

Sunday, February 1, 2026—Grace Life School of Theology—*From This Generation For Ever*  
 Lesson 276 Assessing the Printed History of the King James Text (PCE: First Historic Printing)

## **Introduction**

- In [Lesson 275](#), we examined the Pure Cambridge Edition (PCE) position's reliance on Psalm 12:6–7 and the so-called “double purified seven times” argument. We found that this claim rests on selective historical categorization and arbitrary numerology rather than objective evidence. By omitting significant editions such as Scattergood's 1683 Cambridge Quarto and Parris' 1743 and 1762 revisions, the argument forces a neat sevenfold pattern that does not reflect the complex reality of the King James Bible's printed history.
- Additionally, we noted that the PCE framework introduces internal contradictions. On one hand, it asserts that purity exists timelessly at multiple levels. On the other, it claims that “total perfection” was historically unavailable until the PCE. These conflicting premises create logical tension and undermine the coherence of the position. The theological implications are equally concerning, as 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.
- Having surveyed the key pillars of the PCE position, we are now prepared to examine Verschuur's claims regarding when the PCE was first published in history.
- 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 identicity* of wording is not a tenable position.

## **First Historic Printing of the PCE**

- Matthew Verschuur identifies the first historic printing of the PCE as being produced by Cambridge University Press under printer Charles F. Clay around 1900. Clay served as printer from 1886 to 1916, and the PCE standard “first came about” during his tenure. After Clay, J. B. Peace (1916–1923) continued printing PCE Bibles, followed by Walter Lewis (1923–1945) and

Brooke Crutchley (1945–1974) during what Verschuur calls the “golden era” of PCE King James Bibles. (183)

- “The Pure Cambridge Edition appeared circa 1900, . . .” (172)
- “The Cambridge printers who produced correct Cambridge Bibles, listed in the front or back pages, begin with Charles F. Clay, who was printer to Cambridge University from 1886 to 1916, in whose days the standard first came about. After him was J. B. Peace, printer from 1916 to 1923, after which came Walter Lewis, 1923–1945, whose name appears in the golden era of Pure Cambridge Edition King James Bibles, and Brooke Crutchley, 1945 to 1974. Those who were printers of Cambridge University Press afterward may have for a time retained the Pure Cambridge Edition, but the text was changed beyond this time, so that by the turn of the millennium, Cambridge no longer stocked nor distributed the Pure Cambridge Edition.

However, God, in His divine providence, brought things about so that the Pure Cambridge Edition would be identified, and that it would be restored, and placed as the central, standard and, ultimately, the common form or edition of the King James Bible text.” (183)

- “Pure Cambridge Edition, circa 1900, C. F. Clay (or J. B. Peace, etc.), Cambridge, (ed. Redpath?)” (570)
- According to the *Guide*, Verschuur does not name a single, dated Cambridge edition (e.g., “1900 Standard Text” or “1904 Edition”) as the definitive first printing of the PCE. Instead, he states that:
  - The Pure Cambridge Edition appeared circa 1900, during the tenure of Cambridge University Press printers such as Charles F. Clay (1886–1916) and later J. B. Peace. (183, 570)
  - He strongly associates its emergence with Cambridge’s adoption of Redpath’s pronouncing scheme and editorial refinements, suggesting Redpath may have influenced the PCE’s formation. (172)
  - Verschuur emphasizes that the PCE was an independent editorial work, not merely a continuation of Victorian Cambridge editions, and that it corrected readings like “*Geba*” at Ezra 2:26 for the first time in King James Bible history. (523, 551)
  - He treats the PCE as a distinct authoritative edition, comparable in significance to the major purifications of 1629, 1638, and 1769. (523)
- So, while Verschuur clearly ties the PCE to Cambridge University Press around 1900 and its internal editorial process, as distinct from Victorian Era Cambridge Bibles which were purer than

Bibles printed at Oxford or London, (175) he does not identify a specific catalogued edition by name or year beyond “circa 1900,” in his *Guide to the PCE*.

- Verschuur does not provide documentary or textual evidence (such as collation data, title-page facsimiles, or catalog references) proving that Charles F. Clay was the first printer of the PCE. Instead, he asserts this claim based on historical association and providential reasoning.
  - “The Cambridge printers who produced correct Cambridge Bibles, listed in the front or back pages, begin with Charles F. Clay, who was printer to Cambridge University from 1886 to 1916, in whose days the standard first came about. After him was J. B. Peace, printer from 1916 to 1923, after which came Walter Lewis, 1923–1945, whose name appears in the golden era of Pure Cambridge Edition King James Bibles, and Brooke Crutchley, 1945 to 1974. Those who were printers of Cambridge University Press afterward may have for a time retained the Pure Cambridge Edition, but the text was changed beyond this time, so that by the turn of the millennium, Cambridge no longer stocked nor distributed the Pure Cambridge Edition.”

**However, God, in His divine providence, brought things about so that the Pure Cambridge Edition would be identified [Over a century later when Verschuur did so.], and that it would be restored, and placed as the central, standard and, ultimately, the common form or edition of the King James Bible text.” (183)**

- The claim is assertive, not evidential: in the *Guide* Verschuur does not cite archival records, ISBN numbers, or specific Cambridge catalog entries. His justification is historical and providential, linking Clay’s tenure (1886–1916) to the emergence of the PCE. Verschuur does not reference Herbert’s *Historical Catalogue of Printed Editions of the English Bible* to identify any specific Cambridge edition as the first PCE printing. In the *Guide*, he only asserts that the PCE appeared “circa 1900” under Cambridge printers like Charles F. Clay, but he does not cite *Catalogue* numbers, title-page descriptions, or catalog other entries to substantiate this claim. The argument is based on internal textual features (e.g., his list of twelve distinctive PCE readings from p. 18 of the *Guide*) and providential reasoning, not on historical evidence from specific printed editions. The claim that Charles F. Clay printed the first PCE is asserted without documentary or textual proof.
- Based on the *Guide*, Verschuur does not give a precise bibliographic list of historic Cambridge printings by year (such as “1900 Standard Text” or “Herbert Catalogue #”) that cohere with the PCE. Instead, he provides:
  - A general time frame: “circa 1900.”
  - Printer names: Charles F. Clay (1886–1916), J. B. Peace (1916–1923), Walter Lewis (1923–1945), Brooke Crutchley (1945–1974).
  - A claim: “in whose days the standard first came about” (pp. 183).

- A timeline entry: “Pure Cambridge Edition, circa 1900, C. F. Clay (or J. B. Peace, etc.), Cambridge, (ed. Redpath?)” (p. 570).
- Internal textual markers (e.g., Ezra 2:26 “Geba,” Acts 11:28 lowercase “spirit,” Joshua 19:2 “or Sheba”).
- Providential reasoning tied to Psalm 12:6–7 and the “seven purifications” concept.
- “Circa 1900” is chosen because it fits the prophetic schema of seven purifications and the timing of the Pentecostal Revival of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, not because Verschuur provides bibliographic evidence from Herbert or archived Cambridge editions. The claim rests on interpretive theology, not historical proof.
  - “The seventh thunder was to provide the answer to the questions, “What Bible does God use? What is the pure language in the time of Church Restitution and in the Millennium? Is God’s pure Word available now? In one volume? In diverse communication forms? Accessible anywhere on Earth? Consistent with the entire weight and direction of God’s providence in history? Consistent with the dethroning of Roman Catholicism and its words? To be in the heart of true believers? And the fulfilment of its own prophecies?” There was a question to the scientific credibility of the Bible, its truth and its transcendence. These questions were especially raised because of the introduction of the false “Bible” into the Church. The revelation of the true Bible would, therefore, be a fulfilment of the purification of God’s Word in English and would be the thing by which Romanist doctrine should be consumed. **This was answered by the Pure Cambridge Edition, circa 1900, which was done in a manner consistent with honest scientific inquiry, and contemporary with the Pentecostal Revival.** This would also solidify and end the purification of the English Bible, showing that the Version or underlying texts were never to be altered, that the translation was never to be changed, that the English Bible was not lost, nor irrecoverable, that the English was accurate and infallible, that it was the model standard, that it was for universal use and that it was especially blessed as the very thing which was carried down from God to Earth and purified in the Earth. Thus, the truth of itself was self-fulfilled.” (360)
- A comparison between A.S. Herbert’s *Historical Catalogue of Printed Editions of The English Bible 1525-1961* and Verschuur’s list of Cambridge publishers is extremely instructive. While the *Catalogue* is admittedly not exhaustive, one is struck by how few editions are listed as having been printed by Cambridge University Press (CUP) during the period in question. Most importantly, there are no entries for CUP in the *Catalogue* during the year 1900. The following is a breakdown by the CUP printer as laid out by Verschuur above.

- Charles F. Clay (1886-1916)—5 editions
  - 1887—New Testament (H2051)—“printed for the B.F.B.S. at the University Press: Cambridge” (Herbert, 434)
  - 1901—Whole Bible (H2104)—“printed for the B.F.B.S. at the University Press: Cambridge” (Herbert, 446)
  - 1904—New Testament (No H#)—“printed for the B.F.B.S. at the University Press: Cambridge.” Includes five out of the six New Testament markers of a PCE, excluding Mt. 26:39. Mt. 26:39 reads “farther” instead of “further.”
  - 1909—Whole Bible (H2156)—“The Authorized Version of the English Bible 1611.” “Edited by Aldis Wright.” (Herbert, 456)
  - 1911—Whole Bible (H2171)—printed by James Pott: New York (American Branch)—“University Press: Cambridge; James Pott: New York (American Branch).” (Herbert, 459)
- J.B Peace (1916–1923)—0 Editions
- Walter Lewis (1923–1945)—2 Editions
  - 1931—Whole Bible (H2239)—“B.F.B.S, London: (Cambridge printed). Ruby 32mo. Paragraph markings (following the RV, as far as possible) have been inserted after Acts xx, 36. Pp. 1266.” (Herbert, 471)
  - 1936—Whole Bible (H2255)—“University Press: Cambridge” “This new edition is the outcome of a desire to produce a medium-sized Bible, which would not only have typographical merit, but also be designed with the “general reader” in mind. It has accordingly the following outstanding points: 1) The type has been specially designed; 2) The use of italics has been discontinued; 3) Small but important typographical improvements have been made; 4) The text of the preface, The Translators to the Reader, has been restored to its proper place at the beginning.’ Pp.xxii, 870. With two maps.” (Herbert, 475)
    - This is the first locatable edition via Herbet’s *Catalogue* that coheres with Verschuur’s PCE standards. A publication date of 1936 does not qualify as “circa 1900.”
- Brooke Crutchley (1945-1974)—0 Editions, listing ends in 1961

- In addition to CUP, Verschuur identifies the following additional printers who published the PCE.

- William Collins (Scotland)
  - “I obtained old copies of the Pure Cambridge Edition from various second-hand book dealers. The authentic standard publications were printed by Cambridge University Press, and by Collins and affiliated publishers.” (12)
  - “In 1839 Queen Victoria granted that William Collins, the Scottish royal printers, should also be able to print the King James Bible.” (113)
  - “In Australia, for example, the Pure Cambridge Edition can be found to have been used specifically, for example, by Presbyterians in Victoria, and other various Protestant denominations. It is no accident that Collins printed Bibles were being used by Pentecostals in Victoria.” (120-121)
  - “William Collins of Scotland received the right to print Bibles in 1824. Under Queen Victoria, he was made the Royal Printer for Scotland. On many occasions since that time, William Collins publishers has, under various sovereigns, published Bibles. At some stage early in the twentieth century, William Collins publishers must have begun printing the Pure Cambridge Edition. Their editions bear the name of the maker of the pronunciation scheme (when such is presented in a Bible) H. A. Redpath.

Vast quantities of Bibles have been printed by William Collins publishers in the twentieth century, the majority of which were Pure Cambridge Editions. Their Bibles were to be found “in large numbers” in England, even though their base of operations was in Scotland.<sup>2</sup> They have sometimes printed for the British and Foreign Bible Society. Around the year 2000, some editions of the King James Bible being printed were still the Pure Cambridge Edition.” (178)

- American World Publishers & Riverside Company
  - “The American World Publishers, and the Riverside company have also printed Collins Bibles. Collins Bibles have a differing set of marginal notes, as well as some slight differences as to which words are treated with pronunciation marks. Collins Bibles do not present Hebrew characters in Psalm 119. Collins Bibles consistently have “and Joseph” rather than “And Joseph” at Genesis 41:56, and the unique rendering of “And wilt” rather than “and wilt” at 1 Chronicles 14:10. Some editions on occasions contain a few renderings from the London or Oxford Editions.” (178)

- Pitt Press, London
  - “The Late Victorian Cambridge Edition text with chapter summaries, no Epistle Dedicatory was still printed for years after the making of the Pure Cambridge Edition, especially in cheaply made Cambridge Editions printed for the British and Foreign Bible Society. This is because the printing plates did not need to be replaced for a long period. Nevertheless, the Pitt Press did eventually print the pure text in all its editions (as late as 1957 or so), so that the Bible societies could say, “The cheapest copies of our Authorized Version at least exhibit the Word of GOD faithfully and helpfully.” (175)
  - “The Pitt Press situated at London must have likewise printed many millions, because Norton reveals that the Ruby 32mo size alone reached ten million in 1966. There must have been millions more.” (178)
- Verschuur’s framework strongly benefits from placing the PCE around circa 1900, and here is why:
  - Historicist Prophetic Alignment—His interpretation of Revelation 10 and Psalm 12:6 hinges on the idea of seven purifications culminating in the last days. By situating the PCE near 1900, he can align it with:
    - The Pentecostal Revival (Azusa Street, 1906), which he views as prophetically significant.
    - The rise of global missions and English as a dominant language, fitting his claim that the purified Word was ready for worldwide proclamation.
  - End of the Purification Timeline—if the PCE appeared much earlier (e.g., 1769), it would weaken his argument that the final purification coincided with the modern era of Spirit outpouring and global evangelism. Circa 1900 allows him to frame the PCE as the last-days Bible, perfectly timed for the prophetic fulfillment of Revelation 10’s “little book.”
  - Providential Narrative—His theological narrative emphasizes that God preserved His Word through history and finalized it just before the 20th century—a period he associates with the restoration of apostolic gifts and the preparation for Christ’s return. This timing reinforces the sense of divine orchestration.
  - Why Not Earlier?—If Verschuur admitted the PCE existed in the 1800s or earlier, it would undermine the symbolic connection to the seven thunders and the idea that the purified Bible was completed at the dawn of the modern Pentecostal age. Circa 1900 is not just a historical guess—it’s a prophetic anchor.

- Bottom line—the circa 1900 date is essential for his historicist interpretative framework because it ties the PCE to eschatological themes, the Pentecostal revival, and the global spread of Christianity. Without that timing, the prophetic narrative loses much of its force.
- On page 452 of the *Guide*, Verschuur quotes correspondence from Cambridge University Press' managing editor that he dates from "Around 2010." (452)
  - "I am always puzzled when I see occasional references made to the 'Pure Cambridge Edition'.

I have seen no real evidence to suggest that there was any distinct revision process undertaken (by or on behalf of Cambridge) at the end of the 19th century (i.e. after Scrivener, and after the process of revision which led to the publication of the Revised Version) which justifies the claim that 'an edition' was consciously developed at that time.

I would suggest that then, as before and after, each time a new setting of the Bible was undertaken the editorial and production teams responsible (whether at Cambridge, Collins, Oxford or elsewhere) took as their pattern copy text for typesetting what they regarded as the best, most accurate version of the text available and re-keyed it as accurately as they could. "For a brief period of time it is possible that most Cambridge Bibles did conform to the version of the text that adherents of the 'Pure Cambridge Edition' regard as perfection but we have no means to identify which — if any — Cambridge editions or typesettings of the early 20th century might have been the one that prompts the 'Pure Cambridge Edition' notion.

On the Bible Protector website (the main proponent of the PCE concept) there is a brief list of key passages/spelling for identification, and a much longer list of over 500 textual elements. (It should be noted that even here, in the context of someone suggesting a definitive piece of research, these 2 lists do not agree: not all the items listed in the 'key' identifiers appears in the supposedly definitive list.)

Insofar as I have been able to evaluate these it appears that there are three current or recent Cambridge editions which come close to the PCE. Some new Cambridge editions were originated during the 1920s and 1930s, apparently using as their pattern copy a version that (nearly) accords with your expectations. Our Cameo and Turquoise (now called Presentation Reference) and Pitt Minion editions fall into that category." (452)

- Researchers at CUP were not able to identify a specific Cambridge printing that would qualify as the fountainhead of the PCE. Moreover, they found no evidence of any edition being called the PCE during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The response from CUP regarding the PCE position essentially expresses skepticism and caution about the claims made by proponents of the PCE .

- No Evidence of a Distinct Revision Process—CUP states that they have not seen any real evidence that a conscious, distinct revision process was undertaken by or on behalf of Cambridge University Press at the end of the 19th century (after Scrivener and the revisions leading to the Revised Version) that would justify calling the PCE a formally developed edition. This challenges the PCE claim that it is a uniquely purified and finalized edition produced at that time.
- Pattern Copy Text Usage—CUP suggests that, historically, whenever Cambridge or other publishers set a new edition, they simply used what they regarded as the best and most accurate version available as their pattern copy text and re-keyed it as accurately as possible. This implies that the PCE may not be a uniquely created or finalized edition but rather a product of normal printing practices using the best available text at the time.
- Possible Conformity but No Definitive Identification—CUP acknowledges that for a brief period in the early 20th century, many Cambridge Bibles may have conformed closely to the text that PCE proponents regard as perfect. However, CUP admits that they have no means to identify which specific Cambridge editions or typesettings correspond exactly to the PCE or prompted the PCE notion. This suggests that the PCE is not clearly documented as a distinct edition in Cambridge's historical records.
- Multiple Cambridge Editions Close to PCE—CUP notes that there are several Cambridge editions from the 1920s and 1930s (such as the Cameo, Turquoise/Presentation Reference, and Pitt Minion editions) that come close to the PCE text. This indicates that the PCE text is not unique to one edition but may be reflected in multiple editions over time.
- Inconsistency in PCE Identification Lists—CUP points out that even on the Bible Protector website (a main proponent of the PCE), the lists of key passages and textual elements for identifying the PCE do not fully agree. This inconsistency undermines the claim of a definitive, well-established PCE text.
- Implications for the PCE Position—The CUP response does not deny the existence of a text similar to the PCE but questions the claim that it was a consciously developed, distinct edition with a formal revision process. It suggests that the PCE may be more of a retrospective identification of a text type found in several Cambridge printings rather than a uniquely produced edition. The lack of clear archival or production records supporting a formal PCE edition means the PCE position relies heavily on textual comparison and doctrinal interpretation rather than historical publishing evidence. CUP's mention of multiple editions close to the PCE text implies that the PCE is not a single, exclusive edition but part of a continuum of Cambridge textual tradition. The inconsistency in PCE identification criteria weakens the argument for a definitive, authoritative PCE text.
- The Cambridge University Press response essentially challenges the PCE position's claim of a distinct, consciously produced, and formally recognized edition at the end of the 19th century. It

frames the PCE more as a textual tradition or ideal reflected in several Cambridge editions rather than a single, documented edition. This means that while the PCE text may represent a purified form of the King James Bible, the CUP does not officially endorse it as a unique or formally established edition.

- According to the *Guide*, there is no evidence that anyone before Matthew Verschuur ever identified, named, or promoted a specific Cambridge text as “the Pure Cambridge Edition.” The *Guide* repeatedly implies—and in places directly states—that this designation and the precise identification of the PCE as a distinct, final purified Cambridge text originated with Verschuur and his circle (Victory Faith Centre). The *Guide* emphasizes that—even within the KJB-Only movement—no scholars, editors, or defenders had ever pinned down which Cambridge edition was the correct one. (6) Verschuur notes that even respected KJB experts did not know of a single correct Cambridge text. When he sought answers from prominent KJB defenders, he says: “not even the greatest experts, seemed to know anything about it.” (10) The *Guide* marks the identification of the PCE as Verschuur’s own discovery April 4, 2001, thereby marking the moment when he personally concluded which Cambridge text was the correct one. (10) The *Guide* claims a “proper purification” occurred around 1900 in Cambridge printing tradition but adds: it was not documented, not recognized, and generally unknown before his investigation. Moreover, the *Guide* never claims the term existed prior to Verschuur’s work. Instead, it consistently treats “the Pure Cambridge Edition” as a label he and Victory Faith Centre applied after recognizing the correct Cambridge form. (11) The *Guide* provides *no evidence whatsoever* that anyone before Matthew Verschuur: used the term Pure Cambridge Edition, identified one specific Cambridge text as the uniquely correct standard, or articulated the twelve defining readings that later became PCE markers.
  - **There has been a great ignorance of the fact that a final purification took place in the history of the King James Bible.** Those who have studied the history of the King James Bible in depth would have been aware of the major purifications that took place, such as the editions of 1629, 1638 and 1769. **There was also a proper purification that took place circa 1900, which has resulted in the final text of the King James Bible, which is in all ways the definitive presentation of the King James Bible, and should not be altered.”** (6)
  - “It was God, who by His divine providence, led me to believe and now promote the exact right text of the King James Bible, which we came to call, “The Pure Cambridge Edition.” (11)
- No one knew about this for over 100 years before Bible Protector revealed it to the world in the early 2000s. The *Guide* does NOT identify any specific historical edition—by year, publisher, printer, or edition code—as the first published PCE. It never provides: a first-print date, a specific Cambridge edition name, a catalog number, a Bible society printing date, or a bibliographical reference for the earliest PCE. According to the PCE doctrine outlined in the *Guide*, the PCE

existed for over a century before anyone (including Cambridge) knew about it or recognized it as a distinct edition—until Verschuur identified it in 2001.

- Therefore, the PCE position is guilty of the historical error of “Presentism.” Historians use the word “presentism” to describe a methodological error where: a modern idea, category, or interpretation is projected backward onto the past, even though the people at the time did not use that concept, recognize it, or operate according to it. “Presentism” creates a false impression that the past was consciously participating in a framework invented later. (Wilson, 102, 104) The PCE position is guilty of “Presentism” for the following reasons:
  - The PCE supposedly existed in printed form around 1900.
  - Nobody at the time recognized, named, or documented it.
  - The term “Pure Cambridge Edition” was created by Verschuur in the early 2000s.
  - The specific 12-reading definition of the PCE did not exist historically.
  - The first “definitive” PCE was actually the 2006 electronic edition.
- The *Guide* teaches the following timeline:
  - 1900—Supposed final pure Cambridge text printed
  - 1900–2001—Nobody recognizes or names it
  - 2001—Verschuur identifies it
  - 2006—First “definitive” edition created electronically
- Thus, the narrative requires: a modern category (“PCE”), a modern definition (twelve readings), a modern doctrinal interpretation (“final purification”) to be retroactively applied to historical printings that never claimed or represented those things. That is exactly the historical fallacy of “presentism,” according to standard historical methodology. Put another way, the PCE position is guilty of “presentism” because it 1) retroactively labels old Cambridge printings with a 21st-century category, 2) claims they represented a concept nobody at the time held, and 3) interprets the past through a framework invented long after the fact.

## Conclusion

- According to the *Guide to the Pure Cambridge Edition*, historical Cambridge and Collins printings contained many of the readings later associated with what Matthew Verschuur and Victory Faith Centre would call the “Pure Cambridge Edition.” However, the *Guide* explicitly

acknowledges that no single historical printing could be considered perfect, authoritative, or completely accurate. Verschuur states that when he examined the surviving Cambridge and Collins Bibles, “none was necessarily definitive, neither was there one that I could be sure was free from typographical errors.” (15) This admission forms the foundation of the *Guide*’s argument: although a tradition of Cambridge-type printings existed, no single printed Bible represented a fully pure or final form of the text.

- Because of this, the *Guide* teaches that a decisive step was required to produce what it calls a “definitive” PCE. Verschuur explains that Scripture itself convinced him that such a definitive form must exist but did not yet exist in any printed Bible. He writes, “There should be a definitive and scrupulously correct representation... create[ed] in an electronic text which would be able to be disseminated abroad and become a universal standard.”(15) In other words, the *Guide* claims that earlier printed editions—though often close—were incomplete or flawed, and therefore the “real” PCE had to be produced through human reconstruction, not simply recovered in an existing printed form.
- As the *Guide* describes the process, Verschuur and his associates spent several years comparing historical Cambridge/Collins printings, reconciling differences, and correcting perceived errors. This project culminated in 2006, when Verschuur completed what he calls the first truly authoritative PCE text. The *Guide* states plainly, “The electronic file was finalised... July 2006.” This finalized electronic edition is the first version that the *Guide* presents as complete, perfect, and definitive. In effect, the PCE—understood as a precise, unified, authoritative text—came into existence not in the early 1900s but in 2006, through deliberate editorial reconstruction.
- From this, the internal logic of the *Guide* becomes clear: while the PCE is claimed to have historical roots around 1900, the *Guide* also asserts that no historical printing actually embodied the PCE in its final, authoritative form. Instead, Verschuur argues that only the reconstructed 2006 electronic edition can rightly be called the definitive PCE. Because earlier printings each contained minor variations or potential errors, none of them constituted the exact PCE recognized today—meaning the definitive PCE did not exist in print before Verschuur created it.
- Thus, the *Guide*’s own narrative requires the conclusion that no historical printing exactly matches the 2006 electronic PCE, and that the PCE as a fixed, final standard is a modern reconstruction rather than a historically attested edition. The *Guide*’s position is not that the PCE was preserved and recognized in history, but rather that it had to be identified, reconstructed, and completed in the 21st century because the historical record lacked a single, perfect exemplar.
- In the next Lesson we will begin looking at some of Verschuur’s more recent claims from some of his newer written works.

### Works Cited

Verschuur, Matthew. *Guide to the Pure Cambridge Edition*. Bible Protector, 2013.

Wilson, Douglas L. "Thomas Jefferson and the Meaning of Liberty" in The Atlantic Monthly. November 1992.

## 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 do not 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 do not 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 is common to see a move toward compression and caricature: turning a nuanced analysis into a punchy claim that is 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 is 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 is 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 is 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 distinguished 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 do not 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.