

Computer Analysis of Printings of The Urantia Book: Publisher's Changes, 1955-1999

by Merritt Horn

Introductory Notes

- [I. Summary of Conclusions for the Impatient Reader](#)
- [II. Scope of Analysis](#)
- [III. Editorial Philosophy](#)
- IV. Critical Apparatus
 - [A. Classification of Editorial Intent for Changes in the Text](#)
 - [B. Classification of Errors](#)
 - [C. Abbreviations; editions of *The Urantia Book*](#)
- V. Changes in Urantia Foundation editions of *The Urantia Book* (1955-1999)
 - [Changes in 0:0.0 through 42:5.1](#)
 - [Changes in 42:6.7 through 69:3.9](#)
 - [Changes in 71:7.2 through 110:5.2](#)
 - [Changes in 117:7.4 through 196:3.29](#)

I. Summary of Conclusions for the Impatient Reader

Of the 133 changes to the text covered by this Appendix:

1. There was no basis for making 67 of them.

2. Database (spelling) standardization could justify 19 of the changes, but only if standardization were consistently applied—which it has not been.

3. Changes appropriately corrected simple typographic errors in 43 cases.

4. There are only 4 instances in which a change was made to correct an error that this editor cannot yet categorize as typographical, i.e., the error appears to be real but its origin has not yet been explained without resort to postulated erroneous pre-publication editing by the humans involved—editing which those same humans consistently testified as never having occurred.

5. The 11th printing diverged most widely from the first edition, but the text has been returned to its 1955 form at many locations, so that none of the later editions actually differ from the first at every point in the text where a change has sometime occurred. One way to summarize the status of the last three printed editions and the currently available electronic texts is as follows:

a) All agree with each other, but differ from the 1955 text in 81 cases

b) All agree with each other and with the 1955 text in 19 cases.

c) Two notes are difficult to classify (because of end-of-line issues).

d) The late editions disagree with each other on the remaining 31 points. The last two softcover editions (13th; 14th) are identical, and almost always agree with the electronic texts and with the first edition; but the 15th printing (the new paperback and hardbound edition) is almost always at variance with the others (and is, in fact, very close to the 11th printing).

The impatient reader will have to read further for more details.

II. Scope of Analysis

This appendix covers only those changes known to have taken place from the 2nd (1967) through the 11th printings (1993), but tracks those changes through the printed and electronic editions published

through 1999.

Textual issues which are outside the limited scope of this Appendix, but which can be profitably analyzed following the methodology employed here, will be included in the subject matter of forthcoming articles.

III. Editorial Philosophy

This analysis of changes in the text of *The Urantia Book* is based on the following assumptions about the origin and resolution of these problems:

- 1) *The Urantia Book* was actually written by the authors claimed in the text and by the process described in the text.
- 2) The revelators had reasons for using the linguistic constructions they employed. These reasons may have been variously artistic, semantic, conceptual or spiritual, just as they may be for any author, but the writing of the Fifth Epochal Revelation was neither mindless nor careless.
- 3) The quality of English usage in the text is acceptable proof that the revelators had the ability to learn proper English grammar, spelling and usage. The authors were capable of choosing words and phraseology that conveyed precise meanings from among many similar constructions or synonyms.
- 4) Nothing touched by human hands can be perfect; therefore, mistakes may exist in the first edition of the *Urantia Book*.
- 5) Whether working on *The Urantia Book* or an ancient manuscript, an editor does not attempt to “correct” an apparent problem in the text without regard to what the author originally wrote; the editor’s goal is to *reconstruct* or *restore* the original if the extant text appears defective in some way. Any proposed reconstruction must not only read well, but must be logically consistent with the theory put forward by the editor to explain the evolution of the extant text from the author’s original expression. This issue has never been addressed by any list of *Corrections To The Text* published by Urantia Foundation (or Uversa Press or Michael Foundation).

IV A. Classification of Editorial Intent for Changes in the Text:

Each change has been classified according to the following outline of (presumed) rationales for the changes. Please note that this listing does not express the current editor’s opinion of the validity of specific categories or changes. (See Editorial Philosophy above, and the specific notes.)

Spelling

- S1) Correction of misspelled common English words
- S2) Standardization of variant spellings
- S3) Changes for lexical reasons (updating an archaic form or improving the etymological basis of the word)
- S4) Changes in non-English words and names either to correct presumed typographical errors or to harmonize with standard transliterations
- S5) Changes for grammatical reasons
- S6) Changes in spelling for reasons unknown

Capitalization

- C1) Changes in capitalization based on English usage
- C2) Changes suggested by *Urantia Book* usage

Punctuation

- P1) Changes required to conform with English usage
- P2) Changes of preference, phrasing or convenience

Modification, insertion or deletion of entire words or phrases

- M1) Grammar-based changes (The original appears ungrammatical and has been changed on that basis.)
- M2) Changes to correct perceived inconsistencies or contradictions within *The Urantia Book* itself
- M3) Changes to correct perceived inconsistencies or contradictions between *The Urantia Book* and current scientific theory or historical evidence

Database Errors (Unintentional changes)

- D1) Changes that may be due to the inadvertent loss of a character in the typesetting database when it was translated from one form to another after initial publication. This type of problem should be most evident in the 1971(3rd) printing—the first that did not utilize the original plates.

IV B. Classification of Errors

Errors by the Author(s)

- A1) Grammatically incorrect use of language (Given the revelators’ unequalled command of English, this

type of error does not seem likely.)

A2) Contradictions or inconsistencies within the text—internal errors (It would seem, given the revelators' command of their material, as demonstrated throughout *The Urantia Book*, and by the general consistency and unity of the revelation, that, except for cases in which A3 might apply, errors of this type are not likely in *The Urantia Book*)

A3) Errors of scientific or historical statements—external errors (The revelators explicitly warn that apparent errors of this type do exist in the text.)

Transcription Errors (at any stage of copying or typesetting)

T1) A dropped keystroke

T2) An extra keystroke

T3) An incorrect keystroke—either the wrong letter or number, or a mistakenly shifted or un-shifted character (capitalization)

T4) Transposed characters—with or without an intervening letter

T5) Pattern insertion or deletion errors—the inadvertent repetition of a near-by word pattern

T6) An overlooked word—usually short connectives (or, an, of, if, it)

T7) Mis-read letters from the handwritten manuscript.

Editorial Errors

E1) The mistaken “correction” of what was perceived to be either a transcription or proofing mistake (This would include any changes that cannot be reverse-engineered to fall within the oft-repeated bounds of “spelling, capitalization and punctuation” that are covered by category E2.)

E2) The inconsistent or incorrect exercise of the power to “correct spelling, capitalization and punctuation.”

IV C. Abbreviations; Editions of *The Urantia Book*

Chicago Manual or *CM* *A Manual of Style*, University of Chicago Press, 1927, 1937, 1949 (9th - 11th editions). The 12th and 13th editions are also referenced, but these post-date the period of the original preparation of the text of *The Urantia Book* for publication.

OED *The Oxford English Dictionary*, [1933] Compact Edition 1971.

Webster's *Webster's New International Dictionary*, Second Edition, [1934] 1944.

Editions of *The Urantia Book* cited in Appendix

Printed Editions

1 st	1955	Original hardcover size (6e " x 10")
2 nd	1967	"
3 rd	1971	"
4 th	1973	"
5 th	1976	"
6 th	1978	"
7 th	1981	"
8 th	1984	"
9 th	1986	"
10 th	1990	"
11 th	1993	"
12 th	1995	Soft-cover size (5e " x 7e ")
13 th	1995	"
14 th	1998	"
15 th	1999	Paperback & new hardcover size (5½" x 8d ")

Electronic Editions

E-11 HTML text based on 11th printed edition. This is the version licensed by Urantia Foundation to Jesusonian Foundation for the latter's website. It appears to be identical to the 11th printing, so it is not separately referenced in this Appendix.

CD Refers to the following two electronic editions (E-12a and CD-ROM), as their content is identical insofar as the referenced changes are concerned.

E-12a HTML text edition available on Urantia Foundation web site in May, 2000. (This text was available at an earlier date, but it is not known when that text reached its quoted form.) The text in this edition seems to be the same as that found on the CD-ROM, and appears to be most closely related to the 12th printed edition.

CD-ROM The 1997 Folio Bound VIEWS edition

Computer Analysis of Printings of The Urantia Book: Publisher's Changes, 1955-1999

by Merritt Horn
January 2001

Changes in 0:0.0 through 42:5.1

[I. Summary of Conclusions for the Impatient Reader](#)

[II. Scope of Analysis](#)

[III. Editorial Philosophy](#)

IV. Critical Apparatus

[A. Classification of Editorial Intent for Changes in the Text](#)

[B. Classification of Errors](#)

[C. Abbreviations; editions of *The Urantia Book*](#)

V. Changes in Urantia Foundation editions of *The Urantia Book* (1955-1999)

[Changes in 0:0.0 through 42:5.1](#)

[Changes in 42:6.7 through 69:3.9](#)

[Changes in 71:7.2 through 110:5.2](#)

[Changes in 117:7.4 through 196:3.29](#)

1) 0:1.19; p.3 ¶11 Change type: M1

1st: 5. Absolute perfection in no direction, relative perfection in all other manifestations.

2nd - 15th, *CD*: 5. Absolute perfection in no direction, relative perfection in all manifestations.

Discussion:

The original phraseology is incorrect because the reference to *other* manifestations requires the existence of one or more additional manifestations to which this *other* is being contrasted. Inasmuch as this particular phase of perfection exists in only one manifestation—relative perfection—there are no additional types which require or permit the use of *other* in this context.

Conclusion:

There was a T5 error in the 1955 text—*other* was inserted into the text during one of the pre-publication transcriptions by accidentally repeating the pattern of use found immediately before and after this sentence.

) 3:1.12; p.46 ¶4 Change type: C2

1st - 6th: ...with the power of choice (concerning Himself)...

7th - 15th, *CD*: ...with the power of choice (concerning himself)...

Discussion:

Because there are four additional changes of this type in Urantia Foundation printings, and a large number of similar changes in the Uversa Press and Michael Foundation editions, it is necessary to examine this issue in some detail.

Although pronouns referring to Deity are usually not capitalized (see, for example, *himself* later in the subject paragraph), after extensive computer-aided analysis of the entire text of *The Urantia Book*, it has been found (without known exception) that the capitalization of pronouns referring to Deity is consistent with the guidelines found in the three editions of the *Chicago Manual* available during the period from 1927 to 1955*:

“Capitalize nouns and adjectives used to designate the Supreme Being, or any member of the Christian Trinity†; and all pronouns referring to the same when not closely preceded or followed by a distinct reference to the Deity:

...‘Trust Him who rules all things’ (*but*: ‘When God had worked six days, he rested on the seventh.’)”

[*§72 of 9th *CM* ed.; §28 of 10th *CM* ed.; §29 of 11th *CM* ed. †11th *CM* ed. adds “, the Virgin Mary” here.]

Even if, for argument’s sake, it was appropriate to “modernize” the text of *The Urantia Book* to keep its style current, the changes under discussion are not supported by later editions of the *Chicago Manual* either. The 12th *CM* ed., the standard from 1969 until 1982 (the time period during which these changes were made), is equally explicit:

“7.77 Pronouns referring to [Deity personalities] are today seldom capitalized except in instances

where capitalization offers a simple way to avoid ambiguity:

Trust in Him.

God gives man what He wills.

but:

God in his mercy

Jesus and his disciples”

Although the revelators did not have to be slaves to the mandates of the *Chicago Manual*, it was, by all reports, the stylistic authority used by those responsible for the preparation of the first edition when questions of “capitalization and punctuation” arose. Anyone attempting to “correct” the text is required to justify a suggested departure from the guidelines used in the process of preparing the text for its first publication; the relevant part of those guidelines being, in this instance, “Choose your authority and stick to it.”

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 11:7.7; p.125 ¶1 Change type: S5

1st: The relatively quiet zone between the space levels,...,are enormous...

2nd - 15th, *CD*: The relatively quiet zones between the space levels,...,are enormous...

Discussion:

The plural, found in all editions after 1955, agrees with the verb *are*, and is otherwise consistent with the general sense of the paragraph.

Conclusion:

There was a T1 (dropped keystroke) error in the 1955 text; *zones* is correct.

) 12:4.15; p.134 ¶4 Change type: P2

1st: ...next to the domains of the seven superuniverses, seem to be...

2nd - 15th, *CD*: ...next to the domains of the seven superuniverses seem to be...

Discussion:

While the comma in question may be unnecessary, it may nevertheless assist the reader in phrasing an otherwise unwieldy sentence.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 12:4.16; p.134 ¶5 Change type: D1

1st, 2nd, 11th - 15th, *CD*: ...is a complement or equilibrant of gravity.

3rd - 10th: ...is a complement or equilibrant of gravity [missing period]

Discussion:

This is one of the minor errors that entered the database when the original plates were first discarded.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 29:4.27; p.328 ¶3 Change type: S6

1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, *CD*: Together with their co-workers, the dissociators,...

10th, 11th, 15th: Together with their coworkers, the dissociators,...

Discussion:

Neither form is found in *Webster's*; the *OED* contains only the hyphenated form. The *Chicago Manual's* 9th - 11th editions use *co-worker* as an explicit example of a general rule regarding certain prefixes. The *CM's* 10th reads as follows:

“221. Prefixes when joined to roots do not retain the hyphen except in combination with words beginning with their terminal vowel, or with *w* or *y*:

...co-operation

co-worker”

The relevant rule in *CM's* 11th edition (1969) appears to allow *coworker* by glossing over the case of prefixes formed with initial *w* roots, but its 13th edition (1982) again specifically prescribes the hyphenated form (Table 6.1, p.180).

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 30:3.12; p.340 ¶1 Change type: S4

1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, *CD*: ...beings enroute elsewhere who pause...

10th, 11th, 15th: ...beings en route elsewhere who pause...

Discussion:

Although the original may be understandable, it is incorrect French and is not the form that has been adopted into English (according to *Webster's*, the *OED*, and the *Chicago Manual*). A simple dropped

space-key explains the original.

Conclusion:

There was a T1 (dropped keystroke) error in the 1955 text.

) 35:6.3; p.391 ¶1 Change type: P2

1st, 12th - 14th: ...at the universe headquarters, as he frequently is,...

2nd - 11th, 15th, CD:...at the universe headquarters as he frequently is,...

Discussion:

The comma after headquarters is required to enclose, with the following comma, the parenthetical phrase “as he frequently is.”

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 36:3.6; p.400 ¶1 Change type: S1 or S3

1st: ...subsequently add any thing new or supplemental...

2nd - 15th, CD: ...subsequently add anything new or supplemental...

Discussion:

The compound word was probably the author’s choice in this case. The sentence simply does not read well if, to test an alternative hypothesis, the assumption is made that the two-word format was chosen by the author for emphasis (which, to this editor, is the only discernible rationale for the two-word form).

Conclusion:

A T2 (extra keystroke) error was present here in the 1955 text.

) 37:8.3; p.413 ¶6 Change type: M2

1st: ...the secondary Universe Circuit Supervisor stationed in...

2nd - 15th, CD: ...the tertiary Universe Circuit Supervisor stationed in...

Discussion:

While both a secondary and a tertiary Circuit Supervisor are assigned to the supervision of a single local universe’s circuits, only the tertiary Circuit Supervisor is stationed within the local universe—the secondary Circuit Supervisor is located on the superuniverse headquarters (See 24:1.5-7). Therefore, if Andovontia is “stationed in our local universe” he would be a tertiary Universe Circuit Supervisor.

The differences between the words appear to rule out typing or proofing errors as the source of this problem, leaving this editor’s “last resort” explanation: Sometime prior to publication, but when the handwritten manuscript was no longer available as an authoritative reference, someone noticed what appeared to be an internal inconsistency (ascribed, presumably, to an earlier human error), and an E1 change (erroneous “correction”) was made to the text.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is incorrect. This editor’s best explanation, at present, is an E1 change (*tertiary* to *secondary*) made prior to publication to correct what was believed to be an earlier human error.

) 40:7.2; p.449 ¶0 Change type: S5

1st - 6th: ...When you and your Adjusters are finally and forever fused,...

7th - 15th, CD: ...When you and your Adjuster are finally and forever fused,...

Discussion:

The original, plural form is correct, not only because the referent of every other instance of *you* and *your* in this paragraph is plural (the ascending Sons of God; planetary sons; sons of ascension potential, etc.), but more importantly, the grammar of the sentence requires a plural: “When you and your Adjusters are finally and forever fused,...then in fact have you become the ascending sons of God.”

The change to the text was probably made because of the confusion caused by the enclosed, parenthetical phrase, “when you two are made one,...”

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 41:1.1; p.456 ¶0 Change type: P2

1st - 10th, 12th - 15th, CD: Within the domain of this Paradise Son of God the Supreme...

11th: Within the domain of this Paradise Son of God, the Supreme...

Discussion:

By indicating the end of the initial adverbial phrase, a comma here does greatly assist the reader. If present in the original manuscript, a simple dropped keystroke (T1) error would have produced the 1955 text.

Conclusion:

A probable instance of a T1 error in the 1955 edition.

) 41:4.4; p.460 ¶1 Change type: M2

1st: ...having become sixty thousand times as dense as your sun.

2nd - 15th, *CD*: ...having become forty thousand times as dense as your sun.

Discussion:

Textual consistency and current scientific estimates of our sun's density both support the change to "forty thousand." The first paragraph of this section states that our sun is about 1.5 times the density of water, or about 0.054 pounds per cubic inch, and 40,000 times this is about 2,160 pounds per cubic inch; the current scientific estimate of the sun's density is 1.4 times the density of water; 40,000 times that is roughly 2,035 pounds per cubic inch.

There are two possible explanations for the appearance of this error in the 1955 text:

1) It is this editor's opinion that the number in question was written as a numeral in the manuscript (40,000 not *forty thousand*), and that the error was caused by a simple keystroke error (T3) in which 6 was mis-keyed for 4, creating 60,000 instead of 40,000. When the text was formatted for printing, the numerals were changed to words, and an error that formerly consisted of one digit was transformed into an incorrect word. There is no direct evidence in support of this theory, but the formatting of words and numbers for printing is not a revelatory issue; it is a matter of style, and is covered extensively in the *Chicago Manual*. The proper formatting of words and numbers is precisely the type of editorial decision that the revelators could give to the humans preparing the *form* of the text for printing without giving those humans any authority to change any of the *content* of the text.) If this theory is correct, this is a simple T3 (incorrect keystroke) error, disguised by the later change in formatting of the number. (The problem at 43:1.6 appears to have had an identical origin, and 42:5.1 is very closely related.)

2) The appearance of "sixty thousand" in the 1955 text could be due to an E1 error: a well-meaning but erroneous re-calculation of the underlying math—60,000 is 1.5 times 40,000—which means that the near-by sun is 60,000 times the density of water, though it is only 40,000 times as dense as our sun.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is incorrect; it should read *forty thousand*. There are two likely causes; this editor favors a T3 (incorrect keystroke) error based on the theory that the manuscript contained numerals rather than written-out numbers. Alternatively, an E1 change (*forty* to *sixty*) was made prior to 1955 to correct what was believed to be an earlier human error.

) 42:5.1; p.474 ¶5 Change type: S4

1st: ...ten octaves up are the X rays, followed by the Y rays of radium.

2nd - 15th, *CD*: ...ten octaves up are the X rays, followed by the gamma rays of radium.

Discussion:

From external reference to physics, and multiple internal cross-references (see for example 42:5.7), *gamma* is clearly intended here. As to the origin of the *Y* in the 1955 text, it is likely that the Greek letter (gamma) was mistakenly transposed into *Y* at some point in the preparation of the original edition (probably at the time of the first typing from the original manuscript) either because of a faulty inference from the immediately preceding *X*, from an unfamiliarity with the Greek alphabet, or simply because there was no better way to represent the character on a standard typewriter.

Even though a typesetter would have been able to place the letter (on the page, the later decision to replace that letter with *gamma* is clear, reasonable, and consistent with the usage found elsewhere throughout *The Urantia Book*.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text was incorrect; *Y* should have been (. The error type is best classified as T3 (incorrect keystroke), although it should be understood that the technology available for any transcriptions prior to typesetting did not have a mechanism for representing the correct character.

Computer Analysis of Printings of The Urantia Book: Publisher's Changes, 1955-1999

by Merritt Horn
January 2001

Changes in 42:6.7 through 69:3.9

[I. Summary of Conclusions for the Impatient Reader](#)

[II. Scope of Analysis](#)

[III. Editorial Philosophy](#)

IV. Critical Apparatus

[A. Classification of Editorial Intent for Changes in the Text](#)

[B. Classification of Errors](#)

[C. Abbreviations; editions of *The Urantia Book*](#)

V. Changes in Urantia Foundation editions of *The Urantia Book* (1955-1999)

[Changes in 0:0.0 through 42:5.1](#)

[Changes in 42:6.7 through 69:3.9](#)

[Changes in 71:7.2 through 110:5.2](#)

[Changes in 117:7.4 through 196:3.29](#)

) 42:6.7; p.477 ¶1 Change type: M2

There are two interdependent changes in this paragraph:

- (a) 1st: ...an electron weighs a little less than 1/2,000th of the smallest atom,...
2nd - 15th, CD: ...an electron weighs a little more than 1/2,000th of the smallest atom,...
- (b) 1st: The positive proton...weighs from two to three thousand times more.
2nd - 15th, CD: The positive proton...weighs almost two thousand times more.

Discussion:

[For historical reference, the first discussion of the relative masses of the structural elements of atoms in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* is found in its 13th Edition (1926):

“Through the experimental discoveries of the second half of the 19th century it became gradually clear that the atoms of the elements, far from being indivisible entities, had to be thought of as aggregates built up of separate particles. Thus from experiments on electrical discharges in rarified gases and especially from a closer study of the so-called cathode rays, one was led to recognise the existence of small negatively charged particles the mass of which was found to be about 2,000 times as small as the mass of the lightest atom, the hydrogen atom. These small particles, which may be regarded as atoms of negative electricity are now, following Johnstone Stoney, generally called electrons. Through the investigations of J. J. Thomson and others convincing evidence was obtained that these electrons are a constituent of every atom...” (Vol. 29 pg. 262)]

The revised wording is consistent with the statement in the paragraph following the subject paragraph (42:6.8), where the author states that a proton is “eighteen hundred times as heavy as an electron;” and is also in general agreement with current scientific opinion which places the ratio at about 1:1,836.

If it is assumed that the author of this paper is not the source of the apparent error in the 1955 text, the only mechanism available is an E1 error similar to explanation #2 for the note regarding 41:4.4: If one erroneously interpreted the electron : proton ratio of 1:1,800 as being slightly less than 1/2,000, one might view an original (inferred) passage that was synonymous with the 1967 version as being in error, and suggest those changes in wording which are found in the 1955 text—which then had to be un-done once the erroneous correction was recognized.

There is no direct evidence that this was the actual mechanism for the origin of this error, but if the *authors* were prone to mathematical clumsiness, and the quality of the text was due to excellent mathematical editing, *The Urantia Book* would not contain the flaw under discussion, but would contain a number of errors that simply could not have been found without computers. (For instance, the calculation of the days and dates in the Jesus papers was virtually impossible until a few years ago, but now, anyone with a good calendar program can go back to the years a.d.1 - a.d.30 and find that every day associated with a date was calculated correctly somehow by someone during the 1930's.)* If, however, the authors were far better mathematicians than the editors, we might observe precisely what we do observe: one or two errors caused by the well-intentioned editorial misinterpretation of proximate data.

(*The apparent miscalculation of Pentecost is a separate issue that will be analyzed in a forthcoming

paper.)

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is incorrect. This editor's best explanation, at present, is an E1 change, apparently involving several words, made prior to publication to correct what was believed to be an earlier human error.

) 42:7.7; p.478 ¶1 Change type: M3

1st: ...the instantaneous disruption of the central proton...

2nd - 15th, CD: ...the well-nigh instantaneous disruption of the central proton...

Discussion:

The insertion of *well-nigh* was perhaps made because the observed deterioration of the known man-made elements with atomic numbers above 100, while extremely rapid, is not instantaneous—if by that description one means that such elements would have half-lives of zero. However:

a) Given the time-frame within which a Mighty Messenger (the author of Paper 42) views reality, the phraseology hardly requires correction even if the sentence is to be understood as just described.

b) It is not self-evident that the “disruption of the central proton” is identical with the nuclear deterioration which we measure in terms of half-lives. The central proton's disruption might be the immediate cause for the rapid, though not instantaneous, decay which our scientists observe.

c) The procedure described by the paper's author which leads to the disruption—the insertion of an additional electron into the orbital field of an element that already contains 100 electrons—is itself distinct from the methods whereby transuranium elements are created by our scientists, which involve the insertion of additional particles into the atomic nucleus by various means.

d) It is of interest to note that (laboratory-scale creation of minuscule quantities—no more than a few thousand atoms—of short-lived, heavier elements notwithstanding), the heaviest element ever created during the large-scale matter/energy conversions/interactions of either nuclear reactors or underground nuclear explosions has consistently been an isotope of fermium (the 100th element)—an unexpected fact for which our scientists have found no ready explanation since the early 1960s when this phenomenon was first observed.

Thus, the editorial decision to introduce *well-nigh* into the text was unwarranted—being unnecessary at best, and scientifically incorrect at worst.

Conclusion:

Current science does not require alteration of the 1955 text (even if, for the sake of argument, such a change were within the editor's province).

) 43:1.6; p.486 ¶5 Change type: M2

1st: ...established almost four thousand years ago, immediately after...

2nd - 15th, CD: ...established almost forty thousand years ago, immediately after...

Discussion:

The second edition correction appears to be warranted based on a reference at 119:7.2:

“The public announcement that Michael had selected Urantia as the theater for his final bestowal was made shortly after we learned about the default of Adam and Eve. And thus, for more than thirty•five thousand years, your world occupied a very conspicuous place in the councils of the entire universe.”

The default occurred about 37,800 years ago, so “almost forty thousand” and “more than thirty•five thousand” would seem to be equally reasonable descriptions.

While the original reading could have been caused by a T2/T3 typing error, the words don't really fit that type of error very well. Another possibility is that an (E1) incorrect pre-publication edit was made by mistakenly associating the establishment of the college with the time of Machiventa's bestowal (4,000 years ago).

It is this editor's opinion, however, that the problem is identical in origin to that of 41:4.4: the number in question was written as a numeral in the manuscript (*40,000* not *forty thousand*), and that the error was caused by the loss of a zero before the number was formatted into words for printing. (The proper formatting of words and numbers is precisely the type of editorial decision that the revelators could give to the humans preparing the *form* of the text for printing without giving those humans any authority to change any of the *content* of the text.) If this theory is correct, this is a simple T1 (dropped keystroke) error, disguised by the later change in formatting of the number.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is incorrect; it should read *forty thousand*. There are several possible causes, this editor favors a T1 (dropped keystroke) error based on the theory that the manuscript contained numerals rather than written-out numbers.

) 43:8.2; p.494 ¶1 Change type: S2

1st: While you are rekeyed each time...

2nd - 15th, CD: While you are re-keyed each time...

Discussion:

The only other occurrence of *re-keyed* is in hyphenated form (48:2.14).

Words formed with the “re-” prefix, fall under the same general *Chicago Manual* rule referred to for (29:4.27) above, but this instance is covered by an exception:

“a) When the first vowel of the added word would...suggest mispronunciation, the hyphen is retained.”

In this case, the un-hyphenated form appears to indicate that the first syllable is pronounced with a short *e*, causing the reader to stumble. Insertion of the hyphen resolves the problem.

Conclusion:

There was an error of either type T1 (dropped keystroke) or type E2 (incorrect editorial decision regarding hyphenation) in the 1995 text.

) 44:0.1; p.497 ¶1 Change type: P2
1st: ...divisional and universe headquarters worlds, may be found...
2nd - 15th, CD: ...divisional and universe headquarters worlds may be found...

Discussion:

Although the comma in the first edition is optional, it is not ungrammatical.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text required no modification.

) 46:1.8; p.520 ¶4 Change type: P2
1st, 2nd, 12th - 15th, CD: ...but it is not dependent on them; worlds like Jerusem...
3rd - 11th: ...but it is not dependent on them, worlds like Jerusem...

Discussion:

The replacement of the original semicolon by a comma was erroneous. The semicolon is the correct choice for joining two independent clauses.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 46:5.18; p.526 ¶0 Change type: D1
1st, 2nd, 6th - 15th, CD: ...it is among the more recent constructions.
3rd - 5th: ...it is among the more recent constructions [missing period]

Discussion:

This is one of the minor errors that entered the database when the original plates were first discarded.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 47:0.2; p.530 ¶2 Change type: D1
1st, 2nd, 6th - 15th, CD: ...of the finaliter corps assigned to Satania.
3rd - 5th: ...of the finaliter corps assigned to Satania [missing period]

Discussion:

This is one of the minor errors that entered the database when the original plates were first discarded.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 47:0.4; p.530 ¶4 Change type: M1
1st - 6th: The seven mansion worlds are in charge of the morontia supervisors...
7th - 15th, CD: The seven mansion worlds are in the charge of the morontia supervisors...

Discussion:

This was an unnecessary edit, as the phrase *in charge of* may be employed either actively (“...the morontia supervisors in charge of the mansion worlds...”) or passively (“...the mansion worlds in charge of the morontia supervisors...”). Although the former is more common today, the latter construction would not have appeared awkward for any reader of English before the mid-twentieth century; even now, no reasonable reader could claim a basis for confusion unless the author has used the phrase in an inappropriate setting—when the priority of the related parties is not self-evident. The underlying relationship between the parties, here and at the other instances of this construction in the text (46:5.17; 73:7.4; 183:4.4; 187:6.2), is clear; so the authors’ choice of words was correct, unambiguous and reasonable.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 49:3.3; p.563 ¶6 Change type: D1/P2
1st, 2nd, 12th - 14th, CD: ...meteorites enter the atmosphere of Urantia daily, coming in...
3rd - 11th, 15th: ...meteorites enter the atmosphere of Urantia daily coming in...

Discussion:

The comma in the original sentence is correctly utilized to separate the beginning independent phase

from the trailing dependent phrase. The comma's location at the end of a line makes it a likely candidate for inadvertent loss when the text was translated from the original plates—a D1 change—but does not explain its later disappearance in the 15th printing.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

-) 51:6.3; p.587 ¶1 Change type: S5/S6
1st - 5th, CD: ...situated not far•distant still another and older headquarters...
6th - 15th: ...situated not far distant still another and older headquarters...

Discussion:

There is no basis for removing the hyphen. *Far-distant* in any structural setting is a single concept. The only un-hyphenated instance of these two words in the text (94:5.6) bears no grammatical relationship to this construction and is very closely related to all of the hyphenated examples. That one case cannot therefore be used as a justification for this change and is itself a reasonable candidate for editorial standardization.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

-) 52:6; p.597 Change type: S2
1st: 6. URANTIA'S POST-BESTOWAL AGE
2nd - 15th, CD: 6. URANTIA'S POSTBESTOWAL AGE

Discussion:

The un-hyphenated form is more commonly found in the text, but the original form is appropriate at this location (as a section title) because of its parallelism with the titles of sections two through five and seven of this paper. Only standardization for electronic search might justify the change (which would require the alteration of section five's title as well).

Conclusion:

There was no error in the 1955 text, but standardization for electronic search, if universally applied, might justify a change.

-) 53:5.2; p.605 ¶6 Change type: P2
1st - 10th, 12th - 15th, CD:...the two which preceded it there was no absolute...
11th: ...the two which preceded it, there was no absolute...

Discussion:

Although a comma here might assist in phrasing, there is no need to insert one.

Conclusion:

The 1955 punctuation is reasonable.

-) 53:7.8; p.608 ¶4 Change type: M2
1st: Of the 681,227 Material Sons lost in Satania,...
2nd - 15th, CD: Of the 681,217 Material Sons lost in Satania,...

Discussion:

The change from 681,227 to 681,217 was, presumably, made because of the following passage: "Since the inception of the system of Satania, thirteen Planetary Adams have been lost in rebellion and default and 681,204 in the subordinate positions of trust." (51:1.5)

It does appear that one of the numbers is in error, but whether 681,227 should be reduced by ten or 681,204 should be increased by ten cannot be determined from the text. The cause of the error in the first edition is almost certainly a single mistaken keystroke (T3).

Conclusion:

There was an T3 error made at some point but insufficient contextual evidence makes it impossible to reconstruct the original.

-) 54:6.10; p.620 ¶2 Change type: P2
1st - 10th, 12th - 15th, CD: At least I was not even when I had thus attained...
11th: At least I was not, even when I had thus attained...

Discussion:

Though this comma may help the reader in phrasing the sentence, in the absence of compelling evidence that the extant text is a corrupted version of the original, the editor is not justified in superimposing his own preferences over the author's choice of expression.

Conclusion:

The 1955 punctuation is acceptable.

-) 55:2.8; p.624 ¶2 Change type: D1
1st, 2nd, 11th - 15th, CD: ...not yet occurred according to my observation.

3rd - 10th:

...not yet occurred according to my observation [missing period]

Discussion:

This is one of the minor errors that entered the database when the original plates were first discarded.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 55:7.4; p.632 ¶3 Change type: D1

1st - 5th, 12th - 15th, CD: ...settledness for one millennium of system time,...

6th - 11th: ...settledness for one millenium of system time,...

Discussion:

The loss of the second *n* in the sixth printing was probably due to an unnoticed database corruption. The likelihood that this is the source of the problem is increased by the fact that in the first through eleventh editions, the text flow caused *millennium* to be broken after the first *n*, with the remaining letters moving to the following line.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 55:12.5; p.636 ¶6 Change type: S5

1st, 2nd: None of us entertain a satisfactory concept...

3rd - 15th, CD: None of us entertains a satisfactory concept...

Discussion:

This change was apparently made under the misconception that, because of their semantic similarity, *none* and *no one* share the same syntax. However, both *Webster's* and the *OED* attest that *none*, commonly takes a plural verb.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 57:8.18; p.662 ¶5 Change type: D1

1st, 2nd, 12th - 15th, CD: ...and to regulate its flow, as is disclosed...

3rd - 11th: ...and to regulate its flow as is disclosed...

Discussion:

The removal of this comma, located originally at the end of a line, was probably inadvertent, one of many similar problems arising in the 3rd printing.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 61:3.13; p.697 ¶8 Change type: S3

1st: Weasels, martins, otters, and raccoons...

2nd - 15th, CD: Weasels, martens, otters, and raccoons...

Discussion:

A single mistaken keystroke (T3 error) could have produced *martins* from an intended *martens*. It is also possible, however, that the original form was the author's choice, being a correct, though less common, variant. (We cannot assert that the author would not use an unusual variant, because *coons* was used for *raccoons* only two pages previously. (61:2.7; p.695 ¶5))

Inasmuch as *martin* is not found in any other context (e.g. *purple martin*), there is no need to change the spelling to improve the accuracy of the electronic database.

Unless it is the policy of an editor to standardize *all* of an author's spellings to the most common variant, the best course of action, if it is believed that the reader will need assistance with unusual words, is to create a comprehensive cross-reference.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text *might* contain a T3 error, but requires no change.

) 69:3.9; p.774 ¶8 Change type: S2

1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, CD: ...the flint flakers and stonemasons...

10th, 11th, 15th: ...the flint flakers and stone masons...

Discussion:

The original is clear, and is a correct form, but of nine occurrences in the text this is the only instance in which the compound form is found; this change would therefore be a reasonable standardization of the database.

Conclusion:

It is likely that the 1955 text contained a dropped keystroke (T1) error here.

Computer Analysis of Printings of The Urantia Book: Publisher's Changes, 1955-1999

by Merritt Horn
January 2001

Changes in 71:7.2 through 110:5.2

- [I. Summary of Conclusions for the Impatient Reader](#)
 - [II. Scope of Analysis](#)
 - [III. Editorial Philosophy](#)
 - IV. Critical Apparatus
 - [A. Classification of Editorial Intent for Changes in the Text](#)
 - [B. Classification of Errors](#)
 - [C. Abbreviations; editions of *The Urantia Book*](#)
 - V. Changes in Urantia Foundation editions of *The Urantia Book* (1955-1999)
 - [Changes in 0:0.0 through 42:5.1](#)
 - [Changes in 42:6.7 through 69:3.9](#)
 - [Changes in 71:7.2 through 110:5.2](#)
 - [Changes in 117:7.4 through 196:3.29](#)
-

-) 71:7.2; p.806 ¶2 Change type: S1/S6
1st: ...and philosophy sometime becomes the chief pursuit of its citizens.
2nd - 15th, CD: ...and philosophy sometimes becomes the chief pursuit of its citizens.

Discussion:

The change from *sometime* to *sometimes* is, from a typographical standpoint, a minor matter, but the meaning of the sentence is dramatically transformed from a confident prediction about the evolution of the ideal state in the original text to the mere acknowledgment of a possible development in all later editions.

To paraphrase the original:

...philosophy *eventually* becomes the chief pursuit of the citizens of the ideal state.

By contrast, all later editions convey the impression that:

...philosophy *occasionally* becomes the chief pursuit of the citizens of the ideal state.

Given the immediate context in which this statement occurs and the revelators' broader narrative of the evolution of inhabited worlds toward light and life, and in the absence of compelling evidence that the 1955 text was in error, this editor's assumption is that the original wording was the author's choice.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

-) 73:7.4; p.827 ¶3 Change type: M1
1st: ...he and Eve were to divide their time between these...capitals...
2nd - 15th, CD: ...he and Eve were to divide their time among these...capitals...

Discussion:

The original construction is correct because *between* can appropriately be used when more than two objects are related, especially if the relationship is to each object individually rather than in an indeterminate way to the group. Here, the relationship is the division of Adam and Eve's time *between* world capitals; it is immaterial that there are more than two capitals involved. The following paraphrase based on the passage may help to distinguish the usages:

The Adamic children were to live *among* the evolutionary peoples, administering the affairs of the planetary government from the various world capitals, while Adam and Eve would divide their time *between* the capitals as advisors and coordinators.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

-) 76:5.3; p.852 ¶2 Change type: D1
1st, 2nd, 12th - 15th: ...the sovereign of this universe, was so soon to appear...
3rd - 11th, CD: ...the sovereign of this universe was so soon to appear...

Discussion:

The location of this comma, at the end of a line in the original format, makes it likely that the change was an accidental database corruption coincident with the use of the new printing plates in 1971. (Unfortunately, the electronic text has not been restored to the original.)

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

-) 78:0.1; p.868 ¶1 Change type: D1
1st, 2nd, 12th - 15th, *CD*: ...the doings of historic times, and who have so...
3rd - 11th: ...the doings of historic times and who have so...

Discussion:

Same as note for 76:5.3 (except that electronic text has been restored).

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

-) 78:2.3; p.870 ¶1 Change type: S5
1st: ...was there a civilization in anyway comparable.
2nd - 15th, *CD*: ...was there a civilization in any way comparable.

Discussion:

The two-word form is the appropriate choice when serving as an adverb only, rather than as an adverbial conjunction, in which case the compound *anyway* is more common. This latter use, roughly synonymous with *at any rate* or *in any case*, is well illustrated by its only occurrence in the papers (at 148:6.4) when Job's friend, Eliphaz, is quoted as saying:

"Anyway, man seems predestined to trouble, and perhaps the Lord is only chastising you for your own good."

Conclusion:

The 1955 format is incorrect and probably reflects a simple T1 (dropped keystroke) error.

-) 79:3.5; p.881 ¶5 Change type: S1
1st: ...religious, philosophic, and commerical civilization...
2nd - 15th, *CD*: ...religious, philosophic, and commercial civilization...

Discussion:

This is one of only four instances in the 1955 text (the others being *hesititate* at 121:7.3, *anniversary* at 123:2.3, and *peformance* at 126:1.5) in which common English words have been typeset incorrectly where there is no possible basis for morphological confusion (e.g. *anyway/any way*, *sometime/some time*). The ease with which such typing mistakes are made, combined with the difficulty of their detection in proofing (because of the mind's tendency to see the correct word even when an error is present), made this a very common form of error in the days prior to spell-checking programs in even the most rigorously proofed book. That there are only four such errors in the first edition is the strongest evidence for the care with which that printing was prepared, and a potent rebuttal for the many "corrections" put forth over the years which presuppose careless preparation of the original text.

Conclusion:

Two keystrokes were transposed in the first edition—a T4 error.

-) 79:5.6; p.883 ¶7 Change type: M3
1st, 2nd: and when the land passage to the west, over the Bering isthmus...
3rd - 15th, *CD*: and when the land passage to the east, over the Bering isthmus...

Discussion:

There is no question that North America is east of Siberia—that fact being the basis for the 1967 change. It is difficult to account for the appearance of *west* in the first printing if *east* was in the original manuscript, but if the original was *West*, referring to the Western Hemisphere, the only explanation required is a mistakenly un-shifted keystroke—a simple T3 error.

In the Urantia Papers, *West* and *East* are frequently utilized to designate a generalized geographical location rather than direction, but in all other cases they refer to the western and eastern reaches of Eurasia. Because there is no other instance of *West* referring to the Western Hemisphere, we cannot be certain that this was the original wording, but it is certain that if *West* had been printed here in the first edition, the meaning would have been obvious, the passage would never have been revised, and the question of this unique usage of *West* would never have come up.

[A more complex explanation involving an E1 error (a mistaken pre-publication "correction") is the only mechanism available for the transformation of *east* in the manuscript to *west* in the 1955 text, but in view of the simplicity of the *West/west* solution, it would seem to be unnecessary to resort to the E1 explanation in this case.]

Conclusion:

There was a T3 error in the 1955 text: the *W* in *West* was mistakenly keyed without being shifted into

its capitalized form.

-
-) 79:8.3; p.887 ¶3 Change type: S2/S4
1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, *CD*: ...following the disruption of Graeco•Roman civilization.
10th, 11th, 15th: ...following the disruption of Greco•Roman civilization.

Discussion:

A change for the purpose of database standardization is reasonable, as the original text contained both forms at different locations, but the subsequent reversion of the printed text, and the variant electronic text are problematic and quite incomprehensible to this editor.

The origin of the variants in the text may be related to a change in recommended spellings between the 1927 and 1937 editions of the *Chicago Manual*. (The former specifying *Graeco-*, the latter, *Greco-*.) The *OED* and *Webster's* include both forms, but their preferences are split—along lines the reader can, no doubt, predict. (See also note for 98:4.1)

Conclusion:

The 1955 spelling is an acceptable variant. However, database standardization (if consistently applied), could be a reasonable justification for adopting the more modern form.

-) 80:2.4; p.890 ¶8 Change type: P1
1st: ...to the level of the Atlantic Ocean [missing period]
2nd - 15th, *CD*: ...to the level of the Atlantic Ocean.

Discussion:

This period, at the end of the last line on the page in the original format, was missing in the first printing. There were only two missing periods in the first edition. (See 117:7.4)

Conclusion:

The was a T1 (dropped keystroke) error in the 1955 text.

-) 80:5.8; p.894 ¶1 Change type: S5
1st: Central Europe was for sometime controlled by the blue man...
2nd - 15th, *CD*: Central Europe was for some time controlled by the blue man...

Discussion:

The two-word form is correct as the reference is to an indefinite period of time rather than to an indefinite point in time. (See *Webster's*)

Conclusion:

There was a T1 (dropped keystroke) error in the first edition.

-) 80:7.1; p.895 ¶1 Change type: S5
1st: ...there persisted for sometime a superior civilization...
2nd - 15th, *CD*: ...there persisted for some time a superior civilization...

Discussion:

As in the previous case (80:5.8), the two-word form is correct because the reference is to an indefinite period of time; not an indefinite point in time.

Conclusion:

There was a T1 (dropped keystroke) error in the first edition.

-) 83:7.6; p.928 ¶7 Change type: S2
1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, *CD*: ...a life-long partnership of self•effacement, compromise...
10th, 11th, 15th: ...a lifelong partnership of self•effacement, compromise...

Discussion:

Database standardization is a good justification for the change here and at (89:8.1) below, as out of the ten occurrences of *lifelong* or *life-long* in the text, only these two were hyphenated. However, the later changes and current discrepancies between editions are at odds with the presumed goal.

Although *Webster's* lists the compound word, differences between *Chicago Manual* editions may have given rise to the varied spellings. The 1927 and 1937 editions contain the general rule (as §251 or §213):

“Compounds of ‘life’ and ‘world’ require a hyphen:

life-history, life-principle (*but*: lifetime)...”

But the 1949 *Chicago Manual* modifies the rule slightly and lists *lifelong* as a specific example:

“§214. Compounds with ‘god’ and some compounds of ‘life’ require a hyphen:

...life-history, life-line, life-principle, life-story (*but*: lifeblood, lifelong, lifetime, etc.)”

Conclusion:

The 1955 spelling is an acceptable variant. However, database standardization (if consistently applied), could be a reasonable justification for adopting the compound form.

-) 86:5.13; p.955 ¶5 Change type: S4

1st: The children of Badanon developed a belief in two souls...

2nd - 15th, CD: The children of Badonan developed a belief in two souls...

Discussion:

Badonan is the correct spelling; *Badanon* was, no doubt, the result of an inadvertent key transposition.

Conclusion:

There was a T4 (key transposition) error in the 1955 text.

) 89:8.1; p.982 ¶5 Change type: S2

1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, CD: ...with dedication to life-long virginity...

10th, 11th, 15th: ...with dedication to lifelong virginity...

Discussion:

See note for (83:7.6) above.

Conclusion:

As for (83:7.6) above, the 1955 spelling is an acceptable variant. However, database standardization (if consistently applied), could be a reasonable justification for adopting the compound form.

) 90:2.9; p.988 ¶5 Change type: S4

1st: ...the Shawnee Teuskwatawa, who predicted the eclipse of the sun...

2nd - 15th, CD: ...the Shawnee Tenskwatawa, who predicted the eclipse of the sun...

Discussion:

Tenskwatawa is the standard transliteration for the Shawnee prophet's name; the spelling in the first edition may have been caused by a mistaken keystroke or may have been the result of an error in reading the original manuscript. (Regarding the latter possibility, see the note for 195:3.1.)

Conclusion:

An incorrect letter was present in the 1955 text. It is not possible to determine whether it was a T3 (incorrect keystroke) or T7 (mistaken reading of the manuscript) error.

) 95:2.3; p.1044 ¶2 Change type: S6

1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, CD: ...more particularly did each of the two-score separate tribes...

10th, 11th, 15th: ...more particularly did each of the twoscore separate tribes...

Discussion:

The replacement of the original *two-score* with the compound *twoscore* is without support in *Webster's*, the *OED*, or the *Chicago Manual*.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 96:3.1; p.1055 ¶4 Change type: C1/C2

1st: ...from Egypt to the Arabian desert under his leadership.

2nd - 15th, CD: ...from Egypt to the Arabian Desert under his leadership.

Discussion:

Desert was not capitalized in the 1955 edition, but in all subsequent Urantia Foundation printings it was changed to the capitalized form. The original is appropriate if *desert* is a geographic description rather than part of a name. (See, for example, *Mediterranean coast* (96:2.1), *Nile valley* (96:2.2).)

The Uversa Press edition reflects the correct analysis by restoring this occurrence to its original form and by lowercasing the instance found three paragraphs later so that both of these are consistent with the other examples of this phrase found elsewhere in the text (95:7.1; 187:5.1).

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 96:4.4; p.1057 ¶0 Change type: C1

1st: ...received the ten commandments which Moses promulgated...

2nd - 15th, CD: ...received the Ten Commandments which Moses promulgated...

Discussion:

The capitalized form is the standard approved by the *Chicago Manual*, however, of the six occurrences of this designation in the text, only one was capitalized in the first edition. Because it is statistically unlikely that five of six would be random errors, a more reasonable explanation is required. In this editor's opinion, the lowercased version was the choice of the several authors because it reflected the evolutionary relationship of Moses' *ten commandments* to the earlier *seven commandments* of Melchizedek (93:4.6-13), the *seven commands* of Eden (74:7.5-6), and the *seven commands* of Dalamatia (66:7.8-15) [which are referenced as the *seven commandments* of Dalamatia at 74:7.6]. The single capitalized instance in the 1955 text is probably the result of a stylistic edit to conform with the usage prescribed by the *Chicago Manual*. (See also note at 137:2.9)

Conclusion:

The 1955 text probably reflects the original manuscript.

) 98:4.1; p1081 ¶4 Change type: S4

1st: The majority of people in the Graeco•Roman world...

2nd - 15th, CD: The majority of people in the Greco•Roman world...

Discussion:

See note for 79:8.3 for a detailed analysis. It is interesting to note that these two occurrences are now found in two different forms in the electronic editions.

Conclusion:

The 1955 spelling, although slightly archaic, is correct. Neither “modernization” nor “standardization” has been achieved by the vagaries of later editing.

) 101:3.4#1; p.1108 ¶4 Change type: P1

1st: ...adverse ani / malistic tendencies. [missing hyphen at end of line]

2nd - 11th: ...adverse ani-/ malistic tendencies. [hyphen inserted]

Discussion:

In the later printed editions, *animalistic* is not broken by a new line.

Conclusion:

There was a T1 (dropped keystroke) error in the 1955 text.

) 104:3.9; p.1147 ¶8 Change type: P2

1st, 2nd, 15th: ...among absolute relationships; there are several existential triunities...

3rd - 14th, CD:...among absolute relationships, there are several existential triunities...

Discussion:

The original punctuation was correct, as the use of a semi-colon is required to join two independent clauses.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 105:3.8; p.1156 ¶5 Change type: S1

1st: Unifier of the deified and the undeified; corelater of the absolute...

2nd - 15th, CD: Unifier of the deified and the undeified; correlator of the absolute...

Discussion:

Although it is possible that the original word (which is not found in either *Webster's* or the *OED*) was a coined extension of *corelation* and *corelative* (both of which are found), it is not readily apparent how *corelater* would differ in meaning from *correlator(s)*, the now standard form, which is found five times elsewhere in the text. The more likely situation is that two separate typographical errors were made when this word was set. The first was a T1 (dropped keystroke) error at the end of a line of type; the second was an incorrect keystroke (T3) error, substituting *e* for *o*. This doubly misspelled word would still be difficult to catch in proofing because it would sound the same if read out loud, and interestingly enough, if it looked odd to a proofreader and consequently led him or her to consult the dictionary, the spelling could neither be confirmed nor denied by either *Webster's* or the *OED*—neither dictionary contained *correlator* or *corelater*—and without an electronically searchable text, it is unlikely that the evidence of the otherwise unanimous usage within the revelation itself could have been brought to bear on the problem.

Conclusion:

This word contained two errors in the 1955 edition. However, the external reference authorities available at the time did not contain the now standard spelling and provide reasonable etymological support for the possible validity of this variant form.

) 105:3.9; p.1157 ¶0 Change type: S2

1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, CD: ...is invalidated by the eternity co•existence of the Son, the Spirit...

10th, 11th, 15th: ...is invalidated by the eternity coexistence of the Son, the Spirit...

Discussion:

The hyphenated form is not found elsewhere in the text and is not supported by the guidelines of the *Chicago Manual* or the reference dictionaries. (*Coexist* [no hyphen] and its various derivative forms are found twenty times throughout the *Papers*.)

Conclusion:

An error was present here in the 1955 text—possibly an extra keystroke in typing (T2), or, more likely, an editorial (E2) error.

) 106:5.1; p.1167 ¶2 Change type: C2

1st: ...and the Unrevealed Consummator of Universe Destiny.

2nd - 15th, CD:...and the unrevealed Consummator of Universe Destiny.

Discussion:

The lowercase version appears to be correct because *unrevealed* does not seem to be part of the name but is solely descriptive (the title being found in several places without *unrevealed* preceding it). In the one other case in which *unrevealed* is found in conjunction with *Consummator of Universe Destiny*, it is not capitalized (0:12.7). [*Unrevealed* is found in one other location as a capitalized component of a title—*The Unrevealed Creative Agencies of the Ancients of Days* (30:1.21)—so such a format is possible.]

-) 107:6.2; p.1182 ¶4 Change type: S6
1st - 5th, 10th - 15th, CD: The Adjuster is man's eternity possibility;...
6th - 9th: The Adjuster is man's eternal possibility;...

Discussion:

The original text does appear unusual at first glance because one expects a noun like *possibility* to be modified by an adjective such as *eternal*; not by another noun. In this situation however, *eternity* is not serving as an adjective, rather the two nouns together form a single concept or nominal group, identical in structure to the group which ends the subject sentence: ...*man is the Adjuster's personality possibility*.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

-) 109:7.2; p.1201 ¶3 Change type: S2
1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, CD: Personalized Thought Adjusters are the untrammelled...
10th, 11th, 15th: Personalized Thought Adjusters are the untrammeled...

Discussion:

Although both variants are acceptable, *untrammeled* is the unanimous usage elsewhere in the text and is preferred by the *Chicago Manual*.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text was not in error, but database standardization, if consistently applied, is a reasonable basis for making the suggested change.

-) 110:3.4; p.1206 ¶2 Change type: S2
1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, CD: ...wholly compatible with a light•hearted and joyous life...
10th, 11th, 15th: ...wholly compatible with a lighthearted and joyous life...

Discussion:

All other occurrences in the text follow the compound form: *lighthearted* (with the possible exception of one which is hyphenated at a line break). Database standardization is probably in order here, although it is interesting to note that this may be a stylistic variation as it is the only use of the word by an author other than the midwayers responsible for Part IV.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text was not in error, but database standardization, if consistently applied, is a reasonable basis for making the suggested change.

-) 110:5.2; p.1208 ¶1 Change type: S6
1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, CD: ...disconnected parade of the un•co•ordinated sleeping mind...
10th, 11th, 15th: ...disconnected parade of the unco•ordinated sleeping mind...

Discussion:

The original, fully hyphenated form is found in *Webster's*, and the fully closed form is found in the *OED*, but the hybrid of the 10th, 11th and, 15th editions is not found anywhere. The modified spelling also violates the general hyphenation guidelines of the *Chicago Manual* regarding the avoidance of forms which might cause the reader to stumble over either pronunciation or meaning.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

Computer Analysis of Printings of The Urantia Book: Publisher's Changes, 1955-1999

by Merritt Horn
January 2001

Changes in 117:7.4 through 196:3.29

[I. Summary of Conclusions for the Impatient Reader](#)

[II. Scope of Analysis](#)

[III. Editorial Philosophy](#)

IV. Critical Apparatus

[A. Classification of Editorial Intent for Changes in the Text](#)

[B. Classification of Errors](#)

[C. Abbreviations; editions of *The Urantia Book*](#)

V. Changes in Urantia Foundation editions of *The Urantia Book* (1955-1999)

[Changes in 0:0.0 through 42:5.1](#)

[Changes in 42:6.7 through 69:3.9](#)

[Changes in 71:7.2 through 110:5.2](#)

[Changes in 117:7.4 through 196:3.29](#)

-) 117:7.4; p.1291 ¶8 Change type: P1
1st - 5th: ...of the Qualified Vicegerents of the Ultimate [missing period]
6th - 15th, CD: ...of the Qualified Vicegerents of the Ultimate. [period added]

Discussion:

This is one of two missing periods in the first edition. (*See* 80:2.4)

Conclusion:

There was a dropped keystroke (T1 error) in the 1955 text.

-) 118:6.2; p.1299 ¶5 Change type: S2
1st - 9th, 12th - 15th, CD: ...the freewillness of the myriads of the children of Deity...
10th, 11th: ...the free-willness of the myriads of the children of Deity...

Discussion:

Free-willness is found at four other locations in the text and all in instances refers to an attribute or characteristic of a being or beings. *Freewill* and *free will* each occur numerous times—the former as an adjective (modifying such words as *choice*, *action*, or *personality*), while the two-word form is used when *free* modifies *will* itself (i.e. when *will* is under discussion). In light of these consistent usages, conforming this variant is appropriate as the original was probably the result of a dropped hyphen.

Conclusion:

There was a dropped keystroke (T1 error) in the 1955 text.

-) 118:7.5; p.1301 ¶2 Change type: S2/S6
1st - 6th: Only as a creature becomes God identified...
7th - 15th, CD: Only as a creature becomes God-identified...

Discussion:

Although *God identified* here, and its only related form, *God identification* (at 111:1.6) are both open (separate words) in the 1955 text, the guidelines within the *Chicago Manual* provide a good argument for both being hyphenated. In each case a single concept is referred to, and the missing hyphen causes the unsuspecting reader to stumble (albeit briefly) by suggesting here, "...as a creature becomes God..." and at 111:1.6, "...the exquisite melodies of God..."

Further, at the present location, the comparison with *God-unidentified* in the prior sentence is being made.

Conclusion:

The original text was not in error, but the hyphenated form would have been better.

-) 119:7.6; p.1317 ¶2 Change type: M2
1st: These men of God visited the newborn child in the manger.

2nd - 15th, CD: These men of God visited the newborn child.

Discussion:

Presumably, this change was made because the original seems to be inconsistent with the narrative of Jesus' birth in 122:8, which states that three wise men from the east visited Jesus when he was almost three weeks old—about the time the family left the inn and over two weeks after they had moved out of the stable.

However, it is certainly possible that Joseph and Mary might have taken the manger with them up to the room in the inn in order to continue to have a cradle for Jesus. The need for a cradle would have been no less in the room than in the stable, and if the manger was portable, as small feed-boxes often are, moving it along with the family seems quite reasonable.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text required no “correction.”

) 121:7.3; p.1340 ¶1 Change type: S1

1st - 10th: ...one who did not hesitate to clash with dogmas...

11th - 15th, CD: ...one who did not hesitate to clash with dogmas...

Discussion:

See note at 79:3.5.

Conclusion:

There was an extra keystroke (T2 error) in the 1955 text.

) 123:2.3; p.1357 ¶7 Change type: S1

1st: ...one month before his fifth birthday anniversary...

2nd - 15th, CD: ...one month before his fifth birthday anniversary...

Discussion:

See note at 79:3.5.

Conclusion:

There was a dropped keystroke (T1 error) in the 1955 text.

) 123:5.12; p.1363 ¶5 Change type: M3

1st: Far to the east they could discern the Jordan valley and, far beyond, the rocky hills of Moab.

2nd - 15th, CD: Far to the east they could discern the Jordan valley and far beyond lay the rocky hills of Moab.

Discussion:

As others have suggested, the March, 1959 letter from Rev. Benjamin Adams may well have provided the impetus for the change made here. [Rev. Adams: “But the rocky hills of Moab were not east of Nazareth but east of the Dead Sea.”] Setting aside (as throughout these notes) a discussion of the nature of the editorial policy which allowed such changes to be made, an analysis of the 1955 text shows that there was no need to “correct” it in any case because the author of the paper does not state that the hills of Moab are east of Nazareth.

The context for this sentence is the “panoramic view” from atop the Nazareth hill: Jesus and his father are standing on top of the hill and are moving their gaze from Mt. Carmel in the northwest around an arc to the north, east, south and west. Mt. Hermon is to their north, and from springs in its foothills near Dan (northeast of Nazareth) the Jordan valley extends to the Dead Sea in the south. Thus, as Jesus and Joseph follow the line of the river valley along the arc of their survey, as the Jordan approaches the Dead Sea, father and son “discern...far beyond, the rocky hills of Moab.”

This interpretation is further supported by the punctuation of the following sentence which does **not** read “Also, to the south and the east,…” (suggesting a change in direction from the last reference), but rather, “Also to the south and the east,…” which implies that the last referenced location (Moab) was in the same direction.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 124:1.12; p.1368 ¶1 Change type: S2

1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, CD: ...on pleasure or business to nearby Cana, Endor, and Nain.

10th, 11th, 15th: ...on pleasure or business to near-by Cana, Endor, and Nain.

Discussion:

All other instances of *near-by* as an adjective are hyphenated; adverbs are open (*near by*), and the closed form, originally found here, is otherwise entirely absent from the text. Consistent usage would therefore support this change.

Conclusion:

There was a dropped hyphen (T1 error) in the 1955 text.

-) 126:1.2; p.1387 ¶2 Change type: S4
1st, 2nd: Not far away he could look upon Tannach,...
3rd - 15th, CD: Not far away he could look upon Taanach,...

Discussion:

The corrected spelling is the standard transliteration of the name.

Conclusion:

There was a mistaken keystroke (T3 error) in the 1955 text.

-) 126:1.5; p.1387 ¶5 Change type: S1
1st: ...some superhuman or miraculous performance, but always...
2nd - 15th, CD: ...some superhuman or miraculous performance, but always...

Discussion:

See note at 79:3.5.

Conclusion:

There was a dropped keystroke (T1 error) in the 1955 text.

-) 130:6.3; p.1438 ¶0 Change type: S2
1st - 9th, 12th - 15th, CD: ...its abject fear•slave and the bond-servant of depression...
10th, 11th: ...its abject fear•slave and the bond servant of depression...

Discussion:

As discussed in greater detail in the note for 162:7.2, *bond servant* is found in three different forms in the first edition. The only form found in our primary references is the open form (*bond servant*) in *Webster's*. Although the hyphenated version could not be considered incorrect, and at this location it parallels *fear-slave* to good effect, database standardization around the open form would be reasonable.

Conclusion:

Database standardization could justify this change if consistently implemented.

-) 133:7.9; p.1480 ¶1 Change type: S1/S2
1st - 9th, 12th - 15th, CD: ...functioning of a consciousness sorter and associater...
10th, 11th: ...functioning of a consciousness sorter and associator...

Discussion:

While the meaning of *associater* is clear and that variant is found in a reference dating to 1626 in the *OED*, it is probably the result of a keystroke error because the common form, *associator*, is the unanimous usage elsewhere in the text. [Unlike other archaic English words occasionally used in *The Urantia Book* to convey unique meanings (e.g., *inconcussible* at 118:3.3), the ancient word-form *associater* did not convey a meaning distinct from *associator* and no such differentiation is apparent here.]

The original spelling may have been caused by a typist's inadvertent repetition of the *er* pattern from *sorter*.

Conclusion:

There was an incorrect keystroke (T3 error) in the 1955 text.

-) 134:7.5; p.1492 ¶5 Change type: S4
1st: ...Sychar, Schecham, Samaria, Geba,...
2nd - 15th, CD: ...Sychar, Shechem, Samaria, Geba,...

Discussion:

The standard transliteration is *Shechem*. [A similar problem occurred at 186:3.2.]

Conclusion:

An extra keystroke was inserted (T2) and a wrong keystroke (T3) was made.

-) 137:2.9; p.1527 ¶3 Change type: C1
1st: ...in the form of the ten commandments and other mottoes...
2nd - 15th, CD: ...in the form of the Ten Commandments and other mottoes...

Discussion:

See discussion in note for 96:4.4.

Conclusion:

For the reasons cited in earlier note, the 1955 text probably reflects the original manuscript.

-) 138:7.4; p.1544 ¶3 Change type: S2
1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, CD: ...this was their first clearcut and positive intimation...
10th, 11th, 15th: ...this was their first clear•cut and positive intimation...

Discussion:

This word is found eight additional times; all are hyphenated.

Conclusion:

The hyphen was missing (a T1 error) in the 1955 text; database standardization, if consistent, is appropriate.

-) 139:12.1; p.1566 ¶0 Change type: P1
1st - 6th: Judas' parents were Sadducees, and when their son...
7th - 15th, CD: Judas's parents were Sadducees, and when their son...

Discussion:

The correct form is *Judas's* and it is found that way at all other locations except 177:4.9.

Conclusion:

There was a missing *s* in the 1955 text (T1 error).

-) 139:12.12; p.1567 ¶5 Change type: S2
1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, CD: ...in these lucid intervals he faintheartedly conceived,...
10th, 11th, 15th: ...in these lucid intervals he faint-heartedly conceived,...

Discussion:

Usage is split between the two forms in the 1955 text. Though *Webster's* supports the closed form, the *OED* suggests using the hyphen and it is clear from the history of usage documented there that both forms have been commonly used. Database standardization is appropriate here, and this editor suggests that the hyphenated form be used for clarity's sake—in its closed form the word may cause the reader to momentarily stumble over the *th* at the joining of the words. (*see also* 190:3.1)

Conclusion:

The original text was not in error, but database standardization is appropriate.

-) 140:8.9; p.1583 ¶4 Change type: S6
1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, CD: He was liberal, bighearted, learned, and tolerant.
10th, 11th, 15th: He was liberal, big-hearted, learned, and tolerant.

Discussion:

The only other occurrence of this word is at 139:9.8, where it is hyphenated. Given that this compound could not be considered common in current usage, the hyphenated form is preferable.

Conclusion:

The original text was not in error, but database standardization is appropriate.

-) 142:8.4; p.1606 ¶1 Change type: S6
1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, CD: The Sabbath week ends they usually spent with Lazarus...
10th, 11th, 15th: The Sabbath weekends they usually spent with Lazarus...

Discussion:

The two-word form is supported by *Webster's*; the hyphenated form (*week-end*) by the *OED*, but the closed form is not found in any of the contemporary sources.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

-) 147:5.1; p.1651 ¶5 Change type: S2
1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, CD: He was a half-hearted believer, and notwithstanding...
10th, 11th, 15th: He was a halfhearted believer, and notwithstanding...

Discussion:

The closed form is the unanimous usage elsewhere in the text, so database standardization is reasonable.

Conclusion:

The original was not in error, but standardization is appropriate.

-) 149:6.12; p.1677 ¶1 Change type: M1
1st: Of all the sorrows of a trusting man, none are so terrible...
2nd - 15th, CD: Of all the sorrows of a trusting man, none is so terrible...

Discussion:

As at 55:12.5, the original is correct; *none* commonly takes a plural verb.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

-) 151:6.2; p.1695 ¶5 Change type: S2
1st - 9th, 13th, 14th, CD: ...with fetters and chains and confined in one of the grottos.
10th - 12th, 15th: ...with fetters and chains and confined in one of the grottoes.

Discussion:

Though both forms are correct, this word is found elsewhere in the text as *grottoes*. Therefore,

database standardization would be reasonable.

Conclusion:

The original was not in error, but standardization is appropriate.

) 152:3.2; p.1702 ¶3 Change type: S2

1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, CD: ...but you are short-sighted and material•minded.

10th, 11th, 15th: ...but you are shortsighted and material•minded.

Discussion:

The closed form is the unanimous usage elsewhere, so database standardization would be reasonable.

Conclusion:

The original was not in error, but standardization is appropriate.

) 153:1.7; p.1709 ¶1 Change type: S5

1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, CD: Jairus' only reply to all this pleading was:...

10th, 11th, 15th: Jairus's only reply to all this pleading was:...

Discussion:

The corrected form is supported by usage elsewhere and by the general rules in the *Chicago Manual* regarding the formation of possessives for ancient names.

Conclusion:

There was a missing *s* in the 1955 text (T1 error).

) 158:4.6; p.1756 ¶3 Change type: P2

1st, 2nd: Come out of him you unclean spirit;...

3rd - 15th, CD: Come out of him, you unclean spirit;...

Discussion:

While a comma here is not unreasonable, it is also not necessary.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text does not need correction.

) 158:7.1; p.1759 ¶3 Change type: P2

1st - 6th: The apostles had slept very little that night; so they were up early...

7th - 15th, CD: The apostles had slept very little that night, so they were up early...

Discussion:

The stronger separation created by the semi-colon may be unnecessary, but it is also not incorrect.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text does not need correction.

) 159:1.3; p.1763 ¶0 Change type: P2

1st - 6th: ...whatsoever you shall decree on earth, shall be recognized in heaven.

7th - 15th, CD: ...whatsoever you shall decree on earth shall be recognized in heaven.

Discussion:

This is another case of reasonable punctuation by the author that hardly stands in need of correction by an editor.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text does not need correction.

) 162:2.3; p.1791 ¶1 Change type: C2

1st - 6th: By refusing to hear me, you are refusing to receive Him who sends me.

7th - 15th, CD: By refusing to hear me, you are refusing to receive him who sends me.

Discussion:

Capitalization of *Him* at this point is correct usage and is required for clarity. (See note for 3:1.12.)

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 162:2.3; p.1791 ¶1 Change type: C2

1st - 6th: You, if you will receive this gospel, shall come to know Him who sent me.

7th - 15th, CD: You, if you will receive this gospel, shall come to know him who sent me.

Discussion:

Capitalization of *Him* at this point is correct usage and is required for clarity. (See note for 3:1.12.)

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 162:2.4; p.1791 ¶2 Change type: P2

1st: ...wonderful than this Jesus of Nazareth has already done?"

2nd - 15th, *CD*:...wonderful than this Jesus of Nazareth has already done."

Discussion:

While it may be true that the sentence is declarative, the question mark does seem to more acceptably convey the wondering attitude of the people, and it does not confuse the reader. In the absence of compelling evidence that an error has been made, any reasonable punctuation in the 1955 text should be left alone—as the presumed choice of the author.

Conclusion:

The 1955 punctuation does not require correction.

) 162:2.7; p.1792 ¶1 Change type: C2

1st - 6th: In just a short time I go to Him who sent me into this world.

7th - 15th, *CD*: In just a short time I go to him who sent me into this world.

Discussion:

The original is supported by the *Chicago Manual* and by consistent usage in *The Urantia Book*. See note for 3:1.12 for full discussion.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 162:5.2; p.1795 ¶1 Change type: M1

1st, 2nd: You only judge by the appearances of the flesh;...

3rd - 15th, *CD*: You judge only by the appearances of the flesh;...

Discussion:

While the modified construction may represent adverbial placement “by the rules,” the original is perfectly intelligible and conforms with ordinary usage. Regarding the placement of *only*, Fowler’s *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage* (1926), among other examples, cites the common, “He only died a week ago,” in which, technically (as in the subject phrase), the author ought to have located *only* after the verb: “He died only a week ago.” Fowler, however, rejects the absolutism of “orthodoxy” and concludes: “The advice offered is this: there is an orthodox position for the adverb, easily determined in case of need; to choose another position that may spoil or obscure the meaning is bad; but a change of position that has no such effect except technically is both justified by historical and colloquial usage and often demanded by rhetorical needs.”

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is clear, and well within the bounds of normal usage.

) 162:7.2; p.1796 ¶4 Change type: S2

1st - 9th: ...who commits sin is the bond-servant of sin. [*line break at hyphen*]

10th, 11th:...who commits sin is the bond servant of sin. [*identical line break w/ no hyphen*]

12th - 15th: ...who commits sin is the bondservant of sin. [*no line break*]

CD: ...who commits sin is the bond-servant of sin. [*no line break*]

Discussion:

In the 1955 text, this word is hyphenated and is broken at the hyphen to begin a new line of type, so it is impossible to determine whether *bond-servant* or *bondservant* was intended. The only form that the type (as set) could not have represented was *bond servant*. In the following sentence, *bondservant* is found as one word, so it would be a reasonable assumption that the same closed form was intended here. Both *bond servant* and *bond•servant* are found once elsewhere in the Urantia papers (69:5.8 and 130:6.3, respectively). In the 10th and 11th Urantia Foundation printings, both occurrences in the present paragraph were separated into two words, as was the 130:6.3 instance, thus standardizing all four to the two-word format. Database standardization would be reasonable for this word, but the electronic editions and the printed texts subsequent to the 11th have diverged (as noted).

Conclusion:

Database standardization, if consistently applied, would be reasonable, though the original text was not in error.

) 162:7.2; p.1796 ¶4 Change type: S2

1st - 9th, 12th - 15th, *CD*: And you know that the bondservant is not likely...

10th, 11th And you know that the bond servant is not likely...

Discussion:

No line break is found here in any edition. See previous note for more information.

Conclusion:

Database standardization, if consistently applied, would be reasonable, though the original text was not in error.

) 164:5.6; p.1816 ¶3 Change type: P2

1st - 10th, 12th - 15th, *CD*:With the two apostles and Josiah the Master went back to Pella.

11th: With the two apostles and Josiah, the Master went back to Pella.

Discussion:

A comma could assist the reader in phrasing the sentence, but it is hardly necessary.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text does not require correction.

) 165:0.3; p.1817 ¶3 Change type: S4

1st: ...from these regions during the times of Judas Maccabeus.

2nd - 15th, *CD*:...from these regions during the times of Judas Maccabee.

Discussion:

Although *Maccabeus* is a more accurate transliteration of the Greek, *Maccabee* is very common in English works and is used in all other occurrences of the word in the Urantia papers. Database standardization is appropriate reasonable here.

Conclusion:

Database standardization is reasonable, though the original text was not in error.

) 166:3.4; p.1829 ¶1 Change type: P2

1st, 2nd: Lord open to us; we would also be great in the kingdom.

3rd - 15th, *CD*:Lord, open to us; we would also be great in the kingdom.

Discussion:

In the original format, *Lord* was the last word in the line, making a dropped comma not unlikely. It is possible that the comma was simply viewed as unnecessary within such a short phrase, and it should also be noted that while the use of the comma in direct address is regarded as standard, the *Chicago Manual* was silent on the matter until its 12th edition (1969).

Conclusion:

It cannot be determined whether an error in typesetting was made here, but the end-of-line location tips the balance in favor of making the change adopted in the 3rd printing.

) 167:4.3; p.1837 ¶2 Change type: P2

1st - 10th, 12th - 15th, *CD*:...so that on the second, or even the third, day such a one...

11th: ...so that on the second, or even the third day such a one...

Discussion:

Although the second comma seems clumsy, it is required to enclose the parenthetical phrase *or even the third*.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 167:5.3; p.1839 ¶0 Change type: S2

1st - 9th, 12th - 15th, *CD*: ...he had become enamoured of a better•looking woman.

10th, 11th: ...he had become enamored of a better•looking woman.

Discussion:

This word is also found at 121:5.6; there, the American spelling, *enamored*, is used. Both forms are acceptable, though database standardization would justify the choice of one over the other.

Conclusion:

Database standardization, if consistently applied, would be reasonable, though the original text was not in error.

) 168:0.2; p.1842 ¶2 Change type: D1/S6

1st, 2nd, 10th, 11th, 15th: ...and Mary sent word to Jesus concerning Lazarus's illness,...

3rd - 9th, 12th - 14th, *CD*: ...and Mary sent word to Jesus concerning Lazarus' illness,...

Discussion:

The original version, *Lazarus's*, is correct. Although the missing final *s* in the 3rd through 9th printings might have originally been due to a database conversion error, it is not known why the incorrect form was again adopted for the softcover and electronic editions.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 168:3.7; p.1847 ¶7 Change type: S4

1st - 3rd: ...with friends in Bethpage, a hamlet near Bethany.

4th - 15th, *CD*: ...with friends in Bethphage, a hamlet near Bethany.

Discussion:

The 1955 text uses *Bethpage* in all thirteen occurrences of this word. In the 4th printing, the original

was changed to *Bethphage* here, and at ten other locations; the remaining two were changed in the 9th printing. These changes were presumably made because *Bethphage* is the spelling found in English Bibles since the *Authorized Version* (King James) of 1611. While the apparent misspelling in *The Urantia Book* is not theologically or historically significant, it seems unlikely to the present editor that so many identical typographical errors could have occurred, so the spelling *Bethpage* must have been used in the original manuscript.

Whenever names are translated from one language into another (based on the name's sound rather than its meaning), different transliterations are often chosen by different translators because it can be difficult to transfer sounds precisely from one language to another. Some modern examples would be Peking/Beijing, Cambodia/Kampuchea and Ceylon/Sri Lanka. This phenomenon also occurs when translating ancient names into modern languages: Akenaton/Ikhnaton, Jerome/Hieronymus, Nimrod/Nimrud, Beth Shean/Beth Sha'an/Beth Shan, Khufu/Chefren, etc.

The Greek form of the word in question is #02N" (Z. It is found in only 3 places in the New Testament (Mat. 21:1, Mk 11:1, Lk 19:29). Using standard transliteration principles, it would become *Bethphage* in English, and that is how it is found in modern Bibles. However, the usual rules for transliteration do not always produce the most accurate rendering of the original, and may be overruled when appropriate. An example closely related to the present case is the word 5"N"D<"bμ: if transliterated by the same standard rules, it would become *Capharnaum*, but *The Urantia Book* and English Bibles use *Capernaum* instead. Why? 5"N"D<"bμ is found throughout the New Testament; it is hard to talk about Jesus without talking about 5"N"D<"bμ. So it is natural that translators would attend more carefully to accuracy of transliteration and to ease of vocalization in English. It is this editor's belief that that is precisely what the authors of *The Urantia Book* did when they chose *Bethpage* over *Bethphage*. The former is a more accurate approximation of the Greek original, is much easier for English speakers to say, and doesn't sound like a type of plague.

[As to the origin of the general error of converting N into the *f* sound in English: In Latin, *ph* was used to replace the Greek N and was pronounced properly as an aspirated consonant (as in *uphill*). However, English speakers pronounced Greek N and Latin *ph* as *f* because of a mistaken inference from certain Latin and Greek cognates such as *frater*/ND"JZD. This conversion is well-evidenced in common English words such as *philosophy* and *pharmacy*, but it is not accurate, and certainly does not need to be adopted for an unfamiliar place name like #02N" (Z/*Bethpage*.)

Conclusion:

The 1955 spelling was intended by the authors and needs no revision.

) 168:5.1; p.1849 ¶5 Change type: M2
1st: ...until the day of the crucifixion of Jesus,...
2nd - 15th, CD:...until the week of the crucifixion of Jesus,...

Discussion:

The change from *day* to *week* was made, because the former is inconsistent with the ensuing narrative (at 174:0.1, 175:3.1, and 177:5.3) which would place the time of Lazarus's flight between Tuesday at midnight (when his death was decreed by the Sanhedrin) and Wednesday evening (when "certain ones" at the camp "knew that Lazarus had taken hasty flight from Bethany")—two days before the crucifixion of Jesus.

Other than a mistaken pre-publication (E1) change, this editor does not presently have a theory to explain this problem with the 1955 text.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text appears to be inconsistent with itself at this point; the origin of the error is not known.

) 169:3.2; p.1855 ¶0 Change type: M1
1st, 2nd: ...a certain beggar named Lazarus, who laid at this rich man's gate,...
3rd - 15th, CD:...a certain beggar named Lazarus, who lay at this rich man's gate,...

Discussion:

This sentence, as structured, does require *lay* rather than *laid*, the former being the past tense of the intransitive verb *to lie*; the latter being the past of the transitive verb *to lay*. However, it is this editor's opinion that the error here is not poor grammar by the author, but a lost word in transcription. The authors of Part IV of *The Urantia Book* generally follow the text of the *American Standard Version* (ASV) of 1901, with certain modernizations and corrections as needed. The ASV text of Luke 16:19-21 is as follows:

"Now there was a certain rich man, and he was clothed in purple and fine linen, faring sumptuously every day: *and a certain beggar named Lazarus was laid at his gate*, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table; yea, even the dogs came and licked his sores." [emphasis added]

The passage from *The Urantia Book* follows the ASV very closely:

"There was a certain rich man named Dives, who, being clothed in purple and fine linen, lived in mirth and splendor every day. *And there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, who laid at this rich man's gate*, covered with sores and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table; yes, even

the dogs came and licked his sores.” [emphasis added]

If the ASV narrative provides the structure for the subject passage, the grammatical problem observed in the original text was caused by the inadvertent loss of the *was* that should have immediately preceded *laid*.

Another logical support for this argument is based on the beggar’s inability to fend for himself. If “even the dogs came and licked his sores,” he surely would have been carried to the rich man’s gate by others, who would then have laid him there.

Conclusion:

There was a T6 error made here at some point in the preparation of the text, and “who was laid” became “who laid.”

-) 172:0.2; p.1878 ¶2 Change type: S4
1st - 3rd: ...the common folks of Bethany and Bethpage did their best...
4th - 15th, CD: ...the common folks of Bethany and Bethpage did their best...

Discussion:

See note for 168:3.7.

Conclusion:

The 1955 spelling was intended by the authors and needs no revision.

-) 172:1.2; p.1878 ¶5 Change type: S4
1st - 8th: ...all Bethany and Bethpage joined in celebrating...
9th - 15th, CD: ...all Bethany and Bethpage joined in celebrating...

Discussion:

See note for 168:3.7.

Conclusion:

The 1955 spelling was intended by the authors and needs no revision.

-) 172:3.6; p.1881 ¶4 Change type: S4
1st - 3rd: ...directing them to go over to Bethpage,...
4th - 15th, CD: ...directing them to go over to Bethpage,...

Discussion:

See note for 168:3.7.

Conclusion:

The 1955 spelling was intended by the authors and needs no revision.

-) 172:3.6; p.1881 ¶4 Change type: S4
1st - 3rd: Go to Bethpage, and when you come...
4th - 15th, CD: Go to Bethpage, and when you come...

Discussion:

See note for 168:3.7.

Conclusion:

The 1955 spelling was intended by the authors and needs no revision.

-) 172:3.6; p.1881 ¶4 Change type: S4
1st - 3rd: ...when the two apostles had gone into Bethpage...
4th - 15th, CD: ...when the two apostles had gone into Bethpage...

Discussion:

See note for 168:3.7.

Conclusion:

The 1955 spelling was intended by the authors and needs no revision.

-) 172:4.3; p.1883 ¶5 Change type: S4
1st - 3rd: ...among their friends in Bethany and Bethpage.
4th - 15th, CD: ...among their friends in Bethany and Bethpage.

Discussion:

See note for 168:3.7.

Conclusion:

The 1955 spelling was intended by the authors and needs no revision.

-) 172:5.2; p.1884 ¶1 Change type: S5
1st, 2nd: ...some of the twelve whom he knew were armed with swords;...
3rd - 15th, CD: ...some of the twelve who he knew were armed with swords;...

Discussion:

The pronoun is the subject of the verb *were armed*, not the object of *knew*; therefore *who* is the correct form (see also 177:5.2). To illustrate:

...some of the twelve *whom* he knew Peter had armed...[he knew Peter had armed *them*]

...some of the twelve *who* he knew were armed... [he knew *they* were armed]

Conclusion:

Either a T2 (extra keystroke) error, or an E2 (mistakenly “corrected” grammar) error occurred here, causing *whom* to appear in the 1955 text. (There is also an identical error two sentences prior to this which was corrected in the Uversa Press edition.)

) 175:1.20; p.1908 ¶4 Change type: C2

1st - 6th: ...while you plot to destroy Him of whom they spoke.

7th - 15th, CD: ...while you plot to destroy him of whom they spoke.

Discussion:

Capitalization of *Him* at this point is correct usage and is required for clarity. (See note for 3:1.12.)

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 176:4.1; p.1918 ¶4 Change type: P2

1st - 5th: ...his seventh and last bestowal, as a mortal of the realm.

6th - 15th, CD: ...his seventh and last bestowal as a mortal of the realm.

Discussion:

The comma is required to give the sentence its correct meaning:

Urantia was the place of Michael’s seventh and last bestowal, as a mortal of the realm. [the seventh bestowal—the one in which he was a mortal of the realm]

Not:

Urantia was the place of Michael’s seventh and last bestowal as a mortal of the realm. [his seventh bestowal as a mortal]

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 177:3.7; p.1924 ¶3 Change type: S3

1st: ...why he would be willing to forego the great advantage...

2nd - 15th, CD:...why he would be willing to forgo the great advantage...

Discussion:

Although *forgo* is etymologically preferable, *forego* has been in use for over 400 years and leads to no confusion; *forego* is also found at two other locations in the text, while *forgo* is absent altogether. In addition, *forego* appears (for the first time for either form) as the preference in the 11th edition (1949) of the *Chicago Manual* (§122).

Conclusion:

The usage in the 1955 text is consistent and reasonable.

) 177:4.9; p.1926 ¶2 Change type: S6

1st, 2nd, 11th, 13th, 14th: ...Judas's betrayal of Jesus was the cowardly act...

3rd - 10th, 12th, 15th, CD:...Judas' betrayal of Jesus was the cowardly act...

Discussion:

The correct form is *Judas’s* and it is found that way at all locations in the 1955 text except 139:12.1. It is not known why the correct form was changed in the first place, or why it has been changed and changed back again so many times in recent printings.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

) 177:5.2; p.1927 ¶3 Change type: S5

1st, 2nd: ...still others whom you think love the truth will be scattered,...

3rd - 15th, CD:...still others who you think love the truth will be scattered,...

Discussion:

This is a situation similar to that found at 172:5.2. The pronoun concerned is the subject of *love*, not the object of *think*; therefore *who* is the correct form. To illustrate:

...others whom you think Jesus loved... [you think Jesus loved *them*]

...others who you think love the truth... [you think *they* love the truth]

Conclusion:

Either a T2 (extra keystroke) error, or an E2 (mistakenly “corrected” grammar) error occurred here, causing *whom* to appear in the 1955 text.

) 179:5.9; p.1943 ¶2 Change type: M2

1st: ...he said to the twelve: “And as often as you do this,...

2nd - 15th, *CD*: ...he said to the apostles: “And as often as you do this,...

Discussion:

There were only eleven apostles still present for the establishment of the remembrance supper because Judas had left earlier; so the *twelve* of the 1955 text was incorrect, and was changed to *apostles* to make this sentence consistent with the rest of the narrative.

The error may have originated either as an inadvertent pattern error (T5) for either *eleven* or *apostles*, or through an E1 error (the conscious but mistaken “correction” of the original based on the assumption that an earlier T5 error had occurred).

Conclusion:

The 1955 text contained either a T5 or E1 error.

) 183:4.3; p.1976 ¶1 Change type: S4

1st - 3rd: ... went into hiding at Bethpage and Bethany.

4th - 15th, *CD*: ... went into hiding at Bethphage and Bethany.

Discussion:

See note for 168:3.7.

Conclusion:

The 1955 spelling was intended by the authors and needs no revision.

) 184:3.1; p.1982 ¶2 Change type: S6

1st - 9th, 12th, *CD*: ...on informal charges of law-breaking, blasphemy,...

10th, 11th, 13th - 15th: ...on informal charges of lawbreaking, blasphemy,...

Discussion:

Of the five occurrences of *lawbreak[er] [-ing]* in the text, three are closed and two are hyphenated. There is no differential in meaning indicated by the two forms, so database standardization is appropriate. (Note, however, that the electronic texts do not reflect this standardization.)

Conclusion:

The 1955 text was not in error, but database standardization, if consistently applied, justifies this change.

) 184:3.12; p.1983 ¶7 Change type: S6

1st - 9th, 12th, *CD*: ...be done with this law-breaker and blasphemer?

10th, 11th, 13th - 15th: ...be done with this lawbreaker and blasphemer?

Discussion:

See note for 184:3.1.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text was not in error, but database standardization, if consistently applied, justifies this change.

) 186:3.2; p.2001 ¶0 Change type: S4

1st: ...Philadelphia, Sidon, Schechem, Hebron, Damascus, and Alexandria.

2nd - 15th, *CD*:...Philadelphia, Sidon, Shechem, Hebron, Damascus, and Alexandria.

Discussion:

The standard transliteration is *Shechem*. [A similar problem occurred at 134:7.5.]

Conclusion:

An extra keystroke was inserted (T2) in the 1955 text.

) 186:5.5; p.2002 ¶6 Change type: P2

1st: ...throughout the universe of universes, have existed from eternity;...

2nd - 15th, *CD*:...throughout the universe of universes have existed from eternity;...

Discussion:

This comma is not appropriate as found in the 1955 text. Either it was inserted in error (a T2 mistake), or a second comma earlier in the sentence was inadvertently dropped (a T1 error). In this editor’s view, the latter explanation is more likely; and the missing comma would have been located immediately following *Maker*, which would create an enclosed parenthetical statement. The complete sentence would read as follows:

“These touching and divinely beautiful relations between man and his Maker, on this world and on all others throughout the universe of universes, have existed from eternity; and they are not in any sense dependent on these periodic bestowal enactments of the Creator Sons of God, who thus assume the nature and likeness of their created intelligences as a part of the price which they must pay for the final acquirement of unlimited sovereignty over their respective local universes.”

Conclusion:

Either a T1 or a T2 error exists in the 1955 text.

-) 189:4.1; p.2025 ¶2 Change type: S4
1st - 3rd: ...going to the home of Simon in Bethpage,...
4th - 15th, CD: ...going to the home of Simon in Bethphage,...

Discussion:

See note for 168:3.7.

Conclusion:

The 1955 spelling was intended by the authors and needs no revision.

-) 190:2.5; p.2032 ¶3 Change type: S4
1st - 8th: ...even while they looked for him at Bethpage,...
9th - 15th, CD: ...even while they looked for him at Bethphage,...

Discussion:

See note for 168:3.7.

Conclusion:

The 1955 spelling was intended by the authors and needs no revision.

-) 190:3.1; p.2033 ¶1 Change type: S6
1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, CD: ...strengthen those who are fainthearted and fear•ridden.
10th, 11th, 15th: ...strengthen those who are faint-hearted and fear•ridden.

Discussion:

See note for 139:12.12.

Conclusion:

The original text was not in error, but database standardization is appropriate.

-) 191:0.1; p.2037 ¶1 Change type: S4
1st - 3rd: Thomas was brooding over his troubles alone at Bethpage.
4th - 15th, CD: Thomas was brooding over his troubles alone at Bethphage.

Discussion:

See note for 168:3.7.

Conclusion:

The 1955 spelling was intended by the authors and needs no revision.

-) 191:0.13; p.2039 ¶0 Change type: S4
1st - 3rd: John Mark located Thomas at the home of Simon in Bethpage...
4th - 15th, CD: John Mark located Thomas at the home of Simon in Bethphage...

Discussion:

See note for 168:3.7.

Conclusion:

The 1955 spelling was intended by the authors and needs no revision.

-) 191:0.13; p.2039 ¶0 Change type: S4
1st - 3rd: ...John went over to Bethpage and brought him back with them.
4th - 15th, CD: ...John went over to Bethphage and brought him back with them.

Discussion:

See note for 168:3.7.

Conclusion:

The 1955 spelling was intended by the authors and needs no revision.

-) 192:4.5; p.2051 ¶2 Change type: S6
1st - 9th, 12th - 14th, CD: This was a sad home•coming for John Mark.
10th, 11th, 15th: This was a sad homecoming for John Mark.

Discussion:

The only other instance of *home-coming* in the text (at 150:7.3) is broken at the hyphen by the end of a line, so it could support either spelling. Only the hyphenated form is found in *Webster's*, and the *Chicago Manual* gives no guidance. The original should therefore have been left alone.

Conclusion:

The 1955 text is correct.

-) 195:3.10; p.2074 ¶5 Change type: S4
1st: Poutaenus taught Clement and then went on to follow Nathaniel...
2nd - 15th, CD: Pantanus taught Clement and then went on to follow Nathaniel...

Discussion:

The correct spelling of this name is *Pantaenus*; Dr. Sadler, in a March 17, 1959 letter to the Reverend Benjamin Adams of San Francisco, suggested the possible source of the error: “I think the spelling of the name of the teacher in Alexandria is undoubtedly an error in transcribing the manuscript into typewriting. An “an” was undoubtedly transcribed as an “ou”. I remember when we were sometimes in doubt as to whether a letter was an “n” or a “u” in the manuscript. Of course, we who were preparing this matter, did not know the name of this teacher so could have easily made this mistake.”

Conclusion:

Two incorrect letters were present in the 1955 text. There is evidence to support a T7 (mistaken reading of the manuscript) error.

-) 196:3.29; p.2097 ¶3 Change type: P1
1st: And the spirit of the Father is in his Son’s sons—mortal men.
2nd - 15th, *CD*: And the spirit of the Father is in his Sons’ sons—mortal men

Discussion:

Sons’ does appear to be correct in view of the context.

Conclusion:

A T4 error (transposed keystrokes) was present in the 1955 text.