

“Part 06 – Which Bible Translation is the Best? | Tom Shepherd” was posted on YouTube by the Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventists on 6/20/25. This was a presentation from the Michigan camp meeting of 2025. The speaker is advertised as “TOM SHEPHERD, PHD, DRPH ANDREWS UNIVERSITY.” A DrPH has a doctor of public health degree and a PhD has a doctor of philosophy degree. He’s also a senior research professor of New Testament at Andrews University. In the initial photo that comes up on YouTube he’s also called “Dr. Tom Shepherd.” If you wish to watch the video, you can find it here:

<https://www.youtube.com/live/yWzgwIzs-yk?si=uDmhtg0Z4CFrwOxu>

Tom attests that “the Bible is trustworthy.” At 8:27 Tom gives the “quick short answer” to the question of “which Bible translation is best?” He says it’s “The one you will keep on reading!” He got an audible “amen!” for that. He says, “It’s, it’s no good if you say oh it’s a great translation but I don’t read it. Ha. Ha, ha. I don’t like it, ha, ha, ha. Ha. It’s not interesting; it’s hard to read. I don’t. Then that’s not the best translation for you. The best translation is the one that you will keep on reading because the Word of God, is the, the sword that cuts away from our life that which doesn’t belong.” He says the Word of God is “valuable for instruction, valuable for correction, valuable fo, for putting us on and keeping us on the right road. Amen?” He then says we should not leave the Word of God or attack it.

The attack on the King James Version (KJV) starts at 9:20. You may think it’s not an attack but it is. It starts out with a history of the Bible, Erasmus, various Bible translations with the conclusion being, though it’s not said so plainly, that the KJV needed some improvement and we still can’t be entirely sure of what God said.

At 9:52 Tom starts discussing the Geneva Bible published in 1560 that he says had “anti-Catholic notes” and was the Bible the Pilgrims used. Tom then mentions the Bishop’s Bible published in 1568 that King James didn’t like because it appeared anti-monarchy.

Tom mentions that King James had a lavish lifestyle and was always looking for money. The defects of King James, real and invented, are commonly used to imply that the KJV isn’t quite right. Be it known that King James didn’t translate the KJV. Dissing the KJV because of King James’ undesirable proclivities is less logical than dissing Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon because of Solomon’s defects.

Tom says the “King James Bible” was the next English Bible to be authorized. The KJV is the only Bible to be currently called “the Authorized Version” and Dr. Tom missed some earlier Bible translations. The Douay Rheims Bible, authorized by the Roman Catholic Church, was published as a complete Bible before the KJV. There was also the Coverdale Bible published in 1535 and the Great Bible published in 1539.

Tom says the KJV was based on Erasmus’ Greek New Testament and was eventually called the “*Textus Receptus*” and “was based only on a handful of Byzantine manuscripts; not our strongest manuscripts” and claims that was the basis for the KJV. Actually, the KJV was based on a lot more than that.

At 14:30 Tom alleges that “The, uh, here’s Erasmuses [sic] Greek text eventually known as *Textus Receptus*, eventually, it wasn’t called that at first. It was published first in 1516. He based most of his Greek text on eight mainly Byzantine text type miniscules, uh, category five, which was our last category, the, the least valuable for determining the original text and, uh, these came from the eleventh to fifteenth centuries. So Erasmuses [sic] uh, Greek, Greek New Testament wasn’t the strongest; we have much stronger um, manuscript basis for our text today.”

Alrighty then. If you wish to say a walrus owned an oyster you would call that oyster the “walrus’ oyster” because in current English punctuation the possessive of a word that ends in “s” is indicated by an apostrophe after the “s.” If you wish to discuss a group of that animal you would call them “walruses.” Therefore in English it should be “Erasmus’ Greek text” and not “Erasmuses Greek text.”

The work of Erasmus did contribute greatly to what became the Bible in English but obviously there is a lot more to the Bible than the New Testament. In addition, the KJV was not the product of one man or of members of the fallen churches that became fallen with their rejection of the 1844 message. It is the product of the carefully reviewed and critiqued translations of around fifty scholars based in the English universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Westminster. There is another good reason not to dis the KJV. The Lord’s Messenger endorsed it.

“They come to me, those that are copying my writings, and say, ‘Now here is the better revised words, and I think I will put that in.’ Don’t you change one word, not a word. The revised edition we do not need at all. We have got the word that Christ has spoken Himself and given us. And don’t you in my writings change a word for any revised editions. There will be revised editions, plenty of them, just before the close of this earth’s history, and I want all my workers to understand, and I have got quite a number of them. I want them to understand that they are never to take the revised word, and put it in the place of the plain, simple words just as they are.” Ellen G. White Manuscript 188, 1907.

I am aware that bible versions other than the KJV are used in Sister White’s writings. If she, as the Lord’s Messenger, chose to use quotations from historians or even other bible versions I will not argue with her choice. The current practice of publishing some of her books using quotations from bibles that didn’t exist when she was alive is wrong.


At 15:22 Tom claims that the *Textus Receptus* “was the basis for the New Testament translation of the King James Version.”

At 15:50 Tom says the KJV is “the most influential book ever published in the English language.” I’ll say amen to that.

Regarding the KJV, Tom says there were two publishers (true) and “there were over two thousand differences in the two printings. Ha, huh, so they put it out and it wasn’t perfect. Over 300 changes were made within three years, six major revisions were done between 1611 to 1894. Over 100,000 changes have been made since 1611.”

There are a few things the blowhard isn't telling you. The vast majority of the changes were in punctuation and spelling and not in meaning. I can take my facsimile of first edition of the KJV, or Blaney's 1769 edition, or my original 1681 edition or my facsimile of the Cambridge edition or my 2013 printing of the KJV and I will get the same message about the 2,300 day prophecy, the Sanctuary message, the doctrine on the state of the dead, etc., as in the very first edition. The KJV also doesn't contradict the Spirit of Prophecy unlike the New King James Version (NKJV), the New International Version (NIV) and many other modern so called improved translations. To yap about "100,000" changes which were inconsequential or to say "the best translation is the one that you will keep on reading" is plain stupid.

Here's a photo of a passage from the first edition of the 1611 KJV Bible that I think gives new meaning to "hard to read."



I have no way to reproduce the Germanic typeface that was used in the first edition but have retained the spelling and changed it to a Roman typeface for easier reading. The lower case "s" that doesn't appear at the end of a word looks like a lower case "f" so I've used it for the lower case "s." There is, however, a slight difference. In the lower case "s" that doesn't appear at the end of the word, the horizontal bar as it appears in the lower case "f" doesn't go all the way through the vertical portion of that letter. The lower case "j" also looks different than the current Roman

typeface we're used to, the "v" looks a "u" and the "d" looks somewhat like a small cap d. Spacing between the end of a word and punctuation like a "," or a ":" isn't always as in current usage.

"For Chrift alfo hath once fuffered for finnes, the iuft for the uniuft, that he might bring us to GoD , being put to death in the flefh, but quickened by the Spirit. By which alfo he went and preached unto the fpirits in prifon, Which fometime were Difobedient , When once the long-fuffering of GoD waited in the Dayes of Noah, while the Arke was a preparing : wherein few, that is, eight foules were faued by water." 1 Peter 3:18-20 from the first edition of the KJV.

I think this is easier to read.

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water." 1 Peter 3:18-20 from a KJV published in 2013.

Have some fun and count up all the changes made between the 1611 edition and the 2013 printing.

Here is that passage from the new, improved and easier to read NIV Andrews Study Bible. Notice the changes.

"For Christ also suffered once for sins, the righteous for the unrighteous, to bring you to God. He was put to death in the body but made alive in the Spirit. After being made alive, he went and made proclamation to the imprisoned spirits—to those who were disobedient long ago when God waited patiently in the days of Noah while the ark was being built. In it only a few people, eight in all, were saved through water," 1 Peter 3:18-20 (NIV).

Here's what that says in ENGLISH. Christ was put to death in the body and His resurrection was "in the Spirit." That means His body wasn't resurrected; just his Spirit. Then His resurrected Spirit spoke to the spirits of wicked men who had died in the flood several thousand years before that. In the ENGLISH of 1611 and now, the KJV says Christ was "quickened" (brought to life) "by" (not "in") the "Spirit" (Holy Spirit) and it was "by" that Spirit the antediluvians were preached to. That would be through Noah.

"And spared not the old world, but saved Noah the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly;" 2 Peter 2:5 (KJV).

A rocket scientist at Andrews University came up with an unbelievable (yes, really, unbelievable) explanation for the reading in the NIV Andrews Study Bible.

"3:19-20 made proclamation. Christ spoke by His Spirit through Noah, proclaiming the message of salvation. This passage cannot be used to teach that between His crucifixion and His resurrection, Christ went and preached to the immortal souls of the people of Noah's time."

It's true that the passage in the NIV doesn't teach that "between His crucifixion and His resurrection" Christ preached to immortal souls of people Noah's time but it can be used to teach that Jesus' resurrected Spirit (it doesn't say body) preached to said immortal souls.

At 16:44 Tommy says, "Translators were to use all the English translations, several foreign versions, Spanish, French, Italian and Dutch ah, as background to help them, several Latin translations, the *Septuagint*, which is the Old Testament translated into Greek, the *Targums* which are ancient Aramaic translations and interpretations of the Hebrew Bible and the Syriac *Peshitta* which is the Syriac edition of the Bible in Aramaic translated from Greek. The New Testament was translated in the fifth century, the Syriac *Peshitta*. All these were to be used to determine the best readings of the Hebrew and Greek texts. Alright? So a variety of words were used for the same Hebrew words and Greek words."

Notice that Tommy felt the need to emphasize that the KJV New Testament was translated from *Textus Receptus* which allegedly used about the "least valuable" manuscripts to determine what God said in English. As Tommy has now admitted, the KJV translators used much more than that to give us the KJV.

He also mentions that "a variety of words were used" for the same Hebrew and Greek words. This isn't newsworthy. English, Spanish, Portuguese and other languages have words that are the same with the meaning being different depending on the context. For instance, in English, "trunk" means different things depending on whether you're speaking of a tree, an elephant, a car, packing for a trip or a communication system.

At 18:04 Tommy says, "They used italics for words not in the original but needed, needed words, words that were needed to make sense in English." No kidding. That's a bit better than the NIV which doesn't have needed words to make sense in English in italics and doesn't let you know when they have changed or deleted critical words to make that "the Bible" say what they want it to say.

At 18:51 Tommy mentions Daniel 8:14 and quotes it as "unto two thousand three hundred, uh, evenings and mornings then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Let's look at that from the real Bible and from two study bibles sold by Andrews University.

"And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Daniel 8:14 (KJV).

"And he said to me, 'For two thousand three hundred days; then the sanctuary shall be cleansed.'" Daniel 8:14 (NKJV).

"He said to me, 'It will take 2,300 evenings and mornings; then the sanctuary will be reconsecrated.'" Daniel 8:14 (NIV).

It's apparent that Tommy has mixed and matched a bit. That can easily happen when you're in the habit of consulting multiple counterfeit "the Bible." The word "unto" has a different meaning than "for." "Unto" means something will start in 2,300 days and "for" means something goes on

for 2,300 days and will be accomplished after 2,300 days has elapsed. The NIV clearly says it will take 2,300 evenings and mornings and the sanctuary will be reconsecrated. You may think that “evenings and mornings” means the same thing as “days” but it doesn’t. There is an evening and morning in each day so the NIV is actually saying 1,150 days. Here’s a “the Bible” with an American Bible Societies copyright date of 1976 that I’ve seen used in Seventh-day Adventist publications that says that clearly.

“I heard the other angel answer, ‘It will continue for 1,150 days, during which evening and morning sacrifices will not be offered. Then the Temple will be restored.’” Daniel 8:14 from the *Good New Bible* in the Today’s English Version (TEV) translation.

By corrupting this passage alone, the NKJV, NIV and TEV have destroyed the Seventh-day Adventist doctrine of the cleansing of the Heavenly Sanctuary starting in 1844. If that ain’t enough for ya, it’s also destroyed in another place in those “the Bible.”

“Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.” Hebrews 9:12 (KJV).

“Not with the blood of goats and calves, but with His own blood He entered the Most Holy Place once for all, having obtained eternal redemption.” Hebrews 9:12 (NKJV).

“He did not enter by means of the blood of goats and calves; but he entered the Most Holy Place once for all by his own blood, thus obtaining eternal redemption.” Hebrews 9:12 (NIV).

“When Christ went through the tent and entered once and for all into the Most Holy Place, he did not take the blood of goats and bulls to offer as a sacrifice; rather, he took his own blood and obtained eternal salvation for us.” Hebrews 9:12 (TEV).

That passage is not a prophecy; it’s describing what already happened after Christ’s resurrection. If Christ started His ministry in the “Most Holy Place” at that time, His Most Holy Place ministry and the investigative judgment started LONG before 1844.

Tommy thinks calling Elijah, Elias in the New Testament might confuse people. I would say some people are easily confused. Tell me now; is it easier to know that Elias is another Bible name for Elijah or to know in reading your fake “the Bible” that Jesus’ Spirit didn’t preach to the spirits of people who died in the flood and He didn’t start His Most Holy Place ministry right after His resurrection? I heartily invite Seventh-day Adventist ministers to explain that Elias is another name for Elijah to those who are confused.

Speaking of the KJV at 20:21 Tommy says, “Chapter and verse divisions were retained from previous work but with new headings. Other specialists were used to provide assistance in difficulties and the result was a clear fluent English. I think the modern kind of, ahum, what is it parallel to this might be the New International Version.” The New International Version is written in clear fluent English and it’s clearly wrong in critical places.

I've had a tract about bible versions for sale on eBay for a while. Here's the cover. Before you decide to become offended, consider the meaning of this passage from the NKJV in clear fluent English.

“So He said to them, ‘Are you thus without understanding also? Do you not perceive that whatever enters a man from outside cannot defile him, because it does not enter his heart but his stomach, and is eliminated, thus purifying all foods?’” Mark 7:18-19 (NKJV).



What that means in English is that whatever goes into your mouth, through your digestive tract and out the other end has been purified. If it's purified it's pure and you shouldn't get sick from eating it.

Here's that passage from the "the Bible" Tommy is favorably comparing to the KJV.

“‘Are you so dull?’ he asked. ‘Don’t you see that nothing that enters a person from the outside can defile them? For it doesn’t go into their heart but into their stomach, and then out of the body.’ (In saying this, Jesus declared all foods clean.)” Mark 7:18-19 (NIV).

If you go with the NIV you should be OK eating pork. I believe the NKJV was trying to say the same thing as the NIV but unfortunate wording was used.

“And he saith unto them, Are ye so without understanding also? Do ye not perceive, that whatsoever thing from without entereth into the man, it cannot defile him; Because it entereth not into his heart, but into the belly, and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats?” Mark 7:18-19 (KJV).

I think the real Bible is right. Food goes into the mouth, through the digestive tract, out the other end into the draught (latrine or in more modern parlance, sewer).

This photo is inside the front cover. I, by the way, made the pies but not with the above “little” in them.



Does it matter if your Bible has “just a little in it?”

“But it is required that we have firm faith in the Word of God as the flesh and blood of Christ.”
Letter 17, 1902.

“The Word of God is our sanctification and righteousness because it is spiritual food. To study it is to eat the leaves of the tree of life.” *Ibid*.

He who has a knowledge of God and His word through personal experience has a settled faith in the divinity of the Holy Scriptures. He has proved that God’s word is truth, and he knows that truth can never contradict itself.” *The Ministry of Healing* page 462.

At 21:29, Tommy says the KJV was a “monumental translation.” What KJV bashers do is compliment it enough so you won’t think they’re bashing it. They also try to get other translations, such as Tommy has done with the NIV, to ride on the coattails of the KJV because they’re allegedly just as good or better.

Tommy says there were 80 years of bitter attacks on the KJV. Actually, there have now been 414 years of bitter attacks on it but they’re now better disguised. Here it comes. Tommy says the KJV translators had their integrity attacked and were accused of blasphemy, most damnable corruptions, intolerable deceit and they called the KJV a “vile imposture.” I suspect that if Tommy disclosed the source of those criticisms, they would be found to emanate from the Roman Catholic Church. Tommy then says, “This is what people say about modern translations!” That’s to make you think modern translations are being treated unfairly.

Tommy thinks reading a bit of the “original preface of KJV” will help and that “it has some surprises for those who think the KJV is the only Bible we should use.” Keep in mind that the preface of a bible is not part of the Bible. Also, I have no problem with Tommy or anyone else using a fake “the Bible” as long as they disclose that what they’re using has errors and they’re using it because they like what it says and they don’t believe any Bible in the world at this time is free from error.

Under the heading of “SUSPICION OF SOMETHNG NEW” Tommy posts “Zeal to promote the common good, whether it be by devising anything ourselves, or revising that which hath been laboured by others, deserveth certainly much respect and esteem, but yet findeth but cold entertainment in the world. It is welcomed with suspicion instead of love, and with emulation instead of thanks: and if there be any hole left for cavil to enter, (and cvil, if it do not find a hole, will make one) it is sure to be misconstrued, and in danger to be condemned. This will easily be granted by as many as know story, or have any experience.”

Tommy says, “boy, that’s how its the started off. Huh huh.” He continues to read the preface in what I would call a dramatic fashion. If you wish to read the whole original preface to the KJV, more power to you. What I’ll say to the blowhard is that show me a clear error in the KJV, if you can find one, that isn’t a typo or a misprint, and I’ll show you two from the “the Bible” Tommy said was like the KJV, i.e., the NIV. He doesn’t get any Greek, Hebrew or Aramaic to establish that there’s an error. All he gets is his fake ENGLISH “the Bible,” an ENGLISH dictionary and the Spirit of Prophecy.

Tommy concludes saying, “So what are they saying? We do not condemn translations that were made before us. We acknowledge them as raised up by God. OK? It’s interesting, isn’t it.” Yea,

it's interesting. Tommy is comparing the work of translators who were doing the best they could with what they had after hundreds of years of suppression of the reading of the Holy Scriptures by the common man by the Roman Catholic Church. That's a bit different than rejecting the Bible that was obtained by sacrifice and the efforts of men who were not members of the fallen churches and comparing it to the "the Bible" that followed that promote corrupt doctrine and saying, in effect, that we still can't really know what God said.

After more talk, at 27:35, Tommy says, "So they were OK with making corrections!" Certainly they were OK with making corrections but there are no corrections of the KJV in Tommy's fake "the Bible" he thinks is like the KJV, i.e., the NIV. Here's a correction in Tommy's favorite fake "the Bible" I heartily approve of.

"In another battle with the Philistines at Gob, Elhanan son of Jaare-Oregim the Bethlehemite killed Goliath the Gittite, who had a spear with a shaft like a weaver's rod." 2 Samuel 21:19 from an NIV "inclusive language edition" published in 2001.

"In another battle with the Philistines at Gob, Elhanan son of Jair the Bethlehemite killed the brother of Goliath the Gittite, who had a spear with a shaft like a weaver's rod." 2 Samuel 21:19 as found in the NIV *Andrews Study Bible*.

Hallelujah! Someone figured out after a while that David and not Elhanan killed Goliath.

Here's a place where Satan's editing of the Bible has never been corrected in the NIV. The KJV never needed correcting here.

"For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one." 1 John 5:7-8 (KJV).

"For there are three that testify: the Spirit, the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement." 1 John 5:7-8 (NIV).

You'll easily notice that the NIV version is much shorter than the KJV version of the passage. That's because 1 John 5:7 has been deleted and 1 John 5:8 has been split and part of it called 1 John 5:7. Scholars, like Tommy, like the NIV rendering of the passage and Satan agrees.

There is a book titled *Communication with the Spirit World* by Johannes Greber. In it are quotations of things said by a demon speaking through a medium. Here is one of those quotations that's found on page 369.

"The doctrine that three persons are united in one Godhead finds its main support in the grossly falsified passage in the Epistle of John, the correct version of which reads: 'For there are three that bear witness, the Spirit, the water, and the blood: and the three of them are in accord'. (1st John 5:8.) To this has been added the spurious sentence: 'And there are three who bear witness in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one'.

That this entire last sentence is a spurious interpolation is a fact of which your Catholic theologians are well aware.”

Do you think the demon was being helpful by pointing out a doctrinal error in the Bible?

“Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils.” 1 Timothy 4:1.

Any bible that doesn't contain the entirety of 1 John 5:7-8 is a bible that will have other errors.

At 28:12 Tommy says, “What about different translations?” This is followed by a quotation that says in part, “As the King's speech, which he uttereth in Parliament, being translated into French, Dutch, Italian, and Latin, is still the King's speech.” This is another attempt by the KJV basher to make it appear that it doesn't matter which “the Bible” you read.

If the translation in French, Dutch, Italian and Latin is contrary to what the King said, it isn't the King's speech. NONE of the other foreign language translations that were published between the time the KJV was published and the time the churches fell because of their rejection of the 1844 message, were the product of around fifty translators who checked each other's work and weren't members of a fallen church. You need a translation that's pure to test the others by and that translation is the KJV. The fact is that holy men of God first wrote God's Word in Hebrew and not in every other language on the face of the earth. The fact that English is about the most coveted language to learn and is used by air traffic controllers in every international airport on the face of the earth is thanks to the King James Bible.

At 29:13 Tommy says, “So, what in the world are they saying? They're saying that whatever translation you have, it's still the king's speech.” He continues, “Any translation of the Bible is the Word of God.” To which I say, if those translators were around today and could read the lies that have entered the new “the Bible” they would probably be aghast and express a different opinion. Also, when Tommy talks about “whatever translation” he may be forgetting about such translations as the *New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures* that says in John 1:1, “In [the] beginning the Word was, and the Word was with God, and the Word was a god.” And remember...

“He is to regard the Bible as the voice of God speaking directly to him.” *The Acts of the Apostles* page 475.

Tommy says, “the Bible is the King's speech, it's the Word of God.” Understand that Tommy doesn't have one Bible as is implied by the phrase “the Bible.” Tommy means multiple “the Bible” from which he picks what he likes even when those “the Bible” contradict themselves, contradict each other, contradict Protestant doctrine, contradict the Spirit of Prophecy and contradict unique Seventh-day Adventist doctrine. I have already given you evidence of this and I have a LOT more.

At 29:41 Tommy says, “Just sixteen years after the King James Version was published, *Codex Alexandrinus* which is a much superior to what they had had, arrived at the British museum from Constantinople.” Thus the KJV bashing continues. Guess what? No changes had to be made in the KJV because *Codex Alexandrinus* arrived.

At 30:39 Tommy says, “Texts go back through exemplars to the autograph.” Do you know what “autograph” means? It means something personally written down by the author. There is not even one autograph of any portion of Scripture in the world today.

Tommy says, “I was a pastor and I went to a church, umm, I was asked to be the pastor of a church, and, uh, the church with, there, the people were, you know, King James only. They’re really, that’s their thing. I said I would preach from the King James Bible, probably for at least a year. You know, I’m not going to stir up the boat; stir up everything. You know. The people have to trust their pastor first.” You should NEVER trust your pastor or anyone else. You should trust your Bible and it’s very helpful if your Bible is the infallible one.

Tommy says we have to uncover “the original” through careful study and research. Yeah, that’s what they say. Put another way, we’re still not sure what God said.

At 36:05 Tommy claims “So you had the King James Version it was revised and called the Revised Version.” To be very clear, the Revised Version (RV) was a different version and not a new and improved King James Version. He then talks about the Revised Standard Version (RSV) and the English Standard Version (ESV) but doesn’t mention that those are both bibles accepted by the Roman Catholic Church as legitimate bibles. Tommy then claims “the heritage of the King James Version is found down today in the English Standard Version.” Thus Tommy attempts to show the ESV is OK even though it’s a corrupted version, unlike the KJV, and is another Roman Catholic bible.

Tommy says he’s on the committee that’s producing the new *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* and that he is writing the commentary on the gospel of Mark which is his area of specialization. I recommend that you study the real Bible and the writings of Sister White and not waste your money on a Bible commentary emanating from Andrews University. He says the “the Bible” used in that commentary is the NKJV and ESV. That’s another reason not to buy it.

Tommy thinks what bible to choose depends on age, education level, etc. Christian experience, etc. Yeah. How does that work? Who do you use the bad bibles for?

At 42:33 Tommy says, “Of course the best thing would be to learn Greek, and Hebrew and Aramaic. How many of you are going to do that?” I think I read that somewhere.

“But even when you are assured that the Bible contains the Word of God, and nothing but the Word of God, how do you know that the translation is faithful? The Books of Scripture were originally written in Hebrew and Greek, and you have only the translation. Before you are certain that the translation is faithful you must study the Hebrew and Greek languages, and then compare the translation with the original. How few are capable of this gigantic undertaking!” *The Faith of Our Fathers* by James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, page 80 of the 73rd edition.

Here's another opinion.

“The Bible with its precious gems of truth was not written for the scholar alone. On the contrary, it was designed for the common people; and the interpretation given by the common people, when aided by the Holy Spirit, accords best with the truth as it is in Jesus.” *Testimonies for the Church* volume 5 page 331.

I was mistaken. I had thought the NIV was Tommy’s favorite translation but he said at 45:45 that his favorite is the ESV. Sorry Tommy.

Tommy thinks saying words like saith, thee and thou might be challenging for some.

At 48:50 Tommy compares the NIV to the New Word Translation of The Holy Scriptures (the one that calls the Word in John 1:1 a “god”). He believes you should use the latter when studying with Jehovah’s Witnesses because you can use it to teach Seventh-day Adventist doctrine.

I believe it’s true that in teaching some people you may need to use their bible of choice but if what they have isn’t the best, at some point you should try to lead them to something better. All bibles I’ve looked at can be used to teach the sanctity of the seventh day Sabbath. I think that’s where you need to start. The New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures like the NIV, ESV and others teach that Jesus said you could eat anything; even pig. It also has the problematic wording in Daniel 8:14 that could lead one to believe the time prophesied was 1,150 years instead of 2,300 years and there are other errors aside from Jesus being called “a god” rather than God.

“The most dangerous falsehoods are those that are mingled with truth.” *Patriarchs and Prophets* page 338.

“There is a wide field for elders and the helpers in every church. They are to feed the flock of God with pure provender, thoroughly winnowed from the chaff, the poisonous mixture of error. You who have any part to act in the church of God, be sure that you act wisely in feeding the flock of God; for its prosperity much depends upon the quality of this food.” Ellen G. White Manuscript 59, 1900 or page 439 of the New Testament section of *The Mission Study Bible*.

At 52:59 Tommy starts to discuss *The Clear Word* and says it’s not technically a translation. Then he says, “This translation adds and subtracts things from the text to make things more clear.” Tommy says *The Clear Word* isn’t really a bible.

The very title, *The Clear Word*, implies that the Bible isn’t particularly clear without modifications. Inside my *The Clear Word For Kids* there’s a note to “Dear Young Reader” that says, “This paraphrased Bible was written especially for you! It’s not a translation that people use for deep study, but you’ll discover that it makes the Bible easier to read and understand.” It’s obviously a translation but it’s a loose one and any kid reading it would think it was a Bible. In addition, as of 6/25/25 if you go to the AdventistBookCenter.com you will find *The Clear Word* if you look for bibles. Tommy says *The Clear Word* “is not billed as a translation, it’s not called a bible.”

Under a heading of “CHOOSING A TRANSLATION” and a subheading of “Education” for “children and ESL” Tommy mentions the Phillips translation. I have a book titled *Ring of Truth* by J. B. Phillips of Phillips translation fame. In that book J. B. Phillips, on page 118 and 119,

describes meeting C. S. Lewis after C. S. Lewis had died. He writes, “I was a little puzzled by this, and I mentioned it to a certain saintly bishop who was then living in retirement here in Dorset. His reply was, ‘My dear J—, this sort of thing is happening all the time.’”

Tommy says if he had someone that was starting to read the Bible, and they had never read it before, he would start them on bibles like the NLT, NIV; something that’s smooth and easy to read. Seriously, if you start someone out on those do you think they will ever want to change to something else? I started reading the KJV around age eight. I didn’t find it hard to read because I was never contaminated by someone who told me it would be hard to read. Tommy has told you it would be helpful to learn Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic and is now harping on easy to read English.

Tommy transitions to a question-and-answer session and admits the NIV gets “upgraded all the time.” “Upgraded” does not mean it’s better. Allegedly in one of the upgrades, in Acts 10 in discussing Peter’s vision it says “the Bible declares all food, uh, clean” and that made him cringe. Tommy says, “you’ll find that any translation that you read you read that there’ll be things you will cringe from.” That proves conclusively that Tommy doesn’t believe there is any English Bible in the world with no error; i.e., that’s infallible. He also says if you have a question on something you should ask your pastor and if he gets stuck, he can call someone at the seminary. It’s another version of ask your priest, your bishop or the pope.

Tommy is asked about Catholic bibles. He mentions the “Douay version,” and the “newer one, the Jerusalem Bible.” He doesn’t mention his favorite, the ESV, which is as much a Catholic bible as either of those.

At 1:12:22 Tommy claims that his favorite English bible, the ESV, is “an update, of an update, of an update of the King James Version.” A big LOL to that. That illustrates perfectly how fake “the Bible” promoters attempt to find legitimacy by attaching themselves to the KJV.

www.SatanIsDead.com

www.InfallibleBible.com

www.AdventistsToday.com

www.SabbathSchoolGuide.com

www.AdventistDeathConfusion.com