

Sunday, March 15, 2026—Grace Life School of Theology—*From This Generation For Ever*  
 Lesson 282 Assessing the Printed History of the King James Text (PCE: *Vintage Bibles*)

## Introduction

- [Lesson 281](#) demonstrated that Matthew Verschuur’s argument for the Pure Cambridge Edition (PCE) rests on an elaborate Historicist framework that overlays prophetic timelines, geopolitical events, and even the physical qualities of “vintage” Cambridge Bibles onto the history of the English text. By applying Historicist readings of Daniel 8, 10, 11, and 12, Verschuur constructs a narrative in which the rise and fall of the Ottoman Empire, the displacement of Greek Scripture, and the eventual ascendance of the English language culminate in the appearance of the PCE as the purified, end-time manifestation of the “scripture of truth.” He further merges Pentecostal and Word-of-Faith theology into a “Word & Spirit” movement that he believes uniquely possesses the spiritual insight needed to recognize the PCE’s supposed prophetic status. In this system, the year 1967 becomes the prophetic hinge where the 1,335 “days” of Daniel meet modern charismatic renewal, renewed KJV advocacy, and Cambridge’s continued printing of the PCE.
- With these interpretive pillars in place, Lesson 281 established that the PCE’s authority within Verschuur’s system does not arise from the actual printed history surveyed in previous lessons—which showed no single, continuous Cambridge textual line—but from the acceptance of his prophetic scaffolding. Without this Historicist structure, the claim that the PCE is a divinely intended or prophetically purified edition collapses. As we move into Lesson 282, the analysis will now build on this foundation by examining how this prophetic-historical framework continues to function, what claims it attempts to support in later chapters, and how well these claims correspond to the documented history of the King James Bible’s printed text. This transition allows us to evaluate not only the internal logic of Verschuur’s system but also its explanatory power when measured against verifiable historical evidence.
- Verschuur responded to Lesson 281 with a blog article on March 10, 2026, titled, “[Bryan Ross’ Debate Continues](#).” Interested parties are encouraged to see my response in Appendix A of these notes beginning on page 13.
- 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 7 is titled “Vintage Bibles in the Book of Revelation” and runs for sixteen pages from 161 through 177. The chapter applies Historicism to Revelation 9–11 to argue that Islam’s and the Ottomans’ “woes” scattered Scripture westward; that Revelation 10’s “little book” and “seven thunders” depict the public manifestation and purification of the English Bible; and that Revelation 11’s 1260-year “sackcloth,” 1798 “death,” and 1882 revival chart the KJV’s historical trajectory—all culminating under the seventh trumpet in the triumph of “vintage” Cambridge Bibles as the world standard, identified as the Pure Cambridge Edition. (161–176, 170–172)

### *Revelation Chapter 9*

- Chapter 7 opens by stating that the section will consider “vintage Bibles” in the Book of Revelation, explain the four main interpretive approaches (Preterist, Historicist, Futurist, Idealist), and proceed specifically with a Historicist reading to connect Revelation’s visions to church history and the legacy of “vintage” Cambridge KJV Bibles. Verschuur notes Revelation’s narrative structure and focuses on the second major section (seven seals→ seven trumpets), highlighting that the last three “woe” trumpets (Revelation 8–11) are especially relevant to the story of Scripture’s transmission that culminates in “vintage Bibles.” (161-162)
- Within Historicism, the first four trumpets correspond to invasions that contributed to the fall of the Western Roman Empire (476 AD). The fifth trumpet introduces a 150-year period (“five months” × 30 days, applied by the day–year principle). According to Verschuur, the fifth trumpet = rise/expansion of early Islam (Saracens). The 150-year period is identified as 612–762 AD, from the rise of Mohammed to the establishment of Baghdad as the Islamic center; this period features the Saracen expansion across the Middle East, North Africa, and into Spain. This Saracen advance is presented as part of the chain of events that disrupted Eastern Christian practice and helped set conditions that would ultimately send Greek biblical manuscripts westward, a prelude to later Reformation-era textual work that undergirds English Bible history. (162-163)
- The sixth trumpet = the Turks and the fall of Constantinople, according to Verschuur. The “loosing of the Euphrates” is read as the rise of the Turks, culminating in the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople (1453); details like gunpowder and cannon in the symbolism are emphasized. The fall of Constantinople leads to the westward movement of Greek manuscripts, enabling Erasmus’ Greek New Testament and fueling Reformation translations, ultimately reaching the King James Bible—the text tradition preserved in the “vintage” Cambridge (PCE) Bibles celebrated throughout the book. As page 165 closes, the narrative points forward to Revelation 10’s “mighty angel” with a “little book,” which the author will

connect to the printed, vernacular Bible tradition (especially the English Bible) in the following pages. (163-165)

- On page 165 Verschuur closes the first part of chapter 7 by stating the following:
  - “This means that the outcome of the chain of providence, and the direct consequence of the Turks taking Constantinople, was the improvement of the Scripture in the West, which eventually led to the making of vintage Bibles, and the ultimate position of the raising of the standard of the Pure Cambridge Edition of the King James Bible.

One underutilised apologetic for Christianity and the veracity of Scripture content is the dates and descriptions in the Historicist understanding of Bible prophecy. The Word and Spirit movement is reclaiming the heritage of proper Bible interpretation, particularly in relation to prophecy, which is a surety for a wonderful future of relying upon the very veracity of the words of the King James Bible.” (165)

- Within the PCE framework, Verschuur contends that God’s providence turned the Ottoman sack of Constantinople (1453) into a redemptive hinge in textual history: the scattering of Greek manuscripts to Western Europe catalyzed the Textus Receptus tradition, the English Reformation’s vernacular Scripture, and, by a long editorial arc at Cambridge, the emergence of the “vintage Bibles” that culminate in the PCE as a raised, final standard of the King James Bible (the “outcome of the chain of providence”). (165) In this telling, Historicism—with its dated prophetic periods and event-sequences in Daniel and Revelation—functions as an apologetic: fulfilled timelines (e.g., the Islamic and Turkish waves under the fifth–sixth trumpets, the Reformation’s “little book open,” and the post-Revolution vindication of Scripture) publicly corroborate both Christian truth and the providential textual purification that issues in the PCE, (161–165, 169–173) Finally, the author situates the present in a Word-and-Spirit synthesis—“Word” as the exact, preserved wording of the KJV in its PCE form, and “Spirit” as Pentecostal/Charismatic vitality—claiming this union reclaims proper prophetic interpretation and secures a “wonderful future” grounded in the veracity of the very words of the King James Bible. (165)

### *Revelation Chapter Ten*

- After describing the Saracens and then the Turks in Revelation 9, Verschuur proceeds to explain that Revelation 10 interrupts the trumpet sequence with a new vision. This pause serves to introduce a major prophetic development relevant to the history of Scripture itself. John sees a *mighty angel* descending from heaven, clothed with a cloud, crowned with a rainbow, shining like the sun, and standing with one foot on the sea and one on the earth. Verschuur stresses that these attributes symbolize authority over the whole world. The angel holds a “little book open,” which the author identifies as a prophetic symbol for the

Scriptures becoming available in a new and more accessible form — a shift from restricted or suppressed Scripture toward open publication. (165-166)

- Within the Historicist framework, the “little book open” is interpreted as the rise of the printed Bible in common languages, especially through the Reformation and the development of English Bible translations. The “open” condition symbolizes the end of medieval suppression and the beginning of public availability. The angel’s feet on sea and earth signify worldwide publication and distribution—something uniquely possible only after the invention of printing and later fulfilled through English Bible circulation. John hears “seven thunders” but is told not to write them. The author notes that this symbolizes truths or developments in church history that were *not* revealed or preserved in writing at that moment. Their silence emphasizes the significance of what *was* revealed—the open book. The angel declares that “time should be no longer,” which Verschuur interprets not as the end of time but rather the end of a prophetic delay—the beginning of the major movement that brings the Scriptures into full openness. This includes the Reformation and the emergence of printed Bibles. The finishing of the mystery of God corresponds to the Scriptures being fully available, understood, and circulated, especially through Protestant nations. This is seen as a providential step toward the establishment of the English Bible as the standard. (167-168)
- John is commanded to take and eat the book. It is sweet in his mouth but bitter in his belly, which Verschuur interprets as the dual nature of Scripture reception during the Reformation: joy at recovering the Word of God, but bitterness from persecution, conflict, and martyrdom that followed. After eating the book, John is told he must “prophesy again before many peoples, nations, tongues, and kings,” which Verschuur identifies as the global missionary and publishing efforts of Protestant nations—especially the English-speaking world. The section concludes by linking Revelation 10 directly to the rise of the English Bible and ultimately to the PCE preserved in “vintage” Cambridge Bibles. These editions embody the “open little book,” representing the culmination of centuries of providential preservation and worldwide distribution. (168)
- The following are a couple of citations to note from this subsection.
  - “[Regarding Rev. 10:3-4] The lion is a potent symbol, and well known as a symbol of England, both on the coat of arms (three lions) and as a supporter of the coat of arms (a lion), as it has been from the time of King Henry VIII to this day. Queen Elizabeth I famously said, “Although I may not be a lioness, I am a lion’s cub, and inherit many of his qualities”.

The lion roaring indicates the language of England. The seven thunders indicate the seven major Protestant translations of the Bible that were made. These translations are the same that are listed as to be used in the making of the King James Bible, being the Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Great, Geneva, Bishops’ with the seventh being the drafting and making of the King James Bible, which Bible represents them all.



but the creation of an English-speaking Protestant culture shaped by Scripture. That Scriptural culture, in turn, generated the powerful missionary impulse of the 17th–19th centuries, as English-speaking Christians—armed with their vernacular Bible—carried the Gospel abroad. Verschuur argues that this missionary expansion prepared the global, cultural, and institutional conditions under which Cambridge University Press would eventually produce millions of high-quality King James Bibles, the very “vintage” Cambridge editions that later serve as the textual witnesses underpinning the PCE. (168)

- Thus, in the PCE framework, Revelation 10’s “little book” does not merely symbolize the printing of Scripture; it symbolizes the entire providential arc in which the English Bible reshapes England, fuels world missions, spreads biblical literacy, and leads—through Cambridge’s role as a printer under royal authority—to the material creation, preservation, and eventual standardization of the Scriptural text in its PCE form.

### *Revelation Chapter Eleven*

- Revelation 11 continues the narrative of the sixth trumpet, shifting attention from military powers (as in Revelation 9) to the role of Scripture itself in Church history. The chapter introduces the measuring of the temple, interpreted as defining the standard of true doctrine and the canon of Scripture. The measuring rod symbolizes Scripture’s authority: the *complete 66-book canon* becomes the standard by which teaching is judged. The outer court excluded from measurement represents teachings and institutions outside of true doctrine. Using the Historicist day–year principle, the 42 months of trampling correspond to 538–1798 AD, the period traditionally identified as the height of papal temporal authority. (169-170)
- Verschuur states that in Historicist interpretation, the Two Witnesses symbolize the Old and New Testaments, testifying throughout the 1,260-year period despite opposition. Their “sackcloth” condition reflects the Scriptures’ diminished public status under medieval ecclesiastical dominance. The miracles—shutting heaven, turning waters to blood, striking the earth with plagues—are symbolic of the Bible’s power to bring spiritual judgment on corrupt systems. The “beast” rising to attack the Witnesses is interpreted as Infidelity, especially Enlightenment rationalism and French Revolutionary atheism, which sought to “kill” the testimony of Scripture. (170-171)
- The banning of the Bible and abolition of Christianity in France (1793–1797) is applied to the prophecy that the Witnesses lie dead in the “street of the great city.” France is viewed as one-tenth of the symbolic city, being one of the ten Western European kingdoms. After 3½ prophetic “days,” corresponding to roughly 3½ years, the Witnesses stand again—symbolizing the restoration of the Scriptures following the Terror and the re-legalization and spread of the Bible. The “earthquake” symbolizes the French Revolution’s political convulsions, which shattered the old order and dealt a major blow to papal political power. The “tenth part of the city” falling is interpreted as France’s break with Rome. (171-172)

- The chapter moves toward the sounding of the seventh trumpet, seen in Historicism as signaling the transition into a new prophetic era in which Scripture triumphs. Verschuur connects this directly to the global spread and renewed authority of the Bible. The resurrection and ascension of the Witnesses demonstrate the enduring and divinely protected authority of the Bible. Their elevation prefigures the eventual triumph of God’s Word despite historical attempts to suppress it. Verschuur highlights how this chapter underscores the need for a correct and preserved text—linking it to the value of the PCE as a precise representative of Scripture in the modern era. (172-173)

### *The Seventh Trumpet*

- Revelation 11:15–19 marks the sounding of the seventh trumpet, signaling the culminating phase of prophetic history. The proclamation that “the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord” is interpreted as the beginning of a future global Christian ascendancy. Verschuur emphasizes that the seventh trumpet, in strict Historicist interpretation, is yet future, picking up after the end of the sixth trumpet period (which he places around 1882). This trumpet represents a sweeping transformation of world affairs under Christ’s authority. (173-174)
- Revelation 11:18 shows the nations becoming angry. Verschuur stresses that this anger is not universal but broadly representative of global resistance to the rising influence of Christianity. The “destroyers of the earth” are associated with anti-Christian ideologies, with a possible Russian-led geopolitical threat suggested as a future fulfillment. The seventh trumpet includes a period of reward for prophets and saints, representing the vindication of faithful believers and the triumph of the preserved Scriptures. (174-175)
- Revelation 11:19 describes the heavenly temple opening and the Ark of the Testament appearing. Verschuur interprets this symbolically as the universal Church rising to prominence and, more importantly, the recognition of God’s preserved Word. The Ark symbolizes the preserved Scripture, specifically tied here to vintage King James Bibles and the Pure Cambridge Edition (PCE). The seventh trumpet’s era is portrayed as one in which the Word (pure Scripture) and the Spirit (Pentecostal/Charismatic power) unite into a single global movement, fulfilling prophetic expectations. (175-176)
- The symbolic “lightnings, voices, thunderings, earthquake, and hail” are interpreted as a coming period of global upheaval—including geopolitical turmoil, prophetic activity, and possibly a major Russian confrontation with Israel, connected to Ezekiel 38–39 (“Gog”). Verschuur sees the seventh trumpet as the stage leading to widespread Christian influence over nations, the rewarding of the saints, and the eventual triumph of Scripture. This includes a post-conflict revival in which nations turn to Christ and the preserved English Scriptures—especially the PCE—become the world standard. The overarching conclusion is that the seventh trumpet foresees the worldwide recognition of the PCE as the authoritative English

Bible, representing the culmination of centuries of preservation reflected through “vintage” Cambridge Bibles.

- In this section, Verschuur states the following in relation to Revelation 11:19:
  - “This suddenly brings to absolute clarity what was being preserved, and why. It is an overt testimony to the legacy of vintage Bibles. After all, it is the outcome of that they have come through the Church by manner of preservation — the world standard Bible, the King James Bible, in the Pure Cambridge Edition.

Because the promise to reward the saints already begins literally in the present time (Mark 10:30), which is the Word of Faith doctrine in line with Historicist prophecy, and the world standard Bible came to its fulness through the vintage Bibles and making of the Pure Cambridge Edition, which is the King James Bible only doctrine in line with Divine Providence, the proposition is the resulting manifestation of the Word and Spirit movement.” (175)

- In the PCE framework, this statement asserts that the prophetic symbolism of Revelation—particularly as interpreted through Historicism—reveals with “absolute clarity” that what God has been preserving through centuries of providential history is not merely “the Bible” in a generic sense, but the specific, materially manifested textual line that culminates in the King James Bible in its PCE, as evidenced by the witness of “vintage” Cambridge Bibles. (175). The “legacy of vintage Bibles” therefore becomes the visible historical testimony of God’s preservation: they are the physical carriers through which the purified wording, spelling, and punctuation that define the PCE survived and reached their final form. Verschuur ties this preservation to two doctrinal streams he sees converging in the present: first, the Word of Faith doctrine—grounded in the promise that the saints’ reward begins “now in this time” (Mark 10:30)—which he aligns with Historicist prophecy’s expectation of blessing unfolding within history; and second, King James Bible-only doctrine, which in his system reflects Divine Providence guiding the textual line toward its perfect expression in the PCE. (175) These two currents, one emphasizing Spirit-empowered faith and the other Word-based textual purity, merge into what Verschuur calls the Word and Spirit movement, a prophetic era in which the purified English Scriptures (the PCE) and Spirit-energized believers jointly manifest God’s purposes in the last days. Thus, the quote means that the PCE is the divinely preserved, providentially perfected form of Scripture, and its emergence—confirmed historically through “vintage Bibles” and theologically through Historicist prophecy—produces the final, eschatological union of Word (PCE) and Spirit (Pentecostal/Charismatic power) that defines the closing movement of Church history. (175)

- In this last quote from Chapter 7, Verschuur ties together the “Historicist seventh trumpet” and the “triumph of the legacy of vintage Bibles.”
  - “The Historicist seventh trumpet will ultimately lead to the triumph of the legacy of vintage Bibles, which is to say, that the victory of history would be the Pure Cambridge Edition of the King James Bible being accepted as the world standard.” (176)
    - Within Verschuur’s PCE framework, the claim that “the Historicist seventh trumpet will ultimately lead to the triumph of the legacy of vintage Bibles” (176) means that the final prophetic era described in Revelation 11:15–19—the sounding of the seventh trumpet—marks the eschatological moment in which God vindicates not only His Word abstractly, but the specific historical form in which He has preserved it: the King James Bible in the PCE. The “legacy of vintage Bibles” is the material chain of Cambridge-printed PCE copies through which Verschuur believes God providentially safeguarded the exact spellings, capitalizations, punctuation, and readings that constitute the perfected English Scriptures. Thus, the “victory of history” is the prophetic climax in which the PCE becomes the recognized world standard Bible, not merely by preference but by divine orchestration, as the seventh trumpet ushers in the global acknowledgment of Christ’s reign and the authoritative establishment of His Word in its purest transmitted form. (176). In this framework, the triumph of the PCE is not a human editorial achievement but the foreordained outcome of Historicist prophecy, the culmination of centuries of providential preservation reflected in “vintage” Cambridge Bibles, and the textual counterpart to the eschatological victory of the Kingdom of God itself.

## Conclusion

- In sum, the PCE position cannot cohere without Historicism, because Historicism is a *structural framework* that renders the PCE *prophetically necessary* rather than a late editorial preference: it furnishes the timeline (e.g., the 2300 “days” from 333 BC→1967, the 1290/1335 to 1967, the 1260 years to 1798, and the fifth–sixth trumpets as Saracens/Turks) that stages the PCE as arriving *on schedule* in salvation history rather than as one Cambridge stream among many; remove those periodizations and the PCE loses its eschatological inevitability. ([Lesson 281](#); Lesson 282) Historicism also supplies the causal bridge that turns world empires into textual providence—e.g., 1453 and Ottoman ascendancy as the divine means of scattering Greek Scripture westward, feeding Reformation vernaculars, “little-book” openness, missionary diffusion, and ultimately “vintage” Cambridge printings that host the PCE—a chain that collapses into mere contingency if the prophetic reading is withdrawn. (161–168, 170–173; Lesson 282) Further, Historicism authorizes the hermeneutic by which Revelation/Daniel imagery is mapped onto the PCE position: the “little book” as the publicly manifested English Bible, the “seven thunders” (in *Vintage Bibles*) as the seven English Protestant translations converging in the KJV, the linen-robed angel as a typological mirror of *vintage* Bible materiality, and the seventh trumpet

as the era of Scripture’s triumph—interpretations that lose their textual footing and devolve into *ad hoc* allegory without Historicism’s grid. (166–168, 173–176 ) Finally, the same framework legitimates the constituency that recognizes the PCE—linking the post-1967 “cleansing” to Word-of-Faith/Pentecostal renewal plus KJB-only elevation in a “Word & Spirit” synthesis—so that, absent Historicism, this becomes sociological coincidence rather than prophetic necessity. (138, 154, 158–159; Lesson 281) Hence the verdict of the current Lesson stands: without the Historicist scaffolding, the claim that the PCE is a divinely intended, prophetically purified, world-standard text “collapses,” leaving, at most, a harmonized Cambridge text reconstructed in the 2000s with no *sui generis* mandate (See also [Lessons 273](#) & [Lesson 274](#) for the three-pillar structure that installs Historicism beside Pentecostal spirituality and KJB-onlyism).

- In Verschuur’s corpus, Revelation 10’s “Little Book” is driven in two incompatible directions that expose a structural inconsistency in the PCE apologetic: in *Vintage Bibles* the *open* Little Book is historicized as the printed vernacular Bible—specifically the English stream whose “seven thunders” are the seven major Protestant translations (Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Great, Geneva, Bishops’, with the seventh being the drafting/making of the KJV)—so that Reformation openness, missionary diffusion, and Cambridge production culminate in the PCE. (166-168) By contrast, the *Guide to the PCE* frames the “Little Book” prototypically as the heavenly volume that must be perfectly embodied on earth as one gathered, world-standard Book (invoking Rev 10:10–11) and recasts the “seven thunders” not as translations but as seven providential purifications that climax in the PCE itself (Part Two, “What is the Book of the LORD?”; and as summarized on pp. 358–360 of the *Guide*)—shifting the center of gravity from *historical process* → *PCE to heavenly prototype* → *PCE*. Thus, while both works aim at the same objective (the PCE as world standard), they differ materially on what the thunders signify, when/where the Little Book “opens/manifests,” and how Rev 10 underwrites the PCE—yielding a theologically significant contradiction in the PCE framework’s reliance on Revelation 10 as a prophetic warrant.
- In classical Protestant Historicism, Revelation is read as a continuous panorama of church history in which the empires of Daniel culminate in Papal Rome as Antichrist, the Reformation registers as a decisive trumpet/vial, and convulsions like the French Revolution often explain Rev 11’s “earthquake”—a broad, trans-national frame shared across Wycliffe, Luther, the Reformers, Puritan commentators, and later historicists (including Adventist streams). By contrast, Verschuur advances an idiosyncratic Historicism that narrows the field of fulfillment to the English Bible tradition and even to the material and editorial history of Cambridge KJV printings, reassigning symbols such as the “little book” and “seven thunders” to the rise of the English vernacular and to stages culminating in the PCE—applications for which there is no precedent in classical Historicist exegesis. Moreover, modern surveys of the schools of interpretation note a recurring danger in Historicism: an ethnocentric, self-referential tendency to “work things out so that the end falls in one’s own time.” Verschuur’s timelines converge precisely at 1967, his preferred hinge year for Word-of-Faith/Pentecostal renewal and KJV resurgence, and they elevate his favored English edition as the eschatological standard—features that exemplify the very methodological cautions raised by contemporary assessments of Historicism’s variability and

subjectivity. Consequently, while Verschuur uses the vocabulary of the Historicist tradition, his assignments of prophecy to KJV edition-specific phenomena and Cambridge editorial minutiae represent a novel, bespoke construction aimed at validating the PCE, rather than a continuation of the historic Protestant consensus about Revelation’s scope, actors, and climactic conflicts.

- From *Vintage Bibles*, I showed that Verschuur’s *Word & Spirit* motif is not window-dressing but an engine of his prophetic and textual claims: Revelation 10–11 is recast so that the “Word” = the purified English Bible culminating in the King James Bible/PCE and the “Spirit” = Pentecostal/Charismatic power; these unite in the seventh-trumpet era to yield Scripture’s triumph and the PCE’s rise as “world standard.” He makes this explicit when he ties the “little book,” “seven thunders,” and the temple/ark scenes to the public manifestation of the English Bible and to the Word-and-Spirit convergence, culminating in the claim that the seventh trumpet “will ultimately lead to the triumph of the legacy of vintage Bibles,” i.e., world acceptance of the PCE. (166–168, 173–176). In [Lesson 273](#), I documented that this very logic is already embedded in his earlier framework: he names Faith Pentecostalism—alongside KJB-Onlyism and Historicism—as a founding pillar of Victory Faith Centre’s theology and its role as “Guardians of the PCE” (*Guide*, 340–341); he adjudicates half of his hallmark PCE “tests” by Pentecostal pneumatology (e.g., “Spirit/spirit” in Matt 4:1; Mark 1:12; Acts 11:12, 28; 1 John 5:8), showing that doctrinal categories—not neutral editorial history—decide the “pure” reading (*Guide*, 10, 18, 535–544); and he links the timing and authorization of the PCE to Pentecostal revival, providential leading, and even an “apostolical ordination” of the elders as custodians. (*Guide*, pp. 11, 180, 341, 360)
- That is why his recent denials—“*providentialist not Pentecostalist*”—are out of alignment with both his earlier and more recent testimony, where he seeks to deny the impact of Pentecostalism on his framework. I showed from his own writings that providence and Pentecostal guidance are treated as functionally equivalent: Pastor Craig Savage explicitly writes that *true Pentecostalism* entails the Spirit guiding believers, “The true Pentecostal position, therefore, will be that of the Spirit empowering and guiding a person into truth. Since the Pure Cambridge Edition of the King James Bible is on Earth for all to see, then the guidance will be towards this perfect Word of God,” directly merging providence with Pentecostal leading. (Savage, [The King James Bible Position and True Pentecostalism](#), 10) Moreover, in *Vintage Bibles*, he doubles down on the same *Word & Spirit* schema—locating the eschatological victory of Scripture precisely where the PCE rises under the Word-and-Spirit banner—so his current attempt to separate the PCE from Pentecostal theology contradicts both his earlier pillar-statements and his latest publication’s explicit statements.
- From a Futurist, dispensational, premillennial reading of Revelation—where Rev 4–22 chiefly describes *future* Tribulation events, a personal Antichrist, Israel’s end-time restoration, Armageddon, and Christ’s visible return—the hermeneutical posture offers no theological mechanism that would compel adoption of the PCE as uniquely authoritative, because this approach (unlike Historicism) neither retrofits John’s visions to post-apostolic Western history nor assigns prophetic weight to the English Bible’s editorial/printing stream (e.g., Cambridge

lineages, capitalization norms, “vintage” editions). In standard accounts contrasting the schools, Futurism looks *forward* to eschatological fulfillment, while Historicism reads Revelation as a *chronological panorama* of church history—precisely the framework Verschuur requires to map trumpets, thunders, and dates onto Islam, the Ottomans, the Reformation, the French Revolution, and finally the rise of the KJV/PCE; absent that historical scaffolding, the PCE’s special status becomes editorial preference (Thus my Disclaimer in the Introduction to each Lesson.) rather than prophetic necessity. Indeed, as asserted in the Introduction to this Lesson, “without this Historicist structure, the claim that the PCE is a divinely intended or prophetically purified edition collapses”—a judgment that follows directly from the Futurist/dispensational premillennial insistence that Revelation’s symbols await future fulfillment and therefore do not validate a past Anglocentric textual arc culminating in the PCE.

- In sum, outside the Pentecostal & Historicist stream there is no compelling doctrinal, theological, historical, or editorial reason to adopt the PCE position. Verschuur’s own framework makes Faith-Pentecostalism a pillar of the position and even uses *Pentecostal pneumatology* to decide hallmark PCE “tests” (e.g., the capitalization of Spirit/spirit in Matt 4:1; Mark 1:12; Acts 11:12, 28; 1 Jn 5:8), so the edition’s “purity” rests on Pentecostal presuppositions rather than neutral textual criteria. The rest of the scaffolding supporting the PCE framework comes from Historicism that repurposes Revelation/Daniel—e.g., the “little book,” “seven thunders,” and the seventh trumpet—to the English-Bible stream and ultimately to the PCE as a prophesied world standard; absent that idiosyncratic mapping, the PCE reverts to a preference for Cambridge KJB editions, not a prophetic necessity. And because Futurist/dispensational premillennial approaches treat Rev 4–22 as largely future, not a panorama of post-apostolic Western history, they offer no hermeneutical mechanism for tying John’s visions to English translation stages, capitalization norms, or Cambridge typography—leaving no external theological or historical warrant for elevating the PCE above other reputable KJV texts.

### Works Cited

Verschuur, Matthew. [\*Vintage Bibles\*](#). BibleProtector.com, 2025.

## Appendix A

### *Reply to “Bryan Ross’ Debate Continues” (March 10, 2026)*

- In his March 10 blog post titled, “[Bryan Ross’ Debate Continues](#),” Matthew Verschuur repeatedly recasts what I actually said in [Lesson 281](#) into arguments I never made. For example, he claims that I “try to make... the Pure Cambridge Edition... hav[e] some Pentecostal specificity,” and that I “read in Pentecostalism” because six of the twelve diagnostics involve *Spirit/spirit*—what he caricatures as “a Pentecostal conspiracy.” He even asserts that I accused him of creating “6 secret rejoinders to promote Pentecostal doctrine.” In reality, I explicitly acknowledged that the twelve items function as identification markers, not doctrinal propositions. My point was simply that his own printed rationales for half of those tests are *theological*—and specifically *Pentecostal*—in his [Guide](#). I documented his use of claims such as Oxford’s reading in Matthew 4:1 being “a blasphemy,” (542) his reliance on Wigglesworth at Mark 1:12, (180) his appeal to “ordinary Pentecostal manifestations” at Acts 11:28, (540) and his statement that 1 John 5:8 reflects “proper Pentecostal doctrine.” (10) As I wrote in [Lesson 281](#), “The twelve tests are identification markers, yes—but your printed rationales are theological,” and “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.”
- Likewise, regarding the Cambridge evidence, Verschuur claims I “misinterpret” Cambridge University Press (CUP) and want “to say that no printed Bible from Cambridge is a PCE,” implying I deny that early-20th-century Cambridge printings matched what he calls the PCE. But in Lesson 281, I explicitly acknowledge that some Cambridge lines “come close.” My point—grounded in CUP’s own statement reproduced in his *Guide*—is that there is no documentary basis for a single, consciously created, Cambridge-recognized PCE. I wrote: “Cambridge never produced a single, uniform textual line that matches the modern PCE ideal... [CUP’s note is] a documented non-endorsement of a singular, consciously created, Cambridge-recognized ‘PCE’ edition.” I further explained that the harmonized 2006 PCE e-text is best understood as a *post-hoc* standardization created by resolving differences among non-identical witnesses (e.g., hyphenation, casing, small caps, LORD’s).pdf) In short, my critique in Lesson 281 concerns method, documentation, and historical claims—not motives. His reply substitutes theological and personal framing for the textual-historical points I actually made and documented.
- And this is precisely why his response is incongruent with what Lesson 281 was actually about: Historicism—not Pentecostalism. The lesson’s central task was to describe and assess his Historicist framework in *Vintage Bibles* (Part 2): how Verschuur time-stamps the PCE with day-year calculations (e.g., 333 BC → 1967; 1,290/1,335 years), integrates the Ottomans as Daniel’s “little horn,” maps the linen-clad angel of Daniel 10 onto the material features of “vintage” Cambridge Bibles (linen → India paper, gold → gilt, etc.), and then infers from Daniel’s “scripture of truth” that a finite, exact earthly manifestation must exist—identified as the PCE e-text. My analysis showed that Historicism is the load-bearing pillar for his PCE

- framework in Part 2 of Vintage Bibles, without that scaffolding, the prophetic case collapses into assertion. By pivoting to Pentecostalism and misattributing claims I did not make, his blog post does not confront the lesson’s core argument head-on—namely, that his Historicist timeline, typology, and symbolic correspondences do the determinative work of authorizing the PCE despite the printed record and CUP’s non-endorsement. If that core is left unaddressed, readers may reasonably infer that engaging the Historicism analysis on the merits is a losing issue for him, which is why the reply relocates the discussion to side points rather than the thesis of Lesson 281.
- Verschuur asserts that I “do not ascertain how many different views there are that are labelled ‘Pentecostal’,” attributing this to my cessationist commitments. This accusation is irrelevant to the argument I actually made in Lesson 281 for three reasons:
    - Lesson 281 is about Historicism, not Pentecostal typology. The lesson analyzed his use of Historicism to defend the PCE—Ottoman timelines, prophetic markers, angelic typology, and the claim that Daniel’s “scripture of truth” requires a finite, exact earthly manifestation fulfilled in the PCE.
    - I was not critiquing Pentecostal doctrine; I was citing his printed rationales. I did not argue that his position is wrong because it is Pentecostal. I showed that his own explanations for several diagnostics explicitly employ Pentecostal categories—e.g., calling Oxford’s Matt 4:1 “a blasphemy,” appealing to Wigglesworth on Mark 1:12, invoking “ordinary Pentecostal manifestations” at Acts 11:28, and labeling 1 John 5:8 “proper Pentecostal doctrine”—and I questioned the methodological weight of those rationales.
    - I never claimed there is only one kind of Pentecostalism. He is refuting an argument I did not make. My analysis concerned his writings and how they function within his PCE framework; the internal diversity of Pentecostalism is beside the point for adjudicating his Historicist claims and the CUP evidence.
  - In short, focusing on whether I appreciate the diversity of Pentecostal positions does nothing to answer the central issues documented in Lesson 281; the dependence of his PCE case on a Historicist scaffold, the symbolic/typological leaps he makes (e.g., linen → India paper; gold → gilt), the *post-hoc* nature of the harmonized PCE e-text, and CUP’s non-endorsement of a singular, consciously created PCE edition.
  - Verschuur’s brief appeal to Professor David Norton—“even Professor Norton has mentioned a few things”—adds nothing substantive to the discussion. He provides no quotation, no citation, no date, and no context for what Norton supposedly “mentioned,” making the claim entirely hearsay. In Lesson 281, I noted that *Norton’s published work does not define or recognize any Cambridge ‘Pure Cambridge Edition’ category* (if they did Verschuur would cite them). His *New Cambridge Paragraph Bible* and his historical scholarship contain no

- reference to a distinct early-20th-century Cambridge editorial program that would correspond to Verschuur's PCE claims. Without documentation, this appeal to Norton is a rhetorical flourish, not evidence.
- Verschuur's reply reiterates that he 'did copy-editing' and produced an 'exactly correct electronic text,' but it does not engage the copy-editing definitions and examples I cited (CMOS, CIEP), including his standardization across non-identical PCE witnesses and the LORD's convention. Those activities exceed copy-editing and fit the category of textual/critical editing, i.e., constituting a unified text from divergent witnesses—the very point Appendix A documents.
  - Regarding Verschuur's claim that Baptists originated or documented the twelve readings, he provides no verifiable evidence—no names, no dates, no sources, and no bibliographic documentation. He merely asserts that "Baptists" made comparison tables, yet none of those alleged materials have ever been produced or shown to contain the exact twelve readings he later canonized as a diagnostic set. And even if some Baptists noted differences in Spirit/spirit or verses like Joshua 19:2, no Baptist writer prior to Verschuur ever treated these readings as a unified list, as distinctive, or as edition-defining. My point stands: no one before him claimed anything unique or special about this particular set of twelve readings, and no historical or theological tradition recognized them as constituting a distinct Cambridge "Pure Cambridge Edition." His claim therefore contributes nothing toward establishing documentary or historical grounding for the PCE as he defines it.
  - Verschuur notes in his blog post that he "was not a Historicist" when he first embraced the PCE, implying that Historicism is not foundational to his position. This, however, does not affect the argument of Lesson 281. My analysis focused on the *current, published form* of his PCE system in *Vintage Bibles* (2025), where Chapters 6–7 explicitly use Historicism—prophetic timelines, symbolic correspondences, and angelic mediation of the 'scripture of truth'—as the theological and interpretive framework that legitimizes the PCE. The order in which he personally adopted these views is irrelevant; what matters is that his *defense* of the PCE now depends upon Historicist reasoning. Moreover, his admission suggests that Historicism functions as an after-the-fact justification layered onto a prior commitment to the PCE, which weakens rather than strengthens its evidential value.
  - Verschuur now claims that 'Historicist prophecy' is a false narrative I invented, yet his own book *Vintage Bibles* (2025) makes Historicism the central theological scaffold supporting the PCE. Chapters 6–7 interpret Daniel 8, 10, and 12 through day-year calculations, Ottoman and geopolitical typology, symbolic readings of the linen angel, and the assertion that Daniel's 'scripture of truth' requires a perfect earthly manifestation fulfilled uniquely in the PCE and its electronic text. These are not my constructions; they are his published claims. Whether he personally adopted the PCE before or after embracing Historicism is irrelevant. What matters is that his current defense of the PCE *depends upon* these Historicist arguments. Denying this

now is simply an attempt to avoid addressing the substance of Lesson 281, because that Historicist framework is precisely where his position is most vulnerable.

- It is also noteworthy that Verschuur does not address at all my documentation of his prophetic use of the physical features of vintage Cambridge Bibles—India paper, gilt edges, Persian Morocco leather, and other manufacturing elements—which in *Vintage Bibles* he explicitly ties to the angelic symbolism of Daniel 10. These claims form a major component of his Historicist validation of the PCE (139–140, 144), yet his March 10 reply simply ignores them. This silence is significant: these symbolic correspondences are among the least defensible parts of his argument, and their omission further demonstrates that his response avoids the substantive Historicist issues raised in Lesson 281.
- On the claim that I ‘went quiet’ about Cushing (1829): Lesson 281 did not mention the 1829 Cushing Bible because that lesson had a different purpose—namely, to assess the Historicist framework in *Vintage Bibles* (Part 2) and to answer specific claims from Verschuur’s March 2 blog post in Appendix A. The appendix addressed the CUP letter, overlapping/parallel streams, the theological rationales attached to six of the twelve diagnostics, and why his 2006 harmonized e-text goes beyond mere copy-editing. In other words, the omission reflects *scope*, not *silence*. More importantly, nothing about the 1829 Cushing edition changes Lesson 281’s documented conclusions: Verschuur’s current defense of the PCE is carried by Historicist timelines and symbolism rather than by the printed record, and CUP itself provides no endorsement of a singular, consciously created Cambridge “PCE” setting.
- Verschuur concludes with a pre-emptive rhetorical strike when he writes, “One only hopes he doesn’t accuse of numeretics on the 12 test references, or of favouring the book of Matthew three times.” This is a classic example of poisoning the well: he attributes to me a hypothetical charge I have never made, mocks it, and uses that caricature to predispose readers to dismiss my actual arguments. Nothing in Lesson 281 or the broader series deals in numerology or pattern-hunting; my critique is textual, historical, and methodological. By raising a fictitious accusation at the end of the post, he deflects attention from the substantive issues—his Historicist framework, CUP’s non-endorsement, his theological rationales for half the diagnostics, and the harmonization involved in the 2006 e-text—and attempts to color future criticism as unreasonable before it is even offered.
- Bullet Summary: What Verschuur Misrepresented About What I Said:
  - He says I framed the PCE as “Pentecostal in specificity. In fact, I stated the twelve tests are identification markers and documented that his *published rationales* for half of them are explicitly Pentecostal (e.g., Matt 4:1, Mark 1:12, Acts 11:28, 1 John 5:8), which is a different claim.
  - He claims I “read in Pentecostalism” and even accused him of six “secret rejoinders” to promote it. I never alleged hidden motives; I showed where his own *Guide* uses

Pentecostal theological categories to justify half of the PCE diagnostic readings (As I documented in Lesson 281. See also the first point of this Appendix.).

- He says I deny that Cambridge printed early-20th-century editions that match the PCE. I explicitly acknowledged some Cambridge lines “come close”; my point is that CUP’s own statement (which he himself reproduced in the *Guide*) does not document a single, consciously created, Cambridge-recognized PCE.
- He alleges I misinterpreted CUP’s letter. I accurately summarized CUP as reporting no evidence of a distinct late-19th-century revision, no ability to identify the PCE setting, and noting inconsistencies in his identifier lists—points he himself reproduced (as I cited in [Lesson 281](#)).
- He recasts my methodological critique as a personal attack. My lesson critiques documentation and method (lack of dated/archival evidence; theological rationales) rather than motives; his reply reframes this as bias or misunderstanding.
- He suggests I claimed he “invented” the PCE. I said the 2006 PCE e-text is a post-hoc harmonization/standardization across non-identical Cambridge witnesses (hyphenation, casing, small caps, LORD’s), not that he invented the notion of a Cambridge tradition. The following fact remain undisputed: 1) no one in history called a specific text form printed by Cambridge the PCE until Verschuur and the elders of Victory Faith Center did so in the early 2000s, and 2) that no historic Cambridge printing is an identic match to his e-text.
- He portrays my critique as collapsing the PCE to Pentecostalism alone. I identified a multi-pillar framework in his writings—Historicism, Pentecostal/Word-of-Faith spirituality, and KJB-Onlyism—and analyzed how these combine to support his PCE claims.