

Appendix A

Response to “[Pointless Points](#)” by Matthew Verschuur from February 23, 2026

- The following is my direct response to Verschuur’s blog article. For the readers’ sake, I have endeavored to build my discussion of [Vintage Bibles](#) on ordinary bibliographical grounds: (1) specific printed specimens, (2) dated catalog/series/edition evidence, and (3) archival or documentary testimony when universal claims are made. Where [Vintage Bibles](#) supplies those, I interact with them directly; where Verschuur’s case rests on inference or theological construction, I mark that distinction. I will address the following points in this Appendix:

- 1) Clarification About My Summary of Your Current PCE Definition
- 2) What My Critique Established—And Your Reply Did Not Overturn
- 3) On the “Two Hyphens and a Capital A” Caricature
- 4) Edition vs. Setting
- 5) “Copy-Editing” vs. What Your 2006 Work Actually Did
- 6) A Central Issue You Sidestep: Pentecostal Theology is Operative in Multiple Diagnostics—and Your Recent Re-framing Doesn’t Erase the Record
- 7) On the “AI” & “Propaganda” Accusations—Why They Are Rhetorical & Irrelevant
- 8) On the Claim that Lesson 279 “Helps” the PCE Position (and Why the 1829 U.S. Printing Matters)
- 9) How You Seek to Leverage Dr. David Norton (and Why That Use is Selective)
- 10) On Your Claim That I “Disparage” or Am “Hypocritical” About Norton
- 11) On Contradictions in Your Published Record (and Why They Need Correction)

1) Clarification About My Summary of Your Current PCE Definition

- In [Lesson 279](#) I wrote that, per [Vintage Bibles](#), the PCE is “not based on any single first edition,” (52) is identified by shared, consistent readings across many Cambridge printings, and has a first confirmed exemplar in a 1911 Lectern (with a Jasper plate line from 1910). That paragraph summarizes your *current* formulation; it was not my endorsement. My point was that your argumentation has changed over time:
 - Earlier ([Guide](#), 2013): you place the *edition princeps* “circa 1900,” which reads like a single-event origin claim.

- Then (*A Century of the PCE*, 2024): you discuss a 1920s consolidation across Cambridge settings—more rollout than point event.
- Now (*Vintage Bibles*, 2025): you explicitly say the PCE is “not based on any single first edition,” (52) define it as a collective editorial profile across many printings, and name 1911 as the first confirmed witness.
- Because you now present the PCE as a family profile (rather than a single c.1900 printing), it follows—on your own framing—that the first fully unified, single-file form of that profile is your 2006 e-text, which harmonizes across multiple PCE printings and resolves their setting-level differences (including the stylistic change LORD’S → LORD’s). This is a historical description, not a pejorative.

2) What My Critique Established—And Your Reply Did Not Overturn

1. 1921 shows parallel streams at Cambridge. Using your own snapshot, the catalog comprises PCE, near-PCE, and Victorian KJV lines in active print—i.e., multiple textual streams in parallel. You do not dispute the math; you recast it as “expected transition,” which is compatible with my conclusion that the PCE had not yet become a unified/dominant standard by 1921.
2. Several “PCE” diagnostics pre-date 1911. Capital “Spirit” at Matt 4:1 and Mark 1:12 appears before 1911 (e.g., the 1906 Interlinear and other late-Victorian/Oxford settings). Therefore, these tests do not uniquely mark an early-1910s Cambridge “origin,” but belong to a longer thread that later coalesces.
3. A 1829 American printing containing 8 out of 12 PCE readings narrows uniqueness of your claims. This Edmund Cushing printing matches 8 of 12 diagnostics nearly a century earlier, outside Cambridge. This pushes the narrative toward restoration/standardization rather than novel creation—a shift you also adopt when you say many PCE changes restore earlier KJB forms.
4. Your 2006 file is not “copy-editing” but the creation of a new, harmonized text that never existed exactly as such in print. You repeatedly call yourself a “copy-editor,” but your own descriptions show that you (1) collated multiple PCE printings, (2) adjudicated their internal differences (e.g., *Gen 41:56 And/and; Josh 17:11 Endor/En-dor; Song 6:12 Amminadib/Ammi-nadib*), and (3) issued a single, unified electronic text that no single historical setting matches exactly, including at least one introduced stylistic innovation (LORD’S → LORD’s). That sequence is not mere copy-editing of one setting; it is editorial consolidation and standardization across witnesses—i.e., text creation in the critical sense.
5. No Cambridge University Press (CUP) archival directive establishing “the PCE” exists. You note that Cambridge has no institutional memory of intentionally creating a PCE standard. That does not falsify inference from extant books, but it leaves categorical assertions such as “**all**” newly set after WWI were PCE undocumented. The evidentially careful restatement is “many” or possibly

more generously “most” newly originated post-WWI lines align with a Lectern/PCE baseline, while legacy plates continued to vary.

6. WWI plate-melting narrative remains undocumented. The claims about donated/melted plates are not supported with CUP archival documents in your presentation.

3) *On the “Two Hyphens and a Capital A” Caricature*

- You write that I am “fighting about two hyphens and the case of a letter ‘A’.” That is an oversimplification designed to reframe my substantive claims as trivial typography. My documented points in Lesson 279 concern (1) your 1921 catalog distribution, which shows parallel streams at CUP; (2) pre-1911 attestations of several “PCE” diagnostics (e.g., capital “Spirit” at Matt 4:1 and Mark 1:12 in the 1906 Interlinear and other late-Victorian/Oxford printings); (3) the 1829 Edmund Cushing U.S. printing that matches 8/12 tests—evidence that many “PCE” readings were not Cambridge-unique and pre-existed the early 20th century; (4) the absence of any CUP archival directive establishing your categorical claim that “all newly set after WWI were PCE”; and (5) your 2006 electronic file as a harmonized construction created by collating multiple PCE printings and even introducing LORD’s, meaning no single historic setting matches it exactly. None of that reduces to “two hyphens and a capital A”; it is the printed and documentary record or your own writings that you have not overturned.

4) *Edition vs. Setting*

- I acknowledge your Edition-vs-setting framing because it is central to your current argument, and I analyze it; I do not adopt it as my own conclusion. I use your framing to test what the record actually demonstrates: parallel streams in 1921 (PCE, near-PCE, Victorian), no single immaculate historic printing that embodies “the PCE” perfectly, and thus the first fully unified, one-file PCE appears only in 2006 as a harmonized construction, not as a reproduction of any single historical setting.

5) *“Copy-Editing” vs. What Your 2006 Work Actually Did*

- Your descriptions of your work in created the PCE e-file in 2006 show three distinct tasks:
 - (1) Copy-editing: typo/punctuation cleanup within a setting;
 - (2) Harmonization/standardization: choosing among and normalizing readings across multiple PCE printings to create a single reference text;
 - (3) Editorial innovation: at least one introduced style (e.g., LORD’S → LORD’s).
- Only task (1) is copy-editing in the narrow sense. Tasks (2) and (3) are editorial consolidation and critical standardization across witnesses—precisely why the 2006 e-file is best described as a harmonized construction, not a reproduction of any one historic printing.

6) *A Central Issue You Sidestep: Pentecostal Theology is Operative in Multiple Diagnostics—and Your Recent Re-framing Doesn't Erase the Record*

- You now prefer to style your approach as “providentialist, not Pentecostalist,” and to recenter debate on Edition-vs-setting. But in your own explanations of specific capitalization/wording choices, Pentecostal categories and concerns actively do decision-making work—especially in the Spirit/spirit loci that sit at the core of your tests. What follows is not a judgment about Pentecostalism per se; it is a bibliographical observation about how theological premises functioned in your argumentation.
 - (a) Half of your twelve tests are “Spirit/spirit”—and the *Guide* ties them to Pentecostal doctrine.
 - Your twelve readings used to identify a “pure” PCE include six that hinge on “Spirit/spirit” (Job 33:4; Ezek’ 11:24; Matt 4:1; Mark 1:12; Acts 11:28; 1 John 5:8). In the *Guide*, these are not neutrally profiled; your rationales explicitly invoke Pentecostal theology to adjudicate which form is “correct.”
 - (b) Matthew 4:1 (Spirit) — Oxford “makes a blasphemy,” and the capitalization safeguards a Pentecostal reading.
 - Your explanation for capital-S “Spirit” at Matt 4:1 asserts that if Jesus were led by “spirit” (lowercase) He would be “relying on something out of the realm of the normal believer,” whereas capital “Spirit” shows reliance on the Holy Ghost “available to all believers.” You conclude the following on page 524 of the *Guide*:
 - “...the Oxford reading makes a blasphemy and a mockery of Christianity... Whereas the Cambridge shows that man needs the Spirit of God... which would eventually lead to the Pentecostal manifestation, which is available for all.” (524)
 - (c) Mark 1:12 (Spirit) — Supported by Pentecostal authority (Wigglesworth) and cross-referenced to Matt 4:1.
 - For Mark 1:12, you cite Smith Wigglesworth—“Pentecostal authority, apostle and evangelist” (*Guide*, 180)—as using a text conforming to the Cambridge reading, and direct readers repeatedly back to the Matt 4:1 rationale, i.e., the same Pentecostal argument governs the parallel.
 - (d) Acts 11:28 (spirit) — Ordinary “Pentecostal manifestations,” prophecy practice, and a critique of “anti-Pentecostal” modern opinion.

PCE printings, resolve their differences, and enforce a theologically preferred set of outcomes (plus one admitted style innovation—LORD’S → LORD’s) in a single, unified file that no one historical printing matches exactly.

- Summary: I’m not critiquing Pentecostal theology. I’m noting that in your own explanations (esp. on the Spirit/spirit tests), theology does the choosing. That is not “mere copy-editing”; it is editorial adjudication among competing witnesses on theological grounds, later standardized as one file in 2006.

7) On the “AI” & “Propaganda” Accusations—Why They Are Rhetorical & Irrelevant

- On “AI.” Whether my notes were typed solo, with an assistant, or using drafting tools has no bearing on the truth of any claim about the 1921 distribution, the 1829 American specimen, the absence of CUP directives in your documentation, or the fact that the 2006 file is a harmonized construction rather than a single historical setting. These stand or fall on evidence, not on who (or what) typed the words. Speculating about “AI” is an *ad hominem circumstantial* and *poisoning-the-well* move. You make this insinuation explicitly on your blog (e.g., describing my work as “a mixture of [my] assistant minister’s input and the likely use of AI”). (“[Dealing With Confusion](#)”)
- On “propaganda.” My lessons present checkable evidence (dated specimens, edition snapshots, and your own statements) and invite readers to verify every claim. For example, [Lesson 279](#) quantified your 1921 list to demonstrate parallel streams at CUP; you did not dispute those counts—you reframed them as “transition,” which is interpretation, not propaganda. I documented that several “PCE” diagnostics (e.g., capital “Spirit” at Matt 4:1 / Mark 1:12) pre-date 1911, and that an 1829 American edition matches 8/12 of your twelve tests—data you acknowledged while reinterpreting their significance. Finally, you describe your 2006 file as a single, unified PCE text built by collating multiple PCE printings and resolving their differences, including introducing LORD’s—which means it does not reproduce any one historic printing exactly. None of this is propaganda; it’s documentary analysis. If any citation is wrong, name the page and line. Otherwise, labeling my work “propaganda” avoids the evidence rather than answering it.
- On whether I engaged with the content of *Vintage Bibles*. Ten days before “Pointless Points” (Feb. 23), you wrote that I had “not yet discussed” *Vintage Bibles* (Feb. 13). In “Pointless Points,” you then acknowledge I’ve been reviewing *Vintage Bibles* and “focused” on it. Those two claims conflict. The record shows: when I hadn’t treated the book yet, I was faulted for not engaging it; when I did, I was faulted for engaging it “unfairly.” Readers can judge whether that is consistent.
- On linking to the material, you criticize. A continuing obstacle for readers who want to evaluate both sides is your consistent failure to link the lessons you are critiquing. In Lesson 279 (See [Appendix A](#)) I flagged this as a pattern: you rarely provide links or full citations for my lessons while asserting broad claims about what I “really” said. That choice makes it harder for readers to check me; it also contributes to the “propaganda” atmosphere you attribute to me. I link your

writings so readers can confirm my quotations; I would welcome the same standard be applied to mine. Consider the following summary statement of this point:

- “I’m citing *your* lists, *your* timelines, *your* 2006 process, and printed specimens anyone can check. If any page/line is mis-cited, name it and I’ll correct it. Otherwise, calling the citations ‘propaganda’ is rhetoric, not rebuttal.”

8) *On the Claim that Lesson 279 “Helps” the PCE Position (and Why the 1829 U.S. Printing Matters)*

- Lesson 279 demonstrates *parallel streams*, not early PCE dominance. Your own 1921 list shows multiple lines in active print—an ecosystem of coexistence, not a catalog unified by PCE. You did not refute those numbers; you reinterpreted them as “transition.” The data remained mixed in 1921.
- Several “PCE” diagnostics pre-date 1911; they aren’t Cambridge-unique. Capital-“Spirit” in Matt 4:1/Mark 1:12 appears before 1911 (e.g., 1906 AV/RV Interlinear and other late-Victorian/Oxford settings). That means these markers cannot serve as exclusive signatures of a 1910–1911 Cambridge origin; they’re already in circulation prior to the early-1910s.
- The 1829 Edmund Cushing (Mass., USA) “8/12” specimen undercuts CUP-uniqueness. An American printing aligns with 8 of 12 PCE tests decades before the supposed PCE emergence. That hard data shifts the PCE story toward restoration/standardization of pre-existing readings, rather than a uniquely Cambridge editorial breakthrough. You acknowledge the specimen and reinterpret it—thereby conceding the factual point that many “PCE” readings predate early-20th-century Cambridge.
- If “PCE” is now a *family profile*, coherence—not uniqueness—remains; and that coherence first exists as a single artifact only in 2006. You now define PCE as a collective profile across many printings, with 1911 as “first confirmed” exemplar. On that framing, the sole fully unified version of that profile is the 2006 e-text that harmonizes across divergent PCE settings and introduces at least one style change—not a discrete 1910–1911 Cambridge printing. Lesson 279 thus constrains, rather than “helps,” any exclusivist claim.

9) *How You Seek to Leverage Dr. David Norton (and Why That Use is Selective)*

- You repeatedly invoke Dr. David Norton to bolster your narrative in several ways:
 - Borrowed timeline authority: you cite Norton’s view that “something happened around the turn of the 20th century,” using his scholarly stature as external corroboration that an early-1900s editorial shaping occurred.
 - Explaining archival gaps: you quote Norton that the later KJV history is “often obscure” and that CUP’s “institutional memory had been lost,” to justify leaning on specimens when CUP cannot furnish a directive.

- Style precedent: when defending your introduced style “LORD’s,” you note it “seems to be the convention used in Norton’s editing work also,” thereby normalizing a novelty in your 2006 file via a Cambridge-connected editor.
- Guardian narrative: you echo the broader Cambridge-as-guardian storyline (to which Norton contributes) to cast “vintage” CUP series (Lectern, Cameo, Turquoise, etc.) as the natural locus for a refined text (your PCE).
- On the alleged Norton remark: You write in “Pointless Points,” “In about 2001 or 2002 David Norton told me that the PCE (he didn’t name it that) was made around the turn of the 20th century.” You also add, “Norton knew something happened though.” and “Even though David Norton said it happened.” There is no citation, no quoted wording, no email or letter, and no public source for readers to check. By contrast, in Dr. Norton’s published work and CUP materials—where he lays out the KJV’s editorial history—he does not identify a Cambridge-defined “PCE” category or place one “at the turn of the 20th century.” If you intend to rely on Norton, please provide the documented source (date, medium, exact words). Otherwise, this remains hearsay and cannot function as evidence.
- At the same time, you reject Norton’s *New Cambridge Paragraph Bible* as an unwelcome modernization—so Norton is authoritative when he supports your timeline or softens your innovations, but sidelined when his own edition conflicts with your narrative. That selective use of Norton does not substitute for CUP documentation, nor does it address the empirical facts I presented (pre-1911 attestations, the 1829 8/12 specimen, the 1921 parallel streams, and the 2006 harmonization).

10) *On Your Claim That I “Disparage” or Am “Hypocritical” About Norton*

- I did not disparage Dr. Norton. Throughout the [*From This Generation For Ever*](#) class I quoted him accurately and interacted with his published and quoted remarks in a normal scholarly way: using what is relevant and distinguishing those observations from claims his work does not establish. That is analysis, not disparagement.
- Nor is it “hypocrisy” to cite Norton in one context and not in another. I consistently use Norton where his findings illuminate the history of the King James text, and I do not force him to say what he does not. The inconsistency lies in selectively invoking Norton as an authority when his words seem to validate an early-1900s editorial moment or normalize your LORD’s choice, while dismissing Norton’s own edition and editorial program when those conflict with your PCE narrative. My use of Norton is methodologically consistent; yours is opportunistic. (If any quotation or citation of Norton in my lessons is inaccurate, please specify page and line; I will correct it. Otherwise, calling my engagement “disparagement” or “hypocrisy” is rhetorical and does not touch the evidence.)

11) *On Contradictions in Your Published Record (and Why They Need Correction)*

- For readers’ clarity, your current publications contain mutually incompatible claims that you should either revise, clarify, or withdraw:
 - Pentecostalism: pillar vs. denial. In the *Guide*, you list Faith Pentecostalism as a foundational pillar of the PCE/“Guardians” framework (340–341), while later asserting the project was “providentialist, not Pentecostalist.” Both cannot stand as written.
 - Theology decides the tests vs. “Ross invented Pentecostal motives.” The *Guide* explicitly makes Pentecostal doctrine decisive in 6 of 12 identification readings—e.g., Matt 4:1 (Oxford “makes a blasphemy”), Mark 1:12 (appeal to Wigglesworth), Acts 11:28 (ordinary Pentecostal manifestations), and 1 John 5:8 (lower-case “spirit” tied to “proper Pentecostal doctrine”)—yet your 2026 blog rebukes me for linking the PCE to Pentecostalism. These are irreconcilable without revisions.
 - “Editio princeps” framing vs. “I never said that.” Your writings describe an early-1900s concerted edit and first manifestation; your 2026 post says you never claimed a first edition. One of these must be corrected.
 - 2006 file: “no actual changes” vs. your own descriptions of collating/standardizing and introducing LORD’s. Your blog denies “actual changes,” but your published account describes choosing among divergent PCE witnesses and an admitted style innovation (LORD’S → LORD’s). That is editorial standardization by any normal bibliographical measure.
 - Cambridge (1985) vs. your 1 John 5:8 criterion. CUP’s Hooper called lower-case “spirit” in 1 John 5:8 an “error” to be corrected, while you treat it as a PCE marker on Pentecostal grounds. If Cambridge authority matters, this conflict requires a public note or withdrawal.
 - Requested remedy: a short errata or clarification post that (1) states which claims now govern (with dates), and (2) retires/rewrites earlier conflicting statements, so readers are not left with a self-contradictory paper trail.