

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Why I still Use the KJV1611 Bible

Why I still Use the KJV1611 Bible, on: 2010/7/12 9:00

Some one asked why any one would still use the Old KJV1611 Bible and I find myself happy this day to answer that question in my own words. Before I went in the U.S.Navy in 1956 I spent the Christmas of 1955 at home with my family. My Mother gave me a King James 1611 Bible with my name embossed on the cover, it had the words of Jesus Christ in Red Letters and a zipper binder. When I got saved in 1983 I began to read that old black book, my sorrows melted away, I had a new song in my heart, a new book with pages yet unread! I read, I studied, I memorized and for a long time I wept over the wasted years that I had spent in vanity and pride. My love of poetry carried over to the Old Book with the Thees and the Thous and I marveled at the majesty of the old English! I began to go to Nursing Homes and passed out gospel tracts to people everywhere on the streets of the USA and Canada, I led my wife, my son and 2 daughters to the Lord that first year. I was a Babe in Christ and didn't know a lot, but I knew that when I got to Heaven I wanted to see lots of people that I knew there. I am 72 years old and I still see people on the street and say "How is the Lord treating you?" Once in 1993 I did that on a street and the man broke down and wept...I later led him to Christ. I have prayed with people on their deathbed, led folks to the Lord in their 70s. 80s and one in her 90s in 2005. All I am is a witness at a wedding, I stand and behold the marvelous works of the Almighty God. I said all this to say that I still read the KJV1611 Bible because "I love to tell the story of unseen things above, of Jesus and His glory, of Jesus and His love." But that's just me. Doug Lamb
www.lastrump.org

Re: Why I still Use the KJV161 Bible - posted by Nellie, on: 2010/7/12 12:11

This is Beautiful!
It was a Blessing to me.
Thanks for sharing.
God is so Faithful.
God Bless you and yours.
Nellie

Re: Why I still Use the KJV161 Bible - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/13 4:09

Good to hear but I doubt that you are using the 1611 version of the King James Version. You are almost certainly using the 1769 version. The 1611 version would be so archaic that it would be very difficult to understand easily.
;-)

Re: , on: 2010/7/13 7:43

That is all very edifying, but the Bible which is on the desk in front of me is called the 1611 version! (I still have it since 1955) Only in the last 50 years did Godless depraved men start quibbling over "gnats and swallowing camels." (Matthew 23:24) My Bible has no copyright, it is in the public domain..Who wrote your book? and who copyrighted it? Doug Lamb
John 12:48

Re: , on: 2010/7/13 10:51

Quote:
-----Only in the last 50 years did Godless depraved men start quibbling over "gnats and swallowing camels." (Matthew 23:24) My Bible has no copyright, it is in the public domain..Who wrote your book? and who copyrighted it? Doug Lamb
John 12:48

God wrote my book. As far as the copyright goes, the KJV used to have one too. I hope this isn't more KJV only, Ruckmanite thinking in the boiler.

Re: Why I still Use the KJV161 Bible - posted by mielle, on: 2010/7/13 11:07

Beautiful indeed!

many blessings to you

Re: , on: 2010/7/13 11:23

No! Ruckman believes that Abraham was saved by faith"plus" works, He believes in a "secret" pre tribulation rapture and that a baby is not a person until he breathes his first breathe! (I believe none of that!) So I would consider it an act of Christian charity if you would not lump me in with others, because you have a preset judgemental attitude toward anyone who has a "solid" belief in the word of God! Now without the word of God there is no new birth, you can't have it both ways! "Being born again by the Word of God "which liveth and abideth forever." 1 Peter 1:23-25 Now in the garden of Eden, Eve was presented with 2 views of the Bible...a Choice! "Yea, hath God said?" By the way I was reading the KJV1611 Bible in 1944, 5 years before PSR got saved and 15-25 years before anyone ever heard of Pete Ruckman! Doug Lamb

Re: , on: 2010/7/13 13:07

Reply to Osama; I should been a little clearer on the birth of a child! Some believe that a child doesn't "exist" until the actual birth(the cry) some believe at the "quickening" (baby flutters) or as I do at the moment of inception when the ingredients begin to form. See Psalm 139:13-16 God also knew Jeremiah 1:5 in the womb.and also called Isaiah from the womb(Isa.49:1) and the Apostle Paul (Gal.1:15) He knew Tamar's twins in the womb and fooled the midwife with the scarlet thread (Gen. 38:27) and Rebekah's twins/2 nations in the womb. (Gen.25:23) I have every confidence that a God that can create the Earth in 7 days, make a man from the dust of the Earth, part the Red Sea and cause a Virgin to bear a Son, have that Son (with God's blood in His veins/Acts 20:28) have the Son of God in the fiery furnace (Prior to the birth, in Daniel 3:25.) after His incarnation as God manifest in the flesh...John 1:14/1 Timothy 3:16/2 John 7... He died on the Cross of Calvary(My Bible still has "Calvary" in Luke 23:33) He descends into Hell preaches to souls in prison and then on the 3rd Day..."Up from the ground He arose with a mighty triumph o'er His Foes." In reflecting on all that; I think he can preserve His words intact for these "Last Days! Tractsman P.S. I have a slight cloudiness in my right eye, i worked in an Automobile factory for 25 years,some fumes contained sulfuric acid and in 1965 on my first day in the building (Number 7) I got burns on my eyes. So please forgive me, if I omit words, etc.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/13 13:14

Hi there

Quote:

-----My Bible has no copyright, it is in the public domain.

technically the KJV is Crown Property but I'm sure her majesty won't quibble. Here is an image of the 1611 version for you...

<http://www.bible.ca/kjv-1611-version-margin-notes-matthew-13-1-29.jpg>

the KJV is still my version of choice too.

Re: , on: 2010/7/13 13:58

Thanks....I will have to hunt for where to click on the image! (Vision problems) I call my Bible the KJV1611 Bible and always have, I didn't know until the early 1960's that there was any such thing as another version! I bought an RSV in 1982 and studied with it for about a week or two and I noticed, because my King James Bible had Red Letters that they were leaving out the Lord's words.... Matthew 18:11; says I quote; "For the Son of man is came to save that which was lost." Gone out of the new "books." I threw the \$12 New Testament in the trash! I heard J.Vernon McGee say in 1990 that they made "good doorstops." I am Scotch-Irish...I wish that I had known about that doorstep thing in 1982, DGL

Re: , on: 2010/7/13 14:00

However you set that file up, I don't seem to be able to bring it up...maybe you could send it in private message! DGL

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/13 14:20

Just copy this line (click in the middle of it 3 times and then copy) and then paste it into your browser.. and hit return.

<http://www.bible.ca/kjv-1611-version-margin-notes-matthew-13-1-29.jpg>

Does that work?

Re: , on: 2010/7/13 14:48

I tried it! As is usually the case with these long entries like that, I will get at least one character wrong! I will try it again in the AM when my eyes are fresher. DGL

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2010/7/13 15:13

Philologos wrote

Quote:

-----technically the KJV is Crown Property but I'm sure her majesty won't quibble. Here is an image of the 1611 version for you...

Thanks for this, I like the language!

I can just hear those folk in 1611 saying "This new translation dedicated to King James is a heresy, we only use Wycliffe's translation!" :)

BTW - Didn't the Apostles and Jesus quote from the Septuagint (greek translation of OT), which has variations from the original Hebrew. I bet there were folk back then who got upset about the Septuagint. Probably they were the ones who strain out gnats and swallowed camels!

Re: , on: 2010/7/13 16:24

Reply to Philologos; I would be interested in your thoughts on Matthew 13:1-29 and verse 30 (The tares, First,) also the "zinger" where everyone uses Matthew Chapter 13 to teach that you can lose your salvation. I notice in the context that one of the 4 had "no root," Question; Do you know any plant that can survive without roots? Also if you read the last page of the Bible, you will see in Rev.22:16(b); "I am the root and the offspring of David and the bright and Morning Star." Unlike the Modern Versions in Isa.14:12, where they make Lucifer "the morning star." C.I. Scofield says; The Wheat goes first, the KJV1611 text says the Tares get "taken" and bound "first." All this is quite a lot for the average Christian ...because it says in Matt.24:40; "one is "taken" and the other left." I would be interested in your thoughts. Was that why you directed me to those Footnotes? DGL

Re: , on: 2010/7/13 19:29

Hey, no offense intended, sir. The only reason I asked was because many of the KJV only crowd seem to herald Mr. Ruckman as their champion proponent of the KJV movement. And I don't have a preset judgement against anyone who has a solid belief in the Word of God (that is unless that person believes that the KJV 1611 is the only pure version of the Bible in existence today). You must forgive me if I offended you in some way. I had only found it quite.... intriguing..... that your first post on sermonindex was in answer to a question that no one here asked, in favor of a certain translation that some have said is the ONLY Word of God. That's all.

Re: , on: 2010/7/13 21:36

Reply to Everestosama; I need to explain why I put up that thread. I am a novice on the web! To make it worse, if the print on a site is small I have a hard time reading it. Before I logged in yesterday (New to this site) I saw a remark by a guy about the King James Bible asking why anyone would still use it. By the time I navigated around and registered I had no idea how to find the comment or even what Forum it was on. In order to find my way back to a site I have to hit "favorite" and save it until I can feel acquainted enough with it to find the site when I want to! To show you how much trouble I have with my eyes... I think that I misspelled KJV1611 on the thread. It says KJV161 and I don't know if I spelled it that way or the Site Manager entered it that way. I didn't notice it for a day and a half. Anyway I am not mad at you, in life we all want to strongly defend our position and I am as vigorous with mine as I hope that you are with yours...The Lord hates lukewarm Christians. I am one who lost a lot of things in my life, my Father disappeared when I was less than a year old and left my Mother with 3 boys to raise before WW2. That KJV 1611 Bible that I have is one of the few possessions that I still have left, I treasure it. On this site I gave that account of my love of the word of God...I have my children, grandchildren and their wives/spouses birthdays and wedding anniversaries written in the middle page between the OT and the NT. So you can see that I treasure it and the words in it. As far as I am concerned it is good between us and I will enjoy hearing what God is doing in your life. At least I know that He has given you a spirit of "reconciliation." (2 Cor.5:17-21) Doug

Re: - posted by StarofGOD (), on: 2010/7/13 23:31

Personally, I still read kjv, but still refer to several other translations all the time.

However, I am beginning to like the Nasb nearly as much as the kjv. I nearly read it just as much!

Why I commented on this silly topic I am not for sure. ;) God bless you all.

Re: , on: 2010/7/14 1:15

Hey, sorry if I came off as inquisitive or sharp, sir. I just usually see people joining fairly often who have only the intention to teach the members here new doctrine or to share their own little personal "gems" of revelation with us, but have little or no interest in actual fellowship, or the sharpening of one another. They'll make their new posts and try to show us some new or secret light, or attempt to say something that sounds profound, only to be completely spiritually incompatible and dry.

I now understand where you're coming from, so please forgive my prior lack of understanding regarding your position. You indeed do have a very valuable Bible, and I'm glad that it has meant so much to you, and has been a treasure for you throughout your walk. I'm glad that you love the Word of God. So thank you for your post, and once again, please forgive my former skepticism.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2010/7/14 1:57

Hi tractsman...

I agree with brother Ron (Philologos) that you probably are using a version OTHER THAN the "original" 1611 edition. The "original" KJV contained the books of the Apocrypha (in fact, they were the first portion to be completed and published) as well as many errors, which led to the subsequent revisions that culminated in the 1769 (or later) editions that are commonly used today for the "Authorized Version."

In addition, as Ron pointed out, the version is still held by the Crown of the United Kingdom and is only "authorized" to be published by a select group of publishers in the UK. Those of us outside of the UK are not worried, because this ownership exceeds the copyright protection recognized by US law. Thus, we are free to publish it without fear of legal action, even if it is still technically owned by the Crown.

You wrote: "

Quote:
-----So I would consider it an act of Christian charity if you would not lump me in with others, because you have a preset judgemental attitude toward anyone who has a "solid" belief in the word of God!

"

I can't speak for this brother. I suppose that he might be concerned because of the history of certain brothers or sisters who have joined this forum and immediately proclaimed their view that the KJV is the ONLY inspired version or translation of the Word of God. Such brethren have been somewhat divisive and have even gone so far as to proclaim that those of us who aren't KJV-exclusive are "believing a lie." Even your statement above seems to skirt such an opinion...because the brother you were speaking to did not demonstrate a "judgmental attitude toward anyone who has a 'solid' belief in the word of God." I didn't really read that in his post at all.

Personally, I use the KJV, NIV and NASB as my primary sources of Scripture. I view these as faithful translations from the sources that each group of translators used. I tend to use the KJV and NIV the most...simply because of the plethora of study materials available.

Anyway, I wanted to clear that up just a bit. Welcome to the forum! I hope that you will be blessed, challenged and encouraged by the material that is contained here!

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/14 9:15

DGL

Sorry, I am not following this very well. I am not sure what point you are making or asking me to comment on.

"English and American... two peoples divided by a common language" Winston Churchill (just joking)

Re: , on: 2010/7/14 9:27

My response to all the good words that I have read is that there seems to be a lot of talk in Christianity about what the Bible is and what it contains. Everyone "seems" to be a self-proclaimed expert in all matters regarding the text of the scripture. I heard a preacher back in 1985 that would preach on the "binder/seals on the cover of the Bible. I heard a man in the rear of sanctuary say "Why don't you just preach the Book.(That's my view) There was a fellow on this Forum the other night who was very distraught, he felt that he had lost his joy and his Hope...members were giving all kinds of advice. It reminded me of a Curtis Hutson Gospel Tract(Sword of the Lord) I read many years ago about a drowning man, and how people went about to save him. One helper shouted out directions on How to Swim..encouraging him to swim harder, one read to him from a book about great swimmers and the third one dove in and pulled him out!(Jude 23) "And others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire; hating even the garment spotted by the flesh." You are probably right about me I am guilty! I am opinionated and brusque and if you called my house I would probably say; "What do you want?" I was raised in Western New York and my years in the Navy gave me an "Oh Yeah" attitude...that I fight to conquer..."The spirit is willing." I am a Hell and Brimstone Preacher (Licensed Baptist) I have been preaching in the Nursing Homes since 1987 and my voice finally started dying out in January. I am lost without my Pulpit, so forgive me if I come on strong, when you wasted years like I did (1955-1982) you will feel a sense of urgency like I do. Each year I re-play the Video; "7 Days in New York City," and think of those people that jumped to their death on September 11, 2001, some of them "NOT" prepared to meet their God. (Amos 4:12) I am King James only, because I can't find anything else that fills my soul with Jesus. That should not bother you, some of you are Democrats and it hasn't stopped you yet! If people feel I am a cause of division I will leave. There are people out there that agree with me and those that agree with you. When they asked a politician what his views were, he said; "Some of my friends are for 'X' and some of my friends are for 'Z.'" They said; "How about you?" He said; "I am with my friends!" I don't know if my Christian walk can be like that. Remember in John 9:22 the people feared the Jews and did not confess Christ, "he should be put out of the synagogue." This world is not my home I'm just a passing thru, My treasures are laid up somewhere beyond the blue, The angels beckon me from Heaven's open door and I can't feel at home in the world anymore. Tractsman

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2010/7/14 10:04

I edited the title of this thread from 161 to 1611. I am both impressed and thankful that this discussion hasn't taken the glorious turn this particular topic has seemed to precipitate in the past. Thank you for keeping it civil, factual and agenda-free. All can glean and grow from such treatment.

God bless you all dear brethren,

Paul

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/14 13:36

Quote:
----- can just hear those folk in 1611 saying "This new translation dedicated to King James is a heresy, we only use Wycliffe's translation!" :)

You are not far from the truth.

Henry VIII banned Tyndale's version but finally put a very similar version in the churches. There were several other versions. Many Puritans preferred the Geneva Bible.

Later the Bishop's Bible was produced but most sympathetic to the reformation never took to it.

the King James version was not popular to begin with but the authorities banned the printing of other versions so gradually it gained traction and became 'the Bible'.

I always think it is fascinating that the Pilgrim Fathers on the Mayflower used the Geneva Bible rather than the KJV. Somewhere along the line the KJV gained the race in the USA too.

This is a fascinating story.

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2010/7/14 18:04

For those who are interested in the history of the King James Bible, and other early English Bibles. Alistar McGrath wrote a book titled "In the Beginning" on the topic. It discusses many of the issues that have been brought up here, such as the Geneva Bible, as well as the translation process, translations teams, translation rules put in place by James I (!), and other interesting things.

The book also discusses the King James Bible's impact on culture.

With care in Christ...