

# Review Of The VPP Heresy

## 1. INTROCDUCTION.

Preaching at a graduation<sup>1</sup> ceremony of the Far Eastern Bible College (FEBC), Rev. (Dr.) Timothy Tow concluded with the following prophetic statement.

“The battle for Truth is an unending one. **Far Eastern Bible College has advanced beyond<sup>2</sup> the ICCC Bible Resolution** to declare the Preservation of the Scriptures to be part and parcel of the Doctrine of its Inspiration... The pioneers of this rediscovered Truth are E F Hills, ThD (Harvard), a classmate of McIntire, Dr Otis Fuller, David Cloud, Dr D A Waite, Dr S H Tow, G Riplinger....”

In recent years the Far Eastern Bible College (FEBC) has been promoting aggressively<sup>3</sup> the teaching of the verbal plenary preservation (VPP) of the texts underlying the KJV. They claimed that these texts<sup>4</sup> are identical to the autographs of the Bible.

## 2. USAGE OF THE TERM VPP

One of the earliest record of the term, “verbal plenary preservation” is by Dr. Thomas Strouse when he presented a paper<sup>5</sup>, “Fundamentalism And The Authorized Version” at the National Leadership Conference, Calvary Baptist Theological Seminary, Landsdale, PA on Feb. 29, 1996.

In another article<sup>6</sup> Dr Strouse asserts, “The Bible teaches not only the verbal, plenary inspiration of the *autographa*, but also the verbal, preservation of the *autographa*.” He identified the New Testament autographic text as the *textus receptus*, equating it to the words of Jesus Christ, concluding that “...Christians have maintained that the *textus receptus* is *the voice of the Lord* and that the variants in the modern versions are *the voice of strangers*.”

---

<sup>1</sup> 27th Graduation and 40th Anniversary of FEBC at Calvary Pandan B-P Church, May 5, 2002.

<sup>2</sup> “FEBC admits that it is taking the Doctrine of Inspiration a step further than ICCC Bible Resolution”, authors.

<sup>3</sup> “*It has been promoted with such vehemence as to produce much controversy and strife among brethren and cause some churches to split... Those who disagree with them are unkindly accused of denying the Bible and branded as Neo-Evangelicals and Neo-Fundamentalists. They promote this new teaching at all costs without considering how destructive it is to the peace and unity of the church.*” C. Seet,(Sermon preached on 28<sup>th</sup> Oct. 2007, Life BP Church)

<sup>4</sup> “You are also correct to conclude that my statement meant that the texts underlying the KJV may be considered “virtual photocopies of the autographs”... We do not deny that the autograph and apograph *though distinct are the same*. The paper may be different, but the *contents* are the same.”(J. Khoo in his written reply to C. Seet).  
[http://www.truthbpc.com/v2/main.php?menu=resources&page=resources/vpp\\_08](http://www.truthbpc.com/v2/main.php?menu=resources&page=resources/vpp_08)

<sup>5</sup>T. Strouse, *Fundamentalism And The Authorized Version* <http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/fundamentalismkjv.htm>

<sup>6</sup> *The Biblical Defense For The Verbal, Plenary Preservation Of God's Word*, by Dr T. M. Strouse.  
[http://www.graceway.com/articles/article\\_007.html](http://www.graceway.com/articles/article_007.html)

## Review Of The VPP Heresy

### 3. DEFINITION OF VPP BY THE FEBC.

The FEBC espouses the theory of the VPP of the Holy Scriptures. By VPP they mean that (i) the *autographa* is preserved completely intact<sup>7</sup> without any loss of words or characters and, (ii) the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament underlying the King James Version<sup>8</sup> to be identical to the *autographa*.

Therefore, the FEBC has identified the inspired words of the Hebrew OT as all the words of the Hebrew Masoretic Text, (Ben Chayyim)<sup>9</sup>. As for the traditional and preserved Greek New Testament underlying the KJV, it is Scrivener's *textus receptus*<sup>10</sup>

### 4. REDEFINING ESTABLISHED TERMS AND MISQUOTING SOURCES BY DR. KHOO.

Much confusion regarding VPP teaching is caused by Dr. Khoo<sup>11</sup> (i) redefining established terms and giving them new meanings, and (ii) when quoting sources, to leave out phrases or important words.

#### (i) Redefining 'Closest' to give a different meaning.

The internet on-line dictionary, *dictionary.com*, defines **closest** as, "marked by fidelity to an original <a *close* copy of an old master>", and **identical** as, "having such a close similarity or resemblance as to be essentially equal or interchangeable".

FEBC, in explaining the term, 'the apograph is *closest* to the autograph', wrote that it means that their contents are the same and but the material in which they are written on are different! In Dr. Khoo's words,

"VPP fundamentalists do not deny that the autographa and apographa *though distinct are the same*. The *paper* may be different, but the *contents* are the same."<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> J.Khoo and T.Tow, *Theology for Every Christian*. p.78

<sup>8</sup> FEBC Constitution Article 4: Statement of Faith, 4.2.1.1, "We believe the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament underlying the Authorised (King James) Version to be the very Word of God, infallible and inerrant."

<sup>9</sup> J. Khoo, *Lost Words in Our Bible?* p.49, The Burning Bush, January 2007

<sup>10</sup> J. Khoo, *In Defence Of The Far Eastern Bible College, The Reformed Faith, And The Reformation Bible*, p.79, The Burning Bush, July 2006,

<sup>11</sup> Academic Dean of FEBC since July 1997 and an Elder of True Life B-P Church.

<sup>12</sup> J. Khoo, *A Plea For A Perfect Bible*, p. 4, The Burning Bush, January 2003.

## Review Of The VPP Heresy

By redefining ‘closest’ to mean apograph and autograph as having the same contents, Dr. Khoo is *deceiving* God’s people.

### (ii) Redefining ‘*providential preservation*’ to give a different meaning

When Dr. Khoo uses the term ‘*providential preservation*’<sup>13</sup> he misleads God’s people into thinking that VPP’s teaching on *preservation* is similar to that of historic Christianity (on *preservation*). But what he really means is *miraculous preservation*.

For example, in an article<sup>14</sup> subheading, ‘Affirmation of VPI and VPP’, Dr. Khoo wrote,

“I do affirm the biblical doctrine of **providential preservation** that the inspired words of the Hebrew OT Scriptures and the Greek NT Scriptures are ‘kept pure in all ages’....”

In another article<sup>15</sup> Dr. Khoo clarified his position on ‘*providential preservation*’

“The ‘providential’ preservation of Scriptures is understood as God’s *special* and not general providence. Special providence or *providentia extraordinaria* speaks of **God’s miraculous intervention in the events of history and in the affairs of mankind** in fulfilment of His sovereign will for the sake of His elect and to the glory of His Name...”

So, therefore, the term ‘*providential preservation*’ used by Dr. Khoo should be rightly called ‘*miraculous preservation*’. Dr. Khoo’s insistence on using the term ‘*providential preservation*’ is misleading and confusing. His motive for doing so is that Christians who are unaware would be led astray into thinking that VPP’s teaching on ‘*preservation*’ conforms to mainstream Christianity.

An example of VPP teaching on ‘*preservation*’ is given by Dr. Khoo as follows:

“**Could God have restored for His Church all of His inspired and preserved words in the days of the Reformation? As the all-powerful God, He certainly could, and by faith we believe He surely did.** Just as He restored the Old Covenant words of His Decalogue through His servant Moses (Exod 19:16-21:26, 31:18-32:28, 34:1-4; Deut 5:1-29, 9:20-21, 10:1-5), and all His words in the scroll which Jehoiakim cut up and burned (Jer 36:1-32), so we believe the Lord has similarly done for His New Testament words which have been kept pure in the Traditional and Majority manuscripts and are now found in the Printed Text of the Protestant Reformation—the time-tested and time-honoured Textus Receptus underlying the KJV.”<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> He used the term ‘*providential preservation*’ at least five times in his recent book *Theology for Every Christian*

<sup>14</sup> J. Khoo, *A Plea For A Perfect Bible*, p. 13, The Burning Bush, January 2003.

<sup>15</sup> J. Khoo, *Verbal Plenary Preservation (VPP) of Sacred Scriptures*, p. 2, The Burning Bush, January 2006.

<sup>16</sup> J. Khoo, *In Defence Of The Far Eastern Bible College, The Reformed Faith, And The Reformation Bible*, p. 78, The Burning Bush, July 2006.

## Review Of The VPP Heresy

It is, therefore, very clear that the ‘*preservation*’ spoken of by Dr. Khoo takes on a whole different meaning from that understood by Trinitarian Bible Society (TBS), International Council of Christian Churches (ICCC). For example, the TBS meaning of the ‘preservation’ of Scriptures is given by Rev. M. H. Watts who is also the President of the TBS:

“God has preserved His Word. This is not to be understood as meaning that, throughout history, God has performed repeated miracles, nor that He has "inspired" the various rabbis and scribes who worked on the text. We concede that the autographs have long since perished and that some errors have crept into the copies now available to us. **Hence there is need for textual criticism.**”<sup>17</sup> (TBS)

Two important characteristics typifies this type of *preservation*

- (a) some **errors** have crept into the copies now available,
- (b) there is a need **textual criticism**.

This kind of preservation is called **providential preservation**.

Rev. Watts uses a definition which he took from Professor John Skilton from Westminster Theological Seminary.

“The doctrine of "providential preservation" requires careful definition. What exactly do we mean by it? Here, I would quote the words of Professor John H. Skilton: "God who gave the Scriptures, who works all things after the counsel of his will, has exercised a remarkable care over his Word, has preserved it in all ages in a state of **essential** purity, and has enabled it to accomplish the purpose for which he gave it”.<sup>18</sup>

Note that in **providential preservation**, the Scriptures are preserved in a state of **essential** purity, whereas for **miraculous (supernatural) preservation**, the Scriptures are preserved in a state of **absolute** purity. The reason being that in **miraculous** or **(supernatural) preservation**, the Holy Spirit would have had actively superintended the preservation process to ensure accuracy in all the manuscripts and there would absolutely be no variant readings between them. {please refer to point 6, on p.6, on FEBC’s teaching on preservation of Scriptures}

### (iii) **Misquoting the KJV translators.**

In his ‘question and answer’ book<sup>19</sup> on the KJV, Dr. Khoo answered his rhetorical question, “*What did the KJV translators mean when they said that ‘the meanest translation’ is still ‘the Word of God’?*”

“...It is clear that by the word ‘meanest’ they do not mean ‘worst’ (i.e. ‘evil in the highest degree’). Who would dare mistranslate the king’s speech?”

<sup>17</sup> M. H. Watts (President of TBS), *The Lord Gave the Word: A Study in the History of the Biblical Text*

<sup>18</sup> M. H. Watts (President of TBS) quoting John H. Skilton, *The Transmission of the Scriptures* in ), *The Lord Gave the Word: A Study in the History of the Biblical Text*

<sup>19</sup> J. Khoo, *KJV, Questions and Answers*, p.12

## Review Of The VPP Heresy

Clearly they were not talking about **sense but style**. By ‘meanest’ they meant poor in literary grace.”

However, on checking the source, Dr. Khoo left out the phrase, “*nor peradventure so fitly for phrase, nor so expressly for sense, everywhere.*”<sup>20</sup> (please refer to Appendix A for details)

### (iv) **Misquoting E.F. Hills and John Owen, and made false claims about Trinitarian Bible Society and G.I. Williamson subscribing to VPP.**

In 6<sup>th</sup> November 2005, the Calvary B-P Church at Jurong under Rev. James Chan published a document to explain why the church had taken a stand against VPP a month earlier. The document, ‘*Explanation Of Our Non-VPP Stand*’, showed detail evidence of VPP proponents from the FEBC misquoting E.F. Hills and John Owen, and misrepresenting the Trinitarian Bible Society and G.I. Williamson as subscribing to VPP<sup>21</sup>.

It is sad and surprising to see what length the Academic Dean of the FEBC and Elder of True Life B-P would go to *mislead, misquote* and *misrepresent* good Christian people and organizations to promote VPP of the KJV underlying texts.

## 5. VPP PROPONENTS BELIEVE IN THE PERFECTION OF THE KJV.

Although VPP proponents are careful not to say that the KJV bible is inspired, they would, nevertheless, deny that it is not perfect. In the article ‘*A Plea for a Perfect Bible*’, Dr. Khoo from the FEBC asserted that the KJV is **the only perfect Bible**<sup>22</sup>.

In a recent book, ‘*Theology for Every Christian*’, FEBC, again, made the assertion that the KJV is perfect.

“...we must categorically deny that our Bible contains any mistake or error (scribal or otherwise). But it is troubling that certain evangelicals and fundamentalists would rather choose to deny the present infallibility and inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures by considering the ‘discrepancies’ found in 1 Samuel 13:1 and 2 Chronicles 22:2 and other like passages to be actual instead of apparent discrepancies, and calling them ‘scribal errors.’”<sup>23</sup>

In answering his rhetorical question, “*Can we say we have a Perfect Bible today?*”, Dr. Khoo answered

---

<sup>20</sup> *The Translators to the Readers*, found in the 1611 version of the KJV Bible.

<sup>21</sup> *Explanation Of Our Non-VPP Stand*, <http://www.truth.sg/response/caljurong.htm>

<sup>22</sup> Refer to APPENDIX B, J. Khoo, *A Plea For A Perfect Bible*, p.11, under the column ‘ALL PERFECT, Perfect Then and Now’, the KJV is listed as the only perfect Bible.

<sup>23</sup> J. Khoo and T. Tow, *Theology for Every Christian*, p. 83-84

## Review Of The VPP Heresy

“Of course we can! By ‘perfect’ we mean the Bible is infallible (incapable of error) and inerrant (without mistakes)<sup>24</sup>.

Again FEBC implied the perfection of the KJV when discussing *Knowing Our BP Faith* in its website

“The Bible **in our hands today** is not only 100% inspired but also 100% preserved... There is only one Bible today...”<sup>25</sup>

The remark is made by the FEBC as *‘the Bible in our hands today’*. Surely, the Bible in our hands today for the B-P is the KJV Bible. Earlier we saw how Dr. Khoo claimed perfection for the KJV but being also *100% inspired?*

It comes as no surprise for FEBC to teach the perfection of the KJV because the so-called *‘pioneers of rediscovered Truth [of VPP]’* (to quote Rev. Timothy Tow), David Cloud, D. A. Waite and G. Riplinger are key players in the KJV-only movement, and who believe that the KJV Bible is perfect. Please refer to Appendix C for their details about their beliefs regarding the perfection of the KJV and at least one of them claiming the KJV to be given by inspiration.

### 6. FEBC ON PRESERVATION

It is important to note that the FEBC uses the Latin theological term *providentia extraordinaria*, to define what it means by *providential preservation* of Scriptures. As noted earlier (p. 3 of this paper), this term implies that the preservation of Scripture was **miraculous** rather than **providential**. However, the FEBC keeps insisting on using the term *‘providential preservation’* in its articles and this is one of the main causes of confusion.

**The FEBC emphasizes the 1611 event (when the KJV Bible was translated) as significant in the preservation of Scripture. It believes that**

- (a) the preservation of scripture can be compared to canonization in that it has a terminus.**
- (b) God through the KJV translators restored the autographic texts of Holy Scriptures, like the prophets of the Old Testament.**

**For 6(a)**, Dr. Khoo from the FEBC asserts,

“Is there a historical precedent that tells us that God’s providential work can involve a closure, a terminus? The answer is yes.... There was a terminus to the canonisation of Scripture at the Council of Carthage in AD 397. In like manner, the Lord allowed copyist errors and corruptions to enter into the transmission process through the pen of fallible and heretical scribes... in the most opportune time of the Reformation...—God restored from out of a pure stream of preserved Hebrew and Greek manuscripts, the purest Hebrew and

---

<sup>24</sup> J. Khoo, *KJV, Questions and Answers*, p.36

<sup>25</sup> *Knowing Our BP Faith*, <http://www.febc.edu.sg/Knowing%20Our%20B-P%20Faith.htm>

## Review Of The VPP Heresy

Greek Text of all—the Text that underlies our KJV—that accurately reflects the original Scriptures.”<sup>26</sup>

In an earlier article in which Dr. Khoo discusses the same topic, he concluded

“...just as God gradually settled the *Canon* of the New Testament by weaning His churches from non-canonical books, so He did with the *Text* also.”<sup>27</sup>

If the *preservation* of Scriptures is akin to the *canonisation* of Scriptures **who should sit in the council to decide which are the canonical biblical texts and which are not?**

### Preservation and textual criticism

As noted earlier the two important characteristics that typifies *providential preservation*

- some *errors* have crept into the copies now available,
- there is a need for *textual criticism*.

The Christian doctrine of preservation has always been *providential preservation*. Those that truly understand its implication see the **need for textual criticism** because factual evidence shows that not a single manuscript has been perfectly preserved.

VPP proponents, on the other hand, believing in miraculous preservation and therefore having a perfect text does not see the need for textual criticism. Dr. Khoo from the FEBC thinks that **‘textual criticism’ is from Satan**

“Satan hates God’s Word, ...He cunningly contrives rules for interpreting, yea, rather is misinterpreting, Scripture which he hides under a big word ‘hermeneutics,’ and ‘historical criticism,’ and ‘textual criticism.’ ”<sup>28</sup>

Rev. Quek also from the FEBC, calls it a ‘deadly pill’<sup>29</sup>.

**For 6(b)**, Dr. Khoo gives us an example of what he means when he applies the term *providentia extraordinaria*<sup>30</sup>, in describing the preservation of Scriptures.

**“Could God have restored for His Church all of His inspired and preserved words in the days of the Reformation? As the all-powerful God, He certainly could, and by faith we believe He surely did.** Just as He restored the Old Covenant words of His Decalogue through His servant Moses (Exod 19:16-21:26, 31:18-32:28, 34:1-4; Deut 5:1-29, 9:20-21, 10:1-

---

<sup>26</sup> J. Khoo & T. Tow, *Theology for Every Christian*, p. 93-94

<sup>27</sup> J. Khoo, *A Plea For A Perfect Bible*, p. 10, The Burning Bush, January 2003.

<sup>28</sup> J. Khoo & T. Tow, *Theology for Every Christian*, p. v

<sup>29</sup> Quek SY, *The Deadly Pill Called “Textual Criticism”*, elder’s page, 1 Oct 2006, Calvary Pandan BP Church

<sup>30</sup> “extraordinary or special providence, according to which God performs in his wisdom special acts or miracles (*miracula* q.v.) that lie beyond the normal possibilities inherent in secondary causality...” Richard A Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms*, p.252

## Review Of The VPP Heresy

5), and all His words in the scroll which Jehoiakim cut up and burned (Jer 36:1-32), so we believe the Lord has similarly done for His New Testament words which have been kept pure in the Traditional and Majority manuscripts and are now found in the Printed Text of the Protestant Reformation—the time-tested and time-honoured Textus Receptus underlying the KJV.”<sup>31</sup>

“God had providentially guided the KJV translators to produce the purest TR of all.”<sup>32</sup>

“The Lord providentially guided the King James translators to make the right textual decisions. As such, there is no need to improve on the TR underlying the KJV.”<sup>33</sup>

“In light of God’s special providence, that nothing happens by chance, and that history is under His sovereign control, we see that in the fulness of time...God restored from out of a pure stream of preserved Hebrew and Greek manuscripts, the purest Hebrew and Greek Text of all—the Text that underlies our KJV—that accurately reflects the original Scriptures.”<sup>34</sup>

By asserting that God through the KJV translators *restored* the complete autographic text in 1611 like OT prophets, VPP advocates are saying that certain readings<sup>35</sup> in the TR, not found in *any* of the Greek New Testaments manuscripts, but only in the Latin Vulgate, is part of the autograph.

Indeed, the charge by a certain ‘truth’ website<sup>36</sup> that FEBC is promoting *progressive revelation and post-canonical inspiration* is accurate in the face of these evidence. The Bible is very clear that **revelation has ceased and that the canons are closed**. This is expressed in the WCF (1:1),

“...Therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times, and in diverse manners, to reveal Himself, and to declare that His will unto His Church (Heb 1:1); and afterwards, for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the Church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing (Pro

---

<sup>31</sup> J. Khoo, *In Defence Of The Far Eastern Bible College, The Reformed Faith, And The Reformation Bible*, , p.78, The Burning Bush, July 2006.

<sup>32</sup> J. Khoo & T. Tow, *Theology for Every Christian*, p. 90

<sup>33</sup> J. Khoo & T. Tow, *Theology for Every Christian*, p. 90

<sup>34</sup> J. Khoo & T. Tow, *Theology for Every Christian*, p. 93-94

<sup>35</sup> Acts 9:5-6: “After *diqkeis* [“persecuting” in NRSV] (and omitting *alla* [“But” in NRSV] of ver. 6.) the Textus Receptus adds *skleron soi pros kentra laktizein*. (6) *tremōn te kai thambōn eipe, Kurie, ti me thelis poiēsai; kai ho krios pros auton*, which is rendered in the AV [Authorized Version, i.e., KJV] as follows: “it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. (6) And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him.” So far as is known, no Greek witness [manuscript] reads these words at this place; they have been taken from 26:14 and 22:10, and are found here in codices of the Vulgate, with which it<sup>h</sup>p syr<sup>h</sup> with \* cop<sup>G67</sup> substantially agree (all except the Vulgate add after *thambōn* the words *epi to gegonoti auto*, taken from 3:10). The spurious passage came into the Textus Receptus, when Erasmus translated it from the Latin Vulgate into Greek and inserted it in his first edition of the Greek New Testament (Basel, 1516).” Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, Second Edition*, 1994, p. 318

<sup>36</sup> J. Khoo, *In Defence Of The Far Eastern Bible College, The Reformed Faith, And The Reformation Bible*, , p.76, The Burning Bush, July 2006.



## Review Of The VPP Heresy

22:19-21; Isa 8:19, Isa 8:20; Mat 4:4, Mat 4:7, Mat 4:10; Luk 1:3, Luk 1:4; Rom 15:4); which maketh the Holy Scripture to be most necessary(2Ti 3:15; 2Pe 1:19); *those former ways of God's revealing His will unto His people being now ceased (Heb 1:1, Heb 1:2).*"

### 7. VPP PROPONENTS BELIEVE THAT UNLESS CHRISTIANS HAVE A PHYSICAL COPY OF BIBLICAL TEXTS IDENTICAL IN CONTENTS TO THE AUTOGRAPHS THE CHRISTIAN FAITH IS IN DOUBT.

The FEBC has taken VPP to its logical conclusion by making assertions which other VPP advocates only imply. Claim is made that *a denial of VPP means that the central doctrines are called into question*. They are denying that they are Ruckmanites but the conclusions drawn are very similar.

Dr. Khoo implies that the Christian faith is a myth without a perfect KJV.

"If the Church does not have an infallible and an inerrant Scripture, and have it **today**, then her supreme and final authority of faith and practice is all myth."<sup>37</sup>

And if we deny that the KJV is perfect then the Christian faith is vain. (Note that in the article, *A Plea for a Perfect Bible*, Dr.Khoo claimed perfection for the KJV)

"If the Bible today contains mistakes, how can we know for certain that our faith is sure?...Are we still not in our sins? Christians are a most miserable lot for sure!"<sup>38</sup>

The Bible today as most of us in B-P churches know it is the KJV. We know that there are some translation errors in the KJV e.g. 'Easter', which should have been translated 'Passover' in Acts 12:4.

Dr. Koshy<sup>39</sup> gave twelve consequences when VPP is denied (refer to Appendix D), **advocating that the Church is built on VPP-KJV and not Christ**.

VPP proponents do gravely err in insisting that Christians must have in their possession Bibles that are exact replica of the autographs to be sure of their salvation. If not, the claims of truths by our Lord Jesus would be false and Christianity would be a sham and a myth. This assertion by the VPP proponents is a *heresy* because our assurance of salvation, and the claim of truths by Jesus as taught in the Bible, is solely dependent upon *the inward work of the Holy Spirit bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts*. As expressed in the Westminster Confession of Faith(1:5), "*...our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts(Isa 59:21; John16:13, John16:14; 1Cor 2:10-12; 1John 2:20, 1John 2:27).*"

---

<sup>37</sup> J. Khoo & T. Tow, *Theology for Every Christian*, p. 99

<sup>38</sup> Knowing Our BP Faith, <http://www.febc.edu.sg/Knowing%20Our%20B-P%20Faith.htm>

<sup>39</sup> Lecture on VPP given in Truth BP church. [http://www.truthbpc.com/v2/main.php?menu=resources&page=resources/vpp\\_toc](http://www.truthbpc.com/v2/main.php?menu=resources&page=resources/vpp_toc)

## Review Of The VPP Heresy

### 8. INERRANT AUTOGRAPHS AND MISTAKES IN COPIES IS NOT A NEW CONCEPT.

VPP proponents accuse conservative evangelical churches of not believing in the inerrancy of the Bible, as Dr. Khoo puts it

“Many evangelical Bible Colleges and Seminaries today teach that the Bible was only infallible and inerrant in the past, **but no longer infallible and inerrant today**. According to popular theology, the Bible today contains ‘insignificant mistakes,’ ‘redundant words,’ and so-called ‘scribal errors.’<sup>40</sup>”

He calls this “Warfield’s novel concept of *Sola Autographa*”<sup>41</sup>. However, Dr. Khoo and other VPP proponents are mistaken. This is not a new concept because Augustine of Hippo, in replying a letter (AD 405) to St. Jerome of Stridonium wrote,

“For I confess to your Charity that I have learned to yield this respect and honour only to the canonical books of Scripture: *of these alone do I most firmly believe that the authors were completely free from error*. And if in these writings I am perplexed by anything which appears to me opposed to truth, *I do not hesitate to suppose that either the manuscript is faulty*, or the translator has not caught the meaning of what was said, or I myself have failed to understand it...”<sup>42</sup>

Augustine knew full well that the autographs were infallible and inerrant but these qualities do not carry over to the copies of manuscripts (apographs), because in the copying process errors are made.

### 9. COMMENTS ON THE TENETS<sup>43</sup> OF VERBAL PLENARY PRESERVATION OF SCRIPTURE (VPP) UPHELD BY THE FAR EASTERN BIBLE COLLEGE.

Although the term “VPP” was used by advocates of the extreme KJV-only movement, it was popularised, promoted and developed into a “doctrine” by the FEBC.

Article 2: This article of the tenet explicitly states that VPP holds to the miraculous preservation (*providential extraordinaria*) of Scriptures. Conservative evangelical Christians hold to the providential preservation of Scriptures.

Article 3: Apographs are inerrant and infallible in so far as they reflect the Autographs. Errors, omissions and additions to Apographs do not make the Bible errant or fallible because these qualities are no part of the Bible.

Article 4: Conservative evangelicals believe that the words of Scripture are preserved in **all** the manuscripts. The Westcott and Hort texts are based to a large extent on the *Codex Sinaiticus* and the *Codex Vaticanus*. The way the *Codex Sinaiticus* was discovered by Constantin von

---

<sup>40</sup> J. Khoo & T. Tow, *Theology for Every Christian*, p.119

<sup>41</sup> J. Khoo & T. Tow, *Theology for Every Christian*, p.100

<sup>42</sup> <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1102082.htm> (Church Fathers, Augustine, Letter 82)

<sup>43</sup> See APPENDIX E

## Review Of The VPP Heresy

Tischendorf in the Monastery of Saint Catherine, at the foot of Mount Sinai in Egypt testified to the way God has providentially preserved the words of Scripture. He found in a basket of manuscript pieces of the Old Testament which according to the monastery librarian "were rubbish which was to be destroyed by burning it in the ovens".

Article 5: Indeed, there are no errors in the Bible. The correct meaning of any discrepancy found in Apographs are to be corrected within the texts of Scripture. (WCF.1:9)

Article 6: It is strange indeed to declare D.A. Waite an expert in "textual recognition". To make a mere man an expert is God-dishonouring, that job is best left to the Holy Spirit working in the hearts of believers. (WCF 1:5)

Article 7. This article plainly **contradicts** article 4, because the Chinese Union Bible (和合本), published in 1919 is based on the Westcott and Hort (W&H) texts. Article 4 of the VPP tenet accuses the W&H texts as corrupt. If W&H texts are corrupt and cannot be considered the Word of God, the Chinese Union Version which is based on the W&H, according to VPP theory, must not be considered the Word of God. Yet, article 7 of the VPP tenets says the CUV is "the best, most faithful, most reliable, and most accurate version" and commend it as a "Word of God". **VPP theory must, therefore, be rejected because it is confused and, not based on truth and reason which is the underlying theme of God's Word.**

VPP theory is symptomatic of modern day philosophies and religions which emphasises personal experiences and downplay the use of reason. It abandons truth, reason and the serious thought process for sentimental religious escapism and what is falsely called 'faith', or as VPP advocates say 'logic of faith'. 'Religious truth' is separated from the historical truth of the Holy Scriptures. There is therefore, no place for reason and, historical facts are relegated to the realm of fairy stories.

For example, VPP proponents claim that God restored the contents of the Original texts through the KJV translators. However, the KJV translators wrote in the preface of the 1611 version that they were translating the Bible into the English language and not restoring the autographical text. **They were KJV translators and not KJV prophets.**

### 9. CONCLUSION

The Lord Jesus told the Pharisees that their diligent search of the Scriptures, and having them could not save them (John 5:39) much less possessing copies of Scripture identical to the complete autographs.

We have reviewed the teaching of VPP carefully and conclude that it has no biblical foundation. It is at best an opinion or a personal conviction. Taken it its logical conclusion, as FEBC has done, **VPP is a heresy.** The words of Dr. Price is most apt in describing VPP-KJV, **"in dealing with the text of Scripture, one is obligated to work with reliable evidence, not with history reconstructed after a theological agenda"**<sup>44</sup>.

---

<sup>44</sup> J.D. Price, *King James Onlyism*, p. 171

## Review Of The VPP Heresy

### APPENDIX A

*Note: In misquoting the KJV translators, Dr. Khoo from the FEBC left out the phrase that is in bold and underlined.*

**What did the KJV translators mean when they said that “the meanest translation” is still “the Word of God”?**<sup>45</sup>

The 1611 Preface of the KJV is often used by anti-KJVists to support the corrupt modern versions. They argue that in that Preface the KJV translators themselves viewed even the worst English versions as the Word of God.

Did the KJV translators really say that every translation of the Bible even if filled with grammatical, translational, or doctrinal errors could be rightly called the Word of God? They certainly did not. The context in which they wrote those words clearly reveals this: **“Now to the latter we answer, that we do not deny, nay, we affirm and avow, that the very *meanest* translation of the Bible in English set forth by men of our profession (for we have seen none of theirs of the whole Bible as yet) containeth the word of God, nay, is the word of God: as the King’s speech which he uttered in parliament, being translated into French, Dutch, Italian, and Latin, is still the King’s speech, though it be not interpreted by every translator *with the like grace.*”**

It is clear that by the word “meanest” they do not mean “worst” (i.e. “evil in the highest degree”). Who would dare mistranslate the king’s speech? Clearly they were not talking about sense but *style*. By “meanest” they meant *poor in literary grace*. When beginning Greek students translate their Greek Bible into English, it may be rough and wooden; but if literal and precise, it is the Word of God. The KJV translators, some of whom were Puritans, certainly did not humour wicked or corrupt versions. It is utterly ridiculous and absurd to suggest that they did.

Anti-KJVists have thus put words into the mouths of the King James translators to make them mean what they did not mean by “meanest” in a mean attempt to demean the Pro-KJV position.

#### **WHAT THE KJV TRANSLATORS REALLY SAID.**

“Now to the latter we answer, that we do not deny, nay, we affirm and avow, that the very meanest translation of the Bible in English, set forth by men of our profession, (for we have seen none of theirs of the whole Bible as yet) containeth the Word of God, nay, is the Word of God. As the King’s Speech which he uttered in Parliament, being translated into *French, Dutch, Italian, and Latin*, is still the King’s Speech, though it be not interpreted by every translator with the like grace, **nor peradventure so fitly for phrase, nor so expressly for sense, everywhere.**”<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> J. Khoo, *KJV, Questions and Answers*, p.12

<sup>46</sup> *The Translators to the Readers*, found in the 1611 version of the KJV Bible.

# Review Of The VPP Heresy

## APPENDIX B

### A PLEA FOR A PERFECT BIBLE

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

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

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

# Review Of The VPP Heresy

## APPENDIX C

### PIONEERS OR REDISCOVERED TRUTH

**Dr. Waite**, in his book, “Defending the King James Bible” p. 48, wrote,

“...it is my own personal conviction and belief, after studying this subject since 1971, that the WORDS of the Received Greek and Masoretic Hebrew texts that underlie the KING JAMES BIBLE are the very WORDS which God has preserved down through the centuries, being the exact WORDS of the ORIGINALS.”

**G. Riplinger**, in addition to believing in the inspiration of the KJV, stated categorically that “*The new birth occurs from the KJV seed*<sup>47</sup>.” And, that people may “...receive a false salvation or a false spirit from reading them<sup>48</sup> [modern Bible versions]”

The Trinitarian Bible Society in reviewing her book, “*New Age Bible Versions*”, concluded that it was not trustworthy.

"She makes her statements without differentiating between the various translations, nor with differentiation between the reasons for the fallacies in these translations (e.g., text, translation principles, etc.). ... In addition, the book contains many factual errors, false innuendoes, mistakes in logic, misquotations and instances of misleading research as well as general English language errors [in accompanying appendixes examples are given of each of these charges]. ... It is therefore recommended that this book be read with the utmost discernment and that nothing be taken at face value. As far as is possible, the reader is encouraged to verify the truth of the information presented in this book before accepting and repeating the information to others. Because of the vast number of problems with this book, the Trinitarian Bible Society believe it is not trustworthy and therefore should not be used to defend the Authorised Version"<sup>49</sup>

**David Cloud** in the introductory chapter of the book, ‘*For Love of the Bible*’<sup>50</sup>, claimed the perfection of the KJV,

“Though there is a serious difference between the various applications of this position [King James Only], and I personally take exception to any position

---

<sup>47</sup> G Riplinger, *Which Bible is God's Word*, p.12

<sup>48</sup> G Riplinger, *Which Bible is God's Word*, p.80

<sup>49</sup> Trinitarian Bible Society, *A Review of New Age Bible Versions*, 1994 (quoted by D. Cloud, *Examining the King James Only Controversy*.) <http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/examining01.htm>

<sup>50</sup> <http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/kingjamesonlyism.htm>

## Review Of The VPP Heresy

which claims that we no longer have a perfect Bible, ... I do not believe the King James Bible contains any errors.”

Although Cloud is not a Ruckmanite, he nevertheless is sympathetic to his (Ruckman) views and thinks well of him.

I believe Peter Ruckman is a saved man who knows and loves the Lord and who is genuinely zealous for God's Word, but something is strange and twisted about the man...Though we don't agree with Dr. Ruckman on many points... there can be no doubt that he is a Christian scholar.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> D. Cloud, *Examining the King James Only Controversy*. <http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/examining01.htm>

## Review Of The VPP Heresy

### APPENDIX D

*Note: Dr. Koshy lectured on VPP in Truth B-P Church.*

If we reject the Perfect Preservation of the Bible, then we concede that:

1. We don't have the inspired Word of God intact, as the words of the originals are not kept pure (cf. 2 Timothy 3:16).
2. We don't have an absolutely infallible, inerrant Word of God, even though the Lord promises a perfect Word of God forever (cf. Psalm 19:7-9).
3. God is unfaithful in keeping His repeated promise that He will preserve His Word forever (cf. Psalm 12:6-7; Psalm 111:7-8; Psalm 119:89, 152, 160).
4. Jesus' promises, such as, "my words shall not pass away," are unreliable (Matthew 24:35; Mark 13:31; Luke 21:33).
5. Jesus did not mean what He said, because the Bible is not preserved as He uttered - "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matthew 5:18; cf. Luke 16:17).
6. God was so incapacitated by the errors of man and dark events of history that He failed to keep His promises concerning the Preservation of His Word. (It also casts doubt on God's sovereignty, providence, omnipotence, omniscience, etc.)
7. The faith of the Old Testament prophets and saints that God's Word will be kept intact forever is a false faith. "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever" (Isaiah 40:8). "The fear of the LORD is clean, enduring for ever: the judgments of the LORD are true and righteous altogether" (Psalm 19:9).
8. The affirmation of the apostles of Christ and the New Testament writers that God's Word will be kept intact forever is false. (Matthew, Mark and Luke quoted Jesus' affirmation of the Preservation of God's Word, cf. 1 Peter 1:25).
9. Our forefathers' faith that the Word of God "by His singular care and providence, kept pure in all ages" is not acceptable (Westminster Confession of Faith I.VIII).
10. Anyone can question the authenticity and authority of the words in the Bible (cf. John 17:17).
11. Some parts of the Bible must be subjected to the "scholarly opinion" of certain individuals. When those intellectuals point to us where the Bible is allegedly wrong, we should believe them more than the Bible itself (cf. Matthew 5:17-19).
12. It is wrong to have the presupposition that believers have an absolutely trustworthy, perfect Bible (cf. Psalm 18:30; Psalm 111:7-8; Psalm 119:128).



## Review Of The VPP Heresy

### APPENDIX E

**The Far Eastern Bible College upholds the VPP of Scripture and believes in the following tenets:**

(1) God has supernaturally preserved each and every one of His inspired Hebrew/Aramaic OT words and Greek NT words to the last jot and tittle, so that in every age, God's people will always have in their possession His infallible and inerrant Word kept intact without the loss of any word (Ps 12:6-7, Matt 5:18, 24:35, Mark 13:31, Luke 21:33, John 10:35).

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

(3) The Bible is not only infallible and inerrant in the past (in the Autographs), but also infallible and inerrant today (in the Apographs).

(4) The infallible and inerrant words of Scripture are found in the faithfully preserved Traditional/Byzantine/Majority manuscripts, and fully represented in the Printed and Received Text (or Textus Receptus) that underlie the Reformation Bibles best represented by the KJV, and **NOT** in the corrupted and rejected texts of Westcott and Hort that underlie the many modern versions of the English Bible like the NIV, NASV, ESV, RSV, TEV, CEV, TLB etc.

(5) There are no mistakes in the Bible, period. If there are "discrepancies" in the Bible, the "discrepancies" are only seeming or apparent, **NOT** real or actual. Any inability to understand or explain difficult passages in the Bible in no way negates its infallibility and inerrancy, applying the faithful Pauline principle of biblical interpretation: "let God be true, but every man a liar" (Rom 3:4).

(6) Knowing where the perfect Bible is is a matter of textual recognition and **NOT** textual criticism. In the field of textual recognition, Burgon is good, Hills is better, Waite is best.

(7) The Chinese Union Version (CUV) is the "Word of God" for the Chinese people today since it is the best, most faithful, most reliable, and most accurate version among the Chinese versions presently available. Great care ought to be taken not to undermine our Chinese brethren's confidence in the CUV. Nevertheless, versions or translations are never superior to the inspired and preserved Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Scriptures; thus there is a need to consult these original language Scriptures for clarity and fulness of meaning, and to compare Scripture with Scripture.