “over the rolling waves” westward or perish. Hundreds of thousands of Europeans between 1600-1900 take this westward fire escape. The Christianity they brought to North America (in spite of later masses of Catholics from Ireland, Italy and Cuba) is basically **PROTESTANT**. It was built on the **Geneva Bible** (a revision of Tyndale’s Bible), which the Pilgrim Fathers brought over with them in 1620, and on the **King James Bible**, which was the first English Bible printed in the United States.”*

Koine Greek seems to have played no significant part in the establishment of Biblical Christian belief in the United States, any more than in the westward advance of the Gospel and the scriptures. Dr Ruckman continues.

“In tracing the movements of the Holy Spirit from the completion of the New Testament to the times of Martin Luther and John Knox, we have observed a northwestern intent that skirts Rome to the west and takes root in North Ireland and Iona; the same movement then skirts Rome to the east and then rolls through the Balkans taking roots in Southeast Germany, Northern Italy and Northern Austria. It is obvious from a subsequent study of this spiritual movement that it eventually arrives on the Atlantic seaboard of North America and erupts into a series of movements called “The Great Awakening” (1720-1750)...

*“By the time Dwight L. Moody and Billy Sunday showed up New England was shot through with...Bible-rejecting apostates from one end to the other. The Lord used Moody (who was from **Illinois** – not New England) and then He placed His hand on the next national evangelist. He pursued His usual westward course; Billy Sunday came from **Iowa**. After Billy Sunday’s ministry it was time to go west again...so the Lord didn’t pick any evangelist from the North, South, or East; instead He picked out a Southern Baptist pastor in the **WEST**: J. Frank Norris of Texas.”*

Dr Ruckman later refers to Jack Chick as having *“caused the biggest stir of all tractarian evangelists in the twentieth century.”* Jack Chick, he notes, was from Chino, California, which is about as far WEST in mainland USA as it’s possible to get.

Jack Chick, it should be noted, is a staunch supporter of Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work.

With respect to the direction and destinations that the Spirit of God chose to progress the Gospel of Christ and *“the scripture of truth,”* Dr DiVietro is on a different track in a different race going backwards (Greece-Egypt-India-Rome and back to Greece again, while the Gospel of Christ and *“the scripture of truth”* are long gone, bound for the Britannic Isles and ultimately the Atlantic seaboard).

In sum, for Challenge #4:

1. Dr DiVietro alters Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #4 in order to take her to task for stating that the New Testament books were directly given by inspiration in other ancient languages besides Greek, *as originals*. He alters "give one Bible verse that says that the New Testament was originally written to the Greeks only" to a question that asks if it is reasonable to believe that the New Testament books were *originally* written in Greek. In response, he still fails to give a Bible verse, which is what Challenge #4 is essentially asking for. However, he answers his redrafted challenge by stating that the New Testament was originally written in Koine Greek but insists that it was never inspired in any language other than Koine Greek. He says this to deny the citation he gives from pp 114-115 of *Hazardous Materials* that says in part "This chapter has proven the absolute necessity of having one inspired Holy Bible for each language. God would not inspire Greek originals (which few would ever see) and cast the translation of the great mass of Holy Bibles (which billions would see) to a panoply of opinions." Dr DiVietro therefore denies that Dark Age believers like the Waldenses, who suffered repeated papal persecutions over many centuries, could have possessed an inspired Old Latin Bible to sustain them through the fiery trials they underwent. In effect, Dr DiVietro has invented a two-tiered 'word of God,' one inspired of God, the other not. In this author's view, therefore, Dr DiVietro "***hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace***" Hebrews 10:29, through Whom true Bible believers like the Waldenses were and are blessed with "***the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God***" Ephesians 6:17.
2. Dr DiVietro does not comment in this chapter on the extensive work of Herman Hoskier that Dr Mrs Riplinger has described in detail in Chapter 30 of *Hazardous Materials* pp 1097ff, *even though* Hoskier's research *impinges directly* on Dr DiVietro's accusations against Sister Riplinger in this chapter of *Cleaning-Up*.

It is *Herman Hoskier*, not Dr Mrs Riplinger, who stated originally that "Some or all of the first originals may have been in languages other than Greek" and that "Multiple language editions were available immediately and were concurrent with Greek editions."

See additional remarks on Herman Hoskier's research in **Setting Up the 'Clean-Up'**.

Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, does take issue with Dr Mrs Riplinger's citations from Hoskier on pp 252ff of *Cleaning-Up* in his comments against *Hazardous Materials*. On p 256 of *Cleaning-Up*, he basically accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of lying and states that he is attempting to ascertain what Herman Hoskier *really* said, in the firm belief that he will be able to prove that Dr Mrs Riplinger has misrepresented Hoskier. Just in case she hasn't, he adds that even a great scholar can be wrong, i.e. when the results of his work contradict the diktats of the DBS Executive Committee.

Dr DiVietro's book was published in February 2010. He must have begun his search for Herman Hoskier's statements up to a year ago. Thus far, nothing has emerged from the DBS Executive Committee camp about the results of this search, which is strange, considering the collective DBS venom directed at Sister Riplinger. Dr DiVietro's comments concerning the citations from Hoskier will be answered when that section of *Cleaning-Up* is addressed.

3. Dr DiVietro says further that Dr Mrs Riplinger's claim requires that the Old Testament scriptures be inspired in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic immediately after the events of Acts 2 as well. He states that no evidence exists to show that such

inspiration happened, insisting, *Cleaning-Up*, p 114 that the gift of tongues had only to do with speaking and nothing to do with producing inspired translations, in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek.

It will be observed that Peter quotes extensively from ***“the old testament”*** 2 Corinthians 3:14 in Acts 2, 3 *but not verbatim*. Moreover, by inspection, a later Old Testament citation, Acts 8:32-33 reads differently, like Peter’s quotations in Acts 2, 3 with respect to its Old Testament counterpart, Isaiah 53:7-8. Yet they are *both* ***“The place of the scripture which he read...Esaias the prophet.”***

This author therefore draws this conclusion with respect to the New Testament sets of Old Testament citations in Acts 2:16-21, 25-28, 3:22-23, 8:32-33 and the sets of their Old Testament counterparts, Joel 2:28-32, Psalm 16:8-11, Deuteronomy 18:15, 19, Isaiah 53:7-8.

These passages are key portions of scripture, such as are used in today’s Gospel tracts, e.g. Chick’s, because they refer respectively to the 1st Advent, 2nd Advent and the believer’s walk all the way in between where ***“God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble”*** Psalm 46:1.

It should also be noted that Acts 2:16-21/Joel 2:28-32, Acts 2:25-28/Psalm 16:8-11, Acts 3:22-23/Deuteronomy 18:15, 19, Acts 8:32-33/Isaiah 53:7-8 represent parts of ***“the law of Moses...the prophets, and...the psalms”*** Luke 24:44 and therefore ***“all the scripture”*** with respect to the Old Testament, Luke 24:27. If ***“all the scripture”*** of the Old Testament, therefore, can be ***“the place of scripture”*** i.e. inspired scripture, in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic, then surely so can the New Testament, in languages other than Koine Greek. See the unequivocal statements above by John Wycliffe to this effect.

Therefore, this author believes, contrary to Dr DiVietro that the Lord Jesus Christ has sufficient grace, mercy, wisdom and power to provide *written inspired* portions of Old Testament scriptures at least soon after Acts 2, *directly inspired* from an apostle’s ‘free’ quotations from the Old Testament. The differences between the New Testament citations of the Old Testament in Acts 2, 3, 8 and their Old Testament counterparts show that these portions were in languages *other than Hebrew* but no less ***“The place of scripture”*** for that. Crucially, the differences between Acts 2:16-21, 25-28, 3:22-23, 8:32-33 and their Old Testament counterparts show that the New Testament passages must have been ***“given by inspiration”*** in languages other than Hebrew because Jewish scribes were required to make perfect copies of their Old Testament manuscripts. Even minor blemishes could result in the entire copy being destroyed and the manuscript recopied to perfection.

As the Hebrew Old Testament became more widely circulated in the ensuing centuries of the church, these early inspired translations appear to have passed from the scene, preserved only in the New Testament citations such as Acts 2, 3, 8 but they clearly fulfilled the purpose the Lord had for them.

“For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it” Isaiah 55:10-11.

Dr Moorman has shown that parts of a Syriac Old Testament existed by about the middle of the 1st Century A.D.. It appears that an Aramaic Old Testament existed at

about the same time and this author thinks it possible, from a comparison of Isaiah 61:1, 2 and Luke 4:18, 19 that the Lord may have read and studied at least portions of an Aramaic Old Testament during His earthly ministry.

Dr DiVietro would naturally utterly reject this analysis but, as indicated, it will be interesting to see what happens at *“the judgment seat of Christ”* Romans 14:10.

4. Dr DiVietro then insists once again, p 84 that inspiration of translations is found nowhere in the New Testament. Revelation 5:13, 14:6-7 show otherwise. The fulfillment of these verses is yet future. The creatures that speak in Revelation 5:13 and the angel who speaks in Revelation 14:7 *“unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people”* will not be speaking Koine Greek, even if that was the language in which John originally wrote the Book of Revelation. Many of the speakers in these verses, including the angel, would, however, be speaking English as the *lingua franca* of the End Times *as recorded in King James English*, the *Biblical lingua franca* of the End Times. (With *“his mouth as the mouth of a lion”* Revelation 13:2, even *“the beast”* has to speak English¹³¹.) This means that *John’s Koine Greek ‘original’ must have been an inspired translation of at least in part an inspired spoken original in King James English. In God’s timing, wisdom and power, the spoken inspired King James English original that John received prophetically became the written inspired 1611 Authorized King James English Holy Bible historically and to the present day.*

That conclusion merits prayerful reflection, James 1:5.

5. Dr DiVietro devotes pp 82-84 of his book to a potted history of the spread of Koine Greek from Egypt to India and concludes his response to Challenge #4 by reiterating, essentially that Dr Mrs Riplinger is wrong to equate interpretation with translation, according to 2 Timothy 3:16 and Job 32:8, which are the only references to *“inspiration”* in scripture. He says that Dr Mrs Riplinger’s approach to understanding the meanings of Biblical words (i.e. by *“comparing spiritual things with spiritual”* 1 Corinthians 2:13) is inadequate to give a complete understanding of the word *“inspiration.”*

Although he does not explicitly say so, Dr DiVietro’s final point in this chapter appears to refer back to his denial of interpretation as ever being equivalent to translation in his answer to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #3. See previous section for remarks on Genesis 40:8 and the material following.

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s outline of the spread of Koine Greek, including its evident popularity in Rome and with the Caesars, two basic problems arise that Dr DiVietro overlooked, with respect to the propagation of the Gospel and the spread of the scriptures.

1. He is headed in the wrong direction.
2. He has ended up in the wrong place (Rome).

It should be noted first that most of the regions that Dr DiVietro describes as having been blessed with an overspreading of Koine Greek are now in Muslim hands and most likely will be until the Second Advent. ‘The Greek’ therefore didn’t help the inhabitants of these areas much, especially insofar as Dr DiVietro fails to mention one single nation among those areas that has been noted for either spiritual greatness or initiating missionary outreach for the last two thousand years. To the contrary, these

areas remain some of the most difficult in the world for missionaries to reach with the Gospel to the present day.

It should also be noted that in addition to orchestrating the deaths of Peter and Paul, which Dr DiVietro is forced to acknowledge, *Cleaning-Up*, p 82, Rome is described prophetically as papal Rome in scripture as **“MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH”** Revelation 17:5.

‘The Greek’ therefore doesn’t appear to have helped Rome much, either, considering the scripture’s unwavering and eternally damning verdict on her and her eventual fate, at the Second Advent, Revelation 18. Indeed, far from supporting Dr DiVietro’s ringing endorsement of Koine Greek as the language of the theatre in ancient Rome, Revelation 17, 18 appear to be in much closer agreement with Sister Riplinger’s warning about, this author’s emphasis, *“crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks.”* See remarks in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** and p 90 of *Hazardous Materials*.

Then, note again the comments of Benjamin Wilkinson, cited above.

“In the silent watches of the night, along the lonely paths of Asia Minor where robbers and wild beasts lurked, might have been seen the noble missionaries carrying manuscripts, and verifying documents from the churches of Judea to encourage their struggling brethren under the iron heel of the Papacy...”

Wilkinson’s comments point to a movement of the Spirit of God and the scriptures in the *opposite* direction from that which Dr DiVietro indicates for Koine Greek i.e. Greece to Egypt to India and looping back to Rome, at least following the completion of the New Testament canon.

Dr Ruckman’s extensive researches, as recorded in his 2-volume work *The History of the New Testament Church*, bear out Wilkinson’s comments.

“In tracing the movements of the Holy Spirit from the completion of the New Testament to the times of Martin Luther and John Knox, we have observed a northwestern intent that skirts Rome to the west and takes root in North Ireland and Iona; the same movement then skirts Rome to the east and then rolls through the Balkans taking roots in Southeast Germany, Northern Italy and Northern Austria. It is obvious from a subsequent study of this spiritual movement that it eventually arrives on the Atlantic seaboard of North America and erupts into a series of movements called “The Great Awakening” (1720-1750)...

*“By the time Dwight L. Moody and Billy Sunday showed up New England was shot through with...Bible-rejecting apostates from one end to the other. The Lord used Moody (who was from **Illinois** – not New England) and then He placed His hand on the next national evangelist. He pursued His usual westward course; Billy Sunday came from **Iowa**. After Billy Sunday’s ministry it was time to go west again...so the Lord didn’t pick any evangelist from the North, South, or East; instead He picked out a Southern Baptist pastor in the WEST: J. Frank Norris of Texas.”*

Dr Ruckman later refers to Jack Chick as having *“caused the biggest stir of all tractarian evangelists in the twentieth century.”* Jack Chick, he notes, was from Chino, California, which is about as far WEST in mainland USA as it’s possible to get.

With respect to the direction and destinations that the Spirit of God chose to progress the Gospel of Christ and **“the scripture of truth,”** Dr DiVietro is on a different track

in a different race going backwards (Greece-Egypt-India-Rome and back to Greece again, while the Gospel of Christ and *“the scripture of truth”* are long gone, bound for the Britannic Isles and ultimately the Atlantic seaboard).

Once again, Dr DiVietro has failed to provide a satisfactory answer to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s challenge. Instead, he has simply kept up his tirade of insinuation, innuendo and vindictiveness against her.

As well as keeping up a high level of ‘flannel.’

Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials – Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #5 is, her emphases, “*Give one sentence from a professional linguist or professional translator that proves **scientifically** that a Greek word **must** be translated differently from that of the KJB. There are hundreds of different translations of the Bible because translation is not a science.*”

Dr DiVietro, *Cleaning-Up*, p 85, replies that a professional linguist or translator is not needed because no-one says that Greek words have to be translated differently from how they appear in the KJB. This author has found otherwise¹³². In the wider context, Dr DiVietro has naively ignored the raft of new bibles since Westcott and Hort’s 1881 RV that made 5,337 changes in the KJ New Testament based on their revised Greek text, many of them word changes¹³³. See also the changes to supposedly “*churchy*” words in the KJB urged by Danker as documented in *Hazardous Materials*, Chapter 16 that have been noted in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.

However, Dr DiVietro goes on to say in yet another evasive response to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s challenges that lexicons and other study aids are necessary in order to understand the KJB, not to ‘correct’ it, although Dr DiVietro is about to ‘correct’ the KJB in John 11:33 on p 94 of *Cleaning-Up*, in this very chapter, under the guise of ‘clarifying’ it. See remarks in **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up,’ Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** and below.

For now, it should be noted that Dr DiVietro’s claim about lexicons etc., written in bold no less, is contrary to scripture.

“The entrance of thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding unto the simple” Psalm 119:130.

“Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come” John 16:13.

Dr DiVietro’s claim about lexicons also cuts across Peter’s exhortation about the priesthood of all believers, whereby no special ‘priest class’ exists to impart what God ‘really’ said ***“in an unknown tongue”*** 1 Corinthians 14:2 to ***“unlearned and ignorant men”*** Acts 4:13, who don’t know ‘the Greek.’

“Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ” 1 Peter 2:5.

It is true that God raised up a special group of scholars and linguists who compiled the 1611 English Holy Bible but as Dr Smith states near the conclusion of *The Translators to the Reader*, that compilation in itself effectively dispensed with the need for ‘the Greek,’ emphases are this author’s.

“...on the other side we have shunned the obscurity of the Papists, in their AZIMES, TUNIKE, RATIONAL, HOLOCAUSTS, PRAEPUCE, PASCHE, and a number of such like, whereof their late Translation is full, and that of purpose to darken the sense, that since they must needs translate the Bible, yet by the language thereof, it may be kept from being understood [like theopneustos]. But we desire that the Scripture may speak like itself, as in the language of Canaan, that it may be understood even of the very vulgar.”

Observe that the parallel passage 1 Peter 2:9 draws no distinction between believers as ‘haves’ and ‘have-nots’ with respect to ‘the Greek.’

“But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light:”

Although Hebrews 8:11 refers doctrinally to Israel during the Lord’s millennial reign, see Dr Ruckman’s commentary *The Book of Hebrews*, pp 152ff, the verse illustrates that Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek intermediaries and their lexicons are superfluous for anyone who can testify with Paul ***“Christ liveth in me”*** Galatians 2:20. In this author’s view, Hebrews 8:11 can be applied devotionally to God’s words, as well as His Person and therefore to genuine vernacular Bibles such as the 1611 English Holy Bible.

“And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest.”

According to the Psalmist, the Apostle Peter and the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, therefore, Dr DiVietro is wrong about the need for lexical study aids.

Dr DiVietro’s next relevant comment in this chapter is on pp 87-88, where he acknowledges that the original autographs of the scriptures are long gone and that they were never collated into a single volume. However, he then declares that God’s words in Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek have been preserved so that the original inspired words can still be determined.

Regrettably, Dr DiVietro still does not say where these words can be found between two covers as a perfect Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek match mate to the KJB. His actual ‘bible’ is still a mystery to this author. See comments in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

In this author’s view, according to their own standards where ‘the original text’ is the final authority for ***“the scripture of truth”*** Daniel 10:21, *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-4, neither Dr DiVietro nor any other member of the DBS Executive Committee could *prove* that they possess a perfect Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek match mate to the KJB, which they claim to represent an accurate translation of the correct i.e. original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text, even though they insist that the KJB is not inspired, *Cleaning-Up*, p 18, *unless they could produce all the original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek manuscripts*.

They won’t.

They have no ‘Bible’ between two covers that could truly be called ***“all scripture...given by inspiration of God.”*** They insist, *Cleaning-Up*, p xi, that their ‘original’ consists of the original words of Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek and support this contention by means of several statements from Dean Burgon, found in *Cleaning-Up*, pp 327-330, where, ironically, the term *Received Text*, for the ‘inspired’ Greek text, Dr Williams informs readers, was probably derived by the Elzevir brothers from John 12:48, 17:8 *in the supposedly ‘uninspired’ KJB!*

The DBS Executive Committee position, therefore, as indicated in this author’s earlier work¹³⁴, is really just a rehash of the position of Hodge and Warfield in 1881.

“We do not assert that the common text [i.e. the AV1611], but only that the original autographic text was inspired.”

(Note that Dr DiVietro, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 2-3, has had to resort to fluid tenses in order to head off the problem with Hodge and Warfield’s statement, with respect to the past tense expression *“was given.”* This expression fits the DBS Executive Committee insistence on ‘once-only’ inspiration¹³⁵ but conflicts with the present tense of 2 Timothy 3:16 with respect to ***“all scripture is given by inspiration of God.”*** Dr DiVietro seeks to resolve the dilemma by insisting that the words of God ***are*** given because they ***were*** given, his emphases. On that basis, the next time any of Dr DiVietro’s insurance documents come up for renewal, he could

avoid the renewal fees by insisting that the documents *are* valid because they once *were* valid. Dr DiVietro did, after all, urge that contemporary usage of words be studied in order to ascertain the meanings of Biblical words, *Cleaning-Up* pp 62-65.)

However, Hodge and Warfield never said where “*the original autographic text*” exists between two covers.

Neither has the DBS Executive Committee.

All else on their part is sheer ‘flannel.’

Another observation about ‘originals-only inspiration’ comes to mind at this point.

It has to do with Dr Ruckman’s study on Genesis 2:7, *The Christian’s Handbook of Biblical Scholarship*, pp 250ff. Genesis 2:7 is both a picture and an example of inspiration. Inspiration with respect to the Lord’s word is spiritual as the Lord said in John 6:63 but some interesting parallels can be drawn from the life of Adam.

God intended that the ‘original’ man and woman, Mr and Mrs Adam Genesis 3:20, 5:2, should have perfect offspring, Genesis 1:28. The Fall brought sin into the world Romans 5:12 but had our ‘original’ parents obeyed God, they would have had perfect offspring just as ‘inspired’ as they were, i.e. able to live forever - and the offspring would not have lost their capacity for immortality if they had spoken a variety of languages. These came about via Babel, of course, Genesis 11 but without the Fall, Adam and Eve’s pure offspring would still be perfect, whether mono or multilingual.

It should be noted in this context that Eve was actually derived from Adam as a form of perfect offspring, with the same everlasting life as he had, prior to the Fall. Nothing is said in Genesis 2:21, 22 about God breathing life into Eve in the way that He did for Adam, for whom God’s breath was necessary for Adam’s life because Adam was “*formed...of the dust of the ground,*” which was itself lifeless. However, God was able to fashion Eve from living tissue, namely Adam’s rib, so that she would have been created as “*a living soul.*”

Had Adam and Eve been able to reproduce perfect offspring, Genesis 1:27, 28 indicate that each one of them would have been “*a living soul*” at birth, “*in the image of God*” Genesis 1:27, like their parents, imbued with “*the breath of life*” Genesis 2:7, which is “*the breath of God*” Job 37:10. Adam and Eve’s perfect descendants would have enjoyed “*the life of God,*” Ephesians 4:18, forever. (“*The tree of life*” Genesis 2:9, 3:22 would have been needed for their physical life¹³⁶, not their spiritual life.)

The parallel with the inspiration of the scriptures is clear. As indicated, it is really Babel that has made for the necessity of the scriptures in many tongues, but that would not affect the perfection and inspiration of the pure ‘offspring’ of the pure ‘originals,’ any more than multilingualism would, or could have affected the perfection of Adam and Eve’s pure offspring, if they had been able to have any *or the descendents of such offspring*. By direct analogy, all the familiar references in scripture to “*the scripture of truth*” Daniel 10:21, such as Psalm 12:6, 7, 119:140, Matthew 24:35, John 6:63, 2 Timothy 3:15, 16, 17, 1 Peter 1:23, 25 refer to the pure offspring and descendents of the original documents. It would appear, for example that the Lord Jesus Christ possibly had access to a pure Aramaic Old Testament text, including one to which his hearers could refer, certainly with respect to the prophet Isaiah. If such was the case, this text would have been a pure offspring of its pure Hebrew ‘parent.’ See remarks in the previous section on Isaiah 61:1, 2 and Luke 4:18, 19.

Psalm 12:6, 7, it should be noted, has a considerable emphasis on the successive stages of purification of “*the words of the Lord.*” See remarks in **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint** on this passage, with respect to the analyses of Dr Mrs Riplinger and Dr Vance that set out

the purification of *“the words of the Lord”* from Old Testament Hebrew to *“the word of the king”* Ecclesiastes 8:4 of the 1611 English Holy Bible of today.

However, note that Psalm 12:7 speaks of the *preservation* of *“the words of the Lord”* in their successive stages of purification but does not specifically mention *inspiration*. The explanation may be that anyone like David who loved *“the law of the Lord”* Psalm 19:7, 119:97, would know that *“the word of our God shall stand for ever”* Isaiah 40:8 i.e. inspired by *“the breath of God.”* These words would be imbued with *“the life of God.”* Observe, as Dr Mrs Riplinger¹³⁷ points out, the corresponding parallels in Psalm 33:6.

“By the word of the LORD were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth.”

Armed with the knowledge of Psalm 19:7, 33:6, 119:97, David and like-minded saints would therefore simply need assurance that none of the Lord’s *inspired* words would be lost, which assurance Psalm 12:7 gives.

The stages in the purification of *“the words of the Lord”* can be set out explicitly because discernment of *“the scripture of truth”* is straightforward according to the principle outlined in Matthew 7:16, 20, *“Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them.”* See Dr Ruckman’s analysis of church history in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** and Dr Mrs Riplinger’s works e.g. *In Awe of Thy Word* and *Which Bible Is God’s Word?* for more details. Other works, such as those by Drs Fuller, Gipp, Grady, Hills, Ruckman and from Chick Publications, will greatly testify further to *“the scripture of truth.”*

The successive stages in the purification of *“the words of the Lord”* consisted essentially of *God-guided translation*. Translation is not fossilization of the scripture as the DBS Executive Committee¹³⁸ appears to imply but *regeneration*, Matthew 19:28. See Dr Gipp’s analysis¹³⁹ in this author’s earlier work. Again, see remarks in **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint** on this passage, with respect to the analyses of Dr Mrs Riplinger and Dr Vance outlining the purification of *“the words of the Lord”* from Old Testament Hebrew to *“the word of the king”* Ecclesiastes 8:4 of the 1611 English Holy Bible of today.

The Lord *“did let none of his words fall to the ground”* 2 Samuel 3:19 during translation in the purification process and neither did they lose their life-giving seed of inspiration. They are *“the word of life”* Philippians 2:16 and *“every good tree”* that *“bringeth forth good fruit”* Matthew 7:17. Again, see Dr Ruckman’s analysis of church history in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** for historical testimony to the *“good fruit”* of the translated scriptures, especially that of the 1611 English Holy Bible.

By contrast, for the corrupt fruit of the satanic counterfeits of scripture, see Dr Gipp’s incisive analysis¹⁴⁰.

“Today’s modern translations haven’t been able to spark a revival in a Christian school, let alone be expected to close a bar. In fact, since the arrival of our modern English translations, beginning with the ASV of 1901, America has seen:

1. *God and prayer kicked out of our public school.*
2. *Abortion on demand legalised.*
3. *Homosexuality accepted nationally as an “alternate life style”.*
4. *In home pornography via TV and VCR.*
5. *Child kidnapping and pornography running rampant.*
6. *Dope has become an epidemic.*

7. *Satanism is on the rise.*

“If this is considered a “revival” then let’s turn back to the King James to STOP it.”

It appears that ‘the Greek’ hasn’t been much help in the above context at all. Dr Mrs Riplinger’s¹⁴¹ warning in the light of Exodus 20:4 applies, her emphases in red bold, including with respect to imposition of the DIY* ‘Greek,’ for whatever purpose, including supposed ‘clarification,’ as in *Cleaning-Up*, p 94. *Do-It-Yourself.

“Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth:”

It is noteworthy that the counterfeit versions and corrupted manuscripts even have their parallel, ***“Cain, who was of that wicked one”*** 1 John 3:12. He slew his righteous brother Abel, just like the KJB critics (at either extreme, like James White, who accuses the AV1611 of inferiority, *The King James Only Controversy*, Chapter 9 or Donald Waite and the DBS Executive Committee, who accuse the AV1611 of confusion and ambiguity, *Cleaning-Up*, p 32) will try to ‘slay’ KJB believers, if they can. See White’s comments on Dr Ruckman and Dr Mrs Riplinger in Chapter 5 of *The King James Only Controversy* entitled *The King James Only Camp*, the contents of *Cleaning-Up*, pp vii-xii, 281-309, 321-326 and those of A **WARNING!!** throughout the text. The mentality of the KJB critics is such that, as the references immediately above indicate, they will also try to ‘slay’ the KJB, by the method ‘scholarly’ strangulation, stripping it of its quality of inspiration, i.e. ***“the breath of his mouth”*** Psalm 33:6.

In addition to their ***“evil fruit”*** Matthew 7:17, 18, e.g. as Dr Gipp reveals, the source of the corrupt scriptures will be evident via the parallel with Cain, whose religion was works-based, not faith-based like Abel’s and who offered a counterfeit sacrifice (fruit juice instead of actual blood), Genesis 4:3-5¹⁴². The adherents to Cain’s religion also murder true believers, like Abel, Genesis 4:8-12, Revelation 18:24 and will attempt to character-assassinate¹⁴³ anyone they can’t literally murder - yet.

In sum, ‘originals onlyism’ is ***“of that wicked one”*** 1 John 3:12 in that it is drawn from ***“doctrines of devils”*** 1 Timothy 4:1. Just as ***“the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born”*** Revelation 12:4, ‘originals onlyism’ stands ***“for to devour”*** God’s pure scripture offspring Genesis 1:11, 28 such as the 1611 English Holy Bible that are as inspired as God’s parent scripture, Genesis 2:7, ***“whose seed is in itself”*** for the purpose of ***“yielding fruit after his kind...upon the earth.”***

“And it was so.”

With the completion of the purification process of Psalm 12:6, 7 the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek no longer dominate. The Bible believer has ***“the words of the LORD”*** as the ***“pure words”*** of the pure offspring of the original parents in ***“a pure language”*** Zephaniah 3:9; the English AV1611 in English-speaking countries, the other AV1611s in non-English-speaking countries.

The above analysis underlines why God has exalted the AV1611 above all His name, Psalm 138:2 and why the Devil hates that Book so much. It is ***“the sword of the Spirit”*** Ephesians 6:17 that ***“is quick, and powerful”*** Hebrews 4:12 against the world, the flesh and the Devil just as surely now in *King James English* as it was when the Son of God defeated Satan in the Wilderness, Matthew 4:4, 7, 10. God has countered the Fall with His word that will never fall, nor fail, Matthew 24:35 and will give everlasting life, 1 Peter 1:23 in *King James English*.

However, Dr DiVietro makes an intriguing statement to the effect that handwritten Greek manuscripts are the very words of God, even though any given manuscript might contain copyist's errors, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 87-88. These errors are identified, he says, by comparing manuscripts to locate the occasional false reading so that it can be eliminated in order to obtain a pure text. Interestingly, James White says much the same in the *King James Only Controversy*, pp 39, 48. This procedure doesn't help in a case such as Mark 2:15, where extant printed Greek sources all wrongly omit the first "**Jesus.**" See remarks in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**. Neither does it help where the KJB follows different extant Greek sources that don't match each other, e.g. in 2 Peter 1:1 (Elzevir against Stephanus), nor where the KJB follows early vernacular Bibles against printed Greek sources, e.g. Matthew 10:25 ("**Beelzebub**" KJB, German, Latin bibles etc. versus "**Beelzebū**" Berry's, TBS Edition), Acts 19:20 "**God**" KJB, 5th, 6th century manuscripts versus "**the Lord**" Berry's, Scrivener's editions) as Dr Mrs Riplinger has documented in *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 952. See also Dr Mrs Riplinger's extensive further documentation of up to 50 differences between the KJB and extant printed Greek Received Text editions of Berry and/or Scrivener and 200 differences between Beza's 1598 Edition and Scrivener's in *Hazardous Materials*, Chapter 18. See also the differences between the KJB and the various Greek Received Texts that Dr Hills¹⁴⁴ lists with respect to the KJB as a variety of the Textus Receptus and comments in **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint**, where Scrivener states "*Out of the 252 passages examined in Appendix E, where the differences between the texts of these books is sufficient to affect, however slightly, the language of the version, our translators abide with Beza against Stephen in 113 places, with Stephen against Beza in 59, with the Complutensian, Erasmus, or the Vulgate against both Stephen and Beza in 80....*"

As Dr Mrs Riplinger notes in *In Awe of Thy Word*, p 955, these differences are minor by comparison with the corrupt Greek sources such as Nestle's, which Dr DiVietro acknowledges as corrupt, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 24-25. Nevertheless that fact that these differences exist, highlights the futility of supposing that what Dr DiVietro perceives as the very words of God can *at the present time* be determined unequivocally by, as Dr DiVietro proposes, a comparison of manuscript evidence, for which Dr DiVietro would have to take into account printed Greek editions because these may be the only means of representing manuscripts no longer extant but which the original editors possessed. See *In Awe of Thy Word*, p 930. For Bible believers of course, such effort is futile. "**The word of life**" Philippians 2:16, being "**quick and powerful**" Hebrews 4:12, has moved forward. For Bible believers, "**by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God**" Acts 2:23, the KJB is now the standard for the very words of God, as Dr Moorman¹⁴⁵ indicates, under-linings are the author's. See remarks in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

"Our extant MSS reflect but do not determine the text of Scripture. The text was determined by God in the beginning (Psa. 119:89, Jude 3)...

"When a version has been the standard for as long as the Authorized Version, and when that version has demonstrated its power in the conversion of sinners, building up of believers, sending forth of preachers and missionaries on a scale not achieved by all other versions and foreign language combined; the hand of God is at work. Such a version must not be tampered with..."

Especially not by conceited KJB 'clarifiers' who tamper with "**the scripture of truth**" Daniel 10:21 by means of 'the Greek' in order to purge it of its supposed 'confusion' and 'ambiguity.' See *Cleaning-Up* pp 32, 94 and remember Spurgeon's warning from the very first page of this work, this author's emphases.

*“We shall gradually be so bedoubted and becriticized, that only a few of the most profound will know what is Bible, and what is not, and they will dictate to all the rest of us. I have no more faith in their mercy than in their accuracy: they will rob us of all that we hold most dear, and glory in the cruel deed. **This same reign of terror we shall not endure**, for we still believe that God revealeth himself rather to babes than to the wise and prudent, and **we are fully assured that our own old English version of the Scriptures is sufficient for plain men for all purposes of life, salvation, and godliness**. We do not despise learning, but we will never say of culture or criticism. “These be thy gods, O Israel!””*

See also Dr Mrs Riplinger’s similar comment in *Hazardous Materials* pp 693-694.

Further problems persist with Dr DiVietro’s approach to determining what he terms the very words of God via Greek manuscripts.

His approach would require that he resolve *all* differences between Greek manuscripts and Greek printed texts *in favour of the KJB* because he has declared the KJB to be an *accurate* translation that he does not seek to ‘correct,’ *Cleaning-Up*, pp 18, 88, 94 – even though he does. This in itself would be a galling task for Dr DiVietro because ostensibly partially inspired and slightly inaccurate Greek manuscripts would have to be edited to match an accurate but totally non-inspired English Bible. See remarks below on the apparent anomaly (to this author) of Greek manuscripts that may be partially inspired versus an English Bible that can’t be at all inspired because it went through several editions but must still be used to ‘correct’ the partially inspired Greek source, whatever it is. See *Cleaning-Up* p 20.

Even assuming, as Dr DiVietro’s approach requires that *none* of God’s words have been lost with the disappearance of non-extant Greek sources, he would have to collate *all* extant Greek manuscripts in order to establish his definitive Greek text that is, in his view, the very words of God. Such a full collation has not been carried out and most likely never will be. As Dr Moorman has shown in the above work and as Dr Mrs Riplinger notes in *King James Version Ditches Blind Guides*, pp 50-51, less than 10% of the available Greek manuscripts have been collated, 100 years ago by Baron von Soden. Dr DiVietro therefore faces a daunting task. And what if, after such a collation is completed, it is found that some apparent ‘minority’ readings persist in the KJB, e.g. Luke 17:36, Acts 8:37, 1 John 2:23b, 5:7-8? Would Dr DiVietro still be prepared to allow these apparent ‘minority’ readings in the supposedly uninspired KJB to stand against the agreed ‘inspired’ Greek majority? He has dismissed the critical Greek texts such as Nestle’s as corruptions but his approach requires that he give them due consideration along with their sources because they may bear witness to some KJB readings, e.g. 1 John 2:23b that are not found in the Received Text. Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, perceives the KJB as an accurate translation of the correct Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek texts. See *Cleaning-Up*, pp 18, 24-25.

It should be noted further that even if Dr DiVietro could compile the supposed very words of God between two covers as an updated Majority Greek Text, he would surely be obliged to provide a translation for all those who cannot understand Koine Greek. He should note, therefore that the last attempt to do so resulted in the failed NKJV. See *New King James Omissions*, available from A.V. Publications.

If, however, Dr DiVietro was to insist, *Cleaning-Up*, p 85 that the KJB could stand as an accurate translation of the perfect Greek text, then what would be the point of a collation of Greek manuscripts for the supposed very word of God in the first place?

Such would appear to be the problems associated with Dr DiVietro’s strategy of putting together the very words of God from the mass of hand-written Greek copies, which would in turn require harmonisation with uncorrupted i.e. Received Text Greek sources. It seems

unlikely to this author that the DBS Executive Committee will provide ready solutions to these problems.

Dr DiVietro and his colleagues could of course solve these problems very simply if they were prepared to acknowledge that the KJB *is* the very words of God, the DBS Executive Committee's "**private interpretation**" 2 Peter 1:20 of "*theopneustos*," *Cleaning-Up*, pp 2-3 notwithstanding. See Dr Mrs Riplinger's remarks in *Hazardous Materials*, pp 693-694. If Dr DiVietro then wanted a perfect equivalent Greek text for the KJB, he could simply use the method of reverse translation, which could well be a valid approach in this case, as even Dr DiVietro himself allows, *Cleaning-Up*, p 20. Regrettably, it seems unlikely in this respect that the members of the DBS Executive Committee will obey Peter's injunction of 1 Peter 5:6 and "**Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time.**"

In the meantime, Dr DiVietro's approach illustrates how even confirmed antagonists like James White and Kirk DiVietro, who wrote a book entitled *Why Not The King James Bible! An Answer* against White's *King James Only Controversy*, can join in ecumenical oneness when exalting 'the Greek' over the KJB, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 91-95 and/or attacking Sister Riplinger. "**The word of God**" Hebrews 4:12 has had the same effect on sworn enemies as "**the Word of God**" Revelation 19:13 did long ago.

"And the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together: for before they were at enmity between themselves" Luke 23:12.

It is further interesting that again, Dr DiVietro doesn't inform the reader what the cut-off point is with respect to Greek manuscripts when sufficient copyists' errors have accumulated for that particular source no longer to be the very words of God even in part but a corrupt text like that of Nestle-Aland, which Dr DiVietro declares is a perversion of the word of God, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 24-25. See **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**. Surely it is only fair that Dr DiVietro should give the reader some enlightenment in this respect.

What is really interesting, though, is that on p 11 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro insists (as does Dr Waite) that one of the main reasons why the KJB can't be the inspired words of God, i.e. the very words of God, is that it went through several editions that differ from each other. See remarks in **Preface and Introduction**. He mocks the notion of a Bible that could be partially inspired because its text differs in some respects from a perfect standard edition that would therefore be fully inspired (if a translation in Dr DiVietro's view could be inspired). Yet he insists that handwritten Greek manuscript copies *can be the inspired words of God where they agree even though some readings don't agree because the manuscripts contain copyists' errors*.

In other words, according to Dr DiVietro, it is *not* possible to have a partially inspired English Bible but it *is* possible to have a partially inspired handwritten Greek manuscript. Dr DiVietro may explain away this apparent anomaly because 'the Greek' was/is "*God-breathed*" according to the DBS Executive Committee's "**private interpretation**" 2 Peter 1:20 of "*theopneustos*," *Cleaning-Up*, pp 2-3, whereas the 1611 King's English, Ecclesiastes 8:4 wasn't, again according to the DBS Executive Committee. However, it still looks like an unexplained anomaly to this author and the potential confusion is not mitigated by Dr DiVietro's ambivalent attitude to differences between the KJB editions. See *Cleaning-Up*, pp 7, 11 and remarks in **Preface and Introduction**.

Once again, this author is left with the distinct impression of 1 Corinthians 14:33 and Spurgeon's warning yet again, this author's emphases.

"For God is not the author of confusion..."

*“We shall gradually be so bedoubted and becriticized, that only a few of the most profound will know what is Bible, and what is not, and they will dictate to all the rest of us [by means of ‘the Greek’ that supposedly clears up the confusion and ambiguity in the KJB, *Cleaning-Up*, p 32]. I have no more faith in their mercy than in their accuracy: they will rob us of all that we hold most dear, and glory in the cruel deed. **This same reign of terror we shall not endure...**”*

Amen. See remarks under **A Time-Honoured Warning** and at the end of **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

Dr DiVietro next draws attention to *The Defined King James Bible*, which he says is a valuable tool to ‘clarify’ the 1611 English Holy Bible by placing the meanings of any supposed archaic KJB words in footnotes.

Dr Mrs Riplinger¹⁴⁶ has this evaluation of *The Defined King James Bible*.

*“Most of The Defined King James Bible’s definitions came from modern English dictionaries, as noted in Waite’s introductory material. Such modern dictionaries contain highly secularized words, often seen in new versions. In *Awe of Thy Word* chapter 15 demonstrates, using the recently released notes of the KJB translators, that they considered and rejected just such words.”*

The likely real motive behind Dr DiVietro’s book *Cleaning-Up* and Dr Waite’s book *A WARNING!!* therefore becomes clear. Sister Riplinger’s research is likely to jeopardize the sales of *The Defined King James Bible*. Paul’s verdict is found in 1 Timothy 6:10.

“For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.”

“Many sorrows” aren’t done yet, as this work will show.

Dr DiVietro now repeats the rule of Bible study that he has alluded to before, namely that anything new is not true and vice versa, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 15, 31, 92. See remarks in **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’ and Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

This time, Dr DiVietro applies the rule with respect to the use of Hebrew and Greek, via lexicons, which he stipulates is absolutely essential for understanding the Holy Bible and, by implication, the final word on any God-given revelation from the scriptures. In so doing, of course, he has once again denied the priesthood of believers. See 1 Peter 2:5, 9 at the beginning of this section and associated comments.

However, Dr DiVietro proceeds to illustrate this stipulation, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 91-95, with Romans 5:15*, which he says is an impossible sentence in English, the word propitiate, which he says cannot be understood without a lexicon and the words *oinos* (“**wine**”) and *baptizo* (“**baptize**”), which he says cannot be understood without a lexicon and John 11:33, which Dr DiVietro insists cannot be expounded correctly without going to ‘the Greek.’

*Romans 5:15 is actually two sentences in the KJB, neither of which is impossible.

For the supposed absolute necessity of lexicons in order to understand the scriptures, see remarks in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** and **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint** on Dr DiVietro’s notion that God’s words derive from common, everyday usage, especially with respect to the Biblical view of this notion, as found in Job 14:4, Psalm 94:11, Proverbs 8:8, 9, 13, Isaiah 55:8-9, Jeremiah 23:28, John 2:24-25, 16:13, 1 Corinthians 2:4, 11, 13 (again), 3:20.

Proverbs 2:3-6 should be noted. Not a word is said about consulting lexicons or any other extra-Biblical sources.

“Yea, if thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding; If thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasures; Then shalt thou understand the fear of the LORD, and find the knowledge of God. For the LORD giveth wisdom: out of his mouth cometh knowledge and understanding.”

Revelation 1:8 should be noted with respect to the final (and foremost) word on any God-given revelation from the scriptures, together with Colossians 2:2-4. Once again, not a word is said about consulting lexicons or any other extra-Biblical sources.

“I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.”

“That their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgement of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ; In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. And this I say, lest any man should beguile you with enticing words.”

Proverbs 2:3-6 should be applied to access ***“all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge”*** in accordance with Isaiah 66:2.

“For all those things hath mine hand made, and all those things have been, saith the LORD: but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word.”

God gives the understanding of His words, John 16:13 (again). Lexicons don't enter into the equation.

Concerning Romans 5:15, this verse states:

“But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.”

Dr DiVietro states that it is impossible to expound this verse fully without recourse to ‘the Greek.’ He doesn't do so, however, in *Cleaning-Up*.

Dr Ruckman¹⁴⁷ expounds the verse as follows, without recourse to ‘the Greek.’

He states that one man, Adam, earned the right to die through his sin and thereby sentenced the whole human race to death, Romans 5:12. By contrast, one man, the Lord Jesus Christ, purchased ***“eternal life”*** Romans 5:21 on man's behalf through the shedding of His blood as payment for man's sin so that by the grace of God, He is therefore able to give eternal life to anyone who comes to Him to receive it.

Dr Ruckman also states¹⁴⁸ that all men since Adam have earned death through their own sins, not solely because they inherited sin and death from Adam. ***“The grace of God”*** in salvation, therefore, is that the Lord Jesus Christ died for both the individual's inherited sin and all his subsequent sins and the Lord can therefore offer both eternal life and ***“the gift of righteousness”*** to every man, having paid for every man's sin and sins.

As an illustration of ***“abundance of grace”*** Romans 5:17 to each and every individual through the Lord Jesus Christ, Dr Ruckman alludes to an incident concerning Fiorello La Guardia, former mayor of NYC¹⁴⁹. ***“According to Try and Stop Me by Bennett Cerf, La Guardia often officiated in municipal court. He handled routine misdemeanor cases, including, as Cerf wrote, a woman who had stolen a loaf of bread for her starving family. La***

Guardia insisted on levying the fine of ten dollars. Then he said "I'm fining everyone in this courtroom fifty cents for living in a city where a person has to steal bread in order to eat!" He passed a hat and gave the fines to the defendant, who left the court with \$47.50." Dr Ruckman notes that La Guardia also paid the fine himself.

It's unlikely that any Greek lexicon will provide as telling an illustration of Romans 5:15 as Fiorello La Guardia's example. Dr DiVietro certainly doesn't provide one.

Concerning the word propitiate, or the related Biblical term "**propitiation**" Romans 3:25, 1 John 2:2, 4:10, again 'the Greek' isn't necessary to determine the meaning of the word.

Following Dr Mrs Riplinger's approach¹⁵⁰, the word "**propitiation**" is understood from scripture as follows.

Romans 3:24-25 "**Christ Jesus: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God;**"

1 John 2:1-2 "**Jesus Christ the righteous: And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.**"

1 John 4:10 "**Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.**"

"**Propitiation**," like salvation, Luke 2:30, 19:9, is above all a Person¹⁵¹, "**Jesus Christ the righteous.**" God is a personal God, not simply a theological or doctrinal God.

Dr DiVietro gives no indication of any lexicon that reveals this basic meaning of the word "**propitiation.**"

The scripture, however, gives further insight into this meaning.

1 John 4:14 states "**And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world.**"

In sum, "**The Saviour**" and "**the propitiation**" are one and the same. He is "**Jesus Christ the righteous**" or "**Jehovah is salvation**"¹⁵² Matthew 1:21, Who is "**the Messiah the Prince**" Daniel 9:25 and "**the Holy One**" 1 John 2:20, anointed of the Holy Ghost Luke 3:22, 4:18.

The word "**propitiation**" may be understood in more detail by a study of what the Lord Jesus Christ did as "**the Saviour of the world.**"

As such, He is "**the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world**" John 1:29.

Therefore, as Paul states in 1 Corinthians 5:7 "**For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us.**"

Ephesians 5:2, Hebrews 7:26-27, 9:26, 1 Peter 1:18-19 are all important in the context of "**Christ our Passover**," along with Genesis 8:21.

"And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savour."

"For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself."

"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."

“Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot” 1 Peter 1:18-19.

“And the LORD smelled a sweet savour; and the LORD said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man’s sake; for the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done.”

The voluntary, sinless sacrifice ***“which taketh away the sin of the world”*** of the Lord Jesus Christ *Himself “to God”* as ***“a sweetsmelling savour”*** turned away God’s wrath as Noah’s sacrifice did after the flood, for anyone who believes that the Lord Jesus Christ is both ***“the Saviour”*** and ***“savour”*** for him personally, John 3:36. This is ***“propitiation.”***

Dr Waite and Dr DiVietro may dismiss this analysis as an example of having to ***“chase all over the King James Bible to find the definitions of its words”***¹⁵³ but maybe the exercise would do them good. See Acts 17:10, 11.

Concerning the words *oinos* (***“wine”***) and *baptizo* (***“baptize”***) and John 11:33, see remarks in **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up.’** The essential points from this author’s earlier work are as follows¹⁵⁴.

On the subject of the word *oinos* and abstinence, reference need only be made to the example set by the Lord Jesus Christ. He drank only ***“new wine”*** Matthew 9:17, refused ***“wine”*** even on the cross, Mark 15:23 and provided only ***“good wine”*** at the wedding, John 2:10, not wine that caused ***“woe,” “sorrow”*** and transgression, Genesis 9:21-24, Proverbs 23:29, 30, Habakkuk 2:5, 15.

“But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father’s kingdom” Matthew 26:29, Mark 14:65. See also Mark 14:25.

Definitions of ‘the Greek’ are unnecessary.

On John 11:33, the AV1611 English states ***“he groaned in the spirit, and was troubled.”***

Dr DiVietro’s ‘Greek’ rendition changes ***“groaned”*** into ***“stirred”*** and bypasses the Lord’s ***“spirit”*** altogether.

The Lord Jesus Christ was ***“full of the Holy Ghost”*** Luke 4:1. When ***“he groaned in the spirit,”*** it was His joint intercession with the Third Person of the Godhead for the bereaved around Him, according to the principle of Romans 8:26, ***“the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.”*** On this occasion, of course, both Intercessors knew how to pray as They ought and the Lord continues that ministry to the present hour for His saints, Hebrews 7:25. That the Lord’s groaning was that of prayer for the sake of the bereaved is indicated by John 11:41, which shows that the Lord had already been in prayer before He uttered the words recorded in the verse. Note the underlined word ***“heard.”*** It is in the *past* tense.

“Then they took away the stone from the place where the dead was laid. And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me.”

Lazarus’s return to life, John 11:44, would have comforted the bereaved, like the friends of Eutychus, ***“And they brought the young man alive, and were not a little comforted”*** Acts 20:12 and so the Lord’s prayer of John 11:33 was answered.

The Lord did weep tears of sorrow, contrary to Dr DiVietro’s assertion. Otherwise He would have violated Romans 12:15.

“Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep.”

None of this is apparent in Dr DiVietro’s Greek but it is in the AV1611 English of ***“the king’s word”*** 2 Samuel 24:4.

Having attended the funeral of a close family member not long ago, this author is aware of the kind of feeling experienced by the bereaved on such an occasion and therefore views Dr DiVietro’s exercise in ‘clarification’ of John 11:33 via ‘the Greek’ as grotesque.

Note that for the Second Person of the Godhead, the Lord Jesus Christ, the terms ***“the spirit”*** small s, John 11:33 and ***“the Spirit”*** capital S in Romans 8:26 are equivalent. The Lord had a human spirit but as Luke 4:1 indicates, He was ***“full of the Holy Ghost”***

On the word *baptizo*, for which Dr DiVietro alludes to an unnamed papyrus fragment, resorting to ‘the Greek’ is wholly unnecessary. Baptism needed ***“much water”*** John 3:23 and when baptism is first mentioned in scripture, with respect to John, repentant sinners ***“were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins”*** Matthew 3:6, again in a place of ***“much water.”*** Baptism clearly cannot be sprinkling or pouring and the Old Testament picture is that of Naaman, of whom 2 Kings 5:14 states ***“Then went he down, and dipped himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God: and his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child, and he was clean.”*** Naaman’s cleansing, which clearly required full immersion, pictures New Testament salvation¹⁵⁵ because leprosy pictures sin¹⁵⁶.

In addition, The Trinitarian Bible Society¹⁵⁷ states that ***“The primary meaning of the English word “Baptize” is “to immerse” [it still is in The Concise Oxford Dictionary] and the translators of 1611 used the word in this sense...It was in fact used in English literature as early as the year 1200 A.D. and was well established in the language for nearly two hundred years before Wyclif used it in his translation in 1382 A.D. [i.e. as an established Biblical word].”***

Dr DiVietro’s unnamed Greek papyrus fragment is not needed to determine the meaning of the Biblical English word ***“Baptize.”*** None of his Greek is needed for the meaning of *any* Biblical English word.

Dr DiVietro concludes this chapter by declaring that scholarship must not be used to correct the Scriptures but only to enable the ordinary reader to understand the word of God, the ordinary reader being anyone who hasn’t learned Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek. The study of Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek, Dr DiVietro states, should be undertaken solely to make the scholar a better communicator of God’s truth and to build up faith in the word of God.

Significantly, although Dr DiVietro refers to the Scriptures, the word of God and God’s truth in these concluding remarks, he doesn’t explicitly refer to the KJB. In this author’s view, Dr DiVietro’s insistence in this chapter and earlier in his book on the necessity of lexicons comes dangerously close to meriting the Lord’s condemnation as found in Revelation 2:6, 15.

“But this thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate.”

“So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate.”

Dr DiVietro would probably insist that a lexicon or Bible dictionary is necessary to understand the word ***“Nicolaitans,”*** the meaning of which is the conquerors of the laity¹⁵⁸. Their deeds are to conquer or lord themselves over the laity and their doctrine is to teach that God has raised them up as a special ‘priest class’ for this purpose, in contradiction to Peter’s exhortations about the pastorate in 1 Peter 5:1-4.

In this case, it is ironic that ‘the Greek’ should yield such a result for this transliterated word ***“Nicolaitans.”*** What is interesting is that, just before the Book of Revelation, John warns

against those that “*abideth not in the doctrine of Christ*” and their “*evil deeds*” 2 John 9, 11. He then denounces Diotrefes, who “*loveth to have the pre-eminence*” and “*his deeds*” 3 John 9-10, thereby revealing that Diotrefes is typical of “*the Nicolaitans.*” John gives further insights into “*the Nicolaitans*” as “*them which are evil...which say they are apostles, and are not,*” are found “*where Satan’s seat is*” and are associated with “*them that hold the doctrine of Balaam,*” a type of “*the false prophet,*” who in turn is associated with “*Balac,*” a type of “*the beast,*” who is associated with “*the dragon,*” who is Satan (whose type is “*Baal*” Numbers 22:41), who “*gave him (“the beast”) his power, and his seat, and great authority*” Revelation 2:2, 13-14, 13:2, 16:13.

These scriptures therefore lead back to the “*false apostles*” of 2 Corinthians 11:13, who are associated with “*Satan himself...transformed into an angel of light*” 2 Corinthians 11:14. A mark of one of these “*deceitful workers*” is that “*he preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached*” 2 Corinthians 11:4. Compare 2, 3 John 9.

It should be noted that on p 94 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro preaches a raging conquering Jesus instead of a prayerful compassionate Jesus. That observation merits prayerful consideration because, to judge by Dr DiVietro’s analysis, a prayerful compassionate Jesus is not apparent in ‘the Greek’ for John 11:33. The full scriptural revelations about the dangers of Nicolaitanism, which this chapter of *Cleaning-Up* has dangerously bordered onto, aren’t revealed in ‘the Greek,’ either but they are in the KJB.

In sum, for Challenge #5:

1. Dr DiVietro, *Cleaning-Up*, p 85, replies that a professional linguist or translator is not needed because no-one says that Greek words have to be translated differently from how they appear in the KJB. This author has found otherwise. Only recently, the pastor of the church this author attends stated that “*a sinner*” in Luke 18:13 should be “*the sinner.*” This is a nonsense reading in the light of Psalm 51:5, Romans 5:12 and 1 Timothy 1:15. However, the pastor made this error by going to ‘the Greek.’ In the wider context, Dr DiVietro has naively ignored the raft of new bibles since Westcott and Hort’s 1881 RV that made 5,337 changes in the KJ New Testament based on their revised Greek text, many of them word changes. See also the changes to supposedly “*churchy*” words in the KJB urged by Danker as documented in *Hazardous Materials*, Chapter 16 that have been noted in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.
2. Dr DiVietro goes on to say in yet another evasive response to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s challenges that lexicons and other study aids are necessary in order to understand the KJB, not to ‘correct’ it, although Dr DiVietro is about to ‘correct’ the KJB in John 11:33 on p 94 of *Cleaning-Up*, in this very chapter, under the guise of ‘clarifying’ it. See remarks in **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up,’ Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** and below. Dr DiVietro is, however, at odds with the Lord Jesus Christ about the need for lexicons.

“Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come” John 16:13.
3. Dr DiVietro’s next relevant comment in this chapter is on pp 87-88, where he acknowledges that the original autographs of the scriptures are long gone and that they were never collated into a single volume. However, he then declares that God’s words in Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek have been preserved so that the original inspired words can still be determined.

Regrettably, Dr DiVietro still does not say where these particular words can be found between two covers as a perfect Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek match mate to the KJB, or if such a compilation even exists. His actual ‘bible’ is still a mystery to this author. See comments in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

In this author’s view, neither Dr DiVietro nor any other member of the DBS Executive Committee could *prove* that they possess a perfect Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek match mate to the KJB, which they claim to represent the correct i.e. original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text, even though they insist that KJB is not inspired, *Cleaning-Up*, p 18, *unless they could produce all the original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek manuscripts*. They will not be able to do so. To this author’s knowledge, the DBS Executive Committee has not *unequivocally* even produced a perfect *inspired* Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek match mate to the KJB.

Dr DiVietro nevertheless maintains that the very words of God may be ascertained from the hand written Greek manuscripts in all passages where they agree with each other, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 87-88.

However, production of a single, definitive Greek text by this method would be a daunting task. The extant manuscripts remain 90% un-collated. The Received Text Greek editions would have to be consulted as part of the compilation process because these editions are the only possible representatives of non-extant manuscripts that were available to the original editors. Dr DiVietro’s approach to the ascertainment of the very words of God must require that *all* manuscripts of the Received Text variety, extant and non-extant, somehow be taken into account. In addition, although Dr DiVietro dismisses the critical Greek texts such as Nestle’s as corruptions, his approach requires that these texts and their sources also be considered because they may bear witness to KJB readings that are not found in the Received Text e.g. 1 John 2:23b. Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, declares the KJB to be an accurate translation of the correct Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek texts. See *Cleaning-Up*, pp 18, 24-25.

However, even if such a definitive Greek text was compiled, vernacular translations would still be necessary for non-Koine Greek readers and these translations would almost certainly share the fate of the failed NKJV, the pathetic end result of the last attempt at producing a single definitive Greek text.

If, however, the KJB is allowed to stand as an accurate translation of an as yet non-extant single definitive Greek text, then compilation of such a text is obviously pointless. Dr DiVietro and his colleagues could of course resolve this dilemma very simply if they were prepared to acknowledge that the KJB *is* the very words of God, the DBS Executive Committee’s “*private interpretation*” 2 Peter 1:20 of “*theopneustos*,” *Cleaning-Up*, pp 2-3 notwithstanding. See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks in *Hazardous Materials*, pp 693-694. If Dr DiVietro then wanted a perfect equivalent Greek text for the KJB, he could simply use the method of reverse translation, which could well be a valid approach in this case, as even Dr DiVietro himself allows, *Cleaning-Up*, p 20. Regrettably, it seems unlikely that the members of the DBS Executive Committee will obey Peter’s injunction of 1 Peter 5:6 in this respect and “*Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time.*”

4. Dr DiVietro next draws attention to *The Defined King James Bible*, which he says is a valuable tool to ‘clarify’ the 1611 English Holy Bible by placing the meanings of any supposed archaic KJB words in footnotes.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has this evaluation of *The Defined King James Bible*.

“Most of The Defined King James Bible’s definitions came from modern English dictionaries, as noted in Waite’s introductory material. Such modern dictionaries contain highly secularized words, often seen in new versions. In Awe of Thy Word chapter 15 demonstrates, using the recently released notes of the KJB translators, that they considered and rejected just such words.”

The likely real motive behind Dr DiVietro’s book *Cleaning-Up* and Dr Waite’s book *A WARNING!!* therefore becomes clear. Sister Riplinger’s research is likely to jeopardize the sales of *The Defined King James Bible*. Paul’s verdict is found in 1 Timothy 6:10.

“For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.”

5. Dr DiVietro now proceeds to illustrate the supposed need for ‘the Greek,’ *Cleaning-Up*, pp 91-95, with Romans 5:15*, which he says is an impossible sentence in English, the word propitiate, which he says cannot be understood without a lexicon and the words *oinos* (“*wine*”) and *baptizo* (“*baptize*”), which he says cannot be understood without a lexicon and John 11:33, which Dr DiVietro insists cannot be expounded correctly without going to ‘the Greek.’

*Romans 5:15 is actually two sentences in the KJB, neither of which is impossible.

Dr Ruckman expounds Romans 5:15 as follows, without recourse to ‘the Greek.’

He states that one man, Adam, earned the right to die through his sin and thereby sentenced the whole human race to death, Romans 5:12. By contrast, one man, the Lord Jesus Christ, purchased “*eternal life*” Romans 5:21 on man’s behalf through the shedding of His blood as payment for man’s sin so that by the grace of God, He is therefore able to give eternal life to anyone who comes to Him to receive it.

‘The Greek’ is unnecessary. Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, did not here expound Romans 5:15, even with ‘the Greek.’

Concerning the word propitiate, or the related Biblical term “*propitiation*” Romans 3:25, 1 John 2:2, 4:10, again ‘the Greek’ isn’t necessary to determine the meaning of the word. Again, Dr DiVietro failed to provide an exposition, even with ‘the Greek.’

Following Dr Mrs Riplinger’s approach, the word “*propitiation*” is understood from scripture as follows.

“Propitiation,” like salvation, Luke 2:30, 19:9, is above all a Person, “*Jesus Christ the righteous.*” God is a personal God, not simply a theological or doctrinal God.

The scripture, however, gives further insight into the meaning of “*propitiation.*”

1 John 4:14 states “*And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world.*”

“The Saviour” is the same as “*the propitiation*” Who is “*Jesus Christ the righteous*” or “*Jehovah is salvation,*” Matthew 1:21, Who is “*the Messiah the Prince*” Daniel 9:25 and “*the Holy One*” 1 John 2:20, anointed of the Holy Ghost Luke 3:22, 4:18.

Additional scriptures, John 1:29, 1 Corinthians 5:7, Ephesians 5:2, Hebrews 7:26-27, 9:26, 1 Peter 1:18-19, Genesis 8:21 show that the voluntary, sinless sacrifice “*which taketh away the sin of the world*” of the Lord Jesus Christ *Himself* “*to God*” as “*a sweetsmelling savour*” turned away God’s wrath as Noah’s sacrifice did after the

flood, for anyone who believes that the Lord Jesus Christ is both *“the Saviour”* and *“savour”* for him personally, John 3:36. This is *“propitiation.”*

Dr Waite and Dr DiVietro may dismiss this analysis as an example of having to *“chase all over the King James Bible to find the definitions of its words”* but maybe the exercise would do them good.

6. On the subject of the word *oinos* and abstinence, reference need only be made to the example set by the Lord Jesus Christ. He drank only *“new wine”* Matthew 9:17, refused *“wine”* even on the cross, Mark 15:23 and provided only *“good wine”* at the wedding, John 2:10, not wine that caused *“woe,” “sorrow”* and transgression, Genesis 9:21-24, Proverbs 23:29, 30, Habakkuk 2:5, 15. Definitions of ‘the Greek’ are unnecessary, although on this occasion and with respect to the term *baptizo* and John 11:33, Dr DiVietro does provide explanations, however unsatisfactory. See comments below.
7. On John 11:33, the AV1611 English states *“he groaned in the spirit, and was troubled.”*

Dr DiVietro’s ‘Greek’ rendition changes *“groaned”* into *“stirred”* and bypasses the Lord’s *“spirit”* altogether.

The truth is that the Lord Jesus Christ was *“full of the Holy Ghost”* Luke 4:1. When *“he groaned in the spirit,”* it was His joint intercession with the Third Person of the Godhead for the bereaved around Him, according to the principle of Romans 8:26, *“the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.”* On this occasion, of course, both Intercessors knew how to pray as They ought and the Lord continues that ministry to the present hour for His saints, Hebrews 7:25. That the Lord’s groaning was that of prayer for the sake of the bereaved is indicated by John 11:41, which shows that the Lord had already been in prayer before He uttered the words recorded in the verse. Note the past tense of the word *“heard.”*

The Lord did weep tears of sorrow, contrary to Dr DiVietro’s assertion, otherwise He would have violated Romans 12:15.

“Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep.”

Dr DiVietro therefore, in his comments on John 11:33, is in grave danger of preaching *“another Jesus, whom we have not preached”* 2 Corinthians 11:4.

8. On the word *baptizo*, for which Dr DiVietro alludes to an unnamed papyrus fragment, resorting to ‘the Greek’ is wholly unnecessary. Baptism needed *“much water”* John 3:23 and when baptism is first mentioned in scripture, with respect to John, repentant sinners *“were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins”* Matthew 3:6, again in a place of *“much water.”* Baptism clearly cannot be sprinkling or pouring and the Old Testament picture is that of Naaman, of whom 2 Kings 5:14 states *“Then went he down, and dipped himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God: and his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child, and he was clean.”*

Naaman’s cleansing, which clearly required full immersion, pictures New Testament salvation because leprosy pictures sin.

In addition, The Trinitarian Bible Society states that *“The primary meaning of the English word “Baptize” is “to immerse” [it still is in *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*] and the translators of 1611 used the word in this sense...It was in fact used in English*

literature as early as the year 1200 A.D. and was well established in the language for nearly two hundred years before Wyclif used it in his translation in 1382 A.D. [i.e. as an established Biblical word].”

In short, none of Dr DiVietro’s ‘Greek’ is needed for the meaning of *any* Biblical English word. His insistence to the contrary comes dangerously close to meriting the Lord’s condemnation as found in Revelation 2:6, 15.

“But this thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate.”

“So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate.”

Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials – Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint

Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #6 is *"Give one spiritually edifying insight found in the ancient Koine Greek New Testament (not the English in a lexicon) that cannot be found in the English Bible or other widely available vernacular Bible."*

Dr DiVietro, *Cleaning-Up*, p 97, first responds to this challenge by in effect crying "Foul!" He complains that by removing lexicons from 'the database,' Dr Mrs Riplinger has forced the student to possess a detailed knowledge of all languages in which the Bible exists or has existed, in order to meet the challenge.

That is not true. The challenge refers to *"the English Bible or other widely available vernacular Bible,"* not and *"other widely available vernacular Bible."* Familiarity in one vernacular Bible is sufficient for meeting the challenge, if it can be met. Dr DiVietro has misconstrued what Dr Mrs Riplinger said, a not uncommon trait among her detractors. See her book *King James Version Ditches Blind Guides* for the chapters on Dave Hunt, Robert Morey and James White.

This analysis will, as has essentially been the practice so far in this work, make use of just one *"widely available vernacular Bible"* in answer to Dr DiVietro, the 1611 English Holy Bible.

Dr DiVietro's initial protest notwithstanding, he is confident that he can rise to Challenge #6 and provides 6 examples as proof. He insists throughout that he is not 'correcting' the KJB but using 'the Greek' to give it greater and more meaningful impact (for the poor benighted individuals who don't know 'the Greek'). It is noteworthy that so far, Dr DiVietro has not specifically mentioned even one individual, much less a church congregation that professes to have been edified by 'clarification' of the KJB by means of 'the Greek' (apart from other members of the DBS Executive Committee mutual admiration society). Proverbs 26:25 comes to mind.

"When he speaketh fair, believe him not: for there are seven abominations in his heart."

As does the admonition of 1 Samuel 2:3 because Dr DiVietro cites no authority higher than himself for his application of 'the Greek' to the Holy Bible, certainly not any chapter and verse from scripture.

"Talk no more so exceeding proudly; let not arrogancy come out of your mouth: for the LORD is a God of knowledge, and by him actions are weighed."

In his fixation with 'the Greek,' Dr DiVietro has also overlooked the implications for the mission field. See comments in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** as follows:

Would Dr DiVietro be prepared to write to Spanish, Chinese and French believers, who are most likely under more intense pressure with respect to their faith than believers in English-speaking countries, to admonish them like he does Sister Riplinger for believing that they have "all scripture...given by inspiration of God"? Would he then insist in writing that they learn Hebrew/Aramaic and Koine Greek if they want to know what God really said, or submit to the collective wisdom of the DBS Executive Committee in this respect?

It appears to this author that Dr DiVietro would be forced into this position by his colleague Dr Waite, who insists in his book *A WARNING!!* that *"I firmly believe that I have the original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek."* Dr Waite adds in his very next sentence, his under-lining and emphasis that *"Once again Gail Riplinger reveals her HERESY of throwing away God's original Words in favor of the exaltation of a translation of those Words."* He declares further on p 54 that *"God did not*

inspire these translations. She is in serious theological HERESY here. This is the reason for the title of this book.”

In other words, Spanish, Chinese and French believers would have to learn Hebrew/Aramaic and Koine Greek if they *really* wanted to know what God said, according to Dr Waite.

In passing, it should be understood that Dr Waite has misrepresented Dr Mrs Riplinger with the statement that *“Gail Riplinger reveals her HERESY of throwing away God’s original Words in favor of the exaltation of a translation of those Words.”* Parts 3 and 4 of *Hazardous Materials* show that the book is *not* taking issue with “God’s original words” as Dr Waite perceives them *but with the currently printed Hebrew and Greek Old and New Testament editions, all of which are defective in at least some readings, e.g. approximately 100 or more in Scrivener’s Greek Text, Hazardous Materials, p 668. Hazardous Materials* also shows that the *only* currently available Biblical Text that corrects these defects is the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible in *English*, or its equivalent in another vernacular language.

It should further be understood that *nowhere* in the DBS *Statement of Faith*, www.theoldpathpublications.com/articles.html is *any* currently available Hebrew or Greek edition said to be either *inspired* or a *perfect* copy of “God’s original words,” even though Part C of the statement says that these words have been preserved. Part D of the statement, for example, says only that the Greek New Testament edition published in 1976 by the Trinitarian Bible Society (i.e. Scrivener’s) is “*closest to the original autographs of the Bible*” (a misleading statement in itself because the DBS admits that ‘the originals’ were never collated into one book or ‘Bible,’ *Cleaning-Up*, p 87).

Clearly **“there is a great gulf fixed”** Luke 16:26 between Parts C and D of the DBS statement of faith on the scriptures. Neither Dr Waite in *A WARNING!!* nor Dr DiVietro in *Cleaning-Up* has bridged it. Neither have they disclosed *where* they have “God’s original words” nor how these words may be accessed by anyone else.

Nevertheless, Dr DiVietro’s examples are as follows and will be addressed in turn.

1. John 11:33, about which he states that his insight (from ‘the Greek’), outlined in his answer to Challenge #5, is not found in any Bible translation of which he is aware, including the KJB. That is just as well, because Dr DiVietro’s ‘insight’ into John 11:33 (from ‘the Greek’) is a travesty. See comments in the previous section.
2. The statement **“It is finished”** from John 19:30, although Dr DiVietro fails to give the reference.
3. The word for **“sin”** in the New Testament according to its Greek equivalent *hamartia* and related terms.
4. The words for **“trespass”** and **“transgression”** in the New Testament, according to their Greek equivalents *paraptoma* and *parabasis*, which, according to Dr DiVietro, help explain Romans 5:12-15, although Romans 5:15 uses the word **“offence”** for *paraptoma*, not *“trespass.”* Dr DiVietro then lists 17 meanings of the word **“sin”** culled, he says, from the Hebrew and Greek terms for this word, two of the examples being taken from Trench’s *Synonyms of the New Testament*.
5. The meaning of the Greek word for **“confess”** in 1 John 1:9 and the synonyms for the word of God found in Psalm 119. Dr DiVietro refers erroneously to **“the Word”** in this example instead of *“the word.”*

6. 2 John 9-10, for which passage Dr DiVietro states that deeper insights can be gained from studying its Greek grammar.

Example 1 has already been addressed in the previous section.

Example 2, according to Dr DiVietro, shows that ‘the Greek’ gives a much deeper understanding of the statement ***“It is finished”*** than merely ‘I finished the job I came to do and carried out the plan.’ Dr DiVietro insists that from ‘the Greek’ (in this case the Greek tense used), the statement *really* says ‘I have carried out the great plan of redemption and made the once-for-all sacrifice for sins never to be repeated so that sinners can now be forgiven.’ Dr DiVietro states further that the completion of this plan is in effect now, according to ‘the Greek.’

Dr DiVietro cites two scriptures in support of his interpretation of ***“It is finished.”***

“But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God” Hebrews 10:12.

“For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit” 1 Peter 3:18.

Dr DiVietro’s English interpretation of ***“It is finished”*** that he portrays as inferior to ‘the Greek’ is a ‘Straw man¹⁵⁹.’ Put simply, Dr DiVietro’s supposition is *not* what the King James *English Bible* says.

“...Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done” Luke 22:42.

“Jesus saith unto them, My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work” John 4:34.

“I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do” John 17:4.

The statement ***“It is finished”*** does not imply what Dr DiVietro tries to make it superficially imply in English, as the *English Bible* shows, *not* ‘the Greek.’ The Lord did not finish some scheme of His own on the cross, as Dr DiVietro tries to imply by means of his English rendition of John 19:30. He finished the work that *His Father* gave Him to do.

Dr DiVietro may have discovered this fact if He had spent more time in the 1611 *English Bible* and less time in ‘the Greek.’

As it happens, in spite of his citation of the cross references, Dr DiVietro’s interpretation of ***“It is finished”*** is not entirely correct.

Referring to the Lord Jesus Christ, Romans 3:24, Paul states in Romans 3:25 ***“Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God;”***

See also Matthew 26:28. Dr Ruckman¹⁶⁰ explains that God forgave sins from Genesis 3 to Romans 3 through His forbearance. However, those sins were not taken away, Hebrews 10:4 until the Lord’s perfect sacrifice at Calvary (according to Hebrews 10:12, which Dr DiVietro obligingly quotes). As Dr Ruckman explains, ***“the remission of sins that are past”*** consisted of the mercy of God’s forgiveness to the repentant sinner, pending the eventual, effectual payment for those sins at Calvary, in order to satisfy God’s righteous wrath on sin.

Dr DiVietro’s foray into ‘the Greek,’ therefore, with respect to John 19:30 has resulted in 3 errors on his part.

1. He invents an unscriptural ‘Straw man’ to try to inflate the supposed superiority of ‘the Greek.’
2. He neglects to state that the Lord’s death on the cross was the fulfilment of *His Father’s* work, not a project of His own, according to Dr DiVietro’s ‘Straw man.’
3. He overlooks the fact that God had repeatedly forgiven sins e.g. Psalm 99:8 for millennia before Calvary as Romans 3:25 explains, in King James English, not Koine Greek.

It would also be interesting to know precisely where the expression concerning ‘the great plan of redemption’ emerges from ‘the Greek’ for **“It is finished.”** Dr DiVietro asserts that the expression comes from the Greek tense but it is unclear how tense alone would account for the greatly expanded vocabulary that Dr DiVietro uses. He appears to have resorted to theology to arrive at this expression, which is considerably removed from a grammatical explanation of tense.

Example 3, according to Dr DiVietro’s use of ‘the Greek,’ with some help from Homer, Thucydides and, of all things, the Septuagint (a great treasure* for determining Hebrew thoughts behind Greek New Testament words though not an accurate translation of the Hebrew Bible, Dr DiVietro bizarrely informs his readers, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 58-59, see **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**), describes sin as missing the target, in contrast to Judges 20:16. (This verse describes the shooters i.e. the slingers, as expert shots.) Dr DiVietro states that sin is also falling short, Romans 3:23, because the Bowman doesn’t have the strength to get the arrow all the way to the target.

*The arch anti-AV1611 critic, James White says the same about the corrupt manuscript Aleph, Codex Sinaiticus in his book *The King James Only Controversy*, p 33. Yet in *The Revision Revised*, p 319, Dean Burgon, no less, says of Aleph, along with its stable-mate B, the basis from Brenton’s LXX, that the survival of these supposed treasures must be attributed **“solely to their ascertained evil character,”** author’s emphasis.

What Dr DiVietro fails to mention in this example is that the Old Testament depicts sin as wickedness in the sight of God and evil committed against God personally, Genesis 13:13, Psalm 51:4 as well as a chronic condition inherent from birth, Psalm 51:5. Sin as revealed in the Old Testament is therefore considerably more serious than simply being off target because you’re a bad shot or have a weak arm, as Dr DiVietro would have his readers believe from ‘the Greek’ – and secular Greek at that.

Dr DiVietro also fails to understand that in Romans 3:23, coming short by missing the mark is not the sin itself but the result of sin. Definitions of sin are found in the King James English New Testament without any recourse to ‘the Greek;’ Romans 14:23, James 4:17, 1 John 3:4, 5:17. Dr DiVietro fails to mention any of these verses in this chapter and yet they are explicit statements on what sin is, in **“great plainness of speech”** 2 Corinthians 3:12.

“And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin” Romans 14:23.

“Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin” James 4:17.

“Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law” 1 John 3:4.

“All unrighteousness is sin: and there is a sin not unto death” 1 John 5:17.

The definitions of sin in 1 John 3:4, 5:17, could in fact be said to show that sin is being *way off target* and even *wilfully* hitting the *wrong* target, not merely falling short of the *right* target, if Dr DiVietro's illustration of sin from 'the Greek' was pursued to its logical conclusion.

Romans 14:23 reveals that doubt leading to unbelief is sin, e.g. for an unsaved person, not believing on the Lord Jesus Christ for salvation, John 3:36 *and for a saved person, not living "by the faith of the Son of God"* Galatians 2:20. The verse also reveals that a saved person sins by partaking of anything where doubts arise, i.e. 'if it's doubtful, it's dirty.'

James 4:17 reveals that negligence is sin, for whatever reason e.g. fear, pride, sloth.

"For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind" 2 Timothy 1:7. For example, *"To sin by silence when they should protest makes cowards of men"* – Abraham Lincoln¹⁶¹.

"And I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth: lo, there thou hast that is thine. His lord answered and said unto him, Thou wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather where I have not strawed: Thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and then at my coming I should have received mine own with usury" Matthew 25:25-27. See also Luke 19:20-23.

"Be...Not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord;" Romans 12:10-11.

"Amon...humbled not himself before the LORD, as Manasseh his father had humbled himself; but Amon trespassed more and more" 2 Chronicles 33:21-23.

"But when his heart was lifted up, and his mind hardened in pride, he was deposed from his kingly throne, and they took his glory from him:...And thou his son, O Belshazzar, hast not humbled thine heart, though thou knewest all this;" Daniel 5:20-21.

1 John 3:4 reveals that disobedience is sin, going against what God said.

"And he said, Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat?" Genesis 3:11.

"And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression" 1 Timothy 2:14.

For a Christian, the term *"the law"* would apply to *"the ordinance of God"* that is imposed by *"the powers that be"* Romans 13:1, 2 and *"the law of Christ"* Galatians 6:2, which is explained in Romans 13:8 ***"Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law."*** See also Romans 13:9.

The Lord Jesus Christ Himself revealed *"the law of Christ"* in His response in Luke 10:28 to the lawyer's statement in Luke 10:27, following the Lord's question in Luke 10:26.

"He said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live."

See also Matthew 22:37-40, Mark 12:30-31. Luke 10:27 is, of course, only fulfilled by keeping the Lord's words.

"Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him" John 14:23.

According to the DBS Executive Committee, no-one could obey John 14:23 unless they were familiar with Hebrew/Aramaic and Koine Greek, *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3. Moreover, if the DBS

Executive Committee is correct, any believer unfamiliar with Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek *would spiritually starve to death*, according to what the Lord said in Matthew 4:4.

“It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.”

See also Luke 4:4 and note that the ‘starvation diet’ thus imposed by the DBS Executive Committee is yet another denial of the priesthood of all believers, 1Peter 2:5, 9. See remarks in the previous section.

1 John 5:17 reveals that whether it leads immediately to the death of the sinner e.g. Uzzah, 2 Samuel 6:6, 7 or not e.g. Uzziah 2 Chronicles 26:16-21, anything not right before God is sin, such as the Lord revealed in Matthew 15:19 ***“For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies:”*** These are ***“the works of the flesh”*** Galatians 5:19-21 that by inspection include ***“evil thoughts”*** in the form of ***“hated”*** and ***“envying.”*** They issue ***“out of the heart”*** as Jeremiah also revealed.

“The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?” Jeremiah 17:9. In answer, **“the word of God”** can know the heart of man because it ***“is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart”*** Hebrews 4:12 and it can cleanse the heart.

“Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you” John 15:3.

It should also be noted that prayerlessness is sin.

“Moreover as for me, God forbid that I should sin against the LORD in ceasing to pray for you; but I will teach you the good and the right way:” 1 Samuel 12:23.

Isaiah 53:6 reveals that sin is to forsake **“the good and the right way”** and to go one’s own way.

“All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.”

As Proverbs 21:4, 24:9 also reveal.

“An high look, and a proud heart, and the plowing of the wicked, is sin.”

“The thought of foolishness is sin: and the scorner is an abomination to men.”

God in His mercy made provision for payment for sin, according to Isaiah 53:10.

“Yet it pleased the LORD to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the LORD shall prosper in his hand.”

See the previous section with respect to comments on **“propitiation.”**

(A graphic illustration of the Lord making **“his soul an offering from sin”** emerges from Northumbrian history in the 7th century northeast England¹⁶².

“626AD - ASSASSINATION ATTEMPT ON NORTHUMBRIAN KING (YORKSHIRE)

“Eumer, an agent of Cuichelm, King of the West Saxons, has attempted to assassinate King Edwin while he was celebrating the pagan festival of Easter at his royal palace in the Yorkshire wolds between York and Beverley. The assassin entered the King’s court and asked to speak with the king on the pretence of having an important message from the West Saxon King. On seeing the king, Eumer produced a poisoned dagger from beneath his cloak and attempted to stab Edwin. Fortunately one of Edwin’s men, Lillam, jumped in the way and

was killed. A fight followed in which Edwin was injured but Eumer was eventually put to death. On the same night Edwin's queen, Ethelburga, gave birth."

King Edwin became a Christian the following year. In the above historical account, a devoted servant died for his beloved king. In the Gospel account, summarised by, for example, Romans 5:8, the King of kings took the poisoned dagger for *sinner* at enmity with Him. This sombre, vivid and compelling illustration of "**propitiation**" was prompted to this author by the King's English, *not* the DBS Executive Committee's 'Greek.'

"But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.")

It should further be noted that all sin is primarily doing evil against God, as David's confession in Psalm 51:4 shows, even though David¹⁶³ had also sinned against Uriah, Joab, Bathsheba and his nation.

"Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight: that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest."

Dr DiVietro's list of 17 applications of the term sin when the Hebrew and Greek words translated as sin are inserted into Romans 3:23 are part of Example 4 but they will be considered here in the context of scriptural definitions for sin. See *Cleaning-Up* pp 100-101.

These applications include the statement "**For all have sinned**" and the weak interpretation of missing the target – see comments above.

Of the remaining 15 applications, one consists of committing acts of sin and another of doing wicked things, which are repetitions of the expression "**For all have sinned.**"

Of the remaining 13 applications, 6 have to do with going against God in some way, either against His Person or His will, wilfully, treacherously or defiantly.

Of the remaining 7 applications, one deals with acting foolishly, another with corrupting something good.

4 of the 5 remaining applications deal with the effects of sin i.e. becoming corrupted, guilty, a captive to sin and incurring God's wrath.

The final application of the term sin that Dr DiVietro lists is that a sin offering has been provided for the sinner.

It is immediately apparent from Dr DiVietro's list that, apart from quoting Romans 3:23, he illustrates none of his applications of the term sin by means of scripture, although he does cite Trench's *Synonyms of the New Testament* for 2 of them.

The question then arises "**what saith the scripture?**" Romans 4:3, with respect to Dr DiVietro's list. The initial answer to that question is found in the scriptural study on sin that precedes Dr DiVietro's list. The italicised statements in what follows show how the scripture in *King James English* reveals *more* than Dr DiVietro's stated Hebrew and Greek.

1 John 5:17 and associated verses cover the application of committing acts of sin or wicked things, *with specific examples, Matthew 15:19 and the necessary remedy, John 15:3, Hebrews 4:12.*

1 John 3:4 and associated verses together with Psalm 51:4 cover the application of going against the Person or Will of God in some way, *with a specific example, Genesis 3:11 and with respect to "the ordinance of God" that is imposed by "the powers that be" Romans 13:1, 2 and "the law of Christ" Galatians 6:2.*

Genesis 3:11 and Psalm 51:4 also cover foolish acts and corrupting something good *and James 4:17 reveals how foolishness and corruption can stem from sins of omission as well as sins of commission.*

Romans 14:23 and John 3:36 cover the effect of sin, namely damnation and Isaiah 53:10, together with the study on **“propitiation”** in the previous section cover the need for the offering for sin. *Note that Dr DiVietro does not link his list derived from Romans 3:23 with his reference to **“propitiation”** in his previous chapter on Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #4. In that respect he has been negligent.*

*The study has also highlighted the nature of sin with respect to doubt, unbelief, negligence, fear, pride, sloth, prayerlessness, evil thoughts and works, breaking God’s laws and failing to keep God’s words e.g. discarding **“given by inspiration of God”** in favour of a **“private interpretation”** 2 Peter 1:20 of the word theopneustos. Dr DiVietro does not specifically mention any of those aspects of the study in his list of derivations from the Hebrew and the Greek but they emerge distinctly from studying **“the king’s word”** 2 Samuel 24:4 in King James English.*

Example 4, according to Dr DiVietro, shows how the Greek in Romans 5:12-15, not the English, draws a necessary distinction between sin as Adam’s wilful disobedience to God (*parabasis*) and the sin of all of Adam’s descendants, who have fallen short (*paraptoma*). Dr DiVietro states that it is necessary to draw such a distinction (from the Greek not the English) because Adam’s descendants had no command to obey like Adam did. Dr DiVietro also inserts the comment that men are now sinners both by nature and by choice. He does not explain how revelation of the inherent sin nature emerges from the words *parabasis* and *paraptoma*. It doesn’t of course but it is readily apparent from Psalm 51:5 *in the English*. See comments above.

Closer inspection of Romans 5:12-15 shows that once again, ‘the Greek’ is unnecessary and adds nothing to the English.

Romans 5:12 states ***“Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned:”***

Romans 5:12 states clearly that all men inherited sin and death from Adam i.e. the sin nature. Men deserve death because they follow their sin natures, i.e. sinning by choice and incurring the death penalty. Genesis 5:3 underlines the inheritance of the sin nature from Adam, which was part of Adam’s image inherited by all his descendants.

“And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth:”

Romans 5:13-14 state ***“For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.”***

Romans 5:13-14 state that men were not blamed for their sin after the manner of the Mosaic Law before that Law came into existence at Sinai, Exodus 20 but they still suffered death through sin because men *knew the Law even before it was written down and knew when they went against it*. Abimelech, Genesis 20, is a case in point even though the 7th Commandment Exodus 20:14 had not been written at the time.

“For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which shew the work of the law

written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another;” Romans 2:14-15.

Romans 5:13-14 also specify the distinction between Adam’s sin of disobedience to a specific command, Genesis 2:17 and the sin of his descendants, which was going against **“the work of the law written in their hearts.”**

Dr DiVietro’s reference to ‘the Greek’ is unnecessary and does not prompt the cross references to Genesis 5:3, 20, Romans 2:14-15, which is what *really* helps in understanding Romans 5:12-15¹⁶⁴ rather than ‘the Greek,’ in spite of Dr DiVietro’s pretensions to the contrary. Some further comment on Dr DiVietro pretensions in this respect are in order.

Jeremiah 15:16 states:

“Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart: for I am called by thy name, O LORD God of hosts.”

If Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee are correct, how is the ordinary believer, who does not know Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek, able to fulfil Jeremiah 15:16, which every Christian should aim to do? See Matthew 4:4 above. Dr DiVietro gives no indication, except to be spoon-fed by self-appointed puppet masters such as himself. See *Cleaning-Up* pp 92-95. Again, this high-handed stance of the DBS Executive Committee is seen to be totally out with the priesthood of all believers and therefore **“the word of God”** 1 Peter 1:23, 2:5, 9.

Moreover, the scripturally-based study of Romans 5:12-15 leads to a much more serious approach to the passage than Dr DiVietro’s Greek-based illustrations of *parabasis* and *paraptoma*. A reference to jumping into a river after ignoring a no-trespassing sign versus accidentally falling in and being slow to get out may illustrate the difference between these words in ‘the Greek’ but it trivialises the grave issue of defying conscience and the law of God written in the heart, Romans 2:15, as Proverbs 4:23 warns explicitly.

“Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life.”

Example 5, according to Dr DiVietro, shows the necessity of ‘the Greek’ for defining the word **“confess”** in 1 John 1:9 as calling sin what God calls it, i.e. sin. Dr DiVietro then indicates that a study of the synonyms for the Word (actually word, insofar as the term Word refers specifically to the Lord Jesus Christ, John 1:1-14) of God in Psalm 119 apparently in Hebrew is beneficial but he gives no examples.

With respect to a definition for the word **“confess”** in 1 John 1:9, the wording of the previous and following verses *in English* far exceeds ‘the Greek.’

“If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us” 1 John 1:8.

“If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us” 1 John 1:10.

1 John 1:8 includes sin by nature, Psalm 51:5 and 1 John 1:10 includes individual sins, either by commission, Romans 14:23 or omission, James 4:17. The underlined expressions in these verses indicate the opposite of confession, which is therefore to say truthfully that you *have* sin and that you *have* sinned, according to the definitions of sin that John includes in his letter, i.e. 1 John 3:4, 5:17 and which are found elsewhere in scripture, i.e. 1 Samuel 12:23, Proverbs 21:4, 24:9, Romans 14:23, James 4:17. This definition is more searching than that of Dr DiVietro’s from ‘the Greek.’ An alcoholic may call a drink problem alcoholism but for him to admit that he *has* the problem calls for much greater honesty on his part.

David was prepared to be honest about sin.

“I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the LORD; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin. Selah” Psalm 32:5. Note the further aspect of confession as the opposite of concealing sin, in agreement with Job’s declaration in Job 31:33 and Solomon’s exhortation in Proverbs 28:13.

“If I covered my transgressions as Adam, by hiding mine iniquity in my bosom:”

“He that covereth his sins shall not prosper: but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy.”

Solomon goes on to describe a whole generation that will not admit to their sin problem. His words have turned out to be prophetic. See Dr Gipp’s analysis in the previous section.

“There is a generation that are pure in their own eyes, and yet is not washed from their filthiness” Proverbs 30:12.

In sum, the word “*confess*” means to *admit* to *having* sin, as defined in scripture; 1 Samuel 12:23, Proverbs 21:4, 24:9, Romans 14:23, James 4:17, 1 John 3:4, 5:17 and to *having sinned* according to these definitions, laying sin and sins bare before God.

Dr DiVietro’s definition of “*confess*” from ‘the Greek’ is much weaker, by comparison with the above.

With respect to Psalm 119 and synonyms for the word of God, a study of the English instead of the Hebrew, which Dr DiVietro does not cite, reveals the *effects* of following God’s words for the first 8 verses, under the heading **ALEPH**. These effects are more important than synonyms, although information on synonyms for the word of God does emerge from the study.

“ALEPH. Blessed are the undefiled in the way, who walk in the law of the LORD” Psalm 119:1.

“The law of the LORD” is intended for ***“strangers and pilgrims on the earth”*** Hebrews 11:13 who ***“shall keep the way of the LORD”*** Genesis 18:19 along ***“the king’s high way”*** Numbers 20:17, spiritually speaking. ***“The law of the LORD”*** overcomes defilement because ***“The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul:”*** Psalm 19:7.

Note that ***“the law of the LORD”*** is above all *a book*, by which the nation of Israel was meant to be governed, 2 Chronicles 17:9, 34:14, Nehemiah 9:3.

“Blessed are they that keep his testimonies, and that seek him with the whole heart” Psalm 119:2.

The ***“strangers and pilgrims on the earth”*** who ***“keep his testimonies”*** are blessed because they are sure of their way as Psalm 19:7 states.

“The testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple.”

Being made wise, the wayfarers who ***“keep his testimonies”*** are blessed because they are prudent, as in Proverbs 14:15b.

“The prudent man looketh well to his going.”

Note that ***“his testimonies”*** were part of ***“the law which Moses set before Israel”*** that included ***“the testimonies, and the statutes, and the judgments, which Moses spake unto the children of Israel, after they came forth out of Egypt”*** Deuteronomy 4:44, 45. God intended that Israel keep and do His statutes and judgements:

“Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the LORD my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. Keep therefore

and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people” Deuteronomy 4:5-6a.

God’s testimonies addressed *the outcome* of keeping His statutes and judgments.

“For this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people” Deuteronomy 4:6b.

Blessing would result from keeping God’s testimonies i.e. remembering and acting in the light of them, because these would be perceived as God’s fulfilment of promise in return for keeping His law. The wisdom, therefore, of keeping God’s testimonies, Psalm 19:7, is evident.

“They also do no iniquity: they walk in his ways” Psalm 119:3. See comments for Psalm 119:1.

“Thou hast commanded us to keep thy precepts diligently” Psalm 119:4.

To be diligent with respect to God’s commandments, or precepts, is to *“seek him with the whole heart”* Psalm 119:2, as David states in Psalm 119:10.

“With my whole heart have I sought thee: O let me not wander from thy commandments.”

“O that my ways were directed to keep thy statutes!” Psalm 119:5.

The Lord’s statutes are right directions and therefore to follow them brings great rejoicing.

“The statutes of the LORD are right, rejoicing the heart:” Psalm 19:8.

See remarks on Deuteronomy 4:5, 6, 44, 45 above.

“Then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect unto all thy commandments” Psalm 119:6.

The Lord’s commandments overcome shame because they give light on the right way to live.

“The commandment of the LORD is pure, enlightening the eyes” Psalm 19:8.

“For the commandment is a lamp; and the law is light; and reproofs of instruction are the way of life:” Proverbs 6:23.

“I will praise thee with uprightness of heart, when I shall have learned thy righteous judgments” Psalm 119:7.

Learning *“thy righteous judgements”* leads to heartfelt praise to God from an upright heart because such a heart will fear God and therefore God will enable that heart to praise Him for eternity as Psalm 19:9 shows. Note that Psalm 19:9 associates *“the fear of the LORD”* with *“the judgments of the LORD.”*

“The fear of the LORD is clean, enduring for ever: The judgments of the LORD are true and righteous altogether” Psalm 19:9.

It was *“the judgments of the LORD”* that David needed in order to have a clean and upright heart.

“Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight; that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest...Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me” Psalm 51:4, 10.

See remarks on Deuteronomy 4:5, 6, 44, 45 above.

“I will keep thy statutes: O forsake me not utterly” Psalm 119:8.

See remarks on Psalm 119:5 above. God answered David’s prayer in Psalm 119:8 ahead of time, with respect to His faithfulness to the man who keeps His commandments, or statutes.

“There shall not any man be able to stand before thee all the days of thy life: as I was with Moses, so I will be with thee: I will not fail thee, nor forsake thee...This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein: for then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success” Joshua 1:5, 8.

In sum, Psalm 119:1-8 are *“reproofs of instruction”* in *“the way of life:”* in order for *“strangers and pilgrims on the earth”* to be *“blessed”* and *“the undefiled in the way”* throughout their earthly pilgrimage. This emphasis on Psalm 119 is more important than a study solely on synonyms in Psalm 119, although information about synonyms does emerge from the study e.g. *“the law of the LORD”* is above all *a book*, by which the nation of Israel was meant to be governed, 2 Chronicles 17:9, 34:14, Nehemiah 9:3.

See Dr Ruckman’s commentary *Volume II of the Book of Psalms* pp 941ff for a comprehensive study on Psalm 119.

Example 6, according to Dr DiVietro, shows that knowledge of the tense of ‘the Greek’ is necessary in order to understand the strength of the expression *“receive him not”* in 2 John 10.

John 5:34, 41, 2 Corinthians 6:1, 1 Timothy 5:19, Revelation 18:4 prove otherwise. They show that the expression *“receive...not”* is extremely strong *in English*. Yet again, ‘the Greek’ is both unnecessary and inferior because a focus on expounding the sense of a Greek tense does not immediately lead to cross references in the way that a study of the resultant English expression does.

“But I receive not testimony from man: but these things I say, that ye might be saved” John 5:34.

“I receive not honour from men” John 5:41.

“We then, as workers together with him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain” 2 Corinthians 6:1.

“Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses” 1 Timothy 5:19.

“And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues” Revelation 18:4.

Irrespective of tense in ‘the Greek’ the strength of the term *“receive not”* in scripture is evident from the above verses.

The Lord Jesus Christ would *“receive not”* testimony and honour from men just as He would *“receive not”* the same from unclean spirits. Even though they called Him *“the Holy One of God”* Mark 1:24, the Lord *“suffered not the devils to speak, because they knew him”* Mark 1:34 because they were of the Devil and the Lord said in John 14:30 *“for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me,”* including no free publicity.

The Lord also knew that the heart of man *“is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked”* Jeremiah 17:9 and the Lord *“knew what was in man”* John 2:24, 25¹⁶⁵. The testimony and honour from men that they sought to bestow on the Lord Jesus Christ in Matthew 21:8-11 was not steadfast. Cries of *“Hosanna to the Son of David”* turned to shouts of *“let*

him be crucified” in Matthew 27:22, 23. The Lord has no time for *“a double minded man...unstable in all his ways”* James 1:8. By contrast, through the Apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians 15:58, He enjoins steadfastness.

“Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord.”

The Lord Jesus Christ would especially *“receive not honour from men”* because *“the son of perdition”* 2 Thessalonians 2:4 will receive it.

“I am come in my Father’s name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive” John 5:43.

Paul’s exhortation¹⁶⁶ in 2 Corinthians 6:1 to *“receive not the grace of God in vain”* is for any unsaved readers that *“now is the day of salvation”* as he states in the very next verse and for saved readers in 2 Corinthians 6:14-18 where he is urging them by *“the grace of God”* to *“Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers”* in order to avoid uncleanness. In each case, the exhortation *“receive not”* could not be stronger.

The context of 1 Timothy 5:19, 20, together with that of 1 Timothy 5:1, is one of the most serious that a pastor¹⁶⁷ can face in the ministry and must be approached with the utmost attention to scriptural principles, Matthew 18:15-17. The expression *“receive not”* in 1 Timothy 5:19 is therefore extremely strong.

The strength of the expression *“receive not”* in Revelation 18:4 refers to avoidance of the plagues that will consume *“Babylon the great”* Revelation 18:2 and are described in Revelation 18:8.

“Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her.”

The strength of the expression *“receive not”* in Revelation 18:4 with respect to the plagues that will consume *“Babylon the great”* is that of the Lord Himself, *“for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her.”*

That is the strength of all the above expressions *“receive not”* in their respective contexts and of *“receive him not”* in 2 John 10. No input from any Greek tense is needed. Nor is such input even helpful, because Dr DiVietro fails to make any reference to *“for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her”* concerning the *“corrupt spring”* Proverbs 25:26 from whence emerge the false teachers condemned in 2 John 9, 10. *“Receive him not”* in this passage is therefore the same as the well-known expression ‘avoid him like the plague’ Revelation 18:4 and the exhortation in James 4:7 *“Resist the devil”* as indicated by John 5:34, 41, 14:30 with Mark 1:24, 34.

Dr DiVietro concludes this chapter, *Cleaning-Up* pp 102-103 by reiterating that a study of Hebrew and Greek gives a deeper understanding of what he again wrongly refers to as the Word of God in the form of the King James Bible, which is actually *“the word of God”* 1 Samuel 9:27, Mark 7:13.

He states that he has no other way of acquiring this level of understanding without going to the Hebrew and the Greek. As this section has shown, he should try going to *“the scripture of truth”* Daniel 10:21.

Dr DiVietro’s final comment in this chapter is that vernacular Bibles may, or may not be, the words of God. In other words, the 1611 Authorized English Holy Bible may, or may not be the words of God.

Dr DiVietro's statement is the same as that which he made on p 18 of his book, namely that the 1611 Authorized English Holy Bible is the words of God because it is an accurate translation of its Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek sources but it isn't the words of God because it isn't inspired, i.e. the 1611 Authorized English Holy Bible isn't "*all scripture...given by inspiration of God.*" (Or is it?)

In the words of an exasperated prophet Elijah in 1 Kings 18:21:

"And Elijah came unto all the people, and said, How long halt ye between two opinions? if the LORD be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him. And the people answered him not a word."

In sum, for Challenge #6:

Dr DiVietro cites the following passages of scripture in response this challenge.

1. John 11:33. His exposition from 'the Greek' is a travesty. See remarks in the previous section.
2. John 19:30, "***It is finished.***" Dr DiVietro insists that from 'the Greek' (in this case the Greek tense used), the statement *really* says 'I have carried out the great plan of redemption and made the once-for-all sacrifice for sins never to be repeated so that sinners can now be forgiven.' Dr DiVietro states further that the completion of this plan is in effect now, according to 'the Greek.'

However, The Lord did not finish some scheme of His own on the cross, as Dr DiVietro tries to imply by means of his English rendition of John 19:30. He finished the work that *His Father* gave Him to do.

"I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do" John 17:4.

Moreover, Dr DiVietro's use of 'the Greek' has overlooked how God remitted, or forgave sins from Genesis 3 to Romans 3 through His forbearance but those sins were not taken away until the Lord's perfect sacrifice at Calvary (according to Hebrews 10:12, which Dr DiVietro obligingly quotes). See Romans 3:25, with respect to the Lord Jesus Christ.

"Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God;"

3. Dr DiVietro uses 'the Greek' to define sin in Romans 3:23 as falling short, like an arrow that doesn't hit the target because the bowman hasn't got the strength to shoot it that far. Sin is actually much more serious than Dr DiVietro's illustration of a weak bowshot, as the New Testament definitions of sin reveal.

"And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin" Romans 14:23.

"Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin" James 4:17.

"Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law" 1 John 3:4.

"All unrighteousness is sin: and there is a sin not unto death" 1 John 5:17 i.e. sin is deadly serious, whether it leads immediately to the death of the sinner e.g. Uzzah, 2 Samuel 6:6, 7 or not e.g. Uzziah 2 Chronicles 26:16-21.

Dr DiVietro lists 17 applications of the term sin when the Hebrew and Greek words translated as sin are inserted into Romans 3:23, which he implies are not evident in King James English. These applications include committal of acts of sin or wickedness, going against the Person or Will of God, acts of foolishness or corruption of something good and the effects of sin e.g. damnation. Dr DiVietro provides no examples to substantiate his list.

The scripture in *King James English based on the scriptural definitions of sin* covers all of Dr DiVietro's 17 applications with specific examples that yield far more than what Dr DiVietro has disclosed from 'the Hebrew and the Greek.'

1 John 5:17 and associated verses cover the application of committing acts of sin or wicked things, *with specific examples, Matthew 15:19 and the necessary remedy, John 15:3, Hebrews 4:12.*

1 John 3:4 and associated verses together with Psalm 51:4 cover the application of going against the Person or Will of God in some way, *with a specific example, Genesis 3:11 and with respect to "the ordinance of God" that is imposed by "the powers that be" Romans 13:1, 2 and "the law of Christ" Galatians 6:2.*

Genesis 3:11 and Psalm 51:4 also cover foolish acts and corrupting something good and *James 4:17 reveals how foolishness and corruption can stem from sins of omission as well as sins of commission.*

Romans 14:23 and John 3:36 cover the effect of sin, namely damnation and Isaiah 53:10, together with the study on "**propitiation**" in the previous section cover the need for the offering for sin. *Note that Dr DiVietro does not link his list derived from Romans 3:23 with his reference to "propitiation" in his previous chapter on Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #4. In that respect he has been negligent.*

4. Dr DiVietro uses 'the Greek' in Romans 5:12-15 to draw what he perceives as a necessary distinction between sin as Adam's wilful disobedience to God (*parabasis*) and the sin of all of Adam's descendants, who have fallen short (*paraptoma*). Dr DiVietro also inserts the comment that men are now sinners by nature and by choice. He does not explain how revelation of the inherent sin nature emerges from the words *parabasis* and *paraptoma*. It doesn't of course but it is readily apparent from Psalm 51:5 *in the English.*

Closer inspection of Romans 5:12-15 shows that once again, 'the Greek' is unnecessary and adds nothing to the English.

Romans 5:12 states ***"Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned:"***

Romans 5:12 states clearly that all men inherited sin and death from Adam i.e. the sin nature. Men deserve death because they follow their sin natures, i.e. sinning by choice and incurring the death penalty. Genesis 5:3 underlines the inheritance of the sin nature from Adam, which was part of Adam's image inherited by all his descendants.

"And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth."

Romans 5:13-14 state ***"For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over***

them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come."

Romans 5:13-14 state that men were not blamed for their sin after the manner of the Mosaic Law before that Law came into existence at Sinai, Exodus 20 but they still suffered death through sin because men *knew the Law even before it was written down and knew when they went against it*. Abimelech, Genesis 20, is a case in point even though the 7th Commandment Exodus 20:14 had not been written at the time.

All is clear from the English. Reference to 'the Greek' is not only unnecessary but even counterproductive because the scripturally-based study of Romans 5:12-15 leads to a much more serious approach to the passage than Dr DiVietro's Greek-based illustrations of *parabasis* and *paraptoma*. A reference to jumping into a river after ignoring a no-trespassing sign versus accidentally falling in and being slow to get out may illustrate the difference between these words in 'the Greek' but it trivialises the grave issue of defying conscience and the law of God written in the heart, Romans 2:15, as Proverbs 4:23 warns explicitly.

"Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life."

Once again, it should be noted that Dr DiVietro's insistence on 'the Greek' in this example is in direct conflict with the priesthood of all believers and therefore ***"the word of God"*** 1 Peter 1:23, 2:5, 9.

5. Dr DiVietro insists that use of 'the Greek' is necessary in 1 John 1:9 in order to determine the meaning of the word ***"confess"*** as calling sin what God calls it, i.e. sin. However, the verses immediately before and after 1 John 1:9 define the word ***"confess"*** from a scriptural perspective.

"If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" 1 John 1:8.

"If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us" 1 John 1:10.

1 John 1:8 includes sin by nature, Psalm 51:5 and 1 John 1:10 includes individual sins, either by commission, Romans 14:23 or omission, James 4:17. The underlined expressions in these verses indicate the opposite of confession, which is therefore to say truthfully that you *have* sin and that you *have* sinned, according to the definitions of sin that John includes in his letter, i.e. 1 John 3:4, 5:17 and found elsewhere in scripture; 1 Samuel 12:23, Proverbs 21:4, 24:9, Romans 14:23, James 4:17. This definition is more searching than that of Dr DiVietro's from 'the Greek.' An alcoholic may call a drink problem alcoholism but for him to admit that he *has* the problem calls for much greater honesty on his part.

David was prepared to be honest about sin.

"I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the LORD; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin. Selah" Psalm 32:5.

In sum, the word ***"confess"*** means to *admit* to *having* sin, as defined in scripture; 1 Samuel 12:23, Proverbs 21:4, 24:9, Romans 14:23, James 4:17, 1 John 3:4, 5:17 and to *having sinned* according to these definitions, laying sin and sins bare before God.

Dr DiVietro's definition of ***"confess"*** from 'the Greek' is much weaker, by comparison with the above.

Dr DiVietro indicates that much is to be gained from a study of the Hebrew synonyms for the word of God in Psalm 119. However, a study of the English instead of the Hebrew, which Dr DiVietro does not cite, reveals the *effects* of following God's words in Psalm 119. See for example Psalm 119:1.

“ALEPH. Blessed are the undefiled in the way, who walk in the law of the LORD”

“The law of the LORD” is intended for ***“strangers and pilgrims on the earth”*** Hebrews 11:13 who ***“shall keep the way of the LORD”*** Genesis 18:19 along ***“the king's high way”*** Numbers 20:17. ***“The law of the LORD”*** overcomes defilement because ***“The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul.”*** Psalm 19:7.

As an added bonus of such a study, information on synonyms in Psalm 119 does emerge from the King James English. Note for example that ***“the law of the LORD”*** is above all *a book*, by which the nation of Israel was meant to be governed, 2 Chronicles 17:9, 34:14, Nehemiah 9:3.

Dr DiVietro has not shown how a study of Hebrew synonyms in Psalm 119 reveals the above material. See Dr Ruckman's commentary *Volume II of the Book of Psalms* pp 941ff for a comprehensive study on Psalm 119.

6. Dr DiVietro claims that knowledge of the tense of 'the Greek' is necessary in 2 John 10 in order to understand the strength of the expression ***“receive him not.”***

John 5:34, 41, 2 Corinthians 6:1, 1 Timothy 5:19, Revelation 18:4 prove otherwise. They show that the expression ***“receive...not”*** is extremely strong *in English*. Yet again, 'the Greek' is both unnecessary and inferior because a focus on expounding the sense of a Greek tense does not immediately lead to essential cross references in the way that a study of the resultant English expression does.

Taking the last verse listed, the strength of the expression ***“receive not”*** in Revelation 18:4 refers to avoidance of the plagues that will consume ***“Babylon the great”*** Revelation 18:2 and are described in Revelation 18:8.

“Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her.”

The strength of the expression ***“receive not”*** in Revelation 18:4 with respect to the plagues that will consume ***“Babylon the great”*** is that of the Lord Himself, ***“for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her.”***

That is the strength of all the above expressions ***“receive not”*** in their respective contexts and of ***“receive him not”*** in 2 John 10. No input from any Greek tense is needed. Nor is such input even helpful, because Dr DiVietro fails to make any reference to ***“for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her”*** concerning the ***“corrupt spring”*** Proverbs 25:26 from whence emerge the false teachers condemned in 2 John 9, 10. ***“Receive him not”*** in this passage is therefore the same as the well-known expression 'avoid him like the plague' Revelation 18:4 and the exhortation in James 4:7 ***“Resist the devil”*** as indicated by John 5:34, 41, 14:30 with Mark 1:24, 34.

Dr DiVietro's final comment in this chapter is that vernacular Bibles may, or may not be, the words of God. In other words, the 1611 Authorized English Holy Bible may, or may not be the words of God.

How starkly does Dr DiVietro's limp-wristed statement contrast with the words of Bishop J.C. Ryle, with respect to the preachers of revival in "*desperately wicked*" Jeremiah 17:9 18th century England, see **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint:**

*“The spiritual reformers of the last century taught constantly **the sufficiency and supremacy of Holy Scripture**. The Bible, whole and unmutated, was their sole rule of faith and practice. They accepted all its statements without question or dispute. They knew nothing of any part of Scripture being uninspired. They never allowed that man has any “verifying faculty” within him, by which Scripture statements may be weighed, rejected or received. They never flinched from asserting that there can be no error in the Word of God; and that when we cannot understand or reconcile some part of its contents, the fault is in the interpreter and not in the text. In all their preaching they were eminently men of one book. To that book they were content to pin their faith, and by it to stand or fall. This was one grand characteristic of their preaching. They honoured, they loved, they revered the Bible.”*

Yet Dr DiVietro's statement is the same as that which he made on p 18 of his book, namely that the 1611 Authorized English Holy Bible is the words of God because it is an accurate translation of its Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek sources but it isn't the words of God because it isn't inspired, i.e. the 1611 Authorized English Holy Bible isn't "*all scripture...given by inspiration of God.*" (Or is it?)

In the words of Elijah in 1 Kings 18:21:

“And Elijah came unto all the people, and said, How long halt ye between two opinions? if the LORD be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him. And the people answered him not a word.”

The DBS Executive Committee will, however, give answer when they give account at "*the judgment seat of Christ*" Romans 14:10.

Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials – Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #7 is “Give one Bible verse that says to “understand,” “study,” “search,” “preach,” or “teach” the Bible involves using another language. It is a shame that David did not speak Hebrew*. In the Psalms he said five times, “Give me understanding.” David not only spoke Hebrew**, he wrote a part of the Hebrew text. Yet he said such things in Psalm 119:34, 73, 125, 144, 169 as, *Humouring the KJ Biblically-challenged. **Confirmation of the humouring.

““Give me understanding...

““give me understanding...

““give me understanding...

““give me understanding...

““give me understanding...

““***Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition? Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition.***” (Matthew 15:3, 6).”

Dr DiVietro evades the Lord’s question and rebuke in Matthew 15:3, 6 by pretending that they don’t apply to him. He then inserts 2 Timothy 2:15 and John 5:39 and uses these verses to justify the supposed necessity of accessing the original languages in order to understand the scriptures, *Cleaning-Up*, p 105.

2 Timothy 2:15 and John 5:39 say nothing about the need for a student to access the *original* languages in order to understand the scripture. Dr DiVietro is ‘flannelling’ – again.

Dr DiVietro then declares that the verses in Psalm 119 that Dr Mrs Riplinger quotes have to do with application of the scriptures, not translation of them. Dr Mrs Riplinger did not say otherwise. The essence of her challenge is to show *from scripture* that the student must understand the *original* languages for the necessary of clarification of what God *really* said.

Dr DiVietro is evading the challenge – again. See remarks in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**. However, he then claims, *Cleaning-Up* pp 105-108, to have answered the challenge by appealing to Nehemiah 8:8, Genesis 28:19, Judges 18:19, Matthew 1:23, Mark 5:41, 15:22, 34, John 1:38, 41, Acts 4:36, Hebrews 7:2.

None of these verses answers Dr Mrs Riplinger’s challenge. They actually show *the opposite* of what Dr DiVietro thinks they do and therefore reinforce Dr Mrs Riplinger’s challenge.

Dr DiVietro has alluded to Nehemiah 8:8 before. See **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint** for remarks on *Cleaning-Up* pp 74-75.

Nehemiah 8:8 states “***So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading.***”

Dr DiVietro insists that this verse answers Dr Mrs Riplinger’s challenge because it shows how Ezra and his associates read the Hebrew scriptures to the Israelites who were returned from exile and then explained the scriptures in a language (e.g. Aramaic) that the returnees could understand.

That isn’t what Dr Mrs Riplinger’s challenge said.

Challenge #7 asks for a verse that commands or requires a Bible believer to seek understanding of the scriptures *in a language other than the one he already has in “words easy to be understood”* 1 Corinthians 14:9. Nehemiah 8:8, by inspection, describes *the reverse* of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #7. Whether those that “***gave the sense***” translated from Hebrew

or expounded the Hebrew scriptures to their listeners or both, nowhere does Nehemiah 8 stipulate that any non-Hebrew speaking Jews present, or any non-Hebrew speaking Gentiles for that matter, were required to learn the ‘original’ Hebrew themselves. Once they had **“the law of God”** in their own language, no further input from the ‘original’ Hebrew was needed in order **“to understand the reading,”** according to Nehemiah 8.

Dr DiVietro has therefore failed to answer Challenge #7 by means of Nehemiah 8:8.

Dr Mrs Riplinger actually makes it easy for the reader to see that no such verse of scripture exists, because she alludes to Psalm 119:34, 73, 125, 144, 169, which show that David prays for understanding of the Hebrew scriptures, *even though he knew Hebrew*. David’s example gives the lie to Dr DiVietro’s notion that the Hebrew must be studied in order to get light on the English Text of the 1611 Holy Bible.

On the contrary, it is the 1611 Holy Bible *itself* that must be studied, 2 Timothy 2:15 as even Dr DiVietro is compelled to cite, see above, along with an attitude of prayer like David’s, as James expressed in James 1:5.

“If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him.”

Dr DiVietro then alludes to the other 10 verses listed above because they each contain a phrase or place name in one language that the writer then translates so that the reader can understand the original term or expression. Mark 5:41 is an example, where the Lord uses the Aramaic expression **“Talitha cumi.”** That expression is immediately followed by the clause **“which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, arise.”** That clause contains the translation and the explanation of the expression that the Lord used.

All 10 verses give a translation and/or explanation of a term or expression also contained in the verse that is stated in a language different from that which the inspired writer is using for his portion of the scriptures.

Along with Nehemiah 8:8, Dr DiVietro uses these 10 additional verses to assert that he has answered Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #7.

However, like Nehemiah 8:8, what these 10 additional verses set out is not what Dr Mrs Riplinger’s challenge said. They each set out an unknown or unfamiliar name or phrase in a language *foreign* to the reader *such that the writer provides the necessary explanation and/or translation in the very same verse in “words easy to be understood” by the reader.*

In other words, by inspection, these 10 verses, like Nehemiah 8:8 illustrate *the reverse* of what Challenge #7 requires *and actually reinforce Challenge #7 because none of the inspired writers of these 10 verses urges readers to return to the unknown languages mentioned in the verses to get deeper insights into the scriptures* that the readers already have in their own languages.* See remarks on Nehemiah 8:8 above.

*Dr DiVietro states on p 93 of *Cleaning-Up* that the student should go to ‘the Greek’ for a deeper understanding of or more light on the English text (no doubt still uninspired, *Cleaning-Up* pp 18, 88). He professes therefore, to have knowledge that the ordinary believer does not have access to, contrary once again to the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. And again Dr DiVietro fails to say exactly WHAT ‘the Greek’ is, or WHERE ‘the Greek’ can be obtained.

Dr DiVietro has therefore failed to answer Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #7 and in turn *all* her challenges. With respect to her 7 challenges, he is more ‘Way Out West’ than Laurel and Hardy¹⁶⁸.

Dr DiVietro continues, nevertheless, to assert the necessity of ‘the Greek’ and ‘the Hebrew’ in order to understand the words *“atonement”* and *“propitiation,”* *Cleaning-Up* pp 108-109. On this occasion, he lists the verses that contain the word *“propitiation”*; Romans 3:25, 1 John 2:2, 4:10, which he did not do when he mentioned the word *propitiate*, *Cleaning-Up* p 92. See remarks in **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**.

It should be noted immediately that, typically, Dr DiVietro has not here either stipulated or even referred to the actual source of ‘the Greek’ and ‘the Hebrew’ that he consults for the meanings of these words, apart from the Septuagint that he has earlier disavowed as an inaccurate translation of the Hebrew scriptures, *Cleaning-Up* pp 58-59. The reader is not helped, though, when on pp 88-90 of *Cleaning-Up* Dr DiVietro professes to deplore statements from the pulpit like *“in the Greek it says”* and *“what the Bible really says”* because, he insists, these statements cause the hearers to lose confidence in the inspired word of God and their own Bible, *neither of which he clearly defines*.

However, he is certain that God did not inspire the King James Bible and unequivocally says so on p 88 of *Cleaning-Up*. See also *Cleaning-Up* p 18. Dr DiVietro then says that the teacher must use the Greek and Hebrew languages (sources still undefined except as ‘lexicons’) to clear up ambiguities and apparently self-conflicting or paradoxical statements in the KJB, such that its grammar is sometimes difficult. He even has a sub-section of *Cleaning-Up* pp 90-91 that addresses what he terms the sometimes difficult KJB grammar (with respect to Romans 5:15, see **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**), which difficulties, he claims, can only be resolved by resorting to the Greek grammar of Romans 5:15. In this way, Dr DiVietro assures his readers, the Greek and Hebrew, when properly used, enable the teacher of the Scriptures (undefined) to get down to the level of his students and bring them up to his own level.

The teacher must, of course, according to Dr DiVietro, only refer sparingly to the Greek and Hebrew in order to prevent his students from getting the impression that they can’t understand the scriptures (undefined except as the now extant Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek text, though undefined between two covers) unless they learn Hebrew and Greek.

In short therefore, since Dr DiVietro has learned Hebrew and Greek, it is *he* who, when teaching his students, will therefore have *“caused them to understand the reading”* Nehemiah 8:8, say with respect to words like *“atonement”* and *“propitiation,”* according to him.

It is instructive that Dr DiVietro does not mention even one student, or class of students that requires this form of teaching because they supposedly found that the KJB was difficult, ambiguous or paradoxical.

Nor does Dr DiVietro remark on the fact that nowhere in Nehemiah 8 is anyone required to receive any more from the ‘original’ Hebrew once he has *“the law of God”* in his own language. It is *that* language e.g. possibly Aramaic, see remarks on the Lord’s reading of Luke 4:18-19 in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** that is then sufficient for understanding *“the sense”* of the scriptures in that language. ‘Original languages’ expositors/interpreters like Dr DiVietro are surplus to requirements.

It is clear from the above that Dr DiVietro has defied the priesthood of all believers yet again, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. He has also shown yet again, despite professions to the contrary that no-one *really* has *“the law of God”* unless he is sufficiently conversant with the now extant Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek text (uniquely inspired but location still unknown) to expound it to others who don’t know Hebrew/Aramaic and/or Greek.

This conclusion is evident from Dr DiVietro’s explanation of the words *“atonement”* and *“propitiation”* set out as follows.

He explains the full meaning of the word “*atonement*” as the blood that covered the sins of Israel and insists that this meaning cannot be determined without the aid of lexicons.

He forgot the simple, self-interpreting English meaning of the word, as found even in *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*.

The word “*atonement*” occurs but once in the New Testament, in Romans 5:11.

“And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement.”

“*The atonement*” is made possible through the blood of Christ shed for sin at Calvary to hold back God’s wrath John 3:36, as Romans 5:9 shows.

“Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.”

The meaning of the word “*atonement*” is found in the next verse, Romans 5:10.

“For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.”

“*Atonement*” in the New Testament means reconciliation to God, “*being now justified by his blood*” through the death of His Son, Jesus Christ, i.e.:

Atonement = At + One + Ment.

That is, reconciliation of the saved sinner to “*God our Saviour*” 1 Timothy 1:1 is achieved via justification through Christ’s blood according to Ephesians 2:13.

“But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.”

The above meaning and the meaning reconciliation, associated with propitiation, are both found in *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*. Both meanings are evident in the scripture. No lexicons are necessary. Moreover, the meanings they give, as Dr DiVietro has cited them, are inferior to the true scriptural meaning of “*atonement*.”

Lexicons are therefore not only unnecessary but a hindrance with respect to determining the meanings of Bible words and, as indicated earlier, a denial of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See remarks in **Challenges #5, #6, Point-Counterpoint**.

As indicated above, Dr DiVietro, *Cleaning-Up* pp 108-109, then resorts to the Septuagint (!) again to connect the word translated as “*propitiation*” in Romans 3:25, 1 John 2:2, 4:10 to its Hebrew root to show that this word is tied to the annual Yom Kippur sacrifice in the temple. He then extends that meaning to the Lord’s sacrifice for all sin at Calvary. Dr DiVietro therefore insists once again that lexicons are necessary to understand biblical words.

See comments about the corrupt Septuagint that Dr DiVietro commends in *Cleaning-Up* pp 58-59 in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.

As the study in **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** shows, see citation below, the scriptural definition of “*propitiation*” has no need of ‘the Greek,’ the Septuagint, the Hebrew roots or the annual temple sacrifices “*which can never take away sins*” Hebrews 10:11. The citation is as follows.

In sum, “The Saviour” and “the propitiation” are one and the same. He is “Jesus Christ the righteous” or “Jehovah is salvation” Matthew 1:21, Who is “the Messiah the Prince” Daniel 9:25 and “the Holy One” 1 John 2:20, anointed of the Holy Ghost Luke 3:22, 4:18...

The word “**propitiation**” may be understood in more detail by a study of what the Lord Jesus Christ did as “**the Saviour of the world.**”

As such, He is “**the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world**” John 1:29.

Therefore, as Paul states in 1 Corinthians 5:7 “**For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us.**”

Ephesians 5:2, Hebrews 7:26-27, 9:26, 1 Peter 1:18-19 are all important in the context of “**Christ our Passover,**” along with Genesis 8:21.

“**And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savour.**”

“**For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people’s: for this he did once, when he offered up himself.**”

“**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.**”

“**Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot” 1 Peter 1:18-19.**

“**And the LORD smelled a sweet savour; and the LORD said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man’s sake; for the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done.**”

The voluntary, sinless sacrifice “**which taketh away the sin of the world**” [John 1:29] of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself “**to God**” as “**a sweetsmelling savour**” [Ephesians 5:2] turned away God’s wrath as Noah’s sacrifice [Genesis 8:21] did after the flood, for anyone who believes that the Lord Jesus Christ is both “**the Saviour**” and “**saviour**” for him personally, John 3:36. This is “**propitiation.**”

Moreover, God’s forgiveness of sin did not begin, as Dr DiVietro perhaps inadvertently seems to imply, with the temple sacrifices. God had been forgiving sin *and sins* from Genesis 3, almost three millennia before the temple sacrifices began. See Dr Ruckman’s remarks in **Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to John 19:30.

In sum, Dr DiVietro’s lexical-LXX-based definition of the word “**propitiation**” is a poor substitute for the scriptural definition.

At this point, *Cleaning-Up* p 109, Dr DiVietro concludes his attempts to answer Dr Mrs Ripplinger’s challenges and turns his attention to sniping at Sister Ripplinger and her work by means of selected quotes from *Hazardous Materials*. These selected quotes, in excess of 200, and Dr DiVietro’s comments occupy approximately the next 170 pages of his book, before he hands over to his DBS Executive Committee colleagues and the book’s lengthy *Appendix, Cleaning-Up* pp 281-374. The appendix does not directly address Dr Mrs Ripplinger’s work except for a short piece, pp 307-309 by Dr David Cloud that will be answered when that part of this work is reached.

For now, this work will continue by addressing the criticisms that Dr DiVietro levels at the selected quotes from *Hazardous Materials* with which he concludes this chapter of *Cleaning-Up* pp 109-114. The quotes are taken from *Hazardous Materials* pp 1192-1193.

On these pages, just before issuing her 7 challenges, Dr Mrs Riplinger puts forward 5 possible reactions to her work from sceptics. It is with respect to these possible reactions that Dr DiVietro takes issue. The first is as follows.

“*Some of this is too dry to read and my flesh is too lazy to ‘work’ through it. It would be easier simply to call Dr. ‘so and so’ and see what he thinks.’ [If he has made his living using Greek lexicons, do not count on him to thoroughly read the material or to have a humble reaction to it if he does. He has too much to lose.]*”

In reply, Dr DiVietro states (in bold) that he has read *Hazardous Materials* a total of three times and is quite able to refute its contents as necessary. He insists (in capitals) that he has never corrected the KJB or suggested that anyone else do so. He emphatically denies that he has been either lazy or careless in his approach to *Hazardous Materials* and accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of setting forth these 5 possible reactions to her work in an attempt to head off any valid refutation of it.

Dr DiVietro didn’t read Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement cited above too carefully. He reproduced “lose” as “lose.” However, he states that he read *Hazardous Materials* three times. It appears that he accomplished this commendable feat in three days, *Cleaning-Up* p 10, or possibly nine days if he meant each reading occupied three days. Yet he describes the size of *Hazardous Materials* as overwhelming, *Cleaning-Up* p 31, with considerable repetition and small print for documentation at the end of quotes from other works making for a difficult read. Dr DiVietro’s statements with respect to his reading of *Hazardous Materials* do not therefore seem entirely consistent to this author. In any event, however thoroughly, or otherwise, Dr DiVietro read *Hazardous Materials*, he failed to provide a single satisfactory answer to any of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s 7 challenges, as this work has shown.

Dr DiVietro’s claim that he has never corrected the KJB is a blatant lie.

He was not 5 pages into his part of *Cleaning-Up* before he changed “**given by inspiration of God**” 2 Timothy 3:16 into “*God-breathed*” on the basis of ‘the Greek,’ *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3.

He went on repeatedly to elevate Hebrew and Greek sources over the 1611 English Holy Bible on pp 32, 69 and 94-95 of *Cleaning-Up* in order, supposedly, to ‘clarify’ its ambiguities and confusing grammar. Regardless of Dr DiVietro’s assertion to the contrary, his manner of ‘clarification’ amounts to a supplanting or changing of the KJB by the KDB – Kirk DiVietro ‘Bible.’ See remarks on *oinos* (“**wine**”) and *baptizo* (“**baptize**”) and on John 11:33 in **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’, Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint, Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint, Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint.**

See also **Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint** for comments on Dr DiVietro’s supposed 5 additional ‘improvements’ injected into the KJB by means of ‘the Greek’ with respect to John 19:30, the word “**sins,**” the words for “**trespass**” and “**transgression**” in Romans 5:12-15, the word “**confess**” in 1 John 1:9 and the Greek grammar for 2 John 9-10.

Each of these examples is an attempt on Dr DiVietro’s part to impose a supposedly superior rendering of a KJB word or expression from an outside source, which amounts to correction or at least alteration by Dr DiVietro (via ‘the Greek’) of what he perceives as an inferior KJB reading *in English*, however he seeks to mask his misdeeds against the 1611 Holy Bible with euphemisms like ‘clarification,’ Dr DiVietro is at least *changing* the English Text of the 1611 Holy Bible by means of his Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek conjectures even though he professes with reference to *The Defined King James Bible, Cleaning-Up* p 91 that the 1611 Holy Bible should not be either replaced or retranslated. By means of ‘the Greek’ etc., Dr DiVietro is doing both. See remarks above on his alteration of “**given by inspiration of God**” 2 Timothy

3:16 into “*God-breathed*” on the basis of ‘the Greek,’ *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3 and associated comments.

It should be re-emphasized that Dr DiVietro has, of course, also repeatedly denied the Biblical doctrine of the priesthood of all believers 1 Peter 2:5, 9 by means of his 8 examples listed above. See remarks at the end of **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**, in **Challenges #5, #6, Point-Counterpoint** and above with respect to Dr DiVietro’s reference to Nehemiah 8:8.

The second possible reaction to *Hazardous Materials* that Dr Mrs Riplinger sets out is as follows, her emphases.

*“I am a solid fundamental Christian, therefore I could not be wrong about **anything**; God wouldn’t give **this** author this information **before** giving it to me.’ [Maybe it was given to this disabled author, with a heart for ‘helps,’ because you were rightly busy doing important things which this author cannot do.]”*

Dr DiVietro protests in response to the above statement that he has often had to adjust his beliefs, teaching and practice in the light of scripture, though it should be observed that he does not define what ‘the scripture’ is in this response. He then accuses Sister Riplinger of violating 1 Timothy 2:12 because he insists that as a woman, she has no business (in capital letters) correcting pastors and teachers. Dr DiVietro is further indignant with Dr Mrs Riplinger because, in his view, she has taken it upon herself to speak for God and the Bible.

Continuing his tirade against Sister Riplinger, he lists his own chronic disabilities and declares that, unlike Sister Riplinger, he does not believe that his particular infirmities enhance his spiritual understanding in any way. Dr DiVietro is apparently outraged that Sister Riplinger has in the above statement accused him personally of pride and indolence simply because he disagrees with *Hazardous Materials*. In bold text, he totally rejects Sister Riplinger’s statement on her disability and accuses her again of being a false teacher without understanding of what she purports to teach, thereby preventing the next generation of ministerial graduates from understanding what God ‘really’ said and therefore doing permanent damage through *Hazardous Materials* to the ‘true’ revelation of God’s words*.

*These appear to be the inspired Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text now extant but undisclosed between two covers. See again *Cleaning-Up* p 88.

By inspection of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement above, nothing is said about speaking for God, correcting pastors and teachers, setting herself up as an authority over pastors and teachers, implying that physical disability enhances spiritual understanding or specifically accusing Dr DiVietro of anything.

Moreover, Dr DiVietro gives no evidence of any ministerial students, graduates, churches or institutions that have been hindered from understanding the scriptures either through *Hazardous Materials* or any of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s other works. Nor does he identify any pastor, teacher, church, institution or individual believer who has been irreparably damaged by *Hazardous Materials* or any of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s other works.

Nehemiah 6:8 provides the scriptural response to Dr DiVietro’s above diatribe against Sister Riplinger.

“Then I sent unto him, saying, There are no such things done as thou sayest, but thou feignest them out of thine own heart.”

The above verse applies particularly to Dr DiVietro because in his outburst against Sister Riplinger, he has overlooked the significance of the little word “‘helps’” in her statement,

even though he quotes it in his emboldened denunciation of her and her work. Paul explains the significance of the word “*helps*” in 1 Corinthians 12:28.

“And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger is not setting herself up in authority over “*pastors and teachers*” Ephesians 4:11 or seeking to teach and ‘correct’ them. She is carrying out a scriptural function of providing them with “*helps*.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger describes her manifold purposes in writing *Hazardous Materials* on pp 43ff. One of those purposes is, p 47, this author’s emphasis “*To alert pastors, parents, pupils about*” the dangers inherent in the contents of currently available Greek and Hebrew sources. “*To alert*” another person or group about perceived danger cannot by any stretch of the imagination be construed as exalting one’s self in authority over them, much less purporting to speak for God.

No way, therefore, could Dr DiVietro have accused Sister Riplinger of violating 1 Timothy 2:12 if he had been willing to “***Provide things honest in the sight of all men***” Romans 12:17 in his reading of *Hazardous Materials* pp 43ff.

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s third statement of a possible reaction to *Hazardous Materials* is as follows.

“I must quickly skim for some small error to prove this wrong. I couldn’t have been wrong all these years. I must find something somewhere in the book to show that I know something that this author does not seem to know.” [This may be a test of your humility. “Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God...” (1 Peter 5:6).]”

Dr DiVietro’s response is that he has found almost every page of *Hazardous Materials* to be replete with errors, including errors of judgement and citation, statements that either mislead or don’t follow logically from each other or are simply *ad hominem* attacks. He demands that it is Sister Riplinger who should obey 1 Peter 5:6, because, in Dr DiVietro’s opinion, her books will bind a whole generation of ministerial students in total ignorance of the word of God.

It is instructive that in this response, Dr DiVietro fails to mention even one of the multitudes of errors that he claims to have identified on almost every page of *Hazardous Materials*. He will make more detailed comments in this respect in the next chapter of *Cleaning-Up* but given the level of his vehemence against Sister Riplinger, he should have paid his readers the courtesy of providing at least some examples to back up his vitriolic criticism of her work at this point.

This author’s considered opinion, after having worked through Dr DiVietro’s supposed answers to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s 7 challenges, is that he has failed to locate even one significant error in *Hazardous Materials* on the potential dangers of currently available Greek and Hebrew study materials with respect to studying the Bible, 2 Timothy 2:15. Readers may judge for themselves from the preceding pages of this work.

It is noteworthy that once again, Dr DiVietro has failed to identify even one ministerial student who is ignorant of what God ‘really’ said as a result of reading *Hazardous Materials* or any of Sister Riplinger’s books. Nor does Dr DiVietro specifically explain how at present a whole generation of ministerial students are being *bound in ignorance* of the word of God (undefined again) by Dr Mrs Riplinger’s books.

Again, Nehemiah 6:8 applies to Dr DiVietro's petulance against Sister Riplinger, along with Proverbs 26:2.

"As the bird by wandering, as the swallow by flying, so the curse causeless shall not come."

Dr Mrs Riplinger's fourth statement with which Dr DiVietro takes umbrage is as follows, her emphasis.

*"What will so-and-so think? Will this put me "without the camp" or denomination I currently follow?' [Maybe God has plans for **you** to help them]."*

Acting once again as though the statement was aimed directly at him, Dr DiVietro protests that he is loyal only the Word of God and the God of the Word. He does not here specify what the Word of God is but if he means **"all scripture...given by inspiration of God"** it should be noted that he has once again incorrectly used the term Word, which refers in scripture to the Lord Jesus Christ John 1:1, 2, 14 instead of word, which refers to the scriptures, as the Lord made clear in John 10:35.

"If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken;"

See also remarks in the previous section on Dr DiVietro's Example 5 and 1 John 1:9 on the terms **"Word"** and **"word."**

In answer to this part of Dr DiVietro's protest, it would appear to this author that Dr DiVietro's loyalty certainly extends to the DBS Executive Committee conclave with which he has closed ranks against Dr Mrs Riplinger. His profession of loyalty is somewhat misleading, therefore.

Dr DiVietro continues his protest by quoting (from the KJB, not 'the Hebrew/Aramaic,' as though the KJB could, in Dr DiVietro's view, almost be the 'inspired word of God' on this occasion) Psalm 1:1, Hosea 4:6, Amos 8:11.

He intimates that these verses prove that Dr Mrs Riplinger's work is causing **"a famine...of hearing the words of the LORD,"** a misinterpretation of Psalm 1:1 and the starvation of 'people' (undefined) who, through Dr Mrs Riplinger's works, are being kept in ignorance of the words of God (undefined).

Yet again, Dr DiVietro has substantiated nothing. He could at least pay his readers the courtesy of stating where Dr Mrs Riplinger's work has resulted in a misinterpretation of Psalm 1:1 but he does not state where she even mentions the verse in any of her books.

Again, as with all his responses to Dr Mrs Riplinger's statements in this chapter, Dr DiVietro fails to specify any instances of any individuals, churches or other institutions that have been starved of the words of God (still undefined by Dr DiVietro in this part of his book) and kept in ignorance of them by means of anything in any of Dr Mrs Riplinger's books.

Instead, with his fixation with 'the Greek' etc., it is Dr DiVietro who could be charged with the very same offence of which he accuses Sister Riplinger, as Dr Miles Smith describes in *THE EPISTLE DEDICATORY to the 1611 Holy Bible*. Note the under-linings by this author. **"Popish persons"** are not necessary all members of the Church of Rome and **"self-conceited Brethren"** did not necessarily all die out in the 17th century.

"So that if, on the one side, we shall be traduced by Popish Persons at home or abroad, who therefore will malign us, because we are poor Instruments to make GOD'S holy Truth to be yet more and more known unto the people, whom they desire still to keep in ignorance and darkness; [i.e. supposedly through ignorance of 'the Greek'] or if, on the other side, we shall

be maligned by self-conceited Brethren, who run their own ways, and give liking unto nothing, but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their Anvil; [like Dr DiVietro's grotesque distortion of John 11:33, by means of 'the Greek'] we may rest secure, supported within by truth and innocency of a good conscience, having walked the ways of simplicity and integrity, as before the Lord; and sustained without by the powerful protection of Your Majesty's grace and favour, which will ever give countenance to honest and Christian endeavours against bitter censures and uncharitable imputations [like A WARNING!! and Cleaning-Up]."

As indicated, thus far in this chapter, Dr DiVietro has produced *nothing* to substantiate his calumny against Dr Mrs Riplinger's approach to the scriptures or its consequences with respect to any member or part of the Body of Christ. ("**The words of the LORD**," it should be noted, are herein defined as the successive editions of the 1611 Holy Bible refined as its Author has seen fit from 1611 to the present day.)

The same goes for all the preceding chapters of *Cleaning-Up*.

Sister Riplinger should therefore, in this author's view, "*rest secure, supported within by truth and innocency of a good conscience...and sustained without by the powerful protection of "the King of kings, and Lord of lords"*" 1 Timothy 6:15.

Dr Mrs Riplinger's fifth and final statement of a possible reaction to *Hazardous Materials* that upsets Dr DiVietro is as follows.

"I don't believe that Greek and Hebrew study is wrong (although I have not read this book, documenting its problems, nor can I refute it). [“He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him” (Prov. 18:13)]."

Dr DiVietro is appalled at the above statement, which he declares to be the height of arrogance. He complains that Dr Mrs Riplinger is accusing anyone who disagrees with *Hazardous Materials* on an informed basis of not having intelligently considered its contents. He further insists that *Hazardous Materials* is totally in error about Greek and Hebrew study aids.

In this author's considered view, Dr DiVietro has not produced any evidence at all to show that *Hazardous Materials* is in error in any way about Greek and Hebrew study aids in the last 113 pages of his book. Readers of this work may judge for themselves.

Dr DiVietro admits that some authors no doubt taught error because they were either not Christians or of dubious moral character or both. However, he defends the use of currently available Greek and Hebrew study aids on the basis of the familiar don't-throw-the-baby-out-with-the-bathwater argument, except that his analogy is with respect to edible versus poisonous mushrooms. Select the good parts out of the lexicons and leave the bad parts, Dr DiVietro urges, like one would choose edible mushrooms and leave the bad ones.

Dr DiVietro gives no indication of how such a selection is to be made. Perhaps the student seeking to make such a selection is meant to be referred to the DBS Executive Committee for wisdom on how to make an informed choice.

As was noted back in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**, with respect to Job's comment to his three dogmatic friends in Job 12:2:

"No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you."

See, however, **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** and **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to the serious distortion of Biblical words by modern lexical authors such as Danker, *Hazardous Materials* Chapter 16, who weakens the pivotal Biblical word "**grace**"

into the secular term “generosity.” If an analogy is drawn with Dr DiVietro’s baby-bathwater illustrations, a more appropriate example with respect to lexicons would be that of the A380 Airbus. The Australian airline QANTAS grounded *all* its Airbuses after one of them suffered a midair explosion¹⁶⁹ of an engine.

In this author’s view the QANTAS Airbus incident and its aftermath is much more pertinent to the dangers of current Greek/Hebrew study aids as explained by Sister Riplinger than merely picking mushrooms.

Dr DiVietro has also gone against scripture in endorsing the work of ungodly men with respect to determining the meanings of Biblical words, in addition to flouting once again the principle of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9.

“This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach;” 1 Timothy 3:1-2.

“Likewise must the deacons be grave, not doubletongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre; Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience” 1 Timothy 3:8-9.

“For a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God; not selfwilled, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre; But a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate; Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers” Titus 1:7-9.

Observing the qualifications of those who “*ought to be teachers*” Hebrews 5:12, how can ungodly lexical editors be fitted to provide study aids for teaching “*the words of God*” John 3:34 (defined in this work as the words of the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible)?

Answer: they can’t.

As was noted in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint:**

“Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one” Job 14:4.

Dr DiVietro may object that supposed Bible study aids compiled by ungodly men are still useful because Adoniram Judson learned the Burmese language from unsaved natives and David Brainard used a drunken interpreter for his Gospel ministry to the Delaware Indians, *Cleaning-Up* pp 42-43.

However, God also used “*the dumb ass speaking with man’s voice*” 2 Peter 2:16. That does not mean that donkeys, drunks and unsaved heathen should become either Bible teachers or Bible study aid resource generators.

Dr DiVietro concludes this chapter, *Cleaning-Up* pp 113-114, by gainsaying Dr Mrs Riplinger’s analysis of Acts 2, to be found, although Dr DiVietro does not say so, in the greatest detail in Chapters 17, 18 of *In Awe of Thy Word, The Sounds of the First English Bibles and Acts 2 to You: From the Gothic Bible to the KJV*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in support of her analysis, *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 621-624 that the Christian Goths most likely first received their Bible early in the 2nd century. Ulfilas, ‘the little wolf’ and Bishop to the Goths, compiled his 4th century Gothic Bible from “*“a comparatively pure Byzantine text in the New Testament...[and it] is so extraordinarily faithful to the Greek.”*” She states, her emphasis that “*Philostorgius said Ulfilas’ “grandparents were Christians,” converts of those “dwellers in...Cappadocia” which received the gift of “other*

tongues” heard in Acts 2:9. His grandparents were the direct converts of the “strangers scattered throughout...Cappadocia” spoken of by Peter (1 Peter 1:1). These Cappadocians were the “hearers of Peter’s first sermon, and its Christian residents among the readers of his first epistle.””

Dr Mrs Riplinger states further, her emphases that “*The Goths “migrated into Scythia” and became part of the “Barbarian, Scythian,” people mentioned in Paul’s letter to the Colossians (3:11). “At this time [150 A.D.] a vast number of Goths were Christians, their conversion having been effected by those whom they had carried into captivity.”*”

Dr Mrs Riplinger states, *In Awe of Thy Word*, p 628 that “*The following charts document the faithful preservation of the word of God. It was given to the Goths in the book of Acts and “endureth to all generations” (Ps. 100:5). Its sounds and words are often still evident in the King James Bible...*”

Dr Mrs Riplinger then lists the following 37 verses to show this preservation; Ephesians 3:14, 1 Corinthians 16:22, Romans 16:24, 1 Timothy 2:7, Philippians 4:13, Romans 14:10-12, 1 Corinthians 5:4, 2 Thessalonians 1:12, 1 Corinthians 9:1, 2 Thessalonians 1:8, Galatians 4:7, 1 Thessalonians 3:13, 1 Corinthians 5:5, Matthew 8:29, 1 Corinthians 15:47, 2 Corinthians 4:10, 2 Timothy 4:1, Galatians 6:17, Luke 2:33, Matthew 5:22, Romans 9:28, 1 Corinthians 11:24, Colossians 2:11, 1 Corinthians 5:7b, Ephesians 2:1, Matthew 5:44, Ephesians 4:6, Colossians 3:22, 2 Corinthians 10:4, Colossians 2:18, 23, Romans 8:1, Ephesians 5:5, Luke 16:23, Colossians 3:6. She concludes, *In Awe of Thy Word* p 648, her emphases, “*The Gothic language not only often sounded like English, sometimes it even looked just like it, because it used Roman letters, as well as Greek and Runic. These words ‘Name’ and ‘AMEN,’* 𐌺𐌰𐌹𐌿 𐌰𐌺𐌹𐌺 *were taken directly from the Lord’s Prayer in an ancient Gothic manuscript.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger follows with another 20+ New Testament verse examples revealing the likeness in both sound and appearance between the Gothic, 7th-century Anglo-Saxon, Pre-1611 Bibles i.e. Wycliffe, Tyndale, Bishops’, Geneva and the AV1611. Her citations in Chapter 17 shows that the lineage for the 1611 Holy Bible does indeed go back to Acts 2 via the Bible of the Goths and their association with Bishop Ulfilas and in turn the Cappadocian believers who received the words of God “*in our own tongue, wherein we were born*” Acts 2:8.

Who is Dr DiVietro to dismiss Sister Riplinger’s thesis in Chapters 17, 18 of *In Awe of Thy Word, The Sounds of the First English Bibles* and *Acts 2 to You: From the Gothic Bible to the KJV* out of hand when he hasn’t even had the decency to comment on it intelligently in this part of his book or to document his objections?

Though harsh, Proverbs 26:16 does apply to Dr DiVietro at this point.

“The sluggard is wiser in his own conceit than seven men that can render a reason.”

The reason is that Dr DiVietro does not specifically analyse Dr Mrs Riplinger’s material. He simply denies it and states, using ‘the Greek’ in 1 Corinthians 13:8 for the expression “*shall cease*” that the gift of tongues was a temporary speaking gift as a sign to Israel warning the nation that it risked missing out on God’s will “*when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord*” Acts 3:19, although Dr DiVietro does not cite this verse explicitly.

Dr DiVietro insists that in no way can the tongues of Acts 2 be taken as a means of producing inspired written translations of scripture in non-Hebrew languages. He is therefore flatly denying the historical links that Dr Mrs Riplinger has established between the early Cappado-

cian believers, the Gothic Bible and the 1611 Holy Bible. See also **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to the New Testament sets of Old Testament citations in Acts 2:16-21/Joel 2:28-32, Acts 3:22-23/Deuteronomy 18:15, 19, Acts 2:25-28/Psalm 16:8-11, Acts 8:32-33/Isaiah 53:7-8 and note again that in Acts 5:28, “*the high priest*” Acts 5:27 declared “*behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine.*” Acts 2:5 states “*And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven.*” These visitors were “*dwelling at Jerusalem,*” not simply paying a flying visit and these men received “*the apostles’ doctrine*” that must have included “*the word of the Lord*” Acts 2:42, 8:25 – as also 2 Timothy 3:16 indicates, “*all scripture is...profitable for doctrine.*” The scriptural indication from inspection of the 11 verses that Dr DiVietro lists in answer to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #7 is that each of them received it “*in his own language...every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born*” Acts 2:6, 8 i.e. *inspired* translations of at least portions of “*the word of the Lord.*” These translations were clearly preserved in written forms e.g. Gothic as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in *In Awe of Thy Word* Chapters 17, 18 that eventually became complete *inspired* Bibles. Equally clearly, Acts 2 was the starting point.

Dr DiVietro is simply in dogmatic denial.

He cannot, of course, say otherwise. His book, *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-iv, 2-3 is emphatic that no translation is or ever can be ‘inspired’ (except of course in the unscriptural, two-tier fashion of the DBS Executive Committee. See **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** and *Cleaning-Up* pp 3-6) but its thesis remains an unproven assumption. See also **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** for the testimony of Wycliffe with respect to inspired *written* translations of the scriptures from Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek.

The answer to Dr DiVietro’s denial of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s analysis of Acts 2 is first that Dr DiVietro’s explanation of Acts 2 does not in any way *preclude* Dr Mrs Riplinger’s analysis. Observe, for example, how Paul makes spiritual application of Hosea 2:23 to the Gentiles in Romans 9:24-25, whereas Hosea 2:23 strictly applies to the faithful remnant of Israel at the Second Advent¹⁷⁰.

“Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles? As he saith also in Osee, I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved.”

Like Hosea 2:23, Acts 2 can therefore have more than one application and Dr DiVietro is limiting God by asserting otherwise. Psalm 78:41 describes his attitude.

“Yea, they turned back and tempted God, and limited the Holy One of Israel.”

Even though the gift of tongues was temporary, it appears to have lasted long enough for multiple translations of at least certain portions of scripture e.g. Acts 2:16-21/Joel 2:28-32, Acts 3:22-23/Deuteronomy 18:15, 19, Acts 2:25-28/Psalm 16:8-11, Acts 8:32-33/Isaiah 53:7-8 to be progressed, as Dr Mrs Riplinger’s analysis of Acts 2 shows. See remarks above. See also **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** for the list of written scriptures that could have been available for translation in the 1st century.

Further, more detailed answers to Dr DiVietro’s denial of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s analysis of Acts 2 in this work may be found in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**. Note this statement from Point 11 of the analysis of key portions of Old Testament scripture cited in the New Testament with respect to inspired written translations of scripture in non-Hebrew languages.

The key portions of scripture referred to are those listed above; Acts 2:16-21/Joel 2:28-32, Acts 2:25-28/Psalm 16:8-11, Acts 3:22-23/Deuteronomy 18:15, 19, Acts 8:32-33/Isaiah 53:7-8.

Given that God can inspire Gentile kings to send written edicts to their subjects **“according to the language of every people”** Esther 1:20, 22, the possibility certainly exists that God could enable these key portions of Old Testament scripture to be written in the languages of **“every nation under heaven,”** including Ethiopic, for the edification of His subjects, insofar as **“the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men”** Daniel 4:17. If this happened, they would have to be inspired scripture if they were to sustain new converts like the Ethiopian eunuch, 1 Peter 2:2 and they appear to have been inspired directly from Peter’s quotations in Acts 2, **“after the manner that holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost”** 2 Peter (!) 1:21, Acts 2:4, not obtained by direct translation of extant Hebrew scriptures, although this means was no doubt used subsequently for other parts of the Old Testament. See remarks on the scholar Helvidius below and Point 12, which immediately follows. God is not limited by the ‘mono-inspiration’ dogma of the DBS Executive Committee, as Jeremiah indicates in Jeremiah 32:17 **“Ah Lord God!...there is nothing too hard for thee.”** In addition, as indicated above, **“the word of God is not bound”** 2 Timothy 2:9. The Lord is free to edit and even re-inspire His own work¹⁷¹, again regardless of the DBS Executive Committee but He nevertheless used rigid Jewish scribal tradition to His own advantage. See the next point.

The key portions of scripture listed and the accompanying comments speak overwhelmingly in favour of New Testament evidence for written inspired translations of **“the holy scriptures”** 2 Timothy 3:15 in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek. The following extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** should also be noted with respect to such translations.

With respect to Acts 2 as the instigation of the preaching of the Gospel in multiple languages, note Acts 2:4, mentioned above under Point 11.

“And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.”

All that Peter and the apostles speak in the rest of Acts 2 e.g. “his word” Acts 2:41, in whatever language, have to be “the words of God” John 3:34, according to 2 Samuel 23:2.

“The Spirit of the LORD spake by me, and his word was in my tongue.”

Unless Dr DiVietro can prove from scripture that the words of “The Spirit of the LORD” in Acts 2 are somehow only man’s words if not in Hebrew/Aramaic and/or Greek, then the words spoken in all the languages listed in Acts 2:9-11 are “the words of God” that declare “the wonderful works of God” Acts 2:11 and are “given by inspiration of God.” Up to this point in Cleaning-Up, he has not done so.

Dr DiVietro has still failed to prove otherwise. He has not even addressed the above evidence in his book, let alone refuted it. See also the testimony of Bishop J.C. Ryle at the end of the previous section with respect to the 18th century English Reformers concerning the 1611 Holy Bible. *“They knew nothing of any part of Scripture being uninspired”* – meaning the 1611 Holy Bible in English, not Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek. It is not surprising, therefore that the DBS Executive Committee has not brought in any kind of Reformation.

In sum, for Challenge #7:

1. The essence of Challenge #7 is to show *according to scripture* that the student must understand the original languages in order to gain a deeper understanding of what God *really* said. Dr DiVietro claims to have answered the challenge by appealing to Nehemiah 8:8, Genesis 28:19, Judges 18:19, Matthew 1:23, Mark 5:41, 15:22, 34, John 1:38, 41, Acts 4:36, Hebrews 7:2. However, these verses do not answer Challenge #7. They actually show the opposite of Challenge #7.

Challenge #7 asks for a verse that commands a Bible believer to seek understanding of the scriptures *in a language other than the one he already has in “words easy to be understood”* 1 Corinthians 14:9. Nehemiah 8:8, by inspection, describes *the reverse* of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #7.

Dr DiVietro has therefore failed to answer Challenge #7 by means of Nehemiah 8:8.

Like Nehemiah 8:8, the 10 additional verses that Dr DiVietro lists do not set out what Dr Mrs Riplinger’s challenge said. They each set out an unknown or unfamiliar name or phrase in a language foreign to the reader *such that the writer provides the necessary explanation and/or translation in the very same verse in “words easy to be understood” by the reader*. Dr DiVietro’s attempts to misuse these verses in order to dragoon the Bible believer back to unfamiliar tongues of which he has no need continue to constitute the denial of the priesthood of all believers on Dr DiVietro’s part, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. Moreover, these verses do *not* require a reader to return to any scriptures in earlier languages that are unknown to him.

Dr DiVietro has therefore failed to answer Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #7 and in turn *all* her challenges. See **Challenges #1-#7 – Overview** that follows this section.

2. Dr DiVietro continues, nevertheless, to assert the necessity of ‘the Greek’ and ‘the Hebrew’ in order to understand the words *“atonement”* and *“propitiation,”* *Cleaning-Up* pp 108-109. On this occasion, he lists the verses that contain the word *“propitiation”*; Romans 3:25, 1 John 2:2, 4:10.

It should be noted immediately that, typically, Dr DiVietro has not here either stipulated or even referred to the actual source of ‘the Greek’ and ‘the Hebrew’ that he consults for the meanings of these words, apart from the Septuagint that he has earlier disavowed as an inaccurate translation of the Hebrew scriptures, *Cleaning-Up* pp 58-59.

The teacher of scripture must, of course, according to Dr DiVietro, only refer sparingly to the Greek and Hebrew in order to prevent his students from getting the impression that they can’t understand the scriptures (undefined except as the now extant Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek text, though undefined between two covers) unless they learn Hebrew and Greek.

It is instructive that Dr DiVietro does not mention even one student, or class of students that requires this form of teaching because they found that the KJB was difficult, ambiguous or paradoxical, as Dr DiVietro states that the KJB sometimes is, *Cleaning-Up* pp 90-91.

However, It is clear from the above that Dr DiVietro has defied the priesthood of all believers yet again, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. He has also shown yet again, despite professions to the contrary that no-one *really* has *“the law of God”* Nehemiah 8:8 unless he is sufficiently conversant with the now extant Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek text (uniquely in-

spired but location still unknown) to expound it to others who don't know Hebrew/Aramaic or Greek.

Dr DiVietro goes on to explain the full meaning of the word **“atonement”** as the blood that covered the sins of Israel and insists that this meaning cannot be determined without the aid of lexicons.

He forgot the simple, self-interpreting English meaning of the word, as found even in *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*.

The word **“atonement”** occurs once in the New Testament, in Romans 5:11.

“And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement.”

“The atonement” is made possible through the blood of Christ shed for sin at Calvary to hold back God's wrath John 3:36, as Romans 5:9 shows.

“Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.”

The meaning of the word **“atonement”** is found in the next verse, Romans 5:10.

“For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.”

“Atonement” in the New Testament means reconciliation to God, **“being now justified by his blood”** through the death of His Son, Jesus Christ, i.e.:

Atonement = At + One + Ment.

The above meaning and the meaning reconciliation are both found in *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*. Both meanings are evident in the scripture. No lexicon is necessary.

Dr DiVietro, *Cleaning-Up* pp 108-109, then resorts to the Septuagint (!) again to connect the word translated as **“propitiation”** in Romans 3:25, 1 John 2:2, 4:10 to its Hebrew root to show that this word is tied to the annual Yom Kippur sacrifice in the temple. He then extends that meaning to the Lord's sacrifice for all sin at Calvary. Dr DiVietro therefore insists once again that lexicons are necessary to understand biblical words.

As the study in **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** shows, see citation below, the scriptural definition of **“propitiation”** has no need of ‘the Greek,’ the Septuagint, the Hebrew roots or the annual temple sacrifices **“which can never take away sins”** Hebrews 10:11. The citation, in sum, is as follows.

In sum, “The Saviour” and “the propitiation” are one and the same. He is “Jesus Christ the righteous” or “Jehovah is salvation” Matthew 1:21, Who is “the Messiah the Prince” Daniel 9:25 and “the Holy One” 1 John 2:20, anointed of the Holy Ghost Luke 3:22, 4:18...

The voluntary, sinless sacrifice “which taketh away the sin of the world” [John 1:29] of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself “to God” as “a sweet-smelling savour” [Ephesians 5:2] turned away God's wrath as Noah's sacrifice [Genesis 8:21] did after the flood, for anyone who believes that the Lord Jesus Christ is both “the Saviour” and “savour” for him personally, John 3:36. This is “propitiation.”

Moreover, God's forgiveness of sin did not begin, as Dr DiVietro perhaps inadvertently seems to imply, with the temple sacrifices. God had been forgiving sin *and sins*

from Genesis 3, almost three millennia before the temple sacrifices began. See Dr Ruckman's remarks in **Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to John 19:30.

In sum, Dr DiVietro's lexical-LXX-based definition of the word "*propitiation*" is a poor substitute for the scriptural definition.

3. Dr DiVietro now takes up the first 5 of 200+ selected quotes from *Hazardous Materials* that he uses as a basis for his on-going attacks against Sister Riplinger and her work. These attacks occupy the next 170 pages of *Cleaning-Up*. The first 5 quotes are taken from pp 1192-1193 of *Hazardous Materials*, in which Dr Mrs Riplinger sets out possible reactions to the book by its critics.
4. The first quote is with respect to the critic who says "*It would be easier simply to call Dr. 'so and so' and see what he thinks.*" In response, Dr DiVietro states that he has read carefully through *Hazardous Materials* three times and can refute its contents. He maintains that he has never resorted to anyone's opinion in order to 'correct' the KJB and has never done so himself.

Up to and including this chapter on Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #7, Dr DiVietro has refuted nothing in *Hazardous Materials* that addresses current Greek and Hebrew supposed Bible study aids. Readers may judge for themselves from this work.

Dr DiVietro's claim that he has never corrected the KJB is a blatant lie.

He was not 5 pages into his part of *Cleaning-Up* before he changed "*given by inspiration of God*" 2 Timothy 3:16 into "*God-breathed*" on the basis of 'the Greek,' *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3.

He went on repeatedly to elevate Hebrew and Greek sources over the 1611 English Holy Bible on pp 32, 69 and 94-95 of *Cleaning-Up* in order, supposedly, to 'clarify' its ambiguities and confusing grammar. Regardless of Dr DiVietro's assertion to the contrary, his manner of 'clarification' amounts to a supplanting and changing of the KJB by the KDB – Kirk DiVietro 'Bible.' See remarks on *oinos* ("*wine*") and *baptizo* ("*baptize*") and on John 11:33 in **Setting Up the 'Clean-Up', Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint, Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint, Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**.

Dr DiVietro went on to concoct another 5 supposed 'improvements' in the KJB by means of 'the Greek' with respect to John 19:30, the word "*sins*," the words for "*trespass*" and "*transgression*" in Romans 5:12-15, the word "*confess*" in 1 John 1:9 and the Greek grammar for 2 John 9-10.

Each of these examples is an attempt to impose a supposedly superior rendering of a KJB word or expression from an outside source, which amounts to correction by Dr DiVietro (via 'the Greek') of what he perceives as an inferior KJB reading *in English*, however he seeks to mask his misdeeds against the 1611 Holy Bible with euphemisms like 'clarification.' All 8 of these examples constitute a denial of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See remarks at the end of **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint, in Challenges #5, #6, Point-Counterpoint** and above with respect to Dr DiVietro's reference to Nehemiah 8:8.

5. The second quote is with respect to the critic who thinks "*I am a solid fundamental Christian, therefore I could not be wrong about anything; God wouldn't give this author this information before giving it to me.*" Dr Mrs Riplinger adds that it was pos-

sibly her disability which gave her the time to provide “*helps*” for pastors and teachers, in the form of her books.

Dr DiVietro in response accuses Sister Riplinger of violating 1 Timothy 2:12 because he insists that as a woman, she has no business (in capital letters) correcting pastors and teachers. Dr DiVietro is further indignant with Dr Mrs Riplinger because, in his view, she has taken it upon herself to speak for God and the Bible.

Dr DiVietro then lists his own chronic disabilities and declares that, unlike Sister Riplinger, he does not believe that his particular infirmities enhance his spiritual understanding in any way. Dr DiVietro is apparently outraged that Sister Riplinger has in the above statement accused him personally of pride and indolence simply because he disagrees with *Hazardous Materials*. In bold text, he totally rejects Sister Riplinger’s statement on her disability and accuses her again of being a false teacher without understanding of what she purports to teach, thereby preventing the next generation of ministerial graduates from understanding what God ‘really’ said and therefore doing permanent damage through *Hazardous Materials* to the ‘true’ revelation of God’s words*. *These appear to be the inspired Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text now extant but undisclosed between two covers. See again *Cleaning-Up* p 88.

By inspection of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement, nothing is said about speaking for God, correcting pastors and teachers, setting herself up as an authority over pastors and teachers, implying that physical disability enhances spiritual understanding or specifically accusing Dr DiVietro of anything.

Moreover, Dr DiVietro gives no evidence of any ministerial students, graduates or institutions that have been hindered from understanding the scriptures either through *Hazardous Materials* or any of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s other works. Nor does he identify any pastor, teacher, church, institution or individual believer who has been irreparably damaged by *Hazardous Materials* or any of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s other works.

Nehemiah 6:8 provides the scriptural response to Dr DiVietro’s above diatribe against Sister Riplinger.

“Then I sent unto him, saying, There are no such things done as thou sayest, but thou feignest them out of thine own heart.”

In his outburst against Sister Riplinger, Dr DiVietro overlooked the significance of the little word “*helps*” in her statement, even though he quotes it in his emboldened denunciation of her and her work. Paul explains the significance of the word “*helps*” in 1 Corinthians 12:28.

“And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger is not setting herself up in authority over “*pastors and teachers*” Ephesians 4:11 or seeking to teach and ‘correct’ them. She is carrying out a scriptural function of providing them with “*helps*.” No way could Dr DiVietro have accused Sister Riplinger of violating 1 Timothy 2:12 if he had been willing to “***Provide things honest in the sight of all men***” Romans 12:17 in his reading of *Hazardous Materials* pp 43ff, with respect the author’s purpose in writing the book. Her purpose was in part “*To alert pastors, parents, pupils about*” the dangers inherent in the contents of currently available Greek and Hebrew sources.

“*To alert*” another person or group about perceived danger cannot by any stretch of the imagination be construed as exalting oneself in authority over them, much less purporting to speak for God.

6. The third quote is with respect to the critic who says “*I must quickly skim for some small error to prove this wrong. I couldn’t have been wrong all these years.*”

Dr DiVietro’s response is that he has found almost every page of *Hazardous Materials* to be replete with errors. He demands that it is Sister Riplinger who should obey 1 Peter 5:6, because, in Dr DiVietro’s opinion, her books will bind a whole generation of ministerial students in total ignorance of the word of God.

It is instructive that in this response, Dr DiVietro fails to mention even one of the multitudes of errors that he claims to have identified on almost every page of *Hazardous Materials*. Given the level of his vehemence against Sister Riplinger, he should have paid his readers the courtesy of providing at least some examples to back up his vitriolic criticism of her work at this point.

This author’s considered opinion, after having worked through Dr DiVietro’s supposed answers to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s 7 challenges, is that he has failed to locate even one significant error in *Hazardous Materials* on the potential dangers of currently available Greek and Hebrew study materials with respect to studying the Bible, 2 Timothy 2:15. Again, readers may judge for themselves from the preceding pages of this work.

It is noteworthy that once again, Dr DiVietro has failed to identify even one ministerial student who is ignorant of what God ‘really’ said as a result of reading *Hazardous Materials* or any of Sister Riplinger’s books, let alone a whole generation of students.

7. The fourth quote is with respect to the critic who says “*What will so-and-so think? Will this put me “without the camp” or denomination I currently follow?*”

Dr DiVietro protests that he is loyal only the Word of God and the God of the Word. He does not here specify what the Word of God is but if he means “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God*” it should be noted that he has incorrectly used the term Word, which refers in scripture to the Lord Jesus Christ John 1:1, 2, 14 instead of word, which refers to the scriptures, as the Lord made clear in John 10:35.

“If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken;”

In answer to this part of Dr DiVietro’s protest, it would appear to this author that Dr DiVietro’s loyalty certainly extends to the DBS Executive Committee conclave with which he has closed ranks against Dr Mrs Riplinger. His profession of loyalty is somewhat misleading, therefore.

Dr DiVietro continues his protest by quoting (from the KJB, not ‘the Hebrew/Aramaic,’ as though the KJB could, in Dr DiVietro’s view, almost be the ‘inspired word of God’ on this occasion) Psalm 1:1, Hosea 4:6, Amos 8:11.

He intimates that these verses prove that Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work is causing “*a famine...of hearing the words of the LORD,*” a misinterpretation of Psalm 1:1 and the starvation of ‘people’ (undefined) who, through Dr Mrs Riplinger’s works, are being kept in ignorance of the words of God (undefined).

Again, as with all his responses to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statements in this chapter, Dr DiVietro fails to specify any instances of any individuals, churches or other institu-

tions that have been starved of the words of God (still undefined by Dr DiVietro in this part of his book) and kept in ignorance of them by means of anything in any of Dr Mrs Riplinger's books. Nor does he mention anyone who misinterpreted Psalm 1:1 through reading Dr Mrs Riplinger's books.

As indicated, thus far in this chapter, Dr DiVietro has produced *nothing* to substantiate his calumny against Dr Mrs Riplinger's approach to the scriptures or its consequences with respect to any member of the Body of Christ. ("***The words of the LORD***," it should be noted, are herein defined as the successive editions of the 1611 Holy Bible refined as its Author has seen fit from 1611 to the present day.)

8. The fifth and final quote is with respect to the critic who says "*I don't believe that Greek and Hebrew study is wrong (although I have not read this book, documenting its problems, nor can I refute it).*"

Dr DiVietro is appalled at the above statement, which he declares to be the height of arrogance. He complains that Dr Mrs Riplinger is accusing anyone who disagrees with *Hazardous Materials* on an informed basis of not having intelligently considered its contents. He further insists that *Hazardous Materials* is totally in error about Greek and Hebrew study aids.

In this author's considered view, Dr DiVietro has not produced any evidence at all to show that *Hazardous Materials* is in error in any way about Greek and Hebrew study aids up to this point in his book. Again, readers of this work may judge for themselves.

Dr DiVietro then defends the use of currently available Greek and Hebrew study aids on the basis of the familiar don't-throw-the-baby-out-with-the-bathwater argument, except that his analogy is with respect to edible versus poisonous mushrooms. Select the good parts out of the lexicons and leave the bad parts, Dr DiVietro urges, like one would choose edible mushrooms and leave the bad ones.

See, however, **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** and **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to the serious distortion of Biblical words by modern lexical authors such as Danker, *Hazardous Materials* Chapter 16, who weakens the pivotal Biblical word "***grace***" into the secular term "***generosity***." If an analogy is drawn with Dr DiVietro's baby-bathwater illustrations, a more appropriate example with respect to lexicons would be that of the A380 Airbus. The Australian airline QANTAS grounded *all* its Airbuses after one of them suffered a midair explosion of an engine.

In this author's view the QANTAS Airbus incident and its aftermath is much more pertinent to the dangers of current Greek/Hebrew study aids as explained by Sister Riplinger than merely picking mushrooms.

Dr DiVietro has also gone against scripture in endorsing the work of ungodly men with respect to determining the meanings of Biblical words, in addition to flouting once again the principle of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. 1 Timothy 3:1-9 and Titus 1:7-9 give the qualifications of the men who are to be entrusted with teaching God's words. How, then, can ungodly lexical editors be fitted to provide study aids for teaching "***the words of God***" John 3:34 (defined here as the words of the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible)?

They can't, as was noted in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**:

"Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one" Job 14:4.

9. Dr DiVietro concludes this chapter, *Cleaning-Up* pp 113-114, by gainsaying Dr Mrs Riplinger's analysis of Acts 2, to be found, although Dr DiVietro does not say so, in greatest detail in Chapters 17, 18 of *In Awe of Thy Word, The Sounds of the First English Bibles* and *Acts 2 to You: From the Gothic Bible to the KJV*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states in support of her analysis, *In Awe of Thy Word*, p 628 that "The following charts document the faithful preservation of the word of God. It was given to the Goths in the book of Acts and "endureth to all generations" (Ps. 100:5). Its sounds and words are often still evident in the King James Bible..."

These charts contain approximately 60 examples of New Testament verses in Chapters 17, 18 of *In Awe of Thy Word* revealing the likeness in both sound and appearance between the Gothic Bible and the 1611 Holy Bible. Dr Mrs Riplinger's historical citations in Chapter 17 shows that the lineage for the 1611 Holy Bible does indeed go back to Acts 2 via the Bible of the Goths and their association with Bishop Ulfilas and in turn the Cappadocian believers who received the words of God "**in our own tongue, wherein we were born**" Acts 2:8.

Yet Dr DiVietro insists that in no way can the tongues of Acts 2 be taken as a means of producing inspired written translations of scripture in non-Hebrew languages. He is therefore flatly denying the historical links that Dr Mrs Riplinger has established between the early Cappadocian believers, the Gothic Bible and the 1611 Holy Bible. The scriptural indication from inspection of the 11 verses that Dr DiVietro lists in answer to Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #7 is that each of the believers in Acts 2 received "**the word of the Lord**" Acts 8:25 "**in his own language...every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born**" Acts 2:6, 8 i.e. *inspired* translations of at least portions of "*the word of the Lord.*" These translations were clearly preserved in written forms e.g. Gothic as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in *In Awe of Thy Word* Chapters 17, 18 that eventually became complete *inspired* Bibles. Equally clearly, Acts 2 was the starting point.

Dr DiVietro is simply in dogmatic denial.

He cannot, of course, say otherwise. His book, *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-iv, 2-3 is emphatic that no translation is or ever can be 'inspired' (except of course in the unscriptural, two-tier fashion of the DBS Executive Committee. See **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** and *Cleaning-Up* pp 3-6) – as if translation of the scriptures was a barrier to inspiration of the translation for a God for whom nothing is impossible, Luke 1:37.

The answer to Dr DiVietro's denial of Dr Mrs Riplinger's analysis of Acts 2 is first that Dr DiVietro's explanation of Acts 2 does not in any way *preclude* Dr Mrs Riplinger's analysis. Observe, for example, how Paul makes spiritual application of Hosea 2:23 to the Gentiles in Romans 9:24-25, whereas Hosea 2:23 strictly applies to the faithful remnant of Israel at the Second Advent.

"Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles? As he saith also in Osee, I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved."

Like Hosea 2:23, Acts 2 can therefore have more than one application and Dr DiVietro is limiting God by asserting otherwise. Psalm 78:41 describes his attitude.

"Yea, they turned back and tempted God, and limited the Holy One of Israel."

Further, more detailed answers to Dr DiVietro's denial of Dr Mrs Riplinger's analysis of Acts 2 may be found in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**. This extract should be noted.

With respect to Acts 2 as the instigation of the preaching of the Gospel in multiple languages, note Acts 2:4...

“And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.”

All that Peter and the apostles speak in the rest of Acts 2 e.g. “his word” Acts 2:41, in whatever language, have to be “the words of God” John 3:34, according to 2 Samuel 23:2.

“The Spirit of the LORD spake by me, and his word was in my tongue.”

*Unless Dr DiVietro can prove from scripture that the words of “**The Spirit of the LORD**” in Acts 2 are somehow only man's words if not in Hebrew/Aramaic and/or Greek, then the words spoken in all the languages listed in Acts 2:9-11 are “**the words of God**” that declare “**the wonderful works of God**” Acts 2:11 and are “**given by inspiration of God.**” Up to this point in *Cleaning-Up*, he has not done so.”*

Dr DiVietro has still failed to show that the words of Acts 2:9-11 are anything less than “**given by inspiration of God**” according to Dr Mrs Riplinger's thesis in Chapters 17, 18 of *In Awe of Thy Word, The Sounds of the First English Bibles and Acts 2 to You: From the Gothic Bible to the KJV*.

Dr DiVietro hasn't up to this point in his book even seriously addressed the material contained therein. His manifold failure in this respect will be made more evident in the following section, **Challenges #1-#7 – Overview**.

Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials – Challenges #1-#7 – Overview

This overview will begin with summary statements from the preliminary chapters of *Cleaning-Up*, as follows:

Preface and Introduction

In sum, it may be observed from Dr DiVietro's ***Preface and Introduction*** that:

1. Drs Waite, Williams and DiVietro each deny that the AV1611 is ***“all scripture...given by inspiration of God.”***
2. They base their denial on Dr Waite's exposition of *“theopneustos”* and therefore insist that no translation can truly be the inspired word of God. They forget that the King's men, arguably the foremost Greek expositors of all time, came up with a different reading for *“theopneustos”* that God has honoured in the 1611 English Holy Bible for 400 years and which *does* allow for the freshest KJB copy right off the printing press to be truly the inspired word of God.
3. Dr Williams then inconsistently claims that the words of God, from the 'original' scriptures, can then be translated into the languages of the world. However, they can't be if by translation these words then lose the quality of inspiration.
4. Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of believing in 're-inspiration,' namely that God could 'inspire' 'new' scriptures at any time. However, Dr Mrs Riplinger's own statements from *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 560ff show that this accusation is baseless.
5. Dr DiVietro then displays further inconsistency in that he states that the AV1611 is a perfect translation, such that any revisions that later editions underwent, even though printers' errors had to be corrected, were minor and can be ignored. Yet he later uses these minor revisions as supposed evidence to prove that the AV1611 cannot possibly be inspired.
6. This work has therefore already revealed significant inconsistencies in Dr DiVietro's book.

Setting Up the 'Clean-Up'

In sum, it may be observed from Dr DiVietro's **Setting Up the 'Clean-Up'**:

1. Dr DiVietro has identified two main themes of *Hazardous Materials*, which he perceives as heresies, namely that the 1611 English Holy Bible is ***“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”*** and that contemporary Bible study aids, i.e. dictionaries, lexicons and interlinear testaments do not enable the student to understand the scriptures.
2. Dr DiVietro has overlooked the AV Publications catalogue, where several such aids are listed, even though Dr Mrs Riplinger would advise caution in the use of these aids.
3. *Hazardous Materials* strongly warns against using these aids to 'correct' or 'improve' the AV1611. This warning is vindicated by Dr DiVietro's use of 'the Greek' with respect to his expositions of *oinos* (***“wine”***), *baptizo* (***“baptize”***) and John 11:33, by which he reached erroneous conclusions.
4. Dr DiVietro contradicts himself in this chapter by asserting first that the AV1611 is not ***“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”*** but then on the same page stating that wherever the correct Hebrew and Greek texts are accurately translated, the reader has the very words of God, which of course he can't have if translation has prevented these words from being inspired. But just as a Catholic priest can 'explain' how the wafer at the mass *is* Christ though it *isn't*, the Nicolaitan priests of the DBS Executive

Committee appear able to assert that the 1611 English Holy Bible *is* the word of God though to them it simultaneously *isn't*.

5. The DBS stance, therefore, as revealed once again by Dr DiVietro in this chapter, is that *no-one* has **“the words of God”** Numbers 24:4 (N.B. first mention of the expression) unless the DBS Executive Committee condescends to reveal it *through the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek ‘originals,’* the pure, finally authoritative contemporary sources of which are, apparently, known only to the august members of the DBS Executive Committee. This attitude is totally opposed to scripture. Balaam speaks **“the words of God”** (first mention, Numbers 24:4) i.e. that which God speaks and can be heard, Numbers 23:5, 18, throughout Numbers 22-24, in a language *that cannot have been either Hebrew/Aramaic or Greek,* especially insofar as Balaam, *who is not an Israelite* exhorts Balak, *who is a Moabite,* to **“Rise up, Balak, and hear.”** It also follows that wherever God, Balaam or Balak speak in Numbers 22-24, the Hebrew ‘original’ *must itself have been an inspired translation, even though the DBS insists, Cleaning-Up, p 2 that no such work has ever existed.*
6. Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of stating that the King James translators did not translate their work but only purified earlier Anglo-Germanic bibles. Inspection of her book *In Awe of Thy Word* shows that they both translated their original language sources and refined the texts of those translations that preceded their work, such as the Bishops’ Bible.

Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint

In sum, for Challenge #1:

1. This author would cite Green’s Hebrew/English interlinear and Nestle’s 21st and Ricker Berry’s Greek/English interlinears in answer to the challenge. However, it should always be remembered that *“the TR,”* i.e. Scrivener’s and Ricker Berry’s editions, actually departs from the 1611 English Holy Bible in numerous verses, e.g. Mark 13:37, 14:43, Luke 23:34, 46, John 12:26, 18:1, Acts 2:22, 13:15, 24:25, 26:6, Romans 7:6, Ephesians 3:1, Philippians 2:5, 2:21, Revelation 13:10, 18:23, where critical texts, e.g. Nestle’s, actually *agree* with the AV1611. No published Greek (or Hebrew) text can *ever*, therefore, be taken as an authority over the words of the 1611 English Holy Bible.
2. Although he lists several Greek New Testament editions, Dr DiVietro *does not state unequivocally anywhere in his response to Challenge #1 which definitive* Hebrew or Greek source that he would use if he were to refer to *“the Hebrew”* or *“the Greek.”* He has therefore evaded Challenge #1.
3. Dr DiVietro asserts that where extant Greek and/or Hebrew texts agree, then these passages are the pure, inspired word of God. Yet he then states that the discrepancies must be resolved by ‘back translation’ from the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible. That is, man’s words determine God’s words, a wholly unscriptural attitude, according to Amos 4:13, **“For, lo, he that formeth the mountains, and createth the wind, and declareth unto man what is his thought, that maketh the morning darkness, and treadeth upon the high places of the earth, The LORD, The God of hosts, is his name.”**
4. Regrettably for Dr DiVietro, if he used the KJB to resolve discrepancies in the Greek editions, he would have to alter all such printed editions in Mark 2:15, because Dr Mrs Riplinger has shown that all omit the first **“Jesus”** in the verse. So Dr DiVietro’s

position of inspiration-by-majority-Greek-rule plus the KJB as necessary is not a safe one. He would do better to drop the first part of that stipulation.

5. Nevertheless, it is apparent once again from Dr DiVietro's comments in his response to Challenge #1 that, as with Dr Waite, *the* Greek text (or Hebrew/Aramaic text) exists only in his mind, or in the collective consciousness of the Burgonists of The DBS Executive Committee. See this author's remarks in the **Introduction** to this work.
6. Dr DiVietro claims, pp 22-23 of *Cleaning-Up* that Dr Mrs Riplinger believes that vernacular translations were inspired separately from translation. However, Dr Mrs Riplinger's citation of Hoskier and others shows that vernacular translations, e.g. Latin, Syriac, etc., followed very quickly from the Greek originals so that they were virtually concurrent with them. This accusation of Dr DiVietro's is therefore false.
7. Dr DiVietro then accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of being one of only a recent few who believe that the 1611 English Holy Bible is the pure word of God. That Dr DiVietro has lied in this respect is proven by Dr Mrs Riplinger's citations of the Bible translators of the Reformation, including the martyred Archbishop Cranmer who believed that "*the Great Bible...was "given" by the "holy spirit."*" This author has also documented in his response to Dr Waite's *A WARNING!!* several outstanding servants of God from history, including Whitefield and Wesley, who believed in the inspiration of the 1611 English Holy Bible. Their testimonies invalidate this accusation of Dr DiVietro's against Dr Mrs Riplinger.
8. Dr DiVietro then accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of trying to cut students off from 'the Greek' (and the Hebrew/Aramaic) by means of her insistence that the AV1611 was inspired of God independently of any original language sources. God *did* inspire the AV1611, in a manner spiritually equivalent to God's 'inspiration' of Adam, Genesis 2:7 but the fact that A.V. Publications lists Greek and Hebrew sources for purchase, along with analyses of important passages of scripture by means of manuscript evidence shows that Dr DiVietro has once again falsely accused Sister Riplinger.
9. Dr DiVietro continues to insist that the study of Greek and Hebrew is necessary to 'clarify' the 1611 English Holy Bible and to clear up any confusion and/or ambiguities in certain passages. As has been shown, see remarks immediately preceding the summary section for Challenge #1, Dr DiVietro has signally failed to do this for the examples he cited on pp 94-95 of *Cleaning-Up*.

Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint

In sum, for Challenge #2:

1. Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of *ad hominem* attacks against lexicon editors like James Strong but ignores the evidence that Dr Mrs Riplinger provides in Chapter 7 of *Hazardous Materials* of Strong's corrupt lexical definitions for essential Bible words such as "**Godhead,**" "**charity,**" "**heresy,**" "**hell,**" "**devils,**" and "**Lucifer.**"
2. Dr DiVietro ridicules Dr Mrs Riplinger's application of Bible numerics to 1 John 5:7, *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1182-1184. However, he fails to mention that she is citing the work of Periander A. Esplana, a Christian from Camarines Norte, Philippines. He has written two extensive works, entitled *The Bible Formula* and *The Mathematical Perfection of the King James Bible*. If Dr DiVietro wishes to take issue with Dr Mrs Riplinger's use of Periander Esplana's work, then he must refute both of Mr Esplana's books. Dr DiVietro has so far failed to do so.

3. Dr DiVietro repeats his accusation of *ad hominem* arguments against Dr Mrs Riplinger with respect to her comments on lexicon editors such as Liddell, Trench, Moulton and Thayer. Once again, see point 1 above, he has ignored the substance of her comments, where, for example, Dr Mrs Riplinger shows that where the AV1611 has the term **“Godhead”** in Acts 17:29, Romans 1:20 and Colossians 2:9, Thayer’s Unitarian influence on the ASV led to the substitution of the weaker word *“divinity”* in Romans 1:20. Thayer’s ungodly influence persists in later translations, e.g. with respect to alteration of the term **“Godhead”** in Acts 17:29, Romans 1:20, Colossians 2:9 by the NIV, TNIV, HCSB (all 3 references), NKJV (Acts 17:29).
4. Dr DiVietro castigates Dr Mrs Riplinger for emphasising the use of the 1611 English Holy Bible to define its own words. He forgot Wycliffe’s exhortation, which states that *“In Holy Scripture is all truth; one part of Scripture explains another”* and similar exhortations from other prominent Bible translators of the 16th century such as Tyndale and Coverdale.
5. Dr DiVietro insists that in spite of ungodly word meanings contained in lexicons compiled by unsaved individuals, the correct Biblical meanings may still be gleaned by means of the right heart attitude. He has failed to appreciate Luke 8:15, which shows that *only the word heard and kept* has made or can make the heart honest and good. Given the availability of the pure heart-cleanser, John 15:3, **“Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you,”** the use of lexicons is rendered unnecessary and even counter-productive.
6. Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of prejudice against Gerhard Kittel because he was a Nazi war criminal but he fails to comment on *New Age Versions*, Chapter 42, which documents numerous examples of Kittel’s anti-Semitism that has influenced modern editors, e.g. Acts 23:12, 26:17 in the NASV, NIV, HCSB.
7. Dr DiVietro criticizes Dr Mrs Riplinger for her warning about lexicons based on the corrupt texts of Westcott and Hort, Nestle-Aland and the UBS, United Bible Society. See *Hazardous Materials*, p 70. She gives the example of Revelation 15:3, where these lexicons will give the words for *“ages”* or *“nations”* that should be in Revelation 15:3 according to ‘the Greek’ instead of **“saints”** as in the AV1611. Dr DiVietro states that this example is invalid because the student would simply consult *Strong’s Concordance* and get the correct word because Strong’s numbers are based on the King James vocabulary. Dr DiVietro is naive, however, to suppose that students will necessarily receive God-given guidance with respect to use of *lexicons*. Many exponents of ‘the Greek’ will readily change **“saints”** to *“ages”* or *“nations”* in Revelation 15:3 and the all-pervasive nature of their false teaching is reflected in new bibles such as the NIV, TNIV and HCSB.
8. Dr DiVietro repeatedly accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of distorting the facts about the sources she identifies for word definitions found in lexicons, which include corrupt bible versions. Dr DiVietro insists that such versions are only used for ‘version-specific’ lexicons, not general lexicons. However, the one example that he cites, from Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work, is Newman’s, which has the title *A Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament*. Any ordinary student would take this title to mean a general lexicon, not one that is ‘version specific,’ so Dr DiVietro’s accusation against Dr Mrs Riplinger is, to say the least, both discourteous and uncalled-for.
9. Dr DiVietro is, however, later forced to admit that one source for general lexical word definitions is in fact early secular authors or heretical church writers such as Josephus,

Philo, Clement and Origen. He nevertheless defends these early writers by insisting that their works, including the notorious Septuagint, LXX, of which Origen was a major contributor, give invaluable insight into the meanings of New Testament words. Dr DiVietro fails to substantiate this astounding claim and has ignored Dr Mrs Riplinger's comments on Origen in *Hazardous Materials*, pp 93-94. As Psalm 94:11 states, which Dr DiVietro also ignored, ***"The LORD knoweth the thoughts of man, that they are vanity."***

10. Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of compounding her *ad hominem* attacks on lexical editors by her criticisms of Liddell and Scott. He tries to justify their efforts by stating that their lexicon has of necessity been repeatedly revised but he fails to notice Dr Mrs Riplinger's citation of the distinguished scholar Chadwick on p 85 of *Hazardous Materials*, who insists that Liddell and Scott's lexicon is desperately in need of "a thorough overhaul." So what use is Liddell and Scott's lexicon to the Bible student of today? Dr DiVietro does not specify. Yet it would appear that he would still have the student immerse himself in "crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks," from which came the Liddell-Scott definitions, in order to learn the scriptures via 'the Greek.' See *Hazardous Materials*, p 90.
11. Dr DiVietro insists, therefore that God took words from these ungodly sources and imparted Biblical meanings to them. He fails to substantiate this outrageous claim, even though he admits that Koine Greek is a dead language and forgets that God's use of heathen Greek writers is limited to a mere six words in the New Testament, cited by the Apostle Paul. ***"For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring"*** Acts 17:28. This total will rise to a mere 15 words if the Cretian statement of Titus 1:12 is included, ***"One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies."***
12. Dr DiVietro then claims that KJB words are the same as those found in Shakespeare and therefore Shakespeare should be studied to help find the meanings of KJB words. This is not true, as explained to this author many years ago by the then Editorial Manager of the Trinitarian Bible Society in London. ***"The Authorised Version - following its predecessors, including Tyndale - was written in the common language of its time, although in a literary rather than colloquial style. It was not written in "the classical language of Shakespeare". The literary style used by the translators is what has enabled the Authorised Version to stand the test of time. It must also be remembered that the edition of the Authorised Version which is used today is the 1769 revision, which is indeed closer to us than it is to Shakespeare."***
13. On the last page of this chapter of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro finally admits that Dr Mrs Riplinger's application of 1 Corinthians 2:13, ***"comparing spiritual things with spiritual,"*** will enable the student to determine meanings of words in the KJB (!) but he insists that this application will not enable a Bible translation to be carried out.

In answer, Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals the opposite in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 456ff, a most profound and uplifting revelation that Dr DiVietro fails to address.

"Jesus Christ, "the Word" and even "the ending" letter (Rev. 1:8) speaks and spells words in similar ways to the Greek, English, German, French, Italian, and Hebrew (Yiddish). The KJV is the only English Bible that speaks and spells like all of these language groups. Wise missionaries love the KJV...

“The KJV is international English and is God’s bridge to reach a world now clamouring to learn English.”

That would be a far better way forward than floundering in a 3rd century lexical philosophical Alexandrian Greek swamp.

Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint

In sum, for Challenge #3:

1. Dr DiVietro has evaded Challenge #3 by likening it to asking for a verse where the Lord Jesus Christ explicitly says *“I am God”* or verses that explicitly use the words *Trinity* or *Rapture*. In this way, Dr DiVietro attempts to associate Dr Mrs Riplinger with unsaved, even malicious Bible critics like Jehovah’s Witnesses and Muslims. This is after accusing her repeatedly of *ad hominem* attacks. His excuses are invalid because the Lord Jesus Christ reveals His Deity plainly in John 8:58, 59.
2. Inserting quotes from pp 233, 719, 90, 101, 81-82 in turn of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr DiVietro continues to attack Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work. It should be noted that Dr DiVietro fails to provide one single example of relevant lexical use to counter any of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statements that he has cited in this part of his book. It is straightforward, therefore, to summarise freely what appears to be Dr DiVietro’s stance on the application of contemporary secular Koine Greek word usage to determine Greek New Testament word meanings, as follows.
3. Dr DiVietro maintains that Hebrew and Greek are earthly languages that God created specifically to write the Bible (in the original text) using everyday terms. He denies that Bible words are special words with meanings that cannot be deduced from contemporary secular writings but only from the scriptures themselves. Dr DiVietro has overlooked the scriptural reference, Acts 24:16 that strongly implies the heavenly nature of Biblical Hebrew, even though Dr DiVietro has declared it to be a dead language, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 7, 16. Hebrew would not appear to be dead in heaven. It is this author’s considered view that *“the king’s word”* 2 Samuel 24:4 in the form of the 1611 English Holy Bible is not dead there either and never will be, Matthew 24:35, because it is *“the book”* Revelation 3:5, 5:2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13:8, 17:8, 20:12, 15, 22:19 of the End Times.
4. Dr DiVietro does not specifically challenge the quote from pp 233, 719 in *Hazardous Materials*, author’s emphases *“a Greek lexicon, which held up Plato and the Greek myths as **the** source for meaning and truth, **higher** than the Holy Bible, could not help but place Greek philosophy on a pedestal shadowing the Bible itself.”* It appears that he would therefore hold Plato and the Greek myths as found in the lexicons above the Holy Bible.
5. Dr DiVietro does not specifically challenge the quote from p 90 in *Hazardous Materials*, *“all Bible study tools, new Bible versions, and lexicon authors gathered [their] word meanings crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks.”* It appears that he would therefore approve of such Bible study aids.
6. Dr DiVietro does not specifically challenge the quote from p 101 in *Hazardous Materials*, *“The English definitions and translation choices in lexicons are highly secularized, that is, “they are the words which men’s wisdom teacheth,” not those special separate from sinners words which God instilled early in the English Bible.”* It appears that he would therefore approve of such secularized definitions.

7. Citing pp 81-82 of *Hazardous Materials*, which includes the statement, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphasis, "*Danker admits there are hazards in semantic [word] transference from one language to another,*" Dr DiVietro says that Dr Mrs Riplinger insists that a lexicographer work directly from one of the original languages i.e. Hebrew/Aramaic and/or Greek to English without any intermediate stage e.g. German. Dr DiVietro assures his readers that a Greek-English dictionary obtained via a German intermediary translation is still a satisfactory Bible study aid and declares that the very hazards that Dr Mrs Riplinger mentions prove the need for lexicons to give correct Greek-English equivalents.

However, Dr DiVietro failed to mention Dr Mrs Riplinger's reference on p 82 of *Hazardous Materials* to Chapter 42 of *New Age Versions* that documents the ungodly word meanings from German sources, e.g. Gerhard Kittel, "*Adolph Hitler's propaganda high priest, promoting the genocide of the Jews during World War II,*" Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphasis, which have influenced numerous new bibles; NIV, TNIV, NKJV, HCSB etc. e.g. with respect to Acts 23:12, 26:17. Kittel's insinuations against the Jewish people would have contributed in no small way to the furnaces of Auschwitz and the other extermination camps in mainly Catholic Poland during WW2.

8. On p 74 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro claims to have answered Challenge #3 by means of Nehemiah 8:8. "*So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading.*" Dr DiVietro says that Ezra and his associates verbally translated the Hebrew scriptures as they were read out into Aramaic for the Aramaic-speaking audience from the captivity and thereby carried out the function of a 'good' lexicon, to give the meanings of the words from the original languages. However, as Nehemiah 8:9 shows, any translated words from the Hebrew scriptures are still "*the words of the law*" and that law is "*the law of God.*" Nothing in Nehemiah 8 refers to manmade word meanings being set out in authority *above* the Holy Bible of that time, "*the law of God.*" Moreover, any word meanings being given at the time were clearly drawn directly from "*the law of God*" according to Nehemiah 8:8 and *not* from familiar, everyday non-Biblical usage in the way that Dr DiVietro describes in *Cleaning-Up*, p 73.
9. On pp 75-76 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of absurdity because she insists that readers must choose between the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible and lexicons. He fails to document his accusation but repeats the dogma that a 'good' lexicon (here unspecified by Dr DiVietro) will enable the student to understand the KJB by showing how its words were used in the worldly environment of the 17th century. Again, Dr DiVietro fails to provide any examples to back up this claim.
10. On pp 76-77 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of not understanding how to use a lexicon and of being shallow in believing that the 1611 English Holy Bible defines its own terms. He inserts a quote from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1195-1196 in which Dr Mrs Riplinger states in part, her emphasis that "*Greek and Hebrew study tools...elevate the English words in lexicons by unsaved liberals above the English words in our Holy Bible, demote the words of the Holy Bible...establish an elevated priest-class of a few Greek and Hebrew scholars and [incite] a rebellious anarchism in the pews, where everyman's own interpretation, taken from stacks of software, supersedes that in the Holy Bible...*"

Dr DiVietro does not directly challenge that statement. It would appear, therefore that he approves of the manner in which "*Greek and Hebrew study tools...elevate the English words in lexicons by unsaved liberals above the English words in our Holy Bi-*

ble” and “an elevated priest-class of a few Greek and Hebrew scholars” who “[in-cite] a rebellious anarchism in the pews, where *everyman’s* own interpretation, taken from stacks of software, supersedes that in the Holy Bible...”

Moreover, he makes no comment about the Bible-believing martyrs that Dr Mrs Riplinger mentions – and documents; Ralph Allerton, John Cavel, Thomas Cranmer, John Philpot, Richard Wilmot, Reginald Peacock, John Hooper, John Bradford and many more. Of them, Dr Mrs Riplinger states “*The martyrs throughout history loved the word of God and actually died rather than re-define it.*”

Perhaps Dr DiVietro felt that these martyrs were too ‘shallow’ to be worthy of comment.

11. Dr DiVietro states that Dr Mrs Riplinger is entirely wrong to equate interpretation with translation in Genesis 40:8 because Joseph was simply giving Pharaoh the meaning of the dreams he had described. He didn’t read the relevant part of the verse very carefully. It said “***Do not interpretations belong to God?***” not “*Do not interpretations of dreams belong to God?*”

All “interpretations” belong to God, whether “***understanding in all visions and dreams***” Daniel 1:17 or languages.

Dr DiVietro is grossly in error both with respect to his self-imposed limitation on the application of the scriptural term “***interpretation***” and his condemnation of Sister Riplinger.

12. Dr DiVietro then dismisses the letter meanings summarised in the Appendix of *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 1114ff as Cabalistic mysticism. He has clearly not read the Appendix very thoroughly, because Dr Mrs Riplinger distinguishes between authentic and bogus research into letter meanings.

“*Be careful to limit your study to that of verifiable science; avoid mystical New Age information that counterfeits the truth of God (e.g. Kabbalah)...*”

It is Dr DiVietro’s responsibility to address Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warning about New Age counterfeits of letter meanings. He must also show that the academic disciplines that she has listed with respect to letter meanings are *themselves* New Age or Cabalistic counterfeits before he can accuse Dr Mrs Riplinger of cabalism, just as he must refute the work of Periander A. Esplana on Bible numerics before he take issue with her on this subject as well. See **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.

13. Dr DiVietro’s parting shot at Dr Mrs Riplinger in this chapter, p 80 of *Cleaning-Up*, is to liken her warnings about lexical meanings from unregenerate editors using ungodly sources to a warning about cars being evil because they are assembled by, in many cases, unsaved sinners.

Ironically, Dr DiVietro’s allusion to use of cars as an example of use of lexicons is in direct conflict with his criticism on the page immediately preceding this allusion of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s description of letter meanings. On p 79 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of being Cabalistic because *some* use is made of letter meanings for propagating New Age or Cabalistic doctrine. On the very next page of his book, he then resorts to his car illustration to justify the use of lexicons with misleading word meanings, which is clearly a complete about face with respect to his remarks on the previous page about Sister Riplinger’s description of letter meanings.

Dr DiVietro's inconsistent attitude when confronted with scriptural truth that God did not show *him* is not new. The Lord Jesus Christ encountered the same inconsistency during His earthly ministry, with respect to the presentation of spiritual or scriptural truth, Luke 7:31-34. Only the entrenched determination to *reject* that truth was consistent.

Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint

In sum, for Challenge #4:

1. Dr DiVietro alters Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #4 in order to take her to task for stating that the New Testament books were directly given by inspiration in other ancient languages besides Greek, *as originals*. He alters "give one Bible verse that says that the New Testament was originally written to the Greeks only" to a question that asks if it is reasonable to believe that the New Testament books were *originally* written in Greek. He answers his redrafted challenge by stating that the New Testament was originally written in Koine Greek but insists that it was never inspired in any language other than Koine Greek. Dr DiVietro therefore denies that Dark Age believers like the Waldenses, who suffered repeated papal persecutions over many centuries, could have possessed an inspired Old Latin Bible to sustain them through the fiery trials they underwent. In effect, Dr DiVietro has invented a two-tiered 'word of God,' one inspired of God, the other not. In this author's view, therefore, Dr DiVietro "***hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace***" Hebrews 10:29, through Whom true Bible believers like the Waldenses were and are blessed with "***the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God***" Ephesians 6:17.
2. Dr DiVietro does not comment in this chapter on the extensive work of Herman Hoskier that Dr Mrs Riplinger has described in detail in Chapter 30 of *Hazardous Materials* pp 1097ff, *even though* Hoskier's research *impinges directly* on Dr DiVietro's accusations against Sister Riplinger in this chapter of *Cleaning-Up*.

It is *Herman Hoskier*, not Dr Mrs Riplinger, who stated originally that "Some or all of the first originals may have been in languages other than Greek" and that "Multiple language editions were available immediately and were concurrent with Greek editions."

Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, does take issue with Dr Mrs Riplinger's citations from Hoskier on pp 252ff of *Cleaning-Up* in his comments against *Hazardous Materials*. On p 256 of *Cleaning-Up*, he basically accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of lying and states that he is attempting to ascertain what Herman Hoskier *really* said, in the firm belief that he will be able to prove that Dr Mrs Riplinger has misrepresented Hoskier. Just in case she hasn't, he adds that even a great scholar can be wrong, i.e. when the results of his work contradict the diktats of the DBS Executive Committee.

Thus far, nothing has emerged.

3. Dr DiVietro says further that Dr Mrs Riplinger's claim requires that the Old Testament scriptures be inspired in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic immediately after the events of Acts 2 as well. He states that no evidence exists to show that such inspiration happened, insisting, *Cleaning-Up*, p 114 that the gift of tongues had only to do with speaking and nothing to do with producing inspired translations, in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek.

It will be observed that Peter quotes extensively from "***the old testament***" 2 Corinthians 3:14 in Acts 2, 3 *but not verbatim*. Moreover, by inspection, a later Old Testa-

ment citation, Acts 8:32-33 reads differently, like Peter's quotations in Acts 2, 3 with respect to its Old Testament counterpart, Isaiah 53:7-8. Yet they are *both* "***The place of the scripture which he read...Esaias the prophet.***"

Therefore, this author believes, contrary to Dr DiVietro that the Lord Jesus Christ has sufficient grace, mercy, wisdom and power to provide *written inspired* portions of Old Testament scriptures at least soon after Acts 2, *directly inspired from an apostle's* 'free' quotations from the Old Testament. The differences between the New Testament citations of the Old Testament in Acts 2, 3, 8 and their Old Testament counterparts show that these portions were in languages *other than Hebrew* but no less "***The place of scripture***" for that. Crucially, the differences between Acts 2:16-21, 25-28, 3:22-23, 8:32-33 and their Old Testament counterparts show that the New Testament passages must have been "***given by inspiration***" in languages other than Hebrew because Jewish scribes were required to make perfect copies of their Old Testament manuscripts. Even minor blemishes could result in the entire copy being destroyed and the manuscript recopied to perfection.

Dr Moorman has shown that parts of a Syriac Old Testament existed by about the middle of the 1st Century A.D.. It appears that an Aramaic Old Testament existed at about the same time and this author thinks it possible, from a comparison of Isaiah 61:1, 2 and Luke 4:18, 19 that the Lord may have read and studied at least portions of an Aramaic Old Testament during His earthly ministry.

Dr DiVietro would naturally utterly reject this analysis but, as indicated, it will be interesting to see what happens at "***the judgment seat of Christ***" Romans 14:10.

4. Dr DiVietro then insists once again, p 84 that inspiration of translations is found nowhere in the New Testament. Revelation 5:13, 14:6-7 show otherwise. The fulfillment of these verses is yet future. The creatures that speak in Revelation 5:13 and the angel who speaks in Revelation 14:7 "***unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people***" will not be speaking Koine Greek, even if that was the language in which John originally wrote the Book of Revelation. Many of the speakers in these verses, including the angel, would, however, be speaking English as the *lingua franca* of the End Times as recorded in *King James English*, the *Biblical lingua franca* of the End Times.

This means that *John's Koine Greek 'original' must have been an inspired translation of at least in part an inspired spoken original in King James English. In God's timing, wisdom and power, the spoken inspired King James English original that John received prophetically became the written inspired 1611 Authorized King James English Holy Bible historically and to the present day.*

That conclusion merits prayerful reflection, James 1:5.

5. Dr DiVietro devotes pp 82-84 of his book to a potted history of the spread of Koine Greek from Egypt to India and concludes his response to Challenge #4 by reiterating, essentially that Dr Mrs Riplinger is wrong to equate interpretation with translation, according to 2 Timothy 3:16 and Job 32:8, which are the only references to "***inspiration***" in scripture.

Although he does not explicitly say so, Dr DiVietro's final point in this chapter appears to refer back to his denial of interpretation as ever being equivalent to translation in his answer to Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #3. See previous section for remarks on Genesis 40:8.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's outline of the spread of Koine Greek, it should be noted first that most of the regions that Dr DiVietro describes as having been blessed with an overspreading of Koine Greek are now in Muslim hands and most likely will be until the Second Advent. 'The Greek' therefore didn't help the inhabitants of these areas much, especially insofar as Dr DiVietro fails to mention one single nation among those areas that has been noted for either spiritual greatness or initiating missionary outreach for the last two thousand years. To the contrary, these areas remain some of the most difficult in the world for missionaries to reach with the Gospel to the present day.

Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint

In sum, for Challenge #5:

1. Dr DiVietro, *Cleaning-Up*, p 85, replies that a professional linguist or translator is not needed because no-one says that Greek words have to be translated differently from how they appear in the KJB. This author has found otherwise. Only recently, the pastor of the church this author attends stated that "a sinner" in Luke 18:13 should be "the sinner." This is a nonsense reading in the light of Psalm 51:5, Romans 5:12 and 1 Timothy 1:15. However, the pastor made this error by going to 'the Greek.' In the wider context, Dr DiVietro has naively ignored the raft of new bibles since Westcott and Hort's 1881 RV that made 5,337 changes in the KJ New Testament based on their revised Greek text, many of them word changes. See also the changes to supposedly "*churchy*" words in the KJB urged by Danker as documented in *Hazardous Materials*, Chapter 16 that have been noted in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.
2. Dr DiVietro goes on to say in yet another evasive response to Dr Mrs Riplinger's challenges that lexicons and other study aids are necessary in order to understand the KJB, not to 'correct' it, although Dr DiVietro is about to 'correct' the KJB in John 11:33 on p 94 of *Cleaning-Up*, in this very chapter, under the guise of 'clarifying' it. See remarks in **Setting Up the 'Clean-Up,' Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** and below.
3. Dr DiVietro's next relevant comment in this chapter is on pp 87-88, where he acknowledges that the original autographs of the scriptures are long gone and that they were never collated into a single volume. However, he then declares that God's words in Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek have been preserved so that the original inspired words can still be determined.

Regrettably, Dr DiVietro still does not say where these particular words can be found between two covers as a perfect Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek match mate to the KJB, or if such a compilation even exists. His actual 'bible' is still a mystery to this author. See comments in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

Dr DiVietro nevertheless maintains that the very words of God may be ascertained from the hand written Greek manuscripts in all passages where they agree with each other, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 87-88.

However, even if such a definitive Greek text was compiled, vernacular translations would still be necessary for non-Koine Greek readers and these translations would almost certainly share the fate of the failed NKJV, the pathetic end result of the last attempt at producing a single definitive Greek text.

4. Dr DiVietro next draws attention to *The Defined King James Bible*, which he says is a valuable tool to ‘clarify’ the 1611 English Holy Bible by placing the meanings of any supposed archaic KJB words in footnotes.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has this evaluation of *The Defined King James Bible*.

“Most of The Defined King James Bible’s definitions came from modern English dictionaries, as noted in Waite’s introductory material. Such modern dictionaries contain highly secularized words, often seen in new versions. In Awe of Thy Word chapter 15 demonstrates, using the recently released notes of the KJB translators, that they considered and rejected just such words.”

The likely real motive behind Dr DiVietro’s book *Cleaning-Up* and Dr Waite’s book *A WARNING!!* therefore becomes clear. Sister Riplinger’s research is likely to jeopardize the sales of *The Defined King James Bible*. Paul’s verdict is found in 1 Timothy 6:10.

“For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.”

5. Dr DiVietro now proceeds to illustrate the supposed need for ‘the Greek,’ *Cleaning-Up*, pp 91-95, with Romans 5:15, which he says is an impossible sentence in English, the word propitiate, which he says cannot be understood without a lexicon and the words *oinos* (“**wine**”) and *baptizo* (“**baptize**”), which he says cannot be understood without a lexicon and John 11:33, which Dr DiVietro insists cannot be expounded correctly without going to ‘the Greek.’

Dr Ruckman expounds Romans 5:15 as follows, without recourse to ‘the Greek.’

He states that one man, Adam, earned the right to die through his sin and thereby sentenced the whole human race to death, Romans 5:12. By contrast, one man, the Lord Jesus Christ, purchased “**eternal life**” Romans 5:21 on man’s behalf through the shedding of His blood as payment for man’s sin so that by the grace of God, He is therefore able to give eternal life to anyone who comes to Him to receive it.

‘The Greek’ is unnecessary.

Concerning the word propitiate, or the related Biblical term “**propitiation**” Romans 3:25, 1 John 2:2, 4:10, again ‘the Greek’ isn’t necessary to determine the meaning of the word.

Following Dr Mrs Riplinger’s approach, the word “**propitiation**” is understood from scripture as follows.

“Propitiation,” like salvation, Luke 2:30, 19:9, is above all a Person, “**Jesus Christ the righteous.**” God is a personal God, not simply a theological or doctrinal God.

The scripture, however, gives further insight into the meaning of “**propitiation.**”

1 John 4:14 states “***And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world.***”

“The Saviour” is the same as “***the propitiation***” Who is “***Jesus Christ the righteous***” or “***Jehovah is salvation,***” Matthew 1:21, Who is “***the Messiah the Prince***” Daniel 9:25 and “***the Holy One***” 1 John 2:20, anointed of the Holy Ghost Luke 3:22, 4:18.

Additional scriptures, John 1:29, 1 Corinthians 5:7, Ephesians 5:2, Hebrews 7:26-27, 9:26, 1 Peter 1:18-19, Genesis 8:21 show that the voluntary, sinless sacrifice “***which taketh away the sin of the world***” of the Lord Jesus Christ *Himself* “***to God***” as “***a***

sweetmelling savour” turned away God’s wrath as Noah’s sacrifice did after the flood, for anyone who believes that the Lord Jesus Christ is both *“the Saviour”* and *“savour”* for him personally, John 3:36. This is *“propitiation.”*

6. On the subject of the word *oinos* and abstinence, reference need only be made to the example set by the Lord Jesus Christ. He drank only *“new wine”* Matthew 9:17, refused *“wine”* even on the cross, Mark 15:23 and provided only *“good wine”* at the wedding, John 2:10, not wine that caused *“woe,” “sorrow”* and transgression, Genesis 9:21-24, Proverbs 23:29, 30, Habakkuk 2:5, 15. Definitions of ‘the Greek’ are unnecessary.
7. On John 11:33, the AV1611 English states *“he groaned in the spirit, and was troubled.”*

Dr DiVietro’s ‘Greek’ rendition changes *“groaned”* into *“stirred”* and bypasses the Lord’s *“spirit”* altogether.

The truth is that the Lord Jesus Christ was *“full of the Holy Ghost”* Luke 4:1. When *“he groaned in the spirit,”* it was His joint intercession with the Third Person of the Godhead for the bereaved around Him, according to the principle of Romans 8:26, *“the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.”* On this occasion, of course, both Intercessors knew how to pray as They ought and the Lord continues that ministry to the present hour for His saints, Hebrews 7:25. That the Lord’s groaning was that of prayer for the sake of the bereaved is indicated by John 11:41, which shows that the Lord had already been in prayer before He uttered the words recorded in the verse. Note the past tense of the word *“heard.”*

The Lord did weep tears of sorrow, contrary to Dr DiVietro’s assertion, otherwise He would have violated Romans 12:15.

“Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep.”

8. On the word *baptizo*, for which Dr DiVietro alludes to an unnamed papyrus fragment, resorting to ‘the Greek’ is wholly unnecessary. Baptism needed *“much water”* John 3:23 and when baptism is first mentioned in scripture, with respect to John, repentant sinners *“were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins”* Matthew 3:6, again in a place of *“much water.”* Baptism clearly cannot be sprinkling or pouring and the Old Testament picture is that of Naaman, of whom 2 Kings 5:14 states *“Then went he down, and dipped himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God: and his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child, and he was clean.”*

In addition, The Trinitarian Bible Society states that *“The primary meaning of the English word “Baptize” is “to immerse” [it still is in The Concise Oxford Dictionary] and the translators of 1611 used the word in this sense...It was in fact used in English literature as early as the year 1200 A.D. and was well established in the language for nearly two hundred years before Wyclif used it in his translation in 1382 A.D. [i.e. as an established Biblical word].”*

Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint

In sum, for Challenge #6:

Dr DiVietro cites the following passages of scripture in response this challenge.

1. John 11:33. His exposition from ‘the Greek’ is a travesty. See remarks in the previous section.

2. John 19:30, ***“It is finished.”*** Dr DiVietro insists that from ‘the Greek’ (in this case the Greek tense used), the statement *really* says ‘I have carried out the great plan of redemption and made the once-for-all sacrifice for sins never to be repeated so that sinners can now be forgiven.’ Dr DiVietro states further that the completion of this plan is in effect now, according to ‘the Greek.’

However, The Lord did not finish some scheme of His own on the cross, as Dr DiVietro tries to imply by means of his English rendition of John 19:30. He finished the work that *His Father* gave Him to do.

“I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do” John 17:4.

Moreover, Dr DiVietro’s use of ‘the Greek’ has overlooked how God remitted, or forgave sins from Genesis 3 to Romans 3 through His forbearance but those sins were not taken away until the Lord’s perfect sacrifice at Calvary (according to Hebrews 10:12, which Dr DiVietro obligingly quotes). See Romans 3:25, with respect to the Lord Jesus Christ.

“Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God;”

3. Dr DiVietro uses ‘the Greek’ to define sin in Romans 3:23 as falling short, like an arrow that doesn’t hit the target because the bowman hasn’t got the strength to shoot it that far. Sin is actually much more serious than Dr DiVietro’s illustration of a weak bowshot, as the New Testament definitions of sin reveal.

“And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin” Romans 14:23.

“Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin” James 4:17.

“Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law” 1 John 3:4.

“All unrighteousness is sin: and there is a sin not unto death” 1 John 5:17 i.e. sin is deadly serious, whether it leads immediately to the death of the sinner e.g. Uzzah, 2 Samuel 6:6, 7 or not e.g. Uzziah 2 Chronicles 26:16-21.

Dr DiVietro lists 17 applications of the term sin when the Hebrew and Greek words translated as sin are inserted into Romans 3:23, which he implies are not evident in King James English. These applications include committal of acts of sin or wickedness, going against the Person or Will of God, acts of foolishness or corruption of something good and the effects of sin e.g. damnation. Dr DiVietro provides no examples to substantiate his list.

The scripture in *King James English based on the scriptural definitions of sin* covers all of Dr DiVietro’s 17 applications with specific examples that yield far more than what Dr DiVietro has disclosed from ‘the Hebrew and the Greek.’

For example, 1 John 5:17 and associated verses cover the application of committing acts of sin or wicked things, *with specific examples, Matthew 15:19 and the necessary remedy, John 15:3, Hebrews 4:12.*

See detailed comments in **Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint** for the additional applications of the term sin and the relevant scriptures.

4. Dr DiVietro uses ‘the Greek’ in Romans 5:12-15 to draw what he perceives as a necessary distinction between sin as Adam’s wilful disobedience to God (*parabasis*) and the sin of all of Adam’s descendants, who have fallen short (*paraptoma*). Dr DiVietro also inserts the comment that men are now sinners by nature and by choice.

Closer inspection of Romans 5:12-15 shows that once again, ‘the Greek’ is unnecessary and adds nothing to the English.

Romans 5:12 states ***“Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned:”***

Romans 5:12 states clearly that all men inherited sin and death from Adam i.e. the sin nature. Men deserve death because they follow their sin natures, i.e. sinning by choice and incurring the death penalty. Genesis 5:3 underlines the inheritance of the sin nature from Adam, which was part of Adam’s image inherited by all his descendants.

“And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth:”

Romans 5:13-14 state ***“For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.”***

Romans 5:13-14 state that men were not blamed for their sin after the manner of the Mosaic Law before that Law came into existence at Sinai, Exodus 20 but they still suffered death through sin because men *knew the Law even before it was written down and knew when they went against it*. Abimelech, Genesis 20, is a case in point even though the 7th Commandment Exodus 20:14 had not been written at the time.

Once again, all is clear from the English and recourse to ‘the Greek’ is unnecessary.

It should be noted yet again that Dr DiVietro’s insistence on ‘the Greek’ in this example is in direct conflict with the priesthood of all believers and therefore ***“the word of God”*** 1 Peter 1:23, 2:5, 9.

5. Dr DiVietro insists that use of ‘the Greek’ is necessary in 1 John 1:9 in order to determine the meaning of the word ***“confess”*** as calling sin what God calls it, i.e. sin. However, the verses immediately before and after 1 John 1:9 define the word ***“confess”*** from a scriptural perspective.

“If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us” 1 John 1:8.

“If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us” 1 John 1:10.

1 John 1:8 includes sin by nature, Psalm 51:5 and 1 John 1:10 includes individual sins, either by commission, Romans 14:23 or omission, James 4:17. The underlined expressions in these verses indicate the opposite of confession, which is therefore to say truthfully that you *have* sin and that you *have* sinned, according to the definitions of sin that John includes in his letter, i.e. 1 John 3:4, 5:17 and found elsewhere in scripture; 1 Samuel 12:23, Proverbs 21:4, 24:9, Romans 14:23, James 4:17. This

definition is more searching than that of Dr DiVietro's from 'the Greek.' An alcoholic may call a drink problem alcoholism but for him to admit that he *has* the problem calls for much greater honesty on his part.

In sum, the word "**confess**" means to *admit* to *having* sin, as defined in scripture; 1 Samuel 12:23, Proverbs 21:4, 24:9, Romans 14:23, James 4:17, 1 John 3:4, 5:17 and to *having sinned* according to these definitions, laying sin and sins bare before God.

Dr DiVietro indicates that much is to be gained from a study of the Hebrew synonyms for the word of God in Psalm 119. However, a study of the English instead of the Hebrew, which Dr DiVietro does not cite, reveals the *effects* of following God's words in Psalm 119. See for example Psalm 119:1.

"ALEPH. Blessed are the undefiled in the way, who walk in the law of the LORD"

"The law of the LORD" is intended for **"strangers and pilgrims on the earth"** Hebrews 11:13 who **"shall keep the way of the LORD"** Genesis 18:19 along **"the king's high way"** Numbers 20:17. **"The law of the LORD"** overcomes defilement because **"The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul:"** Psalm 19:7.

As an added bonus of such a study, information on synonyms in Psalm 119 does emerge from the King James English. Note for example that **"the law of the LORD"** is above all *a book*, by which the nation of Israel was meant to be governed, 2 Chronicles 17:9, 34:14, Nehemiah 9:3.

Dr DiVietro has not shown how a study of Hebrew synonyms in Psalm 119 reveals the above material.

6. Dr DiVietro claims that knowledge of the tense of 'the Greek' is necessary in 2 John 10 in order to understand the strength of the expression **"receive him not."**

John 5:34, 41, 2 Corinthians 6:1, 1 Timothy 5:19, Revelation 18:4 prove otherwise. They show that the expression **"receive...not"** is extremely strong *in English*. Yet again, 'the Greek' is both unnecessary and inferior because a focus on expounding the sense of a Greek tense does not immediately lead to essential cross references in the way that a study of the resultant English expression does.

Note that the strength of the expression **"receive not"** in Revelation 18:4 with respect to the plagues that will consume **"Babylon the great"** is that of the Lord Himself, **"for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her."**

That is the strength of all the above expressions **"receive not"** in their respective contexts and of **"receive him not"** in 2 John 10. No input from any Greek tense is needed.

Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint

In sum, for Challenge #7:

1. The essence of Challenge #7 is to show *according to scripture* that the student must understand the original languages in order to gain a deeper understanding of what God *really* said. Dr DiVietro claims to have answered the challenge by appealing to Nehemiah 8:8, Genesis 28:19, Judges 18:19, Matthew 1:23, Mark 5:41, 15:22, 34, John 1:38, 41, Acts 4:36, Hebrews 7:2. However, these verses do not answer Challenge #7. They actually show the opposite of Challenge #7.

Challenge #7 asks for a verse that commands a Bible believer to seek understanding of the scriptures *in a language other than the one he already has in "words easy to be*

understood” 1 Corinthians 14:9. Nehemiah 8:8, by inspection, describes *the reverse* of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #7.

Like Nehemiah 8:8, the 10 additional verses that Dr DiVietro lists do not set out what Dr Mrs Riplinger’s challenge said. They each set out an unknown or unfamiliar name or phrase in a language foreign to the reader *such that the writer provides the necessary explanation and/or translation in the very same verse in “words easy to be understood”* by the reader. Dr DiVietro’s attempts to misuse these verses in order to dragoon the Bible believer back to unfamiliar tongues of which he has no need continue to constitute the denial of the priesthood of all believers on Dr DiVietro’s part, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. Moreover, these verses do *not* require a reader to return to any scriptures in earlier languages that are unknown to him.

2. Dr DiVietro continues, nevertheless, to assert the necessity of ‘the Greek’ and ‘the Hebrew’ in order to understand the words **“atonement”** and **“propitiation,”** *Cleaning-Up* pp 108-109. On this occasion, he lists the verses that contain the word **“propitiation”**; Romans 3:25, 1 John 2:2, 4:10.

It should be noted immediately that, typically, Dr DiVietro has not here either stipulated or even referred to the actual source of ‘the Greek’ and ‘the Hebrew’ that he consults for the meanings of these words, apart from the Septuagint that he has earlier disavowed as an inaccurate translation of the Hebrew scriptures, *Cleaning-Up* pp 58-59.

The teacher of scripture must, of course, according to Dr DiVietro, only refer sparingly to the Greek and Hebrew in order to prevent his students from getting the impression that they can’t understand the scriptures (undefined except as the now extant Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek text, though undefined between two covers) unless they learn Hebrew and Greek.

It is instructive that Dr DiVietro does not mention even one student, or class of students that requires this form of teaching because they found that the KJB was difficult, ambiguous or paradoxical, as Dr DiVietro states that the KJB sometimes is, *Cleaning-Up* pp 90-91.

However, it is clear from the above that Dr DiVietro has defied the priesthood of all believers yet again, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. He has also shown yet again, despite professions to the contrary that no-one *really* has **“the law of God”** Nehemiah 8:8 unless he is sufficiently conversant with the now extant Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek text (uniquely inspired but location still unknown) to expound it to others who don’t know Hebrew/Aramaic or Greek.

Dr DiVietro goes on to explain the full meaning of the word **“atonement”** as the blood that covered the sins of Israel and insists that this meaning cannot be determined without the aid of lexicons.

He forgot the simple, self-interpreting English meaning of the word, as found even in *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*.

The word **“atonement”** occurs once in the New Testament, in Romans 5:11.

“And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement.”

“*The atonement*” is made possible through the blood of Christ shed for sin at Calvary to hold back God’s wrath John 3:36, as Romans 5:9, 10 show, Romans 5:10 giving the Biblical definition for the word “*atonement*.”

“*Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.*”

“*For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.*”

“*Atonement*” in the New Testament means reconciliation to God, “*being now justified by his blood*” through the death of His Son, Jesus Christ, i.e.:

Atonement = At + One + Ment.

The above meaning and the meaning reconciliation are both found in *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*. Both meanings are evident in the scripture. No lexicon is necessary.

See point 5 in **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** above and the more detailed studies in **Challenge(s) #5, 7, Point-Counterpoint** for the scriptural definition of the word “*propitiation*.”

3. Dr DiVietro now takes up the first 5 of 200+ selected quotes from *Hazardous Materials* that he uses as a basis for his on-going attacks against Sister Riplinger and her work. These attacks occupy the next 170 pages of *Cleaning-Up*. The first 5 quotes are taken from pp 1192-1193 of *Hazardous Materials*, in which Dr Mrs Riplinger sets out possible reactions to the book by its critics.
4. The first quote is with respect to the critic who says “*It would be easier simply to call Dr. ‘so and so’ and see what he thinks.*” In response, Dr DiVietro states that he has read carefully through *Hazardous Materials* three times and can refute its contents. He maintains that he has never resorted to anyone’s opinion in order to ‘correct’ the KJB and has never done so himself.

Up to and including this chapter on Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #7, Dr DiVietro has refuted nothing in *Hazardous Materials* that addresses current Greek and Hebrew supposed Bible study aids. Readers may judge for themselves from this work.

Dr DiVietro’s claim that he has never corrected the KJB is a blatant lie.

He was not 5 pages into his part of *Cleaning-Up* before he changed “*given by inspiration of God*” 2 Timothy 3:16 into “*God-breathed*” on the basis of ‘the Greek,’ *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3.

He went on repeatedly to elevate Hebrew and Greek sources over the 1611 English Holy Bible on pp 32, 69 and 94-95 of *Cleaning-Up* in order, supposedly, to ‘clarify’ its ambiguities and confusing grammar. Regardless of Dr DiVietro’s assertion to the contrary, his manner of ‘clarification’ amounts to a supplanting and changing of the KJB by the KDB – Kirk DiVietro ‘Bible.’ See remarks on *oinos* (“*wine*”) and *baptizo* (“*baptize*”) and on John 11:33 in **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’, Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint, Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint, Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**.

Dr DiVietro went on to concoct another 5 supposed ‘improvements’ in the KJB by means of ‘the Greek’ with respect to John 19:30, the word “*sins*,” the words for “*trespass*” and “*transgression*” in Romans 5:12-15, the word “*confess*” in 1 John 1:9 and the Greek grammar for 2 John 9-10.

Each of these examples is an attempt to impose a supposedly superior rendering of a KJB word or expression from an outside source, which amounts to correction by Dr DiVietro (via ‘the Greek’) of what he perceives as an inferior KJB reading *in English*, however he seeks to mask his misdeeds against the 1611 Holy Bible with euphemisms like ‘clarification.’ All 8 of these examples constitute a denial of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See remarks at the end of **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**, in **Challenges #5, #6, Point-Counterpoint** and above with respect to Dr DiVietro’s reference to Nehemiah 8:8.

5. The second quote is with respect to the critic who thinks “*I am a solid fundamental Christian, therefore I could not be wrong about **anything**; God wouldn’t give **this** author this information **before** giving it to me.*” Dr Mrs Riplinger adds that it was possibly her disability which gave her the time to provide “*helps*” for pastors and teachers, in the form of her books.

Dr DiVietro in response accuses Sister Riplinger of violating 1 Timothy 2:12 because he insists that as a woman, she has no business (in capital letters) correcting pastors and teachers. Dr DiVietro is further indignant with Dr Mrs Riplinger because, in his view, she has taken it upon herself to speak for God and the Bible and has accused him personally of pride and indolence simply because he disagrees with *Hazardous Materials*, which book, he insists, is doing irreparable damage to pastors and ministerial students.

By inspection of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement, nothing is said about speaking for God, correcting pastors and teachers, setting herself up as an authority over pastors and teachers, implying that physical disability enhances spiritual understanding or specifically accusing Dr DiVietro of anything.

Moreover, Dr DiVietro gives no evidence of any ministerial students, graduates or institutions that have been hindered from understanding the scriptures either through *Hazardous Materials* or any of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s other works. Nor does he identify any pastor, teacher, church, institution or individual believer who has been irreparably damaged by *Hazardous Materials* or any of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s other works.

Dr Mrs Riplinger is not setting herself up in authority over “*pastors and teachers*” Ephesians 4:11 or seeking to teach and ‘correct’ them. She is carrying out a scriptural function of providing them with “*helps*” 1 Corinthians 12:28. No way could Dr DiVietro have accused Sister Riplinger of violating 1 Timothy 2:12 if he had been willing to “*Provide things honest in the sight of all men*” Romans 12:17 in his reading of *Hazardous Materials* pp 43ff, with respect the author’s purpose in writing the book. Her purpose was in part “*To alert pastors, parents, pupils about*” the dangers inherent in the contents of currently available Greek and Hebrew sources.

6. The third quote is with respect to the critic who says “*I must quickly skim for some small error to prove this wrong. I couldn’t have been wrong all these years.*”

Dr DiVietro’s response is that he has found almost every page of *Hazardous Materials* to be replete with errors. He demands that it is Sister Riplinger who should obey 1 Peter 5:6, because, in Dr DiVietro’s opinion, her books will bind a whole generation of ministerial students in total ignorance of the word of God.

It is instructive that in this response, Dr DiVietro fails to mention even one of the multitudes of errors that he claims to have identified on almost every page of *Hazardous Materials*.

This author's considered opinion, after having worked through Dr DiVietro's supposed answers to Dr Mrs Riplinger's 7 challenges, is that he has failed to locate even one significant error in *Hazardous Materials* on the potential dangers of currently available Greek and Hebrew study materials with respect to studying the Bible, 2 Timothy 2:15. Again, readers may judge for themselves from the preceding pages of this work.

It is noteworthy that once again, Dr DiVietro has failed to identify even one ministerial student who is ignorant of what God 'really' said as a result of reading *Hazardous Materials* or any of Sister Riplinger's books, let alone a whole generation of students.

7. The fourth quote is with respect to the critic who says "*What will so-and-so think? Will this put me "without the camp" or denomination I currently follow?*"

Dr DiVietro protests that he is loyal only the Word of God and the God of the Word. He does not here specify what the Word of God is but if he means "*all scripture...given by inspiration of God*" it should be noted that he has incorrectly used the term Word, which refers in scripture to the Lord Jesus Christ John 1:1, 2, 14 instead of word, which refers to the scriptures, as the Lord made clear in John 10:35.

"If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken;"

In answer to this part of Dr DiVietro's protest, it would appear to this author that Dr DiVietro's loyalty certainly extends to the DBS Executive Committee conclave with which he has closed ranks against Dr Mrs Riplinger. His profession of loyalty is somewhat misleading, therefore.

Dr DiVietro continues his protest by quoting (from the KJB, not 'the Hebrew/Aramaic,' as though the KJB could, in Dr DiVietro's view, almost be the 'inspired word of God' on this occasion) Psalm 1:1, Hosea 4:6, Amos 8:11.

He intimates that these verses prove that Dr Mrs Riplinger's work is causing "*a famine...of hearing the words of the LORD,*" a misinterpretation of Psalm 1:1 and the starvation of 'people' (undefined) who, through Dr Mrs Riplinger's works, are being kept in ignorance of the words of God (undefined).

Again, as with all his responses to Dr Mrs Riplinger's statements in this chapter, Dr DiVietro fails to specify any instances of any individuals, churches or other institutions that have been starved of the words of God (still undefined by Dr DiVietro in this part of his book) and kept in ignorance of them by means of anything in any of Dr Mrs Riplinger's books. Nor does he mention anyone who misinterpreted Psalm 1:1 through reading Dr Mrs Riplinger's books.

8. The fifth and final quote is with respect to the critic who says "*I don't believe that Greek and Hebrew study is wrong (although I have not read this book, documenting its problems, nor can I refute it).*"

Dr DiVietro is appalled at the above statement, which he declares to be the height of arrogance. He complains that Dr Mrs Riplinger is accusing anyone who disagrees with *Hazardous Materials* on an informed basis of not having intelligently considered its contents. He further insists that *Hazardous Materials* is totally in error about Greek and Hebrew study aids.

In this author's considered view, Dr DiVietro has not produced any evidence at all to show that *Hazardous Materials* is in error in any way about Greek and Hebrew study

aids up to this point in his book. Again, readers of this work may judge for themselves.

Dr DiVietro then defends the use of currently available Greek and Hebrew study aids on the basis of the familiar don't-throw-the-baby-out-with-the-bathwater argument, except that his analogy is with respect to edible versus poisonous mushrooms. Select the good parts out of the lexicons and leave the bad parts, Dr DiVietro urges, like one would choose edible mushrooms and leave the bad ones.

See, however, **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** and **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to the serious distortion of Biblical words by modern lexical authors such as Danker, *Hazardous Materials* Chapter 16, who weakens the pivotal Biblical word “*grace*” into the secular term “*generosity*.” If an analogy is drawn with Dr DiVietro’s baby-bathwater illustrations, a more appropriate example with respect to lexicons would be that of the A380 Airbus. The Australian airline QANTAS grounded *all* its Airbuses after one of them suffered a midair explosion of an engine.

In this author’s view the QANTAS Airbus incident and its aftermath is much more pertinent to the dangers of current Greek/Hebrew study aids as explained by Sister Riplinger than merely picking mushrooms.

Dr DiVietro has also gone against scripture in endorsing the work of ungodly men with respect to determining the meanings of Biblical words, in addition to flouting once again the principle of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. 1 Timothy 3:1-9 and Titus 1:7-9 give the qualifications of the men who are to be entrusted with teaching God’s words. How, then, can ungodly lexical editors be fitted to provide study aids for teaching “*the words of God*” John 3:34 (defined here as the words of the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible)?

They can’t, as was noted in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**:

“*Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one*” Job 14:4.

9. Dr DiVietro concludes this chapter, *Cleaning-Up* pp 113-114, by gainsaying Dr Mrs Riplinger’s analysis of Acts 2, to be found, although Dr DiVietro does not say so, in greatest detail in Chapters 17, 18 of *In Awe of Thy Word, The Sounds of the First English Bibles* and *Acts 2 to You: From the Gothic Bible to the KJV*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states in support of her analysis, *In Awe of Thy Word*, p 628 that “*The following charts document the faithful preservation of the word of God. It was given to the Goths in the book of Acts and “endureth to all generations” (Ps. 100:5). Its sounds and words are often still evident in the King James Bible...*”

These charts contain approximately 60 examples of New Testament verses in Chapters 17, 18 of *In Awe of Thy Word* revealing the likeness in both sound and appearance between the Gothic Bible and the 1611 Holy Bible. Dr Mrs Riplinger’s historical citations in Chapter 17 shows that the lineage for the 1611 Holy Bible does indeed go back to Acts 2 via the Bible of the Goths and their association with Bishop Ulphilas and in turn the Cappadocian believers who received the words of God “*in our own tongue, wherein we were born*” Acts 2:8.

Yet Dr DiVietro insists that in no way can the tongues of Acts 2 be taken as a means of producing inspired written translations of scripture in non-Hebrew languages. He is therefore flatly denying the historical links that Dr Mrs Riplinger has established between the early Cappadocian believers, the Gothic Bible and the 1611 Holy Bible. The scriptural indication from inspection of the 11 verses that Dr DiVietro lists in an-

answer to Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #7 is that each of the believers in Acts 2 received **"the word of the Lord"** Acts 8:25 **"in his own language...every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born"** Acts 2:6, 8 i.e. *inspired* translations of at least portions of **"the word of the Lord."** These translations were clearly preserved in written forms e.g. Gothic as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in *In Awe of Thy Word* Chapters 17, 18 that eventually became complete *inspired* Bibles. Equally clearly, Acts 2 was the starting point.

Dr DiVietro is simply in dogmatic denial.

The answer to Dr DiVietro's denial of Dr Mrs Riplinger's analysis of Acts 2 is first that Dr DiVietro's explanation of Acts 2 does not in any way *preclude* Dr Mrs Riplinger's analysis. Observe, for example, how Paul makes spiritual application of Hosea 2:23 to the Gentiles in Romans 9:24-25, whereas Hosea 2:23 strictly applies to the faithful remnant of Israel at the Second Advent.

"Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles? As he saith also in Osee, I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved."

Like Hosea 2:23, Acts 2 can therefore have more than one application and Dr DiVietro is limiting God by asserting otherwise. Psalm 78:41 describes his attitude.

"Yea, they turned back and tempted God, and limited the Holy One of Israel."

Further, more detailed answers to Dr DiVietro's denial of Dr Mrs Riplinger's analysis of Acts 2 may be found in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**. This extract should be noted.

With respect to Acts 2 as the instigation of the preaching of the Gospel in multiple languages, note Acts 2:4...

"And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance."

All that Peter and the apostles speak in the rest of Acts 2 e.g. "his word" Acts 2:41, in whatever language, have to be "the words of God" John 3:34, according to 2 Samuel 23:2.

"The Spirit of the LORD spake by me, and his word was in my tongue."

*Unless Dr DiVietro can prove from scripture that the words of "The Spirit of the LORD" in Acts 2 are somehow only man's words if not in Hebrew/Aramaic and/or Greek, then the words spoken in all the languages listed in Acts 2:9-11 are "the words of God" that declare "the wonderful works of God" Acts 2:11 and are "given by inspiration of God." Up to this point in *Cleaning-Up*, he has not done so."*

Dr DiVietro has still failed to show that the words of Acts 2:9-11 are anything less than **"given by inspiration of God"** according to Dr Mrs Riplinger's thesis in Chapters 17, 18 of *In Awe of Thy Word, The Sounds of the First English Bibles* and *Acts 2 to You: From the Gothic Bible to the KJV*.

Dr DiVietro hasn't up to this point in his book even seriously addressed the material contained therein.

Necessary Additional Observations

Following comments by Bro. Peter Heisey, missionary to Romania

Preface and Introduction

1. See [point 2](#). The insistence by Drs Waite, Williams and DiVietro that no translation can truly be the inspired word of God is an assumption that on their part that has not been proven from scripture.
2. See [point 3](#). Strictly speaking, the words of the ‘original’ scriptures could be translated into another language but according to the DBS Executive Committee, they could not then be considered scripture because, again according to the DBS Executive Committee, translation overrides inspiration.
3. See [point 5](#). Note that the essence of this point is to illustrate Dr DiVietro’s inconsistency with respect to the KJB. On p 7 (and later on, on p 18) of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro refers to the 1611 KJB as a consistent and accurate translation of its underlying Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek sources. On p 7, he disavows any revisions as found in later editions, up to and including the 1769 Edition, as introducing any translational imperfections. However, on pp 10-11 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro points to the differences between the various KJB Editions as a means of raising doubts that any of them could be *“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”* i.e. a perfect Bible.

Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’

1. See [point 4](#). On p 18 of *Cleaning-Up*, see remarks under point 5 above, Dr DiVietro states that the KJB is an accurate translation of the correct Hebrew and Greek texts and is therefore the words of God. On that same page of his book, Dr DiVietro states that the KJB is not inspired. This inconsistency raises the question, how can the words of God *not* be the inspired words of God? Dr DiVietro does not answer this question satisfactorily anywhere in his book and he therefore is implying the existence of a two-tiered word of God, one inspired, one not inspired. See **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** and summary point 1 above for **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.
2. See [point 5](#). It is noted that first mention of an expression usually determines its meaning e.g. John 1:42 *“Thou art Simon the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, A stone.”*

With reference to the professed possession by the DBS Executive Committee of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek ‘originals,’ attention is drawn to Dr Waite’s statement on p 52 of *A WARNING!!*, *“I firmly believe that I have the original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.”* The precise location of these inspired, preserved originals is as yet undisclosed by the DBS Executive Committee.

With reference to the words that passed between God, Balaam and Balak according to a common language or languages that they must have shared, the question arises, is it certain that none of these language was Biblical Hebrew? Deuteronomy 23:4 refers to Balaam as *“the son of Beor of Pethor of Mesopotamia”* but in Numbers 23:7, Balaam states that *“Balak the king of Moab hath brought me from Aram, out of the mountains of the east.”*

It appears on the basis of Numbers 23:7 therefore that God and Balaam most likely spoke a form of Aramaic. *The New Compact Bible Dictionary* indicates this, as do secular sources, e.g. www.mountlebanon.org/aramaiclanguage.html. Aramaic is also

the Syrian language, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Syriac_language and different from the language of the Jews i.e. Hebrew, 2 Kings 18:26, Isaiah 36:11.

The DBS Executive Committee allows that Aramaic is an ‘inspired’ language but the written ‘original’ of Numbers is nevertheless in Hebrew, which means that where God and Balaam speak in Numbers 22, the written Hebrew original would have to be an inspired translation of the inspired spoken original in Aramaic.

However, *Cleaning-Up* p iv is explicit that *no* translation can be inspired, not even a Hebrew translation. Dr Waite is firm that the words *theopneustos graphe* or God-breathed never refer to any Bible translation in any language of the world.

Concerning the dialogues between Balak and Balaam, for Balak’s sake, these would have taken place in the language of Moab, of which Balak was king at the time, Numbers 22:4. Secular references (e.g. the Catholic Encyclopaedia no less, www.newadvent.org/cathen/10409b.htm) indicate via the Moabite Stone that the language of Moab was not Hebrew but a Hebrew dialect. The indications of scripture are that it would be a mixture of Hebrew, from Abraham’s nephew Lot, Genesis 11:27, 14:13, Egyptian, from Lot’s wife, Genesis 13:1, 14:16, 19:15, 42:23 and “*the language of Canaan*” Isaiah 19:18, from Lot’s sojourn in Sodom, which spanned enough years for his family to grow up there, Genesis 19:14, 30. That is, the language of Moab was neither Biblical Hebrew nor Biblical Aramaic but a mongrelised mess of Hebrew, Egyptian and Canaanite. Yet where Balaam and Balak speak and the conversation is recorded in scripture, even this mongrelised version of Hebrew is an inspired spoken original and therefore the inspired written Hebrew original is yet another translation.

That appears to be the scriptural position.

The DBS Executive Committee will not allow this, however. As indicated, in *Cleaning-Up*, pp iii-v, 2-4, Drs Waite, Williams and DiVietro are adamant that *no* translation can be inspired in *any* language and *only* the Biblical Hebrew, *Cleaning-Up* p 7 (as “*a pure language*” Zephaniah 3:9, even if now dead according to the DBS Executive Committee, not a mongrelised mess of the Hebrew-Egyptian-Canaanite dialect of Moab), the Biblical Aramaic and the Biblical Greek are inspired languages.

Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint

1. See [point 1](#). Note that the TR editions specified, Scrivener’s and Ricker Berry’s, have been alluded to with respect to the verses listed where those editions depart from the 1611 Holy Bible. It can safely be said that no published edition of the TR matches the KJB precisely. See this author’s earlier work, **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society**, pp 25ff, especially p 31, citing Scrivener’s evaluation of the departures of published i.e. existing TR editions from the 1611 Holy Bible. It is possible that a future edition of the TR could be published that would be a perfect match-mate for the KJB but it would undoubtedly need to use the KJB for part of its content, by means of reverse translation, as even Dr DiVietro is forced to admit. See *Cleaning-Up* p 20.
2. See [point 4](#). The dilemma here for Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee is that new print runs would be needed for hard copy editions of the TR, even if only for the first occurrence of the word “*Jesus*” in Mark 2:15. Alteration of electronically published TR editions would be straightforward. Production of amended bound copies of the TR would, as indicated, be a more onerous task. It should also be remembered the so-called Majority Greek Text is, strictly speaking, not the Majority Greek

Text. See remarks in **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** about von Soden's limited manuscript collation.

3. See point 5. The term 'Burgonists' may be too generous for the members of the DBS Executive Committee. As cited by Dr David Otis Fuller in *Which Bible*, 5th Edition, p 105, Dean Burgon did state categorically that "*We are thoroughly convinced that the project of a rival Translation is not to be entertained for a moment. For ourselves we deprecate it entirely.*" Dr DiVietro, evidently in agreement with his DBS colleagues, has displayed a disturbing tendency towards a rival translation, the KDB, Kirk DiVietro 'Bible.' See remarks in **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint** and point 4 in the overall summary section for **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint**.

Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint

1. See point 7. Dr DiVietro on p 74 of *Cleaning-Up* has misrepresented Dr Mrs Riplinger's statements on pp 81-82 of *Hazardous Materials*. She is not demanding – his word – that lexicographers only use ancient source texts or indeed that lexicographers omit secular word meanings from their work. She is simply warning that the use of intermediate language sources, e.g. German, can introduce error into the stated meanings for Biblical terms and she illustrates her warning by reference to the Nazi war criminal Gerhard Kittel, whose anti-Semitic distortions of scriptural terms she documents in Chapter 42 of *New Age Versions*, together with their influence on the modern versions. Dr DiVietro fails to address this warning, which prompts the obvious questions, is he trying to cover up for Kittel and if so, why?

It is interesting, indeed poignant in this context, to read the Prologue and the chapters immediately following it, of the book *God, Guns and Israel* by Jill, Duchess of Hamilton, www.jill-hamilton.com/god-guns-israel.html. Jill Hamilton reveals how the driving force for the re-establishment of Israel as the homeland for the Jewish people was the pre-WW1 British political establishment. This effort clearly bore fruit, in spite of an anti-Semitic backlash among Britain's leaders after WW1. Before WW1, however, most of the leading British politicians, including David Lloyd George, Britain's prime minister in the later years of WW1, believed passionately in the literal truth of the Old Testament, in particular the prophecies concerning Israel because these men came from Non-Conformist backgrounds where they had been brought up on the King James Bible. Lloyd George was a Baptist and so was President Harry Truman, who was instrumental in achieving UN recognition for the State of Israel in 1948.

It is not too much to say that the re-emergence of the nation of Israel on the world scene after the Diaspora of nearly two millennia owes everything to the King James Bible and the national leaders in Britain and the US of the 19th and 20th centuries who believed it, especially Baptists.

2. See point 13. Dr DiVietro's attitude as expressed on p 80 of *Cleaning-Up* could be summarised by 1 Corinthians 2:14, even though he appears to be a saved individual, "*But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.*"

Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint

1. See point 1. Note that Dr DiVietro's dogmatic statement to the effect that the scriptures were only ever inspired in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek is merely presumption. See Benjamin Wilkinson's statement in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**, with re-

spect to the Waldensian believers and “*the word of truth*” that they possessed in the form of their Old Latin Bibles during the Dark Ages.

2. See [point 4](#). On the issue of the spoken originals for Revelation 5:13, 14:6-7, 1 Corinthians 12:3 states that “***no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.***” Both sets of speakers in Revelation 5:13, 14:6-7 are examples of 1 Corinthians 12:3 in action, even if the Holy Ghost has to ‘inspire’ the speakers in Revelation 5:13 worldwide. It is then a question of whether they will say the exact words as recorded in the KJB, whether in English or another language* but in words directly equivalent to the KJB English words. It is virtually certain that they will speak the exact words as found in the KJB, according to Psalm 138:2, 1 Corinthians 2:13, 1 Thessalonians 2:13 and that the Spirit of God will achieve this in the future, in the Tribulation. It is impossible that God will dishonour His words by means of having the speakers recite a modern counterfeit that changes the words of Revelation 5:13, 14:6-7. *Not Koine Greek, because that can be shown to be a dead language, as even Dr DiVietro admits, *Cleaning-Up*, p 63.

Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint

1. See [point 1](#). Peter Heisey notes that “*the pastor unfortunately did not take into account the Greek grammatical principles elucidated, for example, in A Manual Grammar of The Greek New Testament, by H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, pp 150-151 (citing Moulton’s Prolegomena, p 27), “It is important to bear in mind that we cannot determine the English translation by the presence or absence of the article in Greek. Sometimes we should use the article in the English translation when it is not used in the Greek, and sometimes the idiomatic force of the Greek article may best be rendered by an anarthrous noun in English [i.e. without the article]. The best guide in this matter is well-informed common sense, exercised in keeping with the principle of exegesis [and context – POH] proposed long ago by William Webster: ‘The reason then for the usage or absence of the article will not be evident, unless we can look at the matter from the same point of view as that in which the writer regarded it.’”*”
2. See [point 2](#). It should be added with respect to this point that Dr DiVietro’s continuing insistence on the necessity of lexicons in order to understand the KJB via the Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek is a continuing denial on his part of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9, with respect to those believers who do not know the Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek.
3. See [point 3](#). Concerning the failed NKJV, the *true* King James Version remains the definitive vernacular translation of the correct definitive Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek texts, which it alone represents in English and has stood the test of time, as Dr Miles Smith wrote in the preface to the 1611 Holy Bible, *The Translators To The Reader*, “*Truly (good Christian Reader) we never thought from the beginning, that we should need to make a new Translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one...but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, that our mark.*” No just exceptions have emerged in the last 400 years.
4. See [point 4](#). Peter Heisey rightly observes “*The practical result of works like The Defined King James Bible, and Dr DiVietro’s own approach, is lazy Bible students who are not motivated (and who are in fact de-motivated) to “search the scriptures daily” (Acts 17:11) and to “study” (2 Timothy 2:15) in order to find the Bible’s (God’s) own meaning of the terms it (He) uses. Thus it is no surprise to find Dr D.A. Waite com-*

plaining that, “She [Riplinger] believes you must chase all over the King James Bible to find the definitions of its words,...” (A WARNING!! p 27). Dr Waite’s (and Dr DiVietro’s) implicit, though probably unintended, promotion of laziness over study is unbiblical and despicable in light of the above mentioned scriptures. Dr Mrs Riplinger did not say nor imply that it is a matter of “chas[ing] all over the King James Bible,” but rather “tracing” (her word) the word(s) all through the King James Bible to find their exact, precise, correct, in-context biblical meaning.”

The procedures to which Peter Heisey alludes above may be studied in Dr Mrs Riplinger’s books *The Language of the King James Bible* and *In Awe of Thy Word*, Parts 1 and 2.

Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint

1. See point 5. True confession on the part of the alcoholic includes, of course, admission that his ‘problem’ is really sin and an offence against a holy God, Romans 13:13, Galatians 5:21.

Peter Heisey observes with respect to Psalm 119 that “*there are numerous verses in Psalm 119 that either say or imply that David had all of the words of God (written to that point), in his hands and in a language that he could understand, so that he could obey them. The application of this truth is that it is possible, yea necessary, for Christians today to have all the words of God (not the mere “words of men” promoted by Drs Waite, Williams, DiVietro et al) in order to experience the blessings described in Psalm 119. See also Matthew 4:4 and Luke 4:4.*”

Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint

1. See point 2. It should be emphasised yet again that nowhere in this chapter does Dr DiVietro stipulate where the inspired, perfectly preserved original text of the Hebrew and Greek scriptures may be accessed. He insists that he has never corrected the King James Bible and that nothing should override its authority, *Cleaning-Up* pp 107, 110, yet he further insists that no-one can fully understand what God has said without going to the scriptures in the original languages (perfectly preserved in an undisclosed location). Dr DiVietro’s statement as summarised in the preceding sentence is clearly self-contradictory and, once again, a denial of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9.
2. See point 8. Concerning the fitness, or otherwise, of ungodly lexical editors for provision of study aids for teaching “*the words of God*” John 3:34, the opposite will apply at the Second Advent, according to Romans 9:22.

“What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction:”

In that day, God’s power will be made known against “*he that hath despised the word of the LORD*” Numbers 15:31.

This work will continue with responses to Dr DiVietro’s remaining comments against Dr Mrs Riplinger and *Hazardous Materials*.

Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials – Quotes and Comments, Point-Counterpoint

See **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint** and point 3 of the **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint** summary in the previous section for the answers to Dr DiVietro's objections to the 5 quotes he took from pp 1192-1193 of *Hazardous Materials*.

This section will cite in turn the quotes that Dr DiVietro has selected from *Hazardous Materials* beginning in *Cleaning-Up* p 115, his accompanying statements and this author's responses.

Quote 1, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 12

Dr DiVietro quotes the first 6 lines from under the heading *The Men Behind the Smoke-screens*, though without the list of corrupt new versions given.

Dr DiVietro allows that the quote is a fair statement of Dr Mrs Riplinger's thesis in writing *Hazardous Materials* but insists that the work is flawed and betrays a misunderstanding of God's Words*, according to 2 Timothy 2:15.

*Dr DiVietro has applied the term 'Words' incorrectly. See explanation below.

It is noteworthy that Dr DiVietro does not extend *Quote 1* to the question "What men spawned the sinister words wrongly used to 'correct' or redefine the words in the King James Bible?" The reason may be apparent in John 8:9, with respect to Dr DiVietro and the rest of the DBS Executive Committee "**being convicted by their own conscience**" about *The Defined King James Bible*. See **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** and point 4 of the summary section for **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** in the previous section.

It is ironic that once again, while accusing Sister Riplinger of misunderstanding the scripture, Dr DiVietro uses the term Word(s), capital W, for the scripture, when the term word(s) should strictly be used. The term Word, capital W *singular*, applies specifically to the Lord Jesus Christ (and therefore the plural term Words, capital W actually has no meaning at all). See John 1:1, 2, 14, 10:35. See comments on Dr Mrs Riplinger's fourth quote in **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint** and point 7 of the summary section for **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint** in the previous section.

Dr DiVietro also refers to God's (w)ords according to 2 Timothy 2:15, forgetting that this is a Bible translation chapter and verse reference that did not exist as such in the original text, which is the only Biblical text that God ever inspired, according to the DBS Executive Committee, *Cleaning-Up*, pp iii-iv, 2-3. Dr DiVietro is therefore either inconsistent in referring explicitly to 2 Timothy 2:15 as God's (w)ords or he is once again implying the existence of a two-tiered 'word of God,' one inspired the other uninspired. See comments in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** and in point 1 for the summary section of **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** in the previous section.

It appears that Dr DiVietro is not off to a particularly good start in this part of his book.

Quote 2, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 12-13

Dr DiVietro quotes Sister Riplinger's information about the ungodly associations of RV and ASV committee members and lexical editors with paedophiles, spiritualists, Unitarians and other confirmed heretics, who denied the blood atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ, Colossians 1:14. Dr DiVietro maintains that this information is nothing more than *ad hominem* attacks and has no bearing on the quality of any Biblical language study aids that some of these individuals, i.e. the lexical editors, produced, since they had outstanding linguistic ability regardless of unrighteous aspects of their personal lives.

The Lord's verdict on that kind of attitude and the individuals that it applies to is found in Matthew 12:35.

“O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.”

Dr DiVietro is like a Sunday school superintendent who would invite Satan to be one of his teachers because ***“thou art wiser than Daniel”*** Ezekiel 28:3.

Dr DiVietro protests that Sister Riplinger's past life could be used to discredit her own books. However, he makes a fatal error of overlooking the fact that Sister Riplinger has repeatedly testified in her *Broadcast Interviews on New Age Bible Versions* to God's saving grace for her as expressed in Psalm 40:2.

“He brought me up also out of an horrible pit, out of the miry clay, and set my feet upon a rock, and established my goings.”

This very same issue was raised in Challenge #2, which is to give the Christian testimony of the editor of any currently available Greek lexicon.

Dr DiVietro signally failed to answer it. His blatant attempt to associate Sister Riplinger with unsaved liberals and worse is a travesty.

See **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.

Quote 3, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 16

Dr DiVietro inserts the brief quote emboldened by Dr Mrs Riplinger ***“This author learned many things while researching this book. I trust that all who find this book in their hands will not assume that they have nothing left to learn.”***

Dr DiVietro is highly indignant at this quote, which he perceives as insulting to an objective reader of *Hazardous Materials* like himself, who can therefore level specific criticisms at the work, which he promises to do with respect to subsequent quotes from the work. (He makes a raft of unspecific criticisms of the book in this response, with respect to supposed distortions, inaccuracies and deliberate misrepresentations. Readers may judge for themselves from the content of this work up until now whether or not Dr DiVietro has actually substantiated any of those criticisms thus far in *Cleaning-Up*.)

Note that Dr DiVietro's objectivity is self-proclaimed and may be suspect for that reason.

“Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips” Proverbs 27:2.

This author can easily specify new learning that has benefitted him from reading *Hazardous Materials*. To give just 3 examples:

1. The secular nature of Liddell and Scott's lexicon, based on wine-bibbing Proverbs 23:20 and pagan Greek contexts that they used intentionally to corrupt New Testament terms, *Hazardous Materials*, pp 209ff. Dr DiVietro, it should be remarked, has given no indication thus far in *Cleaning-Up* that either Liddell and Scott's lexicon or those that were later derived from it have ever been fully purged of their pagan Greek roots. See **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** and Dr Mrs Riplinger's citation of the scholar Chadwick who drew attention to the glaring inadequacies of the Liddell and Scott lexicon that persist to this day.
2. The pronounced leanings of Frederick Scrivener towards the Alexandrian text of Westcott and Hort and the changes he therefore introduced into his own Greek New Testament that was supposed to reflect the Greek Text underlying the KJB New Tes-

tament. (Any back translation of the KJB by Scrivener into Koine Greek is not the issue here. The changes that he introduced into his Greek New Testament in *departing* from the 1611 Holy Bible and why he did so are the issue.) See *Hazardous Materials*, Chapters 17, 18.

3. The research of Herman Hoskier, which indicates that the Books of the New Testament were compiled in multiple languages contemporaneously or almost contemporaneously with the original writings. See *Hazardous Materials*, Chapter 30.

Whether or not Dr DiVietro is aware of these matters, he would do well to meditate upon Proverbs 14:16, as it could be applied to ungodly so-called aids to Bible study, compiled by ungodly men.

“A wise man feareth, and departeth from evil: but the fool rageth, and is confident.”

Psalm 115:8, 135:18 are instructive concerning ***“The idols of the heathen...the work of men’s hands,”*** be they ***“silver and gold”*** as in the immediate context Psalm 115:4, 15 or the ***“enticing words of man’s wisdom”*** 1 Corinthians 2:4, like ungodly so-called aids to Bible study based on pagan Greek.

“They that make them are like unto them; so is every one that trusteth in them.”

It is this author’s considered opinion that Dr DiVietro’s real problem with ***Quote 3*** is that when he and his cronies of the DBS encountered Sister Riplinger’s research ***“the ground clave asunder that was under them. And the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed them up...with all that appertain unto them”*** Number 16:30-32, including Dr DiVietro’s notion that anything new is not true and vice versa, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 15, 31, 92 (unless first thought of by the DBS Executive Committee, no doubt).

Dr DiVietro and his cronies have been trying to dig themselves out of the rubble ever since and have only succeeded in digging themselves in deeper.

Quote 4, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 18

Dr Mrs Riplinger refers to ***“the so-called ‘originals’”*** in this quote. Dr DiVietro then asks what Dr Mrs Riplinger means by ‘the originals’? That isn’t the issue. The issue is what are ***“the so-called ‘originals’”***? Dr Mrs Riplinger explains what they are: they are the ***“so-called ‘original’ Greek and Hebrew study tools”*** to enable the student supposedly to find out what God ‘really’ said in any particular passage of scripture. Examples include:

1. The largely undisclosed Hebrew and Greek study aids that Dr DiVietro used to ‘clarify’ the ambiguous, confusing and difficult grammar of the 1611 Holy Bible, his words, *Cleaning-Up* pp 32, 91, 93-95, resulting in his gross distortion of John 11:33. See remarks at the end of **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**, at the beginning of **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint** and at the end of **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**.
2. The papyrus fragment to which Dr DiVietro refers on pp 94-95 of *Cleaning-Up* and which enables him to state *authoritatively* that the English word baptize means immerse. On p 110 of *Cleaning-Up* Dr DiVietro insists that he has never questioned either the meaning or the authority of the 1611 Holy Bible. Yet on pp 94-95, he feels compelled to call upon a variety of ancient sources in order to vouch for the authority of the 1611 Holy Bible, which seems to this author inconsistent at the very least.
3. The largely undisclosed Greek sources that Dr DiVietro used to expand, supposedly, upon what he perceives as the limited and unclear wording of the 1611 Holy Bible in John 19:30, Romans 3:23, 5:12-15, 1 John 1:9, 2 John 9-10. See **Challenge #6**,

Point-Counterpoint. Dr DiVietro's only *disclosed* Greek sources in this chapter are Homer, Thucydides and R. C. Trench, of which the scripture says, certainly with respect to ***"the deep things of God"*** 1 Corinthians 2:10:

"But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" 1 Corinthians 2:14.

In all these instances, Dr DiVietro has yet again gone against the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. Note that He states that the original words of scripture, i.e. in the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek, still exist but he does not say where they exist between two covers (or as an accessible web site).

Quote 5, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 21

This quote contains an overview of how *New Age Versions* and *Hazardous Materials* ***"create a complete examination of Greek and Hebrew study dangers."***

In answer, Dr DiVietro describes how he helped to set up subject and scripture indices for *New Age Versions* and how he was once Sister Riplinger's friend. He now declares that he must respond to the faulty logic in Dr Mrs Riplinger's work.

It should be recalled that Sister Riplinger extended a most gracious invitation to Dr DiVietro to co-labour on issues arising from *Hazardous Materials* ***"as brother and sister in Christ,"*** *Cleaning-Up* pp xiii-xiv.

Dr DiVietro appears not to have answered the invitation.

Far and away the most likely explanation for Dr DiVietro's silence is that Sister Riplinger has warned against the study dangers inherent in the very sources that Dr DiVietro evidently cherishes as the real 'authorities' for what he pretends that God 'really' said and for bolstering up the perceived *secondary* authority of the Holy Bible and upon which he has based his 30+ years of ministry.

That is, anyone who *really* wants to know what God *really* said, those who have 'over-learned, over-studied and over-prepared' with respect to 'the Greek' etc. are the ones best equipped to oblige. See *Cleaning-Up* pp 89, 95. Again, violation of the priesthood of all believers is apparent, 1 Peter 2:5, 9.

This author is moved to ask, that's really what all this is about, isn't it Doctor, all 400+ pages of *Cleaning-Up*?

Sister Riplinger ***"cut down all the idols"*** 2 Chronicles 34:7 that you had set up in the course of over three decades of ministry in ascendancy over ***"the scripture of truth"*** Daniel 10:21, the 1611 Holy Bible, in violation of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9 and culminating in *The Defined King James Bible* that was meant to be such a lucrative investment for the DBS. See remarks in **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**.

You therefore don't want to be Sister Riplinger's friend any more, do you, Doctor? Neither do your DBS Executive Committee fellow travellers.

Pathetic.

Proverbs 17:17 indicates none of you ever was Sister Riplinger's friend.

"A friend loveth at all times, and a brother is born for adversity."

Given the martyrdom associated with the 1611 Holy Bible, as Dr Mrs Riplinger documents in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 871ff, application can be made from Hebrews 9:19 **“he took the blood...and sprinkled both the book, and all the people.”**

The 1611 Holy Bible is a blood-sprinkled Book. Those **“born again...by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever”** 1 Peter 1:23 should therefore believe and obey Hebrews 13:12-13.

“Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate. Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach.”

Additional Information on Quote 5. Sister Riplinger has forwarded the following additional information with respect to Dr DiVietro’s claim that he was ‘her friend,’ her emphasis.

*“[Dr DiVietro] pretends that he was [my] personal ‘friend’ and implies that he collaborated with me. Such is childish exaggeration on his part. He and Dr Waite wanted an index for New Age Bible Versions for their own use (to sell on the Bible For Today website, no doubt \$\$\$\$\$). I graciously gave them my file. What they did to it to make their index, I have no idea, but he did not turn a Mac file into a WordPerfect file “for Mrs. Riplinger.” He did it for “Dr Waite’s purse.” I spoke to him once on the phone for a few minutes, many, many years ago, as I have thousands and thousands of callers. This is not the first time someone who spoke to me **once** has claimed to be my ‘friend.’”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s testimony is a warning to all of Dr DiVietro’s readers in these increasingly **“perilous times”** 2 Timothy 3:1.

“Confidence in an unfaithful man in time of trouble is like a broken tooth, and a foot out of joint” Proverbs 25:19.

Quote 6, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 22

This quote refers to *“the collusion between B. F. Westcott and C. J. Vaughan, the child molester.”*

Dr DiVietro asks if Dr Mrs Riplinger can produce any official records about Vaughan, like the ones the DBS produced on Sister Riplinger’s past and inserted into *Cleaning-Up* pp 321ff.

Dr DiVietro returns to this subject in **Quote 165**, p 239 of *Cleaning-Up* with respect to the first part of Chapter 22 of *Hazardous Materials*, pp 828-839, by means of a passing reference to what he terms *ad hominem* attacks. Given that official records of any kind of offence rely heavily on witness statements, much of the kind of evidence he requests under **Quote 6** is found in the remainder of the chapter, pp 840-858. Yet more evidence is found in Chapter 23 of *Hazardous Materials*, contributed by the Canadian scholar Dennis Palmu.

However, Dr DiVietro skips over both these portions of *Hazardous Materials*. He excuses himself for doing so on the grounds that even if the RV translators were Jesuit plants associated with Freemasons, sodomites and child molesters, it could have no bearing on any lexicon produced, it seems according to Dr DiVietro’s wording, from members of this camp.

Yet under **Quote 6**, p 119 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro totally disavows the Westcott and Hort text and all its derivatives e.g. Nestle’s editions. How can he not similarly disavow any so-called Bible study aids emanating from the same **“corrupt spring”** Proverbs 25:26?

The Lord said in Matthew 12:33 **“Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by his fruit.”**

Like the pitiful Lot who *“lingered”* Genesis 19:16, Dr DiVietro seems to be dithering with respect to Matthew 12:33 as applied to Bible study aids.

He should review Chapter 15 of *Hazardous Materials* and the fruit of the Nazi connection with respect to Bauer’s lexicon. Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, skips over this chapter in his comments.

In addition to Chapter 15 of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr DiVietro should review 1 Corinthians 2:14, with respect to supposed Bible study aids compiled by ungodly editors.

“But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.”

Quote 7, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 22

This quote concerns the editions of the Received Text available today. Dr DiVietro gives a lengthy comment to the effect that the 1611 Holy Bible is not ***“all scripture...given by inspiration of God,”*** that only the ‘God-breathed’ Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek scriptures* are ***“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”*** and that no-one believed otherwise for two millennia of the Christian church until the advent of Drs Ruckman and Mrs Riplinger, who originated the heresy, as Dr DiVietro perceives it that the 1611 Holy Bible is ***“all scripture...given by inspiration of God.”***

*The exact, preserved inspired copies that the DBS Executive Committee profess to have but won’t let on where they have them between two covers.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comment on *Quote 7* with the statement that Papias (140 A.D.) believed that the Gospel of Matthew was (apparently) first written in Hebrew.

It should be noted that typically, Dr DiVietro does not explain where the ‘God-breathed’ Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek scriptures may be located between two covers, or via any accessible web site, even though he demands in his comment on *Quote 4* that Dr Mrs Riplinger identify the ‘originals.’ That seems like an inconsistency on Dr DiVietro’s part to this author.

Moreover, on p 255, with respect to *Quote 181*, Dr DiVietro declares that it is *“absurd”* to believe the New Testament originals were written in any language other than Greek. It is strange, therefore that he does not accuse Papias of making an *“absurd”* remark about the Gospel of Matthew. See above. That seems like another inconsistency on Dr DiVietro’s part to this author.

Dr DiVietro should have reviewed Dr Mrs Riplinger’s latest book *The Hidden History of the English Scriptures* pp 2-6. She states the following.

“Scholars, such as Herman Hoskier, have long demonstrated that the originals were not written in Greek only. In the 1500s John Foxe records a statement from what he called “a certain old treatise, found in a certain ancient English book.” This “ancient” book says, “Also the four evangelists wrote the gospel in divers languages, as Matthew in Judea, Mark in Italy, Luke in Achaia, and John in Asia. And all these wrote in the languages of the same countries...” It goes on to say, “since Christ commanded his apostles to preach his gospel unto all the world, and excepted no people or language.””

Sister Riplinger states further that *“The Prologue before the book of Matthew in an edition of the Bishops’ Bible said, “Matthew, who also was called Leui, being of a Publican made an Apostle, did first in Iurie (Jewry) write the Gospel of Christ in the Hebrew tongue for their sakes which beleueed of the circumcision. It is uncertaine who afterwards did translate it into the Greeke tongue. Howbeit the copy of the Hebrew is kept vnto this day in the library of Cesarea, which library Pamphilus Martyr did gather together most diligently...”*

See also comments with respect to Foxe in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.

The list of individuals whom Dr DiVietro would have to accuse of absurdity in order for him to be ‘consistent’ grows longer.

For encouragement, the words of one of John Foxe’s most devoted disciples bear prayerful reflection. He was one of England’s mighty men and faithful Bible believers of the past. This is what he said in a letter to the martyrologist, John Foxe¹⁷². The words of the letter have an almost prophetic ring about them with respect to the subversion of the 1611 Holy Bible by those of whom the Lord warned in Matthew 7:15. **“Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.”**

*“To my very loving friend John Foxe...continue a faithful remembrance of us in your prayers that our present service may take that good effect as God may be glorified, His Church, our Queen and country preserved and the enemy of truth [“**thy word is truth**” John 17:17] utterly vanquished, that we may have continued peace in Israel* - our enemies are many, but our Protector commandeth the whole world, let us pray continually, and our Lord Jesus will help in good time mercifully - Francis Drake” *England.*

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s remarks on the supposed heresy of believing that the 1611 Holy Bible is **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”** and how long that supposed heresy has existed, see **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint** and comments by the pre-1611 translators, Bishop J. C. Ryle and George Bernard Shaw.

See also **Preface and Introduction** and Dr Smith’s admonition from *The Translators to the Reader* with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible, **“Be not like swine to tread under foot so precious things, neither yet like dogs to tear and abuse holy things...”**

The identity of **“that holy thing”** Luke 1:35 is well known. So is that of the **“holy things”** to which Dr Smith refers. They are both of **“the Holy Ghost”** and both are genuinely inspired. See also the remarks of Professor William Lyon Phelps and the remarks of Charles Haddon Spurgeon in the **Introduction**.

Dr DiVietro seems loathe even to address, let alone answer this kind of testimony about the 1611 Holy Bible.

Quote 8, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 29

The quote states in part that *“The resident evil and heresy in the New King James Version (NKJV)...lies in [the editors’] use of lexicons, all of which are corrupt.”*

Dr DiVietro states that it is very wrong to say that use of lexicons has resulted in the NKJV departing from the truth. He says that 96% of the NKJV is faithful to the original and that only a small part of the NKJV text was compiled through use of lexicons. The changes were made to its text, he explains, so that the NKJV could be legally copyrighted. He accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of producing no evidence to support her claim.

Again, Dr DiVietro fails to identify what he calls ‘the original’ and to disclose where it can be found between two covers, although he requires that Dr Mrs Riplinger do so. See comments under **Quote 4**.

Dr Mrs Riplinger does produce evidence to support her statement. Dr DiVietro is lying in this respect. Dr Mrs Riplinger lists the lexicons that Arthur L. Farstad, NKJV editor, cited for the NKJV, those of Arndt et al, Brown et al and Gesenius and she provides a chapter on each, Chapters 16, 24, 25. Chapter 16 of *Hazardous Materials* reveals that Danker denies the readings **“God was manifest in the flesh”** in 1 Timothy 3:16, **“Jesus”** in Hebrews 4:8 (and there-

fore in Acts 7:45), “*by Jesus Christ*” in Ephesians 3:9, “*Joseph*” in Luke 2:33 and all of Acts 8:37. The chapter also shows that Danker mocks the word “*hell*.”

The NKJV alters “*Jesus*” to “*Joshua*” in Acts 7:45, Hebrews 4:8, denying the Lord’s pre-incarnate interventions on behalf of His people and disputes the 1611 Holy Bible readings of Luke 2:33, Acts 8:37, Ephesians 3:9, 1 Timothy 3:16 in its footnotes, all of which impinge on major doctrine.

The NKJV removes “*hell*” from 13 verses in the Old Testament, replacing it with “*Sheol*”; 2 Samuel 22:6, Job 11:8, 26:6, Psalm 16:10, 18:5, 86:13, 116:3, Isaiah 5:14, 14:15, 28:15, 18, 57:9, Jonah 2:2 and from 10 verses in the New Testament, replacing it with “*Hades*”; Matthew 11:23, 16:18, Luke 10:15, 16:23, Acts 2:27, 31, Revelation 1:18, 6:8, 20:13, 14, 23 verses in all.

See also comments about Danker in **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint**.

It is up to Dr DiVietro to show that the above NKJV detractions from “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God*” are not at least in part attributable to the subversive influence of lexical editors like Danker et al.

Dr DiVietro’s comments about the supposed faithfulness of the NKJV to the (unidentified by Dr DiVietro) original are disconcerting, to say the least, for an individual who declares that he has been faithful to the KJB throughout his ministry, *Cleaning-Up* p 110.

The following authors rightly denounced the heinous NKJV. It is strange that Dr DiVietro does not do so in this part of his book.

1. *Final Authority* by Dr William Grady, Grady Publications, 1993, Chapter XVII, *The Cutting Edge of Apostasy*
2. *About The “New” King James Bible* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1983

Dr Ruckman rightly refers to the NKJV as the JFV, Jerry Falwell Version, after one of that version’s main promoters, who is also remembered as the leader of the Moral Majority¹⁷³ in the USA, a short-lived evangelical Christian political movement in the 1970s-1980s.

Dr Ruckman’s book documents numerous errors in the NKJV where its readings depart from the Text of the 1611 Holy Bible, including Job 1:1, 3:7, 8, 26, 4:4, 17, 13:8, 12, 27, 28, 24:24, 26:6, 13, 30:29, 32:15-16, 35:3, 38:19, 20, 41:25, Proverbs 1:4, 5, 6, 32, 2:1, 7, 7:6, 11, 16, 8:17, 12:4, 14:12, 15:4, 19:24, 20:1, 2, 24, 21:27, 25:25, 26:11, 30:31, Romans 1:18, 25, 2 Corinthians 2:17, 1 Thessalonians 5:22, 1 Timothy 6:5, 10, 20; 48 verses in all and the list is not exhaustive.

3. *NKJV Nonsense* by Daryl R. Coats, Soldiers in Training, Blessed Hope Baptist Church, P.O. Box 1172, Natchitoches, LA 71458-1172, 1992, also available from the Bible Baptist Bookstore
4. *Counterfeit* by Terry Watkins, www.av1611.org/nkjb.html

This work extensively documents the satanic nature of the NKJV logo and lists the 23 verses where the NKJV changes “*hell*” to “*Sheol*” or “*Hades*”; 2 Samuel 22:6, Job 11:8, 26:6, Psalm 16:10, 18:5, 86:13, 116:3, Isaiah 5:14, 14:15, 28:15, 18, 57:9, Jonah 2:2, Matthew 11:23, 16:18, Luke 10:15, 16:23, Acts 2:27, 31, Revelation 1:18, 6:8, 20:13, 14. The tract discusses many other NKJV errors in additional verses that include Genesis 2:18, 22:8, 24:7, Ezra 8:36, Psalm 109:6, Matthew 7:14, 12:40,

18:26, 20:20, Mark 13:6, Luke 21:8, John 1:3, 4:24, 14:2, Acts 17:22, 24:14, Romans 16:18, 1 Corinthians 1:21, 22, 6:9, 9:27, 2 Corinthians 2:10, 5:17, 10:5, 11:6, Galatians 2:20, Titus 3:10, 2 Peter 2:1, 1 John 3:16, 5:13, Revelation 2:13, 6:14; a further 32 verses, 55 in total.

5. *NKJV Death Certificate* by Gail Riplinger,

www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html

This work describes the 666 logo of the NKJV, lists many verses revealing the more difficult words used by the NKJV to satisfy the derivative copyright law and many more verses revealing changes to the KJB that show how the NKJV demotes the Lord Jesus Christ and the Godhead and promotes works/progressive salvation for the Christian, the heresy of pantheism, the mark of the beast and the one world 'New Age' religion with self-esteemed i.e. sinful standards of individual behaviour.

6. *Which Bible is God's Word?* by Gail Riplinger, pp 22ff etc. See the index to that work.
7. *The New King James Bible* by A. & M. McBride, 61 Sealstown Road, Mallusk, Co. Antrim, N. Ireland, BT36 4QU, Tel: 028 9083 2524
8. *Three Modern Versions* by Alan J. Macgregor, The Bible League, 2004, Chapter 7, www.bibleleaguetrust.org/publications.html
9. *An Examination of the New King James Version, Parts 1, 2* by A. Hembd, MACS, www.trinitarianbiblesociety.org/site/articles/ahnkjb1.pdf, www.trinitarianbiblesociety.org/site/articles/ahnkjb2.pdf
10. *The New King James Version, A Critique* by Malcolm H. Watts, www.trinitarianbiblesociety.org/site/articles/a123.pdf
11. *What Today's Christian Needs To Know About The New King James Version* by G. W. & D. E. Anderson, www.trinitarianbiblesociety.org/site/articles/a110.pdf

Of course, the verses listed above in total will fall short of the 4% departure of the NKJV from what Dr DiVietro terms 'the original,' or whatever the percentage change of the NKJV text was in order to satisfy copyright laws. They are serious departures nevertheless that impinge on major doctrine and Dr DiVietro should have remarked upon them..

His comments under *Quote 8*, regrettably, imply that he is unconcerned even about the full total of NKJV alterations that together constitute the 4% changes to which he refers. The references listed above show that those changes are changes from the text of the 1611 Holy Bible.

The words of J. Coad¹⁷⁴, a concerned layman from Totnes, Devon, England should therefore be considered carefully. Mr Coad is commenting upon an estimated 3% difference between the Received Text underlying the 1611 Holy Bible and the Critical Text underlying the NIV.

““Yet wait...consider these NIV 3% short measures. They are not short measures of any secular book out of Egypt. They are part of the sacred measures of the **“Shekel of the Sanctuary”**!...we demand full measure after **“the Shekel of the Sanctuary”**! A 97% salvation is no salvation, and a 97% Bible is not God's Book. It has no place in the Sanctuary!””

A 96% Bible is not God's Book either and Dr DiVietro should say so.

“And Elijah came unto all the people, and said, How long halt ye between two opinions? if the LORD be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him. And the people answered him not a word” 1 Kings 18:21.

Quote 9, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 32, 36, 38

Quote 9 consists of 3 quotes warning against the deficiencies of currently available Greek and Hebrew lexicons. Dr DiVietro uses these quotes to mock Dr Mrs Riplinger’s material on the 1611 Holy Bible’s built-in dictionary, including embedded words, for example the words *ear* and *hear* in *hearken* and *evil* in *devil*. See *The Language of the King James Bible* p 30 and *In Awe of Thy Word* p 89. Dr DiVietro doesn’t mention these examples or their sources but he picks on the transliterated Hebrew word *sheol*, translated as **“pit”** or **“hell”** in scripture and says that Dr Mrs Riplinger finds the embedded words *hel(l)* and *hol(e)* in *sheol*, which he arrogantly and carelessly dismisses as stupid and cabalistic because he can find the word *shel(l)* in *sheol*.

Dr DiVietro’s remarks betray wilful ignorance 1 Corinthians 14:38 of the discipline of computational linguistics that Dr Mrs Riplinger explains in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 110-111, 1114ff. See **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint**.

His remarks also betray a wilful ignorance of Biblical geology, which Dr Gerardus Bouw describes in his book *Geocentricity* pp 11-19. Figures 1, 2 provide an overview of Biblical geology based on Dr Bouw’s book. Note that the scripture indicates that **“the bottomless pit”** Revelation 20:1 appears as a *shell* in the earth’s interior and that the Biblical English of the 1611 Holy Bible therefore sheds light on the original Hebrew word. Note further that the descriptions of earth’s interior of scripture and seismological science compare closely.




Figure 1 Earth and “The Nether Parts of the Earth”

Figure 1 - Key to Texts. N.B. **“Hell”** occurs 54 times in **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21

“A great gulf fixed” Luke 16:26

“Abraham’s bosom” Luke 16:22

“Bottomless pit” Revelation 9:1, 2, 11, 11:7, 17:8, 20:1, 3


“Hell” (*sheol**) Deuteronomy 32:22; 2 Samuel 22:6; Job 11:8, 22:6; Psalm 9:17, 16:10, 18:5, 55:15, 86:13, 116:3, 139:8; Proverbs 5:5, 7:27, 9:18, 15:11, 24, 23:14, 27:20; Isaiah 5:14, 14:9, 15, 28:15, 18, 57:9; Ezekiel 31:16, 17, 32:21, 27; Amos 9:2; Jonah 2:2; Habakkuk 2:5 (*hades**) Matthew 11:23, 16:18; Luke 10:15, 16:23; Acts 2:27, 31; Revelation 1:18, 6:8, 20:13, 14, (*geena**) Matthew 5:22, 29, 30, 10:28, 18:9, 23:15, 33; Mark 9:43, 45, 47; Luke 12:5, James 3:6, (*tartarus**) 2 Peter 2:4. *The distinctions are irrelevant in English

“Lowest hell” Deuteronomy 32:22, Psalm 86:13

“Nether parts of the earth” Ezekiel 31:14, 16, 18, 32:18, 24

“Pillars of the earth” 1 Samuel 2:8

“Sides of the pit” Isaiah 14:15, Ezekiel 32:23



The earth is divided into four main layers: the **inner core**, **outer core**, **mantle**, and **crust**. The core is composed mostly of iron (Fe) and is so hot that the outer core is **molten**, with about 10% sulphur (S). The inner core is under such extreme **pressure** that it remains solid. Most of the Earth's mass is in the mantle, which is composed of iron (Fe), magnesium (Mg), aluminum (Al), silicon (Si), and oxygen (O) **silicate** compounds. At over 1000 degrees C, the mantle is solid but can deform slowly in a **plastic** manner. The crust is much thinner than any of the other layers, and is composed of the least dense calcium (Ca) and sodium (Na) aluminum-silicate minerals. Being relatively cold, the crust is rocky and **brittle**, so it can fracture in **earthquakes**.

Figure 2 Earth's Interior – from the Nevada Seismological Lab¹⁷⁵

Quote 10, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 42

Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals in this quote that she has spent 22 years studying Greek New Testament words for eight hours a day and a total of 30 years helping bewildered believers escape the entanglements of apostasy that ensnared them through currently available Greek and Hebrew supposed Bible study helps.

Dr DiVietro declares that he has extensively studied Hebrew and Greek study resources and that he has never seen the apostasy that Dr Mrs Riplinger describes.

Dr DiVietro states further that he has been steadfast in his belief that the Bible is the Words of God and that the King James Bible is the most reliable translation of God's words in English.

He adds that he cannot believe that Dr Mrs Riplinger has studied Greek for eight hours a day for 22 years.

Before calling Sister Riplinger a liar with respect to her Greek studies, Dr DiVietro should remember that Dr John Bois, a noted King James translator, customarily studied Biblical languages for 16 hours a day, *while standing*. See **Preface and Introduction**.

“With God all things are possible” Matthew 19:26, according to His calling for all individuals **“for the work whereunto I have called them”** Acts 13:2.

Note again Dr DiVietro's inaccurate use of the term Words to describe the scriptures. See comments under **Quote 1**, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 12. Whatever Dr DiVietro and the rest of the DBS Executive Committee perceive the meaning of the term Word to be, this author chooses to abide by the scriptural usage of the term **“Word,”** John 1:1, 14, 1 John 1:1, 5:7, Revelation 19:13.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's stance on the 1611 Holy Bible, see remarks in **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’, Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint and Necessary Additional Observations, Preface and Introduction** point 3. Compare Dr DiVietro's statements about the 1611 Holy Bible on pp 7, 18, 88, 93-94 of *Cleaning-Up* with respect to its accuracy as a translation.

He now refers, *Cleaning-Up* p 123, to the 1611 Holy Bible as the most *reliable* translation of God's words (unspecified with respect to what actually *is* God's words between two covers) i.e. the Bible (unspecified with respect to what actually is the Bible between two covers).

A ‘most reliable’ translation, *Cleaning-Up* p 123 is *not* the same as a ‘consistently accurate’ translation, *Cleaning-Up* pp 7, 18, not to this author it isn't.

The Concise Oxford Dictionary definition of the word *accurate* is *in exact conformity with a standard or with truth* i.e. inerrant, which word Dr DiVietro does not appear to use with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible. The definition of the word *reliable* is *of sound and consistent character or quality* but the word *reliable* is *not* given as a synonym for the word *accurate*. Dr DiVietro's ‘most reliable’ translation could therefore easily be perceived as one that is sounder and more consistent than any other with respect to an exact standard but *not in exact conformity with that standard*.

One wonders if Dr DiVietro is inclining towards those **“who in their hearts turned back again into Egypt”** Acts 7:39 and those who **“in their hearts”** ‘prefer’ the in-the-majority-word-for-word-with-the-original NKJV, *Cleaning-Up* pp 121-122. According to Dr DiVietro, the NKJV is ‘reliable,’ even 96% so.

Finally on this point, it appears to this author that Dr DiVietro cannot see the apostasy that Dr Mrs Riplinger describes because he is part of it.

“Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!” Isaiah 5:20.

Additional Information on Quote 10. Sister Riplinger has forwarded the following observation with respect to Dr DiVietro’s comments in which he distorts her actual words as found on p 42 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphases.

“Regarding “Quote 10”: DiVietro completely changes what I said and makes up his own straw man. He says “her claim that she spent five days per week, eight hours per day reading the Greek New Testament” is “excessive” and “unreal.” I never said such a thing. I said I spent that amount of time on “such materials” which include “Greek and Hebrew study tools” (in the same paragraph) and “years and years reading all of the hard-to-find-books written by the authors of Greek and Hebrew lexicons and editions” (next paragraph) (see Hazardous Materials, p. 42). How he turned “such materials” into the Greek N.T. alone is beyond me.”

It may well be that any reference to ‘the Greek’ as in “*the Greek work*” *Hazardous Materials* p 42 provokes a reaction in DBS quarters equivalent to that which Paul encountered in Acts 22:22, after he had spoken the word “**Gentiles**” in Acts 22:21. Jews would hate the very mention of the word “**Gentiles**.”

“And they gave him audience unto this word, and then lifted up their voices, and said, Away with such a fellow from the earth: for it is not fit that he should live.”

Today’s DBS “**Grecians**” 9:29 would appear to hate the very mention of the word ‘Greek’ by a ‘non-Grecian.’ If so, it provides further explanation for the sustained level of DBS vitriol directed against Sister Riplinger.

It should be noted that Dr DiVietro refers to those with wide experience of “*the Greek New Testament*,” no doubt including himself. Yet again, he does not disclose the actual identity of ‘the’ Greek New Testament, nor where it can be obtained between two covers, nor, explicitly, why it should be perceived as superior to “*the king’s word*” 2 Samuel 24:4 of the 1611 English Holy Bible.

Once again, Dr DiVietro has violated the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9 by his obsession with ‘the Greek.’ He may be likened to the sinister Cornish wreckers of the early 19th century that Daphne du Maurier described in her celebrated novel *Jamaica Inn* “***that put darkness for light, and light for darkness***” Isaiah 5:20. See comments above *Additional Information on Quote 10*.

Quote 11, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 60

Dr DiVietro quotes the statement at the top of the page that reads “*Greek and Hebrew lexicons, infected by the unhealthy minds of their authors, have contaminated modern bible versions, Bible study tools, and Bible dictionaries with their hazardous materials.*”

Dr DiVietro makes the perplexing statement in response that Dr Mrs Riplinger is inconsistent in stating (with no references given by Dr DiVietro) on occasion that lexicons are the basis for translations and in other parts of her book(s) that translations come from lexicons.

This author can’t see any inconsistency at all in the two statements but without actual page references from Dr DiVietro, it is not possible to comment further in this respect.

Dr DiVietro, however, seems to have missed the point of the quote, namely that currently available lexicons and so-called Bible study aids have a contaminating influence on the meanings of the words of scripture.

He should have read the quote near the bottom of p 60 of *Hazardous Materials*, which substantiates **Quote 11**. Emphases appear to be Dr Mrs Riplinger's.

““[W]e cannot know for certain that what we find in front of us is sound. [A]ll the existing lexical entries in **all our dictionaries** are now **obsolete**” – John Lee, Lexicographer”

Quote 12, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 61

This quote includes the statement from Frederick Danker to the effect that ““*lexicography is more of an art than a craft...*””

Dr DiVietro agrees. However, he insists that corrupt bible translations are not the result of lexicons but come from corrupt sources and ungodly translators. Dr DiVietro illustrates his statement by means of Philippians 2:6. He consults 10 lexicons to show that the underlying Greek word *harpagmos* should indeed be translated “**robbery**” as in the 1611 Holy Bible. He says that the lexicons are almost agreed that “**robbery**” is the correct term and that the modern alteration to “*a thing to be grasped*” or similar as found in the NASV, NIV, NRSV has been imposed by biased editors with unscriptural leanings and is not the fault of the lexicons.

Dr DiVietro states further that without the help of lexicons, it would be impossible to define the word *harpagmos*, which, he says, appears only once in scripture i.e. in Philippians 2:6, as indeed it does (in any Greek New Testament).

Inspection of the 10 lexical definitions that Dr DiVietro cites shows that one of them, No. 4, explicitly states that “**robbery**” as theft is the necessary meaning. That source is cancelled out by another lexicon, No. 10 that says that the sense of the term “**robbery**” in Philippians 2:6 is as a thing to be grasped. 8 of the 10 lexicons that Dr DiVietro cites contain the definitions of seizing, grasping or holding by force, No.'s 4 and 5 appearing to be the exceptions. Dr DiVietro's conclusion that the lexical testimony is almost uniform with respect to the wording “**robbery**,” i.e. as theft or plunder, is therefore over-optimistic. The lexicons he cite also contain enough substance to support the modern reading found in the NASV, NIV, NRSV, certainly for a modern editor who sought to undermine the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Dr DiVietro forgot John 18:40, describing the individual whose place the Lord took at Calvary.

“Then cried they all again, saying, Not this man, but Barabbas. Now Barabbas was a robber.”

He also forgot Mark 15:27 and John 10:1.

“And with him they crucify two thieves; the one on his right hand, and the other on his left.”

“Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber.”

Regardless of different wording in ‘the Greek,’ the Lord's enemies knew exactly *why* they wanted Him dead. They understood Isaiah 42:8 where the Lord said “***my glory will I not give to another***” and they perceived the Lord Jesus Christ as a usurping “***another***” according to John 10:33.

“The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.”

The Jews perceived the Lord Jesus Christ as a ‘God robber’ with respect to God's glory and that is why “**with him they crucify two thieves.**” That is also why the word “**robbery**” as

theft or plunder is the only feasible translation of ‘the Greek’ in Philippians 2:6. The derivation of the wording “**robbery**” is therefore *Biblical*, not *non-Biblical* as Dr DiVietro claims. The lexicons, with their additional meanings of seizing, grasping or holding by force, are wrong and misleading.

See Dr Ruckman’s¹⁷⁶ detailed commentary on Philippians 2:6.

Quote 13, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 61

This quote describes how modern lexical editors essentially perpetuate the errors of past editions. Dr DiVietro is indignant with the content of the quote because he insists once again that much is to be gained from studying everyday usage of words to which he says that God imparted Biblical meanings. See *Cleaning-Up* pp 61-65.

He also accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of being inconsistent in using the lexical editors’ own words to condemn their own works. See, for example, the statement from John Lee at the end of **Quote 11**.

Sister Riplinger is not being inconsistent in this respect at all. Her citation of John Lee is no different from her citation¹⁷⁷ of the late Dr Frank Logsdon¹⁷⁸ with respect to modern counterfeits such as the NASV and NIV. Dr Logsdon made the following statement in 1987, shortly before his death.

“Friends, you can say the Authorized Version is absolutely correct. How correct? 100% correct! Because biblical correctness is predicated upon doctrinal accuracy, and not one enemy of this Book of God has ever proved a wrong doctrine in the Authorized Version. You’ve never heard of anyone’s intellect being thwarted because he believed this Authorized Version, have you? And you never will. You’ve never heard of anyone anytime going astray who embraced the precepts of the Authorized Version, and you never will...”

“I’m afraid I’m in trouble with the Lord, because I encouraged [Dewey Lockman] to go ahead with [the NASV]. We laid the groundwork; I wrote the format; I helped to interview some of the translators; I sat with the translators; I wrote the preface. When you see the preface to the New American Standard, those are my words...”

“Dr. David Otis Fuller in Grand Rapids [Michigan]. I’ve known him for 35 years, and he would say (he would call me Frank; I’d call him Duke), “Frank, what about this? You had a part in it; what about this; what about that?” And at first I thought, Now, wait a minute; let’s don’t go overboard; let’s don’t be too critical. You know how you justify yourself the last minute...”

“But I finally got to the place where I said [to my wife], “Ann, I’m in trouble; I can’t refute these arguments; it’s wrong; it’s terribly wrong; it’s frightfully wrong; and what am I going to do about it?” Well, I went through some real soul searching for about four months, and I sat down and wrote one of the most difficult letters of my life, I think.

“I wrote to my friend Dewey, and I said, “Dewey, I don’t want to add to your problems,” (he had lost his wife some three years before)... “but I can no longer ignore these criticisms I am hearing and I can’t refute them. The only thing I can do - and dear Brother, I haven’t a thing against you and I can witness at the judgment of Christ and before men wherever I go that you were 100% sincere,” (...I guess nobody pointed out some of these things to him) “I must under God renounce every attachment to the New American Standard.”...”

“I tell you, dear people, somebody is going to have to stand. If you must stand against everyone else, stand...”

In conclusion, Dr Logsdon said this.

“Let’s be people of the Book. It took my mother to heaven; and my dad, my grandfather, my grandmother. It was Moody’s Book; it was Livingstone’s Book. [C. T.] Studd gave up his fortune to take this Book to Africa. And I don’t feel ashamed to carry it the rest of my journey. It’s God’s Book.

““Our Father, we thank Thee and praise Thee for Thy Word. Help us to love it, and preach it, and teach it, and tell everybody we can the Good News through thy Word. In Jesus’ name. Amen.””

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s notion that much can be gained by studying everyday usage of Greek words to which he asserts that God imparted Biblical meanings, *Cleaning-Up* pp 61-67, see extract from **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.

Dr DiVietro further insists that Biblical meanings of New Testament Greek words can only be understood by means of contemporary study aids (AIDS?) that are the next best thing to immersing oneself in the society that spoke the language i.e. Koine Greek. That is, the student is supposed to immerse himself in “crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks” in order to understand the “pure words” of the Lord, Psalm 12:6 and the “wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ” 1 Timothy 6:3.

Dr DiVietro, who substantiates nothing in this part of his book, seems to think that “the washing of water by the word” Ephesians 5:26 can be understood by means of a metaphorical swim in a sewer. Flannel, sheer flannel. He evidently hasn’t read 1 Corinthians 15:33 recently.

“Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners.”

And again, he forgot Job 14:4.

“Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.”

Dr DiVietro then concludes this section of his book with the eye-watering assertion that God took the words the early Greeks used (evidently from the “crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks”) and invested them with Biblical meanings.

Chapter and verse? Dr DiVietro cannot provide chapter and verse to substantiate this assertion, not even from the Greek ‘original,’ the source of which remains known only the DBS Executive Committee.

Once again, like **“a stranger”** against whom the Lord warned in John 10:5, Dr DiVietro is misleading his readers, in the direction of *“crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks.”*

Quote 14, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 67

This quote states that lexicographers and Bible dictionary editors themselves admit that commonly used Bible study aids contain blatant errors and that any Bible dictionary only lasts about 20 years before it needs to be revised.

Dr DiVietro maintains that lexicons etc. must be updated as new information comes to hand and that this process would apply even to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s books, thereby invalidating her earlier work. He states that it is quite acceptable to use those parts of the out-dated Bible study aids that have not been revised.

Dr DiVietro has clearly neglected to peruse Dr Mrs Riplinger’s updated works, including later editions of *New Age Versions* and the second editions of *Which Bible is God’s Word?*

and *King James Version Ditches Blind Guides*. These revisions differ from the lexical revisions to which Dr Mrs Riplinger refers because they do *not* invalidate her earlier work. They essentially *add* material that *strengthens* her original theses.

If Dr DiVietro is intent on charging Sister Riplinger with updating her books to correct blatant errors, he should provide examples. Thus far he has failed to do so.

The glaring difficulty of using out-dated, error-riddled Bible study aids that has escaped Dr DiVietro's notice is that *the ordinary student cannot know in advance of any revision* where the serious errors lie in the lexical aids that he possesses. He can only acquire this knowledge after going to the trouble and expense, which impediment Dr DiVietro fails to address, of renewing his lexical library *and diligently checking the entire contents of the new volumes for changes in word definitions*. Dr DiVietro lists 10 Bible study aids, so-called, with respect to **Quote 12**. How often must these sources be updated and at whose expense? If the necessary costs are borne by Dr DiVietro in his case, would it not be a better use of the Lord's resources to trust in the 1611 Holy Bible's built-in dictionary, see *The Language of the King James Bible* Chapter 1 and give the money to a missionary instead?

In the meantime, while the student is checking through his renewed lexical acquisitions, anything that he wrote, preached or taught based on unforeseen errors in his older editions **"will eat as doth a canker"** 2 Timothy 2:17.

Quote 15, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 68

This brief quote states, author's emphasis *"Given the ever-changing theories of scholars, Chadwick says that any **printed** lexicon is subject to error."*

Dr DiVietro basically repeats his mantra from the previous quote that a careful student can still benefit from using a Bible study aid marred with error.

The context of **Quote 15** *Hazardous Materials* pp 68-70 shows otherwise, as Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals, first quoting Lee, her emphases throughout.

"...all the existing lexical entries in all our dictionaries are now obsolete...."

Quoting Chadwick:

*"A **continuously progressive** lexicon should be created...with on-line facilities for consultation at a distance"*

Such a resource may be of limited usefulness on many parts of the mission field that don't have internet access. Even where internet access is possible, such a resource would obviously have to be multilingual, which is an essential requirement that Dr DiVietro and the DBS do not appear to have addressed.

Quoting Danker:

*"Changes in language are such that bilingual dictionaries [e.g. Greek-English] cannot lay claim to permanence. Their very genre is subject to an inexorable **evolutionary** process..."*

Dr Mrs Riplinger rightly warns against this kind of lexical Darwinianism, which Dr DiVietro appears to condone but is yet again an example of the violation of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9.

"Conclusion – avoid the hazardous materials:

"[M]eddle not with them that are given to change" (Prov. 24:21)."

It should also be noted that Korean Pastor Gene Kim in his book *Ruckmanism Ruckus*, Chapter 19, warns against the unsaved editors of lexicons, interlinears and other supposed Bible

study aids who give incorrect definitions of Biblical words that are then used by unsuspecting students to ‘correct’ the 1611 Holy Bible.

Pastor Kim also explicitly denounces as apostate the following Hebrew/Greek editors; Thayer, Robertson, Trench, Briggs, Vine, Gesenius, Danker, Ricker Berry, Strong and Schaff. Pastor Kim reaches his conclusions about these editors directly on the basis of their own works or biographical works about them, *not* on the basis of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s books.

Pastor Kim concludes from 1 Corinthians 2:14 that the editors listed above are not fit to provide meanings for Biblical words. See remarks under **Quote 4**.

“But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.”

Dr DiVietro should include a section denouncing Pastor Kim if he publishes a second edition of *Cleaning-Up*. Otherwise, he would be ‘inconsistent.’

Quote 16, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 69

The statement quoted by Dr DiVietro reads *“In the end scholars simply want the reader to “make up his or her own decisions about the meanings of words” rather than take definitions dogmatically from a lexicon.”*

Dr DiVietro fully agrees with the scholars. However, in a strangely unrelated statement that he fails to substantiate at this point, Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of being harsh in declaring that lexical editors deliberately change word meanings in order to prevent accurate translation.

Sister Riplinger is of course not being harsh at all in this respect. See **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** and the extensive comments on how *Hazardous Materials* Chapter 4 reveals the unscrupulous manner in which editors of lexicons impose worldly meanings on Biblical words, e.g. Danker’s ***“private interpretation”*** 2 Peter 1:20 of the word ***“grace”*** as mere *“generosity.”*

Dr DiVietro nevertheless goes on to make the astounding statement that students should make their own decisions about the meanings of words defined by lexicons, based on their individual intelligence, knowledge and experience. According to Dr DiVietro, such decisions should not be based on emotion or pragmatism, which in the context appears to mean a definition that suits the reader’s personal preference.

Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing in his response to **Quote 16**. Nor does he explain how intelligence, knowledge and experience may be absolutely partitioned from emotion or pragmatism. How can any student be certain that he is trusting in the former with no influence of the latter, independently of simply believing the words of the 1611 Holy Bible as they stand?

Dr DiVietro makes no mention of prayer for understanding the Lord’s words, Proverbs 2:1-5 and he seems to be totally unaware of Jeremiah 17:9.

“The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?”

Significantly, he omits Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statements before and after **Quote 16**, as follows, her emphases.

“Their Final Conclusion = No Conclusions

““every man did that which was right in his own eyes” Judges 17:6

*“Danker says that his lexicon “opens the door to the reader’s own innovative translation”...In other words, he admits that there is no such thing as **the** ‘meaning’ of a Greek word.”*

Danker’s admission shows that he is **“the natural man”** of 1 Corinthians 2:13 with no real understanding of the scripture according to Proverbs 8:8-9.

“All the words of my mouth are in righteousness; there is nothing froward or perverse in them. They are all plain to him that understandeth, and right to them that find knowledge.”

Why should his so-called Bible study aids be trusted, or those of any academic like him, Dr DiVietro’s repeated recommendations notwithstanding?

On p 93 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro states that any individual translation of a passage in the (undisclosed between two covers) Hebrew and Greek texts should match the equivalent passage in the KJB, otherwise the translation is incorrect.

How is the student able to achieve a correct translation if he is forced to rely on Hebrew and Greek sources that are effectively a lexical free for all? Why indeed should he do so, given that the accurate text of the 1611 Holy Bible already exists? Dr DiVietro does not address these questions.

Nor has he shown that he is able to expound the text of the 1611 Holy Bible satisfactorily himself from recourse to ‘the Hebrew and the Greek’ by means of intelligence, knowledge and experience or any other means. See remarks in **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** on John 11:33 and in **Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint** on the 5 additional examples he provides in exaltation of ‘the Greek.’

Dr DiVietro should carefully consider Luke 6:39.

“And he spake a parable unto them, Can the blind lead the blind? shall they not both fall into the ditch?”

Quote 17, from Hazardous Materials, p 70

This quote warns against Bible study aids based on the Westcott-Hort/Nestle-Aland/UBS texts that give the incorrect words “ages” or “nations” in Revelation 15:3 instead of the correct term “saints.” The lexicons compound the error by giving the definitions “ages” or “nations” with reference to Revelation 15:3.

Dr DiVietro insists that Dr Mrs Riplinger’s example of Revelation 15:3 is not valid because the student should simply be taught to use a correct lexicon based on the King James New Testament Text. Dr DiVietro refers to *Strong’s Concordance* for this purpose.

Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals the dangers inherent in using *Strong’s Concordance* in *Hazardous Materials* Chapter 4, from which Dr DiVietro extracts his **Quotes 56-60** inclusive. Dr DiVietro’s comments on these quotes will be addressed when that part of his book is reached.

What Dr DiVietro appears to have overlooked with respect to editors of Bible study aids is ***“their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of”*** 2 Peter 2:2. This is the substance of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warning in *Hazardous Materials* p 70.

Vine’s *Expository Dictionary of Bible Words* for the word saint(s) is an example, citing Revelation 15:3, p 315.

“In Rev. 15:3 the RV follows those texts which have aionon, “ages,” and assigns the reading ethnon, “nations,” to the margin: the A.V. translates those which have the inferior reading hagian, “saints,” and puts “nations” and “ages” in the margin.”

Modern Cambridge Editions of the AV1611 put “*nations*” and “*ages*” in the margin but the 1611 AV1611 does not, showing that the King James translators did not consider that “*nations*” and “*ages*” were viable alternative translations.

Vine’s insidious treatment of the term “*saints*” in Revelation 15:3 could easily infiltrate the classroom, along with all other such instances of “*evil speaking*” Ephesians 4:13 against “*the way of truth.*”

That is the substance of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warning that Dr DiVietro tries to obscure.

Whatever his profession to the contrary and his declared aversion to the Westcott-Hort text, *Cleaning-Up* pp 24-25 and the modern versions, Dr DiVietro is like the individual pictured below, from *The Attack* by Chick Publications, with respect to ‘The Greek etc.’




Figure 3 *The Attack*

Dr DiVietro by his statements that repeatedly deny inspiration for the 1611 Holy Bible, *Cleaning-Up* pp 3, 18, 88, is also aiding and abetting the “*grievous wolves*” Acts 20:29 who deny the very existence of the word of God for today’s believers in “*words easy to be understood*” 1 Corinthians 14:9.

See also comments on Revelation 15:3 in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**. Much of Dr DiVietro’s commenting on quotes that he has abstracted from *Hazardous Materials* p 77-78 is repeated in this section of his book.

Quote 18, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 77-78

The quote states “*New version editors and naive Bible students look to lexicons for what they think are ‘advanced’ insights. How shocking to discover that lexicons often take their ‘meanings’ from corrupt bible versions themselves.*”

Dr DiVietro complains that on pp 74-75 of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr Mrs Riplinger objects to the use of past sources to put together new Bible dictionaries etc. He states that this practice is quite legitimate and indeed a necessary part of the editors’ work.

Dr DiVietro therefore accuses Sister Riplinger of making an unsubstantiated statement because, according to him, students of the KJB do not want ‘advanced insights’ but instead what the KJB translators believed to be the correct meanings of words (i.e. in Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek) underlying the KJB Text.

Dr DiVietro’s presumption to speak for students of the 1611 Holy Bible and with respect to what they want or do not want from that source is the height of arrogance. It is also a slur on the King James translators. What they believed to be the correct meanings of words underlying

ing their English Text, as has been repeatedly stated in this work, *are found in that Text, by “comparing spiritual things with spiritual”* 1 Corinthians 2:13. They are *not* found by digging “*for words buried in haunted Greek graveyards.*” See again *The Language of the King James Bible* and *In Awe of Thy Word*, Parts 1-3 and p 544.

Moreover, this author *does* want ‘advanced insights’ from the 1611 Holy Bible in obedience to Jeremiah 33:3.

“Call unto me, and I will answer thee, and shew thee great and mighty things, which thou knowest not.”

It is significant that Dr DiVietro fails to specify the *content* of pp 74-75 of *Hazardous Materials*, the context of which continues to p 77. Dr Mrs Riplinger lists 7 sources of lexical definitions and cites statements of lexicographers who admit to plagiarism. Parts of their statements follow, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases.

Chadwick:

“...it is often possible to use dictionaries which have lost [copyright] protection. Raids on other dictionaries will usually go undetected...most scholars have found it easier to rely on another’s opinion, especially if enshrined in the dense print of a lexicon.”

Roberts:

“A reader familiar with the terminology of [Louw and Nida]’s definitions will recognize the impact” on Bauer, Danker, Arndt and Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*.

Kubo:

“The meanings of the words are by and large taken from Walter Bauer’s A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger notes that “*Because Kubo follows the corrupt “Nestle-Aland text” he falsely charges, “Mark 16:9-20 was not originally part of Mark...”*”

Metzger:

Dr Mrs Riplinger notes further that Bruce Metzger, “*great grandfather of all things Greek...also used the Catholic lexicon by Franciscus Zorell, a man he calls a “capable Jesuit scholar.”*”

Chadwick again:

“I have a poor opinion of most of the notes on words which have been handed down to us from antiquity, and I believe they have exerted far too great an influence on modern commentators...If the first publication of a new document incorrectly identifies a word, it is very hard for the lexicographer to escape from the wrong path.”

The practice of lexical hand-me-downs appears to have been carried out in a clandestine, haphazard and indeed scurrilous manner without any proper system of referencing and with no regard for “*the word of the LORD...precious in those days*” 1 Samuel 3:1, then as now.

As the Lord states in Jeremiah 23:30, 36:

“Therefore, behold, I am against the prophets, saith the LORD, that steal my words every one from his neighbour” and then “*have perverted the words of the living God, of the LORD of hosts our God.*”

The result is predictable.

“But he...is like a man that without a foundation built an house upon the earth; against which the stream did beat vehemently, and immediately it fell; and the ruin of that house was great” Luke 6:49.

Isaiah 32:7 sums up God’s attitude to lexical editors and the tools of their nefarious trade.

“The instruments also of the churl are evil: he deviseth wicked devices to destroy the poor with lying words, even when the needy speaketh right.”

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments on **Quote 18** by stating in effect that Dr Mrs Riplinger is lying because major lexicons do not take word meanings from Bible versions. This statement will be addressed in more detail under **Quote 19**, where it will be shown that it is Dr DiVietro who could be accused of lying.

Quote 19, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 78

This quote refers to the work by Newman entitled *A Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament*, in which the editor states that he used various modern versions, namely the RSV, Goodspeed and the Good News New Testament for the English definitions in his book.

Dr DiVietro objects mightily to the content of this quote because he states that Newman’s dictionary is a lexicon designed to give meanings of Greek words as they have been used in particular modern translations, i.e. Newman’s is a ‘version(s)-specific’ lexicon and not a general lexicon like that of Arndt et al that gives secular word meanings for New Testament Greek words.

See comments on Newman’s dictionary in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**. Dr DiVietro has given via the quote on p 78 of *Hazardous Materials* the title of Newman’s work, which he had not included in his earlier comments about Newman’s book on pp 56-57 of *Cleaning-Up*. Commenting on **Quote 19** he admits once again that he has not consulted Newman’s lexicon. In fairness to Sister Riplinger, Dr DiVietro surely should do so to confirm whether or not that dictionary is indeed ‘version(s)-specific,’ as he so strongly declares, given the level of vehemence in his accusations against Sister Riplinger.

Once again, it should be noted that nothing in the title of Newman’s dictionary would suggest that it is anything other than a general lexicon.

It is perhaps significant, therefore that Dr DiVietro does not here include, or comment on the statement in *Hazardous Materials* that follows **Quote 19** a mere two sentences later.

“The chapters [in Hazardous Materials] on Vine’s and Strong’s dictionaries demonstrate that their so-called ‘definitions’ come from the vile Revised Version (1881) and American Standard Version (1902).”

See comments above on Revelation 15:3. Before Dr DiVietro denounces these works as ‘version(s)-specific,’ he should note the comments by none other than W. Graham Scroggie and F. F. Bruce on their perception of Vine’s book.

Scroggie:

“The average reader is not wholly cut off from the treasures which lie (!) in the Greek New Testament, for these have been put within our reach by means of Grammars and Lexicons...so far as my acquaintance with these works goes, I do not hesitate to say that this Expository Dictionary more completely fulfils this design than any other such effort...”

Bruce:

“This Expository Dictionary comes as near as possible to doing for the non-specialist what is being done for the specialist by Kittel’s encyclopaedic Theological Dictionary to the New Testament...”

“[This Expository Dictionary] is so valuable a handbook to the study of the New Testament that many of us who have learned to use it regularly wonder how we ever got on without out.”

See *New Age Versions* Chapter 42 on Kittel, *Hazardous Materials* Chapter 12 on Vine and related comments in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.

Neither the Spirit of God, John 16:13, 1 Corinthians 2:13, nor earnest prayer for understanding Proverbs 2:1-5 seem to have any part in understanding the New Testament, according Bruce and Scroggie. Note the following from the introductory portions of Vine’s dictionary.

Scroggie:

“The Holy Spirit did not create a special language for Christianity, but used the colloquial [tongue] of the time. He employed the cosmopolitan Greek.”

Bruce:

“During the last seventy or eighty years [prior to 1952]...many documents have been found in the Near East written in this same [cosmopolitan] Greek, from which we have learned the very salutary lesson that the “language of the Holy Ghost” is nothing other than the language of the common people.”

Scroggie and Bruce appear to have been among Dr DiVietro’s mentors. See comments in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** on *Cleaning-Up* pp 62-63, where Dr DiVietro dumbs God’s words down to secular 1st century usage and the theatre of Shakespeare’s time. See also his comments on p 128 of *Cleaning-Up* under **Quote 13** where he states (without chapter and verse) that much is to be gained from studying Biblical words in a non-Biblical context.

It is as well that the King’s men have provided today’s Bible believers with the pure words of the Lord, according to Psalm 12:6.

“The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.”

See *In Awe of Thy Word*, Chapter 5 *The Holiest of All – Separate From Sinners – Pure Words* and Chapter 6 *Pure Words...Tried*.

Dr DiVietro gives no specific indication with respect to **Quote 19** that Newman’s work is any more ‘version(s)-specific’ than those of Kittel, Vine and Strong.

His level of invective against Sister Riplinger demands that he should do so. Otherwise, Dr DiVietro could be accused of lying.

Quote 20, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 78

This quote states, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphasis *“Newman based his lexicon on W. F. Moulton and Geden’s A Concordance to the Greek Testament which is based on the adulterated Greek texts of “Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and the English Revisers [Revised Version].”*

In response, Dr DiVietro repeats the mantra (in block capitals) that the title and introduction of Newman’s work should be read to show that it is ‘version(s)-specific.’ He accuses anyone who doesn’t do this of being lazy.

It should be noted that Dr DiVietro up to this point in his book, *Cleaning-Up* p 134, has not consulted Newman's work.

He has also skipped over the next two paragraphs of *Hazardous Materials* p 78 that cast further doubt on the notion that Newman's dictionary is any more 'version(s)-specific' than the compilations of Kittel, Vine and Strong – and Danker, see below.

"In the preface Newman admits that "meanings are given in present-day English, rather than in accord with traditional ecclesiastical terminology" [what Danker disdainfully calls "churchly" words].

"He then admits he "borrowed" from the lexicons of Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich, Liddell, Scott, Moulton and Milligan."

Newman's and Danker's attitudes to the New Testament are the same as those of the unregenerate sceptic J. J. Griesbach¹⁷⁹, 1745-1812. By implication, with all of Newman's 'borrowing,' so are those of Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich, Liddell, Scott, Moulton and Milligan.

"The most suspicious reading of all," Griesbach wrote, "is the one that yields a sense favorable to the nourishment of piety (especially monastic piety)." And to this he added another directive: "When there are many variant readings in one place, that reading which more than the others manifestly favors the dogmas of the orthodox is deservedly regarded as suspicious."

Just how is the student of scripture Acts 17:11 supposed to benefit from studying the non-Biblical works of the unbiblical sceptics listed above? Dr DiVietro does not say at this point.

Instead, he continues to insist under **Quote 21**, see below that Newman's lexicon is atypical. If that is the case, it appears from the extent of Newman's borrowing and his conformity of opinions on Biblical words with those of Griesbach and Danker that *all* lexicons are atypical – with respect to Paul's admonition in 2 Timothy 1:13 to **"Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus."**

They certainly don't seem to be faithful to the **"pure words"** of scripture.

Quote 21, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 78-79

This quote states that Newman's lexicon uses word definitions based on corrupt bibles (RSV, Goodspeed, Good News), the corrupt Westcott-Hort and earlier lexicons that stem from the heathen Greek definitions of Liddell and Scott. Dr Mrs Riplinger states that in these respects *"Newman's is typical of all lexicons."*

Dr DiVietro objects that Newman's is not a typical lexicon, which he insists does not take word definitions from Bible translations, that successive lexicons must make use of earlier works and that even if the lexicon uses a corrupted Hebrew or Greek text, careful editing will ensure that correct word meanings are derived.

Dr DiVietro's comment is like most of his statements encountered thus far in this **Quotes and Comments** section, namely unsubstantiated dogma laced with railings against Sister Riplinger.

He studiously avoids any reference to the sentence on p 79 of *Hazardous Materials* that immediately follows **Quote 21**.

"...Danker recommends the Catholic New American Bible, which he says "does better" at points..."

Does Dr DiVietro really believe that word definitions from Catholic bibles can meet the standards set by Ecclesiastes 12:10?

“The preacher sought to find out acceptable words: and that which was written was upright, even words of truth.”

Dr DiVietro does not address that question. With Danker’s apparent at least partial reliance on a bible translation for word definitions, Dr DiVietro should, however, be prepared to denounce Danker’s work as at least in part atypical of lexicons but he does not do so.

See remarks under **Quote 20** for the supposedly atypical or otherwise nature of Newman’s lexicon.

Concerning the utility, or otherwise, of lexicons based on corrupt Hebrew/Greek texts, see remarks in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to James 3:12 and the work of individuals such as Schaff, Thayer, Trench et al.

“Can the fig tree, my brethren, bear olive berries? either a vine, figs? so can no fountain both yield salt water and fresh.”

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s apparent approval of successive lexicons building on each other, he seems to have overlooked Dr Mrs Riplinger’s essential warning in **Quote 13** that *they have perpetuated error*, beginning with the aberrant definitions introduced by the founders of modern lexicons, Liddell and Scott. See *Hazardous Materials* Chapter 8 and remarks on Liddell and Scott in **Challenge #1 Point-Counterpoint** and **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.

See also the comments by Chadwick under **Quote 18** about the unreliability of Liddell and Scott’s work and in turn that of all those who have followed in their train.

Before moving to **Quote 22**, Dr DiVietro makes a lengthy statement on p 135 of *Cleaning-Up* criticising Sister Riplinger for warning against Nazi lexical sources (Gerhard Kittel), *Hazardous Materials* p 82, for seeing something sinister in lexicons taking their definitions from the kinds of sources listed in **Quote 21** and for daring to suppose that lexicons might give deceptive word meanings. He seeks to illustrate the last point by reference to **Quote 17** and Revelation 15:3.

See the remarks under **Quote 17** and Vine’s dictionary to see who is being deceptive with respect to Revelation 15:3. (Clue: it isn’t Sister Riplinger.) On the Nazi connection, see once again *New Age Versions* Chapter 42 on Kittel and related comments in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.

Dr DiVietro again* informs readers that he has a library of five to six thousand books on language and grammar, evidently including many lexicons (at least 10, see **Quote 12**), from which, though none of them is inerrant, he is able to determine meanings of Biblical words.

In this author’s view, Dr DiVietro’s library let him down badly with respect to the examples he produced from ‘the Greek’ etc. in his answers to Challenges #5, #6. See **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** and **Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint**.

He would have done better to have reflected prayerfully on Luke 10:21 and John 14:26.

“In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight.”

“But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.”

*Dr DiVietro has mentioned his library at least twice before, *Cleaning-Up* pp 43, 59. See comments in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.

The implication on Dr DiVietro's part that a library of five to six thousand books is necessary to find out what God 'really' said is contrary to the principle of comparing scripture with scripture 1 Corinthians 2:13 and the priesthood of all believers 1 Peter 2:5, 9.

Quote 22, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 81

This quote states, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphasis "*Did God express his opinion of the **German** to English Bauer, Arndt, and Gingrich Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature?*"

Dr DiVietro uses this quote to accuse Dr Mrs Riplinger of what he terms the absurdity of requiring that all lexicons be inspired of God.

Dr DiVietro has not given the context of **Quote 22**, which is essentially that word definitions in the 5 major lexicons that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists (Liddell-Scott, Trench, Thayer, Bauer et al, Danker) came from unbiblical German critical sources. For example, Dr Mrs Riplinger states with respect to Thayer's *Greek-English Lexicon*, her emphases:

*"Thayer's title indicates that his is merely an English translation of one rising out of the **German** mind of Carl Grimm as seen in his **Latin-Greek Lexicon**.... It had been a revision of Wilke's **Greek-Latin** lexicon (1839-1851). Catholic Latin, through an unbelieving German mind, then translated into English by an American Unitarian. Hmmmm. Sounds like the 'originals' to me."*

The procedure sounds to this author like an *im*-purification process in total contrast to Psalm 12:6 and therefore wholly inappropriate for the determination of New Testament word meanings. Sister Riplinger is right to be cynical.

Dr DiVietro appears to have misconstrued the sense of **Quote 22**. The next sentence states "*In 1952 its [Bauer et al's lexicon] tentative notes made a trip to Germany. The ship which carried them, the *Flying Enterprise*, sank and the notes were buried in Davy Jones locker.... Back to the drawing board.*"

Dr Mrs Riplinger is saying that God's opinion of Bauer et al's lexicon notes was evidently expressed in the sinking of the *Flying Enterprise*. She is not in any way implying that lexicons should be inspired of God.

Quote 23, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 81-82

The part of the quote that Dr DiVietro objects to is Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement, her emphasis that "*[Danker] cites several **German**-based lexicons, as sources of his definitions, such as those by the Nazi war criminal Gerhard Kittel...*"

Dr DiVietro's objection is that the statement aims to play on fears of Nazi German anti-Semitism, which he says is entirely misleading unless it can be shown that lexicons such as Danker's contain word meanings that are anti-Semitic.

Dr DiVietro fails to mention that Dr Mrs Riplinger substantiates her concerns about Kittel's and therefore Danker's word definitions via anti-Semitic connections on the remainder of p 82 of *Hazardous Materials*. See comments under **Quote 21** and note Dr Mrs Riplinger's concluding remark on p 82 that Dr DiVietro did not have the courtesy to allude to.

"For more details about the anti-Semitic tendency of Greek and Hebrew study aids see the chapters in this book on the Hebrew Critical text and the Bauer German Lexicon."

Quote 24, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 83

Dr Mrs Riplinger here warns about the dangers of the Liddell-Scott lexicon as “*the whorish MOTHER of all harlot lexicons*,” her capitalisation.

Dr DiVietro objects to that statement on the basis that the Liddell-Scott lexicon needed revision, which was done to make it better, just like sending sick folks to hospital can make them better.

See comments in response to **Quotes 13, 21** and the dangers of which Dr Mrs Riplinger warns of successive lexicons that perpetuate the errors of earlier volumes.

Moreover, Dr DiVietro has in **Quote 24** repeated himself from p 61 of *Cleaning-Up* where he inserts the identical quote from *Hazardous Materials* p 83, with the same analogy about hospitalisation. See comments in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**. Note this extract.

*The errors of Liddell and Scott, he insists, must be excused because their lexicon has been repeatedly revised and the revisers may be likened to good doctors who succeeded in making sick folks healthier, i.e. Liddell, Scott and their lexicon were sick. Contemporary lexicographers, however, have concluded that, despite considerable ministrations, the patients are still sick, very sick. Citing Lee, who in turn cites the distinguished scholar Chadwick, Dr Mrs Riplinger states, her emphases, on p 85 of Hazardous Materials, a page that Dr DiVietro must have skipped over in his three-day canter through the work that “““It is about time that Greek scholars recognized **the need for a thorough overhaul** of this indispensable tool.”””*

The physicians still seem keen to resuscitate the patients when in reality, palliative care would seem to be a better option.

Especially in view of Dr DiVietro’s marked inability to produce any kind of healthy exegesis of scripture by means of the (lexical) Greek etc. Once again, see remarks in **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** on John 11:33 and in **Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint** on the 5 additional examples that Dr DiVietro provides in exaltation of ‘the Greek.’

Quote 25, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 90

This quote contains the statement that the “*crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the ancient Greeks*” did indeed provide the word meanings for “*the Liddell-Scott Lexicon (and from it all Bible study tools, new bible versions, and lexicon authors)*.”

Dr DiVietro insists in response that the student must totally immerse himself in the secular literature of 1st century Greece in order to understand the meanings of New Testament words. He is in this respect repeating himself again, from *Cleaning-Up* pp 61-62, where he has inserted the exact same quote mentioned above. See **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**, from where this extract is taken from this author’s response.

*Dr DiVietro further insists that Biblical meanings of New Testament Greek words can only be understood by means of contemporary study aids (AIDS?) that are the next best thing to immersing oneself in the society that spoke the language i.e. Koine Greek. That is, the student is supposed to immerse himself in “crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks” in order to understand the “**pure words**” of the Lord, Psalm 12:6 and the “**wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ**” 1 Timothy 6:3.*

*Dr DiVietro, who substantiates nothing in this part of his book, seems to think that “**the washing of water by the word**” Ephesians 5:26 can be understood by means of a metaphori-*

cal swim in a sewer. Flannel, sheer flannel. He evidently hasn't read 1 Corinthians 15:33 recently.

“Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners.”

And again, he forgot Job 14:4.

“Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.”

Dr DiVietro then concludes this section of his book with the eye-watering assertion that God took the words the early Greeks used (evidently from the “crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks”) and invested them with Biblical meanings.

Chapter and verse? Dr DiVietro cannot provide chapter and verse to substantiate this assertion, not even from the Greek ‘original,’ the source of which remains known only the DBS Executive Committee.

God's use of heathen Greek writers is limited to a mere six words in the New Testament, cited by the Apostle Paul.*

“For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring” Acts 17:28.

**Or a mere 15, if the Cretian statement in Titus 1:12 is included.*

“One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies.”

*Had Dr DiVietro confined himself to this Greek source, he could have saved a considerable amount of cash from the Lord's resources, in that **“for all things come of thee, and of thine own have we given thee”** 1 Chronicles 29:14, used for purchasing his library of books, *Cleaning-Up* pp 43, 59 and donated it to KJB-based missions (none would be Koine Greek-based).*

It is instructive to note that under this quote, Dr DiVietro describes how he achieves understanding of the Greek New Testament (unidentified). He states that he consults his study books and online resources and insists again, without documentation that God took everyday words from the Greek language and imparted His own meanings to them. According to Dr DiVietro, therefore, it is necessary to understand the secular meaning of a word before he can understand the God-given meaning of the word. He does not give chapter and verse for this procedure. Dr DiVietro forgot again* that the scripture states the opposite of his carnal procedure.

“For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts” Isaiah 55:8-9.

See the application of Isaiah 55:8-9 in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint.*

Moreover, nowhere in his description of his study procedure does Dr DiVietro indicate that he applies Proverbs 2:3-6 in order to understand God's words.

“Yea, if thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding; if thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasures; Then shalt thou understand the fear of the LORD, and find the knowledge of God. For the LORD giveth wisdom: out of his mouth cometh knowledge and understanding.”

By his own admission, Dr DiVietro has not done what God told him to do in order to get understanding, so why should God show him anything from either the Greek or the English?

“Though the LORD be high, yet hath he respect unto the lowly: but the proud he knoweth afar off” Psalm 138:6.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states on p 92 of *Hazardous Materials* that later chapters of her book address word definitions based on heathen Greek sources, in particular Chapter 4 on secularizing New Testament words and Chapters 9, 10 on Thayer and Trench respectively. Dr DiVietro could at least have paid Sister Riplinger the courtesy of withholding his comments until he addressed these chapters. He does not do so. However, his comments with respect to these chapters will be addressed when they reached in this work.

Quote 26, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 90-91

This quote describes the unsuitability of lexical definitions for Biblical words where these definitions have been taken from unsaved, secular Greek writers such as Homer.

The quote and Dr DiVietro’s accompanying comments are yet another copy, almost word for word with respect to Dr DiVietro’s comments, from earlier in *Cleaning-Up*, p 63 in this case. See **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**. Note the following extract from this author’s comments from that section.

Dr DiVietro continues on pp 63-64 of Cleaning-Up with a quote from pp 90-91 of Hazardous Materials, which concludes with the question “If we can not be sure what Homer meant (and Homer himself did not know), why are we using his writings to define Bible words?”

*Dr DiVietro evades the question. His feeble response to the quote is that KJB words are the same as those found in Shakespeare and therefore Shakespeare should be studied to help find the meanings of KJB words. He admits that Biblical Greek is a dead language – see remarks in **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’** - but then tries to turn that admission on its head by claiming that lexicons are therefore necessary so that the student can learn Biblical Greek words in the way that a child growing up during the era of Koine Greek would learn the meanings of its own common language.*

*Again, Dr DiVietro substantiates none of his comments. It remains a mystery why he would suppose that a dead language can give the students of today any useful insights into **“the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever”** 1 Peter 1:23. See remarks in this author’s response to Dr Waite¹⁸⁰.*

Dr DiVietro is wrong about the words of the KJB and Shakespeare being equivalent and he is wrong about learning the meanings of Biblical words (in English, since English, unlike dead Koine Greek, is a living language) from common, everyday usage.

The extract below is taken from an earlier work¹⁸¹ of this author’s and includes a communication from the Trinitarian Bible Society. Note that the critic in the context, like Dr DiVietro, substantiated nothing. Also like Dr DiVietro, this critic put forward the old familiar Shakespearean argument, although from a negative stance because he favoured the NIV. Both Dr DiVietro and this critic have the same objective, however; subjugate the words of the 1611 English Holy Bible to the words of men, e.g. playwrights (Shakespeare), novelists (Geoffrey Chaucer, to whom Dr DiVietro also alludes in this context) and Athenian children who lived between 330 BC and 330 AD¹⁸² in order to justify the existence of lexical editors and their supporters, like Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee.

The extract from this author’s earlier work follows.

“Our critic also states in this sub-section “Insistence on the supremacy of the KJV is a reversal of the Holy Spirit’s action by insisting that the best idiom for the Word of God should not be the modern living colloquial idiom but the classical language of Shakespeare.”

“...One is surely entitled to ask for ‘Chapter and verse’ with respect to such “action”. Unfortunately, our critic does not provide any...

“His assertion is answered by G.W. Anderson, Editorial Manager of the TBS:

““The Authorised Version - following its predecessors, including Tyndale - was written in the common language of its time, although in a literary rather than colloquial style. It was not written in “the classical language of Shakespeare”. The literary style used by the translators is what has enabled the Authorised Version to stand the test of time. It must also be remembered that the edition of the Authorised Version which is used today is the 1769 revision, which is indeed closer to us than it is to Shakespeare.””

BBC commentator Melvyn Bragg in his recent book *The Book of Books, The Radical Impact of the King James Bible 1611-2011* pp 141-142 states with respect to Shakespeare that the playwright quotes from the Bible, i.e. the Geneva Bible with which Shakespeare was most familiar, approximately 1350 times.

Shakespeare attended Holy Trinity Church in Stratford-upon-Avon regularly as a boy. He was steeped in the text of the Geneva Bible from an early age, both in church and in his schooling. Although Shakespeare wrote in a different style from that of the King James translators as G. W. Anderson’s statement shows, the scripture evidently permeated his work. It would appear, therefore that a study of the scripture is valuable for understanding Shakespeare, not the other way round.

Dr DiVietro includes in his answer to **Quote 26** a reference to the word “gay” that he also did before and to which this author responded. Note the following extract from that response.

The word appears once in the KJB.

“And ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place; and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool:” James 2:3.

The definition of “gay” is found in the preceding verse – with the definition of “apparel” – and “raiment” – in the next verse, James 2:3.

“For if there come unto your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment;” James 2:2.

The wearer of “the gay clothing” or “goodly apparel” is clearly one of the “rich men” James 2:6, in contrast to “a poor man” James 2:3. “Goodly” is “of great price” Matthew 13:45. It is also of “outward adorning” Luke 21:5, 1 Peter 3:3, 4, which is “of great price” in the eyes of the world but not “in the sight of God.”

That is how the word “gay” is used in scripture and the full meaning, especially with respect to God, will not emerge from a study of everyday usage, whether in the 1st, 17th or 21st centuries. That is one reason why the Lord Jesus Christ said “my words shall not pass away” Matthew 24:35. God determines the Biblical usage of His words and they are independent of man’s fluctuating usage, whether in the time of Koine Greek, the time of Shakespeare or the time (hastening to its close with the nearness of the Lord’s Return) of the DBS Executive Committee. It is true that the scripture contains many ordinary words, e.g. “clothing” in James 2:3 with meanings that are fixed in both Biblical and common usage but the words of

the Holy Bible are still not subject to common usage because God, not common usage at any time in history, determines the meanings of words in His Book...

See also Dr Mrs Riplinger's comments on pp 31-32 of Hazardous Materials.

Those comments contain this statement, capitalisations are the author's.

"Words, such as 'dog,' 'river,' and 'bread,' may be simply transferred from Greek to English. But those are not the words that new versions and those who reject God are interested in remolding. And those are not the words that God wants to enlighten men about. He seeks to enlighten men about the nature of God, Jesus Christ, salvation, the Christian walk, heaven, hell, and eternity. Neither the pagan Greek philosophers nor the Egyptian peasants, who left grocery lists among the papyri, can shed any light upon these subjects. Yet lexicons pretend that they can. They do this with an ulterior motive. That motive is to bring the higher things of God BACK DOWN to the mundane man-centered view. For this reason, Greek lexicons cannot be used for most of the words of the New Testament."

Dr DiVietro does not address this statement in his list of quotes from *Hazardous Materials*.

However, he accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of being unreasonable and unrealistic in warning against the use of secular sources in order to understand Biblical words. Yet he insists without a shred of substantiation, certainly no scriptural substantiation, that Biblical words must be understood by means of their non-Biblical contexts.

Inspection of Dr Mrs Riplinger's comments and the above extracts show that it is Dr DiVietro who is being unreasonable and unrealistic.

Quote 27, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 92

This quote warns of the unreliable sources used by Greek-English lexicons and other so-called Bible study aids in the form of early Catholic church 'Fathers' and secular writings such as those of Philo and Josephus.

Once again, this quote and much of Dr DiVietro's response is simply repetition from what he said about Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #2 in *Cleaning-Up* pp 64-65. See again **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** and this author's extract, which follows.

Dr DiVietro now accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of being absurd, blind, foolish, prejudiced and inconsistent, Cleaning-Up, pp 64-66 (while insisting he is not making ad hominem attacks on her (!)) because she warns that lexicon editors have used early Church 'Fathers,' who were the source of Catholic heresies, early secular historians e.g. Josephus and pagan Greeks to determine "Christian meanings" Hazardous Materials, pp 92, 100, which pages Dr DiVietro cites in part.

He explains that he uses the works of these early heretics and heathen to learn about the Greek language. Again, Dr DiVietro gives no indication about how these unbiblical writers have helped him learn about the language of the 1611 English Holy Bible.

Moreover, he fails to inform his readers that on p 93 of Hazardous Materials, Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals that Clement, whom Dr DiVietro cites as having helped him learn Greek, "denied that Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost were part of the Godhead, calling them created beings."

Dr DiVietro admits that he wouldn't go to Clement or any other Alexandrian academic, e.g. Origen, for theology. Ephesians 5:11, however, is not limited to theology.

"And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them."

Sister Riplinger has obeyed this command of scripture. Dr DiVietro has not.

Dr DiVietro inserts under **Quote 27** a statement copied from *Cleaning-Up* p 65 to the effect that Dr Mrs Riplinger is inconsistent because, he says, she claims that God gave parts of the New Testament in Latin but she then denies that a study of parallel Latin-Greek writings of the Catholic Church can serve any useful purpose in the construction of a lexicon.

At least, that is what this author makes of Dr DiVietro's somewhat convoluted paragraph at the top of p 141 of *Cleaning-Up*.

This author has stated the following in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to Dr DiVietro's allusion to the material in *Hazardous Materials* Chapter 30 that addresses the possibility of some original New Testament books being written in Latin.

Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, does take issue with Dr Mrs Riplinger's citations from Hoskier on pp 252ff of Cleaning-Up in his comments against Hazardous Materials. On p 256 of Cleaning-Up, he basically accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of lying and states that he is attempting to ascertain what Herman Hoskier really said, in the firm belief that he will be able to prove that Dr Mrs Riplinger has misrepresented Hoskier. Just in case she hasn't, he adds that even a great scholar can be wrong, i.e. when the results of his work contradict the diktats of the DBS Executive Committee.

Dr DiVietro's book was published in February 2010. He must have begun his search for Herman Hoskier's statements up to a year ago. Thus far, nothing has emerged from the DBS Executive Committee camp about the results of this search, which is strange, considering the collective DBS venom directed at Sister Riplinger.

Dr DiVietro's comments concerning the citations from Hoskier will be answered when that section of Cleaning-Up is addressed.

The above statement still applies. For now, it is this author's view that Dr Mrs Riplinger is not inconsistent because regardless of whatever language(s) in which the New Testament was first written, Dr Mrs Riplinger has shown that lexicons are themselves not fit for purpose and Dr DiVietro has failed to show otherwise. See remarks in **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** on John 11:33 and in **Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint** on the 5 additional examples he provides in exaltation of 'the Greek.'

Parallel Latin-Greek studies in relation to lexical definitions will therefore clearly avail nothing for the serious student of scripture. Once again, they would violate the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:4, 9.

Quote 28, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 100

This quote refers to the procedure of obtaining an English meaning of a Greek word by checking the word in context followed by the ten words before and after the word under study. The quote contains the key statements "*The context must be the one in which the word is used, not that of another author...Even within the work of one author, a word may have several different meanings, depending upon each individual context*" and warns that the Lord's use of the word "love" would be different from that of pornographers or popes. The quote warns further that lexicographers abandon the context of scripture for Biblical word definitions and then by means of secular Greek sources "*plunge God's pearls into the murky mire of paganism.*"

Dr DiVietro has cited **Quote 28** before, on pp 65-66 of *Cleaning-Up* where he grudgingly admits that a KJB word could be understood by reading ten words before and after it. Here, however, he deems it 'insane' to suppose that a KJB word can be understood by that procedure, which betrays a level of inconsistency on his part.

Dr DiVietro has, however, lied twice in this respect earlier in his book and now lies again for a third time.

Note the following extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.

*It has already been noted from Cleaning-Up pp 15, 66 that Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of setting forth a crude rule of thumb to determine word meanings in scripture by examining ten words before and after the word in question. See comments in **Setting Up the 'Clean-Up'** and **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**. However, on p 116 of Hazardous Materials, i.e. the very next page from Dr DiVietro's quote from the book [he inserts a quote from Hazardous Materials pp 114-115 on p 81 of Cleaning-Up], Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals that this procedure actually forms part of the method given by The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of the English Language for determination of dictionary definitions. She then shows, pp 117-118, how the method can, with careful use, have application to scripture by means of the example of the word "hell" but the procedure is not Dr Mrs Riplinger's originally. (Note that the ten-words-before-and-after rule is not hard and fast, as Dr Mrs Riplinger also shows.)*

Yet Dr DiVietro has tried to imply that it is. He therefore attempts to discredit Dr Mrs Riplinger by casting aspersions at the work of other authors, which he hasn't studied himself but which Sister Riplinger has used or cited, in good faith. Readers will note that Dr DiVietro did the same with the research of Herman Hoskier, with the work of Periander A. Esplana on Bible numerics and with the burgeoning field of Computational Linguistics, compounding his accusations in the last two instances with insinuations against Sister Riplinger of Cabalistic heresy. See remarks above and in the previous section. This duplicity on Dr DiVietro's part strongly suggests that his primary aim is not an objective critique of Hazardous Materials at all. Instead, it appears to be a personal vendetta against Sister Riplinger because God has given her insights into the scriptures that He has not given Dr DiVietro.

The above extract still applies, with respect to Dr DiVietro's comments under **Quote 28**.

Dr DiVietro then states that Biblical words cannot be understood by studying them in context but only by researching all Biblical uses of them. He says that even this method is unreliable because it only considers English words and meanings and he then claims baldly that many Bible students have confessed to not understanding passages in the English Bible. This claim prompts him to promote the Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek yet again by insisting that God did not give the New Testament in either 17th or 20th century English but in these original languages, which of course require long, hard study for understanding.

Dr DiVietro then ridicules any belief in God giving His word by inspiration in any of the non- Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek languages of Acts 2 or Genesis 10, 11 and reiterates that even if such 'absurd notions' were true, English was clearly not among these languages.

He goes on to declare that the 1611 Holy Bible was produced by the efforts of *translators*, not original writers of scripture in that God did not directly dictate the KJB and the KJB translators were not endowed with the supernatural gift of tongues as, in his opinion, with no references given, that Dr Mrs Riplinger asserts that Paul was gifted.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments on **Quote 28** with the insistence that the KJB translators had to do their translation work by learning Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek and Latin both directly and via their teachers from many sources, including heretical and pagan ones and that what they produced i.e. the 1611 King James Bible, was several stages removed from what Dr DiVietro calls the original inspired texts of the Scriptures.

It is not altogether clear from his comments what Dr DiVietro's main point is with respect to **Quote 28** but it appears yet again to be the notion that no-one can know what God *really* said

without long, hard study in Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek – or taking as ‘gospel’ the word of someone like Dr DiVietro, who purports to have done the long, hard study in Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek.

The source between two covers of the *definitive* ‘Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek’ text remains undefined.

Study of the 1611 Holy Bible alone cannot, in Dr DiVietro’s opinion, yield what God *really* said because it confuses folks. See his comments to this effect in *Cleaning-Up* pp 32, 69, 91, 94-95 and the accompanying comments in **Challenges #1, #2, #5, Points-Counterpoints**.

Yet again, Dr DiVietro has violated the priesthood of all believers 1 Peter 2:4, 9 and this time he subtly disavows the 1611 Holy Bible as **“the word of truth”** 2 Timothy 2:15 because that is what Paul exhorts his readers to study, without specifying that ‘Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek’ are the only sources of **“the word of truth.”**

It should also be noted that Dr DiVietro does not explicitly include prayer for understanding Proverbs 2:1-5 or trust in the Spirit of God John 16:13 as part of the long, hard study that he urges for his readers. See comments under *Quotes 16, 19*.

As usual, Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing in any of his comments above but merely pretends as usual to **“speak as the oracles of God”** 1 Peter 4:11. He fails to mention anyone who was actually confused by the 1611 Holy Bible or to list any KJB words that are ‘clarified’ by means of ‘the Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek’ or any KJB word meanings derived from studying only the KJB that have proved to be ‘unreliable.’

It is true of course that English was not one of the languages used by the New Testament writers. It is also true that the King James translators were translators, not writers of scripture in the way that the apostles and prophets were, that they learned the ancient languages from many sources and that the 1611 English Holy Bible is several stages removed from ancient language sources of scripture.

However, to paraphrase the writers of the US Declaration of Independence, the above truths are essentially self-evident and are in fact truisms that are not at issue with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible as **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God.”**

The remainder of Dr DiVietro’s response to *Quote 28* is by contrast riddled with error.

His objection that KJB words can *only* be understood in a particular context by studying their usage throughout scripture contradicts scripture itself. The word **“remain”** for example occurs 79 times in the KJB in 77 verses. By inspection, it can refer to a definite or limited but protracted time period, Genesis 38:11, a definite but very short time period, Exodus 12:10 or an indefinite time period, Exodus 8:9. Context is clearly vital for accurate determination of Biblical word meanings as the following study emphasises.

The word **“remain”** occurs in the important verse John 15:16 that refers to fruit-bearing by believers in the Lord Jesus Christ. As such, the term provides an important aspect of the definition of the word **“abide”** that occurs in John 15:4, 5, 6, 7, 10. The context of John 15 clearly indicates that an indefinite, indeed *permanent** stay is the correct sense of the word **“remain”** in John 15. Any notion to the contrary could not be reasonably entertained for an instant.

*i.e. a further, refined connotation of the term **“remain”** in the precise context of John 15:16

Dr DiVietro might object that the above is a very simple example and indeed it is but it is up to him to show how ‘the Greek etc.’ sheds any light upon **“the word of truth”** that the King James English does not. He has not done so.

Again, it should be noted that like any run-of-the-mill anti-KJB critic, Dr DiVietro does not identify anyone who was confused by any passage of scripture in the KJB such that they received useful help from ‘the Greek etc.’ Dr DiVietro’s efforts in this respect were neither fit for use nor ornament as the English saying goes. See **Challenges #5, #6, Points-Counterpoints**.

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s denial of inspiration of God’s words in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek in Acts 2, see **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**, where this subject is addressed in considerable detail. Reference to God’s confusion of tongues at Babel in Genesis 11 to which Dr DiVietro alludes is not necessary in order to answer Dr DiVietro’s objections to **Quote 28** and it is strange that he would make such an allusion.

In answer to Dr DiVietro’s continued insistence that God did not inspire the 1611 Holy Bible directly, it should be remembered that according to Dr DiVietro and the DBS, God did not inspire the 1611 Holy Bible in any respect whatsoever, or any other Bible translation, English or otherwise. See again *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3, 18.

In that respect, Dr DiVietro is at odds with John Wycliffe, William Tyndale, Thomas Cranmer, John Rogers, Miles Coverdale, Dr Miles Smith of the King James translation committee, John Bunyan, John Wesley, Charles Haddon Spurgeon, Bishop J. C. Ryle, Professor William Lyon Phelps and even the lifelong atheist George Bernard Shaw, who in spite of his infidelity to “*the word of truth*” knew enough about literature to recognize the 1611 Holy Bible for what it is – “*the word of truth.*”

See remarks in the **Introduction, Preface and Introduction, Challenges #1, #2, Points-Counterpoints** for the testimonies of the above individuals with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible. Compared with their testimonies, the pronouncements of the DBS Executive Committee are feeble in the extreme.

That the KJB is several stages removed from the original writings is of course not a problem in the light of Psalm 12:6, 7. Dr DiVietro is trying to make out that God cannot preserve “*the words of the LORD*” as inspired beyond the text of the original writings (professed to be in the possession of the DBS Executive Committee but unidentified as a single document between two covers, *Cleaning-Up* p xi) whereas Psalm 12:6, 7 show that He can and has done as the 1611 Holy Bible.

The explanation is as follows.

Consider the term “*preserve*” in Psalm 12:6, 7 in the 1611 Holy Bible. Dr Waite, Dr DiVietro and the rest of the DBS Executive Committee profess that God preserved His words accurately in the KJB but without life, or inspiration i.e. breathing life *in* to that which was perfectly formed but without life as such, Genesis 2:7. The DBS perceives the KJB to be like a fossilised woolly mammoth in Siberia preserved intact but lifeless in the frozen tundra. See **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Introduction**.

However, the word “*preserve*” and its derivatives are never used in that sense in scripture. This is one time when the meaning of the word under study is confirmed by looking beyond the immediate context of the passage and surveying how the word is used elsewhere in scripture. Note that despite Dr DiVietro’s insinuation to the contrary in his comments under **Quote 28**, Dr Mrs Riplinger does indicate that meanings of KJB words can be determined by studying their usage throughout scripture. See *In Awe of Thy Word* p 50.

First note that Psalm 12:7 states with respect to “*the words of the LORD*” that “*Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.*”

To “**preserve**” is therefore to “**keep**” in the context. The Lord obviously could not have *kept* His words according to Psalm 12:6, 7 if they had lost inspiration during the preserving process. Clearly they did not. Turning to the whole of scripture, it is found that the word “**preserve**” and its derivatives occur 56 times in 55 verses. The vast majority of occurrences refer to the preservation of *life*, and often individuals e.g. in Genesis 45:5 Joseph says to his brothers “**God sent me to preserve life**” i.e. as living beings. The nearest context of Psalm 12:7, the Book of Psalms itself, contains the word “**preserve**” and its derivatives 22 times in 21 verses. On 21 occasions, the term refers to the preservation of life as in the rest of scripture, especially of the saints with respect to their *eternal* preservation, as in Psalm 37:28.

“For the LORD loveth judgment, and forsaketh not his saints; they are preserved for ever: but the seed of the wicked shall be cut off.”

The first occurrence of the word “**preserve**” in Psalms is in Psalm 12:7. The use of the word “**preserve**” in Psalm 12:7 is consistent with its use throughout the Book of the Psalms and indeed throughout the whole Bible because “**the words of the LORD**” are “**the words of the living God**” Jeremiah 23:36. “**The words of the LORD**” therefore by definition *live*, as indicated by familiar references such as Matthew 24:35, John 6:63, 1 Peter 1:23, 25 and are therefore preserved as *living* words i.e. “**all scripture...given by inspiration of God**.” They are the “**lively oracles**” of God Acts 7:38, they *live*.

“The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life” Job 33:4.

Drs Waite, DiVietro and the DBS insist of course that preservation with inspiration applies only to the original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek texts and never to translations from those texts. See *A WARNING!!* pp 2, 52 and *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3. (See again **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**, where this subject is addressed in considerable detail.)

Psalm 12:7 shows that they are wrong.

Psalm 12:7 speaks of a *seven-fold* purification of “**the words of the LORD.**” The Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek texts (in whatever form) were only the initial stages of the purification process and they have been superseded, eventually by the fully purified form of “**the words of the LORD**” that is now the 1611 Holy Bible in English. See the lists in **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint** that Dr Mrs Riplinger and Dr Vance have provided with respect to the seven-fold purification of the English Bible* and of the scriptures in the broad sweep of history. The DBS Executive Committee has never refuted those lists.

*It may even be conjectured that the 1611 Holy Bible has itself been through seven purifications. Dr Ruckman in *Differences in the King James Version Editions* p 3, interestingly, lists seven editions; 1611, 1613, 1644, 1676, 1680, 1701, 1769. The main editions where the actual text of the AV1611 was amended appear to have been those of 1611, two¹⁸³, 1613, 1629, 1638, 1701, 1769, a total of seven again – or the main editions may possibly be counted as 1611, 1612, 1613, 1629, 1638, 1701, 1769. The actual breakdown of the purification stages of the 1611 Holy Bible may, of course, be among “**The secret things**” that “**belong unto the LORD our God**” Deuteronomy 29:29 but it appears certain to this author that the number of stages will be seven.

See also the statement from Dr Mrs Riplinger that accompanies the above lists, from *In Aw of Thy Word* p 560, her emphases.

“*“Seven” times “they purge...and purify it...” (Ezek. 43:26) – not eight. The KJV translators did **not** see their translation as one in the midst of a chain of ever evolving translations.*

They wanted their Bible to be one of which no one could justly say, 'It is good, except this word or that word...'"

Note further Dr Gipp's analysis of how, from scripture, a translation is actually an *improvement* on 'the original,' with respect to 2 Samuel 3:10, Colossians 1:13, Hebrews 11:5. See **Dr D. A. Waite and *The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Dr Waite and the Imaginary 'Original Bible,' Unidentified in Print.***

The analyses of Drs Gipp, Mrs Riplinger and Dr Vance all support the correct* application of Psalm 12:7 to *translations* from the ancient languages as **"all scripture...given by inspiration of God,"** in particular the 1611 Holy Bible translation *in English*.

*Some crude commentators like James White, *The King James Only Controversy* pp 243-244 and Doug Kutilek, *Why Psalm 12:6, 7 is a Promise of the Infallible Preservation of Scripture* by Dr Ruckman, have tried to distort Psalm 12:7 by mistaken allusion to Psalm 12:5 to make the passage apply generally to poor and needy Jews from David's generation onward, as the corrupt NIV/TNIV wording for Psalm 12:7 indicates. This misapplication and mistranslation of Psalm 12:7 by modern commentators/editors is decisively refuted by the Lamentations of Jeremiah, which have prophetic application to the End Times and show that *not* all poor and needy Jews will experience God's deliverance, Zechariah 13:7, 8. See also Dr Ruckman's commentary *Volume 1 of the Book of Psalms* pp 65-73. Dr Ruckman shows that Psalm 12:5 is essentially a prophetic reference to the Antichrist, Psalm 11:2, 5, 6 and God's deliverance of Israel's believing remnant, Zechariah 13:9 – *not* all poor and needy Jews from David's time onwards. Psalm 12:8 also has prophetic application to the way **"iniquity shall abound"** Matthew 24:12 in the End Times but the insertion of the intervening verses Psalm 12:6, 7 reassures the Bible believer that the Lord's words remain **"holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners"** Hebrews 7:25 even though **"the whole world lieth in wickedness"** 1 John 5:19 during the **"perilous times"** 2 Timothy 3:1 leading up to the Second Advent.

In sum, the use of the word **"preserve"** in Psalm 12:6, 7 is a testimony to God's *keeping, inspiring and improving* of **"the words of the living God"** via the seven-fold purification process that has *included* translation and has *finally yielded* **"all scripture...given by inspiration of God"** as the most recent copy of the 1611 Holy Bible fresh from the printing press that *supersedes* the Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek in *any* form.

On p 72 of *Cleaning-Up* Dr DiVietro quotes Psalm 12:6, 7 and says that the Hebrew and Greek texts were purified seven times. He provides absolutely no information to back up this claim, which is obviously sheer dogma on Dr DiVietro's part.

Dr DiVietro's comments about the education of the King's men are, as indicated, not called into question. However he would do well to consider how their learning enabled them **"to discern both good and evil"** Hebrews 5:14, **"to refuse the evil, and choose the good"** Isaiah 7:15 and to **"take forth the precious from the vile"** Jeremiah 15:19. See Dr Mrs Riplinger's remarks in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** taken from *King James Version Ditches Blind Guides* p 38, her emphases, showing how some modern version editors have applied the results of their long, hard study of 'the Greek etc.' that Dr DiVietro recommends, to the detriment of the Body of Christ.

"Longenecker chides the KJV's "begotten Son" because "it neglects the current [time of Christ] usage for the word." Current usage amongst PAGAN OCCULTISTS should not change how Christians use words! He and the NIV translators have broadened the "semantic range of meaning" (Longenecker p. 122) to include the broad way that leadeth to destruction. The translators of the King James Version were so highly educated that they not only knew of these Greek quotes, but knew who Parmenides was and what he taught. They

wouldn't touch such pagan sources. Either the NIV translators are **ignorant** of the philosophies of those they cite, like Aeschylus, Plato and Parmenides, and the Orphic Hymns or they are **sympathetic** to such ideas. (The "begotten God" seen in John 1:18 in the NASB comes directly from lexical support from the occult tome *The Trimorphic Proitenoia!*)"

Even though he disavows the modern versions, see remarks under **Quote 30**, Dr DiVietro could probably benefit from the kind of higher education in which the King James translators were tutored.

Quote 29, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 101

This quote begins "*The words of the King James Bible are often higher, 'special' words, not defiled or defined by worldly use*" and ends with the words "*The English definitions and translation choices in lexicons are highly secularized, that is, "they are the words which men's wisdom teacheth," not those special separate from sinners words which God instilled early in the English Bible.*"

Dr DiVietro inserts the end sentence of **Quote 29** in bold on p 72 of *Cleaning-Up* in a pejorative sense, as the context of that particular citation will show, although he makes no direct comment on the statement.

Little need be said in response to Dr DiVietro's comments on **Quote 29**. Dr DiVietro refers to diligent study under **Quote 28**.

His comments on **Quote 29** can be summed up as a diligent study in evasion.

They can be simply expressed as 'don't blame the lexicons, blame the folk who misuse them.' He criticises modern translators who dumb down the special words of the 1611 Holy Bible with their modern alternatives but exonerates the lexicographers who provide these alternatives.

That is like blaming the light-fingered youth Jack Dawkins aka the Artful Dodger in Charles Dickens's novel *Oliver Twist* for being a pickpocket while at the same time providing alibis for the Dodger's mentor the unscrupulous Fagin.

Or like building the tombs of the prophets:

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, And say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets" Matthew 23:29-31.

Dr DiVietro skips over the numerous examples that Dr Mrs Riplinger provides in *Hazardous Materials* pp 101-108 of lexical distortion and corruption of Biblical words, especially from Frederick Danker's definitions. See also **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint**.

Proverbs 11:1 comes to mind.

"A false balance is abomination to the LORD: but a just weight is his delight."

The book *Cleaning-Up* seems to be increasingly unbalanced and unjust to this author.

Quote 30, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 103

Quote 30 is the short, bracketed paragraph in smaller print on p 103 of *Hazardous Materials*. It reads "*(Reading is dependent upon the number of syllables in a word. As [usual], lexical substitutes have many more syllables than their corresponding KJB words. In this case 'grace,' a one syllable word, is replaced by generosity, a five syllable word. Consequently,*

new versions, which use the words in lexicons, are always a higher reading grade level than the KJB.)”

Once again, Dr DiVietro sets about exonerating the lexical editors. He states first that reading grade level is dependent on other factors besides the number of syllables in a word and that Dr Mrs Riplinger is effectively misleading her readers in this respect.

He then accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of being unable to distinguish between lexicons and translations and seeks to enlighten *his* readers by likening lexicons to dictionaries from which good translators should make intelligent choices of words for their various versions.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments by reiterating that bible translations depend far more on the theological and philosophical mindset of the translators than on word meanings given by lexicons.

As usual, Dr DiVietro has substantiated nothing, apart from disavowing certain modern versions e.g. the NASV, because its underlying text is corrupt. His comments on translators’ mindsets are intriguing, however. One wonders how he would account for the following¹⁸⁴ ‘translators’ mindset.’

Gustavus Paine in *The Men Behind The KJV* p 181 writes “*in the long run it [the 1611 Holy Bible] appealed to High Church, Low Church, and chapel alike. Though it was never merely a Puritan work, Cromwell and his fellow Roundheads pushed it forward. George Fox, Milton, Bunyan, and Defoe used it. Boswell quoted it roughly. In early Plymouth Elder William Brewster appears to have had only a Great Bible, yet soon Roger Williams, Increase Mather, Cotton Mather, the New Lights, Wesley, all made their teachings comport with the King James text...it suited nearly all Protestant sects. In the United States it has been the standby not only of “the Bible belt” but of all other regions.*”

Dr Ruckman in *The Christian’s Handbook of Biblical Scholarship* p 123 writes, his capitalisations ““*We are reminded ten times a year that (the translators) were baby-sprinkling Anglicans under a King who had no use for Baptists; you are NOT told they produced THE BOOK that built the NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION IN AMERICA and produced the ten largest Sunday Schools the world has ever seen...No mention is found of a supernatural chapter and verse numbering system that would astound a professional gambler in Las Vegas, although the SCHOLAR’S UNION simply ignores it as “verse numbers made while riding horseback.” No mention is made of an order of Books that is AGAINST the Hebrew original manuscripts (scholar’s cliché: more properly “ANY set of Hebrew manuscripts making up the Orthodox Hebrew canon”), so that the PREMILLENNIAL COMING OF CHRIST is indicated by the order of those Books - ALTHOUGH THE TRANSLATORS WERE NOT PREMILLENNIAL.*

“Finally, no mention is made of the amazing fact that, to this day, this Book can be taught to children 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 years old without ANY OTHER VERSION, and they can get saved, called to preach, live separated lives, and grow up as NON-BABY SPRINKLING, PREMILLENNIAL ANTI-CATHOLICS.”

Matthew 7:20 can rightly be said of the translators’ mindset of the men behind the KJV.

“By their fruits ye shall know them.”

Only one overall mindset could have produced the fruits listed above, though and that had to have been ***“the mind of Christ”*** 1 Corinthians 2:16.

With reference to ***Quote 30***, Dr DiVietro’s accusations against Dr Mrs Riplinger are not only both ungracious and ungenerous, they are disingenuous. Once again, he has ignored the ex-

amples of ungodly word meanings that Dr Mrs Riplinger has provided in *Hazardous Materials* pp 101-108. Had he studied them and the subsequent examples more closely, he might have realised that ungodly lexical editors who provide ungodly new version editors with the means of downgrading the Lord Jesus Christ from God's "**Son**" and "**child**" to a mere 'servant' in Acts 3:13, 26, 4:27, 30 in the NIV/TNIV/NKJV via 'the Greek' are just as guilty as the editors themselves. See *Hazardous Materials* p 115 and note the Lord's warning in Luke 17:1.

"Then said he unto the disciples, It is impossible but that offences will come: but woe unto him, through whom they come!"

No confusion between lexicographers and translators exists on Dr Mrs Riplinger's part therefore but she has shown the manner in which they collude.

"Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished:" Proverbs 11:21a.

Dr DiVietro should also remember that the Lord will call unregenerate Bible corrupting academics to account according to Jude 15, when He comes back **"To execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him."**

Dr DiVietro and his DBS associates should therefore pay close attention to Paul's exhortation in 2 Corinthians 6:17 while they have time.

"Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you"

On the matter of reading grade levels, Dr DiVietro has yet again shown his disingenuousness.

Dr Mrs Riplinger gives the formula for calculating reading grade level in Chapter 11 of *New Age Versions* entitled *King James for Kids*. Inspection of the formula shows that it includes more factors than the number of syllables per word. Anyone reading *Hazardous Materials* p 103 would be prompted to consult Dr Mrs Riplinger's other work for the reading grade level formula because the paragraph in brackets that forms **Quote 30** ends with the sentence "See *New Age Versions*."

Dr DiVietro in his duplicity did not include that last sentence in **Quote 30**.

Quote 31, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 108-109

Quote 31 is a lengthy passage which shows how the words *hell* and *hole* are embedded in the transliterated Hebrew word *sheol*. The quote notes the inconsistency of new version translators and lexicon editors who translate *ouranos* as *heaven* but who simply transliterate *sheol* and *hades* from their Hebrew and Greek characters, leaving them un-translated in English.

Dr DiVietro essentially picks up on only one sentence in this lengthy quote. The sentence, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphasizes, states "*The Language of the King James Bible traces the etymology of the word (s)heol back to the Hebrew word Helel, meaning Lucifer.*"

Dr DiVietro distorts this sentence to say that if the KJB is supposed to have taken its word definitions from within transliterations of Greek and Hebrew, [why] didn't 'they' (sic) do the same with *ouranos*? If, however, Dr Mrs Riplinger can only identify selected words like *sheol* that lend themselves to that method of word definition, then the method cannot be part of the KJB's construction and therefore, in his view doesn't that mean that Dr Mrs Riplinger is as inconsistent as new version translators and lexicon editors?

It means nothing of the kind. **Quote 31** does not say that the KJB takes word definitions from within Greek and Hebrew transliterations. **Quote 31** is a reference to Dr Mrs Riplinger's book *The Language of the King James Bible*, pp 120-121, where Dr Mrs Riplinger states "*the Bible itself elaborates correctly the definition of any unclear words.*"

As **Quote 31** indicates, the unclear word under study is "**Lucifer**" and Dr Mrs Riplinger shows how this word is associated with 'shining, burning light' as revealed in Job 41:18-19, matching the dictionary definition of Lucifer as *lux fero*, light bearer. She also gives a list of the words for "**hell**" in several languages, including (s)heol in Hebrew showing how these derive from *helel*, the meaning of which includes burning.

Dr DiVietro's comment is clearly a distortion of what Dr Mrs Riplinger actually said. He also omits the last sentence of the paragraph from which **Quote 31** was taken. It explains in more detail why the focus of the quote is on hell rather than on heaven.

"New Age Bible Versions (chapter 18) exposes why new versions avoid the word 'hell'; their editors do not believe in it! They sometimes substitute the word 'grave' or death."

Why didn't Dr DiVietro comment on Dr Mrs Riplinger's disclosures about Lucifer and her warnings about the false beliefs of new version editors?

Has he got something to hide?

Or someone?

Quote 32, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 111

Quote 32 refers to the NIV's translation of 12 different Greek words as one English word, "destroy(ed)." Dr Mrs Riplinger states that this limited manner of translation is "*very typical of nearly every sentence in the NIV and other new versions.*"

Dr DiVietro essentially accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of deceiving her readers in that he states that the KJB has the same uniformity of translation that Dr Mrs Riplinger has criticised the NIV for and that in his opinion, she is hoping that her readers will not find out.

Dr DiVietro has ignored the context of Dr Mrs Riplinger's remarks. This section of *Hazardous Materials* addresses and illustrates the *erratic* nature of new version translating.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states plainly, p 110, her emphases that "*The KJB is not unique in its use of three English words to translate one Hebrew or Greek word. All versions do it on just about every line of the Bible. (That is why there are 400 plus new Bible versions and none of them match each other.) Conversely, the Greek and Hebrew culture may have several words which only have one English equivalency. Note the following examples, beginning with 'a', of multiple Greek words which are translated by a single English word in the KJB.*"

Having listed four examples of English 'a' words, *abide, about, above, abundance*, each with 7-10 Greek equivalents, Dr Mrs Riplinger then lists selected Greek concordances that clearly show this disparity of English-Greek word equivalents. Kohlenberger's concordance is the one mentioned in **Quote 32**.

Note that the King James translators specifically addressed the matter of varied translation in *The Translators to the Reader*. Dr Miles Smith's explanation matches Dr Mrs Riplinger's remarks in *Hazardous Materials* pp 107ff and serves as a rebuke to Dr DiVietro's insinuation of deceit on Sister Riplinger's part. Dr Smith describes the variations in translation for the AV1611 that show that they do not exhibit the *randomness* of new version variations about which Dr Mrs Riplinger has warned.

“But, that we should express the same notion in the particular word; as for example, if we translate the Hebrew or Greek word once by PURPOSE, never to call it INTENT; if one were JOURNEYING, never TRAVELING; if one were THINK, never SUPPOSE; if one were PAIN, never ACHE; if one were JOY, never GLADNESS, etc. Thus to mince the matter, we thought to savor more of curiosity than wisdom, and that rather it would breed scorn in the Atheist, than bring profit to the godly Reader. For is the kingdom of God become words and syllables? Why should we be in bondage to them if we may be free, use one precisely when we may use another no less fit, as commodiously?” *That is, pedantic “wisdom”*

See also Section 10.8 of ‘*O Biblios*’ – *The Book* by this author, for the response to a critic of the 1611 Holy Bible who finds fault with its variations in translation.

Dr Mrs Riplinger sums up the purpose of this section of *Hazardous Materials* on p 113.

“The New Testament has approximately 5,170 lexical items, which potentially could have scores of thousands of English equivalents...But only one of these equivalents is “holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, made higher” and is perfect for each context (Heb. 7:26). Who, but God, can choose which word fits in which context? Because of these wide varieties of options, none of the hundreds of English translations of the Bible are the same. The Bible says, “let one interpret” (1 Cor. 14:27).”

Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, describes this statement as absurd and he lists it as **Quote 33**, which will be addressed below.

Quote 33, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 113

Dr DiVietro describes the 1611 Holy Bible as the most accurate, blessed and trustworthy translation of the scriptures in English. However, he criticises Dr Mrs Riplinger for alluding to the statement *“let one interpret”* in 1 Corinthians 14:27.

Dr DiVietro declares that any accurate translation of the correct Hebrew/Greek text (still unidentified between two covers) yields the words of God in English. He insists that because the English language has changed in 400 years, it would be possible to change words like *“let”* and *“prevent”* as found in the 1611 Holy Bible and still have the words of God in modern English.

It would not be possible.

It has not been done since the year 1611, apart from the refinements to the 1611 Holy Bible. See allusions to the editions of the 1611 Holy Bible under **Quote 28**. It is not about to be done. Dr DiVietro provides absolutely no evidence to the contrary.

Moreover, *Biblical* English has *not* changed in 400 years. See the comments by Dr Hills and others in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.

The English of the 1611 Holy Bible fulfils the Lord’s words in Matthew 24:35.

“Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.”

Concerning the word *“let,”* it appears 1511 times in the 1611 Holy Bible. Dr Vance¹⁸⁵ states that on only three of those occasions, Isaiah 43:13, Romans 1:13, 2 Thessalonians 2:7 and once as its derivative *“letteth”* 2 Thessalonians 2:7 does the term have the sense of to hinder, or to obstruct.

The definition of the word *“let”* in Romans 1:13 is found in a parallel passage where Paul expresses similar concerns for ministering to the saints by means of a personal visit.

“Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes I purposed to come unto you, (but was let hitherto,) that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among other Gentiles” Romans 1:13.

“Wherefore we would have come unto you, even I Paul, once and again; but Satan hindered us” 1 Thessalonians 2:18.

See also Romans 15:22.

“For which cause also I have been much hindered from coming to you.”

The Cambridge Cameo Edition of the 1611 Holy Bible has already done the hard work for Drs Waite, DiVietro etc. by linking all three verses in its marginal cross references so that they don't have to chase all over the KJB to find the meaning of the word “*let*” when used in the sense of to hinder or obstruct. See A **WARNING!!** p 27. See also comments on ‘the chase’ in **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Dr Waite and Dr Mrs Ripplinger – Preliminary Observations.**

Discernment of the meaning of the word “*let*” in Isaiah 43:13 requires more study. The verse states:

“Yea, before the day was I am he; and there is none that can deliver out of my hand: I will work, and who shall let it?”

Isaiah 43:13 suggests that the meaning of the word “*let*” in the context is that no-one can “*deliver*” God's work from God's hand, or possibly reverse it.

However, the Cambridge Cameo cross reference this time is Psalm 90:2.

“Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God.”

The sense of both verses is the eternal existence of God. Psalm 90:3 in the immediate context extends the association with Isaiah 43:13.

“Thou turnest man to destruction; and sayest, Return, ye children of men.”

A study of the words “*turn*” and “*return*” in Isaiah yields the following.

“For the LORD of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? and his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?” Isaiah 14:27.

“I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear” Isaiah 45:23. See also Isaiah 55:11.

The sense of all these references is that whatever God does, purposes or says will not be turned back or re-turned by man's efforts.

The meaning of the word “*let*” in Isaiah 43:13, therefore, is to turn back, a similar but slightly different meaning from that of the word in Romans 1:13, once again emphasising the importance of context with respect to determining the meanings of Biblical words.

It's interesting that the Cambridge Cameo margin gives the meaning of ‘the Hebrew’ for the word “*let*” as “*turn it back.*”

It may be argued therefore that it is not necessary to check the various cross references listed above. The benefit of so doing is that the student learns more about God's character, is exposed to more of the scriptures and, as a bonus, finds a definition for the unusual word “*disannul*” in Isaiah 14:27. Isaiah 14:27 shows that this word also means “*turn...back.*”

The sense of **“letteth...let”** in 2 Thessalonians 2:7 may be discerned from the word **“withholdeth”** in 2 Thessalonians 2:6.

The terms to hinder, turn back and withhold are all shades of meaning conveyed by the word **“let”** or its derivatives in their various contexts in the 1611 Holy Bible. These meanings have not changed in 400 years. They may be determined by the Lord’s command to **“Search the scriptures”** in John 5:39 and as Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement in **Quote 33** shows, they, like their Author are **“holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens;”** Hebrews 7:26, with Psalm 138:2. Those meanings and their underlying words in the 1611 Holy Bible are not subject to **“them that are given to change”** Proverbs 24:21 like the **“enticing words of man’s wisdom”** 1 Corinthians 2:4, however absurd Dr DiVietro may find that principle to be.

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s book *The Language of the King James Bible* p 84 and Dr Vance’s book pp 269-270 provide the necessary insights into the Biblical meaning of the word **“prevent.”**

Once again, context is important for meaning and therefore for correct translation*. The meaning of the word **“prevent”** in the familiar verse 1 Thessalonians 4:15 is clearly to go (up) first, as 1 Thessalonians 4:16 shows. Compare **“shall not prevent”** with **“shall rise first.”**

*As even Dr DiVietro is forced to admit in his comments under **Quote 32**.

The meaning of the related word **“prevented”** in 2 Samuel 22:6 is that David’s perils were before him every way he turned, having **“compassed me about.”** He needed the Lord as **“my stay”** 2 Samuel 22:19 and that is likely to be increasingly the Christian’s necessity in these **“perilous times”** 2 Timothy 3:1.

In sum, words such as **“let”** and **“prevent”** have precise definitions in the 1611 Holy Bible that are timeless because they are indeed *God’s* words and not subject in any way to the vicissitudes of secular English, as Psalm 33:11 shows.

“The counsel of the LORD standeth for ever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations.”

It is blasphemous of Dr DiVietro even to suggest otherwise.

However, Dr DiVietro’s comments are reminiscent of what he said in response to **Quote 8** with respect to the supposed near-faithfulness of the NKJV to the (unidentified) ‘original.’

The reader should review the comments under **Quote 8** and consider if Dr DiVietro is secretly inclining towards the heinous NKJV. Such a perfidious inclination would further explain his attacks on Sister Riplinger. See comments under **Quote 5**.

Dr DiVietro’s blatant inconsistency* in response to **Quote 33** should also be noted. According to Dr DiVietro, Dr Waite and the DBS Executive Committee, the words of God cannot even exist in English or in any translation from Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek. See *Cleaning-Up* pp i-v, 2-3, 18 and **A WARNING!!** pp 2, 7, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 40, 51, 52, 53, 59, 64, 84, 85, 87, 88, 90 as summarised in **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society** by this author. See sections entitled **Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration, Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print, The ‘not “perfect”” AV1611 and The ‘not “inspired by God”” AV1611.**

*Once again, so should that of Dr Waite. Note this particular statement from **A WARNING!!** p 33, addressed in **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, The ‘not “inspired by God”” AV1611.** Note in particular the underlined statements.

P. 33 *“I stand for the King James Bible as the Word of God in English, but underlying it are not “two weak legs of Greek and Hebrew.” The Greek and Hebrew (and a few Aramaic) Words of the Old and the New Testaments are the strongest “legs” on which we can stand. They are “legs” given to us by the everlasting, omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent Triune God Himself. They were the legs used by the King James Bible translators. These “legs” are stronger than any translation in the world, including the King James Bible and all of the other “pure” Bibles Gail Riplinger believes were given by verbal plenary inspiration.”*

“This is her HERESY. The King James Bible is only an excellent translation of those Words rather than the Words themselves. How wicked is Gail Riplinger for castigating the very Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of God and replacing them for English words as being inspired by God and Godbreathed!”

See this author’s statement in the **Introduction**, to the effect that the expressions *“the words of God”* Numbers 24:4, 16, 1 Chronicles 25:5, Psalm 107:11, John 3:34, Revelation 17:17 and *“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”* 2 Timothy 3:16 are interchangeable. Their finally purified form is the 1611 Holy Bible in *Biblical English*. See remarks on Psalm 12:6, 7 under **Quote 28**.

According to the DBS Executive Committee, the above terms apply *only* to the unidentified-between-two-covers perfect and ‘inspired’ Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text and *not* to *any* translation (however accurately translated from *any* Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek sources in existence) including the 1611 Holy Bible.

According to the DBS Executive Committee, the 1611 Holy Bible is merely the words of men, not God’s words*. See **A WARNING!!** p 64.

“God did not write or give the words of the King James Bible. Men did.”

*Except in fossil form.

The above citation is overwhelmingly the position of the DBS Executive Committee, Dr Waite’s inconsistent profession to the contrary on p 33 of **A WARNING!!** that he contradicts on the very same page notwithstanding.

See remarks under **Quote 28**.

Dr DiVietro is misleading his readers in stating otherwise, as he does under **Quote 33**.

Quote 34, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 113

Quote 34 is the opening lines of the next paragraph after **Quote 33**. It states *“It is absolute blasphemy for an undergraduate Bible school student to be told to make a translation of a chapter of the Bible. The possibilities are endless; the assault upon the word of God is akin to the crucifixion. Using the available lexicons and grammars, he will merely replicate the translation errors exposed later in this book. More seriously, he will be following the serpent, as Adam did, to think “Yea, hath God said?””*

Dr DiVietro does not like this quote because he is forced to confess that he taught himself Greek by means of the exact same procedure that Dr Mrs Riplinger has described i.e. ‘a hit dog yells...’ He protests that he never sought to correct the 1611 Holy Bible by means of that procedure but simply to understand it better for ministry purposes.

How, else, he asks, can any student learn New Testament Koine Greek?

This author has not studied Koine Greek and does not intend to. However, the answer to Dr DiVietro’s question seems obvious, in this author’s opinion.

The 1611 Holy Bible determines its own word meanings. See *The Language of the King James Bible* and *In Awe of Thy Word* Parts I-IV. Those meanings then interpret the corresponding Greek terms or expressions in any Greek New Testament text under study, e.g. *monogenes* is understood as “**only begotten**” in John 3:16. Knowledge of equivalent English versus Greek sentence structure would be necessary but the whole procedure would be independent of the lethal lexicons about which Dr Mrs Riplinger rightly warns.

As the study proceeds, mismatches between the Biblical English and the selected Greek text(s) e.g. Nestle’s text and/or any edition of the Received Text, would emerge. The mismatches could simply be listed under a heading *Where ‘the Greek’ is Wrong, Missing or Indeterminate*. The list would be comparatively long for texts such as Nestle’s and relatively short but still extant* for the editions of the Received Text. *See *Hazardous Materials* Part III.

Such a list, when complete, which it soon would be, would quickly find its way onto the internet, prompting the question, would it still be beneficial for ministerial students* to study Greek? The answer is undoubtedly yes but for the purpose of gaining a more detailed understanding of the purification and preservation process of Psalm 12:6, 7 in order to “**cut off occasion from them which desire occasion; that wherein they glory**” 2 Corinthians 11:12 against the 1611 Holy Bible. See remarks under *Quote 28* with respect to the critics of Psalm 12:6, 7.

*i.e. not for anyone else other than Bible-believing researchers with a particular calling, such as Dr Mrs Riplinger

It is to be hoped that the study of Koine Greek would be accompanied by introductory studies of other historically important New Testament languages such as Syriac, Latin, Gothic and German in order to gain a comprehensive overview of the purification and preservation process of Psalm 12:6, 7.

Note in conclusion with respect to *Quote 34* that Dr DiVietro holds lethal lexicons and an unidentified Greek text in authority over the 1611 Holy Bible, because those sources, he says, are necessary for an improved understanding of the scriptures. Once again, he says nothing about praying for understanding of the scriptures, Proverbs 2:1-5, trusting the Spirit of God for understanding of the scriptures, John 16:13 or comparing scripture with scripture for understanding of the scriptures, 1 Corinthians 2:13. See remarks under *Quote 28*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger rightly denounces Dr DiVietro’s ‘alternative’ approach to understanding the scriptures as blasphemous.

Quote 35, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 114-115

Quote 35 states “*An upcoming chapter on R. C. Trench will explain the Biblical directive for having only one Bible translation in each language. Only God can place the proper translation equivalency in the proper context. This chapter has proven the absolute necessity of having one inspired Holy Bible for each language. God would not inspire Greek originals (which few would ever see) and cast the translation of the great mass of Holy Bibles (which billions would see) to a panoply of opinions.*”

Dr DiVietro’s response is yet another study in evasion. See comments under *Quote 29*. He starts by accusing Dr Mrs Riplinger of lying in that the chapter will not present what R. C. Trench said but what Dr Mrs Riplinger says. This is a strange accusation in that *Quote 35* plainly states that the chapter is *on* R. C. Trench not *by* R. C. Trench.

The chapter of *Hazardous Materials* on R. C. Trench is Chapter 10. Dr DiVietro states under **Quote(s) 91, Cleaning-Up** p 185 that he dismisses Chapters 10-16 of *Hazardous Materials* as mere *ad hominem* attacks and therefore he will not address these chapters.

Dr DiVietro is being both cowardly and disingenuous in so doing. He has in **Quote 35** accused Dr Mrs Riplinger of lying about the work of R. C. Trench. That accusation is a most serious one that Dr DiVietro should substantiate if he thinks it is valid. By evading that responsibility, Dr DiVietro has made himself **“a liar, and the father of it”** John 8:44.

See comments in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**, especially **Table 1**, with respect to the verse-tampering by R. C. Trench that has influenced both modern versions and later Greek-English Interlinear editors such as Ricker Berry. Dr Mrs Riplinger has documented this material extensively in Chapter 10 of *Hazardous Materials* and Dr DiVietro has by-passed it yet again, as he did in his response to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #2.

Dr DiVietro continues his comments under **Quote 35** by reiterating that the original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek words are ‘inspired,’ i.e. words that God Himself has spoken and that the KJB is the only source that accurately translates these words, or carries them over into English with the same meanings, connotations and grammar of the original inspired words. He states that where accurate translation of the original inspired words has been achieved, the result is the Words of God in the language of the translation e.g. English. Note, however that Dr DiVietro carefully refrains from stating explicitly that the 1611 Holy Bible is *itself* the *inspired* words of God. See summary comment below, with respect to **Quote 33**.

The reader should be reminded that although Dr DiVietro says that the 1611 Holy Bible is the most accurate and trustworthy preservation of the W(w)ords of God in English, which statement he immediately follows up with one to the effect that it is not inspired, *Cleaning-Up* pp 17-18, he does not state that the 1611 Holy Bible is finally authoritative. That omission is significant in the light of the summary statements that immediately follow.

Once again, Dr DiVietro has failed to disclose the single, definitive, finally authoritative, preserved, inspired source between two covers of what he terms the original inspired Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek words.

Once again, Dr DiVietro has incorrectly used the term Words, capital W, for the scriptures instead of the correct term words, small w. See comments under **Quote 1**.

Once again, Dr DiVietro has inconsistently used the term (w)ords of God with respect to a translation, which he insists is *not* **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”** and which therefore *cannot* be **“the words of God”** John 3:34. See comments under **Quote 33**.

Dr DiVietro states further that he can get extra light and clarity on the English words of the 1611 Holy Bible by means of what he terms the original inspired words*. He has not shown so far that he or any other member of the DBS Executive Committee is able to do so. See comments on Dr DiVietro’s ‘examples’ in **Challenges #5, 6, Points-Counterpoints**.

*Once more it should be noted that nowhere in his comments on **Quote 35** or anywhere else thus far in his book has Dr DiVietro stated explicitly where these so-called original inspired words exist *as a single document between two covers, like the 1611 Holy Bible*. He has only made qualitative reference to where the various editions of the Received Text agree, then these are the inspired words of God, *Cleaning-Up* pp 20-21. However, he still does not identify *any particular published source(s) of Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek texts* as consisting of the original inspired words of God.

Dr DiVietro insists finally with respect to **Quote 35** that when he refers to the original inspired words of scripture, he does not mean the original documents but the original inspired text of scripture that God has preserved to the present.

Yet again, Dr DiVietro fails to identify where this particular inspired text exists between two covers as a perfect inspired 'Bible'*.

*See comments in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to Ben Chayyim's Hebrew Old Testament and Scrivener's Greek New Testament edition and note this extract from those comments.

Dr DiVietro then admits that no printed Greek Text was ever the final authority for the New Testament, but he then insists that some unprinted and unpublished Greek Text was the final authority for the words of the New Testament...

*But it is difficult to understand how even this unprinted and unpublished Greek Text could be finally authoritative and therefore, of necessity, 'inspired' (or vice versa) insofar as it consists of a dead language, as Dr DiVietro himself acknowledges, pp 6, 16. See remarks in **Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials – Setting Up the 'Clean-Up'**.*

The difficulty remains unresolved for this author.

Bro. Peter Heisey, American missionary to Romanian Gypsies, notes from separate correspondence with Dr D. A. Waite, which Dr Waite now refuses to answer that *"At times it seems like DBS says, 'It is Scrivener's Greek text and Ben Chayyim's 1925 edition of the Hebrew text which are the real, genuine, preserved Words [sic] of GOD.' At other times they say, 'It is the exact readings underlying the KJB which are those Words [sic].'"*

That is, the DBS Executive Committee continues to evade the issue of precisely where what it terms the original, inspired words of God may actually be found.

Note also this author's comments from **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to the duplicity of the DBS Executive Committee over its professed allegiance to the so-called inspired original text that Dr DiVietro refers to above, in order, supposedly, not to be 'misrepresented.' The profession of the DBS, like that of Hodge and Warfield before them (see **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**), is a mere smokescreen in order to cover up the awkward fact of life (for the DBS) that the 'originals' no longer exist.

In this author's view, according to their own standards where 'the original text' is the final authority for "the scripture of truth" Daniel 10:21, Cleaning-Up pp 2-4, neither Dr DiVietro nor any other member of the DBS Executive Committee could prove that they possess a perfect Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek match mate to the KJB, which they claim to represent an accurate translation of the correct i.e. original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text, even though they insist that the KJB is not inspired, Cleaning-Up, p 18, unless they could produce all the original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek manuscripts.

They won't.

As indicated, Dr DiVietro's response to **Quote 35** is yet another study in evasion.

Quote 36, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 116-117

This quote states *"The definition can be gathered: 1.) from the word next to the word in question, 2.) from several words away, or 3.) by taking 10 words or so from either side of the word. Observe the following 'meaning' or definition which is formed by examining most of the usages of the word 'hell' in the Bible."*

Dr DiVietro's main objection to the above statement is that the method was not and cannot be used for determining English equivalents to the Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek words of scripture because the Bible (unspecified as a single document between two covers) was not first written in English.

Dr DiVietro wrongly refers to the above quote as (Dr) Mrs Riplinger's methodology. It is not. Dr Mrs Riplinger states on p 116 of *Hazardous Materials* that the method is that of *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Dr DiVietro is misleading his readers. Moreover, the context of this section of *Hazardous Materials* is not addressing in detail the determination of the 1611 Holy Bible English equivalents from their underlying Hebrew and Greek terms. Dr Mrs Riplinger's only comment in this respect, at the top of p 116, which Dr DiVietro does not address, is that, her emphasis, "*Bible word meanings and translation equivalencies...cannot be determined by the current lexical method of examining the same word in us in pagan, secular, or apostate religious Greek cultural contexts. Yet this is exactly what New Testament lexicographers do, in spite of their very own rule which requires finding the definition of a word from its own context...Therefore Bible words must be defined within the context of the Bible only.*"

Dr Mrs Riplinger's illustration of the Biblical usages of the word "**hell**" then follows on p 117 of *Hazardous Materials*.

Dr DiVietro's objection to **Quote 36** has clearly wrested the quote out of context and is itself most objectionable for that reason.

Quote 37, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 118

"The pagan Greeks describe hades (NIV, NKJV, ESV, HCSV et al.) as a cold, dreary place in which to muse."

Dr DiVietro takes issue with Dr Mrs Riplinger's explanation of the Greek perception of *hades*. He insists that the word *hades* is the source of the English word hell, derived, he says, from its Germanic equivalent, which Dr DiVietro states further, has a meaning very similar to that of *hades*, i.e. the afterlife. Dr DiVietro then states that, having determined the 'original' meaning of the word *hades*, which he inserts as domain of the dead, the Bible (unspecified) must then be consulted to determine the meaning that God has given to the word.

Once again, Dr DiVietro has misled his readers. He has ignored both the context of **Quote 37** and Dr Mrs Riplinger's detailed analysis of the word "**hell**" on pp 117-118 of *Hazardous Materials*. Dr DiVietro also seems to have quickly forgotten Dr Mrs Riplinger's analysis of the words *sheol* and *helel* on p 109 of *Hazardous Materials*. See remarks under **Quote 31**.

What follows is this author's summary analysis.

The first mention of the word "**hell**" in scripture is from *sheol**, in Deuteronomy 32:22, a verse that Dr Mrs Riplinger includes in her analysis.

"For a fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell, and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains."

*Dr Mrs Riplinger notes on p 108 of *Hazardous Materials* that *sheol* is translated 31 times as "**hell**" in the KJB, 31 times as "**grave**" and 3 times as "**pit**." The King James translators knew when to draw the appropriate distinction from the particular context. Compare Genesis 37:35, Numbers 16:30, Deuteronomy 32:22 in the 1611 Holy Bible for the first mentions of *sheol* as "**grave**," "**pit**" and "**hell**" respectively. (The NIV/TNIV editors were not so discerning. By contrast, on these occasions, the NKJV editors had enough sense to follow the KJB.)

The first mention of “*hell*” in the New Testament is in Matthew 5:22, to which Dr Mrs Rip-linger also alludes.

“But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.”

The underlying Greek word is *geenna*, not *hades* but the King’s men translated both words identically. “*Hell*” from *hades* first occurs in Matthew 11:23.

“And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell: for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day.”

However, the connotation is the same as that for *sheol* in Deuteronomy 32:22 and *geenna*, i.e. fire and burning. See Matthew 11:24, Jude 7.

“But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee.”

“Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.”

It follows that the *Biblical* usage of the word *hades* is the same as that of *sheol* (as “*hell*”) and *geenna* and therefore the pagan Greek usage of the term is irrelevant. That would explain why the King’s men translated these words identically as “*hell*” according to the dictates of scriptural context, not secular corruption.

They appear to have appreciated “*the difference between the holy and profane, and...the unclean and the clean*” Ezekiel 22:26, 44:23 in a way that Dr DiVietro has not.

Quote 38, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 119

“When working with books other than the Bible, lexicographers do not define words in contexts written by someone other than the original author.”

Dr DiVietro insists that *Quote 38* is untrue. He says that the meaning of a word is first given in a lexicon and then the way that any particular author would use the word.

It would help the reader if Dr DiVietro had provided a suitable illustration for that statement.

He does not.

Nevertheless, Dr DiVietro seems to be saying that a lexicon gives the primary meaning of a word and then the various shades of meaning that different authors attach to it. He does not mention under *Quote 38* how the primary meaning of a word is determined but this extract from **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** strongly suggests how:

[Dr DiVietro] quotes from Hazardous Materials pp 83, 90, from which citations he is forced to acknowledge that the Liddell-Scott definitions did indeed come from “crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks.”

To which sources may be added “*haunted Greek graveyards*” *In Awe of Thy Word*, p 544.

By inspection, any word meaning dependent upon the above sources is useless for understanding the word in its scriptural context, regardless of how the word’s primary meaning is obtained, if that meaning derives from secular and indeed corrupt sources.

Dr DiVietro therefore seems to have misconstrued Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement. She is emphasising yet again that only scripture can interpret scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13. See remarks in **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint** on Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement "*The words of the King James Bible are often higher, 'special' words, not defiled or defined by worldly use*" from *Hazardous Materials* p 101. See also remarks under **Quote 32** from *Hazardous Materials* p 113 and **Quote 33**.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states immediately after **Quote 38**, her emphasis, "*When translating Plato or Homer, classicists will ask, 'How did Homer use this term?' or 'How did Plato use it?' But they refuse to see God as the author of the Bible, therefore they will **not** say, 'How did God use this term?' They scarcely will ask 'How did Paul use this term?' The question is: If a word's 'meaning' is derived from its context, why would Bible students look outside of the Bible for its meaning?*"

Dr DiVietro skips over the above statement, probably because he can't satisfactorily answer the question at the end. The statement does, however, put **Quote 38** in context and Dr DiVietro's criticism is wholly unjustified.

Quote 39, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 120

Quote 39 follows immediately from the statement quoted above. It reads "*It is unscholarly to define Bible words using the pagan Greeks or the liberal and confused Catholic 'fathers.'* The context in which to define Paul is Paul, not Plato...The King James Bible's built-in dictionary holds the 'meaning' and 'definition' for every Bible word."

Dr DiVietro omitted the following statement from **Quote 39**, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphases. Note the ellipsis as he presented the quote.

*"Yet the plans to repair the old lexicons merely include accessing **more** of the same secular contexts using the new digital, Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. Johnson says, with this new tool, "we can now easily locate **all** of the contexts in which a word form appears" (Taylor p. 76). We already have all of the contexts in which Bible words appear, we do not need unsavoury contexts. "According as his divine power hath given unto us **all** things that pertain unto life and godliness" (2 Peter 1:3)."*"

That statement, which Dr DiVietro omitted, gives the full sense of **Quote 39** and Dr Mrs Riplinger follows up the full **Quote 39** with reference to *In Awe of Thy Word*, Chapter 1 and *The Language of the King James Bible*. She even provides a *Biblical* illustration, which is more than Dr DiVietro has done in his comments on this quote, showing how the Bible's built-in dictionary defines the words "**cause**," "**overspreading**" and "**cease**" from Daniel 9:27 as "**make**," "**poured upon**" and "**desolate**," "**consumption**" respectively.

The full context of **Quote 39**, therefore, shows that use of non-Biblical sources for defining terms in their Biblical contexts, such as Dr DiVietro urges, is futile.

Dr DiVietro is, however, attacking Dr Mrs Riplinger's work at a different level with respect to **Quote 39**. He declares that non-Biblical sources i.e. "*crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks*" plus "*haunted Greek graveyards*" are indeed necessary to find the 'base meaning' of a word (a fitting term in the context) so that accurate *translation* can then be made. Dr DiVietro allows that the English Bible's built-in dictionary may enable approximate word meanings to be found in an *English Bible* but the method is not suitable for translation work.

He seeks to illustrate this point with reference to the well-known French novel *Les Misérables*. It is strange that Dr DiVietro cannot seem to allude to translation from the 'inspired'

Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text that the DBS professes to have. See comments under *Quote 33* in this respect. However, he does not.

Dr DiVietro is misleading his readers with respect to the accuracy of the Bible's built-in dictionary. He is yet again being extremely ungracious to Sister Riplinger. See comments above with respect to the Biblical definitions of the words "cause," "overspreading" and "cease" from Daniel 9:27, which are precise meanings in the context, not merely approximate. See also comments under *Quote 33* with respect to the precise *Biblical* definitions for the words "let" and "prevent."

Concerning translation work, Dr DiVietro is once again misleading his readers. Note again Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement from *King James Version Ditches Blind Guides*, p 38 cited under *Quote 28*.

"Longenecker chides the KJV's "begotten Son" because "it neglects the current [time of Christ] usage for the word." Current usage amongst PAGAN OCCULTISTS should not change how Christians use words! He and the NIV translators have broadened the "semantic range of meaning" (Longenecker p. 122) to include the broad way that leadeth to destruction. The translators of the King James Version were so highly educated that they not only knew of these Greek quotes, but knew who Parmenides was and what he taught. They wouldn't touch such pagan sources. Either the NIV translators are ignorant of the philosophies of those they cite, like Aeschylus, Plato and Parmenides, and the Orphic Hymns or they are sympathetic to such ideas. (The "begotten God" seen in John 1:18 in the NASB comes directly from lexical support from the occult tome The Trimorphic Proitenoia!)"

The King James translators clearly had language sources for their work that accurately distinguished between Biblical and non-Biblical meanings of Greek New Testament words. See remarks under *Quote 40*. The accuracy of the 1611 Holy Bible's built-in dictionary shows that they had equivalent sources for all aspects of their translation work and knew without fail which sources* to use for the Biblical text.

*Including the scripture itself, 1 Corinthians 2:13 and of course vernacular Bibles, as Dr Smith stated in *The Translators To The Reader* that:

"Neither did we think much to consult the [earlier] Translators or Commentators, Chaldee, Hebrew, Syrian, Greek or Latin, no nor the Spanish, French, Italian, or Dutch; neither did we disdain to revise that which we had done, and to bring back to the anvil that which we had hammered: but having and using as great helps as were needful, and fearing no reproach for slowness, nor coveting praise for expedition, we have at length, through the good hand of the Lord upon us, brought the work to that pass that you see."

In other words, the translation work has been done using the correct sources. It does not need to be re-done, any more than the wheel needs to be re-invented.

Whatever translation problems may be posed with respect to worldly French novels or any other non-English non-Biblical tomes, Dr DiVietro is fixated on a problem that does not exist with respect to *"all scripture...given by inspiration of God."*

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments under *Quote 39* by accusing Sister Riplinger of entertaining an absurd theory that the scriptures were given simultaneously in all languages via the gift of tongues.

Dr DiVietro is lying. See **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** for the explanation of how *portions* of the scriptures were communicated in different languages in Acts 2. These portions would then have *"laid the foundation"* 1 Corinthians 3:10 for complete Bibles in those languages, e.g. Old Latin, Old Syriac, Gothic, or even extended it, if any of the New Testa-

ment Books were first written in languages other than Koine Greek, e.g. Latin or Syriac for the Gospel of Mark. See *Hazardous Materials* Chapter 30 on the research of Hoskier and comments in **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’ and Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint.**

Dr DiVietro has clearly misrepresented Sister Riplinger in this respect. He should therefore reflect carefully on Leviticus 19:11.

“Ye shall not steal, neither deal falsely, neither lie one to another.”

Quote 40, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 123

“If professional Greek grammarians recognize problems in Greek grammar textbooks, why are professors presenting such material as if it were woven from the veil of the temple?”

Dr DiVietro objects to **Quote 40** in that it appears to him that Dr Mrs Riplinger wishes to discard all Greek grammars as aids to Bible study. He states that it is hugely over-simplistic to believe that English grammar has not changed since 1611 and that no passages in the 1611 Holy Bible require clarification by means of resorting to Greek grammar*.

*Practically speaking, Dr DiVietro’s objection in this respect is yet another denial of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9, 2 Peter 1:3.

Dr DiVietro infers that, contrary to **Quote 40**, Greek grammar text books are basically sound and although Koine Greek idiom is not fully understood, only minor improvements are needed for a complete understanding of Greek New Testament grammar.

Dr DiVietro has ignored the context of **Quote 40**.

He is also deceitfully concocting problems that don’t exist with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible and, with like duplicity, glossing over significant problems that apparently *do* exist with respect to the contemporary understanding of New Testament Koine Greek.

Dr DiVietro should again carefully consider Proverbs 11:1, if he wishes to please God, as he should. See remarks at the end of **Quote 29**.

“A false balance is abomination to the LORD: but a just weight is his delight.”

Any changes in English grammar since 1611 are irrelevant. Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in *The Hidden History of the English Scriptures* pp 37ff that *“The KJB translators generally followed the grammatical elements and word order (syntax) of the Bishops’ Bible. This was their foundation and they seldom varied from it.”* They worked with *“a firmly established, long standing structure.”*

A study of changes in English grammar since 1611 is therefore not required for understanding the 1611 Holy Bible, the grammar of which has obviously *not* changed in 400 years. A study of *the Bible*, along with prayer for understanding Proverbs 2:1-5, is what is required for understanding the 1611 Holy Bible, as David says in Psalm 119:125. See related comments in **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint.**

“I am thy servant; give me understanding, that I may know thy testimonies.”

Dr DiVietro gives no evidence to the contrary. See **Challenges #5, 6, Points-Counterpoints** with respect to Dr DiVietro’s examples on how Greek grammar, or any aspect of ‘the Greek’ somehow ‘clarifies’ the 1611 Holy Bible. They do not, which is all Dr DiVietro actually ‘clarifies’ by means of his several examples.

The context of **Quote 40** that Dr DiVietro has ignored includes this statement, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases.

“Linguist...Trevor V. Evans presented a paper at the Society of Biblical Literature bemoaning the – “Long-ignored problems which lie at the heart of the Greek verbal system and thus at the heart of the Greek language itself. The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that we have barely begun the process of unravelling these problems...””

Quote 40 then follows, followed in turn by another telling statement.

“These men may not know God, but they know Greek. Evans warns of the “dangers” and says discussions about verbs – “...raise new questions and demand reassessment of numerous long-accepted truths...””

These additional statements from *Hazardous Materials* that Dr DiVietro neglects to mention indicate that *major problems* exist for modern researchers with respect to deciphering Koine Greek that will not be solved by the kind of minor tweaking with Greek idiom that Dr DiVietro implies.

As the Lord Jesus Christ said in Matthew 23:24:

“Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel.”

By contrast, such problems do not exist with respect to understanding the 1611 Holy Bible because, as Dr Mrs states in *The Hidden History of the English Scriptures* pp 39ff *“The KJB translators had the best primary sources written by Christians [and] the entire original works of ancient authors. They could read any word in question in its entire context, unlike contemporary translators, who by their own admission are distanced from the entire works of the ancient writers, and do not study words in the contexts of the original editions, but rely on English interpretations in modern lexicons.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger shows further that the King James translators were able to write their own lexicons from their ancient sources with parallel word definitions given in Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldee, and Arabic in addition to Greek. They also had *““the chief manuscripts of Chrysostom [the most devout early Greek Christian pastor and writer]””* thanks in part to the *““cost and pains [and] Herculean labour...””* of translator Henry Savile, who *“compiled the writings of Chrysostom into 8 volumes”* such that *“In addition to helping the translators determine the usage of Greek words, Chrysostom’s manuscripts, which contain many scripture citations, document true ancient Greek New Testament readings.”*

In addition, as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows, the King James translators were able to consult *“Holy Bibles used by all language groups”* i.e. including the established vernacular Bibles such that *“if one Greek source seemed out of joint at a point, they looked at other manuscripts, verses, and vernacular translations”* and thereby identified and overcame the kind of verse-tampering and deliberate unwarranted omission that *“the sometimes unorthodox Greek Orthodox Church”* indulged in *“in order to perpetuate one of their doctrinal errors (e.g. Acts 8:37, 1 John 5:7 et al.)”* See Dr Smith’s statement above.

Concerning, therefore, Dr DiVietro’s insistence on the need for modern Greek grammars*, with respect to understanding the 1611 Holy Bible, Nehemiah 6:8 applies, not that either Dr DiVietro or the remainder of the DBS Executive Committee is likely ***“to give the more earnest heed”*** Hebrews 2:1 in response, or anything like it.

*A further denial by Dr DiVietro of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9, 2 Peter 1:3.

“Then I sent unto him, saying, There are no such things done as thou sayest, but thou feignest them out of thine own heart.”

Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee could also reflect carefully on the following, given their evident fascination with Greek grammar.

Acts 1:8 is central to following the Lord Jesus Christ, Luke 9:23.

“But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.”

The following citation from Dr Ruckman’s autobiographical book *The Full Cup* p 186 is therefore instructive. As a young ministerial student at Bob Jones University seeking to be an evangelist, he was advised not to major in Greek grammar by the faculty adviser, Dr William T. Brunner, an outstanding Greek grammarian who had been a pupil of Dr A. T. Robertson of Louisville for eight years and Dr Roberston’s private pupil for four of those years.

Dr Brunner said this.

“...I have tried to win people to Christ, Mr Ruckman, but somehow I cannot do it. I wanted to be a soul winner, but I have never led a soul to Christ...”

“I was out in a field last week, witnessing to a farmer who did not believe in a literal hell. I showed him my Greek New Testament and proved to him from the original Greek that such a place existed. And you know, Mr Ruckman, he simply looked at me and said, ‘You know what yer trouble is, mister?’ I said, ‘No,’ and he replied, ‘Yer trouble is, ya know too much!’”

The unsaved farmer had a better grasp on Isaiah 45:19, even if he did not know of the verse, than Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee.

“I have not spoken in secret, in a dark place of the earth [the undisclosed ‘original Greek’ that the DBS professes to have but has not identified]: I said not unto the seed of Jacob, Seek ye me in vain [if you don’t have the ‘original Greek’ that no-one has]: I the LORD speak righteousness, I declare things that are right [“How forcible are right words!” Job 6:25 as brought forth in the year 1611 according to “the word of a king” Ecclesiastes 8:4].”

Quote 41, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 126

“The life of the Bible is shown in its verbs and Satan’s scribes have pointed their “hurtful sword” at the Bible’s very heart. The errors, heresies, and faulty translations in Greek grammars will be examined throughout this book...Students are also not taught that all Greek grammar books are based on the corrupt Nestle-Aland or the UBS Greek texts, with verb frequency counts and other particulars varying from the Textus Receptus and its historic translation.”

The ellipsis in the middle of the quote should be noted.

Dr DiVietro insists that students should read the preface and introduction to their grammar books in order to know which Greek text the books are based upon. He adds that if a reading from a Greek grammar book doesn’t match the equivalent Received Greek Text reading (edition unspecified), the grammar book reading should be discarded.

Once again, Dr DiVietro has bypassed the context of the quote.

The quote is actually addressing two separate issues, indicated by the ellipsis that Dr DiVietro has inserted, although this separation is not apparent from his comments.

On p 125 immediately preceding the first part of **Quote 41** Dr Mrs Riplinger states, her emphases that *“To academics the Bible is a history book, not the living breath of God. New versions such as the NKJV, copy their dead verb choices such as, “For by grace you **have been saved**” instead of the KJB’s “For by grace **are ye saved**” (Eph. 2:8).”*

See *New Age Versions*, Chapter 14, *Initiated or ‘In Christ’?* for a detailed explanation of the heretical new version English* readings such as *“have been saved.”*

*See also **Additional to Quotes 41-45, Greek Grammars, English and Non- English Verbs** at the end of this section on *Quotes 41-45*.

Inspection of Nestle's 21st Greek New Testament edition and Ricker Berry's Received Text edition of Stephanus shows that the Greek wording for Ephesians 2:8 is the same in each edition. However, Ricker Berry's interlinear translation reads "*ye are saved*" essentially as the KJB but Nestle's translation reads "*ye are having been saved.*" The words "*having been*" are in italics in Nestle, indicating that they are an insertion but "*the dead verb choice*" is evident nevertheless.

It is this kind of error in translation about which Dr Mrs Riplinger is warning. The student will be misled by most Greek grammar books (e.g. where they match Nestle's translation* in Ephesians 2:8) even where the extant Greek texts are uniform. Dr Mrs Riplinger illustrates this warning, her emphases, with the following statement on p 126 of *Hazardous Materials* that Dr DiVietro skated around by means of his ellipsis.

*"An heretical form of progressive works salvation is taught in all Greek grammars. Their incorrectly translated marching orders, "you **are being** saved," instead of you **are** saved," have mustered a works salvation army, enlisting religionists of every creed."*

*See **Additional to Quotes 41-45, Greek Grammars, English and Non- English Verbs** at the end of this section on *Quotes 41-45*.

Taken at face value, Dr DiVietro's comment on *Quote 41* suggests that he is unconcerned about the spread of this works-based salvation heresy via incorrect translation of extant Greek sources.

Concerning the second issue that *Quote 41* raises, Dr DiVietro may well be justified in stating that students *should* read the preface and introduction of their Greek grammar books.

However, that is not Dr Mrs Riplinger's point. Her point is that students are not *taught* to do so, or, in more basic terms, they are not explicitly taught where their Greek grammars originate. Dr DiVietro's objection does not address that specific point.

It is well known in academic circles that what students *should* do in the course of their studies and what they *do* do, may be two different things. A university educator is being naive to assume otherwise.

Moreover, if students are not being taught where their Greek grammars come from, it seems likely that they will not be taught that different Greek texts, such as Nestle's and Received Text editions, differ considerably and so may have no incentive to consult Greek texts other than those on which their Greek grammars are based. Indeed they may actively be discouraged from accepting readings from Received Text editions where these differ from those of Nestle or similar Minority* Text editions** especially Received Text readings that correspond to the 1611 Holy Bible, which is most of them.

*Sometimes loosely called the Critical Text, e.g. see J. A. Moorman, *When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text*, p v.

The academic critic who featured in this author's work '*O Biblios*' – *The Book* pp 113ff was extremely dismissive of any edition of the Received Text and no doubt conveyed that condescending attitude to generations of students to whom he taught New Testament Greek for a period of 20 years. "*One sinner destroyeth much good***" Ecclesiastes 9:18.

How then are they supposed to follow Dr DiVietro's directives and reject Nestle in favour of the Received Text where differences in the Greek wording do arise?

Further, how is the student supposed to appreciate the small but significant number of KJB readings that are supported by Minority Texts similar to Nestle's but not by extant Received Text editions such as Ricker Berry's and Scrivener's? See *Hazardous Materials*, Chapters 17-19, especially Chapter 18, pp 654ff, 669-679.

Dr DiVietro's blanket endorsement of the Received Text against the Greek texts that disagree with it will inevitably cause the student to blunder into the very pitfalls about which Sister Riplinger has sought to warn him.

The Devil will therefore have succeeded in producing another *disbeliever* in the 1611 Holy Bible and Satan obviously doesn't care about the devices he uses to achieve that end, whether Ricker Berry and Scrivener or Nestle-Aland.

Noting that students who attend Bible college may still be young in the faith, Dr DiVietro should give serious consideration to the Lord's warning in Matthew 18:6.

“But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.”

Quote 42, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 127

“In their English translation all Greek grammars ignore the inflected endings on Greek verbs.”*

*See **Additional to Quotes 41-45, Greek Grammars, English and Non- English Verbs** at the end of this section on **Quotes 41-45**.

Dr DiVietro chooses to split hairs on this quote or **“strain at a gnat”** Matthew 23:24. He says that Greek grammar books do not ignore inflected endings on Greek verbs, they simply use the pronoun *you* for the singular and plural second person, instead of what he calls the 17th century forms *thee, thy, thine, ye* because these are obsolete. He therefore insists that modern Greek grammars shouldn't have to use them but allows that what he terms again these 17th century forms are good for clarity.

The pronouns *thee, thy, thine* and *ye* are not 17th century forms, which is a misidentification that Dr DiVietro commits not once but twice. See Dr Hills's remarks in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.

“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.”

Dr DiVietro's grudging concession to the clarity achieved by means of the singular second person pronouns flies in the face of what he had said about 'the Greek' with respect to the 'clarity' supposedly achieved by 'the Greek' for John 11:33 and the words *baptizo* and *oinos*. See remarks under **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**. Dr DiVietro's inconsistency in this respect betrays an underlying prejudice against **“the king's word”** 2 Samuel 24:4 and yet again against the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments with reference to the word *anow* that he says was found in the 1611 AV1611 but removed from the 1769 and later AV1611 editions. He asks, therefore, whether Dr Mrs Riplinger consults the 1611 or the 1769 AV1611. Dr DiVietro could answer that question by means of the site www.ourkjb.com/ that contains Dr Mrs Riplinger's extremely informative article on editions of the 1611 Holy Bible entitled *Settings of The King James Bible*.

The word *anow* does not appear in the online 1611 Edition of the 1611 Holy Bible available from *e-Sword*, which is a very thorough source, www.e-sword.net/ and Dr DiVietro does not give any scriptural reference where the word occurs in either of the 1611 KJB editions. Online sources, e.g. Google, reveal nothing of Biblical relevance. Further comment on this word is therefore not possible at this time.

Yet again, however, Dr DiVietro has misconstrued or glossed over what Dr Mrs Riplinger actually said in **Quote 42**. She said, this author's underlining "*In their English translation all Greek grammars ignore the inflected endings on Greek verbs.*" She did not say that the Greek grammar books ignore inflected verb endings in the Greek language *but in the English language*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger makes an important statement to this effect at the end of p 127 that Dr DiVietro overlooked.

Dr Mrs Riplinger makes an important statement to this effect at the end of p 127 that Dr DiVietro overlooked.

"The Bible is a legal document; the words in the KJB are not archaic words, they are Bible words (See In Awe of Thy Word, pp. 446-452). If it is important to see that these Greek verbs are different in their endings for each person (I, thou, he, we, ye, they et al.), why do they not translate the endings? They are so apt to say, "The Greek really says..." in other cases, why not with verbs?"

"The translations in Greek grammars also do not express other aspects of the inflected endings seen in Greek. For example, the KJB accurately translates the first person, "I write" and the second person, "thou writest," but the translation of first and second person in all Greek grammars is "write" for both first and second person; this is not a reflection of the inflected Greek verb endings."

Dr DiVietro obviously ignored this explanation simply in order to continue his attack on Sister Riplinger.

He should carefully consider Proverbs 14:16. See remarks under **Quote 3**.

"A wise man feareth, and departeth from evil: but the fool rageth, and is confident."

Quote 43, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 128

Quote 43 states that Ray Summers's Greek grammar is incorrect in translating the Greek preposition *dia* as "*through*" in John 1. The quote is placed under the heading *Preposition Preview* in *Hazardous Materials*.

Dr DiVietro says in response to **Quote 43** that Greek prepositions can be translated various ways in English and that the King James translators consistently did so correctly according to the context of the scriptural passages where each preposition occurred. While charging Summers's Greek grammar with error in John 1, Dr DiVietro then shifts the blame to the student, who, in Dr DiVietro's opinion, should not be using a particular Greek grammar if he can't see where the editor's translations are wrong.

Significantly, Dr DiVietro ends **Quote 43** with another ellipsis as follows "*But Summers blasphemously translates it as "through" and that denies Christ is God..."*" This apparent oversight by Dr DiVietro will be addressed below.

It appears from Dr DiVietro's comments on **Quote 43** that the only realistic standard for determining if a Greek preposition has been translated correctly is the 1611 Holy Bible, prompting the question once again, why should the study of New Testament Greek be undertaken at

all? See remarks under **Quote 34** with respect to this question. In sum, however much the ancient Biblical languages are studied, Dr Di Vietro's remarks give tacit assent to the conclusion that *the 1611 English scriptures must be studied above all*.

Dr DiVietro, therefore, is hardly justified in levelling any criticism at Dr Mrs Riplinger for reaching the same conclusion and expressing it in *Hazardous Materials* and her other books.

The statement that Dr DiVietro left off the end of **Quote 43** reads, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphasis "...saying ""*The world was made **through** him.*" Here Christ is looked upon as the intermediate agent of creation; God is the original agent" (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1950, p. 36)

*"The verse clearly states that "the Word was God." That is, Jesus is God. Summers is separating God and Jesus in a verse whose clear **purpose** is to teach that Jesus Christ **is** God and he made the world. Summers' comment shows the heretical results of not translating contextually. This context demands the word 'by.'"*

Dr Mrs Riplinger is emphasising that the grammarian's use of 'the Greek' has resulted in a translation that is not only wrong but blasphemous. (Note that the NIV, TNIV, NKJV have the same blasphemous reading, along with the JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB. The 1582 Jesuit Rheims New Testament www.hailandfire.com/1582RheimsTestament/index.shtml, the Douay-Rheims, DR, Challoner's 1749-1752 Edition and the RV have "by" but Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops' also have "by" in agreement with the 1611 Holy Bible.) Dr DiVietro has bypassed this evidence of blasphemy in his eagerness to denigrate Dr Mrs Riplinger's work and in so doing "***hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace***" Hebrews 10:29 himself.

Quote 44, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 130-131

"Memorizing the misdirected English translations of verbs in any current Greek grammar will be as fruitful as memorizing a medical text book from the 1700s..."

Dr DiVietro responds by stating that grammars give the implications of grammatical forms, not word meanings. He does not provide any illustrations.

Dr DiVietro has missed the point of **Quote 44**. Even if Greek grammars only give the implications of verb forms, Dr Mrs Riplinger shows that the implications are *wrong*. She states, her emphases:

"Greek grammar makes dead believers, as well as dead Bibles. Buth's definitions of baptidzō as "wash" and "dip" will have the same deadly results..."

- *If you are 'dipped,' you drown because you are not brought up to "walk in newness of life...in the likeness of his resurrection" (Rom. 6:4, 5).*
- *If you are 'washed' only, you **do not** go under to be ("buried with him by baptism...planted together in the likeness of his death").*
- *Only the word 'baptize' means to put under **and** to bring back up."*

Dr Mrs Riplinger has therefore both substantiated **Quote 44** and furnished a necessary warning about the misleading nature of current Greek grammar sources with respect to an important New Testament doctrine.

Dr DiVietro has ignored both the substance and the warning. He appears to be "***in bondage...to the weak and beggarly elements***" Galatians 4:9 of the shape-shifting ""*Ancient Greek verbal system function.*"" See *Hazardous Materials* p 130.

Quote 45, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 132-133

Quote 45 warns of how the theories of “*this linguistic shift from a Hebrew origin of language to an Indian origin mirrored the late 18th century shift from Western Christianity to Eastern mysticism and from creationism to evolution.*”

Dr Mrs Riplinger warns how this ungodly shift in perception of the origins of language i.e. from “**a pure language**” Zephaniah 3:9 such as Hebrew to a heathen language i.e. Sanskrit, has been instrumental in ushering into the West the New Age heresy that threatens to displace belief in the 1611 Holy Bible – and is doing so, as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in *New Age Versions*.

Dr DiVietro fails to recognise the threat and comments only that Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement merely reflects the development of languages over time and advances in language study, neither of which, he maintains, affects inspiration and preservation of the scriptures.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments on **Quote 45** with an insinuation that Dr Mrs Riplinger is alluding to modern perceptions of the origin of languages in order to discourage philological studies, i.e. the study of languages and of how their words came to be formed. She is not. She is solemnly warning, *Hazardous Materials* p 135, her emphases “*that the old ‘scholars’ do not agree with the new ‘scholars’ and the new ‘scholars’ do not agree with each other...The conclusion is simple: toss your Bible remodelling tools. Do not replace them with the new chainsaw views of Generation X, since their Nintendo-warped grandchildren will change them again and the cycle will continue. “Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.” 1 Thes. 5:21.*”

Dr DiVietro has ignored both the above admonition and the warning about New Age falsehood that “**will eat as doth a canker**” 2 Timothy 2:17 and does, incubated by the wisdom that “**is earthly, sensual, devilish**” James 3:15 spawned by heathen languages such as Indian Sanskrit.

1 Corinthians 14:38 applies.

“But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant.”

Additional to Quotes 41-45, Greek Grammars, English and Non- English Verbs

Courtesy Dr Mrs Riplinger and Bro. Heisey (see *Quote 35*)

Certain Greek grammars e.g. those of Robertson and Dana and Mantey occasionally give correct i.e. KJB readings in English for verb constructions. Nevertheless, phrases such as “*are being saved*” (indicating works and process salvation) and “*have been saved*” (indicating baptismal regeneration or ‘you can lose it’ salvation) are found repeatedly throughout these sources, especially those of Robertson:

See Robertson’s *Word Pictures in the New Testament* Volume 4 and *A Grammar of Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*,

www.archive.org/details/Grammargreeknewtestamentlighthistoricalresearch.Robertson.1914.

Where Robertson’s readings depart from those of the KJB, they are derived from the Greek grammar of Georg Benedikt Winer, who invented the “*are being saved*” and “*have been saved*” interpretation of New Testament verbs that describe salvation. Winer appears to be noted for little apart from delving into Koine Greek.

See en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Georg_Benedikt_Winer.

Table 2 gives some examples of Greek grammar versus KJB readings for verses on salvation and calling. See *New Age Versions* pp 243-245 for more examples.

Table 2
Greek Grammar versus KJB Readings on Salvation and Related Verses

Verse	<i>Word Pictures etc.</i> Volume 4 Robertson	AV1611
1 Corinthians 1:18	<i>are being saved</i> , p 77	<i>are saved</i>
1 Corinthians 6:11	<i>were washed, were sanctified</i> , p 120	<i>are washed, are sanctified</i>
1 Corinthians 15:2	<i>as a process, ye being saved</i> , p 77	<i>ye are saved</i>
Ephesians 2:8	<i>By grace have ye been saved*</i> , p 524	<i>For by grace are ye saved</i>
Colossians 2:20	<i>died</i> , p 498	<i>be dead</i>
Colossians 3:1	<i>ye were raised</i> , p 500	<i>ye then be risen</i>
Colossians 3:3	<i>ye died</i> , p 500	<i>ye are dead</i>
Colossians 3:10	<i>is being renewed</i> , p 502	<i>is renewed</i>
1 Timothy 6:12	<i>thou wast called</i> , p 594	<i>thou art also called</i>

*Robertson’s *Grammar* and Dana and Mantey’s grammar evidently have the KJB reading for Ephesians 2:8. It is worthy of note that Dr Mrs Riplinger has been working extensively from a KJB basis with numerous non-English languages for Bible publication, including Chinese, Miskito, Persian, Spanish, Swahili, Tamil, Thadou-Kuki, Urdu. Bro. Heisey has been carrying out similar work with respect to the Romanian language.

The site www.holybiblefoundation.org/ describes Dr Mrs Riplinger’s researches.

Quote 46, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 133

“Imagine, a Christ-rejecting Unitarian like Thayer, giving English interpretations from a German grammar. That does not sound like the ‘original’ Greek to me.”

Dr DiVietro insists, in effect that if a Greek grammar first written in German is correctly translated into English, then it is fully trustworthy, just as accurate English translations of books such as Victor Hugo’s *Hunchback of Notre Dame* or Solzhenitsyn’s *Gulag Archipeligo* are great classics, even though not first written in English.

He chides Sister Riplinger for apparently being afraid of the ‘original Greek,’ his single quote marks.

The key word is “*if*,” which Dr DiVietro does use with respect to the Greek-German-English editions of Thayer’s and Moulton’s Greek grammars, *Hazardous Materials*, p 133.

‘If **“the interpretation of a thing”** Ecclesiastes 8:1 from Greek to English, even via German, is valid, then students will not be misled *but what ‘if’ it is not?* That is the warning that Sister Riplinger is seeking to convey, not from ‘Greekaphobia’ of which Dr DiVietro accuses her but out of loving concern for students and anyone else who may be deceived by a Devil’s disciple such as J. H. Thayer. See *New Age Versions* p 3.

Dr DiVietro should have enough grace and discernment to know the difference.

He should also have enough spiritual insight to recognize that reference to secular works in non-English languages is of no relevance for English-speaking congregations in keeping at bay **“grievous wolves...not sparing the flock”** and **“men...speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them”** Acts 20:29, 30. Neither has Dr DiVietro shown that any such reference is of use even for French or Russian-speaking congregations. Dr Ruckman has, however, made mention of his Ukrainian interpreter who came to know the Lord Jesus Christ *through a 1611 Holy Bible*, not the works of Solzhenitsyn. See *Bible Believers’ Bulletin* July 2011 p 4.

Dr Mrs Riplinger addresses Thayer and his lexicon in Chapter 9 of *Hazardous Materials* pp 328-357 and Dr DiVietro promptly leaps to the defence of this *“Christ-rejecting Unitarian...Thayer,”* who Dr DiVietro does not deny was such under **Quote 46**, in **Quotes 85-91**, *Cleaning-Up* pp 180-185. This work will respond to those quotes when in turn they are reached.

Quote 47, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 135

*“The harsh allegations about the dated character of both lexicons and grammars proves only that there is no agreement among the last four centuries’ finest minds – I said ‘minds’ not hearts. There are no authorities, outside of God’s word, merely **opinions**, like Adam’s, Eve’s, and Satan’s.”*

Dr DiVietro begins his comments on **Quote 47** with reference to **Quote 45** above and accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of distorting the words of Dr A. T. Robertson in order to say that lexicons and grammars have no value. Inspection of **Quote 45** and the accompanying response to Dr DiVietro will show that it is actually Dr DiVietro who is distorting Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warning about creeping (or possibly galloping) New Age false teaching via Greek so-called Bible study aids.

Dr DiVietro does not explain how Dr Mrs Riplinger is supposed to have distorted the words of Dr A. T. Robertson, so no further comment in this respect is necessary.

However, Dr DiVietro then accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of undermining students' confidence in *all* Bible study aids by her criticism of lexicons etc. According to Sister Riplinger, he insists, all Bible students should simply ask God to enable them to understand the scriptures, without any lexical aid.

It seems to this author that Solomon said exactly what Dr DiVietro is denigrating Sister Riplinger for.

***“My son, if thou wilt receive my words, and hide my commandments with thee; So that thou incline thine ear unto wisdom, and apply thine heart to understanding; Yea, if thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding; If thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasures; Then shalt thou understand the fear of the LORD, and find the knowledge of God”* Proverbs 2:1-5.**

It seems to this author that Dr DiVietro is in fact seeking to undermine students' confidence in the Spirit of God and even in the Lord Jesus Christ Himself.

***“Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come”* John 16:13.**

Dr DiVietro cannot reasonably extrapolate Dr Mrs Riplinger's warnings against current lexicons and Greek grammars to *all* Bible study aids, as inspection of the A. V. Publications catalogue will show, shop.avpublications.com/. He has disobeyed 1 Thessalonians 5:21 in that respect, which verse Dr Mrs Riplinger cites on the same page as **Quote 47**, so Dr DiVietro has no excuse for his disobedience.

“Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.”

Quote 48, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 141

“No one seeking to define a word, should ever define it with a more difficult, longer, less-used word. But this is what is done. I have cringed every time I have heard teachers define Bible words for over 30 years. The definition given is usually the word in the modern versions!”

Dr DiVietro adopts a mocking tone in his comments on **Quote 48** but he does not explicitly address Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement. He says that the thought behind any Greek or Hebrew word cannot be satisfactorily conveyed by one equivalent English word but requires several English words for this purpose, which is why he insists yet again that lexicons are necessary.

Dr DiVietro has once again violated the priesthood of all believers 1 Peter 2:5, 9 in his remarks on **Quote 48**. Moreover, he substantiates nothing but merely voices his opinion.

As Dr Mrs Riplinger rightly said in **Quote 47**, anyone can have an opinion, Adam, Eve, Satan, or Kirk DiVietro.

However, in this author's 'opinion,' Dr DiVietro should subordinate *his* opinion to the conviction of Dr Miles Smith, who with his scholarly companions successfully conveyed the thoughts of 'the Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek' into Biblical English and obviated the need for any further lexical or grammatical input into ***“the scripture of truth”*** Daniel 10:21.

“But we desire that the Scripture may speak like itself, as in the language of Canaan, that it may be understood even of the very vulgar.”

The last 400 years have shown that Dr Smith and his colleagues would have every reason to know that ***“The desire accomplished is sweet to the soul”*** Proverbs 13:19.

With their obsession with the supposed ‘full impact’ of ‘the Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek’ as Dr DiVietro terms it (from the as yet still undisclosed Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek definitive source), which the Biblical English supposedly does not convey, Dr DiVietro and his DBS Executive Committee colleagues should reflect carefully on the second part of Proverbs 13:19.

“But it is abomination to fools to depart from evil.”

It should also be noted that in his eagerness to ridicule Sister Riplinger, Dr DiVietro failed to mention the list of 18 examples on pp 141-142 of *Hazardous Materials* where Dr Mrs Riplinger contrasts simple or “*very vulgar*” KJB words with the corresponding “*Hard Greek Nugget*.”

Dr DiVietro should also check Chapter 11 of *New Age Versions* entitled *King James for Kids* and the appendix of *The Language of the King James Bible* pp 152ff together with the *New King James Omissions* tract, where Dr Mrs Riplinger lists many examples of new version hard words, contrasted with the easy words of the KJB.

Once again, Dr Mrs Riplinger has substantiated her stance on Biblical words and once again, Dr DiVietro has failed to pay his readers the courtesy of doing likewise.

Quote 49, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 145

Quote 49 is a graphic quote in which Dr Mrs Riplinger explains that the English word *fornication* comes not from the derivative *porn* but most likely from the words *fornax* and *furnus* (similar to the English word *furnace*) that mean to burn and which therefore match 1 Corinthians 7:9 “***for it is better to marry than to burn.***”

Dr DiVietro dismisses **Quote 49** as absurd and insists that the word *fornication* and related words come from the Greek word *porneia*. He does not substantiate that statement though of course, as an analytical concordance e.g. Young’s, will show, the Greek equivalents of *fornication* and related words in scripture are indeed words such as *porneia* and derivatives.

However, an English translation of a particular Greek word, or set of words, does not mean that the Greek term, or terms is the actual basis of the English word. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*, for example, states that the word *fornication* derives from the Latin word *fornix*, similar to the term *fornax*, to which Dr Mrs Riplinger refers. The dictionary does not mention any Greek basis in the context.

Dr DiVietro should be aware that in maligning Sister Riplinger, he is likewise maligning W. Skeat, editor of *The Concise Dictionary of English Etymology* and the editors of *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*, because those are the sources that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists at the end of **Quote 49**.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments on **Quote 49** by stating explicitly in words to this effect that no English Bible could ever be “***all scripture...given by inspiration of God***” and that only the Greek and Hebrew words that God breathed out and has preserved for thousands of years could ever be “***all scripture...given by inspiration of God.***” Any notion that an English Bible could be “***all scripture...given by inspiration of God***” is Dr Mrs Riplinger’s (absurd) theory, he claims.

Once again, Dr DiVietro does not specify where these God-breathed and perfectly preserved Greek and Hebrew words may be found between two covers.

Once again, Dr DiVietro has denied the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9.

Once again, Dr DiVietro is in direct conflict with some of God's greatest servants; Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Cranmer and the revival preachers of the 18th century that Bishop Ryle described. See **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

Once again, Dr DiVietro is in direct conflict with the King James translators. He continues to be "like swine to tread under foot so precious things" and "like dogs to tear and abuse holy things..." See **A Time-Honoured Warning**. "The holy scriptures" 2 Timothy 3:15 are "holy things" in the form of the Holy English scriptures that Dr Smith and his colleagues brought forth in 1611 and as "the word of the LORD was precious in those days" 1 Samuel 3:1, so it was in 1611 to Dr Smith and his colleagues and continues to be to Bible believers.

Once again, Dr DiVietro is in direct conflict with the Book and its Author.

"And I saw in the right hand of him that sat on the throne a book written within and on the backside, sealed with seven seals" Romans 5:1.

Dr DiVietro should examine what is "***on the backside***" of a Cambridge Cameo Wide Margin Holy Bible. It might make him think twice about inadvertently giving aid and comfort to "***the accuser of our brethren...which accused them before our God day and night***" Revelation 12:10.

Quote 50, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 148

"The only thing that is being learned when Greek tools are consulted is that the English Bible is not quite right. The implicit question arises in the listener's heart – 'if the Greek word means such and such, why didn't the KJB say that? Oh...my Bible is wrong...'"

Dr DiVietro protests that words like 'let,' 'prevent' and a huge number of other KJB words have changed in meaning in the last 400 years and therefore the original languages must be consulted in order to interpret them. He adds in effect that no student of scripture could possibly understand words like 'superfluidity' (sic) or 'lasciviousness' without consulting the original languages and accuses Sister Riplinger of having a weak view of scripture by her apparent denial of the supposed necessity for such consultation.

It is Dr DiVietro who has a weak view of scripture, not Sister Riplinger. However much *secular* word meanings have changed over the centuries, *Biblical* word meanings have *not* changed and never will, as the Lord Jesus Christ Himself gives assurance in Matthew 24:35.

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

See remarks with respect to the words "***let***" and "***prevent***" under **Quote 33**. It is both stupid and sinful to suppose that Biblical words are somehow subject to the vicissitudes of man's usage. Progression of an endless stream of new 'bibles,' e.g. according to the NIV *Preface* p vii, in order to 'update' the KJB or regression to ancient languages in order to 'clarify' the KJB, e.g. according to *Cleaning-Up* p 94, is to compound that sin and stupidity. In short, "***This is wickedness***" Zechariah 5:8, as the Lord Jesus Christ rebuked the religious leaders of His day in Mark 7:13.

"Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye."

See also **Challenges #5, #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints** for Dr DiVietro's 'examples' and his wholly inadequate explanation of Bible verses and Biblical words by means of 'the original languages.'

The word to which he refers as 'superfluidity' is actually "***superfluity***" and it is found in James 1:21, which is the only time it occurs in the KJB.

“Wherefore lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls.”

By inspection of James 1:21 “*superfluity*” or more explicitly “*superfluity of naughtiness*” is associated with “*filthiness*” and is contrasted with “*the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls.*”

“*Superfluity of naughtiness*” is therefore that which is filthy and cannot save the soul. Note James 1:26-27.

“If any man among you seem to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man’s religion is vain. Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.”

James 1:21, 26-27 show therefore that “*superfluity of naughtiness*” is vain man’s religion, impure and defiled before God, filthy and unable “*to save your souls.*”

The expression is an exact picture of the Catholic Church “*teaching for doctrine the commandments of men*” Mark 7:7 and all her evil offspring including Islam, apostate Protestantism, Orthodoxy, Marxism and all else “*that cannot save*” Isaiah 45:20, as summed up in Revelation 17:4-5 and their description of Rome. Note the association with James 1:21 by means of the term “*filthiness.*”

“And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication: And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.”

That is what James is warning against by means of the expression “*superfluity of naughtiness*” knowing full well, as Paul warned in 2 Timothy 3:1 “*This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come.*” The nature of James’s warning is found by searching the scriptures, John 5:39. ‘The Greek’ is unnecessary.

Queen of All by Jim Tetlow et al. is a most informative summary of how the above scriptures are being fulfilled in these “*perilous times.*” See also *The Godfathers* and *The Prophet* by Chick Publications.

The term “*lasciviousness*” is found 6 times in the 1611 Holy Bible; Mark 7:22, 2 Corinthians 12:21, Galatians 5:19, Ephesians 4:19, 1 Peter 4:3, Jude 4. Inspection of those verses and their respective contexts shows that in the scripture “*lascivious*” is defilement and the carrying out of any kind of “*uncleanness.*”

Further elaboration is neither necessary nor desirable, likewise resorting to ‘the Greek.’

Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, does not give any explanation of the words “*superfluity*” or “*lasciviousness*” from ‘the Greek’ or any other source, which is another discourtesy on his part, both to Dr Mrs Riplinger and the reader.

Quote 51, from Hazardous Materials, p 149

“Metzger thinks that even the ‘originals’ contain errors. In Metzger’s A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, he says that Matthew penned “erroneous spelling” in the ‘original’ edition, in both Matthew 1:7 and 10, in the genealogy of Christ.”

Dr DiVietro dismisses *Quote 51* on the basis that Metzger is not to be trusted to either explain or understand the scriptures but only as a means of identifying the manuscript evidence used for readings in modern versions that depart from the Received Text.

However, *Quote 51* is simply Dr Mrs Riplinger's introduction to a more sinister aspect of Metzger's influence on the text of scripture, which Dr DiVietro is forced to acknowledge as pre-eminent in the USA over the last 50 years. Dr Mrs Riplinger describes the significance of Metzger's influence on pp 150-151 of *Hazardous Materials*.

“The Greek-English Dictionary” included in Metzger’s United Bible Society’s Greek Text, 4th edition...says [in the Dictionary’s Preface] “the meanings are given in present-day English, rather than in accord with traditional ecclesiastical terminology.” This diluting and secularization of the Holy Bible’s words is characteristic of all lexicons.”

See comments in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** on lexical editor Danker's substitution of “generosity” for “grace” and in **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint** on the undermining by lexical editors of the “higher ‘special’ words” of the 1611 Holy Bible.

Even though Metzger's comments on the scriptures may be ignored, the word meanings given in his Greek-English dictionary may not be. That is the substance of Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement in *Quote 51*, which Dr DiVietro overlooked.

This author recently encountered an example of the secularization of a Biblical word that was condoned by a Bible study leader who would not endorse Metzger's heresies but was nevertheless adversely affected by ‘the Greek’ that lexical editors like Metzger undoubtedly influenced.

Commenting on John 14:2, this leader said that some versions had “mansions” (KJB) and others had “rooms” (NIV) “but the important thing is, there’s plenty of room” (TNIV). Ironically, a large local hardware and gardening store closed for business not long after that comment was made. Emptied of all stock and furnishings, the store now has “plenty of room” but it could hardly be called a mansion.

That is the kind of lexical corruption from the likes of Metzger and co. against which Dr Mrs Riplinger is warning. *“And their word will eat as doth a canker”* 2 Timothy 2:17.

Quote 52, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 150

“Most new versions are based upon the Greek text created in the 1950s by Metzger for the United Bible Societies. He admits that the “German word for “butcher” is Metzger.” He is well-named, because his Greek text carves, chops, and grinds to mincemeat nearly 8,000 words from the Received Text.”

Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of making an *ad hominem* attack on Bruce Metzger. She isn't. She is commenting on the irony of his surname (the meaning of which he appears to have disclosed initially, not Dr Mrs Riplinger) with respect to his Greek New Testament, which is based on that of Westcott and Hort.

It is noteworthy that Dr DiVietro refers to Metzger compiling his Greek New Testament in order to replace ‘the Greek New Testament.’ Yet again, Dr DiVietro does not specify where ‘the Greek New Testament’ can be found between two covers. He may be implying from *Quote 52* that ‘the Greek New Testament’ is “the Received Text” but he does not say so and certainly does not allude to any particular edition of “the Received Text” as ‘the Greek New Testament.’

Even though they use different final authorities, Dr DiVietro's sustained silence with respect to identification of ‘the Greek New Testament’ puts him in the same camp as Bruce Metzger

when it comes to violating the priesthood of all believers 1 Peter 2:5, 9 and aspiring at “*being lords over God’s heritage*” instead of “*ensamples to the flock*” 1 Peter 5:3.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments on *Quote 52* by declaring that the meaning of Bruce Metzger’s surname is of no importance.

Dr DiVietro should not be so dismissive of the potential significance of an individual’s name.

“...for as his name is, so is he; Nabal is his name, and folly is with him:...” 1 Samuel 25:25.

It appears that these days, as in Solomon’s day “*Folly is set in great dignity*” Ecclesiastes 10:6, especially among the “*Traitors, heady, highminded*” of academia in 2 Timothy 3:4.

Quote 53, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 155

“*In the transformation of the RSV into the NRSV, Metzger joined Jesuit priest, George MacCrae, S. J., secular Jew, Harry Orinsky, Lucceta Mowry, and others “in eliminating masculine-oriented language” and coming up with “the least unsatisfactory rendering.”*”

Dr DiVietro dismisses *Quote 53* as irrelevant with a statement to the effect that KJB believers don’t trust either heretics like Metzger or the modern versions associated with them.

Yet only two quotes before, Dr DiVietro was forced to acknowledge that Metzger had influenced the text of scripture more than any other American scholar over the last half-century. It is that “*leaven of malice and wickedness*” 1 Corinthians 5:8 that Dr Mrs Riplinger is seeking to counter. *Hazardous Materials* was written with that overarching purpose in mind, not simply to warn KJB believers against heretics like Metzger. See *Introduction* especially pp 48ff *Why This Book?* As an example of the leaven of Metzger, this author is acquainted with several supposedly mature fundamental Christians who either use or condone the TNIV, which Dr Grady¹⁸⁶ states is ““*gender friendly*”” in his most informative work *Given By Inspiration*. The TNIV joins with the NRSV and other modern versions ““*in eliminating masculine-oriented language*”” as Dr Mrs Riplinger warns and as **Table 3** shows.

Table 3
Occurrences of Gender-Specific Terms, AV1611 versus Modern Versions

Word	AV1611	RV	NKJV	NIV	TNIV
<i>man</i>	2737	2661	2195	2226	1248
<i>men</i>	1677	1679	1614	1834	1032
Totals	4414	4340	3809	4060	2280
% AV1611	100	98	86	92	52
<i>woman</i>	367	361	412	362	401
<i>women</i>	179	190	195	230	256
Totals	546	551	607	592	657
% AV1611	100	101	111	108	120

Inspection of **Table 3** shows a significant decrease in the occurrences of masculine terms from the AV1611 to the modern versions, with the trend being discernible even as far back as the 1880s with Westcott and Hort’s RV. The TNIV has eliminated almost half of the common masculine terms “*man*” and “*men*.”

Table 3 shows further a significant, even if less pronounced, increase in the occurrences of feminine terms from the AV1611 to the modern versions. Again, the trend is discernible in Westcott and Hort's RV but the increase has risen to 20% with the TNIV.

These changes are contrary to scripture according to what Paul said in 1 Timothy 2:12 (which verse, it should be noted, Sister Riplinger faithfully abides by in that all her researches and writings come under the heading of **"helps"** 1 Corinthians 12:28. See *New Age Versions* pp 3-4).

"But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence."

The usurpation is gradual, like the effect of leaven but it is in progress and if left unchecked ***"leaveneth the whole lump"*** Galatians 5:9.

Dr DiVietro should have made the same observations from **Quote 53**.

Quote 53 also applies to the leaven of *The Defined King James Bible*, aka *The DEFILED King James Bible* that Dr DiVietro supports. See *Traitors, Heady, Highminded* by Dr Mrs Riplinger pp 10ff and remarks in **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**. The leaven of Metzger's modernism will be apparent in the secularized word meanings in the DKJB that Dr Mrs Riplinger describes.

Quote 54, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 163

"Philip Schaff denied the inspiration of the Bible and only chose committeemen who agreed that the Bible had never been inspired; he called 'inspiration,' 'the moonshine theory of the inerrant original apostolic autographs.'"

Dr DiVietro doesn't actually dispute **Quote 54** so little further comment is necessary. He adds that Schaff's work on church history is nevertheless valuable in spite of its author.

The same could be said of the book *Defending The King James Bible* by Dr D. A. Waite.

What Dr DiVietro fails to do, however, is to inform his readers that this part of *Hazardous Materials* pp 162-163 is warning about James Strong, who *"was hand-selected by American RV chairman Philip Schaff"* and whose lexicon is contaminated by the same heresies that Dr DiVietro professes to eschew with respect to Philip Schaff. See *Hazardous Materials* Chapter 7.

Dr DiVietro should reflect upon his consent by silence of James Strong's heresies in the light of John 10:12.

"But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep."

Quote 55, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 171

"God will not promote a bible that teaches heresy. The RV/ASV Committee included several Unitarians..."

Dr DiVietro agrees with **Quote 55**. However, he makes the telling remark that while modern versions eventually fade into obscurity, the KJB lives on.

The KJB *cannot* 'live on' according to Dr DiVietro. He explicitly denied that the KJB is ***"all scripture...given by inspiration of God"*** on pp 2-3, 18 of *Cleaning-Up*. Not once in 160 pages has Dr DiVietro stated explicitly that the KJB has ***"the breath of life"*** Genesis 2:7 in it, which it must have if it is to 'live on' 1 Peter 1:23, 25.

The KJB can only ‘live on’ if it has **“the breath of life”** Genesis 2:7 in it. Spiritually **“the breath of life”** is the basic attribute, indeed definition, of **“inspiration”** with respect to **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God.”** Having denied **“inspiration of God”** for the KJB, Dr DiVietro cannot say truthfully that the KJB ‘lives on.’

His comment on **Quote 55** is therefore the height – or depth – of hypocrisy.

Yet again, however, he fails to warn of the false teachings of James Strong that contaminate his lexicon, because *Hazardous Materials* p 163 shows that Strong’s ASV demotes the Lord Jesus Christ to **“a creature”** in John 9:38 but leaves open with respect to Luke 4:6, 7 the possibility that the Devil might be the Creator!

James Strong is kowtowing to the Devil in Isaiah 14:14 **“I will be like the most high”** and so is Dr DiVietro by his silence.

It appears to this author that Dr DiVietro has considerable standing among Christian fundamentalists in the USA. See *Cleaning-Up* pp 389-391. Given his denial of inspiration for the 1611 Holy Bible, perhaps Dr DiVietro should reflect on how he really, even if indirectly, came to acquire such impressive standing, in the light of Luke 4:7.

“If thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine.”

Quote 56, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 174

“If Strong intends to use a translation that still needs to be translated (i.e. a transliteration of Greek words, such as ‘Hades’ or ‘demon’), why did he not leave the KJB’s transliterated words such as heresies (hairesis), heretic (hairetikos) Jesus (Jesus in Heb. 4:8 & Acts 7:45) or martyr, (martur)? Strong’s ASV omits what his fellow committee members called “fearful” terms and “excessive conservatism,” such as the words ‘heresies,’ ‘martyr,’ ‘hell,’ and ‘devils’.”

Dr DiVietro says that **Quote 56** is correct. However, he then says that *Strong’s Concordance* is valid and so is Strong’s lexicon provided that it is not misused.

Dr DiVietro has skipped over the examples that Dr Mrs Riplinger has listed on pp 172-173 of *Hazardous Materials* that reveal how Strong’s corrupt lexical definitions have found their way into many new versions, including the NIV, TNIV, NKJV. See also Dr Mrs Riplinger’s extensive documentation on the heretical readings of James Strong that are found in modern versions in *Which Bible is God’s Word?* 2007 Edition, pp 70-100.

Again, Dr Mrs Riplinger is issuing a warning against **“grievous wolves...not sparing the flock”** and **“men...speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them”** Acts 20:29, 30. That is what *Hazardous Materials* is all about. Dr DiVietro should re-read the book’s *Introduction*, especially pp 43ff.

Further, if Dr DiVietro, for once, endorses Dr Mrs Riplinger’s stance against heretics, why can he not **“Provide things honest in the sight of all men”** Romans 12:17 and cite a DBS publication that includes the same warning? Even a secular commentator has shown greater honesty.

“To sin by silence when they should protest makes cowards of men” – Abraham Lincoln¹⁸⁷

See also comments on the use of *Strong’s Concordance* in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**, where Dr DiVietro takes a far less conciliatory stance against Sister Riplinger with respect to her disclosures on James Strong. He reverts to type under **Quote 57**.

Quote 57, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 188

“Where does James Strong get his definitions? He gets some of them from the Koran! He believes the higher critics’ false theory that the Hebrews got their Bible words, not from God, but from neighboring pagans.”

Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of ignorance of classical languages and insists that the study of Semitic languages related to Hebrew, such as old Arabic, is valuable in helping to determine the meaning of Hebrew words. He arbitrarily dismisses as ‘foolish’ any statement to the effect that higher critics obtained definitions of Biblical Hebrew words from the Qur’an and he accuses Sister Riplinger of trying to discredit Semitic language study as an *aid* to defining Biblical Hebrew words.

Dr DiVietro maintains that the Qur’an is one such aid as a source of Old Arabic.

Strong and co., Dr DiVietro insists, are quite innocent in their efforts to use other Semitic languages in order to define Biblical Hebrew words.

With his fixation on non-Biblical sources such as the Qur’an as a means of helping to explain scriptural terms, Dr DiVietro still doesn’t get it. He should reflect upon Isaiah 55:8-9.

“For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.”

Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, provides not a single example under **Quote 57** of how the study of Semitic languages related to Hebrew, such as old Arabic, helps to define *any* Biblical word, *either* in English *or* in Hebrew.

Neither does he inform the reader that any such relevant study has already been carried out and the results are to be found in the 1611 Holy Bible, as the biographies of some of the King James translators reveal¹⁸⁸.

It was said of Dr Lancelot Andrewes that *“His knowledge in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac and Arabic...was so advanced that he may be ranked as one of the rarest linguists in Christendom.”*

It was said of Dr Miles Smith that *“He had Hebrew at his fingers’ ends; and he was so conversant with Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic, that he made them as familiar to him as his native tongue.”*

It was said of William Bedwell M. A. that he *“is recognized as the Father of Arabic studies in England.” He was the author of the Lexicon Heptaglotton in seven folio volumes, including Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldee and Arabic.”*

The other King James translators chosen for their knowledge of the Oriental languages were of the same standard. They had to be, in order to be selected for the translation committees.

As 19th century historian Alexander McClure¹⁸⁹ wrote, his emphases:

“As to the capability of those men, we may say again, that, by the good providence of God, their work was undertaken in a fortunate time. Not only had the English language...then ripened to its full perfection, but the study of Greek, and of the oriental tongues [including Hebrew], and of rabbinical lore, had then been carried to a greater extent in England than ever before or since. This particular field of learning has never been so highly cultivated among English divines as it was at that day...All the colleges of Great Britain and America, even in this proud day of boastings, could not bring together the same number of divines equally qualified by learning and piety for the great undertaking.”

McClure gave his evaluation of the ability of the King James translators at a time contemporaneous with James Strong, 1822-1894. See *Hazardous Materials* p 160. Strong's corrupt lexical definitions, therefore, would appear to be little more than an addition to "*this proud day of boastings*" that persists to this day.

What Dr DiVietro is proposing with respect to Semitic language study for enlightenment on Biblical words (in any language), which he himself does not substantiate, is therefore superfluous with respect to "***the scripture of truth***" Daniel 10:21. Thanks to God's provision through the King James translators, the necessary enlightenment is fully accessible in the 1611 Holy Bible and its faithful equivalents in other languages.

Once again, however, Dr DiVietro has misled his readers and once again, he had falsely accused Dr Mrs Riplinger, this time with respect her disclosure about James Strong and the Qur'an.

What follows is the sentence immediately *after Quote 57*, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphasis.

*"[Strong] cites higher critic Eichorn to prove that the word 'Babylon,' "seems to be connected to Babel "to confound," "but the native etymology (see the **Koran**, ii, 66) is Bab-il, "the gate of the god..." He concludes, [T]his no doubt was the original intention of the appellation..."*

Dr DiVietro does not contradict that conclusion. He is not prepared to speak out in support of Genesis 11:9.

"Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the LORD did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did the LORD scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth."

Dr Mrs Riplinger is prepared to speak out and did so. Dr DiVietro attacked her for it. Will he and his DBS fellow travellers "***before the judgment seat of Christ***" Romans 14:10 therefore hear words to this effect directed at them?

"Wherefore then were ye not afraid to speak against my servant...?" Numbers 12:8.

Quote 58, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 189

"Strong's encyclopedia charges that Lucifer is not Satan, but Lucifer is Jesus Christ. It quotes one "Dr. Henderson," whom Strong notes, "justly remarks in his annotation:" "The application of this passage [Isaiah 14:12] to Satan, and to the fall of the apostate angels, is one of those gross perversions of Sacred Writ..."

As part of a page-long comment on ***Quote 58***, Dr DiVietro states that the King James translators were correct to use the word "***Lucifer***" in Isaiah 14:12.

Yet he allows that "***Morning Star***" would be a correct translation if the scripture did not apply the term to the Lord Jesus Christ, Revelation 22:16 – though Dr DiVietro does not mention this verse. He says that a literal translation is "*the bringer of the morning*" and so "***Morning Star***" would be accurate because the morning star 'announces' the morning.

However, he then says that modern translators, lexicon editors and commentators use the expression "***Morning Star***" because they are unsaved but he adds that their work is still useful where it is accurate.

This author is minded to think of the fruit of a tree that was also 'useful' because "***the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise***" Genesis 3:8. (Most¹⁹⁰ of what the serpent told Eve in Genesis 3:4-5 was 'accurate.')

The question then arises, how is the student supposed to know when the work of the modern translators, lexicon editors and commentators is accurate and when it is not? Dr DiVietro says that the student should either learn the underlying languages i.e. Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek or trust the KJB.

Dr DiVietro gives no scripture to substantiate his answer but it is easy to see which option accords with the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9, contrasted with Malachi 2:7.

If, however, the student does trust the KJB, why is it necessary to re-invent the wheel of original languages study for the purpose of understanding the scripture? Dr DiVietro doesn't address this question.

In addition, Dr DiVietro has bypassed Dr Mrs Riplinger's explanation, her emphasis, on the very next page of *Hazardous Materials* about the distinction between the terms "**Lucifer**" and "*morning star*" and the sinister implications of attempting to merge them. Her explanation is such that Dr DiVietro's understanding of classical languages could be called into question, rather than that of Dr Mrs Riplinger, which Dr DiVietro sought to do under **Quote 57**. See also *New Age Versions* pp 42-43.

"[Dr. Henderson's] encyclopedia states that in Isa. 14:12, the word 'Lucifer' means 'morning star' (which is impossible since the Hebrew word for 'star' is not used). It continues saying, 'The scope and connection show that none but the king of Babylon is meant,' thereby eliminating any connection to Satan. After denying that Lucifer is Satan and that Isa. 14 describes his fall, Strong's encyclopedia blasphemously insists that Lucifer is Jesus Christ! It quotes the apostate Delitzsch saying,

"'In another and far higher sense, however, the designation [Lucifer, who he believes is the morning star] was applicable to him in whom promise and fulfilment entirely corresponded, and it is so applied by Jesus when he styles himself 'The bright and morning Star' (Rev. Xxii, 16). In a sense it is the emblem also of all those who are destined to live and reign with him. See STAR..."

"The pentagram (star) is the emblem of witchcraft and Satanism, not Christianity! His encyclopedia goes on to say that the Hebrew word for Lucifer is the same word that is used in Ezek. 21:12...A Jewish child who knows the Hebrew alphabet can see that these words do not have the same letters and are clearly not the same word..."*

*Supposedly for the expression "**Cry and howl**" as this apostate site pretends¹⁹¹:

"Isaiah 14:12 says, 'How you are fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! How you are cut down to the ground, You who weakened the nations!' This is the only place where the name 'Lucifer' is found. The Hebrew word 'hêylêl' is found in two other places (Ezekiel 21:12; Zechariah 11:2) in verb form, and is translated as 'cry,' 'wail' or 'howl' depending upon the translation."

"*Morning star*" clearly cannot be a valid translation alternative to "**Lucifer**" and the proponents of this alternative, such as James Strong, are simply seeking to cover up for the Devil. Dr DiVietro's efforts to excuse their writings as sometimes 'useful' make him an accessory.

Quote 59, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 196-197

The central statement of **Quote 59** that Dr DiVietro addresses is with respect to James Strong's denial that vowel points existed in the ancient Hebrew language, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphases:

"Strong's Encyclopedia directs the reader to one of the most extreme works of the higher critics, 'Ewald's Hebrew Grammar'. The encyclopedia denies that the original Hebrew text

had vowel points, saying “the vowel sounds formed no part.” This belief often enables Strong to write *his own Bible*, “when a change of the points [vowels] would give a better sense...””

Dr DiVietro’s response to **Quote 59** fills almost a page of his book. Essentially, he says that, in his view, the ancient Hebrew language did contain vowel points but Dr DiVietro gives the reader no reference to substantiate his belief so his page-long dissertation is not very helpful.

He would have done better for the sake of the reader to have included in **Quote 59** the sentence in *Hazardous Materials* that immediately follows it.

“That vowel points are in fact original is proven in *In Awe of Thy Word*.”

See p 98 of that work where Dr Mrs Riplinger lists no fewer than five references in support of vowel points in the original Hebrew language. As indicated, Dr DiVietro lists none.

It is easy to see which author is helping pastors to “*feed the flocks*” Ezekiel 34:2.

At the end of his comments on **Quote 59**, Dr DiVietro refers to the inspiration and preservation of every word of the scriptures but he does not specify where these words can be found between two covers.

As usual.

Quote 60, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 200

“The front matter of his concordance, in which Strong lists the PLACES where a given word is used, is still perhaps the most valuable tool Christians have to “compare spiritual things with spiritual.””

Dr DiVietro predictably mocks this quote because it appears to him that Dr Mrs Riplinger has renounced all her criticisms of James Strong and his work up to this point because she needs to use the resource *Strong’s Concordance*.

Dr DiVietro has wrenched **Quote 60** out of context. The sentence immediately before **Quote 60** states “Strong’s heresy is a Christian’s warning to “withdraw thyself” from the Greek and Hebrew “private interpretation” in the back of Strong’s Concordance.”

The paragraph that immediately follows **Quote 60** reads in part “The latest editions of Strong’s Concordance have been further corrupted to match the corrupt new versions...The latest fiasco is called *The Strongest Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance*. Its editor is new version fan, John Kohlenberger. It is published by NIV publisher, Zondervan, therefore it is sure to make its definitions match the NIV and TNIV. Zondervan is a subsidiary of Harper Collins, the publisher of the Satanic Bible.”

Under **Quotes 14, 18, 21, 24** and a little later in **Quote 62**, Dr DiVietro insists on the need for lexicons to be updated. He says the same on p 51 of *Cleaning-Up*. Under **Quote 3**, however and in *Cleaning-Up* pp 24-25, he declares that the Westcott-Hort, Nestle and the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament texts are corrupt. These Greek texts are, of course, the basis for the New Testaments of the NIV (Augean) stable. See *New Age Versions* pp 141ff, *Which Bible is God’s Word?* 2007 Edition, p 50, *Evaluating Versions of the New Testament* by Everett W. Fowler, Tables I-IV and this author’s work ‘*O Biblios*’ – *The Book* pp 55-89.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has warned the Body of Christ about the increasingly heretical trend of updates in lexical definitions by means of the example of James Strong. Dr DiVietro has failed repeatedly to do so in all his endorsements so far for the need for lexicons to be updated.

Once again, he has shown himself to be a hireling. See the concluding remarks on **Quote 54**.

“But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep” John 10:12.

Quote 61, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 202

*“Even the reformer Philip Melancthon said, “[I]t is a duty to abide by the pure and simple meaning of Holy Writ, as, indeed, heavenly truths are always the simplest; this meaning is to be found by **comparing Holy Writ with itself**. On this account we study Holy Writ, in order to pass judgement on all human opinions by it as a universal touchstone.”*

Dr DiVietro devotes half of his response to **Quote 61** to more mockery with respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger possibly having to depend on an unsaved translator who may have consulted lexicons, grammars etc. in order to render Melancthon’s statement in German accurately into English.

Dr DiVietro obviously overlooked the little word “*Even*” at the beginning of the quote. Use of this word illustrates that ‘even’ an unlikely source, e.g. a **“dumb ass”** 2 Peter 2:16 or **“an old prophet”** 1 Kings 13:11, 20-26, though not a *dumb* ass, 1 Kings 13:13, can speak or convey the truth. Some truth has ‘even’ emerged from Dr DiVietro’s book, e.g. his comments on Nestle’s text in *Cleaning-Up* pp 24-25.

Dr DiVietro’s latest attempt at mockery shows that he has arrogantly by-passed the sentence immediately before **Quote 61**.

“Definitions from corrupt lexicons, like Strong’s and Young’s; are not necessary, the King James Bible defines all its own words.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger is clearly not suddenly endorsing corrupt lexicons etc., which is what Dr DiVietro’s mockery tries to imply.

Dr DiVietro states in the remainder of his response that indeed scripture is the best interpreter of scripture but typically he neither says what the scripture is nor where it can be found between two covers. Neither does he cite any verse of scripture e.g. 1 Corinthians 2:13 to substantiate his statement and so it is of little assistance to the reader. He adds that interpretation of the scripture is not translation but depends on correct translation.

On the subject of the association between interpretation and translation, see **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to Genesis 40:8, Daniel 5:24-28 and the related comments. Dr Mrs Riplinger is not addressing interpretation and translation as such under **Quote 61**. As the first sentence on p 202 of *Hazardous Materials* indicates, Dr Mrs Riplinger is focussing on the KJB’s built-in dictionary, as the last sentence on p 202 emphasises.

*“My books, *In Awe of Thy Word* and *The Language of the King James Bible*, document and demonstrate just how easily this built-in dictionary can be found.”*

Dr DiVietro has shown nothing but contempt for Sister Riplinger and her work but he has not shown under **Quote 61** any illustrations of how scripture interprets scripture. Dr Mrs Riplinger has given two sources where many such illustrations may be found. These illustrations have proved to be of great benefit to those of us who are **“poor in spirit”** Matthew 5:3 and therefore Proverbs 14:21 perceptively contrasts Dr DiVietro’s mockery with Sister Riplinger’s ministry.

“He that despiseth his neighbour sinneth: but he that hath mercy on the poor, happy is he.”

Quote 62, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 205

Quote 62 consists of all of p 205 of *Hazardous Materials* minus the following omissions, the third and fourth statements each denoted by an inconspicuous ellipsis. Emphases are Dr Mrs Riplinger's. See comments under **Quotes 39, 41, 43**.

"The First Bite Might Kill You

*"But of the tree of the **knowledge of good and evil**, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" Gen. 2:17*

*"The NIV editor, Kenneth Barker, cites the Liddell-Scott Greek-English Lexicon as one of the "works referred to" to support his NIV (Kenneth Barker, *The Accuracy of the NIV*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1996, pp. 7, 8, 114 et al.).*

*"These cooks, Liddell and Scott, hide back in hell's kitchen and their names are rarely seen in the acknowledgements in today's lexicons. Subsequent lexicon authors and Bible [the last part of **Quote 62** follows, to the end of p 205]."*

Dr DiVietro immediately leaps to the defence of the **"winebibbers"** Proverbs 23:20, *Hazardous Materials* p 208 Liddell and Scott. He says that they did good work in setting up a basic lexicon from which all others have legitimately been derived. Dr DiVietro states that Liddell and Scott's lexicon has therefore been improved upon as more understanding is gained of the original languages and as the English language has changed, requiring new definitions of word meanings.

Dr DiVietro, it should first be noted, substantiates *nothing* under **Quote 62**.

While acknowledging that no lexicon is perfect and declaring that none is inspired of God, Dr DiVietro insists that it is not shameful to use lexicons and that none of them is fatally flawed. He says that they just need to be improved and updated.

Dr DiVietro therefore implicitly acknowledges that it is not shameful to use the NIV and that it is not fatally flawed, even though he states that its underlying Greek New Testament Text, i.e. Nestle's, distorts and perverts God's word. See comments under **Quote 60**.

Dr DiVietro also appears to be stating (*again* - see comments below under **Quote(s) 63**) that an *uninspired* document i.e. a lexicon is indispensable for determining the meanings of words in an *inspired* document i.e. **"the scripture of truth"** Daniel 10:21 – or whatever document Dr DiVietro has access to that he considers to be 'inspired' according to *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3. It is not. See comments on Isaiah 55:8-9 under **Quotes 25, 57** and Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement from *Hazardous Materials* p 202 under **Quote 61** with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible's built-in dictionary.

*"Definitions from corrupt lexicons, like Strong's and Young's; are not necessary, the King James Bible defines all its own words...My books, *In Awe of Thy Word* and *The Language of the King James Bible*, document and demonstrate just how easily this built-in dictionary can be found."*

The word meanings of the KJB's built-in dictionary do not change. See **Quote 26** with respect to Matthew 24:35 and **Quote 33** with respect to Proverbs 24:21.

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

"My son, fear thou the LORD and the king: and meddle not with them that are given to change:"

Dr DiVietro's on-going endorsement of lexicons-in-flux as Bible study aids is therefore misleading, irrelevant and worse, an indication that, although unwittingly, he has **"turned aside after Satan"** 1 Timothy 5:15.

Quote(s) 63, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 206, 209

The quotes taken from p 206 of *Hazardous Materials* are as follows.

"The lexicon's English definition for 'bird' may be 'good.' Their pagan definition for 'soul,' 'spirit,' 'heaven' and 'hell' will be 'evil.'"

"Dean Liddell and "The [dons'] wives seemed content to allow this stammering clergyman to photograph their daughters completely nude, though only when they were very young [pre-teens]". Liddell and his coterie provided the children and Dodgson, the pedophile, provided the camera."

The quotes taken from p 209 of *Hazardous Materials* are as follows, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphases.

*"Liddell and Scott, at the baby-faced age of 23, began working on **the first** (of its kind) Greek lexicon in 1834."*

*"The evil purpose of the whole lexicon is openly admitted in a Liddell letter. He "regrets" to see a mind "running too much to **pure** theology.""*

Having stooped to defending **"winebibbers"** under **Quote 62**, Dr DiVietro is now seeking to cover up for paedophile supporters (i.e. Liddell and co.), like all modern versions do in Genesis 18:20, 21, 19:4, 5, 13.

He says that it is quite permissible and indeed valuable for a lexicon to define words used in scripture according to their secular usage because the Bible (unidentified by Dr DiVietro as a single book) was written in ordinary, everyday language. According to Dr DiVietro, the discerning student of scripture, whether a translator or a commentator, is then able to select from those definitions the one that best suits the context of the passage of scripture that he is translating or commenting upon. Dr DiVietro indicates that the selected definition is the one that conveys the 'God-given' meaning(s) of the word(s) under study.

Once again, Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing in his comments. Under **Quote 64**, he denounces as *"most absurd"* Dr Mrs Riplinger's warnings against the paganism, paedophilia and perversion of scripture of the **"winebibbers"** Liddell and Scott et al.

Once again, Dr DiVietro should give serious consideration to the Lord's warning in Matthew 18:6. See **Quote 41**.

"But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea."

Concerning Dr DiVietro's repeated assertion that secular lexical definitions are useful, indeed necessary, for the determination of Biblical word meanings, see comments in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** from which the following extract has been reproduced. The additional quote from *Hazardous Materials* is from p 90.

Dr DiVietro further insists that Biblical meanings of New Testament Greek words can only be understood by means of contemporary study aids (AIDS?) that are the next best thing to immersing oneself in the society that spoke the language i.e. Koine Greek. That is, the student is supposed to immerse himself in "crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks" in order to under-

stand the **“pure words”** of the Lord, Psalm 12:6 and the **“wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ”** 1 Timothy 6:3.

Dr DiVietro, who substantiates nothing in this part of his book, seems to think that **“the washing of water by the word”** Ephesians 5:26 can be understood by means of a metaphorical swim in a sewer. Flannel, sheer flannel. He evidently hasn't read 1 Corinthians 15:33 recently.

“Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners.”

Yet again, what is significant about Dr DiVietro's selections from *Hazardous Materials* for **Quote(s) 63** is the context that he omits.

From p 206, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphasis:

*“Only those who think that **they** are “gods,” dare try to discern “good” from “evil” definitions. It was the devil who lied, saying, “ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil” (Gen. 3:5). Their fellowship with God will wither and will “surely die” from the serpent's lie. Our fellowship with the living God is through the book which “liveth” (1 Peter 1:23). The whole tree of knowledge, where God's words are tested, questioned, refined and redefined, casts a questioning shadow, not an illuminating light, over what “God said.” It is a lifeless counter-feit for comparing “spiritual things with spiritual” (1 Cor. 2:13).”*

Dr DiVietro has failed to show otherwise.

From p 209, more on the **“winebibbers”**:

“Soon the “wine and talk” turned to a scheme to silence the talking book, which gawked at their every evil move...Of course the spirit “that now worketh,” had a publisher that walked on the door of their dreams, and made them an offer from Satan's deep coffers (Eph. 2:2).”

Dr DiVietro should himself take careful note of **“the depths of Satan”** Revelation 2:24, with respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger's further warning about Liddell and Scott from p 210 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphases.

*“When the lexicon was finished, they wrote in the preface: **“...we shall be content if it shall in any sort serve that end of which we spoke in the outset...”***

*“Was “that end” to rid themselves and others of “pure theology,” as they wrote at the outset? Imagine young students still **unable** to live on their own outside of a dorm room, paid for by their parents, spelling out what they thought, after a “wine and talk” session, ‘what English word **might**’ fit ‘what Greek word.’ A less serious, less scholarly enterprise cannot be imagined.”*

Until the advent of two nefarious tomes both from the same **“corrupt spring”** Proverbs 25:26, namely A WARNING!! and *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials*.

Quote 64, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 211

*“As Liddell mocks the Bible's words, a “monster” mocks him. He admits, “Behold the monster, as he has been mocking my waking and sleeping visions for the last many months.” The monster takes the form of the Greek letter π (pi). In July 1842 he writes to Scott: ‘You will be glad to hear that I have all but finished **II**, that two-legged **monster**, who must in ancient times have worn his legs a-straddel, else he could never have strode over so enormous a space as he has occupied and will occupy in lexicons.’”*

Dr DiVietro descends to ridicule again and accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of falsely associating the letter π with the occult. Yet again, he defends the **“winebibbers”** by stating that Liddell is

referring only to the preponderance of Greek words beginning with π and that his statements in **Quote 64** have no other significance. Dr DiVietro then moves to **Quote 65**, where he continues his diatribe against Sister Riplinger.

Dr DiVietro seems to be suffering from selective blindness, at least spiritually. He includes in **Quote 65** the statement that “*The pagan temples of the Greek gods were built using π (3.14), since they thought it was a magical number.*”

Dr DiVietro does not comment on that statement but it shows that it was the ancient Greeks, *not* Dr Mrs Riplinger that associated π and the occult. This is not the first time that Dr DiVietro has falsely accused Sister Riplinger in this manner. See **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to Herman Hoskier’s belief that some of the New Testament books may have been first written in languages other than Koine Greek, as this extract from that section shows.

It is Herman Hoskier, not Dr Mrs Riplinger, who stated originally that “Some or all of the first originals may have been in languages other than Greek” and that “Multiple language editions were available immediately and were concurrent with Greek editions.”

Dr DiVietro still appears to be finding it difficult to “**Provide things honest in the sight of all men**” Romans 12:17.

Sister Riplinger can take comfort, therefore, from Matthew 5:11.

“Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake.”

In addition, if Liddell was merely referring to the disproportionately large number of Greek words beginning with the letter π , why should he include a sketch of the letter in grotesque humanoid form with the caption “*Behold the monster, as he has been mocking my waking and sleeping visions for the last many months*”? See *Hazardous Materials* p 212.

Dr DiVietro fails to mention this sketch and that of the Satanic Colossus of Rhodes depicted in the form of the ungodly Cecil Rhodes, *Hazardous Materials* pp 243ff, whom Dr DiVietro includes in **Quote(s) 75** but without comment.

The figures on p 212 of *Hazardous Materials* therefore lend weight to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement on p 213 “*Liddell’s mind was entombed in the ancient world of the Greek myth, art and architecture.*” Liddell appears to have spent so much time digging “*for words buried in haunted Greek graveyards*” *In Awe of Thy Word* p 544 that he began to see spectres arising from each “***open sepulchre***” Romans 3:13.

Dr DiVietro’s mockery of Sister Riplinger continues under **Quote 65**. She can take further comfort in the knowledge that she is not alone in being subjected to this kind of ‘cultured’ ridicule.

“Likewise also the chief priests mocking him, with the scribes and elders...” Matthew 27:41.

Quote 65, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 213

Quote 65 consists of the first paragraph of p 213, which occupies more than half the page but with a small but significant omission that could easily escape the reader’s notice because Dr DiVietro does not insert an ellipsis to mark the omission.

Apart from continuing to ridicule Sister Riplinger, Dr DiVietro takes issue only with two statements from the lengthy **Quote 65**. These statements are as follows.

“The statue [of the Colossus of Rhodes] represents the pagan Greek sun god, *Helios*, from whence we get the English word ‘hell.’”

“...the pagan sun god, *Baal*, [is] always represented by the circular shape of the sun (and from which we get the word ‘ball’; the football goal posts connecting the horizon line over which the kicked ball ‘sets.’)”

Citing at length *The Barnard Concise Dictionary of Etymology*, Dr DiVietro says that the English word *hell* comes from the Old Norse word *hel* and not *Helios*, although the reference that he cites gives the 8th century Old English words *hel* and *helle* as the basis for *hell* with the Old Norse *hel* merely being ““theorized”” as such. A further reference for the Old Norse theorized basis for *hell* is numbered in the citation but Dr DiVietro does not include it.

Citing the Merriam-Webster online open dictionary, Dr DiVietro states that the word *ball* probably comes from the Middle English word *bal*, deriving originally from similar words in Old English, Old High German and Old Norse.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments on **Quote 65** by accusing Sister Riplinger of distortion and invention with respect to her definitions of *Baal* and *ball*.

Dr DiVietro is not above a degree of distortion himself. The small but significant omission from his **Quote 65** is Dr Mrs Riplinger’s reference for her definition of the word *hell*, which reads “Gail Riplinger, *The Language of the King James Bible*, Ararat: A. V. Publications, 1998, p. 121.” Page 121 *The Language of the King James Bible* lists many of the early forms of the word *hell* from European languages that are found in Barnard’s dictionary that Dr DiVietro cites. Last on the list is the Greek word *helios*, referring not specifically to “*hell*” as such but to the sun. However, as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows, the *form* of all these words, from ancient Greek to King James English, may be traced back to the Hebrew word *helel*, meaning a shining, burning light. See also comments under **Quote 31**.

Anyone who consulted the reference that Dr Mrs Riplinger gave to p 121 *The Language of the King James Bible* would readily understand her statement in **Quote 65** to the effect that the word *hell* comes from the word *helios*, i.e. *in form*, especially insofar as the Greek word most likely pre-dates its northern European counterparts, or is at least contemporaneously linked with them following Babel, where “**the LORD did there confound the language of all the earth**” Genesis 11:9. Even with the confounding of languages at Babel, some word associations e.g. with respect to words like *hell* and *ball*, appear to have persisted.

Dr DiVietro has misled his readers by omitting the reference to p 121 *The Language of the King James Bible* from **Quote 65**.

Concerning the association between the words *Baal* and *ball*, Dr DiVietro doesn’t actually refute what Dr Mrs Riplinger states in *Hazardous Materials*. He only traces the origin of the word *ball* as far back as Old English, Old High German and Old Norse. The question remains, where did these older languages get the form of *their* words for *ball*? Dr DiVietro does not address this question.

Secular sources e.g. Google, Merriam-Webster, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* etc. do not readily provide an etymological link between the words *Baal* and *ball*. However, aside from the connotation of a ball or sphere with *Baal* the sun god “*represented by the circular shape of the sun*” as Dr Mrs Riplinger states in *Hazardous Materials* p 213, the 1611 Holy Bible *does* provide a link between the words *Baal* and *ball* that bears prayerful reflection.

Genesis 38:29, Numbers 21:28, 22:41, 2 Samuel 5:20, 1Chronicles 14:11 show that the word *Baal* can mean “*lords*,” “**the LORD**” and “**God**,” although of course “*Baal*” is not “**the LORD**” or “**the true God**” Judges 2:13, 2 Chronicles 15:3, Jeremiah 10:10, 1 John 5:20.

Isaiah 22:18 is the only reference in scripture to the word “**ball**,” in any form. However, note the reference to “**lord’s**” in the same verse. (By inspection of *Young’s Concordance* and Green’s *Interlinear*, the Hebrew characters for “**lord’s**” do not appear to match those for “**Baal**” but the 1611 Holy Bible is unequivocally the final authority in this study, not ‘the Hebrew.’)

“He will surely violently turn and toss thee like a ball into a large country: there shalt thou die, and there the chariots of thy glory shall be the shame of thy lord’s house.”

Isaiah 22:18 appears to have likened a shamed Baal to a tossed ball, which lends weight to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments on the association between these words. God has caused idols to be cast away in the past and His wrath at the Second Advent will cause men to cast away even their most precious idols in the near future. See 2 Chronicles 33:15, Isaiah 2:20, 31:7.

Dr DiVietro accuses Sister Riplinger at the end of his comments on **Quote 65** of having been unscholarly. However, not having researched the above material before levelling his criticisms at Sister Riplinger, Dr DiVietro has shown *himself* to have been unscholarly.

Quote 66, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 214

*“His biographer wrote of Liddell’s “**unending task of correcting**” the Lexicon. So many errors, a lifetime would not permit them to be fixed. Yet this dorm room project of pimple-pocked preppies is used as THE authority to correct the Holy Bible. Even when he was in his eighties, “He still worked, as has been recorded, at the Lexicon, making many corrections throughout...”*

Dr DiVietro expresses sympathy for all the hard work that he perceives that Liddell put into his lexicon and commends him for trying to get it right. As usual, Dr DiVietro provides no examples of how Liddell’s lexicon, in any edition, ‘accurately’ yields the meanings of any Biblical words.

It is significant that Dr DiVietro does not take issue with the third sentence in **Quote 66**.

“Yet this dorm room project of pimple-pocked preppies is used as THE authority to correct the Holy Bible.”

It is further significant that Dr DiVietro bypasses this most telling statement on the very next page of *Hazardous Materials*.

“The most recent edition of the error Supplement [to Liddell’s lexicon], printed in 1996, contains 320 pages of corrections to the main text. Imagine all of the Greek-o-philes who have, since 1843, mistakenly used an edition of this ever-changing, error-filled Lexicon to find fault with someone’s unchanging Holy Bible. The Bible has always had the word “Holy” on its cover; the Lexicon has wisely never made that claim.”

“This ever-changing, error-filled Lexicon” that Dr DiVietro stubbornly clings to brings to mind Isaiah 57:20.

“But the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt.”

Dr DiVietro evidently believes therefore that uninspired lexicons *do* have the authority to ‘correct’ the Holy Bible, although he would no doubt claim that he uses them merely to ‘clarify’ the KJB, *Cleaning-Up* p 94.

“When he speaketh fair, believe him not: for there are seven abominations in his heart”
Proverbs 26:25.

One wonders how often such ‘clarifications’ of the KJB must be updated as ‘new, improved’ lexical editions are published.

Quote 67, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 215

“Lost in Translation: German to English? Latin to German? Greek-English Lexicons give the false impression that they go from the ‘original’ Greek right into English, supposedly taking today’s reader even closer to the ‘originals’ and the mind of God. In fact all Greek lexicography comes first through German Lexicons, the cesspool of Higher and Lower Biblical Criticism. The Liddell lexicon was based upon one used “used in Germany for the old epic Greeks.””

Dr DiVietro insists that the term Greek-English actually means that the student can now obtain the exact English equivalents of the original Koine Greek words, after 200 years of updating and revision. This suggests, of course that no-one ‘really’ understood what God ‘actually’ said until present-day so-called Bible study aids became available, which is yet another denial by Dr DiVietro of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. As usual, Dr DiVietro did not perceive his denial in this respect.

He goes on to deny that use of Greek-English lexicons has any connection with any Greek manuscripts, ‘originals’ or otherwise. Yet on pp 109-111 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro is adamant that use of Greek-English lexicons is essential for understanding Biblical words such as atonement, propitiation and many others and in bold format, he accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of denying God’s revelation to a generation of Bible students through her criticisms of lexicons and other so-called Bible study aids.

See comments under **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint**. On pp 109-111 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro clearly establishes what he perceives to be a connection between lexicons and Greek New Testament words and therefore in turn *Greek New Testament manuscripts* and on pp 170-171, he removes it.

Dr DiVietro should therefore reflect upon 2 Corinthians 1:17-18.

“When I therefore was thus minded, did I use lightness? or the things that I purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh, that with me there should be yea yea, and nay nay? But as God is true, our word toward you was not yea and nay.”

Dr DiVietro does not address *“the cesspool of Higher and Lower Biblical Criticism”* and by implication, therefore, denies that this criticism has had any contaminating effect on the word meanings found in current lexicons.

Yet again, Dr DiVietro has substantiated nothing in his comments.

However, Dr Mrs Riplinger has shown, for example, the connection between established lexicons and Higher Criticism, as this extract from **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** reveals.

On p 173 of Hazardous Materials, Dr Mrs Riplinger provides a table of important Biblical words such as “Godhead,” “charity,” “heresy,” “hell,” “devils,” and “Lucifer” that she contrasts with Strong’s corrupt lexical definitions that then find their way into the apostate ASV of 1901, the unbiblical readings of which Strong clearly condoned. Dr Mrs Riplinger then provides¹⁹² an extensive table contrasting readings from the AV1611 and the ASV, showing how the latter version repeatedly attacks major doctrines such as the Deity of Christ. The heretical ASV readings, Dr Mrs Riplinger explains, were condoned by both Strong and his Unitarian colleague and co-committee member, J. Henry Thayer, author of a Greek-English lexicon that underlies many subsequent similar works.

Corrupt lexical definitions are clearly associated with a corrupt text.

In the chapter on Vine's Expository Dictionary, Dr Mrs Riplinger provides another table showing how pure KJB words such as "abundance," "righteousness" and "full assurance" have been adulterated by Vine's corrupt definitions that match the word usage in Westcott and Hort's RV. Vine's dictionary, she explains, derives from the earlier works of unsaved heretics such as Thayer, Trench, Moulton and Milligan. Her examples from Vine, therefore, serve as examples of the misleading nature of these works as well.

Dr Benjamin Wilkinson¹⁹³ has shown independently how Higher Criticism influenced Westcott and Hort and therefore all associated so-called Bible study 'aids.'

"Their Higher Criticism

"Westcott writes to his fiancée, Advent Sunday, 1847: "All stigmatize him (Dr. Hampden) as a 'heretic'... If he be condemned, what will become of me?... The battle of the Inspiration of Scripture has yet to be fought, and how earnestly I could pray that I might aid the truth in that."

"Hort writes to Rev. Rowland Williams, October 21, 1858: "Further I agree with them (authors of "Essays and Reviews") in condemning many leading specific doctrines of the popular theology... Evangelicals seem to me perverted rather than untrue. There are, I fear, still more serious differences between us on the subject of authority, and especially the authority of the Bible.""

Dr Wilkinson¹⁹⁴ also reveals Westcott and Hort's contempt for the sources underlying the 1611 Holy Bible itself.

"And as we have previously seen, as early as 1851, before Westcott and Hort began their twenty years labor on their Greek text, Hort wrote, "Think of that vile Textus Receptus"... In 1851, when he knew little of the Greek New Testament, or of texts, he was dominated with the idea that the Received Text was "vile" and "villainous." The Received Text suffered fatal treatment at the hands of this master in debate."

Westcott and Hort were clearly seeking to cast doubt upon the inspiration and authority of the 1611 Holy Bible, Genesis 3:1. As the above citations show, their RV alterations from the 1611 Holy Bible and those of later versions, along with the lexical definitions used to justify these alterations match *"the cesspool of Higher and Lower Biblical Criticism"* as Dr Mrs Riplinger has warned. Dr DiVietro is trying to defend the indefensible.

Earlier in his work, Dr Wilkinson¹⁹⁵ states that *"The Latin Vulgate, the Sinaiticus, the Vaticanus, the Hexapla, Jerome, Eusebius, and Origen, are terms for ideas that are inseparable in the minds of those who know."*

To this author it appears from the work of Dr Wilkinson and Dr Mrs Riplinger that Liddell, Scott, Westcott and Hort, Vine, Thayer, Trench, Moulton, Milligan and their fellow travellers are likewise *"inseparable in the minds of those who know"* and characterised by Isaiah 19:14, especially considering their evident *Alexandrian* influence on lexical definitions. See extract above from **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.

"The LORD hath mingled a perverse spirit in the midst thereof: and they have caused Egypt to err in every work thereof, as a drunken man staggereth in his vomit."

Dr DiVietro and his fellow travellers of the DBS Executive should therefore reflect upon Proverbs 19:2, especially in their haste to condemn Sister Riplinger (even if figuratively on foot, not literally) and in their desperation to dismiss out of hand the explicit warnings that she issues on current lexical definitions and their sinister influence on modern versions and

the interpretation (by the unwary) of the KJB. See especially remarks under *Quote 70*, to follow.

“Also, that the soul be without knowledge, it is not good; and he that hasteth with his feet sinneth.”

Dr DiVietro then completely fails to show how *any* update or revision of Liddell’s lexicon gives any improvement on the KJB’s built-in dictionary that was available to Bible readers over 200 years before Liddell even put pen to paper. See comments under *Quotes 9, 39, 61, 62*.

Dr DiVietro also bypasses Dr Mrs Riplinger’s key statement that immediately follows *Quote 67*, her emphases.

“Liddell...was not a German translator at all. At the age of 24, when he was just commencing his work on the lexicon, “he spent some weeks at Heidelberg...and worked hard at German...” so that he could try to figure out Franz Passow’s German Handwörterbuch der griechischen Sprache (1819-1831 editions) and the German lexicon from which Passow’s was taken, Johann Gottlob Schneider’s Kritisches griechisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch... Visits to Germany to uncover its hot-bed of Biblical criticism could scarcely have brought him closer to the Christ of the Bible.”

Or to the words of scripture that the Lord commanded to be kept by those who love Him, John 14:23. Liddell with his lexicon ***“is like a man that without a foundation built an house upon the earth; against which the stream did beat vehemently, and immediately it fell; and the ruin of that house was great”*** Luke 6:49.

Dr DiVietro does not even attempt to prove otherwise. Yet again, his criticism of Sister Riplinger and her work may be dismissed as groundless.

Yet again, Proverbs 26:2 applies.

“As the bird by wandering, as the swallow by flying, so the curse causeless shall not come.”
See summary comments at the end of **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint**.

Quote 68, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 216

*“There, we can trace the words as they travel from the **pagan** Greek mind, blinded by looks at Catholic-touched Latin-Greek lexicons, shadowed by the dark forest of German unbelief, then stagger into the dorm room of a wine-blushed English **student**, who was not a native speaker of German. English words devised this way are not pure, holy, nor given by inspiration, the words which God uses to describe his words.”*

All that Dr DiVietro can make of this quote is that inspiration of God is not claimed for lexicons and that he has preached messages in various countries through native interpreters that God has used. See remarks under *Quotes 29, 35* with respect to Dr DiVietro’s comments as a study in evasion with respect to each of those quotes.

His comments under *Quote 68* are yet another study in evasion. Under *Quote 63*, Dr DiVietro lauds lexicons as a means of determining the meanings of Biblical words, even though he had to admit, as here, that lexicons are not inspired of God under *Quote 62*.

Dr DiVietro fails utterly to explain satisfactorily under *Quote 68*, or anywhere else thus far in his book how lexicons that are ***“the word of men”*** make any meaningful contribution to the *scriptural* method of understanding what God *really* said, according to ***“the word of God”*** as stated in 1 Thessalonians 2:13.

“For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, *when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe.*”

“*The word of God*” must be received as “*the word of God*” before it can be understood. Dr DiVietro’s preaching via interpreters is irrelevant. The issue is with respect to “*the word of men*” versus “*the word of God*” and the fact that the one *cannot by definition* give light on the other, according to:

Leviticus 10:10: **“And that ye may put *difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean;*”**

Job 14:4: **“Who can bring *a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.*”** See **Challenges #2, 7, Points-Counterpoints.**

Isaiah 8:20: **“To the law and to the testimony: *if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.*”**

Dr DiVietro skipped over the next paragraph in *Hazardous Materials* that puts the above scriptures in context with respect to **Quote 68**. See remarks above with respect to the corrupt texts that Wilkinson lists i.e. the Latin Vulgate etc. and “*the unfruitful works of darkness*” Ephesians 5:11 stemming from lost lexicographers and their unregenerate new version editorial cronies. The remarks under **Quote 69** will amply illustrate those “*the unfruitful works of darkness.*”

“Liddell’s sources include, as he admits in the preface, the same profane Greek names given in J. Henry Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon. (For a lengthy description, see chapter on Thayer). They include Plato, Aristotle, the “comic Poets,” Aeschylus, Sophocles and the whole bag of Greek filth, murder, adultery, homosexuality, debauchery, violence, drunkenness, idolatry, and sadism. Liddell makes reference to what he calls, “the Alexandrian version of the Old Testament...””

Dr DiVietro therefore appears to be condoning all those who fall under the condemnation of John 3:20 by his silence on the paragraph immediately above.

“For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved.”

Quote 69, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 221-222

This lengthy quote lists many of “*Liddell’s ungodly circle of like-minded friends.*”

They included:

- George Eliot, “*pantheist and libertine*”
- Arthur Stanley, occultist, *Hazardous Materials* pp 228-229, “*consoler of Luciferian Annie Besant,*” Revised Version translation committee member
- John Ruskin, “*...member of the Metaphysical Society and Sidgwick’s Society for Psychological Research (contacting the dead through séances)*” i.e. “*a necromancer*” Deuteronomy 18:11
- Charles Kingsley, “*(universalist, whose endorsement appeared in Darwin’s Origin of Species)*” i.e. evolutionist
- Benjamin Jowett, “*(pantheist and heretic).*” The secular source Wikipedia¹⁹⁶ says of Jowett that, this author’s emphases, “*his book on The Epistles of St Paul [was] described by one of his friends as “a miracle of boldness,” is full of originality and sug-*

gestiveness, but its publication awakened against him a storm of theological opposition from the Orthodox (Evangelicals), which followed him more or less through life.”

Wikipedia adds that:

“A famous Balliol rhyme is about him:

““Here come I, my name is Jowett.

““All there is to know I know it.

““I am Master of this College,

““What I don’t know isn’t knowledge!”

“This popular rhyme was composed by undergraduate students at Balliol College, Oxford.”

Jowett’s evident **“heady, highminded”** 2 Timothy 3:4 arrogance towards Bible believers seems to this author to be a bit like the outlook of the DBS Executive Committee. If so, its members should reflect upon 1 Corinthians 8:2.

“And if any man think that he knoweth any thing, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know.”

- Max Müller, *“(professed atheist, lecturer on Hinduism, author of Theosophy (1893), who had a “generous estimation” of Luciferian, Madame Blavatsky)”*
- C. L. Dodgson, *“(pen-name, Lewis Carroll, alleged pedophile and author of Alice in Wonderland, a book named such because of Dodgson’s prurient ‘interest’ in Liddell’s child, Alice; (see also Appendix A, following this chapter)”*

Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, omits the reference to Appendix A in **Quote 69** and makes no reference to the material on Dodgson in that appendix in his subsequent comments.

Again, he should reflect upon the Lord’s warning in Matthew 18:6.

“But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.”

See **Quote 41** and **Quote(s) 63**.

(A cynic might suggest that little Alice was possibly not **“one of these little ones which believe in me”** in which case Luke 17:1, 2 would apply and Dr DiVietro would be further at fault for not censuring the Liddells for having failed their children in that they did not **“bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord”** Ephesians 6:4.)

- Robert Scott, *“(member of Westcott and Hort’s vile Revised Version Committee of 1881),”* also Liddell’s partner in crime in the compilation of his lexicon. 1881, 1+8+8+1 = 18, 666, was the year of infamy for Bible revision, with Hodge and Warfield’s publication of ‘originals onlyism inspiration’ in *The Presbyterian Review* in 1881 while Westcott and Hort brought forth their satanic RV in the same year on the other side of the Atlantic. See remarks under **Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print** in **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society** by this author.

Bounded by *“the insurrection of the workers of iniquity”* Psalm 64:2 against the 1611 Holy Bible in 1881 on each shore, the Atlantic Ocean became a fierce battleground in WW1¹⁹⁷ and WW2¹⁹⁸, claiming a total of 122,200 Allied and German lives, 87,200 of them Allied.

The distinct possibility of God’s judgement in that respect is apparent where Solomon states in Ecclesiastes 9:18 that *“Wisdom is better than weapons of war: but one sinner destroyeth much good.”*

The Devil had a team of them in Liddell and Scott and their satanic circle.

In the wider context of Jeremiah 18:1-9, the Lord would therefore have been obligated to bring down judgement on those who were genuinely *“an increase of sinful men”* Numbers 32:14 through the widespread influence of Liddell, Scott etc. because as Paul prophesied in 2 Timothy 2:17 *“their word will eat as doth a canker.”*

Isaiah 1:4, 19-20, 22, 24, 28 describe God’s judgement for 1881, which thus far has only been a precursor to the Second Advent, 2 Thessalonians 1:7-9, 2:8.

“Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evildoers, children that are corrupters: they have forsaken the LORD, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger, they are gone away backward... If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land: But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword: for the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it...Thy silver [Psalm 12:6, 7] is become dross, thy wine mixed with water [like “the word of men” i.e. new versions, lexicons etc. mixed with “the word of God” i.e. the 1611 Holy Bible, 1 Thessalonians 2:13]...Therefore saith the Lord, the LORD of hosts, the mighty One of Israel, Ah, I will ease me of mine adversaries, and avenge me of mine enemies:...And the destruction of the transgressors and of the sinners shall be together, and they that forsake the LORD shall be consumed [as indicated, with total fulfilment at the Second Advent, 2 Thessalonians 1:7-9, 2:8].”

See historical information below for further indications of God’s judgement thus far on *“a people laden with iniquity”* in the UK and US, with respect to the deepening rejection of the 1611 Holy Bible as *“the scripture of truth”* in the 20th century, in the wake of Liddell, Scott et al. Even though many, indeed a majority of ordinary folk in both nations, remained commendably loyal to the KJB, as even the atheistic George Bernard Shaw observed¹⁹⁹, the *“heady, highminded”* 2 Timothy 3:4 rejection of the KJB was consolidated in 1952 with the publication of the complete apostate RSV and has continued without let-up ever since.

Dr Mrs Riplinger enlarges upon the careers and mindsets of Liddell’s ungodly friends in the remainder of this chapter of *Hazardous Materials*, Chapter 8 and, as indicated, in Appendix A that immediately follows Chapter 8.

Dr DiVietro makes passing reference to the rest of Chapter 8 in *Quotes 70-83*, which will be addressed in turn.

Dr DiVietro dismisses *Quote 69* basically as *ad hoc, ad hominem* verbiage that he claims is typical of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work. Once again, he shows that both churlishness and evasion is typical of *his* work. Dr DiVietro states in answer to *Quote 69* that some of his professors have fallen into sin and some of God’s good servants have followed false doctrine and/or associated with ungodly religious leaders.

They nevertheless did good work, taught good things, wrote good books and composed good hymns, according to Dr DiVietro. (It is noticeable that Dr DiVietro does not extend the same

courtesy to Dr Mrs Riplinger for her refutation of the Westcott-Hort text and the RV that Dr DiVietro also criticises under **Quote 72**. Perhaps he and his DBS Executive Committee associates feel resentful that Dr Mrs Riplinger's researches threaten to dislodge them from their hitherto unchallenged eminence as self-appointed "**lords over God's heritage**" 1 Peter 5:3.)

The basic flaws in Dr DiVietro's answer are that he does not explicitly identify "**any good thing**" John 1:46 to come out of Liddell's satanic circle (even notorious Nazareth did much better in this respect) and he does not show that *any* of the members of this circle fell *into* sin *after* doing good things. Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in Chapter 8 and Appendix A that Liddell's "**vain and light persons, which followed him**" Judges 9:4 were "**hardened through the deceitfulness of sin**" Hebrews 3:13 from the time that they were "**pimple-pocked preppies**" onwards. See **Quote 66**.

Dr DiVietro clearly forgot Matthew 7:20 again. See remarks under **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** and **Quote 30**.

"Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them."

The heart-breaking extract and the tragic statistics that follow need some preliminary explanation with respect to "**their fruits**" from Liddell and his associates.

The extract was recorded by a member²⁰⁰ of the generation destined to "**reap the whirlwind**" Hosea 8:7 from the "**evil fruit**" Matthew 7:17, 18 of Henry Liddell and the "**vain and light persons, which followed him**" with respect to their descent into the occult. As Hosea 8:7 states in full:

"For they have sown the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind: it hath no stalk: the bud shall yield no meal: if so be it yield, the strangers shall swallow it up."

The Devil is associated with "**the wind**" as "**the prince of the power of the air**" Ephesians 2:2. Like Eli's sons, Henry Liddell and the "**vain and light persons, which followed him**" had this in common that they "**were sons of Belial; they knew not the LORD**" 1 Samuel 2:12. They could be said to have "**sown the wind**" by "**giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;**" 1 Timothy 4:1 and having "**walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience:...fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others**" Ephesians 2:2-3.

See *New Age Versions*, Chapters 30-32 *The Necromancers*, *The 'New' Greek & Ghosts*, *Silenced Scribes Summon Psychology* for a full exposition of these "**sons of Belial**" according to Ephesians 2:2, 1 Timothy 4:1, *New Age Versions* p 403.

The inevitable outcome is that these "**sons of Belial**" suffer 2 Peter 2:12.

"But these, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not; and shall utterly perish in their own corruption;"

"Even as others":

Apart from a few men "**valiant for the truth**" Jeremiah 9:3 such as Dean Burgon, author of *The Revision Revised*, church and nation in the UK with respect to Liddell and his following were like Eli. The same was true in the US with respect to Hodge and Warfield - see remarks above - and Philip Schaff and his ungodly ASV of 1901. See *New Age Versions* pp 457-458, Chapter 33 *The Epitaph of Philip Schaff*.

Of Eli, the Lord said in 1 Samuel 3:12-13:

“In that day I will perform against Eli all things which I have spoken concerning his house: when I begin, I will also make an end. For I have told him that I will judge his house for ever for the iniquity which he knoweth; because his sons made themselves vile, and he restrained them not.”

It will eventually be said of the UK and the US that *“the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost”* 1 Thessalonians 2:16 *“but the end is not yet”* Matthew 24:6 because we are still in *“perilous times”* 2 Timothy 3:1 until the fulfilment of 2 Thessalonians 1:7-9, 2:8 at the Second Advent against today’s *“sons of Belial”* that *“knew not the LORD”* and followed on from Liddell, Schaff and co. See related remarks above.

“...when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power;...And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming:”

Turning to the following extract as an example of the *occult “evil fruit”* Matthew 7:17, 18 and *“much evil”* 2 Timothy 4:14 of Henry Liddell and the *“vain and light persons, which followed him,”* its author, Robert Graves, is describing a harrowing experience that he underwent in September 1916 when on leave from the Western Front, where he served as a British Army officer in 1915-1917. Although knowledgeable about the Bible thanks to a largely ‘traditional’ English upbringing of the time, Graves was not a godly man and it appears that, sadly, he was never saved (he died in 1985²⁰¹) but he does appear to have given an honest report of what he experienced, this author’s emphases.

*“Towards the end of September [1916], I stayed in Kent [England’s most south eastern county, bordering the English Channel] with a recently wounded First Battalion [the Royal Welch Fusiliers, a very famous British Army regiment] friend. An elder brother had been killed in the Dardanelles²⁰², and their mother kept the bedroom exactly as he had left it, with sheets aired, the linen always freshly laundered, flowers and cigarettes by the bedside. She went around with a vague, bright religious look on her face. The first night I spent there...though I managed to fall asleep [about 1:00 a.m.], I was continually awakened by sudden rapping noises, which I tried to disregard but which grew louder and louder. They seemed to come from everywhere. Soon sleep left me and I lay in a cold sweat. At nearly three o’clock, I heard a diabolical yell and a succession of laughing, sobbing shrieks that sent me flying to the door. In the passage I collided with the mother who, to my surprise, was fully dressed. ‘It’s nothing,’ she said. ‘One of the maids had hysterics. I’m so sorry you have been disturbed.’ So I went back to bed, but could not sleep again, though the noises had stopped. In the morning I told my friend: ‘I’m leaving this place. It’s worse than France.’ **There were thousands of mothers like her, getting in touch with their dead sons by various spiritualistic means.**”*

These distraught mothers were not *“getting in touch with their dead sons”* at all, of course. They were pitifully *“deceiving and being deceived”* 2 Timothy 3:13 by *“the wiles of the devil”* Ephesians 6:11, like Liddell and his circle were.

Evangelistic work was carried out in WW1 e.g. by the Scripture Readers’ Association²⁰³ and many men no doubt had church backgrounds but Graves remarks from his firsthand observations that *“Hardly one soldier in a hundred was inspired by religious feeling of even the crudest kind. It would have been difficult to remain religious in the trenches even if one survived the irreligion of the training battalions at home.”*

Graves's observation would suggest that even *worship* of the KJB as Shaw remarked upon, commanendable as it is, does not necessarily equate to being **“doers of the word, and not hearers only”** James 1:22. A high death toll among serving men in WW1 is therefore not surprising. As the Lord said to Eli in 1 Samuel 2:30:

“...them that honour me I will honour, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed.”

Ironically and tragically, Eli's two sons were soon to die in battle, along with many of their countrymen, according to the Lord's judgement:

“...and all the increase of thine house shall die in the flower of their age. And this shall be a sign unto thee, that shall come upon thy two sons, on Hophni and Phinehas; in one day they shall die both of them” 1 Samuel 2:33-34.

“And the Philistines fought, and Israel was smitten, and they fled every man into his tent: and there was a very great slaughter; for there fell of Israel thirty thousand footmen. And the ark of God was taken; and the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, were slain” 1 Samuel 4:10-11.

As the UK did in WW1, Israel had experience of both trenches and mediums or **“those that had familiar spirits”** at this time of God's judgement on the nation, 1 Samuel 17:20, 28:3, 7-21. In the case of the UK, as indicated, this descent into the occult, resulting in **“a very great slaughter”** would have owed much to the **“evil fruit”** of influential individuals such as Liddell and his circle, as *New Age Versions* notes in Chapters 30-32, showing how they were the 'trend setters' of their day. Before giving in to the ungodliness of spiritualism himself (as many distraught WW1 mothers did, as indicated), Saul **“had put away those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land”** but the UK has never done so. In the days of Liddell and his circle, the nation as a whole **“restrained them not.”**

The fate of many of its best young men, therefore, was therefore to be that of Saul and his sons, even though Saul's sons never consulted the witch of Endor and were not ungodly men like Eli's sons.

“So Saul died, and his three sons, and all his house died together...Saul died for his transgression which he committed against the LORD, even against the word of the LORD, which he kept not, and also for asking counsel of one that had a familiar spirit, to enquire of it; And enquired not of the LORD: therefore he slew him, and turned the kingdom unto David the son of Jesse” 1 Chronicles 10:6, 13-14.

Sadly, the UK has yet to see a post-WW1 ruler who can fulfil 1 Samuel 18:14 (and not sin after **“the matter of Uriah the Hittite”** 1 Kings 15:5):

“And David behaved himself wisely in all his ways; and the LORD was with him.”

In this context and that of the RV, ASV, Liddell's lexicon and his satanic cohorts, it should be noted that most of the men who served in WW1 would have been born between the appearance of the RV New Testament in 1881 and the ASV of 1901, brought about, as noted, mainly by Westcott, Hort and Schaff, members of Liddell's ungodly gang.

The RV of 1881 and the ASV of 1901 defined a lethal era for **“every man that cometh into the world”** John 1:9 during that time in the UK, Europe and the USA in particular. Note that the Wikipedia data that follow are referenced in considerable detail.

WW1 resulted in 16.5 million deaths²⁰⁴, 9.7 million military, 6.8 million civilian. Over 117,000 Americans died, including 25,000 from Spanish Flu, see below. That total should be noted as probably the highest US casualty rate for the length of time engaged in action, 6-7

months, May-November 1918²⁰⁵, of any of the major wars in which the US has been engaged in the last 200 years, including the Civil War²⁰⁶, WW1, WW2²⁰⁷, Korea²⁰⁸ and Vietnam²⁰⁹.

The Spanish Flu pandemic²¹⁰ of June 1918-December 1920 i.e. concurrent with WW1 and its immediate aftermath, killed many more victims than the war itself, with an estimated 50-100 million deaths worldwide.

WW1 was of course the precursor to WW2 that carried off a further estimated 62-78 million lives²¹¹, of which approximately two-thirds were civilian.

Such were the *occult* “**evil fruit**” Matthew 7:17, 18 and “**much evil**” 2 Timothy 4:14 of Henry Liddell and the “**vain and light persons, which followed him,**” including Westcott, Hort and Schaff, following their abandonment of the 1611 Holy Bible and its replacement on their part by their Alexandrian Catholic Laodicean RV/ASV satanic counterfeits from “**MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH**” Revelation 17:5 “**the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird**” Revelation 18:2.

Dr DiVietro may be inclined to reject the above information out of hand as irrelevant but if so, he would be in denial of Deuteronomy 5:9 and Hosea 9:9 that can apply *generally* “**concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it;**” Jeremiah 18:7, not solely concerning Israel.

“...for I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me,”

See the comment by Robert Graves above, on the apparent lack of *practical* Christian belief among many serving British and, no doubt, Old Dominion men in WW1.

“They have deeply corrupted themselves, as in the days of Gibeah: therefore he will remember their iniquity, he will visit their sins.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger has sought to issue a warning about these issues, with respect to Bible corrupters. Dr DiVietro has callously dismissed it.

Finally, since Dr DiVietro is drawing an analogy between the initially good works etc. of his apostate professors and some of God’s wayward servants and the fruits of Liddell’s lexical labour in spite of his questionable self, then Dr DiVietro must, even if inadvertently, be condoning “*Westcott and Hort’s vile Revised Version*” as a good work. He would do well to reflect upon Isaiah 5:20, 21.

“Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!”

“Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight!”

Dr DiVietro is therefore seriously at fault, both for calling “*evil good, and good evil*” and for failing to warn of the “*great evil...committed against the LORD our God*” Jeremiah 16:10 by Henry Liddell and the “*vain and light persons, which followed him,*” including Westcott, Hort and Schaff, with the “*great evil*” that followed, including the distressing events described by Robert Graves and the horrific death tolls listed above – to be continued in world events leading up to the Second Advent.

Quote 70, from *Hazardous Materials* p 224

*“As a youth, Liddell had read this **very** philosophy expressed by Plato, who taught that each man’s soul was a small part of the Soul of the World and therefore divine.”*

Dr DiVietro does not actually address **Quote 70**. He simply says that although Liddell most likely wasn’t a true Christian and his lexicon was imperfect, needing revision, it is nevertheless a good place to start for obtaining word meanings in the KJB.

Dr DiVietro does not substantiate his comments under **Quote 70**. Neither does he allude to any part of his book that shows that Liddell’s lexicon is useful for obtaining word meanings in the KJB.

Dr DiVietro fails to identify the context of **Quote 70**. The quote is found under the section heading **“George Eliot Denied Every Doctrine of Christianity.”** Eliot, real name Mary Ann Evans, followed the teachings of German transcendentalist D. F. Strauss, who believed that *“the story of Jesus is only a myth to demonstrate the divinity of man.”*

The contents of **Quote 70** immediately follow the above extract in *Hazardous Materials*.

The sentences that immediately follow **Quote 70** read *“(This philosophy is called monism and sometimes pantheism. Liddell’s Greek-English lexicon was the key which opened Plato’s dark cave of Greek philosophy to a new generation. Plato’s view that ‘man is God,’ is the paramount world-view of today’s New Age movement and is also held by many Hindu swamis. Both Liddell and B. F. Westcott’s (and Moulton and Milligan’s) sons followed the footsteps of Luciferian Madame Blavatsky and her pilgrimages to India, seeking the original roots of this philosophy...)”*

Dr DiVietro is at fault again, this time for not drawing attention to key scriptures such as Ephesians 6:4 and Colossians 2:8 that are prompted by Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warning. Fathers whose sons seek after Hinduism, Luciferianism and philosophy have not applied Ephesians 6:4 and Colossians 2:8.

“And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.”

“Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.”

Such fathers are not fit to find word meanings in **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21 any more than they would be worthy of **“the office of a bishop”** 1 Timothy 3:1 as Paul enjoins in 1 Timothy 3:4-5, with respect to a bishop as:

“One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?)”

Dr DiVietro’s **“vain deceit”** in attempting to justify instead of reproving Henry Liddell’s **“unfruitful works of darkness”** Ephesians 5:11 shows that he **“is partaker of his evil deeds”** 2 John 11.

Dr DiVietro should reflect upon Proverbs 17:15 with respect to his endorsement of Liddell’s lexicon and his ire against Sister Riplinger.

“He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination to the LORD.”

Dr DiVietro skips over the statement on p 224 of *Hazardous Materials* where Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals that, her emphasis **“Homes where Hinduism was held high bid the sons of men**

who were lexicon authors and Revised Version translators (Liddell, Westcott and Moulton or Milligan) to follow Blavatsky's path to India (See chapter on the Moulton & Milligan Lexicon)."

Chapter 11 of *Hazardous Materials* addresses Moulton & Milligan's Lexicon. Dr DiVietro bypasses this chapter, together with Chapters 10, 12-16 on the corrupt works of Trench, Vine, Wuest, Vincent, Bauer and Danker. He also skips over much of the material in Chapter 9 exposing the Unitarian influence of Thayer. Dr DiVietro justifies his dismissal of these chapters under *Quote(s) 91* with the charge that they are mere *ad hominem* attacks on the editors.

Inspection of Chapters 9-16 shows that Dr DiVietro is lying.

Table 4 summarises material from Chapters 9-16 of *Hazardous Materials* that Dr DiVietro evidently did not want his readers to see. Note that the content of **Table 4** refers only to verses of scripture cited in Chapters 9-16 of *Hazardous Materials*. Chapters 9-16 contain much more insight into *why* and *how* the "*sons of Belial*" 1 Samuel 2:12 described in those chapters sought to insert so much "*corrupt fruit*" Luke 6:43 into "*the scripture of truth.*"

Dr DiVietro appears to be either too dense or too prejudiced to see that Chapters 9-16 are not *ad hominem* attacks but the "*honest report*" Acts 6:3 of one that God has enabled to "*speak forth the words of truth and soberness*" Acts 26:25.

Table 4
Modern Errors from Lexicon Editors, Chapters 9-16 Hazardous Materials

Page	Editor	Verse	Editor's Errors, many in RV, ASV, NIV, TNIV, NKJV etc.
330 336	Vine Thayer	Acts 17:29 Romans 1:20 Colossians 2:9	"Godhead" not listed by Vine ASV: "Godhead" to <i>"divinity"</i> Romans 1:20
335	Thayer Strong	Luke 2:33 John 9:38 Matthew 4:9 Luke 4:7	ASV: "Joseph" to <i>"his father"</i> ASV note: Jesus <i>"a creature"</i> ¹ ASV note: the devil a creature OR Creator ASV note: the devil a creature OR Creator
382	Trench	Acts 17:22	"too superstitious" to <i>"very religious"</i> ²
384	Trench	James 1:26 James 1:27	"religious" 'is obsolete' "religion" 'is obsolete'
387	Trench	Acts 13:11	"a mist and a darkness" is the gods' favour
388	Trench	Romans 1:20 2 Corinthians 2:14	"Godhead" is <i>"some divine attributes"</i> "causeth us to..." to <i>"leadeth us in..."</i>
392	Trench	See Note 3	"hell" to <i>"hades"</i> ³
392	Trench	Matthew 25:4 Revelation 8:10	"lamps" to <i>"torches"</i> according to Hindus RV: "lamp" to <i>"torch"</i> according to Hindus
393	Trench	2 Corinthians 2:17 Colossians 2:8 James 3:5	<i>"for filthy lucre"</i> added Greek philosophers excused! "matter" to <i>"forest"</i>
413	Moulton	Luke 2:33	RV: "Joseph" to <i>"his father"</i>
414	Moulton	Matthew 18:20 Hebrews 11:1 Revelation 21:27	"in my name" omitted, other words added "substance" to <i>"title deed"</i> RV: "whatsoever maketh" to <i>"he that maketh"</i>
422	Vine	Titus 2:5	RV: "keepers" to <i>"workers"</i>
429	Vine	Matthew 2:7 Matthew 2:8 Matthew 2:16 Acts 18:25 Hebrews 11:6 Hebrews 12:15	RV: "diligently" to <i>"carefully"</i> RV: "diligently" to <i>"carefully"</i> RV: "diligently" to <i>"carefully"</i> RV: "diligently" to <i>"carefully"</i> RV: "diligently" omitted RV: "diligently" to <i>"carefully"</i>
430	Vine	1 Corinthians 5:1	RV: "commonly" to <i>"actually"</i> ⁴
433	Vine	1 Corinthians 4:8 1 John 2:8	RV: "now" to <i>"already"</i> RV: "now" to <i>"already"</i>
440	Vine	Colossians 4:8 Colossians 4:12 Colossians 4:13	RV: "your estate" to <i>"our estate"</i> RV: "complete" to <i>"fully assured"</i> RV: "zeal" to <i>"labour"</i>

Table 4, Continued
Modern Errors from Lexicon Editors, Chapters 9-16 Hazardous Materials

Page	Editor	Verse	Editor's Errors, many in RV, ASV, NIV, TNIV, NKJV etc.
441	Vine	Matthew 6:1 1 Corinthians 3:4 1 Timothy 6:13 Hebrews 4:2 Revelation 15:3	RV: " <i>alms</i> " to " <i>righteousness</i> " RV: " <i>carnal</i> " to " <i>men</i> " ASV, RV marg.: " <i>quickeneth</i> " to " <i>giveth life</i> " RV: " <i>mixed with faith</i> " to " <i>united by faith</i> " RV: " <i>King of saints</i> " to " <i>King of ages</i> "
442	Vine	2 Timothy 4:1 Hebrews 1:6 Hebrews 10:23 Hebrews 10:34	RV: " <i>judge...at his appearing</i> " to " <i>judge..., and by his appearing</i> " RV: " <i>again, when he bringeth</i> " to " <i>when he again bringeth</i> " RV: " <i>faith</i> " to " <i>hope</i> " RV: " <i>me in my bonds</i> " to " <i>them that were in bonds</i> "
443	Vine	1 Corinthians 2:1 1 Corinthians 9:23 Ephesians 3:9 1 Timothy 2:12 Hebrews 10:30 Hebrews 11:13 1 John 2:7 1 John 3:2 2 John 7	RV: " <i>testimony</i> " to " <i>mystery</i> " RV: " <i>this I do</i> " to " <i>I do all things</i> " RV: " <i>from the beginning</i> " to " <i>from all ages</i> " RV: " <i>usurp authority</i> " to " <i>have dominion</i> " RV: " <i>saith the Lord</i> " omitted RV: " <i>and were persuaded of them</i> " omitted RV: " <i>from the beginning</i> " omitted RV: " <i>but</i> " omitted ⁵ RV: " <i>are entered</i> " to " <i>are gone forth</i> "
451	Vine	1 Corinthians 4:9	RV: " <i>appointed to</i> " to " <i>doomed to</i> "
452	Vine	Romans 3:25	RV: " <i>faith in his blood</i> " to " <i>faith, by his blood</i> "
453	Vine	John 1:3 Ephesians 3:9	ASV: " <i>by him</i> " to " <i>through him</i> " RV: " <i>by Jesus Christ</i> " omitted
454	Vine	Colossians 1:16 Colossians 1:17	RV: " <i>by him...by him</i> " to " <i>in him...through him</i> " RV: " <i>by him</i> " to " <i>in him</i> "
456	Vine	2 Corinthians 10:7 Ephesians 1:5 1 Thessalonians 5:22	RV: " <i>outward appearance</i> " to " <i>before your face</i> " RV: " <i>adoption of children</i> " to " <i>adoption as sons</i> " RV: " <i>appearance of evil</i> " to " <i>form of evil</i> "
457	Vine	John 5:26 1 Corinthians 6:11	RV: " <i>hath he given</i> " to " <i>so gave he</i> " RV: " <i>are washed...sanctified...justified</i> " to " <i>were...washed etc.</i> "
458	Vine	1 Corinthians 1:18	RV: " <i>are saved</i> " to " <i>are being saved</i> "
459	Vine	1 Corinthians 15:47 1 Timothy 3:16	RV: " <i>the Lord</i> " omitted RV: " <i>God was manifest</i> " to " <i>He who was manifest</i> "
460	Vine	2 Thessalonians 3:5 1 Timothy 6:17 1 John 4:3 Revelation 1:18	RV: " <i>patient waiting for Christ</i> " to " <i>patience of Christ</i> " RV: " <i>the living</i> " omitted RV: " <i>Christ is come in the flesh</i> " omitted RV: " <i>he that liveth</i> " to " <i>the Living one</i> "
461	Vine	John 1:14 1 Corinthians 9:1	RV: " <i>of the Father</i> " to " <i>from the Father</i> " RV: " <i>Christ</i> " omitted

Table 4, Continued
Modern Errors from Lexicon Editors, Chapters 9-16 Hazardous Materials

Page	Editor	Verse	Editor's Errors, many in RV, ASV, NIV, TNIV, NKJV etc.
463	Vine	John 3:17 Ephesians 3:14	RV: <i>"his Son...to condemn"</i> to <i>"the Son...to judge"</i> RV: <i>"of our Lord Jesus Christ"</i> omitted
464	Vine	Philippians 2:6 Philippians 2:7	RV: <i>"thought it not robbery"</i> to <i>"counted it not a prize"</i> RV: <i>"made himself of no reputation"</i> to <i>"emptied himself"</i>
465	Vine	Philippians 3:3 1 John 4:19 1 John 5:7	RV: <i>"worship God in the spirit"</i> to <i>"worship by the Spirit of God"</i> RV: <i>"him"</i> omitted RV: whole verse omitted
466	Vine	Romans 8:16 Romans 8:26 Colossians 2:2 1 Corinthians 6:20	RV: <i>"itself"</i> to <i>"himself"</i> RV: <i>"itself"</i> to <i>"himself"</i> RV: <i>"and of the Father"</i> omitted RV: <i>"and in your spirit, which are God's"</i> omitted
467	Vine	Matthew 17:21 1 Corinthians 7:5	RV: whole verse omitted RV: <i>"fasting and"</i> omitted
468	Vine	Romans 10:9	RV: <i>"the Lord Jesus"</i> to <i>"Jesus as Lord"</i>
469	Vine	Romans 5:18 Revelation 19:8	RV: <i>"the righteousness of one"</i> to <i>"one act of righteousness"</i> RV: <i>"righteousness of saints"</i> to <i>"righteous acts of saints"</i>
470	Vine	Romans 5:1 1 Corinthians 7:3 1 Corinthians 15:19 1 Timothy 5:16	RV: <i>"we have peace"</i> to <i>"let us have peace"</i> RV: <i>"benevolence"</i> omitted RV: <i>"miserable"</i> to <i>"pitiable"</i> RV: <i>"man or woman..., let them"</i> to <i>"woman..., let her"</i>
471	Vine	Ephesians 6:4 James 4:4	RV: <i>"nuture"</i> to <i>"chastening"</i> RV: <i>"adulterers and"</i> omitted
480	Vine	1 Timothy 6:21	RV: <i>"thee"</i> to <i>"you"</i>
481	Vine	1 Corinthians 1:27 1 Peter 3:21	RV: <i>"confound...confound"</i> to <i>"put to shame...put to shame"</i> RV: <i>"answer"</i> to <i>"interrogation"</i>
493	Wuest	Mark 15:39	<i>"the Son of God"</i> to <i>"a son of God"</i>
494	Wuest	John 11:28 Colossians 1:14	<i>"Master"</i> to <i>"Teacher"</i> ⁶ <i>"through his blood"</i> omitted
495	Wuest	Romans 1:20 Colossians 2:9	<i>"Godhead"</i> to <i>"divine attributes"</i> <i>"Godhead"</i> to <i>"divinity"</i>
499	Wuest	Mark 1:2 Romans 16:1	<i>"the prophets"</i> to <i>"Isaiah the prophet"</i> <i>"servant"</i> to <i>"deaconess"</i> ⁷
504	Wuest	Mark 3:29	<i>"damnation"</i> to <i>"sin"</i>
506	Wuest	Mark 9:44 Mark 9:46	Whole verse omitted Whole verse omitted

Table 4, Continued
Modern Errors from Lexicon Editors, Chapters 9-16 Hazardous Materials

Page	Editor	Verse	Editor's Errors, many in RV, ASV, NIV, TNIV, NKJV etc.
508	Wuest	Ephesians 1:4, 5	<i>"in love: Having predestinated"</i> to <i>"in love having presdestinated"</i>
509	Wuest	Mark 1:3 John 4:24 Ephesians 6:5 Ephesians 6:6 Philippians 3:21	<i>"way"</i> to <i>"road"</i> <i>"God is a Spirit"</i> to <i>"God is spirit"</i> <i>"servants"</i> to <i>"slaves"</i> <i>"servants"</i> to <i>"slaves"</i> <i>"vile body"</i> to <i>"body of our humiliation"</i>
510	All	2 Timothy 3:17	<i>"perfect"</i> to <i>"adequate"</i> or <i>"complete, full, mature"</i>
511	Wuest	Matthew 19:21 Luke 6:40 1 Corinthians 2:6 2 Corinthians 13:11 Ephesians 4:13 1 Thessalonians 5:23 Hebrews 6:1 Revelation 3:2	<i>"perfect"</i> to <i>"complete"</i> <i>"perfect"</i> to <i>"fully trained"</i> <i>"perfect"</i> to <i>"mature"</i> <i>"perfect"</i> to <i>"complete"</i> <i>"perfect"</i> to <i>"mature"</i> <i>"blameless"</i> to <i>"complete"</i> <i>"perfection"</i> to <i>"maturity"</i> <i>"perfect"</i> to <i>"complete"</i>
519	Vincent	Acts 3:13 Acts 3:26 Acts 9:20 1 Peter 2:7 1 Peter 5:10	<i>"Son"</i> to <i>"Servant"</i> or <i>"servant"</i> <i>"Son"</i> to <i>"Servant"</i> or <i>"servant"</i> <i>"Christ"</i> to <i>"Jesus"</i> <i>"He is precious"</i> to <i>"is the preciousness"</i> <i>"Jesus"</i> omitted
523	Vincent	Luke 24:36	<i>"and saith unto them, Peace be unto you"</i> omitted
524	Vincent	1 Peter 3:15	<i>"the Lord God"</i> to <i>"Christ as Lord"</i>
531	Vincent	Romans 1:16	<i>"of Christ"</i> omitted
538	Bauer	Hebrews 9:10	<i>"reformation"</i> to <i>"new order"</i>
544	Arndt	1 Thessalonians 5:22	<i>"appearance"</i> to <i>"form"</i>
550	Danker	1 Timothy 3:16	<i>"God was manifest"</i> to <i>"He who was manifest"</i>
551	Danker	Ephesians 3:9 Hebrews 4:8	<i>"by Jesus Christ"</i> omitted <i>"Jesus"</i> to <i>"Joshua"</i>
552	Danker	Luke 2:33	<i>"Joseph"</i> to <i>"his father"</i>
555	Danker	Acts 8:37	Whole verse omitted
561	Danker	2 Peter 1:1	<i>"God and our Saviour Jesus Christ"</i> to <i>"our God and Savior Jesus Christ"</i>

Notes on Table 4

1. Dr Mrs Riplinger cites numerous examples of corrupt new version readings influenced by Strong's and Thayer's lexical definitions and ASV in *Hazardous Materials* pp 172-173, 177-186. Dr DiVietro ignored all of this material. He should at least have acknowledged Dr Mrs Riplinger's warning about Strong's and Thayer's attack on the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ in their ASV note on John 9:38. See also remarks under *Quote 56*.
2. Dr Mrs Riplinger in *Hazardous Materials* pp 382-384 shows that Trench thought that the term "*devils*" ought to be "*demons*." **Table 4a** shows the distinct satanic influence of lexical editors and modern translators on the post-1611 versions in eliminating references to "*a devil*" and "*devils*" as distinct from "*the devil*."

Table 4a

Elimination of the Terms "*a devil*" and "*devils*" from the Post-1611 Versions

Version	Number of Occurrences			
	" <i>a devil</i> "	" <i>devils</i> "	" <i>a demon</i> "	" <i>demons</i> "
KJB	14	55	0	0
RV	14	53	0	2
ASV/NASV	1, John 6:70	0	13/28	55/43
NIV	1, John 6:70	0	9	49
TNIV	1, John 6:70	0	9	48
NKJV	1, John 6:70	0	10	49

3. **Table 4b** shows the shift from "*hell*" to "*hades*" in the modern versions. Not only do the modern versions repeatedly change "*hell*" to "*hades*" but they progressively *reduce* references to "*this place of torment*" Luke 16:28 compared to the KJB. See the same trend in **Table 4a** with respect to the terms "*a devil*" and "*devils*."

Table 4b

The Shift from "*hell*" to "*hades*" in the Post-1611 Versions and Overall Decrease

Version	Number of Occurrences	
	" <i>Hell</i> "	" <i>Hades</i> "
KJB	54	0
RV	28	10
ASV/NASV	13/13	10/10
NIV	14	5
TNIV	13	5
NKJV	32	11

4. Dr Mrs Riplinger lists 41 KJB expressions on pp 431-432 of *Hazardous Materials* that Vine alters in agreement with the RV and other new versions.
5. Apart from the ASV, the modern versions e.g. NIV, TNIV, NKJV retain "*but*" in 1 John 3:2.
6. See *New Age Versions*, Chapter 21, *Antichrist: The World Teacher*.
7. The RSV uses the term "*deaconess*," the NRSV "*deacon*"!

In sum, **Table 4** lists **130** New Testament verses; Matthew 2:7, 8, 16, 4:9, 6:1, 17:21, 18:20, 19:21, 25:4, Mark 1:2, 3, 3:29, 9:44, 46, 15:39, Luke 2:33, 4:7, 6:40, 24:36, John 1:3, 14,

3:17, 4:24, 5:26, 9:38, 11:28, Acts 3:13, 26, 8:37, 9:20, 13:11, 17:22, 29, 18:25, Romans 1:16, 20, 3:25, 5:1, 18, 8:16, 26, 10:9, 16:1, 1 Corinthians 1:18, 27, 2:1, 6, 3:4, 4:8, 9, 5:1, 6:11, 20, 7:3, 5, 9:1, 23, 15:19, 47, 2 Corinthians 2:14, 17, 10:7, 13:11, Ephesians 1:4, 5, 3:9, 14, 4:13, 6:4, 5, 6, Philippians 2:6, 7, 3:3, 21, Colossians 1:14, 16, 17, 2:2, 8, 9, 4:8, 12, 13, 1 Thessalonians 5:22, 23, 2 Thessalonians 3:5, 1 Timothy 2:12, 3:16, 5:13, 6:13, 17, 21, 2 Timothy 3:17, 4:1, Titus 2:5, Hebrews 1:6, 4:2, 8, 6:1, 9:10, 10:23, 30, 34, 11:1, 6, 13, 12:15, James 1:26, 27, 3:5, 4:4, 1 Peter 2:7, 3:15, 21, 5:10, 2 Peter 1:1, 1 John 2:7, 8, 3:2, 4:3, 19, 5:7, 2 John 7, Revelation 1:18, 3:2, 8:10, 15:3, 19:8, 21:27.

Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals in Chapters 9-16 of *Hazardous Materials* that the lexical editors that **Table 4** lists corrupted *all the above 130 verses* and that these scriptures are but a part of the corruptions that these individuals tried to introduce into the scriptures, many of which have found their way into modern versions such as the NASV, NIV, TNIV, NKJV.

Tables 4a, 4b provide further examples of lexicon-based corruptions in modern versions, with respect to their steady erosion of important, explicit Biblical terms such as “*a devil*,” “*devils*” and “*hell*.” Dr Mrs Riplinger provides yet more examples from “*the mount of corruption*” 2 Kings 23:13 of lexical leaven by means of her list of 41 alterations to the KJB that Vine introduced from the RV. See Note 4 above.

She has also shown in detail in those chapters how the writings of those editors could easily “*deceive the hearts of the simple*” Romans 16:18 with respect to students who may attempt to use the works of the editors listed above in a futile attempt to try to understand the 1611 Holy Bible.

Dr DiVietro under **Quote 70** declares that the works of the above editors, stemming from that of Liddell, are, however, a good place to start in order to understand the KJB.

Under **Quote(s) 91**, which will be addressed in turn, he insists that all the above material from Chapters 9-16 of *Hazardous Materials* that **Table 4** summarises and all the accompanying information from those chapters are but *ad hominem* attacks that can therefore be dismissed out of hand.

Dr DiVietro is in that respect like his mentor, “*a liar, and the father of it*” John 8:44.

Quote 71, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 230

“*Liddell’s Lexicon had broken down long-standing meanings for Bible words...What a relief for all to discover that the burning hell of the English Bible is merely a seven-gated Assyrian amusement park! O, how a lexicon, with dark pagan Assyrian mythology, sheds light upon the English Bible.*”

Dr DiVietro says that the Bible (undefined) does not use the word *sheol* in the Assyrian sense. He then says that Bible readers should understand the word *sheol* in its everyday sense as the place of the dead in order to understand its Biblical sense.

Yet again, Dr DiVietro fails to substantiate anything in his comment or to explain how secular usage of the word *sheol* in any way assists the understanding of its Biblical sense. Neither does he give even a single verse of scripture to support this supposed method of understanding the scripture. See remarks under **Quote 9** with respect to *sheol* and **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** for the futility of supposing that everyday usage is a means of understanding Biblical terms, especially insofar as it denies the 1611 Holy Bible’s built-in dictionary. See **Quotes 9, 14, 39, 61, 62, 67**.

Dr DiVietro’s bald assertion is of course totally at odds with the scripture itself.

“Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures” Luke 24:45. See also Proverbs 2:1-5 and John 16:13.

Moreover, Dr DiVietro’s **Quote 71** creates a misleading impression of what Dr Mrs Riplinger actually said on p 230 of *Hazardous Materials*, disguised yet again by an innocuous-looking ellipsis. The words that Dr DiVietro skipped over via the ellipsis read as follows.

“...including the British Prime Minister Gladstone. Liddell told of a lecture Gladstone gave on his visit to Oxford. He said that Gladstone spoke on “recent discoveries of Assyrian antiquities...” “one of these was that the Assyrian Hades had seven gates, through which the mystical hero Ishtar had to pass.” Gladstone remarked that “Homer speaks of” a “gate-keeper; so that it is clear that Homer had seven Assyrian gates in his mind.” Liddell said that, “He values this discovery so highly that he has sent me a note of it for insertion in the Lexicon” (Thompson, p. 239).”

Gladstone was addressing *hades*, not *sheol*, so Dr DiVietro’s comment under **Quote 71** indicates that he did not read the context of **Quote 71** very carefully.

That said, what Dr DiVietro has overlooked is that lexical alternatives to the translation of *sheol* as **“hell”** as either the place of the dead, according to everyday usage or a succession of Assyrian gates have *not* enhanced a Biblical understanding of the term *sheol* as **“hell.”** Modern versions, influenced by extant lexicons, repeatedly avoid the word **“hell”** and even simply transliterate *sheol*, which does nothing to enhance understanding of the word, as **Tables 5, 6** show. See also **Tables 1, 4b** for the alteration of the word **“hell”** by modern versions in the New Testament.

Tables 5, 6 summarise the potential confusion that greets the student if his mentors, such as Dr DiVietro, persuade him to consult an extant lexicon* in order to help him ‘understand’ the KJB with respect to the term **“hell.”** **Tables 5, 6** illustrate how variations in lexical definitions with respect to the word *sheol* and its KJB counterpart **“hell”** have influenced the equivalent wording of modern versions over the last 130 years *with considerable variation in readings*.

*Aka ‘flexicon,’ because they are always changing, for which Dr DiVietro commends them in **Quotes 24, 47, 62, 66, 67, 70**.

Table 5
Alteration of the Word “hell” from the AV1611 Old Testament by Modern Versions

Verse	RV	ASV/NASV	NIV	TNIV	NKJV
Deuteronomy 32:22	<i>pit</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>realm of death</i>	<i>realm of the dead</i>	<i>hell</i>
2 Samuel 22:6	<i>sheol</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>sheol</i>
Job 11:8	<i>sheol</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>the depths</i>	<i>sheol</i>
Job 26:6	<i>sheol</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>death</i>	<i>death</i>	<i>sheol</i>
Psalms 9:17	<i>sheol</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>realm of the dead</i>	<i>hell</i>
Psalms 16:10	<i>sheol</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>realm of the dead</i>	<i>sheol</i>
Psalms 18:5	<i>sheol</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>sheol</i>
Psalms 55:15	<i>pit</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>realm of the dead</i>	<i>hell</i>
Psalms 86:13	<i>pit</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>realm of the dead</i>	<i>sheol</i>
Psalms 116:3	<i>sheol</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>sheol</i>
Psalms 139:8	<i>sheol</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>the depths</i>	<i>the depths</i>	<i>hell</i>
Proverbs 5:5	<i>sheol</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>hell</i>
Proverbs 7:27	<i>sheol</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>hell</i>
Proverbs 9:18	<i>sheol</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>realm of the dead</i>	<i>hell</i>
Proverbs 15:11	<i>sheol</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>death</i>	<i>death</i>	<i>hell</i>
Proverbs 15:24	<i>sheol</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>realm of the dead</i>	<i>hell</i>
Proverbs 23:14	<i>sheol</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>death</i>	<i>death</i>	<i>hell</i>
Proverbs 27:20	<i>sheol</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>death</i>	<i>death</i>	<i>hell</i>
Isaiah 5:14	<i>hell</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>sheol</i>
Isaiah 14:9	<i>hell</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>realm of the dead</i>	<i>hell</i>
Isaiah 14:15	<i>hell</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>realm of the dead</i>	<i>sheol</i>
Isaiah 28:15	<i>hell</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>realm of the dead</i>	<i>sheol</i>
Isaiah 28:18	<i>hell</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>realm of the dead</i>	<i>sheol</i>
Isaiah 57:9	<i>hell</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>realm of the dead</i>	<i>sheol</i>
Ezekiel 31:16	<i>hell</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>realm of the dead</i>	<i>hell</i>
Ezekiel 31:17	<i>hell</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>realm of the dead</i>	<i>hell</i>
Ezekiel 32:21	<i>hell</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>realm of the dead</i>	<i>hell</i>
Ezekiel 32:27	<i>hell</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>realm of the dead</i>	<i>hell</i>
Amos 9:2	<i>hell</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>the depths</i>	<i>hell</i>
Jonah 2:2	<i>hell</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>realm of the dead</i>	<i>sheol</i>
Habakkuk 2:5	<i>hell</i>	<i>sheol</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>grave</i>	<i>hell</i>
Isaiah 14:11: “grave”	<i>hell</i>				<i>sheol</i>
Ezekiel 31:15: “grave”	<i>hell</i>				<i>hell</i>

Notes on Table 5

1. The 1611 Holy Bible has the word **“hell”** in 31 verses that **Table 5** lists in sequence.
2. The 1611 Holy Bible has the word **“grave”** in Isaiah 14:11 where the RV has **“hell”** and in Ezekiel 31:15 where the RV, NKJV have **“hell.”**
3. The RV retains the word **“hell”** an additional 13 times where the 1611 Holy Bible has **“hell.”**
4. The NKJV retains the word **“hell”** an additional 18 times where the 1611 Holy Bible has **“hell.”**
5. The ASV, NIV, TNIV entirely cut out the word **“hell”** from the Old Testament, not by consistent means but by means of both transliteration and a variety of substitute expressions.

Table 6
Variations from the Word “hell” in the AV1611 Old Testament by Modern Versions

Variation	RV	ASV/NASV	NIV	TNIV	NKJV
<i>death</i>	0	0	4	4	0
<i>grave</i>	0	0	25	7	0
<i>pit</i>	3	0	0	0	0
<i>realm of death</i>	0	0	1	0	0
<i>realm of the dead</i>	0	0	0	17	0
<i>sheol</i>	15	31	0	0	13
<i>the depths</i>	0	0	1	3	0
Total Variations	18	31	31	31	13

“For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints” 1 Corinthians 14:33.

Table 6 shows seven variations on the word **“hell”** that appear in modern versions by means of lexical influence, easily a recipe for potential confusion for a student who has been taught to rely on lexicons to help him ‘understand’ the KJB.

Even if Dr DiVietro insists that lexical influence on the modern versions that has resulted in departures from the KJB is really misuse of lexicons, his comment under **Quote 71** provides no help whatsoever to resolve the student’s potential confusion, apart from, by implication, consulting the KJB, in which case the student does not need any lexicons!

They are clearly a weight that can beneficially be laid aside when searching the scriptures, John 5:39, Hebrews 12:1.

See also remarks on the word *sheol* under **Quotes 7, 9, 31, 37.**

Quote 72, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 231

“Liddell and Stanley allowed the participation of Unitarians on the RV committee.”

Dr DiVietro declares vehemently that Liddell, Stanley and the RV committee tried to destroy the Bible and are therefore to be totally rejected.

Yet under **Quote 70**, Dr DiVietro states that Liddell's lexicon is a good place to start for understanding the words of the KJB. Under **Quote 74**, he quotes extensively from Liddell and Scott's lexicon to show that it gives the correct meaning of *biblos* as book.

Dr DiVietro's inconsistency brings to mind Matthew 12:33.

“Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by his fruit.”

Thus far, Dr DiVietro has produced no examples of good fruit from the works of Liddell etc. It is doubtful that he ever will.

Quote 73, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 233

*“A Greek lexicon, which held up Plato of the Greek myths as **the** source for meaning and truth, **higher** than the Holy Bible, could not help but place Greek philosophy on a pedestal shadowing the Bible itself. The backfire of Liddell's lexicon, and the path it provided to the mysticism of Greece, fuelled the mystical views already nascent in the Anglican Church.”*

Dr DiVietro says in reply that translation committees are not dependent on lexicons for their work. He acknowledges that members of the RV committee were also contributors to, or compilers of 'the lexicon in question' but he insists that it wasn't the fault of the lexicon that the committee members changed the words of the KJB and ignored the context of scripture (undefined) that would have shown them the true meaning of the Greek and Hebrew words of scripture (undefined).

Dr DiVietro appears to have forgotten what he said under **Quote(s) 63** that good Bible translators *do* depend on lexicons for their work. His about-face under **Quote 73** is therefore confusing for his readers.

Dr DiVietro then states that the blame lies with the committee members' prejudice against the KJB instead of with their lexicon and that Dr Mrs Riplinger is blaming what he terms 'the wrong villain.'

Dr DiVietro's choice of words is ironic and perhaps inadvertent. He now appears to be tacitly acknowledging that Liddell's lexicon is, after all, 'a villain.'

Dr Mrs Riplinger is of course blaming the *right* villain, or both villains, because it is impossible to believe that the RV committee members' evident anti-KJB prejudice influenced their Platonic lexicon any less than their apostate translation.

Dr DiVietro provides no evidence to the contrary. He would do well to reflect on the words of Solomon in Proverbs 19:3.

“The foolishness of man perverteth his way: and his heart fretteth against the LORD.”

A man whose ***“heart fretteth against the LORD”*** won't be able to hide it in his published works, whether these are translations or lexicons, as Solomon also shows in Proverbs 20:11

“Even a child is known by his doings, whether his work be pure, and whether it be right.”

The RV translation wasn't pure and it wasn't right. Neither were the men that produced it nor their resources, whether manuscripts, such as Aleph and B, texts, such as the Westcott-Hort text, nor lexicons, such as that of Liddell and Scott. Dr DiVietro's insistence to the contrary is both futile and a denial of scripture, which term, it should be understood, refers explicitly to ***“the holy scriptures”*** 2 Timothy 3:15 that God has vindicated for the last four centuries as the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible. See passages cited immediately above – and below.

When the Lord said in Ezekiel 13:10 **“one built up a wall”** He could well have had Liddell and his lexicon in mind. When the Lord added **“and, lo, others daubed it with untempered mortar”** He could have been thinking of the RV committee members and even Dr DiVietro.

Even Dr DiVietro admits under **Quote 89** that the ASV, American companion to the RV, has faded into obscurity like its English counterpart. In the light of Ezekiel 13:10, he should appreciate that Ezekiel 13:11-15 have come to pass.

“Say unto them which daub it with untempered mortar, that it shall fall:...Thus will I accomplish my wrath upon the wall, and upon them that have daubed it with untempered mortar, and will say unto you, The wall is no more, neither they that daubed it;”

As with the wall, so with the daubing; as with the Platonic lexicons, so with the apostate translations. All are manifestations (or infestations) of sin and all are but **“for a season”** Hebrews 11:25.

“For there is no difference:” Romans 3:22.

Quote 74, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 236-237

“Eavesdropping on one of Ruskin’s lectures shows Liddell’s dotting student desperate to actually “burn” the Bible and its doctrine of punishment. Ruskin said “How wholesome it would be for many simple persons, if, in such places (for instance) as Acts xix. 19, we retain the Greek expression, instead of translating, and they had read – “Many of them also which used curious arts, brought their bibles together, and burnt them before all men...”” Of course the KJB translates the word biblos correctly and contextually into English, as “books,” not “bibles,” in Acts 19:19.”

Dr DiVietro uses this quote to show that Liddell’s lexicon gives the meaning of the word *biblos* as book. He states therefore that the lexicon did not tell the translators to transliterate *biblos* as bible and Ruskin’s attempt to render *biblos* as bible(s) cannot be blamed on Liddell’s lexicon. By implication, therefore, lexicons should be absolved of all blame attached to them in *Hazardous Materials*, according to Dr DiVietro.

The context of Acts 19:19 of course shows that Dr DiVietro’s attempt to exonerate lexicons is a smokescreen. No lexicon could possibly refer to the term bibles as a suitable English equivalent of *biblos* in Acts 19:19 – unless the term could be applied to copies of the late Anton LaVey’s satanic ‘bible.’

However, the issue with respect to **Quote 74** is not the word book(s) but the word **“damned”** that Dr DiVietro refrains from mentioning. Its Greek equivalent is *katakrino*. Dr Mrs Ripplinger states on p 237 of *Hazardous Materials* that *“Occult “books,” not Holy Bibles, teach “curious arts.” Liddell and Ruskin would have Christians burn “their bibles,” if they could; instead their lexicon does it word-by-word.*

“They would burn the book that lovingly warns them of a lake that burns with fire and brimstone. Liddell taught Ruskin well how to deal with the English words ‘hell’ and ‘damned.’ Ruskin scorns what he calls, “the English vulgar mind,” which sometimes translates the Greek word [katakrino] as, ‘damned.’ He mocks saying:

““sermons have been preached by illiterate clergymen on – “He that believeth not shall be damned...”...”

*“Liddell agreed and his presses published the Revised Version which softens “damned” to “condemned.” Ruskin, a master of English prose, knew well the powerful impact of the plosive ‘d.’ (See Ripplinger, *The Language of the King James Bible*, p. 67).”*

The word “*damned*” occurs 3 times in the KJB. It is used forcefully with alliteration in Romans 14:23 to warn in the strongest possible terms against causing a brother in Christ to stumble, Romans 14:21. It is used in Mark 16:16 as the strongest possible warning against rejecting “*the gospel*” Mark 16:15 and in 2 Thessalonians 2:12 with respect to “*them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved*” 2 Thessalonians 2:10.

The word “*condemned*” occurs 21 times in the KJB, often in grim contexts, e.g. Matthew 12:37, 23:7, Mark 14:64 and the word “*condemnation*” occurs 12 times, likewise in grim contexts, e.g. Luke 23:40, John 3:19, 5:24 but it is the stronger term “*damnation*,” associated with “*damned*” and occurring 11 times that is reserved for the grimmest contexts of all.

“*Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation*” Matthew 23:14.

“*Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?*” Matthew 23:33.

“*But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation.*” Mark 3:29.

Dr Mrs Riplinger seeks to warn of Liddell’s efforts to downplay “*damnation*.” Dr DiVietro’s negligence with respect to this warning puts him in danger of some “*damnation*” himself, according to Proverbs 17:15. See remarks under *Quote 70*.

“*He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination to the LORD.*”

On this occasion, Dr DiVietro is “*both*.”

Quote(s) 75, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 240-241, 244, 251

“*He permitted his children to become quite involved with **two** men who were alleged pedophiles...Yale University Press’s definitive two-volume biography of Ruskin, by Tim Hilton, asserts that “he was a paedophile.” Ruskin’s autobiography, *Praeterita*, details in part, his relationships with Liddell’s young daughters.*

“*As a homosexual, “Rhodes had no wife and children...”*

“*Liddell’s lexicon took away his faith and carried him instead to the feet of the Utopian dreamers, Plato and Aristotle. **The Lexicon bars him forever from ever reading the English Holy Bible as it is.***”

Dr DiVietro has only one brief comment on the above quotes. He appears to be saying that putting together and editing a Greek-English dictionary, i.e. a lexicon, does not prevent the editor from understanding how the words in the dictionary are used in scripture.

Dr DiVietro’s comment seems to be aimed only at the very last sentence in the quotes, given in bold in *Hazardous Materials*. Why Dr DiVietro included the other statements in *Quote(s) 75* is therefore difficult to fathom. However, the first paragraph then summarises Ruskin’s later life by means of Ephesians 5:12 “*For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret*” and to show that he died “*a delusional psychotic*” deceived by the unbiblical contents of Liddell’s lexicon and suffering the fate of those described in Titus 1:15 “*whose mind and conscience is defiled.*”

Dr DiVietro does not challenge Dr Mrs Riplinger’s description of Ruskin’s fate, which serves as another warning against the “*heady, highminded*” 2 Timothy 3:4 works and “*word of*

men” 1 Thessalonians 2:13 who **“profess that they know God; but in works they deny him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate”** Titus 1:16.

Dr DiVietro’s citation of Cecil Rhodes from *Hazardous Materials*, like that of Ruskin, appears to bear no relationship to his comment. However, Dr Mrs Riplinger explains that Liddell’s lexicon was Rhodes’s constant companion, even during his prospecting ventures in southern Africa. Dr Mrs Riplinger states, her emphasis that *“The lexicons served to translate the only bawdy material available to a young man in his day. The lexicon also served the same function it did for the liberal clergy who remained in England – it served as the magic book that could challenge any Bible charge against a life of sin.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger has therefore issued another warning with respect to Liddell’s lexicon, exemplified by its effect on Cecil Rhodes, which Dr DiVietro fails to address. That warning is summed up in 1 Corinthians 15:33.

“Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners.”

See also **Quotes 13, 25, 63** for additional application of 1 Corinthians 15:33 to Dr DiVietro’s comments.

Ironically, the tyrant-in-charge of the present-day chaos of Zimbabwe, formerly Rhodesia, had this²¹² to say about its founder’s vice. Mugabe’s evident inconsistency does not detract from the accuracy of his anti-sodomite statement, which, of course, would not earn him any ‘brownie points’ from the contemporary UK and US establishments. Emphases are this author’s.

*“Mr. Mugabe said of sodomy, in defence of anti-sodomite laws **“It’s unnatural and there is no question of ever allowing these people to behave worse than dogs and pigs. If dogs and pigs do not do it, why must human beings?”**...Mr. Mugabe is right in likening sodomites to the two filthiest animals in the Bible, 2 Peter 2:22 but he could not prevent sodomite clergy from attending the World Council of Churches assembly in Harare in 1998, without fear of prosecution...The reason is not difficult to comprehend, because the article stated Fearing that the assembly might take itself and its hard currency elsewhere, Zimbabwe has agreed to a memorandum of understanding relaxing the law. **“For the love of money is the root of all evil”** 1 Timothy 6:10.”*

The last part of **Quote(s) 75**, the last sentence of which is the only part of the entire quote that Dr DiVietro addresses, is followed by this telling paragraph that Dr DiVietro fails to challenge, probably because the paragraph contains further warnings with respect to 1 Corinthians 15:33, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases.

*““Eight men and no women were with [Rhodes] at his death” at the untimely age of forty-eight. The Bible foretold that, “bloody and deceitful men shall not live out half their days” (Ps. 55:23). His sin-abused dying body left viewers – “...shocked to speechlessness. He was repulsively **bloated**, with wild grey hair, heavy, **straining eyes that asked those terrible questions the mouths of the dying dare not utter**, the shape of his face lost in its **swelling**, his skin a livid purple”...*

“...“vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind” and all it took was a lexicon (Colossians 2:18).”

Contrary to Dr DiVietro’s opinion, Liddell’s lexicon did not help Cecil Rhodes to see its word meanings in their Biblical context. Thus far, with the possible exception of the word *biblos*, see **Quote 74**, Dr DiVietro has not shown how it ever helped anyone else in that respect. That result does not speak volumes for the value of Liddell’s volume.

Quote 76, Hazardous Materials, p 255

“Liddell’s constant companions were the wicked god-men of the Greek myths.”

Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of lying with respect to the above quote but he follows up that accusation with ostensibly unrelated statements to the effect that reading Shakespeare doesn’t make a person ‘bawdy’* like the bard of Avon and that reading Poe and Coolridge (sic, Coleridge) doesn’t make a person a dope smoker. Dr DiVietro then reiterates that reading the literature of a language e.g. Greek gives understanding of the words of that language – like the Greek equivalent for the word *bawdy*, perhaps.

*Did Dr DiVietro borrow that word from *Hazardous Materials*? See **Quote(s) 75** above.

Dr DiVietro is the one who is lying.

On this occasion, Dr DiVietro has written comments in open defiance of **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21 according to 1 Corinthians 15:33.

“Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners.”

See remarks under **Quote(s) 75**.

This author has encountered that kind of anarchical attitude to **“the scripture of truth”** from professed Christian fundamentalists before, as no doubt many Bible believers have.

1 Corinthians 5:8 states **“Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.”**

When confronted with that scripture with respect to communion, 1 Corinthians 10:16, 17, two fundamentalist acquaintances of this author directly and wilfully contradicted it, in order to exalt ‘fellowship’ above **“the holy scriptures”** 2 Timothy 3:15. Needless to say, both of them resent the authority of the 1611 Holy Bible and ‘prefer’ the NIV – the nonplussed infidel’s version.

Dr DiVietro is no different in his defiance of 1 Corinthians 15:33.

Note further this citation from *Hazardous Materials* p 244, given under **Quote(s) 75** with respect to Cecil Rhodes, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphasis.

“The lexicons served to translate the only bawdy material available to a young man in his day. The lexicon also served the same function it did for the liberal clergy who remained in England – it served as the magic book that could challenge any Bible charge against a life of sin.”

The context of the above statement is found in the preceding sentence.

“These [Greek classics and Liddell’s Greek lexicon] were the tools of a young man who was seeking to unearth buried diamonds, while burying his Christian upbringing under the titillating pages of the pagan Greek ‘classics’ and myths, [rife] with homosexuality, murder, drunkenness, debauchery, and intrigue.”

Earlier, on p 216 Dr Mrs Riplinger sets out the following with respect to Liddell’s nefarious associates. See also **Quote 68**.

“Liddell’s sources include, as he admits in the preface, the same profane Greek names given in J. Henry Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon. (For a lengthy description, see chapter on Thayer). They include Plato, Aristotle, the “comic Poets,” Aeschylus, Sophocles and the whole bag of Greek filth, murder, adultery, homosexuality, debauchery, violence, drunkenness, idolatry, and sadism. Liddell makes reference to what he calls, “the Alexandrian ver-

sion of the Old Testament... ” infected, it should be noted by the same *Greek filth*” as Liddell’s lexicon evidently was.

The individuals that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists on pp 221-222 of *Hazardous Materials* all imbibed from that same *“troubled fountain”* and *“corrupt spring”* described above that furnished Liddell’s lexicon, Proverbs 25:26. See *Quote 69*.

Regardless of how the works of Shakespeare, Poe and Coleridge may or may not affect an individual, Dr Mrs Riplinger has documented the adverse effects of Liddell’s lexicon and its Greek sources on his associates. See the remarks from *Hazardous Materials* above on Rhodes and liberal clergy e.g. Kingsley²¹³, Dean Stanley and under *Quote(s) 75* on Rhodes and Ruskin, both adversely influenced by the content of Liddell’s lexicon.

The case of Ruskin is indeed tragic.

The remarks under *Quote 69* show that it is impossible to find *“any good thing”* John 1:46 to emerge from Liddell’s circle of associates, certainly not during their mature years, which could have been productive ministerial years if they had believed *“the scripture of truth.”*

However, John Ruskin²¹⁴ is reported as having said of his early, formative years, his emphasis apparently, that the 1611 Holy Bible was *““the most precious, and, on the whole, the one essential part of all my education.””*

Whatever happened to John Ruskin, it appears that Liddell’s lexicon played no small part in Ruskin’s degeneration from a KJB-centred school pupil into *“a delusional psychotic”* and paedophile.

In the wider context, the material that Dr Mrs Riplinger has provided, which Dr DiVietro either ignores or only weakly challenges, indicates that Liddell’s lexicon, its sources, supporters and spin-offs, such as the RV, ASV were some of the means by which God’s hand has been forced according to Romans 1:28.

“And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient;”

The remainder of the paragraph that begins with *Quote 76* states, Dr Mrs Riplinger emphasis:

“Small wonder [Liddell] chose such vile friends and heroes. He and Kingsley’s heroes were not godly Christians or Bible figures, but the god-men in the Greek myths. To indoctrinate children into the pagan myths, Kingsley wrote a book called, The Heroes, in 1856. Given Kingsley’s dishonourable views, Liddell displays his dishonourable mind in wanting to ‘honor’ such an infidel.”

Dr DiVietro’s insistence that Liddell’s lexicon is a good place to start for understanding the KJB, see *Quote 70* and his repeated tendency to excuse the work of *“men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith”* 2 Timothy 3:8 does not bestow a lot of honour on Dr DiVietro’s own mind and even suggests that he is among those of whom Paul states *“so do these also resist the truth.”*

Quote 77, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 258

“There was much Evangelical and Anabaptist dread and protest about what the college’s Greek class was doing to destroy the faith of the students”

Dr DiVietro protests that the reason for the subversion of the students’ faith was the unbelief (in block capitals) of the Greek teachers, not the Greek texts that they used. He adds that he is a Baptist thanks to the Greek New Testament, which Dr DiVietro does not define, not even by reference to any specific edition of the Received Greek New Testament Text. It can only

be concluded therefore that he does not mean any edition of Nestle's Greek Text, *Cleaning-Up* pp 24-25. Which Greek New Testament Dr DiVietro *does* mean, however, remains unknown.

The obvious question arises, which Dr DiVietro fails to address, is, what prompted the unbelief of the Greek teachers *that would have led to the subversion of the students' faith?*

The answer to that question is found in statements from *Hazardous Materials* that, typically, Dr DiVietro skipped over.

The context of **Quote 77** is the section on Benjamin Jowett, "**Heretic and Pantheist Friend #5**" of Henry Liddell, *Hazardous Materials* pp 255-260. See also **Quote 69**.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states that "*Liddell and Jowett had been friends since college days; Jowett and Stanley spent the summers of 1845 and 1846 in Germany, where they became steeped in the Higher Criticism of the Bible, particularly that of F. C. Baur.*"

Nicholas F. Steffens²¹⁵ states in a paper on "*Missionary work among Mohammedans*" that, this author's emphasis, "*We are rich in our Christian faith, we become poor if we enter into a compromise with anti-Trinitarianism in any form. F. C. Baur, the father of the Tubingen School, who cannot be accused of being a friend of traditional orthodoxy, was correct in his statement that Christianity would have lost its character as the universal religion of mankind if Arianism had been triumphant at Nicea.*"

Such was the *unorthodox* i.e. anti-Biblical mindset of Baur, the individual who influenced Liddell's close associates. Jowett went on to become "*one of the seven pantheistic authors of a book titled, Essays and Reviews. The American Unitarians loved the book and reprinted it. Sightler notes that, "This book denied the virgin birth, the Deity and vicarious, propitiatory sacrifice of the Lord, His bodily resurrection, and every miracle in the Bible" ...Jowett followed Hegel and Kant in their philosophy.*"

Paul warns in Colossians 2:8 "**Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.**"

See **Quote 70**.

Jowett's Higher Criticism, therefore, was the foundation for the attack on the students' faith that **Quote 77** refers to. Higher Criticism is clearly associated with "***philosophy and vain deceit.***" These twin evils owe much to *Greek philosophers and their teachings that in turn provide the basis for the unbelief of the Greek teachers that Dr DiVietro professes to deplore but the cause of which he overlooked.* See *The Christian's Handbook of Science and Philosophy* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Chapter 4, *The Philosophers*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has this telling comment that immediately follows **Quote 77**, her emphasis, and which Dr DiVietro bypassed.

"*Jowett's earlier study in Germany and his own methodology for analyzing literature made him one of the most diabolical of England's critics of the Bible...Defending Jowett's book and heresy by public comments were Liddell's friends and RV Committee men, Fenton Hort and A. P. Stanley (Sightler, p. 39)...Liddell saw him not as a heretic, but a hero. Liddell and Jowett were bound like Siamese twins in their two-headed world of Greek to English 'translation.'* *The two passed Greek into English through their moon-struck minds and published it for all to gaze at. Jowett translated works by Plato and Aristotle into English. Liddell and Jowett worked successfully and tirelessly together to do away with the theological test required for graduates. They secularized the college as they secularized the meaning of Greek words.*"

The Greek teachers' unbelief, therefore, *stemmed directly from the Greek works upon which they based their teachings* to undermine their students' Biblical beliefs, namely Plato, Aristotle and the other Greek sources that Liddell used for his lexicon, as Dr Mrs Riplinger lists on p 216 of *Hazardous Materials* "...the "comic Poets," Aeschylus, Sophocles and the whole bag of Greek filth, murder, adultery, homosexuality, debauchery, violence, drunkenness, idolatry, and sadism."

Attention is drawn to Proverbs 12:6.

"The words of the wicked are to lie in wait for blood: but the mouth of the upright shall deliver them."

Like the sentinels depicted for the Gates of Argonath, *The Lord of the Rings*, Part 1, *Hazardous Materials* and its author's researches stand like sentinels of ***"the upright"*** against ***"the words of the wicked"*** Proverbs 12:6 and their ***"Greek filth."***



Figure 4 The Gates of Argonath – *The Lord of the Rings* – Sentinels of *"the upright"*****

Dr DiVietro wouldn't understand.

Quote 78, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 260

"Imagine having THE standard Hebrew-English Lexicon (Gesenius, Brown, Driver, and Briggs) edited by a man who scorns what he calls, "the old Hebrew belief in a personal Jehovah.""

According to Dr DiVietro, he has no problem at all with the lexicon. He says that he simply takes what he deems to be valuable and discards the rest.

Dr DiVietro, however, gives neither examples nor guidelines for his readers to have ***"their senses exercised to discern both good and evil"*** Hebrews 5:14 with respect to ***"THE standard Hebrew-English Lexicon."***

In this respect, he is like ***"the idol shepherd that leaveth the flock!"*** Zechariah 11:17.

Quote 79, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 261

“...Müller’s passion for India’s pagan Hinduism shifted the entire focus of Oxford’s linguistic, religious, and historical study. Müller ripped the roots from the Hebrews and planted them deep in the mountains of India, far from God’s truth and too close to Hindu [devis] (Sanskrit for devils),...instead of the previously assumed Hebrew root. From this ‘new’ root, [its] meaning was re-cast.”

Dr DiVietro states that regardless of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments, both European and Oriental languages have similarities that facilitate the learning of related languages.

That isn’t the issue that Dr Mrs Riplinger raises in the context of **Quote 79**. Dr Mrs Riplinger raises the issue of Müller’s transfer of the basis of language study from Hebrew and by association with the Hebrew Old Testament, to the heathenism of Hinduism, as she explains in the following statement that Dr DiVietro slyly bypasses in **Quote 79**, by means of his second ellipsis.

“Under [Müller’s] (and Skeat’s) influence every word was now traced back to a supposed Indian root (called Indo-European),”

Dr Mrs Riplinger therefore shows that word meanings were then to be derived from a heathen root instead of a Hebrew root, that is, from **“a corrupt spring”** Proverbs 25:26 instead of **“the fountain of living waters”** Jeremiah 2:13, 17:13. Dr DiVietro ignores this warning and reveals yet again that he is in the ranks of the **“blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel”** Matthew 23:24.

However, Dr DiVietro goes on to cite the ease with which he was able to start learning Arabic from having learned Hebrew. Dr DiVietro insists that only God knows if Hebrew was the original language of mankind and declares that if the original language was Sanskrit instead of Hebrew, then neither Bible belief nor Bible translation is adversely affected.

Bible inspiration may have been, however and Dr DiVietro’s throwaway line about Sanskrit therefore raises some questions that he has overlooked.

Dr DiVietro, along with the rest of the DBS Executive Committee, claims that God inspired His words in 3 languages only; Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek, *Cleaning-Up* p 3. However, if Sanskrit was the original language, why didn’t God first inspire His words in Sanskrit? Why would God have delayed the inspiration of His accounts of critical aspects of human history such as the creation, Eden, the fall of man, the alien invasion of **“the sons of God”** Genesis 6:2 necessitating the flood of Noah’s time, Noah’s prophesies of racial destinies, the tower of Babel etc., until the emergence of Hebrew if Sanskrit preceded Hebrew?

The apostle Paul was multilingual, 1 Corinthians 14:18. If Sanskrit was the first language of all, would it not have some tradition carried on in Hebrew and therefore would not Paul have studied it, in his zeal for learning according to Galatians 1:14?

“And profited in the Jews’ religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers.”

If Sanskrit was the original language, would not God have imparted it to Adam as part of the creation of man according to Genesis 1:27, where **“God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him”**? God speaks in Genesis 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 15, 20, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30 and Adam speaks in Genesis 2:23, in the language that God would have to have given him. That language would have to have been Sanskrit, if Sanskrit was the first language and if so would not Sanskrit in turn have to be the language of heaven?

That result, if true, would have given **“Saul, of Tarsus”** Acts 9:11 an even *greater* incentive for learning Sanskrit than the traditions of his fathers. Several more questions follow.

Why then, does the Lord address Paul **“in the Hebrew tongue”** Acts 26:14 and not the Sanskrit tongue and why is **“the Hebrew tongue”** mentioned 6 times in scripture; John 5:2, Acts 21:40, 22:2, 26:14, Revelation 9:11, 16:16 and the Sanskrit tongue is not even mentioned once?

In addition, why then did God write in Hebrew in Daniel 5:24-28 and not in Sanskrit?

God speaking in Exodus 17:16 states that **“the LORD hath sworn that the LORD will have war with Amalek from generation to generation”** but even Amalek rates a mention as **“the first of the nations”** Numbers 24:20. Why, therefore, would not Sanskrit rate a mention in scripture as the first of the languages, if indeed it was, especially insofar as it would have to have been the language of heaven, or at least *from heaven to Adam* and the progenitor of Hebrew? Surely such a citation would have been necessary or the emphasis on **“the Hebrew tongue”** that the scripture gives would have been unbalanced and that is unthinkable with respect to **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21. See Proverbs 11:1, 16:11, 20:23.

The answer to the above question and indeed to all the above questions that Dr DiVietro has overlooked is simple. Sanskrit wasn't the first language. Hebrew was. Or Hebrew at least preceded Sanskrit, not the other way round. Dr Mrs Riplinger is therefore entirely correct in warning about how *“Müller's passion for India's pagan Hinduism shifted the entire focus of Oxford's linguistic, religious, and historical study.”*

In turn, Dr DiVietro's denigration of Sister Riplinger under **Quote 79** and of the warning that she issues is entirely *wrong* and thoroughly discourteous as well.

Note again an innocent-looking ellipsis at the beginning of **Quote 79**. The missing words are *“Under Liddell's patronage,”* indicating that Dr DiVietro is yet again seeking to cover up for the sinister influence of this ungodly individual whose ungodly work he deems under **Quote 70** to be a good place to start for understanding the words of the KJB.

The Second Advent will cleanse out a lot of ungodliness and **“all things that offend, and them which do iniquity;”** Matthew 13:41.

“And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, To execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him” Jude 24-25.

Dr Mrs Riplinger warns at the bottom of p 261 of *Hazardous Materials* that under Müller's tutelage *“This revolution in the etymology of language affects definitions in every lexicon, and kept Liddell busy adjusting his”* by means of, evidently, *“India's pagan Hinduism...far from God's truth.”* Dr DiVietro scorned this warning as well.

It is interesting that in his **Quote 79**, Dr DiVietro has the typo *deies* instead of the correct term *devis*, which Dr Mrs Riplinger explains is Sanskrit for devils. See the first set of square brackets in the quote cited above. (The second set of square brackets is for Dr DiVietro's second typo in **Quote 79**, where he has *it's* instead of *its*.)

Perhaps Dr DiVietro is unconsciously trying to cover up for somebody else besides Henry Liddell, someone whose influence is even more sinister than that of Liddell's. Dr DiVietro would do well to reflect upon 2 Corinthians 2:11.

“Lest Satan should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of his devices.”

Dr DiVietro also missed the statement on p 262 of *Hazardous Materials* where Dr Mrs Riplinger warns that “Müller’s hi-jacked etymology of language gradually slipped its way into the definitions in ensuing editions of the Liddell-Scott Lexicon. The seriousness of this cannot be underestimated, as we shall see – “

See **Tables 4-6** for what evidently became the end effects of “Müller’s hi-jacked etymology of language.”

Quote 80, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 263

“Müller’s and Blavatsky’s minds were nearly mirror images; his beliefs, as seen in his Collected Works, are identical to those found in her books, the Secret Doctrine and Isis Unveiled. They believe that primordial Hinduism was the first, truest, and purest religion.”

Dr DiVietro blithely dismisses **Quote 80** as guilt by association, which doesn’t help the reader at all. He missed this telling statement from the paragraph immediately before **Quote 80**.

“[Müller] oversaw the English translation of the massive 50-volume Sacred Books of the East, including the Muslim Quran. From this hub has spun the move of Islam and Eastern mysticism into Christianized nations.”

Nigerian Christian G. J. O. Moshey²¹⁶ explains this move, according to the tactics that Mohammed devised in the 7th Century, which Moslems are applying today to overthrow Christianity.

“Migrate to Christian areas because they are tolerant. Pretend to be peaceful, friendly and hospitable; begin to clamour for religious political and social rights and privileges that you will not allow to Christians in an Islamic country; breed fast there and settle down; there should be no Christian activities in your community; you may speak or write to discredit their religion, but they must not talk about Islam; begin to expand your community; Christian activities should be restricted in all the places you expand to; the moment you have enough military might against these ‘disbelievers’, these trinitarian kaferis, go ahead and eliminate them or suppress them as much as you can, and be in control.”

Moshay concludes *“Where immediate invasion is not possible, that has always been the policy.”*

Over 1500 mosques²¹⁷ now infest Britain, with over 1200 in the US²¹⁸, where none should exist at all in either nation. Neither the Lord Jesus Christ nor the apostles ever rescinded Exodus 20:3.

“Thou shalt have no other gods before me.”

Moslems, however, are becoming increasingly aggressive²¹⁹ in the UK and some are even demanding their own *official* enclaves. Note the following item from the UK Christian network, The Barnabas Fund.

Published: Thursday 21 July 2011

Islamist group pilots “sharia-controlled zone”

Country: EUROPE, UNITED KINGDOM

Muslims Against Crusades are targeting the London borough of Waltham Forest to be the first “sharia-controlled zone” as part of a new “Islamic Emirates Project.”



Figure 5 Sharia Zone *This message is being distributed in certain Muslim enclaves.*

The announcement comes after the Islamist group released Islamic Prevent, as [reported](#) by Operation Nehemiah last week, which called upon Muslims in Britain to create enclaves in major cities where sharia will one day be implemented.

The group said,

“As part of our Islamic Emirate Project, Waltham Forest is to be the first borough to be targeted for an intense sharia led campaign, introducing the prospect of Islamic law for the Muslim community to abide by.

“Waltham Forest is....a borough with a marked Islamic fingerprint; Muslim businesses, mosques and Islamic schools emblazon its streets, making a transition into a thriving Islamic emirate, very real and plausible.”

The organisation intends to persuade Muslims in Waltham to self-enforce sharia initially with specially designed leaflets and posters that read, “You are entering a Sharia Controlled Zone – Islamic Rules Enforced.”

Such is the end effect of “Müller’s and Blavatsky’s minds,” according to the judgement of Ezekiel 7:24 on Israel’s “**abominations**” mentioned 5 times in the chapter, Ezekiel 7:3, 4, 8, 9, 20, which are paralleled in the UK and the US and of which Dr DiVietro took no notice.

“Wherefore I will bring the worst of the heathen, and they shall possess their houses: I will also make the pomp of the strong to cease; and their holy places shall be defiled.”

Concerning this nation’s once “**holy places**,” many churches in the UK²²⁰ are being converted into mosques. Note that this reference gives the number of mosques in Britain at almost 1,700.

Note, however, that in spite of the aggression of Islam²²¹:



The Christian can take comfort in the eventual fulfilment of Job 38:15.

Figure 6 “The High Arm Shall Be Broken”

As indicated, however, Dr DiVietro, in his obsession with attacking Sister Riplinger, “*cared for none of those things*” Acts 18:17.

Quote(s) 81, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 268, 271

“For the ongoing correction of his Lexicon, Liddell needed a native-speaking German friend to help him access the German lexicon (Passow), of which his was essentially a mere translation. Müller was that go-between. “Liddell’s German knowledge,” though weak, no doubt helped him converse with his German underling.”

*“[Müller] suggests that to understand the **highest** philosophies, we study not only “Sanskrit,” which is an Indian dialect, but “Vedic Sanskrit,” which is the unique Sanskrit used in the Vedas, which are the Hindu ‘scriptures.’”*

Dr DiVietro’s only comment on *Quote(s) 81* is with respect to the statement on p 268, which he seeks to counter with the disclosure that David Brainerd preached through an unsaved, drunken ‘native American.’ Dr DiVietro therefore maintains, by implication that Müller’s and Liddell’s efforts produced a good lexicon, even though they were both unsaved.

Dr DiVietro’s likening of “*winebibbers*” Proverbs 23:20 Liddell and Scott’s wordings to those of a drunken Delaware Indian seems quite valid, though God appears to have overruled for the benefit of David Brainerd if his preaching was effective.

In answer to Dr DiVietro’s comment on *Quote(s) 81*, it is noteworthy that under *Quote 30*, he accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of confusing lexicography and translation. Under *Quote(s) 81*, he appears to be equating them, which calls to mind Proverbs 26:27.

“Whoso diggeth a pit shall fall therein: and he that rolleth a stone, it will return upon him.”

Dr DiVietro’s analogy is invalid, of course.

He is implying by reference to David Brainerd that the end justifies the means, which is false doctrine in violation of Romans 6:1.

“What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?”

The action that David Brainerd took in using the services of an unsaved translator is not in itself made right because a good missionary like Brainerd took that action or even because Brainerd got good results by this means. See Acts 16:16-18 where Paul restrained the propagation of the Gospel by unclean *spiritual* means. See also Mark 1:14, 15, 23-27.

God may nevertheless on occasion take initiative *Himself* to fulfil His purposes by exceptional means e.g. in commanding the prophet Hosea to **“Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredoms”** Hosea 1:2 but this commission to Hosea was for a particular purpose as the remainder of Hosea 1 shows and is emphatically *not* a principle for scriptural marriage. See Proverbs 5:1-23, 1 Corinthians 7:2, 1 Thessalonians 4:1-8, Hebrews 13:4.

Hosea, like Daniel, was the subject of God’s exceptional initiative because Hosea, as a prophet, was a man **“in whom is the spirit of the holy gods”** Daniel 5:11 and David Brainerd, likewise, was man among those who **“have received...the spirit which is of God”** 1 Corinthians 2:12. God could and, it appears, did work effectively with David Brainerd as **“the temple of the Holy Ghost”** 1 Corinthians 6:19 as He did with Hosea.

God *could not and did not* do likewise with Liddell and Scott et al, who were *not* **“the temple of God”** 1 Corinthians 3:16, as even Dr DiVietro concedes the possibility for Henry Liddell, **Quote 70** *Cleaning-Up* p 173 but were among those of whom Paul declares unequivocally in Romans 8:9 **“Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.”**

More detailed analysis follows.

Brainerd’s translator would have used only the source of words that Brainerd gave him, those that Brainerd preached on each occasion. As Dr Mrs Riplinger has shown, Müller and in turn Liddell and Scott were wilfully ignorant 1 Corinthians 14:38 of the *Biblical* source of word meanings, or usage as found in the 1611 Holy Bible. Instead, they used a great variety of distinctly *unbiblical* sources to come up with their word meanings, including Sanskrit and **“Plato, Aristotle, the “comic Poets,” Aeschylus, Sophocles and the whole bag of Greek filth, murder, adultery, homosexuality, debauchery, violence, drunkenness, idolatry, and sadism. Liddell makes reference to what he calls, “the Alexandrian version of the Old Testament...”** See *Hazardous Materials* p 216 and **Quotes 76, 77, 79.**

Most importantly, as indicated above, David Brainerd was a saved man through whom, as also indicated above, God could and no doubt did work to the benefit of Brainerd’s hearers, even though the intermediary was a heathen. In addition to God’s exceptional working through the prophet Hosea, see above, precedents for God’s grace and mercy bestowed on His people and their ministry and/or worship through heathen agents are found in Ezra 6:21-22, 7:27-28.

“And the children of Israel, which were come again out of captivity, and all such as had separated themselves unto them from the filthiness of the heathen of the land, to seek the LORD God of Israel, did eat, And kept the feast of unleavened bread seven days with joy: for the LORD had made them joyful, and turned the heart of the king of Assyria unto them, to strengthen their hands in the work of the house of God, the God of Israel.”

“Blessed be the LORD God of our fathers, which hath put such a thing as this in the king's heart, to beautify the house of the LORD which is in Jerusalem: And hath extended mercy unto me before the king, and his counsellors, and before all the king's mighty princes. And I was strengthened as the hand of the LORD my God was upon me, and I gathered together out of Israel chief men to go up with me.”

Such a bestowal of God’s goodness, however, depends upon the presence of a man of whom God says in Isaiah 66:2 **“to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word.”**

Such a man was Ezra himself, as Ezra 7:6, 10 show.

“This Ezra went up from Babylon; and he was a ready scribe in the law of Moses, which the LORD God of Israel had given: and the king granted him all his request, according to

the hand of the LORD his God upon him...For Ezra had prepared his heart to seek the law of the LORD, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments.”

By contrast, no man like Ezra could be found among Müller, Liddell, Scott and their associates. Dr DiVietro does not identify any. Of Müller et al. versus a man like Ezra, Solomon would have to have said according to Ecclesiastes 7:28 not **“one man among a thousand have I found.”**

Dr DiVietro’s analogy between Müller et al. and David Brainerd and his Indian interpreter (translator) may therefore safely be discarded.

Dr Mrs Riplinger elaborates upon the quote from p 271 that Dr DiVietro does not address in the sentences immediately following, her emphasis.

“If we likewise suggested that a Christian should study, not only English, but ‘King James Bible’ English, we would be quickly patted on the head, and then ushered to a Liddell-Scott Greek-English Lexicon or the Genesis, Brown, Driver, and Briggs Hebrew-Greek Lexicon to replace our English ‘scriptures.’ What hypocrisy!”

Those statements, from p 271 of *Hazardous Materials*, show that Müller et al. elevated the Hindu ‘scriptures’ above the 1611 Holy Bible that is **“all scripture”** that **“is given by inspiration of God.”**

Müller et al. made a grave mistake in so doing. Note 1 Kings 4:29-31.

“And God gave Solomon wisdom and understanding exceeding much, and largeness of heart, even as the sand that is on the sea shore. And Solomon’s wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east country, and all the wisdom of Egypt. For he was wiser than all men; than Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman, and Chalcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol: and his fame was in all nations round about.”

Solomon’s wisdom was **“the wisdom of God”** 1 Corinthians 1:20, 2:7, not **“the wisdom of this world”** 1 Corinthians 1:20, 2:6, 3:19 so the fixation of Müller et al. with the Hindu ‘scriptures’ was futile from the start. **“The wisdom that is from above”** James 3:17, such as God gave Solomon, is to be found in the Books of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Song of Solomon, as Dr Ruckman²²² explains in his comment on 1 Kings 4:30, in that trips to India, China or Japan for insights into Brahmanism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Hinduism, Shintoism or Taoism are a complete waste of time and effort. Solomon was wiser than any eastern mystic or ‘guru’ who has ever lived, who lives now or who will ever live, as God promised Solomon in 1 Kings 3:12.

“Behold, I have done according to thy words: lo, I have given thee a wise and an understanding heart; so that there was none like thee before thee, neither after thee shall any arise like unto thee.”

Solomon in his wisdom is of course a type of the Lord Jesus Christ **“who of God is made unto us wisdom”** 1 Corinthians 1:30.

Dr DiVietro’s comments under *Quote(s) 81* and earlier in his book suggest that he could do with asking for some of **“the wisdom that is from above”** himself, according to James 1:5.

“If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him.”

Quote 82, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 271

“Liddell’s biographer said that he was very involved with the upbringing of his children and that “nothing was complete without his co-operation and approval.””

Dr DiVietro follows this statement with a question that he refers to as his own. However, without explicitly stating so, he has reproduced the very next sentence from *Hazardous Materials* after **Quote 82**.

“Why would he co-operate and “approve” of having his daughter ‘babysat’ and photographed in immodest poses by a known pedophile, Charles Dodgson, alias Lewis Carroll, who has been alleged to be THE infamous Jack the Ripper?”

Dr DiVietro suggests that Liddell did not co-operate with and approve of his daughter being photographed by Dodgson, although he provides no proof of Liddell’s refusal in this respect.

Dr Mrs Riplinger, by contrast, provides Appendix A of *Hazardous Materials* pp 276-327 that reveals Charles Dodgson’s evil character. Dr Mrs Riplinger shows further that Dodgson’s unsavoury nature did not prevent Liddell and Dodgson from becoming lifelong friends.

She states on p 278 of *Hazardous Materials* that *“Liddell allowed Dodgson to take provocative pictures of his seven-year old daughter Alice, costumed as a child prostitute.”*

Some of these photographs may easily be found by means of a web search. These images show Alice in the kind of alluring poses common in tabloid newspapers. The same search will reveal a photograph taken by Dodgson of children posing naked, both male and female. The children appear to be about the same age as Alice was when she became Dodgson’s subject. The secular source Wikipedia²²³ naturally attempts to excuse Dodgson’s behaviour but the article is nevertheless forced to admit that he took *“photographs of nude or semi-nude girls.”*

A father who would allow his own daughters to be naked or semi-naked photographic subjects is on the same descent into degeneration as Lot, who, even though designated under the New Testament as **“just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked:”** 2 Peter 2:7 **“the LORD being merciful unto him”** Genesis 19:16, would have given his own daughters to the sodomites and later had children by his own daughters, Genesis 19:8, 36.

Such a father **“hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel”** 1 Timothy 5:8. Henry Liddell was such a father, unless he was **“an infidel”** to start with, which would not exonerate him in any way.

Dr DiVietro does not challenge any of this information.

He is, however, obligated to do so if he even seeks to imply, as he does, that Dr Mrs Riplinger is lying with respect to Liddell’s complicity in allowing his daughter to pose as a child prostitute for Charles Dodgson.

By failing to do so, Dr DiVietro has aligned himself with the **“false accusers...despisers of those that are good”** 2 Timothy 3:3, whom Paul warns will be rampant when **“in the last days perilous times shall come”** 2 Timothy 3:1 *and who will have invaded the church*²²⁴.

Quote 83, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 273

“Scott had the dubious distinction of being liberal enough to be selected to be on the Westcott and Hort Revised Version Committee of 1881. After all, it was his and Liddell’s English wine-washed words which were now going to jump from their lexicon into the Bible.”

Dr DiVietro again accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of lying, this time with respect to her use of the expression **“wine-washed words”** to describe Liddell’s work on his lexicon. He insinuates

that lying is typical of her work, although he has failed to identify one falsehood on Dr Mrs Riplinger's part in 179 pages of *Cleaning-Up*. He adds that words did not “*jump from their lexicon into the Bible*” but that the translators selected the words. Dr DiVietro has overlooked the figurative nature of the statement, which is similar to the familiar expression to ‘jump at a chance,’ say, for some individual advantage. Dr DiVietro's criticism of Dr Mrs Riplinger in this respect is therefore unjustified – like all his criticisms of her and her work so far.

Concerning “*Liddell's English wine-washed words,*” although Dr DiVietro included statements from *Hazardous Materials* p 209 in **Quote(s) 63**, he bypassed the references to Liddell and Scott's ““*wine and talk*”” sessions to which Liddell's biographer, Henry L. Thompson, alludes. See *Hazardous Materials* p 207. It is clear from Dr Mrs Riplinger's citations from Thompson that Liddell and Scott were well “*wine-washed*” before they returned to Liddell's rooms to work on their “*secularized Greek-English lexicon, which would bastardize pure New Testament words, smearing them with meanings from pagan Greek leanings.*” See *Hazardous Materials* pp 208-210.

It is up to Dr DiVietro to prove that Liddell's biographer was lying or that Dr Mrs Riplinger cited him incorrectly. He has not done so and his criticism of Dr Mrs Riplinger under **Quote 83** can therefore be discarded as invalid, like all of Dr DiVietro's criticisms of Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work thus far.

Quote 84, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 283

Quote 84 is taken from the statement by Lewis Carroll's biographer, Donald Thomas, p 54 outlining the molestation of younger pupils by the senior boys at Harrow School in the 1850s when B. F. Westcott of the RV was a dorm supervisor and his friend Charles Vaughan, later a member of the RV committee, was the school's headmaster.

Dr DiVietro does not challenge **Quote 84**. He simply alludes to the ungodliness of the RV committee members that is well-known.

The context of **Quote 84**, however, which Dr DiVietro does not challenge and on which he refrains from even commenting, is the “*pernicious ways*” of Henry Liddell, “*by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of*” 2 Peter 2:2 as Dr Mrs Riplinger states on pp 281, 282, 284 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphases. See also **Quote 82** and accompanying remarks with respect to Charles Dodgson.

“Dodgson, as a young boy...felt that he needed a key to open the restraining door of his father's church. The Greek-English Lexicon has served as the key to free many young men from the English Holy Bible.”

“The Liddell-Scott lexicon was also the key which had freed [Dodgson's] teachers at Rugby from the Holy Bible. This boarding school was “the shrine as well as the breeding ground of liberals” (W. R. Ward, Victorian Oxford, London: Frank, Cass & Co. Ltd. 1965, p. 130 as cited in Cohen, p. 347).”

“Dodgson's father was a very pro-Catholic Anglican curate. “As a High Churchman, he upset the Evangelicals,” as had Liddell.”

It would appear that the Evangelical wing of the Church of England was responsible for the restraint from which Dodgson sought relief. His pro-papist father aided and abetted his son's apostasy by pulling strings to get Charles accepted at Christ Church College, Oxford, where “*within the physical premises of Christ Church...Dodgson's criminal mind was harboured and nurtured under the shadow of Liddell's dark roof for thirty-six...years.*”

On p 285 of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr Mrs Riplinger, her emphasis, describes how the ungodly Professor Gaisford, Dean of Christ Church College, Oxford, assured new students to the college of “*how Greek and his school would destroy every bit of their faith in their English Bible. He said, “It will be a long time before you will find anything that you can have no doubts about”*” (Thomas, p. 74).”

Gaisford’s successor at Christ Church was none other than Henry Liddell, who would further the gathering apostasy of the college *with the aid of his Greek-English Lexicon*. See *Hazardous Materials* p 259, with respect to how “*Liddell and Jowett...secularized the college as they had secularized the meaning of Greek words.*”

Noting Liddell’s evident ‘preference’ for the Revised i.e. *Alexandrian Version*, *Hazardous Materials* pp 217, 274, it is instructive to draw attention to Benjamin Wilkinson’s work, *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, Chapter 4, *The Jesuits and the Jesuit Bible of 1582*²²⁵ and his analysis of how the evil that overtook Oxford via the subversive offices of Gaisford, Liddell, Dodgson et al. would have to have been masterminded.

Solomon rightly observes in Ecclesiastes 10:5 “*There is an evil which I have seen under the sun, as an error which proceedeth from the ruler:*”

The predominant ruler in the End Times “*is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth*” Revelation 17:18 “*Babylon the great...the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird*” Revelation 18:2. Wilkinson’s analysis, his emphases, clearly identifies “*the habitation of devils*” and describes its influence on centres of learning such as Oxford University. Gaisford, Liddell, Dodgson et al. then appear simply to have been papal puppets unknowingly or otherwise. Under-linings are this author’s.

“Ignatius Loyola came forward and must have said in substance to the Pope: Let the Augustinians continue to provide monasteries of retreat for contemplative minds; let the Benedictines give themselves up to the field of literary endeavor; let the Dominicans retain their responsibility for maintaining the Inquisition; but we, the Jesuits, will capture the colleges and the universities. We will gain control of instruction in law, medicine, science, education, and so weed out from all books of instruction, anything injurious to Roman Catholicism. We will mould the thoughts and ideas of the youth. We will enroll ourselves as Protestant preachers and college professors in the different Protestant faiths. Sooner or later, we will undermine the authority of the Greek New Testament of Erasmus, and also of those Old Testament productions which have dared to raise their heads against the Old Testament of the Vulgate and against tradition. And thus will we undermine the Protestant Reformation.”

The godly Church of England Bishop J. C. Ryle²²⁶ was contemporaneous with Gaisford, Liddell, Scott, Dodgson, Westcott, Hort and co. He issued a dire warning in 1867 as follows, this author’s emphases.

“But what are we going to do? Lectures and speeches are all very well. But something more is needed, something needs to be done. The danger is very great, far greater, I fear, than most people suppose. A conspiracy has been long at work for un-protestantizing the Church of England, and all the energies of Rome are concentrated on this little island. A sapping and mining process has been long going on under our feet, of which we are beginning at last to see a little. We shall see a good deal more by-and-by. At the rate we are going on it would never surprise me if within fifty years the crown of England were no longer on a Protestant head, and high mass were once more celebrated in Westminster Abbey and St. Paul’s. The danger, in plain words, is neither more nor less than that of our Church being unprotes-

tantized and going back to Babylon and Egypt. We are in imminent peril of re-union with Rome."

With the pope having visited "this realm of England," where²²⁷ "the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction" twice in the last 30 years, 1982, 2010 and where he should be *persona non grata*, Bishop Ryle's warning still applies, even if God's mercy to this nation has forestalled its ultimate fulfilment.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has sought to sustain this warning by means of identifying some of the *tools* of the "sapping and mining process." They surely include Liddell's lexicon. See **Tables 4-6** for details of RV i.e. pro-Catholic readings displacing KJB readings as a necessary precursor to reunion with Rome.

Dr DiVietro has failed to highlight this warning under **Quote 84**.

One wonders, therefore, his professed 'preference' for the KJB and Received Text editions notwithstanding, if he too, unconsciously perhaps, with his unfailing support for Liddell's lexicon, has been "mould(ed)" after the manner of its author, by the same Jesuitical shadow-men lurking inconspicuously but lethally in the corridors of academic power and influence.

Truth will out at the Second Advent, Ecclesiastes 12:14.

"Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts: and then shall every man have praise of God" 1 Corinthians 4:5.

Quote 85, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 330

"Ask any Greek-spouting professor or pastor, 'What lexicon do you use?' Many use Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament because it is the least expensive. If he really does not know how to read Greek, he probably uses one of Thayer's stepchildren, Vine's Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words or Berry's Interlinear Greek-English New Testament by George Ricker Berry (lexicon in back)."

Dr DiVietro asks in response to **Quote 85**, why not use these various resources? He specifies the first three New Testament lexicons that he acquired and states that he has since added many more. Dr DiVietro assures his readers that these lexicons did not dislodge his faith in the word of God, which he does not define, because he never sought to correct the KJB, which he does not explicitly equate with the word of God, but simply to understand the KJB.

One reason for not using the lexical sources to which Dr DiVietro alludes is that they clearly ignore the KJB's built-in dictionary. See **Setting Up the 'Clean Up,' Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint, Quotes 9, 14, 39, 61, 62, 67**. The result for Dr DiVietro is that he has so far shown a very *poor* understanding of the New Testament. See material on John 11:33 at the end of **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** and **Challenges #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints**.

The above material will confirm that Dr DiVietro is lying again when he claims that he does not seek to 'correct' the KJB but merely to 'clarify' it. See also **Challenges #1, #2, #3, #5, #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints**, their summary sections and overall summaries, **Quotes 4, 28, 39, 50, 66** with respect to Dr DiVietro's supposed 'clarifying' of the KJB, which turns out to be more like *defying* the KJB.

It is noteworthy that Dr DiVietro refers to the lexicon in the back of the UBS Greek New Testament 2nd Edition as one of the three lexicons that he first acquired in order to 'understand' the KJB. Yet on pp 24-25 of *Cleaning-Up*, he refers to the 4th Edition of the UBS Greek New Testament as a distortion and a perversion of God's words. See **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

As usual, the source of God's words between two covers remains undefined by Dr DiVietro but he gives no explanation about why the UBS lexicon is trustworthy when, according to him, the UBS text is not, which is no help to his readers.

Neither is the implication of Dr DiVietro's comments under **Quote 85** that an unknown number of Greek lexicons must be acquired i.e. purchased for the understanding of the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament. If taken at face value, these comments prompt a number of questions, *all of which must be answered satisfactorily in order to avoid violation of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9.*

- How many lexicons are needed before the student may be confident that he can know what God 'really' said?
- Approximately what cash outlay may be required for the student?
- How are believers on the mission field to be compensated for their lack of sufficient finances required for the purchase of the (supposedly) necessary lexical resources in their own languages?
- More problematically, how are believers on the mission field to be compensated for what is more likely to be *a complete lack* of these lexical resources in their own languages?

See **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** for Dr Mrs Riplinger's observation with respect to well-heeled Westerners with multiple Bible versions versus the relative scarcity of the scriptures in many parts of the mission field. The same would apply for those same Westerners pinning their hopes of scriptural enlightenment on a legion of lexicons, Mark 5:9.

Dr DiVietro does not address those questions, except to indicate for the first question listed that it is indeed '*many*' lexicons that are needed, which is not good news for students who have been persuaded by their mentors that they need lexical advice, especially on the mission field, should that be the case. Moreover, it is not clear how trustworthy these particular sources are, as the following observation shows.

On pp 89-93 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro gives extensive guidelines on what he perceives to be the practicalities of applying Hebrew and Greek to Bible teaching. However, in so doing, he recommends *The Defined King James Bible*. See Dr Mrs Riplinger's incisive analysis of this subversive tool in **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** and in her recent work²²⁸ *Serious Problems in D. A. Waite's The Defined King James Bible's Definitions – Defiled & Declined*.

Whatever may be said in favour of Dr DiVietro's Hebrew/Greek guidelines, their application by means of *The Defined King James Bible* and similar sources relegates them and their user to the condemnation of Psalm 62:9.

"...men of high degree are a lie: to be laid in the balance, they are altogether lighter than vanity."

On the whole, Dr DiVietro's failure to answer or even address the above questions shows that he has violated the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9, again, a failure compounded by his recommendation of the misleading *Defined King James Bible*.

It is further noteworthy that on p 330 of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr Mrs Riplinger states in the paragraph following **Quote 85** that "*It is not surprising that the "Godhead" is not even listed in Vine's [Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words], corresponding to Thayer's Unitarian beliefs (denying the Trinity).*" See **Table 4**.

Why did Dr DiVietro fail to warn, therefore, of how *“Thayer’s poison spread into these and other Greek reference works”*? That sentence is at the end of the paragraph that constitutes Dr DiVietro’s **Quote 85**. Significantly, he did not include it in **Quote 85**, very likely because thus far, Dr DiVietro has sought to excuse each and every heretical lexical editor that Dr Mrs Riplinger has identified and *“his evil deeds”* 2 John 11. Dr DiVietro thereby *“is partaker of his evil deeds”* 2 John 11. See **Quote 70**. He seems more and more to be afflicted by *“a perverse spirit”* Isaiah 19:14. See **Quote 67**.

Such a sinister spirit is apparent in that yet again, contrary to the priesthood of all believers 1 Peter 2:5, 9, Dr DiVietro fails to allude to believing prayer, Proverbs 2:1-5, or comparing scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, in order to *“know the words which he would answer me, and understand what he would say unto me”* Job 23:5. See **Quotes 16, 19, 27, 34, 39, 47, 71**.

In sum, together with Psalm 62:9 above, Daniel 5:27 describes Dr DiVietro’s comments, both here and throughout his book.

“TEKEL; Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting” Daniel 5:27.

Quote 86, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 332

“The naive reader is then drawn down into this whirlpool, struggling to find the hidden ‘meaning’ of words, which are already self-evident in the context of each Bible usage.”

Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote 86** are some of the most objectionable statements that he has made thus far against the 1611 Holy Bible.

He begins by accusing the 1611 Holy Bible of containing ambiguities and obscurities leading to false doctrine upon which rogue denominations have been founded. He states that it is not possible to understand the KJB by means of studying how words are used in the KJB according to their respective contexts. Dr DiVietro therefore declares unequivocally that no-one can *really* understand the 1611 Holy Bible without going to ‘the Hebrew,’ undefined between two covers as any specific text or ‘the Greek,’ undefined between two covers as any specific text or trusting in the Hebrew/Greek expository *skills of some trusted authority* – Dr DiVietro’s actual words.

Yet again, Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing in his comments under **Quote 86**.

Yet again, Dr DiVietro violates the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9 and reveals that he is of *“them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate”* Revelation 2:15 according to the Lord Jesus Christ, namely the doctrine of the special ‘priest class’ who could rule the laity, in this case by means of special knowledge of Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. (As Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote 86** imply, the DBS Executive Committee ‘priest class’ professes to have its own ‘Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek original text’ but never explicitly identifies it as a single document containing both Old and New Testaments between two covers. See *Cleaning-Up* pp xi, 327-330.)

Yet again, Dr DiVietro fails to allude to believing prayer, Proverbs 2:1-5, trusting the Lord Jesus Christ and the Spirit of God, Luke 24:45, John 16:13 or comparing scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, in order to *“know the words which he would answer me, and understand what he would say unto me”* Job 23:5. See **Quote 85**.

It is of course easy to identify who the *preferred* ‘trusted authority’ would most likely be.

As was noted back in **Challenges #1, #7, Points-Counterpoints**, with respect to Job’s comment to his three dogmatic friends in Job 12:2:

“No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you.”

Yet again, however, it should be noted what a *poor* understanding of the New Testament Dr DiVietro’s Hebrew and Greek, however defined, has achieved for him. See material on John 11:33 at the end of **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** and **Challenges #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints**.

Turning to Dr DiVietro’s accusation against the 1611 Holy Bible, he has alluded to what he terms the ambiguities and confusing grammar of the 1611 Holy Bible on pp 32, 69, 91, 94-95, 152 of *Cleaning-Up*. See concluding remarks of **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint** and **Challenges #3, #5, #7, Points-Counterpoints**, their summaries and overall summaries. On this occasion, however, he has extended the accusation to charge the 1611 Holy Bible with being the fount of false doctrine.

Dr DiVietro has yet again aligned himself by means of that accusation with the **“false accusers...despisers of those that are good”** 2 Timothy 3:3, whom Paul warns will be rampant when **“in the last days perilous times shall come”** 2 Timothy 3:1 *and who will have invaded the church*. See **Quote 82**.

As Dr Mrs Riplinger notes in *New Age Versions* p 9: *The Mandate: Infiltrate*.

The infiltra(i)tors have been hard at work with their **“sapping and mining process.”** See **Quote 84** and Bishop Ryle’s insightful comments.

What follows is this author’s overview of a study on hell, entitled *Hell*, completed about 14 years ago in response to the false teachings of a ‘no-heller’ (not a Jehovah’s Witness but a ‘no-heller’ nevertheless), who deeply resented the authority of the 1611 Holy Bible and sought to replace it with his own authority.

This ‘no-heller’ was clearly not a ‘fundamentalist’ and would therefore not be perceived as part of **“the church of God”** Acts 20:28 by its members. What is instructive is that this no-heller’s contempt for the 1611 Holy Bible was matched almost perfectly by the attitude to it of an individual who *was* perceived by many as a member of **“the church of God.”**

This particular individual is designated **“our critic”** in this author’s work **“O Biblios” – The Book**. **“Our critic,”** now deceased, was an M.A., B.D., M.Th. 20-year teacher of Koine Greek and a professed evangelical fundamentalist of the Reformed i.e. 5-Point Calvinist persuasion. While some readers may balk at this individual’s evident Calvinism, he would no doubt have been regarded by many professing evangelicals in this country, the UK, as a thorough-going Christian conservative. Both he and they would have eschewed the ‘no-hell’ teaching of the no-heller.

They would have nevertheless been in complete agreement with him on eschewing the 1611 Holy Bible.

What is even *more* instructive for the present work is the apparent ecumenical agreement with respect to multiple authorities for ‘improving’ the 1611 Holy Bible (either by ‘correction’ or ‘clarification’) between a no-heller *outside* the church, a Reformed teacher of Koine Greek perceived to have been *inside* the church *and Dr DiVietro and their agreement that the KJB causes confusion and ambiguity*.

Note also that Dr DiVietro’s multiple authorities for ‘improving’ the KJB include his many lexicons. See **Quote 85**. It matters little that Dr DiVietro professes to retain the words of the KJB whereas the Calvinist and the no-heller have no qualms about adding to them, subtracting from them or changing them, Genesis 3:2, 3. What matters is that each one of the three

effectively urges the student to look to *him* as the final authority instead of to “*the scripture of truth*” Daniel 10:21, the 1611 Holy Bible.

Dr DiVietro’s notion of ‘improving’ the KJB, via ‘clarifying’ it, does of course amount to *changing* the wording of the KJB by means of the work of anti-Biblical and unregenerate lexicographers. See again the material on John 11:33 at the end of **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** and **Challenges #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints**.

It is Genesis 3:1 all over again. “*Yea, hath God said?*”

The extract from the conclusion to this author’s study on hell follows. Note the added emphases for this work.

*In his opposition to the Holy Bible AV1611, [our critic] has cited **multiple authorities without specifying ANY WRITTEN WORK as the FINAL AUTHORITY in all matters of faith and practice FOR TODAY**. His authorities have been listed as follows, with the appropriate page number from “O Biblios” [1st printed Edition, see Chapters 8-14, 2nd printed Edition and online version www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/]:*

“ <i>The original Hebrew and Greek</i> ”	p 44
“ <i>The original languages</i> ”	p 45
“ <i>The Alexandrian text type</i> ”	p 48
“ <i>The original autographs</i> ”	p 48
“ <i>Eclectic principles</i> ”	p 49
“ <i>Biblical archaeology</i> ”	p 50
“ <i>The Papyri from the 2nd and 3rd Centuries</i> ”	p 50
“ <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls</i> ”	p 50
“ <i>Modern scholars, modern editors, modern textual critics</i> ”	p 50, 60-62
“ <i>The underlying Greek</i> ”	p 52
“ <i>The original</i> ”	p 53
<i>The opinions of modern translators such as Edwin Palmer</i>	p 54
“ <i>The original Bible</i> ”	p 54
“ <i>Some Early Protestant Reactions to the KJV</i> ”	p 56
<i>Tyndale’s New Testament</i>	p 58
<i>Wesley’s New Testament</i>	p 59
<i>Spurgeon’s opinion of the RV</i>	p 60
<i>The opinions of Benjamin Warfield and “the conservatives”</i>	p 60
<i>The preferences of Christian Bookstores</i>	p 62
<i>Darby’s New Testament</i>	p 63
“ <i>The earliest extant codices</i> ”	p 63
<i>The “most reliable manuscripts and earliest fathers”</i>	p 64
“ <i>The best manuscripts</i> ”	p 65
“ <i>The Chalcedonian Definition 451</i> ”	p 65

Continuing his opposition to the Holy Bible, [our critic] has charged the AV1611 with:

“Important omissions from the original text”	p 50
INNUMERABLE “incorrect renderings of the Hebrew and Greek”	p 51
Inconsistent translation of the same Greek and Hebrew words “resulting in confusion to the reader”	p 51
Inconsistent translation of different Greek and Hebrew words	p 51
“Confusion created by the wrong use of the preposition”	p 52
“Confusion created by variety in...spellings”	p 53
“Unintelligibility due to the presence of archaic and obsolete words”	p 53
Stagnation in “the classical language of Shakespeare”	p 53
Lack of either “inspiration or special divine approval”	p 54
Apostasy by comparison with the NIV	p 62

Of course [our critic] has repeatedly resorted to “**the Greek**” in his efforts to overthrow the Holy Bible, AV1611 but it is apparent that he is his own “**final authority**”:

“What troubles me most are **your claims that the KJV is superior to the original Hebrew and Greek...it seems to me a most serious spiritual matter when a manifestly fallible translation made by men who taken as a body were not wholly orthodox, is preferred to the God-breathed originals**” p 44 “O Biblios”.

“I accept the NIV as the most accurate translation available at present, but that does not mean that I accept it uncritically or that I am entirely happy with all its readings. **This version like every other must be subject to the original languages which I constantly consult**” p 45 “O Biblios”.

In other words, given that he does not have “**the God-breathed originals**” [our critic] sees fit to speak for God, on the basis of **his constant consultation of “the original languages” to which the “manifestly fallible...KJV” must be subject, along with “every other” version.**

“**How hast thou plentifully declared the thing as it is...and whose spirit came from thee?**” Job 26:3, 4.

“**So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God**” Romans 14:12.

In HIS opposition to the Holy Bible AV1611, [the no-heller] cited **multiple authorities without specifying ANY WRITTEN WORK as the FINAL AUTHORITY in all matters of faith and practice FOR TODAY.** His authorities have been listed as follows, with appropriate references to his letters: [The dates refer to letters received from the no-heller, the page numbers to those of the letters.]

	letter of:
The item from his ally [another no-heller]	26 th February, enclosed
His opinion that God MUST be more “humane” than humans	21 st January, p 1 26 th February, p 3
“Many modern versions...RSV, NIV, GNB, NEB, NWT*, NJB,	21 st January, p 3
“ Tanakh, the Hebrew Bible in English ”	7 th February, p 4, 5 26 th February, p 2 26 th February, p 4

<i>“Modern critics, modern translators, all responsible scholars... anyone who is anyone in the theological field”</i>	21 st January, p 3 7 th February, p 5 26 th February, p 1, 3
<i>“The NT...originally written in Greek”</i>	21 st January, p 4
<i>“The original Hebrew and Greek scriptures...the original version”</i>	21 st January, p 3 26 th February, p 2
<i>“The earliest manuscripts”</i>	26 th February, p 2
<i>Old Anglo-Saxon vocabulary**</i>	21 st January, p 5
<i>Unsubstantiated “symbolic language”</i>	21 st January, p 4, 5 7 th February, p 2, 4 26 th February, p 3
<i>“The Jews in Jesus’ time”</i>	7 th February, p 3
<i>“Times” “Preacher of the Year” for 1995, Barry Overend</i>	21 st January, p 6 7 th February, p 4
<i>Collier’s Encyclopaedia</i>	7 th February, p 1
<i>Webster’s 3rd New International Dictionary</i>	7 th February, p 1
<i>“Story-tellers all over the Orient”</i>	26 th February, p 3

*The NWT, 1984 Edition, Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania, Appendix 2, provides a description of the Valley of Hinnom which [the no-heller] may have used in his letter of January 21st 1996, page 5. This description refers to the addition of sulphur to the fires, to which [the no-heller] also alludes.

[The no-heller] thought that **“hell” was only derived from the Anglo-Saxon “to conceal” but the Venerable Bede says of the Anglo Saxon Christian, Caedmon, died 680 A.D.: “He made many songs concerning the terror of future judgment, THE HORROR AND PAINS OF HELL and the joys of heaven: besides many more about the blessings and judgments of God, by all of which he endeavoured to draw men away from the love of vice, and excite in them the love of, and applications to good actions” (my emphasis).

Continuing HIS opposition to the Holy Bible, [the no-heller] has charged the AV1611 with:

	letter of:
<i>“Literally thousands of mistranslations”</i>	21 st January, p 3 26 th February, p 2
<i>Being “a very poor translation” in “Shakespearean language”</i>	21 st January, p 3
<i>“Woefully flawed...giving a wrong meaning to the original text”</i>	21 st January, p 4 7 th February, p 5 26 th February, p 2-4
<i>“Causing...confusion, leading many to atheism and unbelief”</i>	21 st January, p 4 26 th February, p 3
<i>“Constant Inconsistency” in translation</i>	21 st January, p 6 7 th February, p 5 26 th February, tabloid enclosure 26 th February, p 2

Being NOT “the word of God”

7th February, p 4

Being “never authorised by God and therefore...not holy”

26th February, p 2

Of course [the no-heller] has repeatedly resorted to “the Greek” in his efforts to overthrow the Holy Bible, AV1611 but it is apparent that he is his own “final authority”:

“It is only right to go to the Greek if there is a dispute about the meaning of a word or phrase when translating from the Greek into today’s English” letter 26th February, p 1.

“I’m not saying the modern versions are all perfect, as you seem to think I am saying...modern versions have mistakes too, some apparently deliberate, depending on the personal religious bias of the translator. Yet all these are actually superior to the out-dated, inconsistent KJV. So then, in the absence of the original holy scriptures, which have perished, it is only sensible that we use the modern versions” letter 26th February, p 2.

In other words, given that he does not have “the original holy scriptures”, [the no-heller] sees fit to speak for God by means of his “sensible” use of “the modern versions” which, in spite of their mistakes, are “superior to “the out-dated, inconsistent KJV” which in turn, he can correct along with the modern versions by going “to the Greek”.

“But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment” Matthew 12:36.

“So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God” Romans 14:12.

Quite clearly there is a striking similarity between [the no-heller] and [our critic] in their respective attitudes to the Holy Bible, AV1611, attitudes which should, of course, be poles apart. Their convergence is one more indication of “the last days” when “perilous times shall come” such that “in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils” 1 Timothy 4:1, 2 Timothy 3:1.

“But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith love, patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses” 1 Timothy 6:11, 12.

“Behold, I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown” Revelation 3:11.

“He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus” Revelation 22:20.

By inspection of the above and Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote 86**, it is obvious that he is at one with the no-heller and the Reformed Calvinist NIV supporter with respect to his perceived need of multiple authorities to ‘improve’ the KJB according to ‘the original’ (whatever it is) of which no precise copy of ‘the original’ between two covers is specified, so that the KJB does not, according to him, cause confusion and false doctrine.

It should be understood that neither the no-heller nor the Reformed Calvinist was ever able to identify anyone who was confused by the 1611 Holy Bible and neither does Dr DiVietro, who, as indicated above, does not identify either a false doctrine or a rogue denomination that may be traced to the English Text of the 1611 Holy Bible interpreted independently of ‘the Hebrew and the Greek.’

In fact, the reverse is true.

Dr DiVietro is himself a member of a rogue denomination or at least a heretical cult that seeks to propagate false doctrine by its insistence that the 1611 Holy Bible is **“the word of**

men” and not *“the word of God”* 1 Thessalonians 2:13 and that only ‘the original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text’ is *“the word of God,”* inspired in all its perfection and purity, though unidentified by Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee between two covers. See *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3, 18 and remarks under **Preface and Introduction**, especially with respect to Dr Waite’s insistence of the *non*-inspiration of the KJB and **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’**.

See also **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Introduction** and material under all the main sections of that work.

See in particular **Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration**, where it is noted that Dr Waite reveals that he too is of *“them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate”* Revelation 2:15 according to the Lord Jesus Christ, namely the doctrine of the special ‘priest class’ who could rule the laity, in this case by means of special knowledge of Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. *“The doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate”* is of course in direct conflict with the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See remarks above with respect to Revelation 2:15 and Dr DiVietro.

See further **Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’**, where it is explained that seven aspects of ‘the Greek’ should be kept in mind. These show that Drs Waite, DiVietro, Williams and the rest of the DBS Executive Committee are akin to 33rd Degree Royal Arch Masons, i.e. only those who’ve been inducted into ‘the mysteries’ of ‘the craft’ actually know ‘absolute truth’ with respect to what God *‘really’* said. ‘The mysteries’ of ‘the craft,’ in this case, are what the DBS Executive Committee perceives to be ‘the pure inspired original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text,’ the whereabouts and contents of which between two covers are unknown to anyone apart from the DBS Executive Committee.

The scriptural designation of this ‘originals only’ 33rd Degree Royal Arch Masonry is of course *“the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate”* Revelation 2:15, see above. Dr DiVietro clearly clings to it with virtually monastic fanaticism.

Yet more can be said on the particular subject of KJB English supposedly giving rise to false doctrine.

Dr Ruckman²²⁹ describes an experience that he had as a young ministerial student in 1951 when he went through 400 Bible verses over a period of 8 hours with an old man whom, he said, had assimilated by memory the entire false teachings of the Seventh Day Adventists, the Mormons, the Jehovah’s Witnesses, the Church of Christ, the Christian Scientists, the Unity Church, the Catholic Church, the British Israelites and the Holiness groups.

Dr Ruckman said that this man could quote from memory every verse that taught every one of the false teachings of those groups, *from the King James Authorized Text*.

However, Dr Ruckman observed that every time the man quoted from the Authorized Text to put forward a false doctrine, *he would change at least one letter of the King James Text!* One example was in John 8:58, where the Lord said *“Before Abraham was, I am.”*

The old man insisted that the Lord *meant “I was.”*

He took the same approach with every one of the 400 verses discussed in the 8-hour session.

That was how he had assimilated every one of the false teachings of the heretical groups listed above, *not* by means of the King James Text *but by changing a word or a letter in a verse from the King James Text*.

That is how false doctrine and rogue denominations are hatched, as described and warned of in Isaiah 59:5.

“They hatch cockatrice’ eggs, and weave the spider’s web: he that eateth of their eggs dieth, and that which is crushed breaketh out into a viper.”

Proverbs 4:14-15 should be obeyed.

“Enter not into the path of the wicked, and go not in the way of evil men. Avoid it, pass not by it, turn from it, and pass away.”

Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee would insist that they do not change the words of the KJB or even the letters, *Cleaning-Up*, p 88 *but they did*. See *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3. They changed **“given by inspiration of God”** to **“God-breathed”** and they did it by means of ‘the Greek,’ namely the term *theopneustos*!

In doing so, they cut out the essential embedded words **“in”** and **“spir(it).”** See *In Awe of Thy Word* p 332 and *The Christian’s Handbook of Biblical Scholarship* pp 250ff.

Genesis 2:7 states **“And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.”**

John 6:63 states **“It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.”**

Genesis 2:7, John 6:63 apply to the scriptures in that these verses portray how **“the Spirit of life from God entered into them”** Revelation 11:11 when they were **“given by inspiration of God”** and they became **“incorruptible...the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever”** 1 Peter 1:23.

Dr DiVietro lost all of the above revelation when he sided with the Jehudis, Jeremiah 36:21-25, who cut out the essential embedded words **“in”** and **“spir(it).”**

In sum, that single change of **“given by inspiration of God”** to **“God-breathed”** via ‘the word in the Greek’ *theopneustos* appears to have been all it took to concoct the DBS Executive Committee members’ false doctrine of ‘originals onlyism’* *that by profession denies “the scripture of truth”* Daniel 10:21 to all but them and their closest adherents, and is equivalent to **“the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate”** Revelation 2:15, in direct violation of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9.

*The DBS Executive Committee may protest that they are faithful to the original *text* of scripture, not the original writings as such. See remarks under **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint, Quote 86** and *Cleaning-Up* pp xi, 327-330. However, the DBS Executive Committee rejects all Bible translations as finally authoritative with respect to its perception of the original, inspired text of scripture and, for the New Testament, all published Greek texts as finally authoritative with respect to its perception of the original, inspired Greek New Testament. See *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3, 18, 21. *The DBS Executive Committee has therefore left itself no option but to produce the original manuscripts of the scripture to prove that it has access to the original text of scripture.* The DBS Executive Committee’s notion of ‘the original text’ is a smokescreen, as summed up by Proverbs 10:26.

“As vinegar to the teeth, and as smoke to the eyes, so is the sluggard to them that send him.”


See again Dr Ruckman’s encounter given above with the old man, who could cite a false doctrine by means of a single word or even letter change to the text of the 1611 Holy Bible.

The discerning reader will give close attention to Proverbs 19:20.

“Hear counsel, and receive instruction, that thou mayest be wise in thy latter end.”

The panel depicted below from Chick's excellent Gospel tract *Somebody Goofed?* www.chick.com/reading/tracts/0003/0003_01.asp sums up *the essential attitude* of the no-heller, the Reformed Calvinist and the DBS Executive Committee, including Dr DiVietro, in their ecumenical oneness with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible, *regardless of how much of its wording that they accept or don't accept*:

"IT'S ONLY WRITTEN BY MEN!"



www.chick.com/reading/tracts/0003/0003_01.asp

Figure 7 *"IT'S ONLY WRITTEN BY MEN!"*

The identity of the sceptic pictured is revealed at the end of the tract, from which revelation the discerning reader will also *"receive instruction."*

Job could rightly question the no-heller, the Reformed Calvinist and the DBS Executive Committee, including Dr DiVietro.

"Will ye speak wickedly for God? and talk deceitfully for him?" Job 13:7.

Yes, they *will*. They *did*, according to Isaiah 14:14.

"I will be like the most High."

In the context of Isaiah 14:14, it should be understood that the DBS and its companion ministry *The Bible for Today*, BFT, have produced much excellent material over the years in support of the 1611 Holy Bible, not least of which is Dr Waite's admirable work *Defending the King James Bible*, which this author has purchased with no regrets.

However, this author recollects that Hal Lindsey, of all people, rightly observed many years ago that *"The Devil will use a lake of truth to hide a pint of poison"* and of course none of the DBS/BFT material will *unequivocally* declare that the 1611 Holy Bible is ***"all scripture"*** that ***"is given by inspiration of God."*** (The DBS Executive Committee actually states that it is heresy to do so. See **Dr D. A. Waite and *The DBS, Dead Bible Society*** pp 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 16, 20, 22, 26, 37, 47, 48, 53.)

That is all the concession that the Devil needs to spread false doctrine such as 'originals only-ism,' as Paul warns in Galatians 5:9.

"A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump."

Quote(s) 87, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 335, 337-338

“Thayer was on the American translation committee for the corrupt Westcott and Hort Revised Version, as well as the American Standard Version.”

*“In the opening pages of Thayer’s Lexicon, he lists the names of well over 300 pagans and philosophers whose writings he consulted to give hints as to ‘meanings’ and usages of Greek words. The Greeks’ writings, of course, do not give the meanings in Greek, let alone English. They can only exhibit the word **in use** and therefore only **hint** at its meaning in **that** context. The hint is still in the Greek. Bringing it into English takes it miles from its origin. Pairing those Greek hints with words in our 500,000 word English vocabulary is a guessing game at best. Thayer’s final destination is miles still from the mind of Christ.”*

Dr DiVietro descends into mockery again, see **Quotes 9, 48, 60, 61, 65** and immediately sets about defending the indefensible again, with respect to Thayer and his secular Greek interpretations of Biblical words, even though under **Quote 84**, he denounced the ungodly nature of the 1881 and 1901 revisers.

Dr DiVietro clearly has no qualms about emulating Herod and Pilate when it suits his purpose of attacking Sister Riplinger by means of bolstering up Unitarians and other Bible deniers.

“And the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together: for before they were at enmity between themselves” Luke 23:12.

Dr DiVietro should reflect upon Jude 17-18 in his mockery of Sister Riplinger coupled with his **“vain and light”** Judges 9:4 attitude to the sins of Unitarian J. Henry Thayer that Dr Mrs Riplinger documents. See *Hazardous Materials* pp 329ff.

“But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; How that they told you there should be mockers in the last time, who should walk after their own ungodly lusts.”

Note in passing that Dr DiVietro’s continuing support for **“an increase of sinful men”** Numbers 32:14 in the persons of Liddell, Scott, Thayer, Strong et al is open defiance on his part of 2 Corinthians 6:14. See comments on this verse under **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint**.

“Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?”

By definition, these unbelievers, Liddell, Scott, Thayer, Strong et al have despised Proverbs 1:7, making Dr DiVietro’s support for them all the more objectionable.

“The fear of the LORD is the beginning of knowledge: but fools despise wisdom and instruction.”

Dr DiVietro makes no direct comment on the quote from p 335 of *Hazardous Materials* and he overlooks the very next sentence following that quote.

“As mentioned in an earlier chapter, Strong Delusion, the ASV note for John 9:38 calls Jesus a “creature” not the “Creator” (in reference to the words, “And he worshipped him”).”

Dr Mrs Riplinger warns on the same page about the ASV corruptions to Matthew 4:9, Luke 2:33, 4:7, which have found their way into later versions e.g. the NIV, TNIV, NKJV footnotes with respect to Luke 2:33. See **Table 4**.

Dr DiVietro ignores these warnings and wastes space with a weak attempt at satire about the negligence of the Greeks and even of the multi-lingual apostle Paul himself, 1 Corinthians

14:18, although Dr DiVietro does not quote this verse, in failing to provide later generations with suitable lexicons. He should take note again of Proverbs 11:1. See also *Quotes 29, 40*.

“A false balance is abomination to the LORD: but a just weight is his delight.”

Dr DiVietro alludes to the absence of lexicons edited by Bible believers under *Quote(s) 90* and his comments will be addressed there.

Dr DiVietro then insists yet again, accusing Dr Mrs Riplinger of naivety, that words can only be understood by studying how they are used in their original languages. Once again, he substantiates nothing but the implication is, yet again, that Dr DiVietro is relying on “*crumbling Greek ruins...bawdy plays...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks*” in order to understand Biblical words, especially in that he does not deny the statement in *Quote(s) 87* “*In the opening pages of Thayer’s Lexicon, he lists the names of well over 300 pagans and philosophers whose writings he consulted to give hints as to ‘meanings’ and usages of Greek words.*”

See *Hazardous Materials* p 90 and **Challenges #2, #3, #4, Points-Counterpoints**, summaries and overall summaries, *Quotes 25, 38, 39, Quote(s) 63*.

Dr DiVietro has, of course, ignored the 1611 Holy Bible’s built-in dictionary again and indeed demeaned it. See **Setting Up the ‘Clean Up,’ Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint, Quotes 9, 14, 39, 61, 62, 67, 71, 85**.

Dr DiVietro states further under *Quote(s) 87* that he has read quickly through *In Awe of Thy Word* and therefore has some slight understanding of how, according to him, Dr Mrs Riplinger believes the King James translators did their work, including how they defined the meanings of Greek words. He adds, however, that Dr Mrs Riplinger believes that the King James translators were re-inspired to receive what he terms Holy Ghost words free from sinners.

Dr DiVietro fails to pay his readers the courtesy of citing any references from *In Awe of Thy Word* to substantiate his claims, which is especially objectionable in that he does not specify where in *In Awe of Thy Word* that Dr Mrs Riplinger mentions re-inspiration. (See **Preface and Introduction** with respect to the related subject of examples of *translations “given by inspiration of God”* cited by Drs Gipp and Ruckman, with references to details given in **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society**.)

Had Dr DiVietro taken the unusual step (for him) of giving *In Awe of Thy Word* a fair reading, he would have found in Chapter 15, entitled *Hidden Notes & Public Views of the King James Translators* a detailed description of how the King’s men went about their work, including their evaluation of many Greek sources, together with early English and foreign Bibles and the important Old Latin versions that were “*so much different from the vulgar [Catholic Latin Vulgate]... ”*”

Dr Mrs Riplinger makes repeated reference to *The Translators to the Reader* in order to illustrate the methods by which the King’s men worked and she includes, her annotations and emphases, this highly revealing summative comment from “*John Selden...in his Table Talk,*

““The translation in King James’ time took an excellent way. That part of the Bible was given to him who was most excellent in such a tongue and then they met together, and one read the translation, the rest holding in their hands some Bible, either of the learned tongues [Greek, Hebrew, Latin], or French, Italian, Spanish &c [and other languages]. If they found any fault, they spoke; if not, he read on (Paine, p. 77; Scrivener, p. 140).””

See also **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Testimonies to the Inspiration of the AV1611**.

That was the means by which the King's men arrived at each of the particular words for the 1611 Holy Bible that was "'*holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, made higher*'" and is perfect for each context (Heb. 7:26)." See *Hazardous Materials* p 113.

Dr DiVietro has absolutely no warrant for trying to imply otherwise, for which nefarious tactic the Biblical term is "**dissimulation**" Romans 12:9, Galatians 2:13.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments on *Quote(s) 87* with the statement that Dr Mrs Riplinger goes on to level criticisms at many more Greek authors. Insofar as Dr DiVietro supports these authors according to his comments in *Quote(s) 91*, he should yet again reflect upon Proverbs 17:15 and the dual role that he is fulfilling *genuinely* "**because of his answers for wicked men**" Job 34:36. See *Quote 70*.

"He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination to the LORD."

Quote 88, Hazardous Materials, p 342

"Thayer's use of pagan and "profane" Greeks led him to reluctantly list at the end of his edition those New Testament words for which he could find no pagan use, and therefore no 'definition.' Thayer would list words such as "collection" and say the word is "not found in profane authors" (1 Corinthians 16:1, 2). God said in 1 Tim. 4:7, "But refuse **profane**...fables." In 1 Tim. 6:20 he said "avoiding **profane** and vain babblings." Aren't you glad the Holy Ghost gave us the words of God in a HOLY Bible in our own language? How convenient; how like God. "Every word of God is pure" (Proverbs 30:5)."

Dr DiVietro ridicules the above statement and accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of deceit and defamation with respect to Thayer, stating that Dr Mrs Riplinger must know that Thayer did not use the word *profane* in the King James Bible sense of crude or vulgar but in the secular sense of non-theological.

The word *profane* is not used in that sense in the 1611 Holy Bible, in any of its 33 occurrences and Dr DiVietro has in his comments on *Quote 88* therefore unwittingly provided an example to the effect that reading the secular literature of a language does *not* necessarily help in understanding the meanings of words in their *Biblical* sense. Under *Quote 76*, however, he has strongly tried to imply that it *does*.

Dr DiVietro should again take note of Proverbs 26:27. See *Quote(s) 81*.

"Whoso diggeth a pit shall fall therein: and he that rolleth a stone, it will return upon him."

The non-theological sense of the word *profane* according to non-Biblical usage is of course well known. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* lists this meaning and the distinguished pre-millennial expositor Clarence Larkin refers to "*profane writers*" in his commentary *The Book of Daniel* p 182 with respect to understanding the "**Seventy weeks**" of Daniel 9:24.

The Unitarian Thayer no doubt used the term *profane* in its secular sense but his usage of the word is immaterial. Dr Mrs Riplinger is perfectly right to allude to 1 Timothy 4:7, 6:20 as she does and it is Dr DiVietro who is being devious, in addition to incurring the Lord's censure in Matthew 23:24. See *Quote 40*.

"Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel."

Dr DiVietro fails to inform his readers that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists on pp 338-342 of *Hazardous Materials* no fewer than 32 Greek authors who were uniformly "**profane**" in the sense of 1 Timothy 4:7, 6:20 and who were Thayer's 'authorities' for his lexicon. She makes on p

338 the following statement, her emphases, about those Greek ‘authorities’ that Dr DiVietro overlooked.

*“A peek at the beliefs of a few of those pagan philosophers, whose Greek writings Thayer consulted, will frighten any Christian of even modest discernment. (All quotes are taken from *The Classical Greeks* by Michael Grant, New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1989 or *The Dictionary of Classical Mythology, Religion, Literature, and Art*, by Oskar Seyffert, New York: Gramercy Books, 1995). Reading these Greek writings would be like watching an X-rated **Greek** movie to see what the words love, God, soul, or hell **really** mean in English. It will not work.”*

The playwright Aeschylus is the first Greek writer on Thayer’s list of ‘authorities.’ Dr Mrs Riplinger exposes him *“As the originator of the Hollywood play.”* She states further that *“Plays full of sex and violence in early Greece are not good places to make the fine distinction between ‘love’ and Christian ‘charity.’”*

Speaking of playwrights, see **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** and **Quote 26** with respect to Dr DiVietro’s endorsement of studying Shakespeare to learn the meaning of KJB words and his at least tacit endorsement of the sodomite Plato for the same purpose, *Cleaning-Up* p 63. Dr Mrs Riplinger lists Plato as one of Thayer’s ‘authorities.’

The following extract applies in response, from **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’**

David W. Norris²³⁰ 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, dikaiosune is translated ‘righteousness’ in our Authorised Version, but in English translations of the Greek philosopher, Plato, the same word is translated ‘justice’. Dikaiosune 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.”*

Like Dr Mrs Riplinger, David Norris has given a sound application of Ezekiel 44:23.

“And they shall teach my people the difference between the holy and profane, and cause them to discern between the unclean and the clean.”

Dr DiVietro fails to do so.

It is also possible that he has overlooked the irony of **Quote 88** with respect to use of the word *profane*.

The scripture has a good example of irony in 1 Kings 13:13, with reference to **“an old prophet in Bethel”** 1 Kings 13:11, which may be an ironic designation in itself, practically speaking, with respect to the ‘originals onlyism’ of the DBS Executive Committee.

“And he said unto his sons, Saddle me the ass. So they saddled him the ass: and he rode thereon,”

Quote 89, Hazardous Materials, p 345

Quote 89 consists of extracts from the second and third paragraphs of *Hazardous Materials* p 345 to the effect that Thayer exercised control over the text of the ASV, American Standard Version and therefore indirectly over the text of its revised form, the NASV, New American Standard Version.

Dr DiVietro does not take serious issue with **Quote 89**, stating that the ASV has long since faded into obscurity, that modern versions come and go within a few years and that the multitude of modern versions was the reason he went back to the KJB, because **“God is not the author of confusion”** 1 Confusion 14:33, although Dr DiVietro does not quote that reference.

Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote 89** are guarded because on p 91 of *Cleaning-Up*, he recommends *The Defined King James Bible* as a valuable resource for understanding the 1611 Holy Bible. See **Quote 85**, where attention is drawn to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s incisive analysis of this subversive device in her recent work *Serious Problems in D. A. Waite’s The Defined King James Bible’s Definitions – Defiled & Declined*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has this disclosure from *Serious Problems in D. A. Waite’s The Defined King James Bible’s Definitions – Defiled & Declined* p 30 about the sources used for *The Defined King James Bible*. Donald Waite Jr, who edited *The Defined King James Bible*, is writing to a gentleman named Edward Carrington.

8/19/08

Dear Edward,

(1) Since it has been over a decade since I did the work on the *Defined King James Bible*, I can't put my finger on the notes that verify which Greek and Hebrew lexicons I used. I suspect that I used lexicons that were available digitally in 1996-1998. These would have included the ones made available by the Online Bible program at the time. I am relatively certain that this would have included *Thayer's Greek Lexicon of the NT* and *Brown, Driver, Briggs Hebrew-English Lexicon of the OT*.

I currently use every electronic Greek and Hebrew lexicon I can get my hands on for research, Sunday school lessons, and sermons. Bible Works 7 provides the following Greek lexicons: *Bauer Danker Greek-English Lexicon**, *Liddell-Scott Greek Lexicon (unabridged)**, *Friberg Analytical Greek Lexicon*, *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*, *Liddell-Scott Greek English Lexicon (abridged)*, *Gingrich Greek NT Lexicon*, *Barclay Newman Greek-English Dictionary*, and *Louw-Nida Greek English Lexicon of the NT*. (Although I normally consult them all, I have listed them in the order of usefulness--from most useful to least useful.)

Figure 8 Donald Waite Jr's Letter to Edward Carrington

Note the references in the letter to Thayer's lexicon. Dr Mrs Riplinger adds on pp 31-32 of her book *Serious Problems*:

“Thayer, Brown, Driver, and Briggs Words

“Chapters 9 and 25 of Hazardous Materials detail the heresies held by these lexicographers and the consequent errors in their lexicons. Thayer, Brown, Driver, and Briggs were some of [history's] most scandalous heretics. All denied the basic tenets of our Christian faith. None of these men believed that even the originals were given by God. Because Hazardous Materials has since alerted readers to the problems in their lexicons, Waite is now avoiding this specific admission. On a radio program, hosted by his mother, D.A. Waite, Jr. tried to give the impression that he had never indicated that he had used these lexicons. However, a copy of his original e-mail, indicating his use of these lexicons, is available for all to read.

“Thayer was a Unitarian who denied the Trinity, the deity of Christ, the fall of man, and the blood atonement. Baker Book House, Thayer's current publisher, even alerts readers in the preface,

““A word of caution is necessary. Thayer was a Unitarian, and the errors of this sect occasionally come through in the explanatory notes. The reader should be alert for both subtle and blatant denials of such doctrines as the Trinity (Thayer regarded Christ as a mere man and the Holy Spirit as an impersonal force emanating from God), the inherent and total de-

pravity of fallen human nature, the eternal punishment of the wicked, and **Biblical inerrancy.**”

“Chapter 5 of *Hazardous Materials* explores the vile beliefs of the pagan philosophers cited by Thayer for his definitions. The secular history book, entitled *The Growth of American Thought*, lists Thayer, Brown, Driver, and Briggs as among the men who shook “The foundations of orthodox belief in supernatural powers...” *The Dictionary of Heresy Trials in American History* exposes the bad influence of Thayer, Brown, Driver, and Briggs. Thayer said people should not be “rigid and unprogressive and imprisoned forever in a book.” Of the Bible’s books, he said, “...no one of them has his [God’s] personal endorsement or authentication.” He says, “The critics are agreed, that the view of Scripture in which you and I were educated, which has been prevalent here in New England for generations, is untenable.” He says a “pestilent tenet gained currency that the Bible is absolutely free from every error of every sort.” (D.A. Waite Sr.’s denial of “Perfection of Translation” and Jack Schaap’s redefinition of ‘perfect’ echo Thayer at this last point.)”

In sum, Dr DiVietro has egg on his face for recommending *The Defined King James Bible* and in turn therefore Thayer’s Bible-denying lexicon. That is very likely why he does not criticise Dr Mrs Riplinger under **Quote 89**.

However, Dr and Mrs H. D. Williams, as editors of *Cleaning-Up, Dedication*, accuse Sister Riplinger under **Quote 108** of lying about D. A. Waite Jr on pp 357, 962 of *Hazardous Materials*. With the copy of D. A. Waite Jr’s note to Mr Carrington in the public domain, however, they should have given more attention to Galatians 6:1 (and perhaps expressed some remorse for conniving at the splashing of Sister Riplinger’s personal details all over the web, Galatians 6:7).

“Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted.”

It seems that the editors of *Cleaning-Up*, along with its author, were tempted, forgot to apply 1 Corinthians 10:13 and fell into the same fault of supporting *The Defined King James Bible*.

“There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it.”

No saved person, therefore, has to engage in a personal vendetta against any individual with whom they disagree, for any reason. The DBS Executive Committee should understand that.

Quote(s) 90, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 349, 350

“Schaff said he wanted to “disentangle the scriptures from traditional embarrassments, such as the theory of a literal inspiration or dictation...” Many charged that his “teaching and writing did not meet biblical standards...” *The ASV readings, seen today as definitions in Strong’s Concordance, came from Schaff and his Unitarian-led bandits, Thayer and Strong.*”

“His [Dr DiVietro inserts Thayer’s] lecture begins and ends by charging the Bible with error. He consoles listeners saying, “No substantive part of the truth of Christianity is discredited, should we perchance discover that the collection and even the composition of its books are not free from traces of the **imperfection** which cleaves to all things human.” He aligns his views with those of the Catholic Church. He says, “And in the second place allow me to remind you that the view of these writings in which we, as New England Puritans, have been reared has not been the prevalent view in the Christian church through the centuries. The church of Rome, as you know, recognizes ecclesiastical tradition as of coordinate authority with the written records.”

Faced with the damning contents of *Quote(s) 90*, Dr DiVietro has no choice but to admit, as he was forced to do under *Quote 84*, that the revisers of 1881 and 1901, together with their lexical “*Unitarian-led bandits*” whom he has been supporting since page 1 of *Cleaning-Up*, were apostate, pro-Catholic, false teachers and, as their books reveal, prejudiced against and subversive towards the Received Text editions and the 1611 Holy Bible.

Dr DiVietro then quite ungraciously accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of ‘attacking’ these individuals and their work, when she has simply documented all the charges listed immediately above that Dr DiVietro has been compelled to concede *because he is unable to refute Dr Mrs Riplinger’s material*.

The Lord Jesus Christ noted a similar inconsistency in Matthew 11:18-19.

“For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil. The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. But wisdom is justified of her children.”

Dr DiVietro’s ungraciousness towards Dr Mrs Riplinger at this point does not reflect great credit on him as a child of wisdom, as perceived by the Lord Jesus Christ. As his comments under *Quote(s) 91* reveal, he continues to speak essentially in support of those individuals whom he has just designated as apostate, pro-Catholic, false teachers prejudiced against and subversive towards the Received Text editions and the 1611 Holy Bible. See again *Quote 70* and also *Quote(s) 87*.

Dr DiVietro maintains his support for ungodly lexicographers under *Quote(s) 90*.

Indeed, his main point unto *Quote(s) 90* is that, however much it may be regretted, the books of Liddell and Scott, Thayer, Strong et al are the only available resources of their kind because no Bible believer (bible unspecified between two covers) has produced a full and proper lexicon for the Greek New Testament (the Greek New Testament unspecified between two covers) that underlies the 1611 Holy Bible.

It follows by implication that in Dr DiVietro’s opinion, editors of currently available lexicons should be commended for their efforts wherever possible, not criticised for their shortcomings and that therefore *Hazardous Materials* should never have been written.

It hasn’t occurred to Dr DiVietro to ask the obvious question.

Why has God not raised up a team of editors to produce the kind of lexicon that Dr DiVietro states is lacking, not even the DBS Executive Committee itself?

With Koine Greek being a dead language, as Dr DiVietro is forced admit, *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-iv, 2-3, 7, 16, 63, 182 under *Quote(s) 87*, the answer to the above question may lie in an application of Hebrews 8:13, to both dead languages and dead bible societies.

“Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.”

As Dr Mrs Riplinger rightly states in *In Awe of Thy Word* p 956, this author’s emphases:

“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.”

*From God’s viewpoint, as the context of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement indicates, in particular the next sentence. The largest collation of extant Greek New Testament manuscripts is that of von Soden, carried out almost a century ago. Von Soden’s collation encompasses less than 10% of available manuscripts and is skewed towards those with Alexandrian leanings but still witnesses in favour of the 1611 Holy Bible in approximately 90% of important doctrinal passages. See **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** for details, together with *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version*, Summary V and *When The KJV Departs From The “Majority” Text*, Chapter 3, both by J. A. Moorman. The deficiencies of von Soden’s work notwithstanding, it is significant that God has not seen fit to extend that work for almost 100 years, just as He has not seen fit to convene another English Bible translation committee for 400 years. That observation reinforces Dr Mrs Riplinger’s conclusion about the “*true original Greek*.” (If the DBS Executive Committee undertook to extend von Soden’s work and collate *all* extant New Testament source materials, it could be useful in that it may distract them from the sin of seeking to have “*discouraged the heart*” Numbers 32:9 of God’s true servants such as Sister Riplinger, for whom “*There remaineth therefore a rest*” Hebrews 4:9.)

See also **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint** and the earlier work, **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society**, pp 31-32. Note further the statement by evangelist Stephen Shutt from *Hazardous Materials* p 735.

““*Let it be clear, these languages were used by God at one time [ancient Hebrew and ancient Koine Greek]. Yet, interestingly enough, God did away with their authoritative solidarity at Pentecost.*””

Dr DiVietro includes Bro. Shutt’s statement under **Quote(s) 155** but, also “*interestingly enough,*” he does not take issue with it. It may be that Dr DiVietro prefers women-only targets if he has a choice, or that he could not find anything in Bro. Shutt’s background to splash all over the web or include in his book by way of a personal attack as he does with Sister Riplinger, *Cleaning-Up* pp 321-326. It may be a combination of both.

The right attitude, therefore, to the 1611 Holy Bible is not to urge for a new lexicon but to follow the prayer of Psalm 19:12.

“Who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret faults.”

Quote(s) 91, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 352-353

Quote(s) 91 is an extended extract from “*Thayer’s Blasphemous Speech*” *Hazardous Materials* p 349. As indicated under **Quote 70**, it is at this point that Dr DiVietro skips over the rest of Chapter 9 of *Hazardous Materials* and all of Chapters 10-16, dismissing their contents as *ad hominem* and guilt-by-association attacks against the authors of Greek-English study aids. While again, as in **Quote(s) 90**, Dr DiVietro allows that some of these authors may not have been fundamentalists or even Christians, he dogmatically insists that their study aids are valid i.e. not invalidated by Dr Mrs Riplinger’s researches.

Strangely, Dr DiVietro also states under **Quote(s) 91** that the words of scripture are defined by their usage. He does not say explicitly what the scripture is but his comment under **Quote(s) 91** suggests that he is not referring to the 1611 Holy Bible as scripture because he stipulated under **Quote 86** that context and KJB word usage by themselves are not sufficient for understanding the 1611 Holy Bible. That is, according to Dr DiVietro, the words of the 1611 Holy Bible are *not* defined by their usage.

In other words, it is apparent that Dr DiVietro's perception of the 1611 Holy Bible is as that stated at the end of *Quote 86*.

"IT'S ONLY WRITTEN BY MEN!"

See also Dr Waite's statement from *Preface and Introduction*, from *A WARNING!!* p 36. The statement is unambiguous with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible, this author's underling.

"Neither the DBS Executive Committee or the DBS Advisory Council will ever call the King James Bible "inspired of God," "given by inspiration of God," "verbally inspired," "inspired," or "God-breathed" at any time or in any place."

One wonders how Drs Waite and DiVietro would answer the question of Job 13:7 at *"the judgment seat of Christ"* Romans 14:10.

"Will ye speak wickedly for God? and talk deceitfully for him?"

Tables 4, 4a, 4b list the material that Dr DiVietro has blithely dismissed as *ad hominem* and guilt-by-association attacks. See also accompanying notes. That material shows that the Greek study aids that Dr DiVietro so eagerly supports are *not* valid and neither is his endorsement of them.

Dr DiVietro should reflect carefully on Proverbs 13:16.

"Every prudent man dealeth with knowledge: but a fool layeth open his folly."

Quote 92, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 580

"Few know that Scrivener moved away from his original Textus Receptus (TR) position in his later book, Six Lectures on the Text of the New Testament, written before he created his TR Greek text. Scrivener did not recommend all of the readings in his TR and suggested removing numerous verses, as well as important words supporting the Incarnation, the sinlessness of Christ and the Trinity."

Dr DiVietro insists that Scrivener's text is the best approximation to the underlying Greek text of the 1611 Holy Bible and accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of attacking Scrivener as an individual in order to discredit his work.

The nature of Scrivener's Greek text with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament is beside the point, see *Quote 93*, although it should be noted that Dr DiVietro does *not* refer to Scrivener's text as 'inspired,' so that the actual identity of the 'inspired' Greek New Testament between two covers remains undisclosed by the DBS Executive Committee.

Dr DiVietro has misled his readers again, as these extracts from p 580 of *Hazardous Materials* show, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphases, which Dr DiVietro neglects to mention. The second extract follows immediately from *Quote 92*.

"Scrivener was the author of several books promoting textual criticism which taught generations of students to question the Bible."

"A complete list follows in this chapter.

- ✓ *Scrivener desires to make two changes in the scriptures which would make Jesus Christ a sinner (Luke 2:22 and John 7:8).*
- ✓ *Scrivener wants to remove the Trinitarian proof texts of 1 John 5:7-8 and Col. 2:2.*
- ✓ *Scrivener rejects the proof text for the Incarnation and the deity of Christ (1 Tim. 3:16), as well as rejecting "God" in 1 Peter 3:15 and the Holy Ghost in Acts 16:7.*

- ✓ *He suggests removing Acts 8:37 to support his Anglican heresy of infant baptismal regeneration.*
- ✓ *He denies the portion of scripture that tells us Jesus was “Broken” for us (1 Cor. 11:24).”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger has cited 9 passages of scripture that support major doctrine and which Scrivener believed should be cut out of the New Testament. She has shown in sum that Scrivener’s text books that no doubt reflected his rejection of scriptures such as those cited influenced generations of students to *doubt* the 1611 Holy Bible.

Those disclosures that Dr DiVietro does not directly challenge, or indeed even address, are not *ad hominem* attacks by any stretch of the imagination. Dr DiVietro is lying in his accusation against Dr Mrs Riplinger in that respect.

He has also overlooked the greater *potential* damage to belief in the 1611 Holy Bible that can be effected by one of those **“who seemed to be pillars”** Galatians 2:9 for the Received Text than, say, by the likes of Westcott and Hort who declared **“that the Received Text was “vile” and “villainous””** as Dr Wilkinson²³¹ has shown.

Scrivener’s subversion of the Received Text and in turn the 1611 Holy Bible is like David’s sin with Bathsheba, according to 2 Samuel 12:14.

“...by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the LORD to blaspheme.”

Paul’s rebuke to the Jews in Romans 2:23-24 applies equally to Scrivener’s perfidy with respect to the Received Text.

“Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is written.”

Scrivener’s defection from the 1611 Holy Bible has contributed to the casting of a long shadow in the Body of Christ in the UK, as the following extract shows, from a note by this author to the pastor of a local fundamentalist church, copied to an elder of the church concerning part of a message by a visiting speaker. The subject of the note is Acts 8:37 that Scrivener sought to excise from the 1611 Holy Bible. Names have been excluded for the sake of confidentiality.

Dear *****

*...I am writing briefly to draw attention to a matter that I noted in Mr *****’s message last Sunday, w.r.t. Acts 8:26-40, in particular Acts 8:37.*

I appreciate that in a sense, the matter is water under the bridge now but hopefully the brief points that follow will be considered should the above Acts passage, in particular Acts 8:37, be addressed in any future ministry of the church.

*Mr ***** made reference to Acts 8:37 as not being in the oldest manuscripts and not part of ‘the original’ or words to that effect.*

Had he limited his comments to the above statement, I would not have raised this matter. Any speaker can give an incorrect report, depending on the sources he consults. It’s happened to me. The simple truth is that Acts 8:37 is scripture, with an unbroken testimony to its validity from the 2nd century AD onwards and God’s blessing of Reformation and Revival on the Bibles that contain it, e.g. all those of the 16th century English Protestant Reformation. Even the versions that omit it imply the validity of Acts 8:37, because they don’t change the verse numbering system, although it would obviously be very easy to do so in this particular instance, if their editors genuinely believed that Acts 8:37 is spurious.*

**Various objections to Acts 8:37 have been raised. I believe that it is possible to answer them all satisfactorily.*

What was real cause for concern to me (and hence this note) was the statement in the message to the effect that the passage loses nothing if Acts 8:37 is cut out because the Ethiopian clearly believed and was saved.

On the contrary, the passage loses everything with respect to Christian salvation if Acts 8:37 is lost.

Significantly, the word “believed” is lost. Without Acts 8:37, it can only be inferred that the individual “believed” anything with respect to salvation (apart from the supposed need for baptism – see comments that follow). It can equally be inferred that belief in the Lord Jesus Christ is not necessary for salvation.

Needless to say, that is a most serious error but it is a possible error if Acts 8:37 is cut out of the account.

Equally significantly, it is known why Acts 8:37 is missing from most Greek manuscripts, including the Catholic manuscripts alluded to but not identified on pages 1024, 1073 of the [NIV] church bibles.

Acts 8:37 was dropped from successive copies of Greek manuscripts by the monkish forbears of those who are now Greek Orthodox priests (as well as by the Catholic forbears), such that it is now omitted by most extant Greek manuscripts, for the majority of which the Greek Orthodox Church is the custodian, notably at St Catherine’s Monastery at the foot of Mt. Sinai.

The reason is that the Greek Orthodox Church teaches that only baptism and communion are necessary for salvation, not belief on the Lord Jesus Christ. Omission of Acts 8:37 provides this church with the necessary justification for this false teaching (as with the Catholic Church, its members don’t readily “Search the scriptures” John 5:39). Once this false teaching is established, it becomes straightforward to impose infant baptism.

The Greek Orthodox manner of infant baptism is even more heinous than that of the Catholic Church. I think it amounts to ritualistic satanic child abuse. It is likely that the young women in the church who work with children would be moved to tears if they knew the details.

All of this is written up in the book Hazardous Materials, by Gail Riplinger, pp 745ff, ISBN 978-0-9794117-6-2.

I fully appreciate that no-one in the church is likely to be led astray by the false doctrines of infant baptism and baptism as part of salvation but, as indicated, I think that it is useful for the church to be informed of the underlying issues.

Yours in the Lord Jesus Christ etc.

The note was sent on August 11th 2011. At the time of writing, a month later, no reply has been received.

As indicated in **Quote 69**, the widespread influence of Liddell, Scott etc. is as Paul prophesied in 2 Timothy 2:17 **“their word will eat as doth a canker.”**

Scrivener’s influence, for the reasons given, is potentially worse than that of Liddell and Scott and Dr Mrs Riplinger has sought to provide fair warning. Dr DiVietro’s attempts to obstruct her warning rightly merit the Lord’s rebuke of Luke 11:52, especially since Dr DiVietro fancies himself as a lawyer, *Cleaning-Up* p 18.

“Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered.”

Quote 93, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 582

Quote 93 lists many of the ungodly individuals with whom Scrivener collaborated on the RV committee.

Dr DiVietro excuses Scrivener’s wilful sinful associations on the basis that, in Dr DiVietro’s view, Scrivener stood honestly for the TR, opposed alternative i.e. Westcott-Hort readings at many points and largely succeeded in providing what Dr DiVietro terms the accurate Greek text underlying the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament, with only a few minor departures. The significance of these supposed few minor departures will be addressed in more detail under **Quote 95**.

For now, it should be noted that wilful sinful associations are never excused in scripture. The scriptural position is entirely the reverse.

“Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them” Romans 16:17.

“Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you” 2 Corinthians 6:14-17. See also **Quote(s) 87**.

Dr DiVietro, as was noted under **Quote 92**, does not refer to Scrivener’s Greek New Testament as inspired. However, his comments are largely evasive in that this chapter of *Hazardous Materials* is not aimed at Scrivener’s view of the TR or the quality of his Greek New Testament.

Dr DiVietro has therefore misled his readers yet again, in having bypassed Dr Mrs Riplinger’s explanatory statement in the paragraph immediately before that which contains **Quote 93**:

“Many use a Greek New Testament (Textus Receptus Variety) edited by Church of England vicar, Frederick Ambrose Scrivener (A.D. 1813-1891). This chapter will examine his aberrant beliefs about the Bible and the grave omissions he recommended for his English Revised Version (RV) of 1881. The next chapter will document the erroneous changes he made to his own edition of the Greek Textus Receptus (KJB/Beza hybrid) used by conservative Christians.”

This chapter, Chapter 17 of *Hazardous Materials*, is entitled *Scrivener’s Textual Heresies*. Dr DiVietro not only fails to inform his readers of this revealing title but avoids addressing any of Scrivener’s heresies *that impinge directly on verses of scripture*. See **Quote 92**.

Dr DiVietro’s response to Chapter 17 of *Hazardous Materials* is therefore quite feeble but the remainder of it covers **Quotes 93-103**, which will be addressed in turn.

Concerning **Quote 93**, neither Frederick Scrivener nor Dr DiVietro has obeyed Paul’s admonition in Romans 12:17 to ***“Provide things honest in the sight of all men”*** with respect to Scrivener’s stand for the TR, for which he did *not* stand honestly, as Dr Mrs Riplinger, her

emphasis, shows in these *well-documented* statements from immediately before and after **Quote 93** that Dr DiVietro bypassed. See also **Quote 92**.

“From 1872 until its completion in 1880, Scrivener was a member of the Westcott and Hort committee which hatched the corrupt Revised Version and a corrupt new Greek text. Scrivener referred to Westcott and Hort as “two of the best scholars of this age”.*”

*See again from **Quote 86** the reference to Isaiah 59:5.

“They hatch cockatrice’ eggs, and weave the spider’s web: he that eateth of their eggs dieth, and that which is crushed breaketh out into a viper.”

It could be said that Dean Burgon’s *The Revision Revised* ‘crushed’ the **“cockatrice’ eggs”** of the Westcott-Hort Greek Text and their RV but many **“a viper”** has nevertheless broken out from the remains, as *New Age Versions* reveals. Moreover, many a Christian ministry has effectively died or at best **“pineth away”** Mark 9:18 from the **“cockatrice’ eggs”** of Westcott and Hort. See *The History Of The New Testament Church Volume II 1600 A. D.* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Chapter 17 *The Last Days Of The New Testament Church*. See also the note without reply under **Quote 92** on Acts 8:37.

Quote 93 follows, after which Dr Mrs Riplinger makes this telling statement.

“For his “thirty pieces of silver,” Scrivener betrayed whatever conscience he had and joined this wicked band [the RV committee], receiving a pension beginning in 1872. (Encyclopedia Britannica, New York: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., 11th edition, 1911, Vol. 3, p 903; F.H.A. Scrivener, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 4th edit., 1997 reprint of 1894 George Bell and Sons, Vol. 2, p. 242; The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1911, Vol. 10, p. 310).”

In his pursuit of the pottage of a pension, Genesis 26:29-34, Hebrews 12:16, 17, Scrivener disobeyed 1 Peter 5:2.

“Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind;”

Scrivener of course didn’t **“Feed the flock of God”** but was as one **“Which goeth in company with the workers of iniquity, and walketh with wicked men”** Job 34:8 in order to *poison* the flock with **“cockatrice’ eggs.”**

In the light of 1 Peter 2:5, 9, Revelation 2:15 and the false doctrine of ‘originals onlyism’ via ‘the word in the Greek’ *theopneustos*, see **Quote 86**, Dr DiVietro has effectively followed Scrivener by disobeying 1 Peter 5:3.

“Neither as being lords over God’s heritage, but being ensamples to the flock.”

Quote 94, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 583

Most of **Quote 94** consists of Scrivener’s statement from his book *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611) Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives* to the effect that, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphasis, **“the substitution of the RV for the KJB would be on the whole, for the better.”** Scrivener stated that in the space of a generation, the RV would have superseded the KJB.

Following an ellipsis, Dr DiVietro includes this statement in **Quote 94**, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphasis.

“Scrivener is *not* an admirer of the King James Bible.”

Dr DiVietro states in response to **Quote 94** that neither Scrivener's contempt for the 1611 Holy Bible nor his character, associations, or philosophy has any bearing on the accuracy of his Greek text as representing that of the KJB New Testament. Dr DiVietro concludes his comments on **Quote 94** by stating that the value of Scrivener's text may be gauged by translating it into English and comparing the result with the KJB New Testament.

Again, Dr DiVietro has bypassed the main point of Chapter 17 of *Hazardous Materials* from which **Quote 94** is extracted, which is to disclose Scrivener's textual heresies, not the deficiencies of his Greek text as Dr Mrs Riplinger makes plain in her opening statement for the chapter. See **Quote 93**. Yet again - see **Quotes 29, 40, Quote(s) 87** - Proverbs 11:1 comes to mind with respect to Dr DiVietro's evasiveness.

"A false balance is abomination to the LORD: but a just weight is his delight."

Dr DiVietro would have to address the verses that Scrivener sought to excise from the 1611 Holy Bible that are listed under **Quote 92** in order to provide **"a just weight"** in his comments on Chapter 17 of *Hazardous Materials*. He completely fails to do so. In sum, his comments on Chapter 17 of *Hazardous Materials* via **Quotes 92-103** are therefore **"abomination to the LORD."**

Dr DiVietro's comments on Scrivener's Greek text under **Quote 94** are, as usual, totally unsubstantiated and amount to little more than sheer speculation.

It should be noted that yet again, see **Quote 93**, Dr DiVietro does not refer to Scrivener's Greek text as 'inspired,' which is spiritual cowardice on his part, given his support for 'the Greek' as 'inspired' in *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3, 18, 20-21 – see related remarks under **Quote 95**. Even if he does not accept the *printed* Greek texts as the final authority, by his own profession, Dr DiVietro ought to have enough faith in 'the Greek' to declare openly at least *which parts* of Scrivener's Greek text are 'inspired,' if he truly believes that such an 'inspired' Greek text exists today within the matching portions of the Received Text editions (though such an 'inspired' Greek text, or part thereof, is still unspecified by Dr DiVietro as a single document between two covers). See **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

Dr DiVietro fails to do so and thereby he incurs the judgement of Hebrews 10:38.

"Now the just shall live by faith: but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him."

It is ironic, of course, indeed bizarre, that yet again, according to Dr DiVietro, the 'uninspired' KJB must be used as the standard for testing the accuracy of, according to Dr DiVietro, the most accurate representation of the 'inspired' Greek text, i.e. Scrivener's, even though Dr DiVietro does not refer to Scrivener's text as 'inspired.' See **Quote 92** and **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

In reality, with respect to **Quote 94**, the accuracy, or otherwise, of Scrivener's Greek text and the means of assessing it to which Dr DiVietro alludes, are totally irrelevant. See Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement from *In Awe of Thy Word* p 956 under **Quote(s) 90** and note again the application of Hebrews 8:13.

"Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away."

As indicated in **Quote(s) 90**, the above scripture may well prove to be the epitaph of **The DBS, Dead Bible Society**.

Quote 95, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 590

Quote 95 is the leading paragraph on p 590 of *Hazardous Materials* consisting of a citation from Scrivener to the effect that he did not believe that New Testament manuscripts could be copied without error.

Dr DiVietro belittles the citation, stating that no-one believes in the infallibility of Greek manuscripts. He then says dogmatically that God providentially preserved the text of the New Testament perfectly, by means of all the resources available that bear witness to it.

Scrivener's statement is of course at variance with the thorough researches of other textual scholars whose conclusions Dr Mrs Riplinger summarises in *New Age Versions* Chapter 34 *The Majority Text* e.g. "[Zane C. Hodges] writes, *"The Majority text, it must be remembered, is relatively uniform in its general character with comparatively low amounts of variation between its major representatives...[T]he majority of MSS in the transmission of any book will, a priori preserve the best text. Thus the Majority Text, upon which the King James Version is based, has in reality the strongest claim possible to be regarded as an authentic representation of the original text...based on its dominances in the transmissional history of the New Testament text."*

See also *Early Manuscripts And The Authorized Version, A Closer Look!* by J. A. Moorman for direct evidence of the relative uniformity of the majority of manuscripts in contradistinction to Scrivener's statement.

Dr DiVietro's comment on the non-infallibility of Greek manuscripts and the implications of his comment with respect to the perfect, inspired, preserved, original Greek New Testament text that the DBS Executive Committee professes to have but fails to specify between two covers will be addressed at the end of this section on *Quote 95*.

For now, it should be noted that Dr DiVietro overlooks the main reason why Dr Mrs Riplinger included the citation from Scrivener, according to the title of the section where it is found, "**Scrivener Denies Preservation**" *Hazardous Materials* p 589. Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals on p 588 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphases, Scrivener's denial of providential preservation of the scriptures together with his apparent intentions with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible.

She substantiates Scrivener's attempts at subverting the 1611 Holy Bible in considerable detail in the rest of the chapter and in Chapter 18 immediately following. Dr DiVietro's blanket assurance about God's preservation of the perfect New Testament (that Dr DiVietro still does not identify as a book between two covers) is beside the point of the chapter. The point of the chapter is Scrivener's cankerous influence 2 Timothy 2:17 on belief in the 1611 Holy Bible as "**all scripture**" that "**is given by inspiration of God.**"

Dr DiVietro either missed that point or wilfully ignored it. The citation from p 588 of *Hazardous Materials* follows.

"If given free [rein], Scrivener would pock-mark the King James Bible and the Received Greek text. Once he has infected the Bible with the virus of textual criticism, he boasts,

*"**Certain passages, it may be, will no longer be available to establish doctrines...**" (Scrivener, *Six Lectures*, p. 119)."*

Dr DiVietro ignored that warning about Scrivener's antagonism to the 1611 Holy Bible. Again, he is like the hireling in John 10:12 because Chapters 17, 18 of *Hazardous Materials* show that Scrivener was certainly intent on scattering the sheep.

“But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep.”

See also *Quotes 54, 60*.

Inspection of *Quotes 96-141* that cover the remainder of the material on Scrivener in Chapters 17, 18 of *Hazardous Materials* shows that Dr DiVietro does not directly address Scrivener’s evil intent as manifested by his textual heresies and the textual distortions of his TR edition. Dr DiVietro is therefore also a hireling in that respect.

However, he seeks to justify his support of Scrivener and his on-going attack on Sister Ripplinger because Scrivener’s departures from the text of the 1611 Holy Bible appear to number less than 100, *Hazardous Materials* p 654 and Dr DiVietro appears to perceive them as insignificant. See *Quotes 93, 103, 105*.

Contrary to Dr DiVietro’s ***“vain words”*** about which Paul warns in Ephesians 5:6, Bro. Peter Heisey, missionary to Romania, has revealed that a full collation of Scrivener’s Greek text against the KJB New Testament has not yet been carried out and that such a comparison may yield a far higher number of departures from the KJB in Scrivener’s text than 100.

In the meantime, Bro. Heisey has brought together a considerable volume of evidence showing how Scrivener was implicated in subverting belief in both the 1611 Holy Bible and the Received Text editions from which its New Testament was drawn i.e. those of Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza etc., by means of his own ***“private interpretation”*** 2 Peter 1:20 of what, in his opinion, the Greek New Testament text *should* say (or not say). This material will be included in a separate section of this work entitled *Quotes 105-141, An Overview*, following the response to KD’s comments under *Quote 141*. *Quotes 105-141* cover Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* that addresses Scrivener’s Greek New Testament Text and these quotes are found in *Cleaning-Up* pp 192-222.

Returning to *Quote 95*, Dr DiVietro forgot Galatians 5:9 ***“A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump,”*** see *Quote 86* and Song of Solomon 2:15 ***“Take us the foxes, the little foxes, that spoil the vines:”*** See *Quote 92* and the enclosed note to the fundamentalist pastor for an example of the eventual effect of ***“A little leaven”*** and ***“the little foxes”*** that was equivalent to the ***“sapping and mining process”*** about which Bishop Ryle warned. See *Quote 84*. That example, in this author’s view, could be replicated many times in this country (the UK). See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ for further extensive documentation.

James 3:5 should also be kept in mind in this context.

“Even so the tongue is a little member” yet ***“Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth!”***

As an example of James 3:5, observe how ***“Behold, how great a matter”*** was kindled by ***“a little member”*** with respect to Genesis 2:16, 17 and Genesis 3:2, 3, namely THE FALL, Genesis 3:6, 7, Romans 5:12.

“And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.”

“And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.”

Note also Genesis 3:1 in this context.

“Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, **Ye** shall not eat of every tree of the garden?”

Note that **13 key words** in Genesis 2:16-17 are significantly affected in the ‘Revised Version’ of Genesis 3:2-3.

“**Freely**” is omitted.

“**Of the knowledge of good and evil**” is changed to “**which is in the midst of the garden.**”

“**Thou**” is entirely omitted and replaced on 3 occasions by “**ye.**” Note that “**the serpent**” is the first speaker to introduce the word “**ye**” in the conversation between Eve and himself.

“**Surely**” is omitted.

Moreover, **5 unwarranted words** are added in Genesis 3:2-3.

“**Neither shall ye touch it.**”

13 + 5 = 18, 6 + 6 + 6, 666, Revelation **13:18**

All those numbers, 5, 6, 13, 18, are scripturally significant and they point to “**the wiles of the devil**” Ephesians 6:11 and to “**him that had the power of death, that is, the devil;**” Hebrews 2:14. See *Bible Numerics* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, pp 14-23, 36-37.

In sum, therefore, concerning “**a little leaven,**” “**little foxes,**” “**a little member**” and “**a little fire,**” 18 words in total are significantly affected between Genesis 2:16, 17 and Genesis 3:2, 3.

This total is much smaller than the 100 or so of Scrivener’s departures from the text of the 1611 Holy Bible *minimum*, see above, yet “**Behold, how great a matter a little fire kin-dleth!**”

See again Genesis 3:6-24 and Romans 5:12.

“**Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned:**”

It is therefore the height of presumption on the part of Dr DiVietro to dismiss Scrivener’s departures from the text of the 1611 Holy Bible as minor. He forgot Psalm 19:13.

“**Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins; let them not have dominion over me: then shall I be upright, and I shall be innocent from the great transgression.**”

Such as ‘originals onlyism.’

It should be noted further in this context that like any alterations to “**the scripture of truth**” Daniel 10:21, the alterations from Genesis 2:16, 17 to Genesis 3:2, 3 are misleading and/or inferior. Genesis 2:9 indicates that “**the tree of life**” was “**in the midst of the garden**” not “**the tree of knowledge of good and evil**” and it is the *identity* of “**the tree of knowledge of good and evil**” that is significant, not its location.

The expression “**thou shalt surely die**” is certain. The expression “**lest ye die**” is probable instead of certain. Even where the expression “**lest ye die**” occurs elsewhere in scripture; Leviticus 10:6, 7, 9, Numbers 18:32, it is as a solemn warning instead of an absolute certainty. “**Strong drink**” was the likely reason that Nadab and Abihu “**offered strange fire before the LORD, which he commanded them not**” but it was the offering, not the drinking that actually got them killed, Leviticus 10:1, 2.

In Genesis 3:2, 3, therefore, Eve *lied*. *That is the effect*, as 1 Corinthians 15:33 emphasises, of dialogue with him of whom the Lord Jesus Christ warned in John 8:44 ***“he is a liar, and the father of it.”***

In addition, the expression ***“thou shalt surely die”*** shows that God would see Adam and Eve as ***“one flesh”*** Genesis 2:24, 3:20, whereas the expression ***“lest ye die”*** shows that *in dialogue with Devil*, Genesis 3:1, Revelation 12:9, Eve *perceived herself* as ***“not the same flesh”*** 1 Corinthians 15:39 as her husband, i.e. as a ‘liberated’ woman. That is, even if it took many years to manifest its ***“corrupt fruit”*** Luke 6:43, the satanic feminist movement therefore gets off to an early start. Eve never uses the word ***“thou”*** with respect to God’s commands to Adam and herself but instead changes ***“thou”*** to ***“ye”*** *three times* from Genesis 2:17 to Genesis 3:3 with respect to what ***“God hath said”*** according to God and ***“what God hath said”*** according to Eve.

It should be emphasised that *God* did not ‘update’ ***“thou”*** in Genesis 2:17 after Genesis 2:21-25 to ***“ye”*** in Genesis 3:3, *Eve did*. What is more, Eve fell for the power of satanic suggestion because, as indicated above, ***“the serpent”*** first used the term ***“ye”*** in the conversation between Eve and himself. ***“The serpent”*** had no regard for God’s perception of Adam and Eve as ***“one flesh”*** Genesis 2:24. Neither does he have any such regard now, as Paul indicates in 1 Timothy 5:14-15. Note the stark contrast between the verses.

“I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully. For some are already turned aside after Satan.”

Researcher Texe Marrs has a very informative study on the feminists aka femi-Nazis, ***“already turned aside after Satan”*** in power during the Clinton era entitled *Big Sister Is Watching You*. Marrs’s work shows how far ***“a little leaven”*** has come from the threefold change of ***“thou”*** to ***“ye”*** from Genesis 2:17 to Genesis 3:3.

The leading big sister of that era is now the 67th US Secretary of State for Barack Hussein Obama²³². It should be noted that $6 + 7 = 13$ and B-a-r-a-c-k H-u-s-s-e-i-n O-b-a-m-a = 18, 666. That demonic duo is almost a picture in type of Revelation 17:3.

“So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns.”

The femi-Nazis, it should be emphasised, are poles apart from the intrepid ***“Bible women”*** of the latter part of the 19th century who laboured assiduously to combat squalor and degradation in the appalling city slums of Victorian Britain and the United States and bring salvation to the destitute.

““Our ammunition of war consisted of a broom, a scrubbing brush, a pail and a [King James] Bible” said one of the ***“Bible women.”***

See *The Book of Books* by English writer Melvyn Bragg, Chapter 23 *The Bible and Women*. Bragg, who was brought up in the Church of England, is not a King James Bible believer and may not even be a saved man but his admiration for the 1611 Holy Bible far exceeds that of many fundamental Christians in this country and his praise for the Book as an instrument for global good in the face of fierce opposition even at the highest levels of government, is unreserved.

All modern version editors, therefore, who substitute ***“you,” “your”*** etc. for ***“thee,” “thine,” “thou”*** reinforce modern satanic feminism that has its ungodly roots in Genesis 3:1, 3.

Paul rightly rebukes them, ***“whose damnation is just”*** Romans 3:8.

The remainder of Dr DiVietro's comments on *Quote 95* are, as usual, little more than vague generalities. He fails utterly to enlighten his readers about either God's preservation process for "*all scripture*" that "*is given by inspiration of God*" or the actual identity of the perfect, presumably inspired New Testament that Dr DiVietro states has been providentially preserved.

Dr DiVietro's failure in this respect is in stark contrast with the detailed documentation that Dr Mrs Riplinger provides in *In Awe of Thy Word* Part Six. His repeated superficiality towards his readers brings to mind Luke 11:46, again since Dr DiVietro fancies himself as a lawyer, *Cleaning-Up* p 18. See *Quote 92*.

"And he said, Woe unto you also, ye lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers."

Finally on *Quote 95*, note again Dr DiVietro's admission that the extant Greek manuscripts are not infallible and see *Quote 86* with respect to the observation that the DBS Executive Committee rejects all Bible translations as finally authoritative with respect to its perception of the original, inspired text of scripture and, for the New Testament, all published Greek texts as finally authoritative with respect to its perception of the original, inspired Greek New Testament. See *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3, 18, 21 and now p 187.

These admissions by the DBS Executive Committee have significant implications with respect to its notion of the perfect, inspired 'original' text of scripture, as the following points reveal, including material from later quotes in *Cleaning-Up*.

According the DBS Executive Committee, therefore, as set forth by Dr DiVietro in *Cleaning-Up*, evidently with the professed full support of his Executive Committee colleagues, as seen in the *Preface*:

- Bible translations are not finally authoritative, never will be and are definitely not inspired.
- No Bible translation is perfect, even if 100% accurately translated and never will be. See *Quote(s) 175*, *Cleaning-Up* p 249.
- Published Greek texts are not the final authority.
- Extant Greek manuscripts are not infallible.
- No printed Greek or Hebrew text is inerrant. See *Quote 171*, *Cleaning-Up* p 247.

Yet those resources are effectively all that are available to anyone seeking to know the contents of both the Old and New Testaments.

So once again, the questions must be raised, where are these perfect, inspired, finally authoritative Hebrew and Greek Old and New Testaments respectively that the DBS Executive Committee declares are/were providentially preserved and how can copies for the whole Body of Christ be obtained?

Dr DiVietro doesn't answer. He and his DBS Executive Committee cronies are "***Ye which rejoice in a thing of nought***" Amos 6:13.

Quote 96, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 592

*“Scrivener came to see before he passed away that the **received text could not be supported so unconditionally as he had once thought. But he expressed himself less distinctly in public...**”*

Dr DiVietro has only a very brief comment to the effect that Scrivener appears to have been a hypocrite but it does not seem to bother him.

Dr DiVietro has been extremely remiss with respect to his sole comment on **Quote 96**, which is actually a quote from Casper Gregory and is set in the context of Scrivener’s “*sapping and mining process*” against the 1611 Holy Bible that Dr DiVietro should have explicitly deplored. See again **Quote 92**.

Quote 96 is taken from the section in *Hazardous Materials* entitled “**From Textus Receptus to Scrivener’s Own “Truth”**.” Dr Mrs Riplinger states on p 591 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphases:

*“Scrivener established a reputation as a moderate ‘critic’ with his early collations and editions of A Plain Introduction. Having read his **early** works, many today do not realize the mindset he later developed. Scrivener’s books became more and more critical of the KJB and “Received text,” wanting to “set it aside” in certain places. This occurred between 1861 and 1875, particularly between 1874 and 1875 as he worked with the RV committee. Marvin R. Vincent, in his A History of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament said that, “His [Scrivener’s] experience led him gradually to modify his views on some points and to make some concessions. At the time of his death he was moving in the direction of the **substitution of the older, uncial text for that of the Textus Receptus**. He gave up 1 John 5:7, 8 and decided for [who] against...[God] in 1 Timothy 3:16...”*

Dr DiVietro ignores the above citation.

It should be noted in passing that Scrivener’s associations with the RV committee seem to have caused him to forsake the admonition of Proverbs 13:20.

“He that walketh with wise men shall be wise: but a companion of fools shall be destroyed.”

Scrivener’s associations with Bible rejecters certainly destroyed him as a Bible believer.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states further on p 593 of *Hazardous Materials* under the section “**From Textus Receptus to Scrivener’s Own “Truth”**,” citing Scrivener’s *A Plain Introduction*, her emphases:

*“Scrivener sets aside many verses saying, “[We] are compelled in the cause of **truth** to make one stipulation more: namely, that this rule be henceforth applied impartially in all cases, as well when it will tell in favour of **the Received text**, as when **it shall help to set it aside**” (Scrivener *A Plain*, Vol. 2, p. 300).”*

Dr DiVietro ignores the above citation.

Dr Mrs Riplinger shows further with actual citations from Philip Schaff, *Hazardous Materials* p 595 her emphases that Scrivener ““*In the second edition of his Introduction (1874), and still more in his **later** Six Lectures on the Text of the New Testament (1875),...already **departs** in some very important cases **from the textus receptus**, as in 1 Tim iii 16; 1 John v. 7, 8; Matt. xvii. 21; xix. 17; Mark iv. 20; xv. 28; Luke xi. 2, 4; John v. [3-4]; vii. 53-viii. 11; Acts xvi. 7; Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Pet. iii. 15; Heb. iv. 2. Even the doxology of the Lord’s Prayer (Matt. vi. 13) he now thinks “can hardly be upheld any longer as a portion of the sacred text...”*”

Dr DiVietro ignores the above citation – and the obvious conclusion.

Scrivener wasn't simply a hypocrite. He was a HERETIC. That is what **Quote 96** highlights. Dr DiVietro's failure to discern Dr Mrs Riplinger's warning in this respect and in turn to warn *his* readers marks him as **"a companion of fools"** as well.

See also **Quote(s) 87** and Proverbs 1:7 **"The fear of the LORD is the beginning of knowledge: but fools despise wisdom and instruction."**

Quote 97, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 598-599

*"...Or as one true believer, Dr. Kirk DiVietro, so aptly expressed in the title of his book, they trust **Anything But the King James Bible.**"*

*"He [Scrivener, KD] paints up the botched Vaticanus with words such as "great" and "this treasure". He insists "codex Vaticanus" belongs in "its rightful place at the head of all our textual authorities." He covers up the fact that the Vaticanus is an upside-down manuscript. In Matt. 27:28 the true text says, "And they stripped him," but the Vaticanus says "And they clothed him." Why don't new versions tell you **that** in their margins?"*

Dr DiVietro has little to say under **Quote 97**, simply reiterating that the Vaticanus manuscript is very flawed.

Dr Mrs Riplinger's remark with respect to Dr DiVietro is reminiscent of her invitation to him to co-labour with her. See *Cleaning-Up* p xiii and remarks under **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint**. As this work has shown throughout, her graciousness has not been reciprocated by the DBS Executive Committee. Its members are not good men because they are not reasonable.

As Dr Bob Jones Snr said in his *Chapel Sayings*, *"Beware of unreasonable people. Good men are always reasonable."*

Dr DiVietro may not be among those who trust *anything* other the King James Bible but he is certainly among those who will trust *some* things other the King James Bible. See **Quote 85** and material on John 11:33 at the end of **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** and **Challenges #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints**.

Dr DiVietro is, in effect, lukewarm Revelation 3:16, just as Scrivener was and it is this danger about which Dr Mrs Riplinger, her emphases, warns in this statement that closely follows the first part of **Quote 97**, which warning lukewarm Dr DiVietro fails to pass on to his readers. See also *Hazardous Materials* pp 596-597.

*"The Holy Bible is not the **very** bread of life, but burnt toast, crumbling word by word. The enemy desires to move Christians off base, to **another** authority, **any other** authority. Scrivener proposed that the Bible be changed. True believers, of course, rejected his RV. However, the lukewarm Scrivener offers a slightly tainted Greek Received text, which makes the KJB look **slightly** wrong (particularly if it translated with RV words from Vine's Dictionary; see upcoming chapter for documentation)."*

All of Dr DiVietro's 'examples' from 'the Greek etc.' for 'clarification' of the KJB make *"the KJB look **slightly** wrong."* He should reflect on Ecclesiastes 10:1.

"Dead flies cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savour: so doth a little folly him that is in reputation for wisdom and honour."

"A little folly" can be grouped with ***"a little leaven," "little foxes," "a little member"*** and ***"a little fire"*** in its effects. This work suggests, however, that Dr DiVietro has committed at least 'a little more' than ***"a little folly."***

See again **Quote 85**, including remarks on *Serious Problems in D. A. Waite's The Defined King James Bible's Definitions – Defiled & Declined* and material on John 11:33 at the end of **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** and **Challenges #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints**. See also **Quote 86** and the so-called ambiguities and confusing grammar of the 1611 Holy Bible to which Dr DiVietro refers on pp 32, 69, 91, 94-95, 152 of *Cleaning-Up*, which also make “*the KJB look slightly wrong*” and which Dr DiVietro purports to ‘clarify.’

See the note on Acts 8:37 under **Quote(s) 91** for a typical outcome of “*a little folly*” that makes “*the KJB look slightly wrong*.”

See also Dr Waite’s statement from A WARNING!! p 28 about Scrivener’s text as cited in **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society** p 25, this author’s underlining.

P. 28 “*The “Scrivener Greek New Testament” is not “slightly tainted.” I believe the Words in this “Greek New Testament” to be accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words. I believe them to be authentic copies of the original New Testament Words. It is sad that Gail Riplinger refuses to take this same position.*”

Like Dr DiVietro, Dr Waite too is therefore guilty of “*a little folly*” and arguably more than “*a little folly*” as will be shown in the material that addresses **Quotes 105-141** that cover Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* on Scrivener’s Greek New Testament Text.

Concerning the latter part of **Quote 97**, Dr Mrs Riplinger writes on p 598 of *Hazardous Materials* that “*Like the new versions, Scrivener wanted to omit numerous words and verses based on the corrupt old uncials, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. The villainy of these manuscripts was discussed in New Age Versions. Although Scrivener did not worship the corrupt Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts, as did Westcott and Hort, he felt that they were very important witnesses to use when determining readings.*”

Again, Dr DiVietro fails to convey this necessary warning to his readers, a grave oversight that is compounded by the observation that in spite of his disavowal of Vaticanus, Dr DiVietro *has himself been deceived by the old uncials, just as Scrivener was.*

This extract from **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** should be noted.

Dr DiVietro makes the astounding statement, pp 58-59 that the notorious Septuagint makes an invaluable contribution to understanding Hebrew thinking behind Greek New Testament words because, supposedly, it was produced by bilingual Hebrew writers.

*As Dr DiVietro no doubt well knows, today’s Septuagint or LXX is the edition of Sir Lancelot Brenton and consists mainly of the infamous Vaticanus manuscript, Codex B, supplemented where necessary by another Alexandrian manuscript, Codex A or Alexandrinus. The Septuagint, like Vaticanus, contains the Old Testament Apocrypha as part of the Old Testament. Its writers²³³ were Aquilla, Symmachus, Theodotian and Origen. These individuals were Ebionites, who believed in salvation by following the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount and denied the doctrines of salvation that the Spirit of God revealed to Paul, Galatians 1:8-11. See also Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments on Origen in *Hazardous Materials*, pp 93-94. Unlike Dr DiVietro, the scripture does not exhort the Bible believer to learn from such individuals, quite the opposite.*

“Go from the presence of a foolish man, when thou perceivest not in him the lips of knowledge” Proverbs 14:7.

Dr DiVietro’s comments on **Quote 97**, therefore, do not reflect favourably upon him with respect to “*the lips of knowledge*” disseminating on his part the necessary knowledge to his readers.

Quote 98, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 600

“The so-called science of textual criticism was hatched by unbelievers, with Catholic priests at the helm. Scrivener adopted and adapted their methodology and waged his subtle war on the Textus Receptus with many of these “Canons” and “rules” of textual criticism.”

Dr DiVietro makes the limp-wristed objection to **Quote 98** to the effect that Scrivener had no choice in following papal textual criticism apart from refusing to join the RV committee.

Dr DiVietro’s comment immediately begs the question, why didn’t Scrivener take the same stance as Dean John Burgon, who wrote *The Revision Revised* that *denounced* the papal textual criticism that Scrivener followed *along with Westcott and Hort*?

Dean Burgon²³⁴ said plainly of the **“corrupt fruit”** Luke 6:43 of this papal textual criticism that *“We are thoroughly convinced that the project of a rival Translation is not to be entertained for a moment. For ourselves we deprecate it entirely.”*

Scrivener could have taken the same stance.

However, Dr Mrs Riplinger states on p 601 of *Hazardous Materials* that, regrettably, *“Scrivener follows many of the Canons of textual criticism created and used by the worst of textual critics, including Westcott and Hort.”*

Dr DiVietro does not challenge that statement.

The question remains, therefore, why didn’t Scrivener support Dean Burgon with respect to *The Revision Revised*?

Dr Mrs Riplinger provides easily the most likely answer to that question from p 582 of *Hazardous Materials*. See **Quote 93**.

“For his “thirty pieces of silver,” Scrivener betrayed whatever conscience he had and joined this wicked band [the RV committee], receiving a pension beginning in 1872.”

As Paul warns in 1 Timothy 6:10:

“For the love of money is the root of all evil.”

The DBS Executive Committee should take note of the same warning if it is displeased that Sister Riplinger’s researches are compromising its revenues e.g. with respect to **“that same red pottage”** Genesis 25:30 from its sales of *The Defined King James Bible*. See remarks under **Quote 104**.

That may be the reason why Dr DiVietro fails to take the same stand that Burgon did and then point out the tainted elements of Scrivener’s text and why the DBS Executive Committee continues, it seems, to laud Scrivener’s text uncritically and whitewash as *“minor”* his deviations from the exact text underlying the KJB. See **Quote(s) 91, 95**.

It is interesting that under **Quote 98**, Dr DiVietro uses the expression *“the words of God”* with respect to the text, or texts, that the RV committee set about changing and he refers in that context to the text of the King James Bible with the changes made by the RV committee.

Dr DiVietro does not explicitly equate the text of the King James Bible with *“the words of God”* under **Quote 98**, or anywhere else in his book thus far but perhaps he has incurred a so-called Freudian Slip²³⁵, or come dangerously close to it, given his earlier comments about the KJB as simply **“the word of men”** 1 Thessalonians 2:13. See **Quote(s) 91**.

He should therefore keep in mind the stern admonition of his superior on the DBS Executive Committee, from *A WARNING!!* p 36, this author’s underling. See **Quote(s) 91**.

“Neither the DBS Executive Committee or the DBS Advisory Council will ever call the King James Bible “inspired of God,” “given by inspiration of God,” “verbally inspired,” “inspired,” or “God-breathed” at any time or in any place.”

It is to be hoped that for his sake, Dr DiVietro minds his terminology in the rest of his book. He would not appreciate being sent to Coventry²³⁶ with the Riplingerites, Ruckmanites and other assorted King James ‘Inspirationalistites.’

Dr Waite, it should be noted, speaking no doubt for the DBS Executive Committee, uses the incorrect term “*Word of God*” capital W* John 1:1, 14, 1 John 1:1, 5:7, Revelation 19:13 instead of small w Luke 4:4, 11:28, Romans 10:17, 2 Corinthians 2:17, 4:2, Ephesians 6:17, 1 Thessalonians 2:13, Hebrews 4:12, Revelation 1:2 etc., for the scriptures, see *Quotes 1, 34*, in *A WARNING!!* p 33. See **Dr D. A. Waite and *The DBS, Dead Bible Society*** p 47. However, regardless of whatever terminology used by the DBS Executive Committee, it has still yet to specify “*the scripture of truth*” Daniel 10:21 between two covers.

*Other writers e.g. Norris, Ryle, **Dr D. A. Waite and *The DBS, Dead Bible Society*** pp 59, 60 also use the expression “*Word of God*” for the scriptures. The difference is that their hearts appear to be right with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible whereas those of the DBS Executive Committee members, by and large, clearly are not.

Quote 99, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 603

“There are well over 5300 manuscripts of the Greek New Testament extant today. Scrivener on the other hand said that there were only “eighteen hundred to two thousand.” This shows that Scrivener was dealing with much less than half of what is available today.”

Dr DiVietro has only a brief comment to the effect that over 5500 Greek New Testament manuscripts are known to exist today but that Scrivener still correctly opposed many of Westcott and Hort’s changes to the New Testament by means of the manuscript resources that he possessed at the time.

Dr DiVietro’s evaluation of the number of extant manuscripts doesn’t invalidate Dr Mrs Riplinger’s estimate so that it is difficult to see why he included it, except for the purpose of carping. Again, he fails to substantiate his comment under **Quote 99** in that he provides no examples whatsoever of the Westcott-Hort changes that he says that Scrivener opposed.

Dr DiVietro has again overlooked the purpose of Chapter 17, which is to reveal Scrivener’s textual heresies and *collusion* with Westcott and Hort, including his rejection of KJB readings that have since been shown to have very early witnesses, as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows on p 603, her emphases. See also **Quote 96** for the citation from Schaff.

*“[Scrivener] questions KJB readings which have now been vindicated by ancient papyri, some as early as A. D. 175. Examples include John 7:8 (P66 and P75), 2 Peter 2:13 (P72), and Acts 10:30 (P50). (See Philip Comfort’s *Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations.*)”*

It is significant, therefore, that Dr DiVietro’s next quote, **Quote 100**, is an extract from p 621 of *Hazardous Materials*. In addition to the KJB readings listed under **Quotes 92, 96** that Scrivener sought to excise from the New Testament, see below, and which Dr DiVietro fails to mention, Dr Mrs Riplinger shows on the 20 pages of *Hazardous Materials* that Dr DiVietro bypassed, pp 601-621, that Scrivener sought to cut out many further KJB readings, according to his *Six Lectures* that Dr Mrs Riplinger cites.

Passages of scripture with KJB readings that Scrivener sought to cut out of the New Testament that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists in *Hazardous Materials* pp 580, 594-595, 601 in turn, i.e. the pages covered between **Quotes 92-99** of *Cleaning-Up*, are as follows.

Luke 2:22, John 7:8, Acts 8:37, 16:7, 1 Corinthians 11:24, Colossians 2:2, 1 Timothy 3:16, 1 Peter 3:15, 1 John 5:7-8, Matthew 6:13, 17:21, 19:17, Mark 4:20, 15:28, Luke 11:2, 4, John 5:[3-4], 7:53-8:11, Romans 16:5, Hebrews 4:2, Acts 9:5-6. The list totals 21 passages of scripture, 35 verses in all.

Dr Mrs Riplinger mentions Mark 16:9-20 and Luke 2:14 on p 597 of *Hazardous Materials*, 13 verses that Scrivener defended for the KJB among others but she cautions that “[Scrivener] was the consummate ‘politician.’ To please both the believer in the pew and the ‘scholar’ in the school, Scrivener gives up the dividing “sword of the spirit” for his mixing spinning ‘spoon of the spirit,’ whereby he hopes “critics of very opposite sympathies are learning to agree better” (Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, Vol. 1, p. 6).”

Dr Mrs Riplinger shows that Scrivener’s “mixing spinning ‘spoon of the spirit,’” is “Hegel’s dialectic” deployed to leaven “**the scripture of truth**” Daniel 10:21.

Dr DiVietro fails utterly to inform his readers of that vitally important warning.

Additional passages of scripture with KJB readings that Scrivener sought to cut out of the New Testament or deform that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists in *Hazardous Materials* pp 602-624, i.e. the pages covered between **Quotes 99-100** of *Cleaning-Up*, are as follows.

Matthew 9:13, 16:2, 3, 23:24, 27:35, Mark 2:17, 6:20, 7:19, Acts 10:30, 11:20, 13:18, 15:34, Romans 13:9, 1 Corinthians 7:5, 11:29, Philippians 2:1, Hebrews 10:23, 12:20, James 4:4, 2 Peter 2:13. This list totals 20 verses.

The two lists of Chapter 17 of *Hazardous Materials* give a combined total of 41 passages of scripture, 55 verses in all, with KJB readings that Scrivener sought to alter or cut out altogether from the English New Testament. By inspection, many of the verses that Scrivener aimed to adulterate bear witness to *major doctrine* yet Dr DiVietro passes no comment on Scrivener’s proposed mutilations of the 1611 Holy Bible whatsoever.

Instead, Dr DiVietro continues to defend Scrivener just as he did Liddell and Scott. See **Quotes 62, 64, 67, Quote(s) 63, 87**. However, he fails to list *any* KJB readings that Scrivener was prepared to support against Westcott and Hort, whereas Dr Mrs Riplinger did at least specifically mention 13; Mark 16:9-20, Luke 2:14. See above.

Dr DiVietro’s silence on these matters is the same as Scrivener’s subterfuge. They have both encouraged “**the enemies of the cross of Christ**” Philippians 3:18 to “**ravin as a wolf**” Genesis 49:27 against “**the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation**” Ephesians 1:13.

Quote 100, *Hazardous Materials*, p 621

“Evil? – the main text of the majority of manuscripts? The KJB translators placed it in italics out of caution as they did many other words which have since been found to have Greek manuscript evidence.”

Quote 100 concerns 1 John 2:23, which is the only verse from the 50+ scriptures addressed in Chapter 17 of *Hazardous Materials* about which Dr DiVietro sees fit to say anything specifically. His main comment is a mere technical one however, about the last clause of 1 John 2:23 being added in conformity with the requirements of Greek grammar but he takes the opportunity to accuse Sister Riplinger of implying that the words are unnecessary and that the King James translators were not sure that they should be included.

Dr DiVietro has bypassed the point of **Quote 100**, possibly because he overlooked the citation from Scrivener immediately above **Quote 100**, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphasis.

“Scrivener adds, “We note this as an instance of the *evil* consequences ensuing on the exclusive adherence to modern Greek manuscripts upon the part of our earliest editors.””

Dr Mrs Riplinger rightly deplores Scrivener’s dismissal of “*the main text of the majority of manuscripts*” as ““*evil*.”” Dr DiVietro should have the integrity to do so as well, otherwise he becomes one of those who “*have walked contrary unto me*” Leviticus 26:40 because he has failed to apply 1 Timothy 5:20 in a case where Paul’s admonition definitely should be applied, even if only to the works of the individual concerned, namely Scrivener.

“Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear.”

Specific aspects of Scrivener’s text will be addressed under **Quotes 105-141** that cover Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* on Scrivener’s Greek New Testament Text. See **Quote 96**.

Concerning the remainder of Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote 100**, his accusation against Sister Riplinger, like all his accusations against her that have been addressed in this work, is unjust. He has also missed the sense of her statement in **Quote 100**.

She uses the word “*caution*” in the same way that Dr Hills²³⁷ makes his comments on 1 John 2:23 with respect to the manner in which the King James translator’s dealt with the second half of the verse.

“[A]t 1 John 2:23 the King James translators followed the Great Bible and the Bishops’ Bible in adding the clause, *he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also*, and in placing the clause in italics, thus indicating that it was not found in the majority of the Greek manuscripts or in the earlier editions of the Textus Receptus. Beza included it, however, in his later editions, and it is found in the Latin Vulgate and in Aleph [Sinaiticus] and B [Vaticanus]. Hence modern versions have removed the italics and given the clause full status. The Bishops’ Bible and the King James Version join this clause to the preceding by the word *but*, taken from Wyclif. With customary scrupulosity the King James translators enclosed this *but* in brackets, thus indicating that it was not properly speaking part of the text but merely a help in translation.”

As honest translators, the King’s men exercised ‘caution’ only in pin-pointing that the clause was not found in the bulk of their Greek witnesses, including the published Greek texts available to them. The fact that they included the second part of 1 John 2:23 *against* the essentially *negative* witness of their Greek sources suggests to this author that the King’s men actually had a considerable degree of confidence that the words *should* be in the scripture, which is contrary to Dr DiVietro’s accusation against Sister Riplinger.

Dr DiVietro has therefore again been shown to have falsely accused her.

Note from *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 532ff that the King’s men had a wide range of sources to consult, including many trustworthy vernacular Bibles in a variety of languages that enabled them to overcome any inadequacies in the Greek texts and manuscripts available to them. ‘The Greek’ was but one witness to the text of the New Testament for them. See remarks under **Quote(s) 87** for the “*excellent way*” in which the King James translators did their work.

See also note at the end of this section for more material on 1 John 2:23 that gives further insight into why the King’s men had considerable justification for their confidence in the words “*he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also*” as part of “*the scripture of truth*” Daniel 10:21.

It should also be noted that according to the Trinitarian Bible Society’s *Quarterly Record*, October-December 1975, No. 453, the reason for the words “*he that acknowledgeth the Son*

hath the Father also” being placed in italics is “To indicate that a word or clause is of doubtful authority as a matter of textual criticism. According to Scrivener* there is only one such instance in the Canonical Books in the A. V. e.g. 1 John 2:23 “But he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also”. The translators were aware that there was an omission in the Greek manuscripts available to them and correctly supplied what was lacking from the Latin Vulgate...”

*This conclusion would appear to have been drawn from Scrivener’s earlier work. See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement under **Quote 96** “Having read his *early* works, many today do not realize the mindset he later developed. Scrivener’s books became more and more critical of the KJB and “Received text,” wanting to “set it aside” in certain places.”

The article has been summarised from Section III of Scrivener’s book *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611) Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*.

The TBS-speak would suggest that the expression “doubtful authority” refers to paucity of Greek witnesses, certainly at the time when work was in progress on the 1611 Holy Bible, not uncertainty on the part of the King James translators, about which Dr DiVietro unjustly accuses Sister Riplinger. See remarks above.

Dr Mrs Riplinger actually cites the evidence from none other than Scrivener himself with respect to Greek witnesses that have vindicated the decision of the King’s men to include the clause, including “at least 34 cursives.”

It may be concluded, therefore, that the King’s men were simply walking – and working – in obedience to Ephesians 5:15 with respect to any ‘caution’ that they exercised in their approach to the latter part of 1 John 2:23.

“See then that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise,”

It should be further noted with respect to the TBS statement on 1 John 2:23 that the reason given for “*he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also*” being placed in italics is ostensibly *not* that which Dr DiVietro gives, i.e. necessitated by the requirements of Greek grammatical structures. The TBS article lists 6 reasons summarised from Scrivener’s book for the use of italic type in the 1611 Holy Bible. Two of these reasons appear to impinge directly on Greek grammar.

The first is Scrivener’s point 3, which states “In instances of “zeugma”, a grammatical figure in Hebrew and Greek, by which an expression belonging to one part of a sentence is made to serve also in another – e.g. Gen. 4:20 “And Adah bare Jabal: he was the father of such as dwell in tents, and **of such as have cattle.**”” The words in bold are those printed in italics in the 1611 Holy Bible.

The second is Scrivener’s point 6, which states “Where the words supplied are essential to the English sense, although they may be dispensed with in Hebrew and Greek, or could even be received into the original without burdening the sentence or marring the style*. This is the most numerous class, far out-numbering all of the others put together.”

*Scrivener’s wording indicates that such cases of insertion are the exception rather than the rule i.e. the sentence would usually be burdened or the style marred.

It would appear to an ordinary reader, such as this author, that Dr DiVietro’s comments about the use of italics to satisfy the requirements of Greek grammar refer to points 3 and/or 6, not point 5, which applies to the second half of 1 John 2:23.

In any event, it does seem to this author that Dr DiVietro’s comments on italic type in the 1611 Holy Bible could certainly do with some ‘clarification’ on his part, starting with, per-

haps, a careful review of Section III of the book *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611) Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*.

That would be a much more profitable use of time by Dr DiVietro than attacking Sister Ripplinger.

Additional material on 1 John 2:23 is as follows²³⁸, noting that older manuscripts e.g. Aleph, B and modern Greek New Testament editors, Griesbach et al, tend to *omit from* rather than *add to* the New Testament.

IS FIRST JOHN 2:23 GENUINE SCRIPTURE?

By Martin A. Shue

Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: (but) [he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also].

First John 2:23 proves the superiority of our AV / KJV.

The phrase in question, "...(but) he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also.", stands in italics (brackets) in our AV. The KJV translators placed these words in italics to show the reader that these words were not found in the Greek text from which they translated the NT. This in no way meant that they were not aware of some of the Greek support for the phrase. They were well aware of the Greek support extant at that time, as well as the support of the early versions.

The phrase is found in the Old Latin (150 AD), the Syriac, the Coptic, the Arabic and the Vulgate. This alone is some strong evidence for the reading. Some of the Early English versions also contained the reading.

The first English translation by John Wycliffe (1380) contained the phrase. Likewise, the Great Bible (Cranmer), the Bishop's Bible and the Rheims Bible all contained the phrase in question.

Tyndale and the Geneva Bible did not contain the phrase which is even further proof as to why God guided the translation of our KJV in 1611.

Though the Greek support was scarce in 1611 it DID exist.

What is so amazing is that since 1611 many Greek MSS have been unearthed that testify to the reading of our AV. Just a few of these MSS would be Aleph and B (imagine that!), Psi, C, 33, 614, 630, 1505, 1739 and others. Clarke notes the following, "It is found in A, B, C, and in between twenty and thirty others of the best authority." It is also found in the Greek texts of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth, Scholz, W-H and N-A.

The phrase is not without strong attestation from the ECF's [Early Church Fathers] either. It is quoted without question by Athanesius, Cyrils, Cyprian, Augustine, and many others.

The phrase is certainly genuine and by the great providence of God our translators were guided by the Holy Ghost to place the phrase in the Biblical text.

Noting that the TBS information on 1 John 2:23 has essentially come from Scrivener, the following statements from *Hazardous Materials* pp 646, 647, Dr Mrs Ripplinger's emphases, should be included with respect to Scrivener's contention that the King James translators used the Latin Vulgate for various readings. Readings from the Vulgate may well have matched readings that the King's men took from their Old Latin sources including the final clause of 1 John 2:23, see Shue's information above and the third paragraph below, but the Vulgate would not have been the *primary source* of those readings.

(Dr DiVietro has taken issue with aspects of the following statements under **Quotes 124, 125, 126** that will be addressed when those quotes are reached in this work.)

“Scrivener is unscholarly in assuming something that opposes everything that the KJB translators ever said in print. On the title page of their New Testament the KJB translators said they used the “Originall Greek,” not any Vulgate readings.

*“Their detailed notes, taken by translator John Bois, never mention the Latin Vulgate Bible. They list many other sources for reference, including one reference to the “Italian” Bible, and two to the “Old Latin,” but NEVER to the Latin Vulgate (Ward Allen, *Translating for King James: Notes Made by a Translator of King James’s Bible*, Vanderbilt University Press, 1969, pp. 41, 47, 113). The Italian Diodati and the Old Latin are pure editions. Scrivener did not have access to these recently discovered notes of the translators. Therefore what he “assumed” has been proven wrong and Scrivener’s text along with it.*

“Even the Latin Vulgate itself carried with it a large majority of readings from the pure Old Itala Bible. The Old Itala’s origin goes back to the work of the “Holy Ghost” in Acts 2, when “out of every nation under heaven”... “every man heard them speak in his own language.” The superscription above the cross was in Latin, as well as in Greek and Hebrew (Luke 23:38). Many spoke Latin, especially those who lived in the countryside and provinces. The gift of tongues provided a way for the scriptures to be immediately put into Latin, as well as other extant languages...

*“Again, the KJB translators expressly stated that they did not follow the Latin Vulgate. A very **large** percentage of the KJB [translators’] introductory “The Translators to the Reader” was taken up to express their utter contempt for the Catholic church and its Latin Vulgate.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger highlights numerous statements from *The Translators to the Reader* with respect to the Latin Vulgate on pp 648-650 of *Hazardous Materials*, including the following that should especially be kept in mind whenever the Vulgate is cited as a primary source for readings in the 1611 Holy Bible.

*“...all is sound for substance, in one or other of our editions, and the **worst of ours far better than their authentic vulgar...**”*

Quote(s) 101, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 622, 626

The quote from p 622 refers to the evidence for the Johannine Comma that Michael Maynard presents in his book *A History of the Debate Over 1 John 5:7*, including the early evidence of the Syriac Bible and the witness of Tertullian.

The quote on p 626 states *“Neither the KJB translators nor Erasmus were “Greek only.” The Greek Orthodox Church has never been God’s sole repository of truth.”*

Dr DiVietro takes issue only with the quote from p 626. He insists that Dr Mrs Riplinger is merely stating truisms, in that no textual critic is *“Greek Only”* and that it is understood that the Greek Orthodox Church simply copied manuscripts. It never originated them.

Dr DiVietro’s comment is both evasive and paltry. As usual, he neglects the context of the quote. It is the last sentence of a section on p 626 that reads as follows, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases.

“Scrivener and Revelation

“Scrivener’s flirtation with corrupt manuscripts comes to full bloom in his dealings with the Book of Revelation. He foolishly says,

““The **Received text** of the Book of Revelation is far more **widely removed** from that of the best **critical** authorities than is the case in any other portion of the New Testament” (Scrivener, *Six Lectures*, p. 206).

“He charges Erasmus with consulting few copies or a “sole authority.” This lie has been thoroughly proven wrong in *In Awe of Thy Word* [pp 962, 979-983]. It is no longer a tenable criticism of Erasmus’s text and other Bibles which seem to follow Erasmus in certain places, but actually are following the thrust of pure vernacular Holy Bibles which have always read as the KJB in Revelation, including in its last six verses, which Scrivener questions.”

The context of the quote from *Hazardous Materials* p 626 is Dr Mrs Riplinger’s further warning about Scrivener as one of the “**grievous wolves**” that “**enter in among you, not sparing the flock**” Acts 20:29. See also *Quotes 17, 46, 56*. Dr DiVietro should be prepared to endorse that warning. Instead, like the hireling he is, John 10:12, 13, he bypasses it in order to heap more unwarranted criticism on Sister Riplinger. See *Quotes 54, 60, 95*.

Quote 102, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 627

“Scholars can only guess about the body of evidence which led Erasmus to frame his Greek text as he did. Erasmus had access to different copies from those of Scrivener. Scrivener believes that manuscripts and witnesses closer in time to the originals are more reliable. Scrivener reveres the uncial Vaticanus because it is 400 years older than many of the Greek cursives. By **his** criteria the witnesses available to Erasmus’s should be more reliable than Scrivener’s library (all other elements being equal e.g. orthography), as Erasmus lived 400 years closer to the originals.”

Dr DiVietro ridicules this statement because, he says, the age of manuscripts is independent of the time when a textual critic lived. He insists, therefore, that the statement in *Quote 102* is merely a device to prejudice the reader against Scrivener.

It seems not to have occurred to Dr DiVietro that Dr Mrs Riplinger is referring to *Scrivener’s* criteria for New Testament sources *based solely on their closeness to the time of the originals*, not hers and that she has referred to both manuscripts *and* witnesses, not simply manuscripts.

See *Did The Catholic Church Give Us The Bible?* by David W. Daniels, Chick Publications, pp 66-69 summarising the material from *In Awe of Thy Word*, Chapter 27, *The Life of Erasmus*, with respect to Erasmus as a *witness* to the Greek and Latin texts of the New Testament.

It should be understood that Erasmus’s researches were sufficiently thorough that he was aware of most if not all of the variant readings in the New Testament, including those of the Book of Revelation. He was therefore able to distinguish clearly between the true Traditional Text of the New Testament and the Catholic corruptions, as Bro. Peter Heisey states, his emphasis:

“An interesting quote of Erasmus occurs in Henk Jan de Jonge’s thesis, *Novum Testamentum a Nobis Versum: The Essence of Erasmus’ Edition of the New Testament*, p. 402, “After comparing a **great number** of Greek manuscripts, we have followed what seemed to us the purest reading and translated it into Latin.”

See *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 941-943 and *Did The Catholic Church Give Us The Bible?* pp 66-69.

Dr Mrs Riplinger is therefore pointing out *Scrivener’s inconsistency* in that he reveres Vaticanus, *Hazardous Materials* pp 598-599, (as does Dr DiVietro by default, in spite of his disavowal of Vaticanus, see *Quote 97*) but *defers* to witnesses *later* than Erasmus and *his* extant

witnesses to the text of the New Testament. See **Quote(s) 101** with respect to Scrivener's statement on the supposed "'best *critical authorities*'" with respect to the Book of Revelation. Scrivener's witnesses include the textual subversives Abbott, Vance Smith, Schaff, Ginsburg, Vaughn, Bentley, Bengel, Griesbach, Lachmann, Westcott, Hort, Alford, Thayer. See *Hazardous Materials* pp 582, 588, 589, 601, 602, 605, 622. Even if they too, like Scrivener, deferred to Vaticanus for those parts of the New Testament where it is extant, the fact remains that they are *later witnesses than Erasmus* to the text of the Greek New Testament.

As indicated, the individuals named immediately above are all witnesses to the Greek text of the New Testament but according to their methods of textual criticism that Scrivener favours, *Hazardous Materials* pp 600-604, they repeatedly depart from editions of the Received Text in many instances where these editions support the words of the 1611 Holy Bible. They are therefore "**false witnesses**" against "**the scripture of truth**" as Psalm 35:11 reveals.

"False witnesses did rise up; they laid to my charge things that I knew not."

*This author's work "*O Biblios*" – *The Book* pp 258-261 lists 60 important readings where the so-called critical texts of Griesbach, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Lachmann, Alford, Westcott and Hort i.e. the textual critics favoured by Scrivener in his later work, often depart from the text of the 1611 Holy Bible. It is ironic, therefore, to find that the texts of these critics repeatedly *agree* with the 1611 Holy Bible *against* Scrivener in the 54 verses that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists in *Hazardous Materials* pp 654-667 as documentation of Scrivener's errors. It would appear therefore that Scrivener was among those who "**have turned every one to his own way**" Isaiah 53:6 and "**did that which was right in his own eyes**" Judges 17:6, 21:25 with respect to parts of his text, possibly in order to promote his own paragraph bible, see **Preface and Introduction**, according to Isaiah 14:14.

"I will be like the most High."

The question arises, however, could Erasmus have had an advantage over Scrivener with respect to the manuscripts and witnesses available to him at the time when he lived i.e. 400 years before Scrivener?

The answer, most likely, is yes, even though numerous Greek New Testament manuscripts have been found since the time of Erasmus. See **Quote 99**. (Erasmus was also aware of most if not all of the textual variants against the 1611 Holy Bible chosen by modern editors. See **Quote 102**.)

Note the very next sentence in *Hazardous Materials* after **Quote 102**, of which Dr DiVietro fails to inform his readers.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states "*Erasmus gave his full-time attention to combing the libraries of Europe for Bible manuscripts (see In Awe of Thy Word);*"

Dr DiVietro has had neither the grace nor the industry to check the relevant part of *In Awe of Thy Word* with respect to Erasmus's literary researches, a summary of which is found on p 930 of that work. (Dr DiVietro has only skim-read *In Awe of Thy Word*. See **Quote(s) 87**.)

Dr Mrs Riplinger makes the following statement on p 930 of *In Awe of Thy Word*.

"Covetous Rome did the legwork for Erasmus, collecting Bible manuscripts the world over. Rome built beautiful and comfortable libraries for them. When all was complete, Erasmus came and spent years studying the manuscripts. When he was finished the libraries were destroyed. "[F]ine libraries, which had been thrown freely open to him," were later destroyed when the French besieged Rome in 1527. Colocci lost his "library and all its treasures." "In the sack of Rome, he [Antonini] lost his priceless library," which no doubt afforded

Erasmus many treasured manuscripts. Another friend Erasmus made during his trip to Italy was Jacopo Sadoleti, who had “priceless treasures” in his “valuable library.” When the attack on Rome began, Sadoleti loaded all of his “treasured tomes” on a ship; it was refused landing at any port because of the plague, “so the library perished.” Through Erasmus, God carried his word forward and the ancient manuscripts could be destroyed. Their survival would only lead to “endless genealogies” of texts. “For we walk by faith, not by sight:” (Mangan, pp. 275, 274, 272, 287; 2 Cor. 5:7).”

See also *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 931-935.

In sum, therefore, Erasmus could well have had access to many more *ancient* sources than those that are extant either today e.g. Vaticanus or in Scrivener’s time and such sources could well have been more *trustworthy* than Vaticanus etc.

It is presumptuous of Dr DiVietro to insinuate otherwise and irresponsible of him to conceal from his readers the information in *In Awe of Thy Word* that refutes the oft-quoted falsehood that Erasmus had relatively few sources to work with for his Greek New Testament. See the false claims to that effect from assorted Bible critics noted in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 936-938.

Quote 103, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 627-628

Quote 103 is taken from the first part of the summary for Chapter 17 of *Hazardous Materials* and addresses the provision of marginal notes and references for the Revised Version, in which Scrivener was engaged.

Dr DiVietro’s comment under **Quote 103** seems to be out of place in that he simply reiterates that in his view, Scrivener’s Greek New Testament is still the closest approximation to the underlying Greek text of the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament, with only minute differences. Yet again, he substantiates nothing.

As indicated, the particulars of Scrivener’s Greek text will be addressed under **Quotes 105-141** that Dr DiVietro has extracted from Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* entitled *TBS Scrivener-Beza Textus Receptus*.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comment with a statement that is as bizarre as it is graceless.

He claims that the material in Chapter 17 on Scrivener’s textual heresies must be set aside because Dr Mrs Riplinger’s qualifications in Koine Greek have not been proven superior to those of Scrivener.

Dr DiVietro’s evasion in the above statement is blatantly apparent in that Chapter 17 of *Hazardous Materials* simply lists Scrivener’s heretical beliefs abstracted from his own writings. A study of Scrivener’s own writings clearly does not require knowledge of Koine Greek.

Further telling inferences may be drawn from Dr DiVietro’s concluding comment under **Quote 103**.

Dr DiVietro’s statement above would suggest that he has no problem at all with Scrivener’s denial of KJB readings in 55 verses of scripture, according to his later work and his numerous contributions to or at least condoning of the RV alterations from the 1611 Holy Bible that **Table 4** shows. See **Quotes 70, 99**. Dr DiVietro certainly makes no statement to the contrary.

Dr DiVietro’s concluding statement under **Quote 103** therefore makes his professed support for the 1611 Holy Bible as the best English translation (though in his opinion not inspired) according to *Cleaning-Up* pp 18, 88 seem hollow. He should consider Job 15:34, especially

in view of his endorsement of *The Defined King James Bible* as a Bible study aid worth purchasing. See *Cleaning-Up* p 91 and remarks under **Quotes 53, 85**.

“For the congregation of hypocrites shall be desolate, and fire shall consume the tabernacles of bribery.”

Quote 104, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 631

“(In the USA it [Scrivener’s Greek New Testament] is available from AV Publications with the caveat that it not be used for study or translation, only for comparison.)”

Dr DiVietro makes the wilfully sarcastic comment to the effect that A. V. Publications doesn’t mind making money from selling Scrivener’s Greek New Testament.

Luke 19:22 comes to mind.

“...Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee, thou wicked servant...”

Anyone else who read the full context of **Quote 104** would almost certainly appreciate Dr Mrs Riplinger’s constructive statements, her emphases.

“Scrivener’s Greek Textus Receptus: The Good Side

*“Frederick Scrivener’s Greek Textus Receptus New Testament is published by the Trinitarian Bible Society (TBS), London, England. (In the USA it [Scrivener’s Greek New Testament] is available from AV Publications with the caveat that it not be used for study or translation, only for comparison.) This edition is a useful tool to show new version users where their bible is missing words, phrases, and verses. It is particularly effective for showing Bible School and Seminary graduates that certain readings are **in** the traditional Greek text which are missing from their corrupt Greek editions of Nestle-Aland (NA²⁷) or the United Bible Society (UBS⁴). Sadly, seminaries have become cemeteries for burying the faith of many young men.”*

Dr DiVietro on pp 24-25 of *Cleaning-Up* condemns the Nestle-Aland and UBS texts as distortions and perversions of God’s words. See **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**. He even states that he agrees with Dr Mrs Riplinger’s evaluation of these texts on pp 21-22 of *Hazardous Materials* that he reproduces in *Cleaning-Up*.

Why then does he not support her evaluation of the Nestle-Aland/UBS texts under **Quote 104** and the usefulness of Scrivener’s text in exposing them that she describes? Why does he instead accuse her, falsely, of referring to that text **“for filthy lucre’s sake”** Titus 1:11?

In answer to those questions, it may be that Dr DiVietro’s support for *The Defined King James Bible* with the sales that might accrue from it was what prompted him to think of **“filthy lucre”** 1 Peter 5:2. See *Cleaning-Up* p 91, **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** and remarks under **Quotes 5, 53, 85, 89**.

Strictly speaking, **Quote 104** is the first quote extracted from Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* but **Quote 105** below is the first part of Chapter 18 about which Dr DiVietro makes explicit comments on Scrivener’s text. As indicated under **Quote 95**, Dr DiVietro specifically addresses Scrivener’s text under **Quotes 105-141** for Chapter 18.

Quote 105, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 632

“Unfortunately, however, Scrivener’s Greek Textus Receptus (TBS, Green, et al.) has become a holy grail in numerous conservative Christian pastors’ libraries, college classrooms, translation centers, and publishing houses. Few are aware of its origin or its leaven (documented at the end of this chapter). This is hardly their fault since Scrivener entitled it falsely, The New Testament in Greek According to the Text Followed in the Authorised Version Together with the Variations adopted in the Revised Version.””

Dr DiVietro protests that Scrivener did the best he could to produce, or reproduce, the Greek text underlying the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament by means of Beza’s 1598 Edition, introducing some changes from the English New Testament, although Dr DiVietro does not use the term ‘back-translation.’

Dr DiVietro states that he has personally examined the 120+ changes from Beza’s 1598 text that Scrivener introduced into his own text and insists that most of them are very minor, consisting for example, of changes relating to the names of individual books and only minimal changes to vocabulary.

Dr DiVietro says further that he checked approximately 30 readings (apparently in the KJB) that Scrivener thought came from Latin sources. Dr DiVietro states that each of these readings either had an identifiable Greek source or had been carried over from earlier English Bibles.

Bro. Heisey notes that Dr DiVietro’s comments on the 30 readings mentioned above are authentic but Dr DiVietro himself gives no documentation whatsoever of any of the changes or readings that he mentions, which is of no help to the reader.

(In spite of repeated requests by Bro. Heisey to Dr Waite over the past couple of years for documentation of any rigorous collation of Scrivener’s text against the King James New Testament carried out by the DBS Executive Committee, no satisfactory reply has been forthcoming. See Bro. Heisey’s extensive study on Scrivener’s text entitled *Waiting for Waite*, www.hacalumni.com/pdfs/WaitingForDrWaite.pdf. A request for a rigorous collation of Scrivener’s text against the King James New Testament by the DBS Executive Committee is entirely reasonable and surely warranted, given Dr Waite’s unabashed promotion of Scrivener’s text in his book *A WARNING!!*, p 28. See **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Dr Waite and ‘the Greek,’** p 25, noting that Dr Waite does not explicitly state that Scrivener’s text is ‘inspired,’ this author’s under-linings.

P. 28 *“The “Scrivener Greek New Testament” is not “slightly tainted.” I believe the Words in this “Greek New Testament” to be accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words. I believe them to be authentic copies of the original New Testament Words. It is sad that Gail Riplinger refuses to take this same position.”*

For the time being, however, the DBS Executive Committee continues, in effect, to plead the 5th, as the saying goes.)

Scrivener’s departures from the text of the 1611 Holy Bible and related subjects will be comprehensively addressed under subsequent quotes extracted from Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* and in the summary after **Quote 141** entitled **Quotes 105-141, An Overview** from Bro. Peter Heisey’s work. See remarks under **Quotes 93, 95, 103**.

As indicated earlier, see **Quotes 95, 104, Quote 105** is the first extract taken from Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* under which Dr DiVietro specifically addresses Scrivener’s Greek Text. Some interesting observations may be made.

Dr DiVietro's quotes and comments vary in length but he makes 205 quotes in total for the 31 chapters of *Hazardous Materials* plus the Epilogue. No fewer than 50 quotes i.e. a quarter, **Quotes 92-141** inclusive, are aimed at Chapters 17 and 18, which concern the work of Frederick Scrivener. Of those 50 quotes, 38 (including **Quote 104**), i.e. almost a fifth of Dr DiVietro's quotes, are aimed at Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* alone.

Chapter 18, as indicated, 'just happens' to be the chapter on Scrivener's Greek Text.

Note further that Chapters 17 and 18 occupy less than 120 pages of the 1200 that make up *Hazardous Materials*, with Chapter 18 taking up 66 pages.

Dr DiVietro has therefore devoted nearly 20% of his quotes to about 5-6% of *Hazardous Materials*.

In sum, the DBS Executive Committee appears to have something of a fetish with respect to Scrivener's Greek Text.

What is also noteworthy is that *Hazardous Materials* pp 654-668 specifically addresses 54 verses where Scrivener changed the KJB readings for his New Testament. See **Quote 102**. Dr Mrs Riplinger shows that Scrivener's changes are unwarranted and that his judgement could be seriously questioned. These appear to be among the readings that Dr DiVietro dismisses as minor. See remarks under **Quote 95**.

Moreover, *Hazardous Materials* pp 668-677 includes a detailed study by Bro. Peter Heisey on Scrivener's text and its numerous shortcomings.

Yet in spite of his disproportionate focus on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials*, see above, Dr DiVietro devotes no more than *two quotes out of 38*, **Quotes 130, 131** to this detailed material that occupies pp 654-677 of *Hazardous Materials*, 24 of the 66 pages inclusive of *Hazardous Materials* i.e. *over a third of the chapter and the most detailed portion of the chapter with respect to the actual readings of Scrivener's text*.

Even **Quotes 130, 131** make no specific mention of Bro. Heisey's detailed work. Dr DiVietro's comments in total under these quotes amount to no more than half a page and, apart from brief remarks on Scrivener's text, mainly in **Quote 130**, consist of little more than further attacks on Sister Riplinger, that under **Quote 131** being particularly objectionable.

Quotes 130, 131 will be addressed in turn when this work reaches that part of *Cleaning-Up*.

For now, it should be carefully noted that Dr DiVietro's complete failure to take issue with Bro. Heisey's work is not only Dr DiVietro's tacit endorsement of that work *but another indication that Dr DiVietro clearly favours women-only targets if possible*.

See **Quote(s) 90** with respect to Dr DiVietro's evident reluctance to protest directly against what must surely have been to him and the rest of the DBS Executive Committee a most provocative statement by Bro. Stephen Shutt about inspiration under **Quote(s) 155**.

In the cases of both Bro. Heisey and Bro. Shutt, Sister Riplinger is Dr DiVietro's *sole target* – and that of the 'Christian gentlemen' of the DBS Executive Committee as a whole.

As Dr Ruckman has said, *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship* p 125:

"Nice folks! I've met better folks at a bar in an Officers' Club on New Year's Eve!"

Dr Mrs Riplinger's opening statements on p 633 of *Hazardous Materials* give the appropriate context for **Quote 105**, which, typically, Dr DiVietro overlooks. However, it will be seen that Dr Mrs Riplinger's statements on p 633 are most usefully cited with respect to Dr DiVietro's comment on **Quote 106**.

Quote 106, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 633

(Quoting David Cloud:) “*The exact Greek text underlying the King James Bible was reconstructed by Frederick Scrivener under the direction of the Cambridge University Press and published in 1891.*”

Dr DiVietro states that the incorrect publication date of 1891 is probably a typing error of some kind but that Dr Mrs Riplinger has highlighted it in an attempt to discredit David Cloud. He says nothing about David Cloud’s error in referring to Scrivener’s text as “*the exact Greek text underlying the King James Bible,*” thereby compounding that error in his comments under **Quote 106**.

The full context of **Quote 106** that Dr DiVietro fails to mention is as follows, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases.

“*Today’s copyright owner**, the Trinitarian Bible Society, merely echoes and begins its own preface affirming,

““*The Textus Receptus printed in this volume is the Greek text followed by the translators of the English Authorised Version of the Bible first published in the year of 1611*” (*H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ, The New Testament The Greek Underlying the English Authorised Version of 1611, London: The Trinitarian Bible Society, 1976, Preface, emphasis mine*). * “[T]he word of God is not bound” (2 Tim. 2:9). *The true Holy Bible will not be bound by special copyright restrictions which require permissions and restrict free unaltered use, because God is the author and owner. Therefore the Scrivener text cannot be the word of God.*”

“*Without examining the veracity of this claim in detail, others such as David Cloud, misinform (and err in the date) saying,...*”

Quote 106 follows and Dr Mrs Riplinger concludes:

“*(It was actually printed in 1881, and again in 1883, 1884, 1886, 1890, 1908; see verso of Preface; F. H. A. Scrivener, The New, emphasis mine).*”

David Cloud should have checked the date of publication of Scrivener’s text and, far from discrediting David Cloud, Dr Mrs Riplinger has simply supplied a necessary correction.

Dr DiVietro’s reaction to that correction puts him in the category of Ecclesiastes 4:13, not with respect to the child.

“**Better is a poor and a wise child than an old and foolish king, who will no more be admonished.**”

As indicated above, Cloud’s error with respect to the publication date of Scrivener’s text is secondary to the essential issues of **Quote 106** and its context.

The essential issues under **Quote 106** and its context, following from **Quote 105**, are that:

- Scrivener, the TBS and David Cloud have created a false impression that Scrivener’s text is the *exact* Greek New Testament Text of the 1611 Holy Bible, which it is not. The DBS Executive Committee is complicit in this deception. See **Quote 107**.
- Scrivener’s text carries a manmade copyright, like modern versions, that immediately disqualifies it from being “*the word of God*” 1 Thessalonians 2:13, as Dr Mrs Riplinger explains in her statement giving the full context of **Quote 106**.

Scrivener’s text is therefore “*the word of men*” 1 Thessalonians 2:13 and although it largely *reflects* the text of the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament, it is not the *exact* Greek text underlying the English Authorized New Testament, as Scrivener, Cloud and the TBS wrongly imply.

Dr DiVietro should have been willing to warn his readers of the shortcomings of Scrivener's text in the above respects. He does not. He is therefore *doubly* an unprofitable servant. He has not even done that which was his duty to do. See Luke 17:10.

“So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do.”

Note that under **Quote 114**, Dr DiVietro denies that the TBS is today's copyright owner of Scrivener's text. This work will address Dr DiVietro's comments under **Quote 114** when that quote is reached.

Quote 107, *Hazardous Materials*, p 633

“Scrivener's Textus Receptus is included in many digital online and Bible software additions, including Logos Research Systems, Online Bible, BibleWorks...”

Dr DiVietro says that he, rather than Dr Mrs Riplinger, should be the one to explain why Scrivener's Textus Receptus has been uploaded onto Logos Research Systems and BibleWorks, because he did the uploading.

Dr DiVietro's comment is little more than a fit of pique. As usual, he has missed the point of Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement, which is an indication of how widespread the false notion of Scrivener's text as *the* Greek text of the King James New Testament has become via the internet. See **Quote 105** for an overview of the errors in Scrivener's New Testament in departing from the King James New Testament that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists in Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials*.

Note further that Dr DiVietro has omitted the warning against misuse of Scrivener's text that Dr Mrs Riplinger rightly issues on pp 630-632 of *Hazardous Materials*. See remarks under **Quote 104**.

Dr Mrs Riplinger now issues yet another warning about the misleading nature of Scrivener's text immediately after **Quote 107** i.e. about the errors in it mentioned above. Emphases are hers. Dr DiVietro bypassed this warning, naturally.

“The end of this chapter will document in detail why Scrivener's Greek Text is not the “exact” text underlying the KJB and does not represent the “Originall Greeke” accessed by the translators. (See Title page to the KJB New Testament 1611).”

Habakkuk 1:15-17 well describes the *“wicked ways”* 2 Chronicles 7:14, Ezekiel 20:44 of the web-wise in *“beguiling unstable souls”* 2 Peter 2:14 by means of Scrivener's text that is *not* *“the “Originall Greeke”* of the King James New Testament.

“They take up all of them with the angle, they catch them in their net, and gather them in their drag: therefore they rejoice and are glad. Therefore they sacrifice unto their net, and burn incense unto their drag; because by them their portion is fat, and their meat plentiful. Shall they therefore empty their net, and not spare continually to slay the nations?”

The DBS Executive Committee will most likely continue striving to refill *“their net”* while there's a market for *Scrivener's Annotated Greek New Testament*, available from *The Bible For Today*, BFT for \$US 40 (including \$US 5 shipping and handling for USA customers). See **Quote 108**, where the advertisement is introduced in Dr DiVietro's comments in bold underlining.

Quote 108, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 634

“Some use Scrivener’s Greek Textus Receptus in Jay P. Green’s Interlinear Bible, Greek-English, with Green’s faulty English below Scrivener’s Greek. Green states on his copyright page that his Greek New Testament text is used by permission of the Trinitarian Bible Society. Green admits that Scrivener’s Greek was “reconstructed.” Don Waite Jr. says Scrivener’s method was to “backwards translate” from the KJB in the main. This was incompletely done due to Scrivener’s dishonest methodology.”

Dr DiVietro has lengthier-than-usual comments under **Quote 108**, occupying over a page and he has even more extensive related comments under **Quotes 113, 114**, which will be addressed when those quotes are reached in this work. See also remarks at the end of **Quote 106**.

Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote 108** include a quote from *Scrivener’s Annotated Greek New Testament* p ix to the effect that Scrivener identified 190 departures from Beza’s 1598 text in the King James New Testament, all of which he listed in the appendix to his work, with manuscript authorities in support of those 190 departures from Beza’s 1598 text.

Dr DiVietro indicates that these 190 departures are very few when set against the approximately 160,000 words* in Beza’s 1598 text. Dr Waite concurs, with this statement from *A WARNING!!* p 33. See **Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society, Appendix 2, Continued, Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’**, p 84.

*For information, the King James English New Testament contains 181,253 words. See *The Oxford Bible Reader’s Dictionary & Concordance* p 29. Another source, http://agards-bible-timeline.com/q10_bible-facts.html gives a slightly different total i.e. 180,522 words.

P. 33 *“According to the Greek scholar, Frederick Scrivener, the primary Greek edition followed by the King James Bible translators was Beza’s 5th edition of 1598. In Scrivener’s Annotated Greek Text...in pages 648-656 he lists only 190 places where the King James Bible departed from that Greek text. This is but a minute percentage of the over 140,000 Greek Words in the New Testament. Scrivener lists ten other sources where these 190 places were found.”*

Dr DiVietro also includes a quote from Dr Hills²³⁹, taken from *Scrivener’s Annotated Greek Text*, which states in part *“Out of the 252 passages examined in Appendix E, where the differences between the texts of these books is sufficient to affect, however slightly, the language of the version, our translators abide with Beza against Stephen in 113 places, with Stephen against Beza in 59, with the Complutensian, Erasmus, or the Vulgate against both Stephen and Beza in 80...”*

See **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint** and **Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society, Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’** p 30.

Dr DiVietro uses the quotes from Scrivener and Dr Hills to accuse Dr Mrs Riplinger of misrepresenting both Scrivener and Donald Waite Jr. He further demands to know, at the end of his comments under **Quote 108**, if Dr Mrs Riplinger possesses what he terms an inspired original to determine if Scrivener’s text is incorrect or if she did so by reverse translation from the KJB. Dr DiVietro poses the second question in block capitals.

The issue of ‘back-translation’ from the KJB to Scrivener’s text, although raised under **Quote 108**, forms the major part of Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote 114** and a response to those comments will be deferred until that quote is reached in this work.

Note in passing, however, that Dr DiVietro has already acknowledged that it is all right for *him* and his DBS Executive Committee colleagues to identify differences between the King James New Testament and Scrivener's or any other edition of the Received Text by means of reverse translation but evidently not for anyone else. See **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint** and *Cleaning-Up* p 20.

Psalm 73:9 comes to mind.

“They set their mouth against the heavens, and their tongue walketh through the earth.”

The concluding comment under **Quote 108** is one from the book's editor stating that D. A. Waite Jr has been misrepresented on pp 357, 634, 637-640, 962 of *Hazardous Materials*.

The author and editor of *Cleaning-Up* must have hoped that readers would not check those pages.

The reference to D. A. Waite Jr on p 357 of *Hazardous Materials* is with respect to his letter to Edward Carrington. D. A. Waite Jr has clearly not been misrepresented. See **Quote 89**.

Dr DiVietro's editor is lying.

D. A. Waite Jr is not even mentioned on pp 638, 639, 640 of *Hazardous Materials*.

Dr DiVietro's editor is lying again.

The reference to D. A. Waite Jr on p 962 of *Hazardous Materials* is with respect to his letter to Edward Carrington, like that on p 357. D. A. Waite Jr has clearly not been misrepresented. See **Quote 89**.

Dr DiVietro's editor is lying yet again.

The reference to D. A. Waite Jr on p 637 of *Hazardous Materials* is also found under **Quote 114**, which will be addressed when that quote is reached in this work. Dr DiVietro refers under **Quote 108** to statements on pp 199ff, 302ff of *Cleaning-Up* from D. A. Waite Jr denying that he ever said anything to the effect that “*Scrivener's method was to “backwards translate” from the KJB in the main.*”

D. A. Waite Jr's statement on pp 199-200 of *Cleaning-Up* forms part of Dr DiVietro's comments under **Quote 114** and will be addressed when this work addresses that quote, likewise his statement on pp 302-303 of *Cleaning-Up*, which is merely is a verbatim copy of that on pp 199-200.

D. A. Waite Jr has a further comment on pp 303-307 of *Cleaning-Up* on how he set up *The Defined King James Bible* with reference to certain English dictionaries that he consulted. He makes only a brief mention of Greek and Hebrew lexicons that he says he used occasionally and does not identify them. This work has already addressed *The Defined King James Bible* so no further comment is needed here. See **Quote 85** with respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger's recent work *Serious Problems in D. A. Waite's The Defined King James Bible's Definitions – Defiled & Declined*, which may be accessed at www.hacalumni.com/.

Concerning the 190 departures of the King James New Testament from Beza's 1598 text that Scrivener identified, the attempt by Drs Waite and DiVietro to downplay them as “*a minute percentage*” of the New Testament, either in English or Greek, misses the essential points of the *misuse* of Scrivener's text to which Dr Mrs Riplinger refers in **Quotes 105, 106, 108**.

These quotes show that Scrivener's text is often perceived, as **Quote 106** shows, as “*The exact Greek text underlying the King James Bible*” when in reality it is not.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has documented 54 verses with readings that depart from the KJB New Testament in Scrivener's text that show that it is *not* "*The exact Greek text underlying the King James Bible.*" Bro. Peter Heisey has studied many of these 54 departures and documented a further 10, making 64 verses in all where Scrivener departs from the KJB New Testament. Dr Mrs Riplinger has stressed that a full collation of Scrivener's text against the KJB New Testament has yet to be carried out. See *Hazardous Materials* pp 654-677 and remarks under *Quotes 102, 105*.

It should be noted in passing that Dr Mrs Riplinger's list includes 24 verses, noted with an asterisk * in *Hazardous Materials*, which Scrivener claimed came from Latin sources but for which Greek textual evidence is readily available. Dr Mrs Riplinger rightly notes in a separate communication to this author that "*if DiVietro admits to 30 places where Scrivener said it came from Latin, but DiVietro admits there is Greek evidence, then he is simply agreeing with me, as that was my thesis and demonstration.*" See remarks under *Quote 105*.

The 64 verses are as follows, in order as they are found in *Hazardous Materials* for Dr Mrs Riplinger's list, followed by Bro. Heisey's references that are in addition to those in Dr Mrs Riplinger's list, an asterisk * denoting a verse included in both collations.

Matthew 12:24*, 27*, Mark 3:22*, Luke 11:15*, 18*, 19*, Mark 13:37, 14:43*, Luke 1:35, 49, 23:34, 46, John 7:9, 10:16*, 12:26, 18:1, Acts 2:22, 4:32, 6:3*, 7:26*, 44, 10:20, 13:1, 15, 17:30, 19:20*, 23:15, 24:25, Romans 16:4, 1 Corinthians 13:1, Colossians 1:4, 1 Thessalonians 2:16, Acts 26:6*, 1 Corinthians 16:23, Galatians 4:15*, Ephesians 6:24*, Philippians 2:21, Colossians 1:24, 1 Thessalonians 2:12*, 13, 1 Timothy 1:17, 3:15, 4:15*, 2 Timothy 1:18*, James 3:14, 1 Peter 2:13, 1 John 3:20*, 5:8, 2 John 3*, Revelation 13:10, 16:11, 17:9, 18:23, Mark 2:15

Acts 27:12, 17, Revelation 6:14, 9:16, 19, 10:7, 8, 11:8, 13:8, 21:8

Bro. Heisey notes that in a few cases; Acts 27:12, 1 Timothy 4:15, 2 John 3, Revelation 9:19, 10:7, 11:8, 13:8, problems of translation from Scrivener's text into English may still enable the King James Text to be achieved but very likely not in another language. In effect, the fact remains that Scrivener's text is *not* "*The exact Greek text underlying the King James Bible.*"

The DBS Executive Committee would, however, have its unsuspecting supporters believe that it *is*. See *Quote 106* and Dr DiVietro's comment that refers only to the error in David Cloud's statement with respect to the date of publication of Scrivener's Greek Textus Receptus, not the incorrect statement that Scrivener's text is "*The exact Greek text underlying the King James Bible.*"

Dr DiVietro's on-going support for Scrivener according to his explicit statements to this effect under *Quotes 92, 93, 98, 99, 103, 105* shows that he is in agreement with David Cloud about the exactness of Scrivener's text apart from what he terms a few minor details that by inference Dr DiVietro believes should be discarded.

Dr Waite is by profession in agreement with Dr DiVietro and Dr Cloud about Scrivener's text.

See *Quote 97* with respect to Dr Waite's statement from *A WARNING!!* p 28 about Scrivener's text as cited in *Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society* p 25, this author's underlining.

P. 28 "*The "Scrivener Greek New Testament" is not "slightly tainted." I believe the Words in this "Greek New Testament" to be accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words. I believe them to be authentic copies of the original New Testament Words. It is sad that Gail Riplinger refuses to take this same position.*"

As Bro. Heisey points out in a separate communication to this author on the above dogma from Dr Waite, *“What is sad indeed is that the statement is a blatant lie. Scrivener’s Greek New Testament is indeed tainted (see the [above list of 64 verses]) and Dr Waite has admitted this in his e-mails (see [extract from Waiting for Waite] below). Furthermore, if the quote from Dr Waite above is indeed his belief (he has never responded to direct questions about that nor to questions about his vacillation on the matter – see [extract from Waiting for Waite] below), then it is clear that Dr Waite believes that there are errors in the KJB. Why? Because there is no way to reconcile the vast majority, if not all, of the verses cited previously where Scrivener’s text differs from the exact text which underlies the KJB.”*

No doubt not wishing to be perceived as anti-KJB by many of the brethren, i.e. customer base, in the US especially, Dr Waite continues to equivocate, in direct defiance of 1 Kings 18:21.

“And Elijah came unto all the people, and said, How long halt ye between two opinions? if the LORD be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him. And the people answered him not a word.”

See **Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint and Quote 8.**

Drs Waite, DiVietro and Cloud are therefore careful not to state outright that Scrivener’s Greek text *is* “*the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words*” of the Greek New Testament but that could well be the facade that they seek to maintain, while continuing to conceal the whereabouts between two covers of the supposed original Greek New Testament text that they purport to have but don’t. The reader should note the careful wording used in *Cleaning-Up* pp xi, 327-330 with respect to published copies of the Received Text, none of which are explicitly said to be a true i.e. inspired copy of the original Greek New Testament text, such as John Bunyan said that he possessed with respect to “*the English Bible.*” See www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1311767565.pdf p 15.

See also **Quotes 4, 7, 8, 10, 16, 28, 33, 35, 36, 49, 52, 59, 61, 85, 86, 90, 92, 94, 95, 98** where it has been shown how Dr DiVietro has repeatedly evaded the issue of what is “*all scripture*” that “*is given by inspiration of God*” available today between two covers.

Neither has he specified what is “*all scripture*” that “*is given by inspiration of God*” available today between two covers in the earlier part of his book where he purports to have answered Dr Mrs Riplinger’s seven challenges.

Bro. Heisey has highlighted the equivocation of Dr Waite and his colleagues with respect to what is “*all scripture*” that “*is given by inspiration of God*” available today between two covers in an extensive work from which the following extract is taken.

www.hacalumni.com/pdfs/WaitingForDrWaite.pdf

Waiting for Dr. Waite, June 2010, pp 3-4

To be blunt, the title of this work has probably already engendered a question in the mind of the reader: “Waiting for what?”, or “Waiting for Dr. Waite to do what?” To be direct: Waiting for Dr. Waite to give an honest, straightforward, unequivocal answer to two simple questions. The title of this work actually came about because of Dr. Waite’s refusal to give this author an answer to the following simple questions: “Does F.H.A. Scrivener’s Greek text need to be corrected so as to match the exact readings underlying the King James Bible New Testament?” and, “Is the text of the King James Bible without error?” To date, this author has not received nor seen a direct, straightforward, consistent, well-explained, non-contradictory answer from Dr. Waite to these two questions. In fact, as will be shown below, Dr. Waite has contradicted himself on these issues as well as several others which are related

to them. The word of God says in James 1:8, “A double minded man is unstable in all his ways.” And in James 5:12b, “but let your yea be yea; and your nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation.” Dr. Waite should obey these biblical exhortations and “tell us plainly” (John 10:24) what he really does believe.”

Bro. Heisey includes in the above work the email exchanges between Dr Waite and himself on Scrivener’s departures from the King James New Testament that are listed above, which Bro. Heisey comments on in detail in *Hazardous Materials* pp 668-677.

Nowhere in that extensive exchange does Dr Waite provide direct answers to the two questions given in the extract above from Bro. Heisey’s work.

In sum, Dr DiVietro’s comments against Sister Riplinger under **Quote 108** are really just more ‘flannel’ to conceal the equivocation of the DBS Executive Committee about what is “**all scripture**” that “**is given by inspiration of God**” available today between two covers so that its members can continue posing as Nicolaitan (Revelation 2:15) equivalents of 33rd Degree Royal Arch Masons with respect to the actual repository of “**the scripture of truth**” Daniel 10:21.

See **Challenges #1, 2, 3, 5, 7, Points-Counterpoints, Quotes 13, 25, 63, 85**. See also **Introduction, Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’, Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint, Quote 86** for the Nicolaitanism of the DBS Executive Committee with respect to what is “**all scripture**” that “**is given by inspiration of God**” available today between two covers.

The undoubted inclination of the DBS Executive Committee to dismiss as trivial the *incomplete* list of 64 departures of Scrivener’s text from the King James New Testament listed above is answered under **Quotes 95, 97** with respect to “**a little folly,**” “**a little leaven,**” “**little foxes,**” “**a little member**” and “**a little fire**” and their effects.

Moreover, the members of the DBS Executive Committee, who would trivialise Scrivener’s departures from the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament should reflect carefully on the following, by Dr Waylon B. Moore on meeting with the late Dawson E. Trotman, founder of The Navigators, www.mentoring-disciples.org/Accountability.html, this author’s emphases.

“Some people might think that one’s need for godly accountability and instruction is only there when this person is young in his faith. I recall an amazing lesson which I learned early on to the contrary. The first time that I heard Dawson Trotman speak was in Fort Worth at a Billy Graham Crusade. He was founder and president of The Navigators. I was immediately struck with the power of his message and sought to meet him.

“Trotman had just accepted Graham’s invitation to set up and oversee their new attempt to personally counsel all those who came forward to make a decision for Christ in Graham’s meetings. Previously everyone just prayed the “sinner’s prayer” together. That was the counseling. Dawson Trotman, and later Lorne Sanny, then Charlie Riggs, led in the respected Counseling/Follow-Up Ministry of Billy Graham.

“After seeing Daws at the Texas Crusade for a couple of weeks, he invited me to a conference in California. I hitchhiked the 1600 miles to Santa Barbara, and was overwhelmed with the mighty men and women of God whom I met. Just before Daws was to speak, he motioned me forward, and whispered, “You’ve had a course in preaching at the seminary, haven’t you?” I nodded. “Well, I want you to critique my message.” I said, “Come on, Daws, I can’t do that. You’re speaking to thousands of leaders with Mr. Graham.”

“Trotman’s passion to know Christ echoes still in my heart. He was always seeking to be better for Jesus. After Daws spoke he took me aside: “Walk with me to the chow hall. What did you notice?” “Oh, it was just a little thing. But the message was wonderful.” Trotman

then quoted Michelangelo: “**Trifles make perfection, and perfection is no trifle.**’ Tell me what you saw!” Slowly I replied, “Well, you are very good with gestures as you speak. But often you put your hand in your pocket and I can hear the coins jingling.” “Ahhhh!” Daws gutted out in a loud explosion of air. “Thank you. Great!” He gave me a hug as we walked. Then he took all the coins out of the pocket, and put them in his back pocket. I never heard him rattle coins again.”

The same applies for *imperfection*. Even if Scrivener’s departures from the King James New Testament are trifling, which they clearly are not, Scrivener’s text would *not* be “*The exact Greek text underlying the King James Bible*” although Drs DiVietro, Waite and Cloud try to pretend that it *is* or for all practical purposes may be perceived as such. See remarks under **Quotes 103, 105, 106, 109** as well as under this quote.

That kind of misrepresentation, too, is *not* trifling.

It should be noted that as far as this author is aware from Trotman’s writings *Born To Reproduce* and *The Need of the Hour*, Dawson Trotman, who “*was always seeking to be better for Jesus,*” believed that the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible is “***all scripture***” that “***is given by inspiration of God***” available today between two covers.

Those like Sister Riplinger who share that belief can truly say with her - and with Daws - “*Aren’t you glad the Holy Ghost gave us the words of God in a HOLY Bible in our own language? How convenient; how like God. “Every word of God is pure” (Proverbs 30:5).*”

See **Quote 88**, *Hazardous Materials*, p 342 and remarks.

Those among the “***scoffers, walking after their own lusts***” 2 Peter 3:3 will be like those described in Job 21:18 (or their works will be, except that it will be a *fire* storm, 1 Corinthians 3:12-15).

“They are as stubble before the wind, and as chaff that the storm carrieth away.”

Finally for **Quote 108**, Dr DiVietro’s support for Scrivener as alluded to above, with respect to **Quotes 92, 93, 98, 99, 103, 105**, is explained by means of the following site that Sister Riplinger drew to this author’s attention.

Some extracts, in italics, follow, this author’s emphases. As Sister Riplinger has stated separately to this author, Dr DiVietro will be receiving royalties from the publication mentioned below. Contrary to his insinuation under **Quote 104**, Sister Riplinger states that she has not received royalties or taken an income from A. V. Publications for the last 17 years.

www.logos.com/product/366/scriveners-textus-receptus-1881-20

Overview

*The Textus Receptus 1881 Greek text is **the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version.** The Scrivener text is a modified Beza 1598 Textus Receptus in which changes have been made to reflect the readings chosen by the KJV translators. Scrivener’s intent was to artificially create a **Greek text that closely matched** the translator-modified Textus Receptus text and **the resulting English version.** This is a useful text for comparison for those with proficiency in Greek.*

Title: Scrivener’s Textus Receptus (1881) 2.0

*Authors: F. H. A. Scrivener, **Kirk DiVietro***

Price: \$24.95

It is not surprising that Dr DiVietro would speak up for his co-author, especially if the sales revenue might be adversely affected by the disclosures in *Hazardous Materials* Chapters 17-18. (Observe that the Scrivener/DiVietro text is *not* said to be ‘inspired.’)

It should be recalled, see concluding remarks under **Quote 107**, that *Scrivener’s Annotated Greek New Testament* is mentioned in Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote 108**, available from *The Bible For Today*, BFT for \$US 40 (including \$US 5 shipping and handling for USA customers). This author thinks it possible that sales of *Scrivener’s Annotated Greek New Testament* could be affected by the disclosures in *Hazardous Materials* Chapters 17-18, not for the better. (It too is *not* said to be ‘inspired.’)

Readers should draw their own conclusions.

Quote 109, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 634

*“This gives the impression that Green may not know that Scrivener’s Greek text and Stevens (Stephanus) Text are **different**. Therefore his Greek may be a hybrid, and one should be cautious, looking for the unique errors of each individual text.”*

Dr DiVietro is indignant that Dr Mrs Riplinger does not provide a list of the differences. He insists that Dr Mrs Riplinger has omitted the differences because, according to him, they are minimal, insignificant and obscure. He states further that the texts of Scrivener and Stephanus are the consensus texts of the manuscripts that each editor possessed, that he has compared both manuscripts (texts?) and that it infuriates him (in bold letters) that Dr Mrs Riplinger is discerning a giant conspiracy where, according to Dr DiVietro, there isn’t one.

Dr DiVietro insists, in bold typing, that he has carefully read through *Hazardous Materials* three times and that he can refute anything that needs refutation. See **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint** and *Cleaning-Up* pp 110, 278.

Dr DiVietro is lying, or boasting.

Note the following parts of *Hazardous Materials* that Dr DiVietro has clearly not read, or noticed.

Dr DiVietro has not read, or noticed, the sentence immediately following **Quote 109**.

“(The next chapter will detail Stephen’s errors.)”

That sentence casts doubt on Dr DiVietro’s statement that Dr Mrs Riplinger does not provide a list of the differences between Scrivener and Stephanus. It actually gives the lie to it, as will be seen. Details are included below.

Dr DiVietro has not read, or noticed, the rest of p 634 of *Hazardous Materials*. He bypasses it and extracts **Quote 110** from p 635. The rest of p 634 reads as follows, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphasis.

*“[Green] misrepresents the Greek text, calling it “the original Greek” (Interlinear Bible Greek-English, Vol. 4, p. vi). This chapter will document 20 errors in his Greek text, where his Greek text does not follow the “Originall Greeke” followed by the KJB translators, ancient Greek manuscripts and pure vernacular Holy Bibles. It will document even more places where Greek manuscript evidence exists to support readings where he wrongly charges the KJB with following the Latin. Hendrickson Publishers, Baker Books, Sovereign Grace, Associated Publishers, and MacDonald Publishing and others are **unwisely** distributing this.”*

Dr DiVietro bypasses all of the documentation that Dr Mrs Riplinger mentions above. See **Quotes 105, 108**. He provides no documentation of his own to show that differences between

the texts of Scrivener and Stephanus are few and insignificant, yet he accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger *falsely* of providing *insufficient* information to substantiate her statements.

On that basis, it could reasonably be asked, just who is this Kirk DiVietro individual to declare, in effect, that *false* representations of “*the “Originall Greeke”*” that in turn may be used to *subvert* the King James New Testament, can be accepted unreservedly as ‘the Greek’ when *rejection* of the 1611 Holy Bible as “*all scripture*” that “*is given by inspiration of God*” is now endemic within the body of Christ?

See *Quote(s) 91* and the note on Acts 8:37 (still unanswered) and *Emails from Bible-‘correctors’* in www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/why-the-av-only-7434.php for evidence of how widespread the anti-1611 Holy Bible “*plague of leprosy*” Leviticus 14:34 is in the professedly ‘fundamental’ churches in England, the land that gave the world the 1611 Holy Bible.

See also later comments under *Quote 109* about the dearth of true KJB churches in the UK, especially in England, the land that gave the world the 1611 Holy Bible. Only the Lord, of course, knows the number and identity of true KJB believers spread amongst the various churches in this country but generally speaking, they appear to be considerably outnumbered by the modern version supporters. These are mostly NIV, TNIV, NKJV supporters, virtually all of whom are, essentially, ‘originals-onlyists,’ like the DBS Executive Committee. The same, regrettably, can be said of many KJB users i.e. users, not believers. Such are the ‘fruits’ of ‘originals-onlyism.’

That evidence shows unequivocally that Dr DiVietro has no business accusing Sister Riplinger of seeing conspiracies where none exist (that she mentions nowhere on p 634 of *Hazardous Materials*), when the real issue, that Dr DiVietro ignores but which Sister Riplinger highlights, is the subversion by ‘the Greek’ of the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament, by far the most important document in existence, together with its Old Testament counterpart.

Moreover, the above question about Kirk DiVietro is especially relevant when the head of the DBS Executive Committee refuses point-blank to state unequivocally where “*the “Originall Greeke”*,” see *Quote 107*, may be obtained today between two covers, although he and his associates profess to have it. See under *Quote 108* for the extract from Bro. Heisey’s work *Waiting for Waite*.

Dr DiVietro has not read, or noticed, p 696 of *Hazardous Materials*.

He bypasses p 696 and moves from *Quote 141*, *Hazardous Materials* pp 693-694, directly to *Quote(s) 142*, *Hazardous Materials* pp 698-699.

Emphases are Dr Mrs Riplinger’s.

“*This 1550 edition [of Stephanus, compiled by Berry] differs from the Textus Receptus and the “Originall Greeke” underlying the KJB a number of times.*

- ✓ *In 80 places Berry’s Interlinear Greek-English does not follow other editions of the Textus Receptus or the “Originall Greeke” underlying the King James Bible.*
- ✓ *Even Beza (1598 and 1598) and Scrivener agree with the KJB approximately 113 times against Stephanus’s third edition of 1550...*

“*Like Scrivener’s, Berry’s Greek text has few serious errors, but its venial mistakes make readers seriously doubt the accuracy of their Holy Bible. That is serious.*”

See remarks above with respect to the subversion of the King James New Testament by means of *false* representations of “*the “Originall Greeke”*.”

Dr DiVietro has not read, or noticed, pp 700-703 of *Hazardous Materials*, except for the first part of p 700 that he extracts as part of *Quote 143*.

Pp 700-703 of *Hazardous Materials* lists examples of the differences between the texts of Scrivener and Berry's 1550 Stephanus Edition that Dr DiVietro accuses Sister Riplinger *falsely* of not providing. The list includes detailed comments.

The verses listed in order as they occur are Luke 17:36 that Berry's 1550 Stephanus Edition *entirely omits*, which is *not* insignificant, Romans 12:1, Luke 2:22, James 2:18, 1 Timothy 1:4, Romans 8:11, Revelation 3:1, John 16:33, 1 John 2:23b, Mark 2:15.

The above list totals 10 verses where the departures of Berry's 1550 Stephanus Edition from the King James New Testament and its discrepancies against Scrivener are *not* insignificant, *not* miniscule and *not* obscure, even if Dr DiVietro insists that they *are*, which he does.

Neither are the differences few by Dr DiVietro's standards because he has seen fit to comment explicitly on only *one* verse of scripture in the last 10 quotes, namely 1 John 2:23 under *Quote 100*.

Dr DiVietro has not read, or noticed, pp 704-705 of *Hazardous Materials*.

On pp 704-705 of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr Mrs Riplinger gives a full summary list of the 113 verses for which Berry's 1550 Stephanus Edition departs from the King James New Testament and *also differs from Scrivener's text*, which *agrees* with the 1611 Holy Bible for these 113 verses.

In addition, on pp 703-709 of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr Mrs Riplinger lists:

- 80 verses, in summary form, where Berry's text departs from the King James New Testament *against* other editions of the Received Text that are in agreement with the King James New Testament,
- 59 verses, in summary form, where Berry's text *agrees* with the King James New Testament against Beza's 1589, 1598 texts and
- 36 verses, with explanatory comments, where in most instances*, *both* Berry's and Scrivener's texts depart from the King James New Testament. *Scrivener retains the King James reading in Luke 1:35, Acts 7:44, Colossians 1:24.

The above lists total 288 verses that show appreciable or at least noticeable differences between various editions of the Received Text and "*the "Originall Greeke"*" of the King James New Testament, 229 of which concern Berry's 1550 Stephanus Edition.

2 Corinthians 13:1 states "*...In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established.*"

How many more examples, therefore, should Sister Riplinger have provided in order to answer Dr DiVietro's criticisms of her work under *Quote 109*? That question is unanswerable because Dr DiVietro churlishly refrains from making any specific comments on the verses listed and studied on pp 700-709 of *Hazardous Materials*. He goes from the first part of *Quote 143*, which does not explicitly mention any verse of scripture, to the remainder of the quote extracted from p 709 but again which does not explicitly mention any verse of scripture.

Isaiah 32:7 describes Dr DiVietro's churlish attitude exactly, and that of the other members of the DBS Executive Committee, including its head.

“The instruments also of the churl are evil: he deviseth wicked devices to destroy the poor with lying words, even when the needy speaketh right.”

As Dr Mrs Riplinger states on p 709 of *Hazardous Materials*, reiterating her statement on p 696, see above, her emphases, under-linings are this author’s.

“Like Scrivener’s, Berry’s Greek text has few serious errors, but its venial mistakes make readers seriously doubt the accuracy of their Holy Bible. That is serious.”

Note again from the lists given above for Berry’s text that the *differences* between Scrivener’s and Berry’s texts, even if mostly not serious, Berry’s omission of Luke 17:36 being a notable exception, are *not* insignificant, *not* miniscule and *not* obscure, Dr DiVietro’s unsubstantiated opinion to the contrary notwithstanding.

It should be noted that according to the Christian Research organisation, Britain has 47,000 churches²⁴⁰. Of those, as far as this author knows, only about 200* are King James Bible churches²⁴¹. Of them, only about 85* are in England. Of the other 115*, 72* or over 60% are in Ulster, which is to be expected, with the Free Presbyterian ministry there of Dr Ian Paisley.

*These numbers are almost certainly an underestimate but even if they are low by a factor of 10, which is unlikely, true KJB churches are still very much in the minority now, in the nation that gave the world the 1611 Holy Bible. See remarks above. Even churches that do use the KJB are likely to have a statement in their basis of belief that reads like the following.

See www.expoundit.com/wordpress/?page_id=47

[Scriptures] We believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are plenarily and verbally given by the inspiration of God and therefore inerrant in all their parts. God has preserved His Word through the Hebrew Masoretic Text and the Greek Textus Receptus. The Authorised Version is the most reliable translation of the Bible in English. The Holy Scripture is the only sufficient, certain and infallible rule of all saving knowledge, faith and practice. (2 Tim 3:14-17; 2 Pet 1:19, 20; Ps 19).

The church with the above creedal statement is the best UK church that this author has attended in the last 15 years. That statement is made unreservedly.

However, one of the church’s links refers to various contributors to its ministry. This is what it said about this author. See www.baptists.net/history/contributors/.

Alan is a contender for the faith, believing that “all Scripture is given by inspiration of God,” which has been preserved in the Authorized Version of the Holy Bible.

What “Alan” actually said is as follows, according to the bio forwarded to the church.

Alan continues to stand for the 1611 Holy Bible as “all scripture...given by inspiration of God” 2 Timothy 3:16 and encourages other Christian believers to do likewise.

The Apostle Paul said in 2 Timothy 3:1, ***“in the last days perilous times shall come.”***

Paul was – and is – right. It is of course most reassuring that parts of the church in the UK are at least observing that the year 2011 is the 400th Anniversary of the 1611 Holy Bible, for which a trust has been set up with some distinguished patrons, pre-eminent among whom is HRH Charles, the Prince of Wales. See www.kingjamesbibletrust.org/. However, the site does not appear to contain a list of churches that are explicitly supporting the Trust, which is not so reassuring.

The relevance with respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warning on pp 696, 709 of *Hazardous Materials* cited above is that this country’s churches did *not* degenerate into their present percep-

tion of the 1611 Holy Bible by believing that the 1611 Holy Bible is “*all scripture*” that “*is given by inspiration of God.*”

Most churches in this country, however, whether nominally KJB or not, *would* accept the creedal statement of the DBS Executive Committee found on pp 2-3, 18 of *Cleaning-Up*, at least with respect to ‘originals-only’ inspiration. See creedal statement given above.

This author knows definitely of only two exceptions in England (though it is hoped that there may be and probably are a number of others), two out of 47,000.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/welcome/ and articles under the AV-Only part of the site.

See www.biblebelievers.co.uk/index.htm. Pastor Dickens is a PBI graduate and a citizen of the USA.

Readers may draw their own conclusions about the importance of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warning on pp 696, 709 of *Hazardous Materials* cited above and the ‘fruits’ of ‘originals-onlyism,’ especially in the light of Amos 8:11-12, in the land that gave the world the 1611 Holy Bible. (Note further that, with the exception of the extenuating circumstances of the world wars, England has not experienced a national revival for over 130 years.)

See *Still No Revival?* by Bro. Chick, www.chick.com/reading/tracts/1069/1069_01.asp.)

“Behold, the days come, saith the Lord GOD, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the LORD: And they shall wander from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east, they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the LORD, and shall not find it.”

Quote 110, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 635

*“Those studying with the illusion that there is one English word, which is **the** “literal” translation of one Greek word, need to examine a copy of a Greek Concordance, such as Wigram’s or Smith’s.”*

Dr DiVietro responds by descending into ridicule and mockery again, without any substance. It is a repeated tactic of his. See **Quotes 9, 28, 48, 60, 61, 64, 65, 87, 88, 102**.

He declares that only Sister Riplinger could be naive enough to believe that only one English word could be used to translate one Greek word.

Inspection of **Quote 110** shows that Dr DiVietro has distorted Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement for the purpose of mockery. She refers plainly to “*the illusion that there is one English word*” and only one that corresponds to any particular Greek word.

As he repeatedly does in *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro has ignored the context of the quote. See **Quotes 15, 18, 22, 32, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 70, 71, 77, 79, 84, 101, 104, 106**. The statements immediately after **Quote 110** read as follows, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases.

“All translations must and do translate one Greek word with any number of different English words, based upon the context. The Greek New Testament vocabulary was about 5000 words; the English vocabulary is easily 500,000 words. Of his English translation Green even admits,

*““Still, it is **not** in a true sense an absolutely **literal** representation of the Hebrew or Greek words” (Interlinear Bible Hebrew-English, vol. 2, p. viii).”*

“Yet that is the impression that most neophytes gather...”

Dr DiVietro denies that is the case but substantiates nothing, another recurring feature of his comments, like mockery and ignoring context. See *Quotes 3, 13, 16, 21, 25, 26, 28, 30, 35, 48, 49, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 67, 70, 71, 86, 87, 94, 99, 103*.

Can Dr DiVietro be absolutely sure that *no* new student of Hebrew and/or Greek will assume that the interlinear English is not a literal translation of the associated Hebrew or Greek text with respect to a one-for-one Hebrew or Greek/English equivalence?

It is perhaps significant that he produces no student testimonies to this effect.

By contrast, at least one testimony to the contrary exists, flying in the face of Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement above about translation but lending support to the possibility that the misleading impression of a one-for-one Greek/English equivalence *may inadvertently be conveyed to the student*.

This author has encountered one Koine Greek teacher whose teaching methods would appear to encourage, even if unwittingly, the exact same student mindset about which Dr Mrs Riplinger warns. See *Quote 86* with respect to "*our critic*" in this author's work "*O Biblios*" – *The Book*. As stated under *Quote 86*, "*our critic*," now deceased, was an M.A., B.D., M.Th. 20-year teacher of Koine Greek and a professed evangelical fundamentalist of the Reformed i.e. 5-Point Calvinist persuasion. See Section 10.8 of "*O Biblios*" – *The Book*. The critic's statements are reproduced in bold italic, as they are given in that work.

In his defiance of the 1611 Holy Bible, this critic referred to what he termed "*Failure to Render the Same Hebrew and Greek Word by the Same English Equivalent - Resulting in Confusion to the Reader.*"

He went on to criticise the King's men who seemed "*to scorn the idea that the same word in Hebrew and Greek should be always rendered by the same English equivalent where possible since it would "savor more of curiosity than wisdom."*"

The critic went on to take the King's men to task for their use of 84 English words to render one Hebrew word and of 17 English words for one Greek word.

His objections to the manner of translation that the King's men adopted are answered in this author's earlier work but do not need to be included here. The allusion to that work has simply been to show that yet again, Dr DiVietro's unsubstantiated statements should not be taken on trust.

In sum, Dr DiVietro insists that no-one apart from Sister Riplinger believes that only one English word can, or should, ever be used to translate one Greek or Hebrew word.

However, the critic who accumulated 20 years of teaching Koine Greek insists that such a translation method is necessary, or at least highly desirable, in order to avoid confusion, although he could never identify anyone who was ever confused by the different word choices that the King's men used for their work. (Neither can Dr DiVietro. See remarks about the KJB's supposed confusing grammar under **Challenges #3, #7, Points-Counterpoints, Quotes 86, 97.**)

Note in passing that, regardless of how *other* English terms may have been used for the underlying Greek words, "*child*" is the *correct* word in Acts 4:27, 30, "*churches*" is the *correct* word in Acts 19:37, "*charity*" is the *correct* word in 1 Corinthians 13:1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 13 and in all 28 occurrences in the 1611 Holy Bible and "*faith*" is the correct word in Hebrews 10:23 and the *other* English terms are wrong. See this author's earlier work "*O Biblios*" – *The Book**, Sections 10.4, 11.3 for "*charity*," 10.8 for "*child*" Acts 4:27, 30 and *James White's 7*

Errors, www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1309647419.pdf for “churches” in Acts 19:37 and “faith” in Hebrews 10:23.

*To be uploaded on Bro. John Davis’s site *Time for Truth* www.timefortruth.co.uk/ early 2012, DV.

Apart from the same insistence that the 1611 Holy Bible is confusing, see pp 32, 69, 91, 94-95, 152 of *Cleaning-Up* and the comments of “our critic” above, some disagreement appears to exist between the two Greek authorities cited i.e. Dr DiVietro and “our critic.” It is possibly explained as follows.

A statement from none other than Dean Burgon comes to mind²⁴².

“Vanquished by THE WORD Incarnate, Satan next directed his subtle malice against the WORD written...”

The detractors of the word written appear to have a certain amount of “subtle malice” in common with the detractors of the Word Incarnate.

However, even though they agree that *they* are best equipped to deal with either the Word or the word, their witness against the Word or the word is divided, after the manner of Mark 14:56, showing that they are really all part of the same anti-Word/anti-word satanic crew.

“For many bare false witness against him, but their witness agreed not together.”

Quote(s) 111, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 636-637

Quote(s) 111 consist of the remainder of the section beginning on p 634 of *Hazardous Materials* entitled **Jay P. Green’s Greek-English Interlinear Bible**. *Quote(s) 111* begin at the second paragraph on p 636.

Dr DiVietro has only brief comments to the effect that in his opinion, Dr Mrs Riplinger is trying to discredit Jay Green’s Greek and Hebrew interlinear bibles. He insists that any user of an interlinear bible knows right away that the intervening English text is a necessary compromise in order to satisfy space limitations. However, Dr DiVietro insists further that the interlinear text is nevertheless a good place to start in order to understand the underlying Greek or Hebrew references.

Again, Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing in his comments. See remarks under *Quote 110*. His criticism of Sister Riplinger is again unjustified because the content of *Quote(s) 111* includes statements from Green’s interlinear bibles setting out the nature of the very compromises to which Dr DiVietro refers above. *Hazardous Materials* pp 635-636 cites a total of 7 such statements by Green, including 4 on pp 635-636 that Dr DiVietro did not include under *Quote(s) 111*.

Dr DiVietro does not take issue with any of those statements either with respect to their content or with respect to any accusation of their having been taken out of context.

How then can Dr DiVietro reasonably accuse Sister Riplinger of seeking to discredit Jay Green, when she has simply reproduced his own statements in a manner that Dr DiVietro does not challenge?

Quite simply, he can’t.

Sister Riplinger can again draw encouragement from Proverbs 26:2.

“As the bird by wandering, as the swallow by flying, so the curse causeless shall not come.”

See **Challenges #3, #7, Points-Counterpoints, Quote 67.**

Neither does Dr DiVietro produce any testimonial evidence to the effect that average users of interlinears will *invariably* perceive the English text as designed mainly to fit the available space and not as the one and only translation of the underlying Greek or Hebrew text. As he has done repeatedly throughout the quotes and comments section of his book, see *Quote 110*, Dr DiVietro simply makes a dogmatic statement and expects it to be accepted without question.

1 Samuel 2:3 rebukes that kind of high-handedness. See **Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint**.

“Talk no more so exceeding proudly; let not arrogancy come out of your mouth: for the LORD is a God of knowledge, and by him actions are weighed.”

See *Quotes 70, 72, 78, 79* with respect to Dr DiVietro’s statements to the effect that Liddell’s lexicon is a good place to start for understanding the words of the 1611 Holy Bible. His comments under *Quote(s) 111* are simply more of the same and, as usual for Dr DiVietro, see *Quote 110*, unsubstantiated with respect to how *any* interlinear bible is a help in understanding *any* Biblical passage.

It is most unlikely that an interlinear translation could be a help in understanding what Dr DiVietro terms, without defining it anywhere between two covers*, the Hebrew original, as Dr Mrs Riplinger explains on p 635 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphasis. Dr DiVietro’s selection of quotes for *Quote(s) 111* shows that he has tried to imply that Dr Mrs Riplinger is unaware of the space limitation for the English text of an interlinear bible.

*See *Quotes 4, 7, 8, 10, 16, 28, 33, 35, 36, 49, 52, 59, 61, 85, 86, 90, 92, 94, 95, 98, 108, 109* for Dr DiVietro’s repeated failure to specify the location of any so-called original text between two covers, i.e. what Dr Waite refers to as “*the plenary verbal inspiration of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words in the original Bible,*” echoing Hodge and Warfield who said, this author’s under-linings, that “*We do not assert that the common text [i.e. the AV1611], but only that the original autographic text was inspired.”* Dr Williams, associate of Dr Waite and Dr DiVietro, alludes to the original text, or original inspired words of scripture in Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek in *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi and assures the reader that those words have been perfectly preserved in various sources such as Traditional Text manuscripts etc. but he does not specify even one single source where those words can be found between two covers as Dr Waite’s “*original Bible.*” Neither does Dr Waite nor Dr DiVietro. See **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** and note this extract:

*In this author’s view, according to their own standards where ‘the original text’ is the final authority for “the scripture of truth” Daniel 10:21, Cleaning-Up pp 2-4, neither Dr DiVietro nor any other member of the DBS Executive Committee could **prove** that they possess a perfect Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek match mate to the KJB, which they claim to represent an accurate translation of the correct i.e. original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text, even though they insist that the KJB is not inspired, Cleaning-Up, p 18, **unless they could produce all the original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek manuscripts.***

See associated remarks in **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** and **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society** p 23. See also *Quote 35* especially, where Dr DiVietro acknowledges that no “*original Bible*” ever existed as a collation of the originals of the 66 Books but that the original words were preserved and are accurately translated in the King James Bible. As indicated, however, he does *not* specify where any inspired original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text exists now between two covers.

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement from p 635 of *Hazardous Materials* follows, her emphasis. The statement indicates that Dr Mrs Riplinger *is* aware of the space limitation for the English text of an interlinear bible, despite Dr DiVietro’s insinuation to the contrary.

“...[Green] chooses English words based on their *SIZE* not on their accuracy of equivalency.”

How is *that* kind of selection capable of being a good place to start in order to understand an underlying Greek or Hebrew text? Dr DiVietro does not explain. He has also failed to appreciate the importance of Psalm 12:6 with respect to David’s prayer in Psalm 119:34, 73, 125, 144, 169 **“Give me understanding.”** See **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint.**

Psalm 12:6 states **“The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.”**

Understanding of **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21 comes from the Lord’s seven-fold **“purified”** words, not an interlinear’s space-limited packaged words. See **Challenges #5, #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints** and remarks on Dr DiVietro’s examples of ‘understanding’ via ‘the Greek.’

Among the extracts from **Quote(s) III** is the following from pp 636 of *Hazardous Materials*.

“Green’s English words are corrupt, taken from corrupt “lexicons” such as “Strong,” “Vine,” “Trench,” “Thayer,” “Brown-Driver-Briggs,” (sic) and “Gesenius” (The Interlinear Bible Greek-English, Vol. 4, p. xv; The Interlinear Hebrew-English, vol. 2, pp. x, xiv). Such lexicons and their authors will be thoroughly discredited in this book. He says that, “Through the use of The Interlinear Bible, one can utilize the lexicons, word books, and other aids...” (The Interlinear Bible, Preface). Therefore one is not reading Green, or any sort of literal English translation, but the nefarious lexical definitions of these corrupt lexicons.”

An interlinear English text such as Green’s is therefore subject to lexical limitations as well as space limitations.

The lexical shortcomings in turn cast further doubt on the usefulness of an interlinear English text as a means of understanding an underlying Greek or Hebrew text.

Dr DiVietro has no direct comment to make on the above statement from *Hazardous Materials*, which means that he either accepts it as correct but is too churlish to say so, or his support for the lexicons of Liddell, Scott and co., see remarks above on **Quotes 70, 72, 78, 79**, prevents him from **“Providing for honest things, not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men”** 2 Corinthians 8:21.

Either way, Dr DiVietro would be wise to reflect upon Proverbs 26:12.

“Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit? there is more hope of a fool than of him.”

Quote 112, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 637

“Scrivener’s Greek Textus Receptus, magnified by some as if it were the original, was “constructed” by and for the Revised Version Committee of Westcott and Hort of 1881.”

Dr DiVietro insists that Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement is incorrect. He says that the convocation which authorized the RV translation instructed Scrivener to compile his text.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states on p 630 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphasis, that *“Scrivener created his Greek text for comparison purposes as part of his work as a member of the Westcott-Hort Revised Version Committee. It was his assignment to recreate the KJB’s underlying Greek text, as his original Preface states.*

*“Contrary to his RV Committee assignment and popular opinion, Scrivener’s one-man Greek text is **not** a precise record of the Greek text underlying the KJB, nor is it precisely the text of Beza, who followed Latin translations of the Syriac and Arabic text, among other sources.”*

Dr DiVietro does not challenge the above statement. He does not even comment on it.

It can, however, reasonably be said that Scrivener worked on his Greek text under the auspices of the RV Committee while he was a committee member, so in that sense it was done “*by...the Revised Version Committee.*”

Dr DiVietro is therefore gnat-straining, Matthew 23:24, revealing yet again the essential weakness of his case against *Hazardous Materials*.

Dr DiVietro also does not take issue with Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement in **Quote 112** that “*Scrivener’s Greek Textus Receptus*” is “*magnified by some as if it were the original.*”

That apparent oversight on Dr DiVietro’s part appears to be significant. See **Quote 108** and the following extracts.

See **Quote 97** with respect to Dr Waite’s statement from *A WARNING!!* p 28 about Scrivener’s text as cited in *Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society* p 25, this author’s underlining.

P. 28 “The “Scrivener Greek New Testament” is not “slightly tainted.” I believe the Words in this “Greek New Testament” to be accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words. I believe them to be authentic copies of the original New Testament Words. It is sad that Gail Riplinger refuses to take this same position.”

As Bro. Heisey points out in a separate communication to this author on the above dogma from Dr Waite, “What is sad indeed is that the statement is a blatant lie. Scrivener’s Greek New Testament is indeed tainted (see the [above list of 64 verses]) and Dr Waite has admitted this in his e-mails (see [extract from Waiting for Waite] below). Furthermore, if the quote from Dr Waite above is indeed his belief (he has never responded to direct questions about that nor to questions about his vacillation on the matter – see [extract from Waiting for Waite] below), then it is clear that Dr Waite believes that there are errors in the KJB. Why? Because there is no way to reconcile the vast majority, if not all, of the verses cited previously where Scrivener’s text differs from the exact text which underlies the KJB”...

*Drs Waite, DiVietro and Cloud are therefore careful not to state outright that Scrivener’s Greek text is “the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words” of the Greek New Testament but that could well be the facade that they seek to maintain, while continuing to conceal the whereabouts between two covers of the supposed original Greek New Testament text that they purport to have but don’t. The reader should note the careful wording used in *Cleaning-Up* pp xi, 327-330 with respect to published copies of the Received Text, none of which are explicitly said to be a true i.e. inspired copy of the original Greek New Testament text, such as John Bunyan said that he possessed with respect to “the English Bible.” See www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1311767565.pdf p 15...*

*Finally for **Quote 108**, Dr DiVietro’s support for Scrivener as alluded to above, with respect to **Quotes 92, 93, 98, 99, 103, 105**, is explained by means of the following site that Sister Riplinger drew to this author’s attention.*

*Some extracts, in italics, follow, this author’s emphases. As Sister Riplinger has stated separately to this author, Dr DiVietro will be receiving royalties from the publication mentioned below. Contrary to his insinuation under **Quote 104**, Sister Riplinger states that she has not received royalties or taken an income from A. V. Publications for the last 17 years.*

www.logos.com/product/366/scriveners-textus-receptus-1881-20

Overview

The *Textus Receptus 1881* Greek text is **the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version**. The Scrivener text is a modified Beza 1598 *Textus Receptus* in which changes have been made **to reflect the readings chosen by the KJV translators**. Scrivener's intent was to artificially create a **Greek text that closely matched the translator-modified Textus Receptus text and the resulting English version**. This is a useful text for comparison for those with proficiency in Greek.

Title: *Scrivener's Textus Receptus (1881) 2.0*

Authors: F. H. A. Scrivener, **Kirk DiVietro**

Price: \$24.95

It is not surprising that Dr DiVietro would speak up for his co-author, especially if the sales revenue might be adversely affected by the disclosures in *Hazardous Materials Chapters 17-18*. (Observe that the Scrivener/DiVietro text is **not** said to be 'inspired'.)

Dr Waite's pretensions with respect to Scrivener's text and DiVietro's literary partnership with the late F. H. A. Scrivener together with his apparent oversight of Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement that "*Scrivener's Greek Textus Receptus*" is "*magnified by some as if it were the original*" may go a long way to explaining the DBS Executive Committee's surprisingly sensitive reaction to the subject of back translation.

See remarks under **Quotes 113, 114**.

Quote 113, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 637

"As an RV committee member between 1873 and 1880, Scrivener was given the assignment of "backwards translating" the KJB into Greek to ascertain the KJB's Greek basis."

Dr DiVietro denies that the above statement is true and refers the reader to pp ii, 302-303 of his book, with respect to statements by D. A. Waite Jr about Scrivener's use, or non-use, of back translation to obtain the Greek text of the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament.

As indicated under **Quote 108**, Dr DiVietro takes up the issue of back translation in considerable detail under **Quote 114**, which follows. See below.

This extract from **Quote 108** should, however, be kept in mind.

*Note in passing, however, that Dr DiVietro has already acknowledged that it is all right for **him** and his DBS Executive Committee colleagues to identify differences between the King James New Testament and Scrivener's or any other edition of the Received Text by means of reverse translation but evidently not for anyone else*. See **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint and Cleaning-Up** p 20.*

Psalm 73:9 comes to mind.

"They set their mouth against the heavens, and their tongue walketh through the earth."

*Apart from a small amount by Scrivener, Dr DiVietro's co-author, *Cleaning-Up* p 199, which essentially means that "*It's all right if we or our pals do it but it's not all right if someone that we don't like says it's been done by one of our pals.*" Sheer double-mindedness, James 1:8. As will be considered in more detail under **Quote 114**, Dr DiVietro states that Scrivener began with Beza's text, by which he ascertained where the King James New Testament departs from Beza's text. However, Dr DiVietro does *not* explain how, in his view, Scrivener determined where these departures occur in the King James New Testament *without extensive reverse translation of the King James New Testament*. That is significant

because *any* amount of reverse translation immediately disqualifies the end text from being an *independent authority* with respect to the source text, an unpalatable fact for the DBS Executive Committee that it seeks to avoid, most likely for fear of losing revenue. See remarks under **Quote 112** with respect to the Scrivener/DiVietro text, price \$US 24.95, and related remarks under **Quote 114**.

Quote 114, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 637-638

*“Those who use Scrivener’s TBS edition (or Green’s) thinking that they must go **back** to the Greek, have placed themselves in a foolish position. They are using a Greek text that was TRANSLATED FROM THE KING JAMES BIBLE! D. A. Waite Jr. notes in his English translation of Scrivener’s original edition that Scrivener’s assignment was to “backwards translate” the KJB...*

“When the fine details are examined it becomes clear that in the minutiae Scrivener did not always back-translate, as Waite also observes. What he did in fact was to create an entirely new entity, a Greek text that matches no other Greek text on earth and which matches no Holy Bible ever made, not even the KJB. It is not Beza’s text, as some pretend; it certainly follows no other edition of the Textus Receptus in the minutiae...Although the text is titled, “the text followed in the Authorized Version,” Scrivener takes an entire page admitting and delineating why and where it is not.”

Dr DiVietro follows **Quote 114** with almost 6 pages of comments. However, only the first page consists of his direct statements. The next page, occupying pp 199-200 of *Cleaning-Up* and replicated on pp 302-303, consists of D. A. Waite Jr’s disavowal of any back-translation by Scrivener. See **Quote 108**.

The remaining comments, occupying almost 4 full pages of *Cleaning-Up*, pp 200-204, are from an unidentified individual, as indicated by double quote marks, with respect to extracts from *Hazardous Materials* pp 630, 633, 634, 637, 640, 642, 643 with a brief conclusion to the effect that D. A. Waite Jr has been misrepresented on pp 634, 637 and that claims of back-translation for the bulk of Scrivener’s text do not stand up to scrutiny.

It is strange that the individual whose comments make up two-thirds of those under **Quote 114** declines to identify himself in that he appears so confident of refuting the material in *Hazardous Materials* that he addresses.

Psalms 11:2, 64:2-4 come to mind.

“For, lo, the wicked bend their bow, they make ready their arrow upon the string, that they may privily shoot at the upright in heart.”

“Hide me from the secret counsel of the wicked; from the insurrection of the workers of iniquity: Who whet their tongue like a sword, and bend their bows to shoot their arrows, even bitter words: That they may shoot in secret at the perfect: suddenly do they shoot at him, and fear not.”

The two ellipses in **Quote 114** should be noted. See also **Quotes 39, 41, 43, 62, 65, 71, 79** where Dr DiVietro has also made subtle use of ellipses.

The first ellipsis bypasses the reference “(D. A. Waite, Jr., *The Doctored New Testament*, Collingswood, NJ: The Bible For Today Press, 2002, p. i, footnote 5, last line).”

The specific footnote reference, “p. i, footnote 5, last line,” should be observed. It will be remarked upon later.

The second ellipsis bypasses the following statement, which will be seen to be pivotal in answering the comments under *Quote 114*.

“It is his own mix and therefore not authoritative at some points.”

Note carefully that neither Dr DiVietro, D. A. Waite Jr nor the anonymous commentator under *Quote 114* appear able to either answer or even address the above statement.

The significance of their silence in that respect will be discussed below.

For now, the comments of each of the above contributors under *Quote 114* will be addressed in turn, starting with Dr DiVietro.

Dr DiVietro is outraged at the contents of *Quote 114*. He insists, in bold letters, that in *Quote 114*, Sister Riplinger has destroyed all her credibility. That is a strange statement from Dr DiVietro because it is apparent from the first page of *Cleaning-Up* that Sister Riplinger never had any credibility with the DBS Executive Committee to start with, according to that particular publication.

However, Dr DiVietro goes on to say that Scrivener’s text is not really *“an entirely new entity.”* He insists that it is largely Beza’s text with 172 readings from other published Greek texts, largely that of Stephanus, which match the KJB where Beza’s text does not.

Dr DiVietro also charges Sister Riplinger with ignorance of the Great Fire of London of 1666, which consumed the meeting notes of the 1611 committee so that their reasons for choosing a particular reading may only be guessed at. He declares, however, that the 1611 committee did translate the New Testament from *“the originall Greeke.”*

Dr DiVietro’s concluding comment under *Quote 114* is that a small amount of reverse translation from the KJB is acceptable in order to identify which of the published Greek texts the translators used for any of the KJB New Testament readings that depart from Beza’s text. Dr DiVietro says that this is the only reverse translation that Scrivener carried out and he accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of trying to imply that Scrivener back-translated the whole of his Greek New Testament from the KJB.

Once again, it should be noted that Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing in his comments. See *Quote 110*. This oversight is perplexing under *Quote 114* because Dr DiVietro fails to explain the variation in the number of departures of the KJB New Testament from Beza’s text that he cites in his book.

On p 20 of *Cleaning-Up*, he refers to 190 departures, which he says was (and is, *Hazardous Materials* p 642) Scrivener’s figure, of which Dr DiVietro states that he was able to account for the published Greek sources of all but 30.

Under *Quote 105*, Dr DiVietro refers to 120+ KJB departures from Beza’s text that he states are minor and a further 30 departures that Scrivener believed to have Latin sources but for which Dr DiVietro says that he found Greek support, apart from some, which Dr DiVietro does not specify, that were retained from pre-1611 English Bibles.

Under *Quote 114*, Dr DiVietro now refers to 172 KJB departures from Beza’s text that Scrivener included in his text.

It would be useful if Dr DiVietro had reconciled these different totals for the KJB departures from Beza’s text that he mentions, i.e. 190, 120+ plus another 30 and 172. It would also help if he had provided some examples of the pre-1611 English readings in the 1611 Text mentioned under *Quote 105* that Scrivener appears to have obtained for his text by means of reverse translation.

Regrettably, Dr DiVietro, as indicated above, does neither.

The above observations, however, yet again raise the spectre for the DBS Executive Committee of the necessity for an *uninspired* English Text to provide readings for the “*accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words*” i.e. Scrivener’s text.

It must be emphasised yet again that the DBS Executive Committee is careful *not* to say that Scrivener’s text is inspired. Dr Waite refers to it as an accurate authentic copy of the inspired original Greek text but not an *inspired* accurate, authentic copy. See **Quote 112** with respect to Dr Waite’s statement in *A WARNING!!* p 28 and Bro. Heisey’s comments from under **Quote 108**, including this extract from his study *Waiting for Waite* with respect to the two key questions that Dr Waite refuses to answer.

““Does F.H.A. Scrivener’s Greek text need to be corrected so as to match the exact readings underlying the King James Bible New Testament?” and, “Is the text of the King James Bible without error?” To date, this author has not received nor seen a direct, straightforward, consistent, well-explained, non-contradictory answer from Dr. Waite to these two questions.”

See also Dr DiVietro’s statement on p 21 of *Cleaning-Up* that published Greek texts are *not* the final authority i.e. they clearly *cannot* be inspired but ‘*the*’ Greek text *was*. The DBS Executive Committee appears to believe that ‘*the*’ Greek text to which Dr DiVietro refers not only *was* but now *is* the final authority, see *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3, and therefore inspired but it has yet to disclose the whereabouts of ‘*the*’ Greek text, which must therefore be as Bunyan would have said “*a true copy*” of the *original, inspired, finally authoritative* Greek New Testament text (even though Koine Greek is a dead language, contrast 1 Peter 1:23, 25) between two covers. See remarks on pp 20-21 of *Cleaning-Up* under **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

*It must therefore also be emphasised yet again that the DBS Executive Committee has not disclosed any source other than a supposedly **uninspired** English Text for complete compilation of the actual inspired original Greek New Testament text that it professes to have but has not yet specifically identified between two covers.*

See **Challenges #1, #3, #5, Points-Counterpoints, Quotes 1, 62, 66, 94.**

See also remarks under **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to back translation to which Dr DiVietro refers on p 20 of *Cleaning-Up* for locating the Greek sources of the KJB variations from Beza’s text.

Those remarks under **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint** also emphasise that it apparently still hasn’t occurred to the DBS Executive Committee that what it perceives as an *uninspired* English Text, i.e. the 1611 English Text itself, is being used to establish “*the originall Greeke*” equivalent of the English Text and *this* Greek, according to the DBS Executive Committee, *is inspired and therefore in authority over the uninspired English Text*. See again *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3, 18.

The DBS Executive Committee is therefore still leaning heavily on what it declares to be only “*the word of men*” * 1 Thessalonians 2:13 to yield what it perceives as “*the word of God*” in the form of its as yet unidentified inspired original Greek text between two covers, which it implies it has. See *Cleaning-Up* pp xi, 327-300 – noting the careful wording on these pages, see **Quotes 86, 108, 112** - with this extract from under **Quote 86**. *Dr Waite, Dr Williams and Dr DiVietro often use the incorrect term “*Word*” for “*the word of God.*” See **Quote(s) 111** and **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society** p 23 and *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi, 2-4, 18, 87-88, 149.

(As Dr DiVietro's comments under **Quote 86** imply, the DBS Executive Committee 'priest class' professes to have its own 'Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek original text' but never explicitly identifies it as a single document containing both Old and New Testaments between two covers. See *Cleaning-Up* pp xi, 327-330.)

Dr DiVietro's repeated evasion of the precise whereabouts of the inspired, original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text *for today* between two covers may be observed using the search string* *between two covers* for **Challenges #1, #3, #5, #7, Points-Counterpoints, Challenges #1-#7**, summaries and overall summaries and **Quotes 4, 7, 8, 10, 16, 28, 33, 35, 36, 49, 52, 59, 61, 85, 86, 90, 92, 94, 95, 98, 108, 109, 111, 112**. *For an e-copy of this work.

The glaring anomaly above considerably overshadows Dr DiVietro's objections to Dr Mrs Riplinger's remarks about Scrivener's reverse translation of the KJB New Testament.

Those remarks notwithstanding, what she *does* show is that Scrivener's Greek text derives at least in part from the King James New Testament and is therefore not an independent Greek authority for evaluating the King James Text, as Dr Mrs Riplinger states clearly in the sentence that Dr DiVietro conceals with his second ellipsis.

"It is his own mix and therefore not authoritative at some points."

Dr DiVietro therefore *cannot* legitimately appeal to the work of his co-author and himself (retail price \$US 24.95), see **Quotes 108, 112**, as a viable, independent authority either, for example, to 'clarify' the King James New Testament, *Cleaning-Up* p 94, or to clear up any supposed confusing grammar etc. that Dr DiVietro perceives to be in the KJB New Testament.

See **Challenges #3, #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints, Quotes 4, 40, 86, 97, 110** for Dr DiVietro's accusations against the 1611 Holy Bible, for its supposedly confusing grammar.

That conclusion is key, with respect not only to Dr DiVietro's comments under **Quote 114** and those of D. A. Waite Jr and the anonymous A. N. Other but with respect to *all* his invective against Sister Riplinger in his entire book and that of Dr Waite in *A WARNING!!*

That situation is what has most likely fuelled Dr DiVietro's ire and that of his cronies, D. A. Waite Jr, the incognito A. N. Other, Dr Waite himself and the rest of the DBS Executive Committee against Sister Riplinger, rather than specifically what she said about Scrivener and back translation.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's accusation against Dr Mrs Riplinger about the Great Fire of 1666, it is Dr DiVietro who is wallowing in wilful ignorance. He should have had the courtesy to study instead of merely skim-read *In Awe of Thy Word*, see **Quote(s) 87**. *In Awe of Thy Word* Chapter 15 gives a detailed overview of how the King's men arrived at specific readings in their work, with numerous examples tabulated. Dr DiVietro may object that Chapter 15 does not explicitly discuss selection of a particular reading from Greek textual variants. However, that selection had largely been achieved by the faithful pre-1611 precursors such as the Bishops' Bible and would therefore not have been a critical issue for the King James translators, although, as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows, they had access to many Greek and vernacular witnesses for the particular readings that they selected.

Previewing Chapter 15 of *In Awe of Thy Word*, Dr Mrs Riplinger states, p 31, her emphases "For hundreds of years, the methods and thoughts of the KJV translators remained lost, until our generation, when every attack possible has buffeted the KJV [including underhanded efforts to 'clarify' it and 'define' it, *Cleaning-Up* pp 91, 94]. "But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound" (Rom. 5:20). The revealing translation notes of the King James Bible committee have been found. These include three documents: Manuscript 98, the Anno-

tated Bishops' Bible, and the handwritten notes from the decisive and final translation committee [documents, evidently, **"upon whose bodies the fire had no power"** Daniel 3:27, not even the Great Fire of London, 1666]. This author's word-for-word collation of these documents demonstrates that the KJV translators considered and **rejected** words used in today's new versions. These documents also reveal the translators' use of a treasure trove of ancient Greek codices and vernacular translations that may not be available to today's translators. The KJV translators' method of translation is shown, which includes use of the Bible's built-in dictionary, looking for a word's "brother" or "neighbour." The translators believed men could "hear **Christ speaking** unto them in their **mother tongue**...by the written word translated." The scriptures foretold that with – **"other tongues and other lips will I speak..."** (1 Cor. 14:21).

"God said, "I have not spoken in secret," in lexicons hidden on scholars' bookshelves, but "in the volume of the book" in "other tongues," such as English (Isa. 45:19, Heb. 10:7). The phrase, "in the Greek" and "in the Hebrew" is too often immediately followed by echoes from the "bottomless pit," warns Rev. **9:11***. Unlike today's editors, the KJV translators' final authorities were Bibles, not lexicons. They saw the KJV as the final "perfected" and "finished" English Bible. "Satan," they warned, benefited from "various editions" [i.e. of future 'bibles' such as RV of 1881 and all those that followed]."

*Revelation 9:11 (!) is the only place in scripture where the expressions **"in the Greek"** and **"in the Hebrew"** occur together in the one verse. The expression **"in the Hebrew"** occurs a total of 8 times in scripture but **"in the Greek"** occurs only once, i.e. in Revelation 9:11. Even though the expression **"in the Hebrew"** is found in Acts 21:40, 22:2, with Paul speaking and in Acts 26:14 with the Lord Himself speaking, the expression has forbidding or at least unhealthy connotations in no fewer than 5 out of its 8 occurrences. See John 5:2, 19:13, 17, Revelation 16:16 in addition to Revelation 9:11. The DRB, RSV, NRSV, NIV, TNIV, NKJV, JB, NJB, NWT, HCSB, CEV, ESV all have "in Greek" and "in Hebrew" in Revelation 9:11. The RV, ASV, NASV retain "in the Greek" but read "in Hebrew" with the other modern versions, showing the leavening effect*, Galatians 5:9, from 1881, 1901, 1963 to the later dates for the later versions. *See **Quote 115**. The Wycliffe and Geneva Bibles read "in Greek" and "in Hebrew" with most of the modern versions but the Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Bishops' ("in ye Greke") Bibles read with the 1611 Holy Bible.

Dr DiVietro's accusation against Sister Riplinger about the Great Fire of 1666 is therefore wholly unjustified and Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement above gives further insight into where Dr DiVietro and his cronies are really coming from with respect to their attacks on Sister Riplinger and her work.

Moving to D. A. Waite Jr's comments under **Quote 114**, he has a page of objections to Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement "D. A. Waite Jr. notes in his English translation of Scrivener's original edition that Scrivener's assignment was to "backwards translate" the KJB..."

D. A. Waite Jr takes exception to the above statement on the basis of "footnote 2 from page xiv of *The Doctored New Testament*."

The text of the footnote may be found online²⁴³ in a 21-page letter that took 5 days to write, July 9th-14th 2009, by D. A. Waite Jr's mom, Mrs Yvonne Waite, to Sister Riplinger and, with only minor differences from the statement quoted by D. A. Waite Jr under **Quote 114**, reads as follows, p 2.

"*"In those KJV portions with no known Greek support, Scrivener (a man of textual integrity) let the readings of Beza's 1598 Greek NT stand (p. 655). He refused to backwards translate from Latin to Greek!"*"

It is apparent from p 637 of *Hazardous Materials* that Dr Mrs Riplinger is referring to a different footnote specification from that stated by D. A. Waite Jr under **Quote 114** and on p 2 of his mom's letter to Sister Riplinger.

As indicated, the footnote specification to which Dr Mrs Riplinger refers is found where Dr DiVietro inserts his first ellipsis under **Quote 114**.

“(D. A. Waite, Jr., The Doctored New Testament, Collingswood, NJ: The Bible For Today Press, 2002, p. i, footnote 5, last line).”

D. A. Waite Jr's mom explains the anomaly as follows, her emphases and underlinings.

“You gave the footnote, to your untrue statement, from the first copy-machine book done in 2002. That was rolled off on the copy machine and bound by hand a year prior to its final publication in a HARDBACK edition. So, when one looks up page I, footnote 5 (the last line in the 2003 edition), one is baffled because page I is on the TITLE PAGE of the published hardback book (published in 2003) is different [sic]. Would you please correct your statements. Thank you.”

What is significant about the above statement is that D. A. Waite Jr's mom does not state explicitly what the original footnote said, i.e. the one cited on p 637 of *Hazardous Materials*. D. A. Waite Jr's mom only says that it cannot be found in the new edition.

Neither does D. A. Waite Jr nor Dr DiVietro state explicitly under **Quote 114** what the original footnote actually said.

One wonders if in the transition from the 2002 to the 2003 edition of *The Doctored New Testament*, the wording of the original footnote underwent some 'doctoring' itself.

Note the text of D. A. Waite Jr's letter to Edward Carrington under **Quote 89** and Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement from *Serious Problems in D. A. Waite's The Defined King James Bible's Definitions – Defiled & Declined* p 30.

“Because Hazardous Materials has since alerted readers to the problems in their lexicons, Waite is now avoiding this specific admission. On a radio program, hosted by his mother, D.A. Waite, Jr. tried to give the impression that he had never indicated that he had used these lexicons. However, a copy of his original e-mail, indicating his use of these lexicons, is available for all to read.”

The failure of the Waites and Dr DiVietro to disclose what the 2002 footnote actually said itself casts serious doubt on the validity of any accusations they have levelled against Sister Riplinger for making false statements, especially if the footnote underwent some careful 'editing' between the 2002 and 2003 editions of *The Doctored New Testament*.

King James Bible believers should therefore always beware of **“the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive;”** Ephesians 4:14.

This work will now focus on the remaining comments under **Quote 114**, occupying almost four pages of *Cleaning-Up* and, as mentioned above, as the double quotes indicate, contributed by an anonymous donor, aka A. N. Other, who will for the remainder of this response under **Quote 114** be referred to as Dr/Mr Coward in recognition of his preferred anonymity.

Dr/Mr Coward states that on p 630 of *Hazardous Materials* Dr Mrs Riplinger states that **“Scrivener's Greek text...was translated from the English KJB originally.”**

Dr/Mr Coward insists that nothing in Scrivener's preface supports Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement.

Dr/Mr Coward goes on to say that Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement on the same page that "*Scrivener's anti-KJB prejudice...led him to mistranslate some of the KJB readings*" is further proof that she is falsely claiming that Scrivener reverse translated the KJB into Greek.

What Dr/Mr Coward has overlooked with respect to p 630 of *Hazardous Materials* is that it is a summary page, with the advisory statement at the bottom "*Documentation to follow.*" Dr/Mr Coward's criticisms of Dr Mrs Riplinger's statements on p 630 of *Hazardous Materials* are therefore unreasonable in that he does not refer to any of the relevant documentation.

He even overlooks the summary documentation that Dr Mrs Riplinger provides on p 630 of *Hazardous Materials*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states with respect to Scrivener's mistranslations of the KJB that "*documented herein is Greek textual evidence proving 20 errors in his Textus Receptus and 24 readings in the KJB which he wrongly ascribes to Latin.*"

See **Quote 108** with respect to the 64 verses where Scrivener departed from the King James New Testament that have been identified so far. Dr Mrs Riplinger's reference to "*some of the KJB readings*" applies *essentially* to Scrivener's errors in departing from the King James New Testament, not reverse translation as such, which is a secondary issue in the context.

Following her comment on Scrivener and reverse translation of the King James New Testament Dr Mrs Riplinger states that "*Additionally, those scores of places where Scrivener's Greek does not match the historic "Originall Greeke" prevent it from being any sort of final authority for study or translation work.*"

The retail price will still be \$US 24.95 per copy, however, see above and **Quote 108**, although Dr Mrs Riplinger's disclosures on p 630 of *Hazardous Materials* with "*Documentation to follow,*" see again **Quote 108**, will not please Scrivener's co-author and his supporters, especially following Dr Mrs Riplinger's additional disclosures in her recent work *Serious Problems in D. A. Waite's The Defined King James Bible's Definitions – Defiled & Declined*. See **Quote 89**.

It is no wonder, therefore, that Scrivener's co-author and his supporters have attacked Dr Mrs Riplinger as shown under **Quote 114**. The matter of how much reverse translation Scrivener did or did not carry out is, as indicated above, a secondary issue in the context of p 630 of *Hazardous Materials*.

Dr/Mr Coward then objects to Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement on p 633 of *Hazardous Materials*, found under **Quote 106**.

"Today's copyright owner, the Trinitarian Bible Society, merely echoes and begins its own preface affirming,*

*"The Textus Receptus printed in this volume is the Greek text followed by the translators of the English Authorised Version of the Bible first published in the year of 1611" (H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ, The New Testament The Greek Underlying the English Authorised Version of 1611, London: The Trinitarian Bible Society, 1976, Preface, emphasis mine). *"[T]he word of God is not bound" (2 Tim. 2:9). The true Holy Bible will not be bound by special copyright restrictions which require permissions and restrict free unaltered use, because God is the author and owner. Therefore the Scrivener text cannot be the word of God.)"*

Dr/Mr Coward maintains that the above statement is incorrect but his very reason for so doing vindicates Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement.

Dr/Mr Coward states that Scrivener's text is now in the public domain where anyone can reproduce it because it is well over 100 years since the text was first published such that copyright no longer applies.

In other words, *copyright once did apply to Scrivener's text and therefore Dr Mrs Riplinger's essential statement on Scrivener's text is correct.*

"Therefore the Scrivener text cannot be the word of God."

Dr/Mr Coward should reflect on Proverbs 26:27.

"Whoso diggeth a pit shall fall therein: and he that rolleth a stone, it will return upon him."

It should also be noted that, whatever his reasoning, Dr/Mr Coward believes the following statement to be false and says so explicitly in his comments.

*"[T]he word of God is not bound" (2 Tim. 2:9). The true Holy Bible will not be bound by **special** copyright restrictions which require permissions and restrict **free** unaltered use, because God is the author and owner. Therefore the Scrivener text cannot be the word of God."*

It is this author's considered view that the TBS will not lift their copyright restrictions unless they receive a direct instruction from **"the third heaven"** 2 Corinthians 12:2 to do so. It would appear, therefore, that the restrictions will remain in place.

Dr/Mr Coward clearly believes that the 1611 Holy Bible is merely **"the word of men"** not **"as it is in truth, the word of God"** 1 Thessalonians 2:13. Like Drs Waite, Williams and Di-Vietro, he shows that the Dean Burgon Society is really part of *The "Yea Hath God Said" Society*. See Genesis 3:1 and *Manuscript Evidence* Chapter 3.

Dr/Mr Coward then takes issue with the following statement from p 634 of *Hazardous Materials*.

"Green states on his copyright page that his Greek New Testament text is used by permission of the Trinitarian Bible Society. Green admits that Scrivener's text was "reconstructed." Don Waite Jr. says Scrivener's method was to "backwards translate" from the KJB in the main."

Dr/Mr Coward insists that Green needed permission only for reproducing the format of the TBS version of Scrivener's text, not the text itself, which was already in the public domain. He tries to imply, therefore, that Dr Mrs Riplinger has misled her readers over the copyright issue.

See remarks above with respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement on p 633 of *Hazardous Materials* concerning the copyright issue.

Dr/Mr Coward then states that Green's admission about the reconstruction of Scrivener's text is not the same as saying that *"Scrivener's method was to "backwards translate" from the KJB"* and that any statements to that effect should be drawn directly from Scrivener and not Green. Dr/Mr Coward insists further that D. A. Waite Jr has made no such statement attributed to him by Dr Mrs Riplinger and reproduces *"footnote 2 from page xiv of The Doctored New Testament"*:

"In those KJV portions with no known Greek support, Scrivener (a man of great textual integrity) let the readings of Beza's 1598 Greek NT stand (p. 655). He refused to backwards translate from Latin to Greek!"

Dr/Mr Coward's citation of the footnote differs from that of D. A. Waite Jr's mom only with the insertion of the word "great" with respect to the textual integrity of Dr DiVietro's co-author mentioned in the footnote.

Dr/Mr Coward then insists that the footnote clearly cannot be used to support the statement "Don Waite Jr. says Scrivener's method was to "backwards translate" from the KJB in the main."

See remarks above with respect to "footnote 2 from page xiv of *The Doctored New Testament*" and the letter to Dr Mrs Riplinger from D. A. Waite Jr's mom.

Dr/Mr Coward has in fact missed, or evaded, the main point of p 634 of *Hazardous Materials*, which is given in the sub-heading at the top of the page and summarised in the opening sentence.

"Jay P. Green's Greek-English Interlinear Bible

"Some use Scrivener's Greek Textus Receptus in Jay P. Green's Interlinear Bible, Greek-English, with Green's faulty English below Scrivener's Greek."

Although Dr Mrs Riplinger mentions backwards translation on p 634 of *Hazardous Materials*, her main purpose is to warn readers about the mixed nature of Green's text. It is not an exact reproduction of Scrivener's text, as Dr Mrs Riplinger explains, her emphasis, in the statements following that which Dr/Mr Coward extracted - see above.

"...However in the General Preface to Vol. 2 of Green's four volume Interlinear, he says that his Interlinear Bible Greek-English has the "Greek words as printed in the Stephens Edition of 1550" (*The Interlinear Bible, Hebrew-Aramaic Old Testament, Jay P. Green ed., 1993 printing, Vol. 2, Preface, pp. vii, xv*). This gives the impression that Green may not know that Scrivener's Greek text and Stephen's (Stephanus) text are **different**. Therefore his Greek may be a hybrid, and one should be cautious, looking for the unique errors of each individual text."

The last two sentences of the above statement form **Quote 109** in *Cleaning-Up* and Dr DiVietro's comments on **Quote 109** have been answered. It is clear, however, that Dr Mrs Riplinger is warning readers that Scrivener's and Green's texts are not the same and neither of them is actually "the "Originall Greeke" followed by the KJB translators, ancient Greek manuscripts and pure vernacular Holy Bibles" to which Dr Mrs Riplinger refers on p 634 of *Hazardous Materials*.

That warning is beneficial to the reader but Dr/Mr Coward has obscured it.

It is of course possible that Green deliberately produced a Scrivener/Stephanus hybrid text in order to try to avoid any copyright issues, Dr/Mr Coward's disavowal of them notwithstanding.

Dr/Mr Coward then reproduces most of **Quote 114** from pp 637-638 of *Hazardous Materials* and insists yet again that D. A. Waite Jr did not make the statement attributed to him by Dr Mrs Riplinger. See again remarks above with respect to "footnote 2 from page xiv of *The Doctored New Testament*" and the letter to Dr Mrs Riplinger from D. A. Waite Jr's mom.

Dr/Mr Coward alludes to the statement "When the fine details are examined it becomes clear that in the minutiae Scrivener did not always back-translate, as Waite also observes." He insists that Dr Mrs Riplinger is therefore trying to imply that Scrivener used reverse translation from the King James New Testament for most of his text, an implication, he says, that is at variance with Scrivener's own preface.

Dr/Mr Coward repeats this charge, together with his insistence that Scrivener's preface does not support Dr Mrs Riplinger's statements on reverse translation, with respect to the following extract from p 640 of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphases and capitalisations.

*"Scrivener admits that [his Greek text] is generally a **back-translation of the English KJB into Greek – a Greek text translated FROM the ENGLISH Bible.**"*

Dr/Mr Coward does not, however, give any relevant citation from Scrivener's preface in either instance. The word of this anonymous donor who will without hesitation "**privily shoot at the upright in heart**" Psalm 11:2 must be taken on trust at this point.

Dr/Mr Coward's accusations against Sister Riplinger from pp 637-638, 640 of *Hazardous Materials* may be answered as follows.

Observe this extract from the remarks above in answer to Dr DiVietro's specific comments under **Quote 114**.

*Dr DiVietro's concluding comment under **Quote 114** is that a small amount of reverse translation from the KJB is acceptable in order to identify which of the published Greek texts the translators used for any of the KJB New Testament readings that depart from Beza's text. Dr DiVietro says that this is the only reverse translation that Scrivener carried out and he accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of trying to imply that Scrivener back-translated the whole of his Greek New Testament from the KJB.*

It does not seem to have occurred to Sister Riplinger's attackers that Scrivener could easily have carried out his own translation of the King James New Testament into Koine Greek and largely retained Beza's text where that text matched his trial translation. His reverse translation would then only be apparent where Beza's text departs from the King James New Testament. Dr DiVietro, D. A. Waite Jr and Dr/Mr Coward may dismiss that possibility as mere speculation but they cannot prove otherwise.

The possibility of Scrivener having carried out his own trial translation is reinforced by the following statement from *Hazardous Materials* p 639, which also indicates that Dr Mrs Riplinger is entirely aware that Scrivener's text is largely Beza's, in spite her accusers' insistence to the contrary, according to the above extract. The extract from p 639 of *Hazardous Materials* reads as follows, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphases and this author's under-linings, those in bold indicating added emphases on Dr Mrs Riplinger's part.

*"Scrivener begins his **original** preface by explaining his RV Committee's charge to him to create this volume for comparison purposes for their project. In the original preface Scrivener gives a seven page description of the purpose of the work as related to his RV work. He adds an eight page appendix at the end of the volume listing the verses where he departs from the readings of Beza's Greek text. **He adds a final page to show some of the places where he did not follow the Greek text underlying the KJB** (Scrivener, *The New*, p 656)."*

Note that the above statement appears in garbled form under **Quote 115** as part of Dr DiVietro's comments, not as part of the quote. That apparent anomaly will be addressed under **Quote 115**.

The underlined statement in the above extract shows first that Dr Mrs Riplinger does in fact perceive Scrivener's text as largely Beza's. However, it also strongly suggests that, in the absence at the time of any specific information about the extent to which the King's men used each of their available Greek sources for their work, Scrivener did his own reverse translation and then compared it with what he thought was the translators' most likely source i.e. the final editions of Beza's text but also any other sources* that he had.

*Dr Mrs Riplinger states that Scrivener only used printed editions of the Received Text for his text. See *Hazardous Materials* p 640 and **Quote 116**.

The obvious question is, how, in fact, could he have done otherwise, *a priori*? As indicated above, his reverse translation would only be evident where the King James New Testament departs from Beza's text. It is therefore rash for Dr Riplinger's accusers* to assume that *only* those parts of the King James New Testament were subjected to reverse translation by Scrivener. It is most unlikely that he would have known in advance *specifically* which parts of the King James New Testament that they were.

*See again the above extract from the remarks above in answer to Dr DiVietro's specific comments under **Quote 114**.

Dr Mrs Riplinger's deduction that Scrivener had to carry out a reverse translation of essentially the entire King James New Testament and then compare it with various Greek sources, principally Beza's final editions, is supported by Scrivener's own statements that Dr Mrs Riplinger has included on p 642 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphases. See also this author's underlining.

The inclusion below shows yet again that Dr Mrs Riplinger is well aware that Scrivener's text is largely Beza's text and that her accusers are wrong to insist otherwise.

*““In considering what text had the best right to be regarded as **“the text presumed to underlie the Authorised Version,”** it was necessary to take into account **the composite nature of the Authorized Version...Beza's fifth and last text of 1598 was more likely than any other to be in the hands of the of the King James's revisers...There are however many places in which the Authorized Version is at variance with Beza's text; chiefly because it retains language inherited from Tyndale and his successors, which had been founded on the text of other Greek editions...These uncertainties do not however affect the present edition, in which the different elements that actually make up the Greek basis of the Authorized Version have an equal right to find a place”** [subjective and incomplete back-translation of AV into Greek].”*

No notes of any reverse translation carried out by Scrivener appear to exist. However, it is easy to see from the above that Beza's 1598 Edition would have been Scrivener's preferred choice for any trial reverse translation. He would have had to carry out at least a significant amount of such a translation in order to reach the findings that he did about the Greek sources for the King James New Testament. Contrary, therefore, to Dr/Mr Coward's accusations based on pp 637, 640 of *Hazardous Materials*, see above, Scrivener's own preface *does* support Dr Mrs Riplinger's conclusions about Scrivener and reverse translation.

The essential point of this conclusion, which Sister Riplinger's accusers have so far missed, is that *Scrivener's text cannot therefore be either inspired or finally authoritative and it is certainly not “the Originall Greeke” from which the King James New Testament was translated, the translation source that even Dr DiVietro acknowledges in his concluding comment under Quote 114.*

Note the relevant portion of **Quote 114**, with the sentence inserted that Dr DiVietro omitted, reads as follows, this author's emphases.

*“When the fine details are examined it becomes clear that in the minutiae Scrivener did not always back-translate, as Waite also observes. What he did in fact was to create an entirely new entity, a Greek text that matches no other Greek text on earth and which matches no Holy Bible ever made, not even the KJB. It is not Beza's text, as some pretend; it certainly follows no other edition of the Textus Receptus in the minutiae. **It is his own mix and there-***

fore not authoritative at some points. Although the text is titled, “the text followed in the Authorized Version,” Scrivener takes an entire page admitting and delineating why and where it is not.”

Note again the statement from p 639 of *Hazardous Materials*.

*“He adds a final page to show some of the places where he did not follow the Greek text underlying the KJB (Scrivener, *The New*, p 656).”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger gives the full title of Scrivener’s text on p 638 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphases, showing, in the light of the above citations that Scrivener’s title of his text is grossly misleading. Neither Dr DiVietro nor D. A. Waite Jr nor Dr/Mr Coward addressed the relevant material on p 638 of *Hazardous Materials*.

““The New Testament in the Original Greek, according to the Text followed in the Authorized Version...Edited for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, by F. H. A. Scrivener...1881.””

Dr Mrs Riplinger is therefore quite right to say, as she does at the top of p 644 of *Hazardous Materials* that, her emphasis, “Scrivener’s Greek text can be helpful, as demonstrated at the beginning of this chapter. But the one-man RV committee intellectual exercise is **hardly** a letter-for-letter repository of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost for this generation.”

Amen.

See also the statement at the conclusion to **Quote 113** from which the following extract is taken any amount of reverse translation immediately disqualifies the end text from being an independent authority with respect to the source text and the remarks above from which this extract is taken, with additional emphases and under-linings.

What [Dr Mrs Riplinger] does show is that Scrivener’s Greek text derives at least in part from the King James New Testament and is therefore not an independent Greek authority for evaluating the King James Text, as Dr Mrs Riplinger states clearly in the sentence that Dr DiVietro conceals with his second ellipsis.

“It is his own mix and therefore not authoritative at some points.”

*Dr DiVietro therefore cannot legitimately appeal to the work of his co-author and himself (retail price \$US 24.95), see **Quote 108, 112**, as a viable, independent authority either, for example, to ‘clarify’ the King James New Testament, *Cleaning-Up* p 94, or to clear up any supposed confusing grammar etc. that Dr DiVietro perceives to be in the KJB New Testament.*

*See **Challenges #3, #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints, Quotes 4, 40, 86, 97, 110** for Dr DiVietro’s accusations against the 1611 Holy Bible, for its supposedly confusing grammar.*

Although they are careful *not to say so explicitly*, see remarks in response to Dr DiVietro’s specific comments under **Quote 114**, it appears that Dr Waite, Dr DiVietro, D. A. Waite Jr (and possibly his mom), Dr/Mr Coward and the rest of the DBS Executive Committee would like “*this generation*” to think that “Scrivener’s Greek text...**IS**...a letter-for-letter repository of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost,” this author’s selective citation, emphasis and capitalisation.

In the meantime, the DBS Executive Committee likes to convey the impression that *it* retains ‘the’ Greek text, *Cleaning-Up* p 21, the whereabouts of which they have yet to disclose between two covers. See again Dr DiVietro’s repeated evasion of the precise whereabouts of the inspired, original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text *for today* between two covers that may be

observed using the search string* *between two covers* for **Challenges #1, #3, #5, #7, Points-Counterpoints, Challenges #1-#7**, summaries and overall summaries and *Quotes 4, 7, 8, 10, 16, 28, 33, 35, 36, 49, 52, 59, 61, 85, 86, 90, 92, 94, 95, 98, 108, 109, 111, 112*. *For an e-copy of this work.

The DBS Executive Committee seems to do so because, to quote Dr Ruckman from *Custer's Last Stand* p 61:

"The tough guy is the man who has the "edge.""

"A thing is almost exactly the opposite of the way it appears.

"If it don't make SENSE, there is a BUCK in it."

It appears to this author that is all there is to the attacks on Sister Riplinger under *Quote 114* by Dr DiVietro, D. A. Waite Jr and Dr/Mr Coward and indeed via the publication of *Cleaning-Up*. See related remarks under *Quote 5*. These attacks and indeed the whole attitude of the DBS Executive Committee to the 1611 Holy Bible are inexplicable to anyone of **"a sound mind"** 2 Timothy 1:7 unless the DBS Executive Committee seeks to retain *"the edge"* with respect to what it *wrongly* perceives as **"the scripture of truth"** Daniel 10:21 i.e. the non-extant Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek 'original.'

The DBS Executive Committee will accuse anyone of *heresy* who dissents from their 'originals-onlyism' dogma, see **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society** pp 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 16, 20, 22, 26, 37, 47, 48, 53 and remarks at the end of *Quote 86*. *Yet the opposite is true* because it is the DBS Executive Committee that has embraced *heresy* by changing **"the scripture of truth"** Daniel 10:21 in order to bolster up its 'originals-onlyism' heresy. See *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, 2-3 and *Quote 86* with respect to Dr Ruckman's encounter with **"an old prophet"** 1 Kings 13:11 who assimilated virtually every heresy in existence *by changing the words of the 1611 Holy Bible*.

The DBS Executive Committee then aims to keep *"the edge"* and inflict its 'originals-onlyism' dogma in order to ensure *"a BUCK"* in return:

Prices (for the supposed facsimile Greek 'original') this author's emphases:

\$US 40 (including \$US 5 shipping and handling for USA customers), *Scrivener's Annotated Greek New Testament*, available from *The Bible For Today*, BFT.

\$US 24.95, *Scrivener's Textus Receptus (1881) 2.0*, Authors: F. H. A. Scrivener, **Kirk DiVietro**, www.logos.com/product/366/scriveners-textus-receptus-1881-20

See *Quotes 107, 108*.

As Solomon observes in Ecclesiastes 10:19:

"...money answereth all things."

And as the apostle Paul notes in 1 Timothy 6:10:

"For the love of money is the root of all evil..."

Neither of the above outlets for Scrivener's text includes the health warning that Dr Mrs Riplinger mentions on p 31 of *Hazardous Materials* that Scrivener's text be used *only* for comparison purposes and *not* for study or translation. *Unhealthy* use of Scrivener's text for purposes *other than comparison* is therefore alarmingly possible.

The above summary shows yet again that Dr Waite, Dr DiVietro, D. A. Waite Jr (and possibly his mom), Dr/Mr Coward and the rest of the DBS Executive Committee are guilty of the violation of the priesthood of all believers.

See **Challenges #1, #5, #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints**, summaries and overall summaries and **Quotes 4, 5, 10, 15, 21, 27, 28, 40, 42, 48, 49, 52, 58, 67, 85, 86.**

Dr/Mr Coward refers next to pp 642-643 of *Hazardous Materials*, which contain the major portion of a lengthy citation from Scrivener's original preface. Dr/Mr Coward objects to Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement "[*subjective and incomplete back-translation of the AV (KJB) into Greek*]" that she has inserted twice into the citation as an interpretation of statements in the preface immediately preceding the insertions and given in bold. Dr/Mr Coward insists that Scrivener's own words do not support Dr Mrs Riplinger's interpretation. He states that Scrivener never mentions "*back-translation of the AV (KJB) into Greek*" and cites the following extract from Scrivener's preface on p 642 of *Hazardous Materials* as follows, insisting that the expression "*uniformly representative*" is not the same as "*back-translation of the AV (KJB) into Greek.*"

"*The Cambridge Press has therefore judged it best to set the readings actually adopted by the Revisers at the foot of the page..., and to keep the continuous text consistent throughout by making it so far as was possible uniformly representative of the Authorized Version...The different elements that actually make up the Greek basis of the Authorized Version have an equal right to find a place.*"

Dr/Mr Coward's last criticism of Dr Mrs Riplinger under **Quote 114** is with respect to p 643 of *Hazardous Materials* where he states that although Scrivener refers in his preface to "*the presumed Greek original of the Authorized Version,*" Dr Mrs Riplinger is wrong to denigrate Scrivener's text as an "*imprecise reconstruction...based in places on "presumed" words...[and] "uncertainties"*" because, he says, she has taken the word "*uncertainties*" out of the context of Scrivener's statement "*These uncertainties do not however affect the present edition...*"

Dr/Mr Coward's conclusion is that neither Scrivener's preface nor D. A. Waite's actual statements support what he terms Dr Mrs Riplinger's claims about reverse translation i.e. "*back-translation of the AV (KJB) into Greek.*"

See yet again remarks above with respect to "*footnote 2 from page xiv of The Doctored New Testament*" and the letter to Dr Mrs Riplinger from D. A. Waite Jr's mom with respect to D. A. Waite Jr's actual statements.

The remainder of Dr/Mr Coward's accusations against Sister Riplinger and the citations from pp 642-643 of *Hazardous Materials* may be answered as follows.

It should first be observed that Dr/Mr Coward is naive to think that Scrivener might actually admit to "*back-translation of the AV (KJB) into Greek.*" As an academic, he is much more likely to couch his method in outwardly more scholarly terms, which is what he appears to have done.

Note therefore that two ellipses occur in Dr/Mr Coward's extract from Scrivener's preface as cited on p 642 of *Hazardous Materials*. The first bypasses Dr Mrs Riplinger's note that the 1881 revisers' readings are omitted from the editions of Scrivener's text published by the TBS and Jay P. Green. The second ellipsis bypasses several statements from the preface between the first and second insertions of Dr Mrs Riplinger's note "[*subjective and incomplete back-translation of the AV (KJB) into Greek*]"

The first of the omitted statements comes immediately after the statement "*to keep the continuous text consistent throughout by making it so far as was possible uniformly representative of the Authorized Version*" and immediately before the first insertion of Dr Mrs Riplinger's note. It reads as follows, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphases.

““The publication of an edition formed on this plan appeared to be all the more desirable, inasmuch as the *Authorised Version* was not a translation of any one Greek text then in existence, and no Greek text intended to reproduce in any way the original of the *Authorised Version* has ever been printed.””

The remaining omitted statements of importance have been cited above with respect to the response to Dr/Mr Coward’s criticisms of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statements on reverse translation on pp 637-638, 640 of *Hazardous Materials* and are reproduced here, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases and this author’s underlining.

““In considering what text had the best right to be regarded as **“the text presumed to underlie the Authorised Version,”** it was necessary to take into account **the composite nature of the Authorized Version...Beza’s fifth and last text of 1598 was more likely than any other to be in the hands of the of the King James’s revisers...There are however many places in which the Authorized Version is at variance with Beza’s text; chiefly because it retains language inherited from Tyndale and his successors, which had been **founded on the text of other Greek editions...These uncertainties do not however affect the present edition, in which the different elements that actually make up the Greek basis of the Authorized Version have an equal right to find a place**”** [subjective and incomplete back-translation of AV into Greek].”

Scrivener therefore admits that no published Greek text *perfectly* matches **“the original of the Authorised Version.”**

Scrivener therefore admits that at least *some* of his text is **“the text presumed to underlie the Authorised Version”** i.e. not *known* to be the text that underlies the Authorised Version.

Scrivener’s statement that **“the different elements that actually make up the Greek basis of the Authorized Version have an equal right to find a place”** is itself therefore a presumption. If at least *some* of Scrivener’s text is **“the text presumed to underlie the Authorised Version”** he cannot know what **“the Greek basis of the Authorized Version”** is precisely and therefore cannot precisely assign **“the different elements”** that **“have an equal right to find a place in it.”**

The title of Scrivener’s text is therefore again shown to be misleading. See above. It is not **“The New Testament in the Original Greek, according to the Text followed in the Authorized Version”.**

Readers should not be charged up to \$US 40 under the misapprehension that it is.

It appears not to have occurred to either Scrivener or Dr Waite, Dr DiVietro, D. A. Waite Jr (and possibly his mom), Dr/Mr Coward and the rest of the DBS Executive Committee that God did not see fit to prompt the King’s men to publish either a companion Hebrew/Aramaic Old Testament or companion Koine Greek New Testament with their work, the 1611 English Holy Bible.

For the explanation, see again Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement from *In Awe of Thy Word* p 956, found in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**, from **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society**, pp 31-32 with this author’s emphases.

“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 Bi-

ble 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.”

See also this extract from **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**, from p 472 of *In awe of Thy Word*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s warning in the light of Exodus 20:4 applies, her emphases in red bold, including with respect to imposition of the DIY ‘Greek,’ for whatever purpose, including supposed ‘clarification,’ as in Cleaning-Up, p 94. *Do-It-Yourself.*

“Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth:”

Dr Waite, Dr DiVietro, D. A. Waite Jr (and possibly his mom), Dr/Mr Coward and the rest of the DBS Executive Committee have blatantly ignored both of the above warnings. They should keep in mind 1 Corinthians 3:13.

“Every man’s work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man’s work of what sort it is.”

Scrivener’s statements given above must surely beg the question that Dr Waite, Dr DiVietro, D. A. Waite Jr (and possibly his mom), Dr/Mr Coward and the rest of the DBS Executive Committee do not directly answer.

With no companion Koine Greek New Testament in existence for the 1611 Holy Bible, how could Scrivener seek to achieve “*the original of the Authorised Version*,” even to the imperfect extent that he did?

Reverse translation of the King James New Testament would be the only feasible method.

Dr DiVietro, D. A. Waite Jr and Dr/Mr Coward do not give any other realistic explanation under *Quote 114*.

See remarks above with respect to “Beza’s fifth and last text of 1598” together with this extract from that discussion.

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s deduction that Scrivener had to carry out a reverse translation of essentially the entire King James New Testament and then compare it with various Greek sources, principally Beza’s final editions, is supported by Scrivener’s own statements that Dr Mrs Riplinger has included on p 642 of Hazardous Materials.

Scrivener’s method for creating a comparative Greek text for the King James New Testament – see *Hazardous Materials* p 631 - would have been *technically* sound where he could establish that his trial translation matched either Beza’s text or one of the other Greek sources at his disposal but he was unable to do so for all of the King James New Testament.

Regrettably, instead of obeying Romans 12:17 to “**Provide things honest in the sight of all men**” by simply highlighting those parts of the King James New Testament for which he had no Greek witnesses, he speculated wrongly about use by the King’s men of the Latin Vulgate and/or inserted his own presumed readings, as shown below.

He therefore produced what Dr Mrs Riplinger states on p 637 of *Hazardous Materials* “*is his own mix and therefore not authoritative at some points.*”

See remarks above with respect to Dr DiVietro’s omission of that key statement and again the extract from p 639 of *Hazardous Materials* that reads as follows, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s empha-

ses and this author's under-linings, those in bold indicating added emphases on Dr Mrs Riplinger's part.

*“Scrivener begins his **original** preface by explaining his RV Committee's charge to him to create this volume for comparison purposes for their project. In the original preface Scrivener gives a seven page description of the purpose of the work as related to his RV work. He adds an eight page appendix at the end of the volume listing the verses where he departs from the readings of Beza's Greek text. **He adds a final page to show some of the places where he did not follow the Greek text underlying the KJB** (Scrivener, *The New*, p 656).”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger then documents Scrivener's "own mix" on pp 654-677 of *Hazardous Materials*, where she warns on p 653 "Scrivener pretends that the KJB readings in the following verses are not 'the' original. Therefore Scrivener's is not the "exact" "Originall Greeke" text that underlies the KJB in the following verses." See the 64 verses where Scrivener has been found so far to depart from the King James New Testament listed under **Quote 108**, from which the following extract is taken.

*The undoubted inclination of the DBS Executive Committee to dismiss as trivial the incomplete list of 64 departures of Scrivener's text from the King James New Testament listed above is answered under **Quotes 95, 97** with respect to "**a little folly**," "**a little leaven**," "**little foxes**," "**a little member**" and "**a little fire**" and their effects.*

It is of course therefore highly inconsistent of Dr Waite to state as he does in A WARNING!! P. 28 "*The "Scrivener Greek New Testament" is not "**slightly tainted**." I believe the Words in this "Greek New Testament" to be accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words. I believe them to be authentic copies of the original New Testament Words. It is sad that Gail Riplinger refuses to take this same position.*"

See **Quote 112** and Bro. Heisey's related comments.

See also Dr Mrs Riplinger's summary statement on pp 949-950 of *In Awe of Thy Word* where she states that "Scrivener admits his "corrected" places were "precarious," based on what he "presumed" and what "appears" to him to be "more likely" the correct data."

In other words, what Dr Mrs Riplinger has rightly stated twice on p 642 of *Hazardous Materials* "[subjective and incomplete back-translation of the AV (KJB) into Greek]."

Dr/Mr Coward is wrong to object.

Dr/Mr Coward is also wrong therefore to accuse Dr Mrs Riplinger of taking Scrivener's use of the word "uncertainties" out of context with respect to the statement "These uncertainties do not however affect the present edition, in which **the different elements that actually make up the Greek basis of the Authorized Version have an equal right to find a place.**"

As indicated above, if at least *some* of Scrivener's text is "**the text presumed to underlie the Authorised Version**" he cannot know what "**the Greek basis of the Authorized Version**" is precisely and therefore cannot precisely assign "**the different elements**" that "**have an equal right to find a place in it.**"

Those are the uncertainties to which Dr Mrs Riplinger is referring and she is right to do so because those uncertainties evidently remain to this day with respect to Scrivener's text, Dr DiVietro's support for his co-author notwithstanding. Scrivener's "uncertainties" appear not to have affected his text only in that he either attributed some King James readings to the Latin Vulgate and either substituted or invented his own, as indicated above.

Scrivener's "'uncertainties'" therefore *seriously do affect* the current perception of what is "*the Originall Greeke*" of the King James New Testament, price up to \$US 40 per copy for US supporters of the DBS Executive Committee.

See again from **Quote 97** Dr Waite's statement from *A WARNING!!* p 28 about Scrivener's text as cited in **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society** p 25, this author's underlining, where the misleading perception of Scrivener's text as "*the Originall Greeke*" is regrettably heavily reinforced, as Bro. Heisey has incisively noted. See again extract from *Waiting for Waite* under **Quote 112**.

P. 28 "*The "Scrivener Greek New Testament" is not "slightly tainted."* *I believe the Words in this "Greek New Testament" to be accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words. I believe them to be authentic copies of the original New Testament Words. It is sad that Gail Riplinger refuses to take this same position.*"

Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement from pp 643-644 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphasis, on Scrivener's uncertainties in his text, cited in part in answer to Dr/Mr Coward's criticisms with respect to pp 637-638, 640 of *Hazardous Materials* reads as follows, showing that Dr/Mr Coward is wrong in his conclusion as well, this author's under-linings*.

*Dr DiVietro, D. A. Waite Jr and Dr/Mr Coward do not challenge or address those statements.

*"Scrivener admits his imprecise reconstruction of the Greek text is based in places on "presumed" words, "more likely" texts, "uncertainties" and "precarious" ideas about what "appears to have been" the KJB's sources (Scrivener, The New, pp. v, vii, viii, 655, 656). This hardly constitutes a final authority and Scrivener had no intention of creating an inspired edition...Scrivener's Greek text can be helpful, as demonstrated at the beginning of this chapter. But the one-man RV committee intellectual exercise is **hardly** a letter-for-letter repository of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost for this generation."*

Amen, again.

Quote 115, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 639

"The telling RV notes and heavy type which reference RV changes have now disappeared from today's TBS and Green editions."

Dr DiVietro's comments are strangely garbled under **Quote 115**. As indicated under **Quote 114**, the second of his two paragraphs of comments consists simply of a disjointed reproduction of this statement, extracted, like **Quote 115**, from p 639 of *Hazardous Materials*.

*"Scrivener begins his **original** preface by explaining his RV Committee's charge to him to create this volume for comparison purposes for their project. In the original preface Scrivener gives a seven page description of the purpose of the work as related to his RV work. He adds an eight page appendix at the end of the volume listing the verses where he departs from the readings of Beza's Greek text. He adds a final page to show some of the places where he **did not follow** the Greek text underlying the KJB (Scrivener, The New, p 656)."*

Dr DiVietro's actual comments on **Quote 115**, therefore, are limited to his first paragraph, which also is partly garbled.

It may be that the publishers will correct Dr DiVietro's distorted comments under **Quote 115** in future editions of his book but some passages of scripture come to mind that may explain why *Cleaning-Up* saw publication without its proof readers catching Dr DiVietro's confused statements under **Quote 115**.

“...and he shall stretch out upon it the line of confusion, and the stones of emptiness” Isaiah 34:11, the **“bitter words”** Psalm 64:3, see introductory remarks under **Quote 114**, and **“hard speeches”** Jude 15 hurled at Sister Riplinger by Dr DiVietro etc. being **“stones of emptiness.”**

“Behold, they are all vanity; their works are nothing: their molten images are wind and confusion” Isaiah 41:29, likewise their **“sent letters to put me in fear”** Nehemiah 6:19. See the reference under **Quote 114** to the 5-page letter by D. A. Waite Jr’s mom to Sister Riplinger.

“...God is not the author of confusion...” 1 Corinthians 14:33. The author of *Cleaning-Up* (amanuensis Dr Kirk DiVietro, Th.M., Ph.D.) clearly *is*. See citation from *In Awe of Thy Word* p 31 under **Quote 114** with respect to Revelation 9:11.

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s first paragraph under **Quote 115**, he appears to be saying, minus the distortion, that the omission of the RV notes from modern editions of Scrivener is of no importance for anyone who simply wants to study Scrivener’s text and that therefore Dr Mrs Riplinger statement in **Quote 115** is superfluous.

Dr DiVietro has missed the point of **Quote 115**. Dr Mrs Riplinger states on pp 638-639 of *Hazardous Materials*, immediately before **Quote 115** **“Co-committee member Philip Schaff...boasts that Scrivener’s Greek text had “value in connection with the English Revision, and supplement each other.” Schaff states that “Scrivener puts the new readings at the foot of the page, and prints the displaced readings of the text in heavier type.” Their second Greek text did the opposite (Philip Schaff, A Companion to the Greek Testament and the English [Revised] Version, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1885, 2nd edition, Revised, p. 282).”**

Dr DiVietro should have reflected on 1 Corinthians 5:6.

“Your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?”

Dr DiVietro evidently doesn’t. What Dr Mrs Riplinger has shown in the context of **Quote 115** is another example of **“a little folly,” “a little leaven,” “little foxes,” “a little member”** and **“a little fire”** and their effects.

The 1881 Revisers’ leavening began early in their work. As Dean Burgon²⁴⁴ himself notes, his emphases, they were supposed **“To introduce as few alterations as possible into the Text of the Authorised Version, consistently with faithfulness.”**

Working away in secret, the Revisers eventually produced a *different* i.e. *Catholic* bible, based on *different texts* from those that the King’s men worked with for the 1611 Holy Bible.

Benjamin Wilkinson²⁴⁵ notes that **“the Revisers “went on changing until they had altered the Greek Text in 5337 places...Even the jots and tittles of the Bible are important. God has pronounced terrible woes upon the man who adds to or takes away from the volume of Inspiration. The Revisers apparently felt no constraint on this point, for they made 36,000 changes in the English of the King James Version, and very nearly 6,000 in the Greek Text. Dr. Elliott, in submitting the Revised Version to the Southern Convocation in 1881, declared that they had made between eight and nine changes in every five verses, and in about every ten verses three of these were made for critical purposes. And for the most of these changes the Vatican and Sinaitic Manuscripts are responsible.”**

That was the result of beginning with **“a little leaven”** on the part of the 1881 Revisers, the latitude to make ‘a few changes’ to the 1611 Holy Bible.

This poem²⁴⁶ summarises the Revisers’ leavening work, under the auspices of their Reviser-in-Chief, 2 Corinthians 11:14.

Making The Evil Seem Good

*In all he did, in all he taught,
He kept this aim in sight;
To get the deeds of darkness done,
Disguised as works of light.*

*He spread his poison, slow and sure,
Through many a specious sect,
And made the evil seem the good,
Bamboozling God's elect - Selected*

Dr DiVietro cannot see what Dr Mrs Riplinger is pointing out in the context of **Quote 115**.

Scrivener's text as originally published was actually *part* of making "*the evil seem the good*" for the Revised Version. Inclusion of the RV readings, or departures from Scrivener's text as footnotes gave these unwarranted departures *acceptability*, even *respectability*, with theologians and many church goers alike in those times, with Scrivener's text having been accepted, wrongly, according to its misleading title as "*The New Testament in the Original Greek, according to the Text followed by the Authorized Version.*" See *Hazardous Materials* p 638 and remarks under **Quote 114**.

The next step, of exalting the RV departures into the *text* and demoting to the *footnotes* Scrivener's equivalent readings, *assumed* to be "*the Original Greek, according to the Text followed by the Authorized Version*" creates a *false impression of superiority* for the RV Greek New Testament text over "*the Original Greek*" (supposed) of the Authorized Version. In turn, "*the hearts of the simple*" Romans 16:18, who at the time may have been disinclined to study Burgon's essential but intricate work *The Revision Revised*, are persuaded i.e. *deceived into accepting* that the Revised English text *is superior to* the Authorized English Text.

Dr DiVietro may object to the above analysis on the basis that the RV is long gone, as indeed it is, but the deception remains and indeed the leavening begun by the 1881 Revisers has not only persisted but is almost complete.

As Solomon observes in Ecclesiastes 11:3, with respect to what's done is done:

"...if the tree fall toward the south, or toward the north, in the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be."

See remarks under **Quote 92** with respect to the note on Acts 8:37 and remarks under **Quote 109** with respect to the very small number of genuine King James Bible-believing churches in England, the nation that gave the world the Authorized Version.

See also the concluding pages of *Did The Catholic Church Give Us The Bible?* by David W. Daniels of Chick Publications for an extremely readable account of "*the church of the Laodiceans*" Revelation 3:14 of these "*perilous times*" 2 Timothy 3:1.

It is no longer necessary for publishers of Scrivener's text to include the RV departures from "*the Original Greek*" (supposed) of the Authorized Version. Whatever the size of today's market for Scrivener's text, see remarks with respect to its BFT and Logos i.e. K. DiVietro editions under **Quote 114**, the Reviser-in-Chief, 2 Corinthians 11:14, knows that by means of what Ezekiel 28:16 describes as "*the multitude of thy merchandise*" i.e. NASV, NRSV, NIV, TNIV, CEV, ESV, HCSB, NKJV (which maintains 'respectability' for the 1881 Revisers' text in its footnotes) etc., he can keep "*the scripture of truth*" at bay from "*the hearts of the simple.*"

As one of the “*many a specious sect,*” the ‘originals-onlyists’ of the DBS Executive Committee, *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-iv, 2-3, 18, 21 even help him in his mission.

Quote 116, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 639-640

“Observe four points, as you read the upcoming abstract from his original preface: Scrivener admits that his Greek text was done **for the Revised Version Committee**. Scrivener admits that it is generally **a back-translation of the English KJB into Greek** – a Greek text translated FROM the ENGLISH Bible. Scrivener admits that his Greek text’s paragraph divisions and punctuation are not from any Greek editions, but are taken from the English Revised Version (RV). Scrivener created a false set of criteria for creating his text, perhaps due to his desire to downgrade the scholarship of the KJB translators, when compared to those of his RV committee. He used **only**, “Greek readings which might naturally be known through printed editions to the revisers of 1611 or their predecessors.””

Quote 116 has been given according to the layout by which Dr DiVietro presents it in *Cleaning-Up* because he begins his comments with a thrice-repeated accusation against Dr Mrs Riplinger of distortion of Scrivener’s intent in publishing his text.

It is Dr DiVietro who is guilty of distortion. The actual layout of **Quote 116** in *Hazardous Materials* is as follows.

“Observe four points, as you read the upcoming abstract from his original preface:

1. Scrivener admits that his Greek text was done **for the Revised Version Committee**.
2. Scrivener admits that it is generally **a back-translation of the English KJB into Greek** – a Greek text translated FROM the ENGLISH Bible.
3. Scrivener admits that his Greek text’s paragraph divisions and punctuation are not from any Greek editions, but are taken from the English Revised Version (RV).
4. Scrivener created a false set of criteria for creating his text, perhaps due to his desire to downgrade the scholarship of the KJB translators, when compared to those of his RV committee. He used **only**,

“Greek readings which might naturally be known through printed editions to the revisers of 1611 or their predecessors” (Scrivener, *The New*, p. viii).”

If Dr DiVietro is going to level criticisms of distortion against Sister Riplinger three times in succession, he should at least be charitable enough to reproduce her statements with complete precision and include any relevant references, both of which he fails to do.

Dr DiVietro then accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of not informing the reader that Scrivener produced his text under the direction of the convocation that authorized the RV. In vivid language, he accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of distorting Scrivener’s notes in **Quote 116** and attempting to deprive the student of the King James Bible of Scrivener’s text.

Dr DiVietro then makes the telling statement that his co-editor had no ulterior motive such as the compilation of a Greek text for sale as ‘the’ Greek text underlying the King James New Testament, even though Scrivener knew and was forced to admit, in effect, that his text was defective in that respect.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments on **Quote 116** with the statement that Scrivener simply documented the King James New Testament readings that the RV committee replaced with their readings.

It seems to this author that Dr Mrs Riplinger has informed the reader why Scrivener undertook the task to create his Greek text, by means of this statement from p 639 of *Hazardous Materials*, alluded to three times under **Quote 114** and even given in garbled form under **Quote 115** in *Cleaning-Up*.

*“Scrivener begins his **original** preface by explaining his RV Committee’s charge to him to create this volume for comparison purposes for their project.”*

That statement would surely satisfy any honest reader with respect to the necessary information about the origin and purpose of Scrivener’s text. Dr DiVietro is merely carping.

Dr DiVietro’s accusation to the effect that Dr Mrs Riplinger is distorting Scrivener’s notes and seeking to deprive the King James Bible student of Scrivener’s text is itself a gross distortion and indeed a blatant lie. Dr Mrs Riplinger’s opening statement in **Quote 116** reads *“Observe four points, as you read the upcoming abstract from his original preface:”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger is simply cautioning the student with respect to the four points that she lists as he *reads* the preface to Scrivener’s text.

In no way could anyone with **“a sound mind”** 2 Timothy 1:7 construe that statement as an attempt to deprive a student of Scrivener’s text.

Note again p 631 of *Hazardous Materials* where Dr Mrs Riplinger advises readers that Scrivener’s Greek Textus Receptus is available from A. V. Publications.

In no way could anyone with **“a sound mind”** 2 Timothy 1:7 construe that statement as an attempt to deprive a student of Scrivener’s text, Dr DiVietro’s unwarranted and indeed immature sarcasm in response notwithstanding. See **Quote 104**.

It is ironic that Dr DiVietro should accuse Dr Mrs Riplinger of trying to deprive King James Bible students of Scrivener’s text when he and his co-conspirators of the DBS Executive Committee are continually engaged in trying to wrest *the King James Bible* from King James Bible students as **“all scripture”** that **“is given by inspiration of God.”** See again *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi, 2-3, 18, 88 and Dr D. A. Waite’s A **WARNING!!**

The malice of the DBS Executive Committee in the above respect is all the more objectionable in that Dr Waite refuses to answer or even respond to legitimate questions about the shortcomings of Scrivener’s text. See Bro. Heisey’s statements under **Quotes 108, 112, 114**, from which this extract is taken.

““Does F.H.A. Scrivener’s Greek text need to be corrected so as to match the exact readings underlying the King James Bible New Testament?” and, “Is the text of the King James Bible without error?” To date, this author has not received nor seen a direct, straightforward, consistent, well-explained, non-contradictory answer from Dr. Waite to these two questions.”

Dr DiVietro’s disavowal of any possible mercenary motive on his co-author’s part in creating his text is revealing. See **Quotes 108, 112** and this extract.

Scrivener’s Textus Receptus (1881) 2.0

*Authors: F. H. A. Scrivener, **Kirk DiVietro***

Price: \$24.95

It may be that in spite of himself, Dr DiVietro senses that he is like the accusers in John 8:9, although he will not admit it – yet.

“And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last: and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst.”

In addition to the possibility of mercenary motives for marketing a defective Greek text, Scrivener did much more than simply document King James New Testament readings that the RV committee replaced with their readings as part of his text.

See this extract from **Quote 114**.

*Dr Mrs Riplinger then documents Scrivener’s “own mix” on pp 654-677 of Hazardous Materials, where she warns on p 653 “Scrivener pretends that the KJB readings in the following verses are not ‘the’ original. Therefore Scrivener’s is not the “exact” “Originall Greeke” text that underlies the KJB in the following verses.” See the 64 verses where Scrivener has been found so far to depart from the King James New Testament listed under **Quote 108**, from which the following extract is taken.*

*The undoubted inclination of the DBS Executive Committee to dismiss as trivial the incomplete list of 64 departures of Scrivener’s text from the King James New Testament listed above is answered under **Quotes 95, 97** with respect to “a little folly,” “a little leaven,” “little foxes,” “a little member” and “a little fire” and their effects.*

*It is of course therefore highly inconsistent of Dr Waite to state as he does in A WARNING!! P. 28 “The “**Scrivener Greek New Testament**” is not “slightly tainted.” I believe the Words in this “Greek New Testament” to be accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words. I believe them to be authentic copies of the original New Testament Words. It is sad that Gail Riplinger refuses to take this same position.”*

See **Quote 112** and Bro. Heisey’s related comments.

See also Dr Mrs Riplinger’s summary statement on pp 949-950 of In Awe of Thy Word where she states that “Scrivener admits his “corrected” places were “precarious,” based on what he “presumed” and what “appears” to him to be “more likely” the correct data.”

Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing in response to the above citations. He should reflect upon Proverbs 26:24.

“He that hateth dissembleth with his lips, and layeth up deceit within him;”

Quote 117, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 641-643

Quote 117 consists of the extract from Scrivener’s original preface, beginning with Dr Mrs Riplinger’s introductory paragraph as follows.

“Scrivener’s original Preface admits that his Greek text was only created because the RV’s changes from the KJB (Authorised Version) burst the seams of the RV margin. His original Preface says, in part – ”

Dr DiVietro complains that Dr Mrs Riplinger has reached the depths of distortion with her reproduction of Scrivener’s original preface by means, he claims, of the format that she has used, first to avoid charges of selective quoting* that were levelled at her for some of her earlier work and then to make Scrivener appear to be saying the opposite of what he really is saying.

*All such charges are baseless. See www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html and *White-washed: A Critique of James White*, Chapter 5 “The King James Only Camp.”

Dr DiVietro grudgingly admits that the parts of Scrivener’s preface that Dr Mrs Riplinger has quoted are given correctly (as Bro. Heisey has confirmed independently) but he continues to

complain that since he can't read the format very well, Dr Mrs Riplinger must therefore have concocted the format in order to deceive her readers.

Pathetic.

Yet again, Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing in his comments.

He gives no illustration whatsoever of Dr Mrs Riplinger's supposed distortion by typeface of even one single statement in Scrivener's preface.

Psalm 144:8 sums up both Dr DiVietro's complaints under **Quote 117** and his accompanying keystrokes.

"Whose mouth speaketh vanity, and their right hand is a right hand of falsehood."

See **Quote 114** for detailed remarks with respect to Scrivener's preface.

Quote 118, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 643

"Scrivener admits his imprecise reconstruction of the Greek text is based in places on "presumed" words, "more likely" texts, "uncertainties" and "precarious" ideas about what "appears to have been" the KJB's resources."

Dr DiVietro makes another pathetic attempt to excuse his co-editor by claiming that Scrivener had no choice but to confess to the possibility of human error in his text because, Dr DiVietro insists, no-one has either the notes of the King James translators or the text that they used.

See this citation from the end of **Quote 114** in answer to Dr DiVietro's complaints above.

Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement from pp 643-644 of Hazardous Materials, her emphasis, on Scrivener's uncertainties in his text, cited in part in answer to Dr/Mr Coward's criticisms with respect to pp 637-638, 640 of Hazardous Materials reads as follows, showing that Dr/Mr Coward is wrong in his conclusion as well, this author's under-linings.*

**Dr DiVietro, D. A. Waite Jr and Dr/Mr Coward do not challenge or address those statements.*

*"Scrivener admits his imprecise reconstruction of the Greek text is based in places on "presumed" words, "more likely" texts, "uncertainties" and "precarious" ideas about what "appears to have been" the KJB's sources (Scrivener, The New, pp. v, vii, viii, 655, 656). This hardly constitutes a final authority and Scrivener had no intention of creating an inspired edition...Scrivener's Greek text can be helpful, as demonstrated at the beginning of this chapter. But the one-man RV committee intellectual exercise is **hardly** a letter-for-letter repository of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost for this generation."*

The pitiful nature of Dr DiVietro's comments under **Quote 118** notwithstanding, they do serve a useful purpose. They do openly acknowledge that Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement above is correct. Scrivener's text is not *"the Originall Greeke"* from which the King James New Testament was translated and it is not *"the text followed in the Authorized Version,"* the title of Scrivener's text being therefore misleading in that respect. See *Hazardous Materials* pp 630, 637-638 and the relevant portion of **Quote 114**, with the statement re-inserted that Dr DiVietro carefully omitted, this author's emphases.

*"When the fine details are examined it becomes clear that in the minutiae Scrivener did not always back-translate, as Waite also observes. What he did in fact was to create an entirely new entity, a Greek text that matches no other Greek text on earth and which matches no Holy Bible ever made, not even the KJB. It is not Beza's text, as some pretend; it certainly follows no other edition of the Textus Receptus in the minutiae. **It is his own mix and there-***

fore not authoritative at some points. Although the text is titled, “the text followed in the Authorized Version,” Scrivener takes an entire page admitting and delineating why and where it is not.”

With Dr Mrs Riplinger having compelled Dr DiVietro to confess that his and his co-editor’s text contains human error, he should insist that the product description of that text be suitably amended, perhaps as follows from the information available in *Hazardous Materials* pp 654-677. See **Quote 108**. Emphases and block capital emphasised insertions are this author’s.

Title: Scrivener’s Textus Receptus (1881) 2.0

Authors: F. H. A. Scrivener, Kirk DiVietro

Price: \$24.95

*The Textus Receptus 1881 Greek text is **the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version EXCEPT IN AT LEAST 64 VERSES**. The Scrivener text is a modified Beza 1598 Textus Receptus in which changes have been made **to reflect the readings chosen by the KJV translators EXCEPT IN AT LEAST 64 VERSES**. Scrivener’s intent was to artificially create a Greek text that closely matched the translator-modified Textus Receptus text **EXCEPT IN AT LEAST 64 VERSES** and the resulting English version **EXCEPT IN AT LEAST 64 VERSES**. This is a useful text for comparison **EXCEPT IN AT LEAST 64 VERSES** for those with proficiency in Greek **WHO WILL NEED IT IN ORDER TO SPOT THE DEPARTURES OF THE TEXT FROM THE 1611 AUTHORIZED NEW TESTAMENT IN AT LEAST 64 VERSES**.*

The above modified product description most likely won’t help Dr DiVietro’s royalties from his and Scrivener’s text but at least it will **“Provide things honest in the sight of all men”** Romans 12:17. That is also what Scrivener could have done, his co-editor’s protests to the contrary under **Quote 118** notwithstanding. See this extract from the remarks under **Quote 114**.

*Scrivener’s method for creating a comparative Greek text for the King James New Testament – see *Hazardous Materials* p 631 - would have been technically sound where he could establish that his trial translation matched either Beza’s text or one of the other Greek sources at his disposal but he was unable to do so for all of the King James New Testament.*

*Regrettably, instead of obeying Romans 12:17 to **“Provide things honest in the sight of all men”** by simply highlighting those parts of the King James New Testament for which he had no Greek witnesses, he speculated wrongly about use by the King’s men of the Latin Vulgate and/or inserted his own presumed readings, as shown below.*

*He therefore produced what Dr Mrs Riplinger states on p 637 of *Hazardous Materials* “is his own mix and therefore not authoritative at some points.”*

Dr DiVietro’s excuse for Scrivener not having either the notes of the King James translators or the text that they used does not excuse Scrivener’s co-editor, as this extract from the remarks under **Quote 114** shows.

Previewing Chapter 15 of *In Awe of Thy Word*, Dr Mrs Riplinger states, p 31, her emphases *“For hundreds of years, the methods and thoughts of the KJV translators remained lost, until our generation, when every attack possible has buffeted the KJV [including underhanded efforts to ‘clarify’ it and ‘define’ it, *Cleaning-Up* pp 91, 94. See **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**]. “But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound” (Rom. 5:20). The revealing translation notes of the King James Bible committee have been found. These include three documents: Manuscript 98, the Annotated Bishops’ Bible, and the handwritten*

*notes from the decisive and final translation committee [documents, evidently, “upon whose bodies the fire had no power” Daniel 3:27, not even the Great Fire of London, 1666]. This author’s word-for-word collation of these documents demonstrates that the KJV translators considered and **rejected** words used in today’s new versions. These documents also reveal the translators’ use of a treasure trove of ancient Greek codices and vernacular translations that may not be available to today’s translators. The KJV translators’ method of translation is shown, which includes use of the Bible’s built-in dictionary, looking for a word’s “brother” or “neighbour.” The translators believed men could “hear **Christ speaking** unto them in their **mother tongue**...by the written word translated.” The scriptures foretold that with – “**other tongues and other lips will I speak**...” (1 Cor. 14:21).”*

This author’s conclusion is that Dr DiVietro could have had access to the same material that Dr Mrs Riplinger collated had he been God-guided by means of “**an honest and good heart**” Luke 8:15.

Quote 119, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 644

*“Scrivener gives a list of 59 places in the KJB (a list he admits is “quite incomplete”) which were “not countenanced by any **earlier edition** of the Greek” but which ‘**appear**’ to follow “the Latin Vulgate”. Notice that he does **not** say “any edition of the Greek.” Notice that he does not say, “any Greek manuscript.” He artificially limits his reconstructed text to “**printed editions**” “**earlier**” than the KJB. **Everyone misreads and misunderstands him; perhaps that was his intent.**”*

Dr DiVietro is of course irate that anyone should dare to charge his co-editor with deception but he goes on to say that Scrivener listed the published Greek New Testaments that the King James translators had access to and accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of arguing from silence about Scrivener’s failure to mention any Greek manuscripts.

Dr DiVietro insists that just because Scrivener never made reference to any Greek manuscripts does not mean that Scrivener did not consult Greek manuscripts. He challenges Dr Mrs Riplinger to list the manuscripts and/or published Greek New Testaments that bear witness to the 59 readings that Dr DiVietro’s co-editor said came from the Vulgate to support her charge against his co-editor. Otherwise, Dr DiVietro declares, that charge is invalid.

Dr DiVietro states in conclusion that he has found that most of the 59 readings did come from another Greek source i.e. other than Beza’s final editions or were retained by means of the rules that the King James translators were required to follow i.e. from earlier English Bibles such as the Bishops’ Bible. See Dr DiVietro’s concluding comments under **Quote 105**, where he makes similar statements about the exceptional readings, except that under **Quote 105**, they number approximately 30 instead of 59. Dr DiVietro does not bother to reconcile these figures, which is a distraction for the reader. See remarks under **Quote 114** with respect to the varying totals that he gives for the number of departures of the King James New Testament from Beza’s text.

Regardless of Dr DiVietro’s insistence to the contrary, Scrivener can reasonably be charged with deception, certainly with respect to the title of his text, as this extract from the remarks under **Quote 114** shows.

*Dr Mrs Riplinger gives the full title of Scrivener’s text on p 638 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphases, showing, in the light of the above citations that Scrivener’s title of his text is grossly misleading. Neither Dr DiVietro nor D. A. Waite Jr nor Dr/Mr Coward addressed the relevant material on p 638 of *Hazardous Materials*.*

““*The New Testament in the Original Greek, according to the Text followed in the Authorized Version...Edited for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, by F. H. A. Scrivener...1881.*””

Dr DiVietro naturally tries to cover up for his co-editor because he too could be charged with deception. See remarks under **Quote 118** with respect to:

Title: Scrivener's Textus Receptus (1881) 2.0

Authors: F. H. A. Scrivener, Kirk DiVietro

Price: \$24.95

See again Bro. Heisey's remark given under **Quote 116** that also applies in this context.

““*Does F.H.A. Scrivener's Greek text need to be corrected so as to match the exact readings underlying the King James Bible New Testament?*” and, “*Is the text of the King James Bible without error?*” To date, this author has not received nor seen a direct, straightforward, consistent, well-explained, non-contradictory answer from Dr. Waite to these two questions.”

It is in Dr Waite's best interests to provide honest answers to those questions, lest he be deprived of the ability to do.

“Let the lying lips be put to silence; which speak grievous things proudly and contemptuously against the righteous” Psalm 31:18.

Dr DiVietro, in the meantime, should reflect upon Leviticus 19:11. See remarks at the end of **Quote 39**.

“Ye shall not steal, neither deal falsely, neither lie one to another.”

It is Dr DiVietro who is arguing from silence about his co-editor's failure to mention any Greek manuscripts that he may supposedly have used in the compilation of his text, not Dr Mrs Riplinger.

Dr Mrs Riplinger simply mentions the sources that Scrivener did use for his text and reasonably states in conclusion that “*He artificially limits his reconstructed text to “printed editions” “earlier” than the KJB.*”

Note again Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement from *Hazardous Materials* p 640 that Dr DiVietro reproduces in **Quote 116** but which he does not directly challenge, most likely because he knows that it is true and therefore beyond dispute even by Dr DiVietro himself.

4. *Scrivener created a false set of criteria for creating his text, perhaps due to his desire to downgrade the scholarship of the KJB translators, when compared to those of his RV committee. He used only,*

“Greek readings which might naturally be known through printed editions to the revisers of 1611 or their predecessors” (Scrivener, The New, p. viii).”

If Dr DiVietro seeks to prove that Scrivener *may* have consulted Greek manuscripts for the 59 King James New Testament readings that he actually said may have come from the Vulgate, *it is not Dr Mrs Riplinger's responsibility to list those manuscripts.* Such a list would still not prove that Scrivener consulted those manuscripts.

It is Dr DiVietro's responsibility to list those manuscripts and other non-Vulgate sources from Scrivener's own writings in order to refute Dr Mrs Riplinger's conclusion above.

Again, Dr DiVietro fails to do so, just as he failed to do so under **Quote 105**.

It is not Dr Mrs Riplinger's case *against* Scrivener that hasn't got a leg to stand on, as Dr DiVietro gibes in his comments under *Quote 119*.

It is Dr DiVietro's case for his co-editor's supposed use of Greek manuscripts for his text that is legless.

Or perhaps, Dr DiVietro's case rests on "*the "two weak legs" of Greek and Hebrew critical study, upon which the college of Cardinals stands.*"

See *Traitors, Heady, Highminded: D. A. Waite Denies KJB Inspiration* by Dr Mrs Riplinger, www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html, p 5.

Either way, his case isn't up to much.

It should also be noted that Scrivener's contemporary, Dean John Burgon, listed many manuscript witnesses to what he termed The Traditional Text in his definitive work on the 1881 revision, *The Revision Revised*. Scrivener could and should have done likewise for his text had he used such sources.

Dr Mrs Riplinger does in fact cite *uniquely* Greek textual sources for the King James readings that Scrivener ascribed to the Latin Vulgate. See *Hazardous Materials* p 653 and *Quotes 114, 116* for the introductory statement below.

*"Scrivener pretends that the KJB readings in the following verses are not 'the' original. Therefore Scrivener's is not the "exact" "Originall Greeke" text that underlies the KJB in the following verses. The following analysis of 52 verses from Scrivener's list of 59 so-called Latin-based KJB readings, including 24 instances (noted with a *) where Greek textual evidence was easily available, even in my office, to contravene Scrivener's list. His text is no more valid than any other Greek edition of the Textus Receptus which misrepresents these 24 verses. Most are not debatable at all..."*

The full list of verses that Dr Mrs Riplinger includes on pp 654-677 of *Hazardous Materials* totals 64 when Bro. Heisey's researches are included. See *Quote 108*. That list essentially answers Dr DiVietro's challenge to Dr Mrs Riplinger under *Quote 119* to provide Greek sources for "*Scrivener's 'Latin list'*" *Hazardous Materials* p 652. Although Dr Mrs Riplinger has therefore responded to his challenge, Dr DiVietro glosses over pp 654-677 of *Hazardous Materials* with only a passing reference to Dr Mrs Riplinger's detailed documentation and Bro. Heisey's researches under *Quote 130*. See also remarks under *Quote 105*.

Dr DiVietro obviously would not relish the statement "*His text is no more valid than any other Greek edition of the Textus Receptus which misrepresents these 24 verses,*" which may be one reason why he fails to make any comment on it.

It is instructive that on p 641 of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr Mrs Riplinger *does* state that Scrivener had access to Greek manuscript sources, in spite of Dr DiVietro's insinuation that she does not. However, Dr Mrs Riplinger also explains why Scrivener overlooked these sources.

Dr Mrs Riplinger's explanation may also reveal why Scrivener's co-editor bypasses it, her emphases.

"Scrivener had to hide the astuteness of the KJB translators [so he could be 'the final authority' with respect to the Greek text of the King James New Testament because he pompously rejected many important King James readings in favour of the Westcott-Hort alternatives, Hazardous Materials pp 640, 652]. So he pretended that they had found certain readings (over 59) in a Latin, not a Greek Bible. Therefore he would not translate them into Greek, although he had Greek manuscript evidence for them, but assumed the translators did not.

*In other words, when the RV committee compared their two man-made Greek texts, they could pretend that the modern critics had made improvements to the **Greek** text.”*

Note also that the above statement shows that Dr Mrs Riplinger is well aware of the contents of “*footnote 2 from page xiv of The Doctored New Testament*” and has explained them.

“*“In those KJV portions with no known Greek support, Scrivener (a man of great textual integrity) let the readings of Beza’s 1598 Greek NT stand (p. 655). He refused to backwards translate from Latin to Greek!”*”

See remarks under **Quote 114** where Dr DiVietro, D. A. Waite Jr and Dr/Mr Coward try to pretend that Dr Mrs Riplinger has distorted the above information. Clearly she hasn’t.

With respect to her detractors’ comments under both **Quote 114** and **Quote 119**, Sister Riplinger can take comfort from Deuteronomy 33:29.

“...O people saved by the LORD, the shield of thy help, and who is the sword of thy excellency! and thine enemies shall be found liars unto thee...”

Quote 120, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 644

“In these 59 plus places he follows Beza’s Greek Textus Receptus. His text is wrong in these and the other undisclosed places for four reasons, the details of which will be thoroughly documented at the end of this chapter.”

Dr DiVietro is irate that someone should dare to charge his co-editor’s text with error. He protests that Dr Mrs Riplinger has not collated the King James New Testament with any manuscript or published Greek text that is more accurate than his co-editor’s (and his) text and declares that Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement in **Quote 120** is without substance.

It should be noted that neither Dr Waite nor Dr DiVietro has produced a full collation of Scrivener’s text against the 1611 Authorized New Testament or even a partial collation to match that of Dr Mrs Riplinger and Bro. Heisey in *Hazardous Materials* pp 654-677. See **Quote 108**. Dr DiVietro is therefore not in a position to level his accusation against Sister Riplinger of insufficient collation of Scrivener’s text.

Dr DiVietro then threatens to examine in due course what he disparagingly terms Dr Mrs Riplinger’s four facts and he encloses the word facts in double quotes.

It is of course ironic that Dr DiVietro should protest about a lack of substance on Dr Mrs Riplinger’s part when he himself has repeatedly shown that he substantiates nothing in many of his comments. See **Quote 110**.

Dr DiVietro’s prejudice against Dr Mrs Riplinger is apparent by his use of the word facts in enclosed quotes with respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s reasons why Scrivener’s text is wrong where he follows Beza’s text against the King James New Testament. Dr Mrs Riplinger labels her reasons as **Fact 1, 2, 3, 4** and with each label she gives a detailed explanation of the shortcomings of Scrivener’s text. Those shortcomings are supported by the documentation of Scrivener’s 64 erroneous readings on pp 654-677 of *Hazardous Materials*. See again **Quote 108**. Dr DiVietro has tried to prejudice the reader against that information, the details of which he bypasses, see **Quote 130**, by his use of a format i.e. enclosed quotes, which in the context is intended to imply falsehood. Dr DiVietro is blatantly hypocritical in so doing, in that he accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of resorting to the very same tactic under **Quote 117** (which she has not, as has been shown under **Quote 117**). His attempts to refute Dr Mrs Riplinger’s reasons will also be given in due course.

The essential reason why Dr Mrs Riplinger has judged that Scrivener's text is wrong where he follows Beza's text against the 1611 Authorized New Testament is simply because Scrivener has therefore departed from the King James New Testament and therefore its underlying text.

It follows that his text must be in error where those departures occur, showing yet again that Scrivener's text is *not* ““*The New Testament in the Original Greek, according to the Text followed in the Authorized Version...Edited for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, by F. H. A. Scrivener...1881.*”” See **Quotes 114, 119**.

Dr DiVietro is of course entirely wrong in accusing Dr Mrs Riplinger of making a statement without substance in **Quote 120** because, as the quote itself shows, she informs the reader that the necessary documentation follows at the end of Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials*.

As indicated, Dr DiVietro has glossed over the documentation that Dr Mrs Riplinger provides, which includes the specific citation of numerous published Greek sources. See remarks under **Quote 119** with respect to **Quote 130**.

The only reasonable explanation for Dr DiVietro's ire in response to **Quote 120** is that he is exalting his and his co-editor's text in authority over the *wording* of the New Testament of the 1611 Holy Bible. Dr DiVietro is therefore one of “*those that oppose themselves*” 2 Timothy 2:25. See **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’**. Earlier in his book he has declared that the 1611 Holy Bible:

- is perfect such that it cannot be either changed or improved,
- received only minor revision between the first and final editions of 1611 and 1769 that may be discounted with respect to the translation itself (except when used for attacking Sister Riplinger. See *Cleaning-Up* pp 10-11),
- is the most accurate and reliable preservation of the W(w)ords of God in English (even though, in Dr DiVietro's opinion, the 1611 Holy Bible is not the *inspired* words of God),
- is a God-guided accurate translation of its underlying Hebrew and Greek texts, which are the correct Hebrew and Greek texts (even though, in Dr DiVietro's opinion, the 1611 Holy Bible is not the *inspired* words of God),
- remains the dominant translation of the English-speaking church,
- does not have to be retranslated or corrected.

See *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3, 7, 17, 18, 88, 91, 93, 94 and remarks under **Challenges #1, #5, Points-Counterpoints**. Moreover, the DBS Executive Committee's tampering with the word “*theopneustos*,”* *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, 2-3, notwithstanding, Dr DiVietro has not specifically mentioned any supposedly valid corrections to the 1611 Holy Bible in over 200 pages of his book.

That omission is perhaps its only commendable feature.

*See **Preface and Introduction, Quote 86**. Note, however, that on pp 88-89 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro cautions against using statements like ““*in the Greek it says*”” or ““*what the Bible really says*”” because he says that such statements prompt the hearers to distrust their Bible, presumably the 1611 Holy Bible. Yet readers of *A WARNING!!* or *Cleaning-Up* have already been repeatedly enjoined not simply to distrust but actually to *reject*** the 1611 Holy Bible as “*all scripture*” that “*is given by inspiration of God.*” Dr DiVietro's admonition about ““*the Greek*”” etc. therefore seems to mirror the stance of the faithless Jews in

Jeremiah 7:4-10, rebuked in Jeremiah 7:8. ***“Behold, ye trust in lying words, that cannot profit.”***

**See again the following references for *the outright denial of the 1611 Holy Bible as “all scripture” that “is given by inspiration of God” with no indication whatsoever of precisely where that inspired scripture exists between two covers:*

Cleaning-Up pp iii-v, 2-3, 7, 17, 18, 88 and *A WARNING!!* pp 51, 59, cited in **Dr D. A. Waite and *The DBS, Dead Bible Society***, pp 9, 17 and especially under ***The ‘not “inspired by God”” AVI611***, pp 47ff, with these citations from *A WARNING!!* pp 7, 31, 33, 35, 36, 52, 64, 84-85. See also **Dr D. A. Waite and *The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Appendix 2 – Full List of Extracts, from A WARNING!! by Dr D.A. Waite*** pp 78ff, with respect to the following citations, in order as they are listed in **Appendix 2**, without duplication, from *A WARNING!!* pp 2, 20, 24, 28, 38, 40, 44, 88, 25, 29, 32, 37, 39, 90, 66, 3, 9, 10, 19, 26, 30, 34, 41, 43, 45, 49, 54, 87. Note that Dr Waite repeatedly concocts a false accusation against Sister Riplinger with respect to a professed belief in what he terms *“verbal, plenary, inspiration”* of the 1611 Holy Bible, which he perceives as God speaking English words to the King James translators in exactly the same way as, for example, God dictated words to Jeremiah and other writers of scripture, Jeremiah 30:2, 36:2. Dr Waite has therefore imposed an unwarranted restriction on 2 Timothy 3:16 with respect to ***“all scripture” that “is given by inspiration of God”*** by means of his ***“private interpretation”*** 2 Peter 1:20 of that verse. See *In Awe Of Thy Word* pp 332-334 for a *Biblical* explanation of inspiration with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible. See also remarks on inspiration under **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**.

Yet Dr DiVietro now casts doubt on all of the above commendations that he has expressed for the *preserved* words (though not the *inspired* preserved words, see comments under the above *) of the 1611 Holy Bible by implying that the *wording* of Scrivener’s text *may nevertheless be correct where it departs with Beza’s text from the 1611 Authorized New Testament Text*.

Dr DiVietro is not so bold to state that Scrivener’s text, with himself as co-editor with Scrivener, *is* the inspired Greek New Testament, see remarks under ***Quotes 97, 108, 112, 114***, but if he is so bold that he tries to exalt his and his co-editor’s text in authority over the *words* of the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament, he should explain why that particular Greek text is superior to any other copy of Scrivener’s text.

Dr Mrs Riplinger, courtesy of Bro. Heisey, has forwarded to this author a copy of a paper entitled *Analysis of Various Copies of Scrivener’s Text* by Alan Bunning, March 3rd 2007. Alan Bunning lists 5 copies of Scrivener’s text; the Aivazian, Kazes, Unbound Bible, 1894 Trinitarian Bible Society and Online Bible texts. Alan Bunning has compared those texts with Scrivener’s published 1881 text and has found numerous differences, many of which are minor, such as orthographic differences but some more serious in the form of alterations in the text. The Unbound Bible, Trinitarian Bible Society and Online Bible texts each has only one or two such alterations but the Aivazian and Kazes texts have in excess of 100 and 400 alterations respectively.

The nature, significance and number of the differences between the various extant copies of Scrivener’s text notwithstanding, the fact that these distinct copies even exist should prompt Dr DiVietro to explain why his and his co-editor’s particular text is superior to any other.

Dr DiVietro does not do so.

Neither does he appear to have considered the implications of trying to exalt his and his co-editor’s manmade work above ***“the scripture of truth”*** Daniel 10:21 that the Lord has exalted above all His name Psalm 138:2.

He should.

See **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint** and Isaiah 42:8.

“I am the LORD: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images.”

Nor to manmade published works that even their editors dare not designate as **“all scripture”** that **“is given by inspiration of God.”**

Quote 121, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 644-645

*“In other words, he assumed as he admits, that he knows what Greek evidence the KJB translators had. He assumed they had only “printed editions,” not old, hand-written manuscripts (manu means ‘hand’, scripts means ‘written’). This is a bald assumption. **The KJB translators very obviously had Greek evidence because the readings, which he pretends came from the Latin, are in MANY Greek printed editions today.** Scrivener even had these Greek editions, he “assumed” that the KJB translators did not know of these readings since they only appeared in “printed editions” since the KJB translation. Totally false is **the self-limiting criteria** he established to construct his Greek text (i.e. only **printed** editions before 1611, not Greek manuscripts pre-dating the KJB or Greek printed editions post-dating the KJB). The KJB translators had a wealth of hand-written manuscripts, compiled for 1500 years before the printing press was widely used. Perusal of the catalogue of the libraries in England before and during the KJB translation reveals many, many of these. The royal library and British Universities were storehouses of Bible manuscripts.”*

Dr DiVietro states in response that several aspects **Quote 121** drew his attention.

He wonders how Dr Mrs Riplinger determined the meaning of the word manuscript without the help of a lexicon, directly or indirectly.

Descending into mockery again, see **Quote 110**, he asks how the King James translators could possibly have accessed **“Greek printed editions post-dating the KJB,”** which statement he reproduces in bold.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments on **Quote 121** by expressing agreement with Dr Mrs Riplinger that the King James translators used both Greek manuscripts and ancient translations for their work. However, Dr DiVietro says that **Quote 121** is an outlandish statement because it expresses certainty which is not possible because the notes of the translation committee are not available.

All of **Quote 121** has been cited in part to illustrate how trite Dr DiVietro’s comments on *Hazardous Materials* typically are.

The etymology of the non-Biblical term manuscript is a non-issue. The issue with respect to lexicons is the ungodly word meanings that they repeatedly ascribe to *Biblical* terms. See for example the lengthy discussion on corrupt lexical definitions and their effects under **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**. See also **Quotes 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 47, 48, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70** with **Table 4**, **71** with **Table 5**, **73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 114** with respect to Revelation 9:11.

Dr DiVietro clearly devotes considerable space to justifying corrupt lexicons and their correspondingly corrupt editors. However, he forgot to check p 650 of *Hazardous Materials* and this statement from Dr Mrs Riplinger.

“I suspect God wanted to expose Scrivener, as almost fifty years ago he gave me a private Latin tutor, for the last 30 years he has kindly surrounded me in a world of wall-to-wall antique and modern reference books.”

A student who was taught by a private Latin tutor would have no problem understanding the Latin origins of the word manuscript.

It is up to Dr DiVietro to show that the student’s tutorship and her *“wall-to-wall antique and modern reference books”* are somehow like the corrupt lexicons and their correspondingly corrupt editors that Dr Mrs Riplinger rightly condemns.

If he can’t, then Dr DiVietro should reflect upon Proverbs 17:28.

“Even a fool, when he holdeth his peace, is counted wise: and he that shutteth his lips is esteemed a man of understanding.”

Dr DiVietro’s mockery with respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement on *“Greek printed editions post-dating the KJB”* is, like the rest of his mockery, entirely misplaced. Dr DiVietro forgot to check the two sentences immediately before Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement.

“The KJB translators very obviously had Greek evidence because the readings, which he pretends came from the Latin, are in MANY Greek printed editions today. Scrivener even had these Greek editions, he “assumed” that the KJB translators did not know of these readings since they only appeared in “printed editions” since the KJB translation.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement *“Greek printed editions post-dating the KJB”* clearly refers to contemporary Greek editions that contain readings which were available to the King James translators in other sources e.g. in the hand-written manuscripts that they had but were not included in published Greek texts until after 1611.

Dr DiVietro should at least pay Dr Mrs Riplinger the courtesy of commenting on her quotes in the correct context.

Moreover, how does Dr DiVietro know that the King James translators who refined the 1611 Edition in 1629 and 1638, see **Quote 28**, did not make use of post-1611 editions of the Greek New Testament such as those of the Elzevir Brothers in 1624 and 1633? It would surely be quite natural for them to check the post-1611 Greek editions for further confirmation of readings that they had selected from hand-written manuscripts, in the light of possible additional manuscript discoveries after 1611. Dr DiVietro cannot reasonably insist that this did not happen.

See Dr Gipp’s analysis in *The Answer Book*, Question #48, *How can the 1611 King James Bible come from the 1633 Textus Receptus?*

See samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=48.htm

That possibility, which Dr DiVietro does not refute, also validates Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement with respect to *“Greek printed editions post-dating the KJB.”*

The above observations show yet again that it is Dr DiVietro who is making outlandish statements, not Dr Mrs Riplinger.

Quote 122, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 645

*“Fact 2: Scrivener’s text is based on human fallibility. He says his Greek choices in some places are based on what “appears” to him. He gives what he admits to being a very “incomplete” list of places where he inserts non-KJB Greek ideas, abandoning the reader to wonder where his **other** mistranslations are located. He admits that his decisions are “precarious.” He confesses,*

*““In the following [59] places the Latin Vulgate **APPEARS** to have been the authority adopted in preference to Beza. The present list is **probably QUITE INCOMPLETE**, and a few cases seem **PRECARIOUS**.””*

Dr DiVietro complains that Dr Mrs Riplinger has wilfully misunderstood the intent of his co-editor, who, according to Dr DiVietro, is simply saying that he thinks that the King James translators may have used the Vulgate in some places but that he can’t be sure. Dr DiVietro insists that his co-editor is being more honest than Dr Mrs Riplinger and tries to excuse him on the basis that Scrivener was writing in the 1880s.

Neither Scrivener nor Dr DiVietro has obeyed Romans 12:17 to **“Provide things honest in the sight of all men”** with respect to **Quote 122**. Dr DiVietro has also quickly forgotten the contents of **Quote 121**, which is reproduced below.

*“In other words, he assumed as he admits, that he knows what Greek evidence the KJB translators had. He assumed they had only “printed editions,” not old, hand-written manuscripts (manu means ‘hand’, scripts means ‘written’). This is a bald assumption. **The KJB translators very obviously had Greek evidence because the readings, which he pretends came from the Latin, are in MANY Greek printed editions today.** Scrivener even had these Greek editions, he “assumed” that the KJB translators did not know of these readings **since they only appeared in “printed editions” since the KJB translation.** Totally false is **the self-limiting criteria** he established to construct his Greek text (i.e. only **printed** editions before 1611, not Greek manuscripts pre-dating the KJB or Greek printed editions post-dating the KJB). The KJB translators had a wealth of hand-written manuscripts, compiled for 1500 years before the printing press was widely used. Perusal of the catalogue of the libraries in England before and during the KJB translation reveals many, many of these. The royal library and British Universities were storehouses of Bible manuscripts.”*

Quote 121 shows that Scrivener possessed Greek editions that contain King James New Testament readings that Scrivener assumed that the translators took from the Latin i.e. the Vulgate. That assumption of Scrivener’s is based on his additional assumption that the King James translators did not have Greek sources for those readings because they only appeared in Greek editions published after 1611, as **Quote 121** also shows.

Yet **Quote 121** shows further that the King’s men used many hand-written Greek manuscripts for their work and that many of these documents still reside in British libraries. Scrivener evidently did not check these manuscripts for the readings that he instead simply assumed came for the Vulgate. He clearly could have done so and indeed should have done so, in the manner that his contemporary Dean Burgon examined many Greek manuscripts for his work on *The Revision Revised*. See comments under **Quote 119**.

Scrivener ought therefore to have obeyed Romans 12:11 to be **“Not slothful in business”** with respect to his researches into the Greek sources for the 1611 Holy Bible instead of taking a convenient shortcut at the expense of the integrity of the King James translators.

Scrivener's own experience with respect to the final clause of 1 John 2:23 should also have prompted him to make a thorough study of the hand-written manuscripts used by the King's men. Note again these comments from **Quote 100** by Martin A. Shue.

First John 2:23 proves the superiority of our AV / KJV.

The phrase in question, "...(but) he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also.", stands in italics (brackets) in our AV. The KJV translators placed these words in italics to show the reader that these words were not found in the Greek text from which they translated the NT. This in no way meant that they were not aware of some of the Greek support for the phrase. They were well aware of the Greek support extant at that time, as well as the support of the early versions...

Though the Greek support was scarce in 1611 it DID exist.

What is so amazing is that since 1611 many Greek MSS have been unearthed that testify to the reading of our AV. Just a few of these MSS would be Aleph and B (imagine that!), Psi, C, 33, 614, 630, 1505, 1739 and others. Clarke notes the following, "It is found in A, B, C, and in between twenty and thirty others of the best authority." It is also found in the Greek texts of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth, Scholz, W-H and N-A...

Martin Shue shows for this example of 1 John 2:23 that *post-1611* Greek editions, some of which Scrivener possessed, contained the clause that is also found in *pre-1611* Greek manuscripts. Martin Shue also lists the Vulgate as containing the clause.

Scrivener was clearly aware of the possibility, by means of 1 John 2:23, that King James New Testament readings that only *post-1611* published Greek editions contained *nevertheless had pre-1611 Greek manuscript support in addition to the Vulgate*. Scrivener therefore had no excuse for not checking the Greek manuscript sources that the King James translators used that were still available to him in British libraries. Instead, he baldly assumed that King James New Testament readings *not* found in the pre-1611 published Greek texts came from the Vulgate.

Scrivener was wrong to assume so and Dr DiVietro is therefore wrong to try to excuse his co-editor's slothfulness.

Moreover, Dr DiVietro's error is compounded by the product description of Scrivener's and his Greek edition that reads as follows, this author's emphases. See **Quotes 108, 112** and the amended product description proposed by this author under **Quote 118**.

*The Textus Receptus 1881 Greek text is **the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version**. The Scrivener text is a modified Beza 1598 Textus Receptus in which changes have been made **to reflect the readings chosen by the KJV translators**. Scrivener's intent was to artificially create **a Greek text that closely matched the translator-modified Textus Receptus text and the resulting English version**. This is a useful text for comparison for those with proficiency in Greek.*

Dr DiVietro should not be putting forward Scrivener's and his Greek edition as "the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version" if he condones Scrivener's statement in **Quote 122**, as he appears to that this Greek text should side with Beza's text and not the King James New Testament in at least 59 places because Dr DiVietro's co-editor thought that those readings came from the Vulgate.

Dr DiVietro should reflect again on Leviticus 19:11. See also **Quotes 39, 119**.

"Ye shall not steal, neither deal falsely, neither lie one to another."

Quote 123, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 645-646

“Fact 3: Scrivener’s own text is peppered in these 59 places (and some others) with faulty vernacular-based texts. In the places where Scrivener does not follow the Greek text underlying the KJB, he follows Beza. Unknown to most TR advocates, Beza followed among other things, a Latin translation of the Syriac Bible, which makes it yet another Greek edition, in addition to Scrivener’s, which was taken from a vernacular Bible. Complete documentation about Beza, including a quote from his own revealing Preface, is included at the end of this chapter. Scrivener’s use of Beza’s edition instead of the KJB’s “Originall Greeke” does not represent the God-honoured text.”

All Dr DiVietro can say in response to **Quote 123** is that most students of Greek New Testament manuscripts and published Greek editions know that Beza used other translations for his text and that therefore the King James translators did not rigidly follow any one particular published Greek edition. Dr DiVietro puts that last statement of his comments on **Quote 123** in bold.

Dr Mrs Riplinger did not say most students of Greek New Testament manuscripts and published Greek editions. She said “*TR advocates.*” Dr DiVietro has misquoted her.

Dr Gipp, samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=25.htm, explains the term “*TR advocates*” as follows.

“Question #25. What’s the difference between a “TR” man and a “KJV” man?”

“Answer: A “TR Man” gets his manuscripts from Antioch and his philosophy from Egypt.”

Dr Gipp’s explanation following his answer is revealing with respect to the philosophy, or mindset, of the DBS Executive Committee. Dr Gipp’s explanation reads in part as follows, his emphases.

*“Under Question #8 concerning Alexandria and Antioch it was pointed out that we derive two things from each of these locations. We derive **manuscripts** and an **ideology** through which we judge those manuscripts.*

*“From Alexandria we receive corrupted manuscripts, tainted by the critical hand of Origen. We also receive an ideology that believes the Bible to be divine, but **not** perfect, not without error.*

*“From Antioch we receive the pure line of manuscripts culminating in what is known as the “Received Text” or *Textus Receptus*. We also receive the ideology that the Bible is not only Divine, but perfect, without error.”*

See this extract from A WARNING!! by Dr Waite p 25.

P. 25 *““**Perfection**” of translation is not possible. Only God has “**perfection**.” He is “**perfect**.” Gail Ludwig Latessa Kaleda Riplinger falsely believes that the King James Bible is “perfect.” Well, is that the A.V. 1611 translation with the Apocrypha, which has all sorts of lies, contradictions and false teachings? Or is it the second edition of the King James Bible that is “perfect”? Or is it the third edition of the King James Bible that is perfect? Or is it the fourth edition? Or is it the fifth edition? Or is it the sixth edition? Or is it the seventh edition?”*

See Dr D. A. Waite and *The DBS, Dead Bible Society The ‘not “perfect”’ AV1611* p 37.

Note in passing that Dr Waite’s statement above that “Only God has “**perfection**”” is in direct violation of Psalm 19:7, 138:2. The statement of Psalm 19:7 has to include all transla-

tions in scripture, into whatever language they are made. See remarks under *Quote 125* with respect to Genesis 42-45, Exodus 4:14, John 19:19, 20, Acts 14:11.

“The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple.”

“...for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name.”

Dr Waite’s statement above is also a denial of Genesis 18:14 and Luke 1:37. Dr Waite states in effect that God cannot bring forth a perfect Bible, which of course God can do and has done, by means of seven stages of purification, Psalm 12:6, 7, with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible. See remarks under *Quote 28* with respect to seven possible major editions i.e. purifications of the 1611 Holy Bible.

“Is any thing too hard for the LORD? At the time appointed I will return unto thee, according to the time of life, and Sarah shall have a son.”

“For with God nothing shall be impossible.”

See also Jeremiah 32:17, 27 that Dr Waite has also denied.

“Ah Lord GOD! behold, thou hast made the heaven and the earth by thy great power and stretched out arm, and there is nothing too hard for thee:”

“Behold, I am the LORD, the God of all flesh: is there any thing too hard for me?”

See *Quotes 95, 120*, insofar as it would be useful at this point to review in sum Dr DiVietro’s remarks with respect to the perfection or otherwise of the 1611 Holy Bible and related Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek source material. The following extracts are taken from *Quotes 95, 120*.

Quote 95 extract:

See *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3, 18, 21 and now p 187...

According the DBS Executive Committee, therefore, as set forth by Dr DiVietro in *Cleaning-Up*, evidently with the professed full support of his Executive Committee colleagues, as seen in the Preface:

- Bible translations are not finally authoritative, never can be and are definitely not inspired.
- No Bible translation is perfect, even if 100% accurately translated and never can be. See *Quote(s) 175*, *Cleaning-Up* p 249.
- Published Greek texts are not the final authority.
- Extant Greek manuscripts are not infallible.

No printed Greek or Hebrew text is inerrant. See *Quote 171*, *Cleaning-Up* p 247.

Quote 120 extract:

The only reasonable explanation for Dr DiVietro’s ire in response to *Quote 120* is that he is exalting his and his co-editor’s text in authority over the wording of the New Testament of the 1611 Holy Bible. Dr DiVietro is therefore one of **“those that oppose themselves”** 2 Timothy 2:25. See *Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’*. Earlier in his book he has declared that the 1611 Holy Bible:

- *is perfect such that it cannot be either changed or improved,*
- *received only minor revision between the first and final editions of 1611 and 1769 that may be discounted with respect to the translation itself (except when used for attacking Sister Riplinger. See Cleaning-Up pp 10-11),*
- *is the most accurate and reliable preservation of the W(w)ords of God in English (even though, in Dr DiVietro's opinion, the 1611 Holy Bible is not the inspired words of God),*
- *is a God-guided accurate translation of its underlying Hebrew and Greek texts, which are the correct Hebrew and Greek texts (even though, in Dr DiVietro's opinion, the 1611 Holy Bible is not the inspired words of God),*
- *remains the dominant translation of the English-speaking church,*
- *does not have to be retranslated or corrected.*

See Cleaning-Up pp 2-3, 7, 17, 18, 88, 91, 93, 94 and remarks under **Challenges #1, #5, Points-Counterpoints**. Moreover, the DBS Executive Committee's tampering with the word "theopneustos," Cleaning-Up pp iii-v, 2-3, notwithstanding, Dr DiVietro has not specifically mentioned any supposedly valid corrections to the 1611 Holy Bible in over 200 pages of his book.

That omission is perhaps its only commendable feature...

*Yet Dr DiVietro now casts doubt on all of the above commendations that he has expressed for the preserved words (though not the **inspired** preserved words) of the 1611 Holy Bible by implying that the **wording** of Scrivener's text **may nevertheless be correct where it departs with Beza's text from the 1611 Authorized New Testament Text**, this author's emphases.*

Note that Dr DiVietro substantiates *nothing* under **Quotes 95, 120**. See **Quote 110** for a summary of how Dr DiVietro *repeatedly* substantiates nothing in his comments.

In sum, according to Dr DiVietro, evidently with the unanimous agreement of the DBS Executive Committee, the following key points emerge from the above extracts with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible and published Greek New Testament texts.

- The 1611 Holy Bible *is* perfect in that it does not need to be changed or improved.
- The 1611 Holy Bible *is not* perfect in that it does not convey the original *perfectly*.
- The 1611 Holy Bible *is not* inspired.
- The 1611 Holy Bible *is not* finally authoritative.
- The 1611 Holy Bible *is*, however, God-guided, *even though God could not inspire it or make it finally authoritative as "all scripture" that "is given by inspiration of God."*
- No *published or extant* Greek source *was/is* infallible, inerrant, finally authoritative or perfect.
- 'The' Greek text, however, *was/is* infallible, inerrant, finally authoritative and perfect.
- Scrivener's text *might be* that Greek text, even where it departs from the 1611 Holy Bible.

However, the precise location of the above infallible, inerrant, finally authoritative and perfect (and evidently inspired, original) Greek text*, together with that of its Hebrew/Aramaic

Old Testament counterpart between two covers nevertheless remains undisclosed by Dr Di-Vietro.

*It should be emphasised that Dr DiVietro has not explicitly stated thus far that Scrivener's and his Greek text *is* that inspired, original Greek text. Neither has Dr Waite. He only states that Scrivener's Greek text consists of "*accurate copies*" of the inspired, original Greek New Testament words. See **Quotes 97, 112** and remarks below. It appears though that they would nevertheless like their supporters to *think* that Scrivener's text is that inspired, original Greek text because who could resist purchasing it then? See **Quotes 108, 114**. If so, then "***They did work wilily***" Joshua 9:4 therefore.

See **Quote(s) 111** for a summary of Dr DiVietro's repeated failure to specify the location of any so-called original text between two covers.

Yet the members of the DBS Executive Committee maintain that they *have* this original inspired Greek text insofar as they refer to it as the W(w)ord(s) of God, *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3, *but they don't explicitly identify it between two covers, as inspection of the following citations will show.*

See Dr Williams's carefully worded statements in *Cleaning-Up* pp xi, 327-330, see also **Quotes 86, 108, 112** and note that Dr Williams does not specify any one particular Greek New Testament Text as consisting of the original inspired words of the New Testament but only alludes to various published texts.

See Dr Waite's profession with respect to the W(w)ord(s) of God in **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society** pp 2, 17, 47, 86 for citations from A **WARNING!!** p 52, 88, 33, 3 that Dr Waite professes to *have* the original inspired "*Words of God*" in Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek. Then note that although Dr Waite refers to the words of Scrivener's Greek New Testament as "*accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words,*" see **Quotes 97, 112**, he does not say that Scrivener's Greek New is the inspired original Greek New Testament Text. Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, uses the words *accurate* and even *perfect* with respect to the *translation* of the 1611 Holy Bible from what he terms the *correct* Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek texts *but he does not claim either inspiration or perfection for the 1611 Holy Bible with respect to conveying 'the original' perfectly* and indeed would deny both.* See again *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3, 17-18.

*This author does, by the way, with reference to the Book with seven seals, Revelation 5:1.

See Dr DiVietro's profession with respect to the W(w)ord(s) of God in *Cleaning-Up* pp 17-18 under **Setting Up the 'Clean-Up'**, pp 25, 31 under **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**, pp 87, 95 under **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**, pp 101-102 under **Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint**, p 112 under **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint**, **Quotes 10, 35, 85, 98**. Dr DiVietro directly or indirectly purports to have the W(w)ord(s) of God in Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek in these citations but like Drs Williams and Waite does not specify it explicitly between two covers.

Dr DiVietro *hints* that the Greek New Testament compiled by F. H. A. Scrivener and himself *might be* the W(w)ord(s) of God *in authority over the 1611 Holy Bible* but of course he is careful not to say so unequivocally. See remarks above and under **Quote 120**.

Regardless of where the DBS Executive Committee members obtained their Biblical texts, it is easy to decide in the light of Dr Gipp's analysis where they got their mentality from, whether Antioch or Alexandria.

There is more to consider in that respect.

Bro. Will Kinney effectively sums up the equivocation of the DBS Executive Committee in his informative article *Devils or Demons?*

See brandplucked.webs.com/devilsordemons.htm.

There are two basic views hotly debated among Christians today concerning the Bible version issue. You are on one side or the other.

#1. Believing God has kept His promises to preserve His words and has given us an inerrant Holy Bible or #2. Believing there is no such thing as a complete, inerrant, and perfect Bible on the face of this earth.

Now which of these two views do you think is a doctrine of devils? 1 Timothy 4:1.

It is easy to see which side the DBS Executive Committee is on.

Quote 124, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 646

*“Fact 4: Scrivener is unscholarly in assuming something that opposes everything that the KJB translators ever said in print. On the title page of their New Testament the KJB translators said that they used “the Originalle Greeke” not any Vulgate readings. Their detailed notes, taken by translator John Bois, never mention following the Latin Vulgate Bible. They list many other sources for reference, including one reference to the “Italian” Bible, and two to the “Old Latin,” but NEVER to the Latin Vulgate... The Italian Diodati and the Old Latin are pure editions. **Scrivener did not have access to these recently discovered notes of the translators.** Therefore what he “assumed” has been proven wrong and Scrivener’s text along with it.”*

Seeing his co-editor, see **Quote 108**, described as “*unscholarly*” and his and his co-editor’s text as “*wrong*,” Dr DiVietro vents his ire at Dr Mrs Riplinger by accusing her of either not knowing the content of John Bois’s notes or of being wilfully misleading. He states that John Bois’s notes do not explain every reading in the 1611 Holy Bible and do not reveal where the Greek text for the 1611 Holy Bible came from. Dr DiVietro adds that the Old Latin differs in places from both the 1611 Holy Bible and the Diodati Bible and that some of the differences are translational but others are not.

Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote 124** show that he is still trying to justify his co-editor’s notion that the King James translators used the Vulgate for some of their readings. See **Quote 122**. *Obviously without actually saying so, Dr DiVietro therefore appears to be implying yet again that his and his co-editor’s text should be trusted even where it departs from the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament.* See **Quote 120** and the extract from **Quote 120** in **Quote 123** above.

Dr DiVietro no doubt appreciates that if word gets out that “*Scrivener is unscholarly*” in suggesting that the King’s men used the Vulgate when they did not and that the Scrivener text is “*wrong*,” it could hurt his and his co-editor’s revenues* from the sale of their text (price \$US 24.95, see **Quote 108**) that by implication on the part of the sole surviving editor and his DBS Executive Committee colleagues may be trusted even above the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament.

*Those revenues, for obvious reasons, accrue solely to the sole surviving editor (Dr Kirk DiVietro).

That conclusion appears to this author to be the essence of Dr DiVietro’s disparaging comments under **Quote 124**.

Inspection of *In Awe of Thy Word*, Chapter 15, pp 532ff for the section entitled *Bois' HIDDEN Handwritten Notes*, Dr Mrs Riplinger's capitalisation, shows that Dr Mrs Riplinger is fully aware of the contents of John Bois's notes and that she has not in any way misled readers.

Dr Mrs Riplinger's summary of John Bois's handwritten notes shows that for their work on the Books of Romans to Revelation, the King's men used both published Greek texts, e.g. those of Beza's 1598 Edition and that of Erasmus, e.g. for 1 Timothy 4:6, and a great many Greek manuscripts, including ancient hand-written codices, e.g. for Revelation 13:5.

They also consulted early church writers, such as John Chrysostom, whose work they used for Romans 4:17.

They further consulted both English and foreign translations, noting that their ancient Greek codices and most of their translation sources supported what became the reading for Hebrews 10:12 in the 1611 Holy Bible *against "the corrupt Catholic bibles"* e.g. the New Jerusalem Bible.

Dr Mrs Riplinger shows further that John Bois's notes reveal that the Old Latin versions were consulted in particular for what became the 1611 Holy Bible readings for Romans 9:6, 1 Corinthians 9:5 and that the Italian Version was mentioned with respect to Revelation 7:1.

What is most revealing in what Dr Mrs Riplinger states about John Bois's notes is with respect to the translators' *final authority* for their work. She writes with respect to Bois's conclusion on Hebrews 10:12, her emphases:

"The translators' final authority was early English and foreign Bibles. Therefore they introduced no novelties or lexical "private interpretation," as do modern translators. One such note confirms this:

"But since all translators, as far as I know, and a good portion of the commentators, both ancient and modern, regard this passage as...I do not deem it prudent...[to institute anew] anything in a matter so commonplace and spread abroad..."

Dr DiVietro claims to have skim-read *In Awe of Thy Word* such that he knows what it is about. See *Quote(s) 87*.

He is lying.

Otherwise he would not have accused Sister Riplinger of either not knowing the content of John Bois's notes or of being wilfully misleading.

It is Dr DiVietro who is misleading readers in that, if he is aware of the contents of John Bois's notes, he does not give an overview of them in the way that Dr Mrs Riplinger has. Dr Mrs Riplinger's overview of John Bois's *does* show where the Greek text underlying the 1611 Holy Bible came from, namely multiple sources (as even Dr DiVietro admits under *Quote 123*) *but also that it was not their final authority*, something that Dr DiVietro would not, of course, be willing to stomach.

Moreover, Dr Mrs Riplinger lists the authorities that were used for 7 specific readings from Romans to Revelation in the 1611 Holy Bible; Romans 4:17, 9:6, 1 Corinthians 9:5, 1 Timothy 4:6, Hebrews 10:12, Revelation 7:1, 13:5. Those examples are sufficient to establish that the 1611 Holy Bible draws from multiple trusted sources and not any single Greek (again, as even Dr DiVietro admits under *Quote 123*).

Explanation of every reading in the King James New Testament is therefore unnecessary. Dr DiVietro's insistence to the contrary is irrelevant and it is up to him to prove otherwise, if he

agrees, as he appears to, with Dr Waite's insistence that the words of Scrivener's Greek New Testament are "*accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words.*" Dr DiVietro should especially be willing therefore to justify Scrivener's 59 known departures from the King James New Testament. See remarks under **Quotes 122, 123.**

Moreover, he has yet to show *from scripture* why extant *Greek* witnesses to the New Testament text should predominate above all others, including "*early English and foreign Bibles.*" Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement above shows that the King James translators did not believe that Greek witnesses should predominate, even though they translated the New Testament from "*the Originall Greeke*" as effectively the earliest i.e. 1st century form of the New Testament or at least among the earliest forms*.

*Keep in mind this extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** and related remarks concerning Hoskier's researches.

That "the word of God" was propagated in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek in the early church is further noted by Dr Mrs Riplinger in a remarkable reference from one particular servant of God whom the Body of Christ would perceive as a most trusted source. Emphases are Dr Mrs Riplinger's.

"In Foxes Book of Martyrs, Vol. 4, pp. 671-675, Foxe quotes an old "treatise." To him, who lived in the 1500s, "old" would definitely be well before the 1400s certainly, probably much, much older than that. It said, "Also the four evangelists wrote the gospel in divers languages, as Matthew in Judea, Mark in Italy, Luke in Achaia, and John in Asia. And all these wrote in the languages of the same countries..." It goes on to say, "since Christ commanded his apostles to preach his gospel unto all the world, and excepted no people or language." Such an old witness, through a man as highly esteemed as Foxe, can hardly be dismissed."

Likewise irrelevant are Dr DiVietro's comments about differences between the Old Latin and Diodati texts that he does not substantiate or elaborate upon. Neither does he show that the differences, such as they are, amount to error or impurity in either text.

Dr DiVietro's comment about those versions is clearly intended merely to sow doubt in the mind of the reader about Dr Mrs Riplinger's work. His tactic is similar to his comments on minor revisions to the 1611 Holy Bible when making his 'bold stand for the KJB' on p 7 of *Cleaning-Up* but which revisions he then magnifies as major issues only three pages further on in his book when attacking Dr Mrs Riplinger about the perfection of the 1611 Holy Bible. See *Cleaning-Up* pp 10-11 and remarks in **Preface and Introduction.**

Dr DiVietro should reflect on Matthew 5:37.

"But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil."

By contrast, Dr Mrs Riplinger has shown the overwhelming agreement of the pre-1611 Bibles in many languages *including Latin and Italian* with the 1611 Holy Bible with respect to important verses from the Gospels from the 12-column Nuremberg Polyglot Bible.

She states in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 1048, 1050, her emphases:

"God has graciously given this author one of the scarce remaining original editions of the twelve language polyglot Bible printed at Nuremberg, Germany in A.D. 1599. It contains the Gospels in Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, English, German, Danish, Bohemian and Polish...It demonstrates the perfect agreement of the English King James Bible with all pure Bibles from other languages. It is perhaps the most important polyglot Bi-

ble in print because it was printed twelve years **before the KJV** and five years before the KJV's translation began...

*“The KJV translators did not create some new text or any new readings. They merely reproduced the type of Bible the world has since the word was given to “all nations.” The following charts will also demonstrate, by contrast, that the corrupt readings in today’s new versions, like the NKJV, NIV, TNIV, NASB, Holman Christian Standard Bible and English Standard Version, yoked their unsuspecting readers with the Jehovah Witness sect and the Roman Catholic system. The purity of the KJV and the depravity of the new versions will be demonstrated through examination of **random** verses which present important doctrines of the Christian faith. The major doctrines covered include:*

1. *The Word of God*
2. *The Nature of God*
3. *The Deity of Christ, his death, resurrection & ascension*
4. *The Salvation by grace through faith*
5. *The Christian life*

“But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith:” Romans 16:26”

*“The collation to follow will document that the KJV matches **precisely** all of the pure Bibles from around the world, that were written **before** the printing of the KJV.”*

The collation that follows in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 1052-1108, 57 pages inclusive, consists of 52 verses that have been listed as follows. See below.

Noting the doubts that Dr DiVietro has raised about the Old Latin and Diodati texts in his comments on **Quote 124**, the Old Latin, 1599 Latin and Italian Bibles have been highlighted in the list that follows.

An asterisk * denotes agreement between the Old Latin text and the Italian Bible where the Latin Version of 1599 departs from the reading of the 1611 Holy Bible, no doubt by means of early Bible-corrupting Jesuit influence. The hash # sign denotes where the 1599 Latin Version departs from the 1611 Holy Bible without inclusion of the Old Latin reading for comparison.

Matthew 5:44, 6:13b, 33, 7:14, 28, 8:19, 29, 11:23 with Luke 10:15 i.e. **“hell”** instead of **“depths”** NIV/TNIV, **“Hades”** NKJV, 15:8*, 9, 17:21, 19:16, 17, 22:32*, 24:45, 25:21, Mark 2:15, 7:28, 9:29, 42, 10:21, 24, 52[#], 12:32, 13:33, Luke 2:40[#], 4:4, 8*, 5:20, 9:35, 11:2*, 4*, 54, 22:64, 68, 23:42, 24:36, 51, 52, John 1:14, 18, 3:13, 4:42*, 6:40, 47, 69, 7:39*, 9:3, 4, 14:14*, 16:16.

8 verses; Matthew 15:8, 22:32, Luke 4:8, 11:2, 4, John 4:42, 7:39, 14:14, show agreement of the Old Latin and 1599 Italian Bibles with the 1611 Holy Bible where the later i.e. 1599 Latin Version departs from the 1611 Holy Bible, undoubtedly through early Bible-corrupting Jesuit influence.

Only two verses; Mark 10:52, Luke 2:40, show departures of the later Latin Version from the Italian Version and the 1611 Holy Bible without Old Latin support listed for the Italian Version and the 1611 Holy Bible. The 1599 Latin Version is the only text in the Nuremberg Polyglot Bible to exhibit extant departures from the 1611 Holy Bible in the verses listed. The pre-1611 Bibles therefore show 96% purity with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible, when the

earlier evidence of the Old Latin witnesses is considered (together with one instance where the departure of the 1599 Spanish Version in John 14:14 was corrected in the 1602 Valera Bible).

As indicated, Jesuit influence would be responsible for any impurities in the pre-1611 Bibles, noting their production of the 1582 Jesuit-Rheims New Testament*, the forerunner of extant English departures from the 1611 Holy Bible, as Dr Mrs Riplinger's tables in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 1052-1108 also show. Without Jesuit influence, 100% purity for the pre-1611 Bibles would appear to be feasible. *See *Did The Catholic Church Give Us The Bible?* by David W. Daniels, Chick Publications, pp 84, 110-111.

That information is clearly beneficial to Dr Mrs Riplinger's readers.

Dr DiVietro, as indicated, produces nothing to resolve the doubts that he has prompted with respect to the Old Latin and Diodati texts in his comments under **Quote 124**.

He should therefore keep in mind the admonition of Proverbs 6:16-19 with respect to ***“he that soweth discord among brethren.”***

The following key observation should also be kept in mind.

The essential point of Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement in **Quote 124** is that John Bois's notes show that the King James translators did *not* use the Vulgate of Jerome.

Dr DiVietro does not refute that essential point. He has simply evaded it in typically churlish fashion in order to cover up for the unscholarly notions of his co-editor and the inaccuracy of his and his co-editor's Greek text.

In addition to Proverbs 6:19, he should therefore give careful consideration to Psalm 50:19.

“Thou givest thy mouth to evil, and thy tongue frameth deceit.”

Quote 125, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 646-647

“Even the Latin Vulgate itself carried with it a large majority of readings from the pure Old Itala Bible. The Old Itala's origin goes back to the work of the “Holy Ghost” in Acts 2, when “out of every nation under heaven”... “every man heard them speak in his own language.” The superscription above the cross was in Latin, as well as Greek and Hebrew (Luke 23:38). Many spoke Latin, especially those who lived in the country and provinces. The gift of tongues provided a way for the scriptures to be immediately put into Latin, as well as other extant languages.”

Dr DiVietro denies that scripture gives any indication at all that God inspired any part of His word at the same time in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek. Dr DiVietro denies further that the gift of tongues was given in Acts 2 to initiate provision of the scriptures in extant languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek, because, he says, Paul explains the reason for the gift of tongues in 1 Corinthians 14. Dr DiVietro states that Paul bases his explanation on Isaiah 28, which warns the Jews that God's judgement would very likely fall on them. Dr DiVietro concludes his comments on **Quote 125** by accusing Dr Mrs Riplinger of adding to scripture and therefore incurring the judgement of Revelation 22:18, though Dr DiVietro neglects to include the verse reference.

See this author's earlier work, **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print** pp 21-22 with respect to God's inspiration of translations in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek in Genesis 42-45, Exodus 4:14, John 19:19, 20, Acts 14:11. See also that work under **The ‘not “inspired by**

God” AV1611 pp 53-55 with respect to God’s inspiration of translations in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek for Esther 1:20-22, 8:8, 9, Daniel 4:1, 2, 6:25, 26.

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 547-548, her emphases, should also be remembered. The entire sections of *In Awe of Thy Word*, entitled *INSPIRATION & TRANSLATION, Views of the King James Translators and Inspiration, Translations & the King of Kings* pp 540ff, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s capitalisations, should be read in the context of **Quote 125** and Dr DiVietro’s lame objections to it.

Neither Dr Waite nor Dr DiVietro has either refuted or even addressed the following statement.

“Translation brings life and prevents death. Enoch was “translated that he should not see death,” and so are God’s words (Heb. 11:5). Through Bible translation, Christ and his words can be made known to all nations and generations to come, in spite of the fact that Koine Greek died around A.D. 800 as a spoken language. Modern Greek pronunciation is different in many ways from ancient Koine. The since-dissolved ‘original Greek’ manuscripts and the library-scarce critical editions are like an arrow through the air with no destination (1 Cor. 14:9). Only when its shell dissolves, as the original manuscripts no doubt did, can the generating and life-giving germ bear fruitful and “profitable” food (2 Tim. 3:16). When it bears fruit, the fruit retains its own life-giving seeds. These seeds in turn can give life once again. Translations keep God’s words alive.”

See also the reference on p 55 of **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society** to Daniel 5:25-28, which is an example of double inspiration, the bane of ‘originals-onlyists’ like the DBS Executive Committee. See **The ‘not “inspired by God” AV1611** p 48, where Dr Waite condemns on pp 84-85 of **A WARNING!!** that which he terms “*This...double inspiration HERESY...*” his capitalisation.

Dr Ruckman shows, the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1037, that what Dr Waite calls heresy “*is known in the Bible as “sound doctrine” (1 Tim. 1:10, 2 Tim. 4:3, Tit. 1:9, 2:1).*”

Dr Waite states on p 32 of **A WARNING!!** that “*There is no scriptural proof that any translation of God’s Words is inspired of God*” and Dr Waite is insistent on p 28 of **A WARNING!!** that “*I know and understand what the Greek Words say in 2 Timothy 3:16. PASA (“each,” “every,” or “all”) GRAPHE (“Old Testament Hebrew Words” and “New Testament Greek Words”) THEOPNEUSTOS (“God-breathed” or “breathed out by God.”) This happened once-for-all when these God-given original Words were given. It has never happened again, including in the King James Bible or in any other translation.*”

See **Appendix 2 – Full List of Extracts, from A WARNING!! by Dr D.A. Waite, Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration:** p 79. The same declaration with respect to God’s breathed-out words is made in *Cleaning-Up* pp iv, 2-3.

It follows therefore, from the dogmatic insistence of Drs Waite and DiVietro that God breathed out any passage of scripture *only once, that an inspired translation is impossible even from Hebrew to Aramaic.* Drs Waite and DiVietro’s emphatic statements with respect to the ‘God-breathed originals’ clearly make no allowance for such a translation.

The underlined words in Daniel 5:25-28, according to Drs Waite and DiVietro, *cannot therefore be inspired scripture even in ‘the God-breathed original’ because these underlined words are clearly a translation of what they term the ‘God-breathed original.’*

“And this is the writing that was written, MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN. This is the interpretation of the thing: MENE; God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it.

TEKEL; Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting. PERES; Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians.

‘Originals-onlyists’ like the DBS Executive Committee members, who obviously “*oppose themselves*” 2 Timothy 2:25, should give careful consideration to what the Lord said in Matthew 12:25. See also Mark 3:24, 25, Luke 11:17.

“And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand:”

Dr DiVietro’s denial of inspiration of translations is clearly contrary to both scripture and the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. So is his denial of multiple inspiration in different languages in Acts 2. One heresy begets another, as Solomon indicates in Ecclesiastes 10:13.

“The beginning of the words of his mouth is foolishness: and the end of his talk is mischievous madness.”

Concerning Acts 2 and inspiration of scripture in many languages that Dr DiVietro has denied, see the detailed remarks under **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** and note the following summary statements for **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** from **Challenges #1-#7 – Overview** and **Necessary Additional Observations**, following comments by Bro. Peter Heisey, missionary to Romania.

1. *Dr DiVietro alters Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #4 in order to take her to task for stating that the New Testament books were directly given by inspiration in other ancient languages besides Greek, as originals. He alters “give one Bible verse that says that the New Testament was originally written to the Greeks only” to a question that asks if it is reasonable to believe that the New Testament books were originally written in Greek. He answers his redrafted challenge by stating that the New Testament was originally written in Koine Greek but insists that it was never inspired in any language other than Koine Greek. Dr DiVietro therefore denies that Dark Age believers like the Waldenses, who suffered repeated papal persecutions over many centuries, could have possessed an inspired Old Latin Bible to sustain them through the fiery trials they underwent. In effect, Dr DiVietro has invented a two-tiered ‘word of God,’ one inspired of God, the other not. In this author’s view, therefore, Dr DiVietro “hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace” Hebrews 10:29, through Whom true Bible believers like the Waldenses were and are blessed with “the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God” Ephesians 6:17.*
2. *Dr DiVietro does not comment in this chapter on the extensive work of Herman Hoskier that Dr Mrs Riplinger has described in detail in Chapter 30 of Hazardous Materials pp 1097ff, even though Hoskier’s research impinges directly on Dr DiVietro’s accusations against Sister Riplinger in this chapter of Cleaning-Up.*

It is Herman Hoskier, not Dr Mrs Riplinger, who stated originally that “Some or all of the first originals may have been in languages other than Greek” and that “Multiple language editions were available immediately and were concurrent with Greek editions.”

Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, does take issue with Dr Mrs Riplinger’s citations from Hoskier on pp 252ff of Cleaning-Up in his comments against Hazardous Materials. On p 256 of Cleaning-Up, he basically accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of lying and states that he is attempting to ascertain what Herman Hoskier really said, in the firm belief that he will be able to prove that Dr Mrs Riplinger has misrepresented Hoskier.

Just in case she hasn't, he adds that even a great scholar can be wrong, i.e. when the results of his work contradict the diktats of the DBS Executive Committee.

Thus far, nothing has emerged [and still hasn't].

3. *Dr DiVietro says further that Dr Mrs Riplinger's claim requires that the Old Testament scriptures be inspired in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic immediately after the events of Acts 2 as well. He states that no evidence exists to show that such inspiration happened, insisting, Cleaning-Up, p 114 that the gift of tongues had only to do with speaking and nothing to do with producing inspired translations, in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek.*

*It will be observed that Peter quotes extensively from **"the old testament"** 2 Corinthians 3:14 in Acts 2, 3 but not verbatim. Moreover, by inspection, a later Old Testament citation, Acts 8:32-33 reads differently, like Peter's quotations in Acts 2, 3 with respect to its Old Testament counterpart, Isaiah 53:7-8. Yet they are both **"The place of the scripture which he read...Esaias the prophet."***

*Therefore, this author believes, contrary to Dr DiVietro that the Lord Jesus Christ has sufficient grace, mercy, wisdom and power to provide written inspired portions of Old Testament scriptures at least soon after Acts 2, directly inspired from an apostle's 'free' quotations from the Old Testament. The differences between the New Testament citations of the Old Testament in Acts 2, 3, 8 and their Old Testament counterparts show that these portions were in languages other than Hebrew but no less **"The place of scripture"** for that. Crucially, the differences between Acts 2:16-21, 25-28, 3:22-23, 8:32-33 and their Old Testament counterparts show that the New Testament passages must have been **"given by inspiration"** in languages other than Hebrew because Jewish scribes were required to make perfect copies of their Old Testament manuscripts. Even minor blemishes could result in the entire copy being destroyed and the manuscript recopied to perfection.*

Dr Moorman [Forever Settled by Jack Moorman, The Bible for Today, 1985, p 28] has shown that parts of a Syriac Old Testament existed by about the middle of the 1st Century A.D.. It appears that an Aramaic Old Testament existed at about the same time and this author thinks it possible, from a comparison of Isaiah 61:1, 2 and Luke 4:18, 19 that the Lord may have read and studied at least portions of an Aramaic Old Testament during His earthly ministry.

*Dr DiVietro would naturally utterly reject this analysis but, as indicated, it will be interesting to see what happens at **"the judgment seat of Christ"** Romans 14:10.*

4. *Dr DiVietro then insists once again, p 84 that inspiration of translations is found nowhere in the New Testament. Revelation 5:13, 14:6-7 show otherwise. The fulfilment of these verses is yet future. The creatures that speak in Revelation 5:13 and the angel who speaks in Revelation 14:7 **"unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people"** will not be speaking Koine Greek, even if that was the language in which John originally wrote the Book of Revelation. Many of the speakers in these verses, including the angel, would, however, be speaking English as the lingua franca of the End Times as recorded in King James English, the Biblical lingua franca of the End Times.*

This means that John's Koine Greek 'original' must have been an inspired translation of at least in part an inspired spoken original in King James English. In God's timing, wisdom and power, the spoken inspired King James English original that John

received prophetically became the written inspired 1611 Authorized King James English Holy Bible historically and to the present day.

That conclusion merits prayerful reflection, James 1:5.

Necessary Additional Observations

1. See point 1. Note that Dr DiVietro's dogmatic statement to the effect that the scriptures were only ever inspired in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek is merely presumption. See Benjamin Wilkinson's statement in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**, with respect to the Waldensian believers and "the word of truth" that they possessed in the form of their Old Latin Bibles during the Dark Ages.
2. See point 4. On the issue of the spoken originals for Revelation 5:13, 14:6-7, 1 Corinthians 12:3 states that **"no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost."** Both sets of speakers in Revelation 5:13, 14:6-7 are examples of 1 Corinthians 12:3 in action, even if the Holy Ghost has to 'inspire' the speakers in Revelation 5:13 worldwide. It is then a question of whether they will say the exact words as recorded in the KJB, whether in English or another language* but in words directly equivalent to the KJB English words. It is virtually certain that they will speak the exact words as found in the KJB, according to Psalm 138:2, 1 Corinthians 2:13, 1 Thessalonians 2:13 and that the Spirit of God will achieve this in the future, in the Tribulation. It is impossible that God will dishonour His words by means of having the speakers recite a modern counterfeit that changes the words of Revelation 5:13, 14:6-7. *Not Koine Greek, because that can be shown to be a dead language, as even Dr DiVietro admits, *Cleaning-Up*, p 63.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's notion that the purpose of the gift of tongues in Acts 2 is explained by 1 Corinthians 14, Dr DiVietro has overlooked the different nature of the tongues in Acts 2 with respect to those in 1 Corinthians 14 and therefore the distinct even if overlapping purposes for which the tongues were given in each case.

Dr Ruckman explains the nature and purpose of tongues in Acts 2 and 1 Corinthians 14 in his commentary *The Books of First and Second Corinthians* pp 280, 294. See also the *Ruckman Reference Bible* pp 1525-1526. He refers first to the **"new tongues"** Mark 16:17 as languages that are new to the speaker that he has never learned before*. Dr Ruckman then explains that **"other tongues"** Acts 2:4, 1 Corinthians 14:21 (prophesied according to the expression **"another tongue"** in Isaiah 28:11, to which Dr DiVietro refers but only with respect to the chapter, not the verse) are languages that are not native to the speaker that he may, 1 Corinthians 14:18, or may not have learned, Acts 2:4 but which the hearers understand, Acts 2:6, 8. A third type of tongue is that which Paul describes as **"an unknown tongue"** 1 Corinthians 14:2, 4, 13, 14, 19, 27 that is unknown to the hearers and possibly even the speaker, so that an interpreter is needed, 1 Corinthians 14:13, 27.

*That he may well have needed if ministering in **"the regions beyond"** 2 Corinthians 10:16, such as Britain, as some websites describe e.g. www.hope-of-israel.org/1stcent.htm. Most of these sites are contaminated with the error of British Israelism and do not stand for the 1611 Holy Bible as their final authority but the historical material they present speaks of an apostolic witness to Britain. See also Dr Ruckman's comments in *The Book of Romans* pp 580-581 on the first church that the Britons named as St Paul's and Dr Mrs Riplinger's extensive material in *In Awe of Thy Word*, Chapter 19, *The Anglo Saxon Bible*, pp 674ff. She states, p 674, her emphases **"According to historians, Christ's command to "Go ye into all the world," coupled with the new gift of tongues, carried countless Christians to "preach the gospel" in the first century to the 'isle' which is today called England (Mark 16:15). The**

trail of blood which brought us our English Bible begins with those nameless Christians who received that tongue spoken by the “Barbarians” – Celtic Britons living in the “isles of the sea” (Acts 2, Isa. 24:15). We will follow the footsteps of the Bible from the disciples (1st century) to Coverdale (16th century) on the upcoming pages through **direct quotations** from the sages who actually lived during these ages; Tertullian (200s), Gildas (500s), Bede (700s), Asser (800s), William of Malmesbury (1100s), *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles* (700-1200s), and John Foxe (1500s). The climb over the rugged spelling and unfamiliar sentence terrain brings the seeker to a vista of truth unclouded by the opinions of today’s liberal historians.”*

*It should never be forgotten that “those nameless Christians” and the equally nameless Barbarian Celtic Britons that by faith, blood and toil they brought to the Saviour are among the **“fellowlabourers, whose names are in the book of life”** Philippians 4:3, Revelation 20:12, 15, 21:27. By way of illustration, attention is drawn to the work of English author Hilary St George Saunders, who says this about the WW2 British Army paratroopers in his book *The Red Beret, The Story of the Parachute Regiment 1940-1945*, p 324.

“...each a comrade of trust and proof...Rewards and hazards alike, they accepted them with a quiet mind, and their motto might have been that of the Roman legion, utrinque paratus, ready to face good or ill-fortune. For [they were] volunteers, every man of them, members of that select company of the brave whose high courage constrains them to go

“‘Always a little further’; it may be*

“‘Beyond that last blue mountain barred with snow,

“‘Across that angry or that glimmering sea...’”

*Matthew 26:39.

Though he quotes from a secular source, *The Golden Journey to Samarkand*, yet ironically with respect to “*the pilgrims*,” Saunders’ words, applied in a spiritual and ministerial sense, fit well with respect to “*those nameless Christians*” in this author’s view.

The DBS Executive Committee would not understand any of that, naturally. Neither would James White, Doug Kutilek, Dan Corner or the rest of the Laodicean apostate IBCs (idiot Bible correctors).

Dr Ruckman stresses that on all the occasions that the use of tongues is recorded in the Book of Acts; Acts 2:4, 11, 10:46, 19:6, Jews are present because **“the Jews require a sign”** 1 Corinthians 1:22, especially unbelieving Jews, as Paul makes clear in 1 Corinthians 14:22.

“Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not: but prophesying serveth not for them that believe not, but for them which believe.”

The use of tongues in apostolic times, to which their use was limited as Dr Ruckman also explains, therefore clearly overlapped with respect to their application as a sign for the Jew in Acts 2 and 1 Corinthians 14. However, the specific application of tongues in Acts 2:4, 8 is to show those **“dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven”** Acts 2:5 *that they had crucified their Messiah* i.e. **“Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain:”** Acts 2:23.

Dr Ruckman points out with respect to the use of tongues in 1 Corinthians 14 that the first meeting place of the Corinthian church was in a **“house joined hard to the synagogue”** Acts 18:7. Use of **“an unknown tongue”** in 1 Corinthians 14, not a multiplicity of tongues given simultaneously as in Acts 2, was therefore intended as a means of witnessing to unsaved Jews locally, not necessarily **“out of every nation under heaven,”** according to the fully developed

statement of the Gospel as found in the very next chapter of 1 Corinthians but which is not given in Acts 2.

“For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures:”

Paul speaks in 1 Corinthians 14:6 of *“speaking with tongues...either by revelation, or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine”* in order to profit his hearers by means of *“words easy to be understood”* 1 Corinthians 14:9. However, nothing is found in 1 Corinthians 14 with respect to citation of freely-quoted scripture, according to Acts 2:17-21, 25-28 by means of *“other tongues...out of every nation under heaven”* such that *“every man heard them speak in his own language”* Acts 2:4, 5, 6.

The occasion in Acts 2 was clearly a strategic one that in addition to being *“for a sign”* for Jewish hearers had the purpose that Dr Mrs Riplinger sets out in *In Awe of Thy Word*, Chapter 18, *Acts 2 To You*. See below.

As indicated, the purpose of tongues in 1 Corinthians 14 was different from the strategic purpose for which they were given in Acts 2. Note the full statement of Isaiah 28:11 and how Paul edits the verse in 1 Corinthians 14:21, adding the last clause of Isaiah 28:12 *“yet they would not hear.”*

“For with stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this people.”

“In the law it is written, With men of other tongues and other lips will I speak unto this people; and yet for all that will they not hear me, saith the Lord.”

Noting the last clause of 1 Corinthians 14:21 from Isaiah 28:12, it is apparent that in Acts 2, by contrast, that the Jewish listeners *did* hear the apostles, who did ***“speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance...the wonderful works of God”*** Acts 2:4-11.

1 Corinthians 14:21 therefore has a different application from Acts 2:4-11. This author’s explanation is as follows.

Paul has used the expression *“another tongue”* in Isaiah 28:11 to refer in 1 Corinthians 14:21 to another people, or peoples, i.e. ***“men of other tongues”*** as John uses the expression *“tongues”* in Revelation 10:11.

“And he said unto me, Thou must prophesy again before many peoples, and nations, and tongues, and kings.”

The *“men of other tongues”* therefore appear to be Gentiles e.g. Greeks in Corinth, whom God gifted with *“an unknown tongue”* i.e. unknown to them in order to *“speak unto this people”* i.e. unbelieving Jews in Corinth.

It appears significant that the expression *“an unknown tongue”* only ever appears in scripture in the singular, indicating that it is *one* language, not many as in Acts 2, with which God gifted Gentiles during the apostolic age to *“speak unto this people”* i.e. unbelieving Jews in Corinth, to get their attention for the purpose of the Gospel. See again 1 Corinthians 14:2, 4, 13, 14, 19, 27 and remarks above with respect to 1 Corinthians 15:3, 4.

What language could that be?

The most likely possibility is Hebrew.

The following passage suggests that possibility because Acts 21:40, 22:2 are the only occasions in the Book of Acts after Acts 2 when a specific language i.e. *“tongue”* is mentioned by

which an apostle speaks to a group, in this case Paul giving his testimony *to unbelieving Jews*.

“And when he had given him licence, Paul stood on the stairs, and beckoned with the hand unto the people. And when there was made a great silence, he spake unto them in the Hebrew tongue, saying, Men, brethren, and fathers, hear ye my defence which I make now unto you. (And when they heard that he spake in the Hebrew tongue to them, they kept the more silence: and he saith,)” Acts 21:40, 22:1-2.

Paul could not complete his address to his hearers, Acts 22:22 but it appears that God’s last desperate attempt to ***“speak unto this people”*** was intended to be by *Gentile* converts who ***“spake unto them in the Hebrew tongue”*** that these Gentiles, from wholly heathen backgrounds, could not have learned and possibly not even understood themselves. That would be the strongest possible sign *to an unbelieving Jew* ***“that God is in you of a truth”*** 1 Corinthians 14:25, such that he should then be open to the Gospel of Christ as set out in 1 Corinthians 15:3, 4.

That sign failed, sadly, as Isaiah 28:12 and 1 Corinthians 14:21 indicate and as Paul states in Acts 28:28, which has largely held true to the present day and will do until the Second Advent.

“Be it known therefore unto you, that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and that they will hear it.”

That is one reason why as Paul states in 1 Corinthians 13:8 ***“whether there be tongues, they shall cease;”*** in that God is no longer dealing with the Jews as He did during the apostolic age and the signs of the apostolic age i.e. ***“the signs of an apostle”*** 2 Corinthians 12:12 and those of their immediate converts that were exercised during the apostolic age have ceased. See Dr Ruckman’s commentary *The Books of First and Second Corinthians* pp 274, 280, 294.

Nevertheless, it may be concluded therefore that though related, i.e. ***“for a sign”*** to Jews, the application of tongues to Jewish hearers was therefore not the same in Acts 2 as in 1 Corinthians 14 and Dr DiVietro has misled his readers in stating otherwise.

Dr DiVietro has also misled, indeed lied to his readers with respect to accusing Dr Mrs Riplinger of somehow violating Revelation 22:18 by adding to scripture. Inspection of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work in *In Awe of Thy Word*, Chapters 17, 18, *The Sounds of the First English Bibles* and *Acts 2 to You: From the Gothic Bible to the KJV*, shows nothing of the kind.

See this extract from **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to *In Awe of Thy Word*, Chapter 17, *The Sounds of the First English Bible*, pp 619-648.

Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in support of her analysis, In Awe of Thy Word, pp 621-624 that the Christian Goths most likely first received their Bible early in the 2nd century. Ulfilas, ‘the little wolf’ and Bishop to the Goths, compiled his 4th century Gothic Bible from “‘a comparatively pure Byzantine text in the New Testament...[and it] is so extraordinarily faithful to the Greek.’” She states, her emphasis that “Philostorgius said Ulfilas’ “grandparents were Christians,” converts of those “dwellers in...Cappadocia” which received the gift of “other tongues” heard in Acts 2:9. His grandparents were the direct converts of the “strangers scattered throughout...Cappadocia” spoken of by Peter (1 Peter 1:1). These Cappadocians were the “hearers of Peter’s first sermon, and its Christian residents among the readers of his first epistle.””

Dr Mrs Riplinger states further, her emphases that “The Goths “migrated into Scythia” and became part of the “Barbarian, Scythian,” people mentioned in Paul’s letter to the Colos-

sians (3:11). “At this time [150 A.D.] a vast number of Goths were Christians, their conversion having been effected by those whom they had carried into captivity.””

Dr Mrs Riplinger states, *In Awe of Thy Word*, p 628 that “The following charts document the faithful preservation of the word of God. It was given to the Goths in the book of Acts and “endureth to all generations” (Ps. 100:5). Its sounds and words are often still evident in the King James Bible...”

Dr Mrs Riplinger then lists the following 37 verses to show this preservation; Ephesians 3:14, 1 Corinthians 16:22, Romans 16:24, 1 Timothy 2:7, Philippians 4:13, Romans 14:10-12, 1 Corinthians 5:4, 2 Thessalonians 1:12, 1 Corinthians 9:1, 2 Thessalonians 1:8, Galatians 4:7, 1 Thessalonians 3:13, 1 Corinthians 5:5, Matthew 8:29, 1 Corinthians 15:47, 2 Corinthians 4:10, 2 Timothy 4:1, Galatians 6:17, Luke 2:33, Matthew 5:22, Romans 9:28, 1 Corinthians 11:24, Colossians 2:11, 1 Corinthians 5:7b, Ephesians 2:1, Matthew 5:44, Ephesians 4:6, Colossians 3:22, 2 Corinthians 10:4, Colossians 2:18, 23, Romans 8:1, Ephesians 5:5, Luke 16:23, Colossians 3:6. She concludes, *In Awe of Thy Word* p 648, her emphases, “The Gothic language not only often **sounded** like English, sometimes it even **looked** just like it, because it used Roman letters, as well as Greek and Runic. These words ‘Name’ and ‘AMEN,’ **NAMQ AMEN** were taken directly from the Lord’s Prayer in an ancient Gothic manuscript.”

Note in addition the following material from *In Awe of Thy Word*, Chapter 18, *Acts 2 to You: From the Gothic Bible to the KJV*, pp 650-671, with the introductory statement on p 650, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases.

“In Acts 2 the gift was given to enable “**every man**” from “**every nation**” to receive “**every word of God.**” The scarlet thread of red letters ties today’s KJV to the Gothic language of Acts 2. For all who care to compare, the charts have “bound the scarlet line in the window,” showing sounds that echo “down” to us. A random sampling of verses shows that the NIV, TNIV, NASB and most other new versions silence those utterances of the Holy Ghost (Acts 2:4-6) and cut the life giving scarlet “cord.” (Josh. 2:15, 18, 21).”

Note that Dr Wilkinson undoubtedly refers to *these Bible translations* as “**all scripture**” that “**is given by inspiration of God**” and descended from multiple inspiration of the scriptures in Acts 2 because he calls these translations, this author’s emphases “**the apostolic scriptures...The Scriptures of the apostle John and his associates, the traditional text, — the Textus Receptus, if you please...And when the Greek East for one thousand years was completely shut off from the Latin West, the noble Waldenses in northern Italy still possessed in Latin the Received Text.**”

Dr DiVietro and Dr Waite would deny that the Waldenses or any Bible believers like them ever actually had “**all scripture**” that “**is given by inspiration of God**” at any time since 100 A.D. if all that they had were translations such as Wilkinson mentions like ““*the old Italic Bible [of] the rude Low Latin of the second century...the language of the people.*”” See point 1 above from the summary points from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.

Job 31:11 well describes the attitude of Dr DiVietro and Dr Waite to the Bibles of those early “**saints, and...martyrs for Jesus**” Revelation 17:6, especially with reference to Romans 14:10, 2 Corinthians 5:10.

“**For this is an heinous crime; yea, it is an iniquity to be punished by the judges.”**

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s examples are as follows, showing that the readings of the 1611 Holy Bible reach back to the pre-350 A.D. Gothic Bible. Dr Benjamin Wilkinson associates “*the Gothic of Ulfilas*” with Bibles translated into “*the Low Latin of the second century*” and in

turn the Syrian Peshitto Bible of 150 A.D. Like the list given earlier from *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 1052-1108, see above, the verses that follow impinge on major doctrine that has been attacked in the modern versions.

Matthew 8:29, Matthew 11:23 with Matthew 16:18, Luke 10:15, Acts 2:27, 31, Revelation 1:18, 6:8, 20:13, 14 “**hell**” instead of “*depths*” twice, “*grave*” twice, “*Hades*” 5 times NIV, “*depths*” twice, “*death*” once, “*realm of the dead*” twice, “*Hades*” 4 times TNIV, “*Hades*” NKJV, Mark 7:16, 9:29, 42, 44, 15:28, Luke 2:40, 4:4, 25, 9:35, 55, 56, John 6:47, 69, 9:4, 35, 10:21, 30, 32, 16:16, 17:11.

Note that the NIV retains “*hell*” in Luke 16:23 but the TNIV weakens the term to “*Hades*.”

The list consists of 30 verses. The two lists give a combined total of 67 verses from throughout the New Testament that support Dr Mrs Riplinger’s thesis that the 1611 Holy Bible reaches back via the pre-350 A.D. Gothic to the apostolic New Testament readings that had their beginning in Acts 2.

Nowhere has scripture been added to in violation of Revelation 22:18 and the verses listed are but a few *random* samples of scriptures that reach back from the 1611 Holy Bible to the inspiration of scripture in Acts 2 in the languages of “**every nation under heaven**” Acts 2:5 as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in greater detail in Chapter 18 of *In Awe of Thy Word*.

Dr DiVietro and Dr Waite are among those who would “*silence those utterances of the Holy Ghost (Acts 2:4-6) and cut the life giving scarlet “cord.” (Josh. 2:15, 18, 21).*”

Quote 126, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 647

*“The **scriptural** viewpoint of vernacular scriptures shows them as “Holy Ghost” inspired and concurrent with Greek scriptures, via Acts chapter 2. Paul, the one who penned much of the New Testament said, “I speak with tongues more than ye all...” (1 Cor. 14:18). As penman of much of the New Testament, the reason for his gift was obvious. His statement would lead to the conclusion that Paul’s epistles would have been “inspired” in numerous languages and he, as well as others, would have had the gift to put the rest of the New Testament into all known languages of the day. The Bible never shows an exclusivity to the Greek language. This is made apparent by the kind of gift the Holy Ghost gave in Acts 2. Nor does it place Greek ‘above’ other languages, given the involvement of the “Holy Ghost” in the known languages of Acts 2.”*

Dr DiVietro falsely accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of subscribing to the Catholic false teaching that the New Testament was first inspired in Latin. He then states that the gift of tongues was given only until the completion of the scriptures according to 1 Corinthians 13:10 and that no evidence exists to show that the scriptures i.e. the New Testament were circulated in Latin, Gothic, Aramaic, or any language other than Koine Greek until the 2nd century at the earliest.

Dr DiVietro fails to document any source for the Catholic false teaching to which he refers. He also has no comment to make with respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s disavowal of such a doctrine on p 1100 of *Hazardous Materials*, even though he begins his **Quote(s) 185** on p 258 of *Cleaning-Up* with that statement, which reads as follows, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases.

*“I would not suggest the liberal theory that the original gospel of Matthew was written **exclusively** in Aramaic, a theory which has been fomented by Catholics. However, it is important to see McClintock, Strong and Hoskier’s observations that the originals may not have been written **strictly** in Greek and vernacular editions born out of Acts 2 accompanied the originals immediately. (See the chapter “The Wobbly Unorthodox Greek Orthodox Church” for a further discussion of this topic.)”*

See remarks under **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.

On pp 738-739 of *Hazardous Materials*, Chapter 20 “*The Wobbly Unorthodox Greek Orthodox Church*,” Dr Mrs Riplinger has this summary statement, her emphases, about the work of Herman Hoskier on *multiple* versions of the New Testament extant during the apostolic age.

It is noteworthy that Dr DiVietro bypasses the following statement in his quotes and comments.

“H. C. Hoskier, the renowned manuscript collator and Bible scholar, wrote *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the N.T.* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1910) proving that the New Testament was circulating immediately in **multiple** languages. (This will be discussed in detail in another chapter [Chapter 30 “*The Scriptures to All Nations*”].) This is not a new idea, but one which is derived from the Bible’s own description in Acts. *In Awe of Thy Word* proved that the English Bible comes directly from the gift of tongues which provided “Holy Ghost” inspired words and Bibles for those who spoke Gothic, Celtic, Latin, Greek, Hebrew and other languages. These words moved directly forward into the English Bible through the seven purifications described in Psa. 12:6, 7, just as Latin words moved forward into Roumaunt, Provinçal, Spanish, French, and Italian. The book of Romans ends saying, “But **now** is made manifest, and by **the scriptures** of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to **all nations**...” (Donald M. Ayers, *English Words From Latin and Greek Elements*, Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1986, 2nd ed., pp. 1-14 et al.).”

The evidence in *In Awe of Thy Word* to which Dr Mrs Riplinger refers in the above statement is found in Chapter 17 *The Sounds of the First English Bibles*, p 620, where she also explains why no record of the circulation of the scriptures in multiple versions prior to the 2nd century exists, her emphases.

What follows is some of the evidence that Dr DiVietro has carelessly, or wilfully, overlooked.

“All of these vernacular Bibles, written during the first centuries after Christ, were destroyed during the persecution of Roman Emperor Diocletian in A.D. 303. John Foxe writes in 1583 of the worldwide **persecution**, testifying,

“...it was universally through **all the churches in the world** fierce and vehement, so in this realm of Britain also it was so sore, that, as all our English chronicles do testify and record, all Christianity almost in the whole land was destroyed, churches subverted, **all books of the Scriptures** burned, many of the faithful, both men and women, were slain” (John Foxe, *The Acts and Monuments*, Vol. I, London: R.B. Seely and W. Burnside, 1836, p. 312).”

““The Diocletian persecution made away altogether with those [Bibles] of the first three centuries which did not perish naturally through the frailty of papyrus” (*Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. James Hastings, Vol. II, New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1928, p. 586.)”

This extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** provides further evidence for vernacular Bibles translated before the 2nd century, even during the apostolic age. See also **Quote 124**. Note that the expression “**the word of God**” used immediately below refers specifically to the Gospels. However, the Lord Jesus Christ through His own example in Luke 24:27 would have sought to impart “**in all the scriptures the things concerning himself**” through the apostles as “**witnesses unto me...to the uttermost part of the earth**” Acts 1:8, as Paul emphasised in Acts 20:27 and which would have characterised his ministry wherever he sought “**to preach the gospel in the regions beyond**” 2 Corinthians 10:16.

“For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.”

That **“the word of God”** was propagated in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek in the early church is further noted by Dr Mrs Riplinger in a remarkable reference from one particular servant of God whom the Body of Christ would perceive as a most trusted source. Emphases are Dr Mrs Riplinger’s.

“In Foxes Book of Martyrs, Vol. 4, pp. 671-675, Foxe quotes an old “treatise.” To him, who lived in the 1500s, “old” would definitely be well before the 1400s certainly, probably much, much older than that. It said, **“Also the four evangelists wrote the gospel in divers languages, as Matthew in Judea, Mark in Italy, Luke in Achaia, and John in Asia. And all these wrote in the languages of the same countries...”** It goes on to say, **“since Christ commanded his apostles to preach his gospel unto all the world, and excepted no people or language.”** Such an old witness, through a man as highly esteemed as Foxe, can hardly be dismissed.”

It would certainly be the height of presumption on the part of the DBS Executive Committee to do so.

Dr Mrs Riplinger [in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 758] has compiled further evidence in support of inspired New and Old Testament portions of the scriptures in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek, her emphases. These portions included translations of the Old Testament into Old Latin.

“Wycliffe said that the scripture is given by the Holy Ghost in all languages. To those who charge that inspiration is lost with translation [Drs DiVietro, Waite, Williams, *Cleaning-Up*, p 18], Wycliffe says, “...such a charge is a condemnation of the **Holy Ghost**, who first **gave the Scriptures** in tongues to the Apostles of Christ, to speak that word **in all languages** that were ordained under heaven”...

Dr Mrs Riplinger states further, her emphases, in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 757-758:

“Wycliffe said, **“The clergy cry aloud that is heresy to speak of the Holy Scriptures in English** [as does the DBS Executive Committee], and so they would condemn the **Holy Ghost**, who **gave** tongues to the Apostles of Christ to speak the word of God in **all languages** under heaven” (John Wycliffe, *Speculum Secularium, Opera Mimora*, London: Wycliffe Society, John Loserth, editor, 1913, p. 74, as cited in Bill Bradley, *Purified Seven Times*, Clayburg, PA: Revival Fires Publishing, 1998, p. 11)...

“Even today many say it is “erroneous and heretical” to believe our English Bible is “scripture” and therefore that it is still the very inspired words of God, not the words of men (quotes on file). Addressing the lack of faith of those who say [the DBS Executive Committee], “God did not do it – men did it,” Wycliffe replies,

““You say it is heresy to speak of the Holy **Scriptures in English**. You call me a heretic because I have translated the Bible into the common tongue of the people. Do you know who you **blaspheme** [the DBS Executive Committee doesn’t care]? Did not the Holy Ghost give the word of God at first in the **mother-tongue of the nations** to whom it was addressed? Why do you speak against the Holy Ghost [because the DBS Executive Committee is **“the messenger of Satan”** 2 Corinthians 12:7 and aspires as he declares in Isaiah 14:14 that **“I will be like the most High”**]?” (as cited in David Guy Fountain, *John Wycliffe: The Dawn of the Reformation*, Southampton: Mayflower Christian Books, 1984, pp. 45-47).

“God did not abandon his word to a scholar’s bookshelf [including those in Dr DiVietro’s library of thousands of books, *Cleaning-Up* pp 43, 59, see **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**]. Wycliffe said, “I am astonished, therefore, that some of our own people

would slander those who say that they possess the Holy Spirit speaking to them in this way” – that is through the scriptures in English [the DBS Executive Committee does exactly that] (John Wyclif, *On the Truth of Holy Scripture* (1378), p 194).”

Herman Hoskier, John Foxe and John Wycliffe clearly contradict Dr DiVietro with respect to early vernacular Bibles. As three witnesses, 2 Corinthians 13:1, they **“have oftentimes proved diligent in many things”** 2 Corinthians 8:22 and it is up to Dr DiVietro to disprove their testimonies, which so far he has not done.

Note finally for **Quote 126** Dr DiVietro’s error with respect to 1 Corinthians 13:10, which he does not quote but which states **“But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.”**

Dr DiVietro equates **“when that which is perfect is come”** to the completion of the New Testament. He overlooked 1 Corinthians 13:12.

“For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.”

See Dr Ruckman’s study in the *Ruckman Reference Bible* pp 1524-1525 and *The Books of First and Second Corinthians* pp 274-277.

Dr Ruckman shows clearly that the expression **“when that which is perfect is come”** refers not to the completion of the New Testament but to the Second Advent, because the expression **“that which”** refers to the Lord Jesus Christ and the expression **“face to face”** does not refer to anything in writing, as the apostle John reveals.

“That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life; (For the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;)” 1 John 1:1-2.

“Having many things to write unto you, I would not write with paper and ink: but I trust to come unto you, and speak face to face, that our joy may be full” 2 John 12.

Dr DiVietro’s tampering with **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21, *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3, has therefore led him into another heresy, that of falsely teaching that 1 Corinthians 13:10 refers to the completion of the New Testament, not the Second Advent. See this extract from **Quote 86**, noting Dr Ruckman’s encounter with the elderly heretic in 1951.

In sum, that single change of “given by inspiration of God” to “God-breathed” via ‘the word in the Greek’ theopneustos appears to have been all it took to concoct the DBS Executive Committee members’ false doctrine of ‘originals onlyism’ that by profession denies “the scripture of truth” Daniel 10:21 to all but them and their closest adherents, and is equivalent to “the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate” Revelation 2:15, in direct violation of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9.

Dr DiVietro’s comment on 1 Corinthians 13:10 again raises the question of just *where* is **“that which is perfect”** as the complete New Testament between two covers *for today*? Yet again, he has failed to answer that question. He has said only that no Greek or Hebrew text or Bible translation is perfect or infallible – except that which is retained by the DBS Executive Committee but not so far specifically identified. See *Cleaning-Up* pp xi, 21, **Quotes 95, 119, 120, 123, 171, 175.**

(Observe that Dr DiVietro uses the term **“perfect”** for the AV1611 only in that he thinks that its words should not be changed. According to Dr DiVietro, the AV1611 is still confusing and therefore imperfect in that it must be ‘clarified’ e.g. by properly qualified exegetes who

know ‘the Greek’ etc. (like himself!), *Cleaning-Up* pp 3, 32, 69, 94-95, 181, once again in defiance of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9.)

Dr DiVietro would have done better to have bypassed **Quote 126** altogether.

Quote(s) 127, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 647-648, 650

Quote(s) 127 is a lengthy statement including part of *The Translators to the Reader* that occupies over a page of *Cleaning-Up*. The only part that Dr DiVietro answers is the question from p 650 “*Has anyone actually examined Scrivener’s trumped-up list of so-called KJB Latin-derived words before?*”

Dr DiVietro assures his readers that he has done so. His editor helpfully informs readers that Dr DiVietro’s 48-page paper on the subject is available from *The Bible for Today*, BFT, for the princely sum of \$US 9.00 total.

That is all that Dr DiVietro has to say about **Quote(s) 127**.

Interestingly, he does not take issue with Dr Mrs Riplinger’s scathing denunciation, her emphases, of his co-editor as follows, from **Quote(s) 127**.

“I suspect God wanted to expose Scrivener, as almost fifty years ago he gave me a private Latin tutor, for the last 50 years he has kindly surrounded me in a world of wall-to-wall antique and modern reference books. Shockingly, when this list is actually examined the following is discovered. Many, many of the instances cited on the Scrivener’s so-called ‘Latin list’ are countenanced by Greek texts. In just one book at my fingertips I found Greek support representing the oldest Greek manuscripts, for 24 out of his 59 listed instances. (Individually documented at the end of this chapter).”

It is also noteworthy that Dr DiVietro also does not take issue with the very first and for him no doubt a most provocative statement from **Quote(s) 127**, which reads as follows.

“God has preserved several original readings in the Old Itala, which were removed by unbelieving Jews from the Hebrew Old Testament and by the apostate Greek Orthodox church from the Greek New Testament.”

These deletions include Acts 8:37 and 1 John 5:7. See *Hazardous Materials* Chapters 20, 27 for further examples of Greek and Hebrew tampering with their own manuscripts.

It may be that Dr DiVietro’s strange silence with respect to the above statements is explained by the following statement from *The Translators to the Reader* that is included in **Quote(s) 127**, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases.

*“...soured with the leaven of their superstition [‘originals-onlyism’ *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3]...So much are they afraid of the light of the Scripture, (*Lucifugae Scripturarum, as Tertulian speaketh*) that they will not trust the people with it [i.e. “**Gail...you are doing irreparable damage by the things you have written**” *Cleaning-Up* p 111, author’s emphases]...Yea, so unwilling they are to communicate the Scriptures to the people’s understanding in any sort [i.e. you need ‘the Greek’ to ‘clarify’ the ‘confusing’ 1611 Holy Bible, *Cleaning-Up* pp 32, 69, 94-95], that they are not ashamed to confess, that we forced them to translate it into English against their wills [i.e. you need a ‘proper’ exegesis of 2 Timothy 3:16 from ‘the Greek’, *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-vi, though all it does is promote the heresy of ‘originals-onlyism’]. *This seemeth to argue a bad cause, or a bad conscience, or both* [both].”*

Dr DiVietro and the entire DBS Executive Committee would do well to reflect carefully upon Acts 24:16.

“And herein do I exercise myself, to have always a conscience void of offence toward God, and toward men.”

Note that the section of *The Translators to the Reader* that is included in **Quote(s) 127** is on this site, www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm, appropriately entitled as follows, regardless of the anti-1611 Holy Bible stance of the commentator whose thesis follows (Edgar J. Goodspeed):

THE UNWILLINGNESS OF OUR CHIEF ADVERSARIES, THAT THE SCRIPTURES SHOULD BE DIVULGED IN THE MOTHER TONGUE

Exactly.

That is exactly the stance of the DBS Executive Committee with respect to *“the scripture of truth”* Daniel 10:21. They would prefer the seven-sealed Book Revelation 5:1 to remain *“sealed”* Isaiah 29:11 until they unseal it, not that *“the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof”* Revelation 5:5.

As indicated, see **Quote 126**, the DBS Executive Committee charter is well expressed in Isaiah 14:14:

“I will be like the most High.”

Quote 128, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 651-652

“In all instances Scrivener also had access to Greek editions which match the KJB.

“The KJB follows Tyndale or other earlier English Bibles in all of these 59 choices. This was done according to the rules laid down for their translation. Therefore the question is not entirely ‘what Greek sources did the KJB translators have?’ but ‘what Greek manuscripts, pre-English and Old English Holy Bibles did Tyndale, the continental traveller, have access to over 350 years before Scrivener?...That question neither Scrivener nor anyone else can answer. Documented elsewhere in this book is evidence proving that God has used editions other than the Greek and Hebrew to preserve certain readings.”

Dr DiVietro insists that Dr Mrs Riplinger has brought forth nothing new and that the facts that she mentions are common knowledge with respect to the preservation of the Bible and its translation into English.

Dr DiVietro’s evasive comment on **Quote 128** immediately prompts the question, what happened to ‘the’ Greek text that Dr DiVietro touts as ‘finally authoritative’ on p 21 of *Cleaning-Up*, even though ‘the’ Greek text is unpublished?

See this extract from **Quote 124** with respect to *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 532ff *“proving that God has used editions other than the Greek and Hebrew to preserve certain readings,”* certainly with respect to *“the Greek and Hebrew”* no longer being ‘finally authoritative’ as Dr DiVietro would have his readers falsely believe.

[The King James translators] further consulted both English and foreign translations, noting that their ancient Greek codices and most of their translation sources supported what became the reading for Hebrews 10:12 in the 1611 Holy Bible against “the corrupt Catholic bibles” e.g. the New Jerusalem Bible.

Dr Mrs Riplinger shows further that John Bois’s notes reveal that the Old Latin versions were consulted in particular for the what became the 1611 Holy Bible readings for Romans 9:6, 1 Corinthians 9:5 and that the Italian Version was mentioned with respect to Revelation 7:1.

What is most revealing in what Dr Mrs Riplinger states about John Bois's notes is with respect to the translators' final authority for their work. She writes with respect to Bois's conclusion on Hebrews 10:12, her emphases:

*"The translators' **final authority** was early English and foreign Bibles. Therefore they introduced no novelties or lexical "private interpretation," as do modern translators. One such note confirms this:*

*"But since **all translators**, as far as I know, and a good portion of the commentators, both ancient and modern, regard this passage as...I do not deem it prudent...[to institute anew] anything in a matter so **commonplace and spread abroad**..."*

Note the list of 52 verses from *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 1052-1108 for which the King James translators relied at least as much on the witness of the Old Latin and pre-1611 vernacular Bibles for the readings in these verses as they did on any Greek source.

See therefore **Quote(s) 90** with respect to the summary statement by evangelist Stephen Shutt from p 735 of *Hazardous Materials* on the superseding of Greek and Hebrew as 'finally authoritative,' noting again that Dr DiVietro includes this statement in **Quote(s) 155** but studiously avoids any comment on it.

"Let it be clear, these languages were used by God at one time [ancient Hebrew and ancient Koine Greek]. Yet, interestingly enough, God did away with their authoritative solidarity at Pentecost."

Concerning the "evidence proving that God has used editions other than the Greek and Hebrew to preserve certain readings" documented in *Hazardous Materials*, see pp 654ff with respect to Scrivener's errors and the pre-1611 vernacular Bibles that were at least as much in authority as Greek sources and whose combined authority considerably outweighed that of Greek sources. Note this extract from **Quote(s) 87**.

*Had Dr DiVietro taken the unusual step (for him) of giving *In Awe of Thy Word* a fair reading, he would have found in Chapter 15, [p 539], entitled *Hidden Notes & Public Views of the King James Translators* a detailed description of how the King's men went about their work, including their evaluation of many Greek sources, together with early English and foreign Bibles and the important Old Latin versions that were "so much different from the vulgar [Catholic Latin Vulgate]..."*

Dr Mrs Riplinger makes repeated reference to *The Translators to the Reader* in order to illustrate the methods by which the King's men worked and she includes, her annotations and emphases, this highly revealing summative comment from "John Selden...in his *Table Talk*,

"The translation in King James' time took an excellent way. That part of the Bible was given to him who was most excellent in such a tongue and then they met together, and one read the translation, the rest holding in their hands some Bible, either of the learned tongues [Greek, Hebrew, Latin], or French, Italian, Spanish &c [and other languages]. If they found any fault, they spoke; if not, he read on (Paine, p. 77; Scrivener, p. 140)."

The manner in which the King James translators did their work matches "evidence proving that God has used editions other than the Greek and Hebrew to preserve certain readings" that Dr Mrs Riplinger introduces on p 654 of *Hazardous Materials* with the following statement.

"The following also includes evidence from a collation completed for this book by Dr. Nico Verhoef of Switzerland. It documents Scrivener's departures from the old Reformation Bibles of Europe, including the Dutch Statenvertaling (1637 ed.), German Luther (1565 ed.), Swiss

Zwingli (1531 ed.), French Martin (1855 ed.). Also examined were various other Received Text editions, such as the Dutch (1563), German 1522, 1534, 1545, 1760, the French Olivetan (1535 ed.), French Osterwald (1890 ed.) and the Spanish Reina-Valera (1865) (letter on file)...

Scrivener's departures from the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament then follow in *Hazardous Materials*. See **Quote 108** for the full list of 64 verses. As indicated under **Quote 108**, Dr Mrs Riplinger marks with an asterisk * 24 verses in the list that Scrivener claimed came from exclusively Latin sources that nevertheless had Greek textual support. However, the list contains numerous verses where vernacular Bibles, such as those listed above or their predecessors in the same languages were collectively the final authority for the readings chosen, as John Selden's *Table Talk* reveals.

The verses listed as follows are examples of "evidence proving that God has used editions other than the Greek and Hebrew to preserve certain readings" and which the King James translators trusted in authority at least equal with or indeed superior to their Greek sources that may or may not have supported those readings.

Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals in *Hazardous Materials* p 644 that in the examples that follow, Scrivener followed Beza's 1598 text against the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament. She also reveals that Stephanus's 1550 Edition, i.e. Berry's, also departs from the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament in many of the examples that follow.

Noting that the texts of Beza and Stephanus usually support the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament against corrupt Greek sources, God's preservation of the true readings in "editions other than the Greek and Hebrew" was therefore essential for the work of the King James translators. Dr Mrs Riplinger's examples follow.

Matthew 12:24, 27, Mark 3:22, Luke 11:15, 18, 19.

Dr Mrs Riplinger notes, her emphasis, that the correct spelling of "**Beelzebub**" is confirmed by Tyndale's New Testament and that "*Matching the KJB are pure vernacular Bibles such as the German, Danish, Latin, Italian, Galice, and Bohemice, as seen in the Nuremberg Polyglot of 1599, as well as Zwingli's Swiss of 1531, Luther's German of 1565, and the Italian Diodati, 1661 edition. Did God give the entire body of Christ worldwide the wrong spelling or did one apostate church (Greek Orthodox) and a few Greek editors carry forward an error? Jesus revealed truth to "babes" who read Bibles, not 'brains' who spurn revivals. Scrivener [Beza] and George Ricker Berry's Greek-English Interlinear (Stephanus's Text) spell it wrongly...*"

Mark 14:43

Dr Mrs Riplinger notes that "*The KJB omits the word "being," wrongly included in both Berry's and Scrivener's texts...Tyndale also correctly omits it. The "Ancient" Greek New Testament, actually from Greece, matches the KJB (See "Scrivener's Leaven Examined and Proven False" for bibliographic information [p 651]). The German of 1565 and the Swiss of 1531 read like the KJB.*"

Luke 1:35

Dr Mrs Riplinger notes that "*The Greek text of Lachmann adds "of thee" in brackets. Berry's Interlinear (Stephanus) wrongly omits it altogether...The KJB matches the Dutch of 1637, the German of 1565, the Swiss of 1531, and the French of 1855.*"

Luke 1:35 is a case where the Greek sources that Lachmann and Stephanus used are in conflict but on this occasion, the source that would usually support the AV1611 (Stephanus) is

wrong and those that support Lachmann's text are correct. God preserved the correct readings in the vernacular Bibles listed above or their forebears that would have been available to the King James translators. God therefore bypassed the anomaly in the conflicting Greek sources. Dr DiVietro disavows published Greek texts as finally authoritative, see end of **Quote 126**, but he is naive to suppose that a 'finally authoritative' single Greek source, *Cleaning-Up* p 21, was accessible even in the 17th century.

As Dr Mrs Riplinger rightly states in *In Awe of Thy Word* p 956, this author's emphases, see **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint, Quote(s) 90, 114**:

"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."

Luke 23:34

Scrivener's and Berry's Greek texts wrongly have "lot" (and in Matthew 27:35, Mark 15:24, John 19:24) but the 1611 Holy Bible has "lots" as found in the Tyndale, Coverdale, Bishops', Geneva, Italian 1661 and Old Spanish Bibles. Nestle's 21st Edition *Minority Text* correctly has "lots" in Luke 23:34, giving rise to the same anomaly observed as for Luke 1:35 and the same need for preservation of the correct reading in the old vernacular Bibles or their pre-1611 forebears.

John 7:9

Scrivener's and Berry's Greek texts wrongly include "and." Some minority texts; Griesbach, Tischendorf, Tregelles, correctly do not. The AV1611 does not include "and" in agreement with the German 1565 and Swiss 1531 bibles. Again Dr DiVietro is naive to suppose that a 'finally authoritative' single Greek source, *Cleaning-Up* p 21, was accessible even in the 17th century.

Acts 2:22

Scrivener's and Berry's Greek texts wrongly omit "approved." Tischendorf and Tregelles's text, along with Nestle's 21st Edition, rightly include it. The German 1565, Dutch 1637, Swiss 1531, French 1855, Italian Diodati 1661 and the old Spanish Bible confirm the AV1611 reading.

Similar remarks apply to the readings that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists for Acts 6:3 "we may appoint," Acts 7:44 "he who" not in the AV1611, Acts 10:20 "But" not in the AV1611, Acts 13:15 "any," Acts 26:6 "our fathers," 1 Corinthians 16:23 "our Lord," Galatians 4:15 "Where," Philippians 2:21 "Jesus Christ" versus "Christ Jesus," 1 Timothy 4:15 "among" not in the AV1611, James 3:14 "hearts," 1 Peter 2:13 "therefore" not in the AV1611, 1 John 3:20 second "for" not in the AV1611, 1 John 5:8 "these three," 2 John 3 "Grace be," Revelation 13:10 first "into," Revelation 18:23 "shall shine."

Matthew 12:24, 27, Mark 3:22, Luke 11:15, 18, 19, Mark 14:43, Luke 1:35, 23:34 with Matthew 27:35, Mark 15:24, John 19:24, John 7:9, Acts 2:22, 6:3, 7:44, 10:20, 13:15, 26:6, 1 Corinthians 16:23, Galatians 4:15, Philippians 2:21, 1 Timothy 4:15, James 3:14, 1 Peter 2:13, 1

John 3:20, 5:8, Revelation 13:10, 18:23 are 29 verses that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists to prove that ‘the Greek’ cannot be finally authoritative with respect to their readings but God nevertheless preserved the true readings in the old vernacular Bibles that King’s men used in authority over ‘the Greek.’

Dr DiVietro evades the above material in an unscholarly, irresponsible and cowardly fashion. His attitude is that of the entire DBS Executive Committee. See again this summary statement from *The Translators to the Reader* at the end of **Quote(s) 127**.

THE UNWILLINGNESS OF OUR CHIEF ADVERSARIES, THAT THE SCRIPTURES SHOULD BE DIVULGED IN THE MOTHER TONGUE

See also **Quote 130** below.

Dr Mrs Riplinger provides further examples in Chapters 20, 27 of *Hazardous Materials* of readings for which the King James translators were able to preserve the true readings of scripture from vernacular Bibles because extant Greek and Hebrew sources were substantially lacking in these cases. See the opening statement under **Quote(s) 127** from p 650 of *Hazardous Materials* that Dr DiVietro does not take issue with, as indicated.

“God has preserved several original readings in the Old Itala, which were removed by unbelieving Jews from the Hebrew Old Testament and by the apostate Greek Orthodox church from the Greek New Testament.”

These examples follow. Dr Mrs Riplinger states on p 746 of *Hazardous Materials* that *“1 John 5:7 and Acts 8:37 have been violently expunged by the Greek Orthodox Church from most of their manuscripts.”* J. A. Moorman in *When The KJV Departs From The “Majority” Text* pp 60-61 shows that over 30 Greek manuscripts are now known to contain Acts 8:37 but he also shows that the earliest witnesses were the Old Latin text and 2nd-3rd century church writers who wrote in Latin, not Greek; Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian. Dr Mrs Riplinger states on pp 751-752 of *Hazardous Materials* with respect to 1 John 5:7 that *“An entire book, The History of the Debate Over 1 John 5:7, by Michael Maynard demonstrates that 1 John 5:7 is original. He traces the verse from the earliest times through many ancient citations and Holy Bibles.”* Dr Mrs Riplinger summarises the evidence for 1 John 5:7 in Chapter 28 of *New Age Versions*. It includes very early witnesses such as the 2nd century Old Syriac and Old Latin texts and the 2nd-3rd church writers who wrote in Syriac or Latin, not Greek; Tatian, Tertullian, Cyprian.

Dr DiVietro has of course insisted that no evidence exists to show that vernacular Bibles in languages other than Greek existed before the 2nd century, see **Quote 126**. However, the point of this response to **Quote 128** is to substantiate Dr Mrs Riplinger’s opening statement from **Quote(s) 127**, see above, and to show that the King James translators did not rely for their work on any ‘finally authoritative’ Greek source but trusted equally *or to a greater extent* in faithful non-Greek sources such as *“many ancient citations and Holy Bibles.”*

Such faithful non-Greek sources were clearly essential for bearing witness to important doctrinal verses such as Acts 8:37 and 1 John 5:7 as part of **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21. Greek sources, though extant, were in isolation insufficient for that purpose.

Citing J. A. Moorman’s book *When The KJV Departs From The “Majority” Text* pp 31ff, Dr Mrs Riplinger lists many more examples *“of changes Greek manuscripts make to the Holy Bible”* *Hazardous Materials* pp 763ff, including Matthew 3:11, 6:18, 10:8, 12:35, Luke 6:26, 9:23, 14:5, Acts 9:38, 17:5, Ephesians 3:9, Hebrews 11:13, 12:20, James 5:9. Even though numerous Greek manuscripts support the AV1611 readings in those verses, the *“majority”* of

Greek manuscripts that contain those verses introduce serious departures from or alterations in the AV1611 Text.

Depending on what their particular Greek sources were, the King James translators would then have to appeal to faithful *non*-Greek sources to confirm the correct reading for the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament. This they no doubt did, because J. A. Moorman shows that the faithful pre-cursors to the 1611 Holy Bible, namely the bibles of the 16th century English Protestant Reformation; Tyndale, Great, Geneva, Bishops', repeatedly confirm the AV1611 readings in the verses above.

Those vernacular Bibles, not 'the Greek,' were therefore finally authoritative for those readings, in keeping with manner in which the King's men worked. See John Selden's *Table Talk* above and note again the following statement from *In Awe of Thy Word* p 534. See **Quote 124** and above, at the beginning of **Quote 128**.

"The translators' final authority was early English and foreign Bibles. Therefore they introduced no novelties or lexical "private interpretation," as do modern translators. One such note confirms this:

"But since all translators, as far as I know, and a good portion of the commentators, both ancient and modern, regard this passage as...I do not deem it prudent...[to institute anew] anything in a matter so commonplace and spread abroad..."

Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, evades *all* of the above examples "*of changes Greek manuscripts make to the Holy Bible*" that Dr Mrs Riplinger gives in *Hazardous Materials* pp 745-766 and *falsely* claims under **Quote 159** that those pages deal only with false teachings in the Greek Orthodox Church.

Clearly, he is lying. See **Quote 124**. Dr DiVietro should therefore pay careful attention to Romans 13:9 (in the King's English). See **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

"Thou shalt not bear false witness."

Moreover, Dr DiVietro has still not produced any 'finally authoritative' Greek source, *Cleaning-Up* p 21 that overrides either the multiple sources that the King James translators used, especially pre-1611 Holy Bibles or the 1611 Holy Bible itself.

In sum, the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament cannot be subservient to 'the Greek.'

Concerning the manner in which apostate Jews may have tampered with their own scriptures, such that God preserved the true readings in ancient, non-Hebrew versions, Dr Mrs Riplinger has these statements on pp 1003-1004 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphasis.

"Where the Versions Preserve the Original Reading

"It is likely that Old Testament Messianic verses, which might have been tampered with by unbelieving Jews during the years following Christ, were preserved by other language versions of the Old Testament. For example in Psalm 22:16, the Latin, Syriac Peshitta, and the Greek Bible preserve "they pierced my hands and my feet." The oldest Hebrew witness for Ps. 22:16, the Dead Sea Scrolls, also matches the KJB ("the Psalms scroll found at Nabal Hever" 95/6HevPS)...

"For over 1900 years the correct reading was missing in Hebrew Bibles, but preserved in the Latin Bible ["Old Latin or Itala Version," Hazardous Materials p 1003]. The unbelieving Jews could not [bear] this verse's witness about the Messiah they rejected. Likewise, the Greek Orthodox church, which teaches baptismal regeneration, could not bear Acts 8:37 so they removed it from most Greek manuscripts. It has been preserved in the Latin and other*

vernacular editions. *The text of the Bible has not been given to one or two language groups, but to all. By destroying certain verses, the Jews and the Greek Orthodox church could be compared to wicked Athaliah. She thought she had “destroyed all of the seed royal.” (The Bible is called the “royal law” 2 Kings 11:1, James 2:8). Yet God hid one son and preserved the kingly line. Likewise, God preserved his words in Bibles other than those of the corrupt Greek Orthodox church and Hebrew nation, when those language groups destroyed certain readings for sectarian reasons...*

Note that Dr DiVietro bypasses all of the above material. See **Quote 168**.

*Dr Mrs Riplinger refers on p 1003 of *Hazardous Materials* to the Ethiopic Version and poses the question “*Was the Ethiopic eunuch reading from this inspired Ethiopic “scripture” 2 Tim. 3:16?* She adds that “*The Ethiopic Version is the Bible of the Falashas, a group of African Jews who migrated to Ethiopia during the reign of King Solomon and the Queen of Sheba (Philip Comfort, The Origin of the Bible, Wheaton, Ill: Tyndale House Publishers, 1992, p. 306).*” See **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to the distinct possibility of an Ethiopic Old Testament that was extant in the 1st century, according to a comparison of Isaiah 53:7-8, Acts 8:32-33. The possibility is raised, therefore, of an Ethiopic ‘original’ of Isaiah 53:7-8 extant in the 1st century “**given by inspiration of God**” as a free quotation by the Author of His own work, see the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1238 with respect to Matthew 2:18, then preserved in the Koine Greek ‘original’ of Acts 8:32-33 as an ‘inspired’ translation, contrary to the restrictions imposed upon the Author by the DBS Executive Committee, *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, 2-3.

Note the following evaluation from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** i.e. point 9.

9. Whether or not a full *Ethiopic* Old Testament ever existed in the early centuries of the church is unknown (at least to this author). Acts 8:32-33 suggest, however, that portions may have existed, *which were not the ‘original’ Hebrew scriptures because they read differently*, at least in Isaiah 53. Yet they were *nevertheless “The place of scripture,”* Dr DiVietro’s denial of inspired translations notwithstanding. Point 12* below enlarges upon this possibility. In the meantime, it should be noted that on the basis of Acts 2:5, the Ethiopian eunuch *could* have been reading a portion of Isaiah *inspired in and translated into his own language, namely Ethiopic*. That particular possibility cannot be dismissed lightly. *Point 12 notes *Jewish scribes were required to make perfect copies of their Old Testament manuscripts*, according to a rigid set of conditions, as even Dr Waite notes in *Defending The King James Bible*, The Bible For Today Press, 1992, pp 24ff. The Ethiopian’s copy of Isaiah 53:7-8 as recorded in Acts 8:32-33 could not have satisfied those conditions, yet it was still “**The place of the scripture which he read.**”

It is as well that “**the word of God is not bound**” 2 Timothy 2:9 by the self-appointed, 33rd Degree Royal Arch Masonic equivalent ‘originals-onlyism’ ‘priest class’ of the DBS Executive Committee.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has further evidence in Chapter 28 of *Hazardous Materials* showing, pp 1006-1064, her emphasis, that “*All currently printed, facsimile, software, and online editions of the Hebrew Massoretic Text fail to reflect the pure historic Massoretic Text in toto (e.g. Numbers 33:8, 2 Sam. 8:3, 2 Sam. 16:23, Ruth 3:5, Ruth 3:17, Judges 20:13 et al.)* [including 2 Kings 19:31, 37 *Hazardous Materials* pp 1025-1026]...”

Dr Mrs Riplinger has a detailed study of those 8 verses on pp 1020-1026 of *Hazardous Materials* showing that “*the pure historic Massoretic Text in toto*” is preserved only in faithful vernacular Holy Bibles, such as the 1611 Holy Bible, not in any ‘finally authoritative’ He-

brew text consisting of a single source text. Such a single source text does not exist in either Hebrew/Aramaic or Greek, in spite of the DBS Executive Committee's vehement protestations to the contrary, *Cleaning-Up* pp xi, 7, 21.

Dr DiVietro has a very careless comment with respect to the above examples from Chapter 28 of *Hazardous Materials* under **Quote 170** to the effect that he doesn't know what happened to examples 7 and 8 but intimates that Dr Mrs Riplinger's handful of 8 examples are insufficient to disprove the existence of an extant finally authoritative Hebrew Old Testament text. Dr DiVietro is wrong in this respect, of course, as Dr Mrs Riplinger explains on p 1026 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphases. Dr DiVietro has bypassed this explanation.

"These 8 verses are merely examples found in my quick 8 hour collation. They certainly do not exhibit all places where one can find the KJB using a different Hebrew text from those currently available. An honest person [Dr DiVietro, take note, Romans 12:17] can see that the original Hebrew readings are perfectly preserved in a Holy Bible that people use (e.g. King James Bible), not in one-man intellectual exercises that sit on sinking lily-pad shelves for scholars to dissect like frogs 'til they croak. The King James Bible and the preceding English Bibles (and other pure vernacular Holy Bibles, no doubt) have been shown to be a shining reflection of the originals, with ample manuscript evidence for those questioned readings. Translators will wisely use these and other pure old vernacular Bibles to make new translations, instead of following today's currently printed or pocked online Hebrew editions (seen through the filthy lens of a corrupt lexicon)."

Dr Mrs Riplinger's explanation is borne out by her observation on p 735 of *Hazardous Materials* that underlines the purpose of these extended remarks under **Quote 128**, namely that no 'finally authoritative' Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text exists today, the acrimonious protestations of the DBS Executive Committee to the contrary notwithstanding, *Cleaning-Up* pp xi, 7, 21.

"...in 1838, the Jews' Society followed the KJB [translators'] method of accessing a pure vernacular Bible, when creating an edition of the Hebrew New Testament. They made changes to the Greek, "following in most dubious cases the reading of the English version" (see the chapter "The Scriptures to All Nations" [Hazardous Materials Chapter 30], for many more such examples; John McClintock and James Strong, Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, vol. 12, p 535.)"

Quote 129, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 652

"In several cases, the KJB would have had to translate a nonsense sentence, not countenanced by the English language. Scrivener's RV, likewise adds words in these cases."

Dr DiVietro descends into mockery again in his comment on **Quote 129**. See **Quote 110**. He adds that the King James translators used italics to supply words implied by but not contained in the underlying Greek statement.

What Dr DiVietro is describing, of course, is not "*a nonsense sentence*" in the Koine Greek underlying the King James English. He is describing a sentence for which a non-literal translation is required in order to convey the correct sense of the underlying expression. The simplest and arguably the most compelling example is the expression that has been cited repeatedly throughout this work, none other than 2 Timothy 3:16.

"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable..."

The King James translators put both occurrences of the word "**is**" in 2 Timothy 3:16 in italics to show that the word had been supplied in English both to give the correct sense and to ensure grammatical English.

That isn't what Dr Mrs Riplinger means in *Quote 129*. What Dr Mrs Riplinger is referring to in her documentation (that Dr DiVietro slyly skips over, see *Quote 130* and remarks earlier under *Quotes 105, 120*) on pp 654ff of *Hazardous Materials* is Scrivener's distortion of "the KJB's Greek base," p 656. See her remarks on Scrivener's various alterations, additions and subtractions and purported Latin origins with respect to the AV1611 readings listed.

Dr DiVietro could have gleaned the above information from the pages in *Hazardous Materials* that he skipped over, if he had been prepared to obey 1 Thessalonians 5:21 in order to "**Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.**" See *Quote 47*.

Quote 130, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 652, 657, 670

"In a few cases the reading of the KJB is merely one of the many English synonyms of the Greek word, which the KJB and all new versions use in either this or the other places. He charges that in a few places the KJB "corresponds but loosely with any form of the Greek original..." Loosely or tightly, it still corresponds and he has no right to assume they had no Greek evidence just because the Latin Bible says something similar. All Bibles are similar."

Dr DiVietro makes a brief and somewhat incoherent response to *Quote 130*, complete with uncorrected typos. He begins by urging the reader to scurry on with him past the 64 verses that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists on pp 654-677 of *Hazardous Materials* that show Scrivener and his co-editor to have *lied* in their product description that asserts that "*The Textus Receptus 1881 Greek text is the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version*" (price \$24.95). See *Quote 108*.

Note in passing that although Dr DiVietro gives pp 652, 657, 670 as the page references in *Hazardous Materials* for *Quote 130*, he quotes nothing from pp 657, 670, only from Dr Mrs Riplinger's point 5 on p 652.

Dr DiVietro is like one that "**hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved**" John 3:20.

He tries to excuse the sins of himself and his co-editor by dismissing Dr Mrs Riplinger's detailed witness against them as just a few different Greek readings about which, in Dr DiVietro's opinion, Dr Mrs Riplinger may or may not be correct.

Dr DiVietro obviously knows full well that Dr Mrs Riplinger's witness against Scrivener and himself on pp 654-677 of *Hazardous Materials* is correct. That is why he has blatantly disobeyed 1 Thessalonians 5:21 with respect to the 64 scriptures that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists. See *Quotes 47, 129*.

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

That is also why, being one that "**sitteth in the seat of the scornful**" Psalm 1:1, Dr DiVietro has scorned Proverbs 28:13 with respect to the 64 scriptures that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists. See **Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint**.

"He that covereth his sins shall not prosper: but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy."

Dr DiVietro "**covereth his sins**" further by insisting that even though the texts of Scrivener and Beza are not infallible (which wasn't what he said under his and co-editor's product description, see above), Scrivener's text is used because it is the closest to the KJB. He accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of attacking Scrivener's text for that reason because, as he declares in bold type, Dr Mrs Riplinger doesn't believe that the King James Bible comes from a Greek text.

A more craven exhibition of providing things *dishonest* “***in the sight of all men***” Romans 12:17 than Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote 130** is difficult to imagine.

See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s question that she poses on p 656 of *Hazardous Materials* with respect to Mark 14:43, alluded to in part at the conclusion of the remarks on **Quote 129**.

“*Why does Scrivener try to misrepresent the KJB’s Greek base?*”

Why, therefore, does Dr DiVietro try to pretend that Dr Mrs Riplinger doesn’t believe that the King James New Testament has a Greek base?

The only realistic answer is that Dr DiVietro is following his mentor who “***is a liar, and the father of it***” John 8:44, according to the Lord Jesus Christ.

See the following statement from *Hazardous Materials* p 630 that Dr DiVietro also bypassed that gives the lie further to his notion that Dr Mrs Riplinger is against Scrivener’s text because it is the closest to the KJB.

“Summary: Scrivener & His Greek Textus Receptus

1. *Scrivener’s own edition of the New Testament Greek Textus Receptus (H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ The New Testament, The Greek Underlying the English Authorised Version of 1611) is generally correct and is the closest Greek Text to the King James Bible (KJB). It can be useful in pointing out errors in the corrupt Greek text which underlies perverted new versions such as the NIV, TNIV, ESV, HCSB, NASB, NAB, NJB, NCV, Message, New Living Translation, etc..”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger does present “***The Good Side***” of Scrivener’s text, on pp 631-632 of *Hazardous Materials*, which Dr DiVietro further ungraciously bypassed in his comments on that section of the book, under **Quotes 104, 105**.

Unlike Dr DiVietro, Dr Mrs Riplinger has therefore sought to present “***whatsoever things are of good report***” Philippians 4:8, even with respect to Frederick Scrivener’s otherwise considerably leavened Greek text, *Hazardous Materials* pp 650ff.

Dr DiVietro concludes his craven comments under **Quote 130** by accusing Dr Mrs Riplinger of not understanding the word “*text*,” which he purports to prove by means of **Quote 131**.

Except that he doesn’t. See **Quote 131** below.

Quote 131, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 677

“*What will Greek-only followers do after seeing that Scrivener’s Greek New Testament does not always represent the pure Greek text underlying the KJB, as so often stated? On what basis can they pretend Scrivener’s Greek text is perfect? Will they become “early printed Greek texts only”? Which one of them? Or will they become Scrivenerites, followers of their god-man who was given the final key to the Textus Receptus after nearly 2000 years without it (yet who himself did not even believe in the verbal plenary inspiration of even the originals)?”*

Dr DiVietro is indignant at **Quote 131** and accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of mean-spiritedness, a share of which he has certainly exhibited himself in *Cleaning-Up*. See **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint, Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.

The main point of Dr DiVietro’s brief comment under **Quote 131** is that no-one makes the claims* that Dr Mrs Riplinger has set out in **Quote 131**.

*Bro. Heisey states in a separate communication to this author that he did forward specific concerns to Drs Waite and Williams, copied to Drs Stringer and DiVietro, in 2009 about

whether they perceived Scrivener's Greek text as perfect and as "*the final key to the Textus Receptus after nearly 2000 years without it.*" It appears that almost three years later, no coherent reply has been received.

Dr DiVietro has distorted what Dr Mrs Riplinger said in *Quote 131*. It should be noted that he has repeatedly distorted both Dr Mrs Riplinger's essential thesis and her subsequent statements throughout his book. See *Setting Up the 'Clean-Up', Quotes 4, 10, 31, 45, 65, 110, 115, 116, 132 and 138* to follow.

Dr Mrs Riplinger is not making claims in *Quote 131*. She is asking questions under the heading of "*What Next?*" after documenting with Bro. Heisey a total of 64 examples of scriptures where Scrivener wilfully departed from the text of the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament. See *Quote 108* (and remarks under *Quote 130* showing that Dr DiVietro evaded all 64 examples).

Dr Mrs Riplinger is surely entitled to ask "*What Next?*" in the light of how Hosea 8:12 could be applied *practically* to Scrivener and any seminary student influenced by him, see *Hazardous Materials* p 631, with respect to Scrivener's disbelief in many King James New Testament readings.

"I have written to him the great things of my law, but they were counted as a strange thing."

What Dr DiVietro does not challenge and therefore cannot deny is Dr Mrs Riplinger's summary of the major shortcomings of Scrivener's text on pp 678-679 of *Hazardous Materials*:

- Scrivener ignored Greek manuscripts underlying the AV1611 in at least 20 places.
- The title of Scrivener's text, *The New Testament in Greek According to the Text Followed in the Authorized Version*, see *Hazardous Materials* p 632, is misleading.
- Scrivener's 59 so-called Latin readings in the AV1611 can *easily* be shown to have Greek manuscript support for at least 24 of them.
- Scrivener was wrong in arbitrarily limiting the Greek sources for his text to pre-1611 published editions and ignoring the manuscript sources available to the King James translators, of which Scrivener himself was aware.
- Scrivener has been shown in Chapter 17 of *Hazardous Materials* to hold heretical views that he allowed to prejudice his views on the Greek text underlying the King James New Testament.
- "*One error in Scrivener's disannuls the supposed infallibility of his text*" as implied by its title. See second bullet point above. (It is futile for Dr DiVietro to protest as he does under *Quote 130* that Scrivener did not claim to be infallible. That is not the impression conveyed by the title of Scrivener's text, or that authored by Scrivener and his co-editor, Kirk DiVietro; "*The Textus Receptus 1881 Greek text is the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version*" (price \$24.95). See *Quote 108*.)

Instead of venting his spleen at Dr Mrs Riplinger as he does under *Quote 131*, Dr DiVietro should, in the light of the bulleted disclosures above, again reflect upon Proverbs 17:28. See *Quote 121*.

"Even a fool, when he holdeth his peace, is counted wise: and he that shutteth his lips is esteemed a man of understanding."

It should be noted yet again that a full collation of Scrivener's text versus the King James New Testament in order to identify all the differences between them has not yet been carried

out. See *Quotes 95, 108, 120*. It is incumbent upon Dr DiVietro to carry out a full collation of those differences if he insists, as he does, see *Quote 130*, that such differences are minor and may be ignored.

Finally for *Quote 131*, it should be noted that Dr DiVietro has not even attempted to do what he purports to do at the conclusion of *Quote 130*, which is to show that Dr Mrs Riplinger does not understand the word “*text*.”

It appears instead that Dr DiVietro doesn’t understand the word “*lightness*” in 2 Corinthians 1:17-18.

“When I therefore was thus minded, did I use lightness? or the things that I purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh, that with me there should be yea yea, and nay nay? But as God is true, our word toward you was not yea and nay.”

Quote 132, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 681, 683

“The Greek text of Scrivener is not the Greek text of Theodore Beza (A.D. 1519-1605), though many assume that it is.”

*“Contrary to Beza’s express statements, Scrivener likes to pretend that Beza **may** not have made “any great use” of “Tremellius’ **Latin** version of the [Syriac] **Peshitta**,” but must admit Beza had it “ready at hand”...In other words, Tremellius had translated the Syriac Bible into Latin. Beza used both the original Syriac and the Latin translation of the Syriac to help create his Greek edition.”*

Dr DiVietro exclaims (in bold letters) that Dr Mrs Riplinger is being hypocritical in *Quote 132* because she does not criticise the King James translators for using multiple language sources in their work. Dr DiVietro protests that Dr Mrs Riplinger should not criticise Beza for doing the same thing, though Dr DiVietro tries to imply in his concluding comment under *Quote 132* that Dr Mrs Riplinger has misrepresented Beza.

It is Dr DiVietro who is being hypocritical and it is Dr DiVietro who is again guilty of misrepresentation. See *Quote 131*.

Dr DiVietro should note first the contents of the title page of the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament, this author’s emphases.

*The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ
Translated out of the Original Greek:
**And with the Former Translations
Diligently Compared and Revised,**
By His Majesty’s Special Command*

As Dr Mrs Riplinger states in *The Hidden History of The English Scriptures* pp 43-44:

“The King James Bible mirrors the manuscripts and printed Bibles which for millennia were the mainstay of Europe: the Old Itala, the Italian, the Gothic, the Anglo-Saxon, the Dutch, the German, the French, the Greek, and the Hebrew. These ancient and medieval vernacular Bibles can provide evidence for the readings in the KJB, particularly wrongly disputed ones in the book of Revelation. Hands-on access to these ancient Bibles makes the KJB unsurpassable by today’s critical ‘scholars.’ The translators’ use of vernacular Bibles follows the pattern of Coverdale (German, Swiss, et al.), Rogers (German), and Theodore Beza, whose Greek New Testament was compiled using a collation of Greek and vernacular editions, particularly Latin editions of the Syriac and Aramaic. In countries where paper was precious, people were poor, and persecution was plenty, the scriptures had been preserved by Chris-

tian who memorized huge portions of the Bible. The translators easily reproduced the type of Holy Bible the world had had since “the scriptures” were given to “all nations.””

The above statements establish that Dr Mrs Riplinger has given an “**honest report**” Acts 6:3 of the multiple sources of the 1611 Holy Bible. She has also given an “**honest report**” about Beza’s text, her emphases, as the following extracts from *Hazardous Materials* pp 681, 683 show, extracts that Dr DiVietro slyly omitted.

“They are perhaps misunderstanding the preface, written by the Trinitarian Bible Society, which states in part,

““The present edition of the Textus Receptus underlying the English Authorised Version of 1611 follows the text of **Beza’s** 1598 edition as the primary authority...” (H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ, *The New Testament The Greek Underlying the English Authorised Version of 1611*, London: The Trinitarian Bible Society, 1976).

“This statement has led many to wrongly assume that the TBS text is Beza’s text or that the Greek text underlying the KJB is that of Beza. Such a broad brush does not paint an accurate picture of the text. Scrivener lists under 200 places where his text differs from Beza (1598). Examine the following verses (not all included) to see how and where they differ. (For details see Scrivener, *The New*, pp 648-655, Scrivener, *The Authorized*, Preface, p. v, Appendix E, pp. 243-262).”

Dr Mrs Riplinger lists numerous examples from the 27 Books of the New Testament and concludes on p 682 of *Hazardous Materials* “The KJB translators ignored Beza about 139 times. They match Stephanus rather than Beza 59 times and Erasmus, the Complutensian Polyglot or other Greek sources against both Stephanus and Beza about 80 times.”

On p 683 of *Hazardous Materials* Dr Mrs Riplinger states above **Quote 132**, her emphasis:

“Beza’s Greek Text: Some from Syriac to Latin to Greek?”

“Even good Greek text authors are not Greek-only. The Cambridge History of the Bible’s General Index under “Beza” notes that Beza “calls the New Testament Greek ‘barbaric’” (Cambridge History of the Bible, S. L. Greenslade ed., Cambridge University Press, 1963, p. 560). Those who feel that they **must** go to the Greek and therefore follow Scrivener’s use of Beza instead of the KJB’s underlying Greek (where Scrivener pretends the translators followed the Latin) will be shocked to find out that Beza’s Greek text was made, according to his preface, by consulting among other things, the vernacular Syriac Peshitta and a Latin translation of this Peshitta. In what Beza’s calls his third edition (1582), he lists his use of these, as well as the “Arabic New Testament Version in a Latin translation prepared by Francis Junius” (Edward F. Hills, *The King James Version Defended*, Des Moines, Iowa, The Christian Research Press, 2000 reprint, p. 206).

“The Cambridge History of the Bible states,

““In the preparation of his text Beza...also had before him the [Latin] version made by Tremellius from the [Syriac] Peshitta New Testament.”

“[It was] ““Tremellius’s Latin of the Syriac New Testament” (Cambridge History, Greenslade, pp. 62, 167).””

The above citations show that Dr Mrs Riplinger has given an “**honest report**” about the sources for both the 1611 Holy Bible and Beza’s text with supporting documentation.

Dr DiVietro’s accusations against Dr Mrs Riplinger under **Quote 132** are without foundation.

Sister Riplinger can take comfort, therefore, from Matthew 5:11. See also **Quote 64**.

“Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake.”

The reason for Dr DiVietro’s ire against Sister Riplinger on this occasion arises from the ‘inspired-Greek-originals-onlyism’ mindset of the DBS Executive Committee for the New Testament.

The DBS Executive Committee insists that no translation can be ‘inspired.’ Only ‘the Greek text’ for the New Testament is therefore ‘inspired’ and in turn finally authoritative and perfect, *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3, 18, 21, 187, 255-256.

When it comes to published Greek texts, Dr DiVietro is forced to concede within *Cleaning-Up*, pp 20, 21, that some reverse translation* from a translation, i.e. the KJB, which is therefore not inspired in his opinion, may be necessary to locate variations from a published text like Scrivener’s. See remarks under **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to this anomaly.

*See also this extract from **Quote 114** in which the issue of Scrivener’s reverse translation from the King James New Testament is discussed in detail.

The underlined statement in the above extract shows first that Dr Mrs Riplinger does in fact perceive Scrivener’s text as largely Beza’s. However, it also strongly suggests that, in the absence at the time of any specific information about the extent to which the King’s men used each of their available Greek sources for their work, Scrivener did his own reverse translation and then compared it with what he thought was the translators’ most likely source i.e. mainly the final editions of Beza’s text but also any other sources that he had.*

**Dr Mrs Riplinger states that Scrivener only used printed editions of the Received Text for his text. See Hazardous Materials p 640 and Quote 116.*

*The obvious question is, how, in fact, could he have done otherwise, a priori? As indicated above, his reverse translation would only be evident where the King James New Testament departs from Beza’s text. It is therefore rash for Dr Riplinger’s accusers to assume that **only** those parts of the King James New Testament were subjected to reverse translation by Scrivener. It is most unlikely that he would have known in advance **specifically** which parts of the King James New Testament that they were.*

As **Quote 131** shows, however, Dr DiVietro’s above concession is not the impression conveyed by the title of Scrivener’s text, or that authored by Scrivener and his co-editor, Kirk DiVietro; “*The Textus Receptus 1881 Greek text is the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version*” (price \$24.95). See **Quote 108**.

The impression that the DBS Executive Committee would like to convey to the (purchasing) general Christian public is that it has for sale in addition to the DiVietro-Scrivener edition, ‘the’ Greek text underlying the King James New Testament in the form of *Scrivener’s Annotated Greek New Testament*, available from *The Bible For Today*, BFT for \$US 40 (including \$US 5 shipping and handling for USA customers) that *by implication is inspired though not stated outright to be so*. See end of **Quote 107**.

This impression is succinctly conveyed by Dr Waite’s statement from **A WARNING!!** p 28 about Scrivener’s text as cited in **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society** p 25, this author’s underlining.

P. 28 “*The “Scrivener Greek New Testament” is not “slightly tainted.” I believe the Words in this “Greek New Testament” to be accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible,*

preserved, original Greek Words. I believe them to be *authentic copies of the original New Testament Words.* It is sad that Gail Riplinger refuses to take this same position.”

See **Quotes 97, 105, 108, 112, 114, 116**, with this cautionary note from under **Quote 114**:

*It must be emphasised yet again that the DBS Executive Committee is careful **not** to say that Scrivener’s text is inspired. Dr Waite refers to it as an accurate authentic copy of the inspired original Greek text but not an **inspired** accurate, authentic copy.*

That would prompt too many searching questions e.g. *If Scrivener’s text is inspired, is it the only inspired published Greek text and if so, why and how did it get to be inspired and not other published Greek texts etc.?* Not having **“the wisdom of Solomon”** 1 Kings 4:34, the DBS Executive Committee would not wish to be in his position to receive the inevitable Queen-of-Sheba type visitor who **“came to prove him with hard questions”** 1 Kings 10:1.

However, since the DBS Executive Committee seeks to propagate Scrivener’s text as ‘the’ Greek text of the New Testament after the manner of Dr Waite’s statement above, being the ‘pure, inspired, original, Greek-only’ words of the New Testament, Dr DiVietro must therefore:

- Try to minimise any need for reverse translation from the King James New Testament for Scrivener’s New Testament, in the hope that readers will gloss over it, *Cleaning-Up* p 20,
- Vigorously attack anyone (e.g. Sister Riplinger) who draws attention to major reverse translation efforts on the part of his co-editor from a supposedly non-inspired source i.e. the King James New Testament, *Cleaning-Up* **Quote 114**,
- Vent his fury by means of accusations of hypocrisy and misrepresentation at anyone (e.g. Sister Riplinger) who discloses by means of an **“honest report”** Acts 6:3 that the Greek text that the DBS Executive seeks to pass off as ‘the pure inspired original Greek’ is derived at least in part from non-Greek sources that are therefore not inspired according to the DBS Executive Committee, which creates (for the DBS Executive Committee) an insoluble anomaly (that is also potentially unsalable) because how can a supposedly pure inspired original Greek text be obtained from a non-Greek source that is by definition (according to the DBS Executive Committee) *uninspired*, most likely impure, see Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quotes 124, 140**, and (according to the DBS Executive Committee) definitely not original?

Dr DiVietro’s stance is therefore extremely objectionable insofar as he has not carried out a *full* collation of the differences between Scrivener’s text and the King James New Testament. See remarks under **Quote 131**. See also remarks in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint** on p 20 of *Cleaning-Up* and **Quotes 105, 114, 127** where Dr DiVietro refers to his examination of a maximum of 190 departures of Beza’s text from the King James New Testament. It is clear from his remarks that a *full* collation of Scrivener’s text versus the King James New Testament remains to be done. Otherwise Dr DiVietro is either delusional or deceitful or both when referring to his and his co-editor’s compilation as **“The Textus Receptus 1881 Greek text is the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version”** (price \$24.95). See above.

Moreover, Dr DiVietro has given no indication of how Scrivener identified departures in Beza’s text from the King James New Testament without the use of reverse translation for a major part of his work. See extract above from **Quote 114**.

The Scrivener i.e. Scrivener/DiVietro text is really, therefore, as Dr Mrs Riplinger has indicated in Chapter 17 of *Hazardous Materials* **the corresponding Greek text DERIVED**

FROM the 1611 King James Version WITH AN AS YET UNDETERMINED NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL CHANGES INTRODUCED BY THE ORIGINAL EDITOR FROM HIS TEXTUAL HERESIES (price still \$24.95). See extended comments under *Quote 133*.

Dr DiVietro should therefore carefully consider Job 15:34 again. See *Quote 103*.

“For the congregation of hypocrites shall be desolate, and fire shall consume the tabernacles of bribery.”

Quote 133, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 684

Quote 133 consists of an extract in Latin from the preface of Beza’s text with the word “**Syra**” highlighted in bold that Dr Mrs Riplinger introduces with the statement “*Beza’s Preface does mention his frequent access to the Latin and Syriac scripture readings, noting in part,*”

Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of attempting to deceive her readers with the Latin quote from Beza because she does not provide a translation. Dr DiVietro states that several Latin translators have assured him that that extract simply says that Beza used Latin and Syriac sources for his text in order to decide between variants in his Greek sources, not that his entire translation, i.e. Greek Receptus, came from Latin or Syriac.

Dr DiVietro then charges Dr Mrs Riplinger with hypocrisy again* for condoning the King James translators’ use of multiple sources for determining the English text but denying that the same method is equally valid for determining the Greek text. *See *Quote 132*.

A full translation of the extract from Beza’s Preface is unnecessary. The highlighted word “**Syra**” indicates to the reader of *Hazardous Materials* that Beza used a Syriac source for his Greek text. Dr Mrs Riplinger has already explained Beza’s use of non-Greek sources (and therefore non-inspired non-Greek sources according to the DBS Executive Committee) for his text on p 683 of *Hazardous Materials*.

See *Quote 132* and note this extract from *Hazardous Materials*.

“The Cambridge History of the Bible states,

““In the preparation of his text Beza...also had before him the [Latin] version made by Tremellius from the [Syriac] Peshitta New Testament.”

“[It was] ““Tremellius’s Latin of the Syriac New Testament” (Cambridge History, Green-slade, pp. 62, 167).””

Quote 133 with its highlighted word “**Syra**” simply reinforces the above statement, which even Dr DiVietro and his Latin translators cannot deny and which Dr DiVietro does not explicitly deny. Dr DiVietro is therefore falsely accusing Dr Mrs Riplinger again. She has simply “**plentifully declared the thing as it is**” Job 26:3 for both the 1611 Holy Bible and Beza’s text.

In doing so, she has warned that Beza’s text, like Scrivener’s, is not actually “*the “exact” “Originall Greeke” text that underlies the KJB*” and that neither text is an essentially pure Greek source. See *Hazardous Materials* pp 630, 653, 681, 683 and note again Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement from *Quote 132* above, from *Hazardous Materials* p 683.

*“Those who feel that they **must** go to the Greek and therefore follow Scrivener’s use of Beza instead of the KJB’s underlying Greek (where Scrivener pretends the translators followed the Latin) will be shocked to find out that Beza’s Greek text was made, according to his preface, by consulting among other things, the vernacular Syriac Peshitta and a Latin translation of this Peshitta.”*

The DBS Executive Committee, by contrast, tries desperately to *imply* that both Beza's and Scrivener's texts are essentially pure Greek sources, such that any differences between them can be ignored and that each text should be *perceived* as "as the preserved original Greek Words" (A WARNING!! P. 89) of the Greek New Testament.

See the following statements from this author's earlier work **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Dr Waite and 'the Greek'** pp 26-28 citing Dr D. A. Waite's work A WARNING!!

P. 52 "It is true that Scrivener's Greek Text is the closest to the KJB. But it is not "miscalled Beza's." Except for only 190 places, Scrivener stated that he used **Beza's 5th edition, 1598 Greek edition.**"

P. 52 "I firmly believe that I have the original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. Once again Gail Riplinger reveals her HERESY of throwing away God's original Words in favor of the exaltation of a translation of those Words."

P. 66 "I don't "unwisely" use Scrivener's Greek New Testament. I believe those are the preserved Words of the original New Testament. Gail Riplinger doesn't want anyone to read God's own Words to see what He gave us, but only a translation of those Words in the King James Bible. This is blasphemy by her against God's verbal plenary inspiration of the New Testament in Greek."

P. 69 "Another lie is that Scrivener's "Greek text" does not "match" any other "Greek text on earth." As I said before, it follows **Beza's 5th edition of 1598** in all but 190 places which he lists in his Appendix. Again she lies that it was not Beza's text. It most certainly was Beza's 5th edition of 1598, and she cannot prove otherwise."

P. 89 "The Dean Burgon Society (DBS) does stand for Scrivener's Greek text as the preserved original Greek Words."

Above all in the above statements cited from A WARNING!!, Dr Waite is trying to convince readers that Beza's and Scrivener's texts are pure *inspired* (without this being explicitly stated, see **Quote 132**) Greek texts that are direct descendents of God's original *inspired* words in Greek, *without being filtered through any non-Greek translation, which according to the DBS Executive Committee would be 'uninspired,' thus contaminating and rendering the resulting Greek text uninspired as well.*

Yet again, it should be noted that a full collation between Scrivener's and Beza's texts to identify differences between them, which may well exceed 190, has yet to be carried out. Likewise, an exhaustive comparison of Scrivener's and Beza's texts with the King James New Testament has yet to be carried out. It is incumbent upon Drs Waite and DiVietro to carry out such a comparison. So far, their dogmatic statements listed above and found under **Quotes 130, 131, 132** with respect to Scrivener's and Beza's texts are unsubstantiated. See also remarks under **Quote 131** with respect to the absence of a full collation of those texts.

Dr DiVietro also insists that the New Testament was originally written in Greek and that only *this* original text was/is inspired. See **Quote 132, Cleaning-Up** pp 2-3, 18, 21, 187, 255-256 again and remarks under **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.

However, Dr Mrs Riplinger's disclosures have revealed that Beza's text (and by association Scrivener's), is at least in part, as Dr DiVietro is forced to acknowledge, a translation (in Greek) of a translation (in Latin) of a translation (in Syriac) of 'the original Greek' (in Greek), if the DBS Executive Committee's stance is taken that the New Testament was originally written in Greek.

The view of Herman Hoskier differs, of course, in that he proposes that Greek and Syriac ‘originals’ may have been concurrent. See remarks under **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’, Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint, Challenges #1-#7 – Overview, Quotes 3, 7, 27, 28, 39, 64, 124, 125, 126**. In that case, Beza’s text would be, at least in part, a translation (in Greek) of a translation (in Latin) from a Syriac original concurrent with a Greek original.

Either way, however, Dr DiVietro’s dishonesty is apparent with respect to the title of his and his co-editor’s Greek text. So is that of the DBS Executive Committee by association. Note the following extract from **Quote 118**.

*With Dr Mrs Riplinger having compelled Dr DiVietro to confess that his and his co-editor’s text contains human error, he should insist that the product description of that text be suitably amended, perhaps as follows from the information available in Hazardous Materials pp 654-677. See **Quote 108**. Emphases and block capital emphasised insertions are this author’s.*

Title: Scrivener’s Textus Receptus (1881) 2.0

*Authors: F. H. A. Scrivener, **Kirk DiVietro***

Price: \$24.95

*The Textus Receptus 1881 Greek text is **the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version EXCEPT IN AT LEAST 64 VERSES**. The Scrivener text is a modified Beza 1598 Textus Receptus in which changes have been made **to reflect the readings chosen by the KJV translators EXCEPT IN AT LEAST 64 VERSES**. Scrivener’s intent was to artificially create a Greek text that closely matched the translator-modified Textus Receptus text **EXCEPT IN AT LEAST 64 VERSES** and the resulting English version **EXCEPT IN AT LEAST 64 VERSES**. This is a useful text for comparison **EXCEPT IN AT LEAST 64 VERSES** for those with proficiency in Greek **WHO WILL NEED IT IN ORDER TO SPOT THE DEPARTURES OF THE TEXT FROM THE 1611 AUTHORIZED NEW TESTAMENT IN AT LEAST 64 VERSES**.*

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s disclosures about Beza’s Greek text and by association Scrivener’s, suggest that in order to **“Provide things honest in the sight of all men”** Romans 12:17 fully, Scrivener’s co-editor should further amend the title of their joint effort as follows, because he should not allow their text to be wrongly perceived as ‘the original Greek’ purported to be so because the King James New Testament was accurately translated from it, *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3, 18. See added red highlighted block capital text.

*The Textus Receptus 1881 Greek text is **the corresponding Greek text DERIVED FROM the 1611 King James Version** (price still \$24.95) **EXCEPT IN AT LEAST 64 VERSES, WITH AN AS YET UNDETERMINED NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL CHANGES INTRODUCED BY THE ORIGINAL EDITOR FROM HIS TEXTUAL HERESIES, NOTING IT IS ALSO FILTERED IN PART THROUGH A LATIN TRANSLATION OF A SYRIAC TRANSLATION OF (WE THINK) AN EARLIER GREEK SOURCE ASSUMED TO BE ‘ORIGINAL’ BUT WHICH REMAINS UNIDENTIFIED**. The Scrivener text is a modified Beza 1598 Textus Receptus in which changes have been made **to reflect the readings chosen by the KJV translators EXCEPT IN AT LEAST 64 VERSES, WITH AN AS YET UNDETERMINED NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL CHANGES INTRODUCED BY THE ORIGINAL EDITOR FROM HIS TEXTUAL HERESIES, NOTING IT IS ALSO FILTERED IN PART THROUGH A LATIN TRANSLATION OF A SYRIAC TRANSLATION OF (WE THINK) AN EARLIER GREEK SOURCE ASSUMED TO BE ‘ORIGINAL’ BUT WHICH REMAINS UNIDENTIFIED**. Scrivener’s intent was to artificially create a Greek text that closely matched the translator-modified Textus Receptus text **EX-***

CEPT IN AT LEAST 64 VERSES, WITH AN AS YET UNDETERMINED NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL CHANGES INTRODUCED BY THE ORIGINAL EDITOR FROM HIS TEXTUAL HERESIES, NOTING IT IS ALSO FILTERED IN PART THROUGH A LATIN TRANSLATION OF A SYRIAC TRANSLATION OF (WE THINK) AN EARLIER GREEK SOURCE ASSUMED TO BE ‘ORIGINAL’ BUT WHICH REMAINS UNIDENTIFIED and the resulting English version **EXCEPT IN AT LEAST 64 VERSES, WITH AN AS YET UNDETERMINED NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL CHANGES INTRODUCED BY THE ORIGINAL EDITOR FROM HIS TEXTUAL HERESIES, NOTING IT IS ALSO FILTERED IN PART THROUGH A LATIN TRANSLATION OF A SYRIAC TRANSLATION OF (WE THINK) AN EARLIER GREEK SOURCE ASSUMED TO BE ‘ORIGINAL’ BUT WHICH REMAINS UNIDENTIFIED.** This is a useful text for comparison **EXCEPT IN AT LEAST 64 VERSES, WITH AN AS YET UNDETERMINED NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL CHANGES INTRODUCED BY THE ORIGINAL EDITOR FROM HIS TEXTUAL HERESIES, NOTING IT IS ALSO FILTERED IN PART THROUGH A LATIN TRANSLATION OF A SYRIAC TRANSLATION OF (WE THINK) AN EARLIER GREEK SOURCE ASSUMED TO BE ‘ORIGINAL’ BUT WHICH REMAINS UNIDENTIFIED** for those with proficiency in Greek **WHO WILL NEED IT IN ORDER TO SPOT THE DEPARTURES OF THE TEXT FROM THE 1611 AUTHORIZED NEW TESTAMENT IN AT LEAST 64 VERSES, WITH AN AS YET UNDETERMINED NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL CHANGES INTRODUCED BY THE ORIGINAL EDITOR FROM HIS TEXTUAL HERESIES, NOTING THAT THIS GREEK TEXT HAS BEEN FILTERED IN PART THROUGH A LATIN TRANSLATION OF A SYRIAC TRANSLATION OF (WE THINK) AN EARLIER GREEK SOURCE ASSUMED TO BE ‘ORIGINAL’ BUT WHICH REMAINS UNIDENTIFIED.**

Those amendments should be sufficient for Dr DiVietro and his co-editor’s Greek text, for now, in order to give an honest appraisal of their text, especially in view of Scrivener’s own comments in his preface. See *Hazardous Materials* p 641 and remarks under **Quote 114**, from which the following extract is taken.

““In considering what text had the best right to be regarded as *“the text presumed to underlie the Authorised Version,”* it was necessary to take into account *the composite nature of the Authorized Version...Beza’s fifth and last text of 1598 was more likely than any other to be in the hands of the of the King James’s revisers...There are however many places in which the Authorized Version is at variance with Beza’s text; chiefly because it retains language inherited from Tyndale and his successors, which had been founded on the text of other Greek editions...These uncertainties do not however affect the present edition, in which the different elements that actually make up the Greek basis of the Authorized Version have an equal right to find a place”* [subjective and incomplete back-translation of AV into Greek].”

Quote 134, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 684

“Scrivener said that Beza used Stephanus’s fourth edition as his basis, from which Beza departs in his 1565 edition – “only twenty-five times, nine times to side with the Complutensian, four times with Erasmus, thrice with the two united, the other nine readings are new, whereof two (Acts xvii. 25; James v. 12) had been adopted by Colinaeus. The second edition of 1582 withdraws one of the peculiar readings of its predecessor, but adds fourteen more. The third edition (1588), so far as Reuss knows, departs from the second but five times and the fourth (1598) from the third only twice, Matt. vi 1...; Hebrews x. 17...”

Dr DiVietro has little comment to make on *Quote 134*. He says only that, in his opinion, Beza was entitled to edit his text as he came across additional source documents that were authoritative enough to justify the edits.

Quote 134 is still under the heading “*Beza’s Greek Text: Some from Syriac to Latin to Greek?*” *Hazardous Materials* p 683. Dr Mrs Riplinger is simply revealing that not only is Beza’s text derived at least in part from non-Greek sources but it is subject to change from contemporaneous sources such as the Complutensian, Erasmus, Colinaeus and that new – and peculiar – readings appear with the publication of successive editions.

Dr DiVietro’s comments under *Quote 134* reveal yet again his tendency to conform to Proverbs 26:24 as the occasion demands. See the end of remarks under *Quote 116*.

“He that hateth dissembleth with his lips, and layeth up deceit within him;”

Dr DiVietro seeks to portray himself as a staunch supporter of the 1611 Holy Bible but he hates Sister Riplinger and her work. Therefore he must also speak against the 1611 Holy Bible in order to attack Sister Riplinger and her work. See this extract from *Preface and Introduction*.

On p 3 of his Introduction, Dr DiVietro insists that the AV1611 is perfect, such that it cannot be changed or improved. He insists further, p 7 that any changes in the AV1611 that were made between 1611 and the appearance of the final standard Text of 1769 were minor and can be discounted.

Yet when it suits Dr DiVietro to attack Dr Mrs Riplinger and Hazardous Materials for her belief in the 1611 English Holy Bible as “all scripture...given by inspiration of God,” these minor changes between successive editions of the AV1611 suddenly assume overwhelming importance...

Dr DiVietro...protests [Cleaning-Up p 10] that surely no ‘inspired’ translation could exhibit such changes between editions and therefore Dr Mrs Riplinger’s entire thesis of Hazardous Materials must be wrong...

Dr DiVietro is showing the same two-faced behaviour with respect to ‘the Greek.’ Under *Quote 130*, when confronted with the numerous departures of Scrivener’s text from the King James New Testament that he hurriedly by-passed, Dr DiVietro nevertheless excused himself from the deceptive title of his and co-editor’s text, *The Textus Receptus 1881 Greek text is the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version*, by acknowledging that neither Scrivener nor Beza claimed to have been infallible (which they clearly weren’t).

By implication therefore, Dr DiVietro is acknowledging that *he himself is not infallible* and that his and his co-editor’s Greek text *may not be the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version in all respects*, only that it is *closest* to the translators’ composite Greek text and certainly not ‘the’ finally authoritative Greek text to which he alludes on p 21 of *Cleaning-Up*. That is as close as Dr DiVietro has come thus far to admitting, even if only by implication, possible error on his part as highlighted by disclosures from *Hazardous Materials*. However, Scrivener’s co-editor’s enforced humility doesn’t last. See below.

By contrast, now that Beza’s text, which is the basis for Scrivener’s text, see full title included under *Quote 133*, has been exposed under *Quote 134* as a kind of ‘moveable feast’ such that no-one can be sure of *the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version* according to identifiable, steadfast ‘original Greek’ sources, Dr DiVietro is trying to excuse the differences between Beza’s editions by implying that they are inconsequential, i.e. minor finishing touches. That is, he is back to saying that he and his co-editor have indeed brought forth *the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version* in all respects.

That is certainly a more saleable position (price \$24.95) and Dr DiVietro most likely hopes that it is the one that his readers will focus on.

The differences between Beza's editions are not inconsequential. They are among "*the little foxes*" Song of Solomon 2:15 and Dr Mrs Riplinger is quite right to point them out. See remarks under *Quotes 95, 97, 108, 114, 115, 116*.

Consistent with his tendency to substantiate nothing that he comments on, see *Quotes 95, 111, 120*, Dr DiVietro has provided no full collation of Beza's editions either to show how many exist or that they are indeed inconsequential, i.e. minor finishing touches. As indicated, by implication, he merely dismisses them as such.

This author is reminded of the comments of none other than Dean Burgon himself in *The Revision Revised* p xxvi, with respect to the "*recension theory*" of Westcott and Hort:

"It dispenses with proof. It furnishes no evidence. It asserts when it ought to argue. It reiterates when it is called on to explain... "I am sir Oracle.""

Dr Mrs Riplinger is therefore also quite right to state as she does on pp 692-693 of *Hazardous Materials* that, her emphases:

"Scrivener's (or Beza's) text is not the "exact" Received text or Textus Receptus God carried into the Holy Bibles. These printed Greek one-man editions must be abandoned as the final authority or their followers must abandon all reason. However, some of the "wise and prudent" would rather abandon reason than appear as one of the "weak," "foolish," "despised," and "base" "babes" God hath chosen "to confound the wise."

"At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise [Scrivener's "intelligent" adherents] and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight" (Matt. 11:25, 26)."

Dr DiVietro has a mocking comment to make on the first part of the above statement (he avoids any comment on the accompanying scripture), which is his *Quote 140*. *Quote 140* will be addressed when that part of *Cleaning-Up* is reached.

Quote 135, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 685

"Wetstein calculates that Beza's text differs from Stephen's in some fifty places."

Dr DiVietro states that these differences between the texts of Beza and Stephanus are not significant. He then accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of trying to imply that the King James New Testament, which he says largely follows Beza's and Scrivener's texts, is not taken from 'the' Greek text, even though the translators said that they translated from the "*Originall Greeke*." Dr DiVietro then asks if Dr Mrs Riplinger is trying to imply, falsely, that the King James translators were liars.

Dr DiVietro then comments briefly, without an inserted quote, on pp 685-689 of *Hazardous Materials*, which is the section of the book on Beza's Calvinism, entitled "*Beza, Calvinism and Geneva*." Dr DiVietro insists that this section is no more than an *ad hominem* attack on Beza and on his text after the manner of guilt-by-association. Dr DiVietro insists that this section achieves nothing because, he says, many of the Puritan translators for the 1611 Holy Bible were also five-point Calvinists but no *ad hominem* attacks are made on them in *Hazardous Materials* and neither is their work subjected to guilt-by-association.

It should first be made clear that Dr DiVietro again falsely accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger with respect to her supposed disbelief in a Greek basis for the King James New Testament. Note this extract from **Quote 130**.

Dr DiVietro “covereth his sins” further by insisting that even though the texts of Scrivener and Beza are not infallible (which wasn’t what he said under his and co-editor’s product description, see above), Scrivener’s text is used because it is the closest to the KJB. He accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of attacking Scrivener’s text for that reason because, as he declares in bold type, Dr Mrs Riplinger doesn’t believe that the King James Bible comes from a Greek text.

*A more craven exhibition of providing things dishonest “in the sight of all men” Romans 12:17 than Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote 130** is difficult to imagine.*

*See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s question that she poses on p 656 of Hazardous Materials with respect to Mark 14:43, alluded to in part at the conclusion of the remarks on **Quote 129**.*

“Why does Scrivener try to misrepresent the KJB’s Greek base?”

Why, therefore, does Dr DiVietro try to pretend that Dr Mrs Riplinger doesn’t believe that the King James New Testament has a Greek base?

The only realistic answer is that Dr DiVietro is following his mentor who “is a liar, and the father of it” John 8:44, according to the Lord Jesus Christ.

Dr DiVietro has repeatedly made false accusations against Sister Riplinger in his book, as the search string *accuse* (or simply *accus*) will reveal for the following sections of an e-copy of this work. See **Preface and Introduction, Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’, Challenges #1, #2, #3, #4, #7, Points-Counterpoints**, (in sum) **Challenges #1-#7 – Overview, Quotes 1, 8, 13, 16, 18, 19, 22, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 35, 39, 46, 47, 50, 52, 57, 64, 65, 67, 76, 81, 83, 87, 88, 90, 92, 100, 104, 108, 109, 111, 114, 116, 119, 120, 124, 125, 126, 130, 131, 132, 133** and now **Quote 135**.

Concerning the differences between the editions of Beza and Stephanus, the full statements from **Hazardous Materials** p 685 from which **Quote 135** has been taken are as follows, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases. It should be noted that the statements that follow are not those of Dr Mrs Riplinger but are those of Scrivener himself, which Dr DiVietro does not make clear to his readers.

“All his [Beza’s] editions vary somewhat from Stephen and from each other” (Scrivener, A Plain, Vol. 2, pp. 192-193).

“Wetstein calculates that Beza’s text differs from Stephen’s in some fifty places (an estimate we shall find below the mark), and that either in his translation or his Annotations he departs from Stephen’s Greek in 150 passages...” (Scrivener, A Plain, Vol. 2, pp. 192-193; p. 206 of E. Hills’s book cites Reuss as saying that Beza departs from Stephen’s 4th edition thirty-eight times.”*

*See wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html.

In spite of Dr DiVietro’s opinion to the contrary, the differences between the texts of Beza and Stephanus were significant enough for Scrivener to remark upon them, as Dr Mrs Riplinger’s citations from Scrivener undeniably show. These differences remain and, essentially, have not been resolved, unlike those of the early editions of the 1611 Holy Bible with the publication of Dr Blayney’s 1769 edition, see remarks under **Quote 28**. The above citations show that it is not certain even yet just how many differences exist between editions of the Received Text compiled by different editors or indeed how many exist between successive editions compiled by the same editor. (Dr DiVietro appears to have accepted the word of an

unsaved liberal i.e. Wetstein in **Quote 135** even against that of his co-editor in order to belittle Sister Riplinger.)

Those differences may be few in number overall but they are significant in that no published Greek text, including that of Drs Scrivener and DiVietro, may therefore truthfully be called *“The Textus Receptus...corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version.”* See remarks under **Quote 134**. It is clear that no specific edition of the Textus Receptus exists as a single, independent, definitive edition of that text as a true reflection of either *“the Original Greek”* or ‘the’ Greek text of the King James New Testament of sufficient authority even to ‘clarify’ it, *Cleaning-Up* p 94, let alone ‘correct’ it, the protestations of the DBS Executive Committee to the contrary notwithstanding. See *Cleaning-Up* pp xi, 327-330.

As Dr Hills rightly states, wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html, *The King James Version Defended* p 220:

“The King James Version a Variety of the Textus Receptus

*“The translators that produced the King James Version relied mainly, it seems, on the later editions of Beza’s Greek New Testament, especially his 4th edition (1588-9). But also they frequently consulted the editions of Erasmus and Stephanus and the Complutensian Polyglot. According to Scrivener (1884)...out of the 252 passages in which these sources differ sufficiently to affect the English rendering, the King James Version agrees with Beza against Stephanus 113 times, with Stephanus against Beza 59 times, and 80 times with Erasmus, or the Complutensian, or the Latin Vulgate [i.e. other Greek sources and pre-1611 vernacular Bibles, including 16th century English Bibles, see *Hazardous Materials* pp 654-677] against Beza and Stephanus. Hence the King James Version ought to be regarded not merely as a translation of the Textus Receptus but also as an independent variety of the Textus Receptus.”*

Dr DiVietro’s ire against her notwithstanding, that is Dr Mrs Riplinger’s essential point under **Quote 135**, as she states on pp 691-692 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphases. Dr DiVietro bypassed the following statements:

“Tremble” At Scrivener or Beza?

“All of the microscopic errors and varieties in printed editions of Greek Textus Receptus editions by Scrivener, Beza, Stephanus and others do not disannul their usefulness as exhibitions of the New Testament text used in the first century. Yet, they are merely intellectual exercises, not Holy Bibles which speak life to anyone today, since first century Greek is a dead language. Their only interpreter is either: 1.) a Greek-English lexicon or 2.) a Holy Bible. The many chapters to follow dissolve the myth that lexicons are God’s interpreter. Jesus said, “It is the spirit that quickeneth...the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life” (John 6:63). If his words died on the paper of the original manuscripts, were buried and never rose again, where do Christians get these “lively oracles” (Acts 7:38) and what of the promise of the “scriptures...to all nations” (Rom. 16:26) and the “word of the truth of the gospel; Which is come unto you, as it is in all the world” (Col. 1:5, 6)?”*

Dr DiVietro protests vehemently under **Quote 135** against Dr Mrs Riplinger’s identification *“of the microscopic errors and varieties in printed editions of Greek Textus Receptus editions”* but he is unwillingly to answer or even address the vital questions that her statement raises.

*Or were stolen away by the ‘original originals-onlyists’ and never seen again as a single document between two covers except by a select few such as the DBS Executive Committee members, who have never disclosed where the exact, inspired original words of scripture in

Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek may yet be found though they profess to have them, *Cleaning-Up* p xi and who therefore continue in open defiance of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See *Quote 114*.

Throughout these considerations under *Quote 135*, it is apparent that Dr DiVietro has not carried out a full collation between the various editions of Beza and Stephanus to determine how many differences actually exist and whether or not they are as insignificant as he claims. Neither has Dr DiVietro carried out a full collation of those texts with Scrivener's and in turn with the King James New Testament. See related remarks under *Quotes 131, 132, 133, 134*.

Yet again, he is posturing as ““*sir Oracle*”” according to the words of Gratiano, *The Merchant of Venice*, Act I, Scene i, this author's emphases.

*There are a sort of men, whose visages
Do cream and mantle like a standing pond;
And do a willful stillness entertain,
With purpose to be dress'd in an opinion
Of wisdom, gravity, profound conceit;
As who should say, "I am Sir Oracle,
And when I ope my lips, let no dog bark!"*

Or King James Bible believer dare profess heart belief in that Book as “*all scripture*” that “*is *given by inspiration of God*” 2 Timothy 3:16 (*not “*God-breathed*”).

See related remarks under *Quote 134*.

God says in Isaiah 66:2 “*to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word.*”

See **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint, Quote(s) 81**. Dr DiVietro shows little or no evidence in his book thus far of obeying Isaiah 66:2.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has essentially answered the above questions in the paragraph that follows her statement cited above, her emphases. (Dr DiVietro is outraged at the last part of the following paragraph, which is his *Quote 139*. *Quote 139* will be addressed when that part of *Cleaning-Up* is reached.)

*“Inspiration without translation is like the incarnation without the resurrection. Mark 16:11 says, “And they, when they had heard that he was **alive**, and had been seen of her believed not.” The Word was alive, but they doubted. The next verse says, “**After that** he appeared in **another form...**” What? After 16:11 the Word appeared in “another form.” Likewise his word, “which liveth and abideth forever” is alive and we have it in “another form” marked on the pages of the 1611 KJB. It was not hard for Jesus to change forms. “Go tell my brethren...(Matt. 28:10). (If all the vultures can do is light upon and chew on this metaphor until it is beyond recognition, they have proven themselves incapable of serious debate.)”*

It was not hard for God to give His word in “another form,” as Jeremiah 32:27 reveals.

“Behold, I am the LORD, the God of all flesh: is there any thing too hard for me?”

In sum, Dr Mrs Riplinger states rightly in *In Awe of Thy Word* p 544, her emphases:

“The Bible appears in many forms – such as Hebrew, Hungarian, English and Polish. The “form” of the Word seemed different at various times, yet it was still Jesus (e.g. the “fiery furnace” (Dan. 3:35), the “babe wrapped in swaddling clothes” (Luke 2:12), when “She supposing him to be the gardener” (John 20:15), and when “his eyes were as a flame of fire” (Rev. 1:14). When the Word “appeared in another form,” as Jesus did, “neither

believed they them” (Mark 16:12, 13). Likewise, some still dig for words in haunted Greek graveyards.”

Like the DBS Excavation Committee (no Freudian slip has occurred), lexical “*picks and shovels in their shaking grasp*” (from *Exposure* by Wilfred Owen, *Collected Poems*, Chatto & Windus, London, 1969, p 49, users.fulladsl.be/spb1667/cultural/owen/exposure.html).

Concerning the section on pp 685-689 of *Hazardous Materials* entitled “*Beza, Calvinism and Geneva,*” Dr DiVietro has again falsely accused Sister Riplinger. See list above. Dr Mrs Riplinger has not carried out an *ad hominem* attack on Theodore Beza. She has simply highlighted his adherence to the false doctrines of 5-Point Calvinism and warned about how his Calvinistic influence is being used today in order to subvert the 1611 Holy Bible by means of a regression to the Geneva Bible.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states that “*The promotion today of the Geneva Bible, with its Calvinistic notes, is a subtle ploy to: 1). influence readers with Calvinism’s misrepresentations of the scripture and 2.) question the authority of the KJB.*”

That promotion of the superseded Geneva Bible has received ‘respectable’ support in this country from the Norwich Reformed Church, located in Norwich, regional administrative centre of the county of Norfolk, England, www.nrchurch.co.nr/. Some extracts follow from what its pastor said in an email circular of January 1st 2011. Emphases etc. are his.

Note that the promotion of the Geneva Bible by this reformed pastor is accompanied by equivalent promotion of the apostate NKJV but it will also be observed that the pastor has no *written* final authority. His essential attitude to the matter of final authority is summarised in Isaiah 14:14:

“I will be like the most High”

AV or not AV? - THAT IS THE QUESTION

*Why Norwich Reformed Church prefers the New KJV
(with considerable sympathy for the GENEVA BIBLE also)...*

While it too has its blemishes, the RAV/NKJV is a preferable version for modern use. We dare not let ‘the opposition’ write off the Reformed Faith as an irrelevant and antiquarian version of Christianity. Let us communicate the Gospel to the twenty-first century using suitably-appropriate contemporary language!

MORE THOUGHTS ON THE GENEVA BIBLE

(now available in a modern edition from Tolle Lege Press, USA and gaining in popularity)

A fruit of the Genevan Reformation, the first edition of the English ‘Geneva Bible’ appeared in 1560.

Predating the AV (1611) by half a century, this was the Bible that established the Protestant Faith in British hearts and minds. *It was the version embraced by Puritan separatists (who disapproved of ‘popish’ features in the AV) and taken with them to the New World. Published for many decades, the final 1599 edition remained in print until 1644.*

On the other hand (as noted above), the ‘Anglican’ AV was a ‘PC’ version authorized by King James I who disliked the GB notes and persecuted the Puritans for desiring a more biblical reformation in England.

While not without its defects, the GB should be preferred before the AV among those who desire older Protestant versions of the Bible. *It is more accurate in Acts 12:4 and Hebrews*

10: 23, for instance. It also follows Tyndale's 'love' rather the AV's 'charity' in 1 Corinthians 13.

The Pilgrim Fathers objected to the AV on several grounds, including the reversion to 'Easter' instead of 'Passover' in Acts 12:4, thus promoting the perpetuation of the 'popish' church calendar (saints days, Lent, etc).

There were also concerns about published images in the first edition and too high a regard for the Apocrypha. All this coupled with Latinate 'establishment' terms reflecting Stuart 'PC' governmental concepts (as Dr David Daniel pointed out in his Tyndale edition introduction).

Despite its occasional defects, the NKJV (or original RAV, 1982) is closer to the GB than the AV, and therefore more satisfactory for modern use.

That is the kind of falsehood that **"will eat as doth a canker"** 2 Timothy 2:17 that the DBS Executive Committee could be countering, were it not that they have the same mindset as in Isaiah 14:14 **"I will be like the most High."**

Most of the objections to the 1611 Holy Bible cited by the reformed pastor mentioned above have been answered in this author's work, *The KJB Story 1611-2011 Abridged Appendix*.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1311768035.pdf.

(Observe the following key references for the Biblical definition of the word **"mitre"** that the reformed folk object to, from Exodus 29:5-6, 9:

"And thou shalt take the garments, and put upon Aaron the coat, and the robe of the ephod, and the ephod, and the breastplate, and gird him with the curious girdle of the ephod: And thou shalt put the mitre upon his head, and put the holy crown upon the mitre."

"And thou shalt gird them with girdles, Aaron and his sons, and put the bonnets on them: and the priest's office shall be theirs for a perpetual statute: and thou shalt consecrate Aaron and his sons.")

See also:

The Deficiencies of the Geneva Bible by Will Kinney:

brandplucked.webs.com/deficientgeneva.htm

New King James Version Counterfeit by Terry Watkins:

www.av1611.org/nkjv.html

New King James Omissions by A. V. Publications:

www.avpublications.com/avnew/downloads/PDF/Tracts/NKJV_tract.pdf

Answers to the Wolf-Man, Question 28, on the Geneva Bible and the USA:

www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1324483243.pdf

Quote 136, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 689

“Though Beza’s Greek text was generally that which came down from the first century, evidently God saw at least 139 small errors in it, to which he alerted the KJB translators.”

Dr DiVietro reacts with mockery again, see **Quote 110**, and declares that Beza was not inspired of God. He then states that, despite any of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s adverse comments about Scrivener, his text, based on Beza’s, is closest to the King James New Testament and the 25-30 departures from it that Dr Mrs Riplinger has identified are unimportant.

Dr DiVietro insists that the King James translators would have started with Beza’s most recently available text but would have considered all the evidence available to them from Greek sources, from which they would have selected the most strongly-supported Greek reading and translated that into English.

Quote 136 does not even suggest that Beza was inspired of God, so Dr DiVietro’s objection in that respect is irrelevant.

Had Dr DiVietro studied the section entitled **“Scrivener’s Leaven: The Documentation”** *Hazardous Materials* pp 653-677 instead of deviously evading it, see **Quote 130**, he would have seen 64 departures of Scrivener’s text from the King James New Testament, not 25-30 and he would have seen that those departures are not minor, as he tries to imply. See **Quote 108** and remarks under **Quote 131**. They disqualify Scrivener’s (and DiVietro’s) text from being **“the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version.”** See remarks under **Quote 133**.

Moreover, Dr DiVietro is wrong in his unsubstantiated speculations about how the King’s men did their work. Note again John Selden’s *Table Talk* for his summary of how the translators assembled their text. They did not ‘major’ on ‘the Greek.’

See this extract from **Quote(s) 87**.

*Had Dr DiVietro taken the unusual step (for him) of giving *In Awe of Thy Word* a fair reading, he would have found in Chapter 15, entitled *Hidden Notes & Public Views of the King James Translators* a detailed description of how the King’s men went about their work, including their evaluation of many Greek sources, together with early English and foreign Bibles and the important Old Latin versions that were ““so much different from the vulgar [Catholic Latin Vulgate]...””*

*Dr Mrs Riplinger makes repeated reference to *The Translators to the Reader* in order to illustrate the methods by which the King’s men worked and she includes, her annotations and emphases, this highly revealing summative comment [In *Awe of Thy Word* p 539] from “John Selden...in his *Table Talk*,*

““The translation in King James’ time took an excellent way. That part of the Bible was given to him who was most excellent in such a tongue and then they met together, and one read the translation, the rest holding in their hands some Bible, either of the learned tongues [Greek, Hebrew, Latin], or French, Italian, Spanish &c [and other languages]. If they found any fault, they spoke; if not, he read on (Paine, p. 77; Scrivener, p. 140).””

See also **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, *Dead Bible Society, Testimonies to the Inspiration of the AV1611***.

*That was the means by which the King’s men arrived at each of the particular words for the 1611 Holy Bible that was ““holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, made higher” and is perfect for each context (Heb. 7:26).” See *Hazardous Materials* p 113.*

Dr Mrs Riplinger has yet again set Dr DiVietro a valuable example with respect to giving an **“honest report”** Acts 6:3. See remarks under **Quote 132**.

Quote 137, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 689

“The KJB translators never listed all of their Greek sources, they merely referred to them as “the Originall Greeke” on the title page of their New Testament.”

Dr DiVietro is peeved at Dr Mrs Riplinger’s use of the expression *“the Originall Greeke”* as if, in his opinion, she thinks that the translators were referring to what he terms a mystical Greek text. Dr DiVietro insists that the King James translators were simply using the form of spelling that existed in 1611.

Dr Mrs Riplinger is quite right to use the expression *“the Originall Greeke”* regardless of Dr DiVietro’s opinion to the contrary.

See image below, taken from *The Original 1611 King James New Testament of OUR LORD AND SAVIO[U]R JESUS CHRIST, A Photographic Reproduction of the Original*, Lifeline, Philippines, lifelineprinting.com/.

The expression *the Originall Greeke* is plainly visible on the title page and Dr Mrs Riplinger is therefore quite entitled to use the expression, especially insofar as she is simply referring to what the King James translators actually *wrote*, not what Dr DiVietro insinuates that she supposes what the translators were clandestinely seeking to convey by the power of suggestion. Moreover, the King James translators were **“men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom”** Acts 6:3. When they said *the Originall Greeke* they meant *the Originall Greeke* in this author’s view, even if by proxy, as Dr Mrs Riplinger explains on p 691 of *Hazardous Materials* with respect to the work of the King’s men, her emphases:

*“By following the already existing English Bibles the translators were, by proxy, accessing the readings which God had preserved since their **origin**. God was attentive to preserve those readings in Holy Bibles; he has not been actively involved in creating and preserving one-man critical Greek editions, intellectual exercises, which popped up **for the first time** 1500 years after the originals... Consequently, Holy Bibles, such as the KJB, contain time-pressed diamonds, where the one-man modern Greek editions (A.D. 1500-2000) still have coal.”*

Dr DiVietro bypassed the above statement. He is therefore totally out of order in attacking Sister Riplinger as he does under **Quote 137** and has falsely accused her yet again. See **Quote 135**. He has also failed to mention some important information in *Hazardous Materials* that follows on from **Quote 137**, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases, see also **Quotes 109, 132, 135**:

*“In following what they called “the Originall” the KJB translators **seem to follow** the Greek of Beza rather than Stephanus about 113 times, Stephanus rather than Beza 59 times, and Erasmus (the Complutensian Polyglot or Greek manuscripts) against Stephanus and Beza about 80 times. The KJB translators ignored Beza about 139 times. These numbers reflect only places wherein “the differences between the texts of these books is sufficient to affect, however slightly, the language of the version” (Scrivener, *The Authorized*, p. 60). There are **other** differences, not listed herein or in standard collations. (Scrivener, *A Plain*, Vol. 2, p. 195 footnote). (More details about the Greek sources matching the KJB are included in *KJB Greek Texts*, available from AV Publications.)”*

These include the Received Text editions of Erasmus (1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598) and Scrivener (1908). The differences between these editions and in turn their differences

from the King James New Testament, all of which as Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement above indicates, have never been fully collated, see remarks under *Quotes 131-135*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger's full statement above emphasises yet again that, strictly speaking, no *genuine* document exists according to the following description, even if an extant document has been given that description: "*The Textus Receptus 1881 Greek text is the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version*" (price \$24.95). See remarks under *Quotes 131-133*.

Dr DiVietro does not refer to Dr Mrs Riplinger's full statement, though it is possible that he read it in that it does follow on directly from *Quote 137* and appreciated its significance as outlined above. If so, that may be the real reason for the bile that Dr DiVietro directs at Sister Riplinger under *Quote 137*. Yet more discomfort is in store. See page after Figure 9.




Figure 9 *The Original 1611 King James New Testament of OUR LORD AND SAVIO[U]R JESUS CHRIST, A Photographic Reproduction of the Original*

Dr Mrs Riplinger has kindly drawn this author's attention to Issue No. 11 of *The Riplinger Report*. She has also kindly permitted this author to use the following material, which highlights a major shortcoming of *all* currently available published Greek New Testament texts, proving yet again that no currently available published Greek New Testament merits the description "*The Textus Receptus 1881 Greek text is the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version*" (price \$24.95). The extract from Issue No. 11 of *The Riplinger Report* is as follows.


"THE GREEK SAYS..."

...The 400th anniversary of the King James Bible is coming to a close. Just this year the NIV came out with a NEW NIV for 2011, their umpteenth major revision of that text. The KJB was never textually revised in 400 years and does not need to be. Its longevity demonstrates that it is God's word for a world that is ever becoming an English-speaking world.


The nationals in foreign countries that I speak to also believe that the KJB is God's perfect gift of grace to a world, in which practically every country mandates that its citizens learn English in school. Many follow it as their final authority. "Why?," you might ask. Why not go to the 'Greek'? **One** of the reasons is because the generally available Greek editions in print today, even of the Textus Receptus, are not perfect. For example, in Romans 1:3, 4 the KJB says,

"Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; And declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead:"

1. In the KJB Jesus Christ is clearly and grammatically identified as the Son of God. However in the critical Greek text, "**Jesus Christ our Lord**" is removed from verse 3 and moved to the end of verse 4, thereby making no grammatical or doctrinal sense. This corruption is followed by new versions also.



2. Unfortunately, the Textus Receptus published by the Trinitarian Bible Society, the Dean Burgon Society, the Bible For Today, and Logos Bible software (Scrivener/DiVietro editors) and used in many conservative 'King James only' colleges (that teach Greek) matches the critical text here in Romans 1:3, 4. It too omits "**Jesus Christ our Lord**" from his proper and primary place.



3. However, lo and behold, my edition (see below) of the 'ancient Greek' text HAS "**Jesus Christ our Lord**" IN VERSE 3, just as the KJB does. The KJB translators did

know what they were doing and had access to handwritten manuscripts in Greek and many languages, that we may not have access to today.

This Greek text was sent to me many years ago by Mr. Tinsley, a missionary to Greece. It was sold to him in Greece and identified by the bookstore owner as “the most ancient Greek text.” It is not widely available, which is evidence that God does not see ‘the Greek’ as the only harbinger of his word, just as he demonstrated in Acts 2, when he gave the apostles the ability to speak and proclaim the gospel in the language of “every nation under heaven.” (It is a parallel text with ‘The New Testament in Today’s Greek Version with the “Ancient text” on the opposite page. (It is called the Greek Diglot New Testament UBS-EPF 1993-50m-TGV263DI, 1989, p. 298)).

ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε προσηγγεῖλαι με τοὺς ἠεροφάντες τοῦ ἁγίου ἁγίου
Ἰεροφάντες τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἕνεκα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ ἱεροφάντου τοῦ ἁγίου
ἁγίου, οἱ ὁποῖοι, ὡς ἀνθρώποι, γεννήθηκαν ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς τοῦ Δαβὶδ, ὁ
ποδείκνυται ὅμως Ἰησοῦς Θεοῦ με δυνάμει ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροφάντου σου ἁγίου,
ὅταν ἀναστήθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νεκροῦ. Ἐκ τούτου ἔλαβα τὴν χάριν καὶ

I bring this up for two reasons:

1. *Most will say, ‘It’s Greek to me...’. However, well-meaning young men are going to Bible colleges to learn ‘The Bible’ and will simply be handed one of the first **two** corrupted Greek editions and be told that ‘This IS THE BIBLE.’ They will never see the Greek text that the Greeks consider “the most ancient.” They will leave Bible college thinking that the KJB is ‘not quite right.’ You and I will have to listen to them say, “The Greek says...” when they have never even seen a real Greek edition. (Before someone runs out to try to find this ‘ancient Greek text,’ please read the chapter “The Wobbly Unorthodox Greek Orthodox Crutch” in Hazardous Materials. The Unorthodox and unsaved Greek monks made numerous mistakes, which are documented in that chapter. God’s safety net was Acts 2.)*
2. *Some will go on the mission field and naively translate the Bible from one of these two corrupt texts. For example, we were rejoicing to hear that a Swahili John and Romans was now in print. I collated it and found it to be better than the Union Swahili or the editions done in the 1800s which Dr. Verhoef had found for our holybiblefoundation.org.*

Unfortunately this new Swahili translation of the book of Romans by now deceased missionary, Mr. Lear (which says it followed the Textus Receptus) did not follow the real Greek Textus Receptus. It followed the Trinitarian Bible Society/Logos (Scrivener/Beza hybrid) edition which has that error in Romans [1:3, 4].

*That is why translators need to follow the KJB. It IS God’s preserved word, a living tool to transfer the living word. Academic exercises, such as Scrivener’s, done by man, will fail. The KJB is the **Holy Bible**, the grace of God to men around the world, who too often have dropped the ball in caring for their scriptures. The book of Amos says, men “**wander from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east, they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the LORD, and shall not find it**” (Amos 8:12). Yet, God has graciously preserved it ALIVE in the language that almost every nation in the world now teaches in its schools. Man drops the ball and God, in his grace, picks it up. In the next issue of the Riplinger Report, I will ‘report’ on my collations, posted at www.purebiblepress.com.*

*In Genesis 45:5 Joseph says to his brothers “**God sent me to preserve life**” i.e. as living beings. See **Quote 28**. God has done the same for “**the scripture of truth**” Daniel 10:21, “**the word of life**” Philippians 2:16 by means of the 1611 Holy Bible.*

The Nestle (21st Edition), Berry/Stephanus and Farstad/Hodges ‘Majority’ texts are each in error with this passage. The Farstad/Hodges NKJV has to correct the so-called ‘Majority’ Greek Text reading by following the AV1611 in order to get the correct reading for Romans 1:3, 4.

Unusually, most of the 16th century English Bibles have the ungrammatical reading. The Tyndale, Coverdale, Great and Bishops’ bibles usually support the 1611 Holy Bible but not on this particular occasion.

The reading was adjusted in the Geneva Bible of 1560 according to the online edition, logos-resourcepages.org/Geneva/romans.htm, to what is now the reading of the 1611 Holy Bible.

The adjusted reading was retained in the 1587 Edition of the Geneva Bible, and in the 1599 Edition (hard copy, L. L. Brown publishers), by which God would also have guided the King James translators. See lookhigher.net/englishbibles/thegenevabible/romans/1.html.

The ungrammatical reading appears in Jerome’s 405 A.D. Vulgate, which suggests that it goes back to Origen. See www.studylight.org/desk/ and *Did The Catholic Church Give Us The Bible?* by David W. Daniels, Chick Publications, Chapters 2, 4.

The above information further gives the lie to the description “*The Textus Receptus 1881 Greek text is the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version*” (price \$24.95).

It also considerably reinforces the material given earlier that shows that the Scrivener/DiVietro edition is not ‘the Greek text’ of the King James New Testament. See this extract from **Quote 108**.

*Dr Mrs Riplinger has documented 54 verses with readings that depart from the KJB New Testament in Scrivener’s text that show that it is not “The exact Greek text underlying the King James Bible.” Bro. Peter Heisey has studied many of these 54 departures and documented a further 10, making 64 verses in all where Scrivener departs from the KJB New Testament. Dr Mrs Riplinger has stressed that a full collation of Scrivener’s text against the KJB New Testament has yet to be carried out. See Hazardous Materials pp 654-677 and remarks under **Quotes 102, 105**.*

*It should be noted in passing that Dr Mrs Riplinger’s list includes 24 verses, noted with an asterisk * in Hazardous Materials, which Scrivener claimed came from Latin sources but for which Greek textual evidence is readily available. Dr Mrs Riplinger rightly notes in a separate communication to this author that “if DiVietro admits to 30 places where Scrivener said it came from Latin, but DiVietro admits there is Greek evidence, then he is simply agreeing with me, as that was my thesis and demonstration.” See remarks under **Quote 105**.*

*The 64 verses are as follows, in order as they are found in Hazardous Materials for Dr Mrs Riplinger’s list, followed by Bro. Heisey’s references that are in addition to those in Dr Mrs Riplinger’s list, an asterisk * denoting a verse included in both collations.*

Matthew 12:24, 27*, Mark 3:22*, Luke 11:15*, 18*, 19*, Mark 13:37, 14:43*, Luke 1:35, 49, 23:34, 46, John 7:9, 10:16*, 12:26, 18:1, Acts 2:22, 4:32, 6:3*, 7:26*, 44, 10:20, 13:1, 15, 17:30, 19:20*, 23:15, 24:25, Romans 16:4, 1 Corinthians 13:1, Colossians 1:4, 1 Thessalonians 2:16, Acts 26:6*, 1 Corinthians 16:23, Galatians 4:15*, Ephesians 6:24*, Philippians 2:21, Colossians 1:24, 1 Thessalonians 2:12*, 13, 1 Timothy 1:17, 3:15, 4:15*, 2 Timothy 1:18*, James 3:14, 1 Peter 2:13, 1 John 3:20*, 5:8, 2 John 3*, Revelation 13:10, 16:11, 17:9, 18:23, Mark 2:15*

Acts 27:12, 17, Revelation 6:14, 9:16, 19, 10:7, 8, 11:8, 13:8, 21:8

Bro. Heisey notes that in a few cases; Acts 27:12, 1 Timothy 4:15, 2 John 3, Revelation 9:19, 10:7, 11:8, 13:8, problems of translation from Scrivener's text into English may still enable the King James Text to be achieved but very likely not in another language. In effect, the fact remains that Scrivener's text is not "The **exact** Greek text underlying the King James Bible."

Quote 138, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 690

"Their prime authority was the Bishops' Bible which carried forth the words of the English Bible since its genesis in Acts 2. The words of the 1611 English Bible (KJB) had their origin in languages and words which were given through the Holy Ghost's gift of tongues in Acts 2. The pre-cursors of the English languages were the then extant languages of Gothic, early Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, and Latin. These words were included among "every nation under heaven" which "heard them speak in their own language.""

Dr DiVietro is most irate at **Quote 138**. He accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of stating that the Holy Ghost gave the words of the Bishops' Bible in Acts 2. He then insists that it follows from Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement that the words of the 1611 Holy Bible are a tampering with the God-given words of the Bishops' Bible. Dr DiVietro insists further that the Anglo-Saxon languages were not spoken in Acts 2, that Dr Mrs Riplinger is adding to the words of scripture and that none of the (non-Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek) languages spoken on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2 is connected with written scriptures at all.

(Dr DiVietro also says that the Geneva Bible, not the Bishops' Bible, was the basis for the King James Bible. He has misled his readers because forty copies of the Bishops' Bible, not the Geneva Bible, were circulated to the translation companies to serve as the basis for the new translation in accordance with Rule 1 of the rules for translation*. See *Manifold Greatness, The Making of the King James Bible* edited by Helen Moore and Julian Reid, Bodleian Library, p 103. *Figure 33 in *Manifold Greatness* shows that fourteen rules appear to have been compiled initially but fifteen are known to have existed. See Paine, *The Men Behind the KJV* pp 70-71, *In Awe of Thy Word* p 586 and *A Brief History of the King James Bible* by Dr Laurence M. Vance, www.av1611.org/kjv/kjvhist.html. Note that Dr Mrs Riplinger has observed in Issue No. 11 of *The Riplinger Report* that, as seen in Figure 33 of *Manifold Greatness*, Rule 11 calls for the input of "any man." Dr Mrs Riplinger notes that later scholars changed the rule to read "any learned man," in violation of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. Those scholars have their heirs and successors in the form of DBS Executive Committee.)

It is first noted that Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing in his comments under **Quote 138**. He is yet again playing "Sir Oracle." See **Quote 110**.

Dr DiVietro's comments under **Quote 138** show that his ire against Sister Riplinger has intensified to the point where he is making gross errors. It should be noted that even faithful servants of God may be prone to this failing.

"And Moses lifted up his hand, and with his rod he smote the rock twice: and the water came out abundantly, and the congregation drank, and their beasts also. And the LORD spake unto Moses and Aaron, Because ye believed me not, to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them" Numbers 20:11-12.

"They angered him also at the waters of strife, so that it went ill with Moses for their sakes: Because they provoked his spirit, so that he spake unadvisedly with his lips" Psalm 106:32-33.

All of the Lord's servants should keep in mind Isaiah 26:3.

“Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee: because he trusteth in thee.”

Yet again, Dr DiVietro has falsely accused Sister Riplinger and distorted what she said. See **Quotes 131, 135**. Dr Mrs Riplinger did not say that the Bishops’ Bible is the Holy Ghost’s words on the day of Pentecost. She said in the sentence immediately following the opening statement of **Quote 138** to which Dr DiVietro takes exception that *“The words of the 1611 English Bible (KJB) had their origin in languages and words which were given through the Holy Ghost’s gift of tongues in Acts 2.”*

Dr DiVietro takes exception to that statement from **Quote 138** as well but it clearly does not say what Dr DiVietro accuses Sister Riplinger of in his opening comment under **Quote 138**.

It follows that his insinuation against Sister Riplinger that she is implying that the King James translators tampered with the pure words of God in the Bishops’ Bible is yet more false accusation against her. He clearly hasn’t read Part Two of *In Awe of Thy Word, How To Understand The King James Bible: From the Bishops’ Bible to the KJV*.

Dr DiVietro has also omitted the following important statement that immediately follows **Quote 138**.

(In Awe of Thy Word gives a comprehensive history of the English Bible from its Gothic origin to A. D. 1611.)

See this extract from **Quote 125** that answers the remainder of Dr DiVietro’s ire against Sister Riplinger under **Quote 138**. Note again how Sister Riplinger carefully documents her statements in complete contrast to Dr “*Sir Oracle*” DiVietro who documents nothing. The following extract concludes this author’s remarks under **Quote 138**.

Dr DiVietro has also misled, indeed lied to his readers with respect to accusing Dr Mrs Riplinger of somehow violating Revelation 22:18 by adding to scripture. Inspection of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work in In Awe of Thy Word, Chapters 17, 18, The Sounds of the First English Bibles and Acts 2 to You: From the Gothic Bible to the KJV, shows nothing of the kind.

*See this extract from **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to In Awe of Thy Word, Chapter 17, The Sounds of the First English Bible, pp 619-648.*

*Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in support of her analysis, In Awe of Thy Word, pp 621-624 that the Christian Goths most likely first received their Bible early in the 2nd century. Ulfilas, ‘the little wolf’ and Bishop to the Goths, compiled his 4th century Gothic Bible from “‘a comparatively pure Byzantine text in the New Testament...[and it] is so extraordinarily faithful to the Greek.’” She states, her emphasis that “Philostorgius said Ulfilas’ “grandparents were Christians,” converts of those “dwellers in...**Cappadocia**” which received the gift of “other tongues” heard in Acts 2:9. His grandparents were the direct converts of the “strangers scattered throughout...Cappadocia” spoken of by Peter (1 Peter 1:1). These Cappadocians were the “hearers of Peter’s first sermon, and its Christian residents among the readers of his first epistle.””*

*Dr Mrs Riplinger states further, her emphases that “The Goths “migrated into Scythia” and became part of the “**Barbarian, Scythian,**” people mentioned in Paul’s letter to the Colossians (3:11). “At this time [150 A.D.] a vast number of Goths were Christians, their conversion having been effected by those whom they had carried into captivity.””*

Dr Mrs Riplinger states, In Awe of Thy Word, p 628 that “The following charts document the faithful preservation of the word of God. It was given to the Goths in the book of Acts and

“endureth to all generations” (Ps. 100:5). *Its sounds and words are often still evident in the King James Bible...*”

Dr Mrs Riplinger then lists the following 37 verses to show this preservation; Ephesians 3:14, 1 Corinthians 16:22, Romans 16:24, 1 Timothy 2:7, Philippians 4:13, Romans 14:10-12, 1 Corinthians 5:4, 2 Thessalonians 1:12, 1 Corinthians 9:1, 2 Thessalonians 1:8, Galatians 4:7, 1 Thessalonians 3:13, 1 Corinthians 5:5, Matthew 8:29, 1 Corinthians 15:47, 2 Corinthians 4:10, 2 Timothy 4:1, Galatians 6:17, Luke 2:33, Matthew 5:22, Romans 9:28, 1 Corinthians 11:24, Colossians 2:11, 1 Corinthians 5:7b, Ephesians 2:1, Matthew 5:44, Ephesians 4:6, Colossians 3:22, 2 Corinthians 10:4, Colossians 2:18, 23, Romans 8:1, Ephesians 5:5, Luke 16:23, Colossians 3:6. She concludes, *In Awe of Thy Word* p 648, her emphases, “The Gothic language not only often **sounded** like English, sometimes it even **looked** just like it, because it used Roman letters, as well as Greek and Runic. These words ‘Name’ and ‘AMEN,’ **𐌺𐌿𐌹𐌿** **𐌹𐌺𐌹𐌺** were taken directly from the Lord’s Prayer in an ancient Gothic manuscript.”

Note in addition the following material from *In Awe of Thy Word*, Chapter 18, Acts 2 to You: From the Gothic Bible to the KJV, pp 650-671, with the introductory statement on p 650, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases.

“In Acts 2 the gift was given to enable “**every man**” from “**every nation**” to receive “**every word of God.**” The scarlet thread of red letters ties today’s KJV to the Gothic language of Acts 2. For all who care to compare, the charts have “bound the scarlet line in the window,” showing sounds that echo “down” to us. A random sampling of verses shows that the NIV, TNIV, NASB and most other new versions silence those utterances of the Holy Ghost (Acts 2:4-6) and cut the life giving scarlet “cord.” (Josh. 2:15, 18, 21).”

Note that Dr Wilkinson undoubtedly refers to **these Bible translations** as “**all scripture**” that “**is given by inspiration of God**” and descended from multiple inspiration of the scriptures in Acts 2 because he calls these translations, this author’s emphases “**the apostolic scriptures...The Scriptures of the apostle John and his associates, the traditional text, — the Textus Receptus, if you please...And when the Greek East for one thousand years was completely shut off from the Latin West, the noble Waldenses in northern Italy still possessed in Latin the Received Text.**”

Dr DiVietro and Dr Waite would deny that the Waldenses or any Bible believers like them ever actually had “**all scripture**” that “**is given by inspiration of God**” at any time since 100 A.D. if all that they had were translations such as Wilkinson mentions like ““the old Italic Bible [of] the rude Low Latin of the second century...the language of the people.”” See point 1 above from the summary points from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint.**

Job 31:11 well describes the attitude of Dr DiVietro and Dr Waite to the Bibles of those early “**saints, and...martyrs for Jesus**” Revelation 17:6, especially with reference to Romans 14:10, 2 Corinthians 5:10.

“**For this is an heinous crime; yea, it is an iniquity to be punished by the judges.”**

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s examples are as follows, showing that the readings of the 1611 Holy Bible reach back to the pre-350 A.D. Gothic Bible. Dr Benjamin Wilkinson associates “the Gothic of Ulfilas” with Bibles translated into “the Low Latin of the second century” and in turn the Syrian Peshitto Bible of 150 A.D. Like the list given earlier from *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 1052-1108, see above, the verses that follow impinge on major doctrine that has been attacked in the modern versions.

Matthew 8:29, Matthew 11:23 with Matthew 16:18, Luke 10:15, Acts 2:27, 31, Revelation 1:18, 6:8, 20:13, 14 “hell” instead of “depths” twice, “grave” twice, “Hades” 5 times NIV, “depths” twice, “death” once, “realm of the dead” twice, “Hades” 4 times TNIV, “Hades” NKJV, Mark 7:16, 9:29, 42, 44, 15:28, Luke 2:40, 4:4, 25, 9:35, 55, 56, John 6:47, 69, 9:4, 35, 10:21, 30, 32, 16:16, 17:11.

Note that the NIV retains “hell” in Luke 16:23 but the TNIV weakens the term to “Hades.”

The list consists of 30 verses. The two lists give a combined total of 67 verses from throughout the New Testament that support Dr Mrs Riplinger’s thesis that the 1611 Holy Bible reaches back via the pre-350 A.D. Gothic to the apostolic New Testament readings that had their beginning in Acts 2.

*Nowhere has scripture been added to in violation of Revelation 22:18 and the verses listed are but a few **random** samples of scriptures that reach back from the 1611 Holy Bible to the inspiration of scripture in Acts 2 in the languages of “**every nation under heaven**” Acts 2:5 as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in greater detail in Chapter 18 of *In Awe of Thy Word*.*


Dr DiVietro and Dr Waite are among those who would “silence those utterances of the Holy Ghost (Acts 2:4-6) and cut the life giving scarlet “cord.” (Josh. 2:15, 18, 21).”

Quote 139, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 692

“It was not hard for Jesus to change forms. “Go tell my brethren...(Matt. 28:10). (If all the vultures can do is light upon and chew on this metaphor until it is beyond recognition, they have proven themselves incapable of serious debate.)”

Dr DiVietro takes great exception to the sentence in brackets at the end of **Quote 139**. He complains that it doesn’t make sense, is wrong and is in smaller print than the surrounding text. He says that the statement is almost as objectionable as the Nazi’s (sic) offering money to prove that a holocaust happened.

On his last comment under **Quote 139**, Dr DiVietro should review Bro. Chick’s material www.chick.com/reading/tracts/0054/0054_01.asp and at least get his terminology correct.



Holocaust is not the correct term. The correct term is INQUISITION.

See *The Godfathers*, www.chick.com/catalog/comics/0114.asp.




Figure 10 Inquisition and *The Godfathers*

It is disappointing that Dr DiVietro should seek to cover up for Catholicism in his attacks on Sister Riplinger. His behaviour is like that of Herod who also compounded his sin, Luke 3:20-21.

“But Herod the tetrarch, being reprov'd by him for Herodias his brother Philip's wife, and for all the evils which Herod had done, Added yet this above all, that he shut up John in prison.”

That is, if you can't stand the message, 'censor' the messenger. Ahab had the same approach, for the same reason, even though he knew that the messenger spoke **“nothing but that which is true in the name of the LORD”** 1 Kings 22:16.

“And the king of Israel said unto Jehoshaphat, There is yet one man, Micaiah the son of Imlah, by whom we may enquire of the LORD: but I hate him; for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil...And the king said unto him, How many times shall I adjure thee that thou tell me nothing but that which is true in the name of the LORD?...Thus saith the king, Put this fellow in the prison, and feed him with bread of affliction and with water of affliction, until I come in peace. And Micaiah said, If thou return at all in peace, the LORD hath not spoken by me. And he said, Hearken, O people, every one of you” 1 Kings 22:8-28.

This extract from *Quote 135* begins with the full paragraph that ends with Dr DiVietro's *Quote 139*. The extract shows that it is Dr DiVietro who is wrong and not making sense. Yet again, he has falsely accused Sister Riplinger and documented nothing.

*“Inspiration without translation is like the incarnation without the resurrection. Mark 16:11 says, “And they, when they had heard that he was **alive**, and had been seen of her believed not.” The Word was alive, but they doubted. The next verse says, “**After that** he appeared in **another form...**” What? After 16:11 the Word appeared in “another form.” Likewise his word, “which liveth and abideth forever” is alive and we have it in “another form” marked on the pages of the 1611 KJB. It was not hard for Jesus to change forms. “Go tell my brethren...(Matt. 28:10). (If all the vultures can do is light upon and chew on this metaphor until it is beyond recognition, they have proven themselves incapable of serious debate.)”*

It was not hard for God to give His word in “another form,” as Jeremiah 32:27 reveals.

“Behold, I am the LORD, the God of all flesh: is there any thing too hard for me?”

In sum, Dr Mrs Riplinger states rightly in In Awe of Thy Word p 544, her emphases:

“The Bible appears in many forms – such as Hebrew, Hungarian, English and Polish. The “form” of the Word seemed different at various times, yet it was still Jesus (e.g. the “fiery furnace” (Dan. 3:35), the “babe wrapped in swaddling clothes” (Luke 2:12), when “She supposing him to be the gardener” (John 20:15), and when “his eyes were as a flame of fire” (Rev. 1:14)). When the Word “appeared in another form,” as Jesus did, “neither believed they them” (Mark 16:12, 13). Likewise, some still dig for words in haunted Greek graveyards.”

Like the DBS Excavation Committee (no Freudian slip has occurred), lexical “picks and shovels in their shaking grasp” (from Exposure by Wilfred Owen, Collected Poems, Chatto & Windus, London, 1969, p 49, users.fulladsl.be/spb1667/cultural/owen/exposure.html).

Quote 140, Hazardous Materials, p 692

“Scrivener's (or Beza's) text is not the “exact” Received text or Textus Receptus God carried into the Holy Bibles. These printed Greek one-man editions must be abandoned as **the final** authority or their followers must abandon all reason.”

Dr DiVietro falsely accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of being inconsistent, though in terms of mockery and ridicule again. He says that differences exist in the vernacular texts and in effect that Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement requires that those versions be abandoned as well.

Dr DiVietro is no doubt peeved at Dr Mrs Riplinger's statements that immediately follow **Quote 140**. See **Quote 134**.

"However, some of the "wise and prudent" would rather abandon reason than appear as one of the "weak," "foolish," "despised," and "base" "babes" God hath chosen "to confound the wise."

"At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise [Scrivener's "intelligent" [adherents]] and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight" (Matt. 11:25, 26)."

Dr DiVietro's comments under **Quote 140** reveal that his reaction is equivalent to that of the Jewish leaders in Luke 20:19.

"And the chief priests and the scribes the same hour sought to lay hands on him...for they perceived that he had spoken this parable against them."

The equivalent reaction of **"the chief priests and the scribes"** of the DBS Executive Committee consists of the books **A WARNING!!** and **Cleaning-Up**.

Dr DiVietro does not appreciate that the essence of **Quote 140** is in the statement *"These printed Greek one-man editions."* Note again this extract from *Hazardous Materials* pp 691-692 alluded to under **Quote 135** and which Dr DiVietro bypassed.

"Tremble" At Scrivener or Beza?

"All of the microscopic errors and varieties in printed editions of Greek Textus Receptus editions by Scrivener, Beza, Stephanus and others do not disannul their usefulness as exhibitions of the New Testament text used in the first century. Yet, they are merely intellectual exercises, not Holy Bibles which speak life to anyone today, since first century Greek is a dead language. Their only interpreter is either: 1.) a Greek-English lexicon or 2.) a Holy Bible. The many chapters to follow dissolve the myth that lexicons are God's interpreter. Jesus said, "It is the spirit that quickeneth...the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life" (John 6:63). If his words died on the paper of the original manuscripts, were buried and never rose again, where do Christians get these "lively oracles" (Acts 7:38) and what of the promise of the "scriptures...to all nations" (Rom. 16:26) and the "word of the truth of the gospel; Which is come unto you, as it is in all the world" (Col. 1:5, 6)?"

As *"intellectual exercises, not Holy Bibles which speak life to anyone today, since first century Greek is a dead language"* *"These printed Greek one-man editions"* are essentially different from the vernacular Bibles that preserved the Traditional Text down through the centuries, as Benjamin Wilkinson states. See again this extract from **Quotes 125, 138** and note that Dr DiVietro gives *no* indication in this section of his book of how **"the scripture of truth"** Daniel 10:21 was preserved as **"all scripture"** that **"is given by inspiration of God"** to counter Dr Wilkinson's remarks.

Note that Dr Wilkinson undoubtedly refers to these Bible translations as "all scripture" that "is given by inspiration of God" and descended from multiple inspiration of the scriptures in Acts 2 because he calls these translations, this author's emphases "the apostolic scriptures...The Scriptures of the apostle John and his associates, the traditional text, — the Textus Receptus, if you please...And when the Greek East for one thousand years was completely shut off from the Latin West, the noble Waldenses in northern Italy still possessed in Latin the Received Text."

*Dr DiVietro and Dr Waite would deny that the Waldenses or any Bible believers like them ever actually had “all scripture” that “is given by inspiration of God” at any time since 100 A.D. if all that they had were translations such as Wilkinson mentions like ““the old Italic Bible [of] the rude Low Latin of the second century...the language of the people.”” See point 1 above from the summary points from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.*

Job 31:11 well describes the attitude of Dr DiVietro and Dr Waite to the Bibles of those early “saints, and...martyrs for Jesus” Revelation 17:6, especially with reference to Romans 14:10, 2 Corinthians 5:10.

“For this is an heinous crime; yea, it is an iniquity to be punished by the judges.”

As for the differences between the vernacular texts, it is up to Dr DiVietro to produce them and to show that they result in errors in or inconsistencies between those texts i.e. that they are something other than ‘non-error’ of the “*he*” and “*she*” editions of the 1611 Holy Bible, Ruth 3:15. Both readings are correct because *both* Ruth and Boaz “*went into the city*.” See Ruth 4:1.

As usual, however, Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing. See remarks to this effect under **Quote 110**.

By contrast, Dr Mrs Riplinger has provided considerable substance in support of the vernacular Bibles as faithful inspired precursors to the 1611 Holy Bible for as long as their respective languages remained in spoken use. See this brief extract from **Quote 138**.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states, In Awe of Thy Word, p 628 that “The following charts document the faithful preservation of the word of God. It was given to the Goths in the book of Acts and “endureth to all generations” (Ps. 100:5). Its sounds and words are often still evident in the King James Bible...”

A total of 67 sample verses follows. Even if obviously not comprising the whole Bible, that total nevertheless compares well with Dr DiVietro’s dissenting total of zero.

Quote 141, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 692-693

“Readers who now find themselves confounded, can now contritely ask God [to] forgive them of any intellectual pride...Any one-man Greek text cannot be the sole repository of the ‘truth,’ because it produces rotten fruit by bruising the weak with doubt. The world of Greek texts and lexicons is a world of uncertainties and personal opinions. One might now ask, ‘If Scrivener’s, Green’s, and Berry’s Greek texts are not entirely reliable, **where** is the word of God? Wouldn’t it be nice if God had sifted out all of the texts and lexicons and given us what he approved, in languages men could read?’ **He has!**...Isn’t God good! Men can now stop wasting their short lives wading through Greek texts, looking for Scrivener’s idea of “truth.” The “babes” had it all along. Now let’s “do it.”” *In Dr Mrs Riplinger’s actual statement, inadvertently omitted by Dr DiVietro in **Quote 141**.*

Dr DiVietro has no comment to make on **Quote 141** at all, apart from descending into mockery again, in accusing Sister Riplinger of living in a dream world. See **Quote 110**.

What is most significant about **Quote 141** are the two ellipses it contains that, like Dr DiVietro’s other subtle ellipses or omissions, see **Quotes 39, 41, 43, 62, 65, 71, 79, 114**, conceal important statements in the context of the quote under consideration. Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statements that Dr DiVietro has deceitfully cut out of **Quote 141** are as follows, her emphases.

From p 693, the first ellipsis:

“God will hear. “Tremble” at the words written directly to man in the Holy Bible.

““[B]ut to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit and **trembleth at my word**” (Isa. 66:2).”

From pp 693-694, the second ellipsis:

“For this commandment which I command thee this day, it is not hidden from thee [in Greek texts you cannot read], neither is it far off [in Greek manuscripts you do not have]. It is not in heaven, that thou shouldest say, Who shall go up for us to heaven, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it? [It is not just “settled in heaven” and did not expire with the originals.] Neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldest say, Who shall go over the sea for us, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it? [at the Greek manuscript center in Germany]. **But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it**” (Deut. 30:11-14).”

Observe that Dr DiVietro has concealed from his readers “**the words of truth and soberness**” Acts 26:41 from “**the scripture of truth**” Daniel 10:21 that wholly support Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statements in **Quote 141**.

He doesn’t want his readers to ““Tremble” at the words written directly to man in the Holy Bible.”

Dr DiVietro has also concealed from his readers Dr Mrs Riplinger’s encouraging exhortation that God is as David describes Him in Psalm 6:9.

“**The LORD hath heard my supplication; the LORD will receive my prayer.**”

Dr DiVietro clearly does not want his readers to know “**the words of truth and soberness**” and he clearly does not want God to “**hear the prayer of thy servant**” Daniel 9:17.

He would prefer that his readers and God’s servants fossick in “*haunted Greek graveyards*” *In Awe of Thy Word* p 544 along with the DBS Excavation Committee. See **Quote 135**.

That may not be surprising in the light of Romans 3:13.

“**Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips:**”

Quote 141 completes the section in *Cleaning-Up* on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials*. As indicated earlier, see **Quotes 104, 105**, the particular attention that Chapter 18 has received in *Cleaning-Up* is such that **Quotes 105-141** should have an overview, which follows.

Quotes 105-141, An Overview

This overview will summarise Dr DiVietro's major failings with respect to his comments on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials*. (He did not produce any successes worthy of mention.)

Note first the following summary statements from earlier in this work.

From the end of **Quote 104**:

*Strictly speaking, **Quote 104** is the first quote extracted from Chapter 18 of Hazardous Materials but **Quote 105** below is the first part of Chapter 18 about which Dr DiVietro makes explicit comments on Scrivener's text. As indicated under **Quote 95**, Dr DiVietro specifically addresses Scrivener's text under **Quotes 105-141** for Chapter 18.*

From **Quote 105**:

*As indicated earlier, see **Quotes 95, 104, Quote 105** is the first extract taken from Chapter 18 of Hazardous Materials under which Dr DiVietro specifically addresses Scrivener's Greek Text. Some interesting observations may be made.*

*Dr DiVietro's quotes and comments vary in length but he makes 205 quotes in total for the 31 chapters of Hazardous Materials plus the Epilogue. No fewer than 50 quotes i.e. a quarter, **Quotes 92-141** inclusive, are aimed at Chapters 17 and 18, which concern the work of Frederick Scrivener. Of those 50 quotes, 38 (including **Quote 104**), i.e. almost a fifth of Dr DiVietro's quotes, are aimed at Chapter 18 of Hazardous Materials alone.*

Chapter 18, as indicated, 'just happens' to be the chapter on Scrivener's Greek Text.

Note further that Chapters 17 and 18 occupy less than 120 pages of the 1200 that make up Hazardous Materials, with Chapter 18 taking up 66 pages.

Dr DiVietro has therefore devoted nearly 20% of his quotes to about 5-6% of Hazardous Materials.

In sum, the DBS Executive Committee appears to have something of a fetish with respect to Scrivener's Greek Text.

*Dr DiVietro's first major failing in his comments on Chapter 18 of Hazardous Materials is his failure to "**Provide things honest in the sight of all men**" Romans 12:17. As he did earlier in his book, Dr DiVietro has made false accusations against Sister Riplinger in his comments on Chapter 18. See **Quotes 104, 108, 109, 111, 114, 116, 119, 120, 124, 125, 126, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 137, 138, 139, 140**.*

Something of a fetish with respect to Scrivener's Greek Text notwithstanding, Dr DiVietro is strangely loath to address the particular verses of scripture where Dr Mrs Riplinger has highlighted Scrivener's departures from the King James New Testament.

Dr DiVietro's second major failing in his comments on Chapter 18 of Hazardous Materials is therefore his failure to discuss specific errors in Scrivener's text.

See this extract from **Quote 105**.

*Yet in spite of his disproportionate focus on Chapter 18 of Hazardous Materials, see above, Dr DiVietro devotes no more than two quotes out of 38, **Quotes 130, 131** to this detailed material that occupies pp 654-677 of Hazardous Materials, 24 of the 66 pages inclusive of Hazardous Materials i.e. over a third of the chapter and the most detailed portion of the chapter with respect to the actual readings of Scrivener's text.*

*Even **Quotes 130, 131** make no specific mention of Bro. Heisey's detailed work. Dr DiVietro's comments in total under these quotes amount to no more than half a page and, apart*

from brief remarks on Scrivener's text, mainly in **Quote 130**, consist of little more than further attacks on Sister Riplinger, that under **Quote 131** being particularly objectionable.

Bro. Heisey has shown further that Dr DiVietro's failing with respect to errors in Scrivener's text is shared by Dr D. A. Waite and therefore in turn by the entire DBS Executive Committee. See this extract from **Quote 108**.

www.hacalumni.com/pdfs/WaitingForDrWaite.pdf

Waiting for Dr. Waite, June 2010, pp 3-4

To be blunt, the title of this work has probably already engendered a question in the mind of the reader: "Waiting for what?", or "Waiting for Dr. Waite to do what?" To be direct: Waiting for Dr. Waite to give an honest, straightforward, unequivocal answer to two simple questions. The title of this work actually came about because of Dr. Waite's refusal to give this author an answer to the following simple questions: "Does F.H.A. Scrivener's Greek text need to be corrected so as to match the exact readings underlying the King James Bible New Testament?" and, "Is the text of the King James Bible without error?" To date, this author has not received nor seen a direct, straightforward, consistent, well-explained, non-contradictory answer from Dr. Waite to these two questions. In fact, as will be shown below, Dr. Waite has contradicted himself on these issues as well as several others which are related to them. The word of God says in James 1:8, "A double minded man is unstable in all his ways." And in James 5:12b, "but let your yea be yea; and your nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation." Dr. Waite should obey these biblical exhortations and "tell us plainly" (John 10:24) what he really does believe."

Bro. Heisey includes in the above work the email exchanges between Dr Waite and himself on Scrivener's departures from the King James New Testament that are listed above, which Bro. Heisey comments on in detail in Hazardous Materials pp 668-677.

Nowhere in that extensive exchange does Dr Waite provide direct answers to the two questions given in the extract above from Bro. Heisey's work.

*Dr DiVietro's third and fourth major failings in his comments on Chapter 18 of Hazardous Materials are his failure to emphasise that Scrivener's text is not the **exact** text underlying the King James New Testament and in turn his failure to emphasise that Scrivener's text is not "**the word of God**" but "**the word of men**" 1 Thessalonians 2:13.*

*See this extract from **Quote 106**.*

*The essential issues under **Quote 106** and its context, following from **Quote 105**, are that:*

- *Scrivener, the TBS and David Cloud have created a false impression that Scrivener's text is the exact Greek New Testament Text of the 1611 Holy Bible, which it is not. The DBS Executive Committee is complicit in this deception. See **Quote 107**.*
- *Scrivener's text carries a manmade copyright, like modern versions, that immediately disqualifies it from being "**the word of God**" 1 Thessalonians 2:13, as Dr Mrs Riplinger explains in her statement giving the full context of **Quote 106**.*

*Scrivener's text is therefore "**the word of men**" 1 Thessalonians 2:13 and although it largely reflects the text of the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament, it is not the exact Greek text underlying the English Authorized New Testament, as Scrivener, Cloud and the TBS wrongly imply.*

Dr DiVietro should have been willing to warn his readers of the shortcomings of Scrivener's text in the above respects. He does not.

See also **Quotes 106, 107, 108, 112** and **Quote 114** particularly with respect to the issue of copyright.

Dr DiVietro's fifth major failing in his comments on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* is *his failure to declare a personal interest in promoting Scrivener's text as 'the' Greek text underlying the King James New Testament*. See this extract from **Quote 108**.

*As Sister Riplinger has stated separately to this author, Dr DiVietro will be receiving royalties from the publication mentioned below. Contrary to his insinuation under **Quote 104**, Sister Riplinger states that she has not received royalties or taken an income from A. V. Publications for the last 17 years.*

www.logos.com/product/366/scriveners-textus-receptus-1881-20

Overview

*The Textus Receptus 1881 Greek text is **the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version**. The Scrivener text is a modified Beza 1598 Textus Receptus in which changes have been made **to reflect the readings chosen by the KJV translators**. Scrivener's intent was to artificially create a **Greek text that closely matched the translator-modified Textus Receptus text and the resulting English version**. This is a useful text for comparison for those with proficiency in Greek.*

Title: *Scrivener's Textus Receptus (1881) 2.0*

Authors: *F. H. A. Scrivener, Kirk DiVietro*

Price: \$24.95

See also **Quotes 112, 116, 118, 119, 132, 133**.

Dr DiVietro's sixth major failing in his comments on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* is *his failure to recognise that differences between published editions of the Received Texts induce students to perceive that the King James New Testament contains errors*. See this extract from **Quote 109**.

Emphases are Dr Mrs Riplinger's.

"This 1550 edition [of Stephanus, compiled by Berry] differs from the Textus Receptus and the "Originall Greeke" underlying the KJB a number of times.

- ✓ *In 80 places Berry's Interlinear Greek-English does not follow other editions of the Textus Receptus or the "Originall Greeke" underlying the King James Bible.*
- ✓ *Even Beza (1598 and 1598) and Scrivener agree with the KJB approximately 113 times against Stephanus's third edition of 1550...*

*"Like Scrivener's, Berry's Greek text has few serious errors, but its venial mistakes make readers **seriously** doubt the accuracy of their Holy Bible. That is serious."*

See this extract from **Quote 115**.

Dr DiVietro should have reflected on 1 Corinthians 5:6.

"Your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leavened the whole lump?"

*Dr DiVietro evidently doesn't. What Dr Mrs Riplinger has shown in the context of **Quote 115** is another example of "a little folly," "a little leaven," "little foxes," "a little member" and "a little fire" and their effects.*

See also **Quotes 116, 134, 135, 136** for further remarks with respect to "**a little leaven**" etc.

The following poem, also from **Quote 115**, applies strictly to the intrigues of the 1881 revisers under Westcott and Hort under their mentor “*transformed into an angel of light*” 2 Corinthians 11:14. However, it also applies to *the effect* of differences in the editions of the Received Text in prompting readers to *doubt*, Genesis 3:1, the 1611 Holy Bible. The mentor is the same one as in 2 Corinthians 11:14.

Making The Evil Seem Good

*In all he did, in all he taught,
He kept this aim in sight;
To get the deeds of darkness done,
Disguised as works of light.

He spread his poison, slow and sure,
Through many a specious sect,
And made the evil seem the good,
Bamboozling God’s elect - Selected*

Dr DiVietro’s seventh major failing in his comments on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* is his failure to acknowledge that Scrivener of necessity used reverse translation for much of the King James New Testament in order to create his own text. See this extract from **Quote 114**.

The possibility of Scrivener having carried out his own trial translation is reinforced by the following statement from Hazardous Materials p 639, which also indicates that Dr Mrs Riplinger is entirely aware that Scrivener’s text is largely Beza’s, in spite her accusers’ insistence to the contrary, according to the above extract. The extract from p 639 of Hazardous Materials reads as follows, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases and this author’s under-linings, those in bold indicating added emphases on Dr Mrs Riplinger’s part.

*“Scrivener begins his **original** preface by explaining his RV Committee’s charge to him to create this volume for comparison purposes for their project. In the original preface Scrivener gives a seven page description of the purpose of the work as related to his RV work. He adds an eight page appendix at the end of the volume listing the verses where he departs from the readings of Beza’s Greek text. **He adds a final page to show some of the places where he did not follow the Greek text underlying the KJB** (Scrivener, *The New*, p 656).”*

*Note that the above statement appears in garbled form under **Quote 115** as part of Dr DiVietro’s comments, not as part of the quote. That apparent anomaly will be addressed under **Quote 115**.*

The underlined statement in the above extract shows first that Dr Mrs Riplinger does in fact perceive Scrivener’s text as largely Beza’s. However, it also strongly suggests that, in the absence at the time of any specific information about the extent to which the King’s men used each of their available Greek sources for their work, Scrivener did his own reverse translation and then compared it with what he thought was the translators’ most likely source i.e. the final editions of Beza’s text but also any other sources that he had.*

Dr Mrs Riplinger states that Scrivener only used printed editions of the Received Text for his text. See Hazardous Materials p 640 and **Quote 116.*

The obvious question is, how, in fact, could he have done otherwise, a priori? As indicated above, his reverse translation would only be evident where the King James New Testament departs from Beza’s text. It is therefore rash for Dr Riplinger’s accusers to assume that only those parts of the King James New Testament were subjected to reverse translation by Scriv-

ener. *It is most unlikely that he would have known in advance specifically which parts of the King James New Testament that they were.*

Bro. Heisey has helpfully summarised material from Scrivener's original Preface, see *Hazardous Materials* pp 640-643 to show that Scrivener confined himself to pre-1611 published editions of the Received Text.

*Scrivener himself, in his preface pp. viii and ix, makes mention of this as well (emphases are mine). p.viii "Wherever therefore the Authorised renderings agree with other Greek readings which might naturally be known **through printed editions***...Beza's reading has been displaced from the text." *See Hazardous Materials p 640, also **Quote 116**.*

What Scrivener is saying is that where Beza had one thing and the KJB's apparent underlying text had something else, Scrivener left Beza's (mistaken) reading because Beza could not find the KJB's EXACT underlying reading in Scrivener's handful of pre-1611 "printed Greek [and only Greek] editions."

Scrivener states further on p.ix, without qualification, that "It was manifestly necessary to accept only printed [this is evident from the context of pp. viii and ix] Greek (and only Greek) authority..."

Furthermore, Scrivener refers again to his limited number and type of source text in the Appendix p. 648 as follows.

"...wherein the readings of Beza's N.T. of 1598 are departed from, to agree with those adopted by the Authorised Version, on the authority of certain earlier [printed – again clear from the context since Scrivener himself refers the reader back to his Preface pp. viii, ix] Greek (and only Greek – clear again from the context) editions."

Scrivener could have produced a useful 'map' or handbook of the extent to which the King James New Testament matched (not necessarily followed) pre-1611 published Greek editions by means of his Greek edition and then highlighted all readings where they used other sources that could then have been identified either by means of extant Greek manuscripts or pre-1611 vernacular versions. A full collation of the King James New Testament with all extant, i.e. in the 19th century, textual sources available to the King's men would then have revealed something of God's preservation of **"the words of the LORD"** according to Psalm 12:6, 7. God would then have been glorified according to 1 Corinthians 10:31.

"...whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God."

However, Scrivener failed to do so as this extract from **Quote 114** shows.

Scrivener's method for creating a comparative Greek text for the King James New Testament – see Hazardous Materials p 631 - would have been technically sound where he could establish that his trial translation matched either Beza's text or one of the other Greek sources at his disposal but he was unable to do so for all of the King James New Testament.

*Regrettably, instead of obeying Romans 12:17 to **"Provide things honest in the sight of all men"** by simply highlighting those parts of the King James New Testament for which he had no Greek witnesses, he speculated wrongly about use by the King's men of the Latin Vulgate and/or inserted his own presumed readings.*

Scrivener did not obey Jeremiah 13:16 therefore and the DBS Executive Committee members have not honoured it either.

“Give glory to the LORD your God, before he cause darkness, and before your feet stumble upon the dark mountains, and, while ye look for light, he turn it into the shadow of death, and make it gross darkness.”

Dr DiVietro’s eighth major failing in his comments on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* is his recurring failure to substantiate his comments. See **Quotes 111, 114, 117, 120, 134, 138, 139, 140, 141.**

Dr DiVietro’s ninth major failing in his comments on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* is his recurring failure to honour the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See **Quotes 114, 126, 135.**

Dr DiVietro’s tenth major failing in his comments on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* is his failure to produce a full collation of Scrivener’s text either against the King James New Testament or against any other editions of the Received Text. See this extract from **Quote 120.**

It should be noted that neither Dr Waite nor Dr DiVietro has produced a full collation of Scrivener’s text against the 1611 Authorized New Testament or even a partial collation to match that of Dr Mrs Riplinger and Bro. Heisey in Hazardous Materials pp 654-677. See Quote 108. Dr DiVietro is therefore not in a position to level his accusation against Sister Riplinger of insufficient collation of Scrivener’s text.

See also **Quotes 131, 132.** Dr Mrs Riplinger and Bro. Heisey have between them produced much more extensive collations of Greek Received Text editions with respect to the King James New Testament than have ever been published by Dr DiVietro, Dr Waite or any other member of the DBS Executive Committee to date. When questioned on that issue they either prevaricate or ignore the questions outright, see *Waiting for Dr. Waite, June 2010, pp 3-4* above and when the issue is brought to the fore elsewhere, e.g. in *Hazardous Materials*, they seek to denigrate and humiliate the researcher instead of obeying 1 Thessalonians 5:21 to **“Prove all things.”**

As Bro. Heisey notes, it may be that Drs Waite, Williams and DiVietro and the rest of the DBS Executive Committee have thus far refrained from doing such a full collation of Greek Received Text editions with respect to the King James New Testament because they are afraid of what they’ll find.

In which case, with the publication of *Hazardous Materials*, Job 3:25 has come to pass for the august but evasive members of the DBS Executive Committee.

“For the thing which I greatly feared is come upon me, and that which I was afraid of is come unto me.”

Dr DiVietro’s eleventh and twelfth major failings in his comments on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* are his failure to acknowledge that other editions of Scrivener’s text exist besides those ‘owned’ by the DBS Executive Committee and in turn his failure to explain why his and the DBS editions should be considered superior to the others. See this extract from **Quote 120.**

Dr Mrs Riplinger, courtesy of Bro. Heisey, has forwarded to this author a copy of a paper entitled Analysis of Various Copies of Scrivener’s Text by Alan Bunning, March 3rd 2007. Alan Bunning lists 5 copies of Scrivener’s text; the Aivazian, Kazes, Unbound Bible, 1894 Trinitarian Bible Society and Online Bible texts. Alan Bunning has compared those texts with Scrivener’s published 1881 text and has found numerous differences, many of which are minor, such as orthographic differences but some more serious in the form of alterations in the text. The Unbound Bible, Trinitarian Bible Society and Online Bible texts each has only

one or two such alterations but the Aivazian and Kazes texts have in excess of 100 and 400 alterations respectively.

The nature, significance and number of the differences between the various extant copies of Scrivener's text notwithstanding, the fact that these distinct copies even exist should prompt Dr DiVietro to explain why his and his co-editor's particular text is superior to any other.

Dr DiVietro does not do so.

Neither does he appear to have considered the implications of trying to exalt his and his co-editor's manmade work above **"the scripture of truth"** Daniel 10:21 that the Lord has exalted above all His name Psalm 138:2.

He should.

See **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint** and Isaiah 42:8.

"I am the LORD: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images."

Dr DiVietro's thirteenth major failing in his comments on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* is his failure to acknowledge his co-editor's duplicity in creating the false impression that the King James translators used the Catholic Vulgate of Jerome. See this extract from **Quote 122**.

Dr DiVietro complains that Dr Mrs Riplinger has wilfully misunderstood the intent of his co-editor, who, according to Dr DiVietro, is simply saying that he thinks that the King James translators may have used the Vulgate in some places but that he can't be sure. Dr DiVietro insists that his co-editor is being more honest than Dr Mrs Riplinger and tries to excuse him on the basis that Scrivener was writing in the 1880s.

Neither Scrivener nor Dr DiVietro has obeyed Romans 12:17 to **"Provide things honest in the sight of all men"** with respect to **Quote 122**. Dr DiVietro has also quickly forgotten the contents of **Quote 121**, which is reproduced below.

*"In other words, he assumed as he admits, that he knows what Greek evidence the KJB translators had. He assumed they had only "printed editions," not old, hand-written manuscripts (manu means 'hand', scripts means 'written'). This is a bald assumption. **The KJB translators very obviously had Greek evidence because the readings, which he pretends came from the Latin, are in MANY Greek printed editions today.** Scrivener even had these Greek editions, he "assumed" that the KJB translators did not know of these readings **since** they only appeared in "printed editions" since the KJB translation. Totally false is **the self-limiting criteria** he established to construct his Greek text (i.e. only **printed** editions before 1611, not Greek manuscripts pre-dating the KJB or Greek printed editions post-dating the KJB). The KJB translators had a wealth of hand-written manuscripts, compiled for 1500 years before the printing press was widely used. Perusal of the catalogue of the libraries in England before and during the KJB translation reveals many, many of these. The royal library and British Universities were storehouses of Bible manuscripts."*

See also **Quote 124**.

Dr DiVietro's fourteenth major failing in his comments on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* is his recurring failure to specify what is **"all scripture"** that **"is given by inspiration of God"** 2 Timothy 3:16 between two covers. See this extract from **Quote 123**.

In sum, according to Dr DiVietro, evidently with the unanimous agreement of the DBS Executive Committee, the following key points emerge from the above extracts with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible and published Greek New Testament texts.

- *The 1611 Holy Bible is perfect in that it does not need to be changed or improved.*
- *The 1611 Holy Bible is not perfect in that it does not convey the original perfectly.*
- *The 1611 Holy Bible is not inspired.*
- *The 1611 Holy Bible is not finally authoritative.*
- *The 1611 Holy Bible is, however, God-guided, even though God could not inspire it or make it finally authoritative as “all scripture” that “is given by inspiration of God.”*
- *No published or extant Greek source was/is infallible, inerrant, finally authoritative or perfect.*
- *‘The’ Greek text, however, was/is infallible, inerrant, finally authoritative and perfect.*
- *Scrivener’s text might be that Greek text, even where it departs from the 1611 Holy Bible.*

*However, the precise location of the above infallible, inerrant, finally authoritative and perfect (and evidently inspired, original) Greek text, together with that of its Hebrew/Aramaic Old Testament counterpart between two covers nevertheless remains undisclosed by Dr DiVietro. See also **Quote(s) III** with respect to Dr DiVietro’s on-going failure in that respect.*

*Dr DiVietro’s fifteenth major failing in his comments on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* is his failure to show from scripture why extant Greek witnesses to the New Testament text should predominate above all others, including “early English and foreign Bibles.” See this extract from **Quote 124**.*

[Dr DiVietro] has yet to show from scripture why extant Greek witnesses to the New Testament text should predominate above all others, including “early English and foreign Bibles.” Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement above shows that the King James translators did not believe that Greek witnesses should predominate, even though they translated the New Testament from “the Originall Greeke” as effectively the earliest i.e. 1st century form of the New Testament or at least among the earliest forms.*

Keep in mind this extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint and related remarks concerning Hoskier’s researches.*

*That “**the word of God**” was propagated in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek in the early church is further noted by Dr Mrs Riplinger in a remarkable reference from one particular servant of God whom the Body of Christ would perceive as a most trusted source. Emphases are Dr Mrs Riplinger’s.*

*“In Foxes Book of Martyrs, Vol. 4, pp. 671-675, Foxe quotes an old “treatise.” To him, who lived in the 1500s, “old” would definitely be well before the 1400s certainly, probably much, much older than that. It said, “**Also the four evangelists wrote the gospel in divers languages, as Matthew in Judea, Mark in Italy, Luke in Achaia, and John in Asia. And all these wrote in the languages of the same countries...**” It goes on to say, “since Christ commanded his apostles to preach his gospel unto all the world, and excepted no people or language.” Such an old witness, through a man as highly esteemed as Foxe, can hardly be dismissed.”*

See also *Quotes 126, 128, 132*.

Dr DiVietro's sixteenth major failing in his comments on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* is his failure to recognise the scriptural basis for inspiration of translations. See this extract from *Quote 125*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement in In Awe of Thy Word pp 547-548, her emphases, should also be remembered. The entire sections of In Awe of Thy Word, entitled INSPIRATION & TRANSLATION, Views of the King James Translators and Inspiration, Translations & the King of Kings pp 540ff, Dr Mrs Riplinger's capitalisations, should be read in the context of Quote 125 and Dr DiVietro's lame objections to it.

Neither Dr Waite nor Dr DiVietro has either refuted or even addressed the following statement.

"Translation brings life and prevents death. Enoch was "translated that he should not see death," and so are God's words (Heb. 11:5). Through Bible translation, Christ and his words can be made known to all nations and generations to come, in spite of the fact that Koine Greek died around A.D. 800 as a spoken language. Modern Greek pronunciation is different in many ways from ancient Koine. The since-dissolved 'original Greek' manuscripts and the library-scarce critical editions are like an arrow through the air with no destination (1 Cor. 14:9). Only when its shell dissolves, as the original manuscripts no doubt did, can the generating and life-giving germ bear fruitful and "profitable" food (2 Tim. 3:16). When it bears fruit, the fruit retains its own life-giving seeds. These seeds in turn can give life once again. Translations keep God's words alive"...

*Concerning Acts 2 and inspiration of scripture in many languages that Dr DiVietro has denied, see the detailed remarks under **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** and note the following summary statements for **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** from **Challenges #1-#7 – Overview and Necessary Additional Observations**, following comments by Bro. Peter Heisey, missionary to Romania. See the list of points that follows the foregoing extract.*

See also *Quotes 126, 127*.

Dr DiVietro's seventeenth major failing in his comments on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* is his failure to acknowledge the serious faults in Scrivener's text that Dr Mrs Riplinger has identified in Chapters 17, 18 of *Hazardous Materials*. See this extract from *Quote 131*.

What Dr DiVietro does not challenge and therefore cannot deny is Dr Mrs Riplinger's summary of the major shortcomings of Scrivener's text on pp 678-679 of Hazardous Materials:

- *Scrivener ignored Greek manuscripts underlying the AV1611 in at least 20 places.*
- *The title of Scrivener's text, The New Testament in Greek According to the Text Followed in the Authorized Version, see Hazardous Materials p 632, is misleading.*
- *Scrivener's 59 so-called Latin readings in the AV1611 can easily be shown to have Greek manuscript support for at least 24 of them.*
- *Scrivener was wrong in arbitrarily limiting the Greek sources for his text to pre-1611 published editions and ignoring the manuscript sources available to the King James translators, of which Scrivener himself was aware.*
- *Scrivener has been shown in Chapter 17 of Hazardous Materials to hold heretical views that he allowed to prejudice his views on the Greek text underlying the King James New Testament.*

- “One error in Scrivener’s disannuls the supposed infallibility of his text” as implied by its title. See second bullet point above. (It is futile for Dr DiVietro to protest as he does under **Quote 130** that Scrivener did not claim to be infallible. That is not the impression conveyed by the title of Scrivener’s text, or that authored by Scrivener and his co-editor, Kirk DiVietro; “The Textus Receptus 1881 Greek text is **the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version**” (price \$24.95). See **Quote 108.**)

Instead of venting his spleen at Dr Mrs Riplinger as he does under **Quote 131**, Dr DiVietro should, in the light of the bulleted disclosures above, again reflect upon Proverbs 17:28. See **Quote 121.**

“Even a fool, when he holdeth his peace, is counted wise: and he that shutteth his lips is esteemed a man of understanding.”

Dr DiVietro’s eighteenth (!) major failing in his comments on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* is his failure to remain coherent and rational when confronted with statements that he doesn’t like. See, for example, this extract from **Quote 138.**

Dr DiVietro is most irate at **Quote 138.** He accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of stating that the Holy Ghost gave the words of the Bishops’ Bible in Acts 2...

Yet again, Dr DiVietro has falsely accused Sister Riplinger and distorted what she said. See **Quotes 131, 135.** Dr Mrs Riplinger did not say that the Bishops’ Bible is the Holy Ghost’s words on the day of Pentecost. She said in the sentence immediately following the opening statement of **Quote 138** to which Dr DiVietro takes exception that “The words of the 1611 English Bible (KJB) had their origin in languages and words which were given through the Holy Ghost’s gift of tongues in Acts 2.”

Dr DiVietro takes exception to that statement from **Quote 138** as well but it clearly does not say what Dr DiVietro accuses Sister Riplinger of in his opening comment under **Quote 138.**

As Proverbs 14:16 states:

“A wise man feareth, and departeth from evil: but the fool rageth, and is confident.”

In sum, Dr DiVietro’s comments on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* reveal manifold major failings:

1. his failure to **“Provide things honest in the sight of all men”** Romans 12:17
2. his failure to discuss specific errors in Scrivener’s text
3. his failure to emphasise that Scrivener’s text is not the **exact** text underlying the King James New Testament
4. his failure to emphasise that Scrivener’s text is not **“the word of God”** but **“the word of men”** 1 Thessalonians 2:13
5. his failure to declare a personal interest in promoting Scrivener’s text as ‘the’ Greek text underlying the King James New Testament
6. his failure to recognise that differences between published editions of the Received Texts induce students to perceive that the King James New Testament contains errors
7. his failure to acknowledge that Scrivener of necessity used reverse translation for much of the King James New Testament in order to create his own text
8. his recurring failure to substantiate his comments. See **Quotes 111, 114, 117, 120, 134, 138, 139, 140, 141**

9. *his recurring failure to honour the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See **Quotes 114, 126, 135***
10. *his failure to produce a full collation of Scrivener's text either against the King James New Testament or against any other editions of the Received Text*
11. *his failure to acknowledge that other editions of Scrivener's text exist besides those 'owned' by the DBS Executive Committee*
12. *his failure in turn to explain why his and the DBS editions should be considered superior to the others*
13. *his failure to acknowledge his co-editor's duplicity in creating the false impression that the King James translators used the Catholic Vulgate of Jerome*
14. *his recurring failure to specify what is "all scripture" that "is given by inspiration of God" 2 Timothy 3:16 between two covers*
15. *his failure to show from scripture why extant Greek witnesses to the New Testament text should predominate above all others, including "early English and foreign Bibles"*
16. *his failure to recognise the scriptural basis for inspiration of translations*
17. *his failure to acknowledge the serious faults in Scrivener's text that Dr Mrs Riplinger has identified in Chapters 17, 18 of Hazardous Materials*
18. *his failure to remain coherent and rational when confronted with statements that he doesn't like*

That list compares well with the ones that Dr DiVietro and his cronies compiled against Sister Riplinger in *Cleaning-Up* pp vii-xii, 9-10.

"Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" Galatians 6:7.

Quote(s) 142, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 698-699

Quote(s) 142 is the introduction to "**George R. Berry: Interlinear Greek-English New Testament.**" It occupies most of pp 698-699 of *Hazardous Materials* and begins with the statement that "Although he did not write either the Greek or English texts of his *Interlinear Greek-English New Testament*, strangely George Ricker Berry (1865-1945) put his name alone on them. The Greek text is that of Stephens (Stephanus) third edition, first published in 1550. The English so-called literal translation below the Greek is by Thomas Newberry. The critical footnotes are also those of Newberry. The Newberry family website says of George Ricker Berry's *Interlinear Greek-English New Testament*, "This interlinear is simply an American reprint of the Bagster edition prepared by Thomas Newberry (1877) with a different introduction and with G. R. Berry's *Lexicon and Synonyms* added to the end" (www.newblehome.co.uk/newberry/bible.html)."

Dr DiVietro's **Quote(s) 142** therefore occupies over a page of his book, yet his comments are trite in the extreme (occupying only about five lines). He says that Berry's text is not perfect and that it does not exactly follow the King James New Testament. However, Dr DiVietro adds that the criticisms of Berry's text in Chapter 19 of *Hazardous Materials* will be the same as those for Scrivener's text in Chapter 18 and that Dr Mrs Riplinger therefore need not have written Chapter 19.

It is first noted that Dr DiVietro is clearly implying in his comments that neither George Ricker Berry nor his Greek text is deserving of Dr Mrs Riplinger's criticism, that is, any im-

perfections in Berry's Greek text may be ignored. It should also be noted that Dr DiVietro has no comment to make on George Ricker Berry's flagrant piracy of another author's work. Psalm 50:18 comes to mind.

“When thou sawest a thief, then thou consentedst with him, and hast been partaker with adulterers.”

The Newberry-Berry text and its interlinear English are flawed, as even Dr DiVietro's comments under ***Quote(s) 142*** imply. Unlike Dr DiVietro, however, Dr Mrs Riplinger identifies many of the flaws in the Newberry-Berry text and its interlinear English for the benefit of the reader. She lists in turn 10 examples of serious errors in the Newberry-Berry text on pp 701-703 of *Hazardous Materials* with respect to the following verses; Luke 17:36, Romans 12:11, Luke 2:22, James 2:18, 1 Timothy 1:4, Romans 8:11, Revelation 3:1, John 16:33, 1 John 2:23b, Mark 2:15.

Dr DiVietro bypasses them as he did with the 64 examples that Dr Mrs Riplinger and Bro. Heisey identified as significant errors in Scrivener's text. See ***Quote 108*** and the end of ***Quote 137***. The last part of Psalm 50:18 therefore has application to Dr DiVietro's condoning of the adulteration of ***“the scripture of truth”*** Daniel 10:21 by serial Greek editorial adulterers.

By means of one of his subtle ellipses, see ***Quotes 39, 41, 43, 62, 65, 71, 79, 114, 141***, Dr DiVietro bypasses the following statement on p 699 of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphasis.

“Berry gives no credit whatsoever to Newberry and nowhere identifies that his volume is an exact reprint of another author's work!”

As indicated above, Dr DiVietro seems entirely at home with spiritual adulterers and plagiarists, showing how 2 Timothy 3:13 is coming to pass in these ***“perilous times”*** 2 Timothy 3:1.

“But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger's writing of Chapter 19 of *Hazardous Materials* has therefore already been vindicated. It has shown up the duplicity of one Kirk DiVietro, Th. M., Ph. D.

It is highly presumptuous of Dr DiVietro to claim that Chapter 19 of *Hazardous Materials* will serve no useful purpose. The Newberry-Berry text is widely used. Its peculiar shortcomings should be revealed. See Dr Mrs Riplinger's statements to that effect with respect to the particular errors that occur in the Newberry-Berry text for Luke 17:36, Romans 12:11, James 2:18, for example, where by contrast, the editions of Beza, Elzevir and Scrivener correctly follow the 1611 Authorized New Testament, along with the Stephanus 1551 text.

As Dr Mrs Riplinger states on pp 700-701 of *Hazardous Materials* *“Woe be unto the student of Greek who thinks that he has ‘the originals’ in Berry's Interlinear Greek-English (Stephanus 3rd edition, 1550) or even the best of Stephanus, when one year later Stephanus realized his error and included the verse.”*

No doubt Dr DiVietro would prefer that the student consults the Scrivener/DiVietro text (price \$24.95) for ‘the originals,’ see ***Quote 108***, although Dr Mrs Riplinger has shown that it too is flawed. See ***Quote 137***.

Dr DiVietro should in the meantime pay careful attention to Psalm 19:13. See ***Quote 95***.

“Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins; let them not have dominion over me: then shall I be upright, and I shall be innocent from the great transgression.”

Quote 143, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 700, 709

“Would a Greek edition of the Textus Receptus, like Berry’s Interlinear Greek-English, which omits an entire verse, omits the Lord, and calls Jesus a sinner, be a good Greek text to hand to Bible school students? Yet, some unknowingly do so. Would it be a help to easily molded Barbie dolls, who are too busy ‘blogging’ to bother with the 1200 verbal forms found in Greek? Yet these both claim to read ‘the originals’ in the Textus Receptus’ using Berry’s English.”

*“The **English** so-called literal translation of the Stephanus Greek text in Berry’s Interlinear Greek-English was originally written by Thomas Newberry in 1893...Few take Berry’s (Newberry’s) **English** translation seriously, any more than a doctor would look in a pre-school reader for insights. It is simply a make-believe tool for those who feel compelled to pretend they are **reading** Greek words, when in fact they are simply reading **English** words.”*

Dr DiVietro has little comment of substance on **Quote 143**. He simply says that as a student, he was told that the United Bible Society second edition Greek New Testament was the authoritative Greek text and that any departures from it would be noted in the critical apparatus. Dr DiVietro states that the UBS 2nd Edition critical apparatus did not note all the departures and that he set out on his own to identify the Greek text of the King James New Testament. He found that Berry’s Greek text was close to the King James New Testament even if not an exact match. Dr DiVietro states that he checked Berry’s Greek text by means of a grid that concealed the interlinear English text.

He adds that his method of checking Berry’s Greek text shows that he wasn’t a naive student such as Dr Mrs Riplinger describes but a thinking student of the word of God (still unspecified between two covers, see **Challenges #1, #3, #5, #7, Points-Counterpoints, Challenges #1-#7**, summaries and overall summaries and **Quotes 4, 7, 8, 10, 16, 28, 33, 35, 36, 49, 52, 59, 61, 85, 86, 90, 92, 94, 95, 98, 108, 109, 111, 112, 114, 123**).

Dr DiVietro is of course admitting under **Quote 143** that he did his own translation to determine where Berry’s text departs from the King James New Testament. That was the only way that he could have identified the departures. He doesn’t say how much of Stephanus’s text he translated or which departures that he identified but again, Dr DiVietro’s admission begs the question of why hasn’t the DBS Executive Committee carried out an exhaustive collation of the published Greek texts to compare them with each other and with the King James New Testament?

See **Quotes 105-141, An Overview** and Dr DiVietro’s tenth major failing with respect to his comments on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials*.

Is it because they would then have to acknowledge that even the DBS Executive Committee doesn’t have ‘the’ Greek text of the King James New Testament, *Cleaning-Up* p 21, though they’d like folk to think that they do have it according to the statement *“The Textus Receptus 1881 Greek text is **the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version**”* (price \$24.95), see **Quotes 108, 137**.

Or is it because they would then be compelled to give unequivocal answers to the questions for which Bro. Heisey is still awaiting an answer since June 2010 from Dr Waite? (See **Quote 144** for evidence that Dr DiVietro and Dr Waite *have* provided answers to Bro. Heisey’s second question, even if inadvertently.)

It should be recalled that Dr Waite has stated the following with respect to Scrivener’s text. See **Quote 97**, in *A WARNING!!* p 28 as cited in **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society** p 25, this author’s underlining.

P. 28 “*The “Scrivener Greek New Testament” is not “slightly tainted.” I believe the Words in this “Greek New Testament” to be accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words. I believe them to be authentic copies of the original New Testament Words. It is sad that Gail Riplinger refuses to take this same position.*”

Bro. Heisey’s questions are “*Does F.H.A. Scrivener’s Greek text need to be corrected so as to match the exact readings underlying the King James Bible New Testament?*” and, “*Is the text of the King James Bible without error?*”

See **Quotes 105-141, An Overview**, *Waiting for Dr. Waite, June 2010, pp 3-4* and **Quote 123** with respect to this summary statement on Dr DiVietro’s unequivocal verdict on the 1611 Holy Bible.

No Bible translation is perfect, even if 100% accurately translated and never can be. See Quote(s) 175, Cleaning-Up p 249.

Dr Waite, with Dr DiVietro’s assistance, should therefore be able to answer Bro. Heisey’s questions easily and without delay. He has not done so but, as indicated, answers to Bro. Heisey’s second question that Drs Waite and DiVietro have let slip will be elaborated upon under **Quote 144**.

Dr DiVietro has bypassed those important issues in his comments under **Quote 143** because, as mentioned above, he has given no indication of any full collation carried out by the DBS Executive Committee of Greek texts for comparison with each other and with the King James New Testament. Such a collation would be essential to substantiate Dr DiVietro’s assertion that even the King James Bible is imperfect, even if accurately translated.

The collective ire of the DBS Executive Committee members directed against Sister Riplinger for her conclusions about the King James New Testament versus ‘the Greek’ therefore surely obligates the members to carry out such a collation but thus far they have evaded their responsibilities in that respect.

His comments under **Quote 143** show that Dr DiVietro has also skipped over some important information on pp 701-709 of *Hazardous Materials* that would certainly warn ‘a thinking student of the word of God’ (the 1611 Holy Bible, between two covers) about the untrustworthy and inconsistent nature of the Newberry-Berry text.

See **Quote 109** and Dr Mrs Riplinger’s summary statement from p 696 of *Hazardous Materials* that Dr DiVietro also carelessly bypassed.

“This 1550 edition [of Stephanus, compiled by [Newberry]-Berry] differs from the Textus Receptus and the “Originall Greeke” underlying the KJB a number of times.

- ✓ *In 80 places Berry’s Interlinear Greek-English does not follow other editions of the Textus Receptus or the “Originall Greeke” underlying the King James Bible.*
- ✓ *Even Beza (1598 and 1598) and Scrivener agree with the KJB approximately 113 times against Stephanus’s third edition of 1550...*

“Like Scrivener’s, Berry’s Greek text has few serious errors, but its venial mistakes make readers seriously doubt the accuracy of their Holy Bible. That is serious.”

See **Quote(s) 142** with respect to the 10 examples of serious errors in the Newberry-Berry text listed on pp 701-703 of *Hazardous Materials*. See pp 703-705 of *Hazardous Materials* with respect to the 193 multiple errors in the Newberry-Berry text, followed by the 59 readings where the 1550 Stephanus/Newberry-Berry text *matches* the King James New Testament (and is therefore correct) *against* the 1589 and 1598 editions of Beza’s text.

Pp 706-709 of *Hazardous Materials* list a further 36 verses where the 1550 Stephanus/Newberry-Berry text is in error, many of those errors being shared with Scrivener's text. See **Quote 108** and the list of Scrivener's 64 departures from the King James New Testament that Dr Mrs Riplinger and Bro. Heisey have identified. (Note that strictly speaking, Colossians 1:24 in Scrivener's text is correct but he charges that the King James translators took the word **"Who"** from Latin sources only, implying that they did so in error.)

The lists mentioned above would very likely prompt 'a thinking student of the word of God' (the 1611 Holy Bible, between two covers) to ask the question 'Which Greek?' Dr Mrs Riplinger provides the student with insights into how to answer that question in *Hazardous Materials*. Dr DiVietro provides nothing remotely comparable in *Cleaning-Up*.

The list of 36 verses from pp 706-709 of *Hazardous Materials* is as follows, in order of appearance; Matthew 12:24, 27, Mark 3:22, Luke 11:15, 18, 19, Mark 14:43, Luke 1:35, 23:34, Matthew 27:35, Mark 15:24, John 19:24, John 7:9, 10:16, 12:26, Acts 2:22, 6:3, 7:44, 10:20, 13:15, 17:30, 19:20, 26:6, 1 Corinthians 16:23, Philippians 2:21, Colossians 1:24, 2 Timothy 1:18, James 3:14, 1 Peter 2:13, 1 John 3:20, 5:8, 2 John 3, Revelation 13:10, 16:11, 17:9, 18:23.

Dr Mrs Riplinger concludes the above section from *Hazardous Materials* with the warning from p 696 in bold.

"Like Scrivener's, Berry's Greek text has few serious errors, but its venial mistakes make readers seriously doubt the accuracy of their Holy Bible. That is serious."

Dr DiVietro is scornful about what he views as Dr Mrs Riplinger's perception of students as naive, although he produces no specific examples to back up his derision. See remarks above. However, anyone who has dealt with students, even at the highest levels of education has **"learned by experience"** Genesis 30:27 that the **"need of milk, and not of strong meat"** Hebrews 5:12 is a long-lasting one.

No doubt with that need in mind, Dr Mrs Riplinger has given the student considerable help with respect to the pitfalls of using 'the' Greek, so-called and indeed the absolute folly of perceiving it as 'the original,' which many mature Christians, *not students*, in this country still *naively* do. See the content of **Quote 143** above.

Dr DiVietro is naive to think otherwise. He obviously continues not to care about the adulteration of **"the scripture of truth"** Daniel 10:21 by means of errors in 'the Greek.' See Psalm 50:18 again.

"When thou sawest a thief, then thou consentedst with him, and hast been partaker with adulterers."

Moreover, in total contrast with Sister Riplinger, as indicated, Dr DiVietro has given the student nothing.

Perhaps he expects each student to reinvent the wheel and set up his own grid.

Note in conclusion that Dr DiVietro makes reference to himself at the beginning of his comments on **Quote 143** according to **Quote 97**, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 598-599, though he does not see fit to provide the reader with the reference:

"...Or as one true believer, Dr. Kirk DiVietro, so aptly expressed in the title of his book, they trust Anything But the King James Bible."

This extract from **Quote 97** is therefore inserted below.

*Dr Mrs Riplinger's remark with respect to Dr DiVietro is reminiscent of her invitation to him to co-labour with her. See Cleaning-Up p xiii and remarks under **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint**. As this work has shown throughout, her graciousness has not been reciprocated by the DBS Executive Committee. Its members are not good men because they are not reasonable.*

As Dr Bob Jones Snr said in his Chapel Sayings, "Beware of unreasonable people. Good men are always reasonable."

*Dr DiVietro may not be among those who trust anything other the King James Bible but he is certainly among those who will trust some things other the King James Bible. See **Quote 85** and material on John 11:33 at the end of **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** and **Challenges #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints**.*

*Dr DiVietro is, in effect, lukewarm Revelation 3:16, just as Scrivener was and it is this danger about which Dr Mrs Riplinger, her emphases, warns in this statement that closely follows the first part of **Quote 97**, which warning lukewarm Dr DiVietro fails to pass on to his readers. See also *Hazardous Materials* pp 596-597.*

*"The Holy Bible is not the **very** bread of life, but burnt toast, crumbling word by word. The enemy desires to move Christians off base, to **another** authority, **any other** authority. Scrivener proposed that the Bible be changed. True believers, of course, rejected his RV. However, the lukewarm Scrivener offers a slightly tainted Greek Received text, which makes the KJB look **slightly** wrong (particularly if it translated with RV words from Vine's Dictionary; see upcoming chapter for documentation)."*

*All of Dr DiVietro's 'examples' from 'the Greek etc.' for 'clarification' of the KJB make "the KJB look **slightly** wrong." He should reflect on Ecclesiastes 10:1.*

"Dead flies cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savour: so doth a little folly him that is in reputation for wisdom and honour."

*"A **little** folly" can be grouped with "**a little** leaven," "**little** foxes," "**a little** member" and "**a little** fire" in its effects. This work suggests, however, that Dr DiVietro has committed at least 'a little more' than "**a little** folly."*

As Solomon also said, In Ecclesiastes 10:6:

"Folly is set in great dignity, and the rich sit in low place."

*"The rich" in this case are those "**rich in faith**" James 2:5. Kirk DiVietro is not among them. He forfeited his "one true believer" status a long time ago.*

***Quote 144**, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 709-710*

*"One **non-literal** example should give fair warning to the Greek neophyte. In Ephesians 1:5 Berry's Greek text says *huiiothesian* (ὑιοθεσία). *Huios* means "children" or "sons", *thespian* from *theo*, means "adoption of." Berry's English translates only "adoption," omitting any translation of the word "children" (or sons) – so much for a 'literal' translation. The KJB being literal says, "the adoption of children"; Berry's **English** which merely says, "adoption" is incorrect, not literal, or even remotely idiomatic. One could write a book about such errors. Berry himself admits elsewhere of the Holy Bible, the "...**Authorized Version** being in proximity, which **will make all plain**..."*

***Quote 144** is given as found in *Cleaning-Up* p 225, where it reads *ὑιοθεσία* instead of the correct term *υιοθεσία*.*

Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of not researching the word *huiiothesian* or of deliberately deceiving her readers. He adds that he desperately hopes that the statement “*thespian from theo, means “adoption of”*” is a typographical error. Dr DiVietro says further that the word *huiiothesian* (*υιοθέσια*) i.e. *υιοθεσία* is made up of the words for son and place and that no “reputable” (Dr DiVietro’s term) lexicon or Greek-English dictionary connects *huiiothesian* with the word *thespian*, which he says means an actor.

Dr DiVietro then quotes two “reputable” (to him) Greek-English dictionaries to explain the meaning of the word *huiiothesian* (*υιοθέσια*) i.e. *υιοθεσία*. These sources are *The Complete Word Study Dictionary* by Spiro Zodiatas (actually Zodhiates, Dr DiVietro made a typo) and Vines (actually Vine’s, Dr DiVietro made another typo) *Expository Dictionary*, of which this author has a copy.

Note under **Quote(s) 91** that Dr DiVietro has skipped over Chapter 12 in *Hazardous Materials* on “*Vine’s Expository Dictionary*” along with Chapters 13-16 on the assumption that Dr Mrs Riplinger was simply attacking the authors of the dictionaries and lexicons described in those chapters.

She was not. A much more credible reason why Dr DiVietro has bypassed those chapters, especially Chapter 12, will become apparent below.

Vine’s definition of *huiiothesian* (*υιοθεσία*) is as follows, pp 31-32.

ADOPTION

HUIIOTHESIA (*υιοθεσία*), from *huios*, a son, and *thesis*, a placing, akin to *tithēmi*, to place, signifies the place and condition of a son given to one to whom it does not naturally belong. The word is used by the Apostle Paul only.

Dr DiVietro then states that *huiiothesian* (*υιοθεσία*) is properly translated as adoption, based on the Roman practice of publicly recognizing a physical son as a legal heir, picturing Christians as formal heirs of God. Dr DiVietro insists that Berry has completely and correctly translated *huiiothesian* (*υιοθεσία*) as adoption and that Dr Mrs Riplinger’s explanation is wrong.

Dr DiVietro isn’t of course desperately hoping that the statement “*thespian from theo, means “adoption of”*” is a typographical error. He is desperately hoping for yet another opportunity to attack Sister Riplinger, which he does in the very first sentence of his comments under **Quote 144**, where he accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger, falsely, of either being careless or wilfully deceiving her readers.

The intent of Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote 144** is therefore blatantly obvious and he has in turn blatantly contradicted himself a mere two sentences further on in stating that he hopes Sister Riplinger has made a typographical error.

As indicated under **Quote 138**, Dr DiVietro’s intense ire against Sister Riplinger is causing him to make gross errors, as his blatant self-contradiction under **Quote 144** shows. Knowing that “*the LORD looketh on the heart,*” Solomon describes Dr DiVietro’s heart condition exactly in Proverbs 19:3.

“The foolishness of man perverteth his way: and his heart fretteth against the LORD.”

Moreover, Dr DiVietro has yet again falsely accused Sister Riplinger. See **Preface and Introduction, Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’, Challenges #1, #2, #3, #4, #7, Points-Counterpoints**, (in sum) **Challenges #1-#7 – Overview, Quotes 1, 8, 13, 16, 18, 19, 22, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 35, 39, 46, 47, 50, 52, 57, 64, 65, 67, 76, 81, 83, 87, 88, 90, 92, 100, 104, 108,**

109, 111, 114, 116, 119, 120, 124, 125, 126, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 137, 138, 139, 140 and now *Quote 144*.

In an extensive work of 1200 pages, Dr Mrs Riplinger has been neither careless nor deceptive with respect to the brief statement in *Quote 144* to which Dr DiVietro objects. Consider the following.

Suppose that instead of “*thespian from theo, means “adoption of,”*” Dr Mrs Riplinger had written “*thesian from thesis, means “adoption of,”*” a change amounting to a difference of a mere five letters at most, eliminating two and replacing them with three.

How, then, would the edited statement compare with Vine’s statement that Dr DiVietro declares to be “*reputable*”?

HUIOTHESIA (υιοθεσία), from huios, a son, and thesis, a placing...signifies the place and condition of a son given to one to whom it does not naturally belong.

By inspection, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s definition of *huiiothesian (υιοθεσίαν)* and that of W. E. Vine would then match and Dr DiVietro would have no basis for complaint against Sister Riplinger in *Quote 144*.

Dr DiVietro could surely have made the above deduction himself and offered a constructive comment. However, it is clear by now that such consideration is neither in Dr DiVietro’s nature nor in that of his mentor. Dr DiVietro should therefore be warned that the question put to Ananias by Peter in Acts 5:3 could apply equally to him.

“...why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost...?”

As Solomon says about “*the wicked*” Proverbs 4:14 in Proverbs 4:16:

“For they sleep not, except they have done mischief; and their sleep is taken away, unless they cause some to fall.”

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s insistence that *huiiothesian (υιοθεσίαν)* be translated simply as “*adoption*” as Berry completely and correctly does, according to Dr DiVietro under *Quote 144*, it is useful to compare what other Greek-English interlinears say about Ephesians 1:5.

Nestle’s 21st Edition English interlinear has “*adoption of sons*” and the Farstad/Hodges ‘Majority’ Text English interlinear has “*adoption as sons*” under *υιοθεσίαν* in Ephesians 1:5, essentially in agreement with Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement in *Quote 144* “*translation of the word “children” (or sons).*”

Dr DiVietro has disavowed Nestle’s text as corrupt on pp 24-25 of *Cleaning-Up* and under *Quote 3*. However, see the following extract from *Quote 8* with respect to the NKJV* text and by implication the Farstad/Hodges ‘Majority’ Text.

*The *Non-King James Version*.

*See *Quote 8, Counterfeit* by Terry Watkins, www.av1611.org/nkjv.html and *NKJV Death Certificate* by Gail Riplinger, www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html.

Quote 8, from Hazardous Materials, p 29

The quote states in part that “The resident evil and heresy in the New King James Version (NKJV)...lies in [the editors’] use of lexicons, all of which are corrupt.”

Dr DiVietro states that it is very wrong to say that use of lexicons has resulted in the NKJV departing from the truth. He says that 96% of the NKJV is faithful to the original and that only a small part of the NKJV text was compiled through use of lexicons. The changes were

made to its text, he explains, so that the NKJV could be legally copyrighted. He accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of producing no evidence to support her claim.

The NKJV and the Farstad/Hodges ‘Majority’ Text English interlinear *both* have “*adoption as sons*” in Ephesians 1:5, each therefore recognizing that the embedded word *huio(s)* should be translated explicitly, even if those texts have done so differently from the King James New Testament by adopting the reading of the Revised Version of Westcott and Hort. The NIV/TNIV read similarly to the RV/NKJV with respect to “*adoption as sons*” in Ephesians 1:5.

The NKJV, the Farstad/Hodges ‘Majority’ Text English interlinear and the King James New Testament therefore all reflect the need to translate the embedded word *huio(s)* explicitly.

Recognition of this need cannot be viewed as a copyright change and must therefore be viewed as part of the NKJV’s 96% faithfulness to ‘the original’ to which Dr DiVietro alludes.

He has therefore contradicted himself in his comments under **Quote 8** versus those under **Quote 144**, where he says in effect that “*translation of the word “children” (or sons)*” is unnecessary or even incorrect. The contradiction is part of the effect of Dr DiVietro’s ire against Sister Riplinger that is causing him to make serious mistakes. See remarks above and under **Quote 138**.

However, worse is to follow.

Dr DiVietro’s insistence that *huiothesian* (*υιοθεσία*) be translated simply as “*adoption*” as Berry completely and correctly does, according to Dr DiVietro under **Quote 144**, has in effect answered Bro. Heisey’s second question to Dr Waite. See **Quotes 105-141, An Overview, Waiting for Dr. Waite, June 2010, pp 3-4** and the question “*Is the text of the King James Bible without error?*”

According to Dr DiVietro, although he said in *Cleaning-Up* pp 7, 17-18 that the 1611 Holy Bible is accurately translated and acknowledges on p 3 of *Cleaning-Up* that the 1611 Holy Bible is perfect and cannot be improved upon (though note his remarks under **Quote(s) 175**, summarised under **Quote 143**), under **Quote 144** he now says, in effect, that the words “*of children*” should be cut out of Ephesians 1:5.

That is, the 1611 Holy Bible does have at least one error, according to Dr DiVietro under **Quote 144**, in Ephesians 1:5, where the words “*of children*” should be cut out according to the authority of the Newberry-Berry interlinear English of the 1550 Stephanus Edition.

Dr DiVietro’s excision of “*of children*” from Ephesians of course weakens the cross references to Romans 8:15-17 and Hebrews 2:13.

“For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together.”

“And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given me.”

Romans 8:17 contains the expression “*heirs of God*” that Dr DiVietro mentions in his comments on **Quote 144** but for which he fails both to give the reference and even to indicate that it is part of scripture. Dr DiVietro’s failure in those respects and his preference for the classical explanation based on the customs of Ancient Rome in turn deprives the reader of an essential understanding of the condition of becoming “*heirs of God*” by means of “*adoption of children*” Ephesians 1:5.

“Adoption of children” for the Ephesians and all Church Age saints since Acts 2 follows from salvation, as Hebrews 2:13 states and as Ephesians 1:12-13 emphasises, encapsulating God’s purpose for the Christian believer:

“That we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ. In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise,”

However, once the Christian believer is adopted and **“accepted in the beloved”** Ephesians 1:6, Romans 8:16-17 shows that becoming one of the **“heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ”** in the context of the passage depends upon maintaining a faithful testimony *that may incur martyrdom*.

It has done so in the past as *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs* shows and is doing so today in Papist, Marxist and Mohammedan countries (all interrelated, Revelation 17:5).

See www.barnabasfund.org/ and www.opendoorsusa.org/.

It will do so for saints in the **“great tribulation”** Revelation 2:13, 7:14, 12:11.

The element of suffering for those who become **“heirs of God”** Romans 8:17 by means of **“adoption of children”** Ephesians 1:5 is emphasised by 2 Timothy 2:12.

“If we suffer, we shall also reign with him: if we deny him, he also will deny us:”

In other words, no cross, no crown, for those who will actually reign with the Lord Jesus Christ on earth when He comes back, Revelation 20:4, 6. See Dr Ruckman’s commentaries *Pastoral Epistles* p 214 and *The Book of Revelation* p 515.

The full implications of becoming **“heirs of God”** by means of **“adoption of children”** Ephesians 1:5 have evidently escaped Dr DiVietro’s notice, thanks to his excision of **“of children”** from Ephesians 1:5 by means of ‘the Greek’ i.e. the Newberry-Berry text and his fixation with the customs of Ancient Rome.

The customs of Ancient Rome, it should be noted, do *not* draw attention to suffering with the Lord Jesus Christ in order to reign with Him as in 2 Timothy 2:12.

That is, **“The entrance of thy words giveth light”** Psalm 119:130, not *The Lays of Ancient Rome*, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lays_of_Ancient_Rome, or anything else equivalent to them.

Dr DiVietro nevertheless seeks to cut **“of children”** out of Ephesians 1:5 on the basis of the Newberry-Berry text, thereby providing an answer to Bro. Heisey’s question above.

That isn’t all.

Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote 144** reveal further ‘corrections’ (not ‘clarifications,’ see *Cleaning-Up* p 94 and related remarks in **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**) that he would at least condone for the 1611 Holy Bible, in spite of his statements to the contrary in *Cleaning-Up* pp 93-95. They have to do with his use of the word **“reputable”** with respect to Vine’s *Expository Dictionary*, as inspection of pp 28-33 of Vine’s dictionary shows. Those six pages have been chosen arbitrarily as the surrounding context of Vine’s **“reputable”** definition of the word *hūiothesian* (υιοθεσίαν) for **“adoption.”**

Observe that Dr DiVietro doesn’t specify anything that is *disreputable* about Vine’s *Expository Dictionary*. He ignored Proverbs 18:6-7.

“A fool’s lips enter into contention, and his mouth calleth for strokes. A fool’s mouth is his destruction, and his lips are the snare of his soul.”

His readers, including this author, are therefore free to interpret Dr DiVietro's use of the word "*reputable*" with respect to Vine's *Expository Dictionary* as they perceive that God leads, Genesis 40:8. This author will, in accordance with Titus 2:15.

"These things speak, and exhort, and rebuke with all authority. Let no man despise thee."

Note that Dr Mrs Riplinger has identified many of Vine's ungodly definitions of Biblical words in Chapter 12 of *Hazardous Materials*; 1 Corinthians 5:1 p 430, 1 Corinthians 4:8, 1 Timothy 2:8 p 433, Colossians 4:12 etc. pp 440 ff. These further examples (that include 1 Corinthians 5:1) follow from the surrounding context of Vine's definition for *HUIOTHESIA* (*υιοθεσία*) on pp 31-32 of his dictionary.

On p 28, Vine states with respect to Romans 5:18 "*the A. V. wrongly renders it the righteousness of One*" compared to the RV's "*one act of righteousness.*" The NIV/TNIV/NKJV agree with the RV in reading "*one act of righteousness*" or similar.

Actually, W. E. Vine wrongly renders it "*the righteousness of One.*" See *New Age Versions*, Chapter 5 *The One vs. the Holy One*. Romans 5:18 reads "***the righteousness of one.***"

On p 28, Vine states with respect to 1 Corinthians 5:1 "*the A. V. "commonly" does not convey the meaning*" compared to the RV's "*it is actually reported.*" The NIV/TNIV/NKJV agree with the RV in reading "*actually.*" As indicated above, see p 430 of *Hazardous Materials* for details for Vine's error in 1 Corinthians 5:1.

On p 30, Vine states with respect to 2 Peter 1:5 that "*the A. V., "giving" does not provide an adequate meaning*" compared to the RV's "*adding on your part.*" The NIV/TNIV/NKJV do not match the RV on this occasion, omitting "*on your part,*" simply illustrating that Bible 'correctors' are not always consistent in their departures from the AV1611, i.e. as with 'the Greek,' so with 'the English.'

On p 32, Vine states with respect to Ephesians 1:5 that "*in Eph. 1:5 they are said to have been foreordained unto "adoption as sons" through Jesus Christ, R. V.: the A. V., "adoption of children" is a mistranslation and misleading. God does not adopt believers as children; they are begotten as such by His Holy Spirit through faith.*" The NIV/TNIV/NKJV read similarly to the RV. See remarks above on Ephesians 1:5.

God does adopt believers as children. See Romans 8:15-17, Hebrews 2:13 above. That is how believers become "***accepted in the beloved***" Ephesians 1:6. No adoption, no acceptance.

The expression "***accepted in the beloved***" has been cut out of the RV/NIV/TNIV and replaced in part by "*the One*" in the NIV/TNIV. See again *New Age Versions*, Chapter 5 *The One vs. the Holy One*. (Vine states on p 118 of his dictionary with respect to the word "***beloved***" in Ephesians 1:6 that "*In Jude 1 the best texts have this verb (R. V.) [AGAPAŌ (ἀγαπάω), as found in Ephesians 1:6]; the A. V., "sanctified" follows those which have hagi-azō...Note: In Luke 9:35, the R. V., translating from the most authentic mss., has "My chosen" (eklegō), for A. V., "beloved" (agapētos); so in Philm. 2, "sister" (adelphē).*" The NIV/TNIV read the same as or similarly with the RV in these verses.)

On p 33, Vine states with respect to 1 Timothy 4:15 "*A. V., "profiting," an inadequate meaning*" compared to the RV's "*progress.*" The NIV/TNIV/NKJV agree with the RV in reading "*progress.*"

Inspection of these few pages of Vine's "*reputable*" *Expository Dictionary*, including p 118, has identified 8 changes to the King James New Testament made by Vine that Dr DiVietro by his own admission must consider "*reputable,*" along with the change that the Newberry-

Berry text makes to Ephesians 1:5. So must Dr Waite because on the back cover of *Cleaning-Up*, he insists on “*The Need For This Clean-Up*,” thus in turn providing his own answer to Bro. Heisey’s second question above. See **Quote 143**.

Under **Quote(s) 90**, Dr DiVietro explicitly repudiates Westcott and Hort and their RV. However, a different perception on his part has emerged with respect to RV departures from the AV1611 that Vine lists in what Dr DiVietro perceives as Vine’s “*reputable*” expository dictionary. Readers should take careful note.

Table 7 summarises the 8 changes made to the King James New Testament by Vine and Newberry-Berry that Dr DiVietro and Dr Waite consider to be “*reputable*.”

Table 7
RV Changes to the AV1611 Condoned by Drs DiVietro and Waite, from Vine and Berry

Verse	AV1611	RV	NIV	TNIV	NKJV
Luke 9:35	<i>beloved</i>	<i>chosen</i>	as RV	as RV	<i>beloved</i>
Romans 5:18	<i>righteousness of one</i>	<i>one act of righteousness</i>	as RV	as RV	as RV
1 Corinthians 5:1	<i>commonly</i>	<i>actually</i>	as RV	as RV	as RV
Ephesians 1:5	<i>adoption of children</i>	<i>adoption (as sons)</i>	as RV	as RV	as RV
1 Timothy 4:1	<i>profiting</i>	<i>progress</i>	as RV	as RV	as RV
Philemon 2	<i>beloved</i>	<i>sister</i>	as RV	as RV	<i>beloved</i>
2 Peter 1:5	<i>giving</i>	<i>adding on your part</i>	<i>make</i>	<i>make</i>	<i>giving</i>
Jude 1	<i>sanctified</i>	<i>beloved</i>	as RV	as RV	<i>sanctified</i>

See again *Hazardous Materials* Chapter 12 for numerous additional examples of Vine's manifold changes to the King James New Testament. A full examination of Vine's "*reputable*" *Expository Dictionary* will identify many more changes to the King James New Testament that Vine makes, all of which must be deemed "*reputable*" by Dr DiVietro and Dr Waite by their own admission.

Bro. Heisey's second question to Dr Waite given above therefore appears to have been answered in spades.

The most likely reason why Dr DiVietro bypassed Chapter 12 of *Hazardous Materials* has also become apparent.

It does not have to do with supposed *ad hominem* attacks on W. E. Vine by Sister Riplinger. See remarks above.

Instead, it has to do with Dr DiVietro's perception of W. E. Vine's *Expository Dictionary* as "*reputable*."

Some further related observations may be made. See this extract from **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**.

Dr DiVietro next draws attention to The Defined King James Bible, which he says is a valuable tool to 'clarify' the 1611 English Holy Bible by placing the meanings of any supposed archaic KJB words in footnotes [see Cleaning-Up p 91].

Dr Mrs Riplinger has this evaluation of The Defined King James Bible [see The College of Cardinals, "Traitors, heady, highminded" 2 Tim. 3:4, D. A. WAITE Denies KJB Inspiration Part 1 by G. A. Riplinger, A.V. Publications, 2-4-2010, p 11].

"Most of The Defined King James Bible's definitions came from modern English dictionaries, as noted in Waite's introductory material. Such modern dictionaries contain highly secularized words, often seen in new versions. In Awe of Thy Word chapter 15 demonstrates, using the recently released notes of the KJB translators, that they considered and rejected just such words."

Dr Mrs Riplinger states further on p 17 of that work with respect to the editors for the sources used for *The Defined King James Bible* that Dr DiVietro supports:

"Briggs was tried for heresy and dismissed from his professorship. Both Thayer and Driver were on the Westcott-Hort Revised Version Committee; Thayer was also on the American

Standard Version Committee. The words of these corrupt versions match these men's lexicons. Imagine 'defining' the words in the Holy Bible with the liberal interpretations of such men...

"Driver was on the Westcott and Hort RV committee. Even lexicographer Frederick Danker charges that BDB [Brown-Driver-Briggs] "relies too much on word meanings of the RV." Imagine defining KJB words with Westcott-Hort RV words!"

That is what Vine does. It is not surprising that Dr DiVietro should therefore perceive Vine's *Expository Dictionary* to be "reputable" in that he supports *The Defined King James Bible* that defines "KJB words" using the same sources as Vine.

See also **Quote 85** with respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger's recent work *Serious Problems in D. A. Waite's The Defined King James Bible's Definitions – Defiled & Declined*.

See www.hacalumni.com/pdfs/KingJamesBibleProblems.pdf and note this statement from p 33.

"Briggs delivered a speech entitled, "How May We Become More Truly Catholic?" Harvard University has published the Jesuit exposé which reveals that Briggs and Driver were a part of a "Plot" in connection with the Pope. Harvard's article said that Briggs' work would "bring about the dissolution of the boundaries separating Protestants and Catholics." One should not be surprised to find Briggs's 'definitions' used in both Catholic and Protestant Bibles.

"Great Britain's Dr. Alan O'Reilly observes that, "Briggs' support for the pope would parallel the Oxford Movement over here, spearheaded by Newman. The Oxford Movement was officially terminated, but the cancer spread throughout the Church of England, resulting, as we know, in Westcott and Hort's Revised Version. The Church of England has never recovered from the 19th century Jesuit infiltration."

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1309715172.pdf pp 9-16 and **Quote 145**.

The cancer continues to spread in the US as well, aided and abetted by Dr DiVietro and Dr Waite with their evident support for the work of Vine, which in turn is unequivocally associated with *The Defined King James Bible*, more accurately aka *The DEFILED King James Bible*, see end of **Quote 53**.

Note this extract from **Quote 67**. It is not difficult to identify the "fellow travellers."

Earlier in his work, Dr Wilkinson [see kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html] states that "The Latin Vulgate, the Sinaiticus, the Vaticanus, the Hexapla, Jerome, Eusebius, and Origen, are terms for ideas that are inseparable in the minds of those who know."

To this author it appears from the work of Dr Wilkinson and Dr Mrs Riplinger that Liddell, Scott, Westcott and Hort, Vine, Thayer, Trench, Moulton, Milligan and their fellow travellers are likewise "inseparable in the minds of those who know" and characterised by Isaiah 19:14, especially considering their evident Alexandrian influence on lexical definitions. See extract above from **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.

"The LORD hath mingled a perverse spirit in the midst thereof: and they have caused Egypt to err in every work thereof, as a drunken man staggereth in his vomit."

Additional to Quote 144

Please note that Dr Mrs Riplinger has provided further, most helpful insights into the expression "adoption of sons." See remarks with respect to Ephesians 1:5 above.

Regarding the translation of huiiothesian:

My comments supporting the KJB reading, which DiVietro tries to refute, are supported by the Abridged Liddell-Scott Greek Lexicon (pre-1927). There are numerous Greek words that come from the same root, but deviate by one or two letters. Their common ancestry is what lexicographers call “presumed.” The words ‘thesian’ (adopt) and ‘thespian’ (act) are among such words, as I noted in Hazardous Materials. Looking at pages 304 and 704 of the LS one can see it defined as “to adopt as a son” and “adoption as the child of some one.” It also says it can be “sons of...orators,” which shows the linguistic correspondence to the word ‘actors.’ An actor ‘adopts’ the characteristics of the person he is ‘acting’ like. An adopted child ‘acts’ as if he were a natural born child.

Pages 302-305 are rife with such ‘presumed,’ as they say, similar words, beginning with ‘God’ (theo). DiVietro gave only the I (first) definition (setting, place), but definition III (third) states that the KJB rendering of ‘adoption of children’ is correct in that context. As usual, DiVietro’s research is broad on the boast and puddle-deep on the proof. As the KJB translators knew, Greek words have different meanings in different contexts, hence definitions, I, II, III, etc.

One would assume DiVietro could count past I.

This author’s note. It appears that when Liddell and Scott support the King James readings and Dr Mrs Riplinger’s analyses, Dr DiVietro will forsake his closest allies* and even lie about them** in order to attack Sister Riplinger.

As the Lord said to Balaam in Numbers 22:32 **“thy way is perverse before me.”**

*See **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint and Quotes 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 47, 48, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70** with **Table 4, 71** with **Table 5, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 114**, where Dr DiVietro has devoted considerable space in his efforts to justify corrupt Greek-English sources and their corrupt editors.

**“Reputable” lexicons (according to Dr DiVietro), e.g. Liddell-Scott pre-1927, evidently DO associate the word *huiiothesian* with “*thespian*.”

Quote 145, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 710-711

“No Everlasting Punishment?

*“And shall be tormented day and night **for ever and ever**” (KJB).*

vs.

*“...for the **ages of the ages**” (Rev. 20:10) (Berry, p. 664)*

“The root for ‘ever’ seen in “for ever” or “everlasting life” (John 6:40) interestingly disappears when punishment is for “ever.” Berry’s ‘age’ is normally thought of as a period of time. What ‘age’ are you? Do you remember the Ice Age? Those who wrongly teach against everlasting punishment of the wicked pretend that when the ‘ages of the ages’ are over and there is “time no longer” (Rev. 10:6) even the devil will be released from torment.”

Dr DiVietro predictably leaps to the defence of his fellow Greekophile, plagiarist George Ricker Berry by stating that Ricker Berry has simply given a correct literal translation of the underlying Greek idiom. He says that the expression the ages of the ages simply means the ultimate age, or eternity, just as similar idioms like the expressions King of kings, Lord of lords, Song of songs and thousands of thousands mean the ultimate King, the ultimate Lord, the ultimate Song and the ultimate number, respectively.

Dr DiVietro insists that a first semester Greek student should understand about the Greek idiom that he has described and therefore so should Dr Mrs Riplinger, whom, Dr DiVietro declares, professes to be familiar with Koine Greek.

It is noted first that Dr DiVietro's examples of King of kings, Lord of lords, Song of songs and thousands of thousands do not correspond explicitly in form to the phrase "*the ages of the ages*," which, as indicated, contains an extra definite article, making the expression even more difficult for the ordinary reader to understand at face value, Greek or no Greek. By contrast, Dr DiVietro's examples do *not* exhibit that difficulty, as will be shown.

Neither should they be perceived strictly as idiomatic, certainly not in King James English, as will also be shown.

It should then be noted that Farstad and Hodges do not appear to share Dr DiVietro's apparent confidence about the extent of a Greek-English interlinear user's understanding of Greek idioms. They have inserted what they term a third line of idiomatic English into their Greek-English 'Majority' Text interlinear in order to overcome what they refer to as "*the "awkwardness" of word-for-word interlinear English.*" See their *Introduction* p viii.

Under "*the ages of the ages*" for Revelation 20:10, Farstad and Hodges have inserted the third line reading "*forever and ever.*"

It is strange that Dr DiVietro doesn't draw his readers' attention to the Farstad/Hodges text with its helpful third line of idiomatic English. It may be, of course, that he would prefer his readers to remain loyal to the Scrivener/DiVietro Greek text (price \$24.95).

As indicated above, Dr DiVietro's examples that he gives under *Quote 145* don't altogether support his explanation of the expression the ages of the ages with respect to Greek and indeed Hebrew idioms.

The expressions "*the King of kings, and Lord of lords*" 1 Timothy 6:15 are understandable literally, without resorting to an idiomatic explanation. The Lord Jesus Christ is, or will be, Ruler over all kings and lords, as Psalm 89:27 and Revelation 1:5 make clear with respect to earthly rulers.

"Also I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth."

"And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood,"

The expression "*The song of songs, which is Solomon's*" Song of Solomon 1:1 is also understandable literally, again without resorting to an idiomatic explanation, because "*his songs were a thousand and five*" 1 Kings 4:32 but only one of them is a particular Book in "*the scripture of truth*" Daniel 10:21.

Concerning the expression "*thousands of thousands*," it is found once in scripture, in Revelation 5:11. At least three reasons emerge from scripture to show that the expression "*thousands of thousands*" is not the ultimate or infinite number in scripture that Dr DiVietro insists that it is.

The first reason is that like the expressions "*the King of kings, and Lord of lords*" and "*Song of songs*," the expression "*thousands of thousands*" may also be understood literally, as at least two million, just as the number preceding it in Revelation 5:11 "*ten thousand times ten thousand*" is readily understood to be one hundred million. The expression "*thousands of thousands*" is of course an indefinite expression and may be considerably in excess of two million but as it is used in Revelation 5:11 it suggests a surplus number still very large

e.g. several millions but appreciably less than one hundred million, like the expression **“time, times, and an half”** Daniel 12:7, where **“an half”** is clearly a surplus quantity, appreciable but less than the main quantities **“time, times.”**

The second reason is that when the scripture must express that which is infinite i.e. boundless, indeterminate, incomprehensible, ultimate, it does so without resorting to idiom. (What ‘the Hebrew,’ ‘the Greek,’ Greek text editors and Dr DiVietro’s first semester Greek course tutor decide to do is their business.)

“Is not thy wickedness great? and thine iniquities infinite?” Job 22:5.

“Great is our Lord, and of great power: his understanding is infinite” Psalm 147:5.

“Ethiopia and Egypt were her strength, and it was infinite; Put and Lubim were thy helpers” Nahum 3:9.

Focussing on the terms **“great,” “great power”** and **“strength,”** a simple working definition of the word **“infinite”** emerges from the Bible’s built-in dictionary without recourse to any form of idiom. See *In Awe of Thy Word* Chapter 1 and *The Language of the King James Bible*.

“Which doeth great things past finding out; yea, and wonders without number” Job 9:10.

“O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!” Romans 11:33.

“But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God” 1 Corinthians 2:10.

The word **“infinite”** in scripture, or ultimate according to the word Dr DiVietro uses, means according to context **“past finding out,” “without number,” “unsearchable”** and **“the deep things of God.”**

Those meanings do not apply to the expression **“thousands of thousands”** which can only refer to a very large but not ultimate or infinite number. **“Thousands of thousands”** is an indefinite number but not **“past finding out,” “without number”** or **“unsearchable”** as Daniel 12:7 and Revelation 5:11 imply. If the first set of **“thousands”** is specified, e.g. as two, the quantity **“thousands of thousands”** immediately becomes definite *yet it is still correctly defined as “thousands of thousands” and not as infinite or ultimate.*

The third reason is that the number **“thousands of thousands,”** although indefinitely large, *is exceeded in scripture by a greater number* (that will nevertheless still fall short of being **“infinite”** for the reasons given above).

“And they blessed Rebekah, and said unto her, Thou art our sister, be thou the mother of thousands of millions, and let thy seed possess the gate of those which hate them” Genesis 24:60.

The expression **“thousands of thousands,”** like Dr DiVietro’s other examples, may therefore be understood literally *in King James English* and does not have to be perceived idiomatically.

Dr DiVietro has no doubt progressed far beyond first semester Greek and probably as far as ultimate semester Greek, if there is such a thing.

He would, in this author’s opinion, be better off taking a course in first semester King James Biblical Arithmetic.

In sum, none of Dr DiVietro's examples explicitly establish an idiomatic basis *in King James English* for comparison with the expression "*the ages of the ages.*" They all may be understood in their respective contexts *literally*, not idiomatically.

Even the word "*ages,*" used four times in scripture, speaks *literally*, not idiomatically, of either times to come, "*the ages to come*" Ephesians 2:7, times past, "*other ages*" Ephesians 3:5, "*hid from ages and from generations*" Colossians 1:26, or times past, present and future, into eternity, "*throughout all ages, world without end. Amen*" Ephesians 3:21 but not eternity itself.

In addition, Dr DiVietro has overlooked Genesis 2:23, which contains two expressions that are similar in form to his examples "*the King of kings, and Lord of lords,*" "*Song of songs*" and "*thousands of thousands.*"

"And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man" Genesis 2:23.

The expressions "***bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh***" do not, of course, mean 'my ultimate bone' and 'my ultimate flesh' as Dr DiVietro's comments would imply. Together they simply mean "***one flesh***" Genesis 2:24. In Adam's case, the expressions were literally true, Genesis 2:21, 22. The expressions are no longer literal as in Genesis 2:21, 22 but are nevertheless still scriptural, Matthew 19:5, 6, Mark 10:8, 1 Corinthians 6:16, Ephesians 5:31. However, they do not lead to the meanings that Dr DiVietro would assign to them according to his comments under ***Quote 145***.

The phrase "*the ages of the ages*" therefore stands isolated as a peculiar mode of expression in Koine Greek that requires specialist knowledge to render satisfactorily into English, which Newberry-Berry either didn't have or neglected to apply. Farstad and Hodges at least made up for that deficit in their Greek text but the King James translators thankfully preceded them by almost 400 years.

Dr DiVietro should not therefore be defending George Ricker Berry. He should instead be taking him to task for his retrograde step in presenting only a literal translation in Revelation 20:10 that doesn't help the reader in the way that Farstad and Hodges at least try to do and the King James translators certainly did. Berry's reading as it stands will inevitably perplex the average reader and very likely result in the kind of confusion that Dr Mrs Riplinger outlines in ***Quote 145***.

What is most significant about Dr DiVietro's comments under ***Quote 145*** is that he has again ignored the context of the quote. See ***Quotes 15, 18, 22, 32, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 70, 71, 77, 79, 84, 101, 104, 106, 110***. The context of ***Quote 145*** is the danger of false doctrine arising from Berry's unrefined literal reading "*the ages of the ages*" in Revelation 20:10. Dr Mrs Riplinger makes the following statement that follows immediately after ***Quote 145*** but which Dr DiVietro has neglected to mention.

"In the 1800s Professor F. D. Maurice brought this anti-everlasting punishment wave into the church of England and it has carried away many who are discussed in this book (See chapter on Liddell-Scott)."

The effect of Maurice's false doctrine continues to this day. See the following summary, this author's emphases.

Frederick Denison Maurice (1805-1872), The Victorian Web

See www.victorianweb.org/religion/maurice/bio.html.

Maurice is, of course, equally important in his main subject area. Growing up in a family riven by religious dissensions, his great aim as a theologian was to promote unity, and he clung to his belief in the infinite love of God, a love, he felt, that all could share. Fortunately, however much his liberal stance upset his principal and colleagues at King's, it did him no harm in the long run. He returned to Cambridge in triumph in 1866 as the Professor of Moral Philosophy there, and, in a sense, he also returned to King's, where there is now an F. D. Maurice Professorship in Moral and Social Philosophy. More importantly, his views have thoroughly permeated his old department at King's, where the need to understand all the faiths practised in our multi-cultural society has long been fully recognised, and students throughout the college are encouraged to take the opportunity of understanding them better. Maurice, whose pioneering book on The Religions of the World was published in 1847 while he was at King's, would surely have approved. But Maurice's influence goes far beyond academe: as the Anglican historian and ecumenist Bishop John Moorman has said, "Most modern theology is in some way indebted to Maurice's clear and courageous thinking" (qtd. in Ellis 232).*

*Ellis, Roger. "Frederick Denison Maurice." *Who's Who in Victorian Britain*. London: Shephard-Walwyn, 1997. 231-32

The *FD Maurice lectures* has its own link for King's College, London. See www.kcl.ac.uk/artshums/depts/trs/events/maurice/index.aspx.

False doctrine about everlasting punishment in hell permeates the Church of England to the present day, as these reports show.

The Independent, December 15th 1993

Anger as Bishop takes torture out of hell: Church of England told not to take descriptions of Second Coming literally

See www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/anger-as-bishop-takes-torture-out-of-hell-church-of-england-told-not-to-take-descriptions-of-second-coming-literally-1467484.html.

THERE were explosions of outrage throughout the Church of England yesterday after it emerged that the Bishop of Durham, Dr David Jenkins, had made two perfectly orthodox statements.

Dr Jenkins denied that sinners were tortured for all eternity in hell, and that descriptions of the Second Coming should not be taken literally. As the controversy intensified, he described as 'psychopathic' the imagery of the book of Revelations, in which the wicked are thrown into a lake of fire and 'tormented night and day for ever and ever'. Instead, he argued in a series of media interviews, that those who turn away from God at the end of time will be annihilated, rather than tortured; and the Second Coming would be 'God's general clear up and gather up of everything worthwhile in human history'.

'We have to understand the wrath of God as the blazing and burning side of the love of God; and the burning of hell is really ourselves,' the Bishop said yesterday.

Dr Jenkins is no stranger to controversy, but it was almost impossible yesterday to find any theologian who disagreed with what he actually said, though several objected to the fact that he said it.

That is why Jenkins's statements were reported as "perfectly orthodox." The outrage no doubt came from the remnant of Bible believers in the Church of England, both clergy and laity but the report gives few details. The most it says about the dissenters is this.

A spokesman for the Bishop of Southwark, the Rt Rev Roy Williamson, said: ‘Dr Jenkins’s comments are not helpful. It is fine for an academic to speculate but it is not the role of a Bishop.’

The report by contrast gives considerable space to Jenkins’s supporters.

But the Bishop of Bath and Wells, the Rt Rev Jim Thompson, defended Dr Jenkins’ views and the heads of two evangelical theological colleges said they taught their students similar things.

Bishop Thompson said: ‘It’s quite possible to imagine a God who would infinitely torture human beings, but I don’t believe that’s what Christ reveals to us and I don’t believe the majority of the Church has believed in that for more than a century...’

Dr Christina Baxter, the Dean [contrast 1 Timothy 2:12, 3:2] of St John’s College, Nottingham, said that it was very rare nowadays to find evangelicals who believed that the wicked really burnt in hell through all eternity. ‘This is not because we don’t believe in the Bible, but as a result of asking what it means when it talks of burning.

‘All the references to the wicked burning in the New Testament are references to Gehenna, the constantly smouldering rubbish dump outside Jerusalem. The burning is part of the process of annihilation. Those who do not repent of sin fall out of a relationship with God, and that is the most terrible thing that can happen to anyone,’ she explained...

Doubt as to the literal truth of some New Testament statements about hell goes back at least to the third century, when Origen, one of the Fathers of the church, maintained that even the devil would be saved in the end, a view also held by St Clement. However, it was bitterly attacked by St Augustine. During the Middle Ages, St Thomas Aquinas taught that the pleasures of the saved must be increased by contemplating the torments of the damned. At the reformation, Calvin and his followers espoused a particularly gloomy version of Augustine’s dogma. According to this, God created most of the human race for eternal damnation, just as some had been created for salvation.

The above paragraph has partly been included for the sake of context. Look who gets an ‘honourable’ mention in the paragraph that follows.

In the 19th century, doubts about the moral propriety of such a God [i.e. Augustine’s, Aquinas’s and Calvin’s] began to surface. The Anglican theologian F D Maurice was sacked from a post at King’s College, London, in 1854 for doubting eternal punishment, but his view is now triumphant, even among students of St Thomas Aquinas.

The heretic Jenkins has retired from his bishopric of Durham, also held by B. F. Westcott from 1890 until his death in 1901*, but false doctrine against hell persists in the Church of England.

*See en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brooke_Westcott, dates of Westcott’s bishopric at Durham confirmed by *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* edited by E. A. Livingstone.

*Note that a B. F. Westcott Chair in Biblical Studies now exists at the Durham University, which is less than an hour’s drive from this author’s home.

*See www.dur.ac.uk/theology.religion/staff/?username=dth0lts.

Hell – it’s about to get hotter, BBC News April 4th 2000, news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/699929.stm

The flames of hell, recently doused to a state of “nothingness” by the Church of England, are to be reignited.

The Nature of Hell, a 140-page report drawn up by **the Evangelical Alliance**, says that while **biblical images of burning lakes should not be taken literally**, they symbolise the horrors that are in store for people who reject Christian teaching...

The Evangelical Alliance was formed in 1846, and **represents Christians from all denominations, including many Anglicans. It claims to represent a million Christians, and campaigns on contemporary social issues...**

The new study, **which has been welcomed by the Roman Catholic Church**, also urges church leaders not to be afraid of telling their congregations of the realities of hell, **but advises against “fire and brimstone” sermons...**

Gavin Drake, senior press officer for the Evangelical Alliance, said... **“There has been a growing disagreement for some time among evangelical Christians about the nature of hell. The traditional position was that hell is eternal, but that has changed in recent years. Now the common view is that hell lasts for a period of time relating to the sins of the individual** [which no doubt explains why the papists welcomed the EA study].”

According to Mr Drake, the new study is based on teachings in the Bible.

The news report doesn't state which Bible.

The Church of England's disbelief in *“The traditional position...that hell is eternal”* Mark 9:43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48 has not diminished in the intervening decade since the EA study was published.

Neither, as it appears from the King's College website, has Anglican establishment allegiance to the *“triumphant”* heresy of F. D. Maurice, who *“is honoured with a feast day in the liturgical calendar of the Episcopal Church (USA) on April 1.”*

See en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Frederick_Denison_Maurice.

The date is certainly fitting, which is more than can be said for Dr DiVietro's comments under **Quote 145**. Matthew 16:6, 12 should be remembered with respect to both F. D. Maurice and K. DiVietro and their *“doctrines of devils”* 1 Timothy 4:1.

“Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees...Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.”

Additional to Quote 145

Dr Mrs Riplinger has provided further, most helpful insights into the expression *“the ages of the ages.”* See remarks with respect to Revelation 20:10 above.

The word aiōn can be and has been translated in the KJB as: ever, world, never, evermore, age, eternal, course, world without end, etc. By showing only ‘one’ possible translation of a Greek word, Berry's interlinear ignores context and gives the false impression that there is but one equivalency. ‘Age’ is only one of the many possible translations for aiōn. The KJB used many words for aiōn, as shown above. The NIV, following interlinear nonsense, usually uses the word ‘age’ for aiōn. The deception lies in the fact that ‘age’ and aiōn both start with the letter ‘a’**.*

*This author's note. It appears from Dr DiVietro's comments under **Quote 145** that he too has fallen for the NIV's interlinear nonsense. The reader should not be surprised, as **Table 7** and associated remarks reveal Dr DiVietro's apparent liking for the RV/NIV/TNIV trend of W. E. Vine.

**This author's note. What Sister Riplinger is referring to is akin to what some commentators call 'the donkey vote' in elections, where candidates are set out in alphabetical order on the ballot papers. A candidate with the name Aaron is likely to poll more votes than one named Zacharias, for that reason.

Quote 146, from Hazardous Materials, p 712

"He says that "I AM THAT I AM" really means "I will be that I will be" or "I continue to be, and will be, what I continue to be, and will be." This good side-splitting laugh is appreciated about now. No wonder God did not put Berry or Newberry on the KJB committee; the KJB is more succinct."

Dr DiVietro criticises Dr Mrs Riplinger for supposedly not knowing that the Hebrew tense of what he refers to as "*the divine name*" is such that it is usually translated in the future tense. Dr DiVietro insists that Berry's translation is correct in its context because according to Dr DiVietro, Berry aims to bring out the full meaning of the expression "*I AM THAT I AM.*"

According to Dr DiVietro, Berry's aim was not to come up with "*an easily readable English translation.*"

Those are Dr DiVietro's actual words. This author has avoided quoting Dr DiVietro directly as far as possible for obvious reasons. However, on this occasion, a direct quote has been inserted in order to prevent possible and entirely understandable incredulity on the part of the reader.

The inside leaf of the dust jacket of Berry's interlinear text states, this author's emphases, "*First published in 1897, this interlinear has become a standard study tool for locating the Greek words behind specific passages in the King James Version and for easier reading of the Greek New Testament.*"

The *Introduction* to Berry's interlinear text states on p i:

"The ever-growing interest in New Testament study makes it desirable that the general reader, who would be well informed on current topics, should have some acquaintance with the relation of the standard English version [AV1611] to the original text, while a still more intimate knowledge on the part of the clergyman and the Bible Class teacher would seem almost imperative. Toward this end no aid is likely to be more helpful than the Interlinear New Testament...

"We give the Greek Text, with an interlinear translation as literal as may be to be useful..."

According to Dr DiVietro, an English interlinear translation that is *not* "*easily readable*" is nevertheless perceived by him to be "*useful,*" most "*helpful*" and make "*for easier reading of the Greek New Testament.*"

Yet again, Acts 13:10 springs to mind. See **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint.**

"O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?"

"The right ways of the Lord" are to be found in a Book in English, "as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times" Psalm 12:7 over a period of four hundred years, not Greek, as Psalm 18:30 shows.

"As for God, his way is perfect: the word of the LORD is tried: he is a buckler to all those that trust in him."

Concerning what Dr DiVietro refers to as “*the divine name,*” he could at least use Biblical terminology, which is “*that worthy name*” James 2:7 because as Revelation 4:11 states only “*Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.*”

The Hebrew tense, of course, is not the essential issue that arises from **Quote 146**. Neither is any supposed ‘full meaning’ of the statement “*I AM THAT I AM.*” Dr DiVietro’s retreat into technicalities over tenses and ‘full meanings’ bypasses the reason why Dr Mrs Riplinger inserted this section into Chapter 19 of *Hazardous Materials*. See p 711 and note that Dr DiVietro has erred in referring to Berry under **Quote 146**. Dr Mrs Riplinger has taken the citations on pp 711-713 from *The Newberry Reference Bible* by Thomas Newberry, not any work by George Ricker Berry.

Dr Mrs Riplinger alludes to Newberry no fewer than 7 times on pp 712-713, including with respect to **Quote 146**, Newberry, p. xx. Dr DiVietro may complain that the *Newberry* reference citations are in small print that is difficult to read, about which he has already complained, *Cleaning-Up* pp 22, 31. In response, note this extract from **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

If Dr DiVietro has trouble reading the small print in Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work, he should get himself a magnifying glass. He and his august Christian colleagues, Drs Waite and Williams etc., had no trouble putting Dr Mrs Riplinger’s personal life under intense magnification, as Dr DiVietro’s own work shows [Cleaning-Up pp 321-326].

The title of the section on p 711 of *Hazardous Materials* and its introductory paragraph are as follows.

“New Age Names for God

“Playing around with Greek and Hebrew in his own Reference Bible, Newberry re-names and re-defines God, using English words which occur nowhere in the English Bible.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger then notes that Newberry’s ‘God’ becomes ““*the Mighty One*”” of Satanist Helen Blavatsky and then by turns “*the Muslim “Ahlah” [pronounced Allah],*” the false god ““*Yah,*”” “*the Calvinistic “Sovereign”*” - see *The Language of the King James Bible* p 66 - and is then demoted to “*merely “Master, Owner...master and proprietor,”*” while the Holy Ghost becomes an ethereal “*Divine Spirit.*”

Those disclosures are at least as serious as and indeed more serious than Newberry’s clumsy rendering of the expression “*I AM THAT I AM,*” tenses and ‘full meanings’ notwithstanding.

Dr Mrs Riplinger summarises Newberry’s “***New Age Names for God***” as follows on p 713 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphasis, “*He calls these invented names “treasures of precious truth in the Titles of God and of Christ, which are more or less **hidden** or obscured in the Authorized Version” (Newberry, p. xix) [which sounds like ‘clarification’ to this author, see *Cleaning-Up* p 94 and remarks under **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**]. *On the contrary, God said, “I have not spoken in secret...” (Isa. 45:19). Since God said he has “hid these things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes,” the “wise” feel that they must dig deeper and deeper [“in haunted Greek graveyards” In Awe of Thy Word p 544], looking frantically for some kind of wisdom which “babes” find plainly on the pages of a King James Bible. “They are all plain to him that understandeth...” (Prov. 8:9).*”*

How did Dr DiVietro miss all of that and fail to make any useful comment to help readers when he could have done so, except wilfully? He should review James 4:17.

“Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin.”

Finally for **Quote 146**, some specific comments may be made with respect to the tense of the expression “*I AM THAT I AM.*” Dr DiVietro states that the expression is in the Hebrew imperfect tense that is usually translated in the future tense in English.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has drawn this author’s attention to Chapter 5 of *Hazardous Materials*, entitled *Verbs Wounded in Action*, where she describes how Hebrew, Greek and English tenses do not in any way parallel either each other or English tenses. She cites on pp 134-135 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphases, none other than the distinguished Greek grammarian Dr A. T. Robertson, who appears to have succinctly summed up the non-uniformity of Hebrew, Greek and English tenses.

“The Confession:

“Robertson admits,

“**“It is not possible to parallel the Hebrew tenses, for example, with the Greek, nor, indeed, can it be done as between Greek and English.** The English translation of a Greek aorist may have to be in the past perfect or the present perfect to suit the English usage, but that proves nothing as to how a Greek regarded the aorist tense...Good Greek may be very poor English...a literal translation of this neat Greek idiom makes barbarous English (Robertson p. 47).””

See **Quote 47**, under which Dr DiVietro states that Dr Mrs Riplinger has taken Dr Robertson’s words out of context etc. but he does not say why, which *immediately* tells this author that she has NOT.

Dr Robertson’s confession above indicates to this author that Dr DiVietro is being naive in his comments about Hebrew imperfect and English future tenses but in any event, Newberry’s literal alternative translation of “*I AM THAT I AM*” could well be described as barbarous English, which of course is no help to a student or anyone else.

Dr DiVietro clearly forgot Paul’s admonition in 1 Corinthians 14:11.

“Therefore if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me.”

Quote 147, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 713

“Berry’s *Interlinear English* is loaded with liberal watered-down words. The **very first line of the very first page** of Berry’s *Interlinear English* translation begins diluting the unique Christian vocabulary of the Holy Bible. The title of the gospel of Matthew replaces the Christian word “gospel” with the secular “glad tidings”.”

Dr DiVietro states that Berry is simply trying to shed light (i.e. “*elucidate*,” Dr DiVietro’s word, like the word “*clarity*” that he uses on p 94 of *Cleaning-Up*) on the King James English. He declares that the English word gospel comes from the German expression Gott spiel or God speak and insists that Berry’s translation is correct because the word gospel (from ‘the Greek’) literally means good news or good message.

Dr DiVietro has yet again been blinded by ‘the Greek.’ See again *Cleaning-Up* p 94 and related remarks under **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**.

He had the meaning of the word gospel right in front of him. Dr DiVietro even states the meaning in his comments under **Quote 147** and it isn’t good news or good message.

Dr DiVietro also had Dr Mrs Riplinger’s notes for guidance with respect to “the Christian word “gospel”” right in front of him in *Hazardous Materials* in the sentence immediately following **Quote 147**.

*“The psycho-linguistic deterioration inherent in changes such as this [“gospel” to “glad tidings”] is discussed in detail in *The Language of the King James Bible and In Awe of Thy Word.*”*

See *In Awe of Thy Word* Chapter 5 *The Holiest of All – Separate From Sinners – Pure Words* and note Dr Mrs Riplinger’s list of **“separate from sinners”** Hebrews 7:26 words associated with the word **“gospel”** Matthew 4:23 versus the worldly terms associated with the word **“news”** as found in **“good news”** NIV/TNIV/2011 NIV etc.

See also *The Language of the King James Bible* and note Dr Mrs Riplinger’s citation of Romans 10:16, 17, 2 Corinthians 4:2, 3 and 2 Timothy 2:8, 9 that pair the word **“gospel”** with and define it as **“the word of God.”** Dr Mrs Riplinger, her emphases, then cites the following authorities with respect to their definitions of the word **“gospel.”**

Oxford English Dictionary: “The Holy Scriptures”

*Webster’s English Dictionary: “compounded of Anglo-Saxon god, God and spell – lit. **God’s word**”*

*Oxford English Dictionary: “the form of the first element {god} shows unequivocally that it was identified with ‘**God**’ not with ‘good.’ God + spel...was much more obviously appropriate than that of ‘Good tidings’ {news} for a word that was chiefly known as the name of a sacred book.”*

The expression **“good tidings”** does occur in the 1611 Holy Bible, 13 times in total; 2 Samuel 4:10, 18:27, 1 Kings 1:42, 2 Kings 7:9, Isaiah 40:9 twice, 41:27, 52:7 twice, 61:1, Nahum 1:15, Luke 2:10, 1 Thessalonians 3:6. Moreover, the expression **“good tidings”** in Isaiah 61:1 is the basis for the Lord’s use of the term **“gospel”** in Luke 4:18.

However, inspection of the above scriptures shows that the expression **“good tidings”** is used in scripture for any kind of a report, depending in part on individual perception, varying from announcements of Israel’s salvation, Isaiah 52:7 and the Lord’s birth, Luke 2:10 to notifications of deaths in battle and anticipated subversion of the realm, 2 Samuel 4:10, 18:27, 1 Kings 1:42.

The expression **“glad tidings”** is used 4 times in the 1611 Holy Bible; Luke 1:19, 8:1, Acts 13:32, Romans 10:15. These four usages of the expression **“glad tidings”** are always in a good context but Romans 10:15 is a quotation of Isaiah 52:7 and therefore the expression **“glad tidings”** in Romans 10:15 is equivalent to the wide-ranging term **“good tidings”** in Isaiah 61:1.

Inspection of the immediate context of Luke 4:18 shows that the expression **“the book”** occurs twice, Luke 4:17, 20, **“the place where it was written”** occurs in Luke 4:17, **“this scripture”** occurs in Luke 4:21 and the most compelling expression **“the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth”** occurs in Luke 4:22. The cross reference Matthew 4:4 immediately comes to mind.

“But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.”

It would appear, therefore, that when the Lord sought to draw attention to **“the book,”** **“this scripture,”** His **“gracious words”** and Himself (as **“the Word”** John 1:1), He did so by means of the special word **“gospel”** i.e. **“God’s word”** that is found in Luke 4:18, *having necessarily superseded the more general Old Testament terms “glad tidings” and “good tidings”* Isaiah 52:7, 61:1, when the Lord Himself is present with **“the book.”**

The above analysis matches Dr Mrs Riplinger's remaining statements on p 49 of *The Language of the King James Bible*.

*"Most new versions, like the NIV, New Living Translation, NRSV, and Good news Bible, and reference works like Vine's Complete Expository Dictionary [see **Quote 144**] or Zodhaites Complete Word Study Dictionary [see **Quote 144**], opt for the incorrect rendering "good news."*

"The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language says that the 'o' in the Anglo-Saxon language actually meant 'God's mouth' or 'God's word' (much like the more squarish Chinese character for breath or mouth).



mouth

[See chineseculture.about.com/library/character/bl_zi00036.htm]

"Not only was 'God' watered down to 'good,' but 'spell,' meaning 'words,' was changed to 'news' to accommodate liberal textual critics who do not believe the Bible is God's word, but merely a book which contained a 'good message.'"

Dr DiVietro appears to be lining up with the "liberal textual critics" under **Quote 147**. As indicated above, he had the definition of the word "**gospel**" right in front of him, Gott spiel, God speak, "God and spell – lit. **God's word**," yet he chose to ignore it in favour of the non-scriptural definition good news or good message i.e. "‘Good tidings’ {news} for a word that was chiefly known as the name of a sacred book."

Why didn't Dr DiVietro follow up on Dr Mrs Riplinger's guidance notes and, again, make comments that would be helpful to his readers?

Proverbs 13:10 explains why. Dr DiVietro won't humble himself and he is therefore not wise.

"Only by pride cometh contention: but with the well advised is wisdom."

As for the Newberry-Berry text shedding light on the King James English, which is what Dr declares that it does by his use of the word "elucidate" in his opening comment on **Quote 147**, he should reflect on Luke 11:35.

"Take heed therefore that the light which is in thee be not darkness."

Quote 148, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 714

"A master is in a ruling position and teaching may or may not be a part of that position; a teacher only instructs; they do not have the same meaning or connotation in English; a teacher is lower than the master. Condemnation is to be judged, found guilty and sentenced; a judgment is merely a decision; it tells nothing of the verdict or any consequences. The judgment may be 'not guilty.' In both cases the sword of the Spirit becomes a butter knife to butter-up and lather the liberal's conscience, it is no longer "powerful, and sharper...piercing," which causes men to 'tremble' at the "word" (Heb. 4:12; Isa. 66:2)."

Dr DiVietro has only brief comments under **Quote 148**, in which he addresses only the words "master" versus "teacher." He says nothing about the words "condemnation" versus "judgment." He says that he assumes that Dr Mrs Riplinger is attacking a comment on James 3:1 where it is "suggested" (Dr DiVietro's word) that the word διδάσκαλοι, *didaskaloi* for "masters" (διδάσκαλος, *didaskalos* for "master," singular) in the King James New Testament should be translated "teachers." He says that the literal meaning of the word *didaskaloi* is "teachers" but that the translation "masters" is given in order to fit the context of

James 3:1. Dr DiVietro insists that anyone who understands about how words are used would know the difference between the meaning that any particular word would have in isolation compared to the meaning it may take in a particular context.

James 3:1 is the verse to which Dr Mrs Riplinger refers because it is the only verse in scripture that contains the words “*masters*” and “*condemnation*” together, about which Dr DiVietro could easily have informed his readers but he chose not to. What is significant is Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement immediately before **Quote 148** that Dr DiVietro bypassed.

“How to Use New Testament Greek Study Aids by Walter Jerry Clark recommends Newberry saying, “masters” is more correctly rendered as “teachers”... “condemnation” is really “judgment” (New Jersey: Loizeaux Brothers, 1983, p. 95).”

Newberry has clearly said that “*masters*” should be changed to “*teachers*.” He hasn’t merely given a “*suggested definition*,” as Dr DiVietro tries to imply. Dr Mrs Riplinger isn’t attacking anyone or anything. She can say with Paul in 1 Timothy 2:7 “***I speak the truth in Christ, and lie not.***”

Dr DiVietro has falsely accused Sister Riplinger again, as well as therefore misleading his readers, again. See **Quote 144**.

Dr DiVietro also parts company with W. E. Vine with respect to James 3:1, in spite of siding with him as “*reputable*” earlier. See **Quote 144**. Vine states in Vol. III, p 46, this author’s emphases, with respect to:

MASTER

DIDASKALOS (διδάσκαλος)...It is not translated “masters” [διδάσκαλοι, didaskaloi] in the rest of the N. T. [i.e. after the Gospels], save in the A. V. of Jas. 3:1 “(be not many) masters,” where obviously the R. V. “teachers” is the meaning...”

W. E. Vine has therefore, according to Dr DiVietro, spoken unequivocally in favour of the ‘isolation’ meaning of the word *διδάσκαλοι, didaskaloi* in the context of James 3:1 instead of, according to Dr DiVietro, the correct contextual meaning. How, then, can W. E. Vine be considered “*reputable*” but unable to understand how word meanings may change according to whether a particular word is used in isolation or in a particular context?

Dr DiVietro doesn’t say.

Moreover, how can the Newberry-Berry text “*elucidate*” (Dr DiVietro’s word, **Quote 147**) the context of James 3:1, to which Dr DiVietro draws attention, and thereby help the reader, see **Quote 146**, when the Newberry-Berry text uses, as Dr DiVietro terms it, the ‘isolation’ meaning of the word *διδάσκαλοι, didaskaloi* i.e. “*teachers*” in James 3:1 (of which usage Dr DiVietro does not inform his readers)?

Again, Dr DiVietro doesn’t say.

It is of interest to check how the word *διδάσκαλος, didaskalos* in either its singular or plural forms is used in the King James New Testament. *Young’s Analytical Concordance* shows that the word is used 10 times as “*teacher*” or “*teachers*,” mostly in the Pauline Epistles, including Hebrews 5:12, once in the Gospels, John 3:2 and once in the Book of Acts 13:1.

That usage shows that the King James translators were both aware of the meaning “*teacher*” for *διδάσκαλος, didaskalos* and used it as appropriate.

The word *διδάσκαλος, didaskalos* is translated “*master*” 46 times in the King James New Testament, always in the singular form, always in the Gospels and almost always as a direct

reference to the Lord Jesus Christ, besides occurring in the plural form as “*masters*” in James 3:1.

The Newberry-Berry text uses the word “*Teacher*” or “*teacher*” instead of “*Master*” or “*master*” as in the King James New Testament in all 46 readings.

Again, how can the Newberry-Berry text “*elucidate*” (Dr DiVietro’s word, *Quote 147*) the context of each of those 46 verses when the English interlinear text invariably uses what Dr DiVietro designates as the ‘isolation’ meaning of word διδάσκαλος, *didaskalos*?

Again, Dr DiVietro doesn’t say.

It is significant that in *New Age Versions*, Chapter 21 *Antichrist: The World Teacher*, Dr Mrs Riplinger lists Matthew 8:19, 17:24, Mark 4:38, 5:13, 10:17, 35, 13:1, 14:14, Luke 3:12, 8:49, 11:45, 12:13, 18:18, 19:39, 20:21, 28, 39, 21:7, 22:11, John 11:28, 13:13, 20:16 i.e. 22 of the 46 readings for “*Master*” or “*master*” that the Newberry-Berry text changes to “*Teacher*” or “*teacher*.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger states in Chapter 21 of *New Age Versions* pp 321-323 that “*The antichrist hides, not only under the cover of ‘Christ’ but a second title – ‘Teacher.’ Roy Livesey, author and publisher of New Age Bulletin in England explains what New Agers believe:*

““*Christ, however, doesn’t refer to the Lord Jesus Christ but to the World Teacher*”...

“*If the world wants a ‘Teacher’ and not a ‘Lord’ and ‘Master’, the new versions are willing to accommodate, again following their habit of knocking each title of Jesus down one notch.*”

The above list of verses follows, together with several other scriptures cited. Dr Mrs Riplinger concludes “*These changes in the new versions accommodate several aspects of the agenda of the New World Order. (1) They clear the footpath of ‘sectarian’ Christian vocabulary. (2) They emphasize those titles ascribed to the Antichrist – ‘Christ’ [see Chapters 19, 20 of New Age Versions] and ‘Teacher’. (3) They accommodate the ‘historical’ Jesus in a manner that is acceptable to all of the religions of the world, i.e., He is Jesus, one of a series of ‘Teachers’.*”

The new version and Newberry-Berry Greek-English interlinear accommodation and demotion of the Lord Jesus Christ “*in a manner that is acceptable to all of the religions of the world*” appears to be acceptable to Dr DiVietro as well.

“*Will a man rob God?*” the Lord asks in Malachi 3:8. He answers the question in the very next sentence, of which Dr DiVietro should take careful note.

“*Yet ye have robbed me.*”

Quote 149, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 714-715

“*Why do we need his English translation, when this book has shown that his English is not literal and he himself even admits that one must look at the King James Bible to “make all plain”?*”

Dr DiVietro states that an interlinear is mainly useful for showing students which words they need to look up in other sources (unspecified). He then says that students need to obtain Berry’s or some other interlinear in order to have an interlinear.

Dr DiVietro denies that the 1611 Holy Bible is self-explanatory because, he says, otherwise, no Bible study aids such as lexicons, dictionaries and interlinears would be necessary. He accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of being “*disingenuous*” by taking Berry’s brief statement out of context and stretching it to cover the whole of Berry’s interlinear.

An interlinear's main use for 'thinking students of the word of God,' Dr DiVietro's expression, (not necessarily of 'the Greek') see *Quote 143*, would in this author's view be to show how its text matched or differed from the 1611 Holy Bible and other Greek sources. The usefulness of Berry's or any other interlinear would then be maximised by carrying out a full collation of Greek texts currently in use for comparison with the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament and each other, as suggested under *Quote 143*.

See also remarks under *Quotes 105-141, An Overview* with respect to Dr DiVietro's seventh major failing and this extract about Scrivener's text.

Scrivener could have produced a useful 'map' or handbook of the extent to which the King James New Testament matched (not necessarily followed) pre-1611 published Greek editions by means of his Greek edition and then highlighted all readings where they used other sources that could then have been identified either by means of extant Greek manuscripts or pre-1611 vernacular versions. A full collation of the King James New Testament with all extant, i.e. in the 19th century, textual sources available to the King's men would then have revealed something of God's preservation of "the words of the LORD" according to Psalm 12:6, 7. God would then have been glorified according to 1 Corinthians 10:31.

"...whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God."

The kind of collation suggested above would serve a similar purpose, updating the results collated from 19th century textual sources. The updated results would then most likely show, for example, how post-19th century manuscript discoveries repeatedly *agree* with the King James New Testament *against* modern i.e. post-1881 RV departures, as even the old papyri do. See *New Age Versions* Chapter 35 *The Earliest Manuscripts*.

Again, God would be glorified according to 1 Corinthians 10:31, which is what matters.

"...whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God."

If Dr DiVietro was so concerned about the right use of interlinears and what he perceives as the pressing need for them (in what appears above to be a circular statement to this author, i.e. get an interlinear (Berry's or some other) in order to have an interlinear), he and his DBS Executive Committee colleagues should carry out that kind of collation.

It would be a better use of time and resources than indulging in ***"things wherein there is no profit"*** Jeremiah 16:19 like ***A WARNING!!*** and *Cleaning-Up* (except possibly of the monetary kind) in violation of the priesthood of all believers 1 Peter 2:5, 9, see *Quotes 114, 135* and in defiance of 2 Timothy 2:14.

"Of these things put them in remembrance, charging them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers."

Dr DiVietro's continued insistence on the supposed need for Bible study aids, so-called, such as lexicons, dictionaries and interlinears is of course in itself a continued denial of the priesthood of every believer, 1 Peter 2:5, 9, the sufficiency of the Bible, ***"comparing spiritual things with spiritual"*** 1 Corinthians 2:13 ***"that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works"*** 2 Timothy 3:17 and the teaching ministry of the Holy Spirit, e.g. John 16:13. See ***Challenges #2, #5, Points-Counterpoints, Quotes 19, 28, 47, 71, 86.***

"Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come."

Concerning Dr DiVietro's statement that the student should use an interlinear New Testament in order to identify words that he then consults in other sources, the following extract from *Quote(s) III* is a reminder of how precarious Dr DiVietro's suggested procedure is.

The extract also counters Dr DiVietro's denial of the all-sufficiency of the 1611 Holy Bible to give its own word meanings by means of its own built-in dictionary. See **Setting Up the 'Clean-up', Challenges #1, #2, #3, Points-Counterpoints, Quotes 9, 14, 39, 50, 61, 62, 67, 71, 85, 87** for remarks on the 1611 Holy Bible's built-in dictionary and *The Language of the King James Bible* and *In awe of Thy Word* Parts 1-4 for detailed analyses, with numerous examples.

Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement from p 635 of Hazardous Materials follows, her emphasis. The statement indicates that Dr Mrs Riplinger is aware of the space limitation for the English text of an interlinear bible, despite Dr DiVietro's insinuation to the contrary.

"...[Green] chooses English words based on their SIZE not on their accuracy of equivalency."

How is that kind of selection capable of being a good place to start in order to understand an underlying Greek or Hebrew text? Dr DiVietro does not explain. He has also failed to appreciate the importance of Psalm 12:6 with respect to David's prayer in Psalm 119:34, 73, 125, 144, 169 "Give me understanding." See Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint.

Psalm 12:6 states "The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times."

Understanding of "the scripture of truth" Daniel 10:21 comes from the Lord's seven-fold "purified" words, not an interlinear's space-limited packaged words. See Challenges #5, #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints and remarks on Dr DiVietro's examples of 'understanding' via 'the Greek.'

*Among the extracts from *Quote(s) III* is the following from pp 636 of Hazardous Materials.*

"Green's English words are corrupt, taken from corrupt "lexicons" such as "Strong," "Vine," "Trench," "Thayer," "Brown-Driver-Briggs," (sic) and "Gesenius" (The Interlinear Bible Greek-English, Vol. 4, p. xv; The Interlinear Hebrew-English, vol. 2, pp. x, xiv). Such lexicons and their authors will be thoroughly discredited in this book. He says that, "Through the use of The Interlinear Bible, one can utilize the lexicons, word books, and other aids..." (The Interlinear Bible, Preface). Therefore one is not reading Green, or any sort of literal English translation, but the nefarious lexical definitions of these corrupt lexicons."

An interlinear English text such as Green's is therefore subject to lexical limitations as well as space limitations.

The lexical shortcomings in turn cast further doubt on the usefulness of an interlinear English text as a means of understanding an underlying Greek or Hebrew text.

*Dr DiVietro has no direct comment to make on the above statement from Hazardous Materials, which means that he either accepts it as correct but is too churlish to say so, or his support for the lexicons of Liddell, Scott and co., see remarks above on *Quotes 70, 72, 78, 79*, prevents him from "Providing for honest things, not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men" 2 Corinthians 8:21.*

Either way, Dr DiVietro would be wise to reflect upon Proverbs 26:12.

"Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit? there is more hope of a fool than of him."

Finally for **Quote 149**, the following statement from p 714 of *Hazardous Materials* that *immediately precedes Quote 149* shows that it is Dr DiVietro who has been disingenuous. He bypassed the following statement, which shows that Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement in **Quote 149** has *not* been taken out of context and that it *does* apply to the whole of Berry's interlinear.

Dr DiVietro has therefore yet again ignored the context of one of his quotes. See **Quote 145**.

He has yet again falsely accused Dr Mrs Riplinger. See **Quotes 144, 148**.

Emphases are Dr Mrs Riplinger's.

“Very Wary of Berry’s English Verbs

“Berry’s interlinear includes the actual King James Bible text in the margin and sheepishly admits that the KJB is necessary to “make it plain,” regarding verb tenses:

*““We preserve this uniformity for the sake of literalness, always remembering **the fact of the Authorized Version** being in proximity, which **will make all plain** in such instances” (Berry, Introduction, p. iv).”*

Berry's statement is from his *Introduction*, giving notes for guidance for his interlinear. Therefore, Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement in **Quote 149** has *not* been taken out of context and it *must* apply to the whole of Berry's interlinear, wherever the verb tenses occur to which he refers in his *Introduction*.

Dr DiVietro is being disingenuous to insist anything to the contrary.

This author is reminded of Ezekiel 22:27, with respect to Dr DiVietro's repeated dishonesty in his comments and that of his associates, who uniformly support his comments. See the Preface to *Cleaning-Up* by Drs Waite and Williams and Dr Waite's endorsement of *Cleaning-Up* on its back cover.

“Her princes in the midst thereof are like wolves ravening the prey, to shed blood, and to destroy souls, to get dishonest gain.”

Quote 150, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 715

“Berry follows Thayer’s Greek Grammar. Thayer was a Unitarian who translated German grammars and lexicons into English.”

Dr DiVietro states that what Thayer did was entirely right and that he would do the same if he did not have any lexicons or dictionaries in English and his aim was to learn Greek. Dr DiVietro adds that is perfectly acceptable to build knowledge on prior knowledge by using non-Biblical classical Greek grammars in order to start learning the Koine Greek of the Greek New Testament. He accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of trying to reinvent the wheel by denying the usefulness of secular Classical Greek texts for learning Koine Greek.

Rather than learning Greek, Dr DiVietro would have done better to have **“learned Christ”** Ephesians 4:20. He may then have been in a better position to apply Hebrews 5:14 with respect to Thayer's Greek-German-English supposed Bible study 'aids.'

“But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil.”

It would appear that Dr DiVietro has become **“dull of hearing”** Hebrews 5:11, otherwise God's Spirit, John 16:13, may have prompted him to check **Quote 22** and its context in *Hazardous Materials*. See this extract from remarks under **Quote 22**.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states with respect to Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon, her emphases:

“Thayer’s title indicates that his is merely an English translation of one rising out of the German mind of Carl Grimm as seen in his Latin-Greek Lexicon.... It had been a revision of Wilke’s Greek-Latin lexicon (1839-1851). Catholic Latin, through an unbelieving German mind, then translated into English by an American Unitarian. HmMMM. Sounds like the ‘originals’ to me.”

The procedure sounds to this author like an im-purification process in total contrast to Psalm 12:6 and therefore wholly inappropriate for the determination of New Testament word meanings. Sister Riplinger is right to be cynical. [She continues].

“In 1952 its [Bauer et al’s lexicon] tentative notes made a trip to Germany. The ship which carried them, the Flying Enterprise, sank and the notes were buried in Davy Jones locker.... Back to the drawing board.”

Dr DiVietro under **Quote 150** evidently condones the procedure of *“Catholic Latin, through an unbelieving German mind, then translated into English by an American Unitarian”* in order, eventually, to ‘clarify’ **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21 via ‘the Greek,’ so-called.

See *Cleaning-Up* p 94 and note again this extract from **Quote(s) 111** under **Quote 149**.

See Challenges #5, #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints and remarks on Dr DiVietro’s examples of ‘understanding’ via ‘the Greek.’

For the complete overview from *Hazardous Materials* as summarised in this work of the insidious influence of *“the unbelieving German mind”* on lexicons and Greek-English dictionaries etc., see **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** on p 58 of *Cleaning-Up* and accompanying summary points, **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint** on pp 70-74 of *Cleaning-Up* and accompanying summary points, **Challenges #1-#7 – Overview for Challenges #1, #3, Points-Counterpoints** and **Quotes 22, 23, 46, 67, 68, 70** and **Table 4, 4a, 4b** and notes, **77, 81**.

That overview will show that Dr Mrs Riplinger is not reinventing any wheel, with respect to which comment Dr DiVietro has again falsely accused her, see **Quote 149**. It will show instead that Dr DiVietro is **“a fool in his folly”** Proverbs 17:12 with respect to his comments under **Quote 150** that effectively endorse *“Catholic Latin, through an unbelieving German mind, then translated into English by an American Unitarian”* with respect to so-called Bible study ‘aids.’

Dr DiVietro’s evident endorsement of *“Catholic Latin, through an unbelieving German mind, then translated into English by an American Unitarian”* is a further denial on his part of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See **Quote 149**.

Dr DiVietro’s folly is made plain by the context of **Quote 150**. Dr DiVietro has yet again ignored the context of one of his quotes. See again **Quote 149**.

This statement from *Hazardous Materials* immediately follows **Quote 150**.

*“Thayer denied the blood atonement, the Virgin birth, the deity of Christ, the Trinity, salvation by grace through faith, the sinfulness of man, and the infallibility of the scriptures. Thayer’s interest in the Bible was merely to destroy it in any way he could. He found in the grammars and lexicons of unbelieving critical Germans, a lightless shadow which he cast over the English Bible through his grammars and lexicon [see Hazardous Materials pp 334 for Thayer’s distortions of Matthew 4:9, Luke 2:33, 4:9, John 9:38 and Acts 17:29, Romans 1:20, Colossians 2:9 on **“the Godhead”** and **Quote 70** and **Table 4, 4a, 4b** and notes for details on more Thayer-based distortions of scripture].”*

Dr DiVietro fails to challenge the above statement. He evades it just like the Jews evaded the Lord’s questions in John 8:46.

“Which of you convinceth me of sin? And if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me?”

Dr DiVietro doesn't believe ***“the truth”*** any more than the Jews in John 8:48 did. See ***Quote 143***. He continues to attack Sister Riplinger just like the Jews continued to attack the Lord Jesus Christ, ***“a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God”*** John 8:40.

Paul summarises the *real* attitudes of Dr DiVietro and his associates with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible and Sister Riplinger's researches in support of it extremely well in 2 Timothy 3:8-9, see ***Quote 76***, in spite of any genuinely useful material even yet available from *The Bible for Today*, e.g. *Defending the King James Bible*. This work will hopefully help to fulfil 2 Timothy 3:9 with respect to Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee.

“Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith. But they shall proceed no further: for their folly shall be manifest unto all men, as theirs also was.”

Quote(s) 151, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 715, 716

“Berry's Interlinear often places the Bible and our life with Christ in the dead past; it becomes lifeless, just like J. H. Thayer wanted it to...in James 2:11...instead of the KJB's “Do not kill” (plain and to the point) [Berry] plays “Mother may I,” saying “Thou mayest not commit murder.” He shatters three strong syllables into eight sissy syllables. As he admits, the KJB “will make all plain.””

Quote(s) 151 takes up over half a page of *Cleaning-Up* and highlights how Greek and English verb tenses repeatedly do not match. However, Dr DiVietro appears to address only the statements cited above. He insists that it is perfectly all right for editors of interlinears to give literal readings that may then be changed to suit the context of a passage of scripture.

Dr DiVietro states that was what the King James translators did throughout their work, where they gave literal translations of particular words in the margin that they then modified to suit the text.

It seems to have escaped Dr DiVietro's notice that the reading *“Thou mayest not commit murder”* is in the *text* of Berry's Interlinear, not the footnotes. Any ordinary reader could, understandably, easily think that Berry's eight-syllable sissy reading therefore *did* suit the context of James 2:11, *not* that it was an unmodified literal reading.

Dr DiVietro has therefore ignored the context of the quote. See ***Quote 150***.

It should be noted that by inspection, ‘the Greek’ for ***“Do not kill”*** in James 2:11 reads the same in Berry's text, the text of Nestle's 21st Edition and the Farstad-Hodges ‘Majority’ Text. However, the English interlinear texts of Nestle and Farstad-Hodges read *“Do not murder”* and *“You shall not murder,”* essentially following the verb structure of the AV1611 in James 2:11 i.e. with a definite statement, not a cautionary one.

Dr DiVietro appears to believe that the reading ***“Do not kill”*** in James 2:11 is correct for the context of the passage and *two* sets of Greek text editors appear to *agree* with him, *against* a third i.e. Berry. Dr DiVietro on pp 24-25 of *Cleaning-Up* dismisses the Nestle text as distorted and perverted but he obviously cannot do so for Nestle's verb construction in James 2:11. It is of course *Berry's* English reading in James 2:11 that is distorted and perverted and Dr DiVietro should have the grace to acknowledge it as such, instead of trying to come up with an excuse for it that doesn't apply.

The Trinitarian Bible Society states in an article entitled *Fruit Among the Leaves, Quarterly Record*, July-September 1980, no. 472 that the 1611 AV1611 has 112 marginal notes of more literal renderings of the Greek and 582 marginal notes of alternative renderings of the Greek.

Inspection of James 2:11 in *The Original 1611 King James New Testament of OUR LORD AND SAVIO[U]R JESUS CHRIST, A Photographic Reproduction of the Original*, see **Quote 137** and *The Holy Bible, A Reprint of the Edition of 1611*, Oxford University Press, 1985, shows *no* marginal reference for either a literal or alternative reading for **“Do not kill”** in James 2:11.

The TBS article *Fruit Among the Leaves* lists five examples of more literal renderings of the Greek in the 1611 AV1611 that are found in the margin; Mark 1:10, 2:21, 7:3, 4, 9. The same marginal notes are found in the contemporary Cambridge Cameo Edition of the AV1611. Although different words are suggested e.g. “beds” for **“tables”** in Mark 7:4, consistent no doubt with the manner of dining understood to have been practised in Biblical times, not one of the TBS examples shows the kind of major change of verb construction about which Dr Mrs Riplinger warns for James 2:11 and which not one but two Greek editors avoided, contrary to Berry.

Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, fails to supply any examples from the margin of the 1611 AV1611 to support his excuse for Berry’s *textual English* reading in James 2:11.

Dr DiVietro’s comments on **Quote(s) 151** are therefore irrelevant. He has not answered **Quote(s) 151**, let alone refuted Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statements therein.

Quote 152, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 722

“Why does the KJB render Eph. 1:5 correctly, as demonstrated previously? Why is his Old Testament exactly 666 pages long?”

Dr DiVietro adds “see pages 718-722” to **Quote 152**.

Dr DiVietro has no coherent comment to make on **Quote 152** and merely makes a mockery of the question “Why is his Old Testament exactly 666 pages long?” that he fails to answer. See **Quote 141** with respect to Dr DiVietro’s repeated mockery of Sister Riplinger.

Dr DiVietro displays further discourtesy to the reader in that he fails to identify the editor of the Old Testament to which **Quote 152** refers but merely gives page numbers of *Hazardous Materials*, pp 718-722. The editor is Newberry.

Dr DiVietro also fails to give the page reference in *Hazardous Materials* where Dr Mrs Riplinger describes the KJB’s correct translation of Ephesians 1:5 and he fails to cite the quote where he criticises Dr Mrs Riplinger for revealing that Berry omits “of children” in his inter-linear English reading for Ephesians 1:5. The page reference is pp 709-710 and the quote is **Quote 144**.

It may be that Dr DiVietro makes a mockery of Sister Riplinger’s question on the 666 pages of Newberry’s Old Testament in order to excuse his apparent support for the apostate NKJV and its satanic 666 logo. See extensive remarks under **Quote 8**.

In any event, Dr DiVietro’s slipshod response to **Quote 152** shows that he is unwilling to go the extra mile for his readers, unlike Sister Riplinger. See Matthew 5:41.

“And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.”

Quote 153, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 733

“Dr. Gary LaMore of Canada cites these quotes from Burgon and concludes, “[A]nd yet his recognition that in “lesser details,” the copies, versions, and Fathers might yield slight corrections if properly and soundly used”. Therefore Burgon, with all his hands on experience with Greek manuscripts, has concluded that versions, other than Greek, hold the original reading in some cases.”

Dr DiVietro refers the reader to pp 729-733 of *Hazardous Materials*. The relevant pages are actually pp 731-733, where Dr Mrs Riplinger inserts 6 citations from Burgon’s work *The Revision Revised* pp 21, xviii-xix, 269, 385, 392, 392 that were abstracted by Dr LaMore for his work on the Spanish Valera Bible entitled *While Latinos Slept*, available from A. V. Publications, shop.avpublications.com/.

Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of having twisted Dr LaMore’s statement. He says that both Dr LaMore and Dean Burgon would allow that any manmade published text (language unspecified) may contain errors. Dr DiVietro then insists that any change to that text would require that all the available textual evidence be examined to justify any such change. He says that any textual change would need the strongest possible support from manuscripts, versions, church fathers and lexicons [sic, lectionaries is no doubt the intended word]. Dr DiVietro then says that neither Dean Burgon nor Dr LaMore ever expressed or has ever expressed belief in versions i.e. non-Greek texts as **“all scripture”** that **“is given by inspiration of God”** but he concedes that some early versions did preserve original readings e.g. 1 John 5:7-8. However, he then accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of implying that the early versions were **“all scripture”** that **“is given by inspiration of God”** because they preserved readings such as 1 John 5:7-8 that do not have strong support from Greek manuscripts.

It should first be noted that Dr DiVietro has not informed his readers that **Quote 153** is the first quote taken from Chapter 20 of *Hazardous Materials* entitled *The Wobbly Unorthodox Greek Orthodox Crutch: Un-Orthodox Greek Manuscripts from the Un-Orthodox Greek Church*.

Dr DiVietro’s apparent reticence in this respect may be a reflection of his admission under **Quote 95** that the Greek manuscripts are not infallible. That admission would suggest that Dr DiVietro does not wish to go into detail about errors in the Greek manuscripts because that would cast further doubt on the validity of the deceptively eye-catching title of his and co-editor Frederick Scrivener’s joint publication, price \$24.95:

The Textus Receptus 1881 Greek text is the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version

See **Quotes 108, 118, 133**.

Dr DiVietro has, after all, stated under **Quote 95** that *the Greek New Testament text is perfect*. He has not explicitly identified where this, according to him, perfect *and no doubt according to him inspired* Greek text may be found between two covers but in this author’s considered view, Dr DiVietro has tried to *imply that it is his and his co-editor’s effort*, or that he would like the purchasers of that work to *think that it is or at least that it might be* (over and above any other extant Greek New Testaments or manuscripts).

See **Quotes 95, 123**.

Unfortunately for Dr DiVietro, Chapter 20 of *Hazardous Materials* goes into considerable detail about the errors in the extant Greek manuscripts and the necessity to correct them at times with vernacular translations, *according to the most highly regarded authorities on Greek manuscripts*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states on p 731 of *Hazardous Materials* that “*The world’s leading authorities on the Greek Received Text, Dean John Burgon and Dr. Jack Moorman remind us that the extant Greek texts are not the final authority.*”

Dr DiVietro says essentially the same on p 21 of *Cleaning-Up* but he also alludes to the perfect (though explicitly unidentified) Greek New Testament Text. See remarks above and **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**. However, his comments under **Quote 153** show that *Dr DiVietro will never allow that vernacular versions alone could be used to correct ‘the Greek.’* He perceives the vernacular versions as only *a component part* of a composite ‘package’ that could be used to make any possible correction.

The rest of the ‘package,’ Dr DiVietro insists, must necessarily include *Greek* sources i.e. purer manuscripts and lectionaries, because only *Greek* sources, Dr DiVietro would insist further, *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3, could legitimately be regarded as *inspired*.

In that way, Dr DiVietro could best preserve the supposed ascendancy of his and his co-editor’s text over any non-Greek source for the New Testament, such as an ancient version or a more recent one e.g. the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament*.

*Though note in the following extract from **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint** Dr DiVietro’s inherent inconsistency with respect to the supposedly perfect, inspired Greek text:

First, Dr DiVietro makes the incredible statement, p 20 that the few variations between different editions of the Received Greek Text can be resolved by back-translation of the AV1611...

*...according to Dr DiVietro’s approach, therefore, the result would then have to be a **fully inspired** Greek New Testament, **dependent for its full inspiration on an uninspired English translation**. That state of affairs seems truly weird to this author and it is suggested that this author’s earlier work be consulted for discussion of this bizarre situation [Dr D. A. Waite and the Dead Bible Society pp 27ff].*

What will have particularly galled Dr DiVietro in that respect is Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement *immediately after Quote 153* that Dr DiVietro has bypassed.

“This [versions, other than Greek, hold the original reading in some cases] is certainly true of today’s very slightly marred Greek printed editions by Frederick Scrivener [and Kirk DiVietro] and George Ricker Berry, as was demonstrated in the chapters devoted to their texts...”

That is no doubt why Dr DiVietro tries to browbeat Dr Mrs Riplinger for, in his view, implying that early vernacular versions were “**all scripture**” that “**is given by inspiration of God.**” That is also why he falsely accuses her, see **Quote 150**, of twisting Dr LaMore’s statement. By inspection, Sister Riplinger has done nothing of the kind and Dr DiVietro does not show otherwise.

Concerning the inspiration of versions, including early versions of scripture, Dr LaMore’s site is gracembc.org/home.html from which the link to his church’s bookstore is gracembc.org/bookstore.html.

The subtitle for the link is, interestingly enough, *The Only King James Only Bookstore in Toronto*.

This link then links to gracembc.org/images/HBB_INVENTORY-King_James_Bible.pdf, entitled *The King James Bible*. Among the many worthy titles listed in the inventory, including some by King James inspirationalist authors such as Burton, Daniels, Gipp, Grady, Riplinger et al, is the following work, emphases in the inventory:

Lively Oracles - The Inspired Bible In The Hearts of Believers. - by James H. Sightler, M.D. "I believe and I hope this book will help to show that the King James Bible and those faithful vernacular translations which preceded it have not lost any inspiration or authority in translation." ISBN: 0-9673343-1-4 C \$4.00 ea.

Dr DiVietro states that he is acquainted with Dr LaMore. No doubt he would wish to remain acquainted with him (and avoid stepping into the ring with Dr Sightler).

Perhaps that is why Dr DiVietro does not yet appear to have undertaken a work entitled *Cleaning-Up Lively Oracles – The Inspired Bible In The Hearts of Believers*.

He may have in mind Proverbs 18:19.

"A brother offended is harder to be won than a strong city: and their contentions are like the bars of a castle."

Sisters, it would appear, don't count.

Quote(s) 154, from *Hazardous Materials* pp 733, 734, 735

"Author Dr. Jack Moorman of Great Britain, one of today's most prolific collators and researchers, agrees with Burgon, saying,

"Our extant MSS [manuscripts] reflect but do not determine the text of Scripture. The text was determined by God in the beginning (Psa. 119:89, Jude 3). After the advent of printing (AD 1450), the necessity of God preserving the MS witness to the text was diminished. Therefore, in some instances the majority of MSS extant today may not reflect at every point what the true, commonly accepted, and majority reading was...

*"And in those comparatively few places where it seems to depart from the majority reading, it would be far more honouring to God's promises of preservation to believe that **the Greek and not the English had strayed from the original!**"*

*"Even Scrivener admits that versions make "known to us the content of manuscripts of the original older than any at present existing". The KJB translators would agree. The recently discovered notes of the King James translation committee by KJB translator John Bois notes in two places (Romans 12:10 and James 2:22) where the KJB translators said the Greek should be interpreted "as if it had been written" in Greek **another way**. There were originally Greek codices that were correct in James 2:22, for example, but many Greek codices are not...The Encyclopedia Britannica affirms, "The English of the New Testament actually turned out to be superior to its Greek original" because they accessed and confirmed the Received Text in Holy Bibles in other languages. The EB is of course referring to the edition of the Textus Receptus in hand, not the originals."*

Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of again being deceptive. He states that Dr Mrs Riplinger has quoted an author in part and then added her own words to change the sense of the original quote completely. He then asks, if this is not so, why didn't Dr Mrs Riplinger quote the complete passage in question?

Dr DiVietro has again falsely accused Dr Mrs Riplinger, see **Quote 153**, and his criticism of her use of quotations is hypocritical in the extreme.

His accusation against Sister Riplinger is false because nowhere in his comments under **Quote(s) 154** does Dr DiVietro show how Dr Mrs Riplinger has changed anything with respect to the citations that she has given. He simply lies and insinuates to that effect, the same as James White does in his attacks on Sister Riplinger and *New Age Versions*.

See *Blind Guides* p 35 and www.av1611.org/kjv/ripwhit1.html *Just Plain Lies*, from which the following extracts are taken, the first of which explains why Dr Mrs Riplinger has given selective quotes in her books, her emphases.

“It is easy for readers, in this busy non-reading culture, to skip over a few words and thoughts which are submerged in a welter of other words...”

*“White’s lie that “She attempts to paint Dr. Palmer as a closet Aryan...” proves: 1.) White cannot **read** the words on a printed page and 2.) he **substitutes** his own wild imaginations. If that won’t convince his reader, he **ALTERS** Palmer’s quote under his heading “What Dr. Palmer actually said” to give the impression that I have grievously misquoted him (e.g. “few and clear”).”*

Dr DiVietro, like White, blatantly seeks to create false impressions of Sister Riplinger and her work.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has given detailed references for the citations in *Quote(s) 154*. Dr DiVietro could easily have furnished himself with the full quotes and inserted them under *Quote(s) 154* if he thought that he could substantiate his latest accusation against Sister Riplinger.

These references are of course in smaller print than the bulk of the text about which Dr DiVietro complains under **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**. See *Cleaning-Up* p 22.

Rather than equip himself with a magnifying glass or consult a colleague with better eyesight than his in order to *“accomplish a diligent search”* Psalm 64:6 for the full quotes from which Dr Mrs Riplinger inserted extracts under *Quote(s) 154*, Dr DiVietro merely persists with his *“continual dropping”* Proverbs 19:13 of invective against Sister Riplinger.

Dr DiVietro reminds this author of Carson Robison’s lazy canine companion.

See www.madmusic.com/song_details.aspx?SongID=6186 *Life Gits Tee-jus Don’t It*.

*Hound dog howling so forlorn,
Laziest dog that ever was born,
He’s howlin’ cause he’s settin’ on a thorn,
And just too tired to move over.*

Dr DiVietro certainly seems to perceive that *Hazardous Materials* is *“a thorn in the flesh”* 2 Corinthians 12:7 for him. It even gives him a headache. See *Quote(s) 155*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger gives the following reference for the second and third paragraphs of *Quote(s) 154*. Dr DiVietro omitted it.

([emphases] in the original; Jack Moorman, When the KJV Departs From the Majority, Ararat, VA; AV Publications, pp 27, 28)

The references that Dr Mrs Riplinger gives for the fourth and final paragraph of *Quote(s) 154* are as follows. Dr DiVietro has omitted them as well.

Scrivener, *Six Lectures*, p. 106

Ward Allen, *Translating For King James*, Vanderbilt University Press, 1969, pp. 43, 89
In Awe of Thy Word, p 538

Berry’s *Interlinear Greek-English*, Baker Books, 1985, p. 588 footnote for James 2:22

The footnote reads *“Read verse 22 interrogatively, as pointed in the Greek EGLTTrW [Elzevir, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Wordsworth, i.e. post-1611 editions]”*

“*“Biblical Literature: The King James and subsequent versions”*; this citation is from the contemporary EB, all other citations in this book are to the 1910-11 edition.”

As indicated above, it would have been easy for Dr DiVietro to have checked the above references in order to support his charge of duplicity against Sister Riplinger. Dr DiVietro has not done so, showing that the above references do *not* support his charge against Sister Riplinger and indicating that it is he himself who has been duplicitous.

Dr DiVietro’s extreme hypocrisy against Sister Riplinger is revealed by means of the quote from Pastor Moorman from *Hazardous Materials* p 734 that Dr DiVietro not only omitted but failed to indicate the omission by means of an appropriate ellipsis. (The ellipsis at the end of the second paragraph of **Quote(s) 154** is in *Hazardous Materials*. Dr DiVietro did not insert it.)

“When a version has been the standard for as long as the Authorized Version, and when that version has demonstrated its power in the conversion of sinners, building up of believers, sending forth of preachers and missionaries on a scale not achieved by all other versions and foreign language combined; the hand of God is at work. Such a version must not be tampered with.”

Tampering includes changing **“given by inspiration of God”** to **“God-breathed.”** See *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-iv, 2-3 and remarks under **Quote 86**.

Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee go further than tampering, though.

They deny that the 1611 Holy Bible is **“the book of the Lord”** Isaiah 34:16. See *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi, 2-4, 18, 87-88, 149.

They should take careful note of Jeremiah 23:16.

“...they speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the LORD.”

Quote(s) 155, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 735, 736, 737

Quote(s) 155 open with the statement on p 735 that “Evangelist Stephen Shutt reminds us, “Let it be clear, these languages were used by God at one time [ancient Hebrew and ancient Koine Greek]. Yet, interestingly enough, God did away with their authoritative solidarity at Pentecost” (letter on file). There are no verses in the Bible that indicate that the Greek Bible was to be the **only** Holy Ghost-built stepping stone to all other Bibles. “Search the scriptures,” as Jesus said, such a directive is not found in the Bible. Surely if the Greek Bible were to have pre-eminence and be continually used as **the** tool to open up the scriptures there would be at least one verse stating this...”

Quote(s) 155 continue with bullet point **1st** on p 736, then skip to p 737 of *Hazardous Materials* for the last paragraph of bullet point **4th** and conclude with bullet point **5th**.

“When “Samaria had received the word of God,” it was not in Greek, but the Holy Ghost given Samaritan “word of God,” from men who had received the gift of tongues.

“5th. The Lord said to Peter, “What God has [sic] cleansed, that call not thou common” (Acts 11:9). Vernacular means common. In Acts 2 the Holy Ghost cleansed, for his use, what vernacular use had marred.”

Although Dr DiVietro does not include it under **Quote(s) 155**, his comments under **Quote(s) 155** are based on the second last paragraph of bullet point **4th**.

““The Targum, or Samaritan-Aramaic version of the Pentateuch was most probably written down about that time (“not much earlier than the fourth century A. D.”). Hellenistic works, after Alexander were rare and were limited to minor literary works, not to the language of

the populace in general. The Arabic language gradually replaced Samaritan” (E. B. 1911, Vol. 24, pp. 110-111; The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Vol. 10, Funk and Wagnalls, 1911, p. 189).”

Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote(s) 155** indicate that yet again, he has ignored the quote, see **Quote 151**, descended into ridicule and mockery, see **Quote 141** and falsely accused Sister Riplinger, see **Quote(s) 154**.

Note again remarks under **Quote(s) 90**, which refer to the opening statement of **Quote(s) 155** by Bro. Shutt, which Dr DiVietro must perceive as extremely provocative but which he bypasses and continues his attack on Sister Riplinger, evidently preferring women-only targets.

It is **Quote(s) 155** that Dr DiVietro says gives him a headache. (He must have a strange head.) He says that it is an enormous leap of false logic, of Grand Canyon dimensions, to equate the term “word” under bullet point 4th with vernacular Bible translations. Dr DiVietro’s statement to that effect under **Quote(s) 155** is strangely garbled but it appears that once again he has denied that **“the word of God”** Acts 8:14 in the New Testament can exist in any form other than Koine Greek.

Dr DiVietro has of course denied yet again that Dark Age believers such as the Waldenses ever had **“the words of the LORD”** Exodus 4:28, 24:3, 4, Numbers 11:24, Joshua 3:9, 24:27, 1 Samuel 8:10, 15:1, 2 Chronicles 11:4, 29:15, Psalm 12:6, Jeremiah 36:4, 6, 8, 11, 37:2, 43:1, Amos 8:11 (18 occurrences in all). See remarks in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint, Challenges #1-#7 – Overview, Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**, overall summary, point 1.

Note this extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** on the subject of inspired translations.

While still on the subject of inspired translations, which Dr DiVietro denies, careful attention should be paid to the words of Benjamin Wilkinson with respect to the transmission of the Received Text to the Waldensian Church and the preservation of the true scriptures during the Dark Ages. Under-linings are this author’s.

“In the silent watches of the night, along the lonely paths of Asia Minor where robbers and wild beasts lurked, might have been seen the noble missionaries carrying manuscripts, and verifying documents from the churches of Judea to encourage their struggling brethren under the iron heel of the Papacy...

“The Scriptures of the apostle John and his associates, the traditional text – the Textus Receptus, if you please – arose from the place of humiliation forced on it by Origen’s Bible in the hands of Constantine and became the Received Text of Greek Christianity. And when the Greek East for one thousand years was completely shut off from the Latin West, the noble Waldenses in northern Italy still possessed in Latin the Received Text.

“To Christians such as these, preserving apostolic Christianity, the world owes gratitude for the true text of the Bible. It is not true, as the Roman Church claims, that she gave the Bible to the world. What she gave was an impure text, a text with thousands of verses so changed as to make way for her unscriptural doctrines. While upon those who possessed the veritable Word of God, she poured out through long centuries her stream of cruel persecution. Or in the words of [Nolan]:

““The Waldenses were among the first of the peoples of Europe to obtain a translation of the Holy Scriptures. Hundreds of years before the Reformation, they possessed the Bible in manuscript in their native tongue. They had the truth unadulterated, and this rendered them the special objects of hatred and persecution...Here for a thousand years, witnesses for the

truth maintained the ancient faith...In a most wonderful manner it (the Word of Truth) was preserved uncorrupted through all the ages of darkness.””

Benjamin Wilkinson and before him the distinguished theologian Frederick Nolan equated the Waldensian “translation of the Holy Scriptures” with “The Word of truth.” The expression “the word of truth” occurs 5 times in scripture; Psalm 119:43, 2 Corinthians 6:7, Ephesians 1:13, 2 Timothy 2:15, James 1:18 (the plural form, “the words of truth” occurs three times, in Proverbs 22:21, twice and in Acts 26:25). In Ephesians 1:13 “the word of truth” is associated with “the gospel of your salvation,” in 2 Timothy 2:15 it is to be studied in order in order “to shew thyself approved unto God” and in James 1:18 it is capable of begetting spiritual life. “The word of truth” clearly shares common attributes with “all scripture...given by inspiration of God” and in its entirety must be “all scripture...given by inspiration of God.”

See also the extensive remarks on inspiration of translations in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to Old Testament citations in Acts 2, 3, 8 and note this extract from **Challenges #1-#7 – Overview, Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**, overall summary, point 3.

*It will be observed that Peter quotes extensively from “the old testament” 2 Corinthians 3:14 in Acts 2, 3 **but not verbatim**. Moreover, by inspection, a later Old Testament citation, Acts 8:32-33 reads differently, like Peter’s quotations in Acts 2, 3 with respect to its Old Testament counterpart, Isaiah 53:7-8. Yet they are both “The place of the scripture which he read...Esaias the prophet.”*

*Therefore, this author believes, contrary to Dr DiVietro that the Lord Jesus Christ has sufficient grace, mercy, wisdom and power to provide **written inspired** portions of Old Testament scriptures at least soon after Acts 2, **directly inspired from an apostle’s** ‘free’ quotations from the Old Testament. The differences between the New Testament citations of the Old Testament in Acts 2, 3, 8 and their Old Testament counterparts show that these portions were in languages **other than Hebrew** but no less “The place of scripture” for that. Crucially, the differences between Acts 2:16-21, 25-28, 3:22-23, 8:32-33 and their Old Testament counterparts show that the New Testament passages must have been “**given by inspiration**” in languages other than Hebrew because Jewish scribes were required to make perfect copies of their Old Testament manuscripts. Even minor blemishes could result in the entire copy being destroyed and the manuscript recopied to perfection.*

Dr Moorman has shown that parts of a Syriac Old Testament existed by about the middle of the 1st Century A.D [Forever Settled p 28]. It appears that an Aramaic Old Testament existed at about the same time and this author thinks it possible, from a comparison of Isaiah 61:1, 2 and Luke 4:18, 19 that the Lord may have read and studied at least portions of an Aramaic Old Testament during His earthly ministry.

Dr DiVietro would naturally utterly reject this analysis but, as indicated, it will be interesting to see what happens at “the judgment seat of Christ” Romans 14:10.

What appears to be the cause of Dr DiVietro’s cranial discomfort is his notion that Sister Ripplinger is somehow relating Act 11, which he mentions but as indicated doesn’t include in **Quote(s) 155**, to what he terms the flawed Samaritan Pentateuch and Aramaic targums.

Dr Mrs Ripplinger is not associating Acts 11 with the Samaritan Pentateuch and Aramaic targums, which is obvious from the last three paragraphs of **Quote(s) 155**, reproduced below for convenience.

“The Targum, or Samaritan-Aramaic version of the Pentateuch was most probably written down about that time (“not much earlier than the fourth century A. D.”). Hellenistic works, after Alexander were rare and were limited to minor literary works, not to the language of the populace in general. The Arabic language gradually replaced Samaritan” (E. B. 1911, Vol. 24, pp. 110-111; The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Vol. 10, Funk and Wagnalls, 1911, p. 189).”

“When “Samaria had received the word of God,” it was not in Greek, but the Holy Ghost given Samaritan “word of God,” from men who had received the gift of tongues.

“5th. The Lord said to Peter, “What God has [sic] cleansed, that call not thou common” (Acts 11:9). Vernacular means common. In Acts 2 the Holy Ghost cleansed, for his use, what vernacular use had marred.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger has cited the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* etc. with respect to *“The Targum, or Samaritan-Aramaic version of the Pentateuch”* to show that the Greek language had died out as *“the language of the populace in general”* in the area of Samaria in what was then Palestine by the 4th century A. D. The Samaritan language had displaced Greek as *“the language of the populace in general”* (and was itself displaced later by Arabic) such that scripture-based works (even if flawed) e.g. *“The Targum, or Samaritan-Aramaic version of the Pentateuch”* were not written in Koine Greek but in *“the language of the populace in general.”*

That observation, from a secular and relatively objective source, supports Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement that *“When “Samaria had received the word of God,” it was not in Greek, but the Holy Ghost given Samaritan “word of God,” from men who had received the gift of tongues.”*

Dr DiVietro fails to prove otherwise.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has cited Acts 11:9 simply to show that *“Vernacular means common”* according to the 1611 Holy Bible’s built-in dictionary.

Dr DiVietro has therefore entirely misrepresented Sister Riplinger’s statement and, as indicated, again falsely accused her. Note this extract from **Quote 61** about the AV1611’s built-in dictionary.

As the first sentence on p 202 of Hazardous Materials indicates, Dr Mrs Riplinger is focusing on the KJB’s built-in dictionary, as the last sentence on p 202 emphasises.

“My books, In Awe of Thy Word and The Language of the King James Bible, document and demonstrate just how easily this built-in dictionary can be found.”

*Dr DiVietro has shown nothing but contempt for Sister Riplinger and her work but he has not shown under **Quote 61** any illustrations of how scripture interprets scripture. Dr Mrs Riplinger has given two sources where many such illustrations may be found. These illustrations have proved to be of great benefit to those of us who are **“poor in spirit”** Matthew 5:3 and therefore Proverbs 14:21 perceptively contrasts Dr DiVietro’s mockery with Sister Riplinger’s ministry.*

“He that despiseth his neighbour sinneth: but he that hath mercy on the poor, happy is he.”

Note also under **Quote 61** (if some counter-mockery may be allowed) the reference to a **“dumb ass”** 2 Peter 2:16 or **“an old prophet”** 1 Kings 13:11, 20-26, though not a dumb ass, 1 Kings 13:13.

Not a dumb ass and certainly not one of the “*dumb dogs*” Isaiah 56:10, see *Quote(s) 154*, *Cleaning-Up’s “old prophet”* resolutely dissembles on. See the following quotes, comments and responses.

Quote 156, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 740

“Unscriptural beliefs abound about the transmission of the New Testament text. For example, Jay P. Green states in the Preface to his Greek New Testament text that God preserved the scriptures “using the Greek Orthodox church.”

Dr DiVietro refers the reader to pp 738-740 of *Hazardous Materials* with respect to *Quote 156*. He insists that God did use the Greek church to preserve the scriptures and that without the thousands of manuscripts, lectionaries and quotations of church fathers, almost no evidence would exist for the words of the New Testament. Dr DiVietro adds that the many Greek manuscripts made available to the Western Church by the fall of Constantinople enabled that church to break free of the Latin Vulgate.

Dr DiVietro fails to address the context of the quote, see *Quote 155*.

He is wrong to say that the words of the New Testament depend almost entirely on the witness of the Greek sources made available to the Western Church by the fall of Constantinople.

Dr DiVietro should also note that Bible believers in the *true* Western Church had long been able to break free of the Latin Vulgate, well before the influx of Greek sources from the east

Note these statements from *Hazardous Materials* pp 739-740 with respect to the context of *Quote 156*, taken from before and after the quote.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states on p 739 of *Hazardous Materials*:

“Greek-Orthodox Only?”

*“The Greek Orthodox church is responsible for most of the Greek manuscripts which are used today to verify readings in the Bible. Like the Christ-rejecting Jews, the unregenerate Greek Orthodox hierarchy and monks, who transcribed these manuscripts during the years between 500 A. D. and 1500 A. D., made some minor alterations which affect the purity of their Greek manuscripts. They omitted several verses, a number of words, and many of their manuscripts do not even contain the book of Revelation. Given these facts, we see that it is unsafe to lean completely upon the manuscripts of this church as **the** final authority.”*

Quote 156 follows, with references that Dr DiVietro omitted but which refer back to the material covered in *Quotes 93-103* and *142-152*. Inspection of those quotes and the accompanying remarks in this work will show the disdain that both Scrivener and Berry harboured for the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament and Dr DiVietro’s persistent attempts to defend their waywardness by attacking Sister Riplinger.

Dr DiVietro should reflect again upon Proverbs 17:15. See *Quotes 70, 74, 87*.

“He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination to the LORD.”

Dr DiVietro is **“both.”**

The references are *Hazardous Materials*, Chapter 17 “*The Textual Heresies of F. H. A. Scrivener*,” Chapter 19 “*Very Wary of George Ricker Berry*.” These chapters give “*details about Jay P. Green’s The Interlinear Greek-English New Testament, Peabody MA: Hendrikson Publishers, 1988, Vol. IV, p. ix.*”

Dr Mrs Riplinger states on p 740 of *Hazardous Materials*:

“Green’s unscriptural view is shared by seminary trained men in spite of the fact that no Bible verse indicates that a national Greek church and the documents its unregenerate monks produced would have a stranglehold of authority over Bibles preserved by true Christians over the ages. No scripture indicates that the Greeks would be the only ones to have a pure text. Not only is there no verse which states this, but the book of Revelation states dogmatically that God said he would “remove the candlestick out of his place” from the Greek-speaking church if it did not repent of its unscriptural practices (Rev. 2:5). The candlestick, which is the church, holds the candle, which is the word of God and is a light unto our path (Rev. 1:20). The Greek-speaking churches did not repent. Today there are no thriving Christian bodies where the Greek-speaking churches of [Laodicea], Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos and Thyatira, Sardis, and Philadelphia were (Rev. 1:11) – only the skeletal remains in the form of the Greek Orthodox church. Ancient Koine Greek is no longer a spoken language; it died with the removal of their candlestick; its remains merely haunt Modern Greek...”

With respect to the demise of “*Ancient Koine Greek*,” note these extracts from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**. It has not occurred to Dr DiVietro that the fall of Constantinople, to which he refers in his comments under **Quote 156**, could have had anything to do with the spiritual condition of the Greek church, to which Dr Mrs Riplinger alludes above. That church’s attachment to ‘the Greek’ as manifested by their manuscripts did not enable them to repel the heathen invaders.

Dr DiVietro devotes pp 82-84 of his book to a potted history of the spread of Koine Greek from Egypt to India...

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s outline of the spread of Koine Greek, including its evident popularity in Rome and with the Caesars, two basic problems arise that Dr DiVietro overlooked, with respect to the propagation of the Gospel and the spread of the scriptures.

1. *He is headed in the wrong direction.*
2. *He has ended up in the wrong place (Rome).*

It should be noted first that most of the regions that Dr DiVietro describes as having been blessed with an overspreading of Koine Greek are now in Muslim hands and most likely will be until the Second Advent. ‘The Greek’ therefore didn’t help the inhabitants of these areas much, especially insofar as Dr DiVietro fails to mention one single nation among those areas that has been noted for either spiritual greatness or initiating missionary outreach for the last two thousand years. To the contrary, these areas remain some of the most difficult in the world for missionaries to reach with the Gospel to the present day...

Note especially [Dr Ruckman’s] conclusion that “if they go east they will run smack into the Turks, Saracens and Moslems who will consider it a privilege to kill them or make slaves out of them.” This is precisely the area of which Dr DiVietro informs the reader that Koine Greek had spread into. Koine Greek, the language of the Roman theatre and ‘the originals’ according to Dr DiVietro, was clearly not strong enough to resist the Islamic invasion.

The context of **Quote 156** is not denying that God used Greek sources to preserve the words of scripture, as Dr DiVietro tries to imply that Sister Riplinger infers in **Quote 156**. Dr Mrs Riplinger on pp 739-740 of *Hazardous Materials* is warning against the error of supposing, as Jay P. Green appears to, that God used Greek sources *exclusively* to preserve the New Testament scriptures and/or that Greek manuscript sources (and the Greek texts derived from

them) *must be revered in authority over all other witnesses to the New Testament and any and all non-Koine Greek New Testaments e.g. the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament.*

Note these statements from pp 739-740 of *Hazardous Materials* respectively.

*“Given these facts, we see that it is unsafe to lean completely upon the manuscripts of this church as **the** final authority.”*

“Green’s unscriptural view is shared by seminary trained men in spite of the fact that no Bible verse indicates that a national Greek church and the documents its unregenerate monks produced would have a stranglehold of authority over Bibles preserved by true Christians over the ages.”

Dr DiVietro does not challenge any of the statements from pp 739-740 of *Hazardous Materials* that reveal the context of **Quote 156**, which he has clearly misconstrued.

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s notions that the words of the New Testament depend almost entirely on the witness of the Greek sources made available to the Western Church by the fall of Constantinople and that these Greek sources enabled the Western Church to break free of the Latin Vulgate, see the following extracts from **Chapter 12 – “The Old Latin and Waldensian Bibles”** from this author’s work *The ‘Whitewash’ Conspiracy – re: The King James Only Controversy* by **James White** pp 731ff.

See *Whitewashed: A Critique of James White*,
shop.avpublications.com/index.php?cPath=23&osCsId=il41q40hktlflis2u3mpguo9p5.

See also www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php *KJO Review Full*.

Additional citations from Benjamin Wilkinson’s work *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated* have also been included in what follows.

*Dr Moorman [Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version, A Closer Look! B.F.T. #1825 by Jack A. Moorman, The Bible for Today, 1990, pp 28ff] provides 1252 Old Latin citations of 356 doctrinal passages against the Received Text but 2340 citations **with** the Received Text or 2:1 in favour of the Received Text. Dr Moorman notes that the Vulgate of Jerome is about evenly divided in this respect. Moorman states [note this author’s emphases in the following citation].*

“It seems likely that the Old Latin was translated in the Syrian Antioch by missionaries going to the West. Existing manuscripts certainly show a strong Syrian and Aramaic tendency. This being the case, the Old Latin is associated with that city which is the missionary center of the Book of Acts, and had immediate concourse with those centers in Asia Minor which received the Epistles of Paul. History is so unanimous to Antioch being the fountainhead of the Traditional Text that it has been called the “Antiochan Text.”

*“The 55 or 60 OL manuscripts which remain for us today show varying amounts of corruption, and frequently disagree among themselves. As **such they are but an imperfect reflection of the original OL Text**. The OL of North Africa show some of the strange cases of addition and subtraction associated with the so-called Western Text, while those of Europe are generally favourable to the Traditional Text.*

“It is the branch of the Old Latin used in northern Italy that attracts our interest most, and establishes one of the crucial chapters in Bible transmissional history. This version, known as the Itala, is associated with the Christians of the Vaudois – the valleys of northern Italy and southern France. These noble believers withstood every attempt of Rome to “bring them into the fold.” From the days of Pope Sylvester (early 300’s) unto the massacres of 1655,

they were slaughtered, their names blackened and their records destroyed; yet they remained true to the Scriptures. They are known by a number of names, but best as the Waldensians. Research into the text and history of the Waldensian Bible has shown that it is a lineal descendent of the Old Latin Itala. In other words, the Itala has come down to us in the Waldensian form, and firmly supports the Traditional Text.”

Note the following citations from Benjamin Wilkinson’s work *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*. The first is from *Which Bible?* pp 199-200.

Extracts then follow from **Chapter 12 – “The Old Latin and Waldensian Bibles.”**

See also kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html for all the following citations from Wilkinson.

Note again this author’s emphases in the extract that follows.

*“Since Italy, France, and Great Britain were once provinces of the Roman Empire, the first translations of the Bible by the early Christians in those parts were made into Latin. The early Latin translations were very dear to the hearts of these primitive churches, and as Rome did not send any missionaries toward the West before 250 A.D., the early Latin Bibles were well established before these churches came into conflict with Rome. **Not only were such translations in existence long before the Vulgate was adopted by the Papacy, and well established, but the people for centuries refused to supplant their old Latin Bibles by the Vulgate.** “The old Latin versions were used longest by the western Christians who would not bow to the authority of Rome — e. g., the Donatists; the Irish in Ireland, Britain, and the Continent; the Albigenses, etc” [Jacobus].*

“God in His wisdom had invested these Latin versions by His Providence with a charm that outweighed the learned artificiality of Jerome’s Vulgate. This is why they persisted through the centuries. A characteristic often overlooked in considering versions, and one that cannot be too greatly emphasized, needs to be pointed out in comparing the Latin Bible of the Waldenses, of the Gauls, and of the Celts with the later Vulgate. To bring before you the unusual charm of those Latin Bibles, I quote from the Forum of June, 1887:

*““The old Italic version into the rude Low Latin of the second century held its own as long as Latin continued to be the language of the people. The critical version of Jerome never displaced it, and only replaced it when the Latin ceased to be a living language, and became the language of the learned. The Gothic version of Ulfilas, in the same way, held its own until the tongue in which it was written ceased to exist. **Luther’s Bible was the first genuine beginning of modern German literature** [see Wilkinson’s statement below with respect to the Waldensian basis for Luther’s Bible]...the translator needs not only a simplicity of mind rarely to be found in companies of learned critics, but also a language possessing in some large measure that broad, simple, and generic character which we have seen to belong to the Hebrew and to the Greek of the New Testament. It was partly because the Low Latin of the second century, and the Gothic of Ulfilas, and the rude, strong German of Luther had that character in a remarkable degree, that they were capable of rendering the Scriptures with a faithfulness which guaranteed their permanence.”*

“For nine hundred years, we are told, the first Latin translations held their own after the Vulgate appeared [Jacobus]. The Vulgate was born about 380 A.D. Nine hundred years later brings us to about 1280 A.D. This accords well with the fact that at the famous Council of Toulouse, 1229 A.D., the Pope gave orders for the most terrible crusade to be waged against the simple Christians of southern France and northern Italy who would not bow to his power. Cruel, relentless, devastating, this war was waged, destroying the Bibles, books, and every vestige of documents to tell the story of the Waldenses and Albigenses.”

Further extracts from **Chapter 12 – “The Old Latin and Waldensian Bibles”** follow. Note this author’s emphases.

Wilkinson gives a credible explanation [Which Bible? pp 201, 205-206, 209] for the intensity of the papal reaction, with numerous references.

*“Some authorities speak of the Waldenses as having as their Bible, the Vulgate. We regret to dispute these claims. But when we consider that the Waldenses were, so to speak, in their mountain fastnesses, on an island in the midst of a sea of nations using the Vulgate, without doubt they knew and possessed the Vulgate; but the Italic, the earlier Latin, was their own Bible, the one for which they lived and suffered and died. Moreover, to the east was Constantinople, the center of Greek Catholicism, whose Bible was the Received Text; while a little farther east, was the noble Syrian Church which also had the Received Text. In touch with these, northern Italy could easily verify her text. It is very evident that the Latin Bible of early British Christianity [i.e. of the same lineage as the Waldensian Bibles] not only was not the Latin Bible of the Papacy, that is, the Vulgate, **but it was at such variance with the Vulgate as to engender strife...***

Wilkinson provides further evidence to illustrate the differences between the Waldensian Bibles and Jerome’s Vulgate.

“In the fourth century, Helvidius, a great scholar of northern Italy, accused Jerome, whom the Pope had empowered to form a Bible in Latin for Catholicism, with using corrupt Greek manuscripts. How could Helvidius have accused Jerome of employing corrupt Greek MSS. if Helvidius had not had the pure Greek manuscripts? And so learned and so powerful in writing and teaching was Jovinian, the pupil of Helvidius, that it demanded three of Rome’s most famous fathers — Augustine, Jerome, and Ambrose — to unite in opposing Jovinian’s influence. Even then, it needed the condemnation of the Pope and the banishment of the Emperor to prevail. But Jovinian’s followers lived on and made the way easier for Luther...”

With respect to Luther, see above, Wilkinson states, *Which Bible?* p 211, this author’s emphases:

*“It is interesting to trace back the Waldensian Bible which Luther had before him when he translated the New Testament. **Luther used the Tepl Bible, named from Tepl, Bohemia. This Tepl manuscript represented a translation of the Waldensian Bible into the German which was spoken before the days of the Reformation.**”*

Further extracts from **Chapter 12 – “The Old Latin and Waldensian Bibles”** follow.

Dr Mrs Riplinger [In Awe of Thy Word pp 962, 966-968, 982-983] has these comments with respect to the Old Itala and Waldensian Bibles. Emphases are hers...

“The Old Itala Bible, dating back to the time of the apostles, matches Erasmus’ Greek New Testament and the King James Bible. (This author collated them.) Even Augustine in his fourth century writing, *De doctrina Christiana*, admitted that ‘in the early centuries of the church, a very great number of Latin’ [pre-Jerome] Bibles were available, saying “Now among the translations themselves the Italian (Itala) is to be preferred to the others, for it keeps closer to the words without prejudice.”*

****The purpose of this collation is in part to show how closely the Old Itala Bible follows the 1611 Holy Bible. See extract from *Quote 124* at the end of *Quote 156*.**

“Erasmus wrote in his Preface that he consulted, not the Latin Vulgate, but these ancient Italic Bibles...”

“Jerome corrupted [the] pure Old Itala Bible in the fourth century. He admitted in his Preface. “You [Pope Damasus] urge me to revise the Old Latin and, as it were, to sit in judgment on the copies of Scriptures which are now scattered throughout the world...Is there not a man, learned or unlearned, who will not, when he takes the volume in hand...call me a forger and a profane person for having had the audacity to add anything to the ancient books, or to make changes...” In Jerome’s Prologue to the Catholic Epistles, “Preserved in the Codex Fuldensis”...he admits that Christians “have pronounced to have me branded a falsifier and a corrupter of the Sacred Scriptures”...Even Metzger...admits, “Jerome’s apprehension that he would be castigated for tampering with the Holy Writ was not unfounded. His revision of the Latin Bible provoked both criticism and anger, sometimes with extraordinary vehemence.””

*“When Erasmus was in Italy he would have seen, not only the ancient pure Old Itala manuscripts, but the Italian Bibles of his day, as well. These Italian Bibles did not match the corrupt Latin Vulgate of Jerome, according to Samuel Berger, who has done **the** definitive work on the history of the Italian translations. [Citing the Cambridge History of the Bible] “Berger’s general conclusion was that Italian translators depended in large measure on previous French and Provincial versions...before the mid-thirteenth century and representing, in part at least, **non-Vulgate** versions...These conclusions have been accepted in the main...The formation of the Italian Bible was influenced by transalpine versions...It is probable...that the first Italian versions were the work of Waldensian(s)...”*

*“Today we have copies of Italian Bibles that would have been very familiar to Erasmus: the Tuscan version of the 1200s, a Venetian dialect Bible of the 1300s, the Riccardiani Bible of 1252, the Malermi Bible of 1420, and the Jenson Italian Bible. Erasmus would have had no problem determining what readings were accepted by the **real** body of Christ in Italy”...*

“Jacques LeLong states that even in the editions of 1170 and 1180, the [Old] French Bible follows the readings of the Christian Waldenses, not the Catholic edition...”

“Today there are six remaining copies of the 1180 edition of the French Provençal (Rouman) version of the Bible. This language was spoken in the south of Europe between the 9th and 14th centuries. It carried forward the pure old Itala Bibles of the Waldenses.”

Note this extract from **Quote 7**.

*Dr DiVietro should have reviewed Dr Mrs Riplinger’s latest book *The Hidden History of the English Scriptures* pp 2-6. She states the following.*

“Scholars, such as Herman Hoskier, have long demonstrated that the originals were not written in Greek only. In the 1500s John Foxe records a statement from what he called “a certain old treatise, found in a certain ancient English book.” This “ancient” book says, “Also the four evangelists wrote the gospel in divers languages, as Matthew in Judea, Mark in Italy, Luke in Achaia, and John in Asia. And all these wrote in the languages of the same countries...” It goes on to say, “since Christ commanded his apostles to preach his gospel unto all the world, and excepted no people or language.””

Sister Riplinger states further that “The Prologue before the book of Matthew in an edition of the Bishops’ Bible said, “Matthew, who also was called Leui, being of a Publican made an Apostle, did first in Iurie (Jewry) write the Gospel of Christ in the Hebrew tongue for their sakes which beleueed of the circumcision. It is uncertaine who afterwards did translate it into the Greeke tongue. Howbeit the copy of the Hebrew is kept vnto this day in the library of Cesarea, which library Pamphilus Martyr did gather together most diligently...””

Note also this extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** in conclusion for **Quote 156**, citing Wilkinson, *Which Bible* pp 214-215, kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html. Underlinings and emphases are this author's.

"In the silent watches of the night, along the lonely paths of Asia Minor where robbers and wild beasts lurked, might have been seen the noble missionaries carrying manuscripts, and verifying documents from the churches of Judea to encourage their struggling brethren under the iron heel of the Papacy..."

*"The Scriptures of the apostle John and his associates, the traditional text – the Textus Receptus, if you please – arose from the place of humiliation forced on it by Origen's Bible in the hands of Constantine and became the Received Text of Greek Christianity. **And when the Greek East for one thousand years was completely shut off from the Latin West, the noble Waldenses in northern Italy still possessed in Latin the Received Text.**"*

*"To Christians such as these, preserving apostolic Christianity, the world owes gratitude for the true text of the Bible. **It is not true, as the Roman Church claims, that she gave the Bible to the world. What she gave was an impure text, a text with thousands of verses so changed as to make way for her unscriptural doctrines. While upon those who possessed the veritable Word of God, she poured out through long centuries her stream of cruel persecution. Or in the words of [Nolan]:**"*

*"**"The Waldenses were among the first of the peoples of Europe to obtain a translation of the Holy Scriptures. Hundreds of years before the Reformation, they possessed the Bible in manuscript in their native tongue. They had the truth unadulterated, and this rendered them the special objects of hatred and persecution...Here for a thousand years, witnesses for the truth maintained the ancient faith...In a most wonderful manner it (the Word of Truth) was preserved uncorrupted through all the ages of darkness."**"*

Likewise, *it is not true* that Greek sources from Constantinople provide almost the only witnesses of the words of the New Testament, as Dr DiVietro claims.

Nor is it true that Greek sources from Constantinople *exclusively* freed the Western Church from the Latin Vulgate, as Dr DiVietro also claims.

They certainly failed to free the Greek church from its unscriptural practices, as the remainder of Chapter 20 of *Hazardous Materials* unequivocally shows.

Note that the history of the preservation of the Biblical text as outlined above clearly accords with the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9 that Dr DiVietro has yet again denied, in his comments under **Quote 156**. See **Quote 150**.

Extract from Quote 124 on the Old Itala Bible

Dr Mrs Riplinger has shown the overwhelming agreement of the pre-1611 Bibles in many languages *including Latin and Italian* with the 1611 Holy Bible with respect to important verses from the Gospels from the 12-column Nuremberg Polyglot Bible.

She states in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 1048, 1050, her emphases:

*"God has graciously given this author one of the scarce remaining original editions of the twelve language polyglot Bible printed at Nuremberg, Germany in A.D. 1599. It contains the Gospels in Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, English, German, Danish, Bohemian and Polish...It demonstrates the perfect agreement of the English King James Bible with all pure Bibles from other languages. It is perhaps the most important polyglot Bible in print because it was printed twelve years **before the KJV** and five years before the KJV's translation began..."*

*“The KJV translators did not create some new text or any new readings. They merely reproduced the type of Bible the world has since the word was given to “all nations.” The following charts will also demonstrate, by contrast, that the corrupt readings in today’s new versions, like the NKJV, NIV, TNIV, NASB, Holman Christian Standard Bible and English Standard Version, yoked their unsuspecting readers with the Jehovah Witness sect and the Roman Catholic system. The purity of the KJV and the depravity of the new versions will be demonstrated through examination of **random** verses which present important doctrines of the Christian faith. The major doctrines covered include:*

1. *The Word of God*
2. *The Nature of God*
3. *The Deity of Christ, his death, resurrection & ascension*
4. *The Salvation by grace through faith*
5. *The Christian life*

“But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith:” Romans 16:26

*“The collation to follow will document that the KJV matches **precisely** all of the pure Bibles from around the world, that were written **before** the printing of the KJV.”*

The collation that follows in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 1052-1108, 57 pages inclusive, consists of 52 verses that have been listed as follows. See below.

Noting the doubts that Dr DiVietro has raised about the Old Latin and Diodati texts in his comments on **Quote 124**, the Old Latin, 1599 Latin and Italian Bibles have been highlighted in the list that follows.

An asterisk * denotes agreement between the Old Latin text and the Italian Bible where the Latin Version of 1599 departs from the reading of the 1611 Holy Bible, no doubt by means of early Bible-corrupting Jesuit influence. The hash # sign denotes where the 1599 Latin Version departs from the 1611 Holy Bible without inclusion of the Old Latin reading for comparison.

Matthew 5:44, 6:13b, 33, 7:14, 28, 8:19, 29, 11:23 with Luke 10:15 i.e. **“hell”** instead of **“depths”** NIV/TNIV, **“Hades”** NKJV, 15:8*, 9, 17:21, 19:16, 17, 22:32*, 24:45, 25:21, Mark 2:15, 7:28, 9:29, 42, 10:21, 24, 52[#], 12:32, 13:33, Luke 2:40[#], 4:4, 8*, 5:20, 9:35, 11:2*, 4*, 54, 22:64, 68, 23:42, 24:36, 51, 52, John 1:14, 18, 3:13, 4:42*, 6:40, 47, 69, 7:39*, 9:3, 4, 14:14*, 16:16.

8 verses; Matthew 15:8, 22:32, Luke 4:8, 11:2, 4, John 4:42, 7:39, 14:14, show agreement of the Old Latin and 1599 Italian Bibles with the 1611 Holy Bible where the later i.e. 1599 Latin Version departs from the 1611 Holy Bible, undoubtedly through early Bible-corrupting Jesuit influence.

Only two verses; Mark 10:52, Luke 2:40, show departures of the later Latin Version from the Italian Version and the 1611 Holy Bible without Old Latin support listed for the Italian Version and the 1611 Holy Bible. The 1599 Latin Version is the only text in the Nuremberg Polyglot Bible to exhibit extant departures from the 1611 Holy Bible in the verses listed. The pre-1611 Bibles therefore show 96% purity with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible, when the earlier evidence of the Old Latin witnesses is considered (together with one instance where

the departure of the 1599 Spanish Version in John 14:14 was corrected in the 1602 Valera Bible).

As indicated, Jesuit influence would be responsible for any impurities in the pre-1611 Bibles, noting their production of the 1582 Jesuit-Rheims New Testament*, the forerunner of today's English departures from the 1611 Holy Bible, as Dr Mrs Riplinger's tables in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 1052-1108 also show. Without Jesuit influence, 100% purity for the pre-1611 Bibles would appear to be feasible. *See *Did The Catholic Church Give Us The Bible?* by David W. Daniels, Chick Publications, pp 84, 110-111.

That information is clearly beneficial to Dr Mrs Riplinger's readers.

Dr DiVietro, as indicated, produces nothing to resolve the doubts that he has prompted with respect to the Old Latin and Diodati texts in his comments under **Quote 124**.

He should therefore keep in mind the admonition of Proverbs 6:16-19 with respect to **"he that soweth discord among brethren."**

Quote 157, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 741, 742

The first part of **Quote 157** consists of all of p 741 of *Hazardous Materials* apart from the first and last paragraphs and the references to Scrivener's *Six Lectures* and *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*.

Dr DiVietro comments only on the last part of the first paragraph of p 742 of *Hazardous Materials*, which reads as follows.

"These unsaved monks have made alterations to the text many times over the course of centuries. Such alterations appear today in modern versions which say in their margins, "the oldest MSS say...""

Dr DiVietro states that Dr Mrs Riplinger has not informed her readers that changes in the manuscripts were later corrected by monks by means of further changes to the texts of the manuscripts. He says, in effect, that these later changes eventually resulted in the correct New Testament text that was translated in the King James Bible. He adds that these later changes or corrections enable the oldest manuscripts to be rejected as faulty.

Dr DiVietro, typically, substantiates nothing in his comments under **Quote 157**. See **Quote 155**. He has again ignored the context of the quote and accused Dr Mrs Riplinger falsely. See **Quote 156**. He also fails to explain how unsaved Greek Orthodox monks were able to correct errors in their extant manuscripts such that a perfect New Testament was achieved. He cites neither the supposedly pure sources that these unsaved monks purportedly used for the corrections they made nor, yet again, the location between two covers of the perfect Greek New Testament text that they apparently achieved. See **Quote 123**.

Dr Mrs Riplinger is not referring to the correction of faulty manuscripts as such, which Dr DiVietro would have realised if he had read the whole of the paragraph from which he extracted **Quote 157**.

The entire paragraph, from pp 741-742 of *Hazardous Materials*, read as follows, with **Quote 157** included at the end.

"Scrivener says that the Sinaiticus manuscript, which underlies most new versions, was discovered in the Greek Orthodox compound, "the Convent of St Catherine" (Scrivener, Six Lectures, p. 32). It contains the apocryphal Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermes. It is one of the most treasured and most corrupt of all Greek manuscripts. It was under the care and periodic corruption of the monks who live in the walled complex of St. Cath-

erine's Greek Orthodox Monastery on Mt. Sinai. These unsaved monks have made alterations to the text many times over the course of centuries. Such alterations appear today in modern versions which say in their margins, "the oldest MSS say..."

Quote 157 refers to Codex Sinaiticus, or Aleph and the alterations made to its text, not the texts of faulty manuscripts in general. Dr DiVietro could have made far more constructive comments under **Quote 157** if he had simply cited from *New Age Versions*, Chapter 29, *The 1% Manuscripts*, with respect to Codex Sinaiticus.

"Princeton Professor, Bruce Metzger's recent *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible* reveals: "In the light of such carelessness in transcription, it is not surprising that a good many correctors (as many as nine) have been at work on the manuscript...Tischendorf's edition of the manuscript enumerates some 14,800 places where some alteration has been made to the text...[With] more recent detailed scrutiny of the manuscript...by the use of ultra-violet lamp, Milne and Skeat discovered that the original reading in the manuscript was erased...[in places]."

Wilkinson states with respect to Sinaiticus, *Which Bible* pp 307-308 that "Concerning the deprivations of Codex Aleph, we have the further testimony of Dr. Scrivener. In 1864 he published "A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus." In the Introductions he makes it clear that this document was corrected by ten different scribes "at different periods." He tells of "the occurrence of so many different styles of handwriting, apparently due to penmen removed from each other by centuries, which deform by their corrections every page of this venerable-looking document." Codex Aleph is "covered with such alterations, brought in by at least ten different revisers, some of them systematically spread over every page.""

See kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-15.html.

The adulterations to Sinaiticus over the centuries caused manuscript researcher Phillip Mauro to write in the early 1900s that, his emphases, "'From these facts, therefore, we deduce: first that the **impurity** of the Codex Sinaiticus, in every part of it, was fully recognized by those who were best acquainted with it, and that from the very beginning until the time when it was **finally cast aside as worthless for any practical purpose.**"'

See *Let's Weigh the Evidence* by Barry Burton, Chick Publications, 1983, p 61 and *True or False?* edited by Dr David Otis Fuller, Grand Rapids International Publications, 1983, p 76.

The manner in which Dr DiVietro has misconstrued **Quote 157** is so typical of his misconception of *Hazardous Materials* as a whole that Phillip Mauro's description of Codex Sinaiticus appears to this author to be a fair description of *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials* as well.

It too is "**worthless for any practical purpose.**"

Quote 158, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 742

“This [St. Catherine’s monastery, KD] monastery today is the home of the second largest library of Greek and other language Bible manuscripts in the world, housing some 6000 manuscripts, 3000 being from the ancient period. It also houses 2000 idolatrous icons. When someone says, ‘The Greek says...’ he is likely referring to the Greek manuscripts which have been housed in this monastery. These manuscripts are not kept at St. Catherine’s (or any other Greek monastery) because the Greek church and their monks love the word of God; they are kept because they are considered ‘relics’ and as such are superstitiously believed to have supernatural powers.”

Dr DiVietro has only a brief, mocking comment, see **Quote 152**, under **Quote 158** to the effect that God’s mysterious ways preserved the most ancient Greek manuscript copies through superstition.

Was it superstition or dissimulation that made Dr DiVietro bypass most of pp 746-766 of *Hazardous Materials* with only the cursory comment to the effect that these pages deal only with heretical and/or unusual practices in the Greek Orthodox Church. See **Quote 159**.

Dr DiVietro’s statement with respect to the contents of pp 746-766 of *Hazardous Materials* is yet another false accusation against Sister Riplinger. See **Quote 156**.

Sister Riplinger lists many verses on those pages that Greek Orthodox monks or their monkish predecessors sabotaged in some way, showing that superstition was not as benign with respect to the preservation of ancient Greek copies as Dr DiVietro would have his readers believe.

Dr DiVietro has bypassed all those scriptures. It is a recurring habit of his in *Cleaning-Up*.

See **Quote 70**, **Tables 4, 4a, 4b**, **Quotes 96, 99, 108, 109, 124, 125, 128, 142, 143, 144, Table 7, 148** for lists of verses from *Hazardous Materials*, *In Awe of Thy Word* and *New Age Versions* that Dr DiVietro should have checked in his comments on those quotes but failed to do so.

The verses from pp 746-765 of *Hazardous Materials* that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists are as follows. Greek monks either omitted them from many of their manuscript copies or altered them to suit Greek Orthodox false teaching. The first set of altered verses is from the Book of Revelation, changed to support Greek Orthodoxy’s amillennial heresy. This set is found on pp 754-758 of *Hazardous Materials*.

Acts 8:37, omitted, 1 John 5:7, omitted, Revelation 1:11, 2:1, 15, 20, 3:14, 4:6, 5:11, 11:15, 17, 14:1, 8, 15:2, 3, 18:9, 21:24, 17 readings in all, followed by a further 6 alterations that dishonour the Lord Jesus Christ but which are now passed off as the ‘Majority’ Text, edited by Farstad and Hodges.

The 6 verses altered are Revelation 1:8, 1:11, 19:1, 20:9, 21:3, 4. (Revelation 1:11 has been altered twice, the Greeks having omitted the phrases **“which are in Asia”** and **“I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last”** from the verse.)

Dr Mrs Riplinger lists further monkish omissions and alterations to many Greek manuscript copies as follows, from *Hazardous Materials* pp 760-765.

The verses are listed as they occur in *Hazardous Materials*.

Acts 9:5, 6, Luke 17:36, Matthew 27:35, Acts 10:6, 21, Matthew 4:18, 8:5, John 1:43, Revelation 12:17, Acts 15:11, 2 Corinthians 11:31, 2 Timothy 2:19, Revelation 22:21, 19:1, 16:5, James 5:11, Revelation 20:12, Philippians 3:3, Revelation 21:6, 5:14, 14:5, 22:11, 3:18, 5:7,

22:19, 5:5, Matthew 3:11, 6:18, 10:8, 12:35, Luke 6:26, 9:23, 14:5, 9:38, 17:5, Ephesians 3:9, Hebrews 11:13, 12:20, James 5:9, Revelation 6:9, 11, 11:9, 10:4, Luke 11:6, 17:4, 23:25, John 7:33, 8:5, 10, 10:8, Acts 8:10, 7:37, 14:17, 20:8, Ephesians 4:32, 2 Thessalonians 3:6, Titus 2:8, Philemon 6, 1 Peter 1:12, 2:21, 3:10, 5:10, 1 John 3:1, 23, Revelation 1:17, 5:10 with two alterations, as in Revelation 1:11, 20:3, 21:9, John 16:33, 17:2, 20, Acts 3:20, Revelation 17:13, 74 further verses with a total of 75 further monkish alterations to the New Testament.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has listed a total of 98 monkish omissions or alterations to the New Testament from 96 verses. That total hardly speaks well for ‘superstition’ as a means of preserving ancient Greek manuscript copies.

Contrary to what Dr DiVietro tries to imply in his comments under *Quote 157*, it appears that the verses affected as listed above have not been corrected by later correctors.

Dr DiVietro’s failure even to acknowledge in *Quotes 158, 159* the adulteration of Greek New Testament witnesses *by Greeks* makes him their accomplice and ranks him with “*adulterers, an assembly of treacherous men*” Jeremiah 9:2.

Quote 159, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 744-745

“Another source of manuscripts is the Greek Orthodox monastery Mt. Athos. ‘Father’ Harakas says, “...going back at least to 962 A.D., is the Holy Mountain Athos, which consists of twenty monasteries...” “Another interesting note is that despite modern advances, women are still not allowed on Mt. Athos,” known for its monasticism and thought to be a Holy Mountain.”

Dr DiVietro indignantly demands to know what *Quote 159* has to do with preservation of the scriptures. (Perhaps he is experiencing pricks of conscience about picking on women-only targets. See *Quote(s) 155*.)

He dismisses *Quote 159* as an attempt on Dr Mrs Riplinger’s part to discredit Greek manuscripts by the tactic of guilt by association. Dr DiVietro then refers to pp 746-765 of *Hazardous Materials*, without enumerating them, as essentially a further guilt-by-association attempt by Dr Mrs Riplinger to discredit Greek manuscripts, this time by allusion to heretical and/or unusual practices in the Greek Orthodox Church. See remarks under *Quote 158* with respect to pp 746-765 of *Hazardous Materials*.

Yet again Dr DiVietro has ignored the context of the quote and falsely accused Sister Riplinger. See *Quotes 157, 158*.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states in the paragraph immediately before *Quote 159*, her emphases, that “*The anti-Bible perspective of the Greek church is evidenced by the Islamic mosque, minarets and all, that they voluntarily built within the walled complex of St. Catherine’s Greek Orthodox Monastery, where the Sinaiticus manuscript was discovered! You can visit it today; search the internet for tours.*”

Dr Mrs Riplinger states in the paragraph immediately after *Quote 159*, her emphasis, that ““*[F]orbidding to marry*” is a doctrine of devils (1 Tim. 4:1-3). This is a devilish church system. In centuries past Mr. Curzon found a Bible manuscript “on the library floor at the monastery of Caracalla, on Mount Athos, and begged it of the Abbot, who suggested that the vellum leaves would be of use to cover pickle-jars” (Scrivener, *Six Lectures*, pp. 79, 83).”

With an “*Islamic mosque, minarets and all...voluntarily built within the walled complex of St. Catherine’s Greek Orthodox Monastery,*” “*doctrines of devils*” 1 Timothy 4:1 and other unscriptural practices that Dr Mrs Riplinger describes in the remainder of Chapter 20 of *Haz-*

ardous Materials, the Greek Orthodox Church emerges as “**one vessel...unto dishonour**” Romans 9:21.

As “**one vessel...unto dishonour**,” the Greek Orthodox Church is decidedly *not* “**meet for the master’s use**” and nor is it “**prepared unto every good work**” 2 Timothy 2:21.

That is the point of **Quote 159** with respect to Bible preservation that Dr DiVietro missed.

That is also why Dr Mrs Riplinger states on p 745 of *Hazardous Materials* that “*The bulk of Greek manuscripts today are the product of some monastery*” and asks “*Are books and collations by monks now our final authority?*”

Dr DiVietro doesn’t address that question. In addition to joining with “**adulterers, an assembly of treacherous men**” Jeremiah 9:2, see **Quote 158**, he is now uniting with the Greek Orthodox “**one vessel...unto dishonour**” Romans 9:21.

See pp 746-765 of *Hazardous Materials* and the verse lists under **Quote 158** for details of how, in addition to violation of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9, “*books and collations by monks*” cannot be “*now our final authority*” even if Koine Greek could be readily understood, which it can’t.

See **Quote(s) 154** with respect to Pastor Moorman’s summary of how “*Our extant MSS [manuscripts] reflect but do not determine the text of scripture.*”

“*The text of scripture*” between two covers and finally authoritative is that which “*is “holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, made higher”...(Heb. 7:26),*” not brought down to skull houses and scroll heaps. See *Hazardous Materials* pp 113, 742-743, **Quote 32**.

Quote 160, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 759, 766

“*The Greek Bogamiles, Paulicians and others had the true Greek text which included the pure readings.*”

“*Christians Must Reject Heretics & Their Writings*”

Dr DiVietro makes only a brief comment to the effect that a great difference exists between heretics and their writings and the copiers of the scriptures, adding that “*even a flaming anti-God atheist*” can accurately copy letters.

Typically, see **Quote 157**, Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing. He gives no examples of atheistic accurate copyists of scripture from anywhere or any time throughout church history. He can find no scripture to support his pro-atheistic-accurate-copyist-of-scripture stance.

The scripture suggests the opposite of Dr DiVietro’s pro-atheistic-accurate-copyist-of-scripture stance.

“**This Ezra went up from Babylon; and he was a ready scribe in the law of Moses, which the LORD God of Israel had given; and the king granted him all his request, according to the hand of the LORD his God upon him**” Ezra 7:6. See **Quote(s) 81**.

“**For all those things hath mine hand made, and all those things have been, saith the LORD: but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word**” Isaiah 66:2. See **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint, Quotes 81, 135**.

“**The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the LORD**” Jeremiah 23:28. See **Challenges #1, #2, #3, Points-Counterpoints**.

God appears to give no space in scripture for atheistic scribes. Instead, He clearly looks to ready scribes, who tremble at His word and are prepared to speak it faithfully (unlike those whom the Lord Jesus Christ often encountered, Matthew 5:20, 7:29, 8:19, 9:3 etc.).

If he is supportive of atheistic scribes, perhaps Dr DiVietro would even acknowledge the Devil to be an accurate copyist, who, after all, is not an atheist, James 2:19. He appears to have accurately reproduced all of Psalm 91:11-12 that he actually quotes.

“For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone” Psalm 91:11-12.

“He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone” Matthew 4:6.

In addition, Dr DiVietro has again ignored the context of the quote, see **Quote 159**, which describes the dangers of following *heretical* scribes, even if not atheistic ones, with respect to Greek manuscript copies. See *Hazardous Materials* pp 758-759.

“These changes [in the Book of Revelation] were all grafted by the ghoulish Greek monks who were too busy digging up corpses for Halloween-like displays, then burying words which did not match their bizarre world-view. Distracted monks copied the wrong edition of the book of Revelation and today it is sold in ‘Christian’ bookstores as the ‘Majority Text.’ The Andreas manuscripts honor the deity of Christ and the Trinity by generally including the following, which the 046 Greek manuscripts of Revelation omit.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger then lists the 6 verses Revelation 1:8, 1:11, 19:1, 20:9, 21:3, 4 that Greek monks altered to detract from the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ and/or the Trinity. See **Quote 158**. Dr Mrs Riplinger continues, her emphases.

“The Hodges-Farstad text follows Hoskier’s small collation of Greek manuscripts. Moorman adds,

*““The MSS Hoskier gathered on Revelation should be viewed in this light. Though he collated a majority of the available MSS, yet his 200 plus can only be considered a small fraction of the total MS tradition of the book. The cannot be used to reconstruct the text...This leads to another point which is often overlooked. Certainly in Revelation and to a lesser extent in the rest of the New Testament we must occasionally look to the Latin West for corroboration on a disputed reading. The Latin Christians who opposed Rome had a far **more vital faith than that which characterized the Greek East**. We look to them for our spiritual heritage, and they were an important channel through which God preserved His Word. This helps explain why there is a sprinkling of Latin readings in the Authorized Version (Moorman, [When the KJV Departs From the Majority] p. 27).”*

The first part of **Quote 160** immediately follows, followed in turn by the list of 75 monkish alterations to the New Testament on pp 760-765 of *Hazardous Materials* that Dr DiVietro offhandedly dismissed merely as strange practices in the Greek Orthodox Church. See **Quote 159**.

Both Dr Mrs Riplinger and Pastor Moorman have sought to warn of the blemishes inherent even in the mass of Greek manuscripts that largely support the AV1611. These tarnished manuscripts have in turn led *in the present day* to the compilation of untrustworthy Greek New Testament editions by Hodges, Farstad, Pierpoint and Robinson that are erroneously passed off as the ‘Majority’ Text. This misnamed ‘Majority’ Text largely underlies the NKJV counterfeit *that Dr DiVietro himself appears to support, to the detriment of his readers*. See **Quote 8**.

Dr DiVietro seems either wilfully unaware or unconcerned about the insidious insertions into the New Testament Text by unsaved Greek monks or their excisions from it and the long drawn-out consequences of those blemishes. Job 13:28, however, describes the sinister process well.

“And he, as a rotten thing, consumeth, as a garment that is moth eaten.”

The King James translators themselves identified the ready scribes “to whom we look for our spiritual heritage” and “the true Greek text which included the pure readings” in their own Bibles, in spite of papal efforts to impose further impurities in the text of scripture via the Latin Vulgate, backed up by centuries of persecution. See **Quote 156**.

The statement from the King James translators is as follows. See www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm. Emphases are this author’s.

See also *The Hidden History of the English Scriptures* by Dr Mrs Riplinger p 5.

“...the godly-learned were not content to have the Scriptures in the Language which they themselves understood, Greek and Latin, (as the good Lepers were not content to fare well themselves, but acquainted their neighbors with the store that God had sent, that they also might provide for themselves) [2 Kings 7:9] but also for the behoof and edifying of the unlearned which hungered and thirsted after righteousness, and had souls to be saved as well as they, they provided Translations into the vulgar for their Countrymen, insomuch that most nations under heaven did shortly after their conversion, hear CHRIST speaking unto them in their mother tongue, not by the voice of their Minister only, but also by the written word translated...So, S. Chrysostom that lived in S. Jerome’s time, giveth evidence with him: “The doctrine of S. John [saith he] did not in such sort [as the Philosophers’ did] vanish away: but the Syrians, Egyptians, Indians, Persians, Ethiopians, and infinite other nations being barbarous people translated it into their [mother] tongue, and have learned to be [true] Philosophers,” he meaneth Christians. [S. Chrysost. in Johan. cap.I. hom.I.] To this may be added Theodoret, as next unto him, both for antiquity, and for learning. His words be these, “Every Country that is under the Sun, is full of these words (of the Apostles and Prophets) and the Hebrew tongue [he meaneth the Scriptures in the Hebrew tongue] is turned not only into the Language of the Grecians, but also of the Romans, and Egyptians, and Persians, and Indians, and Armenians, and Scythians, and Sauromatians, and briefly into all the Languages that any Nation useth. [Theodor. 5. Therapeut.] So he. In like manner, Ulfilas is reported by Paulus Diaconus and Isidor (and before them by Sozomen) to have translated the Scriptures into the Gothic tongue: [P. Diacon. li. 12.] John Bishop of Sevil by Vasseus, to have turned them into Arabic, about the year of our Lord 717; [Vaseus in Chron. Hispan.] Bede by Cistertiensis, to have turned a great part of them into Saxon: Efnard by Trithemius, to have abridged the French Psalter, as Bede had done the Hebrew, about the year 800: King Alfred by the said Cistertiensis, to have turned the Psalter into Saxon...Much about that time, even in our King Richard the second’s days, John Trevisa translated them into English, and many English Bibles in written hand are yet to be seen with divers, translated as it is very probable, in that age...”

In *The Hidden History of the English Scriptures* p 5, Dr Mrs Riplinger adds that “*The Cambridge History of the Bible states that the scriptures were so widely known worldwide that a deacon in the ancient church in Heraclea was “confident that even if all copies of the Scriptures should disappear, Christians would be able to rewrite them from memory...” All pure vernacular scriptures began from the pure spring of languages used by the Holy Ghost in Acts 2; they were preserved and purified, generation by generation, as those root languages*

developed. Old Latin became Italian, Spanish, French, Portuguese, and Romanian; Gothic became English, German, Danish etc... ”

Dr DiVietro of course would deny that, by definition, any of the recipients of non-Koine Greek “**Translations into the vulgar for their Countrymen**” actually possessed “**the words of the LORD**” Exodus 4:28, 24:3, 4, Numbers 11:24, Joshua 3:9, 24:27, 1 Samuel 8:10, 15:1, 2 Chronicles 11:4, 29:15, Psalm 12:6, Jeremiah 36:4, 6, 8, 11, 37:2, 43:1, Amos 8:11, see **Quote(s) 155**.

See *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi, 2-4, 18, 87-88, 149.

However, on p v on *Cleaning-Up*, Dr Williams asks:

“Who are you going to believe?”

Applying Dr Williams’ question to the present case, the choice is between the King James translators and the ‘originals-onlyists’ of the DBS Executive Committee.

The choice doesn’t seem difficult to this author.

The second part of **Quote 160**, on p 766 of *Hazardous Materials*, is followed by these statements that Dr DiVietro carelessly ignored.

“Just as true Christians avoid the unscriptural practices and beliefs of the Greek Orthodox church, we must also depart from the errors in the manuscripts which were produced by these heretics...If the beliefs and practices of the Greek church are not approved, then neither are their manuscripts when they depart from the rest of the readings preserved by the body of Christ worldwide. We are commanded to “reject” them.

““A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject” (Titus 3:10).”

The reason is clear, from Proverbs 25:19 that applies equally to atheistic scribes, heretical scribes, satanic scribes ghoulish monkish scribes and all other unready scribes of any description, especially for these “**perilous times**” 2 Timothy 3:1.

“Confidence in an unfaithful man in time of trouble is like a broken tooth, and a foot out of joint.”

Quote(s) 161, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 792

“Ancient Greek Was for Ancient Greeks

“...Like the now empty skulls of the men who made the manuscripts, thoughtless scholars mull over the lifeless hulls of manuscripts which no longer bear a living seed to living speakers. Jesus said, “the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life.” Only living things can reproduce. The “life” and “spirit” did not die when Paul spake unto the Jews in the Hebrew tongue, when the Gothic and Latin Bibles burst forth into the English Bible, or when ancient Koine Greek became Modern Greek. Since when was Jesus Greek-only?”

“(Quoting Harakas, KD)”...Did Jesus know Greek? We have no direct evidence that he did?”

Dr DiVietro comments only on the last part of **Quote(s) 161**, the statement from Greek ‘Father’ Harakas, who is an authority on Greek Orthodoxy and the Greek Bible. See *Hazardous Materials* p 781.

Dr DiVietro protests that direct evidence that the Lord Jesus Christ was a Greek speaker does exist because the Gospel writers quoted the Lord Jesus Christ in Greek and no-one can prove that these words are not the original words of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Dr DiVietro insists that he can argue from silence in the same way that Dr Mrs Riplinger can. See **Quote 119** for Dr DiVietro's earlier false accusation against Sister Riplinger that she has argued from silence.

See this extract from **Quote 156**, which shows that Sister Riplinger is not arguing from silence and that the Lord Jesus Christ, by Dr DiVietro's reasoning, must have been multilingual. (In reality, the recording of the Lord's words in Greek by New Testament writers does not of itself prove that the Lord actually spoke Koine Greek, any more than the quotations written in Greek by New Testament writers of Old Testament prophecies e.g. first occurrence Matthew 1:23, prove that the Old Testament prophets spoke Koine Greek.)

*Note this extract from **Quote 7**.*

*Dr DiVietro should have reviewed Dr Mrs Riplinger's latest book *The Hidden History of the English Scriptures* pp 2-6. She states the following.*

"Scholars, such as Herman Hoskier, have long demonstrated that the originals were not written in Greek only. In the 1500s John Foxe records a statement from what he called "a certain old treatise, found in a certain ancient English book." This "ancient" book says, "Also the four evangelists wrote the gospel in divers languages, as Matthew in Judea, Mark in Italy, Luke in Achaia, and John in Asia. And all these wrote in the languages of the same countries..." It goes on to say, "since Christ commanded his apostles to preach his gospel unto all the world, and excepted no people or language.""

Sister Riplinger states further that "The Prologue before the book of Matthew in an edition of the Bishops' Bible said, "Matthew, who also was called Leui, being of a Publican made an Apostle, did first in Iurie (Jewry) write the Gospel of Christ in the Hebrew tongue for their sakes which beleueed of the circumcision. It is uncertaine who afterwards did translate it into the Greeke tongue. Howbeit the copy of the Hebrew is kept vnto this day in the library of Cesarea, which library Pamphilus Martyr did gather together most diligently...."

Dr DiVietro should have kept silent with respect to **Quote(s) 161**. He should reflect again upon Proverbs 17:28. See also **Quotes 121, 131, 141**.

"Even a fool, when he holdeth his peace, is counted wise: and he that shutteth his lips is esteemed a man of understanding."

Quote(s) 162, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 793-794

Quote(s) 162 consists of almost all of p 793 of *Hazardous Materials* and the first paragraph of p 794. The statements that Dr DiVietro omitted, as shown by ellipses, are noted below.

Dr DiVietro fails to address any particular statement in **Quote(s) 162** but merely reiterates that the gift of tongues was never given for producing the scriptures in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek. He refers the reader to the Appendix of *Cleaning-Up* and the section entitled *The Gift of Tongues* on pp 310-317, which declares yet again that God did not give the gift of tongues in Acts 2 for the inspiration of vernacular versions of the scriptures and that no evidence exists in church history to show that He did so.

Dr DiVietro quotes a Dr Stephen Zeinner as a linguistic authority in order to insist that many dialects and languages do not have a vernacular Bible and that it is ridiculous to suppose, as Dr DiVietro *falsely* accuses, see **Quote 159**, Dr Mrs Riplinger of doing, that every language immediately had a Bible in their own tongue in Acts 2.

Dr Stephen Zeinner is a DBS Advisory Council member.

See www.deanburgonsociety.org/DBS_News_51-100/News_84.pdf.

The statements from p 793 of *Hazardous Materials* that Dr DiVietro omitted are as follows.

“The Greeks were not offered the gospel before the Ethiopian eunuch or the Latin Cornelius. Even the Greek Orthodox priest understands what is meant by “Greek” in this verse [Romans 1:16]. Harakas says, “But if we understand the use of the word “Greek” in this context, we cannot interpret it in any narrowly nationalistic way. It would be a mistake to do that (Harakas, p. 37).”

“(See Hutter’s Polyglot A.D. 1599 available from A.V. Publications.)”

“the English Bible of 1599 in the Hutter’s Polyglot says ‘Esai.’”

Dr DiVietro fails to explain in what language Greeks as Gentiles, not Greek nationals, would have received the Gospel according to Romans 1:16 but he clearly can’t insist on Koine-Greek only for **“the gospel of Christ”** in Romans 1:16 so he avoids the verse in **Quote(s) 162**. See **Quote 160** for the explanation that the King James translators gave according to the following extract.

“...the godly-learned were not content to have the Scriptures in the Language which they themselves understood, Greek and Latin, (as the good Lepers were not content to fare well themselves, but acquainted their neighbors with the store that God had sent, that they also might provide for themselves) [2 Kings 7:9] but also for the behoof and edifying of the unlearned which hungered and thirsted after righteousness, and had souls to be saved as well as they, they provided Translations into the vulgar for their Countrymen, insomuch that most nations under heaven did shortly after their conversion, hear CHRIST speaking unto them in their mother tongue, not by the voice of their Minister only, but also by the written word translated...”

Unlike Dr DiVietro, the King James translators were clearly not ‘Greek only’ with respect to **“the word of Christ”** Colossians 3:16. The question remains, where did the translations that they mentioned come from to start with? Note Acts 2:4, 16-17 in answer and see also related remarks in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.

“And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.”

“But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams:”

The apostles are speaking the scriptures e.g. the words of the prophet Joel and the rest of the words as recorded in Acts 2 under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost in a number of languages that are different from Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek.

Acts 2 is therefore an *entirely realistic beginning for the first portions** of the word of God according to the New Testament to be preached to all nations in the languages of all nations, or at least in the major language groups of all nations, as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in *In Awe of Thy Word Part Six, Chapter 18 From Acts 2 to You...* *Subsequent portions and eventually whole Bibles in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic Greek would eventually follow e.g. in the Old Latin, as Wilkinson notes.

See *Which Bible?* p 208 and kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html.

“The Reformers held that the Waldensian Church was formed about 120 A.D., from which date on, they passed down from father to son the teachings they received from the apostles...The Latin Bible, the Italic, was translated from the Greek not later than 157 A.D.”

Luke 24:47 together with Acts 2:4, 16-17 confirms the realistic beginning of inspired translations in Acts 2 with respect to the Great Commission and ***“the apostles’ doctrine”*** Acts 2:42.

“And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.”

No other such beginning is described elsewhere in scripture yet such a beginning must be recorded somewhere in scripture given that *the Great Commission is the major mission for the Church* and is stated four times in the Gospels, once for each of the four Gospels; Matthew 28:18-20, Mark 16:15, Luke 24:46-48, John 20:21-22 and once in the Book of Acts, Acts 1:8, five times in total. Note also Luke’s reference to ***“power from on high”*** Luke 24:49 for the apostles, by means of Acts 1:8, namely ***“power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you”*** for beginning this ministry.

Just as with the Lord Jesus Christ, ***“his word was with power”*** Luke 4:32, *which would have to include inspiration*, so was that of the apostles, with respect to ***“the apostles’ doctrine”*** Acts 2:42 according to Acts 4:31, 33. (Luke 24:33, Acts 2:1, 4:32 indicate that more than the apostles were present during the events described in the context of those passages but Acts 2:6, 7, 14, 15 indicate that only the apostles spoke ***“with other tongues”*** according to Acts 2:4. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1430 and Dr Ruckman’s commentary *The Book of Acts* pp 55-58.)

“And when they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the word of God with boldness...And with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus: and great grace was upon them all.”

Acts 2 therefore emerges as the *definitive scriptural* record and in turn the *only realistic* record for the basis of *Spirit-empowered inspired multi-lingual scripture* in the fulfilment of the Great Commission and the propagation of ***“the apostles’ doctrine”*** to ***“every nation under heaven”*** Acts 2:5*, Dr DiVietro’s opinion to the contrary notwithstanding.

*Beginning with key portions of scripture cited from the Old Testament and used, as in the case of the Ethiopian eunuch, for both evangelism and for the foundations of ***“the apostles’ doctrine.”*** See statement below with respect to **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** and the New Testament sets of Old Testament citations in Acts 2:16-21/Joel 2:28-32, Acts 3:22-23/Deuteronomy 18:15, 19, Acts 2:25-28/Psalm 16:8-11, Acts 8:32-33/Isaiah 53:7-8. See also note above from Wilkinson, *Which Bible?* p 208 and kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html.

In sum, Dr Mrs Riplinger is right with respect to Acts 2 and Dr DiVietro is wrong.

Dr DiVietro also refrains from any comment on *“Hutter’s Polyglot A.D. 1599 available from A.V. Publications.”* Dr Mrs Riplinger states on p 1048 of *In Aw of Thy Word* with respect to Hutter’s Polyglot that *“Its editor, Elias Hutter, was an unsurpassed linguist who “founded a school of languages at Nuremberg...a thing at that time without precedent in any school or university” (The New Schaff-Herzog vol. V, p.422)...Europe’s monarchs recognized his text as the authoritative and beloved Bible of the Christian people.”*

As a Koine-Greek-onlyist for a purported *authoritative* Greek New Testament, see *Cleaning-Up* p 21, Dr DiVietro would not appreciate Hutter’s Polyglot being described as *“authoritative”* but it appears that he does not wish to gainsay Europe’s Bible-believing Reformation kings, so he bypasses Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statements on Hutter’s Polyglot as well.

As indicated, Dr DiVietro has falsely accused Dr Mrs Riplinger under **Quote(s) 162** by his insistence that Sister Riplinger thinks that every language immediately had a Bible in that language in Acts 2.

See Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement under **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** from her book *Which Bible is God's Word?* p 116.

"It is scandalous for rich Americans to have ten versions of the bible, instead of just one...Many tribes and peoples around the world have no King James Bible type bibles at all; the Albanian bible was destroyed during the communist regime. Many of the tribes in New Guinea do not have a bible in their language. But, these countries have no money to pay the publishers. The publishers are not interested in giving these people bibles; they are just interested in making bibles that can produce a profit for their operation."

Further detailed remarks on Dr DiVietro's comments under **Quote(s) 162** on tongues and the Appendix of *Cleaning-Up* with its section entitled *The Gift of Tongues* on pp 310-317 follow, with this extract from **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint**. See also **Quotes 125, 138**.

It should be understood that where the expression *the word of God* occurs in the extracts given below with respect to inspired translations e.g. in Gothic and related expressions such as *written inspired translations*, the expressions refer to a step-by-step reception of **"all the counsel of God"** Acts 20:27, according to the process of Acts 12:24. Whole Bibles in Latin, Syriac, Gothic etc. did not appear all at once.

"But the word of God grew and multiplied."



Dr DiVietro concludes this chapter, Cleaning-Up pp 113-114, by gainsaying Dr Mrs Riplinger's analysis of Acts 2, to be found, although Dr DiVietro does not say so, in the greatest detail in Chapters 17, 18 of In Awe of Thy Word, The Sounds of the First English Bibles and Acts 2 to You: From the Gothic Bible to the KJV.

Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in support of her analysis, In Awe of Thy Word, pp 621-624 that the Christian Goths most likely first received their Bible early in the 2nd century. Ulfilas, 'the little wolf' and Bishop to the Goths, compiled his 4th century Gothic Bible from "'a comparatively pure Byzantine text in the New Testament...[and it] is so extraordinarily faithful to the Greek.'" She states, her emphasis that "Philostorgius said Ulfilas' "grandparents were Christians," converts of those "dwellers in...Cappadocia" which received the gift of "other tongues" heard in Acts 2:9. His grandparents were the direct converts of the "strangers scattered throughout...Cappadocia" spoken of by Peter (1 Peter 1:1). These Cappadocians were the "hearers of Peter's first sermon, and its Christian residents among the readers of his first epistle."*

*Note Dr Mrs Riplinger's observation on p 794 of *Hazardous Materials* (that Dr DiVietro includes under **Quote(s) 162** but without comment) that *"The Goths were living on the Black Sea during the time of Christ; it is not scriptural (Col. 1:5, 6, Rom. 16:26, etc.) to pretend that they had no scripture until hundreds of years later when we are 'told' that Ulfilas translated them from Greek. Do we believe the scriptures or the writings of men? Our history of the Bible must come from the Bible, not from the writings or surmising of liberal non-regenerate British scholars."* The possibility must exist from Psalm 12:6, 7 that Ulfilas' translation was a refinement of previous scriptures available to the Goths.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states further, her emphases that "The Goths "migrated into Scythia" and became part of the "Barbarian, Scythian," people mentioned in Paul's letter to the Colossians (3:11). "At this time [150 A.D.] a vast number of Goths were Christians, their conversion having been effected by those whom they had carried into captivity."

Dr Mrs Riplinger states, *In Awe of Thy Word*, p 628 that “The following charts document the faithful preservation of the word of God. It was given to the Goths in the book of Acts and “endureth to all generations” (Ps. 100:5). Its sounds and words are often still evident in the King James Bible...”

Dr Mrs Riplinger then lists the following 37 verses to show this preservation; Ephesians 3:14, 1 Corinthians 16:22, Romans 16:24, 1 Timothy 2:7, Philippians 4:13, Romans 14:10-12, 1 Corinthians 5:4, 2 Thessalonians 1:12, 1 Corinthians 9:1, 2 Thessalonians 1:8, Galatians 4:7, 1 Thessalonians 3:13, 1 Corinthians 5:5, Matthew 8:29, 1 Corinthians 15:47, 2 Corinthians 4:10, 2 Timothy 4:1, Galatians 6:17, Luke 2:33, Matthew 5:22, Romans 9:28, 1 Corinthians 11:24, Colossians 2:11, 1 Corinthians 5:7b, Ephesians 2:1, Matthew 5:44, Ephesians 4:6, Colossians 3:22, 2 Corinthians 10:4, Colossians 2:18, 23, Romans 8:1, Ephesians 5:5, Luke 16:23, Colossians 3:6. She concludes, *In Awe of Thy Word* p 648, her emphases, “The Gothic language not only often **sounded** like English, sometimes it even **looked** just like it, because it used Roman letters, as well as Greek and Runic. These words ‘Name’ and ‘AMEN,’   were taken directly from the Lord’s Prayer in an ancient Gothic manuscript.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger follows with another 20+ New Testament verse examples revealing the likeness in both sound and appearance between the Gothic, 7th-century Anglo-Saxon, Pre-1611 Bibles i.e. Wycliffe, Tyndale, Bishops’, Geneva and the AV1611. Her citations in Chapter 17 shows that the lineage for the 1611 Holy Bible does indeed go back to Acts 2 via the Bible of the Goths and their association with Bishop Ulfilas and in turn the Cappadocian believers who received the words of God “**in our own tongue, wherein we were born**” Acts 2:8.

Who is Dr DiVietro to dismiss Sister Riplinger’s thesis in Chapters 17, 18 of *In Awe of Thy Word*, *The Sounds of the First English Bibles* and *Acts 2 to You: From the Gothic Bible to the KJV* out of hand when he hasn’t even had the decency to comment on it intelligently in this part of his book or to document his objections?

Though harsh, Proverbs 26:16 does apply to Dr DiVietro at this point.

“The sluggard is wiser in his own conceit than seven men that can render a reason.”

The reason is that Dr DiVietro does not specifically analyse Dr Mrs Riplinger’s material. He simply denies it and states, using ‘the Greek’ in 1 Corinthians 13:8 for the expression “**shall cease**” that the gift of tongues was a temporary speaking gift as a sign to Israel warning the nation that it risked missing out on God’s will “**when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord**” Acts 3:19, although Dr DiVietro does not cite this verse explicitly.

Dr DiVietro insists that in no way can the tongues of Acts 2 be taken as a means of producing inspired written translations of scripture in non-Hebrew languages. He is therefore flatly denying the historical links that Dr Mrs Riplinger has established between the early Cappadocian believers, the Gothic Bible and the 1611 Holy Bible. See also **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to the New Testament sets of Old Testament citations in Acts 2:16-21/Joel 2:28-32, Acts 3:22-23/Deuteronomy 18:15, 19, Acts 2:25-28/Psalm 16:8-11, Acts 8:32-33/Isaiah 53:7-8 and note again that in Acts 5:28, “**the high priest**” Acts 5:27 declared “**behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine.**” Acts 2:5 states “**And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven.**” These visitors were “**dwelling at Jerusalem,**” not simply paying a flying visit and these men received “**the apostles’ doctrine**” that must have included “**the word of the Lord**” Acts 2:42, 8:25 – as also 2 Timothy 3:16 indicates, “**all scripture is...profitable for doctrine.**” The scriptural indica-

tion from inspection of the 11 verses that Dr DiVietro lists in answer to Dr Mrs Riplinger's Challenge #7 is that each of them received it **"in his own language...every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born"** Acts 2:6, 8 i.e. inspired translations of at least portions of **"the word of the Lord."** These translations were clearly preserved in written forms e.g. Gothic as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in *In Awe of Thy Word* Chapters 17, 18 that eventually became complete inspired Bibles. Equally clearly, Acts 2 was the starting point.

Dr DiVietro is simply in dogmatic denial.

He cannot, of course, say otherwise. His book, *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-iv, 2-3 is emphatic that no translation is or ever can be 'inspired' (except of course in the unscriptural, two-tier fashion of the DBS Executive Committee. See **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** and *Cleaning-Up* pp 3-6) but its thesis remains an unproven assumption. See also **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** for the testimony of Wycliffe with respect to inspired written translations of the scriptures from Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek.

The answer to Dr DiVietro's denial of Dr Mrs Riplinger's analysis of Acts 2 is first that Dr DiVietro's explanation of Acts 2 does not in any way preclude Dr Mrs Riplinger's analysis. Observe, for example, how Paul makes spiritual application of Hosea 2:23 to the Gentiles in Romans 9:24-25, whereas Hosea 2:23 strictly applies to the faithful remnant of Israel at the Second Advent²⁴⁷.

"Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles? As he saith also in Osee, I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved."

Like Hosea 2:23, Acts 2 can therefore have more than one application and Dr DiVietro is limiting God by asserting otherwise. Psalm 78:41 describes his attitude.

"Yea, they turned back and tempted God, and limited the Holy One of Israel."

Even though the gift of tongues was temporary, it appears to have lasted long enough for multiple translations of at least certain portions of scripture e.g. Acts 2:16-21/Joel 2:28-32, Acts 3:22-23/Deuteronomy 18:15, 19, Acts 2:25-28/Psalm 16:8-11, Acts 8:32-33/Isaiah 53:7-8 to be progressed, as Dr Mrs Riplinger's analysis of Acts 2 shows. See remarks above. See also **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** for the list of written scriptures that could have been available for translation in the 1st century.

Further, more detailed answers to Dr DiVietro's denial of Dr Mrs Riplinger's analysis of Acts 2 in this work may be found in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**. Note this statement from Point 11 of the analysis of key portions of Old Testament scripture cited in the New Testament with respect to inspired written translations of scripture in non-Hebrew languages.

The key portions of scripture referred to are those listed above; Acts 2:16-21/Joel 2:28-32, Acts 2:25-28/Psalm 16:8-11, Acts 3:22-23/Deuteronomy 18:15, 19, Acts 8:32-33/Isaiah 53:7-8.

Given that God can inspire Gentile kings to send written edicts to their subjects **"according to the language of every people"** Esther 1:20, 22, the possibility certainly exists that God could enable these key portions of Old Testament scripture to be written in the languages of **"every nation under heaven,"** including Ethiopic, for the edification of His subjects, insofar as **"the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men"** Daniel 4:17. If this happened, they would have to be inspired scripture if they were to sustain new converts like the Ethiopian eunuch, 1 Peter 2:2 and they appear to have been inspired directly from Peter's quotations in Acts 2, **"after the manner that holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost"** 2 Peter (!) 1:21, Acts 2:4, not obtained by direct translation of extant Hebrew scriptures, al-

though this means was no doubt used subsequently for other parts of the Old Testament. See remarks on the scholar Helvidius below and Point 12, which immediately follows. God is not limited by the 'mono-inspiration' dogma of the DBS Executive Committee, as Jeremiah indicates in Jeremiah 32:17 **"Ah Lord God!...there is nothing too hard for thee."** In addition, as indicated above, **"the word of God is not bound"** 2 Timothy 2:9. The Lord is free to edit and even re-inspire His own work²⁴⁸, again regardless of the DBS Executive Committee but He nevertheless used rigid Jewish scribal tradition to His own advantage. See the next point.

The key portions of scripture listed and the accompanying comments speak overwhelmingly in favour of New Testament evidence for written inspired translations of **"the holy scriptures"** 2 Timothy 3:15 in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek. The following extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** should also be noted with respect to such translations.

With respect to Acts 2 as the instigation of the preaching of the Gospel in multiple languages, note Acts 2:4, mentioned above under Point 11.

"And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance."

All that Peter and the apostles speak in the rest of Acts 2 e.g. **"his word"** Acts 2:41, in whatever language, have to be **"the words of God"** John 3:34, according to 2 Samuel 23:2.

"The Spirit of the LORD spake by me, and his word was in my tongue."

Unless Dr DiVietro can prove from scripture that the words of **"The Spirit of the LORD"** in Acts 2 are somehow only man's words if not in Hebrew/Aramaic and/or Greek, then the words spoken in all the languages listed in Acts 2:9-11 are **"the words of God"** that declare **"the wonderful works of God"** Acts 2:11 and are **"given by inspiration of God."** Up to this point in *Cleaning-Up* [**Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**], he has not done so.

Dr DiVietro has still failed to prove otherwise [**Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint**]. He has not even addressed the above evidence in his book, let alone refuted it. See also the testimony of Bishop J.C. Ryle at the end of the previous section with respect to the 18th century English Reformers concerning the 1611 Holy Bible. "They knew nothing of any part of Scripture being uninspired" – meaning the 1611 Holy Bible in English, not Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek. It is not surprising, therefore that the DBS Executive Committee has not brought in any kind of Reformation.

It still hasn't.

Quote 163, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 795

"If no English translation can express the original Greek, as he [Harakas, KD] and others claim, what about the English translation given when someone says, "That word in the Greek means 'such and such.'" That meaning given is someone's 'translation.' If no English translation can be correct, why give one to correct the KJB when studying the Bible? Or why not accumulate all of these corrections and more precise renderings and create a new bible? Voilà! Hundreds and hundreds of failed English translations of the Bible have attempted to do this with the very lexical words used to 'define' Greek words."

Dr DiVietro begins his comments by casting aspersions at Dr Mrs Riplinger's linguistic ability. He declares in effect that Dr Mrs Riplinger cannot tell the difference between translation and elucidation. He then insists that it is virtually impossible to translate perfectly from one language to another and states that a Bible-believing preacher seeks to 'elucidate' from the

original Greek text by explaining a word in the King James Bible with all the force of the original Greek word.

Again, Dr DiVietro descends into mockery. See *Quote 158*.

Again, Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing. See *Quote 160*.

Again, Dr DiVietro fails to specify what he terms the original Greek text between two covers. See *Quote 157*.

Again, Dr DiVietro has denied the priesthood of all believers 1 Peter 2:5, 9 by his fixation with supposed explanations of King James Bible words from ‘the Greek.’ See *Quote 156*.

It doesn’t seem to have yet occurred to Dr DiVietro that the sense of Psalm 12:6-7 is that *God Himself* ensures that nothing is lost when His words are transferred from one language to another.

“The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.”

It also hasn’t occurred to Dr DiVietro that Biblically, translation is an *improvement* on the ‘original.’ Note this extract from *Quote 28* that addresses Psalm 12:7 in detail.

Note further Dr Gipp’s analysis of how, from scripture, a translation is actually an improvement on ‘the original,’ with respect to 2 Samuel 3:10, Colossians 1:13, Hebrews 11:5. See Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print.

Note this extract from the above work.

To make matters worse for Dr Waite, Dr Gipp shows how a translation can actually be an improvement on ‘the original.’ The following verses should be studied carefully in this respect.

“As the LORD hath sworn to David, even so I do to him; To translate the kingdom from the house of Saul, and to set up the throne of David over Israel and over Judah, from Dan even to Beersheba” 2 Samuel 3:10.

“Giving thanks unto the Father...Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son” Colossians 1:12, 13.

“By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God” Hebrews 11:5.

The question would of course arise in the above context about translations from the 1611 Holy Bible carried out on the mission field. Would they then be superior to the 1611 Holy Bible because they are translations from it?

The answer is no, because the 1611 Holy Bible is the absolute text for the End Times, as Dr Peter S. Ruckman of Pensacola Bible Institute explains with respect to what happened in history²⁴⁹, his emphases.

“To fulfill Acts 1:8 [for the Lord’s witnesses to go to “the uttermost part of the earth”]...All the Lord needed was a Bible in line with what He had already written and preserved; since He had already decreed (in 1000 BC) that there had to be present “the word of a King” Ecclesiastes 8:4 before there could be any spiritual “power” in that word (Romans 13:1-4), and

since His king was a JEW (John 18:34)...God needed a king with a Jewish name; He got one...this time it was JAMES. James is the English word for JACOB”...

“After 1588, “Britannica ruled the waves,” and...with **absolute time** determined by **England** (Greenwich Observatory), with **absolute location** on the earth’s surface located from Greenwich, England (longitude)...by 1850 the sun “never set on the British Empire.””

Britain set aside the Imperial Book that made her great and her imperial past has therefore faded into history but the Book itself has not.

“Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away” Matthew 24:35.

Dr DiVietro’s use of the word ‘elucidate’ is a reversion to his old favourite ‘clarify’ as found on p 94 of *Cleaning-Up* with respect to his grotesque exposition of John 11:33 by means of ‘the Greek.’ See remarks on John 11:33 in **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**.

See also **Challenges #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints** for Dr DiVietro’s additional ‘examples’ and his wholly inadequate explanation of Bible verses and Biblical words by means of ‘the original languages.’

Finally, for **Quote 163**, note the superior force of the King James English over ‘the Greek’ in this summary for Romans 4:3, 9, 22, Galatians 3:6, where the King’s men used four different words for, evidently, the same Greek word. The four different words are respectively **“counted,” “reckoned,” “imputed,” “accounted.”**

The summary is from www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php, *Answers to the Wolf Man Part 1*, pp 19-23. The extract is from p 23:

*The saved sinner draws on God’s account with respect to “**the gift of God**” [Ephesians 2:8] that is “**accounted to him for righteousness**” [Romans 4:3] being among “**they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness**” [Romans 5:17] because they “**believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead;**” Romans 4:24 “**Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification**” Romans 4:25.*

Therefore, in sum, “**the gift of God**” that is identical to “**righteousness...imputed**” [Romans 4:22] to the believer is:

- **“counted unto”** [Romans 4:3] the believer as the best gift, the hallowed gift and the everlasting gift of God’s righteousness that turns away God’s wrath from the believer.
- **“reckoned to”** [Romans 4:9] the believer as the restorative gift that returns him to a lost former state of innocence and bestows even more upon him by means of a new standing in God’s righteousness and as the established gift underwritten by God Himself.
- **“imputed to”** [Romans 4:22] the believer as the doubly blessed gift for him that bestows God’s righteousness on the recipient and his sin on the Lord Jesus Christ.
- **“accounted to”** [Galatians 3:6] the believer as the royal gift and the abundant gift by which the recipient of God’s righteousness thereby draws from an inexhaustible and ever-current account of God’s righteousness.

“Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift” 2 Corinthians 9:15.

Grievous Wolf’s obsession with ‘the Greek’ denied him both the additional revelation in English and in turn the attendant blessing.

So has Dr DiVietro's.

Quote 164, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 826

“James Strong’s Concordance and its Greek Lexicon often use Revised Version words as definitions. The definitions in Vine’s Expository Dictionary come quite often from the RV, as was demonstrated in chart form in the accompanying chapter which exposes W. E. Vine. Moulton and Milligan’s Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament also uses the words from the RV as of ‘definitions’ for English Bible words. George Ricker-Berry’s Greek-English Interlinear New Testament uses RV words in its English Interlinear and Greek-English Lexicon. Lexicographer Frederick Danker says of the Brown, Driver, Briggs Hebrew-English Lexicon, “BDB” “relies too much on word meanings of the RV...A large number of the words in the new bible versions can be traced back to their original use in the Revised Version.”

Dr DiVietro refers to an unspecified original lexicon* that he says Dr Mrs Riplinger is opposed to. He says that even if the RV was published before this lexicon, the lexical editors didn't get their word definitions from the RV. Dr DiVietro then states that the RV translators decided on particular word meanings and used them for their translation work. He says that the sources that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists in **Quote 164** simply catalogue these word meanings and although the editors suggest that the RV word meanings are superior (to equivalent AV1611 readings), these RV meanings are all clearly identified.

*Most likely Liddell and Scott's lexicon. See *Hazardous Materials* pp 209ff, **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** and **Quote 3**.

Quote 164 is the first quote that Dr DiVietro has extracted from *Hazardous Materials* Chapter 22 entitled *Child Molester on New Version Committee*.

Dr DiVietro has bypassed the very next sentence on p 826 of *Hazardous Materials* after **Quote 164**. It reads as follows and is a telling indictment of Dr DiVietro's evasiveness.

“Such grand larceny demands an autopsy of the RV translators’ hearts, out of which these Bible-correcting words proceeded.”

“For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, Thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness” Mark 7:21-22. The spiritual counterparts to the physical evils are readily discerned with respect to the RV translators and **“all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness”** Romans 1:18, as 'originals-onlyists' do.

A summary autopsy of the heart attitude of the author of *Cleaning-Up*, as discerned in his own book, is most revealing.

See the following extract from **Quote 86**.

*Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee would insist that they do not change the words of the KJB or even the letters, Cleaning-Up, p 88 but they did. See Cleaning-Up pp 2-3. They changed **“given by inspiration of God”** to **“God-breathed”** and **they did it by means of ‘the Greek,’ namely the term theopneustos!***

*In doing so, they cut out the essential embedded words **“in”** and **“spir(it).”** See In Awe of Thy Word p 332 and The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship pp 250ff.*

*Genesis 2:7 states **“And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.”***

*John 6:63 states **“It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.”***

*Genesis 2:7, John 6:63 apply to the scriptures in that these verses portray how “**the Spirit of life from God entered into them**” Revelation 11:11 when they were “**given by inspiration of God**” and they became “**incorruptible...the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever**” 1 Peter 1:23.*

*Dr DiVietro lost all of the above revelation when he sided with the Jehudis, Jeremiah 36:21-25, who cut out the essential embedded words “**in**” and “**spir(it)**.”*

*In sum, that single change of “**given by inspiration of God**” to “**God-breathed**” via ‘the word in the Greek’ theopneustos appears to have been all it took to concoct the DBS Executive Committee members’ false doctrine of ‘originals onlyism’ that by profession denies “**the scripture of truth**” Daniel 10:21 to all but them and their closest adherents, and is equivalent to “**the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate**” Revelation 2:15, in direct violation of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9.*

The above extract from **Quote 86** describes a *heart condition* of Dr DiVietro and his DBS Executive Committee associates.

It is that of “**a proud heart.**” See the remarks above on “**the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate**” Revelation 2:15.

Dr DiVietro’s heart condition explains his support for corrupt lexical editors, see **Quote 121**, and in particular W. E. Vine, see **Quote 144**.

Dr Gipp has the following analysis of the DiVietro/DBS heart problem.

See samgipp.com/essays/88.pdf.

Even though Dr DiVietro is not a professing Alexandrian cultist, his symptoms with respect to non-belief in a perfect Bible are nevertheless very similar to those that Dr Gipp describes.

“...there are...two kinds of “Bible Correctors.” There are the Bible college graduates who trusted their professors and had their professors take advantage of that trust and convince them that there was no perfect Bible on earth. Show this sincere, but deceived, young man the facts and he can be corrected. His is a head problem, not a heart problem.

“The second group of Bible Correctors are the “Movers & Shakers” of modern Textual Criticism. They have seen the manuscript evidence and they know there is no way to prove the Critical Text of Alexandria, Egypt, is superior to the Textus Receptus. They reject the King James Bible for a completely different reason. Somewhere along the line they figured, “Well, of course there’s no perfect Bible on earth. Because if there was then; I’m going to answer to God for not reading it, for violating it, for pretending I didn’t know there was an absolute authority. I’m going to answer to God for my actions and...ah...there is no perfect Bible!” His is a heart problem, not a head problem.”

“Therefore, although all the artillery has been aimed at the King James Bible and its proponents, neither it nor they are the problem to modern Bible Correctors. The problem is that most of the “Movers & Shakers” of modern Christianity are agnostics at heart and reject the concept that there could even be a perfect Bible anywhere on earth.”

That is the DBS Executive Committee attitude. See this extract from **Quote 123** and note Dr Waite’s dogmatic denial of the perfection of any book called a Holy Bible, which he emphatically reiterates under **Quote(s) 175**.

See this extract from *A WARNING!!* by Dr Waite p 25.

*P. 25 ““**Perfection**” of translation is not possible. Only God has “**perfection.**” He is “**perfect.**” Gail Ludwig Latessa Kaleda Riplinger falsely believes that the King James Bible is*

“perfect.” Well, is that the A.V. 1611 translation with the Apocrypha, which has all sorts of lies, contradictions and false teachings? Or is it the second edition of the King James Bible that is “perfect”? Or is it the third edition of the King James Bible that is perfect? Or is it the fourth edition? Or is it the fifth edition? Or is it the sixth edition? Or is it the seventh edition?”

See *Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society The ‘not ““perfect””’ AV1611 p 37.*

(Note that Dr Waite has inadvertently contradicted himself in the above statement. If “Only God has **“perfection,”** then even the God-breathed originals can’t be perfect according to Dr Waite, although he says that they are, because even though these originals are said to be ‘God-breathed,’ they are clearly not God. See this statement from A WARNING!/, from *Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society The ‘not ““perfect””’ AV1611 p 37:*

P. 2 “I believe the King James Bible can be described as the only true, reliable, and accurate English **translation** of the preserved, original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, perfect, pure Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words which underlie it. I do not believe anyone should use these seven adjectives (in their strictest definitions) for any translations in any language of the world.”)

See this extract from **Quote 123** under **Quotes 105-141, An Overview**, with respect to Dr DiVietro’s fourteenth major failing with respect to *Hazardous Materials* Chapter 18.

In sum, according to Dr DiVietro, evidently with the unanimous agreement of the DBS Executive Committee, the following key points emerge from the above extracts with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible and published Greek New Testament texts.

- The 1611 Holy Bible *is* perfect in that it does not need to be changed or improved.
- The 1611 Holy Bible *is not* perfect in that it does not convey the original perfectly.
- The 1611 Holy Bible *is not* inspired.
- The 1611 Holy Bible *is not* finally authoritative.
- The 1611 Holy Bible *is*, however, God-guided, even though God could not inspire it or make it finally authoritative as **“all scripture” that “is given by inspiration of God.”**
- No published or extant Greek source was/is infallible, inerrant, finally authoritative or perfect.
- ‘The’ Greek text, however, was/is infallible, inerrant, finally authoritative and perfect.
- Scrivener’s text might be that Greek text, even where it departs from the 1611 Holy Bible.

*However, the precise location of the above infallible, inerrant, finally authoritative and perfect (and evidently inspired, original) Greek text, together with that of its Hebrew/Aramaic Old Testament counterpart between two covers nevertheless remains undisclosed by Dr DiVietro. See also **Quote(s) III** with respect to Dr DiVietro’s on-going failure in that respect.*

Observe from the above extracts that any profession that Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee have with respect to perfection of the 1611 Holy Bible is merely mechanical, pertaining at best only to the form of words of the extant text (although they changed some of those, see extract above from **Quote 86**).

They do not believe that the 1611 Holy Bible is in any way equivalent to the ‘original,’ with respect to either inspiration or perfection. They insist that it is merely **“the word of men,”**

not **“the word of God”** 1 Thessalonians 2:13 and they will, in Dr Gipp’s words, direct **“all the artillery”** at any dissenters e.g. Sister Riplinger.

They will also, as Dr DiVietro shows in his comments under **Quote 164**, speak at least tacitly in support of Bible critics like W. E. Vine, see **Quote 144** and **“their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of”** 2 Peter 2:2.

Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee should therefore review **“what saith the scripture”** Romans 4:3, with respect to **“a proud heart,”** especially with respect to the contrasting consequences of confessing and forsaking that heart condition, Proverbs 28:13, or not. See also Mark 7:21-22, Romans 1:18 cited above.

“Whoso privily slandereth his neighbour, him will I cut off: him that hath an high look and a proud heart will not I suffer” Psalm 101:5.

“An high look, and a proud heart, and the plowing of the wicked, is sin” Proverbs 21:4. See **Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint** and remarks on 1 John 5:17.

“He that is of a proud heart stirreth up strife: but he that putteth his trust in the LORD shall be made fat” Proverbs 28:25.

Quote 165, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 828-839

Dr DiVietro gives no actual quotes under **Quote 165** but simply dismisses the material on these pages as *ad hominem* attacks, even though the material is carefully documented. He insists that the personal conduct of the individuals mentioned on pp 828-839 of *Hazardous Materials* would not have any bearing on the accuracy of any lexicons they produced.

Once again, Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing in his comments. See **Quote 163**.

Once again, Dr DiVietro has falsely accused Sister Riplinger. See **Quote 162**. As indicated, the content of pp 828-839 of *Hazardous Materials* is extensively documented and cannot be lightly dismissed as mere *ad hominem* attacks.

Dr DiVietro compounds his false accusation against Sister Riplinger with the strange statement in his comments under **Quote 165** that Dr Mrs Riplinger has attempted to assert that the RV translators were Jesuit plants.

It should be noted first that other researchers have reached that conclusion.

Dr William P. Grady in his book *Final Authority* p 214 states **“Having carefully read both the Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott by his son Arthur Westcott (1903) and the Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort by his son Arthur Fenton Hort (1896), this author is firmly convinced...that Drs. Westcott and Hort were A PAIR OF UNSAVED LIBERALS WHOSE OPEN VATICAN SYMPATHIES CAST THEM AS THE CONSUMMATE JESUIT PLANTS!”**

Dr. Grady then substantiates his conclusion with the following 28 pages of his book.

However, Dr Mrs Riplinger does not explicitly discuss Jesuit infiltration into the RV translating committee on pp 828-839 of *Hazardous Materials*, or anywhere in Chapter 22 of *Hazardous Materials*. That is not the purpose of Chapter 22 as its title plainly shows, *Child Molester on New Version Committee*.

Dr DiVietro’s statement under **Quote 165** with respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger asserting that Jesuits infiltrated the RV committee is indeed strange, therefore, considering his own assertion to the effect that he has carefully read *Hazardous Materials* three times. See *Cleaning-Up* p 110 and **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint**.

One wonders, therefore, *how* carefully Dr DiVietro really did read *Hazardous Materials*; not very, it seems. It appears more likely that he simply cherry-picked the book for segments with which to belabour Sister Riplinger. Such an approach is open to falsification.

Proverbs 25:18 comes to mind.

“A man that beareth false witness against his neighbour is a maul, and a sword, and a sharp arrow.”

Dr DiVietro’s insistence, in effect, that evil men can accurately define “*the words of the LORD*” Psalm 12:6 and thereby preserve right meanings of “*forcible...right words*” Job 6:25 in an anti-Biblical lexicon is to describe “*the pride of evil men*” Job 35:12 as “*a vessel unto honour, sanctified, and meet for the master's use, and prepared unto every good work*” 2 Timothy 2:21.

Dr DiVietro’s perception in that respect is explicitly shown to be false under **Quote 70**. See **Tables 4, 4a, 4b** and accompanying remarks. It is also akin to Isaiah 5:20. See **Quotes 10, 69**.

“Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!”

See also related remarks under **Quote 159** with respect to unregenerate Greek monks.

Jeremiah 9:3 describes the *spiritual* condition of the evil individuals whom Sister Riplinger documents in Chapter 22 of *Hazardous Materials*. Dr DiVietro should at least devotionally view the verse as “*beholding...in a glass*” James 1:23.

“And they bend their tongues like their bow for lies; but they are not valiant for the truth upon the earth; for they proceed from evil to evil, and they know not me, saith the LORD.”

Quote 166, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 912

“Lexicon authors Gesenius, Brown, Driver and Briggs were chief among those who gave cynical students what they wanted to hear. (Aren’t most young people looking for an excuse to deny the Bible’s authority?)”

Dr DiVietro states that he does not believe that “*most young people [are] looking for an excuse to deny the Bible’s authority.*” He says that most young Christians do indeed want to know what the Bible says but that the fault lies with their teachers, i.e. college/university/seminary professors, many of whom appear to aim to destroy the students’ belief in the Bible’s authority.

That is certainly the impression gained from Dr DiVietro’s book, along with his repeated denial of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See **Quote 163**.

See thus far in *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi, 2-3, 7, 17, 18, 88, 91, 93, 94, 149, 187, 249-250, 255-256.

See summary statements under **Quote 164** with respect to Dr DiVietro’s ‘Bible’ that he fails to specify under **Quote 166** and note this extract.

...any profession that Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee have with respect to perfection of the 1611 Holy Bible is merely mechanical, pertaining at best only to the form of words of the extant text (although they changed some of those, see extract above from **Quote 86**).*

They do not believe that the 1611 Holy Bible is in any way equivalent to the ‘original,’ with respect to either inspiration or perfection. They insist that it is merely “the word of men,”

not **“the word of God”** 1 Thessalonians 2:13 and they will, in Dr Gipp’s words, direct “all the artillery” at any dissenters e.g. Sister Riplinger.

*i.e. superficial, as in Matthew 23:2-3 **“The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not.”**

When asked by Bro. Heisey to state unequivocally what **“the word of God”** 1 Thessalonians 2:13 is for today, it appears that the august members of the DBS Executive Committee fell in lock-step with the watch at Golgotha, Matthew 27:66.

“And for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men” Matthew 28:4.

See this extract from **Quote 108**.

Bro. Heisey has highlighted the equivocation of Dr Waite and his colleagues with respect to what is **“all scripture”** that **“is given by inspiration of God”** available today between two covers in an extensive work from which the following extract is taken.

www.hacalumni.com/pdfs/WaitingForDrWaite.pdf

Waiting for Dr. Waite, June 2010, pp 3-4

To be blunt, the title of this work has probably already engendered a question in the mind of the reader: “Waiting for what?”, or “Waiting for Dr. Waite to do what?” To be direct: Waiting for Dr. Waite to give an honest, straightforward, unequivocal answer to two simple questions. The title of this work actually came about because of Dr. Waite’s refusal to give this author an answer to the following simple questions: “Does F.H.A. Scrivener’s Greek text need to be corrected so as to match the exact readings underlying the King James Bible New Testament?” and, “Is the text of the King James Bible without error?” To date, this author has not received nor seen a direct, straightforward, consistent, well-explained, non-contradictory answer from Dr. Waite to these two questions. In fact, as will be shown below, Dr. Waite has contradicted himself on these issues as well as several others which are related to them. The word of God says in James 1:8, “A double minded man is unstable in all his ways.” And in James 5:12b, “but let your yea be yea; and your nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation.” Dr. Waite should obey these biblical exhortations and “tell us plainly” (John 10:24) what he really does believe.”

Quote 166 is the first and only extract from Chapter 24 of *Hazardous Materials* entitled Gesenius’ Old Testament Hebrew Lexicon. Dr DiVietro ignored the context of the quote, see **Quote 160**, that is found in the sentence following **Quote 166**, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphasis.

*“What students of that generation craved was, not a mere revived orthodoxy, but a theology which could adjust itself to a more rational and **critical** view of the Bible”* (Cheyne, p. 58).”

Cheyne is T. K. Cheyne, author of *Founders of Old Testament Criticism*, London: Methuen & Co., 1893. The generation referred to is the early 19th century generation during the time of Wilhelm Gesenius, 1786-1842. See *Hazardous Materials* p 906.

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement immediately following **Quote 166** explains what she means by “cynical students.” She is not referring to Christian students as such, which is how Dr DiVietro distorts her words, in addition to substantiating nothing in his comments yet again. See **Quotes 138, 165**.

The issue is not therefore whether young Christians want to know what the (1611 Holy) Bible says, although some certainly do, even if in a minority*.

*See the following statement from **Quote 109**. *Most churches in this country, however, whether nominally KJB or not, would accept the creedal statement of the DBS Executive Committee found on pp 2-3, 18 of Cleaning-Up, at least with respect to 'originals-only' inspiration. See creedal statement given above.*

*This author knows definitely of only **two** exceptions in England (though it is hoped that there may be and probably are a number of others), **two** out of 47,000.*

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/welcome/ and articles under the AV-Only part of the site.

See www.biblebelievers.co.uk/index.htm. Pastor Dickens is a PBI graduate and a citizen of the USA.

This author would now add a third to the number of genuine KJB churches in this country, from further communication from Bro. Davis, namely Riverside Baptist Church in Exeter, Devon, www.riversidebaptist.co.uk/index.htm, led by Pastor Stuart Harvey.

The church's *Statement of Faith* on the scriptures is as follows.

THE SCRIPTURES

We believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Bible, "as it is in truth, the Word of God...": I Thessalonians 2:13. We accept and use the King James Version (Authorised Version) of the Bible. The Bible is our sole authority for faith and practice.

The issue that Dr Mrs Riplinger raises with her question in **Quote 166** that Dr DiVietro distorted is whether young people *as a whole*, not exclusively *saved* young people, are "looking for an excuse to deny the Bible's authority."

The following item implies that they are, regardless of any attempt on Dr DiVietro's to evade that distressing observation.

Even if it is argued that Dr Mrs Riplinger's question should be applied only to cynical theological students, the following item shows the eventual end result of early 19th century theological student cynicism with respect to students of the early 21st century.

It is a far cry from the words of George Bernard Shaw uttered a mere 60 or 70 years ago. See www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/King-James-Bible-Anniversary/ and *The Men Behind the KJV* by Gustavus S. Paine p 182.

"In all these instances the Bible means the translation authorised by King James the First...to this day the common human Britisher or citizen of the United States of North America accepts and worships it as a single book by a single author, the book being the Book of Books and the author being God."

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/content/pages/documents/1300320526.pdf, *Time for Truth News*, Issue 51 – March – June 2010, pp 15-16, by Bro. John Davis.

The item is from a young female student named La Toya Harding aka Toy, who is a student at Aston University, located in Birmingham, England, England's second largest city after Greater London. The contents of the item have been inserted without any editing except formatting and a reference to Bro. Davis.

Update on Toy's Email!

Toy writes...Here at 'Time for Truth!' we have a burden to reach the lost souls of this world before our time on earth is done; and it is with this same vision that I want to reach as many students at University as I can with the gospel. After tracting the accommodation and also giving out booklets on campus to students passing by, at the beginning of this year I decided

to email every student the gospel message. Similar to every University, Aston has an online system that can send an email to every students' personal email account - the downside to this however was that I had to obtain approval to do so. In response to my request, as could be expected, I was turned down and told that the University 'cannot be seen to be endorsing any particular viewpoint as there are students of many different faiths and some with no faith at all.'

Despite this discouraging news I decided to send the email out to students individually by typing out the tract 'Why is our country in such a mess?' and working alphabetically from A to Z. Unfortunately this too was unable to send in spite of the fact that I was sending the email in the normal fashion. Later on during that week, John said that maybe the Lord is stopping the email from being sent out as I could get in trouble with some of its contents e.g. "TV has encouraged and promoted sex before marriage, homosexuality, adultery, violence, pornography etc."

I then decided to change the email content one final time which included the tracts 'Does anyone really care?' and 'Who Cares?' After typing it out and selecting the first 200 students on the list, the email [was] finally sent – and what's more I sent it the exact same way I tried to before!!!

From then on I sent approximately 200 emails a day and received 65 responses in total; 13 of these were positive and the rest negative...Most replies were from Muslims who would often tell me that 'no-one died for my sins,' that 'God did not have a Son,' and that 'the Qur'an is superior to the Bible.' Initially I started to respond to each of these emails, but most just wanted to 'win' an argument and could not answer any of the questions I asked so I just left them with the gospel message and prayed that the Lord would soften their hearts!

Some criticised that I was 'wasting the time of students' and claimed that there is no God, that they will save themselves without Him and that they don't have faith in something they can't see! Others instructed me never to contact them in such a way again, threatening to report my email to the governing staff. Two of the responses I received can be read below:

"Please can you not fill my inbox with this sort of message? While you might be glad of your faith and wish to spread it, there are ways and means other than spam. There are those who have firmly held beliefs (as you appear to have) who will be offended. There are also those who are offended by the pushing of religion on to others. I fall into that category. Religion is a personal choice – not something to be coerced into. Please do not send me any more e-mails asking me to pray or informing me of the fundamentals of your faith. Thank you."

"Hi there, I'm not sure if you are breaking any law, by throwing your missionary stuff at everybody at our Uni, but you certainly won't win any favours with this behaviour! I'll happily start a discussion with you regarding the oppressiveness of Christianity or send you quotes from Dawkins' "God Delusion", but unfortunately I'm too busy with my studies at the moment. If people feel down it would be better, you refer them to trained counsellor than try to recruit them for your religious purpose. It's very irresponsible and can be highly insulting to other faith groups and non-believers. I'm going to inquire, how you got the permission to send stuff like this spam to all our mailboxes."

In spite of this I did receive some encouragement from Christians who were encouraged by the email and told me to keep up the good work... "Thanks for that message. You're probably going to get into big trouble for it, if you get caught because I doubt you're allowed to send a message like that to All Students. But people need to know the truth. God bless you."

As I reached up to letters P, Q and R I received an email from the secretary of one of the University Directors asking me to book an appointment with her regarding the email which

was scheduled for April 30th! Here I was kept waiting for half an hour before I actually went in but this worked out for the best as I only had to see one of the directors due to a late meeting and the other not being able to be there. As soon as I was called in I was asked why I continued to send the gospel emails out even though I had been told not to and was constantly informed that it is against University policy to do so. In response to this, I told the director that the email was sent personally to each student, on my own behalf and I didn't see it as a problem. The lady I saw tried very hard not to use the word 'offend' or say anything that would cause me offense although she didn't fail to mention the small number of people it had irritated. What was quite amazing however was that at one point she said she had noticed that I was going down the list of student addresses on the system and yet she only called me in for an appointment weeks later!!!

Unfortunately I have been verbally warned that I cannot send out anymore gospel related emails again as disciplinary action will follow if I do so...but the Lord really oversaw the whole situation from start to finish. Due to this 9,500 students received the gospel, thank you Lord!!! And thank you everyone for your prayers - please keep praying for these students!

([From Bro. Davis] Please keep praying for Toy as she has taken quite a stand at University & people will certainly be very unhappy with what she has done; pray that God protects her. She is sailing through her exams & we all expect her to get a FIRST in business studies! If she doesn't, I personally shall delete her from the Tft! mailing list & have no more contact with her...EVER!!! (No pressure!!!) [Toy looks set to get a First.]

The above item shows that La Toya contacted a very large sample of young people at a prestigious UK university with **"the gospel of Christ"** Romans 1:16. As university students, they should not have had any problem reading La Toya's presentation or indeed understanding it, at least by means of head knowledge.

The results of La Toya's presentation were that she received only a few replies, 80% of which were hostile *but 99% of recipients appear not to have replied at all.*

That result of itself doesn't mean that those students were looking for an excuse to deny the authority of the 1611 Holy Bible but they were certainly not seeking to submit to its authority, which is a form of denial.

The Lord Jesus Christ succinctly summed up the tragic implications of that kind of denial.

"...ye will not come to me, that ye might have life" John 5:40.

That is the kind of tragedy that Sister Riplinger has highlighted with her rhetorical question in **Quote 166**.

Dr DiVietro missed it, as he has missed the points of earlier quotes. See **Quote 115**.

Maybe he should do a survey of student attitudes to **"the gospel of Christ"** Romans 1:16 at his local university. The results may well show that Dr Mrs Riplinger's summation of young folks' general attitude to the authority of scripture is a lot closer to the truth than Dr DiVietro supposes.

Dr DiVietro's statement under **Quote 166** that he believes that most Christian young people today want to know what the Bible, however defined, says is of course not the same as stating that they wish to submit to its authority. A survey at a Christian college or university may indeed show, therefore, as Dr DiVietro insists, that the destructive criticism of the academic staff has provoked unwillingness on the part of many students to submit to the authority of the 1611 Holy Bible.

This author thinks that such unwillingness may be directly related to a fixation on the part of academic staff to ‘originals-onlyism.’

See again *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi, 2-3, 7, 17, 18, 88, 91, 93, 94, 149, 187, 249-250, 255-256.

Quote 167, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 932

“(She is quoting Hatch, **KD**)

“Indeed, the theory that the Bible is inerrant is the ghost of modern evangelicalism to frighten children.””

The full reference to Hatch that Dr DiVietro neglected to provide for his readers is to the book *The Charles A. Briggs Heresy Trial* by Carl E. Hatch. See *Hazardous Materials* p 926. **Quote 167** is the first and only extract that Dr DiVietro makes from Chapter 25 of *Hazardous Materials* entitled *Brown, Driver, and Briggs Hebrew-English Lexicon Based Upon Gesenius*.

Dr DiVietro’s comments on **Quote 167** occupy nearly two pages of his book, *Cleaning-Up* pp 240-242. They start out with more mockery, see **Quote 163**, that Dr Mrs Riplinger should donate some of the money she has made on her books to produce a perfect KJB lexicon and grammar.

In response to Dr DiVietro’s latest sample of mockery, see this extract from **Quote 108**.

Contrary to his insinuation under **Quote 104**, Sister Riplinger states that she has not received royalties or taken an income from A. V. Publications for the last 17 years.

Dr DiVietro should check his facts before he makes accusations. The same could be said of his whole book.

Dr DiVietro continues his comments with explanations of the words *propitiation*, *reconciliation* and *atonement*, using *The Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament* and *The Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words* by W. E. Vine.

See **Quote 144** with respect to the supposedly “reputable” (Dr DiVietro’s term) nature of Vine’s dictionary.

Dr DiVietro has in his comments on the words *propitiation* and *reconciliation* yet again violated the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9 by insisting that AV1611 Bible terms must be explained by means of sources outside the scriptures that have to be taken on trust by any individual who has not acquired the specialist knowledge of Koine Greek. See **Quote 166**.

Dr DiVietro undertakes these explanations in order to try to discredit the work by Barry Goddard entitled *The King James Bible Built-in Dictionary* that Dr DiVietro mockingly says ‘just happens’ to be sold by A. V. Publications.

See remarks under **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to the word *propitiation* and note the following extract.

The voluntary, sinless sacrifice “which taketh away the sin of the world” of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself “to God” as “a sweetsmelling savour” turned away God’s wrath as Noah’s sacrifice did after the flood, for anyone who believes that the Lord Jesus Christ is both “the Saviour” and “savour” for him personally, John 3:36. This is “propitiation.”

Dr DiVietro’s explanation under **Quote 167** does not convey the above essential aspects of the word *propitiation*.

See remarks under **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to the words *reconciliation* and *atonement* and note the following extract.

“Atonement” in the New Testament means reconciliation to God, **“being now justified by his blood”** through the death of His Son, Jesus Christ, i.e.:

Atonement = At + One + Ment.

That is, reconciliation of the saved sinner to **“God our Saviour”** 1 Timothy 1:1 is achieved via justification through Christ’s blood according to Ephesians 2:13.

“But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.”

The above meaning and the meaning reconciliation, associated with propitiation, are both found in *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*. Both meanings are evident in the scripture. No lexicons are necessary. Moreover, the meanings they give, as Dr DiVietro has cited them, are inferior to the true scriptural meaning of **“atonement.”**

Dr DiVietro’s explanation under **Quote 167** does not convey the above essential aspects of the words *reconciliation* and *atonement*.

Dr DiVietro then says that Dr Mrs Riplinger must have used grammars and lexicons in order to learn Greek, Hebrew and/or Latin, if, he mockingly adds, Sister Riplinger actually knows any of those languages.

By inspection, that statement has nothing to do with **Quote 167**. Neither have the other statements that Dr DiVietro has made under **Quote 167**. His references to *Greek-English dictionaries* are especially puzzling because Chapter 25 of *Hazardous Materials* is about a *Hebrew-English dictionary*, or lexicon.

Dr DiVietro therefore seems to be adrift in the Adriatic in his comments under **Quote 166**, **“driven up and down in Adria”** Acts 27:27, like Paul was.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments on **Quote 167** and Chapter 25 of *Hazardous Materials* pp 919-967, 49 pages in all, by stating that this material is ridiculous and mere *ad hominem* attacks.

Again, Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing and again he has falsely accused Sister Riplinger. See **Quotes 165, 166**.

Note these damaging disclosures that Dr Mrs Riplinger makes in Chapter 25 of *Hazardous Materials* about the Brown, Driver, Briggs lexicon. Note further that the material in Chapter 25 of *Hazardous Materials* is carefully documented in considerable detail like that on the child molester and RV translator C. J. Vaughan in Chapter 22 of *Hazardous Materials*. See **Quote 165**. Chapter 25 of *Hazardous Materials* cannot reasonably or fairly be dismissed as ridiculous and mere *ad hominem* attacks.

Note this extract from Chapter 25 of *Hazardous Materials* pp 923-924, which is explicitly referenced. Dr DiVietro has bypassed it whereas if he perceives himself **“as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God”** 1 Corinthians 4:1, he should have drawn attention to it and reinforced Sister Riplinger’s warning about Briggs’s corrupt Hebrew text, her emphasis.

“Briggs’s Corrupt Hebrew Text Omits “the Son”

“Briggs preferred a Hebrew text that was “not so slavish to its adherence to the Masoretic text (Critical Commentary: Psalms, p. viii). He said, “...I have made a complete lexicon of the Psalter based on a revised Hebrew text...” (Briggs, Critical Commentary: Psalms, p. vii). He added with reference to currently printed Bibles, “I have not hesitated to forsake them in

order to conform to that original which I have determined by the principles of textual criticism (Briggs, Critical Commentary: Psalms, p. viii)."

Dr DiVietro states on p 93 of *Cleaning-Up* that anyone who translates a Greek or Hebrew Biblical text into English should retain the sense of the King James English and that the English translation is in error if it changes the sense of the King James English. See **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpart**.

Yet when Charles Briggs explicitly declares that he has done exactly that for his Hebrew text, Dr Mrs Riplinger's disclosure about Briggs is ridiculous and a mere *ad hominem* attack according to Dr DiVietro.

Moreover, the DBS Executive Committee changed the sense of 2 Timothy 3:16 in the AV1611 from "**given by inspiration of God,**" which indicates breathing *in* to "*God-breathed,*" which specifies neither in nor out and lauded the change as *The Proper Exegesis of 2 Timothy 3:16*. See *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, 2-3 and remarks under **Quote 86**.

Dr DiVietro should reflect on James 2:4.

"Are ye not then partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts?"

Dr Mrs Riplinger continues.

"An example of 'his' ideas about the Hebrew text and its translation can be seen in Psalm 2:12. Here he would omit the Son of God completely. The King James Bible says, "Kiss the Son..."; Briggs says, "Kiss sincerely..." (Briggs, Critical Commentary: Psalms, p. 17). His Critical Commentary states that in the KJB reading, "'kiss the son,' the Messiah cannot be justified by usage or context, and is based on a misinterpretation due to Syriac and Aramaic influence" (Briggs, Critical Commentary: Psalms, p. 17)."

Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals more about the cankerous influence, 2 Timothy 2:17, of Briggs's "*ideas about the Hebrew text and its translation*" in her statements about his colleague Driver at the end of Chapter 25 of *Hazardous Materials* pp 961-962 that Dr DiVietro also carelessly bypassed.

"Driver's Corrupt Hebrew Text

"The fox is in the hen house again. Driver was responsible for the Hebrew text and the corruption of its notes in "Deuteronomy and Joshua, in R. Kittel's Biblia Hebraica (Leipzig, 1905)." Driver's criticism therefore laid a weak foundation for the 1937 Biblia Hebraica Kittel (BHK) and the current Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS) (Schaff-Herzog, p. 6, vol. 4)..."

"The Harvard Theological Review states that Driver's books promote the corruptions and "changes which the Hebrew text has undergone," as well as "the use of the Versions," in place of the pure Hebrew Masoretic text (Cooke, p. 250)."

In passing, it should be recalled that God appears to have used versions to preserve certain Messianic readings in the Old Testament, as Dr Mrs Riplinger notes on p 1003 of *Hazardous Materials*. See **Quote 128**.

"Where the Versions Preserve the Original Reading

"It is likely that Old Testament Messianic verses, which might have been tampered with by unbelieving Jews during the years following Christ, were preserved by other language versions of the Old Testament. For example in Psalm 22:16, the Latin, Syriac Peshitta, and the Greek Bible preserve "they pierced my hands and my feet." The oldest Hebrew witness for

Ps. 22:16, the Dead Sea Scrolls, also matches the KJB (“the Psalms scroll found at Nabal Hever” 95/6HevPS)...”

However, the *Harvard Theological Review* is clearly referring to the influence of Brown, Driver and Briggs as being instrumental in a significant shift away from the Masoretic Hebrew text essentially underlying the 1611 Holy Bible Old Testament that eventually resulted in a new Hebrew text, “*the current Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*” that even Dr Waite warns against in his book *Defending The King James Bible* Chapter II *Superior Hebrew Text*, i.e. the Old Testament Hebrew text underlying the 1611 Holy Bible.

Dr Waite lists what he terms 19 erroneous documents used to change the extant Masoretic Hebrew text for the AV1611 Old Testament that he refers to as the Ben Chayyim Masoretic Text, or Second Great Rabbinic Bible into “*the current Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*.” At the time of writing, 1993, Dr Waite clearly harboured concern that this revised Hebrew edition, published in 1966/1967, was now the one being used in Bible schools.

It appears that “*the current Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*” is now being phased out by the *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*, which, however, has the same erroneous bases as its predecessor. See en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biblia_Hebraica_Quinta and *Hazardous Materials* pp 981-982.

See *Hazardous Materials* pp 977ff for extensive and thorough documentation on corrupt printed Hebrew texts.

Dr DiVietro bypassed all that detailed and well-referenced material.

The *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* is the long-term effect of anti-Biblical influences such as those of Brown, Driver and Briggs against whom Sister Riplinger has sought to warn her readers.

Dr DiVietro should have checked his colleague’s earlier work. That work would have shown him unambiguously that he cannot dismiss Chapter 25 of *Hazardous Materials* as ridiculous and mere *ad hominem* attacks.

Note in passing that the prefaces of the NIV, p vi and the NKJV, p vi, refer to consultation by the translators of the Septuagint and the Vulgate of Jerome, another long-term effect of anti-Biblical influences such as those of Brown, Driver and Briggs against whom Sister Riplinger has sought to warn her readers.

The King’s men knew better. Note these statements from Benjamin Wilkinson.

See kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html, *Which Bible?* p 195.

“*The Latin Vulgate, the Sinaiticus, the Vaticanus, the Hexapla, Jerome, Eusebius, and Origen, are terms for ideas that are inseparable in the minds of those who know.*”

See kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-5.html, *Which Bible?* pp 253-255.

“*The case with the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus is no better. The problems presented by these two manuscripts were well known, not only to the translators of the King James, but also to Erasmus. We are told that the Old Testament portion of the Vaticanus has been printed since 1587.*

““*The third great edition is that commonly known as the ‘Sixtine,’ published at Rome in 1587 under Pope Sixtus V...Substantially, the ‘Sixtine’ edition gives the text of B...The ‘Sixtine’ served as the basis for most of the ordinary editions of the LXX for just three centuries [i.e. the King James translators would have known that the LXX is Vaticanus and would have therefore rejected the LXX as unsound even though they commended its translation effort in The Translators to the Reader]”...*

“The following words from Dr. Kenrick, Catholic Bishop of Philadelphia, will support the conclusion that the translators of the King James knew the readings of Codices æ [Aleph], A, B, C, D, where they differed from the Received Text and denounced them. Bishop Kenrick published an English translation of the Catholic Bible in 1849. I quote from the preface:

““Since the famous manuscripts of Rome, Alexandria, Cambridge, Paris, and Dublin, were examined...a verdict has been obtained in favor of the Vulgate.

““At the Reformation, the Greek text, as it then stood, was taken as a standard, in conformity to which the versions of the Reformers were generally made; whilst the Latin Vulgate was depreciated [sic], or despised, as a mere version”...

“In other words, the readings of these much boasted manuscripts, recently made available are those of the Vulgate. The Reformers [i.e. the King James translators] knew of these readings and rejected them, as well as the Vulgate.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger concludes Chapter 25 of *Hazardous Materials* as follows, her emphasis.

See also **Quotes 85, 89, 144** with respect to the *Defined (Defiled) King James Bible* and Brown, Driver and Briggs. As mentioned under **Quote 108**, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s recent work *Serious Problems in D. A. Waite’s The Defined King James Bible’s Definitions – Defiled & Declined* may be accessed at www.hacalumni.com/.

“Conclusion

*“All books about the Old Testament, which discuss the ‘Hebrew’ and its so-called ‘meaning,’ are using either the Brown, Driver, and Briggs Hebrew-English Lexicon or one of the many works which are based entirely upon it. Hebrew word study has become virtually impossible, outside of the King James Bible. Brown, Driver, and Briggs permeate **everything**, even work done in very conservative circles. When asked what he used to create his definitions, even Donald Waite, Jr., editor of the definitions in the Defined King James Bible, said, “I am relatively certain that this would have included Thayer’s Greek Lexicon of the NT and Brown, Driver, Briggs Hebrew-English Lexicon of the OT (Letter to Edward Carrington, 8/19/08 on file). KJB critics constantly observe that the definitions in the DKJB sometimes mirror those in the new versions (<http://www.a-voice.org/discern/dkjb.htm>). An entire generation has been hoodwinked by BDB; this is a mistake the upcoming generations cannot afford to carry on.”*

Dr DiVietro’s throwaway comments under **Quote 167** will, however, help to ensure that they do.

Finally for **Quote 167**, noting Dr DiVietro’s mockery in his comments about Dr Mrs Riplinger producing a perfect lexicon and grammar for the 1611 Holy Bible, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s recent work *Serious Problems in D. A. Waite’s The Defined King James Bible’s Definitions – Defiled & Declined*, www.hacalumni.com/, reveals that the DBS Executive Committee has a serious responsibility to put its own house in order in that respect. Note Romans 2:21a:

“Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself?...”

Quote 168, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1016

“The Truth: Omitted Verses in ben Chayim

1.) *The original ben Chayim Hebrew Bible wrongly omitted Joshua 21:36, 37.*

“Jacob b. Chayim was the first who omitted these verses in the edito princeps of his Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah of 1524-1525.

*“Of course these two verses **do** belong in the Bible and are exhibited in most of the Hebrew manuscripts. The King James Bible rightly includes these two verses. This proves that the KJB translators DID NOT follow the ben Chayim exclusively.”*

Quote 168 is the first extract from Chapter 28 of *Hazardous Materials* entitled *Hebrew Masoretic Old Testament Non-Authoritative Texts*.

Dr DiVietro comments that Dr Mrs Riplinger is arguing from silence because she does not say if subsequent editions of ben Chayim’s text included the verses. If they do, Dr DiVietro speculates that maybe the omission in the first edition was a typesetting error. He insists that Dr Mrs Riplinger must show that all of the ben Chayim editions omitted Joshua 21:36, 37 for her criticism of Ginsburg to be valid.

Dr DiVietro has missed the point of **Quote 168** and made a further false accusation against Sister Riplinger, who is not arguing from silence. See **Quote 167**. It could be argued that Dr DiVietro is arguing from silence because he has not shown whether or not subsequent editions of ben Chayim’s text omit Joshua 21:36, 37 which he should do if he aims to invalidate Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statements in **Quote 168**.

Dr DiVietro has also potentially confused his readers by his reference to Ginsburg, whose name does not appear in **Quote 168**. The reason is that **Quote 168** and Dr DiVietro’s comments are copied from pp 28-29 of *Cleaning-Up*, which form part of Dr DiVietro’s response to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s Challenge #1.

Dr DiVietro has regurgitated parts of his book essentially verbatim in earlier quotes without informing the reader. See **Quotes 24, 25, 26, 27, 28**. His work has therefore been carelessly organised, especially in that he includes under **Quote 168** a lengthy statement from *Hazardous Materials* pp 1016-1017 as though it was part of his comments under this quote. That could be considered plagiarism, although the statement appears as an extract from *Hazardous Materials* on p 29 of *Cleaning-Up*.

Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote 168** have been answered under **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint** as follows.

*Dr DiVietro, pp 27-29, then takes issue with Dr Mrs Riplinger’s disclosure in Hazardous Materials, pp 1016-1017 that the First Edition of ben Chayim’s Hebrew Old Testament omitted Joshua 21:36, 37. Dr Mrs Riplinger has drawn attention to the claim of Ginsburg, editor of today’s TBS Hebrew Old Testament that he followed ben Chayim’s First Edition, which is not true because Ginsburg’s Old Testament **includes** Joshua 21:36, 37. Dr DiVietro complains that Dr Mrs Riplinger has not revealed whether or not later editions of ben Chayim’s Old Testament contained the verses. If they did, he insists, then Dr Mrs Riplinger should not criticize Ginsburg for having used these later editions, even though he said he only used the First.*

Dr DiVietro has missed the point of this chapter, Chapter 28, of Hazardous Materials. The point of the chapter is to show that no published Hebrew Old Testament available today precisely matches “the “Originall” used by the KJB translators.” No extant Hebrew Old Tes-

tament exhibits perfect one-to-one correspondence with all the readings of the KJB Old Testament. [See *Hazardous Materials* p 1007.]

No available Hebrew Old Testament, therefore, can be used in authority **over** the 1611 English Bible to change or even 'clarify' its Old Testament readings. These Old Testaments are subordinate to the 1611 English Holy Bible for that reason.

Neither can the editors, such as Ginsburg, lay claim to the existence of a **single, authoritative extant source** for the Old Testament Hebrew underlying the AV1611. The non-existence of such a source is highlighted by Ginsburg's need to use another authority for Joshua 21:36, 37, which he himself has to admit, as shown by Dr Mrs Riplinger on p 1017 of *Hazardous Materials*, of which statement Dr DiVietro studiously avoided informing his readers.

That the King James translators **did** insert* Joshua 21:36, 37 shows, as Dr Mrs Riplinger points out that they were **not** limited to one Old Testament source (ben Chayim's First Edition) but the sources that they used (known only in part today) **did** result in an Old Testament Text that God has honoured for the last 400 years. This is why, as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in detail in Chapter 28 of *Hazardous Materials* that only **one** Old Testament is worthy of total trust as truly God's words not corrupted by any one man's editorial imperfections - the AV1611 Old Testament **in English**.

This conclusion is clearly at odds with the notions of the DBS Executive Committee, which explains the current backlash from Dr Waite and Dr DiVietro.

After listing several of the Hebrew sources that contain the verses from *Hazardous Materials*, Dr DiVietro then makes the strange supposition that, although he believes that Joshua 21:36, 37 are legitimate verses, neither Dr Mrs Riplinger nor anyone else can really know that the King James translators did not make these verses up. The uncertainty arises, he says, because the translators' notes were destroyed in the Great Fire of London of 1666.

It doesn't seem to have occurred to Dr DiVietro that God did not see fit to preserve the translators' notes because the translators' work was in print by then and preserved **"to the uttermost"** Hebrews 7:25 **"the certainty of the words of truth"** Proverbs 22:21, including Joshua 21:36, 37.

It is difficult to believe that Dr DiVietro's supposition has any substance because two of the faithful precursors to the AV1611, the Bishops' and the Geneva Bibles, each contain Joshua 21:36, 37 and read essentially as the AV1611. Coverdale's Bible reads similarly to the AV1611. [See www.study-light.org/desk.]

*By insertion of Joshua 21:36, 37 into the King James Old Testament, the translators were of course restoring the words to the chapter and thereby **"did let none of his words fall to the ground"** 1 Samuel 3:19.

Ginsburg's text, it should be noted, does not follow the 1611 Holy Bible Old Testament precisely, exhibiting its own departures in Joshua 5:6, 1 Samuel 1:4, 15:6 and elsewhere, following neither the King James Old Testament nor any other Hebrew text. See *Hazardous Materials* p 1019.

Note finally for **Quote 168** that Dr DiVietro does not even mention how many later editions of ben Chayim's text were published, where they may be found or if any of them is the definitive Hebrew Old Testament text that is perfect and inspired and if so, which one and why it is so. See **Quote 157**. He should do so if he believes that such a definitive Hebrew text *actually exists between two covers*.

Dr DiVietro is clearly not in a position to accuse Sister Riplinger of arguing from silence.

Quote(s) 169, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1017, 1019-1020

Quote(s) 169 consists of statements to the effect that the King James translators did not use a single, final, Hebrew authority for the English Old Testament. Dr DiVietro focuses only on one part of *Quote(s) 169* in his comments, which he highlights, from p 1020 of *Hazardous Materials*.

“The examples are serious only in the sense that Hebrew editions which omit these words are not following the pure Massoretic Text and are therefore guilty of disobeying God’s command to “diminish not a word” (Jeremiah 26:2).”

The examples are referred to in the statement immediately before the extract from *Hazardous Materials* quoted above and, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases, ***“are 8 examples of why the current printed and software editions of the Massoretic Hebrew Bible cannot be used to ‘correct’ the Holy Bible, to study the Holy Bible, or be used to translate Holy Bibles.”***

Dr DiVietro’s only comment on *Quote(s) 169* is a lame one to the effect that if the student cannot find a particular word or verse from the AV1611 in a particular Hebrew edition, he should keep checking other Hebrew editions until he does find it.

Dr DiVietro’s weak suggestion above again fails to specify any *definitive* Hebrew edition *that is perfect and inspired if he believes that such a text exists between two covers*. See *Quote 168*. This is a serious oversight on Dr DiVietro’s part because he has also completely bypassed Chapter 27 of *Hazardous Materials*, apart from giving page references above *Quote 168* that include Chapter 27.

Following Chapter 26 of *Hazardous Materials* entitled *Hebrew Lexicons: Summary & Update*, Dr Mrs Riplinger explains in Chapter 27 of *Hazardous Materials* entitled *Hebrew Old Testament Critical Texts* how *all* currently available Old Testament Hebrew texts contain numerous and at times serious errors. Dr Mrs Riplinger states in Chapter 27, p 983:

“Critical Hebrew Texts vs. Traditional Hebrew Bibles

“There are hundreds of differences between the Bomberg Traditional Hebrew Bible (see next chapter for full discussion of its editions. On p 1019 of Hazardous Materials, Dr Mrs Riplinger notes that the Bomberg Traditional Hebrew Bible is no longer generally available. God, Who is open to reason, Isaiah 1:18, would therefore surely not perceive the Bomberg Bible to be in authority over the 1611 Holy Bible) and the corrupt Hebrew editions (e.g. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, all Jewish and Online Editions) based on the Leningrad, Aleppo and other Codices. For instance, the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia changes the name of God, the Tetragrammaton, in thousands of places, omitting the cholem above the third consonant. Kittel boasted in his “Foreward” of “The new way of writing the Divine Name” in his text (Kittel, p. XXVII).”

Note under *Quote 165* how Dr DiVietro has insisted that an individual editor’s ungodliness has no bearing on the accuracy of his lexicon. It appears from Dr Mrs Riplinger’s disclosure about Kittel that Dr DiVietro bypassed that an individual editor’s ungodliness could nevertheless have a significant bearing on the accuracy of his Hebrew Bible, which makes the accuracy of the lexicon a secondary issue. Dr Mrs Riplinger continues, her emphasis.

*“The following is a very **partial** list of verses in critical editions which contain corruptions (of words and vowels which may change words) (See Kittel, p. XL for Bomberg sigla [abbreviation, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scribal_abbreviation] and its occurrence in his footnotes for his sampling of variants from Bomberg.)”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger then lists 31 verses that show material textual differences between the Bomberg Traditional Hebrew Bible and currently available critical Hebrew texts, followed by a list of 71 verses containing words with vowel changes in the critical texts that result in word changes from the traditional Bomberg text.

Dr DiVietro has evaded all that detailed information about the unreliability of current Hebrew texts. He has thereby failed to warn the student checking successive Hebrew editions that they are riddled with error whether or not they yield the particular word or verse that the student is looking for *and that therefore none of them is either a pure, inspired Hebrew Old Testament text or may be held in authority over the 1611 Holy Bible Old Testament.*

Dr DiVietro has therefore failed in his role as a pastor, to which he has laid claim, *Cleaning-Up* p 110. Having failed to advise the flock about corrupt Hebrew texts as he should have done with the help of Sister Riplinger's material, Dr DiVietro should reflect carefully on Jeremiah 23:1.

“Woe be unto the pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture! saith the LORD.”

The sheep are scattered searching for a pure inspired Hebrew Old Testament text that doesn't exist and their faith in ***“the scripture of truth”*** Daniel 10:21 is therefore in danger of being destroyed.

Dr DiVietro also evades the essential issue that Dr Mrs Riplinger has raised in Chapter 28 of *Hazardous Materials*, as succinctly expressed in the statement that immediately follows the portion of ***Quote(s) 169*** that Dr DiVietro emphasised.

“God commands that we “not add” or “diminish” from the text (Deut. 4:2 et al.). Praise God that Holy Bibles are holy. Period. (Critics should have learned that by simply reading and believing the cover thereby saving much wasted effort.)”

Like writing *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials*.

This author wonders if during that exercise of *“much wasted effort,”* Dr DiVietro's conscience may at times have echoed Job's testimony in Job 7:3.

“So am I made to possess months of vanity, and wearisome nights are appointed to me.”

Quote 170, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1020-1023 (Dr DiVietro refers only to p 1023)

Quote 170 occupies two-and-a-half pages of *Cleaning-Up*, pp 244-246 and consists of the extract beginning ***“Eight strikes against Massoretic Hebrew one-man editions:”*** Six examples are then listed initially; Numbers 33:8, 2 Samuel 8:3, 16:23, Ruth 3:5, 17, Judges 20:13, followed by 2 Kings 19:31, 37 on pp 1025-1026 of *Hazardous Materials*.

Dr DiVietro seeks to justify, Job 9:20, the length of ***Quote 170*** by insisting that the quote shows that Dr Mrs Riplinger's criticism of Ginsburg is absurd. He complains in passing that he doesn't know what happened to the remaining two examples (he should have read pp 1025-1026 of *Hazardous Materials* more closely) but maintains in effect that a mere 8 verses are a very small sample when set against the whole Hebrew Old Testament. Dr DiVietro then makes an essentially superfluous comment that the King James translators occasionally used sources other than ben Chayyim's text.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments under ***Quote 170*** by falsely accusing Sister Riplinger of hypocrisy in pointing out that Ginsburg's notes in his 1028-page *Introduction* are obscure. See ***Quote 168***. Dr DiVietro fails to comment on the nature of Ginsburg's notes but simply

accuses Sister Riplinger of obscurity and distortion with respect to many of the quotes given in *Hazardous Materials*.

Dr DiVietro has clearly made only peripheral comments on the detailed material under **Quote 170**. Those comments about Dr Mrs Riplinger's 8 examples have been addressed earlier in this work. See this extract from **Quote 128**.

It is as well that “the word of God is not bound” 2 Timothy 2:9 by the self-appointed, 33rd Degree Royal Arch Masonic equivalent ‘originals-onlyism’ ‘priest class’ of the DBS Executive Committee.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has further evidence in Chapter 28 of Hazardous Materials showing, pp 1006-1064, her emphasis, that “All currently printed, facsimile, software, and online editions of the Hebrew Massoretic Text fail to reflect the pure historic Massoretic Text in toto (e.g. Numbers 33:8, 2 Sam. 8:3, 2 Sam. 16:23, Ruth 3:5, Ruth 3:17, Judges 20:13 et al..) [including 2 Kings 19:31, 37 Hazardous Materials pp 1025-1026]...”

Dr Mrs Riplinger has a detailed study of those 8 verses on pp 1020-1026 of Hazardous Materials showing that “the pure historic Massoretic Text in toto” is preserved only in faithful vernacular Holy Bibles, such as the 1611 Holy Bible, not in any ‘finally authoritative’ Hebrew text consisting of a single source text. Such a single source text does not exist in either Hebrew/Aramaic or Greek, in spite of the DBS Executive Committee’s vehement protestations to the contrary, Cleaning-Up pp xi, 7, 21.

*Dr DiVietro has a very careless comment with respect to the above examples from Chapter 28 of Hazardous Materials under **Quote 170** to the effect that he doesn’t know what happened to examples 7 and 8 but intimates that Dr Mrs Riplinger’s handful of 8 examples are insufficient to disprove the existence of an extant finally authoritative Hebrew Old Testament text. Dr DiVietro is wrong in this respect, of course, as Dr Mrs Riplinger explains on p 1026 of Hazardous Materials, her emphases. Dr DiVietro has bypassed this explanation.*

*“These 8 verses are merely examples found in my quick 8 hour collation. They certainly do not exhibit all places where one can find the KJB using a different Hebrew text from those currently available. An honest person [Dr DiVietro, take note, Romans 12:17] can see that the original Hebrew readings are perfectly preserved in a Holy Bible that people use (e.g. King James Bible), not in one-man intellectual exercises that sit on sinking lily-pad shelves for scholars to dissect like frogs ‘til they croak. The King James Bible and the preceding English Bibles (and other pure vernacular Holy Bibles, no doubt) have been shown to be a shining reflection of the originals, **with ample manuscript evidence for those questioned readings. Translators will wisely use these and other pure old vernacular Bibles to make new translations, instead of following today’s currently printed or pocked online Hebrew editions (seen through the filthy lens of a corrupt lexicon).**”*

*Dr Mrs Riplinger’s explanation is borne out by her observation on p 735 of Hazardous Materials that underlines the purpose of these extended remarks under **Quote 128**, namely that **no** ‘finally authoritative’ Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text exists today, the acrimonious protestations of the DBS Executive Committee to the contrary notwithstanding, Cleaning-Up pp xi, 7, 21.*

*“...in 1838, the Jews’ Society followed the KJB [translators’] method of accessing a pure vernacular Bible, when creating an edition of the Hebrew New Testament. They made changes to the Greek, “following in most dubious cases the reading of the English version” (see the chapter “The Scriptures to All Nations” [Hazardous Materials Chapter 30], for many more such examples; John McClintock and James Strong, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, vol. 12, p 535.)”*

Why didn't Dr DiVietro check the above material and make warning comments on it for the sake of students seeking words or verses from the 1611 Holy Bible in extant and potentially misleading Hebrew editions?

Yet again, Dr DiVietro has failed in his self-professed role as a pastor. See **Quote(s) 169**. His failure in that respect is worse than absurd, the term that he wrongly applies to Dr Mrs Riplinger's informative even if "quick 8 hour collation." It is dereliction of "**the oversight**" of "**God's heritage**" 1 Peter 5:2, 3.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's false accusation against Sister Riplinger for hypocrisy with respect to quotations in *Hazardous Materials*, the accusation is patently false because Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing. See **Quote 167**.

See this extract from **Quote(s) 154** in response to Dr DiVietro's latest accusation against Sister Riplinger.

Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of again being deceptive. He states that Dr Mrs Riplinger has quoted an author in part and then added her own words to change the sense of the original quote completely. He then asks, if this is not so, why didn't Dr Mrs Riplinger quote the complete passage in question?

*Dr DiVietro has again falsely accused Dr Mrs Riplinger, see **Quote 153**, and his criticism of her use of quotations is hypocritical in the extreme.*

*His accusation against Sister Riplinger is false because nowhere in his comments under **Quote(s) 154** does Dr DiVietro show how Dr Mrs Riplinger has changed anything with respect to the citations that she has given. He simply lies and insinuates to that effect, the same as James White does in his attacks on Sister Riplinger and New Age Versions.*

See Blind Guides p 35 and www.av1611.org/kjv/ripwhit1.html Just Plain Lies, from which the following extracts are taken, the first of which explains why Dr Mrs Riplinger has given selective quotes in her books, her emphases.

"It is easy for readers, in this busy non-reading culture, to skip over a few words and thoughts which are submerged in a welter of other words..."

"White's lie that "She attempts to paint Dr. Palmer as a closet Aryan..." proves: 1.) White cannot read the words on a printed page and 2.) he substitutes his own wild imaginations. If that won't convince his reader, he ALTERS Palmer's quote under his heading "What Dr. Palmer actually said" to give the impression that I have grievously misquoted him (e.g. "few and clear")."

Dr DiVietro, like White, blatantly seeks to create false impressions of Sister Riplinger and her work.

*Dr Mrs Riplinger has given detailed references for the citations in **Quote(s) 154**. Dr DiVietro could easily have furnished himself with the full quotes and inserted them under **Quote(s) 154** if he thought that he could substantiate his latest accusation against Sister Riplinger.*

*These references are of course in smaller print than the bulk of the text about which Dr DiVietro complains under **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**. See Cleaning-Up p 22.*

*Rather than equip himself with a magnifying glass or consult a colleague with better eyesight than his in order to "**accomplish a diligent search**" Psalm 64:6 for the full quotes from which Dr Mrs Riplinger inserted extracts under **Quote(s) 154**, Dr DiVietro merely persists with his "**continual dropping**" Proverbs 19:13 of invective against Sister Riplinger.*

Dr DiVietro reminds this author of Carson Robison's indolent canine companion.

See www.madmusic.com/song_details.aspx?SongID=6186 *Life Gits Tee-jus Don't It.*

*Hound dog howling so forlorn,
Laziest dog that ever was born,
He's howlin' cause he's settin' on a thorn,
And just too tired to move over.*

*Dr DiVietro certainly seems to perceive that Hazardous Materials is "a thorn in the flesh" 2 Corinthians 12:7 for him. It even gives him a headache. See **Quote(s) 155**.*

After 170 quotes, it appears that for Dr DiVietro, "**the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint**" Isaiah 1:5.

An addendum to **Quotes 166-170** follows, in order to show in more detail how no extant Hebrew Old Testament text actually matches the King James Old Testament word-for-word. This material, researched by Bro. Brent Logan and forwarded by Bro. Heisey, shows further that the text of the 1611 Holy Bible is the only fully authenticated and authoritative Old Testament text in existence. See Bro. Logan's notes and **Table 8**.

Addendum to *Quotes 166-170*

Bro. Brent Logan notes the following.

Hebrew Textual Differences from the Exact Texts/Readings of the King James Bible

Possible Exact Matches with the KJB – AJO’R

As far as can be determined, the following editions may match the underlying readings of the KJB, although none of these are in print nor available so far as this author knows as of 2010 (correction welcomed). Obviously only a full, exhaustive collation of these editions with the KJB will show whether there are any possible differences between them and the EXACT text which underlies the KJB.

1. The *Editio Princeps* edition of the entire Bible, Soncino, 1488
2. The Third edition of the entire Bible, Brescia, 1494
3. The Second Quarto edition of the Bible, Bomberg, Venice, 1521
4. The Bible, Quarto, Bomberg, Venice 1525-1528

Known Departures from the KJB – AJO’R

The following generally available Hebrew texts are the closest to the texts/readings underlying the KJB, although in the details there are the noted differences. This is probably not an exhaustive list since only a word by word collation with the KJB might reveal all the differences.

1. TBS’ Ginsberg
 - a. Omits “*his sons*” in 2 Kings 19:37
 - b. Omits “*of hosts*” completely in 2 Kings 19:31
 - c. Omits “*Euphrates*” in 2 Samuel 8:3
 - d. Omits “*as if a man*” in 2 Samuel 16:23
 - e. Omits “*unto me*” in Ruth 3:5
 - f. Omits “*to me*” in Ruth 3:17
 - g. Omits “*children of*” before “*Benjamin*” in Judges 20:13

Total = 7 (There may also be problems in Josh. 5:6; I Sam. 1:4; I Sam. 15:6)

2. 1866 Letteris i.e. editions of Green, British and Foreign Bible Society, B&FBS, most Hebrew TR/MT interlinears, online, electronic etc.
 - a. Omits “*his sons*” in 2 Kings 19:37
 - b. Omits partially “*of hosts*” in 2 Kings 19:31. Leaves space and vowel points, but no consonants
 - c. Omits “*Euphrates*” in 2 Samuel 8:3
 - d. Omits “*as if a man*” in 2 Samuel 16:23
 - e. Omits “*unto me*” in Ruth 3:5
 - f. Omits “*to me*” in Ruth 3:17
 - g. Omits “*children of*” before “*Benjamin*” in Judges 20:13

Total = 6.5

3. Ben Chayim 1524. The following may have been corrected in the 1525 edition, the 2nd edition/editio princeps of Jacob ben Chayim, Venice, 1525.
- a. Omits Josh. 21:36, probably orthographic or ‘eye’ mistake
 - b. Omits Josh. 21:37, probably orthographic or ‘eye’ mistake
 - c. Omits Nehemiah 7:68
 - d. Omits “*unto me*” in Ruth 3:5
 - e. Omits “to me” in Ruth 3:17
 - f. Omits “*and they departed from before Pi-hahiroth*” in Numbers 33:8
 - g. Omits “*Euphrates*” in 2 Samuel 8:3
 - h. Omits “*as if a man*” in 2 Samuel 16:23
 - i. Omits “*children of*” before “*Benjamin*” in Judges 20:13

Total = 9

As Bro. Logan indicates, the above list is by no means exhaustive but is sufficient to show that no such text as ‘the Hebrew’ currently exists for the 1611 Holy Bible Old Testament.

Bro. Logan’s second, more extensive list of differences follows. The differences have been re-formatted in tabular form and abridged. Bro. Logan has a full discussion of each of the differences as part of his original document.

**OT Variant Readings in the King James Bible Compared to the Letteris (1866) Text
Which is Labelled by Many as “*The Masoretic Text*”**

This is a list of [43] places where the KJB did not use a reading from “*the Masoretic Text*” (which most declare to be the Letteris Text of 1866 for *general* standards of comparison to the KJB). The ben Chayyim edition may, however, be closer to the exact texts or readings underlying the King James Bible...This list will show that the usual published and available “*Masoretic Text*” reading is at times NOT the reading followed or used by the translators who gave us the KJB. Only a word-by-word collation with the KJB and all Hebrew texts will reveal all the differences between the choices of our translators and the published Masoretic Text reading.

The vast majority of items below concern what is usually referred to as Kethiv (K) and Qere (Q) readings. The (K) is found in the text while the (Q) is found in the margin. However, one text cannot have two words. Each text must make a choice as to what the “*ORIGINAL*” reading should be. Many times the KJB translators chose another word and meaning from that found in the Letteris text. Both readings (K and Q) cannot be inspired. One must choose, and the choice one makes in each of the 45 instances below will result in a DIFFERENT reading/translation/meaning. The informed individual should choose the texts that match the King James Bible.

This list further shows that the readings of the KJB are in many places unique, and cannot be found in any one place or in any other published text as of this date. IT IS TRULY THE STANDARD AND THE AUTHORITY. The ONLY way in which to determine the underlying “*original*” readings is by an analysis of the text of the King James Bible itself. Therefore, we are back to square one. If the King James Bible is THE basis from which to determine original readings, then the study of it alone is all that is both necessary and scholarly.

Table 8 lists Bro. Logan’s second set of examples. Those of the Letteris Text are the K readings that differ from the AV1611. The AV1611 readings are in bold, accompanied by the Q readings where these are given in Bro. Logan’s list. The braces [] mean that the perceived most likely reading has been given.

Table 8
OT Variant Readings in the King James Bible Compared to the Letteris (1866) Text

No.	Verse	Letteris MT, K Reading	AV1611/Q Reading
1	Numbers 10:29	<i>Reuel</i>	<i>Raguel</i>
2	Deuteronomy 12:19	<i>in your land</i>	<i>upon the earth</i>
3	Deuteronomy 28:30	<i>ravish her</i>	<i>lie with her</i>
4	Joshua 15:47	<i>the [sea] boundary [and its coast/boundary]</i>	<i>the great sea/the great [sea]</i>
5	Ruth 2:1	<i>one known</i>	<i>kinsman/kinsman</i>
6	2 Samuel 11:1	<i>messengers</i>	<i>kings/kings</i>
7	2 Samuel 20:23	<i>captains</i>	<i>Cherethites/Cherethites</i>
8	2 Samuel 22:51	<i>great, magnified</i>	<i>tower/tower</i>
9	1 Kings 22:48	<i>gave tenth</i>	<i>made/made</i>
10	2 Kings 16:6	<i>Edom</i>	<i>Syria</i>
11	2 Kings 20:4	<i>city</i>	<i>court/court</i>
12	1 Chronicles 11:11	<i>thirty</i>	<i>captains/captains</i>
13	2 Chronicles 11:18	<i>son</i>	<i>daughter/daughter</i>
14	2 Chronicles 33:19	<i>Hosai</i>	<i>seers</i>
15	2 Chronicles 34:5	<i>the altars</i>	<i>their altars/their altars</i>
16	2 Chronicles 34:6	<i>in their mountain, in their houses</i>	<i>with their mattocks/in their deserted places</i>
17	2 Chronicles 34:9	<i>dwelling</i>	<i>returned/returned</i>
18	Ezra 4:2	<i>[and we] do not [sacrifice unto him]</i>	<i>and we do sacrifice unto him/[and we do sacrifice] unto him</i>
19	Ezra 4:4	<i>made decayed, frightened</i>	<i>troubled/troubled</i>
20	Ezra 8:14	<i>Zacchur</i>	<i>Zabbud</i>
21	Job 21:13a	<i>wear out</i>	<i>spend/spend</i>
22	Job 30:22	<i>with a storm</i>	<i>substance/substance</i>
23	Job 33:19	<i>contention</i>	<i>multitude/multitude</i>
24	Psalms 22:16	<i>lion</i>	<i>pierced/pierced</i>
25	Psalms 55:15	<i>desolation</i>	<i>seize/seize</i>
26	Proverbs 15:14	<i>face</i>	<i>mouth/mouth</i>
27	Proverbs 17:27	<i>cold, cool</i>	<i>excellent/excellent</i>
28	Proverbs 20:21	<i>by greed</i>	<i>hastily/hastily</i>

Table 8, Continued
OT Variant Readings in the King James Bible Compared to the Letteris (1866) Text

No.	Verse	Letteris MT, K Reading	AV1611/Q Reading
29	Proverbs 23:31	<i>purse, bag</i>	<i>cup/cup</i>
30	Ecclesiastes 9:4	<i>chosen</i>	<i>joined/joined</i>
31	Isaiah 25:10	<i>in the waters of urine of manure/dung pit</i>	<i>for the dunghill/for the dunghill</i>
32	Isaiah 28:15	<i>oar</i>	<i>scourge/scourge</i>
33	Isaiah 65:4	<i>schism, division, fragmentation</i>	<i>broth/broth</i>
34	Jeremiah 2:20	<i>serve</i>	<i>trespass/trespass</i>
35	Jeremiah 4:19	<i>hope, expect</i>	<i>pained/pained</i>
36	Jeremiah 49:36	<i>ever, old,</i>	<i>Elam/Elam</i>
37	Jeremiah 50:6	<i>they led away the backsliding ones [on the mountain]</i>	<i>turned them away on the mountains/turned them away [on the mountain]</i>
38	Jeremiah 50:8	<i>they go forth</i>	<i>you go forth/you go forth</i>
39	Lamentations 1:17	<i>unclean or impure thing</i>	<i>menstruous woman</i>
40	Ezekiel 23:42	<i>drunkards</i>	<i>Sabeans/Sabeans</i>
41	Ezekiel 42:16	<i>cubits</i>	<i>hundreds/hundreds</i>
42	Daniel 9:24a	<i>to seal</i>	<i>to make an end/to make an end</i>
43	Nahum 3:8	<i>nourished, faithful (apparently)</i>	<i>populous</i>

Notes on Table 8

Bro. Logan's research has shown that the Letteris Text, commonly called the Masoretic Text:

1. May be considered a general guide to the King James Old Testament Text
2. Is *not*, however, the original Hebrew text underlying the King James Old Testament Text
3. May *not* be used to correct, 'clarify' or as a supposed 'original Hebrew' text in authority over the King James Old Testament Text.

Quote 171, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1025

“These two editions of the ‘Massoretic Text,’ Ginsburg and Letteris, do not even match each other.”

Dr DiVietro states that he thinks that he sees a pattern. He does not say precisely what it is but he says once again that he does not believe that any published Greek or Hebrew text is without error. Dr DiVietro has made the same statement earlier in his book with respect to Biblical manuscripts and any published linguistic source.

See thus far in *Cleaning-Up* pp 21, 88, 135, 187, 250. Note in passing that Dr DiVietro still hasn't informed his readers of the precise whereabouts of the perfect, inspired, original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text *for today* between two covers. See **Quote(s) 169**.

However, Dr DiVietro states further that just because currently available Greek and Hebrew texts contain errors it doesn't mean that the King James translators didn't use Greek and Hebrew texts for the source of their translation.

That isn't the point of **Quote 171**, or p 1025 of *Hazardous Materials*. See **Quote 167** for the last time that Dr DiVietro missed the point of a quote.

On pp 1025-1026 of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr Mrs Riplinger is describing the precise details of differences between the Ginsburg and Letteris texts in 2 Kings 19:31, 37. (They both depart from the AV1611 in those verses. See **Addendum to Quotes 166-170**.) 2 Kings 19:31, 37 are the last two of her 8 examples of differences between the AV1611 Old Testament and currently available Hebrew Old Testament editions, entitled “**Eight Strikes against Masoretic Hebrew one-man editions**” *Hazardous Materials* pp 1020-1026.

Dr DiVietro missed them, in spite of supposedly having carefully read through *Hazardous Materials* three times (in bold), *Cleaning-Up* p 110. See **Quote 170** and **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint**.

Dr Mrs Riplinger summarises the point of her brief collation of differences between the AV1611 and extant Hebrew texts as follows, namely to show that the AV1611 Old Testament is *the* Old Testament and *not* under the authority of any other.

See again this statement from **Quote 128**, reproduced under **Quote 170**.

“These 8 verses are merely examples found in my quick 8 hour collation. They certainly do not exhibit all places where one can find the KJB using a different Hebrew text from those currently available. An honest person [Dr DiVietro, take note, Romans 12:17] can see that the original Hebrew readings are perfectly preserved in a Holy Bible that people use (e.g. King James Bible), not in one-man intellectual exercises that sit on sinking lily-pad shelves for scholars to dissect like frogs 'til they croak. The King James Bible and the preceding English Bibles (and other pure vernacular Holy Bibles, no doubt) have been shown to be a shining reflection of the originals, with ample manuscript evidence for those questioned readings. Translators will wisely use these and other pure old vernacular Bibles to make new translations, instead of following today's currently printed or pocked online Hebrew editions (seen through the filthy lens of a corrupt lexicon).”

*Dr Mrs Riplinger's explanation is borne out by her observation on p 735 of *Hazardous Materials* that underlines the purpose of these extended remarks under **Quote 128**, namely that **no** 'finally authoritative' Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text exists today, the acrimonious protestations of the DBS Executive Committee to the contrary notwithstanding, *Cleaning-Up* pp xi, 7, 21.*

“...in 1838, the Jews' Society followed the KJB [translators'] method of accessing a pure vernacular Bible, when creating an edition of the Hebrew New Testament. They made

changes to the Greek, “following in most dubious cases the reading of the English version” (see the chapter “The Scriptures to All Nations” [Hazardous Materials Chapter 30], for many more such examples; John McClintock and James Strong, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, vol. 12, p 535.)”

Note that Dr Mrs Riplinger has earlier given the lie to Dr DiVietro’s apparent notion that Greek and Hebrew texts were *the* source for the King James translation. See this extract from **Quote(s) 87**.

Had Dr DiVietro taken the unusual step (for him) of giving In Aw of Thy Word a fair reading, he would have found in Chapter 15, entitled Hidden Notes & Public Views of the King James Translators a detailed description of how the King’s men went about their work, including their evaluation of many Greek sources, together with early English and foreign Bibles and the important Old Latin versions that were “so much different from the vulgar [Catholic Latin Vulgate]...”

Dr Mrs Riplinger makes repeated reference to *The Translators to the Reader* in order to illustrate the methods by which the King’s men worked and she includes, her annotations and emphases, this highly revealing summative comment from “John Selden...in his Table Talk,

““The translation in King James’ time took an excellent way. That part of the Bible was given to him who was most excellent in such a tongue and then they met together, and one read the translation, the rest holding in their hands some Bible, either of the learned tongues [Greek, Hebrew, Latin], or French, Italian, Spanish &c [and other languages]. If they found any fault, they spoke; if not, he read on (Paine, p. 77; Scrivener, p. 140).””

See also **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Testimonies to the Inspiration of the AV1611**.

That was the means by which the King’s men arrived at each of the particular words for the 1611 Holy Bible that was ““holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, made higher” and is perfect for each context (Heb. 7:26).” See Hazardous Materials p 113.

Dr DiVietro missed all that as well, even though the item on John Selden’s *Table Talk* came from his co-editor. See **Quote 108**.

Quote 172, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1029

“Like all Bible doubters, he says he includes his view of the variants he ‘scoured’ up, “in fairness to the Biblical student to afford him an opportunity of judging for himself as to which is the preferable reading.””

The speaker is Ginsburg and Dr Mrs Riplinger gives the reference to his statement as Ginsburg, *Introduction*, pp. 184, 185.

Dr DiVietro states that he agrees with Dr Mrs Riplinger on variant readings, which, he indicates, cause confusion by implying that the text of a Bible translation may be changed to match the variant. See Bro. Logan’s comments under **Addendum to Quotes 166-170** with respect to the K and Q readings that he discusses.

Dr DiVietro then says that variant readings are usually selected by sceptics seeking to change the words of the Bible (unspecified) by means of the lexicon in the back of Strong’s concordance.

Dr DiVietro’s reference to lexicons as a device used by would-be Bible corrupters (assumed to be corrupters of the 1611 Holy Bible) is ironic. See this extract from **Quote 121**.

*The issue with respect to lexicons is the ungodly word meanings that they repeatedly ascribe to Biblical terms. See for example the lengthy discussion on corrupt lexical definitions and their effects under **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**. See also **Quotes 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 47, 48, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70** with **Table 4**, **71** with **Table 5**, **73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 114** with respect to Revelation 9:11.*

Dr DiVietro clearly devotes considerable space to justifying corrupt lexicons and their correspondingly corrupt editors...

The above extract has been included to show that Dr DiVietro will himself side with the Bible (AV1611) corrupters when he seeks to justify an edition of the Received Text against the 1611 Holy Bible. See the extensive remarks under **Quote 144** and note the following extract.

*Dr DiVietro's insistence that huiiothesian (ὑιοθεσίαν) be translated simply as "adoption" as Berry completely and correctly does, according to Dr DiVietro under **Quote 144**, has in effect answered Bro. Heisey's second question to Dr Waite. See **Quotes 105-141, An Overview**, Waiting for Dr. Waite, June 2010, pp 3-4 and the question "Is the text of the King James Bible without error?"*

*According to Dr DiVietro, although he said in *Cleaning-Up* pp 7, 17-18 that the 1611 Holy Bible is accurately translated and acknowledges on p 3 of *Cleaning-Up* that the 1611 Holy Bible is perfect and cannot be improved upon (though note his remarks under **Quote(s) 175**, summarised under **Quote 143**), under **Quote 144** he now says, in effect, that the words "**of children**" should be cut out of Ephesians 1:5.*

*That is, the 1611 Holy Bible does have at least one error, according to Dr DiVietro under **Quote 144**, in Ephesians 1:5, where the words "**of children**" should be cut out according to the authority of the Newberry-Berry interlinear English of the 1550 Stephanus Edition.*

Dr DiVietro's apparent condoning of an unbiblical authority for altering the words of the 1611 Holy Bible is strangely similar to Ginsburg's apparent readiness to do likewise, as Dr Mrs Ripplinger explains in the sentence immediately following **Quote 172**, her emphasis.

*"Being "as gods," deciding **which** words or vowels are "good and evil," is a magic trick he learned, no doubt from the serpent lady at the Luciferian Theosophical Society meeting he attended (documentation to follow)."*

It is therefore perhaps not surprising that Dr DiVietro is eager to bypass all of that documentation. See remarks under **Quote 173**.

Quote 173, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1029

*"In many manuscripts the words of the Hebrew Old Testament are often written continuously, that is, there are no spaces between words. This infrequently gives critics like Ginsburg an opportunity to change the meaning of the sentence. Ginsburg introduces in his margins the choices of what he calls "the best Biblical **critics**," with regard to **word divisions**. He boasts that "the Biblical critics are more or less unanimous in accepting them." Of these Bible criticisms he says in the margin (in Hebrew) "it ought to be so" or "it appears to me."*

"Word divisions do seriously affect the translation of a few readings and some less seriously."

Dr DiVietro dismisses **Quote 173** on the basis that vowel points and various other markings in a continuous Hebrew text indicate word breaks, except where the text consists only of consonants, a situation that he appears to think is unlikely. Dr DiVietro says further that an individual called the Temple cantor had responsibility for preserving word breaks and paragraph

divisions in continuous Hebrew texts even in the absence of vowel points and other distinguishing marks.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments on **Quote 173** by stating that the material on pp 1034, 1042 of *Hazardous Materials* that describes Ginsburg's occult and Luciferian associations and his book on the Kabbalah is boring. Dr DiVietro says, significantly as will be shown, that Dr Mrs Riplinger is associating Ginsburg with the occult as, he says, she did with certain despised New Testament scholars – Dr DiVietro's term.

That material occupies pp 1034-1051 of *Hazardous Materials*. As indicated under **Quote 172**, Dr DiVietro appears eager for the reader to skip over it.

Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing with respect to vowel points in continuous Hebrew texts or Temple cantors for them, which is no help to the reader. The lack of substance in Dr DiVietro's book is a recurring feature of it. See **Quote 170**.

Dr Mrs Riplinger lists 1 Kings 19:21, Psalm 22:16, 68:18, Isaiah 9:3 on pp 1029-1030 of *Hazardous Materials* as examples of verses that Ginsburg corrupted by means of wrong word divisions. Ginsburg's omission of **"not"** in Isaiah 9:3 is a serious error that is perpetuated in *all* new versions without exception, including the NSRB, New Scofield Reference Bible that purports largely to follow the AV1611.

All pre-1611 Bibles, Wycliffe, Coverdale, Matthew, Taverner, Great, Bishops', Geneva have **"not"** in Isaiah 9:3 in agreement with the AV1611. Ginsburg's error obscures important doctrine on the nation of Israel and the Second Advent and seeks to subvert God's blessing with respect to the Bibles of the 16th century English Protestant Reformation, the Bible of **"the morning star"** Revelation 2:28 of the Reformation*, John Wycliffe and the 1611 Holy Bible that the 16th century English Protestant Reformation brought forth.

*See www.reformationsa.org/wycliffe.htm.

Those are major deficiencies of Ginsburg's text that certainly disqualify it from being any kind of authoritative source and about which Dr DiVietro fails to warn his readers.

The information on Ginsburg's occult and Luciferian connections is introduced on p 1034 of *Hazardous Materials* as follows.

"Ginsburg, a Follower of Luciferian Mme. Blavatsky

"Madame Helena P. Blavatsky (A.D. 1831-1891) was the nineteenth century high-priestess of sorcery, magic, Kabbalah, esoteric philosophy, Satan worship, and occultism. Her magazine, Lucifer, evolved into a two-volume book called The Secret Doctrine. Blavatsky's 'secret doctrine' was that Lucifer should be worshipped..."

"Ginsburg was an occult Kabbalist and follower of Mme. Blavatsky. Translators should be aghast to find such an individual as their authoritative source. This information about him has been available since 1999 in the must-have book, A Testimony Founded Forever by Dr. James Sightler, then a member of the Dean Burgon Society..."

Having summarised the main teachings of Ginsburg's book on the Kabbalah on pp 1042-1046 of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr Mrs Riplinger states on p 1046, her emphases:

"Why Was Ginsburg Interested In the Old Testament?

"Ginsburg believed that buried beneath the Hebrew text were Kabbalistic secrets. He viewed the text of the Holy Bible as "unworthy of inspiration." Why then was he so interested in it? He states,

““This view that the mere literal narrative is **unworthy of inspiration**, and that it must contain a spiritual meaning concealed under the garment of the letter, is not peculiar to the Kabbalah” (Ginsburg, *The Kabbalah*, p. 128 footnote 25).”

It certainly is not, even if inextricably bound up with the Kabbalah, as will be seen.

Note first the contributions of James Sightler, former member of the Dean Burgon Society, from earlier in this work. See this extract from **Quotes 77**, which makes reference to the occult connections of certain despised New Testament scholars – Dr DiVietro’s term - including pantheism and the research of Dr Sightler. See additional emphases.

*The context of **Quote 77** is the section on Benjamin Jowett, “**Heretic and Pantheist Friend #5**” of Henry Liddell, *Hazardous Materials* pp 255-260. See also **Quote 69**.*

Dr Mrs Riplinger states that “Liddell and Jowett had been friends since college days; Jowett and Stanley spent the summers of 1845 and 1846 in Germany, where they became steeped in the Higher Criticism of the Bible, particularly that of F. C. Baur”...

*Such was the unorthodox i.e. anti-Biblical mindset of Baur, the individual who influenced Liddell’s close associates. Jowett went on to become “one of the seven pantheistic authors of a book titled, *Essays and Reviews*. The American Unitarians loved the book and reprinted it. **Sightler** notes that, “This book denied the virgin birth, the Deity and vicarious, propitiatory sacrifice of the Lord, His bodily resurrection, and every miracle in the Bible”...Jowett followed Hegel and Kant in their philosophy.”*

*Paul warns in Colossians 2:8 “**Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ**”...*

*Jowett’s Higher Criticism, therefore, was the foundation for the attack on the students’ faith that **Quote 77** refers to. Higher Criticism is clearly associated with “**philosophy and vain deceit**.” These twin evils owe much to Greek philosophers and their teachings that in turn provide the basis for the unbelief of the Greek teachers that Dr DiVietro professes to deplore but the cause of which he overlooked. See *The Christian’s Handbook of Science and Philosophy* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Chapter 4, *The Philosophers*.*

*Dr Mrs Riplinger has this telling comment that immediately follows **Quote 77**, her emphasis, and which Dr DiVietro bypassed.*

*“Jowett’s earlier study in Germany and his own methodology for analyzing literature made him one of the most diabolical of England’s critics of the Bible...**Defending** Jowett’s book and heresy by public comments were Liddell’s friends and RV Committee men, Fenton Hort and A. P. Stanley (**Sightler**, p. 39)...Liddell saw him not as a heretic, but a hero. Liddell and Jowett were bound like Siamese twins in their two-headed world of Greek to English ‘translation.’ The two passed Greek into English through their moon-struck minds and published it for all to gaze at. Jowett translated works by Plato and Aristotle into English. Liddell and Jowett worked successfully and tirelessly together to do away with the theological test required for graduates. They secularized the college as they secularized the meaning of Greek words.”*

*The Greek teachers’ unbelief, therefore, stemmed directly from the Greek works upon which they based their teachings to undermine their students’ Biblical beliefs, namely Plato, Aristotle and the other Greek sources that Liddell used for his lexicon, as Dr Mrs Riplinger lists on p 216 of *Hazardous Materials* “...the “comic Poets,” Aeschylus, Sophocles and the whole bag of Greek filth, murder, adultery, homosexuality, debauchery, violence, drunkenness, idolatry, and sadism.”*

Attention is drawn to Proverbs 12:6.

“The words of the wicked are to lie in wait for blood: but the mouth of the upright shall deliver them.”

Liddell and Jowett’s Bible-rejecting, pantheistic idolatry is of course connected with the occult, according to Galatians 5:20 ***“Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies.”***

Dr Mrs Riplinger reveals the occult connections of these Greek scholars, so-called, further on pp 218-219 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphasis.

“Liddell: Professor of Moral Philosophy and Dean

*“What encompassed the study of “Moral Philosophy” in England during the nineteenth century? The Professor of Moral Philosophy at Cambridge was soon to be Henry Sidgwick. He was “favourably impressed” with Luciferian Madame Blavatsky. Sidgwick’s spiritualistic activities were identified as “Satanism” by the evangelical Christians of his day” (Janet Oppenheim, *The Other World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985, pp. 111, 112, 174, see index under “Sidgwick, Henry” and “Satanism”). His counterpart at Oxford was Henry Liddell, who was elected professor of Moral Philosophy in 1845. Like Sidgwick, his lectures were **not** from the Bible.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger, with the help of Dr Sightler’s research has indentified the occult mindset of Liddell, Jowett and Sidgwick that in turn influenced the lexical definitions of Thayer, *Hazardous Materials* p 216 and therefore other lexicons and the corruptions introduced in the RV of 1881, many subsequent new versions *and the word definitions of the Defined King James Bible*. See **Quote 167** and **Tables 4, 4a, 4b** under **Quote 70** for numerous examples of word changes from the AV1611, *changes that clearly stemmed from occult mindsets*.

Dr DiVietro, who strongly supports *The Defined King James Bible, Cleaning-Up* p 92, would understandably seek to deter readers from the information cited above, just as he would seek to deflect attention from similar disclosures about Ginsburg and his Old Testament corruptions. See remarks above on 1 Kings 19:21, Psalm 22:16, 68:18, Isaiah 9:3 and further remarks below on the implications for the DBS Executive Committee of Ginsburg’s interest in the Old Testament.

Dr DiVietro would also not wish that any attention be drawn to the efforts of Dr Sightler, as a former member of the DBS, in helping to provide readers with the information cited above.

A further contribution from Dr Sightler to this work is found under **Quote 153**. See this extract, with the added emphases.

Concerning the inspiration of versions, including early versions of scripture, Dr LaMore’s site is gracembc.org/home.html from which the link to his church’s bookstore is gracembc.org/bookstore.html.

*The subtitle for the link is, interestingly enough, *The Only King James Only Bookstore in Toronto*.*

*This link then links to gracembc.org/images/HBB_INVENTORY-King_James_Bible.pdf, entitled *The King James Bible*. Among the many worthy titles listed in the inventory, including some by King James inspirationalist authors such as Burton, Daniels, Gipp, Grady, Riplinger et al, is the following work, emphases in the inventory:*

***Lively Oracles - The Inspired Bible In The Hearts of Believers.* - by James H. Sightler, M.D. “I believe and I hope this book will help to show that the King James Bible and those**

faithful vernacular translations which preceded it have not lost any inspiration or authority in translation.” ISBN: 0-9673343-1-4 C \$4.00 ea.

Dr DiVietro abhors any notion of inspiration with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible.

See *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi, 2-3, 7, 17, 18, 88, 91, 93, 94, 149, 187, 249-250, 255-256.

That is another reason why Dr DiVietro would not want readers’ attention drawn to Dr Sightler and why he descends yet again into mockery, in his eagerness to dissuade readers from examining the information on Ginsburg’s Kabbalism. See **Quote 167**.

Further reasons emerge by inspection of the extract given above from p 1046 of *Hazardous Materials*, reproduced immediately below.

“Ginsburg believed that buried beneath the Hebrew text were Kabbalistic secrets. He viewed the text of the Holy Bible as “unworthy of inspiration.” Why then was he so interested in it? He states,

*““This view that the mere literal narrative is **unworthy of inspiration**, and that it must contain a spiritual meaning concealed under the garment of the letter, is not peculiar to the Kabbalah” (Ginsburg, *The Kabbalah*, p. 128 footnote 25).””*

Ginsburg states that the Old Testament of the 1611 Holy Bible is not inspired.

Ginsburg states further that the true spiritual meaning of the Old Testament writings can only be gleaned from the Hebrew text, in Ginsburg’s perception from *beneath* the Hebrew text – and by implication from beneath the English text as well.

Throughout *Cleaning-Up*, see page references above, Dr DiVietro has insisted that neither Testament of the 1611 Holy Bible is inspired. The rest of the DBS Executive Committee agrees with him.

Throughout *Cleaning-Up*, see page references above and in addition pp 105-109, Dr DiVietro has insisted that the English text of the 1611 Holy Bible cannot fully convey the meaning of ‘the original,’ where deeper meanings of the text may be found that are not apparent in the English. That’s the only way to appreciate the fullness of the scriptures, according to Dr DiVietro, *Cleaning-Up* p 250. Once again, the rest of the DBS Executive Committee agrees with him.

See **Quote(s) 175**, to follow.

Dr DiVietro has substantiated nothing under **Quote 173** and he has again violated the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See **Quote 167**.

Most significantly for **Quote 173**, Dr DiVietro has shown that, however he acquired it, he has the same mindset with respect to the English text of the 1611 Holy Bible as C. D. Ginsburg, namely that it is not inspired and that deeper meanings must be determined from *beneath* the English text. The rest of the DBS Executive Committee agrees with Dr DiVietro on those points.

Strange bedfellows.

It is understandable therefore why Dr DiVietro would seek to deflect readers’ attention away from the information in *Hazardous Materials* on Ginsburg’s occult mindset.

That information is clearly most useful in discerning the real origin of ‘originals-onlyism.’

Quote 174, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1045

*“Ginsburg says that in the end, man will be God and rule the world under En Soph, a woman! He writes, “In that state the creature will not be distinguished from the Creator...Then the souls will rule the universe like God, and what **she** shall command he will execute.”*

Quote 174 is fully emboldened in *Hazardous Materials*.

Dr DiVietro comments only briefly on **Quote 174**. He is clearly still keen for the reader to bypass the information on Ginsburg in Chapter 28 of *Hazardous Materials*. He says that *Hazardous Materials* pp 1045-1059, from which Dr DiVietro extracts the first part of **Quote(s) 175**, consists merely of more *ad hominem* attacks on C. D. Ginsburg with respect to his occult associations, his heretical beliefs and his Kabbalistic writings, which Dr DiVietro says is a waste of space on Dr Mrs Riplinger’s part because according to Dr DiVietro no fundamentalist attaches any significance to Ginsburg’s Kabbalistic writings.

Think again, Doctor.

Ginsburg says that the 1611 Holy Bible is not inspired. Dr DiVietro says the same. So do Dr Waite and the rest of the DBS Executive Committee.

Ginsburg says that hidden meanings are to be found in the Old Testament by digging into its Hebrew text. Dr DiVietro says the same. So do Dr Waite and the rest of the DBS Executive Committee. See the end of **Quote 173** and **Quote(s) 175**.

See **Quote 86** and remarks on other individuals of like mind with Dr DiVietro. He should reflect carefully on Matthew 12:36.

“But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment.”

Note that **Quote 174** is clearly Sister Riplinger’s reproof of Ginsburg’s expectation that *“women rule over them”* Isaiah 3:12 universally, not just on earth leading up to the Second Advent, as the scripture shows. **Quote 174** therefore proves that the DBS Executive Committee’s accusation against Sister Riplinger that she is seeking to usurp authority over men in violation of 1 Timothy 2:12 is false. See *Cleaning-Up* pp viii, 10, 111 and remarks on 1 Timothy 2:12 under **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint, Quote 53** and **Table 3**.

The DBS Executive Committee doesn’t understand Dr Mrs Riplinger’s God-given calling for the ministry of *“helps”* 1 Corinthians 12:28. Neither, it appears, does Pastor Brian Donovan of the Bible Baptist Church, Pensacola, Florida, who criticised Sister Riplinger and her work during a message given at the church’s February 2012 Blowout conference. However, this author gained the impression on listening to the recording that the Lord may have been rebuking Pastor Donovan about his criticism of Sister Riplinger even as he concluded his message. If Pastor Donovan later testifies publicly to that effect and repudiates his criticism of Sister Riplinger, asking her forgiveness, Ephesians 4:32, then the reader should discount the above remarks against Pastor Donovan made by this author.

In the meantime, ‘the brethren’ should keep in mind that Sister Riplinger is not one of *“Hillary’s Hellcats,”* see *Big Sister Is Watching You* by Texe Marrs, Living Truth Publishers, 1993, Introduction and she is not *“the prophetess Noadiah”* Nehemiah 6:14.

Sister Riplinger is best described according to Romans 16:1-2, together with *“helps”* in 1 Corinthians 12:28.

“I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea: That ye receive her in the Lord, as becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you: for she hath been a succourer of many, and of myself also.”

Dr DiVietro also says briefly that *Hazardous Materials* pp 1045-1059 contain an item on the Dead Sea Scrolls, which he intimates is also a waste of space.

Dr DiVietro is obviously very keen for the reader to bypass that item as well.

It isn't difficult to discover why.

Dr Mrs Riplinger's item on the Dead Sea Scrolls covers pp 1051-1058 of *Hazardous Materials*. It actually consists of two items, under different sub-headings and describes the discovery in 1883 of a version of the Book of Deuteronomy written on parchment that was brought to England and evaluated by a saved Jew named Moses Shapira, an academic colleague of Ginsburg's. Shapira concluded that the parchment dated from the 9th century B.C., centuries older than any other extant Old Testament manuscript at that time.

Detailed examination of the parchment supported Shapira's conclusion and pointed to Moses as the author of Deuteronomy, which Ginsburg, from his Kabbalistic outlook, strongly denied. Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy as indicated by the parchment would of course in turn support the Old Testament text of the King James Bible as a true preservation of the writings of Moses.

Ginsburg's association with Shapira enabled him to gain access to the parchment and he made strenuous efforts to show that it was a forgery but failed. Ginsburg bided his time, however, and succeeded in purchasing the parchment for a pittance twenty years after it had been discovered, when interest in the document had long since lapsed.

Shortly afterwards, Moses Shapira was found dead in his hotel room, supposedly a suicide.

Some years later, the parchment was destroyed by fire, supposedly by accident. Its text was subsequently vindicated by the discovery in 1947 of the entire collection of Dead Sea Scrolls. God had outwitted the latter-day Jehudis, Jeremiah 36:23, which is an accurate analogy as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in her concluding remarks on this item about the Dead Sea Scrolls.

“Mark it down: Bible critics and their companions, “lewd fellows of the baser sort,” will not be corrected or allow themselves to be proven wrong – no matter what they have to arrange, including stealing manuscripts for a fraction of what they are worth, destroying the reputation of a good Christian and possibly even murdering and burning the world's oldest Bible manuscript and its evidence against their theories.

““The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy” John 10:10”

When **“honest things”** 2 Corinthians 8:21 are turned aside as **“a thing of naught”** Isaiah 29:21, a godly Christian sister repeatedly subjected to vile character assassination and **“the word of God”** 1 Thessalonians 2:13 denigrated as merely **“the word of men,”** **“lewd fellows of the baser sort”** Acts 17:5 are clearly still in operation – for now.

Dr DiVietro's comments under **Quote 174** suggest that he knows that too.

Quote(s) 175, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1059, 1060, 1063

Dr DiVietro comments only on the third extract for **Quote(s) 175** that reads as follows.

“Reliance on their defective Hebrew edition by Ginsburg leads the TBS to state: “The Trinitarian Bible Society does not believe the Authorised Version to be a perfect translation, only that it is the best available translation in the English language...The final appeal must always be to the original languages, in the original Greek and Hebrew texts”...Small wonder they think the KJB is not perfect; they are comparing it to their imperfect Ginsburg text (and no doubt reading Ginsburg’s Hebrew with a corrupt Gesenius, Brown, Driver, and Briggs Hebrew-English Lexicon).”

See remarks on **Quote(s) 175** under **Quotes 95, 123, 143, 171**.

Dr DiVietro says that the TBS statement is right and that Dr Mrs Riplinger is lying, because she objects to the TBS’s statement that the 1611 Holy Bible is not perfect. Dr DiVietro claims that the TBS is not saying that the AV1611 is flawed, only that it isn’t perfect.

Dr DiVietro then goes on to declare that even a translation that is 100% accurate is not perfect, as, he adds, any honest(!) Bible student knows. He says that no translation can ever carry over to itself what he terms the nuances and implications of the original language and that therefore, no translation (in capitals) of a complex literary work, such as the scriptures, is perfect (in capitals).

Dr DiVietro then insists that what he terms the fullness of the scriptures can only be understood by reading the words of the original writings with a full understanding of the original languages. Otherwise, he claims, even the reader of the most accurate translation may fall prey to ambiguities and false impressions.

Dr DiVietro then hastens to add that the most accurate translation is not necessarily inaccurate (sic) and it doesn’t mean that a Bible student having *only* the English Bible can’t understand the Bible (apparently some unidentified document not in English) or that any printed edition (in bold) exactly follows the original writings in every detail. However, Dr DiVietro insists that some things (unidentified) can be learned and elucidated (see **Quote 147, 163**) from the original Hebrew and Greek texts of the (unidentified) Bible.

Dr DiVietro goes on to say that it is right and proper and indeed helpful to study the original languages of scripture because the King James translators stated that they did their work from the original languages. Dr DiVietro then assures his readers that when a published Greek or Hebrew text departs from the text of the King James Bible, it should never be assumed that the translators made an error because, Dr DiVietro says, they were far better translators than even the best scholars today.

Dr DiVietro then states that differences between the King James text and published Greek or Hebrew texts should be assumed(!) by the true(!) Bible student to have come about either because the King James translators used a less well-known meaning of the underlying Greek or Hebrew word or they translated a different Greek or Hebrew word.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments under **Quote(s) 175** with the statement that the true(!) Bible student must try to find out why the AV1611 reads differently in any particular passage from published Greek or Hebrew texts in order to get a fuller understanding of that passage. The student, adds Dr DiVietro, is not dependent on Ginsburg, Thayer or any other lexical editor for that purpose.

The only valid parts of Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote(s) 175** are those with respect to the abilities of the King James translators, see *In Awe of Thy Word* Chapter 15 and that their

work was done out of “*the Original Sacred Tongues*” as stated in the Epistle Dedicatory, www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm.

Note, however, this extract from **Quote 137** with respect to the term “*the Original Sacred Tongues*” together with John Selden’s description of how the King’s men actually did their work, which was by no means confined to Greek and Hebrew sources as Dr DiVietro wrongly implies under **Quote(s) 175**. See **Quote 171**.

Dr Mrs Riplinger explains on p 691 of Hazardous Materials with respect to the work of the King’s men, her emphases:

*“By following the already existing English Bibles the translators were, by proxy, accessing the readings which God had preserved since their **origin**. God was attentive to preserve those readings in Holy Bibles; he has not been actively involved in creating and preserving one-man critical Greek editions, intellectual exercises, which popped up **for the first time** 1500 years after the originals... Consequently, Holy Bibles, such as the KJB, contain time-pressed diamonds, where the one-man modern Greek editions (A.D. 1500-2000) still have coal.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger makes repeated reference to The Translators to the Reader in order to illustrate the methods by which the King’s men worked and she includes, her annotations and emphases, this highly revealing summative comment from “John Selden...in his Table Talk,

““The translation in King James’ time took an excellent way. That part of the Bible was given to him who was most excellent in such a tongue and then they met together, and one read the translation, the rest holding in their hands some Bible, either of the learned tongues [Greek, Hebrew, Latin], or French, Italian, Spanish &c [and other languages]. If they found any fault, they spoke; if not, he read on (Paine, p. 77; Scrivener, p. 140).””

The remainder of Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote(s) 175** are sheer dogma with no substantiation, yet further false accusation against Sister Riplinger, still without any indication of where the perfect, inspired original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text is between two covers and a further denial of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9.

See **Quotes 170, 171, 173**.

Dr DiVietro falsely accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of spin with respect to the TBS statement in **Quote(s) 175**.

The spinner is Dr DiVietro. The TBS considers that the 1611 Holy Bible is both imperfect and flawed. See the following extracts from letters by the TBS to this author. The letters were signed by Mr Andrew J. Brown, the then Editorial Secretary of the TBS.

Dear Mr. O'Reilly

6th December 1985

...Our society testifies to the inspiration and inerrancy of the Original Scriptures but we do not claim perfection for any translation, nor do we claim that the Authorised Version is "without proven error."

At some passages it is quite possible that a modern translation may offer an improvement in the wording, compared with the Authorised Version. It is proper that this should be freely acknowledged...

Dear Mr. O'Reilly

18th December 1985

...Examples of rendering in the Authorised Version which are capable of improvement are Acts 12:4, where "Passover" would be preferable to "Easter" (an anachronism). Matthew 12:40 where "great fish" is preferable to "whale". These points are correctly translated in the New King James Version and the Living Bible (although the latter version is grievously at fault in many other passages). An example of a textual improvement is at Revelation 16:5 where "and shall be" should be "the Holy One" (the A.V. was here misled by a mistake of Theodore Beza's Greek New Testament, while the correct reading was preserved in the 1550 edition of Stephanus and every known manuscript). The Revised Version and other modern versions here give the correct reading, even though in many other passages they may go astray. Please note that we have no desire to find fault with the Authorised Version, and I only mention these specific points because you have particularly requested them...

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ NKJV Counterfeit with respect to Matthew 12:40.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/why-the-av-only-7434.php Curley the Bible Cor-rector Part 2 with respect to Acts 12:4.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php James White's 7 Errors with respect to Revelation 16:5.

See also Will Kinney's articles brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm on "Easter" Acts 12:4 and Revelation 16:5.

Note in passing that the Nestle (21st Edition), Berry/Stephanus and Farstad/Hodges 'Majority' texts are each in error with respect to Matthew 12:40, Acts 12:4 and Revelation 16:5, in agreement with the TBS readings given above, although the NKJV follows the AV1611 in Revelation 16:5.

Concerning perfection of translation, which Dr DiVietro denies for the 1611 Holy Bible, acknowledging only that it is accurate in translation, *Cleaning-Up* p 18, see this extract from **Quote 163**.

It doesn't seem to have yet occurred to Dr DiVietro that the sense of Psalm 12:6-7 is that God Himself ensures that nothing is lost when His words are transferred from one language to another.

"The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever."

It also hasn't occurred to Dr DiVietro that Biblically, translation is an improvement on the 'original.' Note this extract from **Quote 28** that addresses Psalm 12:7 in detail.

Note further Dr Gipp's analysis of how, from scripture, a translation is actually an improvement on 'the original,' with respect to 2 Samuel 3:10, Colossians 1:13, Hebrews 11:5. See *Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Dr Waite and the Imaginary 'Original Bible,' Unidentified in Print.*

Note this extract from the above work.

To make matters worse for Dr Waite, Dr Gipp shows how a translation can actually be an improvement on 'the original.' The following verses should be studied carefully in this respect.

"As the LORD hath sworn to David, even so I do to him; To translate the kingdom from the house of Saul, and to set up the throne of David over Israel and over Judah, from Dan even to Beersheba" 2 Samuel 3:10.

"Giving thanks unto the Father...Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son" Colossians 1:12, 13.

"By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God" Hebrews 11:5.

See this extract from **Quote 28** with respect to the full implications of the word "**preserve**" in Psalm 12:7, which for the 1611 Holy Bible would extend to all aspects of the translation, which Dr Gipp shows Biblically to be an improvement on 'the original,' for both nuances and implications of the original languages as well as for inspiration. Dr DiVietro's denial in that respect is worse than limiting God. It amounts to blasphemy.

Consider the term "**preserve**" in Psalm 12:6, 7 in the 1611 Holy Bible. Dr Waite, Dr DiVietro and the rest of the DBS Executive Committee profess that God preserved His words accurately in the KJB but without life, or inspiration i.e. breathing life in to that which was perfectly formed but without life as such, Genesis 2:7. The DBS perceives the KJB to be like a fossilised woolly mammoth in Siberia preserved intact but lifeless in the frozen tundra. See *Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Introduction.*

However, the word "**preserve**" and its derivatives are never used in that sense in scripture. This is one time when the meaning of the word under study is confirmed by looking beyond the immediate context of the passage and surveying how the word is used elsewhere in scripture. Note that despite Dr DiVietro's insinuation to the contrary in his comments under **Quote 28**, Dr Mrs Riplinger does indicate that meanings of KJB words can be determined by studying their usage throughout scripture. See *In Awe of Thy Word* p 50.

First note that Psalm 12:7 states with respect to "**the words of the LORD**" that "**Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.**"

To "**preserve**" is therefore to "**keep**" in the context. The Lord obviously could not have kept His words according to Psalm 12:6, 7 if they had lost inspiration during the preserving process. Clearly they did not. Turning to the whole of scripture, it is found that the word "**preserve**" and its derivatives occur 56 times in 55 verses. The vast majority of occurrences refer to the preservation of life, and often individuals e.g. in Genesis 45:5 Joseph says to his brothers "**God sent me to preserve life**" i.e. as living beings. The nearest context of Psalm 12:7, the Book of Psalms itself, contains the word "**preserve**" and its derivatives 22 times in 21 verses. On 21 occasions, the term refers to the preservation of life as in the rest of scripture, especially of the saints with respect to their eternal preservation, as in Psalm 37:28.

“For the LORD loveth judgment, and forsaketh not his saints; they are preserved for ever: but the seed of the wicked shall be cut off.”

The first occurrence of the word “**preserve**” in Psalms is in Psalm 12:7. The use of the word “**preserve**” in Psalm 12:7 is consistent with its use throughout the Book of the Psalms and indeed throughout the whole Bible because “**the words of the LORD**” are “**the words of the living God**” Jeremiah 23:36. “**The words of the LORD**” therefore by definition live, as indicated by familiar references such as Matthew 24:35, John 6:63, 1 Peter 1:23, 25 and are therefore preserved as living words i.e. “**all scripture...given by inspiration of God.**” They are the “**lively oracles**” of God Acts 7:38, they live.

“The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life” Job 33:4.

“**The Spirit of God**” in Psalm 12:6, 7 is well able to “**preserve**” for “**The words of the LORD**” life, 1 Peter 1:23, inspiration, accuracy, precision and the nuances and implications of the original languages (whatever these may be, Dr DiVietro doesn’t elaborate under *Quote(s) 175*) i.e. *perfection* of translation and, as Dr Gipp has shown, *improvement* on ‘the originals’ via translation.

“For with God nothing shall be impossible” Luke 1:37.

Otherwise “**The Spirit of God**” is not “**The Spirit of God.**”

Dr DiVietro’s comments under *Quote(s) 175* are an insinuation to that effect, namely that “**The Spirit of God**” is not “**The Spirit of God.**” His comments are therefore blasphemous.

Noting that “**The law of the LORD is perfect**” Psalm 19:7, such that if Dr DiVietro doesn’t have a perfect Bible, he doesn’t have “**The law of the LORD,**” David’s observation in Psalm 119:96 puts the 1611 Holy Bible far beyond the narrow prejudices of those who would find fault or imperfection with it and who are not honest, studious or true with respect to the commandment of the Lord Jesus Christ to “**Search the scriptures**” John 5:39.

“I have seen an end of all perfection: but thy commandment is exceeding broad.”

Dr DiVietro’s insistence on a full understanding of the words of the original writings in order to understand the fullness of the scriptures and to avoid error is immediately seen to be yet another violation on his part of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9.

As indicated, Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing with those comments and it is he, not the KJB believer, who stumbles into error by means of ‘the Greek’ and who repeatedly fails with ‘the Greek’ to bring out or ‘elucidate’ what he terms the fullness of the scriptures.

See **Challenges #5, #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints** for Dr DiVietro’s ‘examples’ and his wholly inadequate explanation of Bible verses and Biblical words by means of ‘the original languages,’ whereby he fails utterly to ‘elucidate’ the scriptures to which he alludes.

Note by contrast this extract from *Quote 163*, which shows that the King James English far outstrips ‘the Greek’ with respect to ‘elucidating’ what Dr DiVietro terms the fullness of the scriptures. A Bible student with *only* the English Bible, by “**comparing spiritual things with spiritual**” 1 Corinthians 2:13 i.e. scripture with scripture, is far in advance of a Greek adherent with access even to *all* ‘the Greek.’ If the following English words listed are latent in ‘the Greek’ from which they must be unpacked by *inspired* translation, then the English has at hand a comprehensive array of robust synonyms that can readily express all the nuances and implications of ‘the Greek’ and more besides. The King’s men did the unpacking and no student of scripture has any need to rummage back through the packaging.

Finally, for **Quote 163**, note the superior force of the King James English over 'the Greek' in this summary for Romans 4:3, 9, 22, Galatians 3:6, where the King's men used four different words for, evidently, the same Greek word. The four different words are respectively "counted," "reckoned," "imputed," "accounted."

The summary is from www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php, Answers to the Wolf Man Part 1, pp 19-23. The extract is from p 23:

The saved sinner draws on God's account with respect to **"the gift of God"** [Ephesians 2:8] that is **"accounted to him for righteousness"** [Romans 4:3] being among **"they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness"** [Romans 5:17] because they **"believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead;"** Romans 4:24 **"Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification"** Romans 4:25.

Therefore, in sum, **"the gift of God"** that is identical to **"righteousness...imputed"** [Romans 4:22] to the believer is:

- **"counted unto"** [Romans 4:3] the believer as the best gift, the hallowed gift and the everlasting gift of God's righteousness that turns away God's wrath from the believer.
- **"reckoned to"** [Romans 4:9] the believer as the restorative gift that returns him to a lost former state of innocence and bestows even more upon him by means of a new standing in God's righteousness and as the established gift underwritten by God Himself.
- **"imputed to"** [Romans 4:22] the believer as the doubly blessed gift for him that bestows God's righteousness on the recipient and his sin on the Lord Jesus Christ.
- **"accounted to"** [Galatians 3:6] the believer as the royal gift and the abundant gift by which the recipient of God's righteousness thereby draws from an inexhaustible and ever-current account of God's righteousness.

"Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift" 2 Corinthians 9:15.

Grievous Wolf's obsession with 'the Greek' denied him both the additional revelation in English and in turn the attendant blessing.

So has Dr DiVietro's - again.

Note the opposite case where 'the Greek' has more than one word that is perfectly expressed by a single, strong term in English, namely **"hell"** where 'the Greek' has three words *Gehenna, Hades* and *Tartarus*.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/why-the-av-only-7434.php Peter Amu e the Bible Corrector Part 1, pp 9-10.

That term *Gehenna* had some relevance when koine Greek was a spoken and written language as a depiction of hell in the 1st century AD when the Valley of Hinnom to the south of Jerusalem, to which *Gehenna* also refers, was an open-air incinerator. That incinerator no longer exists as such and has not existed for centuries.

The King's men therefore correctly translated the word *Gehenna* as **"hell"** interchangeably with *Hades*. It is the literal hell **"in the heart of the earth,"** Jonah 2:2, Matthew 12:40, that is of relevance today. The historical rubbish dump outside ancient Jerusalem, where of course the fires have been quenched, Mark 9:44, 46, 48, no longer bears any relevance for

today's bible believer even as an illustration and therefore neither does any distinction in English between the words Gehenna and Hades.

That Gehenna and Hades should be translated interchangeably as **"hell"** may easily be demonstrated.

Compare Mark 9:43, 44, where **"hell"** is Gehenna or geena and Luke 16:22b, 23, where **"hell"** is hades.

"And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched" Mark 9:43, 44.

"The rich man also died, and was buried; And in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame" Luke 16:22b-24.

Does anyone seriously suppose that the rich man could tell the difference between Gehenna and Hades?

Tartarus is used in 2 Peter 2:4, where it is rendered **"hell"** in the AV1611. Jude 6-7 describe **"hell"** i.e. Tartarus in 2 Peter 2:4 as **"eternal fire,"** which is **"hell...the fire that never shall be quenched"** Mark 9:43, 45. However, as indicated above, **"hell"** is Gehenna in Mark 9:43, 45, 47, showing that the words *Gehenna*, *Hades* and *Tartarus* are interchangeable and perfectly expressed by the single distinct English word **"hell."**

It is noteworthy that Dr Ken Blue, Emeritus Pastor of the Open Door Baptist Church, Lynnwood, WA, www.opendoorbaptist.com/pages.asp?row=5, states in his most informative book *Why Bible Believers Don't Speak in Tongues* p 22 that going to 'the Greek' is futile and merely a ruse because 'the Greek' has never resolved any doctrinal issue and never will. Unlike Dr DiVietro, Dr Blue establishes the thesis of his book *Why Bible Believers Don't Speak in Tongues* by consistently **"comparing spiritual things with spiritual"** 1 Corinthians 2:13 i.e. scripture with scripture.

After 250 pages of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr Blue's statement is most encouraging.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's statement that it is right and proper and indeed helpful to study the original languages of scripture because the King James translators stated that they did their work from the original languages, note this extract from Dr Miles Smith and *The Translators to the Reader*, www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm.

"Translation it is that openeth the window, to let in the light; that breaketh the shell, that we may eat the kernel; that putteth aside the curtain, that we may look into the most Holy place; that removeth the cover of the well, that we may come by the water, even as Jacob rolled away the stone from the mouth of the well, by which means the flocks of Laban were watered [Gen 29:10]. Indeed without translation into the vulgar tongue, the unlearned are but like children at Jacob's well (which is deep) [John 4:11] without a bucket or something to draw with; or as that person mentioned by Isaiah, to whom when a sealed book was delivered, with this motion, "Read this, I pray thee," he was fain to make this answer, "I cannot, for it is sealed." [Isa 29:11]"

Dr DiVietro even quotes this extract in *Cleaning-Up* p 16. See **Setting Up the 'Clean-Up'**. He even admits that Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek are dead languages that the King James translators brought into easily-read English that would free the ordinary church-goer from the high-mindedness of the educated clergy, 2 Timothy 3:4.

Yet throughout *Cleaning-Up*, in direct violation of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9, Dr DiVietro has been aiming to force the reader back under that same kind of high-minde(a)dness that he professes to disavow in *Cleaning-Up* p 16.

See again *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi, 2-3, 7, 17, 18, 88, 91, 93, 94, 105-109, 149, 187, 249-250, 255-256.

The words of the well-known Scottish poet Robert Burns, 1759-1796, come to mind.

See en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_Burns, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/To_a_Louse.

Burns original

Standard English translation

*O wad some Pow' r the giftie gie us
To see oursels as ithers see us!*

*And would some Power the small gift give us
To see ourselves as others see us!*

*It wad frae mony a blunder free us,
An' foolish notion:*

*It would from many a blunder free us,
And foolish notion:*

*What airs in dress an' gait wad lea' e us,
An' ev' n devotion!*

*What airs in dress and gait would leave us,
And even devotion!*

Readers may decide if anything has been lost in translation from 'the original.'

Either way, it appears unlikely that Dr DiVietro's airs in devotion to his foolish notion of 'originals-onlyism' will ever leave him this side of the Lord's Return.

Moreover, it is starkly apparent from Dr DiVietro's comments under **Quote(s) 175** that neither he nor any member of the DBS Executive Committee should ever refer to the 1611 Holy Bible as "**the word of God**" 1 Thessalonians 2:13 when addressing their congregations *but only as "the word of men."* The realisation of having to subscribe to that knock-on foolish notion from 'originals-onlyism' has escaped Dr DiVietro, however.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's statements about how the true(!) Bible student must try to find out why the AV1611 reads differently in any particular passage from published Greek or Hebrew texts in order to get a fuller understanding of that passage, without being dependent on Ginsburg, Thayer etc., see these extracts from **Quotes 85, 169**. Note that Dr DiVietro gives no indication whatsoever under **Quote(s) 175** of what resources the true(!) Bible student *should* depend on if not critical editions (Ginsburg) or extant lexicons (Thayer).

Quote 85 extract:

As usual, the source of God's words between two covers remains undefined by Dr DiVietro but he gives no explanation about why the UBS lexicon is trustworthy when, according to him, the UBS text is not, which is no help to his readers.

*Neither is the implication of Dr DiVietro's comments under **Quote 85** that an unknown number of Greek lexicons must be acquired i.e. purchased for the understanding of the 1611 Holy Bible New Testament. If taken at face value, these comments prompt a number of questions, all of which must be answered satisfactorily in order to avoid violation of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9.*

- *How many lexicons are needed before the student may be confident that he can know what God 'really' said?*
- *Approximately what cash outlay may be required for the student?*
- *How are believers on the mission field to be compensated for their lack of sufficient finances required for the purchase of the (supposedly) necessary lexical resources in their own languages?*

- More problematically, how are believers on the mission field to be compensated for what is more likely to be a complete lack of these lexical resources in their own languages?

See **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** for Dr Mrs Riplinger's observation with respect to well-heeled Westerners with multiple Bible versions versus the relative scarcity of the scriptures in many parts of the mission field. The same would apply for those same Westerners pinning their hopes of scriptural enlightenment on a legion of lexicons, Mark 5:9.

Quote 169 extract:

Dr Mrs Riplinger continues [*Hazardous Materials* p 983], her emphasis.

"The following is a very **partial** list of verses in critical editions which contain corruptions (of words and vowels which may change words). (See Kittel, p. XL for Bomberg sigla [abbreviation, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scribal_abbreviation] and its occurrence in his footnotes for his sampling of variants from Bomberg.)"

Dr Mrs Riplinger then lists 31 verses that show material textual differences between the Bomberg Traditional Hebrew Bible and currently available critical Hebrew texts, followed by a list of 71 verses containing words with vowel changes in the critical texts that result in word changes from the traditional Bomberg text.

Dr DiVietro has evaded all that detailed information about the unreliability of current Hebrew texts. He has thereby failed to warn the student checking successive Hebrew editions that they are riddled with error whether or not they yield the particular word or verse that the student is looking for and that therefore none of them is either a pure, inspired Hebrew Old Testament text or may be held in authority over the 1611 Holy Bible Old Testament.

Dr DiVietro has therefore failed in his role as a pastor, to which he has laid claim, *Cleaning-Up* p 110. Having failed to advise the flock about corrupt Hebrew texts as he should have done with the help of Sister Riplinger's material, Dr DiVietro should reflect carefully on Jeremiah 23:1.

"Woe be unto the pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture! saith the LORD."

The sheep are scattered searching for a pure inspired Hebrew Old Testament text that doesn't exist and their faith in **"the scripture of truth"** Daniel 10:21 is therefore in danger of being destroyed.

Dr DiVietro also evades the essential issue that Dr Mrs Riplinger has raised in Chapter 28 of *Hazardous Materials*, as succinctly expressed in the statement that immediately follows the portion of **Quote(s) 169** that Dr DiVietro emphasised.

"God commands that we "not add" or "diminish" from the text (Deut. 4:2 et al.). Praise God that Holy Bibles are holy. Period. (Critics should have learned that by simply reading and believing the cover thereby saving much wasted effort.)"

Like writing *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials*.

Finally for **Quote(s) 175**, a further example of 'elucidating' the fullness of the scripture by **"comparing spiritual things with spiritual"** 1 Corinthians 2:13 i.e. scripture with scripture has been inserted, with respect to Genesis 18:20 and the little word **"of,"** in order to show by **"comparing spiritual things with spiritual"** 1 Corinthians 2:13 that 'the Hebrew' becomes as superfluous as 'the Greek.' Green's Interlinear agrees with the AV1611 in Genesis 18:20 but

otherwise contributes nothing, *compared to “comparing spiritual things with spiritual” with the King James English.*

See the following study that may be used for an approximately 10-minute presentation.

Whatever alternative ‘Hebrew’ sources the modern editors may have used in order to ‘elucidate’ the fullness of the scriptures in Genesis 18:20, they got it badly wrong, like Dr DiVietro did with his ‘examples.’ See again **Challenges #5, #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints.**

“The Cry of Sodom” – Genesis 18:20



“The LORD rained upon Sodom...fire from the LORD” Genesis 19:24¹

Introduction – “as it was in the days of Lot” Luke 17:28

The Lord said **“Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot;...But the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all”** Luke 17:28-29.

He then said in Luke 17:30 that a return to **“the days of Lot”** would point to His Return.

“Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed.”

References to God’s destruction of Sodom and **“the days of Lot”** are therefore found in the later New Testament letters that look towards the Lord’s Return in fiery judgement, 2 Thessalonians 1:7-9, such as overtook Sodom. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* pp 1629, 1641.

“And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha into ashes condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly; And delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked: (For that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds;)” 2 Peter 2:6-8.

“Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire” Jude 7.

The latest indication of **“the days of Lot”** in this country came on March 15th 2012².

“The government has launched a 12-week consultation on allowing gay [i.e. sodomite] couples in England and Wales to marry.” The PM intends that sodomite marriage be legalised by 2015, www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-19072023.

The PM’s intent shows that **“according to the scriptures”** 1 Corinthians 15:3, 4, the Lord’s Return is near. These are **“the last days”** of the **“perilous times”** 2 Timothy 3:1, www.jesus-is-savior.com/Basics/sodom.htm, *Europe and America are Becoming a Giant Sodom and Gomorrah!*

One aspect of *“the days of Lot”* is *“the cry of Sodom”* Genesis 18:20, and its relation to *“the men of Sodom...wicked and sinners before the LORD exceedingly”* Genesis 13:13.

“The Cry of Sodom” – the Biblical Witnesses

“And the LORD said, Because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is very grievous; I will go down now, and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come unto me; and if not, I will know” Genesis 18:20-21.

Most pre-1611 Bibles support the reading ***“cry of Sodom;”*** the Coverdale, Great, Bishops’, Geneva Bibles. The Wycliffe Bible partially supports it with *“the cry of men of Sodom.”* Early post-1611 versions, Challoner’s Revision 1749-1752, 1885 RV, 1901 ASV support ***“cry of Sodom.”***

The modern bibles change the reading. The RSV, NRSV, 1984 NIV, 2005 TNIV, 2011 NIV, NKJV, JB, NJB, NWT, CEV, NCV, NLT, ESV, HCSB have ***“outcry against Sodom”*** or similar and the NASV has *“outcry of Sodom.”* This is a change of *meaning* but, typically, *it is not for the better.*

“Outcry against Sodom” – What Outcry?

The change to *“outcry”* is wrong. See Jude 7 and Genesis 19:24-25.

Then the LORD rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the LORD out of heaven; And he overthrew those cities, and all the plain, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and that which grew upon the ground.”

No outcry occurred against Sodom. ***“God destroyed the cities of the plain”*** Genesis 19:29 ***“and all the inhabitants of the cities”*** with the exception of Zoar at Lot’s request, Genesis 19:20-23, because they were all engaged in Sodom’s ***“very grievous”*** sin, apart from ***“just Lot”*** whom God delivered. In a city ***“overthrown by the mouth of the wicked”*** Proverbs 11:11, God will spare ***“the men that sigh and that cry for all the abominations that be done in the midst thereof”*** Ezekiel 9:4-6 but God spared none of ***“the men of Sodom.”*** What, then, of the criers?

“The Cry of Sodom” – the Child Victims

The cry of a city in scripture is of *its citizens* and is of *distress*. ***“...and the cry of the city went up to heaven”*** 1 Samuel 5:12. See also Jeremiah 11:12, 14:2, 51:54 but note Genesis 19:4-5:

“But before they lay down, the men of the city, even the men of Sodom, compassed the house round, both old and young, all the people from every quarter: And they called unto Lot, and said unto him, Where are the men which came in to thee this night? bring them out unto us, that we may know them.”

“...all the people” were guilty, whether they ***“commit such things...worthy of death”*** or ***“have pleasure in them that do them”*** Romans 1:32. *The only ones crying in distress were victims, child victims. Only they could have cried “unto me.”* That is why ***“God destroyed the cities of the plain,”*** for sodomy and paedophilia, mercifully delivering the victims by sudden death.

“Occupy till I come” Luke 19:13

Government strategy is ***“...as it was in the days of Lot.”*** *“They want the world to become like Sodom”³ and new versions conceal the danger to children even though psychiatrists confirm it⁴. “...2-4% of men attracted to adults prefer men.; in contrast...25-40% of men attracted to children prefer boys...Thus the rate of homosexual attraction is 6-20 times higher among pedophiles”*

Nevertheless, ***“Occupy till I come”*** Luke 19:13 ***“And the Lord direct your hearts into the love of God, and into the patient waiting for Christ”*** 2Thessalonians 3:5.

References

1. en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sodom_and_Gomorrah
2. www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-17375736
3. www.chick.com/reading/tracts/1070/1070_01.asp
4. www.familyresearchinst.org/2009/02/pro-gay-bias-in-study-of-pedophilia/

Quote 176, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1063

“Unfortunately, even conservative translators of foreign editions are haplessly resting on every jot and tittle of Ginsburg’s Hebrew or J. P. Green’s Interlinear. Such translators have not done a thorough collation with historical texts to uncover the unsoundness of these currently available one-man Hebrew editions, nor do they know the history of their particulars.”

Dr DiVietro makes a strange slip in his comments under **Quote 176**. He starts by saying that a Bible translator should have perfect knowledge of the language into which he is translating but this is not always possible. He then says that some Bible translators are blue collar workmen missionaries trying to minister the word of God in a foreign language and are dependent on imperfect interlinears and lexicons in order to convey the words of God into that language.

Dr DiVietro challenges the notion that the very first English Bible was perfect and insists that 300 years of translations and refinements were necessary to produce the King James Bible. Dr DiVietro demands to know if Dr Mrs Riplinger would deny non-English speakers the words of God in their own language until God gave them their own inspired version.

Dr DiVietro then descends into mockery again, see **Quote 173**, insinuating by means of a somewhat garbled sentence that Dr Mrs Riplinger would be satisfied with a superficial translation of the King James Bible into the receptor language. He then insists that when a passage in the King James Bible may be understood and translated in more than one way, Dr Mrs Riplinger would hinder the translator by denying him any help from supposedly evil lexicons and interlinears.

The superficiality is all on Dr DiVietro’s side, who again substantiates nothing in his comments, see **Quote(s) 175**. He also takes an uncalled-for, *“highminded”* 2 Timothy 3:4 swipe at God-called missionaries, whom he disparages as blue collar workmen evidently not imbued with the higher knowledge of the DBS Executive Committee.

Dr DiVietro should reflect on 1 Corinthians 8:1.

“...Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth.”

However, the most remarkable aspect of Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote 176** is, as indicated, the strange slip that he makes. He refers no fewer than three times to the word, or words of God in a foreign language that is clearly not Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek.

Unless Dr DiVietro is espousing the unscriptural notion of a two-tiered deposit of the word of God, i.e. one inspired, the other uninspired, see **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**, it is not possible for the word or words of God to exist in a foreign, non-Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek language spoken on the mission field regardless of the best translation efforts, according to Dr DiVietro, Dr Waite and the entire DBS Executive Committee.

See again *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi, 2-3, 7, 17, 18, 88, 91, 93, 94, 105-109, 149, 187, 249-250, 255-256.

Dr DiVietro should really pray Psalm 141:3 with respect to his keyboard to help him avoid the kind of inconsistency noted above.

“Set a watch, O LORD, before my mouth; keep the door of my lips.”

Dr DiVietro’s duplicity with respect to what he terms the inspired words of God versus simply the words of God emerges again in **Quotes 200, 201, 204** and will be discussed under those quotes.

(Dr DiVietro is noticeably careless with respect to his usage of the expressions word(s) of God, sometimes Word(s) of God and/or God's word. On pp 2-3 of *Cleaning-Up* and under **Quote(s) 179**, Dr DiVietro uses those expressions to refer to God's inspired words. On pp 17-18 of *Cleaning-Up*, he uses those expressions to refer to *translations*, e.g. into English, of God's inspired words i.e. by definition according to Dr DiVietro *uninspired* words of God and under **Quote 176** he appears to be using the same expressions to apply to both inspired and *uninspired* words of God. All of that is potentially very confusing to the reader and God is clearly not the Author of it, 1 Corinthians 14:33.)

Concerning Bibles on the mission field, Dr DiVietro's speculative jibes about superficiality etc. may be set aside because Dr Mrs Riplinger is far more qualified to speak on the subject of correct preparation of missionary Bibles than Dr DiVietro is. P 390 of *Cleaning-Up* reveals that Dr DiVietro has made a few missionary trips during his ministry. No ministerial details of those trips are given and nothing is said about the provision of vernacular Bibles on the mission field.

(P 391 indicates that Dr DiVietro was planning a preaching/missions trip to England at the time of publication of *Cleaning-Up*. If that trip ever came to pass, the Lord does not seem to have given it a particularly high profile. This author never received notification of it from any King James Bible-believing contacts in the UK.)

By contrast, note this extract from the end of **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.

...concerning translations, Dr DiVietro missed Dr Mrs Riplinger's comments in In AwE of Thy Word pp 456ff, which show that "comparing spiritual things with spiritual" not only enables understanding of word meanings within a vernacular Bible such as the KJB but also between vernacular Bibles of different languages, at least where alphabetical letter symbols are used. See also Whitewashed, A Critique of James White, p 237. Emphases are Dr Mrs Riplinger's. Under-lining is this author's.*

*www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php KJO Review Full.

"Jesus Christ, "the Word" and even "the ending" letter (Rev. 1:8) speaks and spells words in similar ways to the Greek, English, German, French, Italian, and Hebrew (Yiddish). The KJV is the only English Bible that speaks and spells like all of these language groups. Wise missionaries love the KJV...

*"The amazing thing about the KJV's 'est' and 'eth' endings is that they **match** the verb endings in most of the languages of the world. These **too** have an 's' in the second person and a 't' in the third person verb endings! The KJV's 'becamest' is wurdest' in **Modern German...***

"The KJV is international English and is God's bridge to reach a world now clamouring to learn English."

Rather than take advantage of God's English KJB bridge, it appears that Dr DiVietro would prefer that missionary outreach trek the long way round to some murky Greek shallows instead, the exact location of which is known only to the Burgonista elite of the DBS Executive Committee.

In addition, Dr Mrs Riplinger is deeply involved in the preparation of pure Bibles for the mission field in a variety of languages. See purebiblepress.com/bible/mission.html and note this compelling mission statement. Nothing in *Cleaning-Up* matches it.

Every 24 hours, approximately 232,876 people die. 90% of which are more than likely lost without Christ.

That means that, of all the people who died yesterday, only 23,287 people had accepted Christ as Saviour; whereas 209,588 people went to Hell.

Reach the lost with the gospel of Jesus Christ while you can!

Dr DiVietro refers to problems with respect to refinement of Bible texts on the mission field and translation from the King James Bible passages where, he says, more than one rendering is possible.

The Pure Bible Press addresses those and other challenges in providing missionary Bibles that Dr DiVietro hasn't even thought of, judging by his comments under **Quote 176**. Note the following extract from the site referenced above.

What is the mission of Pure Bible Press? Our mission can be summed up very briefly as: Location, Education, and Distribution. Let's look at what we mean by those three things:...

II. Education

Finding a pure text and having it checked for absolute purity does absolutely no good if people do not understand the problems within the current text. If they do not see the need of having a pure Bible in their language, the work in that language is doomed to failure before it has begun. This is where the language advisors and native speakers are invaluable to Pure Bible Press.

Each language and textual advisor, and native speaker, will put together a list of verses, in that specific language text, which they have found the current text to be doctrinally problematic or faulty when compared to the Authorized King James Bible and other pure vernacular Bibles. These charts will also show how the text we are working on and promoting is in agreement with Authorized King James Bible and the other pure vernacular Bibles. These charts may include, but are certainly not limited to the following:

- 1. Verses that show where the current text has or lines up with corrupt Critical Text readings, and how the pure text corrects these problem areas;*
- 2. Verses that show where the current text lines up with the corrupt lexicons (e.g. the NKJV mentality – good texts, bad translation mentality), and how the pure text corrects these areas.*

Pure Bible Press will also put together informational packets to send out to churches and missionaries that work in that language. This packet would include: the text (whether it be a John and Romans sample, a New Testament, or the entire Bible), the comparison chart provided by our language advisors and native speakers, and a response card for the missionary or pastor to send back to us requesting further information to give to his people. There will be some that discard our materials, or inform us that the problems addressed do not really matter. Should the missionary or pastor take that position, we will simply let people know that this church or missionary does not support having a pure text in the language of the people to whom they minister. Christians have a right to know who supports having a pure text in languages around the world, and who does not support it...

Dr DiVietro gives no indication under **Quote 176** that he has any equivalent involvement in any similarly intensive missionary Bible ministry. Neither does his bio on pp 389-391 of *Cleaning-Up*. He has no room to speak against Sister Riplinger about missionary Bibles.

Dr DiVietro's comments against the use of the 1611 Holy Bible for translation purposes on the mission field should be perceived as a denial of 1 Corinthians 2:10-13, with respect to the ability of the Spirit of God to teach the child of God to transfer His words into another lan-

guage and in turn a further denial on Dr DiVietro's part of the priesthood of all believers 1 Peter 2:5, 9 and wilful ignorance of the 1611 Holy Bible's built-in dictionary.

See *Quote(s) 175* and *Setting Up the 'Clean-up', Challenges #1, #2, #3, Points-Counterpoints, Quotes 9, 14, 39, 50, 61, 62, 67, 71, 85, 87.*

Note that in his *History of the New Testament Church* Volume 1 p 390, Dr Ruckman states that the 1611 Holy Bible has been translated into over 800 languages. If Dr DiVietro is so concerned about difficulties of translation from the AV1611, why did he not document any difficulties arising from translation into that multitude of non-English languages? He fails to do so.

Dr Ruckman notes further that the AV1611 has been responsible for the salvation of well over 150,000,000 souls, an estimated one thousand times more than 'the originals' achieved.

Dr DiVietro is clearly too mean-spirited to comment on that evident testimony to God's special approval of the 1611 Holy Bible down through the centuries, over and above 'the originals.'

Finally for *Quote 176*, Dr DiVietro should reflect upon this statement from J. C. Philpot, cited in *The Jewel In The King's Crown* by David Allen, p 246, with respect to corrupt interlinears, lexicons and their corrupt editors that Dr DiVietro not only condones but even approves of, see *Quote 144*, as one of those that **"not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them"** Romans 1:32.

See www.gospelweb.net/About%20Bible/PhilpotOnKeepingAuthorizedVersion.htm.

Philpot was not a full King James Bible believer, stating wrongly that **"charity"** should be altered to **"love"** in 1 Corinthians 13 but his statements on translation, though aimed specifically at the AV1611 versus the RV, are nevertheless a rebuke to Dr DiVietro's notion that God would use even **"one vessel...unto dishonour,"** decidedly **not "meet for the master's use"** and **not "prepared unto every good work"** 2 Timothy 2:21, see *Quote 159*, to fulfil 2 Thessalonians 2:16-17 for believers on the mission field.

J. C. Philpot's statement is as follows.

"Who are to undertake it? Into whose hands would the revision fall? What an opportunity for the enemies of truth to give us a mutilated false Bible! Of course, they must be learned men, great critics, scholars, and divines, but these are notoriously either Puseyites or Neologians (We should say: Anglo-Catholics and Modernists.) - in other words, deeply tainted with either popery or infidelity [like interlinear, critical edition and lexical editors]. Where are there learned men sound in the truth, not to say alive unto God, who possess the necessary qualifications for so important a work? And can erroneous men, men dead in trespasses and sins, carnal, worldly, ungodly persons, spiritually translate a book written by the blessed Spirit? We have not the slightest ground for hope that they would be godly men, such as we have reason to believe translated the Scriptures into our present version."

2 Thessalonians 2:16-17 reads as follows.

"Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, Comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work."

True Bible believers on the mission field would get precious little comfort and stability from 'originals-onlyists' like Dr DiVietro, or none at all.

Quote 177, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1070

“Once Origen and Jerome had used Greek and Hebrew to birth their one man ‘bible’ editions, Greek and Hebrew Bible study was not attempted for well over one thousand years.”

Quote 177 is in bold in *Hazardous Materials*, under the heading of **“Greek and Hebrew Study Rejected for 1500 Years.”**

Quotes 177, 178 are the only two quotes that Dr DiVietro extracts from Chapter 29 of *Hazardous Materials* entitled *The Occult & Catholic Origin of Greek & Hebrew Focus*:

Dr DiVietro insists that **Quote 177** is untrue. He states that monks and Jews kept up the study of Greek and Hebrew in isolated communities, including monasteries, until the Renaissance when a resurgence of those languages among scholars brought in the Reformation.

Yet again, Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing under his selected quote. See **Quote 176**. He has also overlooked the context of **Quote 177**, as indicated earlier, a recurring feature of his comments. See **Quote 166**.

Dr Mrs Riplinger is not denying the existence of Greek and Hebrew language study in individual communities (such as monasteries, which Dr DiVietro is forced to admit under **Quote 177** eventually succumbed to Catholic and Eastern Orthodox corrupting influences). **Quote 177** is actually introductory to her explanation of how **“the serpent”** purposed to use the ancient languages to cast doubt, Genesis 3:1, on the texts of vernacular Bibles of that time and which emerged during the 16th century Protestant Reformation.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states immediately after **Quote 177** that, her emphasis, *“In the late 1400s the Catholic church again conjured these questioning spirits [Origen and Jerome] by promoting the teaching and learning of Greek and Hebrew to re-interpret the words of God. Fellow pagans, the plundering Turks provided the westward push to Rome and sent apostate Greeks packing with piles of Greek manuscripts. Johannes Reuchlin (A.D. 1455-1522), a Catholic and occult Kabbalist, began mining the texts of these languages for mystical meaning which could reinterpret the words of the Bible.”*

That is exactly what Dr DiVietro has advocated throughout *Cleaning-Up*, at least implicitly, even though he would use the term ‘original’ rather than *“mystical.”*

Note also this statement from *In Awe of Thy Word* p 30, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphasis, which reveals the close association between Kabbalism, Catholicism and, by inspection of the citation below, what Dr DiVietro has insisted upon throughout *Cleaning-Up*.

“Erasmus stands in sharp contrast to his contemporary Greek text editors who promote the false notion that Scripture remains full of meanings “which are not able to be understood in any way other than from the very fount of the original languages” [quae nequeant aliunde quam ex ipso archetypae linguae fonte cognosci]. This quote is taken from the preface of the Catholic Complutensian Polyglot produced by Cardinal Ximenez in 1517; this Catholic “father” spawned “the first” Greek New Testament lexicon, which bred today’s mongrels (Pelikan, p. 110; The Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. 3, p. 525).”

See again *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi, 2-3, 7, 17, 18, 88, 91, 93, 94, 105-109, 149, 187, 249-250, 255-256.

Those pages reveal that Dr DiVietro has repeatedly advocated ‘the Greek’ and ‘the Hebrew’ supposedly to ‘clarify’ and ‘elucidate’ the KJB’s supposed ambiguities and confusing grammar. See *Cleaning-Up* pp 32, 69, 90-91, 94-95, 152.

(As usual, Dr DiVietro doesn't specify what 'the Greek' and 'the Hebrew' are. He only says that where the extant sources agree, *Cleaning-Up* pp 20-21, 31-32, then those words are the inspired words of God.

See remarks under **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint** with respect to the main Greek New Testament Received Texts, namely those of Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza and Scrivener, Mark 2:15, **Quotes 96-141** on Chapters 17, 18 of *Hazardous Materials* with respect to Scrivener's departures from the AV1611 New Testament, **Quotes 142-152** on Chapter 19 of *Hazardous Materials* with respect to Berry-Newberry's departures from the AV1611 New Testament, **Quotes 153-163** on Chapter 20 of *Hazardous Materials* with respect to the departures of the Unorthodox Greek Orthodox Greek manuscripts from the AV1611 and J. A. Moorman's book *When The KJV Departs From The "Majority" Text* in order to appreciate the naiveté of Dr DiVietro's insistence on perfect agreement between extant Greek sources as a means of obtaining the supposedly perfect inspired infallible *complete* Greek New Testament between two covers.)

See also **Challenges #3, #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints, Quotes 4, 40, 86, 97, 110** for this author's responses to Dr DiVietro's accusations against the 1611 Holy Bible, for its supposedly confusing grammar. Note this extract from **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint** for more detail on Dr DiVietro's *reinterpretation* of the 1611 Holy Bible.

Dr DiVietro's claim that he has never corrected the KJB is a blatant lie.

*He was not 5 pages into his part of *Cleaning-Up* before he changed "given by inspiration of God" 2 Timothy 3:16 into "God-breathed" on the basis of 'the Greek,' *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3.*

*He went on repeatedly to elevate Hebrew and Greek sources over the 1611 English Holy Bible on pp 32, 69 and 94-95 of *Cleaning-Up* in order, supposedly, to 'clarify' its ambiguities and confusing grammar. Regardless of Dr DiVietro's assertion to the contrary, his manner of 'clarification' amounts to a supplanting or changing of the KJB by the KDB – Kirk DiVietro 'Bible.' See remarks on oinos ("wine") and baptizo ("baptize") and on John 11:33 in **Setting Up the 'Clean-Up', Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint, Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint, Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint.***

*See also **Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint** for comments on Dr DiVietro's supposed 5 additional 'improvements' injected into the KJB by means of 'the Greek' with respect to John 19:30, the word "sins," the words for "trespass" and "transgression" in Romans 5:12-15, the word "confess" in 1 John 1:9 and the Greek grammar for 2 John 9-10.*

*Each of these examples is an attempt on Dr DiVietro's part to impose a supposedly superior rendering of a KJB word or expression from an outside source, which amounts to correction or at least alteration by Dr DiVietro (via 'the Greek') of what he perceives as an inferior KJB reading in English, however he seeks to mask his misdeeds against the 1611 Holy Bible with euphemisms like 'clarification.' Dr DiVietro is at least changing the English Text of the 1611 Holy Bible by means of his Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek conjectures even though he professes with reference to *The Defined King James Bible, Cleaning-Up* p 91 that the 1611 Holy Bible should not be either replaced or retranslated. By means of 'the Greek' etc., Dr DiVietro is doing both. See remarks above on his alteration of "given by inspiration of God" 2 Timothy 3:16 into "God-breathed" on the basis of 'the Greek,' *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3 and associated comments.*

*It should be re-emphasized that Dr DiVietro has, of course, also repeatedly denied the Biblical doctrine of the priesthood of all believers 1 Peter 2:5, 9 by means of his 8 examples listed above. See remarks at the end of **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint, in Challenges #5, #6, Point-Counterpoint** and above with respect to Dr DiVietro's reference to Nehemiah 8:8.*

Note again Dr Mrs Riplinger's concerns about *The Defined King James Bible*, from this extract under **Quote 167**. Dr DiVietro's reinterpretation of the King James Bible is made worse by his reliance on untrustworthy sources such as *The Defined King James Bible*.

See also **Quotes 85, 89, 144** with respect to the *Defined (Defiled) King James Bible and Brown, Driver and Briggs*. As mentioned under **Quote 108**, Dr Mrs Riplinger's recent work *Serious Problems in D. A. Waite's The Defined King James Bible's Definitions – Defiled & Declined* may be accessed at www.hacalumni.com/.

(Bro. Heisey has noted with respect to Job 35:15 where the word “**visited**” has been defined in the D. A. Waite Version notes as “*inflicted punishment, suffering, or judgment.*” The DAWV note is the reading (with distortion of the sense to the opposite of that of the AV1611) of the 1984 NIV, 2011 NIV, TNIV, NKJV, Christian Standard Bible CSB, ESV, HCSB, New Century Version NCV, RSV, NRSV, CEV, JB, NJB. The RV, ASV, NASV have “*visited*” but distort the sense of the verse as the other modern versions do. The NLT, NWT have different readings from the other modern versions but still distort the sense of the verse as they do.

In sum, Job 35:15 shows that the DAWV is clearly a corrupt source for definitions of Biblical words and should be avoided.

“**Visited**” is the correct term because it is the strongest possible term in the context, being up close and personal. Punishment may be inflicted from a distance, in addition to being the incorrect term for Job 35:15. Note however that when the word “**punish**” is required in the AV1611, it is used as appropriate, 32 times.)

Dr Mrs Riplinger continues with respect to Johannes Reuchlin on p 1070 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphases. Note that in what follows, Dr Mrs Riplinger cites her reference, unlike Dr DiVietro.

“The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics traces the hissing sound of Greek and Hebrew study to the serpent’s scribes, Reuchlin and Mirandola, both Kabbalistic occultists.

*““Since the time of Jerome [c. A.D. 347 to 1500] **Hebrew learning had been rare among Western Christians...***

*““The most distinguished among the immediate predecessors of **Reuchlin** were John Wessel (1420-89) and **Pico della Mirandola** (1463-94). Reuchlin owed much to their influence. But he himself was the ‘**Father of Hebrew philology** [science of language] **amongst Christians...***

*““**He did much to promote the study of Greek**, and even in his early days at Basel his activity **provoked the hostility** of obscurantists [true Christians], **who objected to the language as impious and schismatic – i.e. that of the Eastern Church**”...*

Dr Mrs Riplinger adds that “*As the section on Reuchlin and C. D. Ginsburg [in *Hazardous Materials*], editor of the Hebrew text published by the Trinitarian Bible Society, will show, occultism is the final destination of those who want to have special knowledge unavailable to the “multitude.”*”

Observe that at the time of the Reformation, God countered the Catholic strategy by raising up genuine saved scholars who became past-masters of Greek and Hebrew and in turn God ministered through those scholars by means of available Greek and Hebrew sources to bring the scriptures to perfection as the 1611 Holy Bible. See *In Awe of Thy Word* Chapters 16, 23-27 with respect to Erasmus, Tyndale, the King James translators and other God-called Biblical scholars of the 16th century English Protestant Reformation.

The profound expertise in Hebrew and/or Greek acquired by the learned men listed above for the most part helped to provide ancient witnesses to the true text of scripture, as Chapter 28 of *In Awe of Thy Word* on the Nuremberg Polyglot shows, see **Quote 124**, but also forestalled “**heady, highminded**” Catholics 2 Timothy 3:4 “**Whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre’s sake**” Titus 1:11 by devious misuse of the expressions “**in the Hebrew**” and “**in the Greek**” Revelation 9:11.

Finally for **Quote 177**, for occultism, read ‘originals-onlyism’ and Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks about the desire for “*special knowledge unavailable to the “multitude”*” summarise Dr DiVietro’s position exactly and that of Dr Waite and the entire DBS Executive Committee.

It’s no wonder, therefore, that Dr DiVietro is so irate about **Quote 177** and tries to divert attention away from Rome’s strategy described by Dr Mrs Riplinger and onto isolated communities of monks and Jews.

Quote 178, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1091

*“Why is it that once the devil has a man, through occult involvement, such as Reuchlin or Ginsburg, he moves him into the ‘Christian college,’ teaching Greek or Hebrew, or has him begin editing or revising the Bible? Reuchlin was the “Father of Greek and Hebrew study,” while Ginsburg’s edited Hebrew text is today’s holy grail. Let this be a warning as to what the devil’s goal is – **questioning and redefining the word of God.**”*

Quote 178 is all in bold in *Hazardous Materials*.

Dr DiVietro dismisses **Quote 178** as more *ad hominem* attacks on individuals associated with Greek and Hebrew studies. He states that on pp 1076-1095 of *Hazardous Materials*, to which Dr DiVietro refers the reader, Dr Mrs Riplinger shows why she believes that Ginsburg, Reuchlin and others were agents of the occult Kabbalah and Rome in order to subvert Biblical Christianity.

As usual, Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing in his comments. See **Quote 177**. He says nothing either to exonerate Ginsburg, Reuchlin and other Greek/Hebrew editors from Dr Mrs Riplinger’s charges against them or to show that their belief systems never adversely influenced the contents of their Greek/Hebrew publications.

What Dr DiVietro dismisses as more *ad hominem* attacks on individuals associated with Greek and Hebrew studies includes the following disclosures, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases.

Hazardous Materials pp 1078-1079:

*“The influx of Greek manuscripts and Erasmus’ Greek texts beginning in 1516 were **not** needed to bring the German people a Bible. Luther did not need to go to Greek or Hebrew exclusively. He could draw from the 17 previous German Bibles, all printed before Luther...*

*“Relying on the second edition of Erasmus’ Greek New Testament [Luther] wrongly omitted 1 John 5:7, which had been in all previous German Bibles (so much for Greek and Hebrew study). **He would have been better off to simply follow the general text of previous German Bibles, with only reference to Greek and Hebrew, as the KJB translators were charged in the rules of translation.** The German people soon returned 1 John 5:7 to the Bible and it remained there until 1956 when the liberals removed it (Michael Maynard, *A History of the Debate Over 1st John 5:7-8*, Tempe, AZ: Comma Publications, 1995, p. 97 et al.).”*

Why didn’t Dr DiVietro warn his readers of the damage done to the text of the German Bible by misapplication of ‘the Greek’ *as a matter of historical record?*

Dr Mrs Riplinger's above disclosure is not an *ad hominem* attack and DiVietro is wrong to insinuate otherwise.

Hazardous Materials pp 1088-1089:

“Reuchlin says that the Bible is a “dead letter” under which a spirit resides that is bound to fulfil his wishes. This is witchcraft!

*““This Divine revelation to Moses contains **far more than appears of the surface** of the Pentateuch...[We] must believe that something more profound is contained in them, to which the Kabbalah gives the key.” [It is] not to be understood by the multitude...This gift is called Kabbalah...[T]hese have found the living spirit in the **dead letter**...[T]hese signs thus put together are the means of **placing him in close union with spirits, who are thereby bound to fulfil his wishes**” (Ginsburg, *The Kabbalah*, pp. 212, 215).”*

Dr DiVietro states under **Quote(s) 175** that the student must read the words of the original writings in the original languages in order for the student to achieve what Dr DiVietro terms the fullness of the scriptures without any misunderstanding and to avoid falling prey to ambiguities and false impressions that may arise from even the most accurate translation. See *Cleaning-Up* p 250.

Aside from no direct mention of the Kabbalah or **“familiar spirits”** Leviticus 19:31, 20:6, Deuteronomy 18:11, 1 Samuel 28:3, 9, 2 Kings 21:6, 23:24, Isaiah 8:19, 19:3, in principle, how does Dr DiVietro's statement on 'originals-onlyism' differ from Reuchlin's on *“the Kabbalah”*?

In principle, it doesn't. No way could the similarity be dismissed as an *ad hominem* attack.

Hazardous Materials p 1090:

*“Reuchlin closed out his adult life as he began it, teaching Greek and Hebrew. His definitions, as in all lexicons, were a mix of good and evil. No doubt some were correct; this is the sheep's clothing of all lexicons. Too many definitions were picked from the weed-covered Kabbalah and the garden of Greek philosophy, which he gathered in his youth from Aristotle...How different he was from Erasmus and the **King James translators who looked at the Bibles in all languages (Greek, Hebrew, English, English, Old Latin, Dutch, French, Italian, Spanish, and German) as final authorities, needing no further interpretation from the words of mere men.** (See *In Awe of Thy Word* for details [Chapters 27, 28]).”*

The King's men, no doubt through their understanding of **“the weapons of our warfare”** 2 Corinthians 10:4, knew well the importance to their work of applying Proverbs 24:6.

“For by wise counsel thou shalt make thy war: and in multitude of counsellors there is safety.”

That application of Proverbs 24:6, which Dr Mrs Riplinger has described in the above extract, is not an *ad hominem* attack. Dr DiVietro is wrong to insinuate otherwise.

Hazardous Materials p 1092:

*“It seems that all critical editions of the Hebrew and Greek, even the better one [Ben Chayim's], are haunted by bad memories. Ginsburg notes that even Ben Chayim of the Bomberg press published “a commentary of the [Kabbalistic] Sohar. This commentary - ...was first **published by Jacob B. Chayim in Bomberg's** celebrated printing establishment, Venice, 1523, then again, 1545...” (Ginsburg, *The Kabbalah*, pp. 200-201).”*

Ben Chayim and Bomberg failed to obey Ephesians 5:11.

“And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger's disclosure of that failure is not an *ad hominem* attack and Dr DiVietro is wrong to insinuate otherwise.

Hazardous Materials p 1092:

*"Only the **Holy Bible** has no such hidden skeletons in its closet, because it is the word of God which "liveth" forever."*

Dr DiVietro's *Cleaning-Up* closet appears to this author to have accumulated enough skeletons to rival in both quantity and nature Ezekiel's vision **"of the valley which was full of bones...and, lo, they were very dry"** Ezekiel 37:1-2.

Quote(s) 179, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1095-1097

Quote(s) 179 is a lengthy quote that occupies almost a page and a half of *Cleaning Up*. Dr DiVietro states that **Quote(s) 179** begins Part VI of *Hazardous Materials*, which, he says, is possibly the most important part of the book because inspiration, preservation, translation and inspiration (sic) are discussed in Part VI. Dr DiVietro's second use of the word *inspiration* should be *Infiltration*.

Dr DiVietro addresses the following portions of **Quote(s) 179**.

"God knew the Greeks, as a nation could not bear the responsibility of preserving the word of God..."

"Chrysostom [thought] that each had a special language assigned to him, and that this was the indication of the country which he was called to evangelize. (Hom. In Acts ii)..."

"Syria is very close to Judea, Galilee, and Jerusalem. With the growth of the church at Antioch and Damascus, there was no doubt an immediate need for Syriac gospels and epistles. The importance of the churches at Antioch and Damascus made an immediate Syriac translation mandatory. Matt. 4:24 notes of Christ, "and his fame with [sic] throughout all Syria."*

*Matthew 4:24 reads **"And his fame went throughout all Syria."**

*"In the **provinces**, especially at distance from the chief seats of commerce, **Latin was the only language generally spoken**, and in such places the necessity must have first arisen of rendering at least the New Testament in a tongue to be "understood of the people"."*

*"God closed the canon at the end of the book of Revelation with a warning not to "add unto these things." However he never said he would not **translate** the canon (Acts 2, 1 Cor. 14:21, Col. 1:6, Romans 16:26, Esther 8:9), **preserve** its inspiration (Ps. 119:160, 100:5, 105:8, Mat. 5:18, Isa. 40:8) or **purify** it as languages change (Ps. 12:6, 7, Prov. 30:5, Psalm 119:140)..."*

"The Greek language has never been primary for other language groups (except of course for Greeks)..."

Dr DiVietro states first that Dr Mrs Riplinger's reference to the Greek nation is irrelevant because he insists, in capitals, that the Greek language, not the Greek nation, preserved God's words. Dr DiVietro declares, as he did under Challenge #4, that Greek was the universal language of the entire eastern world following Alexander's conquest of the Persian Empire until the time of the Lord Jesus Christ, about 300 years, according to all reputable historians.

Dr DiVietro states further that all the Roman emperors read and spoke Greek. Latin, he says, was only the language of the government whereas Greek was the common language of the first century, even if not always the first language, such that writing the scriptures in Greek immediately made them available to the whole eastern world.

Dr DiVietro declares that Chrysostom is (sic) not God and although he was a notable preacher of the early church, Dr Mrs Riplinger must discount Chrysostom's witness according to her procedure, Dr DiVietro insists, of guilt and incompetence by association because Chrysostom was a member of the "*corrupt Greek Orthodox Church.*"

Dr DiVietro states that Syria, which included Israel during the reigns of the Greek Seleucid kings, which spanned over 300 years, was dominated by the Greek language and literate individuals in both nations spoke Greek, even though Aramaic was their first language. He adds that both Egypt and Turkey under the name of Asia were likewise dominated by the Greek language.

Dr DiVietro insists that Greek was the language of literature, government and commerce throughout the world at that time.

Dr DiVietro states further that the verses that Dr Mrs Riplinger cites, see above, to prove the inspiration (in bold in *Cleaning-Up*) of translation are therefore irrelevant based on the dominance of Greek in the first century.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments under *Quote(s) 179* by insisting that the statement "*The Greek language has never been primary for other language groups (except of course for Greeks)...*" is totally false.

In response to Dr DiVietro's comments under *Quote(s) 179*, it should be noted first that God's preserved words are still in an undisclosed location between two covers according to Dr DiVietro if he perceives God's New Testament words to be inspired of God and perfect in the original Koine Greek writings. See *Quote(s) 175*.

(Under *Quote 181*, see later, Dr DiVietro appears to allow that inspiration is possible for exact copies of the original writings but not for translations of the originals, even if made only half an hour after the originals were given. Dr DiVietro's statement under *Quote 181* is of course contrary to scripture. See *Quotes 28, 163* with respect to the *scriptural* basis for translation as an improvement on 'the original' according to 2 Samuel 3:10, Colossians 1:13, Hebrews 11:5 and Dr Gipp's related study. More details will be given under *Quote 181*.)

It should once again be noted that Dr DiVietro has failed to substantiate anything in his comments. See *Quote 178*.

It should then be noted that Dr DiVietro's insistence that the Greek language, not the Greek nation, was used to preserve God's words does not agree with scripture. A study of the preservation of the Old Testament scriptures explains why.

The following scriptures identify those who had responsibility for the preservation of God's words given in Hebrew and its derivative Aramaic, even when those charged with that responsibility had wickedly forsaken it. Those verses are marked with an asterisk *.

"And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel" Exodus 19:6.

"And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites:" Deuteronomy 17:18.

"And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the LORD, and unto all the elders of Israel" Deuteronomy 31:9.

"Now for a long season Israel hath been without the true God, and without a teaching priest, and without law" 2 Chronicles 15:3.

“Now this is the copy of the letter that the king Artaxerxes gave unto Ezra the priest, the scribe, even a scribe of the words of the commandments of the LORD, and of his statutes to Israel” Ezra 7:11.

“Artaxerxes, king of kings, unto Ezra the priest, a scribe of the law of the God of heaven, perfect peace, and at such a time” Ezra 7:12.

“And I, even I Artaxerxes the king, do make a decree to all the treasurers which are beyond the river, that whatsoever Ezra the priest, the scribe of the law of the God of heaven, shall require of you, it be done speedily” Ezra 7:21.

“And Ezra the priest brought the law before the congregation both of men and women, and all that could hear with understanding, upon the first day of the seventh month” Nehemiah 8:2.

“The priests said not, Where is the LORD? and they that handle the law knew me not: the pastors also transgressed against me, and the prophets prophesied by Baal, and walked after things that do not profit” Jeremiah 2:8*.

“Mischief shall come upon mischief, and rumour shall be upon rumour; then shall they seek a vision of the prophet; but the law shall perish from the priest, and counsel from the ancients” Ezekiel 7:26*.

“Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they shewed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my sabbaths, and I am profaned among them” Ezekiel 22:26*.

“My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children” Hosea 4:6*.

“Her prophets are light and treacherous persons: her priests have polluted the sanctuary, they have done violence to the law” Zephaniah 3:4*.

“Thus saith the LORD of hosts; Ask now the priests concerning the law, saying” Haggai 2:11*.

“And now, O ye priests, this commandment is for you...But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the LORD of hosts. Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the people, according as ye have not kept my ways, but have been partial in the law” Malachi 2:1, 8-9.

“For the priest’s lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he is the messenger of the LORD of hosts” Malachi 2:7.

Inspection of the above verses shows that God intended that the priests of Israel should be the custodians of the law, i.e. the Old Testament scriptures as the Lord Jesus Christ grouped them, **“all things...which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms”** Luke 24:44.

In addition, a number of the most prominent writers of Old Testament scripture were priests or Levites or from priestly families or carried out priestly duties that God honoured e.g. Moses, Exodus 2:1, 2, Samuel, 1 Samuel 2:35, 3:1, David, 2 Samuel 24:25, Solomon, 2 Chronicles 5:6, 7:1, 5, 12, Jeremiah, Jeremiah 1:1, Ezekiel, Ezekiel 1:3, Ezra, Ezra 7:11.

God also intended that His words reach from Israel **“unto the end of the earth.”**

“And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth” Isaiah 49:6.

“The entrance of thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding unto the simple” Psalm 119:130.

“O earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the LORD” Jeremiah 22:29.

God therefore intended that Israel should be ***“a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation”*** for that purpose.

Although faithful priests like Ezra remained true to their calling as custodians of the law and called of God to preserve the written Old Testament scriptures, God’s purposes for Israel as outlined above have not been fulfilled but they will be following the Second Advent.

“And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem” Isaiah 2:3.

“The LORD of hosts hath sworn, saying, Surely as I have thought, so shall it come to pass; and as I have purposed, so shall it stand...This is the purpose that is purposed upon the whole earth: and this is the hand that is stretched out upon all the nations. For the LORD of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? and his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?” Isaiah 14:24, 26-27.

In sum, the Lord has chosen *a nation*, not only a language, for the preservation and propagation of His Old Testament scriptures, which will come to pass in the future, ***“according to the scriptures”*** 1 Corinthians 15:3, 4.

It must follow from the scriptures, therefore, that God would choose a *nation*, not only a language, for the preservation and propagation of His New Testament scriptures.

He has done so.

Note the New Testament counterpart to Exodus 19:6.

“But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light” 1 Peter 2:9.

However, as indicated many times in this work, the expression ***“an holy nation”*** refers to the priesthood of all believers. It does *not* refer exclusively to Greece, which gets only two mentions in scripture, Zechariah 9:13, Acts 20:2, neither of which has any application to the preservation and propagation of the Lord’s words.

Dr Mrs Riplinger is therefore quite right, in the light of scripture in this author’s view, to make the statement on p 1095 of *Hazardous Materials* that ***“God knew the Greeks, as a nation could not bear the responsibility of preserving the word of God...”*** and Dr DiVietro is quite wrong to object to it. It is significant that, like most of Dr DiVietro’s comments, his comments under ***Quote(s) 179*** are devoid of any scriptural basis, whereas Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement does have a scriptural basis, as shown above.

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s insistence on the importance of the Greek language as the universal language of the entire eastern world following Alexander’s conquest of the Persian Empire until the time of the Lord Jesus Christ, about 300 years, see this extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's outline of the spread of Koine Greek, including its evident popularity in Rome and with the Caesars, two basic problems arise that Dr DiVietro overlooked, with respect to the propagation of the Gospel and the spread of the scriptures.

1. He is headed in the wrong direction.
2. He has ended up in the wrong place (Rome).

It should be noted first that most of the regions that Dr DiVietro describes as having been blessed with an overspreading of Koine Greek are now in Muslim hands and most likely will be until the Second Advent. 'The Greek' therefore didn't help the inhabitants of these areas much, especially insofar as Dr DiVietro fails to mention one single nation among those areas that has been noted for either spiritual greatness or initiating missionary outreach for the last two thousand years. To the contrary, these areas remain some of the most difficult in the world for missionaries to reach with the Gospel to the present day.

It should also be noted that in addition to orchestrating the deaths of Peter and Paul, which Dr DiVietro is forced to acknowledge, *Cleaning-Up*, p 82, Rome, especially papal Rome, is described prophetically in scripture as **"MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH"** Revelation 17:5.

'The Greek' therefore doesn't appear to have helped Rome much, either, considering the scripture's unwavering and eternally damning verdict on her and her eventual fate, at the Second Advent, Revelation 18. Indeed, far from supporting Dr DiVietro's ringing endorsement of Koine Greek as the language of the theatre in ancient Rome, Revelation 17, 18 appear to be in much closer agreement with Sister Riplinger's warning about, this author's emphasis, "crumbling Greek ruins...**bawdy plays**...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks." See remarks in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** and p 90 of *Hazardous Materials*.

Dr DiVietro's reference to the Roman emperors is regrettable for him. "**Caesar**" is mentioned 30 times in the scriptures, exclusively in the New Testament. 10 of the first 11 references to "**Caesar**" identify him as "**a raiser of taxes**" Daniel 11:20 and therefore an anti-christ. See Mathew 22:17, 21, Mark 12:14, 16, 17, Luke 2:1, 20:22, 24, 25, 23:2. See also *Mark of the Beast* by Dr Ruckman p 55 and the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1332. 3 further references depict "**Caesar**" at enmity with the Lord Jesus Christ and His followers, John 19:12, 15, Acts 17:7, which states in part "**...these all do contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus,**" as indeed there is, 1 Timothy 6:14, 15.

Dr Ruckman in his commentary *The Book of Revelation* pp 303-304, 370, 470-471 rightly identifies "**Caesar**" as one of the seven heads of "**the great dragon...that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan**" Revelation 12:9, "**a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads**" Revelation 12:3.

If all the Roman emperors read and spoke Greek, therefore, it is not surprising that the expression "**in the Greek**" only ever occurs in scripture once, in Revelation 9:11. See *In Awe of Thy Word* p 31 and **Quote 114**. Dr DiVietro would be advised therefore not to go down that route, with respect to lauding Roman emperors and their preference for 'the Greek.'

Note that Dr DiVietro in his comments under **Quote(s) 179** has contradicted himself with respect to first stating that Latin was the language of government but then that Greek was the language of literature, *government* and commerce throughout the world at that time.

However, his description of the widespread use of Koine Greek for about 300 years up until the time of the Lord Jesus Christ is Dr DiVietro's *only* basis for insisting that the New Testament scriptures are *only* inspired in Koine Greek. Dr DiVietro has therefore unwittingly

made a case for *English* as a legitimate language for “**all scripture**” that “**is given by inspiration of God**” 2 Timothy 3:16. See *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 19-20, 456ff where Dr Mrs Riplinger shows that as a global language, or *lingua franca* of the 20th and 21st centuries, *English* not Koine Greek, would be the means of directly reaching 33% of the world’s population with the Gospel of Christ.

See related comments under **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** and Revelation 14:6-7 and the following extract.

“And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, Saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.”

*Like Revelation 5:13, the literal fulfilment of these verses is yet future. When they are fulfilled, the angel’s words in Revelation 14:7 cannot be spoken in Koine Greek, which is now a dead language, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Koine_Greek, , as even Dr DiVietro admits, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 7, 16. No-one would understand it.*

That observation leads to a striking conclusion.

*Even if the angel will have the power to speak more than one language simultaneously, he will have to include King James English, as the Biblical language of the End Times or the scriptural lingua franca. See comments in this author’s earlier work, **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society**, p 11 on questions for Dr Waite to answer. See also Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work [*In Awe of Thy Word* pp 19-20, 456ff] on *The Missionary Bible KJV*.*

Without contradicting the study above on the priests of Israel as the custodians of the law, i.e. the Old Testament scriptures, “**all things...which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms**” Luke 24:44, it should be noted again in passing that God can inspire Gentile kings to send written edicts to their subjects “**according to the language of every people**” Esther 1:20, 22. See remarks in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** on Esther 1:20, 22, 3:14, 8:13, Daniel 4:1, 6:25.

Those multi-language edicts, which became part of the Hebrew/Aramaic scriptures (*and appear to have preceded the Hebrew/Aramaic scriptures!*) are in essential agreement with and foreshadow, for the Church Age, the study above on 1 Peter 2:9 and the priesthood of all believers as “**an holy nation.**” They are also in agreement with what Dr Mrs Riplinger states on p 1096 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphasis, which Dr DiVietro includes in **Quote(s) 179** but about which he does not comment directly. Dr DiVietro also left out the reference to *In Awe of Thy Word*.

*“The Acts 2 “Scriptures in tongues,” as Wycliffe called them, were created directly by the Holy Ghost and were not man-made **translations** from ‘the’ Greek (G. A. Riplinger, *In Awe of Thy Word*, Ararat, VA: AV Publications , 2003, p 758). These “Scriptures” would have been quickly available in Latin, Coptic, Celtic, Ethiopic, Arabic, Hebrew and a myriad of other languages.”*

Note this extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** in support of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement above.

*Word searches in the scripture for the terms “**word**,” “**word of God**,” “**word of the Lord**” and related terms support Dr Mrs Riplinger’s observation that Acts 2 was the launching ground for the preaching of the Gospel in multiple languages and ultimately “**the whole counsel of God**” Acts 20:27, in fulfilment of the Great Commission. With respect to Acts 2 as*

the instigation of the preaching of the Gospel in multiple languages, note Acts 2:4, mentioned above under Point 11.

“And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.”

All that Peter and the apostles speak in the rest of Acts 2 e.g. “his word” Acts 2:41, in whatever language, have to be “the words of God” John 3:34, according to 2 Samuel 23:2.

“The Spirit of the LORD spake by me, and his word was in my tongue.”

Unless Dr DiVietro can prove from scripture that the words of “The Spirit of the LORD” in Acts 2 are somehow only man’s words if not in Hebrew/Aramaic and/or Greek, then the words spoken in all the languages listed in Acts 2:9-11 are “the words of God” that declare “the wonderful works of God” Acts 2:11 and are “given by inspiration of God.” Up to this point in Cleaning-Up, he has not done so.

He won’t.

It may simply be added that “the words of God” spoken by the apostles in Acts 2:4 were received by the multilingual listeners “in his own language...every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born” Acts 2:6, 8, see **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint**, not explicitly in ‘the Greek’ even though many of the listeners came from areas dominated by ‘the Greek,’ according to Dr DiVietro.

It seems from Acts 2 that “the Holy Ghost” Acts 2:4 was dissatisfied with the level of Greek dominance in those areas of the eastern world, Dr DiVietro’s statements to the contrary notwithstanding.

(It would also appear that surviving faithful Bible believers from those areas were eventually driven westwards by the Mohammedan invasions that the dominant Greek couldn’t hold back and which resulted in the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

See en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fall_of_Constantinople.)

Dr DiVietro’s comments about the spread of the Gospel via Greek into the eastern world of course entirely neglect the witness of the early church in the western world. See this extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.

Then, note again the comments of Benjamin Wilkinson...

[See kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html. See also *Which Bible?* edited by Dr David Otis Fuller, Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975, 205-206, 213-214].

“In the silent watches of the night, along the lonely paths of Asia Minor where robbers and wild beasts lurked, might have been seen the noble missionaries carrying manuscripts, and verifying documents from the churches of Judea to encourage their struggling brethren under the iron heel of the Papacy...”

Wilkinson’s comments point to a movement of the Spirit of God and the scriptures in the opposite direction overall from that which Dr DiVietro indicates for Koine Greek i.e. Greece to Egypt to India and looping back to Rome, at least following the completion of the New Testament canon.

Though Dr DiVietro would probably reject them on an ad hominem basis, Dr Ruckman’s comments [The History of the New Testament Church, Volume I, pp 41-42, 182-183, 185-186, 215-216] are instructive. A simple and informative map illustrating Dr Ruckman’s comments, together with one that depicts the enemy response to the westward spread of the Gospel and the scriptures, may be found in his work The Monarch Of The Books, p 6.

“Rome and Jerusalem are the focal points in church history until the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. under Titus. Since all history moves East to West..., Jerusalem practically drops out of sight after 70 A.D. and the narrative of church history moves us into Asia Minor (Rev. 1-3) and thence to Greece (Acts 16, 17) and then finally – not at the start, or near the start – to Rome (Acts 28). The Bible has clearly identified Rome and things “Roman”...Rome, as a spiritual or religious entity, cannot be credited with one righteous or moral act (in the Biblical sense) since the city was founded, if we are to believe the God-given record (Matt. 2) as given to us by the Holy Ghost (Acts 12:1-5, 18:2). If “all roads lead to Rome,” then the road to Hell will have to be paved with Alexandrian manuscripts and Christian scholarship.”

Having pointed out the direction of the Spirit of God in church history (while Dr DiVietro heads in the opposite direction, in pursuit of ‘the Greek’) and summarising the Biblical perspective on Rome, Dr Ruckman continues, his emphases.

*“It is truly remarkable...that the Goths, up on the Northwest side of the Black Sea, had their own Bible **in their own language** (350 A.D.) before Augustine pronounced a curse on the Donatists; and while Jerome was getting his Alexandrian Cult Vulgate printed on the Holy Virgin Press at Rome (400 A.D.), a missionary in England (Patricus) was getting adults saved right and left and baptizing them. So many of the Germanic warriors were professing faith in Christ that Latourette is driven to confess that the word “Christian” is not the same as the word “Catholic.” Latourette says that the **Burgundians** (Southeast France) became “CHRISTIANS” when the **Visigoths** invaded their country; before this they had been “Catholics”...*

“When Clovis (465-511 A.D.), the Frankish ruler, professed faith in Christ (Dec. 25, 496), many of his troops followed suit. He undoubtedly heard the gospel from hundreds of Christians who were in Gaul (France).

“The Lord had said “to the ends of the earth” and to the ends of the earth the gospel went. The barbarian invasions of Gaul and North Italy only served to reproduce thousands of anti-Catholic Christians who were anti-Roman in every way; many of them settled in those parts and were anathematized as “Albigenses” and Waldenses or Cathari and “Paulicians.” Persecution from Catholics also drove the Donatists, Novatians, Montanists, Messalines, and Paterines along the shores of the Mediterranean out of Africa and through Spain into France and out of Asia Minor up into Switzerland and the Balkans via the Danube; eventually thousands of them cropped up in Silesia, Bohemia, and Moravia (Germany). Maintaining purity of practice and baptism of adult believers only, these “Baptist” groups understood throughout their lifetimes that no “kingdom was coming,” as prophesied in the extravagant fiction by Augustine...”

The above citations show that both the scripture e.g. as the Gothic Bible and the Gospel generally moved westwards, i.e. away from the direction taken by Koine Greek according to Dr DiVietro. It should also be noted that many conversions to Bible-based i.e. non-Catholic Christian belief were taking place in the 4th and 5th centuries, after Koine Greek had lapsed into a dead language by about 330 AD [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Koine_Greek]. See remarks on Revelation 5:13, 14:6, 7 above.

Dr Ruckman continues.

“In the Thyatira period the truth of God makes an “end run” around Rome, going up through the Balkans from Asia Minor into Germany, on the right flank and on the left flank going around Spain to Ireland, and coming back through England to Germany (Friesland: Belgium and Holland). God will send nothing through Rome but corruption; absolutely

nothing. *The pure truths of the Bible preserved in Italy are preserved in North Italy, but not even these truths come northward **through** Rome; they come westward from **Asia Minor** and Antioch. The truths of the word of God that are found in Gaul (France) in the Dark Ages do not come from anywhere near Rome; they come westward from the Piedmont Valley, the Po Valley, and the Italian Alps. Furthermore, the scriptural truths that crop up in Bohemia centuries later, do not come northward from Italy; they come northwest from the Bogomiles and Paulicians in the **Balkans**. What pure Christianity North Ireland has today it certainly never got from Rome. It got its Biblical Christianity from Old Latin manuscripts that originated in **Syria** and from the son of a married deacon who was less Roman in his “catholicism” than Ridley and Latimer (burned at the stake under Bloody Mary, [October 1555]).”*

*Dr Ruckman adds that “The lesser lights that lit up Europe for the next 1,000 years (ten centuries!) were energized before the pages of the Book that God wrote – the Holy Bible. This Book had an **Old Latin version** for believers, an **Old Syriac version** for believers, a **koine Greek version** for believers, and an **Old Gothic version** for believers. Thus, its contents were available for anyone who could read throughout the entire empire. Those fortunate enough to obtain copies of the Book copied it by hand, reverently and carefully, and preserved it by the grace of God (Ps. 12:6, 7) till it became such a potent force that it split Unholy Mother Church right down to the seat of her bloody jeans (Chapter 14, 15).”*

*As Dr Ruckman’s analysis indicates, Koine Greek had its place in propagating the scriptures but the evidence of church history, which Dr DiVietro did not address, is that during the “**perilous times**” 2 Timothy 3:1 of the Dark Ages, Koine Greek never had precedence in either inspiration or authority over the other languages of that period which also served as vehicles for the transmission of the scriptures, i.e. Latin, Syriac and Gothic, as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1096ff.*

*Dr DiVietro demeans Dark Age believers by implying that the non-Greek speakers among them who suffered for centuries “under the iron heel of the Papacy” would have to have learnt Koine Greek in order to have “**all scripture...given by inspiration of God**” and to know what God really said. He also demeans the Persons of the Godhead, 1 John 5:7, by implying that They were unable to provide the inspired scriptures in “**words easy to understand**” 1 Corinthians 14:9 for these Dark Age saints and martyrs.*

Dr DiVietro fails to address any of the above historical material under **Quote(s) 179**. His comments on the spread of ‘the Greek’ and its efficacy with respect to propagating “**the gospel of Christ**” Romans 1:16 and preserving “**the scripture of truth**” Daniel 10:21 are both inadequate and misleading.

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s remarks that Chrysostom is (sic) not God and that Dr Mrs Riplinger must discount Chrysostom’s witness according to her procedure, Dr DiVietro insists, of guilt and incompetence by association because Chrysostom was a member of the “*corrupt Greek Orthodox Church*,” it should first be said that Dr DiVietro has made another false accusation against Sister Riplinger. See **Quote(s) 175** and **Quotes 156-159** with respect to the “*corrupt Greek Orthodox Church*.”

In answer to Dr DiVietro’s remarks that Chrysostom is (sic) not God, it can truthfully be said that Dr Donald Waite is not God and Dr Kirk DiVietro is not God either. According to Dr DiVietro’s line of reasoning, neither he nor his DBS Executive Committee colleague can speak with authority any more than John Chrysostom.

However, Dr DiVietro fails to inform his readers that Dr Mrs Riplinger is citing Strong and McClintock, *Cyclopedia*, vol. 10, p 480-481 about Chrysostom. This is the same James Strong who compiled the lexicon that is the subject of Chapter 7 of *Hazardous Materials* en-

titled “*Strong Delusion*” and whom Dr DiVietro stoutly defends, along with his lexicon, under **Quotes 56-60**, even though Dr DiVietro implies that James Strong was unregenerate, *Cleaning-Up* p 163.

Dr DiVietro should therefore be prepared to acknowledge the validity of the citation from Strong, even if he thinks Sister Riplinger shouldn’t, if he is prepared to “**Provide things honest in the sight of all men**” Romans 12:17. He can’t have it both ways.

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s statements that the Greek language dominated Syria, Egypt and Turkey during the reigns of the Greek Seleucid kings, note again that ‘the Greek’ eventually went from being dominant to dormant such that all three nations fell to Mohammedanism, from which they have never recovered, which doesn’t say much for inspiration of the New Testament scriptures being the special province of ‘the Greek,’ as Dr DiVietro insists that it is.

See again *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi, 2-3, 7, 17, 18, 88, 91, 93, 94, 105-109, 149, 187, 249-250, 255-256 and extracts from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** above.

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s accusation against Sister Riplinger that the statement “*The Greek language has never been primary for other language groups (except of course for Greeks)...*” is totally false, the falsehood is again entirely Dr DiVietro’s.

Not only does he fail to substantiate this further accusation against Sister Riplinger, Dr DiVietro himself admits in his own words under **Quote(s) 179** that although Greek was the common language in the entire eastern world, “*it may not have been their first language.*”

Any uncertainty on Dr DiVietro’s part in the above respect invalidates his accusation against Sister Riplinger. However, he goes on to state specifically that although the Greek language dominated Syria and Israel, Aramaic was the first language of those nations. As indicated above, Dr DiVietro also refers to Greek dominance of Egypt and Turkey i.e. Asia as indicated in Revelation 1:11, yet according to Acts 2:8, 9, 10, these nations are said to have received the apostles’ words in Acts 2 “***in his own language...every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born***” Acts 2:6, 8, not in Koine Greek.

Dr DiVietro has therefore brought another false charge against Sister Riplinger.

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s comment that the verses that Dr Mrs Riplinger cites to prove the inspiration of translation are irrelevant based on the dominance of Greek in the first century, the extensive citations from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** show that it is Dr DiVietro’s notions about the efficacy of ‘the Greek’ with respect to propagating “***the gospel of Christ***” Romans 1:16 and preserving “***the scripture of truth***” Daniel 10:21 that is irrelevant.

The verses that Dr Mrs Riplinger cites on inspiration are as follows.

“For the LORD is good; his mercy is everlasting; and his truth endureth to all generations” Psalm 100:5.

Koine Greek has not endured. Bro. Brent Logan, who is serving the Lord in Thessaloniki, Greece, has said that Koine Greek is useless even in Greece. No-one understands it.

“He hath remembered his covenant for ever, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations” Psalm 105:8.

Dr DiVietro gives a time span under **Quote(s) 179** for the dominance of Koine Greek as 300 years. That is a lot less than “***a thousand generations.***”

“Thy word is true from the beginning: and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth for ever” Psalm 119:160.

Again, Koine Greek has not endured. Even Dr DiVietro is forced to admit that Koine Greek is a dead language, *Cleaning-Up* pp 7, 16. See **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’**. As indicated, none of Dr DiVietro’s attempts at resuscitation of Koine Greek have worked anywhere, not even in Greece.

“The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever”
Isaiah 40:8.

The secular source Wikipedia states that Koine Greek lasted from about 330 B.C. to 330 A.D., when it was replaced by Medieval Greek, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Koine_Greek, twice as long as the time span that Dr DiVietro mentions. However, 660 years is a long way short of “for ever.”

“For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled” Matthew 5:18.

Koine Greek has already passed from the scene. Except as a means of providing witnesses for manuscript evidence, see the works by J. A. Moorman e.g. *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version, A Closer Look!*, Koine Greek is an irrelevance (like Dr DiVietro’s book *Cleaning-Up*, although as this work shows, it must be answered ***“Lest mine enemy say, I have prevailed against him; and those that trouble me rejoice when I am moved”*** Psalm 13:4).

Quote 180, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1097

“H. C. Hoskier, one of the rare scholars who has collated a large and wide range of actual ancient manuscripts, concluded that the originals were created immediately in multiple languages.”

Dr DiVietro insists that **Quote 180** does not mean that the New Testament was inspired simultaneously in many languages. He says that it means only that the books of the New Testament were translated immediately after they were ‘originally given’ by early Christians carrying out the Great Commission.

Dr DiVietro adds that he is attempting to acquire H. C. Hoskier’s actual words because, he insists, he is certain that Dr Mrs Riplinger has quoted Hoskier out of context. He essentially repeats this charge under **Quote 181**, **Quote 182** and **Quote 183**.

Dr DiVietro declares that Hoskier must have believed in the authority of New Testament manuscripts to have spent so much time collating and commenting on them.

In answer to Dr DiVietro’s comments, note first this extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.

*Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, does take issue with Dr Mrs Riplinger’s citations from Hoskier on pp 252ff of *Cleaning-Up* in his comments against *Hazardous Materials*. On pp 255-256 of *Cleaning-Up*, he basically accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of lying and states that he is attempting to ascertain what Herman Hoskier really said, in the firm belief that he will be able to prove that Dr Mrs Riplinger has misrepresented Hoskier. Just in case she hasn’t, he adds that even a great scholar can be wrong, i.e. when the results of his work contradict the diktats of the DBS Executive Committee.*

Dr DiVietro’s book was published in February 2010. He must have begun his search for Herman Hoskier’s statements up to a year ago. Thus far, nothing has emerged from the DBS Executive Committee camp about the results of this search, which is strange, considering the collective DBS venom directed at Sister Riplinger.

It is now over two years since *Cleaning-Up* was published. This author is in regular receipt of Dr Waite's DBS e-newsletter and other email communications from Dr Waite.

So far, nothing has emerged from Dr DiVietro via the DBS email communications to prove that Dr Mrs Riplinger has quoted H. C. Hoskier out of context. Dr DiVietro may indeed retain his certainty that Dr Mrs Riplinger has quoted Hoskier out of context (he says under **Quote 180** that he is *sure* of this) but for now, he has "**put it under a bushel**" Matthew 5:15.

It should be observed in passing that Dr DiVietro's comments under **Quote 180** indicate that he should review certain of his earlier comments.

Under **Quote 95**, Dr DiVietro states that the extant New Testament manuscripts are neither infallible nor perfect. Under **Quote 180**, he says, in reference to Hoskier's work, that they have authority. Dr DiVietro should explain what that authority is, how it is limited and why, in order to be consistent with his comments under **Quote 95**. However, he fails to do so.

Dr DiVietro also fails to show that Hoskier's extensive collation of Greek manuscripts in any way proves that Greek New Testament sources are superior to any other such sources. His appeal to Hoskier is therefore futile. Note this extract from **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**, even if the writer, J. A. Moorman, does not believe in the inspiration of the 1611 Holy Bible any more than Dr DiVietro does.

"Our extant MSS reflect but do not determine the text of Scripture. The text was determined by God in the beginning (Psa. 119:89, Jude 3)..."

"When a version has been the standard for as long as the Authorized Version, and when that version has demonstrated its power in the conversion of sinners, building up of believers, sending forth of preachers and missionaries on a scale not achieved by all other versions and foreign language combined; the hand of God is at work. Such a version must not be tampered with. And in those comparatively few places where it seems to depart from the majority reading, it would be far more honouring to God's promises of preservation to believe that the Greek and not the English had strayed from the original!"

Under **Quote 126**, Dr DiVietro states that Paul's letters were not translated from Koine Greek until the second century or later. Under **Quote 180**, he allows that the Books of the New Testament were translated *immediately* after they were 'originally given' and he has not publicly said anything to the contrary for more than two years. Paul's last letter, 2 Timothy, was written in approximately 68 AD. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1588. Dr DiVietro should explain to his readers how 'immediately' equates to over 30 years. However, he fails to do so.

(The word "**immediately**" is found 55 times in scripture, exclusively in the New Testament. It never refers to a lapse of years but has the same meaning as it has today.)

Concerning Dr DiVietro's insistence that the statement in **Quote 180** "*the originals were created immediately in multiple languages*" means only that the books of the New Testament were translated immediately after they were 'originally given' is of course not what the statement actually says.

Dr DiVietro has therefore distorted Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement. See **Setting Up the 'Clean-Up'** and **Quotes 10, 31, 45, 65, 110, 115, 116, 131, 132, 138, 166**.

In answer to Dr DiVietro's distortion, note the following extracts from **Quote 126** that vindicate Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement in **Quote 180**.

On pp 738-739 of *Hazardous Materials*, Chapter 20 “The Wobbly Unorthodox Greek Orthodox Church,” Dr Mrs Riplinger has this summary statement, her emphases, about the work of Herman Hoskier on multiple versions of the New Testament extant during the apostolic age.

It is noteworthy that Dr DiVietro bypasses the following statement in his quotes and comments.

“H. C. Hoskier, the renowned manuscript collator and Bible scholar, wrote *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the N.T.* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1910) proving that the New Testament was circulating immediately in **multiple** languages. (This will be discussed in detail in another chapter [Chapter 30 “The Scriptures to All Nations”].) This is not a new idea, but one which is derived from the Bible’s own description in Acts. In *Awe of Thy Word* proved that the English Bible comes directly from the gift of tongues which provided “Holy Ghost” inspired words and Bibles for those who spoke Gothic, Celtic, Latin, Greek, Hebrew and other languages. These words moved directly forward into the English Bible through the seven purifications described in Psa. 12:6, 7, just as Latin words moved forward into Roumaunt, Provinçal, Spanish, French, and Italian. The book of Romans ends saying, “But **now** is made manifest, and by **the scriptures** of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to **all nations...**” (Donald M. Ayers, *English Words From Latin and Greek Elements*, Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1986, 2nd ed., pp. 1-14 et al.)”...

That “**the word of God**” was propagated in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek in the early church is further noted by Dr Mrs Riplinger in a remarkable reference from one particular servant of God whom the Body of Christ would perceive as a most trusted source. Emphases are Dr Mrs Riplinger’s.

“In *Foxes Book of Martyrs*, Vol. 4, pp. 671-675, Foxe quotes an old “treatise.” To him, who lived in the 1500s, “old” would definitely be well before the 1400s certainly, probably much, much older than that. It said, “**Also the four evangelists wrote the gospel in divers languages, as Matthew in Judea, Mark in Italy, Luke in Achaia, and John in Asia. And all these wrote in the languages of the same countries...**” It goes on to say, “**since Christ commanded his apostles to preach his gospel unto all the world, and excepted no people or language.**” Such an old witness, through a man as highly esteemed as Foxe, can hardly be dismissed.”

It would certainly be the height of presumption on the part of the DBS Executive Committee to do so.

Dr Mrs Riplinger [in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 758] has compiled further evidence in support of inspired New and Old Testament portions of the scriptures in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek, her emphases. These portions included translations of the Old Testament into Old Latin.

“Wycliffe said that the scripture is given by the Holy Ghost in all languages. To those who charge that inspiration is lost with translation [Drs DiVietro, Waite, Williams, *Cleaning-Up*, p 18], Wycliffe says, “...such a charge is a condemnation of the **Holy Ghost**, who first **gave the Scriptures** in tongues to the Apostles of Christ, to speak that word **in all languages** that were ordained under heaven”...

Dr Mrs Riplinger states further, her emphases, in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 757-758:

“Wycliffe said, “The clergy cry aloud that is heresy to speak of the Holy **Scriptures in English** [as does the DBS Executive Committee], and so they would condemn the **Holy Ghost**, who **gave** tongues to the Apostles of Christ to speak the word of God in **all languages** under

heaven” (John Wycliffe, *Speculum Secularium, Opera Mimora*, London: Wycliffe Society, John Loserth, editor, 1913, p. 74, as cited in Bill Bradley, *Purified Seven Times*, Clayburg, PA: Revival Fires Publishing, 1998, p. 11)..

“Even today many say it is “erroneous and heretical” to believe our English Bible is “scripture” and therefore that it is still the very inspired words of God, not the words of men (quotes on file). Addressing the lack of faith of those who say [the DBS Executive Committee], “God did not do it – men did it,” Wycliffe replies,

““You say it is heresy to speak of the Holy **Scriptures in English**. You call me a heretic because I have translated the Bible into the common tongue of the people. Do you know who you **blaspheme** [the DBS Executive Committee doesn’t care]? Did not the Holy Ghost give the word of God at first in the **mother-tongue of the nations** to whom it was addressed? Why do you speak against the Holy Ghost [because the DBS Executive Committee is “**the messenger of Satan**” 2 Corinthians 12:7 and aspires as he declares in Isaiah 14:14 that “**I will be like the most High**”]?” (as cited in David Guy Fountain, *John Wycliffe: The Dawn of the Reformation*, Southampton: Mayflower Christian Books, 1984, pp. 45-47).

“God did not abandon his word to a scholar’s bookshelf [including those in Dr DiVietro’s library of thousands of books, *Cleaning-Up* pp 43, 59, see **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**]. Wycliffe said, “I am astonished, therefore, that some of our own people would slander those who say that they possess the Holy Spirit speaking to them in this way” – that is through the scriptures in English [the DBS Executive Committee does exactly that] (John Wyclif, *On the Truth of Holy Scripture* (1378), p 194).”

Herman Hoskier, John Foxe and John Wycliffe clearly contradict Dr DiVietro with respect to early vernacular Bibles. As three witnesses, 2 Corinthians 13:1, they “**have oftentimes proved diligent in many things**” 2 Corinthians 8:22 and it is up to Dr DiVietro to disprove their testimonies, which so far he has not done.

Neither has he done so under **Quote 180**.

Neither has Dr DiVietro disproved *concurrent* creation of the New Testament Books in *multiple languages*, to which Wycliffe, Foxe and Hoskier bear witness. Sanders’ study of multi-lingual New Testament manuscripts serves instead strongly to support the concurrent creation of the New Testament Books in multiple languages. See below.

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s search for Hoskier’s actual words, Dr Mrs Riplinger has given on p 1097 of *Hazardous Materials* the specific reference that she used for her citations from Hoskier (in addition to the citation on p 738 of *Hazardous Materials*, see above). She states immediately after **Quote 180** “The large body of documentation in his book, *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the N. T.*, proves his thesis well (H. C. Hoskier, London: Bernard Quaritch, 1910).”

Hoskier’s book may be readily located online.

See AbeBooks.co.uk, www.abebooks.co.uk/9781151852632/Concerning-Genesis-Versions-T-Hoskier-1151852635/plp.

Dr DiVietro must surely have been able to access Hoskier’s book and in turn the citations and details from it that Dr Mrs Riplinger provides in *Hazardous Materials* pp 1097-1102. His silence for more than two years strongly suggests that Dr DiVietro *did* access Hoskier’s book and found that Dr Mrs Riplinger has not quoted Hoskier out of context.

If so, Dr DiVietro owes Sister Riplinger a public apology for his false accusations against her under **Quote 180**, **Quote 181**, **Quote 182** and **Quote 183**. Note that Dr DiVietro makes no

mention in his comments under *Quote 180*, *Quote 181*, *Quote 182* and *Quote 183* of Dr Mrs Riplinger's specific references to Hoskier's work.

This author suggests, however, that Sister Riplinger does not hold her breath.

Dr DiVietro should nevertheless reflect carefully upon the implications of Numbers 32:23.

"But if ye will not do so, behold, ye have sinned against the LORD: and be sure your sin will find you out."

Finally for *Quote 180*, it is interesting in the light of Hoskier's conclusions to note the following extracts from the opening pages of *Hoskier's Genesis of the Versions*, Henry A. Sanders, *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 33, No. 1, 1912, pp 30-42, a study based on Hoskier's book.

See www.jstor.org/stable/288982?seq=1, www.jstor.org/stable/288982?seq=2.

Sanders is studying particular discrepancies between the texts of Greek manuscripts and ancient versions but he makes observations that support Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement under *Quote 180*. See **Addendum to *Quote 180***, Extracts from *Hoskier's Genesis of the Versions*. The extracts are from pp 30, 31 of the journal and Sanders' references to bi, tri and even quadrilingual manuscripts should be noted in particular.

Addendum to *Quote 180*, Extracts from *Hoskier's Genesis of the Versions*

P 30 extract:

II.—HOSKIER'S GENESIS OF THE VERSIONS.

The notable thesis put forward by Hoskier¹ is a working out of the brief sketch given in his edition of Morgan's Golden Gospels. He unites the opposing views of Harris and Chase² in their studies of the Codex Bezae and then proceeds to extend the bilingual relationship to large families of Greek MSS and also to the three earliest Versions, Syriac, Latin, and Coptic. Greek-Latin and Greek-Coptic bilingual MSS exist, and the absence of Greek-Syriac fragments is not a conclusive proof that such a bilingual never existed. In fact the existence of the other bilinguals makes it extremely probable that there was once a Greek-Syriac bilingual, and since Hoskier proves Syriac influence in many Greek and Latin MSS, the point may be considered as settled.

P 31 extract:

It is evident that there was intimate action and reaction of the Greek and the Versions upon each other for a considerable period, and that very early. The regular use of bilinguals over a long period is perhaps an adequate explanation, but Hoskier's suggestion of trilingual MSS is, in view of the evidence, by no means an impossibility, and certainly affords a more natural explanation for the rapid dissemination of some of the errors. The further suggestion that a great quadrilingual may have once existed will doubtless strike many readers as visionary, though I shall not be surprised if others now explain the puzzling *τρισσα* and *τετρασσα* of Eusebius (*de vita Constantini*, 4, 37), when describing Constantine's order of fifty Bible MSS in the year 331, as references to trilingual and quadrilingual Versions.

After mentioning some of the groups of Greek MSS, which show special Syriac, Latin, or Coptic affinities, Hoskier passes on to the question of a double Greek recension of Mark. All the 35 examples cited show noteworthy variations, which go back before the earliest MSS, yet I am now hardly inclined to accept them as adequate proof of two editions of the original Mark. For some 20 cases involve synonyms or near synonyms, which might easily be interchanged in translation, four are almost certainly due to Latin influence, and, if we include tense changes, as many more might point toward Syriac. It seems that most, if not all, of this evidence can be added to the proofs of bilingual MS influence.

Figure 11 Hoskier's *Genesis of the Versions*

Quote 181, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1097

“Hoskier makes three observations...”

“Originals: *Some or all of the first originals they (sic) have been in languages other than Greek.*

“Concurrent: *Multiple language editions were available immediately and were concurrent with Greek editions.*

“Continuity: *The Greek manuscripts we now use to determine the text were often made from vernacular, not Greek editions.*

“Conclusion: *Greek manuscripts have historically been no more authoritative than vernacular editions.”*

Dr DiVietro is outraged at **Quote 181**, though he appears to comment specifically only on Dr Mrs Riplinger’s conclusion, which he insists is absurd (his term). Dr DiVietro declares that if vernacular translations had been made thirty minutes after the originals had been given, they would not be equal to the original words. See note under **Quote(s) 179** with respect to **Quote 181**.

Dr DiVietro then repeats what he said under **Quote 180** that he would have to see Hoskier’s actual words to trust Dr Mrs Riplinger’s citations of them.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments on **Quote 181** by insisting that God would supernaturally have to inspire versions in languages other than Greek for them to have the same authority as the Greek originals, in which case, Dr DiVietro insists, such inspired versions by definition would not be translations.

It should first be noted that like most of his comments, Dr DiVietro’s statements under **Quote 181** are devoid of any scriptural basis and totally lacking in substance. See **Quote(s) 179**. His comments consist mostly of bald assumptions.

Quotes 3, 4, 12, 17, 58, 59, 100, 126, 144, 145, 146, 148, 153, 167, 185, 188, 189, 196, 203, 19 of Dr DiVietro’s 205 quotes from *Hazardous Materials*, are all the quotes where Dr DiVietro makes reference to scripture in his comments, at times only passing reference.

Dr DiVietro’s insistence on seeing Hoskier’s actual words, because he does not trust Dr Mrs Riplinger’s citation of them, is another false accusation against her. See **Quote 180**, noting that Dr Mrs Riplinger cites Hoskier’s actual words with the page references from his book *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the N. T. in Hazardous Materials* pp 1097-1102, of which Dr DiVietro makes no mention under **Quotes 180-183**.

Note what Dr Mrs Riplinger states on p 1098 of *Hazardous Materials*, which Dr DiVietro bypasses.

“Hoskier says,

““Hardly anyone seems to have thought of seeking for the Syriac or Aramaic base of our Gospels via the Latin. Nearly all attempts have been made to consider Greek roots and constructions. But the keys are in the Latin version, and they show not only a translation from a Syriac-Greek exemplar, but Aramaic roots deeply implemented, which cannot be distinguished when handling the Greek” (Hoskier, pp. 14, 15).”

Dr DiVietro fails to show that the above citation is not Hoskier’s actual words *quoted in context*. Hoskier’s remarks also point to a multilingual origin of the Gospels such as Sanders describes. See **Quote 180** and this extract from **Quote 126**, which shows that Dr Mrs Riplinger

rejects Catholic teaching on the origin of the Gospels, about which Dr DiVietro falsely accuses her under **Quote 126**.

Dr DiVietro falsely accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of subscribing to the Catholic false teaching that the New Testament was first inspired in Latin. He then states that the gift of tongues was given only until the completion of the scriptures according to 1 Corinthians 13:10 and that no evidence exists to show that the scriptures i.e. the New Testament were circulated in Latin, Gothic, Aramaic, or any language other than Koine Greek until the 2nd century at the earliest.

*Dr DiVietro fails to document any source for the Catholic false teaching to which he refers. He also has no comment to make with respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger's disavowal of such a doctrine on p 1100 of Hazardous Materials, even though he begins his **Quote(s) 185** on p 258 of Cleaning-Up with that statement, which reads as follows, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphases.*

*"I would not suggest the liberal theory that the original gospel of Matthew was written **exclusively** in Aramaic, a theory which has been fomented by Catholics. However, it is important to see McClintock, Strong and Hoskier's observations that the originals may not have been written **strictly** in Greek and vernacular editions born out of Acts 2 accompanied the originals immediately. (See the chapter "The Wobbly Unorthodox Greek Orthodox Church" for a further discussion of this topic.)"*

Dr DiVietro fails to comment on the above statement under **Quote(s) 185**. It may be that he is perceptive enough to see that he couldn't make his accusation stick. **Quote 181**, of course, points to the distinct possibility of a *multilingual* origin of the Books of the New Testament. Dr Mrs Riplinger, contrary to Dr DiVietro's accusation against her, is therefore not subscribing to any theory of a *rigidly* monolingual origin of the New Testament, whether in Latin, Aramaic or Greek. See quotes below under "**Inspiration for All Nations**."

Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee are, of course, rigid in their dogmatic insistence on a monolingual origin of the New Testament in Greek, in spite of the multilingual environment in which it was created, as Acts 2 shows. The priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9 is itself diametrically opposed to 'Greek-only' authority and inspiration for the origins of the New Testament.

Hoskier's remarks as cited in *Hazardous Materials* pp 1097-1102 also reveal that his research did not indicate any special place of authority ascribed to copies of the Gospels written in Greek versus those written in Syriac or Aramaic, Coptic or Latin. Dr DiVietro fails to prove otherwise. He has again violated the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See **Quote 176**.

As Miles Coverdale said, see *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 846-847 and *Inspiration and Translation* Slide 77, kindly forwarded to this author by Dr Mrs Riplinger, her emphases:

*"No, the **Holy Ghost** is as much the author of it in Hebrew, Greek, French, Dutch, and **English**, as in Latin...the **scripture**...leaveth no poor man unhelped...And why? Because it is given by the inspiration of God..."*

Observe how Miles Coverdale's statement agrees with that of Dr Miles Smith and *The Translators to the Reader*, www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm, this author's emphases.

*"Now to the latter we answer; that we do not deny, nay we affirm and avow, that **the very meanest translation of the Bible in English**, set forth by men of our profession...containeth the word of God, nay, is the word of God. As the King's speech, which he uttereth in Parliament, being translated into French, Dutch, Italian, and Latin, is still the King's speech,*

though it be not interpreted by every Translator with the like grace, nor peradventure so fitly for phrase, nor so expressly for sense, everywhere.”

The later cautionary notes are the reason why Dr Smith had earlier described one of the main aims of the King James translators work as follows, this author’s emphases.

*“For by this means it cometh to pass, that **whatsoever is sound already** (and all is sound for substance, in one or other of our editions, and the worst of ours far better than their authentic [papist] vulgar) **the same will shine as gold more brightly, being rubbed and polished; also, if anything be halting, or superfluous, or not so agreeable to the original, the same may be corrected, and the truth set in place.**”*

Contrary to Dr DiVietro’s comments under *Quote 181*, Dr Smith is referring to *“the word of God”* i.e. *“given by inspiration of God”* in successive English Bibles, not *“the word of men”* 1 Thessalonians 2:13 and not confined to anything *“in the Hebrew”* or *“in the Greek”* Revelation 9:11.

See these further statements from *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 846-851 from true servants of God, whose collective testimony on inspiration and translations Dr DiVietro would find difficult if not impossible to refute, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases.

“Throughout the entire Reformation, its leaders and translators described their vernacular translations as “scripture,” whose author was God. The prologues to all Reformation era Bibles refer to the English Bible as “scripture.” Martyr and Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, wrote in his Prologue to the Great Bible that it was “given” by “the holy spirit.”

*““To the intent that we should know this, by the goodness of God working **by his holy spirit, are the holy writings of the Bible given us...**” (Great Bible, Chadwyck, p. 4)...*

*“In the Prologue to the 1535 edition, Coverdale used the term **scripture** to refer to **the English text**. He closed the introduction with these words,*

*““Finally, who so ever thou be, **take these words of scripture** in to thy heart...and have ever an eye to **the words of scripture**...that the holy scripture may have free passage, and be had in reputation, to the worship of **the author thereof, which is even God himself**: to whom for his most blessed word be glory and dominion now and ever. Amen” (Coverdale Bible, Chadwyck, pp 11, 12)...*

“When it became legal to own Bibles again in 1538, almost 160 years after Wycliffe’s efforts began, “Further Injunctions of the King” decreed,

*““That ye shall discourage no man privily or apertly [openly] from the reading or hearing of the said Bible, but shall expressly provoke, stir, and exhort every person to read the same, as that which is the **very lively word of God**...”*

“Inspiration for All Nations

*“Christians have historically believed that God gave his inspired word “to all nations.” In the 1500s Foxe recorded a statement from what he called “a certain **old** treatise, found in a certain **ancient** English book.” It went so far as to say that –*

*““...the **four evangelists** wrote the gospels in **divers languages**...since Christ commanded his apostles to preach his gospel unto all the world, and excepted no people or language” (For details see Foxe, vol. 4, pp. 671, 675).*

*“Early manuscript collator and researcher, Herman Hoskier, agreed. To support his multi-lingual theory of the originals he documented the very early existence of vernacular editions (See *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the New Testament*, 1910). Bobrick [Bobrick,*

B., *Wide as the Waters*, NY: Simon & Schuster, 2001] asserts that Erasmus and Wycliffe believed that Christ did not use Greek, but the vernacular Aramaic, which then became an **inspired translation** (Greek, Latin, Gothic et al.) (Bobrick, p. 88).”

Hoskier’s research led him to conclude that the New Testament books were created, as far as was practicable, simultaneously, with the intention that they should go to multilingual recipients, without any particular authority attached to the Greek version that he mentions and certainly not any exclusive authority or perceived Greek-only inspiration, which Hoskier also doesn’t mention. Hoskier’s conclusion could therefore be described as an extrapolation but by no means an unreasonable one, especially when coupled with Foxe’s observation about the apostles writing in diverse tongues.

See **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint, Quotes 7, 124, 126, Quotes 105-141, An Overview**, Dr DiVietro’s fifteenth major failing in his comments on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials* and **Quotes 156, 161, 180** with respect to Foxe’s statement cited above.

Those numerous repetitions of Foxe’s statement above may seem tedious but it has been deemed necessary to make them in the light of Dr DiVietro’s persistent ‘originals-onlyism’ tunnel vision with respect to ‘the Greek.’ See again *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi, 2-3, 7, 17, 18, 88, 91, 93, 94, 105-109, 149, 187, 249-250, 255-256 and in addition pp 257, 264, 273, 274, 276-277. See also remarks under **Quote(s) 185** with respect to Dr DiVietro’s reference to the battle of Pork Chop Hill.

See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement above from *Hazardous Materials* p 1100 with respect to her unequivocal repudiation of “*the liberal theory that the original gospel of Matthew was written exclusively in Aramaic, a theory which has been fomented by Catholics.*”

That liberal/Catholic theory as applied in particular to the words “**Peter**” and “**rock**” in Matthew 16:18 is of course exploded by contemporaneous copies of the Gospels in Greek, Latin and Gothic that distinguish between the words “**Peter**” and “**rock**”. Aramaic is the only language of the ancient versions does not distinguish between those words. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1267.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states further on p 851 of *In Awe of Thy Word*, her emphases:

“The scriptures were “given” in “divers languages”; whether each language group has cared enough about them to keep pure copies in print is another question. Yet God preserves the words on bookshelves, just as he did for the Hebrews who exclaimed, “I have found the book...” (2 Kings 22:8). Many Englishmen have offered to give their lives for the English Bible. When Queen Mary sent murderous inquisitors to the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, a large group responded with a letter. It stated that they would die for the treasured English Bible, and –

““...to suffer all manner of persecution, and to lose their lives in the defense of God’s word...[They believed the] Holy Ghost came upon the apostles in fiery tongues, so that they spake the tongues of all nations under heaven” (Foxe, vol. 8, pp. 123, 125).”

Note this extract from **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

Contrary to the opinions of the DBS Executive Committee therefore, Cranmer (martyred), Tyndale (martyred), Coverdale, Rogers (martyred) and the other Bible translators of the English Reformation, plus Wycliffe before them [In Awe of Thy Word pp 757, 759], believed that they had in their hands “all scripture...given by inspiration of God” in English. In contrast to the apostates described in Romans 1:18, they believed they held the truth in righteousness. This inspired English scripture reached its final purified stage with the Holy Bible of 1611, Psalm 12:6, 7, thereby superseding in both inspiration and authority the earlier

English versions. See also *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1165-1167. How did Dr DiVietro miss this material, apart from a vicious prejudice against the Holy Bible and its believers?...

See also this author's earlier work [**Dr D. A. Waite and *The DBS, Dead Bible Society*** pp 57ff] with respect to ***Testimonies to the Inspiration of the AV1611*** and especially Bishop Ryle's remarks on the English Reformers of the 18th century, emphases are the author's and note the unequivocal stance on the inspiration of the 1611 English Holy Bible as the Book of God, this author's under-lining.

““The spiritual reformers of the last century taught constantly **the sufficiency and supremacy of Holy Scripture**. The Bible, whole and unmutated, was their sole rule of faith and practice. They accepted all its statements without question or dispute. They knew nothing of any part of Scripture being uninspired. They never allowed that man has any “verifying faculty” within him, by which Scripture statements may be weighed, rejected or received. They never flinched from asserting that there can be no error in the Word of God; and that when we cannot understand or reconcile some part of its contents, the fault is in the interpreter and not in the text. In all their preaching they were eminently men of one book. To that book they were content to pin their faith, and by it to stand or fall. This was one grand characteristic of their preaching. They honoured, they loved, they revered the Bible.””

Belief in the inspiration of the 1611 English Holy Bible is certainly not recent. Neither, as this author's earlier work shows, is it limited to a supposed small minority of contemporary individuals such as Dr Mrs Riplinger (and this author), who believe that the 1611 English Holy Bible is indeed **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God.”**

““In all these instances the Bible means the translation authorised by King James the First...to this day the common human Britisher or citizen of the United States of North America accepts and worships it as a single book by a single author, the book being the Book of Books and the author being God” – George Bernard Shaw”

The above citations are the testimonies of Reformers, faithful Bible translators, willing martyrs, some of whom e.g. Tyndale, Rogers, Cranmer, became actual martyrs, revivalists and genuinely well-informed historians and researchers.

They are all at odds with Dr DiVietro's insistence upon the superiority of ‘the Greek’ in ‘the original.’

Concerning Dr DiVietro's insistence that inspired scriptures cannot, by definition, be translations of scripture and vice versa, note the following scriptures. See related remarks under **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint**.

“And the king spake unto Ashpenaz the master of his eunuchs, that he should bring certain of the children of Israel, and of the king's seed, and of the princes; Children in whom was no blemish, but well favoured, and skilful in all wisdom, and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science, and such as had ability in them to stand in the king's palace, and whom they might teach the learning and the tongue of the Chaldeans” Daniel 1:3-4.

“In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaister of the wall of the king's palace; and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote.” Daniel 5:5.

“Then came in all the king's wise men; but they could not read the writing, nor make known to the king the interpretation thereof” Daniel 5:8.

“Then was Daniel brought in before the king. And the king spake and said unto Daniel, Art thou that Daniel, which art of the children of the captivity of Judah, whom the king my

father brought out of Jewry? I have even heard of thee, that the spirit of the gods is in thee, and that light and understanding and excellent wisdom is found in thee. And now the wise men, the astrologers, have been brought in before me, that they should read this writing, and make known unto me the interpretation thereof: but they could not shew the interpretation of the thing” Daniel 5:13-15.

“Then was the part of the hand sent from him; and this writing was written. And this is the writing that was written, MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN. This is the interpretation of the thing: MENE; God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it. TEKEL; Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting. PERES; Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians” Daniel 5:24-28.

These verses show that Daniel and his friends had to learn a new language, *“the tongue of the Chaldeans.”* The writing appeared on the wall at the king’s feast but no-one, not even *“the king’s wise men”* could either read it or interpret i.e. translate it. Daniel was summoned. He read the writing at the king’s spoken request and interpreted i.e. translated it.

The significance of the above scriptures is first that the king and all his revellers at the feast, together *“all the king’s wise men”* spoke *“the tongue of the Chaldeans”* that Daniel had learned as a youth. The writing, however, was in Hebrew but Daniel and the king conversed in Chaldean, into which Daniel interpreted i.e. translated the Hebrew words. Chapter 5 of Daniel and indeed Daniel 2:4-7:28 is first written in Aramaic aka Syriac, which is similar to Chaldean, one of two such portions in the Old Testament, the other being Ezra 4:8-6:18. See *The Book of Daniel* by Clarence Larkin p 15 and the *Ruckman Reference Bible* pp 681, 1136, 1147.

Daniel 5 therefore consists of a *spoken* original in Aramaic/Chaldean/Syriac that is then transcribed as a *written* original, with a written original Hebrew insertion (Daniel 5:24-28) that is no doubt inspired in Hebrew because it is *“written with the finger of God”* Exodus 31:18 but which then becomes *an inspired translation* in Aramaic/Chaldean/Syriac.

Daniel 5:24-28 therefore contradicts Dr DiVietro’s notion that translations of scripture cannot be *“given by inspiration of God.”*

See related remarks under **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**, particularly with respect to Esther 1:20, 22, 3:14, 8:13, Daniel 4:1, 6:25, John 19:19, 20, Acts 14:11, 21:40, Acts 2:16-21/Joel 2:28-32, Acts 2:25-28/Psalm 16:8-11, Acts 3:22-23/Deuteronomy 18:15, 19, Acts 8:32-33/Isaiah 53:7-8 and Revelation 5:13, 14:6-7, these last two passages being examples of *future* spoken ‘originals’ *not* in Koine Greek.

Dr Gipp’s analysis of inspired translations samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=29.htm *Can a translation be inspired?* should also be consulted.

Dr Gipp’s work was noted in this author’s earlier work **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society** pp 21ff.

See also 2 Kings 18:26, Isaiah 36:11.

“Then said Eliakim the son of Hilkiah, and Shebna, and Joah, unto Rabshakeh, Speak, I pray thee, to thy servants in the Syrian language; for we understand it: and talk not with us in the Jews’ language in the ears of the people that are on the wall.”

“Then said Eliakim and Shebna and Joah unto Rabshakeh, Speak, I pray thee, unto thy servants in the Syrian language; for we understand it: and speak not to us in the Jews’ language, in the ears of the people that are on the wall.”

2 Kings 18:26, Isaiah 36:11 (which exhibits some slight changes compared with ‘the original’) was undoubtedly a *spoken* original “*in the Syrian language*” not “*in the Jews’ language*.” It subsequently became an *inspired translation* “*in the Jews’ language*” i.e. Hebrew. The passage in 2 Kings 2:18:26, Isaiah 36:11 is therefore another example of what Dr DiVietro thinks is impossible i.e. an inspired translation.

The same may be said for Acts 21:40-22:21 which is a *spoken inspired Hebrew original* that becomes an *inspired translation* in Greek or whatever languages were used for the first transcripts of Paul’s speech – and all subsequent translations, including King James English. See related remarks in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.

Note also this extract from **Quote 135** with respect to inspiration and translation of the scriptures.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states rightly in In Awe of Thy Word p 544, her emphases:

“The Bible appears in many forms – such as Hebrew, Hungarian, English and Polish. The “form” of the Word seemed different at various times, yet it was still Jesus (e.g. the “fiery furnace” (Dan. 3:35), the “babe wrapped in swaddling clothes” (Luke 2:12), when “She supposing him to be the gardener” (John 20:15), and when “his eyes were as a flame of fire” (Rev. 1:14)). When the Word “appeared in another form,” as Jesus did, “neither believed they them” (Mark 16:12, 13). Likewise, some still dig for words in haunted Greek graveyards.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger shows that “*God was manifest in the flesh*” 1 Timothy 3:16 in the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ in various forms, as an infant, Luke 2:12, as an adolescent, Luke 2:42 and as a man, Luke 3:23. Paul then states in 2 Corinthians 5:16 “*Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more.*”

The reason is found in 1 Peter 3:21-22 with respect to “*Jesus Christ: Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.*”

Those versions that went before the 1611 Holy Bible, as extant today with all the God-guided refinements* between 1611 and 1769 incorporated into its text, and equivalent bibles in other languages, are as Paul describes the Lord Jesus Christ in 2 Corinthians 5:16. Henceforth we know them no more insofar as the Book that emerged from them is like the Lord Jesus Christ now in 1 Peter 3:21-22 with all made subject to Him. According to Psalm 138:2, all is now subject to that Book “*for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name.*”

*Concerning the refinement of the 1611 Holy Bible through its successive editions, note Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks from *In Awe of Thy Word* p 600. See also *The Hidden History of the English Scriptures* by Dr Mrs Riplinger pp 49-51.

“The only changes to the KJV since 1611 are of three types:

- 1. 1612: Typography (from Gothic to Roman type).*
- 2. 1629 & 1638: Correction of typographical errors*
- 3. 1762 & 1769: Standardization of spelling”*

Those changes were the major changes to the 1611 Holy Bible between 1611 and 1769. Some textual changes were carried out in the early editions, as Frederick Scrivener notes in *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611) Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*, Appendices A, C, the words “*of God*” first being added to 1 John 5:12 in 1638

and established in all editions after 1682, pp 193-194. Dr William P. Grady in *Final Authority* pp 168-170 states that after having personally reviewed Scrivener's Appendices A, C, his conclusion with respect to the differences between editions that Scrivener identified is that "less than two hundred [are] noteworthy of mention." None of these differences amount to textual discrepancies.

Moreover, none of the changes mentioned above had any detrimental effect on the *inspiration* of the 1611 Holy Bible during the transitional period of its purification, as Dr Grady shows in *Given By Inspiration* p 103. Dr Grady alludes to George Whitfield, who preached with Spirit-filled power to over 100,000 people on a mountainside in Cambuslang, Scotland in 1742, unconcerned about "any remaining errata in his King James Bible" that would later be rectified by Dr Blayney in his edition of 1769.

See also this extract from **Quote 28**, which summarises the remarks under that quote which show that the DBS Executive Committee's notion of preservation of "**The words of the LORD**" Psalm 12:6 without inspiration is not only unscriptural, it is anti-scriptural.

The first occurrence of the word "preserve" in Psalms is in Psalm 12:7. The use of the word "preserve" in Psalm 12:7 is consistent with its use throughout the Book of the Psalms and indeed throughout the whole Bible because "the words of the LORD" are "the words of the living God" Jeremiah 23:36. "The words of the LORD" therefore by definition live, as indicated by familiar references such as Matthew 24:35, John 6:63, 1 Peter 1:23, 25 and are therefore preserved as living words i.e. "all scripture...given by inspiration of God." They are the "lively oracles" of God Acts 7:38, they live.

"The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life" Job 33:4.

Note therefore Dr Mrs Riplinger's warning from *In Awe of Thy Word* p 472 in this extract from **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**.

Dr Mrs Riplinger's...warning in the light of Exodus 20:4 applies, her emphases in red bold, including with respect to imposition of the DIY 'Greek,' for whatever purpose, including supposed 'clarification,' as in Cleaning-Up, p 94. *Do-It-Yourself.*

"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth:"

Under **Quote 200**, Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of being out in left field. In the light of the above citations and scriptures, Dr DiVietro's fixation with 'originals-onlyism' makes him like one of those who lament in Isaiah 59:10 "**we are in desolate places as dead men.**"

Quote 182, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1097

"Hoskier believes, like Wycliffe, that the original books of the Bible were written in the language to whom they were addressed (i.e. Hebrew, Latin, Greek, etc.) He refers to – "...the original languages [plural] in which the "Ur-texts" [plural] of the different books of the New Testament were written."

Dr DiVietro states that even if Hoskier has been quoted correctly, even a great scholar such as he could be wrong. Dr DiVietro insists that no physical i.e. manuscript evidence has been found to back up Hoskier's statements, which are therefore conjecture. Dr DiVietro maintains that any normal reader would perceive the original languages as Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. Dr DiVietro then accuses Sister Riplinger of cherry picking Hoskier's work in this part of *Hazardous Materials* and that Hoskier claims, without any supporting manuscript evi-

dence, only that a Greek, Syrian and Latin polyglot of the Gospels appeared very early, not that the original writings of the Gospels were in any language other than Koine Greek.

It's interesting that Dr DiVietro says that Hoskier's statements about original New Testament writings in languages other than Greek are conjecture but he then conjectures that maybe Hoskier was wrong even if Dr Mrs Riplinger has quoted him correctly.

See this extract from **Quote 180** with respect to Dr DiVietro's notion that Hoskier was wrong about the languages in which some New Testament books may have been written.

*In answer to Dr DiVietro's comments, note first this extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.*

*Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, does take issue with Dr Mrs Riplinger's citations from Hoskier on pp 252ff of *Cleaning-Up* in his comments against *Hazardous Materials*. On pp 255-256 of *Cleaning-Up*, he basically accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of lying and states that he is attempting to ascertain what Herman Hoskier really said, in the firm belief that he will be able to prove that Dr Mrs Riplinger has misrepresented Hoskier. Just in case she hasn't, he adds that even a great scholar can be wrong, i.e. when the results of his work contradict the diktats of the DBS Executive Committee.*

Dr DiVietro's book was published in February 2010. He must have begun his search for Herman Hoskier's statements up to a year ago. Thus far, nothing has emerged from the DBS Executive Committee camp about the results of this search, which is strange, considering the collective DBS venom directed at Sister Riplinger.

*It is now over two years since *Cleaning-Up* was published. This author is in regular receipt of Dr Waite's DBS e-newsletter and other email communications from Dr Waite.*

*So far, nothing has emerged from Dr DiVietro via the DBS email communications to prove that Dr Mrs Riplinger has quoted H. C. Hoskier out of context. Dr DiVietro may indeed retain his certainty that Dr Mrs Riplinger has quoted Hoskier out of context (he says under **Quote 180** that he is sure of this) but for now, he has "**put it under a bushel**" Matthew 5:15.*

As also indicated under **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**, it is Dr DiVietro's responsibility to *prove* that Hoskier was wrong, not merely *conjecture* that he was wrong.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's statement that any normal reader would perceive the original languages as Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, proof not perception is what is required with respect to Hoskier's conclusions. Dr DiVietro provides none, in violation of 1 Thessalonians 5:21 "**Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.**"

With respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger supposedly cherry picking Hoskier's work, Dr DiVietro has falsely accused her again. See **Quote 181**. Dr DiVietro quotes a very brief statement from Hoskier, from which he omits the page reference of Hoskier's work, *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the N. T.*, p 21 and in so doing tries to imply, as he does again under **Quote 183**, that all of Dr Mrs Riplinger's citations from Hoskier are the same i.e. literary sound bites. This is not so, as shown below.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's claims that Hoskier admits that his conclusions are without manuscript evidence e.g. in the form of an early Greek, Syrian and Latin polyglot, that is not what Hoskier actually said in the citations of his work from *Hazardous Materials* pp 1098-1099. See the following, noting the extract from **Quote 181**, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphases.

"[Ur-text means 'original.'] He lists numerous groups of Greek manuscripts containing the book of Mark and concludes, "Both groups, however, ipso facto, seem to be translations from an Ur-Mark in Latin or Syriac, or both" (Hoskier, p. 33). Hoskier says,

““Hardly anyone seems to have thought of seeking for the Syriac or Aramaic base of our Gospels via the Latin. Nearly all attempts have been made to consider Greek roots and constructions. But the keys are in the Latin version, and they show not only a translation from a Syriac-Greek exemplar, but Aramaic roots deeply implemented, which cannot be distinguished when handling the Greek” (Hoskier, pp. 14, 15).”

“He adds,

““Now the point is that both the Latin and Syriac go back so far that they point almost to a **concurrent origin**, practically as old as the Greek...If there was no Greek counterpart, then the Latin came straight from the Syriac. Yet when we turn to [Mss.] *a* and *d* and *e*, we see that the Greek and the Syriac were entirely interwoven **at the start**. So that we are forced to the conclusion that very early, even so much earlier than is supposed, Syriac, Greek and Latin were running side by side (probably in a polyglot). The history of this is apparently hopelessly lost – never referred to except by inference – yet the proofs survive in every page of *a*, *d*, *e*, and *K*” (Hoskier, p. 42).”

“He concludes,

““The truth is that we are wandering round the point, but have not yet firmly grasped the Syriac-Graeco-Latin exemplar used.” “We therefore establish our hypothesis of a triglot very early” (Hoskier pp 52, 42, 166).”

It is true that Hoskier does not cite *direct* manuscript evidence for non-Greek originals but neither can Dr DiVietro or any ‘originals-onlyist’ cite *direct* manuscript evidence for *Greek-only* original writings of the New Testament.

Nevertheless, Hoskier’s conclusion, based on the *available* manuscript evidence and found in *context* from much lengthier citations of his work in *Hazardous Materials* than Dr DiVietro insinuates, is that of “*a* [Syriac-Graeco-Latin] triglot very early” whereby “when we turn to [Mss.] *a* and *d* and *e*, we see that the Greek and the Syriac were entirely interwoven **at the start**.”

As indicated under **Quote 181**, Hoskier’s conclusion that points to a multilingual beginning of the New Testament books “**by inspiration of God**” is an extrapolation from what he was able to discern by means of extant manuscript evidence. As also indicated above, Hoskier’s conclusion nevertheless seems entirely reasonable to this author, in the light of both Acts 2 and Isaiah 66:9.

“Shall I bring to the birth, and not cause to bring forth? saith the LORD: shall I cause to bring forth, and shut the womb? saith thy God.”

Hoskier’s conclusion therefore does bear out the title of this section of *Hazardous Materials* **Multiple Language Originals**: and Dr DiVietro fails to prove otherwise.

Quote 183, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1098

“(quoting Hoskier, KD) “Now the point is that both the Latin and the Syriac go back so far that they point almost to a **concurrent origin**, practically as old as the Greek...””

Dr DiVietro says that he doesn’t know what the three dots i.e. the ellipsis mean at the end of **Quote 183** and on that basis he accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of cherry picking quotes and repeatedly citing individuals out of context in *New Age Versions*.

Yet again, see **Quotes 181, 182**, Dr DiVietro falsely accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of wilfully misquoting Hoskier.

He focuses on the statement “*almost to a concurrent origin*” and insists, partly in bold, that Hoskier therefore does not say to a *concurrent* origin. Dr DiVietro then states that by putting the word “**concurrent**” in bold, Dr Mrs Riplinger has misled readers into thinking that Latin, Syriac and Greek versions of the Gospels *were* concurrent. Dr DiVietro declares that Hoskier’s statement means that the Greek originals for the Gospels existed in parallel with Latin and Syriac translations but no inspired originals in Latin and Greek ever existed.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments on **Quote 183** by stating that Dr Mrs Riplinger has misinterpreted Hoskier on p 1099 of *Hazardous Materials*. Dr DiVietro says that Hoskier is referring to the origin of Codex Aleph and the existence and use of early translations, not their authority.

Dr DiVietro has disobeyed 1 Thessalonians 5:21 “**Prove all things; hold fast that which is good,**” see **Quote 182**, again in his comments on the ellipsis at the end of **Quote 183**. Dr DiVietro has every opportunity of finding out what that ellipsis signifies, simply by consulting Herman Hoskier’s book, *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the N. T.* p 42. As indicated under **Quote 180**, the book may easily be located online.

It should be noted that Dr DiVietro has used ellipses himself in his quotes that may easily mislead the reader. See **Quotes 39, 41, 43, 62, 65, 71, 79, 114, 141, 142**.

Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing in his accusations against Sister Riplinger about misquotes in *New Age Versions* and he has again falsely accused her. See **Quotes 179, 182**. In answer to Dr DiVietro’s accusation, see this extract from **Quote 170**.

*See this extract from **Quote(s) 154** in response to Dr DiVietro’s latest accusation against Sister Riplinger.*

Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of again being deceptive. He states that Dr Mrs Riplinger has quoted an author in part and then added her own words to change the sense of the original quote completely. He then asks, if this is not so, why didn’t Dr Mrs Riplinger quote the complete passage in question?

*Dr DiVietro has again falsely accused Dr Mrs Riplinger, see **Quote 153**, and his criticism of her use of quotations is hypocritical in the extreme.*

*His accusation against Sister Riplinger is false because nowhere in his comments under **Quote(s) 154** does Dr DiVietro show how Dr Mrs Riplinger has changed anything with respect to the citations that she has given. He simply lies and insinuates to that effect, the same as James White does in his attacks on Sister Riplinger and *New Age Versions*.*

*See *Blind Guides* p 35 and www.av1611.org/kjv/ripwhit1.html Just Plain Lies, from which the following extracts are taken, the first of which explains why Dr Mrs Riplinger has given selective quotes in her books, her emphases.*

*“It is easy for readers, in this busy non-reading culture, to skip over a few words and thoughts which are submerged in a welter of **other** words...”*

*“White’s lie that “She attempts to paint Dr. Palmer as a closet Aryan...” proves: 1.) White cannot **read** the words on a printed page and 2.) he **substitutes** his own wild imaginations. If that won’t convince his reader, he **ALTERS** Palmer’s quote under his heading “What Dr. Palmer actually said” to give the impression that I have grievously misquoted him (e.g. “few and clear”).”*

Dr DiVietro, like White, blatantly seeks to create false impressions of Sister Riplinger and her work.

It is ironic that Dr DiVietro should stoop to the same level of false accusation against Sister Riplinger as James White does against her in *The King James Only Controversy* Chapter 5, because Dr DiVietro even wrote a refutation of White's book that this author noted in an earlier work.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php *Introduction to 'King James Only Controversy' by James White.*

*It should be noted that one additional work that addresses James White's book came to this author's attention while this study was in progress but was not utilised. This work is entitled *Why Not The King James Bible! An Answer*, by Dr Kirk DiVietro. It is mentioned because I believe that readers should be aware of its existence, if they aren't already.*

It is Luke 23:12 again. See **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint, Quote(s) 87.**

"And the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together: for before they were at enmity between themselves."

Concerning Dr DiVietro's reference to the expression "*almost to a concurrent origin*" in **Quote 183** and his accusation against Dr Mrs Riplinger for putting the word "*concurrent*" in bold, the full statement that Dr Mrs Riplinger inserts from Hoskier's work is found under **Quote 182.**

*"Now the point is that both the Latin and Syriac go back so far that they point almost to a concurrent origin, practically as old as the Greek...If there was no Greek counterpart, then the Latin came straight from the Syriac. Yet when we turn to [Mss.] a and d an e, we see that the Greek and the Syriac were entirely interwoven **at the start**. So that we are forced to the conclusion that very early, even so much earlier than is supposed, Syriac, Greek and Latin were running side by side (probably in a polyglot). The history of this is apparently hopelessly lost – never referred to except by inference – yet the proofs survive in every page of a, d, e, and K" (Hoskier, p. 42)."*

By inspection, it is Dr DiVietro who is picking cherries, not Dr Mr Riplinger. It is Dr DiVietro who has misled readers by what he *omitted* from **Quote 183**, not Dr Mrs Riplinger.

The full citation, which Dr DiVietro should have been more than capable of checking, shows first that in the statement that makes up **Quote 183**, Hoskier is speaking of evidence from extant Latin and Syriac sources. On drawing attention to extant Greek and Syriac sources, he says that "*we see that the Greek and the Syriac were entirely interwoven **at the start**. So that we are forced to the conclusion that very early, even so much earlier than is supposed, Syriac, Greek and Latin were running side by side (probably in a polyglot).*"

Hoskier then cites as proof of his conclusion with respect to a "*Syriac, Greek and Latin...polyglot*" "*every page of a, d, e, and K.*"

In essence, based on *all* the available evidence, of which Dr DiVietro draws attention only to *part* of the evidence, Hoskier concludes *in favour of concurrent* "*Syriac, Greek and Latin*" versions of the Gospels, that is to say, as Hoskier stated "*entirely interwoven **at the start**...Syriac, Greek and Latin were running side by side (probably in a polyglot)*" *with no evidence anywhere that only the Greek version was "given by inspiration of God" and its companion versions were not.* See remarks at the end of **Quote 182.** Dr DiVietro doesn't allude to any such historical note of caution, which surely must have existed and been perpetuated if God had given 'the Greek' a unique inspirational status in the formation of the New Testament. Clearly He did not. It is therefore Dr DiVietro who has misled readers, not Dr Mrs Riplinger.

Further inspection of Hoskier's statement shows that Dr DiVietro has misled readers again, with respect to his statement that Hoskier was referring to an inspired Greek original in parallel with Latin and Syriac translations. Hoskier's statement contains nothing about inspiration of a Greek original from which *uninspired* Latin and Syriac translations were obtained. Hoskier's statement doesn't mention inspiration. It says simply that, in Hoskier's view, Greek, Latin and Syriac versions of the Gospels existed contemporaneously.

As indicated under **Quote 182**, this is evidence in support of **Multiple Language Originals**;, the subtitle that Dr Mrs Riplinger gave this section of *Hazardous Materials*.

Note that in his reference to Latin and Syriac translations in *parallel* with a Greek original, Dr DiVietro has contradicted himself again, as this extract from **Quote 180** shows.

Under Quote 126, Dr DiVietro states that Paul's letters were not translated from Koine Greek until the second century or later. Under Quote 180, he allows that the Books of the New Testament were translated immediately after they were 'originally given' and he has not publicly said anything to the contrary for more than two years. Paul's last letter, 2 Timothy, was written in approximately 68 AD. See the Ruckman Reference Bible p 1588. Dr DiVietro should explain to his readers how 'immediately' equates to over 30 years. However, he fails to do so.

(The word "immediately" is found 55 times in scripture, exclusively in the New Testament. It never refers to a lapse of years but has the same meaning as it has today.)

Observe that in Dr DiVietro's parlance, translation into ancient versions *immediately after* inspiration of the Greek originals has now become *in parallel with* inspiration of the Greek originals.

With that admission on his part under **Quote 183**, it is up to Dr DiVietro to show *from historical data*, not the DBS Executive Committee's "**private interpretation**" 2 Peter 1:20 of *theopneustos*, *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-iv, 2-3, that inspiration of the New Testament Books was 'original-Koine Greek-only.'

Dr DiVietro fails to do so. He certainly has not been able to do so in the last two years since publication of *Cleaning-Up* from any of Hoskier's published statements.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's statement on Dr Mrs Riplinger's supposed misinterpretation of Hoskier's statement on p 1099 of *Hazardous Materials* and the origin of Codex Aleph, the statement reads as follows.

"This leads us straight to the second cause [of vernacular impact on Greek texts], the early polyglots, and by that I mean to advance the theory that, besides Graeco-Latin and Graeco-Coptic codices, there were other bilinguals, such as Syriac-Greek, Syriac-Latin or Coptic-Latin MSS. perhaps, but more probably trilinguals, Syriac-Graeco-Latin, and [possibly] a great quadrilingual Syriac-Coptic-Graeco-Latin back of [Aleph]" (Hoskier, p. 23)."

Hoskier's statement above clearly refers to a proliferation of multiple versions of New Testament books, of which a four-version parallel text ancestor of Codex Aleph may be an example, just as Origen's Hexapla, or six-version parallel text Old Testament was the basis for the so-called Septuagint, LXX, much of which has a Vaticanus-type text.

See Wilkinson, kjb.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html, *Which Bible?* p 195.

"The Latin Vulgate, the Sinaiticus, the Vaticanus, the Hexapla, Jerome, Eusebius, and Origen, are terms for ideas that are inseparable in the minds of those who know."

See also the extracts from the work by Sanders in **Addendum to Quote 180** with respect to the possibility of quadrilingual parallel versions.

By inspection therefore, Hoskier's statement is not confined to the origin of Aleph and Dr DiVietro has misled his readers in that respect, as the next statement from Hoskier on p 1099 of *Hazardous Materials* shows. Dr DiVietro has bypassed it.

“The supposition, then, that there were current among the Christians at Antioch, where both Greek and Syriac were spoken (see above, p. 116 [evidently Hoskier's reference to another work]), Graeco-Syriac bilingual MSS. of different parts of the N. T. is a hypothesis not only natural in itself, but also in strict analogy with known facts about other Churches” (Hoskier, p. 6).”

Hoskier's statement above actually agrees with Dr DiVietro's comments under **Quote(s) 179** that the inhabitants of 1st century Syria were bilingual, with Aramaic being their first language even though Greek was dominant. It appears that they had parallel text versions of the New Testament scriptures, showing again that Hoskier's statement is not confined to the origin of Codex Aleph, which Dr DiVietro has tried to imply.

Antioch was distinct from Alexandria in the early church and in turn Codex Aleph, see *Did The Catholic Church Give Us The Bible?* by David W. Daniels, Chick Publications, Chapter 2 but Hoskier clearly concluded that Antioch's bilingual population gave rise to bilingual texts of the New Testament scriptures, *where neither one appears to have been cited in authority over the other.*

It is up to Dr DiVietro to show otherwise. So far, he has failed to do so.

Quote 184, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1099

“Greek was not the sole language of the area, nor of the New Testament. The sign above the cross was written in Hebrew, Latin, and Greek because these were the predominant languages of the day.”

Dr DiVietro states that Greek wasn't the only language spoken in the 1st century and repeats his comments from under **Quote(s) 179** that Greek was the *lingua franca* from the Indus River to Rome, just as English is the worldwide language of today. Dr DiVietro repeats that Greek wasn't, however, the first language of any particular nation during the 1st century.

Dr DiVietro then refers to p 1100 of *Hazardous Materials*, which is the basis for his **Quote(s) 185**. He states that Dr Mrs Riplinger is claiming that the Gospels came originally from a lost non-Greek source and that she is adopting the centuries-old Catholic Church argument for a Latin origin of the New Testament.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments under **Quote 184** by insisting that the Gospels must have been first written in Greek because they give the Hebrew word Golgotha, which is equivalent to the word Calvary with an explanatory note. Dr DiVietro insists that such an explanatory note would be unnecessary if Hebrew or Aramaic translations of the Gospels were equivalent to the Greek original (unidentified by Dr DiVietro) with respect to inspiration. (Note that Dr DiVietro is strangely denying the possibility of inspired Hebrew and Aramaic New Testament scriptures, even though he perceives both languages to be inspired for Old Testament scriptures (Ezra 4:8-6:18, Daniel 2:4-7:28 being the Aramaic/Syriac/Chaldean passages, see **Quote 181**). See *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-iv, 2-3. Dr DiVietro's denial of course contradicts Acts 21:40-22:21 with respect to an inspired spoken Hebrew original. See **Quote 181**. See also the statement below from *Hazardous Materials* p 1100 to the effect that McClintock and Strong thought that the Book of Hebrews was first written in Hebrew, a statement that Dr DiVietro fails to challenge.)

Concerning Dr DiVietro's repeated comments on Greek as the *lingua franca* of the 1st century from the Indus River to Rome, note these extracts from **Quote(s) 179**.

...his description of the widespread use of Koine Greek for about 300 years up until the time of the Lord Jesus Christ is Dr DiVietro's only basis for insisting that the New Testament scriptures are only inspired in Koine Greek. Dr DiVietro has therefore unwittingly made a case for English as a legitimate language for "all scripture" that "is given by inspiration of God" 2 Timothy 3:16. See In Awe of Thy Word pp 19-20, 456ff where Dr Mrs Riplinger shows that as a global language, or lingua franca of the 20th and 21st centuries, English not Koine Greek, would be the means of directly reaching 33% of the world's population with the Gospel of Christ.

Dr DiVietro has therefore yet again unwittingly set out the case for an inspired English Holy Bible. He is still among "those that oppose themselves" 2 Timothy 2:25.

See **Setting Up the 'Clean-Up', Quotes 120, 125**.

*Dr DiVietro's comments about the spread of the Gospel via Greek into the eastern world of course entirely neglect the witness of the early church in the western world. See this extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.*

Then, note again the comments of Benjamin Wilkinson...

[See kjb.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html. See also Which Bible? edited by Dr David Otis Fuller, Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975, 205-206, 213-214].

"In the silent watches of the night, along the lonely paths of Asia Minor where robbers and wild beasts lurked, might have been seen the noble missionaries carrying manuscripts, and verifying documents from the churches of Judea to encourage their struggling brethren under the iron heel of the Papacy..."

Wilkinson's comments point to a movement of the Spirit of God and the scriptures in the opposite direction overall from that which Dr DiVietro indicates for Koine Greek i.e. Greece to Egypt to India and looping back to Rome, at least following the completion of the New Testament canon.

Though Dr DiVietro would probably reject them on an ad hominem basis, Dr Ruckman's comments [The History of the New Testament Church, Volume I, pp 41-42, 182-183, 185-186, 215-216] are instructive. A simple and informative map illustrating Dr Ruckman's comments, together with one that depicts the enemy response to the westward spread of the Gospel and the scriptures, may be found in his work The Monarch Of The Books, p 6.

"Rome and Jerusalem are the focal points in church history until the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. under Titus. Since all history moves East to West..., Jerusalem practically drops out of sight after 70 A.D. and the narrative of church history moves us into Asia Minor (Rev. 1-3) and thence to Greece (Acts 16, 17) and then finally – not at the start, or near the start – to Rome (Acts 28). The Bible has clearly identified Rome and things "Roman"...Rome, as a spiritual or religious entity, cannot be credited with one righteous or moral act (in the Biblical sense) since the city was founded, if we are to believe the God-given record (Matt. 2) as given to us by the Holy Ghost (Acts 12:1-5, 18:2). If "all roads lead to Rome," then the road to Hell will have to be paved with Alexandrian manuscripts and Christian scholarship."

Concerning Dr DiVietro's comments on Greek as the dominant language of the 1st century but not the first language of any 1st century nation (except Greece), note these extracts from **Quote 183**.

Hoskier's statement is not confined to the origin of Aleph and Dr DiVietro has misled his readers in that respect, as the next statement from Hoskier on p 1099 of Hazardous Materials shows. Dr DiVietro has bypassed it.

“The supposition, then, that there were current among the Christians at Antioch, where both Greek and Syriac were spoken (see above, p. 116 [evidently Hoskier's reference to another work]), Graeco-Syriac bilingual MSS. of different parts of the N. T. is a hypothesis not only natural in itself, but also in strict analogy with known facts about other Churches” (Hoskier, p. 6)”...

Hoskier clearly concluded that Antioch's bilingual population gave rise to bilingual texts of the New Testament scriptures, where neither one appears to have been cited in authority over the other.

It is up to Dr DiVietro to show otherwise. So far, he has failed to do so.

It is noteworthy that Christian scholarship, so called, has of itself been sufficient for Dr DiVietro to find his way back to Rome again, under **Quote 184**. That may explain his haste to distance himself from Rome **“MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH”** Revelation 17:5 in his next set of comments under **Quote 184**. In these comments he accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of adopting on p 1100 of *Hazardous Materials* the centuries-old Catholic argument for a Latin origin of the New Testament, with respect to a supposed single language lost original source of the Gospels.

Dr DiVietro has thereby made yet another false accusation against Sister Riplinger. See **Quote 183**. What follows, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphases, is the first part of p 1100 of *Hazardous Materials*, of which Dr DiVietro has failed to inform his readers. By inspection, it will be seen that Dr DiVietro has falsely accused Sister Riplinger under **Quote 184**.

Pp 1100-1102 of *Hazardous Materials*, from which **Quote(s) 185** has been extracted, is still under the subheading **Multiple Language Originals**:

*“Even the McClintock and Strong Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature asks, “In what language was it [the Epistle to the Hebrews] written?” It reports that writers during the early centuries and later affirmed that it was written in Hebrew, not Greek (vol. 4, p. 147). Hebrew was the language of the Jews. It appears often in the New Testament. Acts 1:19 says “And it was known unto all the dwellers at Jerusalem; insomuch as that field is called in **their proper tongue**, Aceldama, that is to say, The field of blood.” Paul would only speak Hebrew to the Jews in Acts 21:40-22:2 and 26:14. Jesus read or spoke Hebrew in Matt. 27:46, John 7:15, Luke 4:16, Mark 5:41, 7:34, 14:36, 15:34, and Acts 26:14. The New Testament has many references to Hebrew words, such as ‘Bethesda,’ ‘Gabbatha,’ ‘Golgotha,’ ‘Abaddon,’ and ‘Armageddon.’ Peter understood Hebrew in John 1:42.*

“Latin coins, read by Jesus, in Mark 12:16 demonstrate the use of this language. Words such as ‘Appi forum,’ ‘centurion,’ and ‘Praetorium’ show the Latin influence.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger then immediately follows the above statements with her assurance to the reader that *“I would not suggest the liberal theory that the original gospel of Matthew was written **exclusively** in Aramaic, a theory which has been fomented by Catholics. However, it is important to see McClintock, Strong and Hoskier's observations that the originals may not have been written **strictly** in Greek and vernacular editions born out of Acts 2 accompanied the originals immediately. (See the chapter “The Wobbly Unorthodox Greek Orthodox Church” for a further discussion of this topic.)”*

See *Quotes 126, 181*. The above statement forms the first part of *Quote(s) 185*.

It should first be noted that Dr Mrs Riplinger is citing “*the McClintock and Strong Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature.*” Dr DiVietro has both failed to inform his readers of that reference and to comment explicitly on the citation from McClintock and Strong, still, it seems, preferring women-only targets. See *Quote(s) 90*.

Concerning Dr Mrs Riplinger’s reference to McClintock and Strong, note this extract from *Quote(s) 179*.

Dr DiVietro fails to inform his readers that Dr Mrs Riplinger is citing Strong and McClintock, Cyclopaedia, vol. 10, p 480-481 about Chrysostom. This is the same James Strong who compiled the lexicon that is the subject of Chapter 7 of Hazardous Materials entitled “Strong Delusion” and whom Dr DiVietro stoutly defends, along with his lexicon, under Quotes 56-60, even though Dr DiVietro implies that James Strong was unregenerate, Cleaning-Up p 163.

Dr DiVietro should therefore be prepared to acknowledge the validity of the citation from Strong, even if he thinks Sister Riplinger shouldn’t, if he is prepared to “Provide things honest in the sight of all men” Romans 12:17. He can’t have it both ways.

He still can’t, although it appears that for Kirk DiVietro, anything goes in conducting his personal vendetta against Sister Riplinger.

Inspection of the above extracts from p 1100 of *Hazardous Materials* shows that Dr Mrs Riplinger is not adopting any Catholic argument at all, certainly not with respect to a single lost non-Greek original for the Gospels. The Book of Hebrews is the only full book mentioned on p 1100 of *Hazardous Materials*, not any of the Gospels, even though individual verses from them are listed.

The whole thrust of what Dr Mrs Riplinger is saying on p 1100 of *Hazardous Materials* is summed up in the following sentence, which is clearly contrary to Dr DiVietro’s insinuation against her under *Quote 184*.

“...it is important to see McClintock, Strong and Hoskier’s observations that the originals may not have been written strictly in Greek and vernacular editions born out of Acts 2 accompanied the originals immediately.”

Insofar as the above statement is included in the first part of *Quote(s) 185*, Dr DiVietro should reflect carefully on James 3:14.

“But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not against the truth.”

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s supposed proof of a Greek original for each of the Gospels through their use of the word Golgotha with explanatory notes, note the following four verses, three of which contain the only references to the word “*Golgotha*” in the scriptures and the fourth the only reference to “*Calvary*.”

“And when they were come unto a place called *Golgotha*, that is to say, a place of a skull” Matthew 27:33.

“And they bring him unto the place *Golgotha*, which is, being interpreted, The place of a skull” Mark 15:22.

“And when they were come to the place, which is called *Calvary*, there they crucified him, and the malefactors, one on the right hand, and the other on the left” Luke 23:33.

“And he bearing his cross went forth into a place called the place of a skull, which is called in the Hebrew Golgotha” John 19:17.

Matthew 27:33, Mark 15:22, John 19:17 do not unequivocally point to a Greek original as such, simply to a non-Hebrew original but even that conclusion is not necessarily valid for Matthew 27:33.

“And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled, that is to say, with unwashed, hands, they found fault” Mark 7:2.

The expression ***“that is to say”*** may simply denote the definition or application of a word in a particular context, not necessarily any change of language, such as, by contrast, the more definite example of Daniel 5:5-28 unequivocally shows, ***Quote 181***. See also Hebrews 9:11, 10:20.

However, by Dr DiVietro’s reasoning, which as indicated may or may not be valid in this case, Luke 23:33 would not point to a Greek original at all. Luke 23:33 uses the word ***“Calvary”*** without any explanatory note in the context and ***“Calvary”*** is neither a Hebrew nor a Greek word.

It is a Latin word, from *calvaria* meaning a skull.

Where, then, is Dr DiVietro’s Greek original for the Gospel of Luke?

By Dr DiVietro’s reasoning, it is nowhere, rather like his book *Cleaning-Up*.

Quote(s) 185, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1100-1102

*“I would not suggest the liberal theory that the original gospel of Matthew was written **exclusively** in Aramaic, a theory which has been fomented by Catholics. However, it is important to see McClintock, Strong and Hoskier’s observations that the originals may not have been written **strictly** in Greek and vernacular editions born out of Acts 2 accompanied the originals immediately...”*

*“Hoskier demonstrates that “the texts were concurrent” of Greek, Latin, Aramaic, Coptic and others. Hoskier sees “a **concurrent** Syriac or Aramaic version lying **alongside the Greek.**” He said, “In other words, as regards the Gospels, Latin and Syriac were made at the same time, or Latin and Greek from a Syriac originals; or Latin from a Graeco-Syriac original.” “The real facts stand out clear as light that **Syriac, Latin and Greek were concurrent ever so early**, and in the time of Justin and Irenaeus.”*

*““We are driven to the conclusion that the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament existed in Syriac translations at an early date; a date at least as early as that of the oldest Latin translations, and practically **contemporary with the Greek originals**. When the antiquity of Latin and Syriac versions is fully recognized, the discussion concerning Aramaic originals of certain Books will become in some directions simplified but in turn raise other nice questions.”*

“The Bible cannot clearly be made to give any other impression than that its books were made available immediately and concurrently in multiple languages. No primacy and exclusivity of the Greek language is afforded by Acts 2.”

“Hoskier gives hundreds of pages of examples demonstrating his conclusion that even Greek manuscripts, used to establish the current text, were taken from vernacular editions. He says:

““The point, therefore, is that it was not necessarily “through the medium of a Greek text” but through the medium of a Graeco-Syriac-Latin text existing A. D. 150.””

The full quote has been given, both to show what Dr DiVietro has omitted and to highlight the paucity of his comments under the above lengthy extract from *Hazardous Materials*. It occupies almost a page of *Cleaning-Up*.

Dr DiVietro has omitted all the page references to Hoskier's work that Dr Mrs Riplinger gives on pp 1100-1102 of *Hazardous Materials*. These page references are pp 4, 5, 6, 9, 26, 41, 54, 70, 75, 342. Dr DiVietro could easily have checked them to show if Dr Mrs Riplinger has quoted Hoskier in the correct context. That he fails to make any *specific* comment in that respect proves that Sister Riplinger *has* quoted Hoskier correctly *without* distorting the intent of his words, Dr DiVietro's objections to the contrary notwithstanding. See below.

Dr DiVietro complains that framing his comments is like having to fight and re-fight the battle of Pork Chop Hill (a seesaw engagement in Korean War during the spring and summer of 1953, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Battle_of_Pork_Chop_Hill).

Dr DiVietro declares that the existence of perfect, inspired Syriac and Latin translations of the Greek originals, given in bold in *Cleaning-Up*, would do away with the need for polyglot texts. Each inspired translation, once completed, would then go to its respective language group without the need for 'the Greek.'

Dr DiVietro then accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of copying the bogus method that Charismatics use to justify their false teaching from 1 Corinthians 12, 14 and that she has so arranged Hoskier's and her statements to try to make Hoskier say the exact opposite of what he really did say.

Dr DiVietro then declares, ending with an exclamation mark, that Dr Mrs Riplinger is entirely blameworthy in the above respect i.e. reprehensible.

That is all that Dr DiVietro has to say under his nearly page-long extract from *Hazardous Materials* that is his *Quote(s) 185*.

The only thing reprehensible under *Quote(s) 185* is Dr DiVietro's set of paltry comments, for which, yet again, he substantiates nothing. See *Quote 183*.

Dr DiVietro's supposed need for repetition in commenting on *Hazardous Materials* that he likens to the series of battles of Pork Chop Hill pales in comparison to the constant need for remarks and extracts from earlier parts of this work in order to answer Dr DiVietro's monotonous repetition of his own mantras e.g. the prevalence of 'the Greek' so-called in the 1st century that made it the sole inspired language of the New Testament. See the previous quote, *Quote 184*, for the extract from **Challenge#4, Point-Counterpoint** that has had to be repeated four times (now five) in this work in order to help answer Dr DiVietro's 'perfect-inspired-Greek-originals-only' mantra for the New Testament. See *Quotes 155, 156, 179, 184*. The extract reads as follows.

Then, note again the comments of Benjamin Wilkinson...

[See kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html. See also *Which Bible?* edited by Dr David Otis Fuller, Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975, 205-206, 213-214].

"In the silent watches of the night, along the lonely paths of Asia Minor where robbers and wild beasts lurked, might have been seen the noble missionaries carrying manuscripts, and verifying documents from the churches of Judea to encourage their struggling brethren under the iron heel of the Papacy..."

The necessity to direct the reader repeatedly to remarks made earlier in this work and to make extracts from earlier parts of this work in order to answer the many and varied unscriptural aspects of Dr DiVietro's 'originals-onlyism' fetish may be appreciated by consulting *Preface*

and Introduction, Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’, Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint, Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint, Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint, Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint, Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint, Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint, Quotes 10, 15, 16, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 50, 68, 69, 71, 74, 76, 86, 100, 105, 107, 108, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 116, 118, 119, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 132, 133, 134, 135, 137, 138, 139, 140, 143, 144, 146, 149, 150, 153, 155, 156, 161, 162, 163, 164, 166, 167, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175, 176, 177, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184.

The foregoing list is not exhaustive.

If Dr DiVietro thinks he can compare his work to Pork Chop Hill in the spring and summer of 1953, this author feels entitled to compare his on answering Dr DiVietro’s various ‘originals-onlyism’ mantras to the Western Front, 1914-1918:



Figure 12 The Western Front 1914-1918, www.battlesofwar.com/media/wwi-pictures.php

*“some shell-hole and [pillbox] line in a landscape where the trees were stumps and skeletons and no Quartermaster on earth could be sure of getting the rations up” – Siegfried Sassoon, *The Complete Memoirs of George Sherston*, Faber, 1972, p 540.*

There’s more.

It may seem off-topic but it isn’t.

It relates to genuine inspiration of *“the scripture of truth”* Daniel 10:21 at a time when *“the words of the LORD”* Psalm 12:6 were especially needed in great quantity and about which ‘originals-onlyists’ like Dr DiVietro appear to be clueless.

See 1914-1918.invisionzone.com/forums/index.php?showtopic=152655 with respect to the Pocket Testament League. Note that the United Kingdom in WW1 mobilised over 6,000,000 men, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Allies_of_World_War_I.

Most of these men would have received or at least been offered Bibles or New Testaments. The Pocket Testament League distributed 400,000 New Testaments to British soldiers in 1914 alone www.ptl.org/about/history.php.

New Testaments were also widely distributed throughout the First World War by the Scripture Gift Mission and the Naval and Military Bible Society of London. They were known as ‘Active Service’ Testaments.

Inspection of the graphics that conclude *Quote(s) 185* with respect to the verses listed, John 1:12, 3:36, 6:37, Romans 3:23, shows that only one version was important during those distressing years. It wasn’t ‘the Greek’ (and it wasn’t the RV either, even though that particular version had been in circulation for 33 years by 1914).

“But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name” John 1:12.

“He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him” John 3:36.

“All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out” John 6:37.

“For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God” Romans 3:23.

See end pages of *Quote(s) 185*.

The remainder of Dr DiVietro's comments under *Quote(s) 185* may be answered as follows.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's statement that the need for polyglots would disappear if Latin or Syriac Biblical texts were inspired, *Dr DiVietro is thereby allowing that any monolingual Biblical text e.g. the 1611 Holy Bible in English is therefore inspired i.e. "all scripture" that "is given by inspiration of God"* 2 Timothy 3:16.

Dr DiVietro is of course therefore flatly contradicting under *Quote(s) 185* all that he has said repeatedly in his book thus far about inspiration. See again *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi, 2-3, 7, 17, 18, 88, 91, 93, 94, 105-109, 149, 187, 249-250, 255-256, 257, 264, 273, 274, 276-277. However, this author believes that to be Dr DiVietro's problem.

(Polyglots would of course have been useful for any particular bi or multilingual early church in "*comparing spiritual things with spiritual*" 1 Corinthians 2:13 (possibly after the manner of how the King James translators carried out their work, as recorded by John Selden, see *Quote(s) 87*) e.g. with respect to confirming a correct understanding of Matthew 16:18. See *Quote 181*. Note that direct comparison of scripture with scripture also explains "*this rock*" in Matthew 16:18 as the Lord Himself, according to "*this bread*" in John 6:51, also the Lord Himself, from the context. See Dr Ruckman's commentary *The Book of John* pp 208-209.)

Dr DiVietro fails to explain how Dr Mrs Riplinger has copied Charismatic wresters of the scripture 2 Peter 3:16, in 1 Corinthians 12, 14, so that unsubstantiated comment of his may be set aside as yet another false accusation against Sister Riplinger. See *Quote 184*.

Neither does Dr DiVietro explain how Dr Mrs Riplinger has made Hoskier say the exact opposite of what he really said. See remarks above with respect to Dr DiVietro's failure to make any *specific* comment about Hoskier's statements by consulting the page references of Hoskier's work that Dr Mrs Riplinger provided on pp 1100-1102 of *Hazardous Materials*.

Dr DiVietro's failure in that respect may therefore be dismissed as yet another false accusation against Sister Riplinger, one that could be described as reprehensible.

The graphics for the Pocket Testament League follow, clearly for an edition at or near the war's end. The statement on the upper page of the second graphic appears to read *With Best Wishes for all the Days to be*.

POCKET TESTAMENT LEAGUE.

MEMBERSHIP CARD.

I hereby accept membership in the Pocket Testament League by making it the rule of my life to read at least one chapter in the Bible each day, and to carry a Bible or Testament with me wherever I go.

Name *W. C. B. B.*

Address *3 d*

REQUEST FOR DAILY PRAYER.

Before or after reading God's Word please pray daily :

- For the members of the League that they may be faithful to their covenant ;
- For the unsaved members that they may be led to Christ ;
- For the rapid spread of the movement in your own community, and throughout the world.

SUGGESTIONS FOR MEMBERS.

- Use your Bible or Testament to show others the way of life.
- Mark helpful passages and memorise some of them.
- Send for a dozen membership cards.
- Enrol Christians in the League to make them strong in the Lord.
- Give Testaments to others to interest them in the League and win them to Christ.

For further information and particulars of League Testaments, Gospels, &c., apply to the—

POCKET TESTAMENT LEAGUE HEADQUARTERS,
47 Paternoster Row, London, England

or to

79 WEST REGENT STREET, GLASGOW

84 VICTORIA STREET, TORONTO

376 SWANSTON STREET, MELBOURNE

183 WITHERSPOON BUILDING, PHILADELPHIA, PA., U.S.A.

Figure 13 Pocket Testaments I




Figure 14 Pocket Testaments II

As indicated above, with so many young men on the edge of eternity, God was clearly not interested in 'the Greek.' The Lord was nevertheless clearly interested in ministering "the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever" 1 Peter 1:23 to their souls.

Concerning Dr DiVietro and 'the Greek' therefore, Sister Riplinger should take comfort from Psalm 21:11. "For they intended evil against thee: they imagined a mischievous device, which they are not able to perform."

Quote 186, from *Hazardous Materials* pp 1102-1104

Dr DiVietro does not give any particular extract for **Quote 186**. He only includes the page references for *Hazardous Materials* given above. He accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of wilful distortion with respect to her description of Beza's use for his Greek text of Tremellius's Latin translation of the Syriac New Testament. Dr DiVietro insists that although Beza may have had Tremellius's work available to him, it did not form the basis for Beza's Greek text.

Dr DiVietro then says that Dr Mrs Riplinger is really attacking Scrivener on pp 1102-1104 of *Hazardous Materials* and this attack is ineffectual because according to Dr DiVietro, Scrivener is best placed to provide an explanation of the Greek text used by the King James translators.

Implying that Dr Mrs Riplinger has cited Scrivener out of context, Dr DiVietro then inserts a lengthy quote from Scrivener about "*the Greek basis of the Authorized Version*" but without telling the reader where it came from.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments under (non) **Quote 186** by insisting, in bold, that Scrivener used Beza's text as the basis for his own because it was the last major edition of the Received Text to be published before the King James translators started their work and because Beza's text matches the King James New Testament more closely than any other published Greek text of the time.

Dr DiVietro is adamant under (non) **Quote 186** that Scrivener did not reverse translate his Greek text i.e. he used Beza's.

The quote from Scrivener that Dr DiVietro gives is found on pp 641-643 of *Hazardous Materials* in an abridged form and has been taken from Scrivener's original Preface to his Greek New Testament i.e. "*The New Testament in the Original Greek, according to the Text followed in the Authorized Version with the Variations adopted in the Revised Version*". See *Hazardous Materials* p 632 and remarks under **Quote 114** about the misleading nature of the title of Scrivener's Greek text.

Dr DiVietro does not attempt to show that Dr Mrs Riplinger's abridged citation of Scrivener on pp 641-643 of *Hazardous Materials* conflicts in any way with the equivalent quotation from Scrivener's Preface that Dr DiVietro inserts under (non) **Quote 186**. That insinuation on Dr DiVietro's part may therefore be set aside as yet another false accusation against Sister Riplinger. See **Quote(s) 185**.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's insistence that Tremellius's Latin translation of the Syriac New Testament did not form the basis for Beza's Greek text, see remarks under **Quotes 132, 133**, noting that on pp 1104-1105 of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr Mrs Riplinger gives the extract from Beza's Preface in Latin that forms **Quote 133** with an English translation. See below. Dr DiVietro fails to mention this English translation, which under **Quote 133**, he criticises Dr Mrs Riplinger of neglecting to provide.

Dr DiVietro claims to have read through *Hazardous Materials* carefully three times, *Cleaning-Up* pp 110, 278. He should therefore have had sufficient courtesy both to Sister Riplinger and to his readers to refer under **Quote 133** to the English translation of the extract from Beza's on pp 1104-1105 of *Hazardous Materials* and thereby make a constructive comment instead of using **Quote 133** as merely another opportunity to attack Sister Riplinger.

Dr DiVietro should again review James 4:17 "**Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin.**" See **Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint** and **Quote 146**.

Note these extracts from **Quote 132** with respect to Tremellius's Latin translation of the Syriac New Testament.

Quote 132, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 681, 683

"The Greek text of Scrivener is not the Greek text of Theodore Beza (A.D. 1519-1605), though many assume that it is."

*"Contrary to Beza's express statements, Scrivener likes to pretend that Beza **may** not have made "any great use" of "Tremellius' **Latin** version of the [Syriac] **Peshitta**," but must admit Beza had it "ready at hand"...In other words, Tremellius had translated the Syriac Bible into Latin. Beza used both the original Syriac and the Latin translation of the Syriac to help create his Greek edition"...*

On p 683 of *Hazardous Materials* Dr Mrs Riplinger states above **Quote 132**, her emphasis:

"Beza's Greek Text: Some from Syriac to Latin to Greek?"

*"Even good Greek text authors are not Greek-only. The Cambridge History of the Bible's General Index under "Beza" notes that Beza "calls the New Testament Greek 'barbaric'" (Cambridge History of the Bible, S. L. Greenslade ed., Cambridge University Press, 1963, p. 560). Those who feel that they **must** go to the Greek and therefore follow Scrivener's use of Beza instead of the KJB's underlying Greek (where Scrivener pretends the translators followed the Latin) will be shocked to find out that Beza's Greek text was made, according to his preface, by consulting among other things, the vernacular Syriac Peshitta and a Latin translation of this Peshitta. In what Beza's calls his third edition (1582), he lists his use of these, as well as the "Arabic New Testament Version in a Latin translation prepared by Francis Junius" (Edward F. Hills, *The King James Version Defended*, Des Moines, Iowa, The Christian Research Press, 2000 reprint, p. 206).*

"The Cambridge History of the Bible states,

"In the preparation of his text Beza...also had before him the [Latin] version made by Tremellius from the [Syriac] Peshitta New Testament."

"[It was] ""Tremellius's Latin of the Syriac New Testament" (Cambridge History, Greenslade, pp. 62, 167).""

*The above citations show that Dr Mrs Riplinger has given an "**honest report**" about the sources for both the 1611 Holy Bible and Beza's text with supporting documentation.*

*Dr DiVietro's accusations against Dr Mrs Riplinger under **Quote 132** are without foundation.*

*Sister Riplinger can take comfort, therefore, from Matthew 5:11. See also **Quote 64**.*

"Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake."

As remarks under **Quote 132** reveal, summarised in the above extracts, Dr DiVietro has falsely accused Dr Mrs Riplinger of hypocrisy and misrepresentation with respect to her reference to Tremellius under **Quote 132**. As shown above, however, Dr DiVietro continues in the same vein against Dr Mrs Riplinger under **Quote 186**, wickedly bypassing Dr Mrs Riplinger's additional statements on pp 1104-1105 of *Hazardous Materials* that elaborate upon those on p 683 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphases.

*"Proving Scrivener wrong [i.e. his notion, like Dr DiVietro's, that Beza only had Tremellius's work ""ready at hand""] is Beza's own Preface with its string of Latin ablative absolutes [Dr Mrs Riplinger had a private Latin tutor, see **Quote 121**] wherein he admits his reli-*

ance upon Latin and Syriac editions. This is translated clearly by C. Windsor Wheeler, Ph.D., graduate of Duke University and currently the professor of Classics (Greek and Latin) at Louisiana State University. He translates Beza as follows:

“...the Greek text of the New Testament collated not only with nineteen and everywhere much-printed codices, but even with **the Syriac translation** [Tremellius’ Syriac into Latin], and, as well as I was able by faith and diligence, compared partly not only with the writings [citations of scriptures] of the old Greek and **Latin fathers**, partly with more recent [writings or authors], but also with commentaries...” (letter on file).”

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s provision of “**things honest**” Romans 12:17 and her issue of an “**honest report**” Acts 6:3 with respect to the translation of the extract from Beza’s Preface contrasts sharply with Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote 133**.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has provided the English translation, the identity of the translator, his academic credentials as a Latin translator and notification of his letter on file.

Dr DiVietro provides no translation of the extract from Beza’s Preface, stating only that he forwarded it to several Latin translators whom he fails to identify in any respect and then gives his own comments on the translation to the effect that Beza used the Greek (that Dr DiVietro fails to identify) but consulted the Latin Fathers and the Syrian (unclear whether the reference is to fathers or translations) in order to choose between variant readings.

Dr Wheeler’s translation of the extract from Beza’s Preface suggests to this author that by collating his Greek text with the Syriac and Latin *texts in addition to the writings of the fathers*, Beza paid much closer attention to them than Dr DiVietro’s use of the term consulted would imply.

Dr DiVietro therefore reminds this author of certain individuals featured on a BBC investigative programme called *Watchdog*. These individuals are referred to as rogue traders. See www.bbc.co.uk/watchdog/rogue_traders/.

Dr DiVietro should reflect upon Exodus 23:1.

“Thou shalt not raise a false report: put not thine hand with the wicked to be an unrighteous witness.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger continues, her emphases. See also statement above.

“Those who feel that they **must** follow Scrivener’s Greek text and its occasional substitution of Beza’s text, instead of the KJB’s underlying Greek (where Scrivener pretends the KJB translators followed the Latin) may unknowingly be following a Latin translation of the Syriac. If the editors of Greek texts have no qualms about back-translating from vernacular editions into Greek, why should we embrace their Greek printed editions as if they were **the originals**? If Syriac can be translated into Latin [Tremellius], and that Latin into Greek [Beza], and that Greek into the KJB, and the KJB into Scrivener’s Greek text, why can’t the English Holy Bible be translated into any language, as needed, as it has been in the past, as we shall see?”

The mention of back-translation in the above statement, especially with respect to translation of “*the KJB into Scrivener’s Greek text*” is what raises Dr DiVietro’s ire under **Quote 186**, although he does not explicitly mention the above statement, let alone seek to challenge it. However, the following extracts from **Quote 114**, found in part under **Quote 132**, answer Dr DiVietro’s aversion to reverse translation.

It does not seem to have occurred to Sister Riplinger’s attackers that Scrivener could easily have carried out his own translation of the King James New Testament into Koine Greek and

largely retained Beza's text where that text matched his trial translation. His reverse translation would then only be apparent where Beza's text departs from the King James New Testament. Dr DiVietro, D. A. Waite Jr and Dr/Mr Coward may dismiss that possibility as mere speculation but they cannot prove otherwise.

The possibility of Scrivener having carried out his own trial translation is reinforced by the following statement from *Hazardous Materials* p 639, which also indicates that Dr Mrs Riplinger is entirely aware that Scrivener's text is largely Beza's, in spite her accusers' insistence to the contrary, according to the above extract. The extract from p 639 of *Hazardous Materials* reads as follows, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphases and this author's under-linings, those in bold indicating added emphases on Dr Mrs Riplinger's part.

"Scrivener begins his **original** preface by explaining his RV Committee's charge to him to create this volume for comparison purposes for their project. In the original preface Scrivener gives a seven page description of the purpose of the work as related to his RV work. He adds an eight page appendix at the end of the volume listing the verses where he departs from the readings of Beza's Greek text. **He adds a final page to show some of the places where he did not follow the Greek text underlying the KJB** (Scrivener, *The New*, p 656)..."

The underlined statement in the above extract shows first that Dr Mrs Riplinger does in fact perceive Scrivener's text as largely Beza's. However, it also strongly suggests that, in the absence at the time of any specific information about the extent to which the King's men used each of their available Greek sources for their work, Scrivener did his own reverse translation and then compared it with what he thought was the translators' most likely source i.e. the final editions of Beza's text but also any other sources* that he had.

*Dr Mrs Riplinger states that Scrivener only used printed editions of the Received Text for his text. See *Hazardous Materials* p 640 and **Quote 116**.

The obvious question is, how, in fact, could he have done otherwise, a priori? As indicated above, his reverse translation would only be evident where the King James New Testament departs from Beza's text. It is therefore rash for Dr Riplinger's accusers to assume that only those parts of the King James New Testament were subjected to reverse translation by Scrivener. It is most unlikely that he would have known in advance specifically which parts of the King James New Testament that they were...

Dr Mrs Riplinger's deduction that Scrivener had to carry out a reverse translation of essentially the entire King James New Testament and then compare it with various Greek sources, principally Beza's final editions, is supported by Scrivener's own statements that Dr Mrs Riplinger has included on p 642 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphases. See also this author's underlining [what follows are the opening statements from Dr DiVietro's quotation from Scrivener under **Quote 186**, slightly abridged, about which Dr DiVietro makes no specific comment]...

"In considering what text had the best right to be regarded as **"the text presumed to underlie the Authorised Version,"** it was necessary to take into account **the composite nature of the Authorized Version...Beza's fifth and last text of 1598 was more likely than any other to be in the hands of the of the King James's revisers...There are however many places in which the Authorized Version is at variance with Beza's text;** chiefly because it retains language inherited from Tyndale and his successors, which had been **founded on the text of other Greek editions...**These uncertainties do not however affect the present edition, in which **the different elements that actually make up the Greek basis of the Authorized Version have an equal right to find a place**" [subjective and incomplete back-translation of AV into Greek]."

No notes of any reverse translation carried out by Scrivener appear to exist. However, it is easy to see from the above that Beza's 1598 Edition would have been Scrivener's preferred choice for any trial reverse translation. He would have had to carry out at least a significant amount of such a translation in order to reach the findings that he did about the Greek sources for the King James New Testament. Contrary, therefore, to Dr/Mr Coward's accusations based on pp 637, 640 of Hazardous Materials, see above, Scrivener's own preface does support Dr Mrs Riplinger's conclusions about Scrivener and reverse translation.

The essential point of this conclusion, which Sister Riplinger's accusers have so far missed, is that Scrivener's text cannot therefore be either inspired or finally authoritative and it is certainly not "the Originall Greeke" from which the King James New Testament was translated, the translation source that even Dr DiVietro acknowledges in his concluding comment under Quote 114.

Note the relevant portion of **Quote 114**, with the sentence inserted that Dr DiVietro omitted, reads as follows, this author's emphases.

"When the fine details are examined it becomes clear that in the minutiae Scrivener did not always back-translate, as Waite also observes. What he did in fact was to create an entirely new entity, a Greek text that matches no other Greek text on earth and which matches no Holy Bible ever made, not even the KJB. It is not Beza's text, as some pretend; it certainly follows no other edition of the Textus Receptus in the minutiae. **It is his own mix and therefore not authoritative at some points.** Although the text is titled, "the text followed in the Authorized Version," Scrivener takes an entire page admitting and delineating why and where it is not."

Note again the statement from p 639 of Hazardous Materials.

"He adds a final page to show some of the places where he did not follow the Greek text underlying the KJB (Scrivener, The New, p 656)."

Dr Mrs Riplinger gives the full title of Scrivener's text on p 638 of Hazardous Materials, her emphases, showing, in the light of the above citations that Scrivener's title of his text is grossly misleading. Neither Dr DiVietro nor D. A. Waite Jr nor Dr/Mr Coward addressed the relevant material on p 638 of Hazardous Materials.

"**"The New Testament in the Original Greek, according to the Text followed in the Authorized Version...Edited for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, by F. H. A. Scrivener...1881."**"

Dr Mrs Riplinger is therefore quite right to say, as she does at the top of p 644 of Hazardous Materials that, her emphasis, "Scrivener's Greek text can be helpful, as demonstrated at the beginning of this chapter. But the one-man RV committee intellectual exercise is **hardly** a letter-for-letter repository of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost for this generation."

Amen.

Amen again.

Dr DiVietro gives no clue under **Quote 186** about how Scrivener managed to use Beza's text as the basis for his own without identifying Beza's departures from the King James New Testament without extensive reverse translation.

Dr DiVietro's complete lack of explanation in that respect brings to mind Ezekiel 8:12 with respect to **"what the ancients of the house of Israel do in the dark, every man in the chambers of his imagery."**

It appears that Dr DiVietro is no different, with respect to **“the chambers of his imagery”** concerning the *precise* formation of *The Textus Receptus 1881 Greek text...the corresponding Greek text to the 1611 King James Version* (price \$24.95). See **Quote 108**.

Quote 187, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1105-1106

“The original Latin and Gothic Bible from Acts 2 carried Christ to Europe. As languages continued to be confounded by divergent dialects, God gave each of these languages his words, “forever settled in heaven,” which would judge people in the last day (John 12:48). As language changed, Holy Bibles were “given” and “purified” (2 Tim. 3:16, Psalm 12:6, 7) to fit the linguistic need. The Italic, Gallic, Celtic, and Old Saxon editions came forth. As will be demonstrated, new New Testaments have usually been birthed from previous vernacular New Testaments. For example, the pure Old Latin Bible became the Roumant, Provençal, Vaudois, Toulouse, Piedmontese, and Romanese Bibles. It is unlikely that Greek was even accessed worldwide in most cases because of the lack of availability of Greek manuscripts, compounded by a lack of skill in those languages. Scrivener admits,

““The fact that versions as a class go much farther back than [Greek] MSS., constitutes one of the chiefest points of their importance...some are secondary versions, being derived not from Greek...”

Dr DiVietro acknowledges that some versions may pre-date Greek manuscripts but he insists that the term version simply means a direct translation that cannot pre-date the original language text. Dr DiVietro says (in a slightly garbled statement) that a version may sometimes be helpful in determining the words of the original Greek text but he adds that secondary and tertiary translations on their own do not establish the words of God.

Yet again, Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing in his comments, including giving no scripture to support his comments, failing utterly to show *from scripture* why a ‘Greek-only’ text is essential for establishing the words of God*. See **Quote(s) 185**.

*Apart from the DBS Executive Committee’s **“private interpretation”** 2 Peter 1:20 of *theopneustos, Cleaning-Up* pp iii-iv, 2-3, that inspiration of the New Testament Books was ‘original-Koine Greek-only.’ See **Quote 183**.

Yet again, Dr DiVietro fails to inform the reader where the perfect, inspired, original words of God may be found between two covers. See **Quote(s) 179**.

Yet again, Dr DiVietro violates the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9 by denying that any non-Greek text establishes the words of God i.e. in the language of that text. See **Quote 181**. In Dr DiVietro’s opinion, such translations, by definition, never could establish the words of God, either in or from the languages of those translations.

Dr DiVietro is stating that the recipients of *“The Italic, Gallic, Celtic, and Old Saxon editions...the pure Old Latin Bible [that] became the Roumant, Provençal, Vaudois, Toulouse, Piedmontese, and Romanese Bibles”* never really had the words of God. They only had secondary or tertiary translations that failed to establish the words of God in the languages of those translations. In Dr DiVietro’s opinion, such translations, by definition, never could establish the words of God, either in or from the languages of those translations.

Dr DiVietro is also stating that the recipients of Pocket Testaments on the edge of eternity in the Great War 1914-1918 never really had the words of God either, only a secondary or tertiary translation that by definition therefore is not **“the word of life”** from **“the Word of life”** 1 John 1:1 and the distributors of these testaments could never have fulfilled Philippians 2:16 according to Dr DiVietro’s notions of the words of God.

“Holding forth the word of life; that I may rejoice in the day of Christ, that I have not run in vain, neither laboured in vain.”

In response, see this extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**, noting that the opening statement has now had to be repeated for the sixth time thanks to Dr DiVietro’s heresy of ‘originals-onlyism.’ See **Quote(s) 185**.

*While still on the subject of inspired translations, which Dr DiVietro denies, careful attention should be paid to the words of Benjamin Wilkinson [kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html]. See also *Which Bible?* edited by Dr David Otis Fuller, Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975, 205-206, 213-214] with respect to the transmission of the Received Text to the Waldensian Church and the preservation of the true scriptures during the Dark Ages. Under-linings are this author’s.*

“In the silent watches of the night, along the lonely paths of Asia Minor where robbers and wild beasts lurked, might have been seen the noble missionaries carrying manuscripts, and verifying documents from the churches of Judea to encourage their struggling brethren under the iron heel of the Papacy...

“The Scriptures of the apostle John and his associates, the traditional text – the Textus Receptus, if you please – arose from the place of humiliation forced on it by Origen’s Bible in the hands of Constantine and became the Received Text of Greek Christianity. And when the Greek East for one thousand years was completely shut off from the Latin West, the noble Waldenses in northern Italy still possessed in Latin the Received Text.

“To Christians such as these, preserving apostolic Christianity, the world owes gratitude for the true text of the Bible. It is not true, as the Roman Church claims, that she gave the Bible to the world. What she gave was an impure text, a text with thousands of verses so changed as to make way for her unscriptural doctrines. While upon those who possessed the veritable Word of God, she poured out through long centuries her stream of cruel persecution. Or in the words of [Nolan]:

““The Waldenses were among the first of the peoples of Europe to obtain a translation of the Holy Scriptures. Hundreds of years before the Reformation, they possessed the Bible in manuscript in their native tongue. They had the truth unadulterated, and this rendered them the special objects of hatred and persecution...Here for a thousand years, witnesses for the truth maintained the ancient faith...In a most wonderful manner it (the Word of Truth) was preserved uncorrupted through all the ages of darkness.””

*Benjamin Wilkinson and before him the distinguished theologian Frederick Nolan [[en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Frederick_Nolan_\(theologian\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Frederick_Nolan_(theologian))] equated the Waldensian “translation of the Holy Scriptures” with “The Word of truth.” The expression **“the word of truth”** occurs 5 times in scripture; Psalm 119:43, 2 Corinthians 6:7, Ephesians 1:13, 2 Timothy 2:15, James 1:18 (the plural form, **“the words of truth”** occurs three times, in Proverbs 22:21, twice and in Acts 26:25). In Ephesians 1:13 **“the word of truth”** is associated with **“the gospel of your salvation,”** in 2 Timothy 2:15 it is to be studied in order in order **“to shew thyself approved unto God”** and in James 1:18 it is capable of begetting spiritual life. **“The word of truth”** clearly shares common attributes with **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”** and in its entirety must be **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God.”***

*Not according to Dr DiVietro, however. According to Dr DiVietro, not only were Wilkinson and Nolan deceived in their conviction that the Latin Bibles of the Waldenses were inspired translations but so were “the noble Waldenses” who endured long centuries of papal persecution in their faithful preservation of **“the word of truth.”***

That seems most unlikely to this author, who wonders how Dr DiVietro and his DBS Executive Committee colleagues will give account of these matters at **“the judgment seat of Christ”** Romans 14:10, assuming that they are all there.

Especially when they will give account in front of the multitudes of Waldensian and other Dark Age believers who suffered martyrdom at the hands of Rome for their devotion to **“the word of truth.”**

That is, **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God,”** in the form of translations, yet still as **“the holy scriptures”** 2 Timothy 3:15.

Dr DiVietro is clearly in conflict with John Bunyan with respect to the establishment of the words of God. The following extract is from *The Word: God Will Keep It* by Joey Faust, Fundamental Books, 2011, pp 56-58. Emphases are the author's.

“The following dialogue is titled, A Relation of the Imprisonment of Mr. John Bunyan, Minister of the Gospel at Bedford, in November, 1660...[[appearing before] attorney William Foster]...

““Foster: ‘You are ignorant and do not understand the Scriptures; for how can you understand them when you know not the original Greek? etc.’

““Bunyan: ‘It is your opinion that none can understand the Scriptures but those that had the original Greek, etc., then but very few of the poorest sort should be saved (this is harsh,) yet the Scripture saith, that God hides his things from the wise and prudent (that is, from the learned of the world,) and reveals them to babes and sucklings.’”

Dr DiVietro is therefore in conflict with the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, as Luke 10:21 shows.

“In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight.”

Quote 188, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1106

“The Koine Greek New Testament had but minor use as a medium of comparison and translation from the first century to the 15th century. Its use was local and somewhat metropolitan, it was limited to Greek-speaking people during the centuries and locales encompassed by the Roman and Byzantine Empires.”

Dr DiVietro insists that the Koine Greek New Testament was in use in the entire Eastern Roman Empire, where everyone spoke Greek and that its use lasted until the 15th century. Dr DiVietro then declares that he has in his possession a Greek New Testament that contains the formal blessing of the Greek Church and that it contains all the verses that are found in the King James New Testament, including Acts 8:37, Colossians 1:14, 1 Timothy 3:16, 1 John 5:13 etc.

Dr DiVietro then makes the strange statement that just because the King James translators did not use that particular Greek New Testament, evidently because they did not know of its existence, it **“does not mean that it ceased to be the words of God.”**

Dr DiVietro's actual concluding words under **Quote 188** have been inserted to ensure that his statement has not been misunderstood.

Yet again, Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing, supports none of his statements with scripture and, with his continuing obsession with ‘the Greek’ only as **“the words of God”** (though in reality, it can't be, see below) has again violated the priesthood of all believers. See **Quote 187**.

In response to Dr DiVietro's comments under **Quote 188**, see the following extracts from **Quote(s) 179**.

*Concerning Dr DiVietro's insistence on the importance of the Greek language as the universal language of the entire eastern world following Alexander's conquest of the Persian Empire until the time of the Lord Jesus Christ, about 300 years, see this extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.*

Concerning Dr DiVietro's outline of the spread of Koine Greek, including its evident popularity in Rome and with the Caesars, two basic problems arise that Dr DiVietro overlooked, with respect to the propagation of the Gospel and the spread of the scriptures.

1. *He is headed in the wrong direction.*
2. *He has ended up in the wrong place (Rome).*

It should be noted first that most of the regions that Dr DiVietro describes as having been blessed with an overspreading of Koine Greek are now in Muslim hands and most likely will be until the Second Advent. 'The Greek' therefore didn't help the inhabitants of these areas much, especially insofar as Dr DiVietro fails to mention one single nation among those areas that has been noted for either spiritual greatness or initiating missionary outreach for the last two thousand years. To the contrary, these areas remain some of the most difficult in the world for missionaries to reach with the Gospel to the present day.

*It should also be noted that in addition to orchestrating the deaths of Peter and Paul, which Dr DiVietro is forced to acknowledge, *Cleaning-Up*, p 82, Rome, especially papal Rome, is described prophetically in scripture as **"MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH"** Revelation 17:5.*

*'The Greek' therefore doesn't appear to have helped Rome much, either, considering the scripture's unwavering and eternally damning verdict on her and her eventual fate, at the Second Advent, Revelation 18. Indeed, far from supporting Dr DiVietro's ringing endorsement of Koine Greek as the language of the theatre in ancient Rome, Revelation 17, 18 appear to be in much closer agreement with Sister Riplinger's warning about, this author's emphasis, "crumbling Greek ruins...**bawdy plays**...the pagan myths...and anti-God philosophical writings of the [BC] ancient Greeks." See remarks in **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint** and p 90 of *Hazardous Materials*.*

Under **Quote 188**, Dr DiVietro refers to Koine Greek as being in constant use until the 15th century. Under **Quote(s) 179**, he limits its period of dominance to 300 years. See the following extracts from **Quote(s) 179**.

*Concerning Dr DiVietro's comment that the verses that Dr Mrs Riplinger cites to prove the inspiration of translation are irrelevant based on the dominance of Greek in the first century, the extensive citations from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** show that it is Dr DiVietro's notions about the efficacy of 'the Greek' with respect to propagating **"the gospel of Christ"** Romans 1:16 and preserving **"the scripture of truth"** Daniel 10:21 that is irrelevant.*

The verses that Dr Mrs Riplinger cites on inspiration are as follows.

"For the LORD is good; his mercy is everlasting; and his truth endureth to all generations" Psalm 100:5.

Koine Greek has not endured. Bro. Brent Logan, who is serving the Lord in Thessaloniki, Greece, has said that Koine Greek is useless even in Greece. No-one understands it.

“He hath remembered his covenant for ever, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations” Psalm 105:8.

Dr DiVietro gives a time span under **Quote(s) 179** for the dominance of Koine Greek as 300 years. That is a lot less than **“a thousand generations.”**

“Thy word is true from the beginning: and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth for ever” Psalm 119:160.

Again, Koine Greek has not endured. Even Dr DiVietro is forced to admit that Koine Greek is a dead language, *Cleaning-Up* pp 7, 16. See **Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’**. As indicated, none of Dr DiVietro’s attempts at resuscitation of Koine Greek have worked anywhere, not even in Greece.

“The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever” Isaiah 40:8.

The secular source Wikipedia states that Koine Greek lasted from about 330 B.C. to 330 A.D., when it was replaced by Medieval Greek, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Koine_Greek, twice as long as the time span that Dr DiVietro mentions. However, 660 years is a long way short of **“for ever.”**

“For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled” Matthew 5:18.

Koine Greek has already passed from the scene. Except as a means of providing witnesses for manuscript evidence, see the works by J. A. Moorman e.g. *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version, A Closer Look!*, Koine Greek is an irrelevance (like Dr DiVietro’s book *Cleaning-Up*, although as this work shows, it must be answered **“Lest mine enemy say, I have prevailed against him; and those that trouble me rejoice when I am moved”** Psalm 13:4).

Dr DiVietro’s reference to his Greek New Testament prompts a number of questions that he fails to answer.

What is this Greek New Testament and where may it be obtained?

Does Dr DiVietro consider that the *imprimatur* of the Greek Church is necessary and sufficient for a Greek New Testament to be **“the words of God”** perfect, infallible, authoritative and inspired?

If so, why, with chapter and verse, especially in view of the importance of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9?

If not, why bother mentioning this Greek text in the first place?

How does Dr DiVietro reconcile his description of this Greek New Testament as **“the words of God”** with his earlier insistence that no extant Greek or Hebrew published or written source is authoritative and infallible?

See *Cleaning-Up* pp 21, 87-88, 135, where Dr DiVietro says on p 135 that none of his books is inerrant, one of which must be his Greek New Testament with its Greek Church *imprimatur* and pp 187, 247, 250.

Alternatively, is Dr DiVietro again trying to imply the existence of an unscriptural two-tier word of God, one inspired, one not inspired? See **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** and **Quote 176**.

The unresolved issues and the generally hollow i.e. unsubstantiated nature of Dr DiVietro's book above suggest to this author an epitaph for it from Isaiah 34:11.

“...and he shall stretch out upon it the line of confusion, and the stones of emptiness”

Quote(s) 189, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1106-1107

1. *“Its current craze, beginning with the German higher critics, later adopted by Unitarians, and promulgated recently by liberals, who see it as an avenue to sweep away the Holy Bible...”*
2. *“The use of Greek MSS as a medium of comparison slightly before and past the 16th century when Greek manuscripts were carried into Europe by the Greeks as they fled from the Turks...Their usage at this time simply brought attention to a Greek text which affirmed what European vernacular Bibles already said. It was a confirming witness, not a textual revolution of discovering lost readings. The pre-and post-Reformation era's new access to Greek or Hebrew editions only verified **already existing readings** the French Geneva, the Italian Diodati, the Spanish Reina-Valera, and the German Luther. Of the Gothic Scrivener concedes “Its dialect is marvelously akin to that of modern Germany.””*



Dr DiVietro only comments on the last part of **Quote(s) 189** i.e. the statement *“Of the Gothic Scrivener concedes “Its dialect is marvellously akin to that of modern Germany.””* He inserts a table for comparison between the Gothic, Luther's German and AV1611 texts for Matthew 6:9-13, though Dr DiVietro fails to oblige the reader with that reference. Dr DiVietro uses this table to illustrate the differences in appearance between the three texts and mockingly asks if they appear to be almost identical. See **Quote 176**. He then descends further into mockery by ridiculing Dr Mrs Riplinger's use of charts i.e. tables that according to Dr DiVietro she doesn't use when the information they contain doesn't match what Dr DiVietro refers to as her theories.

Dr DiVietro should of course be directing any criticism against Scrivener, not Dr Mrs Riplinger, who is only quoting Dr DiVietro's co-editor, see **Quote 108**, though perhaps that is why Dr DiVietro refrains from so doing.

Dr DiVietro has of course falsely accused Dr Mrs Riplinger yet again. See **Quote(s) 185**. Dr Mrs Riplinger does not say in her comparison of Bibles in different languages that the Gothic, Luther's German and AV1611 texts look almost identical. See this extract from **Challenge #7, Point-Counter-point** and **Quotes 125, 138, 162**.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states, In Awe of Thy Word, p 628 that “The following charts document the faithful preservation of the word of God. It was given to the Goths in the book of Acts and “endureth to all generations” (Ps. 100:5). Its sounds and words are often still evident in the King James Bible...”

*Dr Mrs Riplinger then lists the following 37 verses to show this preservation; Ephesians 3:14, 1 Corinthians 16:22, Romans 16:24, 1 Timothy 2:7, Philippians 4:13, Romans 14:10-12, 1 Corinthians 5:4, 2 Thessalonians 1:12, 1 Corinthians 9:1, 2 Thessalonians 1:8, Galatians 4:7, 1 Thessalonians 3:13, 1 Corinthians 5:5, Matthew 8:29, 1 Corinthians 15:47, 2 Corinthians 4:10, 2 Timothy 4:1, Galatians 6:17, Luke 2:33, Matthew 5:22, Romans 9:28, 1 Corinthians 11:24, Colossians 2:11, 1 Corinthians 5:7b, Ephesians 2:1, Matthew 5:44, Ephesians 4:6, Colossians 3:22, 2 Corinthians 10:4, Colossians 2:18, 23, Romans 8:1, Ephesians 5:5, Luke 16:23, Colossians 3:6. She concludes, In Awe of Thy Word p 648, her emphases, “The Gothic language not only often **sounded** like English, sometimes it even **looked** just like it, because it used Roman letters, as well as Greek and Runic. These words ‘Name’*

and 'AMEN,'   were taken directly from the Lord's Prayer in an ancient Gothic manuscript."

By his latest false accusation against Sister Riplinger, Dr DiVietro is doing exactly what he accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of under **Quote(s) 154, 170**, with respect to distortion of quotes.

Dr DiVietro should reflect carefully on Romans 2:1.

"Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things."

Quote 190, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1108

"A large percentage of the translations discussed in these books were made in the centuries immediately following the publication of the 1611 Authorized Version (King James Bible) and marked by the British missionary and colonization movement...it becomes quite clear that it is not an exaggeration to say that the majority of individual translation projects since the first century have been taken up initially with a vernacular Bible, not a Greek text."

Dr DiVietro states that missionaries will often translate from a Bible in their own language if they are not competent to translate from Greek and Hebrew. He says that is how the English Bible originated, from Wycliffe's translation of Jerome's Latin Vulgate.

Dr DiVietro then refers to the 16th century English translations of Tyndale, Coverdale etc. and insists that they translated from Greek and Hebrew and that it is wrong to say that Tyndale, for example, only updated the language of earlier English Bibles.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments on **Quote 190** with the allusion to the vernacular Bibles that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists on pp 1008-1012 (sic*) of *Hazardous Materials* that Dr DiVietro says, in a somewhat garbled fashion, is an attempt by Dr Mrs Riplinger to prove what he terms her doctrine of inspiration by translation**. Dr DiVietro insists that one flaw in any of these translations would completely debunk what he then terms Dr Mrs Riplinger's theory of inspiration by translation.

*The correct page references are 1108-1111.

The correct term is translation by inspiration of God, as an improvement on 'the originals.' See **Quote 163 with respect to Dr Gipp's analysis of 2 Samuel 3:10, Colossians 1:13, Hebrews 11:5.

It should be noted first that Dr DiVietro fails to provide any examples of Bibles on the mission field that have been translated from Greek and Hebrew. He should do so if he wishes to comment responsibly on the competence of missionary Bible translators. Note this extract from **Quote 176**.

Dr DiVietro's comments against the use of the 1611 Holy Bible for translation purposes on the mission field should be perceived as a denial of 1 Corinthians 2:10-13, with respect to the ability of the Spirit of God to teach the child of God to transfer His words into another language and in turn a further denial on Dr DiVietro's part of the priesthood of all believers 1 Peter 2:5, 9 and wilful ignorance of the 1611 Holy Bible's built-in dictionary.

See **Quote(s) 175** and **Setting Up the 'Clean-up', Challenges #1, #2, #3, Points-Counterpoints, Quotes 9, 14, 39, 50, 61, 62, 67, 71, 85, 87.**

Note that in his History of the New Testament Church Volume 1 p 390, Dr Ruckman states that the 1611 Holy Bible has been translated into over 800 languages. If Dr DiVietro is so concerned about difficulties of translation from the AV1611, why did he not document any

difficulties arising from translation into that multitude of non-English languages? He fails to do so.

Dr Ruckman notes further that the AV1611 has been responsible for the salvation of well over 150,000,000 souls, an estimated one thousand times more than 'the originals' achieved.

Dr DiVietro is clearly too mean-spirited to comment on that evident testimony to God's special approval of the 1611 Holy Bible down through the centuries, over and above 'the originals.'

Dr DiVietro is quite wrong to say that the English Bible originated with Wycliffe. See *In Awe of Thy Word*, Chapter 21, *English Bibles Before Wycliffe* and this statement from p 745, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphases.

"The Lord Chancellor of England in the early 1500s "says he could show English Bibles earlier than Wycliffe's." He writes:

"The hole bible was long before Wycliffe's days by virtuous and well learned men, translated into the English tong; and by good and godly people with devotion, and soberness, well and reverently red"... "as for olde translacions, before Wycliffe's time, they remain lawful and be in some folks hands. Myself have seen, and can show you. Bybles fair and olde, in Englyshe, which haue been known and seen by the Byshoppe of the Diocese, and left in laymanes hands and womenes..." (taken in part from Dyalogues, 1530, p. 138, as cited in Dore, 2nd edition, pp. 1, 2)."

See also *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 774-778, 788-791 *Myth 1 Wycliffe Wrote the First English Scriptures* and *Myth 3 Wycliffe Used a Corrupt Latin Vulgate*, in answer to Dr DiVietro's statement under **Quote 190** to that effect. Tables or charts of relevant scriptures showing that Wycliffe's Bible repeatedly matches the Bibles of the 16th century English Protestant Reformation and the 1611 Holy Bible and not the Catholic i.e. Jerome's Vulgate-based bibles will be found in Chapter 20 of *In Awe of Thy Word*.

Note that on pp 307-309 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro's colleague, Dr David Cloud, levels criticisms at *In Awe of Thy Word* and supports, with several scriptures, the notion that Wycliffe's Bible came from Jerome's Vulgate. Dr Cloud's criticisms will be addressed at the conclusion of the responses to Dr DiVietro's quotes and comments.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's comment that it is wrong to say that Tyndale, for example, only updated the language of earlier English Bibles, see this extract from **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**

Dr DiVietro then accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of making William Tyndale a liar because she says that Tyndale did not translate his New Testament but only purified an existing English Bible. Dr DiVietro gives no reference for this supposed claim by Dr Mrs Riplinger (after accusing her of omitting important bibliographical details) and his accusation is entirely false. Dr Mrs Riplinger [In Awe of Thy Word pp 805, 846-847, 890, 896, 902] cites Tyndale as stating "'The Newe Testament dylygently corrected and compared with the Greke by Willyam Tindale'" and describes him as a translator, not merely an editor.

*What Dr DiVietro missed in his superficial reading of Dr Mrs Riplinger's books is that she cites Tyndale as warning against an over-emphasis on Hebrew and Greek and as exhorting that the true meaning of scripture can be found from the English Bible's built-in dictionary. This is the emphasis of that part of *In Awe of Thy Word* on Tyndale, which Dr DiVietro overlooked in his persecuting zeal against Dr Mrs Riplinger, *Philippians 3:6*.*

Dr DiVietro (and Dr Waite before him) also overlooked Dr Mrs Riplinger's comments on the Bible translators of the Reformation who "described their vernacular translations as "scripture," whose author was God." She states that "Martyr and Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, wrote in his Prologue to the Great Bible that it was "given" by the "holy spirit.""

Contrary to the opinions of the DBS Executive Committee therefore, Cranmer (martyred), Tyndale (martyred), Coverdale, Rogers (martyred) and the other Bible translators of the English Reformation, plus Wycliffe before them [In Awe of Thy Word pp 757-759] believed that they had in their hands "**all scripture...given by inspiration of God**" in English. In contrast to the apostates described in Romans 1:18, they believed they held the truth in righteousness. This inspired English scripture reached its final purified stage with the Holy Bible of 1611, Psalm 12:6, 7, thereby superseding in both inspiration and authority the earlier English versions. See also Hazardous Materials, pp 1165-1167. How did Dr DiVietro miss this material, apart from a vicious prejudice against the Holy Bible and its believers?

It is therefore easy to see who the liars are in this context. They are not William Tyndale or Dr Mrs Riplinger.

See also comments under **Setting Up the 'Clean-Up'** and Dr Mrs Riplinger's remarks on purification of the scriptures in **Preface and Introduction**.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's continuing disavowal of translations as "**all scripture**" that "**is given by inspiration of God**" see the extensive remarks under **Quote 181** and note this extract.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's insistence that inspired scriptures cannot, by definition, be translations of scripture and vice versa, note the following scriptures. See related remarks under **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint**.

"And the king spake unto Ashpenaz the master of his eunuchs, that he should bring certain of the children of Israel, and of the king's seed, and of the princes; Children in whom was no blemish, but well favoured, and skilful in all wisdom, and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science, and such as had ability in them to stand in the king's palace, and whom they might teach the learning and the tongue of the Chaldeans" Daniel 1:3-4.

"In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaister of the wall of the king's palace: and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote." Daniel 5:5.

"Then came in all the king's wise men: but they could not read the writing, nor make known to the king the interpretation thereof" Daniel 5:8.

"Then was Daniel brought in before the king. And the king spake and said unto Daniel, Art thou that Daniel, which art of the children of the captivity of Judah, whom the king my father brought out of Jewry? I have even heard of thee, that the spirit of the gods is in thee, and that light and understanding and excellent wisdom is found in thee. And now the wise men, the astrologers, have been brought in before me, that they should read this writing, and make known unto me the interpretation thereof: but they could not shew the interpretation of the thing" Daniel 5:13-15.

"Then was the part of the hand sent from him; and this writing was written. And this is the writing that was written, MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN. This is the interpretation of the thing: MENE; God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it. TEKEL; Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting. PERES; Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians" Daniel 5:24-28.

These verses show that Daniel and his friends had to learn a new language, **“the tongue of the Chaldeans.”** The writing appeared on the wall at the king’s feast but no-one, not even **“the king’s wise men”** could either read it or interpret i.e. translate it. Daniel was summoned. He read the writing at the king’s spoken request and interpreted i.e. translated it.

The significance of the above scriptures is first that the king and all his revellers at the feast, together **“all the king’s wise men”** spoke **“the tongue of the Chaldeans”** that Daniel had learned as a youth. The writing, however, was in Hebrew but Daniel and the king conversed in Chaldean, into which Daniel interpreted i.e. translated the Hebrew words. Chapter 5 of Daniel and indeed Daniel 2:4-7:28 is first written in Aramaic aka Syriac, which is similar to Chaldean, one of two such portions in the Old Testament, the other being Ezra 4:8-6:18. See *The Book of Daniel* by Clarence Larkin p 15 and the Ruckman Reference Bible pp 681, 1136, 1147.

Daniel 5 therefore consists of a spoken original in Aramaic/Chaldean/Syriac that is then transcribed as a written original, with a written original Hebrew insertion (Daniel 5:24-28) that is no doubt inspired in Hebrew because it is **“written with the finger of God”** Exodus 31:18 but which then becomes an inspired translation in Aramaic/Chaldean/Syriac.

Daniel 5:24-28 therefore contradicts Dr DiVietro’s notion that translations of scripture cannot be **“given by inspiration of God.”**

See related remarks under **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**, particularly with respect to Esther 1:20, 22, 3:14, 8:13, Daniel 4:1, 6:25, John 19:19, 20, Acts 14:11, 21:40, Acts 2:16-21/Joel 2:28-32, Acts 2:25-28/Psalm 16:8-11, Acts 3:22-23/Deuteronomy 18:15, 19, Acts 8:32-33/Isaiah 53:7-8 and Revelation 5:13, 14:6-7, these last two passages being examples of future spoken ‘originals’ not in Koine Greek.

Dr Gipp’s analysis of inspired translations samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=29.htm Can a translation be inspired? should also be consulted.

Dr Gipp’s work was noted in this author’s earlier work **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society** pp 21ff.

See also 2 Kings 18:26, Isaiah 36:11.

“Then said Eliakim the son of Hilkiyah, and Shebna, and Joah, unto Rabshakeh, Speak, I pray thee, to thy servants in the Syrian language; for we understand it: and talk not with us in the Jews’ language in the ears of the people that are on the wall.”

“Then said Eliakim and Shebna and Joah unto Rabshakeh, Speak, I pray thee, unto thy servants in the Syrian language; for we understand it: and speak not to us in the Jews’ language, in the ears of the people that are on the wall.”

2 Kings 18:26, Isaiah 36:11 (which exhibits some slight changes compared with ‘the original’) was undoubtedly a spoken original **“in the Syrian language”** not **“in the Jews’ language.”** It subsequently became an inspired translation **“in the Jews’ language”** i.e. Hebrew. The passage in 2 Kings 18:26, Isaiah 36:11 is therefore another example of what Dr DiVietro thinks is impossible i.e. an inspired translation.

The same may be said for Acts 21:40-22:21 which is a spoken inspired Hebrew original that becomes an inspired translation in Greek or whatever languages were used for the first transcripts of Paul’s speech – and all subsequent translations, including King James English. See related remarks in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.

Note also this extract from **Quote 135** with respect to inspiration and translation of the scriptures.

Dr Mrs Riplinger states rightly in *In Awe of Thy Word* p 544, her emphases:

“The Bible appears in many forms – such as Hebrew, Hungarian, English and Polish. The “form” of the Word seemed different at various times, yet it was still Jesus (e.g. the “fiery furnace” (Dan. 3:35), the “babe wrapped in swaddling clothes” (Luke 2:12), when “She supposing him to be the gardener” (John 20:15), and when “his eyes were as a flame of fire” (Rev. 1:14)). When the Word “appeared in another form,” as Jesus did, “neither believed they them” (Mark 16:12, 13). Likewise, some still dig for words in haunted Greek graveyards.”

Like Dr DiVietro.

Concerning the list of Bibles on pp 1108-1111 of *Hazardous Materials* of which Dr DiVietro says a single flaw in any of them completely debunks inspiration by translation, Dr DiVietro has yet to produce either a perfect, flawless, inspired Greek and Hebrew copy of the original scriptures between two covers, see **Quote 187**, or a single example of a flaw in any of the Bibles listed on pp 1108-1111 of *Hazardous Materials*.

Dr DiVietro has neglected to inform his readers that the list came from a source text that Dr Mrs Riplinger mentions on p 1107 of *Hazardous Materials*. The text is as follows.

The Bible of Every Land: A History of the Sacred Scriptures in Every Language and Dialect (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 2nd edition, 1860), published from the records of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

It is up to Dr DiVietro to check those records for a list of flaws in those translations and produce them if he wishes to disprove inspiration of translations according to his comments under **Quote 190**.

Thus far, he has failed to do so.

Quote 191, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1112

*“It was originally the standard practice of Bible Societies to translate only from vernacular Holy Bibles. The original American Bible Society, founded in the early 1800s, insisted that all translations be made directly from the King James Bible. Use of lexicons or a Greek or Hebrew text was forbidden. The 1881 Baptist Encyclopedia says, **“The English translation had been made the standard to which all other translations should conform...” not “the Greek and Hebrew texts.”** (my bolding, KD)”*

Dr DiVietro comments only on the last part of **Quote 191** that he has placed in bold. He accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of falsifying the quote, partly by insertion of the word “not” that is not part of the encyclopedia’s article. Dr DiVietro insists that unless the entire article is presented in order to show the true intent of the editor, the quote as given by Dr Mrs Riplinger should be ignored.

Dr DiVietro has made another false accusation against Sister Riplinger and is misleading his readers. See **Quote(s) 189**. Dr Mrs Riplinger gives the specific reference for the quote from the Baptist Encyclopedia that Dr DiVietro omitted from the end of **Quote 191**. It is *William Cathcart, Philadelphia, Louis H. Everts, vol. 1, 1881, p. 98*.

Dr DiVietro could easily have checked the reference. Even if it wasn’t in his extensive library, *Cleaning-Up* p 135, or readily available via the no doubt extensive resources of the DBS Executive Committee, both possibilities being perceived by this author as extremely remote, Dr DiVietro could easily have obtained the volumes of the encyclopedia with a modest outlay of \$75 plus p & p.

See www.baptisttop1000.com/Baptist_Encyclopedia.html *Baptist Encyclopedia* by William Cathcart, Lifeline Philippines.

The encyclopedia is now available online, which is how this author accessed it, and may well have been so even when Dr DiVietro was writing *Cleaning-Up*.

See archive.org/details/baptistencyclope01cathuoft.

In turn, see archive.org/stream/baptistencyclope01cathuoft#page/n105/mode/2up.

The full quote is as follows, this author's emphases. It can be read from the graphic on the next page.

*"The English translation [i.e. the AV1611] had been made the standard to which all other translations should conform and **not** the inspired originals, and the founders of the Union felt compelled by consistency to demand that on the principle of fidelity translations in all languages should be conformed to **the Hebrew and Greek texts.**"*

Dr Mrs Riplinger has clearly given a free quote from the encyclopedia that is correct, *including* the word "*not*" to which Dr DiVietro objects. The context of the quote is the basis for translation adopted and demanded by The American Bible Union, formed in 1850 as a break-away group from The American and Foreign Bible Society. The ABU's demands were at odds with the original American Bible Society's adherence to the King James Bible as the basis for missionary translations.

By inspection, the article goes on to say, this author's emphases, that The American Bible Union "*selected ripe scholars from nine different Christian denominations in Europe and America to whom it committed **the revision of the English Bible.** This was the first organized attempt ever made to apply **the accumulated fruits of Biblical scholarship since 1611,** to a revision of the English Bible for the benefit of the unlearned reader and it met with the most determined resistance. But in an unswerving adherence to a divine principle the attempt was pushed, believing that both ignorance and prejudice must yield at last to **the demands of true scholarship.**"*

Bibb, Rev. Martin, was born in Amherst Co., Va., Aug. 19, 1824, and in 1829 his father, with his family, located at what is now Sewell Depot, on the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad, in West Virginia. He united with the church in his twentieth year, and very soon began to speak in prayer-meetings and to superintend a Sunday-school; was licensed to preach in 1849. Acted as colporteur of the American Tract Society until 1852, when he was ordained and took charge of churches. He was pastor of churches in Fayette, Nicholas, and Kanawha Counties until 1861, when he removed to Giles Co., Va. In 1865 he returned to his home and resumed his work with his churches, but after a brief period moved to Monroe County, remaining five years. He now resides in Hinton, on the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad, and devotes all his time to the Hinton church. He has acted

cognates had been rendered by words signifying "immerse," "immersion," etc. The English translation had been made the standard to which all other translations should conform and not the inspired originals, and the founders of the Union felt compelled by consistency to demand that on the principle of fidelity translations in all languages should be conformed to the Hebrew and Greek texts. Hence the constitution of the Union defines its purpose thus: "To procure and circulate the most faithful versions of the Sacred Scriptures in all languages throughout the world." Under this broad provision it selected ripe scholars from nine different Christian denominations in Europe and America, to whom it committed the revision of the English Bible. This was the first organized attempt ever made to apply the accumulated fruits of Biblical scholarship, since 1611, to a revision



BETHEL COLLEGE, RUSSELLVILLE, KY.

as clerk of Associations for about twenty years, and has frequently written for the press. During his ministry he has baptized about 1000 persons and has preached a large number of sermons. Many of his positions have required hard work and self-denial, and he has had gracious evidences of the divine blessing.

Bible Union, The American, was formed in New York, June 10, 1850, by a number of individuals, chiefly Baptists, who had co-operated with the American and Foreign Bible Society, until it decided that it was not its duty to revise the common English Bible, nor to procure such a revision from others; and so would confine its circulation in that tongue to that version. The Baptists of America had withdrawn from the American Bible Society because it refused aid to the Bengalee and Burmese translations, made by Baptist missionaries, in which the Greek term *βαπτίζω* and its

of the English Bible for the benefit of the unlearned reader, and it met with the most determined resistance. But in an unswerving adherence to a divine principle the attempt was pushed, believing that both ignorance and prejudice must yield at last to the demands of true scholarship. No expense was spared to secure the oldest translations of the Bible, copies of the ancient manuscripts, and other aids for making the revisions and translations as perfect as possible. Nor were the scholars employed restricted as to time and free conference. The New Testament passed through three thorough revisions, the first covering a period of eight years, the second four, and the third more than two.

The following are the rules for the government of the scholars employed by the Union in revising the English New Testament, namely:

"The received Greek text, critically edited, with known errors corrected, must be followed.

Figure 15 *Baptist Encyclopedia* by William Cathcart, Lifeline Philippines

With respect to the outcome of applying “*the accumulated fruits of Biblical scholarship since 1611*” and “*the demands of true scholarship*” see *The Christian’s Handbook of Biblical Scholarship* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman and *New Age Versions, The Men & The Manuscripts*.

It all began with conformity “*to the Hebrew and Greek texts.*”

Quote 192, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1112

“*Dr Gutjahr of Stanford University reiterates that, “This emphasis on the common English version (the King James Version) as the root translation from which translators had to work” brought about a split and the formation of the liberal American and Foreign Bible Society, who wanted to use so-called “originals” of Greek and Hebrew...Making all translations from the KJB was the foundational conviction of the American Bible Society. Their refusal to allow the use of ‘Greek’ came to a head in their ruling related to Adoniram Judson’s translation, which they refused to print because it was not translated directly from the KJB but from Greek.*”

Dr DiVietro descends into mockery again by referring to *Hazardous Materials* as a “*playbook.*” See **Quote(s) 189**. He states that he can argue from silence and says in effect that since Dr Mrs Riplinger did not document her statement in **Quote 192**, it cannot be true but is merely Dr Mrs Riplinger’s interpretation of the facts, not the facts themselves.

Dr DiVietro has falsely accused Dr Mrs Riplinger yet again. See **Quote 191**.

Dr DiVietro’s use of an inconspicuous ellipsis part way through **Quote 192** should be noted. See **Quotes 39, 41, 43, 62, 65, 71, 79, 114, 141, 142**.

This is what Dr DiVietro omitted from **Quote 192** via the ellipsis.

(See the *First Annual Report of the American and Foreign Bible Society, 1838, p. 52*). *Gutjahr noted that “The American Bible Society was tying its translators to an English translation of the scriptures...” (An American Bible, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999, p. 106)...*

“*Gutjahr’s chapter entitled, “Purity,” details other methods used by liberals to alter the purity of the printed Holy Bible, e.g. Unitarians, pp. 89, 95, 96, 98, 99, 100; infant baptizers, p. 100; Campbellites pp. 101-102 (i.e. baptismal regeneration); Cone, a liberal Baptist who wanted to retranslate the entire English Bible; and New Age Parliament of World Religions participant, ASV Chairman, and RV committee member, Philip Schaff, p. 108.)*

Dr Mrs Riplinger has again given specific page references to the works that she is quoting from that, again, see **Quote 191**, Dr DiVietro could easily have checked, certainly with respect to Dr Gutjahr’s book, a copy of which Dr DiVietro could easily have availed himself.

See www.amazon.com/An-American-Bible-History-1777-1880/dp/0804743398 *An American Bible: A History of the Good Book in the United States, 1777-1880* [Paperback].

It is unclear from Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote 192** precisely which of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statements he is alluding to. However, Dr Gutjahr’s book is available online. See:

www.certified-easy.com/aa.php?isbn=ISBN:0804743398&name=An American Bible, A History of the Good Book in the United States, 1777-1880.

This site does not include the entire text of Dr Gutjahr’s book but it does include p 106, which contains the statement in **Quote 192** that Dr DiVietro may be denying.

The Google Books site does appear to contain the full text of Dr Gutjahr’s book.

Dr DiVietro could easily have accessed the above sites, or searched for them. Even if the sites were not available before the publication of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro could quite simply have inserted transcripts from them in Dr Waite's newsletter if they supported his comments under *Quote 192*.

Clearly they don't.

The statement from p 106 of Dr Gutjahr's book about Adoniram Judson is as follows. Note that the controversy over translation of the word *baptizo* is mentioned, as was noted in Cathcart's Baptist encyclopedia. See *Quote 191*.

P U R I T Y

6 Those who succeeded him in the baptism controversy would not show the same deference toward the King James Version. They would also not share Campbell's commitment to unity, but instead moved bible translation toward sectarianism through translations with heavy theological biases. In this tradition, one finds not only the Unitarians, but the Adventists with Nathan Whiting's New Testament of 1849 and the Mormons with Joseph Smith Jr.'s translation, which was finally published in 1867. It was midcentury Baptists, however, who created the most widely disseminated sectarian translations of the nineteenth century. The Baptist interest in retranslating the English Bible had its roots in Adoniram Judson's 1834 conflict with the American Bible Society, a controversy once again centered on issues of original meaning.

Judson, a Baptist missionary in Rangoon, Burma, had submitted his translation of the Bible into the Burmese language for publication by the American Bible Society. He had worked for nearly twenty years on his translation and fully expected the American Bible Society to eagerly publish his work. Judson's request for publication was not unique.⁸⁵ The Society had issued dozens of foreign language translations prior to Judson's and was constantly looking to publish and distribute foreign language versions whenever such translations became available.

What made Judson's translation different from the other bible versions the Society had published was his decision to render the word βαπτίζω as *immerse* in his translation. This choice, and his refusal to change it, caused the American Bible Society not only to refuse publication of his life's work, but also to pass a resolution against any such "sectarian" version of the Scriptures. It maintained that it would not publish or distribute any bibles that did not "conform in the principle of their translation, to the common English version."⁸⁶

This emphasis on the common English version (the King James Version) as the root translation from which translators had to work raised the issue of this version's accuracy to another level. The American Bible Society was tying its translators to an English translation of the Scriptures that was increasingly coming under scholarly attack.

Not translating βαπτίζω was just one of the faults that critics found with the American Bible Society's English translation. The Baptists' larger concern in pushing for their translation of βαπτίζω as *immersion* was founded upon a concern that the original text and its original meaning be given precedence over the fallible human translations of the past.⁸⁷ The Baptists maintained that the American Bible Society was encouraging the production and distribution of error-filled texts in ignoring the primacy of the originals.

In not adopting an immersion translation, the American Bible Soci-

Figure 16 *An American Bible: A History of the Good Book in the United States, 1777-1880*

By inspection, Dr Mrs Riplinger's statements in *Quote 192* about the American Bible Society and Adoniram Judson are seriously accurate. *Hazardous Materials* is not a "play-book" by any stretch of the imagination.

Cleaning-Up, however, could well be described as a non-book.

Note the statement in Dr Gutjahr's book that The American Bible Society had issued dozens of foreign language translations from the King James Bible before Adoniram Judson ap-

proached the society with his translation in 1834. This statement is important with respect to the next quote, *Quote 193*.

Quote 193, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1113

“England’s Prime Minister Winston Churchill wrote the four volume classic, The History of the English-Speaking Peoples. In it he boasts that the King James Bible has been translated into 760 languages, which is no doubt more than have ever been translated from the Greek text.”

Dr DiVietro comments only that the King James Bible reproduces its underlying Greek and Hebrew texts and therefore it is a reliable source for secondary translations, i.e. translations based on its English text. He then insists that any such secondary translation can only be completely reliable with respect to preservation of the inspired words of God if it is carefully checked against the actual words that God spoke out.

Dr DiVietro’s comments under *Quote 193* are sheer supposition without a shred of scriptural support, or any other support, apart from the DBS Executive Committee’s *“private interpretation”* 2 Peter 1:20 of the Greek word *theopneustos*, *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-iv, 2-3, that inspiration of the New Testament Books was ‘original-Koine Greek-only.’ See *Quotes 187, 188*.

Dr DiVietro again fails to inform the reader where the actual words that God spoke out may be found as a single, perfect, inspired original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek volume between two covers. See *Quote 190*. His on-going obsession with ‘originals-onlyism’ is yet another violation of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See *Quote 188*.

For the complete overview of Dr DiVietro’s fixation with ‘originals-onlyism,’ see again *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi, 2-3, 7, 17, 18, 88, 91, 93, 94, 105-109, 149, 187, 249-250, 255-257, 264, 266, 268, 272, 273, 274, 276-277.

In answer yet again to Dr DiVietro’s fixated fetish with ‘originals-onlyism,’ see these extracts from *Quotes 180, 181*.

Quote 180 extract:

Dr Mrs Riplinger [in In Awe of Thy Word pp 758] has compiled further evidence in support of inspired New and Old Testament portions of the scriptures in languages other than Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek, her emphases. These portions included translations of the Old Testament into Old Latin.

*“Wycliffe said that the scripture is given by the Holy Ghost in all languages. To those who charge that inspiration is lost with translation [Drs DiVietro, Waite, Williams, Cleaning-Up, p 18], Wycliffe says, “...such a charge is a condemnation of the **Holy Ghost**, who first gave the **Scriptures** in tongues to the Apostles of Christ, to speak that word in all languages that were ordained under heaven”...*

Dr Mrs Riplinger states further, her emphases, in In Awe of Thy Word pp 757-758:

*“Wycliffe said, “The clergy cry aloud that is heresy to speak of the Holy **Scriptures in English** [as does the DBS Executive Committee], and so they would condemn the **Holy Ghost**, who gave tongues to the Apostles of Christ to speak the word of God in all languages under heaven” (John Wycliffe, *Speculum Secularium, Opera Mimora*, London: Wycliffe Society, John Loserth, editor, 1913, p. 74, as cited in Bill Bradley, *Purified Seven Times*, Clayburg, PA: Revival Fires Publishing, 1998, p. 11)...*

“Even today many say it is “erroneous and heretical” to believe our English Bible is “scripture” and therefore that it is still the very inspired words of God, not the words of men

(quotes on file). Addressing the lack of faith of those who say [the DBS Executive Committee], “God did not do it – men did it,” Wycliffe replies,

““You say it is heresy to speak of the Holy **Scriptures in English**. You call me a heretic because I have translated the Bible into the common tongue of the people. Do you know who you **blaspheme** [the DBS Executive Committee doesn’t care]? Did not the Holy Ghost give the word of God at first in the **mother-tongue of the nations** to whom it was addressed? Why do you speak against the Holy Ghost [because the DBS Executive Committee is “**the messenger of Satan**” 2 Corinthians 12:7 and aspires as he declares in Isaiah 14:14 that “**I will be like the most High**”]?” (as cited in David Guy Fountain, *John Wycliffe: The Dawn of the Reformation*, Southampton: Mayflower Christian Books, 1984, pp. 45-47).”

Quote 181 extract:

Dr Mrs Riplinger states further on p 851 of *In Awe of Thy Word*, her emphases:

“The scriptures were “given” in “divers languages”; whether each language group has **cared enough** about them to keep pure copies **in print** is another question. Yet God preserves the words on bookshelves, just as he did for the Hebrews who exclaimed, “I have found the book...” (2 Kings 22:8). Many Englishmen have offered to give their lives for the English Bible. When Queen Mary sent murderous inquisitors to the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, a large group responded with a letter. It stated that they would die for the treasured English Bible, and –

““...to suffer all manner of persecution, and to lose their lives in the defense of God’s word...[They believed the] **Holy Ghost** came upon the apostles in fiery tongues, so that they **spake the tongues of all nations under heaven**” (Foxe, vol. 8, pp. 123, 125).”

Note this extract from **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

Contrary to the opinions of the DBS Executive Committee therefore, Cranmer (martyred), Tyndale (martyred), Coverdale, Rogers (martyred) and the other Bible translators of the English Reformation, plus Wycliffe before them [*In Awe of Thy Word* pp 757, 759], believed that they had in their hands “**all scripture...given by inspiration of God**” in English. In contrast to the apostates described in Romans 1:18, they believed they held the truth in righteousness. This inspired English scripture reached its final purified stage with the Holy Bible of 1611, Psalm 12:6, 7, thereby superseding in both inspiration and authority the earlier English versions. See also *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1165-1167. How did Dr DiVietro miss this material, apart from a vicious prejudice against the Holy Bible and its believers?...

See also this author’s earlier work [*Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society* pp 57ff] with respect to **Testimonies to the Inspiration of the AV1611** and especially Bishop Ryle’s remarks on the English Reformers of the 18th century, emphases are the author’s and note the unequivocal stance on the inspiration of the 1611 English Holy Bible as the Book of God, this author’s under-lining.

““The spiritual reformers of the last century taught constantly **the sufficiency and supremacy of Holy Scripture**. The Bible, whole and un mutilated, was their sole rule of faith and practice. They accepted all its statements without question or dispute. They knew nothing of any part of Scripture being uninspired. They never allowed that man has any “verifying faculty” within him, by which Scripture statements may be weighed, rejected or received. They never flinched from asserting that there can be no error in the Word of God; and that when we cannot understand or reconcile some part of its contents, the fault is in the interpreter and not in the text. In all their preaching they were eminently men of one book. To that book they

were content to pin their faith, and by it to stand or fall. This was one grand characteristic of their preaching. They honoured, they loved, they revered the Bible.””

Belief in the inspiration of the 1611 English Holy Bible is certainly not recent. Neither, as this author’s earlier work shows, is it limited to a supposed small minority of contemporary individuals such as Dr Mrs Riplinger (and this author), who believe that the 1611 English Holy Bible is indeed **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God.”**

““In all these instances the Bible means the translation authorised by King James the First...to this day the common human Britisher or citizen of the United States of North America accepts and worships it as a single book by a single author, the book being the Book of Books and the author being God” – George Bernard Shaw”

The above citations are the testimonies of Reformers, faithful Bible translators, willing martyrs, some of whom e.g. Tyndale, Rogers, Cranmer, became actual martyrs, revivalists and genuinely well-informed historians and researchers.

They are all at odds with Dr DiVietro’s insistence upon the superiority of ‘the Greek’ in ‘the original.’

They are also all at odds with Dr DiVietro’s fixated fetish with ‘originals-onlyism.’ Note further these extracts from **Quotes 153, 187.**

Quote 153 extract:

Concerning the inspiration of versions, including early versions of scripture, Dr LaMore’s site is gracembc.org/home.html from which the link to his church’s bookstore is gracembc.org/bookstore.html.

The subtitle for the link is, interestingly enough, *The Only King James Only Bookstore in Toronto.*

This link then links to gracembc.org/images/HBB_INVENTORY-King_James_Bible.pdf, entitled *The King James Bible*. Among the many worthy titles listed in the inventory, including some by King James inspirationalist authors such as Burton, Daniels, Gipp, Grady, Riplinger et al, is the following work, emphases in the inventory:

Lively Oracles - The Inspired Bible In The Hearts of Believers. - by James H. Sightler, M.D. “I believe and I hope this book will help to show that the King James Bible and those faithful vernacular translations which preceded it have not lost any inspiration or authority in translation.” ISBN: 0-9673343-1-4 C \$4.00 ea.

Dr DiVietro states that he is acquainted with Dr LaMore. No doubt he would wish to remain acquainted with him (and avoid stepping into the ring with Dr Sightler).

Perhaps that is why Dr DiVietro does not yet appear to have undertaken a work entitled *Cleaning-Up Lively Oracles – The Inspired Bible In The Hearts of Believers.*

He may have in mind Proverbs 18:19.

“A brother offended is harder to be won than a strong city: and their contentions are like the bars of a castle.”

Sisters, it would appear, don’t count.

Quote 187 extract:

Dr DiVietro is clearly in conflict with John Bunyan with respect to the establishment of the words of God. The following extract is from *The Word: God Will Keep It* by Joey Faust, Fundamental Books, 2011, pp 56-58. Emphases are the author’s.

“The following dialogue is titled, *A Relation of the Imprisonment of Mr. John Bunyan, Minister of the Gospel at Bedford, in November, 1660...*[[appearing before] attorney William Foster]...

““Foster: *You are ignorant and do not understand the Scriptures; for how can you understand them when you know not the original Greek? etc.*’

““Bunyan: *It is your opinion that none can understand the Scriptures but those that had the original Greek, etc., then but very few of the poorest sort should be saved (this is harsh,) yet the Scripture saith, that God hides his things from the wise and prudent (that is, from the learned of the world,) and reveals them to babes and sucklings.*”

Dr DiVietro is therefore in conflict with the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, as Luke 10:21 shows.

“In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight.”

Concerning comparisons with the words God actually spoke, unless Dr DiVietro is prepared to call the King James translators liars, which he hasn’t dared to do yet, however the words God actually spoke are construed, the necessary comparison for the sake of establishing a firm foundation for further translations on the mission field has already been carried out.

Note the following statement from the title page of the 1611 Holy Bible, Cambridge Cameo Edition, this author’s emphases.

*The Holy Bible
Containing the Old and New Testaments
Translated out of the Original Tongues
And with the Former Translations
Diligently Compared and Revised
By His Majesty’s Special Command*

That is the true nature of any comparison that needs to be carried out with respect to the words God actually spoke, in accordance with God’s seven-fold purification process of ***“The words of the LORD”*** Psalm 12:6, 7.

As indicated above, that comparison has been accomplished.

Dr DiVietro has *not* been ***“endued with power from on high”*** Luke 24:49 to gainsay it because he is not a king.

“Where the word of a king is, there is power: and who may say unto him, What doest thou?” Ecclesiastes 8:4.

Further Note on Quote 193

A further note on ***Quote 193*** has been included with respect to the statement by Winston Churchill on foreign languages translations of the King James Bible:

Missionary Calvin George has circulated on the web an essay in which he denies that the King James Bible has been translated into many languages on the mission field. George’s essay is entitled *Has the KJV been translated into hundreds or thousands of languages?*

See:

en.literaturabautista.com/files/Has%20the%20KJV%20been%20translated%20into%20hundreds%20or%20thousands%20of%20languages%20april%20rev.pdf.

Calvin George insists that it has not, claiming on p 5 of his essay that the King James Bible has been translated only into 4-5 languages. George bases his claim in part on his consultation of *“The Bible of Every Land: A History of the Sacred Scriptures in Every Language and Dialect Into Which Translations Have Been Made published by Samuel Bagster in editions between 1848-1860.”* George restricts his definition of translation from the King James Bible to versions where *“the KJV was the only one listed as the translation source (and not for mere consultation).”*

On p 3 of his essay, George takes issue with Dr Ruckman’s citation in his *History of the New Testament Church* Volume 1 p 390 that the 1611 Holy Bible has been translated into over 800 languages. See **Quotes 176, 190**. George consults a number of Dr Ruckman’s publications and lists differing totals for translations of the King James Bible e.g. 300 and 700 on pp 18, 170 of *The Christian’s Handbook of Biblical Scholarship*.

It should first be noted that those apparent discrepancies don’t affect the sense of the remarks in those quotes, which are set forth as a challenge to Dr DiVietro to give examples of translational problems with respect to the King James Bible going into other languages and which he fails to do.

It should then be noted that George is not a King James Bible believer.

Concerning translation of the King James Bible into other languages, George quotes explicitly from Churchill’s *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples*, Volume 2.

“In A History of the English-Speaking Peoples, Vol. 2 The New World, 1959, Dood, Mead & Company, 1959, pp. 153-154, Churchill writes as follows:

“If the adventurers took books with them they took the Bible, Shakespeare, and later The Pilgrim’s Progress, and the Bible they mostly took was the Authorised Version of King James I. About ninety million complete copies are thought to have been published in the English language alone. It has been translated into more than seven hundred sixty tongues. The Authorised Version is still the most popular in England and the United States.””

The reference quoted on p 1113 of *Hazardous Materials* is Churchill’s *History of the English-Speaking Peoples Arranged for One Volume by Henry Steel Commager*, NY: Wings Books, 1994 edition, p. 160. It contains the statement to the effect that the King James Bible has been translated into 760 tongues.

Churchill’s *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples*, Volume 2, published by Cassell & Co. Ltd Fifth Edition 1977 has the equivalent statement on p 124, which reads as follows.

“If the adventurers took books with them they took the Bible, Shakespeare, and later The Pilgrim’s Progress, and the Bible they mostly took was the Authorised Version of King James I. About ninety million complete copies are thought to have been published in the English language alone. The Authorised Version is still the most popular in England and the United States.”

The sentence *“It has been translated into more than seven hundred sixty tongues”* has been deleted from the 1977 Cassell Edition. It is not known why.

While not crucial to answering Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quote 193**, insofar as he does not challenge the statement on the number of foreign translations of the King James Bible, clarification of this issue is being sought at the time of writing.

The following information may be of some assistance. BBC commentator Melvyn Bragg in his recent book *The Book of Books, The Radical Impact of the King James Bible 1611-2011*, see **Quote 26**, states on p 280 that in the middle of the 19th century, the British and Foreign

Bible Society sought to provide translations of the 1611 Holy Bible in all the languages of the then British Empire. Robert Montgomery Martin 1803-1868 on p 16 of his book *Colonial Policy of the British Empire* gives an overview of the languages spoken in the then British Empire as follows. See:

ba-bel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=umn.31951002321342v;page=root;view=image;size=100;seq=24;num=16.

16 **LANGUAGES OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.**

remaining 100,000,000 being of various hues, from the light olive of the Northern Hindoo, to the deep sable of the Guinea negro, and New Holland savage ¹.

The languages spoken are numerous among our subjects in Asia. The Bengali is spoken by about 25,000,000; the Hindoostani by about 30,000,000; the Mahratti, by about 10,000,000; the Tamul, by 5,000,000; the Teloo goo, by 8,000,000; the Carnatica, by 5,000,000; the Ooria, by 4,000,000, and the Singalese, by 1,000,000. Various other languages and dialects, including the Burmese or Assamese, Arab, Turkish, Armenian, Affghan, &c. are used in different places. The Persian is the general official and learned language of nearly the whole native population of Hindostan.

The English language is spoken throughout the empire by 28,000,000 of its subjects; and French, Italian, Dutch, Greek, Spanish, and Portuguese, together with various other languages and dialects, are used by about 2,000,000 inhabitants.

It ought to be the object of a patriotic statesman to diffuse widely, but gradually and with caution, a knowledge of the mother tongue; for, although in an incipient government the very diversity of language may be made use of as a subsidiary aid to an arbitrary sway, yet, as freedom extends, other far juster and more comprehensive expedients must be adopted in our colonial policy, and a similarity of language will

¹ The chart prefixed to this work, classifies the white and dark races, as nearly as our imperfect statistics will admit.

Martin lists a total of 20 foreign languages and indicates that other languages were spoken as well. It appears that all 20 languages would have fallen under the British and Foreign Bible Society's undertaking from Bragg's statement on p 283 of his book that William Carey had translated the scriptures, i.e. the King James Bible in the context of Bragg's book, into Bengali. Bragg reveals that Carey's achievement prompted further translations of the King James Bible into 15 more languages, including Sanskrit, Hindustani, Person, Maratha, Gujarati, Oriya. Note that though with different spelling in some cases, Martin explicitly mentions the Bengali, Hindustani, Person, Maratha and Oriya languages.

At a minimum, therefore, the translations of the King James Bible during the 19th century numbered 16 in India alone. This number is not in the hundreds but it far exceeds George's spurious estimate of 4-5, showing that he is at best an appreciably biased witness against the 1611 Holy Bible.

A further essay www.biblesociety.org.uk/uploads/our_history.pdf [site no longer available] *Bible Society History timeline* p 3 notes that during WW1 that "*Despite all the hazards associated with travelling and delays in communication during the war, thirty-four new languages were added to Bible Society's Bible translation lists, an average of one for every seven weeks of the war.*"

The end pages of *Quote(s) 185* with respect to the Pocket Testament League show that the 1611 Holy Bible was the scripture in use at the time. Translations into the "*thirty-four new languages...added to Bible Society's Bible translation lists*" would have been from the King James Bible. In addition to the Indian translations that Melvyn Bragg mentions explicitly, that gives a very incomplete list of 50 languages, nevertheless, under the auspices of the British and Foreign Bible Society by the end of WW1 for translations from the King James Bible.

Note also from *Quote 193* the statement in Dr Gutjahr's book that The American Bible Society had issued dozens of foreign language translations from the King James Bible before Adoniram Judson approached the society with his translation in 1834. "*Dozens*" again is not hundreds but it is far in excess of George's estimate of 4-5 foreign translations from the King James Bible.

Calvin George, it should be noted, fails to refute Dr Gutjahr's reference to dozens of foreign language translations from the King James Bible overseen by the American Bible Society even as far back as 1834.


Note now the item on the next page, to which Dr Mrs Riplinger has drawn this author's attention, this author's emphases. This item further gives the lie to Calvin George's estimate of 4-5 translations from the King James Bible. Mr George may, of course, wish to consult with The British Museum for their sources of information.

It should also be noted that, independently of Calvin George, Dr Mrs Riplinger lists translations from the King James Bible on pp 1116-1120 of *Hazardous Materials* from *The Bible of Every Land: A History of the Sacred Scriptures in Every Language and Dialect*. See *Quote(s) 195*. Dr Mrs Riplinger lists 22 versions and notes that the list is not exhaustive. Of these versions, 12 either used the King James Bible as their *dominant* authority or were *first* translated from the King James and then *changed* by means of 'the Hebrew and the Greek' so-called.

Dr Mrs Riplinger's list from *The Bible of Every Land* therefore suggests that Calvin George's stipulation of the King James Bible being given as the *only* source of translation is a little too prescriptive, to say the least.

The British Museum – BBC, A History of the World, The King James Bible (Authorised)

See www.bbc.co.uk/ahistoryoftheworld/objects/Xa39L5L_Q-Cjpp5cR7RA-w



The Authorized 1611 King James Holy Bible

www.learnthebible.org/king_james_bible.htm

*The King James Bible translation was begun in 1604, at the request of King James I, and translated from the original languages of Hebrew, Latin and Greek, by 47 of the best biblical scholars of the day: it was completed in 1611. This translation eclipsed all previous versions, and became the Bible read by all English-speaking nations. It is so important to the history of the world, because it was the means by which God's word was read and absorbed, for the benefit of all who read it. Also, the language is so beautiful, so as to rival any other prose or poetry. It is the version still read by many believers today, all of whom would attest to its power and comfort in their lives, and to the fact that it is the standard by which they live their lives, teaching them as it does about the birth, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Later versions, **that were translated from the King James version into thousands of languages across the world**, are read daily by millions of people. It is so precious to them that it is the one object they would save in case of fire or flood. It has shaped many of the laws and constitutions of the Western world and deserves its place among the "objects."*

Figure 18 BBC, A History of the World, The King James Bible (Authorised)

N.B. The BBC image of the 1611 Holy Bible has not been used for copyright reasons

Quote 194, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1114

“4. Since it would be a monumental task to translate directly from Greek, many new editions are translated from vernacular Bibles and only later checked or corrupted with the Greek text...Yet the title pages of many Bibles imply that **the entire volume** was ‘translated from the original.’ Many have taken the early existing translations and changed them to match the critical Greek text. Removing words to match the critical text can hardly be called ‘translating.’ Sadly when the corrupt critical Greek text of Griesbach was introduced, many vernacular translations were changed to match it. I purchased the rare Pashto (dialect from India) New Testament from the **mid-1800s**, assuming that it would not have been corrupted by the critical text and found it had already been tampered with.”

Dr DiVietro comments under **Quote 194** appear strangely vague to this author.

Dr DiVietro states first that it is not necessary to reinvent the wheel. He says in effect that where a translation is accurate, the translators have every reason to be satisfied with it.

Dr DiVietro then appears to be saying that changes to vernacular Bibles should not be made using the critical i.e. minority text of Griesbach et al (and by implication the Nestle-Aland text that Dr DiVietro disavows on pp 24-25 of *Cleaning-Up*). Dr DiVietro then says that changes to any vernacular Bible should only be made using the historic Received Text because it is the original, inspired words of God.

Dr DiVietro appears to be agreeing with Dr Mrs Riplinger in the first part of his comments under **Quote 194** in allowing that it is not necessary to translate Bibles i.e. New Testaments on the mission field from a Koine Greek text.

That concession however then contradicts what Dr DiVietro said under **Quote 193** to the effect that all translations on the mission field, i.e. all those from the King James Bible, must then be compared with what God really said, which in Dr DiVietro-speak means a perfect inspired original Greek text - that for Dr DiVietro’s readers remains unspecified between two covers *except by implication the DiVietro-Scrivener Greek edition*. See **Quote 108**.

However, taking Dr DiVietro’s comments under **Quotes 193, 194** at face value, the only way to reconcile them would be for the translator actually to undertake the monumental task of translating directly from Koine Greek.

Yet again, therefore, Dr DiVietro has violated the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See **Quote 193**.

It is ironic therefore that Dr DiVietro should allude to reinventing the wheel, because that is precisely what he is advocating for the hard-pressed translator on the mission field.

Yet again, as indicated above, Dr DiVietro gives no specific indication whatsoever under **Quote 194** of just where the historic Received Text consisting of the perfect, inspired, original words that God actually spoke exists between two covers. See **Quote 193**.

Yet Dr DiVietro expects hard-pressed translators on the mission field to base their translation work on it. Note this extract from **Quote 95**.

His repeated superficiality towards his readers brings to mind Luke 11:46...since Dr DiVietro fancies himself as a lawyer, Cleaning-Up p 18...

“And he said, *Woe unto you also, ye lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers.*”

See *Quote(s) 179* for the wise guidance of Bro. Brent Logan, who actually has years of experience on the mission field with respect to ‘the Greek’ and whose comments about missionary translations should therefore be taken seriously.

“For the LORD is good; his mercy is everlasting; and his truth endureth to all generations” Psalm 100:5.

Koine Greek has not endured. Bro. Brent Logan, who is serving the Lord in Thessaloniki, Greece, has said that Koine Greek is useless even in Greece. No-one understands it.

Finally for *Quote 194*, it should be noted that yet again, as is repeatedly the case with Dr DiVietro’s comments, nothing is substantiated. See *Quote 193*.

*Observations from Bro. Heisey, see **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**, with respect to Dr DiVietro’s comments under *Quote 194**

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s statement that where a translation is accurate, the translators have every reason to be satisfied with it, Bro. Heisey highlights the inherent duplicity of Dr DiVietro’s comment:

“Of course the definition and description of “accurate” are never specified, and especially not by Dr D.A. Waite. Furthermore, though Dr DiVietro and Dr Waite might use the term “accurate” of the KJB, they, as subscribing members of the DBS Executive Committee, have injected their own definition into the term and they would never, and as members of the DBS Executive Committee could never agree to the common, usual, normal, Webster 1828 definition which defines “accurate” as, “In exact conformity to truth, or to a standard or rule, or to a model; free from failure, error, or defect;” This definition of accurate, which includes the ideas of, “inerrant” (free from error), “pure” (free from failure), “perfect” (in exact conformity), “inspired” (in exact conformity to truth – John 17:17), “preserved” (in exact conformity to a standard or rule, or to a model), as applied to the KJB, is called “heresy” by the DBS Executive Committee.”

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s reference to the so-called historic Received Text, Bro. Heisey again highlights Dr DiVietro’s duplicity:

“And once again, Dr DiVietro never specifies that to which he refers when he uses the phrase, “the historic Received Text”. Dr DiVietro also evidences his ignorance of the fact that the vernacular Bible called the King James Holy Bible in reality has as its basis in some places a reading from the currently available minority texts, as being the best attested representative of “the Originall.””

Note this extract from **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.

Ironically and awkwardly for Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee, Dr Mrs Riplinger and missionary Peter Heisey [Hazardous Materials, pp 655ff. See also Waiting for Dr Waite by Peter Heisey, www.hacalumni.com/] have shown that numerous readings exist in the KJB that are not found in what is usually called “the TR,” i.e. Scrivener’s and Ricker Berry’s editions but are found in the critical texts like Nestle’s that Dr DiVietro deems to be corrupt. See remarks above. These readings include Mark 13:37, 14:43, Luke 23:34, 46, John 12:26, 18:1, Acts 2:22, 13:15, 24:25, 26:6, Romans 7:6, Ephesians 3:1, Philippians 2:5, 2:21, Revelation 13:10, 18:23. Dr DiVietro’s work is insufficiently advanced to address this textual anomaly either.

It remains so.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's apparent preference for all missionary translations to be based on, or compared with some perfect, original, inspired Koine Greek text of undisclosed location between two covers, Bro. Heisey further highlights the impracticality of so doing:

"[This] of course is senseless. Why go back 2000 years for the meaning of a word, from a non-exhaustive lexicon which was usually authored by an unsaved individual who has not the Spirit of God (1 Corinthians 2:14), when one can go back only 400 years for the meaning of a word in order to bring it over into the translation?"

As Dr Mrs Riplinger notes on p 668 of *Hazardous Materials*, Bro. Heisey is a missionary translator for the Gypsies of Romania.

Quote(s) 195, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1115-1116

"A certain portion of the books of the Old Testament was allotted to each of the [Modern] Greek [Old Testament] translators, who with the English authorized version, the French of Martin, and the Italian of Diodati, before them, consulting also the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and other versions and aids where necessary, made as good a translation as they were able into Modern Greek."

"It was only after the Greek Old Testament was completely translated directly from the KJB and other versions that, "It was then the office of Mr. Leeves and Mr. Lowndes to compare this translation with the Hebrew, calling in the aid of other versions and critical commentaries, and to make their observations and proposed corrections in the margin of the manuscript"...The marginal suggestions were discussed in a committee meeting and either accepted or rejected. But the KJB tightly wove the warp and woof of the Modern Greek Old Testament, which remains the purest available today."

Dr DiVietro neglects to inform his readers that Dr Mrs Riplinger is quoting from *The Bible of Every Land: A History of the Sacred Scriptures in Every Language and Dialect* (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 2nd edition, 1860), published from the records of the British and Foreign Bible Society, p 243.

Dr DiVietro's only relevant comment on **Quote(s) 195** is that by bringing the Greek Old Testament into conformity with the Hebrew texts consulted, the editors in effect made a translation from the Hebrew text, not the King James Bible or any other non-Hebrew Old Testament text.

Dr DiVietro has employed a slight sleight of hand in his brief comments under **Quote(s) 195**. He refers first to the Hebrew *texts*, plural, then to the Hebrew *text*, singular.

It appears as if Dr DiVietro is subtly trying to persuade his readers that a perfect, inspired original Hebrew text exists consisting of the words that God actually spoke for the Old Testament.

As usual, Dr DiVietro gives no indication about where such a text exists between two covers and, by implication that only such a Hebrew text is God's inspired words for the Old Testament, Dr DiVietro has yet again violated the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See **Quote 194**.

Dr DiVietro seems again to be contradicting what he said under **Quote 193** in that a full translation was not made from Hebrew sources i.e. the wheel was not reinvented but Dr DiVietro seems to be implying that it *should have been*, by conformity of the Greek translation from the King James text with 'the' (unspecified) Hebrew texts. However, 'the Hebrew' was evidently used for comparison with the translated Modern Greek text, with *"the aid of other versions and critical commentaries"* so that any suggested changes did not therefore stem

from pure Hebrew sources. Moreover, “*The marginal suggestions were discussed in a committee meeting and either accepted or rejected*” so that the committee clearly did not consider whatever came directly from ‘the Hebrew’ purely as definitive for that reason.

The Bible of Every Land reference doesn’t indicate how extensive the marginal suggestions were but it is likely, if the equivalent marginal notes in a King James Bible may be used for a rough comparison, that the bulk of the text remained unaltered after comparison with the Hebrew and other sources. (By Dr DiVietro’s reasoning, if that part of the text conformed to any other Old Testament text in a different language, it would imply that the Modern Greek text was a translation from that particular language, which of course would be incorrect.)

In that case, Dr Mrs Riplinger is quite right to say that “*the KJB tightly wove the warp and woof of the Modern Greek Old Testament*” and Dr DiVietro is gnat-straining Matthew 23:24, not for the first time. See **Quotes 40, 42, 79, 88, 112**.

Quote 196, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1120

“The following language groups at one time had Bibles translated from the vernacular Vulgate, which while missing some things is generally much less corrupt than a critical Greek text: Russian, Arabic, Breton, Maltese, German, Flemish, Spanish Reyna, Polish.”

Dr DiVietro is outraged at **Quote 196** and his comments occupy nearly a page of his book. He is outraged that in his view, Dr Mrs Riplinger would prefer a translation from Jerome’s Vulgate than from what he terms “*the critical Greek and Hebrew texts.*” He then rails at Dr Mrs Riplinger for, apparently, going against her earlier insistence that printed Greek and Hebrew texts must match the King James Bible in order to be suitable translation sources.

Dr DiVietro then accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of now accepting Jerome’s Vulgate as a suitable translation source.

Dr DiVietro therefore protests that now according to Dr Mrs Riplinger, the English nation should have adopted the Douay-Rheims Bible that came from Jerome’s Vulgate or even stopped with Wycliffe’s Bible that in Dr DiVietro’s opinion was also translated from Jerome’s Vulgate.

Dr DiVietro describes Dr Mrs Riplinger’s supposed endorsement of Jerome’s Vulgate as “*disgusting.*”

Dr DiVietro’s next comment then seems to have been lifted partly verbatim from p 1120 of *Hazardous Materials* without any indication to this effect. He says that vernacular Bibles have proven to be a strong safety net when the Hebrews (sic) and Greek manuscripts are inconsistent. He says that the vernacular sources help preserve Bible words and verses such as 1 John 5:7-8 that were dropped from the majority of the evidence because they did not fit the bulging apostasy of the groups recording copies of the scriptures.

The statement from p 1120 of *Hazardous Materials* that Dr DiVietro appears to have used almost verbatim reads as follows.

“Vernacular Bibles have proven to be a strong safety net when the Hebrews and the Greeks dropped Bible words and verses, which did not fit their bulging apostasy.”

Dr DiVietro nevertheless uses his part-verbatim statement from *Hazardous Materials* p 1120 to conclude his comments under **Quote 196** by insisting that vernacular Bibles are only useful as witnesses to the inspired words of God (still unspecified anywhere between two covers, see **Quote(s) 195**) and are not equal to the original text (still unspecified anywhere between two covers as a perfect, inspired, intact copy of the original text, so-called, see **Quote(s) 195**).

Yet again, Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing in his comments that yet again rest on sheer supposition and yet again, he violates the priesthood of all believers 1 Peter 2:5, 9 in denigrating vernacular Bibles. See *Quotes 194, 195*.

Dr DiVietro has distorted what Dr Mrs Riplinger said under *Quote 196* and again falsely accused her. See *Quotes 166, 192*. He doesn't give any page reference where Dr Mrs Riplinger has insisted that printed Greek and Hebrew texts must match the King James Bible in order to be suitable translation sources but that is irrelevant because Dr Mrs Riplinger is actually warning on p 1115 of *Hazardous Materials*, her emphasis, against "*corrupt 'corrections' via Greek and Hebrew texts, of Bibles already translated from vernacular Holy Bibles.*"

Dr Mrs Riplinger is therefore not saying that Jerome's Vulgate is a suitable translation source as such. She is saying only that it is less corrupt than a critical, or minority Greek text such as the Nestle-Aland text that Dr DiVietro disavows on pp 24-25, 119 of *Cleaning-Up*. See *Quotes 6, 194*. See also *Quotes 41, 128* for further remarks on the Minority Greek texts.

Dr DiVietro doesn't challenge that statement.

Dr Mrs Riplinger defines what she means by critical Greek text on p 1114 of *Hazardous Materials*. Dr DiVietro has overlooked this definition, *even though he includes it in Quote 194*.

"Sadly when the corrupt critical Greek text of Griesbach was introduced, many vernacular translations were changed to match it."

See *Quotes 20, 102*, with respect to the generally corrupt nature of Griesbach's text, even though, as *Quote 128* shows, minority texts such as Griesbach's occasionally support the King James New Testament against errors in editions of the Received Text such as Scrivener's. See *Hazardous Materials* pp 657, 658, 662, 707, 708 for examples with respect to Griesbach's text.

However, the generally corrupt nature of Griesbach's text may be shown by means of these extracts from *Quote 20, 102* respectively.

Quote 20 extract:

Newman's and Danker's attitudes to the New Testament are the same as those of the unregenerate sceptic J. J. Griesbach [The King James Version Defended, p 65, wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter3.html] 1745-1812...

"The most suspicious reading of all," Griesbach wrote, "is the one that yields a sense favorable to the nourishment of piety (especially monastic piety)." And to this he added another directive: "When there are many variant readings in one place, that reading which more than the others manifestly favors the dogmas of the orthodox is deservedly regarded as suspicious."

Quote 102 extract:

See Quote(s) 101 with respect to Scrivener's statement on the supposed "best critical authorities" with respect to the Book of Revelation. Scrivener's witnesses include the textual subversives Abbott, Vance Smith, Schaff, Ginsburg, Vaughn, Bentley, Bengel, Griesbach, Lachmann, Westcott, Hort, Alford, Thayer. See Hazardous Materials pp 582, 588, 589, 601, 602, 605, 622...they too, like Scrivener, deferred to Vaticanus for those parts of the New Testament where it is extant...

Griesbach's text was of course one of the forerunners of the UBS Nestle-Aland text that Dr DiVietro disavows. See above.

Noting Dr DiVietro's crass misconstruing of Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement in **Quote 196**, his equally crass comments with respect to the Douay-Rheims Bible and Wycliffe's Bible may be bypassed.

See *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 788-791 *Myth 3 Wycliffe Used a Corrupt Latin Vulgate*, in answer to Dr DiVietro's reiteration, see **Quote 190**, that Wycliffe's translation is simply that of Jerome's Vulgate.

For Dr DiVietro's repeated denigration of vernacular Bibles as inferior to the (still-unspecified-between-two-covers) original text, so-called, Wycliffe's own response is appropriate. See **Quote 193**. (Dr DiVietro denies in his comments under **Quote 205** the following statement by Wycliffe, which is also found on p 1166 of *Hazardous Materials*. Dr DiVietro's denial of Wycliffe's response is devious in the extreme and will be answered when **Quote 205** is reached.)

““You say it is heresy to speak of the Holy **Scriptures in English**. You call me a heretic because I have translated the Bible into the common tongue of the people. Do you know who you **blaspheme** [the DBS Executive Committee doesn't care]? Did not the Holy Ghost give the word of God at first in the **mother-tongue of the nations** to whom it was addressed? Why do you speak against the Holy Ghost [because the DBS Executive Committee is “**the messenger of Satan**” 2 Corinthians 12:7 and aspires as he declares in Isaiah 14:14 that “**I will be like the most High**”]?” (as cited in David Guy Fountain, *John Wycliffe: The Dawn of the Reformation*, Southampton: Mayflower Christian Books, 1984, pp. 45-47).”

Amen.

Finally for **Quote 196**, a simple map of selected passages of scripture compared with several versions shows that the *now extant* English texts of the Wycliffe Bible and the Douay-Rheims Bible, that either derive from *or have been edited to match* Jerome's Vulgate depart less frequently from the text of the AV1611 than the modern versions that derive from Minority Texts such as Griesbach's and the UBS Nestle-Aland text.

That is, Sister Riplinger's statement in **Quote 196** is certainly correct for English Bible texts.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/version-comparison.php *English Reformation to Last Days Apostasy* and *What is the Bible? – AV1611 Overview* for a more extensive tabular comparison that yields the same results as the following table.

Note that the departures from the AV1611 tabulated for Wycliffe's Bible may be slightly excessive, insofar as extant versions of Wycliffe's Bible are from a text altered under duress by his co-workers Nicholas of Hereford and, possibly, John Purvey after Wycliffe's death to match Jerome's Vulgate more closely. See *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 777-778, 788-790, 873-874.

The following statements from *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 788-790, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphases, are of particular importance in explaining why Wycliffe's Bible is often *wrongly* perceived as *originating* from Jerome's Vulgate.

“Like the KJV translators, Wycliffe began his work with the foundation of preserved English scriptures. Like them, he polished it, making reference to the aforementioned manuscripts [Hebrew, Old Latin and even ““the **Greek** exemplar””] and an accessible and accurate Bible from another language group. In his case it was the **first** century “vulgar Latin” scriptures, called the Old Latin, first heard in Acts 2. He did **not** translate directly from an uncorrected copy of Jerome's **fourth** century Latin revision, the official Catholic ‘Latin Vulgate.’ The myth that the Wycliffe Bible came from this ‘Latin Vulgate’ arose from the misleading statement – “made from the Latin Vulgate” – **added** to the frontice page of an 1850 printed

edition of Wycliffe's Bible, edited by Frederic Madden and Josiah Forshall. *The Cambridge History of the Bible* questions whether their text gives an "accurate impression" of all Wycliffe's Bibles, since Purvey may have edited the text (vol. 2, pp. 395-407)...

"In 1837 researcher George Townsend documented a 1380 Bible, whose New Testament title page reads as follows:

"*The New Testament with the lessons taken out of the Old Law, read in churches according to the use of Sarum**: translated into English from the **vulgar Latin**, by **John Wycliffe**, D. D. Rector of Lutterworth 1380" (Foxe, vol. 3, p. 64, n. 2).

"Notice that it does not say from the 'Latin Vulgate,' but from the "vulgar Latin" – those Old Latin scriptures brought to England in the first century from the east, perhaps from Jerusalem, Galilee, Judea, Antioch, or Rome (Bruce Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, Oxford Clarendon Press, 1977, p. 288). Smyth's *How We Got Our Bible* admits that Wycliffe used "older Latin versions" than the "Vulgate" (London: The Religious Tract Society, 1886, p. 98)."

*The ecclesiastical name of Salisbury, cathedral city of Wiltshire, England, according to *The Concise Oxford English Dictionary*. Sarum use is the order of "**divine service**" Hebrews 9:1 used in the diocese of Salisbury from the 11th century to the Reformation.

Table 9
English Reformation to Last Days Apostasy – To and From the AV1611

Verse	WY	TY/C	BIS	GEN	AV	DR	RV	JB/N	NWT	NAS	NIV	NKJ
Gen. 50:20												
1 Sa. 10:24												
2 Sa. 8:18												
1 Ki. 10:28												
1 Chr. 5:26								NJB				
Is. 65:11												
Am. 4:4												
Mat. 19:18												
Mat. 27:44												
Mark 6:20												
Mark 9:18												
Luke 18:12												
Acts 5:30												
Acts 7:45												
Acts 12:4												
Acts 19:2												
Acts 22:9a												f.n.
Acts 22:9b												
Ro. 3:4, 6												
Ro. 3:31												
Ro. 6:2, 15												
Ro. 7:7, 13												
Ro. 8:16												
Ro. 8:26												
Ro. 9:14												
Ro. 11:1												
Ro. 11:11												
Ro. 13:9a												
Ro. 13:9b												f.n.
1 Cor. 4:4												
Heb. 4:8												
Heb. 9:7												
Heb. 10:23												
James 3:2												
Departures	16	12	6	6	0	14	21	33/34	32	36	35	31/33
% Depart.	43	32	16	16	0	38	57	89/92	86	97	95	84/89

Notes:

1. The table overleaf lists 37 passages of scripture adapted from *The King James Only Controversy* by James White. The author designates these passages as “*problems in the KJV*,” pp 223ff.
2. Mr White insists that the modern versions, NIV, NASV, NKJV, largely correct these “*problems*” and that these 37 passages are therefore representative of modern ‘improvements’ over the AV1611 as a whole. (This author’s separate review of Mr White’s book has shown that they are not. See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php *KJO Review Full*.)
3. These 37 passages have therefore been used as test passages for comparison with the AV1611 for both pre-1611 and post-1611 bibles, set against church history from Medieval to modern times.
4. The table lists the results for comparison of these 37 passages with the AV1611 for 12 bibles in total. Individual readings have been omitted for brevity but may be checked using the sources listed below.
5. A clear cell in the table denotes agreement between the specified bible and the AV1611 with respect to the sense of the reading, although the actual wording may differ between the two bibles.
6. A shaded cell in the table denotes departure of the specified bible from the AV1611. The shaded cell marked NJB refers to an NJB reading that departs from the AV1611. The shaded cells marked f.n. refer to NKJV readings that match the AV1611 in the NKJV text but follow the NIV in the footnotes.
7. 5 pre-1611 bibles have been used; WY, Wycliffe, TY/C, Tyndale/Coverdale in the Old Testament, BIS, Bishops’, GEN, Geneva. The texts of these bibles may be found here, www.studylight.org/. (Insert any search text and click on the verse displayed to show the NAVBAR. Use the NAVBAR to go to any bible chapter and uncheck Include Resources box for an uninterrupted text display.)
8. 8 post-1611 bibles have been used; DR, Douay-Rheims (Challoner’s Revision, 1749-1752), RV, Revised Version, JB/N, Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles respectively, also for the results cells, NWT, New World Translation, NASV, New American Standard Version, NIV, 1984 New International Version, NKJ, New King James Version. www.studylight.org/ has been used for the DR, RV, NIV*, NASV, NKJV, www.watchtower.org/e/bible/index.htm for the NWT, a printed edition for the JB, www.catholic.org/bible/ for the NJB. *Checked against 2011 readings via biblewebapp.com/niv2011-changes/.
9. The table shows that divergence of the pre-1611 bibles from the AV1611 Text for the 37 test passages decreases markedly as successive translations appear. The corresponding increasing convergence of the pre-1611 bibles with the AV1611 parallels the advance of the English Reformation from its inception in the 14th century to its maturity in the 16th century, followed by its crowning achievement early in the 17th century - the AV1611 Holy Bible.
10. The table shows further that the post-1611 bibles not only diverge increasingly from the AV1611 Text, in agreement with Rome and Watchtower but the popular ‘fundamentalist’ translations, NIV, NASV, diverge from the AV1611 even beyond contemporary Papist and JW versions, changing well over 90% of the test passages. Even the supposedly ‘conservative’ NKJV follows this divergence, with well over 80% departures from the AV1611. The accelerating departure of the post-1611 bibles from the AV1611 corresponds to the deepening apostasy of the church in these last days. *All* modern bibles are germane to this apostasy.

Finally for **Quote 196**, see **Quotes 137, 176** and accompanying remarks for the site purebiblepress.com/bible/mission.html *Pure Bible Press*.

The above site describes Dr Mrs Riplinger's work on foreign language translations from the King James Bible. That site in itself gives the lie to Dr DiVietro's accusation that Dr Mrs Riplinger perceives Jerome's Vulgate as a suitable translation source.

Quote 197, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1121

"Likewise God preserved his words in Bibles other than those of the corrupt Greek Orthodox church and Hebrew nation, when those language groups destroyed certain readings for sectarian reasons. Charges that the KJB wrongly followed the 'Latin' in a verse are only made by those who do not understand the history of Bible preservation; the Latin merely matches other preserved vernacular Bibles, as one would expect."

Dr DiVietro comments only briefly with respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger in order to accuse her of double standards in that now, according to him, she allows that Jerome's Vulgate may be a valid vernacular Bible, whereas before Dr Mrs Riplinger had vigorously denied that the King James translators ever used Jerome's Vulgate. Dr DiVietro insists that Dr Mrs Riplinger would like readers to forget her earlier denial concerning Jerome's Vulgate.

Dr DiVietro appears to have forgotten the precise locations of Dr Mrs Riplinger's denial, insofar as he does not inform readers of where to find them.

Two locations exist. They are **Quotes 124, 127**.

Quote 124 states in part *"Fact 4: Scrivener is unscholarly in assuming something that opposes everything that the KJB translators ever said in print. On the title page of their New Testament the KJB translators said that they used "the Originalle Greeke" not any Vulgate readings. Their detailed notes, taken by translator John Bois, never mention following the Latin Vulgate Bible. They list many other sources for reference, including one reference to the "Italian" Bible, and two to the "Old Latin," but NEVER to the Latin Vulgate..."*

See below with respect to extracts from remarks under **Quote 124**.

Quote(s) 127 states in part, Dr Mrs Riplinger's emphasis *"...the KJB translators expressly stated that they did not follow the Latin Vulgate. A very large percentage of the KJB's [translators'] introductory "The Translators to the Reader" was taken up to express their utter contempt for the Catholic Church and its Latin Vulgate..."*

Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, does not explicitly challenge the contents of either of the above extracts.

Dr DiVietro has also forgotten the contents of **Quote(s) 187**, which show that Dr Mrs Riplinger is not referring to Jerome's Vulgate in **Quote 197** but the faithful Latin text that derives from uncorrupted Old Latin Bibles.

Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, does not explicitly challenge the following extract from **Quote(s) 187**.

"The original Latin and Gothic Bible from Acts 2 carried Christ to Europe. As languages continued to be confounded by divergent dialects, God gave each of these languages his words, "forever settled in heaven," which would judge people in the last day (John 12:48). As language changed, Holy Bibles were "given" and "purified" (2 Tim. 3:16, Psalm 12:6, 7) to fit the linguistic need. The Italic, Gallic, Celtic, and Old Saxon editions came forth. As will be demonstrated, new New Testaments have usually been birthed from previous vernacular New Testaments. For example, the pure Old Latin Bible became the Roumant, Provençal,

Vaudois, Toulouse, Piedmontese, and Romanese Bibles. It is unlikely that Greek was even accessed worldwide in most cases because of the lack of availability of Greek manuscripts, compounded by a lack of skill in those languages...

Note Dr Mrs Riplinger's similar remarks in her book *The Hidden History of the English Scriptures* pp 5-6, this author's emphases.

*"All pure vernacular scriptures began from the pure spring of languages used by the Holy Ghost in Acts 2; they were preserved and purified, generation by generation, as those root languages developed. **Old Latin** became Italian, Spanish, French, Portuguese, and Romanian; Gothic became English, German, Danish etc..*

*God's safety net in Acts 2 provides that no one language group would have a monopoly on the pure gospel or whose apostasy could thwart its preservation. Just as the enemy would have "destroyed the seed royal" in 2 Kings 11, leaving but one descendent, so too the seed, which is the word of God, would be subject to "many which corrupt the word of God" (2 Cor. 2:17). It is because of God's fulfilled promise to speak in "other tongues," that we have support for pure verses in the King James Bible, such as 1 John 5:7, Acts 8:37, and Rev. 16:5, which have been altered or excised by the unorthodox Greek church, but have been preserved in other languages, such as the **Old Latin** manuscripts, which had their genesis in Acts 2. The aggregate body of Christ, as the New Testament priesthood, 'received' and preserved the true text."*

Note also these extracts from **Quote 124** with respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger's access to the 1599 Nuremberg Polyglot.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has shown the overwhelming agreement of the pre-1611 Bibles in many languages including Latin and Italian with the 1611 Holy Bible with respect to important verses from the Gospels from the 12-column Nuremberg Polyglot Bible.

She states in In Awe of Thy Word pp 1048, 1050, her emphases:

*"God has graciously given this author one of the scarce remaining original editions of the twelve language polyglot Bible printed at Nuremberg, Germany in A.D. 1599. It contains the Gospels in Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, English, German, Danish, Bohemian and Polish...It demonstrates the perfect agreement of the English King James Bible with all pure Bibles from other languages. It is perhaps the most important polyglot Bible in print because it was printed twelve years **before the KJV** and five years before the KJV's translation began..."*

Dr Mrs Riplinger states on p 1049 of *In Awe of Thy Word* with respect to her guidelines for the charts that follow, her emphases, "(6.) In a **few** cases the 1599 Latin exhibits the corrupt Catholic edition of Jerome; in these cases I have also shown the **Old Latin** reading, still evident in MS D (Latin d, Codex Bezae, Jesu Christi Domini Nostri Novum Testamentum, Ex Interpretatione Theodori Bezae, Impressa Cantabrigiae A.D. 1642 In Officina Rogeri Danielis, Londoni: Sumptibus Societatis Bibliophilorum, Britannicae et Externae, MCMLXV; sometimes cited was Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis, ed. Frederick H. [Scrivener], Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co., 1864, which sometimes disagrees with the Sumptibus edition)."

See the following extract from **Quote 124** with respect to the verses tabulated in Dr Mrs Riplinger's chart, including those where Old Latin citations were inserted.

The collation that follows in In Awe of Thy Word pp 1052-1108, 57 pages inclusive, consists of 52 verses that have been listed as follows. See below.

Noting the doubts that Dr DiVietro has raised about the Old Latin and Diodati texts in his comments on **Quote 124**, the Old Latin, 1599 Latin and Italian Bibles have been highlighted in the list that follows.

An asterisk * denotes agreement between the Old Latin text and the Italian Bible where the Latin Version of 1599 departs from the reading of the 1611 Holy Bible, no doubt by means of early Bible-corrupting Jesuit influence. The hash # sign denotes where the 1599 Latin Version departs from the 1611 Holy Bible without inclusion of the Old Latin reading for comparison.

Matthew 5:44, 6:13b, 33, 7:14, 28, 8:19, 29, 11:23 with Luke 10:15 i.e. **“hell”** instead of “depths” NIV/TNIV, “Hades” NKJV, 15:8*, 9, 17:21, 19:16, 17, 22:32*, 24:45, 25:21, Mark 2:15, 7:28, 9:29, 42, 10:21, 24, 52#, 12:32, 13:33, Luke 2:40#, 4:4, 8*, 5:20, 9:35, 11:2*, 4*, 54, 22:64, 68, 23:42, 24:36, 51, 52, John 1:14, 18, 3:13, 4:42*, 6:40, 47, 69, 7:39*, 9:3, 4, 14:14*, 16:16.

8 verses; Matthew 15:8, 22:32, Luke 4:8, 11:2, 4, John 4:42, 7:39, 14:14, show agreement of the Old Latin and 1599 Italian Bibles with the 1611 Holy Bible where the later i.e. 1599 Latin Version departs from the 1611 Holy Bible, undoubtedly through early Bible-corrupting Jesuit influence.

Only two verses; Mark 10:52, Luke 2:40, show departures of the later Latin Version from the Italian Version and the 1611 Holy Bible without Old Latin support listed for the Italian Version and the 1611 Holy Bible. The 1599 Latin Version is the only text in the Nuremberg Polyglot Bible to exhibit extant departures from the 1611 Holy Bible in the verses listed. The pre-1611 Bibles therefore show 96% purity with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible, when the earlier evidence of the Old Latin witnesses is considered (together with one instance where the departure of the 1599 Spanish Version in John 14:14 was corrected in the 1602 Valera Bible).

As indicated, Jesuit influence would be responsible for any impurities in the pre-1611 Bibles, noting their production of the 1582 Jesuit-Rheims New Testament*, the forerunner of extant English departures from the 1611 Holy Bible, as Dr Mrs Riplinger’s tables in *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 1052-1108 also show. Without Jesuit influence, 100% purity for the pre-1611 Bibles would appear to be feasible. *See *Did The Catholic Church Give Us The Bible?* by David W. Daniels, Chick Publications, pp 84, 110-111.

That information is clearly beneficial to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s readers.

Dr DiVietro, as indicated, produces nothing to resolve the doubts that he has prompted with respect to the Old Latin and Diodati texts in his comments under **Quote 124**.

He should therefore keep in mind the admonition of Proverbs 6:16-19 with respect to **“he that soweth discord among brethren.”**

The following key observation should also be kept in mind.

The essential point of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement in **Quote 124** is that John Bois’s notes show that the King James translators did not use the Vulgate of Jerome.

Dr DiVietro does not refute that essential point. He has simply evaded it in typically churlish fashion in order to cover up for the unscholarly notions of his co-editor and the inaccuracy of his and his co-editor’s Greek text.

Dr DiVietro therefore has no business insisting as he does under **Quote 197** that Dr Mrs Riplinger now accepts Jerome’s Vulgate as a valid vernacular Bible.

Yet again, he has falsely accused Sister Riplinger. See **Quote 196**.

Quote 198, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1122

“Pure Bibles have existed in all countries, but a large percentage appear to be out of print, preserved by God on library shelves, waiting to be sought, found, collated, and reprinted. Many language groups are consequently left with only those widely proliferated tainted editions printed by liberal Bible societies from the corrupt texts.”

Dr DiVietro descends into mockery again, see **Quote 192**. He ridicules the belief that God gave every people a Bible in their own language, suggesting that God must have given it and taken it away again.

Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of producing no physical evidence to support her statement and says tauntingly that Dr Mrs Riplinger should use the wealth gained from the sale of her books to finance expeditions to locate the pure Bibles left only on library shelves.

Dr DiVietro should first reflect carefully on Galatians 6:7. See **Quote 141**.

“Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.”

Dr DiVietro has made yet another false accusation against Sister Riplinger. See **Quote 197**. Dr Mrs Riplinger has provided physical evidence in support of **Quote 198**, is actively seeking to locate copies of pure foreign language Bibles and assisting with providing them where necessary.

In passing, in answer to Dr DiVietro’s taunt about Sister Riplinger and wealth, note this extract from **Quote 167**.

*In response to Dr DiVietro’s latest sample of mockery, see this extract from **Quote 108**.*

*Contrary to his insinuation under **Quote 104**, Sister Riplinger states that she has not received royalties or taken an income from A. V. Publications for the last 17 years.*

Dr DiVietro should check his facts before he makes accusations. The same could be said of his whole book.

Dr DiVietro fails to inform his readers of the statements that follow **Quote 198**, where Dr Mrs Riplinger has provided physical evidence in support of **Quote 198**.

Note Ecclesiastes 3:15, which applies to God’s preservation of His **“words of truth”** Proverbs 22:21, Ecclesiastes 12:10, Acts 26:25 that Dr Mrs Riplinger describes below. See Dr Ruckman’s commentary *The Book of Ecclesiastes* pp 65-66 with respect to Ecclesiastes 3:15.

“That which hath been is now; and that which is to be hath already been; and God requireth that which is past.”

“Those interested are now scavenging the library shelves for old editions which were printed or translated before the mid-1800s, when the influence of Griesbach infiltrated the Bible Societies. Since English is understood worldwide, many, in search of a pure edition, are using the KJB as a plumb-line to examine old Bibles.

“The ideal situation would be to simply re-print a pure out-of-print Bible. For example, the Morrison Chinese Bible of 1821 has just been digitized in a collaborative and labor-intensive effort by Chinese-speaking Christians and an American missionary.

“In rare cases where no pure text is immediately found, translators are using the KJB, old Bibles in their receptor language, and vernacular Bibles in cognate languages to restore the best edition they can find to its original pure form. The Spanish Santa Biblia, Valera 1602

Purificada was a fourteen year project, begun in 1994 and made available in 2008 after many prayerful years of exhaustive work. It is the only Spanish Bible to follow rules similar to those followed by the KJB translation. That is, in the main, they followed the God-given Spanish Bibles which preceded them, as well as examining many other sources. This is also the only Spanish Bible project in which God gave the rare editions of the 1543 [Francisco] de Enzinas, the 1556 Juan Perez de Pineda New Testament and Psalms, the 1553 Ferrara Spanish Old Testament, as well as the editions of Reina and Valera. Their exhaustive work has been copied in part by other stop-gap translations, such as Reina-Valera-Gomez, which rightly sought to replace the corrupt 1960 Reina Valera, but which falls short in thoroughness and unwisely introduces modernizations. Among scores and scores of errors, it uses 'Jehovah' throughout the Old Testament, breaking the connection between Jesus as Lord of both the Old and New Testament, and missing the old Spanish reading of the Pineda."

Dr Mrs Riplinger gives much more explicit *physical* evidence such as the above on pp 1123-1130 of *Hazardous Materials*. Dr DiVietro skipped over all that evidence.

Dr DiVietro's taunts against Dr Mrs Riplinger also overlook her work with The Pure Bible Press, which is in fulfilment of Ecclesiastes 3:15 "...*God requireth that which is past.*" See also *Quote 176*.

See purebiblepress.com/bible/mission.html and purebiblepress.com/bible/advisors.html.



Figure 19 Pure Bible Press

What is the mission of Pure Bible Press? Our mission can be summed up very briefly as: Location, Education, and Distribution. Let's look at what we mean by those three things:

I. Location

What we mean by "Location" is: finding pure Bibles in as many languages as we possibly can. Generally, there are several places where pure Bible texts can be found:

1. *Old texts that have been taken out of print;*
2. *New texts that have recently been translated;*
3. *Restorations of old texts*

Old Texts:

Finding them is the biggest challenge. Many times, they have been out of print for well over 100 years, so it is often very difficult to locate a book like that – but it is not impossible.

Once the text has been found, we then go about digitizing it. This is often very time consuming – but the end result is often a text that is clearer when it is printed. Dealing with old texts, you must also have someone who speaks the language to help assist in the comparison

– generally, that is a native speaker. Here is where the detailed examination work actually begins on the text. Everything in the text is compared to the Authorized King James Bible, as well as other pure vernacular texts, so that everyone is on the same page concerning the comparative authority.

Generally, a Christian has raised [questions] over the readings in another text while reading the Authorized King James Bible along with it. When further investigation is done, we have found that the text has been corrupted through the use of faulty Greek lexicons which use the wrong sources altogether, or that the work was “retranslated” using a corrupt modern English version. This is where the language and textual advisors affiliated with Pure Bible Press will come in and check the text, along with the native speaker. This is done to ensure that the biblical principles of Proverbs 11:14 and Matthew 18:16 are followed.

New Texts:

There are times when a language has not had a completely pure text available to it. That is where a translator may step in and put together a pure translation. Most of the translators with whom Pure Bible Press works are fluent in both the English language, and in the receptor language (e.g. Russian, Romanian, Ukrainian, Spanish, German, etc.). A rule that Pure Bible Press has set down for translators is that any translation being done at present must use the Authorized King James Bible as their primary source text, while also using pure vernacular scriptures in cognate languages (or in the receptor language) to do their translating. Language and textual advisors affiliated with Pure Bible Press will check to ensure that this rule is being followed. Once again, the biblical principle learned in Proverbs 11:14 and Matthew 18:16 is the main reason we set this rule.

We believe that the beliefs and methods of that translator should be made known clearly to Christians around the world. This is the reason that each translator that has worked on a text will be asked to fill out our “Translator Questionnaire” that is available on our website. Whenever that language is looked at from our “Language Guide” section, people will be able to see information regarding the translation work, such as: the people involved, what materials they used in doing this translation, and what mindset they had when working on the translation. We at Pure Bible Press believe that this is completely fair and necessary in regards to translation work, because it aids in Christians being well informed about the translation work being done in that language.

Restorations

This process can almost be considered a combination of the two previous processes, but in reality, it is different process all together. There are several times when an old text has been found to be generally correct, but there are a few places where the text needs to be corrected. Each time this is done, the restorations have come from going back to the historical precedents for specific readings, and making the corrections based on the consensus of the older readings and the Authorized King James Bible (generally, the older readings line up almost perfectly with the Authorized King James Bible).

As is the case with several of the restoration projects (specifically, the Spanish 1602 Purificada and the French KJF), the translators have gone back to the older readings found in the older texts that are, generally, purer than the current texts available. The work is often very tedious, and it can be very difficult to do, but the end result is a text that lines up with the historical standard set in other pure Bibles, as well as the pure Bible in English - the Authorized King James Bible.

II. Education

Finding a pure text and having it checked for absolute purity does absolutely no good if people do not understand the problems within the current text. If they do not see the need of having a pure Bible in their language, the work in that language is doomed to failure before it has begun. This is where the language advisors and native speakers are invaluable to Pure Bible Press.

Each language and textual advisor, and native speaker, will put together a list of verses, in that specific language text, which they have found the current text to be doctrinally problematic or faulty when compared to the Authorized King James Bible and other pure vernacular Bibles. These charts will also show how the text we are working on and promoting is in agreement with Authorized King James Bible and the other pure vernacular Bibles. These charts may include, but are certainly not limited to the following:

- 1. Verses that show where the current text has or lines up with corrupt Critical Text readings, and how the pure text corrects these problem areas;*
- 2. Verses that show where the current text lines up with the corrupt lexicons (e.g. the NKJV mentality – good texts, bad translation mentality), and how the pure text corrects these areas.*

Pure Bible Press will also put together informational packets to send out to churches and missionaries that work in that language. This packet would include: the text (whether it be a John and Romans sample, a New Testament, or the entire Bible), the comparison chart provided by our language advisors and native speakers, and a response card for the missionary or pastor to send back to us requesting further information to give to his people. There will be some that discard our materials, or inform us that the problems addressed do not really matter. Should the missionary or pastor take that position, we will simply let people know that this church or missionary does not support having a pure text in the language of the people to whom they minister. Christians have a right to know who supports having a pure text in languages around the world, and who does not support it.

III. Distribution

Having a pure Bible does no good if it never reaches the hands and hearts of the people who need it. This is where Pure Bible Press relies on our colleagues to get these texts printed and distributed. If you would like for us to list your printing/distribution ministry, please e-mail us. Some of our colleagues are listed below:

- Bearing Precious Seed in Lansing, Michigan*
- Local Church Bible Publishers in Lansing, Michigan*
- Wings Bearing Precious Seed in McDonough, Georgia*
- Bible and Literature Missionary Foundation in Shelbyville, Tennessee*

Christians around the world must see the need to reach the masses with the pure word of God, and then be willing to act on that sight. Christians must be willing to help us get these pure Bibles out, as well as educate people they know about this issue and need.

As these texts are distributed through the aid of God's people, Christians in these languages will then be able to teach and preach about the pure word of God available to their people. They can also educate their people on the problems in the corrupt text that they had been using, and then showing them how these problems are corrected in the pure text available to them.

These things would not be possible, if Pure Bible Press had not taken the time to do the research and work necessary to give these Christians a pure Bible in their language.

If Dr DiVietro is interested in more *physical* evidence of work with foreign language Bibles, he should sign up to the monthly newsletter of Dr Nicolas Verhoef, language advisor The Pure Bible Press and missionary to the Germanic, and Indo-European speaking people of Europe and Asia.

This is an extract from Dr Verhoef's latest i.e. March 2012 newsletter, his emphases.

*“On the way back to Switzerland we visited **south Asia** for four days to meet with the TEAM: the Urdu OT has been typed in with the exception of two books and 22 of the OT books have been proofread one time. The men of the team work about 20 hours a week proofreading in addition to six-day-a-week jobs and preaching in the villages on the weekends. We only had a short time and a few preaching meetings, but at least 39 souls got saved.”*

There's plenty more *physical* evidence of work with foreign language Bibles to be had through communication with the language advisors of The Pure Bible Press, if Dr DiVietro wished to avail himself of it.

*Observations from Bro. Peter Heisey, missionary translator to Romania, with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible and pure foreign language Bibles, see end of **Quote 194***

Bro. Heisey outlines some of the practicalities of setting up pure foreign language Bibles, an issue that Dr DiVietro fails even to touch.

“A (non-exhaustive) collation of the Italian Diodati (1549 unrevised), Spanish RV1960, 1865, RV-Gomez, and 1602Purificada, German Luther 1545, 1912(?), Schlachter 2000, Romania Bucharest 1688, Blaj 1795, Smyrna 1857, Iasi 1871, Iasi 1874, Orthodox 1914, Nitulescu 1921, Cornilescu 1923, Cornilescu 1931, 1939 Galaction, all the modern ones, TBS, and even to some extent even the best Romanian one (Fidela), (I wasn't able to check anything personally on other versions but am guessing that they too have some problems), shows that ALL of the foregoing are not “pure” in the biblical sense of the words of God.*

*Dr Mrs Riplinger has indicated to this author that the independent Bible-believing Baptist Church of Monterrey, Mexico (*Iglesia Bautista Biblica de la Gracia*) completed correction of a modest number of problems that remained with the 1602Purificada in the spring of 2012 and accordingly updated all their files on the Purificada Bible. Its text is now as close as practicable to that of the 1611 Holy Bible.

More details may be found on the site KJV 1611 RV 1602.

See www.rrb3.com/bibles/spnbibl/1602_purified_bible_pg.htm with the graphic below.




Figure 20 Spanish Valera 1602 Purificada Bible

Bro. Heisey has described some of the work that remains to be done with respect to setting up pure foreign language Bibles, in accordance with the Lord's stipulation in Luke 19:13 "**Occupy till I come**" and the mission of The Pure Bible Press.

Should the Lord return before that work is complete, note this extract from **Quote 181**.

...[I]n *Given By Inspiration* p 103...Dr Grady alludes to George Whitfield, who preached with Spirit-filled power to over 100,000 people on a mountainside in Cambuslang, Scotland in 1742, unconcerned about "any remaining errata in his King James Bible" that would later be rectified by Dr Blayney in his edition of 1769.

Acts 17:30 refers to "...**the times of this ignorance God winked at.**" It is this author's view that the same could apply for Bibles in any language in use during the time of "**Jacob's trouble**" Jeremiah 30:7 and "**great tribulation**" Matthew 24:21, Revelation 7:14 that are still awaiting final purification, which will happen at the Second Advent, most likely in a fulfillment of Zephaniah 3:9.

"For then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the LORD, to serve him with one consent."

Until then, as indicated, the Lord's command is clear. "**Occupy till I come.**"

Quote(s) 199, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1134, 1135, 1136, 1140, 1141

Quote(s) 199 consist of a lengthy series of extracts from *Hazardous Materials* that occupy well over a page of *Cleaning-Up*. These extracts are the paragraph* at the bottom of p 1134, half of the third paragraph from p 1135, the first and half of the third paragraphs of p 1136, the first sentence of the second paragraph of p 1140 and the last paragraph of p 1141 together with the first full sentence on p 1142.

*This paragraph is in small font about which Dr DiVietro complains, in this author's view falsely accusing Dr Mrs Riplinger, see **Quote 198**, of thereby trying to make the paragraph look like an insignificant footnote. Most of the paragraph consists of parts of Dr Mrs Riplinger's testimony that, understandably, she may not wish to place in normal font. See *Which Bible is God's Word?* pp 160-161 and this extract under **Preface and Introduction**.

"God said, "that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God". I have just paraded my abominations before my readers. Academic credentials have never been God's criteria for using a person. Moses did not go to Desert State for forty years."

The only part of **Quote(s) 199** that Dr DiVietro comments on, with yet more mockery and false accusation, see **Quote 198**, is the following brief sentence from *Hazardous Materials* p 1141.

"The word "inspiration" is a compound word."

Dr DiVietro devotes an entire page of his book, including insertion of a definition of the word "inspire" from *Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary (1913 + 1928)*, which is to breathe into. Dr DiVietro insists that "inspiration" is not a compound word at all but a complex word, that Dr Mrs Riplinger's remarks on inspiration are devoid of any grammatical or etymological substance and that in a court of law she would held to account for bearing false or faulty witness.

It is noteworthy that Dr DiVietro is eager to exalt a secular source over the 1611 Holy Bible for the definition of a word.

This author doesn't really aspire (!) to get into a discussion about the distinction between compound and complex words but it is possible that Dr DiVietro may have to update his grammar books as the following secular source suggests.

See en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Compound_%28linguistics%29.

Recent trends

Although there is no universally agreed-upon guideline regarding the use of compound words in the English language, in recent decades written English has displayed a noticeable trend towards increased use of compounds. Recently, many words have been made by taking syllables of words and compounding them, such as pixel (picture element) and bit (binary digit). This is called a syllabic abbreviation.

That definition could well fit the word “*inspiration*.”

Whether considered compound or complex, Dr Mrs Riplinger has the Biblical explanation for the word “*inspiration*” that enlarges upon the material in *Quote(s) 199*.

See www.hacalumni.com/howtodefineaword.shtml.

How to Define a Word

By Gail Riplinger

*Linguists do not define words; they simply demonstrate how they are used in various contexts. Dictionaries are therefore descriptive, not prescriptive. The unique context of a writer or a speaker identifies which ‘definition’ (linguists would never use the word ‘definition’) of the sometimes several definitions a word may have. Dictionaries are formed by accessing modern ‘usage’ data bases such as the Brown University Corpus of American English, The British National Corpus, the Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus of British English, [Collins-Birmingham] University International Language database (COBUILD) or the Longman/Lancaster English Language corpus. (For a good primer on how dictionaries are made see David Crystal’s *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*, i.e. page 438). These databases give a word ‘in use,’ showing **ten words before and ten words after**. The context for Bible words is obviously the Bible itself. Such word samples of usage are not shown in normal short dictionaries, such as the modern Webster’s Dictionary. Therefore dictionary users misunderstand and see what they think are ‘definitions,’ but are sentences derived from the word ‘in use.’ The multi-volume Oxford English Dictionary does show the context from which a so-called definition or example of usage can be derived. When defining ‘Bible’ words, the OED uses the Bible. Most people do not own all the books in the world, nor do they have access to one of the million word corpuses mentioned previously. However, Christians are in a unique position, in that they all own a Bible, the source from which all dictionaries get their definition of all Bible words. Therefore, it is not necessary for Christians to go to a dictionary to define Bible words, when they actually have the original resource dictionary-makers use themselves.*

(Example: If one had all of works of Plato, one would not need a dictionary to study how Plato used a word.)

*For example, the unabridged OED’s theological definition for “*inspiration*” is “the special or immediate **action** of the **Spirit** of God upon the **human** mind of soul, said esp. of that divine **influence** under which the books of the **Scriptures** are held to have been written.” The OED defines ‘**influence**’ as “the **action** or fact of flowing **in**, **inflowing**, **inflow**, **influx**.”*

*Going back to the Bible’s usage of the word “*inspiration*” (the context from which the OED composed its ‘definition.’), note the only two usages of the word “*inspiration in the Bible*:*

“All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable...” (2 Tim. 3:16)

Definition #1: *The word “inspiration” is a compound word, being made up of two words, “in” and “spir.” The meaning of each is obvious to any Bible reader. The word “in” is used many times in the Bible and is the simplest of all words. The phoneme “spir” will only pull up the word “Spirit” for any Bible reader. (A process called ‘cognitive scaffolding’ is that by which vocabulary is built to understand compound words. It erects a meaning from the constituent parts of a word.) The suffix “ation” when applied to a verb (inspire) makes a verb into a noun of **action**. Therefore “inspiration” describes the **action of the “spirit in.”** Therefore, if “All scripture is given by inspiration of God,” then “All scripture is given by the **“spirit ‘acting’ in’** the giving of scripture.” Any elementary school child will garner this ‘meaning’ by simply reading the English Bible. (But ‘scholars’ would love to make it seem more difficult so that we would need to go to them for the real ‘meaning’.)*

Definition #2: *The first usage of the word “inspiration” in the Bible is in Job 32:8. As with all first usages of words, this verse defines the word ‘inspiration.’*

*“But there is a **spirit in man**: and the **in-spir-ation** of the Almighty giveth them understanding.” (Job 32:8).*

*The first usage (in Job) defines “inspiration” EXACTLY as we have just defined it, as the “spirit in.” Since the word “inspiration” is only used in these two places in the Bible, then it can have no other ‘theological’ (see OED) meaning than that which these contexts and its constituent parts (‘in’ and ‘spir’ and ‘ation’) give it. Job 32:8 defines “inspiration” as the **“spirit in”** man. It further defines it as an action by “the Almighty” which “giveth them understanding.”*

Therefore the meaning of inspiration is:

- 1.) *in-spir-ation (that is) the **spirit ‘acting’ in** (2 Tim. 3:16)*
- 2.) *“the **spirit in man**” (Job 32:8)*
- 3.) *“the Almighty giveth them understanding” (Job 32).*

These words in Job can be paralleled with “is given by inspiration of God” in Timothy: a.) the Almighty = God, b.) giveth = is given, c.) understanding = scriptures.

*From these biblical usages men have come up with a so-called definitions such as Webster did in 1828. He said, “inspiration” is “the **infusion of ideas into** the mind by the Holy **Spirit**; the conveying **into** the minds of **men**...”*

So, what is the Bible’s own definition of inspiration? It is so simple that the “wise and prudent” will reject it and look to a wordy, man-made dictionary for their authority. What a word means is not what the dictionary says it means. What a word means is the meaning the word creates in the mind of the reader. That meaning comes from the pre-existing files in the brain which have been created by pre-conditioned associations with the words, letters, and sounds in a word. Since the Bible was the only book that men had for millennia, the pre-existing ‘definitions’ and ‘meanings’ came from Bible usages of words. In Genesis we begin with, “the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.” The phoneme ‘spir’ echoes throughout the Bible as only the ‘spirit.’ The word ‘in’ is pre-defined by hundreds upon hundreds of Bible usages. By the time a Bible reader gets to 2 Tim. 3:16, the phonemes ‘in’ and ‘spir’ could have no other ‘meaning’ to them than the ‘spirit’ being or acting ‘in’ something.

*The **Spirit** of God, **in** the believing KJB translators, (“the spirit in man” Job) , as in all born again believers led them into all truth. The words he led them to use therefore are inspired*

words, that is, words that are the product of being given by the Spirit of God. Jesus said, ‘the words that I speak unto they are spirit...’

Though not a grammarian or an etymologist, this author believes that the above analysis of the word **“inspiration”** has a sound grammatical, etymological and above all *scriptural* basis. Likewise though not a lawyer, this author believes that the above analysis would exonerate its author from any charge of bearing false or faulty witness in any properly constituted court of law. It appears to this author that Sister Riplinger has been able to **“speak forth the words of truth and soberness”** Acts 26:25 with respect to **“inspiration.”** See **Quote 70**.

Dr DiVietro would not agree. However, he can continue to toy with his secular sources he has elevated above **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21 for his non-book and he probably will.

Quote 200, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1146

“In plainer words, the word “is” must be inserted with “given” and with “profitable”; it cannot be “was,” nor “is being,” nor can the word “is” be used only once. Therefore, according to Greek grammar rules, inspired scripture “is.” (It is not merely settled in heaven, as scripture is described as “profitable” to man). Having taught English to Greek speaking adults, I can attest to the fact that the usage of “is given,” in both English and Greek is a “continuing action,” to use the words of Polly Powell, a former instructor of English at Clemson University (phone conversation). In English, “is given” is a present tense verb; it is not time sensitive. In this context “is given” cannot be bound to the time of the writing of the Bible. It is an irregular verb and its passive voice indicates that the scripture receives the action of ‘spirit’ (spir) of God.”

Dr DiVietro dismisses **Quote 200** as **“grammatical nonsense”** because, he says, the expression **“is given”** is not in ‘the Greek’ for 2 Timothy 3:16 but the words were supplied by the translators to **“smooth”** the literal expression **“All scripture God-breathed”** from *theopneustos* into All scriptures (sic) **is given by Inspiration of God**. Dr DiVietro insists that the expression **“is given”** means that the words of God are here now because **“they were given in the past”** and that they are not **“constantly being given.”** The words of God, says Dr DiVietro, were given to mankind at one time in the past and therefore **“we continue to have them.”** He reiterates that the expression **“is given”** does not mean that the words are **“constantly being given,”** neither in Greek nor in English.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments under **Quote 200** with mockery, see **Quote(s) 199**, stating that Dr Mrs Riplinger is way out in left field and cannot see home plate.

A few of Dr DiVietro’s actual statements have been quoted above, in order to ensure that they are not misunderstood. See **Quote 188**.

Concerning the absence of the expression **“is given”** in the Greek for 2 Timothy 3:16, Dr Mrs Riplinger did not state explicitly that it is present. She is simply referring to how the expression is used in both Greek and English and she gives examples from the scriptures on p 1147 of *Hazardous Materials*. See list given below.

Dr DiVietro skips over that list, as he has done repeatedly with respect to important scriptures that Dr Mrs Riplinger has included in *Hazardous Materials*. See **Quote 70, Tables 4, 4a, 4b, Quotes 96, 99, 108, 109, 124, 125, 128, 142, 143, 144, Table 7, Quote 148**.

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s insistence that the expression **“is given”** means that the words are here now because **“they were given in the past”** and that they are not **“constantly being given,”** he fails to substantiate his comment in any way, see **Quote 196**, notably with com-

plete absence of any scriptural support for it and has overlooked Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement in **Quote 200** that "*the word "is"...cannot be... "is being."*"

Dr Mrs Riplinger is not therefore saying that the expression "*is given*" means "*constantly being given.*" Dr DiVietro has accused her falsely yet again. See **Quote(s) 199**.

Dr DiVietro's notion that the expression "*is given*" means that the words are here now because "*they were given in the past*" is a repetition of his statement on p 2 of *Cleaning-Up* that God's words ARE given because they WERE given, Dr DiVietro's capitalisation, in a one-off breathing-out of God's words as the original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek words. Dr DiVietro says of these words that "*we continue to have them*" and according to *Cleaning-Up* p 7, these words are the Masoretic Hebrew Old Testament text (where the original Aramaic appears to have morphed into non-original Hebrew) and the Received Greek text of the New Testament that underlie the King James Bible. Again, Dr DiVietro fails to specify where these words may be found as one document between two covers* or as individual, tangible Old and New Testaments and again, with his fixation on Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek, he has violated the priesthood of all believers. See **Quote 196**.

*Note again that Dr DiVietro says explicitly on p 21 of *Cleaning-Up* that no published (in bold) Greek text was (is) authoritative but 'the' Greek text was (is). See **Quote 123** and detailed remarks about Dr DiVietro's apparent perception of what is/is not perfect with respect to scriptural texts in both English and Greek.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's ARE given/WERE given duality, see this extract from **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint**.

Dr DiVietro's next relevant comment in this chapter is on pp 87-88, where he acknowledges that the original autographs of the scriptures are long gone and that they were never collated into a single volume. However, he then declares that God's words in Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek have been preserved so that the original inspired words can still be determined.

*Regrettably, Dr DiVietro still does not say where these words can be found between two covers as a perfect Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek match mate to the KJB. His actual 'bible' is still a mystery to this author. See comments in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**.*

*In this author's view, according to their own standards where 'the original text' is the final authority for "**the scripture of truth**" Daniel 10:21, *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-4, neither Dr DiVietro nor any other member of the DBS Executive Committee could prove that they possess a perfect Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek match mate to the KJB, which they claim to represent an accurate translation of the correct i.e. original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text, even though they insist that the KJB is not inspired, *Cleaning-Up*, p 18, unless they could produce all the original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek manuscripts.*

They won't.

*They have no 'Bible' between two covers that could truly be called "**all scripture...given by inspiration of God.**" They insist, *Cleaning-Up*, p xi, that their 'original' consists of the original words of Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek and support this contention by means of several statements from Dean Burgon, found in *Cleaning-Up*, pp 327-330, where, ironically, the term Received Text, for the 'inspired' Greek text, Dr Williams informs readers, was probably derived by the Elzevir brothers from John 12:48, 17:8 in the supposedly 'uninspired' KJB!*

The DBS Executive Committee position, therefore, as indicated in this author's earlier work [Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society, p 23], is really just a rehash of the position of Hodge and Warfield in 1881.

“We do not assert that the common text [i.e. the AV1611], but only that the original autographic text was inspired.”

*(Note that Dr DiVietro, *Cleaning-Up*, pp 2-3, has had to resort to fluid tenses in order to head off the problem with Hodge and Warfield’s statement, with respect to the past tense expression “was given.” This expression fits the DBS Executive Committee insistence on ‘once-only’ inspiration [ibid., p 9] but conflicts with the present tense of 2 Timothy 3:16 with respect to **“all scripture is given by inspiration of God.”** Dr DiVietro seeks to resolve the dilemma by insisting that the words of God **are** given because they **were** given, his emphases. On that basis, the next time any of Dr DiVietro’s insurance documents come up for renewal, he could avoid the renewal fees by insisting that the documents **are** valid because they once **were** valid. Dr DiVietro did, after all, urge that contemporary usage of words be studied in order to ascertain the meanings of Biblical words, *Cleaning-Up* pp 62-65.)*

However, Hodge and Warfield never said where “the original autographic text” exists between two covers.

Neither has the DBS Executive Committee.

All else on their part is sheer ‘flannel.’

*As indicated above, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks on pp 1146-1149 of *Hazardous Materials* that Dr DiVietro skipped over answer his ARE given/WERE given duality ‘flannel.’*

*Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks on pp 1146-1149 of *Hazardous Materials* follow, her emphases.*

“The liberals of the 1800s, and yet today, try vigorously to view the Bible as an historic, not a living document. That approach, applied to this context, is non-grammatical.”

Dr DiVietro’s insistence on a one-off breathing-out of God’s words as the original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek words, see above, appears to this author to be dangerously close to the liberal view that the Bible is “an historic, not a living document.” Dr Mrs Riplinger continues.

“The following examples of the usage of the phrase “is given,” seen elsewhere in the Bible, demonstrate that it might not describe an historical event (e.g. ‘once given’), but often refers to a continuing phenomenon or a perpetual promise.

*“**Job 37:10** “By the breath of God frost **is given**.” Frost is given by God yet today.*

*“**Ezek. 33:24** “the land **is given** us for inheritance.” God’s gift of the land to Abraham and his descendents is perpetual.*

*“**Mark 6:2** “what wisdom is this which **is given** unto [him].” God is still giving wisdom daily to those who ask [James 1:5].*

*“**Rom. 5:5** “the Holy Ghost which **is given** unto us.” He is still given to those who receive Jesus Christ as their Saviour.*

*“**Rom. 12:6** “the grace that **is given** to us.” Grace is given to believers daily.*

*“**1 Cor. 1:4** “the grace of God which **is given** you by Jesus Christ.”*

*“**1 Cor. 11:15** “her hair **is given** her for a covering.” Hair is replaced daily. To those who would say that “is given” in 2 Tim. 3:16 refers to the one-time inspiration of the Bible and that Bibles are no longer “given by inspiration,” [Dr DiVietro does under **Quote 200**] one must ask, ‘Are all women now bald?’ No, because hair “is given” repeatedly as it falls out. God even keeps track of the number of our hairs; how much more would he attend to **his** very words?*

“Eph. 4:7 *“But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ.”*

“Phil. 1:29 *“For unto you [it] is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake.” If you live godly in Christ Jesus, you will suffer persecution yet today [certainly from one-off inspiration ‘originals-onlyists’].*

*“According to these verses the Christian “is given” “grace,” “wisdom,” “the Holy Ghost,” and even a continual supply of “covering” hair. It would be unscriptural, given the context in 2 Tim. 3:16, to say that “is given” refers only to the **then current** canon of scriptures. Just as in the aforementioned verses, this context [demands] that a perpetual, continual aspect be applied [this is not the same as saying that the words are “constantly being given”]. The very end of the sentence in 2 Tim. 3:16 says,*

*““All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: **That** the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works [2 Timothy 3:17].”*

*“Just as the aforementioned verses show that the phrase “is given” is used in verses which must apply to **all** Christians, historic and present, 2 Tim. 3:16 too must apply to all Christians, not just those who lived when the scriptures were first given. We need God’s life giving inspired scriptures more than we need lost hairs replaced.*

*“Only scripture “given by inspiration” is “profitable.” It “is given by inspiration of God” for a purpose. That purpose is **“That”** the Christian can profit. Inspiration is absolutely necessary for true “doctrine” and “instruction.” Unless the Holy Bible is the very words of God himself, it cannot be an **infallible** guide to doctrine.*

“Ecclesiastes 12:11 is an interesting parallel. It says.

*““[Ecclesiastes 12:10] The preacher sought to find out **acceptable words**: and that which was written was upright, even **words of truth**. The words of the wise are as goads, and as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies, which **are given from one shepherd**. And further, by these, my son, be admonished...[Ecclesiastes 12:12]”*

*“The **words** of truth, that is, the Holy Bible, **“are given”** from our good **Shepherd**, the Spirit of truth, who promises to “guide” us “into all truth” (John 16:13). The translators or the “masters of assemblies” merely fasten them down on paper.”*

Note also this extract from **Preface and Introduction**, summary points 1 and 2.

*...Dr Waite, Drs Williams and DiVietro each deny that the AV1611 is **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God.”***

They each base their denial on Dr Waite’s exposition of “theopneustos” and therefore insist that no translation can truly be the inspired word of God. They forget that the King’s men, arguably the foremost Greek expositors of all time, came up with a different reading for “theopneustos” that God has honoured in the 1611 English Holy Bible for 400 years and which does allow for the freshest KJB copy right off the printing press to be truly the inspired word of God.

Any purchaser or recipient of a 1611 Holy Bible can say that like salvation, **“it is the gift of God”** Ephesians 2:8. As such it is imbued with **“the life of God”** Ephesians 4:18, that is, inspired, **“words that...are spirit, and they are life”** John 6:63, which is why, though bound between two covers, **“the word of God is not bound”** 2 Timothy 2:9 but in the words of Hebrews 4:12, which should be memorized, *in English*, not in Greek:

“For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.”

Note also 2 Timothy 3:15.

“And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.”

It is reassuring that just as “the context” of “all scripture is given by inspiration of God” “[demands] that a perpetual, continual aspect be applied,” so does the context of “the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.”

Dr DiVietro accuses Sister Riplinger of being too far out in left field to find home plate.

It appears to this author, see *Quote 181*, that Dr DiVietro is so far out “in desolate places as dead men” Isaiah 59:10, with no inspired Bible that he can specify between two covers, that he can’t even find the ball park.

Quote 201, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1149ff

“Warfield moves the inspiration Bull’s Eye...”

Dr DiVietro says that the contents of *Hazardous Materials* pp 1149ff are a *non sequitur* i.e. they supposedly don’t reasonably follow on from or have any relevance to the preceding statements in *Hazardous Materials* on inspiration e.g. *Quote 200*, because they refer only to individuals that Dr DiVietro describes as liberal scholars who confine inspiration only to the original writings of scripture.

Dr DiVietro states in bold that inspiration does not apply to translations and “only to the original Greek and Hebrew and Aramaic words which God’s Spirit gave to men” but that inspiration is not limited to the physical original writings.

Dr DiVietro then says that God has preserved these original Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic words, that “we” have these original words of God and therefore “we” know that the King James Bible “is an accurate, reliable translation of the originals.”

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments under *Quote 201* with the statement that God has used the King James Bible to save many souls and that it “truly breathes with the power of God.” However, he insists that God did not give the actual words of the 1611 King James Bible to the translators and that it was not re-inspired in either 1611 or 1769.

Dr DiVietro again substantiates nothing in his comments, certainly giving no scripture to back up his claims about inspiration. Yet again, his comments consist of sheer supposition, see *Quotes 193, 196*, and by confining inspiration to the Hebrew/Aramaic*/Greek ‘originals’**, Dr DiVietro has again violated the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. Yet again, Dr DiVietro fails to disclose the precise location of God’s perfect, inspired, preserved, original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek words between two covers. See *Quote 200*.

*To an untrained observer, e.g. this author, Hebrew and Aramaic script look virtually indistinguishable, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biblical_Aramaic. However, they are different languages and it is noted that Daniel 2:4-7:28 and Ezra 4:8-6:18 are in Aramaic in the otherwise Hebrew Old Testament. See *Quote 181*. Jay P. Green states in his preface to Volume 1 of his Hebrew-English Interlinear Old Testament p vi that “This work, we believe, contains all the Hebrew and Chaldee words which have been preserved for us by the Masoretes...” However, Green has no further explanatory notes about the Chaldee (Aramaic) portions of his Old Tes-

tament, which would suggest that his text is exclusively in Hebrew. It occurs to this author that Dr DiVietro should explain to his readers if only Hebrew editions that preserve Aramaic script in Daniel 2:4-7:28 and Ezra 4:8-6:18 are trustworthy as God's preserved original words, or why an apparent translation (or morphing, see *Quote 200*) from Aramaic to Hebrew in editions such as Green's, may still be accepted as God's original words, even though a translation. The issue is difficult to express because Dr DiVietro doesn't accept that any *published* original language text is authoritative (and as such it can't be inspired), see *Quote 200* and remarks on *Cleaning-Up* p 21, which must apply equally to published Hebrew (or Hebrew/Aramaic) texts as well as to published Greek texts. Dr DiVietro accepts only that the *actual* original language texts (extant somewhere, apparently) were (are) authoritative (and therefore could be said to be inspired). Dr DiVietro really should review his stance on 'originals-onlyism' in the light of 1 Corinthians 14:33 **"For God is not the author of confusion..."** See **Challenges #1, #5, Points-Counterpoints, Quotes 71, 89, 115, 176.**

**Dr DiVietro does not specify what the 'originals' are. His comments under *Quote 201* would imply that he must mean the original inspired words that God gave only once but has perfectly preserved as inspired scriptures but in an undisclosed location between two covers. 'Originals' is, however, a strange term to apply to actual words. It would seem more readily applicable to documents i.e. the original writings, or autographs.

For the complete overview of Dr DiVietro's fixation with 'originals-onlyism,' see again *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi, 2-3, 7, 17, 18, 88, 91, 93, 94, 105-109, 149, 187, 249-250, 255-257, 264, 266, 268, 272, 273, 274, 276-277.

Concerning the content of *Hazardous Materials* pp 1149ff, Dr DiVietro should be cautious about whom he calls liberal scholars. Dr Mrs Riplinger, her emphases, has the following statement on p 1156 of *Hazardous Materials* that Dr DiVietro fails to challenge.

"Warfield's invention [that "inspiration related only to the originals" i.e. original writings, Hazardous Materials p 1153] has darkened the sense and spread a faltering faith to even good Christians such as John Burgon, Edward Hills, and their modern day proponents, some of whom have cowered and acquiesced to alleged spots or conceivable future updates or improvements to the KJB. These men have become rationalists, naturalists and modernists in practice by exalting man's role in the transmission of the Bible and denying the miraculous intervention of God. The Bible says "Thou shalt preserve them..." It is his work. What shall he preserve? He shall preserve his words – not replace them with men's words. Unwittingly, they have in a sense adopted the neo-orthodox position that the Bible (that we have) only contains God's message (but accurately translated by men into English)."

Dr DiVietro, it should be noted, has failed to exempt John Burgon (and Dr Hills) from those whom he deems to be liberal scholars. His failure amounts to either carelessness or cowardice on his part, given his membership of the Dean Burgon Society Executive Committee.

Note that although Dr DiVietro uses more grandiose language in his comments under *Quote 201* to the effect that the KJB *"truly breathes with the power of God,"* an impossibility for Dr DiVietro's perception of inspiration, as will be seen, Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement *"they have in a sense adopted the neo-orthodox position that the Bible (that we have) only contains God's message (but accurately translated by men into English)"* describes Dr DiVietro's perception of the 1611 Holy Bible quite well.

In his casual dismissal of pp 1149ff of *Hazardous Materials* Dr DiVietro has failed to appreciate the detrimental effect of *"Warfield's invention"* on today's churches. Dr Mrs Riplinger describes that effect on p 1153 of *Hazardous Materials*, making pp 1149ff of *Hazardous Materials* most relevant to the present-day spiritual condition of the Body of Christ as a whole.

*“In order to divest themselves of a living book that contains the words of the Spirit of God [Dr DiVietro denies that God gave the actual words of the AV1611 under **Quote 201**], today’s liberals have adopted [Warfield’s] distinction between the so-called ‘originals’ and the word of God extant today in vernacular Holy Bibles. His ‘original’ idea about the originals has “crept in unaware” into Bible school textbooks and doctrinal statements. It provides a comfortable respite for those who, as Jesus said, are “ashamed of me and my words,” when questions arise (Mark 8:38).”*

The liberal acceptance of “Warfield’s invention” has had a most serious knock-on effect in the form of *fundamental* acceptance, which is easily shown.

In the United Kingdom, the Fellowship of Independent Evangelical Churches, FIEC, consists of over 500 professedly *fundamental* churches.

See en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fellowship_of_Independent_Evangelical_Churches.

This is the FIEC Statement of Faith with respect to the scriptures, this author’s emphases.

See www.arnoldroad.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=56&Itemid=65.

Note the confusion of tenses with respect to “was” versus “is,” this author’s underlining in the statement below.

FIEC Statement of Faith

As a member of the FIEC (Fellowship of Independent Evangelical Churches) we believe the following:

The churches of the FIEC are committed to these truths of historic, biblical Christianity ...

2. THE BIBLE *God has revealed himself in the Bible, which consists of the Old and New Testaments alone. Every word was inspired by God through human authors, so that the Bible **as originally given** is in its entirety the Word of God, without error and fully reliable in fact and doctrine. The Bible alone speaks with final authority and is always sufficient for all matters of belief and practice.*

As Dr Mrs Riplinger rightly notes in *New Age Versions* p 399:

“Wilbur N. Pickering, author of The Identity of the New Testament Text (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1980), pp 38, 42, 96, 90) reveals:

““The dead hand of Fenton John Anthony Hort lies heavy upon us. (Colwell)...””

So do the dead hands of A. A. Hodge and B. B. Warfield, as the FIEC Statement of Faith shows.

Dr DiVietro’s comments on inspiration and preservation of God’s original words betray further carelessness (or cowardice) with respect to pp 1149ff of *Hazardous Materials* in that he has bypassed the following pertinent statement on p 1151 of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases.

*“...the dictionary calls the “Bible” – “the sacred **book** of Christianity including the Old and New Testament.” A ‘book’ is defined by Webster as “a set of written or printed pages fastened on an end and enclosed between protective covers.” This describes precisely the Holy Bible Christians read and have in their homes. A ‘book’ is nowhere identified as ‘dissolved animal skins or parchments which have been written on’; neither is a ‘Bible’ thought of by **anyone** as a rare and unreadable Greek text. No living person identifies a ‘Bible’ as any of these things, except perhaps those ‘clergy’ who, like Humpty Dumpty say, “When I use a word it means just what I choose it to mean.” When children and politicians, like Clinton, do*

this, it is called lying. The new definition and usage of the word 'Bible,' as the lost originals or conflicting Greek and Hebrew manuscripts or editions, is a neologism, that is, "a new meaning for an already established word" (Webster's II New College Dictionary.)"

Note the following remarks from the above statement and this author's under-linings.

*"neither is a 'Bible' thought of by **anyone** as a rare and unreadable Greek text."*

"The new definition and usage of the word 'Bible,' as the lost originals or conflicting Greek and Hebrew manuscripts or editions, is a neologism..."

Contrary to Dr DiVietro's dogma in bold under **Quote 201**, Dr Mrs Riplinger is not confining 'originals-onlyism' to the non-extant original writings. She is clearly indicating that 'originals-onlyism' in practice rests on "*a rare and unreadable Greek text*" and "*conflicting Greek and Hebrew manuscripts or editions.*"

Those sources are of course futile with respect to support for 'originals-onlyism' and a mere pretence. See this extract from **Quote 200**.

*In this author's view, according to their own standards where 'the original text' is the final authority for "**the scripture of truth**" Daniel 10:21, Cleaning-Up pp 2-4, neither Dr DiVietro nor any other member of the DBS Executive Committee could prove that they possess a perfect Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek match mate to the KJB, which they claim to represent an accurate translation of the correct i.e. original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text, even though they insist that the KJB is not inspired, Cleaning-Up, p 18, unless they could produce all the original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek manuscripts.*

They won't.

*They have no 'Bible' between two covers that could truly be called "**all scripture...given by inspiration of God.**" They insist, Cleaning-Up, p xi, that their 'original' consists of the original words of Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek and support this contention by means of several statements from Dean Burgon, found in Cleaning-Up, pp 327-330, where, ironically, the term Received Text, for the 'inspired' Greek text, Dr Williams informs readers, was probably derived by the Elzevir brothers from John 12:48, 17:8 in the supposedly 'uninspired' KJB!*

*In practice, all that Dr DiVietro has been able to produce in over 273 pages of Cleaning-Up is "*a rare and unreadable Greek text*" the precise location of which he has still failed to disclose, see above and "*conflicting Greek and Hebrew manuscripts or editions*" altered by apostate priests and unregenerate scribes or compiled by unregenerate editors and/or lexicographers that Dr DiVietro has repeatedly tried to defend.*

See for example the lengthy discussion on corrupt lexical definitions and their effects under **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**. See also **Quotes 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 47, 48, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70** with **Table 4, 71** with **Table 5, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 114** with respect to Revelation 9:11.

That is why this author, see above, has concluded that Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement "*they have in a sense adopted the neo-orthodox position that the Bible (that we have) only contains God's message (but accurately translated by men into English)*" describes Dr DiVietro's perception of the 1611 Holy Bible quite well, especially in view of his insistence under **Quote 201** that God did not give His actual words to the King James translators.

See the end of **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint, Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint** and the remarks under **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint** on the word "**propitiation**" on Dr DiVietro's attempts to 'clarify' the 1611 Holy Bible and thereby overcome its so-called ambi-

guities and confusing grammar to which Dr DiVietro refers on pp 32, 69, 91, 94-95, 152 of *Cleaning-Up*.

If, in Dr DiVietro's opinion, God did *not* give His words to the King James translators (even though, as Dr Mrs Riplinger notes on p 1156 of *Hazardous Materials*, see above, "*The Bible says "Thou shalt preserve them..." It is his work. What shall he preserve? He shall preserve his words – not replace them with men's words*) such that the 1611 Holy Bible is *not* "**all scripture**" that "**is given by inspiration of God**" and it needs 'clarification' for its ambiguities and confusing grammar by mere *men* such as Kirk DiVietro using the uninspired works of *more mere men* i.e. critical editions and lexicons, then the 1611 Holy Bible is a mere message and not the very words of God, even if accurately translated.

If the 1611 Holy Bible is *not* "**all scripture**" that "**is given by inspiration of God**" - and Dr DiVietro insists that it is not - then Dr DiVietro cannot truthfully say that it "*truly breathes with the power of God.*" The 1611 Holy Bible cannot truly breathe "*with the power of God*" any more than a fossilised Siberian woolly mammoth could take a breath of fresh Arctic air. See this extract from this author's earlier work **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Translation Without Inspiration is Extinction** p 3.

The AV1611, according to Dr Waite, has preserved God's 'original' Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words in translated form but it has been dead for the last 400 years, ever since its inception, even "from the beginning of the creation" of it, 2 Peter 3:4. Because it is merely a translation, it is and has always been like a frozen, fossilized woolly mammoth in Siberia [In the Minds of Men by Ian T. Taylor, TFE Publishing, 1991, pp 97ff] whose form has been preserved but it has no life.

The Devil would naturally be eager to propagate that perception of the AV1611 and he appears to have found an unwitting accomplice in Dr Waite.

He has also found one in Dr Kirk DiVietro.

It is ironic that Dr DiVietro should accuse Sister Riplinger of a *non sequitur* in his comments under **Quote 201**. The *non sequitur* is entirely his.

The following observations from Dr Mrs Riplinger and the citation from her book *The Hidden History of the English Scriptures* give a correct historical and Biblical perspective on God's actual words and their inspiration and preservation, ultimately in the 1611 Holy Bible, *without* confinement to Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has stated as follows in communication with this author, her emphases.

"In The Translators to the [Reader] it says, "The Apostle excepteth no tongue; not Hebrew the ancientest, not Greek the most copious, not Latin the finest..." This proves that the translators thought that the Apostles used Latin, just as Foxe said. This is in paragraph 6. That paragraph goes on to say, "The Scythian counted the Athenian, whom he did not understand, barbarous; so the Roman did the Syrian and the Jew...Therefore as one complaineth that always in the Senate of Rome there was one or other that called for an interpreter..."

"This proves that everyone did not speak Greek.

"The next paragraph says that "most" in Asia spoke Greek. This is Asia only. And it is only most. It goes on to say that in "many" places of Europe it was known. Being known in many places does not mean that 'everyone spoke Greek.' The paragraph after that says, "many countries of the West, yea of the South, East, and North, spake or understood Latin, being made provences to the Romans."

“The paragraph after that says, “Now though the Church were thus furnished with Greek and Latin translations, even before the faith of Christ was generally embraced in the Empire...in the language which themselves understood, Greek and Latin...they provided translations into the vulgar for their countrymen, insomuch that most nations under heaven did shortly after their conversion hear Christ speaking unto them in their mother tongue...The Scripture being translated before in the language of many nations doth shew...” It goes on to list those countries.

“In summary, the translators have asserted that all did not speak Greek and Latin was used, just as the sign on the cross indicates [Luke 23:38, John 19:20]. All we needed was the Bible to know what languages were paramount [i.e. in Acts 2].”

Dr Mrs Riplinger has these further disclosures about God’s actual words and their inspiration and preservation in *The Hidden History of the English Scriptures* pp 4-5. See **Quotes 7, 156, 161.**

See first the following note about the language of the Galatians.

Though incomplete, the article en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Galatian_language *Galatian Language* has this summary information about the association between the Galatian and Celtic languages.

“Galatian is an extinct Celtic language once spoken in Galatia in Asia Minor (modern Turkey) from the 3rd century BC up to at least the 4th century AD, although ancient sources suggest it was still spoken in the 6th century.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s summary information from *The Hidden History of the English Scriptures* pp 4-5 follows.

*“The Prologue before the book of Matthew in an edition of the Bishops’ Bible said, “Matthew, who also was called Leui, being of a Publican made an Apostle, did first in Iurie [Jewry] write the Gospel of Christ in the Hebrew tongue for their sakes which beleueed of the circumcision. It is uncertaine who afterwards did translate it into the Greeke tongue. Howbeit the copy of the Hebrew is kept vnto this day in the library of Cesarea, which library one Pamphilus Martyr did gather together most diligently. And the Nazarenes, which in Berea a city of Syria, did vse the same booke, gaue vs leaue to copie it out” (J.R. Dore, *Old Bibles: An Account of the Early Versions of the English Bible*, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1888, 2nd edition, p. 285).*

““God is no respecter of persons: But in every nation” “the Holy Ghost” gave “the word” in the “tongues” of the people (Acts 10:14, 15, 34-37, 44-47). Acts 10 demonstrates God’s acceptance of “common” men (i.e. Italian) who speak the vernacular (common) language of “another nation.” Paul, who penned much of the New Testament, logically said that he spoke “with tongues more than ye all” (1 Cor. 14:18; Rom. 15:24). His letter to the Galatians, who spoke Celtic, and to the Romans, who spoke Latin, would of necessity be written by him in those languages also. History professor Kenneth W. Harl (Yale Ph.D.) reminds us that it was not a Greek-speaking world when the New Testament was written. The Roman Empire had carried their Latin language across the empire. The barbarians and non-urban provinces often retained their native languages, just as they had during their conquest by the Greeks. Scriptures in Berber, Iberian, Celtiberian, Iranian, Scythian, Basque, Ligurian, Cantabrian, Parthian, Angli, Saxon, Gothic, as well as many other languages and dialects, would have been needed to “preach the gospel” (Rome and the Barbarians, Chantilly, VA: The Teaching Company, 2004).

“The King James translators wrote: “[I]nsomuch that most nations under heaven, did shortly after their conversion, hear Christ speaking unto them in their mother tongue, not by the voice of their minister only, but also by the written word translated.” “But I say, Have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world” (Rom. 10:18). They wrote, “Every country that is under the Sun, is full of these words (of the Apostles and Prophets) and the Hebrew tongue (he meaneth the scriptures in the Hebrew Tongue) is turned not only into the language of the Grecians, but also of the Romans, and Egyptians, and Persians, and Indians, and Armenians and Scythians, and Sauro-matians, and briefly unto all the languages That any nation useth...[including] the Gothic tongue...Arabic...Saxon...French...Sclavonian...Dutch...English (i.e. Trevisa 1300s)...Syrian...Ethiopian....”

““So That to have the Scriptures in the mother tongue is not a quaint conceit lately taken up...but hath been thought upon, and put in practice of old, even from the first times of the conversion of any nation...” (The Holy Bible, London: Robert Barker, 1611, The Translators to the Reader). They add, “As the King’s Speech which he uttered in Parliament, being translated into French, Dutch, Italian and Latin, is still the King’s Speech...No cause therefore why the word translated should be denied to be the word....”

“The Cambridge History of the Bible states that scriptures were so widely known worldwide that a deacon in the ancient church in Heraclea was “confident that even if all copies of the Scriptures should disappear, Christians would be able to rewrite them from memory....” All pure vernacular scriptures began from the pure spring of languages used by the Holy Ghost in Acts 2; they were preserved and purified, generation by generation, as those root languages developed. Old Latin became Italian, Spanish, French, Portuguese, and Romanian; Gothic became English, German, Danish etc...”

Dr DiVietro’s dogma on ‘originals-onlyism’ inspiration confined to Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek once-only God-breathed-out original words (extant today in perfect inspired copies though as unspecified documents residing in an unknown location, or unknown locations) is clearly in conflict with **“the apostles of the Lord and Saviour”** 2 Peter 3:2, Christians down through the centuries, the King James translators, reputable scholarly authorities *and the Lord Himself*.

Quote(s) 202, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1152, 1157, 1160

*“Warfield sought to merge what he learned in Germany with his previous conservatism. On one hand Warfield wrote against the rank unbelief of Briggs, the German higher critic (and author with Brown and Driver of the corrupt English edition of Gesenius’ Hebrew Lexicon, unwisely used today...However, Warfield could not defend the Bible in hand. He did not have a strong enough background in manuscript evidence or a humble enough faith in the scriptures to counter the barrage of textual variants and ‘problems’ thrust at him in the German classroom. He invented a plan whereby he could retain the creed, that stated that ‘the Bible’ was inspired. He redefined the word ‘Bible’ for seminary students. **He moved the locus of inspiration from the Holy Bible to the lost originals.**”*

“What this means is that as the originals have long since turned to dust, no inspired text exists today...Warfield’s book on inspiration is still hailed as a ‘classic’, but his viewpoint has done more to undermine confidence in Scripture than almost any other in the last 150 years or so.”

“Not just the immediate context 2 Tim. 3:16, but every usage of the word “scripture(s)” in the New Testament refers to copies or translations, not the originals. Therefore the word “scripture” cannot refer to the originals alone.”

Dr DiVietro accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of twisting the statements that she has quoted. He insists that the Dean Burgon Society and what he terms other defenders of the King James Bible do not claim inspiration exclusively for the original writings but for the original text. Dr DiVietro then accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of not having addressed that subject of inspiration of the original text in 1200 pages of her book except by disparagement.

Dr Mrs Riplinger would have been quite right to do so because the notion of exclusivity of inspiration for the original text, by which Dr DiVietro means the original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text, see **Quote 201**, is unscriptural. Dr DiVietro has yet again falsely accused Sister Riplinger, who has twisted nothing, and Dr DiVietro has yet again violated the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See **Quotes 200, 201**.

It should first be emphasised that the Dean Burgon Society is a *detractor* from the King James Bible, not a defender of it.

See this extract from the previous quote, **Quote 201**.

*See the end of **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint, Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint** and the remarks under **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint** on the word “propitiation” on Dr DiVietro’s attempts to ‘clarify’ the 1611 Holy Bible and thereby overcome its so-called ambiguities and confusing grammar to which Dr DiVietro refers on pp 32, 69, 91, 94-95, 152 of *Cleaning-Up*.*

*If, in Dr DiVietro’s opinion, God did not give His words to the King James translators (even though, as Dr Mrs Riplinger notes on p 1156 of *Hazardous Materials*, see above, “The Bible says “**Thou shalt preserve them...**” It is **his** work. What shall he preserve? He shall preserve **his words** – not replace them with men’s words) such that the 1611 Holy Bible is not “**all scripture**” that “**is given by inspiration of God**” and it needs ‘clarification’ for its ambiguities and confusing grammar by mere men such as Kirk DiVietro using the uninspired works of more mere men i.e. critical editions and lexicons, then the 1611 Holy Bible is a mere message, even if accurately translated.*

*If the 1611 Holy Bible is not “**all scripture**” that “**is given by inspiration of God**” - and Dr DiVietro insists that it is not - then Dr DiVietro cannot truthfully say that it “truly breathes with the power of God.” The 1611 Holy Bible cannot truly breathe “with the power of God” any more than a fossilised Siberian woolly mammoth could take a breath of fresh Arctic air. See this extract from this author’s earlier work **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Translation Without Inspiration is Extinction** p 3.*

*The AV1611, according to Dr Waite, has preserved God’s ‘original’ Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words in translated form but it has been dead for the last 400 years, ever since its inception, even “**from the beginning of the creation**” of it, 2 Peter 3:4. Because it is merely a translation, it is and has always been like a frozen, fossilized woolly mammoth in Siberia [*In the Minds of Men* by Ian T. Taylor, TFE Publishing, 1991, pp 97ff] whose form has been preserved but it has no life.*

The Devil would naturally be eager to propagate that perception of the AV1611 and he appears to have found an unwitting accomplice in Dr Waite.

He has also found one in Dr Kirk DiVietro.

Dr DiVietro has detracted from the 1611 Holy Bible by relegating it from “**the word of God**” to “**the word of men**” 1 Thessalonians 2:13 and thereby downgrading it to the level of “**dead works**” Hebrews 6:1, 9:14. See **Quote 68, 69, 75, 86, 98, 106, 114, 125, 164, 166, 174, 175, 181, 200, 201**. He has not defended it.

For the complete overview of Dr DiVietro's fixation with 'originals-onlyism,' see yet again *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi, 2-3, 7, 17, 18, 88, 91, 93, 94, 105-109, 149, 187, 249-250, 255-257, 264, 266, 268, 272, 273, 274, 276-277. Dr DiVietro and the Dean Burgon Society as a whole insist that the 1611 Holy Bible is *not* "**all scripture**" that "**is given by inspiration of God**" 2 Timothy 3:16.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's notion of what is "**all scripture**" that "**is given by inspiration of God**" see first this extract from the **Introduction**.

The terms "Holy Bible," "the word of God" 1 Samuel 9:27, "scripture of truth," "the holy scriptures" 2 Timothy 3:15 and "all scripture...given by inspiration of God" will also be taken as interchangeable because that is how this author understands them, along with the expression "finally authoritative." God's word must be finally authoritative because, as all Bible critics of any persuasion agree, there is no higher authority than God. See The Creed of the Alexandrian Cult in any issue of The Bible Believer's Bulletin.

Note also this succinct observation from Bro. Heisey on inspiration that reveals and reproves the basic flaw in Dr DiVietro's 'originals-onlyism' Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek inspiration notion.

"The...issue with regard to "is given ..." is the fact that the inspiration of God is (present tense) preserved in true scripture, no matter the language. That is, the phrase "is given..." specifically indicates that whatever is truly scripture, is(!) also inspired of God. If it is not inspired of God, then it really shouldn't be called "scripture", etc."

See these further extracts from **Quote 201**. This author regrets having to repeat this material so soon but it seems the most appropriate way to answer Dr DiVietro's repeated 'originals-onlyism' dogma.

*Contrary to Dr DiVietro's dogma in bold under **Quote 201**, Dr Mrs Riplinger is not confining 'originals-onlyism' to the non-extant original writings. She is clearly indicating that 'originals-onlyism' in practice rests on "a rare and unreadable Greek text" and "conflicting Greek and Hebrew manuscripts or editions."*

*Those sources are of course futile with respect to support for 'originals-onlyism' and a mere pretence. See this extract from **Quote 200**.*

*In this author's view, according to their own standards where 'the original text' is the final authority for "**the scripture of truth**" Daniel 10:21, *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-4, neither Dr DiVietro nor any other member of the DBS Executive Committee could prove that they possess a perfect Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek match mate to the KJB, which they claim to represent an accurate translation of the correct i.e. original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text, even though they insist that the KJB is not inspired, *Cleaning-Up*, p 18, unless they could produce all the original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek manuscripts.*

They won't.

*They have no 'Bible' between two covers that could truly be called "**all scripture...given by inspiration of God.**" They insist, *Cleaning-Up*, p xi, that their 'original' consists of the original words of Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek and support this contention by means of several statements from Dean Burgon, found in *Cleaning-Up*, pp 327-330, where, ironically, the term Received Text, for the 'inspired' Greek text, Dr Williams informs readers, was probably derived by the Elzevir brothers from John 12:48, 17:8 in the supposedly 'uninspired' KJB!*

*In practice, all that Dr DiVietro has been able to produce in over 273 pages of *Cleaning-Up* is "a rare and unreadable Greek text" the precise location of which he has still failed to dis-*

close, see above and “conflicting Greek and Hebrew manuscripts or editions” altered by apostate priests and unregenerate scribes or compiled by unregenerate editors and/or lexicographers that Dr DiVietro has repeatedly tried to defend.

See for example the lengthy discussion on corrupt lexical definitions and their effects under **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**. See also **Quotes 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 47, 48, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70** with **Table 4, 71** with **Table 5, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 114** with respect to Revelation 9:11.

That is why this author, see above, has concluded that Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement “they have in a sense adopted the neo-orthodox position that the Bible (that we have) only contains God’s message (but accurately translated by men into English)” describes Dr DiVietro’s perception of the 1611 Holy Bible quite well, especially in view of his insistence under **Quote 201** that God did not give His actual words to the King James translators.

That is the true position of the Dean Burgon Society with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible. It is clearly no ‘defence’ of that work at all.

Dr DiVietro also appears wilfully to have bypassed the citations in *Hazardous Materials* that show Warfield’s actual position with respect to inspiration of the scriptures.

The first citation is from *A Testimony Founded Forever* by Dr James Sightler, pp 31, 32. See *Hazardous Materials* pp 1153-1154. Emphases are Dr Mrs Riplinger’s.

““It has been stated by Sandeen that the **Princeton** Theologians Archibald Alexander Hodge and Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, in 1881, were the **first to claim inspiration for the original autographs only** and to exchange the doctrine of providential preservation for restoration of the text by critics...Actually it was Warfield’s teacher and predecessor at Princeton, Charles Hodge, father of A. A. Hodge, who was the first to take up naturalistic text criticism and abandon the doctrine of providential preservation. It should be remembered that the Niagara Creed of 1878, adopted at the Niagara Conference on Prophecy, which was dominated by a coalition of **Princeton** graduates and followers of J. N. Darby, may well have been the **first document** to claim inspiration for every word of scripture ““provided such word is found in the **original** manuscripts.”””

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s next citation is from “*Dr Gary La More of Canada*” on p 1155 of *Hazardous Materials*. See **Quote 153**. Emphases are Dr Mrs Riplinger’s.

““Having been encouraged by A. A. Hodge to defend the Princeton view of verbal inspiration against an attack by the critical theories of Charles A. Briggs, Warfield found himself on the horns of a dilemma...Warfield’s solution was to **shift his authority of inerrancy to include only the original autographa**: no longer holding to the belief in the inerrancy of the Bible of the Reformers, the Traditional Text. Thus he moved that **if the locus of providence were now centred** in restoration via “Enlightenment” textual criticism, rather than preservation of the traditional texts, then we **need not concern ourselves with the criticisms lodged at the text of Scripture presently (and historically!) used in the Church**” (Gary La More, B. B. Warfield and His Followers, Scarborough, Ontario, Canada, Grace Missionary Baptist Church, 2007, pp 27-28).”

Dr Mrs Riplinger notes on p 1155 of *Hazardous Materials* that “Warfield’s inspired ‘originals only’ still stains many churches’ ‘Statement of Faith.’” See **Quote 201** and remarks on the Fellowship of Independent Evangelical Churches, FIEC, in the UK and its statement of faith.

The two citations by Dr Mrs Riplinger show that she has not twisted anything but that Dr DiVietro has misled his readers. James Sightler and Gary La More both refer to Warfield's claim for "*inspiration for the original autographs only*" and "*inerrancy to include only the original autographa.*"

Dr DiVietro should have levelled his criticisms at those two authors, with both of whom, it would appear, he is acquainted. However, it has been shown before that Dr DiVietro prefers women-only targets. See *Quotes 90, 105, 155, 159, 184.*

Again, perhaps through his obsession with women-only targets, Dr DiVietro has failed to inform his readers that the second part of his *Quote(s) 202* is not a statement of Dr Mrs Riplinger's at all. It is another citation, from David W. Norris, *The Big Picture*, pp 295-296, which Dr Mrs Riplinger cites from Gary La More, pp 20-21. The citation is as follows.

"What this means is that the originals have long since turned to dust, no inspired text exists today...Warfield's book on inspiration is still hailed as a 'classic', but his viewpoint has done more to undermine confidence in Scripture than almost any other in the last 150 years or so."

David W. Norris's detailed statement with respect to Warfield and the originals from pp 255-257 of *The Big Picture* is as follows. See www.authenticword.co.uk/originals.html. Emphases are the author's.

Note that David W. Norris's detailed statement below emphasises the necessity for the 1611 Holy Bible to be "*all scripture*" that "*is given by inspiration of God*" 2 Timothy 3:16 and makes nonsense of Dr DiVietro's and the Dean Burgon Society's bogus claim to 'originals-onlyism' by means of the original text preserved perfect, whole, inerrant, inspired – *some-where!*

If Dr Mrs Riplinger's remarks on that bogus claim are disparagement, then David W. Norris's detailed statement below is devastation.

Dr DiVietro would, of course, as he does in *Quotes 201, 202* deny some of David W. Norris's remarks on inspiration but his denial is dead-ended. See further extracts from *Quote 201* above.

*"Throughout the twentieth century, a view of inspiration gained ascendancy among evangelicals and many fundamentalists that marked a departure from that which was previously confessed by believers since New Testament days. (This does not include many, if not most neo-evangelicals, who now frequently hold a neo-orthodox view of inspiration based on the philosophical musings of Barth and Brunner.) Recent scholarship has shown that men like Princeton professor, Benjamin Warfield (1851-1921), were not as committed to the biblical doctrine of verbal inspiration as we are sometimes led to believe. Thinking to answer rationalist theologians on their own ground and legitimise textual studies, these men began to suggest that only the autographs (originals) were inspired, apographs (copies) were not. For this reason many of the Statements of Faith issued by various bodies now speak of the Scriptures being inspired 'as originally given' whereas before this time the conviction was that inspired Scripture was preserved in the copies. All this took place almost unnoticed, but we are being asked to swallow a real whopper! What this means is that as the originals have long since turned to dust, **no inspired text exists today** [cited in *Hazardous Materials* p 1157]. All we have available to us are non-inspired copies. Those who speak of reading an inspired Bible must therefore be mistaken.*

"Now the door stands open for all those of a mind to do so to engage in critical studies. This discipline will generally proceed on the assumption that God has not preserved His Word,

*but that it is now left to men to put together something as best they can [the explanation for the bogus textual theories of Westcott and Hort. See *The Revision Revised* by Dean Burgon]. This cannot be thought of as inspired because God has not preserved an inspired Word beyond the original writings of the prophets and apostles. Having only non-inspired copies with which to work, it would seem, were this in fact so, that all we **can** do is apply human means to a reconstruction of what we think the originals may have said. The conclusion from this must be that however accurate such a reconstruction may or may not be is not really the point, what matters is that this man-made literary patchwork will lack the absolute certainty and therefore the authority of an inspired text. A non-inspired text cannot suddenly turn into an inspired one the moment our back is turned! To lose inspiration **at any point** is to lose an authentic and wholly reliable Bible altogether. We can then never be sure whether the Bible is full of errors or has none. Warfield's book on biblical inspiration is still hailed as a 'classic', but his viewpoint has done more to undermine confidence in Scripture than almost any other in the last 150 years or so [cited in *Hazardous Materials* p 1157].*

*"Without a work of God, there is no way we can be sure whether the manuscripts we possess today are precisely as the originals. Alternatively, the Bible will be exposed to the ravages of the years as any human book. We are being asked to believe that God has allowed His authentic Word to disappear into the mists of time, in direct contradiction of what the Bible itself says. This view provides an excuse for rationalistically orientated 'scholars' to set their grubby little fingers to work on the sacred page [by 'clarifying' it, supposedly, see *Cleaning-Up* pp 32, 69, 91, 94-95, 152]. It gives opportunity for strangers 'to grace and to God' to rewrite the Word of God in their own image [*Hazardous Materials* is sub-titled *The Voice of Strangers*, John 10:5].*

*"If we are to read **a word for word reliable Bible**, any view of the preservation of Scripture must extend the life of the inspired text beyond that of the autographs. Only an inspired text can give us an inerrant Bible. Without the precise words, we do not possess the precise thoughts of God. The promise of God is to preserve **His words** "from this generation for ever" – this presumes the perpetuation of an inspired text. Are we to believe that the Lord Jesus Himself was mistaken or that He was ready to mislead us? Never!*

"For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matthew 5:18)

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away" (Matthew 24:35, cf. Luke 21:33 & Mark 13:31)

"And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail" (Luke 16:17)

*"We include **ALL** Scripture in this promise, for the Word of God is to be thought of only as an organic whole.*

"My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever." (Isaiah 59:21)

"But the word of the Lord endureth for ever." (1 Peter 1:25)"

As David W. Norris makes clear, that word is the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible *in English*.

By inspection, David W. Norris has also shown up the dishonesty of Dr DiVietro and the Dean Burgon Society Executive Committee with respect to their claim to have a perfect in-

spired original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek Biblical text – *somewhere*, precise whereabouts as yet undisclosed.

As indicated above, they could not *prove* that they had such a text without producing the originals manuscripts, which is impossible. See again *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi, 2-3, 7, 17, 18, 88, 91, 93, 94, 105-109, 149, 187, 249-250, 255-257, 264, 266, 268, 272, 273, 274, 276-277. David Norris's statement above, however, yields a most credible explanation of specifically why and how the DBS Executive Committee has attempted (in vain) to overcome that particular impossibility.

David Norris has described how Warfield and others limited inspiration to the Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek original writings, not even allowing for copies of those writings to be inspired and certainly not translations. He then describes how the 'originals-onlyism' scholars like Hodge and Warfield and others like them e.g. Westcott and Hort went about the task of determining what to them was what God 'really' said.

*“What this means is that as the originals have long since turned to dust, **no inspired text exists today** [cited in *Hazardous Materials* p 1157]. All we have available to us are non-inspired copies. Those who speak of reading an inspired Bible must therefore be mistaken.*

*“Now the door stands open for all those of a mind to do so to engage in critical studies. This discipline will generally proceed on the assumption that God has not preserved His Word, but that it is now left to men to put together something as best they can [the explanation for the bogus textual theories of Westcott and Hort. See *The Revision Revised* by Dean Burgon].”*

Observe that rational researchers and authors like James Sightler, Gary La More and David W. Norris have given a true evaluation of what Hodge and Warfield believed about inspiration. However, that evaluation is totally unacceptable to Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee because it would, as David W. Norris shows, land them squarely in the camp of Westcott and Hort with their bogus textual theories behind the 1881 Revision.

That is totally unacceptable to Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee. They are after all The *Dean Burgon* Society.

The challenge is, therefore, to devise a form of 'originals-onlyism' that is different from Hodge and Warfield's 'original-autographs-onlyism.' What follows is a possible explanation of how that futile sleight-of-hand was carried out by the DBS Executive Committee.

It is likely that the DBS Executive Committee's stance on 'originals-onlyism' stems from its members' *“private interpretation”* 2 Peter 1:20 of what Hodge and Warfield actually said. What follows is an overview of inspiration from Presbyterian sources. See the brief citation from Hodge and Warfield under **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint** with reference to the more detailed statements in this author's earlier work **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Dr Waite and the Imaginary 'Original Bible,' Unidentified in Print**, pp 22-23, from which the following extracts have been taken.

Note from James Sightler's citation above, Charles Hodge, who is mentioned below, must have apostatised before he was succeeded by his son A. A. Hodge.

Dr Waite's stance on the imaginary 'Original Bible' is in fact merely a variation on the position taken by Princeton academics Hodge and Warfield, who backed away from belief in an inerrant Bible, except in the 'originals,' as explained by the Presbyterian Church in the USA [Biblical Authority and Inspiration, A Resource Document Received by the 194th General Assembly (1982) of the United Presbyterian Church in: the United States of America,

www.pcusa.org/site_media/media/uploads/resolutions/scripture-use.pdf p 26]. Underlinings, emphases and comment in braces are this author's.

“The son and successor of Charles Hodge, A. A. Hodge, shifted away from his father’s insistence on the inerrancy of the traditional text in use to the inerrancy of the (lost) original autographs. A. A. Hodge with B. B. Warfield co-authored the definitive statement in the Princeton doctrine of Scripture, summarized in an 1881 article on “Inspiration.””

*““Nevertheless the historical faith of the Church has always been that all the affirmations of Scripture of all kinds, whether of spiritual doctrine or duty, or of physical or historical fact, or of psychological or philosophical principle, are without any error, when the **ipsissima verba** [very same words] of the original autographs are ascertained and interpreted in their natural sense.””*

That is, only the ‘original’ words of scripture are without error.

The article in The Presbyterian Review, Vol. 2, No. 6, 1881 may be found online [scdc.library.ptsem.edu/mets/mets.aspx?src=BR188126&div=1&img=14]. The citation from the article is from p 238. The following citation from that article, p 245 is also significant. Underlinings are this author’s.

“We do not assert that the common text [i.e. the AV1611], but only that the original autographic text was inspired.”

See Figure 21 for graphics of *The Presbyterian Review*, Vol. 2, No. 6, 1881, pp 238, 245.

James Sightler, Gary La More and David W. Norris have, quite reasonably, taken Hodge and Warfield’s statements to refer exclusively and specifically to the original writings that constituted “*the original autographic text*” that was inspired but now no longer exists. The expression “*was inspired*” eliminates the possibility of any extant document that could be described as “*inspired*.”

Moreover, Hodge and Warfield’s statement on inerrancy underlines their perception that only the original writings were inspired i.e. any errant document can’t be “*inspired*” and according to Hodge and Warfield all extant documents with respect to the scriptures contain errors.

That would appear to be the understanding of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America with respect to its perception of the stance of Hodge and Warfield on inspiration.

The stance of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America with respect to Hodge and Warfield’s view of inspiration would appear to this author to vindicate Dr Mrs Riplinger’s remarks under **Quote(s) 202**.

Quite obviously, that is totally unacceptable to the DBS Executive Committee. They must extend inspiration beyond the original writings *in order to avoid being lumped in with Westcott and Hort et al.*

They do so by taking the expression “*the original autographic text*” to mean the words of that text, not the actual documents that made up that text. That is what Dr DiVietro states under **Quote(s) 202**. As James Sightler, Gary La More and David Norris explain in some detail, that “**private interpretation**” 2 Peter 1:20 of Hodge and Warfield’s expression is not correct because, as David Norris states, Hodge and Warfield, like Westcott and Hort, leaned to “*critical studies*” not preservation of the Traditional Text in the form of written scriptures to determine what, supposedly God ‘really’ said.

Nevertheless, that is most likely why and how the DBS Executive Committee clings desperately to the notion of a perfect, extant, inspired, inerrant but undisclosed and undiscoverable Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek original text.

That is worse than ‘flannel.’ See *Preface and Introduction*. It is futility.

It should be remembered that Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive have not explicitly identified *any* published Greek text or extant manuscript or indeed any *specific* extant Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek source as finally authoritative or infallible, in which case, in spite of allusions to the Masoretic Hebrew Text and some editions of the Received Greek Text, *Cleaning-Up* pp xi, 327-330, they haven’t identified any *specific* extant Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek source *as inspired**. See *Quotes 95, 114, 123*, end of *126, 201* and *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3, 18, 21, 187, where Dr DiVietro effectively states the opposite.

*They may like readers to *think* that the Scrivener-DiVietro Greek text is such. See this extract from *Quote 114*. See also *Quotes 123, 143, 153*.

*Although they are careful not to say so explicitly, see remarks in response to Dr DiVietro’s specific comments under **Quote 114**, it appears that Dr Waite, Dr DiVietro, D. A. Waite Jr (and possibly his mom), Dr/Mr Coward and the rest of the DBS Executive Committee would like “this generation” to think that “Scrivener’s Greek text...**IS**...a letter-for-letter repository of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost [Hazardous Materials p 644],” this author’s selective citation, emphasis and capitalisation.*

For a rational view of inspiration, these remarks on *Quote(s) 202* conclude with a statement by David W. Norris, *The Big Picture* p 392 (not available on the above-mentioned site).

See **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Testimonies to the Inspiration of the AV1611** p 59.

Veteran biblical researcher and translator David Norris...reaches this conclusion about the 1611 English Holy Bible, this author’s emphases.

“By faith we accept the Bible as [the] Word of God, equally it is by faith in [the] promises of God that we believe that the Bible we now have in our possession to be word for word the inspired and inerrant word of God. In that the Authorized Version in the providence of God is a ‘correct’ and faithful translation, we deem it not to be less the inspired Word of God than the divine originals.”

Amen.

ogy. They are written in human languages, whose words, inflections, constructions, and idioms bear everywhere indelible traces of human error. The record itself furnishes evidence that the writers were in large measure dependent for their knowledge upon sources and methods in themselves fallible; and that their personal knowledge and judgments were in many matters hesitating and defective, or even wrong. Nevertheless the historical faith of the Church has always been, that all the affirmations of Scripture of all kinds, whether of spiritual doctrine or duty, or of physical or historical fact, or of psychological or philosophical principle, are without any error, when the *ipsissima verba* of the original autographs are ascertained and interpreted in their natural and intended sense. There is a vast difference between exactness of statement, which includes an exhaustive rendering of details, an absolute literalness, which the Scriptures never profess, and accuracy, on the other hand, which secures a correct statement of facts or principles intended to be affirmed. It is this accuracy and this alone, as distinct from exactness, which the Church doctrine maintains of every affirmation in the original text of Scripture without exception. Every statement accurately corresponds to truth just as far forth as affirmed.

PROOF OF THE DOCTRINE.

We of course do not propose to exhibit this evidence in this article. We wish merely to refresh the memory of our readers with respect to its copiousness, variety, and cogency.

1st. The New Testament writers continually assert of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and of the several books which constitute it, that they ARE THE WORD OF GOD. What their writers said God said. Christ sent out the Apostles with the promise of the Holy Ghost, and declared that in hearing them men would hear Him. The Apostles themselves claimed to speak as the Prophets of God, and with plenary authority in His name binding all consciences. And while they did so, God endorsed their teaching *and their claims* with signs and wonders and divers miracles! These claims are a universal and inseparable characteristic of every part of Scripture.

2d. Although composed by different human authors on various subjects and occasions, under all possible varieties of

as the principles of historico-grammatical exegesis are relied on to determine the meaning of Scripture, it is impossible to escape the fact that the Bible claims to be thus inspired. And thus, it is not a rare thing to find the very theologians who themselves cannot believe in a strict inspiration, yet admitting that the Scripture writers believed in it.* We cannot, therefore, occupy the ground on which these great and worthy men seem to us so precariously to stand. A proved error in Scripture contradicts not only our doctrine, but the Scripture claims and, therefore, its inspiration in making those claims. It is, therefore, of vital importance to ask: can phenomena of error and untruth be pointed out?

There is certainly no dearth of "instances" confidently put forward. But it is abundantly plain that the vast majority of them are irrelevant. We must begin any discussion of them, therefore, by reasserting certain simple propositions, the result of which will be to clear the ground of all irrelevant objections. It is to be remembered, then, that: 1. We do not assert that the common text, but only that the original autographic text was inspired. No "error" can be asserted, therefore, which cannot be proved to have been aboriginal in the text. 2. We do not deny an everywhere-present human element in the Scriptures. No mark of the effect of this human element therefore—in style of thought or wording—can be urged against inspiration, unless it can be shown to result in untruth. 3. We do not erect inspiration into an end, but hold it to be simply a means to an end, viz, the accurate conveyance of truth. No objection, therefore, is valid against the form in which the truth is expressed, so long as it is admitted that that form conveys the truth. 4. We do not suppose that inspiration made a writer false to his professed purpose; but rather that it kept him infallibly true to it. No objection is

Figure 21 *The Presbyterian Review*, Vol. 2, No. 6, 1881, pp 238, 245

Quote 203, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1161, 1162

“Therefore the term “All scripture” cannot refer to only the originals, ‘from Genesis to Revelation.’ It must include copies of the originals, as well as vernacular versions, as the following section will prove.

“Romans 16:26 refers to “the scriptures of the prophets...made known to all nations.[”] One cannot know something that is in another language. What he does know is referred to as “scriptures.” “All” of which are “given by inspiration of God” according to 2 Tim. 3:16. Many say that a Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament was used by Timothy, who knew the “scriptures” and whose father was a Greek. “Apollos...born at Alexandria,” and “mighty in the scriptures” may also have had a Greek translation of the Old Testament (Acts 18:24-28). (Theirs was certainly not the Vaticanus sold today as the Septuagint, nor would Jews in Israel, including Jesus, have used a Greek Bible.)”

Dr DiVietro declares that Dr Mrs Riplinger has perverted the meaning of Romans 16:26 by cutting it up in order to make it say what she wants it to say, although it doesn't. He then quotes Romans 16:26, followed by Romans 16:25 and states in a sentence without a principal clause that Jesus Christ was the promised messiah whom the prophets predicted and was then fully revealed by the apostle Paul as the Saviour of the world.

Dr DiVietro says that was a mystery that wasn't completely revealed until the apostle Paul received his Gospel. This mystery, says Dr DiVietro, was supported by the scriptures and spread throughout the then known world by Paul's preaching and that of other Christians of that time.

Dr DiVietro insists that Romans 16:25, 26 say nothing, in capital letters, about translation of the scriptures.

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments under **Quote 203** with the statement that no definite evidence of a Greek non-Septuagint translation of the Hebrew Old Testament exists. He says that New Testament citations of Old Testament scriptures are always correct with respect to the Hebrew Old Testament text.

Romans 16:25, 26 read in turn as follows.

“Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began,”

“But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith:”

It should first be noted that Dr DiVietro has not fully identified the mystery of Romans 16:25. It is more than the Gospel of salvation. It is the full body of specifically Christian doctrine that the Lord revealed to Paul to which he testifies in Galatians 1:12.

“For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.”

“The revelation of Jesus Christ” to Paul includes the indwelling Christ in the Christian, Colossians 1:27, the body of Christ, Ephesians 3:1-5, 5:32, the adoption and predestination of the Christian to be conformed to the image of Christ, Romans 8:29, Ephesians 1:5 and the eternal security of the Christian, Romans 8:35-39.

See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* pp 1497, 1498, 1509, 1515, 1555 and Dr Ruckman's commentary *The Book of Romans* pp 331-332, 607-610.

Dr DiVietro didn't edify his readers with the above material that stems from Romans 16:25. That is one reason why that material has therefore been inserted, to make up for the deficiency on his part.

That material has also been inserted to show that Dr DiVietro has yet again falsely accused Sister Riplinger. See *Quote(s) 202*.

Inspection of Romans 16:25, 26 *together* shows that the full body of specifically Christian doctrine that the Lord revealed to Paul, that is ***“the revelation of the mystery”*** i.e. ***“the revelation of Jesus Christ,”*** *Himself* a mystery according to the incarnation, 1 Timothy 3:16, ***“now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets...made known to all nations for the obedience of faith:”***

In sum, it was ***“the scriptures of the prophets”*** that enabled the full body of specifically Christian doctrine that the Lord revealed to Paul to be ***“made known to all nations for the obedience of faith,”*** augmented of course by Paul's preaching that was committed to writing and accumulated as the Pauline Epistles, the heart and essentials of specifically Christian doctrine in the scriptures.

See Paul's exposition based on ***“the scriptures of the prophets”*** in Acts 13:16-41 and note especially Acts 13:22-23 where Paul cites the Old Testament ***“scriptures of the prophets”*** in a free quotation of 1 Samuel 13:14, Samuel having been a prophet, Acts 3:24, 13:20 in order to reveal the Lord Jesus Christ.

“And when he had removed him, he raised up unto them David to be their king; to whom also he gave testimony, and said, I have found David the son of Jesse, a man after mine own heart, which shall fulfil all my will. Of this man's seed hath God according to his promise raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus:”

Dr Mrs Riplinger has distorted nothing. As indicated above, Dr DiVietro has falsely accused her, yet again.

Whilst it is true that Romans 16:25, 26 do not explicitly refer to translations of scripture, for those verses to be fulfilled as described above, translation would have been essential, after the manner of Acts 2:4, with respect to *inspired* translations of scriptures such as Acts 2:16-21/Joel 2:28-32.

“And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.”

See detailed remarks in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has written separately to this author with respect to *Quote(s) 179* stating that *“DiVietro's comment that everyone spoke Greek is nonsense. He gives no footnote from any linguist. If they all spoke Greek, what was Acts 2 all about? The Bible itself proves him wrong, even without the witness of linguists.”*

Exactly.

Concerning definite evidence for early i.e. 1st century translations of the Hebrew Old Testament, in Greek or otherwise, which Dr DiVietro emphatically denies, again, see the extensive remarks in **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** and note the following extract that summarises the case for at least portions of the Hebrew Old Testament being translated into other languages in the 1st century. Ironically, it is *Dr DiVietro's very insistence on the widespread use of Greek*, see *Quote(s) 179*, that would suggest that at least parts of the Hebrew Old Testament, or the apostles' free quotations from it, found their way into 1st century Greek as inspired translations *in writing*.

This author believes, therefore, contrary to Dr DiVietro that the Lord Jesus Christ has sufficient grace, mercy, wisdom and power to provide written inspired portions of Old Testament scriptures at least soon after Acts 2, directly inspired from an apostle's 'free' quotations from the Old Testament in languages other than Hebrew. The differences between the New Testament citations of the Old Testament in Acts 2, 3, 8 and their Old Testament counterparts show that these portions were in languages other than Hebrew but they were no less **"The place of scripture"** for that. As the Hebrew Old Testament became more widely circulated* in the ensuing centuries of the church, these early inspired translated portions of scripture appear to have passed from the scene, preserved only in the New Testament citations such as Acts 2, 3, 8 but they clearly fulfilled the purpose the Lord had for them.

"For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it" Isaiah 55:10-11.

*Hebrew Old Testament manuscripts, for example, had reached England by the time of Wycliffe in the 14th century [In Awe of Thy Word p 788]. Better late than never.

Note also this extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.

Dr Moorman [Forever Settled by Jack Moorman, The Bible for Today, p 28] notes that "The ruling house of Adiabene, a kingdom situated east of the Tigris, was converted to Judaism about A.D. 40....They needed the Hebrew scriptures in a language they could understand – i.e. Syriac, so it is probable that parts of the Old Testament, and at first the Pentateuch, were translated into Syriac in the middle of the 1st century."

Note also that on p 1162 of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr Mrs Riplinger refers to the possibility of a 1st century Ethiopic Old Testament and Dr Moorman certainly allows the possibility as this further extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint** shows.

Dr Moorman [Early Manuscripts And The Authorized Version, A Closer Look! By Jack A. Moorman, B.F.T. #1825, 1990, pp 47-48] concludes that the Ethiopic Bible stemmed from the eunuch's conversion in Acts 8 i.e. in the language of Ethiopia, not Koine Greek or Hebrew. This conclusion is reinforced by an historical overview of the Hebrew language, which shows that it wasn't ever established in Ethiopia but the languages of **"every nation under heaven"** could, therefore, have included Ethiopic.

See en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hebrew_language.

If at least portions of the Hebrew Old Testament could be translated into Syriac and Ethiopic in the 1st century, why not in Greek, i.e. non-Septuagint Greek?

Dr DiVietro would most likely disregard all of the above but he should beware of limiting God. See this brief extract from **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint**.

Psalm 78:41 describes [Dr DiVietro's] attitude.

"Yea, they turned back and tempted God, and limited the Holy One of Israel."

Quote(s) 204, from *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1163, 1164

"The scriptures are the written words of God. The Bible equates "scriptures" with the word of God.

"The phrase "the word of God" summarises and re-iterates that the Holy Bible is still God's words, not man's words (i.e. not the words of the KJB translators, etc.). Some have tried to

re-define the few simple words – “the word of God.” In any other usage the phrase ‘the word of John’ means that they are John’s words, not someone else’s.

*“The vernacular versions continue to be God’s living spirit communicating to each reader through his own culture, using Biblical language. For example, in the Greek Bible in the book of Acts the heathen were described as worshipping the **Greek** goddess **Artemis**. In the English Bible, she is called ‘Diana’ because that is the name by which she was known to “all Asia and the world” (Acts 19:27). Any witch today in America, France or Germany identifies Diana as her goddess, not the strictly Greek goddess Artemis.”*

Dr DiVietro professes to believe that the scriptures are the words of God (small w’s throughout his comments under **Quote(s) 204**. He says that any accurate translation of the Hebrew and Greek words that God first spoke is collectively the words of God in that particular vernacular version.

Dr DiVietro insists that God did not speak His words in any vernacular language. However, he declares that although the translated words are not inspired, provided they have the full impact and meaning of the words God spoke in the originals, they are the words of God with power and impact “*derived*” from the originals.

Dr DiVietro questions the need for Dr Mrs Riplinger’s example of Artemis and Diana. He says that it would be preferable to use the name in translation that is more widely recognised, just as various media personalities are known by their stage names e.g. Bob Dylan instead of Robert Zimmerman etc. Dr DiVietro then states that of several witches that he has been acquainted with, most seem to prefer the ancient names but he cannot speak for all witches and neither, he insists, can Dr Mrs Riplinger.

Yet again, Dr DiVietro substantiates nothing in his comments about inspiration and the words of God, failing to give any supporting scripture for his comments. See **Quote 201**.

Yet again, Dr DiVietro fails to specify where God’s perfect inspired original words in Hebrew and Greek may be found between two covers. See **Quote 201**.

Yet again, by confining inspiration to the Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek ‘originals,’ Dr DiVietro has violated the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9, especially those who aren’t fluent in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. See **Quote 201**.

Yet again, all is sheer supposition on Dr DiVietro’s part about inspiration and the words of God, without substance.

Dr DiVietro is back to his unscriptural two-tiered word of God, one inspired, one not inspired. See this extract from **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint**.

It should be understood, therefore that Dr DiVietro has thus revealed to the student a ‘two-tier’ deposit of the scriptures, one ‘inspired’ and the other ‘un-inspired.’ (The DBS Executive Committee members appear to be the sole custodians of the first (like the pope, who now has oversight of the notorious Turin Shroud) while ordinary believers, including those who suffered under “the iron heel of the papacy” during the centuries-long period of the Dark Ages – see remarks later – have had to make do with the second.)

Acts 13:10 springs to mind.

“O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?”

See wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Shroud_of_Turin.

See kjb.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, Chapter 2, *Which Bible?* p 214.

In response to Dr DiVietro's suppositions about inspiration, scripture and the words of God, see these extracts from *Quotes 201, 202*, with some annotations.

Quote 201 extracts:

They [Dr DiVietro and his fellow travellers of the DBS Executive Committee] have no 'Bible' between two covers that could truly be called "all scripture...given by inspiration of God." They insist, Cleaning-Up, p xi, that their 'original' consists of the original words of Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek and support this contention by means of several statements from Dean Burgon, found in Cleaning-Up, pp 327-330, where, ironically, the term Received Text, for the 'inspired' Greek text, Dr Williams informs readers, was probably derived by the Elzevir brothers from John 12:48, 17:8 in the supposedly 'uninspired' KJB!

In practice, all that Dr DiVietro has been able to produce in over 273 pages of Cleaning-Up is "a rare and unreadable Greek text" the precise location of which he has still failed to disclose, see above and "conflicting Greek and Hebrew manuscripts or editions" altered by apostate priests and unregenerate scribes or compiled by unregenerate editors and/or lexicographers that Dr DiVietro has repeatedly tried to defend.

See for example the lengthy discussion on corrupt lexical definitions and their effects under Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint. See also Quotes 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 47, 48, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70 with Table 4, 71 with Table 5, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 114 with respect to Revelation 9:11.

That is why this author, see above, has concluded that Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement "they have in a sense adopted the neo-orthodox position that the Bible (that we have) only contains God's message (but accurately translated by men into English)" describes Dr DiVietro's perception of the 1611 Holy Bible quite well, especially in view of his insistence under Quote 201 that God did not give His actual words to the King James translators.

See the end of Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint, Challenge #6, Point-Counterpoint and the remarks under Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint on the word "propitiation" on Dr DiVietro's attempts to 'clarify' the 1611 Holy Bible and thereby overcome its so-called ambiguities and confusing grammar to which Dr DiVietro refers on pp 32, 69, 91, 94-95, 152 of Cleaning-Up.

*If, in Dr DiVietro's opinion, God did not give His words to the King James translators [comments under Quote 201] (even though, as Dr Mrs Riplinger notes on p 1156 of Hazardous Materials, see above, "The Bible says "Thou shalt preserve them..." It is **his** work. What shall he preserve? He shall preserve **his words** – not replace them with men's words) such that the 1611 Holy Bible is not "all scripture" that "is given by inspiration of God" and it needs 'clarification' for its ambiguities and confusing grammar by mere men such as Kirk DiVietro using the uninspired works of more mere men i.e. critical editions and lexicons, then the 1611 Holy Bible is a mere message, even if accurately translated [and not the words of God with any power or impact at all].*

If the 1611 Holy Bible is not "all scripture" that "is given by inspiration of God" - and Dr DiVietro insists that it is not - then Dr DiVietro cannot truthfully say that it "truly breathes with the power of God." The 1611 Holy Bible cannot truly breathe "with the power of God" any more than a fossilised Siberian woolly mammoth could take a breath of fresh Arctic air.

See this extract from this author's earlier work *Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Translation Without Inspiration is Extinction* p 3.

The AV1611, according to Dr Waite, has preserved God's 'original' Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words in translated form but it has been dead for the last 400 years, ever since its inception, even **"from the beginning of the creation"** of it, 2 Peter 3:4. Because it is merely a translation, it is and has always been like a frozen, fossilized woolly mammoth in Siberia [In *the Minds of Men* by Ian T. Taylor, TFE Publishing, 1991, pp 97ff] whose form has been preserved but it has no life.

The Devil would naturally be eager to propagate that perception of the AV1611 and he appears to have found an unwitting accomplice in Dr Waite.

He has also found one in Dr Kirk DiVietro.

Quote(s) 202 extracts:

Dr DiVietro has detracted from the 1611 Holy Bible by relegating it from **"the word of God"** to **"the word of men"** 1 Thessalonians 2:13 and thereby downgrading it to the level of **"dead works"** Hebrews 6:1, 9:14. See **Quote 68, 69, 75, 86, 98, 106, 114, 125, 164, 166, 174, 175, 181.**

For the complete overview of Dr DiVietro's fixation with 'originals-onlyism,' see yet again *Cleaning-Up* pp iii-v, xi, 2-3, 7, 17, 18, 88, 91, 93, 94, 105-109, 149, 187, 249-250, 255-257, 264, 266, 268, 272, 273, 274, 276-277. Dr DiVietro and the Dean Burgon Society as a whole insist that the 1611 Holy Bible is not **"all scripture"** that **"is given by inspiration of God"** 2 Timothy 3:16.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's notion of what is **"all scripture"** that **"is given by inspiration of God"** and see first this extract from the **Introduction**.

The terms "Holy Bible," **"the word of God"** 1 Samuel 9:27, **"scripture of truth,"** **"the holy scriptures"** 2 Timothy 3:15 and **"all scripture...given by inspiration of God"** will also be taken as interchangeable because that is how this author understands them, along with the expression **"finally authoritative."** God's word must be finally authoritative because, as all Bible critics of any persuasion agree, there is no higher authority than God. See *The Creed of the Alexandrian Cult* in any issue of *The Bible Believer's Bulletin*. [See again **Quotes 95, 114, 123,** end of **126, 201** and *Cleaning-Up* pp 2-3, 18, 21, 187. Dr DiVietro has thus far disclosed no higher authority than **"two-and-a-half pints of human brains."** See Dr Ruckman's commentary *The Book of Matthew* p 30.]

Note also this succinct observation from Bro. Heisey on inspiration that reveals and reproves the basic flaw in Dr DiVietro's 'originals-onlyism' Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek inspiration notion.

"The...issue with regard to "is given ..." is the fact that the inspiration of God is (present tense) preserved in true scripture, no matter the language. That is, the phrase "is given..." specifically indicates that whatever is truly scripture, is(!) also inspired of God. If it is not inspired of God, then it really shouldn't be called "scripture", etc."

For a rational view of inspiration, these remarks on **Quote(s) 202** conclude with a statement by David W. Norris, *The Big Picture* p 392 (not available on the above-mentioned site).

See *Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Testimonies to the Inspiration of the AV1611* p 59.

Veteran biblical researcher and translator David Norris...reaches this conclusion about the 1611 English Holy Bible, this author's emphases.

"By faith we accept the Bible as [the] Word of God, equally it is by faith in [the] promises of God that we believe that the Bible we now have in our possession to be word for word the inspired and inerrant word of God. In that the Authorized Version in the providence of God is a 'correct' and faithful translation, we deem it not to be less the inspired Word of God than the divine originals."

Amen.

Amen again.

Further citations will be given with respect to inspiration and the words of God under Dr DiVietro's concluding quote, **Quote 205**, from the documented statements of Miles Coverdale and John Wycliffe.

Concerning Dr DiVietro's comments on Dr Mrs Riplinger's allusion to the names Artemis and Diana, Alexander Hislop in *The Two Babylons* has a brief footnote on p 30 with respect to Artemis, whom he identifies as Diana. He has remarks about Diana on pp 30, 76, 85, 100, 188, 195, 299n, 308.

Hislop's work would suggest that Diana is much the more familiar term in the Babylonian religion and in turn it is likely that the present-day adherents of the Babylonian religion i.e. witches would give the same emphasis in their own belief system. That likelihood tends to support Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement about Artemis, Diana and present-day witches.

It should be noted that Dr Mrs Riplinger does not refer to *all* the witches today in America, France or Germany. That is Dr DiVietro's expression. Dr Mrs Riplinger states "Any witch today in America, France or Germany," which could reasonably refer to a representative sample. The statement does not have to refer to all possible individuals.

Dr DiVietro has therefore yet again distorted one of Dr Mrs Riplinger's statements. See **Quote 196**.

That suggests, regrettably, that Dr DiVietro may not be above a certain Wiccan deception himself. He should reflect carefully on Paul's warning in Galatians 5:19-20, quoted here in part:

"Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these;...Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies"

By inspection, the works listed above seem to this author to come under the heading of 'originals-onlyism.'

Quote 205, from *Hazardous Materials*, p 1164

"What is biblical language? The word 'holpen,' for example, is God's Biblical English word for 'helped.' The word was historically used only in the Bible. The word 'help' is much more archaic (800 A. D.) than 'holpen.'"

Quote 205 is Dr DiVietro's last quote from *Hazardous Materials*. He descends into mockery again, see **Quote 200**, stating that Dr Mrs Riplinger must be "kidding" about the word 'holpen,' which Dr DiVietro insists is an obsolete form of the verb *to help*. Dr DiVietro then states that the word *help* may well have pre-dated the word *holpen* because a verb must exist before a form of it, such as *holpen*, which is a past participle, can exist. However, he insists that the word *holpen* was never commonly used.

Dr DiVietro then accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of hypocrisy in that she defines the word in the King James Bible without using the King James Bible to do so. Note that Dr DiVietro repeatedly scoffs at the King James Bible's built-in dictionary. See **Setting Up the 'Clean-up', Challenges #1, #2, #3, Points-Counterpoints, Quotes 9, 14, 39, 50, 61, 62, 67, 71, 85, 87, 176.**

Dr DiVietro then dismisses the citations that Dr Mrs Riplinger gives on pp 1164-1180 of *Hazardous Materials* about the inspiration of the Holy Bible as irrelevant because, Dr DiVietro complains, the context of the quotes is unknown. He says offhandedly that many writers use flowery phrases about what he terms the magnificence, power, beauty and effect of the King James Bible but without knowing the context of their writings, the intent of the writers is unknown.

That is, Dr DiVietro is again accusing Dr Mrs Riplinger of taking quotes out of context. See **Quotes 114, 146 with 47, 149, 180, 181, 182, 183, 186.**

After speaking dismissively of what he terms the gematria, on pp 1182-1184 of *Hazardous Materials*, on which he commented on 36-38 of *Cleaning-Up*, Dr DiVietro then alludes to possible objections to *Hazardous Materials* that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists on pp 1192-1193 and which precede the seven challenges on pp 1193-1194 of *Hazardous Materials* that occupied pp 19-114 of *Cleaning-Up*. See **Challenges #1-#7, Points-Counterpoints and Challenges #1-#7 – Overview.**

The specific objections to which Dr DiVietro alludes are listed below, together with this author's responses, as extracts from **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint.**

Dr DiVietro concludes his comments under **Quote 205** in bold by declaring that he has read *Hazardous Materials* through carefully three times, see also *Cleaning-Up* p 110, that he was by turns shocked, concerned to make sure he understood it and resolved to determine how he should respond.

Dr DiVietro's final word on *Hazardous Materials* is that he has sought to respond honestly (!) and factually (!) to what he perceives as Dr Mrs Riplinger's distortions and that he has no more to say on the matter.

Dr DiVietro's supposed honesty and factuality with respect to his response to *Hazardous Materials* will be summarised in the **Quotes Overall Summary** to follow. Dr DiVietro's supposed honesty and factuality in his response to *Hazardous Materials* may also be gauged by means of **Challenges #1-#7 – Overview** and **Quotes 105-141, An Overview** with respect to Dr DiVietro's eighteen major failings in his comments on Chapter 18 of *Hazardous Materials*, on *Scrivener's Greek Textus Receptus*, which is of particular interest to Dr DiVietro as Scrivener's co-editor.

Yet again, Dr DiVietro has substantiated nothing in his comments, nor has he cited any relevant scripture. See **Quote(s) 204.**

Concerning the word 'holpen,' Dr DiVietro has denied that it is a particular Biblical word, insisting only that it is an obsolete word, which was never commonly used. That last statement by Dr DiVietro would in itself suggest the possibility that holpen may be a Biblical word that is **"holy...undefiled, separate from sinners"** Hebrews 7:26. See remarks under **Challenge #3, Point-Counterpoint.**

Dr DiVietro has overlooked that possibility. He has also neglected to inform his readers that immediately after **Quote 205** Dr Mrs Riplinger refers the reader to *In Awe of Thy word* for examples of Biblical words.

The material on the word *holpen* is found in Chapter 6 of *In Awe of Thy Word* entitled “*Pure Words...Tried*” pp 236-237. Dr Mrs Riplinger explains the explicitly Biblical nature of the word *holpen* as follows, her emphases.

Note that her remarks give the lie to Dr DiVietro’s accusation that Dr Mrs Riplinger used a secular dictionary to define a word in the King James Bible. Dr DiVietro has yet again falsely accused Sister Riplinger. See **Quote 203**.

“The KJV changed ‘helped’ to ‘holpen’ [in Luke 1:54, from the Bishops’ Bible]...Contrary to our preconceived ideas, the word ‘helped’ is not the modern counterpart of ‘holpen.’ The word ‘help’ is the older of the two words, dating back to the 800s. In fact, in A. D. 950 the Lindisfarne Gospels said,

*““Milsa us vel **help**...” Matt. 20:30*

“(The holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Skeat, 1871).

*“The KJV does use the word ‘help’ and ‘helped’ more frequently than ‘holpen,’ but its expanded vocabulary occasionally includes ‘holpen.’ Of course, the KJV defines ‘holpen’ in its built-in dictionary in Daniel 11:34 as “**holpen** with a little **help**.” The KJV uses ‘holpen’:*

- *To help with international recognisability. The KJB’s ‘holpen’ matches the German ‘helfen,’ the Dutch and Low German, ‘helpen’ and the Yiddish ‘helfn.’*
- *When a two-syllable word is needed for meter. For example, in Luke 1:54, the use of ‘holpen’ allows alliteration of ‘h,’ ‘i,’ ‘is,’ ‘m,’ ‘r,’ ‘c,’ and ‘e,’ as well as repeated accents on the second and third syllables.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger then depicts Luke 1:54 in chart form for readers to “*note the recurring rhythm made possible by the use of the two-syllable word ‘holpen.’*”

She concludes:

“The Bible calls the word of God, the “lively oracles” (Acts 7:38). Not surprisingly then, the OED says ‘holpen’ is “alive.”

*““Now U.S. dialect...kept **alive** by biblical and liturgical use, is still employed by poets...”*

“Ask the residents of the Western and Southern United States what ‘holpen’ means. The OED says ‘holp’ is “Now U.S. dialect,”

““holp for ‘help’...may be heard in the ordinary speech of the natives.”

“They also cite E.B. Atwood’s Regional Vocabulary of Texas, vol. vi, p. 118, which says,

““Items of non-standard grammar are usually considerably more frequent...for example...holp...” (OED s.v. [sub voce under such a word] help and holp).”

Dr Mrs Riplinger has informed this author separately that “*DiVietro’s charges about holpen can be answered by a simple review of the unabridged OED for both the words help and holpen. It gives a complete history with dates.*” Sister Riplinger has clearly made out a strong case for ‘holpen’ as a Biblical word.

Dr DiVietro has both failed to address that case and to inform his readers of it so that they could give it due consideration.

Dr DiVietro’s readers were therefore not greatly holpen by him in his comments under **Quote 205**.

It is also possible that he didn’t want to risk a showdown with Texans, not even with their manner of speech.

Concerning the citations on pp 1164-1180 of *Hazardous Materials*, these are statements by Wycliffe and Coverdale who declare unequivocally that God was the Author of the English Bible i.e. God inspired their English Bibles (as would be understood now as perfect intermediate purification stages of ***“The words of the LORD”*** Psalm 12:6, 7 *in English*). Their statements are as follows from pp 1165-1167 of *Hazardous Materials*, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases. See **Challenge #4, Point-Counterpoint, Quotes 181, 193.**

By inspection, they have nothing to do with flowery phrases but are much more explicit about inspiration of the pre-1611 scriptures which they possessed. Dr DiVietro has misled his readers in that respect as well.

It is this author’s considered opinion that Dr DiVietro could easily have checked the following sources with the resources available to him. See **Quotes 154, 185, 191, 192.**

He has failed to do so.

“Coverdale said,

*““No, **the Holy Ghost** is as much the **author** of it in Hebrew, Greek, French, Dutch, and English, as in Latin” (In Awe, p. 846).*

“Coverdale said in the preface to his Bible that -

*““...**the scripture** ...leaveth no poor man unhelped...And why? Because it is given by the **inspiration of God**” (In Awe, p. 847)...*

*“Wycliffe was accused of **heresy** for believing that the English Bible was actually Holy Ghost-given scriptures. He said,*

*““The clergy cry aloud that is **heresy** to speak of the Holy **Scriptures in English**, and so they would condemn the Holy Ghost, who gave **tongues** to the Apostles of Christ to speak the **word of God in all languages** under heaven.” (For these and more such quotes see G. A. Riplinger, *In Awe of Thy Word*, e.g. pp 846, 847, 757, 758).*

*““You say it is **heresy** to speak of the Holy **Scriptures in English**. You call me a heretic because I have translated the Bible into the common tongue of the people. Do you know who you blaspheme? Did not the Holy Ghost give the word of God at first in the **mother-tongue** of the **nations** to whom it was **addressed**? Why do you speak against the Holy Ghost?”...*

“Wycliffe continued his theme of “Scriptures in tongues” in his book Wycket, saying,

*“...such a charge is a condemnation of the Holy Ghost, who first gave **the Scriptures in tongues** to the Apostles of Christ, to speak that **word in all languages that were ordained under heaven**” (In Awe, p. 758).*

“Wycliffe would be burned at the stake in today’s colleges for believing in the Dictation Theory of the originals. He said,

*““Holy Scripture is the unique word of God and our authors are only God’s scribes or heralds charged with the duty of inscribing the law he has **dictated** to them...[H]e himself had **dictated** it within the hearts of the humble scribes, stirring them to follow that form of writing and description which he had chosen...and **not** because it was **their own word**...” (In Awe, p. 759).*

*“When God said he would “preserve” **his** words “for ever,” what was he preserving (Ps. 12:6, 7)? The inspired word which is “forever settled in heaven” includes, by his will and foreknowledge, the vernacular Holy Bibles, by which each man will be judged on the last day.”*

Dr DiVietro insists that the above statements from Coverdale and Wycliffe must be put in context. The respective contexts are as follows.

Coverdale:

See *The Reformation In England* by J. H. Merle D'Aubigné (Originally published in 1866) Reprint by Banner of Truth Trust 1972, American Presbyterian Church, Volume 1, Book 4, this author's emphases.

See www.americanpresbyterianchurch.org/?page_id=1493.

See www.americanpresbyterianchurch.org/?page_id=1630.

Note D'Aubigné's denial of scripture translations given by inspiration of God. He is imposing an unwarranted and incorrect interpretation on what Coverdale said.

Observe that the *context* of what Coverdale said is in reply to Catholic priests who insisted that the scriptures should only be in Latin, somewhat like a modern 'originals-onlyist' who insists that inspired scriptures only exist in Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek.

“Coverdale found happiness in his studies. “Now,” he said, “I begin to taste of Holy Scriptures! Now, honor be to God! I am set to the most sweet smell of holy letters.” He did not stop there, but thought it his duty to attempt in England the work which Tyndale was prosecuting in Germany. The Bible was so important in the eyes of these Christians, that two translations were undertaken simultaneously. “Why should other nations,” said Coverdale, “be more plenteously provided for with the Scriptures in their mother tongue than we?” “Beware of translating the Bible!” exclaimed the partisans of the schoolmen, “your labor will only make divisions in the faith and in the people of God.” “God has now given His church,” replied Coverdale, “the gifts of translating and of printing; we must improve them.” And if any friends spoke of Tyndale’s translation, he answered, “Do not you know that when many are shooting together, every one doth his best to be nighest the mark?” “But Scripture ought to exist in Latin only,” objected the priests. “No,” replied Coverdale again, “the Holy Ghost is as much the author of it in the Hebrew, Greek, French, Dutch, and English, as in Latin... The Word of God is of like worthiness and authority, in what language soever the Holy Ghost speaketh it.” This does not mean that translations of Holy Scripture are inspired, but that the Word of God, faithfully translated, always possesses a divine authority.”

See *The Coverdale Bible 1535 Edition, General Prologue*, this author's emphases. The context is inspiration of the vernacular scriptures.

See www.biblesofthepast.com/, www.biblesofthepast.com/Texts/1535-1535/ File.htm.

*“The onely worde of God (I saye) is the cause of all felicite, it bryngeth all goodnes with it, it bryngeth lernynge, it gēdreth [gendereth i.e. engenders] vnderstondynge, it causeth good workes, it maketh chyldren of obedience, breuely [briefly], it teacheth all estates theyr office and duety. Seynge then that **the scripture** of God teacheth vs euery thyng sufficiently, both what we oughte to do, and what we oughte to leaue vndone: whome we are bounde to obey, and whome we shulde not obeye: therfore (I saye) it causeth all prosperite, and setteth euery thyng in frame: and where it is taught and knowen, it lyghteneth all darkenesses, cōforteth all sory hertes, **leaueth no poore man vnhelped**, suffreth nothyng amyse vnamended, letteth no prynce be disobeyed, permytteth no heresie to be preached: but refourmeth all thinges, amēdeth that is amyse, and setteth euery thyng in order. **And why? because it is geuen by the inspiracyon of God**, therfore is it euer bryngeynge profyte and frute, by teachynge, by improuynge, by amendynge and refourmyng all thē þ^t wyl [them that will] receaue it, to make them perfecte & mete vnto all good worke.”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger has noted separately to this author that “*Coverdale did not access Greek or Hebrew much at all, so his reference to inspiration had to be to vernacular editions.*”

Wycliffe:

See *Beacon Lights Of History - Volume 3, Part-1 John Wyclif - A. D. 1324-1384* by John Lord, LL.D, this author’s emphases.

See:

www.nalanda.nitc.ac.in/resources/english/etext-project/history/beacon/part-1chapter11.html.

The context is the denial by Catholic priests, see remarks above, of vernacular versions of scripture as the true *inspired* word of God.

“The version of Wyclif and all other translations into English were utterly prohibited under the severest penalties. Fines, imprisonment, and martyrdom were inflicted on those who were guilty of so foul a crime as the reading or possession of the Scriptures in the vernacular tongue. This is one of the gravest charges ever made against the Catholic Church. This absurd and cruel persecution alone made the Reformation a necessity, even as the translation of the Bible prepared the way for the Reformation. The translation of the Scriptures and the Reformation are indissolubly linked together.

*“The authorities of those days would have destroyed, if they could, every copy of the version Wyclif made. But the precious manuscripts were secreted and secretly studied, and both from the novelty and the keen interest they excited they were unquestionably a powerful factor in the religious unrest of those times. Doubtless the well known opposition to the circulation of the Bible in the vernacular has been exaggerated, but in the fourteenth century it was certainly bitter and furious. Wyclif might expose vices which everybody saw and lamented as a scandal, and make himself obnoxious to those who committed them; but to open the door to free inquiry and a reformed faith and hostility to the Pope, - this was a graver offence, to be visited with the severest penalties. To the storm of indignation thus raised against him Wyclif’s only answer was: **“The clergy cry aloud that it is heresy to speak of the Holy Scriptures in English, and so they would condemn the Holy Ghost, who gave tongues to the Apostles of Christ to speak the Word of God in all languages under heaven.”***

Today’s ‘originals-onlyism’ clergy continue to raise their voices in like manner, with a “*storm of indignation.*”

For the statement ““*You say it is **heresy** to speak of the Holy **Scriptures in English**. You call me a heretic because I have translated the Bible into the common tongue of the people. Do you know who you blaspheme? Did not the Holy Ghost give the word of God at first in the mother-tongue of the **nations** to whom it was **addressed**? Why do you speak against the Holy Ghost?*”...” see *John Wycliffe, The Dawn of the Reformation* by David Fountain, pp 45-46.

See Figure 22. The context is conflict with *more Catholic priests*, the equivalent ‘originals-onlyism’ clergy of Wycliffe’s time.





Figure 22 John Wycliffe, *The Dawn of the Reformation* by David Fountain, pp 45-46

For the statement “...such a charge is a condemnation of the Holy Ghost, who first gave *the Scriptures in tongues* to the Apostles of Christ, to speak that word in *all languages that were ordained under heaven*” see Figure 23:

Wycklyffes wycket: whych he made in Kyng Rychards days the Second, published 1828, p 18 of 57.

See archive.org/details/wycklyffeswycke00wyclgoog.

See archive.org/stream/wycklyffeswycke00wyclgoog#page/n16/mode/2up/search/holy.




Figure 23 *Wycklyffes wycket: whych he made in Kyng Rychards days the Second*
 Published 1828, p 18 of 57

The statement “*“Holy Scripture is the unique word of God and our authors are only God’s scribes or heralds charged with the duty of inscribing the law he has **dictated** to them...[H]e himself had **dictated** it within the hearts of the humble scribes, stirring them to follow that form of writing and description which he had chosen...and **not** because it was **their own word**...”* (In *Awe*, p. 759)” is from Wycliffe’s work *On the Truth of Holy Scripture*, for which Dr Mrs Riplinger cites pp 208, 209, 210, 211, 222 et al.

This work is available online as a scanned document in its Latin text entitled *De Veritae Sacrae Scripturae* with critical and historical notes added by Dr Rudolph Buddensieg and published for The Wyclif Society, 1905.

See lollardsociety.org/pdfs/Wyclif_de_VeritateSS_voll.pdf.

Without attempting to follow through on the precise statements from Wycliffe’s work *On the Truth of Holy Scripture* given above, a few of Dr Buddensieg’s notes translated from Wycliffe’s text are given below as indicative of Wycliffe’s mindset with respect to the Holy Bible in *English*.

The page numbers refer to the pages of the text, not the pdf file. The abbreviation *Scr.* stands for *Scripture*.

On the *authority* of scripture, p 52:

*Scr. is in its t
literal sense the
highest authority¹*

On the *truth* of scripture, p 54:

*f) the truth of
Scr. is higher
than all human
learning, for
that reason it
ought to be
followed*

On the *inspiration* of scripture, since “*God is a Spirit*” John 4:24:

*Holy Scripture
was made by
God to contain
all truth*

Concerning Dr DiVietro’s dismissive comments on what he terms the gematria, note these remarks from **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint**.

Dr DiVietro’s next accusation against Dr Mrs Riplinger, pp 36-38, is with respect to her application of Bible numerics to 1 John 5:7, Hazardous Materials, pp 1182-1184. He compares her analysis to the concoction of false Bible codes, which he says, can be worked up for any book and accuses her of more inconsistency because, he says, she warns against the occultism of some study aids editors but resorts to mysticism herself to prove inspiration for the 1611 English Holy Bible.

He further insists that her Bible numerics approach cannot be used for textual criticism, is essentially cabbalistic in nature and leaves open the question of which language to use, Greek or English.

*Dr DiVietro fails to mention that Dr Mrs Riplinger is citing the work of Periander A. Esplana, a Christian from Camarines Norte, Philippines. He has written two extensive works, entitled *The Bible Formula* [thebibleformula.webs.com/] and *The Mathematical Perfection of the King James Bible* [thebibleformula.webs.com/kjbperfectmath.htm].*

If Dr DiVietro wishes to refute the Bible numerics that Dr Mrs Riplinger has cited with respect to 1 John 5:7, it is incumbent upon him to refute Periander Esplana's thesis. He cannot airily dismiss it out of hand, as he does. That is unreasonable and in turn it is a poor reflection on his level of spiritual maturity. As a very wise saint [Chapel Sayings of Dr. Bob Jones Snr., p 10] of God once said:

“Beware of unreasonable people. Good men are always reasonable.”

It is clear from Mr Esplana's work that he is focussing on the 1611 English Holy Bible for the development of his formula, or at least single-language vernacular Bibles, so Dr DiVietro's issue about which language to use is a non-problem. Moreover, Dr Mrs Riplinger states that application of Mr Esplana's method to other books, such as “other English Bible versions, or do-it-yourself translations from Greek and Hebrew lexicons” will not produce coherent results as are found for the 1611 English Holy Bible with respect to 1 John 5:7. It is Dr DiVietro's responsibility to prove otherwise. He cannot reasonably merely assert otherwise.

Dr DiVietro's criticism of Dr Mrs Riplinger's use of Bible numerics shows further mean-spiritedness on his part because Dr Mrs Riplinger is unequivocal in her stance that 1 John 5:7 is genuinely a verse of scripture. Dr DiVietro is so anxious to denigrate Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work that he fails to declare in this part of his book whether or not he believes 1 John 5:7 to be genuine. He would do well to consider John 14:23.

“If a man love me, he will keep my words.”

*Dr Mrs Riplinger is clearly committed to keep God's words, including 1 John 5:7. Dr DiVietro does not here show the same level of commitment but he cannot, of course, accept Mr Esplana's thesis because that would be an admission that the AV1611 is “**all scripture...given by inspiration of God**” whereas Dr DiVietro's denies that it is. See *Cleaning-Up*, p 18. Dr DiVietro's preconceived notions in this respect must therefore inevitably colour his response to any analysis that supports inspiration of the AV1611.*

Concerning Dr DiVietro's allusions to possible objections to *Hazardous Materials* that Dr Mrs Riplinger lists on pp 1192-1193, note the following extracts from **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint**.

*It should be re-emphasized that Dr DiVietro has, of course, also repeatedly denied the Biblical doctrine of the priesthood of all believers 1 Peter 2:5, 9 by means of his 8 examples listed above. See remarks at the end of **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**, in **Challenges #5, #6, Point-Counterpoint** and above with respect to Dr DiVietro's reference to Nehemiah 8:8.*

*The second possible reaction to *Hazardous Materials* that Dr Mrs Riplinger sets out is as follows, her emphases.*

*“I am a solid fundamental Christian, therefore I could not be wrong about **anything**; God wouldn't give **this** author this information **before** giving it to me.” [Maybe it was given to*

this disabled author, with a heart for ‘helps,’ because you were rightly busy doing important things which this author cannot do.]”

Dr DiVietro protests in response to the above statement that he has often had to adjust his beliefs, teaching and practice in the light of scripture, though it should be observed that he does not define what ‘the scripture’ is in this response. He then accuses Sister Riplinger of violating 1 Timothy 2:12 because he insists that as a woman, she has no business (in capital letters) correcting pastors and teachers. Dr DiVietro is further indignant with Dr Mrs Riplinger because, in his view, she has taken it upon herself to speak for God and the Bible.

Continuing his tirade against Sister Riplinger, he lists his own chronic disabilities and declares that, unlike Sister Riplinger, he does not believe that his particular infirmities enhance his spiritual understanding in any way [as Bro. Heisey points out, Dr DiVietro should consult Psalm 119:67, 71]. Dr DiVietro is apparently outraged that Sister Riplinger has in the above statement accused him personally of pride and indolence simply because he disagrees with Hazardous Materials. In bold text, he totally rejects Sister Riplinger’s statement on her disability and accuses her again of being a false teacher without understanding of what she purports to teach, thereby preventing the next generation of ministerial graduates from understanding what God ‘really’ said and therefore doing permanent damage through Hazardous Materials to the ‘true’ revelation of God’s words.*

**These appear to be the inspired Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text now extant but undisclosed between two covers. See again Cleaning-Up p 88.*

By inspection of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s statement above, nothing is said about speaking for God, correcting pastors and teachers, setting herself up as an authority over pastors and teachers, implying that physical disability enhances spiritual understanding or specifically accusing Dr DiVietro of anything.

Moreover, Dr DiVietro gives no evidence of any ministerial students, graduates, churches or institutions that have been hindered from understanding the scriptures either through Hazardous Materials or any of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s other works. Nor does he identify any pastor, teacher, church, institution or individual believer who has been irreparably damaged by Hazardous Materials or any of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s other works.

Nehemiah 6:8 provides the scriptural response to Dr DiVietro’s above diatribe against Sister Riplinger.

“Then I sent unto him, saying, There are no such things done as thou sayest, but thou feignest them out of thine own heart.”

The above verse applies particularly to Dr DiVietro because in his outburst against Sister Riplinger, he has overlooked the significance of the little word “‘helps’” in her statement, even though he quotes it in his emboldened denunciation of her and her work. Paul explains the significance of the word “‘helps’” in 1 Corinthians 12:28.

“And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger is not setting herself up in authority over “pastors and teachers” Ephesians 4:11 or seeking to teach and ‘correct’ them. She is carrying out a scriptural function of providing them with “helps.”

*Dr Mrs Riplinger describes her manifold purposes in writing Hazardous Materials on pp 43ff. One of those purposes is, p 47, this author’s emphasis “To **alert** pastors, parents, pupils about” the dangers inherent in the contents of currently available Greek and Hebrew*

sources. “To alert” another person or group about perceived danger cannot by any stretch of the imagination be construed as exalting one’s self in authority over them, much less purporting to speak for God.

No way, therefore, could Dr DiVietro have accused Sister Riplinger of violating 1 Timothy 2:12 if he had been willing to **“Provide things honest in the sight of all men”** Romans 12:17 in his reading of *Hazardous Materials* pp 43ff.

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s third statement of a possible reaction to *Hazardous Materials* is as follows.

“I must quickly skim for some small error to prove this wrong. I couldn’t have been wrong all these years. I must find something somewhere in the book to show that I know something that this author does not seem to know.’ [This may be a test of your humility. “Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God...” (1 Peter 5:6).]”

Dr DiVietro’s response is that he has found almost every page of *Hazardous Materials* to be replete with errors, including errors of judgement and citation, statements that either mislead or don’t follow logically from each other or are simply *ad hominem* attacks. He demands that it is Sister Riplinger who should obey 1 Peter 5:6, because, in Dr DiVietro’s opinion, her books will bind a whole generation of ministerial students in total ignorance of the word of God.

It is instructive that in this response, Dr DiVietro fails to mention even one of the multitudes of errors that he claims to have identified on almost every page of *Hazardous Materials*. He will make more detailed comments in this respect in the next chapter of *Cleaning-Up* but given the level of his vehemence against Sister Riplinger, he should have paid his readers the courtesy of providing at least some examples to back up his vitriolic criticism of her work at this point.

This author’s considered opinion, after having worked through Dr DiVietro’s supposed answers to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s 7 challenges, is that he has failed to locate even one significant error in *Hazardous Materials* on the potential dangers of currently available Greek and Hebrew study materials with respect to studying the Bible, 2 Timothy 2:15. Readers may judge for themselves from the preceding pages of this work.

It is noteworthy that once again, Dr DiVietro has failed to identify even one ministerial student who is ignorant of what God ‘really’ said as a result of reading *Hazardous Materials* or any of Sister Riplinger’s books. Nor does Dr DiVietro specifically explain how at present a whole generation of ministerial students are being bound in ignorance of the word of God (undefined again) by Dr Mrs Riplinger’s books.

Again, Nehemiah 6:8 applies to Dr DiVietro’s petulance against Sister Riplinger, along with Proverbs 26:2.

“As the bird by wandering, as the swallow by flying, so the curse causeless shall not come”...

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s fifth and final statement of a possible reaction to *Hazardous Materials* that upsets Dr DiVietro is as follows.

“I don’t believe that Greek and Hebrew study is wrong (although I have not read this book, documenting its problems, nor can I refute it).’ [“He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him” (Prov. 18:13)].”

Dr DiVietro is appalled at the above statement, which he declares to be the height of arrogance. He complains that Dr Mrs Riplinger is accusing anyone who disagrees with *Hazard-*

ous Materials on an informed basis of not having intelligently considered its contents. He further insists that Hazardous Materials is totally in error about Greek and Hebrew study aids.

In this author's considered view, Dr DiVietro has not produced any evidence at all to show that Hazardous Materials is in error in any way about Greek and Hebrew study aids in the last 113 pages of his book. Readers of this work may judge for themselves.*

Dr DiVietro admits that some authors no doubt taught error because they were either not Christians or of dubious moral character or both. However, he defends the use of currently available Greek and Hebrew study aids on the basis of the familiar don't-throw-the-baby-out-with-the-bathwater argument, except that his analogy is with respect to edible versus poisonous mushrooms. Select the good parts out of the lexicons and leave the bad parts, Dr DiVietro urges, like one would choose edible mushrooms and leave the bad ones.

Dr DiVietro gives no indication of how such a selection is to be made. Perhaps the student seeking to make such a selection is meant to be referred to the DBS Executive Committee for wisdom on how to make an informed choice.

*As was noted back in **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint**, with respect to Job's comment to his three dogmatic friends in Job 12:2:*

“No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you.”

Now the last 279 pages of *Cleaning-Up

*This concludes the answers to Dr DiVietro's quotes and comments on *Hazardous Materials*.*

*The **Quotes Overall Summary** follows immediately and is followed in turn by an answer to the objections to *In Awe of Thy Word* raised by David Cloud, to be found on pp 307-309 of *Cleaning-Up*.*

*For now, Ecclesiastes 12:13 comes to mind, for those who have access to **“the commandments of God”** 1 Corinthians 7:19 **“in words easy to be understood”** 1 Corinthians 14:9.*

“Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man.”

Quotes Overall Summary

Dr DiVietro's quotes and comments in *Cleaning-Up* against *Hazardous Materials* and Sister Riplinger are in this author's view like those against Paul that are described in Acts 25:7.

“And when he was come, the Jews which came down from Jerusalem stood round about, and laid many and grievous complaints against Paul, which they could not prove.”

The following summary of the essential features of Dr DiVietro's comments for **Quotes 1-205** in *Cleaning-Up* will bear out the relevance of Acts 25:7 to those comments. The summary makes reference to earlier parts of this response to *Cleaning-Up* as necessary.

It should be noted first that DiVietro attempts on several occasions to 'clarify' the 1611 Holy Bible and thereby overcome its so-called ambiguities and confusing grammar to which he refers on pp 32, 69, 91, 94-95, 152 of *Cleaning-Up*.

However, Dr DiVietro makes reference in only 19 of his 205 quotes from *Hazardous Materials* to the scriptures and sometimes only passing reference. He appears to look to higher authorities, supposedly, than the 1611 Holy Bible itself, 1 Corinthians 2:10-13, in order to explain it. Dr DiVietro does not mention 1 Corinthians 2:10-13 in his quotes and comments on *Hazardous Materials*.

See **Quotes 3, 4, 12, 17, 58, 59, 100, 126, 144, 145, 146, 148, 153, 167, 185, 188, 189, 196, 203.**

These references are far fewer than Dr DiVietro's attempts to justify corrupt lexicons and their corrupt editors. See below.

“Divers weights are an abomination unto the LORD; and a false balance is not good”
Proverbs 20:23.

Dr DiVietro's additional shortcomings with respect to his quotes and comments in *Cleaning-Up* are as follows.

Dr DiVietro has repeatedly scorned the 1611 Holy Bible's built-in dictionary.

See **Setting Up the 'Clean-up', Challenges #1, #2, #3, Points-Counterpoints, Quotes 9, 14, 39, 50, 61, 62, 67, 71, 85, 87, 176.**

Dr DiVietro has repeatedly distorted both Dr Mrs Riplinger's essential thesis and her subsequent statements throughout his book.

See **Setting Up the 'Clean-Up', Quotes 10, 31, 45, 65, 110, 115, 116, 131, 132, 138, 166, 196, 204.**

Dr DiVietro has repeatedly ignored important lists of verses that support Dr Mrs Riplinger's thesis in Hazardous Materials.

See **Quotes 70, 96, 99, 108, 109, 124, 125, 128, 142, 143, 144, 148, 158, 200.**

Dr DiVietro has repeatedly descended into baseless mockery and ridicule against Sister Riplinger in his comments.

See **Quotes 9, 28, 48, 60, 61, 64, 65, 87, 88, 102, 110, 120, 129, 140, 141, 152, 158, 163, 167, 173, 176, 189, 192, 198, 199, 200, 205.**

Dr DiVietro has repeatedly detracted from the 1611 Holy Bible by relegating it from “the word of God” to “the word of men” 1 Thessalonians 2:13 and thereby downgrading it to the level of “dead works” Hebrews 6:1, 9:14.

See **Quotes 68, 69, 75, 86, 98, 106, 114, 125, 164, 166, 174, 175, 181, 200, 201, 202, 204.**

Dr DiVietro has repeatedly ignored the context of a quote or missed the point of the quote.

See **Quotes 15, 18, 22, 32, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 70, 71, 77, 79, 84, 101, 104, 106, 110, 145, 149, 150, 151, 155, 156, 157, 159, 160, 166, 177.**

See **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint, Quotes 11, 44, 107, 115, 167, 171.**

Dr DiVietro has repeatedly violated the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9, in his comments limiting inspiration only to the original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text of scripture.

See **Challenges #1, #5, #6, #7, Points-Counterpoints**, summaries and overall summaries and **Quotes 4, 5, 10, 15, 21, 27, 28, 40, 42, 48, 49, 52, 58, 67, 85, 86, 114, 126, 135, 149, 150, 156, 163, 166, 167, 173, 175, 176, 181, 187, 188, 193, 194, 195, 196, 200, 201, 204.**

Dr DiVietro has repeatedly failed to specify the location of any so-called perfect, original, inspired Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text between two covers.

See **Introduction, Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’, Challenges #1, #2, #3, #5, #7, Points-Counterpoints, Challenges #1-#7**, summaries and overall summaries and **Quotes 4, 7, 8, 10, 13, 16, 25, 28, 33, 35, 36, 49, 52, 59, 61, 63, 85, 86, 90, 92, 94, 95, 98, 108, 109, 111, 112, 114, 123, 157, 168, 169, 171, 175, 179, 187, 190, 193, 194, 195, 196, 200, 201, 204.**

Dr DiVietro has repeatedly failed to substantiate his comments, which therefore amount to little more than sheer dogma.

See **Quotes 3, 13, 16, 21, 25, 26, 28, 30, 35, 48, 49, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 67, 70, 71, 86, 87, 94, 95, 99, 103, 110, 111, 114, 117, 120, 134, 138, 139, 140, 141, 154, 155, 157, 160, 163, 165, 166, 167, 170, 172, 173, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 183, 185, 187, 188, 193, 194, 196, 200, 201, 204, 205.**

Dr DiVietro has repeatedly sought in his comments to justify corrupt lexicons and their correspondingly corrupt editors.

See **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint, Quotes 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 47, 48, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 114, 121.**

Dr DiVietro has repeatedly made false accusations against Sister Riplinger in his comments.

See **Preface and Introduction, Setting Up the ‘Clean-Up’, Challenges #1, #2, #3, #4, #7, Points-Counterpoints**, (in sum) **Challenges #1-#7 – Overview, Quotes 1, 8, 13, 16, 18, 19, 22, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 35, 39, 46, 47, 50, 52, 57, 64, 65, 67, 76, 81, 83, 87, 88, 90, 92, 100, 104, 108, 109, 111, 114, 116, 119, 120, 124, 125, 126, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 137, 138, 139, 140, 144, 148, 149, 150, 153, 154, 155, 158, 159, 162, 165, 167, 168, 170, 175, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 189, 191, 192, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 202, 203, 205.**

In sum, Dr DiVietro’s book *Cleaning-Up* is largely flotsam, which it is hoped this work has flushed.

Job 21:18 appears to this author to sum up all the insinuations against Sister Riplinger, from all quarters, with respect to their eventual fate.

“They are as stubble before the wind, and as chaff that the storm carrieth away.”

Response to David Cloud's Criticisms of *In Awe of Thy Word*

Extract from David Cloud's Site

See *What About Gail Riplinger's New Book?*, *Cleaning-Up* pp 307-309

This section of *Cleaning-Up* has been taken directly from David Cloud's site. See www.wayoflife.org/database/riplingernewbook.html *What About Gail Riplinger's New Book?* *Cleaning-Up* does not include the site address or the information paragraph at the end of the article.

The section in *Cleaning-Up* from David Cloud's site reads as follows.

“WHAT ABOUT GAIL RIPLINGER'S NEW BOOK?”

“August 29, 2005 (David Cloud, Fundamental Baptist Information Service, P.O. Box 610368, Port Huron, MI 48061, 866-295-4143, fbns@wayoflife.org; for instructions about subscribing and unsubscribing or changing addresses, see the information paragraph at the end of the article) –

“I have been receiving requests from readers to review Gail Riplinger's new book “In Awe of Thy Word: Understanding the King James Bible, Its Mystery & History Letter by Letter.” I have seen enough of Riplinger's writings to know what she is all about and this book is more of the same.

“When I reviewed her first book (New Age Bible Versions) I saw that while she had many good things to say, she also mishandled the words of men and that her conspiratorial mindset colored everything she touches. I also suspected that she had what one Australian pastor friend calls “an attitude problem.” When I wrote to her in those days to express my concerns, she didn't reply. To this day she has never replied to me personally, but she did include me in her next book (Blind Guides) and treated me like some sort of fool, mocked me, took my words out of context and twisted them to make me say things I do not believe, and slanderously lumped me in with modern version defenders such as James White. (For more about this see “Gail Riplinger's Slanders” at <http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/riplinger3.htm>.)

“Her newest book again contains many good things in defense of the KJV but it is interspersed with serious mistakes so that it is impossible to have confidence in her research or conclusions at any point.

“For example, in chapter 22 she claims that John Wycliffe did not use the Latin Vulgate as the basis for his translation but that he used Hebrew, Greek, and Old Latin sources. She says it is a “myth” to say that Wycliffe used the Latin Vulgate. As a matter of fact, a careful comparison of the Wycliffe Bible with the Latin Vulgate and the Old Latin demonstrates that Wycliffe consistently used the Vulgate, with only a very few exceptions. I have done extensive research into the textual basis of the Wycliffe New Testament and it contains most of the textual corruptions found in the Vulgate. For example, the Wycliffe Bible omits “for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever” in Mat. 6:13, “to repentance” in Mat. 9:13 and Mk. 2:17, “spoken by Daniel the prophet” in Mk. 13:14, “get thee behind me Satan” in Lk. 4:8, “the Lord” from 1 Cor. 15:47, “in Christ” in Gal. 3:17, and “God” in 1 Timothy 3:16, to mention only a few of its textual errors. In most of these instances, these things are omitted in the Wycliffe and the Latin Vulgate but are NOT omitted in the Old Latin, so that it is obvious that Wycliffe was indeed following the Vulgate rather than the Traditional Greek Text or the Old Latin.

“It has been said that she claims that the extant Wycliffe Bible has been modified textually from the original, but I have never seen evidence of this.*

*This sentence has been omitted in *Cleaning-Up* p 308 from David Cloud's original article. David Cloud's statement is incorrect and appears to this author to contradict his statement in his article on the Wycliffe Bible that John Purvey revised Wycliffe's text. See *David Cloud and In Awe of Thy Word* below.

"Mrs. Riplinger gives so much seeming documentation that the average reader is convinced that her scholarship is sound, not being in a position to see that she frequently misuses her quotes and reaches conclusions not supported by the facts given in the documents that she cites as her authority.

"Further, Mrs. Riplinger is completely out of place in teaching men as she does. Two things are forbidden in 1 Timothy 2:12, "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." The woman is not allowed to teach men and she is not allowed to usurp authority over them. Mrs. Riplinger is living in open defiance of this divine commandment.

"She also is a true Ruckmanite, teaching that the English KJV is better than and has replaced the Greek and Hebrew, that there is no need today for learning or using Greek and Hebrew, and other such things. If her position were true we would not even have an English Bible because it was laboriously translated by men who learned Greek and Hebrew and diligently studied the Scriptures in those languages!

"There is a strange, almost cultic element within the Independent Baptist movement, and Mrs. Riplinger is right in the middle of it."

David Cloud's selection of verses given above has been extracted from a more detailed list contained in his article www.wayoflife.org/database/historyenglishbiblewycliffe.html *History of the English Bible – Wycliffe*. See below, noting the highlighted verses from David Cloud's list above, which also contains Galatians 3:17 with respect to the omission of **"in Christ."** Galatians 3:17 is not included in David Cloud's list below.

"Wycliffe's translation was based on the Latin Vulgate, and it contained most of the errors common to that version. Following are some examples:

"MATTHEW 5:44 — "bless them that curse you" is omitted in the Wycliffe

----- 6:13 — "for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever" is omitted in the Wycliffe

----- 9:13 — "to repentance" is omitted in the Wycliffe

----- 15:8 — "draweth nigh unto me with their mouth" is omitted in the Wycliffe

----- 16:3 — "O ye hypocrites" is omitted in the Wycliffe

MARK 2:17 — "to repentance" is omitted in the Wycliffe

----- 6:11 — "more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha" is omitted in th the Wycliffe

----- 10:21 — "take up the cross" is omitted in the Wycliffe

----- 13:14 — "spoken by Daniel the prophet" is omitted in the Wycliffe

LUKE 2:33 — "Joseph" is changed to "father" in the Wycliffe

----- 2:43 — "Joseph and his mother" is changed to "his parents" in the Wycliffe

----- 4:8 — "get thee behind me Satan" is omitted in the Wycliffe

----- 11:2-4 — "Our ... which art in heaven ... Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth ... but deliver us from evil" is omitted in the Wycliffe

JOHN 4:42 — "the Christ" is omitted in the Wycliffe

ACTS 2:30 — "according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ" is omitted in the Wycliffe

----- 7:30 — "of the Lord" is omitted in the Wycliffe

----- 16:7 — "Spirit of Jesus" is added in the Wycliffe

----- 17:26 — "blood" is omitted in the Wycliffe

ROMANS 1:16 – “of Christ” is omitted in the Wycliffe

1 CORINTHIANS 5:7 – “for us” is omitted in the Wycliffe

----- 7:5 – “fasting” is omitted in the Wycliffe

----- 15:47 – **“the Lord” is omitted in the Wycliffe**

EPHESIANS 3:9 – “by Jesus Christ” is omitted in the Wycliffe

COLOSSIANS 1:14 – “through his blood” is missing in the Wycliffe

1 THESSALONIANS 1:1 – “from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ” is omitted in the Wycliffe

1 TIMOTHY 1:17 – “wise” God is omitted in the Wycliffe

----- 3:16 – **“God was manifest in the flesh” is changed to “which was manifest in the flesh” in the Wycliffe**

----- 6:5 – “from such withdraw thyself” is omitted in the Wycliffe

HEBREWS 1:3 – “by himself” is omitted in the Wycliffe

JAMES 5:16 – “faults” is changed to “sins” in the Wycliffe

1 PETER 1:22 – “through the Spirit” is omitted in the Wycliffe

----- 4:1 – “for us” is omitted in the Wycliffe

REVELATION 1:11 – “I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last” is omitted in the Wycliffe

----- 8:13 – “angel” is changed to “eagle” in the Wycliffe

It is noteworthy that Dr Mrs Riplinger has written a detailed answer to David Cloud’s article criticising *In Awe of Thy Word* and in particular with respect to David Cloud’s allusions to Wycliffe’s Bible and Jerome’s Catholic Vulgate. See *Wycliffe Vs Cloud*.

See www.avpublications.com/avnew/downloads/PDF/WycliffVSCLoud.pdf.

Note that Dr Mrs Riplinger’s answer to David Cloud’s article was first posted on September 26th 2005, soon after David Cloud published his article. Yet Dr DiVietro and his editor Dr H. D. Williams failed to draw any attention to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s answer to David Cloud in order to enable readers to draw their own conclusions about the sources for the Wycliffe Bible.

Even an unsaved heathen king had a better sense of fairness.

“Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Thou art permitted to speak for thyself...”

David Cloud as yet has not seen fit to respond to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s article *Wycliffe Vs Cloud* even though seven years have elapsed since its original posting.

This author’s remarks follow.

Introduction

David Cloud is a former missionary to Nepal, currently Director of Way of Life Ministries and a former member of the DBS Advisory Council.

See www.hopebaptistlittlerock.com/index.php?file=kop48.php.

See www.wayoflife.org/.

See kjb.landmarkbiblebaptist.net/cloud-DBS.html.

The above site contains this statement by David Cloud. The emphases and under-linings are David Cloud's.

*“As for the term “inspiration,” I agree with Dr. Waite that it applies only to the original giving of the Scripture as expressed in 2 Tim. 3:16. No translation is given by inspiration. **The KJV is not given by inspiration, and it is heresy to say that it is.** The process that occurred in 1611 was not inspiration and was not 2 Timothy 3:16.”*

Some years ago, David Cloud wrote a detailed refutation of James White's anti-Biblical book *The King James Only Controversy*. This author found David Cloud's material very helpful in that respect.

See:

www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php *KJO Review Full.*

David Cloud's material on James White's heresies was available on the following link that no longer exists, www.wayoflife.org/fbns/examining01.htm. It should be noted that David Cloud's site does not seem to have a direct link to his material on James White's heresies any longer, although the material appears to be available in book form, both printed and electronic, www.wayoflife.org/publications/topicalbooks.html *Answering the Myths on the Bible Version Debate* and *The Bible Version Question and Answer Database*.

David Cloud's site does however retain links to his criticisms of Dr Ruckman, Sister Riplinger and their works. See www.wayoflife.org/database/textsversionsheader.html.

That is not surprising in that David Cloud's statement given above shows that his detailed refutation of James White notwithstanding, David Cloud believes, like James White and the DBS Executive Committee that the 1611 Holy Bible is not **“the word of God”** but in reality merely **“the word of men”** 1 Thessalonians 2:13.

The question then arises for anyone who believes that the 1611 Holy Bible is **“not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God”** 1 Thessalonians 2:13, which is the greater menace, the overt opposition to the 1611 Holy Bible of James White or the covert opposition of David Cloud? A practical answer is provided by Rev Ivan Foster of Kilskeery Free Presbyterian Church, Omagh, Co. Tyrone, Ulster, from his newsletter *The Burning Bush*, April 1992, p 4, in the context of the two main parties in the British Parliament, one that opposed Ulster overtly, the other covertly:

“Being shot from the front or shot from the back is not much of a choice...”

It is easy to understand, therefore, why some of David Cloud's criticisms of Sister Riplinger and her work should be included in *Cleaning-Up*. As indicated by his article, these criticisms are levelled at various books by Dr Mrs Riplinger but focus mainly on *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 788-791 *Myth 3 Wycliffe Used a Corrupt Latin Vulgate*, although David Cloud does not mention the reference*.

*Barbara Aho does give the reference in one of a series of lengthy articles attacking *In Awe of Thy Word* and Sister Riplinger, watch.pair.com/TR-0-intro.html. The article is entitled Chapter XVIII *The Wycliffe Translation*, watch.pair.com/TR-18-wycliffe-bible.html. Although lengthy, as indicated, with multiple citations from Wycliffe's own writings, the article does not refer to any relevant scriptures with respect to Wycliffe's Bible and is therefore lacking in substance. Barbara Aho's group describes itself as "'Textus Receptus Only'" which by inspection is also lacking in substance. This group, therefore, like the DBS Executive Committee and Way of Life is found to be yet one more of the legion against the 1611 Holy Bible as "*all scripture*" that "*is given by inspiration of God*" 2 Timothy 3:16.

"...*My name is Legion: for we are many*" Mark 5:9.

David Cloud's criticisms of Sister Riplinger and her work are summarised as follows.

David Cloud and New Age Bible Versions

David Cloud mentions *New Age Bible Versions* briefly in his article and on p 307 of *Cleaning-Up*. He refers to what he perceives as misquotes by Sister Riplinger and a conspiratorial mindset on her part. David Cloud's criticisms of *New Age Bible Versions* may be found here:

See www.wayoflife.org/database/newagebibleversions.html *The Problem With New Age Versions*.

It is not the purpose of this work to answer David Cloud's criticisms of *New Age Bible Versions* in detail. Dr Mrs Riplinger has answered them in *Blind Guides, O Madmen* pp 22-34. See www.avpublications.com/avnew/resources.html *O Madmen: Answering David Cloud Parts 1-4*.

As indicated, this work will focus mainly on David Cloud's specific criticisms of *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 788-791 *Myth 3 Wycliffe Used a Corrupt Latin Vulgate*. However, it is useful to give an example of the first of David Cloud's criticisms and how Dr Mrs Riplinger answers it.

David Cloud states on his site with respect to the first of his criticisms of *New Age Bible Versions* that:

"On page 2 Mrs. Riplinger misquotes Edwin Palmer, editor of the NIV. It would appear from the quote that Palmer is questioning the deity of Jesus Christ. She prefaces the quote with these words:

"'The NIV's chief editor vaunts his version's heresy saying:...[F]ew clear and decisive texts say that Jesus is God.'"

"In her notes, Mrs. Riplinger cites *The Making of a Contemporary Translation*, p. 143.

"Actually Palmer IN NO WAY is questioning the deity of Jesus Christ. In fact, in the paragraph cited, HE IS CONTENDING for Christ's deity! The full quote which Mrs. Riplinger has pulled out of context is as follows:

"'John 1:18, as inspired by the Holy Spirit, is one of those few clear and decisive texts that declare that Jesus is God. But, due to no fault of its own, the KJV, following inferior manuscripts, has altered what the Holy Spirit said through John. It calls John 'Son', whereas it should have called him 'God.'"

Dr Mrs Riplinger's answer is as follows from *O Madmen Part 1*, her emphases.

See www.avpublications.com/avnew/content/Critiqued/cloud1.html.

"Cloud begins his critique shadow-boxing with his own imagination.

““It would **appear** from the quote that Palmer is questioning the deity of Christ...Palmer does believe that Jesus Christ is God and Mrs. Riplinger slanders him...”

“Cloud joins those few careless readers who mistake their own poor reading comprehension skills for error on the part of the material they are reading. Cloud’s claim that “Riplinger slanders him” is preposterous; Cloud was forced to say “It would appear...” because the book doesn’t “say” what Cloud is surmising. He must lie about the book to criticize it. Cloud **IGNORES** the majority of the sentence, “Few clear and decisive texts” and only sees the “Jesus is God” portion. As stated in the book — it is heretical to believe that the Bible only has a **few** **TEXTS** relating to Christ’s deity. Even John said the reason the New Testament was written was to show who Jesus Christ is.

““But these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God...” John 20:31

“Palmer’s NIV omits **many** of these texts and, as a consequence, he can find only a few. (“Christ” is omitted 43 times; “Son of God” is also omitted **many** times.)

“Furthermore, Cloud used this quote to document alleged “misquotations” in the book. The typographical error (substituting “say” for “that declare”) does not affect the meaning of the sentence. **BUT** Cloud’s citation of the quote is a **MISQUOTATION** that **does** affect the meaning. Cloud says,

CLOUD’S MISCITATION

“It calls **John** ‘Son’, whereas it should have called him God.”

ACTUAL QUOTE

“It calls Jesus ‘Son’, whereas it should have called him God.”

“Is Cloud trying to misrepresent Palmer? Does Cloud think John is God? Of course not — all writers, proofreaders, and typesetters are subject to error. But to turn Cloud’s reaction back on himself I would have to blather: “But it is also wrong to misquote him and to have him say something that he does not say, particularly when someone puts heresy in his mouth that he does not believe” (Cloud, p. 4).

“I put no heresy in Palmer’s mouth. Cloud, however, did. **Touché**.”

The above example has in part been cited to show how decisively Dr Mrs Riplinger deals with her critics. It has also been cited to indicate that David Cloud may not have been as thorough in his criticisms of Sister Riplinger and her work as he may wish his readers to believe. David Cloud first published his criticisms of *New Age Bible Versions* in 1994. Dr Mrs Riplinger answered his criticisms in the first edition of *Blind Guides*, pointing out David Cloud’s miscitation above.

David Cloud’s statements with respect to the first of his criticisms of *New Age Bible Versions* have been taken from the 2008 update of his 1994 article. *Blind Guides* was updated in 2007, a year *before* David Cloud’s 2008 updated article appeared.

Yet David Cloud’s miscitation remains in the 2008 update. See above.

That kind of oversight must colour any objective reader’s approach to the criticisms that David Cloud levels at Sister Riplinger.

David Cloud and Blind Guides

David Cloud refers to *Blind Guides* on pp 307-308 of *Cleaning-Up*, stating that Dr Mrs Riplinger has mocked, slandered, and misquoted him, identifying him with modern version defenders such as James White.

David Cloud then states that he has answered Dr Mrs Riplinger's charges against him on his site under the heading Gail Riplinger's slanders.

The link give is <http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/riplinger3.htm>.

It should first be noted that the link should read:

<http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/riplinger3.html>.

It should then be noted that the above link, i.e. in its corrected form, is no longer active. The link may, of course, be updated in future editions of *Cleaning-Up* but it is regrettable that David Cloud did not advise readers to check his site at regular intervals for changes in link-ages etc.

It should be noted further that the inactive link, in its incorrect form, remains unedited on David Cloud's site i.e. www.wayoflife.org/database/riplingernewbook.html *What About Gail Riplinger's New Book?*

David Cloud's criticisms with respect to *Blind Guides* are still available on his site. The article is from 1996 and does not appear to have been updated.

See www.wayoflife.org/database/riplingerslanders.html *Gail Riplinger's Slanders*.

Once again, a brief sample of David Cloud's criticisms of *Blind Guides* will be given for the purpose of illustration because, as indicated, the main purpose of this work to answer David Cloud's criticisms of *In Awe of Thy Word*.

"SLANDER #1 – "Cloud confessed in a personal letter to me (Letter dated June 12, 1994, p. 6) that in India he had used, 'a Westcott-Hort Bible; it was a modern version; yet God used the truth in that Bible...'...He boasted to me that his 'Westcott-Hort Bible' was used 'to build a solid, self-governing, self-supporting, self-propagating New Testament Church.' She then says, "Yet in his earlier days he said 'this very Bible has been one of the root causes for the great weakness and confusion which exists among many Nepali churches to this hour' (Cloud, Is the English Language Provincial?, p. 22). Was the church it built 'solid' or weak? The terms are contradictory and mutually exclusive" (Riplinger, Blind Guides, p. 22).

"This is an incredible bunch of half-truths which are twisted entirely out of shape and made to appear to mean something other than what the author intended. Gail Riplinger has never seen fit to reply to my first letter so I have not persisted in trying to communicate directly with her. I have never said anything directly to Mrs. Riplinger about the Bible we used in Nepal. Possibly she is quoting from the first unpublished edition of my critique of her book which I sent to her, but she writes as if that were a part of my personal letter to her and that I was actually boasting something to her. She says I boasted about using a Westcott-Hort Bible 'in India,' but my church-planting work was not in India; it was in Nepal. She claims there is a contradiction in my statements about the church we started in Nepal and the Nepali Bible, whereas there is no contradiction whatsoever. In one statement I was addressing the church, singular, that we started. In the other statement I was addressing the churches, plural, in general in Nepal. The church we started was solid, but that, in my opinion, was because of the teaching we gave that church and it was IN SPITE of the weakness of the existing standard Nepali Bible, not BECAUSE of it. On the other hand, the churches in general in Nepal are weak, and I do believe that one of the key reasons for this is the condition of the

Nepali Bible. That was what I was stating in the book Gail cites. Mrs. Riplinger treats me like she treats others. She takes things out of context and puts things together from various sources which should not be put together. By so abusing my words, she does not make a liar out of me; she makes a liar out of herself."

David Cloud's lengthy disclaimer cannot disguise the fact that he saw fit to use the corrupt Westcott-Hort text in his missionary work. Like his oversight with respect to his miscitation of Edwin Palmer's statement in *New Age Bible Versions*, see above, David Cloud's acceptance of a Westcott-Hort text on the mission field must colour any objective reader's approach to the criticisms that David Cloud levels at Sister Riplinger. Note 1 Peter 2:2.

"As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby:"

It is unclear from David Cloud's statement above that he ever warned his Nepalese church members of the dangers of the Westcott-Hort text, or that he ever made any effort to improve *"the condition of the Nepali Bible."*

If David Cloud did not do so, those are serious oversights.

Corrupted or *insincere* milk poses a serious threat to **"newborn babes."** That is the sense of Dr Mrs Riplinger's remarks that David Cloud calls *"SLANDER #1."* Note again that his article *Gail Riplinger's Slanders* appears not to have been updated since the year 1996.

Dr Mrs Riplinger has informed this author separately that *"[Cloud] said 'I have never said anything directly to Mrs. Riplinger about the Bible we used in Nepal...Possibly she is quoting from the first unpublished edition of my critique of her book which I sent to her, but she writes as if that were a part of my personal letter to her...' The comical thing is that he is forgetting that the letter that he sent to me was presented, not as an article to be published, but as a personal correspondence. What a tangled web he's woven."*

Isaiah 19:9 states in part that ***"...they that weave networks, shall be confounded."***

As a modern application of Isaiah 19:9, it does seem to this author that a lot of networking has been going on between Way of Life Ministries and the DBS Executive Committee in recent years concerning Sister Riplinger. She should therefore take comfort from Isaiah 19:9.

David Cloud and Hazardous Materials

Cleaning-Up does not contain any direct comments from David Cloud on *Hazardous Materials* and thus far, he does not appear to have added an article on this book to his site. However, he made reference to supposed errors in *Hazardous Materials* in his newsletter on March 2010 as follows, as was drawn to this author's attention by Pastor Scott Mason of Bethany Baptist Church, Scotia, New York State.

"RIPLINGER'S CONFUSION ABOUT STRONG'S CONCORDANCE March 24, 2010...

"Recently Gail Riplinger, author of New Age Bible Versions, has attacked the Strong's Concordance as a dangerous work in her book Hazardous Materials: Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers. In chapter nine she compares Strong's with the 1828 Dictionary of the English Language by Noah Webster, tearing down Strong and exalting Webster. She says,

"I use the 'American Dictionary of the English Language' by Noah Webster 1828. Mr. Webster defines words as they are used in Scripture...It is the best bible study tool you can get, second only to your AV 1611 King James Bible. Mr. Webster was a Christian and the writers of the 'Strong's Concordance' for the most part were not. They were apostates and liberals."

“In fact, though Strong did wrongly associate himself in some way with the American Standard Version project there is no evidence that he was not a Christian, and Riplinger’s accusation is a vicious libel.

“Riplinger gives 33 examples of alleged “discrepancies in the Strong’s Concordance.” In each case, she compares Strong’s definitions with the 1828 Webster. This list is typical Riplingerism in that it is literally filled with mistakes. In only four cases does she demonstrate that Strong was wrong, and in those four we agree with her against Strong. We have never said that Strong was infallible. But in the other 29 cases Riplinger is either entirely wrong about Strong, or she misrepresents him, or there simply is no issue.”

David Cloud then lists many of the supposed “alleged “discrepancies in the Strong’s Concordance”” in an effort to show that Dr Mrs Riplinger has misrepresented Strong, unduly praised Webster’s dictionary and gone against many words that the King James Bible itself uses. David Cloud concludes his comments against Sister Riplinger as follows.

“Strong’s Concordance is not a “liberal” work and it is far too valuable to lightly cast aside as Gail Riplinger has done. She offers Webster’s 1828 as the safe alternative, but we have learned that it also is fallible. Would she have her readers use no dictionaries or concordances?”

It should first be noted that Chapter 9 in *Hazardous Materials* that David Cloud alludes to is about Thayer, not Strong. Chapter 7 is about Strong but it doesn’t contain the material that David Cloud describes.

Understandably, David Cloud’s newsletter item brought forth a decisive response from Dr Mrs Riplinger that she has kindly forwarded to this author.

“March 25th 2010

“Dear Mr. Cloud,

“Someone has played a trick on you, and you have fallen for it. Evidently someone, who wanted to make you look silly, wrote a pretend review of Hazardous Materials. You printed it or parts of it on March 24, 2010, obviously without ever having examined Chapter 7 or 9 in Hazardous Materials. The material you cited not only does not occur in your cited chapter, but nowhere in the book is there a comparison of Strong and Webster or the words you cited.

“You said, “In chapter nine she compares Strong’s with the 1828 Dictionary of the English Language by Noah Webster, tearing down Strong and exalting Webster.”

“The problem is:

“1.) Chapter 9 is about Thayer.

“2.) Chapter 7, which is about Strong, NEVER compares it with the Webster’s dictionary.

“3.) The list of your “33 examples” comparing Strong and Webster appears NOWHERE in Hazardous Materials. Period. Not even one of them is discussed relating to Strong or Webster. In fact, none of the words, but one, is even discussed in the book anywhere at all. Nowhere.

“4.) The words you put in quotation marks, saying that I said “I use the American Dictionary...” occur nowhere in Hazardous Materials. Such a quote does not exist.

“The whole thing has been made up by someone - whether it was yourself or someone who wanted to play a trick on you.

“Page numbers please...”

“(The article also says that Strong was a defender of inspiration. Hazardous Materials documents, from Strong’s own books, that he was not a defender of inspiration. See page 163 and 198 of Hazardous Materials.)

“Thousands upon thousands of people have the book; they will look at your article and think that you have lost your mind. You are now the [laughingstock] of Christianity.

“You must print a retraction immediately.

“Gail Riplinger”

This is David Cloud’s response. By inspection it is extremely brief, contains no immediate apology to Sister Riplinger and is slightly incoherent.

“March 25th 2010

“Hi., apparently I did fall for a trick. It was sent to me by a man who challenged me to change my position on Strong. I will definitely print a retraction. D. Cloud.

“Yes”

David Cloud’s retraction is as follows. It contains no indication of how Dr Mrs Riplinger drew David Cloud’s attention to his error and no direct apology to Sister Riplinger but instead shifts the goalposts to further unwarranted accusations against her.

*“RETRACTION OF “RIPLINGER’S CONFUSION ABOUT STRONG’S CONCORDANCE”
March 26 2010...*

“In January, someone sent me some material that I assumed to be excerpts from Gail Riplinger’s book Hazardous Materials. The material looked authentic, and as I began to examine it, I noticed several errors of fact and scholarship that struck me as being similar to the errors I had found in Riplinger’s previous books. I have since learned, however, that the excerpts were not from her book.

“We take our responsibility to the Lord and to journalistic standards seriously and would not knowingly print something that is false. We apologize for this error.

“Mrs. Riplinger is quick to demand a retraction from others, but she is not quick to retract false statements she has made. As of this writing, she has not corrected the many false statements she made about me years ago in her book Blind Guides, even though these have been pointed out. She also refuses to acknowledge the lies that she told to Dr. and Mrs. D.A. Waite about her multiple marriages.

“A 416-page critique of Hazardous Materials is available from The Dean Burgon Society. This was written by Dr. Kirk DiVietro and edited by Dr. H. D. Williams...”

See above for an example of one of the supposed “false statements” that David Cloud accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of having made against him in *Blind Guides*. The statement was not false, David Cloud’s lengthy disavowal of it notwithstanding.

David Cloud’s further oversight with respect to *Hazardous Materials*, like his oversight with respect to *New Age Bible Versions* and his condoning of a corrupt translation on the mission field must colour any objective reader’s approach to the criticisms that David Cloud levels at Sister Riplinger.

This work has earlier answered the “416-page critique of Hazardous Materials...available from The Dean Burgon Society...by Dr. Kirk DiVietro.”

David Cloud and In Awe of Thy Word

David Cloud insists, see statements above, that “a careful comparison of the Wycliffe Bible with the Latin Vulgate and the Old Latin demonstrates that Wycliffe consistently used the Vulgate, with only a very few exceptions.”

Dr Mrs Riplinger has kindly forwarded to this author a note to the effect that distinguished scholars of the early 19th century were by no means certain of an essentially Vulgate-only original basis for Wycliffe’s Bible. David Cloud makes no reference to this important scholarly conclusion on the sources for Wycliffe’s Bible but it shows that David Cloud’s apparent certainty of an essentially Vulgate-only origin for Wycliffe’s Bible is unwarranted.

“I have found an interesting quote in the 1824 edition of *Bibliotheca Biblica: A Select List of Books on Sacred Literature: with notices Biographical, Critical, and Bibliographical*, by William Orme, Edinburgh: Printed for Adam Black, North Bridge and Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, Brown and Green, London, 1824 . It says **of the view** that Wycliffe translated from the Latin Vulgate, “at least it is so said, though this is by no means established” (p. 34).”

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s overview of the origin for Wycliffe’s Bible and the edits made subsequently to it is as follows from her article *Wycliffe Vs Cloud* p 2 her emphases.

“JOHN WYCLIFFE (c.1330-1384) wrote of his work on the pure English scriptures. Soon, however, the cruel Constitutions of Oxford (1407) called for the **destruction of all** of the scriptures associated with “John Wycliffe.” The Catholic powers left corrupt Vulgate bibles unharmed. Hence, those manuscripts which remain today and underlie 14th century critical editions are Vulgate, not Wycliffe. Not being well-versed in the difference between **manuscripts** and **critical editions** led Cloud to uncritically quote a critical edition mis-called ‘Wycliffe,’ without checking the manuscript history behind his out-of-date and mis-named edition.

- 1.) The manuscripts used in Cloud’s edition are dated “after” the “death” of John Wycliffe (*The Cambridge History of the Bible*, p. 387).
- 2.) Its manuscript editors are identified as being those of “the group of men” who recanted and turned **back** to the Roman Catholic system and its corrupt Vulgate bible (p. 387 et al.).
- 3.) Only “**the name** of Wycliffe has been associated with this work,” not the person (emphasis mine, p. 387).
- 4.) The manuscripts used to create these editions survived the persecution of the 14th and 15th centuries because they were Catholic in text type, that is, Latin Vulgate.
- 5.) All critical editions, which are called ‘Wycliffe’ today, were subjectively compiled over 100 years ago by Anglo-Catholic editors (Forshall, Madden, Paues, Baber, Wilson, Lewis etc.). These editors merged, and then edited, several of the nearly 200 currently extant, highly **divergent** 14th and 15th century manuscripts. Their manuscripts are **no longer linked directly** to Wycliffe, by reputable scholars.

“The leading authorities in the field of manuscript study know these facts. These include *The Cambridge History of the Bible* and more recently, Dr. Christopher De Hamel (Ph.D. Oxford), who for twenty-five years has been Curator of the Medieval and Illuminated Manuscripts at Sotheby’s in London. He cautions against Cloud and others’ “medieval passion for dogmatically linking texts with the name of famous authors” (Christopher De Hamel, *The Book. A History of The Bible* (London: Phaidon Press Ltd., 2001) p. 170 et al.; G.A. Riplin-

ger, *In Awe of Thy Word*, Ararat, VA: A.V. Publications Corp., 2003) p. 774; see also pp. 793-94 which document that things were “attributed...to Wycliffe which he did not write”).

Note these further citations from Dr Mrs Riplinger’s article showing that David Cloud’s so-called Vulgate readings in Wycliffe’s Bible do not come from Wycliffe himself but from later sources revised in favour of Jerome’s Vulgate.

See *Wycliffe Vs Cloud* pp 3, 4, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s emphases.

“Voila! The 14th and 15th century manuscripts, which survived the fires and therefore remain today, DO conform to the Vulgate in places (In Awe, p. 776). Cloud’s critical edition comes from these manuscripts (e.g. MS 369, known to have been written in Rome; for details see upcoming pp. 6, 7, 8).

“Bibles which deviated from the Vulgate were considered heretical.

“De Hamel said,

““If copies were found in the possession of heretics [Christians], he said they would certainly be seized. If they were infiltrated with heretical doctrines [non-Vulgate], they would be destroyed” (De Hamel p. 187).

“The Cambridge History of the Bible notes that “...if the bible contained any **evidence of Wycliffite authorship** or recent date the danger would be increased” (p. 394). Non-Vulgate readings were one evidence of so-called ‘heresy’ or Wycliffe “authorship” (p. 394). Owning a pure Bible was “punishable by death” (De Hamel pp. 177, 186). The true Bibles and their owners were “burnt to death” (De Hamel, p. 166)...

“Only Vulgate 14th & 15th Century Manuscripts Survive

“The Bibles and manuscripts which remain (which Cloud unknowingly cites) are the Catholic editions that escaped destruction because they matched the Vulgate. De Hamel says, “Their custodians were probably **not** Lollards [Christian followers of John Wycliffe]...” (De Hamel, p. 189). He adds,

““...probably most **extant copies** belonged to uncontroversial owners who were regular attendants at **Mass**.”

“Sir Thomas More said that Catholic “Bibles in the English language” were “left” in the hands of “catholyke folke” and not destroyed like Wycliffe Bibles (De Hamel, p. 187). De Hamel continues saying,

““Most owners of what we **call** Wycliffite Bibles would probably **not** have thought of them as Bibles at all, or as especially **Wycliffite**. The books did not look like Bibles or function like Bibles” (De Hamel, p. 184).”

If David Cloud seeks to level valid criticisms at *In Awe of Thy Word*, he should first answer the citations that Dr Mrs Riplinger provides from Christopher De Hamel’s work. David Cloud has not done so in the last seven years.

Dr Mrs Riplinger’s documentation of the Romish manuscripts used for Wycliffe’s Bible follows on pp 6, 7, 8 of *Wycliffe Vs Cloud*.

“Any readings in 14th and 15th century manuscripts, which depart from the Received Text, cannot be attributed to John Wycliffe, 1.) because they are at discord with his express textual views (see *In Awe*) and 2.) because they are not dated during his lifetime. The earliest so-called Wycliffite manuscript has no actual date. Some used to ascribe to it a date before Wycliffe’s death, but *The Cambridge History of the Bible* states that “proof is lacking” for a

“definite date” of its origin (p. 400). *The Cambridge History* states, “The start of the work of translation cannot now be dated to 1382 quite so confidently as **it used to be...**” (p. 392).

“There is no evidence to date this manuscript (MS 959) before the death of Wycliffe in 1384. *The Cambridge History of the Bible* admits the fact that, “[T]he student of the Wycliffite Bible must rely for evidence of its development, not upon the usual mixture of internal and external evidence, but almost solely upon the former, as provided by the manuscripts themselves” (p. 394). However these manuscripts never associate the name Wycliffe with themselves!

“The other early manuscript, used when compiling critical editions such as the one Cloud followed, is Douce 369. **Surprise. Surprise.** It “seems not to have been noticed **until now**,” observes De Hamel, that it is an **ITALIAN** manuscript, produced a thousand miles from England in **ROME**.

“**“It comes as a surprise to learn that one of the primary manuscripts of the most influential Middle English text [Wycliffite] was apparently not made in England at all”** (De Hamel, pp. 171, 172).

“It again is not Wycliffe’s, but is signed, “**translation Nicholay de Herford.**” It matches Bodley 959, which leads to the conclusion that Hereford was the translator of these particular editions, not Wycliffe. Sir Fredrick Madden corroborates, asserting that the third hand on MS 369 was that of the final scribe on MS 959. De Hamel then concludes, “His [Hereford’s] claim to be the translator is made the more secure by the likelihood that the colophon is autograph” (De Hamel, pp. 172-173).

“Hereford, in a vain attempt to be exonerated from charges of heresy, went to Rome to show the Pope manuscripts that were “precisely from the Vulgate,” states De Hamel (p. 172).

“Consequently today we have two corrupt manuscripts (959) and (369), which the naïve and out-of-date, like Cloud, wrongly ascribe to John Wycliffe. Few have taken the time to study the history of these two specific manuscripts which underlie the standard critical editions (e.g. Forshall-Madden; see De Hamel and Joseph Bosworth, *The Gospels: Gothic, Anglo-Saxon, Wycliffe, & Tyndale Versions* (Gebbings & Co., 1907), pp. xxii et al.)...”

“...Hereford, “...recanted his Lollardy around 1391 and became a respectable **priest** and eventually lived to an honourable old age as a Carthusian **monk** in Coventry,” observes De Hamel (pp. 174-175). *The Cambridge History of the Bible* adds that, Hereford, “found it better suited his temporal interests to conform.” It reports that Hereford, “**was soon taking part in the trial of his former fellows**”!!

““[A]fter his recantation he is said to have affirmed that he had greater favor and more delight to hold against them [Christians] than ever he had to hold with them” (Cambridge History, pp. 400-401).

“*In Awe of Thy Word* documented a letter found in the public registry of 1391 showing the public outcry against Hereford for joining the opposition and introducing “false” readings to the Bible (In Awe, p. 873). No wonder manuscripts associated with Hereford have Vulgate readings!! And these manuscripts underlie the critical editions called ‘Wycliffite’ with which many, such as Cloud, are familiar! Wycliffe’s bones were exhumed by monks and burned and scattered on the river because he exposed the corruptions in Catholic bibles and practices. Hereford, on the other hand, re-joined the monks.”

David Cloud does not explicitly state which current edition of Wycliffe’s Bible he was citing for the matches with Jerome’s Vulgate that he lists. He does state that Wycliffe’s Bible was

revised by Wycliffe's disciple John Purvey and that Purvey's edition was the Wycliffe Bible most commonly distributed.

See www.wayoflife.org/database/historyenglishbiblewycliffe.html *History of the English Bible – Wycliffe..*

Dr Mrs Riplinger has the following remarks about John Purvey on p 10 of *Wycliffe Vs Cloud*, her emphases. It appears that, like Hereford, John Purvey made changes to Wycliffe's text favourable to Jerome's Vulgate.

*"To further assuage any notions that any of Cloud's current corrupt readings are from 'the' Wycliffe Bible, it must be remembered that there are **two different critical editions** circulating. Hereford's first edition was "completely revised" in the 1390s, many years **AFTER** the death of Wycliffe (like the New King James) (De Hamel, p. 174). De Hamel reports that, "The **revision** is commonly and credibly attributed to Wycliffe's personal assistant, **John Purvey**..." (De Hamel, p. 175). How Purvey's edition can bear the name 'Wycliffe' is even more surprising than that the early Hereford edition can bear Wycliffe's name.*

"The Cambridge History of the Bible also reports, regarding the so-called Wycliffite editions: "...the full version of the Bible" was "ascribed to Purvey." It says he "is also regarded as responsible for the later version." The Cambridge History states that peevish Purvey recanted and "repudiated" the so-called "errors" of Wycliffe (pp. 410, 408)."

Dr Mrs Riplinger then lists on pp 12-15 several readings from extant manuscripts of Wycliffe's Bible that match Old Latin readings against Jerome's Vulgate. See **Table 10** for summary details with equivalent English readings for the non-English sources. Dr Mrs Riplinger explains:

"Though the Catholic church tried to expunge pure Wycliffe readings from bibles, many original verses remain intact in 14th and 15th century manuscripts called 'Wycliffe.' The pure Old Latin remnants from real Wycliffe Bibles can still be seen in the following charts. After Wycliffe's death, someone removed the words 'Holy Ghost' ("Hooly Goost") from John 7:39."

Table 10
Wycliffe's Bible Mss.: KJB/Old Latin Readings versus Jerome's Vulgate

Verse	KJB/Old Latin	1389 Wyc.	1395 Wyc.	Vulgate
Matthew 8:29	<i>Jesus</i>	<i>Jesus</i>	<i>Jesus</i>	Omitted*
Matthew 23:14	Included	Included	Included	Omitted**
Mark 12:32	<i>God</i>	<i>God</i>	<i>God</i>	Omitted
John 5:29	<i>damnation</i>	<i>damnation</i>	<i>damnation</i>	<i>judgement</i>
John 7:39	<i>Holy Ghost</i>	<i>Holy Ghost</i>	<i>Spirit</i>	<i>Spirit</i>
Acts 10:30	<i>fasting</i>	<i>fasting</i>	<i>fasting</i>	Omitted

*The Biblia Sacra Vulgata (405 A.D.) www.studyLight.org/desk omits *Jesus* [*Iesus, Iesu*]. Dr Mrs Riplinger refers to Skeat, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 1858, Vol. 1, p. 69 that brackets *Jesus* i.e. [*Iesu*].

** The Biblia Sacra Vulgata (405 A.D.) www.studyLight.org/desk omits Matthew 23:14 by means of empty brackets.

If David Cloud wishes to challenge the above information on the basis that “Wycliffe consistently used the Vulgate, with only a very few exceptions” he has failed to do so for almost seven years.

Dr Mrs Riplinger concludes her article *Wycliffe Vs Cloud* with the following summary that David Cloud has also refrained from challenging for almost seven years.

“Summary:

- Wycliffe said that he thought there were corrupt readings in the Latin Vulgate; he said he had access to earlier English scriptures, as well as Old Latin, Greek, and Hebrew texts (See *In Awe of Thy Word* for documentation).
- All Wycliffe Bibles were ordered to be burned by the Constitutions of Oxford.
- Therefore, the Vulgate 14th and 15th century manuscripts, which were created AFTER his death, cannot be ascribed, by any reputable scholar, to John Wycliffe himself.
- These remaining manuscripts were used to create the currently circulating editions, called Wycliffe, and cannot therefore be used uncritically to determine the text of John Wycliffe himself.”

As indicated, David Cloud has failed to show otherwise in almost seven years.

A letter to David Cloud from Sister Riplinger dated September 26 2005 is attached to the article *Wycliffe Vs Cloud*. Dr Mrs Riplinger states in the letter that David Cloud received an inspection copy of *In Awe of Thy Word* that he had requested on August 8th 2005. The letter then states that David Cloud first published his criticisms of *In Awe of Thy Word* in *Friday Church News Notes* August 12th 2005.

David Cloud appears to have taken a mere three days to read the 1200-page work *In Awe of Thy Word* before publishing his criticisms of Sister Riplinger and her work.

That is the same time span that Dr DiVietro states he took to read *Hazardous Materials*. See *Cleaning-Up* p 10.

The value of their respective reviews of Dr Mrs Riplinger's works seems to this author to be about the same, “*unto every good work reprobate*” Titus 1:16.

David Cloud, 1 Timothy 2:12 and the Independent Baptist Cultic Element

David Cloud's comments in the above respects are reproduced below.

"Further, Mrs. Riplinger is completely out of place in teaching men as she does. Two things are forbidden in 1 Timothy 2:12, "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." The woman is not allowed to teach men and she is not allowed to usurp authority over them. Mrs. Riplinger is living in open defiance of this divine commandment.

"She also is a true Ruckmanite, teaching that the English KJV is better than and has replaced the Greek and Hebrew, that there is no need today for learning or using Greek and Hebrew, and other such things. If her position were true we would not even have an English Bible because it was laboriously translated by men who learned Greek and Hebrew and diligently studied the Scriptures in those languages!

"There is a strange, almost cultic element within the Independent Baptist movement, and Mrs. Riplinger is right in the middle of it."

In answer to David Cloud's reference to 1 Timothy 2:12 against Sister Riplinger, see these extracts from **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint** and **Quote 174**.

Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint extract:

The second possible reaction to Hazardous Materials that Dr Mrs Riplinger sets out is as follows, her emphases.

*"I am a solid fundamental Christian, therefore I could not be wrong about **anything**; God wouldn't give **this** author this information **before** giving it to me.' [Maybe it was given to this disabled author, with a heart for 'helps,' because you were rightly busy doing important things which this author cannot do.]"*

...[Dr DiVietro] then accuses Sister Riplinger of violating 1 Timothy 2:12 because he insists that as a woman, she has no business (in capital letters) correcting pastors and teachers. Dr DiVietro is further indignant with Dr Mrs Riplinger because, in his view, she has taken it upon herself to speak for God and the Bible.

Continuing his tirade against Sister Riplinger, he lists his own chronic disabilities and declares that, unlike Sister Riplinger, he does not believe that his particular infirmities enhance his spiritual understanding in any way. Dr DiVietro is apparently outraged that Sister Riplinger has in the above statement accused him personally of pride and indolence simply because he disagrees with Hazardous Materials. In bold text, he totally rejects Sister Riplinger's statement on her disability and accuses her again of being a false teacher without understanding of what she purports to teach, thereby preventing the next generation of ministerial graduates from understanding what God 'really' said and therefore doing permanent damage through Hazardous Materials to the 'true' revelation of God's words.*

**These appear to be the inspired Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text now extant but undisclosed between two covers. See again Cleaning-Up p 88.*

By inspection of Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement above, nothing is said about speaking for God, correcting pastors and teachers, setting herself up as an authority over pastors and teachers, implying that physical disability enhances spiritual understanding or specifically accusing Dr DiVietro of anything.

Moreover, Dr DiVietro gives no evidence of any ministerial students, graduates, churches or institutions that have been hindered from understanding the scriptures either through Haz-

ardous Materials or any of Dr Mrs Riplinger's other works. Nor does he identify any pastor, teacher, church, institution or individual believer who has been irreparably damaged by Hazardous Materials or any of Dr Mrs Riplinger's other works.

Nehemiah 6:8 provides the scriptural response to Dr DiVietro's above diatribe against Sister Riplinger.

"Then I sent unto him, saying, There are no such things done as thou sayest, but thou feignest them out of thine own heart."

The above verse applies particularly to Dr DiVietro because in his outburst against Sister Riplinger, he has overlooked the significance of the little word "helps" in her statement, even though he quotes it in his emboldened denunciation of her and her work. Paul explains the significance of the word "helps" in 1 Corinthians 12:28.

"And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues."

Dr Mrs Riplinger is not setting herself up in authority over "pastors and teachers" Ephesians 4:11 or seeking to teach and 'correct' them. She is carrying out a scriptural function of providing them with "helps."

Dr Mrs Riplinger describes her manifold purposes in writing Hazardous Materials on pp 43ff. One of those purposes is, p 47, this author's emphasis "To **alert** pastors, parents, pupils about" the dangers inherent in the contents of currently available Greek and Hebrew sources. "To alert" another person or group about perceived danger cannot by any stretch of the imagination be construed as exalting one's self in authority over them, much less purporting to speak for God.

No way, therefore, could Dr DiVietro have accused Sister Riplinger of violating 1 Timothy 2:12 if he had been willing to "**Provide things honest in the sight of all men**" Romans 12:17 in his reading of Hazardous Materials pp 43ff.

Quote 174 extract:

Quote 174, from Hazardous Materials, p 1045

"Ginsburg says that in the end, man will be God and rule the world under En Soph, **a woman!** He writes, "In that state the creature will not be distinguished from the Creator...Then the souls will rule the universe like God, and what **she** shall command he will execute."

Quote 174 is fully emboldened in Hazardous Materials...

Note that **Quote 174** is clearly Sister Riplinger's reproof of Ginsburg's expectation that "**women rule over them**" Isaiah 3:12 universally, not just on earth leading up to the Second Advent, as the scripture shows. **Quote 174** therefore proves that the DBS Executive Committee's accusation against Sister Riplinger that she is seeking to usurp authority over men in violation of 1 Timothy 2:12 is false. See Cleaning-Up pp viii, 10, 111 and remarks on 1 Timothy 2:12 under **Challenge #7, Point-Counterpoint, Quote 53 and Table 3.**

The DBS Executive Committee doesn't understand Dr Mrs Riplinger's God-given calling for the ministry of "helps" 1 Corinthians 12:28. Neither, it appears, does Pastor Brian Donovan of the Bible Baptist Church, Pensacola, Florida, who criticised Sister Riplinger and her work during a message given at the church's February 2012 Blowout conference. However, this author gained the impression on listening to the recording that the Lord may have been rebuking Pastor Donovan about his criticism of Sister Riplinger even as he concluded his mes-

sage. If Pastor Donovan later testifies publicly to that effect and repudiates his criticism of Sister Riplinger, asking her forgiveness, Ephesians 4:32, then the reader should discount the above remarks against Pastor Donovan made by this author.

In the meantime, 'the brethren' should keep in mind that Sister Riplinger is not one of "Hillary's Hellcats," see *Big Sister Is Watching You* by Texe Marrs, Living Truth Publishers, 1993, Introduction and she is not "**the prophetess Noadiah**" Nehemiah 6:14.

Sister Riplinger is best described according to Romans 16:1-2, together with "**helps**" in 1 Corinthians 12:28.

"I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a servant of the church which is at Cenchræa: That ye receive her in the Lord, as becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you: for she hath been a succourer of many, and of myself also."

David Cloud (and Dr DiVietro) should also note Dr Mrs Riplinger's statement from *Which Bible Is God's Word?* p 50.

"The Amplified Bible was actually written by a woman, Mrs. Siewert, and the Lockman Committee essentially rubber stamped her work. Since it was written by a woman, is it any wonder it omits "holy" from 2 Peter 1:21 which says, "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.""

How did David Cloud (and Dr DiVietro) miss that statement? Psalm 27:12 explains why.

"...false witnesses are risen up against me, and such as breathe out cruelty."

In answer to David Cloud's accusations of cultism against Sister Riplinger, note the following extracts from **Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint, Quote 86**.

Though aimed specifically at Dr DiVietro, they apply equally to David Cloud. See **Introduction** for his comments on inspiration.

"As for the term "inspiration," I agree with Dr. Waite that it applies only to the original giving of the Scripture as expressed in 2 Tim. 3:16. No translation is given by inspiration. **The KJV is not given by inspiration, and it is heresy to say that it is.** The process that occurred in 1611 was not inspiration and was not 2 Timothy 3:16."

Challenge #2, Point-Counterpoint extract:

It is also extremely ironic of Dr DiVietro to imply that Dr Mrs Riplinger is tending towards cultic and cabalistic practices, Cleaning-Up, pp 31, 38, when he himself is wholly committed to a small select group of "heady, highminded" academics 2 Timothy 3:4 who perceive themselves as effectively the sole custodians of "all the words of the Lord" Exodus 4:28 secreted in an unidentified, unpublished and inaccessible-except-by-the-DBS-Executive-Committee exclusive repository of purportedly 'God-breathed Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek originals.' See remarks in **Introduction**.

Quote 86 extract:

*Dr DiVietro is himself a member of a rogue denomination or at least a heretical cult that seeks to propagate false doctrine by its insistence that the 1611 Holy Bible is "the word of men" and not "the word of God" 1 Thessalonians 2:13 and that only 'the original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text' is "the word of God," inspired in all its perfection and purity, though unidentified by Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee between two covers. See Cleaning-Up pp 2-3, 18 and remarks under **Preface and Introduction**, especially with*

respect to Dr Waite's insistence of the non-inspiration of the KJB and **Setting Up the 'Clean-Up'**.

See also **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Introduction** and material under all the main sections of that work.

See in particular **Dr Waite and 'Originals Only' Inspiration**, where it is noted that Dr Waite reveals that he too is of **"them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate"** Revelation 2:15 according to the Lord Jesus Christ, namely the doctrine of the special 'priest class' who could rule the laity, in this case by means of special knowledge of Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. **"The doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate"** is of course in direct conflict with the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. See remarks above with respect to Revelation 2:15 and Dr DiVietro.

See further **Dr Waite and 'the Greek'**, where it is explained that seven aspects of 'the Greek' should be kept in mind. These show that Drs Waite, DiVietro, Williams and the rest of the DBS Executive Committee are akin to 33rd Degree Royal Arch Masons, i.e. only those who've been inducted into 'the mysteries' of 'the craft' actually know 'absolute truth' with respect to what God really said. 'The mysteries' of 'the craft,' in this case, are what the DBS Executive Committee perceives to be 'the pure inspired original Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text,' the whereabouts and contents of which between two covers are unknown to anyone apart from the DBS Executive Committee.

The scriptural designation of this 'originals only' 33rd Degree Royal Arch Masonry is of course **"the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate"** Revelation 2:15, see above. Dr DiVietro clearly clings to it with virtually monastic fanaticism.

Yet more can be said on the particular subject of KJB English supposedly giving rise to false doctrine.

Dr Ruckman [The Book of Revelation by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1970, pp 353ff] describes an experience that he had as a young ministerial student in 1951 when he went through 400 Bible verses over a period of 8 hours with an old man whom, he said, had assimilated by memory the entire false teachings of the Seventh Day Adventists, the Mormons, the Jehovah's Witnesses, the Church of Christ, the Christian Scientists, the Unity Church, the Catholic Church, the British Israelites and the Holiness groups.

Dr Ruckman said that this man could quote from memory every verse that taught every one of the false teachings of those groups, from the King James Authorized Text.

However, Dr Ruckman observed that every time the man quoted from the Authorized Text to put forward a false doctrine, he would change at least one letter of the King James Text! One example was in John 8:58, where the Lord said **"Before Abraham was, I am."**

The old man insisted that the Lord meant "I was."

He took the same approach with every one of the 400 verses discussed in the 8-hour session.

That was how he had assimilated every one of the false teachings of the heretical groups listed above, not by means of the King James Text but by changing a word or a letter in a verse from the King James Text.

That is how false doctrine and rogue denominations are hatched, as described and warned of in Isaiah 59:5.

"They hatch cockatrice' eggs, and weave the spider's web: he that eateth of their eggs dieth, and that which is crushed breaketh out into a viper."

Proverbs 4:14-15 should be obeyed.

“Enter not into the path of the wicked, and go not in the way of evil men. Avoid it, pass not by it, turn from it, and pass away.”

*Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee would insist that they do not change the words of the KJB or even the letters, Cleaning-Up, p 88 but they did. See Cleaning-Up pp 2-3. They changed **“given by inspiration of God”** to **“God-breathed”** and they did it by means of ‘the Greek,’ namely the term theopneustos!*

*In doing so, they cut out the essential embedded words **“in”** and **“spir(it).”** See In Awe of Thy Word p 332 and The Christian’s Handbook of Biblical Scholarship pp 250ff.*

*Genesis 2:7 states **“And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.”***

*John 6:63 states **“It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.”***

*Genesis 2:7, John 6:63 apply to the scriptures in that these verses portray how **“the Spirit of life from God entered into them”** Revelation 11:11 when they were **“given by inspiration of God”** and they became **“incorruptible...the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever”** 1 Peter 1:23.*

*Dr DiVietro lost all of the above revelation when he sided with the Jehudis, Jeremiah 36:21-25, who cut out the essential embedded words **“in”** and **“spir(it).”***

*In sum, that single change of **“given by inspiration of God”** to **“God-breathed”** via ‘the word in the Greek’ theopneustos appears to have been all it took to concoct the DBS Executive Committee members’ false doctrine of ‘originals onlyism’* that by profession denies **“the scripture of truth”** Daniel 10:21 to all but them and their closest adherents, and is equivalent to **“the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate”** Revelation 2:15, in direct violation of the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9.*

The DBS Executive Committee may protest that they are faithful to the original text of scripture, not the original writings as such. See remarks under **Challenge #5, Point-Counterpoint, Quote 86 and Cleaning-Up pp xi, 327-330. However, the DBS Executive Committee rejects all Bible translations as finally authoritative with respect to its perception of the original, inspired text of scripture and, for the New Testament, all published Greek texts as finally authoritative with respect to its perception of the original, inspired Greek New Testament. See Cleaning-Up pp 2-3, 18, 21. The DBS Executive Committee has therefore left itself no option but to produce the original manuscripts of the scripture to prove that it has access to the original text of scripture. The DBS Executive Committee’s notion of ‘the original text’ is a smokescreen, as summed up by Proverbs 10:26.*

“As vinegar to the teeth, and as smoke to the eyes, so is the sluggard to them that send him.”

See again Dr Ruckman’s encounter given above with the old man, who could cite a false doctrine by means of a single word or even letter change to the text of the 1611 Holy Bible.


The discerning reader will give close attention to Proverbs 19:20.

“Hear counsel, and receive instruction, that thou mayest be wise in thy latter end.”

The panel depicted below from Chick’s excellent Gospel tract Somebody Goofed? www.chick.com/reading/tracts/0003/0003_01.asp sums up the essential attitude of the no-heller, the Reformed Calvinist and the DBS Executive Committee, including Dr DiVietro [and

David Cloud], *in their ecumenical oneness with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible, regardless of how much of its wording that they accept or don't accept:*

"IT'S ONLY WRITTEN BY MEN!"



www.chick.com/reading/tracts/0003/0003_01.asp

The identity of the sceptic pictured is revealed at the end of the tract, from which revelation the discerning reader will also “receive instruction.”

Job could rightly question the no-heller, the Reformed Calvinist and the DBS Executive Committee, including Dr DiVietro.

“Will ye speak wickedly for God? and talk deceitfully for him?” Job 13:7.

Yes, they will. They did, according to Isaiah 14:14.

“I will be like the most High.”

It may be of interest to focus briefly on some early 17th century ‘originals-onlyists.’

David Cloud, Dr DiVietro and the DBS Executive Committee should consider the career of the English Separatist John Smyth, 1554-1612, from Lincolnshire, of whom it is said “Smyth would allow no translations to be used in worship, but preached extemporaneously from the Hebrew Bible and Greek New Testament, translating as he went.” It should also be noted that “Smyth baptized himself with a bucket and a dipper or ladle and then proceeded to baptize the rest of the congregation.”

See:

levellers.wordpress.com/2007/08/28/john-smyth-1570-1612-puritan-separatist-baptist-mennonite/.

Adam Nicolson in *When God Spoke English, The Making of the King James Bible*, Harper Press, 2011, p 181, states that some early 17th century Separatist pastors, like Smyth, believed that God’s word should only be spoken to men in the original languages because God had originally spoken His words in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. These pastors believed that translations should not be used because even the best of them contained errors (today, it might be expressed as a need for ‘clarification’ of ambiguities and confusing grammar in the 1611 Holy Bible, *Cleaning-Up* pp 32, 69, 91, 94-95, 152 – there’s nothing like “**good words and fair speeches**” to “**deceive the hearts of the simple**” Romans 16:18). Smyth therefore regaled his congregation of Lincolnshire farmers with readings of Hebrew and Greek for hour after hour, interspersed it would appear, with his own on-the-spot translation that he may

have perceived contained no errors. Surely nothing less could be expected of a self-accredited self-baptizer (by that particular self).

Nicolson dismisses Smyth as an eccentric. Sister Riplinger's critics could charitably be similarly dismissed.

This author therefore feels even more indebted to the King's men, as Dr Smith states in *The Translators to the Reader*.

*"But we desire that **the Scripture may speake like it selfe**, as in the language of Canaan, that it may bee understood even of the very vulgar."*

As the apostle Paul himself may well have anticipated:

*"**Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech:**"* 2 Corinthians 3:12.

Some further remarks should be made with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible as *"all scripture"* that *"is given by inspiration of God"* 2 Timothy 3:16 that David Cloud emphatically denies. See his statement to that effect above.

The 1611 Holy Bible - "all scripture...given by inspiration of God" 2 Timothy 3:16

Note again the following extracts from **Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint, Quotes 153, 202.**

Challenge #1, Point-Counterpoint extract:

See also this author's earlier work [Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society, pp 57ff] with respect to **Testimonies to the Inspiration of the AV1611** and especially Bishop Ryle's remarks on the English Reformers of the 18th century, emphases are the author's and note the unequivocal stance on the inspiration of the 1611 English Holy Bible as the Book of God, this author's under-lining.

*"The spiritual reformers of the last century taught constantly **the sufficiency and supremacy of Holy Scripture**. The Bible, whole and un mutilated, was their sole rule of faith and practice. They accepted all its statements without question or dispute. They knew nothing of any part of Scripture being uninspired. They never allowed that man has any "verifying faculty" within him, by which Scripture statements may be weighed, rejected or received. They never flinched from asserting that there can be no error in the Word of God; and that when we cannot understand or reconcile some part of its contents, the fault is in the interpreter and not in the text. In all their preaching they were eminently men of one book. To that book they were content to pin their faith, and by it to stand or fall. This was one grand characteristic of their preaching. They honoured, they loved, they revered the Bible."*

*Belief in the inspiration of the 1611 English Holy Bible is certainly not recent. Neither, as this author's earlier work shows, is it limited to a supposed small minority of contemporary individuals such as Dr Mrs Riplinger (and this author), who believe that the 1611 English Holy Bible is indeed **"all scripture...given by inspiration of God."***

"In all these instances the Bible means the translation authorised by King James the First...to this day the common human Britisher or citizen of the United States of North America accepts and worships it as a single book by a single author, the book being the Book of Books and the author being God" – George Bernard Shaw"

Quote 153 extract:

Concerning the inspiration of versions, including early versions of scripture, Dr LaMore's site is gracembc.org/home.html from which the link to his church's bookstore is gracembc.org/bookstore.html.

The subtitle for the link is, interestingly enough, *The Only King James Only Bookstore in Toronto.*

This link then links to gracembc.org/images/HBB_INVENTORY-King_James_Bible.pdf, entitled *The King James Bible*. Among the many worthy titles listed in the inventory, including some by King James inspirationalist authors such as Burton, Daniels, Gipp, Grady, Riplinger et al, is the following work, emphases in the inventory:

Lively Oracles - The Inspired Bible In The Hearts of Believers. - by James H. Sightler, M.D. "I believe and I hope this book will help to show that the King James Bible and those faithful vernacular translations which preceded it have not lost any inspiration or authority in translation." ISBN: 0-9673343-1-4 C \$4.00 ea.

Quote(s) 202 extract:

For a rational view of inspiration, these remarks on **Quote(s) 202** conclude with a statement by David W. Norris, *The Big Picture* p 392 (not available on the above-mentioned site).

See *Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Testimonies to the Inspiration of the AV1611* p 59.

Veteran biblical researcher and translator David Norris...reaches this conclusion about the 1611 English Holy Bible, this author's emphases.

"By faith we accept the Bible as [the] Word of God, equally it is by faith in [the] promises of God that we believe that the Bible we now have in our possession to be word for word the inspired and inerrant word of God. In that the Authorized Version in the providence of God is a 'correct' and faithful translation, we deem it not to be less the inspired Word of God than the divine originals."

Amen.

See the following Statement of Faith from the Hyles Anderson College Alumni, www.hacalumni.com/, this author's emphases and under-lining.

"OUR STATEMENT OF FAITH ON THE KING JAMES BIBLE

"We believe that, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God..." (2 Tim. 3:16) and that "every word of God is pure" (Prov. 30:5). We believe that the 66 books (Old Testament and New Testament) of our English scriptures, which is the King James Bible (1611), were given under the direct supervision and supernatural guidance of the Holy Spirit and therefore constitute the perfect, preserved and inspired words of God without any admixture of error (Ps. 12:6, 7; Ps. 19:7). We do not subscribe to the heresy that only the "original manuscripts" are inspired and preserved. This Holy Bible is our sole authority for truth for all Christian belief and practice."

See the following testimony from Pastor Lordson Roch, of Goa, India, this author's emphases and under-lining, kingjamesbibleministries.com/the_testimony_page.html.

"I am Lordson Roch. I Pastor the Grace and Truth Baptist Church in Goa India. I was born & brought up in a Roman Catholic family in a below poverty line but a staunch & religious family. Right from my childhood days I wanted to be a Roman Catholic priest. Due to poverty at home my parents couldn't afford to educate me & send me to school. I was taught A-Z & 1-100 at home & then I was put in the orphanage run by the Franciscan Order & there I was given free education & I completed my high school.

"Mean while in the orphanage, the superior watched me closely & was encouraging me to join the seminary & to join their orders! Three times I received calling letters from three seminaries from three different states in India. Some situations & circumstances stopped me from joining. When I was 12 years old my daddy passed away which was a big blow to me & my family. After high school the orphanage sent all the students home.

"I started working at a very minor age & left education & instead enjoyed the fashions and courses of this world. Then a year later I dreamed of becoming a lawyer & joined the government higher secondary school. It was here in my 12th standard before my board exams one man came to my home with the Gospel & was sharing it to my family members. I heard as he read John 14v6. This verse came alive to me that day. I felt the smell of my sins & I cried like a baby & cried to The Lord to forgive me & asked the Lord Jesus to come into my heart & save me & be the Lord of my life- that was on the 21st Jan 2000.

"I became active in the church & started to witness to people about the Lord Jesus Christ & in the process; the Lord put a burden in my heart to work among my people. I never wanted to be a pastor & I tried to run away from the calling. One day I came home from an inter-

view & took my Bible & God spoke to me through the scripture as I read Eph 4v1 & then Rom 8v28-30... I knew now what God was telling me!

*"I joined the Bible College & completed my Bth & BD. In the college the Lord met my needs & I graduated. I learnt God's word at the same time & I started preaching during holidays & I led few people to the Lord. But it was only after my graduation that I believed the AV 1611. In the college they are always correcting the AV Bible but God was good to me & sent few people in my life where I studied and believed the infallible word of God THE AUTHORIZED VERSION BIBLE! Despite attending a Bible College that attacks the words of the living God, the Lord opens mine eyes to come to know **the preserved, pure, perfect, inerrant and inspired words of God in the King James Bible** for the English speaking world. Preaching from the KJV is a great blessing and there is power in it. Ecclesiastes 8:4. Where the word of a king is, there is power: When I read my KJV God speaks to me and when I pray I speak to the God the KING!*

"In the year 2006 when I came back to my state from the Bible College, I came trusting the Lord that He will lead me & I would follow. As I went around for two months sharing the Gospel nobody got saved & was discouraged only to see one day one Hindu boy came to me & said "I want to know more about Christ!" I shared the Gospel & the Lord saved him there & then. Regular Bible study began with this young brother & then three more joined us.

"On May 6th 2007 we gathered in my home: altogether five people for Sunday worship service. Slowly the Lord saved a few more & by the end of the year we were 20 in number.

"The Devil also was busy working to split us & he did use some people & some people did leave. But the Lord blessed us again & now we are up to 30 people attending the English service and 25 in the Hindi service. & the Wednesday Bible study & Friday prayer meeting. I also give free tuition to 38 children in the slum every day & Sunday I teach them Bible stories & songs hoping to see some children coming to Christ soon. They are all from Hindu and Muslim families.

"Tracts distribution is done widely & we have seen some trusting Christ and a few have come to our church. The Lord has also allowed me to preach in other states of India in the youth meetings and revival meetings and has seen great fruits in this work too.

"There are ups and downs in the work but the Lord is faithful to me. There are a lot of adversaries but I enjoy it because it is a part & a blessing of the Christian life. Difficulties keep me on my knees and keep me humble and totally dependent upon the Lord. I stay with my mom & my elder brother's family & we have all our church services in my mom's living room. God has been good to us always. I appreciate your prayers for me and The ministry!!

*"..A ministry that is committed to exalt the Lord Jesus Christ, **to magnify the Word of God AV 1611**, edify the saints and evangelize the sinners...*

"Fellow Servant Lordson Roch. Goa, India"

David Cloud (and Dr DiVietro) may wish to reflect on the following excerpts from *The Word: God Will Keep It*, Chapter 9, 1850-1899 by Joey Faust, his emphases. Either of them is, of course, free to consult with Bro. Faust to check that he got the context of the remarks correct in every case.

Bro. Faust has almost 200 pages of quotations from 1611 to the present day testifying to individuals who have believed that the 1611 Holy Bible is **"not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God"** 1 Thessalonians 2:13. Chapter 9, 1850-1899 of Bro. Faust's book consists of approximately 60 of those pages and the excerpts below have been selected because they contain the word *"inspired"* or similar with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible. How-

ever, the remaining quotations in Chapter 9, 1850-1899 carry the same force for the 1611 Holy Bible as unequivocally **“all scripture”** that **“is given by inspiration of God”** 2 Timothy 3:16. All the quotations that Bro. Faust gives with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible as perceived by generations of the Lord’s people over the past 400 years have the same force.

“*“Not a few seem to believe, or at least act as if the King James’ Version was inspired, and consequently infallible...”* (James Challen, *The Necessity of a New Version and the Means of Procuring It*)

“1852: “...many very sincere and pious Christians...entertain the unreasoning prejudice that our English translation is not only a faithful exposition of the word of God, but **they actually regard it as if it was also an inspired translation.”** (J. H. McCulloch, *Analytical Investigations*, 1852)

“1858: “...for a great multitude of readers the English Version is not the translation of an inspired Book, **but is itself the inspired Book.””** (Richard C. Trench, *On the Authorized Version of the New Testament*, 1858)

“1865: “[Lyman Beecher’s] daughter tells us, as his writings show...‘without the shadow of a doubt, that we do have in our English translation the authoritative, inspired declarations of God.’” (*Christian Examiner*, Volume 79, 1865).

“Lyman Beecher (1775-1863), was a Presbyterian minister...who was known for his strong anti-Catholic and anti-Unitarian views...”

“1869: “And yet there is a tendency in certain classes – **even an increasing tendency, to regard the Anglican Bible as a resultant of inspiration...”** (Anon., *What Saith the Scripture? Bible Difficulties*, 1869)

“1871: “...it is obvious that **the popular notion that every word of the authorised translation of the Bible is inspired opens the door to endless errors...”** (John Moore Capes, *Reasons for Returning to the Church of England*, 1871)

“1875: “...Why meddle with a version which presents the word of God in all its substantial integrity, - which has gone home to the hearts of the people, **and is by them regarded as containing the very words of inspiration?’...”** (Henry Charles Fox, *On the Revision of the Authorised Version of the Scripture*, 1875)

“1878: “...Such dogmas as...the plenary inspiration of the King James’ Bible...**are fast dying out of all cultured minds...”** (J. M. Peebles, *New York Freethinkers Association*, 1878)

“1878: “A certain class...is made up of worshippers of the letter, **to whom the traditional version has all the sacredness of the inspired original...”** (*The New York Times*, September 23, 1878)

“1880: “...Familiarity for generations with the **ipsissima verba [i.e. very words] of the Authorized Version has led to an unconscious acceptance of the English words as being themselves literally inspired.”** (Walker Purton, *Churchman*, Issue 1, 1880)

“1881: “...our people...have been in the habit of using our English Bible, not as if it were the translation of the inspired book, **but the inspired book itself...”** (George Salmon, *The Revision of the New Testament; A Paper Read Before the Irish Church Conference*, April, 1881)

“1881: “Another class will oppose the new revision...To them, the King James version of the Bible is the inspired Word of God, in all its language. They regard a revision as a tampering with the sacred text, and as essential profanation.” (J. G. Holland, *Scribner’s Monthly*, 1881)

“1881: “[In the RV] there will be enough...change to disturb the minds of those who have not only believed in verbal inspiration, but practically in the verbal inspiration of the authorized English version.” (*The Bystander*, Volume 2, 1881)

“1881: “The great mass of persons in Christendom to whom the Christian gospels are the word of God do not know in what way that word has taken its present form...they assume that it was inspired as it is presented to them...” (*Harper’s Magazine*, Volume 63, 1881)

“1882: “...I unhesitatingly say, that the same Holy Ghost who gave inspiration to the Apostles to write out the New Testament, presided over and inspired those men in the translation and bringing out of the entire Bible in the English language...I furthermore say, that King James’ Translation of the Bible is the only Divinely Inspired translation directly [in modern ages]...” (*William Washington Simkins, The English Version of the New Testament, Compared with King James’ Translation*, 1882)

“1883: “...with many of them in this country the hitherto authorised English version is the inspired one...” (*The Literary World*, Volume 28, 1883)

“1883: “...The root of the superstitious view is a gross literalism found on the mistaken doctrine of Verbal Inspiration and applied to the Authorized Version.” (*Dickinson’s Theological Quarterly*, Jan., 1883)

“1883: “...timid conservatives...look upon the English version as the inspired Word of God...” (*The Homiletic Review*, Volume 7, 1883)

“1883: “...to the great mass of English readers King James’s Version is virtually the inspired Word of God...” (*Philip Schaff, Companion to the Greek Testament, and the English Version*, 1883)

“1884: “Those godly, liberty-loving but self-controlled, Protestant, Americanized Englishmen of the fourth generation, had not let go their English Bible as the Inspired Word...” (*F. H. Palmer, Edward Payson Cowell, Two Centuries of Church History, First Congregational Church, Essex, Mass., 1884*)”

“1887: “And the remarkable dictum of Chillingworth*, that the Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants, coupled with the grotesque idea of the verbal inspiration of the English version...” (*John William Horsley, Jotting from Jail*, 1887)

*William Chillingworth, 1602-1644, was a controversial English churchman, who wrote *The Religion of Protestants*, of which “The main argument is a vindication of the sole authority of the Bible in spiritual matters, and of the free right of the individual conscience to interpret it.” See en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Chillingworth. The tenor of the quotation suggests that Chillingworth’s “remarkable dictum” was still widely held at the time of the 1887 article and it appears that the writer is trying to persuade his readership to abandon it.

It is said of Chillingworth that “His writings enjoyed a high popularity, particularly towards the end of the seventeenth century, after a popular, condensed edition of *The Religion of Protestants* appeared in 1687, edited by John Patrick. *The Religion of Protestants* is acutely argued, and was commended by John Locke... The gist of his argument is expressed in a single sentence:

“I am fully assured that God does not, and therefore that men ought not to, require any more of any man than this, to believe the Scripture to be God's word, and to endeavour to find the true sense of it, and to live according to it.”

See the end of **Quote 205**, written before consultation of the life and works of William Chillingworth.

Ecclesiastes 12:13 comes to mind, for those who have access to “the commandments of God” 1 Corinthians 7:19 “in words easy to be understood” 1 Corinthians 14:9.

“Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man.”

“1887: *“This unfaithfulness to truth is certainly not so great a sin against the light as the habit which seems to be still prevalent of treating the old authorized version alone as the ipsissima verba [i.e. very words] of inspiration...” (James Frederick McCurdy, quoted in, William Rainey Harper, The Old Testament Student, Volume 6, 1887)*

“1890: *“That by reason the King James version of the Bible, only received as inspired and true by the Protestant religious sects, is regarded by the members of said Roman Catholic Church as contrary to the rights of conscience...” (The Weekly Wisconsin, March 22, 1890)*

“1893: *“...up to the latter end of the present century, it practically amounted, as we have seen, to the most rigid theory of verbal inspiration – an inspiration usually attributed by the people at large, and sometimes by their ministers, to the Authorized English version...” (John James Lias, Eyre and Spottiswoode, Principles of Biblical Criticism, 1893)*

“1894: *“There is a class of ignorant people to whom the King James version of the Bible is the inspired word of God in all its language...” (Harriette Merrick Hodge Plunkett, Josiah Gilbert Holland, 1894)*

“1897: *“The Rev. Dr. Francis H. Smith of the Seventh Street Church, who was also present, said: ‘...Fifty years ago there were Christians who believed that everything about the Bible, down to the commas, was inspired...’” (The New York Times, February 16, 1897)*

“1897: *“A remark of Jowett’s* [Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford] on the work of the [RV] committee when it appeared is perhaps worth recording here...[He stated]: ‘They seem to have forgotten that, in a certain sense, the Authorized Version is more inspired than the original.’” (Evelyn Abbott, Lewis Campbell, The Life and Letters of Benjamin Jowett, 1897)*

*See **Quote 69**.

“1897: *“...When our fathers, as they did, stoutly maintained the doctrine of verbal inspiration, the inspired words they really had in mind were not Hebrew or Greek, but English words; the words of that version which Selden* called ‘the best translation in the world’...” (Minutes of the Annual Meeting, General Association of the Congregational Churches of Massachusetts, 1897)*

*See **Quote(s) 87**.

“1898: *“...many persons now, forgetting that all English versions are merely translations from the ancient Hebrew and Greek, imagine each word and letter of the 1611 translation to be inspired by God...” (Charles Arthur Lane, Illustrated Notes on English Church History, 1898)*

“1898: *“It is said of Bishop Lee, that he considered every word of the English Authorized Version inspired...That may seem an extravagant statement, but it represents a view held*

unconsciously by simple-minded, earnest, sincere Christians...” (Robert Needham Cust, Linguistic and Oriental Essays, 1898)


The above list numbers 30 quotations from different sources. Bro. Faust has listed many more. Set against the broad sweep of Bible belief since 1611 therefore, the DBS Executive Committee is a tiny minority.

The concluding remarks on the 1611 Holy Bible and inspiration aim to highlight a scriptural view of how God preserved ***“The words of the LORD”*** Psalm 12:6, 7 down through the millennia and in particular with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible. See over-page.

Purification of “*The words of the LORD*” Psalm 12:6, 7 – Summary

Introduction

Philippians 2:16 states “*Holding forth the word of life; that I may rejoice in the day of Christ, that I have not run in vain, neither laboured in vain.*” Inspiration must be inviolate throughout the purification process of “*the word of life*” otherwise it is no longer “*the word of life*” and Paul and the other writers of scriptures would have run and laboured in vain. However, they did not, because “*the word of the Lord endureth for ever*” 1 Peter 1:25. An overview of God’s seven-stage purification process of “*the word of life*” follows, noting the seven-stage purification *sub-processes* embedded in the overall purification process.



The Authorized 1611 King James Holy Bible
www.learnthebible.org/king_james_bible.htm

A Seven-Stage Purification Process – Historic Bibles

Dr Vance [*Bible Believers Bulletin*, February 2003, June 2006] shows that Psalm 12:6, 7 was fulfilled in history *largely with inspired translations* Genesis 2:7, 2 Samuel 3:10, Ezekiel 37:9-11, Matthew 24:35, John 6:63, Colossians 1:13, Hebrews 11:5, 1 Peter 1:23, 25:

- A received Hebrew text, 1800 BC to 389 BC
- A received Aramaic text at the same time (Genesis, Daniel, etc.)
- A received Greek text from AD 40 to AD 90
- A received Syrian text from AD 120 to AD 200
- A received Latin text from AD 150 to AD 1500
- A received German text from AD 1500 to AD 2006
- A received English text from AD 1611 to AD 2006 (2012+)

Dr Mrs Riplinger has this incisive observation from *In Awe of Thy Word* p 544, her emphases, in agreement with the priesthood of all believers, 1 Peter 2:5, 9. “*The Bible appears in many forms – such as Hebrew, Hungarian, English and Polish. The “form” of the Word seemed different at various times, yet it was still Jesus (e.g. the “fiery furnace” (Dan. 3:35), the “babe wrapped in swaddling clothes” (Luke 2:12), when “She supposing him to be the gardener” (John 20:15), and when “his eyes were as a flame of fire” (Rev. 1:14)). When the Word “appeared in another form,” as Jesus did, “neither believed they them” (Mark 16:12, 13). Likewise, some still dig for words in haunted Greek graveyards.*”

A Seven-Stage Purification Process – Pre-English and English Bibles

Dr Mrs Riplinger [*In Awe of Thy Word*, p 33] documents the development of the seven purifications of the English Bible from its earliest inception, in fulfilment of Psalm 12:6, 7:

- The Gothic
- The Anglo-Saxon
- The Pre-Wycliffe
- The Wycliffe
- The Tyndale/Coverdale/Great/Geneva
- The Bishops’
- The King James Bible

Dr Mrs Riplinger states, [*In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 560ff] her emphases ““Seven” times “they purge...and purify it...” (Ezek. 43:26) – not eight. The KJV translators did **not** see their translation as one in the midst of a chain of ever evolving translations. They wanted their

Bible to be one of which no one could justly say, 'It is good, **except** this word or **that** word...' They planned [The Translators to the Reader, www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm]:

“...to make...out of many good ones [Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, Bishops'], one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, that our mark...the same will shine as gold more brightly, being rubbed and polished...”

In a sense God did inspire the King's men to achieve their mark after the manner of 2 Peter 1:21, even if not by dictation as in Jeremiah 1:9, 5:14, 36:18, as John Selden notes in *Table Talk*. ““The translation in King James' time took an excellent way. That part of the Bible was given to him who was most excellent in such a tongue and then they met together, and one read the translation, the rest holding in their hands some Bible, either of the learned tongues [Greek, Hebrew, Latin], or French, Italian, Spanish &c [and other languages]. If they found any fault, they spoke; if not, he read on.”” See *In Awe of Thy Word* p 539.

A Seven-Stage Purification Process – King James Bibles

God may have refined the 1611 Holy Bible through seven major editions. See *In Awe of Thy Word* p 600 and *The Hidden History of the English Scriptures* pp 49-51 by Dr Mrs Riplinger.

“The only changes to the KJV since 1611 are of three types:

4. **1612:** Typography (from *Gothic* to **Roman** type)
5. **1629 & 1638:** Correction of typographical errors
6. **1762 & 1769:** Standardization of spelling.” Therefore, fulfilling Psalm 12:6, 7:

Two 1611 editions = seven stages. “**For with God nothing shall be impossible**” Luke 1:37.

Particular Purification Steps

Addition of Words

Scrivener notes in *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611) Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*, Appendices A, C, textual changes to early editions e.g. the words “**of God**” first being added to 1 John 5:12 in 1638. God oversees such changes.

“**Then took Jeremiah another roll, and gave it to Baruch the scribe, the son of Neriah; who wrote therein from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of the book which Jehoiakim king of Judah had burned in the fire: and there were added besides unto them many like words**” Jeremiah 36:32.

Elimination and Alteration of Words

The NIV adds “*of Jesus*” in Acts 16:7. The Geneva Bible has “*Passover*” instead of “*Easter*” in Acts 12:4. God corrects such imperfections as illustrated by John 15:2 with respect to “*the true vine*” John 15:1, which is “*the **Word** of life*” 1 John 1:1, like “*the **word** of life,*” purging being a form of purifying. “**Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away; and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit.**”

Restoration of Words

Current editions of Wycliffe's Bible omit some scriptures e.g. the end of Matthew 6:13. God restores such omissions as illustrated by Romans 11:20, 23. “**Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear:...And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graff them in again.**”

Conclusion

These purification steps ensure that the AV1611 is the “**pure words**” of the Lord, Psalm 12:6.

References

- ¹ *The Translators to the Reader* by Dr Miles Smith, www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm
- ² *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials* by Kirk DiVietro, The Dean Burgon Society, 2010, Preface, pp 2-3, 21
- ³ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society* by Alan O'Reilly, Summary, pp 2, 31-34, 61, A. V. Publications Corp., 2012. This work is available online at www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php
- ⁴ *The Greatest Fight in the World* by C. H. Spurgeon, www.spurgeon.org/misc/gfw.htm
- ⁵ *A WARNING!! On Gail Riplinger's KJB and Multiple Inspiration Heresy* by Dr D. A. Waite, www.BibleForToday.org
- ⁶ *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611)* by F.H.A. Scrivener, Cambridge, 1884, Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2004
- ⁷ *Hazardous Materials* by Dr G.A. Riplinger and Bryn (n) Riplinger, A. V. Publications Corp., 2008, pp 1193-1194, www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html
- ⁸ *A WARNING!!*, pp 73, 93
- ⁹ *Which Bible Is God's Word?* by Gail Riplinger, A. V. Publications Corp., 2007, pp 160-161
- ¹⁰ *The Men Behind the King James Version* by Gustavus S. Paine, Baker Book House, 1977, pp 64-68, Chapters 11, 12, "O Biblios" *The Book** by Alan O'Reilly, Covenant Publishers, 2001, Section 4.2, *Which Bible?* by Dr David Otis Fuller, Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975, pp 21-22, *In Awe of Thy Word* by Dr G.A. Riplinger, A. V. Publications Corp., 2003, pp 610ff. *This work is available online at www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/.
- ¹¹ johnwaynetribute.com/jake.html
- ¹² *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, p 16
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, p 1
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp 9ff, 15
- ¹⁵ *A WARNING!!*, p 36
- ¹⁶ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, p 9
- ¹⁷ *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 560ff
- ¹⁸ *The Translators to the Reader*, www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm
- ¹⁹ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, pp 37ff
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp 21ff
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, pp 40ff
- ²² *Ibid.*, pp 35ff, 52ff
- ²³ *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611)*, Appendices A, C
- ²⁴ "O Biblios" *The Book*, Section 1.6
- ²⁵ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Cambridge_Paragraph_Bible
- ²⁶ *A Textual History of The King James Bible* by David Norton, Cambridge University Press, 2005, pp 120, 125-126
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, p 278
- ²⁸ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, p 57
- ²⁹ *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials*, pp 12ff
- ³⁰ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, p 6
- ³¹ *Ibid.*, pp 7-8, 50ff

-
- ³² *The History of the New Testament Church, Volume II* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, 1984, p 30
- ³³ *John Wycliffe The Dawn of the Reformation* by David Fountain, Mayflower Christian Books, 1984, p 48. See also *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 761ff
- ³⁴ *Whitewashed, A Critique of James White* by Alan O'Reilly, A. V. Publications Corp., e-book, 2010 , pp 550ff
- ³⁵ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, p 3
- ³⁶ *Hazardous Materials*, Chapter 30, *In Awe of Thy Word*, Chapter 17, pp 799-800
- ³⁷ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, p 17
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp 21ff
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp 21ff
- ⁴⁰ *Hazardous Materials*, pp 1193-1194
- ⁴¹ *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials*, pp 19-32
- ⁴² *Hazardous Materials*, Chapters 6, 18-20, 27-28
- ⁴³ *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials, Gail Riplinger's Marriage Licenses*, pp 321-326
- ⁴⁴ "O Biblios" *The Book*, Section 11.2
- ⁴⁵ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, p 10
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p 30
- ⁴⁷ *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials*, pp 302-303
- ⁴⁸ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, pp 27ff
- ⁴⁹ *In Awe of Thy Word*, p 1076
- ⁵⁰ *Hazardous Materials*, pp 655ff. See also *Waiting for Dr Waite* by Peter Heisey, www.hacalummi.com/
- ⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp 9ff, 26ff, 47ff, 63ff, 75ff, 84
- ⁵² *Hazardous Materials*, Chapter 30, pp 1097ff, *In Awe of Thy Word*, Chapter 17, pp 620ff
- ⁵³ *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 805, 846-847, 890, 896, 902
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp 757-759
- ⁵⁵ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, pp 57ff
- ⁵⁶ *Hazardous Materials*, p 1007
- ⁵⁷ www.studylight.org/desk/
- ⁵⁸ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, pp 6-8
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp 57ff
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p 61
- ⁶¹ *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text – A New Twist in the Continuing Attack on the Authorised Version B.F.T. #1617* by Jack. A. Moorman, The Bible for Today, 1988, pp 27-28
- ⁶² *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, p 3
- ⁶³ *Hazardous Materials*, pp 177-178, 329, 419, 431-432
- ⁶⁴ *Whitewashed, A Critique of James White*
- ⁶⁵ thebibleformula.webs.com/
- ⁶⁶ thebibleformula.webs.com/kjbperfectmath.htm
- ⁶⁷ *Chapel Sayings of Dr. Bob Jones Sr.*, p 10
- ⁶⁸ Matthew 2:15, 5:44, 6:13, 17:21, 18:2-3, 24:3, Mark 7:19, 9:29, Luke 1:72, 2:33, 4:8, 9:54-56, 11:2-4, John 2:11, 5:39, Acts 8:37, 13:42, 15:23, 16:7, 24:15, Romans 5:1, 1 Corinthians 5:7, 7:5, 11:24, 29, 15:4, 47, Ephe-

sians 3:9, 5:30, Philippians 3:21, Colossians 1:14, 1 Timothy 3:16, 2 Timothy 3:16, 4:1, Titus 2:13, Hebrews 7:21, 9:27, 10:21, James 5:16, 2 Peter 2:9, Revelation 13:10, 22:14. *From Our Authorized Bible Vindicated* by Benjamin Wilkinson, kiv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-12.html

⁶⁹ *Obama: Muslim Missionary? Part 1* by Chuck Norris, www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=191629. Mr Norris warns, “Unlike any other time in U.S. history, our First Amendment freedoms of speech and religion are in jeopardy. As if recently passed “hate-crime” laws and a politically correct culture weren’t bad enough, now our president is using international pressure and possibly law to establish a prohibition against insulting Islam or Muslims.” A Christian witness to a Muslim could clearly be construed by the Muslim as an insult.

⁷⁰ *John Wycliffe The Dawn of the Reformation* by David Fountain, Mayflower Christian Books, 1984, p 48. See also *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 761ff

⁷¹ *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 896-897

⁷² *King James Version Ditches Blind Guides* by Gail Riplinger and Bryn (n) Riplinger, A. V. Publications Corp., 2007, p 38

⁷³ *Studies in Christian Living, Book 5, Foundations for Faith, Chapter 5, The Conflict with Sin*, The Navigators, 1964, p 25

⁷⁴ *A Brief History of English Bible Translations* by Dr Laurence M. Vance, Vance Publications, pp 106ff

⁷⁵ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, p 33

⁷⁶ “O Biblios” *The Book*, Section 14.4

⁷⁷ www.elizabethfiles.com/spanish-armada-9-god-blew-and-they-were-scattered/4097/

⁷⁸ *Ruckman Reference Bible*, pp 1427-1428

⁷⁹ *The Christian’s Handbook of Manuscript Evidence* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1970, Chapter 5

⁸⁰ *Which Bible is God’s Word?* by Gail Riplinger, A. V. Publications, 2007, p 116

⁸¹ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, p 33

⁸² “O Biblios” *The Book*, Section 10.14

⁸³ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Koine_Greek

⁸⁴ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, p 33. See also *The King James Version Defended*, Chapter 8, p 218, wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html

⁸⁵ www.av1611.org/kjv/ripwhit1.html. See also *Whitewashed, A Critique of James White*, p 423

⁸⁶ *Ruckman Reference Bible*, p 1382

⁸⁷ *The Book of Revelation* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1970, Preface, Chapters 1-3

⁸⁸ *The History of the New Testament Church, Volume 1* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1982, pp 390-391

⁸⁹ *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 560ff

⁹⁰ *The Translators to the Reader*, www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm

⁹¹ *In Awe of Thy Word*, p 33

⁹² *Bible Believers Bulletin*, February 2003, June 2006

⁹³ *Crowned With Glory* by Dr Thomas Holland, Writer’s Club Press, 2000, pp 192-194

⁹⁴ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, p 31

⁹⁵ *Hazardous Materials*, Chapter 18

⁹⁶ *Ruckman Reference Bible*, p 1445

⁹⁷ *The Books of Ezra Nehemiah Esther* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 2004, pp 276-277

⁹⁸ *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 871ff

-
- ⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp 765, 876, 879-880, 884, 888, 897, 898, 993-994
- ¹⁰⁰ *The Book of Genesis* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1969, p 707
- ¹⁰¹ wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Shroud_of_Turin
- ¹⁰² “*O Biblios*” Section 1.8
- ¹⁰³ kiv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html. See also *Which Bible?* edited by Dr David Otis Fuller, Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975, 205-206, 213-214
- ¹⁰⁴ [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Frederick_Nolan_\(theologian\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Frederick_Nolan_(theologian))
- ¹⁰⁵ *The Book of Acts* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1974, p 284. See also *The Christian’s Handbook of Manuscript Evidence*, Chapters 4, 5
- ¹⁰⁶ *Early Manuscripts And The Authorized Version, A Closer Look!* By Jack A. Moorman, B.F.T. #1825, 1990, pp 47-48
- ¹⁰⁷ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hebrew_language
- ¹⁰⁸ *Ruckman Reference Bible*, p 1238
- ¹⁰⁹ *Did The Catholic Church Give Us The Bible?* by David W. Daniels, Chick Publications, 2005, p 17
- ¹¹⁰ *Defending The King James Bible* by Dr D. A. Waite, The Bible For Today Press, 1992, pp 24ff
- ¹¹¹ *In Awe of Thy Word*, p 788
- ¹¹² *The Book of Revelation*, pp 157-158
- ¹¹³ *The Language of the King James Bible* by Gail Riplinger, A. V. Publications Corp., 1998, p 49
- ¹¹⁴ *The New Compact Bible Dictionary*, Zondervan, 1967
- ¹¹⁵ *Ruckman Reference Bible*, pp 1466, 1235, 1571, 1576, 1598, 1617, 1510, 1453-1456
- ¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp 1806-1807
- ¹¹⁷ *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 758, 788
- ¹¹⁸ *Forever Settled* by Jack Moorman, The Bible for Today, 1985, p 28
- ¹¹⁹ *The New Compact Bible Dictionary*
- ¹²⁰ *Ruckman Reference Bible*, p 981
- ¹²¹ *Ibid.*, p 1238
- ¹²² *John Wycliffe The Dawn of the Reformation*, p 47
- ¹²³ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, p 21-22
- ¹²⁴ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Koine_Greek
- ¹²⁵ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, p 11
- ¹²⁶ *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 19-21, 456ff
- ¹²⁷ *The Book of Revelation*, pp 367ff
- ¹²⁸ *The History of the New Testament Church, Volume I*, pp 41-42, 182-183, 185-186, 215-216
- ¹²⁹ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Koine_Greek
- ¹³⁰ *The History of the New Testament Church, Volume II*, pp ii-iii, 14, 168-169, 276-277
- ¹³¹ *The Book of Revelation*, pp 367ff
- ¹³² “*O Biblios*” *The Book*, Chapters 10-14
- ¹³³ *God Only Wrote One Bible* by Jasper James Ray, The Eye Opener Publishers, 1984, p 27
- ¹³⁴ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, p 23
- ¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p 9

-
- ¹³⁶ *The Book of Genesis*, pp 56, 82, 114-116
- ¹³⁷ *In Awe of Thy Word*, p 332
- ¹³⁸ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, p 3
- ¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, p 22
- ¹⁴⁰ *The Answer Book* by Dr Samuel C. Gipp Th. D, Samuel C. Gipp, 1989, p 113
- ¹⁴¹ *In Awe of Thy Word*, p 472
- ¹⁴² *The Book of Genesis*, pp 122ff
- ¹⁴³ *The History of the New Testament Church, Volume II*, 1984, pp 276-277
- ¹⁴⁴ *The King James Version Defended*, Chapter 8, pp 220-223, wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html
- ¹⁴⁵ *When the KJV Departs from the "Majority" Text – A New Twist in the Continuing Attack on the Authorised Version B.F.T. #1617*, pp 27-28
- ¹⁴⁶ *The College of Cardinals, "Traitors, heady, highminded" 2 Tim. 3:4, D. A. WAITE Denies KJB Inspiration Part 1* by G. A. Riplinger, A. V. Publications, 2-4-2010, p 11
- ¹⁴⁷ *The Book of Romans* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 2003, p 224
- ¹⁴⁸ *Ruckman Reference Bible*, p 1492
- ¹⁴⁹ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fiorello_La_Guardia
- ¹⁵⁰ *In Awe of Thy Word*, pp 81-82
- ¹⁵¹ *Ruckman Reference Bible*, p 1638
- ¹⁵² *The Oxford Bible Reader's Dictionary & Concordance*
- ¹⁵³ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, p 6
- ¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp 50ff
- ¹⁵⁵ *Ruckman Reference Bible*, p 557
- ¹⁵⁶ *The Book of Matthew* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Pensacola Bible Institute, 1978, p 142
- ¹⁵⁷ *Article 43, The Use of the Word "Baptism" in the King James Version of 1611*, Trinitarian Bible Society. Reprints may possibly be obtained on request to the society, www.trinitarianbiblesociety.org/
- ¹⁵⁸ *The Book of Revelation* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, pp 38-39
- ¹⁵⁹ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Straw_man
- ¹⁶⁰ *The Book of Romans*, pp 142ff
- ¹⁶¹ thinkexist.com/quotation/to_sin_by_silence_when_they_should_protest_makes/222713.html
- ¹⁶² www.englandsnortheast.co.uk/KingEdwinofNorthumbria.html
- ¹⁶³ *Volume 1 of the Book of Psalms* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1992, pp 337-338
- ¹⁶⁴ *The Book of Romans*, pp 183, 217ff
- ¹⁶⁵ *The Book of John* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 2005, p 182
- ¹⁶⁶ *The Books of First and Second Corinthians* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, pp 469, 476ff
- ¹⁶⁷ *Pastoral Epistles I & II Timothy – Titus* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, pp 99, 108-112
- ¹⁶⁸ [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Way_Out_West_\(1937_film\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Way_Out_West_(1937_film))
- ¹⁶⁹ www.bnet.com/blog/airline-business/qantas-a380-now-we-know-why-the-planes-were-grounded-8212-and-it-8217s-scary/2890
- ¹⁷⁰ *Ruckman Reference Bible*, pp1499-1500, *The Book of Romans*, pp 375-376
- ¹⁷¹ *Ruckman Reference Bible*, p 1238

-
- ¹⁷² *The Defeat of the Spanish Armada – God’s Hand in History* by D.C. Relf
- ¹⁷³ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moral_Majority
- ¹⁷⁴ “*O Biblios*” *The Book*, Section 9.2
- ¹⁷⁵ ircamera.as.arizona.edu/NatSci102/NatSci102/text/seismic1.htm 2019 update
- ¹⁷⁶ *The Books of Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1973, p 396
- ¹⁷⁷ *Which Bible Is God’s Word?* p 45
- ¹⁷⁸ www.av1611.org/kjv/logsdon.html
- ¹⁷⁹ *The King James Version Defended*, p 65, wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter3.html
- ¹⁸⁰ *Dr D. A. Waite and The Dead Bible Society*, p 33
- ¹⁸¹ “*O Biblios*” *The Book*, Section 10.14
- ¹⁸² en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Koine_Greek
- ¹⁸³ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Authorized_King_James_Version
- ¹⁸⁴ “*O Biblios*” *The Book*, Section 11.1
- ¹⁸⁵ *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version* by Dr Laurence M. Vance, Vance Publications, 1996, p 211
- ¹⁸⁶ *Given By Inspiration* by Dr William P. Grady, Grady Publications, Inc., p 154
- ¹⁸⁷ www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/a/abrahamlin135434.html
- ¹⁸⁸ *Which Bible?* edited by Dr David Otis Fuller, Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975, *The Learned Men* by Terence H. Brown. See also *In Awe of Thy Word* Chapter 16 *The King’s Letters Figured In Glory: The King & His Translators*
- ¹⁸⁹ *Translators Revived* by Alexander McClure, Reprint of the 1858 Edition, Maranatha Bible Society, Michigan, *Introductory Narrative* and biographical sketches
- ¹⁹⁰ *The Book of Genesis* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1969, pp 83-85
- ¹⁹¹ fpcc.org/?p=1976. Page no longer available
- ¹⁹² *Hazardous Materials*, pp 177-178, 329, 419, 431-432
- ¹⁹³ kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-9.html
- ¹⁹⁴ kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-10.html
- ¹⁹⁵ kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html
- ¹⁹⁶ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Benjamin_Jowett
- ¹⁹⁷ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/U-boat_Campaign_%28World_War_I%29
- ¹⁹⁸ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Battle_of_the_Atlantic_%281939%E2%80%931945%29
- ¹⁹⁹ *The Men Behind the KJV* by Gustavus Paine, Baker Book House, 1977, pp 182-183
- ²⁰⁰ *Goodbye to All That* by Robert Graves, Penguin Modern Classics, 1960, pp 157, 191-192
- ²⁰¹ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_Graves
- ²⁰² en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gallipoli_Campaign
- ²⁰³ www.sasra.org.uk/pages/pv.asp?p=sasra87
- ²⁰⁴ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_War_I_casualties
- ²⁰⁵ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Expeditionary_Forces
- ²⁰⁶ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Civil_War
- ²⁰⁷ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_War_II_casualties

-
- 208 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Korean_War
- 209 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vietnam_War
- 210 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vietnam_War
- 211 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_War_II_casualties
- 212 *Britain Under Siege* by Alan O'Reilly, Christian Concern, p 63. Contact AJO'R for more details, alan.oreilly@ntlworld.com
- 213 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Charles_Kingsley
- 214 *The People's Bible* by Derek Wilson, Lion Hudson, 2010, p 153
- 215 en.wikisource.org/wiki/Modern_Anti-Trinitarianism_and_Islam,
en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ferdinand_Christian_Baur
- 216 *Who is this Allah?* by G.J.O. Moshay, Dorchester House Publications, 1994, p 25
- 217 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Islam_in_the_United_Kingdom
- 218 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Islam_in_the_United_States
- 219 www.barnabasfund.org/Islamist-group-pilots-sharia-controlled-zone.html
- 220 www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/faith/article1362709.ece
- 221 www.zionism-israel.com/ezine/IsllamReligionofPeace.htm
- 222 *Ruckman Reference Bible*, p 516
- 223 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lewis_Carroll
- 224 *Pastoral Epistles I & II Timothy - Titus* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1989, pp 243-252
- 225 kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-4.html
- 226 www.churchsociety.org/issues_new/history/iss_history_rylemartyrs.asp
- 227 mb-soft.com/believe/txc/thirtyni.htm, Article XXXVII
- 228 www.hacalumni.com/pdfs/KingJamesBibleProblems.pdf
- 229 *The Book of Revelation* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1970, pp 353ff
- 230 *The Big Picture* by David W. Norris, Authentic Word, 2004, pp 372, 384-385
- 231 kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-10.html
- 232 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hillary_Rodham_Clinton
- 233 *The Christian's Handbook of Manuscript Evidence* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1970, Chapter 5
- 234 *Which Bible?* p 105.
- 235 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freudian_slip
- 236 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Send_to_Coventry
- 237 *The King James Version Defended*, p 221, wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html
- 238 groups.yahoo.com/group/KingJamesBible/message/13342
- 239 *The King James Version Defended*, Chapter 8, p 220, wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html
- 240 www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/faith/article1362709.ece
- 241 *A. V. Holiday and Business Directory* Ron and Barbara Smith, 96 Plaistow Lane, Bromley, BR1 3AS
- 242 *The King James Version Defended*, p 139, wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter6.html
- 243 www.bftbc.org/.PDF/DAW/1_RiplingerAnswerPages1-21_098.pdf

²⁴⁴ *The Revision Revised* by Dean John William Burgon, Hobbs Publications, Centennial Edition [1883-1983], pp 2-3, 127.

²⁴⁵ kiv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-10.html. See also *Which Bible?* pp 293-298. Other informative works for this most important subject include *Sabotage?* p 29, *Let's Weigh The Evidence* by Barry Burton, pp 67-71, *Did The Catholic Church Give Us The Bible?* by David W. Daniels pp 116-144, all from Chick Publications, *God Wrote Only One Bible* by Jasper J. Ray, The Eye Opener Publishers, pp 23-30, *Final Authority* by Dr William P. Grady, Grady Publications, pp 249-262.

²⁴⁶ www.jesus-is-savior.com/Bible/GNB/why_we_reject_the_gnb.htm. See also *Let's Weigh The Evidence* p 69

²⁴⁷ *Ruckman Reference Bible*, pp 1499-1500, *The Book of Romans*, pp 375-376

²⁴⁸ *Ruckman Reference Bible*, p 1238

²⁴⁹ 'O Biblios' *The Book*, Section 4.1

The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1988, p 119

The History Of The New Testament Church Volume II by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1984, Chapter Five

The KJB Story 1611-2011 Abridged by Alan O'Reilly, p 17, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/