

### Introduction

- Historically, a Fundamentalist was a Christian who held to the five *fundamentals* outlined in the 1910s.
  - The inspiration of Scripture (The Bible is God’s Word)
  - The virgin birth of Jesus Christ
  - The substitutionary death of Jesus Christ
  - The bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ
  - The historic reality of the miracles of Scripture.
- Because of the impending implosion of evangelicalism, fundamentalism needs to strengthen its position on four key areas, in order to distinguish itself from evangelicalism.
  - #1 – Strengthening the anti-ecumenical argument.
  - #2 – Solidifying its Kingdom position.
  - #3 – Teaching truth about the universal church.

### Adjustment #4: An Insistence on Verbal Plenary Inspiration

- What is verbal plenary inspiration?
  - Verbal means *words* – like *verbose* and *verbiage*.
  - Plenary means *full* – like the *plenary* session of a convention.
  - A fundamentalist believes that God gave every word of the 66 books of the Bible.
- Only in Fundamentalism will you find a rejection of the broad range of Bible translations.
  - Evangelicalism is totally comfortable with multiples of English translations of the Bible.
  - Consider this from the *Got Questions* website, a site that is the “go-to” source for typical evangelical answers:

*“...there is nothing wrong with there being multiple versions of the Bible in a language. In fact, multiple versions of the Bible can actually be an aid in understanding the message of the Bible.*

*There are two primary reasons for the different English Bible versions. (1) Over time, the English language changes/develops, making updates to an English version necessary. If a modern reader were to pick up a 1611 King James Version of the Bible, he would find it to be virtually unreadable. Everything from the spelling, to syntax, to grammar, to phraseology is very different. ...Fierce loyalty to a particular version of the Bible is illogical and counterproductive. When the Bible was written, it was written in the common language of the people at that time. When the Bible is translated, it should be translated into how a people/language group speaks/reads at that time, not how it spoke hundreds of years ago.*

*(2) There are different translation methodologies for how to best render the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek into English. Some Bible versions translate as literally (word-for-word)... Some Bible versions translate less literally, in more of a thought-for-thought method.... Neither method is right or wrong. The best Bible version is likely produced through a balance of the two methodologies.*

*Listed below are the most common English versions of the Bible. In choosing which Bible version(s) you are going to use/study, do research, discuss with Christians you respect, read the Bibles for yourself, and ultimately, ask God for wisdom regarding which Bible version He desires you to use.”<sup>1</sup>*

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.gotquestions.org/Bible-versions.html>

- Notice:
  - Multiple and continual versions are encouraged in evangelicalism.
  - Literal (word-for-word) translation is discouraged.
  - Adherence to a single translation is all but mocked.
  - There is no hint that there may be inaccuracies in these translations.
  - Absolutely nothing is said about the underlying textual issues of the Critical Text -vs- the Textus Receptus.
- Incidentally, do an internet search for “should Shakespeare be translated to modern English” and you will find miles of argument against doing so. Why? Because true lovers of Shakespeare believe you can only get into Shakespeare’s mind by reading his own words.
- Evangelicals believe that God’s word is *contained* in the Bible rather than *recorded* in the Bible.
  - A side-effect: fundamentalism has a lot more verse-by-verse teaching than the topical nature of evangelicalism. (This is why you can find Andy Stanley preaching series called, “The Bad Boys of Easter,” “What Makes You Happy,” and “How to Be Rich,” but never a series through a book of the Bible).
- A few examples:
  - Romans 1:26-27 – Is there a *natural use* (KJV) or *natural relations* (ESV, HCSB, etc.)?
  - 1 Corinthians 10:16 – Is there a *communion* (KJV) or a *participation* (ESV) of the blood?
  - Revelation 2:5 – Was the Ephesian church supposed to do *the first works* (KJV) or *the deeds you did at first* (ESV)?
  - Literally hundreds of examples of word changes could be given that show that these translations are *not* saying the same thing, and that there are definitely doctrinal differences that result.
- What about KJV-onlyism?
  - Within Baptist fundamentalism there are KJV-onlyists.
  - Evangelicals mock KJV onlyism and use this as a reason to reject fundamentalism in totality.
    - The KJV-only article at *God Questions* does not explain the movement, just says it is wrong.
  - The KJV-onlyist would ask, *do I have a copy of the Bible or not?*
    - This is a good question to ask! (And the fundamentalist who is attacked on use of the KJV should ask this of the Evangelical).
  - The KJV-onlyist has decided that the Textus Receptus is the accurate Greek translation. The modern non-KJV translations are based on a variety of committee-prepared texts.
  - The KJV-onlyist believes that an authoritative standard is necessary to remove emotionalism and personal agenda in selecting the text which most suits one’s personal desires.
  - While I am not a KJV-onlyist, I would have no problem worshiping and fellowshiping with one, and would prefer that over one who picks and chooses at whim. Furthermore, the more I study Greek, Hebrew, and English, the more I am convinced that the KJV is the most accurate English translation available today and should be accepted as the default and *functional equivalent* of the originals.
  - If you believe in verbal plenary inspiration, don’t you *have to* determine which words were used?
- My recommendation: *Fundamentalists should strengthen their argument to evangelicals on why they use the KJV.*