

**Dr D. A. Waite and *The DBS, Dead Bible Society*
*Translation Without Inspiration is Extinction***

Alan James O'Reilly

Contents

Summary.....	iii
Introduction.....	1
Dr Waite and Dr Mrs Riplinger – Preliminary Observations.....	5
Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration.....	9
Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print.....	19
Dr Waite and ‘The Greek’	25
Dr Waite and the KJB <u>not</u> “given by inspiration of God”	35
<i>Introductory Remarks.....</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>The ‘not ““perfect”” AV1611.....</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>The ‘not “inspired by God” AV1611.....</i>	<i>47</i>
<i>Testimonies to the Inspiration of the AV1611.....</i>	<i>57</i>
Conclusions.....	61
Appendix 1 – Additional Insights, from P. O. Heisey.....	62
Appendix 2 – Full List of Extracts from A WARNING!!.....	78
References.....	92

Summary

Dr D. A. Waite of *The Dean Burgon Society* and *The Bible for Today* ministries has issued a warning in the form of a book entitled *A WARNING!! On Gail Riplinger's KJB and Multiple Inspiration Heresy*. His book is in retaliation against Dr Mrs Riplinger's latest work, *The College of Cardinals, "Traitors, heady, highminded" 2 Tim. 3:4, D.A. Waite Denies KJB Inspiration*.

In addition to attacking Dr Mrs Riplinger on largely personal matters, Dr Waite denies throughout his book that the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible is "***all scripture...given by inspiration of God***" 2 Timothy 3:16. He dogmatically insists that the expression "***is given***" refers only to a once-only inspiration that applies solely to the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek original texts and never to translations.

That is why this work is entitled **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Translation Without Inspiration is Extinction**, because Dr Waite and his associates insist that the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible is "***alienated from the life of God***" Ephesians 4:18, as Dr Waite says plainly on P. 36 of his book.

"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."

James 2:26 states that, "***the body without the spirit is dead.***" So is the Bible without inspiration.

However, inspection of the scriptures shows that the expression "***is given***" can apply to repeated actions in 22 of its 33 occurrences and if "***all scripture...is profitable***" now, such that "***the man of God may be perfect***" 2 Timothy 3:16, 17 now, then inspiration has to apply to translations, for the sake of "*the very vulgar,*" who are unlearned in "*the Original Sacred Tongues,*" according to Dr Miles Smith who wrote *The Translators to the Reader*. Nothing in 2 Timothy 3:16 precludes inspiration of translations, especially in view of the numerous examples of such inspiration contained in the scriptures, such as John 19:19, 20 where 'inspired' scripture is written in Latin, as well as in Hebrew and Greek.

Inspection of Jeremiah 36 shows that "*multiple inspiration*" is in reality "***sound doctrine***" 1 Timothy 1:10. Inspection of Esther 1:20-22, 8:8, 9, Daniel 4:1, 2, 5:25-28, 6:25, 26 confirm that "***the king's word***" 2 Samuel 24:4 from "***the King of kings***" 1 Timothy 6:15 is still "***the king's word***" when translated into other languages and remains "*the King's speech,*" as Dr Smith notes, which in the case of "***the scripture of truth***" Daniel 10:21 is undiminished in inspiration, power and authority by translation into the 1611 English Holy Bible and, if anything, is enhanced by it, 2 Samuel 3:10, Colossians 1:13, Hebrews 11:5.

Dr Waite insists that he has an inspired Holy Bible in the form of the original Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek texts but he does not identify it any further than stating that it underlies the King James Bible. This is a bizarre situation in that, according to Dr Waite, an 'uninspired' Text, the AV1611, therefore becomes the determinant of the content of an 'inspired' text, which certainly elevates the AV1611 to a position of considerable importance.

Dr Waite does identify specific Hebrew and Greek texts, namely Ben Chayyim's, Scrivener's and Beza's but he never refers to them as inspired. It follows, therefore that Dr Waite's perfect, inspired Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Holy Bible exists only in his mind and prompts reflection on Proverbs 26:12.

"Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit? there is more hope of a fool than of him."

Finally, Dr Waite's insistence that the 1611 English Holy Bible is uninspired is soundly refuted in this work by the testimonies of several distinguished witnesses who were either past masters of literary works or greatly used of God, or both.

As one of the most prominent of all of God's servants of all time once said,

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

Dr D. A. Waite and *The DBS, Dead Bible Society*

Translation Without Inspiration is Extinction

Introduction

Dr D. A. Waite of *The Dean Burgon Society* and *The Bible for Today* ministries has issued a warning¹ in the form of a book entitled *A WARNING!! On Gail Riplinger's KJB and Multiple Inspiration Heresy*. His book is in retaliation against Dr Mrs Riplinger's latest work², *The College of Cardinals, "Traitors, heady, highminded" 2 Tim. 3:4, D.A. Waite Denies KJB Inspiration*.

His warning is against what he terms the heresy of believing that the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible is the pure word of God "**given by inspiration of God**" 2 Timothy 3:16.

He also warns the reader that only the original words of the scriptures in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek can be described as "**given by inspiration of God.**"

In other words, the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible is not "**all scripture**" because it is not "**given by inspiration of God**" and therefore is misnamed. It is not actually a Holy Bible but merely a translation of the original words of the scriptures in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek.

Dr Waite in effect says so repeatedly in his book *A WARNING!!* and the following citation is typical.

The emphases are Dr Waite's. The page number and all subsequent ones listed in this work are from his book, likewise the emphases.

P. 87 "(Quoting Dr Alan O'Reilly), "I believe it is the subject of why all this has blown up, right on the heels of the publication of Hazardous Materials. If I understand correctly, **you believe, as I do that the AV1611 is the pure word of God, given by inspiration of God, II Timothy 3:16,17 and the perfectly preserved word of God in its final (7) purified state, Psalm 12:6,7...I get the impression that the Waites don't altogether share that stance.**"

"Sad to say, Dr O'Reilly partakes in the HERESY of Gail Ludwig Latessa Kaleda Riplinger as they both say the "AV1611" was "**given by inspiration of God II Timothy 3:16, 17.**" He is right that the "**Waites don't altogether share that stance.**" Only the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words were "**given by inspiration of God**" or "**God-breathed.**" No translation (including the AV1611) was given by verbal plenary inspiration. The "AV 1611" was most definitely not "**given by inspiration of God.**" It included the Apocrypha with all of its false doctrines and beliefs. Surely God did not give those words."

The reader should note in passing that Dr Waite refers specifically in his book to the "heresy" that Dr Mrs Riplinger is supposed to adhere to, of believing that the AV1611 "was given by verbal plenary inspiration." These references may be found on the back page (twice), pp 3 (3 times), 7 (5 times), 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 20, 23, 24 (4 times), 28, 33, 34, 37, 38 (twice), 42, 44 (twice), 49, 51 (twice), 53, 54 (twice), 56, (3 times), 66, 72, 82, 84 (4 times), 85, 87, 88, 94, 95 (twice), 97, a total of 53 occurrences. That is more than one occurrence every 3 pages in Dr Waite's 134-page book.

Yet nowhere does Dr Waite specify where Dr Mrs Riplinger has actually stated that the AV1611 "was given by verbal plenary inspiration." The expression is not found in her book that Dr Waite is critiquing. The reader should therefore note further that Dr Waite has already failed to "**provide things honest**" Romans 12:17 in his criticisms of Dr Mrs Riplinger and keep that observation in mind throughout the study of this author's work.

Concerning the statement from this author that Dr Waite quotes on P. 87 of his book, it is part of a note of support I sent to Dr Mrs Riplinger that, with my agreement, she inserted in her latest work, the 60-page treatise entitled *Traitors, Heady, Highminded: D.A. Waite Denies KJB Inspiration*. Inspection of Dr Waite's response shows that he does indeed deny that the AV1611 ***“is given by inspiration of God”*** 2 Timothy 3:16, 17, although he misquotes Dr Mrs Riplinger and myself, in that we don't just say the AV1611 was ***“given by inspiration of God”*** but ***“is given by inspiration of God.”***

Use of the correct tense in English is essential because it allows for the latest copy of the AV1611 fresh from the printing press to be just as ***“given by inspiration of God”*** as any of its predecessors.

Dr Waite's denial that the AV1611 Holy Bible ***“is given by inspiration of God”*** forms a major part of his book *A WARNING!!* in which he issues a detailed critique of Dr Mrs. Riplinger's work and strenuously affirms that only the 'original' words in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek were ***“given by inspiration of God.”***

He also advertises in *A WARNING!!* a new 416-page book by his colleague Dr Kirk DiVietro entitled *Cleaning-Up Hazardous Materials*, which consists of an examination of Dr Mrs Riplinger's recent book *Hazardous Materials*. In addition, *A WARNING!!* contains details of exchanges between Dr Mrs Riplinger and the Waites (Dr and Mrs Waite and their son Don Jnr.) on a variety of issues besides that of inspiration.

However, apart from some preliminary observations, see below, this work mainly addresses the matter of inspiration, because it is foundational to Bible belief.

It should be noted that Dr Waite does affirm his belief in the *preservation* of *“the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words... “given by inspiration of God” or “God-breathed.”*” Dr Waite also affirms that he has these words, which he claims are still ***“inspired,”*** under-linings are this author's.

P. 2 *“I believe it is an inaccurate view of the King James Bible to refer to it as ***“inspired,”*** I believe this term must be reserved exclusively for the original, preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible and not for the King James Bible itself.”*

P. 52 *“I firmly believe that I have the original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.”*

Dr Waite therefore appears to believe, by implication that *copies* of God's preserved 'original' Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words underlying the AV1611, which he has, can be ***“God-breathed”*** or ***“given by inspiration of God.”*** The above quotes show that he also appears to believe that while copies of these words can be ***“inspired,”*** translations of them definitely cannot. However, he never exactly discloses where these ***“inspired”*** copies may be found, which leads to this author's conclusion about Dr Waite's actual source for *“the original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek”* that he professes to have. It is his own mind. See **Dr Waite and 'the Greek'**.

The doctrine of the preservation of the ***“words of truth”*** Ecclesiastes 12:10, according to a *correct* understanding of Psalm 12:6, 7³ is of course also foundational to Bible belief and this doctrine has, understandably, received considerable attention in recent decades because most of the attacks on the Holy Bible have been aimed at casting doubt on the actual *words* of the AV1611. See, for example, *The King James Only Controversy* by James White. These attacks have been complete failures, as the detailed answers to White's objections to the Holy Bible clearly show. See *The Scholarship Only Controversy* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman and *Blind Guides* by Dr Mrs Riplinger⁴.

It appears therefore that the Devil is now *re-focusing** his attack on the Holy Bible by denying its very identity as ***“the holy scriptures...given by inspiration of God”*** 2 Timothy 3:15, 16 and ***“the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever”*** 1 Peter 1:23. In other words, the focus of his attack has shifted from ***“Yea, hath God said?”*** Genesis 3:1 (preservation) back to ***“Yea, hath God said?”*** (inspiration).

*See section entitled **Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print.**

For if, as Dr Waite asserts, God’s ‘original’ Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words underlying the AV1611 are no longer ***“given by inspiration of God”*** once they are changed into another form* by translation, then they no longer have ***“the life of God”*** Ephesians 4:18 and cannot be said to be ***“the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever”*** 1 Peter 1:23.

*Even though the Lord Jesus Christ could appear ***“in another form”*** Mark 16:12 and still be the Lord Jesus Christ⁵.

Therefore, though translations may accurately *preserve* the ‘original’ words of scripture, although in a different form, they are, according to Dr Waite and including the AV1611, like those of the Lord’s hearers who did not come and believe in Him, so that He pronounces against them the solemn judgement ***“ye have no life in you”*** John 6:35, 53.

That is Dr Waite’s apparent perception of the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible.

That is why this work is entitled **Dr D. A. Waite and The DBS, Dead Bible Society, Translation Without Inspiration is Extinction**, because Dr Waite and his associates insist that the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible is ***“alienated from the life of God”*** Ephesians 4:18, as Dr Waite says plainly on P. 36 of his book.

“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.”

James 2:26 states that, ***“the body without the spirit is dead.”*** So is the Bible without inspiration.

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 Siberia⁶, 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.

Practically speaking, given that the Church Age is rapidly drawing to a close, Dr Waite’s ire against Dr Mrs Riplinger therefore has an incisive scriptural explanation.

“The devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time” Revelation 12:12.

In the light of the Devil’s intensifying wrath against ***“the scripture of truth”*** Daniel 10:21, Bible believers must be able to rest assured that the 1611 English Bibles they possess now are not devoid of ***“the life of God”*** but truly ***“the word of the Lord”*** that ***“endureth for ever”*** 1 Peter 1:25 and like the Lord Himself are ***“alive for evermore, Amen”*** Revelation 1:18. They must also be able to ***“resist the Devil”*** James 4:7 with respect to any insinuation of the form ***“Yea, hath God said?”*** aimed as denying, as Dr Waite does, that their recently-purchased AV1611 is ***“all scripture...given by inspiration of God.”***

That is what this work is about.

Much of what follows and more will be found in Chapters 17, 18, 31, 32 of Dr Mrs Riplinger's recent book, *Hazardous Materials*, entitled *Scriptures to All Nations and Seven Proofs of the King James Bible's Inspiration*. However, it is hoped that this author's additional perspective will also prove to be informative.

This work is set out under the following main headings.

Dr Waite and Dr Mrs Riplinger – Preliminary Observations

Dr Waite and 'Originals Only' Inspiration

Dr Waite and the Imaginary 'Original Bible,' Unidentified in Print

Dr Waite and 'the Greek'

Dr Waite and the KJB not "given by inspiration of God"

Typical statements from Dr Waite's book have been cited under each of the above headings, with the **Appendix** containing the full list of selected citations* for all the headings. Emphases included in the statements are Dr Waite's. This author's responses to each of Dr Waite's claims on inspiration and related topics then follow.

*The selected citations are believed to be all the relevant ones. Inspection of the list will reveal considerable overlap. Dr Waite repeats himself a lot.

The reader should note that, as far as possible, this work will cite the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible in English "*given by...inspiration of God*" in response to Dr Waite, according to Isaiah 54:13, which this author takes as vindication of the 1611 English Bible by its own Author, Whose most faithful servant down here is the 1611 English Bible.

"No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. This is the heritage of the servants of the LORD, and their righteousness is of me, saith the LORD."

All else will be resolved at the Judgement Seat of Christ, Romans 14:10.

Before launching into the main topic of inspiration, it is noted that Dr Waite casts certain aspersions at Dr Mrs Riplinger in his book *A WARNING!!* and therefore some preliminary observations are in order in this respect.

Dr Waite and Dr Mrs Riplinger – Preliminary Observations

1. Dr Waite refers repeatedly to what he terms Dr Mrs Riplinger’s “*Pentecostal/Charismatic background.*” These references may be found in *A WARNING!!* on pp 3, 7, 8, 12, 13, 23, 34, 37 (twice), 38 (twice), 39, 42, 44, 49, 53, 54 (twice), 56, 66, 72, 82, 84 (twice), 90, 95.

This is a total of 26 occurrences in Dr Waite’s 134-page book, one such occurrence every 5 pages. However, apart from an allegation that Dr Mrs Riplinger had attended a Pentecostal church*, Dr Waite fails to produce any evidence that Dr Mrs Riplinger ever had such a background and by means of his innuendo against Sister Riplinger, Dr Waite has therefore failed to obey 1 Thessalonians 5:21.

“*Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.*”

*P. 3 “*We have learned from witnesses who knew her that Gail Riplinger originally went to a Pentecostal/Charismatic church before her husband at that time urged her to join a Baptist church.*” However, note the following, which shows that Dr Waite’s accusation is nothing more than innuendo:

- Dr Waite gives no details of either the church or the duration/frequency of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s alleged attendance.
- Dr Waite gives no details of the witnesses that made the allegations, except that they “*knew...Gail Riplinger.*” They evidently prefer to remain anonymous, or ‘plead the 5th.’ They are cowards, all.
- Dr Waite gives no details of any specific Pentecostal/Charismatic teaching that Dr Mrs Riplinger allegedly espouses.
- Dr Waite gives no explanation of why and how Dr Mrs Riplinger’s exposition of Acts 2 as the basis for pure vernacular Bibles⁷ accords with *any* Pentecostal/Charismatic teaching.

2. Dr Waite refers repeatedly to Dr Mrs Riplinger as “*Gail Ludwig Latessa Kaleda Riplinger.*” These references may be found in his book on pp 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45, 46, 49, 51, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 65, 67, 69, 71, 73, 75, 77, 79, 81, 84, 87, 89, 91, 93, 95.

That is a total of 46 occurrences in Dr Waite’s 134-page book, one such occurrence every 3 pages. Every one of them is inappropriate because, as even Dr Waite is forced to acknowledge in his book, e.g. PP. 4-6 of his book, Dr Mrs Riplinger no longer has any association with Messrs Latessa and Kaleda.

Dr Waite’s repeated use of the contrived name “*Gail Ludwig Latessa Kaleda Riplinger*” therefore amounts to a vendetta against her. See P. 58 of his book, where Dr Waite acknowledges having splashed details of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s past life all over the web.

In this author’s opinion, that level of vindictiveness would be more typical of an unsaved individual than a distinguished Christian teacher/broadcaster such as Dr Waite.

Naturally, his ire at Dr Mrs Riplinger leads to some inconsistency on Dr Waite’s part. On P. 43 of his book, Dr Waite roundly protests “*Who is she to tell us what we can do?*”

Yet on PP. 6, 75 of his book, Dr Waite is quite forthright in telling the Riplinger family how they should process mail that they receive and how they should describe each other’s married partners.

All of which puts this author in mind of 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.”

3. Dr Waite insists that Dr Mrs Riplinger hates and despises Greek or Hebrew lexicons, English dictionaries and even Greek and Hebrew words underlying the English scriptures. See the following statements from Dr Waite. Under-linings are this author’s, with reference to the points that will be addressed and all subsequent points.

P. 19 *“Gail Riplinger spread the false view that nobody should use any Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek lexicons to find out meanings of Bible words. Because of her **HERESY** view of the plenary verbal inspiration of the King James Bible, Gail Riplinger doesn’t even want people to look in either Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek or even English dictionaries to find out the meaning of the words in the King James Bible.”*

P. 27 *“Gail Ludwig Latessa Kaleda Riplinger thinks that the King James Bible’s word is the only thing you can use. Otherwise, to her, it is an **“error.”** She believes you can’t explain any of the King James Bible’s words or define them. If people don’t understand the word **“OUCHES,”** for example, it is too bad for them, in her judgment. Gail Riplinger despises the definitions of uncommon words. She is entitled to her opinion, but I strongly disagree with her. She believes you must chase all over the King James Bible to find the definitions of its words, but never consult any dictionaries or lexicons of any kind. In my opinion, this position is insane!”*

*“I don’t use **“corrupt lexicons.”** I use proper lexicons that give me proper meanings of the Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek. Gail Riplinger despises the use of lexicons of any kind, calling them all **“corrupt.”**””*

P. 32 *“The original languages that God breathed-out give the English nuances, illustrations and shades of meaning. The grammatical rules of those languages give further assistance in the proper interpretation of difficult passages. When I preach God’s Words, I do not criticize or change the English King James Bible. I illuminate and give many other acceptable and accurate meanings that the translators could have written down. Gail Riplinger despises the use of any other word than that given by the King James translators. This is ridiculous.”*

P. 40 *“The verb, **“is given”** does not appear in the Greek New Testament that God gave us. Gail Riplinger hates the Words of the Greek and Hebrew that underlie our King James Bible. She just takes the English over against the Greek, even though there is no Greek word here whatsoever! This is theological **HERESY** at its worst! Even if she takes her English **“is given,”** this phrase often translates the aorist or other past tenses. It does not always mean a present tense, even in other places where it is used in the King James Bible. 2 Timothy 3:16 (PASA GRAPHE THEOPNEUSTOS) just speaks of an accomplished past deed that God did when He gave us His Words in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.”*

Dr Waite would get some enlightenment by visiting the AV Publications web site, www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html, shopping link, where he would find the following titles listed.

1. *Webster’s 1828 American Dictionary of the English Language*
2. *Strong’s Concordance*
3. *The Reintroduction of Textus Receptus Readings in the 26th Edition and Beyond of the Nestle/Aland Novum Testamentum-Graece*
4. *Greek Textus Receptus Hardback (Scrivener’s)*

5. *Hebrew Old Testament (Ginsburg 1895 Edition)/Greek New Testament (Scrivener's Edition)*. Dr Mrs Riplinger has a detailed statement on the use and misuse of this work that is informative⁸.
6. *The King James Bible's Own Definition of Over 800 Words*
7. *King James Bible's Built-In Dictionary*
8. *How to Find the KJB's Built-In Dictionary DVD series*

The above titles reveal that, far from Dr Mrs Riplinger despising words in “*the Original Sacred Tongues*”⁹, AV Publications provides several works that bear witness to these words in both Testaments. AV Publications also provides three works that would obviate the need to “*chase all over the King James Bible to find the definitions of its words.*” That said, Dr Waite’s pejorative remark about the scriptural principle of “*comparing spiritual things with spiritual*” 1 Corinthians 2:13 betrays a certain defiance towards the Author of scripture Who enjoined through the Apostle Paul every Bible believer to “*Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth*” 2 Timothy 2:15.

Dr Mrs Riplinger at least identifies the lexicons about which she issues warnings. Dr Waite insists, P. 19 above, “*I don’t use “corrupt lexicons.” I use proper lexicons that give me proper meanings of the Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek*” but he fails to identify the ones he uses. He mentions only the *Oxford English Dictionary* as a resource for determining the meanings of Biblical words, P. 47.

Dr Waite should therefore pay careful attention to the admonition of 1 Samuel 15:23, the last sentence of which has clear application today to the danger of being put on the shelf in the Lord’s service, for rejecting the Lord’s word (in English) in 1 Corinthians 2:13.

“For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the LORD, he hath also rejected thee from being king.”

For the reader’s information, the definition of a word in the AV1611 is often found very close to the verse in which the word occurs, or even in the verse itself, as Mark 13:11 shows.

“But when they shall lead you, and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate: but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost.”

Concerning the word “*ouches*,” which appears to have posed a problem for Dr Waite, no-one has to “*chase all over the King James Bible*” to get its meaning. The first occurrence of the word is in Exodus 28:11.

“With the work of an engraver in stone, like the engravings of a signet, shalt thou engrave the two stones with the names of the children of Israel: thou shalt make them to be set in ouches of gold.”

Note the underlined words. An *ouch* is simply a *setting*, for gemstones, as in Exodus 28, which can be *engraved*, or cut into the host material, in this case gold, as a hollowed-out space, like the embedded word *grave*. The meaning of the word is, ironically, *embedded* in this verse itself, so, far from having to “*chase all over the King James Bible*” for the meaning of “*ouches*,” no-one even has to use a dictionary in this particular instance.

If Dr Waite was prepared to do a little bit of chasing, perhaps with a concordance, he would find the word “*ouches*” again in Exodus 39:6.

“And they wrought onyx stones inclosed in ouches of gold, graven, as signets are graven, with the names of the children of Israel.”

Exodus 39:6 shows that “*ouches*” are clearly hollowed-out enclosures, like a grave. Dr Waite is making up a problem where one doesn’t exist.

Another useful work to elucidate unfamiliar Biblical words, including “*ouches*,” is *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version* by Dr Laurence M. Vance, Vance Publications, 1996. Although this work is not listed in the AV Publications catalogue, it is up to Dr Waite to show that Dr Mrs Riplinger would insist that no-one should ever consult it.

In sum, Dr Waite should apply Romans 13:9 in any future edition of *A WARNING!!*, with respect to Dr Mrs Riplinger’s proper name, prior church associations and perception of extra-Biblical study aids.

“Thou shalt not bear false witness.”

Having dealt with these preliminaries, attention is now drawn to Dr Waite’s claims about “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God*” 2 Timothy 3:16, the Holy Bible and its underlying sources from “*the Original Sacred Tongues.*”

Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration

Dr Waite is clearly a confirmed ‘Originals Onlyist.’ ‘Originals Onlyism’ emerges repeatedly in his book. The following statements are typical. See the **Appendix** for the full list. Underlinings are this author’s, with reference to the points that will be addressed.

P. 2 “I believe that God inspired and breathed-out the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Old and New Testaments. I believe this miraculous event **happened only once and was never repeated. Especially was this inspiration never repeated in any translation in the past, in the present, or in the future.** I believe **2 Timothy 3:16** refers to this once-for-all inspiration by God of those original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. The Greek Words in the first part of that verse are: PASA (“each, every, or all” GRAPHE (“Scripture” referring to the Old Testament, and, by extension to the New Testament) THEOPNEUSTOS (THEO refers to “God,”) PNEUSTOS (comes from “PNEO” “to breathe”) that is, “God-breathed” or “breathed-out by God.” In other words, God “breathed-out” His original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. I believe these Words have been preserved in the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible.”

“I believe it is an inaccurate view of the King James Bible to refer to it as “**inspired**,” I believe this term must be reserved exclusively for the original, preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible and not for the King James Bible itself.”

Dr Waite’s position on ‘originals only’ inspiration from the above is therefore that God gave **“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”** only once, in *“the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Old and New Testaments.”* He affirms elsewhere¹⁰ that his definition of ‘the originals’ and that of most writers on the subject, is not the original manuscripts themselves but the original words in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek.

This definition is useful for Dr Waite because it enables him to sidestep the problem that arises when the scriptures make reference¹¹ to **“the scripture(s),”** which cannot be the *““original autographs,””* as Dr Ruckman shows with reference to Matthew 21:42, Mark 12:24, Luke 4:21, Acts 17:11, Romans 15:4. The Devil is subtle, Genesis 3:1.

Dr Waite further insists in Dr DiVietro’s work that the expression **“is given”** in Matthew 28:18 disproves any application of the term to translations in 2 Timothy 3:16. See also his comment below from P. 40 of his book and accompanying remarks. Dr Waite insists further that the expression **“the faith which was once delivered unto the saints”** Jude 3 likewise proves a once-for-all occurrence of the *““breathed-out by God...original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words.”* Translations, he declares, are the words of men and not *““breathed out by God.””* See quote below.

P. 51 *“Gail Riplinger defines her **HERESY** clearly in this quotation. She calls God’s own **“Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text and the Traditional Received Greek Text”** as **“Two Weak Legs.”** In this way, she is clearly exalting the English King James Bible translation by men (which she believes were given by verbal plenary inspiration) as superior over God’s own Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. This is pure **HERESY!** Shame on her for this blasphemy!”*

However, he also states that *“the original, preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible”* are *““inspired.””* See P. 2 quote above.

Dr Waite therefore implies that inspiration *cannot* have been a single *“miraculous event”* that **“happened only once and was never repeated.”** He is implying that inspiration extends to *copies* of the original words i.e. the *“preserved”* original words. Otherwise, not even Dr Waite would have access to the *““inspired””* scriptures, though he professes that he does.

See again P. 2 quote above*, where Dr Waite refers to “*the original, preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible*” that he describes as “inspired”

*See also his comment on P. 52 of his book, cited in the **Introduction**.

“I firmly believe that I have the original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.”

Moreover, if inspiration “*happened only once and was never repeated,*” no-one could ever have had a Holy Bible, given that no evidence exists to show that the ‘originals’ were ever bound into one single volume, between two covers (or joined together as one single scroll).

It should therefore be noted that Dr Waite has contradicted himself on his basic thesis of inspiration after only two pages into his book.

It should be especially noted that Dr Waite has not said explicitly *where* “*the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Old and New Testaments*” that he says are ““*inspired*”” may be found *independently* of the AV1611.

This omission of Dr Waite’s is a serious one, as will be shown and he appears to be trying to mask this omission by specifying certain published copies of the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Biblical words that he has *now*. Under-linings are this author’s.

P. 51 “*I “promote” the Ben Chayyim Hebrew Text and the Scrivener’s Greek text. I believe the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible are “God’s preserved originals.”*”

Jacob Ben Chayyim and Frederick Scrivener were both *men*, so the only Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek copies that Dr Waite has identified are, like translations, made “*by men.*”

Observe closely therefore that Dr Waite does not say *explicitly* in the above quote (or anywhere else in his book) that *these* published texts are “*the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Old and New Testaments*” or ““God’s preserved originals”” that are ““inspired.”” See later section entitled **Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’**.

Some questions remain therefore, for Dr Waite to answer.

1. Are the Ben Chayyim and Scrivener texts ““inspired?””
2. If so, would the DBS and the BFT be prepared to market them in a single volume as the only ““inspired”” Holy Bible in existence?
3. 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? See section entitled **Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’**.
4. 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?
5. If not, why not?
6. Is it necessary for the ordinary AV1611 reader to have a working knowledge of Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek* in order to know what God *really* said in His word, or can Dr Waite, the DBS and BFT be trusted to provide that information with perfect accuracy 100% of the time?

*Which would probably take a minimum of about two years of fairly intensive study to acquire and then only for students who were disposed to learning ancient lan-

guages. Most Christians do not have such a calling. See the final part of **Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’**.

7. If *copies* of “*the original, preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible*” can be “*“inspired”*” and Dr Waite at least *implies* that they can, see his PP. 2, 52 comments above, then the Greek word *monogenes*, as found in John 1:14, 18, 3:16, 18, 1 John 4:9*, must be “*“inspired.”*” But Koine Greek was eventually replaced by Latin as the *lingua franca* of the developed world¹². Why, then, would God, of Whom Job said “*Thou canst do every thing*” Job 42:2 not inspire the equivalent Latin word *unigenitus* and all Latin counterparts of Koine Greek New Testament words or the later English terms, including “*only begotten*”, given that English is now the *lingua franca* of international business, science, technology and aviation?

*Uninspired chapter and verse designations, according to Dr Waite, because ‘the originals’ never had them, not even the original wording¹³. Dr Waite shouldn’t really refer to 2 Timothy 3:16, therefore, because it, too, is ‘uninspired.’

8. Why therefore is translation such a barrier to inspiration, as Dr Waite insists? Surely it is much more important to have a current *lingua franca* for “*the words of God*” John 3:34 than even for major fields of human endeavour such as international business, science, technology and aviation?
9. Vernacular Bibles, not just the Hebrew and Greek Receptuses that underlie them, have undeniably played a major part in Reformation, revival, soul-winning and missionary outreach down through the centuries¹⁴. How then could such God-honouring results have been achieved by means of ‘dead’ books that, being translations “*by men*” (see the first of Dr Waite’s P. 51 comments above) were and still are *not* “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God*” or indeed *any* scripture, given that “*inspiration of God*” is what essentially defines “*scripture*”?

Dr Waite’s answers to these questions would be most enlightening for members of the Body of Christ.

For now, it appears that Dr Waite’s position on “*scripture*” is that although inspiration happened only once, with respect to the original words of scripture, *copies* of the original Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Biblical words nevertheless *are* “*“inspired”*” but translations *are not*. The “*“inspired”*” Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Biblical words evidently underlie the AV1611 but Dr Waite has not identified the copies that are their source because the only published Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek texts he has identified (Ben Chayyim’s, Scrivener’s and Beza’s) were, like translations, made “*by men*” and Dr Waite has not stated explicitly that these published texts are “*“inspired”*” any more than the AV1611 Translation.

Dr Waite’s position on inspiration therefore seems to be somewhat convoluted and as such it doesn’t match Paul’s pledge to “*use great plainness of speech*” in 2 Corinthians 3:12.

With respect to the expression “*is given*” in Matthew 28:18, the verse itself does not support Dr Waite’s perception of ‘originals only’ inspiration, never to be repeated. The Lord Jesus Christ still has “*all power*” and if an analogy is drawn with “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God,*” that scripture must be available today with its “*inspiration of God*” undiminished and unimpaired.

Dr Waite would probably insist that the scripture available today consists of the *copies** he now has of “*the original, preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible.*”

*Which Dr Waite says are “*inspired.*”” Note again that he hasn’t specified their published source. See his P. 2 comment above.

However, nothing is said in Matthew 28:18 that would preclude *translations* from becoming “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God,*” especially insofar as nowhere in the Great Commission, which is the context of Matthew 28:18-20, or in the Lord’s commandments that are the basis for the Commission, does the Lord explicitly command the disciples to “*teach all nations*” “*the Original Sacred Tongues.*”

Similar comments apply to Dr Waite’s (mis)use of Jude 3, which states “*Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.*”

Just as the Lord Jesus Christ still has “*all power,*” the faith to which Jude alludes clearly “*abideth*” 1 Corinthians 13:13 because Jude urges that his readers “*earnestly contend for the faith*” and trust in it for spiritual strengthening as Paul exhorts his hearers to trust in “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God.*”

“*But ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, Keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life*” Jude 20-21.

“*And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified*” Acts 20:32.

Note that “*the word of his grace*” is another expression for “*the word of God.*”

Therefore, if both the “*most holy faith*” and “*the word of his grace*” are each able to build up the believer and the “*most holy faith*” “*abideth*” then so must “*the word of his grace.*”

Once again, Dr Waite would probably insist that “*the word of his grace*” available today consists of the “*inspired*”” (though anonymous) *copies* he now has of “*the original, preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible.*”

However, like Matthew 28:18, nothing in Jude 3 explicitly precludes translations from being “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God.*”

So Matthew 28:18 with respect to “*is given*” and Jude 3 with respect to “*the faith which was once delivered unto the saints*” actually show the opposite of what Dr Waite thinks they do and by inspection do not prohibit translations from being “*the words of God.*”

The following table may be of interest with respect to the Biblical usage¹⁵ of the expression “*is given.*” The term may refer to a one-time event but it may also refer to repeated or on-going events or actions. Dr Waite therefore cannot use the sense of “*is given*” in Matthew 28:18 to dictate the application of the term in 2 Timothy 3:16.

Table 1
Use of “*is given*” in the AV1611, One-time versus Repeated or On-going Event/Action

Verse	One-time	Repeated or On-going
Esther 3:11	<i>“The silver <u>is given</u> to thee”</i>	
Job 9:24		<i>“The earth <u>is given</u>...to the wicked”</i>
Job 37:10		<i>“By the breath of God frost <u>is given</u>”</i>
Isaiah 9:6	<i>“Unto us a Son <u>is given</u>”</i>	
Jeremiah 6:13		<i>“Every one <u>is given</u> to covetousness”</i>
Jeremiah 8:10		<i>“The greatest <u>is given</u> to covetousness”</i>
Jeremiah 32:24	<i>“The city <u>is given</u> [to] the Chaldeans”</i>	
Jeremiah 32:25	<i>“The city <u>is given</u> [to] the Chaldeans”</i>	
Jeremiah 32:43	<i>“It <u>is given</u> [to] the Chaldeans”</i>	
Ezekiel 16:34		<i>“No reward <u>is given</u> unto thee”</i>
Ezekiel 33:24	<i>“The land <u>is given</u> us for inheritance”</i>	
Matthew 13:11		<i>“It <u>is given</u> unto you to know the mysteries”</i>
Matthew 19:11		<i>“Save they to whom it <u>is given</u>”</i>
Matthew 28:18	<i>“All power <u>is given</u> unto me”</i>	
Mark 4:11		<i>“Unto you it <u>is given</u> to know the mystery”</i>
Mark 6:2	<i>“What wisdom is this which <u>is given</u> unto him?”</i>	
Luke 8:10		<i>“Unto you it <u>is given</u> to know the mysteries”</i>
Luke 12:48		<i>“Unto whomsoever much <u>is given</u>”</i>
Luke 22:19	<i>“This is my body which <u>is given</u> for you”</i>	
Romans 5:5	<i>“The Holy Ghost...<u>is given</u> unto us”</i>	
Romans 12:6		<i>“The grace that <u>is given</u> to us”</i>
Romans 15:15		<i>“The grace that <u>is given</u> to me”</i>
1 Corinth. 1:4		<i>“The grace of God which <u>is given</u> you”</i>
1 Corinth. 3:10		<i>“The grace of God...<u>is given</u> unto me”</i>
1 Corinth. 11:15		<i>“Her hair <u>is given</u> her”</i>
1 Corinth. 12:7		<i>“The manifestation of the Spirit <u>is given</u>”</i>
1 Corinth. 12:8		<i>“For to one <u>is given</u> by the Spirit”</i>

Table 1, Continued
Use of “*is given*” in the AV1611, One-time versus Repeated Event/Action

Verse	One-time	Repeated or On-going
Ephesians 3:2		<i>“The grace of God...<u>is given</u> me”</i>
Ephesians 4:7		<i>“Unto every one of us <u>is given</u> grace”</i>
Philippians 1:29		<i>“It <u>is given</u>...to suffer for his sake”</i>
Colossians 1:25		<i>“The dispensation of God...<u>is given</u> to me”</i>
2 Timothy 3:16		<i>“All scripture <u>is given</u>”*</i>
Revelation 11:2	<i>“The court...<u>is given</u> unto the Gentiles”</i>	

*Dr Waite would dispute this classification, no doubt.

The expression “*is given*” occurs 33 times in the AV1611. Inspection of **Table 1** shows that the term describes a one-time event or action 11 times and a repeated or on-going event or action 22 times. While some AV1611 critics, e.g. Dr Waite, may dispute the precise number of references of “*is given*” to either a one-time or repeated event in the AV1611, both usages of the term clearly exist in scripture.

Matthew 28:18 therefore cannot be used in isolation to ‘prove,’ as Dr Waite attempts to do that the expression “*is given*” refers exclusively to a one-time event and thereby to force this application on 2 Timothy 3:16.

Of course *“the Spirit of God”* Genesis 1:2 is the Agent of the Godhead by which *“all scripture is given by inspiration of God”* as the scripture itself shows.

“The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life” John 6:63.

“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.

But it is interesting that *“Spirit”* and *“breath”* are closely associated in scripture.

“The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life” Job 33:4.

Such a statement is effectively the scripture's own testimony to itself. The scripture is certainly imbued with *“the life of God”* Ephesians 4:18, 1 Peter 1:23, 25 and is therefore *“alive for evermore, Amen”* Revelation 1:18.

These verses confirm that *“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”* exists *now*, according to *“the holy prophets...the apostles of the Lord and Saviour,”* the Lord Himself and the scripture itself. Dr Waite insists that the only scriptures that ever existed are the original Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words but this work will show that *“the form of sound words”* 2 Timothy 1:13 in which the scripture now exists in English is the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible. The scripture need not be confined to *“the Original Sacred Tongues.”*

Dr Waite's opinion to the contrary is therefore of no consequence and his claim of 'Originals Onlyism' is merely his dogmatic *“private interpretation”* 2 Peter 1:20.

Note that Dr Mrs Riplinger¹⁶ discusses the Greek terms that Dr Waite refers to above, namely *pneustos* and *pneo*, in her recent work, along with *pneuma*, of which terms Dr Waite says, P. 24 *“PNEUSTOS does not come from PNEUMA (“spirit”) as Gail Riplinger falsely claims. Both PNEUMA and PNEUSTOS come from the Greek verb PNEO (“to breathe”).”*

Dr Mrs Riplinger's discussion of the words *pneustos*, *pneo* and *pneuma* is, however, explicit and therefore merits careful consideration. It is not reasonable for Dr Waite simply to dismiss it out of hand as he does.

See also Dr Mrs Riplinger's¹⁷ extensive treatment of *The Breath and Heartbeat of God*.

Interestingly, Young¹⁸ indicates that the word *pneo* is used as such 6 times in scripture, Matthew 7:25, 27, Luke 12:25, John 3:8, 6:18, Revelation 7:1, where it is translated not as *“breathe”* but, with its derivatives, as *“blew,” “blow”* or *“bloweth.”* By inspection, such terms are not appropriate in 2 Timothy 3:16. They might fit Dr Waite's treatise though.

Several more statements of Dr Waite's under the present heading bear consideration. The under-linings are this author's, with reference to the points that will be addressed.

P. 24 *“The only Words that God gave by verbal plenary inspiration are the original Words given by God in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. Those Words, and those alone were “inspired Words” which were breathed-out by God. No translation, whether the King James Bible (KJB) or any other translation contains words that were given by God Himself.”*

Dr Waite's statement is untrue, according to Psalm 68:11.

“The Lord gave the word: great was the company of those that published it.”

If a *“great...company”* of publishers has been engaged in bringing forth *“the word”* the Lord gave, that notable feat must surely include faithful translations, insofar as Psalm 68:11 does not explicitly limit these manifold publishing efforts to *“the Original Sacred Tongues.”* So these faithful published translations must themselves *be “the word”* the Lord gave *“by inspi-*

ration of God,” not merely dead words. See later section entitled **Dr Waite and the KJB not “given by inspiration of God”**.

P. 40 *“The verb, “is given” does not appear in the Greek New Testament that God gave us. Gail Riplinger hates the Words of the Greek and Hebrew that underlie our King James Bible. She just takes the English over against the Greek, even though there is no Greek word here whatsoever! This is theological HERESY at its worst! Even if she takes her English “is given,” this phrase often translates the aorist or other past tenses. It does not always mean a present tense, even in other places where it is used in the King James Bible. 2 Timothy 3:16 (PASA GRAPHE THEOPNEUSTOS) just speaks of an accomplished past deed that God did when He gave us His Words in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.”*

Dr Waite’s objection that *“is given”* is not in ‘the Greek’ begs the question of whether the rendering in English is in fact a superior translation *idiomatically*. As none other than Dean Burgon¹⁹ himself said of Westcott and Hort’s Revised Version, *“The schoolboy method of translation is therein exhibited in constant operation throughout. We are never permitted to believe that we are in the company of scholars...the idiomatic rendering of a Greek author into English is a higher achievement by far...”*

So why could not the King’s men have attained this *“higher achievement”* of idiom in their rendition of 2 Timothy 3:16? Dr Waite does not say and it seems remiss of him to overlook this aspect of translation. His comment is therefore a slight against the Westminster Company of King James translators who had responsibility for the New Testament Epistles, including 2 Timothy. They included Dr John Spencer²⁰, who became a Greek lecturer at Corpus Christi College, Oxford University in 1578 at the age of *nineteen*.

And Dr Waite’s exposition of *“the Greek New Testament that God gave us”* is going to override the wording of 2 Timothy 3:16 confirmed by Dr Spencer and his colleagues and by those who laboured on the Bishops’ and Geneva Bibles that God blessed with the 16th century English Protestant Reformation²¹?

That seems highly unlikely to this author. Especially insofar as Dr Waite²² himself acknowledges Dr Spencer’s expertise in his own very useful resource *Defending the King James Bible*.

Dr Waite then describes 2 Timothy 3:16 (an uninspired chapter and verse designation not in ‘the original,’ see comment earlier) as *“an accomplished past deed”* on the basis that *“is given,”...does not always mean a present tense, even in other places where it is used in the King James Bible.”* However, **Table 1** shows that it often *does* and Dr Waite appears to have allowed that *copies* of *“His Words in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek”* are *“inspired,”* so that inspiration of the *copies* would have to be repeated*, or on-going, since they, along with the ‘originals,’ *“perish with the using”* Colossians 2:22. See his comments on PP. 2, 52 above and note that he has *not* shown *from scripture* that the Lord’s people are required to learn *“the Original Sacred Tongues”* in order to know what God said.

*If they were *printed* copies. This assumption is examined further in **Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’**.

It follows therefore that God cannot have restricted inspiration to these tongues, otherwise, men who had not mastered *“the Original Sacred Tongues”* would indeed seek God in vain (if they couldn’t contact Dr Waite, e.g. in 1700, 1800 or 1900 AD), Isaiah 45:19, when the Lord says explicitly that they would *not*.

“And ye shall seek me, and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart” Jeremiah 29:13.

Although historically aimed at Israel, the Lord's exhortation through Jeremiah is clearly timeless, Psalm 33:11 and it is likewise clear that a prior knowledge of "*the Original Sacred Tongues*" is *not* required for successful seeking, only a willingness to "*search the scriptures*" in, therefore, the familiar, or vulgar tongue, for "*they are they which testify of me*" John 5:39.

This is exactly the point that Dr Miles Smith²³ of the AV1611 translating committee made in *The Translators to the Reader*.

"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]."

Observe that Dr Smith says nothing about "*translation into the vulgar tongue*" nullifying inspiration in "*the vulgar tongue*" i.e. English. As indicated above, Dr Waite has imposed that restriction merely by means of his "*private interpretation*" 2 Peter 1:20. As Nehemiah would have said:

"There are no such things done as thou sayest, but thou feignest them out of thine own heart" Nehemiah 6:8.

P. 59 *"This is what I have always believed. The Scripture in 2 Timothy 3:16, PASA GRAPHE THEOPNEUSTOS, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." This literally means "all Scripture is God-breathed." GRAPHE refers to the Old Testament Hebrew and Aramaic Words (and, by extension, the New Testament Greek Words). This word has nothing whatsoever to do with any **translation**, whether in English, Spanish, Italian or any other language."*

Here Dr Waite does what any critic of the AV1611 does²⁴. He changes its words to suit his own "*private interpretation*," just like Eve did, Genesis 2:16, 17, 3:2, 3. He then denies that any believer can have access to the scriptures unless he is conversant with Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. In so doing, Dr Waite 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. God hates this doctrine because it implies that faithful, vernacular translations like the AV1611 are *not* Holy Bibles. See the comments of Dr Miles Smith below.

P. 88 *"The Words of God **ARE** the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Words. In the subtitle of my book, DEFENDING THE KING JAMES BIBLE, I call it "GOD'S WORDS KEPT INTACT IN ENGLISH." Psalm 12:6-7 does not refer to the King James Bible, but to the Hebrew and Aramaic Words (and, by extension, to the Greek N.T. Words). English was not even in existence then."*

The subtitle of Dr Waite's book is misleading. The above comment shows that it should read ***GOD'S WORDS KEPT INTERRED IN ENGLISH***. See comments on the woolly mammoths in the **Introduction**.

His objection to English with respect to Psalm 12:6, 7 applies equally to the Koine Greek of the New Testament. Koine Greek did not come into existence as such until around 330 BC²⁵,

centuries after David wrote the Psalms, before 1000 BC²⁶. So if Dr Waite is going to include Koine Greek as a Biblical language “*by extension*,” then to be ‘consistent’ he should be willing to do the same for “*the king’s word*” 2 Samuel 24:4, 1 Chronicles 21:6 in English.

Let Dr Smith set forth the summing up of “*the king’s word*.”

“Now what can be more available thereto, than to deliver God’s book unto God’s people in a tongue which they understand? Since of a hidden treasure, and of a fountain that is sealed, there is no profit...And this is the word of God, which we translate.”

Dr Smith clearly did not believe that translation cancelled out inspiration but rather that translation was necessary so that God’s people could profit from God’s Book. He continues.

“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...”

“No cause therefore why the word translated should be denied to be the word, or forbidden to be current...”

No cause at all, certainly none that Dr Waite has been able to identify.

In sum, the following points have emerged from this section and the **Introduction** with respect to Dr Waite’s attitude to inspiration of the scriptures.

1. Inspiration only happened once, for the original Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words of scripture.
2. Inspiration cannot have happened only once if Dr Waite is to be believed because he states that he has the original inspired Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words of scripture, although he does not specify where he has them.
3. However, for Dr Waite to possess these words, inspiration would have to extend to copies of the original Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words of scripture, or at least one source that exists now. See **Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’**.
4. Dr Waite’s position on inspiration is therefore self-contradictory.
5. Dr Waite attempts to use the expression “*is given*” in Matthew 28:18 to prove once-only inspiration in 2 Timothy 3:16 but the expression does not have to be limited to a once-only action in scripture and frequently isn’t, i.e. in up to 2/3 of the 33 occasions where it occurs.
6. Inspiration does not apply to translations of the original Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words of scripture, including the AV1611 Translation.
7. The AV1611 is therefore not “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God*” and is therefore not the Holy Bible, if Dr Waite is to be believed.

The last point is really the ‘bottom line’ of Dr Waite’s work and it is a depressing one. However, this work will show that Dr Waite’s attitude to inspiration of the scriptures is false. The reader is therefore encouraged to read on.

Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print

Concerning Dr Waite’s stance on the imaginary ‘original Bible,’ the following citations are typical. See the **Appendix** for the full list. Under-linings are this author’s, with reference to the points that will be addressed.

P. 25 *“Though Gail Riplinger’s “Holy Bible” is limited to the King James Bible, in reality, “Our Holy Bible” is the Bible that God caused to be written in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. That is the true “Holy Bible.” It is not a translation in English or in any other language. I do not deny the inspiration of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek true “Holy Bible” whose very Words were given by the Lord Jesus Christ through God the Holy Spirit to the human writers (John 16:12-15).”*

It is puzzling that Dr Waite does not specify who “our” is. Surely they should be prepared to be identified in total if they believe as strongly as Dr Waite does about what constitutes ““Our Holy Bible.”” Or do they, like Dr Waite’s informants on Dr Mrs Riplinger’s alleged “Pentecostal/Charismatic background” prefer to plead ‘the 5th’? Again, that seems a cowardly way out. See questions raised in **Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration.**

Dr Waite should also be prepared to explain why ““Our Holy Bible”” has never appeared *in print* in the history of the church as such, until, ironically, it is found as at least a facsimile in a single bound volume in AV Publications. See **Dr Waite and Dr Mrs Riplinger – Preliminary Observations.**

Instead, from the 2nd century AD onwards, God has overseen the bringing forth of bibles in many supposedly ‘non-original’ languages^{27, 28}, including Latin, Syriac, Gothic, German and other tongues besides English. Luther’s German Bible resulted in faithful 16th century translations in Dutch, Danish, Icelandic, Polish, Hungarian, Finnish, Serbian, Croatian and other European languages²⁹.

However condescending Dr Waite is to Dr Mrs Riplinger and her work, he cannot deny that she has accurately chronicled the emergence of faithful translations from the earliest years of the Church to the present time³⁰.

It seems altogether strange that God devoted so much time and effort to the development of these vernacular translations, when, according to Dr Waite, the only ‘real’ scripture is that which *“God caused to be written in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. That is the true “Holy Bible.”*

The reality is that such a ‘Bible’ never existed historically as such between two covers³¹, certainly none that Dr Waite has been able to identify. That is why this section is entitled **Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print.**

Because if such a Bible had existed and God had intended it to be widely circulated, it would be expected that God would have raised up multitudes of interpreters like Dr Waite who could do as he states on P. 32 of his book for those without knowledge of *“The Original Sacred Tongues.”* See **Dr Waite and Dr Mrs Riplinger – Preliminary Observations.** Under-linings are this author’s.

P. 32 *“When I preach God’s Words, I do not criticize or change the English King James Bible. I illuminate and give many other acceptable and accurate meanings that the translators could have written down [i.e. from ‘the Greek’ or ‘the Hebrew’ as the case may be].”*

However, Dr Waite fails to mention *any* such ‘illuminators’ like himself down through the centuries who ministered to congregations of any significance. According to him, therefore, multitudes of devoted believers have been short-changed with respect to the scripture for

most of the Church Age. They only received the ‘dead’ words of translated scriptures from the works of dedicated but evidently deluded scholars³² such as Helvidius, Ulfilas, Diodati, Leger, Olivetan, Wycliffe, Luther, Tyndale and the King James translators.

All of which seems highly unlikely to this author. It is much simpler to believe that God has given translations that are “*inspired*.” That would also explain why the Lord developed all the faithful vernacular translations. See Dr Smith’s comments in the previous section.

Note that Dr Waite’s P. 32 comment illustrates the observation made earlier that thanks to Dr Waite’s expertise in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek, then, *you too* can now have access to what God *really* said but only by means of ‘illuminators’ like Dr Waite. This is sheer Nicolaitanism, Revelation 2:6, 15, which God hates. See comments under **Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration**.

Note however that contrary to his comment on P. 32, Dr Waite *did* “*change the English King James Bible*.” See comments in previous section **Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration** in response to his P. 59 comment, where he states “*The Scripture in 2 Timothy 3:16, PASA GRAPHE THEOPNEUSTOS, “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.” This literally means “all Scripture is God-breathed.*”

Dr Waite changed the wording of “*the English King James Bible*” to suit his own agenda, in this case, his stance on ‘originals onlyism.’ In other words, “*Yea, hath God said...?*” Genesis 3:1.

P. 28 “My “**Holy Bible**” is God’s fully “*inspired*” original Words of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, rather than Gail Riplinger’s King James Bible. Though it is an accurate, true, and reliable translation, it is not “*inspired by God*.” It is not “*God-breathed*,” therefore it cannot accurately be termed “*inspired*.” She holds a serious theological **HERESY** by her erroneous view of “*inspiration by God*.”

Note that Dr Waite again effectively denies that the AV1611 is in fact scripture. This denial will be addressed in more detail under **Dr Waite and the KJB not “given by inspiration of God.”** Observe too that “*our*” has now become “*my*” with respect to the Holy Bible. Perhaps Dr Waite’s followers with respect to ‘his’ Holy Bible are not very numerous.

See comments in response to Dr Waite’s P. 25 comment above with respect to “My “**Holy Bible**.”

P. 29 “The “**Bible**” is the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words that underlie our King James Bible. Strictly speaking, it is not a translation. God gave us those Words. *There was no English when God gave Moses His Words, and David His Words, and Ezekiel His Words, and Matthew His Words and Paul His Words. English did not exist when God “breathed-out” or “inspired” His Bible’s Words.*”

See comments about *GOD’S WORDS KEPT **INTERRED** IN ENGLISH* in the previous section, **Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration**. However, Dr Waite is here limiting God.

English as found in the AV1611 did not exist on earth when the scriptures were given in “*The Original Sacred Tongues*” but how is Dr Waite to know that the language did not exist in the mind of God?

“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*” Isaiah 46:9b-10.

How does Dr Waite know that the eventual introduction of AV1611 was not part of God’s “*pleasure*” declared centuries in advance, as the Apostle Paul suggests.

“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” 1 Corinthians 14:21.

Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek were all in existence when Paul wrote his letters. Yet, God could still speak with ***“other tongues”*** according to 1 Corinthians 14:21. How does Dr Waite know that these ***“other tongues”*** could not eventually include the *written* English of the AV1611, or the *written* languages of other faithful translations? See above.

If this is so and Dr Waite cannot prove otherwise, it appears, ironically that even he could be among those who ***“will...not hear me, saith the Lord”*** with his rejection of the AV1611 as ***“all scripture...given by inspiration of God.”***

P. 32 ***“Gail Riplinger confuses people by not defining “our Holy Bible.” My “Holy Bible” is the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Old and New Testaments that God Himself breathed-out and inspired. Her “Holy Bible” is only a translation of that “Holy Bible,” the King James Bible. Gail Riplinger has not and cannot prove that the King James Bible was inspired by God. There is no scriptural proof that any translation of God’s Words is inspired of God.”***

Dr Waite accuses Dr Mrs Riplinger of confusing people. Apart from, apparently, Dr Waite and his immediate circle, which groups of *“people”* has Dr Mrs Riplinger actually confused (evidently by not submitting to what Dr Waite terms ***“our Holy Bible.”***) See remarks above on ***“our Holy Bible”*** and ***“My “Holy Bible”***)?

Dr Waite does not say. Perhaps these groups of *“people”* also wish to plead ‘the 5th.’

Contrary to Dr Waite’s assertion, there is scriptural proof that a translation of *“God’s Words”* can be *“inspired.”* There is even scriptural proof of more-than-once inspiration of ‘the originals.’ Dr Sam Gipp³³ has summarised these proofs. *“Inspired”* translations of *“God’s Words”* may be found in:

1. Joseph’s reunion with his brothers, Genesis 42-45, especially Genesis 42:43. ***“And they knew not that Joseph understood them; for he spake unto them by an interpreter.”***
2. Moses’ encounters with Pharaoh, Exodus 4-14. ***“Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians”*** Acts 7:22 and would have spoken to Pharaoh in Egyptian but he recorded the conversations in Hebrew.
3. Paul addresses the Jews in Acts 22 ***“in the Hebrew tongue”*** Acts 21:40 but Luke records the address in Greek. Dr Waite may insist that a translation can be *“inspired”* if the translation takes place from one *“inspired”* language (Hebrew) to another (Greek). However, he would then be conceding that *“double inspiration”* is scriptural, when he has declared it is heresy³⁴. Worse still, he would be contradicting the very title of his book, which purports to be a warning against the *“Multiple Inspiration Heresy,”* because if a translation into what was *essentially* a contemporary *lingua franca*, (i.e. Greek, see comments under **Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration**), could be *“inspired,”* why couldn’t the same be true for translation into a later *lingua franca*, e.g. Latin, Syriac, Gothic, German and even AV1611 English? Dr Waite provides no proof to the contrary.

Additional examples follow.

4. John 19:19, 20 state that ***“Pilate wrote a title, and put it on the cross. And the writing was, JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS...and it was written in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin.”*** The scripture gives no indication that the writing in Latin was any less *“inspired of God”* than it was in Hebrew or Greek, which writings were *“inspired of God,”* according to Dr Waite. See his P. 32 comments above.
5. Acts 14:11 states that ***“And when the people saw what Paul had done, they lifted up their voices, saying in the speech of Lycaonia, The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men.”*** Here is a ‘verbal, plenary, inspired, original autograph’ that didn’t even ‘originate’ in one of the (according to Dr Waite) *“inspired”* languages (Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek). *It actually had to be translated in order to become “inspired,”* like the ‘original’ words of Joseph and Moses in Genesis 42-45 and Exodus 4-14 respectively (according to Dr Waite).

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.

In sum, according to the Holy Bible, even if not according to Dr Waite, a translation of *“God’s Words”* can be *“inspired.”* It is Dr Waite who has not proved otherwise and cannot prove otherwise.

P. 90 *“What Gail Riplinger wants us to do is to **“uphold the inspiration of her beloved [King James] Holy Bible.** She never defines what she means by the “Holy Bible.” To someone who is not familiar with Gail Riplinger’s distortions, they might think that I denied the plenary verbal inspiration of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words in the original Bible which is the **“Holy Bible.”** I believe strongly in that inspiration, but deny her **HERESY** in believing that the King James Bible and other Bibles as well after Acts 2 (possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background), were given by plenary verbal inspiration.”*

Dr Waite’s assertion about Dr Mrs Riplinger’s definition of *“the **“Holy Bible”**”* is a bald-faced lie. Note the following³⁵, emphases in bold are this author’s.

*“This book is the 2007 update of Which Bible is God’s Word?, originally published in 1994 as a transcript of a nationally broadcast radio interviews done by Noah Hutchings with author, Gail Riplinger. In these programs listeners’ questions about modern versions of the Bible were answered and **the King James Bible held up as THE Holy Bible for the English speaking world...** Gail Riplinger, March 2007”*

Again, for Dr Waite’s benefit, Romans 13:9 applies.

“Thou shalt not bear false witness.”

See related comments under **Dr Waite and Dr Mrs Riplinger – Preliminary Observations.**

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 USA³⁶. Under-linings, 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 online³⁷. The citation from the article is from p 238. The following citation from that article, p 245 is also significant. Under-linings 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."

What Hodge and Warfield claimed is that only the 'original text' is God's inspired, inerrant words and only the 'scholars' (like Hodge and Warfield) can tell the Bible reader what God *really* said.

Dr Waite's position is therefore essentially the same as Hodge and Warfield's. By means of *his* expertise in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek, the Bible reader 'for today' can now have access to what God *really* said.

Via Dr Waite's expertise, the Bible reader therefore ends up in exactly the same place as Hodge and Warfield left him back in 1881, the year of infamy, in which Westcott and Hort published their RV New Testament, 1+8+8+1 = 18, or 6+6+6, 666, Revelation 13:18. In this place of infamy, the Bible reader purportedly needs a 'scholar' (like Dr Waite or Hodge and Warfield) **"which heard the words of God, and knew the knowledge of the most High"** Numbers 24:16, in order to receive those words and acquire that knowledge.

This lamentable state of affairs is entirely contrary to Dr Miles Smith's exhortation to the Bible reader³⁸. Under-linings are this author's.

"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."

Like this author, who has no expertise in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek but is, **"by the grace of God"** 1 Corinthians 15:10, able to read AV1611 English and will remain eternally grateful to Dr Smith and his colleagues. Moreover, they were not alone in affirming of their Translation³⁹ that *"this is the word of God, which we translate."*

In 1891, 10 years after Hodge and Warfield's denial of the inspiration of **"the holy scriptures"** in the form of the AV1611, the Book was still under attack with respect to inspiration. None other than Charles Haddon Spurgeon was moved to resist this attack in his farewell address to his students⁴⁰. See **Dr Waite and the 'imperfect' KJB not "given by inspiration of God."**

That is why the **Introduction** to this work stated that the Devil is now *re*-focusing his attack on the Holy Bible, AV1611, by seeking to deny that it is “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God.*” This attack is most likely the last of “*the fiery darts of the wicked*” Ephesians 6:16 against “*the word of faith, which we preach*” Romans 10:8 that the Devil will launch before the Lord’s Return.

Even this ultimate dart can and will be quenched by faith in that selfsame “*word of faith.*” See comments on Isaiah 54:13 in the **Introduction** and note the outcome of the clash between 1st century academics and a Bible believer, according to Acts 6:9, 10.

“Then there arose certain of the synagogue, which is called the synagogue of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and of them of Cilicia and of Asia, disputing with Stephen. And they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake.”

In sum, the following points have emerged from this section with respect to Dr Waite’s attitude to inspiration of the scriptures.

1. Dr Waite has not identified where his Holy Bible consisting of the original inspired Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words exists in print, or ever existed in history.
2. Dr Waite has ignored scriptural evidence to show that translations can be “*given by inspiration of God*” and indeed have been in scripture.
3. Dr Waite has ignored God’s provision of vernacular Holy Bibles down through the centuries that have been intimately associated with Bible belief, revival, reformation and soul-winning.
4. Dr Waite’s attitude to inspiration contradicts the exhortation of the King James translators with respect to the Holy Bible that they produced.
5. Dr Waite’s position on the Holy Bible is essentially that of Professors Hodge and Warfield who in 1881 confined inspiration to the original texts of scripture and effectively denied that any Bible, including the AV1611, could be “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God.*”

That Professors Hodge and Warfield, along with Bishop Westcott and Dr Hort, ushered in the Laodicean Church Age that makes God sick, Revelation 3:16, is undeniable. Dr Waite continues in their tradition by his attempts to dissuade the Lord’s people from believing that the AV1611 is the pure word of God “*given by inspiration of God.*”

Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’

Concerning Dr Waite’s stance on ‘the Greek,’ the citations given below are typical. See the **Appendix** for the full list. Under-linings are this author’s, with reference to the points that will be addressed.

The reader should note that this author doesn’t purport to be a scholar in “*The Original Sacred Tongues.*” See remarks near the end of the previous section, **Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print.** This section will therefore not embark on a technical discussion of the Greek and Hebrew sources listed, although it will make reference to the pertinent observations of Dr Edward F. Hills⁴¹ about *The King James Version a Variety of the Textus Receptus*, drawn from the work of none other than Dr F.H.A. Scrivener himself⁴². See citations below.

This section will instead mainly highlight the fact, with appropriate specific questions that for all his exaltation of “*The “Scrivener Greek New Testament,”*” P. 28 of his work, see below, Dr Waite does *not* say that it is “*“inspired.”*” Yet Dr Waite states that he *has* the “*“inspired”*” Greek words of the New Testament*. See his statement from P. 52 of his book below. Otherwise he cannot lay claim to possessing “*My “Holy Bible”*” although he *does*, P. 32 of his work. See remarks under **Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print.**

*Dr Waite does not, however, mention any other source for ‘The Greek’ other than Scrivener’s and Beza’s texts and he focuses mainly on Scrivener’s.

Similar remarks apply to “*the Ben Chayyim Hebrew Text*” for the Old Testament that Dr Waite also exalts. See his comment from P. 51 of his work, below.

So why doesn’t Dr Waite specify his “*“inspired”*” Greek Text (and his “*“inspired”*” Hebrew Text) or identify it explicitly as Scrivener’s “*“inspired”*” Greek Text? Thus far, these questions, like the others listed earlier, remain unanswered. See this author’s questions under **Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration.**

It should also be noted that certain scholars differ from Dr Waite about which text *is* the exact source for “*the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible.*” See references to Drs Hills and Scrivener above. What then is the Bible believer to do to obtain a copy of “*My “Holy Bible”*” such as Dr Waite professes to have? See Dr Waite’s comment on P. 28 of his book under **Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print.**

The Bible believer is therefore left with “*an uncertain sound*” 1 Corinthians 14:8.

However, to proceed, selected comments of Dr Waite’s and this author’s responses, follow.

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.*”

The above comment immediately prompts the question once again, is “*this “Greek New Testament”*” “*“inspired”*” in addition to being “*accurate...authentic copies*”? If Dr Waite believes that it is, so why doesn’t he explicitly say so? Inspiration of this published, identifiable Greek text must surely be germane to Dr Waite’s entire thesis on possessing “*My “Holy Bible”*” *now* and such inspiration, if Dr Waite believes that Scrivener’s text is “*inspired,*” should surely be spelt out unequivocally for his readers.

See remarks above and under **Introduction, Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration** and **Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print.**

P. 51 “Gail Riplinger defines her **HERESY** clearly in this quotation. She calls God’s own **“Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text and the Traditional Received Greek Text”** as **“Two Weak Legs.”** In this way, she is clearly exalting the English King James Bible translation by men (which she believes were given by verbal plenary inspiration) as superior over God’s own Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. This is pure **HERESY!** Shame on her for this blasphemy!”

Dr Waite states that the **“Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text and the Traditional Received Greek Text”** are **“God’s own Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words.”** However, the only sources of these texts that he mentions are the Ben Chayyim and Scrivener texts that, like **“the English King James Bible translation”** were compiled **“by men.”**

The question persists, therefore, are these Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek sources, though compiled **“by men,”** nevertheless **“inspired”**? Once again, if Dr Waite believes them to be so, why doesn’t he say so?

P. 51 **“I “promote” the Ben Chayyim Hebrew Text and the Scrivener’s Greek text. I believe the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible are **“God’s preserved originals.”** You can see from this quotation that Gail Riplinger does not believe we have **“God’s preserved originals,”** but only what she considers to be the English King James Bible which she believes was given by verbal plenary inspiration breathed-out by God. As such, it corrects and replaces God’s original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. This view is blasphemy and serious **HERESY!**”**

Note again that Dr Waite does not say explicitly that **“the Ben Chayyim Hebrew Text and the Scrivener’s Greek text”** are **“inspired.”**

Again, the question must be asked, why not, given his vehement denunciation of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s alleged stance? See remarks in the **Introduction** about Dr Waite’s use of the term **“verbal plenary inspiration”** with respect to the AV1611.

One continues to wonder why Dr Waite seems unable to use **“great plainness of speech”** 2 Corinthians 3:12 on this crucial point of inspiration.

For information, Dr Mrs Riplinger’s actual stance on **“the Ben Chayyim Hebrew Text and the Scrivener’s Greek text”** is found in detail in her recent work, *Hazardous Materials*⁴³.

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. 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.”**

So why doesn’t Dr Waite refer to the text as Beza’s text, instead of Scrivener’s, or possibly as the Beza/Scrivener text? Again, he hasn’t given the reader an unequivocal answer to this question. But if the text was compiled by a later editor (Scrivener) and differs, even if in only a few places, from the ‘parent’ text (Beza’s), then surely it can’t be called Beza’s? Elijah’s words found in 1 Kings 18:21 would seem to apply to Dr Waite’s stance.

“How long halt ye between two opinions?”

Note again that Dr Waite has *not* stated categorically that the text of Beza or Scrivener (or Beza/Scrivener) is “*inspired.*” Surely he should do so, if he is convinced, as he appears to be that he has a copy of “My *Holy Bible.*” See his comment from P. 28 of his book, in **See Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print.**

Dr Waite now informs his readers that “*Scrivener’s Greek Text is the closest to the KJB.*” So what is the *actual* source for “*the...Greek Words underlying the King James Bible*”? Dr Waite hasn’t said, which suggests a bizarre situation. See comments below.

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. 89 “*The Dean Burgon Society (DBS) does stand for Scrivener’s Greek text as the preserved original Greek Words. It does **NOT** follow the Ginsberg Hebrew text. It follows the Hebrew Words underlying the King James Bible.*”

Note that Dr Waite does not specify *where* he has “*the original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.*” He states *only* that he has the “*preserved*” words of “*the original New Testament*”^{*} as “*accurate...authentic copies,*” P. 28 of his book, see above, in “*Scrivener’s Greek New Testament,*” which again, he does not say is “*inspired.*”

Once more, Dr Waite has evaded the issue of specifying precisely *where* “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God*” exists *today*, between two covers.

^{*}Which never existed as a single document like a current edition of a Greek New Testament. See remarks under **Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print.**

See remarks under **Dr Waite and Dr Mrs Riplinger – Preliminary Observations** for the list of resources available from AV Publications in response to Dr Waite’s insinuation about Dr Mrs Riplinger’s alleged aversion to Greek and Hebrew equivalents for the words of the AV1611.

Returning to Dr Waite’s above comment on “*the original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek*” and considering for now that Dr Waite *does* have these words, even if in an as yet undisclosed source, the bizarre situation alluded to above is as follows.

The situation can be illustrated with respect to “*Scrivener’s Greek New Testament...[which is] the preserved Words of the original New Testament,*” according to Dr Waite. His pertinent statements with respect to “*the original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in...Greek*” for the New Testament are summarised as follows. Under-linings are this author’s.

P. 2 “*I believe that God inspired and breathed-out the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Old and New Testaments. I believe this miraculous event **happened only once and was never repeated. Especially was this inspiration never repeated in any translation in the past, in the present, or in the future.***”

See Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration.

P. 28 “My **“Holy Bible”** is God’s fully **“inspired”** original Words of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, rather than Gail Riplinger’s King James Bible. Though it is an accurate, true, and reliable translation, it is not **“inspired by God.”**”

See Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print.

P. 87 “No translation (including the AV1611) was given by verbal plenary inspiration. The “AV 1611” was most definitely not “given by inspiration of God.””

See Introduction.

P. 28 “I believe the Words in this [Scrivener’s] **“Greek New Testament”** to be accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words.”

P. 89 “The Dean Burgon Society (DBS) does stand for Scrivener’s Greek text as the preserved original Greek Words.”

P. 32 “When I preach God’s Words, I do not criticize or change the English King James Bible. I illuminate and give many other acceptable and accurate meanings that the translators could have written down.” See **Dr Waite and Dr Mrs Riplinger – Preliminary Observations.**

P. 51 “I believe the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible are “God’s preserved originals.””

P. 52 “I firmly believe that I have the original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.”

P. 52 “It is true that Scrivener’s Greek Text is the closest to the KJB.”

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.”

P. 82 “I believe that the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Bible have been preserved and are those which underlie the King James Bible. They are still in existence and available from the BIBLE FOR TODAY in Scrivener’s Annotated Greek New Testament...and in the Masoretic Hebrew/King James Parallel Bible.”

In sum, from the above, according to Dr Waite:

1. The original, *inspired* Greek words of the New Testament are available today (Dr Waite has them).
2. Inspiration happened only once and was never repeated.
3. Scrivener’s Greek text is not referred to as inspired by Dr Waite.
4. However, Scrivener’s text is an accurate copy of the original, inspired Greek words of the New Testament that are also inerrant and infallible.
5. These Greek words underlie the AV1611 New Testament.
6. Neither the English words of the AV1611 New Testament nor their underlying Greek equivalents should be changed.
7. Scrivener’s text is the closest to the Greek words underlying the AV1611 New Testament.

8. The AV1611 English words are not inspired but they are an accurate translation of the original, inspired Greek words of the New Testament.

The following observations have been deduced from the above.

Points 1 and 2 clearly conflict but assuming that Point 1 prevails, Dr Waite's source for the original, inspired Greek words of the New Testament is unknown because he does not identify any published Greek New Testament as inspired, not even Scrivener's. See Point 3.

Points 4 and 7 clearly conflict but Dr Mrs Riplinger's work resolves the conflict.

Dr Waite may despise Dr Mrs Riplinger and her research but he cannot deny that in Chapter 18 of her book *Hazardous Materials* she does reveal that "*Scrivener's Greek Text*" is not "*the...Greek Words underlying the King James Bible.*" Dr Mrs Riplinger states that Scrivener followed Beza's 1598 5th Edition in 59 verses *against* the AV1611. She lists and analyses 52 of them, showing Greek support for 24, where Scrivener had supposed that the King James translators had only Latin sources. Dr Mrs Riplinger also documents 20 errors in Scrivener's Greek text, e.g. in Mark 2:15, where Scrivener replaces the first "**Jesus**" with "*he.*"

Point 4, therefore, cannot be valid because Dr Mrs Riplinger has shown that Scrivener's text is *not* the full Greek text underlying the AV1611.

As Dr Mrs Riplinger also states, it is not sufficient to dismiss Scrivener's departures from the AV1611 Greek equivalent New Testament as inconsequential because they are few in number. The errors in Scrivener's text and its departures from the AV1611 that Dr Mrs Riplinger has revealed invalidate any claim to inerrancy and infallibility for this text*.

*If the AV1611 is used as the basis for comparison. See below.

Similar remarks apply to Beza's 5th Edition and its departures from the AV1611, to which Dr Waite is forced to admit. See his comments on Scrivener's and Beza's texts from P. 52 of his book above.

Point 5 therefore can only apply to the unknown source for the original, inspired Greek words of the New Testament that Dr Waite has so far failed to disclose. It cannot apply to Scrivener's text.

All of the above assumes, of course, that inerrancy and infallibility for "*the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible*" are predicated on complete correspondence with the *English Text* of the AV1611. This appears to be Dr Waite's stance on inerrancy and infallibility according to his statement on P. 32 of his book, "*When I preach God's Words, I do not criticize or change* the English King James Bible.*" See **Dr Waite and Dr Mrs Riplinger – Preliminary Observations.**

*Except for the translation of "*theopneustos.*" See comments in **Dr Waite and 'Originals Only' Inspiration** with respect to P. 59 of his book.

However, that is precisely Point 6 above.

The situation is, therefore that the *exact* form of Dr Waite's "*inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek [and Hebrew/Aramaic] Words*" is, despite Dr Waite's inferences to the contrary, not actually to be found in *any* printed editions of those words. Even Dr Waite is forced to admit that Scrivener's text is not the exact Greek equivalent to the KJB but only closest to the KJB, i.e. Point 7 is valid.

It follows that the form of the “*inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek [and Hebrew/Aramaic] Words,*” wherever and however it exists today, *depends entirely* on the *English Text* of the AV1611, which, according to Dr Waite is *not* inspired.

See Point 8 above.

That is undeniably the case *in spite of* Dr Waite’s vehement denial that “*Dr Frederick Scrivener “back-translated” his Greek New Testament from the King James Bible’s English*” as follows.

In sum, today, an ‘uninspired’ text, the English AV1611, must be relied upon to determine the content of the ‘inspired’ original language texts on which it is based.

The situation is truly bizarre.

However, it is essentially resolved for the Bible believer by the wisdom and rationality of Dr Hills. Under-lining is this author’s.

“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.”

It is certainly independent of any subservience to “*the Ben Chayyim Hebrew Text and the Scrivener’s Greek text*” that Dr Waite has imposed on the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible, or his undisclosed source for “*inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek [and Hebrew/Aramaic] Words.*” See Dr Waite’s P. 28 comment above.

Addressing aspects of inerrancy and infallibility does not, of course, answer the charge of non-inspiration that Dr Waite has levelled against the Holy Bible but this charge will be answered in the next section, **Dr Waite and the KJB not “given by inspiration of God.”**

The remainder of Dr Waite’s selected comments for this section will now be briefly addressed.

P. 68 “[*Gail Riplinger lies by saying that*] *Dr Frederick Scrivener “back-translated” his Greek New Testament from the King James Bible’s English. That is, he took the English and turned it into Greek. Nothing could be further from the truth! Scrivener had the Greek edition of Beza’s 5th edition of 1598, and found that this was the Greek that the King James Bible translators followed with only 190 Exceptions out of over 140,000 Greek Words.*”

P. 70 “*Gail Riplinger lies when she states that “Scrivener’s text is therefore the English text of the KJB, backwards translated into Greek.” Again, there was no “English text of the KJB” which was “backwards translated into Greek.” Scrivener truly was a Greek scholar, but he did not “backwards translate” from the KJB English into Greek.*”

Yet Dr Waite gives no indication of whether Dr Scrivener’s departures from both Beza’s text and the AV1611 were God-guided, yielding “*the original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in...Greek*” that Dr Waite purports to have. Under-linings and emphasis are this author’s. The reader still does not know the source of Dr Waite’s ‘inspired’ Greek text.

A startling observation now emerges from Dr Waite’s PP. 68, 70 comments.

Dr Waite cannot agree to any back translation of the AV1611 into Greek, even if a perfect match between the two texts was achieved. As indicated, the result would clearly mean that the AV1611 English was the determinant of ‘the original Greek’ instead of the other way around, a situation that Dr Waite could never countenance.

He professes on P. 52 of his book, see above, “*I firmly believe that I have the original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in...Greek.*” These words could not be

“original” if they came into print via an English translation, which by definition is not the “original.”

However, *worse still* for Dr Waite, the resulting Greek text would not only be a *translation* and Dr Waite is adamant that, P. 2 “*inspiration [was] never repeated in any translation in the past, in the present, or in the future*” but a *translation* of a *translation* and therefore not only *not* inspired but indeed *doubly not* inspired.

The result is clearly not God-guided, “**For God is not the author of confusion**” 1 Corinthians 14:33. Dr Waite seems perilously close to acquiring that distinction, however.

Dr Scrivener’s own comments are useful at this point, see reference above.

He states the following, emphases are this author’s. “*Doubtless [the Translators] rested mainly on the later editions of Beza’s Greek Testament, whereof his fourth (1589) was somewhat more highly esteemed than his fifth (1598), the production of his extreme old age. But besides these, the Complutensian Polyglot, together with the several editions of Erasmus, and Stephen’s of 1550, were constantly resorted to. 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...*

“*On certain occasions, it may be, the Translators yielded too much to Beza’s somewhat arbitrary decisions; but they lived at a time when his name was the very highest among Reformed theologians, when means for arriving at an independent judgment were few and scattered, and when the first principles of textual criticism had yet to be gathered from a long process of painful induction. His most obvious and glaring errors their good sense easily enabled them to avoid (cf. Matt. i.23; John xviii.20).*”

Dr Scrivener clearly didn’t regard Beza’s text as inerrant and infallible. He also claims that the King James translators held Beza’s 4th Edition in higher esteem than his 5th, even though Scrivener used that edition to compile his own, which itself departs from the AV1611 on a small but appreciable number of instances, which Dr Mrs Riplinger has listed in detail, such that Dr Hills’s conclusion above is the only reasonable one.

Taken together, these discrepancies, along with the point-by-point discussion above on Dr Waite’s assertions about “*the original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in...Greek*” for the New Testament* (of which Points 1, 2, 4, 5 (in relation to Scrivener) have been invalidated and Point 8 will be in the next section) lead this author to the following inevitable conclusion.

*See Dr Waite’s P. 28 comment above.

Dr Waite’s New Testament Greek text consisting of the “*original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in...Greek*” exists only in his mind. It has not existed in reality for centuries, as Dr Mrs Riplinger succinctly explains⁴⁴, this author’s emphases. Note that it was Dr Mrs Riplinger who first mentioned the expression **Dead Bible Society** that this author has used in the title for this response.

“*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.”

Nor does God need Dr Waite’s ‘Greek’ for “the proper interpretation of difficult passages” in the 1611 English Holy Bible, P. 32 of his book, see comment above. That kind of interpretation is achieved according to the scriptural principle of 1 Corinthians 2:13.

“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.”

Because as the Lord Jesus Christ Himself said in John 6:63, **“The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.”**

These words exist today as any available copy of a 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible.

See **Dr Waite and Dr Mrs Riplinger – Preliminary Observations** and **Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration.**

The Lord in Ezekiel 14:3 describes Dr Waite’s condition exactly⁴⁵.

“Son of man, these men have set up their idols in their heart, and put the stumblingblock of their iniquity before their face: should I be enquired of at all by them?”

No.

In sum, the following points have emerged from this section with respect to Dr Waite’s attitude to inspiration of the scriptures.

1. Dr Waite has still not disclosed his sources for the original *inspired* Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words of scripture available today. These include the lexicons that he insists he uses and are not “*corrupt*,” P. 27, but he fails to specify them. See remarks in **Dr Waite and Dr Mrs Riplinger – Preliminary Observations.**
2. Dr Waite has specified some Hebrew and Greek texts available today, i.e. Ben Chayyim’s, Beza’s and Scrivener’s but he has *not* said that they are inspired, only the “*preserved*” original Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words of scripture.
3. Dr Waite insists that these available Hebrew and Greek texts underlie the AV1611 but by inspection of Dr Mrs Riplinger’s research and even Dr Scrivener’s, see above they are not *perfect* i.e. infallible, inerrant Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek equivalents of the AV1611 English Text (and certainly not “*inspired*.”) His position is therefore inconsistent in this respect.
4. Dr Waite has to disavow any ‘back translation’ from AV1611 English into Greek, if for no other reason, because as a translation, according to his stance, it could be not inspired.
5. The only reasonable conclusion is that Dr Waite’s original, inspired, preserved Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek scriptures exist only in his mind.

For most of the Body of Christ, that is not a particularly helpful place for the scripture to be.

This author suggests that seven aspects of ‘the Greek’ should be kept in mind.

1. A single, definitive Greek text does not exist⁴⁶. Dr Waite has his definitive Greek text (somewhere) but other Greek expositors have theirs.

2. New Testament Greek is a dead language. See Question 7 listed in **Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration.**

Even Dr DiVietro⁴⁷ is forced to admit that “*Biblical Greek is a dead language.*” He appears to consider its demise as “*irrelevant.*” On the contrary, it is most relevant, as 1 Peter 1:23 shows, “*The word of God...liveth and abideth for ever.”*

Dr DiVietro espouses the error in this part of his book of supposing that contemporary non-Biblical literature can be used to find the meanings of how words are used in scripture, e.g. Shakespeare for the AV1611. Dr Hills⁴⁸ states.

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

David W. Norris⁴⁹ 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.”*

Note in the above that “**comparing spiritual things with spiritual**” 1 Corinthians 2:13 in an English 1611 Holy Bible will define how words are used in the scriptures. See discussion on “**ouches**” in **Dr Waite and Dr Mrs Riplinger – Preliminary Observations.** Dr Waite’s method, as outlined on P. 32 “*When I preach God’s Words, I do not criticize or change the English King James Bible. I illuminate and give many other acceptable and accurate meanings that the translators could have written down*” is neither necessary (especially not for a non-Koine Greek-speaking congregation,

which is 100% of present day congregations) nor safe, as Dr Mrs Riplinger shows in *Hazardous Materials* and as David Norris has outlined above.

3. New Testament Greek was a stage in the development of the scriptures, Psalm 12:6, 7. See Dr Mrs Riplinger's comment above and **Dr Waite and the Imaginary 'Original Bible,' Unidentified in Print**, with respect to God's bringing forth of vernacular Bibles in many languages; Latin, Syriac, Gothic, German and English etc. That stage has been superseded by the Biblical English of the AV1611.
4. No command exists anywhere in scripture that requires the Christian to return to "*the Original Sacred Tongues*" to find out what God said. Neither Dr Waite's exposition of "*PASA GRAPHE THEOPNEUSTOS*," P. 59 nor his opinions on once-only inspiration constitute such a command to all Bible readers, certainly not for this author. See **Dr Waite and 'Originals Only' Inspiration**.
5. Unless the Christian undertakes intensive study over a protracted period, in order to become conversant with New Testament Greek, he must rely on a vernacular translation, otherwise he will encounter the dangers of which Dr Mrs Riplinger has warned in *Hazardous Materials* or be compelled to look towards 'illuminators' like Dr Waite and others as 'Protestant popes,'* or both. Either way, he is 'back to square one,' as the saying goes.

*Akin to 33rd Degree Royal Arch Masons, i.e. only those who've been inducted into 'the mysteries' actually know 'absolute truth.'
6. This author estimates that, all things considered, the ordinary church-goer would have to spend up to eighteen months to two years of intensive study to acquire a working knowledge of New Testament Greek (and more for Hebrew and Aramaic). What then? Is he going to give scripture readings in Greek, teach Bible classes in Greek or encourage young people to memorise verses in Greek, which would still have to be acknowledged as a dead language as in Point 2 above? All of which seems impractical to this author, in the light of 1 Corinthians 14:9, "*So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air.*"
7. Dr DiVietro's calumny notwithstanding, Dr Mrs Riplinger's work *Hazardous Materials* contains many detailed warnings about the untrustworthy nature of contemporary Greek sources. Her conclusions have received independent support from the work of David Norris in the UK. See Point 2 above. The Christian would therefore be wise to avoid these sources in seeking to know "*the scripture of truth*" Daniel 10:21.

Dr Waite and the KJB not “given by inspiration of God”

Introductory Remarks

Dr Waite’s stance on the inspiration, or otherwise, of the AV1611 will now be addressed. The citations given below from his book are typical. See the **Appendix** for the full list. Under-linings are this author’s, with reference to the points that will be addressed.

P. iii “*We use and defend the King James Bible.*”

The DBS, Dead Bible Society, just don’t believe it as “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God.*”

Hebrews 4:12 states “*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.*”

Regardless of any profession to the contrary, Dr Waite would deny that verse *in English* or in any vernacular translation. If inspiration is nullified by translation*, then no translation can be either “*quick*” or “*the word of God.*” Neither can it be “*powerful.*”

*See statement in the **Introduction**, commenting on PP. 2, 52 of Dr Waite’s book. *For if, as Dr Waite asserts, God’s ‘original’ Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words underlying the AV1611 are no longer “given by inspiration of God” once they are changed into another form* by translation, then they no longer have “the life of God” Ephesians 4:18 and cannot be said to be “the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever” 1 Peter 1:23.*

Even though the Lord Jesus Christ could appear “in another form” Mark 16:12 and still be the Lord Jesus Christ.

A translation such as the AV1611 can therefore only be “*the word of men*” and emphatically not “*in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe*” 1 Thesalonians 2:13b.

Therefore, if Dr Waite is correct, no-one has ever had the Holy Bible as “*the word of God*” or ever could have unless they have an ‘illuminator’ like Dr Waite who could disseminate to them, P. 28, “*My “Holy Bible”...God’s fully “inspired” original Words of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.*”

Such a ‘Bible’ has never existed, between two covers. See remarks under **Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print.**

See also the 9 questions for Dr Waite listed in **Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration.**

Therefore the words of the Lord Jesus Christ in Mark 7:13 apply to Dr Waite and the DBS.

“Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye.”

The last clause shows that the context is not limited to that which is “*Corban*” Mark 7:11-12.

P. 3 “*This **HERESY** view is held by Gail Riplinger, Peter Ruckman, and many of their followers. What is this view? This **HERESY** view believes that in 1611, when the King James Bible was published, (contrary to all truth and Biblical doctrine) God performed a “second inspiration.” Because of this, their so-called verbal plenary inspiration of the King James Bible supplants the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words given by God Himself as inferior and exalts the verbal plenary inspiration of the King James Bible as superior.*”

The scripture reveals not only “a “*second inspiration*”” but a *third* inspiration, as Dr Gipp shows⁵⁰, emphases are the author’s.

*“Just how much value **does** God put on the originals? To get the answer we must explore several chapters in the book of Jeremiah beginning with the famous passage in chapter 36 concerning the roll that Jeremiah had written.*

“In verse 21 the roll is brought before King Jehoiakim and read by his servant Jehudi. According to verse 23 Jehudi read three or four leaves and King Jehoiakim cut it up with a pen-knife and cast it into the fire on the hearth until it was destroyed.

“Thus ends ORIGINAL #1!

“Then the Lord moved Jeremiah to rewrite the roll adding some words to it. (Jeremiah 36:32).

“Thus ORIGINAL #2 is born.

*“We are shown the text of this second original in Jeremiah 45-51 where it is reproduced for our benefit. Jeremiah told Seraiah to read this roll when he came into Babylon. (Jeremiah 51:59-61). Then Jeremiah instructed Seraiah, after he finished reading the roll, to **bind a stone to it and cast it into the Euphrates river** (Jeremiah 51:63)!*

“Thus ends ORIGINAL #2!

*“But wait! We have a copy of the text of the roll in chapters 45-51. Where did it come from? It came from a **copy** of original #2 which we can only call ORIGINAL #3!*

“So there are two very big problems for those who overemphasize the “originals”.

“(1) Every Bible ever printed with a copy of Jeremiah in it has a text in chapters 45-51 which is translated from a copy of the “second” original, or ORIGINAL #3.

*“(2) Secondly, NO ONE can overlook the fact that God didn’t have the **least** bit of interest in **preserving** the “original” once it had been copied and its message delivered. So **WHY** should we put more of an emphasis on the originals than **God** does? An emphasis which is **plainly** unscriptural.*

*“Thus, since we have the text of the “originals” preserved in the King James Bible we have no need of the originals, even if they **were** available.”*

Clearly God can perform “a **“second inspiration”**” or even a *third* inspiration. The remainder of this section will address three main topics in the following sub-sections.

1. Dr Waite’s insistence that the AV1611 is not “**“perfect”**” because it has undergone various editions.
2. Dr Waite’s insistence that the AV1611 is “**not “inspired by God” or “God-breathed.”**”
3. Testimonies to the inspiration of the AV1611, Dr Waite’s mean-spirited insistence to the contrary notwithstanding.

Dr Waite’s comments will be grouped at the beginning of subsections 1 and 2, followed by this author’s responses. Subsection 3 will stand alone, as little additional comment is necessary.

The ‘not ““perfect””’ AV1611

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.”*

P. 25 *“**“Perfection”** of translation is not possible. Only God has **“perfect.”** 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?”*

P. 26 *“I believe the word, **“perfection,”** is a word we can only use when referring to God Almighty. I stand for the King James Bible, but I don’t like to use the word **“perfect”** for it. All you have to do is find one place where it is not **“perfect.”** God alone is perfect. There have been many printers’ errors in the King James Bible initially. They were not **“perfect.”** There are hundreds of differences in the various editions of the King James Bible. Which one can you say is **“perfect.”** Publishers in the USA have many different spellings of words. Which spelling is **“perfect”**?”*

P. 32 *“The King James Bible has gone through seven different editions. The original 1611 edition had the Apocrypha in it which is filled with errors and false teachings. Does she think that this was inspired by God? If not, which of the other six editions, revised by man, was inspired by God? Which printed edition of the present seventh edition was inspired by God? Is it the one published by Nelson Press? By Moody Press? By Zondervan Press? By Cambridge Press? By Oxford Press? Or by some other press which has many differences with the other publishers?”*

P. 40 *“The three words, **“true, reliable, and accurate”** are three words describing what I consider the King James Bible to be. What about all of the hundreds of changes that have been made in the King James Bible from 1611 to the present? If it were **“perfect,”** why all the changes? I use the word **“perfect”** when referring to things that God Almighty does. God’s Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words are **“perfect.”**”*

P. 53 *“The Scrivener text, which underlies our King James Bible, has nothing to do with the matter of the **“perfection and inspiration of the KJB.”** The Greek Words underlying the KJB are perfect and inspired. It is false for Gail Riplinger to say that the KJB, and many other Bibles since Acts 2 (possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background), were given by verbal plenary inspiration. This is pure theological **HERESY**. If Gail Riplinger believes this about the KJB, which one is she talking about since there are at least seven official “editions” with hundreds of changes and many different printings with multiple printers’ errors and differences in them. If it is the original AV 1611, she has the problem of God **“inspiring”** the errors of the Apocrypha. It is a ridiculous and unfounded position.”*

The first observation about the above set of comments is that of an inconsistency on Dr Waite’s part. He insists throughout that **““Perfection”** of translation is not possible.” However, on P. 32, see below, he declares that *“When I preach God’s Words, I do not criticize or change the English King James Bible.”* See also point-by-point discussion in **Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’**.

Which edition of the AV1611 is Dr Waite referring to? He doesn't say but its wording must be perfect if it is, according to Dr Waite, above either criticism or amendment. Perfection of *this* particular edition must therefore have been achieved, Dr Waite's assertion to the contrary notwithstanding.

Further, on P. 88 of his book Dr Waite has assured his readers that "*In the subtitle of my book, DEFENDING THE KING JAMES BIBLE, I call it "GOD'S WORDS KEPT INTACT IN ENGLISH."*" See remarks in **Dr Waite and 'Originals Only' Inspiration.**

Whichever edition of the AV1611 that Dr Waite is referring must be unimpaired, at least with respect to its text, i.e. perfect, if it has been kept intact. Yet Dr Waite insists, PP. 2, 25 that "*“Perfection” of translation is not possible.*"

Therefore, if Dr Mrs Riplinger "*falsely believes that the King James Bible is “perfect,”*" then so does Dr Waite, at least with respect to the wording one particular though unidentified edition.

Once again, therefore, he has left the Bible believer with "*an uncertain sound*" 1 Corinthians 14:8. See remarks under **Dr Waite and 'the Greek'**.

It is ironic that Dr Waite says that the AV1611 is both perfect and imperfect on the very same page, P. 32. See also remarks in **Dr Waite and the Imaginary 'Original Bible,' Unidentified in Print.** Dr Waite states "*Gail Riplinger has not and cannot prove that the King James Bible was inspired by God.*" He then states on the same page "*When I preach God's Words, I do not criticize or change the English King James Bible.*"

Except that by declaring "*the English King James Bible*" to be uninspired, see his P. 2 comment above, Dr Waite lumps the Holy Bible amongst the "*dead works*" from which men are supposed to purge their consciences in order "*to serve the living God*" Hebrews 9:14.

This is as severe a criticism of the Holy Bible as it gets for a King James Bible believer who believes that the Lord has magnified His Book above all his name, Psalm 138:2 and Dr Waite's double standard on the AV1611 brings to mind the Lord's rebuke in Matthew 23:27-28.

“Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.”

Dr Waite's problem with the Apocrypha is easily resolved by means of Article VI of the Church of England Articles of Religion⁵¹, after which statement cited below, the 14 Apocryphal books are listed.

“And the other books...the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine.”

Dr Gipp⁵² adds that "*In the days when our Bible was translated the Apocrypha was accepted reading based on its historical value, though not accepted as Scripture by anyone outside of the Catholic church. The King James translators therefore placed it BETWEEN the Old and New Testaments for its historical benefit to its readers. They did not integrate it into the Old Testament text...*"

Moreover, the title page of the 1611 AV1611 can be checked online⁵³. The title page states, in modern spelling and script, "*The Holy Bible Containing The Old Testament and The New.*" The Apocrypha is *not* said to be part of "*the holy scriptures*" 2 Timothy 3:15.

Further, as Dr Scrivener⁵⁴ reports, in 1615, the then Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, imposed a penalty of a year's imprisonment for omission of the Apocrypha from printed Bibles. In a letter to this author⁵⁵ dated 5th April 1986, the then Editorial Secretary of the TBS, Mr A.J. Brown, states that "*Abbot's directive applied not only to the Authorised Version but to ALL printed Bibles, i.e. including the Geneva Bible...throughout the 16th century it was standard practice for the Apocrypha to be included in all English Bibles.*"

Mr. Brown states further that, Abbot's directive notwithstanding, "*Several editions of the AV did appear without the Apocrypha between 1611 and 1660*" but by insertion of the Apocrypha between the Testaments of the first and second edition, i.e. 1611, AV1611s, the King James translators were simply following established practice for the time. In view of the attitude of the church hierarchy of the time, they were also obeying Romans 13:1 to "***be subject unto the higher powers.***" The same would apply to later editions containing the Apocrypha until it was dropped altogether, in today's AV1611 editions.

Ironically, Dr Waite states in his earlier work⁵⁶ that the 1611 King James Bible did contain the Apocrypha between the Old and New Testaments as history but not as scripture. It appears in that earlier work that Dr Waite did not perceive the inclusion of the Apocrypha in the early editions of the AV1611 as making the texts of scripture imperfect any more than the inclusion of Bible maps in contemporary AV1611s that *incorrectly* mark the path of the Exodus *around* the Red Sea instead of through it*.

*For interest, this site⁵⁷ shows a *correct* map, published in the year 1712.

Dr Waite regrettably fails to mention any of these facts to his readers in his latest work and his objections to the inclusion of the Apocrypha in early editions of the AV1611 are therefore misleading.

So are his objections to the various editions of the AV1611. He claims that because the AV1611 has undergone numerous editions, that is another reason it cannot be "***perfect.***"

Dr Waite is concerned, for example, about "*many printers' errors in the King James Bible initially*" and "*the hundreds of changes that have been made in the King James Bible from 1611 to the present.*" See his PP. 26, 40 comments above.

It doesn't seem to have occurred to Dr Waite that for "*printers' errors*" to be genuine errors, a *correct*, or *perfect*, text must exist for these errors to be open to correction. Otherwise, the errors could not be errors. An analogy is that it is impossible to counterfeit a \$3 bill (£s 2), because a *genuine* \$3 does not exist and never has.

So the very fact of "*many printers' errors in the King James Bible initially*" is itself an indication that a perfect King James Text must emerge once these printers' errors have been corrected. Dr Waite's objections to "*the hundreds of changes that have been made in the King James Bible from 1611 to the present*" P. 40, will be addressed below.

Dr Hills comments⁵⁸ as follows with respect to the various editions of the AV1611.

"...Which King James Version? — A Feeble Rebuttal

"Opponents of the King James Version often try to refute us by asking us which edition of the King James Version we receive as authoritative. For example, a professor in a well known Bible school writes as follows: "With specific reference to the King James translation, I must ask you which revision you refer to as the one to be accepted? It has been revised at least three times. The first translation of 1611 included the Apocrypha, which I do not accept as authoritative."

“This retort, however, is very weak. All the editions of the King James Version from 1611 onward are still extant and have been examined minutely by F. H. A. Scrivener and other careful scholars. Aside from printers’ errors, these editions differ from each other only in regard to spelling, punctuation, and, in a few places, italics. Hence any one of them may be used by a Bible-believing Christian. The fact that some of them include the Apocrypha is beside the point, since this does not affect their accuracy in the Old and New Testaments.”

This author⁵⁹ has summarised the work of various researchers with respect to different editions of the AV1611. It should be noted that in all of his objections to the perfection of the Holy Bible because it underwent a number of editions, Dr Waite fails to give a single example of how differences between editions have led to imperfections and errors. By contrast, the other researchers whose work this author has summarised have addressed these differences in detail.

Extracts from that summary follow, with some amendments and additional material.

“Dr Ruckman’s book on the variations in the Editions of the AV1611⁶⁰...[cites] the conclusions of the Committee on Versions to the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society in 1852.

““The results of the God-honoured, God-blessed revisions of the original 1611 text are as follows:

““That the edition of 1611, although prepared with very great care, was not free from typographical errors; and that, while most of these were corrected in the edition of 1613, others in much greater numbers were then introduced, which have since been removed.

““That the revision of Dr Blayney made by collating the then current editions of Oxford and Cambridge with those of 1611 and 1701 had for its main object to restore the text of the English Bible to its original purity: and that this was successfully accomplished.””

“Dr Ruckman⁶¹ continues “What surprises do you suppose these greenhorns and tenderfeet are going to pull on a man who has had an exact copy of the original 1611 edition (not a “fairly reasonable” facsimile published by Thomas Nelson and Sons) for more than twenty years and an original copy of a 1613 right off the press? Do you suppose someone is going to try to bamboozle him with “variants in the different editions of the King James Bible”?...”

““I have Scrivener’s complete list of all the variants in all of the editions of the AV (The Authorised Edition of the English Bible: Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives, Cambridge Press, 1884). You are going to impress us with the differences between the editions of the AV, are you? You are going to impress us by telling us that there were five or seven major editions, when we have a list which gives fourteen (1612, 1613, 1616, 1617, 1629, 1630 with the King’s printers; then 1640, 1660, 1701, 1762, 1769, 1833, 1847-51 and 1858)? You have more “authoritative sources” than WE do on the KING JAMES BIBLE, do you? Well, I have the complete list of all the changes in all of the books of both Testaments, including FIVE APPENDICES which detail the readings of the Greek text used by the AV translators. Why did I not lose my faith in THE BOOK after reading every word in this work? As they say “down home”: “It DO present a problem, don’t it?”””

Dr Ruckman concludes, his capitalisations, *“We know WHOM we have believed (2 Tim. 1:12), we know WHAT we have believed (Acts 24:14), and we know WHY we have believed it (Isa. 43:9-12).”*

Dr Waite has not brought forth any witnesses in his book to gainsay Dr Ruckman’s stance on the AV1611, which is essentially Psalm 12:6.

“The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.”

God’s word is ***“for ever...settled in heaven”*** Psalm 119:89 but it was ***“purified seven times”*** on earth ***“as silver tried in a furnace.”*** Without enlarging here on the expression ***“seven times,”*** it is clear that the scripture itself shows that ***“the words of the Lord”*** were subject to a multi-stage refining process on earth, ***“as silver is refined”*** Zechariah 13:9. See also 1 Chronicles 29:4, Malachi 3:3. As in an industrial refining process, the intermediate products were perfect at each stage of the process, to be conveyed to the next for further purification until, in the case of the AV1611, the final purified stage was achieved with the perfected AV1611s* of today.

*One of which even Dr Waite has, with respect to its words, because by his own admission, he won’t change them**. See his P. 32 comments discussed above.

Except in 2 Timothy 3:16. See remarks on Dr Waite’s P. 59 comments on *“PASA GRAPHE THEOPNEUSTOS”*** in **Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration.**

Dr Grady⁶² adds these comments* on the different editions of the AV1611, extracts from this author’s work cited above.

*This author would recommend Dr Grady’s book *Final Authority* as the single most informative work on the issue of the AV1611, for the breadth and depth of information contained therein and ease of reading. *Did The Catholic Church Give Us The Bible?* by David W. Daniels, Chick Publications and *The Monarch of The Books* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman are also highly recommended.

““When all else fails, detractors of the King James Bible will invariably ask their despised opponents, “WHICH Authorised Version do you believe, the 1611, 1613, 1767 or perhaps the 1850?” And while their bewildered victims are pondering this troublesome innuendo (analogous to such nonsense as “Have you quit beating your wife lately?”), they are subjected to an array of staggering statistics. Citing the Evangelical scholar Jack Lewis, Keylock quotes him as stating:

“““Few people realise, for example, that thousands of textual errors have been found in the KJV. As early as 1659 William Kilburne found 20,000 errors in six KJV editions.”

““Reckless statements such as Lewis’ are incredibly misleading as the extent of these so-called “errors” are never explained to be primarily lithographical (printing) and orthographical (spelling) in nature. In 1611, the art of printing was an occupation of the utmost drudgery. With every character being set by hand, a multitude of typographical errors was to be expected...

““In addition to printing flaws, there was a continual change in spelling for which to care. Lewis did not inform his readers that there was no such thing as proper spelling in the seventeenth century...”

Neither did Dr Waite. Citing researcher Dr David Reagan, Dr Grady reveals that *““In the 1600’s spelling was according to whim. There was no such thing as correct spelling. No standards had been established. An author often spelled the same word several different ways, often in the same book and sometimes on the same page...Not until the eighteenth century did the spelling begin to take a stable form. Therefore, in the last half of the eighteenth century, the spelling of the King James Version of 1611 was standardized.”*

Dr Grady continues, emphases are his.

““A significant portion of these twenty thousand “textual errors” were in reality nothing more than changing “darke” to “dark” or “rann” to “ran.” Who but a Nicolataine priest would categorize as serious revisions the normal follow-up corrections of mistakes at the press?

““It is impossible to overstate the duplicity of such critics who would weaken the faith of some with their preposterous reports of tens of thousands of errors in the Authorised Version...In his Appendix A (List of wrong readings of the Bible of 1611 amended in later editions) of his informative work, *The Authorised Edition of the English Bible (1611), Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*, Scrivener catalogued but a fraction of the inflated figures of modern scholarship.

““Excluding marginal alterations and Apocrypha citings, this author has personally reviewed pages 147-194 and counted LESS THAN 800 CORRECTIONS. And even this figure is misleading when you consider that many of the instances were repetitious in nature. (Six such changes involved the corrected spelling of “Nathanael” from the 1611’s “Nathaneel” in John 1:45-49 and 21:2).

“Whereas Geisler and Nix cited Goodspeed’s denouncing of Dr Blayney’s 1769 Oxford edition for deviating from the Authorised Version in “at least 75,000 details,” Scrivener alludes to less than two hundred as noteworthy of mention.””

Dr Grady adds that, under the guidance of Drs John Bois and Samuel Ward, two of the original King James translators, 72% of textual variations in the AV1611 editions were resolved by the year 1638, just over a mere quarter of a century after the publication of the first editions.

These findings contrast sharply with Dr Waite’s assertion of “all of the hundreds of changes that have been made in the King James Bible from 1611 to the present.”

Historian Alexander McClure⁶³, Dr Ruckman, *Differences in the King James Version Editions* and Dr Grady report on the work of the American Bible Society in comparing various editions of the AV1611. The society published the results of this work in 1852.

Alexander McClure states, his emphases that “A very able Committee of the American Bible Society, spent some three years in a diligent and laborious comparison of recent copies of the best edition of the American Bible Society, and of the four leading British editions, namely, those of London, Oxford, Cambridge, and Edinburgh, and also of the original edition of 1611. The number of variations in the text and punctuation of these six copies was found to fall but little short of twenty-four thousand. A vast amount! Quite enough to frighten us, till we read the Committee’s assurance, that “of all this great number, **there is not one which mars the integrity of the text, or affects any doctrine or precept of the Bible.**””

Dr Ruckman and Dr Grady cite the conclusions of the Society: “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.”

Clearly the three-year collation of AV1611 editions carried out by members of the American Bible Society decisively refutes Dr Waite’s protestations about “all of the hundreds of changes that have been made in the King James Bible from 1611 to the present.”

A few samples of the more noticeable changes between the 1611 AV1611 and the current Cambridge Cameo AV1611 have been listed below. These are selections from a list of 30

verses forwarded to this author some years ago by an arch Bible critic (now deceased) as indicating serious changes between AV1611 editions. The full list is; Leviticus 26:40, 2 Samuel 16:8, Psalm 18:47, 42:9, Jeremiah 19:11, Ezekiel 24:7, 46:23, Matthew 12:23, 13:45, 16:16, 26:36, 75, Mark 2:4, 5:6, 10:18, Luke 1:3, 19:9, 22:40, John 5:18, 15:20, Acts 4:27, 6:3, Romans 11:23, 1 Corinthians 4:9, 12:28, 2 Corinthians 12:2, 1 Timothy 1:4, 4:16, 1 Peter 1:22, 1 John 5:12, 30 verses in all.

The list has been addressed in this author's earlier work⁶⁴, although comments on 1 Corinthians 4:9 should be amended as shown below. Apologies for any confusion arising from the earlier work with respect to this verse. The sample changes follow, with this author's comments from the earlier work, with some amendments and supplemented by dates of the changes that Dr Scrivener⁶⁵ noted.

Ezekiel 24:7

1611 AV1611

Current Cambridge Cameo AV1611

“she powred it upon the ground to couer it with dust” ***“she poured it not upon the ground, to cover it with dust”***

“Not” is in the Masoretic Hebrew text, which would suggest that the omission in the 1611 reading is a typographical error. This is apparent not only in the first part of verse 7, “she set it upon the top of a rock” but also in verse 8, which reads “I have set her blood upon the top of a rock, that it should not be covered.”

Dr Scrivener notes that this particular typo was corrected in 1613.

Ezekiel 46:23

1611 AV1611

Current Cambridge Cameo AV1611

“there was a new building round about” ***“there was a row of building round about”***

The context in BOTH Editions indicates that each corner of the court was surrounded by buildings. Of course they were NEW (1611 reading), the whole temple was NEW - it hasn't even been built yet. If the buildings were “round about” a corner, they would have to be in a ROW. Both readings are correct.

Dr Scrivener notes that the current amendment dates from 1638.

Matthew 12:23

1611 AV1611

Current Cambridge Cameo AV1611

“Is this the sonne of David?” ***“Is not this the son of David?”***

“Meti”, which is “not” in an exclamatory sense as “What(?)”, is found in Berry's TR but is untranslated, yielding almost the same reading as the 1611 Bible. The people's amazement in the context shows that BOTH readings have the same sense, although the [current] reading is stronger because it includes the exclamatory term.

The change dates from 1638.

1 Corinthians 4:9

1611 AV1611

Current Cambridge Cameo AV1611

“approved to death” ***“appointed to death”***

Amended comment: No change in meaning has occurred especially insofar as to be “*appointed*” an individual has to be “*approved*.”

The change dates from 1616.

1 Corinthians 12:28

1611 AV1611

Current Cambridge Cameo AV1611

“*helpes in gouernmets*”

“*helps, governments*”

A literal rendering of Berry’s TR appears to support the [current] reading, so the change could be typographical.

However, BOTH Editions show that “governments” was a separate gift, Romans 12:8 and that “helpers” did help those with responsibility for church “government”, such as Paul. See Romans 16:2, 3, 6, 2 Corinthians 11:28, 1 Timothy 3:5. Therefore, both readings would be correct.

The [current] reading simply indicates that “helps” had a wider ministry than helping only in church government and reinforces Romans 12:8. Most significantly, the variation does NOT involve error, in EITHER Edition.

The change dates from 1629.

1 John 5:12

The [contemporary] Edition adds “of God” to the second reading of “the Son.” Obviously, this does NOT alter the meaning of the verse in ANY way. “Theou” or “of God” is found in Berry’s TR and so the addition is clearly typographical.*

*The words “*of God*” are not an unwarranted textual addition. They have support from the Received Text.

Dr Scrivener notes that the addition of “*of God*” dates from 1629 and was retained in 1638 but omitted from some subsequent editions until it was firmly established in 1658.

In sum, the quantity, nature and dates of changes between editions of the AV1611 confirm the conclusion of the American Bible Society in 1852 that “*there is not one which mars the integrity of the text, or affects any doctrine or precept of the Bible.*”” Apart from actual typos, the early AV1611 editions differed only from the contemporary ones in that they needed some refinement that did not amount to changes in meaning. No AV1611 edition could therefore be described as imperfect, although Dr Waite insists in his comments of PP. 25-26 that the changes between various editions *do* amount to imperfection (except for the edition that he possesses, which he does not “*criticize or change,*” see his P. 32 comment below, (except for the expression “*PASA GRAPHE THEOPNEUSTOS*”. See his P. 59 comment in *Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration.*’))

However, the above discussion has shown that Dr Waite is gnat-straining, Matthew 23:24, in addition to misleading his readers about the apparent multitude of changes between AV1611 editions.

Yet, as with his comments on the Apocrypha, this is strange because in his earlier work⁶⁶, Dr Waite says that he only found 421 audible word changes between the original and contemporary AV1611s out of 791, 328 words in the Holy Bible. He appears to have regarded this proportion, 1 in 1880 words, as trifling and states further that only 136 were of any substance.

Dr Mrs Riplinger⁶⁷ has since examined these 136 word changes and found that they were among the early corrections that the King James translators e.g. Drs Bois and Ward, see above, made themselves, no later than the year 1638.

So with respect to both the Apocrypha and word or printing changes in various editions of the AV1611, Dr Waite is not only gnat straining, Matthew 23:24 and misleading his readers, he is even contradicting his own work, *Defending the King James Bible*.

However, Dr Waite further maintains, PP. 25-56 that the AV1611 cannot be described as “**perfect**” because “*God alone is perfect.*” Once again, Dr Waite has contradicted himself.

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.*”

P. 40 “*I use the word “**perfect**” when referring to things that God Almighty does. God’s Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words are “perfect.”*”

P. 53 “*The Greek Words underlying the KJB are **perfect** and inspired.*”

Having asserted that “*God alone is perfect*” Dr Waite must qualify this statement by attributing perfection to “*God’s Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words.*” Otherwise he would not be able to insist on P. 52, this author’s emphases, “*I firmly believe that I have the **original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.***”

However, by doing so, he has overlooked 2 Timothy 3:17 and the remainder of 2 Timothy 3:16, the verse on which Dr Waite focused so much attention with respect to the phrase “*PASA GRAPHE THEOPNEUSTOS.*” See the **Appendix** for his comments on PP. 2, 24, 28, 40, 59.

2 Timothy 3:16, 17 state “***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, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.***”

Note the strong word “**thoroughly**” as against the weaker word “*thoroughly*” as found in the NIV, NKJV.

Does Dr Waite insist that all members of the Body of Christ must become conversant in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek before scripture can be profitable to them, as described by verse 16 and perfect them for the accomplishment of “**all good works,**” as in verse 17? Or does he believe that this responsibility can be satisfactorily discharged by ‘illuminators’ like himself? See remarks in **Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print** and the questions at the end of **Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’**.

Has Dr Waite taken no notice of Paul’s exhortations in 1 Corinthians 14:6-9 that have direct application to written words today as well as to those spoken in tongues in the 1st century as a sign to unbelieving Jews, 1 Corinthians 1:22?

“*Now, brethren, if I come unto you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you, except I shall speak to you either by revelation, or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine?... So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air.”*

How is the expression “*PASA GRAPHE THEOPNEUSTOS*” supposed to be “**words easy to be understood**” compared to “**given by inspiration of God**” for “**the man of God**” who seeks

to “*profit... by revelation, or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine*” so that he “*may be perfect*” but who is not conversant with Koine Greek?

Would Dr Waite please produce ‘chapter and verse’ to show why such an individual should acquire an understanding of Koine Greek, such as Dr Waite professes to have, and is defying God if he doesn’t?

Dr Waite does not address these pertinent questions and yet again he has left the Bible believer with “*an uncertain sound*” 1 Corinthians 14:8.

The context of 2 Timothy 3:16, 17 therefore shows that Dr Waite has once again disparaged the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible and all other faithful vernacular translations by insisting that they are imperfect.

Finally for this section, note Dr Waite’s strange statement on P. 53 “*The Scrivener text, which underlies our King James Bible, has nothing to do with the matter of the “perfection and inspiration of the KJB.” The Greek Words underlying the KJB are perfect and inspired.*”

See remarks in **Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’** and note that again, he does not explicitly call the Scrivener “*inspired*” and he does not precisely identify the current source of the “*perfect and inspired*” Greek words underlying the KJB.

This is yet another “*uncertain sound*” from Dr Waite that the Bible believer can reasonably ignore.

The ‘not “inspired by God”” AV1611

P. 7 “Gail Ludwig Latessa Kaleda Riplinger...defends a different King James Bible than I do. Her Bible is a verbal plenary inspiration of the English King James Bible. This is inspiration **HERESY**. My Bible is the King James Bible which is not “inspired by God” or “God-breathed” but is the only accurate, reliable, and true translation of the preserved, inerrant, inspired, God-breathed, perfect Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Words on which it is based.”

P. 31 “As for those of us who disagree with her **HERESY** on her “**Holy Bible**” (that is her King James Bible) “**resenting its authority,**” our final and ultimate “**authority**” is the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that underlie the King James Bible. This genuine and final “**authority,**” Gail Riplinger despises. This is a blatant lie. That’s false. We strongly believe in the King James Bible’s “**authority,**” but we deny her **HERESY** about its “**inspiration by God.**””

P. 32 “The original languages that God breathed-out give the English nuances, illustrations and shades of meaning. The grammatical rules of those languages give further assistance in the proper interpretation of difficult passages. When I preach God’s Words, I do not criticize or change the English King James Bible. I illuminate and give many other acceptable and accurate meanings that the translators could have written down. Gail Riplinger despises the use of any other word than that given by the King James translators. This is ridiculous.”

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!”

P. 35 “The King James Bible is not “inspired”...The word inspired is only used for the Words that God Himself breathed-out, not that which man has merely translated. God did not breathe-out English or any other modern language. God only breathed-out and inspired the Old and New Testament Words of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.”

P. 36 “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.”

P. 51 “Gail Riplinger defines her **HERESY** clearly in this quotation. She calls God’s own “Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text and the Traditional Received Greek Text” as “**Two Weak Legs.**” In this way, she is clearly exalting the English King James Bible translation by men (which she believes were given by verbal plenary inspiration) as superior over God’s own Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. This is pure **HERESY!** Shame on her for this blasphemy!”

P. 52 “Gail Riplinger’s “**solid and perfect Holy Bible**” is her alleged English King James Bible. Neither I, nor the BIBLE FOR TODAY, nor the Dean Burgon Society have abandoned our defense of the King James Bible. But we do not call it inspired of God or God-breathed... She is exalting man’s English as being superior to God’s Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek

Words. *In effect, Gail Riplinger believes in a deification of man and his works as superior to Almighty God and His works. This is HERESY and blasphemy!*”

P. 64 “Those [in] church pews...should not believe in the plenary verbal inspiration of the King James Bible which is Gail Riplinger’s **HERESY**. *God did not write or give the words of the King James Bible. Men did. For Gail Riplinger to say that the King James Bible was given by plenary verbal inspiration, she would have to say that God produced false doctrine for putting the error-ridden Apocrypha in the A.V. 1611. Does she admit this moral flaw in God? I hope not. **WHICH KING JAMES BIBLE DOES SHE THINK WAS GIVEN BY PLENARY VERBAL INSPIRATION?** The King James Bible has undergone hundreds of different printings and has had at least seven major revisions. Each printing and each edition is different. This shows the foolishness in believing that any **translation** was given by plenary verbal inspiration. It is the GRAPHE, (Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Words)= underlying the King James Bible that were given by plenary verbal inspiration and were God-breathed (THEOPNEUSTOS).”*

PP. 84-85 “What I strongly object to is Peter Ruckman and Gail Riplinger who believe the **HERESY** that the King James Bible was given by verbal plenary inspiration! *This is double inspiration HERESY...*”

Most of Dr Waite says above is clearly unsubstantiated dogma. See comments under *The ‘not ““perfect”” AV1611* for the response to his question “**WHICH KING JAMES BIBLE etc.**” and comments under *Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration and Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print* concerning “*the preserved, inerrant, inspired, God-breathed, perfect Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Words on which [the KJB] is based.*”

This author would question the wisdom of Dr Waite’s insistence that “*The original languages that God breathed-out give the English nuances, illustrations and shades of meaning...When I preach God’s Words, I do not criticize or change the English King James Bible. I illuminate and give many other acceptable and accurate meanings that the translators could have written down.*”

“*The king’s word*” 2 Samuel 24:4 is well able to provide all the “*other acceptable and accurate meanings*” that the Bible believer needs, certainly according to 2 Timothy 3:17.

“*That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.”*

See comments under *The ‘not ““perfect”” AV1611*. Psalm 39:6 provides a striking example.

“*Surely every man walketh in a vain shew: surely they are disquieted in vain: he heapeth up riches, and knoweth not who shall gather them.*”

The “*vain shew*” is clearly vanity as pride. “*Disquieted in vain*” is clearly God’s chastening having no worthwhile effect. Two distinct meanings of the same word are found in the same verse.

Consider also 2 Peter 2:7, 8.

“*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;)”*

The word “*conversation*” refers primarily in the above passage to conduct but its meaning is clearly broad enough to include speech.

Consider Numbers 5:22 and Psalm 22:14.

“And this water that causeth the curse shall go into thy bowels, to make thy belly to swell, and thy thigh to rot: And the woman shall say, Amen, amen.”

“I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint: my heart is like wax; it is melted in the midst of my bowels.”

The word “**bowels**” refers to the lower and upper viscera respectively in these verses, according to the context. These are but three examples (Dr Waite gives none in the context of his P.32 comment). However, they illustrate the fact that “**the king’s word**” will find its own “*English nuances, illustrations and shades of meaning...[and] other acceptable and accurate meanings*” without the need for any input from “*the original languages*.”

The reason, as Norman Ward⁶⁸ shows, is because “*There was a time in the development of our language...when its words were simple, broad and generic, a time when the English language was perfectly suited to expressing the thoughts and concepts of Hebrew and Greek. It was during that specific period that the A.V. 1611 was translated.*”

Dr Gipp⁶⁹ shows that resorting to “*the original languages*” can actually lead to confusion, his emphases.

*“Once while listening to a self-impressed Bible scholar preach I marveled at the ease with which he duped his audience. He was reading Romans chapter 8. Upon reading a particular verse, he stopped at a particular word and stated, “Now the King James translators mistranslated the Greek word used here.” Then he spent 10-12 minutes expounding on the merits of his choice of translation. The audience was duly impressed with this man’s grasp of the “original language.” (I once heard a 14 year old boy do the same thing in a “preaching contest”. You see, **ANYONE** can do it!)*

*“The very next day I was listening to another preacher on the radio. Coincidentally this zealot was also preaching from Romans chapter 8. He **also** read the same verse and **ALSO** stopped at the very same word that the expert from the previous evening had accosted. He then stated, “Sadly, the King James translators did not properly translate the Greek word used here.”*

*“I then braced myself for a rehash of the previous evening’s exposition. But it was not to be. For **this** particular scholar pointed out that the word in question should have been translated an entirely different way (choice #1 vs. choice #4).*

*“He then, as the previous evening’s butcher, expounded on the virtues of **HIS** choice over that of the King James translators, **or** last evening’s expert. I was amazed! Two completely different men, two entirely different opinions. In fact, their **only** point of agreement was that the **Bible** could not possibly be **correct** as it was. I quickly consigned their esteemed (and humble) opinions to the garbage heap of education and accepted the choice that **GOD** had made for His Book in 1611.”*

These Bible critics have no doubt been caught out many times in the manner that Dr Gipp describes, where “**their witness agreed not together**” Mark 14:56. Dr Waite is therefore shrewd enough not to “*criticize or change the English King James Bible*” but he still downgrades “**the scripture of truth**” Daniel 10:21 as the above critics did, by exalting ancient language texts that in the case of Greek, God has finished with* and in the case of Hebrew/Aramaic, were *not* the sole sources of “**the king’s word**,” even in Old Testament times, as will be shown.

*See Dr Mrs Riplinger’s comments to this effect in **Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’**.

It should be noted that Dr DiVietro⁷⁰ is also misled through his devotion to “*the original languages.*”

He states “*The Bible word wine does not always refer to the beverage alcohol. If one is teaching the Bible doctrine of abstinence one must establish this fact. One must define the Greek...[OINOS] and publicly examine its usages in scripture.*”

On the contrary, “*If one is teaching the Bible doctrine of abstinence one*” need only refer 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*” 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.

Dr DiVietro then claims that in John 11:33, Jesus “*stirred himself into a furious rage,*” according to the Greek, so that when “*Jesus wept*” in John 11:35, “*His tears were not tears of sorrow; they were tears of rage!*” Dr DiVietro then claims that “*Far from correcting the King James Bible, this example elucidates with wonderful clarity.*”

In reality, Dr DiVietro is blatantly “*correcting the King James Bible,*” the same as Dr Waite did with the expression “*PASA GRAPHE THEOPNEUSTOS.*” See remarks in **Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration** on his P. 59 comment. Moreover, Dr DiVietro’s “*wonderful clarity*” yields about as much ‘clarity’ as “*Satan...transformed into an angel of light*” 2 Corinthians 11:14.

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 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 past tense of “*heard.*”

“*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 term “*itself*” is correct because the Lord said in John 16:13, 14 that “*the Spirit of truth...shall not speak of himself...He shall glorify me.*” The First and Second Persons of the Godhead are glorified in Romans 8, see verses 16, 17, 19, 21, 26-39, so the Third Person does not speak of Himself.

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 “wonderful clarity” is apparent in Dr DiVietro's Greek but it is in the AV1611 English of ***“the king's word”*** 2 Samuel 24:4.

Dr DiVietro then says that *“If an illustration rises directly out of the ancient usage of a particular word or idiom, it may be necessary to refer directly to the Greek.”* He uses “BAPTIZO translated Baptize in English” as an example, stating that various professing Christian groups have interpreted the word “Baptize” in various ways, e.g. immersion, pouring, sprinkling. The student therefore must go to ‘the Greek,’ according to Dr DiVietro, to show that *“In every ancient instance”* including an unnamed papyrus fragment, *“[Baptize] is associated with immersion.”*

Note in passing that Dr DiVietro does not go to ‘the Greek’ to show⁷¹ that ***“sprinkling,”*** Hebrews 12:24, is *rhantismos* or in Hebrews 11:28, *proschusis*, which is also *“pouring.”*

However, resorting to ‘the Greek’ is wholly unnecessary for determining the Biblical usage of “Baptize.” 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 salvation⁷² because leprosy pictures sin⁷³.

In addition, The Trinitarian Bible Society⁷⁴ 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.

Returning to Dr Waite's statements above, another of his contradictions emerges, this author's emphases.

P. 33 ***“I stand for the King James Bible as the Word of God in English.”***

P. 64 ***“God did not write or give the words of the King James Bible. Men did.”***

Dr Waite repeatedly insists that *“the King James Bible...is not “inspired by God” or “God-breathed,”* his emphasis, see his P. 7 comment above and the comments following. He then asserts that it is ***“the Word of God in English.”***

How can the King James Bible be the word of God in English if God did not write it? Dr Waite doesn't answer.

However, the scripture answers for itself.

“Where the word of a king is, there is power; and who may say unto him, What does thou?” Ecclesiastes 8:4.

Dr Ruckman⁷⁵ has an extensive commentary of this verse. See also this author's⁷⁶ summary of Dr Ruckman's evaluation of Ecclesiastes 8:4, with respect to King James 1st. Dr Ruckman states in his commentary that *"God waited till a king – an EARTHLY king – got on the throne of an island nation before He sent His words to the moon. The words read on the moon...were from a King James Bible. God waited till a king – an EARTHLY king – got on the throne of England, with a Jewish name. The word "James" is the word "Jacob"...Jacob was a "prince" with God (Gen. 32:28), for this is what the word "Israel" means. Hence, one will read in the Dedicatory of the Authorized Version: "To the most high and mighty PRINCE JAMES."...the implications are that any "Bible" unconnected with an EARTHLY king, has no power in it...*

*"**"Israel"** was Jacob's new name. "To the most high and mighty Prince James..."*

"That is what the apostate Christian colleges, universities, and seminaries cannot tolerate; the linking of an English Bible (translated under God's form of government – a monarchy) being connected with the "oracles" (Rom. 3:2), as originally given to the Jews; not the Greek scholars (Acts 17) in Athens (Acts 17)..."

"It is the Philadelphia Church (1500-1900) that keeps God's word (Rev. 3:8), not the Ephesian Church of the early church fathers (90-150 A.D.). If your Bible was not translated (and revised) under the auspices of a king, you have an inferior Bible...Luther's Heilige Schrift and the King James' Authorized Version were both translated while kings reigned...Absolute time, temperature, and location are determined by this island nation. If you ever decided to hunt for absolute truths (Prov. 2:2-4), I could tell you where to look..."

"You can see why the commentators wanted to rid you of an EARTHLY king whose word had "power." The fruits of the Authorized Version of the Holy Bible, alone, are sufficient to shut the mouths of any of the 400,000 educated asses (saved Christians foremost!) who brayed against it...There has not been one national revival in America since 1933 (Billy Sunday). Billy Sunday was the last major Protestant preacher who lived and died untouched by "higher" Christian education. He used, preached, taught, and BELIEVED nothing but a King James Authorized Version..."

The words of evangelist Billy Sunday⁷⁷ ring down the decades.

"When the Bible (AV1611) says one thing and scholarship says another, scholarship can go plumb to the Devil!"

Despite his highly unorthodox attitude and 'offensive' manner⁷⁸, *"Billy Sunday saw over 1,000,000 men and women "hit the sawdust trail" in open profession of faith in our Lord Jesus Christ."*

All of which prompts the question, what has Dr Waite achieved by comparison with *"God's own "Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text and the Traditional Received Greek Text"?"*? See his comment on P. 51 above. Not a lot, to judge by his book **WARNING!!**

The section will conclude with a further* Biblical consideration of inspiration of translations and some witness statements concerning the inspiration of the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible. These last are included especially to counter Dr Waite's repeated assertions to the contrary, see his underlined comments above.

*See Dr Gipp's analysis and accompanying remarks in **Dr Waite and the Imaginary 'Original Bible,' Unidentified in Print.**

Dr Ruckman⁷⁹ has some telling comments about inspiration of the AV1611 that stand as a rebuke to Dr Waite's repeated denials of it.

*“Job 32:8, **“But there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding”**. The verse is a direct cross reference to 2 Timothy 3:16 and every apostate fundamentalist since 1800 missed it. The “spirit in man” is the breath of God (Gen. 2:7). The breath of God enters into a lifeless body, and the Holy Spirit gives that body physical life (Ezek. 37:5-7, 8-10, 14; Job 27:3. **“Inspiration”** is the act of the Holy Spirit breathing life into an object (Job 33:4).*

*“The scriptures are alive (Heb. 4:12) because the Holy Spirit breathed life into them (2 Pet. 1:21). When we say that the KJV is **“the holy scriptures”** in English (Rom. 1:2), or **“given by inspiration”** (2 Tim. 3:16), we mean that the Holy Spirit of God guided its translators in their work and breathed on that Book when they got through with it...*

*“Jeremiah 36:32, **“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.”** What you have in verses 18-32 is the destruction of an actual “original autograph” that was given to Baruch **“by inspiration”**; God breathing His words through a man’s mouth.... What then takes place is what the largest Fundamental Christian Colleges, Seminaries, and Universities would call “double inspiration” [see Dr Waite’s objection in his PP. 84-85 comment above] (vs. 28); Bob Jones University would label that as a “heresy” that comes from “Ruckmanism” [so would Dr Waite]. As it turns out, it is a Bible doctrine that is repeated nearly 300 times when the New Testament quotes Old Testament passages. But Jeremiah goes much further than that. Not only is the book of Jeremiah “doubly inspired,” the second version doesn’t match the first. The Author of the Holy Bible, [Who] warned you about adding to His word (Prov. 30:6), doesn’t hesitate to add to it Himself. That means that what God originally inspired does not have to match the Scripture God preserved, and if you could get a copy of the “original autograph,” you would not have the words God wanted you to have. What the silly scholars (afflicted with the disease of “Ruckmanitis”) call “double inspiration” is known in the Bible as **“sound doctrine”** (1 Tim. 1:10, 2 Tim. 4:3, Tit. 1:9, 2:1).”*

Dr Waite clearly overlooked Jeremiah 36 in his condemnation of “double inspiration.” Dr Ruckman continues.

“2 Timothy 3:16. The process of “inspiration” is the Holy Spirit breathing His words through somebody’s mouth (2 Pet. 1:21; see also note on Job 32:8) and those words then being written down...God can inspire a copy that doesn’t match the original (see note on Jer. 36:32), and He can certainly inspire a translation...”

See Dr Gipp’s analyses of inspired copies and translations in **Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print** and in the *Introductory Remarks* above.

See also this author’s summary⁸⁰ of Dr Ruckman’s explanation of inspiration.

Analyses of several Old Testament passages also give valuable insight into inspiration of a translation such as the AV1611.

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. And the saying pleased the king and the princes; and the king did according to the word of Memucan: 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 8:8, 9

"Write ye also for the Jews, as it liketh you, in the king's name, and seal it with the king's ring: for the writing which is written in the king's name, and sealed with the king's ring, may no man reverse. Then were the king's scribes called at that time in the third month, that is, the month Sivan, on the three and twentieth day thereof; and it was written according to all that Mordecai commanded unto the Jews, and to the lieutenants, and the deputies and rulers of the provinces which are from India unto Ethiopia, an hundred twenty and seven provinces, unto every province according to the writing thereof, and unto every people after their language, and to the Jews according to their writing, and according to their language."

See Ecclesiastes 8:4 above and Dr Smith's statement that "As the King's speech, which he uttereth in Parliament, being translated into French, Dutch, Italian, and Latin, is still the King's speech..." together with related comments in **Dr Waite and 'Originals Only' Inspiration.**

These passages from Esther establish that *"the word of a king"* Ecclesiastes 8:4 and *"the king's decree"* are undiminished in their power and authority, as conferred by the seal of *"the king's ring"* when translated and put into writing *"in the king's name"* by *"the king's scribes...unto every people after their language."*

Note that *"the writing which is written in the king's name"* went *"to the Jews according to their writing, and according to their language."*

With respect to the Jews, *"unto them were committed the oracles of God"* Romans 3:2.

As the Jews received *"the writing which is written in the king's name,"* so did *"every people after their language."*

After the Jews received *"the oracles of God,"* so could *"every people after their language."*

The above principles could apply to any language, whether it existed at the time of the events of the Book of Esther, or not, Psalm 33:11.

"The counsel of the LORD standeth for ever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations."

Therefore, in accordance with the above principles, the *"wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ,"* were received in English from the *"King of kings, and Lord of lords"* 1 Timothy 6:3, 15 via the ministry of *"the king's scribes"* who assembled in 1604 *"in the king's name"* according to *"the king's decree."*

As Paine⁸¹ writes, this author's emphases, *"As soon as James showed approval of Rainolds' proposal, the ambitious Bishop Bancroft...prepared to carry out the royal will with zeal and dispatch...[to choose] the men to work on a proposal...which the royal will had now raised to a splendid design. Tyndale's prayer was now answered in full: James I had ordered what Tyndale died to do.*

"Fervent for what his master wished, Bancroft wrote to an aide: "I...move you in his majesty's name that, agreeably to the charge and trust committed unto you, no time may be overstepped by you for the better furtherance of this holy work...You will scarcely conceive how earnest his majesty is to have this work begun."

"This holy work" emerged in 1611 as the Authorized King James Holy Bible, with power and authority *"in the king's name"* and as much *"all scripture...given by inspiration of*

God” as any texts in “*the Original Sacred Tongues*” that preceded it. See **Dr Waite and Dr Mrs Riplinger – Preliminary Observations.**

The following scriptures reinforce that conclusion.

Daniel 4:1, 2

“Nebuchadnezzar the king, unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth; Peace be multiplied unto you. I thought it good to shew the signs and wonders that the high God hath wrought toward me.”

Daniel 5:25-28

“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 6:25, 26

“Then king Darius wrote unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth; Peace be multiplied unto you. I make a decree, That in every dominion of my kingdom men tremble and fear before the God of Daniel: for he is the living God, and stedfast for ever, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, and his dominion shall be even unto the end.”

All three passages were first written in Aramaic⁸² and form part of “*the holy scriptures*” 2 Timothy 3:15.

Daniel 4:1, 2 and 6:25, 26 are “*the word of a king*” and are delivered *in writing* “*unto all people, nations, and languages.*” These passages will be just as much “*the word of a king*” and part of “*the holy scriptures*” in whatever languages they are received. See remarks on the principles set out in the passages from Esther above. Note that the only time “*the king’s word*” could be changed was *through the direct intervention* of “*the Son of God,*” Who is the “**KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS**” Proverbs 30:4, Daniel 3:25, 28, 1 Timothy 6:15, Revelation 17:14, 19:16. *His* words, consisting of the 1611 English Holy Bible, *won’t* change, Matthew 24:35.

“Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.”

The same is true of the “*wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ*” from the “**King of kings, and Lord of lords**” 1 Timothy 6:3, 15 when these were received in English in 1611, as the 1611 English Holy Bible. The same is true now.

Daniel 5:25-28 is a striking example of a *written* Hebrew original, translated or interpreted verbally into Aramaic and recorded as part of “*the holy scriptures.*” Translation, or interpretation of the words by Daniel was necessary because “*all the king’s wise men...could not read the writing, nor make known to the king the interpretation thereof*” Daniel 5:8. Clearly the *written* translated version was just as much part of “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God*” as the written Hebrew original.

Once again, the same is true of the “*wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ*” from the “**King of kings, and Lord of lords**” 1 Timothy 6:3, 15 when these were received in English in 1611, as the 1611 English Holy Bible and as they are now.

Dr Waite may, of course, argue that an Aramaic translation may be inspired because it is one of “*the Original Sacred Tongues*” but then he would again be faced with “*double inspiration,*” which he vehemently denies. See comments on Acts 21:40 in **Dr Waite and the Im-**

aginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print and comments above on Dr Waite’s comments on PP. 84-85 of his book.

“*Double inspiration,*” however, is not a problem for a Bible believer. It is, as Dr Ruckman shows in his comments on Jeremiah 36:32 above, “***sound doctrine***” (*1 Tim. 1:10, 2 Tim. 4:3, Tit. 1:9, 2:1*).”

As “***sound doctrine,***” Daniel 5:27 appears to this author to be imparting a sound warning to Dr Waite’s *WARNING!!*

“TEKEL; Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting.”

Testimonies to the Inspiration of the AV1611

The following testimonies have been drawn from a wide variety of witnesses, not all of whom are Bible believers or even Christians. It is this author's firm conviction that they are nevertheless all trustworthy witnesses to ***“the scripture of truth”*** Daniel 10:21 in the form of the 1611 English Holy Bible. They constitute a formidable array of adversaries for Dr Waite to overcome.

His denial that the 1611 English Holy Bible is even a Holy Bible should be kept in mind as the following witness statements are read.

P. 36 *“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 after they have given account at ***“the judgment seat of Christ”*** Romans 14:10.

2 Corinthians 13:1 should also be kept in mind when reading the following witness statements.

“In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established.”

Many more than the scriptural minimum of witnesses have been listed below, the first from an unlikely source.

“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 Shaw⁸³.

Yet another distinguished witness, William Lyon Phelps⁸⁴, Lampson Professor of English Literature at Yale University, said this.

“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.

“Now as the English-speaking people have the best Bible in the world, and as it is the most beautiful monument ever erected with the English alphabet, we ought to make the most of it, for it is an incomparably rich inheritance, free to all who can read. This means that we ought invariably in the church and on public occasions to use the Authorized Version; all others are inferior. And, except for special purposes, it should be used exclusively in private reading. Why make constant companions of the second best, when the best is available?”

Contemporary English historian David Starkey⁸⁵ is no supporter of Christian belief but he has said this about the 1611 Authorized Holy Bible.

“The King James Version of the bible, more than any other book, formed the English language and shaped the English mind.”

As indicated in **Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print**, Charles Haddon Spurgeon⁸⁶ made the following remarkable statements in his final address to his fellow pastors, given in April 1891. He refers to the AV1611 as *“the volume of inspiration.”* Spurgeon's testimony is not without alloy, see second paragraph below but he leaves the reader in no doubt about the inspiration of the 1611 English Holy Bible. Emphases are this author's.

“OUR ARMOURY...is to me...**THE BIBLE**. To us Holy Scripture is as “the tower of David builded for an armoury, whereon there hang a thousand bucklers, all shields of mighty men.” If we want weapons we must come here for them, and here only. Whether we seek the sword of offence or the shield of defence, we must find it within **the volume of inspiration**. If others have any other storehouse, I confess at once I have none. I have nothing else to preach when I have got through with **this book**. Indeed, I can have no wish to preach at all if I may not continue to expound the subjects which I find in **these pages**. What else is worth preaching?...

“**Let us quote the words as they stand in the best possible translation**, and it will be better still if we know the original, and can tell if our version fails to give the sense. How much mischief may arise out of an accidental alteration of the Word!...”

No examples are given but Spurgeon continues.

“We are resolved, then, to use more fully than ever what God has provided for us in **this Book**, for we are sure of its inspiration. Let me say that over again. **WE ARE SURE OF ITS INSPIRATION**. You will notice that attacks are frequently made as against verbal inspiration. The form chosen is a mere pretext. **Verbal inspiration is the verbal form of the assault, but the attack is really aimed at inspiration itself**. You will not read far in the essay before you will find that the gentleman who started with contesting a theory of inspiration which none of us ever held, winds up by showing his hand, and **that hand wages war with inspiration itself**. There is the true point. We care little for any theory of inspiration: in fact, we have none. **To us the plenary verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture is fact**, and not hypothesis. It is a pity to theorize upon a subject which is deeply mysterious, and makes a demand upon faith rather than fancy. **Believe in the inspiration of Scripture**, and believe it in the most intense sense. **You will not believe in a truer and fuller inspiration than really exists**. No one is likely to err in that direction, even if error be possible. **If you adopt theories which pare off a portion here, and deny authority to a passage there, you will at last have no inspiration left, worthy of the name.**”

Spurgeon was no doubt denouncing the RV reading of 2 Timothy 3:16, “Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching...” that opens the door to uninspired scripture (which Dr Waite sheared off its hinges with his denunciation of the entire AV1611 as emphatically not “given by inspiration of God”) but note that he still believed in the inspiration of “this Book,” his fixation with “the original” notwithstanding.

Spurgeon⁸⁷ also said this of the 1611 English Holy Bible, this author’s emphases.

“**The Bible is God’s word**, and when I see it, I seem to hear a voice saying, ‘**I am the Book of God, man, read me; I am God’s writing: open my leaves, for I was penned by God**’...I plead with you, I beg of you, respect your Bibles, and search them out. Go home and read your Bibles...**O Book of books! And wast thou written by my God? Then I will bow before thee, thou Book of vast authority! For He has written this Book Himself**...let us love it, let us count it more precious than fine gold!”

Dr Scrivener⁸⁸ has this interesting observation, this author’s emphases.

“Yet John Seldon, who was twenty-seven years old in 1611, and must have had means of information not open to us, is represented in his Table Talk (p. 6) as speaking thus: “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 – as the Apocrypha to Andrew Downes” [Regius Professor of Greek, 1585-1625]. He adds moreover this interesting piece of information, to whatever part of the work it may apply: “Then they met together, and **one read the translation, the rest holding in their hands some Bible**, either of the learned tongues, or French

[Olivetan, 1535, The Pastors, 1588], Spanish [Pinel 1553, De Reyna 1569, the Valencia Bible of 1478 revised by De Valera 1602], Italian [Bruccioli 1532?, or more probably Diodati 1607], &c. **If they found any fault, they spoke; if not, he read on.**”

This procedure could be perceived as “**the plenary verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture**” in the form of the AV1611.

As 2 Samuel 23:2 states, “**The spirit of the LORD spake by me, and his word was upon my tongue.**”

Veteran biblical researcher and translator David Norris⁸⁹ 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.”

Dr Ruckman⁹⁰ makes this observation about the man who was arguably England’s greatest revival preacher and soul-winner.

“Nearly all the historians agree that John Wesley was a great preacher and that he was the prime instrument in turning the English nation from a bloody revolution similar to the terrible catastrophe that befell Catholic France (1789-1790). But having noted this, the writers all contract “typewriter paralysis”...and fail to notice HOW John Wesley accomplished this...You may as well face it: John Wesley saved England from a revolution by street preaching from a King James 1611 Authorized Version...”

“Wesley’s life and preaching were ruled by one Book, even though he translated some on his own. That one Book was his final authority in all matters of faith, preaching, doctrine and practice...”

The distinguished church historian the Rev J.C. Ryle⁹¹ writes as follows about the 18th century revivals that God brought about in the British Isles through the ministries of Whitfield, Wesley and others.

“My object in drawing up these papers was to bring before the public in a comprehensive form the lives, characters, and work of the leading ministers by whose agency God was pleased to revive Christianity in England a hundred years ago...I thought that the Church and the world ought to know something more than they seem to know about such men as Whitefield, Wesley, Romaine, Rowlands, Grimshaw, Berridge, Venn, Toplady, Hervey, Walker and Fletcher...”

Ryle describes how God enabled these men to effect revival, his emphasis, citing in the final statement quoted Wesley’s preface to his volume of sermons.

“I believe firmly that, excepting Luther and his Continental contemporaries and our own martyred Reformers, the world has seen no such men since the days of the apostles. I believe there have been none who have preached so much clear scriptural truth, none who have lived such lives, none who have shown such courage in Christ’s service, none who have suffered so much for the truth, none who have done so much good. If any can name better men, he knows more than I do...”

*“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.”

““I want to know one thing – the way to heaven – how to land safe on that happy shore. God Himself has condescended to teach the way; for this very end He came from heaven. He hath written it down in a book. Oh, give me that book! At any price give me the book of God! I have it: here is knowledge enough for me. Let me be a man of one book.””

It would be easy to answer the question “*Which Bible?*” in this context. Some critics would complain that Ryle’s statement is misleading because Wesley compiled his own New Testament. See Dr Ruckman’s comment above and this author’s earlier work⁹² for an answer to this objection. God ignored Wesley’s translation but blessed his ministry when he met the conditions Ryle outlined above. The Bible believer should take careful note of Psalm 138:2, therefore.

“For thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name.”

Conclusions

Dr Waite denies throughout his book *A WARNING!!* that the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible is *“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”* 2 Timothy 3:16. He does so by dogmatically insisting that the expression *“is given”* refers only to a once-only inspiration that applies solely to the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek original texts and never to translations.

However, inspection of the scriptures shows that the expression *“is given”* can apply to repeated actions in 22 of its 33 occurrences and if *“all scripture...is profitable”* now, such that *“the man of God may be perfect”* 2 Timothy 3:16, 17 now, then inspiration has to apply to translations, for the sake of *“the very vulgar,”* who are unlearned in *“the Original Sacred Tongues,”* according to Dr Miles Smith who wrote *The Translators to the Reader*. Nothing in 2 Timothy 3:16 precludes inspiration of translations, especially in view of the numerous examples of such inspiration contained in the scriptures, such as John 19:19, 20 where ‘inspired’ scripture is written in Latin, as well as in Hebrew and Greek. See **Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print.**

Dr Waite denies what he terms *“double inspiration”* but inspection of Jeremiah 36 shows that *“double inspiration”* is in reality *“sound doctrine”* 1 Timothy 1:10. Inspection of Esther 1:20-22, 8:8, 9, Daniel 4:1, 2, 5:25-28, 6:25, 26 confirm that *“the king’s word”* 2 Samuel 24:4 from *“the King of kings”* 1 Timothy 6:15 is still *“the king’s word”* when translated into other languages and remains *“the King’s speech,”* as Dr Smith notes, which in the case of *“the scripture of truth”* Daniel 10:21 is undiminished in inspiration, power and authority in translation into the 1611 English Holy Bible and, if anything, is enhanced, 2 Samuel 3:10, Colossians 1:13, Hebrews 11:5. See **Dr Waite and the KJB not “given by inspiration of God,”** *Introductory Remarks* and *The “not “inspired by God” AV1611.*

Dr Waite insists that he has an inspired Holy Bible in the form of the original Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek texts but he does not identify it any further than stating that it underlies the King James Bible. This is a bizarre situation in that, according to Dr Waite, an ‘uninspired’ Text, the AV1611, therefore becomes the determinant of the content of an ‘inspired’ text, which certainly elevates the AV1611 to a position of considerable importance. See **Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’.**

Dr Waite does identify specific Hebrew and Greek texts, namely Ben Chayyim’s, Scrivener’s and Beza’s but he never refers to them as inspired. It follows, therefore that Dr Waite’s perfect, inspired Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Holy Bible exists only in his mind and prompts reflection on Proverbs 26:12.

“Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit? there is more hope of a fool than of him.”

The same remarks apply to Dr Waite’s colleague, Dr Kirk DiVietro, who has undertaken to refute Dr Mrs Riplinger’s work *Hazardous Materials* in a book entitled *Cleaning Up Hazardous Materials*. Inspection of Dr DiVietro’s treatment of the term *OINOS* *“wine”* and *BAPTIZO*, *“baptize”* and his exposition of John 11:33, where he has relied on ‘the Greek,’ reveals that ‘the Greek’ has led Dr DiVietro astray. Dr DiVitero’s work is mentioned because it is hoped that a more comprehensive response to it will be compiled, DV.

Finally, Dr Waite’s insistence that the 1611 English Holy Bible is uninspired is soundly refuted by the testimonies of several distinguished witnesses who were either past masters of literary works or greatly used of God, or both.

As one of the most prominent of all of God’s servants of all time once said,

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

Appendix 1 – Additional Insights, from P. O. Heisey

Author’s Introductory Note

Long-term Bible researcher and missionary, Mr Peter Heisey, has kindly forwarded his insights with respect to Dr Waite’s criticisms of the 1611 English Holy Bible as *“all scripture...given by inspiration of God”* 2 Timothy 3:16.

Mr Heisey’s insights follow in **blue bold**, set out in the context of this work where he inserted them. Ellipses denote breaks in the text.

Introduction...

P. 87 *“(Quoting Dr Alan O’Reilly), “I believe it is the subject of why all this has blown up, right on the heels of the publication of Hazardous Materials. If I understand correctly, you believe, as I do that the AV1611 is the pure word of God, given by inspiration of God, II Timothy 3:16,17 and the perfectly preserved word of God in its final (7) purified state, Psalm 12:6,7...I get the impression that the Waites don’t altogether share that stance.”*

“Sad to say, Dr O’Reilly partakes in the HERESY of Gail Ludwig Latessa Kaleda Riplinger as they both say the “AV1611” was “given by inspiration of God II Timothy 3:16, 17.” He is right that the “Waites don’t altogether share that stance.” Only the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words were “given by inspiration of God” or “God-breathed.” No translation (including the AV1611) was given by verbal plenary inspiration.”

The problems with Dr Waite’s position here are:

- 1. This is pure presupposition on Dr Waite’s part.**
- 2. How does Dr Waite KNOW FOR SURE that “no translation (including the AV1611 was [sic = “is”] given by inspiration of God”)?**
- 3. Dr Waite’s God is too small and weak if He cannot provide an inerrant, infallible, inspired translation (Luke 1:37 with Psalm 12:6-7; with Timothy 3:15-16).**
- 4. There are numerous Bible examples of translations which are inspired – see later in this work.**

“The “AV 1611” was most definitely not “given by inspiration of God.” It included the Apocrypha with all of its false doctrines and beliefs. Surely God did not give those words.”

This is a ‘straw man’ as is shown later in this work. The issue is the TEXT of the Old and New Testaments of the AV. The Apocrypha was never considered part of the TEXT of the AV1611...

For if, as Dr Waite asserts, God’s ‘original’ Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words underlying the AV1611 are no longer *“given by inspiration of God”* once they are changed into another form* by translation, then they no longer have *“the life of God”* Ephesians 4:18 and cannot be said to be *“the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever”* 1 Peter 1:23.

The logical consequence of Waite’s position is stated by none other than himself on p. 235 [1996 Edition] of *Defending The King James Bible* where he says, “It follows that that which is not God-breathed is not profitable. It’s only that which God has breathed out in Hebrew or Greek that is His Word...” (Emphases are Waite’s.) Thus, since the King James Bible is not given by inspiration of God, it is not profitable (2 Timothy 3:15-17) nor is it correct or sufficient spiritual food for spiritual living (Matthew 4:4; Luke 4:4)...

Appendix 1, Continued

Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration...

It should be especially noted that Dr Waite has not said explicitly *where* “*the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Old and New Testaments*” that he says are ““*inspired*”” may be found *independently* of the AV1611.

This omission of Dr Waite’s is a serious one, as will be shown and he appears to be trying to mask this omission by specifying certain published copies of the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Biblical words that he has *now*. Under-linings are this author’s.

Dr Waite equivocates on the matter because at times he says these published copies are exact copies of the exact words of the original Biblical books, and yet at other times says that they are merely “*the closest*”.

P. 51 “I “*promote*” the *Ben Chayyim Hebrew Text* and the *Scrivener’s Greek text*. I believe the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible are “**God’s preserved originals.**””

Jacob Ben Chayyim and Frederick Scrivener were both *men*, so the only Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek copies that Dr Waite has identified are, like translations, made “*by men.*”

Observe closely therefore that Dr Waite does not say *explicitly* in the above quote (or anywhere else in his book that *these* published texts are “*the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Old and New Testaments*” or ““**God’s preserved originals**”” that are ““*inspired.*”” See later section entitled **Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’**.

Author’s note. As Mr Heisey points out, Dr Waite does say on p. 28 that he believes Scrivener to be “*copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words.*” However, he does *not* say that Scrivener’s copy of ‘the Greek’ is inspired and he should, if he believes, as he appears to that inspiration must apply to copies of “the... *original Greek Words.*” See **Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’**. Mr Heisey continues.

Dr Waite does say that he believes that Scrivener is a copy “*of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words*” (p. 28). Dr Waite has in other places indicated that he realized that Scrivener’s words were not exactly the words which underlie the King James Bible in a small but significant number of places. This is confirmed by his saying that Scrivener is “*the closest*” (p. 52). This is double talk. If Scrivener needs correcting, as Dr Waite has indicated, then Scrivener cannot be a copy of “*the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words*” of the original New Testament books. **IF, on the other hand, Scrivener is indeed the copy “*of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words*”, then Dr Waite needs to retract his statements that Scrivener is not correct in some places and that Scrivener is merely “*the closest*”. An additional problem is that Dr Waite has indicated that his TR “*is made up exclusively of the exact Words underlying the KJB.*” And that he would like for the English and the Greek to be united or matched exactly and precisely. If that is indeed Dr Waite’s belief, then he has clearly misspoken when he says that Scrivener’s words are “*copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words*”. Dr Waite can’t have it both ways. Scrivener doesn’t precisely and exactly match the readings or wordings (texts) used by the King James translators in producing the AV1611. So either Scrivener is right and the King James Bible is wrong (has errors), or the KJB (and its exact underlying texts/readings) is right and Scrivener is wrong. Scrivener can’t be merely “*closest*” and at the same time be a copy of the exact “*Words*” of the original New Testament books. Dr Waite needs to clearly answer the question as to whether there are**

errors in Scrivener or not, as well as whether there are errors in the King James Bible or not. His usual response of “*I haven’t found any*” will not do, unless he wishes to admit to his lack of study on the matter, since upwards of 40 differences between Scrivener and the readings underlying the King James Bible have already been called to his attention by Dr Mrs Riplinger...

For now, it appears that Dr Waite’s position on “*scripture*” is that although inspiration happened only once, with respect to the original words of scripture, *copies* of the original Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Biblical words nevertheless are “*inspired*” but translations are not. The “*inspired*” Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Biblical words evidently underlie the AV1611 but Dr Waite has not identified the copies that are their source because the only published Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek texts he has identified (Ben Chayyim’s, Scrivener’s and Beza’s) were, like translations, made “*by men*” and Dr Waite has not stated explicitly that these published texts are “*inspired*” any more than the AV1611 Translation.

Dr Waite has stated that these published texts are only “*the closest*” (p. 52), though admittedly he contradicts himself by saying on p. 28 that they (Scrivener in particular) are copies “*of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words*”...

Dr Waite’s objection that “*is given*” is not in ‘the Greek’ begs the question of whether the rendering in English is in fact a superior translation *idiomatically*. As none other than Dean Burgon⁹³ himself said of Westcott and Hort’s Revised Version, “*“The schoolboy method of translation is therein exhibited in constant operation throughout. We are never permitted to believe that we are in the company of scholars...the idiomatic rendering of a Greek author into English is a higher achievement by far...”*”

Furthermore, Dr Waite’s objection begs the additional question: “*How does he [Dr Waite] KNOW FOR SURE that it “does not appear in the Greek New Testament that God gave us”*”? The truth is that only the word “*is*” is in italics, not the word “*given*”. That Scrivener doesn’t have it is obvious. But as has been demonstrated in Dr Mrs Riplinger’s books, Scrivener does not match the readings underlying the King James Bible in every situation...

P. 59 “*This is what I have always believed. The Scripture in 2 Timothy 3:16, PASA GRAPHE THEOPNEUSTOS, “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.” This literally means “all Scripture is God-breathed.” GRAPHE refers to the Old Testament Hebrew and Aramaic Words (and, by extension, the New Testament Greek Words). This word has nothing whatsoever to do with any **translation**, whether in English, Spanish, Italian or any other language.*”

Here Dr Waite does what any critic of the AV1611 does⁹⁴. He changes its words to suit his own “*private interpretation*,” just like Eve did, Genesis 2:16, 17, 3:2, 3. He then denies that any believer can have access to the scriptures unless he is conversant with Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. In so doing, Dr Waite 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. God hates this doctrine because it implies that faithful, vernacular translations like the AV1611 are *not* Holy Bibles. See the comments of Dr Miles Smith below.

Dr Waite’s statement begs two significant questions.

1. **How does he KNOW FOR SURE that Timothy only had Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek copies in his hands?**

2. How does he [Dr Waite] KNOW FOR SURE that Timothy was fluent in Hebrew and Aramaic (especially given the fact that Timothy wasn't even circumcised until later in life)?

P. 88 *"The Words of God ARE the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Words. In the subtitle of my book, DEFENDING THE KING JAMES BIBLE, I call it "GOD'S WORDS KEPT INTACT IN ENGLISH." Psalm 12:6-7 does not refer to the King James Bible, but to the Hebrew and Aramaic Words (and, by extension, to the Greek N.T. Words). English was not even in existence then."*

The subtitle of Dr Waite's book is misleading. The above comment shows that it should read *GOD'S WORDS KEPT **INTERRED** IN ENGLISH.* See comments on the woolly mammoths in the **Introduction.**

Dr Waite does not seem to understand the meaning of the word "intact" – "untouched by any harm, complete". The definition of the word itself when used in describing the Bible argues for the inerrancy and even possible inspiration of the King James Bible, though Dr Waite would reject the usage of those two terms as being able to be used of the KJB...

Appendix 1, Continued

Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print...

P. 28 *“My **“Holy Bible”** is God’s fully **“inspired”** original Words of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, rather than Gail Riplinger’s King James Bible. Though it is an accurate, true, and reliable translation, it is not **“inspired by God.”** It is not **“God-breathed,”** therefore it cannot accurately be termed **“inspired.”** She holds a serious theological **HERESY** by her erroneous view of **“inspiration by God.”**”*

Note that Dr Waite again effectively denies that the AV1611 is in fact scripture. This denial will be addressed in more detail under **Dr Waite and the KJB not “given by inspiration of God.”**

Dr Waite seems not to know the meaning of the terms “accurate”, “true”, and “reliable”, since even a cursory look at the dictionaries (Webster’s 1828, for example) will reveal that all three terms either mean or imply “inerrant” (a term he is unwilling to apply to the King James Bible)...

Appendix 1, Continued

Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’...

P. 52 *“I firmly believe that I have the original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.”*

For the good of us all, Dr Waite should state clearly, directly, and plainly just where those “Words” can be obtained...

P. 66 *“I don’t **“unwisely”** use Scrivener’s Greek New Testament. I believe those are the preserved Words of the original New Testament.”*

The strange thing about the foregoing statement is that Dr Waite in other places indicates that Scrivener is merely “the closest”. Additionally, Dr Waite has indicated to others that he believes Scrivener needs to be corrected in some 25-30 places, thus contradicting the fact that Scrivener’s Greek New Testament could be “the preserved Words of the original New Testament”...

Returning to Dr Waite’s above comment on “the original, *inspired*, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek” and considering for now that Dr Waite *does* have these words, even if in an as yet undisclosed source, the bizarre situation alluded to above is as follows.

The situation can be illustrated with respect to “Scrivener’s Greek New Testament...[which is] the preserved Words of the original New Testament,” according to Dr Waite. His pertinent statements with respect to “the original, *inspired*, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in...Greek” for the New Testament are summarised as follows. Under-linings are this author’s.

Once again, the strange thing about the foregoing statement is that Dr Waite in other places indicates that Scrivener is merely “the closest”. Additionally, Dr Waite has indicated to others that he believes Scrivener needs to be corrected in some 25-30 places, thus contradicting the fact that Scrivener’s Greek New Testament could be “the preserved Words of the original New Testament”.

P. 2 *“I believe that God inspired and breathed-out the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Old and New Testaments. I believe this miraculous event **happened only once and was never repeated. Especially was this inspiration never repeated in any translation in the past, in the present, or in the future.**”*

It seems that Dr Waite means here that even exact copies of those “Words” would not be “inspired” or “breathed out” by God, though elsewhere he seems to admit that it is possible for those exact copies to be considered inspired (another set of Dr Waite’s contradictory declarations). See Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration.

P. 28 *“My **“Holy Bible”** is God’s fully **“inspired”** original Words of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, rather than Gail Riplinger’s *King James Bible*. Though it is an accurate, true, and reliable translation, it is not **“inspired by God.”**”*

Of course Dr Waite wouldn’t even say it is “inerrant”, yet each one of those three words (if the dictionaries are to be understood as they stand), “accurate,” “true,” and “reliable”, all either mean or imply “inerrant” or “without mistake”.

See Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print.

P. 87 *“No translation (including the AV1611) was given by verbal plenary inspiration. The “AV 1611” was most definitely not **“given by inspiration of God.”**”*

See **Introduction**.

P. 28 *“I believe the Words in this [Scrivener’s] **“Greek New Testament”** to be accurate copies of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved, original Greek Words.”*

Yet Dr Waite has indicated to others that he believes Scrivener needs to be corrected in some 25-30 places, thus contradicting the fact that Scrivener’s Greek New Testament could be *“the preserved Words of the original New Testament”*.

P. 89 *“The Dean Burgon Society (DBS) does stand for Scrivener’s Greek text as the preserved original Greek Words.”*

Yet Dr Waite, as head of DBS, has indicated to others that he believes Scrivener needs to be corrected in some 25-30 places, thus contradicting the fact that Scrivener’s Greek New Testament could be *“the preserved Words of the original New Testament”*.

P. 32 *“When I preach God’s Words, I do not criticize or change the English King James Bible. I illuminate and give many other acceptable and accurate meanings that the translators could have written down.”* See **Dr Waite and Dr Mrs Riplinger – Preliminary Observations**.

P. 51 *“I believe the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible are “God’s preserved originals.””*

Yet these words are different from those of Scrivener and thus Dr Waite contradicts what he says above from PP. 28 and 89.

P. 52 *“I firmly believe that I have the original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.”*

Pray tell, Dr Waite, WHERE are they so that others may get a copy?

P. 52 *“It is true that Scrivener’s Greek Text is the closest to the KJB.”*

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.”*

P. 82 *“I believe that the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Bible have been preserved and are those which underlie the King James Bible. They are still in existence and available from the BIBLE FOR TODAY in Scrivener’s Annotated Greek New Testament...and in the Masoretic Hebrew/King James Parallel Bible.”*

In sum, from the above, according to Dr Waite:

1. The original, *inspired* Greek words of the New Testament are available today (Dr Waite has them).
2. Inspiration happened only once and was never repeated.
3. Scrivener’s Greek text is not referred to as inspired by Dr Waite.
4. However, Scrivener’s text is an accurate copy of the original, inspired Greek words of the New Testament that are also inerrant and infallible.

Scrivener’s words *“are those which underlie the King James Bible”* (P. 82). The problem here is that Dr Waite well knows and has admitted that Scrivener’s words are in fact NOT the words *“which underlie the King James Bible”* (see,

for example, what he has said on P. 52 and the resultant numbers 6 and 7 below). This point (4) does not match with points 6 and 7 below.

5. These Greek words underlie the AV1611 New Testament.
6. Neither the English words of the AV1611 New Testament nor their underlying Greek equivalents should be changed.
7. Scrivener's text is the closest to the Greek words underlying the AV1611 New Testament.
8. The AV1611 English words are not inspired but they are an accurate translation of the original, inspired Greek words of the New Testament.

The following observations have been deduced from the above.

Points 1 and 2 clearly conflict but assuming that Point 1 prevails, Dr Waite's source for the original, inspired Greek words of the New Testament is unknown because he does not identify any published Greek New Testament as inspired, not even Scrivener's. See Point 3.

Points 4 and 7 clearly conflict but Dr Mrs Riplinger's work resolves the conflict.

Dr Waite may despise Dr Mrs Riplinger and her research but he cannot deny that in Chapter 18 of her book *Hazardous Materials* she does reveal that "*Scrivener's Greek Text*" is not "*the...Greek Words underlying the King James Bible.*" Dr Mrs Riplinger states that Scrivener followed Beza's 1598 5th Edition in 59 verses *against* the AV1611. She lists and analyses 52 of them, showing Greek support for 24, where Scrivener had supposed that the King James translators had only Latin sources. Dr Mrs Riplinger also documents 20 errors in Scrivener's Greek text, e.g. in Mark 2:15, where Scrivener replaces the first "**Jesus**" with "*he.*"

Point 4, therefore, cannot be valid because Dr Mrs Riplinger has shown that Scrivener's text is *not* the full Greek text underlying the AV1611.

As Dr Mrs Riplinger also states, it is not sufficient to dismiss Scrivener's departures from the AV1611 Greek equivalent New Testament as inconsequential because they are few in number. The errors in Scrivener's text and its departures from the AV1611 that Dr Mrs Riplinger has revealed invalidate any claim to inerrancy and infallibility for this text.

It also shows that Scrivener's text is NOT the exact text or readings underlying the AV1611 and it is not the "*preserved original Greek Words*" of the original New Testament books...

Yet Dr Waite gives no indication of whether Dr Scrivener's departures from both Beza's text and the AV1611 were God-guided, yielding "*the original, inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Words of God in...Greek*" that Dr Waite purports to have. Under-linings and emphasis are this author's. The reader still does not know the source of Dr Waite's 'inspired' Greek text.

Unless of course Dr Waite uses the ['uninspired', not inerrant, etc.] AV1611 to determine the exact Greek text and thus correct Scrivener...

In sum, the following points have emerged from this section with respect to Dr Waite's attitude to inspiration of the scriptures.

Author's note. Two of the points only have been reproduced here.

1. Dr Waite has still not disclosed his sources for the original *inspired* Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words of scripture available today. These include the lexicons that he in-

sists he uses and are not “*corrupt*,” P. 27, but he fails to specify them. See remarks in **Dr Waite and Dr Mrs Riplinger – Preliminary Observations.**

2. Dr Waite has specified some Hebrew and Greek texts available today, i.e. Ben Chayyim’s, Beza’s and Scrivener’s but he has *not* said that they are inspired, only the “*preserved*” original Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words of scripture.

But then he turns around and denies this by saying that Scrivener is merely the closest and in other places has said that Scrivener needs correcting...

Appendix 1, Continued

Dr Waite and the KJB not “given by inspiration of God”

Introductory Remarks...

P. 3 “This **HERESY** view is held by Gail Riplinger, Peter Ruckman, and many of their followers. What is this view? This **HERESY** view believes that in 1611, when the King James Bible was published, (contrary to all truth and Biblical doctrine) God performed a “**second inspiration.**””

Dr Waite cannot and should not be believed merely on his ‘say-so’ (see Acts 17:10-11). He has not proven that a “second inspiration” is “heresy” and has not wrestled with the biblical texts involving such nuances (see what follows by Gipp, for example).

P. 3 “Because of this, their so-called verbal plenary inspiration of the King James Bible supplants the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words given by God Himself as inferior and exalts the verbal plenary inspiration of the King James Bible as superior.”

On Dr Waite’s part, we see here a practical denial of the Bible doctrine of the priesthood of every believer. If the King James Bible is not God’s inspired words, then the believer who is not fluent in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek is at the ‘mercy’ of individuals like Dr Waite to tell them the ‘real’ meaning of words, verses, and scriptural teaching. This is the height of ‘cardinalism’ and ‘popishness’ on Dr Waite’s part. It is quite evident, practically speaking, that for those who are not fluent in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, but do know English, that the King James Bible ‘supplants’ the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. This is the logical necessity for those who do not know fluently those languages...

Appendix 1, Continued

Dr Waite and the KJB not “given by inspiration of God”

The ‘not ““perfect””’ AV1611

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.”

Dr Waite’s unbiblical presuppositions come to the fore clearly here. He says, “I do not BELIEVE...”[POH’s emphasis, not Dr Waite’s]. Dr Waite does not think it is correct to use any of those words of ANY translation in ANY language of the world, including the AV1611 King James Bible. The corollary to that is that the King James Bible is not the preserved words of God in English, is uninspired, has errors, is imperfect and impure. And speaking of strict definitions, Dr Waite clearly does not understand the meanings of the three terms he DOES use to describe the King James Bible: (from Webster’s 1828):

“true” = true is opposed to false; Genuine; pure; real; not counterfeit, adulterated or false; Free from falsehood; Exact; right to precision; conformable to a rule or pattern; as a true copy; a true likeness of the original. “reliable” = adjective that can be relied on; dependable; trustworthy Webster’s New World College Dictionary Copyright © 2010 by Wiley Publishing, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio. Used by arrangement with John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Capable of being relied on; dependable: a reliable assistant; a reliable car. Yielding the same or compatible results in different clinical experiments or statistical trials. The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, 4th edition Copyright © 2010 by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company. Published by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

138 Moby Thesaurus words for “reliable”: absolute, accurate, adducible, admissible, apposite, attestative, attested, attestive, authentic, authenticated, balanced, based on, believable, calculable, certain, circumstantial, circumstantiated, cogent, colorable, compelling, conceivable, conclusive, confirmed, conscientious, convincing, cool, credible, cumulative, damning, decisive, dependable, determinative, documentary, documented, evidential, evidentiary, ex parte, eye-witness, factual, fail-safe, faithful, faithworthy, fast, fiducial, fiduciary, final, firm, firm as Gibraltar, firsthand, founded on, grounded on, guaranteed, harmless, hearsay, honest, honorable, imperturbable, implicit, in equilibrium, incontrovertible, incorruptible, indicative, indisputable, inerrable, inerrant, infallible, invincible, inviolable, invulnerable, irrefutable, irresistible, material, meaningful, nuncupative, overwhelming, plausible, predictable, presumptive, principled, probative, proven, punctilious, reputable, responsible, riskless, safe, secure, significant, solid, sound, stable, staunch, steadfast, steady, straight, substantial, suggestive, sure, surefire, symptomatic, telling, tenable, tested, to be trusted, tried, tried and true, true, trustable, trusted, trustworthy, trusty, undangerous, unerring, unexceptionable, unfailing, unfalse, unflappable, unflinching, unhazardous, unimpeachable, unperfidious, unperilous, unprecarious, unquestionable, unrisky, unshakable, untreacherous, unwavering, valid, validated, verified, warranted, weighty, well-balanced, well-founded, well-grounded, without nerves, worthy of faith [Emphases added]. “accurate” (From Webster’s 1828) = In exact conformity to truth, or to a standard or rule, or to a model; free from failure, error, or defect; as an accurate account; accurate measure; an accurate expression. [Emphases added.] “accurate” (From Webster’s 1828 Dic-

tionary) = *In exact conformity to truth, or to a standard or rule, or to a model; free from failure, error, or defect; [Emphases added]...*

P. 26 *“I believe the word, “perfection,” is a word we can only use when referring to God Almighty.”*

Yet Dr Waite uses it of “Words” on PP. 2, 53. This is another contradiction on his part...

P. 40 *“The three words, “true, reliable, and accurate” are three words describing what I consider the King James Bible to be.”*

That being the case, Dr Waite should also have no problem using words like “inerrant”, “infallible”, “pure”, etc. regarding the King James Bible for those words are part and parcel of the definitions and meanings of “true”, “reliable”, and “accurate”...

P. 53 *“The Scrivener text, which underlies our King James Bible...”*

This is a lie and Waite knows it from numerous sources. He himself has admitted the same by saying it is “the closest” text to the text/readings underlying the King James Bible. What he should have said is that “[t]he Scrivener text, which for the most part underlies our King James Bible...”...

Further, on P. 88 of his book Dr Waite has assured his readers that *“In the subtitle of my book, DEFENDING THE KING JAMES BIBLE, I call it “GOD’S WORDS KEPT INTACT IN ENGLISH.””*

Again, Dr Waite does not seem to understand the meaning of the word “intact” – “untouched by any harm, complete”. The definition of the word itself when used in describing the Bible, argues for the inerrancy and even possible inspiration of the King James Bible, though Dr Waite would reject the usage of those two terms as being able to be used of the KJB...

Whichever edition of the AV1611 that Dr Waite is referring must be unimpaired, at least with respect to its text, i.e. perfect, if it has been kept intact.

“Intact” means or implies “inerrant” which Dr Waite sees as nearly synonymous with or in a direct relationship to “inspired” – the reason he refuses to use the word “inerrant” of the King James Bible...

A few samples of the more noticeable changes between the 1611 AV1611 and the current Cambridge Cameo AV1611 have been listed below...

The list has been addressed in this author’s earlier work⁹⁵, although comments on 1 Corinthians 4:9 should be amended as shown below. Apologies for any confusion arising from the earlier work with respect to this verse. The sample changes follow, with this author’s comments from the earlier work, with some amendments and supplemented by dates of the changes that Dr Scrivener⁹⁶ noted.

It should also be noted that most of these adjustments were made while at least some of the original translators of the AV1611 were still alive, thus confirming the acceptability of these changes.

Appendix 1, Continued

Dr Waite and the KJB not “given by inspiration of God”

The “not “inspired by God” AV1611

P. 7 “Gail Ludwig Latessa Kaleda Riplinger...defends a different King James Bible than I do. Her Bible is a verbal plenary inspiration of the English King James Bible. This is inspiration **HERESY**. My Bible is the King James Bible which is not “inspired by God” or “God-breathed” but is the only accurate, reliable, and true translation of the preserved, inerrant, inspired, God-breathed, perfect Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Words on which it is based.”

Dr Waite once again evidences his misunderstanding of the meanings and implications of the words “accurate”, “reliable”, and “true” in his refusal to apply the word “inerrant” to the King James Bible.

P. 31 “As for those of us who disagree with her **HERESY** on her “**Holy Bible**” (that is her King James Bible) “**resenting its authority**,” our final and ultimate “**authority**” is the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that underlie the King James Bible. This genuine and final “**authority**,” Gail Riplinger despises. This is a blatant lie. That’s false. We strongly believe in the King James Bible’s “**authority**,” but we deny her **HERESY** about its “**inspiration by God**.””

Unfortunately, Dr Waite conveniently ignores the fact that authority, and the context here is with reference to God’s Divine authority, stands or falls with inerrancy [and “inspiration”?!]. See Titus 1:2.

P. 32 “The original languages that God breathed-out give the English nuances, illustrations and shades of meaning. The grammatical rules of those languages give further assistance in the proper interpretation of difficult passages. When I preach God’s Words, I do not criticize or change the English King James Bible. I illuminate and give many other acceptable and accurate meanings that the translators could have written down. Gail Riplinger despises the use of any other word than that given by the King James translators. This is ridiculous.”

Why is this “ridiculous” when in fact the exact construction(s) involved and the particular context(s) of the words chosen by the King James translators show [demand?!] the very word they used? Perhaps Dr Waite doesn’t know the “original languages” as fluently as did the 54 plus learned men.

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.””

Dr Waite is the one who is weak in saying that the King James Bible is the “Word” of God in English, but denying that it is PURE. Psalm 119:140 says that the word of God, something David had in his hand and could read, “is very pure”. Consequently, if Dr Waite wishes to say or admit that the King James Bible is “the Word of God”, then he must, biblically speaking, admit and say that it is pure (i.e., without error, infallible, etc.). Biblically and logically, Dr Waite can’t have it both ways. It is an inconsistency and a contradiction, biblically speaking, to say that the King James Bible is “the Word of God in English” but not say that it is pure.

P. 33 “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.”

Dr Waite here affirms his view that the King James Bible is not the preserved word(s) of God in English. Now THAT is much closer to “HERESY” than what Dr Mrs Riplinger has stated or implied...

P. 51 “Gail Riplinger defines her **HERESY** clearly in this quotation. She calls God’s own “Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text and the Traditional Received Greek Text” as “**Two Weak Legs**.” In this way, she is clearly exalting the English King James Bible translation by men (which she believes were given by verbal plenary inspiration) as superior over God’s own Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. This is pure **HERESY!** Shame on her for this blasphemy!”

Just why this is “pure HERESY” is never proven by Dr Waite. And he seems to forget that the very texts he refers to were compiled “by men” (by one man in Scrivener’s case – a problem in light of 2 Corinthians 13:1 and Matthew 18:16). Furthermore, if Dr Waite is to be consistent, something with which he seems to have a continual problem, then he must admit the logical conclusions of his position with regard to the original writings of scripture which were also done “by men”. Dr Waite’s real problem is a pre-suppositional one in which he consciously or unconsciously believes that God is too small and weak to preserve His words in a translation.

P. 52 “Gail Riplinger’s “**solid and perfect Holy Bible**” is her alleged English King James Bible.”

Why “alleged”? Dr Mrs Riplinger makes it clear that it is an ACTUAL English King James Bible which she can hold in her hand and read which is her “solid and perfect Holy Bible”. Now why such a strong and bold stand should bother Dr Waite so much is puzzling, unless, of course, Dr Waite wishes to escape from the authority of the AV1611. One would think that a professed fundamentalist as Dr Waite would rejoice in the strong and bold stand that someone takes, even if that person is a bit to the ‘right’ of Dr Waite. But no. Dr Waite can only abide accepting (at best) that the exact words underlying the King James Bible, and not the King James Bible itself, are a solid and genuine foundation for faith.

Thus he denies to all who are not fluent in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek that they have a solid and genuine foundation for their faith. Yet even for those who are fluent in those languages, Dr Waite still has a problem. Just WHERE can those words, i.e., the REAL “solid and perfect Holy Bible” according to Dr Waite, be found? WHERE can one get a copy so as to obey in all aspects the command of 2 Timothy 2:15? Dr Waite admits in places that said foundation is neither Scrivener in Greek nor Ben Chayyim in Hebrew. Consequently, it seems that said foundation exists only in Dr Waite’s mind.

P. 52 “Neither I, nor the BIBLE FOR TODAY, nor the Dean Burgon Society have abandoned our defense of the King James Bible. But we do not call it inspired of God or God-breathed... She is exalting man’s English as being superior to God’s Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Words.”

This is an exaggeration on Dr Waite’s part with the conclusion not following from the premises. In this context, even if true, for English speakers it would amount to the fact that the King James Bible is ‘EQUAL TO’ God’s Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek

“Words”. Even for those who believe that the AV1611 in English has advantages over the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek words, it does not follow that such a position amounts to exalting man’s words over God’s words.

P. 52 *“In effect, Gail Riplinger believes in a deification of man and his works as superior to Almighty God and His works. This is **HERESY** and blasphemy!”*

Just how so remains unproven by Dr Waite. And merely stating it on his part does not make it so. Furthermore, is not Dr Waite committing “a deification of man and his works” for any compiler of Greek and Hebrew texts?...

PP. 84-85 *“What I strongly object to is Peter Ruckman and Gail Riplinger who believe the **HERESY** that the King James Bible was given by verbal plenary inspiration! This is double inspiration **HERESY**...”*

This tactic of name-calling and mud-slinging is no proof of the validity of Dr Waite’s assertions. Furthermore, Dr Waite has not disproven the truths brought to light by Gipp’s work cited earlier...

Appendix 1, Continued

Dr Waite and the KJB not “given by inspiration of God”

Testimonies to the Inspiration of the AV1611

The following testimonies have been drawn from a wide variety of witnesses, not all of whom are Bible believers or even Christians. It is this author’s firm conviction that they are nevertheless all trustworthy witnesses to “*the scripture of truth*” Daniel 10:21 in the form the 1611 English Holy Bible. They constitute a formidable array of adversaries for Dr Waite to overcome.

His denial that the 1611 English Holy Bible is even a Holy Bible should be kept in mind as the following witness statements are read.

Additionally, does Dr Waite understand the meaning of “holy”? It certainly implies “set apart from error”. Does Dr Waite refuse to use the term “holy” of the King James Bible? Perhaps so. But of course such a term could not be used of Scrivener’s text either.

So again Dr Waite must face the question of just WHERE is the Holy Bible that we need?

Author’s note. The above is the key question. At the time of writing, Dr Waite has not answered it, with respect to any identifiable and obtainable printed work between two covers.

Appendix 2 – Full List of Extracts, from A WARNING!! by Dr D.A. Waite

Dr Waite and ‘Originals Only’ Inspiration:

P. 2 *“I believe that God inspired and breathed-out the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Old and New Testaments. I believe this miraculous event **happened only once and was never repeated. Especially was this inspiration never repeated in any translation in the past, in the present, or in the future.** I believe 2 Timothy 3:16 refers to this once-for-all inspiration by God of those original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. The Greek Words in the first part of that verse are: PASA (“each, every, or all” GRAPHE (“Scripture” referring to the Old Testament, and, by extension to the New Testament) THEOPNEUSTOS (THEO refers to “God,”) PNEUSTOS (comes from “PNEO” “to breathe.”) that is, “God-breathed” or “breathed-out by God.” In other words, God “breathed-out” His original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. I believe these Words have been preserved in the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible.”*

*“I believe it is an inaccurate view of the King James Bible to refer to it as “**inspired**,” I believe this term must be reserved exclusively for the original, preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible and not for the King James Bible itself.”*

*“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.”*

P. 10 *“Gail Riplinger attacks those who believe God breathed-out and inspired His Words in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek rather than any **translation**, whether in English, Spanish, French, Italian, German, Russian, Chinese, Japanese or in any other language translation.”*

*“Gail Riplinger attacks those who believe that only the Words given by God in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek can be called, “given by inspiration of God” or “Inspired by God”, or “Inspired” or “God breathed” rather than any **translation**.”*

P. 20 *“Gail Riplinger believes in the plenary verbal inspiration of the King James Bible.”*

*“This is clear **HERESY**. The accurate view of Bible inspiration is found in 2 Timothy 3:16. That verse refers to the way the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words were produced by God’s true plenary verbal inspiration. That is the only inspiration that exists. God never gave plenary verbal inspiration of any **translations** in any language of the world.”*

“Inspiration is defined as the once-for-all process of God’s “breathing-out” (THEOPNEUSTOS) of the original Old and New Testament Words of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.”

*“This verse has nothing whatsoever to do with the alleged verbal plenary inspiration of the King James Bible or of any other **translation** of the Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek Words. It refers only and exclusively to the “breathing-out” or inspiration by God of those original Words.”*

P. 24 *“The only Words that God gave by verbal plenary inspiration are the original Words given by God in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. Those Words, and those alone were “inspired Words” which were breathed-out by God. No **translation**, whether the King James Bible (KJB) or any other **translation** contains words that were given by God Himself.”*

“2 Timothy 3:16 describes the inspiration, or God-breathing out of His Words of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.”

“**PASA** (“each, every, or all)

“**GRAPHE** (Scripture, that which is written down in the Old or New Testament originals)

“**THEOPNEUSTOS** (God-breathed from **THEOS** (“God”) and **PNEO** (“to breathe”).”

P. 24 “I “**rightly**” claim that the King James Bible is not given by verbal plenary inspiration of God. You can define inspiration any way you want, but if you define it Scripturally neither the King James Bible nor any other **translation** is “inspired of God.” Neither the word “inspired” nor “inspire” is found in the Bible. Only the word “inspiration” is found once in the Old Testament and once in the New Testament. It is found in 2 Timothy 3:16, “All scripture is given by **inspiration** of God...”

“The one Greek Word for these five English words, “given by inspiration of God,” is **THEOPNEUSTOS**. This is a compound word that comes from two other Greek words, **THEOS** (“God”) and **PNEUSTOS** (“breathed”). **PNEUSTOS** does not come from **PNEUMA** (“spirit”) as Gail Riplinger falsely claims. Both **PNEUMA** and **PNEUSTOS** come from the Greek verb **PNEO** (“to breathe”).”

“Any who teach that God “breathed-out” and gave the King James Bible (or any other translations) by verbal plenary inspiration is unscriptural. In fact, I believe he or she is guilty of a serious theological **HERESY**.”

P. 28 “I deny the “**inspiration of our King James Bible**” because, unlike Gail Riplinger, 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.”

P. 38 “They stand for the King James Bible and use the word, “**inspired**” for it. I do not. I believe it is inaccurate terminology. It confuses the genuine once-for-all inspiration by God of His Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words which underlie the King James Bible. I have no evidence that these men partake of the serious **HERESY** espoused by Gail Riplinger that the King James Bible (and other Bibles since Acts 2 (possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background), have been given by verbal plenary inspiration.”

“The only proper “**inspiration**” of Scriptures was a one-time miracle, never to be repeated, when God Himself caused to be written down the Words of the Bible in Hebrew, a little Aramaic, and Greek. “**Inspiration**” has nothing whatsoever to do with translations.”

“Not a single translation in any language is inspired by God, including the King James Bible and the other Bibles since Acts 2 (possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background), that Gail Riplinger also believes are “**pure**” and given by verbal plenary inspiration. All translations are words chosen by the translators who are men, not words chosen and given by God.”

P. 40 “The verb, “**is given**” does not appear in the Greek New Testament that God gave us. Gail Riplinger hates the Words of the Greek and Hebrew that underlie our King James Bible. She just takes the English over against the Greek, even though there is no Greek word here whatsoever! This is theological **HERESY** at its worst! Even if she takes her English “**is given**,” this phrase often translates the aorist or other past tenses. It does not always mean a present tense, even in other places where it is used in the King James Bible. 2 Timothy 3:16 (**PASA GRAPHE THEOPNEUSTOS**) just speaks of an accomplished past deed that God did when He gave us His Words in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.”

P. 44 “[Gail Riplinger] rejects God’s own Words in the Hebrew and Greek Words in favor of the single one word found in the King James Bible which she thinks was given by verbal plenary inspiration. Gail Riplinger is **HERETICAL** in ridiculing the God of the Bible’s Words and the “**meaning**” of those Words in favor of using exclusively the one single word that the KJB translators set down. Gail Riplinger’s view is **HERESY**. By saying this, she believes the King James Bible was inspired by God in 1611 and therefore completely corrects and rules out the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that God gave us. As such, that translation completely wipes out any Hebrew or Greek “**meaning**” that God Himself gave us. She favors only the one word that man put down in his translation. That is blasphemy against God!”

P. 59 “This is what I have always believed. The Scripture in 2 Timothy 3:16, PASA GRAPHE THEOPNEUSTOS, “**All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.**” This literally means “**all Scripture is God-breathed.**” GRAPHE refers to the Old Testament Hebrew and Aramaic Words (and, by extension, the New Testament Greek Words). This word has nothing whatsoever to do with any **translation**, whether in English, Spanish, Italian or any other language.”

P. 60-61 “Gail Riplinger denies the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible are copies of the “**inspired originals.**” I believe the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible are true and preserved copies of the inspired originals.”

P. 72 “Gail Riplinger is using this terminology [**an apparition exhaling in the corner of the room**] because she does not believe that 2 Timothy 3:16 teaches that the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Bible were THEOPNEUSTOS “**God-breathed.**” By referring to **God the Holy Spirit** in this way, as an “**apparition exhaling in the corner of the room,**” Gail Riplinger has committed blasphemy against the Holy Spirit! Shame on her! One day God will judge her for this blasphemy! Though she doesn’t understand it and will not accept it, THEOPNEUSTOS in 2 Timothy 3:16 comes from THEOS (“God”) and PNEUSTOS (“breathed” from PNEO “to breathe”). She is totally misinformed on the derivation of PNEUSTOS (“breathed,”) thinking it comes from PNEUMA (“Spirit”). This is serious and total Greek error. Both PNEUMA and PNEUSTOS come from PNEO “to breathe.””

“The “**adjective ‘God-breathed’**” does not belong to the “**NIV.**” [Gail Riplinger] lies when she says that it is “**incorrectly used and not a literal or accurate translation of the noun theopneustos.**” It is indeed a literal translation of the Greek word, THEOPNEUSTOS in 2 Timothy 3:16. Gail Riplinger is so ignorant of the morphology and etymology of the Greek language that she falsely thinks “**theopneustos**” is a “**noun**” instead of an adjective. It is clearly an adjective! This shows the twisted and warped ignorance of Gail Riplinger as far as the Greek language is concerned.”

P. 73 “THEOPNEUSTOS does not come from “**Spirit.**” PNEUSTOS does not come from “**Spirit,**” but from PNEO which is “to breathe.” PNEUMA also comes from PNEO “to breathe.””

P. 88 “Gail Riplinger...is defending a “**KJV**” that she wrongly claims was given by verbal plenary inspiration from God directly. That **HERESY** is anything but “**scholarly.**” It is ridiculous idiocy. Her “**defense**” is anything but “**scholarly.**” It is a total misinterpretation of 2 Timothy 3:16 which refers to God’s breathing-out His Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words in the original Old and New Testaments. The GRAPHE (“**scripture**”) cannot refer to translations of any kind.”

“The Words of God **ARE** the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Words. In the subtitle of my book, **DEFENDING THE KING JAMES BIBLE**, I call it “**GOD’S WORDS KEPT INTACT IN**

ENGLISH.” Psalm 12:6-7 does not refer to the King James Bible, but to the Hebrew and Aramaic Words (and, by extension, to the Greek N.T. Words). English was not even in existence then.”

Appendix 2, Continued

Dr Waite and the Imaginary ‘Original Bible,’ Unidentified in Print

P. 25 “Though Gail Riplinger’s “Holy Bible” is limited to the King James Bible, in reality, “Our Holy Bible” is the Bible that God caused to be written in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. That is the true “Holy Bible.” It is not a translation in English or in any other language. I do not deny the inspiration of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek true “**Holy Bible**” whose very Words were given by the Lord Jesus Christ through God the Holy Spirit to the human writers (John 16:12-15).”

P. 28 “God gave His original Words by revelation. That revelation came by the verbal plenary inspiration of the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. This accurate definition of the Bible’s inspiration by God rules out any “**inspiration by God**” of the King James Bible or any other translation in any language in the world.”

“My “**Holy Bible**” is God’s fully “**inspired**” original Words of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, rather than Gail Riplinger’s King James Bible. Though it is an accurate, true, and reliable translation, it is not “**inspired by God.**” It is not “**God-breathed,**” therefore it cannot accurately be termed “**inspired.**” She holds a serious theological **HERESY** by her erroneous view of “**inspiration by God.**”

P. 29 “The “**Bible**” has been inspired by God in the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek languages. Her “**Bible**” is the King James Bible which was not “**given by inspiration of God**” and was not “**God-breathed.**” Her position is serious **HERESY.**”

“The “**Bible**” is the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words that underlie our King James Bible. Strictly speaking, it is not a translation. God gave us those Words. There was no English when God gave Moses His Words, and David His Words, and Ezekiel His Words, and Matthew His Words and Paul His Words. English did not exist when God “**breathed-out**” or “**inspired**” His Bible’s Words.”

P. 32 “Gail Riplinger confuses people by not defining “**our Holy Bible.**” My “**Holy Bible**” is the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Old and New Testaments that God Himself breathed-out and inspired. Her “**Holy Bible**” is only a translation of that “**Holy Bible,**” the King James Bible. Gail Riplinger has not and cannot prove that the King James Bible was inspired by God. There is no scriptural proof that any translation of God’s Words is inspired of God.”

P. 37 “Gail Riplinger’s “**Holy Bible**” (her **HERETICAL** view of the King James Bible and other “**inspired**” Bibles since Acts 2 (possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background), is being “**deflated.**” The true “**Holy Bible,**” which is the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that God Himself gave to us, is being inflated and exalted by the exposure of Gail Riplinger’s **HERESY** on the Bible.”

P. 39 “Gail Riplinger’s **HERESY** in her view of inspiration can easily be “**refuted.**” Here is a simple refutation of it. My “**Holy Bible**” differs from her “**Holy Bible.**” It is the Bible that God Almighty breathed-out in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek original Words. They are inspired Words and Godbreathed Words. Her definition of the “**Holy Bible**” is the King James Bible **translation** of those Words (and other Bibles since Acts 2 possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background), as well). Those words, though accurately **translated**, can never properly be referred to as “**God-breathed**” or “**inspired by God**” no matter how much Gail Riplinger might argue [otherwise].”

P. 84 “Gail Riplinger’s **HERESY** is hidden by her when she talks about “**those of us who believe our Bible is inspired.**” What she means, but doesn’t say, is that she believes the King

*James Bible, and other Bibles since Acts 2 (possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background), have been given by verbal plenary inspiration. This is her **HERESY**. The only "**BIBLE**" that has been given by verbal plenary inspiration is God's Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. No translation (including the King James Bible) has been given by verbal plenary inspiration. This is pure **HERESY**."*

P. 90 *"What Gail Riplinger wants us to do is to "**uphold the inspiration of her beloved [King James] Holy Bible**. She never defines what she means by the "**Holy Bible**." To someone who is not familiar with Gail Riplinger's distortions, they might think that I denied the plenary verbal inspiration of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words in the original Bible which is the "**Holy Bible**." I believe strongly in that inspiration, but deny her **HERESY** in believing that the King James Bible and other Bibles as well after Acts 2 (possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background), were given by plenary verbal inspiration."*

Appendix 2, Continued

Dr Waite and ‘the Greek’

P. 27 “Gail Ludwig Latessa Kaleda Riplinger thinks that the King James Bible’s word is the only thing you can use. Otherwise, to her, it is an **“error.”** She believes you can’t explain any of the King James Bible’s words or define them. If people don’t understand the word **“OUCHES,”** for example, it is too bad for them, in her judgment. Gail Riplinger despises the definitions of uncommon words. She is entitled to her opinion, but I strongly disagree with her. She believes you must chase all over the King James Bible to find the definitions of its words, but never consult any dictionaries or lexicons of any kind. In my opinion, this position is insane!”

“I don’t use **“corrupt lexicons.”** I use proper lexicons that give me proper meanings of the Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek. Gail Riplinger despises the use of lexicons of any kind, calling them all **“corrupt.”**”

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.”

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.”

P. 51 “Gail Riplinger defines her **HERESY** clearly in this quotation. She calls God’s own **“Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text and the Traditional Received Greek Text”** as **“Two Weak Legs.”** In this way, she is clearly exalting the English King James Bible translation by men (which she believes were given by verbal plenary inspiration) as superior over God’s own Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. This is pure **HERESY!** Shame on her for this blasphemy!”

“I **“promote”** the Ben Chayyim Hebrew Text and the Scrivener’s Greek text. I believe the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying the King James Bible are **“God’s preserved originals.”** You can see from this quotation that Gail Riplinger does not believe we have **“God’s preserved originals,”** but only what she considers to be the English King James Bible which she believes was given by verbal plenary inspiration breathed-out by God. As such, it corrects and replaces God’s original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words. This view is blasphemy and serious **HERESY!**”

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.**”

“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. 53 “Scrivener did not go **“from the English KJB into Greek.”** He found the Greek edition that underlay the KJB. With the exception of 190 places, that Greek edition was Beza’s 5th edition of 1598.”

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. 67 “Dr Scrivener [did not] say that he **“back-translated”** or **“backwards translated”** from the King James Bible to the Greek New Testament. Scrivener had the 5th edition of Beza of 1598, which he used for his Greek text, except for 190 places where the King James Bible translators relied on other editions...Scrivener’s Greek New Testament was never translated from the English into Greek.”

“Scrivener’s goal, given to him by the Cambridge University Press, was to come up with a Greek text that underlies the King James Bible showing by **BOLD** marks the places where the Gnostic Critical Greek text used by the English Revised Version differ from this text. He found that the King James translators used the Greek Words in Beza’s 5th edition of 1598 in all but in 190 places.”

P. 68 “[Gail Riplinger lies by saying that] Dr Frederick Scrivener **“back-translated”** his Greek New Testament from the King James Bible’s English. That is, he took the English and turned it into Greek. Nothing could be further from the truth! Scrivener had the Greek edition of **Beza’s 5th edition of 1598**, and found that this was the Greek that the King James Bible translators followed with only 190 Exceptions out of over 140,000 Greek Words.”

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. 70 “Gail Riplinger lies when she states that **“Scrivener’s text is therefore the English text of the KJB, backwards translated into Greek.”** Again, there was no **“English text of the KJB”** which was **“backwards translated into Greek.”** Scrivener truly was a Greek scholar, but he did not **“backwards translate”** from the KJB English into Greek.”

P. 71 “We hold to the Greek text that underlies our King James Bible. We believe it is the closest to the original Words of the New Testament.”

P. 89 “The Dean Burgon Society (DBS) does stand for **Scrivener’s Greek** text as the preserved original Greek Words. It does **NOT** follow the Ginsberg Hebrew text. It follows the Hebrew Words underlying the King James Bible.”

Appendix 2, Continued

Dr Waite and the ‘imperfect’ KJB not “given by inspiration of God”

P. iii “We use and defend the King James Bible.”

P. 3 “This **HERESY** view is held by Gail Riplinger, Peter Ruckman, and many of their followers. What is this view? This **HERESY** view believes that in 1611, when the King James Bible was published, (contrary to all truth and Biblical doctrine) God performed a “**second inspiration**.” Because of this, their so-called verbal plenary inspiration of the King James Bible supplants the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words given by God Himself as inferior and exalts the verbal plenary inspiration of the King James Bible as superior.”

“Gail Riplinger goes even further than Peter Ruckman in her “inspiration” **HERESY**. She teaches that since Acts 2 (possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background), there have been many other “inspired” and “pure” translations in addition to the verbal plenary inspiration of the King James Bible. **We have learned from witnesses who knew her that Gail Riplinger originally went to a Pentecostal/Charismatic church before her husband at that time urged her to join a Baptist church.** This is her **multiple inspiration HERESY**. She rejects the truth that God’s breathing-out His Words or inspiration occurred only once. It occurred when God breathed out His own perfect, inspired, inerrant, infallible, pure Words in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. This process was never repeated by God. Gail Riplinger wrote in her BROCHURE advertizing Hazardous Materials as follows: “**The book demonstrates that Greek texts from UBS to TBS fail to reach the perfection of the Holy Bible [meaning the King James Bible], where God’s words shall not pass away.**” What Gail Riplinger is doing in her view of the King James Bible is what I call “**REPLACEMENT THEOLOGY**.” She totally REPLACES the Old and New Testament original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of God, with the English King James translation which are the words of men. This REPLACEMENT is serious doctrinal **HERESY!**”

P. 7 “Gail Ludwig Latessa Kaleda Riplinger...defends a different King James Bible than I do. Her Bible is a verbal plenary inspiration of the English King James Bible. This is inspiration **HERESY**. My Bible is the King James Bible which is **not** “inspired by God” or “God-breathed” but is the only accurate, reliable, and true **translation** of the preserved, inerrant, **inspired, God-breathed**, perfect Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Words on which it is based.”

“Gail Riplinger does not know where the preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words are. She teaches that we don’t need any Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek Words. She teaches that we have a verbal plenary inspiration of the English King James Bible and that it therefore supersedes the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that God Himself gave us. This is blasphemy and extreme **HERESY!** This trashing of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words is what makes Gail Riplinger’s position a **HERESY** as well as especially her belief that since Acts 2 (possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background), there are many other “inspired” and “pure” Bibles. It’s a bad enough **HERESY** for her to believe that God gave the King James Bible by verbal plenary inspiration.”

P. 9 “These Bible-believing, fundamental organizations [DBS, BFT]...stand for the King James Bible as the only true, reliable, and accurate English translation of the inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that underlie it.”

P. 10 “Gail Riplinger attacks those who believe the King James Bible (as I do) is the only true, faithful, and accurate English translation from the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that underlie it, but do not believe it was given by inspiration of God or that it was God-breathed.”

P. 19 “Gail Riplinger spread the false view that nobody should use any Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek lexicons to find out meanings of Bible words. Because of her **HERESY** view of the plenary verbal inspiration of the King James Bible, Gail Riplinger doesn’t even want people to look in either Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek or even English dictionaries to find out the meaning of the words in the King James Bible.”

P. 20 “Gail Riplinger believes that the words of the King James Bible translation (as well as many other translations) were given by plenary verbal inspiration by God Himself. In reality, the King James Bible is the only faithful, true and accurate English translation of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying it, but it was not “God breathed” or given by plenary verbal inspiration of God. The words were chosen by a group of translators. Though they were scholarly and well equipped, they were still just men.”

P. 24 “I believe that the King James Bible is true, faithful and accurate to the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words underlying it, but it is not given by God’s verbal plenary inspiration. It never claims to be except by Peter Ruckman, Gail Riplinger, and their many followers.”

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?”

P. 26 “I believe the word, “**perfection,**” is a word we can only use when referring to God Almighty. I stand for the King James Bible, but I don’t like to use the word “**perfect**” for it. All you have to do is find one place where it is not “**perfect.**” God alone is perfect. There have been many printers’ errors in the King James Bible initially. They were not “**perfect.**” There are hundreds of differences in the various editions of the King James Bible. Which one can you say is “**perfect.**” Publishers in the USA have many different spellings of words. Which spelling is “**perfect**”?”

P. 30 ““The Bible warned us that men would become ‘**traitors, heady highminded.**’”” Gail Riplinger is quoting the Bible with her word “**TRAITORS**” in order to use such a libelous term to tarnish those who differ with her **HERESY** that the King James Bible and other Bibles are “**inspired by God.**””

P. 31 “As for those of us who disagree with her **HERESY** on her “**Holy Bible**” (that is her King James Bible) “**resenting its authority,**” our final and ultimate “**authority**” is the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that underlie the King James Bible. This genuine and final “**authority,**” Gail Riplinger despises. This is a blatant lie. That’s false. We strongly believe in the King James Bible’s “**authority,**” but we deny her **HERESY** about its “**inspiration by God.**”

P. 32 “The King James Bible has gone through seven different editions. The original 1611 edition had the Apocrypha in it which is filled with errors and false teachings. Does she think that this was inspired by God? If not, which of the other six editions, revised by man, was inspired by God? Which printed edition of the present seventh edition was inspired by God? Is it the one published by Nelson Press? By Moody Press? By Zondervan Press? By Cambridge Press? By Oxford Press? Or by some other press which has many differences with the other publishers?”

“The King James Bible translators took the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words and picked one of the many correct English meanings and translated it. We agree that the King James

*Bible translators picked the best English words when they translated the Bible, but not the only English words that could have been used. It is blasphemous of Gail Riplinger to downplay the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that God Himself wrote. She exalts the King James Bible and many other “pure” Bibles above the very Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Living God. This is Simon-pure **HERESY!**”*

“The original languages that God breathed-out give the English nuances, illustrations and shades of meaning. The grammatical rules of those languages give further assistance in the proper interpretation of difficult passages. When I preach God’s Words, I do not criticize or change the English King James Bible. I illuminate and give many other acceptable and accurate meanings that the translators could have written down. Gail Riplinger despises the use of any other word than that given by the King James translators. This is ridiculous.”

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!”*

P. 34 *“Here are more blasphemous words coming from Gail Riplinger who has a large following of pastors and people. She does not agree that translations like the King James Bible are “**inferior**” to the Hebrew Aramaic, and Greek Words from which they were translated. She wrongly believes these translations like the King James Bible are “superior” to God original Words.”*

*“I am **FOR** the King James Bible, but I am **AGAINST** Gail Riplinger’s lies and phony ideas about her **HERESY** regarding the verbal plenary inspiration of the King James Bible and many other Bibles since Acts 2.”*

*“As far as the King James Bible being an “**inferior product**” when compared to the very inspired and inerrant Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words from the mouth of God Himself, most certainly God’s Words are superior to man’s translations of those Words! How evil is Gail Riplinger to trash and demote the very Words that God gave to us and exalt **translations** of those Words! She believes the false and heretical doctrine that God’s Words of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek are not **superior** to man’s King James Bible translation, but, in fact, are **inferior.**”*

P. 35 *“The King James Bible is not “**inspired**”...The word inspired is only used for the Words that God Himself breathed-out, not that which man has merely translated. God did not breathe-out English or any other modern language. God only breathed-out and inspired the Old and New Testament Words of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.”*

P. 36 *“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.”*

P. 37 *“Gail Ludwig Latessa Kaleda Riplinger’s **HERESY** [is] the verbal plenary inspiration of the King James Bible and many other Bibles since Acts 2.”*

P. 40 “The three words, **“true, reliable, and accurate”** are three words describing what I consider the King James Bible to be. What about all of the hundreds of changes that have been made in the King James Bible from 1611 to the present? If it were **“perfect,”** why all the changes? I use the word **“perfect”** when referring to things that God Almighty does. God’s Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words are **“perfect.”**”

P. 41 “I have never **“shifted away”** from a **“perfect and inspired KJB”** because I have never in my entire life ever held to that position.”

P. 43 “For 32 years...I have never publicly said that the King James Bible is inspired, inspired of God, or God-breathed. I have been consistent in this position. Gail Riplinger cannot find any proof whatsoever to the contrary during these 32 years.”

P. 44 “Gail Riplinger...is trying to get her readers to conclude that my denial of her **HERESY** that the King James Bible and many other Bibles since Acts 2 (possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background), were given by verbal plenary inspiration by God and Godbreathed.”

P. 45 “The words in the King James Bible are accurate, faithful and true. They need not to be changed. However, since they are not inspired by God, there could be other words that could be used that would also be accurate, faithful and true as well.”

P. 49 “She believes in the verbal plenary inspiration of the King James Bible and many other Bibles after Acts 2 (possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background), in her **HERESY.**”

P. 52 “Gail Riplinger’s **“solid and perfect Holy Bible”** is her alleged English King James Bible. Neither I, nor the BIBLE FOR TODAY, nor the Dean Burgon Society have abandoned our defense of the King James Bible. But we do not call it inspired of God or God-breathed... She is exalting man’s English as being superior to God’s Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Words. In effect, Gail Riplinger believes in a deification of man and his works as superior to Almighty God and His works. This is **HERESY** and blasphemy!”

P. 53 “The Scrivener text, which underlies our King James Bible, has nothing to do with the matter of the **“perfection and inspiration of the KJB.”** The Greek Words underlying the KJB are perfect and inspired. It is false for Gail Riplinger to say that the KJB, and many other Bibles since Acts 2 (possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background), were given by verbal plenary inspiration. This is pure theological **HERESY.** If Gail Riplinger believes this about the KJB, which one is she talking about since there are at least seven official “editions” with hundreds of changes and many different printings with multiple printers’ errors and differences in them. If it is the original AV 1611, she has the problem of God **“inspiring”** the errors of the Apocrypha. It is a ridiculous and unfounded position.”

P. 54 “The second great error Gail Riplinger proclaims here wrongly is that she believes there were **“pure”** versions that were given by verbal plenary inspiration from **“the giving of the ‘scriptures in tongues”** in **“Acts 2** (possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background), **until today.”** This is a clear enunciation of her serious Biblical **HERESY.**”

“Gail Riplinger is continuing her **HERESY** of believing that **“a pure English Bible existed and was available before Wycliffe, Tyndale, and Coverdale.”** These, she claims, were **“God’s pure words,”** that is that they were given by verbal plenary inspiration from the day of Pentecost (Acts 2, possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background,) and beyond. She does not limit inspiration to God’s Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words, but extends inspiration not only to the English King James Bible, but to **“Gothic, Anglo-Saxon,**

*Anglo-Norman, and Pre-Wycliffe English scriptures” as well. God did not inspire these translations. She is in serious theological **HERESY** here.”*

P. 56 *“I believe the King James **“English Bible”** is a true, reliable, and accurate translation, but it was not given by verbal plenary inspiration. God did not breathe-out English. He breathed-out Hebrew, a little Aramaic, and Greek.”*

*“The Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that underlie our King James Bible are detailed, perfect, pure and inspired. By her reference to **“pure vernacular editions world wide,”** she believes these were all given by verbal plenary inspiration as she believes the King James Bible was. This is the basis of her serious **HERESY**.”*

P. 64 *“Those [in] church pews...should not believe in the plenary verbal inspiration of the King James Bible which is Gail Riplinger’s **HERESY**. God did not write or give the words of the King James Bible. Men did. For Gail Riplinger to say that the King James Bible was given by plenary verbal inspiration, she would have to say that God produced false doctrine for putting the error-ridden Apocrypha in the A.V. 1611. Does she admit this moral flaw in God? I hope not. **WHICH KING JAMES BIBLE DOES SHE THINK WAS GIVEN BY PLENARY VERBAL INSPIRA[T]ION?** The King James Bible has undergone hundreds of different printings and has had at least seven major revisions. Each printing and each edition is different. This shows the foolishness in believing that any **translation** was given by plenary verbal inspiration. It is the GRAPHE, (Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Words)= underlying the King James Bible that were given by plenary verbal inspiration and were God-breathed (THEOPNEUSTOS).”*

P. 66 *“She believes the **HERESY** that the King James Bible and other Bibles since Acts 2 (possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background), were given by verbal plenary inspiration by God rather than being only a **translation**.”*

P. 72 *“Gail Riplinger believes in the verbal plenary inspiration of the King James Bible, as well as many other Bibles since Acts 2 (possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background). This is **HERESY** without any question. For this to have happened means that she believes God **“breathed-out”** the words of the King James Bible. Though she is ignorant of it and disputes it, this is the genuine meaning of THEOPNEUSTOS in 2 Timothy 3:16.”*

P. 82 *“With [Gail Riplinger’s] **HERESY** on believing in the verbal plenary inspiration of the King James Bible and many other Bibles since Acts 2 (possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background), she is no authority on what **“unbiblical”** means.”*

PP. 84-85 *“What I strongly object to is Peter Ruckman and Gail Riplinger who believe the **HERESY** that the King James Bible was given by verbal plenary inspiration! This is double inspiration **HERESY**. Gail Riplinger goes beyond even Peter Ruckman in that she believes many other Bibles since Acts 2 (possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background), have also been given by verbal plenary inspiration. This is why I call her a believer in the **HERESY** of **MULTIPLE INSPIRATION**.”*

“I believe that the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words of the Bible have been preserved and are those which underlie the King James Bible. They are still in existence and available from the BIBLE FOR TODAY in Scrivener’s Annotated Greek New Testament...and in the Masoretic Hebrew/King James Parallel Bible.”

P. 87 *“(Quoting Dr Alan O’Reilly), “I believe it is the subject of why all this has blown up, right on the heels of the publication of Hazardous Materials. If I understand correctly, **you believe, as I do that the AV1611 is the pure word of God, given by inspiration of God, II***

Timothy 3:16,17 and the perfectly preserved word of God in its final (7) purified state, Psalm 12:6,7...I get the impression that the Waites don't altogether share that stance."

"Sad to say, Dr O'Reilly partakes in the **HERESY** of Gail Ludwig Latessa Kaleda Riplinger as they both say the "AV1611" was "given by inspiration of God II Timothy 3:16,17." He is right that the "Waites don't altogether share that stance." Only the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words were "given by inspiration of God" or "God-breathed." No translation (including the AV1611) was given by verbal plenary inspiration. The "AV 1611" was most definitely not "given by inspiration of God." It included the Apocrypha with all of its false doctrines and beliefs. Surely God did not give those words."

P. 94 "Gail Riplinger's **HERESY** of exalting the King James Bible (which she falsely claims was given by verbal plenary inspiration of God) [may have] wrongly influenced some Christian colleges. She has smashed the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words, so much so, that she alleges that some Christian colleges won't even teach the Biblical Greek language because they don't need it. Just use the King James Bible. If this happens, it will have resulted in a great calamity for the original language of the New Testament. If Christian colleges "drop Greek altogether," Gail Riplinger will have gone far in the promotion of her **HERESY** position of the verbal plenary inspiration of the King James Bible (and other Bibles since Acts 2, possibly due to her previous Pentecostal/Charismatic background), thus exchanging man's words for God's Words."

P. 95 "[Gail Riplinger] exalts the English King James Bible as being given by verbal plenary inspiration and entirely supplanting the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Words that God Himself gave us. This is strong **HERESY!** No one is "selling their feigned Greek and Hebrew expertise" like Gail Ludwig Latessa Kaleda Riplinger is selling her "feigned expertise" on the King James Bible, all of its doctrines and applications, all the lexicons in the world, and on Greek and Hebrew."

P. 97 "It is she who is acting dogmatically like the "College of Cardinals," trying to tell every pastor, and other Christians who disagree with her, to believe and agree with her **HERESY** about the King James Bible and other Bibles since Acts 2 as having been given by verbal plenary inspiration."

References

- ¹ *A WARNING!! On Gail Riplinger's KJB and Multiple Inspiration Heresy* by Dr D. A. Waite, www.BibleForToday.org
- ² *The College of Cardinals, "Traitors, heady, highminded"* 2 Tim. 3:4, D.A. Waite Denies KJB Inspiration by Dr G.A. Riplinger, www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html
- ³ *Why Psalm 12:6, 7 Is A Promise Of The Infallible Preservation Of Scripture* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, store.kjv1611.org/
- ⁴ www.av1611.org/articles.html#KJV, www.avpublications.com/avnew/resources.html
- ⁵ *In Awe of Thy Word* by Dr G.A. Riplinger, A.V. Publications Corp., 2003, p 32, Chapter 16
- ⁶ *In the Minds of Men* by Ian T. Taylor, TFE Publishing, 1991, pp 97ff
- ⁷ *In Awe of Thy Word*, Chapter 18
- ⁸ www.avpublications.com/avnew/downloads/PDF/q13.pdf
- ⁹ *The Translators to the Reader* by Dr Miles Smith, www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm
- ¹⁰ *Cleaning Up Hazardous Materials* by Dr Kirk DiVietro, The Dean Burgon Society, 2010, pp ii-iii, vi, xi
- ¹¹ *Pastoral Epistles, I & II Timothy – Titus* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1989, pp 261ff
- ¹² en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lingua_franca
- ¹³ *A Brief History of English Bible Translations* by Dr Laurence M. Vance, Vance Publications, 1993, pp 3, 13
- ¹⁴ *The History of the New Testament Church, Volumes 1 and 2* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, 1982, 1984
- ¹⁵ *Hazardous Materials* by Dr G.A. Riplinger and Bryn (n) Riplinger, A.V. Publications, Corp., 2008, p 1147
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p 1136
- ¹⁷ *In Awe of Thy Word*, Chapter 9
- ¹⁸ *Analytical Concordance to the Holy Bible* edited by Robert Young, United Society For Christian Literature, Lutterworth Press, 8th Edition, London 1973
- ¹⁹ 'O Biblios' - *The Book*, p 133, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/
- ²⁰ *Translators Revived* by Alexander McClure, Maranatha Bible Society, from the 1858 Edition, pp 177ff
- ²¹ www.studylight.org/
- ²² *Defending the King James Bible* by Dr Donald Waite, The Bible for Today, 1992, p 79
- ²³ *The Translators to the Reader* by Dr Miles Smith, www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm
- ²⁴ 'O Biblios' - *The Book*, Chapters 10-11, 13-14, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/
- ²⁵ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Koine_Greek
- ²⁶ *Ruckman Reference Bible*, p 867
- ²⁷ *The King James Version Defended* by Dr Edward F. Hills, The Christian Research Press, 3rd Edition, 1979, Chapter 5, standardbearers.net/uploads/The_King_James_Version_Defended_Dr_Edward_F_Hills.pdf
- ²⁸ *Final Authority* by Dr William P. Grady, Grady Publications, Chapter 4
- ²⁹ *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship* by Dr Peter S Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1988, Chapter 5
- ³⁰ *In Awe of Thy Word*, Chapters 18-21, 24, 27-28
- ³¹ *The Bible Babel* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1964, p 113
- ³² *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated* by Dr Benjamin G. Wilkinson, abridged in *Which Bible?* edited by Dr David Otis Fuller, Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975, p 200, 205, 210-212, 221, 2228ff, 244ff. See also

Our Authorized Bible Vindicated online, kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html,
kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-5.html

³³ *The Answer Book* by Dr Samuel C. Gipp, Th.D., Bible & Literature Missionary Foundation, 1989, Questions 1, 29, 30, samgipp.com/category/answer/?order=asc

³⁴ *A WARNING!!*, pp 2, 84.

³⁵ *Which Bible is God's Word?* by Dr G.A. Riplinger, A.V. Publications Corp., 2007, p 5

³⁶ *Presbyterian Understanding and Use of Holy Scripture*,
www.pcusa.org/site_media/media/uploads/resolutions/scripture-use.pdf p 26

³⁷ *The Presbyterian Review*, 1881, Vol. 2, No. 6, commons.ptsem.edu/id/presbyterianrevi2618unse-dmd002 pp 237-238, 245. See also www.bible-researcher.com/warfield4.html

³⁸ *The Translators to the Reader* www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ *The Greatest Fight in the World*, archive.spurgeon.org/misc/gfw.php

⁴¹ *The King James Version Defended*, Chapter 8, standardbearers.net/uploads/The_King_James_Version_Defended_Dr_Edward_F_Hills.pdf

⁴² *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611)* by F.H.A. Scrivener, Cambridge, 1884, Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2004, p 60

⁴³ *Hazardous Materials*, Chapters 17, 18, 28

⁴⁴ *In Awe of Thy Word*, p 956

⁴⁵ *The Bible Babel*, p 60

⁴⁶ 'O Biblios' - *The Book*, pp 27-29, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/

⁴⁷ *Cleaning Up Hazardous Materials*, pp 139-140

⁴⁸ *The King James Version Defended*, Chapter 8, standardbearers.net/uploads/The_King_James_Version_Defended_Dr_Edward_F_Hills.pdf

⁴⁹ *The Big Picture* by David W. Norris, Authentic Word, 2004, pp 372, 384-385

⁵⁰ *The Answer Book*, Question 1, samgipp.com/the-bible-shouldnt-we-be-loyal-only-to-the-original-and-not-a-translation/

⁵¹ *Thirty-nine Articles*, mb-soft.com/believe/txc/thirtyni.htm

⁵² *The Answer Book*, Question 34, samgipp.com/34-didnt-the-first-king-james-bible-contain-the-apocrypha/

⁵³ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:KJV-King-James-Version-Bible-first-edition-title-page-1611.jpg

⁵⁴ *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611)*, p 19n

⁵⁵ 'O Biblios' - *The Book*, pp 183-185, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/

⁵⁶ *Defending the King James Bible*, p 72

⁵⁷ ldolphin.org/kitchen/mapexodus.html

⁵⁸ *The King James Version Defended*, Chapter 8, standardbearers.net/uploads/The_King_James_Version_Defended_Dr_Edward_F_Hills.pdf

⁵⁹ 'O Biblios' - *The Book*, pp 176ff, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/

⁶⁰ *Differences in the King James Version Editions* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1983, pp 3, 11, 18-19

⁶¹ *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship*, pp 30-37

⁶² *Final Authority*, pp 168ff

⁶³ *Translators Revived*, pp 223-224

-
- ⁶⁴ 'O Biblios' - *The Book*, pp 176ff, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/
- ⁶⁵ *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611)*, Appendices A, C
- ⁶⁶ *Defending the King James Bible*, p 244
- ⁶⁷ *To The Plummet from The Summit*, by Dr G.A. Riplinger, PowerPoint Presentation, Slides 117-132, www.hacalumni.com/ under Gail Riplinger
- ⁶⁸ *Perfected or Perverted?* by Norman Ward, Which Bible? Society, p 22. See also 'O Biblios' - *The Book*, p 20, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/
- ⁶⁹ *The Answer Book*, Question 47, samgipp.com/47-what-about-nuggets-found-only-in-the-greek-new-testament/
- ⁷⁰ *Cleaning Up Hazardous Materials*, pp 94-95
- ⁷¹ *Analytical Concordance to the Holy Bible*
- ⁷² *Ruckman Reference Bible*, p 557
- ⁷³ *The Book of Matthew* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Pensacola Bible Institute, 1978, p 142
- ⁷⁴ *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/
- ⁷⁵ *The Book of Ecclesiastes* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Believers Press, pp 158ff
- ⁷⁶ 'O Biblios' - *The Book*, p 17, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/, from *The History of the New Testament Church, Volume 1* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1982, p 374.
- ⁷⁷ 'O Biblios' - *The Book*, p 86, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/
- ⁷⁸ *How Great Soul winners Were Endued with Power* by Dr Rev Ian Paisley, Martyrs' Memorial Free Presbyterian Church, Belfast, Northern Ireland
- ⁷⁹ *Ruckman Reference Bible*, pp 759, 1037, 1591
- ⁸⁰ 'O Biblios' - *The Book*, p 121, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/
- ⁸¹ *The Men Behind the King James Version*, by Gustavus S. Paine, Baker Book House, 1959, p 11
- ⁸² *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1136
- ⁸³ 'O Biblios' - *The Book, General Introduction*, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/
- ⁸⁴ *Human Nature in the Bible* by William Lyon Phelps, 1922, *Introduction*
- ⁸⁵ *Monarchy* UK Channel 4 documentary
- ⁸⁶ *The Greatest Fight in the World*, archive.spurgeon.org/misc/gfw.php
- ⁸⁷ 'O Biblios' - *The Book* p 1, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/, from *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship*, p 23
- ⁸⁸ *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611)*, p 140n
- ⁸⁹ *The Big Picture*, p 392
- ⁹⁰ *The History of the New Testament Church, Volumes 1 and 2*, pp 24, 26
- ⁹¹ *The Christian Leaders of the Last (i.e. 18th) Century*, by Rev J.C. Ryle, T Nelson and Sons, 1878, Preface, pp 26, 90
- ⁹² 'O Biblios' - *The Book* pp 217, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/
- ⁹³ *Ibid.*, p 133
- ⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, Chapters 10-11, 13-14
- ⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp 176ff
- ⁹⁶ *The Authorized Edition of the English Bible (1611)*, Appendices A, C