

Reliability of the Bible Historically

Though scores of historical problems are raised by critics of Bible, yet the alleged contradictions between the Bible and well-established historical fact can be counted on fingers of one hand. Vanish before advancing historical research.

1. Once doubted if Moses could write.
2. In 1889, Wellhausen regarded Gen. 14 unbelievable historically. Now all admit such an invasion with the results stated is fully believable.
3. Hittites were once thought to be petty kingdom. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Two great periods of Hittite Empire are now known. Dealt with Egyptians on equal terms.
4. Sargon, mentioned only in Is. 20:1 Eighth edition of Ency. Britannica declared that this mention of Sargon was doubtless a mistake. Khorsabad. Then next ed. contained description of Sargon's magnificent palace and wars, including wars in far west.
5. A Biblical "mistake" re Belshazzar is no longer alleged. Biblical account fully vindicated by Dougherty of Yale.

As long as our knowledge of ancient history is fragmentary, and in spots untrustworthy, we cannot expect all problems to disappear. But every contradiction between a historical source and the Bible is not an error in the Bible. Historical sources often slanted to serve political purposes. Records of ancient kings like to record victories rather than military defeats of themselves. Bible in contrast is not lacking in truth and candor.

(See L. Harris, Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible, pp. 116-119; Theodore Engelder, Scripture Cannot Be Broken, pp. 97-107)

over →
D