

Prof. M.L.Andreasen,
Theological Seminary,
Takoma Park, Washington, D.C.

My dear Professor:

Your letter from Boulder came along all right. Your interest in the date of the Crucifixion greatly interests me. Sr. White says that "every fact connected with it should be verified beyond a doubt." Desire of Ages, p. 571. I stopped drawing for an hour or two to write two or three letters on this point of the proper day of the week to begin the Christian era. I wish to get some testimony on this besides my own reckoning and that of Hales and Bliss. Enclosed is a letter which I am sending to Dr. Jones in London, and also to Arthur M. Harding, professor of Mathematics in the University of Arkansas. It is almost necessary to get a statement from our Naval Observatory on this point. Draper has written me that "I am right so far as I have gone," but ends up by saying that my argument neglects the fact that the Gregorian calendar was first adopted without all the refined calculations that we are now able to make. This is because since 1750 [^]man has known the true length of the solar year.

Instead of writing Draper again on this point perhaps you would care to interview James Robertson, head of the Naval Observatory, on this question. Or you might write him, asking him as follows:

Do you consider that Julian day number 1721424,
or Jan.1, 1 A.D., is correctly designated as Satur-
day on the basis of true Solar time?

I do not know that there would be any harm in sending Robertson a copy of the same letter that I am sending Dr. Jones. It might influence him to give the matter more attention himself instead of turning it over to Draper or someone else. As soon as we can settle this point of the proper week day according to solar time on which to begin the Christian era, I will make out for you a simple outline for determining the time of the Crucifixion through the eclipses on record for the years 31, 32, and 33. We can also include the year 30, and this will take care of the years that are most commonly designated as the date to be used.

The material I have on hand I plan to put in shape for this coming Easter for some Eastern magazine.

I have not copied the quotations by Sr. White as yet. If you are in a hurry, Bro Wilcox will let you take his set. He offered to turn them over to anyone I might name.

Please let me thank you for your encouraging words. I have hesitated for many years to offer any of this material for fear of criticism. "New light," they always cry out, condemning anyone who dares to think out loud. But, someway, I am not so much afraid as in the past. The truth seems so beautiful and so refreshing that it is hard to hold it back. I will close by asking one question: Why was a purple cloth put over the altar of sacrifice when moved? All the rest of the furniture of the sanctuary was covered with blue cloth. What does this mean? I am not sure about this.

Thanking you again for your encouragement,

I am yours sincerely,

UNION COLLEGE
LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

M. L. ANDREASEN, PRESIDENT

October 6, 1937

Miss Grace Amadon
Box 45-K, Route 2
St. Joseph, Michigan

Dear Miss Amadon:

I thank you for your letter of October 4 with reference to my being in Battle Creek.

It is my intention to be there for the time of the Council, but I doubt seriously that it will continue until Wednesday or Thursday, October 27 and 28. It may do so, but it generally stops a few days before. About all I can promise is that I will be in Battle Creek until the close of the Council, and shall be glad to see you any time you may be there. I suppose that I shall stay at the Sanitarium and that by consulting the register you can find me.

Lest you be disappointed, let me say that I know very little about chronology. I have at several times attempted to find solutions to some problems, but have had to give up every time, because of lack of authorities or perhaps conflicting authorities.

Professor McCumber showed me some of your work, which was very neatly done and apparently had caused much effort. However, I felt that you took for granted the very things to be proved. It is not very clear in my mind, however, so I had better not speak authoritatively.

I shall be glad to talk with you, but it must be with a certain amount of prejudice in my mind against the possibility of finding any solution to some chronological controversies that are now current. However, I shall be glad to speak with you.

Sincerely yours,

M. L. Andreasen

M. L. Andreasen

MLA:O

Dear Brother Andreasen:

The question has been put to me as to your exact meaning in your "Sanctuary Service," p. 205, with regard to the passover date. Enclosed is an answer which I have written to a brother in Michigan, although I am not quite sure as to your meaning. If you count crucifixion Friday as the Jewish "fourteenth," then your statement does not affect the chronology, even though you do not agree with "Great Controversy," p. 399, and with Philo's "Special Laws," par. 149, Loeb Series.

However, if with Edersheim and some of our teachers too, you count crucifixion Friday as the fifteenth of Nisan, and Thursday as the fourteenth, in the afternoon of which Edersheim reckons that the typical passover was slain, then how would one answer the Jewish contention that Jesus did not fulfil the type because He was not sacrificed on the same date!

My answer to the assumption that crucifixion Friday was the Jewish "fifteenth" is threefold:

1. If so, then the sacrifice of the great Antitype did not fulfil the type because the date of sacrifice was different.
2. If Thursday of passion week in 31 A.D. was the Jewish "14th," or Friday in 30 A.D., as many conclude, then this 14th coincided with the day of full moon in each case. But such a coincidence does not agree with the position of the Nisan new moon in either year, for it would thereby represent the new moon as appearing before she could possibly be seen, because at so great distance from the earth.
3. And thirdly, two first century witnesses--Philo's "Special Laws," and the "Commentary on the Pentateuch" by Aristobulus teach that both the paschal sacrifice and the national passover supper occurred on one and the same day--the 14th of Nisan.

The origin of the teaching that crucifixion Friday was the fifteenth of Nisan--the feast day of unleavened bread--seems to have arisen in the time of Claudius Apollinaris, whose statement about it is in the "Chronicon Paschale:"

"There are then some who through ignorance raise disputes about these things . . . and say that on the fourteenth day the Lord ate the lamb with the disciples, and that on the great day of the feast of unleavened bread He Himself suffered; and they quote Matthew as speaking in accordance with their view. Wherefore their opinion is contrary to the law, and the Gospels seem to be at variance with them."--Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. VIII, p. 772.

I thought that you would be glad to have this excerpt from Apollinaris. But may be you already have it!

Yours very sincerely,

November 23, 1943.
4 Crescent Place,
Takoma Park, Md.

J. L. MCELHANEY, PRESIDENT

W. E. NELSON, TREASURER

E. D. DICK, SECRETARY

VICE-PRESIDENTS

W. H. BRANSON, GENERAL
L. H. CHRISTIAN, GENERAL
J. F. WRIGHT, GENERAL
W. G. TURNER, NORTH AMERICA

W. H. WILLIAMS, UNDERTREASURER
H. H. COBBAN, ASSISTANT TREASURER

A. W. CORMACK, ASSOCIATE SECRETARY
H. T. ELLIOTT, ASSOCIATE SECRETARY
T. J. MICHAEL, ASSOCIATE SECRETARY
ROGER ALTMAN, OFFICE SECRETARY

GENERAL CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

TAKOMA PARK, WASHINGTON, D. C.

GENERAL FIELD SECRETARIES

M. L. ANDREASEN
F. C. GILBERT
FREDERICK GRIGGS
MEADE MACGUIRE
G. W. SCHUBERT

February 6, 1943

CABLE ADDRESS
"ADVENTIST" WASHINGTON
TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS
"GENERAL CONFERENCE"
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Miss Grace Amadon
4 Crescent Pl.
Takoma Park, Md.

Dear Miss Amadon:

I do not believe that your interpretation of John 18:28 will hold for the following reasons:

1. The evident and natural meaning of "eat the passover", would refer to the paschal lamb.

2. There is serious doubt that the sin-offering at the passover was eaten. It might have been, but probably not. A sin-offering for individuals was eaten. A sin-offering for the congregation might or might not, depending upon circumstances. In Lev. 10 it was eaten; in Lev. 16 it was not eaten. In Lev. 4 it was not eaten. The burden of proof would rest upon the one who holds that it was eaten in the passover feast.

If the priests did eat the passover sin-offering, this would be the situation.

3. There were thousands of priests in Jerusalem and only one goat to be eaten. It would be passing strange if the particular priests who were to eat the goat were in the crowd that night. Priests that officiated in the temple spent the previous night within its precincts. There could be no officiating priests in the crowd that night.

5. The pronoun "they" has no antecedent that could possibly mean "priests". "They" refers to the crowd. If there were priests in that crowd, they could not have been officiating priests who only ate the sacrifice. In any event, "priests" are not once mentioned in the chapter. When you therefore state: "it may have been the sin-offering which the priests in John 18:28 had in mind to eat" it would appear that this could not be the case. Cf. Luke 18:35

Grace Amadon

-2-

2/6/43

6. One more consideration, not bearing directly on your point. If the Jews had observed already the eating of the passover that same evening--that is, eaten it when Christ did--then we have this not easily explainable fact, that while they all should be home waiting for the fatal midnight hour with the blood sprinkled on the door-post, they were all chasing around all night, high priests, priests, people. This needs consideration also.

I appreciate the ingenuousness of your suggestion, but doubt it will hold.

Sincerely,

M. L. Anderson

MLA-r



The Andrews University Center for Adventist Research is happy to make this item available for your private scholarly use. We trust this will help to deepen your understanding of the topic.

Warning Concerning Copyright Restrictions

This document may be protected by one or more United States or other nation's copyright laws. The copyright law of the United States allows, under certain conditions, for libraries and archives to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction to scholars for their private use. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. This document's presence in digital format does not mean you have permission to publish, duplicate, or circulate it in any additional way. Any further use, beyond your own private scholarly use, is your responsibility, and must be in conformity to applicable laws. If you wish to reproduce or publish this document you will need to determine the copyright holder (usually the author or publisher, if any) and seek authorization from them. The Center for Adventist Research provides this document for your private scholarly use only.

The Center for Adventist Research

James White Library
Andrews University
4190 Administration Drive
Berrien Springs, MI 49104-1440 USA
+001 269 471 3209
www.andrews.edu/library/car
car@andrews.edu

Disclaimer on Physical Condition

By their very nature many older books and other text materials may not reproduce well for any number of reasons. These may include

- the binding being too tight thus impacting how well the text in the center of the page may be read,
- the text may not be totally straight,
- the printing may not be as sharp and crisp as we are used to today,
- the margins of pages may be less consistent and smaller than typical today.

This book or other text material may be subject to these or other limitations. We are sorry if the digitized result is less than excellent. We are doing the best we can, and trust you will still be able to read the text enough to aid your research. Note that the digitized items are rendered in black and white to reduce the file size. If you would like to see the full color/grayscale images, please contact the Center.

Disclaimer on Document Items

The views expressed in any term paper(s) in this file may or may not accurately use sources or contain sound scholarship. Furthermore, the views may or may not reflect the matured view of the author(s).