On 11/20/25 "All SDA should help me understand this sermon I am confused" was posted on the YouTube Bro Lawrence channel. The video was about a video in which Dwight Nelson was preaching. Dwight Nelson, as you may know, served as a pastor at the Pioneer Memorial Church of Andrews University for forty years. In the video Bro Lawrence was discussing, Dwight Nelson was preaching using the New King James Version (NKJV) but at least once used the New International Version (NIV) to clarify what the NKJV said.

This review is not about Dwight Nelson but rather about one Timo Flink who responded to a comment I made. Timo was and probably still is, in 2025, the communication director for the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Finland. You can find sermons of his on YouTube but most of the ones I saw were in Finnish. Timo discerned that I was a member of that hated "KJV only" class who believes there is still, in this world, an infallible Bible without any error at all. If you wish to watch Bro Lawrence's video you can find it at:

https://youtu.be/5t8zwRE-02Q?si=vb44CJrURVkKM0Gy

Here's the thread I started.



@martinlohne5128

2 days ago

- 1. DON"T believe a scholar. Study the Bible for yourself. Scholars lie frequently and many times apparently don't understand ENGLISH and don't believe there is a single Bible in the world without error. And yes, I can give examples.
- 2. He quotes the New International Version (NIV) which is a "the Bible" that contradicts itself, contradicts Protestant doctrine and contradicts the Spirit of Prophecy. Stuff like this has been going on for a LONG time. In fact, the majority of Seventh-day Adventist ministers don't believe there is a single bible in the world at this time without some error.

5 replies



<u>@timotflink</u> 18 hours ago

KJV only position is a serious theological error based on false theory of inspiration. Now, if one wants to, one can use KJV. Nothing wrong in that. But it is wrong to say that all other Bible translations are false.



@martinlohne5128

18 hours ago

<u>@timotflink</u> Please tell me which English translation has no error. That would be ONE Bible. I've asked this question before and no one has ever taken me up on it. You could be the first. In my opinion the "serious theological error" is the belief that all bibles have some error and it doesn't matter which one you choose.



<u>@timotflink</u>

18 hours ago

<u>@martinlohne5128</u> There are no translations without errors because translating one language to another, Hebrew and Greek in this case, always means you interpret the text first and then transfer the message from one historical-cultural background to another. The resulting text is never 100% the same as the source text.



@martinlohne5128

17 hours ago

<u>@timotflink</u> "Man is fallible, but God's Word is infallible." Selected Messages Book One page 416.

In English "infallible" means without the possibility of error and it has meant that for a few hundred years. Ellen G. White spoke English and couldn't speak, read or understand either Hebrew or Greek. She was speaking of the English Bible. You don't need any Greek or Hebrew to understand what a bible says in English if you're a native speaker of English. The serious theological error in thinking all bibles have errors is that you then believe the inspired writings of Sister White have errors and you think we can't really know what God said. To solve the problem it's frequently recommended to go to a scholar, priest, minister, etc. to know what God said and there are many examples of the dumb things that class of people have said about the Bible.

Just for a few examples, I can destroy the 2,300 day prophecy using the NKJV. I can teach Purgatory and Hell using the NKJV, NIV and many other bibles. I can teach righteousness by works with the NKJV and NIV and I could give more examples. Those are serious theological errors.

Highlighted reply



@timotflink

2 hours ago (edited)

<u>@martinlohne5128</u> Well, as a biblical scholar who knows Hebrew and Greek, I know that it is impossible to make 100% accurate translations. No two languages are alike to that degree. I never said we cannot know what God said. Of course we can despite the problems of translating one language to another. And as a matter of fact, "infallible" does not mean "inerrant". Ellen G. White used several different Bible versions in her later writings. See the statement on Ellen G. White Estate's website on this. And I absolutely disagree with you when you say that we must not believe scholars. That is not what Paul advises us to do.

For some reason, on 11/22/25, all of Timo's comments were gone and only mine remained. I don't know if Timo decided to retreat so deleted his own comments or if Bro Lawrence decided he didn't like Timo's comments and deleted them. Fortunately, I had saved a copy of the commentary on my computer before I left for church yesterday.

You have to understand that though Timo speaks very good English, his mother tongue is Finnish. In addition, it's likely that Finnish bibles do all have some error and that's why it's important to have an infallible Bible to measure other bibles by. Some bible translations were the product of one or two scholars and many others were the product of a group of translators from the fallen churches that fell because of their rejection of the 1844 message.

The Scripture of the Old Testament was written almost entirely in Hebrew and that of the New Testament entirely in Greek. God did not see the need to personally deliver custom Bibles in every known tongue on the planet. For our time God chose English.

So, what are the possible reasons God would choose English for the infallible error free Bible for our time? God knew that English would become the most coveted language to know in the world. Evidence of this is that an air traffic controller in any international airport in the world has to be able to communicate in English. God also knew that His end time messenger, Ellen G. White, would be a speaker of English. God knew that there would be a large group of English speaking Protestant scholars (about 50) who valued the Bible for truth and were highly qualified to research ancient manuscripts and translate them into English. Those scholars were affiliated with the universities of Oxford, Westminster and Cambridge and they divided the work of translation and checked each other's work.

Timo the scholar readily admitted that he didn't believe there were any bibles without error and that is what the great majority of Seventh-day Adventist ministers believe even though they sometimes wave a "the Bible" around and tell you that you should believe everything in it.

Timo said, "I never said we cannot know what God said." It's true Timo never said that and it's delusional for him to think you can know what God said and at the same time say "it is impossible to make 100% accurate translations." What do you do when a "the Bible" says one thing and several others say something that's contradictory? Do you go with what the majority say? Here's what the NKJV and NIV Andrews study bibles say, compared to the KJV, that destroys a unique Seventh-day Adventist doctrine.

"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).

Hebrews 9:12 describes what had already happened with Paul wrote it. The two English "the Bible" chosen by Andrews University scholars for study bibles both say Jesus entered "the Most Holy Place" and if that is true the Seventh-day Adventist doctrine of Jesus' ministry starting in the Most Holy Place in 1844 is false.

I am aware that Sister White used some quotations from bible translations other than the KJV. I will find no fault with her for that any more than I would find fault with the Apostle Paul for mentioning the writings of some pagans. I do find fault with those who replace the bibles she chose to quote with bibles that didn't exist when she was alive.

Timo apparently thinks "inerrant" is a stronger word than "infallible." Here is the definition of "infallible."

"1 incapable of error 2 (of a method, test, proof, etc.) unfailing; sure to proceed. 3 RC Ch (of the pope) unable to err in pronouncing dogma as doctrinally defined." From the Oxford English Reverence Dictionary (revised second edition).

And here is the definition of "inerrant."

"not liable to er." From the Oxford English Reverence Dictionary (revised second edition).

Now we need to know what "liable" means.

"I legally bound 2 (foll. by to) subject to (a tax or penalty) 3 (foll. by to + infin.) under an obligation. 4 (foll. by to) exposed or open to (something undesirable). 5 (foll. by to + infin.) apt, likely (it is liable to rain). 6 (foll. by for) answerable. [ME perh. f. AF f. OF lier f. L. ligare bind]" From the Oxford English Reverence Dictionary (revised second edition).

In this case, the relevant definition of "liable" is number 5, i.e., "likely." Likely means "probable" and does not mean "incapable of error" so neither does "inerrant" mean "incapable of error." I suspect that Timo doesn't "know" Hebrew or Greek nearly as well as he understands English and he obviously fails a bit with English.

In one of my responses to Timo I already submitted a quote of Sister White where she said the Bible was infallible. Here are more of her statements to ponder.

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

"God's Word is full of precious promises and helpful counsel. It is infallible; for God cannot err." *Signs of the Times*, 3/28/1906.

"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.

Timo said, "And I absolutely disagree with you when you say that we must not believe scholars. That is not what Paul advises us to do." I tried to think of one place where Paul said we were supposed to believe scholars and I couldn't. The words "scholar" or "scholars" don't appear even once in the New Testament in the KJV or NKJV and only appears once in older versions of the NIV. Here's that verse from the 1978 version of the NIV. That's an NIV version that says in 2 Samuel 21:19 that it was Elhanan that killed Goliath.

"Where is the wise man? Where is the scholar? Where is the philosopher of this age? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world? 1 Corinthians 1:20 from the 1978 translation of the NIV.

That is NOT complementary to the scholar. The preceding verse makes this clearer.

"For it is written: 'I will destroy the wisdom of the wise; the intelligence of the intelligent I will frustrate." 1 Corinthians 1:19 from the 1978 translation of the NIV.

And here is what the Lord's Messenger has to say about scholars.

"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.

Take with a degree of skepticism ANYTHING emanating from Andrews University and other scholarly commentary unless it accords with what the real Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy say.

www.SatanIsDead.com www.InfallibleBible.com www.AdventistsToday.com www.SabbathSchoolGuide.com www.AdventistDeathConfusion.com