

A N S W E R I N G

“Dr. Jack Schaap Speaks on Inspiration and the King James Bible...” (*The Voice*, February, 2009)

✎ SYNOPSIS ✎

FOR NEARLY 400 YEARS,

when a pastor said, ‘Turn in your Bibles’...they meant the King James Bible. When they preached, they would say, “The Bible is the inspired word of God.” Those in the pews never for a moment thought that ‘the Bible’ that they were told to turn to was not the same Bible that is inspired.

But liberal theologians have changed their definition of the word ‘Bible.’ It became merely the lost originals (Hodge, Warfield) or something settled only in heaven (Barth). The members in the pews were never told. This heresy moved into seminary textbooks and today some naïve pastors, sadly including Dr. Jack Schaap, have adopted this neologism. Dr. Schaap and others will say, “The Bible is the inspired Word of God.” But to them, this inspired ‘Bible’ is no longer the Holy Bible members hold in their lap.



∞ TABLE OF CONTENTS ∞

Chapter 1 **Answering Schaap's *The Voice***

Chapter 2 **Seven Proofs of the King James Bible's
Inspiration**

Chapter 1

Answering Schaap's *The Voice*

Schaap's Dishonest Alteration of Documents

Misrepresentation #1

Dr. Schaap has compiled a sixteen-page response to the thoughtful criticism he has been receiving since he charged vehemently that our Holy Bibles are not inspired. In an effort to convey the impression that his predecessor, Dr. Jack Hyles, did not believe that our Holy Bibles are inspired, he and his staff present excerpts from Dr. Hyles's sermon 'How to Call a Pastor' (page 9 of the Feb. 2009 issue of *The Voice*). They slyly skip over the *one* sentence which would defeat Dr. Schaap's new theory of 'uninspired Bibles.' They place no ellipses (...) to indicate that anything has been removed. This altered edition skips from item one to item two, omitting the last sentence in item 1. The original sermon can be seen in the book, *The Science of the Christian Life*, Vol. 2. It records Dr. Hyles as saying,

"The man chosen ought to believe that the King James Bible is **THE** inspired and preserved word of God" (Hammond, Ind.: Hyles Publications, p. 177, 2003 ed.; p. 173, 1996 edition).

The word "**THE**" is **bold** in the original transcript. Such purposeful deception by Dr. Schaap and his staff casts a dark shadow over all of their other statements.

Misrepresentation #2

The original July, 2008 edition of “Dr. Schaap Answers...Questions About his position regarding the inspiration of the King James Bible” is different than that printed on page of 7 of “Dr. Jack Schaap Speaks on Inspiration and the King James Bible,” even though Dr. Schaap says, “This is what I wrote in that booklet” (*The Voice*, Feb. 2009). Those “few” who received the original edition were given an additional arrogant and condescending closing paragraph which said,

“Perhaps for **the common man**, it could suffice us to simply say the King James Version is the inspired Word of God. For those of us whose lives center on that Book, let’s be accurate and precise when we talk about it. The King James Version is the preserved Word of God for the English-speaking peoples. It is accurate and complete.”

This last paragraph was clipped from *The Voice*, which was prepared for a wider audience. Suggesting such condescension and Semleresque deception to a few pastors was swept away for the wider audience, which might just include some of us “common” people.

The original ‘Schaap Answers’ stated that there were “58” KJB translators. Eighteen disappeared in the recent edition of *The Voice*, which states that these were only “40-50.” The truth is the King appointed 54 men; an official list of 47 names is extant. The larger number may have included “three or four of the most ancient” scholars, required by rule 15, but not actual members of the committee. Bilson and Bancroft, who did serve

in the project, would bring the number to 53. Perhaps the missing fifty “fourth is like the Son of God” (Dan 3:25).

Such confusion about the most basic historical facts makes it clear that Dr. Schaap’s area of expertise is not the history of our Bible. In Dr. Schaap’s book, *Where Are We Going?* he even pretends that King James “murdered and tortured our Baptist forefathers” (p. 53). This fable was fomented by anti-KJB critics who cite one Baptist who was in the Tower, not for being a Baptist, but for civil crimes, just as there are Baptists on death row today, who are not there for being Baptists. The book, *King James Unjustly Accused*, documents James’s gentle attitude toward all. Those KJB defenders, whom Dr. Schaap charges with “barbarism,” can easily supply such correct information. It would benefit the body of Christ if Dr. Schaap did not impugn them, when his expertise lies in areas *other than* the KJB’s history.

Misrepresentation #3

In baseball, a batter is out with three strikes. It’s back to the dug out, as Dr. Schaap and his team have lost this bout. The most despicable of Dr. Schaap’s misrepresentations are those which cast aspersions upon the King James Bible itself. Page fourteen of *The Voice* begins, “Have any of us really, truly, honestly read what the King James translators said **about the King James Bible?**” (As we have seen, “honestly,” may not be a word which best describes Dr. Schaap’s work.) Dr. Schaap follows that introductory line with three comments, which were actually made, **not about the KJB, but about other Bibles.**

1.) Dr. Schaap quotes the KJB translators as saying, “[T]he very meanest translation of the Bible in English, set forth by men of

our profession (for we have seen none of theirs of the whole Bible as yet) containeth the word of God, nay, is the word of God.” ‘Meanest’ means average, commonest, such as those Bibles distributed to the masses. It is similar to a ‘mean’ in arithmetic. It has nothing to do with being mean or ill worded. Neither were the KJB translators saying that *their* edition was the “meanest.” They are referring to earlier English Bibles, such as those done by John de Trevisa or the edition done in Geneva, neither of which received the acclaim of Wycliffe’s or the Great Bible edition (See *In Awe of Thy Word*, p. 774 et al.). The translators were not demeaning the King James Bible at all.

2.) To Dr. Schaap’s list of so-called quotes about ‘what the King James translators said **‘about the King James Bible,’** he adds *another* quote, in which they are again *not* talking about the KJB. Schaap quotes them as saying, “Notwithstanding that some **imperfections and blemishes may be noted in the setting forth of it.**” Dr. Schaap uses bold so that his reader will be sure not to miss his false accusation that the KJB translators thought that their edition had “imperfections and blemishes.” His citation of this quote and bold type coincide with the statement made by one of Dr. Schaap’s representatives, who told Dr. Fugate that the KJB had “3-5% errors” (*Church Bus News*, Jan. 09). In fact, the KJB translators were *NOT* talking about *their* edition. That sentence about “imperfections and blemishes” is in the midst of the translator’s history of the Bible. The next translation they mention is the corrupt Septuagint, of which they say, “it dissenteth form the Original in many places.” They proceed to mention faulty translations by Origin, Symmachus, Theodotian and Aquila. When their history of the Bible is ended several pages later (in my printing), they say, “But it is high time to leave THEM, and to shew in brief

what WE proposed to ourselves [emphasis mine]. Again, the translators were *not* talking about their KJB.

Of *their* translation they said their intent was to translate —

“...one principle good one, **not** justly to be **excepted against**, that hath been our endeavor, that our mark.”

In plainer words, they wanted to make a translation that no one could say it was good, ‘**except**’ this and that blemish. That they said they would sometimes “revise that which we had done” (which Schaap puts in bold) shows all the more clearly that the Spirit of God could move upon their hearts, until it was just as he pleased. “For we are labourers together with God...” (1 Cor. 3:9). Has God ever had to nudge you to do something *his* way a time or two?

3.) A third KJB translator’s quote, which Schaap says is “about the King James Bible” is *not* about it at all. It again is a part of the history section of “The Translators to the Readers,” where the KJB translators are talking about how the Catholics have mocked Englishmen, who have been involved in the production of the Bible for centuries. Dr. Schaap quotes the translators as saying, “the difference that appeareth between our translations, and our often correcting of them, is the thing we are specially charged with.” The accusers were the “Catholics,” mocking previous English Bibles. The statement could not have been made about the King James Bible because it had not been made public, when their prefatory “To the Readers” was written.

The Catholics were mocking the English Bible, which was “purified seven times.” Each purification was “pure.” What Dr. Schaap is misunderstanding is the fact that when something

is purified, it is pure. If it is purified seven times, it is made pure seven times. The sixth purification is just as pure as the seventh. *In Awe of Thy Word* demonstrates many things that the Lord was doing involving the KJB in that final seventh purification. Dear Dr. Schaap, how do you explain Ps. 12:6, 7. Your claim that changes impugn the inspiration and purity of the English Bible shows that you have not read the collations in *In Awe of Thy Word*, nor have you collated these old Bibles word-for-word, as I have, nor do you recognize the importance of Ps. 12:6, 7 in this discussion. Impure man cannot purify the Bible.

Dr. Schaap says, “Nowhere in all of their writings do the translators claim that they were inspired of God or that what they wrote was given by inspiration” (*The Voice*, p. 14). Many of the original penmen of the scriptures made no such claim either. Dr. James Sightler M.D., former professor of Church History at Tabernacle Baptist College in Greenville, S.C., author of numerous books on the KJB, and son of Harold Sightler responds,

“The KJB translators did not claim inspiration for their work because they did not need to. In their day it was generally understood that the Bible was inspired, and to them it was also clear that the Bible was now English and had been since at least the day of Wycliffe; that the Greek and Hebrew already had served their purpose and had long been properly put into English, perhaps as early as Tyndale. The true church, even in the middle ages, has always had inspired scripture before it. An omniscient, omnipotent God would not have allowed anything else (<http://www.sightlerpublications.com/King%20James%20Bible/Inspiration.htm>.)

Dr. Sightler adds that his father, Harold, used to say, “Has it ever occurred to you that nothing has ever occurred to God?” That would include the King James Bible, through which some two billion people yet today can hear about Christ.

Elsewhere in the *Voice*, Dr. Schaap asks, “Where are the men who know what they are talking about and understand languages?” “Where are the learned men of our clergy who even know how to read these manuscripts and examine the evidence?” “Where are the **knowledgeable** men who can translate for one billion people a perfect and reliable Bible? (*The Voice*, p. 16). He misrepresents the piety of the KJB translators, who ascribe the KJB, not to their own knowledge, but to prayer. The translators said,

“But it is high time to leave them [the corrupt translations they had been talking about], and to shew in brief what we proposed to ourselves, and what course we held in this our perusal and survey of the Bible...And in what sort did these assemble? [KJB translators] In the trust of their own **knowledge**, or of their sharpness of wit, or deepness of judgment, as it were in an arm of flesh? At **no** hand. They trusted in **him** that hath the key of David, opening and no man shutting; **they prayed** to the Lord...”

We should ask, “Where are the men, such as Lancelot Andrews, whose seal said, “And who is sufficient for these things!” (*In Awe*, p. 592). The King James Translators prefatory, “To the Readers,” said we “trample upon our own credit.” Such men will produce translations like the KJB — humble men, like Bryan Girard, who along with his family, gave up the comforts

of our American lifestyle to live in the bush of New Guinea. He is using the KJB to make a Bible for his converts, using one inspired Bible to make another one. Which English words are perfect – those in the Holy Bible or those in an unholy lexicon? (See chapter on the Greek-Only error in the “Scriptures To All Nations” in *Hazardous Materials: Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers*).

The following is a page-by-page review of the sixteen pages of Dr. Jack Schaap’s *The Voice*, mailed to pastors all across America (Feb. 2009).

The Voice: Review of Page Two

Dr. Schaap begins *The Voice* by charging, “others casually or carelessly presume to speak on my behalf” (p. 1). He says, “I supposedly have said” things. The sixteen-page article gives no examples to support the charge that anyone has spoken carelessly on his behalf. The recently published *Church Bus News* article, gives only direct quotations from Dr. Schaap, therefore the charge that others misrepresent his views remains unsubstantiated. His own statements are shocking enough; there is no need to alter them. A whining wounded-puppy introduction is not a manly response to those who have honestly responded to a book and teaching given at Pastor’s School in March of 2008. His claim that he is misrepresented in *never* substantiated in his sixteen-page response. In fact, he never says anything in the sixteen pages, which refutes or adjusts his statements in his book, *Where Are We Going?* and brash his Pastor’s School sermon, in which he states that the King James Bible is not inspired.

Dr. Schaap's article needs to answer the questions, presented in the *Church Bus News*, which arise from his negative comments about the King James Bible, his support of Rick Warren, and the other problematic statements in his book, *Where Are We Going?*. He needs to answer the other charges, such as why a representative from First Baptist Church, who spoke at Commonwealth Baptist Church, said that the KJB contained 3% to 5% errors and was not inspired. These are the questions presented in the *Church Bus News*. None of this has been answered, which leads one to assume that he stands by what he has said in his book, *Where Are We Going* and has no counter response to the charges and conclusions which the review of that book brings forth.

Schaap's Neologisms: New Meanings for Old Words, such as the 'Bible' and the 'Word of God'

Schaap begins page two saying, "I believe the Bible is the inspired Word of God." He immediately makes certain that no one confuses the inspired "Bible" with the King James Bible. For the KJB he gives a *different* definition. If he thought that the KJB was the Bible or an inspired Bible, he would not need a separate definition for it. Evidently, to him inspiration is not a quality which can be attributed to any Bible today, since in his mind the "King James Version" is only a "preserved translation of the inspired Word of God..." (Dr. Schaap frequently refers to the KJB as the KJV; this is fine, but HAC President Emeritus, Dr. Wendell Evens, said, "When Bro. Hyles said that we should call the King James Version the King James Bible, instead of calling it the King James Version, I agreed whole heartedly." It seems Dr. Schaap does not agree with Dr. Hyles on this, as he continually calls it the KJV (*The Voice*, p. 13).

Dr. Schaap's definition and usage of the word 'Bible' is a neologism, that is, "a new meaning for an already established word" (Webster's II New College Dictionary). Pastors say,

“Open your Bibles to....” Sunday School teachers say, “I hope you all brought your Bibles.” The word ‘Bible’ is defined by all dictionaries and used by all people to mean, “The sacred **book** of Christianity....” Webster’s further defines a ‘book,’ as “A set of written or printed pages fastened on one side and enclosed between protective covers.”

The Unabridged 20-volume *Oxford English Dictionary* defines “**Bible**” as, “The **Scriptures** of the Old and New Testament.” As such, the verse “All scripture is given by inspiration of God” would mean that the “Bible” “is given by inspiration of God.” One merely needs to see the OED to determine that the **Bible is scripture** and according to the Bible “All scripture is given by inspiration.” Dr. Schaap charges in *The Voice* that “We have discouraged the use of a good dictionary” and we need to “learn how to define words” (p. 15). Physician, heal thyself. A simple trip to the Webster’s or the *Oxford English Dictionary* would have shown him that 1.) The Bible is a “book,” which has “covers,” not the lost originals, or The Word, Jesus Christ, or something settled only in heaven. 2.) The Bible is Scriptures. A child can read and understand these definitions. The same child can read 2 Tim. 3:16 and discover that “All scripture is given by inspiration of God.” Wow! That book I have with covers is inspired! Simple.

The examples given in the OED of the historic usage of the word “Bible” only include instances in which the Bible was something that people *had*. Never in the OED’s lengthy discussion is the word “Bible” ever used to mean lost originals or words hidden in heaven. For example, the very first English usages of the word ‘Bible’ say,

1300 “As the bibul sais.”

- 1330 “The bible may not lie.”
 1430 “Like as the bibylle rehersith.”
 1528 “He lerned the articles of his beleue in the bible.”
 1798 “Is that the charity **your** Bible teaches?”
 1837 “How your true hearts the open Bible priz’d”
 1850 “[They]carried with them the sword in one hand and the Bible in the other.”
 1908 “the open Bible worked a change.”

All of these instances denote a book one has in hand (OED, s.v. bible). I challenge anyone to find in the OED or any dictionary the definition that Dr. Schaap uses for the word ‘Bible.’

(The OED adds that the Greek usage of *Biblia* “ceased to have a diminutive sense, and was the ordinary word for ‘book,’ whether as a distinct treatise, or as a subdivision of a treatise, before its application to the Jewish and Christian Scriptures.”)

Quite simply, all English-speaking people use the word ‘Bible’ in its conversational and dictionary usage. Never is it used to mean, as Schaap infers, the lost original documents or ethereal words “settled” *only* in heaven. The “Bible,” which is “inspired,” according to Dr. Schaap’s definition, is not a book that anyone on this earth has. His introductory sentence, “I believe the Bible is the inspired Word of God,” is meant to deceive the average reader, who defines the word ‘Bible’ within the parameters of its normal usage and dictionary definition. That he himself also uses the word ‘Bible’ in its normal usage can be heard in his sermon of Feb. 6, 2009. In it he says, “the Bible is inspired,” but the King James Bible is not, it is only a translation that is “preserved.” Only minutes later he closes saying,

“How about if we open **the book** we all love around here. And let’s look at Acts 19. I only have time for one of these. But we’ll enjoy this journey here. And I’d rather talk about the Bible and **use the Bible**. So let’s **open** to Acts 19.”

The undiscerning listener has just heard George Orwell’s 1984 “double-speak.” Dr. Schaap has just used the word ‘Bible’ in its normal usage. Minutes earlier he used it as a neologism, that is, using an old word, with *his own* new meaning. Actually, Dr. Schaap was not the originator of this neologism. Charles Hodge and B.B. Warfield, following the textual criticism of the German higher critics, redefined the word ‘Bible,’ to mean the lost originals. (See Chapter on “KJB Inspiration” in *Hazardous Materials: Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers*).

In addition to using the Hodge-Warfield neologism, which redefines the word ‘Bible,’ Dr. Schaap redefines the simple words, “word of God” into the Barth-Brunner ethereal “Word of God.” Schaap capitalizes the word “Word,” as did Barth and Brunner. These men taught that the “word of God” was not limited to the Bible, but was wrapped up in Christ, the Word and any venue through which he chose to communicate. This is the mantra of the apostate Rick Warren and the seeker-friendly and charismatic churches. They, like Dr. Schaap, say that there is no inspired Bible on this earth. Schaap’s words of knowledge from lexicons and his denying that God *himself* speaks in the English Bible (and in the Bible only), is merely a Baptist-flavored form of a modern man-centered theology.

In *The Voice*’s “Open Letter From Pastor Jack Schaap,” on page two, he refers to “God’s holy Word – our Bible.” The normal usage of those words infers that “our Bible” is a Bible

that we own. His expression, “God’s word” or “the Word of God,” infers that the words in “our Bible” are those of God, not those of men. He, however, is using the term ‘wordofGod’ as another neologism. To him, these three words no longer have their normal English usage, but have again been re-defined. The ‘word of John’ is “John’s word” and the “words of John” are John’s words.” They are not the words of another person. Those hearing or reading the words, “word of God,” place the normal English usage upon them. Schaap does not. He has his own definition. (This usurpation of the authority of God and disregard for the normal sense of things is the result of years of looking at men’s dictionaries to determine what God ‘meant.’ The man defiled thereby begins to think that if other men can re-define the words of the Bible, so can he.) The phrase ‘Word of God’ is to him an expression, a rhetorical tool. In fact, “words” are those building blocks of sentences, which are made up of letters. The words “of God” denote from whom the words “proceedeth” (Matt. 4:4). He will call the KJB the ‘word of God’ and the ‘words of God,’ but he believes that its words are actually those ‘of the KJB translators.’ Yet he deceives his listeners by using the phrase ‘the word of God,’ instead of the ‘word of the translators.’

Words have ceased to have their normal usage to Dr. Jack Schaap. In a dialogue from Lewis Carroll’s *Through the Looking Glass*, Humpty Dumpty said,

“When *I* use a word,” Humpty Dumpty said in a rather scornful tone, “it means just what I choose it to mean, neither more nor less.” “The question is,” said Alice, “whether you can make words mean different things.” “The question is,” said

Humpty Dumpty, “which is to be master, that’s all.”

The book from which these lines come was written to mock the father of Greek-English lexicography, Henry (Humpty) Liddell, editor of the Liddell-Scott Greek-English Lexicon. (Liddell’s lexicon, which is behind all New Testament Greek-English lexicons, is thoroughly discussed in *Hazardous Materials: Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers*).

The history of heresy is the history of the changing of the meaning of Bible words (e.g. ‘Christ’ is not ‘Jesus,’ but a consciousness we can all reach; ‘born again’ is not ‘being a new creature in Christ Jesus,’ it is infant baptism or reincarnation). The common words are retained, but heretical meanings are given to them to subtly change theology. Dr. Schaap and those who say one thing, but mean another, are using Semler’s Theory of Accommodation. Semler, like all of history’s Bible critics, realized that in order to please the common believer (and keep his ecclesiastical salary coming in) one must feign absolute orthodoxy by using ordinary words and theological terms, as the common man might expect. However, the man who places himself above the Bible, may, like a Jesuit, use mental reservation, and give the word a completely new meaning. Ask Dr. Schaap what his definition of the simple word ‘Bible’ is. I would suggest if he and others cannot use that word in its normal conversational or dictionary usage, they should not teach the ‘Bible’ or have a ‘Bible’ college. It is all quite simple.

Schaap’s KJB is Not the Bible and Is Not Inspired

Dr. Schaap claimed the KJB is not inspired in his book, *Where Are We Going?*,

“Because of the amount of “foolishness” being bantered about on this subject by careless Bible students, such as teaching that the King James Version is inspired, we have “shot ourselves in the foot” in the eyes of many...”

He gave an example, saying, “... a statement was made that the King James Bible is inspired by God.” “For one to believe that God inspired the King James Version of the Bible, he would be espousing Catholic or charismatic theology.” “I am confident that the youth pastor who wrote that the King James Version is inspired does not fully understand the error of his wording” (*Where*, pp. 84-85).

The statement of faith of Dr. Bobby Roberson’s Gospel Light Baptist Church in Walkertown, N.C. states regarding the Bible:

“We believe that the 66 books of the King James Version are the preserved and inspired Word of God for this generation”

(http://www.glbcs.org/church_site_005.htm).

Is he accusing Pastor Bobby Roberson of being Catholic or Charismatic? Dr. Schaap’s staff has spoken at a Bus Conference at that church for many years; they are speaking there again this year. Why would they speak at a church that had heretical Catholic or charismatic beliefs? In a February 6, 2009 sermon, Dr. Schaap repeated,

“There are some teachings out there about the KJB and some people are playing with words and they are getting into some, what I would call, some relatively new and dangerous

teaching. It is Charismatic and Catholic philosophy.”

His definition of “playing with words” is when someone simply knows more Greek, more Bible, and more English grammar and linguistics than he knows. Furthermore, it will be necessary for Dr. Schaap to prove that Catholics and charismatics believe that the King James Bible is inspired. He will search long and hard to find such a statement by them. I would suggest that he is using the words “new,” “dangerous,” “Catholic,” and “charismatic” as emotion-packed blood pressure words to frighten his good Baptist listeners. Pastor Bobby Roberson and those who believe as he does are hardly “dangerous.” The post-canonical and extra-biblical nonsense perpetrated by Catholic and Charismatic groups does not disannul the true and real work of the Spirit of God who promised, “All scripture is given by inspiration of God...” (2 Tim. 3:16). Because drug addicts abuse needles and drugs, does not disannul the prudent and medical usage of such. Dr. Schaap’s analogy is non-biblical. It is emotion provoking, not thought provoking. Of course, God has closed the canon, but he never said that he would not *translate* the canon. Such work is spoken of in Isaiah 28 and fulfilled in Acts 2.

“With men of **other tongues** and other lips will I **speak**...saith the Lord” (1 Cor. 14:21).

This is not charismatic gibberish, but known languages for the bringing forth of what Dr. John Wycliffe called, “the Scriptures in tongues.” Furthermore, the use of the present tense verb “is” in Dr. Schaap’s phrase, “the Bible is inspired,” infers that an inspired Bible exists *somewhere*. I had pointed out to him in a September letter that his use of the word “was,” in his

July 2008 *Schaap Answers*, is not scriptural, because the Bible says, “is given by inspiration.” He now sometimes fixes that error. But by using the word “is,” he will be forced to identify the location of this inspired Bible.

Where may we find this inspired Bible? We must conclude that his statement “The Bible is inspired” is meaningless rhetoric. It is simply good words and fair speeches to deceive the hearts of the simple. Schaap begins with this statement, because he knows that to appear orthodox to the man in the pew, he *must* say that the Bible is inspired. Since Dr. Schaap is now trying to expand his numbers to include those who have a lower view of the Holy Bible, he finds the reproach that comes with the KJB ‘embarrassing.’ He believes that a high view of the Holy Bible will “hurt the Independent Baptist church-**growth** movement” (*Where Are We Going*, p. 84). Since when do Christians condescend to the carnal views of the world in order to “grow”? Liberal Protestants, Charismatics, and Catholics have increased their numbers solely by becoming more and more liberal. Of course, liberal views increase numbers. If we served beer and had immodest cheerleaders in church, we could have as many attendees as does the Super Bowl. Hell itself will *really* have the numbers.

“Preserved” Only

1. The word ‘preservation’ demands an object. Something must be preserved. In Dr. Schaap’s mind, nothing tangible is preserved, except the concepts, which must in turn be translated into English words by men. He is closer to the old heretical theory of ‘concept inspiration’ than he realizes.

If a blue suit is preserved, it is still blue. If it is faded and is no longer blue, it is not preserved. The word ‘preserve’ inherently requires an object of preservation. *Something* must be preserved. There is no preservation without an object of preservation. If I said, “The blue suit is preserved,” the suit would still be blue; it would still be a suit. A preserved entity retains *all of the qualities* of the original. If the inspired Bible is preserved, it is still inspired. Another scriptural and grammatical analogy will help. If a ‘saved man’ is “kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time” (1 Peter 1:5), his quality of being a ‘saved man’ is preserved. When a ‘saved man’ and an ‘inspired word’ are “kept” and “preserved,” they retain the adjectival qualities of being “saved” and “inspired.”

2. Webster’s II says that to “preserve” is “to maintain unchanged.” God has preserved and kept his words pure, since he settled them in heaven. God communicated these words to men, as seen in Acts 2, when the Holy Ghost gifted men to be able to speak in the languages of “every nation under heaven.” He said, “let one interpret.” There has been one Bible for each language group. Its inspired words have served as a bridge for the creation of other inspired Bibles, as varied dialects and languages grew from it (e.g. Latin became Spanish, French, and Italian). The Bibles by which each man will be judged on the last day are Bibles that he can read. I will be judged by the English King James Bible. (See chapters on the Greek-Only error in “Scriptures to all Nations” and “Greek Orthodox” heresy in *Hazardous Materials: Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers*; see also *In Awe of Thy Word* for a history of the purification of the English Bible).

3. Who does the preserving? According to Dr. Schaap, it is the translators. Ps. 12:6,7 says however,

“**Thou** shalt keep them, **thou** shalt **preserve** them from this generation for ever.”

What is the Lord preserving? “The **words of the LORD** are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.” The actual words of the LORD must be preserved somewhere. The Bible says that they will be preserved by him and not by men. Note that it says he will “preserve” them, even in the trying “furnace of earth.” The process of preservation includes purification seven times. God does not stop at six times and he does not go beyond seven times. This precludes unending revisions of the Bible by man. It is apparent by the 400 year usage of the KJB that God’s purification of the Bible for English speakers halted with the King James Bible. Although man may try to revise it, God does not preserve their untoward efforts. He is obviously preserving the KJB, whose words stem from the Gothic, Latin, and other languages (extant in Acts 2), given directly by the Holy Ghost in Acts 2. He said he was the preserver in the “earth” of what is settled in heaven. He said he is the one whereby the words are “purified seven times.” When the words of the Gothic scriptures dropped their prefixes and inflected suffixes and began to look much like the words in today’s English Bible, he was there to keep their Holy Ghost inspiration intact. All along, they must be his words, not those of a translator, according to the words of Psalm 12:6, 7.

The Voice: Review of Page Three

On page three of *The Voice* Dr. Schaap gives the answer to sample ‘Questions’ he has received, since he began impugning those who defend the KJB and their belief in its inspiration. Each of his responses will be critiqued here.

Question 1

On page three of the February issue of *The Voice*, Dr. Schaap repeats, “I still believe my King James Bible is the Word of God.” Again, he is using the words ‘Word of God’ in a rhetorical sense and not in their common and widely perceived usage. He believes that the words of the KJB are in fact, only the words of men, the KJB translators. If they were the very words of God, the KJB would have to be inspired by God.

Question 2 and 3

When asked, ‘What’s all the fuss about?’ and “Why are good men “splitting hairs,”” Dr. Schaap responds, “I couldn’t agree with you more!...Good question!...I have no desire to “split hairs” with anyone...”

Dr. Schaap is feigning amnesia and pretending that it was not HE who began all of this discussion with his diatribe, which called it “foolishness” and “heresy” to believe the inspiration of my Holy Bible, the KJB. It was he who charged people with “careless wording,” mandating that “every student of God’s Word be instructed in the theological definitions...” Earlier he said, “Perhaps it seems to you that I am being particularly “picky about this...” Now, he is pretending *we* started being “picky.” We were all out soul winning and doing the work of the ministry, until Dr. Schaap decided to re-educate us “wacky”

and “ignorant” soul-winners with his non-biblical Warfieldian view of inspiration.

It was *he* who accused KJB defenders of “barbarism” “cursing, swearing, name calling and character assassination” (*Which*, pp. 84-86). (Of course he gave no examples to document this.) The Bible says, “in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves.” Yet Dr. Schaap, in his fall sermon, uses highly inflammatory language to describe those who believe that their Holy Bible is inspired. He uses the very “name calling” he accuses KJB defenders of. He uses highly charged words such as,

“wacky...rats in the woodpile...
 novices, extremists...
 cultish teaching...similar to Mormons...
 extremists to bring in damnable heresies...
 damnable lies...bludgeoning...deception...
 creeping in unaware...
 ignorant and deceptive teachers...
 ignorance...blindness...
 naïve... magic
 book...charismatic...Lutheran...Calvinists
 Catholic...
 enemy sews tares...
 ignorance of so many King James Bible
 teachers...
 defending the Charismatic view...” (Nov. 2008
 sermon).

I have never heard such vitriolic language used by those who defend the KJB. He continues name-calling via telephone, calling one KJB defender a “moron,” and an “idiot” (If I told

you the man he call these names, *to his face*, you would fall over.) When I was a child, my mother taught me never to talk like that and she was not even a saved person at the time. Hypocritically, in the February issue of the *Voice*, he has the audacity to say,

“In my opinion, we independent Baptists have not learned how to discuss our differences with

each other without becoming almost explosive in our rhetoric...Can we not grow in our gentlemanliness and discuss our doctrines with wisdom and grace?” (p. 15).

No one who read the *Voice* needed his hypocritical admonition, as vitriolic language such as his is not coming forth from those who believe the KJB has not lost its inspiration.

It was he who said that it was a “distraction” and a “hurt” to defend the KJB; he accused those who did defend it of being “sidetracked.” He closes a section of his book, *Where Are We Going?* by saying, “God’s word did not need defending.” It was he who made the ridiculous charge of “20,000 errors of spelling and typesetting” in the 1611.” It was he who recommended the corrupt “1881 Scrivener’s edition” (*Where*, pp. 84-96). It is illegal to walk away from the scene of a crime, shake one’s head, say, ‘What a shame,’ and pretend he was not the perpetrator. Dr. Schaap has yet to address any of the brash statements he made. He has not stopped at “hair-splitting,” but has engaged in linguistic head chopping.

Question 4

When asked if “the inspired words were preserved in their inspired state,” Dr. Schaap replies,

“I don’t know what you mean by “inspired state.” Inspired scriptures have to do with the original words God **gave**...God **has preserved** for us His word.”

Whenever Dr. Schaap gives any lengthy explanation of his Warfieldian view of inspiration, he must use past tense verbs. Here he uses “gave” and “has preserved.” However, the Holy Bible remains in the present tense when speaking of inspiration and preservation. 2 Tim. 3:16 says, “is given” and Psalm 12: 6, 7 says “preserve” and “keep.” Changing the Bible to prove ones point is a dangerous retort. In his original “Dr. Schaap Answers...Questions About his position regarding the inspiration of the King James Bible” (dated July 2008), he continually used the past tense to explain his truncated view of inspiration. His Open Letter used the *past* tense words and phrases, “was spoken,” “were given,” “was given,” “were given,” “breathed,” “inspired,” “gave,” and “was inspired.” Then it says, “When I hear, the KJV **is** inspired, I wince.” However, the Bible says in 2 Tim. 3:16, “is given.” On page nine of the *Voice*, Dr. Schaap repeats his official position:

“We believe the Scriptures, as they **were written** by the human authors, **were given** by divine inspiration of God or **breathed** out by God.”

We must be careful not add to or change the Bible, as he has done here. The Bible says, “is given,” not “were given.” That is the crux of the debate. One cannot defend a position based upon changing what the Bible says. Nor can one add the words “breathed out,” taken from a highly corrupt Greek lexicon.

(We all know that the word ‘is’ does not occur in the Greek. All Bibles, good and bad, must insert the word ‘is’ somewhere to

make a complete sentence. Only the KJB uses italics to show this. However the construction would never allow a *past* tense, ‘was’ or ‘were,’ to be introduced. Even the liberals know this cannot be done. The word ‘given’ implies a continuous process. (This is explained in great detail in the chapter on “KJB Inspiration” in *Hazardous Materials: Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers*). Dr. Schaap’s Open Letter then continues with the past tense “was given,” “God spoke,” “God spoke,” “were inspired,” “gave,” and “was inspired.” However, the Bible says, “All **scripture is given** by inspiration of God....” The wince-evoking word “is” comes from reading the Bible’s phrase, “is given by inspiration.” Why is the KJB making Dr. Schaap “wince”?

Question 5

Dr. Schaap does not believe that any men, except the Greeks and Hebrews, had inspired Bibles, which were actually God’s own words. He credits other Bibles to the “Hard work and diligent study” of “translators.” Diligence cannot in itself account for the miraculous phenomenon seen in Holy Bibles. Jesus said he was not only the Word, but was also the Alpha and Omega (letters) and the “first and the last.” How do you account for the fact that the first and last verses in the KJB have the exact same number of letters, the same number of vowels and the same number of consonants? (See chapter on “KJB Inspiration” for details). It took 1,200 pages in *In Awe of Thy Word* merely to glance upon the miraculous phenomenon in the KJB.

All things were created by him and for him. The creation of the world’s language families at Babel was by God and for the glory of God. Translating the Bible is like putting a puzzle together. The pieces, or words, already exist. The translator

simply has to try each one and discard those that do not fit. There is a perfect fit. God provides the puzzle pieces. Translators simply put them together. The chapter, “The Seven Proofs of the King James Bible’s Inspiration,” from *Hazardous Materials*, explains that the Spirit of God has merely to nudge ‘yes’ or ‘no,’ when the translator looks at any of the very small number of word-options. If the Spirit of God could not tell a believer, ‘yes’ or ‘no,’ we would all be in a mess. The words of the Spirit of God, seen in cognate language Bibles, usually serve as his voice to the translator. The words in most Bibles, such as the English Bible, have a very long history. *In Awe of They Word* traced words in the KJB all the way back to the first century. (Also see chapter on the “Scriptures to All Nations” for a complete examination of this subject.)

It would be a most unusual case where a translator had to create a Bible with no preceding or cognate language Bible from which to work. The Holy Bible Society, of which I am the president, has been working for some time to resurrect out-of-print pure Received Text Bibles, which are wasting away on library shelves. The society was formed when I saw Dr. Keen’s list of foreign languages in the 10/40 window, which were said to have had no Bible. I knew that many of them were in fact available in very old editions, still sitting on library shelves in stuffy Ivy League libraries. I set about to get them and within a year or so was able to bring Dr. Keen several huge boxes full of the very Bibles, which he thought had never been made. The Bibles in the boxes could affect multiplied millions of people. Our latest ‘find’ on the bookshelves of Europe is the ancient Farsi Bible, readable by millions in Afghanistan and Pakistan. It is being scanned as I write.

I told Dr. Phil Pins, Greek professor at Hyles Anderson College and leader of the Chinese members at First Baptist, that the Chinese Union Bible, which they were using, was from the corrupt RSV. (Schaap later said in *The Voice*, that it was from the English Standard Version, which is impossible, since the ESV was recently produced; *Voice*, p. 16). I told Dr. Pins that I could get a pure Chinese Bible from the 1800s. Dr. Pins soon wrote to me and requested it. When he received it he said, “Perhaps the new materials can be used to help reach these needy people. It is great to have the living word of God to present to them. What an opportunity...” We have the pure Spanish (*Valera 1602 Purificada*), the pure French, and are aware of many other projects to resurrect old pure Bibles. Dr. Schaap asks, “Where are the knowledgeable men who can translate for one billion people a perfect and reliable Bible?” The Chinese Bible was already given by God. The Morrison edition, from the early 1800s, has been digitized and is presently at the printer in Taiwan, waiting to be released. Between that Chinese Bible that I sent Dr. Schaap’s church, the box of old Bibles in Indian dialects I gave Dr. Keen, and the Farsi Bible we found for Afghanistan and Pakistan, God managed to resurrect already inspired Bibles for that billion people Dr. Schaap is worried about. And we did not need one corrupt lexicon or questionable Greek edition to do it. Will Dr. Schaap put pride aside and contact us to get these pure Bibles? Does he *really* care about the millions who are using UBS corrupted editions? He has an opportunity to prove he cares now.

All of these Bible were collated word-for-word to ascertain that they did match the King James Bible. The Holy Bible Society works with linguists who speak many of the languages of the world; Dr. Hinton, Ph.D., linguist from Harvard

University, can cover a very large percentage of them himself, including those in the 10/40 window. Dr. Nico Verhoef in Switzerland, not only collects old European Bibles, but can collate them beautifully. I can learn enough about a language in a summer to collate it and have found myself wading through everything from Swahili to Pashto in our pursuit to find old pure Bibles.

The job at hand is to find the old pure Bibles, not to start from scratch with a corrupt lexicon and a questionable Greek text. Pure Bibles are sitting on library shelves around the world. We need people who speak living languages to evaluate them and eliminate the corrupt ones. For example, I have spent large sums of money, purchasing Indian dialect Bibles from the mid-1800s, only to collate them and find that they already have been corrupted under the influence of Griesbach's Greek text. Many Bibles produced after the early 1900, under the UBS directorship of Harold K. Moulton, are corrupt (He is also the editor of the lexicon Dr. Schaap uses!!).

Question 6 Burning Straw Men

Dr. Schaap says, “If we believe the King James Version is truly inspired...We are also forced into the fallacy of thinking one can only be saved if a KJV was used to win him.” Obviously, new versions are full of KJB words, phrases and sentences, which is more than enough to tell a person about Christ. The book of Romans in the NASB is generally a plagiarization of the KJB. The words ‘Jesus,’ ‘saved,’ ‘believe,’ and ‘sinner’ are all KJB words.

Dr. Schaap props up yet another scarecrow, saying, “To say that the KJV is inspired is...to say that all peoples prior to the KJV did not have the Word of God” (*Schaap Answers,*

July, 2008). He could never find a quotation by anyone saying that the KJB is the only inspired Bible. This is patent exaggeration. Acts 2 said that by the Holy Ghost “every man heard them speak in his own language” “out of every nation under heaven.” The famine, spoken of in Amos, wherein men will go from sea to sea and not find the words of the Lord, has hit many language groups. This has been caused by their own lack of love for the word of God. This parallels the famine for the word which overcame the nation of Israel, when the Lord stopped speaking to them at the end of the Old Testament.

The English King James Bible is one of the remaining remnants among pure Bibles. Why should we not use it as a baseline? Vernacular Bibles have always been used to create other vernacular Bibles. Greek scriptures were unavailable for over one thousand years (from the early isolation of the Byzantine empire to the fall of Constantinople). They were only used in the 16th and early 17th centuries to corroborate the pure Bibles which had already brought Christ to Europe for a millennium. (See chapters on the Greek-Only error, “Scriptures to All Nations” and “Greek Orthodox” heresy in *Hazardous Materials: Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers*).

Dr. Schaap continually creates a straw man to burn so that he can say, as he does here, “I do not believe that the King James Bible is inspired.” He says, “Inspiration does not refer to some spiritual power or “magical” power that God placed on these words.” Again, he is misrepresenting his opposition. He cannot substantiate anyone using the word “magical” in reference to the KJB. Any Bible believer knows that the word ‘magic’ is associated with the devil. Single quotes are used when a word is used in such a way; double quotation marks are used when a direct quotation is cited. He is stating that those

who believe the KJB is inspired believe in ‘magic.’ Inflammatory jargon seems to be his only weapon. Dr. Schaap wallpapers his writings and speech with words which have a negative connotation, so that good people will be misrepresented behind his façade of bad imagery.

He ignites yet another straw man to send forth a blinding smokescreen. He continually charges that the KJB cannot be inspired, because its translators were not party to the physical sign manifestations, which God reserved for Israel alone. He mentions God speaking originally by “vision, by dream, face-to-face.” He says, “But God did not give the English words of the KJV in 1604-11 **the same way**” (Schaap Answers, July, 2008). He says,

“None of them [KJB translators] claimed that God spoke directly to them or that they got their words from a dream or vision or that God handed to them His words on tables of stone, as He did for Moses” (Schaap Answers, July 2008).

Obviously, the scriptures are given in a variety of ways; many of the means we do not know, as the Bible is often silent on this subject. He pretends that for the KJB to be “given by inspiration of God,” God must have “**breathed** the words to the 1604-11 translators.” No one charges, as he infers that “the King James Version was **spoken** by God” or “God **spoke** English words to the translators at Hampton Court **just as** He spoke to Moses or Paul...” He pretends, “They tell me that the King James Version was given by inspiration **just as** the very oracles that Moses composed...” (Schaap Answers, July, 2008). He hammers, “I am not saying that the Bible I hold in my hands

(the KJV) **was** inspired by God **as** were the “originals” (Schaap Answers, 2008).

By using the words “as,” “just as,” and “the same way,” Dr. Schaap has again misrepresented inspiration. His reader concludes that since the KJB was not given “as” some men received revelation from God, then it cannot be “given by inspiration of God.” The newest student of the word of God quickly observes that God does not deal with him **as** he dealt with Moses. The student also knows that God still does, however, *deal* with him. God has not seceded to a remote corner of the universe. His spirit still teaches, convicts, comforts, and leads into all truth. Saying that Bibles are no longer inspired is tantamount to saying that the Holy Ghost is gone. It is through his words that he convicts the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment.

The verse “All scripture is given by inspiration of God” does not mandate it being “breathed,” or “spoken” aloud, or given by replicating the exact method God used with Moses. It is merely the still small voice of the spirit, speaking to men’s hearts. (Might Dr. Schaap be getting the idea of ‘spake’ from 2 Pet. 1:21? Notice that there *the men* did the speaking; they were merely “moved by the Holy Ghost.” In that verse God is not referred to as the speaker, just the ‘mover.’ Also the verse is more specifically about what they “spake,” not what they *wrote*.) His ridiculous exaggeration is easily diffused.

Dr. Schaap has not dealt with the word “inspiration” at all in *The Voice*. The chapter “The Seven Proofs of the King James Bible’s Inspiration” (chapter 2 herein) explains this quite simple phenomenon. It can be summed up so that a child may understand it. The compound word in-**spir**-ation says it all. All

scripture is given by the Spirit. Jesus said, The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit..." (John 6:63).

"God-Breathed" (Jack Schaap, NIV, et al.)

In Dr. Jack Schaap *Answers* he says, "given by inspiration of God," "literally means "God-breathed" (July 2008). 'Literally,'... really Dr. Schaap? His definition of the Greek word places 2 Tim. 3:16 on the wrong foundation. The root (*pneuma*) is never translated as "breathed." In *The Voice*, Dr. Schaap calls for "linguistics" and "etymology," but offers none. When given them in the January, *Church Bus News*, he ignores them. The second part of *theopneustos* comes from *pneuma*, which is almost always translated as "spirit" (322 times), "Ghost" or "ghost" (91 times), "wind" (1 time), "life" (1 time), but *never* as 'breath' or 'breathed' (See J.B. Smith, *Greek-English Concordance to the New Testament*, Scottsdale, PA: Harold Press, 1983.) Dr. Schaap is not distinguishing two different Greek words, *pneuma* (spirit) and *pnoe'* (breath). It would only be marginally correct to say that *theopneustos* was connected with the breath of God, since it is a *different* Greek word, *pnoe'*, that is translated **twice** as "breath[e]" in Acts 17:25 and 9:1 and once as "wind" in Acts 2:2. Even James Strong admits that *pneuma* is only "a **presumed** der. [derivative] of 4154" (*pnoe'*). The derivation is not certain. They are not the same words in the Greek New Testament.

Dr. Schaap's man-made definition 'God-breathed' darkens his understanding of how scripture "is given." His substitution of the tangible "breath" of God, in place of the intangible "Spirit" of God is the crux of his confusion. The Jews require a sign and God dealt with them in tangible ways. A physical

manifestation of his ‘breath’ is not his means of communicating to the Gentiles in this dispensation.

Moulton’s Corrupt Greek Lexicon

What Ever Happened to Jack Schaap? He followed Alice down the rabbit hole and entered the daft world of lexical jabberwocky. No man who stays there very long ever views his Holy Bible with quite the same “awe.” In the *Voice*, Dr. Schaap says, “We have discouraged the use of a good dictionary or lexicon...” The word “good” pared with the word “lexicon” is an oxymoron, kind of like the phrase, “good beer.” Saying that we have ‘just a translation’ or a ‘good’ Bible, in the KJB, is like saying that Jesus was just a good man. The liberals will be happy with both. God does not need the help of men to make his words clear. Dr. Schaap’s balancing act fumbles, as did Uzzah’s (2 Sam. 6:1-12). Dr. Schaap balances a Bible on one knee and a lexicon on the other. His definition “God-breathed” is rooted in his Harold K. Moulton, *Analytical Greek Lexicon*. The fruit does not fall far from the tree. Harold was the son of James Hope Moulton and the grandson of William Fiddian Moulton of the Westcott and Hort’s *Revised Version* Committee! Harold K. Moulton’s lexicon is a slightly edited version of his father’s corrupt lexicon, the Moulton and Milligan *Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament*. It was written to defend the words in their fathers, William Moulton (Harold’s grandfather) and William Milligan, in the corrupt Revised Version of 1881. Harold’s father, the editor of the original lexicon, was sympathetic towards pagan religions, particularly Zoroastrianism, a religion from Iran, which worships a God named Mazda. He “published four books on Zoroastrianism and Parsism: *Early religious poetry of Persia* (Cambridge University Press, 1911), *Early Zoroastrianism* (the Hibbert Lectures; London: Williams & Norgate, 1913), *The teaching of Zarathushtra* (Bombay: P.A. Wadia, 1917), and *The*

treasure of the Magi (published posthumous, London: Oxford University, 1917)” (*The Origin and Scope of Moulton and Milligan’s Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament...*, G.H. R. Horsley, John Rylands Library, Manchester, Bulletin, Vol. 76 (1) 1994). Dr. Schaap says, “This is the official Greek textbook used at Hyles-Anderson College...” In a sermon on February 6, 2009, Dr. Schaap directs his members to read that month’s issue of the *Voice*, where he cited Moulton’s corrupt Greek lexicon. He says that after they read this, they too will be able to “exegete the Greek.”

Harold K. Moulton himself was on the United Bible Societies Greek text committee. This text underlies most modern versions, such as the NIV, TNIV, ESV, NASB, HCSB, and NRSV. Although only five or six names are listed as editors of the corrupt United Bible Societies Greek New Testament, there were actually eight participants. In addition to Bruce Metzger, Kurt Aland, Arthur Vööbus, Matthew Black, and Allen Wikgren, the three other men who participated include, according to Bruce Metzger himself: “J. Harold Greenlee, Robert P. Markham, and Harold K. Moulton.” This text, on which Moulton worked, was done, as Metzger admits,

“On the basis of Westcott and Hort’s edition of the Greek New Testament” (Bruce Metzger, *The Reminiscence of an Octogenarian*, Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997, pp. 69-70).

Many unknowingly access Harold Moulton’s definitions when they use the dictionary in the back of the corrupt UBS Greek New Testament. In addition to Harold Moulton’s work on the punctuation of that Greek text, among other things, he is thanked profusely for his “wise counsel” in the production of

the “Greek-English Dictionary” included in Metzger’s United Bible Society’s Greek Text, 4th edition. The Dictionary’s Preface thanks Moulton and says, “the meanings are given in present-day English, **rather than** in accord with traditional ecclesiastical terminology.” This diluting and admitted secularization of the words of the Holy Bible, with the help of Harold Moulton and others, characterizes all lexicons. Imagine, corrupt Greek text users, accessing Moulton’s English mind via the dictionary in the back of *their* Greek text, while KJB users *define* KJB words, using Moulton’s same English word choices, in *their Greek Analytical Lexicon*. Why would KJB users consult the admittedly secular English word choice of Moulton’s lexicon, based upon the Revised Version of 1881, Westcott and Hort, and the UBS edition, led by Metzger and Catholic Cardinal Carlo ‘Maria’ Martini? (Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo Maria Martini, and Bruce Metzger, *The Greek New Testament*, 4th Revised Ed.; United Bible Societies, 1993, *A Concise Greek-English Dictionary*, Preface, after p. 918; Bruce Metzger, *The Reminiscence of an Octogenarian*, Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997, pp. 2, 69-70).

Harold K. Moulton was also the translation secretary for the British and Foreign Bible Society, which may account for the corruption which is evident in their foreign bibles, printed during Moulton’s tenure and reprinted during subsequent years.

Dr. Schaap says, “The Board of Deacons recently voted to teach Hebrew, Greek, and Latin starting in kindergarten at Hammond Baptist Schools beginning in the fall of 2009.” An introduction to the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew roots of English words is helpful as a subsection of a high school English class, but such has *nothing* to do with the interpretation of the New Testament. I shudder to imagine good people exposing “little ones” and unsettled high school students to such foul and liberal

Bible-correcting lexicons and Greek and Hebrew editions, all of which are exposed in the book, *Hazardous Materials*.

Schaap says, “I believe they are using a peculiar translation for the word inspire that is not found in the long line of Baptist heritage to which I adhere.” The long line he is following is actually rather short. It begins with Church of England heretics, such as OED progenitor, R.C. Trench, then leads straight to the Westcott-Hort-Moulton-Milligan-Vaughan *Revised Version*, and today ends with Harold K. Moulton and the NIV (*The Voice*, p. 13). Moulton’s definition “to breathe” appears in the NIV today as “God-breathed.” The NIV replaces “inspiration” with “God-breathed.” Some good Baptists have no doubt inadvertently used such a definition, but they will rapidly shelve it and other non-Biblical usages, when they read *Hazardous Materials: Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers*. It is a marginal definition and does not address the Bible’s usage of *pneuma*, almost exclusively as ‘spirit.’ (See chapter on “KJB Inspiration” and “Moulton and Milligan” in *Hazardous Materials: Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers*).

It is no wonder Moulton’s definitions are corrupt and secularized, such as changing ‘spirit’ to ‘breathe.’ If God’s spirit moved in the translation of the KJB, neither Harold, his father, nor his grandfather had any business rewriting the Bible or recommending substitute words. We have a *Holy Bible*, not a ‘Holy Lexicon.’ The root *pneuma* means ‘spirit’ according to the Bible. In other words, ‘All scripture is given by God’s spirit.’ God’s spirit has never *stopped* striving with man, drawing man, comforting man, and teaching man. Just as the “Spirit of God moved upon...” in Gen. 1:2, so the spirit of God moved upon the translation of the Bible. He said in 1 Cor. 14:21 that “with men of **other tongues** and other lips will **I speak**...saith the Lord.” God does speak other tongues and does

not need a translator. The man from FBC, who spoke at Commonwealth Baptist College, told Dr. Fugate, that school's president, that God did not speak English. (That would certainly deter getting one's prayers answered.) (See chapter on "KJB Inspiration" for an expanded discussion of *pneuma*, breath, and spirit.)

When asked if the KJB is inspired, Dr. Schaap says, "Tell me how you define the word inspired, and I can better answer that question." Those who believe the Holy Bible and tremble at its words (Isa 66:2) are not as apt as lexicon-addicts to 'define' anything. We compare "spiritual things with spiritual" and are little interested "in the words which men's wisdom teacheth" (1 Cor. 2:13). Where God is silent, the wise Bible student is silent.

Schaap Recommends Trench's Invention, the *Oxford English Dictionary*

Before one brandishes a dictionary as a weapon in the war of words, one must understand the origin, history, and purpose of dictionaries, such as the OED. The book, *Lost For Words*, a history of the OED by Oxford professor Lynda Mugglestone, gives a scholar's view of its purpose. Further research demonstrates that the founder of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, R.C. Trench, was rabidly against the Holy Bible and its all pervading influence and sociological control. He wanted the dictionary to show that words were being used in society in ways which *differed from* the historical Bible usage. He wrote two entire books *against* the KJB: *On the Authorized Version of the New Testament, in connection with some recent proposals for its Revision* (New York, 1858) and *Synonyms of the New Testament* (Cambridge, 1854). In these books he set the stage for the watered-down liberal definitions seen in today's new versions. On the title page of one of these books, he placed the

same serpent logo used by Luciferian H.P. Blavatsky. Because of his hatred for the KJB, Trench was asked to be a member of the Westcott-Hort *Revised Version* Committee. He merits an entire chapter in my book, *Hazardous Materials*, for his vile re-definition of Bible words.

As one might expect, the definition of ‘inspiration’ in Dr. Schaap’s *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* drops the name “God” and replaces it with the watered-down adjective “divine.” Schaap’s dictionary charges that the inspiration of the Scriptures “are believed by **some**” only. Instead of citing the Bible, Schaap’s *Shorter OED* sites Trench’s friend, fellow RV committee member and Ghostly Guild founder, “B.F. Westcott,” who writes what the “early Fathers” believed, instead of what the scripture states. (Other chapters in *Hazardous Materials* detail the heresies of these ancient Catholic “Fathers.”)

The OED editors, which followed Trench, also believed that they were *not* compiling prescriptive ‘definitions,’ but descriptive *samples* of how a word has been used in different contexts (secular, not always Bible-based contexts). Linguists despise the word, ‘definition.’ The OED will allow the inclusion of the Biblical definition of words, but merely sets it in the midst of numerous *other* usages. To take one of its secular definitions and apply it to re-define the Bible’s historic usage is to fall squarely into the clutching hands of R.C. Trench, whose official portrait shows him donning the ‘X’ medallion of the Masonic Grand Scottish Knights of St. Andrew. I use the OED, but very cautiously, understanding its intended purpose, its format, and its secular prejudice. (See chapter on “Trench” and the OED in *Hazardous Material: Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers*).

Not surprisingly, corrupt new bible versions, such as the NIV, replace “inspiration” with the *secular* word “breathed,” thereby erasing the root ‘spir’ and its connection to the Spirit of God. The Calvinist produced *English Standard Version* (ESV) similarly says “breathed out” (yet the word “out” also appears in no Greek texts).

Dr. Schaap uses the lexicon by Moulton, but knows nothing about him, I must presume. He uses the OED and Webster’s, but apparently does not know how to use them. I taught a Freshman Orientation course at the State University where I was on the graduate faculty. A part of that course was reviewing how to use a dictionary, which most students had learned in high school. In *The Voice*, Dr. Schaap makes the freshman mistake of applying the wrong definition of a word, which has *different* meanings in *different* contexts. The error is multiplied when a secular definition is applied to a theological context, as Dr. Schaap does *naively*, but as New Testament lexicographers do *purposely*.

Secular Dictionaries and the Word “inspiration”

Remember:

1. Dictionaries are written by fallible men.
2. Dictionaries contain numerous definitions, which apply to distinct contexts; these definitions are not interchangeable to other contexts.

(To understand that the varied definitions of a word *cannot* be intermixed, look at the dictionary definition of the word “save.” *Webster’s New College Dictionary* shows that its varied meanings include:

- “To copy (data) from a computer’s main memory to a storage medium so that it can be used again,”

- “To accumulate money or goods,”
- “to prevent an opponent from scoring or winning, esp. in hockey,”
- “A game in which a relief pitcher preserves a victory by protecting a teams lead,”
- “To prevent waste,”
- “To treat with care in order to avoid fatigue, wear or damage,” and
- “To put aside for future use.”

The definition “To deliver from sin,” which is the theological definition, is also listed. If one used any of the other definitions of the word ‘saved,’ to describe what Jesus Christ did for us, they would be wrong.)

As one might expect, dictionaries, made by unregenerate men, often give very weak or strictly secular definitions of “inspiration.” After giving several secular definitions of ‘inspiration’ (including “breathing”), which do not apply to theological contexts, Schaap’s *Webster’s New World Dictionary* says that in theological contexts, (“Theo.”) ‘inspiration’ means “a **divine influence** upon human beings, as that resulting in the writing of the Scriptures.” The Webster’s II gives six different usages, of which only one includes “breathing”; only one of the six applies to the Bible. That one says to “arouse by the **divine influence**.” The word “divine” is a quality, a descriptive adjective; it is not “God,” who is a person. The term “influence” implies a minor involvement, not an all-encompassing one. Even the theological definitions in dictionaries are watered-down.

Other, more expanded dictionaries, give a long list of definitions based upon context. These can be misused, as Dr. Schaap does, by those who apply the wrong definition to the

wrong context. The Webster's 1828 Dictionary gives three separate definitions of "inspiration"; the first two definitions are secular and the third definition is theological. The first two include inhaling and breathing; they are distinct from the third usage and definition which says, "The **infusion** of ideas into the mind by the Holy **Spirit**... All Scripture is given by inspiration of God 1 Tim. iii." According to this, inspiration is the work of God's Spirit, not God's breath. In *The Voice*, Dr. Schaap includes the Webster's 1828 secular usage of "breathing" to defend his usage.

Dr. Schaap cites only the little abridged one-volume *Shorter OED*. One who is claiming to be an expert should have at the very least the unabridged edition. The twenty-volume *Oxford English Dictionary* actually uses 2 Tim. 3:16 as a sample of the strictly theological usage of the word 'inspiration'. Those who do not know how to use the OED or Webster's 1828 grasp *any part* of their lengthy entries on "inspiration"; this cannot be done. The OED, for example, divides all words into their *various* usages by Roman numerals (i.e. I, II, III, IV et al.). Under each usage is given *examples* of the word in historical contexts, which elicit that particular definition. The word 'inspiration' is divided into two categories (i.e. I, II). The first usage (I) is "Literal (**physical**).” It includes as “rare” the action of blowing.” It includes, as much more common, the action of “**breathing in**.” No scriptures are used as an example.

The second usage (II) is the “Figurative senses.” It too is divided into two headings. The first includes, “The action of inspiring; the fact or condition of being inspired.” The verse in question falls under this category. The first of these is theological (“a. spec. **Theo.**, etc”). The very verse in question, “2 Tim. iii. 16,” is cited from Tyndale's New Testament as the

perfect example of the theological usage of the word “inspiration.” (The definition of Bible words comes from the Bible itself!) It defines the usage in 2 Tim. 3:16 as,

“A special immediate action or **influence** of the **Spirit of God**...upon the human mind or soul; said esp. of that divine influence under which the books of **Scripture** are held to have been written.”

Under this category another example includes an A.D. 1450-1530 citation which says, “He sente the holy goste on **Penthecoste** sondaye to **enspyracyon** of hys dyscyples.” (He sent the Holy Ghost on Pentecost Sunday to inspiration of his disciples.) Interesting, this old quotation connects the word “inspiration” with Acts 2, as suggested in my books.

The second subcategory under “Figurative senses” includes secular usages, which are defined as “a breathing or infusion into the mind or soul.”

According to the plan of the OED and other dictionaries, a word used in the very *example* for *one* kind of usage could never be defined by the definition of *another* kind of usage. Since the OED, like Webster’s, selects 2 Tim. 3:16 itself to give the definition of “inspiration,” and defines it as the “**influence** of the **Spirit** of God,” [in-spir-ation] then one could not use the OED or Webster’s to support the definition “breathed” for that very context (see OED, s.v. inspiration, vol. 7, p. 1036). Understanding how to use, not misuse, a dictionary is a most basic skill. Highly refined tools, such as the OED, should not be used by those unversed in their format, much less to promote an agenda.

A word's context is the determiner of usage and meaning. That is why the OED's definition ("influence of the **Spirit of God**,") is taken directly from the words of 2 Tim. 3:16 ("inspiration of **God**"). A dictionary's definition of Bible words came originally from the Bible itself; therefore there is no reason to consult a secular dictionary to define Bible words. This can best be seen by viewing the unabridged OED. To take another context, particularly a secular one, to define the word 'inspiration' as "breathed," is the agenda of someone who either knows nothing about lexicography or has an agenda to secularize the Bible (e.g. Strong, Moulton, Trench et al.).

Spirit or Breath

God demands no knowledge of Greek or the methodology of lexicographers. The definition of "inspiration" is "plain to him that understandeth" (Prov. 8:9). The word "inspiration" is a compound word. Even a child can see the definition within the word 'in-spir-ation.' Any English-speaker has been pre-conditioned to know the meaning of the phonemes "in" and "spir," through their previous usage in the Bible and elsewhere. The brain stores words in files in alphabetical order. The 'spir' file will take the mind directly to the word "spirit." The process is called cognitive scaffolding. (*In Awe of Thy Word* explains this in great detail.) The suffix 'ation' changes a verb into a noun of action (e.g. visit-ation, vex-ation). Therefore 'in-spir-ation' conveys the active (because the subject, 'scripture,' is passive) sense of the **Spirit** acting **in** the scriptures.

Men have always known that it is by God's Spirit, not his breath, that the succession of the scripture "is given." Oliver Cromwell in his 1653 *Speech the First* said,

“The true Succession is through the **Spirit** given in its measure. The **Spirit is given** for that use, To make proper Speakers-forth of God’s eternal Truth;” (Cromwell used the 1638 KJB).

King James I said in his 1599 treatise, *Basilikon Doron*,

“The whole scripture is dited [dictated] by God’s **Spirit**, thereby (as by **lively** word) to instruct and rule the whole Church militant, **till the end of the world.**”

Finally, the Bible itself makes it clear that the ever-abiding Spirit of God, not the one-time breath of God, gives life unto the scriptures:

“It is the **spirit** that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the **words** that I speak unto you, they **are spirit.**...” (John 6:63).

Dr. Schaap will call the Bible, the ‘word of God’ (ignoring what those three words mean), but he will not admit that the Bible’s words are still the very words of the Spirit of God (inspiration). But the Bible is “the sword **of the Spirit**, which is the word **of God**” (Eph. 6:17). The Bible is written, “**not** in the words which **man**’s wisdom teacheth, but which the **Holy Ghost** teacheth, comparing **spiritual** things with **spiritual**” (1 Cor. 2:13).

This verse makes it clear that the fleshly minds of the King James translators, or any other translators, cannot profit in the giving of the Holy Bible, without the indwelling direction of the Spirit of God. This is inspiration. Psalm 12:6, 7 says,

“The **words of the Lord** are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. **Thou** shalt keep them, O LORD, **thou** shalt preserve **them** from this generation for ever.”

The words which the LORD keeps and preserves are still *his words*; they do not degrade into the words of mere translators, even after being “being tried in a furnace of earth.” These verses contravene those who wrongly say that God inspired the originals, but the translators preserve them “for ever.” Only the Spirit can convey his own words; otherwise, they would not be the “words of the LORD,” but would become the words of a translator. Because the Spirit gives the words, they are never just ink on paper, but are themselves ‘spirit.’ Hence, the word “in-**spir**-ation” is a perfect description of the way in which the quickening Spirit gives words which “are spirit.” The Bible says of God’s word, “they are spirit, and they are life.” The qualities ‘spirit’ and ‘life’ cannot be separated. Words which are no longer ‘spirit,’ cannot be said to have “life.” It is the word of God which “liveth and abideth forever.”

Summary: Spirit or Breath

To wrongly substitute God’s ‘breath’ for God’s ‘spirit’ is to:

- 1.) ignore the pertinent scriptural parallels, which use the word ‘spirit.’
- 2.) ignore the component definitional phonemes in the word ‘in-**spir**-ation.
- 3.) ignore the preponderant translation of the word *pneuma* as ‘spirit,’ and never as ‘breath.’
- 4.) follow the definition of liberals, such a UBS editor H. K. Moulton (and his father, the corrupt lexicographer and

his grandfather, a member of the RV committee) and Bible reviser, James Strong, whose agenda was to replace the Spirit-filled KJB with his own ASV hot air. These men could only support their cankered new versions by maintaining that the Spirit of God had *not* been involved in the previous pure English Bible's translation, but merely spoke aloud, with his breath, in the distant past, constraining himself to three dead languages. (Modern Greek and Hebrew are not ancient Biblical Greek and Hebrew). It should be apparent that New Testament lexicographers want to supplant their English words for the English words in the Holy Bible.

5.) And finally, to wrongly substitute God's 'breath' for God's 'Spirit' is to disavow the abiding inspiration of God's words. This resigns inspiration to an act of past history and makes today's Holy Bibles the mere words of men, having no authority or claim to inerrancy, because they are not the words of God.

After citing an entire page of *secular* dictionaries, Dr. Schaap says, "I get my theology from God's Word." "He knows what those words mean..." Yet Dr. Schaap never does go to the scriptures to define the word "inspiration" or to understand 2 Tim. 3:16. He merely scans a few secular dictionaries, about which he knows nothing. The ironic thing is that he closes his discussion promoting Moulton, Webster, and the OED by mocking those who *do* use the Bible for their theology. He says, "I would encourage my fellow preachers to be very careful where they get their theology and what sources they use to define their words..." (*The Voice*, Feb., p. 15). Careful? By using Moulton's lexicon, without knowing anything about him, he has disobeyed the scripture which says, "Lay hands suddenly

on no man” (1 Tim. 5:22). Those of us, who have let the Bible speak for itself, remain quite safe from “evil men and seducers,” such as Harold K. Moulton and James Strong, who have “crept in unawares” (2 Tim. 3:13; Jude 4).

Dr. Schaap’s ‘Living’ Bible and the New Versions

Dr. Schaap concludes, “If you tell me you think the word inspired means “alive and powerful,” then, yes, the King James is inspired.” This is one of the numerous times Dr. Schaap replaces the KJB’s words with new version words. He switches the KJB’s words, “quick, and powerful,” for the new version rendering, “alive and powerful,” seen in the TEV, NEB, Phillips, and Catholic Jerusalem Bible (Heb. 4:12). The KJB’s vocabulary, which is “holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher” is destroyed in new versions (Heb. 7:26). (See chapter 5 in *In Awe of Thy Word*). It may be alright to define the word ‘quick’, but it is not alright to eliminate it altogether and place the words “alive and powerful” in quotes, as if that is what the Holy Bible says.

By not comparing “spiritual things with spiritual,” Dr. Schaap missed numerous Bible verses which demonstrate that it is only through God’s Spirit (i.e. inspiration) that something comes alive.

- Ezekiel 37:14 says, “And shall put my spirit in you, and ye shall live.”
- John 3:8 says we are “born of the Spirit.”
- John 6:63 says, “It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing.”

Only the Spirit of God can make a Bible “quick” or as Schaap and Catholic bible say, “alive.”

▪

- Job 33:4 “The Spirit of God hath made me and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life.”
- Job 32:8 “But there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding.”

The Bible must be “given by inspiration of God” for it to be “quick and powerful,” or as Dr. Schaap and the new versions say, “alive.” On page thirteen Dr. Schaap says, “I don’t believe inspiration is the proper word to use in supporting our claim that we have a living Bible.” He repeats the NIV-based mantra that it means “God-breathed.” He points out that “quicken” means “alive.” He says the “Bible is alive because its author is alive...” How hard is it for him to connect the dots from a living God, a living book, and the phrase “word of God” and then conclude that the KJB is alive because its living author is speaking those very words; they are not the cold breath of the dead KJV translators (*The Voice*, p. 13).

Question 7

When asked ‘Is there anything wrong with saying that the King James Bible is inspired?’, Dr Schaap now back-petals and says, “In an informal setting or when speaking on the Bible in a general way, NO, I don’t think there’s anything wrong with that statement. [In March of 2008, Dr. Schaap called it “foolishness” and “heresy.” In a fall 2008 sermon, he called those who do it “wacky.” He says, “Pastors and teachers, however, are called by God to be skilled in knowing and using the Bible.” Yet his definition of “scripture” and “inspiration” do not come from “using the Bible.” They come from corrupt lexicographers, with an agenda to secularize the Bible. Dr. Schaap here repeats his condescension to: “The common folk in the pew,” who do not know words such as “hermeneutics.”

Dr. Schaap would do well to study the “etymology” of the word ‘hermeneutics. Hermeneutics, the so-called study of the principles of the interpretation of scripture, is named after the pagan Greek “god” Hermes. Has anyone who teaches or studies this subject ever considered just ‘who’ this study is named after? Why are Christians even using this word? *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* says Hermes was known for “divination.” “[H]e leads the dead to Hades”...“he was skilled in trickery and deception...[H]e is attested as trickster and thief...but most often he uses his power in mischief, illusion, and mystery...[H]e puts on his feet sandals which erase footprints...Like a magician he knows how to put the enemy camp to sleep.” “Hermes charmed him to sleep with the sound of his flute and cut off his head.” Hermes promoted bestiality and was the messenger for the god Zeus (a type of Satan). Hermeneutics, as taught today in liberal Bible colleges, scarcely brings a message from the God of Christianity. Hermes sends students on a wild goose chase to find Zeus’s interpretation of God’s message, using Greek lexicons, based generally on the writings of the pagan Greeks (*The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996, p. 690, s.v. Hermes; Elizabeth Hallam, *Gods and Goddesses*, NY: Macmillan, 1996, p. 132).

Jesus used fishermen, not the learned scribes and Pharisees. We are to call the “least esteemed” in the church to judge important matters (1 Cor. 6:4). Dr. Schaap says that “we better know” how to define terms, yet Dr. Schaap does not know how to use a simple English dictionary.

Question 8

In Dr. Schaap’s ‘long ago and far away’ fairy tale about inspiration, he multiplies **past tense** verbs, adding “birthed” and

“were,” to build story upon story to erect his heaven-bound inspired ‘Bible.’ The Bible clearly states, “scripture is given by inspiration.” He says, “God did not “birth” the copies and translations.” Why then, is it called the ‘word of God’? The Bible says, “**Thou** shalt keep them, O LORD, **Thou** shalt preserve them...” (Ps. 12:7). To what does the word “them” refer, but God’s very words? Dr. Schaap says, “The originals have died.” Perhaps the paper on which they were written has disintegrated, but not the original “word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever” (1 Peter 1:23). A Bible teacher at a Bible college should teach the Bible. Dr. Schaap’s analogies are a weak substitute.

The Voice: Review of Pages Four and Five

Dr. Schaap underlines for emphasis Dr. Hyles’s statement that, “The Bible itself teaches that God gave to the writers in the original languages the very words to write.” Who does not believe that God inspired the original Hebrew, as well as the New Testament? How does that statement disannul inspired translations and copies? Dr. Schaap pounds his past tense verbs into the ground, repeating something Dr. Hyles had said in his very early days (1965), “...God **gave** to the writers in the original language the very words to write.” These holy men wrote God’s words down as God **gave** the words to them.” The verse “All scripture **is** given by inspiration of God” is never dissected by Dr. Schaap. The phrase “is given” is never addressed.

Dr. Schaap rehearses Dr. Hyles’s progression from a user of the KJB to a believer in the KJB. This is what made Dr. Hyles so great. He grew. He had a humble, teachable spirit when confronted with instruction in righteousness. Pages four and

five should be seen, not as an excuse to doubt the KJB, but as an example of one man who did not balk at correction, but grew in grace and in the **knowledge** of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. On page fifteen Dr. Schaap finally must admit, “I find contradictory statements in much of the literature written by us Baptists...any one of us can see the changes in men’s ministry statements in their books.” Perhaps he is referring to the statement made by Dr. Hyles where he said, “I have never said that the King James Bible is inspired.” The context of that statement clearly identifies what he meant. Just several sentences later Dr. Hyles says, “So, that means we know that those inspired words have been preserved.” If the “inspired words have been preserved,” then they are still inspired! Dr. Hyles said, “I believe the King James Bible, in the English language, contains the very words preserved that God inspired to holy men of old.” These statements clarify the numerous statements by Dr. Hyles, where he did in fact say that the KJB is inspired. In his book, *The Need for an Every Word Bible* he said,

“I’m tired of colleges and universities advertising that they use **the King James Bible**. Tell the whole story! Tell everyone that you do not believe that **it is inspired** word for word and that you use other fake Bibles also” (p. 54).

The antecedent to the word “it” can be nothing but the words “King James Bible.” This sentence is in the introductory section of chapter four on page 54. This statement cannot be disannulled, as Dr. Schaap suggests, by a statement *four pages later*, which says, “In this study thus far, we’ve discussed only the original language.” The study began two pages later, on page fifty-six. The statement claiming the inspiration of the

KJB is on page fifty-four. It stands alone as summative of the ‘study’ which ensues on pages 56-64. Any good teacher knows the dictum of instruction and writing: 1.) Begin by giving a summative thesis; tell the reader what you believe, 2.) Then give them the details, 3.) Then summarize again. The statement that the KJB is inspired in the introduction, placed *before* the study begins, is obviously summative. It proclaims the thesis of Dr. Hyles’s entire book, that is, what God inspired, he was able to preserve, and we have it today in the King James Bible. Its inspiration is preserved, hence “the King James Bible” “is inspired word for word.” Physicists know that matter can be neither created nor destroyed; it merely changes form. The audible form is now in a written form. Could God produce anything that died?

The Voice: Review of Page Six

The Voice shows a picture of Dr. Schaap’s booklet, “Why Stand Against the King James Bible.” In it he repeats his use of past tense verbs to describe a Bible which “was given” and original manuscripts which “were inspired.” The Bible’s present-tense expression, “is given,” escapes him entirely. He repeats his corrupt lexical definition saying, “The word inspiration means God breathed out these very words Himself.” God never calls us to say what the Bible “means.” This penchant for defining the words of the Bible with *other* words from unsaved liberals is dangerous. Almost every English word is easily understood by itself. Those few that are not are easily understood are defined by an English Bible synonym in a parallel verse.

His use of lexicons generates a casual disregard for the very words of the KJB. This is seen in Dr. Schaap’s writings. He

says of 1 Cor. 2:13, “the Holy Spirit teaches with words chosen to reveal the truths of God.” Actually 1 Cor. 2:13 says, the “Holy Ghost teacheth.” (Dr. Schaap’s constant private interpretation is the consequence of his not believing that the KJB is the inspired scriptures for the English speaker.) To a lexicon-addict, the word there is only the Greek *pneuma* and can be translated as Ghost *or* Spirit. How the KJB precisely translated this in each context is immaterial to such addicts. The lexicon’s word choices are the tree of knowledge and the Greek student is free to pick. The disbelief in the KJB’s inspiration does have consequences. Invariably, the Greek student will pick the same rendering seen in the NIV, such as Schaap’s choice of ‘Spirit’ instead of ‘Ghost’ in this context. A ‘Ghost’ is the spirit of a dead person. This word connects this to the ‘Spirit of Christ,’ as well as other things. (The word ‘Ghost’ also comes from the contraction ‘G’host’ which is ‘God host’ et al.) (My other books explain the difference between these two usages.

Dr. Schaap’s most frightening statement in the entire sixteen-page defense is:

“I am presently teaching my 11-year-old son how to exegete Scripture using a Greek text. He finds it fun and rewarding (I pay him \$1.00 weekly to **translate one verse from Greek to English**).

Has anyone told Dr. Schaap and his precious son that the Holy Bible has already been translated into English? Nothing but a mutant NKJV can be derived by using Schaap’s slightly pocked Trinitarian Bible Society’s Greek New Testament by Frederick A. Scrivener and interpreting it using the lexicon by a team-member of the corrupt UBS Greek text committee, Harold

K. Moulton. These are *the* tools Dr. Schaap states he uses (*Where*, p. 85; *Voice*; Feb. 2009, p. 15).

Summary: F.H.A. Scrivener & His Textual Heresies

1. Scrivener was a member of the Westcott and Hort **Revised Version Committee** (RV) of 1881 and worked in masterminding this corrupt version. He stated that the RV was “better” than the KJB.
2. Scrivener was the author of several books promoting **textual criticism**, which taught generations of students to question the Bible.
3. Few know that Scrivener moved away from his original *Textus Receptus* (TR) position in his later book, *Six Lectures on the Text of the New Testament*, written *before* he created his TR Greek text. Scrivener did not recommend all of the readings in his TR and suggested *removing* numerous verses, as well as important words supporting the Incarnation, the sinlessness of Christ, and the Trinity (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co., 1875). **(A complete list is in the chapters on “Scrivener” and the “Trinitarian Bible Society’s Greek Text” in *Hazardous Materials*.)**
 - ✓ Scrivener desired to make two changes in the scriptures which would make Jesus Christ a sinner (Luke 2:22 and John 7:8).
 - ✓ Scrivener wanted to remove the Trinitarian proof texts of 1 John 5:7-8 and Col. 2:2.
 - ✓ Scrivener rejects the proof text for the Incarnation and the deity of Christ (1 Tim. 3:16), as well as rejecting “God” in 1 Peter 3:15 and the Holy Ghost in Acts 16:7.
 - ✓ He suggests removing Acts 8:37 to support his Anglican heresy of infant baptismal regeneration.

- ✓ He denies the portion of scripture that tells us Jesus was “broken” for us (1 Cor. 11:24).

Summary: Scrivener & His Greek *Textus Receptus*

1. Scrivener’s own edition of the New Testament Greek *Textus Receptus* (*H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ The New Testament, The Greek Underlying the English Authorised Version of 1611*) is generally correct and is the closest Greek Text to the King James Bible (KJB). It can be useful in pointing out errors in the corrupt Greek text which underlies perverted new versions such as the NIV, TNIV, ESV, HCSB, NASB, NAB, NJB, NCV, Message, *New Living Translation*, etc..
2. Scrivener created his Greek text for comparison purposes as part of his work as a member of the Westcott-Hort *Revised Version* Committee. It was his assignment to recreate the KJB’s underlying Greek text, as his original Preface states.
3. Contrary to his RV Committee assignment and popular opinion, Scrivener’s one-man Greek text is *not* a precise record of the Greek text underlying the KJB, nor is it precisely the text of Beza, who followed Latin translations of the Syriac and Arabic text, among other sources.
4. Scrivener’s anti-KJB prejudice, out-of-date scholarship, and limited collation of manuscripts lead him to mistranslate some of the KJB readings. Documented in chapter 4 is Greek textual evidence proving 20 errors in his *Textus Receptus* and 24 readings in the KJB which he wrongly ascribes to Latin.
5. It is neither scholarly nor even common sense to go *back* to Scrivener’s Greek text, since it was translated *from* the English KJB originally. Additionally, those scores of places where Scrivener’s Greek does not match the historic

“Originall Greeke” prevent it from being any sort of final authority for study or translation work.

The book, *Hazardous Materials: Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers*, discusses Scrivener’s text and Moulton’s lexicon in great detail, documenting all of the above comments (See chapters on “Scrivener,” “Trinitarian Bible Society’s Scrivener,” and “Moulton and Milligan” in *Hazardous Materials*). Why would one go to the TBS text, when by the admission of its editor, it is a back-translation of the KJB into Greek, in the main. For a Greek aficionado, Dr. Schaap is quite naïve about the pitfalls in Scrivener and Moulton, the faulty man-made tools he is using to ‘shed light’ upon the inspired Holy Bible.

Other slightly corrupt Greek texts have been recommended by him, such as the slightly marred Greek text seen in George Ricker Berry’s Interlinear *Greek-English New Testament* (Baker) and Newberry’s blasphemous English interlinear (Zondervan) edition of the same. Both are the WRONG edition of Stephanus, who had several editions. Also Zodhiates’ Greek Orthodox text has been used in Hammond. It is the worst of the three. All are discussed in minute detail in *Hazardous Materials*. A brief summary follows here:

Summary: George Ricker Berry’s *Interlinear Greek-English New Testament*

- 1.) George Ricker Berry’s *Interlinear Greek-English New Testament* (1897) was actually written by Thomas Newberry (1877).
- 2.) Its Greek text is that of Stephanus’s third edition of 1550.

- 3.) This 1550 edition differs from the *Textus Receptus* and the “Originall Greeke” underlying the KJB a number of times.
- ✓ In 80 places Berry’s *Interlinear* Greek-English does not follow other editions of the *Textus Receptus* or the “Originall Greeke” underlying the King James Bible.
 - ✓ Even Beza (1589 and 1598) and Scrivener agree with the KJB approximately 113 times against Stephanus’s third edition of 1550.
- 4.) Some of the errors in Berry’s Greek text include:
- ✓ It omits an entire verse, Luke 17:36.
 - ✓ It calls Jesus a sinner in Luke 2:22.
 - ✓ It omits the “Lord” in Rom. 12:11
 - ✓ It teaches the opposite of the Bible in James. 2:18.
 - ✓ It omits the name of “Jesus” in one of its two occurrences in Mark 2:15.
 - ✓ It says “Spirits of God” instead of “seven Spirits of God” in Rev. 3:1.
- 5.) Like Scrivener’s, Berry’s Greek text has few serious errors, but its venial mistakes make readers *seriously* doubt the accuracy of their Holy Bible. That *is* serious.
- 6.) Both Berry and Newberry were proponents of the Revised Version of 1881, as well as the corrupt Greek text of Westcott and Hort.
- 7.) They footnote the corrupt Greek text in support of their recommended changes and omissions to the KJB and *Textus Receptus*.

8.) The definitions in the Lexicon and Synonyms in the back of the book were taken mainly from Unitarian J. H. Thayer and Bible-critic and RV committee member, R.C. Trench.

9.) The English Interlinear claims to be literal, but it is not. For example in Eph. 1:5 Berry's Greek text says *huiiothesian* (*υιοθεσίαν*). *Huios* means "children" or 'sons'; *thesian* from *theo*, means "adoption of." Berry's English translated only the word "adoption," omitting any translation of the word "children" (or sons). The KJB is literal and says, "the adoption of children."

10.) A Greek Concordance shows that any *one* Greek word might be translated any *number* of ways in *every* English translation (polysemy). Only a green Greek student would fall for the unscholarly and dishonest notion of one 'literal' meaning for a Greek word (See Smith's, Wigrams, et al.). It must be God's contextual choice, however, as seen in the KJB.

11.) Berry's English Interlinear and Newberry's other editions contain liberal, watered down, and New Age terminology.

On page six of the *Voice*, Dr. Schaap gives another of his non-scriptural analogies. The fairy tale on this page is based entirely on his corrupt lexical definition, 'breathed.' He says, "The word inspired means God breathed out these very words." With a faulty foundation, the analogy is bound to fail. Here he ignores the fact that before God breathed into Adam the breath of life, he was a completely formed man. In Ezekiel, the bones, sinew, flesh, and skin were there, but there was no life. In verse 14 "the spirit" brings life to the dead nation of Israel. (Please read *Hazardous Materials* chapter on "KJB Inspiration," for a rebuttal of his use of the secularized word "breathed," as the central definition of "inspiration")

He infers that the KJB is a “divine work of God,” but that is not what the Bible says. It does not use any such words to describe itself. It says, “All scripture is given by inspiration of God.” How did this “divine work” occur? His “divine work” is no less a mystery than a Bible being “given by inspiration of God.” Dr. Schaap, however, prefers to invent his own scenario, using his own words and those of unsaved apostates. We prefer to limit any discussion of a subject God speaks little about to the very words of the Holy Bible - no more, no less. The word “divine” is an adjective describing quality; it omits the direct reference, evident in both English (*spir*) and Greek (*pneuma*), that the Spirit of God is at work. I would not want to replace the person of the Holy Ghost with the watered down dictionary definition “divine influence.” The Spirit is the third person of the Trinity and is not to be dismissed so lightly. The word “divine” is a favorite of Unitarian, Deist, and atheist lexicographers. It has spread widely into new version, even replacing the word “Godhead.”

“Dr. Jack Schaap Answers,” says God “supervised” and would “watch over the translation process” (*Voice*, p. 7). In his “official Position” statement he says,

“We do not believe that the King James Translators were inspired, nor do we believe that they received this translation by inspiration of God (meaning God breathed, spoke, or **moved upon them.**)”

Of course, men are not inspired; it is the words which are inspired. It was not necessary for God to speak or breath. But how is saying that the spirit of God “moved,” any different than Schaap’s saying he “supervised,” “watched over the translation process,” or that the translations “were translated” “under the

watchful care of divine providence” (*The Voice*, p. 9 et al.). To Dr. Schaap, something called ‘divine providence’ can “watch,” and ‘supervise, but God cannot inspire or move. How much better it is to use the words of the Holy Bible and leave the unspoken details to God. “All scripture is given by inspiration of God.” The KJB translators were brash enough to conclude after all of their study, “[W]e have at length, through **the good hand of the Lord** upon us, brought the work to that pass you see” (“The Translators to the Readers”).

The ironic element in Dr. Schaap’s “Official Position” (*The Voice*, p. 9) is that he summarizes by saying,

“We believe God speaks to man through His words – the words in our Bible today...”

What!? If “God speaks” and they are “His words” HOW ARE THEY MERELY THE WORDS OF THE KJB TRANSLATORS? He concludes with the epitome of mumbo-jumbo saying,

“Brethren, we love God’s holy inspired, and divinely preserved words. We use God’s words every time we enter the pulpit and lift our Bibles and say, “This is God’s Word!””

Translation: He is saying that he loves both the inspired and settled in heaven originals and the uninspired current translation, both of which he calls God’s words, although the latter are not in fact God’s words, but those of the KJB translators. Said with passion and projected powerfully across a microphone, this rhetoric, made up of meaningless words, will only satisfy those who are enraptured in the gestalt (church, steeple, Bible, choir, saved friends etc.). Others are watching

their watches hoping the sermon will end before they miss their favorite television program. The generations which have grown up since the 1950s have been conditioned by television to be zombie spectators, who go into a light state of highly suggestible and non-questioning hypnosis at the snap of a finger. Church has become a theater, where many exchange their word-based, Bible-based reason with an emotional God-excluding treason.

Dr. Schaap and the New Versions

Dr. Schaap is unaware that he is preaching in the same key as the NIV. He uses “divine work,” instead of “inspiration,” “alive,” instead of “quick,” “Holy Spirit,” instead of “Holy Ghost,” and “God-breathed,” instead of “inspiration.” These are the words of the NIV, NASB, NKJV, ESB and lexicons.

In his book *Servant Leadership* Dr. Schaap says the KJB’s “But made himself of no reputation...” simply means “He emptied Himself” (pp. 31, 36, 37, 38, 59). This is the reading of the *New American Standard Bible* (NASB) and other heretical new versions. It based upon the heresy that Christ “emptied himself” of his deity. This is a very, very serious heresy. This is perhaps where Dr. Schaap has gathered some of his dubious ideas about Christ’s childhood. When one gives a meaning from a lexicon, they are merely giving the English word choices of the Unitarian J. H. Thayer, R.C. Trench, the *Revised Version* of 1881, or the *American Standard Version* of 1901. This is thoroughly documented in the book, *Hazardous Materials*. Dr. Schaap follows the new versions and lexicons, which pretend that Jesus and the disciples “reclined,” instead of sat at meals (*Servant Leadership*, p. 88; this book’s bibliography cites Catholic books, such as one by the pro-homosexual priest, Henri Nouwn, and Robert Greenleaf’s *Servant Leadership*, as

well as secular books published by HarperCollins, the publishers of the Satanic Bible). The Bible remains an unread and unstudied book, too often set aside and replaced by the musings of the natural man. In his book *Servant Leadership*, he says, “the Bible wording in the Hebrew means...” (p. 83). He references the corrupt Brown, Driver, and Briggs *Hebrew-English Lexicon*, as well as the tainted Strong’s *Lexicon* in his July 2008 “Schaap Answers...” Briggs, with the support of his friends Brown and Driver, was tried and convicted of heresy by his liberal denomination. He was a key-note speaker at the New Age Parliament of World Religions. (See chapter on “Strong,” as well as chapter on “Brown, Driver, and Briggs” in *Hazardous Materials*).

Dr. Schaap hypocritically says, “Thus, we must be careful not to meddle with the words, lest we distort the truth.” But he does not mean ‘the words of the KJB,’ but he means the English words in Moulton’s lexicon or the Greek words in Scrivener’s text, a man who was on the Westcott-Hort Committee and wrote an entire book blasting the KJB (*Six Lectures on the Text of the New Testament*, Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co., 1875). If he does not want to “meddle with the words,” why doesn’t he just say “given by inspiration,” instead of “supervised” or “watch over”?

Page 7 (Dr. Jack Schaap Answers, July 2008) is discussed through this document.

The Voice, Review of Page Eight

Dr. Schaap has listed the doctrinal statements of numerous churches, colleges, and ministries to support his contention that the KJB is not inspired. However, his own church’s statement, as well as many of those cited, DOES NOT state at all that the

KJB is not inspired. In fact, many of the churches, schools, and ministries he lists are outraged about being included in such a list. Many that he lists believe that the Bible is inspired. Many believe that *the Bible* is still the King James Bible. Commonwealth Baptist College, Grace Baptist College, Texas Baptist College, Revival Fires Baptist College, The Sword of The Lord, and Oklahoma Baptist College are just a few who believe that the KJB is inspired, yet he wrongly lists them as siding with his position. The editor of the Sword of the Lord was so enraged (It is hard to imagine sweet Dr. Smith ever being upset.) that he immediately printed an article affirming his belief in the inspiration of the KJB and his disappointment with Dr. Schaap's stand.

One of the schools Dr. Schaap lists states, "We believe that the Bible is verbally inspired and that it is the final authority in all matters of faith, doctrine and practice." To them and most others who make similar statements, the Bible *is* the KJB. Many who use the word preservation infer that what is inspired is preserved, that is, the inspiration is preserved. The FBC statement, written by Dr. Hyles, even says,

"We believe in the verbal, plenary inspiration of the Bible. The Old and New Testament are definitely inspired word for word. We accept the Textus Receptus manuscripts from which came the King James Bible. The Scripture is the final authority in all matters of faith and practice."

Thousands upon thousands of times, Dr. Schaap and Dr. Hyles said to their congregation, 'Open your Bible to...' or 'Turn in your Bibles...' A member who joins that church has no reason to believe that the 'Bible' that their pastor referred to in

the statement of faith is not the ‘Bible’ used in that church. The reference to the Textus Receptus is simply pointing to the Received Text, as opposed to the Westcott and Hort critical text. Most importantly, the statement says, “The Scripture is the final authority in all matters of faith and practice.” Observe the following: 1.) The author of the statement used the word “scripture.” Dr. Hyles could have used any number of words (Bible, Textus Receptus, word of God etc.) in its place, but he did not. The Bible says, “All scripture is given by inspiration of God.” Evidently, Dr. Hyles believed that whatever was “the final authority” in his church, which was accessed to determine “all matters of faith and practice” was “scripture,” and therefore must be “given by inspiration of God.” If the words in the statement of faith are used according to both their ordinary dictionary definition and their usage in the Holy Bible, then the statement unequivocally states that the Bible (Scriptures) is inspired.

This good statement of faith from Dr. Hyles is also used by Commonwealth Baptist College, Dr. Jeffrey Fugate and Dr. Russell Anderson, Founders. In the *Church Bus News*, Dr. Fugate spearheaded the now thundering response to Dr. Schaap’s sad departure from an inspired Holy Bible. Dr. Anderson showed his love for the word of God, not only by starting numerous great KJB colleges, but by sending a loving letter to students, graduates, and pastors, reminding them of his steadfast allegiance to the inspiration of the King James Bible and informing them that he must distance himself from Dr. Schaap and his own beloved Hyles-Anderson College, until they return to the orthodox position.

Only one church of the many listed by Schaap actually addressed the KJB and inspiration and they merely asserted that

the “translators were not “inspired.” However, no one has ever suggested that the KJV translators were inspired. Moses and Paul were not inspired. It is the words which are inspired. The majority of the seventeen organizations listed by Dr. Schaap as supporting his position, in fact, do not support an uninspired King James Bible.

The Voice, Review of Pages 9, 10, 11, 12, 13

Scholars and scientists wish they could write a defense of their positions by filling page after page (nearly one-third of Dr. Schaap’s document) with space-filling signatures of people who like them or are on their paid staff. It would save many hours of combing through the scriptures and the library stacks. The first such letter Dr. Schaap includes says, “**For whatever reason** certain people have attacked our pastor...” However, the Bible warns that ‘masters’ shall “receive the greater condemnation (James 3:1).

On page fifteen Dr. Schaap chides those who would “infringe upon the autonomy of this church.” On page twelve, Johnny Colsten likewise scolds “those who would tear at the fabric of an independent, autonomous Baptist church.” Should Bible believing pastors, who have been in the ministry much longer than Dr. Schaap, not object when they are invited to a meeting, which has traditionally held up an inspired Bible and are now assaulted by charges that it is no longer inspired? Is this not the church which sends out invitation to men all over the world to attend *their* Pastors’ School? Is this not the church which distributed to paid delegates copies of the book, *Where Are We Going?*, which denies our Holy Bible’s inspiration? Is this not the church which solicits pastors and parents to send

their impressionable young men and women to attend *their* college? And most importantly to the topic at hand, is Dr. Schaap not the one who referred to those who have accepted these invitations (but believe that the KJB is inspired) as wacky, rats in the woodpile, novices, extremists, cultish, similar to Mormons, extremists to bring in damnable heresies, creeping in unaware, ignorant and deceptive teachers, naïve, charismatic, Lutheran, Calvinists, Catholic, who defend the Charismatic view (Nov. 2008 sermon). Speaking of them he warns that the “enemy sews tares.” Did he not mock the “ignorance of so many King James Bible teachers”? He charged that to believe the KJB is inspired is “damnable lies...deception...ignorance...blindness.” In *Where Are We Going?* he called it “foolishness” and equated KJB defenders with “barbarism.” Does that answer Mr. Duff’s question, about the “reason” for the response? Concerning “infringing on the autonomy” of another church: In Dr. Schaap’s sermon “Inspiration and Preservation,” he says,

“I want my **college students to go home** this Thanksgiving. **I want you to stand point blank where Brother Schaap stands on this issue.** I want you to stand not to hurt somebody, to understand, not to insult somebody, to understand, not to pick a fight, or get into an argument, but to understand we have the Bible. We have the Bible I am holding it in my hands right here. **It is not a Bible where God spoke the English...**”

This is Warfieldism at its worst, which he wants peach-faced teenage boys and girls, ages eighteen and nineteen, to parrot and to present as a *challenge* to their pastors and parents,

charging that their English Holy Bibles are not *actually* God's words. Rebellious teens, who already desire to get rid of that old book, with its archaic and *specific* mandate against all "youthful lusts," will relish the opportunity to 'know more than their parents' and trade 'fornication' for the looser Greek lexicon definition, 'immorality.' I asked a college student what her definition of 'immorality' was. She said, 'You know...people like that guy in Virginia who killed 30 people.' Fornicators easily escaped her definition.

Both the letters by Terry Duff and Eddie Lapina say, "the Bible **is** the inspired Word of God." Where **is** this inspired Bible, gentlemen? Why would we send our impressionable teens to a college that will show them a Greek lexicon that offers them a liberal escape hatch from the protective barriers set up by the vocabulary of the KJB.

"False Accusers" (2 Tim. 3:3)

Dr. Schaap has been on my daily personal prayer list for many years. I had refrained from comment about his new view that the King James Bible is not inspired, as I only give my opinion when asked. I merely prayed daily that if I could help him or the situation, he would ask.

It appears that the Lord heard those prayers, because in September of 2008, I received a call from one of Dr. Schaap's staff members at First Baptist Church, Eddie Wilson. He said that Dr. Schaap had told some of his men to take his personal plane and come to talk with me. Brother Wilson was asked to arrange a convenient time for me. I humbly told Brother Wilson that they should not waste their valuable time and gasoline, that I would be happy to dialogue and help them via phone or e-mail. I repeated, but he insisted that this *must* be a personal

visit. I was working on my new book and had to delay confirming a good date. After some time had passed, they said that every time they saw Dr. Schaap, he asked if they had been able to arrange the meeting with me yet. I am not comfortable with arranging a meeting whose objective is unknown to me. Therefore, I requested a printed set of questions for discussion. Bro. Wilson provided some, but said they were only samples.

They had hundreds of questions, he said. The questions ranged from particulars about the best setting of the KJB to details about the history of the Greek text and the English Bible. The team of visitors included one of my heroes, Greek professor Phil Pins, Bob Marshall, Eddie Wilson, and Ray Highfill. Another staff member was scheduled to come, but did not. Weeks were spent researching specific answers to resolve some questions.

When they arrived in September, after some time of general introductions and informal greetings, Bob Marshall began by saying that there were those who were giving his pastor [Dr. Schaap] a hard time over his views on inspiration and preservation. I quickly changed the subject and directed the next three or four hours of discussion to the areas of my research (linguistics, history, etc.).

Before they left, Bob Marshall handed me a copy of a book which 'Dr. Schaap wanted me to have.' It was *Where Are We Going?*. Since their visit was to elicit information and my opinions about the integrity of the KJB text and its history, I felt the Lord had opened the door to express my concern about Dr. Schaap's adoption of the Hodge-Warfield view of the 'Bible.' I drew up a follow-up letter to Dr. Schaap. Following Matt. 18, the letter also included some personal comments about his new

view of ‘no inspired Holy Bibles.’ Along with what I considered a friendly, but informative letter to Dr. Schaap, I included a copy of the entire pre-publication version of my new book, *Hazardous Materials: Greek and Hebrew Study Dangers*, including its chapter 31, “The Seven Proofs of the King James Bible’s Inspiration.” I humbly asked, “Since you have taken the bull by the horns on this issue, you might be my best sounding board, in pointing out to me confidentially why any of its seven proofs fail to convince you— before it goes to press the first of the year.” I also gave copies of it to the four staff members who flew to meet me. In the letter to Dr. Schaap I asked for his response to the material. I said,

“I trust that my efforts to help you will be reciprocated by your reserving comments about the manuscript to *me alone*, until it is available to the public. Actually, I had promised the rough manuscript to Phil Pins quite some time ago, to give him a jump-start on clearing the shelves, so that when the book comes out no one can use it to point a finger at my friends at Hyles-Anderson or First Baptist...”

Four months later, I still had received no reply from Dr. Schaap. When an abridge version of my new book’s chapter, “The Seven Proofs of the King James Bible’s Inspiration,” was printed in the *Church Bus News*, I was in for the virtual shock of my entire life. My simple treatise about the inspiration of the Holy Bible made people from the FBC staff, membership, deacon board, and especially Dr. Schaap himself, turn from Dr. Jekyll to Mr. Hyde. There are not many things one can count upon in this life, but I had always taught my daughter that FBC and HAC were two of them. I would have bet one million

dollars that these were rational, academic, spiritually-minded, and loving people, who could deal with things in a scriptural manner. Their response was perhaps the biggest shock in my entire life. How could a pile of Bible verses and some simple history elicit virtual hatred? The fangs came out and the bear claws flashed as they began a frenzied nationwide smear campaign against me *personally*. No analysis of misinterpreted scriptures, no in-depth historical or linguistic retort, but merely a name-calling diatribe. Unable to deal on an intellectual level with the evidence put forth in the chapter, they flipped out and regressed into childhood playground scuffling and ‘yo mama...’ jabs. I heard every slanderous lie they constructed. Insane internet fables, from tongues set on fire of hell, became fodder to fill their empty guns. Dr. Schaap would be surprised at how quickly his jab to a deacon denouncing “some old woman” scorched my phone.

They have now lost one of their most avid promoters. Worse yet, they have “offended” and shaken the “little ones,” like my daughter and her friends, who were raised to expect the best from those who followed in the footsteps of Dr. Hyles.

Even Brother Colsten gave the straight party line in “Dr. Schaap Speaks” saying,

“We have never heard Brother Hyles or Brother Schaap say anything negative about any one of the brethren...We cheer you, we love you, we pray for you; may it never be said that we are in any way critical of you. Have a nice ministry” (p. 12).

Dream on, Brother Colsten. Matt. 23:3 says, “...for they say, and do not.” Dr. Schaap’s comment in the *Voice*, “let us

practice Matthew 18:15-17” is the same empty rhetoric as his mantra, “the Bible is inspired.” I received no reply to my September 2008 letter, yet he chose to bludgeon and backbite me with untrue statements. He alleges in the *Voice*, “At Hyles-Anderson College any student or staff member who is found to be vocally critical of another Bible-believing preacher, church, or Christian ministry is expelled or asked to leave.” Is Dr. Schaap exempt? Are the staff and membership exempt, as long as it is whispered or typed into blogs? Why do the staff refuse to answer my communication to them regarding their misrepresentations? His comment in the *Voice* shudders with hypocrisy:

“...some of the most damaging words are being spoken about Christian leaders who have demonstrated their faithfulness and integrity for decades. We know their faith and manner of conduct. Let’s be extremely careful with the testimonies and reputation of our fellow brethren, especially those who have labored long before us and who have decades of an open, well-known stand for the faith once delivered to the saints” (*The Voice*, p. 16).

Yet KJB defenders, who have shown “faithfulness and integrity for decades” are exempt from the velvet glove handling Dr. Schaap wants for himself. I challenge him to find one sentence spoken against him *personally*; all discussion is pointed at defending the inspiration of the KJB.

Brother Duff’s comment, “For whatever reason certain people have attacked our pastor.” May I suggest that it has much to do with the law of sowing and reaping? If Dr. Schaap’s

view of the King James Bible lowers anyone's view of it unnecessarily, people's view of Dr. Schaap will dwindle as a natural consequence. If Dr. Schaap and his members think that they are above Matt. 18 and can "speak evil" of someone without reaping the like ill will that they sowed, they are in for a rude awakening. God is no respecter of persons.

The correction of Dr. Schaap has had some small effect. The blind bravado of his book, *Where Are We Going?* and the impassioned rhetoric of his November sermon have turned into sheepish pontificating in the February issue of the *Voice*. In it he acts as if HE were not the one who set off the atomic bomb, blowing inspired Holy Bibles to bits. *The Voice* reminds me of a little boy who was caught tearing up his brother's beloved possession. When charged with the act and set for a spanking, the boy begins preaching to his parent that violent acts are never to be countenanced. Schaap likewise concludes in *The Voice*,

"And unfortunately, all fuss with one another concerning their particular wording's being the only correct wording. It's like listening to an argument between Chevy and Ford owners...Please don't think I'm minimizing the discussion of correct doctrine...I see these brethren trying to point out that their particular way of saying it is more correct than another's...Let's end what the apostles called, "...doting about questions and strifes of words...I don't think any one of us could slide a piece of paper between our differences. Sure, we can argue concerning whether one brother said it or wrote it the way we would have done so, but that is quite self-serving..." (p. 16).

He has no real defense of his position that our Holy Bibles are not inspired. He has met his match in coming against the KJB and suddenly is asking us all to quit pouring on the proof, as he has none.

After writing a book that says my Holy Bible is not inspired, preaching an inflammatory and vitriolic sermon in November, in which he calls ‘wacky’ those who believe it is inspired, and misrepresenting the words of Dr. Hyles, does Dr. Schaap expect his friends to let him go astray with no admonition, no correction, no instruction in righteousness. If no one stood up for the Holy Bible, what would be left for the next generation. If we simply cast him aside, with no effort to correct his errors, that would be unloving. Dr. Bob Gray of Texas says, “Brother Schaap is putting a question mark on the words of God, while we are putting an exclamation point on the words of God.”

(Pages 14, 15, 16 of the *Voice* are reviewed throughout this document.)

Dennis Palmu, author and member of the prestigious North American Conference on British Studies, gives an objective analysis of the current battle,

“The battle has now shifted to divisions of troops wearing the same uniform and the assault is focused on the remnant left upon the ‘hill,’ where the true ‘standard’ and its bearers are camped. An all-out assault, led by Jack Schaap, is underway against the real fundamentalist cognoscente. They declare that we ‘do not have the scriptures (2 Tim. 3:15-17) in a book that we can hold in our hand and read and understand. We must defer to the pseudo-cognoscente and

their lexicons for the ‘real meaning’ of every word, now that we have been told by the ‘real standard bearers’ that the words of our Bibles are not inspired?’ Few are rallying around the new ‘standard,’ which is no standard at all. As with the departure from the gold standard to fiat paper money, signaling the beginning of the end for legitimate currency, the departure from holding to the inspiration of the scriptures that we have in our hands as the King James Bible, signals the beginning of the end for those institutions as unequivocal Bible-believing standard bearers. Thankfully, Bible history tells us that God’s dealings with mankind, during times of trouble for his people, are not dependent on numbers or even appointed leaders. The ‘rank and file’ are capable of reading and studying and ‘rightly dividing the word of truth’ for themselves and thereby being used of God in accomplishing his purposes.”

Prayers are surely going up all over the country that Dr. Schaap will take heed to what Jesus said,

“As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten: be thou zealous therefore, and repent” (Rev. 3:19).