

creationists to be on the lookout for critiques of the established scientific paradigm, but we must be careful not to ‘grasp at straws’ by treating every critique as though it constituted definitive ‘proof’.

James Upton
UNITED KINGDOM

References

1. Hartnett, J., WMAP ‘proof’ of big bang fails normal radiological standards, *Journal of Creation* 21(2):5–7, 2007.
2. Robitaille, P.-M., WMAP: a radiological analysis, *Progress in Physics* 1:3–18, 2007, <www.ptep-online.com/index_files/2007/PP-08-01.PDF>; see section 2.3.
3. Glanz, J., Ripples in Ohio From Ad on the Big Bang, *New York Times*, 19 March 2002, <tinyurl.com/yuphrm>, 9 July 2007.
4. The Nobel Prize in Physics 2006, <nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/physics/laureates/2006/info.pdf>, 9 July 2007.
5. Robitaille, P.-M., On the origins of the CMB: insight from the COBE, WMAP, and Relikt-1 satellites, *Progress in Physics* 1:19–23, 2007, <www.ptep-online.com/index_files/2007/PP-08-02.PDF>.
6. Robitaille, P.-M., On the Earth Microwave Background: absorption and scattering by the atmosphere, *Progress in Physics* 3:3–4, 2007, <www.ptep-online.com/index_files/2007/PP-10-01.PDF>.

Biblical chronology—our times are in his hands

In Mike Viccary’s article, ‘Biblical chronology—our times are in his hands’ (*Journal of Creation* 21(1):62–66, 2007), he defends the accuracy of the biblical data but uses the unbiblical date of 1446 BC for the Exodus. This date is the result of the work of Edwin Thiele who’s revised chronology, which is based on his understanding of Assyrian chronology, does violence to the biblical data. His work *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*, is the basis for much misinformation about biblical chronology for the past 50 years. In Viccary’s footnote to substantiate this

date, he cites the charts of Whitcomb who uncritically accepted Thiele’s work. In the same footnote he cites the works of Ussher in Latin, which very few people have access to, and the works of Dr. Jones.

Why not cite the updated edition which is readily available? In that edition of the works of Ussher, I go to great pains to show the folly of trusting the works of Thiele. See appendices C, D and E. Likewise, Dr Jones devotes almost a third of his book on chronology to showing the errors of Thiele. I challenge anyone to use the biblical data and arrive at a date of 1446 BC for the Exodus. It is impossible to do without seriously compromising the Scriptures as Thiele did. Even Dr Les McFall, who has taken over from Thiele, could not find an error in the appendix C charts in Ussher, which in themselves thoroughly refute Thiele’s chronology.

Writers on chronology should be more careful with the details. Viccary’s mistake mars an otherwise good article.

Larry Pierce
Winterbourne, Ontario
CANADA

Mike Viccary replies:

I want to thank Larry Pierce for drawing my attention to the difficulties of matching the continuous chronology of Scripture with modern dates. At some point we do have to connect the biblical dates post Creation with our calendar AD. My single aim in the article (which was a small part of an original longer piece) was to show that the Bible is sufficient, consistent and accurate, particularly with reference to the chronology in the Pentateuch. Having only recently read Appendix C of the updated edition referred to by Pierce, I note that Ussher uses the ‘terminal date’ of 562 BC taken from Ptolemy’s king lists. There may well be good reasons for using this rather than an Assyrian connection, but the point remains we do have to locate the

perfect, accurate timeline revealed in God’s word with some modern date. As I understand it, my date for creation is 45 years earlier than Ussher’s. Taking Ussher’s view of the king lists this would date the Exodus at 1491 BC rather than 1446 BC.

To conclude, I am grateful for being directed to a work which takes seriously the Scriptures as our sole authority. I heartily endorse this starting point. Assuming that Ussher’s view of the king lists to be correct, we still have the problem of deciding how to connect the Bible’s timeline to our reference points. It would seem that at least part of the difference in the timelines may result from how we connect to modern dates, and not on how we view the Scriptures. Whilst the Bible always remains true and accurate, we are still at the mercy of secular (or extra-biblical) testimony to make that link. However, it occurs to me that if the Bible has an unbroken chronology up until Daniel’s prophecy of Daniel 9:24–27, we thence have an unbroken link right up to the death of Christ.

Mike Viccary
Keighley, West Yorkshire
UNITED KINGDOM

The problems of traditional chronology

I read David Down’s book review, ‘The problems of traditional chronology’ in issue 21(2):44–47, 2007, concerning the recent book, *David and Solomon: In Search of the Bible’s Sacred Kings and the Roots of the Western Tradition*, by Finkelstein and Silberman. The quotations David provides from the book on page 45 illustrate what many secular archaeologists think about Old Testament history: the Old Testament is largely a collection of oral legends and myths before the 8th century BC, the stories recorded centuries after the