

## Chronology of the VPP Heresy in the FEBC.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The term **Verbal Plenary Preservation** or **VPP** first appeared in the Singapore scenario in 2002. It is a theory espoused strongly by Far Eastern Bible College whose chief proponent is Dr Jeffrey Khoo Eng Teck.<sup>1</sup> His view on VPP as defined by Rev Charles Seet, Associate Pastor of Life B-P Church is as follows:

“The process of preservation of the Scriptures culminated in the Hebrew and Greek texts underlying the King James Version. These texts surpassed all other editions of the traditional texts existing at that time. The ones who were responsible for these texts were the translators of the KJV. God used these translators to restore absolute 100% purity to the texts in the year 1611. The result of this is that the Greek and Hebrew texts underlying the KJV are the exact words of the original writings, i.e. a virtual photocopy of the autographs. Christians who use the KJV can therefore claim to have a perfect Bible.”<sup>2</sup>

Dr Khoo’s own definition of Verbal Plenary Preservation (VPP) as expressed in the preamble of the FEBC is as follows:

*“We believe in the divine, Verbal Plenary Inspiration (Autographs) and Verbal Plenary Preservation (Apographs) of the Scriptures in the original languages, their consequent inerrancy and infallibility, and as the perfect Word of God, the supreme and final authority in faith and life (2 Tim 3:16, 2 Pet 1:20-21, Ps 12:6-7, Matt 5:18, 24:35).”<sup>3</sup>*

“...VPP means the whole of Scripture with all its words even to the jot and tittle is perfectly preserved by God without any loss of the original words, prophecies, promises, commandments, doctrines, and truths, not only in the words of salvation, but also the words of history, geography and science. Every book, every chapter, every verse, every word, every syllable, every letter is infallibly preserved by the Lord Himself to the last iota.

What and where are the preserved words of God today? They are the inspired OT Hebrew words and NT Greek words the prophets, the apostles, the church fathers, the reformers used which are today found in the long and continuously abiding and preserved words underlying the Reformation Bibles best represented by the time-tested and time-honoured KJV, and **NOT** in the corrupted Alexandrian manuscripts and critical Westcott-Hort texts underlying the liberal, ecumenical, and neo-evangelical modern English versions.”<sup>4</sup>

But VPP theory did not come into full-term as it is defined today in a short span of time. It took about ten years for it to evolve through the many battles of words, redefinition and twisting of terms. In the process, VPP proponents brought confusion and discouragement

---

<sup>1</sup> Academic Dean of Far Eastern Bible College and an active Elder of True Life Bible-Presbyterian Church.

<sup>2</sup> as defined by Rev Charles Seet in his sermon entitled “The Word that Endures Forever” preached on 28<sup>th</sup> Oct 2007 at Life B-P Church

<sup>3</sup>Statement of Faith of FEBC Constitution (4.2.1). Article 4.2.1 was amended in 2003 by adding,

“...(Autographs) and Verbal Plenary Preservation (Apographs)”.

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.febc.edu.sg/Verbal%20Plenary%20Preservation.htm>

## **Chronology of the VPP Heresy in the FEBC.**

among many Bible-believing adherents. Its ill-effects split churches. In attempting to establish his theory, Dr. Khoo continued to write relentlessly through the emails, letter, the Burning Bush (Journal of FEBC), Bible Witness (Magazine of Gethsemane B-P Church), Newsletters of True Life B-P Church, Calvary Pandan B-P Church, his books and other publications.

### **2. THE DEVELOPMENT OF VPP THEORY**

#### **a). From RSV to the KJV**

From Dr. Khoo's own testimony, his first Bible was the RSV and came to his present position on the KJV through the lecture delivered by D.A. Waite in 1992 and from a book written by Edward F Hills. He said that he did not know the doctrine of preservation until then and was never taught it, and when he discovered it, he felt that he had made a great discovery:

“ In December 1992, Calvary B-P Church invited Dr D A Waite to speak on the KJV issue. It was the first time I had heard of this man, and his book *Defending the King James Bible*. It was a 320-page scholarly defence of the KJV which I read with great delight. I took a greater interest in the textual issue, and remembered another scholarly book on the defence of the KJV that I had seen in my earlier days as a student but could not recall the name of the author. I only remembered the book had a simple, sky-blue cover. I asked Rev Ronny Khoo about it, and he brought me to a certain KJV-Only bookshop (which has since closed down). Walking up to the bookshop I saw the book right there at the display window. It was the only copy left. I quickly bought it. It was Edward F Hills's *The King James Version Defended*. Through Hills's book I discovered the sorely neglected doctrine of biblical preservation. It was a doctrine affirmed in the Westminster Confession of Faith. As a Bible-Presbyterian, I was flabbergasted that I did not know this doctrine. I was never taught it. I knew well the doctrine of biblical inspiration, but had never heard of biblical preservation.”<sup>5</sup>

#### **b). ‘Attacks’ on King James Bible and FEBC**

Dr Khoo relating his testimony, described of how in 1995 Rev. Peter Eng's ‘attacks’ on the KJV impinged on the doctrinal position of Rev. Dr Timothy Tow (FEBC Principal) and Dr. Tow Siang Hwa (Senior Pastor of Calvary Pandan B-P Church). Dr. Khoo wrote,

“In 1995, Rev Peter Eng (the same one who taught textual criticism at FEBC) of Antioch B-P Church (now defunct) wrote a series of articles entitled “From KJV to NIV.” His articles, published in the “Antioch Letter” (a weekly paper of his church), questioned the B-P stand of using the KJV only. He launched a vicious and libelous attack against the KJV and against the B-P Church and her senior pastors, Rev Dr Timothy Tow and Dr S H Tow. We could not let this slide. We had no choice but to do battle with this new NIV champion who sought to undermine the King James Bible and the B-P Church. Rev Tow responded to the attacks in the Life Church weekly. Others who joined the fray were Rev Quek Suan Yew, Rev Charles Seet and myself. All three of us wrote our personal, independent critique of Eng's views. In the heat of the battle three books in defence of the KJV were forged: *Beyond Versions: A Biblical Perspective of Modern English Bibles* (1998)

---

<sup>5</sup> J. Khoo's testimony : “From RSV to KJV” written in June 30, 2002.

## Chronology of the VPP Heresy in the FEBC.

by S H Tow, *A Theology of Every Christian: Knowing God and His Word* (1998)  
by T Tow & J Khoo, and *Kept Pure in All Ages: Recapturing the Authorised  
Version and the Doctrine of Providential Preservation* (2001) by J Khoo.”<sup>6</sup>

It was Rev. Eng’s ‘attacks’ in 1995 that initiated a vehement response from the FEBC led by Dr. Khoo and, is to take FEBC down the road to extremism. He insisted that every faculty member of the teaching staff and Board of Directors must not only take the Oath of Allegiance but also to sign the Statement of Faith of the College as of the year 2000.

The doctrinal position of the FEBC in 1995 as regards the Holy Scripture is what any conservative, fundamental bible-believing college would hold to. This is evidenced by the publication of the January 1995, *Burning Bush* in its editorial penned by Dr. Khoo:

“Far Eastern Bible College is a Reformed, Premillennial, and Separatist School . . . FEBC believes the 66 Books of the Holy Bible to be the inerrant, infallible, verbally and plenary inspired Word of God. The Board of Directors, and Faculty swear before God at every Convocation by taking this solemn oath.”<sup>7</sup>

### **c). Rev. (Dr.) Timothy Tow acknowledges FEBC’s change of position in textual matters and preservation of Holy Scriptures.**

At a Faculty Meeting in April 1997, chaired by Rev. (Dr.) Timothy Tow (Principal of FEBC), a video show was screened in which Dr. Dell Johnson of Pensacola Christian College gave his view on textual matters and the preservation of the Holy Scriptures. After the screening, the then Registrar, Rev. (Dr.) Bob Phee asked Rev. Tow whether the FEBC had changed its position regarding textual matters and preservation. Rev. Tow affirmed that the FEBC had changed its position to that of Pensacola Christian College<sup>8</sup>; previously, FEBC’s view was similar to that held by Faith Theological Seminary.

### **d). Leaven of the Ruckmanites.**

The FEBC leadership was unaware that certain elements of the KJV-only camp held views that are extreme in that the KJV was given by inspiration or that it was a perfect translation. G. A. Riplinger, a Ruckmanite and anti-Calvinist, was frequently mentioned by them as a ‘scholar’ or as a person who has done research.

In a chapel message preached by Rev. Timothy Tow at the FEBC, August 1998, he said

“...Thank God for the coming out of a thick book of I believe 600 pages by G.A. Riplinger who ripped away the false lies of Westcott and Hort.”<sup>9</sup>

“...who has good knowledge of this and I am sure that he must have been enlightened by G.A. Riplinger, who has made the most thorough research....”<sup>10</sup>

Again, G.A. Riplinger was identified as one of the “pioneers of rediscovered Truth” when in a graduation ceremony of the FEBC, May 2002, Rev. Timothy Tow announced the change of position of the FEBC,

---

<sup>6</sup> J. Khoo’s testimony : “From RSV to KJV” written in June 30, 2002.

<sup>7</sup> *Burning Bush*, Jan 1995.

<sup>8</sup> “We believe God has kept that promise by preserving His infallible Word in the traditional Hebrew and Greek manuscripts and that the Authorized Version (KJV) is an accurate English translation of the preserved Word of God.” Article of Faith, Pensacola Christian College

<sup>9</sup> Chapel message preached by Rev. Timothy Tow at FEBC on Monday, 17 Aug 1998

<sup>10</sup> Chapel message preached by Rev. Timothy Tow at FEBC on Monday, 17 Aug 1998

## Chronology of the VPP Heresy in the FEBC.

“Far Eastern Bible College has advanced beyond the ICCC Bible Resolution to declare the Preservation of the Scriptures to be part and parcel of the Doctrine of its Inspiration... The pioneers of this rediscovered Truth are E F Hills,...,G. Riplinger...”<sup>11</sup>

### e). **KJV, the only true Bible in the English language**

In 2001, Dr Khoo wrote a book called *Kept Pure In All Ages*. Partly quoting Edward F Hills and partly adding his own words, Dr. Khoo believed that KJV is the only true accurate translation

“We have the Words of God in English, or in Spanish, or in Italian, or in Portuguese, or in Russian, etc. This is true only in accurate translations like the King James Bible in the English language. .... God wants His Inspired Words of Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek to be accurately translated into all the languages of the world (Rom 16:26, Acts 2:11). God expects us to find the most accurate Bible in our own language (In English, it is the King James Bible) . . .!”<sup>12</sup>

### f). **KJV, the perfect Bible.**

The term “Verbal Plenary Preservation” or VPP was initially mentioned verbally at a FEBC Night Class on Oct 2002. It later appeared in a *Burning Bush* article: “A Plea for a Perfect Bible” (*Burning Bush*, January 2003) when he introduced the topic in these words,

“The Bible controversy today is hotting up. The controversy ironically involves the simple question of whether the Church today has a perfect Bible. Fundamentalists today cannot agree on this very basic question. The issue concerns the biblical doctrine of verbal plenary preservation.”

In the same article, there was a chart entitled: “What Kind of Bible Do You Have?”<sup>13</sup>,” he placed the KJV under the category “All Perfect (Perfect then and now).” By this, Dr Khoo was stating **the KJV as a translation and Bible version is perfect; 100% inspired and 100% preserved.**

### g). **Resignation of some FEBC lecturers over preservation of Scripture.**

Indeed, the differences of views by FEBC lecturers on preservation of God’s Word was ‘hotting up.’ Pressure was put on Rev. Charles Seet and Rev. Colin Wong to conform to FEBC’s new position on preservation.

“...events that have taken place in the past few months have made it impossible for me to continue serving in the Bible College with a clear conscience. These events concern the position that has recently been taken and promoted by some faculty

---

<sup>11</sup>27th Graduation and 40th Anniversary of FEBC at Calvary Pandan B-P Church, May 5, 2002.

<sup>12</sup> *Kept Pure In All Ages* . p.23, J. Khoo

<sup>13</sup> APPENDIX B, p.17

## Chronology of the VPP Heresy in the FEBC.

members on the extent of preservation of God's Word in the King James Version."<sup>14</sup>

"...I must confess that I have not yet attained to the belief that the Textus Receptus we have today is totally without scribal errors, i.e. that it is a virtual photocopy of the autographs...Scribal errors should not be considered as faults or flaws in the text, since they were not made deliberately..."<sup>15</sup>

"They said that we have attacked God's character by holding this view. They said that though they too once held to the same view as us, they have repented of this and hoped we will do the same."<sup>16</sup>

With the differences unresolved, Rev. Seet and Rev. Wong resigned their teaching positions in the FEBC.

### **h). The Word of God has been miraculously preserved.**

Dr. Khoo published the tenets<sup>17</sup> of the VPP in the Burning Bush (January 2006). What was significant in this publication could be interpreted in two ways (i) it is the admission by the FEBC that what they have termed 'Providential Preservation' all along should be interpreted as 'miraculous' or 'supernatural' preservation, or (ii) that the FEBC had made an error in calling it 'Providential Preservation' and, should now be called miraculous preservation.

"The 'providential' preservation of Scriptures is understood as God's special and not general providence. Special providence or *providential extraordinaria* speaks of God's **miraculous intervention in the events of history** and in the affairs of mankind in fulfilment of His sovereign will for the sake of His elect and to the glory of His Name. The divine preservation of the Canon (books) and Text (words) of Scripture comes under God's special providence."<sup>18</sup>

### **i). Restoration of the contents of the autographic text.**

FEBC further developed this concept of the miraculous preservation when it asserted that the autographic text was restored. God, it is claimed by the FEBC, made use of the KJV translators in 1611 to restore the Original text. In July 2006, Dr. Khoo wrote,

"Could God have restored for His Church all of His inspired and preserved words in the days of the Reformation? As the all-powerful God, He certainly could, and by faith we believe He surely did. Just as He restored the Old Covenant words of His Decalogue through His servant Moses (Exod 19:16-21:26, 31:18-32:28, 34:1-4; Deut 5:1-29, 9:20-21, 10:1-5), and all His words in the scroll which Jehoiakim cut up and burned (Jer 36:1-32), so we believe the Lord has similarly done for His New Testament words which have been kept pure in the Traditional and Majority

---

<sup>14</sup> *Why I resigned from teaching at the Far Eastern Bible College*, Rev. C. Seet

<sup>15</sup> *Why I resigned from teaching at the Far Eastern Bible College*, Rev. C. Seet

<sup>16</sup> *Why I resigned from teaching at the Far Eastern Bible College*, Rev. C. Seet

<sup>17</sup> Doctrines held as being true by an organization.

<sup>18</sup> Burning Bush, (January 2006), p. 2

## Chronology of the VPP Heresy in the FEBC.

manuscripts and are now found in the printed Text of the Protestant Reformation—the time-tested and time-honoured Textus Receptus underlying the KJV.”<sup>19</sup>

### j). Questionable means of promoting VPP.

#### i) FEBC misleads by misquoting and misrepresenting prominent Christians and organizations

It is rare to find complete agreement on every doctrine between Christian people. The unwritten rule for anyone, especially a Christian, to promote a doctrine is complete truthfulness and intellectual honesty. An article (A Plea for a Perfect Bible) written by Dr. Khoo and published in the Burning Bush (January 2003), **misled and confused** many, especially those within the Bible-Presbyterian churches. This was pointed out by Rev. Seet:

“This article also included a table (“What Kind of Bible Do You Have?”)<sup>20</sup> defining three views of the Perfection of the Bible... The confusion is found in the third column, which combines the traditional view the church has held, with his own brand of the doctrine of preservation. Among the proponents in the third column, he [Dr. Khoo] erroneously included Burgon, Pensacola Christian College, Trinitarian Bible Society, International Council of Christian Churches, the Bible-Presbyterian Church and FEBC. This gives the uninformed reader the false impression that this view is the official view of a great majority of fundamentalist institutions...”<sup>21</sup>

#### ii) FEBC academic dean (Dr. Khoo) use of anonymous email to cause confusion.

In December 2002, mysterious e-mails<sup>22</sup> containing confidential documents (LIFE B-P Church Session meeting and Dr. Khoo’s responses) were sent to members of LIFE B-P Church. Dr. Khoo, in reply to an elder of the church, **admitted** that he leaked the confidential documents which were to be discussed for the coming session meeting through an email (Dr. Khoo used the anonymous email name ‘FOR GOD’)

“I assured you that I am FOR GOD, and I am fully responsible for my reply to the Sunday School paper that has been sent out.”<sup>23</sup>

Dr. Khoo claimed that he had nothing to do with another email under the name ‘PUTRI SAMI’ who mysteriously possessed the same restricted documents as Dr. Khoo’s “FOR GOD”! This PUTRI SAMI threatened the elder (of LIFE B-P Church) who subsequently referred the matter to the authorities<sup>24</sup>.

### 3. APPEALING TO FEBC LEADERSHIP OVER THIS NEW TEACHING.

---

<sup>19</sup> J. Khoo, The Burning Bush, July 2006, p.78,

<sup>20</sup> APPENDIX B, p.17

<sup>21</sup> *Why I resigned from teaching at the Far Eastern Bible College*, Rev. C. Seet; see APPENDIX A.

<sup>22</sup> APPENDIX A. p.12 to p.16

<sup>23</sup> APPENDIX A. p.15 Dr. Khoo’s email of 21<sup>st</sup> Dec 2002

<sup>24</sup> APPENDIX A. p.14 un-named elder’s email of 21<sup>st</sup> Dec 2002

## Chronology of the VPP Heresy in the FEBC.

Many of the FEBC graduates, before the “Jeffrey Khoo era”, owed much to Rev (Dr.) Timothy Tow for his faithful teaching of God’s Word and the exemplary life-style. They had great respect for him and were sad to see what has become of the FEBC and the situation in some Bible-Presbyterian churches.

A senior pastor wrote to Rev. Tow

“I pray God that things will revert to normal again, to the original position we held for so long, that the Bible in the original languages and manuscripts is inspired and inerrant... By God’s grace, may our B-P leaders and members not be divided by the introduction of this new position regarding the KJV...this latest separation over the KJV is causing schism confusion and sadness in the Church.”<sup>25</sup>

Rev. Tan Eng Boo recalled the time when together with four pastors:

“Almost one and a half years ago, five B-P pastors: the late Rev (Dr) Burt Subramaniam, Rev Anthony Tan, Rev Tan Choon Seng, Rev Yap Beng Shin and myself met up with Rev Timothy Tow and Mrs Tow. Five of us pastors shared with Rev Tow our concern that FEBC was heading towards an extreme view (KJV-Only view). We asked him to stop certain people from advocating this view, and we expressed our fear to him that the B-P church is heading towards another split if nothing is being done to nip this problem in the bud.”<sup>26</sup>

Rev.(Dr.) Paul Hoole from Sri Lanka wrote to Dr. S.H. Tow (Senior Pastor of Calvary Pandan B-P, senior board member of FEBC)

“Speaking as a Pastor I do not think that the VPP issue should be brought to the pulpit or to the fellowship groups of a church, since the majority will know little about the original languages and manuscripts, and they are bound to be confused and react emotionally... It was sometime ago [2002] when you visited Sri Lanka (and I had just heard of the VPP issue) when you mentioned that it is a new doctrine and you were not positive about it...”<sup>27</sup>

The appeals to the leadership of the FEBC to stop the aggressive promotion of this new teaching, especially by its faculty members Dr. Khoo, Rev. Quek S. Y. and Rev. Das Koshy were ignored.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

What started off as a belief by the FEBC leadership regarding the Hebrew-Masoretic text and the Greek Textus Receptus, to be the most accurate and providentially preserved texts, evolved through a period of about ten years to become a ‘doctrine’<sup>28</sup> where God restored the Original texts through the KJV translators in 1611. In the process at least three B-P churches split up over this new teaching.

## APPENDIX A

---

<sup>25</sup> Rev. Philip Heng’s letter on 10<sup>th</sup> Nov. 2003

<sup>26</sup> “The Perfect Bible or the Perfect Version?”, Grace B-P weekly, June 2005

<sup>27</sup> Rev. P. Hoole’s letter to Dr. Tow , 5<sup>th</sup> Oct. 2005

<sup>28</sup> more correctly, **heresy**.

## Chronology of the VPP Heresy in the FEBC.

### Dr KHOO'S MISQUOTATION OF G.I. WILLIAMSON

In August 2002. we corresponded with G.I. Williamson, the one who wrote the commentary on the Westminster Confession (1964) and whom Dr Jeffrey Khoo quoted as saying,

"This brings us to the matter of God's 'singular care and providence' by which He has 'kept pure in all ages' this original text, so that we now actually possess it in 'authentic' form. And let us begin by giving an illustration from modern life to show that an original document may be destroyed, without the text of that document being lost. Suppose you were to write a will. Then suppose you were to have a photographic copy of that will made. If the original were then destroyed, the photographic copy would still preserve the text of that will **exactly the same as the original itself** (emphasis his). The text of the copy would differ in no way whatever from the original, and so it would possess exactly the same 'truth' and meaning as the original. ... Thus it is seen to be the sober Truth, as declared by the Confession of Faith, that the infallible text of the Word of God has 'by... singular care and providence (been) kept pure in all ages,' so that we do now actually possess before our very eyes the "authentic" text of the Word of the living God. We may say concerning the actual words that we see on the pages of the Greek New Testament, 'Behold, there are the very words which have come forth from the mouth of God. Amen.'"

Jeffrey Khoo: I say Amen to Williamson's exposition of the WCF and the doctrine of providential preservation."

This was the reply that we received from G. I. Williamson:

---- Original Message -----

From: "G.I. Williamson" <[giwopc@areonnect.com](mailto:giwopc@areonnect.com)>

Sent: Monday, August 12, 2002 5:25 AM

Subject: clarification

Dear.....

While I have great respect for the so-called Textus Receptus (TR). I do not believe that it is quite equal to a photocopy of the autographa. You may know of Dr. Edward F. Hills who has written defending the King James Version as the best version because it is/was based on the TR. He was a long time friend and we had many discussions of this very question. He helped me to see the cogency of the argument for high respect for the Byzantine/Majority text. Of all people in the ancient world the Greek speaking Eastern Church surely would have been the place where changes - even those made unintentionally by people making hand written copies - would have been most likely detected. I accept that as a sound argument. But even Dr. Hills was not quite willing to absolutize the TR. And neither am I.

It must be remembered that the foundation of the argument for the superiority of the TR is the doctrine of divine providence. God, who controls all things, has seen to it that his word has been preserved. True. But it is this same true God who has also preserved throughout the ages of the world in which the ancient church developed translations into other languages, and some manuscript copies of the Greek N.T. which are not always in



## Chronology of the VPP Heresy in the FEBC.

complete agreement with the TR. I do not think we have a right to automatically rule out as of no value whatever this component. It may be true that the TR is right 99 times out of 100 - when there is a textual question. But that does not, in my opinion, prove that it is always right.

The bottom line for me, then, is that I give great deference to the TR. But I cannot go along with those who think that it is so perfect that there is no work for us to do in comparing the other ancient manuscripts, etc. I think my own Commentary (pp. 15-17) makes this sufficiently clear that no one should presume to quote me as one who thinks the TR (the Byzantine Majority Received Text) is absolutely perfect.

I hope this is of some help. Don't hesitate to come back if I can be of further assistance.

In Christ,

G.I. Williamson

— Original Message —

**From:** G.I. Williamson

**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2002

11:40PM **Subject:** More on TR

Dear.....

I had to respond rather quickly yesterday and now. in reading over your note again, feel that I should add a bit.

In your letter you said: "There are some influential leaders in my Church who understand and quote your statement to support the idea that God has raised, among the midst of the Byzantine/Majority/Received Text, a single purified Text which is the virtual 'photocopy' of the autograph."

This is an interesting sentence because it could so easily be taken either one or the other of two ways. It all depends on what is meant by the word 'virtual.' My dictionary says this word means: "having the essence or effect but not the appearance or form of." The same dictionary says of the word 'virtually' that it means: "in effect though not in fact; practically, nearly." If the word virtually is intended in your letter to mean this then I could agree with it. But if it is intended to mean that the TR is a 100% perfect reproduction of the autograph, then I could not agree with it. I've discussed this with various scholars - including the late Edward F. Hills - and none of them ever went quite that far. I hope that the people you describe as 'influential leaders' in your church do not go that far either because, if they do, they have gone too far. But if they mean what the dictionary defines as the meaning of virtual (virtually) then I believe I could work with them.

I just felt that I should add this to what I wrote yesterday

Wishing you the Lord's grace and blessing.

G.I.

P.S. I am now semi-retired and cannot afford the toll call to Singapore. But I am willing to discuss this with you further if you feel the need and can bear the cost of the call. My phone

## Chronology of the VPP Heresy in the FEBC.

number in the U.S. is (712) 324-3467. I am usually in my study between 8 and noon daily (Central Standard Time U.S.)

### DR KHOO'S MISREPRESENTATION OF EDWARD F. HILLS

In his article, "A Plea For a Perfect Bible" Dr Khoo cited E. F. Hills as follows:

Such a high view of Scripture grants believers *maximum certainty*- with regard to the authenticity of the inspired words of Scripture. And such certainty can only be had if the doctrine of the special providential preservation of the Scriptures is upheld. Dr E F Hills wrote, "if we believe in the special providential preservation of the Scriptures ... we obtain *maximum certainty*, all the certainty that any mere man can obtain, all the certainty that we need. For we are led by the logic of faith to the *Masoretic Hebrew text, to the New Testament Textus Receptus. and to the King James Version.*"

The following is the full context from p.224 of E.F. Hill's book, "The King James Version Defended":

#### "Maximum Certainty Versus Maximum Uncertainty

God's preservation of the New Testament text was not miraculous but providential. The scribes and printers who produced the copies of the New Testament Scriptures and the true believers who read and cherished them were not inspired but God-guided. Hence there are some New Testament passages in which the true reading cannot be determined with absolute certainty. There are some readings, for example, on which the manuscripts are almost equally divided, making it difficult to determine which reading belongs to the Traditional Text. Also in some of the cases in which the Textus Receptus disagrees with the Traditional Text it is hard to decide which text to follow. Also, as we have seen, sometimes the several editions of the Textus Receptus differ from each other and from the King James Version. And, as we have just observed, the case is the same with the Old Testament text. Here it is hard at times to decide between the kethibh and the keri and between the Hebrew text and the Septuagint and Latin Vulgate versions. Also there has been a controversy concerning the headings of the Psalms.

In other words, God does not reveal every truth with equal clarity. In biblical criticism, as in every other department of knowledge there are still some details in regard to which we must be content to remain uncertain. But the special providence of God has kept these uncertainties down to a minimum. Hence if we believe in the special providential preservation of the Scriptures and make this the leading principle of our biblical textual criticism, we obtain maximum certainty, all the certainty that any mere man can obtain, all the certainty we need. For we are led by the logic of faith to the Masoretic Hebrew text, to the New Testament Textus Receptus, and to the King James Version."

The words in red [underlined] were the parts quoted by Dr Khoo. As anyone can see, his selective quotation of E.F. Hills to support his view has caused him to misrepresent Hills. Hills never claimed perfection for the KJV or its underlying text but only claimed that the uncertainties were kept down to a *minimum* by God's special providence. Notice that Dr Khoo also omitted the part that reads, "*and make this the leading principle of our biblical*

## **Chronology of the VPP Heresy in the FEBC.**

*textual criticism.*" This may have been done deliberately, since Dr Khoo is against biblical textual criticism.

### **DR KHOO'S MISREPRESENTATION OF THE TRINITARIAN BIBLE SOCIETY**

In a table entitled *What Kind of Bible Do You Have?* defining three views of the Perfection of the Bible, Dr Jeffrey Khoo misrepresented the Trinitarian Bible Society (TBS) as holding the Perfect Bible view.

A check made with Mr Mark Fenn, Editorial Asst of TBS, London in August 2002 confirmed that TBS does not take the view as Dr Khoo alleged. When asked what is the meaning of the phrase found in the WCF "Kept pure in ages", Mr Fenn produced an article written by Mr A.J. Brown, the Editorial Secretary of the TBS, as found in the *TBS Quarterly Record*, Oct-Dec 1984 entitled "Faith and Textual Scholarship."

The Reformed Position - The great 16th century Protestant Reformers were under no illusion that their manuscripts were perfect. Both Calvin and Beza, for example, were quite prepared to acknowledge that in matters of smaller details, all of their manuscripts might be wrong at particular passages. This possibility did not greatly trouble them because the doctrines of the Christian faith could all be established from other passages which were not in doubt. The Reformers upheld the general reliability of the text of the Greek and Hebrew manuscripts, but they felt at liberty to debate over the exact wording of individual passages.

Essentially the same view as Calvin's and Beza's was reflected in the Westminster Confession and Particular Baptist Confession in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. In declaring that the Old Testament in Hebrew and the New Testament in Greek were "kept pure in all ages." these confessional statements noticeably do not here use the word "perfect" They insisted on the entire perfection of Scripture itself, but they did not speak of the perfection of any or all of the manuscript copies.

Truthfulness - It is right to encourage an overall confidence in the Bible, and a faith in the perfection of the inspired originals, and to give due recognition to the workings of divine providence, but in common with orthodox Christian scholars in every age we should also make a realistic acknowledgement that the manuscript copies and the translations are to some extent subject to the fallibility of human creatures. It is potentially damaging for a minister to pretend to his congregation that there are no differences or difficulties among the manuscripts. Sooner or later the pretence will be found out by those who use the minds which God gave them, and the damage to faith may be far greater than if the existence of difficulties had been candidly admitted. The interests of truth and faith are not well served by suppressing information about the historical evidence.

Faith and Uncertainty - Even some very conservative writers would agree that there are at least some textual details in regard to which we must be content to remain uncertain (for example, Dr E.F. Hills "The King James Version Defended" 1984, p 224). The fact that there are textual difficulties affecting some matters of detail does not destroy any doctrine which is essential to salvation. There is therefore no reason why this limited area of uncertainty should unsettle the saving faith of the believer.

## **Chronology of the VPP Heresy in the FEBC.**

Dr David Allen, the deputation speaker of TBS, verified during his trip to speak at the Life B-P Church camp in June 2004, that TBS does not take the position that Dr Khoo advocates.

### **DR KHOO'S MISREPRESENTATION OF JOHN OWEN**

In an article of the *Burning Bush* (July 2004). Dr Jeffrey Khoo alleged that John Owen believed in VPP. He wrote that

Owen not only believed in a 100% inspired Autographa but also a 100% preserved Apographa. He wrote, "It is true, we have not the Autographa of Moses and the prophets, of the apostles and evangelists; but the Apographa or 'copies' which we have contain every iota that was in them (387).

Unfortunately, he conveniently omitted John Owen's own acknowledgement of variant readings in the immediately proceeding paragraph.

There is no doubt but that in the copies we now enjoy of the Old Testament there are some diverse readings, or various lections....But yet we affirm, that the whole Word of God, in every letter and tittle, as given from Him by inspiration is preserved without corruptions. Where there is any variety it is always in things of less, indeed of no, importance. God by his providence preserving the whole entire, suffered this lesser variety to fall out, in or among the copies we have, for the quickening and exercising of our diligence in our search into His Word.

The words of Owen that were omitted in Dr Khoo's article show that Owen did not hold to Dr Khoo's VPP view, and that he advocated the exercise of diligence in searching into God's Word to harmonise textual difficulties.

### **DR KHOO'S ADMISSION OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANONYMOUS MASS E-MAILING TO CHURCH MEMBERS**

---- Original Message -----

From:

Sent: Tuesday, 17 December, 2002 12:28 PM

Subject: Fw:

Dear.....

The attached mail was sent to me this morning and it incorporates Dr Jeff Khoo's response to Session & Rev Quek's write up on "we have an inerrant Bible". The sender "For God" is circulating to some of the members of Life BP Church. I'm puzzled as to how the sender got hold of Dr Jeff Khoo's response!!!

HS

--- Original Message -----

From: For God

To: Elder Han ; [hedy\\_ho@ite.edu.su](mailto:hedy_ho@ite.edu.su) ; [hengsau@itecnmi.com](mailto:hengsau@itecnmi.com) ;

**Chronology of the VPP Heresy in the FEBC.**

[henry leong@nhb.gov.sg](mailto:henry_leong@nhb.gov.sg) ; [herman\\_nwh@yahoo.com](mailto:herman_nwh@yahoo.com) ; [himbuan@singnet.com.sg](mailto:himbuan@singnet.com.sg) ;  
[hongchoo21@yahoo.com.sg](mailto:hongchoo21@yahoo.com.sg) : [honkit@pacific.net.sg](mailto:honkit@pacific.net.sg);  
[hoonwah@mitsui-marine.com.sg](mailto:hoonwah@mitsui-marine.com.sg) ; [hs200@hotmail.com](mailto:hs200@hotmail.com) ; [hslctalk@singnet.com.sg](mailto:hslctalk@singnet.com.sg) ;  
[htjiang@singnet.com.sg](mailto:htjiang@singnet.com.sg); [htsng@minebea.com.sg](mailto:htsng@minebea.com.sg) ; [huiching@singnet.com.sg](mailto:huiching@singnet.com.sg);  
[humility@postl.com](mailto:humility@postl.com) ; [hweeing@singnet.com.sg](mailto:hweeing@singnet.com.sg) ; [hvangel@hotmail.com](mailto:hvangel@hotmail.com)  
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2002 2:40 AM

[IMAGE] Yahoo! Mobile  
- Play for a chance to win a trip to Sydney!

(See attached file: Answers to Questions by Session Members.doc)  
(See attached file: WE HAVE A INERRANT BIBLE TODAYi.doc)

— Original Message —

**From:**  
**To:** [For God](#)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 17 December, 2002 9:46 AM  
**Subject:** FW: Email on Rev Jeffrey Khoo's Earlier Reply to Session Members

Dear For God,

Kindly identify yourself. Are you a Session member of Life Bible-Presbyterian Church?

If you are, you have committed breach of trust by sending this Q&A document to people outside the Session.

If you are not a Session [member], kindly write in confidence in reply to me. I would like to know how you get this document.

Either way, may I provide you counsel that sending document like this one will not help the congregation to understand the issue at hand. The Lord has appointed pastors, elders and deacons, let them fulfill their responsibility and make the necessary announcement and instructions for the edification of the church members.

Yours in Christ,  
Elder....

— Original Message —

**From:** ...  
**To:** [putri sami](#); [seriousissues2003@yahoo.com.sg](mailto:seriousissues2003@yahoo.com.sg)  
**Cc:** [Dr Jeffrey Khoo](#)  
**Sent:** Saturday, 21 December, 2002 11:31 AM  
**Subject:** Using Anonymous Email Address is most Unethical

**"But that it spread no further among the people, let us straitlv threaten them, that they speak henceforth to no man in this name. And they called them, and commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus." (KJVActs 4:17-18)**

Dear **For God** (if you are truly for God. you will not be doing this very unethical and unchristian work of sending out confidential document emails to Life B-P Church

## Chronology of the VPP Heresy in the FEBC.

*members to explain on behalf of Dr Jeffrey Khoo - he will be given the chance to explain in due process),*

I am appalled that you have received "Private & Confidential" documents from Life B-P Church Session meetings, and from Dr Jeffrey Khoo ("A Reply to the Sunday School Paper, which I had clarified at the Board of Elders meeting that it was not a SS paper *per se*) who only sent it to the Session members three days ago for deliberation at a Board of Elders meeting on Thursday. I say this because I know my fellow Session members and elders are gravely concern with this issue and hold it with much prayer and confidence; they therefore are not the ones who would have provided this to you.

You. and Dr Khoo ( *I can only conclude that Dr Khoo gave it to you since he is the author, or some one who Dr Khoo gave to which has given to you - either way you have implicated Dr Khoo by this action, and he now has to face the BOE to answer this question*), however, have no regard for the office of the Church Session. Through an anonymous email, you are causing confusion and strife in the church -undoing what the Session and Board of Elders is fervently trying to resolve.

To Putri Sami (*or are your For God with another anonymous email address*),

Thank you for your email.

I like to quote your email "Whatever goes around, comes around".

This email is not edifying email, and I do not welcome your threat. I am no gangster. The Lord has appointed me as an elder of Life B-P Church, and therefore, I humbly serve the Lord and His people. Like **For God**, I will be sending your email to the relevant authorities for their investigation now as you have breach the privacy ethics.

If you are a born again believer and have respect for authorities in accordance to Romans 13:1-2 and Hebrews 13:17, please speak with me personally. We do not need to resort to email spamming to destroy the congregation's faith and confidence in God further. In the end, no one wins, and Satan has the last laugh. This is a sincere plea with you. Hiding behind anonymous email addresses will not glorify God, nor help in any way to heal the congregation's confidence. Don't behave like the Sadducees in Acts chapter 4 (quotation above). Don't send any more emails to Life B-P Church congregation, please.

Have a peaceful Christmas.

Yours sincerely,  
Elder....

—Original Message—

**From:** Far Eastern Bible College [<mailto:febc@pacific.net.sg>]

**Sent:** Saturday, 21 December 2002 1:24 PM

**To:** ....

**Subject:** Re: Using Anonymous Email Address is most Unethical

## Chronology of the VPP Heresy in the FEBC.

Dear Eld ...

I do not understand why after our polite conversation over the phone, you sent me this threat?

I already said I do not know and have nothing to do with this "Putri Sami."

I assured you that I am FOR GOD, and I am fully responsible for my reply to the Sunday School paper that has been sent out.

Is this what you meant by keeping our channels of communication open? Elder, I am truly disappointed by this.

Respectfully in Christ,  
Jeffrey Khoo

— Original Message —

**From:** ...

**To:** 'Far Eastern Bible College'

**Sent:** Saturday, 21 December, 2002 11:54 PM

**Subject:** RE: Using Anonymous Email Address is most Unethical

Dear Dr Khoo.

I want to express to you that the disappointment you feel is mutual.

Please see the time stamp of the email (**Sent:** Saturday, 21 December, 2002 11:31 AM) carefully. Prior to sending this email, I tried calling you several times but could not get through to you on your telephone. Hence, at 11.31 am, I had sent this email out to *Putri Sami* and **For God** (at that time, I still do not know that you are "**For God**" email address). If you accept this explanation, you should not misunderstand my point to you about keeping our channels of communication open. And indeed, when I finally got through to you, you told me that Elder Joseph and a new student were with you, and you would prefer to call me back. If my line of communication was not open, I would have told you off not to call me back. But you managed to call me back after 12 noon, by which time the email had long been sent out to you. If you'd read this email, you would probably not call me back, don't you agree?

I also hope that you appreciate the seriousness of sending out Life B-P Church Session document to the congregation without seeking permission from the Session. To put things in perspective. I understand that you feel that you had not been given a fair chance to reply "publicly", but please do understand that you had made your position very clearly at the Life B-P Church pulpit when you were invited to speak, you taught about Bible Preservation at the FEBC night classes on Soteriology until Peter Ong had challenged you publicly, you spoke at the Rehoboth B-P Church 10th Anniversary (my wife and I were in attendance) about the Perfect Bible and challenged the congregation to drag you down, and you post-dated the Burning Bush (January 2003) just to state your paper "A Plea for a Perfect Bible'

early..... you had ample opportunities to present your views loud and clear. Dr Khoo, you are a PhD in Theology and you should appreciate that you actually had several opportunities to get a fair hearing. When the 21 members presented the paper to the Sunday School, notice that it was a Sunday School lesson to Adults, not a debate or forum; and NOT to the entire church at the pulpit. We dare not desecrate the

## Chronology of the VPP Heresy in the FEBC.

pulpit for this purpose. This was the only window for us to make a presentation to our members in the Sunday School at least - the Church Constitutional view. Let me state with all sincerity and let GOD be the Judge that when you raised your hand to make a query, I assumed, on 1st Dec, I honestly did not see it. I was told by a member later that you did raise your hand, but I was not looking at the direction where you were seated. In any case, the time was 10.25 am, I could not have taken any question from any one because I normally take questions from my class privately after the class. You said that your telephone is in the church directory and I could have called you to clarify your view. Likewise, I am always contactable on my phones - why didn't you call me instead, but resort to sending out the Session document and your paper to the church which is confusing and damaging. I was the one who finally took the initiative to call you on the telephone. Dr Khoo - I want to believe that you really love the Lord and His people as you claimed, please consider carefully all that we have tried to put across to you, lest, what Rev Tow had built in the last 52 years of B-P movement may be destroyed by this untenable position.

Many of my colleagues in the Session have advise me not to reply, but I had chosen to speak out and share my thoughts with you in this reply. I hope you now have a clearer picture of the time sequence of the email you had referred to. Please do not be so quick to conclude so poorly of me or any other Session member again. My conscience is clear before the Lord as far as this matter is concerned

Maranatha,  
Elder...

—Original Message—

**From:** Far Eastern Bible College [<mailto:febc@paciflc.net.sg>]

**Sent:** Sunday, 22 December 2002 11:40 AM

**To:** ...

**Subject:** Re: Using Anonymous Email Address is most Unethical

Dear Elder ...

Thank you for your clarification. May I please also take the opportunity to clarify that the "For God" email which I claimed responsibility (as in the email below), I was the author who sent the covering note/explanation and attachment to the person who is "For God" to disseminate it to Lifers. For that one email, it was my responsibility. I am also responsible for asking "For God" to distribute my Answers to the Session. (I am not responsible for any other emails (past, present or future) that "For God" has disseminated to Lifers.) I felt strongly that I was unable to have a fair hearing while much was said against me and requested "For God" to assist in sending it out on my behalf, since there was already a previous email disseminated. I will not ask "For God" again to disseminate my emails to Lifers. As for the other email account (Putri Sami), I am not responsible for it. I agree that we should indeed continue to keep the lines of communications open. May the Lord bless you and your family, and have a blessed Christmas.

In Christ,  
Jeffrey Khoo



**Chronology of the VPP Heresy in the FEBC.**

**APPENDIX B**

*A PLEA FOR A PERFECT BIBLE*

**WHAT KIND OF BIBLE DO YOU HAVE?**

**The Perfection of the Bible: Three Views**

	<b>NOT PERFECT</b> <i>Not Perfect Then &amp; Now</i>	<b>NOT SO PERFECT</b> <i>Perfect Then Not Now</i>	<b>ALL PERFECT</b> <i>Perfect Then &amp; Now</i>
<b>THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL</b>	Liberalism/Modernism, Neo-orthodoxy	Neo-evangelicalism, Neo-fundamentalism	Biblical & Reformed Fundamentalism
<b>DESCRIPTION OF THE BIBLE</b>	Bible <i>is not</i> or <i>becomes</i> the Word of God	Bible <i>contains</i> the Word of God	Bible <i>is</i> the Word of God
<b>VIEW ON BIBLICAL INSPIRATION</b>	Human or Non-miraculous inspiration	Divine inspiration only in Autographs	Divine inspiration in Autographs & faithful Apographs
<b>VIEW ON BIBLICAL PRESERVATION</b>	Denies preservation of words & doctrines	Denies preservation of words / Affirms preservation of doctrines	Affirms preservation of both words & doctrines to the jot & tittle (VPP; WCF 1.8, Matt 5:18)
<b>AUTHORITY</b>	Science Alone	Science plus Bible	Bible Alone ( <i>Sola Scriptura</i> )
<b>EPISTEMOLOGY</b>	Intellect not Faith is supreme (See to believe)	Faith subjected more to the Intellect than to the Bible (See to believe)	Faith and Intellect totally subjected to the Bible (Believe to see)
<b>VIEW OF BIBLICAL INFALLIBILITY &amp; INERRANCY</b>	Denies both infallibility & inerrancy	Denies inerrancy / Affirms infallibility (ie, limited inerrancy)	Affirms both infallibility & inerrancy to the jot and tittle (VPI)
<b>ARE THERE MISTAKES / ERRORS IN THE BIBLE?</b>	Full of mistakes, with all kinds of factual discrepancies & actual contradictions	No mistakes only in spiritual matters but not in science, history, geography where discrepancies are actual or factual errors	No mistakes or errors at all, and any discrepancy is only apparent
<b>CHOICE OF ORIGINAL GREEK TEXT</b>	Westcott-Hort Minority & Critical Text Only	Westcott-Hort Minority & Critical Text is Superior	Textus Receptus (Received Text) Only
<b>POSITION ON BIBLE VERSIONS</b>	Only Liberal, Ecumenical, Roman Catholic, Feminist versions acceptable	All versions acceptable whether corrupt or not	Only KJV acceptable since it is the best (most accurate, faithful & reliable)
<b>CHOICE OF BIBLE VERSIONS</b>	RSV, NRSV, TEV/GNB, TNIV	NIV, NASB, NKJV, ESV	KJV Only
<b>TRANSLATION METHOD</b>	Dynamic Equivalence (Contextualisation)	Dynamic Equivalence (Thought for Thought)	Formal Equivalence (Word for Word)
<b>PROponents</b>	Metzger, Aland, Nida, Martini, Wikgren, UBS, WCC, SBL	Lewis, White, Kutilek, Carson, Wallace, Price, Hudson, IBS, NAE, ETS, BJU, CBTS	Burgon, Hills, Otis Fuller, Waite, Cloud, Paisley, Morris, PCC, TBS, DBS, McIntire, ICCB, BPC, FEBC