

Sunday, March 8, 2026—Grace Life School of Theology—*From This Generation For Ever*

Lesson 281 Assessing the Printed History of the King James Text (PCE: *Vintage Bibles*)

## **Introduction**

- In [Lesson 280](#), we examined Matthew Verschuur’s *Vintage Bibles* (Chapters 3–5) and evaluated his claims about the history and authority of the Pure Cambridge Edition (PCE). Our analysis showed that while Verschuur presents the PCE as a providentially preserved, perfected form of the King James Bible, the actual printed evidence reveals something very different. Cambridge never produced a single, uniform textual line that matches the modern PCE ideal. Instead, the historical record shows multiple coexisting textual streams, frequent internal variations, and no documented editorial program establishing the PCE as a distinct edition. Moreover, the modern PCE text—first fully unified in 2006—is best understood as a harmonized construction created by collating and standardizing diverse Cambridge printings. Lesson 280 therefore demonstrated that the PCE is not a historical edition preserved across the 20<sup>th</sup> century, but a retrospective textual construct applied to a much more complex printing history.
- In Lesson 281 we turn to Part 2 of Matthew Verschuur’s *Vintage Bibles*—“Daniel’s prophecies related to vintage Bibles” (Chapter 6) and “Vintage Bibles in the Book of Revelation” (Chapter 7)—where he explicitly frames the PCE through a Historicist lens. He argues that prophecies in Daniel 8, 10–12 (e.g., the rise of the Ottomans as the “little horn,” the scattering of Scripture to the West, and time-periods like 2300/1290/1335 mapped to 333 BC–1967) and selected scenes in Revelation (trumpets, witnesses) trace a providential arc that culminates in the 20<sup>th</sup>-century spread of Cambridge-printed “vintage Bibles” and, ultimately, the standardized PCE—often tied to the British empire, the Order of St John, and a “Word-and-Spirit” renewal i.e., Word of Faith–style Pentecostal/Charismatic renewal. Our task will be to describe that Historicist construction fairly, identify its evidences and assumptions, and assess how (or whether) the prophetic claims correspond to the printed record surveyed in Lesson 280.
- In [Lesson 274](#), we observed that Historicism is not a peripheral feature of Matthew Verschuur’s PCE system but one of its central theological pillars, functioning alongside Pentecostal spirituality and KJB-Onlyism to portray the PCE as the providentially perfected form of God’s Word in English. Verschuur’s Historicism interprets Revelation—especially the “little book,” the “seven thunders,” and the angelic oath of Revelation 10—as a prophetic roadmap in which the history of the English Bible culminates in the emergence of the PCE around 1900. Within this framework, the PCE becomes the fulfillment of a multi-stage, divinely guided purification process and the key instrument of “Church Restitution” in the last days. In Lesson 281, we will see this same Historicist framework expanded dramatically in Part 2 of *Vintage Bibles*, where Verschuur applies Historicist readings not only to Revelation but also to Daniel 8, 10–12, arguing that global empires, the rise and fall of the Ottomans, the history of the Order of St. John, and even modern Pentecostal/Word-of-Faith renewal all converge to validate the appearance of 20<sup>th</sup>-century “vintage” Cambridge printings as a prophetic event. This Lesson will therefore build

directly on the interpretive structures identified in Lesson 274 by showing how Part 2 uses Historicism to integrate world history, prophecy, and the PCE into a single, overarching narrative.

- Since teaching Lesson 280 on Sunday, March 1, 2026, Verschuur has issued two replies. First there was a blog article published on Monday, March 2 titled “[More Pointless Points](#).” Moreover, that next day (March 3) an over three-hour YouTube video appeared titled “[Answering Bryan Ross on Pointless Points](#).” See Appendix A on page 14 for my response to the blog article. As for the video, Verschuur’s response does not substantively rebut the evidence in Appendix A from Lesson 280; instead, he relies heavily on assertions, personal dismissals, and theological framing rather than empirical documentation. He implicitly concedes several of my key points—such as the absence of a Cambridge directive, the existence of pre-1911 attestations of his so-called PCE diagnostics, and the fact that his 2006 PCE text is a unique harmonized construction—yet reframes these facts as trivial rather than addressing their historical implications. Throughout the video his tone is adversarial and often *ad hominem*, repeatedly accusing me of misunderstanding, bias, confusion, or dishonesty while providing no concrete, dated, archival, or bibliographical evidence that would overturn my findings or establish his central claim that the PCE was ever a dominant or intentionally defined Cambridge standard.
- Unless otherwise noted, all citations in this Lesson are taken from [Vintage Bibles](#).
- 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 identity of wording is not a tenable position.

### *Vintage Bibles*

- Chapter 6 of *Vintage Bibles* is titled “Daniel’s Prophecies Related to Vintage Bibles.” The chapter contains thirty pages running from pages 131 through 161. Verschuur now shifts from historical and textual analysis (Part 1) into prophetic interpretation, connecting “vintage” PCE *Bibles* with biblical prophecy, particularly in the Book of Daniel. Consider the following summary of the chapter.
  - Method—the chapter adopts Historicism as the dominant post-Reformation way English Protestants interpreted prophecy, and it uses that method to read Daniel 8, 10, 11 as a long arc of church history. (132)

- Empire mapping in Daniel 8—Ram = Medo-Persia; He-goat = Greece/Alexander; Four horns = Diadochi. (131–133) Little horn = the Ottoman Turks (House of Osman), expanding south/east/“pleasant land,” destroying the “mighty and the holy people.” (Daniel 8:9, 23–24; pp. 132–134)
- Constantinople & “Daily Sacrifice”—the Fall of Constantinople (1453) fulfills Daniel 8:10–11; Christian worship (“daily sacrifice”) is removed; symbols and practices (“stars/host”) are cast down. (134)
- “Truth Cast Down”—Ottoman policy results in Greek Scripture copies being displaced to Western Europe, ironically aiding the Western recovery of Scripture and later Protestant use. (Daniel 8:12; pp. 135–136)
- “Broken without hand”—the Ottomans oppose the “Prince of princes” yet fall not by battlefield defeat but by secular revolution (end of the Caliphate), completing Daniel 8:25. (136)
- 2300-Year Timeline—using the day-year principle, 333 BC → 1967 marks “then shall the sanctuary be cleansed” (Daniel 8:14), applied spiritually to the Church, not to a Jewish temple event. (137–138)
- Post-1967 “cleansing” Markers—two positive movements are cited as outworkings of this cleansing, Word of Faith emphases (deliverance/inner healing; sanctification by faith), and the renewed elevation of the King James Bible as the best Bible for all Christians. (138)
- Evening→ Morning Symbolism (Daniel 8:26)—“Evening” = Greek era; night = the Arabic Koran/Islamic suppression; “morning” = English’s triumph for Christianity; the day = legacy of vintage Bibles. (139)
- Daniel 10 (Angel in Linen)—a glorious angel oversees the delivery/understanding of the “scripture of truth” across “many days” (years), fighting the prince of Persia/Grecia with Michael’s aid; this frames history as a spiritual conflict guiding Scripture’s transmission. (Daniel 10:14, 20–21; pp. 140–142)
- Multiple Fulfilments in Daniel 11—Verschuur asserts three layers—Early (Antiochus IV), Historicist (Ottoman Turks/Islam), Future (Gog/Russia)—with the Historicist layer highlighting:
  - Ships of Chittim = Order of St John (Hospitallers) resisting the Turks.
  - Polluting the sanctuary/taking the daily sacrifice = Islamization (Hagia Sophia to mosque).

- Protestants “do exploits,” suffer and instruct many; Ottoman rise/fall fits Daniel 11. (142–145)
- Chapter 6 uses Historicism to interpret Daniel’s visions as a prophetic outline of Christian history. In this reading, Medo-Persia and Greece/Alexander lead to the Ottoman Turks as the “little horn,” whose conquest of Constantinople (1453) fulfills the removal of the “daily sacrifice” and the casting down of Christian worship in Daniel 8:10–12. The Ottomans’ fall through secular revolution (not war) is taken as the fulfillment of Daniel 8:25. Verschuur applies the day-year principle to Daniel 8:14, claiming that 333 BC → 1967 marks a prophesied spiritual “cleansing,” shown by the post-1967 rise of Word-of-Faith teaching and renewed KJV emphasis. Daniel 8:26’s “evening/morning” is reinterpreted as a shift from Greek to English, with the “day” symbolizing the legacy of “vintage Bibles.” Daniel 10 introduces an angel who guides the transmission and understanding of the “scripture of truth” across “many days,” battling spiritual powers behind Persia and Greece (Daniel 10:14, 20–21). The beginning of Daniel 11 is then framed as having multiple fulfillments, with the Historicist layer identifying Islam and the Ottoman Empire (and events such as the Hospitallers’ resistance and Ottoman suppression of Christian worship) as fulfilling the King-of-the-North prophecies.

*Historicism: Application To the PCE Framework*

- Throughout Chapter 6, Verschuur uses Historicism not merely as an interpretive backdrop but as the structural scaffold that time-stamps, legitimizes, and situates the PCE within salvation history: Daniel’s long-range timelines (e.g., the 2300 “days” ending in 1967) are read as a prophetic “cleansing” that coincides with a renewed elevation of the KJV and the milieu (“Word & Spirit”) most receptive to recognizing the “vintage” Cambridge text as its purified form. He then extends Daniel 10’s “scripture of truth” motif to argue that Scripture must exist on earth in a finite, exact manifestation; the “vintage” Cambridge Bibles (and the precise electronic PCE text) are presented as that manifestation, while Daniel 11’s Historicist arc (Ottoman rise/fall, Protestant exploits) supplies the historical pathway by which Western—ultimately English—Scripture becomes providentially central.
- The “sanctuary cleansed” statement of Daniel 8:14 is interpreted spiritually to refer to important developments in Evangelical Christianity, the Word of Faith movement and the KJB being uplifted in the English church around the year 1967.
  - “As the sanctuary is to be cleansed, how was there cleansing for the Church beyond 1967? Because people could point to great problems in Protestant and Evangelical Christianity that seemed to get worse from 1967, like compromise with Rome, worldliness and Scriptural illiterateness. But can any positive changes be found for the Church spiritually?

There were several manifestations of very positive advances for the spiritual wellbeing of the future of the Church from this time. One advance is the clarity of the cleansing

(deliverance and inner healing) and renewed mind doctrine (sanctification by faith) as taught by the Word of Faith movement. The other advance is the uplifting within the Church of the King James Bible as the best Bible for all Christians.

These two doctrinal ideas have actually improved and sharpened in clarity since 1967 through an enlargement of Biblical and spiritual understanding. It is not as if these advancements have had universal success, but two broad movements or influences have developed, one in line with Word of Faith ideas (e.g. see 3 John 2), and the other with King James Bible only ideas (e.g. see 2 Thessalonians 3:1).

The combination of these two trends in a proper way is the view of the Word and Spirit movement, and it is only with this movement where the recognition of the highest view of the legacy of vintage Bibles exists.” (138)

- The quoted passage uses Historicism—the prophetic method that reads Daniel as forecasting long arcs of Church history—as a core pillar supporting the PCE. Within that framework, the author interprets Daniel 8:14’s “cleansing” as reaching fulfillment in 1967, after which two spiritually significant developments emerged: the rise of Word of Faith teaching and the renewed elevation of the King James Bible. The quote argues that these post-1967 trends mark the beginning of a prophetic purification in the Church, culminating in the recognition of the PCE contained in “vintage” Cambridge Bibles. By tying these movements to a specific prophetic endpoint calculated through Historicist timelines, the author positions the PCE not merely as an accurate KJV edition, but as the intended, prophetically validated manifestation of the purified Scripture in the latter days, thereby using Historicism to prove the authority and significance of “vintage” PCE Bibles.
- The argument for the PCE in *Vintage Bibles (2025)* depends entirely on Historicism, because Historicism provides the prophetic timeline and interpretive framework that makes the PCE appear divinely intended. By interpreting Daniel’s 2300-year prophecy as ending in 1967 and claiming that this date marks a spiritual “cleansing” in the Church—including the rise of KJV-Only thought—the author uses Historicism to place the PCE within a supposed prophetic sequence. Without that Historicist structure, the connection between biblical prophecy and the emergence of “vintage” Cambridge PCE Bibles disappears, meaning the PCE could no longer be presented as the prophesied purified form of Scripture.
- Daniel 8:26’s “evening and morning... for many days” → night/day metaphor; day = legacy of “vintage Bibles.” Regarding this point Verschuur states the following:
  - “The “many days” in the prophecy means many years. Symbolically, one could suggest that the evening represents the Greek language for believers, but morning is the triumph

of the English language for Christianity. The implied night would be the Arabic Koran. The implied day therefore is the legacy of the vintage Bibles.

This chapter only lays the groundwork for the prophetic links to vintage Bibles, but it will become more direct as the study continues into further passages of the Scripture.” (139)

- This quote uses Daniel 8:26 (“the vision... shall be for many days”) to build another symbolic layer within the book’s Historicism-based defense of the PCE. Verschuur interprets the “evening” and “morning” not merely as time markers but as historical-linguistic ages: evening = the Greek era of Scripture, night = the rise of Islam and the Arabic Koran, and morning = the “triumph” of English as the providential language for Christianity. This symbolic reading allows the author to claim that the “day”—the final, bright stage of God’s prophetic plan—corresponds specifically to the legacy of “vintage” Cambridge Bibles, which contain the PCE. In other words, this passage asserts that prophecy itself anticipates a transition from Greek to English, and that the culmination of that transition is the PCE. Verschuur then says this material is “groundwork,” meaning future sections will make the prophetic connection to vintage PCE Bibles even more explicit.
- The angel’s appearance in Daniel 10:5-6 is interpreted symbolically. On page 140, Verschuur writes, “This angel has attributes, which may be taken as symbolic. Linen denotes righteousness which is directly based upon Scripture (e.g. see Revelation 19:8), gold the preciousness of Scripture (e.g. see Psalm 119:127 and Proverbs 25:11), light the power of Scripture (e.g. see Psalm 119:105), fiery eyes the insight of Scripture (e.g. see Jeremiah 23:29 and 2 Peter 1:19), etc.” (140) Verschuur assigns symbolic meaning to each aspect of the angel’s appearance:
  - Linen = righteousness
  - Gold = preciousness of Scripture
  - Light = power of Scripture
  - Fiery eyes = insight
  - Brass = strength
- The angel’s symbolism is further tied to “vintage Bibles.” Verschuur ascribes typological parallels between the angel and the physical features of “vintage” Cambridge Bibles:
  - Linen → flax → India paper
  - Gold → gilt edges

- Voice of a multitude → global spread of “vintage Bibles”
- Consider the following quote:
  - “There is also another derivative set of symbolic correspondences that may be taken in God’s providence. For example, linen is made from flax, which is the very same thing used to make India paper in the vintage Bibles. The gold also is seen as the gilt on vintage Bibles. And vintage Bibles do speak loudly as the voice of a multitude by their widespread presence throughout the world.

As an aside, this angel was also the presidential power in Persia, and it happens that certain vintage Bibles are bound with Persian Morocco leather. This last derivative interpretation is merely providential, and tertiary to the authority of the other interpretations, and is subject to them.” (140)

- The quote supports the PCE framework by suggesting that the physical materials of “vintage” Cambridge Bibles—such as India paper made from flax, gilt page edges, and even Persian Morocco leather—symbolically mirror the angelic figure in Daniel 10, whose linen, gold, and powerful voice are interpreted as qualities of Scripture. These parallels are presented not as doctrinal proof but as providential signs that reinforce the idea that “vintage” PCE Bibles participate in the same divine pattern of preservation associated with the angel who delivers the “scripture of truth.” In V erschuur’s system, these correspondences deepen the impression that the PCE is not only textually pure but also uniquely marked in its material form as part of God’s providential plan.
- More is said about the “linen angel” and its connection to “vintage Bibles” on page 144.
  - “The linen angel must also be fulfilling his mission at this time, for people to have truthful Bibles, and we can see this prophecy as relevant to the near future and the outcome of vintage Bibles. . .

The Historicist perspective informs us that what Christians observe as world history is actually the product of the actions of these angels in line with what God had forewritten and prophets foretold. On one side is the linen angel, who is narrating this prophecy, and on the other is the outworking of two spirits, connected to the king of the north and the king of the south. Therefore, this prophecy is not just some random account, but is about events in history, helps explain the purpose of Islam and the Ottoman Turks, and is entirely relevant to understanding how believers have the Bible today.

As the linen angel explained that all of this was noted in the Scripture of truth, it follows then that the Scripture itself must exist in a finite form and be true. On one side, this means that the true Scripture exists in Heaven, but on the other side, it means that God has sent the true Scripture that must be known to His people. This which implies that an actual manifestation of Scripture on Earth, answering to the true prototype in Heaven, must come to pass. This is what the vintage Bibles are reflecting, and then, what a computer text file, representing them without any minute error, is really manifesting.” (144)

- In this passage, the author links Historicism to the PCE by claiming the linen-clad angel (Daniel 10) actively steers history so believers receive “truthful Bibles.” Because the angel says events are recorded in the “scripture of truth,” then Verschuur infers Scripture must exist on earth in a finite, exact form—not only in heaven—and then identifies that earthly manifestation with “vintage” Cambridge Bibles and the precise PCE electronic text. In short: prophecy requires a perfect public Bible, and the author asserts the PCE uniquely fulfills that requirement as the angel-guided, accurate embodiment of the heavenly archetype.
- Throughout the duration of Chapter 6 there are various interesting statements made regarding historicism and aspects of PCE position. In the next section I break these statements down by topic.
  - Word of Faith & Pentecost Revival
    - “Likewise, the purging is evident with the progress of the Word of Faith movement because its leaders rejected the error of William Branham, who had died in 1965. Meanwhile, the clear teachings on sanctification by faith and renewing the mind continued, and Kenneth E. Hagin, father of the faith movement, providentially continued using the King James Bible.

So far, then, the history of the battle between the Turks and the Order of St John can be followed into the 20th century, with the British Empire (connected to the Order of St John) fighting the Turks, the progress of the King James Bible and the Word of Faith along side people connected to the traditions of the Order of St John.

[Quotes Revelation 14:13.]

Thus, the honoured dead are figures like Ian Paisley (Baran Bannside) and Kenneth E. Hagin.” (150)

- “In the middle of the 20th century, the Pentecostal revival came into mainline denominations. Those that came into the infilling of the Spirit were known as Charismatics, but those who did not were called “the congregations of the dead”

or “dead churches”. The spiritual decline and demise of many denominations began to become apparent.

[Quotes Daniel 12:3.]

The witness of the Word of Faith movement via radio and television has been evident, as light shining all over the world (transmitted by invisible beams in the firmament). The work of those who have openly supported the King James Bible, like Ian Paisley and Henry M. Morris, has also been a good witness. Morris taught about the accuracy of the King James Bible and stipulated that creationists should not depart away from it if they wish to preserve correct doctrine. Morris’ teachings also emphasised the wonders of creation including the firmament and even suggesting that there were spiritual meanings to the constellations of the stars.

[Quotes Daniel 12:4.]

The prophecy, as concerning the upholding of the King James Bible, and particularly the adherence to Bibles printed by Cambridge, was really only revealed in the time of the end. The promise of preservation of the Scripture, as well as the fulfilling of Scripture and the ultimate understanding of Scripture, is all being manifested.

Worldwide jet travel has allowed people to move across the planet, and televisions, computers, smart phones and the internet have allowed the rapid increase in knowledge and its widespread dissemination. The real benefit for the Kingdom of God with all this has been the ability to communicate the Word of Faith message and to ensure adherence to the King James Bible abroad.

The pure Word and the Spirit message have been brought together, resulting in the Word and Spirit movement. This movement supercedes the various excesses and erroneous thoughts which can exist alongside good things, whether among King James Bible onlyism, creationism, providentialism, prophecy interpretation, etc., or whether among Word of Faith and Charismatic evangelicalism. The preaching and teaching of mid-20th century Christians and having vintage Bibles is the legacy and outcome of the linen-wearing angel’s work.” (154)

- “When Kenneth Copeland, who founded his ministry in 1967, brought out his Reference Bible as printed by Cambridge on at least two occasions, it seemed no one had any idea how important it was that it was the Pure Cambridge Edition.” (157)
  - In *Vintage Bibles*, Pentecostal/Word-of-Faith theology is deployed as both hermeneutical frame and sociological validator for the PCE: the

post-1967 “purging” is narrated through Hagin’s continued KJV usage, thereby presenting charismatic/KJV-loyal leadership as providential witnesses to the “cleansed” English text. (150) Daniel 12:3-4 is read Historicistically to cast mid-20th-century Pentecostal/Charismatic renewal and mass-media dissemination of Word-of-Faith as an end-time unveiling that uniquely elevates Cambridge-printed KJV copies—“particularly” adherence to Cambridge—as the venue in which the linen angel’s work yields “vintage Bibles.” (154) This convergence is tokenized by pointing to Kenneth Copeland’s Cambridge-printed Reference Bible (1967) as a concrete instance of the PCE circulating through Pentecostal channels at the prophetic hinge-year. (157) In parallel, Lesson 273 analyzed how this strategy functions: Faith Pentecostalism is treated as a pillar that supplies (i) a *Spirit-led certainty* and holiness ethic demanding a flawless public Bible, (ii) a doctrinal determiner for key PCE “tests” (e.g., capitalization of *Spirit/spirit* in Matthew 4:1; Mark 1:12; Acts 11:28; 1 John 5:8), thereby letting Pentecostal pneumatology adjudicate the “pure” reading, and (iii) a claim of providential custodianship (“Guardians of the PCE”) that frames Cambridge “vintage” printings and the PCE e-text as the finite, exact earthly counterpart to the heavenly “scripture of truth” (Lessons 273–274). Collectively, these moves weld Historicism’s timelines and the Word & Spirit milieu to the assertion that the PCE is not merely an accurate edition but the angel-guided, eschatologically unveiled form of Scripture for the Church’s “time of the end.” (150, 154, 157; Lessons 273–274)

- Actions of the Turks Led to “Vintage Bibles”
  - “The error of the King of the North is that of man’s claims versus divine determinism. The Scripture accurately and faithfully gives the message of God foretelling the fall of the Turks. The Turks would never have imagined that their actions led to vintage Bibles, or to the return of the Jews to their homeland, or to English-speaking nations becoming powers in the Middle East.” (151)
  - “The King James Bible has stood firm, been multiplied in vintage Bibles and is manifestly available in the Pure Cambridge Edition. Regardless of all attacks by the Turks, or the attempt to revise and replace the King James Bible by Infidelity, the Scripture has been preserved and yet this has not been fully understood until the end.” (156)
    - In the PCE’s Historicist schema, the Turks (Ottoman Empire) are cast as the prophetic “King of the North” whose rise, suppression of Christian worship, and scattering of Greek Scriptures fulfill Daniel’s long arc and, paradoxically, *advance* God’s plan toward an English-language, publicly

preserved Bible: their imperial “claims” are set over against divine determinism, so that even their aggression becomes the unwitting means by which “vintage” Cambridge KJV Bibles emerge as the purified, manifest “Scripture of truth” in history (151; cf. the earlier depiction of Ottoman actions leading to the displacement of Scripture and the casting down of the “daily sacrifice,” 134–135). Thus, when the Verschuur asserts that “the King James Bible has stood firm, been multiplied in vintage Bibles and is manifestly available in the Pure Cambridge Edition, regardless of all attacks by the Turks,” he is using Ottoman failure to extinguish the KJV as *empirical proof* of providential preservation culminating in the PCE—an explicitly Historicist move that reads geopolitical centuries as staged fulfillments tending toward an exact, public, end-time text. (156) Read alongside his broader Historicist scaffolding (Daniel 8–11 mapped onto post-biblical empires, culminating in an English “day”/“morning” and the angelic stewardship of a finite, true earthly Scripture), the Turks function both as antagonist and catalyst, their foretold rise and fall confirming the trajectory by which the PCE is positioned as the angel-guided, purified form of Scripture for the Church’s latter-day clarity. (139–145, 151, 156; cf. Lesson 274 on Historicism as a pillar of the PCE position)

○ Significance of 1967

- “The waiting to the 1335th day brings the counting of years to 1967, at the high tide mark of vintage Bibles. That year the Jews essentially controlled Jerusalem theoretically liberating the temple mount from Islamic control; Word of Faith ministries arose to a new level with the world’s most prosperous preacher, Kenneth Copeland, launching his ministry and the King James Bible was being accepted as the providentially appointed best Bible, thanks to Edward F. Hills. Among other things happening that same year, Queen Elizabeth II visited Malta as Head of State, Ian Paisley openly debated Roman Catholicism at Oxford University, Henry M. Morris wrote *Studies in the Bible and Science* using the King James Bible and at Cambridge they were still printing the Pure Cambridge Edition.” (158)
- In *Vintage Bibles*, 1967 is the prophetic hinge that legitimizes the PCE through a Historicist reading of Daniel 12:12 (“1,335 days” → 1,335 years) that is counted to 1967, which the author calls the “high tide mark of vintage Bibles.” (158) This single year is presented as a bundle of providential confirmations: (1) a geopolitical sign—Jerusalem coming under Jewish control—marking a turning point in sacred history; (2) a Pentecostal/Word-of-Faith surge—Kenneth Copeland launches his ministry; (3) a doctrinal ratification—Edward F. Hills’ influence is cited as the Church’s renewed acceptance of the KJV as providentially

appointed; (4) royal/Order-of-St-John symbolism—Queen Elizabeth II in Malta; (5) Protestant polemics—Ian Paisley debating Roman Catholicism at Oxford; (6) creationist scholarship—Henry M. Morris publishing *Studies in the Bible and Science* using the KJV; and (7) concrete production evidence—Cambridge was still printing the PCE. Collectively, these threads are offered as synchronized fulfillments that “seal” the moment when the PCE—as the pure, public, English manifestation of the “scripture of truth”—is both available and publicly validated by events across church, academy, state, and press. In other words, 1967 functions as the time-stamped convergence where Historicist chronology (the 1,335 years) meets Pentecostal reception, English-language centrality, royal patronage, Protestant witness, creationist defense, and Cambridge’s ongoing typesetting—all marshaled to argue that the PCE is the angel-guided, end-time form of Scripture for the Church. (158)

- “End of the Days” in Daniel 12:11-13
  - “The end of days referred to in the prophecy sees the coming together of the Word and Spirit, and a blessed rest, with truth standing at the end. The “Word” means the movement which stands for pure English Bible, and the “Spirit” means the movement which stand is Pentecostal power. This is the Word and Spirit movement.

At the end of his Book, Daniel is told he will stand in his lot. In the Historicist interpretation that means the Book of Daniel, which stands with the other books of the Bible. It symbolically means that the Bible stands at the end. The end of the Historicist prophecy includes then the status and legacy of the vintage Bibles.” (159)

- In this passage, Verschuur uses Daniel 12:11–13 to argue that the “end of days” culminates in a divinely ordained union of “Word” (those who uphold a *pure English Bible*) and “Spirit” (Pentecostal power), forming the Word and Spirit movement—the only body, he claims, capable of recognizing and defending the purity of the “vintage” Cambridge PCE. (159) He then applies Daniel’s statement that he will “stand in his lot” to the Book of Daniel itself and, symbolically, to the Bible standing at the end, which in his Historicist framework means the appearance of the final purified form of Scripture. Thus, when he concludes that the end of the prophecy includes “the status and legacy of the vintage Bibles,” (159) he is asserting that Daniel’s final vision prophetically terminates in the PCE as the end-time, purified, publicly available manifestation of the “scripture of truth.”

## Conclusion

- Lesson 281 demonstrates that Matthew Verschuur’s prophetic defense of the PCE in *Vintage Bibles* depends almost entirely on a comprehensive Historicist framework—one that blends interpretations of Daniel, Revelation, church history, geopolitical events, Pentecostal/ Word-of-Faith theology, and the physical features of Cambridge-printed “vintage Bibles.”
- The lesson shows that Chapter 6 of *Vintage Bibles* shifts the discussion away from textual history and into a prophetic narrative in which the rise and fall of empires, especially the Ottoman Turks, are treated as fulfillments of Daniel 8, 10, and 11 that ultimately prepare the way for the English Bible and, specifically, the PCE. Verschuur uses day-year calculations (e.g., 333 BC→ 1967 and the 1,290/1,335-day periods) to argue that 1967 marks a prophetic “cleansing,” coinciding with developments such as the rise of Word-of-Faith ministries, renewed KJV advocacy, and continued Cambridge printing of the PCE. These parallel events are presented as synchronized evidence that the PCE is the purified, divinely intended English Bible for the end times.
- The lesson walks through how Verschuur symbolically maps the angelic figure of Daniel 10 onto the physical qualities of “vintage” Cambridge Bibles (linen → India paper, gold → gilt edges, etc.) to argue that the material form of these Bibles reflects heavenly realities. He further asserts that because Daniel references the “scripture of truth,” a perfect earthly manifestation of that Scripture must exist—and he identifies that manifestation with the PCE and its electronic text file.
- Lesson 281 also highlights how Pentecostal and Word-of-Faith movements are integrated into Verschuur’s schema. Their emphasis on Spirit-led certainty, sanctification, media-driven global influence, and KJV usage is portrayed as evidence that God raised up a Spirit-empowered constituency capable of recognizing the PCE as the purified text. Figures such as Kenneth Hagin, Kenneth Copeland, Ian Paisley, and Henry Morris are described as providential witnesses to the arrival of “vintage Bibles.” The year 1967 functions as the prophetic hinge where these spiritual, geopolitical, and textual streams converge.
- Finally, the lesson underscores that Historicism is not peripheral but essential to Verschuur’s argument. Without the prophetic scaffolding—Ottoman symbolism, time-period calculations, angelic stewardship of history, and the Word & Spirit movement—the claim that the PCE is the prophesied, perfected form of Scripture collapses. When contrasted with the actual printed history surveyed in Lesson 280, the PCE emerges not as a long-standing, uniform Cambridge tradition but as a modern standardized text retroactively fitted into a prophetic system. Lesson 281 therefore clarifies that the PCE’s authority, in Verschuur’s system, depends not on evidence from the printing record but on the acceptance of his overarching Historicist, theological, and symbolic framework.

### Works Cited

Verschuur, Matthew. *Vintage Bibles*. BibleProtector.com, 2025.

## 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 20<sup>th</sup> century. Google estimates that close to 15 million copies of the Oxford Scofield Reference Bible were sold during the 20<sup>th</sup> 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.