

*The Authority of the Scriptures: Lesson 3*  
***First Line of Evidence of the Inspiration of Scripture***

I. The Bible's claims about its own inspiration: 2 Timothy 3:16-17/2 Peter 1:20-21

II. Testing the claims: I John 4:1/Deut. 13:1-4

A.. Subjective evidence: Rom.8:16/I John 5:10

B. Objective evidence:

- a. Natural evidences: natural phenomena of the Scripture which, though inconclusive, render it natural to accept the claims as valid.
- b. Supernatural evidences: phenomena of the Scripture which cannot be explained apart from invoking a supernatural explanation.

III. Natural evidences:

A. *Scientific Accuracy*

1. The general opinion of modern people that there is some fundamental conflict between the Bible and science is absolutely false.
2. The record of miracles, which defy scientific explanation, in the Bible does not prove that its writers were superstitious, unscientific men. Nor is it anti-scientific to believe in miracles

#1: "The pervasive presence of miracle offends the existential and the naturalistic mood of our day. Despite the offense, however, miracles fit neatly into the world-view of biblical theism, where they function as part of the total discourse of God. Empirical science cannot contest the validity of a miracle for the simple reason the event cannot be repeated for experiment today. The evidence for a miracle, as for any historical event, is the testimony of those who witnessed it. On that ground, the resurrection of Jesus is a very well-attested miracle." [Clark Pinnock, *A Defense of Biblical Infallibility*, p.27]

3. The Scriptures have frequently *anticipated* the findings of scientists centuries in advance of those discoveries

B. *Historical Accuracy:*

#2:"There can be no doubt that archaeology has confirmed the substantial historicity of Old Testament tradition." [William F. Albright, Archaeologist, Prof. Emeritus of Johns Hopkins University, considered the world's greatest orientologist, *Archaeology and the Religions of Israel*, p.176]

#3: "Naville (1883) and Kyle (1908) found, at Pithom, the lower courses of brick filled with good chopped straw; the middle courses, with less straw, and that was stubble plucked up by the root; and the upper courses of brick were of pure clay, having no straw whatever." [*Halley's Bible Handbook*, p.120]

#4: Testimony of Garstang, who excavated Jericho between 1930 and 1936: "As to the main fact, then, there remains no doubt: the walls fell outwards so completely that the attackers would be able to clamber up over the ruins into the city." [John Garstang, *Joshua Judges* , p.146 / Also *Halley's Handbook*, pp.159-160]

#5: "Until 1853 no mention of Belshazzar was found in Babylonian records; and Nabonidas (555-538 B.C.) was known to have been the last king of Babylon. To the critics, this was one of the evidences that the book of Daniel was not historical. But in 1853 an inscription was found in a cornerstone of a temple built by Nabonidas in Ur to a god, which read: 'May I, Nabonidas, king of Babylon, not sin against thee.

And may reverence for thee dwell in the heart of Belshazzar, my first-born, favorite son.' " [*Halley's Bible Handbook*, p.344/ see also E.J.Young *The Prophecy of Daniel*, pp.115f]

#6: "Back in 1850, for example, many learned scholars were confidently denying the historicity of the Hittites and the Horites, of Sargon 2 of Assyria and Belshazzar of Chaldean Babylon, or even of Sodom and Gomorrah. Yet all of these have more recently become accepted by the scholarly world because of their appearance in ancient documents discovered within the last fifteen decades of archaeological investigation." [Gleason Archer, *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties*, p.210]

#7: "Both Conzelmann and Hänchen discover in Acts 5:36f a definite error in historical order given to Theudas and Judas, since Josephus dates a Theudas in AD 45, a full decade after Gamaliel's speech in Acts. In other words, Luke made a double mistake: a gross anachronism and faulty order. Such a conclusion does not jibe with our knowledge of Luke's general trustworthiness elsewhere. Is it not more probable that Luke is referring to another man named Theudas, otherwise unknown to us, who lived before Judas? It seems uncommonly bold to jettison the accuracy of Luke and the inerrancy of the Bible on the mere supposition that Josephus is always right, and that no evidence could possibly turn up to clear Luke's reputation. *While insisting on their right to treat the Bible 'like any other book'...some critics proceed to treat it like no other book, by bathing it in the acid solution of their skepticism and historical pessimism.*" [Clark Pinnock. *A Defense of Biblical Infallibility*, pp.22-23]

#8: "Readers with some knowledge of ancient history often have occasion to note Luke's careful writing. [Acts 13:7] is an example. In 22 BC Augustus made Cyprus a senatorial province...It was therefore governed by a proconsul or deputy. The name of a proconsul called Paulus has been discovered in a North Cypriot inscription...Luke is a consummate historian, to be ranged in his own right with the great writers of the Greeks." [E.M.Blaiklock, Professor of Classics, Auckland University, *The Acts of the Apostles*, pp.103, 89]

#9: "Luke... should be placed along with the very greatest of historians." [Sir William Ramsay, archaeologist, one-time skeptic of the reliability of Acts as history, *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament*, p.222]

#10: "Luke was an able and deliberate historian, writing more than one-fourth of the volume of the New Testament - more than any other man. Modern research has vindicated the quality of his work." [W.T. Dayton, *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible: "Luke"*]

#11: "On the whole... archaeological work has unquestionably strengthened confidence in the reliability of the Scriptural record. More than one archaeologist has found his respect for the Bible increased by the experience of excavation in Palestine." [Millar Burrows, a nonevangelical, Yale archaeologist, *What Mean These Stones?*, p.1]

#12: "It may be stated categorically that no archaeological discovery has ever controverted a biblical reference." [Nelson Glueck, renowned Jewish archaeologist, *Rivers in the Desert*, p.31]

#13: "Archaeology has not yet said its last word, but the results already achieved confirm what faith would suggest - that the Bible can do nothing but gain from an increase in knowledge." [Sir Frederic Kenyon, former director of the British Museum, *The Bible and Archaeology*, p.279]

#14: Even *Time* magazine, in a cover story on the Bible (December 30, 1974) conceded: "After more than two centuries of facing the heaviest scientific guns that could be brought to bear, the Bible has survived - and is perhaps the better for the siege. Even on the critics' own terms - historical fact - the Scriptures seem more acceptable now than they did when the rationalists began the attack."