

Seventh-day Adventist *Sabbath School Bible Study Guide* for the Second Quarter of 2022

This is a review of the entire *Seventh-day Adventist Adult Teachers Sabbath School Bible Study Guide* (SSBSG) for the second quarter of 2022 titled “Genesis.” In this SSBSG seven different bibles were used two of which are Roman Catholic Bibles. If the list of bibles under the front cover was believed, there would be eight bibles used but I only found seven. I counted the number of times each was used. I did not count them twice so my count could be off a little. There were quite a number of small snippets of quotations that could have been from several different bibles and I didn’t count those. Also not counted were places where just one or two words were in quotation marks with no indication of what bible they might have come from. The numbers were as follows:

New King James Version (NKJV) quotations: 204.
King James Version (KJV) quotations: 1.
Douay Rheims Bible (DRB) quotations: 1.
New International Version (NIV) quotations: 3.
Author’s Translation quotations: 2.
English Standard Version (ESV) quotations: 3.
International Standard Version (ISV) quotations: 2.

All memory texts were from the NKJV.

The DRB and ESV are Roman Catholic bibles. The DRB was first published in 1610. There was a time when I don’t believe any Seventh-day Adventist minister or theologian would have been bold enough to use the DRB in any Seventh-day Adventist publication but many Seventh-day Adventists have been led stupidly and blindly down the path to unbelief and destruction. They have been groomed to think any bible is about the same and are too lazy to study the real Bible and Spirit of Prophecy enough to discern the true from the false. They will be happy, happy, happy, until it’s too late.

There were Hebrew lessons in abundance whose only purpose is to show that the author, Jaques B. Doukhan, DHL, ThD, is so learned that he must be believed.

Page numbers referenced will be as in the Standard Edition of the SSBSG unless otherwise noted.

It’s so ironic. Page 4 of the teachers edition of the SSBSG says, “Good Sabbath School teaching should be Bible-based, Christ-centered, faith-strengthening, and fellowship-building. Jaques doesn’t believe there is a single infallible Bible in the world at this time. Infallible means NO error at all.

LESSON 1. The Creation

On page 9 Jaques says “nothing in Scripture, Old or New Testament, denigrates the body as evil.” That is true. He then says, “Instead, Sabbath keepers are grateful for God’s

creation—which includes their own flesh—and why they take care of it.” That sounds pretty; we’ll see how it goes.

Also on page 9, Jaques says, “This is why Jesus chose the Sabbath as the most appropriate day to heal the sick (*Luke 13:13-16*).” It is true that Jesus healed sick people on the Sabbath but neither *Luke 13:13-16* nor any other Scripture supports the theory that the Sabbath is “the most appropriate day to heal the sick.”

On page 10 Jaques says, “Only humans have been created in the image of God.” Humans were made in the image of God but there is nothing in Scripture that says it was “only humans” that were made so.

On page 11 it says, “The first duty of man concerns the natural environment in which God has put him: ‘to tend and keep it’ (*Gen. 2:15, NKJV*).

That sounds very pretty, doesn’t it? How about this?

“The biblical tradition clearly shows that this renewal entails recovering and respecting the rhythms inscribed in nature by the hand of the Creator. We see this, for example, in the law of the Sabbath. On the seventh day, God rested from all his work. He commanded Israel to set aside each seventh day as a day of rest, a *Sabbath* (cf. *Gen 2:2-3; Ex 16:23; 20:10*).”

That also sounds very pretty, doesn’t it? Maybe a Seventh-day Adventist wrote it. Actually, that quotation is from pages 51-52 of *Laudato Si’*, Pope Francis’ encyclical letter.

Is “the first duty of man” caring for “the natural environment?”

“Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man.” Ecclesiastes 12:13 from the King James Version (KJV) which is the real English Protestant Bible in common use.

It would appear that there is something more important than caring for the environment. You know, don’t you, that there will be a push to let the land rest weekly for a day to help the environment? What day do you think that will be?

LESSON 2. The Fall

The memory text for this lesson is a good one. Here it is from the real Bible and from one of the fake bibles that were used.

“And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.” Genesis 3:15 from the KJV to be referred to hereafter as the real Bible.

“I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed: she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel.”
Genesis 3:15 from the DRB.

In the KJV there is the seed which is singular because it then says “it.” That seed is Jesus Christ who will bruise the serpent’s (Satan’s) head. The serpent has bruised Jesus’ heel but it wasn’t a fatal wound. The wound to the serpent’s head will be a fatal wound. In the DRB it’s the woman (Mary) that gives Satan the fatal wound and Satan lies “in wait for her,” Mary’s, heel.

On page 18 it appears that Jaques may have misunderstood English. That can happen if you study too much Hebrew. He says, “Attached to the somber picture of the crushed serpent eating the dust (*Gen. 3:14*) shines the hope of salvation of humankind, which appears in the form of a prophecy.” Not only did Jaques not understand the verse but he also erroneously thought it was a prophecy. He should have gotten a clue from what he quoted on page 15 from *Patriarchs and Prophets* where it says the serpent had wings and flew.

“And the LORD God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou are cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life:”
Genesis 3:14 from the real Bible.

“Dust shalt thou eat” is just another way of saying “upon thy belly shalt thou go.” The phrase “all the days” means the curse started then. The curse is the reason snakes no longer fly with wings though some glide for short distances without wings and then resume crawling on their belly.

Here’s another verse Jaques may not have understood.

“The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock: and dust shall be the serpent’s meat. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the LORD.” Isaiah 65:25 from the real Bible.

Notice that “dust shall be the serpent’s meat” in the new earth. Snakes in the new earth will still be crawling and not flying.

In the “teachers comments” section of the SSBSG on page 27 of the teachers edition it says, “As soon as Eve hears the serpent’s last words, ‘you will be like God’ (*Gen. 3:5, NKJV*), she wants to be like God.”

“For God knows that in the day you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.” Genesis 3:5 from the NKJV.

“For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.” Genesis 3:5 from the real Bible.

“Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.” Matthew 5:48 from the real Bible.

So no, Eve didn’t wish to be “like God” she wished to be “as” a god. It is no sin to wish to be perfect like God. It is a sin to wish to be a god.

On page 29 of the teachers edition It says, “The Messiah also judges and executes kings and many nations (*Ps. 110:5, 6*), having God on His right side. He even receives a cultic function: He is a priest serving at the head of a cortege of priests, and this priesthood is extended toward eternity (*Ps. 110:4*). Methinks “cultic” is a poor word choice.

LESSON 3. Cain *and* His Legacy

On page 23 it says, “In the Hebrew phrase in Genesis 4:1, the words ‘the LORD’ (*YHWH*) are directly linked to the words ‘a man,’ as the following literal translation indicates: ‘I have acquired a man, indeed the LORD Himself.’” Jaques gives no bible version reference so I have to consider this the Author’s Translation. Jaques is so good he believes he can edit the Word of God.

Following his Word of God editing, Jaques quotes from the ISV to buttress his positions. It says in Genesis 4:1, ‘I have given birth to a male child—the Lord.’” Then in the very next paragraph he quotes from The Desire of Ages page 31 where it says, “They joyfully welcomed their first-born son, hoping that he might be the Deliverer.” The phrase “I have given birth to a male child—the LORD” is not at all consistent with the uncertainty expressed in “hoping that he might be the Deliverer.” Of course, when you believe you are authorized to edit the Word of God, it probably seems like a small thing to denigrate the Spirit of Prophecy.

There were about fifty scholars better than Jaques who revered the Word of God and were more competent than Jaques to decide what the Hebrew meant. Here is what the real Bible and the one most used of Jaques’ fakes says.

“And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the LORD.” Genesis 4:1 from the real Bible.

“Now Adam knew Eve his wife, and she conceived and bore Cain, and said, ‘I have acquired a man from the LORD.’” Genesis 4:1 from the NKJV.

Do you see the italicized words in those verses? No? Good, there aren’t any. In the real Bible (the KJV in case you forgot) and in the NKJV words that had to be added to make a sentence intelligible are put in italics. Since there are no italicized words in those verses it means they were translated literally and don’t need to say “I have acquired a man, indeed the LORD Himself.”

On page 24 Jaques claims that Cain, being a “producer of the fruit of the ground” contrasted with Abel being a “keeper of the sheep” explains their “different psychological

attitudes.” I guess that means Jaques thinks shepherds have a tendency toward being good and farmers a tendency toward not being so good.

On page 27 Jaques says, “The phrase ‘sons of God’ (*Gen. 6:2*) refers to the line of Seth because they are designed to preserve the image of God (*Gen. 5:1, 4*).” The ISV disagrees. Remember, the ISV was the bible Jaques used to show that Genesis 4:1 literally said Eve thought Cain was God.

“Now after the population of human beings had increased throughout the earth, and daughters had been born to them, some divine beings noticed how attractive human women were, so they took wives for themselves from a selection that pleased them. The Nephilim were on the earth at that time (and also immediately afterward), when those divine beings were having sexual relations with those human women, who gave birth to children for them. These children became the heroes and legendary figures of ancient times.” Genesis 6:1-2, 4 from the ISV.

Take a look at this passage from another of Jaques’ fake bibles.

“When human beings began to increase in number on the earth and daughters were born to them, the sons of God saw that the daughters of humans were beautiful, and they married any of them they chose. The Nephilim were on the earth in those days—and also afterward—when the sons of God went to the daughters of humans and had children by them. They were the heroes of old, men of renown.” Genesis 6:1-2, 4 from the NIV.

Let’s pretend that you, being a serious Bible student and not knowing Hebrew, have an NIV and (I know this is rare) have a concordance for it. You wish to find out who the sons of God were because the NIV in saying “human beings” seems to imply that the “sons of God” were something else. Your search comes up with nothing because what is “sons of God” in the real Bible has been changed to “angels” in the Old Testament and “children of God” in the New Testament in Jaques’ fake bible. You can read the verses for yourself. They’re Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7 and John 1:12 and Romans 8:14, 19, and Philippians 2:15 and 1 John 3:1-2.

One of the “discussion questions” on page 28 is “Why did Cain kill his brother.” You are then instructed to read something by Elie Wiesel who wasn’t a Seventh-day Adventist. I fail to see how the opinion of Elie Wiesel belongs in the SSBSG.

LESSON 4. The Flood

On page 34 Jaques says, regarding dietary restrictions, that “not all the animals were proper for food” after the flood and thinks that derives from “the distinction between ‘clean and unclean’ animals.” Here is a verse he should read again. Here it is from all the bibles he used.

“Every moving thing that lives shall be food for you. I have given you all things, even as the green herbs.” Genesis 9:3 from the NKJV.

“And every thing that moveth, and liveth shall be meat for you: even as the green herbs have I delivered them all to you:” Genesis 9:3 from the DRB.

“Everything that lives and moves about will be food for you. Just as I gave you the green plants, I now give you everything.” Genesis 9:3 from the NIV.

“Every moving thing that lives shall be food for you. And as I gave you the green plants, I give you everything.” Genesis 9:3 from the ESV.

“Every living, moving creature will be food for you. Just as I gave you green plants before, so now you have everything.” Genesis 9:3 from the ISV.

“Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things.” Genesis 9:3 from the real Bible.

I should discuss the ISV a bit more at this point. As all new “Bible” versions start out, it was supposed to be the best thing since peanut butter and jelly. The plan was to print it as a complete bible in book form by 2019 but, to the best of my knowledge, that never happened. I have the New Testament of the ISV in book form but had to get the Old Testament verses from what is published online.

Getting back to Genesis 9:3, all of those bibles appear to say everything that crawls, swims or flies could be eaten. I see nothing in that verse about any restriction to eating “every moving thing that liveth” with the exception of man because just a few verses later it clearly states that man’s blood wasn’t to be shed. This would appear to contradict the Spirit of Prophecy. Speaking of God, Ellen G. White says:

“He intended that the race should subsist wholly upon the productions of the earth; but now that every green thing had been destroyed, He allowed them to eat the flesh of the clean beasts that had been preserved in the ark.” *Patriarchs and Prophets* page 107.

Notice that all the bibles except the DRB and the real Bible say “food” and the DRB and the real Bible say “meat.” This is where an English dictionary comes in handy; in this case The Tormont Webster’s Illustrated Encyclopedic Dictionary.

food (fōōd) *n.* **1.** Any material usually of plant or animal origin, containing or consisting of essential nutrients, such as carbohydrates, fats, proteins, vitamins, or minerals, that is taken in and assimilated by an organism to maintain life and growth. **2.** A specified kind of nourishment; *breakfast food; plant food.* **3.** Nourishment eaten in solid form, as distinguished from liquid nourishment: *good food and wine.* **4.** Anything that nourishes or sustains in a way suggestive of physical nourishment: *food for thought.* [Middle English fode, Old English fōda, from Germanic.]

That is the complete entry for “food” in that dictionary. Now let’s try “meat.” As you would expect, some of the definitions of “meat” are flesh foods so those definitions won’t be quoted.

meat (mēt) *n.* **4. a.** The essence or principal part of something: *the meat of the editorial.* **b.** Valuable or significant content; substance: *a witty book but without much meat in it.* **6.** Food in general, especially solid food: *meat and drink.*

As you should be able to see by now, “food” in the context of Genesis 9:3 can only mean something you put in your mouth and swallow. The only fake bible Jaques used that didn’t say “food” was the DRB. “Meat” can also mean the same thing but in addition, can mean “valuable or significant content.”

There aren’t any good really comprehensive English dictionaries written before the 1700s that I’m aware of. There are some older ones but they don’t come close to covering all the common English words. Your real Bible, however, can serve as a dictionary by the way words are used. For instance, where “meat” is used, in the majority of places it doesn’t refer to flesh food; just to food.

“Only rebel not ye against the LORD, neither fear ye the people of the land; for they are bread for us: their defence is departed from them, and the LORD is with us: fear them not.” Numbers 14:9 from the real Bible.

“Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, Nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves: for the workman is worthy of his meat.” Matthew 10:9-10 from the real Bible.

I believe all would agree that God didn’t wish the Israelites to become cannibals so in saying “bread for us” the real Bible means whatever useful items could be obtained from the people they were to dispossess. If the verse had said “meat for us” it would have meant the same thing. When Jesus gave his disciples their instructions for their evangelistic tour as recorded in Luke 10:9-10, he gave them a whole list of things they weren’t to take and then said they were worthy of their “meat.” In that passage, “meat” obviously meant something other than food because there was no reference to food in that passage.

And here’s another passage.

“Go your ways: behold, I send you forth as lambs among wolves. Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes: and salute no man by the way. And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give: for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house.” Luke 10:3-4, 7 from the real Bible.

Those are the same instructions as were given in Matthew 10:9-10 just in different words. That passage shows that “meat” can also mean “hire.”

In summary, there is no contradiction of the Spirit of Prophecy by the real Bible. In Genesis 9:3, “meat” means the use of animals for various purposes. That said, I believe this would be quite hard for someone to understand who had never accepted the Spirit of Prophecy as divine inspiration so pushing the unclean food thing on someone who hasn’t come that far is wrong.

Here's another passage to consider.

“For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well.” Acts 15:28-29 from the real Bible.

The Gentile converts to Christianity were NOT told to abstain from eating unclean flesh food. They were told to abstain from food offered to idols, which would include things like bread, from blood, from eating animals that had been strangled and from fornication. The reason they were told not to eat animals that had been strangled is because a strangled animal hadn’t been drained of its blood and consuming blood is a clear violation of Genesis 9:4 where it says, “flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, ye shall not eat.”

If you wish to go by what the Spirit of Prophecy says, and I do, you should be at least an ovo-lacto vegetarian and there are other things like spices, bread, etc., you should read about since it’s not just the meat that’s of concern. If you wish to go vegan, and that is not mandated in the Spirit of Prophecy, you should take a vitamin B12 supplement. If you wish to continue eating flesh food, I will not chide you and I would even help you clean and cook your fish.

On page 35 part of Genesis 8:22 is quoted from the DRB because Jaques agrees with it saying “literally, ‘all the days of the earth.’” I fail to see how that is an improvement over the real Bible where it says, “while the earth remaineth.”

One point of clarification; Jaques, for a reason I’m not aware of, uses “DRA” for the abbreviation of the Douay Rheims Bible. I use the abbreviation “DRB” because I think it makes more sense. Jaques specified that he quoted the 1899 American edition of the DRB. Is he under the delusion that Seventh-day Adventists, except for a rare one, has that particular edition on their shelf? Mine says the New Testament was first published in 1582 and the Old Testament was first published in 1609 and 1610. I hope you understand that the printing of mine came quite a bit after 1899 but it should say the same thing as Jaques’.

On pages 55-56 of the teachers edition it says, “Therefore, the sixth commandment should be not translated as ‘you shall not murder,’ implying only the specific case of a criminal act, but ‘you shall not kill humans’ in the absolute sense.” I think Jaques needs to think this through some more and preferably after giving Hebrew a rest. If God’s Word was supposed to say “you shall not kill humans” in the “absolute sense” it would contradict itself in Genesis 9:6 where it says in the real Bible, “whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed.”

There are also numerous places in the Old Testament where war against heathen nations was enjoined where people actually killed other people. “Thou shalt not kill” in the real Bible can be correctly taken to mean not to murder. Context makes that clear so it’s not wrong. English speaking people who don’t understand Hebrew understand this. Bibles that say “you shall not murder” in Exodus 20:13 are not wrong in that verse though they are wrong in many other places.

LESSON 5. All Nations *and* Babel

On page 39 Jaques says, “The curse of Ham will, in fact, be a blessing for all nations, including whichever descendants of Ham and Canaan accept the salvation offered them by the Lord.” I don’t see how Ham’s curse can be called a blessing. The last I knew, a curse was a curse.

On page 59, Jaques says “the classification of ‘Hamite,’ ‘Semite,’ and ‘Japhethite’ does not follow clear criteria.” I think that is true but it would have been nice if he had said a bit more about what is known about Ham’s descendants.

“And smote all the firstborn in Egypt; the chief of their strength in the tabernacles of Ham:” Psalms 78:51 from the real Bible.

It would appear that the Egyptians were some of the descendants of Ham. That doesn’t mean they were the descendants of Canaan and it was Canaan’s descendants that were cursed.

On page 66 of the teachers edition Jaques says, “The second reason that Genesis 9:25 does not apply to Africans or those of African descent is that the reference to Canaan is an allusion to the inheritance of the Promised Land, with all that this land symbolizes, concerning the promise of salvation for the world.” Notice that this is in the same lesson where Jaques says the classification of “Hamite” doesn’t follow clear criteria. How does he know it doesn’t apply to those of African descent? He by his own admission doesn’t know that.

Jaques also pretends that the curse of Noah’s son “Canaan” was a blessing because “Canaan” is “an allusion to the inheritance of the Promised Land.”

“And he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren.” Genesis 9:25 from the real Bible.

So, Noah’s son committed a crime for which his son Canaan was cursed and it was somehow a blessing because the Israelites inherited Canaan? Maybe Jaques doesn’t remember that the inhabitants of CANAAN, the CANAANITES who descended from CANAAN, were dispossessed of their land because of their wickedness. The fact that some of those nations were completely exterminated would be a much better argument to support Jaques’ claim that Canaan’s descendants weren’t Africans. Why? Because maybe they all were exterminated and have no descendants.

LESSON 6. The Roots of Abraham

On page 80 of the teachers edition, which you probably won't see unless you're a teacher, it says, "After the battle, Abram is met by a stranger, Melchizedek, to whom he gives his tithe, a way of acknowledging that nothing belongs to him." Really? Abram is met by someone he doesn't know and gives him tithe? LOL. I'll remember that the next time a "stranger" approaches me on the street and asks for money.

On page 83 of the teachers edition it says, "What lessons about the spiritual significance of the tithe can you learn from Abram, who gives his tithe to King Melchizedek, a Canaanite in his origin, who was a priest of God in Salem?" How does Jaques know that Melchizedek was "a Canaanite in his origin?" Here's what Paul said about Melchizedek.

"Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually." Hebrews 7:3 from the real Bible.

Jaques doesn't know that Melchizedek was "a Canaanite in his origin."

LESSON 7. The Covenant *With* Abraham

On page 57 it says that the preying of vultures on the animals of Abram's sacrifice meant his descendants would suffer slavery for four hundred years. I don't think I ever heard that before. A reference would have been appreciated.

LESSON 8. The Promise

On page 66 in the second to the last paragraph Jaques quotes from his own translation. Actually, this isn't the only place he quotes from his own translation but he doesn't always tell you that.

On page 107 in the teachers comments section it says, "The idea of atonement reappears with the ram, which Abraham is surprised to see. Abraham and Isaac were expecting a lamb (*Gen. 22:7, 8*). To Isaac's trembling question, 'Where is the lamb?' which implied another—'Am I the lamb?'—Abraham answers: 'God will provide for Himself' (*Gen 22:8 NKJV*), which means literally, 'God will see in connection to Himself the lamb.'"

When Isaac asked, "Where is the lamb?" I don't think he was trembling yet. In addition, the NKJV which Jaques uses over two hundred times, misses an important lesson that should be taught in the passage.

"And Abraham said, My son, God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt offering: so they went both of them together." Genesis 22:8 from the real Bible.

"And Abraham said, 'My son, God will provide for Himself the lamb for a burnt offering.' So the two of them went together." Genesis 22:8 from the NKJV.

“God will provide himself a lamb” means God Himself was to be the lamb. “God will provide for Himself the lamb” means God was going to get a lamb from somewhere but that lamb wouldn’t necessarily be “God Himself.”

God didn’t supply a lamb that day; he supplied a ram that had horns long enough to be caught in brush.

LESSON 9. Jacob *the* Supplanter

On page 73 Jaques says, “Jacob openly and purposely deceives his father, even using the name of ‘the LORD your God’ ‘ (*Gen. 27:20, NKJV*) in perpetrating that deception.” How is this possible?

“And God spoke to Moses and said to him: ‘I am the LORD. I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, as God Almighty, but my My name LORD I was not known to them.’ Exodus 6:2-3 from the NKJV.

According to Jaques’ fake bible, it would have been impossible for either Isaac or Jacob to have known who “the LORD” was.

“And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am the LORD. And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them.” Exodus 6:2-3 from the real Bible.

There’s no problem with the real Bible.

LESSON 10. Jacob-Israel

On page 134 of the teachers edition it says, “The place of the blow, ‘the socket of Jacob’s hip’ (*Gen. 32:25 NKJV*), which refers to the loin or the thigh, is a euphemism for the place associated with procreation.”

“Then Jacob was left alone; and a Man wrestled with him until the breaking of the day. Now when He saw that He did not prevail against him, He touched the socket of his hip; and the socket of Jacob’s hip was out of joint as He wrestled with him.” Genesis 32:24-25 from the NKJV.

Jaques’ favorite fake bible says Jacob’s hip “socket” was touched and his “hip was out of joint.” The hip socket is not “the loin” nor is the hip socket “a euphemism for the place associated with procreation.”

LESSON 11. Joseph, Master *of* Dreams

The suggested memory text for this lesson is, “Then they said to one another, ‘Look, this dreamer is coming.’ Genesis 37:19 from the NKJV.

When you go to the effort to memorize Scripture don’t memorize from a fake bible and choose passages that will be of use to you personally and/or to those you wish to share

Scripture with. If you think the above Scripture should be something you should memorize then memorize it. Here is a passage I think would be a better choice.

“Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws.” Genesis 26:5 from the KJV.

I like this verse because it demonstrates that before there were any Jews or children of Israel, God had commandments, statutes and laws which were to be kept.

LESSON 12. Joseph, Prince *of* Egypt

Except for the use of fake bibles and the usual Hebrew lessons I found nothing objectionable in this lesson.

LESSON 13. Israel *in* Egypt

At the bottom of the page on page 106 part of 1 Peter 2:9 is quoted with nothing to indicate what bible version it's from; it's from the NKJV.

Toward the bottom of the page on page 108 parts of Genesis 49:10 and Philippians 2:10 are quoted. The first passage is from the KJV and the second is from the NKJV. This is the only KJV (a.k.a., the real Bible) passage I found in this lesson quarterly.

SatanIsDead.com

InfallibleBible.com

AdventistsToday.com

SabbathSchoolGuide.com