

## CHAPTER THIRTY The Benjamin Adams Letter

Following is the full text of the letter. I postpone analysis and discussion until after I show Sadler's reply. In my discussion I shall follow the item numbers shown in the letters. I shall place each critical remark by Adams first, marked by parenthetical numbers (X). I shall place each of Sadler's responses next in order, marked by a number sign. I then offer my comments on each.

March 9, 1959  
Dr. Earl L. Douglass  
c/o The Hilton Hotel  
Los Angeles  
Calif.

Dear Earl:

Your letter of March 1 has just come. I share your disappointment that Los Angeles is not closer to San Francisco.

Was interested to hear of your visit with Dr. Sadler and Miss Rowley. It is a pleasure that I have not thus far had except by correspondence. However, I do keep studying the Urantia Book which I consider in itself a remarkable phenomenon. The author (or authors) of the book have not hesitated to "stick their necks out" in so many areas of human knowledge that a critical analysis of the book should eventually supply a verdict of true or false.

It seems to me that, if I were God, this is the sort of book which I would want to supply my human children on such a benighted and remote speck of dust as the earth. Yet, the best and highest service which can be rendered this book is strictly objective and merciless critical analysis thereof.

As I read what it has to say about cosmology, cosmogeny, geology, chronology, biology, anthropology, astronomy, physics, chemistry, nuclear physics, etc. etc., I find myself wishing that I had considerably more competence in all of these fields. But I know that I had better stick to my own field of competence which happens to be Biblical studies. In passing, I note a few statements outside of my field of competence which I am inclined to challenge. On page 477, for instance, is this statement: "There are just 100 distinguishable atomic materializations of space-energy in a dual universe; that is the maximum possible organization of matter in Nebadon." This seems to me to say that only 100 chemical elements are possible. But I can quote several authorities to the effect that at least 103 elements have been identified and named.

However, returning to the field of Biblical studies, I make the following observations:

(1) Page 2074. The teacher of Clement of Alexandria and the founder of the famous Catechetical School of that city was "Pantaenus" not "Poutaenus." (This may be merely a typographical error.)

(2) Page 1557. Philip the Apostle is identified with Philip the Evangelist (or Deacon) who is said to have gone on the mission to Samaria in Acts 8:5.

(3) Pages 2057-60. The bestowing of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost is represented as occurring on the same day as the ascension and 40 days after the crucifixion. Now this is an obvious error as the very word "Pentecost" means 50 and was supposed to be a week of weeks after the Passover.

(4) Page 542. A quotation from the New Testament Book of Hebrews is attributed to Paul. This is amazing in view of the generally sophisticated and critical attitude toward the authorship of most of the book of the Bible. (E.G. pp 1341-2)

(5) Page 1559. Nathaniel's father is said to be Bartholemew. But Bartholemew is listed by the synoptic writers among the Twelve. It is a patronymic meaning "The Son of Tholmai". Thus it is logical to suppose that Nathaniel of John's Gospel is identical with Bartholemew of the synoptics, and that his father's name was Tholmai.

(6) Page 1362. The synagogue teacher is spoken of as the "chazan." The Hebrew (Aramaic) for this officer is חזן which would be more correctly transliterated "chazzan," (with a double z).

(7) Page 1365(3) (near bottom). "Far to the east they could discern the Jordan valley and, far beyond, the rocky hills of Moab." But the rocky hills of Moab were not east of Nazareth but east of the Dead Sea.

(8) Page 1648. "Early on the morning of Tuesday, March 30, Jesus and the apostolic party started on their journey to Jerusalem for the Passover." But Hastings Bible Dictionary, Vol. I, p. 411 gives a table which shows that the latest possible date for the Passover in A.D. 28 was Tuesday, March 30 (beginning with the sunset the previous day, Mon., March 29). Thus Jesus and His apostles are represented as setting out for Jerusalem and the Passover on the latest possible date for the Passover to begin. They arrived at Bethany on April 2, three days later. By this time the ceremonies of the Passover Feast and the first-fruits of the Barley harvest "waved" before the Lord would have been completed. True, the Feast of Unleavened Bread would go on for another three or four days, but it seems strange that they would deliberately be so late in arriving.

It is only fair to note that the Urantia Book does not claim to be infallible (p.1008). It is also fair to note that on the other side of the ledger are literally thousands of amazingly accurate details harmonizing perfectly with known geographical and chronological facts. For instance, the U.B. states in opposition to a tremendous weight of tradition that Jesus did not die on Passover Day, but on the day preceding that, in 30 A.D. Passover began at Sunset on Friday, April 7 and continued until sunset Saturday, April 8. This agrees with the point-of-view of John's Gospel but disagrees with the synoptics. Moreover, astronomy bears witness that the first visibility of the preceding new moon was at sunset on Friday, March 24. This would then be the beginning of Nisan 1 in the Jewish calendar. This would bring Nisan 14, the "Preparation for the Passover," to the day beginning sunset April 6 (Thurs.) and Nisan 15, the Passover itself to the day beginning at sunset Friday, April 7, continuing throughout Saturday. This agrees with the Gospel of John and the Urantia Book.

No doubt many more discrepancies will be discovered in the Urantia Book. About all that this will prove is that even "Midway creatures" can make mistakes. But, if for each mistake we are able to spot, we are enriched by 1,000 thrilling new facts, then we have a spiritual gold mine before us in the Urantia Book, and the ore we dig out assays at about 999/1,000. We do well not to accept it blindly, but it merits a considerable measure of our confidence.

Mrs. Adams joins me in extending our best wishes to you and your wife. We have now completed eight years in this difficult inner city church. During this period we have had the pleasure of taking into the church 289 new members. The turnover has been

so great that we only have 282 members as of now. Yet we have prospered by the grace of God, and I now have a full-time assistant with an Italian name (Rev. Richard Fagetti) who I think is well-qualified to carry on.

If you know of anyone in New Jersey who would like an experienced Minister of Visitation, I wish you would let me know, -- perhaps even speak a good word for me. I think I could do a good job for some one in helping to build up their membership.

Most cordially yours,  
Benjamin N. Adams.

This was Sadler's response.

March 17, 1959  
Rev. Benjamin N. Adams  
124 Genebern Way  
San Francisco 12, California  
My dear Rev. Adams:

I was very happy to get your letter of March 9, and I think this the first really valid criticism I have ever had from a minister as concerns the Urantia Book. I have gotten hold of several the last year, but it was evident that the critics had never even superficially read the Urantia Book.

If minor discrepancies were to be found in the Urantia Book I have always suspected that they would probably be found in Part IV because that is the part of the Book that was prepared by the midwayers. The midwayers' mind level is but a trifle above that of the human mind.

My own preoccupation with the Urantia Book has been along two lines. First, I was concerned as to whether or not this was some fraudulent psychic phenomena or possibly a case of subconscious dissociation on the part of the subject such as I was familiar with in the fields of automatic writing, trance mediums, etc. I was the last of my family to accept *The Urantia Papers*. I finally decided that the who thing was beyond my ability to understand.

My next concern had to do with the consistency of the Papers. I finally decided that a fraud could not go on the witness stand for twenty-five years, to be examined and cross-examined by 250, and to give more than a million words of testimony and never once contradict himself. I decided that this subject must be telling the truth in order to discuss such a wide range of topics and not once slip into a contradiction.

You ask about others who have critically examined the Urantia Book. From a stand point of general science I think the studies of the late Sir Hubert Wilkins were perhaps the most extended and exhaustive. For more than twenty years he periodically spend time in Chicago going over the Papers. He would work weeks at a time, ten hours a day and his final conclusion was that the Papers were consistent with the known facts of modern science.

Since the Book was published, a young physicist in Philadelphia has been a very careful student of the physics of *The Urantia Papers*. About a year ago he wrote a paper, with many diagrams, for the Gravitational Society, in which he advocated that the cosmology of the Urantia Book was the only one that was possible from the gravitational standpoint.

I was very interested in your criticisms as proposed in your letter to Dr. Douglass. I would offer the following comments on these criticisms:

1. I think the spelling of the name of the teacher in Alexandria is undoubtedly an error in transcribing the manuscript into typewriting. An "an" was undoubtedly tran-

scribed as an “ou.” I remember when we were sometimes in doubt as to whether a letter was an “n” or a “u” in the manuscript. Of course, we who were preparing this matter, did not know the name of this teacher and could have easily made this mistake.

2. As far as I could detect, there is one Philip recognized in the Urantia Book. I note what you say in this matter.

3. Now as to the bestowal of the Spirit of Truth — the possible discrepancy between the end of one Paper and the beginning of another we all noted it one time and discussed it further when the Book was going to press. You should remember that the midwayers prepared a narrative that was many times larger than was finally given us as Part IV of the Urantia Book. It may be that in deletion some difficulties were encountered. Our understanding is that the prayer meeting which Peter conducts at the close of one Paper is not the same as that at the opening of the next Paper. The one ended at the Day of ascension, the other opened up the Day of Pentecost.

4. About Paul and Hebrews — of course, we all puzzled about that the same as you, and it occurs two or three times in the Papers. We have finally come to the conclusion that it was of composite authorship and the Apostle Paul had something to do with the presentation.

5. About Nathaniel’s father I can offer no suggestions except that I know that the manuscript was very clear that it was Bartholemew.

6. About the spelling of “chazan.” Our mandate forbade us in any way to alter the text of the manuscript, but gave us jurisdiction over capitalization, spelling and punctuation. We were told to select our authority and stick to it. Evidently, the authority we chose spelled “chazan” with one z.

7. Your notation about Moab is a puzzler to us. We have just looked into the atlas, and, of course you are right. I have no explanation for this matter — either a mistake of the midwayers or a mistake in copying. I cannot say, but evidently you are right in the matter.

8. The intricacies of Jesus’ crucifixion and the Day of the Passover I am not competent to appraise. In fact, I was not aware that there was any difference in the Gospel of John and in the Synoptics, but I am glad that you are inclined to agree with the Urantia Book.

I was indeed cheered to get such an encouraging estimate of the worth of the Book from one who has made such a careful study of it.

I am taking the liberty of sending you a copy of an outline which I gave to a dozen ministers who came to meet with me about six months ago. I told them that while I was unable to explain to them about how we had got the Book I was able to explain to them how we had not got the Book.

I do hope that we will have the pleasure of seeing you and Mrs. Adams one of these days. I am sure, if you have the occasion to come back East, you will not fail to let us have a visit with you.

With all best wishes, I am  
Sincerely yours,  
William S. Sadler  
WSS/ar

## COMMENTARY

### Item #1

(1) Page 2074. The teacher of Clement of Alexandria and the founder of the famous Catechetical School of that city was “Pantaenus” not “Poutaenus.” (This may be merely a typographical error.)

#1. I think the spelling of the name of the teacher in Alexandria is undoubtedly an error in transcribing the manuscript into typewriting. An “an” was undoubtedly transcribed as an “ou.” I remember when we were sometimes in doubt as to whether a letter was an “n” or a “u” in the manuscript. Of course, we who were preparing this matter, did not know the name of this teacher and could have easily made this mistake.

This remark shows that Sadler worked from a hand-written manuscript, not a typewritten document. Many rumors circulate within the Urantia community that Part IV was given to Sadler in the latter form. If so, he would not have made this mistake, and would not have had difficulty in determining between an “n” and a “u.”

Although not mentioned by Sadler, the “a” to “o” shift was due to the same cause.

This remark by Adams led to a spelling change between the first and second printings of the Papers. This spelling change was not detected by Merritt Horn nor by Kristen Maaherra in their analysis of text changes.

### Item #2

(2) Page 1557. Philip the Apostle is identified with Philip the Evangelist (or Deacon) who is said to have gone on the mission to Samaria in Acts 8:5.

#2. As far as I could detect, there is one Philip recognized in the Urantia Book. I note what you say in this matter.

The name “Philip” occurs seventy-four times within the Papers. Six of those refer to the brother of Herod. In all other cases the reference is to the Apostle.

The biblical account of the work of Philip the Apostle in Samaria is found in Acts 8.

P.1557 - p3, P.1557 -p4, P.1558 - p1, P.1612 - p2, P.1616 - p2 all describe the work of Philip the Apostle in Samaria.

Philip the Evangelist is different from Philip the Apostle. The Evangelist’s work is described in Acts 21. He was one of seven disciples who had entered the work of the kingdom earlier. One of those seven was Stephen, whose devout faith and death did so much for the kingdom. See Acts 6 - 8. See also:

P.1411 - p6 And this was the same Stephen who subsequently became a believer in the teachings of Jesus, and whose boldness in preaching this early gospel resulted in his being stoned to death by irate Jews. Some of Stephen’s extraordinary boldness in proclaiming his view of the new gospel was the direct result of this earlier interview with Jesus.

P.1456 - p3 2. The talk in Jerusalem with Stephen, whose death led to the winning of Saul of Tarsus.

The confusion for Benjamin Adams was in the similarity of the names, with both men spreading the gospel in Samaria. Philip the Evangelist is not mentioned in *The Urantia Papers*.

### Item #3

See discussion in previous chapter.

### Item #4

(4) Page 542. A quotation from the New Testament Book of Hebrews is attributed to Paul. This is amazing in view of the generally sophisticated and critical attitude toward the authorship of most of the book of the Bible. (E.G. pp 1341-2)

#4. About Paul and Hebrews — of course, we all puzzled about that the same as you, and it occurs two or three times in the Papers. We have finally come to the conclusion that it was of composite authorship and the Apostle Paul had something to do with the presentation.

Since early Christian centuries the *Book of Hebrews* has been attributed to Paul. A majority of Christian fundamentalists today continue to believe he was the author. Textual studies and analysis provide arguments that some other hand wrote major portions of the Book.

The explanation by Sadler is fitting. Sections of the Book show Paul's thought and expression. This led to the confusion for modern scholars.

### Item #5

(5) Page 1559. Nathaniel's father is said to be Bartholemew. But Bartholemew is listed by the synoptic writers among the Twelve. It is a patronymic meaning "The Son of Tholmai". Thus it is logical to suppose that Nathaniel of John's Gospel is identical with Bartholemew of the synoptics, and that his father's name was Tholmai.

#5. About Nathaniel's father I can offer no suggestions except that I know that the manuscript was very clear that it was Bartholemew.

Philip and Nathaniel are identified as friends in P.1526 - p3.

Philip invited Nathaniel to be one of the apostles, bottom of page 1526 to top of page 1527.

The selection of Nathaniel (not Bartholomew) by Philip is described in John 1:43-51.

Philip and Nathaniel are listed twice in pair association, P.1538 - p3, P.1681 - p8.

Philip and Bartholomew are shown in pair association in all three synoptic gospels in the listing of the twelve apostles, Matt 10:2-4, Mark 3:16-19, and Luke 6:14-16.

The synoptic gospels do not use the name Nathaniel.

Clearly, the name Nathaniel used by John is the same individual with the name Bartholomew in the synoptic gospels.

P.1559 - p4 Nathaniel's father (Bartholomew) died shortly after Pentecost, after which this apostle went into Mesopotamia and India proclaiming the glad tidings of the kingdom and baptizing believers. His brethren never knew what became of their onetime philosopher, poet, and humorist. But he also was a great man in the kingdom and did much to spread his Master's teachings, even though he did not participate in the organization of the subsequent Christian church. Nathaniel died in India.

Identification of the father of Nathaniel/Bartholomew with the same patronymic is, indeed, strange. Without other evidence we cannot clarify this apparent confusion.

### Item #6

(6) Page 1362. The synagogue teacher is spoken of as the "chazan." The Hebrew (Aramaic) for this officer is which would be more correctly transliterated "chazzan," (with a double z).

#6. About the spelling of "chazan." Our mandate forbade us in any way to alter the text of the manuscript, but gave us jurisdiction over capitalization, spelling and punctuation. We were told to select our authority and stick to it. Evidently, the authority we chose spelled "chazan" with one z.

Comments beyond Sadler's are unnecessary.

### Item #7

(7) Page 1365(3) (near bottom). "Far to the east they could discern the Jordan valley and, far beyond, the rocky hills of Moab." But the rocky hills of Moab were not east of Nazareth but east of the Dead Sea.

#7. Your notation about Moab is a puzzler to us. We have just looked into the atlas, and, of course you are right. I have no explanation for this matter - either a mistake of the midwayers or a mistake in copying. I cannot say, but evidently you are right in the matter.

The paragraph runs as follows:

P.1363 - p5 Nazareth was one of the twenty-four priest centers of the Hebrew nation. But the Galilean priesthood was more liberal in the interpretation of the traditional laws than were the Judean scribes and rabbis. And at Nazareth they were also more liberal regarding the observance of the Sabbath. It was therefore the custom for Joseph to take Jesus out for walks on Sabbath afternoons, one of their favorite jaunts being to climb the high hill near their home, from which they could obtain a panoramic view of all Galilee. To the northwest, on clear days, they could see the long ridge of Mount Carmel running down to the sea; and many times Jesus heard his father relate the story of Elijah, one of the first of that long line of Hebrew prophets, who reprov'd Ahab and exposed the priests of Baal. To the north Mount Hermon raised its snowy peak in majestic splendor and monopolized the skyline, almost 3,000 feet of the upper slopes glistening white with perpetual

snow. Far to the east they could discern the Jordan valley and far beyond lay the rocky hills of Moab. Also to the south and the east, when the sun shone upon their marble walls, they could see the Greco-Roman cities of the Decapolis, with their amphitheatres and pretentious temples. And when they lingered toward the going down of the sun, to the west they could make out the sailing vessels on the distant Mediterranean.

I checked the geographical locations of each of the other locations mentioned in the paragraph. All seem reasonable as viewable locations except for the rocky hills of Moab. Sadler's assignment to a mistake by the midwayers is far-fetched. The junior and senior midwayers have been on this planet for 35,000 and 500,000 years respectively. They know every nook and cranny in intimate detail. To assign this difficulty to the midwayers is completely unreasonable. The other possibility is that the phrase became transported from another location, but this also seems unreasonable.

The note by Adams is correct. Moab is far to the south of Nazareth, at least 100 miles, and is located to the east of the Dead Sea, not to the east of Nazareth. It would not be visible from the hill at Nazareth.

Some persons raised objections to the location of Moab, that it might be viewable from Nazareth. These are the statements by two biblical reference sources:

A neighboring nation whose history was closely linked to the fortunes of the Hebrew people. Moab was situated along the eastern border of the Dead Sea, on the plateau between the Dead Sea and the Arabian desert. It was about 57 kilometers (35 miles) long and 40 kilometers (25 miles) wide. Although it was primarily a high plateau, Moab also had mountainous areas and deep gorges. It was a fertile area for crops and herds. To the south and west of Moab was the nation of Edom; to the north was Ammon. After the Israelites invaded the land, the tribe of Reuben displaced the Moabites from the northern part of their territory and the tribe of Gad pushed the Ammonites eastward into the desert.

(from Nelson's Illustrated Bible Dictionary)  
(Copyright (C) 1986, Thomas Nelson Publishers)

Moab was the district East of the Dead Sea, extending from a point some distance North of it to its southern end.

1. The Land: The eastern boundary was indefinite, being the border of the desert which is irregular. The length of the territory was about 50 miles and the average width about 30. It is a high tableland, averaging some 3,000 ft. above the level of the Mediterranean and 4,300 ft. above that of the Dead Sea. The aspect of the land, as one looks at it from the western side of the Dead Sea, is that of a range of mountains with a very precipitous frontage, but the elevation of this ridge above the interior is very slight. Deep chasms lead down from the tableland to the Dead Sea shore, the principal one being the gorge of the river Arnon, which is about 1,700 ft. deep and 2 or more miles in width at the level of the tableland, but very narrow at the bottom and with exceedingly precipitous banks. About 13 miles back from the mouth of the river the gorge divides, and farther back it subdivides, so that several

valleys are formed of diminishing depth as they approach the desert border.  
(from International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, Electronic Database  
Copyright (C) 1996 by Biblesoft)

The notorious sentence as it appears in the Foundation's second, and all later printings, (for those which I have checked), including the current CD version, of *The Urantia Papers*:

"Far to the east they could discern the Jordan valley and far beyond lay the rocky hills of Moab."

The notorious sentence as it appears in my copy of the first printing of *The Urantia Papers*, dated 1955.

"Far to the east they could discern the Jordan valley and, far beyond, the rocky hills of Moab."

Therefore, Sadler made two changes to the text of this sentence between the first and second printings.

1. He removed the commas around "far beyond."
2. He inserted the word "lay."

These unilateral and arbitrary changes to the text were under his personal authority.

Clearly, Sadler's reaction to the Benjamin Adams letter was acute.

Sadler was attempting to correct an impossibility in the original text. Since the distance to the "rocky hills of Moab" was "far beyond" any visibility from the hill at Nazareth, Sadler altered the text to reflect a possible different interpretation. He could now claim that the phrase, "and far beyond lay the rocky hills of Moab" was merely a statement of fact, and not of visibility to Jesus and his father.

I thank Larry Mullins for pointing this out to me.

In fact, as the evidence now stands, it appears to some of us that Sadler was actually perverting the text in order to "fix" this impossibility.

What can we learn from the process of the Revelation if this was an insertion by Caligastia? Did he replace the entire paragraph with a new one? Why would Sadler not check the geographical possibilities? Were so many changes taking place that this particular one was lost in the crowd? Sadler seemed surprised by it. Apparently no one had checked prior to the criticism by Adams in 1959. Literally thousands of passages can be checked, but no person has devoted a life to such study. For example, the many biblical quotes were not compiled until Duane Faw did his work in the 1980's. The Revelation is a gold-mine of possibilities. Only time will develop those. On practical grounds we cannot fault Sadler for every error we may find. But we can fault him for the major error of not recognizing the hand of Caligastia.

Evidence for the Caligastian method of altering paragraphs is accumulating.

Item #8

(8) Page 1648. "Early on the morning of Tuesday, March 30, Jesus and the apostolic party started on their journey to Jerusalem for the Passover." But Hastings Bible Dictionary, Vol. I, p. 411 gives a table which shows that the latest possible date for the Passover in A.D. 28 was Tuesday, March 30 (beginning with the sunset the previous day, Mon., March 29). Thus Jesus and His apostles are represented as setting out for Jerusalem and the Passover on the latest possible date for the Passover to begin. They arrived at Bethany on April 2, three days later. By this time the ceremonies of the Passover Feast and the first-fruits of the Barley harvest "waved" before the Lord would have been completed. True, the Feast of Unleavened Bread would go on for another three or four days, but it seems strange that they would deliberately be so late in arriving.

#8. The intricacies of Jesus' crucifixion and the Day of the Passover I am not competent to appraise. In fact, I was not aware that there was any difference in the Gospel of John and in the Synoptics, but I am glad that you are inclined to agree with the Urantia Book.

Sadler did not respond to item (8) by Adams. He is responding to the following paragraph, which should have been numbered (9) by Adams.

The Hastings Bible Dictionary went through several editions and abridged publications. The 1903 edition was titled "A Dictionary of the Bible." A 1926 abridged edition carried the same title. A somewhat different edition in 1906 concentrating on the New Testament was titled "A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels." In a previous chapter I cited a *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, 1918. (All published by Charles Scribner's Sons.)

The Table published by Hastings is as follows:

Year AD	Week Day of Passover	Fourteenth Day (Passover)	
		Astronomical new moon	First appearance at sunset
28	Tuesday	28 March 2 AM	(29) 30 March
29	Monday	15 April 8 PM	(17) 18 April
30	Friday	4 April 8 PM	(6) 7 April
31	Tuesday	25 March 1 AM	(26) 27 March
32	Tuesday*	11 April 11 PM	(13) 14 April
33	Saturday*	1 April 1 PM	(2) 3 April or (3) 4 April

\* According to my calendar calculations these two days are off by one day. They should be Monday and Friday, respectively.

First visible appearance of the new moon at sunset is understood to be about 30 degrees from the astronomical value, hence two or three days later than the astronomical new moon. (360 degrees divided by 30 days is equal to about 12 degrees a day.)

The parenthetical values in the last column represent the Passover evening.

According to these calculations the Passover celebration in 28 AD occurred on Tuesday, the 30<sup>th</sup> of March.

Chris Lingle, an expert in calendrics, calculated the New Moon Crescent for the years 26 AD to 34 AD and published them on his Internet web site. These were derived from computer software on a MacIntosh Platform, using the Voyager II Moon Phase Ephemeris.

See <http://www.nazarene.net/Calander/passovr.html>.

His values were as follows:

We can see that the values calculated late in the nineteenth century (Hastings)

Year	New Moon Crescent	14 <sup>th</sup> Day (Passover)
26	Friday, March 8 or Saturday <sup>(1)</sup> , April 7	March 22 or April 21
27	Thursday, March 27	April 10
28	Tuesday, March 16 or Wednesday, April 14	March 30 or April 28
29	Sunday, April 3	April 17
30	Thursday, March 23	April 6
31	Monday <sup>(2)</sup> , March 13 or Wednesday, April 11	March 27 or April 25
32	Sunday, March 30	April 13
33	Friday, March 20 or Saturday, April 18	April 3
34	Wednesday, March 10 or Thursday April 8	March 24 or April 22

(1) In the year 26 AD my calendar calculations show April 7 as a Sunday.

(2) In the year 31 AD my calendar calculations show March 13 as a Tuesday.

agree with those calculated from recent position measurements by our space probes, except where observation of the New Moon Crescent may be off by one day. According to the calculations by Lingle the years AD 29, 30, and 32 were short by one day from the days given by Hastings.

This is crucial, for it determines the date of the Crucifixion in AD 30. See following Chapter.

The troublesome paragraph for AD 28 runs as follows:

P.1648 - p3 "Early on the morning of Tuesday, March 30, Jesus and the apostolic party started on their journey to Jerusalem for the Passover, going by the route of the Jordan valley. They arrived on the afternoon of Friday, April 2, and established their headquarters, as usual, at Bethany. Passing through Jericho, they paused to rest while Judas made a deposit of some of their common funds in the bank of a friend of his family. This was the first time Judas had carried a surplus of money, and this deposit was left undisturbed until they passed through Jericho again when on that last and eventful journey to Jerusalem just before the trial and death of Jesus."

Clearly, if Jesus left Capernaum on March 30 he could not be in Jerusalem for the Passover.

Thus they were four days late for the Passover celebration.

The two following paragraphs state thus:

P.1648 - p4 "The party had an uneventful trip to Jerusalem, but they had hardly got themselves settled at Bethany when from near and far those seeking healing for their bodies, comfort for troubled minds, and salvation for their souls, began to congregate, so much so that Jesus had little time for rest. Therefore they pitched tents at Gethsemane, and the Master would go back and forth from Bethany to Gethsemane to avoid the crowds which so constantly thronged him. The apostolic party spent almost three weeks at Jerusalem, but Jesus enjoined them to do no public preaching, only private teaching and personal work."

P.1648 - p5 "At Bethany they quietly celebrated the Passover. And this was the first time that Jesus and all of the twelve partook of the bloodless Passover feast. The apostles of John did not eat the Passover with Jesus and his apostles; they celebrated the feast with Abner and many of the early believers in John's preaching. This was the second Passover Jesus had observed with his apostles in Jerusalem."

If they celebrated the Passover in Bethany it was not necessary for them to be in Jerusalem but it is highly doubtful that devout Jews would depart that late for the most holy of Jewish festivals.

Hence, we must conclude that the date given for the departure from Capernaum is not valid.