

Elder L.E. Froom  
Office of The Ministry  
General Conference  
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Elder Froom:

Your student inquiry from Emmanuel Missionary College concerning a certain Philonic passover statement I am much interested in. I have been hoping that questions would be returned regarding this particular citation, thus opening the way for deeper research into the crucifixion problem than is consistent for discussion in The Ministry. All of Philo's feast descriptions should be studied in order to understand even one of his statements about the passover, and especially should they be studied in the original Greek. In the following series of references I am translating from the critical text which Colson has used. The series will assist in cataloging the "myriads of victims" mentioned in the letter sent you.

1. Incense at sunrise and sunset. Special Laws VII, p. 197.
2. Every day two lambs--one at dawn, the other in the evening. Special Laws VII, p. 195.
3. Passover for the unclean--on the 14th in the second month, celebration the same as in the first month. Special Laws VI, p. 565.
4. First month and fourteenth day were clearly appointed for the rite. Special Laws VI, p. 563.
5. The day for the national festivity--it is the 14th of the month. Special Laws VII, p. 397.
6. In this month, near, or about, the fourteenth day, when the disk of the moon is becoming full, is kept the crossing, a public feast, the Hebrew pasch. Special Laws VI, p. 561.
7. Peace-offering (preservation-offering). Special Laws VII, p. 227.
8. In which [pascha] all the people en masse sacrifice many myriads of sacrifices from noon until evening. Special Laws VII, p. 395. Cf. p. 627.

First compare Nos. 8 and 6. No. 6 plainly implies that the pascha was kept near the beginning of the 14th day. No. 5 also agrees with this, for it would be impossible to have both sacrifice and banquet on the same day except at the sunset beginning, the same as has always been observed by Karaites, Samaritans, and Falashas. Then what does No. 8 mean? It appears to imply that those "myriads of victims" were not paschal lambs, but instead, burnt offerings and passover peace-offerings, as in 2 Chron. 30:16, 22 and 35:7, 8, 11. The following citations from Maimonides, Lightfoot, and Edersheim confirm this conclusion:

"On the fourteenth day of the first month, when the paschal sacrifice was offered, peace-offerings were made at the same time: and these indeed in the same manner as all the peace-offerings of the herd and the rest of the flock, large and small, male and female: this obviously is that which is commonly called the festal offering of the fourteenth day, for in this manner the divine law regards it, 'Therefore slay the passover to the Lord thy God--of the sheep, goats and beeves. . .'"--Moses Maimonides, Tractatus Primus de Sacrificio Paschali, cap. dec. XII. Tr. into Latin by Compiègne de Veil. London, 1683. Eng. tr. by G.A.

"The peace-offerings for the solemnity of the time were called the Hagigah, and they were to be of some beast, bullocke or sheep. Hereupon in 2 Chron. 30:24 and 35:7, 8, there is mention of Bullocks and Oxen for the Passeover; and in Deut. 16:2, there is speech of sacrificing the Passeover of the heard; which cannot be understood of the Passover that was to be eaten on the fourteenth day at even, for that was punctually and determinately appointed to be of Lambs and Kids, Ex. 12:5; but it is to be construed of these peace-offerings which were for the solemnity of the time. And this is that which Evangelist John calleth the Passeover, when he saith, 'The Jews went not into Pilate's judgement Hall, lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passeover,' John 18:28. For they had eaten the Paschall Lamb the night before.'"—John Lightfoot, The Temple Service as it Stood in the Dayes of our Saviour, London, 1650, 162.

From Edersheim we have the same interpretation as the foregoing with reference to to John 18:28 and its implied peace-offering. He adds that a second Chagigah was offered on the day of the feast of unleavened bread, and that this was the offering which the Jews were afraid that they might be unable to eat if they contracted defilement. (Cf. Albert Edersheim, The Temple, 218, 219. Hodder and Stoughton, New York.) From the Talmud we learn that the Chagigah of a high holiday such as the "first day of the Passover," was compulsory, while that of the fourteenth was not. (Cf. A.W. Streane, Translation of the Treatise Chagigah, Cambridge, 1891, 36.)

In 2 Chronicles 35, the terms "passover" and also "passover offerings" are employed. In verse 11, "they killed the passover, and the priests sprinkled the blood." Here the word passover appears to signify peace-offering, for the blood of the victim was sprinkled in the court, while that of the paschal lamb was not. In verse 14, the priests "were busied in offering of burnt offerings and the fat [the peace-offering] until night." This verse seems to represent what Philo describes.

Please ask your correspondent to write again if I have not made the answer plain.

Yours sincerely always,

February 22, 1944  
4 Crescent Place  
Takoma Park, Md.



My Dear Elder Froom:

We have Elder Thiele's letters showing that he agrees with the Friday crucifixion as the Jewish fourteenth of the first month. This is the Jewish date upon which the whole crucifixion calendation is based, and it is the date which we have followed for five or more years. The Spirit of prophecy is also in complete harmony with this date, and it is for this reason that the Spirit-of-prophecy citations have been repeatedly given in The Ministry.

The new theory of Elder Thiele that the Jews of the crucifixion period had changed their calendar, such as pertained to the time of Moses, and were slaying their paschal lambs in the afternoon of the fourteenth instead of the sunset beginning of that date, has nothing whatever to do with the crucifixion calendar argument. The time of day upon which the passover lamb was slain--whether at the beginning or afternoon of the fourteenth--does not in anyway affect the calendar date. I have written this to him several times and we have published the same conclusion in The Ministry. It is a point well worth remembering by students of chronology.

On the contrary, both Philo and Josephus definitely state that the paschal sacrifice and supper were observed on one and the same day. Sister White says the same. The Philonic citation recently sent by both Elder Thiele and one of his students does not say that the "myriads of animals" which were sacrificed on the day of the pasch--from noon to evening-- and were all passover lambs. The passover peace offering was also sacrificed on the fourteenth day and burnt offerings also. Philo, Josephus, and Maimonides fully describe these sacrifices, and state just when they occurred.

Elder Thiele's theory is different from any yet proposed. I have had many letters from him, and have given him my candid conclusions. I am indeed gratified to know that he and his class are interested in this phase of chronology.

Yours very sincerely always,

Grace Amadon

February 23, 1944  
4 Crescent Place  
Takoma Park, Md.



Elder L.E. Froom  
Office of The Ministry  
General Conference  
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Elder Froom:

Your student inquiry from Emmanuel Missionary College concerning a certain Philonic passover statement I am much interested in (No. 9 in series below). I have been hoping that questions would be returned with respect to this particular citation, thereby opening the way for deeper research into the crucifixion problem. All of Philo's feast descriptions should be studied in order to understand even one of his passover statements, and especially should they be studied in the original Greek. In the accompanying series of references I am translating from the critical text which Colson has used in the Loeb Classics. The series will assist in cataloging the "myriads of victims" mentioned in the letter sent you.

1. Incense at sunrise and sunset.--Special Laws VII, p. 197.
2. Every day two lambs--one at dawn, the other in the evening.--Special Laws VII, p. 195.
3. Passover for the levitically unclean--on the 14th in the second month, celebration the same as in the first month.--Special Laws VI, p. 565.
4. First month and fourteenth day were clearly appointed for the rite.--Special Laws VI, p. 563.
5. The day for the national festivity--it is the 14th of the month.--Special Laws VII, p. 397.
6. In this month, near the fourteenth day, when the disk of the moon is likely to be full, the crossing is kept, a public feast, the Hebrew pasch.--Special Laws VI, p. 561.
7. Because on that day [the spring festival] the sun and moon appear opposite to one another in continuous rays, with no darkness between.--Special Laws VII, p. 439. (This phenomenon of the full moon rising at sunset necessarily occurred at the beginning of the ancient Jewish 14th, for at the end of the day, the moon rose toward 50 minutes after sunset.)
8. Peace-offering (preservation-offering).--Special Laws VII, p. 227. Called also praise or thank offering (VII, p. 231).
9. In which [pascha] the whole body of people, old and young, sacrifice many myriads of sacrifices from noon until evening.--Special Laws VII, p. 395. Cf. also p. 627.

First compare No. 9 with No. 6, which latter plainly implies that the pascha was celebrated near the beginning of the 14th day; for in countries around the Mediterranean, the moon commonly comes to the full sometime on the ancient Jewish 13th--not the modern--and rose full at sunset at the end of the day, as is also implied in No. 7. Nos. 6 and 7 are therefore good statements, and show that Philo understood the relation of the passover to the full moon. No. 5 too agrees with 6 and 7, for it would be impossible to have both sacrifice and "banquet" on one and the same day except at the sunset beginning, as has been celebrated by Karaites, Samaritans and Falashas from very early times.

Then what does No. 9 mean? The accompanying references from Maimonides, Lightfoot, and Edersheim are confirmatory of the conclusion that Philo's myriads of victims were not paschal lambs, but instead, burnt offerings and peace-offerings, occurring in connection with the paschal ceremonies, as in 2 Chron. 30: 16,22 and 35:7,8,11.



"On the fourteenth day of the first month, when the paschal sacrifice was offered, peace-offerings were being made at the same time: and these indeed in the same manner as all the peace-offerings of the herd and the rest of the flock, large and small, male and female: this obviously is that which is commonly called the festal offering of the fourteenth day, for in this manner the divine law regards it, 'Therefore slay the passover to the Lord thy God--of the sheep, goats and beeves beeves . . .'"--Moses Maimonides, Tractatus Primus de Sacrificio Paschali, cap. dec. XII. Tr. into Latin by Compiegne de Veil. London, 1683. (Eng. trans. by G.A.)

"The peace-offerings for the solemnity of the time were called the Hagigah, and they were to be of some beast, bullocke, or sheep. Hereupon in 2 Chron. 30:24 and 35:7,8, there is mention of Bullocks and Oxen for the Passeover; and in Deut. 16:2, there is speech of sacrificing the Passeover of the heard; which cannot be understood of the Passeover that was to be eaten on the fourteenth day at even, for that was punctually and determinately appointed to be of Lambs and Kids, Ex. 12:5; but it is to be construed of these peace-offerings which were for the solemnity of the time. This is that which Evangelist John calleth the Passeover, when he saith, 'The Jews went not into Pilate's judgement Hall, lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passeover,' John 18:28. For they had eaten the Paschall Lamb the night before.'"--John Lightfoot, The Temple Service as it Stood in the Dayes of Our Saviour, London, 1650, 162.

From Edersheim we have a similar interpretation to the foregoing with reference to John 18:28 and its implied peace-offering. He adds that a second Chagigah was offered on the day of the feast of unleavened bread, and that this was the offering which the Jews were afraid that they might be unable to eat if they contracted defilement. (Cf. The Temple, 218,219. Hodder and Stoughton, New York.) From the Talmud we learn that the Chagigah of a high holiday such as the "first day of the Passover"--not the ancient 14th, which the modern Jew has dropped from his calendar, but his substitute 15th--was compulsory, and hence could not be taken from the tithe, but demanded special payment; while the Chagigah of the 14th day was not compulsory. (Cf. A.W. Streane, Translation of the Treatise Chagigah, Cambridge, 1891, 36.)

In 2 Chronicles 35, the terms "passover" and "passover offerings" are employed. In verse 11, "they killed the passover, and the priests sprinkled the blood." Here the word passover appears to signify peace-offering, for the blood of this victim was sprinkled in the court, while that of the paschal lamb was not. In verse 14, the priests "were busied in offering of burnt offerings and the fat [obviously that of the peace-offering] until night." This verse seems to correspond to what Philo describes in Special Laws VII, p. 395. Moreover, in a sentence or two after the citation, Philo particularly stresses the fact that the paschal festival is not only a memorial--the paschal lamb--but that it is also a thank-offering--a peace-offering (χαριστήριον). This Maimonides catalogs as the "festal offering of the fourteenth day,"<sup>^</sup> Thus the significance of the word passover is magnified by Jewish authorities, and it is also one's privilege thereby to enlarge the understanding of these festal terms.

and with  
Christianity  
the word eu-  
charist ap-  
peared.

Yours sincerely always,

February 24, 1944  
4 Crescent Place  
Takoma Park, Md.



Elder L.E. Froom  
Office of The Ministry  
General Conference  
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Elder Froom:

Naturally I am interested in student Day's reply to the question of current witness in the time of Christ. Some of his arguments, however, are based upon error, and his general analysis of the problem is not clear. I will answer the three major features of his inquiry, and these I have numbered according to the pages of his letter. If he cares to send 30 cents in stamps to the Educational Department, the secretary will send him a couple of reprints that further outline the subject.

1--pp. 1-4. Special Laws VII, 436, 438, sec. 210. This long sentence draws a conclusion that is based upon both Tabernacles and Passover, but primarily upon Passover, as the verb ἐπανατέλλω shows. I will translate:

"Again, the beginning of this feast [Tabernacles] comes on the fifteenth of the month, for the reason also mentioned in the time of the spring [Passover], that the world may be full of nature's all beautiful light not only by day but also by night, because of the up-on-and-up appearance of sun and moon to each other in unseparated rays on that day, which no borderland darkness divides."

The foregoing is Philo's significant way of saying that the full moon rises at sunset on the day of the passover. Around the eastern Mediterranean this phenomenon commonly occurred at the sunset beginning of the Jewish fourteenth, and was coincident with the evening paschal ceremony. On the following evening, the moon was about fifty minutes late in rising, and this rate of retardation was continued from night to night. In the season of Tabernacles, this phenomenon occurred, about half the time, at the sunset beginning of the fifteenth, but in other years, one or two days earlier. Inasmuch as the moon of Tabernacles is either the "Harvest moon" or the "Hunter's moon," the retardation of the rising full moon in that season was only a few minutes. Consequently, if the moon full two days before Tabernacles, she would rise about full not long after sunset at the beginning of that feast day. However, Tabernacles did not start with a sunset ceremony as did Passover, and the great hanging lamps in the temple lit up the whole city when the moon was fully on the wane.

The moon seldom fulls on the fifteenth of Tishri in Syria. When Philo speaks of a full moon, he at times means one that is necessarily "full." For the significance of the double-prepositioned verb in the foregoing sentence, cf. A. T. Robertson, Greek Grammar of the New Testament, p. 565, (j). This Philonic citation is one of his most interesting passages as regards the passover. It is also important with reference to Tabernacles, since he implies that Tabernacles came on the fifteenth for the same reason that the spring festival came on its day, <sup>the fourteenth</sup> namely, that they might be lighted by the full moon. But the astronomical conditions were different in each case. The Babylonian inscriptions repeatedly refer to the rising full moon at sunset when they say, "The god was seen with the god." But Philo could not employ such language.



2--p.4. Day's argument on page 4 falls down because the Greek word for passover--πάσχα--is a neuter noun, not feminine, as he claims, and it is not therefore the antecedent of ἐν ἡ. The true antecedent is ἑορτή which is Philo's general term for the feast he is describing, and which Dr. Colson amplifies into "festival." Inasmuch as (1) no date is given for these "myriads" of sacrifices, and (2) seeing that peace-offerings were commonly offered and prepared to be eaten with the paschal supper as Maimonides implies and Edersheim says, Temple, p. 218, and (3) inasmuch as the limiting phrase "honored with the dignity of the priesthood for that day" must refer to those who presided at the fraternity sacrifice on the evening ineunte of the fourteenth, the conclusion is consistent that the "myriads of victims" were afternoon sacrifices preparatory for the eventide paschal ceremony, <sup>beginning the fourteenth.</sup> These included burnt offerings and purification offerings, referred to in John 11:55, and in Acts 21: 24-26, <sup>and</sup> peace-offerings, and at the end of the day, paschal offerings.

3--p. 5. The last paragraph on this page is to be challenged. Day attempts to streamline Philo's Greek text in Special Laws VII, p. 396, and to rearrange the order of the sentence and its chronology. I will translate what Philo says:

"The day of this national feast [ πανδήμου ἑνωχίας ] certainly deserves to be noted; for it is the fourteenth of the month . . ."

There can be no question but that Philo is here timing the "banquet." The word ἑνωχίας means just that. No student of Philo has the right to turn this sentence around, saying, "It is the fourteenth of the month up to this point," and insisting that the banquet is yet to come, when the text plainly says, "The day of the national banquet is the fourteenth."

It is a law of investigation of any kind that conclusions based upon error are erroneous. Brother Day is obviously interested in this subject, and he is to be commended for trying; but it is important that he clarify his argument, if simply for the sake of carrying out a consistent piece of research. On the contrary, his conclusion that the Jews in the crucifixion period kept their national feast of the passover at the beginning of the Jewish fifteenth has no bearing at all upon the crucifixion calendar, or upon the S.D.A. sanctuary teaching. The ancient Jewish calendar was based upon the Jewish sunset to sunset <sup>pass over</sup> date. So long as the paschal sacrifice occurred within these limits, no matter what hour it occurred, it did not change the calendar reckoning in any way.

If Brother Day has further questions relating to crucifixion chronology, or to prophetic reckoning, I shall be glad to answer them, but I do not care to continue an argument that has no value to the ancient calendar.

Thanks for sending the letter. With these explanations he ought to be able to straighten out his argument.

Yours very sincerely,

Grace Amador

March 25, 1944  
4 Crescent Place  
Takoma Park, Md.

Elder L.E. Froom,  
Office of The Ministry,  
General Conference,  
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Elder Froom:

The letter from your student enquirer Kenneth Davis is interesting. It is short and to the point, and his three questions we shall answer as follows:

1. The significance of ben ha-arbayim is fully discussed by Chwolson in Das letzte Passamahl Christi, pp. 37, 159. Read also Jewish Quarterly Review, 1893, July, pp. 684, 687 (Vol. V). Chwolson is an important Talmudic scholar, yet he insists that in the first century ben ha-arbayim coincided with the evening twilight, and not with the whole afternoon. Gesenius also takes the same view in his Thesaurus, p. 1065, col. a. Deut. 16:6 has the paschal lamb slain at sundown. See Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon under shamash.

2. With regard to John 18:28, I will send your correspondent a reprint study of this text as soon as the April numbers are out.

3. Desire of Ages p. 774, second paragraph. The meaning here of the word "Passover" depends upon how it had been observed for centuries. The Old Testament answers this question--cf. April Ministry, ref. 4. The lamb was slain in ben ha-arbayim--in the evening twilight near sunset--and eaten in that night (Exodus 12:6), the entering night of the Jewish fourteenth. The passover for the unclean was both slain and eaten on the fourteenth (Numbers 9:11)--"according to all the ordinances of the passover" it was kept.

Now, to insist that the word "passover" in Desire of Ages, p. 774, corresponds to the regular national passover supper--one that was observed after Jesus was buried, and after the Jewish fifteenth had begun--not only is to deny at once that this passover"had been observed for centuries," but also would ascribe an erroneous interpretation to the Desire of Ages; for the Old Testament has no passover either slain or eaten on the fifteenth of the passover month! This is an important conclusion, which is really the crux of your student's problem.

May I suggest that your E.M.C. enquirer make a complete list of the instances in the Ellen G. White books where the word "passover" is used, and to each one ascribe a definition that can be proved? On no other basis is it consistent to cite Sister White in support of any passover argument.

Thanks for sending the letter. If I can be of further help, please let me know.

Yours very sincerely,

Grace Amadon

March 25, 1944  
4 Crescent Place  
Takoma Park, Md.



L. E. Froom  
Office of The Ministry  
General Conference  
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Elder Froom:

We always welcome constructive criticism. However, Professor Tippet's recent letter--the first of the type received--represents conclusions drawn without critical investigation, as he himself acknowledges.

The passover studies in The Ministry he apparently regards of sufficient importance to merit criticism, but I do not understand why he should think that unproved assumptions, or bias, would have weight with you, while at the same time they venture the reputation of his own chair! He worries because of the bad reputation that our arguments may acquire at the hands of scholars in the field of exegesis and Jewish history. On the contrary, you are well aware that scholarship has already recognized that our passover thesis is based upon honest research and serious investigation.

The passover truth has appeal. It is new and positive in an almost barren field. The obvious and accepted meanings of the Spirit-of-prophecy writings have supported every advance step we have taken in our collective study during the past five years. This progress, step by step, has also conformed to the principles of computation as practiced in the U. S. Government Almanac Office.

Your correspondent assumes an exact date for the passover statement in Wars VI.IX.3. But this traditional view has long since been disproved by the classic of Daniel Chwolson--a Talmudic scholar of repute. And Professor Tippet's brief summation allows no exact date to Wars II.I. 2,3 and its companion text Ant. XVII.IX.3. I can answer for these texts that we not only know their Jewish date, but also their Julian date, because of the relation of this important passover to the one eclipse in Josephus--and to the birth of Jesus and the death year of Herod. This important fact Whiston has correctly observed; and upon the shoulders of this date the chronological outline of the Christian era rests, and thereby all its lunar and solar tables.

I wrote out a critical analysis and outline of the texts to which this last E.M.C. letter refers. But Professor seems assured of his conclusions, and he may not care to have them disturbed. He will doubtless let you know if he is interested.

Yours sincerely always,

April 7, 1944  
4 Crescent Place  
Takoma Park, Md.



I have given a little thought to your views regarding the ancient national passover, which you maintain was celebrated after the death of Jesus. You have not made it clear to me what bearing this would have upon the crucifixion calendar, or what change would be involved in the calendar which Miss Amadon has constructed. From your several letters I have gathered that you consider that her computations are in error, but you have not pointed out what the errors are. The astronomical phase of the problem is reassuring, and materially aids in establishing the chronological outline of biblical history and prophecy. Astronomy is also proving to be an indisputable check upon arguments in theology; and we are encouraged by having this aid to investigation and biblical research.

It would not be the policy of The Ministry to enter into discussion of questions about which there is open difference of opinion unless they should be contrary to doctrines which have stood the test of centuries. Your views, recently proposed regarding the ancient national passover, are not, it seems to me, in any way related to the sanctuary question. Moreover, your textual interpretation of the Desire of Ages is open to serious question, and I doubt whether Adventist scholarship would accept your conclusions concerning the Spirit-of-prophecy use of the word "passover."

If one bases chronological calculations upon the loose English translations of Philo and Josephus, the conclusions may miss the mark. Both these writers group their descriptions of the ancient sacrifices around early Jewish history, and both repeatedly stress that in their own day the festivals were observed in the same manner as in the days of Moses. These asseverations have weight--far more than conclusions that are not critically linked with the original text. The early testimony of Claudius Apollinaris and other Quartodecimans, the later witness of the Karaites, the mediaeval calendar controversy between the Jews of Jerusalem and Babylon definitely demonstrate that a change in the pentateuchal feast laws could not occur without a polemic battle. And yet shall we speciously introduce such festal change into the first century without disputation, debate, or controversial parallel?

solar calendar of the

You appear to claim that the Book of Jubilees became of primary authority in the first century--as opposed to the school of Hillel I. Do you <sup>understand this to be</sup> mean and in collision with the calendar council for examining the moon witnesses? Recently also you have been insisting that the reformed lunar calendar of the Talmudic period was operative in the first century. Our Committee members here have been giving thought to these assumptions, and I will pass on to you some of their <sup>observations,</sup> discussions, necessarily in brief form.

1. The Book of Jubilees is probably the oldest commentary extant on the books of Genesis and Exodus. It is not connected with first century events, and the assumption would have to be proved whether the solar calendar of Jubilees had any influence upon the Jewish calendar of the first century.

2. The solar calendar of the Book of Jubilees is based upon a 364-day solar year, which the author of Jubilees obviously deduced from Genesis 7 and 8, although the flood calendar is tied to both solar and lunar constants as known to astronomy. The adoption of this form of solar year for the first century could not possibly agree with the barley-harvest lunar cycle, which chronology commonly admits prevailed with the Jews to the end of the Second Temple, and which is in harmony with the biblical dates. A 364-day solar year would mean that the festivals should always occur on the same day of the week. Moreover, the attempt to apply one feature only of the Jubilees' calendar to the first century is as incongruous as would be the application of the whole calendar!

3. That the Book of Jubilees is not an authority

therefore and they would have no relation to the movements of sun, moon, or planets.



3. That the Book of Jubilees is not an authority for the ultimate reform of the ancient Jewish calendar has been pointed out by Sidersky, who sees a controversy over the solar and lunar year in process among the schismatic sects of the Maccabean period--the Ecclesiastic of Jesus, son of Sirah being a defense of the lunar year in answer to the attacks against it by the authors of the Book of Enoch and the Book of Jubilees.

4. The assumption that the principles underlying the reformed Jewish calendar were operative before the fall of the Second Temple, is inconsistent, for neither the dehiyoth, nor the 353-day and the 385-day lunar years of the reformed reckoning agree in any manner with the biblical dates.

5. The argument that the reformed Jewish calendar agrees with the calendar of Josephus is denied by Josephus himself, who repeatedly and emphatically states that festal observance in his own day was the same as in the period of Moses. As to the meaning of Wars VI.IX.3, Josephus not only states that he intended to rewrite Wars, but in Ant. III.X.1 and XIV.IV.3, he modified his assertion about sacrifices from the "ninth to the eleventh hour," which obviously refer to the "evening sacrifices," and not to the passover fraternity supper.

6. Josephus makes no mention at all of any change in the Mosaic laws, or of any controversy over feast observance. In fact he stresses the very opposite:

"And how firmly we have given credit to these books of our nation, is evident by what we do: for during so many ages as have already passed, no one hath been so bold as either to add anything to them, or to take any thing from them, or to make any change in them. . ."--Against Apion, I.8.

7. As to the period of Jewish reform of the ancient lunar calendar, Sidersky has <sup>pointed out</sup> demonstrated that the correction of the calculated conjunction which started the Jewish year would necessarily have to be checked with a solar eclipse occurring at the beginning of Nisan. He has shown that in the period from 10 B.C. to 550 A.D. only one solar eclipse occurred in Nisan that could have been seen in Western Asia, namely, that of April 2, 219 A.D. Ginzell also confirms this fact. In this same year the Jewish Academy at Sura was established, with 1200 students in attendance. At Nahardea Mar-Samuel was working on calendar reform. Both Ginzell and Oppolzer record this eclipse. Jewish chronology does not insist upon any calendar reform before this date.

8. As to the date of the Book of Jubilees, scholarship is divided. In any event, both Charles and Jellinek agree with respect to the following conclusion:

"Jubilees was written when the essential character of the Jewish calendar was not definitely fixed."--R.H. Charles, The Book of Jubilees, Introduction, p. xxiii. 1902.

The biblical and historical synchronisms prove that the ancient Jewish calendar was definitely fixed in the period of the crucifixion, and ~~that~~ as late as 31 A.D. the excavations at Dura-Europus prove that traditional intercalation was still in force.

If you care to have the citations upon which the foregoing conclusions are based, please let me know and I will send them.



I have given a little thought to your views regarding the ancient national passover, which you maintain was celebrated after the death of Jesus. You have not made it clear to me what bearing this would have upon the crucifixion calendar, or what change would thereby be involved in the calendar which Miss Amadon has constructed. From your several letters I have gathered that you consider that her computations are in error. ~~Nevertheless~~<sup>But</sup> you have not pointed out what the errors are. The astronomical phase of the problem is reassuring, and materially aids in establishing the chronological outline of biblical history and prophecy. Astronomy is also proving to be an indisputable check upon arguments in theology; and we are encouraged by having this aid to investigation and biblical research.

It would not be the policy of The Ministry to enter into discussion of questions about which there is open difference of opinion unless they should be diametrically opposed to doctrines which have stood the test of centuries. Your views, recently proposed regarding the national passover, are not, it seems to me, in any way related to the sanctuary question. Moreover, your textual interpretation of the Desire of Ages is open to serious question, and I doubt whether Adventist scholarship would accept your conclusions concerning Ellen G. White's use of the word "passover." You say that you have held this interpretation for twenty years. Is it not a bit late to propose such a theory as essential to the review of the sanctuary question in 1944?

One reason that apocryphal literature was never canonized is doubtless because of its disagreement with <sup>although it</sup> pentateuchal law. Nevertheless, you claim that the Book of Jubilees, ~~which~~ <sup>is</sup> widely different from the festal instruction divinely given to Moses, ~~became of primary authority~~ <sup>became of primary authority</sup> in the first century, ~~maintained to the contrary!~~ But you have not proved your assumption. If the Pharisaic teachings were contrary to Moses, how come that the scribes and Pharisees "sat in Moses' seat" in the time of Christ?

If one bases chronological reckoning upon the loose English translations of Philo and Josephus, the conclusions are bound to miss the mark. Both these writers group their descriptions of the ancient feasts around early Jewish history, and both repeatedly state that in their own day the feasts were observed in the same manner as in the days of Moses. These asseverations would seem to have far more weight than conclusions which are not based upon the original text. As regards the time when the apocryphal books were written, Charles and Schurer, for example, by no means agree. The early testimony of men like Claudius Apollinaris, the later witness of the Karaites, the mediaeval calendar controversy between the Jews of Jerusalem and Babylon, and finally more recent testimony of Jewish scholars, definitely ~~show~~ <sup>prove</sup> that a change in original festal observance could not occur without polemical controversy. And yet you would speciously introduce such festal change into the time of Christ without disputation, debate, or controversial parallel!

<sup>However,</sup> ~~But~~ granted that the Book of Jubilees was written in the second century B.C., there were other commentaries on Jewish law written in the same period that were not only in harmony with the Pentateuch, but lunar astronomy as well, and they have been accepted as Jewish authority ever since. Should we not rather cite such historical documents as authority instead of those which differ so widely from pentateuchal law, and which have <sup>not</sup> ~~never~~ maintained their priority. Even Talmudist chronologers do not cite the Book of Jubilees as authority for the changes in their calendar. And necessarily, for the Talmudists do not commonly admit of a change, but repeatedly insist that their halacha date back to the time of Moses. To this thesis, however, the Karaites and Samaritans ~~are~~ <sup>have been</sup> an opposing challenge.





**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](http://www.andrews.edu/library/car)  
[car@andrews.edu](mailto: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).