

## Appendix A

*Response to Matthew Verschuur's Facebook post on the Textus Receptus Academy on January 26, 2026*

 **Matthew Verschuur**  
All-star contributor · January 26 at 11:42 PM ·

Bryan Ross seems to think that different editions of the King James Bible are or contain different translations.

Quote, "But the only difference between King James Version 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 King James Version printings — but no real distinguishing principle allowed. This is because one is not allowed to say the translation differs".

He is saying that KJV printings/editions differ in spelling, punctuation, word order, and sometimes wording itself which are translation level features. So therefore the translation differs from one printing to another, even though some people are saying the translation does not differ in the many editions.

I think that the same translation of the King James Bible is being printed in all editions (despite a few attacks by Scrivener and Norton). I do not think that normal, historical different editions of the KJB ever amount to a different translation at all, but are all same translation of the 1611 translators. Mere handfuls of editorial differences in the many decades of KJB editions since 1769 are not, in the traditional sense, changing the actual translation.



**Different editions  
of the KJB  
are different  
translations.**

**Bryan Ross**

- Taken together, the Facebook post and the meme do not accurately represent what I said in the notes for [Lesson 275](#), and the meme intensifies the distortion. In the notes, I was making a conditional, analytical argument: examining the internal logic of certain PCE claims by pointing out that if one admits real differences in wording, word order, or other translation-level features between KJB printings, yet simultaneously insists that the translation itself never differs, then that position lacks a clear, consistent principle. This is a critique of a claim, not a declaration of my own doctrinal position. The Facebook post partially misrepresents this by reframing my conditional reasoning as a positive assertion—suggesting that I believe different KJV editions are

different translations—rather than recognizing that I was testing the coherence of Bible Protector’s “level of purity” argument.

- The meme worsens the misrepresentation by stripping away all nuance and attributional care. By placing the unqualified statement “Different editions of the KJB are different translations” next to my image and name, it visually and rhetorically attributes that conclusion directly to him. This presentation collapses arguments into assertion and critique into confession. Viewers are led to believe I teach this as my settled view, when the notes show I am instead exposing a logical tension within certain positions about KJB perfection and textual history. As a result, the meme does not merely simplify my argument; it changes its meaning, turning an analytical challenge into a doctrinal claim that I don’t affirm.
- After receiving push back over his post Verschuur posted the following revised meme.



- The second meme changes the argumentation by shifting from a blunt, declarative claim to a reasoned, first-person inference that more closely resembles the structure of my actual analysis. By including an explicit rationale (“editing...is done on the basis of the originals”) and framing the conclusion as something the speaker “thinks,” it moves away from simple slogan-level misattribution and toward an interpretive summary of his reasoning. However, the meme still compresses nuance by presenting a debated implication as a settled personal belief, collapsing distinctions I maintain between editorial variation and translation proper. As a result, it improves the accuracy of the argument’s form while still overstating the certainty and scope of my position.

- Bible Protector, the creator of the memes, is engaging in several classic logical and rhetorical fallacies, especially as the content moves from analysis to slogan. Here are the key ones at work, explained plainly:
  - Straw Man—the memes recast my *conditional analysis* (“if X, then Y follows”) as a *positive assertion* (“I believe Y”). This replaces his actual position—testing the coherence of certain claims—with a simplified and easier-to-attack version of it.
  - Quote Mining / Contextomy—the argument extracts a conclusion implied in a line of reasoning while removing the surrounding context (conditions, purpose, and scope). Even when phrased in the first person, the meme presents a distilled takeaway without the qualifications I explicitly relied on.
  - False Attribution—by visually pairing the statement with my image and name, the meme implies a direct quotation or settled belief, even though the wording is not a verbatim quote and the position is not stated by me in that form.
  - Equivocation—the memes blur the meaning of the word “*translation*.” I carefully distinguish between editorial changes, print variation, and translation proper; the meme collapses these categories, treating any difference arising from editorial activity as a different “*translation*” in the ordinary sense.
  - Oversimplification (Fallacy of Compression)—a multi-step analytical argument is reduced to a single declarative sentence. This removes logical scaffolding and makes a nuanced position appear more extreme or categorical than it actually is.
  - Appeal to Rhetorical Force (Persuasive Framing)—the meme format itself—large text, confident tone, authoritative imagery—substitutes presentation for argument, encouraging acceptance through impression rather than careful reasoning.
- In short, the memes don’t merely disagree with what I actually said; they reframe my reasoning into a claim I did not plainly make, using simplification, category blurring, and visual attribution to make an analytical critique look like a doctrinal confession.
- In argumentation theory and rhetoric, tactics like straw-manning, quote-mining, oversimplification, and sloganizing are often symptomatic of a weak or failing argument, because they shift the focus away from engaging an opponent’s actual reasoning. When someone can no longer (or chooses not to) answer the substance of an argument, it’s common to see a move toward compression and caricature: turning a nuanced analysis into a punchy claim that’s easier

to dismiss or rally against. In that sense, yes—these tactics are frequently used when someone is losing ground at the level of careful reasoning.

- That said, it's also fair to note that such tactics are sometimes employed strategically rather than defensively. Memes, soundbites, and simplified framings are effective for persuasion in public or social-media contexts, even when a more careful argument exists elsewhere. So, their use does not *logically prove* that the person has lost the argument—but it does indicate a shift from analytical engagement to rhetorical control. When precision gives way to distortion, it's usually a sign that winning hearts (or scoring points) has replaced the harder work of answering the argument on its own terms.
- Taken together, the memes misrepresent my views in multiple, distinct ways—not just one. Here's a comprehensive list, moving from most fundamental to more subtle distortions:
  - They turn a conditional argument into a categorical claim—I was analyzing *implications* (“if one grants X, then Y follows”). The memes present Y as my affirmed position, stripping away the conditional structure entirely.
  - They attribute to me a conclusion I am examining, not asserting—I was testing the coherence of PCE claims. The memes depict me as *endorsing* the very conclusion I was using as an analytical pressure point.
  - They collapse critique into confession—I critiqued the internal logic of Verschuur's position. The memes reframe that critique as a personal belief statement (“I think...”), which materially changes the nature of the claim.
  - They equivocate on the term “translation”—I distinguishes between: translation proper, editorial revision, and print-standardization. The memes erase these distinctions and treat any editorial change grounded in the originals as a new “translation” in the ordinary sense.
  - They remove scope and limitation—my discussion was aimed at specific theological claims (e.g., PCE-style arguments), not at redefining all historical KJV editions wholesale. The memes universalize my reasoning beyond its intended target.
  - They substitute paraphrase for quotation without signaling it—the wording in the memes is not a verbatim quote, yet the visual presentation strongly implies that it is—or at least that it faithfully captures my own phrasing.
  - They rely on visual authority to imply endorsement—by pairing my image and name with the statements, the memes leverage visual rhetoric to suggest ownership of the claim, bypassing textual accuracy.

- They oversimplify a multi-step argument into a slogan—my reasoning depends on definitions, distinctions, and logical progression. The memes compress this into a single sentence that cannot carry the original argument’s nuance.
- They shift the debate from logic to optics—rather than engaging my argument directly, the memes reframe it in a way designed to provoke reaction or dismissal, altering how audiences perceive his position before they ever encounter his actual words.
- In the end, the memes don’t merely summarize my views—they reframe, exaggerate, and redirect them, converting an analytical critique into a doctrinal stance I do not plainly hold. This is not a difference of interpretation at the margins; it is a structural misrepresentation of how I argue and what I am actually claiming.
- In the blog article, “[Framing the PCE Position—Part 1](#)” (1/7/26), Verschuur accuses me of collapsing important analytical distinctions—such as Scripture, text, translation, edition, and setting—into a single flattened category, and then criticizing the PCE position on the basis of that collapse. However, when read carefully, Verschuur’s own response on Facebook (see above) mirrors the very problem he identifies: he asserts a multi-tiered framework but then treats objections to one level as though they necessarily misunderstand or deny the others, thereby insulating his position from critique. In practice, this functions as a reverse category collapse, where analytical distinctions are invoked to deflect criticism rather than clarify it, and where my conditional or analytical challenges are reframed as categorical denials. Thus, Verschuur ends up doing what he accuses me of doing—compressing an opponent’s analytical argument into a simplified misrepresentation—while claiming fidelity to nuance.