

Carl Olof Jonsson

Sweden

Watchtower Bible and Tract Society
of New York, Inc.

Writing Dept., Desk EG

117 Adams Street

BROOKLYN

New York 11201

Åmål, Dec. 12, 1977.

Re. "The Gentile Times Reconsidered"

Dear Brothers,

I hope that you received Part I of the above treatise as you requested. It was sent to you on Sept. 5, 1977. I have sent you today, under separate cover (air mail), Part III, which I promised to send you during October, but which has been delayed for several reasons. First of all, the last part turned out to be longer than was intended, in spite of the fact that several things have been touched upon very briefly. The correction of the English took some time, too, and besides, the manuscript has been prepared amidst many other responsibilities, both in the congregation and in my secular work.

Several brothers have now examined the treatise, and most of them tend to agree about the conclusions. We hope, therefore, that you will give the evidence and arguments presented a careful and objective examination. Although some of the evidence may seem to be rather critically presented, it should be borne in mind that the criticism has always reference to an idea which clearly seems to be wrong, never to individuals or an association of individuals. The treatise has been written in a humble state of mind, with love for truth and with a view to the best interests for all of us. I hope, therefore, that the argumentation is not interpreted as being provocative, as this has never been intended.

We are all eagerly looking forward to your comments.

With Christian love to all of you.

Your brother,



PS: On p. 27 of my treatise, the last sentence and footnote 20 referred to a Robert R. Newton, who some years ago exposed Claudius Ptolemy to have "fudged" some of his observations. Perhaps you are aware of the fact that he has now published a book about the matter: The Crime of Claudius Ptolemy, 1977 (John Hopkins University Press). According to Scientific American (Oct. 1977, p.79f): "Newton has also discovered that a large fraction of the observations Ptolemy attributed to other astronomers is not material he has preserved from the past but material he has forged. ... Moreover, Ptolemy's forgery may have extended to inventing the length of reigns of Babylonian kings." Thus the critical attitude taken in the Aid book to Ptolemy is surely justified. "It is clear," Newton concludes his book, "that no statement made by Ptolemy can be accepted unless it is confirmed by writers who are totally independent of Ptolemy on the matters in question." This is exactly what has been done in Part II of my treatise, as the Neo-Babylonian chronology is established by several lines of evidence independent of Ptolemy's canon. These show Ptolemy's list to be correct with respect to the Neo-Babylonian period.