



Fig. 115. GOTHIC ARMOUR (c. 1470)

FIFTH TRUMPET EARLY TURKISH--NOT ARAB WAR II

In the previous study it was shown that prophecy under the fifth trumpet is depicting two antagonistic characters, one of which is the nemesis of the other. Their period of activity was one of confusion, and it was one remarkable for its apostasy against the law of God. The ministers of retribution are called locusts--an historic Biblical term for armies of the ancient East (Nahum 2:15,17). They are represented as a cavalry army whose riders are outfitted with breastplates like iron, and who have crowns like gold on their heads. No other defensive arms are mentioned, but the locusts have the teeth of lions (Joel 1:6), without doubt their weapons of attack--arrows, darts, swords, lances, pikes, javelins (Prov.30:14; Ps.57:4). The army also had wings, and it was prepared for battle. Hence it was organized and under discipline. The locust horses had tails with stings like scorpions; and these tails represented their military prowess for one hundred and fifty years (verse 10). The same army appears to be described by the prophet Joel.

It should be at once apparent that the fifth trumpet description of this army is sufficient to identify the one hundred and fifty year period of locust militarism, in which cavalry war is depicted by the prophet--not the naval battles of the Arab conquest.¹ Between the Arabian wars in the seventh century and the Turkish invasion of Europe in the fourteenth, the East and West met in seven centuries of war. It is impossible that in such a long period of war, there should not have been changes in armor and tactics that can identify warfare under the fifth trumpet--whether early Arab conquest in the Mediterranean circle, or Turkish war in Europe. Early and medieval records have preserved for us the description of the war weapons of these periods.

Of the military writers of antiquity, Vegetius (A.D. 375-392) is said to have been the only one studied during the Middle Ages.² "Indeed," writes Captain Cockle, "the title 'De re militari,' so frequent during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, sufficiently indicates how fully the ideas of the time had reverted to the ancient teaching." After Vegetius, emperors Maurice

(b. circa A.D. 539) and Leo VI (866-912) are important in their description of archer war. Leo VI copied extensively from the Strategicon of Maurice. For nearly five hundred years after Nicephorus Phocas (963-969), no military work of importance appeared. Our apocalyptic chapter in Turkish history actually marks the end of the gap!

We go back to the time of Mohammed when the Roman legion had passed, and horse archers were dominant. In that epoch the cavalry archer represents a force in war that had been established for nearly three centuries.³ We shall describe his cuirass.

The Early Arab Cuirass

The military cuirass was a breastplate or corselet (lōrikion), consisting of a protective covering for the chest, and sometimes also for the back. It came into use particularly as defence armor against the invincible arrow and dart. — described by Homer, Varro, Livy— The early cuirass⁴ was made of leather, as its Latin name implies--the lorica. We find its continuance in England long after the Norman conquest in 1066, and in the far East as late as the thirteenth century, when Marco Polo and Carpini were itinerating among Tartars and Turks.⁴ Carpini gives a description of cuirasses that he found made of cuir-bouilli, or boiled leather.⁵ They were light of weight, yet impenetrable. Matthew Paris passes on a similar description of impenetrable light arms of boiled leather.⁶ The efficacy of leather, according to Ashdown, in warding off a sword-cut, and in mitigating the power of missile weapons, such as arrows or javelins in flight, has at all times been recognized.⁷ The byrnie of the Saxon warriors about A.D. 1000 consisted of leather or canvas upon which were fixed scales of defence--strips of horn, leather, cuir-bouilli, bronze or iron.⁸ "The use of scales of various materials sewn upon a textile base has been known to nations of antiquity from a very remote period."⁹

The early Saracens were well acquainted with an Eastern method of protecting the body by the use of a quilted covering.¹⁰ This sort of battle-shirt was also worn later by the English lord. It was made of layers of cloth, tow, or rags, which were quilted upon a foundation of canvas or leather, and then

covered with cloth, linen, or silk. One form of this war-shirt was called the hacqueton, a name which shows Oriental origin in its relation to the Arabic word al-qutum, implying "stuffed with cotton."¹¹ In the period of the third crusade, the sultan Saladin gave the English king a hacqueton (alcottonem) that was very light, but yet impenetrable to any spear point.¹² It was presented as a specimen of the best Eastern armor. In the Tactica of Leo VI, the lorica is of leather, as its name implies;¹³ and this term throughout medieval literature is opposed to the Greek word thōrax, signifying a breastplate of brass or iron. The army of Leo VI had helmets sheathed with skins (dermatinos), and the shields, large and small, were covered with hide. All the quivers and sheaths were made of leather. As has been before mentioned, the Tactica reflects the still earlier book on military armor by Maurice in his war against the Persians as outlined in his Strategicon.¹⁴ In both these works, the cuirass was made of leather, and hence was a strict accouterment of the leather period of war armament.

We can go back farther into the still earlier period when Vegetius describes the cuirass of the Roman legion. This too was commonly the lorica, that is, of *The ancient Gauls had tunics of iron rings which they called loricas.*¹⁵ leather, but sometimes of iron. ^ The Roman soldier strenuously objected to heavy armor, and at times would cast aside his cuirass and iron helmet.¹⁶ In the famous battle of Hadrianople (378), the traditional tactics of the Roman legion were found wanting as against the sudden charge of the new force of the Gothic cavalry, which henceforward took the upper hand in warfare.¹⁷ Again, in 450, the horse-bowmen of the Huns proved that the Roman legionary had passed. The leather cuirass was in common use when Mohammed was born.

The cuirass is therefore frequently mentioned in connection with the early Arab wars; but there is nothing to indicate that the breastplates which the Saracens captured as booty were not made of leather. Mohammed had a few in his own private collection.¹⁸ The Koran speaks of "coats of mail."¹⁹ But these

were not cuirasses; for the breastplates, which were in use until fire-arms came into practice, were never made of chain-mail, and neither were they coats, having sleeves like the hauberk. Moreover, mail battle-shirts were very old, and hence a consistent mention by the Koran. The Romans were apparently acquainted with such armor, as the discovery of rusty masses of corroded iron rings of Roman origin proves.²⁰ In the British Museum, lumps of rusty iron are reported, which are described as looking like chain-mail, and which came from Nineveh.²¹ The chain-mail coat is consequently an ancient witness of war, but it was not the cuirass. When worn at all, it was worn under the cuirass.

The poetry of the Arabian Antar describes Arabian armor. We do not know just when he lived--perhaps in the time of Mohammed. He writes of an army of 15,000 "armed with cuirasses."²² Again, he depicts soldiers as clothed with "iron armor and brilliant cuirasses," and also "horsemen clad in iron."²³ Hence his poetry upholds the text of the prophet Mohammed, but, on the contrary, not the text of the Apocalypse. For neither the Koran, Antar, nor any other contemporary text describes an iron cuirass ^{or breastplate.} The expositor's conclusion that the Arab cuirass was made of metal is therefore not only inconsistent with the history of plate armor, but it is also out of agreement with the correct meaning of current language in the time of early Arab wars. Moreover, the very word itself for the early cuirass--lorica--means leather.

Medieval Armor in Revelation 9:9

The word for breastplate in our apocalyptic text is thōrax, and, in contrast to the primitive lōrikion (leather), it is the Greek word that designates a metal cuirass. The period that marked the ^{initial} use of the metal cuirass is the historic fourteenth century.²⁴ Before this, Greek fire and many different kinds of missile-hurling machines were in action on the battle fronts. The naval corsair was at his best in the Mediterranean. But these were not new methods of war. In contrast, the Turkish light horse-archer, with his sheaf of arrows and a simple cuirass of iron plate, was a new pattern of war in the Eastern empire. He opposed swiftness of movement and countless numbers against the heavy

arms of the almost moribund Byzantine army. It was not long before the Slav warriors of Eastern Europe had to adopt the Turkish system.²⁵ The same thing happened in Spain, where the Moors demonstrated the same tactical war. Before the introduction of fire-arms, it was very difficult for the arrow or dart to penetrate the iron breastplate, which therefore became the special prophetic mark of its period, and can be seen on nearly every effigy.

As early as 1288, the city of Milan was already an active center for the fabrication of hauberks, breastplates, plates, and plate armor of all kinds.²⁶ They were all of hard iron, and polished to the brilliancy of a mirror. Milan even exported her arms to the Tartars and Turks of the East. Strange to relate, the Milanese weapons of attack carried the mark of the "scorpion," without doubt indicative of their sting! The mark was still met with at the end of the sixteenth century.²⁷ The Indian East was also celebrated for its own fine steel. Kerman in Persia finally became known for the excellent temper of her scimitars and lance points. These were bought at a high price by the Turks, whose sabres could cleave a European helmet without turning the edge.²⁸

At the fatal battle of Angora (1402), when Tamerlane captured Bayazid, the sultan's Serbian vassals, even though fortune had already decided against him, cut through the ranks of the Tartar bowmen, whose arrows repeatedly rebounded from the "iron cuirasses" worn by the Slavs. According to Gibbon, there were 20,000 of them clad in black and impenetrable armor.²⁹

Period of Locust Militarism

When the Greek empire was strong, "its army beyond comparison was the best fighting machine in Europe."³⁰ The Greeks, in their decline, brought the Turks over the Bosphorus as mercenaries, marched them around the empire, and taught them European tactics. The Turks went back with their lesson well learned, but they were slow to change their own system. By the end of the fourteenth century, they had the first standing army in civilization--a mobile host of in-

fantry and cavalry, highly skilled, and outfitted with a uniform.³¹ No prince in Europe maintained such a force. Under the fifth trumpet, we read a description of this army. It was far in advance of any seventh- or ninth-century pattern, and quite different!

A special military order of the locust cavalry was called the Janissaries, whose youthful soldiers, with faces like men (verse 7), were the offspring of Christian parents of Roman, Bulgarian, Serbian, and Hungarian origin.³² They were the conscripted tribute children of the Christian vassals of the Turks. They were strong and well set up, but they wore the turban, and were forced to swear by Islam. The Turks took an ever increasing tithe of the most select children of Eastern Europe, taught them a new religion, invested them with a distinctive dress, and made them into an effectual war weapon with which no nation could compete for a century and a half. They became the arch-enemy^{and scourge} of Christendom.³³ These archer horsemen were noted for their mobility. Their horses were light and swift (Joel 2:4,7), and their armor was light. They could cover as much ground in half a day as other armies might accomplish in three days.³⁴

Othman began his attack on the Greek empire on July 27, 1299,³⁵ but he is supposed to have found the faith of Islam after he settled in Asia Minor.³⁶ He had no permanent army at first. For every new expedition, he had to convoke in advance Turkoman horsemen named ekindii (runners), the only Turkish troops then in use.³⁷ It was Murad I (1359-1389), the grandson of Othman, who brought Islamic militarism to a supreme order of command. This was first demonstrated when the trained Janissaries won such battles as Harmanli on the Maritza (1371), Kosovo (1389), and Nicopolis (1396).³⁸ This military order had the most war-inspiring religion in the world, and its zealots administered to Christendom the punishment deserved on account of dishonor to the law of God.

The Woe of Trumpet Five

We think of the fifth trumpet as the worst period of the Christian Era. It

was the first of the bottomless-pit epochs of prophecy. Sardis, the church of this period, had no life--in the sight of heaven she was dead. For money, remission of sin was assured. For money, release from the flames of hell was assured for those who had died. There was no Lord's supper in Christendom, and the Bible was almost unknown. The children and youth of the Christian East were placed on the block and sold, and were conscripted by the foreign invader.³⁹ They were forced to adopt the faith of Islam, and inducted into an army, eventually to return and attack their own homes. The subjects of the empire lived in the midst of alarm. Disaster followed disaster--usurpations, dynastic intrigues, incursions of Genoese and Venetians, and the ever-^rincroaching Turks, battles, triumphs; hope of aid from Tartar or pope--⁴⁰illusions all! In what other period, or under what other trumpet can such hopeless woe for one hundred and fifty years be found? And yet, when the prophecy reads, "One woe is past," may we not understand that morning had begun to dawn upon this black night? We hear a message direct from heaven with reference to the invader (verse 13).

The one hundred and fifty years of Ottoman torment agrees with the historical symbolism of the prophecy, while early Arab war does not agree:

1. The prophecy calls for a period of extreme darkness and confusion. History describes the era of the Ottoman attack as the blackest that ever overshadowed Christian races--a night said to have been without a single ray of light.⁴¹ The Turk cared little about science, literature, theology, logic, history. Only the Christian art of war was of interest to him. By nature a shepherd and cattleman, he had no liking for farming and industry. He neglected roads, highways, and public utilities. His government was so bad that under his rule woe followed upon woe, and, in the nineteenth century, he was ready to leave Europe--worse than he found it.

In contrast, the early Arab era was by no means remarkable for its darkness. It is a question whether Islam was a party cry in the early Arab conquest. Moreover, prophecy does not allow all the light to have been smitten so early in the history of Christendom (Rev.3:12).

2. The prophecy calls for one hundred and fifty years of locust attack, to be followed by nearly four centuries of empire. Ottoman history exactly agrees with this outline. But Arab history does not agree. With the Arabs, we have first about a century of quick conquest and empire, their caliphs ruling at Damascus for ninety years. Then came their decline. This is contrary to the prophecy, which calls for attack first, and then conquest. Moreover, the Turks are the only Islamic power that ever conquered the Byzantines as a whole.

3. The prophecy calls for a cavalry army whose riders have iron breast-

plates. The Turkish cavalymen had such. We know where they obtained them, and that these iron breastplates were a mark of the period in which the Turks attacked the Greek empire. They represent a new pattern of war which followed the passing of the feudal knight and his heavy armor.

The early Arabs did not have iron breastplates. Their cuirasses were made of leather. In addition, the special feature of Arab war that represented attacks upon Constantinople, was naval war, not land war.

4. Under the fifth trumpet, prophecy calls for an apostate king. He is a fallen star, and has the key to confusion. The government which the sultans set up upon capturing the Greeks, strictly answers to this specification. They combined the theocracy of the Orthodox Greeks with their own, thereby tying two religions to the state. It was a two-fold form of destructive rule, as implied by the names Abaddon and Apollyon.

On the other hand, neither the early Arabs nor Mohammed were apostates. In the apocalyptic sense, the prophet was not a fallen star. Their form of government under the early caliphs was patriarchal, and not theocratic. Hence the early Arabian empire does not answer to the prophecy, and neither does the prophecy answer to conditions under the Umayyads.

The Reformers witnessed to conditions existing at the beginning of the combined period of the fifth and sixth trumpets. Reformation language is the language of this prophecy--abyss, pit, darkness, plague, torment, scourge, the Turk and his horse and cuirass! The Millerites gave witness at the end of the prophecy. William Miller was the first to tie together the period of the fifth trumpet with that of the sixth.⁴² Before his calculation can be attested, the historical background connected with the Turkish empire must be outlined, as predicted under Trumpet Six.

- 1 Cambridge Medieval History (Cambridge, 1936), Vol. II, pp. 349, 352, 354.
- 2 Maurice J.D. Cogle, A Bibliography of English Military Books (London, 1900), Introduction, pp. XVIII, XIX.
- 3 Cambridge Medieval History (Cambridge, 1936), Vol. VI, p. 785.
- 4 Century Dictionary, Vol. IX.
- 5 Johannis de Plano Carpini, "Historia Mongalorum Quos nos Tartaros Appellamus," Recueil de Voyages et de Mémoires publié par la Société de Géographie (Paris, 1839), Tome Quatrième, p. 685.
- 6 The Book of Ser Marco Polo the Venetian Concerning the Kingdoms and Marvels of the East (London, 1903. Ed. by Cordier), Vol. I, p. 263, note.
- 7 Charles H. Ashdown, Armour and Weapons in the Middle Ages (London, 1925), p. 12.
- 8 Sir Guy Francis Laking, Record of European Armour and Arms (London, 1920), Vol. I, p. 2.
- 9 Ashdown, op. cit.
- 10 Charles Oman, History of the Art of War in the Middle Ages (London, 1924), Vol. II, p. 4.
- 11 Id.
- 12 Id.
- 13 Leonis Imperatoris, "Tactica sive De Re Militari," Migne, Patrologiae, SG (Paris, 1863), Tomus CVII, p. 722.
- 14 Cogle, op. cit., Introduction, pp. XXXVIII, XXXIX.
- 15 Stewechii Comentaribus ad Flavi Vegeti Renati, De Re Militari (Lugduni Batavorum, 1592), p. 198.
- 16 Flavi Vegeti Renati, De Re Militari (Lugduni Batavorum, 1592. Ed. by Stewechius), Bk. I, ch. XX.
- 17 Cambridge Medieval History (Cambridge, 1936), Vol. VI, p. 785.
- 18 Jean Gagnier, Histoire des Arabes avec la vie de Mahomed (Amsterdam, 1731), Vol. III, 328-334.
- 19 Koran, Vol. II, p. 104.
- 20 Ashdown, op. cit., p. 41.
- 21 Id.
- 22 E.B. Elliot, Horae Apocalypticae (London, 1846), Vol. I, p. 408. Sec. ed.
- 23 Id.
- 24 Oman, op. cit., p. 8; cf. Webster, "Armor."
- 25 Cambridge Medieval History (Cambridge, 1936), Vol. VIII, p. 648.
- 26 Laking, op. cit., Vol. I, Introduction, p. XIV.
- 27 Id.
- 28 The Book of Ser Marco Polo, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 96.
- 29 Edward Gibbon, The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (New York, 1901, Collier), Vol. VI, p. 358.
- 30 Cambridge Medieval History (Cambridge, 1936), Vol. IV, Introduction, p. XI; Sir Edwin Pears, Destruction of the Greek Empire (London, 1903), pp. 227, 228.
- 31 Gibbon, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 331; Vol. V, p. 390; Pears, op. cit., p. 229.
- 32 Pears, op. cit., pp. 105, 229.
- 33 Pears, op. cit., pp. 223, 228; William Miller, The Ottoman Empire and its Successors (Cambridge at the University Press, 1934), p. 46.
- 34 Pears, op. cit., p. 230.
- 35 "A Landmark of History, July 27, 1299," The Ministry, June and July, 1944.
- 36 Cambridge Medieval History (Cambridge, 1936), Vol. IV, p. 668.
- 37 Alfred de Besse, The Turkish Empire: Its Historical, Statistical, and Religious Condition (Philadelphia, 1854), p. 50.
- 38 Pears, op. cit., pp. 108, 135.
- 39 Pears, op. cit., p. 103; Ducæ, Historia Byzantina, cap. XXIII.
- 40 Pears, op. cit., p. 200.
- 41 Pears, op. cit., pp. 380, 427.
- 42 L.E. Froom, "Time Phase of the Fifth and Sixth Trumpets," The Ministry, June, 1944.

On Turkish Prophecy

Luther

He was there; he should know which system was responsible for the world's woe and distress - Islam or the Papacy! He made free use of the prophetic symbols in his writings. It must have been the study of this ninth chapter of the Revelation that led him to place the judgment about three hundred years hence from his day as referred to in Great Controversy, page 356.

D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation is rich with his interpretation.

Just what then was the FIRST WOE that was ushered in by smoke from the bottomless pit, darkening sun and air? - the calamity that was in some way connected with men who had not the seal of God, and with a time when men sought death and could not find it, and with a king called the Angel of the bottomless pit, the fallen star that had opened the pit? Certainly the locusts and their banditry alone were not this WOE: it would seem to have primarily concerned that against which the locust army was sent, - the throne of iniquity and its heroes of crime. In harmony with this the 150 years of locust warfare would best fit a time when the iniquity of the Papacy was at its height, when extremes of confusion in church and state seemed about to wreck civilization, and when the downfall of the Eastern Empire was imminent. Therefore, in order to save Christendom from disaster, and to protect the Reformation coming on, the locusts were commanded by prophecy to torment the Archenemy of truth and righteousness. But neither the torch and stake of Rome nor the locust scimitar can alone account for the terrible WOE which befell the mediaeval age. The Bible was in sackcloth, and hungry human souls were starving for the bread of life. This the Muslims could not give; neither could Homer, Virgil or Aristotle satisfy the heart. Finally the Eastern Empire went down. Then, with the Reformation on one hand, and the Turkish arms on the other, it was not long before the Papal sun began to set, and not until the French Revolution does history present another phase similar to the FIRST WOE of Revelation 9. Under the SECOND WOE, after 250 years of trial and Protestant persecution, unhappy France lifted her hand in open rebellion against God and His Holy Word; and then, by the same hand, administered a deadly thrust to her ancient mother, the Church of Rome. Both woes are scenes from the bottomless pit. The third will be likewise, as "It cometh quickly," the prophecy saith.

But then shall we see men to and fro to seek the words of the book, and shall not find it. - Rev. 8:12

featured in Rev. 17:8.

Scenes of terrible confusion. In both WOES the Bible was provided.

The "hour, day, month and year" of Rev. 9:13 is a prophetic expression of time. Reckoning one prophetic day as equivalent to one literal year (Ezek. 4:5, 6), the symbolism can be figured as follows:

- 1 pr. hr. = 1/24 of a pr. day, or of its equivalent, 1 year, or 360 literal days, or 360/24, = 15 literal days.
 - 1 pr. day = 1 literal year.
 - 1 pr. month = 30 prophetic days = 30 literal years.
 - 1 pr. year = 360 prophetic days = 360 literal years.
- The whole therefore equals 360+30+1, or 391 years and 15 days.

We should carefully note the order of events of the Sixth Trumpet, which, in order to finish the story of Trumpet Five, must of necessity introduce first its last event in order of time, its earlier events being described in chapters ten and eleven. The fact that in verse 13 John hears a Voice speaking from the four horns of the golden altar would appear to indicate that the Messenger of the Covenant (Mal. 3:10) had already come to His temple to cleanse it, and that the hour had struck to make an atonement for the altar of

The Two Woes

The 150 YEARS

of human society

The 391 YEARS and 15 DAYS and The 150 YEARS THE PERIODS

incense as directed in Ex.30:10, Lev.16:18, and as referred to in Rev.11:1. The 391 years and 15 days would therefore at least reach to 10 Tisri, 1844, for the prophecy reads, "And the four angels were loosed, which had been prepared (A.R.V.) for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year, for to slay the third part of men." These words seem to bring the time period right down to the Great Day of Atonement. Counting back from this date we find that the period began in the fall of 1453, the very time when the Ottomans, under penalty of death, were ordered by Mohamet II to take possession of Constantinople. The city had been stormed and pretty much destroyed by May 29, but it took several months to get it ready for occupation. The fall of 1453 also marked the end of the 150 years of locust torment upon Eastern Rome, for history witnesses to their beginning in the autumn of 1303, when a company of these locust bandits entered the golden gate of Stamboul in response to the invitation of Michael IX, who had hired them as a defense in his internal dynastic struggles. They did not come into the empire as a crowned power, nor did they conquer territory or set up a throne. They were not to "kill," prophecy had commanded, but for 150 years they were to have Abaddon-Apollyon as their king. Hence we need not search the annals of history for the date of an organized Turkey to mark the beginning of this period? After the Turks had conquered Eastern Rome, then they appear in prophecy as the Great River Euphrates, this symbolism showing that by the time the 391 years and 15 days should begin, the Turkish hordes from Asia would have become a nation and a power to be reckoned with. ~~But the "locusts have no king," Solomon said.~~

An important symbol in Rev.9:15 is the expression "the four angels." In Early Writings, page 38, these angels are mentioned. Sr. White saw them as having a work to do on the earth, and asked her accompanying angel what it meant. It was explained to her that God gave His angels charge over things on the earth; that the four angels had power from God to hold the four winds. Applying this explanation to the four angels of Revelation 9 it should be quite clear that for 391 years and 15 days they had been in charge of the Great River Euphrates - Turkey, whose armies, after the fall of the Eastern Empire, had been ready and eager to proceed against the Western sea, but had been held under restraint by the angels of God. However, at the end of this period, in 1844, Turkey's power is gone. She lost Greece in 1832; in 1840, Egypt, and also on this date, by the Treaty of London, she signed away all the rest of her jurisdiction to the allies of Europe. Furthermore, in the spring of this awakening year, 1844, Greece finally got her constitutional government, thereby gaining her full freedom from Turkish interference; and about the same time, under pressure from England and the other powers, Turkey gave up her power of life and death over all her subjects, both native and Christian. And finally, as if to make the surrender complete, also in this same year, England made a treaty of reform with Persia, the remaining vestige of Muslim rule over territory which had formerly comprised Alexander's kingdom, the original four winds, and which now, 10 Tisri, 1844, had been fully released from Turkish control. Thus was Turkey shorn of her dominions. Therefore the Four Angels were then loosed from their charge of Turkey, and we next see them, in Rev.7:1, in command of the very powers to whom she had surrendered, - England and the Allies. And well was there need; for in 1848 it seemed as if all Europe would be capitulated into revolution and disaster. In these scenes from prophecy we may observe how God controls the nations and the great movements which concern His church.

A thrilling anecdote of the part angels take in the affairs of nations is told in Volume I of the Testimonies, page 267. It was the disastrous battle of Manassas, and the "Northern men were rushing on, although the destruction was very great. Just then an angel descended, and waved his hand backward. Instantly there was confusion in the ranks. It appeared to the Northern men that their troops were retreating, when it was not so in reality, and a precipitate retreat commenced. This seemed wonderful to me." God sent His angel to interfere with the plans of man. He had this nation in charge.

And so, in spite of false ideas, History keeps up her forward march as outlined by the finger of prophecy. In Daniel and the Revelation every principal nation is given its part. Prophecy is the guiding star, and it will be fulfilled whether understood or not. If the eye fails to see, or the ear to hear God's Word, the very stones may cry out of the wall, or the host of heaven may witness to the hand of God. Often centuries may pass before events are understood. Similarly the prophecy in Revelation 9 has for long time been silent. Its work is not yet done. Another WOE is yet to come, and it will be similar to the first two, though on a larger scale. ~~It will involve~~ the whole world. In 1844 the men giving the message saw in the Treaty of London and the affairs of Egypt a complete fulfillment of the prophecy concerning Turkey, and divine providence came to their aid and walked into the picture. But it took several years to dismantle Turkey, and Egypt was only the South Wind, as it were! The very day that Rifat Bey landed in Alexandria, Aug. 11, the combined fleet of England, Austria and Turkey appeared off Beirut, to settle the question of Syria, the high spot of the controversy. On Nov. 2 Acre was captured and Mehemet Ali ordered a retreat. On Nov. 25 he resigned all claims to Syria. For six years he had held ~~off~~ ^{out}. Modern Europe, 1815-99, W. Alison Phillips, M.A., pp. 229, 230. But Egypt did not get full sovereignty even by the Treaty of 1841, she still remained a vassal of the Porte. It was 1872 before the Khedive obtained an independent rule, and then he had to continue the tribute to Turkey, and promise of aid in time of war. McCoan's Egypt, p. 101. The case of Greece was different. In 1844 she obtained her constitution and complete freedom; but at the same time Turkey was still further reduced in rank as a nation, and to such an extent that the balance of power as regards the remnants of Alexander's former dominion ~~now~~ rested with the powers of Europe ~~and no longer with Turkey~~. From henceforth upon their shoulders would be the responsibility of peace or war. And there it is today, and there in Europe are the mighty angels of God - The Four Angels - holding the four winds of strife until the sealing of God's children is finished.

The Sixth Trumpet is the longest historical prophecy of any one of the seven trumpets, for it includes parts of three chapters of the Apocalypse. It marks the end of three long prophetic periods, each one of which, according to the year-day principle, reaches into modern time. This trumpet is therefore a modern prophecy, and deals largely with modern history. Chronologically, the sixth trumpet ties to the end of the three periods described. Thus the French Revolution is the main historical subject of Revelation 11, and during this decade of distraught French history, the 1260 years ended. Students of prophecy at the time were expecting them to end!¹ Similarly, chapter 10 registers the end of the longest period of record--Daniel's 2300 years--and briefly touches upon the religious movement which then occurred.² And chapter 9, in its last nine verses, tersely sets forth significant features of nearly four centuries of Turkish history, and points out the historical event which would end this epoch. All of these events were anticipated by early exponents of historical prophecy.

The leading historical events of the sixth trumpet are therefore alike in that they look backward over their stream of time instead of forward. In other words, each principal historical subject of this trumpet is introduced at the end of its accompanying period. Hence each period is obviously to be calculated according to the historic year-day principle, for on no other basis can the periods reach to the events predicted. This principle has thus far been the accepted rule for historical prophecy. On this basis of reckoning, the Turkish symbolic period--"the hour and day and month and year" (Rev.9:15, A.R.V.)--equals 391 years and 15 calendar days. The Greek construction is such that it decisively supports this calculation.³ But a most important feature of interpretation with reference to chapter 9 lies in the fact that, in harmony with the two periods of chapters 10 and 11, we should look for the prophesied histori-

cal event at the end of the 391 years and 15 days, rather than at the beginning. The perfect passive participle (hētoimasmēnoi, verse 15, cf. A.R.V.) is in agreement with our conclusion, for it signifies that the preparedness preceded the loosing. Expositors have reversed these two acts in their interpretation; but on this basis, their historical dates do not agree with the constructive order of the text.

Analysis of the Prophetic Text

Verses 13 and 14 mark the end of the prophetic period, when the Voice is *speaking in modern times,* heard from heaven,[^] and *which* after[^] the prophet announces,

"And the four angels were loosed that had been prepared for the hour and day and month and year, that they should kill the third part of men" (A.R.V.).

Verses 16 and 17 mark the beginning of the prophecy, when John saw in vision immense numbers of horsemen with breastplates of fire, smoke, and brimstone. It is obvious that this description could not apply so late as the nineteenth century when the Turkish army was a crumbling rabble. But it could very specifically mark the fifteenth century when Turkey, England, and France introduced the artillery arm of war into their sieges.⁴ Then the militarism and power of the Turkish horsemen was such that their role demanded a new symbol--the significant "four angels." This is a symbol that the Islamic code itself adopted. According to the Koran, the Mohammedan throne is upheld by four angels.⁵ The number four was a sacred number with the Asiatic and Oriental. His tent had to be supported by four poles; four winds ruled the sky above his head. In this respect, the Turkish divan was like the "four winds" of Alexander's kingdom, whose territory it had come to occupy.

Similarly, the "great river Euphrates" could be representative of Turkey's religion--Islam. Of old this river signified ancient wisdom or cult (Ecclesiasticus 24:25,26). A river was an object of worship in many ancient lands. After many centuries, the Euphrates has come to mark the eastern border of Turkey. Thus its meaning must be ideological, and does not signify mere terri-

tory, but was a symbol at Turkey's entrance gate. These two contrasting prophetic terms--the "four angels" and the "great river"--are like the two names--Apollyon and Abaddon--and fittingly point to Turkey's two-fold form of government, her sultanate and caliphate.

In contrast to the iron breastplates of locust war, the Turkish army has now acquired breastplates of fire and brimstone. This new element in attack was a decisive mark of fifteenth century war in Europe.⁶ By these plagues (verse 18, A.R.V.), the "third part of men" was killed, that is, the Greek empire was completely subjugated. It was the only major part of Christendom that suffered a permanent collapse, ^{in the century} after the introduction of fire-arms, and the first major part to suffer. The prophet proceeds to describe an actual vision of the ensuing strife. He sees the new method of war in action, which enabled the Turks to extend their militarism to a peak of conquest. They fought great naval battles, and displayed in triumph their crimson ensign of crescent and star "on every European shore within the Pillars of Hercules."⁷ For a long time after, Turkish corsairs commanded the Mediterranean.

John's vision of artillery fire does not represent the dated siege of Constantinople (1453), but it does represent the fifteenth-century period of war armament during which the siege occurred. In this same period there were many other artillery sieges in Europe: Harcourt (1449), Normandy (1449-50), Bayonne (1451), Northumbria (1454), Castillon (1453), Northampton (1460), Murat (1476).⁸ Oman features Constantinople as the most famous and complicated system of defences in the civilized world. It was ruined by gun-fire in a fifty-three day siege (April 7-May 29). The siege was not essentially a cavalry charge, although at least two-thirds of Mohammed's army were horsemen. On this occasion, however, the Janissaries and Anatolians fought mainly as infantry,⁹ because the city was surrounded by water on two sides, and on its one landward side, there was a twelve-mile stretch of triple stone wall, and a defensive moat about sixty feet

wide. Pears gives a detailed description of the attack.¹⁰ The Turkish divisions were about 150,000 in number, as against 8000 Greeks and Italians within the walls. Each army was outfitted in much the same manner--modern, medieval, and ancient arms being employed side by side. But in addition, there were cannon of various calibre, and many guns. Mohammed's huge cannon--fired seven times each day--ultimately broke down the walls. "It was the cannon," writes Critobulus, "which did everything."¹¹

John heard the number of the horsemen. It was altogether too many for any one battle or siege in either medieval or modern war. But 200,000,000 horsemen would easily harmonize with a century in which Turkish war eclipsed all Christendom. The vision of the Euphratean horsemen and their breastplates of fire does not therefore represent a simple event or date to which the chronology of the sixth trumpet can tie. On the contrary, it is of great chronological importance to the prophecy that cannon and gun-fire actually identify the fifteenth century, when the new element of artillery war came into general practice.¹² Hence, dates earlier than the beginning of the fifteenth century are altogether too early for the beginning of the 391-year Turkish period.¹³

A Point of Time in Trumpet Six

The actual point of time under the sixth trumpet lies in verse 15. Divine command came to the Philadelphian ministry, or sixth angel, to "loose the four angels." John promptly announces that the "four angels were loosed." His aorist tense (eluthēsan) shows that the "loosing" was an historical act--a point of time. His perfect passive participle (hētoimasmēnoi), as previously mentioned, shows that the act of loosing followed the preparedness. The prophecy is thereby brought down to the end of the 391 years and 15 days--in other words, to modern time in the nineteenth century.

However, Turkish hordes were by no means being loosed upon Christendom in the nineteenth century. The Turkish army had been on the defensive for some

time, and by the fourth decade, was in rout. Their main arm--the Janissaries and Mameluks--had been abolished.¹⁴ Hence the verb *luō* in verse 15 must consistently be allowed its primary sense, and must therefore mean that the four angels were loosened, or unleashed, from that to which they had been bound, namely, the "great river Euphrates," or Islam. Historical expositors commonly agree that these four angels represent Turkish sovereignty or state. An ancient version reads "four kings."¹⁵ In any event, during the century that followed the taking of Constantinople, Turkish armies completed the conquest of the ancient territory which is described by Daniel as the "four winds" (Dan.11:4), by Zechariah, as "four chariots" (Zech.6:1), and later by John as "four angels," or possibly "four kings," as the Aramaic would read. By means of artillery war Turkey completed her conquests. The Ottomans defeated the Mameluks in 1517. Solaiman the Magnificent stretched his empire eastward to Bagdad on the Tigris in 1535. About the same time Barbarossa extended the shadow of the horse-tails westward along the northern coast of Africa to the Atlantic.¹⁶

The Turks held their vassal provinces together for a century and a half, and then began to lose their European foothold (Karlowitz, 1698).¹⁷ But as we come to the end of the prophecy in the nineteenth century, they had lost all of their European countries except a small strip around Constantinople. The Ottoman forces had become a mere rabble; the main army had been defeated, the fleet had deserted, and Greece, Egypt, Syria, and Turkish regencies were in revolt. Moreover, Turkey's famous military order which had been the arch-enemy and scourge of Europe, had been annihilated. The structure of her sovereignty had so decayed and crumbled that, like the historic four winds of ancient time, the four angels seemed ready to be dispersed and broken! Hence the exceedingly ominous words of the divine Voice: "Loose the four angels." The ancient collapse of the kingdom of Alexander seemed about to be repeated in the nation occupying his territory. John apparently saw the dissolution taking place. Our purpose

is to link this event in history with its chronological outline as foretold by the prophet. We must first understand more fully Turkey's form of government.

Turkish Empire and Its Government

A theocratic form of government had been active for many years in the provinces occupied by the Turks. The Greek bishops and patriarchs were everywhere recognized by the conquerors as the civil and religious heads of the Christian communities.¹⁸ So long as the sultan received tribute from his vassal states, it appeared to matter little to him how they were governed. Tribute was the sole unifying principle that held together such vast spaces of empire, where lack of telegraph and railroads made central control practically impossible. Under the Turkish tradition, the collection of tribute was the whole duty of government.¹⁹

Mohammed the Conqueror had no difficulty in extending this regime through all his provinces after his entry into Constantinople, and he immediately required the election of a new patriarch, whom he would use as his tool.²⁰ He did all he could to support the patriarchate and conciliate the Greeks. It therefore came about that the patriarch, as the one responsible to the sultan for the Orthodox Greeks, "exercised a wider power than he had enjoyed under the Byzantine Caesars; but his relation to the sultan was nevertheless that of a slave."²¹ Christian vassals thus came under the immediate civil control of the patriarch, while every Mussulman was obedient to the code of the Ottoman State. Eastern Europe had become a Christian State within the Islamic State. W. Alison Phillips describes it this way:

"Two theocracies, mutually contemptuous and exclusive, were thus established within the [Turkish] State; and the [two] rival religions became the symbols of conflicting interests and ideals in every relation of life. To the Mussulman, his creed was the source and justification of his conscious preeminence; to the Greek, Orthodoxy was the palladium of his national existence. . . the sheet-anchor of his hopes and ambitions."²²

Clair Price makes a similar statement:

"The old Byzantine empire lost its territorial basis in 1453, but it remained in the capital of Islam as an ecclesiastical, political, and commercial power."²³

Barbara Ward describes the government of Turkey:

"The other most remarkable institution was that of the millet. It meant that within the State various communities were organized autonomously, in most cases under a religious head, and had power, under the general authority of the Sultan, to manage their own affairs. The Moslem subjects, the free landlords, and the Moslem peasants were under the Grand Mufti at Constantinople. Next in importance was the "Millet-i-Rum," the community of Orthodox Christians under the Oecumenical Patriarch, again at Constantinople. . . There was an Armenian millet under the Gregorian Patriarch, a Jewish millet under the Grand Rabbi, and a Catholic millet under the Pope's delegate."²⁴

Such was the theocratic system that became the convenient machinery for governing the subjects of Islam. It was the survival of the system of ex-territoriality once general in the Roman empire.²⁵ The Turks found it in full force, "and maintained it, being unwilling, as they still are, to allow Christians, whether their own subjects or foreigners, to rank on an equality with Muslims."²⁶ Christians were mere rayahs or cattle, and as such, were legally incapable of possessing the same rights as Muslims.²⁷

Western Europe took a long time to recognize this form of government in Turkey; for doubt existed "whether it was legal to carry on intercourse with the sultan."²⁸ The first instance of an alliance between the Porte and any Christian power was in 1536, when Francis I and Solaiman concluded a league in common hostility against Charles V, the youthful emperor who opposed the Reformation.²⁹ But the strong arguments influencing the French king were without doubt the geographical position of Turkey, her naval forces, and her control of the Mediterranean trade.³⁰ In this period, the armies of Turkey were a protection to the Protestant cause.³¹ The locust army had been an instrument of divine justice against those who had dishonored the law of God (verses 4, 10). The Turks had defeated Byzantine arms in the East, and papal arms from the West. Turkey's military expansion had competed with the world's great military leaders.³² But, in over half a millennium, she had not learned how to govern her foreign subjects. And it is with her complex government that her prophecy has to do.

- 1 Thomas Goodwin, Exposition of Revelation (London, 1683), Vol. II, p. 173. [Reprinted in part early in French Revolution under title French Revolution Foreseen in 1639.] So also Robert Fleming, Pierre Jurieu, Jacques Philpot, John Willison, Thomas Newton, Joseph Priestly--all 18th century.
- 2 The oath that "there should be time no longer," necessarily refers to the 2300 years, for the 1260 years had ended before the Turkish period had come to its end.
- 3 R.E. Loasby, "The Greek Syntax of Revelation 9:15," The Ministry, June and July, 1944. [Vol. II, p. 226.]
- 4 Charles Oman, History of the Art of War in the Middle Ages (London, 1924),
- 5 Joseph von Hammer, Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches (Pest, 1827), Vol. 2, p. 223.
- 6 "We may almost say that the triumph of artillery only commences in the middle years of the fifteenth century."--Oman, op. cit.
- 7 "Chapters of Turkish History," No. VIII, p. 185, Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine (August, 1842). London.
- 8 Oman, op. cit.
- 9 Sir Edwin Pears, Destruction of the Greek Empire (London, 1903), pp. 251, 252.
- 10 Ibid. ff.
- 11 Pears, op. cit., p. 252; Cambridge Medieval History (Cambridge, 1936), Vol. VIII, pp. 650, 653.
- 12 Oman, op. cit.; Cambridge Medieval History, op. cit.
- 13 Cf. L. E. Froom, "Time Phase of the Fifth and Sixth Trumpets," The Ministry, June, 1944. Table.
- 14 The Mameluks were destroyed in 1811 by Mehemet Ali, and the Janissaries in 1826 by Mahmoud II.
- 15 Wilhelm Bousset, Die Offenbarung Johannis (Gottingen, 1906), p. 303.
- 16 "Chapters of Turkish History," No. VIII, p. 187, op. cit.
- 17 Wilbur W. White, The Process of Change in the Ottoman Empire (Chicago, 1937), pp. 25, 26.
- 18 Cambridge Modern History (Cambridge, 1934), Vol. X, pp. 170, 171.
- 19 Clair Price, The Rebirth of Turkey (New York, 1923), p. 14.
- 20 Cambridge Medieval History (Cambridge, 1936), Vol. IV, p. 625; William Miller, The Ottoman Empire and its Successors (Cambridge at the University Press, 1934), p. 46.
- 21 Cambridge Modern History, op. cit.
- 22 Ibid.
- 23 Price, op. cit., p. 121.
- 24 Barbara Ward, Turkey (Oxford University Press, 1942), p. 20.
- 25 Pears, op. cit., p. 372.
- 26 Ibid.
- 27 Pears, op. cit., p. 417.
- 28 Wilbur W. White, op. cit., p. 30.
- 29 "Chapters of Turkish History," op. cit., p. 197.
- 30 Miller, op. cit., p. 2.
- 31 Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 197. Conflict of the Ages Series; Pears, op. cit., p. 178; M. Michelet, The Life of Martin Luther (New York, 1859), p. 144. Tr. by Smith from French ed.
- 32 Wilbur W. White, op. cit., p. 20.

II The event ending the prophecy

THE TURKISH EMPIRE II

As the nineteenth century began, every sign, both in prophecy and history, pointed to the breaking up of apostate government in Christendom. By the sword of France, the papal hierarchy had lost much of its previous power.¹ Napoleon wrote the Directory: "It is of no use for us to try to maintain the Turkish empire; we shall witness its fall in our time."² And indeed Turkey's vassal provinces were on the attack, and were winning their freedom. The spirit of the movement was both racial and religious. Turkey's two "rival religions," as outlined by so many modern writers, are also symbolized in her prophecy--the "great river Euphrates," or Islam, and the idolatry of the "third part of men," or Greek Orthodoxy (Rev.9:20). No Christian religion had been so impregnated with pagan cult as the Greek church. This fact nourished in the devotees of Islam an antagonism which in turn became the ostensible cause of the major wars against Turkey in her waning centuries. With every uprising, she would issue firman after firman in appeasement to the Christians, but seldom kept her promises. For toward four centuries she had been prepared to kill them--her own subjects--just as the prophet predicted. Finally, when her case was hopeless, she began to advocate reform in her atrophied capital.³ The way was thus opened for her audience with the Christian powers of Europe, who, without doubt unwittingly, brought the sixth trumpet prophecy to conclusion by the London Treaty of 1840. We shall outline briefly the various conditions and incidents that were connected with the completion of this convention.

The Treaty of July 15, 1840

For a hundred years and more Europe had been anticipating the downfall of the Turk, yet he baffled prediction. It was generally recognized that his only hope lay in the interposition of the reformed Christian nations. But he could obtain help from this source only by concession to the progressive spirit of the West, and by increased tolerance of his Christian subjects.⁴ There had consequently been a few advanced measures of reform in Turkey.⁵ Yet she despised

change, and in the early decades of the nineteenth century, when the revolutionary spirit revived, no leader appeared who alone was able to institute the reforms without which her dismemberment was certain. The Turkish empire was pressed on all sides, and the Turks were having to fight the Egyptian army of Mehemet Ali, which was better organized and outfitted than their own had ever been.⁶ France had seen to that.⁷ Almost simultaneously, the nations of Europe had come to the decision that no one nation alone dare venture to calm the struggle between the two Mussulman powers, and much less dare go to war alone on Turkey's behalf in opposition to the rest of Europe!

Russia was apparently the first to act, and in 1839 she joined concert with four other European cabinets rather than continue the responsibility of a secret treaty she had made with Turkey at Unkiar Skelessi (1833).⁸ Nearly a decade had passed before the powers of Europe reached that unity which enabled them to notify the Porte (July 27, 1839) that they had come to an agreement on the Eastern question.⁹ And even then they were not in full harmony with France, who wished her Egyptian "Napoleon" to advance--not retreat.¹⁰

In the spring of 1840, there occurred a change of ministry both in the divan at Constantinople, and in the French cabinet.¹¹ This removed the antagonism that Mehemet Ali had maintained toward the Porte's ministry, and he thereupon announced to the French consul-general at Alexandria that he would return the Ottoman fleet, and thus bring about peace. His proposal was forwarded to London via Paris, Thiers, the new French minister, having added (June 30): "This condition of affairs argues strongly in favour of postponing any decision in London."¹² Viscount Palmerston, Minister of the Foreign Office, fearing intrigue on the part of France, acted immediately, and the convention was signed in London on July 15, 1840, by the five European Powers--Great Britain, Russia, Prussia, Austria, and Turkey.¹³ The draft of the Treaty had been waiting since January. The omission of the signature of France nearly caused war.

On the day that the convention was signed, the representatives of the allied courts agreed to allow two months for the ratification of their memorable act.¹⁴ There was consequently no delay, and copies of the treaty were then forwarded to the various European courts, to their naval squadrons in the Mediterranean, to Constantinople, and to Alexandria. Full arrangements were thereby set on foot to blockade the coast of Syria and Egypt, and to cut off troops and supplies which the Viceroy might plan to send into Syria.¹⁵ The Turkish fleet was still a captive in the port of Alexandria. The British squadron was at Mitylene, with Sir Robert Stopford in command. The first news of the Convention seems to have been delivered to the commander of the British fleet, who was to act promptly if Mehemet Ali refused the terms of the Treaty as pertaining to Egypt.

Incidents Connected with the Completion of the Treaty

1. August 3 "The Marseilles journals of the 22d mention that the treaty of the 15th of July was brought to Constantinople by Mr. Moore [consul], who reached that capital on the 3d inst., after delivering dispatches to Admiral Stopford [at Mitylene] on the way." ¹⁶ He had recently been appointed commander-in-chief of the British fleet.
2. August 4 "The Ottoman ministry received on the 4th inst., by a courier, the official notice of a convention concluded on the 15th July, between the ministers of Austria, Russia, Great Britain, and Prussia, and the minister of the Porte, relating to the affairs of Egypt." ¹⁷
3. August 5 "The mission of this envoy [Rifat Bey] had been officially announced to the ambassadors of the five great powers on the 5th." ¹⁸
4. August 6 "In consequence of this communication a great council was held on the morning of the 6th inst., and the late ambassador to Austria, Rifat Bey, received orders to proceed immediately to Alexandria . . ." ¹⁹
5. " " Colonel Hodges at Alexandria received a copy of the Convention, and at once forwarded copies to the consuls at Damascus, Aleppo, and Beirut, and notified the British merchants in Alexandria. ²⁰
6. " " Mehemet Ali leaves for Damietta. ²¹
7. August 7 "On that day [7th inst.] Rifat Bey, moustechar of the department of foreign affairs, sailed for Alexandria in the 'Tahiri Bahri' steamer, accompanied by a secretary, a dragoman, and a numerous suite, for the purpose of notifying Mehemet Ali the ultimatum of the conditions adopted by the representatives of the four powers in London." ²²
8. August 11 Representatives of the four powers at Constantinople send note to Rechid-Pasha, Minister of Foreign Affairs, "to repeat to the Sublime Porte, of the most formal assurance of the firm resolution of their courts to devote all the means at their disposal to the

8. August 11 defence of the cause with which they have just identified themselves by a solemn and memorable act." ²³
9. " " Rifat Bey lands at Alexandria, and is placed in quarantine for six days. ²⁴
10. " " Mehemet Ali absent at Damietta when Rifat Bey arrives. ²⁵
11. August 12 French steamer of war Tartare brought Comte Walewski from Paris with dispatches for M. Cochelet. ²⁶
12. August 14 British warship Bellerophon arrives at Alexandria. ²⁷
13. " " Mehemet Ali returns to Alexandria in the afternoon. ²⁸
14. August 16 Rifat Bey is released from quarantine, and at 8:30 a.m. had his "first audience with the Pasha." He delivers to the Pasha the vizirial letter from the Turkish ministry. This meeting was "private, as had been arranged between Rifat Bey and the Consuls-General." Interview discouraging. ²⁹
15. " " "French manifesto arrived last night [August 16] at Constantinople." Threats by France. ³⁰
16. August 17 Official session between Rifat Bey and the Four Consuls-General with Mehemet Ali at four p.m. The Viceroy said: "I cannot accept the terms which are offered me." He then continued, "My resolution is taken. . . do not doubt it; I have decided upon resisting, and I beg of you not to make useless efforts to induce me to change my opinion, you will not succeed." ³¹

The European ambassadors on this occasion were the officials indispensable. By submitting to their terms with Mehemet Ali in the name of their united cabinets, Turkey, through her representative Rifat Bey, thereby surrendered to the Powers of Europe. It has been argued that Rifat Bey was the important man of affairs in this business, and that some act on his part must be accepted as the fulfillment of the prophecy. But Rifat Bey did not represent the courts of Europe. He carried a vizirial letter from the Grand Council at Constantinople, whose ambassador he was. The presentation of this letter clarified his position. The European signatories had done everything in their power to prevent Turkey from making a separate peace with Egypt, and had sent their representatives for the express purpose of initiating the terms of the Treaty in the united name of their courts--not in the name of Turkey alone. This fact was made plain in Articles I and II of the Treaty which stated that the terms of the Treaty were to be communicated to Mehemet Ali by the Sultan, and that "the Majesties agree to act in perfect accord, and to unite their efforts in order to determine Mehemet Ali to conform to that arrangement." ³²

The high representatives of the Five Powers met with Mehemet Ali on August

17, 1840. They came "attired in their richest costumes, and preceded and followed by a numerous cortege."³³ The interview occurred at four o'clock in the afternoon in the palace of the viceroy of Egypt.³⁴ Mehemet Ali did not submit to the terms of the Convention until his strongholds had been attacked, and his armies repulsed with great losses. Beirut fell, and Acre was taken. A British ship finally steamed into the bay of Alexandria and brought him to terms.³⁵ By waiting for help from France, he lost Syria and his holdings in Asia Minor. France signed the protocol of the Treaty in 1841.³⁶

The Chronology in Revelation 9

It would clearly be impossible to outline the chronology of our chapter in Turkish history unless the chronological terms of the prophecy be understood. We have based our argument upon the conclusion that John's prediction, "And the four angels were loosed," must refer to an historical incident of note, relating to Turkey, ^{in modern time--} over half a millennium after Othman's attack upon the Greek empire. The attack was in 1299, as commonly acknowledged by history. By adding to this date the sum of the two prophetic periods in the fifth and sixth trumpets, or 541 years, we come to the year 1840. In these two specified years, we find Ottoman affairs the main feature of the ^{we repeat,} day, and ^{and} between these two specified years, we also find the exact difference in time to be precisely equal to the total number of years in the two periods of the prophecy--the five months of trumpet five plus the day and month and year of trumpet six.³⁷

Hence the following conclusion is obvious and consistent:

Since the difference in years between the two dates exactly equals the number of years in the two periods of these two trumpets, the London Treaty in 1840 must therefore mark the end of the prophecy.

This Treaty was the instrument in the hands of the great Powers of Europe to bring about reparation in impotent Turkey. It was not a war treaty. It was essentially a treaty of reform, according to which Turkey committed her civil power to foreign control. From henceforth this covenant governed Turkey's relation to the human rights of her subjects, especially if in jeopardy. This

can be seen in every uprising and war incident throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century, and until the end of World War I, after which the Turkish republic came into power (January 28, 1920).³⁸ The principles of this Treaty were repeated in the Protocole in 1841 on account of France; in the Treaty of Paris in 1856, after the Crimean War; in the Treaty of Berlin in 1878; and they were recognized in the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923.³⁹ The Great Powers had thereby taken matters out of the hands of the sultan ^{in 1840.}⁴⁰ Lord Eversley calls it a "kind of tutelage."⁴¹ Holland is more general in his conclusion that "such an authority has been exercised tentatively since 1826, systematically since 1856."⁴² But Dr. White comes right to the point in saying that by the protocol of the 1840 Treaty "Turkey passed from the tutelage of Russia to the collective tutelage of the powers."⁴³ And so Great Controversy: "At the very time specified, Turkey, through her ambassadors, accepted the protection of the allied powers of Europe, and thus placed herself under the control of Christian nations. The event exactly fulfilled the prediction."⁴⁴

The two most concerned powers were Russia and Great Britain, in whose immediate interest Sir Stratford Canning was sent as British ambassador to the Porte, and whose main conviction was to carry out reform in Turkey, and to prevent her collapse.⁴⁵ The noted Tanzimat of Abdul Medjid was already a dead letter. Canning engineered another Turkish reform--the hatti-humayun--a charter in favor of the Porte's Christian subjects.⁴⁶ This charter was ultimately incorporated into the Treaty of Paris (1856), and the sultan thereby, on paper at least, became "solely responsible for his Christian subjects," and the "seeds of future intervention by the powers were also incorporated into the document." By this Treaty, Turkey had been formally admitted into the membership of the family of nations, and "her independence and territorial integrity," writes Dr. White, "were guaranteed by the powers."⁴⁷

Results, however, did not depend upon Turkey alone, for she occupied the spot

which Napoleon called the "empire of the world!"⁴⁸ But her hold was at the intrigue of nations. They had assumed the responsibility of her disorderly government, which had practically ignored both civil law and human rights. The approach had come from Turkey herself.⁴⁹ However, it was not the work of a day to root principles of law and legality in the Turkish divan. The time was long, and the decades which followed were characterized by almost unbroken war and illegality with the concert of Europe. With every war Turkey repeatedly lost more territory. In the eyes of statesmen generally her empire was fallen, and her glory extinguished.⁵⁰ Nevertheless, the 1840 covenant deferred for almost a century the actual dissolution of the Turkish empire, and instead, separated the civil and religious institutions of Turkey by placing her power of state under foreign tutelage. The completion of the Treaty in August, 1840, was obviously the historical answer to John's announcement, "And the four angels were loosed." This dated covenant appears to have been the divine corrective to the rule of Turkey after centuries of mortal combat between two antagonistic religions--Islam and Orthodox Christianity. Ultimately both sultanate and caliphate were abolished--the sultanate on November 1, 1922, and the caliphate on March 3, 1924.⁵¹ Today neither exists. Thus, up to the present time, the prediction of the prophecy has been in a state of fulfillment for over a hundred years.

My Arab friend bowed his head in deep thought. Then looking up with assurance, he asked: "Is it possible that the Muslim peoples are mentioned by the prophet Jesus?" It is possible and probable. Like the "week" prophecy in Daniel 9, which was given for the Jewish people, so the "hour" prophecy in Revelation 9--an even longer prophecy--is given to the Muslim people. And not to them alone. It is the only prophecy that ended in a prophetic "hour," and thus apparently prepared the way for the further announcement, "the hour of His judgment is come."

Grace Amadon--August 10, 1944

- 1 Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 266. Conflict of the Ages Series.
- 2 William Miller, The Ottoman Empire and its Successors (Cambridge at the University Press, 1934), p. 4.
- 3 The Tanzimat by Abdul Medjid in 1839. Cf. Alfred de Besse, The Turkish Empire: Its Historical, Statistical, and Religious Condition (Philadelphia, 1854. Tr. from fourth German edition by Smith), p. 17.
- 4 Cambridge Modern History (Cambridge, 1934), Vol. X, p. 9.
- 5 Alfred de Besse, op. cit.
- 6 J.C. McCoan, Egypt (New York, 1902. Collier), p. 103.
- 7 "A French officer had organized his army; a French instructor had rebuilt his fleet; a French doctor had taught his physicians."--Miller, op. cit., p. 145.
- 8 Cambridge Modern History (Cambridge, 1934), Vol. X, pp. 494, 546, 562.
- 9 Id., p. 563.
- 10 Mehemet Ali, said to have been "the most remarkable man that the Mohammedan world had produced in modern times."--Cambridge Modern History, Vol. X, p. 513.
- 11 Cambridge Modern History, Vol. X, pp. 565, 567.
- 12 Id., p. 567.
- 13 Id., p. 569; Miller, op. cit., p. 150.
- 14 Great Britain House of Commons, Session 26 January--22 June (London, 1841), p. 9, Art. V; p. 12, Reserved Protocol.
- 15 Id., p. 8, Art. II.
- 16 The Times (London, 1840), August 27.
- 17 Austrian Observer cited by Morning Chronicle (London, 1840), September 1.
- 18 The Times, op. cit.
- 19 Morning Chronicle (London, 1840), September 1.
- 20 Great Britain House of Commons, Affairs of the Levant (London, 1841), Vol. 29, Part II, p. 148.
- 21 Morning Chronicle (London, 1840), September 18; Signs of the Times (Boston, 1841), February 1, p. 162, col. 2.
- 22 The Times (London, 1840), August 27.
- 23 Great Britain House of Commons, op. cit., p. 115, Inclosure in No. 95.
- 24 Id., p. 143, No. 116.
- 25 The Times (London, 1840), September 5, col. 3. Editorial.
- 26 The Times (London, 1840), September 7, col. 3, Editorial.
- 27 Ibid.
- 28 Great Britain House of Commons, op. cit., p. 149, Inclosure 2 in No. 117.
- 29 Ibid.
- 30 The Times (London, 1840), September 8, col. 5.
- 31 Great Britain House of Commons, op. cit., p. 156.
- 32 Edward Hertslet, The Map of Europe by Treaty (London, 1875), Vol. II, p. 1010.
- 33 The Times (London, 1840), September 5.
- 34 Great Britain House of Commons, op. cit., p. 156.
- 35 Cambridge Modern History, Vol. X, p. 571.
- 36 Miller, op. cit., p. 151; Cambridge Modern History, Vol. X, p. 572.
- 37 The chronology can also be reckoned by days. The number of days from July 27 inclusive, 1299 to August 17, inclusive, 1840, is the exact equivalent of the number of calendar days in the prophecy. The problem is easily calculated by using the Julian Day Numbers.
- 38 Wilbur W. White, The Process of Change in the Ottoman Empire (University of Chicago Press, 1937), p. 251.
- 39 Id., p. 143.
- 40 Lord Eversley and Sir Valentine Chirol, The Turkish Empire (London, 1923), p. 291.
- 41 Eversley and Chirol, op. cit., p. 288.

- 42 Thomas Erskine Holland, The European Concert on the Eastern Question (Oxford, 1885), p. 2.
- 43 Wilbur W. White, op. cit., p. 243.
- 44 Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 335.
- 45 Eversley and Chirol, op. cit., p. 292.
- 46 Id., p. 307.
- 47 Wilbur W. White, op. cit., pp. 244, 245.
- 48 Miller, op. cit., p. 46.
- 49 Holland, op. cit., p. 90.
- 50 "A Few Facts Concerning the Turkish Question," Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine (London, 1853), November, p. 640.
- 51 Wilbur W. White, op. cit., pp. 255, 256.

III A prophetic time symbol equals a period, which gets its date from history, astronomy, the Jewish feast types, and synchronisms in general.

LANDMARK OF PROPHECY - I

The application of the Fifth and Sixth Trumpets to the Moslems, has been a favorite interpretation since the time of Joachim of Floris. (Died 1202.) Due to the influence of his expositions, the ancient Apocalyptic traditions began to collapse;¹ and he was about the first medieval scholar to unfold the historicity of this prophecy, and to declare its incontrovertible chronology, which is based upon the year-day principle. He lived in the time when the Turks were overrunning the Near East. Taking his inference from the Trumpets, he predicted that a conqueror from Islam would cause blood of martyrs to run as in the days of Nero and Diocletian.² His views may be said to be those of modern date; for under the Arabic invasion, no interpreter had arisen--Primasius, Autpertus, Beda--to liken the advance of Islam to a message of prophecy!

The historical theology of Joachim was passed on to the Reformers,³ and took more definite form. They saw a literal Antichrist sitting upon the pontifical throne,⁴ and the Turk was his scourge, or torment,⁵ as described under the Fifth Trumpet. Others too have acknowledged that the trumpets in Revelation 9 could represent the half millennium of Turkish history in Christian territory--from the time that Othman attacked the Byzantine border in the thirteenth century.⁶ The Millerites arose in time to help sound the Turkish trumpet at the end of the sixth period. They have left on record the solution of the problem. These students of second-advent prophecy were the first to combine the two prophetic periods--the 150 years and the 391 years and 15 days--and on this basis to augur the precise year and exact month when Turkey would experience a change in authority from which she could not recover. This end to the prophecy was interpreted as preliminary to the coming of Jesus.

These 150 years of Turkish growth into an empire are recognized by history;⁷ and to this period has also been assigned an established beginning date.⁸ Hence it is a simple problem to do as the Millerites, and compare Turkey's historical

period with the prophetic period in Revelation 9. The historical epoch furnishes the beginning date, as of July 27 (inclusive), 1299; while the prophetic period offers its length as a measuring rod. And certainly, we could in no way parallel the two periods and compare them, unless we add together the two epochs that comprise the prophecy. And of what use will the comparison be? It will reveal two things: (1) it will show the exact date in Turkey's historical outline, upon which the combined prophetic period of the Fifth and Sixth Trumpets ended; and (2) this date will immediately reveal whether it is coincident or not with an important event in Turkish history. If so, then the prophecy is Turkish, and checks with Turkish annals. The method is a simple and reliable means of identifying the historical application of this prophecy, and let us not forget that the Millerites pointed it out!

The objection has been raised that there is, according to the prophecy, an actual period of time between the first and second woes (Rev.9:12), and that therefore the two periods to which they belong, cannot be combined. But what are these two woes? Clearly, the first one is the 150-year torment against the ministry (fallen star) that had the key to the "well" of the abyss, and without doubt may have lasted throughout the whole period. But not so, ^{it is claimed,} the second woe, which is announced after the ascent of the beast out of the abyss in Revelation 11, several centuries after the end of the first woe.⁹ Hence it is not altogether clear how much time the second woe involves. The error in the objection lies in the fact that the word woe is not a time symbol, and is not represented as such among the terms of the prophetic calendar as defined in the Bible, which we shall presently outline. This word, therefore, merely corresponds to a terrible epoch within a known epoch, and could be of any length, whatever the prophecy implies. Each woe is an identification mark of its period, whose length, however, the woe does not necessarily outline. For it is not a time symbol. Therefore, it does not interfere with combining the periods.

Let us return to our history. In the year 1639, Thomas Goodwin, vice-chancellor of Oxford, declared that the "year, month, day, hour" was the Turk's number, and that it would not be fulfilled until 1849.¹⁰ Using the solar year as a measuring stick, in place of the prophetic, he computed the time symbol of the Sixth Trumpet as 396 years instead of the usual 391 years, which harmonize with prophetic reckoning. His statement is valuable because showing the trend of interpretation following the Reformation period. Both Reformers and Millerites recognized the sounding of the Turkish trumpets.

Millerite Understanding of the Year-Day Principle

In the third decade of the nineteenth century, William Miller fixed upon the year 1839 as the time for the "third woe" to begin.¹¹ He based his calculation upon a 1298-beginning of Turkish aggression. He later rejected the historical authorities he had consulted, and thereupon looked forward to the year 1840 as the probable date, in harmony with Edward Gibbon's date concerning the invasion of Nicomedia. Josiah Litch also began the Turkish period with this established historical date--when Othman began attacking the Byzantine Oriental border. The earliest forecast of Litch, in 1838, had predicted the event to end "sometime in the month of August."¹² Just a few days previous to the time of expectancy in 1840, he pointed to the 11th of August as a possible terminus. But he did not actually predict this date, for at the same time he wrote:

"But still there is no positive evidence that the first period was exactly to a day, fulfilled; nor yet that the second period began, to a day, where the first closed. If they began and ended so, the above calculation [as given in the Signs of the Times], will be correct. If they did not, then there will be a variation in the conclusion; but the evidence is clear that there cannot be a year's variation from that calculation, so we must wait patiently for the issue."¹³

The historical event occurred so close to the time presaged that the Millerites were astounded at the "accuracy of fulfilment." "True," they wrote editorially in the "Signs of the Times," "the Turkish envoy did not have an audience with the Pasha until the 14th, and did not receive his answer until the 15th."¹⁴

Still, these early Adventists counted it "a very striking fulfilment of the calculation" that the decision was supposedly but four days after the 11th day of August. It was concluded that "the like singular accuracy in the fulfilment of a prophetic period cannot be found in history."¹⁵ They counted the prophecy as the most definite of any in the Bible "even descending to the days" for its final ending.¹⁶

Joshua Himes further stressed the accuracy of fulfilment from the standpoint of the calendar employed, whose smallest symbol is the prophetic hour, or half-hour. He argued on the basis that the symbol hour is not a point of time, but an actual period, like the other prophetic symbols of time, and that it had a latitude of fifteen calendar days. Occurring, as it does, in a series with three other time symbols, there can be no doubt as to its character. Editor Himes made this comment:

"The Ottoman power was given into the hands of the four powers just four days after the expiration of the time given by the prophet. He could not give it more definite without descending to minutes. The four [literal] days would make just 16 [prophetic] minutes; so we have the fulfilment as near as it could be given in prophetic time." ¹⁷

These words were written in the year 1841, when, as yet, the Millerites could not have had any official reports of the recent events in the Near East, for the sessional papers of the British House of Commons for the "Affairs of the Levant" in 1840 were not printed until 1841. Hence the American people did not yet have the correct dates for these events. But even so, the argument of Joshua Himes is significant. For since the symbol minutes is not employed by the prophecy, the conclusion is obvious that the symbol hour allows not merely one calendar day, but a period of over two weeks, which the prophesied event could involve and at the same time satisfy the symbol of time. Consequently, the fulfilment could comprise either all the days of the hour of the prophecy, or simply the last day of it, and thereby answer to the meaning of the time symbol. But we should not expect the prophetic period to end in the middle of the hour! This at least appears to agree with the Biblical defini-

tions, which are based upon the equation, one prophetic day = one solar year.

The Prophetic Calendar

Prophetic Symbol	Calendar Equivalent
1 <u>Day</u>	= 1 literal or solar year. Ezek.4:6; Num.14:34; Rev.2:10; 11:11.
2 <u>Hour</u>	= 1/24 of a prophetic day, or solar year. Hence = 15 calendar days. (Rev.9:15.)
3 <u>Half hour</u>	= 1/48 part of a solar year, or c. 7 1/2 days. (Rev.8:1.)
4 <u>Month</u>	= 30 literal or solar years. 42 <u>months</u> = 1260 <u>days</u> . Rev. 11:2,3; 13:5.
5 <u>Week</u>	= 7 literal or solar years. Gen.29:27. (Dan.9:1.)
6 <u>Time</u>	= 1 solar year. Dan.11:13 (margin). 3 1/2 times = 1260 <u>days</u> , or solar years. (Dan.7:25; 12:7.) Rev.11:2,3; 12:6,14.
7 <u>Year</u>	= 360 literal or solar years. (Rev.9:15.)

Such are the definitions of the prophetic time symbols according to the Bible. Let it be noted that in each case, a time symbol is equivalent to a certain period, which has no inherent calendar date of its own, but has to be located according to the demands of prophecy and the corresponding history.

With Seventh-day Adventists, the August 11 date of the Millerites has commonly been regarded as a landmark of prophecy wherever Adventist periodicals are read. In 1914, A.G. Daniells pointed out in the columns of the Review and Herald that the official report, pertaining to the 1840 Peace Treaty between the five powers of Europe, was given to Mehemet Ali, in the presence of all the representative ambassadors, on August 17, 1840, rather than on August 11.¹⁸ Josiah Litch and others, as noted, recognized a latitude in the "August 11" date. We would repeat, the first pronouncement of Litch had said, "sometime in the month of August." This was the only unqualified prediction that Litch, or any other Adventist, made, that is, aside from the year. Litch's later statement about the ^{"August 11"} date, he himself questioned, as we have previously noted. But his forecast regarding the ^{year and} month was a prediction that was exactly fulfilled.

The application of a literal chronology to the periods of the Turkish historical prophecy had a far-reaching influence, and as a result, multitudes

were convinced of the correctness of the year-day principle adopted by William Miller and his associates.¹⁹ The influence of this interpretation has been wide spread.

Christian Protection for Turkey

The final details of the Turkish epoch in Revelation 9:15 were being enacted at the very time of the William Miller movement, which framed its analysis of the prophecy in terms of the historical events then coming to a climax. Mahmoud II had attacked his vassal, the Viceroy of Egypt, who had for some time been threatening to secede from the suzerainty of Turkey.²⁰ He proposed to restore the religion of Islam, and "light such a fire as that Europe will have enough to do to mind her own affairs, and the Ottoman empire will be saved."²¹ Greece had already gotten her independence--she had a king, though not yet a constitution. And with the Sultan's Asiatic army routed at Nezeb,²² the Turkish fleet a deserter--within a fortnight after the investiture of the new sovereign--²³and Syria and the mountain passes of Taurus in the hands of Mehemet Ali,²⁴ the young Sultan, Abdul Medjid, by the direction of his cabinet and the Grand Vizir, decided to accept the tendered "protection of the allied powers of Europe."²⁵ The powers were making this advance at the moment when the Sultan "was on the point of yielding from imperious necessity to the exactions of the conqueror."²⁶ The chief concern was to prevent Turkey from concluding a peace with any one single power, and especially with Egypt.

The reforms of the previous Sultan, Mahmoud II, had been destructive to the Moslem religion and the anti-Christian policy of the empire.²⁷ To arrest his administration, a faction of religious orders and fanatical secretaries had organized a vast conspiracy throughout the Ottoman dominions, and had induced the Captain-Pasha to surrender the Turkish fleet to Mehemet Ali. We summarize the narrative from Alfred de Bessé:

On the 3rd of November, 1839, a vast crowd gathered around the imperial palace to hear an important paper by the state that was to usher in a new epoch in

Turkey. It was a guarantee of security to her subjects with reference to liberty, property, assessments, and military service. All the ambassadors of Christendom in Constantinople received a copy of this hatti-sheriff, and were to be assured thereby of Turkey's intention to cooperate with the institutions of the Christian nations, in whose allied interposition only the hope of salvation for her empire lay. Thus was the way prepared for the treaty of peace the following year--1840.²⁸

It has been claimed that Turkey thereby lost her independent rule. At that time, those who were looking for the immediate coming of Jesus, were also disturbing expecting the events in the Levant to usher in the battle of Armageddon. However, according to the Spirit of prophecy, Turkey "placed herself under the control of Christian nations."²⁹ In a century and a half she had become a European power; in another century, she had reached her meridian; but at the peace of Carlowitz (1699), her empire began to wane; and at the end of the prophecy--^{was so impotent that it} after 541 years and 15 days from her first aggression--the Moslem system failed to uphold traditional Turkish heroism and might, and yielded to Christian courts for support. Their intention, however, was to maintain Turkey as an independent state. England, the only steadfast supporter of the Turk, held to this intention throughout the greater part of the nineteenth century.

It is possible to affirm Elder Daniell's series on the Turkish prophecy as given in the Reviews of 1914. It is possible to show from history the combined series of events that were the concluding witness to the change in Turkish authority, as confirmed by the peace treaty of 1840, and that led up to the last day of the prophecy. But, in the history of this treaty between Turkey and the powers of Europe, the significance and historical application of the prophecy has by no means been exhausted. The Revelation reveals the historical nature of the first 150-year period as that of the Moslem "torment." Historians recognize this epochal growth of Turkish independence.³⁰ The other time divisions of the prophecy--the day-month-year symbols--may reveal as important historical events as those occurring at the end of the prophecy.

Nor yet does there appear to have been demonstrated at the end of the 150-year torment any event, or series of events, that exactly coincide with a cal-

endarial prophetic date. In this year 1449, the Turkish year began on February 24,³¹ while the indiction of the Greeks began on September 1.³² On October 18, in 1448, the Turks defeated the Hungarians at Kossova.³³ On October 31 of this year, John Paleologus died,³⁴ whom Ducas goes so far as to count the last real emperor of the "Romans,"³⁵ as the Greeks called themselves. On January 6, 1449, Constantine XIII Paleologus was crowned by permission of the Sultan, who had been solicited to lend aid in elevating him to the Greek throne.³⁶ Phrantzes was the legate.³⁷ Not long after, in 1450, Murat II died, and his successor took Constantinople in the year 1453.

All of these dates represent epochal events about the time the 150 years ended; but no one seems thus far to have applied any one of them as a scene[^] exactly identical with the prophecy. Nevertheless, one thing is commonly admitted by expositors and historians alike: Turkey had become a European power before she attacked the capital city. She was ruler of vast territories when John Paleologus died, and for decades she had had mosques throughout the provinces, and her own capitol in Romania, the Turkish name for Thrace. Hence the year 1453 is obviously too late for the hour-day-month-year period to begin. The symbol hour at the head of the series helps to point to its importance at the end of the prophecy.

The statement is deeply significant that "at the very time specified, Turkey, through her ambassadors, accepted the protection of the allied powers of Europe."³⁸ It is essential to know who these officials were, and at what time, and in what manner, Turkey accepted European protection for her state. The effort to complete the allied plan had been proceeding since July 15, 1840. It involved the chief nations of Europe and the Near East, whose dragomans had unwittingly to measure time with prophecy[^] in delivering copies of the Convention. The specific act of fulfilment appears to have been the reception by Turkey, through her ministry, of protection from the allied courts of Four Christian Powers of Europe.

Turkey had sent her minister Chekib to London as plenipotentiary³⁹--at a point of time toward the end of the prophecy. Her prophetic "day" was drawing to its close. But neither Chekib nor the other four Excellencies who signed the treaty were to complete the sanction of their civil act. The European representatives in Constantinople were chosen to appear for their courts in the final session to convene in Egypt. Rifat Bey, a late Turkish minister to Austria, was specially appointed to represent the Grand Council at Constantinople, from whom he carried a personal vizirial letter to the Pasha of Egypt.⁴⁰ Colonel G. Lloyd Hodges, England's Consul-General in Egypt, was to take a leading part in the concluding mission. In the presence of Turkey's belligerent vassal, Mehemet Ali, the minister Rifat Bey was to receive officially in the name of the Sultan and his cabinet the protection of the allied courts of Europe at the hands of their delegates. This session, with full display of dress and ceremony, occurred at four p.m. on August 17, in the palace of Mehemet Ali, the Viceroy of Egypt.⁴¹

- 1 Wilhelm Kamlah, Apokalypse und Geschichtstheologie (Berlin, 1935), pp. 122, 123.
- 2 Paul Eugène Louis Fournier, Etudes sur Joachim de Flore et ses doctrines, par Paul Fournier (Paris, A. Picard et fils, 1909), p. 21.
- 3
- 4 J.H. Merle d'Aubigne, History of the Reformation (New York, 1853), Vol. II, Bk. VI, Ch. IX, XII.
- 5 M. Michelet, The Life of Martin Luther (New York, 1859), tr. Smith, p. 142.
- 6 June and July numbers of The Ministry.
- 7 Alfred de Bessé, The Turkish Empire: Its Historical, Statistical, and Religious Condition (Philadelphia, 1854), p. 47.
- 8 Edward Gibbon, The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (London, 1902. Notes by J.B. Bury), Vol. VII, p. 24. [Series.]
- 9 Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, pp. 278-281. Conflict of the Ages
- 10 Thomas Goodwin, Epistle to the Ephesians and Book of Revelation (London reprint, 1842), p. 596. Condensed from the original.
- 11 William Miller, Views of the Prophecies and Prophetic Chronology (Boston, 1841), pp. 118, 124, 300. Supplement, p. 4.
- 12 J. Litch, Probability of the Second Coming of Christ About 1843 (Boston, 1838), p. 157.
- 13 Signs of the Times (Boston, 1840), August 1, p. 70, col. 2; The Great Controversy, p. 334.
- 14 Signs of the Times (Boston, 1841), February 1, p. 162, col. 3. (Rifat Bey first met Mehemet Ali on the 16th, as recorded in Great Britain House of Commons, "Affairs of the Levant" (London, 1841), Vol. 29, Part II, pp. 152, 153.)
- 15 Signs of the Times (Boston, 1840), November 1, p. 118, col. 1.
- 16 Signs of the Times (Boston, 1841), February 1, p. 162, col. 1.
- 17 Ibid.
- 18 A.G. Daniells, The Review and Herald (Washington, 1914), April 23, pp. 5, 6.
- 19 White, op. cit., p. 335.
- 20 Great Britain House of Commons, Communications with Mehemet Ali (London, 1838), Vol. 50, p. 4, Letter 5.
- 21 The Times (London, 1840), September 8, p. 4, col. 4.
- 22 Great Britain House of Commons, Affairs of the Levant (London, 1841), Vol. 29, Part I, Letter 147.
- 23 De Bessé, op. cit., p. 16.
- 24 Great Britain House of Commons, Affairs of the Levant (London, 1841), Vol. 29, Part II, p. 503.
- 25 White, op. cit.
- 26 Great Britain House of Commons, op. cit., p. 317.
- 27 De Bessé, op. cit.
- 28 Id., pp. 17-21.
- 29 White, op. cit.
- 30 De Bessé, op. cit., p. 47.
- 31 E. Mahler, Wüstenfeld-Mahler'sche Vergleichungs-Tabellen der mohammedanischen und christlichen Zeitrechnung (Leipzig, 1926), p. 23.
- 32 Georgius Phrantzes begins the Greek year on September 1 (Ref. 34); cf. G. Pachymeres, Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae (Bonnae. 1835), Vol. Alt., p. 846.
- 33 De Bessé, op. cit., p. 69.
- 34 Georgius Phrantzes, Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae (Bonnae. 1838), p. 203.
- 35 Ducas, Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae (Bonnae. 1834), p. 223.
- 36 De Bessé, op. cit., p. 70.
- 37 Phrantzes, op. cit., p. 205.
- 38 White, op. cit. [Vol. 31, p. 3 ff.]
- 39 Great Britain House of Commons, Pacification of the Levant (London, 1841),
- 40 Great Britain House of Commons, Affairs of the Levant (London, 1841), Vol. 29, Part II, p. 153.
- 41 Id., p. 156.

LANDMARK OF PROPHECY - II

Let us recapitulate. With the seventeenth century began the decline of the Ottoman Empire. The Sultans were no longer master of their own state, and the supreme power of Turkey began to be vested in her cabinet and ministry.¹ At the time of the 1840 treaty with the allied powers of Europe, the Sultan, Abdul Medjid, was but a young boy. He had known only life in the seraglio, when he was called to head an empire. But the efficiency of the members of his Ministry was the counterpoise to his shyness and timidity. Reschid-Pasha was the sagacious Minister of Foreign Affairs. He is described as "one of the most able statesmen that has ever figured in the annals of Turkish history."² It was probably through his influence that all of the Turkish Council favored the 1840 Convention with the four allied courts of Europe. Rifat Bey stressed this unity to the Viceroy of Egypt at their first, but private, meeting on August 16, when he delivered the vizirial letter from the Council:

"I must also request you to observe that neither Hoshrew Pasha,³ nor the other Ministers of the Sublime Porte, are opposed, as you imagine, to the solution of the Egyptian question; and if they are now acting otherwise toward you, it is the new state of things that oblige them to do so . . . Your Highness thinks that the Ministers of His Highness [Abdul Medjid] are animated by hostile feelings."⁴

The statement by Rifat Bey regarding the Ministers of the Porte conforms to the language of the Spirit of prophecy concerning Turkey and "her ambassadors."⁵ Both authorities are witness to the change in administration which had overtaken Turkey by the year 1840. There were about fifty eyalets, or administrative divisions, in Turkish government at this time.⁶ Some of these were semi-independent, like that of Mehemet Ali, who had jurisdiction over several provinces, and who therefore merited a title similar to a "Pasha of three horse-tails."⁷ But because of his antagonism against the Porte, Rifat Bey reminds him that he had not been admitted among the number of the Vizirs.⁸ Hence, he was not a member of the cabinet in Constantinople, even though he spoke familiarly of his Colleagues there.⁹ And neither was he a party to the treaty that

was signed at London.

Such, in brief, was the historical background upon which the mission to Egypt in 1840 had to go forward. This history helps to clarify the main features of the prophecy, which primarily concerned Turkey and her ^{theocratic} system of government. But before describing the series of incidents which accompanied this mission, it is essential to understand the relation of the civil calendar to the period of ^{the} prophecy--the 541 years and 15 days, that began with July 27 (inclusive), in the year 1299.

Calendar Era Paralleling Revelation 9

From a calendar standpoint, the demonstration of the fulfilment of the Turkish prophecy consists in comparing the actual number of days in the combined prophetic period of the Fifth and Sixth Trumpets with the number of calendar days in the parallel era--from July 27 (inclusive), 1299 to the end of the period in 1840, on the traditional August 11 date.¹⁰ In this problem, let it be remembered that the prophetic period is the measuring-stick, and that the parallel Turkish era is the period to be measured. It is a problem to be proved whether the era ends on August 11 or not. The British sessional papers for the House of Commons in the year 1840, and adjacent years, are dated in two calendars--Julian and Gregorian. The date of the 1840 treaty is commonly double-dated, as "July 3
July 15", the upper date being Julian, or Old Style, and the lower date being Gregorian, or New Style. At this time (1840) there were twelve days' difference between the two.

During the Turkish era parallel to the prophecy, the Julian calendar was employed up to October 5, 1582, and after that, the Gregorian calendar came into general use. The prophecy can be computed in either calendar; but inasmuch as our modern dates are based upon the calendar reform in 1582, it is simpler to work the whole problem in Gregorian time, using Gregorian dates and the Gregorian length of year. It is obvious that the number of days in the prophetic period will run parallel only to the actual number of days on the calendar, dur-

ing the successive epochs of the current history. Hence, all the changes in leap-days must be taken into account exactly as they historically occurred, in order to obtain the precise length of the parallel Turkish era. In other words, the number of days in the prophecy must match a corresponding number of days in the parallel Turkish era, or else the ^{historical} end date would be wrong. And in addition, as has previously been pointed out, an important historical event must coincide with the last day of the prophecy.

The length of the Turkish era in days to the traditional August 11 date, is most simply ascertained by using the Julian Day Numbers, by which the number of actual days in any period can be computed. These numbers, of course, give account for every historical leap-day change on the calendar. By the use of these numbers, we shall proceed to compute the number of days in the Turkish era under analysis:

$$\begin{array}{r} \text{J.D.N. for July 26}^*, 1299 = 2\ 1\ 9\ 5\ 7\ 2\ 4^{11} \text{ (subtract top line)} \\ \text{J.D.N. for August 11, 1840} = 2\ 3\ 9\ 3\ 3\ 2\ 9 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Number of days in Turkish era = 1 9 7 6 0 5 days
to August 11 inclusive

*In order to make July 27 inclusive, subtract J.D.N. for July 26.

Our next step is to find the actual number of days in the period of the prophecy--the 541 years and 15 days--not forgetting that this number has been computed on the basis of the year-day principle, namely, that one prophetic day equals one solar year. Therefore the problem is dealing with 541 solar years and 15 calendar days. These years are of course in Gregorian time, as already noted.

Computation of the Prophecy

The exact length of the Gregorian year is slightly more than the true astronomical year, but the difference would not amount to a whole day in three millenniums! The Gregorian annual constant is 365.2425 days.¹² Hence the number of actual days in the prophecy of the Fifth and Sixth Trumpets =

$$(541 \times 365.2425 \text{ days}) + 15 \text{ days, or } 1\ 9\ 7\ 6\ 1\ 1 \text{ days in all.}$$

(Small fraction over can be neglected.)

By comparing the two results, it can be seen at once that the prophetic period of 197611 days reaches farther than the 197605 days that mark off the calendar era to August 11. The difference is six days, the main reason for

which lies in the fact (1) that the year 1582 was only 355 days long, on account of the ten-day correction by Gregory XIII;¹³ and in addition (2), the years 1300, 1400, and 1500--the earliest centurial years in the 541-year era--had each been given by Julian reckoning, one day more than Gregorian time would have allowed, or three days in all. (Cf. accompanying Table.) Hence, the ten days too few in 1582, less the three days too many in the other years, make the parallel Turkish era just seven days short of the end of the prophecy by Gregorian reckoning.

Calculation of Days in Parallel Calendar

Period	Days	Calendar	Leap-days			
Year 1299 (July 27)	158	Julian		+ or -		
" 1300	366	"		1 +	Total correction in 541 years = 3 days added and 10 subtracted, or only 7 days subtracted in whole period	
Century (1301 - 1400)	36525	"		1 +		
" (1401 - 1500)	36525	"		1 +		
" (1501 - 1600)	36515	Gregorian		1 +		
" (1601 - 1700)	36524	"		10 -		
" (1701 - 1800)	36524	"				
Period (1801 - 1839)	14244	= (39 x 365 days) + 9 leap-days				
Year (1840 to July 26)	208					
<hr/>						
197589 = Calendar count by days for 541 years from July 27 incl., 1299 to July 26 incl., 1840						
Prophetic "hour"	= 15			=	15	
<hr/>						
197604 days ending on August 10 1840						
Days dropped in the 541-year period	7				7	
<hr/>						
Total prophetic period 197611 days ending on August 17 1840						

Every year in the 541-year period begins on July 27--the day on which Othman attacked the Oriental border of the Greeks--and ends on July 26. The Julian century contains 36525 days, and the Gregorian, 36524 days. The total prophetic period = 197611 days, which extend from July 27 (inclusive), 1299 to August 17 (inclusive), 1840.

Then how do we account for the six days' difference on August 11?

Explanation: Josiah Litch obtained his August 11 date by adding the 15 days of the prophecy to the date July 27; but in so doing, he made the last year of the prophecy end on July 27, when it should have ended on July 26, like the other years of the period. On this basis, the final date should have been August 10, instead of August 11. The number of days to August 10 is 197604, and the difference between this figure and the 197611 days of the prophecy is precisely seven days, which correspond exactly to the calendar correction.

Indeed, the historical correction of the calendar, parallel to the Turkish prophecy, plainly shows that the number of days in the prophecy necessarily ended seven days later than the parallel calendar, on account of the Gregorian correction in 1582. Therefore, the literal end date of the prophecy was either August 11 + 6 days, or August 10 + 7 days, that is, August 17, 1840. And in addition, the "hour" of the prophecy included the 15 days from August 3 inclusive to August 17 inclusive. Into this historic period the Millerites looked with great expectancy. And to the period as a whole, including its run of incidents, and especially to the last day of this prophetic hour, the student of prophecy has equal right to look with an interest based upon faith in history and prophetic fulfilment.

The prophetic periods of the Bible are commonly connected with the ancient Jewish calendar. Even the end of Daniel's "2300-day" prophecy, which reached to the nineteenth century, was tied to an ancient Jewish calendar type--the tenth day of the seventh month. But the prophetic period in Revelation 9 exactly harmonizes with man's modern calendar, and its historic correction in 1582. We shall presently show that history agrees with both prophecy and the calendar.

The foregoing correction does not rob the traditional August 11 date of its priority in connection with the remarkable Turkish prophecy. The Millerites predicted the year and the month, which ~~the~~ ^{exactly} concluding events, fulfilled. Their ^{"August 11"} date stood almost in the midst of the hour of the prophecy; it was not the end date, either calendrically, or historically. But the day on which Rifat Bey landed in the port of Alexandria will always be the date which gave immediate courage and hope to those who were looking for the coming of Jesus.

Historical Fulfilment of the Prophecy

The episodes and incidents here enumerated relative to the pacification of the Levant in 1840, have for the most part been taken from the official correspondence and state papers concerning the treaty signed by the Five Powers at

London on July 15, and concerning the subsequent events in early autumn of the same year. On the day that the Convention was signed, the representatives of the allied courts agreed to allow two months for the ratification of their memorable act.¹⁴ There was consequently no delay, and copies of the Convention were then forwarded immediately to the various European courts, to their naval squadrons in the Mediterranean, to Constantinople, and to Alexandria. Full arrangements were thereby set on foot to blockade the coast of Syria and Egypt, and to cut off troops and supplies which the Viceroy might plan to send to his son Ibrahim in Syria.¹⁵

The Turkish fleet was still a captive in the port of Alexandria. The British squadron was at Mytilene, with Sir Robert Stopford in command. Apparently the first news of the Convention was delivered to the commander of the British fleet. The chief incidents pertaining to the last fifteen days of the prophecy followed in quick succession:

1. August 3 "The Marseilles journals of the 22d mention that the treaty of the 15th of July was brought to Constantinople by Mr. Moore [Consul], who reached that capital on the 3d inst., after delivering dispatches to Admiral Stopford [at Mytilene] on the way."¹⁶ He had recently been appointed commander-in-chief of the British fleet.
2. August 4 "The Ottoman ministry received on the 4th inst., by a courier, the official notice of a convention concluded on the 15th July, between the ministers of Austria, Russia, Great Britain, and Prussia, and the minister of the Porte, relating to the affairs of Egypt."¹⁷
3. August 5 "The mission of this envoy [Rifat Bey] had been officially announced to the ambassadors of the five great powers on the 5th."¹⁸
4. August 6 "In consequence of this communication, a great council was held on the morning of the 6th inst., and the late ambassador to Austria, Rifat Bey, received orders to proceed immediately to Alexandria. . . ."¹⁹
5. " " Col. Hodges at Alexandria received ^a copy of the Convention, and ^{once} at forwarded copies to consuls at Damascus, Aleppo, and Beirut, and notified the British merchants in Alexandria.²⁰
6. " " Mehemet Ali leaves for Damietta.²¹
7. August 7 "On that day [7th inst.] Rifat Bey, moustechar of the department of foreign affairs, sailed for Alexandria in the 'Tahiri Bahri' steamer, accompanied by a secretary, a dragoman, and a numerous suite, for the purpose of notifying Mehemet Ali the ultimatum of the conditions adopted by the representatives of the four powers in London."²²
8. August 11 Representatives of the four powers at Constantinople send note to Reschid-Pasha, Minister of Foreign Affairs, "to repeat to the Sul-

- lime Porte, of the most formal assurance of the firm resolution of their courts to devote all the means at their disposal to the defence of the cause with which they have just identified themselves by a solemn and memorable act." ²³
9. " " Rifat Bey lands at Alexandria, and is placed in quarantine for six days. ²⁴
10. " " Mehemet Ali absent at Damietta when Rifat Bey arrived. ²⁵
11. August 12 French steamer of war Tartare brought Comte Walewski with dispatches for M. Cochelet. ²⁶
12. August 14 British warship Bellerophon arrives at Alexandria. ²⁷
13. " " Mehemet Ali returns to Alexandria in the afternoon. ²⁸
14. August 16 Rifat Bey is released from quarantine, and at 8:30 a.m. had his "first audience with the Pasha." Delivers to the Pasha the viziral letter from the Turkish Ministry. This first meeting was "private, as had been arranged between Rifat Bey and the Consuls-General." Interview discouraging. ²⁹
15. " " "French manifesto arrived last night [August 16] at Constantinople." Threats by France. ³⁰
16. August 17 Official session between Rifat Bey and the Four Consuls-General with Mehemet Ali at four p.m. The Viceroy said: "I cannot accept the terms which are offered to me." He continued, "My resolution is taken . . .do not doubt it; I have decided upon resisting, and I beg of you not to make useless efforts to induce me to change my opinion, you will not succeed." ³¹

Article I of the Treaty stated that the terms of this act were to be communicated to Mehemet Ali by the Sultan, and that the "Majesties [of the Four Powers] agree to act in perfect accord, and to unite their efforts in order to determine Mehemet Ali to conform to that arrangement." ³² Article II repeated the stipulation, namely, that the terms of the Treaty were to be communicated to Mehemet Ali "by the Sultan, with the concurrence of the aforesaid Majesties." ³³

It is obvious that this stipulation by the Convention could be officially fulfilled only by the meeting together in person of all the contracting parties with Mehemet Ali. This session occurred on August 17 in the palace of the Viceroy. He ultimately submitted to the terms of the Convention, but not until after the second ten-day period, and his strongholds had been attacked and his forces repulsed with great losses. By waiting for help from France, he lost Syria and his holdings in Asia Minor. France signed the Treaty in 1841.

Thus we have the historical witness to the concluding negotiations between Turkey and the allied Christian courts of Europe at the end of the "15-day"

hour of the prophecy. The 1976^{calendar}11 days of the Turkish prophecy reached, not merely to the signing of the Treaty, but to its concluding session on August 17 with all the involved powers. After five centuries, for the first time in her history, Turkey "placed herself under the control of Christian nations." Whatever deeper meaning the prophetic symbolism may have, the historical fact remains that the 1840 treaty with Christian states prepared the way for Christian reforms to be introduced into the territory which Turkey governed.³⁴ She gave her formal assent to a civil act which was to take many years to adapt to her form of government, but it began immediately to bring some liberty to the people over whom she ruled. For this reform Mahmoud II had laid the foundation. And of this Treaty and the subsequent results prophecy takes note.

The ministers of the allied courts called the Treaty a "solemn and memorable act." In a limited space of time, the contracting legates, from different shores, had to fulfil their mission, and meet in official session before the prophetic period should pass. They came "attired in their richest costumes, and preceded and followed by a numerous cortege."³⁵ The interview between Rifat Bey, the Four Consuls-General, and Mehemet Ali occurred at four o'clock in the afternoon of August 17--the date that agrees with history, prophecy, and the calendar. The last moments of the prophecy, in Turkish sunset time, were soon spent; but the divine message had been fulfilled through the sanction of this Christian Treaty by the Turkish Ministry, in the person of Rifat Bey.

Students of prophecy may not all agree as to the meaning of some of the exacting symbols in Revelation 9. Nevertheless, here is a prophecy with convincing appeal that should interest those who do not recognize the year-day principle. The apocalyptic message concerning Turkey is unequivocally supported by history and the calendar. Its inspired record even involves three calendars--Turkish, Julian, and Gregorian. This prophecy is past. The records of its parallel history are official and complete; the parallel Turkish era is peculiarly

marked by a change in the calendar that is indisputable--a scientific correction that scholarship would not refuse to acknowledge, and may thereby be led to endorse the validity of prophetic chronology. Another century has passed over the head of Turkey. The time is full ripe to inquire anew into the meaning of God's prophecy concerning her. Turkey's former empire has dwindled into a mere state, that is no longer an Islamic theocracy, and is confined almost wholly to territory beyond the borders of Europe.

Grace Amadon April 10, 1944

- 1 Edson L. Clark, Turkey (New York, 1902), p. 149.
- 2 Alfred de Besse, The Turkish Empire: Its Historical, Statistical, and Religious Condition (Philadelphia, 1854), p. 15. Tr. from German by Morris.
- 3 Great Britain House of Commons, Sessional Papers (London, 1839), Vol. 50, p. 10. (Hoshrew Pasha was Séraskier des troupes régulières et Gouverneur-Général de Constantinople.)
- 4 Great Britain House of Commons, Affairs of the Levant (London, 1841), Vol. 29, Part II, p. 153.
- 5 Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 335. Conflict of the Ages Series.
- 6 Ref. 3, pp. 10, 11.
- 7 Clark, op. cit., p. 183.
- 8 Great Britain House of Commons, op. cit., p. 152.
- 9 Ibid.
- 10 J. Litch, Probability of the Second Coming of Christ About 1843 (Boston, 1838), p. 157.
- 11 Cf. any American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac for a table of the Julian Day Numbers. For example, year 1941, pp. 552-557.
- 12 Encyclopedia Britannica, art. "Calendar." (11th ed.)
- 13 In year 1582, J.D.N. for January 0 = 2298883 (subtract top line)
In year 1583, J.D.N. for January 0 = 2299238
Length of year = 355 days (too short by 10 days)
- 14 Great Britain House of Commons, Session 26 January --22 June (London, 1841), p. 9, Art. V; p. 12, Reserved Protocol.
- 15 Id., p. 8, Art. II.
- 16 The Times (London, 1840), August 27.
- 17 Austrian Observer cited by Morning Chronicle (London, 1840), September 1.
- 18 The Times (London, 1840), August 27.
- 19 Morning Chronicle (London, 1840), September 1.
- 20 Great Britain House of Commons, Affairs of the Levant (London, 1841), Vol. 29, Part II, p. 148.
- 21 Morning Chronicle (London, 1840), September 18; Signs of the Times (Boston, 1841), February 1, p. 162, col. 2.
- 22 The Times (London, 1840), August 27.
- 23 Great Britain House of Commons, Affairs of the Levant (London, 1841), Vol. 29, Part II, p. 115, Inclosure in No. 95.
- 24 Id., p. 143, No. 116.
- 25 The Times (London, 1840), September 5, col. 3, Editorial.
- 26 The Times (London, 1840), September 7, col. 3, Editorial.
- 27 Ibid.
- 28 Great Britain House of Commons, Affairs of the Levant (London, 1841), Vol. 29, Part II, p. 149, Inclosure 2 in No. 117.
- 29 Ibid.
- 30 The Times (London, 1840), September 8, col. 5.
- 31 Great Britain House of Commons, Affairs of the Levant (London, 1841) Vol. 29, Part II, p. 156. [1010.
- 32 Edward Hertslet, The Map of Europe by Treaty (London, 1875), Vol. II, p.
- 33 Ibid.
- 34 The reforms of Mahmoud II were regarded "as an attempt to subvert the religious and civil polity of Mahomet, and to establish the Christian system on the ruins of the ancient faith of the country."--De Besse, op. cit., p. 16.
- 35 The Times (London, 1840), September 5.

Gibbon's Date Established

In the last few years the accuracy of Gibbon's date, July 27, 1299, has been questioned. Consequently, it would seem best to give supporting evidence.

Von Hammer, the Turkish historian, has been quoted against Gibbon's date, asserting that it should be 1301. To some it has seemed that Von Hammer is the better authority. But to what do the historic sources of this period testify as to the date? It seems that the reliable Greek records would be more consistent than the Turkish, for the Turks were only barbarians at the close of the thirteenth century. Pachymeres was a church and state historian, born at Nicaea, in the vicinity of the Ottoman invasion; and he wrote his history during this very period. He concluded his work about 1307, so he was a contemporary of Othman.

Possinus worked out a complete chronology of Pachymeres' history, giving the dates for the eclipses of the moon and sun, as well as other events, recorded by Pachymeres in his work. It would seem that the accuracy of this chronologist, of 1669, would be beyond question. Concerning this date he says:

"Now it is our task to give the exact and fundamental epoch of the Ottoman Empire. This we shall try to effect by a thorough-going comparison of the dates given by Arab chronologists and the testimony of our Pachymeres. This last-mentioned author reports in the fourth book of this second part, chapter 25, that Atman (Greek name for Osman) grew strong by taking the command over a very strong band of bold and energetic warriors from Paphlagonia. When Muzalo, the Roman army commander, attempted to block his progress, he defeated him in a battle near Nicomedia, the capital of Bithynia. This city the Lord of the battlefield henceforth kept as it were besieged. Now, Pachymeres is very explicit in stating that these events took place in the immediate vicinity of Bapheum, not far from Nicomedia, on the 27th day of July. The year, we asseverate (affirm) in our synopsis, comparing carefully the events, to have been the year of our Lord 1299."--"Observationum Pachymerianarum," Book III (Chronology), chap. VIII, sec. V, translation made at the Library of Congress.

The synopsis to which Possinus refers, gives the date of the uniting of these Paphlagonians with Othman's forces, which took place on July 27, as 1299 of the Christian era, fifth year of Pope Boniface VIII, and the sixth year of Michael Palaeologus. The statement is as follows:

"Atman (Othman), the satrap of the Persians, called also Ottomanes, the founder of the still reigning dynasty of the Turks, grew strong by joining to himself a great number of fierce bandits from Paphlagonia."--Id., book 4, chap. 25.

The Paphlagonians under the sons of Amurius joined Othman in this attack of July 27, so that Possinus gives the date for this event twice as 1299.

Von Hammer, in his evidence for 1301, misquotes Possinus in a cross reference.

Statement by Georgius Phrantzes with reference to the validity of the election of Constantine Palaeologus --
 Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, Georgius Phrantzes, Bonn edition, 1838. LC = DF503.C8 (marked "Manasses" on back of volume).

	Anno Mundi.				
Amurath the "amera"				p. 118	
John Palaeologus dies	6957	Oct. 31		p. 203	
Legate to Amurath the amera	6957	Dec. 6		p. 205	"quae ille rata habuit meque honoribus et donis ornatum dimittit" [which things he held valid, and sent me (Phrantzes) away adorned with honors and gifts].
Mahomet rules	6958	indiction 14		p. 92	
Siege begins	6960	Mar. 26		p. 233	
City taken	6961	May 29		p. 238	

	Computation (Julian time)								
	Anno Mundi		=	Full Years	m d	=	Full Years	m d	
City taken	6961	May 29	=	6960	4 29	=	1452	4 29	(1453, May 29)
Legate to the amera	6957	Dec 6	=	6956	11 6		3 5	23	
				<hr/>			<hr/>		
			Difference =	3	5 23		1448	11 6	=
							1449, Dec. 6 (Julian)		

Grace Amador, April 25, 1943

the proclaiming that the "mystery of God should be finished." Well, there is one thing true about it,—it will be finished before the Lord comes to gather his elect, or the Revelator would not have stopped to notify us of the fact while he was giving a history of the events which were to transpire under the sounding of the sixth angel, and finishing the second wo. He says "In the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished," Rev. x: 7; not when he has finished his sounding, or has sounded. The first six angels sounded before the events were noticed; not so the seventh. They all alike went forth prepared to sound: see 6th v. Men were the instruments of fulfilling the prophecy in this first six; and so it appears to me they will the seventh. No other instrumentalities are here presented. Before the Lord shall come, the proclamation will be made by some that are looking for him, that the "mystery of God should be finished," for days, certain, but if we are right in symbolizing time for the fifth and sixth trumpets, in the ninth chapter, and the little book and two witnesses, in the 11th chapter, how shall we make these days of his sounding, literal days of twenty-four hours?

I feel very anxious for our brethren to examine and explain this part of the subject. It appears to me that here is the latitude for the advent believers to measure their distances, to determine their longitude on the sea of prophecy. Gabriel told Daniel the wise should understand what was sworn to by him who was above the waters of the river. Dan. xii. I for one, believe it as much as I do the other parts of the vision. Also, when the seventh angel has sounded, the great voices in heaven, saying, "The kingdoms of this world," &c., will be made by the wise virgins. Who else will be ready or prepared to read the heavens with this cry? Not the nominal church! surely not. The angry nations? No, they will be quite differently engaged.—May the Lord help us to obtain our true position on this stormy sea, and again spread all our sails for the gale that shall waft us into the harbor of glory.

Yours, longing and waiting for our coming King.
JOSEPH BATES.

Utica, N. Y., Dec. 4, 1844.

This is a trying time—the wheat must be first gathered in the barn, after the tares are bound in bundles, and then it must be thrashed before it is fit for the garner of the Lord; and I think we have been thrashed by the tongue, the pulpit, nominal churches and rabble of the world, and now the Lord is fanning out the chaff from the wheat. Now the separation is made; those that run well for a season, and for fear the Lord would come, but not because they loved his appearing, now turn back and are not fit for the kingdom. We see it here.—We have been but few in number; but at the last cry, some started anew, but now have gone, I fear, forever, for I do not know what could arouse them again; for if they sin wilfully, after they have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin. O may the Lord bless you, Br. Marsh, and keep you, and all the wheat that shall be left after the fanning and sifting is over. A few may be found here, that will stand before the Son of Man.

C. SWARTWOUT.

LETTER FROM J. B. COOK.

CLEVELAND, Dec. 3, 1844.

Dear Bro. Marsh: Your "Voice of Truth" is to us a very welcome voice. Allow me to swell its voice by a few paragraphs. We are here, as strong in "the faith" as ever; yea, our confidence in our covenant keeping God has been confirmed by our recent experiences. I, and many others in this region, have been drawn out farther from the world and into more sweet and heavenly communion with our blessed Lord. Glory to God!

Our position is expressed by the importunate borrower's knocking at the door of his friend. Luke 11: 6-8. Our prayer is "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done in earth as it is done in heaven." We desire to be of "the elect," who "cry day and night unto him," that he may come speedily in his kingdom. Luke 17: 20 to 28: 8. We would speedily "thrust in thy sickle and reap, for the harvest of the earth is ripe." Rev. 14: 15. With hearts burn-

ing within us, we say in reply to the Redeemer's promised return, "Amen, even so come, Lord Jesus. God's promises are positive, yet it is as positively said, "I will yet for this be inquired of by the house of Israel to do it for them." Daniel's prayer in relation to the return from Babylon, Dan. 9, will explain the nature, as well as the need of prayer. Daniel's Lord, our Lord, furnishes an higher example. Father, the hour is come, glorify thy Son, that thy Son may also glorify thee.

Now shall the prophet pray at the close of the predicted period—shall the Son of God pray for the purpose of event when "the hour" had come? and shall we, can we, be excused from like prayerfulness as the grand prophetic periods in harmony are expiring? Ought we not to be roused to pray with intense emotion as the stupendous events of judgment are impending? Every breath should be prayer; at each pulsation of the heart, we should cry, "thy kingdom come." Amen!

We know that the kingdom is to come, when Jesus appears to judgment. 2 Tim. 4: 1. When the Pharisees asked, "when the kingdom of God should come," our Lord answered by telling them of his coming. Luke 17: 20-30. Therefore we pray that Jesus may come, whenever we pray, understandingly, the Lord's prayer. We virtually say, "Thrust in thy sickle." The hour having come, we can mean nothing less than the language expresses. Our desire is to see Jesus. We look for the Savior from heaven. We love his appearing. "Amen, even so come, Lord Jesus."

O Lord, hear,—O Lord, forgive, O Lord, harken and do, defer not, for thine own sake. O my God, thy people are called by thy name. In the grave, none praise thee. David "is both dead and buried;" he hath not gone up. Thus the word is defined, Acts 2: 29-34. Abel, Abraham, prophets and pious men of old, died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them "afar off." How far! Some would not accept deliverance that they might receive a better resurrection. This was the hope of the fathers: Acts 26-27—The hope of Israel. Acts 28: 20. Ezek. 11: 12.

For this hope we long, we groan, we weep, we pray, saying, "how long, O Lord, how long!"
Yours in the hope,
J. B. COOK.

LETTER FROM E. C. CLEMONS.

WORCESTER, Nov. 27, 1844.

DEAR BRO. MARSH,—Although Israel is not yet "redeemed" we cannot distrust the Lord. We know that He will "perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and remember his holy covenant."—While we acknowledge our fallibility we do not "cast away our confidence, which hath great recompense of reward." For we have need of patience, that after we have done the will of God we might receive the promise. For yet a little while and he that shall come will come and will not tarry. Now (at this time) the just shall live by faith: but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him." As we are led in a measure to relinquish "times and seasons" for the Lord to come, we are admonished that we must watch lest he come on us as a thief. The signs, or indications of his approach have been given, whereby we know that "he is at the door"—momentarily to be expected, and we are exhorted to "lift up the head, for our redemption draweth nigh." "The afflicted and poor people that trust in the name of the Lord" are to be gloriously delivered. Therefore it is written, Sing O daughter of Zion: shout, O Israel: be glad and rejoice with all the heart, O daughter of Jerusalem. The Lord thy God in the midst of thee is mighty: he will save thee, he will rejoice over thee with joy." Then comes the promise, I will gather them that are sorrowful for the solemn assembly who are of thee in whom the reproach of it was a burden. Zeph. 1: 12. As it is written, "for a little moment have I forsaken thee, but in great mercies will I gather thee." Respecting time it seems to me that we are brought to that point in the parable of the Ten Virgins which immediately precedes the foolish asking of the wise. In the parable of the importunate widow, we have arrived at the point just preceding the coming of the adulteress—where such decisions, although the avenging is to be done speedily when the elect cry night and day.

Now the Lord is verifying his promise, "I will feed the flock of slaughter, even you, O poor of the flock." Now he is saying by Peter, the end of all things is at hand: be ye therefore sober and watch unto prayer. Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, &c. Again he says by John, and now little children abide in him: that when he shall appear ye may have confidence and not be ashamed before him at his coming." Now the Lord speaks to us by James, Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord—grudge not one against another, brethren, lest ye be condemned: behold the Judge standeth before the door. Again by Paul the words of the Lord are that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. Finally, my brethren be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armor of God. Eph. 6: 10-18. 1 Thess. 5: 1-8.

Aside from the prophetic periods, the prophet give no light respecting the position we occupy in the stream of time. We read, when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished. Dan. 12: 7. What things? Manifestly the "wonders" mentioned in the preceding verses—the standing up of Michael (coming of Christ) and the resurrection. We see a great scattering of the power of the holy people—they have comparatively little influence with the impenitent—the world at large—their work seems to be confined to the household of faith.—Again our position is in the toes of the image, which symbolizes the dominions of time described in Dan. 2: In Dan. 7: we read that the horn which is the symbol of the Papal power speaks great words even till the beast was slain and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame. The "great words" are sounding—we are in the toes of the image whereby we know that "sudden destruction" is nigh—whereby we know that Anti-Christ is speedily to be destroyed by the brightness of the Lord's coming.

In Zech. 11: 9-11 we have given the breaking of God's covenant with all "the people." This seems to be the finishing of the mystery of God in the days of the voice of the seventh angel when he shall begin to sound. Rev. 10: 7, parallel with the scattering of the power of the holy people.

Ezekiel 12: 22-28. When as now could the proverb be used in the land of Israel, "the days are prolonged and every vision faileth? Never. Now then is the time to which it applies. "Tell them therefore thus saith the Lord God I will make this proverb to cease, and they shall no more use it as a proverb in Israel, but say unto them *The days are at hand and the effect of every vision.* For I am the Lord: I will speak and the word that I shall speak shall come to pass, it shall be no more prolonged." See Isa. 14: 24-27; 59: 10, 11, in connexion with Is. 5: 7, 8. This then is the patience time. The husbandman, the Lord, waiteth, having "long patience." The sower, Math. 13, hath sowed, it appears, the last seed in his field, i. e. *words of the kingdom in the world*—and now he is waiting for the ripening of the "precious fruit of the earth," his sealed ones who are made perfect in patience.

E. C. CLEMONS.

LETTERS RECEIVED TO NO. 13.

POST-MASTERS			
Sanford's Corners, N. Y.	\$2 00	E. R. Pinney, Canan-	\$1 00
Vergennes, Vt.	1 00	daigua, N. Y.	
Maysville, O.	1 00	C. C. Simonds, Le Roy, N. Y.	
Danville, N. Y.	1 00	J. Foreman, Oakville,	
Attica, ..	1 00	C. W.	2 00
Ellington, ..	1 00	E. Edson, Fort Gibson, N. Y.	
Adams, Mass.	1 00	C. Swartwout, Utica, ..	2 00
Governville, N. Y.	1 00	J. B. Cook, Cleveland, O.	
Griffin's Mills, ..		J. Bates, Fairhaven,	6 00
St. Louis Center, ..	0 25	Mass.	
Little Falls, ..	1 50	H. Edson, Newark, N. Y.	1 00
Climax, Mich.	1 00	D. D. Pickands, Cleve-	
Sherburn, Vt.	0 50	land, O.	
Royalton, N. Y.	1 00	T. Johnson, Toronto, C. W.	
Walpole, N. H.	1 00	J. P. Colburn, ..	4 00
Canby Creek, N. Y.	3 80	A. R. Brown, Exeter, N. H.,	
Milwaukee, Wis. T.	1 00	in full for books on ac-	
Stratford Springs, N. Y.	3 00	count of the Christian	
Northbridge, Mass.	1 00	General Book Associa-	
Springfield, ..	3 00	tion	31 00
INDIVIDUALS.		G. W. Peasey, Saratoga	
B. Morley, Buffalo, N. Y.		Spring, N. Y.	
		S. W. Dye, Root, N. Y.	1 00



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

Warning Concerning Copyright Restrictions

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

The Center for Adventist Research

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

Disclaimer on Physical Condition

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

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

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

Disclaimer on Document Items

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