

Sunday, March 22, 2026—Grace Life School of Theology—*From This Generation For Ever*
 Lesson 283 Assessing the Printed History of the King James Text (PCE: Concluding Thoughts)


Introduction

- [Lesson 282](#) examined how Matthew Verschuur’s Pure Cambridge Edition (PCE) position is sustained not by the documented printed history of the King James Bible, but by an extensive Historicist prophetic framework, most fully articulated in Chapter 7 of *Vintage Bibles*. By applying Historicist readings of Revelation 9–11, Verschuur reinterprets Islamic expansion, the Ottoman Empire, the Reformation, the French Revolution, and modern charismatic renewal as providential stages in a divinely orchestrated textual process culminating in the PCE.
- Central to this framework is the claim that Revelation’s imagery refers not merely to the preservation of Scripture in general, but to the English Bible tradition and, ultimately, to “vintage” Cambridge KJV printings as the material carriers of a purified, finalized text. The “little book” of Revelation 10 is identified with the printed vernacular Bible; the “seven thunders” are mapped onto seven English Protestant translations culminating in the King James Bible; and the seventh trumpet is portrayed as the eschatological era in which the PCE emerges as the world standard Scripture.
- Lesson 282 demonstrated that Historicism functions as a load-bearing pillar of this system. It supplies the timelines, symbolic correspondences, and prophetic necessity that elevate the PCE from a preferred Cambridge text to a divinely intended, end-time standard. Without this Historicist scaffolding, the PCE claim collapses into a *post-hoc* editorial harmonization rather than a providentially mandated outcome.
- The lesson also showed that Verschuur’s framework is inseparably bound to a “Word & Spirit” synthesis, in which the “Word” is defined as the exact wording of the PCE and the “Spirit” is identified with Pentecostal/Charismatic vitality. In this schema, recognition of the PCE is not merely textual or historical, but spiritual—belonging to a prophetic movement that uniquely perceives God’s final work of preservation.
- Finally, Lesson 282 exposed internal tensions and inconsistencies within the PCE apologetic—especially in Verschuur’s shifting use of Revelation 10 between *Vintage Bibles* and the *Guide to the PCE*—and demonstrated that his version of Historicism represents a novel, Anglocentric reconfiguration rather than a continuation of classical Protestant Historicist interpretation.
- Verschuur responded to the teaching of Lesson 282 with a blog article on March 19, 2026, titled “[Not Again . . .](#)” See Appendix A on page 16 for my response to the article.
- My goal in this Lesson is to conclude our discussion of the PCE position by considering the following points:

- Revelation & Special Pleading
- The “Exact Sense” & Verbatim Identicality
- Verbal Equivalence & Other Attempts to Answer the PCE Position
- 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 identicality of wording is not a tenable position.

Revelation & Special Pleading

- On July 31, 2025, I recorded a video with Dr. Dan Haifley titled “[Transmission Turnpike: Forging A New Model of Transmission.](#)” While discussing the standard of *verbatim identicality* of wording, Dr. Haifley brought up Matthew Verschuur and the PCE position. The following exchange occurred between the 52:46–53:41 mark in the video.
 - Dr. Haifley: “There’s only one person I know of that has tried that, has attempted to do that, and I think he’s from Australia or something and he’s got this handle called *Bible Protector*.”
 - Ross: “Yeah, Matthew Verschuur.”
 - Dr. Haifley: “...I understand that he believes that God spoke to him maybe in a vision or some other extra-biblical way to confirm with him that the circa Cambridge 1769 / circa 1900 is the only pure, perfect word. “And I believe he determined that in his church and so on and his elders determined that, and then he started publishing that and people picked it up without verifying it.”
- In response to Dr. Haifley’s comments in our video, Verschuur posted the following comment under the link Dr. Haifley’s shared of our video.

 **Matthew Verschuur**
Dan thanks for letting me correct you if are wrong about me, and sadly, you are quite wrong about me.

I do not claim that only ONE edition of the KJB is the actual Word of God to the exclusion of anything/everything else.

I have never claimed, nor believe that, God spoke to me, in a vision or some other prophetic way, to confirm or tell me about Pure Cambridge Edition, nor to say it is the only pure Word.

I believe that the Autographs were pure, and all Scripture copies, manuscripts, texts, versions, editions, etc. of Scripture are pure, in that Scripture itself is pure.

Textually, while the Textus Receptus is pure broadly, and that the KJB's readings are pure specifically.

Translation-wise, while Reformation Protestant translations were pure broadly, the KJB is pure English specifically.

Edition-wise, while Editions of the KJB, in and following the 1769 are pure, the PCE is pure specifically (as an Edition in its own right).


And setting-wise, while Cambridge KJVs with the PCE have been very accurately printed, the files on my websites were thoroughly checked so that there is no errata in the typesetting, and full "critical" standardisation, i.e. jot and tittle kind of purity.

And even after I have insisted for years that the accusation of me drawing on some sort of Pentecostal experience was the means of discovering or confirming the PCE was wrong, you have still repeated that.


You may disagree with things I say, believe or stand for, but I hope you will accept my correcting you regarding this matter.

31w Like Reply


- Dr. Haifley responded with the following post.

 **Dan Haifley**
Matthew Verschuur Thanks for reaching out. Could you explain what you mean by your statements about the revelation you received? You were very clear that God did not give this revelation to those who do not believe the same as you about the Holy Spirit.

31w Like Reply

 **Matthew Verschuur**
What statements about what revelation? And where is the primary source comment that you are referring to, so that the matter may be clear, instead of couched in vagueries?

31w Like Reply

 **Dan Haifley**
"The Elders of Victory Faith Centre, in their providentially appointed role as the Guardians of the Pure Cambridge Edition, have identified the exactly correct text of the Pure Cambridge Edition. The revelation of this is accepted by various sincere Christians around the world." "The progressive revelation of the Spirit has allowed for the discovery of the Pure Cambridge Edition..."
— The Final King James Bible (2006). These are exact quotes. Can you explain what they mean?

31w Like Reply

- One of the topics I would like to consider, in this final lesson on the PCE is whether Verschuur claims any sort of “revelation” for his PCE position.
- In the [Guide to the PCE](#), Verschuur makes the following statements in the Preface:
 - “It has not been a coincidence that this work, **and these revelations have been formed specifically in Australia**, which has been a national vessel for the preserving of the Church and the Word as was once supreme in England.” (14)
 - “**I am sure that it is God’s grace alone that has wonderfully brought me into these revelations.** “Then said he unto them, Therefore every scribe which is instructed unto the

kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old.” (Matthew 13:52). **The King James Bible is the old treasure, and the new treasure is that the King James Bible is to be reinstated, namely, the acknowledging of the Pure Cambridge Edition.**” (16)

- Later in the *Guide*, Verschuur speaks of the “revelation” of the PCE position to the world via the internet in 2007.
 - “Since the inspiration, the Word of God has been present in the Earth. Some have wondered where the Word of God was before the appearance of the King James Bible, or where the pure Word might be found before 1900, or indeed, **before its revelation to the world by the internet in 2007.**” (121)
- On page 126 of the *Guide*, Verschuur speaks of other KJB defenders not accepting or attaining unto the “revelation” that the KJB is now available in “perfect purity.”
 - “There have been King James Bible defenders who have **not accepted or attained to the revelation** that the final form of the Received Text of the Word of God is the King James Bible, which is now available in its perfect purity.” (126)
- Elsewhere the *Guide* speaks in revelatory terms regarding the PCE.
 - **“The revelation of the true Bible would, therefore, be a fulfilment of the purification of God’s Word in English** and would be the thing by which Romanist doctrine should be consumed. **This was answered by the Pure Cambridge Edition**, circa 1900, which was done in a manner consistent with honest scientific inquiry, and contemporary with the Pentecostal Revival. This would also solidify and end the purification of the English Bible, showing that the Version or underlying texts were never to be altered, that the translation was never to be changed, that the English Bible was not lost, nor irrecoverable, that the English was accurate and infallible, that it was the model standard, that it was for universal use and that it was especially blessed as the very thing which was carried down from God to Earth and purified in the Earth. Thus, the truth of itself was self-fulfilled.” (360)
 - “God has brought about **the revelation of there being a pure and final presentation of the Scripture.** Those who lived at some earlier stage are not disqualified, neither does the progressive revelation negate all the intermediary work that took place between inspiration and receiving the final form of the Word.” (371)
- Thus far we have focused our attention on Verschuur’s *Guide*, [*A Century PCE*](#), & *Vintage Bibles*. That said, some of his smaller works are very instructive on the topic of “revelation” and the PCE position.

The Revelation Of The Pure Word (2006)

- Apart from some sort of “revelation”, how did the Elders of Victory Faith Centre know they were apostolic guardians of the PCE?
 - “As for variations in the Pure Cambridge Edition, these have also been settled and resolved by the Elders of Victory Faith Centre in their apostolic office of the guardianship of the Pure Cambridge Edition.” (14)
- The PCE was not immediately recognized; its understanding was “sealed” until the time of the end. It was only after the year 2000 that the PCE “revelation” was understood.
 - “The standard text was arrived at very soon after the year 2000, even though before the year 2000 almost nothing of the revelation of it was understood. This may be according to another prophecy, “But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.” (Daniel 12:4). The Bible has been a sealed book (see Isaiah 29:11), and the understanding of the purification of the King James Bible has also been sealed (see Revelation 10:4).” (14)
- Verschuur and Victory Faith Centre claim divine appointments to guard and promote the PCE. How would they know apart from special revelation?
 - “Because of the general decline of King James Bibles, the lack of knowledge concerning the pure Word, and the direction in which Cambridge University Press itself was heading in regard to the Bible, the Elders of Victory Faith Centre recognised the divine providence in regards to their continuing guardianship of the Pure Cambridge Edition. The Guardians of the Pure Cambridge Edition, being Pastor Craig Savige, Elder Samantha Savige and Elder Matthew Verschuur, understood from the Spirit that they were called to an Apostolic ministry in this regard. This is a very high calling, considering that the approbation and maintenance of the King James Bible was originally vested in the Crown. However, such a succession is not without precedent, for the Lord Protector Oliver Cromwell himself commanded the continuation of the Cambridge printed King James Bible by Authority.” (10)

God’s Chosen Edition of the King James Bible (2006)

- This booklet contains at least two comments regarding “revelation” and the identification and acknowledgment of the PCE.
 - “For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints.” (1 Corinthians 14:33). It is plain that God would have one correct standard representation

of His Word, which would be true and perfect. It is therefore the work of God to **reveal and settle which edition.**” (2)

- “Despite the lack of knowledge of details, **it was divine providence that revealed that God’s chosen standard was the Pure Cambridge Edition.**” (9)

The Pure Cambridge Edition: The Final King James Bible (2006)

- Revelation
 - “By providential circumstance, a comparably large proportion of King James Bibles in Australia in the latter half of the twentieth century were Pure Cambridge Editions. The Christian Church, enjoying the benefits of godly instruction as having passed from Britain and America, has served to make Australia home to the Church Remnant. **The progressive revelation of the Spirit has allowed for the discovery of the Pure Cambridge Edition and other factors in relation to a great restitution of the Church and coming time of world evangelization.**

The great harvest and time of latter day glory for the Church would not be possible without the achievement of several key factors, namely, the Pure Cambridge Edition, a remnant of the Church, the English global language, the situation of Australia and neighbouring islands, the progress and availability of the internet and the Bible promises concerning revival being believed and manifest, “whereof ye heard before in the word of the truth of the gospel; Which is come unto you, as it is in all the world; and bringeth forth fruit, as it doth also in you, since the day ye heard of it, and knew the grace of God in truth” (Colossians 1:5, 6).” (9)

There Is Only One Pure Edition of The King James Bible: The Pure Cambridge Edition (2007)

- This work states the following on pages 2-3
 - “It is not as if the Pure Cambridge Edition came down from Heaven on golden tablets or is enshrined in one particular book locked up in some museum, but is found in one agreed and consistent text that was issued by the millions in various Bibles from circa 1900 to the 1970s by Cambridge, and has been agreed to in the witness of the Collins Editions bearing the Royal Warrant as printed in the same period and beyond. This substantially agreeing text being so consistently presented, and so well represented, that it has been possible for Christians to honestly recognise it as the standard King James Bible.

The Elders of Victory Faith Centre, in their providentially appointed role as the Guardians of the Pure Cambridge Edition, have identified the exactly correct text of the Pure Cambridge Edition. **The revelation of this is accepted by various sincere Christians around the world.**

God has raised up one edition of the King James Bible, one exact representative, one last, refined, purified and unchanging text. This particular text can be vindicated at every point, and should be accepted as the Word of God in English. No other set of words can deserve such a place of esteem or exaltation as the Pure Cambridge Edition. It bears the marks of its divine providence throughout it. Not only are the signs internal, but are also externally manifest: there is no accident as to the situation in space and time as where and when it has resprung in the consciousness of the Church. It must be for the purpose for a great last days publishing in conjunction with a rise of a powerful last days Christianity” (2-3)

- The PCE position, as articulated by Matthew Verschuur in his published works, necessarily engages in theological special pleading. Its core claims rest on appeals to revelation, progressive unveiling, and Spirit-recognized truth rather than on publicly verifiable historical or textual evidence. The identification of the Pure Cambridge Edition is repeatedly framed as something that was divinely revealed, sealed until “the time of the end,” and then disclosed to a specific remnant—namely Verschuur and the elders of Victory Faith Centre. This framework exempts the PCE from the normal historical expectations applied to all other Bible editions, such as continuous recognition, documented editorial lineage, or broad ecclesiastical reception.
- Moreover, the PCE argument applies asymmetric standards: it dismisses all competing KJV editions for lacking exactitude or authority while granting itself exceptions grounded in private revelation, apostolic guardianship, and bespoke Historicist readings of Daniel and Revelation. Historical silence prior to the 20th–21st century is not treated as evidence against the PCE but is neutralized by claims of prophetic “sealing,” rendering the position effectively immune to falsification. Because the prophetic framework is constructed to validate the PCE rather than independently established, and because the claim’s authority ultimately depends on exceptions unavailable to other positions, the conclusion follows that the PCE position does not merely involve special pleading—it depends on it to function as an argument at all.

The “Exact Sense” & Verbatim Identicality

- In 2009 Verschuur wrote a booklet (48 pages) titled *Glistering Truths: Distinctions In Bible Words* in which he argues that only the PCE is capable of giving the “exact sense” of scripture. The following text is printed on the cover of the booklet:
 - **“That every jot and tittle in our pure English Bible is necessary for giving the exact sense.”** (Cover)
- This is the controlling thesis of the entire work. “Exact sense” is presented not as an approximation or sufficient sense, but as something dependent on *every jot and tittle* in the pure English Bible (later identified as the PCE).
- The “Overview” page restates the central thesis of work as follows:

- “The plan of this monograph is very simple. The first section gives the main argument, namely, *That every jot and tittle in our pure English Bible is necessary for giving the exact sense.*”
- Here the phrase is reiterated as the main argument, not a devotional sentiment. The “exact sense” is tied to a specific, materially fixed English form. In the following quotes Verschuur speaks about the “exact sense” in a general way.
 - “The reason for sometimes hard or obscure words in our Bible is because they were the most fitting. They give the sense exactly. On several occasions, William Tyndale even had to invent words, because no adequate English word existed to convey exactly the sense of the originals.

If we take any example, we will find that the use of Bible English is exact and right. There are certainly particular and exact rules covering the use of all King James Bible words.” (7)

- “Rightness and **exactness of words can be a matter of life and death**. The very spelling of Bible words should be observed with the fear of God. “Then said they unto him, Say now Shibboleth: and he said Sibboleth: for he could not frame to pronounce it right. Then they took him, and slew him at the passages of Jordan: and there fell at that time of the Ephraimites forty and two thousand.” (Judges 12:6).

In order to give the sense accurately, the exact words and letters and punctuation are required, “So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading.” (Nehemiah 8:8).” (9)

- The PCE is the exactly correct form of the KJB.
 - “This monograph shows that **the Pure Cambridge Edition is indeed the exact presentation of the King James Bible**, and the following alphabetical list of entries are laid out as an aid in the advancing studies of God’s Word.

The examples provided are ones which may show the superiority of the presentation of the Pure Cambridge Edition to some other editions of the King James Bible. In these cases, the Pure Cambridge Edition is presenting the genuine and intended King James Bible wording. This may be evident **by the exactness ascribed to the Pure Cambridge Edition form**, which would otherwise be potentially lacking or a source of confusion.

The King James Bible has not changed, for the same text and translation of 1611 are given in the Pure Cambridge Edition. What has changed is the correction of printers’ errors, the standardisation of the language (e.g. spelling), and other regularisation. **Therefore, the Pure Cambridge Edition is presenting exactly, to the letter, the Word of God correctly in English.**” (16)

- Part 1 of *Glistering Truths* concludes by stating the following:
 - “There are several points which can be reinforced from the information provided in the following pages:
 1. That the King James Bible is presented exactly, accurately, fully and completely — by translation — the text and the sense of the various inspired autographs.
 2. That the King James Bible is supersuccessionary to any and all Bibles and extant copies, in that it is an improvement on former Bibles, and superior to present Bibles, and succeeds the original languages as the sources of authority.
 3. That the English of the King James Bible is properly and utterly presented in the Pure Cambridge Edition.
 4. **That a change as small as a minor point of punctuation is dire**, if not obviously, at least puts in jeopardy the doctrine of the reliability of its jots and tittles.
 5. That modern versions do not begin to compare with the King James Bible on the grounds of the perfection and signs of divinity in the detail.” (17)
- Across *Glistering Truths*, “exact sense” and “exactness” are not rhetorical flourishes. They function as technical, theological claims: meaning depends on exact wording, exactness extends to letters, spelling, punctuation, case, and one edition (the PCE) uniquely embodies this exactness. The above quotations show that Verschuur’s later PCE claims are already fully present in seed form in *Glistering Truths*—well before *Vintage Bibles*—and that “exact sense” is the conceptual bridge from reverence for Scripture to edition-exclusive perfection.
- In *Glistering Truths*, Verschuur repeatedly asserts that the “exact sense” of Scripture depends upon exact words, exact letters, exact spelling, exact punctuation, and exact distinctions, and he explicitly identifies the Pure Cambridge Edition as the edition that uniquely embodies this exactness. He does not argue that the PCE gives the best, clearest, or most faithful sense among several adequate options; rather, he claims that every jot and tittle is necessary for giving the exact sense, and that the PCE is the edition that presents the King James Bible “exactly, to the letter.” Once those premises are granted, any KJV edition that differs from the PCE—even in spelling, capitalization, punctuation, or word form—necessarily lacks something required for the “exact sense.”
- Therefore, by his own logic, non-PCE King James Bibles are not merely different or less standardized; they are deficient with respect to meaning. They may approximate the sense, convey doctrine, or be useful devotionally, but they cannot, on this view, convey the exact sense, because something essential to meaning is missing or altered. This is why the argument inevitably collapses into edition exclusivity: if exact sense requires exact form, and exact form exists only in

the PCE, then all other forms are, by definition, sub-exact and therefore meaning-deficient at some level.

- This is precisely why the position cannot be maintained as a benign preference or a high view of Scripture. The logic of *Glistering Truths* forces a binary outcome: either a Bible matches the PCE, or it fails—however slightly—to give the exact sense God intended. That conclusion is not imposed from outside the system; it is the system working exactly as designed.
- Verschuur’s PCE framework operates with two incompatible standards of preservation. In *Glistering Truths*, he argues that the Bible’s “exact sense” depends on exact words, letters, spelling, capitalization, and punctuation, and then identifies the Pure Cambridge Edition as the one edition that presents the KJV “exactly, to the letter.” On that premise, *any* non-PCE KJV must be meaning-deficient at some level, because something deemed essential to the “exact sense” has been altered. This is the very definition of *verbatim identity* functioning as the required standard for meaning and preservation.
- Yet elsewhere, the same framework assumes that earlier, non-PCE KJV printings were still God’s preserved Word in actual church use. That concession implicitly relies on *verbal equivalence*—i.e., that different but faithful KJV forms still carried the same substantive meaning—precisely the standard David Reid and I defend against *verbatim identity* in our book [*The Myth of Verbatim Identity*](#). The net result is a structural tension: pre-PCE history is explained by *verbal equivalence*, while post-PCE claims demand to-the-letter exactness. Scripture provides no rationale for this late switch in standards, which is why the PCE position must lean on extra-textual claims (revelation, “sealing/unsealing,” bespoke historicism) to hold the system together. Stated simply: if exact sense requires *verbatim identity*, most historical KJVs were deficient; if they were not deficient, *verbatim identity* is not required. The PCE framework tries to affirm both—and cannot logically do so.
- Verschuur’s objections to the terms *verbal equivalence* and *verbatim identity* do not resolve the underlying problem (See Verschuur’s blog article titled “[Problems with ‘Verbal Equivalence’](#)” from 3/19/25.), because the issue is not what he calls his position but how it functions logically. In *Glistering Truths*, he grounds meaning in the “exact sense” conveyed by exact words, letters, spelling, capitalization, and punctuation, and then identifies the PCE as the edition that uniquely meets that standard— which is *verbatim identity* in substance, regardless of whether he accepts the label. At the same time, he affirms that pre-PCE King James Bibles were providentially preserved and legitimately used by the church, a claim that only works if *verbal equivalence* is allowed to operate historically. Thus, while he verbally rejects *verbal equivalence* and resents the charge of *verbatim identity*, his system depends on both: *verbal equivalence* to preserve continuity with KJV history, and *verbatim identity* to justify PCE exclusivity. The resulting tension is internal to the PCE framework itself and cannot be dismissed by disputing terminology alone.

Verbal Equivalence & Other Attempts to Answer the PCE Position

- Two prior attempts, that I know of, have been made to answer the PCE position within the ranks of King James advocacy. Both of these have sought to do so based upon the principle of verbal equivalence, even if they did not use that terminology. These attempts include:
 - April 7, 2021—[*How Pure Is My King James Bible?*](#) by David Daniels of Chick Publications
 - David Daniels (Chick Publications) walks through the “12 tests” and repeatedly argues that the differences do not change the sense—e.g., capitalization of *Spirit* (a post-printing-press convention), “flieth/fleeth,” “further/farther,” “bewrayeth/betrayeth,” and even “or/and” at Joshua 19:2—concluding there is no doctrinal loss and no reason to “dump” non-PCE KJVs. That is *verbal equivalence*: the wording varies, but the meaning is equivalent.
 - September 10, 2021—[*What about the "Pure Cambridge Edition" \(PCE\)? Q&A 228*](#) by David O’Steen of Hope Bible Church
 - David O’Steen (Hope Bible Church) makes the same move point-by-point. He treats spelling differences (e.g., “ankle/ancle”), capitalization of *Spirit*, and the remaining items on the list as non-corruptions precisely because the substantive meaning remains the same; he even says both readings are correct at places like Joshua 19:2, 2 Chronicles 33:19 (“sin/sins”), Jeremiah 34:16 (“ye/he”), etc. He explicitly urges readers not to let micro-variations shake confidence since they do not change what the verse means. That is *verbal equivalence* in practice.
- Both videos rely on *verbal equivalence* to answer the PCE position. They consistently argue that non-PCE King James Bibles are still pure Scripture because the meaning, doctrine, and teaching remain unchanged despite formal differences. What our work (Reid & Ross) adds—and what theirs does not (Daniels & O’Steen)—is a clear identification of the standard being used and a demonstration that the PCE position itself cannot survive unless that standard is adopted, even while it is verbally denied.
- In O’Steen’s “PCE Q&A (no. 228),” he repeatedly argues that the disputed PCE “tests” do not affect doctrine because the meaning remains the same—treating differences such as *Spirit* capitalization, “flieth/fleeth,” “further/farther,” “bewrayeth/betrayeth,” and even “Beersheba or/and Sheba” as equally valid since they convey the same sense. Functionally, that is *verbal equivalence* (non-identical wording with unchanged meaning). By contrast, in later 2024 videos he repudiates *verbal equivalence*, insisting preservation is of the precise words (not merely content), and warning that equivalence is a “slippery slope” that opens the door to word changes or updates to the KJV. The net effect is a tension: earlier, he defends non-PCE KJVs by accepting

meaning-equivalence across variants; later, he rejects that very principle as unsafe and unbiblical—creating an incompatibility between his *practice-level* defense of equivalence and his *principle-level* denial of it.

- O’Steen’s handling of the PCE debate deploys *verbal equivalence* when it helps him and denounces it when we use it (Ross & Reid), which is logically inconsistent. In his PCE Q&A, he repeatedly treats non-identical KJV wordings as equally valid because the sense is unchanged—e.g., he says capitalization of *Spirit* does not determine whether the Holy Ghost is in view (context does), “Beersheba *or* Sheba” vs. “Beersheba *and* Sheba” both fit the Genesis context, “sin/sins” in II Chronicles 33:19 name the same reality, “ye/he” in Jeremiah 34:16 both point to “every man,” and “flieth/fleeth,” “further/farther,” “bewrayeth/betrayeth” are interchangeable in meaning. That is textbook *verbal equivalence*: where wording differs, meaning does not—and therefore both readings are fully acceptable.
- Yet in subsequent videos, he explicitly criticizes us (Ross & Reid) for teaching *verbal equivalence*, calling it a “watered-down” view that elevates “content” over precise words, warning it is a slippery slope to changing KJV wording, and insisting preservation is of the exact words rather than “different ways of saying the same thing.” In these later pieces, he positions my use of the very principle he employed against PCE as “unbiblical” or “dangerous.”
- The result is a contradiction that cannot be papered over by tone or intent:
 - When rebutting PCE exclusivity, O’Steen depends on *verbal equivalence* to defend non-PCE KJVs as pure Scripture despite minor differences.
 - When critiquing our book, he rejects *verbal equivalence* and declares that real “Bible believers” must stand on to-the-letter precision, implicitly condemning the very standard his own PCE rebuttal requires.
- In fair reasoning, the standard cannot change with the opponent. If preservation truly demands word-for-word identity, then O’Steen’s earlier approval of meaning-equivalent variants (e.g., *Spirit* capitalization; *and/or*; *sin/sins*) collapses. If, by contrast, those variants are legitimately equivalent because they preserve the same sense, then it is unfair—and inconsistent—to accuse me of not being a “real Bible believer” for endorsing the same principle he relies on when answering the PCE.

Conclusion

- Most people who appeal to the PCE have embraced it without fully understanding what the position entails. In practice, many encounter the PCE as a *solution* to anxiety about textual differences—through charts, lists of “tests,” or trusted voices—rather than as a carefully reasoned doctrinal conclusion. As a result, they often affirm the PCE rhetorically while denying its necessary implications, such as exclusivity or the idea that non-PCE KJVs are meaning-deficient.

The widespread habit of saying “the differences do not change the meaning” or “God still used those Bibles” shows that many PCE supporters still rely on *verbal equivalence*, even though the PCE framework itself depends on rejecting that principle.

- This pattern suggests that the PCE spreads less because it is well understood and more because it sounds like a tidy answer to the problem created by insisting on *verbatim identity*. Once people are shown the historical realities (multiple Cambridge/Collins witnesses, the late standardization of a single PCE text, and the editorial choices involved) and the logical consequences (either exclusivity or inconsistency), far fewer are willing to hold the position consistently. In short, a small minority understand the PCE position in full, while the majority adopt it in name or preference, unknowingly retreating to *verbal equivalence* to preserve confidence in the King James Bible they already trust.
- As we conclude our study of the PCE position please consider the following summation points:
 - No single historical PCE exists. Early–mid 20th-century Cambridge/Collins Bibles show family resemblance, not a documented, fixed, final edition. “PCE” is a retrofit label invented by Verschuur himself in the early 2000s, not a contemporaneously attested artifact.
 - The modern “PCE” is an editorial synthesis, not a historically settled edition. What is marketed or circulated today as “the PCE” is *a post-hoc*, harmonized profile assembled from multiple non-identical “vintage” printings. There is no single, contemporaneously published volume that functions as the authoritative standard; the modern PCE derives its uniformity from recent collation and normalization, not from a historically fixed print tradition.
 - The PCE’s authority claim depends on theology, not on documentary history. The edition-exclusive authority asserted for the PCE rests on a theological scaffold (Faith-Pentecostal certainty, edition-specific KJVO claims, and Historicist prophecy), not on archival evidence. Absent acceptance of that framework, the claim that one early-20th-century Cambridge form is the God-ordained, final English Bible cannot be sustained by history alone.
 - “Sevenfold purification” is a numerological construct imposed on the record. The two-stage “seven purifications” storyline (English Bibles, then KJV editions) selects and omits evidence to fit a pattern. It does not arise from contemporaneous documentation or an agreed editorial trajectory. It is symbolic numerology, not a neutral description of how the KJV’s printed history unfolded. The exclusion of Scattergood as a “demi-standard” demonstrates this (See [Lesson 275](#)).
 - Later PCE writing softens the absolutism, which undercuts finality claims. Recent advocacy shifts from a single flawless artifact to a profile with tolerable variation. That

move better reflects reality but dissolves the premise of “jot-and-tittle” finality: once variability is allowed within the “PCE family,” the claim of one unique, edition-level perfection no longer holds.

- The diagnostic 12-reading PCE checklist reveals doctrinal steering of textual choices. Half the PCE “tests” turn on *Spirit/spirit* capitalization and are justified on Pentecostal theological grounds, not on independent textual criteria. That signals doctrine steering the definition of “pure”, rather than neutral evidence producing the doctrine.
- Providence is not equivalent to edition-finality. Historic Protestant preservation affirms that God keeps His Word in the Church without requiring a single, materially perfect, late editorial setting. Conflating providence with edition-finality adds a requirement Scripture never states and history does not evidence.
- The core problem is a category error about preservation. The PCE thesis treats edition-level exactness (orthography, casing, minutiae) as necessary to divine preservation. Scripture presents preservation in terms of truth kept and transmitted, not in terms of typographical absolutism. The categories have been misaligned, which explains the impasse.
- You can honor Cambridge excellence without embracing exclusivity. Early-to-mid-20th-century Cambridge/Collins lines often display exemplary care—but acknowledging their quality does not entail granting any one-line exclusive divine status. Merit in production is not the same as monopoly on purity.
- Preservation is continuity and sufficiency, not editorial eschatology. The decisive question is what preservation requires. Scripture and history align when preservation is understood as God’s faithful maintenance of His Word in the Church, not a quest for a last, flawless English edition. That framing grounds confidence without manufacturing edition-finality.

Works Cited

- Verschuur, Matthew. *[The Revelation Of The Pure Word \(2006\)](#)*. BibleProtector.com, 2006.
- Verschuur, Mathew. *[God's Chosen Edition of the King James Bible \(2006\)](#)*. BibleProtector.com, 2006.
- Verschuur, Matthew. *[The Pure Cambridge Edition: The Final King James Bible \(2006\)](#)*. BibleProtector.com, 2006.
- Verschuur, Matthew. *[There Is Only One Pure Edition of The King James Bible: The Pure Cambridge Edition \(2007\)](#)*. BibleProtector.com, 2007
- Verschuur, Matthew. *[Glistening Truths: Distinctions In Bible Words](#)*. BibleProtector.com, 2009.
- Verschuur, Matthew. *[Guide to the Pure Cambridge Edition](#)*. BibleProtector.com, 2013.

Appendix A

What I Actually Argue in Lessons 271–282—And How the March 18 Blog “[Not Again](#)” Misrepresents It

- My series of Lessons analyzing and responding the Pure Cambridge Edition (PCE) Position (Lessons 271–283) set out to do one thing: evaluate the position on the basis of its own published claims—historical, textual, and theological—by reading Matthew Verschuur’s [Guide to the Pure Cambridge Edition](#), [A Century of the Pure Cambridge Edition](#), and [Vintage Bibles](#) carefully and then testing those claims against the printed record. In Lesson 283 the following shorter titles by Verschuur can be added to this list: [The Revelation Of The Pure Word \(2006\)](#), [God’s Chosen Edition of the King James Bible \(2006\)](#), [The Pure Cambridge Edition: The Final King James Bible \(2006\)](#), [There Is Only One Pure Edition of The King James Bible: The Pure Cambridge Edition \(2007\)](#), & [Glistering Truths: Distinctions In Bible Words](#) (2009) Across the series I make several consistent, documented arguments. In his March 18, 2026, blog post, “[Not again...](#)”, Matthew repeatedly reframes those arguments and often substitutes caricature for engagement. What follows is my own summary of what I actually argue and why the blog does not answer it.
- This Appendix covers the following relevant points:
 - 1) I do not treat the PCE as a mere editorial preference
 - 2) I show the PCE rests on a three-pillar framework that Verschuur himself articulates
 - 3) I distinguish the twelve diagnostics (identifiers) from his printed rationales for them
 - 4) I argue that Historicism is load-bearing in Vintage Bibles
 - 5) I test the prophetic superstructure against the printed record and CUP’s own statement
 - 6) Why I describe Matthew’s historical narrative as presentist and goal-moving
 - 7) What the March 18 blog claims about me—and what I actually wrote
 - 8) My overall conclusion
 - 9) Personal thoughts regarding the back & forth
 - 10) On the “I Haven’t Read His Material” Allegation
 - 11) On “Invented” PCE Pillars
 - 12) On “Answering Ross’ Ranting”

13) On the “Scholarly Trick” & Non-Use of Logic Allegations

14) On “Ignorant Sources” & CUP Allegations

15) On “Rick Norris” Allegations

16) On the “What it’s all About” Section

1) I do not treat the PCE as a mere editorial preference

- From Lesson 271 onward, I document—using Verschuur’s own words—that the PCE position is exclusive: it presents the PCE as the “final,” “pure,” “definitive,” “exact, correct and perfect” form of the Authorized Version, the “historically received true text,” and the edition that uniquely conveys the “exact sense,” while non-PCE KJVs are implicitly treated as lacking “full light.” (*Guide*, 239) I repeatedly say I would have no quarrel if the PCE were simply a best-in-class preference; the problem is that its **authority** is asserted in exclusive, doctrinal terms, not merely editorial ones.

2) I show the PCE rests on a three-pillar framework that Verschuur himself articulates

- In Lessons [273–274](#) I document the three pillars as he presents them: Faith-Pentecostalism, KJB-Onlyism, and Historicism. I’m not imposing this from outside; I quote his *Guide* where Victory Faith Centre identifies itself as “Guardians” of the PCE and where its doctrinal identity integrates these pillars. My point is that, in his corpus, these pillars function together to justify why the PCE is not just a good Cambridge text but the final one.

3) I distinguish the twelve diagnostics (identifiers) from his printed rationales for them

- I explicitly acknowledge—repeatedly—that the twelve items are identification markers. My critique is narrower: in his *Guide*, the rationales he gives for six of the twelve are explicitly Pentecostal (e.g., Matt 4:1 called “blasphemy” in the Oxford reading; appeal to Wigglesworth at Mark 1:12; “ordinary Pentecostal manifestations” at Acts 11:28; “proper Pentecostal doctrine” at 1 Jn 5:8). I’m not saying Pentecostalism created the list; I’m saying his published justifications for half the list are theological, specifically Pentecostal.

4) I argue that Historicism is load-bearing in Vintage Bibles

- When I analyze *Vintage Bibles* in Lessons 279–282, I show that Matthew’s case doesn’t merely treat the PCE as a high-quality Cambridge tradition; he frames it as the prophetic outcome of Daniel 8/10 and Revelation 9–11. In *Vintage Bibles*, the “little book,” the “seven thunders,” and the seventh trumpet are mapped onto the English Bible stream such that the PCE becomes the world-standard Bible under the seventh-trumpet era. My conclusion is simple: in that book’s argument, Historicism is the load-bearing structure that upgrades the PCE from editorial

preference to prophetic necessity. Without that scaffold, the “PCE-as-final” claim collapses back into preference.

5) *I test the prophetic superstructure against the printed record and CUP’s own statement*

- In Lessons 276–277 I shift from the theological frame to the documented printed history. My findings are these:
 - Some Cambridge lines come close to the later PCE profile.
 - Cambridge University Press (as quoted in Verschuur’s own *Guide*) says it has no evidence of a consciously created, distinct “PCE” revision/edition at the end of the 19th or early 20th century.
 - The 2006 PCE e-text is a post-hoc harmonization across non-identical witnesses—resolving PCE-vs-PCE differences, regularizing micro-variation, and introducing at least one new convention (“LORD’s”).
- That’s not “pedantry”; it’s the printed record on its own terms.

6) *Why I describe Matthew’s historical narrative as presentist and goal-moving*

- Given that Cambridge University Press (CUP) does not document a singular PCE revision and that twentieth-century “PCE-era” printings show minute but real differences, *A Century PCE* necessarily redefines “PCE” as a profile with “key criteria,” then justifies a 21st-century master e-text that resolves those differences. Calling that unified, error-scoured composite “the PCE” as though it had existed in a single, stable historical setting is precisely what I mean by presentism (a modern category retrofitted to the past) and moving the goalposts (tight purity criteria when comparing non-PCE KJVs, relaxed tolerance when accounting for PCE-vs-PCE variation).

7) *What the March 18 blog claims about me—and what I actually wrote*

- “I make the tests doctrinal / Pentecostal.” No—I say the tests are identifiers, but his rationales for six of them are explicitly Pentecostal in his *Guide*. I document this with citations.
- “I deny Cambridge printed PCE-like texts.” No—I state some Cambridge lines come close, but CUP’s own statement (in his *Guide*) doesn’t endorse a single, conscious PCE edition; and I show the 2006 file is harmonized across non-identical witnesses.
- “I ignore Verschuur’s broader corpus / misread Rev 10–11 / imply Postmillennialism.” No—my scope was explicit: evaluate *Vintage Bibles* Part 2’s Historicism against the printed record. I keep his seventh trumpet future, and I summarize his own claim that this era yields the PCE as world-standard.

- “Historicism isn’t foundational; Verschuur use multiple modes.” In the current, published defense (*Vintage Bibles*), Historicism is doing the decisive work to upgrade PCE to prophetic necessity. That is the specific claim I make and document.
- “I rely on CUP’s ignorance.” No—I report CUP’s non-endorsement of a consciously created PCE edition as they themselves wrote it (and as he himself reproduced). That is normal historical method.

8) *My overall conclusion*

- Read as a whole, my series does not deny the value of Cambridge Bibles, nor does it caricature the PCE. I take Verschuur’s published claims seriously and then test them. My conclusion is that the authority of the PCE—as a final, exclusive standard—does not arise from the printed history itself. It arises from a layered theological framework—especially Historicism (as deployed in *Vintage Bibles*) and Pentecostal presuppositions (as deployed in the *Guide’s* rationales)—without which the PCE cannot function as anything more than a late editorial preference. The March 18 blog post does not overturn that conclusion, because it does not engage it; it reframes and deflects rather than answering the specific, documented points I made across Lessons 271–282.

9) *Personal thoughts regarding the back & forth*

- I feel frustrated because what I am seeing is not a disagreement over facts, but a retreat from Verschuur’s own published claims. I have not reconstructed his position from assumptions or hearsay; I have quoted his books extensively and allowed him to define his own framework. Everything I have said about Historicism, Word & Spirit/Pentecostal theology, and the emergence of the PCE comes directly from his own explanations of why the PCE exists and why it matters.
- In his writings, he clearly uses Historicist prophecy and Word & Spirit/Pentecostal theology to describe the emergence, timing, and authority of the PCE. He frames the PCE as the fulfillment of Daniel and Revelation, ties it to Church Restitution, and links its appearance to Pentecostal revival. I did not impose that framework on him—I simply took it seriously and followed it where it leads.
- Now, when those explanations are examined and tested against the printed record, he attempts to reframe the discussion so that it appears as though I am misrepresenting him. But the only way that accusation works is if my analysis is detached from the context of his books. It isn’t. My arguments are built by tracing themes across his works, showing continuity, and documenting how the same theological logic repeatedly underwrites his claims about the PCE.
- What I am reacting to is not mere disagreement, but a pattern where clear statements are later softened, requalified, or repositioned once their implications are exposed. Instead of saying, “Yes,

that is my framework and here is why it still stands,” he now speaks as though the PCE exists independently of the very theological reasoning he used to authorize it in the first place.

- My position has been consistent throughout the series. I have distinguished identification markers from theological rationales, preference from exclusivity, and historical description from prophetic necessity. His description of my position, however, has not been consistent. It increasingly replaces engagement with reframing and treats careful analysis as misrepresentation.
- At bottom, this is not about tone or motives. It is about accountability. If someone uses Historicism and Word & Spirit/Pentecostal theology to explain why their position exists, they cannot later accuse others of distortion for taking those explanations at face value. I am not misrepresenting him. I am holding him to what he actually wrote.

10) On the “I Haven’t Read His Material” Allegation

- When he suggests or outright claims that I have not read his material, that accusation is simply false on its face. I did not skim his work, rely on summaries, or respond to second-hand impressions. I read the *Guide to the Pure Cambridge Edition*, *A Century of the Pure Cambridge Edition*, and *Vintage Bibles* (and all the smaller secondary works listed at the beginning of this Appendix) carefully, in full, and I engaged them in sequence, tracing how his argument develops and shifts over time. My analysis is built on direct quotation, page references, and sustained interaction with entire sections and chapters—not isolated lines.
- In fact, the level of detail in my critique presupposes careful reading. I track how claims made in the *Guide* are modified in *A Century PCE* and then re-expressed—often with increased theological confidence—in *Vintage Bibles*. I document internal tensions, redefinitions, and recalibrations precisely because I have read the material closely enough to compare it against itself. Someone who had not read his works would not be able to identify those continuities and shifts.
- The charge that I “haven’t read” his material functions rhetorically, not substantively. It allows him to dismiss conclusions he does not like without having to show where I misquoted him, misunderstood his words, or ignored relevant passages. But he does not do that. He does not point to places where I overlooked clarifying statements or failed to engage key sections. Instead, he asserts unreadiness as a way to avoid answering the implications of what I actually cite.
- Ironically, this accusation only makes sense if one assumes that reading his books correctly should lead to agreement. But disagreement after careful reading is not evidence of ignorance; it is evidence of analysis. I read his works, took his explanations seriously, followed his reasoning where it leads, and then tested it against the printed record and basic logical coherence. That is not neglect—it is engagement.

- So, when I hear the claim that I have not read his material, I see it as another attempt to invalidate critique by questioning the critic’s competence rather than addressing the critique itself. The documentation in my series stands on its own. Anyone can check the quotations, follow the page numbers, and see that my arguments are grounded in what he actually wrote. The problem is not that I failed to read his books; it is that I read them carefully and did not accept their conclusions at face value.

11) On “Invented” PCE Pillars

- Verschuur’s accusation that I “invented pillars” for the PCE position is unfounded, because the concept comes from his own *Guide*, not from me. In his writing, he explicitly presents Faith Pentecostalism, King James Bible Onlyism, and Historicist prophecy as foundational doctrines that together explain why the PCE was identified, why it is authoritative, and why it appears when it does. Whether or not he repeatedly uses the word *pillar*, he clearly treats these doctrines as structural and necessary, not incidental. Calling them “pillars” is simply accurate analytical labeling of what he himself describes as foundational. His current complaint only works if those doctrines are retroactively downgraded to background beliefs—but that is not how he originally wrote. I did not impose a framework on his position; I summarized the framework he explicitly laid out and then analyzed its implications.

12) On “Answering Ross’ Ranting”

- When he introduces the section titled “Ross’ Rantings,” I see a decisive shift away from argument and toward delegitimation. The title itself is pejorative, and the instruction that I should “ask my friends to instruct me” is not an engagement with evidence or logic—it is rhetorical degradation. That tone matters, because it signals that what follows is not a careful logical rebuttal, but an attempt to discredit the critic rather than answer the critique. That said, the specific accusations of logical fallacy also fail when examined carefully.
 - Straw Man Fallacy—A straw man occurs when someone misrepresents an opponent’s position and then refutes the misrepresentation. That is not what I have done. I do not attribute to him positions he does not hold; I quote his own words directly, often at length, and then analyze the implications of those words. I do not say, “Matthew secretly believes X.” I say, “Matthew explicitly says X here, here, and here—therefore Y follows.” That is not a straw man; it is text-based analysis. If my conclusions are wrong, the error would lie in my reasoning, not in misrepresentation. Simply asserting “straw man” without showing where I misquoted or distorted him does not establish the fallacy.
 - Hasty Generalization—A hasty generalization draws a broad conclusion from insufficient evidence. My work is the opposite. I do not rely on isolated statements or single blog posts. I trace themes across multiple books, across years of writing, and across entire chapters—especially in the *Guide*, *A Century PCE*, and *Vintage Bibles*. When I describe Historicism or Word & Spirit/Pentecostal theology as structural, I do so because they

recur consistently, not sporadically. Generalization becomes hasty only when it lacks adequate sampling. My analysis is cumulative and documented.

- Mind Reading / Motive Fallacy—A motive fallacy would require me to speculate about what he *intends* or *feels*. I do not do that. I do not claim to know his inner thoughts, personal psychology, or secret agenda. I analyze what his texts do, not why he feels compelled to write them. When I say that Historicism or Pentecostal epistemology *functions* authoritatively in his system, I am describing structural effects, not personal motives. Function is not motive. Textual consequence is not mind reading.
- Cherry Picking—Cherry picking would mean selecting only favorable quotes while ignoring counter-evidence. But my series repeatedly acknowledges complexity and tension in his corpus. I explicitly note where Cambridge editions “come close,” where he later softens earlier claims, and where *A Century PCE* modifies the absolutism of the *Guide*. I do not hide these developments; I document them. In fact, one of my central arguments is that his position shifts over time, creating internal tension. Cherry picking would require suppressing that data. I do not.
- Overinterpretation / Overreading—This accusation misunderstands the nature of system-level analysis. When an author repeatedly uses Historicist prophecy, Pentecostal epistemology, and providential language to explain *why* a position exists and *why* it is authoritative, recognizing those elements as foundational is not “overreading”—it is reading the argument as an argument. Overinterpretation would involve importing meanings not present in the text. I am doing the opposite: I am taking his explanations seriously and literally, even when he later wishes they were taken more lightly.
- The list of alleged fallacies functions rhetorically, not analytically. None of them are demonstrated with reference to specific misquotes, invalid inferences, or formal logical errors. Instead, they are used as labels to dismiss sustained, text based critique without answering it. My work stands or falls on whether I have quoted him accurately and whether my conclusions follow from those quotations. Accusations of fallacy do not substitute for showing that I am wrong.
- Finally, the tone itself—calling my work “rantings” and suggesting I need remedial instruction—undercuts the credibility of the accusations. Logical fallacies are demonstrated, not declared. They require showing *where* an argument fails, not merely asserting that the arguer is incompetent. When critique is answered with condescension, it usually indicates that the argument itself has not been neutralized.

13) On the “Scholarly Trick” & Non-Use of Logic Allegations

- When he accuses me of using a “scholarly trick,” what he is really doing is recasting normal historical method as bad faith. I am not appealing to academic standards to evade the issue; I am simply asking for the basic things any historical claim requires—identifiable editions, dates,

documented revision processes, and corroboration from the publisher. That is not a trick; it is the minimum evidentiary standard for turning a theological narrative into a historical assertion. The accusation only arises because his position relies heavily on assertion where documentation is thin. Rather than answering requests for evidence, he frames the act of asking for verification as “academic snobbery” or manipulation, effectively reversing the burden of proof. In reality, I am doing what responsible scholarship demands: distinguishing theology from history, testimony from documentation, and narrative from demonstrable fact. Calling that a “scholarly trick” is simply a way to avoid questions his own sources cannot adequately answer.

- When he claims that I am “not using logic,” that accusation does not withstand scrutiny, because my entire critique is explicitly logical in form. I consistently use conditional reasoning (“if X is true, then Y follows”), internal-consistency testing, and category distinction—especially between *translation*, *edition*, *setting*, *theology*, and *history*. What he labels “illogical” is usually just an unwelcome conclusion drawn from his own premises. Rather than identifying a formal fallacy in my reasoning, he objects to where the reasoning leads.
- In practice, I am doing standard logical analysis: examining whether his claims cohere with one another, whether conclusions follow from stated premises, and whether categories are being confused or collapsed. For example, when I show that one cannot simultaneously affirm a perfectly preserved translation *and* a uniquely perfect edition without contradiction, that is not illogic—it is basic consistency testing. Calling that “not using logic” functions as a dismissal, not a demonstration. If my reasoning were actually flawed, the appropriate response would be to identify the specific fallacy or invalid inference. Instead, the accusation substitutes disagreement with outcome for analysis of methods.

14) On “Ignorant Sources” & CUP Allegations

- When he accuses me of appealing to “ignorant” sources—especially by invoking Cambridge University Press (CUP)—this accusation completely collapses on inspection, because I did not introduce CUP as an authority on my own initiative. I cited CUP only because he himself introduced their statement into the discussion by reproducing it in his *Guide*. I simply took what he quoted from CUP and treated it at face value as historical evidence relevant to his own claims. If CUP is now to be dismissed as “ignorant,” then that dismissal rebounds on his own use of their testimony, not on mine.
- More importantly, I never appealed to CUP as a final arbiter of truth or as an infallible authority. I appealed to CUP in the limited, appropriate sense that they are the publisher whose records would be expected to document a conscious revision or edition if one existed. Their statement does not “settle” the matter by itself; it corroborates what the printed record already shows—namely, that there is no evidence of a single, consciously created PCE revision at the turn of the twentieth century. Calling that “appealing to ignorance” is simply an attempt to disqualify inconvenient evidence after the fact.

- What is happening rhetorically is a reversal of responsibility. He first introduces CUP when their testimony seems useful; when that same testimony undercuts later claims, CUP suddenly becomes uninformed, economically motivated, or irrelevant. That is not a flaw in my method—it is selective validation on his part. I did not elevate CUP beyond its proper role; I used his own cited source to test the historical claim he was making. If that source is now deemed unreliable, then the burden is on him to explain why he relied on it in the first place, not on me for taking it seriously.

15) On “Rick Norris” Allegations

- The “Rick Norris” accusation functions as a rhetorical deflection rather than a substantive rebuttal. I have not adopted Rick Norris’s method, conclusions, or evidentiary approach; my arguments are grounded in Matthew Verschuur’s own writings, Cambridge University Press statements reproduced in his *Guide*, and the documented printed history. By invoking Norris, Verschuur shifts the discussion away from evidence and toward guilt-by-association, effectively poisoning the well instead of answering the critique. The timing is telling: the label appears only after I demonstrate that the printed record does not independently establish a single, consciously created PCE, that Historicism and Word-and-Spirit theology do the authorizing work, and that the 2006 text is a harmonized construction. Calling this “Rick Norris” does not address those points; it avoids them.

16) On the “What it’s all About” Section

- When he reaches the “*What it’s all about?*” section, I see a clear shift away from analysis and toward motive-framing. Instead of answering the specific historical, textual, and logical points I raised, he reframes the discussion around what he *suggests* I am really trying to do—casting doubt on the PCE, denying its existence, undermining KJB authority, or attacking his theology. But none of that reflects what I have actually argued.
- What I am doing throughout the series is very narrow and very consistent: I am asking whether the printed history, by itself, establishes the PCE as a single, consciously created, final Cambridge edition—and whether the authority claims made for the PCE depend on Historicism and Word & Spirit/Pentecostal theology. The “*What it’s all about?*” section does not answer that question. Instead, it recasts critique as intent, substituting speculation about my goals for engagement with my evidence.
- This move allows him to imply that I am denying the reality of the PCE, denying Cambridge’s quality, or denying the doctrine of preservation—none of which I say. I explicitly acknowledge that Cambridge printed excellent Bibles, that many editions “come close” to the PCE profile, and that believers used them faithfully for decades. My critique is not about whether such Bibles existed; it is about whether the strong, exclusive claims now being made are warranted by the historical record alone.

- In effect, the “What it’s all about?” section functions as a false dilemma: either one accepts the PCE as he frames it, or one must be rejecting Scripture, providence, or the KJB itself. That framing avoids the real issue, which is whether his own writings *add* a theological superstructure—Historicism, Pentecostal epistemology, and prophetic necessity—to the printed history in order to arrive at his conclusions. That is precisely what I documented using his own words.
- So, when I read that section, I don’t see a rebuttal. I see a rhetorical repositioning. Instead of defending the structure of his argument, he redefines the debate in terms of loyalty, suspicion, and motive. But my series has never been about why I dislike the PCE or what I am “really after.” It has been about what his books actually say, how those claims function together, and whether the conclusions follow. The “What it’s all about?” section sidesteps that work rather than answering it.