

## Appendix A

### *Response to Verschuur's Blog Articles: "Dealing With Confusion" & "The Contradiction of Libertarianism"*

- Since the teaching of [Lesson 277](#) on Sunday, February 8, Verschuur has authored two blog articles in response "[Dealing With Confusion](#)" first published February 9, 2026 and expanded February 13, 2026 and "[The Contradiction of Libertarianism](#)" on February 11, 2026.
- Verschuur's response, "[Dealing With Confusion](#)," argues that Lesson 277 makes a basic category mistake about how editions and God's providence work. I claim that the first clear, unified PCE appeared in July 2006 as an electronic file created by comparing and correcting various older Cambridge/Collins printings. In my view, this means the 2006 file is a later standardization, not a single perfectly preserved Cambridge text from around 1900–1911.
- Verschuur disagrees. He says this confuses "edition purity" with "setting purity," a distinction I already addressed in [Lesson 275](#) and again in the [Appendix](#) to [Lesson 276](#). He argues that I wrongly treat normal copy-editing differences (spelling, punctuation, hyphenation) as if they were changes in translation or doctrine. By doing so, he says, I overlook the fact that God's providential preservation can be seen across multiple matching early-20th-century Cambridge printings.
- He also says that I unfairly accuse him of having charismatic/Pentecostal motives or of "reconstructing" a text. According to him, he simply produced a typographically exact electronic version of an already consistent Edition, with one openly stated formatting change ("LORD's"). He denies creating new readings. Because of this, he rejects my claim that printed PCEs violate his "twelve tests" (such as Hammath vs. Hemath), saying those criticisms misunderstand both Cambridge printing practices and his documentation of the PCE's historical development, which he believes goes back at least to 1911.
- In short, Lesson 277 argues that a single, finalized text fixed in 2006 is necessary for present authority. Verschuur, however, says authority comes from providential consistency—an Edition defined by stable editorial decisions visible across multiple printings. In his view, copy-editing supports the Edition but does not create or redefine it.

#### *Clarification of my View of "Perfection"*

- Update note (Feb. 13, 2026): Verschuur corrected a wording error from his original Feb. 9 article where he stated, "he [Bryan Ross] further certainly **does accept** a perfect Edition (set of editorial choices);" the update now reads, "he further certainly **does not accept** a perfect Edition (set of editorial choices)." This clarification does not alter my central claim that the first definitive, unified PCE as a single text is the 2006 electronic file and misrepresents what I believe about the perfection of the KJB.

- I affirm that the King James Bible is perfect (without error) in English across its standard editions—i.e., preservation by *verbal equivalence*, not *verbatim identicality*. “We believe that all editions (1611, 1629, 1638, 1762, 1769) of the KJV are God’s preserved word in English without error” (Reid & Ross, *The Myth of Verbatim Identicality*, p. 6). What I do not affirm is the existence of a single, uniquely perfect *Edition/edition* (e.g., one PCE typesetting) that alone defines purity at all levels. Thus, the claim that Bryan Ross “**does not accept** a perfect Edition” is false and misstates my position; the accurate statement is that I do not accept his definition of a perfect Edition/edition (PCE-only), which is different from confessing the KJB’s perfection as Scripture. This distinction—perfect Scripture (KJB) preserved by verbal equivalence vs. a single perfect Edition/setting—is why my argument about the 2006 electronic file being the first definitive one-text PCE remains untouched by the update; even on his terms, that file is a *post-hoc* standardization, not a rediscovered early-1900s archetype.

### *Errata & Clarifications*

- I’ve updated the notes for [Lesson 277](#) to remove the statement that Verschuur “fixed” historical PCE printings when they didn’t meet his twelve identifying tests. After looking at his work again, it’s clear that, in his system, those twelve readings are used to identify a PCE edition versus a non-PCE one—not to show errors within PCEs themselves. In other words, for Verschuur, if a printing fails one of the tests, it simply isn’t a PCE. I also removed the Geba/Gaba example (Ezra 2:26) from Lesson 277. Verschuur’s updated article confirms that all PCEs read “Geba,” and that this difference applies to PCE versus other editions, not differences within PCEs. These corrections don’t change the main point of Lesson 277: the first fully unified PCE, treated as a single definitive text, is the 2006 electronic file. That file was created by comparing and standardizing several PCE printings, producing a master text no single historical edition matches exactly (for example, it includes the unique “LORD’s” form and shows normal variations at the typesetting level).
- Verschuur is also correct to call me out for a mistake related to be “bewrayeth” & “betrayeth” in Lesson 277,
  - “Even stranger, Ross says that choices were made around the twelve tests, e.g. “bewrayeth” versus “betrayeth”. This is complete nonsense. Ross has completely got this wrong, no Cambridge had “betrayeth”.”
- As the following screenshot will attest, I did include a discussion of these two words in the second paragraph on page 12 in the original edition of the notes for Lesson 277.
  - Bible Protector enforced the PCE “key criteria” in cases where historical PCE printings occasionally violated them. Historical PCEs sometimes contained “spirit” where he requires “Spirit” or “betrayeth” where he requires “bewrayeth.” But Verschuur’s electronic text enforces the 12-point test absolutely. Whenever a printed PCE disagreed with the twelve tests even once, he fixed that reading in the electronic text.

- This was a mistake on my part. I was looking at a list of differences between Oxford and Cambridge when I typed the paragraph in question and did not catch the mistake. I have updated notes from Lesson 277 to reflect the change. This, however, is minor error that is barely relevant to the overall discussion, nor does it affect the force of my over all argument.

### *Blasphemous Oxford Editions*

- Regarding Verschuur’s statements in his [blog article](#) about “blasphemy” in Matt. 4:1; Mark 1:12 Oxford editions he wrote,
  - “Another case is where I wrote once in the draft of my *Guide to the PCE* that a certain (way of) reading about the “spirit” instead of “Spirit” leading Jesus into the wilderness could be blasphemous. Ross took that one statement and said, in effect, Look, he is calling all these editions, all these historical KJBs, blasphemous. **I concede that I have to revise that one statement for clarity**, and that I am talking about anyone who, especially in the future, would insist that Jesus was not led by the Holy Ghost but something else, would be a blasphemy, and that ensuring “Spirit” (which most editions of the KJB have now anyway) in Matthew 4:1 and Mark 1:12 would be correct, and would ensure no one would insist on a blasphemous statement.”
- The offending passage from *The Guide to the PCE* reads as follows:
  - “If Jesus was led of the “spirit” lowercase, then He was relying on something out of the realm of the normal believer, being His own spirit. Yet, the Scripture teaches that Christ is our example, and that we ought “to walk, even as he walked.” (1 John 2:6a). The Scripture even shows that Christ promised, “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father.” (John 14:12). If Christ was led merely by his own spirit, then this would disallow believers to be able to walk or do exactly as Christ had done. Such a thing could not be walked in by anyone without the Holy Ghost — no one in their own merits could even get close to the standard of Christ. However, if Jesus was relying on the “Spirit” as the Cambridge reading shows, then He was relying on something that became available to all believers, namely, the Holy Ghost. **Thus, the Oxford reading makes a blasphemy and a mockery of Christianity. Whereas the Cambridge shows that man needs the Spirit of God to lead him to Christ, and this would eventually lead to the Pentecostal manifestation**, which is available for all. There are many indications that the Spirit would come upon or fill certain people in the Old Testament or before the day of Pentecost, but Christians who follow Christ as an example are able to do so after Pentecost because the Spirit has been made available to all since that time, if people will believe and receive that baptism.” (542)
- The specific passage from the *Guide* (see the bold section of the above citation) clearly does not read like what he claims in his response article. Bible Protector explicitly states that the “**Oxford reading makes a blasphemy and a mockery of Christianity.**” The fault does not lie with me for

misunderstanding him or misrepresenting him. Bible Protector’s statement is self-evident. Any King James reading that does not cohere with the PCE standard is “blasphemy.” If the PCE has all the correct readings, and only these readings can give the “exact sense” (See [Glistening Truths](#) Cover, 3, 20) why does the statement from the *Guide* need to be revised? Is there something martially better about the PCE when compared to Oxford or other non-PCE printings or not? If Oxford printings are not blasphemous, why do we need the PCE? Is the PCE superior in some significant way? If yes, then all non-PCEs are inferior. Why will Bible Protector not answer these questions directly without equivocating?

### *Construction vs Reconstruction*

- The point is not that Verschuur tried to rebuild a lost original text (which would mean guessing at an unattested archetype, like eclectic text-critics do). Instead, the claim is that he *constructed or standardized* a single reference text by comparing existing historical PCE printings and then producing one fixed electronic edition in July 2006. He himself describes this work as copy-editing and typographical cleanup—plus one acknowledged change (from “LORD’S” to “LORD’s”)—not as creating new readings. In his view, this makes the 2006 file a helpful standardization that serves an already continuous, providentially preserved Edition, not an attempt to recover a lost original. Lesson 277 argued that the first fully unified, definitive PCE—as one authoritative reference text—appears in this finalized 2006 electronic file, which his own [Guide](#) says was finalized in July 2006. (15) His description shows that the process was standardization based on existing PCE printings, not the restoration of a hypothetical, missing “true PCE.” Because of this, careful theological language should refer to his work as construction/standardization (canonizing a reference form of an already existing Edition), not reconstruction (which would imply recreating a lost text). This respects the way he explains his own process and avoids attributing to him a method he explicitly rejects. In the updated February 13 version of his article, he also gives an example: combining a hypothetical 1926 Cambridge Lectern and Cameo could, he says, produce the same results as the e-file—except for the newly introduced “LORD’s” style. This further supports the point that the 2006 file is a constructed/standardized reference text, not a reconstructed archetype.
- Based on Verschuur’s own statements, there is no single historical printed PCE whose text and typography exactly match his 2006 electronic file. He repeatedly notes that early PCE printings contain small setting-level differences—“one or two things in this printing and one or two in that,” plus normal typographical inconsistencies like missing punctuation. Because of this, no historical PCE Bible contains the fully unified form that later appears in the July 2006 electronic file. This point becomes certain when we consider his own admissions: the electronic text required comparing multiple printings, fixing errors found in scanned or typed files, and introducing one new typographical feature (“LORD’s” instead of the older “LORD’S”). That single change alone guarantees that the 2006 text differs from every historical PCE printing at least in that respect. Furthermore, Verschuur views the pre-2006 PCE as an Edition recognized through agreement among many printings, not as something embodied in one perfectly identical physical Bible. Therefore, the first time the PCE becomes one fixed, fully determinate text—

something that can be reproduced exactly—is in the electronic finalization of July 2006. His own [Guide](#) describes this file as the first fully “finalised” and typographically exact presentation of the Edition. So, while the PCE may conceptually exist in the shared features of the older Cambridge printings, the first actual occurrence of the PCE as a single, standardized, authoritative text is the 2006 digital file. That makes it the first—and only—definitive PCE in the strict textual-critical sense. This conclusion is not an accusation but follows directly from Verschuur’s own explanations of the text, the typography, and his method. The February 13 update still acknowledges setting-level variation in printed PCEs and still keeps the unique “LORD’s” form—further confirming that no historical PCE matches the 2006 electronic file exactly.

### *Typographical Innovation & David Norton*

- Verschuur’s adoption of the novel typographical convention “LORD’s” is interesting to say the least. Especially when one considers that the Modernist Dr. David Norton did the same thing in his *New Cambridge Paragraph Bible*, an edition Verschuur derides. In the 2025 publication *Vintage Bibles* Verschuur states the following regarding his adoption of the convention.
  - “Besides these, this present author did one new thing in line with actual English usage, which was to put the possessive letter “s” in lower case after an apostrophe when the word “LORD’s” with small capitals is used, because it is a contraction for the word “his” (the old usage of “his” can be seen with the King James Bible translators). It is, in fact, not always readily discernible in many historical printings whether a small capital “S” is being used anyway. In this typeface it is more obvious, but in others far less so.

The author has not insisted upon it, but seeing that same use is elsewhere in modern times (e.g. **it seems to be the convention used in Norton’s editing work also**), and having had no objection to it to the present time, and tacit or willing acceptance, it stands.” (64)
- It is interesting to note when Verschuur wishes to cite the Modernist Dr. Norton as an authority and when he does not.

### *Pentecostal Claims*

- [Lesson 273](#) (see pages 8-11) demonstrated conclusively that Pentecostal theology plays a decisive role in determining Verschuur’s 12-point checklist used to identify if a given KJB is a PCE. Exactly half of the entries on the list (six of twelve) are related to differences between uppercase or lowercase “S/s” on the word “Spirit/spirit” (Job 33:4, Ezekial 11:24, Matthew 4:1, Mark 1:12, Acts 11:28, and I John 5:8). For many of these verses, Pentecostal doctrine is the determining factor in identifying the exactly correct reading, according to the *Guide*. Bible Protector links the PCE’s correct readings (e.g., capitalization of “Spirit”) to Pentecostal theology about the Holy Spirit’s work, claiming that doctrinal precision in the PCE aligns with Spirit-led truth (See page 10 of the [Guide](#)). Put another way, Cambridge PCE editions agree with his Pentecostal theology

whereas the non-PCE Cambridge editions, Oxford editions, and American editions do not. Verschuur has yet to refute these findings and claims from his own written works.

### *Assistant Minister & AI Convolution*

- Verschuur’s comment that my response is “convoluted” because I had help from my “assistant minister” or “likely used AI” is a faulty argument. It’s an *ad hominem circumstantial* attack—criticizing the conditions under which something was written instead of addressing the argument itself—and it also *poisons the well* by trying to make readers distrust my work before they even look at the evidence. How the notes were drafted—alone, with collaborators, or with tools—has no bearing on whether my citations are accurate or my reasoning is sound. Arguments should be judged by evidence, not by who (or what) typed the words. In his February 13, 2026, update, he introduces this suggestion about an assistant or “AI” instead of answering my actual argument about the 2006 electronic file and its being the first definitive PCE text. By doing this, he shifts the discussion away from real evidence and toward the supposed source of my writing, which signals a rhetorical move rather than a substantive rebuttal. Verschuur criticizes me for receiving help from my assistant pastor—suggesting it clouds my analysis—yet in his own writings he openly celebrates extensive pastoral assistance, mentorship, doctrinal guidance, and collaboration from Pastor Craig Savige as foundational to his work on the PCE. This creates an obvious double standard: the same kind of pastoral influence he portrays as problematic in my case is depicted as providential and essential in his own.

### *Thoughts on “The Contradiction of Libertarianism”*

- Regarding his “[The Contradiction of Libertarianism](#)” article from February 11, 2026, I offer this response. Verschuur’s blog post is not a textual or historical rebuttal; it is an example of *poisoning the well* and *ad hominem* argumentation. Instead of addressing my historical claims about PCE standardization, he portrays me as part of a supposed “Libertarian” infiltration of KJB/Free-Grace circles and then argues that Libertarianism is inherently unbiblical. This approach tries to make readers distrust anything I say before considering my evidence (*poisoning the well*) and attacks my character and presumed motives rather than my actual arguments (*ad hominem*). Specifically, the article begins by naming me and claiming that my disagreement with his PCE position comes from “Libertarianism” conflicting with “Biblical authoritarianism.” He then spends the rest of the piece condemning Libertarian ideas and concludes that it is a “political religion that defies proper doctrine.” At no point does he quote, cite, or respond to my arguments about the 2006 finalized electronic text or any of the historical claims I make. The logic of the article is that because I am (in his view) a Libertarian, my conclusions must be flawed—a textbook example of *ad hominem circumstantial*. And by warning readers that my supposed ideology corrupts my work, he encourages them to dismiss my evidence before examining it, which is precisely poisoning the well. This same pattern appears in his earlier piece, “[Dealing With Confusion](#),” where he assigns Pentecostal or propagandistic motives to me without documentation, again avoiding the central historical issue. Taken together, these writings do not engage the substance of my argument—that the first definitive, unified PCE as a single text is the 2006 electronic file. Instead, they rely on

credibility attacks whose force depends on who he says I am, not on what I have demonstrated from his own writings.

- When someone stops responding to another person’s arguments—claims, evidence, historical sources—and instead starts attacking that person’s character, motives, or worldview, both classical Christian writers and traditional logic view that shift as a possible sign of intellectual retreat. In Verschuur’s case, moving away from answering the argument in Lesson 277—that the first definitive, unified PCE text is the finalized 2006 electronic file—and instead calling me a promoter of “Libertarianism,” “anti-authoritarianism,” and “dangerous ideas” replaces real argument with accusation. This is a clear example of both poisoning the well and the ad hominem circumstantial fallacy. His earlier “Dealing With Confusion” article follows the same pattern: he assigns motives to me without evidence, substituting claims about intentions in place of direct engagement with my textual and historical points. Theologically, this shift signals a weakening of his position, because Scripture teaches that truth is proven by witnesses and evidence, not by attacking personalities. When someone abandons evidence and focuses on the person making the argument, it usually implies that the evidence itself cannot be successfully challenged. By refusing to address my documented claims about the 1911–1990s Cambridge printings (as shown in his own writings), the inconsistencies among those printings, and the status of the 2006 digital file—and instead framing my disagreement as the product of ideological corruption—Verschuur effectively indicates that he cannot win the textual or historical argument. As a result, he directs his efforts at discrediting me rather than answering the evidence itself.
- Verschuur’s anti-Libertarian polemic ends up contradicting itself when compared with the Pentecostal framework he assumes elsewhere. In his essay, he rejects “voluntarism,” decentralized authority, and individual discernment as forms of lawlessness. He argues that Scripture requires a strong, top-down hierarchy—saying things like “government without coercion is not government at all” and insisting that submission is mandatory (citing Romans 13:1–4 and 1 Peter 2:13). But classic Pentecostal practice actually works the opposite way: authority is expressed through personal, Spirit-led experiences (prophecy, guidance, discernment) and through congregational participation. This approach naturally decentralizes institutional control. In structure, it closely resembles the very “voluntarism” and individual agency he condemns. By his own standards, Pentecostalism shares the same basic features—individual immediacy, resistance to formal mediation, and experiential authority—that he attributes to “Libertarianism.” This makes his criticism a category mistake and an example of special pleading: he rejects voluntarism in political theory while relying on voluntarism in theology to explain spiritual authority. In short, calling Libertarianism a “rival doctrine of authority” and a “political religion” serves to *poison the well* against my textual and historical claims rather than address them. And in doing so, his rhetoric unintentionally condemns Pentecostal modes of authority too—showing that the argument functions polemically, not on the basis of a consistent principle of authority.

*Lack of Links to My Material*

- One thing that consistently frustrates me in interacting with Verschuur is that he never provides links to the material he is criticizing. I always link to his books and articles so that students and readers can verify my claims for themselves. They never have to take my word for anything—they can check every citation directly. When a critic refuses to provide links, citations, or primary sources for the material he is attacking, that choice can reveal something theologically and rhetorically important about the strength of his position. In classical Christian polemics, and throughout the history of theological debate, this pattern suggests that the critic either cannot or will not engage the evidence directly and must rely on bare assertion instead of demonstrated proof. This is especially evident in Verschuur’s case. In both “Dealing With Confusion” and “The Contradiction of Libertarianism,” he repeatedly makes claims about my views while rarely quoting my words, rarely linking to my lessons, and rarely citing my material. Instead of documented interaction, he substitutes assumptions about my motives and ideological accusations—for example, labeling me a Libertarian—in place of engaging the actual evidence I present.
- Theologically, this shows that Bible Protector’s position is epistemically weak. If truth is established by *martyria*—witness, evidence, and attestation—then refusing to engage the actual sources amounts to admitting that the critic cannot overturn the other side’s factual or textual claims. Instead, he must shift the discussion to character, motive, or ideology, because those are easier to assert than to prove. In the Augustinian and Reformed traditions, this kind of move is viewed as a sign of polemical desperation: it abandons reasoned refutation and replaces it with personal attacks. Logically, refusing to cite sources often indicates the use of *ad hominem*, *straw-man arguments*, or *poisoning the well*. These fallacies can only survive if readers are prevented from checking what the opponent actually said. In plain terms, when someone criticizes another person’s writings without providing links, quotations, or evidence, it shows that his argument does not rest on Scripture, reason, or historical documentation, but on the hope that readers will accept his assertions instead of examining real evidence.