

Appendix A

Reply to “MORE POINTLESS POINTS” (March 2, 2026)

This reply consolidates what I documented in Lessons 276–280 and responds point-by-point to claims in Matthew Verschuur’s “[MORE POINTLESS POINTS](#)” from March 2, 2026. Where relevant, I cite (1) Matthew’s blog post/PDF documents, (2) my lesson notes, and (3) the CUP passage Matthew himself reproduced in his [Guide](#) (quoted in [Lesson 276](#)). This Appendix addresses the following points:

- 1) What Cambridge University Press Actually Said (It’s More than “Puzzled by the Label”)
- 2) The “Parallel Streams” Finding Stands; Your Revised Cut-Offs Are Asserted, Not Proven
- 3) The Twelve Tests: Identification Markers, Yes—But Your Printed Rationales Are Theological
- 4) “Copy-Editing” vs. What Your 2006 Work Actually Did (Summary)
- 5) Numbers & Authorities: Still Unsubstantiated
- 6) On /Rhetoric (“AI,” Etc.)

1) What Cambridge University Press Actually Said (It’s More than “Puzzled by the Label”)

- In “More Pointless Points,” you reduce Cambridge University Press’s (CUP) position to mere unfamiliarity with the label “Pure Cambridge Edition.” In your own [Guide](#) (See page 452), however (as quoted in [Lesson 276](#)), CUP says much more: (1) it has seen no real evidence of a distinct revision process at the end of the 19th century that would justify calling a consciously developed edition; (2) the historical practice was to re-set from the best available pattern copy rather than promulgate a single “PCE”; (3) CUP cannot identify which (if any) early-20th-century setting would be *the* PCE; and (4) several 1920s–1930s Cambridge lines (Cameo, Turquoise/Presentation Reference, Pitt Minion) merely “come close” to that profile, while noting inconsistencies in Bible Protector’s identifier lists. That is a documented non-endorsement of a singular, consciously created, Cambridge-recognized “PCE” edition—well beyond “puzzled by a label.”

2) The “Parallel Streams” Finding Stands; Your Revised Cut-Offs Are Asserted, Not Proven

- You object to my statement in [Lesson 280](#) that Cambridge printed Victorian, near-PCE, and PCE streams well into the late 20th century, and you propose two new cut-offs: (1) Victorian “only survived in the RV/AV parallel” later on; (2) near-PCEs “survived into the 1950s.” In “More Pointless Points,” you provide no dated specimens, series IDs, catalogue entries, or images for either endpoint; they remain assertions without evidence.

- By contrast, Lesson 280 records late variation *within* lines you treat as “PCE-era,” e.g., the Large Print Cameo carrying the “mightv” typo at Jer. 48:41 into the 1990s, which undercuts a simple mid-century stop for “near-PCE-like” behavior and supports the observation of parallel, overlapping streams well into the late century.
- CUP’s note (quoted in your *Guide*; see Lesson 276) likewise does not supply the shutdown dates you assert; it depicts early-20th-century overlap (“several lines come close”) and CUP’s inability to name a single defining setting—precisely the picture of parallel streams I described.
- Bottom line: I am not changing the wording at the beginning of Lesson 280. Your cut-offs lack documentable evidence, whereas the published record—including your own catalogue notes and CUP’s statement—supports overlap and co-existence of streams well beyond the dates you assert.

3) *The Twelve Tests: Identification Markers, Yes—But Your Printed Rationales Are Theological*

- You stress that the twelve tests are identification markers. I agree they function as markers in your PCE framework. My critique concerns the reasons you offer elsewhere (especially in the *Guide*) for preferring those readings. There, six of the twelve markers hinge on Spirit/spirit and are defended explicitly on theological (Pentecostal) grounds—e.g., Matt 4:1 (“Oxford ... makes a blasphemy” p. 542), Mark 1:12 (appeal to Wigglesworth p. 180), Acts 11:28 (“ordinary Pentecostal manifestations” p. 540), and 1 John 5:8 (“proper Pentecostal doctrine” p. 10). The blog post doesn’t overturn those printed rationales; it merely restates the tests as markers, which was never in dispute.
- In your YouTube Video “[Answering Bryan Ross On Pointless Points](#)” (3/3/26) you repeatedly assert that I “misunderstand” your process and that you “already knew” the correct PCE readings before ever bringing Pentecostal theology to bear, I find myself compelled to clarify why such a claim cannot bear doctrinal or methodological weight. When one examines your published *Guide*, it is beyond dispute that your rationale for half of the twelve PCE diagnostics are grounded in explicitly Pentecostal categories (See the paragraph above.). If, as you now claim in the video, these doctrinal commitments were *not* the operative criteria guiding your textual selections, then you have effectively removed the only articulated theological architecture you have ever provided for adjudicating between competing capitalization traditions; and without that framework, no hermeneutical, bibliographical, or ecclesial principle remains to justify why these readings—and not their equally well-attested Oxford, Victorian Cambridge, or other non-PCE counterparts—should be normatively binding. Thus, once your theological explanations are disowned as secondary or merely illustrative, your editorial determinations retreat into bare assertion, lacking the doctrinal coherence, providential logic, or textual-historical method necessary to sustain the claim that these specific forms constitute a divinely preserved or textually superior “pure” edition of the English Bible.
- Here are the exact spots where you claim you had already settled the “correct” PCE readings before bringing Pentecostal theology into it (i.e., *text first, theology later*), with brief pull-quotes for context:

- 1:32:03–1:32:12 — while discussing his *Guide* and the use of the 12 tests: “That’s **me writing years later after knowing the PCE is correct** ... not me dictating it because of some pre-commitment.”
- 1:37:33–1:37:48 — explicit sequencing claim: “**It happened the other way round. ... Pentecostal thinking came *after* the providential understanding and reception.**”
- 1:57:01–1:57:12 — on the 12 tests and theology: “The 12 tests were originally conceived for comparing editions ... **then** I thought it good to make theological arguments for each.” (i.e., tests/identification first, doctrinal explanation later).
- 1:51:00–1:51:12 & 1:51:58–1:52:13 — about 1 John 5:8 specifically: “*Then* I came to understand ... the meaning of the word ‘spirit’ with a lowercase ‘s’...” (he frames the doctrinal rationale as subsequent to accepting the lowercase reading historically).

4) “Copy-Editing” vs. *What Your 2006 Work Actually Did (Summary)*

- In “More Pointless Points” you again insist you merely “copy-edited.” Yet you also admit you (1) standardised across PCE printings where persistent differences existed (hyphenation, word-division, casing, small-caps conventions) and (2) introduced a new typographic convention (LORD’S → LORD’s)—precisely the harmonization/standardization across divergent witnesses I described. That is not merely polishing one manuscript; it is the editorial constitution of a single text out of non-identical PCE witnesses.
- Authoritative definitions of copy-editing:
 - *Chicago Manual of Style* (CMOS): Copy-editing is the final editorial stage focused on technical errors, style, and internal consistency, preparing/coding the text for typesetting; it is distinct from line editing and far removed from textual constitution across multiple witnesses. ([CMOS](#))
 - Chartered Institute of Editing and Proofreading (CIEP): Copy-editing comes after developmental/line work and involves grammar/spelling/punctuation, consistency, clarity for purpose, and coding/mark-up for design/typesetting. ([writerandthewolf.com](#))
 - Purdue OWL / IPed: Copy-editing = sentence/house-style work (clarity, consistency, mechanics), distinct from substantive editing (structure/content) and proofreading (last pass on proofs). ([grammarly.com](#)), ([ktproofreading.com](#))
- Takeaway: Copy-editing refines a single manuscript for accuracy, style, and consistency; it does not create a new unified text by collating divergent witnesses and adjudicating variants across them—that work belongs to textual/critical editing. ([literariness.org](#)), ([CMOS](#))

- What you say you did (“More Pointless Points” and *Vintage Bibles*)
 - Copy-editing functions: You eliminated typographical errors and presented text without press errors.
 - Beyond copy-editing: You “standardised the PCE” where persistent differences existed among PCE printings (hyphens, word-division, italics, small-caps), i.e., you chose among divergent PCE witnesses; and you introduced a new global convention (LORD’S → LORD’s).
 - Stated result: a “critical/standard electronic text” produced by comparing multiple electronic files and resolving variations against multiple printed Bibles such that “all textual and punctuation places were resolved” (and later italics).
- Conclusion: Your first bullet (fixing typos/house style) = copy-editing. The core bullets (collating witnesses, resolving inter-witness differences, and introducing LORD’s) are beyond copy-editing and align with textual/critical editing—the editorial constitution of a text from multiple non-identical witnesses.

5) *Numbers & Authorities: Still Unsubstantiated*

- “Millions” of PCE copies. You assert “millions,” but neither “More Pointless Points” nor the relevant sections of *Vintage Bibles* furnish edition-specific production figures across families. The lone concrete number that surfaces (Ruby 32mo at “ten million” by 1966) cannot be generalized across other series. Nor do you address the publication numbers for Oxford, Victorian Cambridge editions, or other non-PCE printings during the 20th century. Google estimates that close to 15 million copies of the Oxford Scofield Reference Bible were sold during the 20th century. Assertions ≠ data.
- On Norton. You repeat that “Norton knew something happened,” yet provide no email, letter, or quotation. Norton’s published work and CUP’s *New Cambridge Paragraph Bible* do not define a Cambridge-recognized “PCE” category; the anecdote remains hearsay.

6) *On /Rhetoric (“AI,” Etc.)*

- Labeling parts of Lesson 280 “AI-produced waffle” is not a rebuttal. If any page/line is wrong, identify it and I will correct it; otherwise, the *ad hominem* avoids the printed record—including your own written works and the CUP passage you reproduced.