

# Biblical Reliability

*Kerby Anderson provides classic reasons the bible can be believed and trusted as a divine book from God.*

Is the Bible historically reliable? That is an important question that deserves an answer since so many people today believe that the Bible is not accurate or reliable. We will look at various tests we can use to evaluate any book and will discover that the Bible is reliable and trustworthy. But before we look at the Bible's reliability, it is worth mentioning its uniqueness.

No doubt you have heard people say they don't read the Bible because it is merely another book. That is not true. Josh McDowell and Sean McDowell spend pages in their book, *Evidence That Demands a Verdict*, listing all the many ways the Bible is unique.



First, it is unique in character. This includes the fact that it is unique in time span, geographical production, authorship, literary genres, and languages. Professor F.F. Bruce, in *The Books and the Parchments*, summarized it this way: "The Bible, at first sight, appears to be a collection of literature—mainly Jewish. If we enquire into the circumstances under which the various Biblical documents were written, we find that they were written at intervals over a space of nearly 1400 years the writers wrote in various lands, from Italy in the west to Mesopotamia and possible Persia in the east."

He goes on to remind us that "The writers themselves were a heterogeneous number of people, not only separated from each other by hundreds of years and hundreds of miles but belonging to the most diverse walks of life . . . The writings themselves belong to a great variety of literary types. They include history, law, religious poetry, didactic treatises,

lyric poetry, parable and allegory, biography, personal correspondence, personal memoirs and diaries, in addition to the distinctively Biblical types of prophecy and apocalyptic.”

The Bible is also unique in its theology. There are teachings in the Bible that are not found in any other religious book. And the Bible is certainly unique in its impact (art, literature, history) and circulation (best-selling book of all time).

The Bible is unique, but it is reliable? The Bible makes significant claims about itself, and events recorded in the Bible. These are historical events and can be tested by the same criteria used to evaluate other historical documents.

There are three specific tests scholars, researchers, and archaeologists use to determine the authenticity of historical material. There are three basic principles of historiography: the internal test, the external test, and the bibliographic test. We will apply these three tests to the Bible to determine its reliability as an accurate historical source.

## **Internal Test**

The internal test looks at a document to first see what the document claims for itself, and then to see if there are internal contradictions. What does the Bible claim for itself?

The Bible makes some very significant claims. It claims to be the Word of God. “All Scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for training in righteousness” (2 Timothy 3:16). Just because the Bible claims to be inspired is not enough to accept that claim, but it does serve to remind us about the unique nature of the Bible. Jesus made an even more significant claim: “But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one stroke of a letter of the Law to fail” (Luke 16:17).

The Bible is unique in another significant way: its

unity. Consider that the Bible was written over a 1400-year period, by over 40 authors, from many walks of life. It was written in three languages, on different continents, under different circumstances. And it addresses numerous controversial topics, and yet we have unity and consistency throughout the Bible. Imagine if you had three people living at the same time, same place, speaking the same language writing on one controversial topic. Would they agree? They would not. The unity of the Bible suggests its inspiration.

But this raises another question. Skeptics often like to point to contradictions in the Bible. My quick answer often is to merely point to the number of books written over the last few centuries that provide reasonable answers to apparent contradictions. These many books illustrate that these difficult biblical texts can be resolved.

Professor Gleason Archer has written about Bible difficulties and concludes, "As I have dealt with one apparent discrepancy after another and have studied alleged contradictions between the biblical record and evidence of linguistics, archaeology, or science, my confidence in the trustworthiness of Scripture has been repeatedly certified and strengthened."

The reliability of the gospels is also supported by what is called undesigned coincidences. Professor Tim McGrew has been on my radio program to talk about these, and his wife Lydia has written a book on the subject. The writer in one gospel provides part of a testimony, while the writer of another gospel provides another key fact. These are not planned but give a fuller picture of the event. They are like pieces of a puzzle and provide yet another important piece of evidence for the internal test.

## **External Test**

The external test looks at how the document aligns itself with facts, dates, and persons from its world. The facts from

archaeology and history validate the historical accuracy of the Bible. In previous articles, we have provided many examples of archaeological verification of the historical accuracy of the Bible.[\[1\]](#)

Dr. William Albright concluded, "There can be no doubt that archaeology has confirmed the substantial historicity of the Bible." Yale professor and expert on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Millar Burrows explained, "Archeological 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."

One of the most famous and most significant archeological finds was the [Dead Sea Scrolls](#). Over 800 fragments were found including a complete scroll of the book of Isaiah. It has provided a way to check the accuracy of the transmission of the Old Testament.

Another archaeological find occurred in 1993 when a stone monument fragment was discovered near the border of Israel and Syria. It mentions the "House of David" and implies a victory by Ben-Hadad, king of Damascus (1 Kings 15:20).

More recently, archaeologists uncovered a Curse Tablet found in Joshua's altar on Mount Ebal (Joshua 8:30). This ancient Hebrew inscription is centuries older than any known Hebrew inscription from ancient Israel. This is the earliest recorded Divine name in Israel and supports the biblical date of the Exodus.

There are also archaeological finds that validate the New Testament. In 1961, archeological work at Caesarea Maritima discovered a stone with the name "Pontius Pilate." He was a prefect of the Roman province of Judea and was responsible for ordering the crucifixion of Jesus. More recently, a ring was found at the Herodium (a desert palace outside of Bethlehem)

with the inscription "Pontius Pilate." The ring was not fancy enough to have been worn by Pilate and was likely used for official communications.

Classical scholar and historian Colin Hemer chronicles Luke's accuracy in the book of Acts. With painstaking detail, he identifies 84 facts in the last 16 chapters of the Book of Acts that have been confirmed by historical and archaeological research. This includes nautical details, names of gods, designation of magistrates, and proper names and titles.

## **Bibliographic Test**

Now we will look at the bibliographic test. Since we do not have the original documents of any ancient literature, this test is used to evaluate the transmission from the original document to the manuscripts we possess today. The Bible is far superior to any ancient historical book in its- manuscript evidence with respect to time and the number of manuscripts.

Sir Frederic Kenyon observed, "In no other case is the interval of time between the composition of the book and the date of the earliest manuscripts so short as in that of the New Testament."

Many of the books on apologetics or biblical reliability provide a chart of the gap between the original manuscript and the earliest copy that we have: Plato (1200 years), Thucydides, *History* (1300 years), and Tacitus, *Annals* (1000 years). That smallest gap is Homer's *Iliad* (500 years). By contrast, the gap for the New Testament is just a few decades.

Above, we mentioned the importance of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Until their discovery, there was a significant gap between the original and the earliest copy (around AD 900). The discovery allowed us to now see there was an accurate transmission over a 1000-year period.

The number of manuscripts is also important. When we have more

manuscripts, we can compare them and have a better understanding of what was written in the original document. We have seven copies of Plato, eight copies of Thucydides, and twenty copies of Tacitus. There are over six hundred copies of Homer's *Illiad*.

By contrast, the number of manuscripts for the Bible is significant. The total number of Greek and non-Greek New Testament manuscripts is nearly 24,000. The number of Old Testament scrolls is more than 42,000. F.F. Bruce concludes, "There is no body of ancient literature in the world which enjoys such a wealth of good textual attestation as the New Testament."

The early church fathers also quoted from the New Testament as they wrote to each other. We have more the 36,000 of scripture citations from them as well.

John Warwick Montgomery concluded, "To be skeptical of the resultant text of the New Testament books is to allow all of classical antiquity to slip into obscurity; for no documents of the ancient period are as well attested bibliographically as the New Testament."

## **One Last Test: Prophecy**

We have discussed three tests that show the reliability of the Bible, especially when compared to other literature of antiquity. The Bible passed the internal test because of its unity and cohesion. The Bible passed the external test because of the history and archaeology that confirms its accuracy. And the Bible passes the bibliographic test because of the number of manuscripts and the short time gap between the original and its copies.

But there is an additional test that only the Bible can meet. More than one-fourth of the Bible's content was prophetic at the time that it was originally written. More than half of

these 1000+ prophecies have been fulfilled down to the minutest detail. No other book (religious or secular) can make this claim.

Fifty years ago, J. Barton Payne compiled the *Encyclopedia of Biblical Prophecy*. It lists 1,239 prophecies in the Old Testament and 578 prophecies in the New Testament, for a total of 1,817. These encompass 8,352 verses.

In previous articles we have discussed the [prophecies of the Messiah](#). Hundreds of prophecies written down in the Old Testament are literally fulfilled in the person of Jesus Christ. For example, Zechariah records prophecies about the Messiah that were fulfilled by Jesus during the week He entered Jerusalem and was crucified. He predicted that the Messiah would enter Jerusalem riding a donkey (Zechariah 9:9). That was fulfilled during what we often call "Palm Sunday" (Matthew 21:5; Luke 19:32-37).

The price of his betrayal would be thirty pieces of silver (Zechariah 11:12-13) and the money would be cast onto the floor of the Temple. That was fulfilled by Judas and the chief priests (Matthew 27:3-10). Also, he predicted that the betrayal money would be used to buy a potter's field (Zechariah 11:13). We read about its fulfillment in Matthew 27:6-10.

Prophecy is history written before it happens and is another indication of the inspiration of the Bible. It also can give us confidence that prophecies that have not been fulfilled will be fulfilled in the future.

The Bible is historically accurate, and it also shows in many ways that it is also the inspired word of God.

### **Additional Resources**

F. F. Bruce, *The Books and the Parchments: How We Got Our English Bible*, Old Tappan, NJ: Revell, 1984.

F. F. Bruce, *The New Testament Documents: Are They Reliable?* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1964.

Colin Hemer, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History*, Eisenbrauns reprint edition 1990.

Josh McDowell and Sean McDowell, *Evidence That Demands a Verdict*, Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2017.

Lydia McGrew, *Hidden in Plain View: Undesigned Coincidences in the Gospels and Acts*, Deward Publishing, 2017.

J. Barton Payne, *Encyclopedia of Biblical Prophecy*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1973.

Chauncey Saunders, *Introduction to Research in English Literary History*, New York: Macmillan, 1952.

## Notes

1. [probe.org/biblical-archaeology/](http://probe.org/biblical-archaeology/), [probe.org/archaeology-and-the-old-testament/](http://probe.org/archaeology-and-the-old-testament/),  
[probe.org/archaeology-and-the-old-testament/](http://probe.org/archaeology-and-the-old-testament/)

©2024 Probe Ministries

---

# “How Did the Church Recognize Which Books Were Inspired by God?”

Please elaborate on this statement from your article on [The Da Vinci Code](#): “...the Canon gradually took shape as the church recognized and embraced those books that were inspired by God.”



How did the church “recognize” which books were inspired by God? Did the church, therefore, consider other texts not to be “inspired by God”? Can you suggest any material that refers to the above?

Thank you for your thoughtful question and for visiting our web site.

Below is a document that I composed from information found in F. F. Bruce’s book *The Canon*. I highly recommend his work if you are interested in digging deeper into the subject of canonicity.

Other works were used by the early church (Didache and Shepherd of Hermas) but were not equated to scripture. Later writings were weighed against the Apostles’ teachings and rejected or read accordingly.

Sincerely,

Don Closson

---

## The Canon

From *The Canon of Scripture* by F. F. Bruce

“That the New Testament consists of the twenty-seven books which have been recognized as belonging to it since the fourth century is not a value judgment; it is a statement of fact. Individuals or communities may consider that it is too restricted or too comprehensive; but their opinion does not affect the identity of the canon. The canon is not going to be diminished or increased because of what they think or say: it is a literary, historical and theological datum.”[\[1\]](#)

Bruce defines the criteria for canonicity in chapter 21 of his book; he includes the following items:

**Apostolic Authority** – All of the NT writings contained a degree of apostolic authority. This could be established by direct apostolic appointment (those chosen directly by Jesus), writing on behalf of one with apostolic authority (Mark writing on behalf of Peter), or being a member of Jesus' family (James & Jude). The *Acts of Paul*, which was written in the middle of the second century, was orthodox but the author had no apostolic authority and it was a work of fiction. Bruce also points out that any book known to be pseudonymous [written by a person other than the attributed author] would not have been included in the canon.

**Antiquity** – The writing must belong to the apostolic age. Anything written later, although useful and theologically accurate (Shepherd of Hermas) would not be considered canonical. "Writings of a later date, whatever their merit, could not be included among the apostolic or canonical books." {2}

**Orthodoxy** – Any writing considered to be part of the canon must be theologically consistent with the apostolic faith. This faith rested upon the undisputed apostolic writings and the teachings established in those churches founded by the apostles. The Bishop of Antioch (199 AD) named Serapion had *The Gospel of Peter* removed from books that were read in the church of Rhossus when he discovered that it included a docetic (heretical) view of Christ. Docetism and Gnosticism were two views of Christ that competed with the orthodox apostolic teachings in the early church.

**Catholicity** – Only those works that were received by the greater part of the catholic or universal church could be acknowledged as canon. This might be combined with the notion of traditional use. Bruce writes, "If any church leader came along in the third or fourth century with a previously unknown book, recommending it as genuinely apostolic, he would have found great difficulty in gaining acceptance for it: his fellow Christians would simply have

said, 'But no one has ever heard of it!'"[\[3\]](#)

**Inspiration** – Canonicity and inspiration have been closely connected in the minds of Christians since the early days of the church. Even when apostolic authority was questioned (as with Mark and Luke) works were accepted because they were considered authoritative (inspired, God breathed) and trustworthy witnesses to the saving events of Christ's ministry.

## Notes

1. F. F. Bruce, *The Canon of Scripture*, (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1988), p. 250.
2. Ibid., p. 259.
3. Ibid., p. 263.

Edited by Don Closson, Probe Ministries, 2004

See related posts for more relevant articles and answers to questions.