

Sunday, January 25, 2026—Grace Life School of Theology—*From This Generation For Ever*
 Lesson 275 Assessing the Printed History of the King James Text (PCE: Purified Seven Times Argument)

Introduction

- [Lesson 274](#) explored the Historicist interpretation of Revelation as a foundational pillar of the Pure Cambridge Edition (PCE) position. This perspective views Revelation not merely as a prophecy of future events but as a panoramic outline of church history, culminating in the emergence of the PCE around 1900. Advocates argue that passages such as Revelation 10—the “little book” and the “seven thunders”—symbolize the progressive purification of God’s Word in English, aligning with Psalm 12:6–7 and the concept of sevenfold refinement.
- All told Lesson 274 considered the following points regarding the PCE position:
 - Historicist Interpretation as a Pillar of the PCE Position—Revelation is viewed as a prophetic outline of church history, supporting the emergence of the PCE.
 - Contrast Between Historicist and Futurist Views of Revelation
 - Historicist: Revelation unfolds progressively through history.
 - Futurist: Revelation primarily predicts future events before Christ’s return.
 - Prophetic Framework Applied to the PCE—Revelation 10’s “little book” interpreted as the King James Bible in its perfected form. Seven thunders linked to seven stages of purification, culminating in the PCE.
 - Church Restitution and End-Time Role of the PCE—The PCE is presented as essential for restoring truth and preparing the Church for Christ’s coming.
 - Layered Fulfillment of Prophecy—Prophecies can have multiple valid interpretations across different historical and future contexts.
 - Providence of English as Global Language—English positioned as God’s chosen language for worldwide Gospel proclamation. The PCE is affirmed as the enduring standard beyond the year 2000.
 - Summary of Verschuur’s Argument—Integration of historicist and moderate futurist perspectives to validate the PCE as divinely appointed.
- Matthew Verschuur’s framework blends historicist and futurist elements, asserting that prophecy can have layered fulfillments, both historical and eschatological. This interpretation positions the PCE as the providentially perfected form of Scripture, essential for the Church’s restitution and

global proclamation in the last days. Understanding this theological and prophetic foundation sets the stage for evaluating the next pillar of the PCE position.

- In this Lesson we will consider the following additional pillar of the PCE position:
 - Psalm 12 & The Double Purified 7 Times Argument
- Unless otherwise noted, all the citations in this Lesson are taken from the [*Guide to the PCE*](#) and follow the pagination in the PDF document.
- *Disclaimer:* if the PCE position was just a personal preference/belief that the circa 1900 Cambridge text was/is the most accurately printed text of the KJB, I would not have a problem with it. Unfortunately, however, the PCE position, as enunciated by Matthew Verschuur, is much more than mere editorial preference; it is an exclusive KJB edition advocacy position that is built upon layers of doctrinal, philosophical, theological, and historical strata that need to be unpacked and understood. This is borne out by his written works, YouTube videos, and comments on the Textus Receptus Academy Facebook page. My decision to include extended coverage of the PCE position in this class is consistent with the overall theme of the class to enunciate a position on the King James Bible that begins with faith-based presuppositions and does not deny the facts of history or break the laws of logic. Our survey of the printed history of the text has been a prolonged case study in why *verbatim identity* of wording is not a tenable position.

Psalm 12 & The Double Purified 7 Times Argument

- Matthew Verschuur uses Psalm 12:6–7 as a cornerstone for arguing that the PCE is the final, perfect form of the King James Bible. The passage serves as a prophetic and doctrinal basis for believing that the King James Bible has undergone seven divine stages of refinement, culminating in the PCE around 1900.

- Historical Process of Purification

- “The appearance of the pure Word in its final form was not instantaneous. Between inspiration and the present time, the pure words must have passed through the process of purification. From the time of the inspiration there was a scattering. The pure Word was present, but needing to be purified. The Scripture gives a finite number: seven.

The Word was pure before the Protestant Reformation, but this was generally true rather than specifically so in any place. Therefore, in English, there was the process of gathering in one volume of the book, as it were, the successive purifications of the text and translation of the Bible. The refining of the English Bible versions is one of refining in the by the process of purification, because Protestants went from Tyndale to better new versions, such as the Geneva

Version. Furthermore, things were not always properly translated, for example in the Bishops' Bible. The translators saw that their work was to improve the former English translations — indeed, their instructions were to consult them all. The outworking of this matter required the process of purification to have its full course, which resulted in the appearance of both the correct version, and an exact translation in English of God's pure Word." (128)

- This is linked to the seven major English Bible revisions culminating in the King James Bible and its final refinement in the PCE.

- Fulfillment in the PCE

- "Thus, in the midst of the worst Papal darkness of history, the Word was pure, though the exact text was not gathered together in one place, but it was scattered in many various manuscripts and among a great host of witnesses. And it came to pass, in the process of the fullness of time that the Pure Cambridge Edition was the last and final gathering of the words, answering exactly to the heavenly volume of the book.

Thus the fulfilment, "Seek ye out of the book of the LORD, and read: no one of these shall fail, none shall want her mate: for my mouth it hath commanded, and his spirit it hath gathered them." (Isaiah 34:16)." (122)

- Here Verschuur claims the PCE fulfills the prophecy of Psalm 12:6–7 and Isaiah 34:16 by being the ultimate purified form.

- Seven Purifications and Prophetic Connection

- "The work of the translators was pure, but the King James Bible, in the history of its printing had to pass through seven purifications itself, so that with the completion of a seventh purification edition of the King James Bible, that is, the Pure Cambridge Edition, the English Bible could at last be free from all impurity." (128)

- The PCE position explicitly teaches two distinct sevenfold purification processes, and Verschuur explains this in detail.

- First Sevenfold Purification – English Bible History

- "That the Word is preserved in a state of purity, and by purifications leads to the conclusion that the Word must be presently available pure and perfect in the Earth. Furthermore, it will be discernable that seven modes or phases or happenings of purification occurred to it, as the Scripture predicts, "seven times".

The appearance of the King James Bible, known also as the Authorized Version, is in fact the seventh purification, directly advancing upon six purifications which came before it. This implies that the production of English Bibles leading to the King James Bible are generally cumulative, and accrue in goodness. There are seven English Bibles which match to the principle of seven purifications, which are easily historically identified. What Tyndale started, the others continued and followed, until the appearance of the seventh. They are:

1. Tyndale
2. Matthew
3. Coverdale
4. Great
5. Geneva
6. Bishops'

With these identified, the seventh, as fulfilment of the prophecy in the psalm, would have to be the Authorized King James Bible.

In counting seven purifications, it must be that all Old English (e.g. Alfred's) or Middle English (e.g. Wycliffe's) works are not included. First, this is because they do not directly feed into the Authorized Version [Recent research by Alex Bojko on William Tyndale strongly questions this assumption.], and are based on the Vulgate. Second, they were not printed, but handwritten, and had a relatively limited circulation. Third, they are in substantially different forms of the English language. Wycliffe's Version, while having some recognisable words, has many incomprehensible words, and a different word order; whereas, Tyndale is more familiar, taking into account typographical errors and old spelling, because its wording is often copied in full or in majority in the Authorized Version.

Taverner's Bible of 1539 is not included because it did not contribute in any meaningful way to Protestant Versions. The Rheims-Douay Version is not counted because it is not a Protestant Version, and being based on the Vulgate, does not directly fall into the lineage of the English Bible." (90)

- "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." (Psalm 12:6, 7). The King James Bible of 1611 was pure in its underlying text and translation, and it was a purification of the six main Protestant Bibles which came before it, Tyndale, Matthew, Coverdale, Great, Geneva and Bishops'.

All of these were printed in the method based on that invented by Gutenberg, and Gutenberg's method would be employed for many years to come." (430)

- These six earlier versions plus the King James Bible itself represent the seven purifications leading to the 1611 Authorized Version.

- Second Sevenfold Purification—King James Bible Editions
 - “The work of the translators was pure, but the King James Bible, in the history of its printing had to pass through seven purifications itself, so that with the completion of a seventh purification edition of the King James Bible, that is, the Pure Cambridge Edition, the English Bible could at last be free from all impurity.” (128)
 - He explicitly ties the “seven times” to seven historical purifications of the King James Bible, culminating in the PCE. So, the PCE is the seventh purification of the seventh purification.
- The second sevenfold purification refers to the historical process by which the King James Bible underwent successive refinements after its initial 1611 publication, culminating in the PCE. Here is what is counted in the second sevenfold purification (i.e., the seven major purifications of the Authorized Version itself):
 - First 1611 Edition (“He” Bible)—Printed by Barker, London, Folio.
 - Second 1611 Edition (“She” Bible)—Barker, London, Folio.
 - 1613 Edition—Barker, London, Folio.
 - 1629 Cambridge Edition—Printed by Thomas and John Buck, Cambridge, Folio.
 - 1638 Cambridge Edition—Printed by Thomas Buck and Roger Daniel, Cambridge, Folio; editors included John Bois, Samuel Ward, Joseph Mede, and Thomas Goad.
 - 1769 Oxford Edition—Edited by Benjamin Blayney, Oxford, Folio.
 - Pure Cambridge Edition (circa 1900)—Cambridge University Press (e.g., C. F. Clay or J. B. Peace), later Collins and others. (184)
- Verschuur considers the preceding list the major “authentic revisions” leading to the final purified form of the King James Bible, culminating in the PCE. (184) Bible Protector subjectively makes a distinction between “authentic revisions” and “demi-standards” (The word “demi-standard(s)” generally refers to something that is half the size or a partial version of a standard item, or occasionally something considered less than fully standard.) as in the case of 1762 because it was surpassed by the 1769. (154)
 - “The 1762 [Paris] was not the actual standard, in that while it became the basis for Bible printing by Cambridge until it finally abandoned it in or by the 1830s, Cambridge also made various adjustments in the presentation, thus, J. Smith’s edition of 1817 which

introduced certain renderings. In reality, the 1762 was at most a demi-standard, *which has rightly not been counted as one of the major purification editions of the King James Bible. . .*” (154)

- F.H.A. Scrivener, David Norton, Gordon Campbell, and Laurence M. Vance would all disagree with Verschuur’s proclamation that the 1762 is a “demi-standard.”
- Likewise, Dr. Anthony Scattergood’s work on the text for Cambridge University in the 1670s and 1680s are not counted as “authentic revisions” by Verschuur. The following quote demonstrates that Scattergood’s 1683 work is acknowledged as part of the historical process of refining the King James Bible text. Therefore, Scattergood’s work is not to be counted among the seven major purifications because those editions are defined by broad, providentially recognized revisions that became enduring standards.
 - “Thomas Turton wrote, “Dr Adam Clarke states, in the General Preface to his Bible, that our Authorized Version was corrected ‘by Dr Scattergood, in 1683; by Dr Lloyd, Bishop of London, in 1701; and afterwards by Dr Paris, at Cambridge.’ Dr Scattergood was a learned member of the University of Oxford ... It is singular that Dr Clarke should have mentioned Dr Lloyd (also a member of the University of Oxford) as Bishop of London. Bishop of London that eminent prelate never was. He died Bishop of Worcester, in 1717. Dr Paris was a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. He was distinguished for his attainments in his life-time; and is still commemorated, as a Benefactor to his College. His edition of the Bible was published, in 1762, in two Quarto Volumes. It is a correct and beautifully printed work.” (152)
- According to Verschuur, Scattergood’s work was a minor scholarly correction without broad historical impact. Therefore, Scattergood’s work is not evaluated textually in the *Guide* to justify its placement outside the main line of King James Bible refinement.
- In [Lesson 250](#) (originally taught on 12/22/24) we began discussing the influence of an overlooked 1683 Cambridge Quarto edition (H780) upon the printed history of the text. This edition had been passed over by Drs. Norton, Campbell, and Vance in their respective collations and histories of the text. Recall that these men had focused their efforts primarily on the flagship folio editions from 1611, 1629, 1638, 1762, and 1769. With the help of Christopher Yetzer, we were able to state the following on pages 13-14 of Lesson 250:
 - “Christopher Yetzer produced an Excel Spreadsheet listing all the examples of changes attributed to Parris by Norton in the main text *A Textual History of the King James Bible* (This does not include any additional examples that might be found in Appendix 8 at the back of the book.). Of the 63 examples contained in the list, 23 of them, or 36.5%, had already been edited in 1683 by Cambridge University Press in their quarto edition. In addition to the eight examples already covered in Lessons 249 and 250, please note the following additional changes found in the 1683 Cambridge quarto. Lastly, the “Other”

column records editions other than the 1683 Cambridge which contain the change, although it should not be taken as definitive since not every printing was checked.” (Ross, 13)

Verse	Change	Nature of Change	Other
Genesis 23:18	“gates” to “gate”	Plural to singular	Also, in 1640 Cambridge (46, 63, 65, 71, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 80 etc). It seems to have been a standard reading after 1640.
Deuteronomy 4:25	“shalt” to “ye shall”	Added preposition	Also, in 1677 Cambridge Quarto (H736)
Numbers 7:31	“the weight whereof <i>was</i> ”	Added words (4)	This was changed again later.
Numbers 7:55	“of the weight of”	Added words (4)	
Joshua 12:6	“Gadites” to “the Gadites”	Added definite article	1643 London
II Samuel 4:4	“feete, and was fiue yeeres” to “feet. He was five years”	Revised sentence structure	1677 Cambridge
II Samuel 11:1	removed “that”	Removed a word	
I Kings 6:1	“fourscore” to “eightieth”	Revised word choice	
I Kings 15:27	“belongeth” to “belonged”	Revised verb tense	
Psalms 107:19	“trouble: he” to “trouble, and he”	Revised punctuation	Possible harmonization with Psalms 107:6, 13, 28
Isaiah 44:20	“of ashes” to “on ashes”	Changed preposition	1643 London
Jeremiah 1:13	“was” to “is”	Revised verb tense	
Zechariah 4:2	“which were” to “which are”	Revised verb tense	
John 12:22	“told Jesus” to “tell Jesus”	Revised verb tense	1620 London, 1677 Cambridge
Acts 24:14	“the prophets” to “in the prophets”	Added preposition	
Acts 25:6	“sitting in” to “sitting on”	Revised preposition	
Romans 11:28	“sake” to “sakes”	Revised from singular to plural	1631, 1635, 1637, etc. 1677 Cambridge
I Corinthians 13:2	“have no charity” to “have not charity”	Revised part of speech	
II Corinthians 11:26	“journeying” to “journeyings”	Singular to plural	1661 London. 1677 Cambridge does not, but 1677 London does.
Revelation 17:2	“inhabiters” to “inhabitants”	Revised word	

- We then concluded Lesson 250 with the following statement regarding the emerging importance of the 1683 Cambridge Quarto (H780) edition.
 - “The 1683 Cambridge Quarto (H780) seems like a massively undervalued edition when assessing the printed history of the text. This is interesting given that the 1683 was the last Cambridge edition to be published until the Parris edition of 1743. Recall that the Cambridge University Press went dormant for a period, in terms of printing Bibles, in the late 17th and early 18th century. Given that more than 35% of the changes ascribed to

Parris by Norton and Campbell had already been made in 1683, one wonders if Parris utilized the last Cambridge printing as the base text for his work.” (Ross, 15)

- [Lesson 251](#) (1/12/25) documented additional changes ascribed to F.S. Parris that had previously been made in the 1683 Cambridge Quarto (H780) edition. Then came [Lesson 252](#) (1/19/25), at which time we considered changes to the pronouns you/ye made by F.S. Parris in 1762. Once again, we learned the following regarding the 1683 Cambridge Quarto (H780) edition:
 - “Recall from above that 193 or 94.6% of the 204 “you/ye” changes catalogued by Vance in Chapter 3, were ascribed to the 1762 and 1769 folio editions of Cambridge and Oxford respectively. Of these 193 changes, my research uncovered that 132 or 68.3% of them had already been made in the 1683 Cambridge Quarto edition (H780). This is a staggeringly high number of edits that were not supposed to have been made until nearly eighty years later.” (Ross, 11)
- Subsequent Lessons continued to track additional editorial revisions that appeared in the 1683 Cambridge Quarto edition prior to the work of F.S. Parris (1743, 1762) and Benjamin Blayney (1769) in the 18th century. Then on February 13, 2025, Alex Bojko and I released a video titled [“RESEARCH BREAKTHROUGH! Uncovering The Identity Of The 1683 Cambridge Editor \(Chat With Alex Bojko\)”](#) revealing the identity of 1683 Cambridge Quarto was Dr. Anthony Scattergood (Click [here](#) to read Alex’s notes.). Until recently, Scattergood’s work on the text has been largely overlooked by those studying and cataloging the printed history of text.
- Scattergood’s work is not a “demi-standard” according to Verschuur’s own subjective reckoning of the difference between a “standard” and “demi-standard.” Scattergood’s work reached well into the 18th century and arguably furnished F.S. Parris with a base text from which Parris worked to prepare his 1743 duodecimo edition for Cambridge University Press as well as the later 1762 folio edition for which he is largely responsible. Why are the editions of Scattergood and/or Parris not counted in Verschuur’s seven-fold purification of the King James Text? Because he needs seven-editions for the math to work for his argument.
- Verschuur's list of what counts as the seven purifications of the KJB text, culminating in the PCE, is a selective and arbitrary categorization based on an incomplete interpretation of the textual history. The actual history of the King James Bible’s printed text is complex and continuous, involving dozens of editorial refinements over centuries. Reducing this to two neat sets of seven is a forced numerological construct, not a reflection of documented history. The “seven purifications” argument is not grounded in historical evidence but is a selective narrative designed to fit a theological interpretation of Psalm 12:6–7. It cherry-picks editions and ignores inconvenient data, making the argument arbitrary and logically unsound.
- Twice in recent blog articles engaging with these Lessons, Verschuur has argued for what he calls “levels of purity.” Consider the following from the article titled [“Framing the PCE position — Part One”](#) from January 7, 2026:

- “The most consequential flaw in Ross’ critique is his refusal to engage in my multi-level framework of purity, despite clear evidence that Ross understands such distinctions exist. At the heart of a lot of Ross’ misunderstanding is a refusal to engage a layered bibliology, one that distinguishes where and how Scripture exists in purity in different levels. The PCE position is not a flat ontology in which Scripture can exist in only one form at one time. Rather, it recognises levels of purity and representation:

Scripture itself

In the mind of God — pure and perfect
 In Heaven — pure and perfect
 In the autographs — pure and perfect
 In faithful copies and translations

Text/Version/Readings

The Textus Receptus tradition
 Foreign and English Protestant translation versions
 The King James Bible (1611) — pure and perfect

Translation

Protestant English translations from Tyndale through the KJB
 The KJB itself — pure and perfect

Edition

Specific editorial forms (e.g., 1769, later Cambridge editions)
 The Pure Cambridge Edition (PCE) itself — pure and perfect

Setting

A particular, editorially stable instantiation of the PCE by having a text file with no typographical error — pure and perfect

Ross repeatedly collapses these levels into one flat category, then accuses the PCE position of denying or being made “more” Scripture than elsewhere. That conclusion only follows because Ross deliberately ignores the framework altogether, and he does so from his biased viewpoint rather than fair dealing.

Of course the PCE cannot be more pure than Scripture in Heaven or the autographs. Of course the PCE can be completely correct without denying or being against other levels of manifestations of Scripture.

It is completely unfair, like comparing apples and oranges, to mix the purity of an edition with the purity of a version. What needs to be understood is that a version needs a pure edition to represent it. The purity of a version is presented correct in an edition. Yet the concepts remain separate, dealing with a version in a textual critical way is entirely different to dealing with typesetting in an orthographic and copy-editorial way. These

separate classes or levels of purity relate in both being able to be present in any copy of Scripture or not.”

- What Bible verses teach the “levels of purity” identified by Verschuur? The proposed multi-level framework of scriptural purity faces significant challenges. Logically, it introduces artificial distinctions between “levels of purity,” creating category confusion and risking circular reasoning. The repeated claim of “pure and perfect” across different levels shifts in meaning—from divine perfection to typographical accuracy—leading to equivocation. Additionally, the argument is non-falsifiable and prone to infinite regression, as no clear criteria determine which level is practically authoritative.
 - Theologically, the framework overemphasizes the material form of Scripture, potentially elevating one edition to near-idolatrous status. It neglects the historic doctrine of God’s providence in broadly preserving His Word and undermines the primacy of original languages by asserting an English edition as “pure and perfect.” Finally, while claiming not to deny other versions, the rhetoric implies exclusivity, conflicting with the universal accessibility of Scripture.
 - The logical error committed by Verschuur’s “levels of purity” argument is known as *fallacy of undifferentiated difference* (also known as the *false equivalence fallacy*). He is making two incompatible claims at the same time:
 - Claim 1—“The KJV as a translation is perfect and pure.”
 - Claim 2—“One particular KJV printing is the uniquely perfect edition.”
- These cannot be both true without contradiction. They assert *difference without distinction*. For example, Verschuur essentially argues “The KJV is perfect as a translation generally yet one specific printing is uniquely perfect.” But the only difference between KJV printings is spelling, punctuation, word order, and sometimes wording itself which are translation-level features. So, if the translation itself is perfect, but one printing differs in translation-level features, then there is now a *real difference* between KJV printings—but no real distinguishing principle allowed. This is because one is not allowed to say the translation differs, since “the translation is perfect.” So the PCE position asserts, “There is a real difference, but no allowed real distinction.” Which is a difference without distinction. This is a logical contradiction.
 - Verschuur’s position also asserts a *distinction without difference*. For instance, the PCE position maintains, “All non-PCE KJBs are still ‘pure and perfect translations’ even though only one edition is actually perfect.” Now the edition is said to differ. Yet the translation is said to be the same and perfect, but the “edition” just is the translation as instantiated. There is no separable ontological object called “translation” floating above its textual instances. So Verschuur is claiming a conceptual distinction (“edition vs translation”)—proves a real

separation of purity. Which is a distinction without difference. He is treating a *category distinction* as if it were an *ontological partition*.

- Thus, Verschuur has locked himself into the following inescapable dilemma. He must choose one of the following options along with its consequence.
 - All KJB editions are equally perfect—No uniquely perfect edition exists
 - One KJB edition is uniquely perfect— Then the KJB translation as such is not perfect
- Verschuur cannot logically affirm both. He is confusing *translation* (an abstract description) with *edition* (the actual text that exists). You cannot make the abstract (translation) perfect while allowing the concrete (edition) to vary and still claim perfection is real. That is like saying, “The blueprint is perfect, but the building that actually exists is flawed — yet the building is still a perfect building.” It is incoherent. This is why this position *must* eventually retreat into mystery, providential faith-assertion, or circularity — it cannot be stabilized logically.
- Applying the genus/species distinction, as used in logic, to the PCE position helps clarify how the *fallacy of undifferentiated difference* operates. Consider the following terms as they relate to the PCE position:
 - Genus = The broader category—KJB editions as a whole (1611 He, 1611 She, 1629 Cambridge, 1638 Cambridge, 1769 Oxford, etc.).
 - Species = A specific member of that category—Pure Cambridge Edition (PCE).
- The PCE position treats the species (PCE) as categorically different from the genus (all KJB editions) in terms of purity, rather than recognizing that they share the same essential nature: they are all editions of the King James Bible conveying the same doctrinal content i.e., verbally equivalent. Here is where the *undifferentiated difference fallacy* comes in:
 - Inflating Trivial Differences—Verschuur argues that the PCE is “pure and perfect” because it corrects minor orthographic or typographical details (e.g., spelling, punctuation). These differences are accidental, not essential, they do not alter the meaning or doctrine of the text. Treating these accidental differences as if they create a new level of purity confuses species-level variation with a genus-level essence.
 - False Hierarchy—By claiming that only the PCE represents “full light” (see section below on page 12), the argument implies that other KJB editions (within the same genus) are deficient in a way that affects their authority. This creates a false hierarchy where the

species (PCE) is elevated above the genus, even though all members share the same essential characteristic: they are faithful representations of the KJB.

- Failure to Differentiate Meaningful vs. Trivial Differences—The genus/species distinction should recognize that essential properties (textual fidelity, doctrinal accuracy) are common to all KJB editions. The PCE argument ignores this and treats non-essential editorial refinements as if they were essential, committing the *undifferentiated difference fallacy*.
- The bottom line is this, the PCE position conflates accidental editorial differences with essential textual purity, elevating one species (PCE) as if it were ontologically superior to the genus (KJB editions). This is a classic case of failing to differentiate between essential sameness and non-essential variation.
- Consider the following statement from the *Guide*.
 - “The Word of God has always been available to God’s people as they were open to be led by the Spirit of truth. In Tyndale’s time, the light available to them was reflected in his version. The total perfection of the Word was not yet available, because the Word of God had not yet been brought together in one place, and therefore, its transfer from Heaven to Earth had not been finalized. Nevertheless, Tyndale’s work functioned as a light which was growing stronger through the passage of time. At the appearance of the King James Bible there was a complete restoration of the light, so that people could see and identify what was the Word. “We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts:” (2 Peter 1:19). The Romanists in the Dark and Middle Ages had hidden much, and a restoration of the Word was needed, that is, through the Reformation. The Eastern Orthodox Church released manuscripts which Erasmus utilized in the West, and the Waldenses communicated with the Reformers. This allowed for a continual increase of the light until the King James Bible was produced. Satan attacked the Word by various methods, **and even though impurities were introduced into printings of the King James Bible, the process of purification continued. When the Pure Cambridge Edition was arrived at, it marked the arrival at the full light. This occurred exactly at the time in history when it could be used for God’s providential purposes.**” (239)
- If only the PCE equals “full light” what does that logically mean for KJB editions before circa 1900 and non-PCE editions since? Logically it means that they do not possess “full light.” This is consistent with Bible Protector’s claims that only the PCE is capable of giving the “exact sense” (See [Glistening Truths](#): Cover, 3, 20) If “impurities” existed in the text until the arrival of the “full light” of the PCE how can the implication of the position be not clear. When pressed with this question online Bible Protector dodged and presented the “levels of purity” argument cited above.

- According to the framework presented in the citation from page 239, people living before the PCE would not have had the “full light.” They would have had access to partial light, meaning versions of the Bible that were considered good and useful but not fully purified or perfected. According to the logic expressed by Bible Protector, Bibles before the PCE including KJBs were not “fully capable” of given the exact sense of scripture. Here is why:
 - Verschuur claims that before the PCE (circa 1900), the Word of God was present but not yet in its “total perfection.”
 - Earlier Bibles (like Tyndale’s or even early King James editions) are described as light that was growing stronger, but not the “full light.”
 - Therefore, in this framework, those earlier Bibles could give the sense of Scripture—enough for faith and understanding—but not the exact, final sense as perfectly as the PCE supposedly does. If the PCE is described as the point of “full light” and total perfection, then everything before it—including: Tyndale’s translation and early King James editions (1611 and later revisions before PCE) would be considered deficient in some way. Not necessarily heretical or useless, but not fully perfected according to this view. They were steps toward the final product, but not the final product itself. This reasoning creates a hierarchy:
 - Pre-PCE (and non-PCE KJB editions) Bibles = partial light (good, but incomplete)
 - PCE = full light (perfect, final, providential)
 - It is interesting to note that Bible Protector believes non-PCE KJBs are not necessarily heretical or useless yet, according to the *Guide*, Oxford editions (and by implication all those not conforming to the PCE) make “a blasphemy and a mockery of Christianity” for their reading “spirit” (lowercase) at Matthew 4:1. (542)
 - That is a strong claim because it implies:
 - For centuries, English speaking Christians who used the KJB did not have the “perfect” Word. This is essentially the same collapsing of “levels” that Verschuur accuses me of since he says they had a perfect translation/version prior to the PCE just not the perfect edition yet.
 - Authority and exactness only arrived with the PCE.
- Note the tension that exists in the last two quotations. The first quote (from the January 7, 2026 blog article) presents a framework where scriptural purity exists timelessly across multiple levels—such as in God’s mind, Heaven, the autographs, and faithful copies—so that perfection is

never absent, even if earthly editions vary. In contrast, the second quote (from page 239 of the *Guide*) asserts that “total perfection” was historically unavailable until the King James Bible and ultimately the PCE, framing purity as a progressive achievement culminating in one edition. This creates a fundamental tension: one view treats purity as ontological and ever-present, while the other treats it as chronological and finalized, implying that earlier believers lacked full access to God’s perfect Word—contradicting the layered, non-competitive model of purity in the first quote.

- This contradiction is illogical because it combines two incompatible premises about the nature of scriptural purity. If purity is defined as timeless and existing at multiple levels (as the first quote claims), then it cannot simultaneously be something that was historically absent and only achieved in a specific edition (as the second quote asserts). These positions create a logical inconsistency: one assumes purity is ontological and ever-present, while the other treats it as chronological and progressive. By conflating these models, the argument undermines its own coherence—either purity was always accessible at some level, or it was not. Claiming both leads to a self-contradictory framework that cannot consistently explain the status of Scripture across history.

Conclusion

- The “double purified seven times” argument, as advanced by Matthew Verschuur, fails to withstand historical and logical scrutiny. While Psalm 12:6–7 affirms God’s promise to preserve His Word, the attempt to map this verse onto two rigid sevenfold purification schemes—first through English Bible versions and then through King James Bible editions—rests on selective and incomplete historical data. Key editions such as Scattergood’s 1683 Cambridge Quarto and Parris’ 1743 and 1762 revisions are excluded to maintain an artificial numerological pattern, revealing the PCE position’s arbitrary and *ad hoc* nature.
- Furthermore, the PCE position introduces contradictory frameworks: one claims purity is timeless and multi-leveled, while another asserts that “total perfection” was historically unavailable until the Pure Cambridge Edition. These conflicting premises create category confusion and undermine the coherence of the argument. Theologically, elevating one edition as the sole bearer of “full light” risks diminishing the sufficiency of earlier Bibles and challenges the historic doctrine of God’s providential preservation.
- In short, the PCE position is not merely an editorial preference, but a system built on selective history, logical inconsistencies, and theological overreach. A faith-based approach to the King James Bible should affirm God’s preservation without resorting to arbitrary constructs or exclusive claims that cannot be substantiated by Scripture or history.

Works Cited

Verschuur, Matthew. [*Guide to the Pure Cambridge Edition*](#). Bible Protector, 2013.

Verschuur, Matthew, “[Framing the PCE position — Part One](#)” January 7, 2026.