

From: Far Eastern Bible College <febc@pacific.net.sg>  
To: FEBC List (including Churches)  
Subject: A Public Response to an Open Letter  
Date: Sun, 14 Aug 2005 08:20:16 +0800

Dear friends,

Attached please find my public response to Lim Seng Hoo's open letter against the verbal plenary preservation of the Scriptures.

You may freely distribute to those who wish for a copy or as you see fit.

"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 forever." (Ps 12:6-7).

In Christ,  
Jeffrey Khoo

---

Dear brethren in the Lord,

I thank the pastor who forwarded this public response to me, as Dr Jeffrey Khoo did not do this himself. I have written my response in red Arial font against JK's black Times New Roman.

Dear Jeff, as before, I am emailing to you a copy. Let this be a public written debate if you will, and in your words, "freely distribute to those who wish for a copy or as you see fit!"

What reputable seminary gives only one side of a view to its students? If its does, how shall they stand when they are in the real world outside and presented with the other case? Rather, a good seminary allows its students to fully see both sides of any debate, and even participate in it. Have you the courage to "freely distribute" this to all FEBC students and associates?

May the Lord be pleased to use this debate to unchain the chained and to give sight to the blinded! May the truth truly prevail! The Lord shall surely help the godly and humble, and preserve each and everyone who trusts in Him (Ps 12:1, 5 and 7).

In our glorious Lord Jesus Christ, the only Saviour of the world,

**Lim Seng Hoo, 25 Aug 2005**

---

# Lim Seng Hoo Vs Jeffrey Khoo Perfect KJV-VPP Written Debate

## **A Public Response to Mr Lim Seng Hoo's Open Letter and Paper Against the Verbal Plenary Preservation of Scripture**

**By Jeffrey Khoo (14 Aug 2005)**

With Rejoinder by Lim Seng Hoo (25 Aug 05)

---

I refer to Mr Lim Seng Hoo's open letter of July 13, 2005, and his so-called "evidential review" against the Biblical doctrine of the 100% perfect preservation of the Holy Scriptures.

It is my sincere desire that in all things, including the writing of this response, that our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ be glorified always (Isa 42:8, Jer 9:23-24, 1 Cor 1:17-31), and that I should be loyal and faithful to Him no matter what the cost (Mark 8:34, Rev 2:10). For the last 13 years of my teaching ministry at the Far Eastern Bible College (FEBC), I have been taking the Dean Burgon oath that the Word of God is perfect without any mistake. This oath was instituted by FEBC's founding principal—the Rev Dr Timothy Tow—and required of all faculty members at the college's annual convocation since the 1970s. I gladly take this oath and dare not break it by denying that the Sacred Scriptures I swore by and have in my hands today are infallible and inerrant, without any mistake.

### Lim Seng Hoo's response:

1. **Faith** and **evidence** run in parallel and are not contradictory. When John and Peter reached our Lord's empty sepulchre, John saw the evidence of our Lord's resurrection – the linen clothes lying and the separately wrapped head napkin – and he believed! (Jn 20:8).

**Reason** and **Faith** are companions, as illustrated in that great Divine call, "Come now, and let us reason together, saith the LORD" (Isa 1:18). Reason is the prelude to faith, as seen throughout the Scriptures, for example in 1Sam 12:7, 1Pet 3:15, Matt 7:9, 10, 16, 21:42, Rom 6:1, 1Cor 11:4, 15:35-36, Jam 3:8-12, 1Jn 4:20, etc. However, at the shoreline where reason can go no more, they bid their fond farewells, whereupon faith departs on alone, upon the waters, into the far horizon, as beholding Him who is invisible!

2. The context of Isa 42:8 "I am the LORD: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images" is Isa 42:6-7, "I the LORD have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; To open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house."

May the Lord deliver all from the dark prison house and the blind eyes of Perfect KJV-VPPism!

3. When Dean Burgon penned these words, he referred to the Divine Autographs and not to the KJV nor to the TR, which Burgon did not regard as perfect. (See p13 of "An Evidential Review" or just see JK's own notes below on Matt 10:8!)
- 

The perfect Bible is not only for me, but for every one who bears the name of Christ. The truth that Christians today possess an infallible and inerrant Scripture based on the Biblical doctrines of the Verbal Plenary Inspiration (VPI) and Verbal Plenary Preservation (VPP) of Scripture is clearly taught and explained in the following books and papers written by the FEBC faculty:

(1) Timothy Tow and Jeffrey Khoo, *A Theology for Every Christian: Knowing God and His Word* (Singapore: FEBC Press, 1998).

(2) Timothy Tow, "Holy Hatred," *The Burning Bush* 4 (1998): 106-113.

- (3) Jeffrey Khoo, *Kept Pure in All Ages: Recapturing the Authorised Version and the Doctrine of Providential Preservation* (Singapore: FEBC Press, 2001).
- (4) Jeffrey Khoo, "Bob Jones University and the KJV: A Critique of *From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man*," *The Burning Bush* 7 (2001): 1-24. Republished together with another review by Thomas Strouse, in "Reviews of the Book *From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man*" by Pensacola Theological Seminary for distribution in USA.
- (5) Timothy Tow, "Death in the Pot!," *The Burning Bush* 7 (2001): 35-37.
- (6) Prabhudas Koshy, "Why We Should Regard the Bible as Authoritative," *Bible Witness*, July-September 2001, 8-10.
- (7) Timothy Tow, "God's Special Providential Care of the Text of Scripture," *Bible Witness*, October-December 2002, 3-4.
- (8) Jeffrey Khoo, "A Perfect Bible Today!," *Bible Witness*, October-December 2002, 5-6.
- (9) Prabhudas Koshy, "Jesus' View of the Holy Scripture: An Exposition of Matthew 5:17-19," *Bible Witness*, October-December 2002, 12-15.
- (10) Prabhudas Koshy, "If We Reject the Doctrine of the Perfect Preservation of the Bible," *Bible Witness*, October-December 2002, 16-17.
- (11) Prabhudas Koshy, "Faith Guides, Intellectualism Beguiles," *Bible Witness*, October-December 2002, 18-20.
- (12) Jeffrey Khoo, "A Plea for a Perfect Bible," *The Burning Bush* 9 (2003): 1-15.
- (13) Jeffrey Khoo, *KJV Questions and Answers* (Singapore: Bible Witness Literature Ministry, 2003).
- (14) Jeffrey Khoo, "The Emergence of Neo-Fundamentalism: *One Bible Only?* or "Yea Hath God Said?," *The Burning Bush* 10 (2004): 2-47.
- (15) Quek Suan Yew, "Judges 18:30: Moses or Manasseh?," *The Burning Bush* 10 (2004): 48-53.
- (16) Jeffrey Khoo, "John Owen on the Perfect Bible," *The Burning Bush* 10 (2004): 74-85.
- (17) Prabhudas Koshy, "Did Jesus and the Apostles Rely on the Corrupt Septuagint," *The Burning Bush* 10 (2004): 93-95.
- (18) Quek Suan Yew, "Did God Promise to Preserve His Words?: Interpreting Psalm 12:6-7," *The Burning Bush* 10 (2004): 96-98.
- (19) Jeffrey Khoo, "*Sola Autographa* or *Sola Apographa*?: A Case for the Present Perfection and Authority of the Holy Scriptures," *The Burning Bush* 11 (2005): 3-19.
- (20) Quek Suan Yew, "Jesus on Perfect Preservation of the Bible," *Bible Witness*, March-April 2005, 3-6.
- (21) Jeffrey Khoo, "The Canonisation and Preservation of Scripture," *Bible Witness*, March-April 2005, 7-8.
- (22) Timothy Tow, "'My Glory Will I Not Give to Another' (Isaiah 42:8)," *The Burning Bush* 11 (2005): 67-68.
- (23) Carol Lee, "A Child of God Looks at the Doctrine of Verbal Plenary Preservation," *The Burning Bush* 11 (2005): 69-81.
- (24) Jeffrey Khoo, "Bob Jones University, Neo-Fundamentalism, and Biblical Preservation," *The Burning Bush* 11 (2005): 82-97.

Lim Seng Hoo's response:

4. Here is powerful illustration of the basic VPP flaw - all 24 articles cited are from FEBC only! And none dated before 1998! If I were to cite 24 articles to support my side, I would name at least a dozen reputable seminary sources that hold not to VPP; indeed have not even heard of "VPP", which is also thus clearly a "**new doctrine**"! I am sad for FEBC getting into this far extreme and untenable position.
- 

Despite my efforts to uphold the reliability of the KJV and the infallibility and inerrancy of its underlying Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, Mr Lim appears to do whatever is in his power to oppose and criticise my defence of the KJV and the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures on which it is based. Many who are knowledgeable of the VPP of Scripture and what it truly means are not troubled by Mr Lim's paper, but there are some who are disturbed and confused, and are asking the question: "Mr Lim uses the KJV, and so do you, so why is he then so dead against your defence of the KJV? What is the difference between Mr Lim's position and yours?" It is a good question which must be answered.

Lim Seng Hoo's response:

5. The crux of our difference: JK says a singular set of Hebrew and Greek texts **underlying the KJV** was perfectly restored jot and tittle in 1611, so as to be infallible, inerrant and exactly identical to the Divine Autographs. He did not and still cannot prove this and he is not even perfectly sure which these specific Hebrew and Greek texts are! He says that since the Autographs are no longer with us, (he thinks) he cannot be disproved. He calls his weak KJV-VPP hypothesis "doctrine" and feels justified in indiscriminately labelling all who do not share this view as neo-fundamentalists, liberals or without faith. I am obliged to simply call this heresy!
- 

I think it will clarify if I (1) list the differences between Mr Lim's position and my position on the preservation of Scriptures; (2) respond to Mr Lim's allegations made against the doctrine of the VPP of Scripture, and (3) rebut, point-by-point, his arguments against the present perfection of Scripture.

The following letters from Mr Lim and other documents that I have (and will be prepared to release if required or necessary) have been used to collate or summarise Mr Lim's non-VPP position:

- (1) Letter dated January 2, 2003 to Rev Dr Timothy Tow (copied to Dr SH Tow and to me).
- (2) Letter dated February 12, 2003 to me (copied to Rev Dr Timothy Tow, and Dr SH Tow).
- (3) Letter dated March 14, 2003 to me.
- (4) Letter dated March 27, 2003 to me (copied to Rev Dr Timothy Tow, and Dr SH Tow).
- (5) Letter dated September 24, 2003 to me with his paper, "An Evidential Review of the VPP Theory."
- (6) Open Letter dated July 13, 2005 to me, "10 Jul 05 Morning Sermon at Calvary Pandan: Jn 7:24 'Judge Righteous Judgement'—No Basis for Perfect KJB."

Lim Seng Hoo's response:

6. I also have JK's letters besides his publications. In them, he changed his mind about the VPP Greek text several times. First it was Beza 1598. When surprised to learn that this differed from Scrivener 1881/84 in over 190 places, he said it was Scrivener (a post-engineered text). When I pointed out that **Scrivener** served on the **Revised Version Committee** with **Westcott and Hort**, JK wrote that "Scrivener's TR is only extremely close to the VPP text, which is none other than E F Hill's "The Reformation Text"!"

I then wrote back that “if such a text as Hill’s “The Reformation Text” existed, there would have been many copies already published – it would have been the talk of the Millennium and all Bible scholars would know it, use it, scrutinize it and study it, resulting in its infallibility being clearly known and proven, or otherwise! But Burgon, living two centuries after the KJV translation did not know of such a text! Moreover both he and Dr Hills would have argued that God would not allow such a text to be hidden in some monastery or in a bottle, but would ensure its wide accessible public use in the churches! Poor Scrivener also who spend great efforts and years reconstructing the Greek TR underlying the KJV from Beza, Stephens and other sources!”

And missionaries like Hudson Taylor and William Chalmers Burns did not know of this “well-known perfect” text so that the Chinese Bible (CUV) was not translated out of it!?

When the above were pointed out, Dr Khoo admitted and conceded that there is “**no single purified text**” but indefatigably still insisted on VPP. But plainly and crucially, this is a concession completely fatal to the entire VPP postulate! “No single purified text” equals “No VPP” text – the two terms are by definition synonymous! Without a single purified text that is perfect and pure, jot and tittle exact to the Autographs, you have no VPP text.

My ending thoughts: “Would not this make the “VPP text”, less existent and/or “more intangible” than the Autographs! Without a single purified text, would not the KJV translators have to be inspired in their textual criticism, in order to have arrived at the perfect underlying text?”

Below is the table showing Mr Lim's position and the 20 points of differences between Mr Lim’s position and mine:

Lim Seng Hoo’s response:

7. I sent JK the very first copy of “An Evidential Review” on 24 Sep 03, with the sincere, but now seemingly fruitless, hope that it would help him correct his position. Now after 22 months, he finally crafts this, his main reply, in a table form. He should know that it is not dignified and scholarly to use such tables where statements can be misrepresented as well as easily taken out of context. Singapore Advertising rules, even, ban such specific tabular comparisons in sales adverts! This is one of JK’s weaknesses. I give my response underneath his points.

### A Summary and Comparison of the Two Positions on the Preservation of Scripture

	Non-VPP: Imperfect Preservation of Holy Scriptures	VPP: Perfect Preservation of Holy Scriptures
<u>LSH</u>	This header from the outset misleads. It should be <b>Providential preservation in the extant manuscripts, <u>Versus</u> VPP: Perfect Preservation only in the KJV Hebrew-Greek texts.</b>	
1.	VPP of Scripture is “ <i>theory</i> .”	VPP of Scripture is <i>doctrine</i> (Ps 12:6-7, Matt 5:18).
<u>LSH</u>	By VPP, JK means VPP of the KJV underlying text, so it would be more accurate to term this KJV-VPP. The term Verbal Plenary Preservation is unheard of in most conservative theological literature. It is less than “theory” and even as “hypothesis” is extremely weak. The KJV Translators themselves, as well as the Westminster Divines in their annotation of the Bible, 1645, held that Ps12:6-7 referred to the saints. Thus this verse is omitted in Ch I, Sect VIII of the Westminster Confession of Faith, which states that “God’s Word, being immediately inspired” “is <b>kept pure in all ages</b> ”. If so, it is not purified only in 1611 onwards!	
2.	Only VPI autographs are infallible and inerrant. <i>Bible perfect only in the past</i> . Dean Burgon Oath refers not at all to the apographs, but <i>only autographs</i> .	Both VPI autographs and VPP apographs are infallible and inerrant. <i>Bible perfect in the past as well as in the present</i> . Autographs are fully/entirely preserved in the faithful and infallible apographs. The infallibility of the apographs is a reformed

		doctrine.
<u>LSH</u>	<p>Dean Burgon certainly refers only to the Autographs. (See Part IV of “An Evidential Review”.)</p> <p>Preservation is not in any one particular copy such as the post-engineered Scrivener or other text, but is in reality dispersed throughout all the extant manuscripts, as Burgon wrote, “But I would especially remind my readers of Bentley’s golden precept, that ‘The real text of the sacred writers does not now, since the originals have been so long lost, lie in any MS, or edition, but is dispersed in them all.’ This truth, which was evident to the powerful intellect of that great scholar, lies at the root of all sound Textual Criticism.”<sup>1</sup></p>	
3.	Based on logic of <i>facts per se</i> . No support from Bible whatsoever. “Without doubt, Almighty God could easily have given us a VPP apographs [sic] as well as made the autographs indestructible, but <i>the evidence is that He did not!</i> ”	Based on logic of <i>faith</i> that rests on the Bible itself (Heb 11:6). This leads to the <i>correct interpretation of facts or evidences</i> . The Holy Scriptures (autographs and apographs) by God’s divine inspiration and special preservation are incorruptible and indestructible.
<u>LSH</u>	<p>The term “stern logic of <i>facts</i>” is Burgon’s.<sup>2</sup> Obviously, as already pointed out in Note 1 above, faith and facts are not contradictory but must go hand in hand (see again Jn 20:8).</p> <p>Heb 11:8 reads, “By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went.” Abraham responded to God’s revelatory call. True Biblical faith is always based on God’s revelation. KJV-VPP is based on man’s presuppositions where God had not spoken. These grievously mistaken men, such as JK, think that 1611 is a magical year and the KJV is specially based on a magical underlying text that alone is infallible and inerrant. All other Bibles throughout history are based on erroneous and corrupt texts.</p> <p>With respect to support from the Bible, students of the Bible, including the KJV Translators, well know that the apostles used variegated textual sources in their quotations of the OT. Some examples where they quoted the LXX rather than the Masoretic, and this can be proven, includes Heb 1:6 (Deut 32:43), Heb 10:37-38 (Hab 2:3-4) and 1 Cor 15:55 (Hos 13:14).</p>	
4.	Facts say that Bible contains <i>actual</i> discrepancies. Discrepancies are found in 2 Kings 8:26 / 2 Chron 22:2, and 2 Sam 8:4 / 1 Chron 18:4. These are <i>scribal errors</i> .	Faith that is based <i>on the Bible alone</i> ( <i>Sola Scriptura</i> ) says that the Bible is “perfect” and “very pure” (Pss 19:7, 119:40). Discrepancies are only <i>apparent</i> . There are <i>no errors at all</i> in 2 Kings 8:26 / 2 Chron 22:2, and 2 Sam 8:4 / 1 Chron 18:4 <i>scribal or otherwise</i> . “Let God be true, but every man a liar” (Rom 3:4).
5.	God’s Word has “built-in redundancy.”	The Bible has no redundant words at all. Every word in the Bible is important (Matt 4:4).
6.	God’s Word has “built-in checks” (citing out of context, 2 Cor 13:1, Matt 18:16, Deut 29:15), ie, Scripture <i>corrects</i> Scripture; <i>rejects harmonisation</i> of Scripture.	Scripture does not correct itself by virtue of its inerrancy and infallibility. Scripture <i>interprets</i> Scripture, and <i>harmonises with</i> Scripture (1 Cor 2:13).
<u>LSH</u>	There is only one Bible essentially, which is the Divine Autographs, which alone is perfect and	

**These footnotes as referenced are JK’s (black) and LSH’s (red)**

1 The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels, Volume I, 1896, by Dean John William Burgon, edited by Edward Miller, M.A posthumously after the Dean’s death. Re-published, Dean Burgon Society. Page 26.

2 The Revision Revised – A Refutation of Westcott and Hort’s False Greek Text and Theory, 1881, by Dean John William Burgon. Re-published by the Dean Burgon Society. Page 21.

4, 5 and 6	<p>pure. Every jot and tittle of it must be scrupulously observed and obeyed. All the other versions are copies or translations, of which no two are alike in their current language or underlying Hebrew and Greek text, and no single one is thus perfect, infallible and inerrant!</p> <p>Almighty God in His Providence preserved for us many copies of manuscripts, codices and uncials, and in His Wisdom gave us this law, “In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established.” (2Cor 13:1, Matt 18:16 Deut 19:15). From this, it could be ensured that judgement in any trial may be true and just. The same law also helps establish if a difficult verse in any Bible version is a scribal error or not!</p> <p>Let me illustrate this working: In Gal 3:16, Paul carefully distinguished “seed” from “seeds”, minutiae of utmost importance! We know safely that there is no chance of scribal error here because the Scriptures repeat this several times in Rom 4:16&amp;18, 9:8, Gen 13:15, 17:8!</p> <p>For 2Sam 8:4 Vs 1Chr 18:4 however, there is a conflict with no witness to establish the true reading. The KJV translators recognised this and favoured the reading of 1Chr 18:4 (as corroborated in the LXX 2Sam 8:4, which they had). Having to exercise their judgment based on the available Hebrew texts (their mandate was to translate from the Hebrew and not from the LXX), they deviated from the Masoretic 2Sam 8:4, “one thousand seven hundred horsemen” (as given in the CUV). Note the italicized “<i>chariots</i>” indicates a word not in the original (Masoretic). The KJV translators broke up the one thousand seven hundred into one thousand, to which they added the word “<i>chariots</i>” and left the balance seven hundred as horsemen, to reduce the discrepancy and render a more accurate reading for the public. In doing so, they recognised and acknowledged the Masoretic scribal error! Today, in accordance with Dan 12:4, “knowledge has increased.” If the KJV translators were to do their work today, they would have the Hebrew warrant of the Dead Sea Scrolls to make the correct rendition of 2 Sam 8:4, as well as other now resolved scribal errors.</p>	
7.	<p>“No single purified text.” Therefore <i>no perfect Bible today.</i></p>	<p><i>Every God-breathed Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek word is preserved to the jot and tittle</i> (Matt 5:18, 24:35). Therefore <i>perfect Bible exists today</i> in all the inspired Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek <u>words</u> (not text <i>per se</i>) underlying the Reformation Bibles best represented by the KJV, not the modern Bible versions which are based on the corrupt and critical <u>texts</u> of Westcott-Hort.</p>
<u>LSH</u>	<p>JK confuses and is confused. Sometimes he says text, at other times, words. This is typical twist and turn. When he could not identify the <u>perfect text</u> underlying the KJV, he changed to <u>words</u>. Does he now agree with Bentley’s golden rule that preservation is in all the extant manuscripts and not in any single text? But when he talks about W&amp;H, he calls it texts.</p>	
8.	<p>“Of the thousands of extant apographa both OT and NT, no two are alike, which would mean ... not even a single one is jot and tittle perfect.”</p>	<p>Jesus in AD 27 held the OT apograph in His hands, and declared that it is jot and tittle perfect (Matt 5:18). Jesus Christ is true, not any “textual critic.”</p>
<u>LSH</u>	<p>When our Lord preached on the mount, was He holding any OT apograph in His hands?</p> <p>Matt 5:1-2 records, “And seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain: and when he was set, his disciples came unto him: And he opened his mouth, and taught them.”</p>	
9.	<p>Cites for authority, many human authors and commentaries.</p>	<p>Cites for authority the 100% perfect Word of God—our only supreme and final rule of faith and life.</p>
<u>LSH</u>	<p><b>JK is the one that cited</b> many human authorities such as G I Williamson, Theodore Letis, E F Hills, Dean Burgon, Scrivener and Dr O T Spence. <b>I merely audited to check</b> if these authorities actually supported KJV-VPPism <b>and found none of them did: -</b></p>	



	<p><u>Williamson</u>: "I find the NKJV to be my version of choice for use in the pulpit and in teaching."<sup>3</sup> "And so, while the true (or perfect) original text would not be entirely reproduced in any single copy, yet it would not be lost or inaccessible because by the majority testimony of the several copies, error would always be witnessed against. The true text would be perfectly preserved within the body of witnesses."<sup>4</sup></p> <p><u>Letis</u>: in a scorching review of the Dean Burgon Society, wrote, "the irony is a profound one" that "not only could Dean Burgon not be a committee member, he could not even be a member in any way of this society that, nevertheless uses his name!"<sup>5</sup></p> <p><u>Hills</u>: "God's preservation of the New Testament Text was not miraculous but providential. On the KJV, "Admittedly this venerable version is not absolutely perfect, but it is trustworthy. No Bible-believing Christian who relies upon it will ever be led astray."<sup>6</sup></p> <p><u>Scrivener</u> sat on the Revision Committee, commissioned to revise the AV via "the removal of 'PLAIN AND CLEAR ERRORS' whether in the Greek Text originally adopted by the Translators, or in the Translation made from the same"<sup>7</sup>.</p> <p><u>Dr H T Spence</u>, son of the late Dr O T Spence, "As to the multi-English Bible versions debate (there are now well over 500 English versions of the Bible), I do not know about the debate over in Singapore; I do not know about the "Verbal Plenary Preservation" theory and what it declares."<sup>8</sup></p>		
10.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="276 846 842 1137"> <p>Contentends for the "inerrancy of the <i>meaning</i>." "Whether we have all the original jots and tittles or not, every key meanings [sic] and salvation doctrines [sic] are [sic] entirely preserved!"</p> </td><td data-bbox="850 846 1404 1137"> <p>Contentends for the inerrancy of the <i>words</i>. Meaning comes from words (how can there be meaning without words?). Every word to the jot and tittle is therefore preserved (Matt 5:18), not just "salvation doctrines." Every spiritual, historical, geographical, and scientific word is preserved.</p> </td></tr> </table>	<p>Contentends for the "inerrancy of the <i>meaning</i>." "Whether we have all the original jots and tittles or not, every key meanings [sic] and salvation doctrines [sic] are [sic] entirely preserved!"</p>	<p>Contentends for the inerrancy of the <i>words</i>. Meaning comes from words (how can there be meaning without words?). Every word to the jot and tittle is therefore preserved (Matt 5:18), not just "salvation doctrines." Every spiritual, historical, geographical, and scientific word is preserved.</p>
<p>Contentends for the "inerrancy of the <i>meaning</i>." "Whether we have all the original jots and tittles or not, every key meanings [sic] and salvation doctrines [sic] are [sic] entirely preserved!"</p>	<p>Contentends for the inerrancy of the <i>words</i>. Meaning comes from words (how can there be meaning without words?). Every word to the jot and tittle is therefore preserved (Matt 5:18), not just "salvation doctrines." Every spiritual, historical, geographical, and scientific word is preserved.</p>		
<u>LSH</u>	<p>The KJV Translators' Preface to the Reader, "It hath pleased God in his Divine Providence here and there to scatter words and sentences of that difficulty and doubtfulness, not in doctrinal points that concern salvation, (for in such it hath been vouched that the Scriptures are plain) but in matters of less moment, that fearfulness would better beseech us than confidence, and if we will resolve, to resolve upon modesty with S. Augustine: <i>It is better to make doubt of those things which are secret, than to strive about those things that are uncertain.</i>"</p>		
11.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="276 1357 842 1682"> <p>Misrepresents by stating that "VPPism requires an inspired KJV textual criticism;" "VPPism requires ... English as the singly blessed language of the Gospel;" the KJV is "absolutely perfect;" "it is KJV fundamentalism gone extreme." Creates a false dichotomy, "May we be Christians first, theologians second."</p> </td><td data-bbox="850 1357 1404 1682"> <p><i>Absolute perfection lies only in the Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek Scriptures on which the KJV is based</i> (2 Tim 3:16). The KJV is the best, most faithful, most accurate, most trustworthy, most beautiful Bible in the English language. Its "perfection," "infallibility," or "inerrancy" is only in the <i>derived</i> sense (as far as it accurately and faithfully</p> </td></tr> </table>	<p>Misrepresents by stating that "VPPism requires an inspired KJV textual criticism;" "VPPism requires ... English as the singly blessed language of the Gospel;" the KJV is "absolutely perfect;" "it is KJV fundamentalism gone extreme." Creates a false dichotomy, "May we be Christians first, theologians second."</p>	<p><i>Absolute perfection lies only in the Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek Scriptures on which the KJV is based</i> (2 Tim 3:16). The KJV is the best, most faithful, most accurate, most trustworthy, most beautiful Bible in the English language. Its "perfection," "infallibility," or "inerrancy" is only in the <i>derived</i> sense (as far as it accurately and faithfully</p>
<p>Misrepresents by stating that "VPPism requires an inspired KJV textual criticism;" "VPPism requires ... English as the singly blessed language of the Gospel;" the KJV is "absolutely perfect;" "it is KJV fundamentalism gone extreme." Creates a false dichotomy, "May we be Christians first, theologians second."</p>	<p><i>Absolute perfection lies only in the Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek Scriptures on which the KJV is based</i> (2 Tim 3:16). The KJV is the best, most faithful, most accurate, most trustworthy, most beautiful Bible in the English language. Its "perfection," "infallibility," or "inerrancy" is only in the <i>derived</i> sense (as far as it accurately and faithfully</p>		

3 Should We Still Use the KJV Today? A review article by G. I. Williamson, extracted from Ordained Servant vol. 6, no. 4 (October 1997).

<sup>4</sup> The Westminster Confession of Faith for study classes, 1964, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co. Page 16.

5 The Revival of the Ecclesiastical Text and the Claims of the Anabaptists, by Theodore Letis, published by the Institute for Reformation Biblical Studies, 1992. Page 41 – 50.

6 The King James Version Defended by Dr Edward F. Hill's, Fourth Edition 1984, reprinted 1996, The Christian Research Press, Page 224 and 230.

7 The Revision Revised, Pages 37, 231 and 502, and Page 3.

8 Email to Rev Dr Peter Ng, Pastor of Jesus Saves Missions on 20 Jul 05.



		reflects the original). The KJV is <i>not directly, doubly or separately inspired</i> (rejects Ruckmanism which is “KJV fundamentalism gone extreme”).
<u>LSH</u>	<p>My representations are factual. JK has a mastery of “twist and turn” / “bait and switch” tactics.</p> <p>Here for example, he starts with the words, “Absolute perfection”, and then switches to the beauty of the KJV English. Finally, he admits (as all the facts would anyhow show) that “the Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek Scriptures on which the KJV is based” is not actually perfect, infallible and inerrant, except <b>only in the “derived” sense!</b> (But by now such an admission would usually be lost to the reader!) Allow me then to make clear: if it is “derived”, it simply means not direct; not actual; not jot and tittle exact! And the words “as far as it accurately and faithfully reflects the original” can only mean there are places where it does not faithfully do so!</p>	
12.	Understands providential preservation in terms of <i>general</i> providence—non-miraculous.	Understands providential preservation in terms of <i>special</i> providence—supernatural and miraculous (involving God’s personal supervision and direct intervention). “By His <i>singular</i> care and providence, kept pure in all ages” (WCF, I:8). Biblical preservation is God’s work, not man’s.
<u>LSH</u>	<p>Ch 1 Sect VIII of the WCF: “The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old) and the New Testament in Greek (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations) being immediately inspired by God, and by His singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentical; so as in all controversies of religion the Church is finally to appeal to them.”</p> <p>Although Hills coined the term, “<i>special</i> providence”, with respect to events in 1611, he could offer no scriptural basis for this. In any case, Hills conceded that preservation of God’s Word was providential rather than miraculous. The WCF affirms that God used the vernacular of people, and preservation is by His providence, i.e. providential and not miraculous.</p> <p>After criticizing Peter Ruckman for upholding a miraculous translation, JK now himself says that the specific KJV underlying Hebrew and Greek text is miraculously preserved!</p>	
13.	Perfect preservation is a “new doctrine.”	Perfect preservation is as old as the Bible (Ps 12:6-7). “It stands perfectly written” (Greek perfect tense of <i>gegraptai</i> ).
14.	Psalm 12:6-7 means preservation of the <i>people</i> of God, not the words of God.	Psalm 12:6-7 means preservation of the <i>words</i> of God according to Hebrew grammar and exegesis (GKC, 440).
<u>LSH</u> 13 & 14	Please refer to my Note 1, or for more, to “An Evidential Review” Appendix B (An answer to: “Did God Promise to Preserve His Words?: Interpreting Psalm 12:6-7” by Rev Quek Suan Yew, The Burning Bush, July 2004). Clearly, Ps 12:6-7 refers to the preservation of the godly.	
15.	Falsely accuses VPP holders of saying, “the Bible was not kept pure in all ages, but only restored pure from 1611 onwards.”	“The purity of God’s words has been <i>faithfully maintained</i> in the Traditional/Byzantine/ Majority/Received Text, and <i>fully represented</i> in the Textus Receptus that underlies the KJV.”
<u>LSH</u>	<p>The term “Textus Receptus” was really only first used in 1633 by the Elzivers, some 22 years after the 1611 KJV was published.</p> <p>It should be noted that Tyndale and Luther, translated the NT from Erasmus 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, which was not identical with the text used for the KJV.</p>	
16.	The perfect Bible is found only in heaven, kept in the Ark of His testament (Rev	The perfect Bible is not only found in heaven <i>but also on earth</i> (Ps 119:89, Matt

	11:19), not on earth!	4:4). “Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven” (Matt 6:10).
17.	The words of God will <i>not</i> be forever preserved. God’s words <i>will pass away</i> when the earth passes away.	God’s words are permanently, perpetually and perfectly preserved, and will never pass away. God will keep and fulfil every jot and tittle of His words both in heaven and on earth (Matt 5:18), and His words shall never pass away (Matt 24:35), “forever settled,” (Ps 119:89), and “endureth for ever” (1 Pet 1:25).
<u>LSH</u> 16 & 17.	<p>Thanks for the verse JK! Ps 119:89 “For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven.” (JK, did you add to Holy Scripture the words, “but also on earth”?)</p> <p>16 is another sad distortion by JK! Rather, I affirmed with the WCF that God’s Word is “kept pure in all ages” and with Burgon on Bentley’s golden precept. Complete preservation thus is in all the extant manuscripts, including those underlying the KJV. A good critical apparatus offers an easy-to-use broad overview of what’s in these extant manuscripts. For this, we have to thank the pioneering textual scholars like Burgon, Scrivener and others.</p> <p>On 17, it is manifest that when this earth passes away, all material apographs therein shall also pass away. In heaven, God’s Word shall be inscribed in our hearts! Do angels carry copies of Bibles? One thing for sure, there will be no versions debate in heaven!</p>	
18.	Accuses VPP proponents of teaching an “insidious heresy.”	Believing that God’s inspired Canon and words are 100% preserved in the original language Scriptures, the Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek words underlying the KJV is <i>not heresy</i> , but the truth (cf 2 Cor 13:8).
<u>LSH</u>	<p>2 Cor 13:8 states, “For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth.” If only JK would submit to the power of truth as seen in the clear evidential facts. We have already seen the ruinous divisive effects when KJV-VPP was introduced in FEBC, Life BPC and other churches.</p> <p>KJV-VPPism originated with Benjamin G. Wilkinson, (1872 – 1968), Dean of Theology at the <b>Seventh Day Adventist</b> Washington Missionary College, today known as Columbia Union College, 7600 Flower Avenue, Tomoka Park, MD 20912. The SDA is a cult that holds to limited Verbal Inspiration. Their defence of the KJV is due to their fears that clearer translations would make their practice of Gentile Saturday worship (Act 13:42) and soul sleep (Heb 9:27) indefensible. Otis Fuller, founder of the Dean Burgon Society, relied extensively on Wilkinson’s works, but concealed his identity, describing him as “all but unknown in the world of scholarship”, and “taught for many years in a small and obscure Eastern college.”<sup>9</sup></p> <p>Wilkinson’s books, as well as the books of Mrs Gail A Riplinger, an avid KJV-Ruckmanist, are sold on a DBS website “The Bible for Today.” What does this say of their biblical separation?</p> <p>Dr Thomas Strouse, a leading KJV-VPP proponent, in his “Biblical Defense for the Verbal, Plenary Preservation of God’s Word” wrote: “<i>My Sheep Hear My Voice</i>”. Christ not only teaches that He will preserve the words of the Father, but also that believers will hear His voice (Jn. 10:26). Where is the voice of the Lord Jesus Christ? HIS VOICE IS HIS WORDS. The Lord has given believers the means by which to verify the “received words.” Believers, indwelt with the Holy Spirit, “hear” and know which words are Christ’s “received words.” Furthermore, according to Jn 10:5, believers “know not the voice of strangers.” Consequently, believers not only recognize a “received text,” but believers also reject the voice of strangers (“rejected text”). This is why Christians have maintained that the <i>textus receptus</i> is <i>the voice of the Lord</i> and that the variants in the modern versions are <i>the voice of strangers</i>.</p>	

9 The Unlearned Men: The True Genealogy and Genesis of King-James-Version-Onlyism plus The Great Which Bible? Fraud. Both by Doug Kutilek.

	<p>The above would mean that our Chinese brethren follow the voice of strangers and are lost. It is disquieting that Dr Strouse's works are oft quoted and published in "The Burning Bush".</p> <p>Vine's Expository Dictionary: Hairesis (αἵρεσις), "denotes (a) a choosing, choice; then, that which is chosen, and hence, an opinion, especially a self-willed opinion, which is substituted for submission to the power of truth, and leads to division and the formation of sects, Gal 5:20 ("parties"); such erroneous opinions are frequently the outcome of personal preference or the prospect of advantage; see 2 Pet 2:1, where "destructive" (R.V.) signifies <u>leading to ruin</u>."</p>	
19.	It is godly and scholarly to believe that the Bible is no longer perfect today. VPP defenders are divisive and unscholarly men.	It glorifies God and edifies the saints to believe that the Bible today is totally infallible and inerrant, pure and perfect in every way (Isa 42:8). Believes in Biblical <i>separation</i> from unbelief and compromise.
20.	Unable to say, "I have a 100% perfect Bible today."	Can confidently say, "I have a 100% perfect Bible today that is absolutely infallible and inerrant."
<u>LSH</u> 19 & 20	<p>Another sad twist and turn. Can one glorify God by telling lies? If we would stand for the truth, let the Holy Spirit convict us on this: - the <i>ends</i> never justify the <i>means</i>, but are oft of the same feather. If we stand truthfully for the Truth, the Lord Himself shall stand with us! If we have to use untruthful means, we can already be sure that our ends are untrue.</p> <p>As clearly stated already, I uphold the Verbal Plenary Inspiration and thus the perfection of the Autographs and its consequent witness in all the extant manuscripts that God has preserved for us to this day, some surviving 2,000 years.</p> <p>JK contends not for the Perfect Bible but extravagantly for a 100% Perfect KJB in its specific underlying Hebrew and Greek texts, despite his being hard-pressed to clearly identify these!</p>	

I am not alone in defending the VPP of Scripture. Hear from no less a stalwart of the fundamentalist faith than the Rev Dr Ian Paisley who, in his book *My Plea for the Old Sword (KJV)*, wrote:

*Divine Revelation plus Divine Inspiration plus Divine Preservation equals the Divine Bible. These all, without exception, cover the whole field of every Word of God. There is no such thing as verbal Revelation without verbal Inspiration and there is no such thing as verbal Inspiration without **verbal Preservation**. In all cases it is **not partial but plenary i.e. full, complete, perfect**. ...*

*The Divine Revelation, put into writing the verbally Infallible Scriptures through Divine Inspiration, must have Divine Preservation in order to be available to all generations. The verbal Inspiration of the Scriptures demands the verbal Preservation of the Scriptures. Those who would deny the need for verbal Preservation cannot be accepted as being really committed to verbal Inspiration. If there is no preserved Word of God today then the work of Divine Revelation and Divine Inspiration has perished.*

*In such a case any Bible is as good as any other. Hence the multiplication and continuing changes of perverted English versions of the Bible on the market today.*

*Those who believe in a partial preservation are not much better. To say that God has preserved most of the Original Scriptures but not them all, robs us of every Word of God. Therefore we cannot live [by His every word, Matt 4:4]. This is but another way to pen-knife God's every Word.*

*Those who do not believe that God preserved His Word are really going down the path of final rejection of that Book of which the Lord Jesus Christ said, 'The Word of God cannot be broken.' Thank God, no potency can disintegrate this Rock.<sup>10</sup>*

Dr Paisley went on to defend the VPP of Scripture and the KJV from Psalm 12:6-7:

*Surely here we have the Doctrine of Divine Preservation divinely revealed. The preserved Scriptures cannot be lost or caused in any way to perish. As of the God who uttered them, so we can say, 'Thou remainest!'*

*It is interesting to note that the new Bibles vary the words of Psalm 12:6-7 and so eliminate the testimony of that verse to the Divine Preservation of the Scriptures. They insist that the 'them' of verse seven is not a reference to God's words but to God's people ...and destroy the text's testimony to the Preservation of God's Word.*

*God's providential preservation of His own Word ensured that the true Scriptures were not hidden away in the library of the Antichrist nor in a monastery of 'Greek Catholic' idolatry at the time when Tyndale prepared his Bible. Faithful and true copies of the originals were at hand for the Divine Bombshell (Tyndale's translation of God's Holy Word into English) which would smash the Roman Antichrist. He translated into English the Preserved Word of God, not the Perverted Word of God.*

*A return to the Apostolic Gospel comes as a result of Tyndale's work. A return to the Apostate Gospel comes as a result of the translation of Rome's long hidden, perverted text and other such perverted texts in the Modern Perversions of the Scriptures.*

*The Authorised Version translated into English the Preserved Word of God and so preserved for the English speaking peoples of the World, the Word of the Living God, the only infallible Rule of Faith and Practice.<sup>11</sup>*

Can Mr Lim say Amen to Paisley?

#### Lim Seng Hoo's response:

8. Would Rev Paisley kindly confirm if he really believes that the Hebrew and Greek underlying the KJV are 100% perfectly preserved texts? If so, why refer to Tyndale, which is based on Erasmus 4<sup>th</sup> edition, a slightly different text than the KJV's?

---

Now, let me respond to Mr Lim's open letter of July 13, 2005 point-by-point.

#### **Mr Lim's Skewed Version of My Sermon**

Mr Lim started by presenting a skewed version of my sermon: "I refer [to] your sermon last Sunday morning, which was diverted to promote your pet but unfounded 'doctrine' of KJV Perfectionism in its underlying Hebrew and Greek apographs (copies). Your two points on the assigned Scripture text are that 1) 'judge not according to appearance' means not by dress, good looks, and a good singing voice, etc, and 2) 'but judge righteous judgement' means to hold to 'Verbal Plenary Preservation' (VPP) of the KJV underlying texts." He then went on to present his "true exegesis" of the text.

#### **My Refutation**

---

<sup>10</sup> Ian R K Paisley, *My Plea for the Old Sword: the English Authorised Version (KJV)*, (Belfast: Ambassador, 1997), 102-3, emphasis mine.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, 106.

First, let me say that the topic I preached on—"Judge Righteous Judgement" (John 7:14-24)—was not a topic I chose, but was one assigned to me. I indeed preached a two-point sermon based on the assigned theme, but Mr Lim's skewed phrasing and slanted summary of what I preached do not accurately reflect my position on the VPP of Scripture, nor the tenor of my sermon. My two points in answer to the question, "How may we judge righteous judgement?," were (1) Do not Judge According to Outward Appearance (John 7:24), but (2) Judge According to the Word of God (John 7:16-17). I did not spend every minute of my sermon talking about my "pet doctrine" as alleged. I applied my sermon to a variety of issues in life. I spoke against the Hollywood philosophy that a good-looking outward appearance is the secret to success and happiness in life. I warned of how we as Christians are also prone to form impressions just by looking at a person's external appearance, and thereby make wrong judgements. I cited Samuel as an example of one who made a mistake in looking for the "tall, dark and handsome" man among Jesse's children to be Israel's new king (1 Sam 16). I read to the congregation 1 Sam 16:7, "But the LORD said unto Samuel, Look not on his countenance, or on the height of his stature, because I have refused him: for the LORD seeth not as a man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the LORD looketh on the heart." I also cited 2 Cor 11:14-15 where Paul warned against Satan who presents himself handsome and charming, not ugly and terrifying, in his efforts to seduce and deceive the unwary and ignorant, "And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works." (I expect Satan and his minions to be very unhappy with my sermon; but believers? Surely not!)

Lim Seng Hoo's response:

9. I did not skew the facts of JK's sermon. As I had pointed out, the Jews sought to kill our Lord Jesus, not because of His physical looks that He did not look like Saul or some movie star but because they had judged Him superficially as having broken Moses law, by healing on the Sabbath and by saying that God was His Father (Jn 5:16, 18, 7:1, 19). He tells them (in the Greek present imperative), "Stop judging superficially", and His conjunctive (in the aorist imperative), "but judge righteous judgement", directs urgent attention to the specific example of His case. The Jews had evaluated superficially and unrighteously. None of them kept the law (Jn 7:19), whereas Christ did not break the law. Healing on the Sabbath is as legitimate as circumcision on the Sabbath (Jn 7:23), and Jesus is in truth the Son of God! They discarded Jesus as not being the Christ because He was from Galilee and not from Bethlehem (Jn 7:42) and carelessly concluded that He was thus worthy of death for blasphemy.

Since JK raised this, I have to also respond albeit sadly: Satan is always pleased with half-truths and lies, and more particularly when preached from conservative church pulpits.

---

In my second point, I pointed out that the only way believers can make righteous judgements today is by basing their judgements on the Word of God. I then went on to point out that if we are to make righteous/truthful judgements, we can only do so if we have a Perfect Standard, and this Perfect Standard cannot be man and his philosophy, but God and His Theology—His Word! I went on to ask the question: "Do we have a Perfect Written Standard in the Word of God today?" And the answer is an unequivocal "yes" based on God's unfailing promise of the infallible preservation of His words as taught in Ps 12:6-7, Matt 5:18, Matt 24:35, 1 Pet 1:24-25 and many other Scripture verses. The authority of the Scriptures is bound to its perfection, is it not? If the Scriptures that we have today are not totally infallible and inerrant, how then can the Scriptures be our only, final, and supreme rule of faith and practice?

Lim Seng Hoo's response:

10. This is already well covered in my response notes to JK's 20-point Table above.

---



In another letter to Dr SH Tow, Mr Lim's senior pastor, and the elders of Calvary Pandan BPC dated July 30, 2005, Mr Lim accused me of disturbing the peace of the Church, "As for disturbance of the peace, it was Dr Jeffrey Khoo's sermon on 10 Jul ... that really disturbed the peace and harmony of our Church. After the sermon, many were disgruntled and disturbed. I being just one of them." Is this true? Were "many" indeed "disgruntled and disturbed?" If so, precisely how many? What was the percentage of members who felt that my sermon was erroneous and unedifying?

There was in fact no confusion or chaos in Calvary Pandan BPC after my sermon. I have not received any protest from members of Calvary Pandan except for Mr Lim's open letter of unjust accusations against me which he personally distributed and mass emailed to his church members and others. This he did without the approval of his pastors or the Board of Elders. Was Mr Lim's conduct ethically acceptable given his membership vows?

Now, if the Holy Spirit convicts us of sin when the truth is preached, do we then conclude that it is disturbing the peace and harmony of the church? Must every believer "feel good" before a sermon can be considered "edifying?" The B-P Church has always preached the unpopular but Biblical doctrine of separation, has it not? If such an "unpleasant" sermon is preached, and some members of the church are "disgruntled and disturbed," should we then conclude that the preacher is divisive and unedifying? If we allow this, will we not create an ecumenical pulpit that will only seek to tickle the ears of the hearers? Is this not what Paul warned against in 2 Tim 4:2-3, "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth." May the Lord continue to preserve the faithful pulpit ministry of Calvary Pandan BPC and all Bible-believing and Bible-defending BPCs.

#### Lim Seng Hoo's response:

11. Did the Holy Spirit bear convicting testimony with JK's sermon? JK's Bible position therein is not the Bible position enshrined in the Calvary Pandan BPC's Constitution. This, together with my valid open letter to JK of 13 Jul 05 would be left to Calvary BPC's BOE to take up.

---

### **Mr Lim's Confusion over the VPP of Scripture in Relation to Translations**

Mr Lim wrote, "The same verses [i.e. Ps 12:6-7, Matt 5:18, 24:35, 1 Pet 1:24-25] that you cited are also found in all the other Bible versions such as the Chinese United Version (CUV), the Indonesian Akitab [sic], The [sic] Thai Bible, NASV, NIV, NKJV, etc. Anyone reading these in those versions, if interpreting as you do, would conclude that it is their version that is 'VPP,' rather than the KJV."

### **My Clarification**

Mr Lim claimed that he has read "carefully" all my papers on the VPP of Scripture, but I doubt that he has from what he has stated above. It must be underscored that VPP refers to God's *special* providential preservation of every jot and tittle of His God-breathed *Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words*, and *not the translated words* whether English, Chinese, Indonesian, or Thai. It is important to understand that the inspiration and preservation of Scriptures in light of Scripture itself (and accurately stated in the Westminster Confession) concerns the Scriptures in the "original languages" or the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament, *not any version or translation*, ancient or modern. Versions and translations can be improved on (eg, *The Defined King James Bible* published by Bible For Today is certainly an improvement on the 1611 and 1769 editions of the KJV), but not the original language Scriptures which God has promised to keep pure, perfect, infallible, inerrant, and authentic.



Do note that the NASV and NIV render Ps 12:6-7 quite differently from the KJV. They may have the same verses but they do not have the same words. Ps 12:6-7 in the KJV reads:

*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.*

But the NIV reads quite differently, especially verse 7:

*And the words of the LORD are flawless, like silver refined in a furnace of clay, purified seven times. O LORD, you will keep **us** safe and protect **us** from such people forever.*

The NASV also reads rather differently:

*The words of the LORD are pure words; As silver tried in a furnace on the earth, refined seven times. Thou, O LORD, will keep **them**; Thou wilt preserve **him** from this generation forever.*

Which of the above translated words accurately translate the verbally and plenarily preserved words of the Hebrew Scripture? I urge you to read Rev Dr Quek Suan Yew's article, "Did God Promise to Preserve His Words?: Interpreting Psalm 12:6-7" for insights and answers.<sup>12</sup>

#### Lim Seng Hoo's response:

12. JK again twists and turns to confuse. The truth is that all the various translations listed are based on different Hebrew and Greek texts, and yet these all contain most, if not all of JK's "proof verses". Thus if readers of those translations regard these verses in the same way as JK does, would they not conclude that is it their version that is VPP-based!

As for Ps 12:6-7, the KJV translators also held "them" to be the people, and in the margin states, "them from: Hebrew, him & c.: that is, every one of them & c. This is even clearer in the 1611 version than in the 1769 version on which our current KJV is based. Is it a wonder that the Westminster Divines also regarded "them" as referring to the saints?

---

If we do not have a perfect written standard in a verbally and plenarily preserved original language Scripture today, there will be no way to prove which translation or version is correct; as anything goes. The NIV or NASV could be just as good as, if not better than, the KJV. Who is to say that the good old KJV is reliable and the many new and modern versions unreliable? Your judgement would be as good as mine. Man becomes the final authority, not the Scriptures. Please realise that the doctrine of the VPP of Scripture is the solid bedrock for the defence of the KJV. The moment we throw out the VPP of Scripture, we surrender our only sure defence of the KJV against the modern versions or perversions of the Bible. The devil knows this, and it is no wonder he is doing all he can to tear this doctrine down!

#### Lim Seng Hoo's response:

13. JK's primary concern is the KJV, even to the extent of its glorification, rather than truth and the glory of God. What if the KJV is actually not perfect? Do we need to exaggerate in order to defend? The best KJV defence is credibility based on truthful facts.

---

### **Mr Lim's Misinterpretation of Matt 5:18 and Matt 24:35**

Mr Lim commented, "When the earth passes away, would not all that it contains including all material apographs also pass away? In these verses therefore, our Lord was not referring to

---

<sup>12</sup> Quek Suan Yew, "Did God Promise to Preserve His Words?: Interpreting Psalm 12:6-7," The Burning Bush (2004): 96-98.

apographs, but rather as the context clearly shows, to the absolute and inviolable claims of God and of the Son upon us, for Jesus spake ‘as one having authority, and not as the scribes.’ (Mt 7:28).”

### My Refutation

According to Mr Lim, Matt 5:18 means that all the words in the “material apographs” would pass away when the earth passes away. Mr Lim’s interpretation of Matt 5:18 contradicts Matt 24:35 which clearly says, “Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away” (Luke 21:33, Mark 13:31). Having created a contradiction in Scripture, he then attempted a “harmonisation” by spiritualising the term “words” in Matt 24:35 to mean the “claims” of God. I submit to you that the Scriptures must be understood literally, “words” mean precisely “words,” not just “claims” or “doctrines,” or “truths.” Now, I do not dispute that the claims of God are inviolable, but how can we have God’s claims without God’s words?

Mr Lim is wrong to dismiss the apographs of the Scriptures, denying their infallibility and inerrancy. Please know that the reformers never thought of the infallibility of the Scriptures in terms of the non-existent autographs but the present and extant apographs. Francis Turretin (1623-87)—pastor-theologian of the Church and Academy of Geneva—wrote:

By original texts, we do not mean the autographs written by the hand of Moses, of the prophets and of the apostles, which certainly do not now exist. *We mean their apographs* which are so called because they set forth to us the word of God in the *very words* of those who wrote under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

13

In the final analysis, whether the “material” apographs (or for that matter the “material” autographs which we no longer have) will pass away or not is immaterial and not the point. What we do know for sure in light of Jesus’ promise in Matt 5:18 and 24:35 is that every one of the inspired words of the Holy Scriptures in the autographs and the apographs will never pass away.

#### Lim Seng Hoo’s response:

14. In Matt 5:18-19, clearly our Lord is not teaching a 100% perfectly restored KJV underlying Hebrew and Greek texts, but warning against breaking the least of God’s commandments. “*For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.*”

In Matt 24:35 “Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away,” our Lord warns of the judgement that would come upon the world imminently and suddenly.

---

### Mr Lim’s Misinterpretation of Ps 119:140

Mr Lim questioned, “Was the psalmist’s love of God’s Word due to the purity of the apographs? And this Psalm, being written before the completion of Scripture canon, if VPP pureness (completeness, perfect to every jot and tittle) is meant, should have been the last book of the Bible. Is not the purity here rather the purifying effect of God’s Word?”

### My Refutation

---

13 Francis Turretin, Institutes of Elenctic Theology (Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1992), 1:106; see also my paper, “Sola Autographa or Sola Apographa? A Case for the Present Perfection and Authority of the Holy Scriptures,” The Burning Bush 11 (2005): 3-19.

It is absurd for Mr Lim to suggest that I take the psalmist to mean that Ps 119 is the last book of the Bible just because he wrote, “Thy word is very pure.” The psalmist was referring to the nature or quality of the Word, that it is pristine, pure and perfect in every aspect. This is also the case with Ps 19:7, “The law of the LORD is perfect.” The words “pure” and “perfect” are adjectives, describing the *nature* of God’s Word and not simply the effect of the Word.

Lim Seng Hoo’s response:

15. Let me cite more completely what I wrote.

“Was the psalmist’s love of God’s Word due to the purity of the apographs? And this Psalm, being written before the completion of Scripture canon, if VPP pureness (completeness, perfect to every jot and tittle) is meant, should have been the last book of the Bible. Is not the purity here rather the *purifying effect of God’s Word*, as illustrated through the entire Psalm as well as say in Ps 19:7-9, “The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the LORD are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the LORD is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the LORD is clean, enduring for ever: the judgments of the LORD are true and righteous altogether.” And in Heb 4:12, “For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart.”

---

### **Mr Lim’s Misrepresentation of the VPP of Scripture**

Mr Lim misrepresents the VPP of Scripture when he wrote, “For the KJV to have an identical apograph text to the Divine Autographs (Originals), in jot and tittle terms, would necessitate a second inspiration either in the copying process, the textual editing process or the translation process.”

### **My Refutation**

If Mr Lim knows basic theology and has indeed read my papers carefully, he would not wrong me by accusing me of advocating a “second inspiration” of the Scriptures. I did not confuse inspiration with preservation. Inspiration speaks of God’s miraculous one-time work of “breathing out” the original inspired words in the autographs in the days of the prophets and apostles (2 Tim 3:16). Preservation, on the other hand, refers to God’s supernatural and continuous work of keeping pure the very same original inspired words in all ages so that in every generation God’s people will always have every iota of His words (Matt 5:18).

The processes and dynamics involved in God’s work of inspiration and preservation are inscrutable and inexplicable. “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgements, and his ways past finding out!” (Rom 11:33). I do not pretend to know everything about how God inspired His words, or how He preserved them. I simply believe Him—my Lord and my God—who is all-powerful to keep His words, His truths and His promises. I just take Him at His Word with simple, childlike faith, period. Bottom line is: “God says it, that settles it, I believe it.” The logic of faith is precisely this: “The Bible says it, that settles it, we believe it.”

Mr Lim believes in the partial or imperfect preservation of Scripture. But the problem with his view is that there is not a single verse in the Bible which says God’s Word is imperfectly preserved, or we do not have a 100% perfect Bible in our possession today. What we do find however is that there are many verses in the Bible which teach the perfect, permanent, and perpetual preservation of God’s inspired original language words (Ps 12:6-7, Matt 5:18, 24:35, 1 Pet 1:23-25). Please see George Skariah’s doctoral dissertation on the perfect preservation of the Holy Scriptures which offers a most Christ-honouring and faith-building exegesis and exposition

of no less than 50 Biblical verses/passages that prove this *doctrine* (not “theory” or “heresy” as Mr Lim would have us believe).<sup>14</sup>

Lim Seng Hoo's response:

16. On double inspiration or miraculous preservation, please see my response to point 12 in JK's Table above and also my Response Note 6 above.

JK confuses by using “Perfect Bible” and “Perfect KJB”, interchangeably. He contends for the latter while I for the former. I must thus deny that the KJV is 100% perfect, as this would otherwise make the Original Inspired Autographs from which it manifestly does differ, imperfect!!

(JK would true to his form probably argue, “Show me the Autographs!” but that would be a desperate grasp at a straw when one is already drowned deep in high waters.)

---

### **Mr Lim's Dubious Affirmation**

After arguing against the VPP of Scripture, Mr Lim says, “This does not mean that God's Word is not preserved for us! They are in the providential sense!”

### **My Critique**

I had used the term “providential preservation” in my book *Kept Pure in All Ages: Recapturing the Authorised Version and the Doctrine of Providential Preservation*. Mr Lim uses the same word, but appears to understand it differently. In these days of deception, it is not enough just to know what is said, it is equally if not more important to know what is meant by what is said.

There is a recent book entitled *God's Word in Our Hands: The Bible Preserved for Us*. The book title makes it appear that the writers believe and support the doctrine of the 100% preservation of the words of Scripture, but the contents of the book prove otherwise. Read my review of this book, “Bob Jones University, Neo-Fundamentalism, and Biblical Preservation” in the latest issue of *The Burning Bush*.<sup>15</sup> In my critique, I exposed why and how BJU and other pro-Westcott/Hort advocates do not believe that God will and is able to preserve perfectly all of His words to the last iota, that all of His inspired words will always remain available and accessible to His people all the time until the end of time. Mr Lim's arguments against the KJV and VPP of Scripture are déjà vu, and not new to me. I have not only answered them in my above critique, but in two other earlier ones as well.<sup>16</sup>

Lim Seng Hoo's response:

17. See my response to point 2 and 12 in JK's Table above. Burgon's view, which I share, is that preservation is throughout the ages in all the extant manuscripts, versions and the citations by the Church fathers.

JK's view is that perfect preservation actually occurred in 1611. Otherwise, he should say that Tyndale or Coverdale or even Luther or some other is based on the perfect VPP Hebrew and Greek text. Thus his expression, “Will always remain available and accessible to His people all the time until the end of time”, really means “all the time from 1611 until the end of time!”

---

---

14 George Skariah, “The Biblical Doctrine of the Perfect Preservation of the Holy Scriptures,” unpublished Doctor of Theology dissertation, Far Eastern Bible College, Singapore, 2005.

15 Jeffrey Khoo, “Bob Jones University, Neo-Fundamentalism, and Biblical Preservation,” *The Burning Bush* 11 (2005): 82-97.

16 Jeffrey Khoo, “Bob Jones University and the KJV: A Critique of From the Mind of God to the Mind of Man,” *The Burning Bush* 7 (2001): 1-34, and “The Emergence of Neo-Fundamentalism: One Bible Only? or “Yea Hath God Said?,” *The Burning Bush* (2004):2-47.

### Mr Lim's Quotation of Dean Burgon

Mr Lim quoted Burgon to argue that there is no such thing as VPP. He wrote, "Dean Burgon expresses it thus, 'But I would especially remind my readers of Bentley's golden precept, that 'The real text of the sacred writers does not now, since the originals have been so long lost, lie in any MS, or edition, but is dispersed in them all.'"

### My Explanation

We are thankful to the Lord for Dean Burgon for a number of reasons: (1) Burgon was a defender of the Byzantine or Majority Text which he called the Traditional Text over against the Alexandrian or Minority Text of Westcott and Hort which he viewed as the Corrupted Text and rightly so. (2) Burgon was a strong defender for the KJV and spoke against any revision of it. Although Burgon defended the KJV in no uncertain terms, there was a weakness in his defence of it. It is unfortunate that Burgon did not defend the Textus Receptus—the Greek Text underlying the KJV—as strongly as he did the KJV. That is the reason why he spoke in terms of the "dispersed" rather than the "received" text.

Why did Burgon have such a relatively low view of the Textus Receptus? Dr E F Hills—a friend and classmate of Dr McIntire at Westminster, a ThD graduate of Harvard, and a Presbyterian defender of the Textus Receptus—made an astute observation. He noted that Burgon was biased against the Textus Receptus because of his extreme Anglicanism which believes in the doctrine of apostolic succession. Dr Hills rightly commented that Burgon's mistaken Anglican view of apostolic succession and emphasis on the NT quotations of the Bishops or Church Fathers failed him

*when he came to deal with the printed Greek New Testament text. For from Reformation times down to his own day the printed Greek New Testament text which had been favored by the bishops of the Anglican Church was the Textus Receptus, and the Textus Receptus had not been prepared by bishops but by Erasmus, who was an independent scholar. Still worse, from Burgon's standpoint, was the fact that the particular form of the Textus Receptus used in the Church of England was the third edition of Stephanus, who was a Calvinist. For these reasons, therefore, Burgon and Scrivener looked askance at the Textus Receptus and declined to defend it except in so far as it agreed with the Traditional Text found in the majority of the Greek New Testament manuscripts.<sup>17</sup>*

Dr Hills went on to say that Burgon's approach to identifying the preserved text is "illogical." Hills wrote:

*If we believe in the providential preservation of the New Testament text, then we must defend the Textus Receptus as well as the Traditional Text found in the majority of the Greek manuscripts. For the Textus Receptus is the only form in which this Traditional Text has circulated in print. To decline to defend the Textus Receptus is to give the impression that God's providential preservation of the New Testament text ceased with the invention of printing. It is to suppose that God, having preserved a pure New Testament text all during the manuscript period, unaccountably left this pure text hiding in the manuscripts and allowed an inferior text to issue from the printing press and circulate among His people for more than 450 years. Much, then, as we admire Burgon for his general orthodoxy and for his defense of the Traditional New Testament Text, we cannot follow him in his high Anglican emphasis or in his disregard for the Textus Receptus.<sup>18</sup>*

---

<sup>17</sup> Edward F Hills, *The King James Version Defended* (Des Moines: Christian Research Press, 1984), 192.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

Lim Seng Hoo's response:

18. Thanks JK for confirming that Burgon does not share your perfect TR view. Say, why then do you take the Dean Burgon oath this last 13 years? Or why call it the Dean Burgon oath?

As for JK's quotation of Hills, I would remind that Hills contradicts JK's Pt 12 of Table that "preservation is supernatural and miraculous and is God's work, not men's!" Clearly, Almighty God used men in the process of transmission, and exercised singular providential care in the process of preservation through His raising up ready scribes.

Furthermore on Hills' claim that "Erasmus was influenced by this common faith and probably shared it, and God used it providentially to guide Erasmus in his editorial labours on the Textus Receptus."<sup>19</sup> Note Hill's tentative language "probably" etc. But if there is such a thing as being "guided by the common faith" and if Erasmus was thus guided, for which of his editions was he thus guided? If he had been guided only in his fifth attempt, why not in earlier attempts? If in all his attempts, why keep making changes? What if he had attempted a sixth edition! And for all this "guiding by the common faith", Erasmus still is not the final identified KJV-VPP text!

As for Dr Carl McIntire, who is no longer with us, Dr Ralph Colas, Secretary General of the ACCC, when asked by me about VPP, replied by taking out from his coat pocket the ACCC Constitution, then 62 years old, and saying, "In 62 years, we have not changed this, and do not see the need now to change either." He then added, referring to KJV-VPP being unproven, that "we should not write in anything that we cannot prove."

---

### **Mr Lim's Endorsement of Textual Criticism**

Mr Lim without qualification said, "Textual criticism is not a dirty word or a needless science."

#### **My Response**

Textual criticism is not really a science. Subjectivity and speculation are part and parcel of textual criticism. Under pro-Westcott/Hort lecturers and professors in my Bible college and seminary days, I had studied textual criticism and even practised it. Has it been an edifying exercise for me? Not a bit! In fact, it left me with more questions than answers and filled me with pride because it made me think I had the intellect or intelligence to judge which part of Scripture is God's word and which part is not. The principle of faith and doctrine is totally left out in the so-called "science" of textual criticism, and I found that to be very disturbing and dangerous to my faith in God's Word.

The subjectivity and speculation involved in textual criticism made A E Houseman to comment that "A textual critic engaged upon his business is not at all like Newton investigating the motions of the planets: he is much more like a dog hunting for fleas."<sup>20</sup> Georg Luck of Johns Hopkins University rightly said, "our critical texts are no better than our textual critics."<sup>21</sup>

If I were to build my faith in God's Word based on textual criticism, I would be building my house on sand and not on rock. Instead of subjective, speculative and rationalistic textual criticism, we should employ the Biblical principle of the VPP of Scripture to help us identify where God's words are. Based on Biblical doctrine of the VPP of Scripture (Ps 12:6-7, Matt 5:18, 24:35 etc), I believe I am building my house upon a rock-solid foundation. Thus, I refuse to hear the voice of textual critics, but the voice of my Lord Himself in His forever infallible and inerrant Word, "Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: And the rain descended, and the floods

---

<sup>19</sup> The King James Defended, page 197.

<sup>20</sup> A E Houseman, "The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism," in Selected Prose, ed J Carter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 131-2.

<sup>21</sup> Quoted by David Alan Black, ed, Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 50.



came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock” (Matt 7:24-25).

Dr Timothy Tow rightly used the Biblical principle of the glory of God to argue that the Bible today is perfect without any mistake because of God’s perfect preservation of His words.<sup>22</sup> Does it glorify God to say that the Bible is imperfectly preserved based on the so-called “logic of *facts*,” or to simply believe what the Bible so clearly says about itself, that the Bible is perfectly preserved based on the logic of *faith* (Heb 11:3, 6)?

Lim Seng Hoo’s response:

19. See my note in Pt 2 of JK’s Table. Burgon and Scrivener were advocates of sound Textual Criticism, and praised each other as *facile princeps* in textual criticism.<sup>23</sup> Without them both, where would the KJV be today? How would we have known that the KJV underlying text was more reliable and to be preferred to W&H? How would we have known that W&H did harm to the Greek texts of the NT, whether advertently or inadvertently?

---

### **Mr Lim’s Textual Problems**

Mr Lim wrote, “As for clear evidence of textual problems in the KJV underlying texts, I here cite two (we both know of more, yet only one is needed to disprove the ‘Perfect KJV-VPP’ case).”

#### **My Defence of the Hebrew and Greek Texts Underlying KJV**

Mr Lim believes that there is “clear evidence of textual problems” in the underlying texts of the KJV. His “evidence” is “clear” only to him and all sceptics who consider apparent problems as actual problems due to their cynical approach toward the Scriptures. A faith-based, Christ-exalting, Biblical preservationist approach to textual identification does not see them as “problems,” “discrepancies,” or “mistakes” at all for they are not.

#### **Mr Lim on 2 Sam 8:4 and 1 Chron 18:4**

Mr Lim accuses me of using “a ‘spiritualising,’ non-literal, and liberal interpretation of God’s Word” in my attempt to harmonise or reconcile the apparent discrepancy in 2 Sam 8:4 and 1 Chron 18:4.

#### **My Rebuttal**

Harmonising the Scriptures is far from spiritualising the Scriptures. Contrary to what Mr Lim thinks, the harmonisation of Scriptures takes the Scriptures literally, 700 means 700, 7,000 means 7,000 in 2 Sam 8:4 and 1 Chron 18:4 respectively. Mr Lim dismisses my attempt at harmonisation by pontificating, “The obvious difficulty is that there are no groups.” But Matthew Henry, the renowned puritan commentator himself, did not think such a harmonisation improbable. In his commentary on 2 Sam 8:4, he wrote, “The horsemen are here said to be 700, but 1 Chron. Xviii.4. seven thousand. If they divided their horse by ten in a company, *as it is probable they did*, the captains and companies were 700, but the horsemen were 7000.”<sup>24</sup>

But Mr Lim dismisses such faithful attempts at defending the inerrancy of the Scripture with demeaning and conceited words which I do not care to repeat. His solution actually creates more problems because it looks like he agrees with the Westcott and Hort textual critical view that (1) older manuscripts are better, that (2) the old and traditional textual readings must be replaced by

---

22 Timothy Tow, “My Glory Will I Not Give to Another,” *The Burning Bush* 11 (July 2005): 67-68.

23 *The Revision Revised*, pages 231 and 246.

24 Matthew Henry, *Commentary on the Whole Bible* (Wilmington: Sovereign Grace, 1972), 1:798, emphasis mine.

new and recently discovered ones, and the Ruckmanite view that (3) translations or versions can be more inspired than, and can thus be used to correct, the original language text.

Lim Seng Hoo's response:

20. See my response to Points 4 - 6 of Table. JK misses the primary point: The KJV English says "1000 chariots and 700 horsemen" whereas the Masoretic reads "1700 horsemen". Clearly, at least, one of them must be wrong!

By citing Matthew Henry and majoring on the secondary (700 versus 7,000 horsemen), JK contends for the KJV English, to the detriment of his own VPP hypothesis. If so, the Masoretic (Hebrew underlying the KJV) must be wrong! He has shot himself and VPP fatally, has he not?!

And with all due respect to Matthew Henry, he missed the italics in the *chariots* of 2Sam 8:4, indicating not in the original Masoretic text. Had he observed this detail, he would probably not have speculated thus. He also failed to notice that all the other numerals are in concurrence – *twenty thousand footmen* and horses David reserved for *one hundred chariots* and his slaying of *twenty two thousand men* (Syrians). If therefore "they did probably divide their 7,000 horses by ten unto 700 captains", they should also have done the same of the 20,000 footmen, to make it read 2,000 footmen, and so on. This is what I meant by there are no groups. At the most, there was only one group, which made the whole proposition untenable. The Hebrew word for captains is also quite different from the word for horsemen. We should interpret God's Word literally, should we not? If our Lord meant group, He would tell us clearly "group (of ten)". If He meant basket of five loaves and two fishes, He says, "basket."

---

### Mr Lim on Matt 10:8

Following Burgon, Mr Lim doubts the reading of Matt 10:8 in the Textus Receptus concerning Jesus' commission to His disciples to "raise the dead."

### My Rebuttal

Although we admire Burgon's stout defence of the KJV, and his powerful offence against Westcott and Hort and their Revised Version, we do not agree with his relatively low view of the Textus Receptus. Unlike Mr Lim, we do not follow Burgon blindly. The reason why Burgon held to such a disparaging view of the Textus Receptus is already explained above. Burgon as noted by Hills was coloured by his Anglican bias, and hence became clouded in his understanding of God's special preservation of the Scriptures in the days of the Protestant Reformation.

I thus agree with Hills that Burgon's approach to identifying the preserved text is "illogical." Unlike Burgon, Hills supported the authenticity of Matt 10:8 because he believed that it has been "placed in the Textus Receptus by the direction of God's special providence."<sup>25</sup> Calvin in his commentary on Matt 10:8 took for granted the authenticity of Matt 10:8, and had no problem affirming that the Lord "is quite deliberate in telling them to raise the dead."<sup>26</sup>

Lim Seng Hoo's response:

21. Here is JK relying on men; Hills and Calvin (Calvin incidentally held that Ps 12:6-7 refers to the saints) rather than God's Word to argue a point. Burgon did not do this but carefully checked the Scripture manuscripts and found, "Eusebius, Basil, Chrysostom, Jerome, Juvenius, omit the words. P.E. Pusey found them in no Syriac copy. But the conclusive evidence is supplied by the Manuscripts; not more than 1 out of 20 of which contains this clause."<sup>27</sup>

---

25 Hills, *The King James Version Defended*, 200.

26 David W Torrance and Thomas F Torrance, eds, *Calvin's New Testament Commentaries: A Harmony of the Gospels: Matthew, Mark and Luke*, trans A W Morrison (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), 1:292.

27 *The Revision Revised*. Page 107 & 108 and their footnotes.

Since JK cites Matthew Henry, Hills and Calvin, this is perfect place to show how all three regarded the problematic Ps 22:16, where the KJV has “they pierced my hands and my feet” whereas the Hebrew Masoretic has “like a lion my hands and my feet”: -

- a. Matthew Henry: “He is here crucified. The very manner of his death is described, though never in use among the Jews: They pierced my hands and my feet (v. 16), which were nailed to the accursed tree, and the whole body left so to hang, the effect of which must needs be the most exquisite pain and torture. There is no one passage in all the Old Testament which the Jews have so industriously corrupted as this, because it is such an eminent prediction of the death of Christ and was so exactly fulfilled.”
- b. E F Hills in *The KJV Defended*, pg223, wrote: “And in Ps 22:16 the KJV reads with the Septuagint, the Syriac, and the Latin Vulgate, they pierced my hands and my feet. The Hebrew text, on the other hand, reads, like a lion my hands and my feet, a reading which makes no sense and which, as Calvin observes, was obviously invented by the Jews to deny the prophetic reference to the crucifixion of Christ.”
- c. John Calvin: “They have pierced my hands and my feet. The original word, which we have translated they have pierced, is *yarak*, *caari*, which literally rendered is, like a lion. As all the Hebrew Bibles at this day, without exception, have this reading, I would have had great hesitation in departing from a reading which they all support, were it not that the scope of the discourse compels me to do so, and were there not strong grounds for conjecturing that this passage has been fraudulently corrupted by the Jews.”

What does this say for the perfection of the Masoretic text underlying the KJV? Does it surprise if the Masoretic rabbis of the 10<sup>th</sup> C AD would undermine a prophetic reference to our Lord's crucifixion, which is at the very heart of God's salvation plan? Despite such problems in the underlying Hebrew-Greek texts, Calvin; MH, the Westminster Divines, Trinitarian Bible Society and Williamson taught the sufficiency of the scriptures including the “Perseverance of the Saints”. They had full assurance that God's elect are saved and shall reach heaven.

---

### **Mr Lim's Puzzling Appeal**

Mr Lim wrote, “Stop alleging that we say that the Bible contains errors!”

#### **My Questions**

If Mr Lim does not say that the Bible contains errors, then why does he keep on arguing for errors in the Bible (in 2 Sam 8:4, 2 Chron 22:2 and many other places) when there are no such errors to begin with? If Mr Lim does not believe there are any errors in the Bible, then why does he say that the Bible has “built-in redundancy?” Why is he on this crusade against those who believe the Bible is without any error? Why are his words contradicting his beliefs and practices?

Furthermore, if Mr Lim does truly believe he has a perfect, infallible, and inerrant Bible in his possession today, can he kindly produce it? With his denial of VPP, I do not think Mr Lim can produce such a Bible. He does not have it. I submit to you that Mr Lim's Bible that contains no mistakes is simply non-existent, invisible and intangible.

True Biblical preservationists can confidently say they possess an existing, visible and tangible 100% perfect Bible today without any mistake because of God's infallible promise to preserve His inerrant Word throughout the ages to the last jot and tittle (Ps 12:6-7, Matt 5:18).

Dr Hills correctly observed that those who deny the VPP or special providential preservation of Scripture will not be able to affirm a perfect or an infallible and inerrant Bible today. Hills gave a very pertinent warning against those who ignore or reject the doctrine of the *special* providential preservation of Scripture:

Lim Seng Hoo's response:

22. JK is puzzled between the Perfect Bible and the Perfect KJV. He holds to the Perfect KJV whereas I hold to the Perfect Autograph Bible and its preserved manuscript witnesses.

---

*If we ignore the providential preservation of the Scriptures and defend the New Testament text in the same way that we defend the texts of other ancient books, then we are following the logic of unbelief. For the special, providential preservation of the holy Scriptures is a fact and an important fact. Hence when we ignore this fact and deal with the text of the New Testament as we would with the text of other books, we are behaving as unbelievers behave. We are either denying that the providential preservation of the Scriptures is a fact, or else we are saying that it is not an important fact, not important enough to be considered when dealing with the New Testament text. But if the providential preservation of the Scriptures is not important, why is the infallible inspiration of the original Scriptures important? If God has not preserved the Scriptures by His special providence, why would He have infallibly inspired them in the first place? And if the Scriptures are not infallibly inspired, how do we know that the Gospel message is true? And if the Gospel message is not true, how do we know that Jesus is the Son of God?*

*It is a dangerous error therefore to ignore the special, providential preservation of the holy Scriptures and to seek to defend the New Testament text in the same way in which we would defend the texts of other ancient books. **For the logic of this unbelieving attitude is likely to lay hold upon us and cast us down into a bottomless pit of uncertainty.** ...*

*The Bible teaches us that faith is the foundation of reason. Through faith we understand (Heb. 11:3). By faith we lay hold on God as He reveals Himself in the holy Scriptures and make Him the starting point of all our thinking. ...*

*Like the Protestant Reformers therefore we must take God as the starting point of all our thinking. We must begin with God. Very few Christians, however, do this consistently. For example, even when a group of conservative Christian scholars meet for the purpose of defending the Textus Receptus and the King James Version, **you will find that some of them want to do this in a rationalistic, naturalistic way. Instead of beginning with God, they wish to begin with facts viewed apart from God,** with details concerning the New Testament manuscripts which must be regarded as true (so they think) no matter whether God exists or not. ...*

*Conservative scholars ... say that they believe in the special, providential preservation of the New Testament text. Most of them really don't though, because, as soon as they say this, they immediately reduce this special providential preservation to the vanishing point in order to make room for the naturalistic theories of Westcott and Hort. As we have seen, some say that the providential preservation of the New Testament means merely that the same "substance of doctrine" is found in all the New Testament documents. Others say that it means that the true reading is always present in at least one of the thousands of extant New Testament manuscripts. And still other scholars say that to them the special, providential preservation of the Scriptures means that the true New Testament text was providentially discovered in the mid-19th century by Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort after having been lost for 1,500 years.*

***If you adopt one of these false views of the providential preservation of Scriptures, then you are logically on your way toward the denial of the infallible inspiration of the Scriptures.** For if God has preserved the Scriptures so carelessly,*

*why would he have infallibly inspired them in the first place? It is not sufficient therefore merely to say that you believe in the doctrine of the special, providential preservation of holy Scriptures. You must really believe this doctrine and allow it to guide your thinking. You must begin with Christ and the Gospel and proceed according to the logic of faith. This will lead you to the Traditional text, the Textus Receptus, and the King James Version.*<sup>28</sup>

Lim Seng Hoo's response:

23. Logic of faith does not mean "blind faith" or worst, "misplaced faith" where God has not called or revealed. True faith is based on what God has revealed, and made clear in the circumstances and facts surrounding us. All of Hill's guiding by the common faith was to result in Erasmus having to prepare 5 editions, Stephanus 4 editions and Beza 10 editions. So where does it all lead to? A perfectly restored 100% perfect Greek text underlying the KJV? Which one? Whose faith, yours, mine, his or hers? How do you prove it is this or that particular one text?

---

### **Mr Lim's Undermining of the KJV**

Although Mr Lim says he affirms wholeheartedly with Dean Burgon that "The Bible is none other than the voice of Him that sitteth upon the throne. Every book of it, every chapter of it, every verse of it, every word of it, every syllable of it, every letter of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High ...," he concludes that "The King James Version is however not so."

### **My Defence of the KJV**

It must be clarified that any "perfection," "infallibility" or "inerrancy" that is attributed to the KJV (and for that matter all other faithful and accurate translations of the Bible) must be understood not in the direct but *derived* sense. Dr Timothy Tow illustrates this point well, "The original text may be likened to ginseng, and its translation ginseng tea."<sup>29</sup>

Nevertheless, I do not think Dean Burgon would take kindly to Mr Lim's disparaging remarks against the KJV. Hear the Dean's unreserved defence of the KJV:

*Our Authorised Version is the one religious link which at present binds together ... millions of English-speaking men scattered over the earth's surface. Is it reasonable that so unutterably precious, so sacred a bond should be endangered, for the sake of representing certain words more accurately,—here and there translating a tense with greater precision,—getting rid of a few archaisms? It may be confidently assumed that no 'Revision' of our Authorised Version, however, judiciously executed, will ever occupy the place of public esteem which is actually enjoyed by the work of the Translators of 1611,—the noblest literary work in the Anglo-Saxon language. We shall in fact never have another 'Authorised Version.' ... As something intended to supercede our present English Bible, we are thoroughly convinced that the project of a rival Translation is not to be entertained for a moment. For ourselves, we deprecate it entirely.*<sup>30</sup>

Lim Seng Hoo's response:

24. JK is skilled at taking statements out of context. The rival Translation that Burgon here deprecated was clearly the RV effort, which was based on German prejudices of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, et al, and with Hort on the RV team. Burgon also clearly was not against revision per se, which was his own dream endeavour.

---

28 Edward F Hills, *Believing Bible Study* (Des Moines: Christian Research Press, 1977), 216-20, emphasis mine.

29 Cited in Jeffrey Khoo, *KJV: Questions and Answers* (Singapore: Bible Witness Literature, 2003), 8

30 John William Burgon, *Revision Revised* (Collingswood: Dean Burgon Society, 2d printing, 2000), 113-114, emphasis mine.



“Once for all, we request it may be clearly understood that we do not, by any means, claim perfection for the Received Text. We entertain no extravagant notions on this subject. Again and again we shall have occasion to point out (e.g. at page 107) that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction. We do but insist, (1) That it is an incomparably better text than that which either Lachmann, or Tischendorf, or Tregelles has produced: infinitely preferable to the ‘New Greek Text’ of the Revisionists. And, (2) That to be improved, the *Textus Receptus* will have to be revised on entirely different ‘principles’ from those which are just now in fashion. Men must begin by unlearning the German prejudices of the last fifty years; and address themselves, instead, to the stern logic of *facts*.”<sup>31</sup>

“I am not defending the ‘Textus Receptus’; I am simply stating the fact of its existence. That it is without authority to bind, nay, that it calls for skilful revision in every part, is freely admitted. I do not believe it to be absolutely identical with the true Traditional Text.”<sup>32</sup>

Moreover Burgon’s most important work was “*A Textual Commentary Upon the Holy Gospels, Largely from the Use of Materials, and Mainly on the Text, Left by the Late John William Burgon Part I, St. Matthew, Division 1 I-XIV*”, a comprehensive revision of the TR, with copious notes.

---

Mr Lim claims to “hold the KJV as reliable, trustworthy, venerable and beloved,” yet he spares no effort to attack those who defend the KJV and its underlying Hebrew and Greek texts. If Mr Lim is truly supportive of the KJV, he should be spending his time and energy doing all he can to defend the KJV and FEBC against the attacks made by pro-Westcott/Hort anti-preservationists of the BJU mould. Sadly, Mr Lim does the opposite. Instead of defending his own, he does all he can to support the enemy camp and undermine the KJV and VPP Scripture held by his pastors and FEBC.

### **Mr Lim’s Attack on the KJV**

Mr Lim says “there are mistakes in the English of the KJV due to translation errors.”

### **My Defence of the KJV**

Please note that I do not hold to Ruckman’s view that the KJV is “doubly inspired” or “separately inspired” for there is no such teaching in the Scriptures. Many find it very convenient to hit below the belt by misrepresenting FEBC’s view of the KJV. This only goes to show that their arguments are so weak that they need to resort to such underhand blows just to get the upper hand.

Mr Lim believes “there are mistakes in the English of the KJV due to translation errors.” I for one do not believe there are mistakes in the English of the KJV. David Marshall—Singapore’s first chief minister—who had for his English textbook the King James Bible would have dismissed any puerile criticism of the English of the KJV. The KJV was written in an age when the English language was at its zenith, and we today can learn much good and high English from the KJV.

Mr Lim is quick to criticise the KJV for its “translational errors,” but I would rather not be so conceited and trigger-happy to criticise the KJV translation of the Holy Scriptures. Please know that the King James translators were extremely careful in their translation of God’s Word, and they have used at least one correct word, and at least one correct rule of grammar in their rendering of the inspired and preserved original language Scriptures. That is why “We uphold the Authorised (King James) Version to be the Word of God—the best, most faithful, most accurate, most beautiful translation of the Bible in the English language, and do employ it alone

---

<sup>31</sup> The Revision Revised, footnote on page 21.

<sup>32</sup> The Traditional Text, Vol I, page 15.



as our primary scriptural text in the public reading, preaching, and teaching of the Bible” (Article 4.2.1.2 of the FEBC Constitution which was unanimously passed by her Board of Directors on December 29, 2003). We agree with the Dean Burgon Society that “we can without apology hold up the Authorised Version of 1611 and say ‘This is the Word of God!’ while at the same time realising that, in some verses, we must go back to the underlying original language Texts for complete clarity, and also compare Scripture with Scripture” (“Articles of Faith,” Section II.A).

Dr Hills had wisely advised, “We must be very cautious therefore about finding errors in the text of the King James Version, and the same holds true also in the realm of translation. Whenever the renderings of the King James Version are called in question, it is usually the accuser that finds himself in the wrong.”<sup>33</sup>

#### Lim Seng Hoo’s response:

25. Showing factually a few errors in the KJV does not mean that one attacks the KJV. It is God’s Word and Truth that one must defend. JK equates the exposing of the falsity of his Perfect KJV-VPP hypothesis as an attack on the KJV Bible! He forgets the divisive effects of VPP on the Church that our Lord Jesus Christ purchased with His own blood. Truth hurts, and this truth I know is too painful for JK to admit or bear, and he feels hurt and personally affronted. But I do not even wish to attack him as he and his friends had done to me. I just pray the Lord would open their eyes and hearts and grant them repentance to the acknowledgement of the truth. We need not exaggerate to the extent of incredulity to make the KJV more loved.

26. JK has often protested that he had been misunderstood as saying that the KJV English translation was perfect. He had clarified that he did not mean the English but rather the Hebrew and Greek texts underlying the KJV that is perfect.

“Passover” translated as “Easter” in Act 12:4 is a clear example of a translational error (as further witnessed by comparing Act 12:3 and Mk 14:1)! About 24,000 various corrections had been made to the 1611 KJV. This leaves still various remaining discrepancies in grammar, spelling, capitalization, and printing to be corrected in our 1769 KJV, as noted by Scrivener (**Yes, Scrivener!**) Dr James D Price, General Editor of the NKJV, gives us some of these: -

#### **Grammar**

Scrivener listed a number of examples of grammatical irregularities:

(1) The following illustrate irregular verb forms:

- Ex. 9:31—“the flax and barley was smitten”
- 2 Sam. 17:29—“The people *is* hungry, and weary, and thirsty”
- 2 Chr. 1:12—“wisdom and knowledge is granted”
- Mark 9:3—“no fuller...can white them.”
- Luke 1:19—“Gabriel, that stand”
- John 11:57—“if any man knew where he were”
- Acts 1:15—“the number of names together were...”
- Acts 6:7—“a great company...were obedient”
- Acts 23:15—“or ever he come near”
- 1 John 5:15—“if we know that he hear us”
- Rev. 18:17—“so great riches is come”

(2) The following illustrate antiquated singular forms that were usually corrected to plurals by the revisers, but evidently overlooked in these places:

- Judg. 14:12, 13—“thirty change of garments”
- 1 Kings 10:17—“three pound of gold”
- Ezra 2:69—“five thousand pound of silver”
- Neh. 7:71—“two hundred pound of silver”
- Neh. 7:72—“two thousand pound of silver”
- Luke 9:28—“an eight days”

---

33 Hills, Believing Bible Study, 83.

(3) The following illustrate the irregular use of an adjective for an adverb:

2 Chr. 2:9—"wonderful great"

2 Pet. 2:6—"live ungodly"

(4) The following illustrate the irregular use of double superlatives:

Mark 10:44—"chiefest" (see also 1 Sam. 2:29; 9:22; 21:7; 2 Chr. 32:33; Song 5:10; 2Cor. 11:5; 12:11)

Acts 26:5—"most straitest"

(5) The following illustrates the irregular suppression of the sign of the genitive (of):

Rev. 18:12—"all manner vessels" (twice)

### Spelling

The revisers usually corrected the archaic spelling of words. Scrivener listed numerous examples of words not corrected due to oversight:

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Archaic Spelling</u>	<u>Usually Corrected to</u>
Gen. 8:11	pluckt	plucked
Gen. 18:7	fetchtd	fetchd
Ex. 17:7	Tentation	Temptation
Ex. 33:22	clift	cleft
Judg. 6:31	whilst	while
2 Sam. 7:13, etc.	stablish	establish
2 Chr. 2:16	flotes	floats
Ezra 9:3, etc.	astonied	astonished
Job 41:18	neesings	sneezings
Psa. 68:13	lien	lain
Ezek. 21; 29	whiles	while
Ezek. 35:6	sith	since
Ezek. 40:31,	etc. utter	outer
Luke 9:62	plough	plow

---

### Mr Lim's Malicious Accusation

Mr Lim accused me of being "divisive, and self promoting ... Brethren are falsely attacked, and the unity of our churches affected."

### My Reply

Mr Lim's charge against me is both unjust and unjustifiable. His words against me are malicious. His senior pastor graciously gave him a chance to retract his statements but he refused. When publicly disciplined by his senior pastor and his pastor, instead of showing remorse he threatened them with a lawsuit. I believe Mr Lim owes his pastors and me an apology.

### Bottom Line

The Bible is the Christian's sole and supreme authority of faith and practice. My faith in the present perfection of Scripture is based on the Biblical doctrine of God's infallible preservation of His forever inerrant Word as taught in Ps 12:6-7, Matt 5:18, and many other passages in the Bible.

What is Mr Lim's faith based on? On which book, chapter, and verse does Mr Lim base his doctrine of the non-VPP, imperfect, and partial preservation of Scripture? Is Mr Lim asking us to trust him and his scholarly judgement that there is no such thing as a perfect Bible today? I rather trust in my infallible and inerrant Lord and Saviour who has promised to preserve His infallible and inerrant words. I trust no man but the Lord Jesus Christ who "died for our sins according to the scriptures; and ... was buried, and ... rose again the third day according to the scriptures" (1 Cor 15:3-4).

It is never safe to trust in fallible men and their errant-prone commentaries, especially when their beliefs and judgements go against the clear teachings of the infallible and inerrant Word of God. We follow men and their comments only if and when they follow and agree with Christ and His words (1 Cor 11:1). I place my complete trust in Christ and Him alone, and I trust only the Bible—His Word—which I believe is not only perfect in the past (in the inerrant God-breathed Hebrew and Greek words of the autographs) but also perfect today (in the infallibly preserved Hebrew and Greek words of the apographs underlying the Reformation Bibles best represented by the KJV).

I appreciate the faithful and courageous words of Dr Paisley who believes that

*this English Authorised Version is unsurpassably pre-eminent over and above all other English translations, ... I cry out ‘There is none like that, give it me,’ and in so doing I nail the Satanic lie that the Authorised Version is outdated, outmoded, mistranslated, a relic of the past and only defended by stupid, unlearned, untaught obscurantists. ...*

*I believe this Book will always be the unsurpassable pre-eminent English version of the Holy Bible and no other can every take its place. To seek to dislodge this Book from its rightful pre-eminent place is the act of the enemy, and what is attempted to put in its place is an intruder—an imposter—a pretender—a usurper.*<sup>34</sup>

Lim Seng Hoo's response:

27. Just because I disproved JK's hypothesis does not make me malicious. In debate, one ought never to personally attack one's opponent, which otherwise indicates that one has no constructive rejoinder left and has lost the debate. It is sad for JK that he has consistently attacked those that hold not his view. He calls them "neo-fundamentalist", "malicious", "Satanic" etc. See for example his table on p 21 of KJV: Q&A, or examples in this very document.

28. The Church issue would be left to the BOE of Calvary BPC to take up.

29. JK's colleague Rev Dr Quek S Y contradicts, in an email to me on 20 Jul 05, "If there is in the future one that is better than the KJV then we will replace the KJV. KJV is not our sacred cow."

---

Dear friends, it is not enough just to believe and defend the VPI of Scripture, we must also believe and defend the VPP of Scripture with all our faith and with all our might with God's help. If we do not, the Biblical foundation of our Christian faith will be swept away by the destructive forces of unbelief and apostasy. "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" (Ps 11:3). Absolutely nothing! We would have no good news to preach to a lost world so in need of Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour if He is not absolutely truthful in His promises, and if His words are not forever infallible and inerrant. We would also be exposed to the dangers of liberalism, postmodernism, ecumenism, neo-evangelicalism, and new heresies like open-theism and neo-deism.

Faith is the key to spiritual understanding. We believe in order to see. "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom 11:17). "But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him" (Heb 11:6). Do not trust in the weak words of fallible men; but in the very powerful and ever perfect words of the Holy Scriptures, infallible and inerrant, 100% inspired and 100% preserved by its almighty Author—the Lord Jesus Christ—who is "the same yesterday, today and for ever" (Heb 13:8). We have an immutable God who has given to us an indestructible Word.

---

<sup>34</sup> Paisley, My Plea for the Old Sword, 10-11, emphasis mine.

“He who hath ears to hear, let him hear” (Matt 11:15).

### Lim Seng Hoo's Concluding Remarks

30. A crucial problem of KJV Only – VPP, is that some of its proponents promote the English as perfect and regard the Hebrew and Greek as subservient, whereas other proponents regard the underlying Hebrew-Greek as supreme even if the English had errors. Both claims are, in Burgon's words, extravagant; and each camp supply the irrefutable evidence against the other!

JK at times seems unsure which of the above two camps he falls into. He says he is of the second, but you get the feeling he sometimes wishes idealistically for both – a perfect KJV English plus perfect underlying Hebrew-Greek texts! This makes his claims all the more confusing and difficult to follow, except for the discerning ones (ahem).

Not only is the term VPP unheard of in conservative theological seminaries and literature, what JK means by VPP of Scripture is a Perfect KJV-VPP, which is a 100% Perfect KJV underlying Hebrew and Greek text to the exclusion of all other texts and manuscript evidence. Thus, all sound textual criticism must stop at 1611. Archaeological expeditions should also stop, lest they inadvertently turn out some new or very old evidence against their postulate. JK should realise that these precious manuscripts were the preserved Bibles of believers of yesteryears.

31. JK shied away from my invitation to publicly debate. His mentor, Dr D A Waite, fared badly in a similar debate against Dr James White. In reality, “An Evidential Review of the VPP Theory” was already a compilation of several debates in letter between us, and the verdict is already out in the minds and hearts of the many that have read this.

Now after 22 months, JK has written these 19 pages. My reply has added about 10 pages. Let this together with “An Evidential Review” be the public written debates. In JK's own words, please “freely distribute to those who wish for a copy or as you see fit”!

32. In “An Evidential Review”, all four areas investigated: a) the detailed examination of the VPP theoretical basis: its arguments, assumptions and rhetoric, b) literature research to determine the true views of key authorities put forward by VPP proponents, c) The inability of the proponents to convincingly identify the “VPP text” itself, and d) the last VPP defence that the “Dean Burgon Oath” refers to a Perfect Apographa Bible, were found to be null for the VPP hypothesis. Therefore the conclusion was unanimous against the Perfect KJV-VPP theory.

This conclusion is re-echoed. **Common sense** tells us that KJV-VPP is unreasonable. **Factual investigation** manifestly shows it is false. Finally, **Faith in Almighty God** is greater than to allow our salvation to turn precariously upon the perfection of the specific KJV texts.

In conclusion, our faith ought not thus to rest on the perfection of any one Bible version per se, translated by fallible men, but in the Divine Author of the Word. It suffices that God hath given us His Word and we have it in a reliable, trustworthy English translation. He has promised to come in His Third Person to indwell us and teach us all truth. As we study His Word prayerfully and apply it to our lives daily, we know that whenever we meet with difficulties, we can simply wait upon Him. He shall never fail us, and will clear all things in His sovereign time.

All praise to the Triune God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit! Amen.