


the
PLAIN TRUTH
a magazine of understanding

VOLUME XXIV, NUMBER 3

MARCH, 1959



The TOMB of CHRIST

The Garden Tomb in which Jesus Christ was buried and from which He arose after being three days and three nights in this grave. No remains of the huge stone door which once sealed the tomb now exist. Nearby, to the right, is Golgotha—the Place of the Skull—where Jesus was crucified. Read in this issue the astounding truth that Christ's resurrection was not on Sunday—and that the crucifixion was not on Friday!

The PLAIN TRUTH

a magazine of understanding.

VOL. XXIV

NO. 3

HERBERT W. ARMSTRONG

Publisher and Editor

Herman L. Hoeh

Executive Editor

Roderick C. Meredith

Garner Ted Armstrong

Associate Editors

Sent FREE to all who request it, as the Lord provides. Address all communications to the editor, Box 111, Pasadena, California. Our readers in Britain should address the editor, B.C.M. Ambassador, London W.C. 1.

Copyright February, 1959

By the Radio Church of God

NOTICE: Be sure to notify us immediately of any change in your address. Please in-
clude both old and new addresses. IM-
PORTANT!

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Bible Story Helpful

Response to the "Bible Story Book" has been truly remarkable. Here for our readers are a few brief excerpts from the thousands of letters we have received:

"Dear Mr. Armstrong:

"I think 'The Bible Story' book for children is a good way to start children off on the search for knowledge and understanding of God's book. It has certainly answered my problem, for I did not know how to commence teaching my children."

"Dear Mr. Armstrong:

"It is the only one I've ever read that even a child can understand."

Another writes:

"Thank you so much for 'The Bible Story.' Our 5 year old boy was trying to explain to his Grandmother (who
(Please continue on page 18)

RADIO LOG

"The WORLD TOMORROW"

Herbert W. Armstrong analyzes today's news, with the prophecies of The WORLD TOMORROW!

TO THE U.S. & CANADA

WLAC—Nashville, Tenn.—1510 on dial—7:00 P.M., daily.

WABC—New York—770 on dial—11:30 P.M., Mon. thru Sat.; 9:30 A.M., Sun., E.S.T.

WLS—Chicago—890 on dial—10:30 P.M., Mon. thru Fri.; 1:00 P.M. & 8:30 P.M. Sun.

WWVA—Wheeling, W. Va.—1170 on dial—10:30 A.M.; 11:15 P.M., Sun., E.S.T. 10:00 P.M., Mon. thru Fri.

CKLW—Windsor, Ontario—800 on dial—6:00 P.M. Sundays.

KLZ—Denver, Colo.—560 on dial—10:45 P.M. Sun. thru Fri.; 9:30 A.M., Sat.

XELO—800 on dial, every night, 9:00 P.M. Central Standard time. (8:00 P.M. M.S.T.)

XEG—1050 on dial—every night, 8:30 P.M. Central Std. time.

WCAE—Pittsburgh, Pa.—1250 on dial—6:30 P.M. Sundays.

WPIT—Pittsburgh, Pa.—730 on dial—7:00 A.M., daily.

KOME—Tulsa, Okla.—1300 on dial—6:30 A.M., Mon. thru Sat.; 9:00 P.M., Sunday.

KGBX—Springfield, Mo.—1260 on dial—6:15 A.M. Mon. thru Sat.; 10:30 A.M. Sunday.

KSTL—St. Louis, Mo.—690 on dial—7:00 A.M. Mon. thru Fri.

WEW—St. Louis, Mo.—770 kc.—1 P.M. Sat.; 1:30 P.M. Sun.

WKYB—Paducah, Ky.—570 on dial—12:00 noon, Mon. thru Sat.; 7:00 P.M., Sun.

WKYR—Keyser, W. Va.—1270 on dial—5:30 A.M., daily.

KRBI—St. Peter, Minnesota—1310 on dial—1:00 P.M. Sundays.

HEARD ON PACIFIC COAST

XERB—1090 on dial—7:00 P.M. every night.

KGO—San Francisco—810 on dial—10:00 P.M., daily.

KABC—Los Angeles—790 on dial—10:00 P.M., Sun.; 7:25 P.M., Mon. thru Fri.; 8:00 P.M., Sat.

KRKD—Los Angeles—1150 on dial—7:00 A.M. Mon. thru Fri.; 1:30 P.M., Sundays.

KARM—Fresno—1430 on dial—6:30 P.M. daily.

KBLA—Burbank—1490 on dial—7:30 A.M. & 12:30 P.M. daily.

KPDQ—Portland—800 on dial—8:30 A.M. daily.

KWJJ—Portland—1080 on dial—9:00 P.M., Sun. thru Fri. 10:00 P.M., Saturdays.

KUGN—Eugene—590 on dial—7:00 P.M. Sun. thru Fri.

KVI—Seattle-Tacoma—570, first on dial—10:30 P.M. every night.

TO EUROPE AND NORTH AFRICA

RADIO LUXEMBOURG—208 metres. Mondays and Tuesdays: 23:30 Greenwich time.

RADIO TANGIER INTERNATIONAL—1232 kc. & S. W. Saturdays 16:30 Greenwich time.

TO SOUTH AFRICA

RADIO LOURENCO MARQUES, MOZAMBIQUE 10:00 P.M., Saturdays; 10:30 P.M., Mondays and Tuesdays.

RADIO ELIZABETHVILLE (Belgian Congo)—OQ2AD—7150 k.c., 9:30 P.M. Fridays.

TO ASIA

RADIO GOA—60 metre band, 9:30 P.M. Mondays; 9:00 P.M., Fridays.

RADIO BANGKOK—HSIJS—4878 k.c. Monday thru Friday: 10:35-11:05 P.M.

RADIO TAIWAN (FORMOSA)—840 k.c. 7:00 P.M. Wednesdays and Fridays.

RADIO OKINAWA—KSBK—880 k.c. Sundays: 12:00 noon.

ALTO BROADCASTING SYSTEM—PHILIPPINE ISLANDS 9:00 P.M. Sundays—DZAQ, Manila—630 k.c.; DZRI, Dagupan City—1040 k.c.; DZRB, Naga City—1060 k.c.; DXMC, Davao City—900 k.c.

TO AUSTRALIA

2AY—Albury—Sun., 10:00 P.M.

2CH—Sydney—Sat., 10:15 P.M.

2GF—Grafton—Sun., 9:30 P.M.

2GN—Goulburn—Sun., 10:00 P.M.

3AW—Melbourne—Sun., 10:30 P.M.

3BO—Bendigo—Thurs., 4:15 P.M.

4CA—Cairns—Sun., 10:00 P.M.

4KQ—Brisbane—Sun., 10:30 P.M.

4TO—Townsville—Fri., 10:15 P.M.

4WK—Warwick—Tues., 9:30 P.M.

6BY—Bridgetown—Sun., 10:30 P.M.

6IX—Perth—Sun., 10:00 P.M.

6MD—Merredin—Sun., 10:30 P.M.

6WB—Katanning—Sun., 10:30 P.M.

7HT—Hobart—Wed., 10:25 P.M.

TO SOUTH AMERICA

7:00 P.M., Sundays—

HOC21, Panama City—1115 k.c.

HP5A, Panama City—11170 k.c.

HOK, Colon, Panama—640 k.c.

HP5K, Colon, Panama—6005 k.c.

RADIO AMERICA—Lima, Peru 6:00 P.M. Saturdays—1010 k.c.

The CRUCIFIXION was NOT on FRIDAY!

Easter Sunday does NOT commemorate the resurrection! Christ did NOT die on "Good Friday"! Read here the astounding, irrefutable PROOF that the true date of the crucifixion and the resurrection can be known!

by Herman L. Hoeh

EITHER the "Good Friday-Easter Sunday" tradition is a *fable*—or you have NO Savior! Jesus gave only one sign to prove that He was the Messiah! And that sign was the *length of time He would be dead and buried*.

Notice Jesus' own words concerning the ONLY SIGN that would prove His Messiahship:

"An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas: FOR AS JONAS WAS THREE DAYS AND THREE NIGHTS IN THE [FISH'S] BELLY; SO SHALL THE SON OF MAN BE THREE DAYS AND THREE NIGHTS IN THE HEART OF THE EARTH" (Mat. 12:39-40).

If He did not fulfill that sign, then He was an impostor and you are without a Savior!

Of course theologians and scholars deny that Jesus fulfilled this sign. They say He was in the heart of the earth only one day and two nights—half as long as He thought He would be! And in so doing they deny the ONLY PROOF Jesus gave that He is the Messiah, the Savior of the world.

It Was Prophesied!

Did you know that it was prophesied that people would deny this sign—would deny that Jesus actually is the very Christ?

Turn to the Scripture: "But there were false prophets also among the people [in Old Testament times], even as there shall be false teachers among you [Christians], who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, *even denying the Lord that bought them* . . . and MANY shall follow their pernicious ways" (II Peter 2:1-2).

The MANY are today denying their Savior by believing a tradition that re-

jects the only sign Jesus gave to prove He is the Messiah!

Did you know that it was not until after the death of the last of the twelve apostles—John—that the "Good Friday-Easter Sunday" tradition began to spread through the churches?

How Long Dead and Buried?

Let's examine Jesus' own words, recorded in the gospels, to find out *if He meant what He said* about the sign of Jonas. Did Jesus really expect to be buried in the earth for three days and three nights?

Notice Mark 8:31: "And He began to teach them, that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders, and of the chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and *AFTER THREE DAYS* rise again."

Did you grasp that? Jesus did *not* say "after a day and a half." Jesus said, "*after three days*."

Consider! If Jesus were crucified and buried late on "Good Friday," then one day *after* would be Saturday evening, and two days *after* would be Sunday evening, and three days *after* would be Monday evening. But Jesus rose long before Monday evening. Either Jesus was not crucified on "Good Friday," or He did not fulfill His sign and He is therefore an impostor and not the Messiah!

Did Jesus fulfill His sign? Turn to Matthew 28:6. Here is the testimony of the angel: "He [Jesus] is not here: for He is risen *AS HE SAID*"! Jesus did fulfill His sign, exactly as He said He would. He IS the Savior. Then He could not have been crucified on "Good Friday"!

But this is not all. Turn to John 2:19,21: "Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three

days I will raise it up. . . . But He spake of the temple of His body." If Jesus would have been crucified and buried on Friday evening and been resurrected on Sunday morning, the temple—His body—would have been built in a day and one-half. But Jesus did not say it would occur in a day and one-half. Not even in two and one-half days, but *IN THREE DAYS' TIME*—72 hours. In other words, in exactly three days and three nights, at the precise moment, three 24-hour days after his death and burial. Isn't it plain that Jesus meant exactly what He said?—three days and three nights, not parts of three days.

But Jesus also declared He would rise "the third day." Let us suppose again that Jesus was crucified on Friday. If He were to rise on the *first day* after His crucifixion and burial, He would be raised on Saturday; if on the *second day* after his crucifixion, He would rise on Sunday; but if He were to rise on the *third day*, He would have been raised on Monday! But Jesus was already resurrected by Sunday morning. Plainly, Friday was not the day of the crucifixion!

How clear that all these expressions mean the same thing—three days and three nights—72 hours! Jesus never once said He would be parts of three days in the grave.

How the Bible Counts Days

Adam Clarke, in his commentary on Matthew 12:40, quotes the *Jewish Talmud* in support of the idea that three days and three nights supposedly mean one day and two nights! The *Seventh Day Adventist Bible Commentary* implies the same. But the Bible is not interpreted by the Jewish Talmud or by a human Commentary. Jesus rejected the Talmudic traditions of the Jews.

In the April 1956 issues of the *Re-*

view and Herald, the official publication of the Seventh Day Adventists, appeared two articles on the crucifixion listing several texts which, they claim, indicate that three days means no more than a day and one-half! Let's look at these verses to see if the Scripture supports what they claim.

Here is the first text they offer as "proof" that "after three days" does *not* mean *after* three days! Notice it!

King Rehoboam told the people who came to meet him: "Come again unto me after three days. And the people departed" (II Chronicles 10:5). The same event is quoted in I Kings 12:5, "Depart yet for three days, then come again unto me." The story continues with verse 12: "So Jeroboam and all the people came to Rehoboam the third day, *as the king had appointed*, saying, Come to me again the third day."

The people left "for three days" and did not return until "after three days" — "*as the king had appointed*." Let us suppose they had first met the king sometime on Friday. As they were ordered to return at the end of three days, they could not have returned before the same time of day the following Monday. Now was Monday "*the third day*" from the day they had originally met with the King? The first day from that Friday was Saturday; the second day from that Friday was Sunday; and *the third day* was Monday—exactly the time the king expected them to return.

Monday, not Sunday, was the third day from Friday.

Notice how the Bible counts from one period of time to another. Turn to Nehemiah 5:14: "... I was appointed to be their governor in the land of Judah, from the twentieth year even unto the two and thirtieth year of Artaxerxes the king, that is TWELVE YEARS . . ." Notice that from the 20th year to the 32nd year is TWELVE YEARS, not thirteen years. Similarly, the third day from a Friday is a Monday, not a Sunday.

The next text the *Adventist Commentary* offers as "proof" that "three days and three nights" means only one day and two nights is in Esther 4:16 and 5:1. "Fast ye for me," said Queen Esther, "and neither eat nor drink three days, night or day: I also . . . will fast

likewise; and so will I go unto the king." "Now it came to pass on the third day, that Esther put on her royal apparel" and went to the king. Which day was this?—the third day of the fast. Suppose Queen Esther had requested the Jews late Friday evening, shortly before sunset, to fast. The first day of their fast would have been Saturday; the second day would have been Sunday; and on the third day—Monday—the Queen would have entered the king's palace. Isn't that plain and simple? The Jews did not fast parts of three days, but three days, night and day!

The *Adventist Bible Commentary* and the *Review and Herald* claim that the manner of counting the eight days for circumcising a boy baby demonstrated that three days and three nights do not mean three days and three nights. Let us see if this claim is true. Turn to Genesis 17:12. "He that is eight days old shall be circumcised." Jesus was circumcised. When? "And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcision, his name was called Jesus" (Luke 2:21). The Revised Version renders the verse: "And when eight days were fulfilled . . ." Let us suppose Jesus were born on a Monday. One week later, the following Monday, he would have been seven days old. He would have been eight days old on the following Tuesday—the correct day of his circumcision. Was that Tuesday "the eighth day" (Luke 1:59) *from the day of birth*? Exactly! One day from a Monday is a Tuesday. The eighth day from a Monday is the Tuesday of the following week—no matter what the Talmud says! Here again is no proof that three days and three nights mean only parts of three days.

Another illustration is also presented—II Kings 18:9-10. In these verses it is claimed that "at the end of three years" (verse 10) means only *parts* of three years, not at the end of three full years. The siege of Samaria, the ancient capital of Israel, commenced in the fourth year of Hezekiah and ended in his sixth year. Here, the *Adventist Commentary* claims, is "proof" that "the end of three years" means only half that length of time!

How could the siege of Samaria have ended "at the end of three years?"

By having begun at the *beginning* of Hezekiah's fourth year, and ending at the close of Hezekiah's sixth year—three years! Not a year and one-half, a meaning some try to read into this verse. In no other way could the siege have continued till the "end of three years." The original inspired Hebrew gives the meaning precisely, so there can be no doubt. It reads: "at the *ends* of three years." From one end of the year to the other, in three successive years the siege continued—for three full years, exactly as the Bible declares.

Notice that in each of these examples, three days means three days, not *parts* of three days or only a day and one-half. There is no exception! After three days does not mean after one and a half days. It means after three days!

What Day Was the Resurrection?

Jesus was buried shortly *before sunset* on the day of the crucifixion (Luke 23:54). Since Jesus said that he would "rise the third day" after the day of His crucifixion, it is obvious that the resurrection must have occurred *precisely at the completion of the third day following his burial*.

Then the resurrection must have occurred *near sunset* three days later. When the women came to the tomb, early Sunday morning, *Jesus had already risen*. The angel said, "He is risen: he is not here" (Mark 16:6).

Therefore Jesus could not have risen later than near sunset Saturday afternoon three days after His burial—because He was *not* at the sepulchre Sunday morning.

Three days before Saturday would place the crucifixion *on Wednesday*, the preparation day for the Feast of Unleavened Bread. Thursday of that year must have been an *annual sabbath*, the first annual sabbath in the Days of Unleavened Bread.

So that we would know that *that sabbath* which followed the crucifixion was not necessarily the weekly sabbath, John was inspired to call it a "high day" (John 19:31), which, according to Jewish usage, means an *annual sabbath* which may occur any day *during the week*!

Mark picks up John's account by adding that *AFTER THAT SABBATH*, which

was a high day, the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, the women *bought* sweet spices to use in anointing the body of Jesus (Mark 16:1). This purchasing of the spices could not have been on Thursday, the annual sabbath: it must have been Friday!

Having made their purchases, the women *prepared* these ointments "and rested the sabbath day *according to the commandment*" (Luke 23:56). This was the *seventh day sabbath* upon which, near its close, Jesus was raised from the dead.

Thus the Bible proves that the resurrection was *not* on Sunday, the crucifixion *not* on Friday. **THERE WERE TWO SEPARATE SABBATHS THAT WEEK!**—one, an *annual* sabbath, the other, a *weekly* sabbath.

Matthew 28:1 Proves It!

A vital text proving that there were two sabbaths in that week has been obscured by almost every translation into English. Only Ferrar Fenton's version has this point correct.

Turn to Matthew 28:1. In the common versions it says, "In the end"—or more correctly, "*After the sabbath.*" Notice that both of these renderings use the singular—sabbath. *But in the original Greek the word is in the PLURAL.* Fenton renders it correctly by saying, "*After the Sabbaths.*" In a footnote to this text, he says, "*The Greek original is in the plural, 'Sabbaths'*"—which all the scholars should know!

Another verse causing the Bible apparently to contradict itself is found in Mark 16:9. Open your Bible to this verse. This verse does *not* prove the resurrection was on Sunday. In the common versions, the comma is placed *following* the word "week," making it *appear* that Jesus arose on Sunday morning. But the use of commas in the Bible did not develop until about *fourteen centuries after* this was written.

Here is the explanation.

In the original Greek the phrase "early the first day of the week" can be *grammatically* connected either with the words "having risen" or with the words "he appeared first to Mary Magdalene." The *Expositor's Greek Testament* says the phrase "early the first day of the week" may be either "connected with



This is Golgotha, the Place of the Skull, upon which Jesus Christ was crucified as the Savior of the world. The natural caves in this small hill outside the walls of Jerusalem give the appearance of eyes—hence the name of the hill. Immediately to the left is the Garden Tomb, which once belonged to Joseph of Arimathea, where Jesus was buried shortly before the first annual sabbath of the Feast of Unleavened Bread.

[having risen], indicating the time of the resurrection, or with [appeared], indicating the time of the first appearance."

The Scriptures elsewhere prove it *could not refer* to the time of the resurrection. As it *could refer* to the first appearance of Jesus to Mary (John 20:14), Mark 16:9 should have been translated, "Now having risen, early the first day of the week he appeared first to Mary Magdalene."

The Montgomery translation renders this verse correctly. The translation of this verse in the Revised Standard Version is absolutely incorrect.

How It All Began

It was the so-called "apostolic fathers," steeped in pagan traditions, who first began to teach that the crucifixion occurred on Friday. Yet they admitted that the ancient custom of fasting *on Wednesday*—the actual day of the crucifixion, as we shall prove—probably was derived from "the day on which Jesus was betrayed" and "on which the Sanhedrin decided to kill him"! (*Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, art. "Fasting.")

What an admission!

These same men attempted to **CHANGE** the *year of Jesus' birth*; they attempted to **CHANGE** the *year that He began His ministry*; they attempted to **CHANGE**

the *length of his ministry*; they attempted to **CHANGE** the *day of his death*, and they attempted to **CHANGE** the *day of his resurrection*—all to justify a pagan tradition of the Sunday resurrection of Nimrod, the pagan savior!

Astounding proof exists of these attempts to change the day of the resurrection and of the crucifixion. James A. Walther, in an article entitled "The Chronology of Passion Week," in the June 1958 *Journal of Biblical Literature*, mentions that numerous Catholic writers for centuries maintained that Jesus ate the Passover Tuesday night—that early Wednesday morning He was taken by the Jewish mob. He declares: "References in the *Didascalia*, in Epiphanius, in Victorinus of Pettau, . . . support the Tuesday [night] Passover dating and the subsequent arrest of Jesus in the morning hours of Wednesday."

One of the first attempts to change the day of the resurrection from late Saturday to the early hours of Sunday occurred in the spurious "Gospel of Peter," probably circulated from Rome about the time of the death of the apostle John. This "gospel" reads as follows: ". . . And they drew out the nails from the hands of the Lord, and laid Him upon the earth . . . And the Jews rejoiced, and gave His body to

Joseph that he might bury it. . . . And he took the Lord, and washed Him, and rolled Him in a linen cloth, and brought Him into His own tomb. . . . And I and my companions were grieved; and being wounded in mind we hid ourselves. . . . And upon all these things we fasted and sat mourning **NIGHT AND DAY UNTIL THE SABBATH**.

"But the scribes and Pharisees and elders being gathered together one with another . . . came to Pilate, beseeching him and saying, Give us soldiers, that we may guard His sepulchre *for three days*, lest His disciples come and steal Him away. . . . And with them came elders and scribes to the sepulchre, and having rolled a great stone together with the centurion and the soldiers, they all together set it at the door of the sepulchre; and they affixed seven seals . . . and guarded it. And *early in the morning as the sabbath was {dawning}*, there came a multitude from Jerusalem and the region round about, that they might see the sepulchre that was sealed.

"And in the night in which the Lord's day was drawing on . . . the tomb was opened"—and the resurrection supposedly occurs. (From the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, volume 10.)

Notice! Between the crucifixion and the Sabbath, the disciples and Peter are said to have fasted "night and day until the Sabbath." This alone is a candid admission that the crucifixion was not on "Good Friday"! It was decades later before the idea of a Friday crucifixion and a Sunday morning resurrection was widely believed.

Which Day Was the Passover?

The apostle Paul called Jesus Christ our Passover (I Corinthians 5:7). According to the gospel records, Jesus was crucified on the Passover day—Abib (or Nisan) 14—immediately before the Feast of Unleavened Bread. Jesus ate the passover—which was also a day on which no leavened bread was used—(Luke 22:8) on the eve of the 14th of Abib, shortly after sunset. This was the precise time commanded for the first passover in Exodus 12:6. (Remember that according to the Bible a day begins at sunset, not at midnight.) But the Jews, following their own traditions, killed their lambs late on the afternoon

of the 14th and ate them the next night (John 18:28).

In either case the Jews and Jesus and the apostles agreed as to which day it was. There was no question about the date. The only difference concerned what ought to have been done on that date. But how did the Jews know which day it was? How did Jesus and the apostles know that this was the passover day *as God had appointed it*?

By GOD's calendar, of course! The Passover was the 14th day of the first month according to the Sacred Calendar used by Jesus and the Jews.

But where did this calendar come from? Was it the invention of Jewish tradition—or revealed by God to the people? Was Jesus observing the Passover according to Jewish tradition or according to the revelation of God?

IF THE CALENDAR WHICH JESUS AND THE JEWS WERE USING WAS A DIVINELY INSPIRED CALENDAR AND IF THE JEWS ARE STILL USING THAT SAME CALENDAR TODAY, THEN WE CAN KNOW PRECISELY WHICH DAY THE PASSOVER WAS IN THE YEAR OF THE CRUCIFIXION!

Is the Calendar of the Jews Divinely Inspired?

We are told that the "Jewish Calendar" is an invention of the Jews—that it is different today from the one which the Jews and Jesus used. We are further told that the Jews at first determined the months solely by observation of the new moons and that they determined the year by observing the clouds which ended the rainy season and which allowed the spring harvest to begin.

But is this true? Is observation the basis of GOD's Calendar?

Will every individual be able to observe the faint *crest* of the new moon at the same time? Do people always agree upon what they see? And what if the day were cloudy and no one can see the new moon—what then? And how would the Jews know which day should be the first of the month—the day when the new moon occurred, or the day when they first saw the new moon?

Did God give the Jews permission to create their own calendar; or did He, instead, reveal to Israel His very own Sacred Calendar and require them

to preserve it through all generations? Notice the answer in Scripture!

Consider Nehemiah 8:9. The Feast of Trumpets—the first day of the seventh month—"this day is HOLY unto the Lord your God."

Do you grasp it? It is God who made the day holy. No man can make anything holy. The 10th verse repeats again that *that* day is holy to God. Since that day is holy to God, then God must determine which day it is. The very fact that this annual festival is HOLY TO GOD is proof that man is not free for himself to determine which day it is. The only way for the Jews to have known that the seventh annual new moon is holy is by having been given a calendar which reveals which day it is!

If the Jews were left solely to observation, and the day were cloudy or the atmosphere were not clear, they certainly would not have been able to know which day was holy to God. OBVIOUSLY THE JEWS WERE NOT LEFT TO OBSERVATION! GOD MUST HAVE REVEALED TO THEM HOW TO CALCULATE HIS DIVINE CALENDAR!

Notice the proof of Scripture: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, Concerning the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, even *these are My feasts*" (Lev. 23:2).

The Israelites are required to proclaim a convocation—a commanded meeting for the people—on the days of God's choice, but God determined which days are His feasts.

And now notice Exodus 23:15: "Thou shalt keep the feast of unleavened bread: (thou shalt eat unleavened bread seven days, AS I COMMANDED THEE, IN THE TIME APPOINTED OF THE MONTH ABIB . . . and none shall appear before Me empty)."

Notice that the particular days of the festival are *appointed by God*. God commanded the Israelites when to celebrate His Festival. Men must appear before Him. Unless God had revealed His own inspired calendar, the Jews could never have known by observation alone when to appear before God and which days were holy.

And notice further, Psalm 81:3-5: (Please continue on page 15)

The Autobiography of Herbert W. Armstrong

At last, in this 15th installment, we find Mr. Armstrong angered into the first real study of the Bible—and the account of his conversion!

IT WAS bewildering—utterly frustrating! It seemed as if some mysterious, invisible hand was disintegrating every business I started!

That was precisely what *was* happening! The hand of God was taking away every activity on which my heart had been set—the business success before whose shrine I had worshipped. This zeal to become important in the business world had become an idol. God was destroying the idol. He was knocking me down—again and again! He was puncturing the ego, deflating the vanity.

Midas in Reverse

At age 16 ambition had been aroused. I began to study constantly—to work at self-improvement—to prod and drive myself on and on. I had sought the jobs which would provide training and experience for the future. This had led to travel, to contacts with big and important men, multi-millionaire executives.

At twenty-eight a publishers' representative business had been built in Chicago which produced an income equivalent to some \$25,000 a year measured by today's dollar-value. The flash depression of 1920 had swept it away. At age thirty, discouraged, broken in spirit, I was removed from it entirely.

Then, in Oregon, had come the advertising service for laundries. It was growing and multiplying rapidly. After one year, in the fall of 1926, the fees were grossing close to \$1,000 per month. I saw visions of a personal net income mounting to from \$300,000 to a half million a year with expansion to national proportions. Then an action by the Laundryowners National Association swept the laundry advertising business out from under my feet. They had contracted for a \$5,000,000 co-operative national campaign in the big-circulation

women's magazines. The national Association had possessed power to assess every local laundry within ½ of 1% of the maximum it was safe for any laundry to spend for advertising. All of my clients' advertising money had been diverted to this national campaign. There was nothing I or my clients could do about it!

There was yet another million-dollar project—not a gold-mine, but a mysterious clay mine which promised to turn into gold. And it, too, was to be disintegrated by the depression of 1929. But that is getting ahead of my story.

It seemed that I was King Midas in reverse. Every material money-making enterprise I started *promised* gold, but turned to *nothing*! They vanished like mirages on a desert.

Yes, God Almighty the Creator was knocking me down—again and again. As often as I got back to my feet to fight, on starting another business or enterprise, another blow of utter and bitter defeat seemed to strike me from behind by an unseen hand. I was being "softened" for the final knock-out of material ambition.

Driven to Bible Study

The merchandising survey for the Vancouver *Columbian* had begun in August, 1924. That and the six months' engagement as a merchandising specialist with *The Columbian* had terminated about the first of April, 1925. At that time we had moved back to my parents' home in Salem, Oregon, to reduce expenses while starting the laundry advertising business. About eight or nine months later we had moved to a house we rented on Klickitat Street, in Portland. Our elder daughter, Beverly, had gone to school one year in Iowa before we moved to Oregon, and then another year in Vancouver, and in Salem. Our younger daughter, Dorothy, was started in school in Portland in the fall of 1926.

It was probably in the early fall of 1926, while visiting again in Salem, that my mother's neighbor, Mrs. O. J. Runcorn, had led my wife through a series of Biblical passages which convinced her that she ought to be keeping Saturday as the Sabbath, instead of Sunday. Mrs. Armstrong had accepted this conviction quickly, and with enthusiasm had come running back to my parents' home to break the "good" news to me.

"Are you CRAZY?" I had asked, shocked, incredulous!

My wife gone into religious *fanaticism*! I was horrified, outraged! What would my friends—my business associates say?

I demanded that she drop this ridiculous heresy at once! But she wouldn't. I argued. Week after week I argued. But all to no avail. I threatened divorce. I told her I would not have our children brought up in any such fanatical religion—and I was sure any sane court would grant me custody of our daughters.

I had been humiliated, my ego punctured, by unpreventable business reverses. But this was the greatest humiliation of all. This seemed more than my vanity and conceit could take. It was a mortifying blow.

"You can't tell me that all these Churches have been wrong all these years and centuries! They all teach that SUNDAY is the day to keep and hold church services, all but one strange, queer, fanatical sect."

My wife was broken up, too, when for the first time in our married life I threatened divorce. She was sobbing.

"But I can't help it," she sobbed. "I have seen with my own eyes in the Bible that God made holy the hours between Friday sunset and Saturday sunset. I would be disobeying GOD if I gave it up now—I would be LOST!"

I was boiling with indignation and anger.

"I know that the BIBLE says we are

to keep SUNDAY," I said sternly. "I don't know just *where*, but I do know that all these churches can't be wrong! I'm going to give you just one more chance, before your nonsensical fanaticism breaks up our home! I have an analytical mind. I've been trained in getting and analyzing *facts*! Now I'm going to research the Bible! I'm going to find *where* the Bible commands us to observe SUNDAY. I'LL PROVE IT TO YOU IN THE BIBLE! Will you *then* give up this fanaticism?"

She agreed—*IF* I could prove it, and show it to her *in the BIBLE*. That was good enough for me! I was supremely confident. I knew it was there. I knew I could find it!

And so it came about that in the fall of 1926, with my business gone—with but one laundry client left, whose advertising required only some thirty minutes of my time a week, that I was goaded into my first real study of the Bible.

"Ignorant" of Evolution

Meanwhile, in the summer of 1925, my brother-in-law, Walter Dillon, with his sister Bertha, his father, and a new bride, had returned to Oregon. Both Walter and his sister obtained jobs teaching school, and my father-in-law bought a small-town store.

Walter's wife had been indoctrinated with the theory of evolution in college. One day she and I became engaged in a discussion. I didn't believe in the evolutionary theory.

"You are *ignorant*!" Her words stabbed deeply into what was left of my ego—and there was still an enormous amount of it left. "You have never studied evolution. One is uneducated, and simply ignorant, if he has not studied evolution. All educated people know it's true!"

That challenge came hot on the heels of this "Sabbath" challenge from my wife.

"Hertha," I said, "I am just starting a study of the Bible. I will include in my research a thorough study of the Biblical account of creation, and also I will make a thorough study of evolution. I'm sure I'm going to find that it is *you* who are ignorant, and in error, and if and when I do, *I am going to make you EAT those words!*"

And so it came about that I now had a *double* challenge on my hands—a *dual*-subject study of the Bible, and also a research into texts on biology, geology, and evolution.

I began my study by obtaining everything I could in the way of books and pamphlets refuting what they called "the Jewish Sabbath." I read reams of arguments on the subject of "law and grace," or, as often expressed, "law *or* grace." I soon became very familiar with certain passages in the New Testament Books of Romans and Galatians. These began to seem rather convincing.

At the same time, I found, in the Portland Public Library, many scientific works either directly on evolution, or teaching it indirectly in connection with biology and geology. Also I found books by scientists and doctors of philosophy puncturing many holes in the evolutionary hypothesis. Strangely, even the critics of evolution, being themselves scientific men, paradoxically accepted the very theory they so ably refuted.

But, reading first the works of men like Haeckel, Darwin, Spencer, Huxley, Vogt, and more recent and modern "authorities," the evolutionary postulate began to become very convincing.

It became apparent early that the *real* and thorough-going evolutionists universally agreed that evolution excluded the possibility of the existence of GOD! While some of the lesser lights professed a sort of fence-straddling "theistic" evolution, I soon learned that the real dyed-in-the-wool evolutionists all were atheists. Evolution *could not* honestly be reconciled with the first chapter of Genesis!

Does God Exist?

And so it came about that, very early in this study of evolution and of the Bible, actual *doubts* came into my mind as to the existence of God!

In a very real sense, this was a good

thing. I believe God Himself was directing it. I had always *assumed* the existence of God because I had *been* taught it from childhood. I had *grown* up in Sunday school. I simply took it for granted.

Now, suddenly, I realized I had never *PROVED* whether there is a God. Since the existence of God is the very first *BASIS* for religious belief and authority—and since the inspiration of the Bible *by* such a God as His revelation to mankind is the secondary and companion basis for faith and practise, I realized that the place to start was to *PROVE* whether God exists and whether the Holy Bible is His *WORD*!

I had nothing but *TIME* on my hands. I rose early and *STUDIED*. Most mornings I was standing at the front entrance of the Public Library when its doors were opened. Most evenings I was chased out of the Library at 9 p.m., closing time. Most nights I continued study at home until my wife, at 1 a.m. or later, would waken from her sleep and urge me to break off and get to bed.

I delved somewhat into science. I learned facts about radioactive elements. I learned that radioactivity proves there has been no past eternity of matter. There was a time when matter did not exist. Then there came a time when matter came into existence. This was *CREATION*, one of several proofs of *GOD*.

By the laws of science, including the law of biogenesis, that only *LIFE* can beget life—that dead matter cannot produce life—that the living cannot come from the not-living, by these laws came *PROOF* that God exists.

In the Bible I found one quoted, saying in the first person, "I am *GOD*." This God was quoted directly in Scriptures, *proved* to have been written hundreds of years before Christ, pronouncing the future fates of *every* major city and nation in the ancient world. I delved into *HISTORY*. I learned that these prophecies, in every instance, had come to pass precisely as written!

Debunking Evolution

I studied the creation account in the Bible. It is not *all* in Genesis One. I studied it *all*! I studied evolution. At first it seemed very convincing—just

The World Tomorrow in Spanish with Benjamin Rea.

RADIO LA CRONICA—Lima, Peru
—7:00-7:15 P.M. Sundays

RADIO COMUNEROS — Asuncion, Paraguay — 8:00-8:15 P.M., Sundays

RADIO SPORT — CXA19 — Montevideo, Uruguay — 4:00-4:15 P.M., Sundays

as it does to freshman students in most colleges and universities.

I noted evidences of comparative anatomy. But these evidences were not, in themselves, PROOF. They merely tended to make the theory appear more reasonable IF proved. I noted tests and discoveries of embryology. These, too, were not PROOF, but only supporting evidence IF already proved.

I noticed that Lamarck's original theory of use and disuse, once accepted as science, had been laughed out of school. I learned that the once scientific "spiral nebular" theory of the earth's existence had become the present-day laughing stock, supplanted by Professor Chamberlain's "Planetesimal Hypothesis." I hunted out and read the story of Darwin's life—of his continual sickness—of his preconceived theory and inductive process of reasoning in searching *only* for such facts and arguments as would sustain his theory, refusing to consider any facts on the other side of the fence. I read all about his tour on the good ship *Beagle*. I read of how he finally came to *doubt* and lose confidence in his theories and what he had written, but how his colleagues hushed this up from the world, and propagandized his theory into "scientific" acceptance.

I came to see that there was only ONE possible PROOF of evolution as a FACT. That was the assumption that, in the study of paleontology, the most simple and unintelligent fossils were always in the *oldest* strata, laid down first; while, as we progress gradually into strata of later deposition, the fossils found in them become gradually more complex and tending toward intelligence.

That one claim, I finally determined, was the TRUNK of the tree of evolution. If the trunk stood, the theory appeared proved. If I could chop down the trunk, the entire tree would fall with it.

I began a search to learn HOW these "scientists" determined the age of strata. I was months finding it. None of the texts I searched seemed to explain anything about it. This TRUNK of the tree was carelessly *assumed*—without proof. Yet the entire "onion-coat" theory of geology was bound up in it.

Were the oldest strata always on the bottom—the next oldest next to the

bottom, the most recent on the top? Finally I found it in a recognized text on Geology. No, sometimes the most recent were actually *below* the most ancient strata. The age of strata was *not* determined by stages of depth. These things varied in different parts of the world.

How, then, was the age of strata determined? Why, I finally discovered in this very reputable "authority," their age was determined by the FOSSILS found in them. Since the geologists "*knew*" their evolutionary theory was true, and since they had estimated how many millions of years ago a certain fossil specimen had lived, that age determined the age of the strata!

In other words, they PROVED the age of the strata by the supposition that their theory of evolution was true. And they PROVED their theory was true by the supposition of the progressive ages of the strata in which fossil remains had been found! This was ridiculous arguing in a circle!

The TRUNK of the evolutionary tree was chopped down. There WAS NO PROOF!

I wrote a short paper on this discovery. I showed it to the head librarian of the technical and science department of the Library.

"Mr. Armstrong," she said, "you have an uncanny knack of getting right to the crux of a problem. Yes, I have to admit you have chopped down the trunk of the tree. You have robbed me of PROOF! But, Mr. Armstrong, I still have to go on *believing* in evolution, even if it is totally disproved. I have done graduate work at Columbia, at the University of Chicago, and other top level institutions. I have spent my life in the atmosphere of science and in the company of scientific people. I am SO STEEPED in it that I could not root it from my mind!"

What a pitiful confession, from one so steeped in "the wisdom of this world."

The Creation MEMORIAL

I had *disproved* the theory of evolution. I had found PROOF of CREATION—PROOF of the existence of GOD—PROOF of the divine inspiration of the BIBLE.

Now I had a BASIS for belief. Now

SIX LIVRETS FRANÇAIS

Les SIX livrets français sont offerts GRATUITEMENT à tous ceux qui nous en font la demande:

"La Foi nécessaire au Salut"

"La Résurrection ne tombe pas le dimanche"

"Quel est le Sabbat du Nouveau Testament?"

"Dieu guérit-Il toujours?"

"Qu'est-ce que la Foi?"

"Pourquoi êtes-vous né?"

Prière de s'adresser à

LE MONDE À VENIR

Box 111

Pasadena, California

I had a solid FOUNDATION on which to build. The BIBLE had proved itself to contain AUTHORITY. I had now studied far enough to know that I must LIVE by it, and that I shall finally be JUDGED by it—not by men, nor by man's church denominations, theories, theologies, tenets, doctrines, or pronouncements. I would be judged by Almighty GOD finally, and according to the BIBLE!

So now I began to study further into this Sabbath question.

I learned that CREATION is the very PROOF of GOD! A heathen comes along, pointing to an idol made by man's hands out of wood, stone, or marble or gold.

"This idol is the real god," he says. "How can you prove your God is superior to this idol that I worship?"

"Why," I answer, "My God is the CREATOR. He *created* the wood, stone, marble or gold that your god is made of. He created MAN, and man, a *created* being, MADE that idol. Therefore my God is greater than your idol because it is only a little particle of what my God MADE!"

Another comes along and says, "I worship the SUN. We get our light from the sun. It warms the earth and makes vegetation grow. I think the SUN is God."

"But," I reply, "the true God CREATED the sun. He created light. He created force, energy, and LIFE. He makes the sun shine on the earth. He CONTROLS the sun, because He *controls* all the forces of His creation. He is

supreme RULER over His universe."

Then I began to see that on the very seventh day of creation week, God set that day aside from other days. On that day He RESTED from all He had created by WORK. On that day He *created* the Sabbath, not by work, but by REST, putting His divine presence in it! He made it HOLY TIME. No man has authority to make future time holy. No group of men—no church! Only GOD is HOLY! Only GOD can make things HOLY. The Sabbath is a constantly recurring space of time, marked off by the setting of the sun. God made every recurring Sabbath HOLY, and commanded man (Exodus 20) to *keep* it holy.

WHY did He do it? WHY does it make any difference?

I found it in the SPECIAL SABBATH COVENANT in Exodus 31:12-18. He made it the SIGN between Him and His people. A SIGN is a mark of identity. First, it is a sign that GOD is the CREATOR, because it is a MEMORIAL OF CREATION—and CREATION is the PROOF of God—it identifies Him. No other space of time could be a memorial of CREATION. Thus God chose that very space of time for man to assemble for worship which KEEPS MAN IN THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE TRUE IDENTITY OF GOD AS THE CREATOR. Every nation which has NOT kept the Sabbath has worshipped the *created* rather than the Creator. It is a sign that identifies God's own people, because it is they who OBEY God in this commandment, while this is the very commandment which every one else regards as the LEAST of the commandments — which they REBEL against obeying!

GOD is the one you OBEY. The word LORD means MASTER—the one you OBEY! This is the one point on which the largest number of people refuse to OBEY the true GOD, thus proving they are *not* His people!

Law and Grace

I studied carefully everything I could obtain which attempted to *refute* the Sabbath. I wanted, more than anything on earth, to refute it—to prove that SUNDAY was the true Christian Sabbath, or "Lord's Day."

I read the arguments about "law or grace."

I was pointed to, and read, Romans 3:20: "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight."

But I looked into the BIBLE, and found the pamphlet had left out the rest of the verse which says: "for by the law is the knowledge of sin." That is true, because I read in I John 3:4 that the Bible definition of SIN is NOT man's conscience, or his church "DON'TS," but "*Sin is the transgression of the law.*" Naturally, then, the KNOWLEDGE of sin comes by the LAW.

And I discovered the pamphlet forgot to quote the 31st verse:

"Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, *we establish the law.*"

I read in a pamphlet, ". . . the law worketh WRATH" (Rom. 4:15).

I turned to my Bible and read the rest of the same verse: "for where no law is, there is no transgression." Of course! Because the law DEFINES sin. Sin is disobedience of the law!

I read in one of the pamphlets that the law was an evil thing, contrary to our best interests. But then I read in Romans 7: "Is the law sin? *God forbid!* Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said 'Thou shalt not covet.'" And "Wherefore the law is HOLY, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." And again, "For we know that the *law is spiritual*" (Verses 7, 12, 14).

I learned that GRACE is PARDON, thru the blood of Christ, for having *transgressed* the law. But if a human judge pardons a man for breaking a civil or criminal law, that pardon does not appeal the law. The man is pardoned so that he may now OBEY the law. And GOD pardons only after we REPENT of sin!

The Bitter Pill

But do not suppose I quickly or easily came to accept the seventh-day Sabbath as the truth of the Bible.

I spent a solid SIX MONTHS of virtual night-and-day, seven-day-a-week STUDY and research, in a determined effort to find just the opposite.

I searched IN VAIN for any authority in the Bible to establish SUNDAY as the

day for Christian worship. I even studied Greek sufficiently to run down every possible questionable text in the original Greek.

I studied the Commentaries. I studied the Lexicons and *Robert's Grammar of the Greek New Testament*. Then I studied HISTORY. I delved into encyclopedias—the Britannica, the Americana, and several religious encyclopedias. I searched the Jewish Encyclopedia, and the Catholic Encyclopedia. I read Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, especially his chapter 15 dealing with the religious history of the first four hundred years after Christ.

I left no stone unturned.

I found clever arguments. I will confess that, so eager was I to overthrow this Sabbath belief of my wife, at one point in this intensive study I believe I might possibly have used some trick arguments to confuse and upset my wife on the Sabbath question. But I *knew* these arguments *were not honest!* There was a brief inward battle between desire and honesty. But I *could not* deliberately try to deceive my wife with dishonest arguments. The temptation was soon pushed aside.

Finally, after six months, the TRUTH had become crystal clear. At last I KNEW what was the truth. Once again, GOD had taken me to a licking!

Now came the greatest inner battle of my life.

To accept this truth meant to *cut me off from all former friends, acquaintances and business associates*. I had come to meet some of the independent "Sabbath-keepers" down around Salem and the Willamette Valley. Some of them were what I then, in my pride and conceit, regarded as back-woods "hill-billies." None were of the financial and social position I had associated with.

My associations and pride had led me to "look down upon" this class of people. I had been ambitious to hob-nob with the wealthy and the cultural.

I saw plainly what a decision was before me. To accept this truth meant to throw in my lot for life with a class of people I had always looked on as inferior. I learned later that God *looks on the heart*, and these humble people were the real salt of the earth. But I was then

(Please continue on page 18)

The *Plain Truth* about the PROTESTANT Reformation

Was the Reformation a return to the TRUTH preached by Jesus Christ? This series of articles contains startling FACTS which you need to consider!

by Roderick C. Meredith

PART IX

MILLIONS of books, pamphlets and tracts boldly proclaim as the Protestant foundation: "The BIBLE, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, is the religion of Protestants."

In the previous installments of this series, we learned from the Bible and the record of history that a remarkable *change* took place in nominal "Christianity" soon after the death of the original apostles. *Pagan* philosophies and traditions crept into the visible Church. During the "Dark Ages" the religious hierarchy became a veritable cesspool of iniquities, whoredoms and abominations of every description.

We have seen how Martin Luther *rebelled* against this corrupt hierarchy, but *still retained most of its doctrines and traditions*. In fact, he rebelled against *all authority* and presumptuously *added a word to the Bible*. In his guilt-ridden desire to do away with obedience to God's law, Luther translated Romans 1:17: "The just shall live by faith *alone*." This attitude led Luther to condone the *bigamy* of the landgrave of Hesse, and the *slaughter* of hundreds of peasants in the infamous Peasants' War.

Last month, we discussed the harsh teachings and actions of John Calvin based on his theory of predestination. Recall his statement: "For *all men are not created on an equal footing*, but for some eternal life is pre-ordained, for others eternal damnation . . ." (Bettenson, *Documents*, p. 302).

The shocking result of Calvin's harsh system can only be understood by reading the account of how he *burned at the stake* a religious opponent, Michael Servetus.

Now we will discuss the amazing *truth* about the Reformation in England.

As in the previous phases of this movement, let us ask ourselves: Was this a return to the faith and practice of Jesus Christ and His apostles? Was this, indeed, a return to "the BIBLE, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible"?

The English Revolt

The third key reformatory movement which needs to be considered as distinct in itself is that which took place in England. It was a reformation by *force* even more than that under John Calvin.

The so-called "reformation" in England was due almost entirely to the actions of one man, Henry VIII. Since, under his influence, the English revolt produced no outstanding religious leaders and very few distinctive doctrines, a detailed analysis of its progress is not necessary for an understanding of its unique place in the Reformation as a whole. Yet, an understanding of its principal *origins* and *results* is important to aid our comprehension of its later influence on the English speaking peoples of the world.

King Henry VIII

When Henry VIII ascended the throne of England in 1509, it was already an established royal policy for the kings to control most ecclesiastical appointments, and to fill many of the *chief political posts* with highly educated churchmen. Naturally, this led to many *abuses*, and often encouraged *greed, dishonesty* and *worldly shrewdness* in the higher clergy.

This situation also tended to subvert the religious allegiance normally felt by the Roman clergy toward Rome. It was replaced, through political office and interest, by a feeling of *national loyalty*. This was further strengthened by a growing national antagonism to all foreign encroachments, papal or

otherwise (Walker, p. 401).

Under such circumstances, it was not at all difficult for Henry VIII, a young, handsome, brilliant and vain monarch, to sway and intimidate the English Catholic clergy according to his whims.

Henry had inherited an ample treasury from his father, Henry VII, and enjoyed immense popularity with his subjects. But because of a political alliance with the Spanish, he had been pledged by his father to marry Catherine of Aragon, the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain. Actually, she had first been his older brother's wife, though it was said that the marriage was never consummated before Arthur's early death.

Catherine was about six years older than Henry. Although this had seemed to make little difference at first, some fifteen years later the passionate, self-willed monarch found himself married to a fat, prematurely aging woman of forty. Henry began to look around and for many years satisfied his passions with a *series of mistresses*. This might have continued indefinitely but for two circumstances.

First, it appears that Henry became especially enamored of Anne Boleyn, and that she insisted on becoming his *wife*. Secondly, only one of the six children Catherine had borne him survived infancy—a girl, Mary. A woman *had never ruled England before*, and Henry may have feared that the absence of a male heir to the throne would lead to civil war. He wanted another woman, and a male heir (Hausser, p. 170-171).

The Marriage Question

About the year 1526, Henry applied to Rome for a declaration declaring the nullity of his marriage to Catherine. He based his appeal on the fact that she had first been his deceased brother's

wife, and that a *papal dispensation* had been granted to allow him to marry her, as this relationship normally constituted an impediment to marriage according to Catholic law.

Henry *now* wished to have this dispensation, and consequently his marriage, declared invalid. He tried to gain the support of Thomas Wolsey—whom he had made lord chancellor, and Pope Leo X had made a cardinal.

Up to this point, Wolsey had been Henry's right-hand man. But he was also the *pope's representative*, and was trying to protect himself by steering a middle course in the matter. Consequently, the matter was delayed—the pope and Wolsey hoping that Henry might change his mind.

This proceeding soon exhausted the king's patience, and he was advised by Thomas Cranmer and Thomas Cromwell to put his case before the universities of Europe. This Henry did, using *bribery* abroad and *threats* at home to gain a *partial* endorsement from some of the Protestant scholars and theologians for his divorce (Fisher, *The Reformation*, p. 319).

In the meantime, Henry dismissed Cardinal Wolsey on *trumped-up charges*, and the disgraced cardinal died on his way to be tried for *treason*. From the beginning, Henry was willing to *kill* those who opposed his *unbridled lust* for women and power.

Henry now bullied the English Parliament into passing measures which stated that he was "the Protector and Supreme Head of the Church and Clergy of England" after which was added, after a long debate, "as far as is permitted by the law of Christ." He then caused Parliament to pass laws forbidding the introduction of papal bulls into England, and cutting off the papal *revenues* from England (*The Reformation*, p. 320).

While his case was still pending at Rome, Henry rushed through a hasty divorce and secretly "married" Anne Boleyn on about January 25, 1533. It seems evident that he had *already entered into illegal relations with her* because on September 7 of the same year she bore a daughter, Elizabeth, later to be queen (Walker, p. 403).

Soon after, Henry's *new favorite*,

Thomas Cranmer, was appointed as Archbishop of Canterbury. On May 23, he held an ecclesiastical court and formally adjudged Henry's marriage to Catherine *null and void*.

The Break with Rome

The inevitable result of all these actions was soon forthcoming. On July 11, 1533, Pope Clement VII issued a bull excommunicating Henry. Henry replied in kind, and soon obtained from Parliament statutes *forbidding all payments* to the pope, directing that all bishops were now to be elected on the king's nomination, and doing away with all other recognition of papal authority (Fisher, *The Reformation*, p. 320-321).

In November of 1534, Parliament passed the famous Supremacy Act. In it, Henry and his successors were declared "the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England," without *any* qualifying clauses, and with full power to redress "heresies" and "abuses" (Bettenson, *Documents*, p. 322).

The break with Rome was now complete. Although it was primarily a matter of Henry's own *self-will*, it could not have been accomplished without the strong national feeling and dislike of papal authority already growing among the English people.

What now made the breach with Rome irreparable was the policy Henry now proceeded upon of *confiscating the monasteries* and abbey lands, and *distributing* part of the *plundered wealth* among his courtiers and friends (*The Reformation*, p. 321).

"For his work, Henry had found a new agent in Thomas Cromwell (1485?-1540), a man of very humble origin, a soldier, merchant, and money-lender by turns, of whom Wolsey had made much use as a business and parliamentary agent. By 1531 Cromwell was of the privy council; in 1534 master of the rolls; and in 1536, layman that he was, vice-regent for the King in ecclesiastical affairs. Henry was hungry for ecclesiastical property, both to maintain his lavish court and to create and reward adherents—the Reformation everywhere was marked by these confiscations—and late in 1534 he commissioned Cromwell to have the monasteries visited and report on their condition.

The alleged facts, the truth or falsity of which is still a disputed matter, were laid before Parliament, which in February, 1536, adjudged to the King, 'his heirs and assigns forever, to do and use therewith his and their own wills,' all monastic establishments having an income of less than two hundred pounds annually. The number thus sequestered was three hundred and seventy-six" (Walker, p. 404).

It is significant to note, as Walker states, that it was a common practice among the Protestant princes and nobles to *confiscate the wealth* of the Catholic Church whenever possible. It is evident that most of these influential "Protestants" were much more concerned with *enriching themselves* than with any theological changes that might be made. In fact, Henry's break with Rome resulted in practically *no change whatever* in doctrine except the rejection of papal authority and the substitution of the English monarchs as "head" of the church.

The entire situation developed primarily because of Henry's *sexual passion* and *lust for power*—*not* as a result of earnest men seeking to restore Scriptural truth.

Theological Developments

During this time, a number of religious leaders had been influenced by the work of the Reformation on the continent. One of them, William Tyndale, translated the New Testament into English. However, he was unable to have it published in England. So it was published on the continent in 1526, and many copies found their way to England, although churchly and civil authorities tried to suppress it.

This placing of the Bible in the hands of the people helped prepare the way for later doctrinal changes along *Lutheran lines*. But for the time being, the Roman Catholic dogma was to be enforced (Walker, pp. 404-405).

King Henry's own religious attitude, except for the papacy, was that of *Catholic orthodoxy*. At times, he would make limited doctrinal concessions to please the German Protestants when he needed their support. But in 1539, because of fears of France and Spain, Henry induced Parliament to pass the

Six Articles Act. It maintained a strict doctrine of transubstantiation, vows of chastity, auricular confession and other *Catholic* practices (Fisher, *The Reformation*, p. 324).

Meanwhile, however, he proceeded to complete the *confiscation* of all the monasteries in 1539, and strengthen his position as head of the church and state. His *sharing* of the *seized wealth* of the ecclesiastical properties built up the fortunes of the Protestant ruling class whose *personal interests* now lay in continued separation from Rome.

The true fact is that they were *Catholics in doctrine* but Protestant in their confirmation of Henry's right to substitute himself for the pope as head of the church and to share with them the *booty of the plundered monasteries*.

King Henry's Marital Escapades

As "supreme Head" of the church of England, Henry's conduct toward his enemies and, strangely, even toward his wives, was *as far removed* from Christian principles as would seem possible.

In the summer of 1535, he cruelly *executed* two of England's ablest scholars and theologians, Bishop John Fisher and Sir Thomas More, because they refused to endorse his supremacy over the church and clergy of England. Many other notable persons paid *with their lives* for disagreeing with Henry's views.

A helpful summary of Henry's vicious conduct toward his wives and nobles is given by Alzog:

"Henry was as atrociously cruel to his wives as he was to his ministers and other subjects of inferior degree. Catharine of Aragon survived her repudiation a little less than three years, dying a most exemplary death, January 8, 1536. She was hardly laid in her grave, when Anne Boleyn, who had taken her place in her husband's affections, and was the cause of all her misfortunes, was tried on the charges of adultery, incest, and high treason, declared guilty, and beheaded on the green within the Tower, May 19, 1536. Cranmer, who had formerly, 'in virtue of his apostolic authority,' pronounced the marriage between Henry and Anne lawful and valid, was now called upon to reverse his former decision, and, 'in the name of Christ and for the glory of God,' de-

clared that the same marriage was and always had been null and void. On the day of Anne's execution, as if to express his contempt for her memory, Henry dressed himself in a suit of white, and on the following morning was married to Jane Seymour, who died (October 24, 1537) in less than a fortnight after giving birth to a male child, subsequently known as Edward VI. Henry was next married to Anne of Cleves in the beginning of the year 1540. The marriage was a political one, brought about through the agency of Thomas Cromwell, who hoped to strengthen the Protestant cause in England and prop up his own power through the influence of the new queen, who was known to be a thorough-going Lutheran. Deceived as to her beauty and personal attractions, Henry married her only because he could not well help himself, and, after living with her six months, procured a divorce mainly on these grounds (July 13). Within a month (August 8) he married Catherine Howard, who, being shortly after charged with having committed adultery, was pronounced guilty, and beheaded February 13, 1541. Henry's sixth and last wife, Catharine Parr, was on one occasion nearly losing her head for venturing to differ on theological questions with the Head of the Church of England; but quickly detecting her mistake, she escaped the royal vengeance by adroitly flattering his great wisdom and theological learning, expressing her most humble submission to his judgment, and professing that in differing from him she had only desired to draw him into a heated discussion, because when animated, he seemed to forget the pain of the malady from

which he was suffering. By this clever expedient, Catharine kept her head on her shoulders, and had the good fortune to outlive the brutal monster, who died in 1547.

"Henry reigned for thirty-eight years, and during that time he ordered the execution of two queens, two cardinals, two archbishops, eighteen bishops, thirteen abbots, five hundred priors and monks, thirty-eight doctors of divinity and laws, twelve dukes and earls, one hundred and sixty-four gentlemen, one hundred and twenty-four commoners, and one hundred and ten ladies" (Alzog, *Manual of Universal Church History*, vol. III, pp. 322-3).

Protestantism Advanced Under Edward VI

At the death of Henry VIII, the great body of Englishmen stood with the late king in desiring *no considerable change* in doctrine or worship (Walker, p. 408). But *despite* this fact England was to witness the introduction of many *Lutheran* teachings during the reign of Edward VI.

Upon his ascension, Edward was *only nine years of age*. The Duke of Somerset was immediately created *Protector* and headed the governmental council. He was a man of *Protestant sympathies* and was a friend of the dispossessed lower agricultural classes.

Under the influence of Somerset and Archbishop Cranmer, a number of changes in doctrine and worship were introduced.

It was at this time that the Six Articles were repealed and the real *basic doctrines* of the Church of England were framed. Cranmer was a thorough-going Protestant in his sympathies, and brought over a number of *Lutheran theologians* for advice and counsel.

Laws enforcing the celibacy of the priesthood were now repealed. Communion with both the bread and wine for the congregation was introduced, following Luther. The use of English in the church services was made mandatory, and help in formulating prayer books and liturgies was given by the continental reformers" (Fisher, *The History of the Christian Church*, pp. 357-8).

During this period, the basis of

UND JETZT INS DEUTSCHE ÜBERSETZT!

Die Broschüren

„Wie oft sollten wir das heilige
ABENDMAHL nehmen?“

„WOZU sind wir geboren?“

„Die AUFERSTEHUNG war
nicht an einem Sonntag!“
sind erschienen!

Postanschrift:

Die Welt von Morgen
P.O. Box 1030
Pasadena, Kalifornien

English Protestantism was definitely established. But, as we have seen, it was the Protestantism of the *German reformers* that was brought in on a limited scale.

Bloody Queen Mary's Reign

The plans for reformation came to an abrupt halt with the early death of Edward VI in 1553, and the accession of the Catholic Queen Mary. Because of the conniving of some of the Protestant noblemen, Mary even had the sympathies of most of her subjects when she came to the throne (Walker, p. 405).

Mary proceeded with caution at first upon the astute advice of her cousin, Emperor Charles V. Before long *Parliament reversed itself* and declared the marriage of her mother to Henry valid. The whimsical attitude of the monarchs and political leaders of England toward the marriage state is appalling. Their actions are but a *shameful parody* of Christ's words: "What therefore God hath joined together, *let not man put asunder*" (Mark 10:9).

Also, these actions certainly indicate that the *hearts* of the British people were *not strongly persuaded* about their new Protestant "faith" at all. As one English scholar cynically comments: "With Parliament Mary had no difficulty. As a contemporary ironically observed, they would have voted the establishment of the *Mahometan religion* with equal alacrity and zeal at the bidding of the Queen" (Babington, *The Reformation*, p. 286).

With *little opposition*, Mary persuaded Parliament to repeal the ecclesiastical legislation passed under Edward's reign, and public worship was restored to the forms of the last year of Henry VIII. But Cranmer was now *imprisoned*, and many of the more earnest *Protestants fled* to the continent.

At this time also, Mary contracted a marriage with Philip, son of Emperor Charles V, and soon to be Philip II of Spain. Fear of Catholic and Spanish domination made this an exceedingly *unpopular marriage* with Mary's subjects, and she lost much public support through this action (Fisher, *The History of the Christian Church*, p. 359).

The English nobles now feared the

loss of the church property they had *seized*, and a series of mutinous uprisings took place. During much of this time, it was difficult to tell whether their Protestant sympathies or their English *nationalism* provoked these incidents (Hausser, p. 569).

"Bloody" Mary now began the extermination of her enemies, and in February, 1554, *fifty people were hanged*. The entirely innocent Lady Jane Grey and her husband, the Duke of Suffolk, were both *executed* for alleged conspiracy against the crown. Mary had never regarded her sister Elizabeth with much affection, so she was imprisoned in the Tower. But through all these years, Elizabeth prudently avoided anything that would arouse Mary's suspicion of her, and so kept her life (Hausser, pp. 570-573).

Even at the beginning of this persecution, the English nobles and Parliament were still ready to *give up their Protestantism* and "to regulate the Church and her doctrine in accordance with the Pope's pleasure if no one would interfere with the *distribution of Church property* . . ." (Hausser, p. 571). It should certainly be plain that these nobles were more concerned with their *lust* for wealth and power than they were in trying to find true religion.

Once Mary allowed the erstwhile

Have you enrolled in our free Bible Correspondence Course?

This is a totally new, *different* kind of Bible study course, designed to lead you, by the study of *your own Bible*, to UNDERSTAND the whole meaning of today's fast-moving SPACE AGE, of the PURPOSE being worked out here below, of PROPHECY, of SALVATION.

The most VITAL, most IMPORTANT questions of YOUR LIFE are thoroughly gone into, and you are directed to the clear, plain, simple answers in your BIBLE! You will learn HOW to study the Bible—WHY so few UNDERSTAND it. You will PROVE whether the Bible is the INSPIRED WORD OF GOD!

Just address your letter requesting the Ambassador College Bible Correspondence Course to Box 111, Pasadena, California. Those in Europe should address our European office: B.C.M. Ambassador, London W.C. 1.

Protestants to keep the *seized church property*, Parliament readily consented to render obedience to the Pope and to renew the edicts against heretics. Now those who continued to oppose the Roman religion began to be persecuted in full force. In the three years before Mary's death, about two hundred and seventy Protestant "Heretics" were *burned at the stake*, among whom were fifty-five women and four children (Hausser, p. 571).

Many of these common people were faithful to their Protestant convictions to the end. Their spiritual leader, Thomas Cranmer, who had been Archbishop of Canterbury under Henry VIII and Edward VI, was not quite as constant. He *recanted* of his Protestant sympathies under Queen Mary, in hope of *saving his life*. But once it was determined that he should die anyway, his courage revived. He disavowed his former recantation, declared that he was a Protestant, and died with dignity. As Fisher states: "What course he would have pursued had he been permitted to live, it is *impossible* to tell . . ." (*The Reformation*, p. 328).

Under Mary, the government prosecuted the Protestants like criminals. This naturally developed a *hatred of Rome* among the English people. *Not* because of true religious feeling, but in a *political sense*, the idea now arose that "Protestantism and English nationality were *identical*" (Hausser, p. 573).

Thus, when we read of the staunch "Protestant" feelings among the English peoples, we need to realize *why*. It became a spirit of English nationalism in opposition to Rome. It is a *national religion* that has persisted in England to our day. And, as any informed student knows, its course has always depended more on *politics* and *power* than on sincere religious motives.

The English people continued in a partial state of *rebellion* until their Catholic Queen Mary died in November, 1558. The nation now welcomed her sister, Elizabeth, to the throne (Fisher, *The History of the Christian Church*, p. 362).

English Protestantism Established

Elizabeth soon established herself, as
(Please continue on page 31)

CRUCIFIXION

(Continued from page 6)

"Blow up the trumpet in the new moon, in the time appointed, on our solemn feast day, for this was a statute for Israel, and a law of the God of Jacob."

God, not man, determines the times and the seasons (Dan. 2:21).

Jews in Possession of God's Calendar

It is the Jews to whom God committed His revelations or oracles. Paul declared: "What advantage then hath the Jew? . . . chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God" (Romans 3:1-2).

The oracles of God included the Old Testament Scriptures, the knowledge of the week and the knowledge of the Sacred Calendar. The Jew preserved for the world the knowledge of which day the seventh day of the week is. Without a knowledge of when a week begins and ends we could never have told from the Bible alone which day the seventh day actually is. No nation preserved the week properly until they learned it from the Jews! That is the record of history.

And in the same way only the Jews have preserved God's calendar. "But," you ask, "what if some Jews did not believe in the oracles of God—including the Sacred Calendar—which were committed to them? Did they lose them or corrupt them?"

The Bible gives us the answer plainly in Romans 3:3-4: "For what if some did not believe? shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar."

If the Jews did not believe in what God committed to them, even if they lie about God's truth, THEY STILL MUST PRESERVE THEM or God has failed to be God! Notice: "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children FOREVER" (Deut. 29:29). The Jews have had to preserve these things. God purposed it!

Jews Forbidden to Determine Calendar for Themselves

Now consider what God says of those Jews who decided not to follow the

calendar God gave them and decided, instead, to observe their own new moons for themselves. Did God say that was permissible? Was that all right with Him?

Turn to God's answer in Isaiah 1:14: "YOUR new moons and YOUR appointed feasts My soul hateth . . ." The same condemnation is voiced in Hosea 2:11 against the House of Israel.

But do we find specific laws in the Bible which forbid the Jews to determine for themselves when the year begins?

Indeed we do: "There shall not be found among you . . . an OBSERVER OF TIMES . . ." (Deut. 18:10). The same command is repeated in Leviticus 19:26: "Ye shall not eat any thing with the blood . . . nor OBSERVE TIMES." Why? "For these nations, which thou shalt possess, hearken unto observers of times, and unto diviners: but as for thee, the Lord thy God hath not suffered thee so to do" (Deut. 18:14).

The words "observer of times" are translated from *anan*—meaning "cloud"—in the original Hebrew. An observer of times is one who "watched the clouds" in order to determine when the winter rainy season was over and when the spring harvest season would begin. He was one who set himself up in place of God to determine when the year should begin in the spring. But God forbids any such thing.

Notice from Galatians 4:10 that Paul forbids the observance of "times" or "months" and *holidays* which the Gentile converts had been accustomed to celebrate. *Here is a surprising NEW TESTAMENT command not to follow the months of the pagan Roman calendar then in use, but rather to follow the months as God gave them.* Because this command was not followed by the professing Christian world, the Roman calendar is still in use today.

If the Jews have not preserved the Sacred Calendar since the crucifixion, then Christians would not know when to observe the Passover ANNUALLY—or any of the other Holy Days of God commanded for New Testament times (I Cor. 5:8 and 16:8, Acts 18:21 and 20:6). For proof that the Passover has to be observed *annually*—not several times each year—write immediately for

Mr. Armstrong's free booklet "When and How Often Should We Partake of the 'Lord's Supper'?" (See Benson's Commentary and Scott's Commentary for further particulars on an "observer of times.")

How plain that God has required the Jews to preserve His sacred calendar!

Even the great Jewish calendar expert Maimonides, who lived nearly 1000 years ago, declared that the Jews preserved the calendar "transmitted by the Sages from one generation to another on the authority of Moses, our Teacher . . . on the basis of calculation" (from *Sanctification of the New Moon*, chapter 18, §7).

Now that we have determined that the calendar which Jesus and the Jews used was divinely inspired of God and committed to the Jews for transmission through all generations, then there are only two things left in order to prove when the crucifixion and the resurrection of Jesus Christ occurred. One is to determine the calendar dates of the Passover during the years of Christ's ministry. The other is to determine the exact year of the crucifixion.

Now for the seven historical and calendrical proofs that the "Good Friday-Easter Sunday" tradition is a fable which denies Jesus to be the Savior.

Proof One: The CALENDAR Tells When

Here is the chart, which can be verified by any work on the "Jewish Calendar," ABSOLUTELY CORRECT ACCORDING TO THE EXACT AND INSPIRED COMPUTATION PRESERVED SINCE THE DAYS OF MOSES!

Passover Dates

- A.D. 29, Saturday, April 16
- A.D. 30, Wednesday, April 5
- A.D. 31, Wednesday, April 25
- A.D. 32, Monday, April 14
- A.D. 33, Friday, April 3

To place the passover on a Friday in 30 A.D. is to violate one of the *inspired rules* of the calendar—that no common year of the sacred calendar may have 356 days. Common years of twelve months may be only 353, 354 or 355 days long—a fact you can verify in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*. Theologians place

the passover of 30 A.D. on Friday, April 7—356 days after the passover of 29 A.D. Count it for yourself! This date is two days late. The passover in 30 A.D. was only 354 days after that of 29 A.D.

These scholars forget that God had His sacred calendar, together with the Bible, preserved since the days of Moses to this very day—and that every date of the passover may be infallibly determined!

Moreover, astronomers recognize that the 14th of the month Nisan could have occurred on Wednesday in 30 A.D., as well as in 31 A.D.—but the theologians will not receive their testimony because of their human traditions.

Thus, if you want to believe that the crucifixion were in 30 A.D.—which it was NOT—you would still have to admit that Friday is NOT the day of the crucifixion!

For the year 31 A.D. several references, unacquainted with God's calendar, mistakenly give the passover, Nisan 14, as Monday, March 26. But this is one month too early. The year 30-31 A.D. was intercalary—that is, it had 13 months—thus placing the passover thirty days later in 31 A.D., and on a Wednesday!

During the time of Christ and up to 142 A.D., according to the rules of the Sacred Calendar, the passover could not occur earlier than six days after the vernal equinox—which in that year occurred on March 23, about 3 a.m. Greenwich time. Remember, in Jesus'

day the equinox did *not* occur on March 21, but on March 22 or 23, because the Roman world was using the *Julian* calendar. Since March 26 was only *three* days after the equinox, it could *not* have been the passover. Hence in 31 A.D. the passover was 30 days later on a Wednesday—and this is the *ONLY POSSIBLE YEAR* in which Christ could have been crucified, as we shall now PROVE.

It would take a pamphlet to explain in full detail the simple methods of computing the dates of the passover according to the Sacred Calendar—which most people call the "Jewish calendar"—and as there is not room in this article for it, you will have to patiently wait until it is later published.

Proof Two: the Decree of Artaxerxes

There are several basic dates from which the exact year of Christ's death may be determined. These dates are so precise that there can be no doubt that the passover upon which Jesus was crucified occurred on Wednesday, April 25, A.D. 31.

The first date is the year in which Artaxerxes issued his decree to restore and build Jerusalem (Ezra 7). It is recorded in Daniel 9:25-26 that there would be sixty-nine prophetic weeks (7+62) till the Messiah would come, after which he would be "cut off"—crucified—"not for himself" but for the sins of the whole world. Sixty-nine prophetic weeks equals 483 years (69×7).

When we determine the year in which this decree was issued, we can locate the exact year, 483 years later, when Christ—the Messiah—began His ministry.

In recent years an abundance of documents from the era of Ezra and Nehemiah—business records giving exact dates according to the Persian, Egyptian and Jewish calendars, and astronomical tablets recording eclipse cycles in the years of kings—have been translated. These records continue fundamentally to corroborate the chronological table of Persian kings recorded in Ptolemy's canon.

Records, preserved in world-famous American and foreign libraries, have been found that were written in the very month that Artaxerxes—under whose reign the decree was issued—came to power. The death of Xerxes occurred in late December 465 B.C. and his son, Artaxerxes, came to throne in that month.

According to the Persian spring-to-spring reckoning of regnal years—as these business documents clearly show—Artaxerxes' first year extended from April 464 to April 463 B.C. These same business documents show that the Jewish autumn-to-autumn mode of reckoning, used by Ezra and Nehemiah, placed the first year of Artaxerxes from September 464 to September 463 B.C. The period of time from the day the new king ascended the throne to the first year of his reign was called his ACCESSION YEAR and was regarded as completing

SACRED CALENDAR

with the corresponding Roman months at the right
in the year before the crucifixion.

30 A.D. 1ST MONTH							30 A.D.
NISAN							
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SABBATH	
				1 NEW MOON	2	3	
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
11	12	13	14 PASSOVER	15 DAYS OF UNLEAVENED BREAD	16	17	
18 DAYS OF UNLEAVENED BREAD	19	20	21 DAYS OF UNLEAVENED BREAD	22	23	24	
25	26	27	28	29	30		

ROMAN CALENDAR

with the corresponding Sacred month at the left
in the year before the crucifixion.

30 A.D.	30 A.D. MARCH							30 A.D.
	APRIL							
	SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SABBATH	
					23 NEW MOON	24	25	
	26	27	28	29	30	31	1	
	2	3	4	5 PASSOVER	6 DAY OF UNLEAVENED BREAD	7	8	
	9 DAYS OF UNLEAVENED BREAD	10	11 UNLEAVENED	12 UNLEAVENED	13	14	15	
	16	17	18	19	20	21		

SACRED CALENDAR

with the corresponding Roman months at the right
in the year of the crucifixion.

31 A.D. 1ST MONTH						
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SABBATH
				1 NEW MOON	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14 CRUCIFIXION	15 DAYS OF UNLEAVENED BREAD	16	17 RESURRECTION
18 DAYS OF UNLEAVENED BREAD	19	20 DAYS OF UNLEAVENED BREAD	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

ROMAN CALENDAR

with the corresponding Sacred month at the left
in the year of the crucifixion.

31 A.D. APRIL						
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SABBATH
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25 PASSOVER	26 DAYS OF UNLEAVENED BREAD	27 DAYS OF UNLEAVENED BREAD	28 RESURRECTION
29 DAYS OF UNLEAVENED BREAD	30 DAYS OF UNLEAVENED BREAD	1 DAYS OF UNLEAVENED BREAD	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	

the last regnal year of the previous king.

The astronomical tablets containing over a dozen precise records of eclipses prove that the first year of Artaxerxes, according to the Jewish reckoning, was from 464 to 463 B.C. You may verify these facts in any of the latest thorough books on archaeology.

The seventh year of Artaxerxes—the year in which he issued his decree (Ezra 7:8)—would extend from about September 458 B.C. to September 457 B.C.

From the first month to the fifth month of God's calendar—from the latter part of March to the latter part of July, 457 B.C.—Ezra journeyed to Judaea in the seventh year of Artaxerxes at which time the decree went forth to build Jerusalem as the capital of the revised Jewish nation.

And just 483 years later would bring us to the autumn of A.D. 27—the year when the Messiah would appear.

Although the date of the issuance of this decree is amply proved from astronomy, dozens of business documents, and the Canon of Ptolemy, historians sometimes mis-interpret the facts to suit their pet theories. Then theologians quote from whatever historical sources suit them in order to change the true date for the beginning of Christ's ministry.

But the true date—457 B.C.—is absolutely fixed by the most accurate records of history written at that very time.

Some religious sects would incorrectly put this decree as late as 455 B.C. in

order to have the crucifixion occur on Friday in 33 A.D.! Such a date is totally rejected by ALL historians today!

Age of Jesus at His Baptism

Jesus, according to Daniel's prophecy, was anointed the Messiah in 27 A.D., which was 483 years after the decree of Artaxerxes to restore Jerusalem. The next fact that we need to understand is the age of Jesus when he was baptized and entered upon his ministry.

The only historical account of this was written by Luke to Theophilus (Luke 1:1-4). In this account it is plainly stated that when Jesus began his ministry "he was about thirty years old." (Luke 3:23).

Luke did not say, "about 29," or "about 31." He records that Jesus "began to be about thirty"—and he meant it, for he was an inspired historian. Either this record is true or you might as well discard the Bible.

As Jesus was about 30 years old in the autumn of 27 A.D., then he must have been born in the autumn of 4 B.C. as we shall now prove.

Proof Three: The Death of Herod

The time of Jesus's birth is important. Jesus was born before the death of Herod the king (Mat. 2:15). When did Herod die? Again the critics are in utmost confusion because they have refused to weigh all the facts.

According to Josephus, the Jewish historian, Herod died, "having reigned, since he had procured Antigonus to be

slain, thirty-four years; but since he had been declared king by the Romans, thirty-seven" (*Antiquities*, XVII,viii, 1).

The two dates for the beginning of Herod's reign are not disputed, but given as 37 B.C. and 40 B.C. respectively. Reckoning as Josephus does, the last year of Herod's reign extended from about April 4 B.C. to April 3 B.C.

Although Herod's death is commonly dated in April 4 B.C.—or even as late as 2 B.C.—neither of these dates is correct. Simple subtraction ought to prove that! Herod died just prior to the beginning of spring in B.C. 3!

Notice!

Josephus, in *Antiquities of the Jews*, XVII, vi, 4, mentions an eclipse of the moon before the death of Herod. That eclipse, as calculated, occurred about March 13, 4 B.C. Yet it was after this that Herod went beyond the river Jordan to be cured of his diseases. Finding that the physicians couldn't cure him, he still revived sufficiently to return to Jericho. There, he gathered together and contrived the death of the principal men of the entire Jewish nation. And as if this were not enough, Herod had his son Antipater killed five days before his own death. Since these and other events occurred after the eclipse mentioned by Josephus, and since Herod died just prior to a passover according to Josephus, that passover must have been THIRTEEN MONTHS AFTER THE ECLIPSE and not one month later. Thus Herod died in B.C. 3, the only date that agrees with

all the known facts of history.

As Jesus was about thirty years old in the early autumn of 27 A.D., then he must have been born in the early autumn of B.C. 4, about half a year before the death of Herod. *Jesus could not have been born before this time*, or he would have been more than thirty years old at the beginning of his ministry. Neither could he have been born later in B.C. 2 as some assume, for he would have been only twenty-eight years old. But Luke plainly said that he was *about* THIRTY years of age.

When Did the Wise Men Arrive?

But what are we going to do with the statement recorded in Matthew 2:16 that just before his death Herod had all the children in Bethlehem killed "from two years old and under"? This would appear to indicate that Jesus may have been born one year earlier than He really was born.

Most people carelessly read this account by *assuming that Herod knew the date of Jesus' birth*. They think he had all the children killed because Jesus must have been between one and two years old.

Think for a moment how illogical this would be. Would a murderer like Herod wait for at least one whole year *after the Magi left before attempting to kill the child Jesus*? Of course not.

The truth is that *Herod did not know the time of Jesus' birth*. Notice what the Scriptures states: *As soon as Herod saw that the Magi didn't return to him he became very angry, ordering all those little children butchered "from two years old and under, ACCORDING TO THE TIME WHICH HE HAD exactly LEARNED of the magi"* (Mat. 2:16).

Now what was the *exact time* that he learned from the magi? Was it the date of Jesus' birth? No!

Notice verse seven of this same chapter: "Then Herod privily called the magi, and learned of them exactly the time of . . . what? The birth of Jesus? No. But *"of the appearing star."*

Of course!

The wise men or magi had come a great distance from the East and the star had appeared *some time before the birth of Jesus* in order for them to prepare to make their journey to Beth-

lehem while Jesus was still very young. Since the star appeared more than one year previously, Herod took no chances but had every infant killed up to two years of age.

Jesus was slightly less than six months
(Please continue on page 30)

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

(Continued from page 2)

is an unbeliever) about Adam and Eve being chased out of the Garden of Eden."

"It's all you said it would be and more. I've never seen anything like it before."

"It's wonderful. No words to express how I really feel."

"Though I'm quite a way from being a youngster anymore I found myself all wrapped up in the new 'Bible Story' beginning there. That is going to be a blessing to both young and old alike."

"I'm not 5 but 76 and have never read a Bible story so interesting."

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

(Continued from page 10)

still looking on the outward appearance. It meant being cut off completely and forever from all to which I had aspired. It meant a total crushing of vanity. It meant a total *change of life*!

I counted the cost!

But then, I had been beaten down. I had been humiliated. I had been broken in spirit, frustrated. I had come to look on this formerly esteemed self as a failure. I now took another good look at myself.

And I acknowledged: "I'm nothing but a burned-out old hunk of junk."

I had maintained that the business failures were not my fault. Now I began to doubt that. I began to suspect that I was not even remotely the man of great talents and abilities I had always imagined. I realized I had been a swell-headed egotistical jackass.

Finally, in desperation, I threw myself on God's mercy. I said to God that I knew, now, that I was nothing but a

failure, a burned-out hunk of junk. My life was worth nothing more to ME. I said to God that I knew now I had nothing to offer HIM—but if He would forgive me—if He could have any use whatsoever for such a worthless dreg of humanity who had fallen all the way down in failure and disillusionment, that He could have my life; I knew it was worthless, but if He could do anything with it, He could have it—I was willing to give this worthless self to HIM—I wanted to accept Jesus Christ as personal Saviour!

I meant it! It was the toughest battle I ever fought. It was a battle for LIFE. I lost that battle, as I had been recently losing all battles. I realized Jesus Christ had bought and paid for my life. I gave in. I surrendered, unconditionally. I told Christ He could have what was left of me! I didn't think I was worth saving!

Jesus said, "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it." I then and there gave up my life—not knowing that this was the *ONLY* way to really find it!

It was humiliating to have to admit my wife had been right, and I had been wrong. It was disillusioning to learn, on studying the BIBLE for the first time that what I had been taught in Sunday School was, in so many basic instances, the very opposite of what the Bible plainly states. It was shocking to learn that "all these churches *were* wrong" after all!

But I did, later, have one satisfaction. I wrote up a long manuscript about the Sabbath, finally tying it up with evolution, and PROVING evolution false. I gave it to my sister-in-law, Mrs. Dillon. She read it unsuspectingly. Before she realized what she was reading, she had accepted the evidence and PROOF that evolution was false.

"You tricked me!" she exclaimed.

But she *did* have to "eat those words!"

How I continued on and on with the STUDY OF THE BIBLE, starting out with this one doctrine, going on to other doctrines, finding real love and satisfying fellowship among humble people whose hearts were right, and being finally drawn into the ministry, will continue with the next installment.

The Bible Story

by Basil Wolverton

CHAPTER FOUR

THE TOWER OF BABEL

NOAH and his family journeyed down from the mountains where the ark rested to start a new life in the nearby plains.

From then on, all the people who came into the world were started by Noah's three sons and their wives. (Genesis 9:19.) After some years had gone by, there were many people in the plains area south of where the ark had landed. Some of them kept on moving farther down into the valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates, the two main rivers of the ancient land of Assyria. As the years passed and people increased in numbers, many of them moved southeast and over the lower plains toward what is now known as the Persian Gulf. There the soil was rich, and wonderful crops sprang out of it. The ground was at its best in the region where the Tigris and the Euphrates rivers flowed closest together in a land called Shinar. (Genesis 11:2.) More and more families chose that area to live in. There were very few rocks or trees there. Probably no great city would have been built there if it hadn't been discovered that much of the soil was just right for making excellent bricks. These were made by pressing the moist clay into block shapes and baking them around hot fires or even in the sun.

Furthermore, there were places where a thick, pitchy liquid oozed from the ground. This liquid, now called bitumen, was the very thing needed to hold the bricks together. (Genesis 11:3.)


Human Beings Huddle Together

Men began putting up homes, barns, warehouses and all kinds of buildings. Before long a good-sized town was sprawling out over the plain of Shinar. People were

massing together again just as they had done before the flood.

This did not please God. He knew that when human beings huddled together

After the Flood people went contrary to God's wish by crowding
into newly built cities.



in crowded buildings they failed to get the best out of the good things He had created for men to find in the fields, the forests, the mountains, the streams and even in the seas and the deserts. Besides, men were more likely to break God's rules of happy living when they existed in masses. God had told Noah and his family that people should spread out over the Earth.

Noah lived for three hundred and fifty years after the flood. (Genesis 9:28.) During that time he probably proclaimed God's wishes every time he had the chance to do so. It was also through Noah that God told people who lived after the flood about the Man who would some day come to Earth and die for human beings so that they would be free of wrong ways of living—free from sin. This man, God told them through Noah, would be brought back to life and return to Heaven, the place from which God rules the universe and all in it.

Most men were living further and further from God, and didn't care much about their Creator. However, many of them, through Noah's efforts, understood something of God's laws and plans. But one thing they didn't know was just when this Person who was to give his life for them would come to Earth. Today we know that the Man was Jesus Christ, God's Son, and that he came to our planet as a human being about two thousand three hundred years after the flood. (Luke 1:32, 43.)

Nimrod Becomes a Hero

But something happened back then to cause men to believe that the son of a god had come to Earth shortly after the flood. Satan, ruler of demons, planted the idea so that he could lead people into worshipping false gods.

This evil plan started with a man who came down from one of Noah's sons, Ham. The man's name was Nimrod. He went by various other names as the centuries passed. Most of Earth's inhabitants today wouldn't have any idea who this man was, although he has in one way or another had a powerful effect on the life of most every one who has lived in the past four thousand years.

Nimrod was a very large, strong, fierce man with very dark skin. Because of his power and skill as a successful hunter of the wild beasts that attacked people, he became a hero and a leader among his tribesmen. (Genesis 10:8-9.)

Like most others of his time, Nimrod knew of his Creator's laws. But Nimrod hated those laws. Just as many other people today have been led to believe, so he believed that if he lived by God's rules he wouldn't enjoy life. He lived by his own laws, and tried to prove to others that they would be happier if they would live the same way.

Nimrod became chief over the people who grouped together in that sprawling

town in the land of Shinar. Probably there were many families that didn't like the way he ordered them to do this or that. But whenever wild animals attacked, Nimrod and his warriors fought to protect the townspeople. Later, Nimrod had a wall built around the growing town. Deeds like these helped make him a strong leader, and caused more and more families to move in and settle under his rule.

Before many more years had passed, the town had grown into a city. It was the first large city to be built on the Earth after the flood, and it was such a wonder that people came from afar to gaze upon the vast mass of buildings and high walls. That country later came to be known as Babylonia, and the name of the city was Babel or Babylon. (Genesis 10:10.)

Nimrod Begins Idol Worship

Meanwhile, Nimrod was not only ruler of Babylon, but he had become the most feared man in the land. His power and wealth grew as people moved into or near Babylon.

He made the laws, and those laws decreed that Babylonians should not look to the God of Noah as their ruler, but should be ruled by human governments. Nimrod also taught them that Satan should be honored by their worship of objects they could see, such as the sun and snakes and other kinds of things. (Romans 1:21-23.)


Nimrod called Satan "Merodach" —meaning "Lord" or "Master." (Jeremiah 50:2.) In the Hebrew language the name was "Baal." He was the sun-god. He was considered the chief god among the many idols. Nimrod strengthened his power over his subjects by making himself the high priest of Merodach or Baal.

There, in ancient Babylon, were born the false beliefs that have wormed their way into almost every religion. Even today millions and millions of people who may want to live according to the right ways are not aware that their manner of worship follows very closely that of ancient idol worship and pagan rites begun at Babel.

One of Nimrod's schemes to hold people together under his rule was to build a tower so gigantic that it would excite everyone's awe and wonder. It was to be a temple, a monument to the sun-god, and the center of a world-ruling human government. Nimrod intended that it would be the greatest tower ever built. (Genesis 11:4.)

Men slaved for a long time just to erect the base of the tower. Then little by little, as workers swarmed over it month after month, the temple took shape toward the sky. Nimrod's plan for a brick monster to loom up over the plains was working out very well.

Then God stepped in. He saw that Babel was only the beginning of what men would do. God knew that if the people continued their efforts, "then nothing would be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do." (Genesis 11:6.) God had to



Babylonian mothers bowing before Nimrod, high priest of the sun-god, to present their babies to be purified by being sacrificed in fire.

step in to stop men from doing then the things which men are now beginning to do for the first time. Think what it would have been like if men such as Nimrod would have been able to possess weapons like we have today in order to enslave the whole Earth!


Many Languages Begin

Up to that time there was only one language. Men hadn't moved apart in different tribes long enough to start speaking in different ways as do the people of today in different sections of the Earth. (Genesis 11:1.)

But something happened to the men working on the tower. They began to

accuse each other of not talking plainly. Some talked one way, while others talked other ways. The less they understood one another, the more they argued. Arguments grew

God confused the language of the nations at the Tower of Babel.



into fights. Work came to a halt on the tower. (Genesis 11:7-8.)

Can you imagine what it would be like if each one in your family would start speaking in a language of his own? Not understanding each other would lead to much trouble, and it would be hard to live together. So it was with the men who were working under Nimrod on the tower that came to be known as the "tower of Babel." Not every workman necessarily spoke a different language, but so many ways of speaking developed through God's influence that there was too much confusion to continue erecting the tall temple. The tower was thereafter called "Babel" because "Babel" meant "confusion" in the language Noah spoke.

Not understanding their neighbors, many of the families living in or near the city of Babylon moved away to seek a living in distant parts of the land.

This was what God had intended for them to do. (Genesis 10:25 and Deuteronomy 32:7-8.) His way of scattering them by confusing their language was a great blow to Nimrod and his schemes for quick growth of his kingdom and greater control over man's religious habits.

But during the next few years, while people were scattering out over the lands, those who stayed in or near Babylon were also becoming greater in numbers. Besides, many families who had never before been near Babylon stopped there in their travels. In time, there were so many men again living there that Nimrod once more put men to work on the city of Babylon.

People came from afar to gaze upon the vast mass of buildings and high walls of the city called Babylon.



But it was not God's will that the tower would ever be finished—and it never was.

Nimrod Plans to Rule the Earth

With the passing of years, Nimrod built other cities on the plains of Shinar in Babylonia. He spread his kingdom into Assyria, into the continents of Asia and Europe and even down into the land of Egypt and Ethiopia in the continent of Africa. Everywhere he implanted the evil custom of worshipping the devil in the form of a snake or as the sun-god. Nimrod claimed that Satan the devil had secret knowledge which he alone was able to open up to his fellowmen. Nimrod's followers therefore called him "Peter," which means the "opener" in the language of Babylonia.

Meanwhile, many of Earth's inhabitants had little or nothing to do with Nimrod's ways. Some tribes had traveled so far beyond Babylonia that they didn't even know about the start of idol worship. Others didn't care much about God or about idols.

A small part of the people still chose to obey their Creator. Shem, one of Noah's sons, was a leader among God's followers. For many years he worked against the wave of idol worship that spread out of Babylon. Ancient writings in stone have shown that Shem warned the Egyptians of Nimrod's evil plans. As a result Nimrod fled from Egypt to Europe where he hid out at Rome until he was killed. And that is how the story of Nimrod or "Peter" being killed at Rome began over four thousand years ago.

Nimrod's death was a shocking surprise to his followers. They couldn't understand how or why the high priest of the sun-god could be allowed to die. So many subjects lost faith in their hero that Nimrod's religious system started to crumble.

But Satan had no idea of giving up his struggle to turn man against his Creator. He worked in a very shrewd way to use Nimrod's death to shock men into going on with their worship of idols. Satan had a plan to make pagan religions something that would not only become more and more popular at the time, but which would cause them to last for thousands of years!

Nimrod's Wife

To understand how this happened, we must know something about Nimrod's wife, Ishtar. Many people called her Semiramis. When her husband was killed, she became the ruler over his kingdom. But because many of her subjects believed that Nimrod wasn't the god-like being he had claimed to be, Semiramis feared that she might lose control over them. She knew that she must think of something that would appear to be a great miracle—something that would fill the people with awe and show them that Nimrod was really a god.

Some time after Nimrod's death, Semiramis gave birth to a baby boy. This was just

what this evil woman needed to carry out her greedy plan! Immediately she commanded the following news to be proclaimed throughout the land:

"Our queen has just given birth to a son. This baby has no human father, but was brought into being by a magic beam of light from the great sun-god! You have heard that someday one would be born who would be like a god, and have the power to save all people. This baby who has been born to our queen is that god! He is Nimrod's son come to restore his father's government!"

This terrible lie was probably too much for some to believe. Nevertheless, the queen succeeded in keeping control of the kingdom. Nimrod was looked upon more and more as the sun-god. Furthermore, because of more of her efforts, Semiramis began to be worshipped as the mother of god. She was also known as "The Virgin Mother" and "Queen of Heaven." (Jeremiah 7:18 and 44:17-19, 25.) She was the first religious ruler of the world.

All this happened more than four thousand years ago. It was the very beginning of various pagan religions, and it had such a strong effect down through the centuries that even today many people worship a "Queen of Heaven," even though there never was such a person.

Satan worked in such a crafty way that those ancient idol-worship symbols, dates, customs, ideas and traditions have become mixed in with the manner in which most of us worship today. These things from the past, spoken of in the Bible as "hidden mysteries," still hide the truth from millions who truly want to obey God.

Pagan Holidays Observed Today

God tells us through His scriptures not to learn the customs of idol-worshippers. (Jeremiah 10:2 and Deuteronomy 12:30-31.) On the other hand, many religious leaders sincerely tell us that it would be pagan *not* to observe the twenty-fifth of December as a holiday. The twenty-fifth day of December is the day celebrated by those ancient pagans as the day of the birth of Nimrod, god of the sun! Christ's birthday was sometime in the autumn, not in December.

Semiramis claimed that on December twenty-fifth an evergreen tree grew up overnight from a dead stump in Babylon, and that Nimrod's spirit would come at the same time to leave gifts on the tree. This was the real beginning of what is celebrated now as Christmas!

Another time observed by world-wide religious festivals is that of the birth of Semiramis or Ishtar. She falsely claimed to have lived as a spirit before the flood, and to have come down from heaven in a huge egg dropped into the Euphrates river. The god-

dess in the Ishtar egg (Easter egg) was none other than Semiramis under another name!

You will find Easter mentioned in the King James Bible. (Acts 12:4.) However, it was wrongly put there by translators in place of the word "Passover." Passover is one of the times God wants us to observe, whereas Easter Sunday, with its ancient sunrise services, is entirely pagan. (I Corinthians 5:7-8.) Later on we will tell you how Christ came out of his grave late Saturday afternoon, and had no connection with the fable that a savior arose on what is wrongly called Easter Sunday.

Among the popular beliefs that have come down to us from ancient idol-worship and have been mixed in with our religions is the one that each of us has a spirit that will live forever. The Bible tells us that one can live forever only if given eternal life as a gift from God. (Romans 6:23.) Those who continue to disobey God when they know the right thing to do will die. (Ezekiel 18:4, 20.) However, people are still taught, through the influence of false religions, that those who are wicked will be sent to a fiery place inside the Earth, there to live forever and ever. (Malachi 4:1.)

Now you can begin to understand how Satan worked through Nimrod and Semiramis to cause human beings to believe lies (Revelation 12:9), just as he caused Eve to believe the first lie.


However, Satan will not always be able to deceive human beings. The time is soon coming when his power will be cut off for a thousand years. (Revelation 20:1-3.) Then the false religions will be blotted out, and the world will happily receive all the truth—much of which has been kept from us for so long. But that is another story to come later.

Noah Dies of Old Age!

At the time Nimrod's kingdom had spread all the way into Egypt, Noah was still living! He was over seven hundred years old when God scattered men from Babylon. Still he was not feeble, and because he remained faithful to God, God gave him many more years of life. He became a successful farmer, and was nine hundred and fifty years old when he died!

That is a long, long time to live, especially when we consider how short a time we live in these days. Yet those who are wise enough to turn from the wrong kind of living in order to seek the ways God has given us will enjoy even longer lives. They will get to live forever as spirit beings (I Corinthians 15:44-45, 53), and many of them will start that long life by ruling the Earth soon with Jesus Christ for a thousand years! (Revelation 2:26-27 and 5:9-10.)

Later, they will dwell in a beautiful, jewelled city God will send down from heaven to earth. (Revelation 21:2.)



"And all the days of Noah were 950 years; and he died."

This is one of the many wonderful things God has prepared for those who love Him.

To be continued

CRUCIFIXION

(Continued from page 18)

old at the time of Herod's death. The latest possible date for the birth of Jesus was the autumn of B.C. 4, before winter arrived (Luke 2:8). This places the commencement of the ministry of Christ, thirty years later in the autumn of the year 27.

Proof Four: Temple Under Construction 46 Years

Here is another clinching fact.

Jesus was about thirty years old when he began his ministry in the autumn of 27 A.D. The *first passover* in his ministry must have occurred the next spring, A.D. 28. It was at that time that the Jews told Jesus that the temple of Herod was already "forty-six years in building" (John 2:20).

Herod began constructing the temple, after three years' thorough preparation, in the very last part of his 18th year according to Josephus (*Antiquities* XV, xi, 1). Since he reckons this 18th year from the spring of B.C. 37, the 18th year would be 20-19 B.C. The temple was begun in the months immediately preceding the passover, B.C. 19. The major part of the construction was completed by the autumn of B.C. 18 (*Antiquities* XV, xi, 6) in about 1½ years.

Forty-six full years from B.C. 19 would bring us to the beginning of A.D. 28, just before the first passover in Jesus' ministry.

If the ministry of Christ began in any other year than the autumn of A.D. 27, then the temple would *not* have been exactly 46 years in building by the time of the passover in the spring of 28 A.D.

Proof Five: The Reign of Emperor Tiberius

One of the most vital keys to the chronology of Christ's ministry—and yet one of the most universally misunderstood dates—is the 15th year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar. Luke tells us that John the Baptist began to preach in his 15th year (Luke 3:1).

When was this fifteenth year?

The trouble arises from the fact that there are at least *two dates* from which the reign of Tiberius Caesar may be

counted—the *first* commences with his being made co-ruler with Augustus Caesar, at the very end of A.D. 11 or the beginning of A.D. 12. The exact month is not known, but it is not essential anyway. The *second* date begins with his sole rule in August, A.D. 14. Luke could have used either date and been historically correct. But which one *did* he use?

To be consistent with all the other facts, Luke must have used the earlier date as the beginning of the reign of Tiberius. In fact, for the word "reign" Luke uses a Greek word meaning "government" in general, indicating that he did not mean his sole emperorship, but merely his elevation to joint authority—about the end of A.D. 11 or beginning of A.D. 12.

In determining the emperor's regnal year, Luke used the customary Jewish form, practiced also by Josephus. "Josephus also . . . in order to avoid making the last year of one emperor coincide with the first year of his successor, reckoned the final year of each emperor as continuing to the end of the current year, and made the first year of his successor begin [in] April following his accession," says the competent scholar W. M. Ramsey in his book *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?*, page 223.

This method *which has but recently been understood*, was used by Luke also to determine imperial *joint reigns*. The first year of the joint reign of Tiberius would extend from about April 12 A.D. to April 13 A.D. His fifteenth year would extend from about April 26 A.D. to April 27 A.D.

In this 15th year John the Baptist began to preach repentance all about the Jordan River before Jesus was baptized by him. *John's ministry occupied several months* in which he prepared the way for Jesus.

Notice how this dovetails with the next proof.

Proof Six: When Was Pilate Governor?

Luke names Pontius Pilate as governor of Judaea when John received his call (Luke 3:1). "Now in the fifteenth year of the *government* of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea . . . the word of God came unto John." Pilate ruled for *ten years*. Many

historians give his dates as 26 to 36 A.D., but this is a mistake.

Pilate was deposed a few months before the passover at the close of his tenth year. He *hurriedly* sailed for Rome to appeal to Emperor Tiberius. On his way news came that Tiberius died. You will read this in Josephus' *Antiquities* XVIII, iv, 2.

Since Pilate was in a *great hurry* to reach Rome, he must have left shortly before the death of the Emperor which occurred in March, 37 A.D. Ten years before this is about the beginning of A.D. 27 at which time Pilate began his procuratorship.

Here is what the *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* says in its article "Pilate": The assumed date for Pilate is usually "from 26 to 36 A.D. . . . Tiberius died on March 16, 37 A.D. Such a delay [in Pilate's journey to Rome] is inconceivable in view of the circumstances; hence . . . the period of his procuratorship [is] 27-37 A.D."

The *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia* states, under the article "Pilate": "He probably succeeded Gratus 27 A.D. and ended his procuratorship early in 37; it is not likely that Pilate required more than a year for his return journey to Rome . . . and he arrived there after Tiberius' death, which took place Mar. 16, 37."

Now notice. As Pilate did not begin his governorship till about the commencement of 27 A.D. and as Tiberius' 15th year ended about April of that year, *John the Baptist must have begun his ministry in the first few months of 27 A.D.*

Jesus, therefore, could *not* have begun his ministry earlier than the autumn of 27 A.D. Neither could his ministry HAVE BEGUN AFTER THE PASSOVER in the spring of A.D. 28 because the temple was already 46 years in building. Therefore Jesus must have begun to preach in the autumn of A.D. 27. THERE IS NO OTHER DATE THAT WOULD BE CONSISTENT WITH ALL THE PROVABLE FACTS.

To find the date of the crucifixion, we now need only find how long the ministry of Jesus lasted.

Proof Seven: How Long Was the Ministry?

The prophet Daniel foretold that the

length of Christ's ministry *at his first coming*—to confirm the new covenant—would be one-half of a prophetic week of seven years. In the midst of that prophetic week he caused the need of sacrifices for sin to cease by offering himself for the sins of the world. He was "cut off" in the midst of the week, making the ministry at his first coming *three and one-half years* (Daniel 9:26, 27). "Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks"—69 prophetic weeks or 483 years in all—"And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself. . . . And He shall confirm the covenant with many for a week"—this prophecy is not yet completely fulfilled—why? because "in the midst of the week He shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease"—He died for the sins of the world in the middle of the week.

In a sense this is a dual prophecy. Christ died in the midst of the prophetic week of seven years, after $3\frac{1}{2}$ years of ministry; but He also died *in the midst of the week—Wednesday!*

Now let's turn to the gospels to find the proof that Jesus Christ's ministry was exactly three and one-half years. There would have to be three passovers during the three years of his ministry, and a fourth on the last day of his earthly life—the crucifixion.

The first passover occurred in A.D. 28 and is recorded in John 2:23. "Now when He was at Jerusalem at the passover, during the feast, many believed in his name." During the following weeks Jesus spent time baptizing in Judaea (John 3:22). "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judaea, and there tarried with them, and baptized."

The next note of time is found in John 4:35, which indicates *a lapse of time of nearly seven weeks*—bringing us to about Pentecost A.D. 28 when Jesus began to preach publicly (Luke 4:16).

In Luke 6:1 is the next time reference—"the second sabbath after the first." This is an obscure translation. It comes from the Greek *deutero proton sabbaton* which means the "second sab-

bath of first rank"—the second high day or annual Sabbath—the last day of Unleavened Bread in 29 A.D. (*Die Biblische Chronologie* by Friedrich Westberg, page 122). And in 29 A.D. that last day fell on a Saturday according to the Sacred Calendar as Matthew 12:14 and Mark 3:6 plainly state.

Two passovers have now occurred. Again in John 6:4 is another passover which brings us to a Wednesday in the year 30 A.D. "Now the passover, the feast of the Jews, was nigh." This was the third passover in Jesus' ministry. The fourth and final passover is recorded by all the gospel writers (John 11:55). "Now the passover of the Jews was near: and many went up to Jerusalem out of the country before the passover, to purify themselves."

This last passover completed a ministry of three and one-half years—from autumn of A.D. 27 to the Spring of A.D. 31—THE VERY YEAR WHEN THE PASSOVER UPON WHICH CHRIST WAS CRUCIFIED FELL ON WEDNESDAY.

Since Jesus began his $3\frac{1}{2}$ -year ministry not later than 27 A.D., he could not have been crucified so late as 33 A.D. *There was therefore no passover which occurred on a Friday during his entire ministry!*

Yes, history proves false the tradition that Jesus was crucified on Friday and rose on Easter Sunday!

In *this* present article we have given you the undeniable *record of history* and of the calendar that the crucifixion could not have been on Friday—that the resurrection was not on Sunday!

Now you need the *COMPLETE* proof, *from the Bible itself*, that the resurrection was not on Sunday morning, so write immediately for Mr. Armstrong's challenging free booklet "*The Resurrection Was NOT on Sunday!*"

REFORMATION

(Continued from page 14)

Henry VIII had done, as head of the Church of England. But, since the title, "Supreme Head," had seemed objectionable to Catholics, she was now styled "Supreme Governor" of the national church (Walker, p. 414).

Now, step by step, the Protestant principles formerly established under

Edward VI were reintroduced. By the Act of Uniformity, 1559, the Prayer Book of Edward VI was restored for use in all the churches. All persons were *required* to attend the national church under penalty and fine, except for "lawful or reasonable excuse" (Moncrief, *A Short History of the Christian Church*, p. 339).

Babington comments upon the *hypocritical changeableness* of the "religious" situation in England during this time. "Thus within the space of a few years the English Parliament for the *third time* formally *recanted* its religious belief. It is vain to give any creditable reason for this amazing fact. To suppose that in making these changes the hereditary legislators and the representatives of the English people were swayed by spiritual zeal or religious conviction would be the *height of absurdity*" (*The Reformation*, p. 299).

Although Queen Elizabeth herself *dominated* in religious as well as civil affairs, Matthew Parker was now consecrated as Archbishop of Canterbury. Under his direction, the *forty-two articles of faith* originally formulated by Thomas Cranmer were reduced to thirty-nine. In 1571, Parliament adopted them as the *basis of doctrine* of the Church of England. They set forth "a type of doctrine midway between Lutheranism and Calvinism" (Kurtz, *Church History*, p. 315).

Actually, the religious *basis* of the Church of England was more of a *mixture* of Lutheranism, Calvinism, and Catholicism. But the Thirty-Nine Articles were primarily based on *Lutheran* confessions of faith (Moncrief, p. 339). And, of course, *Luther's* theory of justification by faith *alone* was held. Yet *Calvin's* doctrines on the "Lord's Supper" and on *predestination* were, in the main, accepted.

But *many* Roman Catholic *rituals, customs* and *concepts* were retained. "The Thirty-Nine Articles contain many Protestant dogmas, but they also retain *much of the Roman cult*" (Moncrief, p. 340).

Although there have been *some alterations* from time to time, the *doctrines* and *form of religion* established at this time under Queen Elizabeth remain *essentially the same* to this day

in the Church of England (Wharey's *Church History*, p. 240).

Summary

It is not our purpose in the present work to go into a detailed history of the various splits and divisions of the three main Protestant "trees." As we have already seen, *Luther's doctrines* spread over most of northern Germany, from there primarily to the Scandinavian countries, thence to the New World. *Calvin's theology* eventually dominated in Switzerland, parts of France and Germany, the Netherlands, and Scotland. Later, it too found its way, with adaptations, to America and particularly the New England states.

Anglicanism held sway in its pure form only in England itself. But throughout the British Commonwealth and in America it has since taken the name "Protestant Episcopal" and other forms, holding practically identical beliefs.

As a *guiding principle*, it is important to realize that *every major Protestant body* must rightfully recognize as its legitimate ancestor one of these *key reform movements*. And Lutheranism, Calvinism, and Anglicanism must acknowledge that they *all* came, in the first-place, from the church of Rome.

Referring again to England, we may safely state that the three main churches rising out of the "puritan" movement of the seventeenth century—the Presbyterian, the Congregational, and the Baptist—all owe to *Calvin* the major part of their *doctrines, customs and concepts*.

The later Methodist movement under John and Charles Wesley did *not* involve any change in the *basic doctrines* of the Church of England. It was only intended as a reformation *within* the Anglican church, rejecting predestination and emphasizing personal holiness and a consciousness of a "witness of the Spirit" in the believer (Hurlbut, *The Story of the Christian Church*, p. 177).

To the end of his life, Wesley urged his followers to *remain in* the Church of England, declaring: "I live and die a *member* of the Church of England; and none who regard my judgment will ever separate from it" (Bettenson, *Documents*, p. 361).

So it is clear that even the Church

of England, sprung from Rome, herself is a parent of other religious bodies holding *the same basic doctrines*. The point we wish to emphasize is that *all* of the major splits and divisions within Protestant "Christendom" are *agreed* upon most of their *basic doctrines, traditions, and religious concepts*. The significance of this will be considered later.

Returning to the English revolt, we find that the *uncontrolled lust* of King Henry VIII for women and power resulted in a new religious body. The blunt *truth* is that the "reformation" in England was *conceived in lust*, and guided to success through *political pressure and force of arms!*

One eminent Protestant historian admits: "The remarkable feature of the *English revolt* is that it produced no outstanding religious leader—no Luther, Zwingli, Calvin or Knox. Nor did it, before the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, manifest any considerable spiritual awakening among the people. Its impulses were *political and social*" (Walker, p. 415).

As we have seen, the English revolt was conceived in the *lust and sin* of Henry VIII. It was promoted among the people by a spirit of *nationalism* and *antagonism* toward Rome. It was helped to success by the *greed* for the wealth of the Catholic monasteries and lands which possessed the English nobility. And it was placed on the throne by the royal realization of the *unchecked power* it conferred upon the English monarchs.

It is acknowledged that this movement produced *no religious leader* worthy of the name. There was practically *no spiritual awakening* among the people. Its motives were *political and social*.

Let us face *honestly and squarely* the questions: Was this a return to pure New Testament Christianity? Was it a Spirit-led restoration of the "faith once delivered"?

In the following installment, the real *meaning* of all that we have discussed, and the *answers* to these questions, will be made plain. We need to *know* where today's Protestant "Christianity" really came from—and where it is headed! *Don't miss* next month's installment in this important series!

The PLAIN TRUTH
Printed in the U.S.A.
Box 111—Pasadena, California

Entered as second-class
mail at Pasadena, Calif.